

Georgian reflexives in subject function in special contexts

Nino Amiridze 

Utrecht University

Proceedings of the 12th International Conference on
Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar

Department of Informatics, University of Lisbon

Stefan Müller (Editor)

2005

Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications

pages 449–466

Amiridze, Nino. 2005. Georgian reflexives in subject function in special contexts. In Stefan Müller (ed.), *Proceedings of the 12th International Conference on Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar, Department of Informatics, University of Lisbon*, 449–466. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications. DOI: 10.21248/hpsg.2005.26.



Abstract

Georgian is a language allowing reflexives to be marked by ergative. The subject use of the Georgian reflexive phrase was first documented with causative verbs by Asatiani (1982). The later works such as (Amiridze and Everaert, 2000), (Amiridze, 2003), (Amiridze, 2004) discuss the use with object-experiencer verbs and transitive verbs on non-agentive reading. The present paper offers the first hand data on subject uses of the Georgian reflexive phrase with transitive verbs on their agentive reading in special contexts (such as a twin context, Madame Tussaud context, etc.) which are problematic for the Binding Theory of Chomsky (1981) as well as for the Reflexivity Theory of Reinhart and Reuland (1993). The data could be accounted for within the approach developed in (Reuland, 2001). However, the subject uses of the Georgian reciprocal *ertmanet-* leave the issue of subject anaphors open.

1 Introduction

The paper deals with the subject occurrences of the Georgian reflexive phrase exemplified in 1 and 2. In both examples the reflexive phrase *tavis-ma tav-ma* is marked by ergative and it triggers the Set A agreement suffix *-a* which is the agreement marker for subject arguments in the Aorist Indicative. The phrase is the subject argument of the verb forms *da-∅-marx-a* (1) and *ga-∅-u-γim-a* (2).

- (1) [tavis-ma tav-ma] da-∅-marx-a
self's-ERG¹ self-ERG PV-3_{NOM}.SG-bury-3_{ERG}.SG.AOR.INDIC
mixa.
Mixa.NOM
Lit.: Himself.ERG buried Mixa.NOM
- a. "Some property of Mixa ruined his life/career."
b. "Mixa's savings made it possible to pay for the expenses related to his funeral."

[†]This research was supported by the Language in Use project of the Utrecht Institute of Linguistics OTS. I am grateful to Martin Everaert, Alice C. Harris and Eric Reuland for the insightful comments on an earlier version of this work. Special thanks go to Kevin Tuite for suggesting to consider subject uses of Georgian reciprocals as well. All errors are mine.

¹Abbreviations: 3=3rd person; A=Set A agreement marker; ABS=absolute; ACC=accusative; ADV=adverbial; AOR=aorist; AUX=auxiliary; B=Set B agreement marker; CL=clitic; CLASS=class; DAT=dative; DET=determiner; EMPH=emphatic; ERG=ergative; EV=epenthetic vowel; FOC=focus; GEN=genitive; HAB=habitual; INDIC=indicative; INST=instrumental; M=masculine; NOM=nominative; NP=noun phrase; OBL=oblique; PART=particle; PL=plural; PRES=present; PRV=pre-radical vowel; PV=preverb; R=R(eferential); REC=reciprocal; REFL=reflexive; SE=type of anaphor; SELF=type of anaphor; SG=singular; SUBJ=subjunctive.

The indices show the case of the argument triggering the particular agreement marker. For instance, 3_{NOM}.SG=3rd person singular Set B agreement marker triggered by the NOM argument;

- (2) [tavis-ma tav-ma] ga-∅-u-γim-a
 self's-ERG self-ERG PV-3<sub>B_{DAT}.SG-PRV-smile-3_{A_{ERG}.SG.AOR.INDIC}
 gogo-s sark-i-dan.
 girl-DAT mirror-INST-from
 Lit.: Herself smiled to the girl from the mirror.
 “The reflection of the girl_i smiled to her_i from the mirror.”</sub>

Note that in 1 and 2 the relation between the referents of the reflexive phrase and its postcedent is not of a full but rather of a partial identity. In 1 the reflexive phrase refers to an aspect/property or the referent of the postcedent while in 2 it refers to an image/representation of the referent of the postcedent.

