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Abstract: This paper describes χɯ, the Sarikoli reflexive personal and possessive pronoun, in terms of its agreement, relative prominence, and domain. The reflexive χɯ does not overtly agree with its antecedent, always maintaining the same form. It is subject-oriented and is complementarily distributed with non-reflexive pronouns. In both finite and non-finite subordinate clauses, χɯ is usually used as a local reflexive, with long-distance potential in one variety—the reason adverbial clause. Sarikoli provides confirmatory evidence for the correlation between long-distance reflexives and subject orientation (Pica 1987, 1991; Cole & Sung 1994), since χɯ is subject-oriented whether it refers to an antecedent within the same clause or across a clause boundary.
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1 Introduction

Sarikoli [srh] is an Iranian language spoken in Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region of northwest China, and it is the easternmost of the extant Iranian languages (Payne 1989). It is a Pamir language that has received little attention in Iranian linguistics. The aim of this paper is to describe the Sarikoli reflexive in terms of its agreement, relative prominence, and domain. Section 2 introduces the forms of the Sarikoli ‘self’ pronoun; Section 3 shows that there is no overt agreement between the reflexive and its antecedent; Section 4 describes the relative prominence between the reflexive and its antecedent; Section 5 discusses the distance by which a reflexive and its antecedent may be separated. Section 6 is a summary of findings.

To date, there has been no sustained discussion regarding cross-linguistic typology of reflexives, reflexives often being a minor component of descriptive grammars and grammar textbooks. Most of the discussion on reflexives has served to provide parameters for binding and movement (Pica 1987; Cole et al. 1990). Reflexives are most often defined according to the features [+anaphor, -pronominal] because they are thought to be bound to an antecedent according to syntactic requirements or semantic features of a predicate (Huang 2006). Previous scholarship has attempted to distinguish between morphologically complex ‘self’ anaphors and simplex anaphors, and to define the conditions for grammaticality of each (Reinhart & Reuland 1993).\footnote{Reinhart & Reuland (1993) use the term SE anaphor for simplex expressions and SELF anaphor for complex expressions.} Here I will use the term “reflexive” in a loose fashion as a lexical category, simply denoting a ‘self’ word with a restricted semantically or syntactically determined distribution, referring usually to a particular NP, as opposed to personal pronouns, which have wider, normally complementary, distribution. Languages may employ syntactic (grammatical relations), semantic, and pragmatic means to determine the antecedent of an anaphor (Lappin & Leass 1994; Mitkov 1999). When a language reckons antecedents of reflexives through grammatical relations, it is overwhelmingly the subject of a minimal clause that serves
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as the antecedent (Cole et al. 1990). However, the subject of a matrix clause is sometimes reported to serve as an antecedent for a reflexive in an embedded clause, a phenomenon known as a long-distance reflexive. All long-distance reflexives are thought to be both morphologically simplex and subject-oriented, although not all simplex reflexive anaphors are required to operate long-distance. With this in mind, I have sought to describe the overt morphological form, syntactic behavior, and semantic interpretation of the reflexive pronoun in Sarikoli, and to determine whether and how this subject-oriented reflexive might be considered long-distance or merely local. Rather than focusing on theories of binding and movement, I rely on “basic linguistic theory” as a framework for description of surface structure (Dixon 1997, Dryer 2006). My aim is to describe Sarikoli on its own terms, presenting data that display the language’s commonalities and idiosyncrasies, and offering interpretations of surface structures in English. The data presented in this paper are predominantly drawn from natural conversations among native speakers, along with some sentences intentionally elicited from native speakers.

2 Form

In Sarikoli, the pronoun that means ‘self’ has two forms: χɯbaθ in the nominative case and χɯ in the accusative and genitive cases. This follows the pattern of non-reflexive pronouns, which also come in the nominative and the accusative/possessive forms. Table 1 shows the set of non-reflexive pronouns (the forms marked as accusative are also used as possessive pronouns):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Sarikoli non-reflexive personal pronouns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.NOM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.ACC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.NOM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.ACC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.NOM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.ACC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The nominative ‘self’ pronoun, χɯbaθ, is used as an emphatic pronoun (as shown in (1) & (2)), and cannot function as a reflexive pronoun.

