Conference on the Languages of the Caucasus
Leipzig, 07 – 09 December 2007

Intensifiers, reflexivity and logophoricity in Axaxdərə Akhvakh

Denis CREISSELS
Université Lumière (Lyon2)
e-mail: denis.creissels@univ-lyon2.fr

1. Introduction

Akhvakh is a Nakh-Daghestanian language belonging to the Andic branch of the Avar-ADDic-Tsezic family, spoken in the western part of Daghestan and in the village of Axaxdərə near Zaqatala (Azerbaijan). The variety of Akhvakh spoken in Axaxdərə (henceforth AD Akhvakh) is very close to the Northern Akhvakh varieties spoken in the Axvaxskij Rajon of Daghestan (henceforth AR Akhvakh), presented in Magomedbekova 1967 and Magomedova & Abdullaeva 2007. AD Akhvakh shows no particular affinity with any of the Southern Akhvakh dialects spoken in three villages (Cegob, Ratlub and Tljanub) of the Šamil'kij Rajon (formerly Sovetskij Rajon).

The analysis of Akhvakh intensifiers, reflexives and logophorics proposed in this paper is entirely based on a corpus of narrative texts I collected in Axaxdərə between June 2005 and June 2007.[1]

I will be concerned here by the uses of the pronoun *ži-CL* (*CL* = class marker) in its simple form and in the form enlarged by the addition of the intensifying particle *-da*. The use of identical or related forms in intensifying, reflexive, and logophoric functions is attested in many languages of the world, and pronouns cognate with Akhvakh *ži-CL* fulfilling similar functions are found in the other Andic languages, but in some details of its use, Akhvakh *ži-CL* shows features which deserve to be examined.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 summarizes basic information about Akhvakh morphosyntax. Section 3 gives the inventory of pronouns relevant to this study (personal pronouns, demonstratives, and the anaphoric pronoun *ži-CL*) and describes their morphological properties. Section 4 describes the use of intensive pronouns in local reflexivization. Section 5 is devoted to long-distance reflexivization. Section 6 analyzes the logophoric use of *ži-CL*. Section 7 addresses the question of the possible similarities / contrasts between the reflexive and logophoric systems of AD Akhvakh and those found in related languages.

[1] The texts that constitute my corpus were produced by about twenty different speakers whose ages range from 11 to 70. They include reports of real events and different types of fiction narratives. I have observed some idiolectal differences between speakers, but none of them concerns the points addressed in this paper.

2. General remarks on Akhvakh morphosyntax

2.1. Clause structure

Akhvakh clause structure is characterized by flexible constituent order. Case marking and gender-number agreement between the verb and its core arguments are consistently ergative. In contrast, assertive agreement (see section 2.4) follows a split intransitive pattern.

Arguments whose identity is recoverable from the context can freely be omitted, and unexpressed arguments receiving an arbitrary interpretation are common too.

Causative is the only valency-changing mechanism systematically expressed via verb morphology or grammaticalized periphrases.

2.2 Nouns and noun phrases

Three semantically transparent agreement classes of nouns 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). Noun morphology shows only frozen vestiges of gender prefixes.

In canonical NPs, the head noun is in final position and is inflected for number and case. Noun dependents other than adjectives show no agreement mark, and the agreement morphology of attributive adjectives is reduced in comparison with AR Akhvakh or the other Andic languages.[3]

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.

The absolute form of nominals (used in the extra-syntactic function of quotation or designation and in S or P roles) has no overt mark. Case suffixes may attach to a stem identical with the absolute form, or to a special *oblique stem*. In the singular, the formation of the oblique stem is very irregular and involves considerable free variation. In the plural, the formation of the oblique stem is more regular. In particular, 'oblique stem markers' expressing class distinctions (M *-sːu-*, F/N *-tːi-*, HPL *-lo-*, NPL *-le-* ~ *-li-*) are more systematically used in the plural than in the singular.

Case inflection includes the following cases:

– ergative *(-de)*,
– dative (*-ʟa*),

[2] The only exceptions to the semantic rule of class 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] In AR Akhvakh, all noun dependents in canonical NPs optionally take class suffixes agreeing with the head noun, but in the data I collected in Axaxdərə, noun dependents other than adjectives never occur with agreement marks in canonical NPs, and suffixal agreement of adjectives never occurs in classes other than HPL.

– genitive (*Ø* or *-ī́i*),[4]
– comitative (*-k'ena*),
– purposive (*-ʁana*),
– five series of spatial cases encoding different spatial configurations,[5] with three cases in each series: essive *-i* or *-e*, lative *-a*, and elative *-u(ne)*.[6]

Personal pronouns have an irregular inflection but show the same case distinctions as nouns, and the distinction between three spatial cases applies to locative adverbs too.

There are two possible constructions for NP coordination: either "NP_1-*k'ena* NP_2", where *-k'ena* is the suffix of the comitative case (also used for comitative or instrumental adjuncts), or "NP_1-*la* NP_2-*la* ", where *-la* is an additive particle (glossed ADD) also found in contexts in which it corresponds to English 'also', 'in turn', or 'even'. See section 3 for more details on this particle.

2.3. Adjectives

Like verbs (see section 3.4.2), adjectives divide into those obligatorily including a class agreement prefix, and those devoid of it. Like nouns, they cannot bear TAM inflection and fulfill the predicate function by combining with the copula *godi* or with the verb *bik'uruɬa* 'be'.[7]

In Axaxdərə Akhvakh, adjectives in the role of noun dependent or in predicate function do not show suffixal inflection, whereas nominalized adjectives (i.e., adjectives occurring as the last word of a noun phrase) are inflected for plural and take suffixed class marks.[8] In the absolute form, the class marks suffixed to nominalized adjectives are M *-we*, F *-je*, N *-be*, HPL *-ji*, NPL *-re*, whereas in combination with overt case markers, the class marks suffixed to nominalized adjectives are identical to the 'oblique stem markers' found in the case inflection of some nouns (M *-s̄u-*, F/N *-ɬ̄i-*, HPL *-lo-*, NPL *-le-* ~ *-li-*).

[4] In principle, zero-marked genitive characterizes M and HPL NPs, whereas *-ī́i* is used with F, N or NPL NPs, but this rule is not very strict, and variations are observed.

[5] The system of spatial cases of Akhvakh departs from the typical Daghestanian pattern in that one of the series (the *-g-* series) is a default series that does not encode a particular spatial configuration, and spatial configurations tend to be encoded by combining NPs showing default spatial case marking with locative adverbs showing parallel spatial case inflection, rather than via 'traditional' case marking. Moreover, the characteristic consonant of the *-g-* series is not always apparent, due to morphophonological processes (for example, *šaha-ɬ̄i-ga* 'to the town' can optionally be realized *šaha-ɬ̄-a*).

[6] Magomedbekova (1967) identified *-u* has as ablative proper, and *-une* as perlative, but in AD Akhvakh, these two endings are in free variation.

[7] In Akhvakh, non-verbal predications involving neither the copula nor the verb *bik'uruɬa* 'be' are exceptional in statements. By contrast, the omission of the copula regularly occurs in questions.

[8] In AR Akhvakh, attributive or predicative adjectives optionally show gender-number suffixes.

2.4. Verb inflection

Independent verb forms are inflected for TAM, polarity, and gender-number agreement; TAM and polarity are conjointly expressed by portemanteau markers. Assertive agreement (see section 2.4.3 below) is morphologically distinct from gender-number agreement and occurs in one tense only.

In addition to the synthetic forms listed in section 2.4.1, AD Akhvakh has analytic verb forms with the copula *godi* or the verb *bik'uruʟa* 'be' in auxiliary function.

2.4.1. TAM-polarity marking in independent verb forms

TAM/polarity inflection of verbs heading independent clauses includes the following possibilities:

– PF_1 (perfective$_1$): HPL *-iri*, other classes *-ari*
– PF_2 (perfective$_2$): HPL *-idi*, other classes *-ada(-CL)*
– PF.NEG (perfective negative): *-iʟa (-CL)*
– IPF_1 (imperfective$_1$): *-iri*
– IPF_2 (imperfective$_2$): HPL *-idi*, other classes *-ida(-CL)*
– IPF_1.NEG (imperfective$_1$ negative): *-iki*
– IPF_2.NEG (imperfective$_2$ negative): *-ika(-CL)*
– UW (past unwitnessed): M *-u-wi(di)*, F *-i-wi(di)*, N *-a-wi(di)* NPL *-ari-wi(di)*
– UW.NEG (past unwitnessed negative): M *-iʟ-u-wi(di)*, F *-iʟ-i-wi(di)*, N *-iʟ-a-wi(di)*, NPL *-iʟ-ari-wi(di)*
– MIR (mirative): M *-u-wa*, F *-i-wa*, N *-a-wa*, HPL *-aji*, NPL *-ari-wa*
– MIR.NEG (mirative negative): M *-uš-u-wa*, F *-uš-i-wa*, N *-uš-a-wa*, HPL *-uš-aji*, NPL *-uš-ari-wa*
– POT (potential): M/N *-u-wa*, F *-i-wa*, HPL *-oji*, NPL *-uri-wa*
– IMP (imperative): *-a*
– PROH (prohibitive): *-uba*
– OPT (optative): *-a-ī'a*
– OPT.NEG (optative negative): *-uba-ī'a*

