The reflexive pronoun *ži* in Northern Akhvakh:
A corpus-based study

Denis Creissels
University of Lyon
denis.creissels@univ-lyon2.fr
http://deniscreissels.fr

1. Introduction

Northern Akhvakh, spoken in western Daghestan, belongs to the Andic sub-branch of the Avar-Andic(-Tsezic) branch of the Nakh-Daghestanian family. It is documented through Magomedbekova's (1967) monograph, Magomedova & Abdulaeva's (2007) dictionary, and a series of articles by the author of this presentation (Creissels 2008, 2009, 2010, 2012, 2013, 2014, 2016a, 2016b, 2017, 2018, Forthcoming). The analysis of the Northern Akhvakh reflexive pronoun **ži** proposed in this paper is entirely based on a corpus of texts that were collected mainly in Tadmagitl' and Lologonitl' with the help of Indira Abdulaeva. The corpus includes 625 occurrences of **ži**.

The pronoun **ži** occurs in intensifying, reflexive, and logophoric functions, either in its simple form or in a form enlarged by the addition of the intensifying particle **-da**. The use of identical or related forms in attested in many languages of the world, and pronouns cognate with Akhvakh **ži** fulfilling similar functions are found in the other Andic languages. The main contribution of this paper to the debate on reflexivity is that it provides a corpus-based study of the functions fulfilled by the two forms of the pronoun **ži** (the bare form and the **da**-form) in Northern Akhvakh.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 provides basic information about Northern Akhvakh morphosyntax. Section 3 gives the inventory of pronouns relevant to this study (personal pronouns, demonstratives, and the pronoun **ži**) and describes their morphological properties. Section 4 provides an overview of the uses of **ži**. Section 5 describes the use of **ži** in local reflexivization. Section 6 is devoted to long-distance reflexivization (including logophoricity). Section 7 summarizes the main conclusions.

2. General remarks on Akhvakh morphosyntax[1]

2.1. Clause structure

Akhvakh clause structure is characterized by flexible constituent order. Case marking of NPs and gender-number agreement of the verb with one of its core arguments are consistently ergative. Arguments whose identity is recoverable from the context can be omitted (although anaphoric zeros are much less common in narration than in dialogue), and unexpressed arguments receiving an arbitrary interpretation are common. Causative is the only valency-changing mechanism systematically expressed via verb morphology or grammaticalized

---

[1] More details on the basic aspects of Northern Akhvakh morphosyntax can be found in Creissels (Forthcoming).

periphrases. For more details on transitivity and verbal valency in Northern Akhvakh, see Creissels (2017).

2.2 Nouns and noun phrases

Three semantically transparent genders are distinguished in the singular: human masculine (M), human feminine (F), and non-human (N).[2] In the plural, the distinction *masculine* vs. *feminine* is neutralized, resulting in a binary opposition *human plural* (HPL) vs. *non-human plural* (NPL).

In canonical NPs, the head noun in final position is inflected for number and case. There is a subclass of adjectives with an obligatory prefix expressing gender-number agreement with their head, but the general rule is that noun modifiers (including the adjectives with an obligatory agreement prefix) optionally agree with their head by means of suffixes. However, the agreement suffixes of noun modifiers are rarely found in spontaneous texts. In the absence of a head noun, the last word of the NP, whatever its nature, is marked for gender, number, and case.

Number inflection of nouns is irregular and involves considerable free variation.

In addition to the nominative (quotation form of nouns, also used in S/P role), which has no overt mark, the case inflection of Northern Akhvakh nouns includes the so-called 'syntactic cases' traditionally recognized in descriptions of Daghestanian languages (ergative, dative, and genitive), and several series of spatial forms whose ending can be segmented into an *spatial configuration marker* followed by a *directionality marker* that can be analyzed as the case marker proper, with a tripartite distinction *locative* vs. *allative* vs. *ablative*. In addition to that, Northern Akhvakh has a comitative case, and several other suffixes are more or less serious candidates to the status of case markers (causal, mediative, functive-transformative, and similative).

As a rule, case markers attach to the *oblique stem* of nouns (which however may coincide with the nominative).

