



NATIONAL RESEARCH UNIVERSITY
HIGHER SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS

Michael Daniel

**ISSUES IN KHINALUG
SYNTAX: BUILDING ON
CORPUS EVIDENCE**

BASIC RESEARCH PROGRAM

WORKING PAPERS

SERIES: HUMANITIES
WP BRP 27/HUM/2013

This Working Paper is an output of a research project implemented at the National Research University Higher School of Economics (HSE). Any opinions or claims contained in this Working Paper do not necessarily reflect the views of HSE.

*Michael Daniel*¹

**ISSUES IN KHINALUG SYNTAX:
BUILDING ON CORPUS EVIDENCE²**

The paper treats several issues in the syntax of Khinalug, an East Caucasian language of Northern Azerbaijan, presenting some results of the author's ongoing research of Khinalug syntax. The analysis is based on corpus data and covers three issues that can not be adequately accounted for by mere elicitation: the locus of expression of shared participants in a polypredicative construction; the non-coordinative uses of the additive particle; and some properties of the constructions involving the quotative particle.

JEL Classification: Z.

Keywords: Khinalug, East Caucasian, polypredicative constructions, clause chaining, converb, quotative.

¹ National Research University Higher School of Economics, faculty of philology / Moscow State University, department of theoretical and applied linguistics.

² This study was carried out within "The National Research University Higher School of Economics' Academic Fund Program in 2012-2013", research grant No. 11-01-0200 (Syntax of Khinalug).

Introduction

Khinalug is an East Caucasian language spoken in the Northern Azerbaijan by less than 2,000 people living in the village of the same name (Azerbaijani *Xınalıq*). The language has long been thought to belong to the Lezgetic branch of East Caucasian (cf. implicit assumption in [Ganieva 2002]; however, more reserved stance is expressed in [Desheriev 1959]. Schulze [2010], focusing on this problem, believes that Khinalug may constitute a separate branch within East Caucasian.

Khinalug morphology, first briefly considered by A. Dirr and R. Shaumian, was subject to thorough analysis in [Desheriev 1959, Kibrik et al 1972, Kerimov 1980]. I should however emphasize that, according to my experience of working with the texts, the verbal morphology of Khinalug has not yet been studied in an exhaustive way. Thus, a very accurate analysis in Kibrik et al [1972] does not answer some questions of paramount importance, such as the presence and the position of class agreement affixes in individual verbal lexical items. This is especially important because, in Khinalug, first and third (and homophonous HPL) class markers receive morphophonologically conditioned zero expression, and fourth (and homophonous NPL) class is always unmarked. As a result, the presence of an agreement slot is best seen with second (feminine) controller, which is not a very frequent situation in the texts. Here, Ganieva's Khinalug-Russian dictionary [2002] is of great help, because she provides all different class forms for the perfective and imperfective bases. However, the dictionary does not contain all verbs that occur in the corpus; and the morphology of such extremely productive derivations as movement predicates is not fully described in by Aleksandr Kibrik and his co-authors or by Junus Desheriev. Consequently, while nominal glossing is pretty straightforward, morphological glossing of verbal forms that I provide below is preliminary, inconsistent (it follows the present state of the glossing in the corpus) and in many cases may prove seriously wrong.

In any case, Khinalug morphology was analyzed by several generations of scholars who build upon each other results. The syntax, however, has been addressed only partially in Kibrik et al. [1972]; [Desheriev 1959], who has a long section on syntax (pp. 155-194), theoretically somewhat outdated theoretically. It is enough to say that none of the sources provides even as much as an exhaustive list of reflexivization devices.

The aim of this paper is twofold. On the one hand, it is a setting-off point for a further research of Khinalug syntax. I will try to summarize some of the data available so far on several aspects of the Khinalug syntax, first of all on main polypredicative constructions. This part, second in terms of the structure of the paper, is just a generalization of the data available from the sources, with some fresh blood brought as the examples from the Khinalug corpus (see below). Recent descriptions of East Caucasian languages, compiled by Aleksandr Kibrik and his field groups, are all results of team field work primarily based on grammatical questionnaires. It must be emphasized that the present paper build exclusively on the textual data of a relatively small corpus (about thirty texts), with no elicited data. It is clear that this research basis may provide enough data only for a patchwork description of the syntax of a language. I consider this to be only a starting point or a sort of a databank for a further field research. And even here corpus data comes in useful, as the section of the second part treating reflexive pronouns shows.

On the other hand, for some types of linguistic analysis, corpus data, however scarce they are, are in my opinion the only possible source, and no field work may help. These are discourse related phenomena as well as phenomena that are best viewed as tendencies than rules. The first part of the paper includes brief studies of several such topics in polypredicative construction, including the locus of overt presence of a participant NP shared by several predications (Section 1), the discourse use of the additive particle (Section 2) and the non-subordinating nature of the quotative particle (Section 3).

The corpus of Khinalug texts this research is based upon mainly consists of the texts collected and published in the 70s by Aleksandr Kibrik and his colleagues [Kibrik et al 1972]. The book included 18 texts with word-by-word and free translations but no morphological glossing. Starting from 2007, National Science Foundation supports a project of digitalization of the old corpus within the framework of the NSF project 'Five languages of Eurasia', that has been co-directed by Aleksandr Kibrik and Alexandre Nakhimosvkij (NSF ELDP 0553546). Field work on texts and their analysis back home were done by Aleksandr Kibrik, Sandro Kodzasov, Alexandre Arkhipov, Anna Khoroshkina and myself. The digitalization included field trips from 2008 to 2010, during which many new texts have been recorded, few of which have been transcribed and glossed. Currently the size of the corpus grew about twice its original size and

counts 28 texts of about 700 sentences or 5,000 word tokens.

As I explained above, the structure of the paper is as follows. Part 1 contains three short essays analyzing specific issues in polypredication. Part 2 is a preliminary account of what is known on some central issues of Khinalug syntax.

Part 1. Three issues in polypredication

Section 1. *Converb clauses: argument NP sharing*

Kibrik et al [1972] has several sections dedicated to the use of various converbs and other strategies of complex clause formation. This section focuses on the issue of overt / covert presence of NPs representing participants shared by the converbial and the main clause. Inasmuch this evidence is indicative of the relative syntactic status of the clauses, it seems that the clauses headed by the so called simple converb in Khinalug represent clausal co-ordination rather than subordination (cf. [Kibrik 2007]).

As in other East Caucasian languages, using conjunctions is not typical of Khinalug. The section on conjunctions in Desheriev [1959] contains some loan function words, and none of them is used for clausal co-ordination in the texts available to us. Some lexical items that might seem conjunctions are of a different nature (cf. sections on the additive particle *-m* and the quotative particle *-ki*). Strategies of complex clause formation are based on the use of converbs, participles and action nominals.

All converbs may be divided into simple (general) converb in *-jä* and various special converbs that specify temporal and logical relations between the finite clause and converbial clauses. Most frequently, a polypredicative construction is a sequence consisting of one or several predications headed by simple converbs followed by a predication headed by a finite verb. This chain designates a sequence of situations each of which follow the other. Simple converb, which in principle may be formed both from imperfective and perfective verbal bases, much more frequently occurs as a perfective converb:

(1)

c-χi-jä, *q unši* *ligil-ir* - *χinibir* *ka-ž-k'u-jä*,
2-go.PFV-CVB neighbour man-PL woman.PL LAT-4-do.PFV-CVB,

čka-zi-bi.

bring-4-go.PFV.PTCP

‘She went, collected neighbours, both men and women, and brought them.’

