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Abstract
For languages like Greek, where `affixal' reflexives share their verbal morphology with passives, unaccusatives, middles, and experiencer verbs, a long-standing intuition holds that these reflexives are unaccusative. I provide novel evidence supporting this generalization, showing that the single overt argument in Greek reflexives is a) a deep object and b) the only argument in the structure. I argue that the morphosyntax of reflexives, their interpretive properties, and restrictions on reflexivization all follow from the fact that reflexivity is tied to the agent-introducing head Voice in Greek.
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1 Introduction

Reflexivity as ‘intransitivization’, exemplified in (1), raises at least two important argument-structural questions. The first concerns the syntactic status of the sole overt argument nominal, John in (1); the second concerns how reflexivity arises, that is, what factor guarantees that (1) yields the entailment that John shaved John. In this paper, I approach these questions through the lens of Modern Greek, a language where argument structure alternations stand in a particular relation to verbal morphology.

(1) John shaved.  

Greek marks active/passive alternations on the verb form:1,2

(2) a. I the linguist. PL NOM  

the.PL.NOM linguist.PL.NOM √DEVELOP PFV.ACT 3PL strange.PL.ACC theories.  

theory.PL.ACC  

‘The linguists developed strange theories.’

b. I the theories anaptix- θ- ik- an apo χλωσολογούς.  

the.PL.NOM theory.PL.NOM √DEVELOP PFV.NACT PST.NACT 3PL from linguist.PL  

‘The theories were developed by linguists.’

It is well-known that the Greek nonactive does not just realize passives, as in (2b), but also a range of distinct argument-structural configurations that share ‘passive-like’ properties, such as (many) unaccusatives (3) (see Alexiadou et al. 2015, ch. 3), dispositional middles (4) (Lekakou, 2005), and experiencer verbs (5) (Zombolou and Alexiadou, 2014). This pattern of Voice syncretism, common cross-linguistically (see Haspelmath 1990), seems to target a natural class, namely, those constructions that plausibly lack a thematic subject (Marantz, 1984; Lidz, 1996; Embick, 1998, 2004).

(3) Ta the plant. PL NOM  

the.PL.NOM plant.PL.NOM √DEVELOP PFV.NACT PST.NACT 3PL from alone.PL their  

‘The plants grew on their own.’ (unaccusative)

(4) Afto to book.  

this.NOM the.NOM book.NOM √READ- 3SG.NACT easily  

‘The book reads easily.’ (dispositional middle)

(5) O John detests bugs.  

the.NOM John.NOM √DESPIZE 3SG.NACT the.PL.ACC bug.PL.ACC  

‘John detests bugs.’ experiencer verb

Much work on Greek takes this type of Voice syncretism to arise from a realizational morphology capable of referencing the syntactic properties of the agent-introducing head, Voice (Kratzer, 1996); one such implementation is the PF rule in (6), which assigns to any Voice head lacking a specifier
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the diacritic feature NACT. I take this rule as a working understanding of Greek-type syncretism.\(^3\)

\[(6) \text{Voice} \rightarrow \text{Voice}_{\text{NACT}} / \text{No DP specifier} \]

(Embick 1998, 2004; Alexiadou et al. 2015; but see Angelopoulos et al. 2020)

Interestingly, in Greek, reflexives and reciprocals also participate in Voice syncretism; inherent reflexives and reciprocals (Kemmer, 1993; Geniušienė, 1987) systematically surface in the nonactive (7)-(8), as do reflexives formed with the reflexivizer afto- (9) and reciprocals formed with the reciprocalizer alilo- (10).