The subject uses of the Georgian reflexive phrase are problematic for various theories dealing with anaphoric dependencies. In this paper I will review the facts already reported in the literature as well as bring some new data. Section 2 gives some basic facts about the Georgian reflexive phrase which seems to obey the binding principles (Chomsky, 1981); Section 3 will, however, focus on the non-anaphoric behavior of the reflexive phrase which is able to surface as a subject argument of verbs; Section 4 argues whether the relation between the subject uses of the reflexive phrase and their postcedents is that of binding; Section 5 examines whether the form of the anaphor can influence its interpretation. For the similar Greek facts a solution has been proposed by Anagnostopoulou and Everaert (1999) within the Reflexivity Theory of Reinhart and Reuland (1993). However, the Georgian reciprocal *ertmanet-*, also being able to act as a subject argument of verbs, makes the application of the solution to Georgian data problematic. Section 6 examines a hypothesis on the importance of the verb classes proposed by Amiridze (2004). Although there is a clear cut distinction between the subject-experiencer verbs versus object-experiencer verbs, the former disallowing while the latter allowing the reflexive phrase as a subject argument, it is not necessary for a verb to be an object-experiencer verb to be able to take a reflexive phrase as a subject, as was previously proposed by Amiridze (2004). The new facts presented in Section 7 illustrate subject uses of reflexives with typical transitive verbs in special contexts. Especially relevant to those facts seems to be the Reuland (2001)'s analysis of complex anaphors as a relevant function of the antecedent. However, again the Georgian reciprocal *ertmanet-* unable to be analyzed as a complex anaphor but being able to appear as a subject argument leaves the issue of subject anaphors open for further investigation.

2 Georgian Reflexive Phrase Obeying Binding Principles

Georgian has a complex anaphoric phrase with the grammaticalized body-part *tav-* “head” as its head and a possessive pronoun as its determiner. The literal translation

³_{A_{ERG}.SG}=3rd person singular Set A agreement marker triggered by the ERG argument (Example 1).

of the whole expression is “one’s head”. However, it no more means a body-part in reflexive constructions; see (Shanidze, 1973), (Harris, 1981). The reflexive phrase has to be bound in a local domain necessarily by a c-commanding antecedent and can never be used as a long-distance anaphor (3) or in logophoric contexts (4).

- (3) *ilia_i pikrobs, rom gia-s_j sjera, kaxa-s_k surs,*
Ilia.NOM he.thinks that Gia-DAT he.believes Kakha-DAT he.wants
*bakar-is_l zma-m_m akos tavis-i tav-i_{*i/*j/*k/*l/m}.*
Bakar-GEN brother-ERG he.praises.SUBJ self’s-NOM self-NOM
 “*Ilia_i thinks that Gia_j believes [that] Kakha_k wants [that] Bakar_l’s brother_m*
*praises himself_{*i/*j/*k/*l/m}.”*
- (4) **šen-i tav-is msgavs-i xalx-is-tvis diktaṭor-s*
your.SG-NOM self-GEN alike-NOM people-GEN-for dictator-DAT
qoveltvis moeṭebneba ert-i saṭan-i.
always it.can.be.searched.by.him/her one-NOM prison.cell-NOM
 “For people like yourself the dictator always has a prison cell.”

The Georgian reflexive phrase requires a c-commanding antecedent (3). Irrespective of what is the order of the arguments in a sentence, it is only the direct object argument of a 2-argument verb which can be realized as a reflexive (cf. the examples 5a vs. 5b and 6b vs. 6a).

- (5) a. *ḱac-i_i akebs [tavis tav-s]_i.*
man-NOM he.praises.him self’s self-DAT
 “The man praises himself.”
- b. *[tavis tav-s]_i akebs ḱac-i_i.*
self’s self-DAT he.praises.him man-NOM
 “The man praises HIMSELF.”
- (6) a. **[tavis-i tav-i]_i akebs ḱac-s_i.*
self’s-NOM self-NOM he.praises.him man-DAT
- b. **ḱac-s_i akebs [tavis-i tav-i]_i.*
man-DAT he.praises.him self’s-NOM self-NOM

The importance of c-command is clear also from the 3-argument structures where an indirect object cannot be bound by a direct object irrespective of what is the order of these arguments (cf. 7 vs. 8):

- (7) *giorgi-m_i [tavis tav-s]_{i/*j} bakar-i_j aṛuṭera.*
Giorgi-ERG self’s self-DAT Bakar-NOM he.described.him.to.him
 “Giorgi described Bakar to himself.”
- (8) *giorgi-m_i bakar-i_j [tavis tav-s]_{i/*j} aṛuṭera.*
Giorgi-ERG Bakar-NOM self’s self-DAT he.described.him.to.him
 “Giorgi described Bakar to HIMSELF.”

Both in 2- and 3-argument structures the antecedent must c-command the anaphor, and neither case morphology (being dependent on the tense, aspect, mood, verb class and volitionality) nor word order affects this.

3 Georgian Reflexive Phrase Violating Binding Principles

However, the reflexive phrase may also perform an exceptional behavior—it can be marked by ERG case marker and function as a subject argument.² Asatiani’s original examples of ergative-marked reflexive phrases involve causative verbs where the subject argument is given as a reflexive phrase (9). According to Amiridze and Everaert (2000) and Amiridze (2004), also transitive verbs can take the reflexive phrase marked by ergative as an argument but on a non-agentive reading (10). The same phenomenon with the so-called object experiencer verbs allowing their subject argument to be a reflexive (11) is discussed in (Amiridze, 2003).