(2)

e, c'ingil – c'ingil – c'ingil – c'ingil ku-jä, hana saz-im ant-ir
eh twang twang twang twang **do.PFV-CVB** then saz-and ground-LOC
zä-b-u-k'u-jä, p'irrrr ku-jä uçmiş-f₁-i p-χi
down-3-?-do.PFV-CVB flutter do.PFV-CVB **fly-LV.PFV-PTCP** **3-go.PFV.PTCP**

‘He did twang-twang-twang, threw the saz down, fluttered around and flew away.’

As is common in East Caucasian languages, simple converbs do not have to share subject or any other argument with the finite predication. Cf.:

(3)

k'u č'uval čä-pi-jä, halamχer-i süri-lli lattı-ki
lamb ram run-LV.PFV-CVB **shepherd-?** herd-EL away-go.PFV.PTCP
p-χi-šä-mä činä čiχi dahar-i k'aanik'.
HPL-go.PFV-PST-ind one.OBL big rock-GEN under

‘The lamb and the ram having escaped, the shepherds when away from the herd and were wandering under a big rock.’

All these predications seem to be examples of subordination: they are headed by non-finite forms that all morphosyntactically depend on the finite predicate placed at the end of the sentence. By morphosyntactic dependence I mean that the use of the converbs is licensed by the use of the finite predicate; a sentence that only contains converbs is ungrammatical. The syntactic status of the converbial predication is less clear.

As syntactic evidence, I will consider the locus of a fuller reference to a participant shared by several predications. Of all possible configurations (full NP – full NP; full NP – pronominal expression; full NP – zero; pronominal expression – zero), the Khinalug corpus provides relatively rich evidence only on pairs full NP – zero, which is the main data considered below. (Cf. the different agenda of Kibrik [2007], who studies NP – pronoun distributions on elicited data across the languages of the family). My assumption is that if the locus depends on factors other than (non)finiteness of the clause – as it seems indeed to be the case – converbial clauses should not be considered as syntactic subordination.

Indeed, in (4) the ergative NP (sparrow) unambiguously belongs to the transitive converbial predication; in the intransitive finite predication, the co-referent nominative NP is dropped. In (5), on the other hand, the intransitive converbial predication contains a nominative NP (they), whose ergative co-referent in the transitive finite

predication is absent.

(4)

sin-im le-s-q'awi, činā c'imir-i sa däst-ä tik,an č'i-jä
once=and look-2-COND one.OBL **sparrow-ERG** one bunch thorn hold.PFV-CVB
ka-bi-β-šä-mä
here-3-go-PST-ind

'Then she looks, there came a sparrow holding a bunch of thorns.'

(5)

hoz mik'ilga al-ft-jä so-r, dä häkajä
they.HPL.NOM in.evening down-go.PFV-CVB village-LOC this.3 story
žamäfät-u söhbät kui-šä-mä
people-DAT conversation do.PFV-PST-ind

'In the evening they went down to the village and told this story to the villagers.'

In (6), the translation suggests that the question word (P) is shared by the converb and the finite predication:

(6)

davistan,i täpä-r χi-jä, ja če-k'u-jä, q'in-i
Daghestan-GEN mountain-PL go.PFV-CVB, **what** sell-do-CVB, eat.PFV-PTCP
gäχ-k-wi-du?
turn-go.IPFV-1

'When they went to Daghestan mountains, what did they sell, (what) did they eat?'

In (7), the fact that the P, shared by the converbial and finite clause, belongs to the former, is clear from the fact that it is placed between the adjunct 'from their house' and the converb verb 'having stolen':

(7)

hin-i hindä hina q'ar-u il-li ut-ullu hanim vaxt-ir hä
he.ERG ? this.OBL old.woman-DAT here-EL there-EL then time-LOC **that**
hot-ur c'vo-lli kartiška, pšä, q'afin, q'änd,
that.FAM.GEN house-EL potato bread drink sugar,
če bla-ku-jä q'ar-u la-t-ar-šä-mä.
tea **thief-do-CVB** old.woman-DAT bring-AUX-PST-ind

'At that time, for this old woman, from here and from there, he stole from their house potatoes, bread, drinks, sugar and brought all this to the old woman.'

Other evidence is based on word order. If there is an A or S/P common to a converb(s)-finite verb chain, and there is no constituency evidence such as in (7), it is

impossible to decide whether it belongs to the converb predication or to the finite predication which, then, embraces the converbial clause. The fact remains that, more often than not, such arguments are placed in sentence initial position rather than together with the finite verb form.

(8) shared A

q̣ar-i *tenčqu-jä* *tik₁an*, *t̄unor-ur* *č̄äš-i*
 [old.woman-ERG [take-CVB thorn] stove-LOC put-PFV] or
 [old.woman-ERG take-CVB thorn] [stove-LOC put-PFV]

‘The old woman took the thorn and put it into the stove’.

(9) shared P

pišä *č̄i-la-fi-jä* *halamχer-u* *la-k’ui*
 [bread [hold-LAT-LV.PFV-CVB] shepherd-DAT away-give.PFV.PTCP] or
 [bread hold-LAT-LV.PFV-CVB] [shepherd-DAT away-give.PFV.PTCP]

‘Having brought the bread, he gave it to the shepherd’.

These examples are ambiguous as to whether the shared argument belongs to the finite or the infinite clause. The first analyses above suggest that the finite predication frames the converbial one, and that the main participant, though placed before the converbial construction, belongs to the finite clause.

There are several counterarguments against this interpretation. First, the argument of the finite clause shows tendency to be fronted only when it is also the argument of the converbial clause; when they are not, they remain with the finite verb. Second, adverbs of the finite clause do not seem to be fronted. Third, for cases like (1) above, where the shared argument is placed between the first and the second converb, we are supposed to have to posit sophisticated (though not impossible) configurations, which seem to be unnecessary complications (especially given the examples where there is a mismatch between case marking in the finite and converbial clause like (4) and (5) in the first place). An additional argument could be provided by considering intonational contours of the clauses, assuming that whenever the argument NP constitutes a single intonational unit with the converb, it belongs with it.

On the whole, it seems that, in a chain of clauses sharing an argument, there is a strong preference to put the argument in the first clause of the chain and assign to it the case marking licensed by this first clause rather than by the finite verb. That this is a tendency, not a rule, is shown by (10); the argument shared by the two converbial

clauses appear in the second one rather than in the first one. As discussed in the end of the section, there may be other factors (first of all semantic role and morphosyntactic status of the shared noun phrase); but the corpus does not provide enough evidence to (dis)prove their presence.

(10)

hīlam-ill_i tenč-qu-jä, moll-e ätraf-ir sa dairä
 donkey-EL take.from-LV.PFV-CVB **molla-GEN** around-LOC one circle
čäkmiš-ku-jä li-ki ...
 draw-LV.PFV-CVB say.PFV=that...

‘Having brought him down from the donkey, they drew a circle around him and said:...’

The next example shows a deviation from the principle of placing the finite predication as the last element of the chain. Although this example would be in conformity with the general principle of placing the shared argument into the first clause (here, the first clause being finite rather than converbial), the fact remains that the temporal sequence of events is inversed which, I believe, makes an important difference with the examples considered so far.

(11)

molla sä q’ä hin-e χinimk’ir-iškili q’onši so-r
 molla one time this.OBL-GEN woman-COMIT neighbour village-LOC
la-k’o-e-šä hīlam_i g’ivī-jä
 sl.EL-go-AUX-PST **donkey-?** **mount.3.PFV-CVB**

‘Molla and his wife once went to the neighboring village, having mounted a donkey.’

