

6.1 Introduction

Many languages ban nominative/subject anaphors. This chapter deals with several possible explanations for this fact. Sections 6.2 and 6.3 discuss, respectively, the Anaphor Agreement Principle of [Riz90] and its modified version by [Woo99], which is claimed to account for the lack of subject anaphors, supplementing the Binding Theory [Cho81]. Section 6.4 shows that Georgian anaphors represent a counter-example for both versions of the Anaphor Agreement Principle. Section 6.5 refers to an alternative explanation within the Reflexivity Theory of [RR93] offered in [AE99]. Section 6.6 argues that the Reflexivity theoretic explanation in [AE99] for the Greek subject anaphors cannot be adopted for Georgian, as was previously suggested in [Eve01, Eve03]. For [Eve01, Eve03] following [AE99], it is the internal structure of the anaphor in a given language that allows such a language to have subject anaphors. Section 6.6 offers data illustrating subject uses of reflexives in Georgian which cannot be explained by the internal structure of anaphors and the related anaphoric properties alone, contrary to what is argued by [Eve01, Eve03]. Instead of concentrating only on the form of the anaphors it is suggested in this chapter to pay attention also to the verb classes which allow both the reflexive phrase *POSS+tav-* and the reciprocal *ertmanet-* as their subject argument. In Section 6.7 the chapter will be summarized.

6.2 Anaphor Agreement Effect

Taking some Italian and Icelandic data into account [Riz90, p. 32] argues that there could be “an intrinsic incompatibility between the property of being an anaphor and the property of being construed with agreement.”

The Icelandic and the Italian data illustrate that when an anaphor is marked by nominative and, therefore, triggers agreement like any nominative NP does in these languages, the sentences are ungrammatical (6.2.1a, 6.2.2a). But if the anaphors are marked by a case other than nominative (i.e., accusative in example 6.2.1b and genitive

in example 6.2.2b) and, thus, do not trigger agreement, the sentences are grammatical:

6.2.1. EXAMPLE. (Icelandic, [Mal84])

- a. *Jón_i segir að sig_i elski Maria.
 Jon says that SELF.NOM loves.SUBJ Maria.ACC
 “Jon says that he loves Maria.”
- b. Jón_i segir að Maria elski sig_i.
 Jon says that Maria.NOM loves.SUBJ SELF.ACC
 “Jon says that he loves Maria.”

6.2.2. EXAMPLE. (Italian, [Riz90, p. 33])

- a. *A loro_i interessano solo se stessi_i.
 to them.DAT interest.3PL only themselves.NOM
 “They’re only interested in themselves.”
- b. A loro importa solo di se stessi.
 to them.DAT matters only of themselves.GEN
 “They only matter to themselves.”

The anaphor in Example 6.2.1a is a subject and the sentence is ungrammatical, while the same anaphor in object position (6.2.1b) is fully grammatical. This could give rise to the idea that there are certain positions (i.e., object position) associated with anaphors in which they can appear, as opposed to other positions in which one can never find anaphors.

According to [Riz90], what precludes a nominative anaphor is the presence of agreement. On the basis of this he formulates a generalization which “holds quite systematically in natural languages” the following way:

The Anaphor Agreement principle: Anaphors do not occur in syntactic positions construed with agreement.

As [Riz90] shows, not the subject/non-subject status of an anaphor is crucial but the presence/absence of agreement ([Riz90, p. 33]). As is illustrated in Example 6.2.3, an anaphor becomes available in subject position if it is marked by a non-nominative case, consequently does not trigger agreement. And an object anaphor becomes ungrammatical if marked nominative, consequently triggering agreement (Example 6.2.4):

6.2.3. EXAMPLE. (Icelandic, [Mal84])

- Hún_i sagði að sig_i vantadi peninga.
 she said that SELF.ACC lacked.SUBJ money
 “She said that she lacked money.”

6.2.4. EXAMPLE. (Icelandic, [Mal84])

*Sigga_i telur að mér líki sig_i.
 Sigga thinks that to me likes.SUBJ SELF.NOM

Therefore, it does not matter whether a reflexive is a subject or an object argument. The most important condition is that the reflexive is not associated to agreement.

Contrary to [And82, Mal84] who suggest that the ungrammaticality of nominative anaphors is related to the lack of the nominative form of the long-distance reflexives in Icelandic, [Riz90] supposes that there has to be “a deeper syntactic incompatibility [between anaphors and agreement] than just the lack of a form in the case paradigm”.