There are two variants of the genitive case in complementary distribution: the zero-marked genitive (identical to the oblique stem) with masculine singular and human plural nouns, and the ƛ:**i**-genitive with feminine singular, non-human singular and non-human plural nouns. The zero-marked genitive optionally combines with gender-number suffixes expressing agreement with its head.

3. The pronouns of Akhvakh

This presentation of Akhvakh pronouns is limited to personal pronouns, demonstratives, and the pronoun **ži**, since the other words commonly classified as pronouns play no direct role in the mechanisms described in the following sections.

3.1. Personal pronouns

Akhvakh has no 3rd person pronoun proper. The anaphoric / deictic function fulfilled in other languages by specialized 3rd person pronouns is fulfilled in Akhvakh by demonstratives.

---

[2] The main exceptions to the semantic rule of gender assignment are **ãde** 'person' and **mik'e** 'child', which in the singular trigger N agreement, whereas the corresponding plural forms **ãdo** and **mik'eli** regularly trigger HPL agreement.

3.1.1. 1st & 2nd person singular pronouns

1st & 2nd person singular pronouns do not exhibit gender distinction in their form, but trigger masculine or feminine agreement depending on the sex of their referent.

In the inflection of 1st & 2nd person singular pronouns, the ergative suffix does not attach to the oblique stem selected by the other case markers, but to a truncated form of the nominative (**dene + de > de-de**, **mene + de > me-de**), whereas the other case markers attach to a stem identical to the genitive.

	1SG	2SG
Nom.	**dene**	**mene**
Erg.	**de-de**	**me-de**
Dat.	**di-ƛa**	**du-ƛa**
Gen.	**di**	**du**
Comit.	**di-k'ena**	**du-k'ena**
etc.		

3.1.2. 1st & 2nd person plural pronouns

Akhvakh has an exclusive vs. inclusive distinction in the 1st person plural.

In the inflection of 1st & 2nd person plural pronouns, the ergative and dative suffixes attach to a stem identical to the nominative, whereas the other case markers attach to a stem identical to the genitive.

Reduced forms **-e** and **-a** of the ergative and dative suffixes **-de** and **-ƛa** are common in the inflection of 1st & 2nd person plural pronouns.[3]

	1PL.EXCL	1PL.INCL	2PL
Nom.	**is:i**	**iƛ:i**	**ušti**
Erg.	**is:i-de ~ is:-e**	**iƛ:i-de ~ iƛ:-e**	**ušti-de ~ ušt-e**
Dat.	**is:i-ƛa ~ is:-a**	**iƛ:i-ƛa ~ iƛ:-a**	**ušti-ƛa ~ ušt-a**
Gen.	**es:e**	**eƛ:e**	**ošte**
Comit.	**es:e-k'ena**	**eƛ:e-k'ena**	**ošte-k'ena**
etc.			

3.1.3. The intensive form of 1st & 2nd person pronouns

1st and 2nd person intensive pronouns (i.e., pronouns used to emphasize the identity of a participant), used in particular (but not only) in reflexive function, are formed by adding the intensifying particle **-da** 'self' to the forms described in the preceding section. Note that **-da** follows the case markers.

(1) **čes:e**   **ãɫi**   *di-da*   **dadas:wa**   **otari,**
one.CONTR   ram   1SG(GEN)-INT   father.DAT   N.send.CPL
'I sent one of the rams to my father,
čes:ebe   *dede-da*   **biq:wari.**
one.CONTR.N   1SG.ERG-INT   N.slaughter.CPL
and I slaughtered the other myself.'

---

[3] The same reduced forms are also common with nominals whose oblique stem includes the formatives **-s:u-** (M), **-ɫ:i-** (F/N) **-do-** (HPL), and **-di-** (NPL), in particular the demonstrative pronouns and **ži**.

