



NATIONAL RESEARCH UNIVERSITY
HIGHER SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS

Alexandra A. Kozhukhar

**DISTINGUISHING LOGOPHORIC
PRONOUNS AND LONG-
DISTANCE REFLEXIVES IN
MEHWEB DARGWA**

BASIC RESEARCH PROGRAM

WORKING PAPERS

SERIES: LINGUISTICS

WP BRP 27/LNG/2015

*Alexandra A. Kozhukhar*¹

DISTINGUISHING LOGOPHORIC PRONOUNS AND LONG-DISTANCE REFLEXIVES IN MEHWEB DARGWA²

This study analyses the difference between logophoric pronoun and long-distance reflexive in Mehweb Dargwa of East Caucasian language family. Following paper cites the examples that provide evidence for the difference existing between logophoric pronouns and long-distance reflexives in Mehweb and explains the cases of the reference ambiguity by introducing the idea of the zero pronoun with non-subject reference.

Keywords: Daghestan, East Caucasian, Mehweb, reflexive, logophor

JEL classification code: Z19

¹ Student of Higher School of Economics, Faculty of Humanities, School of Linguistics; E-mail: sasha.kozhukhar@gmail.com

² The author would like to thank the supervisors of the field trip Michael Daniel, Dmitry Ganenkov and Nina Dobrushina for their comments and suggestions during the field work. I would also like to express my gratitude to the consultants who were very patient and kind to me during by field work – Patimat Sharbuzova, Munira Pakhlaeva, Kamilat Sharbuzova, Zalmu Sharbuzova and Majsarat Musaeva.

1. Introduction³

Mehweb is spoken in the aul⁴ of the same name in the Gunib (also spelt Ghunib) district of the Republic of Dagestan (Russia). Mehweb is a lect of the Dargwa group of the East Caucasian (Nakh-Dagestani) language family and is only spoken by the residents of Mehweb and, sparsely, as a L2 in some neighbouring villages (Obokh, Shangoda) [Kozhukhar & Barylnikova 2013].

According to oral history, Mehwebs separated from other Dargwa-speaking communities and re-settled among Avar- and Lak-speaking villages approximately seven centuries ago. Mehwebs are confident that they originally come from the village of Mugi (Akusha district). However, there is no linguistic evidence that Mehweb as a lect is especially closely related to the Dargwa variety spoken in Mugi (Akusha dialect), as these two dialects are not mutually intelligible. Other lects of the Dargwa group seem to have more common linguistic features with Mehweb than the Akusha dialect [Moroz 2013].

Mehweb does not have its own writing system. The Mehwebs are literate in Avar and Russian. Since Mehweb is located in the Gunib district which is mostly inhabited by Avars, Avar and not Mehweb is taught to Mehweb children at school.

Mehweb demonstrates multifunctionality of the pronominal stem *sa<CL>i*.⁵ It can be used in at least three different functions: as a logophor, as a reflexive and as an intensifier ([Kozhuxar 2014]). There is also evidence that *sa<CL>i* can be used as a resumptive pronoun, i.e. pronoun coreferential to the head of the relative clause. This is also observed in Tanti Dargwa [Lander & Sumbatova 2014] where the reflexive *sa-CL* has similar functions.

The functions of *sa<CL>i* are distinguished by the presence of the emphatic suffix *-al*, the semantic conditions in which pronominal stem is used and, sometimes, by the syntactic position in which the pronominal stem is used (see intensifier function in [Kozhukhar 2014]). Table 2 shows the distribution of the semantic conditions and emphatic suffix between the functions:

³ This study (research grant No 15-05-002) was supported by The National Research University–Higher School of Economics’ Academic Fund Program in 2015.

⁴ Turkic ‘village’

⁵ Non-oblique form of the pronominal stem contains class marker infixes. There are three primary noun classes in Mehweb (with one additional secondary class in the singular) and two noun classes in the plural. Table 1 shows the forms of the class markers:

Table 1. Noun classes in Mehweb

	SG	PL
M	-w-	
F/F1	-r-/-r-;-d-	-b-
N	-b-	-r-

Table 2. Functions of the pronominal stem and corresponding features

Function	Suffix	Semantic conditions
Logophor	(-)	«Reflective of another individual's perception, and not the speaker's subjective account of the linguistic content being transmitted» [Clements 1972: 171].
Local reflexive	(+)	Coreference to the antecedent in the same clause.
Long-distance reflexive	(-)	Coreference to the antecedent in the superordinate clause.
Intensifier	(+)	Emphasises the argument it is coreferent to.
Resumptive	(-)	Coreferential to the head of the relative clause, (relative contexts only).

The problem arises when the semantic context and the absence of the emphatic suffix is not enough to define the function of the pronominal stem. In some contexts, a logophoric pronoun and a long-distance reflexive cannot be distinguished owing to the formal resemblance of semantic conditions, and its homonymy in Mehweb Dargwa.

This is the topic of the present paper.

2. Theoretical background

According to [Pica 1987] long-distance reflexives tend to share a number of characteristics across languages:

- Long-distance reflexives are monomorphemic;⁶
- Long-distance reflexives take the subject as an antecedent;
- Their occurrence in certain languages can be restricted to environments in which the antecedent and reflexive are found in specific domains.

Moreover, long-distance reflexivization demonstrates a “Blocking Effect” [Sung 1990], i.e. the change of the possible antecedent of the reflexive if the two antecedents share the same features for person. Chinese, for example, demonstrates this phenomenon [Huang 1984]:

⁶ Cf. also [Testelefs & Toldova 1997]. However, Cole and co-authors [Cole, Herman & Huang 2000] argue that Pica’s generalizations about the monomorphemic long-distance reflexives can be applied only to those LDR that are bound anaphors and not to those that are pronominals.

