

From intensifiers to discourse particles and conjunctions: novel data from East Caucasian

Aigul Zakirova (University of Potsdam)

Timur Maisak (Institute of Linguistics RAS / HSE University)

Michael Daniel (University of Tübingen)

Abstract

*Intensifiers are often diachronically related to reflexives and logophoric pronouns. In addition, they have been reported to sometimes develop into scalar additive focus particles, cf. German *selbst*, French *même*. The present paper focuses on the mechanisms whereby intensifiers develop into other types of discourse-structuring devices. Based on synchronic data from several East Caucasian languages, including Upper Andi, Tukita (both < Andic), Rutul, Tsakhur (both < Lezgian), we reconstruct the diachronic processes whereby intensifiers evolve into restrictive focus particles ('just', 'only') and different types of conjunctions (adversative 'but', coordinating 'and also'). The data come from written and spoken text corpora, as well as from the authors' on-site and remote elicitation.*

1 Introduction

Intensifiers, i.e., expressions such as English *himself / herself / itself*, have received a great deal of attention in both formal and descriptive-typological traditions, see, *inter alia*, Moravcsik (1972), Edmondson & Plank (1978), Kemmer (1995), König & Siemund (2000), Siemund (2000), Eckardt (2001), König & Gast (2006), Gast (2006) and Constantinou (2014). In this paper, we will use the typologically oriented definition by König et al. (2013): intensifiers are expressions “which can be adjoined to either NPs or VPs, are invariably focused and thus are prosodically prominent. The main function of intensifiers can be seen in the evoking of alternatives to the referent of the NP they relate to”. For example, *herself* in (1) means that it is the writer who appeared in the show and not, e.g., one of her assistants.

(1) *The writer appeared in the show **herself**.*

The main focus of the research on intensifiers has been on their semantics and syntax, as well as on their relationship with reflexives (König & Gast 2006). Diachronic research on intensifiers has identified their grammaticalization sources: names of body parts, notions like ‘life’ and ‘soul’, items expressing “precision of reference”, ‘one’ and ‘alone’ (König & Gast

2006), ‘again’ and ‘owner’ (Kuteva et al. 2019). In the languages of Europe, further development of intensifiers into scalar additive focus particles has been attested (Kuteva et al. 2019), cf. German *selbst* and French *même* (Fr. *Même Mark était là* ‘Even Mark was there’). In particular, the diachronic evolution of the German *selbst* has been studied in detail by Eckardt (2001).

In this paper, we deal with a similar development in several East Caucasian languages spoken in Dagestan (Russia), incl. Upper Andi and Tukita (< Andic branch of the family). However, whereas in the languages of Europe intensifiers develop into scalar additives (~‘even’), in the languages under study the resulting focus operators are restrictive, or exclusive (~‘only’, ‘just’). In addition, we discuss the development of intensifiers into connecting devices (conjunctions) in Rutul, Tsakhur (< Lezgian branch of the family) and Upper Andi. We are not aware of cross-linguistic parallels to the latter development.

Upper Andi and Tukita are closely related languages, and they both are only distantly related to Rutul, which belongs to another branch of the East Caucasian (a.k.a. Nakh-Dagestanian) family. As is typical for the family, they are ergative languages with rich inflectional morphology and pervasive gender-number agreement (see Ganenkov & Maisak 2020 for an overview of the typological profile of East Caucasian). Upper Andi data come from a published collection of fairy-tales written in the variety of the Andi village (henceforth Andi proper, Magomedova & Alisultanova 2010), as well as from an unpublished spoken corpus of the Zilo dialect (≈26,000 tokens). In addition, some remote fieldwork has been conducted on Zilo Andi. Standard Rutul data come from a published collection of folklore tales (Folklore Collection 2011–2013) and the Gospel of Luke (Lukašdi bosam... 2015), whereas the data from Kina Rutul come from one of the authors’ fieldwork in the village of Kina. Data from Tukita come from an unpublished spoken corpus (≈107,000 tokens). Whenever citing examples from text collections or from other researchers, we adapt the transcription and glosses.

The paper is structured as follows. Section 2 introduces intensifiers and their relation to focus particles in the languages of the world. Section 3 overviews the morphosyntax of intensifiers in Upper Andi, Tukita and Rutul. Section 4 discusses the development of intensifiers into focus particles in Upper Andi and Tukita, while Section 5 deals with the development of intensifiers into conjunctions in Rutul, Tsakhur and possibly Upper Andi. Section 6 is a short conclusion.

2 Intensifiers and their development into focus particles

One of the most exciting features of intensifiers is their recurrent patterns of polyfunctionality. Current literature takes a bottom-up approach, analyzing the wealth of the attested uses of intensifiers and trying to account for the constellations observed (Section 2.1). Notably, some of these uses can function as bridging contexts, which become the base for the reanalysis of intensifiers into scalar additive particles (Section 2.2).

2.1 Polyfunctionality and use patterns of intensifiers.

Intensifiers are often formally identical to reflexives: this is true of about one third of all languages in König & Gast's sample of 110 languages (2006). This formal correspondence can also be partial (another 16/110 of the sample). An example of identical expression of the two meanings comes from English, cf. (1), where *herself* is an intensifier, and (2), where an identical form is used as a reflexive.

(2) *Sue sees **herself** in the mirror.*

Within intensifiers proper, several use patterns are distinguished according to their syntactic properties and semantics. Table 1 overviews the types distinguished in the classifications by König & Siemund (2000), Siemund (2000), Gast (2006), König & Gast (2006)¹ and Constantinou (2014); we follow the terminology used in König & Gast (2006).

Table 1. Use types of intensifiers (König & Gast 2006)

	Use type	Example
1.	Adnominal	<i>Writers themselves, rather than their works, should be examined for their sense of social responsibility.</i>
2.	Adverbial-exclusive (≅ 'on one's own, alone')	<i>Mrs. Dalloway wanted to buy the flowers herself.</i>
3.	Adverbial-inclusive (≅ 'too')	<i>Mr. Salmon was all right, though. You see, he'd once been a costermonger himself, but that was before he married Miss Roach, the baker's daughter. [British National Corpus]</i>

The best-studied use of intensifiers is the adnominal use. A widely accepted analysis of this use dates back to Eckardt (2001) and Moravcsik (1972), who argued that adnominal intensifiers

¹ König & Gast (2006) also mention an attributive use (e.g., English *one's own*); we do not treat it here since it is not relevant to our study.

denote the identity function ID. This function takes as its argument a referent x and maps it onto an output which is identical to the input: $ID(x) = x$. While Moravcsik first suggested this analysis, Eckardt was the first to consider it in terms of the alternative theory of focus (Rooth 1985). In accordance with this theory, intensifiers to which the identity function is applied become focused and thus evoke a set of alternatives. Since intensifiers are functions from individuals to individuals, their most natural alternatives are relational nouns, e.g., alternatives of *(the writer) herself* include ‘the writer’s parents’, ‘the writer’s siblings’, ‘the writer’s assistants’, etc.

The analysis by Eckardt and Moravcsik predicts the tendency of adnominal intensifiers to occur in several types of contexts. One group of such contexts is scalar, e.g., the referent of the NP combined with an intensifier may have a higher position on a scale than its alternatives or be more significant in a specific situation than other referents, cf. (3) from König & Siemund (2000). Eckardt (2001) hypothesizes that scalar contexts of intensifiers served as bridging contexts for their reanalysis as scalar additive particles in German, French and Spanish.

(3) *The chancellor **himself** was surprised at the results.*

Another typical context for adnominal intensifiers is when referents are defined in terms of other referents, e.g., in (4), Lucy’s sister is defined in terms of Lucy.

(4) *Lucy’s sister is more intelligent than Lucy **herself**.*

A closely related type of use is mentioned by Kemmer (1995) and Ljutikova (2002), who notice that adnominal intensifiers are commonly found in contexts of unexpected topic return, cf. also Ljutikova’s (2002) *discourse-conditioned* (Russian *diskursivnoe*) use of intensifiers. The latter context can be exemplified by the following constructed text:

(5) *John has a sister, who lives in the city. She loves it, especially the nightlife. John **himself** lives in the countryside.*

In (5), the first local topic is John. Later, the topic shifts to his sister and then unexpectedly returns to John again. This type of use will be important for us in Section 5.1, where we will argue that this use served as a bridging context for the development of an intensifier into an adversative conjunction in Rutul.

In addition to the adnominal position, intensifiers can also combine with VPs, yielding adverbial-inclusive and adverbial-exclusive uses (see Table 1). Siemund (2000) and König & Gast (2006) show that structurally adverbial-inclusive and adverbial-exclusive uses are different from the adnominal use and from one another (e.g., in English the adverbial-inclusive use only scopes over negation, while the adverbial-exclusive use scopes under it). Eckardt analyses the adverbial-inclusive and adverbial-exclusive uses as based on the identity function. Crucially, even if in these uses the intensifiers are structurally combined with VPs, the presence of an associated NP is always implied, and alternatives to this NP are generated.

