46. Case marking in Daghestanian

We dedicate this paper to our teacher Aleksandr E. Kibrik,
who initiated us into the lore of Daghestanian languages,
and on whose various publications this paper is built
to a great extent

Michael Daniel (Moscow State University)
Dmitry Ganenkov (Institute of Linguistics, Moscow)

46.1 Introduction

This paper provides an overview of case systems in Daghestanian languages. To facilitate the presentation of the data, we will start with a brief introduction to the classification of the Nakh-Daghestanian, of which Daghestanian is a regional subset (rather than a genetic subgroup). The family includes several branches – Nakh, Tsezic, Avar-Andic and Lezgic. Dargwa and Lak are traditionally considered either family level isolates or forming a separate Lak-Dargwa branch of Nakh-Daghestanian.

Nakh includes Chechen and Ingush, both major written languages spoken in the Republics of Chechnya and Ingushetia, respectively; and Bats, alias Tsova-Tush, an unwritten minority language spoken in Georgia. Data from these languages will not be used below.

Tsezic is divided into East Tsezic, including Hunzib and Bezhta, and West Tsezic, including Tsez, Ginukh and Khvarshi, all unwritten. Tsezic languages are spoken in the North-West Daghestan near the Chechnya border. Avar-Andic includes Avar, the most widespread language of Daghestan with a number of dialects, not always mutually understandable, spoken in Central Daghestan, and Andic languages, including Akhvakh, Andi, Botlikh, Chamalal, Godoberi, Karata, Bagvalal and Tindi, all minority unwritten languages, spoken in the North-West of Daghestan near the Chechnya border, to the North of the Tsezic speaking area. Lak is a major language spoken in Central Daghestan, to the South-East of Avar. Various dialects of another major language, Dargwa, sometimes considered to be separate languages that constitute a group on their own, are spoken in the Eastern Daghestan. Lezgic languages are spoken in the South Daghestan, near the Azerbaijani border, including the most well-populated representative of the group, Lezgian, and then Agul, Tabassaran, Rutul, Tsakhur and, in Azerbaijani itself, Kryz, Budukh, Udi and Khinalug. In Azerbaijani, there are also important Lezgian, Rutul, Tsakhur (as well as minor Avar and Akhvakh) communities. Khinalug, traditionally classified as Lezgic, is considerably different from the rest of the group, and is sometimes considered to be a family level isolate. Another Lezgic language, Archi, spoken well to the North from the Lezgic area, in Central Daghestan, mostly surrounded by Avar and Lak speaking villages, also manifests important structural differences from other languages of the group.

For the sake of brevity, we do not insert reference to a grammar of language each time we quote data. If there is no source indicated, the data comes from one of our 'main sources', i.e. basic grammars of the language. These main sources include:

Tsezic: Bezhta (Kibrik, Testelets 2004); Hunzib (van den Berg 1995); Ginukh (Lomtadze 1963).
Avar: (Bokarev 1949a; Alekseev, Ataev 1998).
Andic: Godoberi (Kibrik 1996), Chamalal (Bokarev 1949b), Bagvalal (Kibrik 2001), Akhvakh (Magomedbekova 1967); Karata (Magomedbekova 1971).
Lak: Zhirkov (1955), Murkelinskij (1971).
Dargwa: (Abdullaev 1954; Magometov 1963; Magometov 1982; van den Berg 2001; Mutalov 2002; Sumbatova, Mutalov 2003).
Lezgic: Lezgian (Haspelmath 1993); Tabassaran (Magometov 1965); Agul (Magometov 1970; Merdanova 2004); Tsakhur (Talibov 1979; Ibragimov 1990; Kibrik 1999); Rutul (Ibragimov 1978; Makhmudova 2001); Kryz (Authier, ms); Archi (Kibrik et al 1977); Udi (Gukasian 1974; Schulze, ms.).
Khinalug: (Kibrik 1972).

Other references are made explicitly in the text. The data that comes from authors' own fieldnotes is marked (f.n.). A more comprehensive list of references on Daghestanian languages may be found in (van der Berg 2005).

46.2 Overview

Daghestanian languages are world-famous for the richness of their nominal paradigm. A recently published paper by Aleksandr Kibrik is even entitled "Nominal Inflection Galore..." (Kibrik 2003a). Indeed, the richest systems, such as those of some Tsezic languages, count up to some seven dozens forms (within each number value). This is due mostly to the impact of the spatial forms that express such categories as localization (*under the bed*) and movement (*onto the wall*) (see Kibrik 1970, Comrie, Polinsky 1998). Daghestanian case systems are very consistently ergative. They also show a tendency towards high semantization of case forms. One case form typically covers a set of semantically similar role-marking functions (valency re-arranging processes like passives, applicatives, and antipassives are very marginal); see (Kibrik 2003a, b). They tend to mark Experiencer separately from both Agent and Patient to a much greater degree than e.g. Standard Average European, and some of them even use a dedicated case marker, affective. Similarly, most languages have a dedicated construction or, rarely, a dedicated case marker to mark involuntary Agent.

46.3 Paradigm Structure

There is a common type of paradigm visible in most Nakh-Daghestanian languages, which manifests several general principles. Declension mostly follows a two-stem pattern: all cases except nominative[1] are derived from a common stem called oblique, while the nominative is derived from a direct stem and is most often formally identical to it (thus being zero marked). The oblique stem is derived from the direct stem by adding various morphemes called oblique stem markers. The choice of the oblique stem marker is considerably lexicalized, although, sometimes, some phonotactic (syllable count, direct stem auslaut) and, more rarely, semantic correlations may be observed; most languages also have a default oblique stem marker, used whenever there are no phonotactic or semantic preferences. The derivation is similar in both singular and plural; however, the number of oblique stem markers is usually much lower in the plural.

