## Intensifiers, reflexivity, and logophoricity in Akhvakh

Akhvakh is a Nakh-Daghestanian language belonging to the Andic branch of the Avar-Andic-Tsezic family, spoken in the western part of Daghestan and in the village of Axax-dərə (ašo<sup>‡</sup> i hani) near Zaqatala (Azerbaijan). The analysis of Akhvakh intensifiers, reflexives and logophorics proposed in this presentation is based on narratives collected in Axax-dərə. The variety of Akhvakh spoken in Axax-dərə belongs to the Northern Akhvakh dialect presented in Magomedbekova 1967.

This presentation deals with the uses of the pronoun  $\check{z}i$ -,<sup>1</sup> 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 by no means unusual, and cognate pronouns with similar functions are found in the other Andic languages, but Akhvakh  $\check{z}i$ - shows some uncommon features which deserve to be examined.

The intensifying particle -da is mainly found attached to demonstratives in determiner function, to 1st or 2nd person pronouns, and to the pronoun  $\tilde{z}i$ -.<sup>2</sup> The forms resulting from the addition of -da to 1st / 2nd person pronouns or to  $\tilde{z}i$ - are used as intensifiers in the sense of König and Gast 2006.

- (1) eq-a me-de-da ri $\lambda$ 'i-gunu či b-ik'w-ala b-iž-a look-INJ 2SG-ERG-INT meat-EL what N-be-COND N-cook-INJ 'Decide yourself what you should prepare with this meat'
- (2) χwe-λaĩ-λλ-a-da gaza b-oλ-iλ-awi
   dog-DAT ŽI-OF/N-DAT-INT nothing N-happen-NEG-EVID.N
   'Nothing happened to the dog itself'

Reflexivity (either strictly 'local' or 'long-distance' reflexivity) triggers the use of the same pronominal forms characterized by the attachment of the intensifying particle *-da*.

- (3) du-da ači-λλi-k'ene du-λa-da kw-ĩda-be gwij-a
   2SG.O-INT money-OF/N-COMIT 2SG.O-ESS-INT want-IPF(PTC)-N do-INJ
   'Do what you want with your own money'
- q'iru b-eχ-e ĩ-ssu-da q'ẽλe-λλi-ga t'-eni
   wheat N-take-PCONV ŽI-OM-INT bag-OF/N-LAT put-NAR
   'He took some wheat and put it into his own bag'

But in contrast to 1st and 2nd person pronouns (*dene* 'I' > *dene-da* 'myself', etc.), the 3rd person intensifier or reflexive pronoun  $\dot{z}i$ -...-*da* is not morphologically derived from an ordinary 3rd person pronoun. Akhvakh does not have 3rd person pronouns proper, and uses demontratives (whose stems are based on roots *ha*- 'proximal' and *hu*- 'distal') to represent discourse salient referents. In other words, synchronically,  $\dot{z}i$ -...-*da* is the intensive or reflexive counterpart of demonstrative pronouns, with which it bears no formal resemblance.

The simple form  $\check{z}i$ - is used only as a logophoric pronoun in the strictest sense of this term:  $\check{z}i$ occurs only in reported speech explicitly introduced by  $e\lambda' uru\lambda a$  'say' or another verb of saying
(such as  $\hbar u loru\lambda a$  'shout', or  $r\tilde{a}c' unu\lambda a$  'ask'), and represents the author of the reported speech.

The person to whom the reported speech is attributed cannot be a 1st or 2nd personparticipant, which constitutes a common restriction in the use of logophoric pronouns. But in some other respects, zi- shows uncommon characteristics. Apart from the use of zi-, the stretches of discourse within which zi- occurs have every characteristic of direct speech, contrary to the common assumption that clausal complements of verb of saying universally constitute the most central type of context within which logophoric pronouns are found. Deictics (in particular, 2nd person pronouns) always refer to the author of the reported speech, not to the person reporting. In addition to that, the reported speech passages including zi- may be relatively long sequences of sentences which cannot be analyzed as clausal complements of the verb introducing the reported speech.

 (5) molla rasadi-de eλ'-awi: Molla Rasadi-ERG say-EVID.N
 "Molla Rasadi said:

uss-e q'ori k'ar-ari  $\tilde{\lambda}$ 'a, <u> $\tilde{1}$ -ssw-e-la</u>  $\tilde{\lambda}$ 'onu b-eq-ada; 2PL-ERG board tie-CAUS.PF on.ESS ŽI-OM-ERG-and on.EL N-take off-PF.1/2 You tied a board, and I took it off;

ĩč'a k'ar-aj-e b-ik'w-ãčala <u>ĩ-ssu-ge</u>, <u>ĩ-ssw-e</u> b-eq-ida b-ik'w-iλe stone tie-CAUS-INJ N-be-COND ŽI-OM-ESS ŽI-OM-ERG N-takeoff-IPF N-be-PFNEG

if you had tied a stone on me, I would not have taken it off."