(1) 

waz  χɯbaθ  suɾəw=am.  
1sg.nom refl  select.npst=1sg.npst

‘I myself will choose.’

(2) 

təw  χɯbaθ  wef=ir  lev.  
2sg.nom refl.nom 3pl.acc=dat say.npst

‘You tell them yourself.’

The Sarikoli reflexive must be lower on the Relational Hierarchy than the subject of the matrix clause. Since χɯbaθ is always in the subject position and cannot take an antecedent that outranks it grammatically, it cannot be a reflexive pronoun. Consequently, χɯbaθ will not be discussed further in this paper.

The accusative ‘self’ pronoun, χɯ, which is used as both reflexive personal pronoun and reflexive possessive pronoun in Sarikoli, will be the focus of this paper.

2 According to Relational Grammar, grammatical relations follow the hierarchy below (Johnson 1977:156): subject » direct object » indirect object » other object
3 Agreement

A pronoun and its antecedent must show agreement in certain semantic features, but this agreement may or may not be reflected in the form of the pronoun. Morphologically, the reflexive pronoun χɯ shows no person or number distinction and always maintains the same form, but is always interpreted as having the same person and number as the subject of its clause. In the following examples, χɯ functions as a personal reflexive pronoun in (3)-(4) and as a possessive reflexive pronoun in (5)-(6).

(3)  piɕ  a=χɯ  kudʑur  naɣmɯɣdʑ?
       cat  ACC=REFL.ACC  where  hide.PRF
   ‘Where did the cat hide itself?’

(4)  pa  teed  dið=an,  a=χɯ  θɯm  ka=n.
   LOC  house  enter.NPST=1PL.NPST  ACC=REFL.ACC  warm  do.NPST=1PL.NPST
   ‘Let us go into the house and warm ourselves.’

(5)  təw=at  χɯ  tilfon  numɯr  mu=ri  na  levd.
   2sg.nom=2sg.pst  refl  phone  number  1sg.acc=dat  neg  say.pst
   ‘You didn’t tell me your phone number.’

(6)  woð=af  χɯ  ano  ziv  ranɯxtɕ.
   3pl.nom=3pl.pst  refl  mother  tongue  forget.prf
   ‘They forgot their mother tongue.’

Some sentences, such as an imperative sentence or a sentence in which a subject pronoun is dropped, may not contain an overt subject NP. In such cases, χɯ still agrees semantically with the understood subject in person and number, which is indicated by the subject-verb agreement clitics.

(7)  razu  χiɡ  tɕi  prud  χɯ  ðɯst  znej=it.
   food  eat.inf  loc  front  refl.poss  hand  wash.npst=2pl.npst
   ‘Wash your hands before you guys eat.’

(8)  χɯ  ano  ziv  mas  na  wazon=in.
   refl.poss  mother  tongue  also  neg  know.npst=3pl.npst
   ‘They don’t even know their mother tongue.’

4 Relative prominence

Cross-linguistically, reflexive pronouns are commonly less prominent than their antecedents (Kroeger 2004). Some languages indicate prominence through grammatical relations, while others rely on semantic roles or pragmatic information; Sarikoli is of the former type. Sarikoli reflexives are subject-oriented: the antecedent of χɯ must be the subject of the clause. Since χɯ must be less prominent than its antecedent, it is naturally ranked lower on the Relational Hierarchy, and occurs as an object, oblique argument, or non-argument.
Because χɯ is subject-oriented, its antecedent is rarely ambiguous, despite its unvaried form. Even in a sentence with a subordinate clause and two different subjects (a matrix clause subject and a subordinate clause subject), the antecedent of χɯ is not ambiguous because χɯ within a subordinate clause will always take the subordinate clause subject as its antecedent (with the exception of reason ACs, as illustrated in Section 5.4). In the examples below, χɯ is preceded by both the subject and either the object (9), a dative argument (10), or an object of a preposition (11). Even though these non-subject arguments appear closer to the χɯ than the subject does, none of them can function as the antecedent because they are not the subject of the clause.

(9) nejkramon a=sojragul χɯ pa tɕɛd wand.
    Neikramon ACC=Soirageel REFL.POSS LOC house see.PST
    ‘Neikramon, saw Soirageel at his house.’

