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-Andic-Tsezic family, spoken in the western part of Daghestan and in the village of Axaxdərə (*ašoʔi ħani*) near Zaqatala (Azerbaijan). The variety of Akhvakh spoken in Axaxdərə (henceforth AD Akhvakh) is very close to the variety of Akhvakh spoken in the Axvaxskij Rajon of Daghestan (henceforth AR Akhvakh), presented in Magomedbekova 1967 and Magomedova & Abdullaeva In press. AD Akhvakh shows no general affinity with any of the Southern Akhvakh dialects spoken in three villages (Cegob, Ratlub and Tljanub) of the Šamil'kij Rajon (formerly Sovetskij Rajon).[1]

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.[2]

I will be concerned here by the uses of the pronoun *ži‹be›*,[3] 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‹be›* fulfilling similar functions are found in the other Andic languages, but in some details of its use, Akhvakh *ži‹be›* 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‹be›*) 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‹be›*. Section 7 addresses the question of the possible similarities /

[1] This does not exclude the possibility of coincidences limited to some particular points. For example, AD Akhvakh and the Cegob variety of Southern Akhvakh have in common the loss of the distinction between strong and weak voiceless obstruents, the tendency to substitute a glottal stop for the former weak glottalized consonants, and the tendency to substitute fricative ɬ for the former weak affricate ɬʔ. But in other important aspects of its phonology (for example, the loss of consonants in coda position), AD Akhvakh behaves like AR Akhvakh, and judging from the available information, AD Akhvakh morphology shows no affinity with that of any of the three Southern Akhvakh dialects.

[2] 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.

[3] Words obligatorily including a class marker are conventionally quoted in the non-human singular (N) form, with the class marker between small angle brackets.

contrasts between the reflexive and logophoric systems of AD Akhvakh and those found in related languages.

2. General remarks on Akhvakh morphosyntax

2.1 Clause structure

Akhvakh clause structure is characterized by flexible constituent order, without clear evidence of a preferred position for focalized constituents.

Case marking and gender-number agreement between the verb and its core arguments are consistently ergative. In contrast, assertive agreement (see section 2.3) 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 agreement classes of nouns are distinguished in the singular: human masculine (M), human feminine (F), and non-human (N). 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 morphology.

Nouns are inflected for number and case.

Noun phrases are consistently head-final. In canonical NPs, with the exception of a subclass of adjectives obligatorily including class prefixes, noun dependents show no gender, number or case agreement with their head.[4] In non-canonical NPs, gender, number and case marks are suffixed to the last word of the NP, whatever its nature.

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

Except for 1st and 2nd person singular pronouns, whose absolute form is characterized by a non-void ending *-ne*, 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 same way as plural formation, the formation of the oblique stem is very irregular and involves considerable free variation, but the most productive type of oblique stem formation is the addition of an oblique stem formative identical to those regularly used with nominalized noun dependents: *-su-* (M) / *-λi-* (F/N) / *-lo-* (HPL) / *-le-* (NPL).

Case inflection includes the following cases:

– ergative *(-de)*,[5]

– affective (*-λa*),[6]

[4] It seems that in AR Akhvakh, noun modifiers in canonical NPs optionally take class suffixes agreeing with the head noun, but the data I have collected in Axaxdərə includes no example of canonical NPs with modifiers showing class suffixes, either in texts or in elicited material.

[5] In addition to marking A arguments of transitive verbs, this case only has a relatively marginal instrumental use. In AD Akhvakh, instrumental adjuncts are more commonly marked by the comitative case.

[6] This case is called 'dative' in Magomedbekova 1967 and Magomedova & Abdullaeva In press. The reason for preferring 'affective' is that the use of this case is obligatory for experiencers and beneficiaries, whereas recipients can optionally occur in this case or in the lative case, which means that the semantic role 'recipient'

– genitive (*Ø* or *-ƛi*),[7]
– comitative (*-ḳena*),[8]
– causal (*-ʁana*),[9]
– five series of spatial cases, which however tend to depart from the typical Daghestanian pattern in that the *on*-series (marked by the formative *-g-*) tends to function as a default series that does not really imply any particular spatial configuration, and spatial configurations tend to be encoded through combinations of NPs with default spatial case marking and locative adverbs showing parallel spatial case inflection, rather than via 'traditional' case marking.

Each series of spatial cases includes an essive (*-i/e*), a lative (*-a*), and an elative (*-u(ne)*), and the distinction between 3 spatial cases applies to locative adverbs too.[10]

2.3. Verbs

Independent verb forms are inflected for TAM, polarity, and gender-number agreement; in most tenses, TAM and polarity are conjointly expressed by portemanteau markers. Assertive agreement (see section 2.3.3 below) is morphologically distinct from gender-number agreement and occurs in one tense only.

In addition to the synthetic forms listed in section 2.3.1, AD Akhvakh has analytic verb forms with the copula *g‹o›di* or the verb *‹b›iḳuruλa* 'be' in auxiliary function.

2.3.1. TAM-polarity marking

TAM/polarity inflection of verbs heading independent clauses includes the following possibilities:[11]
– perfective positive (*-ari* ~ *-ada* – see section 2.3.3),
– perfective negative (*-iλa*),
– imperfective positive (*-ida*),

---

does not act as a prototype in the organization of Akhvakh noun inflection, contrary to what suggests the choice of the label 'dative case'.

[7] In principle, zero-marked genitive characterizes M and HPL NPs, whereas *-ƛi* is used with F, N or NPL NPs, but with M or NPL nouns that do not have an oblique stem distinct from the absolute form, there is a tendency to generalize *-ƛi*, especially among young speakers. In AD Akhvakh, genitives behave like other noun dependents in taking class suffixes when nominalized, or in predicate function, but never in modifier function within canonical NPs.

[8] *-ḳena* is described as a postpositional clitic in Magomedova & Abdulaeva's dictionary. However, the examples they provide shows that, in AR Akhvakh too, this morpheme occurs exactly in the same morphosyntactic slot as the morphemes analyzed as case suffixes.

[9] The examples in Magomedova & Abdulaeva's dictionary show that, in AR Akhvakh, *-ʁana* combines with nouns in the affective case, and is therefore better analyzed as a postpositional clitic (or as a 'secondary' case marker). However, in AD Akhvakh, *-ʁana* attaches directly to the oblique stem of nouns, in the same way as the other case suffixes.

[10] In AR Akhvakh, *-u* has been identified as ablative proper, and *-une* as perlative, but in AD Akhvakh, these two ending are in free variation.

[11] This inventory differs from that found in the morphological sketch of Akhvakh included in Magomedova & Abdullaeva In press on several points. All of these divergences are however easy to explain as the result of cross-linguistically common types of changes that often lead to contrasts between the TAM systems of otherwise closely related varieties of a single language:
(a) a form identical to AD Akhvah 'narrative' is labeled 'present' in Magomedova & Abdullaeva In press;
(b) a form identical to AD Akhvah 'potential' is labeled 'future' in Magomedova & Abdullaeva In press;
(c) the form I have identified in AD Akhvakh as 'past evidential' does not figure in Magomedova & Abdullaeva In press, but it seems to be morphologically related to an analytic form found in AD Akhvakh in perfect function, and identified as past evidential (*prošedšee zaglaznoe*) in Magomedova & Abdullaeva In press.

