

2017

Long-Distance Reflexivization and Logophoricity in the Dargin Language

Muminat Kerimova

Florida International University

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.fiu.edu/linguistics_ma



Part of the [Linguistics Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Kerimova, Muminat, "Long-Distance Reflexivization and Logophoricity in the Dargin Language" (2017). *MA in Linguistics Final Projects*. 3.

https://digitalcommons.fiu.edu/linguistics_ma/3

This work is brought to you for free and open access by the College of Arts, Sciences & Education at FIU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in MA in Linguistics Final Projects by an authorized administrator of FIU Digital Commons. For more information, please contact dcc@fiu.edu.

FLORIDA INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY

Miami, Florida

LONG-DISTANCE REFLEXIVIZATION AND LOGOPHORICITY IN THE DARGIN LANGUAGE

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of

the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

in

LINGUISTICS

by

Muminat Kerimova

2017

ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS
LONG-DISTANCE REFLEXIVIZATION AND LOGOPHORICITY IN THE DARGIN
LANGUAGE

by

Muminat Kerimova

Florida International University, 2017

Miami, Florida

Professor Ellen Thompson, Major Professor

The study of anaphora challenges us to determine the conditions under which the pronouns of a language are associated with possible antecedents. One of the theoretical questions is whether the distribution of pronominal forms is best explained by a syntactic, semantic or discourse level analysis. A more practical question is how we distinguish between anaphoric elements, e.g. what are the borders between the notions of pronouns, locally bound reflexives and long-distance reflexives?

The study analyzes the anaphora device *saj* in Dargin that is traditionally considered to be a long-distance reflexivization language. We show that the previous research did not cover all uses of *saj* that are essential for the notion of long-distance reflexivization and logophoricity. The course of analysis leads to the conclusion that *saj* does not have the syntactic restrictions imposed on long-distance reflexives or logophors in other languages.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. LITERATURE REVIEW	
Anaphora. Binding Theory	2
Reflexivization Theory.	5
Long-Distance Reflexives and Logophors.....	12
Logophoricity and Empathy	19
Previous Research on Dargin Anaphora	21
III. CURRENT ANALYSIS	
Defining the Problem.....	27
Logophoric and Reflexive Behavior	31
Anaphoric and Pronominal Behavior.....	37
IV. CONCLUSIONS.....	39
REFERENCES.....	40

I. INTRODUCTION

The study of anaphora challenges us to determine the conditions under which the pronouns of a language are associated with possible antecedents. One of the theoretical questions is whether the distribution of pronominal forms is best explained by a syntactic, semantic or discourse level analysis. A more practical question is how we distinguish between anaphoric elements, e.g. what are the borders between the notions of pronouns, locally bound reflexives and long-distance reflexives?

The study analyzes the anaphora device *saj* in Dargin that is traditionally considered to be a long-distance reflexivization language. We show that the previous research did not cover all uses of *saj* that are essential for the notion of long-distance reflexivization and logophoricity. The course of analysis leads to the conclusion that *saj* does not have the syntactic restrictions imposed on long-distance reflexives or logophors in other languages.

The work is structured as follows. In section 2 we review the literature on binding, long-distance reflexivization, logophoricity in several languages and the previous discussion about Dargin anaphora. In section 3 we analyze the behavior of *saj* in the light of the definitions of different anaphoric devices given in section 2 and test *saj* to identify its linguistic status. Section 4 is the conclusion.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Anaphora. Binding Theory.

The word *anaphora* is translated from Greek as “carrying back” (Huang, 2007:1). The linguistic term is used to refer to “a relation between two linguistic elements, wherein the interpretation of one (called *an anaphor*) is in some way determined by the interpretation of the other (called *an antecedent*)” (Huang 2007). In broad understanding, the categories of nominal that are regulated by the principles of anaphora are empty categories, pronouns, reflexives and reciprocals, names and descriptions (called *R(eferential)-expressions*). Huang (2007) classifies anaphora on the basis of syntactic categories (NP-anaphora, N-anaphora, VP-anaphora – both lexical and empty categories), truth conditions (referential anaphora, bound-variable anaphora, E-type anaphora, ‘lazy’ anaphora, bridging cross-reference anaphora), contexts (use of anaphora in encyclopedic knowledge context, physical context, linguistic context) and discourse reference-tracking systems (gender/class systems, obviation, switch-reference systems, switch-function systems and inference systems). An interested reader is referred to Huang (2007) for a short overview of this classification, or Karttunen (1976), Clark (1977), Ariel (1990), Comrie (1989b), Bloomfield (1962), Jacobsen (1967), Foley & Van Valin (1984) for a more detailed introduction to some of the types of anaphora. The traditional classification of Dargin, the language under study, as a long-reflexivization language leads us to reduce the scope of the discussion to lexically covert R-expressions, pronouns and reflexives. These can be exemplified in the following English sentences:

- (1) John likes himself (where the reflexive *himself* obligatorily refers to *John* as its antecedent)

(2) John likes him (where the pronoun *him* obligatorily refers to someone other than *John*)

(3) He likes John (where the name John refers to someone other than *he*).

In order to formulate and systematize the distribution of exemplified anaphoric elements, Chomsky (1981) proposed the following Binding Principles within his Binding Theory (henceforth, BT):

Principle (or Condition) A. An anaphor is bound in its governing category;

Principle (or Condition) B. A pronominal is free in its governing category;

Principle (or Condition) C. An R-expression is free;

where binding is defined as:

α binds β iff

- i. α is in an argument position,
- ii. α c-commands β ,
- iii. α and β are coindexed;

and c-command is defined as:

α c-commands β iff

- i. α does not dominate β ,
- ii. β does not dominate α ,
- iii. the first branching node dominating α also dominates β ;

and Governing Category (GC) is defined as:

α is a GC for β iff α is the minimal category containing β , a governor of β , and a

SUBJECT accessible to β ; α is accessible to β iff α is in the c-command domain of β and α and β are co-indexed.

In (1), the reflexive *himself* follows Principle A and is bound to and co-indexed with the c-commanding DP *John*:

(1') $John_i$ looked at himself_i

In (2), the pronoun *him* obeys Principle B and cannot be interpreted as co-referential (or co-indexed) with its c-commanding DP:

(2') $John_i$ looked at him_j

In (3), the R-expression *John* is always free in any domain.

In English, however, one can find sentences like (4), where apparently the reflexive is not bound in its local domain, in violation of Principle A:

(4) Max_i boasted that the Queen invited Lucie and himself_i for a drink. (Reinhart & Reuland, 1993)

Reflexivity Theory.

Authors have argued that in other languages, in addition, one can find many examples that cannot be explained by the original BT. For example, Dutch has reflexives – simplex anaphor (SE-anaphor) *zich* and complex anaphor (SELF-anaphor) *zichzelf* in addition to a pronoun (Reuland, 2011:100):

(5) Willem_i wast zich_i/zichzelf_i.

William washes self/himself.

Such a three-way anaphoric system is quite common in the world languages. SE-anaphors also exist, for example, in Japanese (*zibun*):

(6) Keiko-wa zibun-o aisite-iru.