2.2 Intensifiers and focus particles

As was mentioned in Section 2.1, intensifiers operate as focus-sensitive devices. In fact, in their early work König & Siemund (2000) and Siemund (2000) argued that all instances of German intensifying *selbst* are focus particles. One of the counterarguments to this analysis was that *selbst* differs from other German focus particles in terms of syntax and the placement of stress (Eckardt 2001). In later works, e.g., König & Gast (2006), König and his co-authors abandoned this analysis.

Nevertheless, intensifiers do show striking similarities to focus particles, allowing for reanalysis from intensifiers to focus particles. For example, adverbial-exclusive uses of intensifiers (e.g., *He did it himself*) imply that no other alternative to the associated NP took part in the situation, thus resembling restrictive particles, such as ‘only’, for which this is a presupposition (Horn 1969). Adverbial-inclusive uses (e.g., *He was a costermonger himself* in Table 1) are reminiscent of plain additives such as ‘too’: both imply that another alternative to the associated NP took part in the situation; for plain additives this is a presupposition (König 1991: 60).

The best-researched instance of reanalysis, however, is from scalar uses of intensifiers to scalar additive particles. According to Eckardt (2001), this diachronic change occurred in the German *selbst*.

Just like other adnominal intensifiers, *selbst* often (but not always) has scalar surprise inferences. For example, in (6) it is presumed that Jane Fonda is less likely to eat sweets than other individuals related to her.

(6) German

<i>Jane</i>	<i>Fonda</i>	<i>selbst</i>	<i>nasch-t</i>	<i>manchmal</i>	<i>Yougurette.</i>
Jane	Fonda	oneself	eat-PRS.3SG	sometimes	Yougurette

‘Jane Fonda herself sometimes eats Yougurette.’
(Eckardt 2001)

Intensifiers in contexts like (6) do not have an additive presupposition. However, in contexts like (6) other alternatives are often present, e.g., it is very likely that people around Jane Fonda also eat sweets. Based on their experience with scalar additive particles, at some point speakers reanalyzed *selbst* in (6) as such a particle. The scale of surprise was conventionalized, and the additive presupposition was included in the meaning of the particle. The reanalyzed scalar focus particle was placed in front of the associated NP, as is the case with other German focus particles:

(7) German

<i>Selbst</i>	<i>Jane</i>	<i>Fonda</i>	<i>nasch-t</i>	<i>manchmal</i>	<i>Yougurette.</i>
oneself	Jane	Fonda	eat-PRS.3SG	sometimes	Yougurette

‘Even Jane Fonda sometimes eats Yougurette.’
(Eckardt 2001)

The semantic reanalysis was accompanied by some other changes in the syntax and prosody of *selbst*: in addition to changing its position, the focus particle *selbst* lost the accent. Its combinatorial potential also grew: while intensifying *selbst* in its adnominal use is only found with specific NPs, with the focus particle *selbst* this restriction was lifted. Moreover, *selbst* started to associate with all types of constituents, including VPs and clauses. In Section 4, we will discuss a similar instance of reanalysis, namely from intensifiers to restrictive particles in East Caucasian.

3 Intensifiers and their polyfunctionality in East Caucasian

Turning to the intensifying pronouns in East Caucasian languages, let us start with looking at their morphological structure. Tables 2-3 provide simplified paradigms of the intensifying pronouns in Upper Andi, Tukita and Mukhad Rutul. The Tukita paradigm is rather similar to that of Upper Andi, and the Tsakhur paradigm resembles that of Rutul. Importantly, in all languages under discussion the intensifying pronouns are built from two different stems, depending on the case form. The stem used in the absolutive, the unmarked case of the intransitive subject and

direct object (patient), contains a slot for gender-number agreement. In all other, so-called oblique, cases (including ergative), a suppletive stem is used. This second stem does not contain the gender-number marker found in the absolutive, although gender-number distinctions can still be expressed in the oblique cases by stem allomorphs. For details on the morphological structure of reflexive/intensifying pronouns, see Ganenkov & Bogomolova (2020).

In both varieties of Upper Andi (Zilo Andi and Andi proper), the absolutive stem is *ži<GN>*-, where *GN* stands for a gender-agreeing marker (five genders are distinguished in Zilo Andi in the singular), see Table 2. The oblique forms are built from the second stem *en-* followed by the oblique stem extensions, namely *-š:(u)-* (masculine singular), *-nu-* (masculine plural), *-li-* (non-masculine singular) and *-ni-* (non-masculine plural). Although the oblique stem extensions are not gender markers as such, they express gender-number distinctions, in particular between masculine vs. non-masculine referents. The intensifier *ži<GN>=gu* always contains the enclitic particle *=gu*, which follows the gender-number and case suffixes. This enclitic is also found in contexts of emphatic identity (‘same’) and as part of other morphemes, such as simulative *-gagu* and adverbializing *-guža*; see Maisak (2021) on some functions of *=gu* and Forker (2015) on this type of particles in East Caucasian in general.

Table 2. Simplified paradigm of the intensifying pronoun *ži<GN>=gu* in Zilo Andi

Absolutive	Gender	SG	PL
	M	<i>ži<w>=gu</i>	<i>ži<w>-ul=gu</i>
	F	<i>ži<j>=gu</i>	<i>ži<j>-il=gu</i>
	AN	<i>ži=gu</i>	<i>ži-ul=gu</i>
	N1	<i>ži=gu</i>	<i>ži-ul=gu</i>
	N2	<i>ži<r>=gu</i>	<i>ži<r>-ul=gu</i>
Other cases (e.g., Ergative, Dative, Genitive)	M	<i>en-š:(u)-CASE=gu</i>	<i>en-nu-CASE=gu</i>
	Other	<i>en-(l:i)-CASE=gu</i>	<i>en-ni-CASE=gu</i>

In closely related Tukita, the absolutive stem is also *ži<GN>-*, and the oblique stem is *in-*. The pronoun is followed by the particle *=gi*, which has approximately the same functions and distribution as the Upper Andi *=gu*. What distinguishes it from Upper Andi is a differently structured paradigm of the gender-number marking suffixes in the absolutive: three genders are distinguished in the singular (masculine *ži<w>=gi*, feminine *ži<j>=gi*, neuter *ži=gi*) and human plural *ži-e=gi* is opposed to non-human plural *ži<r>-e=gi*. Likewise, in the plural oblique cases the opposition is not between masculine vs. non-masculine, but the human forms (stem *in-du-*) are opposed to the non-human ones (stem *in-da-*).

In Rutul, which belongs to a different branch of East Caucasian, the absolutive form of the intensifier includes a prefixal gender-agreeing slot, which is partly fused with the pronominal stem (four genders are distinguished in the singular). The structure of the absolutive singular form is *<GN>iž*. In the absolutive plural, gender oppositions are neutralized in the single suppletive form *ž^wa^r*. The oblique forms are built from the stems *žu-* (for masculine nouns) and *ži-* (for all other genders). Table 4 presents the paradigm of the pronoun in Standard Rutul based on the Mukhad Rutul dialect (Maxmudova 2001: 177). Kina Rutul variety displays some minor differences: in particular, the absolutive singular form in the masculine is *juž* and the plural absolutive form is *ž^wer*.

Table 3. Simplified paradigm structure of the intensifying pronoun *<GN>iž* in Mukhad Rutul

	Gender	SG	PL
Absolutive	M	<i><w>iž</i>	<i>ž^wa^r</i>
	F	<i><r>iž</i>	
	N1	<i><w>iž</i>	
	N2	<i><j>iž</i>	
Other cases (e.g., Ergative, Dative)	M	<i>žu-CASE</i>	<i>ž^wa^r-ši-CASE</i>
	Other	<i>ži-CASE</i>	

In Tsakhur, a Lezgian language closely related to Rutul, which will be briefly discussed in Section 5, the system of intensifying pronouns is very similar, although not identical (Sosenskaja

1999: 132). For example, the absolutive singular pronouns are *wuž* in the masculine and neuter 1 genders and *již* in the feminine and neuter 2 genders, and the absolutive plural pronouns are *žo* in the human (masculine and feminine) genders and *již-bi* in the non-human (neuter 1 and neuter 2) genders.

An important respect in which Rutul and Tsakhur differ from the Andic languages is that the Rutul and Tsakhur intensifying pronouns do not carry any obligatory particles.