– imperfective negative (*-ika*),
– narrative positive (*-iri*),
– narrative negative (*-iki*),
– potential (M/N/NPL *-uwa*, F *-iwa*, HPL *-oji*),
– past evidential (M *-uwi*, F *-iwi*, N/NPL *-awi*, HPL *-i goli*),
– imperative (*-a*),
– prohibitive (*-uba*),
– optative positive (*-a-χ̣a*),
– optative negative (*-uba-χ̣a*).[12]

2.3.2. 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 having an initial slot for gender-number concord, and those devoid of it. The verbs belonging to the 1st subset always begin with a gender-number prefix indexing the S or P argument (i.e., to the argument encoded by an NP in the absolute form), those belonging to the 2nd one never take such a prefix. The two classes are roughly of equal importance, and there seems to be no evidence of a historical explanation of this situation, which is found in the other Andic languages too.

– 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.

Ex. (1) and (2) illustrate gender-number agreement with intransitive and transitive verbs in the perfective negative. The verbs appearing in these examples obligatorily bear one of the gender-number prefixes *w-* (M) / *j-* (F) / *b-* (N) / *b(a)-* (HPL) / *r-* (NPL), and in this tense an optional gender-number marker *-we* (M) / *-je* (F) / *-be* (N) / *-ji* (HPL) / *-re* (NPL) may follow the TAM suffix *-ιλa*, or merge with it.[13]

(1) a. *eχ̣wa* / *de-ne* / *me-ne* *w-oq̇-ιλo*
man 1SG-ABS 2SG-ABS M-come-PFV.NEG.M
'The man / I (masc.) / You (sing.masc.) did not come'

b. *aχ̣i* / *de-ne* / *me-ne* *j-eq̇-ιλe*
woman 1SG-ABS 2SG-ABS F-come-PFV.NEG.F
'The woman / I (fem.) / You (sing.fem.) did not come'

[12] In addition to this inventory, I have noted the sporadic occurrence of specialized interrogative verb forms, but my main informant is reluctant to reproduce these forms in elicitation, and it is always possible to substitute indicative forms for them.

[13] For example, *w-oq̇-ιλo* in ex. (1a) is in free variation with *w-oq̇-ιλa* (without suffixed agreement mark) and *w-oq̇-ιλa-we* (with the suffixed agreement mark realized as a distinct segment).

c. *χwe / mašina b-eq̇-iλe*
dog car N-come-PFV.NEG.N
'The dog / The car did not come'

d. *miḳeli / iℵi / isi / ušti b-eq̇-iλi*
child.PL $1PL_I$ $1PL_E$ 2PL HPL-come-PFV.NEG.HPL
'The children / We (incl.) / We (excl.) / You (pl.) did not come'

e. *χwadi / mašinadi r-eq̇-iλe*
dog.PL car.PL NPL-come-PFV.NEG.N
'The dogs / The cars did not come'

(2) a. *eḳwa-sw-e jaše j-ič-iλe*
man-O_M-ERG girl F-push-PFV.NEG.F
'The man did not push the girl'

b. *eḳwa-sw-e mašina b-ič-iλe*
man-O_M-ERG car N-push-PFV.NEG.N
'The man did not push the car'

c. *jašo-de eḳwa w-uč-iλo*
girl.O-ERG man M-push-PFV.NEG.M
'The girl did not push the man'

d. *de-de me-ne j-ič-iλe*
1SG-ERG 2SG-ABS F-push-PFV.NEG.F
'I (masc. or fem.) did not push you (fem.)'

The same mechanism of gender-number agreement operates in all tenses. The variations concern the possibility to have gender-number prefixes or suffixes, depending on a complex combination of lexical and grammatical factors, but not the rule of agreement itself: when gender-number marks are present in a verb form, their value is always determined by the argument in S or P role, represented by an NP in the absolute form.

2.3.3. Assertive agreement

The perfective positive is the only tense in which, in addition to gender-number agreement with the argument in S or P role, verbs show variations reflecting person distinctions. There are two possible endings for this tense, with basic allomorphs *-ada* (glossed PFV.1D/2Q) and *-ari* (glossed PFV). The following chart summarizes the rule governing the choice between *-ada* and *-ari*.

(3) *Assertive agreement in the perfective positive in AD Akhvakh*

	declarative clauses	questions
1st person A / S_A	***-ada***	*-ari*
2nd person A / S_A	*-ari*	***-ada***
3rd person A / S_A	*-ari*	*-ari*
no A / S_A	*-ari*	*-ari*

As indicated in the above chart, the choice between *-ada* and *-ari* expresses a *1st person* (*-ada*) vs. *2nd/3rd person* (*-ari*) contrast in declarative clauses, but *2nd person* (*-ada*) vs. *1st/3rd person* (*-ari*) contrast in questions, and follows a split intransitive pattern. Transitive verbs invariably show agreement with A (*-ada* with 1st person A and *-ari* with 2nd/3rd person A in declarative clauses, *-ada* with 2nd person A and *-ari* with 1st/3rd person A in questions), whereas intransitive verbs divide into two semantically motivated classes: S_A verbs agree with S in the same way as transitive verbs with A (accusative alignment), whereas S_P verbs do not agree, and invariably show the ending *-ari* (ergative alignment).

Ex. (4a-d) illustrate the choice between *-ari* and *-ada* in declarative and interrogative transitive clauses in which A is a speech act participant, and ex. (4e) shows that *-ari* is invariably selected (in declarative clauses as well as in questions) if A is not a speech act participant.

(4) a. *eχ̣-ada "di-λa qabuλ-ere goλa", me-de-la eχ̣-ari "di-λa-la"*
say-PFV.1D/2Q 1SG-AFF agree-PROG COP.NEG. N 2SG-ERG-and say-PFV 1SG-AFF-and
'I said "I don't agree", and you said "me too"'

b. *de-de čūda eχ̣-ari ha-be?*
2SG-ERG when? say-PFV DEM-N
'When did I say that?'

c. *me-de čugu eχ̣-ada ha-be?*
2SG-ERG why? say-PFV.1D/2Q DEM-N
'Why did you say that?'

d. *me-de čūda b-eχ-ada hu šāχ̣e? –šuni b-eχ-ada*
2SG-ERG when? SN-buy-PFV.1D/2Q DEM dress yesterday N-buy-PFV.1D/2Q
'When did you buy this dress? –I bought it yesterday'

e. *hu-sw-e čūda b-eχ-ari hu mašina? –šuni b-eχ-ari*
DEM-O_M-ERG when? N-buy-PF DEM car yesterday N-buy-PF
'When did he buy this car? –He bought it yesterday'

Ex. (5) illustrates the behavior of an intransitive verb agreeing with S in the same way as a transitive verb with A, whereas (6) illustrates the case of an intransitive verb invariably taking the ending *-ari*, irrespective of the person of S.

(5) a. *me-ne čūda w-ošq-ada? –šuni w-ošq-ada*
2SG-ABS when? M-work-PFV.1D/2Q yesterday M-work-PFV.1D/2Q
'When did you work? –I worked yesterday'

e. *hu-we čūda w-ošq-ari? –šuni w-ošq-ari*
DEM-M when? M-work-PFV yesterday N-buy-PFV.1D/2Q
'When did he work? –He worked yesterday'

(6) a. *me-ne* *čūda* *h-ēni?* *–šuni* *h-ēni* [14]
2SG-ABS when? recover-PFV yesterday recover-PFV
'When did you recover? –I recovered yesterday'

b. *hu-we* *čūda* *h-ēni?* *–šuni* *h-ēni*
DEM-M when? recover-PFV yesterday recover-PFV
'When did he recover? –He recovered yesterday'

The division of Akhvakh intransitive verbs into two classes according to assertive agreement in the perfective positive transparently reflects the degree of control of the participant encoded as S. Consequently, the precise function of the ending *-ada* is to encode coincidence between the controller of the event and the speech act participant responsible for the assertion (the speaker in declarative speech acts, the addressee in questions). This is the reason why I propose the term 'assertive agreement'.[15]

2.3.4. Dependent verb forms

Each of the four participles of AD Akhvakh is characterized by a stem homonymous with one of the independent verb forms listed above (perfective positive *-ada*, perfective negative *-ɪλa*, imperfective positive *-ida*, and imperfective negative *-ɪka*).