- (1) a. woi juede nij dui ziji*_{i/j} meixinxin.
 I think you to SELF not confidence
 ‘I think you have no confidence in yourself/*me.’
- b. nii juede woj dui ziji*_{i/j} meixinxin ma?
 you think I to SELF not confidence Q
 ‘Do you think I have no confidence in myself/*you?’
- c. Zhangsani juede wo/nij dui ziji*_{i/j} meixinxin.
 Zhangsan think I/you to SELF not confidence
 ‘Zhangsan thinks I/you have no confidence in myself/yourself/*him.’
- d. Zhangsani zhidao Lisij dui ziji_{i/j} mei xinxin.
 Zhangsan how Lisi to SELF not confidence
 ‘Zhangsan knows that Lisi has no confidence in him/himself.’

Logophoric pronouns are used to indicate coreferentiality or conjoint reference with the subject or the non-subject argument of superordinate predicates of communication and mental experience [Sells 1987]. Long-distance reflexives never indicate coreferentiality with the non-subject argument of the superordinate clause [Cole, Herman & Huang 2000].

In the present study, some of the cross-linguistically attested properties of long-distant reflexives and/or logophoric pronouns will be tested on the Mehweb material⁷ in order to distinguish these two functions of the pronominal stem. Table 3 shows the characteristics of functions checked in the present paper:

⁷ Language material stated in the paper was collected during the field trip to the village of Mehweb, Gunibski district of the Republic of Daghestan in August 2015.

Table 3. Characteristics of the logophors and long-distance reflexives:

	Logophor	Long-distance reflexive
Subject orientation	not obligatory [Cole, Herman & Huang 2000], [Reuland 2011]	obligatory [Cole, Herman & Huang 2000]
Finiteness of the subordinate clause	obligatory	only non-finite subordinates [Cole, Herman & Huang 2000]
Monomorphemic structure	not obligatory	obligatory [Cole, Herman & Huang 2000]
Subject position in the subordinate clause	obligatory [Sells 1987], [Cole, Herman & Huang 2000]	not obligatory

Table 3 demonstrates that according to [Cole, Herman & Huang 2000], [Reuland 2011], [Sells 1987] and others functions of the logophoric pronouns and long-distance reflexives are almost opposite.

3. Mehweb evidence

Mehweb uses the same pronominal stem in order to express logophoric and reflexive meanings. Table 4 shows selected slots of the paradigm of the pronominal stem with the emphatic suffix. The forms of the long-distance reflexive and logophoric pronouns are homophonous and overlap in syntactic contexts. Table 5 shows selected slots of the paradigm of the pronominal stem without the emphatic suffix. Table 7 and Table 8 further below define the syntactic positions which can be occupied by each pronominal and its antecedents.

Table 4. Case-number-gender forms of the pronoun *sa<CL>i* with -al (part of the inventory)

	NOM	ERG	GEN	DAT	INTER(LAT)	INTER-EL	COMIT
M	<i>sa<w>i</i>						
3SG	F/F1 ⁸ <i>sa<r>i</i>	<i>sune-jni</i>	<i>sune-la</i>	<i>sune-s</i>	<i>sune-ze</i>	<i>sune-ze-la</i>	<i>sune-ču</i>
	N <i>sai</i>						
3PL	HPL <i>sai</i>	<i>ču-ni</i>	<i>ču-la</i>	<i>ču-s</i>	<i>ču-ze</i>	<i>ču-ze-la</i>	<i>ču-ču</i>
	NPL <i>sa<r>i</i>						

⁸ Feminine class suffix does not distinguish between married and unmarried women, but feminine class prefix is *d-* in situation when the controller is an unmarried woman and *r-* (i.e. prefix is the same as suffix) when the object is a married woman [Magometov 1982]. The semi-independent class that uses prefix *d-* and suffix *-r* is glossed as F1 in the present paper.

Table 5. Case-number-gender forms of the pronoun sa<CL>i without -al (part of the inventory)

		NOM	ERG	GEN	DAT	INTER(LAT)
	M	<i>sa<w>i-jal</i>				
3SG	F/F1	<i>sa<r>i-jal</i>	<i>sunej-ni-jal</i>	<i>sune-la-l⁹</i>	<i>sune-s-al</i>	<i>sune-ze-l</i>
	N	<i>sai-jal</i>				
3PL	HPL	<i>sai-jal</i>	<i>ču-ni-jal</i>	<i>ču-la-l</i>	<i>ču-s-al</i>	<i>ču-ze-l</i>
	NPL	<i>sa<r>i-jal</i>				

3.1. Logophorocity

Logophoric pronouns define the point of view the situation as described in [Toldova 1999]. Some languages have special lexical entities used for this function (African languages), while some use existing lexical means (Daghestanian).

The behaviour of the pronominal stem in the logophoric function in Mehweb is relatively similar to the “logophoric reflexivization” in Chechen and Ingush [Nichols 2000]. Chechen uses reflexives in subordinate finite clauses marked by quotation clitic *eanna*¹⁰ in order to refer to the speaker, i.e. subject of the superordinate clause. Nichols [2000] calls such contexts semi-direct speech.¹¹ Semi-direct speech contexts differ from pure direct speech contexts which use personal pronouns (1SG pronouns) and do not use a quotation clitic. Mehweb does not have such rigid distinction between semi- and pure direct speech: quotation clitic *ile*¹² is optional in both types of contexts (see Table 6) and the only difference is in the pronoun *sa<CL>i* in semi-direct speech and personal pronoun *nu* (1SG) in the singular or *nuša* (1PL) in the plural in pure direct speech. Pure direct speech allows a shift of the empathy focus as the verb form is inflected for person see Table 6. (2) shows how some of the sentences in Table 6 may be interpreted:

⁹ The problem of morpheme border in this form is disputable, but if the form of INTER-LAT looks like *sune-ze-l* and not *sune-z-al* the author would rather place the border after genitive *-la-* leaving emphatic suffix truncated.

¹⁰ Derivate, presumably a converb, of the verb ‘to speak’.

¹¹ In semi-directional speech «quoted matter is identical to the reported speech act except that coreferents to the speaker are reflexivized and the clause is marked with a quotative particle» [Nichols 2000].