Table 46.1 <u>Lezgian: oblique stem formation and diversity</u>

	paradigm structure for *balk'an* 'horse'		oblique stem markers	
	Singular	Plural	Singular	Plural
Nominative	balk'an horse	balk'an-ar horse-PL	-di-, -ci-, -c'i-, -či-, -č'i-, -ži-, -ra-, -re-, -ni-, -i-, -u-, -ü-, -a-, -e-	-i-
Oblique stem	balk'an-di- horse-OBL-	balk'an-ar-i- horse-PL-OBL		
Genitive	balk'an-di-n horse-OBL-GEN	balk'an-ar-i-n horse-PL-OBL-GEN		
Dative	balk'an-di-z horse-OBL-DAT	balk'an-ar-i-z horse-PL-OBL-DAT		

In some languages the oblique stem is most often formally identical to one of the oblique cases, ergative (most Lezgic, Avar, some Tsezic, Dargwa) or genitive (Kryz); thus, Lezgian oblique stem *balk'andi-* in Table 46.1 is formally identical to ergative *balk'andi*. There is a great deal of variation in the choice of oblique stem markers; often, nouns have two variants of oblique stem, as Bagvalal *ʕužruq'* 'hedgehog', OBL *ʕužruq'-i-* or *ʕužruq'-u-*. Oblique stem formation may also be irregular, especially in

---

pronouns; cf. Archi 'I' which has nominative *zon*, ergative *zari*, genitive *-is/-as-* and dative *-ez* (with class agreement prefix), and other cases formed on the oblique stem *za-*.

Some languages may show correlation between the choice of the oblique stem markers and the agreement class of the noun (e.g. masculine and feminine oblique stem markers in Avar-Andic and Archi) or other semantic properties of the noun (e.g. oblique stem marker *-ala-/-ela-* in Agul, characteristic of utensils and other instruments, although this correlation is limited to monosyllabic stems). These patterns, however, never represent a major declension pattern in any of the languages.

At least some declension types in a language may deviate from the Daghestanian prototype. In some languages and dialects one-stem declension is dominant (Khinalug, Udi, Gigatli Chamalal) or well represented (Akhvakh, Godoberi, Tsez, Khvarshi, Tsakhur), with all cases produced directly from one stem (usually identical to the nominative) (Kibrik, Kodzasov 1990).

On the other hand, Dargwa oblique cases derive from oblique stem, but genitive is formed independently from the direct stem; in one of Tabassaran declension types the oblique stem is marked by *-na*, *-ra* while ergative is formed from the direct stem by adding *-nu*, *-ru*, *-lu*.

Table 46.2 <u>Deviations from the prototype</u>

Godoberi		Dargwa		Tabasaran	
one stem declension		genitive derived from direct stem		ergative derived from direct stem	
Nominative (direct stem)	hanqu house	Nominative (direct stem)	ganzi stairs	Nominative (direct stem)	č'al language
Oblique stem	hanqu- house	Oblique stem	ganzi-li stairs-OBL	Oblique stem	č'al-na- language-OBL-
Genitive	hanqu-ʟi house-GEN	Genitive	ganzi-la stairs-GEN	Ergative	č'al-nu language-ERG
Dative	hanqu-ɬi house-DAT	Dative	ganzi-li-s stairs-OBL-DAT	Dative	č'al-na-z language-OBL-DAT

Note that these cases could have derived from the prototype by some diachronic process, e.g. contraction in the case of Dargwa. Another mode of deviation is attested in Bagvalal, where the vocative suffix is attached to the nominal stem. In case this formation is considered to be a case form, it must be admitted to be produced from the direct stem along with the nominative (same is true of the Bagvalal 'generalized locative' *-ɬa*).

A rare typological feature of the Daghestanian languages is the presence of an agreement position in some case markers, including genitives in human noun declension in Bagvalal (controlled by the class of the head) or affective in Andi and Tukita Karata and some locative forms in Dargwa and Lak (all controlled by the class of the nominative core argument); cf. Dargwa 'under the chair' *uta-li-u-w* (chair-OBL-SUB-M).

46.4 Inventory Of Non-Local Cases
Case paradigm consists of non-local (alias grammatical) cases and spatial forms. All Daghestanian languages distinguish at least three non-local cases – nominative, ergative and dative (except some southern Dargwa dialects that lack dative). Most languages also have genitive (disputable exception is Tsakhur), and some even have two different genitives, see below on their syntactic distribution. Lak genitive is, however, homophonous with the ergative.

In some languages, personal pronouns do not distinguish between ergative and nominative: this is true of all personal pronouns 'I', 'you.sg', 'we', 'you.pl' (most Tsezic and Lezgic, some Andic); only singular pronouns 'I' and 'you.sg' in (Tsez, Andi and a dialect of Karata); only plural pronouns (Khinalug, Gakvari Chamalal); and only second person pronouns 'you.sg' and 'you.pl' in Archi. Avar, Lezgian, Lak and Dargwa lack this syncretism (Magomedova 1979, Kibrik, Kodzasov 1990).

Only few languages limit themselves to the basic set of the four grammatical cases. However, presence of further cases is a matter of variation between languages and branches. Lezgic languages often introduce comitative, absent from all other branches except Dargwa and, according to (Creissels p.c.), Akhvakh. All Tsezic languages have instrumental; outside Tsezic, instrumental is only reported in Kryz (where it is probably derived from dative) and Dargwa (where it is poorly attested). All Andic languages feature affective, a dedicated case marker that codes Experiencer with some verbs (other experiential verbs use dative). In Akhvakh, the case marker cognate to the affective of other Andic languages is, in addition to Experiencer, also used to mark Recipient (competing with lative in this function). Outside Andic, the affective is only found in Tsakhur. Dedicated comparative, the case of the benchmark of comparison ('I am higher <u>than you</u>') is found in e.g. Tsez, Hunzib, Rutul and Archi.