Strictly dependent verb forms include an infinitive (*-u(ruλa)*), a general converb (M *-o(ho)*, F *-e(he)*, N *-e*, HPL *-i*, NPL *-ere(he)*), a progressive converb mainly used in the formation of analytical tenses, and several specialized converbs expressing various semantic types of adverbial subordination.

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‹be›*. Akhvakh also has interrogative and indefinite pronouns, which however play no direct role in the mechanisms described in the following sections.

[14] *h-ēni* is the realization of the underlying form |*hī(j)-ari*|.

[15] Assertive agreement has not been identified in previous studies of Akhvakh (Magometbekova 1967, Kibrik 1985), which report verb agreement with 1st person S/A arguments but illustrate it in declarative clauses only, without providing examples of interrogative clauses that could reveal an agreement pattern of the type I have discovered in AD Akhvakh. Verb agreement patterns involving a binary choice with a 1 vs. 2/3 contrast in declarative clauses and a 2 vs. 1/3 contrast in questions have been labeled *conjunct/disjunct systems* by Hale 1980. In addition to being semantically opaque, a major inconvenience of 'conjunct/disjunct' is that the same terms have already been applied in different traditions to a variety of morphosyntactic phenomena that have nothing in common with the agreement pattern for which I propose the term 'assertive agreement'. Agreement patterns of this type have been first described for Tibetan, Newari, and a few other Tibeto-Burmese languages (Hale 1980, DeLancey 1986, DeLancey 1990, DeLancey 1992, Hargreaves 2005). Assertive agreement has also been found in Awa Pit, a Barbacoan language spoken in Colombia and Ecuador (Curnow 2002), and in the Papuan language Oksapmin (Loughnane 2007). Among Caucasian languages, assertive agreement has so far been recognized in the Mehweb dialect of Dargwa only (Magometov 1982).

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 *-ƛi*).

(7)	(1SG)	(2SG)
	de-ne	*me-ne*
Erg.	*de-de*	*me-de*
Aff.	*di-λa*	*du-λa*
Gen.	*di*	*du*
Comit.	*di-ḳena*	*du-ḳena*
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 affective 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 affective *-λa* follow the oblique stem formatives *-su-* or *-λi-*), but are particularly common in the ergative and affective forms of 1st & 2nd person plural pronouns.

(8)	(1PL$_I$)	(1PL$_E$)	(2PL)
	iƛi	*isi*	*ušti*
Erg.	*iƛi-de ~ iƛ-e*	*isi-de ~ is-e*	*ušti-de ~ušt-e*
Aff.	*iƛi-λa ~ iƛ-a*	*isi-λa ~ is-a*	*ušti-λa ~ušt-a*
Gén.	*eƛe*	*ese*	*ošte*
Comit.	*eƛe-ḳena*	*ese-ḳena*	*ošte-ḳena*
etc.			

The 2nd person plural has the variant *usi*, gen. *ose ~ oso.*

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 *-su / -λi / -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:

(9)

	di-we (M)	*di-je* (F) / *di-be* (N)
Erg.	*di-su-de*	*di-λi-de*
Aff.	*di-su-λa*	*di-λi-λa*
Gén.	*di-su*	*di-λi-χ̌i*
Comit.	*di-su-ḳena*	*di-λi-ḳena*
etc.		

	di-ji (HPL)	*di-re* (NPL)
Erg.	*di-lo-de*	*di-le-de*
Aff.	*di-lo-λa*	*di-le-λa*
Gén.	*di-lo*	*di-le-χ̌i*
Comit.	*di-lo-ḳena*	*di-le-ḳena*
etc.		

In ex. (10), the elative form *du-λi-gune* of *du-be* 'yours (N)' figures in a sentence uttered in a context in which it is obvious that *ɋẽλe* 'bag' must be understood – in other words, *du-λi-gune* can be viewed here as the reduced form of the canonical NP *du ɋẽλeno-gune* 'from your bag', in the same way as *eḳwa-λi-ga* is the reduced form of *eḳwa ɋẽλeno-ga* 'into the bag of someone else'.

(10) *me-ne hušta ʕadada w-ũč-ala,*
2SG-ABS thus madman M-find-COND
'If you are mad to such a degree,

du-λi-gune eḳwa-λi-ga čugu ṭ-õšawa?
2SG.O-$O_{F/N}$-EL someone_else's-$O_{F/N}$-LAT why put- NEG.Q
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.

(11) a. *eq-a me-de-da riχ̌i-gunu či b-iḳw-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-eq̇-ide*
2PL-AFF-INT N-know-IPFV
'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‹be›i* (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 (12), are based on the roots *ha* (proximal) and *hu* (distal), alone or enlarged by one of the three formatives *-de/u*, *-λe/u*, and *-ge/u*. The meaning of the formative *-de/u* is not clear.

(12) *The demonstratives or Akhvakh*

(proximal)	(distal)	
ha	*hu*	
hade	*hudu*	
haλe	*huλu*	(higher than the SPAs)
hage	*hugu*	(lower than the SPAs)

The proximal meaning or *ha* is particularly obvious in phrases such as *ha duna-λ-e* 'in this world', 'in the world where we live', *ha q'ada-λ-e* 'at this moment', 'now' *ha leq-e* 'at this place', here.

3.2.2. Demonstratives as determiners

Demonstratives preceding a noun they modify occur in one of the forms presented in (12), without the addition of any agreement mark.

(13) a. *hudu ãdo-lo-λa* *b-eq̇-iλ-awi* *molla rasadi-de* *ħila* *gw-e-sa*
DEM person-O_{HPL}-AFF N-know-NEG-EVID.N Molla Rasadi-ERG trick do-PFV-SBD
'Those people did not know that Molla Rasadi had imagined a trick'

b. *jaše* *heč̣-e* *qinaλ-iri* *hudu* *eḳwa-su-x̌ira*
girl stand_up-CVB go_near-NAR DEM man-O_M-ADLAT
'The girl stood up and went near to that man'

c. *ha* *miḳeli* *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 *-su*, F/N *-λi*, HPL *-do*, NPL *-di*) followed by a case suffix – ex. (14), to be compared with ex. (13) above.

(14) a. *hudu-do-λa* *b-eq̇-iλ-awi* *molla rasadi-de* *ħila* *gw-e-sa*
DEM-O_{HPL}-AFF N-know-NEG-EVID.N Molla Rasadi-ERG trick do-PFV-SBD
'They did not know that Molla Rasadi had imagined a trick'

b. *jaše* *heč̣-e* *qinaλ-iri* *hudu-su-χ̌ira*
girl stand_up-CVB go_near-NAR DEM-O_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 (15), but not to demonstratives used as pronouns.

(15) a. *če* *ḳeda* *žo-λi* *sigi-la* *če* *ɦwila-λi-ʁana*
one two day-$O_{F/N}$.ESS in_front.ESS-and one matter-$O_{F/N}$-CAUSAL
'A couple of days later, for some matter,

molla *hudu-da* *ɦãki-su-χ̌ira* *w-oχ̌-o* *w-āno* *w-uk'-uwi*
Molla DEM-INT juge-O_M-ADLAT M-lead-CVB.M M-take_away.PROG.M M-be-EVID.M
they were bringing Molla to the same judge'

b. *qe* *ḳebiχ̣a* *ç̌ili-λ-a* *w-õhõ* *hade-da* *q̇aʕida* *gw-ēwi*
then second house-$O_{F/N}$-LAT M-go.CVB.M DEM-INT manner do-EVID.N
'Then he went to the second house and did the same thing'

3.3. The anaphoric pronoun *ži‹be›*

3.3.1. Inflection

The inflection of the anaphoric pronoun *ži‹be›* 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.