In order to explain the incompatibility of anaphors and agreement, [Riz90] claims that the agreement affix, assumed to be pronominal [Cho81], and the anaphor will clash whenever forming a chain. Both members of the chain are never able to satisfy binding conditions simultaneously. Since the agreement is pronominal, it is subject to the Principle B and is required to be locally free while the anaphor has to satisfy principle A and is required to be locally bound. Under these considerations, agreeing anaphors are correctly predicted to be ungrammatical.

Since anaphors are incompatible with agreement, anaphors in the absence of agreement should be grammatical, as predicted by the principle. Chinese, which lacks agreement, is a support for the hypothesis since it allows subject anaphors:

6.2.5. EXAMPLE. (Chinese from [Hua82] cited in [Riz90, p. 40])

Zhangsan_i shuo ziji_i hui lai.
 Zhangsan said himself will come
 “Zhangsan said he will come.”

Thus, according to [Riz90], anaphors are incompatible with agreement.

6.3 Modified Anaphor Agreement Effect

The Anaphor Agreement Effect proposed by [Riz90] is discussed in [Woo99], in which the author first gives a short overview of the arguments offered by [Riz90] in support of the principle. Then to the Chinese example 6.2.5, brought by [Riz90] from [Hua82], [Woo99] adds such languages as Khmer, Vietnamese, Korean and Thai to support the idea that nominative/subject anaphors are expected in languages without agreement. All of these languages allow subject anaphors while they lack agreement.

Additionally, [Woo99] proposes that not only agreeing subject anaphors are ungrammatical but object anaphors will also be excluded in languages with object agreement. Data from object agreement languages support this prediction. These languages show that the normal object agreement cannot be used when the object is an anaphor. Some of them behave like, for instance Swahili, in which anaphors can only trigger

anaphoric agreement (Example 6.3.1a) but not the normal object agreement (Example 6.3.1b) while others, like Inuit, employ intransitive constructions reflecting only subject agreement for expressing reflexivity (compare the reflexive example 6.3.2a employing the intransitive verb form to the normal transitive verbal marking in 6.3.2b¹):

6.3.1. EXAMPLE. (Swahili, [Vit81])

- a. Ahmed a-na-ji-penda mwenyewe.
 Ahmed 3S-PRES-REFL-love himself (emphatic reflexive)
 “Ahmed loves himself.”
- b. *Ahmed a-na-m-penda mwenyewe.
 Ahmed 3S-PRES-3O-love himself (emphatic reflexive)
 “Ahmed loves himself.”

6.3.2. EXAMPLE. (Inuit, [BB91])

- a. Angut_i immi-nut_i taku-vuq.
 man himself.DAT see-INDIC.3SG
 “The man sees himself.”
- b. Angutip arnaq taku-vaa.
 man.ERG woman.ABS see-INDIC.3SG.3SG
 “The man sees the woman.”

[Woo99] argues that if a language still allows agreement triggered by an anaphor, like the languages with object agreement do, then the agreement will exclusively be special—not normal object agreement characteristic to these languages but a special anaphoric form of agreement (see, for instance, 6.3.1a). [Woo99], thus, modifies Rizzi’s principle as follows:

The Anaphor Agreement Effect (modified): Anaphors do not occur in syntactic positions construed with agreement, unless the agreement is anaphoric.

¹Note also that the subject of the transitive verb in 6.3.2b is marked ergative while the subject in the reflexive example in 6.3.2a is not, which reflects how the reflexive actions are classified within this language, namely, as intransitive.

Many ergative languages do not use the ergative construction when the object is an anaphor (cf. for instance, the Inuit 6.3.2a vs. 6.3.2b). However, [Woo99] argues against the ungrammaticality of object anaphors to follow from ergativity. By illustrating an examples from Enga (see (i) from [Lan73] cited in [Woo99, p. 268]) the author shows that not all ergative languages bar object anaphors in ergative constructions. Enga is in fact an example which supports the anaphor agreement principle in that the language allows object anaphors while not having object agreement:

- i. Baa-mé tänge pi-ly-á-mo.
 he-ERG self hit-PRES-3S.SG-AUG
 “He is hitting himself.”