Further cases are introduced individually, e.g. substitutive 'instead of' in Bagvalal and Hunzib; involuntary Agent case in Lak and Bagvalal; thematic 'about, on the subject of, referring to' in literary Dargwa; causal 'because of' in Akhvakh (Creissels p.c.) and Hunzib. Archi is the absolute champion in extending its non-local case paradigm by including comitative, comparative ('(smaller) than the horse' *niⱡši-χur* horse.OBL-CMPR), substitutive ('instead of you' *wa-ⱡ'əna* you.sg.OBL-SUBST), causal ('because of the booze' *c'at'i-li-ši* drink-OBL-CAUSAL), elective ('(one) of these seven girls' *wiⱡaru laha-qⱡiš* seven girl-ELECT), and equative ('in the way of, similarly to the poor' *misgin-ni-qⱡdi* poor-OBL-EQUAT).

Note that some of peripheral non-local forms are clearly connected to locatives formally (e.g. Archi elective *-qⱡiš,* which is diachronically related to Inter marker *-qⱡ* plus elative marker *-š* or Bagvalal unintentional Agent marker *-č'ali,* which is probably related to Cont *-č'*) or even have residual spatial usages (Bagvalal affective *-ba* is required by some spatial adverbs and has a lative value with some place names; while Archi comparative *-χur* is peripherally used to designate spatial adjacency).

46.5 Inventory Of Spatial Forms

Unlike many languages of the world where they are mostly expressed by means of adpositions, many spatial meanings in Nakh-Daghestanian are conveyed by bound morphemes and form a subsystem of nominal inflection, fairly rich in most of the languages (Kibrik 1970 and 2003a, Comrie, Polinsky 1998). Paradigmatically, these subsystems are clearly delimited from non-local cases. A spatial form typically includes two separately coded categories, localization and orientation. Localization defines a certain spatial domain with respect to a landmark – cf. the following examples:

Table 46.3 Agul: three localizations

χul-a-q	χul-a-h	χul-a-ʔ
house-OBL-POST	house-OBL-ANTe	house-OBL-IN
behind the house	in front of the house	in the house

Here the house is the landmark, which defines three spatial domains 'behind', 'in front of' and 'inside', coded by three localization markers, *-q* (glossed Post), *-h* (Ante) and *-ʔ* (In), respectively.

Orientation conveys the notion of movement, indicating direction of the motion of an object with respect to the spatial domain specified by the localization marker. Central values of the orientation category include motion from the domain (elative), motion to the domain (lative), less often motion towards the domain (allative), motion through the domain (translative) and motion until reaching the domain (terminative). Cf.:

Table 46.4 Agul: three localizations x three orientations

χul-a-q	χul-a-q-ti	χul-a-q-as
house-OBL-POST	house-OBL-POST-LAT	house-OBL-POST-EL
behind the house	(to) behind the house	from behind the house
χul-a-h	χul-a-h-ti	χul-a-h-as
house-OBL-ANTE	house-OBL-ANTE-LAT	house-OBL-ANTE-EL
in front of the house	(to) in front of the house	from in front of the house

The orientation marker thus necessarily requires presence of a localization marker, while the opposite is not true – absence of an orientation marker (or, under an alternative interpretation, zero marked orientation) indicates absence of movement (essive). One rare exception is Dargwa, where essive is more marked than lative, differing from the latter by presence of a class agreement marker: 'onto the chair' *uta-li-či* (chair-OBL-SUPERLATIVE), but 'on the chair' *uta-li-či-b* (chair-OBL-SUPER-III).

The number of localizations in Nakh-Daghestanian varies from four (e.g. Tsakhur) to eight (Agul) or nine (Bezhta and Tsez), typically including meanings such as 'inside', 'on (the surface)', 'behind', 'near', and 'under', more rarely 'in front of' (only Agul and some southern Dargwa dialects). Languages tend to further specify some of these relations by splitting them into two localization categories – especially 'inside' and 'on', sometimes also 'near' (Kibrik 1970).

Thus, 'inside'-relation often splits into two localizations, In vs. Inter. Some languages use the distinction simply to classify types of landmarks, as Archi, Avar and most Andic languages, where In conveys the meaning 'inside a hollow object' (containers such as house or mug), while Inter means 'inside a mass object' (such as flour or water). Inter-forms of the names of containers and In-forms of the names of mass objects are ungrammatical in these languages. In Agul and Lezgian the distinction is similar but optional – In may be used with names of both containers and mass objects (when the structure of the latter is irrelevant), while Inter is limited to mass objects and is only used to emphasize the mass character of the landmark. Similarly to Agul and Lezgian, Tabassaran allows both containers and mass objects to combine with In. Additionally, it extends Inter to containers, using the choice between the two forms (In vs. Inter) to convey the distinction between 'loose' (default) and 'close' containment. Close containment means that the object occupies the whole of the inner space of the container ('the wardrobe is full with clothes') or hardly enters in it ('the child hid in / squeezed himself into a box') or is fixed in it ('the glass is inserted into the window frame'). In Akusha and some other dialects of Dargwa Inter is impossible with the names of containers; the use of In with the names of mass objects indicates that the landmark includes an object as its element, such as 'The sand contains stones; the sand is stony', while Inter is reserved for simple physical location ('the stones are in the sand').