3.2. Demonstratives

3.2.1. Inventory

Akhvakh demonstratives are based on the roots **ha** (proximal) and **hu** (distal), alone or enlarged by one of the following three formatives expressing vertical deixis: **-de/u**, **-ƛe/u**, and **-ge/u**. In exophoric function, the semantic distinctions carried by the choice of a particular demonstrative can be described as follows:

(proximal)	(distal)	
ha	**hu**	(no indication of vertical deixis)
ha-de	**hu-du**	(same level as the deictic center)
ha-ƛe	**hu-ƛu**	(higher than the deictic center)
ha-ge	**hu-gu**	(lower than the deictic center)

The forms most commonly found in endophoric function are **hu**, **hudu**, and **hugu**, but in this function, I have not been able to find semantic distinctions that could explain the choice between the eight forms of the demonstrative listed above.

3.2.2. Demonstratives as determiners

Like the other noun modifiers, demonstratives used as noun modifiers optionally take suffixes expressing gender-number agreement with their head.

3.2.3. Demonstratives as pronouns

In pronominal function, demonstratives are inflected for gender-number and case. In the nominative, they take a suffix **-we** (M), **-je** (F), **-be** (N), **-ji** (HPL), or **-re** (NPL); in the other cases, they take an oblique stem formative **-sːu-** (M), **-łːi-** (F/N), **-do-** (HPL), or **-di-** (NPL), followed by the case marker.

	hu-we (M)	**hu-je** (F) / **hu-be** (N)	**hu-ji** (HPL)	**hu-re** (NPL)
Erg.	**hu-sːu-de ~ hu-sːw-e**	**hu-łːi-de ~ hu-łː-e**	**hu-do-de ~ hu-dw-e**	**hu-di-de ~ hu-d-e**
Dat.	**hu-sːu-ƛa ~ hu-sːw-a**	**hu-łːi-ƛa ~ hu-łː-a**	**hu-do-ƛa ~ hu-dw-a**	**hu-di-ƛa ~ hu-d-a**
Gen.	**hu-sːu**	**hu-łːi-ƛːi**	**hu-do**	**hu-di-ƛːi**
Com.	**hu-sːu-k'ena**	**hu-łːi-k'ena**	**hu-do-k'ena**	**hu-dii-k'ena**

etc.

3.2.4. Demonstratives and the intensifying particle -da

As illustrated by example (2), the intensifying particle **-da** can attach to demonstratives used as determiners. The meaning expressed is 'same'.

(2) **k'ebiliƛ':a raƛałːi miče godi hade ek'wasːuƛa** *hudu-da* **miƛ':e.**
second night.LOC N.occur.CVB COP.N PROX.SL man.DAT DIST.SL-INT dream
'The second night, the man had the same dream.'

By contrast, the particle **-da** cannot attach to demonstratives used pronominally.

3.3. The pronoun *ži*

Like the inflection of demonstrative pronouns, the inflection of the pronoun **ži** involves gender-number suffixes in the nominative, and oblique stem formatives in the other cases, with however the following two irregularities:

  – in the nominative, the HPL suffix is **-ba** instead of the regular HPL suffix **-ji**;

– the oblique stem formatives are added to a stem **ĩ-** completely different from the stem **ži-** to which gender-number suffixes attach in the nominative.

	ži-we (M)	**ži-je** (F) / **ži-be** (N)	**ži-ba** (HPL)	**ži-re** (NPL)
Erg.	**ĩ-sːu-de ~ ĩ-sːw-e**	**ĩ-ɬːi-de ~ ĩ-ɬː-e**	**ĩ-do-de ~ ĩ-dw-e**	**ĩ-di-de ~ ĩ-d-e**
Dat.	**ĩ-sːu-λa ~ ĩ-sːw-a**	**ĩ-ɬːi-λa ~ ĩ-ɬː-a**	**ĩ-do-λa ~ ĩ-dw-a**	**ĩ-di-λa ~ ĩ-d-a**
Gen.	**ĩ-sːu**	**ĩ-ɬːi-λːi**	**ĩ-do**	**ĩ-di-λːi**
Comit.	**ĩ-sːu-k'ena**	**ĩ-ɬːi-k'ena**	**ĩ-do-k'ena**	**ĩ-dii-k'ena**

etc.

All these forms are compatible with the intensifying particle **-da**, which invariably follows the case marker.

4. The uses of *ži*: an overview

As illustrated by ex. (3) and (4), **ži** in its bare form is used as a long-distance reflexive, both in logophoric and non-logophoric contexts. Example (3) illustrates the logophoric use of **ži**.

