

Minimal pronouns, logophoricity and long-distance reflexivisation in Avar^{*}

Pavel Rudnev

Revised version; 28th January 2015

Abstract

This paper discusses two morphologically related anaphoric pronouns in Avar (Avar-Andic, Nakh-Daghestanian) and proposes that one of them should be treated as a minimal pronoun that receives its interpretation from a λ -operator situated on a phasal head whereas the other is a logophoric pronoun denoting the author of the reported event.

Keywords: reflexivity, logophoricity, binding, syntax, semantics, Avar

1 Introduction

This paper has two aims. One is to make a descriptive contribution to the crosslinguistic study of long-distance anaphoric dependencies by presenting an overview of the properties of two kinds of reflexive pronoun in Avar, a Nakh-Daghestanian language spoken natively by about 700,000 people mostly living in the North East Caucasian republic of Daghestan in the Russian Federation. The other goal is to highlight the relevance of the newly introduced data from an understudied language to the theoretical debate on the nature of reflexivity, long-distance anaphora and logophoricity.

The issue at the heart of this paper is the unusual character of the anaphoric system in Avar, which is tripartite. (1) is intended as just a preview with more

^{*}The present material was presented at the Utrecht workshop *The World of Reflexives* in August 2011. I am grateful to the workshop's audience and participants for their questions and comments. I am indebted to Eric Reuland and an anonymous reviewer for providing valuable feedback on the first draft, as well as to Yakov Testelefs for numerous discussions of anaphora-related issues in Avar spanning several years. Last but not least, I use this occasion to thank Ali Magomedov, Aminat Eldarova, Abidat Radzhabova, Patimat Makhmudova and Magomedamin Magomedov for providing me with more data than can be done justice to in so modest a contribution as the present one.

detailed descriptions to be developed in the coming sections.^{1,2}

- (1) a. maḥmud bož- ula [žiw lik'aw či w-uk'-in- al- da]
 Mahmud believe-PRS self.ABS good.M man.ABS M-be- MSD-OBL-LOC
 'Mahmud₁ believes he_{1/*2} is a good man.' (simplex; long-distance)
- b. ebelalda b-ix- ana [malikica žindiego ruq' b-a- l- e- b]
 Mother.LOC N-see-PST Malik.ERG self.DAT house.ABS N-build-PRS-PTCP-N
 'Mother₁ saw Malik₂ build her₁/himself₂ a house.'
 (complex; local and long-distance)
- c. ʕalica žincago žiwgo č'w-ana
 Ali.ERG self.ERG self.ABS kill- PST
 'Ali killed himself.' (reduplicated; only local)

It can be seen from the three examples above that these pronouns have an overlapping distribution in that the complex reflexive *žiwgo* allows both local and long-distance uses, there already being a dedicated pronoun to fulfil either function. It is my intention, therefore, to determine, by the application of some of the well-established tests, whether the distribution is as it seems. Anticipating the outcome of those tests, we shall see that the distributional overlap is much smaller than it would appear. Finally, I develop a tentative analysis of the two non-local reflexives within the framework of [Kratzer \(2009\)](#).

1.1 Preliminaries on Avar

Descriptively speaking, Avar is a robustly head-final language with SOV as the base word order. It is morphologically ergative with no evidence of splits, and displays a great flexibility of word order. With respect to clausal embedding, non-finite complementation strategies prevail, and adjunct clauses are realised by a highly articulated class of converbial clauses.

1. The romanisation I adopt here differs very slightly from that in [Yamada \(2013\)](#). To avoid confusion, the Roman-to-Cyrillic correspondences are as follows, where the apostrophe represents ejectives: a = a, б = b, в = w, г = g, гъ = ʁ, гь = h, гл = ʕ, д = d, е = e, ж = ž, з = z, и = i, й = j, к = k, къ = q', кь = ʔ, кл = k', л = l, лъ = ʎ, м = m, н = n, о = o, п = p, р = r, с = s, т = t, тл = t', у = u, ф = f, х = χ, хъ = q, хь = x, хл = h, ц = c, цл = c', ч = č, чл = č', ш = š, шц = šš, э = e, ю = ju, я = ja, ь = ʔ.

The romanisation above is similar to the orthography of Standard Avar in not making a distinction between the lateral affricate, and the lateral fricative, which itself can be strong and weak, all of which are standardly written as *лъ*, or *l* in the system adopted here. Yakov Testelefs (p.c.) notes, however, that these distinctions have neutralised in most dialects. Finally, such processes as glide formation are only rendered in those cases where they are reflected orthographically in the original spelling.

2. The present paper uses the following abbreviations in glosses: 1 = First person, ABL = ablative, ABS = absolutive, ACC = accusative, CAUS = causative, CM = class marker, CNJ = conjunction, COMP = complementizer, CVB = converb, DAT = dative, ERG = ergative, F = feminine, FUT = future, GEN = genitive, INESS = inessive, INF = infinitive, LOC = locative, LOG = logophoric, M = masculine, MSD = masdar, N = neuter, NEG = negative, NOM = nominative, OBL = oblique, PFV = perfective, PL = plural, PRS = present, PST = past, PTCP = participle, Q = question particle, SG = singular, TOP = topic.

1.2 Avar pronouns

Avar reflexives are instantiated by three morphologically related pronouns: the simplex reflexive *ži-CM*, the complex reflexive *ži-CM=go*, and the reduplicated form of the latter, *žinca=go ži-CM=go*.³ All of these pronouns inflect for noun class, number and case, and as it is fairly obvious that they are all morphological derivatives of *ži-CM*, it is the declension paradigm of this particular pronoun that I give in (2) below.⁴

(2) *žiw* in core cases

	Singular	Plural
Abs	ži-CM ⁵	žal
Erg	žinca	žideca
Gen	žindir	žider
Dat	žindie	židee
Loc	žinda	žideda

Before proceeding to describe the behaviour of the three types of reflexive pronouns introduced above, a brief note on their distribution is in order. The reduplicated anaphor *žincago žiwgo* must be bound by a very local (coargument) antecedent; the complex reflexive *žiwgo* may be bound by both a local and a non-local antecedent, but only across a *non-finite* clause boundary. The simplex reflexive *žiw*, on the other hand, only allows long-distance uses and can be separated from its antecedent across a non-finite and a finite clause boundary. As the behaviour of *žincago žiwgo* is rather typical of complex reflexives and conforms to Principle A of the binding theory, in the rest of this paper I confine my attention to the remaining anaphors.

3. I follow [Testelefs & Toldova \(1998\)](#) in using *reflexive* to refer to all three pronouns in question, even though their uses need not be purely reflexive. I therefore do not adopt the partition of various anaphoric elements into anaphors, pronominals and R-expressions characteristic of the classical binding theory. Nor is every *pronoun* synonymous with *pronominal* and therefore subject to Principle B but is rather intended to be a cover term for the anaphors and pronominals of the binding theory as well as logophors and intensifiers. In §3, however, I depart from *žiw*'s traditional description as a reflexive by including it in the class of logophors attested in a variety of languages.

4. In addition to cases listed in (2) Avar possesses a significant number of derivative cases (apudessive, subessive, inessive, allative, apudlative, sublative, inlative, elative, apudelative, subelative, inelative) used to express various spatial relations. Some of these have recently received an explicit formal treatment in [Pantcheva \(2011\)](#).