Table 46.5 Distribution and functions of the two 'inside' localizations – In vs. Inter

	Avar		Dargwa		Tabassaran	
	mass object	**container**	**mass object**	**container**	**mass object**	**container**
In		default	element of a composite structure	default	landmark structure irrelevant	default
Inter	default		default		default	close containment

Another frequently occurring split is between two types of 'on'-relation: localization Super vs. localization Cont. Traditionally, this distinction is considered to convey the opposition between location on horizontal vs. vertical surfaces. In fact the portrait of this distinction is much more complicated. To give some examples, in Agul, Super is used for location on a supporting surface (such as a book lying on the table), animate objects autonomously keeping on the landmark (a fly sitting on the wall/on the ceiling), as well as objects being part of the surface (a scratch on the mirror) or natural extensions of the landmark (as a leaf on the branch). Cont, on the other hand, is used for objects attached to, rather than being part of, the landmark, such as a painting hanging on the wall, or being a characteristic of the

landmark (such as a beard on the cheeks - bearded cheeks, or for meanings like 'there are raindrops on the window, the windowpane is covered with raindrops'). In Tsez, Super is limited to supporting surfaces and surfaces including the object as its element. All other 'on'-relations are expressed by Cont.

For a more detailed discussion of 'split localizations' see (Ganenkov 2005).

Further complication is that there is a number of non-spatial or not straightforwardly spatial meanings formally integrated into the spatial sub-paradigm as additional localizations. Some languages have a dedicated human locative (HumLoc) localization which conveys the meaning of being located in someone's personal space (house etc.), attested in Bagvalal and Archi. In Tindi and Bezhta (and, probably, Karata), there is a dedicated possessive localization marker, used in predicative possessive constructions (possessive essive) and in 'take-away-from' constructions (possessive elative).

Tladal Bezhta (D.G., f.n.)

(1) dī-qa   oqro   gel
    I.OBL-POSS   money(NOM)   COP
I have money (on me).

Some languages contribute further categories to the typological profile of the Daghestanian spatial morphology, already extremely rich. Thus, in Bezhta and Hunzib, there is a marker described as approximate location, while Kaitag Dargwa has morphologized the expression of vertical and personal deixis; cf. *qalžirk'en* / *qalžiχen* 'up/down the roof'; *qalžirten / qalžiržen* 'thither / hither by the roof'.

As was already mentioned before, the richness of the spatial paradigm in Daghestanian is mostly due to the combinatorial regularity of a limited set of markers. However, this regularity must not be considered to be absolute. It is relatively common not to distinguish between lative and essive with some localizations, while distinguishing them in the others. Thus, Andi distinguishes lative and essive in Apud, In and Super, but doesn't in Cont, Sub, Inter and Ad (Magomedova 1979). Gigatli Chamalal distinguishes between these two orientations everywhere except Cont, while in Rutul, on the contrary, only Cont makes the distinction. In Agul and Lezgian, lative does not combine with 'In', and dative or a special combination of dative plus lative is used instead (while normally dative does not combine with orientation markers). Archi is exceptional in that it has no essive or translative for the Cont localization. In Karata, there is a human lative 'to someone's place' in *-χar*, in which the lative marker *-ar* may be isolated; however, the putative *-χ-* localization does not combine with any other orientation marker, synchronically.

The distinction between grammatical cases and spatial forms is by no means purely functional, in the sense that some of the latter have widespread syntactic usages. E.g., the Stimulus of 'fear, be afraid of' is coded by Sub-Elative in Archi, Apud-Elative in Tabassaran, Post-Elative in Lezgian, Ante-Elative in Agul, Super-Essive in Hunzib (Testelets 1980), Cont-Essive in Bagvalal, Cont-Elative in Andi and Godoberi, Super-Elative in Lak and Rutul (D.G., f.n.). For further discussion see (Kibrik 2003a).

46.6 Place Names And Natural Locations
Speaking of space in Daghestanian, it is hard not to mention place names. Local place names (such as names of neighboring villages) often have a reduced case paradigm, being limited to spatial forms. Thus, in Bagvalal (and some other Avar-Andic and Tsezic), there are place names that, of all non-local cases, only have genitive; essive serves as their citation form. In an argument position, instead of e.g.nominative, a periphrastic construction with some kind of hyperonym is used, such as 'village' or 'place', as in the following example.

Bagvalal (Daniel, in preparation)

(2) di-č'   k'ʷan-ɫ   han   raq'ʷa-ɫi   ek'ʷa
    I.OBL-CONT   Kvanada-GEN   village(NOM)   heart-INTER   COP
I remember Kvanada (lit. 'The village of Kvanada is in my heart').

Even inside the spatial sub-paradigm, place names may behave differently from regular nominals. Typically, they either do not have a localization marker at all or combine but with a single localization marker, lexically defined (and probably historically motivated), as in Avar-Andic or Dargwa (Avar 'in

Khunzakh' *χunza-q* Khunzakh-APUD, but 'in Holotl' *holo-ʟ'* Holotl-SUB), or with a default localization marker, as in Lezgian and Agul (Agul 'in Tpig' *tip̄aʀ-a-ʔ* Tpig-OBL-IN). They distinguish orientations only (essive vs. lative vs. elative) and, in this respect, behave very much like the spatial adverbs (which typically use the same set of orientation markers as the nominals but have no localizations). Further, in e.g. Agul, lative of place names is morphologically unusual, being formed immediately from the direct stem, with no oblique stem or localization marker ('to Tpig' *tip̄aʀ-di* Tpig-LAT), unlike essive and elative, which have both. All these phenomena clearly reflect the intimate relation between place names and spatial semantics.