\[(7) \text{I}\_ \text{NOM}\_ \text{Mar}\_ \text{NOM} \text{pli-} \_ \text{θ-} \_ \text{ik-} \_ \text{e}.
\text{the.NOM} \text{Mary.NOM} \sqrt{\text{WASH}} \text{PFV.NACT PST.NACT} 3\text{SG}
\text{‘Mary washed.’} \hspace{1cm} (\text{inherent reflexive})
\]

\[(8) \text{I}\_ \text{NOM}\_ \text{Mar}\_ \text{NOM} \text{ke} \_ \text{o} \_ \text{Jan}\_ \text{NOM} \text{angali\text{a}ς-} \_ \text{θ-} \_ \text{ik-} \_ \text{an}.
\text{the.NOM} \text{Mary.NOM} \text{and.the.NOM} \text{John.NOM} \sqrt{\text{HUG}} \text{PFV.NACT PST.NACT} 3\text{PL}
\text{‘Mary and John hugged.’} \hspace{1cm} (\text{inherent reciprocal})
\]

\[(9) \text{Ο}\_ \text{Jan}\_ \text{NOM} \text{afto} \_ \text{διαφιμις-} \_ \text{θ-} \_ \text{ik-} \_ \text{e}.
\text{the.NOM} \text{John.NOM} \text{self} \sqrt{\text{ADVERTISE}} \text{PFV.NACT PST.NACT} 3\text{SG}
\text{‘John advertised himself.’} \hspace{1cm} (\text{derived reflexive})
\]

\[(10) \text{I}\_ \text{NOM}\_ \text{Mar}\_ \text{NOM} \text{ke} \_ \text{o} \_ \text{Jan}\_ \text{NOM} \text{alilo-} \_ \text{ipostirix-} \_ \text{θ-} \_ \text{ik-} \_ \text{an}.
\text{the.NOM} \text{Mary.NOM} \text{and.the.NOM} \text{John.NOM} \text{each.other} \sqrt{\text{SUPPORT}} \text{PFV.NACT PST.NACT} 3\text{PL}
\text{‘Mary and John supported each other.’} \hspace{1cm} (\text{derived reciprocal})
\]

It is not merely the case that reflexives and reciprocals can occur with nonactive morphology; rather, they must do so. Hence, the counterparts of (7) and (8) with active morphology lack a reflexive reading, while derived reflexives and reciprocals with active morphology are altogether ungrammatical.

From the perspective of (6), the participation of reflexives in Voice syncretism is surprising. Unlike the other verb classes participating in the syncretism, reflexives do involve a DP argument that, at some level of representation, bears the Agent role. A puzzle thus arises: why does the morphology group reflexives, a seemingly agentive class of structures, together with passives, unaccusatives, middles and experiencers?

In this paper, I use a range of diagnostics to lend support to the intuition that Greek reflexives pattern with passive-like structures morphologically because, like these structures, they have the syntax that satisfies (6); that is, they are true intransitives whose sole argument is a deep object. Though long-standing (Embick 1998, 2004; Zombolou 2004; Alexiadou 2014; Spathas et al. 2015; Rivero 1992; cf. Tsimpli 1989), this intuition has eluded detailed study. Under the analysis that results, reflexivity and nonactive morphology go hand in hand because reflexivization is a Voice phenomenon: in Greek(-type) languages, reflexivizers head a passive-like Voice_{\text{REFLEXIVE}}P (Ahn 2015; Labelle 2008; cf. Spathas et al. 2015).

### 2 Diagnosing Unaccusative syntax

A crucial goal of the theory of verbal reflexives for languages such as Greek, where the sole argument of these verbs behaves for all intents and purposes as a surface subject, is to specify how this sole overt argument is linked to two thematic roles. The following broad options present themselves:

\(^3\) (6) is left purposefully abstract, generalizing over several competing more concrete implementations that I lack the space to compare here. In particular, the adoption of structure-building [D] features on Voice in recent work (notably Alexiadou et al., 2015) makes it possible in principle to use such features as the target (or context) for (6). This move would amount to some extent to a return to the understanding of Voice syncretism in Marantz (1984), where the ‘nonactive’ feature is causal (forcing the creation of a particular structure), rather than reflective (assigned in a particular structural configuration). I lack the space to compare the two approaches here; see Paparounas (forthcoming) for some discussion.
(11) *Unergative* 

\[
\text{VoiceP} \\
\text{DP} \\
\text{Voice} \rightarrow \text{vP} \\
\sqrt{\text{ROOT}} 
\]

