

Язык. Константы. Переменные

Памяти Александра Евгеньевича Кибрика

УДК 811+81'44
ББК 81
Я 410

Редакционная коллегия:

*М. А. Даниэль, Е. А. Лютикова,
В. А. Плунгян (гл. ред.),
С. Г. Татевосов, О. В. Федорова*

Я410 Язык. Константы. Переменные. Памяти Александра Евгеньевича Кибрика. – СПб.: Алетейя, 2014. – 680 с.

ISBN 978-5-90670-514-3

Настоящая книга представляет собой сборник научных статей, посвященных памяти замечательного российского ученого и организатора науки, крупнейшего полевого лингвиста и оригинального теоретика, члена-корреспондента РАН Александра Евгеньевича Кибрика (1939–2012). Представленные в книге статьи затрагивают актуальные вопросы теории языка и методологии лингвистических исследований, лингвистической типологии, описания русского языка и других языков мира (особенно языков Дагестана). Ряд статей содержит мемуарные фрагменты. Для широкого круга лингвистов.

УДК 811+81'44

ББК 81

В оформлении обложки использована картина матери А. Е. Кибрика художницы Лидии Тимошенко «Портрет сына» (1962)

ISBN 978-5-90670-514-3



9 785906 705143

© Коллектив авторов, 2014
© Издательство «Алетейя» (СПб.), 2014

FUNCTIVE-TRANSFORMATIVE MARKING IN AKHVAKH AND OTHER CAUCASIAN LANGUAGES

1. INTRODUCTION

The combination of a noun phrase or adposition phrase with a verb is not always designed to express a participant in an event encoded by the verb. In addition to participative roles (such as agent, patient, instrument, beneficiary, etc.), noun phrases or adposition phrases may also fulfill circumstantial roles, in which they refer to circumstances of the event (place, time, manner, cause, etc.), and predicative roles, in which they express secondary predications about participants. Nouns may also combine with verbs into complex predicates of the type commonly termed light-verb constructions, in which they contribute to the definition of a type of event.

This article deals with markers found in Akhvakh and other Caucasian languages that express two closely related non-participative roles that noun phrases or adposition phrases may fulfill in the construction of verbs, for which the label *functive* and *transformative* are used. The justification for treating these two roles together follows from the observation that the functive-transformative syncretism is particularly common in Caucasian languages.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 consists of a general discussion of the notions of functive and transformative. Section 3 and 4 briefly present the functive and transformative uses of the so-called Adverbial cases of South and North West Caucasian languages. In Section 5, I show that Akhvakh has a functive-transformative marker that meets the conditions for being analyzed as a case suffix. Section 6 extends the discussion to the other Avar-Andi-Tsez languages. In Section 7, I discuss the possible existence of more or less similar functive-transformative markers in languages belonging to the other branches of the East Caucasian language family. Section 8 summarizes the main conclusions.

2. DEFINITIONS AND GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

2.1 The notion of functive¹

As a negotiator in *He was sent as a negotiator* is a typical example of a functive phrase. Crucially, *a negotiator* does not refer here to an additional participant in the event described by *He was sent*. In this construction, *as a negotiator* expresses a predication about the referent of the subject (*he*), and the semantic contribution of this phrase can be paraphrased as *to fulfill the role of a negotiator*.

¹ A general discussion of the notion of functive, of the syncretisms in which functive markers may be involved in the languages of the world, and of the grammaticalization processes that may result in the emergence of functive markers can be found in Creissels (submitted).

In this paper, the term ‘functive’ is used with the following definition:

1. A functive phrase is either a noun phrase headed by a noun N normally used to refer to concrete entities (animate beings or concrete things), or the combination of such a noun phrase with an adposition.
2. A functive phrase is syntactically a direct dependent of the verbal head of the clause.
3. A functive phrase does not refer to a participant identifiable as an N and distinct from the participants referred to by the other noun phrases in the construction of the same verb, but predicates the property of fulfilling the role of an N, taking one of the participants as its argument.

The noun phrase about whose referent the functive phrase predicates the property of fulfilling the role of an N can be designated as the *controller* of the functive phrase. For example, in *I am talking to you as your friend*, *I* is the controller of the functive phrase *as your friend*.

Functive phrases are sometimes referred to as role phrases, for example by Haspelmath & Buchholz (1998), whose definition (“Role phrases express the role or function in which a participant appears”) is equivalent to the definition of the functive formulated above. These authors also use the term of functive (which as far as I know has been used for the first time with reference to role phrases in Haspelmath’s grammar of Lezgian), but they restrict its use to languages in which nouns are inflected for case, and one of the case forms of nouns is used to express this notion.

In English, noun phrases in functive role are typically introduced by the preposition *as* — Ex. (1).

- (1) English: *as*-phrases in functive role
 - a. *John is working as a teacher.*
 - b. *I got these books as a gift.*
 - c. *I mentioned this as an example.*
 - d. *I am talking to you as your friend.*
 - e. *We were given melon with prosciutto as a first course.*
 - f. *I used my sweater as a pillow.*

The expression of the functive as defined above is rarely the only possible use of functive markers. Ex. (2) illustrates uses of *as* that the definition adopted prevents from being recognized as functive, since they do not really involve the notion of function or role, although their semantic closeness to the functive is obvious.

- (2) English: *as*-phrases in roles distinct from the functive
 - a. *She appeared on stage as a man.* (participant-oriented simulative)
 - b. *As a child he was very rebellious.* (temporally-bound equative)²
 - c. *As a woman you should not tell that.* (individual-level equative)

² *Equative* is taken here in its broad meaning, conflating equative stricto sensu with *specificational* and *identificational* — for a recent discussion of these notions within the frame of a typology of copular clauses, see Mikkelsen (2011). Note that this use of equative has nothing to do with the label *equative case* found in the descrip-

The syncretisms involving markers or constructions that have the expression of the func-tive role as one of their possible uses show important cross-linguistic variation. For example, in Mandinka, the postposition *tí* marking the func-tive phrase in (3a) cannot be used to mark nouns expressing temporally-bound identification, which are marked by a suffix *-mâa* also used in the expression of participant-oriented similative — Ex. (3b–c). *Tí* is not used with secondary predicates expressing individual-level identification either, and Mandinka has a special suffix *-tôo* for this function — Ex. (3d). By contrast, transformative, which cannot be expressed in English by means of *as*, is one of the possible uses of the Mandinka postposition *tí* — Ex. (3e–f), and *tí* also occurs in independent equative clauses — Ex. (3g).³

(3) Mandinka (p. d.)