¹² Converb of the perfective stem of the verb *as* ‘to speak’.

(2)	адајни	иб	сунезе	/	дизе	жанавар
	adaj-ni _i	ib	sune-ze _i	/	di-ze _{i;j}	žanawar
	father-ERG	say:PFV.AOR	self-INTER/	1SG-INTER	wolf(ABS)	
	зубра		иле			
	gu-b[-ra]		ile			
	see:PFV-AOR[-LCT ¹³]	say(CVB)				
	‘Father _i said that he _{i;j} had seen a wolf.’					

Table 6 shows that the first person pronoun can refer either to the current speaker (indexed with *j* in example (2)), or the original speaker, indexed with *i*, and a subject of the superordinate clause, here *adaj* ‘father’. This shift of empathy focus occurs due to the verb form in the subordinate clause. If the verb is in the ‘locutive’ form (glossed as LCT), the first person pronoun is coreferential to the subject of the superordinate clause; if the verb is not inflected for LCT, the personal pronoun is coreferent with the current speaker. As stated above, the absence of the quotation marker *ile* does not interact with the shift of the empathy focus. *sa<CL>i* is resistant to the change of the verb form and is always coreferential to the subject of the superordinate clause.

For Mehweb semi-direct speech is postulated in cases when the subject of the subordinate clause is expressed by a pronoun in the first person singular and the predicate of the subordinate clause expressed by a verb form in the third person singular. Another case of semi-direct speech is postulated when the subject of the subordinate clause is a *sa<CL>i* pronoun and the verb form is in ‘locutive’ singular, i.e. marked with *-ra*.

Table 6. Shift of the empathy focus in direct and semi-direct speech

pronoun	verb form	<i>ile</i>	antecedent	example
<i>nu</i>	1SG	+	S of the main clause	<i>adaj-ni ib di-ze žanawar gu-b-ra ile</i>
<i>nu</i>	1SG	–	S of the main clause	<i>adaj-ni ib di-ze žanawar gu-b-ra</i>
<i>nu</i>	3SG	+	current speaker	<i>adaj-ni ib di-ze žanawar gu-b ile</i>
<i>nu</i>	3SG	–	current speaker	<i>adaj-ni ib di-ze žanawar gu-b</i>
<i>sawi</i>	1SG	+	S of the main clause	<i>adaj-ni ib sune-ze žanawar gu-b-ra ile</i>
<i>sawi</i>	1SG	–	S of the main clause	<i>adaj-ni ib sune-ze žanawar gu-b-ra</i>
<i>sawi</i>	3SG	+	S of the main clause	<i>adaj-ni ib sune-ze žanawar gu-b ile</i>
<i>sawi</i>	3SG	–	S of the main clause	<i>adaj-ni ib sune-ze žanawar gu-b</i>

¹³ Suffix *-ra* is the inflection of the 1SG in affirmative sentences and 2SG in negative and interrogative questions. In the present paper it is glossed as LCT – locutor.

3.1.1. Non-subject coreference

According to [Cole, Herman & Huang 2000] long-distance reflexives cannot be coreferential to a non-subject argument of the superordinate clause, whereas logophoric pronouns can be potentially coreferent to non-subject argument of the main clause thus its function is to define the shift in empathy focus. This type of coreference, i.e. coreference to the non-subject argument (IO) of the main clause, occurs in such contexts as ‘I found out from Ali_i that he_i bought a goat’. In the following context, Ali is an indirect object of the matrix clause and serves as an antecedent of the subject of the subordinate clause. Examples (3), (4) and (5) show that non-subject reference is possible in Mehweb in cases when the subject of the superordinate clause is not in the third person singular.

- (3) *ди́зе* *или́зела* *ба́гьура* *сунейни* *маза*
di-ze *il-i-ze-la* *b-ah-ur-ra* *sune-jni* *maza*
 1SG-INTER this-OBL-INTER-EL N-know:PFV-AOR-LCT SELF.OBL-ERG sheep
берхИри
b-erħ-ri
 N-slaughter:PFV-NMLZ
 ‘I found out from him_i that he_i slaughtered a ram.’

(3) and (4) show that verb *CL-ahas* ‘to know’ allows two complementation strategies: *-ri* complementation and *-deš* complementation; note also pro-drop in (4). For more comments on complementation strategies see section 3.1.2.

- (4) *ити́зела* *ба́гьура* *сунейни* *маза*
it-i-ze-la *b-ah-ur-ra* *sune-jni* *maza*
 that-OBL-INTER-EL N-know:PFV-AOR-LCT self.OBL-ERG ram(ABS)
берхундеш
b-erħ-un-deš
 N-slaughter:PFV-AOR-NMLZ
 ‘I found out from him_i that he_i had slaughtered a ram.’

(5) shows that an intensifier can be used as the subject of the subordinate clause with reference to the non-subject argument of the superordinate clause. However, since (4) also shows the possibility of pro-drop, it can be argued that the intensifier *sunejnijal* is coreferential to the absent pronoun which is the true subject of the subordinate clause. The main argument for this

hypothesis is the fact that the intensifier has to be bound by an antecedent inside its clause [Kozhukhar 2014]. (6) shows that pronoun can be easily reconstructed.

(5)	<i>ди́зе</i>	<i>или́зела</i>	<i>ба́гьура</i>	<i>сунейни́ял</i>	<i>ма́за</i>
	<i>di-ze</i>	<i>il-i-ze-la</i>	<i>b-ah-ur-ra</i>	<i>sune-jni-jal</i>	<i>maza</i>
	1SG-INTER	this-OBL-INTER-EL	N-know:PFV-AOR-LCT	self.OBL-ERG-EMPH	ram(ABS)
	<i>берхIпу</i>				
	<i>b-erĥ-ri</i>				
	N-slaughter:PFV-NMLZ				
	‘I found out from him _i that he _i had slaughtered a ram.’				