(12) *Transitive type A* 

\[
\text{VoiceP} \\
\text{DP} \\
\text{Voice} \rightarrow \text{vP} \\
\text{afto} \rightarrow \text{vP} \\
\sqrt{\text{ROOT}} 
\]

(13) *Unaccusative* 

\[
\text{(VoiceP)} \\
\text{DP} \\
\text{(Voice)} \\
\text{vP} \\
\sqrt{\text{ROOT}} 
\]

(14) *Transitive type B* 

\[
\text{VoiceP} \\
\text{DP} \\
\text{Voice} \rightarrow \text{vP} \\
\text{afto} \rightarrow \text{vP} \\
\sqrt{\text{ROOT}} 
\]

(11) illustrates an unergative structure whereby the single argument of a reflexive verb is a deep subject (Bruening, 2006; Reinhart and Siloni, 2004; Jo, 2019; Labelle, 2008; Reinhart and Siloni, 2005), including Greek (Papangeli, 2004; Tsimili, 1989). The mirror-image of such an analysis is the unaccusative structure (13), defended widely for Romance (Marantz 1984; Kayne 1988; Pesetsky 1995, a.m.o.), and for Greek (Embick 2004; Spathas et al. 2015; Alexiadou et al. 2014; cf. Alexiadou and Schäfer 2013, where only a tentative conclusion is drawn).

Within the unaccusative camp, the presence of nonactive morphology is often given as the main argument for an unaccusative analysis, without additional syntactic tests (Embick, 2004; Spathas et al., 2015; Alexiadou, 2014); a notable exception is Alexiadou and Schäfer (2013) for Greek natural reflexives, where the diagnostics used are however admitted to be problematic. Within the unergative camp, syntactic tests either are either not deployed in the first place (Papangeli 2004, 59 for NRVs), or can be shown to be unreliable (Tsimili, 1989). 4

There exist at least two more structures to consider, schematized in (12) and (14). Both analyses treat reflexives as ‘secret transitives’, whereby what appears to be a reflexivizing morpheme is in fact an argument coindexed with the overt argument DP, originating either as a deep object (12) or a deep subject (14). (14) is in fact the structure sometimes labeled the unaccusative analysis, in that the relevant works often take the internal argument DP to undergo movement to bind the external argument reflexive, which has cliticized onto the verb (e.g. Marantz, 1984; Kayne, 1988).

In what follows, I begin by showing that Greek *afto*- reflexives behave as true intransitives, ruling out (12) and (14); I then demonstrate that the single argument DP patterns with internal arguments in the language, thus favoring (13).

2.1 Intransitivity

The reflexivizer *afto*- behaves unlike the reflexive pronoun *o eafos mu* in several crucial respects. 5

---

4 Tsimili (1989) argues that the unergative analysis is evidenced by (a) the agentive semantics of the subject of reflexives and (b) the ability of these subjects to control into purpose clauses. The former is a non-argument, since it is not clear *a priori* that competing analyses cannot assign agentive semantics to the single argument of reflexives; the latter diagnostic is not sensitive to the difference between deep and surface subjecthood (or indeed to syntactic projection of the relevant argument; see Biggs and Embick 2020, 28-29 for brief recent discussion and references).

5 I focus on *afto*- here, but the facts and analysis here onwards extend to *alilo*- reciprocals and, with certain questions about Root meaning, to inherent reflexives.
A first contrast comes from proxy readings (Jackendoff, 1992; Fauconnier, 1985; Lidz, 2001). It has been observed that reflexive pronouns, but not verbal reflexives, can refer not just to their antecedent proper, but also to a contextually salient metonymic proxy for the antecedent; as such, the argument reflexive in (15a) can pick out Ringo’s statue, and the inherent reflexive in (15b) cannot. Here and throughout, Greek inherent reflexives pattern together with their English counterparts in the translations.

