



Diversitas Linguarum

Volume 38

# Advances in Kartvelian Morphology and Syntax

*Contributions to the Festival of Languages  
Bremen, 17 Sep to 7 Oct, 2009*

Edited by

Nino Amiridze, Tamar Reseck & Manana Topadze Gäumann

Bochum

Universitätsverlag Dr. N. Brockmeyer

2014

## Anaphora in Svan\*

### Abstract

In many respects, Svan anaphora is very similar to what may be called the Georgian Standard. For instance, it has “zero anaphora” (1) and reflexive (2) and non-reflexive (non-anaphoric) (3) “dummy head”-constructions: (1) *ešxu<sub>1</sub> māre<sub>2</sub> sga<sub>3</sub> loxcvīrax<sub>4</sub> murq̄vam<sub>5</sub>-te<sub>6</sub>, mād<sub>7</sub> āmqed<sub>8</sub> ka<sub>9</sub> murq̄vam<sub>10</sub>-xānka<sub>11</sub>* ‘one<sub>1</sub> man<sub>2</sub> [they say], [they] left<sub>4</sub> in<sub>3,6</sub> the tower<sub>5</sub>, [he] didn’t<sub>6</sub> come<sub>8</sub> out of<sub>9,11</sub> the tower<sub>10</sub>’; (2) ‘then he will throw himself [txum lit. ‘(his) head’] down from his donkey’; (3) *γertem<sub>1</sub> mačvēnas<sub>2</sub> švidebd<sub>3</sub> isgvej<sub>4</sub> txvim<sub>5</sub>* ‘may God<sub>1</sub> let me see<sub>2</sub> you [lit. ‘your<sub>4</sub> head<sub>5</sub>’] [living] in peace<sub>3</sub>’. However, there are some features which Svan shares with its contact language Megrelian rather than with the Georgian standard language: it has a deictic proximity opposition between *ala* ‘this’ and *eža* ‘that’, but it lacks the addressee-related demonstrative (Georgian *magi*) and has a third person anaphoric pronoun *ža/mič-/miž-*, which is a “short form” of its deictic counterpart *e-ža* ‘that’. Apart from the 3rd person pronoun use it shares with its Georgian counterpart (*is, m-is, ma-s...*), *ža* has some special uses where Georgian has the intensifier particle *tviton* ‘s/he her/himself’: the exclusive use (“the brain he gave to his parents, and the meat he ate himself (*miž-nēm* ‘he.ERG’)”) and the “discourse prominence” use it shares with Megrelian and Laz (“Now he came home. The girl he accommodated in a lodge; he himself (*ža* ‘he.NOM’) went into the house and met his brothers”). The formal, systematic and textual properties of Svan demonstratives and of the personal pronoun *ža* are discussed, and a hypothesis that *ža* is used for “long-distance anaphora” (TESTELEK & TOLDOVA 1998) is qualified by considering a tentative alternative which takes account of the suppletive distribution properties of *ža* and demonstrative *eža*.

### 1. The problem

It is a common feature of Kartvelology to take Modern Georgian as a standard of reference which facilitates a quick identification of linguistic units, categories and meanings. While this practice is justified by the ease

---

\* This paper is dedicated to the memory of my dear teacher of Svan, ALEKSANDRE ONIANI (1926–2008) – *xoča lakunu xār*. – I wish to express my deepest gratitude to CIURI GABLIANI for her patient assistance and expertise and to ČATO GUŽEŽIANI for her unfailing native-speaker judgments on the Upper Bal dialect of Svan (both Mestia, Georgia), to REZO KIKNAZE (Tbilisi/Lübeck) for his valuable comments on Georgian *tviton*, and to ŠUKIA APRIDONIZE (Tbilisi) for her observation on *tavi(s)*. They should not be held responsible for any errors and misunderstandings! – I am indebted to DAVID BROWN for improving my English.

with which Svan or Megrelian native speakers produce word-by-word translations which are more or less good Georgian, and while it is unwise to ignore the rich and insightful tradition of Georgian grammar, this orientational use of the literary Georgian language occasionally has the disadvantage of filtering out specific phenomena in the other Kartvelian languages. A case in point is the omission or misunderstanding of the Svan (and, for that matter, Megrelian; see 4.3; 4.5) anaphorical pronoun.

When Svan informants translate the Svan pronoun *ža/ži* into Georgian, they use either the demonstrative pronoun *is* ‘he/that’, as in (1e), or *tviton* ‘himself, herself’, as in (2), or they vacillate between the two:

- (1) (d) *miča koršär-s amĩzum simind-s ka*  
 (d) *his family-DAT so.much wheat-DAT PREV*  
*laxvedna,* (e) *ežas<sub>1</sub> ža<sub>2</sub> al<sub>3</sub> kvecan*  
 he.would.give.it (e) *that<sub>1</sub>.DAT he<sub>2</sub>.NOM this<sub>3</sub> wheat.DAT*  
*xahvedda* [Chr 151, 7]  
 he.would.give.it

[(a) I could neither borrow nor buy maize seeds anywhere from my neighbours (in Karachay). (b) One neighbour had two baskets of summer wheat. (c) However, he was going to barter that (*ežas*) wheat in Svanetia in the following way:] (d) if<sup>1</sup> somebody (there) would give a corresponding amount of maize to *his* own family, (e) *he<sub>2</sub>* was going to give *this<sub>3</sub>* wheat to *that<sub>1</sub>* [person]’ (Georgian: *imas<sub>1</sub> is<sub>2</sub> am<sub>3</sub> xorbals azlevda*)

- (2) *dĩna larda-te adgene i ža sga ačäd*  
 girl.NOM lodge-to he.put.her and *he*.NOM PREV he.went  
 house-to  
*kor-te* [BZ 253, 3–4]  
 ‘The girl he accommodated in a lodge; *he himself* went into the house’ (Georgian: *gogo otaxši šeiqvana da tviton ševida saxlši*)

And indeed, the Svan-Georgian dictionary by TOPURIA & KALDANI (2000) offers: *ži* ‘*tvit, tviton* ‘him/herself’ (TOPURIA & KALDANI s.v., with no further specification) and its plural counterpart *min* ‘third person plural pronoun’ as separate entries. Standard descriptions of Svan tend simply to omit this word and its paradigm (see BOEDER 2003), and some mention one or two of its forms, characterizing them as reflexive pronouns.<sup>2</sup> The translation ‘him/herself’ is also confirmed by IVANE NIŽARAŽE (1910): *сам* ‘*tvitan, txumšv, ža*’, *самый* ‘*tvitan, sčored, namdvild, titon*’. Notice, however, that, with the exception of *txumšv* (see 4.5) and *ža* (as in (2)), these equivalents are Georgian loanwords, which points to the fact that some uses of English “himself” are in fact foreign to the Svan lexicon:

<sup>1</sup> The protasis is asyndetic in this example (cp. BOEDER 2011). For the indefinite subject (“somebody”) in the protasis, see BOEDER (2002a: 92).

<sup>2</sup> MARTIROSOVI (1964: 221): *uķukcevitoba*; ČARTOLANI (1985: 140): *ža* ‘*tvit*’, *uķukceviti nacvalsaxeli*. As we will see, the term “reflexivity” is, strictly speaking, wrong (5.3).

- (3) *tvitan*                      *laxvbas*                      *ži*                      *laxjäcxənx*  
 [them]selv[es]    brother.PL.DAT    PREV    they.woke.up  
 ‘The brothers woke up by themselves’                      [P 76 No. 25a,54]

Similarly, the 3rd person possessive pronoun *miča* is translated either as Georgian *misi* ‘(non-reflexive) his/her/its’ (V. TOPURIA) or as *tavisi* ‘his/her (own)’ (A. ONIANI).<sup>3</sup> As we will see (3.1, 6.1), both readings occur, and the lack of a dedicated reflexive possessive pronoun in Megrelian and Svan is another characteristic feature of Western Kartvelian.

This fragmentary and confusing information makes it advisable to tabulate the largely unknown paradigm of *ža* and to clarify its systematic position among the pronouns of Svan (Upper Bal dialect). Therefore, the paradigms of Svan demonstratives (“this”, “that”) and of the 3rd person pronoun (“s/he/it”) will be presented (2.1) and some specific properties of Svan demonstratives will be outlined (2.2–3). A chapter on the personal pronoun *ža* (3) begins with a description of its syntactic properties (3.1), of its use in reported speech (3.2), of its relationship to the distal demonstrative in anaphora resolution (3.3), and of its occurrence with focus particles (3.4). All this confirms the category membership of *ža* as a simple personal pronoun. Of special interest is the behaviour of *ža* in argumental positions (4). While the use of personal pronouns in contrast positions is amply attested in many “pro-drop” languages and has a close equivalent in Georgian (4.1), there are at least two uses that are more specific and which caused the mess mentioned above: The use of *ža* to mark exclusivity (“only X”) (4.2) and its use for “discourse prominence” (4.3) have no counterpart in Georgian, the particle *tvit(on)* ‘him/herself’ being used instead as an intensifier. By contrast, other intensifier meanings are expressed by particles or particle-like expressions in Svan (as in Georgian): the inclusive use (“X too” and “even X”) (4.4), the agentive use (“X without the help of Y”) (4.5), etc. Finally, the possibility of the “discourse prominence” use and of the “exclusivity” use is derived from the emphatic value of argumental, verb-external pronouns (4.6). Svan reflexivity coding needs to be outlined (5), considering the fact that *ža* has been partially interpreted as a reflexive pronoun or a “distant reflexive” in the literature (6). A final section (7) will give an overview of the results.

<sup>3</sup> ONIANI (1998: 92 = 2005: 78); TOPURIA (2002: 50, 76, 174) does not even distinguish Svan *miča* and the genitive of the demonstrative pronoun *ežiš*: ‘Georgian *misi*, Russian *ego*’.

## 2. Demonstratives and 3rd person pronouns

### 2.1. The paradigms

Svan has two demonstratives which have close equivalents in Georgian, namely *ala* 'this', which corresponds to Georgian *es* 'this', and *eža* 'that', which corresponds to Georgian *is/igi* 'that' (Table 1).

		Svan	Georgian	
(a)	NOM	<i>a-l-a</i>	<i>e-s</i>	'this, <i>hic</i> '
	ERG	<i>a-m-nēm(d)</i>	<i>a-ma-n</i>	
	INSTR	<i>a-m-noš</i>	<i>a-m-it</i>	
	DAT	<i>a-m-is</i>	<i>a-ma-s</i>	
	GEN	<i>a-m-iš</i>	<i>a-m-is</i>	
(b)	NOM	<i>e-ž-a/e-ž-i</i>	<i>i-s/i-gi</i>	'that, <i>ille</i> '
	ERG	<i>e-ž-nēm</i>	<i>i-ma-n</i>	
	INSTR	<i>e-ž-noš/e-č-noš</i>	<i>i-m-it</i>	
	DAT	<i>e-č-as</i>	<i>i-ma-s</i>	
	GEN	<i>e-ž-iš/e-č-a</i>	<i>i-m-is</i>	

Table 1

In addition, both Svan and Georgian have 3rd person personal pronouns: *ža/mižnem/mič...* and *is/man/mas...*, respectively (Table 2).<sup>4</sup> (Notice that Kartvelian languages have no grammatical gender, but the translation of 3rd person pronouns into English enforces a distinction between *he*, *she*, and *it*.)

	Svan		Georgian
	Singular	Plural	Singular
NOM	<i>ža/ž-i</i>	<i>mi-n</i>	<i>is</i>
ERG	<i>mi-ž-nem/ž-inem</i>	<i>mi-n-d</i>	<i>ma-n</i>
INSTR	<i>mi-č-oš</i>	<i>mi-n-ovš</i>	<i>mi-t</i>
DAT	<i>mi-č</i>	<i>mi-n-s</i>	<i>ma-s</i>
GEN	<i>mi-č-eš/mi-č-a</i>	<i>mi-n-eš</i>	<i>m-is</i>

Table 2

<sup>4</sup> In interpreting the Georgian forms *man*, *mas*, *mis* etc. as personal pronouns, I follow VOGT (1971: 87): "Comme anaphorique on se sert du pronom de la troisième série avec chute de la voyelle initiale aux cas obliques." (Cp. p. 53: "Le pronom *is/igi* sert aussi de pronom personnel de la 3e personne. Le thème est alors *ma-* sans préfixe deictique *i-*." ARONSON (1982: 240), who distinguishes two paradigms, *is*, *iman...* 'that' and *is*, *man...* 'he/she/it', is less categorical. He describes the personal pronoun as "usually" showing "loss of the initial *i* in all the oblique forms." The native speaker grammarians implicitly or explicitly deny any difference between long and short form: "Zwar sind die mit *i* anlautenden Formen von *is* abgeleitet, die ohne Anlaut *-i* hingegen von *igi*; es besteht jedoch zwischen ihnen kein Bedeutungsunterschied. So können also *imas*, *imis* usw. und *mas*, *mis* usw. in gleicher Weise gebraucht werden" (TSCHENKÉLI 1958: 131). My impression is that this is not true and that there have always been distinctive uses of the two paradigms, but the matter cannot be pursued here.

The distribution of the genitive pronoun forms *mič-eš/mi-č-a* in Table 2 cannot be discussed here. Its adnominal form is *mi-č-a* and will be called “possessive” in the following.