Keiko_i loves SE_i. (Huang 2007)

Cross-linguistically, SE-anaphors are morphologically simple (mono-morphemic). SELF-anaphors can be either of the form SE-SELF or Pronominal-SELF, or both, as in Scandinavian languages. (Reuland, 2011). Anaphors are usually in complementary distribution with pronouns in the local domain. An example of this from Russian is the following (Testelets & Toldova 1998):

(7) On_i vidit sebja_i/sam sebja_i/*ego_i

He_i sees self_i/himself_i/*him_i

Further, SE-anaphors usually lack ϕ -features: person, gender, number (Reuland 2011, and others). Another example from Russian:

(8) Ja vižu sebja. / Ty vidiš' sebja. / On vidit sebja. / Ona vidit sebja. / Oni vid'jat sebja.

I see self. / You see self. / He sees self. / She sees self. / They see self.

Furthermore, both SE- and SELF- anaphors are referentially defective in the sense that they cannot be used as demonstratives, referring to some entity in the world; and they are usually subject-oriented, which means that their antecedents must be the subject of the clause. Reinhart & Reuland (1993:665) observe, however, that SE- and SELF-anaphors can be in complementary distribution with each other:

(9) Max haat *zich/zichzelf. (Dutch)

Max hates *self/himself.

They notice that the difference between (5) and (9) is not in the anaphors, but in the types of the verbs: *wast* (“washes”) is semantically reflexive (or, “intrinsically reflexive”), while *haat* (“hates”) is non-reflexive (or, “non-intrinsically reflexive”). Based on this distinction, Reinhart & Reuland (1993:678) propose the Reflexivity Theory (RT), according to which:

a. The syntactic predicate formed of (a head) P is P, all its syntactic arguments, and an external argument of P (subject). The syntactic arguments of P are the projections assigned θ -role or Case by P.

b. The semantic predicate formed of P is P and all its arguments at the relevant semantic level.

c. A predicate is reflexive iff two of its arguments are co-indexed.

d. A predicate (formed of P) is reflexive-marked iff either P is lexically reflexive or one of P's arguments is a SELF anaphor.

These definitions are the basis of the A and B Conditions of RT:

Condition A: A reflexive-marked syntactic predicate is reflexive.

Condition B: A reflexive semantic predicate is reflexive-marked.

For the purposes of our study we will not go into the details of the A and B Conditions and the definitions of RT. Suffice it to say that Reinhart and Reuland apply the Conditions to the predicates, where pronouns, SE-anaphors and SELF-anaphors are in the argument position to the verb (are directly selected by the main verb). They also say that these arguments must be in a binding (but not coreferential) relation with their antecedents. The difference between the two types of relations is that through coreference a pronoun (or reflexive) and its antecedent can be independently used to refer to the same individual (or object) as a discourse referent. Coreference is possible across sentences (Reuland, 2011:28):

(10) John has a gun. Will he attack?

Binding, however, requires that the antecedent c-command any element that is dependent on it (Reuland, 2011:28):

(11) John was convinced that he would be welcome. (*John* c-commands *he*)

The difference between coreference and binding is responsible for the contrast between (12) and (13); (12) is ill-formed, while (13) is acceptable with coreference of the pronoun and the quantificational antecedent. (Reuland, 2011:28):

(12) Everyone has a gun. *Will he attack?

(13) Everyone was convinced that he would be welcome.

The difference between coreference and binding is also exemplified by the strict and sloppy identity readings of the following sentence (Anagnostopoulou & Everaert, 2013:353):

(14) Martin said that he would submit on time, and so did Elena.

- a. Sloppy identity interpretation (binding): Martin said that Martin would submit on time and Elena said that Elena would submit on time.
- b. Strict identity interpretation (coreference): Martin said that Martin would submit on time and Elena said that Martin would submit on time.

English reflexives normally trigger only a sloppy identity reading (Anagnostopoulou & Everaert, 2013:354):

(15) Bill liked himself and Charles did too. (=Charles liked himself too)

Thus, according to Reinhart and Reuland (1993) only bound variables in argument positions are subject to syntax, and the following examples illustrate how some sentences are explained by Condition A of RT and some sentences are ruled out, as they violate it:

(16) Max_i boasted that the queen invited him_i for a drink.

- (17) *Max_i boasted that the queen invited himself_i for a drink. (Reinhart & Reuland, 1993:670). (The predicate is reflexive-marked, but is not reflexive; the co-arguments of invited are not co-indexed.)

Example (3), which was illustrated as puzzling for BT, according to RT, is considered not subject to analysis, because *himself* there is not in an argument position. The following examples of long-distance binding are excluded by the syntax for the same reason:

- (18) John_i put a book close to himself_i

- (19) Lucie_i saw a picture of herself_i

Condition B of RT is illustrated by the following examples from Dutch (Reinhart & Reuland, 1993:710):

- (20) a. *Henk_i hoorde hem_i

Henk heard him (co-indexation impossible)

- b. *Henk_i hoorde zich_i

Henk heard SE (SE-anaphors are –R(eflexive), but the verb requires a +R element to make the predicate reflexive)

- c. Henk_i hoorde zichzelf_i

Henk heard himself (non-reflexive verb is reflexivized with SELF, which is +R)

- d. Willem_i schaamt zich_i. (Reinhart & Reuland, 1993:666)

Willem shames SE. (intrinsically reflexive verb does not need a +R argument)

As for verbs that select two arguments, as Reinhart and Reuland (1993:667) explain it, in the standard Dative case a SE-anaphor is excluded:

(21) *Peter_i vertraute sich_i seine Tochter an. (German)

*Peter_i vertrouwde zich_i zijn dochter toe. (Dutch)

Peter_i.Nom entrusted to self_i.Dat his daughter.Acc PRT (the verb is not intrinsically reflexive)

A SELF-anaphor in (22) remedies the situation in (21) (Reinhart & Reuland, 1993:667):

(22) Peter_i vertraute seine Tochter nur sichselbst_i an. (German)

Peter_i vertrouwde zijn dochter slechts zichzelf_i toe. (Dutch)

Peter_i.Nom entrusted his daughter.Acc only to himself.Dat PRT

However, in (23), where the verb is intrinsically reflexive with respect to its Dative argument, a SE-anaphor is grammatical and Condition B is met:

(23) Peter_i stellte sich_i die Statue vor. (German)

Peter_i stelde zich_i het standbeeld voor. (Dutch)

Peter_i.Nom imagined himself.Dat the statue.Acc PRT

Peter imagined the statue.

SE-anaphors may sometimes find their antecedents beyond their governing category. A classic example of such long-distance binding in Indo-European languages is Icelandic (Reuland 2011:48):

(24) Jon_i sađdi Mariu_j hafa latiđ mig þvo ser_{i/j}

John said Mary have made me wash SE

John said that Mary had made me wash him/her.

Again, as in (4), the case is ruled out as belonging not to a syntactic, but to a discourse level of language, namely, to the case of logophoricity (to be discussed in the next section).

Some languages also have possessive anaphors along with possessive pronouns (Reuland 2011:166):

(25) Honum_i likar bilinn sinn_i/*hans_i. (Icelandic)

Her.DAT pleases car SE's/*her

She likes her car.

(26) Nadja_i vidit svoj_i/*ejo_i avtomobil. (Russian)

Nadja sees SE's/her car.

As we see, possessive anaphors are in complementary distribution with possessive pronouns (of course, if co-indexing is intended). The possessive anaphors are always locally bound and hence do not allow long-distance binding. However, Huang (2007:91) notices that possessive anaphors can be arbitrary in reference and provides some examples, one of them from Toman (1991:116):

(27) Swoj dom jest zawsze najmilszy. (Polish)

SE's house is always dearest

One's house is always the dearest.