Some uses of the general converb are independent from the one discussed above. Together with finite verbs, converbs may form semantic units that should not, probably, be analyzed as polypredication at all. In (12), the converb and the finite verb look like an idiomatic complex. In (13), as the translation by the native speakers suggest, the lexical verb conveys an aspectual (Aktionsart) type of meaning. In (14), the function of the finite verb is to introduce reported speech, while the lexical meaning, again, is conveyed by the converb.

(12)

*q’ä-bir hasim ka-**vi-jä** la^ā-k’o-ar-šä-mä.*
 day-PL thus **LAT-go.PFV-CVB** **EL-go.IPFV-AUX-PST-ind**

‘Days were thus coming and going.’

(13)
činä buzov-iχ čimi sa č'uval c'imir-u lä-k'u-jä
 this.OBL bread-AD in.exchange one sheep sparrow-DAT EL-give.PFV-CVB
or-k-u-i
send-LV-PFV

'In exchange for this bread (they) gave the sparrow one sheep.'

(14)
c'imiri c'ar-ku-jä liki ...
 sparrow-ERG yell-do-CVB say-that <...>

'The sparrow yelled: ...'

To sum up, the locus where the shared participant is expressed (converbial vs. finite clause) seems to be determined more by the relative order of the clauses than by their finiteness. It seems typical to have it expressed at the beginning of the chain rather than together with the finite predicate. What remains to be seen, however, is whether this pattern is prohibited / dispreferred / similarly widespread with other types of clauses. As comparative evidence, let us consider two forms, the purposive *-su* and one of the special converbs, the temporal *-soχ*.

The form derives directly from the verbal base, expresses the purpose (with some functional extensions) and, possibly, originates from a combination of a now non-transparent suffix *-s* with the dative suffix *-u*. Just as is the case with general converbs, the purposive clause is most often placed to the left from the finite verb. Unlike general converbs, there seems to be a preference for participant sharing, and in most cases the shared participant is the S/A (the latter may be explained by semantics of the purpose). Contexts where it is not so – cf. (15) with a shared P and impersonal (16) with no participants shared – are rare.

(15)
q-li-dur žämäfat kil-bi-β-ät, anžax v-u-k'u-r-su
 play-IPFV-that.HPL people gather-HPL-go-AUX, only 3-slaughter-LV-IPFV-PURP
ħajvan₁-i ävüz piχra at, piχra v-u-k'-r-at
 cattle-GEN instead dog be, dog 3-slaughter-LV-IPFV-AUX

'Musicians, villagers all gathered, but instead of a ram there is (but) a dog to be slaughtered, they are slaughtering a dog.'

(16)

hinä täräf-ir ink č'uv-ur-su rähät-ž-mä.
that.OBL side-LOC grass mow-IPFV-PURP easy-4-cop

'It is easy to mow on that side.'

Further, there are two cases where the shared argument appears within the purpose clause:

(17)

kät'id-inz-i sä xin-iš maflizä ki-r-su
Khinalug-PL-ERG this.N.OBL water-Poss ? do-IPFV-PURP

k'až-γi-t-ar-mä.

use-LV-IPFV-AUX-ind

'The Khinalugs use this water to prepare drugs (?)'.

(18)

hoz-i q'ättigä pšä q'an-dä-su činel kil-bi-β-šä-mä.
that.PL-ERG at.noon bread eat-IPFV-PURP together gather-HPL-go-PST-ind

'They met to have a meal at noon'.

In these cases, again, it seems that the linear order of the clauses determines where the shared argument is expressed. All other occurrences, on the other hand, are either ambiguous, as (19), where both finite and purpose clauses are intransitive, or clearly indicate that the NP belongs to the finite clause, as in (20), where the or (21), where the purpose clause, containing an experiential verb, would ascribe experiential dative, or in (21), where the main clause is intransitive and the purpose clause is transitive. Note also that, unlike general converb clauses, there are cases where the shared argument is located to the right of the converb clause (15), which is in conflict with the linear principle; there seem to be no such occurrences in the case of general converb chains.

(19)

säq'ä sa alim-jä sa halamχer dərjah-ir k'at-k'u-su
once one scholar-and one shepherd see-LOC walk-go.IPFV-PURP

la-p-χi

EL-HPL-go.PFV.PTCP

'One day a scholar and a shepherd went to sail in the sea.'

(20)

vĭ pšo pan üs la-k'u-i-d-u=ki, č'añ-i
you three hundred year EL-go.IPFV-PTCP-1-INTRG=that crow-GEN

jaš-im muxu-ki-r-su?
age=and known-do-IPFV-PURP

‘Are you going to live three hundred years to learn the age of the crow?’

(21)

halamχer-ir t'ač-fĭ v-oku-šä-mä, k'ič'ir-χer k'ič'ir
shepherd-PL stand.up-LV HPL-run-PST-ind **lamb.PL-herd** lamb

žürä-kü-r-su, **halamχer** halam žürä-kü-r-su.
different-do-IPFV-PURP **shepherd** sheep different-make-IPFV-PURP

‘The shepherds stood up and ran, the lamb-shepherd (ran) to separate the lamb, the sheep-shepherd (ran) to separate the sheep.’

Let us now consider the temporal converb in *-soχ*. The form is derived directly from the verbal base, conveys the meaning of precedence (the situation expressed by the finite clause occurs after the situation expressed by *-soχ*-clause), and, just as the purposive marker, probably comes back to a combination of the same suffix *-s* with the Poss (Apud) localization marker *-χ*. What makes it less similar to purpose clauses is that the form is most often followed by a nominal postposition *totuχ* ‘after’. In all occurrences in the corpus, the converb clause precedes the finite clause. There seem to be no preference for argument sharing: in about half of the examples, the two clauses do not have common arguments (22):

(22)

pšä q'insoχ totuχ, halam=jä k'ič'ir sa-r-činä-sir šic'ilic'-šä-mä.
bread eat-ANTE after sheep=and lamb.PL one-NMLZ-one.OBL-DAT mix-PST-ind

‘After they had a meal, the sheep and the lambs mixed.’

In those cases where the arguments are shared, both its expression in the finite clause and in the temporal converb clause are equally attested:

(23) S/A expressed in the converb clause

halam-χer hu-ton χi-k-soχ totuχ, hä č'uval tal-tu-q'-šä-mä.
sheep-herd so.much **go-LV-ANTE** after this.N ram LAT-LB-cause-PST-ind

‘After the shepherd went (after it) around for some time, (he) brought the ram back’.

(24) S/P expressed in the main clause

q'i-säχ *totuχ* *hä* *ink* *taja-r* *liq'-t-ar-mä.*
dry.PFV-ANTE after **this.N** **grass** sheaf-LOC **put-IPFV-AUX-ind**

‘After it (the hay) has dried, they put it into sheaves.’

In other words, it seems that, unlike purpose clauses discussed above, the temporal converb clauses are similar to general converb clauses in that the linear position may be a factor in choosing the locus of expression of the shared participant. On the other hand, they allow configurations that are not observed with general converbs – in (24), the shared argument appears in the finite clause, to the right of the clause that first refers to it.

This intermediate position of *-soχ*-clauses is supported by the following indirect evidence. In two cases, when the NP appears in the temporal converb clause to the left, the finite clause to the right contains a co-referent pronoun.

(25)

dä *žubab-irdir* *k'ič'ir-χer-iš* *li-soχ* *totuχ*
this.N answer-PL **lamb.PL-herd-POSS** say.PFV-ANTE after

hu *iχer* *mähtäl* *j-äc'in-šä-mä*
this.1 very amazed 1-remain-PST-ind

‘When he reported these words to the lamb herd, the latter was quite astonished.’