The Georgian oblique forms in Table 2 (*man, mas, mis...*) are “short forms” of the demonstratives (*iman, imas, imis...*). Similarly, the Svan personal pronoun *ža, miž-/mič-* lacks the *e-* of *e-ž-/e-č-*. The initial vowels seem to be the primary carriers of the deictic value of Kartvelian demonstratives.

In many respects, Svan is a Western Kartvelian language, and one of the features it shares with Megrelian and Laz is the absence of a second person related deictic pronoun like literary Georgian *magi* ‘this (what you said etc.)’.

## 2.2. The demonstratives

I will not give a detailed account of Svan deixis here, but a few tentative observations may help to understand the difference between the deictic pronouns and the the 3rd person pronoun *ža*.

*ala* ‘this’ contrasts with *eža* ‘that’ by a “distance” opposition, where distance depends on the basis of its identification: the same referent can be “proximal” and “distal”: in (4), anaphoric *ala* denotes its proximity in discourse and *eža* distance of an event in which it is involved.<sup>5</sup> In addition, distance is not simply linear in discourse. For instance, proximal “this” can refer to a protagonist whose last mention is “distant” (see 2.3 below on (19)), and “that” can be adjacent to its antecedent (see 3.3; cp. (12), (59c)).

- (4) *gu-d anqäd, ere ala ež xoča dīna*  
 heart-to he.came SUB this.NOM that good girl.NOM  
*läsv<sub>v</sub>-é, xedvāj laxlatən<sub>v</sub> yvačär-s mänkvineš*  
 she.was-é, who.NOM he.fell.in.love merchant-DAT first  
 [BZ 381, 2]

‘[The merchant’s wife perceived the golden trout her husband had brought home and] she understood that this was that good girl with whom the merchant had fallen in love first]’

*ala* denotes proximity to the speaker’s place and time (5), (6a) and to its last mention in discourse (cp. (6b), (13c), (45), (58)), and to the text itself (“discourse deictic” in the proper sense, as in (7a)). In (8), the intervening comment (“we had no corn in Svaneti”) does not count as belonging to the main text line, so “this” can skip it and codes the discourse proximity of the theft narrative. At the same time, *ala*, like English *this*, “signals a shift of entity or focus of attention to a new focus”

<sup>5</sup> Cp. the double identification in: *läxčödda amī xexv-s, miča telyəra-s* (BZ 268,3) he.asked this.GEN wife-DAT, his sister.in.law-DAT ‘he asked the wife of this [man], his sister-in-law’

(MCCARTHY 1994: 275), namely the shift of place and time when entering (see 4.3).

- (5) *ž' ämqidd ala murqvam-te* [BZ 234, 339]  
 PREV bring.him.to.me this tower-to

‘[The girl sees Rostom from above and tells her parents:] Bring me this [man] up into the tower! [If you don’t, I will jump down.]’

- (6a) *al kori-sga semi čqint gezal amtavānx.*  
this house-in three boy child.NOM they.were.born.to.me.

- (6b) *aljār atxēj aš ärix mäg*  
this.PL.NOM now.too thus they.exist all.NOM

[Chr 148, 12–13]

‘[A 120-year-old woman tells about her three marriages and her life in the three families.] (a) In this family [where I live now] I brought up three sons. (b) These are still all alive now’

- (7a) *mučvdāni amiš ləmzəre-v li,*  
 reading.NOM this.GEN blessed.NOM-OPT he.is,

- (7b) *ečis švendba-v xār* [BZ 37, 27]  
that.DAT salvation-OPT it.is.for.him

‘(a) The reader of this [my story] be blessed, (b) may that [man, about whose perishing I told you] have eternal salvation’

- (8) *am lēt Čōlir-tē-’sg’ očädd* [Chr 149, 14]  
this evening Cholir-to-in we.went.down.to

‘[On our way back, we took corn cobs from the fields in Lower Svaneti. We didn’t have corn in Upper Svaneti at that time.] On this evening [of the day when we stole the corn cobs] we went into Cholir.’

*eža* denotes a non-proximity (“distance”) of its referent in time (9)–(10) and preceding discourse (7b), (11), and it is used to mark a shift of perspective in interaction (e.g. from one interlocutor’s speech to the other’s reaction, as in (12)). As in English, the distal demonstrative *eža* “refers across from the current focus to entities or foci that are non-current, non-central, marginalizable or other-attributed”, to quote a description of its English counterpart *that* (MCCARTHY 1994: 275).

- (9) *ež lēt Latpäri zir-xän-žīn ž’očädd*  
that evening Latpar.GEN root-from-on PREV we.went  
*cxeki txum-d* [Chr 148, 21]  
 forest.GEN head-till

‘[We left home and] on that evening, we went from the foot of Latpari to the upper line of the forest’

- (10) *žamob ču mašqid i miž ädburān,*  
 plague.NOM PREV I.remember.it and sun.NOM it.became.dark,  
*eža imži mōd mešqdi* [Chr 147, 6]  
 that.NOM how not I.will.remember.it  
 ‘The plague I remember, when the sun became dark, how will I not remember that?’
- (11) *xvākvd Somex-s “...”. ežnem nākv: “...”*  
 we.told.him Armenian-DAT “...”. that.ERG he.told.us “...”  
 ‘[and we went to an Armenian and] we said to the Armenian: “...”.  
 He told us: “...”’ [BZ 38, 13–14]
- (12) *mine di-s ala Cxvitāgn-d*  
 their mother-DAT this.NOM Tskhvitagan-ERG  
*kōxōmbave. eča-s atsästkan* [BZ 376, 30–33]  
 PREV.he.told.it.to.her. that-DAT she.became.severe  
 ‘Tskhvitagan told this to their [own] mother. She [that (one)]  
 became furious.’

*eža* can denote a specific relationship of “grounding” (GIVÓN 1990: 897–900; FOX & THOMPSON 1990): very often, it refers to a noun phrase occurring in an adjacent clause which identifies the referent by relating it to a context in which it occurred previously. For instance, while *ala* denotes textual proximity in (13c), *eža* in (13b) does not literally mean distance in time, place or discourse, but points to *siminds* ‘corn’ in the clause (13a) in which it is “grounded” and which could be replaced by a relative clause: “(the corn) which we had bought with the earned money”. Roughly speaking, (13a) is thereby backgrounded or “distanced” from the main line of the narrative. The same applies to presupposed or hypothetical propositions of relative clauses (as in (14) and (15), respectively). In (16), the relative clause has no “grounding” function, and the proximal deixis of the demonstrative is a property of its head, whose referent has been introduced in the immediately preceding discourse (cp. “this”(13c) referring to the corn in (13a–b)). – The unmarked position of Svan complement clauses is postposition (17a), but left-dislocated complement clauses do occur (17b). (17b) shows that *ala* can have the proposition of a complement clause as its antecedent and behaves like an ordinary proximal demonstrative. In (17a), on the other hand, cataphoric *eža* points to a subsequent proposition, and the proximity opposition is neutralised, only its non-proximal member *eža* being used. If this distribution turns out to be correct, both grounding and cataphora are positions where the proximity opposition is neutralised. That *eža* is the unmarked member of this opposition is also supported by its suppletive function (its use with inanimate referents (see 3.1), in anaphora resolution (see 3.3), as an emphatic personal pronoun (see 3.5)) and in subordinate clauses (see 6.2)).

- (13a) *näkim-šv*            *simind-s*            *xviqiddad*  
 earned-INSTR            corn-DAT            we.used.to.buy.it
- (13b) *i ež'*            *ānyvān*            *agi-te kap-šv*  
 and that.NOM we.brought.it place-to load-INSTR
- (13c) *i amnoš*            *ka*            *xvisālvōldad*            [Chr 149, 22–23]  
 and this.INSTR            PREV            we.used.to.subsist  
 ‘(a) We would buy corn with [the money] we had earned (b) and brought that home with our load (c) and we subsisted on this’
- (14a) *imvāj*            *kož-te*            *miča*            *laxvb'*            *āčādx,*  
 which            rock-to            his            brother.PL.NOM            they.went
- (14b) *ež*            *kož-s*            *xecād*            [BZ 391, 34–35]  
that            rock-DAT            he.perceived  
 ‘(b) he saw the [“that”] rock (a) to which his brothers had gone’
- (15a) *mare*            *eči-s*            *gar*            *xahvdi,*  
 but            that-DAT            only            he.gives.her.to.him,
- (15b) *jervāj*            *ču*            *moš*            *ätxōli,*  
 who.NOM            PREV            PART            he.will.understand.it,
- (15c) *ime*            *do*            *xāg*            *miča*            *dīna-s*            *nišān*  
 where            PART she.has.it.on.her his            girl-DAT sign.NOM  
 ‘(a) But [the king] will give her as a wife only to the one [“that”]  
 (b) who knows (c) where his daughter has the mole’  
 [BZ 387, 31–32]
- (16) *amēsga*            *ervāj*            *māre*            *arda,*            *ala*            *läsv*  
this.in            who.NOM            man.NOM existed,            this.NOM he.was  
*xelcipi*            *gezal*            *Simon*            [BZ 296, 14]  
 king.GEN            son            Simon.NOM  
 ‘[A woman sees a young man lying dead in a coffin. He comes back to life and rises, and they have a conversation.] The man who stayed in this [sc. the coffin], this was the king’s son Simon’
- (17a) *ečiš*            *mām*            *xoxaldax,*            *ere*            *nāj*            *tvit*            *semi*            *I*            *ošt'xv*  
that.GEN not            they.knew.it, SUB            we            each            three            and            four  
*manät*            *gar*            *nuyvān*            [Chr 148, 36–37]  
 rouble.NOM            only            we.had.it  
 ‘that they didn’t know, that we only had three and four roubles each’
- (17b) *esyvri,*            *esyvri,*            *imte*            *do*            *esyvri,*            *amiš*            *mi*            *mama*  
 I.go,            I.go,            where            PART I.go,            this.GEN            I            not  
*mixal*            [BZ 117, 22]  
 I.know.it  
 ‘I go and go, but where I go, I don’t know at all [“of this I don’t know (anything)”]’

In (18b, d), textual proximity would allow *ala* ‘this’, but situational distance requires “that”. In other words, deictic proximity properties override discourse anaphora.

- (18a) *eče* *eser* *äri* *tvetne* *čäg-räš*.  
 there QUOT it.exists white mare-steed.NOM.  
 ‘There [sc. in the mountains] there is a mare, he said.’
- (18b) *eža* *eser* *izāl* *tve-isga* *jarün*. [...] [Chr 160, 26–29]  
 that.NOM it.foals month-in twice [...]  
 ‘It [that] foals twice every month. [...]
- (18c) *mič* *eser* *ežya* *xori* *semi* *ləčišx* *räš*,  
 he.DAT QUOT therefore he.has.it three legged steed.NOM,  
 ‘I have a three-legged steed,
- (18d) *ere* *ečī* *lizāl-āl-d* [...] [Chr 160, 26–29]  
 SUB that.GEN foaling-PL-until [...]  
 because until its foaling [...]

### 2.3. Expanded demonstratives

Demonstratives sometimes co-occur with their respective deictic vowels (-*a* in (19)–(20), (22c), (59a), -*e* in (4), (21), (22a)) as (separable!) reinforcing particles which are stressed (ZVENTI 1949: 105–106) and which normally announce the identification of a referent whose accessibility the speaker wants to ensure in an afterthought construction. In (19), the last mention of the protagonist boy is five clauses apart from its resumption. This form of “repair” is even indispensable with non-canonical uses of the demonstrative in cases of “associative anaphora” (or “inferrable” or “indirect anaphora”): in (20), the antecedent (“the creditors”) is only implicit in the noun “debts”.<sup>6</sup> – The use of the proximity opposition is the same as with simple demonstratives. Although the position of the afterthought unit and its co-reference with the demonstrative seem to suggest a cataphoric use of the latter, the postposed unit itself does not control the proximity value of the demonstrative. Rather, the expanded demonstrative anaphorically points back to an antecedent which the speaker supposes to have been “activated” in the addressee (in the sense of GUNDEL et al. 1993 and others). In the following examples, the expanded demonstratives anaphorically refer to a proximal or non-proximal nominal antecedent ((19)–(20) vs. (21)) or a proposition (e.g. in the minimal pair (22c) vs. (22a), where the reference of *eža* -*é* in (a) skips

<sup>6</sup> This example is remotely reminiscent of the use of demonstratives with first mentions (HIMMELMANN 1996: 232). Indeed, the use of the afterthought construction resembles the so-called “recognitional use”, where “the speaker anticipates problems with respect to the information used in referring to a given referent” and refers “to entities assumed [...] to be established in the universe of discourse” and to “specific, but presumably shared knowledge” (HIMMELMANN 1996: 230, 240).

the boy's report on the king's request; cp. (96), where the information of the complement clause is "recalled").<sup>7</sup> Notice that a cataphoric use of non-expanded *eža* (pointing to a subsequent complement clause as in (17a)) would be possible in (22a), but *eža -é* is not cataphoric, and its proximity value is not neutralized, since it contrasts with *ala -á* in (22c).

(19) *ašxv ladäy rākv amnēm-á, čqint-əld-d: ...* [BZ 339, 18]  
 one day he.said.it this.ERG-á, boy-DIM-ERG

'[An orphan boy lives with an old woman. One day the woman sweeps out the kitchen, a millet seed falls into the yard, where it grows into a high tree.] One day, this [one] *á*, the boy, said: [...]'

(20) *rākv aljār-d-á, gadan er xugdānx, ere ...*  
 they.said these-ERG-á, debt.NOM SUB it.stood.to.them, SUB...