(3) **wacːoga   eλ'ːawi,   "*ĩsːuλa*   komokiɬːa   woq'a!"**
brother.ALL   say.CPL.N   ŽI.M.DAT   help.DAT   come.M.IMP
'He$_i$ said to (his$_i$) brother "Come to my$_i$ aid!"'

In example (4), **ži** belongs to a participial clause modifying the dative argument of the main verb, and its antecedent is the ergative argument of the main verb.

(4) **bakala   oxːewi   [*ĩɬːiλa*   komoki   gweda]   ak'ːaɬːiλa   šĩde.**
thanks   give.CPL.N   ŽI.N.DAT   help   do.PTCP   woman.DAT   bear.ERG
'The bear$_i$ thanked the woman who had helped it$_i$.'

The addition of the intensifying particle **-da** to **ži** yields intensive pronouns that can be used to emphasize the identity of discursively salient referents other that speech act participants, in particular in contexts implying a contrast between different protagonists (König and Gast 2006). The **da**-form of **ži** can be found alone – sentence (5a), in combination with a co-referent NP – sentence (5b) – or in combination with a demonstrative pronoun – sentence (5c). The corpus includes 35 occurrences of **ži** in intensive pronoun function out of 625.

(5) a. **xːwanage   duk'ari   dene,   *žiwe-da*   imaχage   duk'ari.**
horse.LOC   sit.CPL   1SG   ŽI.M-INT   donkey.LOC   sit.CPL
'I sat on the horse, and he sat on the donkey.'

   b. ***ĩsːwa-da*   baširiλa   qː'abuɬe   bik'iλeːwudi   hu   iši.**
ŽI.M.DAT-INT   Baširi.DAT   be.acceptable.CVB.N   N.be.NEG.CPL   DIST   matter
'Baširi himself did not like this matter.'

   c. **[...]   qe   hugusːude   *ĩsːwe-da*   buqː'ewi.**
then   DIST.LL.M.ERG   ŽI.M.ERG   N.cut.CPL
'[An old man had a tree, he called young men to cut the tree, the young men did not come,] then he himself cut it.'

Like the **da**-form of 1st and 2nd person pronouns, the **da**-form of **ži** also has reflexive uses. In strictly local configurations (i.e., when both **ži** and its antecedent are terms in the construction of the same verb), the particle **-da** is required – example (6)

(6) **χãs:ude žo:wudi *ĩs:uλ:ira-da* ĩk':was:e waša.**
    king.ERG   call.CPL.M ŽI.M.ALL-INT small.CONTR boy
    'The king called his younger son to himself.'

The particle **-da** is also required in reflexive configurations involving a term in the construction of a verb and a genitive modifying another term in the construction of the same verb – example (7)

(7) **qe [hade šĩ] maʔewidi [[*ĩł:iλ:i-da*] rec':ał:iq:a].**
    then   PROX.SL bear go.CPL.N   ŽI.N.GEN-INT cave.ALL
    'Then the bear$_i$ went to its$_i$ cave.'

Finally, **ži** can be used as a long-distance reflexive in non-logophoric configurations not only in its bare form, but also in the **da**-form. In example (4) above, repeated here as (8), the bare form of **ži** in long-distance reflexive function is found in a participial clause modifying the dative argument of the main verb, and its antecedent is the ergative argument of the main verb. Example (9) illustrates a very similar configuration involving the **da**-form of **ži**.

(8) **bakala ox:ewi [*ĩł:iλa* komoki gweda] ak':ał:iλa šĩde.**
    thanks   give.CPL.N ŽI.N.DAT help   do.PTCP woman.DAT bear.ERG
    'The bear$_i$ thanked the woman who had helped it$_i$.'

(9) **dibi [[*ĩs:u-da* č'ilił:ige k'onada] č'ari] bis:o:ruλa woλ:ari.**
    molla   ŽI.M.GEN-INT house.LOC start.PTCP fire   put.out.N.INF get.off.M.CPL
    'The molla$_i$ got off to extinguish the fire that had started in his$_i$ house.'

5. *Ži* in local reflexivization

As already stated above, in local reflexivization, **ži** can only be found in the **da**-form.