(26)

ki *v-uk'-soχ* *totuχ,* *hin-i* *q'ursax* *žürä*
ram 3-slaughter-ANTE after **that.OBL-GEN** stomach different

tuv-t-ar-mä.
take.4-IPFV-AUX-ind

‘After having slaughtered the ram, they took its stomach apart.’

That may, in principle, be considered as evidence that the special converb ~ finite verb clauses are less syntactically equal than general converb ~ finite verb, as the latter do not show this pattern in our data.

To sum up this section, in the available corpus data, the three types of clauses seem to behave differently with respect to the rules of overt expression of the shared participants. General converb chains ending with a finite form tend to prefer to express the NP in the first clause whose predicative structure includes it as an argument; thus, in chains of argument sharing converbs the shared argument appears in the first clause. Purpose clauses tend to cede the priority to the finite clause so that, when they are

placed before the finite clause (which seems to be the majority of the contexts), the shared argument follows in the next clause. Temporal precedence clauses seem to be intermediate: they show the presence of both patters.

Note that these observations may only be preliminary because of the size of the corpus; thus, purpose clauses have only 18 occurrences, and temporal clauses have 15 occurrences. Also, the factor that should obviously be controlled in further analysis is the semantic role and especially grammatical relation held by the NP in the clause. It might well prove that the S/P grammatical relation, controlling the agreement on the verb, and probably the discourse prominent semantic role of A, requires overt expression to a lesser extent than non-core arguments and NPs marked by oblique cases. That could explain examples such as (17).

Section 2. *Reported speech: quotative construction*

Khinalug's main quotative construction, that with the quotative particle *-ki*, may at first glance look as subordination. Below, I try to show that *-ki* is not a complementizer, and argue that it probably has a different function which is independent of the subordination / co-ordination dimension: that of point of view, thus similar to the function of logophoricity (as understood, e.g., in [Huang 2002]).

The particle *-ki* is enclitic to the verb of the main clause (or, much more rarely, to another constituent) which, in these cases, is invariably placed in the clause final position. The quotative particle thus marks the boundary between the speech predication and the reported speech clause.

(27)

hoz-š-illi čināw-i li=ki: “ja həjardä ric'in”.
 they.OBL-POSS-EL one.OBL-ERG say.PFV.PTCP=that, what beautiful stone

‘One of them said: what a beautiful stone!’

(28)

q'ar₁-i halamxer₁-iš li=ki: “žan bala,
 old.woman-ERG shepherd-POSS say.PFV=that, VOC child,
asir=im hinä q'ičär-ir, sa t'ing al til-q'u-jä, tä”.
 I.DAT=and this.OBL cup-LOC one drop milk milk-3-do-CVB give.here.IMP

‘The old woman said to the shepherd: Sonny, milk me a drop of milk into this cup.’

(29)

q̄ar₁-i *halamχer-u* *q̄arβiš* *kwi=ki* “*vi* *k’ač’in*
old.woman-ERG shepherd-DAT curse do.PFV=that, you stone
j-aχ *k̄w-a*”.
1-let become.IPFV-JUSS

‘The old woman cursed the shepherd: You turn into a stone!’

Interestingly, all cases of reported speech show direct reporting. It preserves original speaker’s deictic perspective, including the use of personal pronouns and the use of volitional moods and forms of address. It is unclear whether *-ki* (or other construction) may introduce indirect speech reporting clause at all, and whether there is any device similar to logophoric uses of the reflexive pronoun in other East Caucasian languages.

The construction extends to reported thought, as in (30). By way of further expansion, example (31) is an expletive clause, in (32) it clearly introduces the cause, and in (33) it introduces the purpose clause.

(30)

hin-u *hanim* *säčini* *q’-i-ki* *hīlam-zir* *k’o-a*.
this.OBL-DAT thus as.if become-PFV-that donkey-PL become-be

‘It seemed to her (to her it became as if) they were donkeys.’

(31)

zī *ävāli* *hinä-χ* *χäkin-i=ki*, *ži* *hä* *sa* *misi* *sa* *zad*
I first this.OBL-AD laugh-PTCP=that, this.4 that.4 one small one thing
ha *zuṭon* *žämäsät-iš-illi* *heč-kiš-u* *dä*
that how.many community-POSS-EL at.all-who.OBL-DAT this.3
muxo-ndä-val
know-PTCP.NEG-NMLZ

‘First I laughed that out of so vast a community not a single one knew this small thing.’

(32)

hin-ä *žig-i* *c’u* *hanim-zabi* *č’af* *bi-q’i-dä-mä=ki*,
this.OBL place-GEN name thus.far-CAUSAL Chaf 3-become-3-ind=that
hin-ä *č’af-ir* *č’oz*, *cuvaz-ir* *č’eb-i* *č’uval₁-i*
this.OBL Chaf-LOC in.spring, autumn-LOC sit.3-PFV sheep-ERG
hin-ä *žig-e* *ink-š-illi* *heč* *sa* *χeri* *tuv-aṭ₁-i*.
this.OBL place-GEN grass-POSS-EL none one profit take-be-ind

‘The name of this place since then has become Chaf (damp pasture), because the sheep that remain in this Chaf, during spring and autumn time, they receive no profit from

the grass of this place.’

(33)

hā ki gāräg āniš žīgä v-uk’u-r-at-kwa=ki,
well, ram must slanted place 3-slaughter-IPFV-be-DEBIT=that

hin-i p’i tāmīš ant-ir v-aχ kʷ-a.
this.OBL-GEN blood clean ground-LOC 3-let go.IPFV-JUSS

‘Well now, a ram must be slaughtered on a slanting surface so that its blood would go over clean grounds.’

In the last example, note the use of the jussive form, which at least formally connects this construction with true reported speech (cf. similar use with the other quotative construction in 41). The following example shows that the particle may introduce the speaker’s own point of view (amounting to epistemic modality) rather than the point of view of the subject of the main clause:

(34)

hālbāt=ki, uzab-ill_i ka-bi-βi hādmi-r-z-u borž=mä.
certainly=that far-EL LAT-HPL-go.PFV.PTCP man-PL-OBL.PL duty=cop

‘Of course it is (our) duty (to show respect) towards people who came from far away.’

All these examples suggest subordinating interpretation of the particle *-ki*. However, there are some arguments against this. General considerations make it strange to have a dependent clause situated strictly to the right of the main clause in a left-branching language; also, there is not a single occurrence of the quote being inserted into the presumably main clause (cf. 40 below). Further evidence that the particle is not a means of subordination comes from the following two examples, where it does not introduce any clause at all; the expletive clauses ‘there is no one like Rahim’ and ‘you will come in the evening’ are omitted in an ellipsis-like way:

(35){a}

at_i-i-d_i-i=ki
be-PTCP-1-NEG=that

‘[There is no one like Rahim] – There is no one? [– No one at all].’

(36)

han=im ksan k`wi-ž-mä=ki?
what-and good become.IPFV-4-ind=that

‘[- You’ll come in the evening.] Won’t it be good (that you will come back in the evening? [- It will be ok.])’

In (37), subordination is marked by the special (CAUSAL) converb. It seems that the construction would be grammatical even without *-ki* (though of course this remains to be checked):

(37)

sav ulsun p`adšahi=ki, dä pensije pıl-dır laşq`ir-zabi.
thanks government-that, this retirement money-PL provide.4-CAUSAL

‘We are grateful to the state for paying (us) retirement money.’

(38)

vi pšo pan üs la-k`u-i-d-u=ki,
you three hundred year same.level.EL-go.IPFV-PTCP-1-INTRG=that

č`aň-i jaš=im muxu=ki-r-su?
crow-GEN age-and know-become-IPFV-PURP

‘Are you going to live three hundred years to learn the crow’s age?’