- (9) (Asatiani, 1982, p. 86)

tavis-ma tav-ma gaak̄etebina nino-s es.
self’s-ERG self-ERG she.made.her.do.it nino-DAT this.NOM

“(Something in) Nino_i’s personality made her_i do this.”

- (10) (Amiridze, 2004, p. 437)

tavis-i tav-i ačamebs k̄ac-s.
self’s-NOM self-NOM he.is.torturing.him man-DAT

Lit.: Himself is torturing the man.

“His own property(/properties) make(s) the man suffer.”

- (11) (Amiridze, 2003)

[tavis-ma_i tav-ma_j]_j gaaoca [k̄ac-i]_i.
self’s-ERG self-ERG he.surprised.him man-NOM

“The man got surprised because of something related to himself.”

From the Binding Theory perspective (Chomsky, 1981), such sentences as those in the examples 9, 10 and 11 are problematic because there the reflexive phrases do not have a c-commanding antecedent. Cross-linguistically there are languages

²It should be noted that subject arguments can be not only ergative-marked. Verbs of different verb classes have different alignment in different Tense-Aspect-Modality (TAM) Series (see, for instance, (Anderson, 1984), (Aronson, 1994), (Boeder, 1989), (Hewitt, 1995), (Kvatchadze, 1996), (Shanidze, 1973) among many others). For instance, transitive verbs have the subject argument marked by ERG in TAM Series II, by NOM in TAM Series I and by DAT in TAM Series III. Thus, the examples of subject reflexives (or subject reciprocals) are not only those marked by ERG (cf. 9, 10, 11) but also those marked by NOM (cf. 26a) or DAT.

which have anaphors without a c-commanding antecedent, qualified as logophors. However, the absence of a c-commanding antecedent does not make the reflexive phrase *tavis- tav-* in the examples 9, 10 or 11 a logophor with an antecedent in the possible previous discourse. In fact the only NP (*nino-s* in 9, *ḡac-s* in 10 or *ḡac-i* in 11) on which the interpretation of the reflexive phrase depends is a co-argument and, in fact, is in the same local domain as the reflexive. Since the reflexive phrases in subject position in the examples 9, 10 and 11 are referentially dependent on a co-argument NP, they are anaphoric elements rather than pronominals or R-expressions. The case-marking and the agreement pattern they trigger as well as their referential behavior only indicates that they are anaphoric elements acting as a subject argument.

4 Can It Be Called Binding?

In order to make sure the relation between the ergative-marked subject reflexive phrase and its nominative postcedent in the examples 9 and 11, or between the nominative-marked subject reflexive phrase and its dative postcedent in 10, is a binding not just a coreference let us check subject anaphors with a quantificational postcedent.

As known, a pronominal can be dependent on the interpretation of a quantificational expression if there is a binding relation between them. For instance, the pronominal *he* in Example 12a cannot get the value of the quantificational expression *everyone* because there is no binding relation between them. However, the pronominal *he* can get the value of the quantificational expression when there is a binding relation between the two as in Example 12b:

(12) (Reuland and Everaert, 2001)

- a. *Everyone_{*i*} had been worrying himself stiff. He_{*i*} was relieved.
- b. Everyone_{*i*} who had been worrying himself stiff said that he_{*i*} was relieved.

If in Georgian the interpretation of the reflexive phrase in subject position is dependent on the interpretation of the postcedent quantificational expression, we could argue that there is a binding relation between the anaphoric phrase and the quantificational expression. Thus, we could argue that there is a binding relation between the subject anaphor and its postcedent. Therefore, in general, subject anaphors in Georgian could be claimed to bind their postcedents and not just be coreferential with them.

Below I bring some examples of the reflexive phrase as a subject argument with a quantificational postcedent in 13, 14, 15. Each of these examples has an ergative marked reflexive phrase *tavis-ma tav-ma* as a subject argument. The interpretation of the reflexive phrase *tavis-ma tav-ma* ‘‘himself/herself’’ is dependent on the interpretation of the postcedent *qvela-∅* ‘‘everybody’’, showing a relation of variable binding:

- (13) cxovreba-ši ertxel mainc tavis-ma tav-ma qvela
 life-in once at.least self's-ERG self-ERG everybody.NOM
 šeižleba daaprtxos.
 it.is.possible (s)he/it.scares.SUBJ.him/her
 Lit.: In.the.life once at.least himself/herself everybody it.is.possible
 (s)he/it.scares.SUBJ.him/her.
 “At least once in the life everybody can get scared of himself/herself.”
- (14) tquil-ad daabralebt zemo-dan zeçola-s, uzraob-is
 lie-ADV you.PL.will.blame.it above-from press-DAT Stagnation-GEN
 çl-eb-ši mainc, tavis-ma tav-ma ubižga
 year-PL-in at.least self's-ERG self-ERG (s)he/it.pushed.him/her
 qvela-s, šesuliqo partia-ši.
 everybody-DAT him/her.to.be.entered party-in
 Lit.: Wrongly you.PL.will.blame.it from.above press. Of.Stagnation in.years
 at.least self's self it.pushed.him/her everybody to.join party.
 “You.PL will wrongly blame the press from above, at least in the years of
 Stagnation everybody was pushed by himself/herself to enter the party.”³
- (15) gadamçqvet moment-ši tavis-ma tav-ma qvela
 decisive moment-in self's-ERG self-ERG everybody.NOM
 šeižleba daapikros.
 it.is.possible (s)he/it.makes.SUBJ.him/her.start.think
 Lit.: Decisive moment.in himself/herself everybody it.is.possible
 (s)he/it.makes.SUBJ.him/her.start.think.
 “In a decisive moment a property/aspect of one's own can make everybody
 start thinking.”