This list of independent synthetic verb forms calls for the following remarks:

a. The forms labeled 'perfective$_1$' and 'perfective$_2$' carry distinctions in the involvement of the assertor (i.e., the speaker in assertive clauses, the addressee in questions) in the event referred to: in assertions, PF_2 is typically used with transitive verbs involving a 1st person A, or intransitive verbs representing controllable events involving a 1st person S, whereas in questions, PF_2 is typically used with transitive verbs involving a 2nd person A, or intransitive verbs representing controllable events involving a 2nd person S (see Creissels 2008a & 2008b for more details). This distinction is neutralized in the negative.
b. The distinctions PF_1 vs. PF_2 and IPF_1 vs. IPF_2 seem to be historically related, since the PF_1 and IPF_1 suffixes have in common the ending *ri*, contrasting with *da* common to the PF_2 and IPF_2 suffixes. Moreover, PF_2 and IPF_2 share the possibility

to be used as participles, whereas PF_1 and IPF_1 are strictly finite verb forms. However, functionally, the choice between IPF_1 and IPF_2 in their use as independent verb forms clearly puts into play aspecto-modal distinctions, and has nothing to do with distinctions in assertor's involvement, or more generally with person distinctions: both forms can express a habitual meaning, but there is a clear tendency (particularly strong in AD Akhvakh) to prefer IPF_2 as the marker of habitual aspect, whereas IPF_1 is used in modal contexts in which it is impossible to substitute IPF_2 for it. In AD Akhvakh, IPF_2 is particularly common as a narrative tense (historical present), whereas IPF_1 is never used in this function.

c. UW (past unwitnessed) is typically used to refer to events known by hearsay. It occurs in inferential contexts too, but this use is much less common. This tense has no HPL form, and in contexts in which it could be expected to occur with HPL agreement, Akhvakh speakers use the perfect (an analytic tense consisting of the general converb HPL of the auxiliated verb and the copula in auxiliary function).
d. MIR (mirative) is a verb form encountered mainly (but not exclusively) in questions. This form is particular common (in fact, almost obligatory) in *why*-questions, which suggests analyzing it as expressing surprise.

2.4.2. Gender-number agreement

Gender-number agreement of verbs involves both prefixes and suffixes, with two different kinds of conditioning:

– The presence of gender-number *prefixes* in verb forms involves no grammatical conditioning. Verbs divide into two phonologically and semantically arbitrary morphological classes, those that cannot occur without a gender-number prefix indexing the S or P argument (i.e., to the argument encoded by an NP in the absolute form), and those that never take such a prefix.
– By contrast, the presence of gender-number *suffixes* indexing the S or P argument is conditioned by the grammatical nature of the verb form. The rules governing the presence and the phonological realization of gender-number suffixes in verb forms are complex. In some verb forms, gender-number suffixes do not occur at all; in others, obligatory gender-number agreement marks merge with TAM/polarity markers; in a third group of verb forms, gender-number suffixes are optional, and when they are present they may appear as distinct segments, or merge with TAM/polarity markers.

The presence of gender-number prefixes or suffixes in verb forms depends therefore on a complex combination of lexical and grammatical factors, but the agreement rule itself is very simple, at least in the general case: when gender-number marks are present in a verb form, they index the argument in S or P role, represented by an NP in the absolute form. Exceptions to this rule are however observed in some complex constructions in which the suffixal agreement of

dependent verb forms may be controlled 'externally', i.e., by an NP that does not belong to the clause headed by the dependent verb form.

2.4.3. Participles

AD Akhvakh has four participles. Each of them is characterized by a stem homonymous with one of the independent verb forms listed above: perfective$_2$ *-ada*, perfective negative *-iɬa*, imperfective$_2$ *-ida*, and imperfective$_2$ negative *-ika*.

2.4.4. Dependent verb forms

Strictly dependent verb forms include an infinitive *-u(ruɬa)*, a general converb (M *-o(ho)*, F *-e(he)*, N *-e*, HPL *-i*, NPL *-ere*), a progressive converb (M *-ero*, HPL *-eri*, other classes *-ere*), and several specialized converbs whose description constitutes the topic of this paper.

AD Akhvakh also has a verbal noun *-e*, which however is rarely found with dependents treated like dependents of a verbal head. Contrary to the verbal noun (or 'masdar') of most Caucasian languages, the verbal noun of Akhvakh tends to behave like a noun with respect to its internal syntax too.

3. The pronouns of Akhvakh: inventory and morphological description

Given the topic of this paper, this presentation of Akhvakh pronouns is limited to personal pronouns, demonstratives, and the anaphoric pronoun *ži-*$_{CL}$. Akhvakh also has interrogative and indefinite pronouns, which however play no direct role in the mechanisms described in the following sections.

3.1. Personal pronouns

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

3.1.1. 1st & 2nd person singular pronouns

1st & 2nd person singular pronouns do not exhibit gender distinction in their form, but trigger M or F agreement according to the sex of their referent. They have the following morphological particularities:

– a non-void ending (*-ne*) in the absolute form;
– the use of the same stem for the absolute form and the ergative case, contrasting with a different stem in the other cases (whereas in the inflection of nouns having an oblique stem distinct from the absolute form, the ergative suffix selects the oblique stem).

– a zero ending in the genitive irrespective of gender (whereas in noun inflection, F nouns have the genitive ending *-ɬi*).

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

3.1.2. 1st & 2nd person plural pronouns

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

1st & 2nd person plural pronouns differ from all other nominals (including singular pronouns) in using a stem coinciding with the absolute form for the ergative and dative cases, and another stem, which coincides with the genitive form, for all other cases.

Contracted forms are observed in the case inflection of other nominals (in particular when ergative *-de* or dative *-ʟa* follow the oblique stem formatives *-s̄u-* or *-ɬ̄i-*), but are particularly common in the ergative and dative forms of 1st & 2nd person plural pronouns.

(2)	(1PL$_I$)	(1PL$_E$)	(2PL)
	iɬ̄i	*is̄i*	*uš̄ti*
Erg.	*iɬ̄i-de ~ iɬ̄-e*	*is̄i-de ~ is̄-e*	*uš̄ti-de ~ uš̄t-e*
Dat.	*iɬ̄i-ʟa ~ iɬ̄-a*	*is̄i-ʟa ~ is̄-a*	*uš̄ti-ʟa ~ uš̄t-a*
Gen.	*eɬ̄e*	*es̄e*	*oš̄te*
Comit.	*eɬ̄e-k'ena*	*es̄e-k'ena*	*oš̄te-k'ena*
etc.			

The 2nd person plural has the variant *us̄i*, gen. *os̄e ~ os̄o.*

3.1.3. The genitive of personal pronouns in noun dependent role

Akhvakh does not have specialized possessives. The genitive form of personal pronouns is used as a noun dependent like the genitive form of canonical NPs. Its behavior is identical to that of any other type of noun dependents:

– it necessitates no adjunction to precede a noun it modifies;

– if it constitutes an NP by itself in the absence of an explicit nominal head, it must take either a class suffix *-we / -je / -be / -ji / -re* (in the absolute form), or an oblique stem formative *-sū- / -ī̄i- / -lo- / -le-* followed by a case suffix (in the other cases).

For example, the genitive of the 1st person singular pronoun used as the equivalent of an English possessive pronoun ('mine') shows the following inflection:

(3)

	di-we (M)	*di-je* (F) / *di-be* (N)
Erg.	*di-sū-de*	*di-ɬ̄i-de*
Dat.	*di-sū-ɮa*	*di-ɬ̄i-ɮa*
Gen.	*di-sū*	*di-ɬ̄i-ī̄i*
Comit.	*di-sū-k'ena*	*di-ɬ̄i-k'ena*
etc.		

	di-ji (HPL)	*di-re* (NPL)
Erg.	*di-lo-de*	*di-le-de*
Dat.	*di-lo-ɮa*	*di-le-ɮa*
Gen.	*di-lo*	*di-le-ī̄i*
Comit.	*di-lo-k'ena*	*di-le-k'ena*
etc.		

In ex. (4), the elative form *du-ɬ̄i-gune* of *du-be* 'yours (N)' figures in a sentence uttered in a context in which it is obvious that *q'ẽɮe* 'bag' must be understood – in other words, *du-ɬ̄i-gune* can be viewed here as the reduced form of the canonical NP *du q'ẽɮeno-gune* 'from your bag', in the same way as *ek'ʷa-ɬ̄i-ga* is the reduced form of *ek'ʷa q'ẽɮeno-ga* 'into the bag of someone else'.

(4) *mene hušta ʕadada w-ūč-ala,*
2SG thus mad M-find-COND
'If you are mad to such a degree,

du-ɬ̄i-gune ek'ʷa-ɬ̄i-ga čugu t'-ɔ̃̄š-awa?
2SG(GEN)-N-EL someone_else's-N-LAT why put-NEG-MIR.N
why don't you put [corn] from yours into that of other people?'