Huang (2007:91) also draws the reader's attention to the fact that such arbitrary reference is not restricted only to possessive anaphors. SE-anaphors can be employed in reflexive impersonal constructions, e.g. in German:

(28) Da wurde sich zurecht geschämt. (Everaert, 1986:116)

There was SE rightly shamed

People are rightly shamed.

A SE-anaphor can also occur in a 'SE V SE' structure (Huang 2007:91):

(29) Caki-ka caki-lul soki-nun kes-un nappu-ta. (Korean)

SE.Nom SE.Acc deceive.Comp.Top bad.Decl

Deceiving oneself is bad.

As mentioned earlier, these and other examples of anaphora use are said to be explained by a theory of logophoricity rather than syntax and thus are not given much attention in RT. The following section is dedicated to the explanation of the phenomenon and a general overview of logophoricity in several languages.

Long-Distance Reflexivization and Logophoricity.

Logophoricity is the term first introduced by Hagege (1974) with reference to a particular disambiguating phenomenon, concerning pronominal reference, namely logophors, in African languages. As defined by Huang (2007), Culy (1994), Clements (1975) and others, logophors are linguistic means selected by a current, external speaker to cast his description of the events in terms of their perception by the protagonist of a sentence or discourse. These means, used by the external speaker, can be morphological, syntactic or morpho-syntactic. Culy (1994) groups languages into three types with respect to the mechanisms for expressing logophoricity:

- i. Pure logophoric languages, which use special morphological and/or syntactic forms to express logophoricity (logophoric pronouns, logophoric verbal affixes, logophoric addressee pronouns) that are employed only in logophoric (reported speech) domains.

These are mostly African languages. Some examples:

- (30) Free logophoric pronouns in Donno So (Culy (1994), found in Huang (2007:174):

Oumar_i Anta_k inyemeñ_i/woñ_j waa be gi.

Oumar Anta_k LOG.Acc/3SG.Acc seen Aux said

Oumar_i said that Anta_k had seen him_{i/j}.

- (31) Logophoric pronouns cliticized to the verb in Ewe (Clements (1975) found in Huang (2007:174):

Kofi_i be ye_i-dzo/e_j-dzo.

Kofi said LOG-leave/3SG-leave

Kofi_i said that he_{i/j} left.

- ii. Non-logophoric languages that have no special forms used for expressing logophoricity – English, Arabic.
- iii. Languages of mixed logophoricity which use SE-anaphors in logophoric contexts (Icelandic, Italian, Japanese, Korean, Chinese, etc.). Dargin is believed to belong to this group. An example from Chinese (Huang, 2007:192):

- (32) Mama biaoyang le ziji shi Xiaoming hen gaoping.

Mum praise PVF SE make Xiaoming very happy.

That Mum_i praises SE_{i/k} makes Xiaoming very happy

In Reinhart & Reuland's (1993) understanding, however, a logophor is any anaphor, which is unbound in its local domain, for example, in (4), (18) and (19), repeated here as (33), (34) and (35):

(33) Max_i boasted that the queen invited Lucie and himself_i for a drink.

(34) John_i put a book close to himself_i

(35) Lucie_i saw a picture of herself_i

Huang (2007) criticizes this description of logophoricity as circular, because the notion of logophoricity is defined in the terms of binding and, consequently, any anaphor that violates binding is taken as a logophor.

He argues that any adequate theory must (Huang, 2007:100):

- Postulate a condition that licenses the occurrence of long-distance reflexivization in a language;
- Specify a domain within which an antecedent can be found;
- Identify potential antecedents within the domain specified;
- Explain the motivation behind the optional use of a long-distance reflexive (henceforth, LDR).

In order to review what linguists have observed in Dargin and how they have explained the use of LDRs in it, it is essential to compare pure logophoricity and long-distance reflexivization in other languages.

First of all, long-distance reflexivization is typical for SE-anaphors, rather than SELF-anaphors, although, according to Kim et al. (2006), Korean SELF-anaphor *caki-casin* can also be long-distance bound:

(36) Inphyo_i-nun kyenchalcheng_j-I caki-casin_i-i swumkin cungkemwul-ul
chacanayssta-ko malhay-ss-ta.

Inphyo_i said that the police_j found out the evidence that SELF_i had hidden.

In addition, Huang (2007) identifies many similarities between logophors (henceforth, LOGs) in African languages and LDRs in East-Asian languages; their comparison in this section is mainly based on the overview in his book.

In all languages with logophoric pronouns, logophoric pronouns can be third person; in fewer languages they can be second or first person (Hyman and Comrie (1981) found in Huang (2007:178)):

(37) Mm ko mm do-ε (Gokana)

I said I fell-LOG

I said that I fell.

Huang (2007:177), following Hyman and Comrie (1981) and Wiesemann (1986), suggests the following implicational universal of person hierarchy for LOGs:

(38) 3>2>1

(the existence of first-person LOGs in a language implies the existence of second-person LOGs, and the existence of second-person LOGs implies the existence of third-person LOGs).

Long-distance reflexivization languages have only LDRs for third person, but it complies with the hierarchy above (Huang 2007:191).

All pure logophoric languages have singular LOGs, but a few have plural LOGs as well. Ewe, for example, has both the singular LOG *ye*, and the plural LOG *yewo* (Clements 1975). In contrast, East-Asian LDRs are not specified for number. However, in

some languages (e.g. Russian) LDRs are specified for gender, case and number. In this case they function as intensifiers:

- (39) Ona_i sdelala eto sama_i. / My_i sdelali eto sami_i./Im samim eto ne ponravilos'
 She.Nom did it herself.Nom. / We did it ourselves./ They.Dat didn't like it
 themselves.Dat

To our knowledge, LOGs in African languages and LDRs do not express gender.

As for grammatical functions that LOGs and LDRs perform in a sentence, they typically act as subjects of the subordinate clauses (40) in LOG languages and LDR languages, but they also can be objects (41) in East-Asian LDR languages:

- (40) Tà nē yé ā lò'ō ghã èwén (Mundani, Parker (1986) found in Huang (2007:180))
 3Sg.Subj that LOG IPFV Fut go market

He_i says that he_i will go to market

- (41) Takasi-wa Hiroshi-ga zibun-o kiratteiru koto-o sitteiru. (Japanese, Huang (2007:191))

Takasi_i has broken the car, which Hiroshi_j lent SE_i

Other grammatical functions are possessive (42) and emphatic use (43):

- (42) Takasi-wa Yukiko-ga Hiroshi-ni zibun-no syasin-o miseta to omotta

Takasi.Top Yukiko.Subj Hiroshi.Obj SE's photo.Obj showed COMP thought

Takasi_i thought that Yukiko_j had shown SE's_i photo to Hiroshi_k (Japanese, Huang 2007:191)

- (43) N'dú ... sú-á nē è ká wú zìá

Giant rat fact-say.IPFV that DS NEG be 3SG.LOG.Emph

Giant Rat_i was saying that it was not him_i (Mundani, Parker (1986) found in Huang (2007:180))

Huang (2007) gives examples of emphatic LOGs (43), but there is no example of an emphatic LDR in his book.

As Huang (2007) generalizes, the most unmarked pattern of LOGs and LDRs is one that encodes logophoricity by the use a third-person, singular, non-possessive LOG or LDR which refers to a human subject. The subject is normally a co-argument of a logophoric predicate: typically, predicates of speech or thought. These predicates also have implicational universals:

(44) Hierarchy for logocentric predicates (Huang 2007:185):

Speech predicates > epistemic predicates > psychological predicates > knowledge predicates > perceptive predicates > unmarked directional predicates.