That the reflexive phrase is the subject argument of the verb forms in the above given examples 13, 14 and 15 can be checked by a substitution test correspondingly in the examples 16, 17 and 18:

- (16) cxovreba-ši ertxel mainc umçeob-is grznoba-m qvela
 life-in once at.least helplessness-GEN feeling-ERG everybody.NOM
 šeižleba daaprtxos.
 it.is.possible (s)he/it.scares.SUBJ.him/her
 Lit.: In.the.life once at.least of.helplessness feeling everybody it.is.possible
 (s)he/it.scares.SUBJ.him/her.
 “At least once in the life the feeling of helplessness can scare everybody.”

³What is meant by Example 14 is the following: in the former Soviet Union in the years of Stagnation (1970's) people used to join the already corrupt communist party more to use the membership for their own carrier, rather than for sharing the principles of the party.

- (17) *t̥q̥il-ad daabralebt zemo-dan zeçola-s, uzraob-is*
lie-ADV you.PL.will.blame.it above-from press-DAT Stagnation-GEN
çl-eb-ši mainc, uket moçqob-is survil-ma
year-PL-in at.least better making.oneself.comfortable-GEN will-ERG
ubizga qvela-s, šesuliqo partia-ši.
 (s)he/it.pushed.him/her everybody-DAT him/her.to.be.entered party-in
 Lit.: Wrongly you.PL.will.blame.it from.above press. Of.Stagnation in.years
 at.least better of.making.oneself.comfortable will it.pushed.him/her every-
 body to.join party.

“You.PL will wrongly blame the press from above, at least in the years of Stagnation the will to make oneself comfortable pushed everybody to enter the party.”

- (18) *gadamçqveṭ moment-ši tavis-ma tviseb-eb-ma qvela*
decisive moment-in self’s-ERG quality-PL-ERG everybody.NOM
šeižleba daapikros.
it.is.possible (s)he/it.makes.SUBJ.him/her.start.think
 Lit.: Decisive moment.in self’s qualities everybody it.is.possible
 (s)he/it.makes.SUBJ.him/her.start.think.

“In a decisive moment one’s own qualities can make everybody start thinking.”

Thus, the reflexive phrase in subject position has to be co-valued with an argument in the VP not only when the argument is a referential expression (as in 9, 10 and 11) but also when it is quantificational (as in 13, 14 and 15). Therefore, the cases with quantificational postcedents in 13, 14 and 15 illustrate variable binding, not just coreference, between the subject anaphor and its postcedent.

5 Is the Form of the Anaphor Responsible for Its Interpretation?

Like Georgian, there are some other languages too allowing reflexives to occupy a subject position under certain conditions. For instance, Everaert (2001) observes that the Georgian reflexive phrase *tavis- tav-* is structurally very similar to the Greek anaphor *o eaftos tu* (as described in (Iatridou, 1988) and (Anagnostopoulou and Everaert, 1999)) which is also able to appear as a subject (19, 20):

- (19) (Anagnostopoulou and Everaert, 1999)

[O eaftos_j tu_i]_j ton provlimatizi [ton Petro]_i.
 The self his CL.ACC puzzles the Peter.ACC

“Himself puzzles Peter.”

(20) (Anagnostopoulou, 1999)

Tin Maria tin provlimatizi/enoxli/anisihi o eaftos tis.
The Maria.ACC CL.ACC puzzles/bothers/worries the self her

“Maria is puzzled/bothered/worried with/at/by herself.”

The same applies to the Basque anaphor which has a similar structure and which also may serve as a subject in certain cases (21, 22):

(21) Basque, X. Artiagoitia, personal communication, 2001

[neure_i buru-a-k_j]_j hilko nau (ni_i).
my head-DET-ERG it.kills.me me.has.it I

Lit.: Myself kills me.

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

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

Egunotan, neure buru-a-k kezkatzen nau (ni).
day.DET.in my head-DET-ERG worry.HAB me.has.it I

“These days, my(own)self worries me.”