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

As illustrated by ex. (11), intensifiers in the sense of König and Gast 2006 (i.e., forms used to emphasize the identity of a participant) can be obtained by adding the intensifying particle *-da* to the forms described in the preceding section. Note that *-da* is added after case markers.

(5) a. *eq̄-a* *me-de-da* *riɪ̄'i-gune* *či* *b-ik'^{w}-ala* *b-iž-a.*
look-IMP 2SG-ERG-INT meat-EL what N-be-COND N-cook-IMP
'Take a look yourself and cook what can be cooked with the meat.'

b. *ušt-a-da* *b-eq'-ide.*
2PL-DAT-INT N-know-IPF$_2$
'You know it yourself.'

The intensive form of personal pronouns is also used in reflexivization – see sections 4 & 5.

Apart from its use with 1st / 2nd person pronouns, the intensifying particle *-da* is can attach to the anaphoric pronoun *ži-CL* (see section 3.3), to demonstratives in determiner function (see section 3.2), and to deictic adverbs (for example *hãže* 'now' > *hãže-da* 'in this very moment', *hašte* 'thus' > *hašte-da* 'in this very way'), but cannot attach to the head noun of canonical NPs, proper names, or demonstratives in pronoun function.

3.2. Demonstratives

3.2.1. Inventory

Akhvakh demonstratives, whose inventory is given in (6), are based on the roots *ha* (proximal) and *hu* (distal), alone or enlarged by one of the three formatives *-de/u*, *-ʟe/u*, and *-ge/u*.

(6) *The demonstratives or Akhvakh*

(proximal)	(distal)	
ha	*hu*	
ha-de	*hu-du*	(same level as the SAPs)
ha-ʟe	*hu-ʟu*	(higher than the SAPs)
ha-ge	*hu-gu*	(lower than the SAPs)

3.2.2. Demonstratives as determiners

Demonstratives preceding a noun they modify occur in one of the forms presented in (6), without the addition of any agreement mark.

(7) a. *hudu ãdo-lo-ʟa* *b-eq'-iʟ-awi* *molā rasadi-de* *ħila* *g^{w}-e-šā.*
DEM person-HPL-DAT N-know-NEG-UW.N Molla Rasadi-ERG trick do-PF$_1$-COMP
'Those people did not know that Molla Rasadi had imagined a trick.'

b. *jaše* *heč'-e* *qinaɬ-iri* *hudu* *ek'^{w}a-šu-ɪ̄ira.*
girl stand_up-CVB.F go_near-IPF$_1$ DEM man-M-ADLAT
'The girl stood up and went near to that man.'

c. *ha mik'e-li ũk-aj-a!*
DEM child-PL eat-CAUS-IMP
'Make these children eat!'

3.2.3. Demonstratives as pronouns

In pronoun function, demonstratives take either a class suffix (in the absolute form), or an oblique stem formative indicating class (M *-sū-*, F/N *-ɬ̄i-*, HPL *-do-*, NPL *-di-*) followed by a case suffix – ex. (8), to be compared with ex. (7) above.

(8) a. *hudu-do-ɪa b-eq'-iʟ-awi molā rasadi-de ħila gʷ-e-sa.*
DEM-HPL-DAT N-know-NEG-UW.N Molla Rasadi-ERG trick do-PF_1-COMP
'They did not know that Molla Rasadi had imagined a trick.'

b. *jaše heč'-e qinaɬ-iri hudu-sū-ɪira.*
girl stand_up-CVB.F go_near-IPF_1 DEM-M-ADLAT
'The girl stood up and went near to him.'

c. *ha-ji ũk-aj-a!*
DEM-HPL eat-CAUS-IMP
'Make them eat!'

3.2.4. Demonstratives and the intensifying particle -da

The intensifying particle *-da* can attach to demonstratives in determiner function, as in (9), but not to demonstratives used as pronouns.

(9) a. *če k'eda žo-ɬ̄i sig-i-la če hula-ɬ̄i-ʁana*
one two day-N(ESS) in_front-ESS-ADD one matter-N-PURP
'A couple of days before, for some matter,

molā hudu-da ħãki-sū-ɪira w-oʟ-o w-āno w-uk'-uwi.
Molla DEM-INT juge-M-ADLAT M-lead-CVB.M M-take_away.PROG.M M-be-UW.M
they had brought Molla to the same judge.'

b. *qe k'ebiɪ̄'a č'ili-ɬ̄-a w-õħo hade-da q̄'aʕida gʷ-ēwi.*
then second house-N-LAT M-go.CVB.M DEM-INT manner do-UW.N
'Then he went to the second house and did the same thing.'

3.3. The anaphoric pronoun *ži-CL*

3.3.1. Inflection

The inflection of the anaphoric pronoun *ži-CL* involves class suffixes in the absolute form, and oblique stem formatives identical to those used with demonstrative pronouns, but shows the following two irregularities:

– the HPL suffix is *-ba* instead of the regular HPL suffix *-ji*;
– the oblique stem formatives are added to a stem *ĩ-* entirely different from the stem *ži-* to which class suffixes attach in the absolute form.

(10)

	žiwe (M)	*ži-je* (F) / *ži-be* (N)
Erg.	*ĩ-sū-de*	*ĩ-ɬ̄i-de*
Dat.	*ĩ-sū-ʟa*	*ĩ-ɬ̄i-ʟa*
Gén.	*ĩ-sū*	*ĩ-ɬ̄i-ī*
Comit.	*ĩ-sū-k'ena*	*ĩ-ɬ̄i-k'ena*
etc.		

	ži-ba (HPL)	*ži-re* (NPL)
Erg.	*ĩ-do-de*	*ĩ-di-de*
Dat.	*ĩ-do-ʟa*	*ĩ-di-ʟa*
Gén.	*ĩ-do*	*ĩ-di-ī*
Comit.	*ĩ-do-k'ena*	*ĩ-di-k'ena*
etc.		

As illustrated by ex. (11), the forms given in (10) are mainly found as logophorics in reported speech. Section 6 below is devoted to a detailed description of this use.

(11) *ži-ba b-eq'-ere golidi eī'-ari hu-do-de.*
ANA-HPL HPL-come-PROG COP_1.HPL say-PF_1 DEM-HPL-ERG
'They said they were coming.'

ži-CL also has reflexive uses, which will be described in section 5.

3.3.2. ži-CL *and the intensifying particle* -da

The addition of the intensifying particle *-da* to the anaphoric pronoun *ži-CL* gives intensifiers used to emphasize the identity of referents other that speech act participants. In other words, functionally, *ži-CL-da* is the intensifier corresponding to demonstrative pronouns. In this function, *ži-CL-da* can be used alone – sentences (12a-b), or in combination with co-referent NPs – sentence (12c) – or demonstrative pronouns – sentence (12d).

(12) a. *ĩ-ɬ̄i-gũ-da rãc'-ada, eɪ̄'-ari "b-eq'-ike."*
ANA-F-EL-INT ask-PF_2 say-PF_1 N-know-IPF_2.NEG.N
'I asked herself, and she said "I don't know." '

b. *hu-be ĩ-s̄^{w}-a-da b-eq'-ere b-ik'-awi.*
DEM-N ANA-M-DAT-INT N-know-PROG N-be-UW.N
'He was himself acquainted with that matter.'

c. *χ^{w}e-ɪa ĩ-ɬ̄-a-da gaza b-oɪ̄-iɪ-awi.*
dog-DAT ANA-F-DAT-INT nothing N-happen-NEG-UW.N
'Nothing happened to the dog itself.'

d. *hudu-je ži-je-da j-eq'-ari eše-ga.*
DEM-F ANA-F-INT F-come-PF 1PLE-LAT
'She herself came to our place.'

Like other intensifiers, *ži-CL-da* also has a reflexive use, which will be described in sections 4 & 5.

3.3.3. Other items cognate with ži-CL

The anaphoric pronoun *ži-CL* is probably cognate with *žiži* (det.) 'each' – ex. (13), *žida* (adv.) 'simply', 'without anything else', 'in vain' 'gratis' – ex. (14), and *židase* (adj.) 'void', 'alone' – ex. (15).

(14) a. *žiži ek'^{w}a-s̄^{w}-a o-x̄-a če-če beli!*
each man-M-LAT N-give-IMP one-one spade
'Give a spade to each man!'

b. *žiži-s̄^{w}-a o-x̄-a če-če beli!*
each-M-LAT N-give-IMP one-one spade
'Give a spade to each of them!'

(15) *mašina žida m-āni.*
car simply N-go.PF_1
'The truck went away without any load.'

(16) *čugu hušte židase χaba-čaba g^w-ēre goda?*
why? thus void discussion do-PROG COP_2.N
'Why are you carrying on such a meaningless discussion?'

4. Local reflexivization

Local reflexivization, as opposed to long-distance reflexivization, is characterized by the fact that the reflexive pronoun and its antecedent belong to the same minimal

clause (which means that no clause boundary intervenes between the antecedent and the reflexive pronoun).