Another class that shows spatial irregularities are names of locations, such as 'landscape elements' ('field', 'village', 'cave'), buildings ('house', 'cowshed), bodily locations ('hand', 'skirt hem', 'armpit'). These nominals, naturally occurring in locative contexts, tend to preserve older spatial morphology longer than other nominals and thus become in some way irregular, e.g. possessing a separate 'locative' stem (identical to the former oblique stem, now lost), which is different from both the direct and oblique stem (Archi), or a specific localization marker (Bagvalal).

46.7 Black Sheep Of The Family

What was described earlier may be called the Daghestanian prototype. However, there are some Daghestanian languages that lack such typically Daghestanian feature as the spatial subsystem in the nominal inflection, or almost do so. South Avar dialects have lost the elaborate locative morphology. Khinalug and Budukh also have but a very reduced version of the system. Vartashen Udi does not show any vestiges of the older spatial sub-paradigm, and Nidzh Udi evidence is not much stronger. Cf. the Nidzh Udi case suffixes.

Table 46.6 Nidzh Udi: inventory of cases

nominative	(zero)	ablative/comitative	*-χun*
ergative	*-en/-in*	adessive	*-sīa*
benefactive	*-jnak̄*	allative	*-č̆*
genitive	*-e/-a/-in*	superessive	*-l*
dative	*-a*	superelative	*-lχun*

Note that Super-Elative is formally identical to super(essive) plus ablative, which is reminiscent of Daghestanian locatives. However, all the locative forms except ablative are not in common usage; and Super-Essive and Super-Elative are extremely rare.

46.8 Core Arguments

In terms of case marking, all Nakh-Daghestanian manifest ergative alignment. Verbs fall into two major groups, intransitive and transitive, of which transitives take an argument in ergative (Agent) and another argument in nominative (Patient), while intransitives take a nominative argument but do not take an ergative argument. Most Nakh-Daghestanian languages also have labile verbs that have both patterns, transitive and intransitive. Some intransitives may have additional arguments, typically in one of the spatial cases. Cf. Lezgian examples:

Lezgian (Haspelmath 1993)

(3) am   gamiš-di   ja-na
     that(NOM)   buffalo-OBL(ERG)   gore-PST
A buffalo gored him.

(4) χalq'   wič-i-n   q̄uwat-di-q   inanmiš   tir
     people(NOM) refl-OBL-GEN   power-OBL-POST   believe   become.PST
The people believes in its own force(s).

Different from the latter are experiential verbs, which include 'see', 'hear', 'know', 'love, want', sometimes also 'find', 'forget' and consistently use dative or, for some verbs in some Andic languages

and Tsakhur, a dedicated, affective case marking for the Experiencer; the Stimulus is expressed by nominative or a complement clause (cf. discussion in Kibrik 2003a, Ganenkov 2006). Cf.:

Bagvalal (Kibrik 2001)

(5) he<b>ō   du-ha   q'oča-m-o   ek'ʷa ?
    what<N>   you.sg.OBL-DAT   want-N-CVB   COP

What do you want?

(6) basqan   ʕumar-i-ba   uha-m-o   ek'ʷa han   b-uh-ā
    Baskan   Omar-OBL-AFF   be.able-N-CVB COP   village(NOM) N-gather-POT.INF

Baskan Omar managed to capture the village

Many languages have a special intransitive construction introducing an Agent-like participant with limited agentive properties (cf. Ganenkov et al. 2006; Kittilä 2005), typically coded by one of the spatial cases or, rarely, by a dedicated case form, as in Lak and Bagvalal.

Archi (M.D., f.n.)

(7) za-ra-š   č'ut   a<b>qI-u
    I.OBL-CONT-EL   jar(NOM)   <III>break-PF

I broke a jar (occasionally)

Bagvalal (Kibrik 2001)

(8) di-č'ali   o-w   w-ič'a
    I.OBL-INVOLUNTARYAGENT   that-I(NOM)   I-die

He died because of me, I killed him unintentionally.

Ditransitive constructions follow the "indirect object" pattern in all languages, coding the Theme (the object transferred) by nominative and the Recipient by dative. Some Dargwa dialects have no dative and use a spatial form instead, as Super-Lative in Icari Dargwa.

Icari Dargwa (Sumbatova, Mutalov 2003)

(9) q'ʷaIl-li-j   mura   saka<b>ix̄-a
    cow-OBL-SUP(LAT)   hay(NOM)   <III>put.PFV-IMP

Give the hay to the cow.

(10) du-l   cin-na   qal   c'a-l   b-ik̄-ub   admi-li-j
     I-ERG refl-GEN   house(NOM)   fire-ERG   N-burn:PF-PRET   person-OBL-SUPLAT

azir   q̄uru   b-īč'-ib-da
thousand   ruble(NOM)   N-give:PF-PRET-1SG

I gave one thousand rubles to the man whose house had burnt down.

Some languages further distinguish between 'give'-situations that involve transfer of possession ('give, donate') and those that do not involve it ('lend, give back'). Cf. examples from Archi.

Archi (Kibrik 1977)

(11) zari   wa-s   aʟ'   ʟo
     I.ERG you.sg.OBL-DAT   meat(NOM)   4.give.PF

I gave you the meat (for good).

(12) za-ra-k   jamu-t   heʟ'əna   aк̄u-s   oq'i
     I.OBL-CONT-LAT this-IV thing(NOM)   4.see-INF   4.give(IMP)

Give me this thing so that I (can) look at it.

(13) zari   to-w-mu-ra-k   q'onq'   baq'Ia-s   aw
     I.ERG that-1-OBL.1-CONT-LAT   book(NOM)   go.back-INF   do.4

I returned him the book.