In one case, the particle is used in a conditional construction, but its syntax is unclear:

(39)

ňükümät-i hinel ägär=ki, sa dänä näzär-ir t`uv-undä-q`ali,
state-ERG there if-that one a.little look-LOC take.4-PTCP.NEG-COND,

joχsa kir-i guž lač`vin-dä-ž-i-mä.
or.if incl-GEN strength suffice-IPFV-4-NEG-ind

‘If the state will not pay attention a little bit, our own resources will not be enough.’

To sum up, the quotative particle *-ki* does not seem to function as a subordinator. Prosodically, it belongs to its host, the last (usually predicative) word of the first clause; the reporting clause always follows the speech predication, which is unusual for a left-branching language. The use of the particle is not associated with any kind of indirect strategy of speech reporting (whether indirect reporting exists at all in Khinalug remains to be seen), introducing all types of both finite and non-finite clauses, volitional forms and forms of addresses and preserving the original speaker’s deictic perspective. The particle does not require the presence of the second clause which may be omitted under certain contextual conditions (clausal ellipsis). Using or not-using the

particle is thus independent from the syntactic construction: in some examples the clause introduced by *-ki* is independently marked for subordination. It seems, then, that what *-ki* does is marking personal perspective; the clause following the particle reflects the subject's (usually that of the previous clause but sometimes also the actual speaker) state of mind, including speech, thought, or intention (cf. the discussion of logophoricity in [Huang 2002]).

There is also at least one alternative strategy of reporting using the perfective converb *lijä* 'having said' following the reported clause. The verb of speech is void of its lexical meaning and used in a complementizer-like function to introduce a clause. Note that, here again, the reported clause is direct speech, even though it is inserted into the main clause (the adverb precedes the reported clause).

(40)

hinel "aj *dahar*, *xiric'* *dahar*, *xiric'* *dahar*" *lijä*
 there hey rock white rock white rock say-PFV-CVB

c'ar-ku-i-šä-mä.

yell-do-PTCP-PST-ind

'There he shouted: Hey, rock, white rock, white rock!'

(41)

ist'armejram *čä-s-pi-n-si-zī* *li-jä,* *hun₁-i* *ägni-r*
 witch run-2-LV-PSBL-PROH-2 say.PFV-CVB that.N-GEN clothes-LOC

sanžab-irdir *zaš-k'₁-i.*

needle-PL stuck-LV.PFV-PTCP

'They stuck needles into the witch's clothes so that she could not run away'

In the last example, the same typologically and areally widespread semantic shift to purpose is attested as with the particle *-ki*. What is interesting is the use of the prohibitive form, literally 'having said, let the witch not run away' in the sense of 'so that the witch could not run away'; this is the same pattern we have seen above in (33).

Section 3. Additive particle: predicative uses

The additive particle *-m* may be used on the first co-ordinand in NP coordination, as in (42).

(42)

rāhim, za-h, gi k'ala-ll_i ja lazim-ži-q'i,
Rahim down-go.IMP ? Quba-EL what need-4-COND
va vuχur=um, šir-u=m či-qal-ir.
you.ERG you.DAT=and, we.OBL-DAT=and hold-up-IMP

‘Rahim, go down, if there is anything needed from Quba, you bring it up for you and for us.’

However, being very frequent in the corpus (81 occurrences), this is the only occurrence of the additive particle as an NP coordinator. Other cases of co-ordination use the particles *ja* or *sam*, and many are simple juxtaposition. The additive particle otherwise functions as a discourse linker attached to a non-verbal constituent of a clause. Most often it is attached to the first constituent; typically, it seems, the host is the NP designating the main participant: the nominative with intransitive verbs, the ergative with transitive verbs, sometimes the dative with experiential verbs; but it may also be placed on a spatial or temporal adjunct.

(43) nominative host

šošu=um tamam-bi-q'i
tale=and end-3-become.PFV.PTCP

‘And the tale ends (here)’

(44) nominative host (headless NP)

sa žürä-dä=m i-š či-k'i-n-ku-dä-mä,
one **other-this.N=and** I.OBL-POSS talk-PSBL-become.IPFV-3-Ind

sa gižä-dä.
one short-that.N

‘I can tell yet another (tale), a short one.’

(45) ergative host

hoz_i=m kir-e mic' sic'i-r-to-mä.
that.PL-ERG=and incl.OBL-GEN language write-IPFV-AUX-ind

‘They are writing down our language.’

(46) experiential dative host

q_iar-u=m, al cul-orun, suk'ur-ar mit'ir za-bi-β_i-i.
old.woman-DAT=and milk drink-TEMP cup-LOC dung see-3-go.PFV-PTCP

‘The old woman, when she was drinking milk, found the dung in her cup.’

(47) hosted by a spatial adjunct

hotur c'wa=m sa misi riši at-zi-q'-dä.
that.PL.FAM house.in=and one small girl be-2-AUX-2

‘In their house there was a small girl.’

(48) hosted by a temporal adverb

χisansan=im jir činel tü-dur-šä-mä.
last.night=and we there there-HPL-PST-ind

‘Yesterday night we went to a certain place.’

In the following two contexts, the hosts are possessors, but they, too, are in the sentence initial position and seem to be free (floating) genitives. This analysis is more obvious in the first case, where the possessor and the possessum are separated by other material, but can be tentatively extended to the second case, where they are in contact position.

(49) hosted by a floating possessor

boz₁-i=m ma čarä q'-ät₁-i iχer luv₁-i
this.HPL-GEN=and ptcl solution become-AUX-NEG a.lot pull.PFV-PTCP

‘Well, they had no solution’ (they couldn’t help it)

(50) hosted by a floating (?) possessor

i=m kul lačχin-dä-zad-i-mä, inqer hädmi zi=m.
I.OBL.INAL=and hand reach-IPFV?-NEG-ind old man I.NOM=and

‘My hand does not reach it (=I can do nothing about it), either, I am old, ain’t I.’

Although in all these cases the particle invariably attaches to an NP head, it seems that there are two types of the additive particle’s usage: one where its scope is an NP (or even narrower) and one where its scope includes the whole clause. Cf. the following case:

(51)

jaχ č'i-t-wa=ki nukar₁-i kol₁i sa hīlam=im
1-let say-IPFV-JUSS=that servant-INAL at one donkey=and
at-bi-q'-ät-mä, q'obuχ-urdur=um hīlam₁-i q'in-ät-mä
be-3-become-be-ind, shell-PL=and donkey-ERG eat-AUX-ind

‘Let them say that there was a donkey with the servant, and the skin was eaten by the donkey.’

The context is a Molla Nasreddin story where he starts by eating a water melon

in someone’s garden he passes on his way; then, feeling hungry again, comes back to finish the skin. He says to himself, let the owner of the garden think that the man (the servant), who ate the water melon, also had a donkey who ate the skin. The first use of the additive particle focuses the newly introduced referent, donkey. The second use, which I will call ‘linker’, does not however introduce the shells, that have been mentioned in the previous text – it is the whole predication that is under the particle’s scope.

The particle which focuses NP often has a contrastive value (52); in (53), though the particle is hosted by the head noun, it contrasts the attribute, not the whole NP.

(52) contrasted NPs

zi=m an-u, zi=m anä.
I.NOM=and go.HORT-INTRG, **I.NOM=and** go.HORT

‘Shouldn’t I go, too? I should go too.’