(16)

	ži-we (M)	*ži-je* (F) / *ži-be* (N)
Erg.	*ĩ-su-de*	*ĩ-λi-de*
Aff.	*ĩ-su-λa*	*ĩ-λi-λa*
Gén.	*ĩ-su*	*ĩ-λi-χ̌i*

Comit.	*ĩ-su-ḳena*	*ĩ-λi-ḳena*
etc.		

	ži-ba (HPL)	*ži-re* (NPL)
Erg.	*ĩ-do-de*	*ĩ-di-de*
Aff.	*ĩ-do-λa*	*ĩ-di-λa*
Gén.	*ĩ-do*	*ĩ-di-ƛi*
Comit.	*ĩ-do-ḳena*	*ĩ-di-ḳena*
etc.		

As illustrated by ex. (17), the forms given in (16) are mainly found as logophorics in reported speech. Section 6 below is devoted to a detailed description of this use.

(17) *ži-ba b-eq̇-ere golidi eƛ̣-ari hu-do-de*
ANA-HPL HPL-come-PROG COP.HPL say-PFV DEM- O_{HPL}-ERG
'They said they were coming'

ži‹be› also has reflexive uses, which will be described in section 5.

3.3.2. ži‹be› *and the intensifying particle* -da

The addition of the intensifying particle *-da* to the anaphoric pronoun *ži‹be›* gives intensifiers used to emphasize the identity of referents other that speech act participants. In other words, functionally, *ži‹be›da* is the intensifier corresponding to demonstrative pronouns. In this function, *ži‹be›da* can be used alone – sentences (18a-b), or in combination with co-referent NPs – sentence (18c) – or demonstrative pronouns – sentence (18d).

(18) a. *ĩ-λi-gũ-da rãç-ada, eƛ̣-ari "b-eq̇-ike"*
ANA-$O_{F/N}$-EL-INT ask-PFV.1D/2Q say-PFV N-know-IPFV.NEG.N
'I asked herself, and she said "I don't know" '

b. *hu-be ĩ-sw-a-da b-eq̇-ere b-iḳ̣-awi*
DEM-N ANA-O_M-AFF-INT N-know-PROG N-be-EVID.N
'He was himself acquainted with that matter'

c. *χwe-λa ĩ-λ-a-da gaza b-oƛ̣-iλ-awi*
dog-AFF ANA-$O_{F/N}$-AFF-INT nothing N-happen-NEG-EVID.N
'Nothing happened to the dog itself'

d. *hudu-je ži-je-da j-eq̇-ari ese-ga*
DEM-F ANA-F-INT F-come-PFV $1PL_E$.O-LAT
'She herself came to our place'

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

3.3.3. Other items cognate with ži‹be›

The anaphoric pronoun *ži‹be›* is probably cognate with *žiži* (det.) 'each' – ex. (19), *žida* (adv.) 'simply', 'without anything else', 'in vain' 'gratis' – ex. (20), and *židase* (adj.) 'void', 'alone' – ex. (21).

(19) a. *žiži eḳwa-sw-a o-x-a če-če beli*
each man-O_M-LAT N-give-IMP one-one spade
'Give a spade to each man'

b. *žiži-sw-a o-x-a če-če beli*
each-O_M-LAT N-give-IMP one-one spade
'Give a spade to each of them'

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

(21) *čugu hušte židase χaba-čaba gw-ēre goda?*
why? thus void discussion do-PROG COP.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. (22), 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.

(22) *de-de di-λa-da če xwani b-eχ-ida gweda*
1SG-ERG 1SG.O-AFF-INT one horse N-buy-IPFV COP.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. (23).

(23) a. *ralа ɣ̣āḳ-idelі ošte-ge-da baɣ̣iqe ç̣ani b-iɬ-a*
at_night sleep.HPL-when 2PL.O-ESS-INT near.ESS salt N-put-IMP
'At night when you go to bed, put some salt near you'

b. *ha* *saba* *du-ge-da* *ḳoli-ge* *ṭam-a*
DEM amulet 2SG.O-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‹be›da*.

Not surprisingly, *ži‹be›da* is also the form used in the reflexivization of 3rd person referents, as in ex. (24). Note that, in sentences (c) and (e), the antecedent of *ži‹be›eda* is not expressed within the minimal clause to which *ži‹be›da* belongs, but constitutes an unexpressed argument of the verb heading this clause.

(24) a. *ūča-de*$_i$ *ĩ-λ-e-da*$_i$ *qedo* *eq-ari*
ox-ERG ANA-O$_{F/N}$-ESS-INT behind look-PFV
'The ox$_i$ took a look behind itself$_i$'

b. *eḳwa*$_i$ *ĩ-su-gu-da*$_i$ *w-ȭhõ* *gudi*
man ANA-O$_M$-EL-INT M-go.CVB.M COP.M
'The man$_i$ went away from his$_i$ place' (lit. '… from himself')

c. *molla*$_i$ *ġalada* *heč̣-o* *mišidi* *ĩ-su-λa-da*$_i$ *b-eχ-ari*
Molla quickly stand_up-CVB.M gold ANA-O$_M$-AFF-INT N-take-PFV
'Molla$_i$ stood up quickly and Ø$_i$ took the gold for himself$_i$'

d. *molla-sw-e*$_i$ *ĩ-su-da*$_i$ *qeleqo* *qeleqa* *r-uq-iλ-a* *b-eƛ̣-ari*
Molla-O$_M$-ERG ANA-O$_M$-INT cock cock.PL NPL-fight-VLOC-LAT N-bring-PFV
'Molla$_i$ brought his$_i$ cock to the place where cock fights are organized'

e. *molla-sw-e*$_i$ *ġiru* *b-eχ-e* *ĩ-su-da*$_i$ *ġẽλe-λi-ga* *ṭ-ēni*
Molla-O$_M$-ERG corn N-take-CVB ANA-O$_M$-INT bag-O$_{F/N}$-LAT put-NAR
'Molla$_i$ took corn and put it into his$_i$ bag'

Ex. (25) illustrates the possibility to have two occurrences of *ži‹be›da* in the same clause with two different functions: in this sentence, *ĩsweda* is in intensive function (and its deletion would not modify the denotative meaning), whereas *ĩsugada* is in reflexive function.

(25) *molla rasadi-de*$_i$ *ĩ-su-ga-da*$_i$ *ĩ-sw-e-da*$_i$ *eƛ̣-awi …*
Molla Rasadi-ERG ANA-O$_M$-LAT-INT ANA-O$_M$-ERG-INT say-EVID.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. (26).

(26) a. *hudu-sw-e*$_i$ *ži-we-da*$_i$ *boʁoda w-oc-ari*
DEM-O_M-ERG ANA-M-INT much M-praise-PFV
'He$_i$ praised himself$_i$ much'

b. *molla-sw-e*$_i$ *ži-we-da*$_i$ *aħmaq̇ada g-ōho eƛ̣-iri …*
Molla-O_M-ERG ANA-M-INT fool make-CVB.M say-NAR
'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. (27) illustrates reflexive configurations in which the antecedent of a reflexive in genitive function within an NP in the absolute form is an affective-marked experiencer (sentence (a)), a 'floating genitive' (sentence (b)), or a lative-marked oblique argument (sentence (c)).