Causative constructions. Nakh-Daghestanian are rich in various causativization patterns. The Causer is consistently marked by ergative, and the Patient of the originally transitive verb is coded by nominative. The Causee marking depends on the (in)transitivity of the original, non-causative verb: a

Causee originating from the only argument of an intransitive (intransitive Causee) is coded by nominative, while a Causee that used to be a transitive Agent (transitive Causee) is coded by one of the spatial cases. Cf. Agul examples.

Agul (Daniel, Maisak, Merdanova, to appear)

(14) baw-a   šünǖk   ʀarx-a-s   q'-u-ne
      mother-OBL(ERG)   child(NOM)   sleep-IPF-INF   do-PF-PFT
Mother made the child sleep.

(15) malla-ji   gada-ji-w   q'urʔan   ruχ-a-s   q'-a-a
      priest-OBL(ERG) boy-OBL-APUD   Koran(NOM)   read-IPF-INF   do-IPF-PRS
The priest makes his son read the Koran.

Interestingly, Agul has other options of coding the Causee. Intransitive Causee may be coded by Apud, emphasizing the decrease in his or her control over the caused situation, while transitive Causee may be coded by an ergative, marking the increase in this control. The latter marking results in the presence of two ergatives, which makes the morphosyntactic status of Agul 'do'-causatives disputable.

Agul (Daniel, Maisak, Merdanova, to appear)

(16) dad-a   uči-n   uқub-ar-i-l-di   gada-ji-w   χula-as
      father-ERG   REFL-GEN   beating-PL-OBL-SUP-LAT   son-OBL-APUD   house-IN.ELAT

      hiš-a-s   q'-u-ne
      flee-IPF-INF   do-PF-PFT
Father's beating made (his) son run away from home.
(lit. "by his beating father made son run away from home")

(17) a. gi   šünük̄-ar-i   wak̄-a-n   jak̄   ʕut'-a-s   q'-u-ne.
          that(ERG)   child-PL-ERG   pig-OBL-GEN   meat(NOM)   eat-IPF-INF   do-PF-PFT
He let children eat pork.
    (e.g. he forgot that they are Muslims, or neglected the dietary restrictions).

      b. gi   šünük̄-ar-i-w   wak̄-a-n   jak̄   ʕut'-a-s   q'-u-ne.
          that(ERG)   child-PL-OBL-APUD   pig-OBL-GEN   meat(NOM)   eat-IPF-INF   do-PF-PFT
He made children eat pork.
    (e.g. although, being Muslims, they didn't want to)

Nominative requirement. Nakh-Daghestanian clauses typically require one and only one nominative NP to be present, although this fact is dimmed by a more or less extensive prodrop. However, there is a number of recurrent exceptions. Meteorological predicates may have no arguments at all (in Bagvalal, an Arabic loan *dunijal* 'universe' may optionally be inserted into the nominative slot; cf. (18)). With verbs with "default objects", the Patient-nominative may be omitted because the object is predictable from the verbal semantics, while any non-default object must be expressed; cf.(19). With 'hitting'-verbs it is often the hitting object (rather than object or person hit) that is conceptualized as Patient-nominative; this instrument-like nominative may be omissible; cf. (20).

Bagvalal (Kibrik 2001)

(18) [dunijal]   ʀori
      [world(NOM)]   thunder.strike
Thunder stroke.

(19) a. den   turi   b. den   raʟ'   turi
          I.ERG spit.PST   I.ERG stone(NOM)   spit.PST
I spat (saliva) / I spat out a fruit stone

Agul (D.G., f.n.)

(20) fas   jarH-a-j-e   ramiz-a   Hajwan-di-s ?
       why   hit-IPF-CVB-COP   Ramiz-ERG   horse-OBL-DAT

Why is Ramiz beating the horse?

Finally, a nominal stem may be closely related to the verb in terms of the participant structure. These stems do not form full fledged NPs in the sense that they may not have adnominal dependents (nouns or adjectives). Still, they may behave differently in being fully integrated with the verb, morphosyntactically, and thus freeing the nominative slot for another noun, as in (21), or keeping the nominative slot for itself without letting any real Patient or Patient-aligned argument occupy this position, as in (22).

Agul (Daniel, Maisak, Merdanova, to appear)

(21) wa-s   haraj-ar   un   x-u-ne-wa ?
       you.sg.OBL-DAT shout-PL(NOM)   sound   become-PF-PFT-Q

Have you heard the yelling?

(22) wa-s   bawa   un   q'-a-a ?
       you.sg.OBL-DAT mother(ERG)   sound(NOM)   make-IPF-PRS

Mother calls you (lit. "mother to you sound makes)

Another type of context where two nominatives are present are analytic forms of transitive verbs, where both Agent and Patient may be coded by nominative, resulting in the so-called binominative construction, fairly widespread in Daghestanian. Their function varies across languages, and their morphosyntactic status is subject to debate.

46.9 Adnominal And Predicative Possession

Genitive is a quasi-universal case form in Daghestanian.

There is one language where the existence of the genitive case is disputed. In Tsakhur, the 'genitive' marker is attached to various lexical categories, including plain nouns, nominal case forms, adjectives and finite verbal forms (forming relative clauses) and is thus qualified as a transcategorial attributivizer. On the other hand, with nouns, this attributivizer is added to oblique stems, which is a property specific only to the members of the case paradigm.

Distinction between alienability and inalienability is only attested in Budukh (Authier, p.c.) and Khinalug.