4.1. Local reflexivization of speech act participants

As illustrated by ex. (17), reflexivization of speech act participants triggers the use of the intensive form of 1st / 2nd person pronouns. The data I have collected include no attestation of clauses with two occurrences of the non-intensive form of the same 1st / 2nd person pronoun, whatever the syntactic roles involved.

(17) *de-de di-ʟa-da če x̄ʷani b-eχ-ida gʷeda.*
1SG-ERG 1SG -DAT-INT one horse N-buy-IPF$_2$ COP$_2$.N
'I will buy a horse for myself.'

The antecedent of the intensive form of a 1st / 2nd person pronoun used as a reflexive may be an unexpressed argument, as in ex. (18).

(18) a. *raʟa ī'‹ã›k'-ideɬ̄i ošte-ge-da baʟ'i-qe c̄'ani b-iɬ-a!*
at_night ‹HPL›sleep-when 2PL-ESS-INT side-ESS salt N-put-IMP
'At night when you go to bed, put some salt near you!'

b. *ha saba du-ge-da k'oli-ge t'am-a!*
DEM amulet 2SG-ESS-INT neck-ESS put-IMP
'Hang this amulet to your neck!'

4.2. Local reflexivization of 3rd person referents

As already mentioned, demonstrative pronouns constitute the functional equivalent of the specialized 3rd person pronouns found in other languages, but the intensifying particle *-da* can attach to demonstratives in determiner function only, not to demonstratives used as pronouns, and the intensive pronoun corresponding to demonstrative pronouns is *ži-CL-da*.

Not surprisingly, *ži-CL-da* is also the form used in the reflexivization of 3rd person referents, as in ex. (19). Note that, in sentences (c) and (e), the antecedent of *ži-CL-da* is not expressed within the minimal clause to which *ži-CL-da* belongs, but constitutes an unexpressed argument of the verb heading this clause.

(19) a. *ũča-de$_i$ ĩ-ɬ̄-e-da$_i$ qedo eq̄-ari.*
ox-ERG ANA-N-ESS-INT behind look-PF$_1$
'The ox$_i$ took a look behind itself$_i$.'

b. *ek'ʷa$_i$ ĩ-sū-gu-da$_i$ w-õho gudi.*
man ANA-M-EL-INT M-go.CVB.M COP$_1$.M
'The man$_i$ went away from his$_i$ place.' (lit. '… from himself')

c. *molā*$_i$ *q̄'alada heč'-o* *mišidi* *ĩ-sū-ʟa-da*$_i$ *b-eχ-ari.*
Molla quickly stand_up-CVB.M gold ANA-M-DAT-INT N-take-PF
'Molla$_i$ stood up quickly and Ø$_i$ took the gold for himself$_i$.'

d. *molā-s̄^{w}-e*$_i$ *ĩ-sū-da*$_i$ *q̄eleko* *q̄eleka* *r-uq̄-it̄-a* *b-eʟ-ari.*
Molla-M-ERG ANA-M-INT cock cock.PL NPL-fight-VLOC-LAT N-bring-PF$_1$
'Molla$_i$ brought his$_i$ cock to the place where cock fights are organized.'

e. *molā-s̄^{w}-e*$_i$ *q'iru* *b-eχ-e* *ĩ-sū-da*$_i$ *q'ẽʟe-t̄i-ga* *t'-ēni.*
Molla-M-ERG corn N-take-CVB.N ANA-M-INT bag-N-LAT put-IPF$_1$
'Molla$_i$ took corn and put it into his$_i$ bag.'

Ex. (20) illustrates the possibility to have two occurrences of *ži-CL-da* in the same clause with two different functions: in this sentence, *ĩs̄^{w}eda* is in intensive function (and its deletion would not modify the denotative meaning), whereas *ĩsūgada* is in reflexive function.

(20) *molā rasadi-de*$_i$ *ĩ-sū-ga-da*$_i$ *ĩ-s̄^{w}-e-da*$_i$ *eī'-awi ...*
Molla Rasadi-ERG ANA-M-LAT-INT ANA-M-ERG-INT say-UW.N
lit. 'Molla Rasadi$_i$ himself$_i$ told to himself$_i$ …'

4.3. Possible syntactic functions of the reflexive pronoun and its antecedent

In the vast majority of the examples of local reflexivization occurring in the texts I have collected, the antecedent of the reflexive pronoun is either an NP in the absolute form in S role, or an ergative NP in A role. In such cases, the reflexive pronoun can occupy any other role within the clause.

In particular, in all the attestations I have of reflexivity involving the A and P arguments of prototypical transitive verbs, the antecedent is in A role, and the reflexive pronoun in P role, as in ex. (21).

(21) a. *hudu-s̄^{w}-e*$_i$ *ži-we-da*$_i$ *boʁoda* *w-oc̄-ari.*
DEM-M-ERG ANA-M-INT much M-praise-PF$_1$
'He$_i$ praised himself$_i$ much.'

b. *molā-s̄^{w}-e*$_i$ *ži-we-da*$_i$ *aħmaq̄'ada* *g-ōho* *eī'-iri …*
Molla-M-ERG ANA-M-INT fool make-CVB.M say-IPF$_1$
'Molla pretended to be fool (lit. Molla$_i$ made himself$_i$ a fool) and said …'

Antecedents of reflexive pronouns do occur in other roles, but I have in my texts no attestation of configurations departing from what is commonly observed cross-linguistically, and this absence is confirmed by the judgments of informants in elicitation. Ex. (22) illustrates reflexive configurations in which the antecedent of a reflexive in genitive function within an NP in the absolute form is an dative-marked experiencer (sentence (a)), a 'floating genitive' (sentence (b)), or a lative-marked oblique argument (sentence (c)).

(22) a. *hudu-s̄^{w}-a*$_{i}$ *ĩ-s̄u-da*$_{i}$ *hamaʁe harig^{w}-ari.*
DEM-M-DAT ANA-M-INT friend see-PF$_1$
'He$_i$ saw his$_i$ friend.'

b. *hudu baša-ī*$_{i}$ *hãže ĩ-ɬ̄i-ī-da*$_{i}$ *rašiba gedi.*
DEM young_animal-GEN now ANA-N-GEN-INT young_animal.PL COP$_1$.NPL
'This young (mouse) now has its own young.'
lit. 'Of this young (mouse)$_i$ now its own$_i$ young exist.'

b. *ĩ-s̄u-da*$_{i}$ *jaše naɬ̄-iwi imo-ga*$_{i}$
ANA-M-INT daughter insult-UW father -LAT
'The father$_i$ was insulted by his$_i$ daughter'
lit. 'His own$_i$ daughter insulted the father$_i$'

5. Long-distance reflexivization

5.1. Long-distance reflexivization of SAPs

Ex. (23) shows that the intensive form of 1st/2nd person pronouns is used both in local reflexivization (in ex. (23a), *du-da* belongs to the same minimal clause as the understood antecedent), and non-local reflexivization (in ex. (23b-c), *mene-da* and *dene-da* belong to a relative clause modifying the P argument of the clause to which its antecedent belongs).

(23) a. *du-da ači-ɬ̄i-k'ena du-ɪa-da k^{w}-ĩda-be g^{w}ij-a!*
2SG(GEN)-INT money-N-COM 2SG-DAT-INT want-IPF$_2$-N make-IMP
'Do what you want with your own money!'

b. *me-de mene-da ʁad‹u›k'-ada hala b-uq'-ere godi.*
2SG-ERG 2SG-INT ‹M›sit-PF$_2$ branch N-cut-PROG COP$_1$.N
'You are cutting the branch on which you are sitting.'

c. *de-de dene-da ʁad‹u›k'-ada hala b-uq'-ere goɪe*
1SG-ERG 1SG-INT ‹M›sit-PF$_2$ branch N-cut-PROG COP.NEG.N
'I am not cutting the branch on which I am sitting'

5.2. Long-distance reflexivization of 3rd person referents

5.2.1. ži-CL-da *in long-distance reflexive function*

Ex. (24) shows that the intensive form *ži-CL-da* of the anaphoric pronoun *ži-CL* occurs not only in local reflexivization of 3rd person referents, but also in non-local reflexivization:

– in sentence (a), *ĩs̄u-da* is in genitive function in a complement clause, and its antecedent is an argument of the main verb;
– in sentence (b), *žiwe-da* is in S function in a relative clause whose head is the participle *ʁaduk'ada*, and its antecedent is the understood A argument of the infinitive *buq'uruɬa*;
– in sentence (c), *ĩs̄u-da* belongs to the same minimal clause as its antecedent *žiži ek'^{w}aš̄^{w}e*, but *ĩs̄^{w}a-da* belongs to a free relative in P role within the clause to which its antecedent belongs.

