

LOGOPHORIC PRONOUN *SAWI* AND ITS FUCTIONS IN DARGWA MEHWEB¹

1. Introduction	1
2. Logophor	2
1.1. Types of predicate	3
1.2. Ambiguity	4
3. Reflexive	5
3.1. Morphology.....	5
3.2. Syntax.....	6
3.3. Semantics.....	7
4. Intensifier.....	8
4.1. Bi-absolutive construction.....	9
5. Conclusion.....	9
6. References.....	10

1. Introduction

Mehweb is a one-village idiom that is spoken in the aul of the same name. Mehweb belongs to the Dargwa group of the Nakh-Daghestanian language family (East Caucasian) and spread only among residents of Mehweb and some neighboring villages (Obokh, Shangoda) [Kozhukhar, Barylnikova 2013] in Gunibski district of Republic of Daghestan. Mehwebs were separated from other Dargwa-speaking societies and had been residing among Avar- and Lak-speaking settlements for a significant period of time. Mehweb's high-level divergence from other Dargwa idioms caused by the territorial remoteness made some researches consider Mehweb as a separate language [Koryakov 2006]. According to the 2010 Census there are about 1000 of Mehweb native speakers today. Unfortunately, today the perspectives of Mehweb's preservation and transmission cannot be described as optimistic ones that is why it is crucial to capture all the typological features of the following idiom.

This paper is based on the data of the work of the previous year [Kozhukhar 2013] and language material gathered during the field trip to the village of Mehweb (Gunibski district, Republic of Daghestan) in May 2014². Following paper describes Mehweb pronominal system from other point of view that was introduced in [Kozhukhar 2013], e.g. [Kozhukhar 2013] describes reflexives as nuclear function of pronoun *sawi*, however this paper tends to claim that the nuclear function of this pronoun is logophor.

The objective of this paper was to show that Mehweb demonstrates logophoric function of pronoun *sawi* and create divaricate system of its pronominal usages. The principle tasks of the following paper were:

- a. to describe profoundly all the reflexive contexts where pronoun *sawi* is used;
- b. to show the difference between reflexive and intensifier contexts;
- c. to circumscribe the logophoric meaning of the pronoun *sawi*.

The following paper also deals with semantics of Mehweb reflexive (strict and sloppy readings) and includes some syntactic tests that can be held with the usage of intensifiers (bi-absolutive (bi-nominative) construction test).

¹ by Kozhukhar Alexandra. Student of Higher School of Economics, Faculty of Philology, Department of Fundamental and Applied Linguistics; E-mail: sasha.kozhukhar@gmail.com

² This study (research grant No 13-05-0007) was supported by The National Research University – 'Higher School of Economics' Academic Fund Program in 2013- 2014.

2. Logophor

In the majority of languages of the world there are special markers to define the empathy focus (for instance, Latin *ipsum*), point of view situation is described from, and some languages operate long-distant reflexives to express the change in empathy focus in the phrase [Kuno 1987]. Following characteristics can be applied to Mehweb as well (see example (2)). Two possible readings in English in sentence ‘Father said that he had made a mistake’³ can be consequently eliminated in Mehweb due to logophoric function of long-distant reflexive.

Example (1a) differs from example (1b) in the form of the verb in the subordinate clause. In (1a) *ɓamle wikib* ‘to make a mistake’ is third person singular and in (1b) *ɓamle wikira* is first person singular. Pronoun *nu* in the example (1) does not have a logophoric function and can be coreferential to subject of the main clause (e.g. father) and to the speaker depending on the verb form in subordinate clause. In example (2) long-distant reflexive pronoun *sawi* shows different behavior:

(1)	a.	адајни	иб	ну	гъамле	викиб	иле
		adaɟ-ni	ib	nu	ɓamle	w-ik-ib	ile
		father-ERG	say(AOR)	1SG.ABS	mistake(ABS)	M-do-AOR	say(CVB)
		‘father _i said that he _i had made a mistake’					
	b.	адајни	иб	ну	гъамле	викира	иле
		adaɟ-ni	ib	nu	ɓamle	w-ik-ra	ile
		father-ERG	say(AOR)	1SG.ABS	mistake(ABS)	M-do-1/2	say(CVB)
		‘Father said that I had made a mistake’					
(2)	a.	адајни	иб	сави	гъамле	викиб	иле
		adaɟ-ni	ib	sa<w>i	ɓamle	w-ik-ib	ile
		father-ERG	say(AOR)	<M>self(ABS)	mistake(ABS)	M-do-AOR	say(CVB)
		‘Father _i said that he _i had made a mistake’					
	b.	адајни	иб	сави	гъамле	викира	иле
		adaɟ-ni	ib	sa<w>i	ɓamle	w-ik-ra	ile
		father-ERG	say(AOR)	<M>self(ABS)	mistake(ABS)	M-do-1/2	say(CVB)
		‘Father _i said that he _i had made a mistake’					

In (2a) and (2b) the antecedent of pronoun *sawi* is always the subject of the main clause irrespective of the form of the verb. To show coreference to the third person of the discourse Mehwebs tend to use demonstrative pronoun which does not allow the verb in first person singular:

(3)	a.	адајни	иб	ит	гъамле	викиб	иле
		adaɟ-ni	ib	it	ɓamle	w-ik-ib	ile
		father-ERG	say(AOR)	3SG.ABS	mistake(ABS)	M-do-AOR	say(CVB)
		‘Father _i said that he _y had made a mistake’					
	b.	*адајни	иб	ит	гъамле	викира	иле
		*adaɟ-ni	ib	it	ɓamle	w-ik-ra	ile
		*father-ERG	say(AOR)	3SG.ABS	mistake(ABS)	M-do-1/2	say(CVB)
		‘Father _i said that he _y had made a mistake’					

Table 1 shows all the types of coreference that are possible in the context stated in (1) and (2):

Table 1. Combinations of pronoun and verb form according to their grammaticality

³ First – ‘Father_i said that he_i had made a mistake’; second – ‘Father said that someone third had made a mistake’

- (8) итис бикиб ну гъамле викиб (иле)
 it-i-s b-ik-ib nu kamle w-ik-ib (ile)
 3SG-OBL-DAT N-happen-AOR 1SG.ABS mistake(ABS) M-do-AOR (say(CVB))
 'He_i thought that I had made a mistake'

There is another narrow class of predicates, for example verb 'to be afraid' *uruχ k'es*, that can be easily treated as the second class of predicates (9), like verbs *bikes* 'to happen' or *es* 'to say', and also has its own strategy of treating pronouns (10):

- (9) a. ит урух к1уве лев сави гъамле викиб иле
 it uruχ.k'-uwe le-w sa<w>i kamle w-ik-ib ile
 3SG.ABS to.be.afraid-CVB AUX-M <M>self(ABS) mistake(ABS) M-do-1/2 say(CVB)
 'He is afraid that he made a mistake'

- b. ит урух к1уве лев ну гъамле викиб иле
 it uruχ.k'-uwe le-w nu kamle w-ik-ib ile
 3SG.ABS to.be.afraid-CVB AUX-M 1SG.ABS mistake(ABS) M-do-1/2 say(CVB)
 'He is afraid that I made a mistake'

- (10) ит урух к1уве лев сави (*ну) гъамле
 it uruχ.k'-uwe le-w sawi (*nu) kamle
 3SG.ABS to.be.afraid-CVB AUX-M <M>self(abs) (*1SG.ABS) mistake(ABS)
 викес (иле)
 w-ik-es (ile)
 M-do-INF (say(CVB))
 'He is afraid of making mistakes'

Table 2 shows three predicate patterns that are demonstrated in Mehweb:

Table 2. Anaphoric pronouns and types of predicate

Type of predicate	1SG	1SG + CVB	3SG	3SG + CVB
goal-predicate	*	*	*	*
speaking-predicate	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)
'to be afraid'-type	*	*	(+)	(+)