In fact, the use of  $\dot{z}i$ - instead of the 1st person pronoun to represent the author of the reported speech is the only thing that distinguishes stretches of discourse including  $\dot{z}i$ - from canonical direct speech. Moreover, the use of  $\dot{z}i$ - is never obligatory, and speakers always accept the replacement of  $\dot{z}i$ - by a 1st person pronoun without any readjustment in the context, and with no difference in meaning. Consequently,  $\dot{z}i$ - does not fulfill the disambiguating function commonly considered as an essential feature in the use of logophorics.

In conclusion, a comparison with the available data on the use of cognate forms in other Andic languages will be proposed.

Notes

- 1. The root  $\dot{z}i$  appears in the absolute case only, with gender/number markers attached to it. Case suffixes attach to an oblique stem formed from the suppletive root  $\tilde{i}$ -.
- 2. --*da* has been encountered attached to some adverbs too (for example, *hãže-da* 'in this very moment'), but can attach neither to the head noun of canonical NPs nor to proper names.

## Abbreviations

1/2: agreement with a 1st or 2nd person controller, 2PL: personal pronoun, 2nd person plural, 2SG: personal pronoun, 2nd person singular, CAUS: causative, COMIT: comitative, COND: conditional, DAT: dative, EL: elative, ERG: ergative, ESS: essive, EVID: past evidential, INJ: injunctive, INT: intensifying particle, INTER: interrogative, IPF: imperfective, L: lative, N: non-human singular,

NAR: narrative, NEG: negative, O: oblique stem, OF/N: oblique stem, feminine singular or nonhuman singular, OM: oblique stem, masculine singular, PCONV: perfective converb, PF: perfective, (PTC): in participle function, QUOT: quotative

References

- 1. Anderson, S. 1986. The typology of anaphoric dependencies: Icelandic (and other) reflexives. In Hellan, L. & K. Christensen(eds.), *Topics in Scandinavian syntax*. Dordrecht: Reidel.
- 2. Cercvadze, I.I. 1965. Andiuri ena (gramat'ik'uli analizi t'ekst'ebit). Tbilisi: Mecniereba.
- 3. Clements, G. 1975. The logophoric pronoun in Ewe: Its role in discourse. *Journal of West African Languages* 10. 141-77.
- 4. Comrie, B. 1983. Switch-reference in Huichol: a typological study. In Haiman, J. & P. Munro (eds.), *Switch-reference and Universal Grammar*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- 5. Hagège, C. 1974. Les pronoms logophoriques. *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique* 69. 287-310.
- 6. Huang, Y. 2000. Anaphora: a crosslinguistic study. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 7. Hyman, L. & B. Comrie. 1981. Logophoric reference in Gokana. *Journal of African Languages and Linguistics* 3. 19-37.
- 8. Kibrik, A. E. (ed.). 1996. Godoberi. München: Lincom Europa.
- 9. Kibrik, A. E. (ed.). 2001. Bagvalinskij jazyk (grammatika, teksty, slovari). Moscow: Nasledie.
- 10. König, E. & V. Gast. 2006. Focused assertion of identity: A typology of intensifiers. *Linguistic Typology* 10-2. 223-276.
- 11. 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.) *Tipologija i teorija jazyka, ot opisanija k ob "jasneniju (k 60-letiju A. E. Kibrika)*. Moscow: Jazyki russkoj kul'tury. 302-18.
- 13. Magomedbekova, Z.M. 1967. Axvaxskij jazyk (grammatičeskij analis, teksty, slovar'). Tbilissi: Mecniereba.
- 14. Magomedbekova, Z.M. 1971. Karatinskij jazyk (grammatičeskij analis, teksty, slovar'). Tbilissi: Mecniereba.
- 15. Reinhart, T. & E. Reuland. 1991. Anaphors and logophors: an argument structure perspective. In Koster, J. & E. Reuland (eds.).
- 16. Polinsky, M. & B. Comrie. 1999. Reflexivity in Tsez. In Raxilina, E. V. & Ja. G. Testelec (eds.) *Tipologija i teorija jazyka, ot opisanija k ob "jasneniju (k 60-letiju A. E. Kibrika)*. Moscow: Jazyki russkoj kul'tury. 319-39.
- 17. Sells, P. 1987. Aspects of logophoricity. Linguistic Inquiry 18. 445-79.
- 18. Stirling, L. 1992. *Switch-reference and discourse representation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.