Huang proposed the latter type of predicate as logocentric for LDR-languages, because despite the observed similarity, LDRs differ from LOGs in that deictically-oriented predicates like come/go and bring/take seem to affect the acceptance of LDRs, but not LOGs (Huang 2007:198):

(45) a. Xiaoming shao mama yihumir hui lai kan ziji.

Xiaoming_i says that Mum will come to see SE_i soon.

b. ?Xiaoming shao mama yihumir hui qu kan ziji.

Xiaoming_i says that Mum will go to see SE_i soon.

Huang attributes this contrast to the fact that LDRs refer to subjects of matrix clauses as centers of deixis, thus the movement away from the subject that is created by *go* leads to unacceptable structure.

One more central notion in the understanding of LOGs and LDRs is ‘logophoric domain’. Huang defines it as a stretch of discourse in which the internal protagonist’s perspective is represented. Logophoric domain can be restricted to sentences, where a LOG or LDR is in a subordinate clause, and the matrix clause contains an antecedent explicitly or implicitly (sentential logophoric domain). Logophoric binding can also operate across sentences (discourse logophoric domain), but it typically is created by either logocentric predicates (above) or ‘report-opening’ complementizers:

(46) À wò gā tí sã:rã tchi sã:rã. (Tuburi, Hagege (1974) found in Huang 2007:187))

They PL COMP head LOG-PL hurt LOG-PL

They (said) that they had headaches.

Logophoric domains, as Huang (2007) notices, can be extended to constructions that are not directly related to the reporting of a protagonist’s perspective. But he says that these construction seem to be restricted to purpose clauses in African languages (47), topic constructions in East-Asian languages (48) and relative clauses in both LDR- and LOG-languages (49).

(47) Lébareè dù ko baá mon-ee e

Lebaree came that they see.Log him

Lebaree_i came for them to see him_i (Gokana, Hyman & Comrie (1981) found in Huang (2007:189)

(48) Xiaoming zuiba guan bu zhu ziji. (Chinese, Huang (2007:196)

Xiaoming mouth control not RV SE

Xiaoming_i, mouth_k cannot control self_i

(49) Kim-un caki-lul chingchanha-nun sensayung-ul cohahanta

Kim.Top SE.Acc praise.to teacher.Acc like

Kim_i likes the teacher_k who praises self_{i/k} (Korean, Huang 2007:196)

Logophoricity and Empathy

It should be noticed however, that Reinhart & Reuland (1993) and Huang (2007) see logophoricity somewhat differently. Although they agree that the purpose of logophoricity is to express the protagonists' perspective, for Huang the central notion of logophoricity is associated with reported speech (sentence logophoricity) or reported discourse (discourse logophoricity), and for Reinhart & Reuland logophoricity does not have to be connected to reported speech or discourse, although in many languages it is restricted (to a various extent) to reported speech or reported discourse. What these understandings of logophoricity have in common is that the purpose of logophoricity is to express the protagonists' perspective. This understanding is close to Kuno's (1987) explanation of empathy, or "camera angle", when the current external speaker chooses to cast the events from his (speaker's) or either of the protagonists' point of view, if there are more than one:

(50) John hid the book behind him.

(51) John hid the book behind himself.

The difference, as Kuno explains it, is “when the reflexive is used, it is overtly asserted that the referent of the reflexive is the target of the action or mental state represented by the sentence. When the pronoun is used, however, there is no overt or covert assertion to that effect”. (Kuno, 1987:153).

Moreover, Yoshima (2007) argues that empathy and logophoricity should be kept apart. He gives some evidence from Kuno (1978:212, 213) that they need to be distinguished; one of these is the fact that Japanese logophoric *zibun* can co-occur with a first person pronoun (52), but empathic *zibun* cannot (53):

(52) Taro_i-wa boku-ga zibun_i-o but-ta koto-o mada urande-i-ru.

Taro-Top I-Nom self-Acc hit-Past fact-Acc still resent-Asp-Pres

Taro_i still resents (it) that I hit him_i.

(53) *Taro_i-wa boku-ga zibun_i-ni kasi-ta okane-o nakusite-simat-ta rasii.

Taro-Top I-Nom self-Dat lend-Past money-Acc lose-end.up-Past it.seems

It seems that Taro_i lost the money I lent to him_i.

This is supported also by Kuno’s (1987: 212) Speech Empathy Hierarchy:

(54) The speaker cannot empathize with someone else more than with himself.

Yoshima (2007:14), in addition, provides cross-linguistic evidence from Maling

(1984:223) of the fact that not all languages with LDRs allow empathy:

(55) a. *Joni yrði glaður ef Sigga byði seri.(Icelandic)

Jon would-be (subj.) glad if Sigga invited (subj.) SE

b. Taro_i-wa, mosi Hanako-ga zibun_i-o syootai-site-kure-tara, ooyorokobi-suru-daroo.

Taro-Top if Hanako-Nom SE_i-Acc invite-Ben-Cond be.delighted-will

Taro_i will be very pleased if Hanako invites him_i.

Yoshima's proposal is that logophoric pronouns and empathy-based anaphors ("pov-o-phors") are typologically different, although "pov-o-phors do not have exclusive forms: if a language has pov-o-phors and has logophors formally distinct from personal pronouns, pov-o-phors are homophonous with logophors" (e.g., Ewe), "otherwise, pov-o-phors may be homophonous with locally bound anaphors" (e.g., English *himself*) (Yoshima, 2007:15).

In this section we have shown how BT, RT and Kuno's view the distribution of pronouns and simplex and complex reflexives in their bound and logophoric interpretations. We have also discussed simple reflexives in their logophoric function in some Indo-European and East-Asian languages and logophors of African languages. Now we review the linguistic research on long-distance reflexivization of the simplex reflexive *saj* in Dargin.

Previous Research on Dargin Anaphora.

Dargin (Dargwa, Dargi) is a language of the Nach-Dagestanian branch of North-Caucasian family. Dargin is the language of the Dargin people, mostly living in the Dagestan Republic in North-Caucasian region of Russia. UNESCO assesses Dargin as vulnerable; the number of speakers in 2002 was about 500,000. Abdullaev (1954) states that there are at least 38 dialects of Dargin, some of them mutually unintelligible. According to Big Russian Encyclopedia (online), "Dargin languages are traditionally considered as dialects of one language, but in fact they are a group of more than 17 languages that started separating approximately at the same time when the Germanic

languages did”. The standard norm of Dargin is based on the Akusha dialect, which is a language officially chosen in 1930 to represent the literary standard of Dargin languages. Newspapers, magazines and books are issued, and TV and radio programs are broadcasted in the standard language and it is taught at schools in those parts of Dagestan where the Dargin population is predominant.