(6)	<i>ди́зе</i>	<i>или́зела</i>	<i>ба́гьура</i>	<i>сунейни́</i>	
	<i>di-ze</i>	<i>il-i-ze-la</i>	<i>b-ah-ur-ra</i>	<i>sune-jni</i>	
	1SG-INTER	this-OBL-INTER-EL	N-know:PFV-AOR-LCT	self.OBL-ERG	
	<i>сунейни́ял</i>	<i>ма́за</i>	<i>берхIпу</i>		
	<i>sune-jni-jal</i>	<i>maza</i>	<i>b-erĥ-ri</i>		
	self.OBL-ERG-EMPH	ram(ABS)	N-slaughter:PFV-NMLZ		
	‘I found out from him _i that he _i had slaughtered a ram.’				

(7)¹⁴ shows that demonstrative *ilini* used in the position of the logophoric *sunejni* in (6) cannot take reference from any argument of the main clause and behaves as a pronominal rather than bound reflexive:

(7)	<i>ди́зе</i>	<i>или́зела</i>	<i>ба́гьура</i>	<i>или́ни</i>	<i>ма́за</i>
	<i>di-ze</i>	<i>il-i-ze-la</i>	<i>b-ah-ur-ra</i>	<i>il-i-ni</i>	<i>maza</i>
	1SG-INTER	this-OBL-INTER-EL	N-know:PFV-AOR-LCT	this-OBL-ERG	ram(ABS)
	<i>берхIпу</i>				
	<i>b-erĥ-ri</i>				
	N-slaughter:PFV-NMLZ				
	‘I found out from him _i that he _y had slaughtered a ram.’				

3.1.2. Complementation strategies

According to [Cole, Herman & Huang 2000] long-distance reflexives can be used only in non-finite subordinate clauses whereas logophoric pronouns are allowed only in quotation

¹⁴ y marks the third participant of the situation described.

contexts. However, Mehweb shows (in (4) and (5)) that *sa<CL>i* as a logophor, since it is coreferential to the non-subject argument of the main clause, and can occur in non-finite subordinates, namely in a nominalization subordinate (*-deš*) and with masdar *-ri*. This section discusses complementation strategies compatible with logophoric pronouns.

(8) and (9) show that logophoric pronouns are allowed in finite quotation subordinates with optional *ile*.

(8)	<i>итини</i>	<i>пикри</i>	<i>бахъиб</i>	<i>сави</i>	<i>къам</i>
	<i>it-i-ni</i>	<i>pikri</i>	<i>b-aq-ib</i>	<i>sa<w>i</i>	<i>q'am</i>
	that-OBL-ERG	thought	N-do:PFV-AOR	<M>SELF	late
	<i>угъубле</i>		<i>лев</i>	<i>иле</i>	
	<i>uh-ub-le</i>		<i>le-w</i>	<i>[ile]</i>	
	become:PFV-AOR-CVB		COP-M	<i>[say(CVB)]</i>	
	'He _i thought that he _i was late.'				

(9)	<i>итис</i>	<i>бикиб</i>	<i>сави</i>	<i>къам</i>	<i>угъубле</i>
	<i>it-i-s</i>	<i>b-ik-ib</i>	<i>sa<w>i</i>	<i>q'am</i>	<i>uhub-le</i>
	that-OBL-DAT	N-think:PVF-AOR	<M>SELF	late	M-become:PFV-AOR-CVB
	<i>лев</i>	<i>иле</i>			
	<i>le-w</i>	<i>[ile]</i>			
	COP-M	<i>[say(CVB)]</i>			
	'He _i thought that he _i was late.'				

(10)	<i>баба урухКуве</i>	<i>лер</i>	<i>сари</i>	<i>ардикала</i>	<i>иле</i>
	<i>baba uruχ-k'-uwe</i>	<i>le-r</i>	<i>sa<ɾ>i</i>	<i>ar-d-ik-ala</i>	<i>[ile]</i>
	granny	be.afraid-CVB	COP-F	<F>SELF	<F>fall.down-APPR
					<i>[say(CVB)]</i>
	'Grandmother is afraid of falling down.'				

Nominalization marked with *-deš* and masdar *-ri* are also possible while preserving the pronominal stem in logophoric function. Some consultants allow the quotation converb *ile* with non-finite subordinate clauses. See (11), (12) and (13):

- (11) *итини* *пикри* *бахъиб* *сави* *къам* *угъубле*
it-i-ni *pikri* *b-aq-ib* *sa(w)i* *q'am* *uh-ub-le*
that-OBL-ERG thought N-do:PFV-AOR <M>SELF late M-become:PFV-AOR-CVB
левдеш *иле*
le-w-deš *[ile]*
COP-M-NMLZ [say(CVB)]
‘He_i thought that he_i was late.’

- (12) *итис* *бикиб* *сави* *къам* *угъубле*
it-i-s *b-ik-ib* *sa(w)i* *q'am* *uhub-le*
that-OBL-DAT N-think:PVF-AOR <M>SELF late M-become:PFV-AOR-CVB
левдеш *иле*
le-w-deš *[ile]*
COP-M-NMLZ [say(CVB)]
‘He_i thought that he_i was late.’

- (13) *дизе* *илизела* *багъура* *илини* *маза*
di-ze *il-i-ze-la* *b-ah-ur-ra* *il-i-ni* *maza*
1SG-INTER this-OBL-INTER-EL N-know:PFV-AOR-LCT this-OBL-ERG ram(ABS)
берхIри *иле*
b-erħ-ri *[ile]*
N-slaughter:PFV-NMLZ [say(CVB)]
‘I found out from him_i that he_y had slaughtered a ram.’

3.1.3. Double predication

In order to check the presence of the blocking effect in Mehweb, I applied the ‘double predication’ test. In (14), (15) and (16), all pronouns are coreferent with the embedded subject. (14) contains the non-emphasized form of the pronominal stem; (15) contains a personal pronoun in first person singular; (16) contains the emphasized form of the pronominal stem.