'[Beginning of a fairy-tale:] A man had many debts. He couldn't pay them back and at that time he died.] These said-á, who had given him a credit: ...' [BZ 288, 17]

(21) *sgōtnācde lezob-te ež mešxe leyv-é,*  
 PREV.he.mixed.into food-to that black fig-é,  
*xedvāj xošxvān žib-iswa* [BZ 283, 33–34]  
 which.NOM he.kept.it pocket-in

'He mixed that black fig into the food *é* which he kept in his pocket'

(22a) *ečunyōn kōxōmbve ser eža-i-é,*  
 that.after PREV.he.told.it.to.her besides that.NOM-and-é,

(22b) *invājžīn jār xexōlx šukv-s [...]*  
 how who.NOM they.met.him way-DAT [...]

(22c) *aljār-s či kōxōmbve alā (< ala-a),*  
these-DAT all.NOM he.told.them this.NOM-a,

(22d) *māj pasux oxvčirex min-eš-te*  
 what.NOM answer.NOM they.charged.him they-GEN-to

'[A king sends a boy into the other world to meet his mother. On his way there, he meets several people who charge him with presenting their problems in the other world. He meets the king's mother, and he first tells her about her son's request.] (a) After that, he told her

<sup>7</sup> HEWITT (2005: 122–124) considers the possibility that *é* in front of postposed relative clauses is a form of the "reduced complementiser [sc. *e(re)*] at the end of the main clause", but he rightly asks why it "appears to be so critically linked to there being a preceding demonstrative of some sort" (HEWITT 2005: 124). The reason is that *é* is not a complementiser but an expansion of the demonstrative *eža* which contrasts with *á* as an expansion of *ala*. HEWITT (2005: 124) provides an interesting example of what he calls an "adverbial clause of manner" (a clause with a relative manner adverbial): *Zurab hädur-d ežži suleli mama lē (< li é), zural-s er xabža* [normalised transcription] Zurab.NOM complete-ADV thus foolish.NOM NEG is-é, woman-DAT SUB she.thinks 'Zurab is absolutely not so foolish as the woman thinks' (HEWITT's translation "...such a foolish father" is a mistake). It is problematic to judge on an isolated sentence, but I suppose that the final clause resumes a fact that occurred in the preceding context.

that, too, é, (b) who met with him on his way and under what circumstances [...] (c) [On his return home he meets the same people who ask him for the answer to their problems.] He told these people all this á (d) which answer they had charged him with for them'  
[BZ 340,15; 33]

Similarly, *ža* can be used with an afterthought identification of its referent (as in (69)). However, it not only lacks the initial deictic vowel of *e-ža*, but also fails to occur with it as a particle. It is not a demonstrative, but a personal pronoun.

### 3. *ža* as a personal pronoun

#### 3.1. General properties

*ža* is neither a particle like Georgian *tviton* 'him/her/itself; G *selbst*' nor a demonstrative: a) While *tviton* co-occurs with personal pronouns (*me tviton/tviton me* 'I myself'), Svan *ža* does not (*\*mi ža, \*ža mi*); the translation of 'I myself have no time' shows the simple verb-external personal pronoun (*mi mām mižib* (CG) I not for.me.is.free.time). b) While demonstratives are freely used as determiners of nouns, personal pronouns are restricted to a few constructions: they occur with emotionally qualifying expressions (*mi šter* I stupid.NOM 'How stupid I am [I forgot to shut the door]') and in vocatives (*si šter* you stupid.NOM 'You block-head!'). c) Unlike demonstratives, *ža* occurs as a regular substitute of 1st and 2nd person pronouns in reported speech (3.2). d) Unlike Georgian *tviton* (*ise gaxmeba tviton* '[sc. the grass] will dry by itself') and unlike demonstratives (which can freely refer to non-human referents, including propositions; see 2.2–3), the reference of headless *ža* is restricted to humans (but not in adnominal use, see 4.2), a feature it shares with the standard use of 1st and 2nd person pronouns. The unmarked demonstrative *eža* (see 2.2) is used as an anaphoric pronoun for non-human referents without its distal value:

- (23) *ču ləg stol i māj eče-ži (\*mičäš-ži)*  
PREV it.stands table.NOM and what.NOM that-on  
*mōd äri* [BZ 381, 15–16]  
not it.exists  
'There stands a table, and what is not on it!'

All this confirms its interpretation as a personal pronoun.

That *ža* is a non-deictic anaphoric pronoun can most easily be seen where it is not used as a verbal argument, specifically, as an adjunct (24)–(28) or a possessive form (*miča* in Table 2) in (1c), (12), (14a), (15c), (29)–(33).

The genitive form of *ža* has both reflexive and non-reflexive readings in adjuncts of main clauses (cp. (24)–(25) with (26)–(27)). Similarly, possessive *miča* in (26), (70), and *mine(-mine)* in (29)–(30), (31b–c) is reflexive, but non-reflexive in (14a), (15c) and in (31a), where *miča* has an antecedent in the preceding clause. In (32), only “world knowledge” tells us that kings have viziers, but not their daughters. Since Svan has no gender distinction, only number (“his”, not “their”) determines the reference of *miča* in (33): it is a singular, which cannot refer to the subject. Notice that *miča* also occurs inside the subject, as in (40).

- (24) *mič-eš-te almāz* [BZ 382, 24]  
 he-GEN-to he.came  
 ‘[His father decided to see his son and] came to him’
- (25) *itjāl̄x, ere min-eš-xän-čün ädkāpix*  
 they.try.it, SUB they-GEN-from-below they.drag.it  
*murq̄vam* [Chr 9, 34–35]  
 tower.NOM  
 ‘They try to drag the [snow-]tower down from them’
- (26) *vāzri gezal-d miča xexv sgād*  
 vizier.GEN son-ERG his wife.NOM in.again  
*ān̄tix, miča mu-j miča-caxä*  
 he.made.her.return, his father.NOM-and he.GEN-at  
*adurdune* [BZ 284, 24–25]  
 he.made.him.stay  
 ‘The vizier’s son let his wife come back to him, he let his father live with himself, too’
- (27) *ečkas min-eš-d kamasär xočām ləčīd-s inqax*  
 then they-GEN-for additional good *ləčīd-DAT* they.baked.it  
 ‘Then they baked additional good stuffed bread for themselves’  
 [Chr 12, 9]
- (28) *lādi gurgvin mičāš-ži xār ləge*  
 today crown.NOM she.GEN-on she.has.it put.NOM  
 today the wedding-crown is put on me [“she has it put”]  
 [BZ 295, 13–14]
- (29) *čv-ašdüyx mine häzvi-sga* [BZ 380, 14]  
 PREV-they.buried.him their yard-in  
 ‘They buried him in their yard’
- (30) *alj-ār-s mine-mine lätxvar min-s*  
this-PL-DAT their-their for.hunting.NOM they-DAT  
*xotrax* [BZ 77, 33–34]  
 they.know.it  
 ‘These [brothers] know [G *kennen*] their (respective) hunting [grounds] themselves’

- (31a) *näboz-s miča lažmilaj anqädx*  
 evening-DAT her brother.PL.NOM-and they.came
- (31b) *i mine dačvir lax amž' esxvīdx,*  
 and her sister.NOM when so they.met.her,  
*suru äncaxvānx.*  
 very they.worried.
- (31c) *ž' oxōznanex mine dačvir-s* [BZ 380, 10–11]  
 PREV they.looked.after.her their sister-DAT  
 '(a) In the evening her brothers came too, (b) and when they found their sister like that, they were very sorry. (c) They took care of their sister'
- (32) *ašxv ladäy sīmak lanqavāl-t' āčäd miča*  
 one day girl.NOM amusing-to she.went his  
*vāzr-äl-caxän* [BZ 387, 9–10]  
 vizier-PL-together.with  
 '[A king had a beautiful daughter.] One day she went out to promenade with his viziers'
- (33) *ka laxtōnex miča dekävil* [Chr 151, 33]  
 PREV they.showed.it.to.him his heifer.NOM  
 'They showed him his [own] heifer [which he did not recognise]'

### 3.2. *ža* in reported speech

*ža* is particularly frequent in reported speech, specifically in “semi-indirect speech” (with the quotative particle *eser* or *rok*) where non-third persons are shifted to third-person forms<sup>8</sup> (cp. (18c), (72), (73), (80)–(81), (86)):

- (34) *mič eser xočil-d xoxal al dīnā*  
he.DAT QUOT better-ADV he.knows.it this girl.GEN  
*nišän* [BZ 388, 8–9]  
 mole.NOM  
 '[He said:] I know the mole of this girl better'
- (35) *žā-v eser adzəze ečxāv-e, Giorgīš-te* [BZ 271, 28]  
she.NOM-OPT-QUOT he.sent.her there-e, Giorgi.GEN-to  
 '[The younger girl said:] Send me there, to Giorgi'
- (36) *bāzi eser min-eš-məq irdix* [BZ 386, 19]  
 tonight QUOT they-GEN-at they.will.dwell  
 'Tonight you will be with us'

<sup>8</sup> For a detailed discussion of this and other properties of semi-indirect speech see BOEDER (2002b).

Even vocatives are transposed. In (37), ‘you bad woman’ has been shifted to ‘she bad woman’. Compare the direct speech in (38) with its shifted “semi-indirect speech” version in (38’).

(37) *a, xola eser ži zural!* [P 242, No. 67, 14–15]  
 oh, bad QUOT she.NOM woman.NOM  
 ‘Oh, you bad woman!’

(38) *a, sgäj mārāl, xaqceda txwim-s?* [KM 5: 316]  
 oh, you man.PL.NOM, you.make.perish.it head-DAT  
 ‘Oh, you men, do you want to ruin yourselves?’

(38’) *hm, [...] min mārāl, i xädurd amži*  
 hm, [...] they man.PL.NOM, and always this.way  
*imžin algižēlix* [KM 5: 316]  
 how they.are.mad  
 ‘Hm, [...] you men, how is it that you are always so mad?’

The interpretation of shifted forms requires a very competent knowledge of their linguistic and non-linguistic context:

(39) *tura-d xäkve: jayo, miča eser-í miča*  
 jackal-ERG he.told.him: now.then, his QUOT and his  
*cod mag mič-u xar* [BK 59, 10]  
 sin.NOM all he.DAT-OPT he.has.it  
 ‘The jackal said to him: Well then, may the evil both I and you have done come on you’

### 3.3. Anaphora resolution

Both free personal pronouns and bound verb-internal (overt or covert) person markers are used where the antecedent’s referent is “in focus”,<sup>9</sup> as e.g. in the dialogue: “I want my father Iaman’s eye! – Come out and I’ll give it to you” (*mi makuc mišgva baba Jamani te. – kāye i ka lažödne!* BZ 66, 30–31), where the reference of “it” is “unproblematic” (HIMMELMANN 1996: 227), since its referent is “in focus”. However, this restriction is not a sufficient condition to determine the form to be used, if there is more than one potential antecedent. Anaphor resolution (“ambiguity resolution”, HIMMELMANN 1996: 228) can be a problem, and the antecedents have to be distinguished into those which are referred to by third person personal pronouns (type (a)) and those that are singled out by a different form (type (b)). As COMRIE (2000: 53) observes, the basis of

<sup>9</sup> This term (see e.g. GUNDEL et al. 1993) is used here as an informal, intuition-based label for a phenomenon that, to my knowledge, has not been studied in the Kartvelian languages. Even a general survey such as SCHWARTZ (1986) reveals the multiplicity of its possible aspects.



refers to the by now “more remote” Tambi, skipping the rightmost noun phrase preceding it (viz the dog).

- (41e) *atxē ala, Tāmbi miča žey-d*  
 now this.NOM, Tambi.NOM his dog-ERG  
*č' atir*  
 PREV it.recognized.him

- (41f) *i her ečĩš, e* [KM 5: 334–336]  
 and voice.NOM that.GEN, *e*<sup>10</sup>

‘[The story is about Tambi and his deeds. There follow several sentences about the people of Mestia who drive cattle to the market and about the locality, its owners etc. Then the story continues with: (a) Now this one (*ala*<sub>1</sub>) began to shout, Tambi, from Badzgnierish: (b) “I am here, drive the cattle back! [...]”. (c) These (*aljārd*<sub>2</sub>), the people of Mestia, thought: (d) “This (*ala*<sub>3</sub>) is not accidental, this one (*ala*<sub>4</sub>) [sc. Tambi] will have done something bad.”] (e) Now this [one] (*ala*<sub>5</sub>), Tambi, his dog recognized him (f) and the voice of his, *e* [(g) It [sc. the dog] came down and barked at him [sc. Tambi] from this side of the water.]’

In general, problems of anaphor resolution can be solved by an after-thought construction, as in (41a, c, e). On the other hand, the exuberant use of the expanded or unexpanded demonstratives in recently tape-recorded texts shows that it is being extended to cases where no communicative problem would arise: (42) would be perfectly understandable without any verb-external argument coding.

- (42) *č'otžārvex alj-ār-d ala-s i*  
 PREV they.trusted.him this-PL-ERG this-DAT and  
*ka-laxdiānex al'ā, tvep i*  
 PREV-they.lent.it.to.him this.NOM-*a*, gun.NOM and  
*anpišvdx*  
 they.let.him.go [KM 5: 316]  
 ‘[a man meets some drovers and asks them for their gun. After some discussion, they are willing to lend it to him.] They [“these”] trusted him [“(to) this”] and lent him this, *a*, the gun, and let him go’

### 3.4. *ža* in focal and conjunct positions

As a personal pronoun, *ža* also occurs with focus particles (43)–(45), (71a, b) and co-ordinative conjunctions (46):

<sup>10</sup> In the examples I am aware of, the deictic particle is followed by its target: *ečĩs e*, *Tāmbĩš* (see 2.3), but its omission in this context may result from the redundancy of such a resumption.