- a. *Í* *há* *até* *le* *lón* *í* *faamáa* *tí*.
1SG CMP.POS 3SG:EMPH FOC know 1SG father:DEF OBL
'It is him that I knew **as my father.**' (func-tive)
- b. *Í* *há* *i* *faamáa* *díndím-mâa* *lón*.
1SG CMP.POS 2SG father:DEF child-SPR know
'I knew your father **as a child.**' (stage-level equative)
- c. *Íbúliisá* *saa-mâa* *naatá* *Awá* *kaŋ*.
Satan snake-SPR come:OMP.POS Eve on
'Satan came to Eve **as a snake.**' (participant-oriented similative)
- d. *Íte* *musu-tôo* *mâŋ* *ñanna* *ñiŋ* *fóla*.
2SG woman-SPR CMP.NEG must DEM tell:INF
'**As a woman** you should not tell that.' (individual level identification)
- e. *Jíyo* *yelematá* *dolóo* *tí*.
water:DEF change:OMP.POS wine:DEF OBL
'The water changed **into wine.**' (transformative)
- f. *Kewólu* *ye* *yírjúwo* *lésé* *kúlúŋo* *tí*.
man:DEF:PL CMP.POS tree_trunk:DEF carve boat:DEF OBL
'The men carved the tree trunk **into a boat.**' (transformative)
- g. *Ñiŋ* *yíróo* *mu* *bantáŋo* *le* *tí*.
DEM tree:DEF COP silk_cotton_tree:DEF FOC OBL
'This tree is **a silk-cotton tree.**' (independent clause expressing identification)

Moreover, the Mandinka postposition *tí* is not limited to the encoding of predicative roles. It is also fully productive as a marker of the standard of comparison in the construction expressing the comparative of superiority — Ex. (4a), and is marginally found as a marker of phrases in other non-predicative roles: comitative — Ex. (4b) — and substitutive ('in exchange for') — Ex. (4c).

tion of the nominal inflection of Sumerian and a few other languages. In the terminology used in the present paper, such cases forms would rather be labeled *similative*.

³ In the glosses of the Mandinka examples, the suffixes *-tôo* and *-mâa* are glossed SPR (secondary predicate marker), because they are used exclusively with nouns in secondary predicate function, whereas the postposition *tí* is simply glossed OBL (oblique NP marker), because in addition to its use with NPs in predicate function, it also occurs with NPs expressing a variety of participative roles.

(4) Mandinka (p. d.)

- a. *Sánóo le kúlyáatá kódóo ti.*
 gold:DEF FOC be_heavy:CMP.POS silver:DEF OBL
 ‘Gold is heavier than silver.’
- b. *Kewó naata kídóo ti.*
 man:DEF come:CMP.POS gun:DEF OBL
 ‘The man brought a gun.’ (lit. ‘came with a gun’)
- c. *I yé jorólu saŋ kidímúŋkóo ti.*
 3PL CMP.POS slave:DEF:PL trade gun:powder:DEF OBL
 ‘They traded slaves for gun powder.’

The main difficulty in identifying functive phrases is to draw a distinction between phrases predicating the property of fulfilling the role of an N (N a noun) and phrases predicating other semantic types of identification. The view adopted here is that prototypical equative (the term equative being taken in its broad meaning — see footnote 2) can be defined as the expression of individual-level identification, i.e. the identification of an entity with reference to relatively stable properties, whereas the functive can be defined as the expression of functional identification, or role-bound identification, and constitutes therefore one of the non-prototypical varieties of the equative, alongside with for example temporally-bound identification.

A definition of the relationship between functive and equative in terms of relative closeness to prototypes is made necessary by the absence of a clear-cut boundary between prototypical and non-prototypical identification, of between the various non-prototypical subtypes of identification, as evidenced by the cross-linguistic variation in the cut-off points between constructions expressing prototypical identification and constructions more or less specialized in the expression of non-prototypical varieties of identification.

For example, the closeness between role-bound identification (functive) and temporally-bound identification is obvious, as reflected by the use of the same marker for functive phrases and phrases expressing temporally-bound identification in English and other languages, but at the same time, Ex. (3) above shows that the distinction is relevant in some languages at least.

The sharpness of the distinction between the functive and other varieties of identification crucially depends on the lexical meaning of the noun in functive role. For example, in *I used my sweater as a pillow*, it is clear that the relationship between *sweater* and *pillow* can only be interpreted in terms of functional identification: a sweater is not a pillow, even when used as a pillow. By contrast, in *John is working as a teacher*, the distinction between functive and individual-level equative tends to blur. Working as a teacher is not exactly the same thing as being a teacher, since being a teacher suggests a permanent state requiring a qualification, whereas working as a teacher suggests that the position is temporary, and does not necessarily correspond to the main qualification of the person that occupies it. Speakers are aware of the distinction, and it is not difficult to imagine contexts in which it is relevant, but in most contexts, *John is working as a teacher* and *John is a teacher* can be used interchangeably, since a person who is a teacher (i.e., who has a professional qualification in teaching) is normally expected to work as a teacher, and vice-versa.

Reanalysis processes in such transitional contexts are responsible for the fact that, when a language has several constructions or markers expressing various types of identifica-

tion, the markers used in prototypical functive situations do not necessarily extend their use to all types of identification for which a functive interpretation is conceivable, and at the same time may also be used to encode types of identification for which a functive interpretation is clearly ruled out.

2.2. Zero-marked functive phrases

The following examples can be analyzed as including functive noun phrases devoid of any mark of their role in the clause.

- (5) Arhavi Laz (René Lacroix, p. c.)

Ma xezmek'yari kemzdi!
1SG servant take:IMP:1SG

‘Take me as your servant!’

- (6) Chechen (Zarina Molochieva, p. c.)

Iza imaam xaerzhina.
3SG imam choose:PRF

‘They chose him as (their) imam.’

- (7) Andic languages (Saidova (2006), Magomedova & Xalidova (2001), Magomedova (2003))

wakil iⁿhi (Godoberi)

wakil gāla (Karata)

wakil ihiʔa (Tindi)

representative do:INF

‘choose someone as a representative’

Interestingly, all the examples of zero-marked functive phrases I have been able to gather illustrate situations in which the distinctions functive vs. individual-level identification and functive vs. transformative tend to blur, since the presumed functive phrases in most of the examples in question are headed by nouns referring to professions or relatively stable interpersonal relationships. Moreover, in the languages in which I came across zero-marked functive phrases, they are possible with very limited sets of verbs with which the functive phrase is arguably an argument rather than an adjunct. For example, in the documentation I have been able to gather, none of the translational equivalents of *I am talking to you as your friend* includes a zero-marked functive phrase.

2.3. Functive periphrases

From a purely onomasiological perspective, translational equivalents of functive constructions must exist in all languages, but fully grammaticalized functive marking does not necessarily exist in all languages, and the use of functive periphrases may be relatively common even in languages that have developed a grammaticalized expression of the functive.