- (14) *зIалини иб* *расуйни* *иб* *сунейни* *ежа* *асира*
žali-ni ib *rasuj-ni* *ib* *sune-jni* *eža* *asi-ra*
ali-ERG say(AOR) rasul-ERG say(AOR) SELF.OBL-ERG goat(ABS) buy:PFV-LCT
‘Ali_y said that Rasul_i said that he_{i/*y} had bought a goat.’

- (15) *ʒAli-ni ib rasuj-ni ib nu-ni eža asi-ra*
ʒali-ni ib rasuj-ni ib nu-ni eža asi-ra
 ali-ERG say(AOR) rasul-ERG say(AOR) SELF.OBL-ERG goat(ABS) buy:PFV-LCT
 ‘Ali_y said that Rasul_i said that he_{i/*y} had bought a goat.’

- (16) *ʒAli-ni ib rasuj-ni ib sunejnija eža asi-ra*
ʒali-ni ib rasuj-ni ib sune-jni-jal eža asi-ra
 ali-ERG say(AOR) rasul-ERG say(AOR) SELF.OBL-ERG-EMPH goat(ABS) buy:PFV-LCT
 ‘Ali_y said that Rasul_i said that he_{i/*y} had bought a goat.’

Each pronoun takes its reference from the closest subject, which is *Rasul*. In order to refer to the external subject, a demonstrative must be used instead of the logophoric stem or personal pronoun:

- (17) *ʒAli-ni ib rasuj-ni ib ilinija eža asi-ra*
ʒali-ni ib rasuj-ni ib il-i-ni-jal eža asi-ra
 ali-ERG say(AOR) rasul-ERG say(AOR) that-OBL-ERG-EMPH goat(ABS) buy:PFV-LCT
 ‘Ali_y said that Rasul_i said that he_{*i/y} had bought a goat.’

If one of the subjects does not agree with the logophoric pronoun in number and class, the pronoun chooses the argument of one of the superordinate clauses which does agree. This cannot be classified as a blocking effect since the reference is not blocked but chosen from the most appropriate argument of the superordinate clauses.

- (18) *nu-ni ib rasuj-ni ib sunejni eža asi-ra*
nu-ni ib rasuj-ni ib sune-jni eža asi-ra
 1SG-ERG say(AOR) rasul-ERG say(AOR) SELF.OBL-ERG-EMPH goat(ABS) buy:PFV-LCT
 ‘I_y said that Rasul_i said that he_{i/*y} had bought a goat.’

(18) shows reference shift from the embedded subject to the external subject due to a mismatch of the pronoun and the embedded subject in person. (19) shows that pronominal stem takes its reference from the closest argument which agrees with the pronoun in number and person.

- (19) *зІалини иб нуни иб сунейни ежа акура*
ʒali-ni ib nu-ni ib sune-jni eža asi-ra
 ali-ERG say(AOR) 1SG-ERG say(AOR) SELF.OBL-ERG-EMPH goat(ABS) buy:PFV-LCT
 ‘Ali_y said that I_i said that he_{*i/y} had bought a goat.’

- (20) *зІалини иб нушайни иб сунейни ежа акура*
ʒali-ni ib niša-jni ib sune-jni eža asi-ra
 ali-ERG say(AOR) 1SG-ERG say(AOR) SELF.OBL-ERG-EMPH goat(ABS) buy:PFV-LCT
 ‘Ali_y said that I_i said that he_{*i/y} had bought a goat.’

3.1.4. Narrative regime

Logophoric pronouns can be used to refer to the speaker in the narrative regime. In the following contexts a logophoric pronoun can be used in all syntactic positions and is always coreferential to the narrator.

This function should be distinguished from a pure logophoric one because it depends on the regime, and takes its reference from outside the sentence. This function of the pronominal stem will be called discursive. The actual logophoric pronoun is homophonous to the discursive pronoun in form; they are also similar in that both are able to change the point of view situation is described from.

- (21) [...] *гьел хунул дяхІяш дикъес, хІябай рукІес, бяхІизеди рур ихъес. баръа бакиб кІван гьеллеб халкъане, ит бакІиб кІван пришел, иш бакииб кІван, визулле гва кІван, сави сия варав хешев бикиба иле. [...]*

[...] *hel xunul da^hqa^ʃ diq'es, ha^ʃbaj ruk'es, ba^hhizedi rur iqes. bar^ʔa bakib k'^wan helleb xalq'ane, it bak'ib k'^wan prišel, iš bakiib k'^wan, wizulle g^wa k'^wan, sawi sija waraw hešeb bikiba ile.[...]*

‘The woman started to shout, jumped and tore the hear of her head. All the Laks came, they came from here, they came from there, and I asked myself desperately what had happened here.’

- (22) [...] дамадан гIарагъалла гIала урхес ваъиб кIван марияйс. сунейни ира кIван
 абайлахеш дурсира дахуве дуъакIагъу дуес гIай хан ванал [...]
 [...] *damadan ʔaravalla ʔala urxes waʔib kʷan marijajs. sunejni ira kʷan abajlaheš dursi-*
ra d-aḡ-uwe duʔak'ahu dues ʔaj ḡan wanal [...]
 ‘But Damadan still followed Mariam. And I said that she'd better take care of her
 daughter.’

(22) shows that pronoun *sunejni* is used with verb form *i-ra* ‘say’ which is the form of the 1SG and is glossed as go-LCT.

3.1.5. Pronominal usage

The pronominal stem in a logophoric function can be used as a free pronominal. This function can be observed in texts and implies coreference to some participant of the narrative but not the narrator. (23) and (24) demonstrate pronominal usage of pronominal stem:

- (23) [...] кудил итин бакъасиялла хIабалхуве дуъира кIван гIай **сари** [...]
 [...] *kudil itin baq'asijalla ḡabalhuwe duʔira kʷan ʔaj sari [...]*
 ‘Me too, I also waited [to see] what **she** would do.’