5. For ease of reference, in what follows I will ignore the gender features on the reflexive where irrelevant and simply use the singular masculine absolutive form *žiw* (as well as *žiwgo* and *žincago žiwgo*).

2 *žiwo* and *ži* under a microscope

2.1 *žiwo*

As already mentioned, *žiwo* can be bound both locally (3), and at longer distances. To be more precise, (3a) illustrates the reflexive pronoun in the position of the direct object, (3b) does the same for the indirect object, the antecedent in both cases being the subject.

- (3) a. *ʃalica (ʒincago) žiwo č'w-ana*
 Ali.ERG self.ERG self.ABS kill-PST
 'Ali killed himself.'
- b. *ʃalica žindiego ruq' b-a- l- e- b b-ugo*
 Ali.ERG self.DAT house.ABS N-build-PRS-PTCP-N N-be.PRS
 'Ali is building himself a house.'

Similarly, *žiwo* can be bound across a PP boundary, just like in English.⁶

- (4) *wasasda žindago ask'o-b tumank' b-ix- ana*
 boy.LOC self.LOC near- N rifle.ABS N-see-PST
 'The boy saw a rifle near himself.'

Even though all sentences above have involved an anaphoric dependency between *žiwo* and an antecedent in subject position, *žiwo* itself is not subject-oriented: in (5) the antecedent of the reflexive is the oblique object of the causative verb.

- (5) *dibiras pat'imatida suratalda žijgo j-ix- iza- j-una*
 Dibir.ERG Patimat.LOC picture.LOC self.F:ABS F-see-CAUS-F-PST
 'Dibir showed Patimat₁ herself₁ on the picture.'

An important restriction on reflexive binding in Avar is that the binding cannot proceed "upwards": the reflexive cannot appear in a structurally superior position with respect to its antecedent, however structural superiority is defined. Put differently, reflexive binding obeys the general c-command requirement on binding dependencies (Reinhart 1983), as (6) demonstrates.

- (6) a. **žincago dir hudul č'w-ana*
 self.ERG my friend.ABS kill-PST
 ('My friend killed himself.')
- b. **žincago rasulie ruq' b-ale- b b-ugo*
 self.ERG Rasul.DAT house.ABS N-build.PRS.PTCP-N N-be.PRS
 ('Rasul is building himself a house.')

This observation is true regardless of the order in which the constituents follow: although there is a slight preference for anaphora over cataphora in Avar, the latter

6. Unlike English, however, the option of using a 3rd person pronoun in the same domain is unavailable in Avar, which can probably be attributed to the fact that the language has no specialised 3rd person pronouns with demonstratives being used in their stead.

alone can by no means serve as a decisive factor in ruling out certain structures as ungrammatical.

- (7) *žiwo* č'w-ana ʔalica
 self.M:ABS kill-PST Ali.ERG
 'Ali killed himself.'

It is fairly obvious that the cataphoric (7) corresponds to (3a) with the VP containing the reflexive “scrambled” to the left of the subject, which is also the reflexive’s antecedent, yet the sentence is perfectly fine. We can therefore rule out cataphora as being implicated in the ungrammaticality of (6) and attribute it to the hierarchical factors instead.

In sentences involving local reflexivisation the reflexive pronoun can be semantically interpreted as a bound variable:

- (8) *kinazego* *žalgo* r- oʔ- ula
 every.DAT self.PL:ABS PL-love-PRS
 'Everyone loves themselves.'

As argued at length by [Reinhart \(1983\)](#), [Büring \(2005\)](#), reflexive pronouns not only can be interpreted as bound variables when locally bound, but actually prefer to do so. It appears that this generalisation holds of *žiwo* as well, as evidenced by the obligatory sloppy readings in elliptical contexts:

- (9) *insuda* *žiwo* *mat'ujaŋu-* w w-ix- ana, *hedingo* *wasasda=gi*
 father.LOC self.M:ABS mirror.INESS-M M-see-PST also son.LOC= CNJ
 'Father saw himself in the mirror, and his son did too.'
 = the son saw himself in the mirror
 ≠ the son saw the father in the mirror

The only available interpretation of the elliptical continuation in (9) is the one under which the son sees himself in the mirror, and the intuition is very robust across the speakers and structural relations between the anaphor and its antecedent. Put differently, the interpretive effects seen in (9) are also observed in both coargument and non-coargument anaphoric configurations, as well as with possessive reflexivisation.⁷ I thus take this behaviour as evidence of *žiwo* being always semantically bound irrespective of the status of its antecedent, even if that antecedent is itself referential.

Having established the semantic interpretation of local anaphoric dependencies involving *žiwo*, we can answer the question if these interpretive properties manifest themselves in long-distance anaphoric dependencies too.

It is often taken to be the case that Avar *žiwo* and its counterparts in other Nakh-Daghestanian languages can be long-distance bound by an antecedent within a non-finite CP, as well as one across a non-finite CP boundary. Given the recent proposals as to how the locality restrictions the binding of reflexives or pronominals

7. Exactly the same behaviour with respect to semantic interpretation characterises the reduplicated version of *žiwo*. It appears, therefore, that the only difference between *žiwo* and *žiwo žincago* concerns the binding domain, which for the latter is very small, probably no bigger than vP.

might be reduced to the independently motivated notion of *phases* (Hicks 2009, Sundaresan 2012), the two kinds of configuration seem to be distinct.

The first case of relevance for my purposes involves an anaphoric relation between a reflexive pronoun inside an embedded clause and an antecedent outside it, a prototypical instance of long-distance reflexive binding. Although (10) below illustrates this very relation to be established between *žiwgo* in the position of the applicative argument of *CM-aze* ‘build’ and the experiencer subject of the matrix verb, the very same pattern holds for reflexives in the direct object position of the embedded verb. Observe that the embedded clause is non-finite and has its own overt subject, a state of affairs that is very typical for the Caucasian languages.

- (10) ebelalda b-ix- ana [malikica žindiego ruq’ b-ale- b]
 mother.LOC N-see-PST Malik.ERG self.DAT house.ABS N-build.PRS.PTCP-N
 ‘Mother₁ saw Malik₂ building her₁/himself₂ a house’

As it stands, the sentence in (10) is ambiguous, because in addition to the matrix subject, that of the embedded clause can function as the antecedent of the reflexive, somewhat similarly to *ziji* in Mandarin Chinese; anaphoric binding of *žiwgo*, therefore, is not constrained by minimality (cf. Volkova 2014 for similar observations in a number of Uralic languages).⁸ In its long-distance uses *žiwgo* can quite unproblematically be bound by a quantificational antecedent (11), thus raising the question whether these bound-variable interpretations are obligatory or merely optional.

- (11) kinazdago b-ix- ana χadižatica žideego čaj t’ole- b
 everyone.LOC N-see-PST Khadizhat.ERG self.PL:DAT tea.ABS pour.PRS.PTCP-N
 ‘Everyone saw Khadizhat pour them some tea.’

That Avar speakers uniformly prefer sloppy readings of *žiwgo* in elliptical environments (12) points to the conclusion that even in long-distance anaphoric dependencies this pronoun is interpreted as semantically bound:

8. A crucial difference between long-distance reflexivisation in Avar and Chinese is that there are no blocking effects in the former language of the kind observed in the latter (contrast (ia) from Chinese with (ii) from Avar).