The distinction between grammaticalized functive marking and functive periphrases may however be problematic, since expressions of the types discussed in this section often show evidence of grammaticalization. Diachronically, they are a possible source of fully grammaticalized functive marking, and there is no universal criterion making it possible to decide at what point in the grammaticalization process a functive marker has emerged from a construction initially analyzable as a functive periphrasis.

A first case is that of formulations such as *by way of N*, *in one's capacity/nature/quality of N*, in which the notion of role or function is implied by the lexical meaning of the abstract noun that constitutes the head of the construction. Ex. (8) illustrates the case of languages in which such constructions constitute the usual equivalent of *as*-constructions in English.

(8) Hindi (Annie Montaut, p. c.)

Usne do sal maastar ke rūp men kām kiyâ hai.
 3SG:ERG two year schoolteacher GEN way in work do PF
 'He worked two years as a schoolteacher.'

In some languages, nouns expressing quality derived from concrete nouns constitute the commonest way to express the meanings expressed in other languages by functive phrases as defined in Section 2.1. For example, in Agul, nouns derived by means of the abstraction suffix *-ŝ^wel* are widely attested as the Nominative argument of *aq'as* 'do' with the meaning 'work/act as N' — Ex. (9a), in the Dative case with the meaning 'in order to act as N' — Ex. (9b), and in the Locative case or with the adverbial marker *-di* with the meaning 'acting as N' — Ex. (9c).

(9) Agul (Timur Maisak, p. c.)

- a. *Kāndejefij čas müŝelim-ŝ^wel aq'as.*
 want:PST we:DAT teacher-ABSTR do:INF
 'We wanted to work as teachers (lit. 'We wanted to do teacherhood').'
- b. *Zun ŝune dijarkā-ŝ^weli-s.*
 I go:PF milkmaid-ABSTR-DAT
 'I went to work as a milkmaid (lit. 'I went to milkmaidhood').'
- c. *Čas qārawul-ŝ^wel-di hataje ŝinebi.*
 we:DAT guard-ABSTR-ADV send:IPF Xinebi
 'They send us Xinebi as a guard (lit. 'with guardhood').'

Another possibility is the use of bi-verbal constructions implying argument sharing with the following division of labor: the shared argument is expressed as an argument of the verb that assigns it a participant role, whereas the noun phrase in functive role is introduced as an argument of the other verb. Ex. (10) illustrates this type of periphrasis in Karata, with a converbial form of *gāta* 'do' introducing a functive noun phrase that, semantically, expresses a predication about the Nominative argument of *k'use idja* 'is sitting'.

(10) Karata (Magomedova & Xalidova 2001)

Hīc'u ela qārawul gē χ'aj idja k'use.
 door at guard do:CVB dog COP sit:CVB
 'A dog is sitting at the door as a guard.'

In other languages, similar periphrases are rather of the type commonly designated as serial verb construction. For example, Mandarin Chinese uses serial constructions involving *dāng* 'act as' or *zuò* 'do' — Ex. (11).

(11) Chinese (Wu Tong, p. c.)

Ta xuan wo dang hezuo huoban.
 3SG choose 1SG act_as collaboration partner
 'He chose me as (his) collaborator.'

Finally, as illustrated by Ex. (12), some languages have functive periphrases in which the functive phrase is introduced by a dependent form of a copula, i.e., a word whose literal meaning can be glossed as ‘being’.⁴

(12) Turkish (Göksel & Kerslake: 216)

Bun-u san-a avukat ol-arak değil, arkadaş ol-arak söyl-üyor-um.
 DEM-ACC 2SG-DAT lawyer be-CVB NEG friend be-CVB say-PROG-1SG

‘I’m saying this to you not as a lawyer but as a friend.’

2.4. The transformative

The label *transformative* is used here for a comparative concept defined as follows: noun phrases in transformative role refer to the final state of a participant undergoing a transformation, as in *He decided to become a writer*, or *Jesus made water into wine*. Like noun phrases in functive role, noun phrases in transformative role do not refer to participants distinct from those encoded by the other noun phrases included in the same construction, but rather contribute to the expression of a predication about the referent of another noun phrase.

The relationship between equative and transformative is obvious, since transformative phrases can be viewed as equative phrases in the scope of a verb encoding a transformation event, and the transformative can therefore be considered a contextual variant of the equative. The fact that unflagged transformative phrases are not uncommon can be viewed as a manifestation of this affinity, since phrases in plain equative role are commonly unflagged, in particular in independent equative clauses. Ex. (13) illustrates unflagged transformative phrases in Basque.

(13) Basque (Céline Mounole, p. c.)

a. *Printze-a igel bilakatu zen.*
 prince-SG frog change:CMP PST:3SG

‘The prince changed into a frog.’

b. *Jesus-ek ur-a ardo bilakatu zuen.*
 Jesus-SG.ERG water-SG wine change:CMP PST:3SG:3SG

‘Jesus changed the water into wine.’

Among the varieties of equative, there is a particularly close relation between transformative and functive, since there is no clear-cut distinction between a change that affects the essential properties of an entity, and the acquisition of a more or less temporary role that does not affect the very nature of the entity concerned. It is therefore not surprising that the constructions or markers found in contexts in which they are unambiguously interpreted as functive are also commonly found in uses that cannot be easily categorized as functive or transformative.

Specialized transformative markers can however be found in some languages, as well as transformative markers involved in syncretisms other than the functive-transformative syncretism. Cases (relatively) specialized in transformative marking are found for example in Hungarian (-vá ~ -vé), Finnish (-ksi), Estonian (-ks), etc.) — ex. (14).

⁴ See Schönig (2008) and Schroeder (2008) for a detailed discussion of this construction in Turkish and other Turkic languages.

(14) Hungarian (Anna Sörös, p. c.)

- a. *A királyfi béká-vá változott.*
 DEF prince frog-TRNSF change:PST:3SG
 ‘The prince changed into a frog.’
- b. *Jézus bór-rá változtatta a vizet.*
 Jesus wine-TRNSF change:CAUS:PST:3SG:DEF DEF water:ACC
 ‘Jesus changed the water into wine.’

2.5. Syncretisms and grammaticalization paths

In a so far unpublished paper entitled ‘Functive phrases in typological perspective’, I show that, in addition to the particularly widespread functive-similative syncretism and to the use of the same markers for the functive and other varieties of equative (particularly in dependent equative predications), functive markers are also commonly involved in the expression of the following meanings:

- transformative,
- comparative of superiority
- location,
- manner,
- instrumental,
- substitutive,
- lative,
- separative.

In the same paper, I discuss the following grammaticalization paths:

- deictic manner adverbs or words expressing similarity in complex constructions > similative markers > functive markers,
- ‘in the quality of’ > functive marker,
- dependent form of a copulative verb > functive marker,
- ‘in the way / state / shape of’ > functive marker,
- ‘be like’ > similative marker > functive marker,
- locative marker > functive marker,
- lative marker > transformative marker > functive marker,
- benefactive marker > surrogative marker > functive marker,
- separative marker > functive marker.