Khinalug (Kibrik 1972)

(23) gad-i   kʰalla   vs.   gad-e   cʼʷa
       boy-GEN.INAL   head   boy-GEN.AL   house

boy's head vs. *boy's house*

In some Tsezic languages, e.g. Bezhta, there are two distinct genitives that are distributed syntactically (Kibrik 1995). One is used with nominative heads, the other with heads in any other case; Tsakhur has a similar distinction using two different attributive markers depending on the case of the head.

Sometimes, the genitive form may function as an NP head and is further declinable.

Bagvalal (Kibrik 2001)

(24) a-b   hob   in-ɫi-ɫ-da   waša-šu-b-ɫi-ba   b-aɫi-li-b-o
       this-N   tomb(NOM) refl-OBL-GEN-PART boy-OBL-GEN-OBL-AFF   N-similar-VBLZ-N-CVB

o-w-la   raq'ʷa-lā   w-ā-w-o
that-M-PART   heart-SUP.LAT   M-come-M-CVB

Because this tomb was similar <u>to that of my son</u>, I remembered him.

Functionally, genitive in Daghestanian covers a relatively wide range of adnominal meanings, including material ('a mug <u>of copper</u>'), elective ('one <u>of them</u>'), feature object ('girl <u>with blue eyes</u>, blue-eyed girl'), as well as of course such core meanings as possessive, part-whole and kin relation.

Possessive predication. Daghestanian languages fall into three groups according to how they express possessive predication formally.

a) Possessor in possessive predication is always expressed by a genitive (e.g. Dargwa and Archi)

b) Possessor may be coded either by a genitive or by a spatial form (typical of Andic and Tsezic)

c) Possessor may be coded by two spatial forms, genitive is only used in adnominal possessive constructions (typical of Lezgic)

In (b) and (c), the contrast between the two marking of the possessor is close to permanent vs. temporary possession or general vs. actual ('I have it on me') possession.

Agul (D.G., f.n.)

(25)   za-w   kant'   f-a-a
    I.OBL-APUD   knife(NOM)   APUD-be-PRS

I have got a knife (with me).

(26)   če   χuj-i-q   jaq'u   kurc'ul   q-a-a
    our(Excl)   dog-OBL-POST   four   cub(NOM)   POST-be-PRS

Our dog has four cubs.

Bagvalal (Kibrik 2001)

(27)   di-b / di-č'   tup   ek'ʷa
    I.OBL-GEN / I.OBL-CONT   gun(NOM)   COP

I have a gun (I possess a gun) / *I've got a gun* (somebody else's gun, I've got it with me).

Note that in predicative possessive constructions the respective word order of the genitive viz. the Possessee is very free, so the Possessor seems to be syntactically independent.

46.10 Some Peripheral Roles And Functions: Highlights

<u>Instrument</u>. Special instrumental case is attested in Tsezic and Dargwa. Other cases that may have instrumental function are comitative (Dargwa, Archi, Tsakhur, Kryz, Budukh), ergative (Avar-Andic, some Lezgic) or a spatial form, as Agul and Lezgian Super-Lative. Note that many languages have several different ways to mark Instruments, with no clear semantic contrast. In Icari Dargwa, there are even three ways to express Instruments: ergative, comitative and a dedicated instrumental (the latter in a very limited number of contexts). <u>Benchmark</u>. Quite a few languages have a specialized form for a standard of comparison, including Tsez, Hunzib, Rutul and Archi. Other languages express benchmarks by means of spatial forms, such as Super-Elative in most Lezgic, Avar, Chamalal, Cont-Essive in Andi and Bagvalal, Cont-Elative in Godoberi, Super-Essive in Khvarshi or Ad-Essive in Bezhta. <u>Addressee</u>**.** Andic and Tsezic languages and Archi confute the typologically widespread pattern of marking the addressee of speech verbs in the same way as the recipient of 'give'-verbs, coding the former with one of the spatial forms instead, such as Super-Lative in Bagvalal, Ad-Essive in Godoberi, Poss-Essive in Bezhta or Cont-Essive in Tsez.

Main sources:

Abdullaev, S. (1954). *Grammatika darginskogo jazyka (fonetika i morfologija)*. Makhačkala: IIJaL.

Alekseev, M.E., and Ataev, B.M. (1998). Avarskij jazyk. Moscow: Academia.

Authier, G. (ms.) *Elements de grammaire kryz*.

Bokarev, E.A. (1959). *Cezskie (didojskie) jazyki Dagestana*. Moscow: AN SSSR.

Bokarev, A.A. (1949a). Sintaksis avarskogo jazyka. Moscow-Leningrad: AN SSSR.

Bokarev, A.A. (1949b). *Očerki grammatiki čamalinskogo jazyka*. Moscow: AN SSSR.

Gukasian, V. (1974) Udinsko-azerbajdžansko-russkij slovar'. Baku: Elm.

Haspelmath, M. (1993). *A Grammar of Lezgian*. Berlin–New York: MdG.

Ibragimov, G.Kh. (1978). *Rutul'skij jazyk*. Moscow: Nauka.

Ibragimov, G.Kh. (1990). *Caxurskij jazyk*. Moscow: Nauka.

Kibrik, A.E. et al. (1977). *Opyt strukturnogo opisanija arčinskogo jazyka*. Vol. 1-4. Moscow: MGU.

Kibrik, A.E. et al. (eds.) (1996). *Godoberi*. München - New Castle: Lincom.

-------- (1999). *Elementy caxurskogo jazyka v tipologičeskom osveščenii*. Moscow: Nasledie.

-------- (2001). Bagvalinskij jazyk: grammatika, teksty, slovari. Moscow: Nasledie.