(10) amad nɯjuft=ir χɯ xic gap lɛvd.
    Amad Neeyuft=DAT REFL.POSS secret word tell.PST
    ‘Amad told Neeyuftj his secrets.’

(11) zulfiya az ojɕam χɯ tilfon numɯr parst.
    Zeelfiya from Oisham REFL.POSS phone number ask.PST
    ‘Zeelfiyai asked Oishamj for her phone number.’

Reflexive and non-reflexive pronouns are in complementary distribution within a simple clause: any pronoun referring to the subject must take the reflexive form, and non-reflexive pronouns can never take a subject antecedent within its minimal clause, as demonstrated in the following pairs of examples:

(12) lejlīgɯl χɯ tɕur qati ɯsɯl kaxt.
    Leiligeel REFL.POSS husband with dance do.3SG.NPST
    ‘Leiligeeli will dance with her husband.’

(13) lejlīgɯl wi tɕur qati ɯsɯl kaxt.
    Leiligeel 3SG.POSS husband with dance do.3SG.NPST
    ‘Leiligeeli will dance with her husband.’

(14) waz=am a=χɯ jaχ bo tɕəwɡ.
    1SG.NOM=1SG.PST ACC=REFL.POSS sister kiss do.PST
    ‘I kissed my sister.’

(15) *waz=am a=muu jaχ bo tɕəwɡ.
    1SG.NOM=1SG.PST ACC=1SG.POSS sister kiss do.PST
    ‘I kissed my sister.’
Non-reflexive pronouns may refer to any argument except the subject; they can only occur in the subject position or refer to non-subject arguments:

(16) \( \text{woð}=\text{af} \quad \text{nu}=\text{wi} \quad \text{aroj} \quad \text{guður} \quad \text{wand}. \)

\(^{3}\text{pl.nom}=\text{3pl.pst today ACC=3sg.acc three time see.pst} \)

‘They saw her three times today.’

(17) \( \text{nu}=\text{mu} \quad \text{malum} \quad \text{mu}=\text{ri} \quad \text{anur} \quad \text{bud}. \)

\(^{3}\text{sg} \cdot \text{poss teacher 1sg.acc=dat pomegranate give.pst} \)

‘Today my teacher gave me pomegranates.’

In previous works on reflexive pronouns, it has been observed that there is a strong cross-linguistic tendency for long-distance reflexives to be subject-oriented (Pica 1987, 1991; Cole, Sung 1994). As Cole & Sung point out, “in a number of languages the forms that can be used as LD are always subject-oriented, even when they are local in reference” (1994:360). They argue that Universal Grammar requires long-distance reflexives to be obligatorily subject-oriented (1994). Sarikoli provides confirmatory evidence for the correlation between long-distance reflexives and subject orientation, since \( \chi_u \) is subject-oriented whether it refers to an antecedent within the same clause or across a clause boundary.

5 Domain

Domain refers to the degree of distance by which a pronoun and its antecedent may be separated. In some languages reflexives are clause-bounded, so that the reflexive and its antecedent must occur in the same local domain (a minimal clause). Other languages have long-distance reflexives, which allow antecedents both within and outside their local domain (Cole et al. 2001; Huang 2006; Pica 1991; Reinhart & Reuland 1993).

The examples presented so far have shown \( \chi_u \) occurring in simple clauses. This section will introduce \( \chi_u \) usage in three types of subordinate clauses: 1) In non-finite subordinate clause constructions, the embedded clause often lacks an explicitly-stated subject. In such cases, \( \chi_u \) may have no apparent antecedent within the minimal clause, and appears to take the matrix clause subject as a long-distance antecedent. It may be theorized that the embedded clause has a null subject that is functionally controlled by the matrix clause subject, which provides a local subject antecedent for \( \chi_u \). If we posit a null subject in the embedded clause, such examples do not demonstrate long-distance usage of \( \chi_u \), but are instead examples of local usage. 2) In non-finite subordinate clauses with a subject that is different from the matrix clause subject, \( \chi_u \) refers to the embedded clause subject and not the matrix clause subject, which shows local usage of \( \chi_u \). The exception is the reason AC, illustrated in Section 5.4. 3) In finite subordinate clauses (finite CCs & conditional ACs), \( \chi_u \) is used as a local reflexive, as it cannot cross clause boundaries. Thus, \( \chi_u \) is used as a local reflexive in both finite and non-finite subordinate clauses, with LD potential in one variety – the reason AC.