- (24) [...] нушашур патIи хIадирхъаре настолько ванал адами левре ахIмад. **сави**
 гъисагIат уръунихIев гва, бунагъуне дялдахъиле даргаб **сунела** [...]
 [...] *nišašur pat'i hadirqare hetcad nastol'ko wahal adami lewre aḡmad. sawi hisaʔat*
urʔuniḡew gʷa, bunahune daʕldaʕqile dargab sunela [...]
 ‘Ahmed would never leave Pati with us, he was a very evil man. **He** is in the better place
 now, and all **his** sins will be forgiven.’

3.2. Reflexivization

Local reflexives can be bound with the antecedent only inside the same clause and the emphatic suffix *-al* is obligatory [Kozhukhar 2013] (some of the forms are given in Table 4); while long-distance reflexives are separated from their antecedent across the clause boundary [Cole, Herman & Huang 2000].

(25) [Kozhukhar 2013]:

*расуйни сави витиб
 rasuj-ni sa<w>i w-it-ib
 rasul.OBL-ERG <M>self M-beat:PFV-AOR
 ‘Rasul beat himself.’

Mehweb shows logophoric uses not only in quotation contexts but also in non-finite complementation strategies (see section 3.1.2.) since some of the predicates of the mental experience allow non-finite complementation strategies. Since the finiteness of the subordinate clause cannot be the argument for or against the type of the function of the pronominal stem in Mehweb, this criterion should be eliminated from the list of the functions in Table 3.

Long-distance reflexives can occur in subordinate clauses in non-subject positions with coreference to the subject of the superordinate clause [Kozhukhar 2013]. This restriction on long-distance reflexives is also suggested in [Cole, Herman & Huang 2000].

3.2.1. Long-distance reflexives in subject position

Since logophoric function is possible only if the superordinate predicate has the meaning of a speech act or mental experience [Sells 1987], other types of predicates and other types of complementation strategies, e.g. purpose predication, use long-distant reflexives in subject position. (see examples (26) and (27)). Examples (26) and (27) show that infinitive complementation strategies and *-alis* complementation strategy are compatible with the bare pronominal form.

(26) *ʔAli-ni giḃ rasuj-s kʔalam sunej-ni ɣabar*
ʔali-ni g-ib rasuj-s q'alam sune-jni ɣabar
 ali-ERG give:PFV-AOR rasul-DAT pencil(ABS) SELF.OBL-ERG text
belkʔes
b-elk'-es
 N-write:PFV-INF
 ‘Ali gave Rasul a penil to have Ali write the text.’

(27) *гИалини гИб расуйс къалам сунейни хабар*
ʒali-ni g-ib rasuj-s q'alam sune-jni ʒabar
 ali-ERG give:PFV-AOR rasul-DAT pencil(ABS) SELF.OBL-ERG text
белкИалис
belk'-alis
 N-write:PFV-PURP
 Ali gave Rasul a pencil to have Ali write the text.

Some consultants allow the quotation converb *ile* in purpose predications. This compatibility questions the test using *ile* since this converb is optional and speaker dependent. (26) and (27) do not allow personal pronoun in the place of the pronominal stem, but all the non-finite complementation strategies disallow personal pronouns in the slot of the pronominal stem.¹⁵ The slot in the purpose predication can be occupied with intensifier:

(28) *гИалини гИб расуйс къалам сунейниял хабар*
ʒali-ni g-ib rasuj-s q'alam sune-jni-jal ʒabar
 ali-ERG give:PFV-AOR rasul-DAT pensil(ABS) SELF.OBL-ERG-EMPH text
белкИалис
belk'-alis
 N-write:PFV-PURP
 Ali gave Rasul a pencil to have Rasul write the text.

However, if an intensifier is used instead of bare pronominal stem *sa<CL>i* a shift of the empathy focus occurs which changes the antecedent of the intensifier. In this case, the pronominal stem takes its coreference from a non-subject argument of the superordinate clause.

3.4. Emphatic marker shift

As attested above emphatic marker change occurs in case when:

1. a sentence consists of two predications;
2. the subordinate clause contains pronominal stem *sa<CL>i* in subject position; and

¹⁵ *итис бакиб ну къам угъубле левдеи иле*
**it-i-s b-ak-ib nu q'am uhub-le le-w-deš [ile]*
 that-OBL-DAT N-think:PVF-AOR 1SG late become:PFV-AOR-CVB COP-M-NMLZ [say(CVB)]
 He_i thought that he_i was late.

3. a superordinate clause contains more than one argument that can serve as an antecedent of the pronominal stem, i.e. agree with the pronoun in person and number (cf. examples (5) and (6)), e.g. subject and indirect object.

If all the conditions are satisfied, then a bare pronominal stem takes its reference from the subject of the superordinate clause whereas pronominal stem with emphatic suffix takes its reference from another argument of the superordinate clause. These rules apply to all the complementation strategies and all predicates of the superordinate clause which allow a second argument or adjunct as a potential antecedent. If the superordinate clause lacks other argument or if the arguments of the superordinate clause do not agree with the pronominal stem in person and number, indexical shift does not occur.

- (29) *гАлини гиб расуйс къалам сунейни хабар белкАлис*
ʔali-ni g-ib rasuj-s q'alam sune-jni xabar b-elk'-alis
 ali-ERG give:PFV-AOR rasul-DAT pencil SELF.OBL-ERG text N-write:PFV-PURP
 Ali gave Rasul a pencil to have Ali write the text.

- (30) *гАлини гиб расуйс къалам сунейниял хабар*
ʔali-ni g-ib rasuj-s q'alam sune-jni-jal xabar
 ali-ERG give:PFV-AOR rasul-DAT pencil(ABS) SELF.OBL-ERG-EMPH text
белкАлис
belk'-alis
 N-write:PFV-PURP
 Ali gave Rasul a pencil to have Rasul write the text.

- (31) *гАлини иб расуйзе сунейни ежа асура*
ʔali-ni ib rasuj-ze sune-jni eʒa asi-ra
 ali-ERG say(AOR) rasul-INTER(LAT) SELF.OBL goat(ABS) buy:PFV-LCT
 Ali_y said that Rasul_i said that he_{*i/y} had bought a goat.