(27) a. *hudu-sw-a*$_i$ *ĩ-su-da*$_i$ *hamaʁe harigw-ari*
DEM-O_M-AFF ANA-O_M-INT friend see-PFV
'He$_i$ saw his$_i$ friend'

b. *hudu baša-ƛ̌i*$_i$ *hãže ĩ-λi-ƛ̌i-da*$_i$ *rašiba gedi*
DEM young_animal-GEN now ANA-$O_{F/N}$-GEN-INT young_animal.PL COP.NPL
'This young (mouse) now has its own young'
lit. 'Of this young (mouse)$_i$ now its own$_i$ young exist'

b. *ĩ-su-da*$_i$ *ješe naλ-iwi imo-ga*$_i$
ANA-O_M-INT daughter insult-EVID father.O-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. (28) shows that the intensive form of 1st/2nd person pronouns is used both in local reflexivization (in ex. (28a), *du-da* belongs to the same minimal clause as the understood antecedent) and non-local reflexivization (in ex. (28b-c), *mene-da* and *dene-da* belong to a relative clause modifying the P argument of the clause to which its antecedent belongs).

(28) a. *du-da ači-λi-ķene du-λa-da kw-ĩda-be gwij-a*
2SG.O-INT money-$O_{F/N}$-COM 2SG.O-AFF-INT want-$IPFV_{PTCP}$-N make-IMP
'Do what you want with your own money'

b. *me-de me-ne-da ʁaduķ-ada hala b-uq̇-ere godi*
2SG-ERG 2SG-ABS-INT sit.M-PFV_{PTCP} branch N-cut-PROG COP.N
'You are cutting the branch on which you are sitting'

c. *de-de de-ne-da ʁaduḳ-ada hala b-uq̇-ere goλe*
1SG-ERG 1SG-ABS-INT sit.M-PFV$_{PTCP}$ 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‹be›da *in long-distance reflexive function*

Ex. (29) shows that the intensive form *ži‹be›da* of the anaphoric pronoun *ži‹be›* occurs not only in local reflexivization of 3rd person referents, but also in non-local reflexivization:

– in sentence (a), *ĩsu-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 *ʁaduḳada*, and its antecedent is the understood A argument of the infinitive *buq̇urulλa*;

– in sentence (c), *ĩsu-da* belongs to the same minimal clause as its antecedent *žiži eḳwaswe*, but *ĩswa-da* belongs to a free relative in P role within the clause to which its antecedent belongs.

(29) a. *hudu-sw-a*$_i$ *harigw-ari ĩ-su-da*$_i$ *č̣ili č̣-āre we*
DEM-O$_M$-AFF voir-PFV ANA-O$_M$-INT house burn-PROG COP.N
'He$_i$ saw that his$_i$ house was burning'

b. *molla*$_i$ *w-ašl-ēri ži-we-da*$_i$ *ʁaduḳ-ada hala b-uq̇-urulλa*
Molla M-begin-NAR ANA-M-INT sit.M-PFV$_{PTCP}$ branch N-cut-INF
'Molla$_i$ began to cut the branch on which he$_i$ was sitting'

c. *b-eλ-a žiži eḳwa-sw-e*$_i$
N-let-IMP every man-O$_M$-ERG
'Allow every man$_i$

ĩ-su-da$_i$ *mižoλ̌i-λa ĩ-sw-a-da*$_i$ *kw-īda-be g-ūrulλa*
ANA-O$_M$-INT beard-AFF ANA-O$_M$-AFF-INT want- IPFV$_{PTCP}$ -N make-INF
to do what he$_i$ wants to his$_i$ beard'

In ex. (30) *ĩswe-da* and *ĩsu-da* belong to the clause headed by the infinitive *q̇eleč̣u* in a control construction headed by he verb *ĩdunulλa* 'be able'. Given the obligatoriness of the control relation, it is possible to delete *ĩswe-da* without modifying the meaning or introducing an ambiguity. Consequently, *ĩswe-da* can be analyzed as an intensifier with respect to an obligatorily controlled (and normally unexpressed) argument in an infinitival construction.

(30) *ãde-λa*$_i$ *ĩ-sw-e-da*$_i$ *ĩ-su-da*$_i$ *hãde q̇eleč̣-u ĩd-ike*
person-AFF ANA -O$_M$-ERG-INT ANA-O$_M$-INT ear bite-INF be_able-IPFV.NEG.N
'Nobody$_i$ can bite his own$_i$ ear himself$_i$'

5.2.2. ži‹be› *in long-distance reflexive function*

Long-distance reflexivization of 3rd person referents may also involve the non-intensive form of the anaphoric pronoun *ži‹be›*, as in ex. (31).

(31) a. *biči̦l-āwi* *hado-lo-λa*$_{i}$
understand-EVID.N DEM-O_{HPL}-AFF
'They$_{i}$ understood

ži-ba$_{i}$ *q̇ũλe* *ba-x-i* *goli-sa* *molla rasadi-de*
ANA-HPL teasing HPL-catch-CVB.HPL COP.HPL-COMP Molla Rasadi-ERG
that Molla Rasadi had made fun of them$_{i}$'

b. *ʁe-χi* *eḳwa-sw-a*$_{i}$ *ĩgo-qunu* *eqaj-e*
neighborhood-GEN man-O_{M}-AFF window-EL look-CVB
'The neighbor$_{i}$ took a look through the window

molla *ĩ-do-ga*$_{i}$ *w-oq̇-ida* *harigw-iri*
Molla ANA-O_{HPL}-LAT M-come-IPFV see-NAR
and saw Molla coming to their$_{i}$ place'

c. *ħãki-sw-e*$_{i}$ *geλa* *b-eχ-awi* *mina*
judge-O_{M}-ERG inside.LAT N-take-EVID.N head
'The judge$_{i}$ moved his head back

molla-sw-a *ži-we*$_{i}$ *harigw-iλo?u*
Molla-O_{M}-AFF ANA-M see-INF.NEG
in order that Molla cannot see him$_{i}$'

d. *hu-sw-e*$_{i}$ *de-ne* *ž-āri* *ĩ-sw-a*$_{i}$ *ači* *o-x-u* *de-de*
DEM-O_{M}-ERG 1SG-ABS call-PFV ANA-O_{M}-LAT money N-give-INF 1SG-ERG
'He$_{i}$ called me so that I should give him$_{i}$ money'

e. *molla-sw-e*$_{i}$ *eq-awi* *ʁe-χi* *aḳa-λ-e-la*
Molla-O_{M}-ERG look-EVID.N neighborhood-GEN woman-$O_{F/N}$-ERG-too
'Molla$_{i}$ saw that the neighbor

ĩ-sw-e$_{i}$ *č̣-ēraqe* *č̣-ēre* *godi*
ANA-O_{M}-ERG plant-as plant-PROG COP.N
was planting (trees) like him$_{i}$'

f. *eḳwa-sw-e*$_{i}$ *χã-su-λa*$_{j}$ *b-eq̇-u* *o-t-iki*
man-O_{M}-ERG king-O_{M}-AFF N-know-INF N-let-NAR.NEG
'The man$_{i}$ did not let the king$_{j}$ know

ži-we$_{i}$ *ĩ-su-da*$_{j}$ *išwada* *gwi-sa*
ANA-M ANA-O_{M}-INT shepherd COP.M-COMP
that he$_{i}$ was his$_{j}$ shepherd'

5.2.3. *The choice between* ži‹be› *and* ži‹be›da *in long-distance reflexivization*

The following generalization accounts for all the attestations I have of *ži‹be›* and *ži‹be›da* used as long-distance reflexives: *ži‹be›da* is selected if its syntactic role rules out the possibility of having an antecedent within the limits of its minimal clause, whereas *ži‹be›* 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‹be›da* is used as in local reflexivization, otherwise *ži‹be›* is selected.