Whether it is Greek (19, 20), Basque (21) or Georgian (11), only the possessor within the reflexive NP has an agreement relation with the postcedent. It is claimed in (Everaert, 2001) and (Everaert, 2003) that precisely because of such structure of the anaphor Georgian allows a locally bound “subject” anaphor. In 11 the predicate is both reflexive and reflexive-marked satisfying binding conditions A and B of the Reflexivity Theory (Reinhart and Reuland, 1993); and because of its internal structure (the two co-indexed elements *tavis-* and *ḱac-* in 11 do not form an A-chain) the reflexive is able to escape Chain Formation violation.

The A-chain cannot be formed also because the reflexive phrases in these languages qualify as a [+R, +SELF] anaphor. Being fully specified for phi-features (and, thus, being [+R]), these anaphors are unable to form an A chain with the antecedent because according to Reinhart and Reuland (1993)’s chain condition the formation of A chains with two [+R] links is not allowed.

However, as argued in (Amiridze, 2003) and (Amiridze, 2004), if only the structure of an anaphor matters (enabling to escape the Chain Formation) then the anaphor has to be grammatical in subject position in Georgian, Greek or Basque with any verb but it is not (see 23 for Georgian, 24 for Greek and 25 for Basque).

(23) Georgian, from (Amiridze, 2004, p. 437)

*tavis-i tav-i açamebs ḱac-s.
self’s-NOM self-NOM he.is.torturing.him man-DAT

Himself is torturing the man. (Agentive reading)

(24) Greek, from (Anagnostopoulou, 1999)

*Tin Maria den tin thavmazi/aghapai o eaftos tis.
The Maria.ACC not CL.ACC admires/likes the self her

Herself doesn't admire/like Mary.

(25) Basque, from (Artiagoitia, 2003, p. 622)

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

Himself killed Mirande.

Also, the subject uses of the Georgian reciprocal *ertmanet-* show that the *aspect/property of reading* has nothing to do with the form of the anaphor. The reciprocal when appearing in subject position only has the *aspect/property of reading* (cf. 26a) but it neither forms a possessive construction nor is derived from any body-part (27).

- (26) a. ertmanet-i amxiarulebt bavšv-eb-s.
REC-NOM it.makes.them.cheerful child-PL-DAT
“Something in each other makes the children cheerful.” (i.e., their behavior, the way they look, etc.) (Non-agentive reading)
- b. bavšv-eb-i ertmanet-s amxiaruleben.
child-PL-NOM REC-DAT they.make.them.cheerful
“The children make each other cheerful.” (i.e., by performing, telling, etc.) (Agentive reading)

- (27) ertmanet- < ert+man+ert-
one+ERG+one-
“each other”

Thus, the *aspect/property of reading* of the reflexive phrase in the subject position is not related to the structure, otherwise the reciprocals would also be of a possessive form but they are not (27).

6 Do Verb Classes Play a Role?

As argued by Amiridze (2004), since the formally different reflexive phrase and the reciprocal *ertmanet-* when put in a subject position of a certain class of verbs both get interpreted alike, the similar interpretation has to be related to the verb class rather than to the form of any of the anaphors.

Observe that the anaphors are grammatical exclusively on the object experiencer reading of the originally transitive verbs but not on the agentive one (cf. the examples 10 vs. 23 for Georgian and 25 vs. 21 for Basque). Also, notice that none of the subject experiencer verbs are able to take the reflexive phrase as a subject argument (see 28a for Georgian, 24 for Greek and 29 for Basque). According to the data, Amiridze (2004) concludes that the subject anaphors are unable to refer to either an agent or an experiencer.

(28) (Amiridze, 2003)

- a. *tavis tav-s uqvars ivane.
 self's self-DAT he.loves.him Ivane.NOM
 Himself loves Ivane.
- b. ivane-s uqvars tavis-i tav-i.
 Ivane-DAT he.loves.him self's-NOM self-NOM
 "Ivane loves himself."

(29) Basque, I. Laka, personal communication, 2001

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

Herself loves Miren.

It has been argued by Amiridze (2004) to relate the interpretation of the anaphors which they get in the subject position of the verbs under the object experiencer reading to the thematic properties of the verbs under the very reading. Namely, it has been argued that although the form and the anaphoric properties of the reflexive phrase and the reciprocal *ertmanet-* differ, they get the same kind of interpretation because the verb reading can only be associated with the subject argument of the type of cause rather than of the agent. In other words, the anaphors get interpreted not fully identical to the postcedent but as an aspect/property of it because the verbs taking them as a subject argument can only have a cause but not an agent as a subject.