5.1 Relative clause (RC)

Sarikoli has two main types of RCs: one formed with a finite verb stem and one formed with the infinitive stem, even though both are non-finite because they do not contain subject-verb agreement clitics (Kim 2014). The finite stem RC is formed with the past or perfect stem of the verb followed by the relativizer \( =\text{dzendz}=\text{tzendz} \). The infinitive stem RC is formed with the relativizer \( =\text{itsuz} \) and expresses events that will happen in the future or those that are timeless or habitual. If the RC subject is a pronoun, its case is determined by the case of the RC head within the matrix clause; in (18)-(19), the RC subjects are in the accusative case because the RC head is the object of the matrix clause. Unless the RC has a non-pronominal
subject, any argument in the RC referring to the matrix clause subject must take the reflexive form. This is true even when the RC modifies, and therefore precedes, the subject of the matrix clause (as in (20)):

(18) ɣɯbun [χɯ bunost=tɕɛndʑ] barqo vɯɡ.
    shepherd REFL.ACC lose.PR chim.3sg.PST
   ‘The shepherd, found the lamb [that he_i/*j had lost].’

(19) faridun [χɯ puɡan levd=iteuz] bejt mαcq kaxt.
    Faridun REFL.ACC tomorrow say.INF=REL song training do.3sg.NPST
   ‘Fariduni will practice the song [that he_i/*j will sing tomorrow].’

(20) [χɯ yɯbun awudʑ wazɔnd=iteuz] kalo χɯ pond
    REFL.POSS shepherd sound know.INF=REL sheep REFL.POSS path
    na bunost.
    NEG lose.3sg.NPST
   ‘A sheepi [that knows its_i/*j shepherd’s voice] will not lose its way.’

If a non-reflexive pronoun is used within a RC with a pronominal subject, it cannot refer to the matrix clause subject. In (21), the third person pronoun can only refer to a non-subject argument; in (22), the first person pronoun in the RC is ungrammatical because its antecedent, the matrix clause subject, is already in the first person:

(21) faridun [wị puɡan levd=iteuz] bejt mαcq kaxt.
    Faridun 3sg.POSS tomorrow say.INF=REL song training do.3sg.NPST
   ‘Fariduni will practice the song [that he_i/*j will sing tomorrow].’

(22) *waz=am [muɔ parus levd=dʑɛndʑ] bejt ranuxte.
    1sg.NOM=1sg.PST 1sg.ACC last.year say.PST=REL song forget.PRF
   ‘I forgot the song [that I sang last year].’

When χɯ occurs in a RC with a non-pronominal subject, it has two potential antecedents: the matrix clause subject and the RC subject. However, in such a case, there is no ambiguity because χɯ will always be coreferential with the RC subject. Thus, χɯ is used as a local reflexive rather than a long-distance reflexive:

(23) waz=am [amad χɯ=ri zuxt=tɕɛndʑ] duri χɯɡ.
    1sg.NOM=1sg.PST [Amad REFL.ACC=DAT buy.PST=REL medicine eat.PST
   ‘I took the medicine [that Amad bought for himself_i/*j].’

(24) zwufia [χonim χɯ=ri insuvd=dʑɛndʑ] a=ɕejdoji
    Zeelfiya Honim REFL.ACC=DAT sew.PST=REL ACC=crown
    χɯ tɛi kɔl ɔdud.
    REFL.POSS loc head wear.PST
   ‘Zeelfiya, wore the crown [that Honim sewed for herself_i/*j] on her_i/*j own head.’
5.2 Complement clause (CC)

Sarikoli has a non-finite nominalized CC and a finite CC. The nominalized CC is formed with an infinitival clause followed by the nominalizer –i. If the matrix clause has a regular NP as the subject and a nominalized CC as the object, and if the CC does not have its own subject that is different from the matrix clause subject (as in (25)) or has a subject that is possessed by the matrix clause subject (as in (26)), any argument within the CC which refers to the matrix clause subject takes the reflexive form:

(25)  
\[ \text{jɯ} [\text{χɯ} \text{wa} \text{ʑɛvd-i}=\text{ri qasam tɕəwɡ}.] \] 
3sg.nom REFL.acc return.inf-nmlz=dat swear do.pst

‘He swore [that he will come back].’