6 Logophoricization

6.1. The logophoric use of *ži‹be›* : introduction

In addition to its use in long-distance reflexivization, *ži‹be›* occurs in reported speech introduced by verbs such as *eƛ̣urulа* 'say, tell', *rãçurulа* 'ask', *ħulōrulа* 'scream', *ūʁwilōrulа* 'think', etc. In this use, illustrated by ex. (32), *ži‹be›* 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.

(32) a. *wašo-de*$_i$ *molla-ssu-ga eƛ̣-ari, hudu χwe ĩ-su-λa*$_i$ *beχ-a*
boy-ERG Molla-O_M-LAT tell-PFV DEM dog ANA-O_M-AFF N-buy-IMP
'The boy$_i$ told Molla: "Buy this dog for me$_i$!"'

b. *mačada eḳwa-sw-e*$_i$ *eƛ̣-iri ima-sw-a, ĩ-su-ga*$_i$ *muχadi r-ač-uba*
rich man-O_M-ERG tell-NAR imam-O_M-LAT ANA-O_M-LAT story.PL NPL-tell-PROHIB
'The rich man$_i$ told the imam: "Don't tell me$_i$ stories!"'

c. *ġačali-ƛ̣i raši-le-de*$_i$ *eƛ̣'-awi, ĩ-di-ƛ̣i*$_i$ *ila harigw-a-či*
dragon-GEN young_animal.PL-O_{NPL}-ERG say-EVID.N ANA-O_{NPL}-GEN mother see-PFV-Q
'The dragon's young$_i$ said: "Have you seen our$_i$ mother?'

d. *baḉa*$_i$ *ūʁil-āre b-iḳ-awi,*
wolf think-PROG N-be-EVID.N
'The wolf$_i$ was thinking:

hagiƛ̣unu ĩ-λ-a$_i$ *ġõhõla b-iχw-ida b-iḳ-awa*
where.EL ANA-O_{NPL}-AFF food N-become_available-IPFV N-be-Q
"Where will I$_i$ get food from?"'

e. *ġačali-de*$_i$ *išwada-su-ga eƛ̣-awi, ži-be*$_i$ *čaka makoč-e godi,*
dragon-ERG shepherd-O_M-LAT tell-EVID.N ANA-N very be_hungry-CVB COP.N
'The dragon$_i$ told the shepherd: "I$_i$ am very hungry,

ĩ-λi-ƛ̣i$_i$ *λoda baša-la makoč-e goda*
ANA-$O_{F/N}$-GEN three young_animal-too be hungry-CVB COP.N
and my$_i$ three children are hungry too."'

f. *molla rasadi*$_i$ *ħul-ōwi geƛ̣une,*
Molla Rasadi scream-EVID.M inside.EL
'Molla Rasadi$_i$ screamed from inside:

ĩ-su-ge$_{i}$ *ƛ̣a* *q̇ori* *ķar-uba* *ĩč̣a* *ķar-a*
ANA-O_M-ESS on_top.ESS board tie-PROHIB stone tie-IMP
"Don't tie a board on me$_i$, tie a stone!'

g. *raši-le-de*$_{i}$ *eƛ̣-awi* *ilo-ga,*
young_animal.PL-O_{NPL}-ERG say-EVID.N mother.O-LAT
'The young$_i$ told their mother:

ži-re$_{i}$ *azzaho-de* *q̇-ẽ̄da* *zama-λ-e,*
ANA-NPL dragon-ERG eat-$IPFV_{PTCP}$ time-$O_{F/N}$-ESS
"When the dragon was about to eat us$_i$,

maħmaʕali-de *q̇-ȭ* *o-t-ilλa* *ži-re*$_{i}$
Mehmet_Ali-ERG eat-INF N-let-PFV.NEG ANA-NPL
Mehmet Ali did not let it eat us$_i$."'

h. *molla rasadi-de*$_{i}$ *eƛ̣-awi,* *hudu* *ĩ-su*$_{i}$ *q'e* *m-išw-ada* *eķwa*
Molla Rasadi-ERG say-EVID.N DEM ANA-O_M belongings N-steal-PFV_{PTCP} man
'Molla Rasadi$_i$ said: "The man who stole my$_i$ belongings

čũda b-iķw-ala *haga* *w-oq̇-ida* *gwida,*
when N-be-COND here.LAT M-come-IPFV COP.M
will come here sooner or later,

qe *ʁaduķ-o* *gwido* *ži-we*$_{i}$ *hage*
then sit.M-CVB.M COP.M ANA-M here-ESS
therefore I$_i$ will stay here."'

i. *molla rasadi-de*$_{i}$ *eƛ̣-ari,* *ĩ-su*$_{i}$ *č̣ili* *č̣-ādelλi,*
Molla Rasadi-ERG say-PFV ANA-O_M house burn-when
'Molla Rasadi$_i$ said: "When my$_i$ house burnt,

ĩ-su-λa$_{i}$ *boʁoda* *mišidi* *b-eq̇-ari.*
ANA-O_M-AFF much gold N-come-PFV
I$_i$ found much gold." (lit. 'much gold came to me')

ãdo-lo-de-la$_{j}$ *ĩ-do-da*$_{j}$ *č̣ila* *č̣-āri,*
person.PL-O_{HPL}-ERG-and ANA-O_M-INT house.PL burn-PFV
Then the people$_j$ burnt their$_j$ houses,

b-eq̇-i *molla rasadi-ga* *eƛ̣-ari,*
HPL-come-CVB.HPL Molla Rasadi-LAT say-PFV
came to Molla's place and said:

ĩ-do-λa$_{j}$ *mišidi* *b-eq̇-ilλa*
ANA-O_{HPL}-AFF gold N-come-PFV.NEG
"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‹be›* 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‹be›* 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. (32h) 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. (33), even in reported speech involving the use of *ži‹be›* 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.

(33) a. *imaχa-de*$_i$ *eƛ̣-iri,* *hu-do-de* *ƛ̣or-eλi,* *ži-be*$_i$ *du-ga* *naλ-ida* *goda*
donkey.O-ERG say-NAR DEM-O_{HPL}-ERG hit-when ANA-N 2SG-LAT insult-IPFV COP.N
'The donkey$_i$ said: "When they will hit (me), I$_i$ will insult you"'

b. *aḳo-lo-de*$_i$ *molla rasadi-ga* *eƛ̣-awi,*
woman.PL-O_{HPL}-ERG Molla Rasadi-LAT tell-EVID.N
'The women$_i$ told Molla Rasadi:

ĩ-do-λa$_i$ *me-ne* *čaka* *kw-ĩdo*
ANA-O_{HPL}-AFF 2SG-ABS much love-IPFV.M
"We$_i$ love you much"'

c. *molla rasadi*$_i$ *ҫe-su-ƛ̣ira* *w-ũ̃wi,* *eƛ̣-awi,*
Molla Rasadi friend-OM-ADLAT M-go.EVID.M tell-EVID.N
'Molla Rasadi went to his friend, he$_i$ told him:

me-de *ĩ-su-λa*$_i$ *či* *gw-ida* *saba* *qor-ada?*
2SG-ERG ANA-O_M-AFF what make-$IPFV_{PTCP}$ amulet write-PFV1D/2Q
"Which kind of amulet (lit. 'an amulet doing what?') did you write for me$_i$?"'

d. *molla rasadi-de-la*$_i$ *eƛ̣-awi,*
Molla Rasadi-ERG-and say-EVID.N
'And Molla Rasadi$_i$ said:

ĩ-sw-e$_i$ *eƛ̣-ada* *čwila* *g-ux-ide* *ušt-e*
ANA-O_M-ERG say-PFV_{PTCP} thing make-OBLG-IPFV.N 2PL.ERG
"You must do what I$_i$ said"'

e. *molla-sw-e*$_i$ *eƛ̣-awi,* *ha* *imaχa* *ĩ-su-re*$_i$ *geda*
Molla-O_M-ERG say-EVID.N DEM donkey.PL ANA-O_M-NPL COP.NPL
'And Molla Rasadi said: "These donkeys belong to me,

du-λa *r-ešq-ādeλi* *ĩ-sw-a*$_i$ *λuda* *b-eχ-ika-be*
2SG-AFF NPL-work-CAUS.when ANA-O_M-AFF wood N-take-IPFV.NEG-N
and when I make them work for you, I do not collect wood for myself$_i$"'

f. *ima-sw-e*$_i$ *eƛ̣-iri,*
imam-O_M-ERG say-NAR
'The imam$_i$ said:

me-de istalowa-λ-e ĩ-sw-a$_{i}$ *o-x-ada sadaq̇a-λi-ʁana*
2SG-ERG pub-$O_{F/N}$-ESS ANA-O_{M}-LAT N-give-PFV_{PTCP} alms-$O_{F/N}$-CAUSAL
"Owing to the alms you gave me$_{i}$ in the pub,

alla-sw-e ima-λi-ga ž-āri me-ne
God-O_{M}-ERG faith-O_{M}-LAT call-PFV 2SG-ABS
God called you to the faith."

g. *ǯabula-de*$_{i}$ *eɬ̣-ari,*
Jabula -ERG say-PFV
'Jabula$_{i}$ said:

me-ne aħmadi jaco-ƛi waša w-uķ-iλa w-uķ-āčala,
2SG-ABS Ahmad sister.O-GEN son M-be-PFV.NEG M-be-COND
"If you were not the son of Ahmad's sister,

ĩ-sw-e$_{i}$ *me-ne w-uɬ̣-ēda w-uķ-ada*
ANA-O_{M}-ERG 2SG-ABS M-die-CAUS.IPFV M-be-PFV
I_{i} would kill you."

h. *aķo-de*$_{i}$ *eɬ̣-iri,*
wife.O-ERG say-EVID.N
'The wife$_{i}$ said:

ĩ-λ-e$_{i}$ *me-ne q̇eƛa q̇õhõla b-eχ-u w-oƛ-õho w-uķ-ada*
ANA-$O_{F/N}$-ERG 2SG-ABS home.LAT food NA-buy-INF M-send-CVB.M M-be-PFV
"I_{i} had sent you in order to buy food for the family,

me-de qeleko-la b-eχ-o w-oq̇-ari
2SG-ERG cock-and N-buy-M M-come-PFV
and you brought a cock."

molla-sw-e$_{i}$ *eɬ̣-iri, ĩ-sw-e*$_{i}$ *ha qeleko b-uq-aj-e*
Molla-O_{M}-ERG say-NAR ANA-O_{M}-ERG DEM coq N-fight-CAUS-CVB
Molla$_{i}$ said: "I_{i} will make this cock fight,

me-de o-x-ada-λi-gu λoda q̇ati b-eχ-ide
2SG-ERG N-give-PFV_{PTCP}-$O_{F/N}$-EL three layer N-take-IPFV.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‹be›* in logophoric function does not trigger any other change in the reported sentence: as illustrated by ex. (34), in reported declarative sentences including *ži‹be›* in S / A role, verbs in the perfective positive mark assertive agreement exactly in the same way as with 1st person pronouns.

(34) a. *hu aje-λ-e alla-sw-e*$_{i}$ *eɬ̣-ere godi,*
DEM verse-$O_{F/N}$-ESS God-O_{M}-ERG say-PROG COP.N
'In this verse God$_{i}$ says:

ĩ-sw-e$_{i}$ *ha duna b-ižw-āda*
ANA-O_M-ERG DEM world N-be_created-CAUS.PFV.1D/2Q
"I_i have created this world"'

b. *ilo-de*$_{i}$ *eχ̣-iri waša-su-ga,*
mother.O-ERG tell-NAR boy-O_M-LAT
'The mother$_i$ told the boy:

ha ĩgora ĩ-λ-e$_{i}$ *magazi-gune b-eχ-e j-eq̇-ada*
DEM bread ANA-$O_{F/N}$-ERG shop-EL N-buy-CVB F-come-PFV.1D/2Q
"I have brought this bread from the shop"'

6.6. Additional remarks and conclusion

In addition to that, very often, as illustrated by ex. (35), the length and the internal structure of the stretches of discourse within which *ži‹be›* 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.

(35) a. *če žo-λi ādo-lo-de*$_{i}$ *rāç-awi,*
one day-$O_{F/N}$.ESS person.PL-O_{HPL}-ERG ask-EVID.N
'One day the people$_i$ asked:

me-de čugu q̇alada w-ɔ̃hɔ̃ w-oq̇-ero gwido?
2SG-ERG why quickly M-go.CVB.M M-come-PROG.M COP.M
"How is it possible that you go there and come back so quickly?

ži-ba$_{i}$ *m-aʔ-ideλi, me-n-oqe b-eq̇-iki*
ANA-HPL HPL-go-when 2SG-ABS-like HPL-come-IPFV.HPL
When we$_i$ go there, we do not come back (quickly) like you."'

b. *molla rasadi-de*$_{i}$ *eχ̣-awi: ĩ-sw-e*$_{i}$ *oso-ga eχ̣-e-či b-iķw-iλe*
Molla Rasadi-ERG say-EVID.N ANA-O_M-ERG 2PL.O-LAT tell-CVB-Q N-be-PFV.NEG
'Molla Rasadi$_i$ said: "Hadn't I_i told you

ĩčˇa ķar-a-χ̣e ĩ-su-ge$_{i}$ *χ̣a?*
stone be_tied-IMP-QUOT ANA-O_M-ESS on_top.ESS
that a stone should be tied on me$_i$?

us-e q̇ori ķar-āri χ̣a,
2PL-ERG board be_tied-CAUS.PFV on_top.ESS
You tied a board on me,

ĩ-sw-e-la$_{i}$ *ƛ̣onu* *b-eq-ada;*
ANA-O$_{M}$-ERG-and on_top.EL N-remove-PFV1D/2Q
and I$_{i}$ removed it;

ĩç̣a ḳar-aj-e b-iḳw-ãčala ĩ-su-ge$_{i}$*,*
stone be_tied-CAUS-CVB N-be-COND ANA-O$_{M}$-ESS
if you had tied a stone on me$_{i}$,

ĩ-ssw-e$_{i}$ *b-eq-ida b-iḳw-iλe*
ANA-O$_{M}$-ERG N-remove-IPFV N-be-IPFV.NEG.N
I$_{i}$ would not have removed it"'

c. *q̇iru ç̌-īda eḳwa-sw-e*$_{i}$ *eƛ̣-iri,*
corn sow-IPFV$_{PTCP}$ man-O$_{M}$-ERG say-NAR
The man$_{i}$ who sows corn said:

alla-sw-e ũsi b-ižw-aj-e b-iḳw-iλala,
God-O$_{M}$-ERG soil N-be_created-CAUS-CVB N-be-NEG.COND
"If God had not created the soil,

q̇iru hagiƛ̣i ç̌-īda b-iḳw-ada?
corn where sow-IPFV$_{PTCP}$ N-be-PFV
where would the corn have been sown?

q̇onaḳ-ideλi ç-āre b-iḳ-ũčiλala,
be_necessary-when rain-PROG N-be-NEG.COND
If it had not rained when necessary,

alla-sw-e miλi-la b-ižw-aj-e b-iḳ-ũčiλala,
God-O$_{M}$-ERG sun-and N-be_created-CAUS-CVB N-be-NEG.COND
and if God had not created the sun,

ĩ-ssw-e$_{i}$ *q̇iru čige ç̌-īda b-iḳw-ada?*
ANA-O$_{M}$-ERG corn how sow-IPFV$_{PTCP}$ N-be-PFV
how would I$_{i}$ have sown corn?"'