In all languages discussed above, intensifiers (Upper Andi *ži*<GN>=*gu*, Tukita *ži*<GN>=*gi*, Rutul and Tsakhur <GN>*iž*) demonstrate a typologically expected pattern of polyfunctionality. Their contexts of use coincide with those of other East Caucasian languages, whose intensifying pronouns received a detailed description, such as Bagvalal (< Andic, Ljutikova 2001: 642–645); on Tsakhur intensifiers see (Ljutikova 1999, Toldova 1999: 644–670). Here, for reasons of space, we will illustrate these uses with examples from Upper Andi.

Intensifying pronouns are found in the adnominal (8) as well as in the adverbial position (9–10), with exclusive (9) and inclusive (10) readings.

(8) Zilo Andi

<i>ži-w=gu</i>	<i>Direktor</i>	<i>jagi</i>	<i>zamestitel</i>	<i>w-oʔo-j=le?</i>
self-M=EMPH	Director	or	deputy	M-PL.come-PRF=Q

‘Was it the headmaster himself or his deputy who came?’
(elicited)

(9) Zilo Andi

<i>hege-w</i>	<i>ži-w=gu=kodi</i>	<i>w-uʔonni-j</i>
DEM-M	self-M=EMPH=REP	M-go-PRF

{The tsar’s son fell in love with a peasant girl. Normally, the tsar would send someone to arrange a marriage but the tsar was already dead, so} ‘...he went himself’.

(corpus)

(10) Zilo Andi

<i>ži-w=gu=lo</i>	<i>w-ubi</i>	<i>zolo</i>	<i>akuratnij</i>	<i>hek’wa</i>
self-M=EMPH=ADD	M-stay.AOR	very	neat	man

{This man’s house and barn were very tidy. In the Soviet times, he would secretly

repair the roof of the mosque.} ‘He himself also was a very neat person.’
(corpus)

The discourse use of the intensifying pronoun (‘topic return’) is likewise attested:

(11) Andi proper

ži-j=gu=lo *hagi-dos:ja-la* *j-eq’aš:i-d:u*
self-F=EMPH=ADD see-PTCP.IPFV.NEG-SUP.ESS F-hide-PRF

{This woman turned the young man into a foal and brought this foal into the tsar’s son’s stable.} ‘And she herself hid’.

(Magomedova & Alisultanova 2010)

The same pronoun *ži*<*GN*>=*gu* is also used as a reflexive (12) and in logophoric contexts (13); note that in logophoric contexts the clitic =*gu* is absent (13). The polyfunctionality of reflexive, intensifier and logophor is typical for East Caucasian, cf. (Testelec & Toldova 1998; Ganenkov & Bogomolova 2020: 901).

(12) Zilo Andi

učitel-š-di *ži-w=gu* *w-ec:iqi*
teacher-M.OBL-ERG self-M=EMPH M-praise.AOR

‘The teacher praised himself.’

(Kaye et al. forthc.)

(13) Zilo Andi

ži-w *du-lu* *kumeki-lu* *hek’wa-š-qi* *w-u?inni-ja*
self-M you.SG.OBL-DAT help-DAT man-M.OBL-INSTR M-leave-FUT

{And the fox says:} ‘I will go fetch a person to help you.’

(corpus)

As described above, in all four languages (Upper Andi, Tukita, Rutul and Tsakhur), the intensifying pronoun in the absolutive carries a gender agreement marker. This marker reflects the gender of the NP with which the pronoun is associated, cf. (8)-(12); note that sometimes the

NP is omitted (10-11), as the so-called pro-drop is common across East Caucasian. In this paper, we will describe this relation as agreement, similarly to how König & Gast (2006) qualify inflected intensifiers in their sample as demonstrating agreement.

Note that in addition to gender-number agreement, intensifying pronouns in Upper Andi, Tukita, Rutul and Tsakhur demonstrate person agreement with the associated NP. In the 1 and 2 persons, instead of dedicated pronouns, personal pronouns are used (Ganenkova & Bogomolova 2020: 881). Note that in Andic languages the personal pronouns in these contexts always carry the emphatic particle (exs. 14-15, see also Ganenkova & Bogomolova 2020: 881).

(14) Zilo Andi

<i>(du-<w>o)</i>	<i>men=gu</i>	<i>žiʔi-b!</i>
you.SG.OBL-	you.SG=EMPH	love-ITR.IMP
<M>AFF		
‘Love yourself!’		

(Kaye et al. forthc.)

(15) Zilo Andi

<i>den-ni=gu</i>	<i>he-w</i>	<i>č’inni-ja</i>	<i>rok’o</i>	<i>b-ic’i-lo</i>
I-ERG=EMPH	DEM-M	beat-FUT	heart	N1-fill-CVB.LIM
‘I will beat him myself until I am happy.’ [lit. ‘until my heart is full’]				

(corpus)

4 From intensifiers to focus particles: data from East Caucasian

In Section 2, we have mentioned one trajectory by which intensifiers may develop into scalar additive focus particles, as described for the German *selbst* by Eckardt (2001). In this section, we show that Upper Andi and Tukita also feature some extended uses of the intensifiers. Unlike the German *selbst*, Upper Andi *ži<GN>gu* and Tukita *ži<GN>gi* occur in restrictive contexts, being approximately equivalent to the English focus particles *only* and *just*.

Similarly to German *selbst*, the restrictive uses of *ži<GN>gu* and *ži<GN>gi* cannot be analyzed as instances of intensifying pronouns: whereas intensifiers normally associate with NPs, restrictive *ži<GN>gu* and *ži<GN>gi* can associate with other types of constituents, such as VPs and clauses. Our hypothesis is that in some of their restrictive uses, *ži<GN>gu* and *ži<GN>gi*

underwent decategorialization (Hopper & Traugott 1993), i.e. they lost some properties of intensifying pronouns and developed into particles.

4.1 Evolution of the Upper Andi *ži<GN>gu*

As mentioned in Sections 2 and 3, in many languages of the world, including Upper Andi and Tukita, intensifiers can be used in *adverbial-exclusive* contexts. In these contexts, their reading is as follows: no other alternatives to the referent of the associated NP take part in the situation. One frequent context is doing something without help from others, as in (9) from Zilo Andi.

Zilo Andi *ži<GN>gu* is also attested in several other contexts where alternatives to the associated NP are excluded, such as (16). Similar uses are found in the closely related Andic languages Tukita (see Section 4.2 below), Akhwakh (Magomedova & Abdulaeva 2007: 176) and Karata (Magomedova & Xalidova 2001: 147).

(16) Zilo Andi

<i>muḥammadi-di</i>	<i>ži-r=gu</i>	<i>ɬ'en</i>	<i>c'adi-r</i>
Muhammad-ERG	self-N2=EMPH	water	drink-PROG

‘Muhammad drinks only water’.

(elicitation)

In (16), the intensifier is used with associated inanimate NPs. This is attested cross-linguistically, although in some languages intensifiers can only combine with animate referents. What is more important, the NP in (16) has a generic reading, i.e., it is non-specific, while intensifiers normally only combine with specific NPs (Eckardt 2001). This can already be considered a loosening of selectional restrictions on intensifiers in restrictive contexts. However, there seem to be no other arguments for a different status of *ži<GN>gu* in (16). As expected, *ži<GN>gu* is associated with NPs meaning ‘water’ and evokes, as alternatives, sets of various types of beverages to be consumed.

A more problematic example is (17), where *ži<GN>=gu* is associated with a VP.

(17) Zilo Andi

<i>muḥammadi</i>	<i>w-aɣo-r-s:u,</i>	<i>he-w</i>	<i>ži-w=gu</i>	<i>helli-r</i>
Muhammad	M-fight-PROG-NEG	DEM-M	self-M=EMPH	run-PROG

‘Muhammad isn’t fighting {with anyone}, he is just running around.’

(elicitation)

One might argue that $\dot{z}i<GN>gu$ in (17) is associated with the NP *hew* ‘he’. However, the set of alternatives evoked by $\dot{z}i<GN>gu$ does not consist of individuals, such as {Muhammad’s father, Muhammad’s brother Rasul, Muhammad’s sister Aishat}, as would be expected, had $\dot{z}i<GN>gu$ been associated with *hew*. Rather, the alternatives evoked are an ordered set of possible behaviors of Muhammad, e.g., {‘Muhammad is sitting still’ < ‘Muhammad is walking’ < ‘Muhammad is running around’ < ‘Muhammad is fighting with someone’ < ‘Muhammad is breaking things’}. The semantic contribution of $\dot{z}i<GN>gu$ in (17) seems to be that Muhammad’s behavior is located relatively low on the scale mentioned above: he is not afflicting damage, he is just moving around (and probably creating some noise). This suggests that $\dot{z}i<GN>gu$ in (17) is used as a *restrictive* device, in particular, one expressing *rank-order readings* (Horn 2000).