(26)  
\[ \text{kɯd} [\text{χɯ} \text{suji}=\text{an wi a=dvɛr at tɕejg-i}] \text{ xɯd}. \] 
dog REFL.poss owner=gen 3sg.poss ACC=door open do.inf-nmlz hear.pst

‘The dog heard [his owner opening the door].’

If the CC has a subject that is different from the matrix clause subject, a reflexive that occurs in the CC will always be coreferential with the CC subject and not the matrix clause subject, which demonstrates local usage of χɯ:

(27)  
\[ \text{waz} [\text{sobir χ-ono=ri tsejz levd-i}] \text{ wazon=am}. \] 
1sg.nom Sobir REFL.poss-mother=dat what say.inf-nmlz know.npst=1sg.npst

‘I know [what Sobir told his mother].’

(28)  
\[ \text{waz} [\text{χjɛb mɯ jaχ χɯ tilfon kudʑur latɕejg-i}] \text{ na wazon=am}. \] 
1sg.nom yesterday 1sg.poss sister REFL.poss phone where put.inf-nmlz neg know.npst=1sg.npst

‘I don’t know [where my sister put her phone yesterday].’

The finite CC is most commonly used for reporting direct speech (or thoughts, dreams, etc.), and is formed with the post-verbal particle iko followed by the object, which is the quoted speech. Within a finite CC, χɯ can only refer to the CC subject and not the matrix clause subject, which shows that χɯ in a finite subordinate clause cannot cross clause boundaries and is used as a local reflexive:

(29)  
\[ \text{ojɕam levd iko} [\text{mina mac}=\text{ir χɯ surat vusond}]. \] 
oisham say.pst sc Mina 1pl.acc=dat REFL.poss picture show.pst

‘Oisham said: [Mina showed us her picture].’

(30)  
\[ \text{nurbija levd iko} [\text{χalisa χɯ ljeq na znud}]. \] 
nurbiya say.pst sc halisa REFL.poss clothes neg wash.pst

‘Nurbiya said: [Halisa did not wash her clothes].’
The Sarikoli reflexive pronoun

5.3 The dil construction

Sarikoli has a desiderative construction in which a CC functions as a predicate nominal. The subject of the matrix clause is always dil ‘heart’, and the content of desire is expressed in an infinitival CC which follows the dil. In the nonpast tense, the subject and the predicate nominal are simply juxtaposed without any auxiliaries. Any reflexive in the CC must refer to the possessor of the matrix clause subject, and non-reflexives cannot refer to the possessor of the matrix clause subject:

(32) wi dil [χɯ djɛst-ɛf qati tup skit tɕejɡ].

3SG.POSS heart REFL.POSS friend-ACC.PL with ball play do.INF

‘His desire is [to play ball with his friends].’

(33) mɯ dil [χɯ pɯts ar bedzin xajond].

1SG.POSS heart REFL.POSS son LOC Beijing study.CAUS.INF

‘My desire is [make my son study in Beijing].’

(34) *mɯ dil [[mɯ mom wand=ir] dɯχtɯrχuno tid]].

1SG.POSS heart 1SG.POSS grandmother see.INF=DAT hospital go.INF

‘My desire is [to go to the hospital [to see my grandmother]].’

The dil construction of expressing desire is noteworthy because the reflexives in the CC are not coreferential with the matrix clause subject. The matrix clause subject is dil ‘heart’, rather than the person who is the source of desire. The desirer, who might have functioned as the antecedent of χɯ, only serves as the possessor of ‘heart’. However, semantically, the reflexives clearly refer to the desirer, not the ‘heart’—for example, in (32), it is the desirer who wants to play ball with his friends, not the heart. It may be that ‘X’s heart’ gets idiomatically interpreted as ‘X’, so that the possessor of dil appears to be the antecedent of the reflexive. Alternatively, this may be evidence of anaphoric control, in which the controller is understood to be the source of desire and the reflexive within the CC is the controllee.