(24) a. *hudu-š̄^{w}-a*$_{i}$ *harig^{w}-ari* *ĩ-s̄u-da*$_{i}$ *č'ili* *č'-āre* *we.*
DEM-M-DAT see-PF$_1$ ANA-M-INT house burn-PROG COP$_1$.N
'He$_i$ saw that his$_i$ house was burning.'

b. *mol̄a*$_{i}$ *w-ašl-ēri* *ži-we-da*$_{i}$ *ʁad‹u›k'-ada* *hala* *b-uq'-uruɬa.*
Molla M-begin-IPF$_1$ ANA-M-INT ‹M›sit-PF$_2$ branch N-cut-INF
'Molla$_i$ began to cut the branch on which he$_i$ was sitting.'

c. *b-eɬ̄-a* *žiži* *ek'^{w}a-s̄^{w}-e*$_{i}$ *ĩ-s̄u-da*$_{i}$ *mižoīi-ɬa* *ĩ-s̄^{w}-a-da*$_{i}$ *k^{w}-ĩda-be* *g-ūruɬa.*
N-let-IMP every man-M-ERG ANA-M-INT beard-DAT ANA-M-DAT-INT want-IPF$_2$-N make-INF
'Allow every man$_i$ to do what he$_i$ wants to his$_i$ beard.'

In ex. (25) *ĩs̄^{w}e-da* and *ĩs̄u-da* belong to the clause headed by the infinitive *q'eleč'u* in a control construction headed by he verb *ĩdunuɬa* 'be able'. Given the obligatoriness of the control relation, it is possible to delete *ĩs̄^{w}e-da* without modifying the meaning or introducing an ambiguity. Consequently, *ĩs̄^{w}e-da* can be analyzed as an intensifier with respect to an obligatorily controlled (and normally unexpressed) argument in an infinitival construction.

(25) *ãde-ɬa*$_{i}$ *ĩ-s̄^{w}-e-da*$_{i}$ *ĩ-s̄u-da*$_{i}$ *hãde* *q̄'eleč'-u* *ĩd-ike.*
person-DAT ANA-M-ERG-INT ANA-M-INT ear bite-INF be_able-IPF$_2$.NEG.N
'Nobody$_i$ can bite his own$_i$ ear himself$_i$.'

5.2.2. ži-CL *in long-distance reflexive function*

Long-distance reflexivization of 3rd person referents may also involve the non-intensive form of the anaphoric pronoun *ži-CL*, as in ex. (26).

(26) a. *biči'il-āwi* *hado-lo-ɬa*$_{i}$
understand-UW.N DEM-HPL-DAT
'They$_i$ understood

ži-ba$_{i}$ *q̄'ũ-ɬ̄-a* *ba-x̄-i* *goli-s̄a* *mol̄a rasadi-de.*
ANA-HPL teasing-N-LAT HPL-catch-CVB.HPL COP$_1$.HPL-COMP Molla Rasadi-ERG
that Molla Rasadi had made fun of them$_i$.'

b. *ʁe-ī-i* *ek'^{w}a-s̄^{w}-a$_{i}$* *ĩgo-q̄une* *eq̄aj-e*
neighborhood-GEN man-M-DAT window-EL look-CVB.N
'The neighbor$_{i}$ took a look through the window

mol̄a *ĩ-do-ga$_{i}$* *w-oq'-ida* *harig^{w}-iri.*
Molla ANA-HPL-LAT M-come-IPF$_{2}$ see-IPF$_{1}$
and saw Molla coming to their$_{i}$ place.'

c. *ħãki-s̄^{w}-e$_{i}$* *geī-a* *b-eχ-awi* *mina* *mol̄a-s̄^{w}-a* *ži-we$_{i}$* *harig^{w}-iʟoʔu.*
judge-M-ERG inside-LAT N-take-UW.N head Molla-M-DAT ANA-M see-INF.NEG
'The judge$_{i}$ moved his head back in order that Molla cannot see him$_{i}$.'

d. *hu-s̄^{w}-e$_{i}$* *dene* *ž-āri* *ĩ-s̄^{w}-a$_{i}$* *ači* *o-x̄-u* *de-de.*
DEM-M-ERG 1SG call-PF$_{1}$ ANA-M-LAT money N-give-INF 1SG-ERG
'He$_{i}$ called me so that I should give him$_{i}$ money.'

e. *mol̄a-s̄^{w}-e$_{i}$* *eq̄-awi* *ʁe-ī-i* *ak̄'a-ɬ̄-e-la*
Molla-M-ERG look-UW.N neighborhood-GEN woman-F-ERG-ADD
'Molla$_{i}$ saw that the neighbor

ĩ-s̄^{w}-e$_{i}$ *č'-ēroq̄e* *č'-ēre* *godi.*
ANA-M-ERG plant-SIMIL plant-PROG COP$_{1}$.N
was planting (trees) like him$_{i}$.'

f. *ek'^{w}a-s̄^{w}-e$_{i}$* *χã-s̄u-ʟa$_{j}$* *b-eq'-u* *o-t-iki*
man-M-ERG king-M-DAT N-know-INF N-let-IPF$_{1}$.NEG
'The man$_{i}$ did not let the king$_{j}$ know

ži-we$_{i}$ *ĩ-s̄u-da$_{j}$* *iš^{w}ada* *g^{w}i-s̄a.*
ANA-M ANA-M-INT shepherd COP$_{1}$.M-COMP
that he$_{i}$ was his$_{j}$ shepherd.'

5.2.3. *The choice between* ži-CL *and* ži-CL-da *in long-distance reflexivization*

The following generalization accounts for all the attestations I have of *ži-CL* and *ži-CL-da* used as long-distance reflexives: *ži-CL-da* is selected if its syntactic role rules out the possibility of having an antecedent within the limits of its minimal clause, whereas *ži-CL* is selected if the syntactic configuration does not exclude the possibility of a 'local' antecedent.

In other words, the choice depends on the presence of another potential antecedent between the antecedent and the long-distance reflexive ('between' being understood as referring to syntactic embedding, not to linear order): if no other potential antecedent can intervene, the same reflexive pronoun *ži-CL-da* is used as in local reflexivization, otherwise *ži-CL* is selected.

6 Logophoricization

6.1. The logophoric use of *ži-CL*: introduction

In addition to its use in long-distance reflexivization, *ži-CL* occurs in reported speech introduced by verbs such as *eī'uruɪa* 'say, tell', *rãč'uruɪa* 'ask', *ħulōruɪa* 'scream', *uʁilōruɪa* 'think', etc. In this use, illustrated by ex. (27), *ži-CL* always 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.

(27) a. *wašo-de*$_i$ *molā-šu-ga* *eī'-ari,* *hudu* *χ^{w}e* *ĩ-šu-ɪa*$_i$ *beχ-a!*
boy-ERG Molla-M-LAT tell-PF$_1$ DEM dog ANA-M-DAT N-buy-IMP
'The boy$_i$ told Molla: "Buy this dog for me$_i$!"'

b. *mačada* *ek'^{w}a-š^w-e*$_i$ *eī'-iri* *ima-š^w-a,* *ĩ-šu-ga*$_i$ *muχa-di* *r-ač-uba!*
rich man-M-ERG tell-IPF$_1$ imam-M-LAT ANA-M-LAT story-PL NPL-tell-PROHIB
'The rich man$_i$ told the imam: "Don't tell me$_i$ stories!"'

c. *q̄'ačali-īi* *raši-le-de*$_i$ *eī'-awi,* *ĩ-di-īi*$_i$ *ila* *harig^w-a-či?*
dragon-GEN young_animal.PL-NPL-ERG say-UW.N ANA-NPL-GEN mother see-PF$_1$-Q
'The dragon's young$_i$ said: "Have you seen our$_i$ mother?'

d. *bač'a*$_i$ *uʁil-āre* *b-ik'-awi,*
wolf think-PROG N-be-UW.N
'The wolf$_i$ was thinking:

hagiī-une *ĩ-ɬ̄-a*$_i$ *q'õhula* *b-iχ̄^{w}-ida* *b-ik'-awa?*
where-EL ANA-N-DAT food N-remain-IPF N-be-MIR.N
"Where will I$_i$ get food from?"'

e. *q'ačali-de*$_i$ *iš^{w}ada-šu-ga* *eī'-awi,* *ži-be*$_i$ *čaka* *makoč-e* *godi,*
dragon-ERG shepherd-M-LAT tell-UW.N ANA-N very be_hungry-CVB.N COP$_1$.N
'The dragon$_i$ told the shepherd: "I$_i$ am very hungry,

ĩ-ɬ̄i-īi$_i$ *ɪoda* *baša-la* *makoč-e* *goda.*
ANA-N-GEN three young_animal-ADD be_hungry-CVB.N COP$_2$.N
and my$_i$ three children are hungry too."'

f. *molā* *rasadi*$_i$ *ħul-ōwi* *geī-une,*
Molla Rasadi scream-UW.M inside.EL
'Molla Rasadi$_i$ screamed from inside:

ĩ-šu-ge$_i$ *ɪ'a* *q'ori* *k'ar-uba* *ĩč'a* *k'ar-a!*
ANA-M-ESS on_top.ESS board tie-PROH stone tie-IMP
"Don't tie a board on me$_i$, tie a stone!'

g. *raši-le-de* $_{i}$ *eɬ’-awi ilo-ga,*
young_animal.PL-NPL-ERG say-UW.N mother-LAT
‘The young$_{i}$ told their mother:

ži-re$_{i}$ *ažaho-de q̄’-ẽ̃da zama-ɬ̄i,*
ANA-NPL dragon-ERG eat-IPF$_2$ time-N(ESS)
“When the dragon was about to eat us$_{i}$,

maɦmaʕali-de q̄’-õ̃ o-t-iʟa ži-re$_{i}$*.*
Mehmet_Ali-ERG eat-INF N-let-PF.NEG ANA-NPL
Mehmet Ali did not let it eat us$_{i}$.”’

h. *mol̄a rasadi-de*$_{i}$ *eɬ̄’-awi, hudu ĩ-šu*$_{i}$ *q̄’e m-išʷ-ada ekʼʷa*
Molla Rasadi-ERG say-UW.N DEM ANA-M(GEN) belongings N-steal-PF$_2$ man
‘Molla Rasadi$_{i}$ said: “The man who stole my$_{i}$ belongings

čũda b-ikʼʷ-ala haga w-oq’-ida gʷida,
when N-be-COND here.LAT M-come-IPF$_2$ COP$_2$.M
will come here sooner or later,

qe ʁad‹u›k’-o gʷido ži-we$_{i}$ *hag-e.*
then ‹M›sit-CVB.M COP$_2$.M ANA-M here-ESS
therefore I$_{i}$ will stay here.”’

i. *mol̄a rasadi-de*$_{i}$ *eɬ̄’-ari, ĩ-šu*$_{i}$ *č’ili č’-ādeɬ̄i,*
Molla Rasadi-ERG say-PF$_1$ ANA-M(GEN) house burn-POST
‘Molla Rasadi$_{i}$ said: “When my$_{i}$ house burnt,

ĩ-šu-ʟa$_{i}$ *boʁoda mišidi b-eq’-ari.*
ANA-M-DAT much gold N-come-PF$_1$
I$_{i}$ found much gold.” (lit. ‘much gold came to me’)

ãdo-lo-de-la$_{j}$ *ĩ-do-da*$_{j}$ *č’ila č’-āri,*
person.PL-HPL-ERG-ADD ANA-M-INT house.PL burn-PF$_1$
Then the people$_{j}$ burnt their$_{j}$ houses,

b-eq’-i mol̄a rasadi-ga eɬ̄’-ari, ĩ-do-ʟa$_{j}$ *mišidi b-eq’-iʟa.*
HPL-come-CVB.HPL Molla Rasadi-LAT say-PF ANA-HPL-DAT gold N-come-PF.NEG
came to Molla’s place and said: “We$_{j}$ have found no gold.”’

6.2. Direct and indirect speech

Insofar as they occur in indirect speech 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 the report opening verb, and may

extend across sentence boundaries to arbitrarily long stretches of discourse – Hagège 1974, Mithun 1990. A distinction can thus be made between *local logophorics*, whose domain is limited to subordinate clauses of the type traditionally analyzed in terms of indirect speech, and *non-local logophorics*, whose domain is delimited in purely discursive terms. In other words, the notions of long-distance reflexivity and logophoricity overlap (since logophorics in canonical indirect speech meet the definition of long-distance reflexivity), but are fundamentally distinct.

The question raised by the logophoric use of *ži-CL* is therefore to characterize the reported sentences in which it occurs with respect to the notions of direct *vs.* indirect speech.

Traditionally, the following three types of reported speech are recognized:

– *direct speech*, in which a sentence or sequence of sentences is supposed to be reproduced exactly as the speaker to which it is attributed uttered it; an important characteristic of direct speech is that the reported sentences are not syntactically subordinated to the verb that introduces them;
– *indirect speech*, in which the reported sentence shows evidence of syntactic subordination, and the deictic elements included in the reported sentence are modified in order to conform to the reporting speaker's deixis; more generally, indirect speech is supposed to reflect the content of the reported utterance, but not necessarily the original formulation;
– *free indirect speech*, which like direct speech is supposed to reproduce the original formulation of the reported sentences, and also has in common with direct speech the absence of syntactic subordination, but in which the deictics are modified in the same way as in indirect speech.

In the absence of any other evidence, the presence of a logophoric pronoun also used in long-distance reflexivization suggests that in the examples given in section 6.1, the reported sentences represent indirect speech. However, additional observations lead to the conclusion that AD Akhvakh has no distinction between direct and indirect speech, and that the only type of reported speech found in AD Akhvakh has all characteristics of canonical direct speech, except for the possibility to substitute *ži-CL* for 1st person pronouns.

6.3. Deictic adverbs in reported speech

When a speaker A reports a sentence uttered by a speaker B, indirect speech is characterized by the readjustment of all deictics present in the reported sentence to speaker A's deixis. Such a readjustment never occurs in my data, except for the particular treatment of 1st person. For example, in ex. (27h) above, the use of *žiwe* instead of *dene* 'I' in the reported sentence suggests that this sentence represents indirect speech, but the proximal locative adverbs *haga* 'here (lat.)' and *hage* 'here (ess.)' reflect Molla Rasadi's deixis, not the narrator's deixis.

6.4. 2nd person pronouns in reported speech

The clearest evidence that AD Akhvakh ignores indirect speech comes from the treatment of 2nd person in reported speech. For example, *John told Peter*$_i$*: "Mary saw you*$_i$*"* becomes in indirect speech *John told Peter*$_i$ *that Mary saw him*$_i$, and *you* in *John told Peter that Mary saw you* refers to the interlocutor of the speaker reporting John's speech, not to John's interlocutor.

In my Akhvakh corpus of narrative texts, I have no attestation of reported sentences in which a 2nd person pronoun would refer to the interlocutor of the reporting speaker, and such a configuration does not occur in my elicited data either. As illustrated by ex. (28), even in reported speech involving the use of *ži-CL* in logophoric function, 2nd person pronouns always refer to the interlocutor of the speaker whose speech is reported, never to the interlocutor of the reporting speaker.

(28) a. *imaχa-de*$_i$ *eī'-iri, hu-do-de ī'or-eɬ̄i, ži-be*$_i$ *du-ga naɬ̄-ida goda.*
donkey -ERG say-IPF$_1$ DEM-HPL-ERG hit-when ANA-N 2SG-LAT insult-IPF$_2$ COP$_2$.N
'The donkey$_i$ said: "When they will hit (me), I$_i$ will insult you."'

b. *ak'o-lo-de*$_i$ *molā rasadi-ga eī'-awi, ĩ-do-ɪa*$_i$ *me-ne čaka k*^{w}*-ĩdo.*
woman.PL-HPL-ERG Molla Rasadi-LAT tell-UW.N ANA-HPL-DAT 2SG-ABS much love-IPF$_2$.M
'The women$_i$ told Molla Rasadi: "We$_i$ love you much."'

c. *molā rasadi*$_i$ *c̄'e-šu-īira w-ũ̃wi, eī'-awi,*
Molla Rasadi friend-M-ADLAT M-go.UW.M tell-UW.N
'Molla Rasadi went to his friend, he$_i$ told him:

me-de ĩ-šu-ɪa$_i$ *či g*^{w}*-īda saba q̄or-ada?*
2SG-ERG ANA-M-DAT what make-IPF$_2$ amulet write-PF$_2$
"Which kind of amulet (lit. 'an amulet doing what?') did you write for me$_i$?"'

d. *molā rasadi-de-la*$_i$ *eī'-awi,*
Molla Rasadi-ERG-ADD say-UW.N
'And Molla Rasadi$_i$ said:

ĩ-s̄^{w}*-e*$_i$ *eī'-ada č*^{w}*ila g-ūx̄-ide ušt-e.*
ANA-M-ERG say-PF$_2$ thing make-OBLG-IPF$_2$.N 2PL.ERG
"You must do what I$_i$ said."'

e. *molā-s̄*^{w}*-e*$_i$ *eī'-awi, ha imaχa ĩ-šu-re*$_i$ *geda,*
Molla-M-ERG say-UW.N DEM donkey.PL ANA-M-NPL COP$_2$.NPL
'And Molla Rasadi said: "These donkeys belong to me,

du-ɪa r-ešq-ēdeɬ̄i ĩ-s̄^{w}*-a*$_i$ *ɬuda b-eχ-ika-be.*
2SG-DAT NPL-work-CAUS.SIMULT ANA-M-DAT wood N-take-IPF$_2$.NEG-N
and when I make them work for you, I do not collect wood for myself$_i$."'

f. *ima-s̄^{w}-e*$_{i}$ *eī’-iri, me-de istalowa-ɬ̄i ĩ-s̄^{w}-a*$_{i}$ *o-x̄-ada šadaq̄’a-ɬ̄i-ʁana,*
imam-M-ERG say-IPF$_1$ 2SG-ERG pub-N(ESS) ANA-M-LAT N-give-PF$_2$ alms-N-PURP
‘The imam$_i$ said: “Owing to the alms you gave me$_i$ in the pub,

alā-s̄^{w}-e ima-ɬ̄i-ga ž-āri mene.
God-M-ERG faith-M-LAT call-PF$_1$ 2SG
God called you to the faith.”’