Here, a short terminological discussion is in order. Restrictives (also called *exclusives*), such as English *only*, *just*, *exclusively*, *merely*, *solely*, etc., have been studied since at least the 1960s (cf. Horn 1969, König 1991, Krifka 1992, Bonomi & Casalegno 1993, Coppock & Beaver 2014). In this paper, we follow Coppock & Beaver (2014) in distinguishing between two types of readings of restrictive devices: *complement exclusion* and *rank-order* readings.

The *complement exclusion* reading is paraphrasable as ‘and nothing/nobody else’. For example, in (18), *only* has a complement exclusion reading. Due to the focalization of *Sue*, a set of alternatives is generated, e.g., {Bill, Mary, Tom}. The restrictive presupposition is that no other alternatives to the focussed constituent (Sue) hold true, i.e., neither Bill, nor Mary, nor Tom know the answer.

(18) **Only** *Sue knows the answer.*

(Coppock & Beaver 2014)

The *rank-order reading*, as in (17) above, is paraphrasable as ‘and nothing more’. This can be illustrated by the English example (19). The difference from the complement exclusion reading is that James may in principle be other things and play other roles, e.g., he may be a person, a Capricorn, someone’s son, etc. What is said in (19) is that, in addition to other possible qualifications of James, there exists a scale of his proficiency in chess, and from complete newbie to professional James is located no higher than an amateur.

(19) *In chess, James is only / just an amateur.*

In Zilo Andi, *ži<GN>gu* is normally used in rank-order contexts (17), whereas in the contexts of complement exclusion a different construction with double negation (N=NEG=EMPH Pred-NEG) is found, which literally means ‘not X not P’ (20), see also Tatevosov (2021) on this double negation construction.

(20) Zilo Andi

<i>di-j-il</i>	<i>gedoba-di</i>	<i>kitiket</i>	<i>s:u-gu</i>	<i>k'am-es:a</i>
I.GEN-GEN.AN.PL-PL	cat.OBL.PL-ERG	Kitekat	NEG-EMPH	eat-FUT.NEG

‘My cats only eat Kitekat.’ [lit. ‘My cats do not eat not Kitekat’]
(elicitation)

In rank-order contexts, *ži<GN>gu* often scopes over a verb phrase; note that the gender-number agreement with the absolutive NP is still preserved, e.g., in (17) *ži<GN>gu* agrees with the demonstrative pronoun *hew* ‘he’, which is the absolutive argument of the intransitive clause. Person agreement, however, may be lost. In (21), the pro-dropped absolutive argument is second person masculine singular. The expected form of the intensifier would have been *men=gu* [you.SG=EMPH]; instead, in (21) we see the 3rd person pronoun *ži<GN>gu*.

(21) Zilo Andi

<i>daru</i>	<i>c':adi-č'igu,</i>	<i>ži-w=gu</i>	<i>giri-b</i>
medicine	drink-NEG.CVB	self-M=EMPH	lie-ITR.IMP

‘Don’t take the medicine, just lie down [for a while]’.
(elicitation)

Note that the interpretation of *ži<GN>gu* in (21) again differs from that of a well-behaved intensifier. Had *ži<GN>gu* been one, the alternatives would have been evoked for the argument of the verb ‘lie down’, i.e., the addressee: {you, your family, your friends, your neighbors}. The meaning of the second clause in (21) would have been something like ‘precisely you lie down’ or ‘lie down without help from others’. However, in (21) alternatives are evoked for the situation ‘lie down’ and are the following: {‘do nothing’ < ‘lie down’ < ‘take the medicine’ < ‘go to the

doctor’ < ‘call the ambulance’}. The rank-order restrictive $\dot{z}i<GN>gu$ implies that lying down is one of the easiest options to implement.

Finally, $\dot{z}i<GN>gu$ can scope over a clause. In (22), the alternatives evoked by $\dot{z}i<GN>gu$ are situations, which may involve different arguments: {‘flour dust made his beard silver’; ‘his clothes made him look old-fashioned’; ‘he was in fact old’}. The form $\dot{z}i-b=gu$ probably agrees with the absolutive argument of the clause, the NP $\lambda'e\chi^w a$ ‘dust’ (although alternatively it may be default neuter 1 gender agreement).

(22) Andi proper

$\dot{z}i-b=gu$	$len\dot{s}:ur-\dot{\lambda}i$	$\lambda'e\chi^w a$	$hege-\dot{s}:u-r$	$miga\dot{z}u-\dot{\lambda}i$
self-N1=EMPH	flour-GEN	dust	DEM-M.OBL-N2	beard-GEN
$i\dot{\lambda}u=lo$	$b-o\chi:on-d:u,$	$hege-r$	$hac'a=ko$	$ihi-d:u=d:u$
inside=ADD	N1-rise-PRF	DEM-N2	white=QUOT	do-PRF=QUOT
{They say, he was not particularly old.} ‘It’s just that flour dust penetrated into his beard and made it silver.’				

(Magomedova & Alisultanova 2010)

To sum up, the uses in (17, 21-22) are different from typical uses of intensifiers. First, their range of possible associates includes VPs or clauses, while agreement is controlled by the absolutive argument of this clause. Second, person agreement of $\dot{z}i<GN>gu$ in at least some of these forms has been lost. We believe that $\dot{z}i<GN>gu$ has thus evolved into a restrictive device; in addition, we find it probable that it is on its way of becoming a restrictive *particle*.

The main obstacle to analyzing $\dot{z}i<GN>gu$ as a focus particle seems to be its ability to agree in gender and number, as prototypical focus particles are usually deemed to be invariable. In particular, French *même* is invariable when used as a particle, and German *selbst* has been invariable already as an intensifier. However, the class of particles in East Caucasian does not necessarily impose such a restriction: the East Caucasian languages are famous for their gender-number agreement marking, which can be found on very different types of targets, such as verbs, adjectives, adverbs and different types of function words, including particles (Forker 2018). For example, Zilo Andi demonstrates agreement of adverbs (Zakirova 2023, Kaye et al. forthc.). Archi (< Lezgie) has an agreeing emphatic particle $=ij<GN>u$ (Bond & Chumakina 2016: 74), which always agrees with the absolutive argument of the clause. Tsakhur features an additive

clitic =<GN> agreeing with the absolutive argument in gender and number (see Section 5.2). All in all, agreement in East Caucasian is not a feature of particular word classes, such as pronouns or adjectives, hence *ži<GN>gu* can in principle be qualified as a particle.

So far, we have seen several examples of the restrictive use of the Upper Andi *ži<GN>gu* but have not discussed the diachronic development of this use. A possible bridging context for this development would be (23), which demonstrates a restrictive rank-order reading, yet with an NP in the predicate:

(23) Zilo Andi

<i>hege-w-ul</i>	<i>generaladu-l</i>	<i>s:u,</i>
DEM-M-PL	general.PL-PL	COP.NEG
<i>hege-w-ul</i>	<i>ži-w-ul=gu</i>	<i>saldato-l</i>
DEM-M-PL	self-M-PL=EMPH	soldier.PL-PL
‘They are not generals, they are just soldiers.’		
(elicitation)		

Apparently, in (23) the NP *saldatol* ‘soldiers’ accompanied by an intensifier was interpreted as a relatively low point on the scale – unlike in German, where it was interpreted as a high point. Later, this was conventionalized as a restrictive device and expanded onto clauses with verbal predicates.

4.2 Evolution of the Tukita *ži<GN>gi*

The contexts where the Tukita intensifier *ži<GN>gi* is found are very similar to those of the Upper Andi *ži<GN>gu*.

As in Upper Andi, *ži<GN>gi* may be in some contexts associated with non-specific NP (‘water’ in (24)), which already is not a prototypical use of an intensifier.

(24) Tukita

<i>wugi-š:u-d</i>	<i>ži-b=gi</i>	<i>l:in</i>	<i>c’ar-dak’a</i>
DEM-M.OBL-ERG	self-N=EMPH	water	drink-HAB
‘He only drinks water.’			
(elicitation)			

In addition, just as in Upper Andi, in Tukita *ži<GN>gi* can have rank-order readings. In (25), it is associated with the NP ‘little white stripes’, marking its referent as a low point on a scale {‘have no teeth’ < ‘have white stripes’ < ‘have somewhat damaged teeth’ < ‘have good teeth’}. Note also that *žibgi* in (25) does not agree with its supposed nominal head ‘stripes’, although it is linearly preceded and followed by agreeing adjectives carrying the agreeing markers *-r-e* (-NPL-PL). This is probably an indication of decategorialization of *ži<GN>gi* and its change into a particle.