However, there remain several questions. First of all, if the reason of having subject anaphors is in the thematic properties of verbs, then why subject anaphors with object experiencer verbs and transitive verbs on a non-agentive reading are disallowed in so many languages, even in those which have a formally similar reflexives? For instance, although Dargwa (30a) and Bagwalal (31a) allow subject occurrences of the reflexive phrase of an inalienable type, similar to the reflexive phrases of Georgian, Greek and Basque, they does not get interpreted as an aspect/property of the postcedent. Rather in Dargwa and Bagwalal the use is, in fact, intended to correct the expectation of the hearer (cf. 30a vs. 30b, 31a vs. 31b):

(30) Dargwa, (Kibrik, 1997, p. 300)

- a. *musa caratajir cin-na cin-ni c'aIq'il*
 Musa-NOM than.others REFL-GEN REFL-ERG more
gap'irq'aca-w.
 praise.PRES-CLASS1
 “Musa praises himself more than others (praise him).”
- b. *musa-l caratajir cin-na ca-w c'aIq'il*
 Musa-ERG than.others REFL-GEN REFL-NOM-CLASS1 more
gap'irq'aca-w.
 praise.PRES-CLASS1
 “Musa praises himself more than (he praises) others.”

(31) Bagwalal, (Ljutikova, 1999, p. 176)

- a. *in-çu-r-da ima w=eSiSi.*
 REFL-OBL.M-ERG-EMPH father M=praise
 Lit.: Himself.ERG praised father.ABS.
 Context: No one praised the father.
- b. *ima-çu-r e=w-da w=eSiSi.*
 father-OBL.M-ERG REFL=M-EMPH M=praise
 Lit.: Father.ERG praised himself.ABS.
 Context: The father did not praise anyone.

The next question arises if we consider not just the group of examples of subject anaphors with transitive verbs on a non-agentive reading but also those examples where there is no change in the thematic properties of transitive verbs and still the subject anaphors are allowed. Such examples are those in 9, 32 which use a verb form referring to a transitive action carried out by a subject affecting a theme. Although the subject argument refers exclusively to a cause rather than to an agent, the object argument is still a theme affected by the subject.

(32) (Amiridze and Everaert, 2000)

tavis-ma tav-ma ixsna prezident-i.
 self's-ERG self-ERG (s)he.saved.him/her president-NOM

“It was his/her own positive personal properties, and/or his/her achievements, etc., that saved the president.”

Thus, it is not the semantics and thematic properties of the verb readings which constrain the interpretation of the anaphors in subject position. Subject anaphors in Georgian are available both on the non-agentive and the agentive readings of transitive verbs. Thus, their interpretation as an aspect/property of the postcedent is not conditioned by the verb semantics.

7 Special Contexts

The examples below also involve transitive verbs on their agentive reading and allow the subject reflexive phrase to be interpreted as an image/representation of the postcedent. These uses also turn out to be problematic if we want to relate the availability of the subject anaphors with the thematic properties of verbs allowing them.

These are the cases where the referent of the reflexive is not an aspect/property of the referent of its postcedent but a representation such as a TV image (33), a recorded voice (34), a close associate or someone closely resembling, for instance, a twin sibling (35). These are contexts with identity splits, or those reflecting dream/unreal worlds, associations. In these special, representational, contexts the transitive verbs taking an ergative reflexive phrase as an argument do have an agentive reading.

(33) TV-image context

televizor-is ekran-i-dan [tavis-ma tav-ma]
 TV-GEN screen-INST-from self's-ERG self-ERG
 damozγvra parti-is lider-i.
 (s)he.instructed.him/her party-GEN leader-NOM

Lit.: From the TV screen himself.ERG instructed party leader.NOM.

The context: The leader of the party was watching his own speech on the TV and was instructed by himself as an ordinary TV viewer would have been instructed by a party leader.

(34) Voice recording context

xširad ucnaur-i gržnoba mičndeba, roca [čem-i-ve
 often strange-NOM feeling.NOM it.appears.to.me when my-NOM-FOC
 tav-i] meubneba, ris šemdeg ra unda gavaqeto.
 self-NOM (s)he.tells.me what.GEN after what should I.do.SUBJ

[“Sometimes I dial my home number and leave a list of instructions for myself on the voice mail in order to listen to them when returned back home and remind myself what still has to be done for the next day.] I often get a strange feeling when [I hear my own voice and realize that it is] myself [who] tells me what has to be done and in which order.”

(35) Twin context

mašin ki martla vipikre, rom mesizmreboda, rogor
 then PART really I.thought that I.was.dreaming.about.it how
 qocnida [tavis-i tav-i] natia-s.
 she.was.kissing.her self's-NOM self-NOM Natia-DAT

[An amazed viewer: “I came out and got amazed. Natia has turned into two persons. They stood and talked to each other. Finally they also kissed each other.] It was only then when I really thought that I was dreaming how Natia was being kissed by her(own)self.”

In the TV image context in 33 the referent of the postcedent, the full NP *part̄i-is lider-i*, refers to a certain individual while the ergative marked subject reflexive phrase refers only to one part of his/her personality. This example can also be viewed as representational—the person affected by his/her own TV-image. However, irrespective of how the referent of the postcedent is qualified—as affected by one of the aspects of his/her personality or by his/her TV image—it gets affected as an ordinary patient (cf. 33 vs. 36):

- (36) *prezident-ma damoḡvra part̄i-is lider-i.*
 preident-ERG (s)he.instructed.him/her party-GEN leader-NOM
 “The president instructed the party leader.”

