

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

Denis CREISSELS

University of Lyon

denis.creissels@univ-lyon2.fr

<http://deniscreissels.fr>

1. Introduction

Akhvakh is a group of four closely related languages included in the Andic sub-branch of the Avar-Andic(-Tsezic) branch of the Nakh-Daghestanian family. The most important of them is designated as Northern Akhvakh, whereas the other three (traditionally viewed as ‘dialects’) are grouped under the label of Southern Akhvakh.

Northern Akhvakh is spoken in four villages of the Axvaxskij Rajon in the western part of Daghestan (Tadmagitl’, Lologonitl’, Kudijab-Roso, and Izani), in recent settlements in the lowlands of Daghestan, and in Axaxdərə near Zaqatala (Azerbaijan). I am aware of no systematic variation that could justify subdividing Northern Akhvakh into dialects.

The analysis of the reflexive pronoun *ži* of Northern Akhvakh 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*.

I will be concerned here by the uses of the pronoun *ži* 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* fulfilling similar functions are found in the other Andic languages. The main contribution of this paper to the debate on reflexivity in Nakh-Daghestanian language 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 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

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. 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 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).¹ 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. Suffixal agreement of noun dependents is optional (and is 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, which has no overt mark, the case inflection of Northern Akhvakh nouns includes the so-called ‘syntactic cases’ traditionally recognized in other Daghestanian languages: ergative, dative, and genitive, and several series of spatial forms the ending of which can be segmented into an *orientation 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.

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 *l̄i*-genitive with feminine singular, non-human singular and non-human plural nouns. The zero-marked genitive optionally combines with class suffixes expressing agreement with its head.

Akhvakh does not have dedicated 3rd person pronouns, and uses demonstratives in the functions fulfilled by 3rd person pronouns in other languages.

¹ The main 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. 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.

3.1.1. 1st & 2nd person singular pronouns

1st & 2nd person singular pronouns do not exhibit gender distinction in their form, and their behavior as agreement controllers varies according to the nature of their referent. They have the following morphological particularities:

- the ergative ending does not attach to the oblique stem selected by the other case endings, but to a truncated form of the nominative: **de(ne)-de** (not ***di-de**), **me(ne)-de** (not ***du-de**);
- the genitive has a zero ending irrespective of gender (whereas in noun inflection, F nouns select the genitive ending **-li**).

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

3.1.2. Plural pronouns representing speech act participants

Akhvakh has an inclusive pronoun distinct from the 1st person plural and 2nd person plural pronouns.

In the inflection of plural pronouns representing speech act participants, the ergative and dative endings select a stem identical to the nominative form, whereas the other cases case markers attach to a stem identical to the genitive.

Reduced forms **-e** and **-a** of the ergative and dative endings **-de** and **-la** are common in the inflection of plural pronouns representing speech act participants.²

| | (1PL) | (INCL) | (2PL) |
|--------|----------------------|----------------------|------------------------|
| Nom. | iši | iīi | ušti |
| Erg. | iši-de ~ iš-e | iīi-de ~ iī-e | ušti-de ~ ušt-e |
| Dat. | iši-la ~ iš-a | iīi-la ~ iī-a | ušti-la ~ ušt-a |
| Gen. | eše | eīe | ošte |
| Comit. | eše-k'ena | eīe-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** to the forms described in the preceding section. Note that **-da** follows the case markers.

- (1) **če-sē āli di-da dada-s̄w-a o-t-ari,**
 one-SEL ram 1SG(GEN)-INT father-M-DAT N-send-CPL
 'I sent one of the rams to my father,
- če-sē-be de-de-da b-iq̄w-ari.**
 one-SEL-N 1SG-ERG-INT N-slaughter-CPL
 and I slaughtered the other myself.'

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**, **-le/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) |

² The same reduced forms are also common with nominals whose oblique stem includes the formatives **-s̄u-** (M), **-ī-** (F/N) **-do-** (HPL), and **-di-** (NPL), in particular the demonstrative pronouns and **ži**.

| | | |
|--------------|--------------|----------------------------------|
| ha-le | hu-lu | (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

Demonstratives as noun modifiers optionally take suffixes expressing gender-number agreement with their head, but in practice, agreement suffixes are very rarely used with demonstratives in modifier function.