As [Woo99] notes, there are counter-examples to the modified version of the principle. There are languages with object agreement that still have object anaphors, such as Tamil, Modern Greek, Georgian, Albanian, Jacaltec, Selayarese (an Austronesian language spoken in Indonesia) and French. [Woo99] tries to show that, for different reasons, the languages in question are not real counter-examples.² [Woo99] argues that, for instance, in Georgian the features of the agreement morpheme do not match those of the anaphor and the agreement is a default form of agreement (thus, in the technical sense, no agreement). For instance, a reflexive object phrase in Georgian always triggers 3rd person object agreement even when it is bound by the 1st or 2nd person antecedent (Example 6.3.3). Thus, only the possessor within the reflexive NP is coindexed with the antecedent, while the agreement between the object NP and the verb is triggered by the whole phrase:

6.3.3. EXAMPLE. (Georgian, [Har81])

(me) čem-s tav-s v-a-k-eb.
 1SG.NOM 1POSS.SG-DAT self-DAT 1ANOM.SG-PRV-praise-TS
 Lit.: I myself I.praise.him/her
 “I praise myself.”

[Woo99] groups Albanian and Georgian together because they both use a default agreement strategy to avoid the violation of the Anaphor Agreement effect. In Albanian, like in Georgian, the anaphors trigger 3rd person agreement whatever the person of the antecedent:

6.3.4. EXAMPLE.

a. Vetja më dhimset.
 self.NOM CL.1SG.DAT feel.sorry.for.3PRES.INACT
 “I feel sorry for myself.”

²Jacaltec is only mentioned but not discussed in any detail in [Woo99]. Even from those object-agreement languages that are considered in [Woo99] only Albanian and Greek will be mentioned because they are similar to Georgian, the main focus of this dissertation. In general [Woo99] tries to argue that the languages employ default agreement for their object anaphors and that agreement in technical sense does not hold. As for the French past participle, default agreement was not in question as such. There the reflexive clitic gets the same agreement as a non-reflexive one (see the suffix *-e* on the past participle form *décrit-e* in (i) vs. (ii)). One of the solutions found in [Woo99] was to argue that, under [Mar84]’s account, the reflexive clitic *s’-* is not an object clitic but an intransitivizing morpheme while the agreement *-e* on the verb form in (i) is instead triggered by the surface NP subject *Cécile*, moved from the object position:

- i. Cécile s’était décrit-e comme chaotique.
 Cecile REFL-was described-FEM as chaotic
 “Cecile described herself as chaotic.”
- ii. Cécile l’a décrit-e comme sympathique.
 Cecile her-has described-FEM as friendly
 “Cecile described her as friendly.”

- b. Dritës i dhimset vetja.
 Drita.DAT CL.3SG.DAT pity.3SG.PAST.INACT self.NOM
 “Drita pities herself.”

[Woo99] argues that the subject-verb agreement relation in the Albanian examples 6.3.4a (from [Hub85]) and 6.3.4b (from [Mas91]) is a manifestation of a “default” agreement, and that such agreement does not count for the Anaphor Agreement principle, because the agreement morpheme is an inert slot filler, not indicating actual agreement.

According to [Woo99], Greek uses a different strategy to avoid the Anaphor Agreement effect. As Example 4.3.16 (repeated as 6.3.5) illustrates, in Greek a reflexive NP consist of a definite determiner (*ton*), a possessor (*mu*) and a head (*eafton*) and it triggers some kind of non-anaphoric agreement (here the accusative, masculine, singular clitic *ton*), contrary to the predictions of both versions of the Anaphor Agreement Principle [Riz90, Woo99]. However, as [Woo99] argues, the Greek case is no counterexample to the Anaphor Agreement principle. As already discussed by [Iat88], the element that agrees with the antecedent is, in fact, the embedded possessive. In Example 6.3.5 it is not the anaphor (*mu*) that is doubled by a clitic but the whole NP (*ton eafton mu*).

6.3.5. EXAMPLE. (Greek, [Iat88])

- Egho_i ton_j xero [ton eafton_j mu_i]_j.
 I CL.ACC.MASC.SG know DET.ACC.MASC.SG REFL POSS.GEN.1SG
 “I know myself.”