- (i) a. Zhangsan renwei Lisi zhidao Wangwu zihuan ziji
 Zhangsan think Lisi know Wangwu love self
 ‘Zhangsan₁ thinks that Lisi₂ knows that Wangwu₃ loves himself₃/him_{1/2}’
 b. Zhangsan renwei wo zhidao Wangwu zihuan ziji
 Zhangsan think I know Wangwu love self
 ‘Zhangsan₁ thinks that I know that Wangwu₂ loves himself₂/*him₁’ (Cole et al. 2001)
- (ii) ebelalda b-ix- ana [dica žindiego ruq’ b-ale- b]
 mother.LOC N-see-PST 1SG:ERG self.DAT house.ABS N-build.PRS.PTCP-N
 ‘Mother saw me building her a house.’

- (12) pat'imatie b-ol'- ana χadižatica žindiego čaj t'ura- b-li,
 Patimat.DAT N-like-PST Khadizhat.ERG self.DAT tea.ABS pour.PST.PTCP-N-MSD
 hedingo muradie= gi
 same Murad.DAT=CNJ
 'Patimat liked it that Khadizhat poured her(self) some tea, and so did Murad.'
 = Murad liked it that Khadizhat poured herself some tea
 = Murad liked it that Khadizhat poured him some tea
 ≠ Murad liked it that Khadizhat poured Patimat some tea

Because the reflexive in (12) can be bound by two noun phrases, two bound-variable interpretations are available: a local one, whereby the anaphor in the ellipsis site covaries with the subject of the embedded clause, and a long-distance one involving covariation with the matrix subject; crucially, the strict reading, where the reflexive in the ellipsis site corefers with the matrix subject of the antecedent clause, is unavailable.

The second anaphoric relation, that is one between a reflexive pronoun in a position at the left edge of the embedded clause and an antecedent in a higher clause, can hardly be considered properly long-distance. To see why this is so, let us consider (13):

- (13) untarase b-ol'- ana [žindago raład b-ix- ize] hedingo toxturase= gi
 sick.DAT N-want-PST self.LOC sea.ABS N-see-INF same doctor.DAT=CNJ
 'The patient wanted to see the sea, and the doctor did too.'
 = the doctor wanted to see the sea
 ≠ the doctor wanted the patient to see the sea

Although the reflexive and its antecedent in (13) above belong to two different chunks of the syntactic derivation, their relation can well be construed of as sufficiently local, and given the notion of the *edge* of a phase (Chomsky 2001), particularly so. Now, as far as the interpretation of the ellipsis site is concerned, we again see that only the bound-variable interpretation of the reflexive is available.

Recall that, as shown in (6) on p. 4, local instances of *žiwgo* could not be bound by an antecedent lower than themselves in the structure. Rather unsurprisingly, the same constraint holds at longer distances, as (14) makes clear.

- (14) *žindago b-ix- ana [χadižatica pat'imatie čaj t'ole- b]
 self.LOC N-see-PST Khadizhat.ERG Patimat.DAT tea.ABS pour.PRS.PTCP-N
 ('Patimat saw Khadizhat pour her some tea.')

The intended binding dependency in (14) is one between the subject of the embedded clause and that of the matrix clause, realised as the reflexive. Under these circumstances the variable denoted by the reflexive has no way to receive a value from a c-commanding operator, given that it occupies the topmost position in the clause at the relevant stage of the derivation. This could be captured on the assumption that reflexives are indeed bound variables, and semantic binding requires structural superiority, whether it is defined in terms of c-command or dominance. Further evidence for the c-command requirement comes from possessive

reflexivisation:

- (15) a. ššibaw insue žindirgo limer b-oł'- ula
 every.M man.DAT self.GEN child.ABS N-love-PRS
 'Every father loves his (own) child.'
- b. *ššibaw limadul insue žibgo b-l'- ula
 every.M child.GEN father.DAT self.ABS N-love-PRS
 ('Every child's father loves it.')

Sentence (15a) illustrates a normal instance of possessive reflexivisation, where the antecedent of the possessive reflexive *c*-commands, and therefore semantically binds it. In (15b), on the other hand, the intended antecedent of *žibgo* is embedded inside the noun phrase, which stops it *c*-commanding the anaphor, in violation of the structural constraint on semantic binding.

Finally, a couple of words about the nature of non-finite clauses across whose boundary *žiwgo* can look for an antecedent. As can be seen from the examples above, *žiwgo* can be bound by a long-distance antecedent when inside clausal complements to certain verbs, which can receive a variety of morphological spell-outs as either participial clauses or nominalisations, as well as in structures with obligatory control. What of clausal adjuncts? It appears that these are opaque for the purposes of binding in the sense that *žiwgo* inside a matrix clause cannot find an antecedent inside an adverbial clause regardless of the position of the adverbial clause with respect to the main clause. As can be seen in (16), the reflexive pronoun's potential antecedent was 'son' is located inside an adjunct clause that is preposed relative to the matrix clause containing the reflexive pronoun, yet the anaphoric dependency between them cannot be established.

- (16) *[was c'aq'go swakan] insuca žiwgo χis- ana
 son.ABS very get.tired.CVB father.ERG self.M:ABS replace-PST
 ('When the son₁ got very tired, his₁ father replaced him₁.')

Let us now briefly summarise the core properties of *žiwgo*. The crucial observation is that for the purposes of variable binding and structural constraints on their use, both local and long-distance instances of *žiwgo* behave alike in requiring a *c*-commanding antecedent and strongly favouring sloppy readings in elliptical continuations.⁹ It is the constellation of these properties that will lead me, in §3, to analyse *žiwgo* in a uniform fashion within the minimal pronouns approach put forth by Kratzer (2009).

2.2 *žiw*

The other anaphoric element in Avar often taken to be a long-distance reflexive is *žiw*, with whose declension paradigm on p. 3 we started our acquaintance with the

9. With respect to both structural and interpretive properties the Avar complex reflexive *žiwgo* therefore seems different from similar reflexive pronouns in neighbouring languages such as Tsakhur (Toldova 1999) and Bagwalal (Lyutikova 2001).

pronominal inventory of the language. It is this pronoun which is used to form the complex reflexive *žiwgo* by attaching an emphatic particle, *-go* to it.

Despite the clear morphological relation between *žiw* and *žiwgo*, their syntactic and semantic properties are distinct in many respects. Firstly, unlike the local reflexive, *žiw* may not be used with an antecedent, either referential (17a) or quantificational (17b) within the same minimal domain:

- (17) a. *insuca žiw c'unule- w w-uk'-ana
 father.ERG self.M:ABS defend.PRS.PTCP-M M-be- PST
 ('Father was defending himself')
- b. *kinazgo židee mašina b-os- ana
 everyone.ERG self.DAT car.ABS N-buy-PST
 ('Everyone bought themselves a car.')
- c. *kinazego žal r- ol'- ula
 everyone.DAT self.PL:ABS PL-love-PRS
 ('Everyone loves themselves.')

When there is at least one clause boundary separating *žiw* from its antecedent, the status of the sentences improves considerably. For some speakers, therefore, *žiw* and *žiwgo* with an antecedent outside the non-finite clause containing them appear in what can for now be viewed as free variation (18), whereas others only allow an anaphoric dependency involving *žiw* across a finite clause boundary.

- (18) kinazdago lalaan [rasulie žal//žalgo r- ol'- un r- uk'-in]
 everyone.LOC know.PRES Rasul.DAT self.PL:ABS PL-love-CVB PL-be- MSD
 'Everyone one knows that Rasul loves them.'