- (43) *kor-te lax mušgvri-d jār xoqdeni,*  
 house-to when guest-ADV who.NOM he.comes.to.him,  
*i mič-eš-d-i masär-d xuyve* [Chr No. 180, 153,32]  
 and he-GEN-for-and abundant-ADV he.has.it  
 ‘[The hunter shoots a lot of game.] If somebody comes to him as a  
 guest, he has plenty of it for him, too.’
- (44) *ameču arda ža gar i igvānda*  
 here she.existed she.NOM only and she.wept  
 ‘Only she was here, and she wept’ (cp. (48a)) [BZ 369, 9–10]
- (45) *ala ču lalēm mižnēm gar i päkvna-s*  
this.NOM PREV she.ate.it she.ERG only and puppy-DAT  
*māma loxvēt* [BZ 379, 26–27]  
 nothing she.gave.it.to.him  
 ‘[The girl found a hazle-nut.] Only she ate this [sc. nut] and didn’t  
 give anything to the puppy’
- (46) *anāgānx ža-j miča cēvār-mežbār*  
 they.stood.up he.NOM-and his dragging-tracing.NOM  
*i ačādx* [BZ 252, 14]  
 and they.went.away  
 ‘[Khvtisavar expressed his thanks and] he and his tracker dog rose  
 and went away’

Even though the verb in a sense contains the 3rd person subject, it must be overt outside the verb to be in the focus of the particle.

### 3.5. Argumental and non-argumental positions of *ža*

The personal pronouns *ža/miča* occur in two different positions: non-argumental and argumental positions. In argumental positions, all personal pronouns are emphatic, since they contrast with their absence (“Ø”, “pro-drop”). In non-argumental positions, they are in complementary distribution with verb-internal person markers and function like personal pronouns in other languages (see 3.1). From this distribution, an asymmetry results: while free argumental personal pronouns are the emphatic counterpart of non-emphatic verbal person-marking, free non-argumental personal pronouns are non-emphatic. This systematic gap seems to be filled by the distal demonstrative, which has an emphatic function in:

- (47) *imya do esyfi ečiš-te?* [CG] L<sup>r</sup>  
 [Giorgi has a good friend.] Why doesn’t he go to hīm [“that.GEN-  
 to”) [instead of asking *mé*]?

- (48) *ečunyo Bondo anqad. eči šalbar tqərāl läsv* [CG]  
 ‘[First came Giorgi. His trousers were clean.] Then Bondo came.  
 His [“that.GEN”) trousers were dirty’

### 3.6. Third person vs. first and second person pronouns

Since *ža* is a personal pronoun like *mi* ‘I’, *si* ‘you’ etc., they should share relevant properties. However, the texts printed so far offer too little material, one reason being the predominant person shift in reported speech (3.2). So the following discussion will be limited to the third person pronoun *ža*.

## 4. *ža* in argumental positions

Arguments of finite verbs are normally marked inside the verb, but as soon as they have special properties that cannot be coded in the verb, a verb-external expression is needed: a simple pronoun or a nominal group.

### 4.1. *ža* in contrast positions

Contrast cannot be coded by verb-internal markers, and appropriate personal pronouns like *ža* are used to bear a contrastive stress (or the like).

- (49) *si* *inväj xäri, dema igni, inväj*  
 you.SG.NOM where you.exist, not it.stands, where  
*xäri, ža mām äri* [P 162, No. 46, 57–58]  
 you.exist, it.NOM not it.exists

‘[A woman addresses her fiancé who stays in the woods: O poor Ashdarkhan, you are roaming around in the forests, even the game has pity on you:] Where you are, it doesn’t stop, where you are, it is not to be found.’

- (50) *xatxelinax* *Gigo Galpxān-s.* *mič*  
 they.were.searching.for.him.PERF Gigo Galpkhan-DAT. he.DAT  
*daqläš kvirkv-ild sga loxkva, žäri-s amži*  
 goat.GEN skin-DIM.NOM he.put.it.on.PERF, troop-DAT thus  
*sga laxčäda* [P 44, No. 13, 5–7]  
 he. mixed.with.it.PERF

‘[They betrayed the Galpkhans.] They were searching for Gigo Galpkhan, they say. He had put on a goat-skin and mixed with the crowd’

- (51) *ara-čxara čūv xodgara,*  
 eight-nine.NOM PREV.OPT(?) he.killed.them.PERF,  
*ara-čxara mič yal xaqidx*  
 eight-nine.NOM he.DAT alas they.came.over.him  
 ‘He killed eight or nine, they say, eight or nine, alas, came over him’  
 [P 278, No. 92, 47–48]
- (52) *C: lədxald mām li-a, ha? – D: amži xocxa mič. – B: mi amži micxa,*  
*amži mi xoča* [conversation between Domna Vezden, Ciuri  
 Gabliani, Bondo Gabliani and others in Mestia 1974]  
 C: flimsy not it.is-Q, ha? – D: like.this he.prefers.it he.DAT. – B: I  
 thus I.prefer.it, thus I it.is.good.for.me  
 ‘[G: What do you do, Domna? – D: I have to knit a jumper for  
 Bondo. <There follows an exchange of 6 turns on the technique of  
 knitting.>] C: Isn’t it [sc. the pullover] too flimsy? – He [= B] pre-  
 fers it like this. – B: I prefer it like this, I like it this way’
- (53) *mi lamlatən paq̄v, eča-s māma* [CG]  
I I.liked.it cap.NOM, that-DAT not  
 ‘[Giorgi showed me and Tsiuri his cap.] I liked it, but she didn’t’
- (54) *mānḳvi ežnem m-äqid, ečunyo mi xvāj mič* [CG]  
 first that.ERG me-he.beat, that.after I much he.DAT  
 ‘[We quarreled:] First he beat me, then I really [beat] him’
- (55) *mānḳvi mare-d x-äqid zurāl-s, ečunyo*  
 first man-ERG her-he.beat woman-DAT, that.after  
*zurāl-d x-äqid eža-s/mič* [CG]  
 woman-ERG him-she.beat that-DAT/he.DAT  
 ‘First the man beat the woman, then the woman beat him’

The details of contrastivity are far from being clear, but the following observations may be made: 1) The referent contrasting with the referent *ža* occurs in the immediately preceding sentence. It is mostly its subject, as in (49)–(51), and both contrasting entity and antecedent are “in focus” (see 3.3). 2) (52) shows that *ža* can be used at a large distance from its overt antecedent. The typical discourse proximity condition of being “in focus” is cancelled by a situational factor (B’s being a participant of the conversation). Again, a deictic proximity property overrides discourse anaphora (see 2.2). At the same time, its contrasting referent is implicit: C’s rhetorical question implies: “I would not prefer it like this”. 3) With multiple contrasts, my data are insufficient. While the contrast between same-role referents is coded by *ža* in (49)–(50), the choice of *eža* for different arguments with the same role in (53) (cp. (11)–(12)) and for same arguments with different roles needs further investigation; cp. (54)–(55).

Notice that in addition to contrastiveness, (50)–(52) allow an intensifier interpretation (“he himself”), depending on the textual centrality (“importance” KÖNIG 2001: 749) of the referent of *ža* (cp. (77)).

#### 4.2. Exclusive *ža*

In another group of examples, *ža* is used to emphasize the exclusion of, and a contrast with, others: “only X did/was... Z, not Y”, i.e. as an “intensifier”.<sup>11</sup> As with contrastive *ža*, the occurrence of its antecedent is probably restricted to subjects of immediately preceding clauses or sentences.

- (56) *tvel miča di-s i mu-s-əd*  
 brain his mother-DAT and father-DAT-again  
*esvde-ji išv mižnēm lalēm* [BZ 258, 19]  
 he.laid.it.to.them-and meat.NOM he.ERG he.ate.it  
 ‘He offered the brain [of the game] to his mother and father again and he ate the meat himself’

- (57) *Gvāriš-isga min esagānx* [P 54, No. 14, 51]  
 Gvarish-in they they.stopped  
 ‘[The Tatars they drove to Mashelan,] in Gvarish they settled themselves.’

- (58) *čv-adgār dāv. ami xexv mič*  
 PREV-he.killed.him dev.NOM this.GEN wife.NOM he.DAT  
*xād* [BZ 243, 16]  
 he.got.her  
 ‘He killed the Dev. He had his wife himself’

- (59a) *anqād ečka alā, čqint,*  
 he.rose then this.NOM.a, boy.NOM,  
 ‘Then this [one]-a, the boy, rose,

- (59b) *i txvim kātkvic yvačār-s*  
 and head.NOM PREV.he.cut.it.on.him merchant-DAT  
 and he cut off the merchant’s head

- (59c) *i eči lirde-lizge mič*  
 and that.GEN existing-dwelling.NOM he.DAT  
*essād* [BZ 337, 8–9]  
 it.remained.to.him  
 and his property became his’

In contrast to the other uses of *ža*, its exclusive use has both an adjunct variant where *ža* is not adjacent to the noun (phrase) it refers to, as in

<sup>11</sup> For a survey of research on intensifiers, see KÖNIG (2001) and KÖNIG & SIEMUND (2000).

(60), and an adnominal variant,<sup>12</sup> as in (61)–(62) ) (where Modern Georgian uses *tvit*, for instance in (63): *tvit* /\**tviton* *çigni* ‘the book itself’).<sup>13</sup> (63) shows that adnominal *ža* can refer to non-human referents (see 3.1).

- (60) *Aleksandre* *čike* *ž’ēsbizān*,  
 Alexander.NOM still he.NOM he.satiated.himself,  
*yo* *bašləq* [BZ 56, 6]  
 then hood.NOM  
 ‘first Alexander ate his fill himself, then his hood’
- (61) *mižnem* *Bondo-d* *mākvin* [CG]  
 he.ERG Bondo-ERG he.told.it.to.me  
 ‘Bondo himself told me’
- (62) *mič* *čāži* *patron-s* *māmgveš* *xaqer* [CG]  
 it.DAT horse.GEN owner-DAT nothing.NOM it.did.it.to.him  
 ‘[The bear killed the horse, but] it didn’t do any harm to the horse’s owner himself’
- (63) *mare* *ža* *lāir* *hādvir* *läsv* [CG]  
 but it.NOM book.NOM whole.NOM it.was  
 ‘[He sent me a book. Its cover was torn,] but the book itself was intact’

#### 4.3. “Discourse-prominent” *ža*

Very often, *ža* reintroduces the protagonist X after a scene change. For instance, after X is said to have performed Z on Y or to have a relationship to Y in one scene, it appears in another, from which Y is excluded (64)–(66) (cp. (2)). The aspect of exclusion connects this use with exclusive *ža* (4.3). – A whole clause describing the protagonist’s “look back” (67) or perception (68) can expand the first scene before its switch to the second one. None of the categories given up to now applies in these examples: we have neither focusing by means of focus particles or conjunctions, nor indeed contrast in the narrow sense, since the subjects of the two respective clauses are the same. Rather, these examples seem to be

<sup>12</sup> The adnominal variant seems to be rare in the printed texts. I have not been able to spot an example. In any case, it should be noted that adnominal pronouns occur less often than their non-adnominal counterparts. With the demonstrative *eža* and *ala* the proportion is 50:3 and 50:24 in the nominative and ca. 70:30 and 70:65 in the oblique cases of the singular. This preliminary finding is at odds with HIMMELMANN’s observation that “adnominal use tends to be clearly more frequent than pronominal use” (HIMMELMANN 1996: 214).

<sup>13</sup> Besides invariable *tavad* (< *tav-ad* ‘head-ADV’), which has a somewhat archaic or dialectal flavor in Modern Georgian (cf. ŠALVAŠVILI 1989: 320–326), Old Georgian uses the agreeing pronoun *tavad-* ‘her/him/itself’ (ŠALVAŠVILI 1989: 294): *tavad-man ymert-man* himself-ERG God-ERG ‘God himself’.

related to instances of “discourse prominence” in the sense that X is “more important” than Y in a specific situation (BAKER 1995): after a “shift of attention” (KEMMER 1995) to a potential topic of the next clause(s) (e.g. to the husband (66), to the Devs in (67), to the sleeping Kadj (68), or to the protagonist’s brothers (69), the referent most prominent at that point of the story is refocussed in a different situation. (70) presents a revealing contrast between *ža* and *ala* ‘this’: whereas *ža* underlines a continuity of focus to the exclusion of other elements of the preceding situation, *ala* signals a shift of attention (see 2.2), since the man is no longer in focus after leaving the scene.