(15) Ringo Starr dislikes the beard on the statue depicting him. Armed with a razor...
   a. O Ringo arçise na ksiriz- i ton eaf fo tu.
       the.NOM Ringo.NOM begin.PST.3SG COMP √SHAVE 3SG.ACT the.ACC self.ACC his
       ‘Ringo started shaving himself.’
   b. #O Ringo arçise na ksiriz- ete.
       the.NOM Ringo.NOM begin.PST.3SG COMP √SHAVE 3SG.NACT
       ‘Ringo started shaving.’

Crucially, afto- verbs pattern with the natural reflexives (see also Oikonomou, 2014): in (16), the only appropriate rendering of the human-photographs-statue situation utilizes the full reflexive pronoun, and the afto- verb is infelicitous.

(16) [Pleased with his statue, Ringo decides to take a photographic souvenir.]
   a. O Ringo fotoyência s- e ton eaf fo tu.
       the.NOM Ringo.NOM √PHOTOGRAPH PFV.ACT 3SG the.ACC self.ACC his
       ‘Ringo took a picture of himself.’
   b. #O Ringo afto- fotoyência 0- e.
       the.NOM Ringo.NOM self √PHOTOGRAPH PFV.NACT PST.NACT 3SG
       ‘Ringo self-photographed.’

Different ellipses provide an additional testing ground. Consider comparative ellipsis (Zec, 1985; Sells et al., 1987; Lidz, 2001; Dimitriadis and Everaert, 2014). (17a), with a pronominal reflexive, is ambiguous between object and subject comparison readings, as shown in the translation; (17b), the inherent reflexive, lacks the ambiguity. Greek inherent reflexives behave similarly (18).

(17) a. Aftos o kureas ksiriz- i ton eaf fo tu pio
       this.NOM the.NOM barber.NOM √SHAVE 3SG.ACT the.ACC self.ACC his more
       yriyora apo  ton pelati.
       ‘This barber shaves himself faster than the client.’
       ✓ object comparison: ‘...than the barber shaves the client.’
       ✓ subject comparison: ‘...than the client shaves himself.’
   b. Aftos o kureas ksiriz- ete pio yriyora apo  ton
       this.NOM the.NOM barber.NOM √SHAVE 3SG.NACT more fast from the
       pelati.
       client.ACC
       ‘This barber shaves faster than the client.’

(18) a. Aftos o poðosferistis δiafimiz- i ton eaf fo tu
       this.NOM the.NOM footballer.NOM √ADVERTISE 3SG.ACT the.ACC self.ACC his
       perisotero apo  ton xoriyio  tu.
       more from the sponsor.ACC his
       ‘This football player advertises himself more than his sponsor.’ ✓ object ✓ subject
   b. Aftos o poðosferistis afto- δiafimiz- ete perisotero apo
       this.NOM the.NOM footballer.NOM self √ADVERTISE 3SG.NACT more from
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though I lack the space to present them here, diagnostics involving gapping, focus alternatives, the scope of reciprocals, and de re readings of reflexives reinforce the conclusions yielded by proxy readings and comparative ellipsis; see Paparounas (forthcoming).

In short, afto- behaves unlike argument anaphors with respect to a wide range of diagnostics; I propose that this divergence follows from a treatment of afto- as a verbal reflexivizer, on a par with similar morphemes in Dravidian languages (see e.g. Lidz 1996). Since afto- is not itself an argument – and barring the existence of another (null) element, which is also not evidenced – we must conclude that afto- verbs are true intransitives, involving a single argument.6

2.2 Internal Argumenthood of the Sole DP

Having ruled out the ‘hidden transitive’ analyses of reflexives, we are now left to decide between the unergative and unaccusative analyses. Though unaccusativity tests have been difficult to identify in Greek (see Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou, 1999), several established diagnostics speak in favor of the unaccusative analysis in the case of reflexives. These include complex event nominalization, agent noun formation and malefactive applicatives; I put these to the side here for reasons of space (see Paparounas (forthcoming)), and present just one novel test, involving predicative complements.