- (32) *гАлини иб расуйзе сунейниял ежа асура*
ʔali-ni ib rasuj-ze sune-jni-jal eʒa asi-ra
 ali-ERG say(AOR) rasul-INTER(LAT) SELF.OBL-ERG-EMPH goat(ABS) buy:PFV-LCT
 Ali_y said that Rasul_i said that he_{i/*y} had bought a goat.

This phenomenon can be explained by introducing a zero pronoun which is non-subject-oriented. This explanation is supported by the fact that the reference of the bare pronominal stem with an intensifier, *sunejni sunejnijal*, is always subject-oriented except for cases when the nearest subject does not agree in person and/or number with the pronominal stem. Moreover, the intensifier cannot take its reference from an argument outside the clause, thus there has to be special tool to express the coreference between the non-subject argument of the main clause and an intensifier inside the subordinate clause. Example (33) shows that the bare pronominal stem with an intensifier is subject oriented:

- (33) *ʒAli-ni ub rasuʒze sunejni sunejnijal*
ʒali-ni ib rasuʒ-ze sunej-ni sune-jni-jal
 ali-ERG say(AOR) rasul-INTER(LAT) SELF.OBL-ERG SELF.OBL-ERG-EMPH
ежа асура
ежа аси-ра
 goat(ABS) buy:PFV-LCT
 Ali_y said that Rasul_i said that he_{*i/y} had bought a goat.

Another hypothesis could be that there is no omitted subject in the subordinate clause and intensifier, e.g. *sunejnijal* in example (32), serves as the real subject of the clause and takes as an antecedent the closest argument disregarding clause boundaries. However, there is no evidence that the subject can be replaced by an intensifier, and since Mehweb is a pro-drop language (see example (5) in section 3.1.1.) it is more likely that subject is dropped rather than eliminated in the contexts where an intensifier takes the place of the subject of the clause:

- (34) *сунезел расул зуб*
sune-ze-l rasul g-ub
 SELF.OBL-INTER(LAT)-EMPH rasul see.PFV-AOR
 He saw Rasul.

- (35) *ʒAli-ze sunezel rasul зуб*
ʒali-ze sune-ze-l rasul g-ub
 Ali-INTER(LAT) SELF.OBL-INTER(LAT)-EMPH rasul see.PFV-AOR
 Ali himself saw Rasul.

3.5. Functional overview

This section represents an analysis of the examples stated in the paper. Table 7 defines the syntactic positions that can be occupied by pronominal stem in each function.

Table 7. Syntactic position pronominal stem *sa<CL>i* can occupy

syntactic position	log. pron.	local refl	distant refl	intensifier
S of the main clause	!(+)	(-)	(-)	(+)
DO of the main clause	!(+)	(+)	(-)	(+)
IO of the main clause	!(+)	(+)	(-)	(+)
S of the subordinate clause	(+)	(-)	(+)	(+)
DO of the subordinate clause	!(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)
IO of the subordinate clause	!(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)

sa<CL>i as a logophoric pronoun can occupy all the positions listed in Table 7 but all of them except the subject of the subordinate clause are possible only in narrative regime (see section 3.1.4). All the position of the logophoric pronoun marked with the exclamation mark are possible only in narrative regime. Pronominal stem as a local reflexive can occupy all the positions listed except subject of the main clause, since it violates Principle C of the Binding Theory, and is ungrammatical in Mehweb [Kozhukhar 2013]. Local reflexive can take non-subject positions of the arguments of the subordinate clause only if its antecedent is inside the same subordinate clause. Long-distant reflexive cannot occupy any syntactic position inside main clause, but is allowed in all syntactic positions in the subordinate clause (see examples (19) and (20) and [Kozhukhar 2013]). Intensifier can be bound only inside the clause but can occupy all possible syntactic positions. Example (26) and similar show that the intensifier in the subordinate clause, presumably, have a slot for a true subject of the subordinate clause; in other words, there is an antecedent of the intensifier inside the subordinate clause (see example (5)).

Table 8 shows all possible syntactic positions of the antecedent of each pronominal function.

Table 8. Syntactic position of the possible antecedent of the pronominal stem

syntactic position	logophor	local refl	distant refl	intensifier
S of the main clause	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)
DO of the main clause	(X)	(+)	(-)	(+)
IO of the main clause	(+)	(+)	(-)	(+)
Outside the sentence	(+)	(-)	(-)	(?)

Logophor cannot take its reference from the direct object of the main clause since there are no predicates of speech act or mental experience that code its addressee of the source of information as a direct object in Mehweb. Local reflexive can take its reference only inside the clause it is placed in. Long-distant reflexive can be coreferential only to the subject of the main clause. Intensifier can be bound only inside its clause.

Table 9 shows how Mehweb data correlate with characteristics driven in Table 3.

Table 9. Characteristics of the logophors and long-distance reflexives in Mehweb

	Logophor	Example	Long-distance reflexive	Example
Subject orientation	not obligatory	(4), (5)	obligatory	(22)
Finiteness of the subordinate clause	not obligatory	(10), (12)	only non-finite subordinates	(22)
Monomorphemic structure	obligatory	Table 4	obligatory	Table 4
Subject position in the subordinate clause	obligatory	Scheme 1 (see also [Kozhukhar 2014])	not obligatory	(36) (see also [Kozhukhar 2013])

Scheme 1 demonstrates all the positions that can be occupied by the logophoric pronoun, anaphoric pronoun and morphologically complex reflexive (*sa<CL>i + -al*) according to [Kozhukhar 2014]:

Scheme 1. Universal hierarchy of reflexive positions in Mehweb

	DO _{DV}	DO _{TV}	IO _{OB}	IO _{OP}	NP _{INF}	NP _{FV}
MCR (e.g. <i>sawijal</i>)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(-)	(-)
Logophoric (e.g. <i>sawi</i>)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(+)	(+)
Anaphoric (e.g. <i>it</i>)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(+)

(36) shows that LDR can be used in non-subject position in subordinate clause:

(36) [Kozhukhar 2013]:

расуйс	дигуве	лев	адайзе	сави
<i>rasuj-s</i>	<i>dig-uwe</i>	<i>le-w</i>	<i>adaj-ze</i>	<i>sa<w>i</i>
rasul-dat	want:ipf-cvb	cop-m	father-inter(lat)	<m>self
<i>дяхИмицайхЛев</i>		<i>звес</i>		
<i>da^hmic'aj-ħe-w</i>		<i>g^w-es</i>		
mirror-in-m		see:pfv-inf		

‘Rasul wants his father to see him (*himself) in the mirror.’