Other copular sentences in which the subject is a possessed item, even inalienably possessed items such as body parts or kinship relations, clearly contrast (as shown in (35)-(36)). If the subject is an inalienably possessed item other than dil, a reflexive that occurs in the copular CC always refers to the subject, not the possessor of the subject, as expected based on the subject orientation of Sarikoli reflexives. Thus, reflexives that occur in the dil construction are an exception to their tendency towards subject orientation.

(35) mɯ dust [χɯ suجيب na wazond=itɛuz].

3SG.POSS hand REFL.POSS owner NEG know.INF=REL

‘My hand is (one) [that does not know its owner].’
5.4 Adverbial clause (AC)

Sarikoli temporal, purpose, and reason ACs are non-finite, whereas conditional ACs are finite. Temporal ACs are marked by the infinitive stem of the verb followed by the temporal particle alo or a postposition. If the AC lacks an explicitly-stated subject, χɯ is used for any (lower) argument that is coreferential with the matrix clause subject:

(37) [χɯ tej tɕeŋ alo] a=muq iv ka jo?
    REFL.POSS wedding do.INF TEMP ACC=1SG.ACC call do.NPST Q

‘Will you invite me [when (youi) do your *i/*j wedding]?’

If the AC contains a subject that is different from the matrix clause subject, χɯ within the AC refers to the AC subject, not the matrix clause subject. In this case, χɯ is used locally.

(38) [waz χɯ tej tɕeŋ alo] təw=at kudʑur vɯd?
    1SG.nom refl POSS wedding do.INF TEMP 2SG.NOM=2SG.PST where be.PST

‘Where were youi [when Ij did my *i/*j wedding]?’

In Sarikoli, the purpose AC cannot contain a subject that is different from the matrix clause subject. This type of AC is marked with the infinitival clause followed by either the dative enclitic =ir/=ri or the postposition avon, which marks the benefactive. Arguments in the embedded clause that refer to the matrix clause subject take the reflexive form, even when the embedded clause occurs before the matrix clause subject:

(39) waz cits [χɯ amru tar pond wɛd=ir] so=m.
    1SG.nom now POSS friend toward road put.INF=DAT become.NPST=1SG.NPST

‘I’m going [to put my friend on the road] (i.e., to see her off).’

(40) [χɯ radʑen az xats zuwɔst avon], amerdin ar darju
    REFL.POSS daughter from water take.out.INF BEN Amerdin LOC river
    rawuxt.

    jump.PST

‘[In order to take his, daughter out of the water], Amerdin jumped into the river.’

The reason AC is formed with the preposition az ‘from’ preceding the verb in a nominalized infinitival clause. As in the other ACs discussed above, if a reason AC lacks an explicitly-stated subject, arguments within the AC that refer to the matrix clause subject take the reflexive form and not the non-reflexive form:

(41) ju g [χɯ kilit az bɯnost-i] tɛlan ðud.
    3SG.nom POSS POSS key from lose.INF-NMLZ fine give.PST

‘Hei paid a fine [for losing his, key].’
(42) rajongeel [χɯ  garun  batɕo  tʃer  az  tɕejɡ-i]  aluk  sut.
Rayongeel REFL.POSS heavy child lift from do.INF-NMLZ tired become.PST
‘Rayongeel, got tired [from carrying her, heavy children].’

If the reason AC contains a subject that is different from the matrix clause subject, the use of χɯ results in an ambiguous antecedent, because it is equally acceptable for χɯ to refer to the matrix clause subject or the AC subject. When χɯ is interpreted as being coreferential with the matrix clause subject, it is used as a long-distance reflexive; when it is interpreted as being coreferential with the AC subject, it is used as a local reflexive:

(43) amad [olim  χɯ  a=kilit  az  bunost-i]  telan  ɗud.
Amad Olim REFL.POSS ACC=key from lose.INF-NMLZ fine give.PST
‘Amad, paid a fine [because of Olim, losing his, key].’

(44) alima [az  nurbija  χɯ  a=mon  χɨɡ-i]  χafo  sut.
Alima from Nurbiya REFL.POSS ACC=apple eat.INF-NMLZ upset become.PST
‘Alima, got upset [because of Nurbiya, eating his, apple].’