(25) Tukita

<i>muk'uħu-r-e</i>	<i>ži-b=gi</i>	<i>qaħu-r-e</i>	<i>muqal-di</i>	<i>r-uk'u-r-aχ:=e</i>
small-NPL-PL	self-N=EMPH	white-NPL-PL	stripe-PL	NPL-be-NPL-CVB=COP
<i>ƣereni</i>	<i>araqī<r>a</i>			
in_mouth	through<NPL>			
{This old woman’s teeth were worn away.} ‘There were just small white stripes in [her] mouth’.				
(corpus)				

As in Upper Andi, *ži<GN>gi* in Tukita can be associated with a VP. In (26), it is associated with the VP ‘is lying in bed’; the alternatives generated are along the following lines: {‘is sick’, ‘is exhausted’, ‘is unconscious’}. ‘Simply lying in bed’ is located low on this scale.

(26) Tukita

<i>wugi-w</i>	<i>ži-w=gi</i>	<i>berx^wan-di</i>	<i>gili-w-aχ</i>	<i>egu</i>
DEM-M	self-M=EMPH	bed-IN	lie_down-M-CVB	COP
{My son is not sick,} ‘he’s just lying in his bed.’				
(elicited)				

As is the case with Upper Andi *ži<GN>gu*, the Tukita *ži<GN>gi* can scope over a clause: in (27), it marks the situation ‘it is overcast’ as a relatively low point on the scale of bad weather – at least lower than rain.

(27) Tukita

<i>ži-b=gi</i>	<i>cekulu-b</i>	<i>baq'a~baq'aniłi</i>	<i>ł'erha-b-aχ</i>
self-N=EMPH	a_bit-N	RDP~in_the_evening	be_overcast-N-CVB

{It's not raining,} 'it's just that in the afternoon it's overcast.'
(elicited)

Examples (25-27) above indicate that Tukita *ži<GN>gi* is in some contexts used as a restrictive particle with rank-order readings: it may be associated with other types of constituents than NPs and generate alternatives for them and not for NPs. In some cases, *ži<GN>gi* seems to have lost gender-number agreement (25), in others, it retains agreement (26).

Interestingly, *ži<GN>gi* can also mark extreme (in our data, mostly lowest) points on the scale (28); this is attested with focus devices meaning 'just', cf. English *just terrible*, Russian *prosto zamečatel'no* 'just wonderful' (Lee 1987; Morzycki 2012; Beltrama 2021). This development further supports that in Tukita *ži<GN>gi* is becoming an equivalent of *just* and *prosto*.

(28) Tukita

<i>poworot-d-a-la</i>	<i>halua</i>	<i>ži-b=gi</i>	<i>wižitiĵ</i>
turn-PL-OBL.PL-SUP	upwards<HPL>	self-N=EMPH	squeezed
<i>limon=daq</i>	<i>j-ik'o</i>	<i>dini=k'e</i>	
lemon=COMP	F-be.AOR	I=PTCL	
'I (felt) just like a squeezed lemon (going) upwards through road turns.'			
(corpus)			

5 From intensifiers to conjunctions: data from East Caucasian

This section deals with another diachronic change found in Rutul (< Lezgian), where intensifiers develop into adversative conjunctions (Section 5.1). In addition, we discuss the coordinative construction in the closely related Lezgian language Tsakhur (Section 5.2), which may be on its way to grammaticalize out of a combination of an intensifier and an additive particle. We are not aware of other descriptions of analogous phenomena in the literature, e.g., neither of the two development paths is mentioned by König & Gast (2006) or Kuteva et al. (2019).

5.1 Evolution of the Rutul *již*

Describing the functions of the intensifying pronoun *wuž* in Tsakhur, Ljutikova (1999: 627-628) singles out a special *discourse use*, which marks "return to the reference point" (cf. Kemmer's

“topic return”, Section 2.1). The reference point is a discourse participant, with respect to which other discourse participants are characterized: thus, in (29) the reference point is Rasul, and the other participant is introduced as Rasul’s brother. Importantly, after the topic shifts back to the reference point, the reflexive pronoun *wuž* is employed. In (29), *wuž* is adnominal and agrees with the head noun in gender and number.

(29) Mishlesh Tsakhur

<i>in'a:</i>	<i>sažu</i>	<i>čož</i>	<i>wo-r-na</i>	<i>rasul-na,</i>
here	only	brother(M)	COP-M-ATTR	Rasul-ATTR
<i>wuž</i>	<i>rasul</i>	<i>wo-r-na</i>	<i>χiw-e:</i>	
self.M	Rasul(M)	COP-M-ATTR	village-IN	

‘Only Rasul’s brother is here, (and/but) Rasul [lit. himself] is in the village.’

(Ljutikova 1999: 628)

The “topic return” use of the intensifier does not have to be adnominal: often, it is just the intensifier that expresses the respective argument. The following examples come from Rutul, the genealogically closest relative of Tsakhur, which also possesses gender-agreeing reflexive pronouns (see Section 3). In (30), the intensifier expresses the absolutive subject of a motion verb. In (31), *wiž* is the absolutive patient of a transitive verb, namely the derived causative ‘kill’. In both examples, the last clause with the reflexive pronoun brings the topical participant back into the focus, as opposed to the previous clause(s), where other participants’s involvement was highlighted (e.g., the father’s children in (30), the villagers in (31)).

(30) Standard Rutul

<i>midi</i>	<i>did-e</i>	<i>mi-bir</i>	<i>si<d>irga-ra</i>	<i>č'irineq'e-mi-χda,</i>
here	father-ERG	this-PL	<HPL>send.IPFV-PRS	strawberry-OBL-POST
<i>wiž</i>	<i>ruɟu-ra</i>	<i>us-bir</i>	<i>haɟa-s.</i>	
M.self	M.go.IPFV-PRS	firewood-PL	NPL.do-INF	

‘Now, the father sent them for strawberries, (and) he went (lit. himself) to chop firewood.’

(Folklore Collection 2011–2013, vol. 2, text 34; glosses added)

(31) Standard Rutul

<i>mugu^ε-biš-e</i>	<i>mi-nij-di</i>	<i>χal-i-s</i>	<i>c'ij</i>	<i>riχi^ε-re,</i>
villager-OBL.HPL-ERG	this-OBL.H-ATTR	house-OBL-DAT	fire(N2)	N2.beat.IPFV-PRS
<i>wiž</i>	<i>jiq'e</i>	<i>ž-i?i-r</i>	<i>salta-ra</i>	
M.self	kill	NEG-M.do.PFV-CVB	M.leave.IPFV-PRS	

‘The villagers set fire to his house, (but) leave him (lit. himself) alive.’

(Folklore Collection 2011–2013, vol. 3, text 87; glosses added)

These uses of intensifiers are often associated with adversative semantics. This is even more visible in those examples, where one and the same participant is described. Examples like (32)–(34) can be hardly subsumed under the “topic return” function strictly speaking, as there is no change in the topic. What is being contrasted are the different qualities of the same subject: for example, the subject of (32) is a man who is poor, but at the same time kind. The adversative use of the reflexive in such contexts (‘X, but Y’) can be opposed to the incremental additive use of the “reflexive + additive” combination (‘X and also Y’), attested in Tsakhur and Azerbaijani (see below Section 5.2).

(32) Standard Rutul

<i>a-j,</i>	<i>a-diš-ij,</i>	<i>a-j</i>	<i>sa</i>	<i>bala</i>	<i>kasib-di,</i>	<i>wiž</i>
be-PST	be-NEG-PST	be-PST	one	much	poor-ATTR	M.self
<i>sa</i>	<i>žennetali,</i>	<i>jik'</i>	<i>saf-di,</i>	<i>miz</i>	<i>id-di</i>	<i>sa edemi.</i>
one	righteous	heart	pure-ATTR	tongue	sweet-ATTR	one man(m)

‘There lived [lit. ‘there was, there was not, there was’] one very poor, but (lit. himself) very kind man with a pure heart and sweet talk.’

(Folklore Collection 2011–2013, vol. 1, text 105; glosses added)

(33) Standard Rutul

<i>mi</i>	<i>riš</i>	<i>bit'ra-d</i>	<i>r-i?i-naqun=ki,</i>	<i>riž</i>	<i>diri-d</i>	<i>diš.</i>
this	girl(F)	beautiful-ATTR	F-COP-COND=ADD	F.self	nimble-ATTR	COP.NEG

‘Although this girl is beautiful, but she (lit. herself) is not nimble.’

(Mariza Ibragimova, p.c.; glosses added)

(34) Standard Rutul

<i>gät</i>	<i>k'aʔ-di</i>	<i>w-iʔi,</i>	<i>wiʒ</i>	<i>bit'ra-d</i>
cat(N1)	small-ATTR	N1-COP	N1.self	beautiful-ATTR

‘Although the cat is small, but it (lit. itself) is beautiful.’