4. Conclusion

Table 9 shows that the behavior of the pronominal stem in logophoric function differs from the reflexive function. According to Table 9 the following functions of the logophor and reflexive in Mehweb can be postulated to differentiate these two functions of the pronominal stem:

Logophor:

- Superordinate predicate is a verb of speech act or mental experience
- If the superordinate predicate means mental experience then subordinate clause can be non-finite
- Only subject position allowed
- Antecedent can be in non-subject position
- Changes empathy focus

Long-distance reflexive:

- Superordinate predicate does not mean speech act or mental experience if LDR occupies subject position
- Superordinate predicate means speech act or mental experience if LDR occupies non-subject position
- Only subject-oriented
- Can occupy all possible syntactic positions in the subordinate clause

Mehweb potentially can demonstrate a dedicated zero pronoun which is coreferent to the non-subject argument the superordinate clause. This zero pronoun can take slot of the logophoric pronoun and long-distant reflexive and always followed by an intensifier.

List of abbreviations

1 – first person

3 – third person

ABS – absolutive

AOR – aorist

CL – class marker

COMIT – comitative

COP – copula

CVB – converb

DAT – dative

EL – elative

EMPH – emphatic marker

ERG – ergative

F – feminine class

GEN – genitive

HPL – human plural

INTER – inter localization

LAT – lative

LCT – locutor

M – masculine class

NMLZ – nominalization

NOM – nominative

NPL – non-human plural

OBL – oblique

PFV – perfective

PL – plural

SELF – reflexive

SG – singular

References

- Kozhukhar 2014 – Kozhukhar A. A. *The pronoun sawi and its functions in Dargwa Mehweb* // Working papers by NRU HSE. Series WP BRP "Linguistics". 2014. No. 14.
- Kozhukhar, Baryl'nikova 2013 – Kozhukhar, Alexandra; Baryl'nikova, Daria. *Multilingualism in Daghestan*. In: Working papers by Izdatelski dom NIU VSHE. Series WP BRP 04/LIN/2013 "Linguistics", 2013.
- Moroz 2013 – Moroz, George. *Fonologija i fonetika konsonantnoi sistemy megebskogo jazyka v sopostavlenii s drugimi darginskimi idiomami*. In: Problemy jazyka: vzglyad molodych uchyonyh. Moscow.: The Institute of Linguistics, Russian Academy of Sciences, 2013.
- Kozhukhar 2013 – Kozhukhar A. A. *Reflexivnyje i Reciprocalnyje mestoimenija v megebskom jazyke* // In: Sbornik nauchnykh statej po materialam Vtoroj konferencii-shkoly «Problemy jazyka: vzglyad molodykh uchenykh», M. : Institut jazykoznanija RAN, 2013.
- Lander & Sumbatova 2014 – Lander Yu. A, Sumbatova N. R. *Darginskij govor seleniya Tanty: grammatičeskij očerok, voprosy sintaksisa*. M. : Jazyki slavjanskoj kul'tury, 2014.
- Clements 1972 – Clements, George N. (1975), *The Logophoric Pronoun in Ewe: Its Role in Discourse*, Journal of West African Languages 2: 141–177, 1972.
- Pica 1987 – Pica, P. *On the nature of reflexivization cycle*. // In J. McDonough and B. Plunkett (eds.), Proceeding of NELS 17, 483 – 499, GLSA, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- Testelets & Toldova 1997 – Toldova, Svetlana; Testelets, Jakov. *Reflexivnyje mestoimenija vdagestanskix jazykax i tipologija refleksiva*. In: Voprosy jazykoznanija, 4. Moscow, 1997.
- Sung 1990 – Cole, Peter, Gabriella Hermon and Li-May Sung. (1990). *Principles and parameters of long-distance reflexives*. Linguistic Inquiry 21, 1-22.
- Huang 1984 – Huang, C.-T. James. *Logical relations in Chinese and the Theory of Grammar*. PhD Dissertation, MIT. 1984.
- Sells 1987 – Sells, Peter. *Aspects of Logophoricity*, Linguistic Inquiry 18 (3): 445–479, 1987.
- Cole, Herman & Huang 2000 – Cole P., Herman G., Huang C.-T. *Syntax and Semantics 33: Long-Distance Reflexives*. New York: Academic Press.
- Magometov 1982 – Magometov, Alexander. *Megebskij dialect darginskogo jazyka*. Tbilisi, 1982.
- Nichols 2000 – Nichols, Johanna. 2000. *Long-Distance Reflexivization in Chechen and Ingush*. In Cole, P. et.al. (ed.), Long-Distance Reflexives. (Syntax and Semantics, vol. 33), 255-278.
- Toldova 1999 – Toldova, Svetlana. *Osobennosti mestoimennoj referencii pri peredache chuzhojrechi: mezhdur deixisom i anaphoraj*. In: Trudy mezhdunarodnoj konferencii Dialogue-1999. Moscow, 1999.

Alexandra A. Kozhukhar
National Research University Higher School of Economics (Moscow, Russia), Faculty of
Humanities, School of Linguistics;
E-mail: sasha.kozhukhar@gmail.com

**Any opinions or claims contained in this Working Paper do not necessarily
reflect the views of HSE.**

© Kozhukhar, 2015