In (18) the reflexive pronoun occurs as the internal argument of the embedded predicate with the complement clause spelled out as a nominalisation. Incidentally, this sentence also illustrates the availability of a bound-variable interpretation for the simplex reflexive.

As was mentioned, the prototypical environment for the simplex reflexive to appear in are finite complement clauses, where the more complex reflexives are unacceptable (19). Importantly, the only finite complement clauses in Avar as well as other languages of Daghestan are those used for reported speech and indirect questions; all other forms of clausal complementation are non-finite.¹⁰

- (19) [žinca//*žincago ču b-ič- il= ilan] ab- una wacas
 self.ERG horse.ABS N-sell-FUT=COMP say-PST brother.ERG
 'Brother said that he would sell the horse.' (Samedov 2003: §7.12, ex. 2)

In (19) the finite verb is followed by a specialised complementiser *-(j)ilan*, in the typological literature often dubbed *quotative*; other similar particles/complementisers include *-(j)in* for reported statements and *-(j)an* for indirect questions.

10. By finite I mean those verbal forms that can appear in non-embedded environments. See Sumbatova & Kalinina (2007) for an extensive discussion of clause structure and finiteness in Nakh-Daghestanian.

Naturally, predicates that subcategorise for finite clausal complements form a closed class — they are verbs of speech and perception like *abize* ‘say/tell’, *bicine* ‘speak’, *k’alaze* ‘say/talk’, *harize* ‘ask’, *aḥdeze* ‘yell’, *šurize* ‘whisper’, *t’ad žubaze* ‘add’, *lazabize* ‘announce’ (lit. ‘know-make’), *žawab l’eze* ‘answer’ (lit. ‘answer give’) along with some others, and they all license the simplex reflexive appearing inside their finite complement.¹¹ The second characteristic with respect to which the simplex and complex reflexives differ is subject orientation: unlike *žiwgo*, which can be bound by a non-subject (cf. (10) above), the simplex reflexive is distinctively subject-oriented. Consider (20), where the simplex reflexive could in principle be coreferential with two noun phrases in the matrix clause, *jasal* ‘girl.ERG’ or *hudulalda* ‘girlfriend.LOC’ (the third noun phrase, the subject of the reported event, is too close to the anaphor to qualify as its antecedent):

- (20) *jasal hudulalda bicun b- ugo [učitelal žij*
 girl.ERG friend.F:LOC tell.CVB N-be.PRS teacher.F:ERG self.F:ABS
j- eccule- j j- ik’an= ilan]
 F-praise.PRS.PTCP-F F-be.PST=COMP
 ‘The girl₁ told her friend₂ that the teacher₃ praised her_{1/*2/*3}.’

Although both noun phrases in the matrix clause should be able to bind the simplex reflexive from their surface position, the interpretation of the sentence indicates that only the matrix subject can do so.

A third difference between *žiwgo* and *žiw* concerns bound-variable interpretations. Recall from the preceding subsection that the complex reflexive forced sloppy readings in ellipsis sites, which led us to suggest that it was its prototypical interpretation, the size of the binding domain notwithstanding. The simplex reflexive, on the other hand, is markedly different in this regard:

- (21) *murad ħinq’-un w-ugo žinqago dica žindie qarzaḷe*
 Murad.ABS fear- CVB M-be.PRS self.ABL 1SG:ERG self.DAT debt
l’u- ra- b řarac b- ilan= ilan, hedingo hesul was= gi
 give.PST-PTCP-N money.ABS N-lose.PST-COMP same his brother=CNJ
 ‘Murad₁ is afraid he₁ has lost the money I lent him₁, and so is his brother’
 = Murad’s brother₂ is afraid he₂ has lost the money I lent him₂
 = Murad₁’s brother₂ is afraid he₂ has lost the money I lent Murad

The availability of the strict reading in (21) whereby the simplex reflexive in the ellipsis site corefers with the matrix subject of the antecedent clause shows that

11. This is an oversimplification, mainly because of the existence of sentences like (i), taken from *Testelefs & Toldova 1998* in a slightly modified form:

- (i) [*žinda= jišš k’alale- w w-uge- w-ali] řin-cin t’amič’o dos*
 self.LOC=Q talk.PRS.PTCP-M M-be.PRS.PTCP-M-COMP ear-even move.PST:NEG he.ERG
 ‘He did not bat an eyelid as if one wasn’t talking to him.’ (Testelefs & Toldova 1998: 47)

In (i) the matrix verb can only be classified as a perception predicate with a stretch; nevertheless, the simplex reflexive is acceptable in such a context. I leave the exploration of the intricacies of this and similar constructions for future research.

žiw does not have to be semantically bound, even though it can be.

Having established that the simplex reflexive *žiw* and the complex reflexive *žiwgo* display different behaviour with respect to the binding domain, subject orientation and bound-variable interpretations, we can now concentrate on their similarities.

First, the simplex reflexive *žiw*, just like its complex counterpart and most overt pronouns crosslinguistically, cannot be bound “upwards”:

- (22) *[ʃali kiw w-uge- w-ali] lala- ro žinda
 Ali.ABS where.M M-be.PRS.PTCP-M-COMP know.PRS-NEG self.DAT
 (‘Ali₁ does not know where he₁ is.’) (based on Testelefs & Toldova 1998: ex. 61)

In (22) *žiw* in the matrix clause c-commands its intended antecedent inside the subordinate clause, in violation of Principle C, resulting in ungrammaticality.

Second, similarly to *žiwgo*, the simplex reflexive cannot appear in coordinate clauses (23a) and adjunct clauses with the antecedent situated in the main clause (23b)–(23c).

- (23) a. *pat’imat c’aq’ hik’aj jas j- igo, hedinlidal rasulica žij
 Patimat.ABS very good girl.ABS F-be.PRS that’s-why Rasul.ERG self.F:ABS
 j- eccule- j j- ik’-ana
 F-praise.PRS.PTCP-F F-be-PST
 (‘Patimat is a very nice girl, which is why Rasul was praising her’)
- b. *dir wacase dun w-ol’- ula ššajgurelul žiw w-ugo hik’aw
 my brother.DAT 1SG:ABS M-love-PRS because self.ABS M-be.PRS good
 was
 boy.ABS
 (‘My brother loves me because he is a nice guy.’)
- c. *muradica mašina bičun, insuca žiw w-uχ- ana
 Murad.ERG car.ABS sell.CVB father.ERG self.ABS M-beat-PST
 (‘Murad sold the car and his father beat him up (for it).’)

It is intuitively clear why all the sentences in (23) are unacceptable: in none of them is the matrix predicate a verb of saying, belief or perception, and in the absence of such a licenser anaphoric dependencies between *žiw* and an antecedent across a clausal boundary cannot be established, *modulo* some exceptions similar to those mentioned in note 11.

The requirement that *žiw* must have an attitudinal predicate as its licenser, in combination with subject orientation, no (positive) locality constraints on the anaphoric dependency and the availability of bound-variable and referential interpretations, allows us to draw a parallel between it and *logophoric pronouns* in a number of African languages (Hagège 1974). Logophoric pronouns appear exclusively in indirect discourse (normally in the scope of an attitude verb) and usually denote the source of the reported speech act (see, among others, Clements 1975 for Ewe, Hyman & Comrie 1981 for Gokana, Koopman & Sportiche 1989 for Abe).