- (64) *Mərziläš txvim k̄ā-ži esvde, mižnem*  
 Murzila.GEN head.NOM ka-on he.put.it, he.ERG  
*qor-ka läjskine* [P 92, No. 27a, 4–75]  
 house-from he.leapt  
 ‘He put Murzila’s [cut-off] head on the Ka [a slate plate for bread-baking]. He (himself) leapt out of the door’
- (65) *atxe gudra čv-esge i ža*  
 now bag.NOM PREV-he.put.it.down and he.NOM  
*kāčäd. Kamnīl-d ž’ānkucūre i*  
 PREV.he.went.away. Kamnil-ERG PREV he.cut.it.open and  
*sgānču gurnāl esvde i čv-acvir*  
 inside stone.PL.NOM he.put.them and PREV-he.left.it  
*ežži, ž’āčäd* [BZ 335, 23–24]  
 thus, he.NOM he.went.away  
 ‘Now he [sc. the merchant] put the bag down [with Kamnil in it] down and he (himself) went away. Kamnil cut [the bag] open and put stones into it and left it like that, [and] he (himself) went away’
- (66) *telyəra-s čäš läšiāl-s xori*  
 daughter.in.law-DAT husband.NOM fighting-DAT she.has.him  
*i ža yanav li*  
 and she.NOM pregnant.NOM she.is [BZ 332, 8–9]  
 ‘the daughter-in-law’s husband is at war, and she (herself) is pregnant’
- (67) *i ala tkisd amecūn espadgān i*  
 and this.NOM indeed here he.suddenly.appeared and  
*dāv-är čv-asādx mindver-isga. ža*  
 dev-PL.NOM PREV-they.remained field-in. he.NOM  
*čv-əri xelmçipi qōr-ži i kveqanas mehad ka*  
 PREV-is king.GEN court-on and world.DAT always PREV  
*xosgdi i mič dār xosgdi* [BZ 279, 37]  
 he.sees.them and he.DAT nobody.NOM he.sees.him  
 ‘[The Devs’ carpet taught the vizier’s son to fly on it to the king’s palace,] and all of a sudden, he [“this”] turned up there and the

Devs remained in the field. He (himself) is at the king's court and can always see everybody else, but nobody sees him'

- (68a) *i kād aṭāx.*  
and PREV.again he.returned
- (68b) *kāž čv-ādūžda-j*  
*kaž.NOM PREV-he.fell.asleep-and*
- (68c) *ža sgād aṭāx amī dačvir-te i*  
*he.NOM PREV.again he.returned this.GEN sister-to and*  
*igni* [BZ 276, 23]  
he.weeps

'[The poor boy began to cry again] (a) and returned again. (b) The Kadj had fallen fast asleep and (c) he (himself) went in to his sister and weeps.'

- (69) *atxe, mēsma ladey, ža, Qalačuqlan,*  
now, third day, he.NOM, Qalachuqlan.NOM,  
*asād ägis* [BZ 246, 6]  
he.stayed home.DAT

'[First, his two brothers stayed at home, and were attacked by the Dev.] Now, on the third day, he (himself), Qalachuqlan, stayed at home'

- (70) *miča gezal čv-esgure i čv-acvir*  
his boy.NOM PREV-he.set.him.down and PREV-he.left.him  
*bačv-žin i ž'āčād. al'ēr*  
stone-on and he.NOM.he.went.away. this.NOM  
*ačād, ečka kāž kānqād* [BZ 274, 22–24]  
SUB he.went.away, then *kaž*.NOM PREV.he.came  
*ləc-xänka-j xākv: "..."*  
water-out.of-and he.told.him "..."

'he set down his boy and left him on a stone, and he (himself) went away. When he [this] had gone away, then the Kadj came out of the water and told him: "..."

Unlike contrastive *ža*, discourse-prominent *ža* seems to be restricted to subjects (like Georgian *tviton* as an adjunct; ŠANIŠE 1973: §138,3).

The discourse-prominence function of *ža* is strikingly similar to the function of *mu* in the neighboring language of Svan, Megrelian.<sup>14</sup>

<sup>14</sup> *cxeni oro-s kigiorinu, mukə ža-ši žincə kidiinžirə* (QIPŠIŠE 1914: [texts] 96,17 apud EZUGBAIA 2009: 202–203) horse.NOM shade-DAT he.placed.it, he-ERG tree-GEN root-DAT he.lay.down 'He placed the horse in the shade, but he (himself) lay down at the foot of a tree'. EZUGBAIA comments: "The action of the subject *mukə* refers to the direct object, towards which it is oriented, but the second action is oriented towards the subject itself, which either experiences this action or is affected by its result (*anu tviton gaicdis am mokmedebas an mas exeba am mokmedebis šedegi*)'. Cp. *Ludikis kəduṭu kəla do mu-k midartə, mu-š mula-ša paṭi oḱo kocas Duduḱi-k* (X 89,13–14) Ludik-DAT he.left.to.him

4.4. Inclusive contexts of *ža*

In (71b), the addition of the focal particle “too” (3.4) gives the reciprocal situation an inclusive meaning: “X too did Z to Y”:

- (71a) *mare eča-s deš otbädva i ža gar*  
 but that-DAT not.possible he.dared.it.PERF and he.NOM only  
*sgāxcāda Taträl-s xanžar-šv*  
 PREV.he.overwhelmed.them Tatar-PL-DAT dagger-INSTR  
*i voxvišd čotdagra.*  
 and five.NOM PREV.he.has.killed.them.PERF
- (71b) *ečunyo yal ža-j čotdagrax* [BZ 1, 20–22]  
 that.after alas he.NOM-too PREV.they.killed.him.PERF  
 ‘[One man said to the other: Let us attack the Tatars with our  
 knives!] (a) But that [one], they say, didn’t dare to do it, and he  
alone overwhelmed the Tatars with his dagger and killed five. (b)  
 Afterwards, alas, they killed him, too’

This type of inclusivity is also expressed by particles like *tviton* and *tavad* ‘him/herself’ (borrowed from Georgian) and by Svan *mičošd/mičäšvd* ‘(litt.) for him/herself’ (?):<sup>15</sup>

- (72a) *ž’ ēser im-xän lahödne.*  
he.NOM QUOT where-from he.will.give.it.to.him  
 ‘Where will you take it [sc. the money] from?’
- (72b) *mičošd eser yärib li* [BZ 263, 2]  
he.for QUOT poor he.is  
You are poor yourself’

Similarly, the other type of inclusivity: “even X did Z (not only Y)” is expressed by the particle *-i* ‘and; too’ (Georgian *-c* (*ki*)):

- (73) *ešxvi lelätur Lamār’ ēser-ī mād*  
 one.NOM lover.less.NOM Lamaria.NOM QUOT-too not

key.NOM and he-ERG he.went, he-GEN coming-unto honour.NOM it.is.necessary he.gives.her.SUBJV Duduk-ERG ‘Ludik left the key with him, and he [himself] went away. Until his return, Dudik has to treat her decently’. Notice that *mus* corresponds to Svan *miča*, but the Georgian reflexive *tavis* would not be appropriate here (even though some informants use it in their translation). (See CXADAIA 2010 for further examples.)

<sup>15</sup> The morphological details are not clear to me. The final segment of *mičošd/mičäšvd* (and *maremišvd* ‘for the man’, Lentekh dialect apud TOPURIA & KALDANI 2000 s.v. *miča*) seems to correspond to the Georgian postposition *-tvis* ‘for’, which governs the genitive and marks e.g. the indirect object in cases of perfect series inversion: *mič eser amži-amži xoqra mičošd* (BZ 295,12) ‘he has done such and such [“thus and thus”] to him’; cp. the unambiguous genitive plural *min-eš-d* in (27). However, *meqed-* in (81) is not a genitive form. In addition the “postposition” seems to be *-vd-* in *mičošd*, *mičäšvd* and *maremišvd*, but *-d-* in (27) and (81), which looks like the suffix of the adverbialis. Finally, *mičošd* looks like an instrumental as in (74)–(76) plus adverbialis *-d*; cp. Georgian *tviton* < *tv-it* (etymologically: head-INSTR) + *man* (s/he.ERG), which is a possible translation of *mičoš-d* in (72).

*olgenēli*

[Chr 147, 17]

she.stayed.PERF

'Even Lamaria didn't stay without one lover, they say'

## 4.5. Other intensifiers

To express the exclusive meaning "X did Z by himself/alone/without the help of Y",<sup>16</sup> Svan uses the Georgian loan-word *tvit(an)* (as in (3)) or the instrumental of the possessive pronoun *miča* (see Table 2),<sup>17</sup> as in (74)–(76). (75) shows that "agentivity" does not imply animateness. – Again, the instrumental form has an exact counterpart in Megrelian.<sup>18</sup>

(74) *mičoš deš texni mare* [BZ 35, 31]  
 he.INSTR not.possible he.returns man.NOM  
 'the man [who fell into a hole] cannot come up by himself'

(75) *ežkəlib qor amisq ere mičoš*  
 that.kind house.NOM make.for.me SUB it.INSTR  
*sipdeds* [CG]  
 it.rotates.SUBJV  
 'Make such a house for me that it rotates by itself'

(76) *megm-är min-ovš iš[š]vparalex* [P 250, No. 74, 2]  
 tree-PL.NOM they-INSTR they.performed.šušpari  
 'The trees performed a round-dance by themselves'

*mičoš* belongs to a paradigm of possessive pronoun instrumentals: *mišgva-vš* 'by myself', *isgva-vš* 'by yourself' etc. Cp. the second-person counterpart of *mičoš* in: *isgva-vš žuyve mārēmi cod* (BZ 70, 24–25) you(SG)-INSTR you.have man.GEN sin.NOM 'you have the sin of man by yourself'.<sup>19</sup>

<sup>16</sup> "Agentive" meaning (MORA VCSIK 1972); cp. "pırovneba, sagani mokmedebs an mokmedebas ganicdis ušualod, damoukideblad sxvisi daxmarebisa tu monaçileobis gareše" (MARTIROSOVI 1964: 77 on Georgian *tviton*).

<sup>17</sup> Cp. Modern Georgian *tavis-it* his/her.reflexive-INSTR 'by him/herself', which is an elliptic form of Old Georgian *tav-it twis-it* head-INSTR his.reflexive-INSTR 'by him/herself' (ŠALVAŠVILI 1985: 190; 1989: 243). Cp. *me tav-it čem-it vičqwi* (J. 7,17) I head-INSTR my-INSTR I.say.it 'I say it by myself'.

<sup>18</sup> (75) is an exact equivalent of: *eperi 'ude gamiket-ia, mušit irtudas-ie* (XUBUA 1937: 21,19) such house.NOM make.it.for.me-QUOT, it-INSTR it.spins.SUBJV-QUOT 'Make such a house for me which rotates by itself, he said'.

<sup>19</sup> Cp. the Georgian paradigm *tavis-it* 'by him/herself', *čem-it* 'by myself', *šen-it* 'by yourself', *vis-it* whose-INSTR (*visit isçavle? – man maşçavla* 'from whom/with whose help did you learn it? – S/He taught it to me'; ŠALVAŠVILI 1985: 194; 1989: 245) etc. ŠALVAŠVILI considers these Modern Georgian forms as suppletive of the personal/interrogative pronominal paradigms and not as possessive pronouns.

The intensifier meaning “s/he personally” (Georgian *tavad, piradad*) is expressed by the instrumental of the dummy noun *txum* ‘head’ (see 5.2):<sup>20</sup>

- (77) *änmārān*                      *txum-šv*                      *ža*                      [BZ 100, 26]  
 he.prepared.himself    head-INSTR    he.NOM  
 ‘[At home, the king’s son was waiting for the messengers he had sent, but they had been killed, and nobody returned home. Now] he prepared himself [to go] personally [and took 60 soldiers with him]’
- (78) *žgārāg*    *pusda*                      *txumšv*                      *ansgveži*                      [P 298, 41]  
 George    lord.NOM    head.INSTR    he.deigned.to.come  
 ‘George the Lord deigned to come himself’

#### 4.6. The form of intensifiers

Comparing these data with the taxonomy of intensifier meanings (see LJUTIKOVA 1997, KÖNIG 2001 and others) we see that only two meanings are expressed by *ža*: exclusive “only X” and “discourse prominence”. All other meanings are expressed by particles or other lexical means.

As we saw above, *ža* has the distribution of a personal pronoun. How can *ža* gain the contextually conditioned exclusivity and discourse prominence meanings? In my opinion, the reason is that *ža* has this function only in those cases where it duplicates the verb-internal marking of an argument (BOEDER 2003). Since Svan is a “pro-drop” language like Georgian, an explicit personal pronoun counts as emphatic. Simplifying matters, there is a proportion: he : himself =  $\emptyset$  : *ža*. It has often been noted (KÖNIG 2001) that intensifiers tend to be formally marked in comparison with their simple pronominal counterparts (*s/he* – *him/herself*, *Ger/sie* – *er/sie selbst*). The sheer presence of a personal pronoun duplicating verb-internal person marking iconically codes emphasis. If this interpretation is correct, only those arguments can be intensified by *ža* which are also marked in the verb. Other intensified noun phrases require a different kind of expression which makes explicit a meaning that otherwise would only be suggested by the context, namely focus particles like “only” and “too” (3.4) or the instrumental of *mič-* in (74)–(76) or the dummy head construction, such as *txumšv* (4.5).

<sup>20</sup> Examples of Old Georgian counterparts are rare: *tav-it šeirṭqi sartqeli* (John 21,18C) head-INSTR you.put.it.on.as.a.girdle girdle.NOM ‘thou girdedst thyself [but when thou shalt be old, another shall gird thee]’ (ŠALVAŠVILI 1988: 299). The normal and very frequent expression is the form mentioned in note 18: *tav-it twis-it*.

## 5. Reflexivity

As we saw above, *ža* has been connected with reflexivity by some authors. This interpretation has gained a wider theoretical interest through the hypothesis that e.g. *mič* is a syntactically bound pronoun. We will therefore consider reflexivity in Svan now.