1.2. Ambiguity

There are two cases where logophoric pronoun can have two equivalent antecedents and in both cases informants give preference to the subject of the main clause: first context has subject and addressee of speech in the main clause and logophoric pronoun in the subordinate clause (11), second has verb that does not distinguish between first and third person in the subordinate clause (12):

- (11) расуйни иб мусазе сунейни ошибка
 rasuj-ni ib musa-ze sune-jni ošibka
 rasul+OBL-ERG say(AOR) musa-INTER(LAT) self+OBL-EGR mistake(ABS)
 бакъиб иле
 b-aq'-ib ile
 N-do:PF-AOR say(CVB)
 'Rasul_i said to Musa_y that he_{i/y} had made a mistake'

- (12) адайни иб наб усар1вас диган иле
 adaj-ni ib nab u-saʔ^w-as dig-an ile
 father-ERG say(AOR) 1SG.DAT M-sleep:IPF-INF want-HAB say(CVB)

‘Father_i said he_i/*I wanted to sleep’

All the informants asked said that *sunejni* in example (11) can refer to Rasul and Musa as well, although all of them said that interpretation with Rasul is more natural. Example (12) is ambiguous in different way – since the only factor that makes distinction between antecedents in case of *nu* usage is verb form and in example (12) verb in subordinate clause does not have person agreement *nu* gets two antecedents – subject of the matrix clause and a speaker. However, all the informants are eager to consider subject of the main the antecedent of *nu*.

3. Reflexive

As the majority of Gaghestanian languages [Testelets, Toldova 1998] Mehweb has morphologically complex (MCR) and morphologically simple reflexives (MSR) whose distribution is quiet rigid.

3.1. Morphology

MCR agrees by number, case, class and person with object of the predicate in the clause and coreferential in the majority of cases with the subject. MCR in its intensifier meaning agrees by number, case, class and person with the argument of the clause (S, DO or IO) whose role in the situation described need to be emphasized, e.g. intensifier is used as focus marker.

Morphological complexity of co-predicative reflexive is due to emphatic suffix *-al* which also appears on cardinal numerals [Magometov] and can be easily adjoined to nouns (as in (13a)) and pronouns (as in (6b)) in order to define them as focused:

- (13) a. ит дурсиличел x1улевизур
 it dursi-li-če-l ħule<w>iz-ur
 3SG.ABS girl-OBL-SUP(LAT)-EMPH <M>see:PF-AOR
 ‘He/She saw only this girl’
- b. урши итичел x1улевизур
 urši it-i-če-l ħule<w>iz-ur
 boy(ABS) 3SG-OBL-SUP(LAT)-EMPH <M>see:PF-AOR
 ‘The boy_i looked only at him_y/her_y’

In case where *-al* is adjoined to the stem that ends on the vowel in intervocalic position occurs an epenthesis *-j-* like in ergative form *sunejnijal* or absolutive form *sawijal* (see Table 1), if the vowel preceding epenthesis is labialized *-j-* changes into *-w-* as in comitative form *dičuwal* or absolutive form *nuwal* (see Table 3). Table 3 gives full paradigm of MCR:

Table 3. MCR paradigm

	ABS		ERG	DAT	GEN	COMIT
1SG	nu-wal		nu-ni-jal	nab-al	di-la-l	di-ču-wal
2SG	ħu-wal		ħu-ni-jal	ħad-al	ħu-la-l	ħa-ču-wal
3SG	M	sa<w>i-jal	sune-jni-jal	sune-s-al	sune-la-l	sune-ču-wal
	F/F1	sa<r>i-jal				
	N	sai-jal				
1PL	nuša-l		nuša-jni-jal	nušab-al	nuša-la-l	nuša-ču-wal
2PL	ħuša-l		ħuša-jni-jal	ħušab-al	ħuša-la-l	ħusa-ču-wal
3PL	HUM	sai-jal	ču-ni-jal	ču-s-al	ču-la-l	nuša-ču-wal
	NONHUM	sa<r>i-jal				