All dialects of Dargin are agglutinating, morphologically ergative languages with left-branching sentence structure. The verb morphology is very rich. For example, infixes of class markers show the gender of the subjects (only if they are in Absolutive case) and the gender of objects. As a result, the subject and the direct object can be dropped:

(56) w-ak’ira – I came (masc); r-akira – I came (fem)

(57) če-r-aira – (I) saw (her); če-w-aiβ– (he, they, she) saw (him)

The personal pronominal system is represented by first-person pronoun *nu* (pl. *nuša*) and second-person pronoun *hu* (pl. *huša*). As for the third-person pronoun, some disagreement is observed. Abdusalamov (2012) and Abdullaeb (1954) say that the third-person pronoun is *saj* for masculine, *sari* for feminine, *saβi* for inanimate (neuter) and plural (For convenience, henceforth we will use the masculine form to refer to all forms). Uslar (1892) (on Urahi Dargwa), Magometov (1963) (on Kubachi Dargwa), Mutalov & Sumbatova (2003) (on Itsari Dargwa), Sumbatova & Lander (2014) (on Tanti Dargwa), Temirbulatova (2007) (on Khaidak Dargwa), Forker (2016) (Sanzhi Dargwa) say that *saj* in these dialects is a simplex reflexive, and the languages lack a special form for expressing third person: either simplex reflexives or demonstrative pronouns are used. Kozhuhar’ (2015), however, argues that the element discussed is a logophor.

It is important for us to say here that although these authors (except for Abdullaev and Abdusalamov) draw their conclusions from the observations of different dialects of Dargin (and they call them different languages), the internal morphological structure and principal syntactic features of *saj* allow us to claim that the phenomenon discussed across these languages is the same and comparable with the literary (Akusha) Dargin. We should also emphasize that only the works by Forker (on Sanzhi) and Kozhukhar' (on Mehweb) were specially dedicated to *saj*, the remainder of the available literature discusses Dargin anaphors very briefly: the authors mainly do not go further beyond mentioning *saj* as a reflexive (or a pronoun) and giving its partial case paradigm. Mutalov & Sumbatova (2003) also describe some morphological features of complex reflexives in Itsari. Abdullaev (1954) and Abdusalamov (2012), as we mentioned, classify *saj* as a regular third person pronoun and do not indicate or otherwise mention reflexive pronouns in the description of Akusha Dargwa. Abdusalamov (2012) provides one example of *saj* in the subject position and one example of *saj* as the direct object:

(58) Saj wak'ib

Saj.Masc came.Masc_{subj}

He came

(59) Nuni sari čeraira

I.Erg sari.Fem saw.Fem_{Obj}

I saw her

Forker (2016) distinguishes several functions of *saj* in Sanzhi. She provides the following sentences as an example of local reflexivization (the transcription is the author's):

- (60) ca ca ilt:a-j d-ič:-ib, ca cin-i-j b-at-ur
one one 3pl.obl-dat npl-give.pfv-pret one refl.sg-obl-dat n-let.pfv-pret
(The boy) gave them one pear each, one (he) kept for himself.

However, in Forker (2014), she provides examples of disjoint reference in what one would call a bound anaphora position:

- (61) itij ca-w či<w>ig-ul=ca-w
3Sg.Dat Refl-Masc see<M>-CVB=Cop-Masc
He_i sees himself_i. /He_i sees him_j.

The second function that Forker (2016) observes in Sanzhi is the emphatic use:

- (62) ca-r ka-r-ic:-ur ca-r er-či-ka-r-ik'-ul heχ-i-j
refl-f down-f-stand.pfv-pret be-f look-spr-down-f-look-icvb 3sg-obl-dat
(He says, Hello, Asja Iwanowna.) (She) herself is standing and looking at him.

She also says that *saj* as a LDR is not restricted to predicates of speech and cognition; it refers to a topical referent in a discourse and such co-reference may occur across clauses:

- (63) hel ʔuʳus x:unul er r-ik'-ul r-už-ib-le; alžana b-ik:-ab cin-i-j
that Russian woman look f-look.at.ipfv-icvb f-be-pret-cvb heaven n-give.pfv-
opt.3 refl.sg-obl-dat

It turned out that the Russian woman had looked (at the events), may heaven be given to her. (Forker 2016)

Forker also says that *saj* in Genitive case (both in plural and singular) is used as a pause filler :

- (64) heχ cinna c'aq'-le w-artaq-ib admi ca-w
3sg pause.filler very-advz m-enjoy.oneself.pfv-pret person be-m
He is a person that is very extroverted.

Other uses of *saj* include relative clauses and commitative constructions (Forker 2016):

- (65) il=q:el juldaš-li [juldaš:-a-l cin-i-j sa-q:-ib-te] xunul-be ʔaʕli-j d-ič:-ib
that=when friend-erg friend.pl-obl-erg refl.sg-obl-dat
hither-carry.pfv-pret-attr.pl gift-pl Ali-dat npl-give.pfv-pret
At that the friend gave to Ali the gifts that his friend had brought to him.
- (66) hin-na [badra=ra ca-w=ra] heχ ka-jc:-ur ca-w
water-gen bucket=add refl-m=add dem.down down-stand.pfv-pret be-m
With a bucket of water he is standing.

Kozhukhar' (2014, 2015, 2016) analyzes *saj* in Mehweb (where the masculine form is realized as *sawi*). She goes from dispensing the notion of long-distance reflexivization for *sawi* and attributing all its functional scope to extensions of logophoric use in 2014 to distinguishing LOG and LDR functions of *sawi* in 2015 and to calling it a multi-functional pronominal stem in 2016. In the latter article she proposes that in Mehweb Dargwa there are three main functions performed by *sawi*: logophoric, reflexive and intensifying. In the local domain *sawi* is obligatorily disjoint in reference with the subject when *sawi* is in Absolute case. Kozhukhar' attributes this to the logophoric function of

sawi. She does not clarify her understanding of logophoricity here, but we may deduce that it is similar to that of Reinhart and Reuland (1993):

- (67) *rasuj-ni sa<w>i w-it-ib
rasul.-Erg <M>SELF M-beat:PVF-AOR
*Rasul_i beat himself_i. (Kozhuhar' 2015:16)

As a (sentential) LOG, according to Kozhuhar', *sawi* always refers to the subject of the matrix clause, although she also mentions cases of ambiguity such as the following:

- (68) rasuj-ni ib musa-ze sune-jni ošibka b-aq'-ib i-le
rasul.Obl-ERG say(AOR) musa-INTER(LAT) self.OBL-EGR mistake(NOM)N-
do.PFV-AOR say-CVB
Rasul_i said to Musa_y that he_{i/y} had made a mistake.

It is interesting to compare this ambiguity with that observed by Nichols (1983) as long-distance binding out of a topic construction in an adjunct clause (the example found in Huang 2000; it is unknown exactly which Dargin dialect is exemplified):

- (69) Abadil_i sinc''e_{j/k} γaj ha'ib-mu:til gal_j aqhic''ij.

Mother to SE word said-when boy got up.

When (his) mother_i spoke to SE_{j/k} the boy_j got up (i.e. SE-anaphor may refer to a third person not mentioned in the sentence).

Sawi in Mehweb can take subject and non-subject positions in finite and non-finite subordinate clauses or in the main clause (Kozhuhar' 2016).