g. *žabula-de*$_{i}$ *eī’-ari, mene aħmadi jaco-īi waša w-uk’-iʟa w-uk’-ãčala,*
Jabula-ERG say-PF$_1$ 2SG Ahmad(GEN) sister-GEN son M-be-PF.NEG M-be-COND
‘Jabula$_i$ said: “If you were not the son of Ahmad’s sister,

ĩ-s̄^{w}-e$_{i}$ *mene w-uʟ’-ēda w-uk’-ada.*
ANA-M-ERG 2SG M-die-CAUS.IPF$_2$ M-be-PF$_2$.
I$_i$ would kill you.”

h. *ak’o-de*$_{i}$ *eī’-iri,*
wife.O-ERG say-UW.N
‘The wife$_i$ said:

ĩ-ɬ̄-e$_{i}$ *mene q’eī-a q’õhula b-eχ-u w-oī-ōho w-uk’-ada*
ANA-F-ERG 2SG home-LAT food N-buy-INF M-walk-CAUS.CVB.M M-be-PF$_2$
“I$_i$ had sent you in order to buy food for the family,

me-de q̄eleko-la b-eχ-o w-oq’-ari.
2SG-ERG cock-ADD N-buy-M M-come-PF$_1$
and you brought a cock.”

molā-s̄^{w}-e$_{i}$ *eī’-iri, ĩ-s̄^{w}-e*$_{i}$ *ha qeleko b-uq̄-aj-e*
Molla-M-ERG say-IPF$_1$ ANA-M-ERG DEM coq N-fight-CAUS-CVB
Molla$_i$ said: “I$_i$ will make this cock fight,

me-de o-x̄-ada-ɬ̄i-gu ʟoda q̄’ati b-eχ-ide
2SG-ERG N-give-PF$_2$-N-EL three layer N-take-IPF$_2$.N
and will get three times more than what you gave me.”’

6.5. Assertive agreement in reported speech

Assertive agreement provides additional evidence that the use of *ži-CL* in logophoric function does not trigger any other change in the reported sentence: as illustrated by ex. (34), in reported declarative sentences including *ži-CL* in S / A role, verbs in the perfective positive mark assertive agreement exactly in the same way as with 1st person pronouns.

(29) a. *hu aje-ɬ̄i aļa-s̄^{w}-e*$_{i}$ *eī'-ere godi,*
DEM verse-N(ESS) God-M-ERG say-PROG COP$_1$.N
'In this verse God$_i$ says:

ĩ-s̄^{w}-e$_{i}$ *ha duna b-iž^{w}-āda.*
ANA-M-ERG DEM world N-be_created-CAUS.PF$_2$
"I$_i$ have created this world."'

b. *ilo-de*$_{i}$ *eī'-iri waša-šu-ga,*
mother-ERG tell-IPF$_1$ boy-M-LAT
'The mother$_i$ told the boy:

ha ĩgora ĩ-ɬ̄-e$_{i}$ *magazi-gune b-eχ-e j-eq'-ada.*
DEM bread ANA-F-ERG shop-EL N-buy-CVB.N F-come-PF$_2$
"I have brought this bread from the shop."'

6.6. Additional remarks and conclusion

In addition to that, very often, as illustrated by ex. (30), the length and the internal structure of the stretches of discourse within which *ži-CL* occurs in logophoric function exclude the possibility to analyze the relation between a sequence of reported sentences and the verb of saying in terms of clausal subordination. Note in particular that in these examples, the indirect speech hypothesis would imply to recognize a very unusual type of complex construction with an interrogative complement clause and a declarative complement clause subordinated to the same verb without any mark, either of their mutual relation, or of their relation to the main verb.

(30) a. *če žo-ɬ̄i ãdo-lo-de*$_{i}$ *rãc̄'-awi,*
one day-N(ESS) person.PL-HPL-ERG ask-UW.N
'One day the people$_i$ asked:

me-de čugu q̄'alada w-õ̃ho w-oq'-ero g^{w}ido?
2SG-ERG why quickly M-go.CVB.M M-come-PROG.M COP$_2$.M
"How is it possible that you go there and come back so quickly?

ži-ba$_{i}$ *m-a?-ideɬ̄i, men-oq̄e b-eq'-iki.*
ANA-HPL HPL-go-SIMULT 2SG -like HPL-come-IPF$_2$.NEG.HPL
When we$_i$ go there, we do not come back (quickly) like you."'

b. *moļa rasadi-de*$_{i}$ *eī'-awi, ĩ-s̄^{w}-e*$_{i}$ *oš̄o-ga eī'-e-či b-ik'^{w}-iɪe*
Molla Rasadi-ERG say-UW.N ANA-M-ERG 2PL -LAT tell-CVB.N-Q N-be-PF.NEG
'Molla Rasadi$_i$ said: "Hadn't I$_i$ told you

ĩč'a k'ar-a-ɪ̄'e ĩ-sū-ge$_{i}$ *ʟ'a?*
stone be_tied-IMP-QUOT ANA-M-ESS on_top.ESS
that a stone should be tied on me$_{i}$?

uš̄-e q'ori k'ar-āri ʟ'a,
2PL-ERG board be_tied-CAUS.PF$_1$ on_top.ESS
You tied a board on me,

ĩ-s̄^{w}-e-la$_{i}$ *ʟ'one b-eq̄-ada;*
ANA-M-ERG-ADD on_top.EL N-remove-PF$_2$
and I$_{i}$ removed it;

ĩč'a k'ar-aj-e b-ik'^{w}-ãčala ĩ-sū-ge$_{i}$ *,*
stone be_tied-CAUS-CVB N-be-COND ANA-M-ESS
if you had tied a stone on me$_{i}$,

ĩ-s̄^{w}-e$_{i}$ *b-eq̄-ida b-ik'^{w}-iʟe.*
ANA-M-ERG N-remove-IPF$_2$ N-be-IPF.NEG.N
I$_{i}$ would not have removed it."'

c. *q̄'iru č'-īda ek'^{w}a-s̄^{w}-e*$_{i}$ *eɪ̄'-iri,*
corn sow-IPF$_2$ man-M-ERG say-IPF$_1$
The man$_{i}$ who sows corn said:

alla-s̄^{w}-e ũs̄i b-iž^{w}-aj-e b-ik'^{w}-iʟ-ala,
God-M-ERG soil N-be_created-CAUS-CVB N-be-NEG-COND
"If God had not created the soil,

q̄'iru hagiɪ̄i č'-īda b-ik'^{w}-ada?
corn where. ESS sow-IPF$_2$ N-be-PF$_2$
where would the corn have been sown?

q'onaʕ-ideɬ̄i c̄'-āre b-ik'-ũč‹iʟ›ala,
be_necessary-SIMULT rain-PROG N-be-‹NEG›COND
If it had not rained when necessary,

alā-s̄^{w}-e miɬi-la b-iž^{w}-aj-e b-ik'-ũč‹iʟ›ala,
God-M-ERG sun-ADD N-be_created-CAUS-CVB N-be-‹NEG›COND
and if God had not created the sun,

ĩ-s̄^{w}-e$_{i}$ *q̄'iru č^{w}ige č'-īda b-ik'^{w}-ada?*
ANA-M-ERG corn how sow-IPF$_2$ N-be-PF$_2$
how would I$_{i}$ have sown corn?"'

The conclusion is therefore that the domain within which *ži-CL* can be used to represent the speaker argument of a verb of saying is delimited in purely discursive

terms, and involves a type or reported speech that, apart from the use of a logophoric pronoun, has all characteristics of direct speech.

To have a full account of the logophoric use of *ži-CL*, two further remarks are necessary:

(a) The antecedent of *ži-CL* must be a 3rd person referent; if the person whose speech is reported is a SAP, (s)he is necessarily represented by 1st/2nd person pronouns in the reported sentence – ex. (31).

(31) a. *hudu-s̄ʷ-e eī'-ari, ĩ-s̄ʷ-e ači o-x̄-uwa du-ɪa!*
DEM-M-ERG say-PF_1 ANA-M-ERG money N-give-POT.N 2SG-DAT
'He said: "I will give you money!"'

b. *me-de eī'-ari, de-de / *ĩ-s̄ʷ-e ači o-x̄-uwa du-ɪa*
2SG-ERG say-PF_1 1SG-ERG money N-give-POT.N 2SG-DAT
'You said: "I will give you money"'

c. *de-de eī'-ada, de-de / *ĩ-s̄ʷ-e ači o-x̄-uwa du-ɪa*
1SG-ERG say-PF_2 1SG-ERG money N-give-POT.N 2SG-DAT
'I said: "I will give you money"'

(b) The use of *ži-CL* is never obligatory: the use of 1st person pronouns instead of *ži-CL* in logophoric function is always possible without further readjustments, and in the narrative texts I have collected, *ži-CL* and 1st person pronouns often alternate within a single stretch of reported discourse with the same referential value, as in ex. (32) – which incidentally confirms that the distinction between direct and indirect speech is not relevant in AD Akhvakh.