(53) contrasted attributes

dä xu jäläsäb azar-dur-u=m ksan därmän=mä.
 this water ? illness-PL-DAT=and good medicine=cop.

bäfzi içäri azar-dur-u=m sä xin₁-i xejri iχer=mä.
 some inner **illness-PL-DAT=and** this-OBL water-INAL profit a.lot=cop

‘This water is a good medicine also for psychological illnesses. This water is very useful for **inner** illnesses, too’.

When the whole predication is within the scope of the particle, however, there seem to be no contrastive function, as in the following example or in most of the examples above.

(54) linker

gänä dahaar-i=m žuab lä-k’ui-šä-mä=ki xiric’ dahaar
 after **rock-ERG=and** response away-give.PFV-PST-ind=that white rock

xiric’ dahaar
 white rock

‘Again the white rock replied: white rock, white rock!’

It seems a plausible suggestion that the discourse function of the particle correlates with its position in the clause. The clause initial position is typically taken by the NP designating the main participant or an adjunct; the main participant NP may also follow the clause initial adjunct, as in the above example. This seems to be the

particle's default location; when hosted by such (nearly) initial constituent, it may have either this constituent or the whole clause in its scope.

(55) clause initial, contrastive

gäši, unk₁-i-m gäši.
close.PFV.PTCP **lock-ERG=and** close.PFV.PTCP

'I closed it, I locked it'. (= closed it with a lock)

(56) clause initial, linker

hot_{ur} c'wa=m sa misi riši at-zi-q'-dä.
they.FAM house.in=and one small girl be-2-AUX-2

'They had a small girl'. (= in their house there was a small girl).

On the other hand, in the few cases when the particle is hosted by a constituent in a different position, it tends to have this constituent rather than the whole clause in its scope:

(57) non-clause initial, contrastive:

mäsälä hinel q'o-mä=ki hä jaza-q'i heč asi=m
matter then be-ind=that that.N what-indef at.all **I.DAT=and**

muxo-äť-i-mä
known-be-NEG-ind

'The matter is that I do not know what it is **myself!**'

Cf. similar examples above. Another use of the additive particle is typical of East Caucasian languages but is irrelevant for this discussion; in combination with negation, it is used to express meanings like 'not a single X':

(58)

hinä halamiš tāk sa-dä=m v-ač'in-dä-d-i-mä.
this.PL.OBL sheep-POSS one **one-3.NOM=and** 3-remain-IPFV-3-NEG-ind

'Not a single one of these sheep survives.'

(59)

heč=im at₁-i-d₁-i-mä.
nothing=and be-PTCP-1-NEG-ind

'Nothing (at all).'

Part 2.

Unlike Part 1 which contains some new observations on the discourse behavior of several forms and particles, Part 2 has a more modest intention to survey complementation, already discussed in [Kibrik et al 1972], supplying naturalistic examples of this from the corpus; and morphology (but not syntax for which too few data are available) of reflexivization devices. Reflexive forms are surprisingly ignored by all available sources except [Ganieva 2002], whose data, however, are somewhat different from the corpus evidence.

Section 1. Complement Clauses

Complement clauses in Khinalug are based either on participles (imperfective participle in the vast majority of the cases) or action nominals. Subordinated uses of the participles are lexically limited to several matrix verbs (not to mention relativization which is not considered here). Action nominals as non-finite predication, on the other hand, seem to be a default and universal strategy which competes with the participles with some verbs as well as cover other functions, including clausal subjects and, if case marked, adverbial clauses. The latter are also widely expressed by the so-called special (as opposed to general) converbs, specifying temporal and logical relations between the main and the dependent clauses (causal converb, several temporal converbs and several conditional converbs; for details see [Kibrik et al. 1972] and [Kerimov 1985]).

Khinalug has no infinitive as a morphological category. The category that corresponds closest to the infinitive is the purposive suffix *-su* (mentioned in Part 1 of this paper). However, if anything else than purposive, it may only be called a supine; the *-su*-suffix marks ‘complements’ of movement verbs and various purpose clauses. Phase verbs like ‘begin’ or ‘cease’ only combine with participles, never with action nominals or the purposive form. The infinitives of some other East Caucasian languages have developed from datives; it seems that the Khinalug purposive (supine) *-su* may have followed a similar path (cf. dative *-u*) but has not yet reached the infinitival stage through extension to phase verbs. As for the modal verbs, they may have complements other than infinitives even in those East Caucasian languages that do have infinitives; in Khinalug, they are either based on morphologically complex modal forms (possibilitive, debitive) or follow the participial strategy. This is briefly discussed at the

end of this section.

Unlike some other East Caucasian languages, the general converb does not seem to provide a means for complementation.

Participles as complement clauses

This section considers the verbs that introduce participial complement clauses. Note that the form called participle in Khinalug may head an independent clause; in fact, the perfective participle is the most frequent narrative finite perfective verb form (aorist). The finite use of the imperfective participle is rather rare [Kibrik et al. 1972: 168], but it does occur in this function to convey the present durative.

(60) The perfective participle in finite function

q̄ar-i *tenč-qu-jä* *tik,an,* *īunor-ur* *č̄äši,*
old.woman-ERG take-LV-CVB thorn stove-LOC put.PFV.PTCP

č̄ä *laž-q'u* *žigä-lli* *č̄ä* *gurhagur* – *gurhagur* *juv₁-i*
fire set-CAUS.PFV place-EL fire pah pah **burn.PFV-PTCP**

‘The old woman took the thorns, put them into the fire, she set up fire, the fire went pah-pah and flared up.’

(61) Imperfective participles in finite function

etsi *mida-dir-ill₁* *ura* *un-k'u-r-i,* *geoliğ-ir,*
this mountain-PL-EL iron search-LV-IPFV-PTCP geologist-PL

č̄i-r-i, *k'at-k'w-i.*
say-IPFV-PTCP(PRS) **walk-LV-IPFV-PTCP(PRS)**

‘In these mountains geologists wander, they say, searching iron.’

In principle, one could argue that using these forms in subordination, as discussed below, is the use of finite forms in dependent clauses. Calling this strategy participial is based more on systemic and comparative data. First, other non-finite forms (converbs, purposive etc.) may not serve as unmarked finite forms; adopting this solution for participles would then be exceptional. Second, subordinated participial clauses are attested also in those East Caucasian languages where finite uses of participles are clearly peripheral, participles being morphologically dedicated non-finite forms. Finally, the forms are mirror distributed in the main and dependent clauses: the imperfective participle is by far more frequent strategy for sentential complementation than the perfective one, while the finite use of the latter are by far more frequent than those of the former.

Below I provide examples for the verbs ‘let’, ‘want’, ‘know’, ‘begin’ and ‘cease’ as well as some additional constructions.

Several volitional constructions are based on the verb ‘let’. These constructions are strongly morphologized and considered by Kibrik as analytical volitional moods (jussive etc). When the same verbal root occurs independently, it introduces a dependent clause with the imperfective participle:

(62)

šir-e *mümkün* *t'o-q'i-q'äšin,* *jir* *kulgalib,-i* *t'al-ill₁i*
 we.OBL-GEN possibility be-become-CVB.IRR, we(ERG) Kulgalyg-GEN edge-EL
däväč-i *lant'in* *sa* *k'ind* *lač'i-p-χi-r-dä-šä,* *č'uval₁-i* *ink₁a-mzir*
 Devichja-GEN until one bridge put-3-LV-IPFV-3-PST sheep-GEN leg-PL
näm-iš *žigä-bir-ir* *χäl-k-ri* *v-a-χi-r-d₁-i-šä.*
 damp-? place-PL-LOC step-do-IPFV 3-let-LV-IPFV-3-NEG-PST

‘If we could, we would build a bridge from the edge of Kulgalyg to Devichja, so that the sheep would not put their feet on damp places.’