Greek is typically said to lack standard cases of resultative secondary predication (Giannakidou and Merchant, 1999); but the language does provide an analogue to resultatives, in the form of the complements of verbs like declare, appoint, and name.

(19) a. O papa anakirikse ton Karlomaiño vasilia.
the.NOM pope.NOM declare.PST.3SG the.ACC Charlemagne.ACC king.ACC
   ‘The pope declared Charlemagne king.’

   b. I prótipurýso díorise ti Maria ípurýo
the.NOM prime.minister.NOM appoint.PST.3SG the.ACC Mary.ACC minister.ACC
didéias.
education.GEN
   ‘The prime minister appointed Mary minister of education.’

In (19), the predicate agrees in case with the object; in passives (20), the predicate continues to case-match the (now promoted) object, thus showing nominative. Predicates and internal arguments always match: the examples in (19) are ungrammatical with accusative predicates, for example, as are those in (20) once changed to involve accusative predicatives.

(20) a. O Karlomaiños anakiríxthike vasilias (apo ton papa).
the.NOM Charlemagne.NOM declare.NACT.PST.3SG king.NOM from the pope
   ‘Charlemagne was declared king (by the pope).’

   b. I Maria díoristike ípurýos didéias (apo tin
the.NOM Mary.NOM appoint.NACT.PST.3SG minister.NOM education.GEN from the
prime.minister
   ‘Mary was appointed minister of education (by the prime minister).’

These predicates thus plausibly attach to the internal argument, matching the behavior of resultatives more generally (Levin and Rappaport Hovav, 1995, 34).

Crucially, predicative complements are perfectly grammatical with afto- verbs:

6It is of course possible in principle to assume, in the face of the wide-ranging differences between afto- and the reflexive pronoun proper, that afto- is an anaphor, albeit one that is defective and as such fails to pattern with other argument anaphors. The burden of proof seems to fall on the side of the debate advocating this defectiveness.
(21) a. O Karlomaynos afto-anakirixthike vasilias.
the.NOM Charlemagne.NOM self declare.NACT.PST.3SG king.NOM
Charlemagne declared himself king.

b. I Maria afto-dioristice ipuryos pebias.
the.NOM Mary.NOM self appoint.NACT.PST.3SG minister.NOM education.GEN
Mary appointed herself minister of education.

Since predicative complements require an underlying object to attach to, and afto- reflexives freely take predicative complements, then the single argument of afto- reflexives must be internal, as in the passive (20). Note that, if Charlemagne in (21a) were a deep subject, the case matching facts would be entirely unexpected (cf. Marantz, 1984, 164-165).

3 Analysis: Reflexivity on Voice

I propose to tie reflexivization directly to the domain responsible for (external) argument introduction, building on the intuition that Voice, the projection responsible for the introduction of the external argument (Kratzer, 1996, et seq.), can be the locus of reflexivization (Ahn, 2015; Labelle, 2008; Spathas et al., 2015).

(22)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{VoiceP} \\
\text{Voice}_{\text{REFL}} \\
\nuP \\
\text{DP} \\
\sqrt{\text{ROOT}}
\end{array}
\]

In particular, I propose that afto- realizes a specific type of Voice head, namely Voice_{REFLEXIVE} in (22). This head is specifierless, guaranteeing that afto- reflexives take part in Voice syncretism, by (6).

Syntactically, then, Voice_{REFLEXIVE} is effectively a passive Voice head. Semantically, it takes a predicate of events and identifies its theme role with the agent role, (23).

(23) \[ [\text{afto-}] = \lambda P_{</>}.\lambda e'.P(e') \land TH(e') = AG(e') \]

(23) amounts to an operator that identifies roles, not variables; effectively, there exists one event participant in afto- reflexives, as opposed to two participants identified via binding, as in pronominal reflexives. In Paparounas (forthcoming), I argue that this difference accounts for the wide range of divergences between intransitive and argumental anaphors, some of which were described in Section 2.1.