### 5.1. Verb-internal reflexivity

I will not discuss verb-internal reflexivity marking. Suffice it to say that the so-called subjective version with *-i-* marks reflexive indirect objects of the beneficiary type, as in Georgian (BOEDER 2004: 34–38): *lezöb-s i-tqbe* (BZ 268,12) food-DAT SV-he.roasts ‘He is roasting food for himself’; *ži lä-j-sgure čāž-ži* (BZ 299,36) PREV Preverb-SV-he.puts.her horse-on ‘He puts her [“to himself”] on his horse’. However, subjective version can be lexically fixed for specific meanings of a verb without an indirect object, and no matter how close its semantic relationship with subjective version in the “syntactic” sense, its reflexivity is semantic at best: *i-kyter* ‘s/he steals it’, *i-bne* ‘s/he begins it’ (TOPURIA 2002: 194). In other words, subjective version as such is not necessarily a syntactic reflexivity marker controlled by the subject of the verb.

### 5.2. The “dummy head construction”

Similarly, the well-known construction of a dummy head noun *txvim* ‘head’ plus appropriate possessive<sup>21</sup> has a reflexive and a non-reflexive use. In (79)–(80) it is non-reflexive, in (38), (81)–(82) it is reflexive, as is the emphatic (contrastive) use in (83)–(84) and the reciprocal use in (85)–(86). Out of context, (86) is ambiguous between a reflexive and a reciprocal reading (“each other”/“themselves”).

(79) *šter mišgu txvim!* [CG]  
 stupid my head.NOM (self-address)  
 ‘How stupid I was! [I forgot to shut the door]’

(80) *miča di-s i mu-s eser miča gezlä*  
her mother-DAT and father-DAT QUOT his hild.GEN  
*gvär-d loxbärjax miča txvim*  
 kind-ADV they.committed.her.to.him.PERF her head.NOM  
 ‘My parents have put me into your hands as a [“kind of”] daughter,  
 she said.’ [BZ 369, 1–2]

<sup>21</sup> For the grammatical properties of “head” see BOEDER (2002a); for its semantics cp. the possessive derivation *le-txim* ‘personal, private’ (NIŽARAŽE 2007 s.v. *sobstvennyj*). For a detailed study of reflexivity in Modern Georgian see AMIRIŽE (2006).

- (81) *bāzi* *eser amxav meqed-d miča txvim ka*  
 this.evening QUOT hither coming-for her head.NOM PREV  
*lohoda* [BZ 383, 9–10]  
 she.gave. it.PERF  
 ‘This evening, you gave yourself to a visitor, he said’
- (82) *xākv miča txum* [BZ 393, 19]  
 he.said.to.it his head.DAT  
 ‘He said to himself’
- (83) *dēsa, mišgva txvims oxkčir* [CG]  
 no, my head-DAT I.gathered.them.for.it  
 ‘[Are you gathering flowers for your brother?] No, I gather them  
 for myself’
- (84) *Rus-i xelcip mād xekvādx i de*  
 Russian-GEN czar.NOM not they.wanted.him and neither  
*išgen maxvši, mine txum-ənka* [BZ 3, 32]  
 other chief.NOM, they.GEN head-except  
 ‘They didn’t want the Russian Czar and no other chief either, ex-  
cept themselves’
- (85) *aljār-d-ī čv-atirx ušxvāre txvim* [BZ 260, 14]  
these-ERG-too PREV-they.knew.it each.other.GEN head.NOM  
 ‘These, too, recognized each other’
- (86) *Sosruq-v-d rākv, ere “ža eser [dāv-är-s]*  
 Sosruq-ERG said, SUB “he.NOM QUOT [*dev-PL-DAT*]  
*xäjsenävne txvim-s* [Chr 162, 29–30]  
 he.makes.them. kill.it (causative) head-DAT  
 ‘Sosruq said: I will make [the Devs] kill each other’

(84)–(86) show that in its number behaviour, “head” is dissociated from its non-grammaticalised counterpart as in Georgian: only the singular is possible (BRAITHWAITE 1973: 119; AMIRIŽE & LEUSCHNER 2002).<sup>22</sup> This underspecification of morphological categories is typical of, but not restricted to, reflexive pronouns. A plural form of “head” would be equally ineligible in non-reflexive contexts. However, all “head constructions” are highly accessible (because they refer to the speaker, as in (79), or to

<sup>22</sup> By contrast, Old Georgian had number agreement with arguments, but mostly not in genitive phrases: *tav-isa tkuen-isa tana* (J. 5, 42) head-GEN your.PL-GEN at ‘[you have no love of God] in you’; *tav-isa tkuen-isa sapasē* (L. 12, 33 Xanmeti) head-GEN your.PL-GEN treasure.NOM ‘a treasure for yourself’. However, in spite of its grammaticalisation (AMIRIŽE & LEUSCHNER 2002), “head” occurs with the hypocoristic suffix *-ild*, which is extensively used in Svan: *ot, sablu laxvba! txvim-ild-s ežyaj do xilečed* (P 76, No. 25a, 56–57) oh, pitiful brother.PL.NOM! head-DIM-DAT even.so not weep.for.it ‘O, poor brothers! Even so weep for yourselves, won’t you’. What is expressed by this form is not a diminutive “self”, but an attitude of the speaker towards the referent (as in the modifier “pitiful”).

arguments in their local domain), and in comparison with pronouns we have “an inverse relation between the descriptive content of the referring expression and [...] the accessibility of the discourse referent” (REULAND 2006: 12). In addition, their reference is “unexpected” (a speaker addressing himself (82); co-referentiality of arguments; verb-external marking instead of verb-internal marking in non-reflexive arguments), which correlates with the use of special marked forms (COMRIE 1998; for a GRICEan interpretation see LEVINSON 1991: 128). Finally, the non-emphatic “head construction” is restricted to arguments, i.e. to the most local domain, whereas peripheral elements like adjuncts (as in (24)–(28)) have no specific reflexivity marker in Svan, but use the “less marked” pronoun *ža*. This distribution again conforms to a universal principle of co-reference coding (COMRIE 1998: 338–342). Emphatic “head constructions” (83)–(84), on the other hand, are independent of the distinction between argument and adjunct. An emphatic adjunct owes its form to the fact that contrastive, but not non-contrastive, adjuncts need a dummy head noun (as in Georgian) (cp. (84) with (24)–(28)).

### 5.3. Form and function of reflexivity markers

None of the two forms of anaphora described above (5.1–2) is a dedicated marker of reflexivity, which is in accordance with the longstanding observation that “languages may have forms that must be bound in one environment, and need not be bound in another” (REULAND 2006: 2). This also applies to *ža*, which is free in main clauses (3.–4.), but is bound in subordinate clauses, to which we turn now.

## 6. Anaphora in subordinate clauses

So far, we have discussed the personal pronoun *ža/miča* in main clauses. We have seen that these pronouns occur in non-argumental and argumental positions (3.5). Let us now consider the behaviour of *ža/miča* in subordinate clauses. I will begin with their non-argumental use.

### 6.1. *ža/miča* in non-argumental positions

As we saw above (3.1), non-argumental personal pronouns occur with two functions: as adjuncts and as possessives. Since I have only examples for possessives in subordinate clauses, they will be taken for illustration.

In (87), *miča* is co-referential with the matrix-clause subject, but in (88c) and (89) it is co-referential with an indirect object of its higher

clause. Reference across main clause boundaries is restricted: it can refer to the subject of a co-ordinate main clause (90), but not to a non-subject (91), where the distal demonstrative must be used. In (92), there are two competitors for the role of antecedent: *miča*<sup>2</sup> can co-refer either with its matrix clause subject or with its co-ordinate noun phrase (“his brother”).

- (87) *xelcip-d* [...] *čv-adcxire*, *ere zurāl*  
 king<sub>i</sub>-ERG [...] PREV-he.understood.it, SUB woman.NOM  
*miča xexv lāmār i bopš-är – miča*  
*his<sub>i</sub> wife.NOM she.was.PERF and child-PL.NOM his<sub>i</sub>*  
*gezlīr* [BZ 302, 3–5]  
 son.PL.NOM  
 ‘The king<sub>i</sub> understood that the woman obviously was his<sub>i</sub> wife, and the children his<sub>i</sub> sons’
- (88a) *atxe ala-s miča čäš ka läxčvedda*  
 now this-DAT her<sub>i</sub> husband<sub>j</sub>.NOM PREV he<sub>j</sub>.asked.her<sub>i</sub>  
 ‘Now her<sub>i</sub> husband<sub>j</sub> asked this<sub>i</sub> [woman],
- (88b) *i mäg kōxāmbave miča xexv-d,*  
 and all.NOM PREV.she.told.it.to.him<sub>i</sub> his<sub>i</sub> wife-ERG,  
 and his<sub>i</sub> wife<sub>i</sub> told him<sub>j</sub> everything,
- (88c) *imvājži läsv miča lākma-te mečdan-γo* [Chr 163, 28–29]  
 how it.was his<sub>i</sub> earning-to gone-after  
 how it was after his<sub>i</sub> departure to earn [a living].’
- (89) *Giorg er laxčvedda am-ya, mām*  
 Giorg<sub>i</sub>.NOM SUB he<sub>j</sub>.asked.him<sub>i</sub> this-for, not  
*xākvin, ime arda miča tvep* [CG]  
 he<sub>i</sub>.told.it.to.him<sub>i</sub>, where it.was his<sub>i</sub> un.NOM  
 ‘[Bondo<sub>i</sub> kept Giorg<sub>i</sub>’s gun.] When Giorg<sub>i</sub> asked him<sub>i</sub> about it, he<sub>i</sub> didn’t tell him<sub>j</sub>, where his<sub>i</sub> gun was’
- (90) *Bondo kor-s mām ari i mām mixal,*  
 Bondo<sub>i</sub>.NOM house-DAT not he.is and not I.know.it,  
*ime do ari miča tvep* [CG]  
 where PART it.is his<sub>i</sub> gun.NOM  
 ‘[Couldn’t you lend me Bondo<sub>i</sub>’s gun? – ] Bondo<sub>i</sub> is not at home and I really don’t know where his<sub>i</sub> gun is.’
- (91) *Bondo<sub>i</sub>-d ašxvin Giorg<sub>j</sub> tvep i Zurab-s*  
 Bondo<sub>i</sub>-ERG he.hid.it Giorg<sub>j</sub>-GEN gun-NOM and Zurab<sub>k</sub>-DAT  
*mām xoxalda, ime arda eč<sub>i</sub> tvep* [CG]  
 not he.knew.it where it.was his<sub>j</sub> gun.NOM  
 ‘Bondo<sub>i</sub> hid Giorg<sub>j</sub>’s gun and Zurab<sub>k</sub> didn’t know where his<sub>j</sub> gun was’
- (92) *Adilar<sub>i</sub>-s mām xoxalda, ime ärix miča<sup>1</sup><sub>i</sub>*  
 Adilar<sub>i</sub>-DAT not he.knew.it where they.exist his<sub>i</sub>



- (96) *läxšqäd ečka Āmiran-s ež'ē, mič*  
 he.remembered.it then Amiran-DAT that.NOM-e, he.DAT  
*er xangär xābada* [BZ 95, 28]  
 SUB sword.NOM it.was.bound.on.him  
 'then Amiran remembered that-e, that he had a sword hanging [on his side]'
- (97) *ečkas gu-d qednix aljār-é, min di-gezal*  
 then heart-to they.come these-é, they.NOM mother-son.NOM  
*lix* [BZ 381, 24]  
 they.are  
 'then these understand-é [that] they are mother and son'
- (98) *Adilar-s xaķu, ere Bondo-s xoxaldeds*  
 Adilar<sub>i</sub>-DAT he.wants.it, SUB Bondo<sub>j</sub>-DAT he.knows.it.SUBJV,  
*ere Zurab mič mām xoŷvrevi*  
 SUB Zurab.NOM he<sub>j,j</sub>.DAT not he.deceives.him  
 'Adilar<sub>i</sub> wants that Bondo<sub>j</sub> knows that Zurab doesn't deceive him<sub>i,j</sub>.'
- (99) *Giorgi muxvbe xvi, mare mām mixalda,*  
 Giorgi<sub>i</sub>.GEN brother.NOM I.am, but not I.knew.it,  
*ere Adilar-d čotyorve eža-s* [CG]  
 SUB Adilar-ERG he<sub>j</sub>.deceived.him that<sub>i</sub>-DAT  
 'I am Giorgi<sub>i</sub>'s brother, but I didn't know that Adilar deceived him<sub>i</sub>.'
- (100) *xola zurāl li i šgvir li, ere*  
 bad woman.NOM she<sub>i</sub>.is and shame.NOM it.is, SUB  
*Adilar-d eža xexv-d anqdas* [CG]  
 Adilar-ERG that<sub>i</sub>.NOM wife-ADV he.should.bring.her<sub>i</sub>  
 'She<sub>i</sub> is a bad woman, and it is a shame if Adilar takes her<sub>i</sub> as his wife'
- (101) *Vano-s erkada ču xotra i xoxa,*  
 Vano<sub>j</sub>-DAT both.NOM PREV he.knows.them and he.knows,  
*ere Zurab mič mām xoŷvrevi* [CG]  
 SUB Zurab.NOM he<sub>i?k?</sub>.DAT not he.betrays  
 '[Giorgi<sub>i</sub> is Bondo<sub>j</sub>'s friend.] Vano<sub>k</sub> knows [G *kennt*] them both and he<sub>k</sub> knows [G *weiß*] that Zurab doesn't betray him<sub>i?k?</sub>'