Concerning the transformative, the extension of lative marking to transformative phrases, illustrated by Ex. (15) and (16), is particularly common. The obvious explanation is that many verbs used to express transformation are originally movement verbs. The extension of verbs meaning ‘turn’ to the expression of transformation is particularly widespread cross-linguistically.

(15) Russian (p. k.)

- a. *Ved'ma prevratila mal'čika v pticu.*
 witch:SG transform:PST:SGF boy:SG:ACC in bird:SG:ACC
 ‘The witch changed the boy into a bird.’

- (15) b. *Voda prevratila-s' v lěd.*
 water:SG transform:PST:SGF-REFL in ice:SG:ACC
 'The water changed into ice.'
- (16) Akhvakh (p. d.)
 a. *Waša šakiba-g-a šoruwi.*
 boy bird-CFG₁-LAT turn:PF₃:M
 'The boy changed into a bird.'
- b. *Ālā-š^w-e waša šakiba-g-a šorōwi.*
 God-M-ERG boy bird-CFG₁-LAT turn:CAUS:PF₃:M
 'God changed the boy into a bird.'

The functive-transformative syncretism, already illustrated by the Mandinka postposition *tí* in Ex. (3), is relatively widespread too. Mordvin (Uralic) provides an additional illustration of the functive-transformative syncretism: in Mordvin, the so-called Translative case, marked by a suffix *-ks* cognate with the Translative case of Finnish (originally expressing destination of movement, and specialized now in transformative marking), is found both in transformative and functive marker function — Ex. (17).⁵ In the particular case of Mordvin, the transformative manifests its affinity with both the lative and the functive, since a grammaticalization path *lative* > *transformative* > *functive* can be reconstructed.

- (17) Erzya Mordvin (Grünthal 2003: 185)
 a. *Son roboti vračo-ks.*
 (s)he work:3SG doctor-TRANSL
 '(S)he works as a doctor.'
- b. *Ekšeš vel'avtš kel'me-ks.*
 weather:DEF change:REFL.PASS:IMPF.3SG cold-TRANSL
 'The weather became cold.'

The functive-transformative syncretism is found in the Tupi-Guarani family too, with a suffix labeled *Attributive* in Seki (2000) but more commonly labeled *Translative* in descriptions of Tupi-Guarani languages. This suffix is reconstructed as **(r)amō* in Proto-Tupi-Guarani (Françoise Rose, p. c.). For descriptions of its use in Tupi-Guarani languages, see among others Rose (2011: 235–240), Seki (2000: 110–112).

As already announced above, the functive-transformative syncretism is particularly common among Caucasian languages, whose functive-transformative markers constitute the central topic of this paper.

3. FUNCTIVE-TRANSFORMATIVE MARKERS IN SOUTH CAUCASIAN LANGUAGES

In Kartvelian languages (with the exception of Laz), the same suffix (traditionally labeled *Adverbial case*) is found with noun phrases in functive role (18a), in transformative role (18b), or expressing embedded equative predications (18c), and in the derivation of manner adverbs from adjectives (18d). According to Boeder (2005), most of the manner adverbs formed by means of the Adverbial case “seem to have a semantic subject orientation”.

⁵ See Riese (1992–1993) for an overview of Translative in Uralic.

(18) Georgian (Boeder (2005) and Manana Topadze, p. c.)

- a. *Masc'avlebl-ad mušaobs.*
 teacher-ADV work:PRS:3SG
 'He/she works as a teacher.'
- b. *Yvino zmr-ad gadaikca.*
 wine vinegar-ADV change:AOR:3SG
 'The wine changed into vinegar.'
- c. *K'arg ekim-ad itvleba.*
 good doctor-ADV be_counted:PRS:3SG
 'He/she is considered a good doctor.'
- d. *Mat'arebeli zant'-ad daižra.*
 train lazy-ADV moved
 'The train moved lazily.'

Note however that, at least in Georgian, the functive use of the Adverbial case is subject to restrictions about which I am unfortunately not able to be more precise. For example, in English, *as* is equally used in *work as a doctor* and *say something as a doctor*, but according to my Georgian consultant, in Georgian, the Adverbial case can be used only with 'work', and *rogorc* 'like, as' must be used with 'say' — Ex. (19).

(19) Georgian (Manana Topadze, p. c.)

- a. ***Ekim-ad** mušaobs.*
 doctor-ADV work:PRS:3SG
 'He/she works as a doctor.'
- b. *Me amas geubnebi šen ara rogorc ekimi,*
 1SG this:DAT say:PRS:1SG:2SG 2SG NEG as doctor
aramed rogorc megobari.
 but as friend
 'I am saying this to you not as a doctor, but as a friend.'

One may imagine that, in Georgian, functive-transformative marking by means of the Adverbial case is typically used for relatively argument-like functive phrases, whereas functive-simulative marking by means of *rogorc* 'as, like' is preferred with functive phrases that are clearly adjuncts. This hypothesis would however require further investigation.

4. FUNCTIVE-TRANSFORMATIVE MARKERS IN NORTH WEST CAUCASIAN LANGUAGES

The existence of an a suffix found with nouns in functive and transformative role and also used to derive manner adverbs from adjectives is a feature common to South and North West Caucasian languages, and the label 'adverbial case' traditionally used in descriptions of Kartvelian languages is also used in descriptions of North West Caucasian languages.

For example, as illustrated by Ex. (20), Adyghe has an Adverbial case marked by a suffix *-ew* with a range of functions quite similar to that of the Georgian Adverbial.

(20) Adyghe (Arkad'ev & al. 2009: 55)

- a. *Sjezdəm djeljegat-ew wəqekʷəbɛš'tən.*
 to_the_meeting delegate-ADV you_probably_came
 'You probably came to the meeting as a delegate.'
- b. *Aš'əš-ew se səχʷəb.*
 his_brother-ADV I I_became
 'I became his brother.'
- c. *Dax-ew matxe.*
 beautiful-ADV he_writes
 'He writes beautifully.'

5. THE FUNCTIVE-TRANSFORMATIVE FORM OF NOUNS IN NORTHERN AKHVAKH

In Northern Akhvakh, a complex suffix consisting of a first formative *-t-* (glossed FUNC) and an second formative (glossed ADV) expressing gender-number agreement can be added to the Nominative form of nouns. The agreement marker that constitutes the second formative of this complex suffix varies as follows:

human masculine (M)	<i>-ō(he)</i>
human feminine (F)	<i>-ē(he)</i>
non-human (N)	<i>-ē(he)</i>
human plural (HPL)	<i>-ī(hi)</i>
non-human plural	<i>-erē(he)</i>

The second formative of the complex suffix '*-t-* + adverbial agreement' expresses agreement with the Nominative argument of the clause. It is glossed ADV for 'adverbial agreement' because the same set of agreement marks is found in other adverbial forms: the general converb (which is formed simply by adding the adverbial agreement suffix to the verb stem), the progressive converb, the mediative case of nouns (historically derived from the ablative), plus isolated adverbs such as *huštē(he)* 'thus'.