Tying this type of reflexivity to Voice, the agent introducer, makes one crucial prediction: afto-reflexives should be agent-oriented, since their structure inevitably implicates the introduction of an agent role at LF. This prediction is correct: as Alexiadou (2014) points out, verbs with non-canonical external arguments such as experiencer verbs (5) cannot be afto--reflexivized in Greek, as in (24a-b).\(^7\) In fact, Alexiadou points out a broader generalization regarding reflexivization in Greek: the verbs that can be ‘affixally’ reflexivized are all and only the verbs that can passivize; experiencer predicates are not among these verbs (24c).

\(^7\)As Alexiadou points out, the language’s deponent verbs, which, like experiencer verbs, normally do not passivize, also cannot be reflexivized; if deponents also lack canonical external arguments (thereby systematically surfacing with nonactive morphology; Zambolou and Alexiadou 2014; Grestenberger 2018), they are correctly predicted not to be reflexivizable. Interestingly, some speakers do seem to allow deponents to be passivized (Alexandros Kalomoiros, p.c.), and the same speakers also tolerate deponent reflexivization. This
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(24) a. O Janis apexθan- ete ton eafto tu. the.NOM John.NOM √DESPISE 3SG.NACT the.ACC self.ACC his
‘John despises himself.’

b. *O Janis afto- apexθan- ete. the.NOM John.NOM self √DESPISE 3SG.NACT

c. *O Janis apexθan- ete apo polus. the.NOM John.NOM √DESPISE 3SG.NACT from many
‘John is despised by many.’

That ‘affixal’ reflexivization operates only on true-agent-taking verbs is a recurring pattern cross-linguistically (see Reuland 2018); in theories with reflexivization in the lexicon (Reinhart and Siloni, 2004, 2005), this restriction has been stated as a stipulation on the operation that ‘bundles’ together thematic roles, which is taken to apply specifically to agents and themes. Compared to the constructivist Voice-based approach advocated here, the lexical theory arguably misses the clear connection discussed above between reflexivization and passivization: while the restriction on the bundling operation guarantees that the relevant verbs will not undergo reflexivization, nothing in a system with lexical bundling guarantees that the same verbs normally cannot be passivized; and moreover, that only speakers who are able to passivize the relevant verbs can also reflexivize them (see footnote 7).

4 Reflexivity, not Anti-assistivity

Before concluding, I briefly defend the view of afto- as a reflexivizer advanced in (23). In tension with this view, Alexiadou (2014) and Spathas et al. (2015) propose that Voice-level afto- is in fact an anti-assistive modifier, equivalent to herself in Mary built the house herself; on this analysis, the combination of anti-assistivity with a passive yields a reflexive denotation, without the need for a dedicated reflexivizer (call this view emergent reflexivity, and cf. Wood 2014; Kastner 2017).

There are a few reasons not to adopt this view for Greek. Firstly, under the analysis in Spathas et al. (2015), the obligatory co-occurrence of afto- with nonactive morphology must be stipulated. Recall that afto- is systematically ungrammatical with active morphology; this was mentioned in Section 1, and is exemplified in (25). All things being equal, an anti-assistive afto- should make this example grammatical on the reading ‘Mary advertised herself/John without help’

(25)*I Maria afto- katiyori- s- e (ton eafto tis / ton Jani). the.Mary:NOM self- √ACCUSE PFV.ACT 3SG the.ACC self.ACC her the.ACC John:ACC
‘Mary self-accusedACTIVE herself/John.’