- (24) Adé ní ó / òhún ti dé
 Ade say he LOG PFV come
 ‘Ade₁ said he₂/he₁ has arrived.’ [Yoruba, Atoyebi (2011: 15)]

In the Yoruba example above only the designated pronoun, *òhún* (alternative spelling *òun*) can signal coreference between the attitude holder, *Adé*, and a term inside the embedded clause. If the regular 3rd person pronoun *ó* is used, it will refer to a salient individual in the preceding discourse.

Given that the source of an attitude report normally coincides with the author of that report, and authors frequently function as subjects, reducing *žiw* to a *bona fide* logophoric pronoun should rather neatly capture its subject orientation property. Logophoric pronouns, moreover, impose a well-known requirement on the relation between the attitude holder and the pronoun (the *de se* requirement, cf. Lewis 1979): informally, the author of a speech act involving an attitude report must be conscious of that the logophor’s referent and themselves are one and the same. Crucially, we can manipulate the context in such a way as to subtract this identity condition from it, in which case the use of a logophoric pronoun should become infelicitous. The scenario involving mistaken identity in (25) below is modelled after Anand (2006).

- (25) *Dibir is a participant in a reality show. He is watching a video recording of himself giving a speech at a contest where every participant must give a speech. He likes his own performance, but he is so drunk that he cannot recognise himself.*

If we hypothesise that *žiw* is a genuine logophoric pronoun, we predict that given the mistaken identity context in (25) its use in the scope of a speech predicate like *abuna* ‘say’ should be infelicitous. As the contrast between (26a) and (26b) demonstrates, this prediction is borne out.

- (26) a. dibirica abuna hew wugila [žindie biššun b–ol’ara– w
 Dibir.ERG say.PST he.ABS consider self.DAT most N–like.PST.PTCP–M
 kandidat]]
 candidate.ABS
 b. *dibirica abuna ži=w wugila [žindie biššun b–ol’ara– w
 Dibir.ERG say.PST self.ABS consider self.DAT most N–like.PST.PTCP–M
 kandidat]]
 candidate.ABS
 ‘Dibir said he was his favourite candidate.’ (*lit.*: ‘the candidate that he liked the most’)

The two sentences in (26) differ with respect to the pronoun occupying the subject position of the highest embedded clause, which I have put in a box to enhance readability in both cases. Because the subject of the attitude report is interpreted *de re* from the perspective of the attitude holder, the subject of the reported event is appropriately spelled out as a demonstrative (26a).¹²

12. Observe that both sentences above have another instance of the simplex anaphor inside the relative clause, yet the (a) sentence is fine. The explanation for this is trivial: in both sentences the

I therefore believe that the evidence against treating the simplex anaphor *žiw* as a long-distance reflexive is overwhelming and suggest instead that it belongs to the same class of logophoric pronouns as, for instance, *òhún* in Yoruba.

2.3 Summary

Let us take stock. We have seen that Avar displays a tripartite split in reflexive pronouns: [i] the simplex anaphor *žiw* that only allows long-distance uses, [ii] the complex reflexive *žiwgo* that can be bound by local, semi-local and long-distance antecedents, and [iii] the reduplicated super-local reflexive *žincago žiwgo*, derived from *žiwgo*. Of these three only [ii] and [iii] are in any way reflexive, primarily because they must be semantically bound by a c-commanding antecedent, a hallmark of “core” anaphora. The simplex anaphor, on the other hand, is not subject to locality constraints, allows both bound and referential interpretations, is subject-oriented. It is licensed almost exclusively in the scope of speech and attitude predicates and is then obligatorily interpreted *de se*, enough reason to class it together with logophoric pronouns in African languages.

3 Towards an analysis

I use this subsection to sketch a preliminary analysis of the two long-distance anaphors in Avar based on the data just presented.

3.1 A syntactico-semantic explanation

From what we have seen above, an important generalisation emerges, namely that irrespective of the distance between the reflexive *žiwgo* and its antecedent, the reflexive strongly favours a bound-variable reading. Such behaviour is attested in a wide range of languages, with a number of well-known exceptions. In Japanese, for instance, both local and long-distance reflexives pattern alike, whereas in English only local anaphors require bound variable readings.¹³ Mainland Scandinavian languages contrast with both English and Japanese in allowing strict readings under ellipsis even for the most local reflexives (Büring 2005). In this respect Avar patterns with Japanese, with a potentially important difference regarding empathy sensitivity, to which I now turn.¹⁴

relation between *dibirica* and *žindie* is *de se*, since Dibir realises that he is talking about a favourite candidate of his own.

13. The observation that English reflexives disprefer sloppy readings under VP-ellipsis is not uncontroversial, as both its empirical foundation (e.g., Keenan 1972; Dahl 1973) and theoretical implications (cf. Dotlačil 2010) have been questioned.

14. The Japanese anaphor *zibun* has several uses: reflexive, logophoric and empathic (Oshima 2006). Reflexive *zibun* must be bound to its coargument subject. Empathic *zibun* is long-distance bound to a structurally commanding subject, and must be the empathy locus of the minimal clause or NP containing it. Logophoric *zibun* in an embedded attitude report is long-distance bound to the noun phrase which is the attitude holder. Space precludes me from discussing each of the uses in any

The empathic use of *zibun* is rooted in the notion of *empathy* – the speaker’s identification, which may vary in degree, with a person/thing that participates in the event or state that (s)he describes in a sentence (cf. Kuno 1987). The *empathy locus* mentioned above is, in Kuno’s (1987) system, the participant that receives the highest degree of empathy within a clause. Adopting Kuno’s *empathy hierarchies* (Kuno 1987: 632), Oshima (2006) proposes that the logophoric and empathic uses of *zibun* can be distinguished empirically in three ways.

The first way of diagnosing *zibun*’s empathic uses is by appealing to the Speech Act Empathy Hierarchy, whereby the speaker is uniformly treated as the empathy locus. A consequence of this is that *zibun* in its empathic use should be unable to cooccur with first-person pronouns, which it indeed cannot, as in (27) below.

- (27) *Taro-wa [boku-ga zibun-ni kasi-ta] okane-o nakusite-simat-ta
 Taro-TOP 1SG- NOM self- DAT lend-PST money-ACC lose- end.up-PST
 rasii
 it.seems
 (‘It seems that Taro_i lost the money I lent him_i.’)

Following earlier work on the matter, Oshima (2006) argues that (27) is unacceptable because of a conflict in empathy loci between *boku-ga* ‘1SG-NOM’ and its coargument *zibun-ni* ‘self-DAT’, both of which are hypothesised to be unique empathy loci of the same sentence, a clear contradiction.¹⁵

The Avar *žiw*, on the other hand, can have a first-person pronoun as a coargument, suggesting a less significant involvement of empathy than in Japanese:

- (28) murad ħinq’un w-ugo žinqago dica žindie řura- b
 Murad.ABS fear.CVB M-be.PRS self.ABL 1SG:ERG self.DAT give.PST.PTCP-N
 řarac b-ilan= ilan
 money.ABS N-lose.PST=COMP
 ‘Murad is afraid that he has lost the money I lent him.’

