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0. PRELIMINARIES


Typological features: ergative alignment; class (+ number) agreement.

Rich nominal inflection: two subsystems differentiated on formal grounds. Syntactic cases include nominative (absolutive), ergative, genitive, dative plus other cases, depending on the specific language. Locative subparadigm is produced by combining a localization marker locating an object regarding a landmark (on, under, behind...) and orientation marker conveying the notion of movement (essive, lative, ablative...). Some languages, however, lack this system (Khinalug, Nakh languages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Khwarshi</th>
<th>Archi</th>
<th>Bagvalal</th>
<th>Chechen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominative</td>
<td>Nominative</td>
<td>Nominative</td>
<td>Nominative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ergative</td>
<td>Ergative</td>
<td>Ergative</td>
<td>Ergative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dative</td>
<td>Dative</td>
<td>Dative</td>
<td>Dative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive 1</td>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>Genitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive 2</td>
<td>Comitative</td>
<td>Affective</td>
<td>Instrumental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>Substitutive</td>
<td>Substitutive</td>
<td>Comparative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(more...)</td>
<td>(more...)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Locative superlatives: Locative

1 This common project has been conceived and started during the first author’s stay at EVA MPI in Spring of 2007.
1. **Variation in Recipient Coding: ‘give’**

two markings available for Recipient, contrasting ‘give’ vs. ‘pass, let have’ situations

1. **Chechen**

   zāra-s hū-na/hoe-ga knīga j-ella.
   
   Z.-ERG you.SG.OBL-DAT/you.SG.OBL-ALL book(NOM) 2-give.PRF
   
   ‘Zara gave you a book.’ (permanently ~ temporarily)

2. **Hinuq**

   de hajlo-z/hajlo-qo t'ek tol-iš
   
   I.ERG he.OBL-DAT/he.OBL-CONT book(NOM) give-PST
   
   ‘I gave him a book.’ (permanently ~ temporarily)

3. **Tsez**

   di nesi-r/nesi-qo-r t'ek tel-si
   
   I.ERG he-LAT/he-POSS-LAT book(NOM) give-PST
   
   ‘I gave him a book.’ (permanently ~ temporarily)

4. **Bagvalal**

   den ḡali-la/ḡali-la as iči
   
   I.ERG Ali-DAT/Ali-HUMLOC money(NOM) give
   
   ‘I gave the money to Ali.’ (permanently ~ temporarily; probably, less salient here)

We will call the ‘less spatial’ marking dative strategy and the ‘more spatial’ marking locative strategy.

**Give or Pass?**

temporary vs. permanent recipient? as in (5)

5. **Archi** – situation of transfer to a mediator

   han edi wa-ra-k lo-ťu-t heł'ana
   
   what(NOM) 4.be.PF you.SG.OBL-CONT LAT 4.give.PF-ATR-4 thing(NOM)
   
   ‘What was the thing given to you (for transfer to a third party)?’

   But:

6. **Bezhta** – situation of giving back

   do hogco-qa t'ek nir-ijo
   
   I.ERG he-POSS book(NOM) give-PST
   
   ‘I gave his book back to him’
7. **Archi** – situation of transfer from a mediator to a third party

waj aman madad i-t’u za-ɬu lo-t’u za-ra-k
waj EXCLAM EXCLAM 4.be-NEG I.OBL-COMIT 4.give.PF-NEG I.OBL-CONT-LAT

‘Oh, I don’t have it, (they) didn’t give it to me!’

(The wife denies that the mediator brought her an object sent by her husband)

Thus, transfer of rights of possession (provisionally, give vs. pass) is relevant rather than temporary vs. permanent recipient.

**STRUCTURAL POSITIONS AND ROLES**

Same or different roles?

8. **Bezhta** – presence of both locative and dative strategies

do öždi-q’a okko ado-l ni jó
I.ERG boy-POSS money(NOM) father-DAT give.PF

‘I gave the money for the father to the boy’

9. **Archi**

tu-w-mu za-ra-k weţ arsi lo
that-1-OBL(ERG) I.OBL-CONT-LAT you.pl.DAT money(NOM) give.PF

‘He gave me the money for you’

10. **Chechen**

as k’anta-ga die-na axč d-iel-ira
I.ERG boy-ALL father.OBL-DAT money(NOM) 3-give-WP

‘I gave the money for the father to the boy’

In 11, Dative might be understood in the sense of 8 – 10 even in the absence of the locative strategy.