Kibrik, A.E., Kodzasov, S.V., Olovjannikova, I.P., Samedov Dzh. S. (1972). Fragmenty grammatiki xinalugskogo jazyka. Moscow: MGU.

Kibrik, A.E., Testelets, Ja.G. (2004). Bezhta. In: M. Job (ed.) Indigenous Languages of the Caucasus. Vol. 3. The North East Caucasian Languages. Ann Arbor.

Lomtadze. E.A. (1963) Ginukhskij dialekt didojskogo jazyka. Tbilisi.

Magomedbekova, Z.M. (1967). *Axvaxskij jazyk*. Tbilisi.

Magomedbekova, Z.M. (1971). *Karatinskij jazyk*. Tbilisi.

Magometov, A.A. (1963). *Kubačinskij jazyk (issledovanie i teksty)*. Tbilisi.

Magometov, A.A. (1965). *Tabasaranskij jazyk*. Tbilisi: Mecniereba.

Magometov, A.A. (1970). *Agul'skij jazyk*. Tbilisi: Mecniereba.

Magometov, A.A. (1982). *Megebskij dialect darginskogo jazyka (issledovanie i teksty)*. Tbilisi: Mecniereba.

Makhmudova, S.M. (2001). *Morfologija rutul'skogo jazyka*. Moscow: IJa RAN.

Murkelinskij, G.B. (1971). Grammatika lakskogo jazyka. Maxačkala.

Mutalov, R.O. (2002). Glagol darginskogo jazyka. Maxačkala.

Schulze, W. (ms.) Functional Grammar of Udi.

Sumbatova, N.R., Mutalov, R.O. (2003). *A Grammar of Icari Dargwa*. München-Newcastle: Lincom.

Talibov, B.B. 1979. "Morfologičeskaja i sintaksičeskaja xarakteristika padežej caxurskogo jazyka". In: Mejlanova (ed.) (1979).

van den Berg, H.E. (1995). *A Grammar of Hunzib (with texts and lexicon)*. München: Lincom

van den Berg, H.E. (2001). *Dargi folktales. Oral stories from the Caucasus with an introduction to Dargi grammar*. Leiden: CNWS.

Zhirkov, L.I. (1955). Lakskij jazyk. Fonetika i morfologija. Moscow: AN SSSR.

Additional bibliography:

Comrie, B. (1999). *Spatial cases in Daghestanian languages*. Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung 52-2, 108–117.

Comrie, B., and M. Polinsky. (1998) 'The great Daghestanian case hoax', in A. Siewerska, J. J. Song (eds.) *Case, Typology and Grammar*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1998.

Daniel, M. (in preparation). Bagvalal place names as a problem of part-of-speech typology.

Daniel, M., Maisak, T., and Merdanova, S. (to appear). 'Causatives in Agul'. Bernard Comrie, Valery Solovyev, and Pirkko Suihkonen (eds.). Selected Proceedings of the International Symposium on the Typology of Argument Structure and Grammatical Relations in Languages Spoken in Europe and North and Central Asia (LENCA-2). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Friedman, V.A. (1992). 'Lak substantival declension: 40 cases or 50'. In H.I. Aronson (ed.) *The Non-Slavic Languages of the USSR*. Chicago: CLS. Pp. 113–133.

Ganenkov, D. (2005). *Kontaktnyje lokalizacii v nakhsko-dagestankikh jazykakh*. Ph.D. ms. Moscow.

------- (2006). 'Experiencer coding in Nakh-Daghestanian'. In L. Kulikov et al. (eds) *Case, Valency and Transitivity* [Studies in Language Companion Series]. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Ganenkov, D., Maisak, T., and Merdanova, S. (in preparation) 'Non-canonical Agent marking in Agul'.

Kibrik, A.E. (1970). 'K tipologii prostranstvennyx značenij (na materiale dagestanskix jazykov)'. In *Jazyk i čelovek*. Moscow: MGU.

------- (1992). 'Principy organizacii imennoj paradigmy v dagestanskix jazykax (sopostavitel'no-tipologičeskie nabl'udenija)'. In: A.E. Kibrik. *Očerki po obščim i prikladnym voprosam jazykoznanija*. Moscow: MGU.

------- (1995). 'Direct-oblique agreement of attributes in Tsez and elsewhere in Daghestanian'. In: F. Plank (ed.) *Double Case: Agreement by Suffixaufnahme*. New York – Oxford: OUP.

------- (2003a). Nominal inflection galore: Daghestanian, with side glances at Europe and the world. In: Frans Plank (ed.) 2003.

------- (2003b). *Konstanty i peremennyje jazyka*. Moscow: Aleteia.

Kibrik, A.E., and Kodsazov, S.V. (1990). Sopostavitel'noe izučenie dagestanskix jazykov. Im'a. Fonetika. Moskva: MGU.

Kittilä, S. (2005). 'A Typology of Involuntary Agent Constructions'. *Word* 56.3.

Magomedova, P.T. (1979). Osnovnye voprosy sklonenija v andijskix jazykax v sravnitel'nom aspekte. In: Mejlanova (ed.) 1979, p. 41-69.

Mejlanova, U.A. (ed.) 1979. Imennoe sklonenie v dagestanskix jazykax. Maxačkala: IIJaL.

Merdanova, S.R. (2004). Morfologija i grammaticheskaja semantika agul'skogo jazyka. Moscow: Institut jazykoznanija.Temirbulatova, S. (2004). *Xajdakskij dialekt darginskogo jazyka*. Maxačkala: IIJaL.

Plank, Frans (ed.) (2003) Noun Phrase Structure in the Languages of Europe. Mouton de Gruyter.

van den Berg, Helma. 2005. The East Caucasian language family. Lingua, 115(1-2), 147-190.