The matrix verb ‘want’ also subordinates an imperfective participle and agrees with the nominative NP of the embedded clause.

(63)

as *č'ä* *laž-q'i-r-i* *j-u-kw-at*
 I.DAT fire set-CAUS-IPFV-PTCP 4-want-become-AUX

‘I want to make a fire.’

(64)

dä *ki* *v-u-k'u-r-i* *bi-ži-bi-q'i.*
 this ram 3-slaughter-?-IPFV-PTCP 3-want-3-become.PFV.PTCP

‘They wanted to slaughter this ram.’

Kibrik et al (1972) mentions a volitional idiom based on the existential construction (‘to be to P’) which also introduces a participial clause (76); it does not, however, occur in the corpus. In one case in the corpus, the verb ‘want’ combines with an action nominals (see (71) below). Kibrik also provides examples with verbs of speech manipulation such as ‘permit’, ‘suggest’ and ‘agree’ and some other, which all combine with participial subordination (p. 199). Many modal meanings are expressed morphologically rather than lexically; these are discussed at the end of this section.

The matrix verb ‘begin’ subordinates an imperfective participle. It is unclear

which argument controls its agreement as the verbal stem does not have a class agreement position, and there are no complex verbal forms with secondary class agreement position in the corpus.

(65)

hinä-χ totuχ hoz,-i hinä täp-i gus χnä
 this.OBL-AD after they-ERG this.OBL hill-GEN top henna
c'i-li č'aχ-ši.
 4.plant-IPFV.PTCP begin-LV.PFV.PTCP

‘From that time, they started to grow henna on the top of this hill.’

The matrix predicate ‘know’, which is formally a combination of an adjective ‘known’ with an auxiliary predicative morpheme, subordinates an imperfective converb. In those forms where the auxiliary has a class agreement slot, it contains the marker of the default class 4, which means that the controller is the subordinate clause on the whole:

(66)

č'k'i-ri muxwí-ž-u
 talk-IPFV know-4-INTRG?

‘Can you talk?’

The matrix predicate ‘stop’ is formally a combination of an adjective ‘complete’ with light verbs ‘become’ or ‘do’; the distribution is unclear, but it may depend on the transitivity of the embedded verb. It is the only predicate that subordinates a perfective participle. It agrees with the S/P argument of the embedded predicate (there is actually no evidence as to whether this argument belongs to the main or to the subordinate clause).

(67)

q'in-i tamam-ku-soχ totuχ c'imir to-p-χun,-i=ki...
 eat-PFV complete-do-? after sparrow <3>stand.up.PFV=that

‘After they finished eating, the sparrow stood up (and said) that: ...’

Action nominals as complement clauses

Action nominals are a more universal means of subordination than participles. They occur in all argument positions and as sentential adjunct (the latter are not considered here). In the examples from the corpus, they preserve their case frame.

(68)
k'war č'i-kó-k'u-val lazim-mä
 road hold-?-?-NMLZ necessary-ind
 'It is necessary to build a road.'

(69)
liqez k'if-ki-r-val e bujroβ-mä.
 calf suck.3-do-IPFV-NMLZ I.GEN order-ind
 'Making calfs suck is my job.'

(70)
sin činä-gä χalid-i ungum-illi q'ar-u inq-iχ-ki-r-val
 once one-time Xalid-GEN heart-EL old.woman-DAT fear-AD-do-IPFV-NMLZ
la-tā-χi-šä-mä.
 EL-LOC-go-PST-ind
 'Once Xalid decided to frighten an old woman.'

(71)
hun-u pišä q'izi-val j-u-k'w-at
 that.OBL-DAT bread bake-IPFV-NMLZ 4-want-become-IPFV-AUX
 'She wanted to bake bread.'

(72)
k'ävvi k'at-k'w-i pšu ladir-ki-r-val lazim-ž-i-mä
 strong go-become-IPFV horse-DAT beat-do-IPFV-NMLZ necessary-4-NEG-ind
 'There's no need to hurry up a horse that has a strong pace.'

Note that action nominals are also formed from abstract predicate nouns like 'help':

(73)
sa tufandaβ-i q'änäd-ir iχer kir-u kümäg-val ji-ž-mä
 one Tufandag-GEN wing-LOC very we.incl-DAT help-NMLZ needed-4-ind
 'On this side of Tifandag we need help very much.'

Modal constructions

Finally, I consider one additional functional domain which is usually associated with subordination, though it is not exactly the case in Khinalug. Modal meanings are conveyed by morphological forms rather than subordination. There is a possibilitive participle which serves as a base to modal predication, as in the following example (cf. also 15.34, 17.52, 17.57, 17.54)

(74)

ada, vi-χ jir zuḥon k'at-bi-β-dur,
hey you.OBL-AD we(NOM) how.much walk-HPL-go-HPL

ži swa kutaš-illi la-t̄ir-q'w-i jir, vi č'ab-t-an-in-dä.
this.4 village in.hands-EL EL-LB-cause-PFV we, you find-IPFV-PSBL-NEG

'Hey, how long we've been walking around after you, we searched through all this village (= we let it through our hands), we couldn't find you.'

(75)

pšwa jaš-iχ totuχ pši gé-b-i-n-kw-ar-mä.
three year-AD after horse mount-3-PFV-PSBL-become-?-IND

'After three years (when it is three years old), one may mount a horse.'

The subject of the modal meaning, when expressed, may take the AD suffix:

(76)

kuj j-et-mä, dä i-š a-n-kwi-zad-i.
go.IPFV 4-be-IND, intrj I.OBL-AD SUPRA-PSBL-go.IPFV-?-NEG

'I want to go, but I can not.'

The construction with the adjective 'known' is used in the sense of internal possibility ('be able to', 'know how to'); cf. example (66) above. External possibility is expressed by the particle *bälkä* (a Turkic loanword) which, according to [Kibrik et al 1972] may introduce another morphological construction, the debitive form:

(77)

häki jä äk'iš č'i-nä, bälkä hin-i c'u
now I.ERG look.up.IMP say-HORT maybe that.OBL-ERG name

xiric' dahaar li, bälkä žürä sas lä-k'u-i.
white rock say.PFV.PTCP maybe different sound away-give.PFV-PTCP

'When they came close, (one of them) said: now I will look up, maybe it will say the name "White Rock", maybe another sound it will say.'

In the two cases where it occurs in the corpus, though, it is combined with a simple perfective finite verbal form. The construction is not formally marked for subordination. On the one hand, it could be interpreted as a polypredicative construction, with the particle occupying the finite predicate slot: that would explain why it occurs only with the form which is otherwise not the most frequent form in the finite function. On the other, it may be a coincidence; availability of other finite forms under *bälkä* should be checked by elicitation.

between the choice of the strategy (reduplication vs. *n*-suffixation) and obliqueness: the reflexive suffix only occurs in oblique cases in the corpus and in Ganieva, while all occurrences of the ‘reflexive’ nominative (see below) invariably show reduplication. However, this correlation is not absolute: in two cases, the oblique case form is attested without *-n-* (82 and 83). Ganieva only gives forms which combine reduplication with suffixation in the oblique; but none such form occurs in the corpus.