Unlike MCR MSR lack emphatic marker *-al*. Paradigm of MCR is shown in Table 4:

Table 4. MSR paradigm

	ABS		ERG	DAT	GEN	COMIT
1SG	nu		nu-ni	nab	di-la	di-ču
2SG	ħu		ħu-ni	ħad	ħu-la	ħa-ču
3SG	M	sa<w>i	sune-jni	sune-s	sune-la	sune-ču
	F/F1	sa<r>i				
	N	sai				
1PL	nuša		nuša-jni	nušab	nuša-la	nuša-ču
2PL	ħuša		ħuša-jni	ħušab	ħuša-la	ħusa-ču
3PL	HUM	sai	ču-ni	ču-s	ču-la	nuša-ču
	NONHUM	sa<r>i				

It is important to mention that the paradigm of homonymic 1PL and 2PL

is important to the MSR in 1SG, 2SG, to the

paradigm of anaphoric pronouns, like *you* or *we* in English. The only unique forms are 3SG and 3PL which also contributes to the fact that logophoric function is nuclear one since for the means of long-distance reflexives anaphoric pronouns can be used. The following idea can be consequently applied to the paradigm of MCR as the unique forms can be found only in 3SG and 3PL whereas others are the combination of anaphoric pronoun and emphatic marker.

Pronoun *sawi* can be used with intensifier that agrees by number, case, person and class with the subject of the sentence. The following combination of the same pronouns could be considered a compound reflexive like *sam sebya* in Russian, although the semantics of this construction demonstrates that *sunejnial sawial* in the sentence does not behave as a solitary construction since intensifier topicalizes the subject whereas reflexive shows that object and subject of the clause are coreferential:

- (14) расуйзе сунезел савиял гуъ
 rasuj-ze sune-ze-l sa<w>i-jal gu-b
 rasul+OBL-INTER(LAT) self+OBL-INTER(LAT)-EMPH<M>self(ABS)-EMPH see:PF-AOR
 ‘Rasuli himselfi saw himselfi’

3.2. Syntax

MCR is used in co-predicative (coargument) reflexivization position, e.g. inside one clause as in (15):

- (15) a. расул сунечел х1улевизур
 rasul sune-če-l ħule<w>iz-ur
 rasul(ABS) self+OBL-SUP(LAT)-EMPH <M>see:PF-AOR
- b. *расул сунече х1улевизур
 *расул sune-če ħule<w>iz-ur
 *расул(ABS) self+OBL-SUP(LAT) <M>see:PF-AOR
 ‘Rasuli saw himselfi’

MCR can be present in subordinate clause when its antecedent is located in the same subordinate clause:

(16)	расуйс	дигуве	леб	адай
	rasuj-s	dig-uwe	le-b	adaj
	rasul+OBL-DAT	want:IPF-CVB	AUX-N	father(ABS)
	сунечел	х1улевизес		
	sune-če-l	ħule<w>iz-es		
	self+OBL-SUP(LAT)-EMPH	<M>see:PFV-INF		
	'Rasul _i wants his father _y to see himself _{y/i} '			

MSR is used in long-distant reflexivization position, e.g. when antecedent is in the main clause and reflexive is in subordinate clause⁵ like in (17):

(17)	a.	расуйс	дигуве	леб	адай	сунече
		rasuj-s	dig-uwe	le-b	adaj	sune-če
		rasul+OBL-DAT	want:IPF-CVB	AUX-N	father(ABS)	self+OBL-SUP(LAT)
		х1улевизес				
		ħule<w>iz-es				
		<M>see:PFV-INF				
	b.	*расуйс	дигуве	леб	адай	
		*rasuj-s	dig-uwe	le-b	adaj	
		*rasul+OBL-DAT	want:IPF-CVB	AUX-N	father(ABS)	
		сунечел				
		sune-če-l				
		self+OBL-SUP(LAT)-EMPH				
		<M>see:PFV-INF				
		'Rasul _i wants his father _y to see himself _{i/y} '				