3.2.3. Demonstratives as pronouns

In pronominal function, demonstratives are inflected for gender-number and case. Their inflection is identical to the suffixal inflection of adjectives used nominally, or to that of other determiners used pronominally: 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 **-su-** (M), **-fi-** (F/N), **-do-** (HPL), or **-di-** (NPL), followed by the case marker.

| | hu-we (M) | hu-je (F) / hu-be (N) |
|--------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Erg. | hu-su-de ~ hu-sw-e | hu-fi-de ~ hu-fi-e |
| Dat. | hu-su-La ~ hu-sw-a | hu-fi-La ~ hu-fi-a |
| Gén. | hu-su | hu-fi-li |
| Comit. | hu-su-k'ena | hu-fi-k'ena |
| etc. | | |

| | hu-ji (HPL) | hu-re (NPL) |
|--------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Erg. | hu-do-de ~ hu-dw-e | hu-di-de ~ hu-d-e |
| Dat. | hu-do-La ~ hu-dw-a | hu-di-La ~ hu-d-a |
| Gén. | hu-do | hu-di-li |
| Comit. | hu-do-k'ena | hu-di-k'ena |
| etc. | | |

3.2.4. Demonstratives and the intensifying particle **-da**

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

- (2) **k'ebiliĭ'a** **raLa-ĭi-la** **m-ič-e** **godi**
 second night-N(LOC)-and N-occur-CVB COP
- ha-de** **ek'wa-sū-La** **hu-du-da** **miĭ'e.**
 PROX-SL man-M-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*

The inflection of the pronoun *ži* involves class suffixes in the nominative, and oblique stem formatives identical to those used with demonstrative pronouns in the other cases, 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-** completely different from the stem **ži-** to which class suffixes attach in the nominative.

| | ži-we (M) | ži-je (F) / ži-be (N) | |
|--------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
| Erg. | ĩ-sū-de ~ ĩ-sw-e | ĩ-ĭi-de ~ ĩ-ĭ-e | |
| Dat. | ĩ-sū-La ~ ĩ-sw-a | ĩ-ĭi-La ~ ĩ-ĭ-a | |
| Gén. | ĩ-sū | ĩ-ĭi-ĭi | |
| Comit. | ĩ-sū-k'ena | ĩ-ĭi-k'ena | |
| etc. | | | |
| | ži-ba (HPL) | ži-re (NPL) | |
| Erg. | ĩ-do-de ~ ĩ-dw-e | ĩ-di-de ~ ĩ-d-e | |
| Dat. | ĩ-do-La ~ ĩ-dw-a | ĩ-di-La ~ ĩ-d-a | |
| Gén. | ĩ-do | ĩ-di-ĭi | |
| Comit. | ĩ-do-k'ena | ĩ-di-k'ena | |
| etc. | | | |

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

The uses of *ži*, with and without the intensifying particle, are described in the following sections.

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. Ex. (3) illustrates the logophoric use of *ži*.

- (3) **wačo-g-a eī'-awi, "ĩ-šū-la komoki-ĩ-a w-oq'-a!"**
 brother-OR-ALL say-CPL.N ŽI-M-DAT help-N-DAT M-come-IMP
 'He said to his brother "Come to my aid!"'

In Ex. (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 o-ḡ-ewi [ĩ-ĩ-la komoki gweda]**
 thanks N-give-CPL.N ŽI-N-DAT help DO.PTCP

aḡ'a-ĩ-la šĩ-de.
 woman-F-DAT bear-ERG
 The bear thanked the woman who had helped it.'

The addition of the intensifying particle **-da** to *ži* gives intensive pronouns that can be used to emphasize the identity of discursively salient referents other than 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).

- (5) a. **ḡwana-g-e duk'-ari dene, ži-we-da imaxa-g-e duk'-ari.**
 horse-OR-LOC sit-CPL 1SG ŽI-M-INT donkey-OR-LOC sit-CPL
 'I sat on the horse, and he sat on the donkey'
- b. **ĩ-šw-a-da baširi-la-la q'abuł-e b-ik'-ilēwudi**
 ŽI-M-DAT-INT Baširi-DAT-and be_acceptable-CVB.N N-be-NEG.CPL.N

hu iši.
 DIST matter
 'Baširi himself did not like this matter.'
- c. [...] **qe hu-gu-šū-de ĩ-šw-e-da b-uq'-ewi.**
 then DIST-LL-M-ERG ŽI-M-ERG N-cut-CPL.N
 '[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.'

The corpus includes 35 occurrences of *ži* in intensive pronoun function out of 625.

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 – Ex. (6)

- (6) **χã-sū-de žōwudi ĩ-sū-ĭir-a-da ĩk'wa-sē waša.**
 king-M-ERG call.CPL.M ŽI-M-OR-ALL-INT small-SEL 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 – Ex. (7).

- (7) **qe [ha-de šĩ] m-aʔ-ewidi [[ĩ-ĥi-ĭi-da] reč'a-ĥi-q̄-a].**
 then PROX-SL bear N-go-CPL.N ŽI-N-GEN-INT cave-N-OR-ALL
 ‘Then the bear went to its 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 Ex. (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. Ex. (9) illustrates a very similar configuration involving the **da**-form of **ži**.