As illustrated by Ex. (21), the complex suffix '*-t-* + adverbial agreement' marks nouns in functive role and other closely related roles, including transformative.

(21) Northern Akhvakh (Magomedova & Abdulaeva 2007 and p. d.)

- a. *Aqīqā-t-ō w-ošaḳ-er-ē gudi hu-du-we.*
 gardener-FUNC-ADV.M M-work-PROG COP.M DIST-SL-M
 'He works as a gardener.'
- b. *Jaše imo-Īir-a išʷada-t-ē j-ešeḳ-u j-āhe gidi.*
 girl father_o-CFG₂-LAT shepherd-FUNC-ADV.F F-work-INF F-go.ADV.F COP.F
 'The girl went to her father's to work as a shepherd.'
- c. *Du dada čʷi-t-ō w-ošaḳ-er-ō gʷida?*
 2SG_o father what-FUNC-ADV.M M-work-PROG-ADV.M COP.M
 'What is your father's profession?' lit. 'Your father works as what?'

- (21) d. *Di-be maḡs̄ara ūdada-t-ēhe b-uḡ-ari hu-du-s̄^w-a.*
 1SG₀[GEN]-N joke real-FUNC-ADV.N N-OCCUR-PF₁ DIST-SL-M-DAT
 ‘He took my joke seriously.’ lit. ‘My joke occurred to him as real.’
- e. *Di-la hu-be čaka ḡirada řadati-t-ē harig^w-ari.*
 1SG₀-DAT DIST-N very dear custom-FUNC-ADV.N see-PF₁
 ‘I considered this (lit. I saw this as) a very good custom.’
- f. *Hu āl’oda waša-li b-oḡ-ī goli řab-idi ād-o-t-īhi.*
 DIST all boy-PL HPL-become-ADV.HPL COP.HPL learn-PF₂.HPL person-PL-FUNC-ADV.HPL
 ‘All these boys became learned men.’

As already mentioned above, the second formative of this complex suffix is the adverbial agreement marker, which also constitutes the ending of the general converb (compare for example *toḡtoro-t-ōhe* ‘as a doctor (M)’ < *toḡtoro* ‘doctor’ with *w-oq’-ōhe* ‘having come (M)’, masculine form of the general converb of *-eq’-* ‘come’). As regards the first formative *-t-*, it coincides with a derivative suffix productively used to derive verbs from adjectives, as illustrated by *ik’a* ‘large’ > *ik’a-l-urula* ‘enlarge’ (*-urula* is the infinitive suffix).

Consequently, two alternative analyses can be considered: either the inflection of nouns in Northern Akhvakh includes a complex functive-transformative suffix ‘*-t-* + adverbial agreement’, or the forms in question are better analyzed as the general converb of verbs derived from nouns by means of the derivative suffix *-t-*.

In discussing this question, a careful distinction between the synchronic and diachronic perspectives is in order.

In a synchronic analysis, the following four conditions should be met before one can consider analyzing forms decomposable as ‘N + *-t-* + adverbial agreement’ as the converbs of denominal verbs formed by the addition of the derivative suffix *-t-* to noun stems.

- Forms ‘noun + *-t-* + adverbial agreement’ should exist only for nouns from which a verb stem ‘N + *-t-*’ can be derived. In other words, the interpretation of adverbial agreement as a verbal inflectional suffix marking the general converb implies the compatibility of the stem to which it is attached with other verbal inflectional suffixes.
- In forms ‘noun + *-t-* + adverbial agreement’, *-t-* should always follow a bare noun stem; in other words, the interpretation of *-t-* as a derivative suffix implies that the stem to which it attaches does not include nominal inflectional suffixes.
- As inflected verb forms, the forms decomposable as ‘noun + *-t-* + adverbial agreement’ should be incompatible with noun dependents.
- Like converbs, forms ‘noun + *-t-* + adverbial agreement’ should be found exclusively in adjunct role.

None of these conditions is met:

- The complex suffix ‘*-t-* + adverbial agreement’ is used productively with nominals for which the derivation of a verb by means of the suffix *-t-* is not possible. For example, as illustrated by Ex. (21c) above, the interrogative pronoun *č^{wi}* ‘what’ is compatible with this complex suffix, giving rise to forms such *č^{wi}-t-ō* ‘as what? (in reference to a masculine Nominative argument)’, whereas the possibility to derive a verb **č^{wi}-t-urula* whose meaning would be ‘be/become what’ is categorically rejected by speakers.

- As illustrated by Ex. (21f) above, the complex suffix ‘-*t*- + adverbial agreement’ is found attached to nouns in the plural.
- Ex. (21f) above also shows that forms decomposable as ‘noun + -*t*- + adverbial agreement’ can combine with noun dependents.
- Forms decomposable as ‘noun + -*t*- + adverbial agreement’ are not only found in adjunct role. They can also be used to encode predicative arguments of the following verbs: *boĭurula* ‘become’ — Ex. (22a–b), *buĭurula* ‘fall’ in the sense of ‘happen to be’, *biĭilōrula* ‘choose, elect’, *beĭurula* ‘leave’ in the sense of ‘nominate’; they can even be found instead of the Nominative in the construction of *bik’urula* ‘be’ — Ex. (22d).

(22) Northern Akhvakh (Magomedova & Abdulaeva 2007 and p. d.)

- a. *Hu āl’oda waša-li b-oĭ-t̄ goli žab-idi ād-o-t̄-īhi.*
DIST all boy-PL HPL-become-ADV.HPL COP.HPL learn-PF₂.HPL person-PL-FUNC-ADV.HPL
 ‘All these boys became learned men.’
- b. *Hu-gu-ṣ^w-e mik’e-lo-we toχtoro-t̄-ōhe w-oĭ-urula χija g^w-ēre godi.*
DIST-LL-M-ERG child-HPL[GEN]-M doctor-FUNC-ADV.M M-become-INF dream do.N-PROG COP.N
 ‘He dreams of becoming a pediatrician (lit. children’s doctor).’
- c. *Di-la hu-we di-da ima-t̄-ō harig^w-er-ō gudi.*
1SG₀-DAT DIST-M 1SG₀[GEN]-INT father-FUNC-ADV.M see-PROG-ADV.M COP.M
 ‘I consider him as my father.’
- d. *Īč’a-t̄-ē j-ik^w-ari hu-du-je.*
stone-FUNC-ADV.F F-be-PF₁ DIST-SL-F
 lit. ‘She was a stone.’ → ‘She obstinately refused.’