3.3. Semantics

Morphologically complex reflexive always gets sloppy identity what is mainly caused by its distribution:

(18)	расуйни	сунелал	хьунул	ардукиб
	rasuj-ni	sune-la-l	xunul	ar-<d>uk-ib
	rasul+OBL-ERG	self+OBL-GEN-EMPH	wife(ABS)	<F>LOC-steal:PF-AOR
	мухамadiniра	илваънал		
	muḥamad-i-ni-ra	ilwaʔn-al		
	muhammad-OBL-ERG-ADD	same.way-EMPH		
	'Rasul stole his wife, and Muhammad too'			

Example (18) can be interpreted only as Rasul_i stole his_{i/y} wife and Muhammad_y stole his_{y/i}. Morphologically complex reflexive always gets bound reading irrespective of syntactic role of its antecedent (21) or whether antecedent NP is quantified or not:

⁵ Cases where reflexive is in subordinate clause and its antecedent is in main clause were considered ungrammatical or referred to non-coreferential usage of reflexive.

- (19) патИматини г1ализе сунесал (*сунес)
pat'imat-i-ni ʔali-ze sune-s-al (*sune-s)
fatima-OBL-ERG ali-INTER(LAT) self+OBL-DAT-EMPH (*self+OBL-DAT)
машина асахъиб
mashina as-aq-ib
car(ABS) buy:PF-CAUS-AOR
'Fatima_i made Ali_y to buy herself/himself_{i/y} a car'
- (20) гъарил адайни уршилизе сунесал
har-il adaj-ni urši-li-ze sune-s-al
every-ATR father-ERG son-OBL-INTER(LAT) self+OBL-DAT-EMPH
(*сунес) машина асахъиб
(*sune-s) mashina as-aq-ib
(*self+OBL-DAT) car(ABS) buy:PF-CAUS-AOR
'[Every father]_i made his son_y to buy himself_{i/y} a car'
- (21) адайни гъарил уршилизе сунесал
adaj-ni har-il urši-li-ze sune-s-al
father-ERG every-ATR son-OBL-INTER(LAT) self+OBL-DAT-EMPH
(*сунес) машина асахъиб
(*sune-s) mashina as-aq-ib
(*self+OBL-DAT) car(ABS) buy:PF-CAUS-AOR
'Father_i made [every son]_y to buy himself_{i/y} a car'

Mehweb does not have analogs of compound reflexives like Russian *sam sebya*, or German *sich selbst* but Mehwebs tend to use complex forms consisting of intensifier and morphologically complex reflexive. Such a combination gets only bound reading:

- (22) расуйзе сунезел савиял
rasuj-ze sune-ze-l sa<w>i-jal
rasul+OBL-INTER(LAT) sune+OBL-INTER(LAT)-EMPH <M>self(ABS)-EMPH
дах1миц1айх1ев губ
daħmic'aj-ħe-w gu-b
mirror-IN-LOC see:PF-AOR
'Rasul saw himself in the mirror'

4. Intensifier

Pronoun *sawi* in its intensifier meaning agrees by number, case, class and person with the argument of the clause (S (23), DO (24) or IO (25)) whose role in the situation described need to be emphasized, e.g. intensifier is used as focus marker:

- (23) итини сунейниял деркун хинч1е
it-i-ni sune-jni-jal d-erk-un χinč'-e
3SG-OBL-ERG self+OBL-ERG-EMPH F-eat:PF-AOR khinkal-PL(ABS)
'He/She ate the khinkals himself/herself'
- (24) расул сунечел мух1амадиче х1улевизур
rasul sune-če-l muħamad-i-če ħule<w>iz-ur
rasul(ABS) self+OBL-SUP(LAT)-EMPH muhammad-OBL-SUP(LAT) <M>see:PF-AOR
'Rasul_i saw Muhammad_y himself_{y/i}'
- (25) расуйни сунесал мух1амадис ежа асиб
rasuj-ni sune-s-al muħamad-i-s eža as-ib
rasul+OBL-ERG self+OBL-DAT-EMPH muhammad-OBL-SUP(LAT) goat(ABS) buy:PF-AOR