Although the way the verbal complex agrees with subjects/objects is different in Georgian and Greek (agreement marking vs. clitic doubling) they both employ the same mechanism with regard to the reflexive NP—the whole phrase gets clitic-doubled in Greek (Example 6.3.5) / marked in Georgian (Example 6.3.6) but not the possessive. The agreement mechanism remains the same irrespective of whether the same treatment of Georgian possessors as embedded anaphors is adopted and, thus, Georgian is put into the same group as Greek according to the coindexing (cf. 6.3.5 vs. 6.3.6):

6.3.6. EXAMPLE.

- (me_i) [čem-s_i tav-s_j]_j v-a-k-eb.
 1SG.NOM 1POSS.SG-DAT self-DAT 1ANOM.SG-PRV-praise-TS
 Lit.: I myself I.praise.him/her
 “I praise myself.”

It could be argued as well that Greek employs, in fact, the same “default agreement” strategy as Georgian. In both languages, the whole reflexive phrase (but not its

- b. *is_i [tavis_i] \emptyset -a-k-eb-s.
 1SG.NOM 1POSS.SG 3B_{DAT}.SG-PRV-praise-TS-3A_{NOM}.SG
 “(S)he praises himself/herself.”

Following [AE99], who showed that “ α is an anaphor” is not equivalent to “ α agrees with its antecedent”, [Eve01] argues that the element that agrees with an antecedent as a result of an anaphoric relation should be distinguished from the anaphoric element itself.

This means that when considering what exactly is an anaphor in Georgian, the phrase POSS+*tav-* as a whole should be distinguished from its determiner, namely, the POSS. Perhaps it is the POSS which shares the features with the antecedent, however, the determiner alone is unable to serve as an anaphor (cf. 4.3.17 vs. 6.3.6, 6.3.9a vs. 6.3.8a, 6.3.9b vs. 6.3.8b) but only the combination of both the determiner and the head of the phrase *tav-*.

6.4 Georgian and the (Modified) Anaphor Agreement Effect

It will be shown here that there is no reason to assume that Georgian has a default agreement strategy. If the language would have had such a strategy, default agreement would hold only in the cases where the phrase *šen-s tav-s* is a reflexive like it is in Example 6.3.8a (or *tavis tav-s* in Example 6.3.8b). However, Example 6.4.1 shows that the same phrase also triggers 3rd person agreement when used non-anaphorically, either as a body-part (6.4.1) or in object camouflage (5.2.1, 5.2.9):

6.4.1. EXAMPLE. (From [Ami03, p. 105])

(me) sarke-ši šen-s tav-s v-xed-av, ŧan-s
 1SG.NOM mirror-in 2POSS.SG-DAT head-DAT 1A_{NOM}.SG-see-TS body-DAT
 ki vera.
 while/but cannot
 “I see your head in the mirror, but I cannot see your body.”

Therefore, the agreement is regular, triggered by the phi-feature specification of the head of the phrase *tav-*: 3rd person, singular. It is clear that not the anaphoric status of the phrase is responsible for triggering the 3rd person agreement in the examples 6.3.3, 6.3.8a, 6.3.8b but the referential properties of the whole phrase, namely the person feature (3rd) of the head of the phrase (*tav-*). The fact that agreement both in Greek and Georgian is always 3rd person singular, irrespective of the phi-features of the antecedent, is due to the morphosyntactic properties of the specific type of anaphoric expressions these languages use, not to their referential (anaphoric) status [Eve01]. Therefore, Georgian still remains a counter-example for the Anaphor Agreement Effect. The language has object agreement and also object anaphors which trigger neither

anaphoric agreement, nor default agreement but instead only normal object agreement, contrary to the Anaphor Agreement Effect [Riz90] or its modified version [Woo99].

Observe that Georgian not only allows agreeing object anaphors but also agreeing anaphors in subject position, contrary to what [Woo99] claims. In discussing Georgian data [Woo99] argues that the language does not allow subject anaphors. The author relates their ungrammaticality to the fact that Georgian allows “default” agreement in the construction where the anaphor is an object but not in the construction where it is a subject ([Woo99, p. 272]). However, certain verbs in Georgian do not show the usual subject-object asymmetry for binding (cf. 6.4.2a vs. 6.4.2b) and the reflexive phrase in subject position, by the way, triggering the subject agreement (see the 3rd person Set A agreement marker *-a* on the verb form *g-a-čam-a*³) is perfectly grammatical with them (Example 6.4.2a):

6.4.2. EXAMPLE. (From [AE00])

- a. *šen-ma tav-ma g-a-čam-a*
 2POSS.SG-ERG self-ERG 2B_{NOM}.SG-PRV-torture-3A_{ERG}.SG.AOR.INDIC
 (šen).
 2SG.NOM
 Lit.: Yourself.SG it.tortured.you.SG you.SG
 “Something related to you made you suffer.”
- b. (šen) šen-i tav-i ∅-a-čam-e.
 2SG.ERG 2POSS.SG-NOM self-NOM 2A_{ERG}.SG-PRV-torment-AOR.INDIC
 “You tormented yourself.”
 “You made yourself suffer.”