The only possible conclusion in a synchronic account of Northern Akhvakh grammar is that, whatever the etymology of the formative -*t*- (we will return to this point in the following section), the complex ending ‘-*t*- + adverbial agreement’ has grammaticalized as a nominal suffix. Forms decomposable as ‘noun + -*t*- + adverbial agreement’ are only found in contexts in which nothing prevents analyzing them as heading noun phrases, and nothing in their distribution in the clause prevents analyzing them as forming part of case inflection. In a strictly synchronic description, there can only be hesitation about the label that should be used to designate it: Functive case, Functive-Transformative case, or Predicative case. I leave this question open.

In a synchronic analysis, the only obstacle to recognizing ‘-*t*- + adverbial agreement’ as a case suffix lies in idiosyncratic restrictions to the use of the notion of case in the traditional description of East Caucasian languages: in the East Caucasian tradition, cases must be, either ‘syntactic’ cases (nominative — alias absolute, ergative, dative, and genitive) or spatial cases, and the case forms other than the nominative must result from the addition of a case marker to a special oblique stem. Consequently, a very general characteristic of East Caucasian grammars is the marginalization of noun forms that depart from the East Caucasian canon, but that linguists raised in other traditions would identify as cases without the slightest hesitation: in grammatical sketches, most of the time, such forms are simply ignored, and in more detailed grammars, they are only briefly mentioned as ‘case-like particles’.

This applies in particular to the functive-transformative form of Akhvakh nouns. If Akhvakh belonged to the Uralic family, the meaning expressed by this form would not

be an obstacle to recognizing it as a case, since cases having the expression of functive or transformative meanings as their central use are commonly recognized in the Uralist tradition, and the Uralist tradition is quite liberal about the morphological structure of the noun forms recognized as cases.⁶ But Akhvakh is a Nakh-Daghestanian language, and the functive-transformative form of Akhvakh nouns departs from the forms traditionally recognized as cases in grammars of North-East Caucasian languages, both semantically and morphologically. In addition to its meaning, that does not allow classifying it as ‘syntactic’ or ‘spatial’, its morphological structure does not follow the pattern ‘oblique stem + case marker’. With nouns that have an oblique stem distinct from the Nominative form, the functive-transformative marker does not attach to the oblique stem, but to the Nominative form. For example, the attachment of case markers to the oblique stem is illustrated in (21b) above by *imo-ĕir-a* ‘to (her) father’s’, in which the complex case ending *-ĕir-a* attaches to *imo-*, oblique stem of *ima* ‘father’. By contrast, the stem to which the functive-transformative ending attaches coincides with the Nominative form, as illustrated by (*di-da*) *ima-t-ō* ‘as (my own) father’ in Ex. (22c).

This however should not prevent recognizing the functive-transformative marker as a case suffix. Variation in the morphophonological properties of markers belonging to the same paradigm is common in the languages of the world, and it reflects the fact that the individual markers that constitute a paradigm may have grammaticalized at different periods in the history of the language. The fact that the case suffix of Northern Akhvakh used as a functive-transformative marker attaches to a stem coinciding with the Nominative form should only be viewed as evidence of its relatively recent grammaticalization.

6. FUNCTIVE-TRANSFORMATIVE FORMS OF NOUNS IN OTHER AVAR-ANDI-TSEZ LANGUAGES

In Section 5, I have shown that, synchronically, the functive-transformative form of Akhvakh nouns cannot be analyzed as the converb of a denominal verb. However, the coincidence between the first formative *-t-* of the functive-transformative marker and a derivative suffix *-t-* used to form verbs with the meaning ‘become X’ strongly suggests that the functive-transformative form of nouns results from the grammaticalization of a construction whose original meaning was ‘having become X’, in which a noun in the Nominative case preceded a converbial form of a verb **t-* ‘become’.

Data from the other Avar-Andi-Tsez languages confirms the analysis of the functive-transformative marker of Akhvakh as resulting from the grammaticalization of a converbial form of a verb **t-* ‘become’ that has ceased existing as an autonomous word but whose direct reflex is a derivative suffix productively used in Avar-Andi-Tsez languages to convert adjectives (and marginally nouns) into verbs expressing change of state.

The existence of a suffix *-tun* functionally similar to the functive-transformative suffix of Akhvakh is acknowledged in some descriptions of Avar, although this suffix is never included in the inventory of Avar cases. According to Ebeling 1966: 72, Čikobava & Cercvadze 1962: 166f. mention it as a ‘case-like’ ‘predicative’ form of nouns, with the following illustration:

⁶ See for example Creissels 2006 for a discussion of the morphophonological heterogeneity of the case inflection of Hungarian.

⁷ This ending consists of the spatial configuration marker *-ĕir-* ‘in the vicinity of’ and the lative marker *-a*.

(23) Avar (Čikobava & Cercvadze 1962, quoted by Ebeling 1966: 72)

Do-w bet'ér-lun w-iš-ana.

DEM-M head-FUNC M-elect-PF

'He was elected head.'

In the descriptions of Avar that mention this suffix, it is decomposed as *-l-un*, where *-l-* is a suffix used to derive verbs from nouns or adjectives, and *-un* is the past converb (or 'past gerund') suffix, and Alekseev (1988: 35) explicitly states that this 'predicative' suffix of nouns originates from a formerly independent verb **l-ize* 'become' (*-ize* is the Infinitive suffix of Avar verbs). However, synchronically, the initial *l* of *-l-un* cannot be identified with the derivative suffix *-l-*, since the sequence '*-l- + -un*' in Avar shows exactly the same properties as '*-l- + adverbial agreement*' in Akhvakh. The logical conclusion is that, synchronically, *-l-un* should be analyzed as having grammaticalized into a case suffix:

- *-l-un* can attach to nouns incompatible with the derivative suffix *-l-*,
- *-l-un* can follow a plural marker (compare *wakil-lun* 'as a delegate' / *wakil-zabi-lun* 'as delegates'),
- nouns suffixed with *-l-un* are compatible with noun dependents (as in *kolxozaŋul predsdatelasul zamestitel-lun* 'as the substitute of the president of the kolkhoz'),
- nouns suffixed with *-l-un* can be used as predicative arguments (as in Ex. (23) above).

A similar suffix is briefly signaled in Bagvalal (Andic) by Daniel & al. (2001: 193). This suffix is illustrated by *hak'uj-li-j-o* 'as (his) wife', and the ending of this form is decomposed as follows: *-li-* is a derivative suffix with the same function as *-l-* in Akhvakh or Avar, *-j-* marks feminine agreement, and *-o* is the converbial ending. However, as discussed above for Akhvakh and Avar, the mere possibility of this segmentation does not ensure that *hak'uj-li-j-o* can really be analyzed synchronically as the converbial form of a verb derived from a noun, since this analysis also implies that such forms exist only for nouns from which a verb can be derived, are incompatible with plural marking and noun dependents, and are not found in predicative argument function. Unfortunately, these questions are not discussed in the Bagvalal grammar.