Spathas et al. (2015, 1334) ‘attribute the ungrammaticality of [(25)] to brute-force c-selection; afto-c-selects for an unsaturated projection of...Voice’. Though it is perfectly possible to stipulate the connection between afto- and nonactive, this move misses the connection between afto- and the rest of the Greek voice system (afto- verbs are just one of a few classes participating in Voice syncretism, all sharing the same structural property, (6)). Importantly, as Spathas et al. (2015) point out, the language does have a free anti-assistive modifier, which, however, freely occurs in the active:

(26) I Maria katiyori- s- e to Yani moni tis. the.NOM Mary:NOM √ACCUSE ACT 3SG the.ACC John:ACC alone:NOM her
‘Mary accused John herself’

Secondly, the anti-assistive analysis of afto- fails to predict its complementarity with inherent reflexivies: on the anti-assistive analysis, (27) should be fully acceptable on the meaning ‘Mary washed without help’. Such examples are decidedly felicitous without contrastive focus, suggesting that afto- and ‘Root-level’ reflexivity are contributing the same entailments, a fact that does not follow if afto- is unrelated to reflexivity. Once again, the bona fide anti-assistive behaves differently (28).

pattern would go unaccounted for if deponents were true transitives, and thus counterexamples to the analysis of Voice syncretism in (6), as they are taken to be in Angelopoulos et al. (2020).
Thirdly, if *afto-* asserted the lack of delegation of assistance, it should produce a contradiction when combined with elements that overtly denote delegation or assistance. This is true of the *bona fide* Greek anti-assistive modifier:

(29) #Me ti voiðia tis Marias, o Janis dieynos-e ton eafto tu
with the help the.GEN Mary.GEN the John.NOM √DIAGNOSE 3SG the self.ACC his
alone his
‘With Mary’s help, John diagnosed himself.’

The same prediction, however, is not borne out for *afto-*, which is fully compatible with assistive PPs.

(30) [John, a doctor, has been suffering from an unknown disease. He and his colleague Mary come up with the diagnosis.]

Me ti voiðia tis Marias, o Janis afto- diaynos-θ- ik- e.
with the help the.GEN Mary.GEN the John √DIAGNOSE NACT PST 3SG
‘With Mary’s help, John diagnosed himself’.

Finally, recall from section 1 that *afto-* has a reciprocal counterpart *alilo-* with an identical distribution. *alilo-* is even less amenable to an anti-assistive semantics than *afto-* (and it is not clear that such a semantics could yield emergent reciprocity); more broadly, the identical distribution of the two elements suggests clarifies that the phenomenon at hand picks out anaphoric elements, a generalization that would go missing if *afto-* were not anaphoric.

5 Conclusion

The observations and analysis presented here, although focussed on Greek, bear on two broad issues in the area of reflexivity and its links to thematic interpretation more generally.

Firstly, the divergences between ‘affixal’ and pronominal reflexives, presented here in abridged form and in much more detail in Paparounas (forthcoming), suggest that the two reflexivization ‘strategies’ should not be assimilated to each other. As such, analyses that treat reflexivization as arity reduction following Bach and Partee (1980) are appropriate, albeit for a proper subset of cases, as are analyses asserting that arity reduction cannot account for all instances of reflexivization (most recently Sportiche 2022). What seems inadmissible is a reduction of both intransitive and pronominal reflexives to a common core, as in Reinhart and Reuland (1993) (cf. Lidz 2001).

Secondly, if the analysis proposed here is correct, then a single syntactic entity can be linked to two thematic positions; in the case of interest here, the syntactic structure seems to furnish just one (internal) argument, but the interpretation is reflexive, suggesting this argument is linked to two ‘thematic roles’. This conclusion is in sharp tension with theories positing a strong link between syntactic position and thematic interpretation, notably the Theta Criterion (Chomsky, 1981) and the UTAH (Baker, 1988), under which all instances of reflexivity must necessarily involve two distinct elements, one of which is anaphoric to the other; see also Raghotham (2022). In place of such theories, the analysis has been framed in terms of a view of thematic roles as functions contributed at LF by functional heads and dissociated from syntactic argument introduction (Myler, 2016; Wood,

---

8This observation, and the observation on the lack of reflexivization of active predicates, are also made in Sportiche (2022) in considering a Spathas et al. (2015)-style approach to French *auto-* and English *self-*. 
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