5.1. Strictly local reflexivization

By strictly local reflexivization, I mean configurations in which both **ži** and its antecedent are terms in the construction of the same verb. In the configurations attested in the corpus, the antecedent of **ži** is always an ergative or nominative argument, and a nominative antecedent is only attested with **ži** in cases other than ergative and dative:

ži ant.	NOM	DAT	ALL	LOC	COMIT
ERG	4	11	13	–	1
NOM	–	–	9	7	2

table 1: **ži** in strictly local reflexivization

5.2. Configurations involving a genitival modifier

Configurations involving a term in the construction of a verb and a genitival modifier of another term in the construction of the same verb are particularly well represented in the corpus: 183 out of the 234 occurrences of local-reflexive configurations found in the corpus (about 78%). In 4 cases out of 182, **ži** occurs in argumental function, and its antecedent in adnominal genitive function:

ži \ ant.	NOM	DAT	ABL
adGEN	2	1	1

table 2: **ži** as a local reflexive with an adnominal genitive as its antecedent

In the remaining 179 cases, **ži** in adnominal genitive function has an antecedent in one of the following functions: ergative argument, nominative argument, dative argument, locative argument, or framing genitive:[4]

ži \ ant.	adGEN
ERG	124
NOM	38
DAT	13
LOC	1
frGEN	3

table 3: **ži** as a local reflexive in adnominal genitive function

5.3. Local reflexivization and syntactic roles

Not all possible combinations of syntactic roles are equally attested in local reflexivisation. The predominance of the ERG-adGEN configuration (whose typical semantic correlate is 'interaction involving an agent and a participant belonging to the agent's sphere') is particularly striking, since it accounts for 124 out of the 236 occurrences of local-reflexive configurations found in the corpus (about 52%).

More generally, the particular behavior of ergative arguments in local reflexivization is obvious, since (a) in 152 out of the 236 occurrences of local-reflexive configurations found in the corpus (about 64%), the antecedent of **ži** is an ergative argument, and (b), among the local-reflexive configurations found in the corpus, **ži** never occurs in ergative argument function.

Another interesting observation is that the involvement of 'non-syntactic' cases (i.e., cases other than nominative, ergative, dative, and genitive) is relatively marginal; moreover, the 'non-syntactic' cases are not attested as antecedents of **ži**.

5.4. Double-reflexive configurations

In addition to the 47 attestations of **ži** as a reflexive pronoun with a strictly local antedecent, and the 183 attestations of local-reflexive configurations in which either **ži** or its antecedent is in adnominal genitive function, the corpus also includes 6 *double-reflexive* configurations, in which **ži** occurs twice in the same clause. The attested combinations are NOM-DAT (2), NOM-ALL (2), ERG-NOM (1), and ERG-adGEN (1). Example (10) illustrates the NOM-DAT configuration.

---

[4] I designate as 'framing genitives' genitive-marked phrases that cannot be analyzed as noun modifiers, and whose framing function is similar to that of **u**+GEN phrases in Russian – cf. Creissels (2013).

(10) **gwãλ̃ːalaq'o**   *žiwe-da*   *ĩsːwa-da*   **huge**   **rec'ːaqːe**   **wũčuwudi.**
　　　at.dawn　　　　ŽI.M-INT　ŽI.M.DAT-INT　DIST.LL.LOC　cave.LOC　M.find.CPL
　　　'At dawn he found himself (litt. himself found himself) in this cave.'

A possible analysis is that, in double-reflexive configurations, one of the two occurrences of **ži** is an emphatic pronoun represents a referent retrievable from the context and acts as the antecedent of the other occurrence of **ži**. This analysis is supported by ex. (11), in which a referent given by the context is represented by a demonstrative pronoun in the nominative accompanied by **ži** in the same nominative case in intensifier function, and resumed by a second occurrence of **ži** in the allative case, in reflexive function.

(11) **huji**　　*ĩdoga-da*　　*žiba-da*　　**bašwidi.**
　　　DIST.HPL　ŽI.HPL.ALL-INT　ŽI.HPL-INT　HPL.go.back.CPL
　　　'They$_i$ went back to their$_i$ place.' (litt. 'They themselves went to themselves.')