Thus, the Georgian reflexive phrase *POSS+tav-* can appear both in object and in subject positions triggering an agreement which has been argued in Section 6.4 to be neither anaphoric nor default. Thus, the very phrase is a counter-example to the original Anaphor Agreement Effect [Riz90] as well as to its modified version [Woo99].

6.5 Reflexivity Theoretic Explanation for Subject Anaphors

It has been established that the standard Binding Theory does not give a straightforward account for the nominative/subject anaphor gap. Rizzi’s hypothesis [Riz90] and its modified version [Woo99] have been designed to account for that gap. However, the Georgian reflexive expression is a problem for both the original Anaphor Agreement Effect [Riz90] and its modified version [Woo99] since, as argued in Section 6.4, the expression triggers a regular agreement (not a default one as argued by [Woo99]) and

³See Footnote15 in Section 5.4.

contrary to both versions, it can appear as an object (Example 6.4.2b) and even as a subject (Example 6.4.2a).

In [AE99] an explanation is given for the fact that Greek allows a nominative/subject anaphor with certain verbs. [AE99]'s explanation is formulated within the Reflexivity [RR93] Theory. Treatment of the Georgian data through the reflexivity framework (like that of the Greek by [AE99]) also seems to be possible.

As was already noted in Chapter 4, and, in particular, in Section 4.2, in the Reflexivity framework binding is not directly about the relative distribution of anaphors vs. pronominals, as it was in the standard Binding Theory, but about reflexive predicates. It should be repeated here that the two non-structural conditions of Reflexivity such as Conditions A and Conditions B given earlier in Section 4.2 which make clear what it means for a predicate to be reflexive and reflexive-marked:

- A predicate is *reflexive*, iff two of its arguments are coindexed.
- A predicate (formed of P) is *reflexive-marked* iff either P is lexically reflexive or one of P 's arguments is a SELF-anaphor.

As was already noted, unlike in the standard Binding Theory, in Reflexivity the configurational effects of anaphora are not attributed to the Conditions A and Conditions B (which are non-structural and, thus, do not refer to the notion c-command) but to the Condition on Chain Formation based on the notion of Generalized Chain Condition defined in Section 4.2 and repeated below:

- Condition on A-chain: A maximal A-chain $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)$ contains exactly one link α_1 which is +R.
- An NP is +R iff it carries a full specification for phi-features (person, number, gender) and structural case.

In Reinhart and Reuland's view [RR93], every lexical element is subject to A-Chain Formation under the conditions given above. The Chain Condition interacts with the Reflexivity Conditions A and B, and in the example below it will be explained how this works exactly. Nominative anaphors are excluded by the Chain Condition under the assumption that anaphors are typically [-R]. To illustrate this, consider the examples in 6.5.1a, 6.5.1b:

6.5.1. EXAMPLE.

- a. The man_{*i*} pleases himself_{*i*}.
- b. *Himself_{*i*} pleases the man_{*i*}.

In 6.5.1a, 6.5.1b the predicates are both reflexive and reflexive-marked satisfying Reflexivity Conditions A and B. In other words, as far as the Reflexivity Conditions are

concerned, both 6.5.1a and 6.5.1b are grammatical. The ungrammaticality of 6.5.1b is due to a violation of the Condition on A-chains because in 6.5.2b the head of the chain is [-R] since the English anaphor *himself* is not fully specified for phi-features, as argued for by [RR93].

6.5.2. EXAMPLE.

- a. [(the man)_i [+R], himself_i [-R]]
- b. [himself_i [-R], (the man)_i [+R]]

So let us turn the argumentation around. If in a language a sentence like 6.5.1b would be grammatical, the Chain Condition, apparently, has not been violated. But that is only possible if the anaphor is marked [+R]. As claimed in [AE99], this is the case in Greek. *O eaftos tu* is headed by a noun (*eaftos*) which acts as a [+SELF] element, satisfying the Reflexivity conditions, while, at the same time, it is fully specified for phi-features (masculine, 3rd person, inflected for number/case), thus being [+R].