I have not found explicit mentions of similar suffixes in other descriptions of Andic or Tsezic languages, but they sporadically occur in sentences illustrating other grammatical phenomena, and in dictionary examples. In most cases, they lend themselves to an obvious decomposition into a first formative *-l-* also found with the derivative function mentioned above for Akhvakh and Avar *-l-*, and a second formative identical with a converbial ending of the language in question:

- Botlikh (Andic) *wakil-lun* 'as a delegate' (Saidova & Abusov 2012: 109)
- Karata (Andic) *axiŋan-le* 'as a gardener', *ušter-le* 'as a teacher' (Magomedova & Xalidova 2001: 27 & 78),
- Godoberi (Andic) *savetiŋi pirsidatel-lu* 'as the president of the Council' (Saidova 2006),
- Khwarshi (Tsezic) *dibir-lin* 'as a mullah' (Khalilova 2009: 76).

Note that, in the Godoberi example, the genitival dependent provides decisive evidence that *pirsidatel-lu* is a case form of *pirsidatel* rather than the converbial form of a derived verb.

We can therefore safely conclude that the process that led to the grammaticalization of a converbial form of a verb reconstructable as **t-* ‘become’ into a functive-transformative marker synchronically analyzable as a case has operated, not only in Akhvakh, but also in other Avar-Andi-Tsez languages too, although it is not possible to be more precise about the exact extent of this phenomenon, and the role that diffusion by contact may have played in its development.⁸

It is also interesting to mention that **t-* ‘become’ is also the source of derivative suffixes that combine with concrete nouns to form abstract nouns of quality such as Karata *ušter-ter* ‘teacherhood’ < *ušter* ‘teacher’, or Avar *χan-ti* ‘reign’ < *χan* ‘king’. The masdar is formed in Karata by means of a suffix *-er*, and in Avar by means of a suffix *-i*, which suggests that these abstraction suffixes result from the grammaticalization of the masdar of **t-* ‘become’.

7. FUNCTIVE-TRANSFORMATIVE MARKING IN THE OTHER BRANCHES OF NORTH EAST CAUCASIAN

With the notable exception of Haspelmath’s analysis of Lezgi (see below), the existence of cases functionally similar to the ‘adverbial’ cases of South and North West Caucasian languages (i.e., cases mainly used as functive-transformative markers) is never considered in descriptions of North East Caucasian languages, and the possible existence of cases more or less specialized in the expression of functive and/or transformative meanings is not even discussed in Daniel and Ganenkov’s recent survey of Daghestanian case systems (Daniel & Ganenkov 2009), although according to the analysis put forward in the present paper, such cases are attested at least among Avar-Andi-Tsez languages. Consequently, one may wonder whether such forms of nouns are really inexistent in the other branches of the East Caucasian language family, or perhaps their existence is simply occulted by a tradition that tends to marginalize them.

The languages for which I have been able to get relatively precise information about functive-transformative marking (or lack thereof) include Chechen (Zarina Molochieva, p. c.), Standard Dargi (Musaev 1987 and Dmitry Ganenkov, p.c.), Lezgi (Haspelmath 1993), Archi (Michael Daniel, p. c.), and Agul (Timur Maisak and Solmaz Merdanova, p. c.). This is quite obviously not enough to put forward generalizations about the existence of functive-transformative markers, their synchronic status and their possible origin at the level of the East Caucasian language family. It is however interesting to observe that, in contrast to Akhvakh and Avar, none of the languages just mentioned has a functive-transformative marker showing clear evidence of having grammaticalized as a case suffix.

⁸ I have not tried to find cognates of Avar-Andi-Tsez **t-* ‘become’ in other branches of North East Caucasian, because this would necessitate solving first a question I am not in a position to solve. The point is that, in addition to grammaticalized reflexes of an old root **t-* ‘become’, Andic languages also have verbs with lateral consonants in their roots and ‘become’ among their possible meanings, like Akhvakh *b-oī-urua* (see Ex. (22a–b) above). Any attempt at enlarging the comparative data summarized here should therefore be very careful with phonetic correspondences involving Andic laterals. For example, Bagvalal has a verb *b-ūtu-la* including ‘become’ among its possible meanings, but Bagvalal *t* regularly corresponds to *l̄* in other Andic languages, whereas *t* in other Andic languages regularly corresponds to Bagvalal *l(h)*, and the derivative suffix attested as *-t* in other languages is in Bagvalal *-l(h)i*; consequently, Bagvalal *b-ūtu-la* ‘become’ is probably not a reflex of **t-* and is rather cognate with Akhvakh *b-oī-urua*, Tindi *b-ū-ti#a*, Karata *b-oī-ata*, or Godoberi *b-ū-i*.

In Chechen, some of the translational equivalents of Russian or English functive constructions provided by Zarina Molochieva include zero-marked functive/transformative phrases, as in Ex. (6) above, but I have not been able to identify anything that could be analyzed as a more or less grammaticalized functive/transformative marker.

Standard Dargi (North East Caucasian) has a suffix *-li* which, in addition to its use with nouns as a functive-transformative marker, also marks a converbial form of verbs — compare *qaraul-li* ‘as a guardian’, *wana-li* ‘warmly’, *uku-li* ‘eating’ (Musaev 1987: 70–72). At first sight, it seems interesting to compare this situation with that found in Akhvakh, with a functive-transformative marker including as its second formant an adverbial suffix also used to mark a converbial form of verbs. Unfortunately, the situation of Dargi is much less easy to analyze than that of Akhvakh.

According to Musaev, the functive-transformative form of Dargi nouns has the same origin as the functive-transformative form of Akhvakh nouns, but he provides no convincing evidence in support of this analysis. Musaev’s hypothesis is that a form such as *qaraul-li* ‘as a guardian’ results historically from the reduction of the phrase *qaraul wiubli* [guardian being], where *wiubli* is a converbial form of the copulative verb: the stem *wiub-* was simply deleted, and the suffix *-li* became attached directly to the noun. However, Musaev does not provide any evidence of a historical process of deletion, and his hypothesis remains purely speculative.

Archi has a suffix *-ši* with a similar distribution. This suffix productively marks a functive-transformative form of nouns (as in *dijarka-ši* ‘as a milkmaid’) and a converbial form of verbs (as in *lap’a-r-ši* ‘throwing’, where *-r-* is an imperfective marker), and is also found in some adverbs derived from nouns or adjectives (as in *kutak-ši* ‘strongly < *kutak* ‘strength’). But in addition to that, *-ši* also takes part in another type of syncretism (the functive-lative syncretism), since in the system of spatial cases, *-ši* encodes destination of movement (as in *perma-l-a-ši* ‘into the farm’, where *-l-* is the oblique stem marker, and *-a-* the spatial configuration marker ‘in’) — Michael Daniel, p. c.