6. *Ži* as a long-distance reflexive

6.1. *Ži* in logophoric function

As already illustrated by example (3) (repeated here as (12)), in reported speech, the bare form of **ži** represents the speaker to which the reported speech is attributed, and there is no limitation with respect to its possible syntactic roles within the reported sentences.

(12) **wacːoga**　　**eλ'ːawi,**　　**"ĩsːuλa**　　**komokiłːa**　　**woq'a!"**
　　　brother.ALL　say.CPL.N　ŽI.M.DAT　help.DAT　　come.M.IMP
　　　'He$_i$ said to (his$_i$) brother "Come to my$_i$ aid!"'

Insofar as they occur in sentences analyzable as involving syntactic subordination of a reported sentence to a verb of saying, logophorics can be viewed as a particular type of long-distance reflexives. But the use of logophoric pronouns is not necessarily limited to complement clauses subordinated to a report opening verb, and may extend across sentence boundaries to arbitrarily long stretches of discourse – Hagège 1974, Mithun 1990. In other words, the notions of long-distance reflexivity and logophoricity overlap (since logophorics in complement clauses subordinated to a report opening verb meet the definition of long-distance reflexivity), but are fundamentally distinct.

　In Northern Akhvakh, the length and internal structure of the stretches of discourse within which **ži** occurs in logophoric function are often incompatible with an analysis in terms of clausal subordination. In particular, the corpus analyzed here includes several narratives with the following structure: after an introductory sentence such as 'My grandmother used to tell us stories about her childhood', the story is told exactly as the grandmother could have told it herself, apart from the fact that **ži** is consistently used to represent the original speaker (the grandmother).

　An interesting feature of reported speech in Northern Akhvakh is a marked asymmetry in the treatment of the original speaker and the original addressee. As mentioned above, in the corpus of narrative texts I collected, the original speaker in reported speech is most of the time encoded as **ži** 'self' rather that **dene** 'I', which departs from canonical direct speech, but at the same time, the original addressee is with very few exceptions encoded as **mene** 'you', as in canonical direct speech – example (13).

(13) **wašode** **ʒawa** **ox:e** **godi,** **"mede** *žiwe* **wux:ux:ari"** **ƛ':e:.**
    boy.ERG   answer   N.give.CVB   COP.N   2SG.ERG   ŽI.M   M.raise.CPL   say.CVB.N
    'The boy answered, "You raised me."'

6.2. Ži as a long-distance reflexive in non-logophoric configurations

This section is about configurations in which **ži** and its antecedent are separated by a clause boundary, and the antecedent of **ži** does not represent the speaker in the construction of a speech verb.

The corpus includes 105 occurrences of **ži** meeting this definition. In all cases, **ži** is found within an embedded clause, and its antecedent is a term in the construction of the main verb. The attested combinations of possible roles for the antecedent in the main clause and **ži** in the embedded clause are as follows.

ži ant.	ERG	NOM	DAT	adGEN	ALL	LOC	ABL
ERG	9	9	20	11	2	1	–
NOM	1	8	7	7	–	–	1
DAT	2	7	5	9	2	1	–
frGEN	–	–	1	–	1	1	–

<u>table 4</u>: **ži** as a long-distance reflexive in non-logophoric configurations

It follows from this distribution that the preferred configurations combine an antecedent in ergative argument, nominative argument, or dative argument function, and **ži** in ergative argument, nominative argument, dative argument, or adnominal genitive function. Here again, the particular behavior of ergative arguments is obvious, since in 52 cases out of 105 (nearly 50%), the antecedent of **ži** is the ergative argument of the main verb. Note that the predominance of ergative arguments as antecedents of **ži** in long-distance reflexivization would be even much greater if reported utterances analyzable as syntactically subordinated to a speech verb were included in the count.

There are however two clear differences with the combinations observed in local reflexivization: in long-distance reflexivization, **ži** can be found in ergative argument function, and configurations with **ži** in adnominal genitive function are not particularly frequent.

The question that must be discussed now is the choice between the bare form and the **da**-form of **ži** in long-distance reflexivization, since both forms occur as long-distance reflexives.