(32) a. *ãdo$_i$ b-eq'-ideɬ̄i, eī'-iri molā-sū-ga,*
person.PL HPL-come-SIMULT tell-IPF_1 Molla-M-LAT
'When the people$_i$ arrived, they$_i$ told Molla:

ĩ-do$_i$ x̄ʷana mokoč-e r-iɪ'-ari,
ANA-HPL horse.PL be_hungry-CVB.NPL NPL-die-PF_1
"Our$_i$ horses have died of hunger,

me-de is-a$_i$ x̄ʷana r-eχ-ux̄-ide
2SG-ERG $1PL_E$-DAT horse.PL NPL-buy-OBLG-IPF_2.NPL
you must buy horses for us$_i$."'

b. *molā rasadi-de$_i$ če k'eha aχ-e eī'-iri,*
Molla Rasadi-ERG one eye open-CVB.N say-IPF_1
'Molla Rasadi$_i$ opened an eye and said:

ži-we$_i$ saʁada w-uk'-ãčala,
ANA-M alive M-be-COND
"If I$_i$ were alive,

ušt-a *di*$_{i}$ *imiχi* *ɬ'aɬ'-ō* *ĩd-ika* *b-ik'^{w}-ada*
2PL-DAT 1SG(GEN) donkey tear-INF be_able-IPF$_2$.NEG N-be-PF$_2$
you could not tear my$_{i}$ donkey into pieces."'

7. Comparison with other languages

Anaphoric pronouns not available for ordinary discourse anaphora, but occurring in the non-intensive form in relatively 'distant' anaphoric relations only (including logophoric contexts), whereas their intensive form assumes more 'local' anaphoric relations, are cross-linguistically common. A situation somewhat similar to that of AD Akhvakh was found for example in Ancient Greek – Humbert 1954:62-4. But cross-linguistically, the pronouns roughly comparable to AD Akhvakh *ži-CL* may show important variations in some details of their behavior. What is particular in AD Akhvakh is the use of *ži-CL* in logophoric contexts that in all other respects show the characteristics of direct speech. The possibility to have in the same reported sentence both the logophoric pronoun and a 2nd person pronoun representing the interlocutor of the speaker whose speech is reported is diagnostic of such a situation.

All Andic languages have anaphoric pronouns cognate with Akhvakh *ži-CL*, and the descriptions that go beyond mere morphological charts mention that the non-intensive form occurs in logophoric and long-distance reflexive functions, whereas the intensive form is found in intensifying and local reflexive functions. Comparison with Avar *ži-CL* (see in particular Charachidze 1981:72-3) suggests a diachronic scenario similar to that of Ancient Greek, by which the intensive form of a reflexive pronoun replaces the non-intensive form in the expression of local reflexivity, the non-intensive form subsisting in non-local reflexive function.

Judging from examples figuring in the texts included in Magomedbekova's description of Akhvakh, the combination of logophoric pronouns and 2nd person pronouns characteristic of the type of reported speech described above for AD Akhvakh is possible in the Southern dialects of Akhvakh too – ex. (38).

(38) *Southern Akhvakh, Ratlub dialect* (Magomedbekova 1967:161-2)

bač'ode$_{i}$ *eɬ'edabajo,* *inɬ̄e*$_{i}$ *kumake* *g^{w}ajra* *duɬa*
wolf.ERG say.UW ANA.ERG help make.FUT 2SG.DAT
'The wolf said: "I will help you"'

Several examples of the same configuration can be found in the Bagvalal texts included in Kibrik (ed.) 2001. This description of Bagvalal also mentions the possibility to refer to the interlocutor of the speaker whose speech is reported by means of 3rd person pronouns, characteristic of indirect speech (Kibrik (ed.) 2001:550-1), but the only illustration of this possibility seems to be an elicited example.

The problem is that none of the available descriptions of Andic languages provides a precise and explicit description of the type of reported speech involving a

logophoric pronoun. A detailed analysis of the local and non-local reflexive uses of pronouns cognate with Akhvakh *ži-CL(da)* can be found in several recent descriptions, but nothing comparable is available with respect to their logophoric use. Consequently, further investigation would be necessary in order to establish to what extent the logophoric system of AD Akhvakh could be considered representative of a situation more generally found among Andic languages, or perhaps even among a wider group of languages.

8. Conclusion

In this paper, I have described the reflexive and logophoric uses of the anaphoric pronoun *ži-CL* and its intensive form *ži-CL-da* in AD Akhvakh. The main conclusions can be summarized as follows:

(a) local reflexivization of 3rd person referents triggers the use of the intensive form *ži-CL-da* ;
(b) in long-distance reflexivization, both non-intensive *ži-CL* and intensive *ži-CL-da* occur, but they are in complementary distribution, and the use of *ži-CL* implies a more 'distant' relationship between the reflexive pronoun and its antecedent than *ži-CL-da* ;
(c) the non-intensive form *ži-CL* is used as a logophoric pronoun in reported speech stretches that, apart from the use of a logophoric pronoun, show all characteristics of direct speech;
(d) in spite of some evidence suggesting the existence of logophoric systems similar to that of AD Akhvakh among related languages, further investigation would be necessary before putting forward a hypothesis about the distribution of this type of logophoric system among related languages.

Abbreviations

1PLI: 1st person plural inclusive
1PLE: 1st person plural exclusive
1SG: 1st person singular
2PL: 2nd person plural
2SG: 2nd person singular

ADD: additive
ADLAT: adlative
ANA: anaphoric pronoun
CAUS: causative
COM: comitative
COMP: complementizer
COND: conditional converb
COP: copula
CVB: general converb
DAT: dative
DEM: demonstrative
EL: elative
ERG: ergative
ESS: essive
F: feminine singular
F: future
GEN: genitive
HPL: human plural
IMP: imperative
INF: infinitive
INT: intensifying particle
IPF: imperfective
LAT: lative
M: masculine singular
MIR: mirative
N: non-human singular
NEG: negation
NPL: non-human plural
NPOST: non-posterior
OBLG: obligative
PF: perfective
PL: plural
POST: posterior converb
POT: potential
PROG: progressive converb
PROH: prohibitive
PURP: purposive case / converb
Q: interrogative
QUOT: quotative
SG: singular
SIMIL: similative converb
SIMULT: simultaneous converb
UW: past unwitnessed
VLOC: verbal locative

References

Anderson, S. 1986. 'The typology of anaphoric dependencies: Icelandic (and other) reflexives'. In Hellan, L. & K. Christensen (eds.), *Topics in Scandinavian syntax*. Dordrecht: Reidel.

Cercvadze,i.I. 1965. *Andiuri ena (gramat'ik'uli analizi t'ekst'ebit)*. Tbilisi: Mecniereba.

Charachidzé, G. 1981. *Grammaire de la langue avar*. Saint-Sulpice de Favières (France): Association Jean Favard.

Clements, G. 1975. 'The logophoric pronounin Ewe: its role in discourse'. *Journal of West African Languages* 10. 141-77.

Comrie, B. 1983. 'Switch-reference in Huichol: a typological study'. In Haiman, J. & P. Munro (eds.), *Switch-reference and Universal Grammar*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Creissels, D. 2008a. 'Person variations in Akhvakh verb morphology: functional motivation and origin of an uncommon pattern'. *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforchung* 61-4. 309-325.

Creissels, D. 2008b. 'Remarks on so-called "conjunct/disjunct" systems.' Paper delivered at the conference *Syntax of the world's languages III*. Berlin.

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

Huang, Y. 2000. *Anaphora: a crosslinguistic study*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Humbert, J. 1954. *Syntaxe grecque*. Paris: Klincksieck.

Hyman, L. & B. Comrie. 1981. 'Logophoric reference in Gokana'. *Journal of African Languages and Linguistics* 3. 19-37.

Kibrik, A. E. 1985. 'Towards a typology of ergativity'. In Nichols, J. & A. Woodbury (eds.), *Grammar inside and outside the clause*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 268-324.

Kibrik, A. E. (ed.). 1996. *Godoberi*. München: Lincom Europa.

Kibrik, A. E. (ed.). 2001. *Bagvalinskij jazyk (grammatika, teksty, slovari)*. Moscow: Nasledie.

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

Koster, J. & E. Reuland (eds.). 1991. *Long distance anaphora*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ljutikova, E.A. 1999. 'Bez podležaščix i dopolnenij: refleksivizacija v bagvalinskom jazyke'. In Raxilina, E. V. & Ja. G. Testelec (eds.) *Tipologijai teorija jazyka, ot opisanija k ob"jasneniju (k 60-letiju A. E. Kibrika)*. Moscow: Jazyki russkoj kul'tury. 302-18.

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

Magomedbekova, Z.M. 1971. *Karatinskij 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.

Reinhart, T. & E. Reuland. 1991. 'Anaphors and logophors: an argument structure perspective'. In Koster, J. & E. Reuland (eds.).

Polinsky, M. & B. Comrie. 1999. 'Reflexivityin Tsez'. In Raxilina, E. V. & Ja. G. Testelec (eds.) *Tipologijai teorija jazyka, ot opisanija k ob"jasneniju (k 60-letiju A. E. Kibrika)*. Moscow: Jazyki russkoj kul'tury. 319-39.

Sells, P. 1987. 'Aspects of logophoricity'. *Linguistic inquiry* 18. 445-79.

Stirling, L. 1992. *Switch-reference and discourse representation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.