In Example 6.5.3a which illustrates a subject reflexive there can be no violation of the Chain Condition because the two coindexed elements *tu* and *tu Petru* do not form an A-chain.

6.5.3. EXAMPLE.

- a. [O eaftos_j tu_i]_j tu aresi [tu Petru]_i.
The self his CL.DAT like.3SG the Petros.DAT
“Himself pleases Petros.”
- b. [(O eaftos tu_i)_j (+R)] [(tu Petru)_i (+R)]

Recall that for proper A-Chain Formation, it is obligatory that the chain is headed by [+R] element. In 6.5.3a (see also 6.5.3b) both NPs that could potentially form a chain are characterized as [+R]. Note, however, that the predicate in 6.5.3a is reflexive-marked but not reflexive, therefore not satisfying Reflexivity Conditions A [RR93]. It is not reflexive because its arguments are not co-indexed, but it is reflexive-marked because one of its arguments is an anaphor with the feature [+SELF] (see Definition 4.2.2). To account for this, [AE99] assume that the head of the reflexive phrase undergoes covert head incorporation, with subsequent possessor raising (6.5.4). By noun incorporation analysis the possessor *tu* and the object *tu Petru* are co-arguments. Therefore, *o eaftos tu* confines with condition A.

6.5.4. EXAMPLE.

- [O t_j tu_i]_i tu [eaftos_j-aresi] [tu Petru]_i.
The his CL.DAT self-like.3SG the Petros.DAT

As is well-known, overt noun incorporation is restricted to subjects of unaccusative verbs [Bak88]. According to [AE99], it is expected that covert noun incorporation will be restricted likewise. Since nominative anaphors in Greek are restricted to unaccusative verbs (while being unavailable with unergative/transitive verbs) the incorporation analysis makes it possible to account for the verb class restriction in the distribution of nominative anaphors in Greek.⁴

6.6 Georgian and the Reflexivity Theoretical Explanation

The Georgian reflexive phrase *POSS+tav-* is exactly of the same feature specification as the Greek anaphor, namely, [+SELF;+R] (see Subsection 4.3.2), the subject occurrences of the reflexive phrase could also be attributed to the feature specification and the specific structure of the phrase, as it is done for Greek in [AE99]. However, before adopting the treatment of the “inalienable” type of anaphors also to Georgian, first, the Georgian data will be thoroughly examined in this section.

First of all, in Example 6.6.1 the Chain Condition is not violated. Given the structure of the anaphor, there is no Chain Formation in this Georgian example, contrary to the English example just discussed—the two coindexed elements *tavis-* and *prezident-* cannot form an A-chain (see Condition on A-chain in Section 4.2):

6.6.1. EXAMPLE. (Adapted from [Ami04a, p. 429])

[*tavis-ma_i* *tav-ma_j*]_{*j*} *∅-i-xsn-a*
 3REFL.POSS.SG-ERG self-ERG 3BNOM.SG-PRV-save-3AERG.SG.AOR.INDIC
prezident-i_i.
 president-NOM
 Lit.: Himself/herself (s)he/it.saved.him/her president

“His own positive/*negative personal properties, and/or his past achievements/*failures, etc. saved the president.” (the only available reading is to be out of the hard situation rather than to survive physically)

Example 6.6.1 is grammatical, contrary to 6.5.1b. Note, however, that the predicate is reflexive-marked but not reflexive, therefore not satisfying Reflexivity Condition A and B [RR93]. It is not reflexive because its arguments are not-coindexed, but it is reflexive-marked because one of its arguments is an anaphor with the feature [+SELF] (see Definition 4.2.2). To account for this, [AE99]’s analysis for Greek could be followed (6.5.3a) and, it could be assumed like the Greek (6.5.4) that the head of the reflexive phrase undergoes covert head incorporation, with subsequent possessor raising:

⁴See, however, [RS04] arguing against the unaccusative analysis of reflexives in general.

- b. *Tin Maria den tin thavmazi/aghapai o eaftos tis.
 DEFIN Maria.ACC not CL-ACC admires/likes DEFIN REFL-NOM her
 Herself does not admire/like Mary.