It is not difficult to see that the syntactic roles of **ži** in the embedded clause and/or of its antecedent in the matrix clause are not relevant. In the corpus, the **da**-form is more frequent in long-distance reflexive function (61 occurrences) than the bare form (44 occurrences), but there is no significant difference between the combinations attested with **ži** in the **da**-form (table 5) and those involving the bare form of **ži** (table 6).

ži \ ant.	ERG	NOM	DAT	adGEN	ALL	LOC	ABL
ERG	7	7	14	5	–	1	–
NOM	1	6	4	4	–	–	1
DAT	2	1	2	2	–	1	–
frGEN	–	–	1	–	1	1	–

table 5: the **da**-form of **ži** in long-distance reflexive function

ži \ ant.	ERG	NOM	DAT	adGEN	ALL	LOC	ABL
ERG	2	2	6	6	2	–	–
NOM	–	2	3	3	–	–	–
DAT	–	6	3	7	2	–	–
frGEN	–	–	–	–	–	–	–

table 6: the bare form of **ži** in long-distance reflexive function

A reasonable hypothesis would be that the choice is conditioned by the syntactic relationship between the embedded clause in which **ži** is found and the matrix clause. Unfortunately, no clear pattern emerges from the corpus. On the contrary, in long-distance reflexivization, the bare form and the **da**-form can be found in the same types of syntactic configurations. For example, the corpus includes several sentences in which **ži** is found in a participial clause modifying a co-argument of its antecedent, and in this type of configuration, there is no clear preference for the use of the bare form of **ži** (as in (8) above) or of the **da**-form (as in (9)).

Similarly, examples (14) and (15) illustrate a configuration that can be characterized as follows: **ži** occurs in a finite complement clause marked by the complementizer **-sːa**, and its antecedent is the dative argument of the higher verb **beq'uruλa** 'know'. In this configuration, **ži** occurs in the bare form in (14), and in the **da**-form in (15).

(14) **ħužuruqʼːiλa** [**žibe** **λʼːãkʼanokʼena** **betu** **meqʼːełːikasːa**]
    hedgehog.DAT   ŽI.N hare.COMIT   N.run.INF be.equal.ICPL.NEG.COMP
    beqʼere **bikʼwari.**
    N.know.PROG   N.be.CPL
    'The hedgehog$_i$ knew that it$_i$ could not compete with the hare in running.'

(15) **jacːoλa** [**huguwe** **ĩłːiλːi-da** **wacːi** **gwidasːa**] **beqʼere** **bikʼwiλa.**
    girl.DAT   DIST.LL.M ŽI.F.GEN-INT brother COP.M.COMP N.know.PROG N.be.CPL.NEG
    'The girl$_i$ did not know that he was her$_i$ brother.'

Further investigation would be necessary in order to establish to what extent, in long-distance reflexivization, the bare form and the **da**-form of **ži** vary freely or obey a conditioning I have not been able to discover, but what is certain is that no straightforward syntactic conditioning can account for the distribution observed in the corpus I have analyzed.

7. Conclusion

In this paper, I have analyzed the uses of the bare form and the **da**-form of the Northern Akhvakh pronoun **ži** in a corpus. The main conclusions can be summarized as follows:

(a) local reflexivization of 3rd person referents triggers the use of the **da**-form;

(b) both the bare form and the **da**-form of **ži** can be used as long-distance reflexives in non-logophoric contexts; the corpus shows no obvious regularity in the choice between the two forms, but rules out the possibility of a straightforward conditioning in terms of the syntactic nature of the embedded clause in which **ži** is found;

(c) the bare form of **ži** is used as a logophoric pronoun in arbitrarily long stretches of reported speech that, apart from the use of a pronoun distinct from the 1st person pronoun to represent the original speaker, show rather characteristics of direct speech;

(d) reflexivization in Northern Akhvakh supports the traditional distinction between 'syntactic' and 'semantic' cases, since the only NPs commonly involved in reflexivization are ergative arguments, nominative arguments, dative arguments, and adnominal genitives;

(e) among syntactic cases, ergative arguments are particularly prone to acting as antecedents of **ži**, and **ži** is particularly prone to occurring in adnominal genitive function.