Example 34 illustrates a context in which a recorded voice of a person helps him/her to recall the schedule for the next day. In this particular example a voice recording is a representation of that person affecting him/her just as an ordinary agent affects an addressee (cf. 34 vs. 37):

- (37) [*čem-i-ve xelkveit-i meubneba...*]
 my-NOM-FOC subordinate-NOM (s)he.tells.me
 “My own subordinate tells me...”

Example 35 illustrates a twin context where the referent of the reflexive phrase is not an aspect or image of the referent of the postcedent as it is in 33, 34 but it is a completely different personality closely resembling the referent of the postcedent. In 35 the reflexive phrase refers to the twin of the referent of the postcedent NP *natia-s*. It is as human and as agentive as the referent of the full NP *deda* in 38:

- (38) *deda ḡocnida natia-s.*
 mother.NOM she.was.kissing.her Natia-dat
 “The mother was kissing Natia.”

In these contexts the Georgian reflexive phrases refer to an image or a close associate which is not necessarily [-human]/[-animate] at all but can perform agentive behavior and act as an agent. In 33 and 34 the TV image of the party leader and the voice recording are in no way agentive. However, the referent of the postcedent gets affected by the images as an ordinary patient (cf. 33 vs. 36) or as an ordinary addressee (34 vs. 37). As for the twin context in Example 35, not only the referent of the postcedent gets affected as an ordinary patient (35 vs. 38) but also the referent of the reflexive phrase—the twin—performs an agentive behavior. One might call these cases non-anaphoric. However, as Jackendoff (1992) shows,

reflexive pronouns may in general be interpreted as referring to a representation of their antecedents and not only strictly identical to them.

Similar contexts like Mme. Tussaud's and Münchhausen's are discussed for Dutch in (Reuland, 2001). In both cases the complex anaphor *zichzelf* is interpreted as a representation of the antecedent (39b, 40b) while the simplex *zelf* as identical to it (39a, 40a). Both in 39b and 40b the SELF anaphor *zichzelf* expresses a relation between the antecedent and its function that bears a systematic resemblance to the antecedent, but can be distinguished from it.

(39) (Reuland, 2001, p. 483), Madame Tussaud context: Marie is famous and walked into Madame Tussaud's. She looked in a mirror and...

- a. ze zag zich in een griezelige hoek staan.
she saw SE in a creepy corner stand
"she saw herself standing in a creepy corner."
- b. ze zag zichzelf in een griezelige hoek staan.
she saw herself in a creepy corner stand
"she saw her statue standing in a creepy corner."

(40) Münchhausen context, (Reuland, 2001, p. 483)

- a. De baron trok zich uit het moeras.
the baron pulled SE out of the swamp
"The baron pulled himself out of the swamp." (by grabbing a branch of a tree hanging over him)
- b. De baron trok zichzelf uit het moeras.
the baron pulled himself out of the swamp
"The baron pulled himself out of the swamp." (by his hair)

Since the complex reflexive *zichzelf* is able to refer to objects which stand proxy to the antecedent and not be strictly identical to it, while the simplex *zich* cannot do so, Reuland (2001) interprets complex anaphors as a relevant function of the antecedent. For instance, the Frisian complex anaphor in 41a is interpreted as a function (41b) which maps the antecedent onto an object standing proxy for the antecedent.

(41) a. From (Reuland, 2001, p. 480)

Willem hatet himsels.
"Willem hates himself."

b. Willem λx (x hates f(x))

According to Reuland (2001), it is no accident that cross-linguistically the equivalent of *his head/soul/body/bone/eye/etc.* is a possible anaphor, and the equivalent of *his table* is not. Body-parts are inalienable nouns which in many languages can stand to refer to a person or objects which stand proxy to that person.

Therefore, it is possible to consider the semantics of body-part nouns to be responsible for interpreting them as a relevant function of the antecedent in reflexive constructions. The subject uses of the reflexive phrase in Georgian (headed by a body-part *tav-* “head”) which refer to an image of the postcedent (33, 34, 35) are a nice illustration of a complex reflexive to be interpreted as a function of the postcedent.

However, it is then again problematic to explain why the reciprocal *ertmanet-* in subject position (26a) gets the same interpretation as a reflexive phrase in subject position would have got (see, for instance, 10). The reciprocal in 26a is interpreted as an aspect/property of the referent of its postcedent but has no structure of inalienable anaphors (27).

8 Conclusion

The paper discusses the Georgian reflexive phrase as a subject argument of verbs in special contexts. Such contexts include a TV or mirror image, voice recording and twin contexts which illustrate the referent of the anaphor interpreted as an image/representation of the postcedent. The facts, although problematic both for the Binding Theory (Chomsky, 1981) and the Reflexivity Theory (Reinhart and Reuland, 1993), could in principle be accounted for by the analysis of complex anaphors as a relevant function of the antecedent, proposed in (Reuland, 2001). However, the Georgian reciprocal *ertmanet-*, being unable to get the same treatment as the Georgian reflexive phrase but, at the same time, being able to appear as a subject argument of verbs, makes the application of the analysis offered by Reuland (2001) to the Georgian data problematic.

