Subject anaphors and agreement oral

Most linguists seem to agree that in reflexive and reciprocal constructions of accusative as well as of ergative languages the controller of the reflexive or reciprocal pronoun must be the most prominent argument (i.e. higher on a hierarchy of grammatical roles), whereas the pronoun itself must be a less prominent argument (Chomsky 1981, Dixon 1994). Similarly, it has been claimed that anaphors do not trigger agreement (Woolford 1999). However, Daghestanian languages provide fascinating data that violate such proposed universals regarding the syntactic alignment in reflexive and reciprocal constructions. For instance, in Icari Dargwa there is a choice between the canonical reflexive construction for transitive verbs (1), whereby the controller is in the ergative case (agent), and the pronoun is in the absolutive case (patient), and the unusual pattern involving a 'reversal of grammatical roles' (2).

- (1) *murad-il cinna_ca-w w-alX:-a=ca-w* Murad-ERG REFL-M[ABS] M-feed:IPFV-PROG=COP-M 'Murad is earning his own living.' (lit. 'is feeding himself')
- (2) murad cinna_cinni w-alX:-a = ca-w
 Murad[ABS] REFL.ERG M-feed:IPFV-PROG = COP-M
 'Murad is earning his own living.' or 'As for Murad, he is earning his own living.'

In my talk, I will first provide a descriptive account of reflexive and reciprocal constructions in a number of Daghestanian languages by considering parameters that determine the 'reversal of grammatical roles': (i) the form of the pronouns (simple vs. different types of complex pronouns), (ii) the valency type of the predicate (canonical transitive, affective, extended intransitive), (iii) the grammatical role of the controllers and the pronouns (S, A, P, experiencer, stimulus, non-canonical agent, other), and occasionally (iv) word order. Most of the data has been gathered by the author during fieldwork in Daghestan.

In the second part I will examine previous analyses of the Daghestanian data and of quirky reflexive and reciprocal constructions in other languages (Anagnostopoulou & Everaert 1999, Amiridze 2003). I will show that Yamada's (2004) proposal to analyze sentences similar to (2) as intransitive cannot be maintained. Instead, it is possible to analyze the 'reversal of grammatical roles' building on Ljutikova (1997). The difference between (1) and (2) must be explained through the historical development of the constructions and subtle pragmatic differences. In (2) the antecedent NP behaves similar to left-dislocated NPs (e.g. it bears the unmarked case) and only the reflexive is a true argument of the predicate 'feed' (see the translation). This is supported by the fact that in Icari Dargwa simple reflexive pronouns are also used to establish coreference between clauses (Sumbatova & Mutalov 2003: 167-168).

The talk concludes by proving that anaphors in Daghestanian languages trigger verbal agreement in gender and number (1) and thus contradict the anaphor agreement effect, but the agreement is rather different from the person agreement in familiar European languages.

References

Amiridze, Nino. 2003. The anaphor agreement effect and Georgian anaphors. In Claire Beyssade, O.
Bonami & P. C. F. Cabredo Hofherr (eds.), *Empirical issues in formal syntax and semantics* 4, 99–114.
Paris: Presses de l'université Paris-Sorbonne.

Anagnostopoulou, Elena & Martin Everaert. 1999. Towards a more complete typology of anaphoric expressions. *Linguistic Inquiry* 30. 97–119.

Chomsky, Noam. 1981. Lectures on Government and Binding. Dordrecht: Foris.

Dixon, Robert M. W. 1994. Ergativity. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ljutikova, Ekatarina A. 1997. Refleksivy i èmfaza. Voprosy jazykoznanija(6). 49-74.

Sumbatova, Nina R. & Rasul O. Mutalov. 2003. *A grammar of Icari Dargwa*. München: Lincom Europa. Woolford, Ellen. 1999. More on the anaphor agreement effect. *Linguistic Inquiry* 30. 257–287.

Yamada, Hisanari. 2004. On the ergative reciprocal *tsotsaz* construction in Standard Avar. *Talk at the LENCA2 conference*, University of Kazan.