Abbreviations

ABL: ablative, adGEN: adnominal genitive, ALL: allative, ANT: antecedent, CAUS: causative, COMIT: comitative, COMP: complementizer, CONTR: contrastive, COP: copula, CPL: completive, CVB: converb, DAT: dative, DIST: distal, ERG: ergative, F: human feminine singular, FCT: functive, frGEN: framing genitive, GEN: genitive, HP: human plural, ICPL: incompletive, IMP: imperative, INCL: inclusive, INF: infinitive, INT: intensive, LL: lower level (vertical deixis), LOC: locative, M: human masculine singular, N: non-human singular, NEG: negative, NOM: nominative, NPL: non-human plural, OR: orientation marker, PL: plural, PROG: progressive, PROX: proximal, PTCP: participle, SG: singular, SL: same level (vertical deixis)

References

Creissels, Denis. 2008. Person variations in Akhvakh verb morphology: functional motivation and origin of an uncommon pattern. *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung* 61(4). 309-325.

Creissels, Denis. 2009. Participles and finiteness: The case of Akhvakh. *Linguistic Discovery* 7.1. 106-130.

Creissels, Denis. 2010. Specialized converbs and adverbial subordination in Axaxdere Akhvakh. In Isabelle Bril (ed.) *Clause linking and clause hierarchy: syntax and pragmatics*. John Benjamins. 105-142.

Creissels, Denis. 2012. External agreement in the converbal construction of Northern Akhvakh. In Volker Gast and Holger Diessel (eds.) *Clause linkage in cross-linguistic perspective*. De Gruyter Mouton. 127-156.

Creissels, Denis. 2013. Floating genitives and possessive framing in Northern Akhvakh. In Anne Carlier and Jean-Christophe Verstraete (eds.) *The genitive*. Benjamins. 333-354.

Creissels, Denis. 2014. Functive-transformative marking in Akhvakh and other Caucasian languages. In V.A. Plungjan, M.A. Daniel, E.A. Ljutikova, S.G. Tatevosov & O.V. Fedorova (eds.) *Jazyk. Konstanty. Peremennye. Pamjati Aleksandra Evgen'eviča Kibrika*. Saint-Petersburg: Aleteja. 430-449.

Creissels, Denis. 2016a. Word-formation in Akhvakh. In Peter O. Müller, Ingeborg Ohnheiser, Susan Olsen, and Franz Rainer (eds.) *Word-Formation, An International Handbook of the Languages of Europe, volume 5*. De Gruyter Mouton.

Creissels, Denis. 2016b. Univerbation via liaison and the evolution of lexicon and grammar in Northern Akhvakh. *Languages of the Caucasus* 1(1). 107-125.

Creissels, Denis. 2017. Transitivity and valency in Northern Akhvakh. *Linguisticae Investigationes* 40(1). 82-117.

Creissels, Denis. 2018. Perfective tenses and epistemic modality in Northern Akhvakh. In Diana Forker & Timur Maisak (eds.), *The semantics of verbal categories in Nakh-Daghestanian languages*. Leiden / Boston : Brill. 166-187.

Creissels, Denis (Forthcoming). A sketch of Northern Akhvakh. In Yuri Koryakov, Yury Lander and Timur Maisak (eds.), *The Caucasian languages, an international handbook*. Mouton. (dowloadable from deniscreissels.fr, other downloadable documents 2018)

Hagège, C. 1974. Les pronoms logophoriques. *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique* 69. 287-310.

König, E. & V. Gast. 2006. Focused assertion of identity: A typology of intensifiers. *Linguistic Typology* 10-2. 223-276.

Magomedbekova, Z.M. 1967. *Axvaxskij jazyk (grammatičeskij analiz, teksty, slovar')*. Tbilissi: Mecniereba.

Magomedova, P & I. Abdulaeva. 2007. *Axvaxsko-russkij slovar'*. Maxačkala: Dagestanskij Naučnyj Centr Rossiskoj Akademii Nauk.

Mithun, M. 1990. Third-person reference and the function of pronouns in Central Pomo natural speech. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 56-3. 361-376.