(Mariza Ibragimova, p.c.; glosses added)

What makes Rutul exceptional on the East Caucasian background is the development of the gender-agreeing intensifying pronoun in the contrastive or “topic return” function into a dedicated adversative conjunction (‘but, however’) with an invariable form. For the Mukhad Rutul variety, this has been explicitly claimed by Maxmudova (2001: 207), who describes *již* as an adversative conjunction (translated into Russian as *odnako* ‘but, however’), providing two examples, see (35) and (36) below. Likewise, in a short grammatical sketch of Standard Rutul appended to the Rutul-Russian dictionary, Alisultanov & Sulejmanova (2019: 485) mention *již* ‘but, however’ (Russian *odnako*) alongside *amma* and *ammani* ‘but’ as adversative conjunctions. At the same time, *již* ‘however’ is not found in the dictionary itself as a separate lexical entry, nor a separate adversative meaning is listed in the entry for *již* ‘self’ (Alisultanov & Sulejmanova 2019: 165).

(35) Mukhad Rutul

<i>zi</i>	<i>rubu-r-i,</i>	<i>již</i>	<i>ačar</i>	<i>aqiği-r-diš</i>
I	N2.search.PFV-CVB-COP	but	key(N2)	N2.find.PFV-CVB-COP.NEG

‘I searched, but the key could not be found.’

(Maxmudova 2001: 207)

(36) Mukhad Rutul

<i>ha</i>	<i>saxir-diš,</i>	<i>již</i>	<i>asijič</i>	<i>w-iši-r-i</i>
that	M.sleep.PFV-CVB-COP.NEG	but	rest(N1)	N1-become.PFV-CVB-COP

‘He did not sleep, but he had some rest.’

(Maxmudova 2001: 207)

Interestingly, neither Maxmudova (2001: 207) nor Alisultanov & Sulejmanova (2019: 485) mention that the conjunction *jijž* is formally identical to the neuter 2 form of the ‘self’-pronoun. This etymology appears to be the most plausible, given the uses of the intensifying pronoun

discussed above in this section. The unusual aspect of *již* in Mukhad Rutul / Standard Rutul is its invariable form. In the examples like (32)–(34) above, the pronoun in the contrastive function occupies an argument position and bears the gender-number values of its referent (e.g., *riž* in (33) stands for a female absolutive subject). On the contrary, as an adversative conjunction *již* does not agree in gender and, if the full NP is present, does not copy the case of the respective argument. For example, in (36) the absolutive subject *asijič* ‘rest’ is a noun of the neuter 1 gender, whereas *již* keeps its neuter 2 form. In (37) and (38), *již*, which is originally an absolutive case form, co-occurs with the ergative subject of a transitive verb and with the dative subject of an experiential verb, respectively. In all available examples of the adversative *již*, it occupies the clause-initial position.

- (37) Mukhad Rutul
již *wa* *ruxu-naqun,* *ma:* *kije-s-i.*
 but you.SG.ERG N2.say.IPFV-COND again N2.throw_in-INF-COP
 {Simon answered: Master, we’ve worked hard all night and haven’t caught anything.}
 ‘But if you say so, we will throw the nets again.’
 (Lukadaady šaddy xabar, Luke 5:5; glosses added)

- (38) Mukhad Rutul
již *za-s* *sada* *ki* *hu<w>gu-d* *diš*
 but I-DAT once ADD <N1>see.PFV-ATTR COP.NEG
žag^war-di *sīwa-jac.*
 white-ATTR mountain-ox(N1)
 {I hunted for all my life,} ‘but I have never seen a white wild goat.’
 (Folklore Collection 2011–2013, vol. 4, text 73; glosses added)

In case of the the Mukhad Rutul *již* we see an advanced grammaticalization process leading from an intensifying pronoun to an adversative conjunction. This process is accompanied by decategorialization of the source pronoun, which in the function of a conjunction becomes fixed in an invariable form of the absolutive, singular, neutral 2 gender. Besides, the conjunction loses any syntactic connection with the (originally coreferent) NP and occupies the same clause-initial position as a dedicated adversative conjunction ‘but’ (an Arabic loan *amma*) in Rutul.

The decategorialization of ‘self’ into ‘but’ has been only described for the Mukhad Rutul variety (which is the base for Standard Rutul), while the other varieties may lack it. Still, our own field data for Kina Rutul (2021, 2025) allow us to confirm the use of the intensifying pronoun as an adversative conjunction in this variety, too.

In Kina Rutul, *již* (which is identical to the Gender 4 form of the ‘self’-pronoun) is not normally suggested in translations of adversative constructions presented as stimuli, and it is not found in the available text corpus. However, *již* is attested in some elicited examples and is normally approved (although not necessarily by all speakers and in all sentences) as an adversative conjunction ‘but’. For example, (39) was used in the retelling of the “Pear Story” (Chafe 1980). A dedicated adversative conjunction *amma* (Arabic loan) was judged as possible replacements of *již* with the same function. Note that *již* in (39) does not reflect the gender-number values of the absolutive NP *ečbir* ‘apples’, which is plural (and the plural form of the intensifying pronoun is *ž^wer* in Kina Rutul, see Section 3).

(39) Kina Rutul

<i>mi</i>	<i>χuk-a</i>	<i>u:</i>	<i>k'aʔ-di,</i>	<i>již</i>	<i>id-di</i>
this	tree-OBL(SUP)	above	small-ATTR	but	sweet-ATTR
<i>eč-bir</i>	<i>ruʔu-r=a.</i>				
apple-PL	NPL.become.IPFV-CVB=be				

‘There are little, but tasty apples (growing) on this tree.’
(elicitation)

Although use of reflexives in contrastive or adversative contexts can be found in other languages of the family, Rutul is so far the only language for which further grammaticalization into a conjunction has been attested. At a less advanced stage, an adversative use of intensifiers is also found in Upper Andi, where *ži<GN>gu* can be used in contexts similar to those of the Rutul *již*. Importantly, in Zilo Andi, the pronoun is not invariable and still retains its agreement with the associated NP.

(40) Zilo Andi

<i>šu-w</i>	<i>w-ubi</i>	<i>ži-w=gu</i>	<i>strogij</i>	<i>w-ubi</i>
good-M	M-be.AOR	self-M=EMPH	strict	M-be.AOR

‘Father [did not allow to go] anywhere... He was good but strict.’

(corpus)

However, person agreement of *ži<GN>gu* is at least not obligatory, cf. (41), where instead of the 2nd person *men=gu* [you.SG=EMPH], the (originally) 3rd person pronoun *ži<GN>gu* is used. The gender agreement of *žigu* in (41) is with the addressee of the prohibitive (negative imperative): it is the monster, which is a non-human animate being.

(41) Andi proper

<i>ži-b=gu</i>	<i>min</i>	<i>b-oł'i-di</i>	<i>b-et'inno-s:ub=rexu</i>
self-AN=EMPH	you.SG	AN-between-LAT	AN-talk-PROH=PTCL
<i>dil-?o</i>	<i>anč:i-b</i>		
I.OBL-SUP.LAT	listen-ITR.IMP		

{Azhdaha the monster asked a boy to tell him a fairy-tale. The boy answers: Fine.} ‘But do not interrupt me and listen in silence.’

(Magomedova & Alisultanova 2010)

For Upper Andi *ži<GN>gu*, the same grammaticalization path as for Rutul *již* can be reconstructed. On the other hand, *ži<GN>gu* has some restrictive (rank-order) uses, and colexification of restrictives (such as ‘only’) and adversatives (e.g., ‘but’) is found across different families, cf. English *but*, Dutch *maar*, Nahuatl *zan*, Hebrew *ax* and *ela*, etc. (König 1991: 106-107). In Upper Andi, the development of adversative uses of *ži<GN>gu* can thus be traced either to Kemmer’s (1995) topic return, or to the restrictive focus particle *ži<GN>gu*.

In fact, it may well be that the adversative uses of intensifying pronouns are much more widespread in the languages of the family (and cross-linguistically), although more research is needed to establish the parameters of grammaticalization along the cline from a proper pronoun to a dedicated conjunction.

5.2 Evolution of the Tsakhur *wuž=ADD*

In the contrastive “topic return” function, a clause-initial reflexive pronoun can host an additive marker ‘and, also’. Thus, in (42) from Agul (< Lezgian), the absolutive subject *uč* ‘self’ combines with the additive clitic *=ra*. Dedicated enclitic additives are very common in East Caucasian languages, they tend to be very frequent in discourse and possess a wide range of grammatical

and pragmatic functions (see Forker 2016 on the semantic typology of additives and Russkikh, submitted specifically on East Caucasian additives). In particular, they can occur in contrastive and topic shift contexts, which seems to be the function of the additive in (42). Here, the additive can be said to additionally stress, or reinforce, the contrastive topic meaning which is associated with the use of the intensifier.