References

- Amiridze, Nino. 2003. The anaphor agreement effect and Georgian anaphors. In C. Beyssade, O. Bonami, P. Cabredo Hofherr and F. Corblin (eds.), *Empirical Issues in Formal Syntax and Semantics 4*, pages 99–114, Paris: Presses de l’Université de Paris-Sorbonne.
- Amiridze, Nino. 2004. On the *Aspect of Reading of Georgian Anaphors in Subject Position*. In J.-Y. Kim, Y. A. Lander and B. H. Partee (eds.), *Possessives and Beyond: Semantics and Syntax (University of Massachusetts Working Papers in Linguistics 29)*, pages 427–439, Amherst, MA: GLSA Publications.
- Amiridze, Nino and Everaert, Martin. 2000. On subject anaphora in Georgian, paper presented at the 10th Caucasian Colloquium, Munich, August 2-5, 2000.
- Anagnostopoulou, Elena. 1999. On experiencers. In A. Alexiadou, G. C. Horrocks and M. Stavrou (eds.), *Studies in Greek Syntax*, pages 67–93, Dordrecht: Kluwer.

- Anagnostopoulou, Elena and Everaert, Martin. 1999. Towards a more complete typology of anaphoric expressions. *Linguistic Inquiry* 30, 97–119.
- Anderson, Stephen R. 1984. On representations in morphology. Case, agreement and inversion in Georgian. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 2(2), 157–218.
- Aronson, Howard I. 1994. Paradigmatic and Syntagmatic Subject in Georgian. In H. I. Aronson (ed.), *Non-Slavic Languages of the USSR. Papers from the Fourth Conference*, pages 13–33, Columbus Ohio: Slavica Publishers Inc.
- Artiagoitia, Xabier. 2003. Reciprocal and Reflexive Constructions. In J. I. Hualde and J. O. de Urbina (eds.), *A grammar of Basque*, pages 607–632, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Asatiani, Rusudan. 1982. *martivi çinadadebis tipologiuri analizi* [Typological Analysis of Simple Sentence]. Tbilisi: Mecniereba, (in Georgian).
- Boeder, Winfried. 1989. Verbal person marking, noun phrases and word order in Georgian. In L. Marácz and P. Muysken (eds.), *Configurationality*, pages 159–184, Dordrecht: Foris.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1981. *Lectures on Government and Binding*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Everaert, Martin. 2001. Paradigmatic restrictions on anaphors. In K. Meegerdooimian and L. A. Bar-el (eds.), *WCCFL 20 Proceedings*, pages 178–191, Somerville: Cascadilla Press.
- Everaert, Martin. 2003. Reflexivanaphern und Reflexivdomänen. In L. Gunkel, G. Müller and G. Zifonun (eds.), *Arbeiten zur Reflexivierung*, pages 1–23, Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.
- Harris, Alice C. 1981. *Georgian Syntax*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hewitt, George. 1995. *Georgian: A structural Reference Grammar*, volume 2 of *London Oriental and African Language Library*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Iatridou, Sabine. 1988. Clitics, anaphors and a problem of coindexation. *Linguistic Inquiry* 19, 698–703.
- Jackendoff, Ray. 1992. Mme. Tussaud meets the binding theory. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 10, 1–31.
- Kibrik, Aleksandr E. 1997. Beyond subject and object: Toward a comprehensive relational typology. *Linguistic Typology* 1, 279–346.
- Kvatchadze, Leo. 1996. *tanamedrove kartuli enis sintaksi* [Syntax of Modern Georgian]. Tbilisi: Rubikoni, (in Georgian).

- Ljutikova, Ekaterina. 1999. Bez Podležaščix i Dopolnenij: Refleksivizacija v Bagvalinskom Jazyke [Without subjects and objects: Reflexivization in Bagwalal]. In E. V. Rakhilina and Y. G. Testelec (eds.), *Tipologija i Teorija Jazyka*, Moscow: Jazyki Russkoj Kul'tury, (in Russian).
- Reinhart, Tanya and Reuland, Eric. 1993. Reflexivity. *Linguistic Inquiry* 24, 657–720.
- Reuland, Eric. 2001. Primitives of Binding. *Linguistic Inquiry* 32(3), 439–492.
- Reuland, Eric and Everaert, Martin. 2001. Deconstructing Binding. In M. Baltin and Ch. Collins (eds.), *Handbook of Syntactic Theory*, pages 634–670, London: Blackwell.
- Shanidze, Akaki. 1973. *kartuli enis gramaṭikis sapuzvlebi* [*Foundations of Georgian Grammar*]. Tbilisi: Tbilisi University Press, (in Georgian).