The forms said reduplicated as listed in Ganieva are produced by a combination of *hä* (normally the feminine / non-human demonstrative) with the nominative of the relevant class (*hähu* (1), *hähä* (2), non-human not attested) in the nominative and with *-hnä-* in the oblique cases. The latter most probably comes from a syncopated oblique base of the same demonstrative *hinä-*. Several forms, however, show *-o-* instead of *-ä-*. The suffixed forms, only attested in the oblique, add the suffix *-n-* followed by a case marker. Personal reflexives ‘myself’ and ‘yourself’, ‘ourselves’ and ‘yourselves’ are formed by a composition of the ergative form with the relevant case form in the singular and of the oblique stem with the relevant case form in the plural. The double case marking and the presence of hiatus in the singular first and second person reflexive pronouns suggest that these reflexive forms are not morphological words but combinations of wordforms. In this connection, it would be important to check contexts where, e.g., the reflexive personal dative can not combine with a syntactic ergative (as ‘I see myself’ or ‘I myself am cold’, both predicates being dative in Khinalug). In any case, it seems probable that the plural personal pronouns result from the syncope of the vowel marking ergative (*sur-suru* < *sur-i-sur-u*) which would make this construction similar to that in the singular.

Below, I provide all examples of the use of reflexive pronouns available so far. The first two examples show clear reflexive uses (suffixed pronoun in both cases):

(79)

hükümät-i hinä-n-e dalig-šilli, hinä-n-e pıl-šilli
 state-GEN **this.OBL-self-GEN** work-COMIT, **this.OBL-self-GEN** money-COMIT

č äš-q’ası, aftobus işlämiš-k wi-ž-mä.
 help-COND, bus work-become.IPFV-4-ind

‘If the state will help with its work, with its money, the bus connection will function.’

(80)

halamχer ink-i gus hinä-n-e halam-iškili k'ač'in
shepherd foot-GEN on **this.OBL-self-GEN** sheep-COMIT stone

q'i.

become.PFV.PTCP

'The shepherd and his sheep turned into stone where he stood.'

(81)

ku-i-m č'aχ-ši hunä-n-e pišä q'izi
this-ERG-and begin-LV-PFV-PTCP **that-self-GEN** bread bake.IPFV.PTCP

'And she started to bake her bread.'

There are too few examples in the corpus to describe functional or syntactic distribution of the forms. However, it is obvious that, as in other East Caucasian languages, the contexts where these pronouns may be used are by no means limited to clausal co-reference (reflexive function) as in the examples above. On the contrary, more than the half of examples do not contain the antecedent within the same clause (82), or even within the same syntactic structure at all.

(82)

aχri du t'in-i tamam-q'i, hähnä-š ka-β₁-i,
finally this.1 cry.PFV-PTCP end-become **self~this.OBL-POSS** LAT-go.PFV-PTCP,

'Finally (when) he finished crying (and) came back to his right feelings (= (in)to himself), they told him:...'

(83)

hohoz-i düz-ki-r-dä-mä, dur-um išt'ämiš-k'u-dur-mä.
self-this.PL.OBL-ERG correct-do-IPFV-3-ind, this.PL-and work-do-HPL-ind

'They themselves (geologists) will put it (the road) into order, and they (the locals) be working, too.'

(84)

bäs hä li alim hohu pšo pan üs
ptcl this.N say.PFV.PTCP scholar **self~this.1** three hundred year

laχid-š-u?

live-PST-INTRG

'And the scholar who said that, did he himself live three hundred years?'

(85)

hähä *zap`as-mä, tamam-k`w-et-mä.*
self~this.N stock-cop end-become-AUX-ind

‘There is this stock, it is coming to an end.’

(86)

aχri sa q`ä du χinimk`ir-iš li-ki,
finally one day this.m woman-POSS say.PFV.PTCP=that,
soχtotuχ hinä-n-u vä jümü lä-k-ä
after this.OBL-self-DAT you.ERG ? away-give-IMP

‘Then, once he said to his wife, well, now you give (food) to it (the donkey).’

There are no examples of logophoric uses of either of the form, so typical of East Caucasian. However, it must be noted that all examples of reported speech in our corpus seem to manifest direct strategy of reporting. Although direct reported speech, in East Caucasian, is not incompatible with logophoric uses of pronouns, such contexts seem to be more rare than the original speaker’s pronominal perspective.

Abbreviations:

1, 2, 3, 4, HPL, NPL – noun class categories

AD – ad(essive) (one of the two localizations)

ANTE – anterior (verbal form)

AUX – auxiliary

CAUSAL – causal converb

COMIT – comitative

COND – conditional (verbal form)

Cop – copula

CVB – converb

DAT – dative

DEBIT – debitative

EL – elative

ERG – ergative

FAM – family reference pronoun

(Khinalug distinguishes between family and general reference of some pronouns: our 'belonging to my family' vs. 'belonging to us'; they 'a family' vs. 'group of people')

GEN – genitive

HORT – hortative (volitional verbal form)

IMP – imperative (volitional verbal form)

INAL – inalienable

(a case marker dedicated to inalienable possession; it is however only available to a rather narrow morphophonological class of nominal stems; other nouns do not distinguish between alienable and inalienable possession)

INTRG – interrogative particle

IPFV – imperfective (one of the verbal stems)

IRR – irrealis (converb)

JUSS – jussive (volitional verbal form)

LAT – lative

LB – locative base

(In Khinalug, many spatial predications are formed by adding spatial prefixes to a predicative base; the latter is void of specific spatial meaning and serves only as a predicative nucleus to a predication)

LOC – locative

LV – light verb

N – neuter

(Category neutralizing the non-human 3 and 4 classes as opposed to human 1 and 2 classes)

NEG – negative

NMLZ – nominalization

NOM – nominative

OBL – oblique stem of nominals and oblique form of an attribute

(In Khinalug, some attributive dependents to nouns inflect in function of the nominative vs. oblique case form of their nominal head)

PFV – perfective (one of the verbal stems)

PL – plural

POSS – possessive

(One of the two localization, intermediate between abstract possessive and spatial apud relation)

PROH – prohibitive (volitional verbal form)

PSBL – possibilitive (one of the verbal stem)

PST – past

PTCP – participle

PURP – purposive (verbal form)

TEMP – temporal converb

VOC – vocative particle

References:

Desheriev, Junus (1959). *Grammatika khinalugskogo jazyka* [A Grammar of Khinalug]. Moscow: AN SSSR.

Ganieva, Farida (2002). *Khinalugsko-russkij slovarj* [Khinalug-Russian Dictionary]. The Daghestan department of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, the Gamzat Tsadasa Institute of Language, Literature and Arts and Max Plank Institute of Evolutionary Anthropology. Makhachkala.

Huang, Yan (2008). *Anaphora: A cross-linguistic study*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kerimov, Kerim (1985). *Glagol khinalugskogo jazyka* [Khinalug verb]. Manuscript

of PhD dissertation. The Daghestan department of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, the Gamzat Tsadasa Institute of History, Language and Literature. Makhachkala.

Kibrik, Aleksandr, Sandro Kodzasov and Irina Olovjannikova (1972). *Fragmenty grammatiki khinalugskogo jazyka*. Moscow: MGU.

Kibrik, Aleksandr (2007). *Principy i strategii klauzalnogo sochinenija v dagestanskix jazykax*. [Principles and strategies of clausal co-ordination in Daghestanian languages]. *Voprosy jazykoznanija*, 3.

Schulze, Wolfgang (2008). *Towards a History of Khinalug*. In: Brigitte Huber, Marianne Volkart und Paul Widmer. Halle (Saale): International Institute for Tibetan and Buddhist Studies GmbH.

Michael Daniel,

professor at the National Research University Higher School of Economics (Moscow, Russia), assistant professor at the Moscow State University.

E-mail: misha.daniel@gmail.com, phone: +79031496747

Any opinions or claims contained in this Working Paper do not necessarily reflect the views of HSE.