(42) Agul

<i>kaiki-na</i>	<i>hup:-ar=ra</i>	<i>ʕut'a-s</i>	<i>aq'a-j,</i>
drive.PFV-CVB	sheep-PL=ADD	eat.IPFV-INF	do.IPFV-CVB
<i>uč=ra</i>	<i>karxu-naa</i>	<i>me</i>	<i>gada.</i>
self=ADD	lie_down.PFV-PRF	this	boy

{The boy went further and saw a good land with gardens.} ‘He drove the sheep to graze, and (as for himself) went to bed, this boy.’

(corpus)

In Mishlesh Tsakhur texts, however, we also find a different type of uses of the intensifier hosting the additive clitic.² Thus, in both (43) and (44), there is no contrast between the discourse participants (as there is between the sheep and the boy in (42)). One and the same participant is being described, Temraz the thief in (43) and the bear in (44). Rather, the combination of ‘self’ and the additive conjoins the two descriptions on the referent, one complementing the other: Temraz was very famous *and also* decent, whereas the bear was big *and also* black. The meaning of the ‘self + also’ combination can be paraphrased as simply ‘and also’.

(43) Mishlesh Tsakhur

<i>ge:-r</i>	<i>do-ju-k^{wa}a-na,</i>	<i>wuž=ur</i>	<i>lamis-na-na</i>
very-M	name-OBL-COMIT-ATTR	self.M=ADD.M	conscience-ADVZ-ATTR
<i>adami:</i>	<i>wo-r</i>	<i>ixa.</i>	
man(M)	COP-M	M.become.PFV	

{There lived in our valley a horse-stealer named Temraz.} ‘He was very famous and also decent man.’

² As mentioned in Section 4, the additive clitic in Tsakhur consists of an agreeing gender marker (e.g., =*r* ‘Gender 1 or 2’, =*b* ‘Gender 3’, =*d* ‘Gender 4’), with an epenthetic vowel after a consonant-final host (e.g., =*ur* or =*ir* for Gender 1). To our knowledge, this form of the additive is unique among East Caucasian.

(Kibrik & Testelec 1999: 792)

(44) Mishlesh Tsakhur

s'o *wo-b=i:* *χe-b-na,* *wuǰ=ub* *k'ar-ba.*

bear(N1) COP-N1=PST big-N1-ATTR self.N1=ADD.N1 black-ADV.N1

{Then I see that a bear is crossing the creek.} 'The bear was big, and also black.'

(Kibrik & Testelec 1999: 766)

Although we are not aware of a similar use of the 'intensifier + additive' combination in other East Caucasian languages, there is one apparent parallel between Tsakhur and genealogically unrelated, but areally adjacent Turkic language Azerbaijani, an important contact language of southern Dagestan.

In Azerbaijani, the combination of the 3rd person intensifying pronoun and the additive clitic *özü də* [self-POSS.3 ADD] is used with the incremental additive meaning 'and also, and besides, on top of that', as in (45). The combination appears as a separate lexicon entry in some big dictionaries (e.g., Tağıyev 2006: 667) and also in grammatical overviews. For example, both Hüseynzadə (2007: 236–238) and Kazımov (2010: 357–358) cite *özü də* among the coordinating conjuncting devices alongside such items as *və*, *ilə*, *həm*, *həm də*, *bir də* and *da / də* proper, among others.

(45) Azerbaijani

<i>Namizəd-lər-i</i>	<i>diqqət-lə</i>	<i>nəzər-dən</i>	<i>keçir-mək,</i>	<i>öz-ü</i>	<i>də</i>
candidate-PL-POSS.3	attention-COMIT	view-ABL	hold-INF	self-POSS.3	ADD
<i>ən</i>	<i>layiq-li-si-nə</i>	<i>üstünlük</i>	<i>ver-mək</i>	<i>lazım=dır</i>	
most	worthy-ADJ-POSS.3-DAT	superiority	give-INF	need=COP	

'It is necessary to carefully consider the candidates and also give preference to the most deserving one.'

(Hüseynzadə 2007: 237)

The use of the Tsakhur combination 'intensifier + additive' as 'and also', which is not typical for the Lezgi languages, may thus represent an instance of pattern copy from Azerbaijani.

6 Conclusion

In the descriptive literature on East Caucasian, several uses of intensifiers have been discussed, such as adnominal uses (often expressing unexpectedness), adverbial inclusive and adverbial exclusive uses. Their polyfunctionality with reflexives and logophors has also been examined, and some discourse-related uses have been reported as well (e.g., focus of empathy).

In this paper we have described several less common and less well-known polyfunctionality patterns of East Caucasian intensifiers. In Upper Andi and Tskhet, the intensifiers *ži<GN>gu* and *ži<GN>gi* have developed uses that resemble those of scalar focus particles (~‘only’, ‘just’). Another development attested is the development of intensifiers into clause-coordinating devices, as in Rutul (intensifier > adversative conjunction ‘but’) and Tsakhur (intensifier + additive particle > coordinating conjunction ‘and also’).

In all of these changes signs of decategorialization can be observed. Most importantly, intensifiers normally require a specific NP in their scope and evoke alternatives to the denotation of this NP. This is no longer the case in the particle/conjunction uses, where former intensifiers can associate with different types of phrases, including VPs and clauses, and alternatives to the denotations of these phrases are generated. Yet another symptom of grammaticalization may be loss of person and gender agreement: for example, in Mukhad Rutul the adversative conjunction *již* is a frozen form, which does not agree in gender with any of the NPs in the clause.

Similar developments may be present in other languages of the family but remain underdescribed due to the general shortage of detailed descriptions and large corpora for East Caucasian. Therefore, one direction for further research is expanding it onto other languages of the family.

Another direction is more detailed investigation of the phenomena discovered. While for the German *selbst* stress and intonation patterns have been described to some extent (Eckardt 2001), not much is known about stress patterns and prosody of East Caucasian. Taking into account prosody may be instrumental for studying diachronic change from intensifiers into functional elements such as particles and conjunctions.

Abbreviations

3	3rd person	ADD	additive	ADV	adverb
ABL	ablative	ADJ	adjective	ADVZ	adverbializer

AFF	affective	H	human gender	PFV	perfective
AN	animal gender	HAB	habitual	PL	plural
AOR	aorist	HPL	human plural gender	POSS	possessive
ATTR	attributive	IMP	imperative	POST	localization ‘behind’
COMIT	comitative	IN	localization ‘inside’	PRF	perfect
COMP	comparative	INF	infinitive	PROG	progressive
COND	conditional	INSTR	instrumental	PROH	prohibitive
COP	copula	IPFV	imperfective	PRS	present tense
CVB	converb	ITR	intransitive	PST	past tense
DAT	dative	LAT	lative	PTCL	particle
DEM	demonstrative	LIM	limitative	PTCP	participle
EMPH	emphatic	M	masculine gender	Q	question
ERG	ergative	N1	neuter gender 1	QUOT	quotative
ESS	essive	N2	neuter gender 2	RDP	reduplication
F	feminine gender	NEG	negation	REP	reportative
FUT	future	NPL	neuter plural gender	SG	singular
GEN	genitive	NPST	non-past tense	SUP	localization ‘on surface’
<GN>	gender-number slot	OBL	oblique stem		

References

- Alisultanov, Alisultan S. & Taisija A. Sulejmanova. 2019. *Rutul'sko-russkij slovar'* [Rutul–Russian dictionary]. Makhachkala: Alef.
- Beltrama, Andrea. 2021. *Just perfect, simply the best: An analysis of emphatic exclusion. Linguistics and Philosophy* 45(2). 321–364. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10988-021-09326-x>.
- Bond, Oliver & Marina Chumakina. 2016. Agreement domains and targets. In Oliver Bond, Greville G. Corbett, Marina Chumakina & Dunstan Brown (eds.), *Archi: Complexities of agreement in cross-theoretical perspective*, 43–76. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bonomi, Andrea & Paolo Casalegno. 1993. Only: Association with focus in event semantics. *Natural Language Semantics* 2(1). 1–45.
- Burukina, Irina S. 2017. *Refleksivny i intensifikatory* [Reflexives and intensifiers]. In Egor V. Kaškin (ed.), *Elementy gornomarijskogo jazyka v tipologičeskom osveshhenii*, 595–613. Moscow: Buki Vedi.
- Chafe, Wallace (ed.). 1980. *The Pear Stories: Cognitive, cultural, and linguistic aspects of narrative production*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Chumakina, Marina, Oliver Bond & Steven Kaye (eds.). 2023. *Agreement beyond the verb: Unusual targets, unexpected domains*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Constantinou, Harris. 2014. *Intensifiers: meaning and distribution*. PhD thesis. London: University College London.