III. CURRENT ANALYSIS

Defining the Problem

Testelelets & Toldova (1998) made their observations based on other Nach-Dagestani languages, but their conclusion that LDRs in Dagestani languages display a full paradigm of grammatical features (case, number, gender and person) can be applied to Dargin as well. This makes them look different from LDRs in other long-distance reflexivization languages. Above we stated that in Akusha Dargin the LDR for masculine is *saj*, for feminine - *sari*, for neuter and plural – *saβi*. This distinction for gender/class is lost in cased forms and in plural, as shown in the following partial case paradigm:

Table 1. Partial case paradigm of *saj*

Case	Singular	Plural
Abs.	<i>saj/sari/saβi</i>	<i>saβi</i>
Erg.	<i>suneni</i>	<i>čuli</i>
Gen. (Possessive)	<i>Sunela</i>	<i>čula</i>
Dat.	<i>Suns</i>	<i>čus</i>

From this one may conclude that *saj* is not derived of ϕ -features (also, Testelelets & Toldova 1998). Remember that their absence (or only partial presence) was a crucial factor for the definition of SE-anaphors according to Reflexivity Theory. In addition, the example (58), where *saj* is grammatical in the subject position, makes it exempt from the simplex anaphor definition (Reuland 2011). Such a position is ungrammatical not only for LDRs, but also for LOGs in most African languages:

(70) *Ye` dzo.

LOG leave (Ewe, Pearson 2015)

(71) *e zigha tipn wo. (Aghem, Butler 2009)

LOG left forever you

I have left you forever

Additional evidence from the newspapers corpus is provided here:

(72) Ilk'aidali, pedagogla sani?at q'astfjewsi baħandoβla ?amruliziβ bek'liβiuβsi
muradli βetaur, saj halati wa murhti ustadeβla pedagog wetaur.

That.like teacher.Gen profession goal-oriented Bagandov.Gen life.in.Neut
Neut.main goal.Erg Neut.became, saj.Abs big.Pl and deep.Pl skilfulness.Gen
pedagog.Abs Masc.became

Thus, a teacher's profession became the main goal in the life of goal-oriented
Bahandov, saj (he) became a teacher of broad and deep knowledge.

(73) It qali, it contora, ifdi ħaβri. Suneni tʃeħediuliw?

That house, that office, these graves. Saj.ERG see.NEG. PL(OBJ).PRES.?

That house, that office, these graves. Doesn't he see (them)?

(74) Saj t^sarħil ħankilitʃiw sajħelira politexliziβsi ayi sen sabil sualik'i

Saj.Abs different work.at be.when.and technical.institute.in.Attr situation how
be.CNV inquired.Masc

(Even when) saj had a different job (he) inquired how the things at the technical
institute were going.

One can compare (73) and (74) with (62) from Sanzhi and argue that *saj* is used in the
emphatic function here, the subject position in the sentences being empty. But this cannot
provide an explanation for (72).

However, there is another way in which *saj* behaves not like an LDR, viz. the disjoint reference in the co-argument position of a non-intrinsically reflexive verb: see (59), (61) and (67) repeated here:

(75) Nuni sari čeraira

I.Erg sari.Fem saw.FemObj

I saw her.

(76) itij ca-w či<w>ig-ul=ca-w

3Sg.Dat Refl-Masc see<M>-CVB=Cop-Masc

He_i sees himself_i. /He_i sees him_j.

(77) *rasuj-ni sa<w>i w-it-ib

rasul.-Erg <M>SELF M-beat:PVF-AOR

*Rasul_i beat himself_i.

Such disjoint reference is typical for pronouns, not simple reflexives (Condition B of BT). It is also stated that possessive anaphors are in complementary distribution with possessive pronouns (Reuland 2011:166):

(78) Nadya_i vidit svoj_i/*ejo_i avtomobil

Nadya sees SE's/her car.

For the illustrative purposes we will modify the sentence:

(79) Kogda Nadja_i razbila svoj_i avtomobil, Katja_k očen' ogorčilas'

When Nadya_i crashed SE's car, Katja_k became very upset.

(80) Kogda Nadja_i razbila ejo_k avtomobil, Katja_k očen' ogorčilas'

When Nadya_i crashed her_k car, Katja_k became very upset.

In (79) we have to use a possessive anaphor to show that the car was Nadya's, while in (80) we use possessive pronoun to show that the car was Katya's. However, in Dargin the anaphor in possessive domain is not necessarily bound by the subject of a predicate containing the anaphor:

(81) Muradli_i sunela_{i/k} mašina bačunheli, Rasul_k deβali humariub.

An example of *sunela* (possessive) from the newspapers corpus shows, in addition, that it can have its antecedent across two equally qualifying NPs:

(82) hanuršis Aquša-la ši-liziwad-si aeq'lukar Aelihaži_i sunes-ra TaxoGodi-ni Lenin-na šajzi-bad sunela_i u βelk'unsi Murhi-la sae'aet bedib-si.

1Sg.remember Akusha.Poss village.From.Attr wise Alihaži saj.Dat.Rel. Taho-Godi.Erg Lenin.Gen side.from saj.Gen name write.Partic Gold.Gen watch.Abs gave.Partic.

I remember wise Aligadji from Akusha, to whom Taho-Godi on behalf of Lenin gave a watch with his name on it.

In fact, here *sunela* is as ambiguous for its antecedent as English *his*, and we choose the antecedent, which is the most plausible for the situation described in the sentence.

To conclude at this point, we have seen that in many cases *saj* behaves like a normal third-person pronoun: it can be ambiguous for its referent (can choose its antecedent from subject or object NP in a higher clause or even outside it), can stand in a subject position in a clause (matrix or subordinate), can be (and usually is) disjoint with its c-commanding NP. All these functions are usually performed by a pronoun.

Moreover, it is known that anaphors do not allow co-indexation with quantificational antecedents:

(83) *Every girl's father loves herself (Reuland 2011:79)

(84) Otet^s každoj devočki_i ljubit *sebj_i/ejoj_i. (Russian, the same meaning as in (83))

As we see below, *saj* allows the co-indexation disallowed for (83) and (84):

(85) ħar rursila_i dudešli sari_i maħkamriru

every girl.Poss father.Erg sari(Fem).Abs cherish.Fem.Pres

Every girl's_i father cherishes self_i

Logophoric and Reflexive Behavior

Despite its pronominal behavior, we cannot claim that *saj* is a pronoun, as it is –R in that it cannot be used demonstratively, and even if it is bound outside the sentence, one feels that it can be used this way only if there is some salient referent in the previous sentences.

On the other hand, pronominal behavior is observed in the Aghem language where, according to Butler (2009), if a logophor is used with verbs other than one of saying, thinking, knowing, perceiving or showing emotion, then it displays the referential properties of a normal pronoun:

(86) Abanj_i zigha ndugho mo e_{i/j} gbin zi

Abang leave house PST LOG morning eat

Abang_i left the house when he_{i/j} ate breakfast.

However, as we have compared above, logophors in Aghem cannot be in the subject position, whereas *saj* can. Here is another example to this:

(87) Murad_i wak'ibheli, suneni_k čehedaibla dariβ.

Murad.Abs_i came(Masc).when, he.Erg_k not.see.Past.Attr made.

When Murad_i came, he_k pretended as if he didn't see (him)

Following Yoshima (2007), we could try to distinguish logophoric readings from empathic in order to possibly conclude that *saj* could be a “pov-o-for”. But if we literally translate his contrastive sentences with logophoric *zibun* (43) and empathic *zibun* (44), repeated here, into Dargin we do not receive any ungrammaticality despite the prediction that an empathic element cannot co-occur with a first-person pronoun:

(88) a. Taro_i-wa boku-ga zibun_i-o but-ta koto-o mada urande-i-ru.

Taro-Top I-Nom self-Acc hit-Past fact-Acc still resent-Asp-Pres

Taro_i still resents (it) that I hit him_i.

b. Dargin translation:

Murad hannara himuk'ili saj nuni suneči daqira ili

Murad.Abs still angry is I.Erg saj.Loc hit CVB

(89) a. *Taro_i-wa boku-ga zibun_i-ni kasi-ta okane-o nakusite-simat-ta rasii.