11. **Archi**

tu-w-mu el arsi lo-li
that-1-OBL(ERG) 4.we.DAT money(NOM) 4.give-EVID

‘He gave (sent) money for us, they say’ (through someone)

**POSSESSIVE PREDICATION**

Cf two types of ‘give’-situations correlates with similar effects in ‘have’-situations.

12. **Chechen**

a. soe-ħ top j-u.
   I.OBL-LOC gun(NOM) 2-COP
   ‘I have a gun with me.’

b. san top j-u.
   I.GEN gun(NOM) 2-COP
   ‘I have (possess) a gun.’
However, there is not necessarily a full formal parallelism; cf. Archi (same in Bagvalal)

13. **Archi**
   a. za- lu tumank b-i  
      I.OBL-COMIT gun(NOM) 3-be  
      ‘I have a gun with me.’
   b. za- ra-k tumank bo- lo  
      I.OBL-CONT-LAT gun(NOM) 3-give.PST  
      ‘(He) gave me a gun’

2. **OUTSIDE ‘GIVE’**
   creation verbs do not allow variation

15. **Khwarshi**
   de isu- l aq l-ij-i  
   I.ERG he.OBL-LAT house(NOM) 4-do-PST  
   ‘I built a house for him.’
   ‘buy’ behaves similarly :

16. **Hinuq**
   de hajlu- z šel’u r-ux-iš  
   I.ERG she.OBL-DAT clothes(NOM) 5-buy-PST  
   ‘I bought her clothes.’
   Other may display this variation with a similar semantic effect.

17. **Khwarshi**
   a. de isu- ko- l tarpa l-ot’ok’-i  
      I.ERG he.OBL-APUD-LAT bag(NOM) 4-carry-PST  
      ‘I brought him a bag’
   b. de isu- l tarpa l-ot’ok’-i  
      I.ERG he.OBL-LAT bag(NOM) 4-carry-PST  
      ‘I brought a bag to him’ (for a while)
      (also ‘throw’ in Archi – pass by throwing vs give by throwing; but cf. below)

3. **VERBS OF SPEECH**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Chechen</th>
<th>Ingush</th>
<th>Bezhta</th>
<th>Hinuq</th>
<th>Khwarshi</th>
<th>Tsez</th>
<th>Archi</th>
<th>Bagvalal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>say</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Poss(Ess)</td>
<td>Cont(Ess)</td>
<td>ContLat</td>
<td>PossLat</td>
<td>ContAll</td>
<td>SupLat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ask</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Poss(Ess)</td>
<td>Cont(Ess)</td>
<td>Cont(Ess)</td>
<td>Poss(Ess)</td>
<td>ContAll</td>
<td>SupLat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tell</td>
<td>Da/All</td>
<td>Dat/All</td>
<td>Poss(Ess)</td>
<td>Cont(Ess)</td>
<td>Cont(Ess)</td>
<td>Poss(Ess)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>SupLat</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
18. Chechen
zāra-s ṭūira sū-na/soe-ga d-ic-ira.
Z.-ERG tale(NOM) I.OBL-DAT/I.OBL-ALL 3-tell-WP
‘Zara told me a tale’

‘Ask’ and ‘say’ do not show this variation.

19. Chechen
as mas sahat d-allā xiett-ira cun-ga
I.ERG what time(NOM) 3-come.PF ask-WP this-ALL
‘I asked him what time it was’

Tsezic differ only in the choice of localization, plus separate treatment of ‘tell’, ‘ask’ in Khwarshi and Tsez.

20. Khwarshi
uža ešet’-qo-l bit’t’ura-l himon il-in
boy.ERG mother.OBL-CONT-LAT true-4 thing(4) say-UW
‘The boy told the truth to his mother.’

21. Tsez
nesi-q di imaru esis
he.OBL-POSS I.ERG tale tell.PST
‘I told him a tale’

22. Bezhta
same as Khwarshi

23. Hinuq
same as Bezhta

24. Archi
u-q’a-īa ṭīsa-r-šī aʔ? + bo ṭīsa-s jaqʷan eʔi-li
1-come.PF-TEMP Isa-CONT-ALL call SAY.PF Isa-DAT be.evident 4.INCH.PF-CVB
w-e-q’i-šī i[w]dī
1-come.POT-POT-CVB.AUXDEP (1)AUX.PF
‘On my way I called out to Isa – he understood and came (up to me)’

A NOTE ON ‘ASK ABOUT’ VERBS
Bezhta, Tsez and Khwarshi: ‘to ask about’ = ‘cause to tell’

Bezhta: treats the second participant of ‘ask’ as Addressee of a speech verb (PossEss) rather than Causee of a causative verb (instrumental).