'Rasul bought Muhammad_y himself_{y/i} a goat'

Table 5 shows full paradigm of intensifiers in Mehweb:

Table 5. Paradigm of Mehweb intensifiers

		ERG	NOM	DAT	INTER-LAT	SUP-LAT
3SG	M	sune-jni-jal	sa<w>i-jal	sune-s-al	sune-ze-l	sune-če-l
	F/F1	sune-jni-jal	sa<r>i-jal	sune-s-al	sune-ze-l	sune-če-l
	N	sune-jni-jal	sai-jal	sune-s-al	sune-ze-l	sune-če-l
3PL	HUM	ču-ni-jal	sa<r>i-jal	ču-s-al	ču-ze-l	ču-če-l
	NONHUM	ču-ni-jal	sai-jal	ču-s-al	ču-ze-l	ču-če-l

4.1. Bi-absolutive construction

Intensifiers can be used as a test on bi-absolutive (bi-nominative) construction. However, Mehweb demonstrates only one type of bi-absolutive construction (26b):

- (26) a. расуйни сунейниял кунг лучлуве леб / *лев
 rasuj-ni sune-jni-jal kund luč'-uwe le-b / *le-w
 rasul+OBL-ERG self+OBL-ERG-EMPH book(ABS) read-CVB AUX-N / *AUX-M
- b. *расуйни савиял кунг лучлуве леб / лев
 *rasuj-ni sa<w>i-jal kund luč'-uwe le-b / le-w
 *rasul+OBL-ERG <M>self-EMPH book(ABS) read-CVB AUX-N / AUX-M
- c. *расул сунейниял кунг лучлуве леб / леб
 *rasul sune-jni-jal kund luč'-uwe le-w / le-b
 *rasul(ABS) self+OBL-ERG-EMPH book(ABS) read-CVB AUX-N / AUX-M
- d. расул савиял кунг лучлуве леб / *леб
 rasul sa<w>i-jal kund luč'-uwe le-w / *le-b
 rasul(ABS) <M>self-EMPH book(ABS) read-CVB AUX-M / *AUX-N
- 'Rasul himself reads a book'

5. Conclusion

Since the system of Mehweb pronouns was not described profoundly in previous works ([Khajdakov 1985], [Magometov 1982]) following research introduces multilayer description of one of the aspects of Mehweb pronoun system. Material gained during 2014 field trip (and 2013 as well) to Daghestan can be used not only in interlingual comparison in synchronism but in diachronic description of Caucasian languages.

6. References

Khajdakov S.M. Darginskij i megebskij yazyki: Printsypy slovoizmenenija. Makhachkala, 1985.

Kiparsky, P. 2002. Disjoint reference and the typology of pronouns. In *More than Words*, eds. Ingrid Kaufmann and Barbara Stiebels, 179-226. Berlin: Akademie Verlag. URL: <http://www.stanford.edu/~kiparsky/Papers/anaph.hierarchies-t.pdf>

Kozhukhar A.A. Refleksivnyje i retsyprokalnyje mestoimenija v megebskom yazyke // «Problemy yazyka: vzglyad molodych uchyonych». Moscow.: The Institute of Linguistics, Russian Academy of Sciences 2013.

Magometov A.A. Megebskij dialect darginskogo yazyka. Tbilisi, 1982.

Testelets Ya.G., Toldova S.Yu. Refleksivnyje mestoimenija v dagestanskich yazykach i tipologija refleksiva. // *Voprosy yazykoznanija*. 1998. №4. C. 35-57.

Kozhukhar A. A., Barylnikova D. Multilingualism in Daghestan / Working papers by Izdatelski dom NIU VSHE. Series WP BRP 04/LIN/2013 "Linguistics". 2013.

Kuno S. *Functional Syntax: Anaphora, Discourse, and Empathy*. Chicago, 1987.

Koryakov Yu. B. *Atlas kavkazskich yazykov*. 2006