Taro-Top I-Nom self-Dat lend-Past money-Acc lose-end.up-Past it.seems

It seems that Taro_i lost the money I lent to him_i.

b. Dargin translation:

Muradli nuni sunes dediβti art^s detaqaqili duryar

Murad.Erg I.Erg saj.Dat gave.Attr money(Pl) get.lost.Caus Pl.maybe.Pres

Possibly (here it is an intransitive verb to which *money* is the subject) Murad lost the money I gave him (lit. caused the money to get lost)

As we see here, *saj* violates Kuno's Speech Empathy Hierarchy, so we cannot state strictly that *saj* is an empathic element. However, one feels that when we use *saj* we choose its antecedent's point of view to cast the events (also in Testelet & Toldova (1986) for other Dagestania languages). Then we might say that *saj* could be a pronoun employed to refer to the topic of a current discourse. If we state so, we need an explanation why in (76) or in the following examples *saj* can potentially refer to the co-argument of the predicate:

(90) a. Muradli sunes mašina asiβ

Murad.Erg saj.Dat car bought

Murad bought a car for himself

b. Muradli saj suratliziw čewaiβ

Murad.Erg saj.Abs picture.in.Masc saw.Masc_{obj}

Murad saw himself in the picture

c. Muradlis saj igaqu

Murad.Dat saj.Abs love. Masc_{obj}

Murad loves himself

d. Murad suneči daħimts'aizi herik'i

Murad.Abs saj.at mirror.in looked.Masc_{subj}

Murad looked at himself in the mirror.

The issue is easily resolved if we compare *saj* with first- and second-person pronouns.

If we look at the following examples we will see that using a pronominal form with reflexive predicates instead of complex reflexives is the unmarked situation in Dargin:

(91) a. Nuni nab mašina asira.

I.Erg I.Dat car.Abs bought

I bought a car for myself

b. Nuni nu daħimts'aiziw čewaira

I.Erg I.Abs in the mirror see. Masc. Past

c. ħuni_i ħeči_i ħera!

You.Erg you.Dir look.Imp

Look at yourself!

Such utilization of pronouns to encode reflexivity is not unusual for languages. We can observe the same pattern in Frisian (Reuland, 2011:8):

(92) Jan_i waske him_i

Jan_i washed him_i

This is not the only parallel between the first- and second-person pronouns and *saj* in Dargin. They also have the same case paradigm and the same way to form complex reflexives. Partial case paradigm is presented in Table 2 for comparison.

Table 2. Partial case paradigm of Dargin anaphora

Case	1 st Person		2 nd Person		demonstrative		Saj	
	Sing	Plural	Sing	Plural	Sing	Plural	Sing	Plural
Absolutive	nu	nuša	ħu	ħuša	il	ildi	Saj/sari/saβi	saβi
Ergative	nuni	nušani	ħuni	ħušani	ilini	ildani	Sune-ni	čuni
Genitive (Possessive domain)	dila	nušala	ħela	ħušala	ilala	ildala	sunela	čula
Dative	naβ	nušaβ	ħed	ħušaβ	ilis	ildas	sunes	čus
Reflexive	Poss + <i>nu</i> in the needed case: dila nuni, dila naβ		Poss + <i>ħu</i> in the needed case: ħela ħed		-		Poss + <i>saj</i> in the needed case: sunela sunes, sunela saj	

The possessive forms for all pronouns function as intensifiers and are always bound in their governing category:

(93) Nuni dila naβ mašina asira.

I.Erg [I.Poss I.Dat] mašina asira

I bought the car for myself

Compare the use of *saj* and its complex reflexive:

(94) a. Muradli_i sunes_{i/k} mašina asiβħeli, Rasul_k deβali raziwiuβ

Murad.Erg saj.Dat car buy.Past.when Rasul very glad.became

When Murad_i bought self_{i/k} a car, Rasul was very glad.

b. Muradli_i sunela sunes_{i/*k} mašina asiβħeli, Rasul_k deβali raziwiuβ

Murad.Erg saj.Dat car buy.Past.when Rasul very glad.became

When Murad_i bought himself_{i/*k} a car, Rasul was very glad.

Pronominal behaviour of *saj* makes it difficult to classify it as an anaphor or a long-distant reflexive. In the view of its freedom of reference and syntactic positions it is also difficult to call it a logophor, and it is undesirable to explain its behaviour by extensions of logophoric domain, as it would be then difficult to keep the notion of logophoricity still valid.

We can use Huang's (2007) diagnostic given in Section 2 (34) to test if *saj* is a logophor or an anaphor:

(95) a. Murad wik'ar neš saj čewaes larq'an ili

Murad_i says that Mum will come to see SE_i.

b. ?Murad wik'ar neš saj čewaes arq'an ili.

Murad_i says that Mum will go to see SE_i soon.

We get the result predicted by Huang (2007) that IDRs are not compatible with deictic verbs denoting the motion away from the LDR. We could thus conclude that *saj* is an LDR after all. But one could argue that the same effect would be achieved with the first- and second-person pronouns even in English:

(96) a. I/You said that my/your mother would come to see me/you.

b. ? I/You said that my/your mother would go to see me/you.

Also, for the English third-person pronoun the sentence with *go* will be absolutely acceptable in the case of disjoint reference, but not in the case of co-reference:

(97) a. John_i said that Mother will go to see him_k.

b. ?John_i said that Mother will go to see him_i

Thus, on the hand, Huang's test could be used to state that *saj* is not a logophor, but it cannot be the basis for diagnosing *saj* as necessarily an LDR.

Anaphoric and Pronominal Behavior.

The problems of distinguishing anaphors and pronouns were addressed by Anagnostopoulou and Everaert (2013). They list the diagnostics generally used for deciding whether an anaphoric element is an anaphor (Anagnostopoulou & Everaert (2013:353):

- (98) a. strict/sloppy identity
- b. split antecedents
- c. deictic reference
- d. a command restriction on the anaphoric dependency

Although Anagnostopoulou & Everaert (2013) argue that only diagnostics (c) and (d) are the most reliable ones, we will apply all these tests to see if we can call *saj* an anaphor.

First, the diagnostic (a) doesn't seem to be applicable to Dargin, as this language doesn't allow gaps:

(99) ?? Rašidli_i iβ suneni_i ħanči βaryiβ ili, Saidlira_k ilq'aidali.

Rashid.Erg said saj.Erg job.Abs found CVB, Said.Erg.too this.way

Rashid_i said that he_i found a job, and so did Said

For Dargin, it seems that it is possible for *saj* to have split antecedents:

(100) Aminatli_i nešlizi_k βuriβ čuni_{i+k} χat'a βariliri ili.

Aminat.Erg mother.to said saj.Pl.Erg mistake.Abs made CVB

Aminat_i said to her mother_k that they_{i+k} had made a mistake.

Compare the impossibility of split antecedents for Italian anaphor *se* (Anagnostopoulou & Everaert, 2013:356):

(101) ?? Maria_i ha presto che il capitano_k raccontasse queste storie di se_{i+k}

Maria insisted that the captain tell these stories about themselves.