The preliminary conclusion is, therefore, that *žiw* does not display the same empathy-sensitivity as *zibun* in Japanese.¹⁶

Below I try to show how the syntactic and semantic properties of *žiwgo* in both local and long-distance occurrences can be accommodated within a *minimal pronouns* approach to anaphoric relations (Kratzer 2009). I shall also show that in order to accommodate the data from Avar the original framework must be modified to allow reflexive pronouns, local or otherwise, to be generated with ϕ -features of their own.

significant detail, which is why I limit myself to a brief comparison between the empathic *zibun* in Japanese and *žiw* in Avar.

15. I invite the reader to consult Oshima (2006) for an explicit discussion and very detailed formalisation.

16. The conclusion is preliminary primarily because the existence, in Avar, of such empathy triggers as the benefactive elements *yaru/kureru* in Japanese has not been established, and more work is required to disentangle the empathic and logophoric environments.

3.1.1 Kratzer (2009)

For Kratzer (2009) reflexives are the simplest form of pronouns in that they are merely bound variables that inherit most or all of their features from their antecedents via an Agree relation. This relation is mediated by verbal functional heads like *v* that do the actual binding. Kratzer therefore follows the general tendency in the binding literature to treat reflexives as not only referentially dependent on an antecedent but also φ -deficient (Reinhart & Reuland 1993, Reuland 2001, 2011, Rooryck & Vanden Wyngaerd 2011).

Here is how Kratzer proposes to derive a simple sentence involving a reflexive pronoun with the logical form for it given in (29b):

- (29) a. I blame myself.
 b. $[_{VP} I [_v [_\lambda [n] [_{VP} blame [n]]]]]$ (Kratzer 2009: 194)

The reflexive starts out as an index, or an individual variable. When it is merged as the object of a transitive verb like *blame*, which denotes a relation of blaming between an individual *x* and an event *e* (3ob), it saturates that argument and is immediately “rebound” by a λ -operator hosted by *v* – the head that introduces the external argument (3oc). Importantly, at the point where the reflexive predicate is calculated, the reflexive pronoun has no φ -features – it only acquires them after interpretation has taken place.

- (30) a. $\llbracket v \rrbracket = \lambda x. \lambda e. \mathbf{agent}(x)(e)$
 b. $\llbracket \mathbf{blame} \rrbracket = \lambda x. \lambda e. \mathbf{blame}'(x)(e)$
 c. $\llbracket \lambda [n] [_{VP} blame([n])] \rrbracket = \lambda x. \lambda e. \mathbf{blame}'(x)(e)$
 d. $\llbracket v [_\lambda [n] [_{VP} blame([n])]] \rrbracket = \lambda x. \lambda e. \mathbf{agent}(x)(e) \wedge \mathbf{blame}'(x)(e)$
 From (a) and (c) via Predicate Conjunction
 e. $\llbracket [_{VP} I [_v [_{VP} blame([n])]]] \rrbracket = \lambda e. \mathbf{agent}(I)(e) \wedge \mathbf{blame}'(I)(e)$

As Kratzer herself notes, the denotation of the VP after the variable has been “rebound” by the λ -operator is exactly the same as that of V – the VP still denotes a relation between an individual *x* and an event *e* (3oc). This VP then combines with *v* by Predicate Conjunction to yield a reflexive predicate (3od). At the point that the antecedent DP is merged into the structure, the structure receives the interpretation in (3oe).

We are not quite done yet – in order to spell out a morphologically legitimate structure the reflexive must acquire φ -features; to do that, Kratzer splits the Agreement operation between an anaphor and its antecedent into two very local “flavours” of an Agree operation, defined immediately below.¹⁷

- (31) *Feature Transmission under Binding:*
 The φ -feature set of a bound DP unifies with the φ -feature set of the verbal functional head that hosts its binder. (Kratzer 2009: 195)

17. For Kratzer Agree is defined as set unification rather than copying of one feature’s value onto another (1). See Rooryck & Vanden Wyngaerd (2011) for a similar view.

- (32) *Spec-Head Agreement:*
 When a DP occupies the specifier position of a head that carries a λ -operator, their φ -feature sets unify. (Kratzer 2009: 196)

After both of these operations have applied, Kratzer argues, the reflexive anaphor in (30) shares the person and number features with v and the antecedent and is therefore spelled out as *myself*.

Having briefly summarised the minimal pronouns approach, in the rest of this section I attempt to extend it with minor modifications to account for the Avar data, the focus of this paper.

3.1.2 Avar reflexives as almost minimal pronouns

The main intuition we want to capture is that *žiwgo* is semantically interpreted as a bound variable, which could be seen by the way that the speakers preferred sloppy readings to strict ones in elliptical sentences.

If we attempt to adopt Kratzer's (2009) analysis sketched above to account for Avar reflexivisation without modification, we run into the following problem with morphological agreement.¹⁸

Recall from the introduction that Avar is an ergative language where the goal for agreement is an absolutive (nominative) DP within a certain local domain. In a transitive clause, therefore, verbal agreement will be object agreement; similarly, in prototypically reflexive contexts the object position will be filled by the absolutive-marked reflexive pronoun. If this reflexive pronoun were φ -deficient, the unvalued φ -features on the relevant verbal head would fail to receive a value and the resultant structure would be morphologically ill-formed. It seems therefore that φ -deficiency is unlikely to be a universal property of reflexive pronouns as proposed by Rooryck & Vanden Wyngaerd (2011) among others.

If, however, the Avar reflexive were generated with its own set of φ -features, verbal agreement would proceed just as per usual, the gender features just restricting the semantic interpretation, and the agreement problem goes away.^{19,20}

(i) *Unification:*

Given feature sets $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n$ associated with expressions $a_1, \dots, a_n$, define their unification as $\bigcup \{\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n\}$ (Kratzer 2009: 195)

18. Kratzer herself discusses the overt realisation of φ -features on v in languages with object agreement very briefly. In doing so, she claims that her approach has just enough flexibility to accommodate those object agreement languages that display the Anaphor Agreement Effect (Woolford 1999). She says nothing, however, about object agreement languages whose agreement patterns remain unaffected by the presence of an anaphor, of which Avar happens to be one.

19. That reflexive pronouns must sometimes be generated with φ -features of their own is the conclusion Reuland (2010) reaches based on a different set of facts. It therefore appears that the present approach is compatible with Reuland's, but since the detailed comparison is beyond the aims of this paper, it should be left to future work.

20. Additional albeit indirect support for the idea that verbal agreement in Avar is negotiated inside the verb phrase comes from the so-called *biabsolutive construction*, in which both the agent and patient of agentive — and otherwise ergative — predicates are morphologically absolutive (Forker

In line with Kratzer (2009) and Adger (2011) I propose that this restriction should be represented as presupposition, and the gender features themselves be treated as partial identity functions from individuals to individuals:²¹

- (33) $\llbracket [\text{masc}] \rrbracket = \lambda x: x \text{ is masculine} . x$
 $\llbracket [\text{fem}] \rrbracket = \lambda x: x \text{ is feminine} . x$
 $\llbracket [\text{neut}] \rrbracket = \lambda x: x \text{ is neuter} . x$
 $\llbracket [\text{plural}] \rrbracket = \lambda x: x \text{ is plural} . x$

I notate the variable core of any pronoun as *Id*, adopting the convention of Adger (2011).