6.6.10. EXAMPLE. (Greek, from [Ana99])

*Ton eafto tu tu aresi o Petros.⁶
 the REFL POSS.ACC CL.DAT like-3SG DEFIN Petros.NOM
 Himself likes Petros.

6.6.11. EXAMPLE. (Basque, X. Artiagoitia, personal communication)

neure buru-a-k hilko nau.
 my head-DET-ERG it.kills.me AUX
 Lit.: Myself kills me

“Something like my personality, the things I do and worry about... that is going to kill me.”

6.6.12. EXAMPLE. (Basque, from [Art03, p. 630])

Niri batez ere neure buru-a-k ematen dit beldurra.
 1SG.DAT above all my.own head-DET-ERG give.IMPERF AUX fear
 “Above all it is myself that causes me fear.”

6.6.13. EXAMPLE. (Basque, from I. Laka’s Basque Grammar Page)

- a. Egunotan, neure buru-a-k kezkatzen nau.
 day.DET.in my.own head-DET-ERG worry.HAB me.has.it
 “These days, my(own)self worries me.”
- b. *Neure buru-a-k ikusi nau ni.
 my.own head-DET-ERG seen me.has.it I
 “Myself has seen me.”

6.6.14. EXAMPLE. (Basque, [Art03, p. 622])

*Bere buru-a-k Mirande hil zuen.
 his head-DET-ERG Mirande kill AUX
 Himself killed Mirande.

6.6.15. EXAMPLE. (Basque, I. Laka, personal communication, 2001)

*Bere buru-a-k Miren maite du.
 her head-DET-ERG Miren.ABS love has
 Herself loves Miren.

⁶are^si is a subject experiencer verb [Ana99] taking a dative experiencer as a subject and a nominative theme as an object. Thus, the anaphor in 6.6.10 is the subject argument of the verb.

Lit.: Friends it.makes.them.happy each.other

“Something related to each other makes the friends happy.”

- b. From [Tui98, p. 133], example (77)

amxanag-eb-i ∅-a-xar-eb-en ertmanet-s.
friend-PL-NOM 3_{DAT}.SG-PRV-happy-TS-3_{NOM}.PL REC-DAT

Lit.: Friends they.make.them.happy each.other

“The friends make each other happy.”

6.6.18. EXAMPLE. (Georgian, adapted from [Tui87, p. 300])

- a. am gogo-eb-s ertmanet-i ∅-a-inṭeres-eb-t.
this.DAT girl-PL-DAT REC-NOM 3_{DAT}.SG-PRV-interest-TS-PL_{DAT}

Lit.: this girls each.other it.makes.them.interested

“Something related to each other interests these girls.”

- b. es gogo-eb-i ertmanet-s ∅-a-inṭeres-eb-en
this.NOM girl-PL-NOM REC-DAT 3_{DAT}.SG-PRV-interest-TS-3_{NOM}.PL
zγapr-eb-it.
tale-PL-INST

Lit.: this girls each.other they.make.them.interested with.tales

“These girls are getting each other interested in folk tales.”

Furthermore, note that, apparently, the reciprocal being coindexed with the postcedent does not create a chain condition violation.

All this might suggest that there is not a simple primitive concept anaphor. A distinction between reflexives and reciprocals has to be made (for the similar view see also [Eve00]), just like it is made for different types of reflexives [RR91, RR93, Saf96, AE99]. If this is accepted, there should be a distinction between reflexives and reciprocals and it should be agreed that in the distribution of the subject reflexives, their form is a relevant factor:

If a language has a subject anaphor, the anaphor will be “non-pronominal”.
i.e. its form (structure, properties) is relevant [AE99].

⁸Note that [Tui98]’s original example (78) on page 133 (brought in this footnote as (i)) gives the reciprocal as a determiner. However, the reciprocal can be given not only as a determiner but also as a head of the phrase as in 6.6.17a or in 3.6.40a:

- i. amxanag-eb-s ∅-a-xar-eb-t ertmanet-is amb-eb-i.
friend-PL-DAT 3_{DAT}.SG-PRV-happy-TS-PL_{DAT} REC-GEN news-PL-NOM
Lit.: Friends it.makes.them.happy each.other’s news
“Each other’s news makes the friends happy.”

