

## Complex Reflexives & the Principle A Problem

The English data in (1) illustrate that anaphors are sensitive to Principle A, Chomsky (1981). It is debatable whether Principle A should be expected to apply to the examples in (2). One could argue that in (2), *his pathetic self* is a noun phrase where *self* is a noun, therefore subject to Condition C; whereas in (1), *himself* is an anaphor and thus sensitive to Principle A.

- (1) a. John saw **himself** (in the mirror) *Sensitive to Principle A*  
 b. \* John knows that Maria saw **himself** (on the reality show)
- (2) a. John saw **his pathetic self** (in the mirror) *Not sensitive to Principle A*  
 b. John knows that Maria saw **his pathetic self** (on the reality show)

In Greek and Kutchi Gujarati it is not immediately obvious that *self* is lexically ambiguous in the above sense. Both the unmodified *self* and the modified *self* forms look identical apart from the presence or absence of the adjective, shown in (3) and (4). Thus, it seems appealing to assume simply one, non-lexically ambiguous *self* (at least for Greek and Kutchi Gujarati).

- (3) a. O Costas<sub>i</sub> vlepi [ton eaftos<sub>i</sub> tu] *Greek*  
 Costas<sub>i</sub> sees det self<sub>i</sub>.m.sg 3.m.sg  
 “Costas<sub>i</sub> sees himself<sub>i</sub>”
- b. \*O Costas<sub>i</sub> xeri oti Maria vlepi [ton eaftos<sub>i</sub> tu ]  
 Costas<sub>i</sub> knows that Maria sees det self.m.sg 3.m.sg  
 “Costas<sub>i</sub> knows that Maria sees himself<sub>i</sub>”
- c. [I mitera tu Janni<sub>i</sub>] agapai [ton alithino eaftos<sub>i</sub> tu]  
 3.f.sg.nom mother Janni<sub>i</sub>.gen loves 3.m.sg.acc true self<sub>i</sub> 3.m.sg.gen  
 “Jannis<sub>i</sub>’s mother loves his true self<sub>i</sub>”
- (4) a. John<sub>i</sub> [e-na potha<sub>i</sub>-ne] joyo *Kutchi Gujarati*  
 John<sub>i</sub> 3.sg.gen self<sub>i</sub>-acc see.pfv.m.sg  
 “John<sub>i</sub> saw himself<sub>i</sub>”
- b. \*John<sub>i</sub> kidthu ke Maria [e-na potha<sub>i</sub>-ne] joyo  
 John<sub>i</sub> said that Maria 3.sg-gen self<sub>i</sub>-acc see.pfv.m.sg  
 “John<sub>i</sub> said that Maria saw himself<sub>i</sub>”
- c. Valji<sub>i</sub>-ni ma [e-na sacho potha<sub>i</sub>-ne] prem kare  
 Valji<sub>i</sub>-gen mother 3.sg-gen true self<sub>i</sub>-acc love do  
 “Valji<sub>i</sub>’s mother loves his true self<sub>i</sub>”

I argue that the meaning of *self* in these languages cannot be identity (i.e. conveying that the subject and object are identical), and propose a less conservative meaning, equivalent to a *part of* relation (i.e. the object is a part of the subject). I follow Anagnostopoulou and Everaert (1999) who claim (for Greek), that the anaphor (when unmodified) obligatorily incorporates into the matrix verb, giving rise to Principle A effects. The proposed syntactic and semantic analysis ultimately reduces Principle A to locality: *self*-incorporation of unmodified *self* yields a symmetric relation triggering Principle A effects; *self*-incorporation of modified *self* is blocked (by independent syntactic constraints), resulting in the absence of Principle A effects. This is the correct, and desired result.