- (34) $\llbracket [\text{Id}] \rrbracket = x_e$

We can therefore propose that the derivation for a reflexive sentence like (35), will proceed just as illustrated above for English, except that the index will have composed with the gender feature before merging as the internal argument of *praise*. To keep the denotation of the reflexive minimal I assume that *žiwgo* does not project person features and, *Id* having combined with [fem], remains of type $\langle e \rangle$.

- (35) *jasal žijgo j- eccule- j j- ik'-ana*
 girl.ERG self.F:ABS F-praise.PRS.PTCP-F F-be-PST
 'The girl praised herself.'

Once the external argument is merged into the structure as the specifier of *v*,
 2012):

- (i) a. *insuca ruq' b-ale- b b-ugo*
 father.ERG house.ABS N-build.PRS.PTCP-N N-be.PRS
 b. *emen ruq' b-ale- w w-ugo*
 father.ABS house.ABS N-build.PRS.PTCP-M M-be.PRS
 'Father is building a/the house.'

In (i) the verb's internal and external arguments differ in noun class/gender features. The verb *CM-aze* 'build' has an agreement slot that is filled by the neuter class marker *b-*, the verb having agreed with the most local absolutive DP. This is about the only similarity between (ia) and (ib) as far as agreement is concerned. In the absence of another absolutive-marked DP in (ia) further agreement relations (i.e., the concord suffix on the participle and the agreement prefix on the auxiliary) are established with the very same absolutive DP. If, however, the external argument is also absolutive, as in (ib), agreement outside the domain of *vP* is controlled by this other absolutive DP, hence the masculine class markers on both the participle and the auxiliary.

It is therefore not particularly attractive to revert the otherwise common agreement procedure allowing the verb to agree with the ergative antecedent in the reflexive construction exclusively, which is why I find it more plausible to allow *žiwgo* to be generated with the gender feature already in place.

21. Because the plural has been argued to instantiate a separate noun class in Northeast Caucasian languages and not number, I am treating the plural feature on a par with other noun class features. An anonymous reviewer points out that such a unification is not unproblematic for my analysis. In particular, if number is equated with noun class, it becomes unclear why non-absolutive forms of the reflexive display a syncretism in the singular (*žindie* 'self.{M/F/N}DAT') but the plural form is nevertheless distinct (*židee* 'self.PL'). At present I have no answer to this question.

Kratzer’s (2009) operation of *Predication* obtains, resulting in the unification of feature sets of the reflexive pronoun and its antecedent. Needless to say, the gender features of one DP must match those of the other so as not to give rise to presupposition failure at the level of interpretation.²²

The necessity of *žiwgo* being generated with its own gender features becomes even more obvious once we consider long-distance uses of this anaphor. To illustrate this we will need a long-distance reflexivisation construction involving a biclausal structure with *žiwgo* in the position of the internal argument of the embedded verb. The external argument of the embedded verb should carry φ -features that are distinct from those of the internal argument thus making it impossible for the agreement morphology on the verb to have been inherited from the external argument. The verb’s φ -features will be inherited from the reflexive, whose antecedent with matching φ -features will appear much later in the structure as one of the arguments of the matrix verb. Incidentally, we have already seen such an example in (11), repeated here as (36):

- (36) kinazdago b-ix- ana [χadižatica žideego čaj t’ole- b]
 everyone.LOC N-see-PST Khadizhat.ERG self.PL:DAT tea.ABS pour.PRS.PTCP-N
 ‘Everyone saw Khadizhat pour them some tea.’

Observe that stipulating *žiwgo* to be lexically ambiguous for the purposes of local and long-distance binding with only the latter version being specified with gender features is not a very attractive line of saving the φ -defectiveness analysis, since we have not seen any evidence of local and long-distance occurrences being distinct in any other way than just the size of the binding domain; on the contrary, our strongest evidence that we are dealing with one and the same anaphor comes from bound-variable interpretations.

To go back to our example (36), at the stage that *vP* is formed the variable inside it has not yet been identified by an operator, which it must to for the whole structure to be semantically interpretable. I propose, following Adger’s (2011) proposal for resumptive pronouns, that this variable is semantically bound from the next closest phasal head, C in this instance. On this view, some C heads, like the nominalising/relativising one in (36) will be carrying λ -binders, whereas others, the ones underlying the derivation of adjunct islands, will not, leaving the variable without a value and leading to the ungrammaticality of sentences like (16).

We can now summarise our discussion of the syntax and semantics of *žiwgo*: in both local and long-distance uses this anaphor denotes a presuppositionally restricted individual variable that is bound by a functional head carrying a λ -operator. When this operator appears on *v*, we are dealing with local reflexivisation; if *v* lacks such a binder, the anaphor can find it on a higher functional head, C (or possibly T).

22. It is important to emphasise at this point that the requirement that the anaphor’s φ -features must match those of the antecedent is not narrow-syntactic in that there is no direct syntactic dependency between these two elements. In this respect the present proposal differs from the otherwise similar theories of Hicks (2009), Sundaresan (2012)

Unlike the reflexive *žiwo*, I assume that the logophoric pronoun *žiw* in Avar does project person features in addition to the number and gender features described above. Just as Adger (2011), who himself adopts the insight of Schlenker (2003), I take person features to be responsible for creating sets of individuals and be more fine-grained than just 1st or 2nd person, consisting of features like [participant] and [author]:

- (37) a. $\llbracket [\text{participant}] \rrbracket = \lambda x: x \in \mathbf{i} \vee x \in \mathbf{u}. \lambda y. x = y$, where $\mathbf{i}$ and $\mathbf{u}$ stand for (the set containing) the author or the hearer of the reported event.
 b. $\llbracket [\text{author}] \rrbracket = \lambda f: \text{speaker} \in f . f$

I assume, following Schlenker (2003) and Haida (2009), that logophoric pronouns contain individual variables which refer to the author of the reported context, and the lexical entries will have to be enriched with either a context variable or a situation variable. The pronouns themselves spell out definite descriptions (or individual concepts, taking into account the contextual/situational variables) in which these variables are bound by the definiteness operator defined, rather traditionally, in (38).

- (38) $\llbracket [\text{def}] \rrbracket = \lambda P. \iota x. P(x)$

The meaning we assign to the logophoric *žiw*, then, is along the lines of (39) (the order of feature composition will be type-driven):

- (39) $\llbracket \text{žiw} \rrbracket = \lambda c'. \iota x. \{x = a_{c'} \wedge x \neq a_{c^*}\}$, where c^* is the utterance context and c' the reported context

The context variables will be manipulated by attitudinal predicates, the most natural licenser of logophoric pronouns, which would explain the ungrammaticality of *žiw* appearing outside the scope of such verbs, just as in our adjunct island configuration in (23) on p. 11. Whether the embedded clause hosting the logophor is finite or non-finite is immaterial as long as the matrix predicate is a verb of saying, thinking etc., and c-commands the embedded clause.

4 Conclusion

I began this paper by introducing two long-distance anaphors in Avar which seemed to be in free variation in a certain domain. We have nevertheless seen that their distribution is near-complementary from the point of view of both the syntax and semantics.

The long-distance reflexive *žiwo* behaves identically with the local uses of the same anaphor; essentially, both are obligatorily interpreted as bound variables. Putting these bound-variable interpretations in the corner of my analysis, I have proposed, following Kratzer (2009) and Adger (2011), that *žiwo* is referentially dependent and needs an operator to receive semantic interpretation. Such operators are situated on phasal heads — *v* for local anaphoric dependencies, and *C* for long-distance ones. Crucially, I argued that *žiwo* contributes φ -features of its own

to the semantic interpretation of the structure, rather than receives them from the antecedent after interpretation has taken place. These φ -features, I argued, are necessary to generate the observed agreement patterns.