This is in accordance with the data, since all the languages reported in the literature having subject reflexives also have non-pronominal anaphors (Basque (6.6.12, 6.6.13a), Modern Greek (4.3.15a, 4.3.16, 6.3.7), Dargwa [Kib97], Nepali [BY00], Albanian (6.3.4a and also [Hub85, Wil88]), Toba Batak [Sch84, CH05]). However, a cross-linguistic examination is required to establish whether the reverse is also the case—whether languages having non-pronominal anaphors always show the phenomenon of subject anaphors. If the answer is “yes”, then the reason of having subject anaphors could lie in their structure. If not, then either the structure of the anaphor is not relevant at all, or there is also something else apart from the structure which needs further investigation.

Perhaps it is not the structure of the anaphor but the semantic/structural properties of the classes of verbs that make it possible for reflexives to appear as a subject.

In Georgian irrespective of the structure of the anaphor, whether it is an inalienable type reflexive (the reflexive phrase POSS+*tav-*) or a non-inalienable type reciprocal (*ertmanet-*), it can surface as a subject with verbs of certain characteristics.

The next chapter will be devoted to assessing the verb classes allowing/disallowing the reflexive phrase and reciprocal as their subject argument. Below, this chapter will be summarized in Section 6.7.

6.7 Summary

While some authors have related the non-existence of nominative/subject anaphors to the lack of the nominative forms in the paradigm of anaphors [And82, Mal84], others have proposed the gap in the paradigm of anaphors to be related with an inconsistency between anaphors and agreement. [Riz90] has called this the Anaphor Agreement Effect discussed here in Section 6.2. The principle, according to which anaphors do not occur in syntactic positions construed with agreement, has been claimed by [Riz90] to be working cross-linguistically. Via applying the principle to wider data including some languages having object agreement, [Woo99] modified the principle acknowledging its cross-linguistic character. Section 6.3 dealt with the Anaphor Agreement Effect modified by [Woo99], which says that if anaphors trigger an agreement, the agreement will be exclusively either anaphoric or “default”.

Section 6.4 has argued that Georgian represents a counter-example for both versions of the principle. Namely, it was argued that the agreement triggered by anaphors in Georgian is neither anaphoric nor default, but instead is a normal agreement. Additionally, it was argued that apart from agreeing object anaphors, Georgian also allows agreeing anaphors in subject position with certain verbs and verb readings so that the agreement is neither anaphoric nor default. Thus, the cross-linguistic nature of the principle becomes doubtful.

Section 6.5 discussed another explanation for the presence/absence of the gap in the paradigm of anaphors by [AE99]. To be more precise, [AE99] has offered an expla-

nation as to why nominative/subject anaphors were not banned in Greek. The authors have claimed the Greek anaphor to be [+SELF;+R] which makes Chain Formation with the antecedent unavailable. If there is no Chain Formation, consequently Chain Formation violation is not an option. And if in Greek there is no Chain Formation violation, the anaphors can appear in any position. The far reaching prediction implied in [AE99] is that if in a language no Chain Formation is possible because of the type of anaphor, the language will allow subject anaphors.

Later [Eve01, Eve03] have tried to extend the explanation of [AE99] also for Georgian and argued that, because of its structure and properties, the [+SELF;+R] type anaphoric phrase POSS+*tav*- (see Subsection 4.3.2) is unable to form an A-Chain and thus, it could appear in any position, including the subject position.

Section 6.6 has argued against adopting the treatment of the Greek data by [AE99] also for Georgian. Even for Greek (and also for Georgian), if the structure enables the anaphors to appear in subject position it has to be possible for the anaphor to be a subject of verbs of any semantic class. However, this is not true in either Greek or Georgian. Additionally, the Georgian reciprocal *ertmanet*-, which is of a different formation and not at all a [+SELF;+R] anaphor, is also allowed in subject position.

Since it is not the structure and the anaphoric properties of the reflexive phrase POSS+*tav*- and the reciprocal *ertmanet*- that are shared but the verb classes and verb reading which allow them as a subject argument, it was suggested in Section 6.6 to take into the consideration the verb classes and verb readings allowing the phenomenon.

In Section 6.7 Chapter 6 was summarized, and the next Chapter 7 will continue with a detailed discussion on subject uses of the Georgian reflexive phrase POSS+*tav*- and those of the reciprocal *ertmanet*- and thereby looking into the verb classes allowing the phenomenon.