### 6.3 "Long-distance anaphora"

In a review of anaphora in the Daghestanian and other languages TESTELEK & TOLDOVA (1998: 43, 54) suggest that Svan *mic* shows the behaviour of "long-distance anaphors" in the sense of Binding Theory: while the "head construction" is bound in its local (clausal) domain, they say, *mic* is a "distant reflexive", and the demonstrative *eža* 'that' is a "distant pronominal" which does not allow a "privileged antecedent",

“avoids positions of co-reference with any subject” and in subordinated clauses is not allowed to be bound by the subject of the matrix clause.<sup>23</sup> Their example is (102); to complete the picture, I add  $\emptyset$  (absence of a verb-external pronoun):

- (102) *Vano<sub>i</sub>-s ču xoxa, Zurab<sub>j</sub>*  
 Vano<sub>i</sub>-DAT PREV-he.knows.it, Zurab<sub>j</sub>-NOM  
*mič/ežak-s/∅<sub>i,k</sub>/txvim<sub>j</sub>-s mām xoyvrevi*  
 him<sub>i</sub>/that<sub>k</sub>/him<sub>i,k</sub>/head<sub>j</sub>-DAT not he<sub>j</sub>.deceives.him  
 ‘Vano knows that Zurab doesn’t deceive him’

Without going into the main issue raised by the authors (the typology and implicational hierarchy of reflexives and pronominals in different languages), I will confine the following discussion to the Svan data. An in-depth study of Svan anaphora is called for in the future, one which is based on a systematic and sophisticated elicitation of relevant material as well as on the rich theoretical framework developed over the last decades. For the time being, however, consider the following examples:

- (103) *Bondo-d Adilar-s šokolad lax*  
 Bondo<sub>i</sub>-ERG Adilar<sub>j</sub>-DAT chocolate.NOM when  
*čukvre, Giorgi-s mām otbace,*  
 he<sub>i</sub>.gave.it.to.him<sub>j</sub>, Giorgi<sub>k</sub>-DAT not he<sub>i</sub>.promised.it.to.him<sub>k</sub>,  
*ere mič xahvedda šokolad-s [CG]*  
 SUB he<sub>k</sub>-DAT he<sub>i</sub>.would.give.it.to.him<sub>k</sub> chocolate-DAT  
 ‘When Bondo<sub>i</sub> gave chocolate to Adilar<sub>j</sub>, he<sub>i</sub> didn’t promise Giorgi<sub>k</sub> that he<sub>i</sub> would give him<sub>k</sub> chocolate’

- (104a) *Gurmač-d Adilar-s mām oxumbve, ere Alpez*  
 Gurmach-ERG Adilar-DAT not he.told.him, SUB Alpez.NOM  
*läjtjälne ere čv-addagras ža [CG]*  
 he.tries SUB PREV-he.kill.him.SUBJV he.NOM  
 ‘Gurmach didn’t tell Adilar that Alpez tries to kill him’

- (104b) *Gurmač-s gun xaqlūni Alpez-iš-d mare [CG]*  
 Gurmach-DAT very he.fears Alpez-GEN-to but  
*Adilar-s mām oxumbve ere Alpez läjtjälne,*  
 Adilar-DAT not he.told.him SUB Alpez.NOM he.tries.it,  
*ere čv-addagras ža i Šanši māma*  
 SUB PREV-he.kill.him.SUBJV he.NOM and Shanshi.NOM not  
 ‘Gurmach is very much afraid of Alpez, but he didn’t tell Adilar that Alpez tried to kill him and not Shanshi’

There are two problems with the interpretation of these examples.

<sup>23</sup> “[eža] izbegaet pozicii koreferentnosti kakomu by to ni bylo podležaščemu” (p. 43); “zapret na svjazyvanie pronominala pridatočnogo predloženiya podležaščim glavnoġo” (p. 54)

- 1) Even the very limited material presented here shows that argumental *ža* is not necessarily referentially dependent on the subject of a higher clause. While in (103) the subject is excluded as an antecedent and takes no precedence over the indirect object of the higher clause (since one cannot normally promise something to oneself), both subject and indirect object are potential antecedents in (104): “to tell” is not subject to a same-subject restriction, and yet Adilar is the preferred antecedent of *ža* in (104a). In (104b), on the other hand, both Adilar and Gurmach are possible antecedents. Although subject-orientation is considered to be crucial for “long-distance anaphora” (TESTELEC & TOLDOVA 1998: 39–40), this restriction of local binding does not seem to account for all instances of *ža*, and anaphora resolution seems to be controlled by semantic or pragmatic factors rather than by syntactic properties alone.
- 2) Argumental *ža* in subordinated clauses shares an essential property with its main clause occurrences: it is “emphatic” since it stands in opposition to its absence (and verb-internal person marking). In fact, the written English translation of *ža* in argumental positions misleadingly levels a distinction: as native speakers observe, the difference between  $\emptyset$  and *ža* in a sentence like (98) or (104) is that *ža* stresses the identity of its referent: it is “emphatic” (“mteli datvırtva masze modis”, CG). Specifically, although many of the sentences (93)–(101) lack an appropriate contextualization, some examples permit a tentative assignment of the specific conditions of “emphasis” we know from main clauses (4.1–3). An example of contrastive *ža* is (103) (Giorgi contrasts with Adilar). In (95) it seems to be exclusive (“he and not somebody else”). In (104) the use of *mič* could mean that Zurab may deceive others, but not him. And finally (94) is an example of “discourse prominence” (cp. (66)). As for the domain in which the antecedent of *ža* occurs, the “preceding clause condition” for its contrastive (4.1) and exclusive use (4.2) and the focus continuity condition for discourse-prominent protagonists (4.3) seem to apply here, too. As appears from the many hedges of the preceding description, the details are largely unknown, but if my analysis is correct, it seems to be at variance with the observation that discourse interpretations are blocked where the crucial binding conditions are given (REULAND 2006: 12).

Therefore, the question is not only if the personal pronoun *ža* is bound in its domain, but also why it is the emphatic personal pronoun whose domain is locally restricted in such a way. The affinity between emphasis, reflexivity and long-distance anaphora cannot be discussed here. Their formal identity and historical relatedness<sup>24</sup> is obvious in many languages,

<sup>24</sup> “the evolution of reflexives from the use of emphasis to mark non-stereotypical interpretations” (LEVINSON 1991: 139 with reference to FALTZ 1985). For some Daghestanian

and Svan (and Kartvelian in general) is a good case in point: the dummy head construction is used both for emphasis and (local) reflexivity, and in subordinate clauses, argumental *ža* is both emphatic and used for long-distance anaphora (in a broad sense), as we shall see now.

#### 6.4. *The distribution of personal and demonstrative pronouns*

In main clauses, *ža* and the demonstratives contrast with each other. Their distribution results from the conditions of their use outlined above. Among other things, it is controlled by a general principle: roughly speaking, referring expressions can be thought of as forming an implicational scale of the Givenness Hierarchy (see e.g. GUNDEL 1996). Specifically, demonstratives are “weaker” forms of coding referents than verb-internal person-marking and personal pronouns since the “cognitive status” of the latter (“being in focus”) implies the status of the former (“activated”) and not vice versa. By a generalized conversational implicature (LEVINSON 1991: 110–112), the use of the “weaker”, more specific form tends to be interpreted as indicating that the stronger form cannot be used. In other words, verb-internal person-marking and personal pronouns like *ža* are used where e.g. the proximity conditions for “this” or “that” may obtain, but where a “stronger” form is preferred (e.g. the possessive *miča* ‘his/her’ instead of *amiš* ‘of this’ or *ečiš* ‘of that’).

In subordinate clauses, as was pointed out above (6.2), the emphatic 3rd person pronoun is *ža* with same-sentence antecedents, the distal demonstrative being used instead. For instance in (99)–(100), *eža* being used elsewhere. If this rule is correct, the “long-distance” interpretation of *ža* follows from a constraint on emphatic pronouns in subordinate clauses, and subordination is one of the positions where *eža* is the suppletive form of *ža* (see 2.2; 3.1; 3.3; 3.5). Notice that independently of this rule, the demonstratives are used for cross-sentential anaphora without any dominational restriction (main vs. subordinate clause), whereas intra-sentential antecedents of demonstratives are severely restricted (cp. TESTELEČ & TOLDOVA’s restrictions quoted above). As far as I can see, demonstratives must have same-level antecedents: a co-ordinative constituent (as in (40a)), a complement clause anaphorically or cataphori-

---

parallels see LJUTIKOVA (1997); TESTELEČ & TOLDOVA (1998). The oldest discussion of this affinity goes back to the Ancient Greek grammatical tradition, where some grammarians (e.g. the Alexandrian philologist Aristarchus) took the view that the stressed counterpart (e.g. accusative *hé*) of the anaphoric 3rd person pronoun (*he*) is used as a reflexive in the older texts, and while local reflexivity is expressed by a “strengthened” form (*he-autón*) in Attic prose (see 5.2), long-distance (“indirect”) reflexivity preserves the non-expanded variant.

cally pointed at in the main clause (as in (17b) and (17a)), a constituent in a co-ordinate clause<sup>25</sup> or in a preceding sentence.

The result is a system where co-reference of arguments is marked in the most local domain (by the dummy head construction; see 5.2), whereas non-co-reference is marked in the more global domain (by the use of *eža* instead of *ža*). This distribution is in keeping with more general cognitive and discourse principles of the more local and more “extended” domains, respectively. Moreover, the restriction of the range of antecedents is strongest in the most local domain (subject only), weaker in the more global domain (*ža* controlled by any higher same-sentence argument), and absent from adjuncts. In Modern Georgian, on the other hand, referential identity marking is not extended to subordinate clauses, but to same-clause adjuncts (for instance, it uses a dedicated reflexive in the translation of (26) (*tavis-tan* ‘with himself’) and (27) (*tavis-tvis* ‘for themselves’)).<sup>26</sup>

Finally, if we assume that the dummy head construction and the demonstratives are used according to specific morphological, syntactic and pragmatic rules, other verb-external forms can be said to be used by default: *ža* is used in cases where demonstratives cannot be used, but where a verb-external marking is called for (with non-arguments and with emphasis). This interpretation is supported by the heterogeneity of conditions under which *ža* is used: it can be argumental or non-argumental, reflexive or non-reflexive, emphatic or non-emphatic. At the same time, this default status may reflect a diachronic development: since the Georgian counterpart of *ža* (the personal pronoun *is/igi, mas* ...) is neutral with regard to referential dependence, the distribution of Svan *eža* and *ža* could be the result of an extension of *eža* at the expense of *ža*. *eža* was the best candidate to give rise to the redistribution, because it cannot refer “upwards” (and thus is exempt from dominational relations) and because it is the suppletive form of *ža* in various other positions. The present-day domain of argumental *ža* in subordinate clauses would be a residual of its former (Kartvelian) domain as a general emphatic pronoun. In main clauses, on the other hand, the use of *ža* is restricted by the dummy head construction. The use of *eža* in subordinate clauses parallels this use in that both limit the use of the default form *ža*. However, while the use of *eža* can be interpreted as an extension at the expense of *ža*, we have no evidence so far that the dummy head construction was extended from its emphatic use to its reflexive use in main clauses.

<sup>25</sup> Cp. *esyvri da ašxv ägis læg yvačär i ala läxčvedda* (BZ 336,1) he.goes and one place.DAT he.stands merchant.NOM and this.NOM he.asked.him ‘He goes and a merchant stands in one place and this [man] asked him’

<sup>26</sup> For the different domains of personal pronouns and reflexives in various languages see LJUTIKOVA (1997: 69) and TESTELEČ & TOLDOVA (1998: 53).

## 7. Results

Four types of Svan anaphora and the interrelationship of their scopes have been studied here: (1) demonstrative pronouns, (2) verb-internal person markers and non-argumental personal pronouns, (3) argumental personal pronouns, and (4) reflexives. Determining their antecedents requires at least three dimensions: their domains in terms of syntactic structure, their “proximity” in terms of textual structure or situation, and their syntactic and pragmatic function.

(1) The use of Svan demonstratives is syntactically and pragmatically restricted. In their non-situational use, their antecedents must be same-level (in co-ordinative noun phrases and clauses, and in cross-sentential positions). In many positions, the proximity opposition is neutralized, with the distal demonstrative *eža* being used as its unmarked member (see 2.2: with grounding clauses; 3.1: with inanimate referents; 3.3: with anaphora resolution in co-ordinative constructions; 3.5: as an emphatic non-argumental personal pronoun; 6.4: with emphatic cross-sentential antecedents in subordinate clauses). The distal demonstrative is used as a suppletive form where 3rd person pronouns cannot be used.

(2) The antecedents of verbal-internal person-marking and of non-argumental 3rd person pronouns (*ža*) must be in focus. They have a less global domain than demonstratives, which need not be in focus and can “skip” intervening text segments on the basis of textual conditions. The antecedents of the verb-internal and verb-external, non-argumental 3rd person pronouns, on the other hand, are not restricted to their occurrence in adjacent clauses as in the following group.

(3) Argumental third person pronouns are emphatic. They have contrastive, exclusive or prominence (“intensifier”) functions. Their antecedents must again be “in focus” as in (2). However, two domains have to be distinguished with regard to their antecedent relationships. In main clauses, they have cross-sentential antecedents. In subordinate clauses, their antecedents must occur in the same sentence, but they need not be subjects. The distal demonstrative provides a suppletive counterpart for cross-sentential antecedents. Historically, this distribution seems to be the result of an extension of the distal demonstrative at the expense of the 3rd person pronoun.