According to (c), an anaphor cannot be used deictically, and this seems to be the case for *saj*, too. As for the diagnostic (d), i.e. the command restriction, Anagnostopoulou & Everaert (2013:353) argue that it should be ultimately derived from (c). Even if so, we have discussed above that *saj* in a co-argument position prefers disjoint reference with its c-commanding antecedent; the cases of co-reference in such positions were explained as the default unmarked use analogous with the first- and second- person pronouns. We will repeat here that *saj* seems to be commanded only semantically: the antecedent must be salient in discourse, or, in other words, it must be the topic of the discourse.

These tests seem to have supported our suggestion that *saj* does not have any syntactic restrictions. As for the semantics, it should also be noted that unlike LOGs and LDRs, *saj* allows its antecedent to be inanimate:

(102) Il žuz_i ħuni sunela_i we?lizi βeda

this book.Abs you.Erg saj.Poss owner.to give.Neut_{obj}.Imp

Give this book to its owner.

II. CONCLUSIONS.

We have shown that theories of LD-reflexivisation and logophoricity cannot account for all uses of *saj* in Dargin. We have also shown that anaphoric versus pronominal syntactic tests do not help identify *saj* as either anaphor or pronoun in their commonly accepted understanding. Although we believe that this phenomenon requires one complete explanation, rather than an extensive account for the ways in which its behavior is “unusual”, at this point of research we are not ready to suggest such an explanation. However, we argue that Dargin should not be considered a long-distance reflexivization language as it has been until now. We agree that the claim that *saj* does not have syntactic restrictions might need statistical support that comes from experimental studies (e.g. anaphora-resolution tests, etc.).

REFERENCES

- Abdullaev, S. (1954). *Grammatika Darginskogo Yazyka* (Phonetika i Morphologija). Makhachkala: DFUSSRSA.
- Abdusalamov, A. (2012). *Dargan Mez: Uchebnoje Posobie Dlya Uchashihsya 10-11 Klassov*. Makhachkala: NII Pedagogiki.
- Anagnostopoulou, E. and Everaert, M. (2013). Identifying Anaphoric Dependencies. In L. Cheng and N. Corver (Eds.), *Diagnosing Syntax*. Oxford University Press: Oxford
- Ariel, M. (1990). *Assessing Noun-Phrase Antecedents*. Routledge: London
- Bloomfield, L. (1962). *The Menomini Language*. Yale Univcveraity Press: New Haven
- Butler, L.K. (2009). *Explaining Logophoricity, With Special Reference to Aghem*. Preliminary paper. University of Arizona.
- Chomsky, N. (1981). *Lectures on Government and Binding*. Dordrecht: Foris
- Clark, H.H. (1997). Bridging. In P.Watson and P.Johnson-Laird (Eds.) *Thinking: Readings in Cognitive Science*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.
- Clements, G.N. (1975). The Logophoric Pronoun in Ewe: Its Role in Discourse. In *Journal of West African Languages*, X, 2, pp. 141-177
- Comrie, B. (1989). Some general Properties of Reference-Tracking Sytems. In D. A. Arnold, D. Martin, J. Grover and L.Sadler (Eds.) *Essays on Grammatical Theory and Universal Grammar*. Oxford University Press: Oxford
- Culy, C. (1994). Aspects of Logophoric Marking. In *Linguistics*, 32: 1055-1094.
- Everaert, M. (1986). *The Syntax of Reflexivization*. Dordrecht: Foris
- Foley, W. A., Van Valin, R.D. (1984). *Functional Syntax and Universal Grammar*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.
- Forker, D. (2014). Are There Subject Anaphors? In *Linguistic Typology*, 18: 51-81
- Forker, D. (2016). Reflexive Pronouns in Sanzhi Dargwa. *Workshop on Nakh-Daghestanian languages*. Bamberg, Germany
- Hagège, C. (1974). Les Pronoms Logophoriques. In *Bulletin de la Societe de Linguistique de Paris*, 69: 287-310

- Huang, Y. (2007, reprinted from 2000). *Anaphora. A Cross-Linguistic Study*. Oxford University Press: Oxford.
- Hyman, L., Comrie, B. (1981). Logophoric Reference in Gokana. In *Journal of African Languages and Linguistics*, 3: 19-37.
- Jacobsen, W. H. (1967). Switch-Reference in Hokan-Coahuiltecan. In D. Hymes and W. Bittle (Eds.) *Studies in Southwestern Ethnolinguistics*. The Hague: Mouton
- Karttunen, L. (1976). Discourse Referents. In J. McCawley (Ed.), *Syntax and Semantics 7: Notes from the Linguistic Underground*. Academic Press: London
- Koryakov, Y.B., Sumbatova, N.R. Darginskije Jazyki In *Big Russian Encyclopedia* <http://bigenc.ru/linguistics/text/1941121>
- Kozhukhar, A. (2014). *The Pronoun Sawi and its Functions in Dargwa Mehweb*. Working Paper. National Research University of Higher School of Economics: Moscow
- Kozhukhar, A. (2015). Distinguishing Logophoric Pronouns and Long-Distance Reflexives in Mehweb Dargwa. *Working Paper as an output of a research project implemented at the National Research University of Higher School of Economics*. Moscow: Russia
- Kozhukhar, A. (2016). The Self-Pronoun in Mehweb. In M. Daniel, D. Ganenkov, N. Dobrushina (Eds.) *Mehweb. Selected Essays on Phonology, Morphology and Syntax*. Language Science Press: Berlin
- Kuno, S. (1987). *Functional Syntax. Anaphora, Discourse and Empathy*. The University of Chicago Press: Chicago.
- Magometov, A.A. (1963). *Kubachinskiy Yazik*. Georgian SSR Science Academy's Publishing House: Tbilisi
- Maling, J. (1984). Non-Clause-Bounded Reflexives in Modern Icelandic. In *Linguistics And Philosophy Pages*, 211–24.
- Nichols, J. (1983). Switch-Reference in the Northeast Caucasus. In J. Haiman and P. Munro (Eds.) *Switch-Reference and Universal Grammar*. John Benjamins: Amsterdam
- Parker, E. (1986). Mundani Pronouns. In U. Wieseemann (Ed.) *Pronominal Systems*. Narr: Tuebingen
- Reuland, E. (2011). *Anaphora and Language Design*. The MIT Press: Cambridge, MA.
- Reinhart, T., Reuland, E. (1993). Reflexivity. In *Linguistic Inquiry* 24: 657–720.

Sumbatova, N.R., Mutalov, R. (2003). *A Grammar of Icari Dargwa*. München — Newcastle: LINCOM Europa.

Sumbatova, N.R., Lander, Y.A. (2014). *Darginskiy Govor Seleniya Tanti: Grammatichesriy Ocherk. Voprosi Sintaksisa*. Yaziki Slavyanskoy Kulturi: Moscow

Temirbulatova, S. M. (2007). *Khaidakskiy dialect Darginskogo Yazika*. PhD dissertation. <http://diss.rsl.ru/diss/07/0557/070557047.pdf>

Toman, J. (1991). Anaphors in Binary Trees: An Analysis of Czech Reflexives. In J. Koster and E. Reuland (Eds.) *Long-Distance Anaphora*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge

Uslar, P.K. (1892). *Etnographiya Kavkaza. Yazikoznanie*. Tbilisi

Wiesemann, U. (1986). Switch-Reference in Bantu Languages. In *Journal of West African Languages*, 12: 42:57

Yoshima, D. Y. (2007) On Empathic and Logophoric Binding. In *Research on Language and Computation*, 5(1):19-35.