- Coppock, Elizabeth & David I. Beaver. 2014. Principles of the exclusive muddle. *Journal of Semantics* 31(3). 371–432.
- Eckardt, Regine. 2001. Reanalysing *selbst*. *Natural Language Semantics* 9(4). 371–412.
- Edmondson, Jerold A. & Frans Plank. 1978. Great expectations: An intensive self. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 2. 373–413.
- Folklore Collection (2011–2013). *Svod pamjatnikov fol'klora narodov Dagestana* [Folklore Collection of Dagestan Peoples]. Vols. 1–4. Moscow: Nauka.
- Forker, Diana. 2015. Towards a semantic map for intensifying particles: Evidence from Avar. *STUF – Language Typology and Universals* 68(4). 485–513.
- Forker, Diana. 2016. Toward a typology for additive markers. *Lingua* 180. 69–100.
- Forker, Diana. 2018. Gender agreement is different. *Linguistics* 56(4). 865–894.
- Ganenkov, Dmitry & Timur Maisak. 2020. Nakh-Dagestanian languages. In Maria Polinsky (ed.), *The Oxford handbook of the languages of the Caucasus*, 87–145. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ganenkov, Dmitry & Natalia Bogomolova. 2020. Binding and indexicality in the Caucasus. In Maria Polinsky (ed.), *The Oxford handbook of languages of the Caucasus*, 690–711. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gast, Volker. 2006. *The grammar of identity: Intensifiers and reflexives in Germanic languages*. London: Routledge.
- Hopper, Paul J. & Elizabeth Closs Traugott. 1993. *Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Horn, Laurence R. 1969. A presuppositional analysis of only and even. In *Proceedings of the 5th annual meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, 98–107. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.
- Horn, Laurence R. 2000. Pick a theory (not just any theory). In Laurence R. Horn & Yasuhiko Kato (eds.), *Negation and polarity: Syntactic and semantic perspectives*, 147–192. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hüseynzadə, Muxtar. 2007. *Müasir Azərbaycan dili. Morfologiya*. Baku: Şərq-Qərb.
- Kaye, Steven, George Moroz, Neige Rochant, Samira Verhees & Aigul Zakirova. In press. A sketch of Andi (Zilo dialect). In Yuri Koryakov, Timur Maisak & Steven Kaye (eds.), *The*

Caucasian Languages: An International Handbook. Vol. 1. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton (HSK series).

Kazımov, Qəzənfər Şirin oğlu. 2010. *Müasir Azərbaycan dili. Morfologiya*. Baku: Nurlan.

Kemmer, Suzanne. 1995. Emphatic and reflexive-self: Expectations, viewpoint, and subjectivity. In Dieter Stein & Susan Wright (eds.), *Subjectivity and subjectivisation*, 55–82. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kibrik, Aleksandr E. & Jakov G. Testelec (eds.). 1999. *Èlementy caxurskogo jazyka v tipologičeskom osveščanii* [Aspects of the Tsakhur language from a typological perspective]. Moscow: Nasledie.

König, Ekkehard. 1991. *The meaning of focus particles: A comparative perspective*. London: Routledge.

König, Ekkehard & Volker Gast. 2006. Focused assertion of identity: A typology of intensifiers. *Linguistic Typology* 10. 223–276.

König, Ekkehard & Peter Siemund. 2000. Intensifiers and reflexives: A typological perspective. In Zygmunt Frajzyngier & Traci Walker (eds.), *Reflexives: Forms and functions*, 41–74. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

König, Ekkehard & Peter Siemund (with Stephan Töpper). 2013. Intensifiers and reflexive pronouns. In Matthew S. Dryer & Martin Haspelmath (eds.), *WALS Online* (v2020.3) [Data set]. Zenodo. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7385533>. Available online at <http://wals.info/chapter/47>, accessed 2024-09-26.

Krifka, Manfred. 1992. A compositional semantics for multiple focus constructions. In Joachim Jacobs (ed.), *Informationsstruktur und Grammatik*, 17–54. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.

Kuteva, Tania, Bernd Heine, Bo Hong, Haiping Long, Heiko Narrog & Seongha Rhee. 2019. *World lexicon of grammaticalization*. 2nd edn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lee, David. 1987. The semantics of just. *Journal of Pragmatics* 11. 377–398.

Ljutikova, Ekaterina A. 1999. Èmfatičeskoe mestoimenie wuž [Emphatic pronoun wuž]. In Aleksandr E. Kibrik & Jakov G. Testelec (eds.), *Èlementy caxurskogo jazyka v tipologičeskom osveščanii* [Aspects of the Tsakhur language from a typological perspective], 620–629. Moscow: Nasledie.

- Ljutikova, Ekaterina A. 2001. Anaforičeskie sredstva [Anaphoric devices]. In A. E. Kibrik, K. I. Kazenin, E. A. Ljutikova & S. G. Tatevosov (eds.), *Bagvalinskij jazyk: Grammatika. Teksty. Slovari* [Bagvalal: grammar, texts, dictionaries], 615–681. Moscow: IMLI RAN.
- Ljutikova, Ekaterina A. 2002. *Kognitivnaja tipologija: Refleksivy i intensifikatory* [Cognitive typology: Reflexives and intensifiers]. Moscow: IMLI RAN.
- Lukadaady šaddy xabar* [The good news according to Luke]. 2004. Moscow: Institut perevoda Biblii.
- Lukašdi bosam rerh 'anol' 'l' 'i xabar* [The good news according to Luke]. 2015. Moscow: Institut perevoda Biblii.
- Magomedova, Patimat A. & Mesedu A. Alisultanova (eds.). 2010. *Dunjalla baxunnirs:i xalgiltol gwanabol gwanab mic':illas:ol muḡal* [Fairy tales from around the world in the Andi language]. Makhachkala.
- Magomedova, Patimat T. & Indira A. Abdulaeva. 2007. *Axvaxsko-russkij slovar'* [Akhvakh–Russian dictionary]. Makhachkala: Dagestanskij naučnyj centr RAN.
- Magomedova, Patimat T. & Rašidat Š. Xalidova. 2001. *Karatinsko-russkij slovar'* [Karata–Russian dictionary]. Saint-Petersburg & Makhachkala: Scriptorium.
- Maisak, Timur. 2021. Endoclititics in Andi. *Folia Linguistica* 55(1). 1–34.
- Maxmudova, Svetlana M. 2001. *Morfologija rutul'skogo jazyka* [Morphology of the Rutul Language]. Moscow: IJaZ RAN.
- Moravcsik, Edith. 1972. Some cross-linguistic generalizations about intensifier constructions. In *Papers from the 8th regional meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, 271–277. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.
- Morzycki, Marcin. 2012. Adjectival extremeness: Degree modification and contextually restricted scales. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 30(2). 567–609.
- Rooth, Mats. 1985. *Association with focus*. PhD dissertation. Amherst: University of Massachusetts.
- Russkix, Alina A. Submitted. *Additivnye časticy v jazykax vostočnogo Kavkaza* [Additive particles in the languages of the eastern Caucasus]. Dissertation for the purpose of obtaining academic degree Doctor of Philosophy in Philology and Linguistics. Moscow: National Research University Higher School of Economics.
- Siemund, Peter. 2000. *Intensifiers in English and German: A comparison*. London: Routledge.

- Sosenskaja, Tat'jana B. 1999. Mestoimenie [Pronoun]. In Aleksandr E. Kibrik & Jakov G. Testelec (eds.), *Èlementy caxurskogo jazyka v tipologičeskom osveščanii* [Aspects of the Tsakhur language from a typological perspective], 128-151. Moscow: Nasledie.
- Tağıyev, Məmməd Tağı oğlu (red.). 2006. *Azərbaycanca-rusca lüğət*. Dörd cildə. III cild. Baku: Şərq-Qərb.
- Tatevosov, Sergej G. 2021. Not Magomed did not come: On the semantics of split 'only'. In Timur A. Maisak, Nina R. Sumbatova & Jakov G. Testelec (eds.), *Durqazi xazna: Papers on the occasion of Rasul Mutalov's 60th anniversary*, 346–364. Moscow: Buki Vedi
- Testelec, Jakov G. & Svetlana Ju. Toldova. 1998. Refleksivnye mestoimenija v dagestanskikh jazykakh i tipologija refleksiva [Reflexive pronouns in Dagestania languages and the typology of reflexives]. *Voprosy Jazykoznanija* 3. 35–57.
- Toldova, Svetlana Ju. 1999. Mestoimennye sredstva podderžanija referencii [Pronominal referential devices]. In Aleksandr E. Kibrik & Jakov G. Testelec (eds.), *Èlementy caxurskogo jazyka v tipologičeskom osveščanii* [Aspects of the Tsakhur language from a typological perspective], 629-674. Moscow: Nasledie.
- Zakirova, Aigul. 2023. *Number marking across different word classes in the East Caucasian languages*. PhD thesis. Moscow: HSE University.