(4) On the clause level, the dummy head construction is used for all personal pronoun constituents that cannot be marked by their person marker in the verb (self-address, reflexive and emphatic arguments).

## Glosses

ADV	adverbialis	PERF	perfect
DAT	dative	PL	plural
DIM	diminutive	POSS	possessive
ERG	ergative	PREV	(separable) preverb
G	German	Q	question marker
GEN	genitive	QUOT	quotative
INSTR	instrumental	SG	singular
NEG	negation	SUB	subordinator
NOM	nominative	SUBJV	subjunctive
OPT	optative particle	SV	subjective version
PART	particle		

## Abbreviations

- BK = DAVITIANI, A.; TOPURIA, VARLAM & KALDANI, MAKSIME (1957): *Svanuri prozauli tekštebi II: Balskvemouri kilo*. Tbilisi.
- BZ = *Svanuri prozauli tekštebi I. Balszemouri kilo*. Tekštebi šekribes AKAKI ŠANIŽEM – VARLAM TOPURIAM. Tbilisi 1939.
- Chr = *Svanuri enis krestomatia*. Tekštebi šekribes A. ŠANIŽEM, M. KALDANMA da Z. ČUMBURIŽEM. Tbilisi 1978.
- CG = Ciuri Gabliani;
- KM = *Kartveluri memkvidreoba*; P = *Svanuri poezia I: Simyerebi*. Tekštebi šekribes da Kartulad targmnes AKAKI ŠANIŽEM, VARLAM TOPURIAM, MERI GUŽEŽIANMA. Tbilisi 1939.

## References

- [AMIRIŽE, NINO] NINO AMIRIDZE (2006): *Reflexivization strategies in Georgian* (LOT/Netherlands Graduate School of Linguistics 127). Utrecht.
- AMIRIŽE, NINO & LEUSCHNER, TORSTEN (2002): Body-part nouns as a source of reflexives: towards a grammaticalization account of Georgian *tav-* 'head', in: *STUF* 55, 259–276.
- ARONSON, HOWARD I. (1982): *Georgian. A reading grammar*. Columbus, Ohio: Slavica
- BAKER, CARL L. (1995): Contrast, discourse prominence, and intensification, with special reference to locally free reflexives in British English, in: *Language* 71, 63–101.
- BOEDER, WINFRIED (2002a): Syntax and morphology of polysynthesis in the Georgian verb, in: NICHOLAS EVANS & SASSE, HANS-JÜRGEN (eds.), *Problems of polysynthesis* (Studia Typologica 4). Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 87–111.
- BOEDER, WINFRIED (2002b): Speech and thought representation in the Kartvelian (South Caucasian) languages, in: GÜLDEMANN, TOM & VON RONCADOR, MANFRED (eds.), *Reported discourse. A meeting ground of different linguistic domains*. (Typological Studies in Language 52). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins, 3–48.
- BOEDER, WINFRIED (2003): Anapher im Swanischen, in: BOEDER, WINFRIED (ed.), *Kaukasische Sprachprobleme*. (Caucasica Oldenburgensia 1). Oldenburg: Bibliotheks- und Informationssystem der Universität Oldenburg, 75–94.
- BOEDER, WINFRIED (2004): The South Caucasian languages, in: *Lingua* 115(1/2), 5–89.
- BOEDER, WINFRIED (2011): Unterordnung im Swanischen, in: TANDASHVILI, MANANA & POURTSKHVANIDZE, ZAKARIA (eds.), *Folia Caucasica. Festschrift für Jost Gippert zum 55. Geburtstag*. Frankfurt am Main/Tbilisi, 35–60.
- BRAITHWAITE, KIM (1973): *Case shift and verb concord in Georgian*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

- ČARTOLANI, NELI (1985): *Čvenebit nacvalsaxelta sistemebi Kartulši sxva Kartvelur enebtan šedarebit/Sistemy ukazatel'n'nyx mestomimenij v gruzinskom jazyke v sravnenii s sistemami drugix kartvel'skix jazykov*. Tbilisi: Mecniereba.
- COMRIE, BERNARD (1998): Reference-tracking: description and explanation, in: *STUF* 51, 335–346.
- COMRIE, BERNARD (2000): Pragmatic binding: demonstratives as anaphors in Dutch, in: *Proceedings of the 23rd Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, 50–61.
- CXADAIA, TAIA (2010): III p̄iris nacvalsaxebebi Megrulši/Third person pronouns in Megrelian [R. 138–139], in: *Enatmecnierebis Sakitxebi* 2009, 1/2, 129–139.
- EZUGBAIA, LALI (2009): *mu-* mesame p̄iris nacvalsaxelis mravlobitis pormebi Megrul-Lazurši/Plural forms of the third person pronoun *mu* 'he/she/it, himself/herself/itself' in Megrelian and Laz, in: *Guram Kartozia 75/Guram Kartozia* (Kartvelologiuri biblioteka/Kartvelological Library 11). Tbilisi: Sezani, 201–209.
- FALTZ, LEONID M. (1985): *Reflexivization. A study in universal syntax*. New York: Garland.
- FOX, BARBARA & THOMPSON, SANDRA (1990): A discourse explanation of relative clauses in English conversation, in: *Language* 66, 297–316.
- GIVÓN, TALMY (1990): *Syntax: a functional-typological introduction*. Vol. II. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- [GUŽEŽIANI, CATO] GUDJEDJIANI, CHATO & PALMAITIS, LETAS (1985): *Svan-English dictionary*. Compiled by CHATO GUDJEDJIANI and LETAS PALMAITIS. Edited, with a preface and index by B. GEORGE HEWITT. (Anatolian and Caucasian Studies). Delmar, New York: Caravan Books.
- GUNDEL, JEANETTE K. (1996): Relevance theory meets the givenness hierarchy. An account of inferrables, in: FRETHEIM, THORSTEIN & GUNDEL, JEANETTE (eds.), *Reference and referent accessibility*. (Pragmatics and Beyond. New Series 38). Amsterdam: Benjamins, 141–153.
- GUNDEL, JEANETTE K.; HEDBERG, NANCY & ZACHARSKI, RON (1993): Cognitive status and the form of referring expressions in discourse, in: *Language* 69, 274–307.
- HEWITT, GEORGE (2005): Towards a comparative syntax of the Kartvelian languages, in: HAUG, DAG & WELO, EIRIK (eds.), *Haptaçahaptāitiš. Festschrift for Fridrik Thordarson on the occasion of his 77th birthday*. Edited by (ISK. Serie B: Skrifter CXVI). Oslo: Novus forlag, 119–138.
- HIMMELMANN, NIKOLAUS (1996): Demonstratives in narrative discourse: a taxonomy of universal uses, in: FOX, BARBARA A. (ed.), *Studies in anaphora*. (Typological Studies in Language 33). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins, 205–254.
- KEMMER, SUZANNE (1995): Emphatic and reflexive *-self*: expectations, viewpoint, and subjectivity, in: STEIN, DIETER & WRIGHT, SUSAN (eds.), *Subjectivity and subjectivisation. Linguistic perspectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 55–82.
- KÖNIG, EKKEHARD (2001): Intensifiers and reflexive pronouns, in: HASPELMATH, MARTIN; KÖNIG, EKKEHARD; ÖSTERREICHER, WULF & RAIBLE, WOLFGANG (eds.), *Language typology and language universals. An international handbook*. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 747–760.
- KÖNIG, EKKEHARD & SIEMUND, PETER (2000): Intensifiers and reflexives: a typological perspective, in: ZYGMUNT FRAJZYNGIER & CURL, TRACI S. (eds.), *Reflexives. Forms and functions*. (Typological Studies in Language 40). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins, 41–74.
- KUNO, SUSUMO (1987): *Functional syntax. Anaphora, discourse and empathy*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- LEVINSON, STEPHEN C. (1991): Pragmatic reduction of the binding condition revisited, in: *Journal of Linguistics* 27, 107–161.
- LJUTIKOVA, EKATERINA (1997): Refleksivy i ėmfaza, in: *Voprosy jazykoznanija* 6, 49–74.
- MCCARTHY, MICHAEL (1994): *It, this and that*, in: COULTHARD, MALCOLM (ed.), *Advances in written text analysis*. London/New York: Routledge, 266–276

- MARTIROSOVI, ARAM (1964): *Nacvalsaxeli Kartvelur enebši*. Ištōriul-šedarebiti analizi/ Mestoimenie v kartvel'skix jazykax. Istoriko-sravnitel'nyj analiz. Tbilisi: SMA gam-ba.
- MORAVCSIK, EDITH (1972): Some cross-linguistic generalizations about intensifier constructions, in: *CLS* 8, 271–277.
- NIŽARAŽE, BESARION (2007): *Kartul-Svanur-Rusuli leksiķoni*. Balszemouri dialekti. Ťekštī gamosacemad moamzada da ċinasitqvaoba daurto Lela Nižaradžem/Bessarion Nižaradže: Gruzino-svansko-russkij slovar'. Verxnebal'skij dialekt. Tekst podgotovila k izdaniju i predisloviem snabdila Lela Nižaradže. Tbilisi: Universali.
- [NIŽARAŽE, IVANE] I. I. Nižaradže (1910): *Russko-svankij slovar'*. (SMOMPK 41, Priloženie). Tiflis.
- ONIANI, ALEKSANDRE (1998): *Svanuri ena (ponologiisa da morpologiis sakitxebi)* (Kartvelologiuri biblioteka 2). Tbilisi: TPU gamomcemloba.
- ONIANI, ALEKSANDRE (2005): *Die swanische Sprache*. Teil I: *Phonologie, Morphonologie, Morphologie des Nomens* [übersetzt von Heinz Fähnrich]. Jena: Friedrich-Schiller-Universität.
- [QIPŠIŽE, IOSEB] (1914): *Grammatika mingrel'skago (iverskago) jazyka s" xrestomatieju i slovarem"*. S.-Peterburg".  
L. I. Kipšidze
- REULAND, ERIC (2006): Logophoricity, in: EVERAERT, MARTIN & VAN RIEMSDIJK, HENK (eds.), *The Blackwell companion to syntax*. Vol. III. With editorial assistance from Rob Goedemans and Bart Hollebrandse. Oxford: Blackwell, 1–20.
- SCHWARTZ, LINDA (1986): The function of free pronouns, in: WIESEMANN, URSULA (ed.), *Pronominal systems*, with an introduction by Joseph H. Greenberg. (Continuum 5). Tübingen: Narr, 405–436.
- ŠALVAŠVILI, LEILA (1985): Čemit rigis pormebi pīris nacvalsaxelta mokmedebitis punkciit/Oppozitivnye formy čemit, šemit... v funkcii tvoritel'nogo padeža ličnyx mestoimenij [R. 202], in: *Tbilisis Universitetis Šromebi* 262 (Enatmecniereba 9), 188–202.
- ŠALVAŠVILI, LEILA (1988): *tvit, tviton, tavat* nacvalsaxelta ganačileba tanamedrove saliteraturo Kartulši, in: *Kartuli Sitqvis Kulturaš Sakitxebi* 8, 293–327.
- ŠALVAŠVILI, LEILA (1989): *mit – misit* rigis pormebi Kartulši, in: *Kartuli Sitqvis Kulturaš Sakitxebi* 9, 240–254.
- ŠANIŽE, AKAKI (1973): *Kartuli enis gramašikis sapuzvlebi I. Morpologia*. Meore gamocema. Tbilisi: TU gam-ba.
- TESTELETS, JAKOV G. & TOLDOVA, S. JU (1998): Refleksivnye mestoimenija v dagestanskix jazykax i tipologija refleksiva, in: *Voprosy jazykoznanija* 4, 35–57.
- TOPURIA, VARLAM (2002): *Šromebi II / Works II*. Tbilisi: Kartuli Ena.
- TOPURIA, VARLAM & KALDANI, MAKSIME (2000): *Svanuri leksiķoni/Svan dictionary* (SMA, Enatmecnierebis Inštītuți). Tbilisi: Kartuli Ena.
- TSCHENKĒLI, KITA (1958): *Einführung in die georgische Sprache*. I. *Theoretischer Teil*. Zürich: Amirani.
- VOGT, HANS (1971): *Grammaire de la langue géorgienne*. (ISK. Skrifter, Serie B 57). Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- XUBUA, MAKAR (1937): *Megruli tekštēbi*. Tbilisi.
- ŽGENTI, SERGI (1949): *Svanuri enis ponetīkis ziritadi sakitxebi*. Eksperimentuli gamoķvleva/Osnovnye voprosy fonetiki svanskogo jazyka. Eksperimental'noe issledovanie [R. 203–210]. Tbilisi: SMA gam-ba.

Yakov Testelec (April 12th, 2014) notes the following: “Now I don’t think myself anymore that long-distance reflexives are consistently object-oriented. Rather, LD-reflexives that occur in all sorts of subordinate clauses (finite, nonfinite, indirect questions etc.) are often oriented toward prominent antecedents, topics, sources of information or speech etc. The negative restriction on the superordinate subject antecedents with LD-pronominals now seems to me typical for demonstratives that can be used anaphorically, cf. English *The flowers are too expensive for me to buy them* (*\*those*). The problem is whether demonstratives’ anaphoric use, as with *eža*, is really anaphoric, or rather a special sort of deixis.”