The conditional AC is a finite embedded clause formed with the particle tsa immediately preceding or following the verb. If the conditional AC does not have an explicitly-stated subject, χɯ within the AC refers to the matrix clause subject:

(45) [χɯ  num  tsa  na  wazond],  jɯ  t će  z  wazond?
REFL.POSS name COND NEG know.3SG.NPST 3SG.NOM what know.3SG.NPST
‘[If (he) doesn’t know his, name], what does he, know?’

When the AC and the matrix clause have different subjects and the AC contains the reflexive χɯ, the χɯ must refer to the AC subject. As with the finite CC, this finite AC shows that χɯ within a finite clause cannot be used as a long-distance reflexive:

(46) amad  χafo  sawd,  [soqdzon  χɯ  batɕo  tsa  vird].
Amad upset become.3SG.NPST Soqjon REFL.POSS child COND bring.3SG.NPST
‘Amad, will get upset [if Soqjon, brings his, child].’

(47) romila  tung  tizi,  [alima  χɯ  kutub  na  ɗid  tsa].
Romila Teeng go.3SG.NPST Alima REFL.POSS book NEG give.3SG.NPST COND
‘Romila, will go to Teeng [if Alima, does not give (her) her, book].’

Finally, in iterated embedded finite clauses, χɯ refers to the subject of the innermost embedded clause, which further demonstrates that χɯ cannot cross clause boundaries when used in finite embedded clauses. In the following examples, χɯ occurs in a conditional AC embedded in a finite CC:

(48) isoq  lev'd  iko
Isoq say.PST SC
[guulpia  tizi,  [niso  χɯ  teco  na  brozd  tsa]]).
Geelpia go.3SG.NPST Niso REFL.POSS tea NEG drink.3SG.NPST COND
‘Isoq, said: (Geelpia, will leave [if Niso, does not drink her, tea]).’
(49) amad levd iko
   Amad say.PST SC
   {mina xafo sawd, [tilak χu batco-jef tsa rond]}. [tilak REFL.POSS child-ACC.PL COND scold.3G.NPST

   ‘Amad said: {Mina will get upset [if Tilak scolds her, her children]}.’

6 Conclusion

This paper has described the agreement, relative prominence, and domain of the Sarikoli reflexive. Section 3 showed that χu does not overtly agree with its antecedent; only one form, χu ‘self’, is used as the reflexive personal and possessive pronouns. Section 4 showed that χu must refer to the subject of its minimal clause and that any pronoun referring to the subject must take the reflexive form. Because it must be ranked lower on the Relational Hierarchy than its antecedent, χu occurs as an object, oblique argument, or non-argument. Non-reflexive pronouns are complementarily distributed with χu, as they can never take as their antecedent the subject of their minimal clause. Finally, Section 5 described the degree of distance by which χu and its antecedent may be separated, in non-finite subordinate clauses without an explicitly-stated subject, non-finite subordinate clauses with a subject that is different from the matrix clause subject, and finite subordinate clauses. In non-finite clauses lacking an explicitly-stated subject, χu is coreferential with the matrix clause subject, and appears to function as a long-distance reflexive. One possible explanation for this is that the embedded clause contains a null subject that is functionally controlled by the matrix clause subject, which serves as a local antecedent for χu. In finite and non-finite subordinate clauses that do contain a subject that is different from the matrix clause subject, χu is used as a local reflexive referring to the embedded clause subject. The only exception is the reason AC: if a reason AC has a subject that is different from the matrix clause subject, χu within the AC may refer to either subject, so the antecedent is ambiguous. In such cases, χu is used as a long-distance reflexive when interpreted as being coreferential with the matrix clause subject. Thus, χu has both local and long-distance usage, and is subject-oriented in both cases.
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Abbreviations:

1 = first person
2 = second person
3 = third person
AC = adverbial clause
ACC = accusative
ADJ = adjectivizer
BEN = benefactive
CAUS = causative
CC = complement clause
COND = conditional
DAT = dative
GEN = genitive
INF = infinitive
LD = long-distance
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NOM = nominative
NEG = negation
NMLZ = nominalizer
NPST = nonpast
PL = plural
POSS = possessive
PRF = perfect
PST = past
Q = question particle
RC = relative clause
REFL = reflexive
REL = relativizer
SC = subordinating conjunction
SG = singular
TEMP = temporal
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