The conclusion is therefore that the domain within which *ži‹be›* 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‹be›*, two further remarks are necessary:

(a) The antecedent of *ži‹be›* 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. (36).

(36) a. *hudu-sw-e eƛ̣-ari, ĩ-sw-e ači o-x-uwa du-λa*
DEM-O$_{M}$-ERG say-PFV ANA-O$_{M}$-ERG money N-give-POT 2SG-AFF
'He said: "I will give you money"'

b. *me-de* *eƛ'-ari,* *de-de/*ĩ-sw-e* *ači* *o-x-uwa* *du-λa*
2SG-ERG say-PFV 1SG-ERG money N-give-POT 2SG-AFF
'You said: "I will give you money"'

c. *de-de* *eƛ'-ada,* *de-de/*ĩ-sw-e* *ači* *o-x-uwa* *du-λa*
1SG-ERG say-PFV.1D/2Q 1SG-ERG money N-give-POT 2SG-AFF
'I said: "I will give you money"'

(b) The use of *ži‹be›* is never obligatory: the use of 1st person pronouns instead of *ži‹be›* in logophoric function is always possible without further readjustments, and in the narrative texts I have collected, *ži‹be›* and 1st person pronouns often alternate within a single stretch of reported discourse with the same referential value, as in ex. (37) – which incidentally confirms that the distinction between direct and indirect speech is not relevant in AD Akhvakh.

(37) a. *ãdo*$_i$ *b-eq̇-ideλi,* *eƛ̣-iri* *molla-su-ga,*
person.PL HPL-come-when tel-NAR Molla-O_M-LAT
'When the people$_i$ arrived, they$_i$ told Molla:

ĩ-do$_i$ *xwana* *mokoč-e* *r-iƛ̣-ari,*
ANA-O_{HPL} horse.PL be_hungry-CVB NPL-die-PFV
"Our$_i$ horses have died of hunger,

me-de *is-a*$_i$ *xwana* *r-eχ-ux-ide*
2SG-ERG $1PL_E$-AFF horse.PL NPL-buy-OBLG-IPFV.NPL
you must buy horses for us$_i$."'

b. *molla rasadi-de*$_i$ *če* *ḳeha* *aχ-e* *eƛ̣-iri,*
Molla Rasadi-ERG one eye open-CVB say-NAR
'Molla Rasadi$_i$ opened an eye and said:

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

ušt-a *di*$_i$ *imiχi* *ƛ̣aƛ̣-ō* *ĩd-ika* *b-iḳw-ada*
2PL-AFF 1SG.O donkey tear-INF be_able-IPFV.NEG N-be-PFV
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‹be›* may show important variations in some details of their behavior. What is particular in AD Akhvakh is the use of *ži‹be›* 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‹be›*, 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‹b›* (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 other varieties of Akhvakh too – ex. (38).

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

bač̣ode$_i$	*eƛ̣ƛ̣edabajo,*	*inλλe*$_i$	*kumake*	*gwajra*	*duƛa*
wolf.ERG	say.EVID	ANA.ERG	help	make.FUT	2SG.AFF

'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‹be›(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‹be›* and its intensive form *ži‹be›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‹be›da*;

(b) in long-distance reflexivization, both non-intensive *ži‹be›* and intensive *ži‹be›da* occur, but they are in complementary distribution, and the use of *ži‹be›* implies a more 'distant' relationship between the reflexive pronoun and its antecedent than *ži‹be›da*;

(c) the non-intensive form *ži‹be›* 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

1D/2Q: agreement with a 1st person controller in declarative clauses, or with a 2nd person controller in questions (assertive agreement)
$1PL_I$: personal pronoun, 1st person plural inclusive
$1PL_E$: personal pronoun, 1st person plural exclusive
1SG: personal pronoun, 1st person singular
2PL: personal pronoun, 2nd person plural
2SG: personal pronoun, 2nd person singular
ABS: absolute form
ADLAT: adlative
AFF: affective case
ANA: anaphoric (*ži-*)
CAUS: causative
CAUSAL: causal case
COMIT: comitative
COND: conditional converb
COP: copula
CVB: general converb
DEM: demonstrative
EL: elative case
ERG: ergative case
ESS: essive case
EVID: past evidential
F: feminine singular
GEN: genitive
HPL: human plural
IMP: imperative
INF: infinitive
INT: intensifying particle
IPFV: imperfective
LAT: lative case
M: masculine singular
N: non-human singular
NAR: narrative
NEG: negative
NPL: non-human plural
O: oblique stem
OBLG: obligative
$O_{F/N}$: oblique stem, feminine singular or non-human singular
O_{HPL}: oblique stem, human plural
O_M: oblique stem, masculine singular
O_{NPL}: oblique stem, non-human plural
PFV: perfective
PL: plural
POT: potential
PROG: progressive converb
PROHIB: prohibitive
PTCP: in participle function
Q: interrogative
QUOT: quotative
SBD: subordinator
SG: singular
VLOC: verbal locative ('at / to / from the place where *V*-ing occurs')

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 pronoun in 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.

Curnow, T. 2002. 'Conjunct/disjunct marking in Awa Pit'. *Linguistics* 40-3. 611-627.

DeLancey S. 1986. 'Evidentiality and volitionality in Tibetan'. In Chafe, W. & J. Nichols (eds.), *Evidentiality : the Linguistic Coding of Epistemology*. Norwood NJ: Academic Press. 203-213.

— 1990. 'Ergativity and the cognitive model of event structure in Lhasa Tibetan'. *Cognitive Linguistics* 1-3. 289-321

— 1992. 'The Historical status of the conjunct/disjunct pattern'. *Acta Linguistica Hafniensa* 25. 39-42.

Hagège, C. 1974. 'Les pronoms logophoriques'. *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique* 69. 287-310.
Hale, A. 1980. Person markers: finite conjunct and disjunct forms in Newari. In Trail R. (ed.), *Papers in Southeast Asian Linguistics* 7. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics. 95-106.
Hargreaves, D. 2005. Agency and intentional action in Kathmandu Newar. *Himalayan Linguistics* 5. 1-48.
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.) *Tipologija i teorija jazyka, ot opisanija k ob"jasneniju (k 60-letiju A. E. Kibrika)*. Moscow: Jazyki russkoj kul'tury. 302-18.
Loughnane, R. 2007. 'Expanding the typology of evidentiality: the participatory/factual in Oksapmin'. Paper delivered at the ALT 7 conference. Paris.
Magomedbekova, Z.M. 1967. *Axvaxskij jazyk (grammatičeskij analis, teksty, slovar')*. Tbilissi: Mecniereba.
Magomedbekova, Z.M. 1971. *Karatinskij jazyk (grammatičeskij analis, teksty, slovar')*. Tbilissi: Mecniereba.
Magomedova, P & I. Abdullaeva. In press. *Axvaxsko-russkij slovar'*. Maxačkala: Dagestanskij Naučnyj Centr Rossiskoj Akademii Nauk.
Magometov, A. 1982. *Megebskij dialect darginskogo jazyka*. Tbilissi: Mecniereba.
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. '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.
Sells, P. 1987. 'Aspects of logophoricity'. *Linguistic Inquiry* 18. 445-79.
Stirling, L. 1992. S*witch-reference and discourse representation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.