25. Bezhta
marking of the Causee

26. Bezhta
‘ask about’ verbs – Causee is treated as Addressee

A NOTE ON ‘ASK ABOUT’ VERBS
Bezhta, Tsez and Khwarshi: ‘to ask about’ = ‘cause to tell’

Bezhta: treats the second participant of ‘ask’ as Addressee of a speech verb (PossEss) rather than Causee of a causative verb (instrumental).
27. Tsez

\[ \text{I.ERG} \text{ he-POSS answer(NOM) ask-CAUS-PST} \]

‘I asked him for the answer’

Nakh languages and Archi: ‘ask’ is not a causative, Addressive marking

28. Chechen

\[ \text{I.ERG mother-ALL ask-WP soup(NOM) DX-2-finish-INTER QUOT} \]

‘I asked (my) mother whether the soup was ready.’

29. Ingush (Nichols 1994)

\[ \text{I.ERG what time(NOM) 3-came-PF ask-WP him-ALL} \]

‘I asked him what time it was.’

European-type Addressees – a metaphor or vestiges of the dative’s locative prehistory?

4. VERBS OF CONTACT
‘throw’ – dative vs. locative alternation

30. Bezhta

\[ \text{I.ERG boy-DAT/wall-DAT ball(NOM) 3-throw-PST} \]

‘I threw a ball at the boy / against the wall.’

31. Bezhta

\[ \text{I.ERG boy-POSS ball(NOM) 3-throw-PST} \]

‘I threw a ball to the boy’ (so he can catch it)

32. Chechen

\[ \text{M-ERG I. OBL-DAT/I.OBL-ALL ball(NOM) throw-WP} \]

‘Musa threw a ball at me / to me.

33. Archi

\[ \text{3-I. DAT stone(NOM) 3-throw.IMP} \]

‘Throw a stone at me!’ (if I did anything wrong)

34. Archi

\[ \text{A bird trew an apple at him (dropped an apple on him)} \]

Dative strategy ‘less recipientive’ than the locative strategy?

Dative is used in its locative function; cf. examples with ‘hit’, ‘push’:
35. Chechen
as hū-na p’elg tüox-na
I.ERG he.OBL-DAT finger(NOM) hit-PF
‘I tapped you with my finger.’

36. Archi
ju-w gurži-li-n os gon qieč+ bo-li o-b-qla-li to-r laha-s
this-1 Georgian-OBL-GEN one finger(NOM) push SAY.PF-CVB go.PF-EVID thot-2 lad obl(ERG)-DAT
‘This Georgian pushed her with his finger’

The dative marking with ‘throw’ has nothing in common with the dative in ‘give’-constructions. Locative marking with ‘throw’, on the contrary, is in principle identical with the locative ‘give’ strategy – in both cases the concept of physical transfer from one person to another is in focus (‘pass’), without any assumption regarding the transfer of possession (‘give’). Locative marking with ‘throw’ or ‘give’ are variants of Animate Goal marking.

CONCLUSIONS:
Too many goals... Nakh-Daghestanian languages are extremely rich in locative morphology, and can afford distinguishing many goals (true Recipient, Animate Goal, Addressee...) which other languages often combine in one marker.

Disrupt dative. Dative covers a variety of meanings which are not obviously due to any kind of extension or metaphor – they may well be different ex-metaphors inherited from the dative’s spatial pre-history. One of the arguments is a conceptually discontinuous marking where locative strategy of marking Animate Goal seems to cut between Target and Recipient. (The same might be true of Addressee marking in those languages that use dative).
Ergativity in Nakh-Daghestanian

Diana Forker Bamberg University

1. Introduction

The Nakh-Daghestanian (or East Caucasian) language family is the largest and the linguistically most diverse of the three autochthonous language families in the Caucasus. The more than 30 Nakh-Daghestanian languages are primarily spoken in the southern parts of Russia and in northern Azerbaijan. A few speech communities are found in Georgia.

Introduction

Tense and aspect systems of languages belonging to the Lezgic group of the Nakh-Daghestanian (East Caucasian) family share the following important features — some of which are certainly not restricted to this particular group, but can be viewed as defining the typological profile of the family as a whole:

- Most finite indicative verbal forms are analytical, at least historically, and have more.
- Non-finite forms (at least participles and converbs) are regularly marked for either perfective or imperfective aspect, and as a rule are derived from the corresponding verbal stems: this constitutes what may be called the perfective vs. imperfective subsystems within the tense and aspect system;
- As the copula appears in the present or in the past form, there is also the present.