- (8) **bakala o-x̄-ewi [[ĩ-ĥi-la komoki gweda]**
 thanks N-give-CPL.N ŽI-N-DAT help DO.PTCP

aĥ'a-ĥi-la] šĩ-de.
 woman-F-DAT bear-ERG

The bear thanked the woman who had helped it.’

- (9) **dibi [[ĩ-sū-da č'ili-ĥi-g-e k'on-ada] č'ari]**
 molla ŽI-M(GEN)-INT house-N-OR-LOC start-PTCP fire

b-iš-ōruLa w-oĭ-ari.
 N-die_out-CAUS.INF M-move_off-CPL

‘The molla got off to extinguish the fire that had started in his 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:³

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

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

³ 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).

5.3. Local reflexivization and syntactic roles

Quite obviously, 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 antecedent, 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). Ex. (10) illustrates the NOM-DAT configuration.

- (10) **gwā̄lalaq’o ži-we-da ĩ-šw-a-da hu-g-e reč’a-q̄-e**
 at_dawn ŽI-M-INT ŽI-M-DAT-INT DIST-LL-LOC cave-OR-LOC

w-ũč-uwudi.

M-find-CPL.M

‘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) **hu-ji ĩ-do-g-a-da ži-ba-da ba-šw-idi.**
 DIST-HPL ŽI-HPL-OR-ALL-INT ŽI-HPL-INT HPL-go_back-CPL.HPL
 ‘They went back to their place.’ (litt. ‘They themselves went to themselves.’)

6. *Ži* as a long-distance reflexive

6.1. *Ži* in logophoric function

As already illustrated by Ex. (3) (repeated here as (12)), in reported speech, the bare form of *ž*i 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) **wačo-g-a** **eī'-awi,** “**ĩ-šū-la** **komoki-ī-a** **w-oq'-a!**”
 brother-OR-ALL say-CPL.N ZI-M-DAT help-N-DAT M-come-IMP
 ‘He said to his brother “Come to my 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. 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.

In Northern Akhvakh, the length and the internal structure of the stretches of discourse within which *ž*i occurs in logophoric function is often incompatible with an analysis in terms of clausal subordination. In particular, the corpus analyzed here includes several narratives with the following structure: the first sentence of the narrative is something like ‘My grandmother used to tell us stories about her childhood’, and the remainder of the text is reported speech, without any introducing formula such as ‘She told that...’. The story is told as the grandmother could have told it herself, with however an important difference: *ž*i 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 analyzed here, the original speaker in reported speech is most of the time encoded as *ž*i ‘self’ rather than **dene** ‘I’, which evokes canonical indirect speech, but at the same time, the original addressee is with very few exceptions encoded as **mene** ‘you’, as in canonical direct speech.

As illustrated by Ex. (13), this asymmetry in the treatment of the original speaker and the original addressee results in the frequency of reported utterances mixing features of direct and indirect speech, since they include a logophoric pronoun encoding the original speaker (indirect strategy) and a 2nd person pronoun encoding the original addressee (direct strategy).

- (13) **wašo-de žawa o-x̄-e godi,**
 boy-ERG answer N-give-CVB.N COP.N
 ‘The boy answered,

“me-de ži-we w-uḫuḫ-ari” l̄’-ē.
 2SG-ERG ŽI-M M-raise-CPL say-CVB.N
 “You raised me.””

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

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

The corpus includes 105 occurrences of **ž**i meeting this definition. In all cases, **ž**i 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 **ž**i in the embedded clause are as follows.

| ž i 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 | – |

table 4: **ž**i 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 **ž**i 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 **ž**i is the ergative argument of the main verb. Note that the predominance of ergative arguments as antecedents of **ž**i 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, **ž**i can be found in ergative argument function, and configurations with **ž**i 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 **ž**i 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).

| ant. \ ži | 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

| ant. \ ži | 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 if **ži** (as in Ex. (8) above) or of the **da**-form (as in (9)).

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

- (14) **hužuruq'i-la** [**ži-be** **ī'āk'ano-k'ena** **b-et-u**
 hedgehog-DAT **ŽI-N** hare-COMIT N-run-INF

meq'eĭ-ika-s̄a] **b-eq'-ere** **b-ik'w-ari.**
 be_equal-ICPL.NEG-COMP N-know-PROG N-be-CPL
 'The hedgehog knew that it could not compete with the hare in running.'

(15) **jačo-la** **[hu-gu-we** **ĩ-ĩi-l̄i-da** **wači** **gwida-s̄a]**
 girl-DAT DIST-LL-M ŽI-F-GEN-INT brother COP.M-COMP

b-eq'-ere **b-ik'w-ila.**
 N-know-PROG N-be-CPL.NEG
 'The girl did not know that he was her 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 logophoric pronoun, 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, 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, SEL: selective, SG: singular, SL: same level (vertical deixis)

References

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