As for the simplex anaphor *žiw*, I took it to be a *bona fide* logophoric pronoun familiar from some African languages, which denotes the author of the reported context and syntactically corresponding to a reduced definite description (with the descriptive content being contributed by φ -features).

The data described in this article pose a serious challenge to those theories which encode referential dependence by equating it with φ -deficiency (Rooryck & Vanden Wyngaerd 2011).

References

- Adger, David. 2011. Bare resumptives. In Alain Rouveret (ed.), *Resumptive Pronouns at the Interfaces* (Language faculty and beyond 5), 343–366. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1075/lfab.5.09adg>.
- Anand, Pranav. 2006. *De de se*: Massachusetts Institute of Technology dissertation. <http://hdl.handle.net/1721.1/37418>.
- Atoyebi, Joseph Dele. 2011. On the syntax of reflexives in Yoruba: a descriptive perspective. Paper presented at *The World of Reflexives* workshop, Utrecht University, August 2011.
- Büring, Daniel. 2005. *Binding Theory* Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 2001. Derivation by phase. In Michael Kenstowicz (ed.), *Ken Hale: A life in linguistics*, 1–52. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Clements, George. 1975. The logophoric pronoun in Ewe: Its role in discourse. *Journal of West African Languages* 10. 141–177.
- Cole, P., G. Hermon & C.-T.J. Huang (eds.). 2001. *Long-distance reflexives* (Syntax and Semantics 33). New York: Academic Press.
- Dahl, Östen. 1973. On so-called ‘sloppy identity’. *Synthese* 26(1). 81–112. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/bf00869757>.
- Dotlačil, Jakub. 2010. *Anaphora and Distributivity: A study of same, different, reciprocals and others*: Universiteit Utrecht dissertation. LOT Dissertation 231, available at http://www.lotpublications.nl/Documents/231_fulltext.pdf.
- Forker, Diana. 2012. The bi-absolute construction in Nakh-Daghestanian. *Folia Linguistica* 46(1). 75–108. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/flin.2012.3>.
- Hagège, Claude. 1974. Les pronoms logophoriques. *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique* 69(1). 287–310.
- Haida, Andreas. 2009. (Proto-)Logophoricity in Tangale. Paper presented at NELS 40 Semantics Workshop on Pronouns. <http://patrickgrosz.org/haida-talk.pdf>.
- Hicks, Glyn. 2009. *The Derivation of Anaphoric Relations* (Linguistik Aktuell/Linguistics Today 139). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1075/la.139>.

- Hyman, Larry & Bernard Comrie. 1981. Logophoric reference in Gokana. *Journal of African languages and linguistics* 3. 19–37.
- Keenan, Edward L. 1972. On Semantically Based Grammar. *Linguistic Inquiry* 3(4). 413–461. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4177731>.
- Koopman, Hilda & Dominique Sportiche. 1989. Pronouns, logical variables, and logophoricity in Abe. *Linguistic Inquiry* 20(4). 555–588.
- Kratzer, Angelika. 2009. Making a Pronoun: Fake Indexicals as Windows into the Properties of Pronouns. *Linguistic Inquiry* 40(2). 187–237. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1162/ling.2009.40.2.187>.
- Kuno, Susumu. 1987. *Functional Syntax: Anaphora, Discourse, and Empathy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lewis, David. 1979. Attitudes *De Dicto* and *De Se*. *The Philosophical Review* 88(4). 513–543. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/0195032047.003.0010>.
- Lyutikova, Ekaterina A. 2001. Anaforičeskie sredstva [anaphoric means]. In A. E. Kibrik (ed.), *Bagvalinskij yazyk: grammatika, teksty, slovari*. [Bagwalal: Grammar, Texts, Dictionaries], Moscow: IMLI RAN.
- Oshima, David Y. 2006. *Perspectives in reported discourse*: Stanford University dissertation. <http://www.semanticsarchive.net/Archive/zEyNjJhN/oshima-2006-dissertation.pdf>.
- Pantcheva, Marina Blagoeva. 2011. *Decomposing Path: The Nanosyntax of Directional Expressions*: University of Tromsø dissertation. <http://hdl.handle.net/10037/3631>.
- Reinhart, Tanya. 1983. *Anaphora and semantic interpretation*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Reinhart, Tanya & Eric Reuland. 1993. Reflexivity. *Linguistic Inquiry* 24(4). 657–720.
- Reuland, Eric. 2001. Primitives of Binding. *Linguistic Inquiry* 32(3). 439–492. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1162/002438901750372522>.
- Reuland, Eric. 2010. Minimal versus not so minimal pronouns. In Martin Everaert, Tom Lentz, Hannah de Mulder, Øystein Nilsen & Arjen Zondervan (eds.), *The Linguistics Enterprise: From knowledge of language to knowledge in linguistics* (Linguistik Aktuell/Linguistics Today 150), 257–282. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1075/la.150.11reu>.
- Reuland, Eric. 2011. *Anaphora and Language Design* (Linguistic Inquiry Monograph 62). Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Rooryck, Johan & Guido Vanden Wyngaerd. 2011. *Dissolving Binding Theory* (Oxford Studies in Theoretical Linguistics 34). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Samedov, D.S. 2003. *Osložnennoe predloženie v avarskom jazyke v sopostavlennii s francuzskim* [Complex sentences in Avar: a comparison with French]. Moscow: Institute of Linguistics, Russian Academy of Sciences.
- Schlenker, Philippe. 2003. A Plea For Monsters. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 26(1). 29–120. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:1022225203544>.
- Sumbatova, Nina R. & Elena J. Kalinina. 2007. Clause structure and verbal forms. In Irina Nikolaeva (ed.), *Finiteness: Theoretical and empirical foundations*, 183–249.

- Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sundaresan, Sandhya. 2012. *Context and (co)reference in the syntax and its interfaces*: Universitet i Tromsø and Universität Stuttgart dissertation. <http://hdl.handle.net/10037/4835>.
- Testeleets, Yakov G. & Svetlana Y. Toldova. 1998. Refleksivnye mestoimenija v dagestanskix jazykax i tipologija refleksiva [Reflexive pronouns in Daghestanian languages and the typology of reflexives]. *Voprosy jazykoznanija* 4. 35–57.
- Toldova, Svetlana Y. 1999. Mestoimennye sredstva podderžanija referencii [anaphoric means of reference tracking]. In A. E. Kibrik & Ya. G. Testeleets (eds.), *Elementy tsaxurskogo jazyka v tipologičeskom osveščanii* [Elements of Tsakhur: A typological perspective], 629–674. Moscow: Nasledie.
- Volkova, Anna. 2014. *Licensing Reflexivity: Unity and variation among selected Uralic languages*: Universiteit Utrecht dissertation. LOT Dissertation 359, available at http://www.lotpublications.nl/Documents/359_fulltext.pdf.
- Woolford, Ellen. 1999. More on the anaphor agreement effect. *Linguistic Inquiry* 30(2). 257–287. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1162/002438999554057>.
- Yamada, Hisanari. 2013. Reciprocal constructions in Avar. *Lingua* 126. 150–171. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2013.01.001>.