The analysis of the functive-transformative marker *-ši* of Archi poses the same kind of problem as that of the functive-transformative marker of Dargi. In contrast to Avar-Andic-Tsezic languages, in which a functive-transformative marker synchronically analyzable as a case suffix is the reflex of a converbial form of an ancient verb ‘become’, the functive-transformative markers of Dargi and Archi can only be analyzed synchronically as transcategorial markers, and there seems to be no clear evidence supporting the reconstruction of a particular historical scenario accounting for their transcategoriality.

In Lezgi, according to Haspelmath 1993: 105, the use of functive periphrases involving the derivational suffix *-wal* used to form abstract nouns is systematic, and there is evidence suggesting the emergence of a functive case:

“The suffix *-wal* on nouns denoting a profession or function is also so regular and common that it could perhaps be regarded as an inflectional suffix. In order to express ‘work as an X’, one has to use it: *X-wal awun* (lit. ‘do X-hood’), or *X-wile k’walaxun* (lit. ‘work in X-hood’), e.g. *muallimwal awun* ‘work as a teacher’, *reğuxbanwile k’walaxun* ‘work as a miller’. That *-wile* in such constructions is a sort of “functive case” suffix can be seen in examples like (230), where *-wile* is added to a plural noun.”

The example mentioned in this quote includes a form *sopresedatel-ar-wil-e* ‘as co-chairmen’ in which the plural suffix *-ar-* precedes *-wil-* (allomorph of the suffix of abstract nouns *-wal*) and *-e* (inessive), which can be viewed as evidence that *-wile* has been reana-

lyzed as a case suffix. However, Haspelmath does not discuss the other criteria that have been mentioned above as supporting the analysis of the Akhvakh and Avar functive-transformative markers as case suffixes.

According to Timur Maisak and Solmaz Merdanova (p. c.), in Agul, in the same way as in Lezgi, nouns expressing quality derived from concrete nouns constitute the commonest way to express the meanings expressed in other languages by functive phrases. Nouns derived by means of the abstraction suffix *-ʃ^wel* (cognate with Lezgi *-wal*) are widely attested as the Nominative argument of *aq'as* 'do' with the meaning 'work/act as N' — Ex. (24a), in the Dative case with the meaning 'in order to act as N' — Ex. (24b), and in the Locative case or with the adverbial marker *-di* with the meaning 'acting as N' — Ex. (24c).

(24) Agul (Timur Maisak, p. c.)

a. *Ķandejefj ĉas müʃelim-ʃ^wel aq'as.*

want:PST WE:DAT teacher-ABSTR do:INF

'We wanted to work as teachers.' (lit. 'We wanted to do teacherhood.')

b. *Zun šune dijarkā-ʃ^weli-s.*

I go:PF milkmaid-ABSTR-DAT

'I went to work as a milkmaid.' (lit. 'I went to milkmaidhood.')

c. *Ćas q̄arawul-ʃ^wel-di hataje Xinebi.*

WE:DAT guard-ABSTR-ADV send:IPF Xinebi

'They send us Xinebi as a guard (lit. 'with guardhood').'

Here again, there does not seem to be clear evidence that such forms have been reanalyzed as case forms of the concrete noun to which the suffix *-ʃ^wel* is attached.

In a diachronic perspective, it is however interesting to mention here that, as pointed to me by Timur Maisak, the abstraction suffix of Agul and Lezgi, whose inessive form has been analyzed by Haspelmath as an emerging Functive case suffix, can be analyzed as resulting from the grammaticalization of a nominalized form of the verb 'become'. As mentioned in Section 6, Avar-Andi-Tsez languages also have abstraction suffixes analyzable as reflexes of the masdar of **l-* 'become', and **l-* 'become' is also the source of the functive-transformative markers found in Avar-Andi-Tsez languages.

Consequently, both Avar-Andi-Tsez languages and core Lezgi languages illustrate the possibility that functive-transformative markers develop from dependent or nominalized forms of a verb 'become'. The difference is that, in Avar-Andic-Tsez languages, a sequence whose original meaning was 'having become N' has been directly reanalyzed as a functive-transformative form of nouns, whereas in core Lezgi languages, a sequence whose original meaning was 'the fact of being/becoming N' has been reanalyzed as a derived abstract noun, and inflected forms of this derived abstract noun are now engaged in a grammaticalization process that might convert them into grammaticalized functive-transformative forms.

8. CONCLUSION

In this paper, after discussing the notions of functive and transformative and briefly presenting the functive-transformative uses of the so-called Adverbial cases of South and North West Caucasian languages, I have discussed the possible existence of similar functive-transformative markers in East Caucasian languages. Two relatively straightforward types

of situations have been identified, in Avar-Andi-Tsez languages, and in core Lezgian languages. In both cases, the origin of grammaticalized or emerging functive-transformative markers is a dependent or nominalized form of a verb 'become'. The grammaticalization paths are however not identical, and the grammaticalization process is more advanced in Avar-Andi-Tsez languages. I have tried to show that, at least in Akhvakh and Avar, synchronically, nothing prevents recognizing the functive-transformative marker resulting from the grammaticalization of a converb of */- 'become' as a case suffix, and that marginalizing it as a 'case-like particle' is just a matter of tradition. The situation of Archi and Standard Dargi is more complex, with functive-transformative markers that must be described as transcategorical markers, and for which there seems to be no clear evidence supporting the reconstruction of a particular historical scenario. A more systematic investigation of functive-transformative marking across the East Caucasian language family would be necessary before trying to propose a solution.

Abbreviations

o — oblique stem, ABSTR — abstraction, ACC — accusative, ADV — adverbial, AOR — aorist, AUX — auxiliary, CAUS — causative, CFG — spatial configuration, CMP — completive, COP — copula, CVB — converb, DAT — dative, DEF — definite, DEM — demonstrative, DIST — distal, EMPH — emphatic, ERG — ergative, ESS — essive, F — feminine, FOC — focus, FUNC — functive, GEN — genitive, HPL — human plural, IMP — imperative, INESS — inessive, INF — infinitive, INSTR — instrumental, INT — intensive, IPF — imperfective, LAT — lative, LL — lower level, M — masculine, N — neuter, NEG — negative, NPL — neuter plural, OBL — oblique, PF — perfective, PL — plural, POS — positive, PRF — perfect, PROG — progressive, PRS — present, PST — past, REFL — reflexive, SG — singular, SL — same level, SPR — secondary predicate, TERM — terminative, TRANSL — translative, TRNSF — transformative.

References

- Alekseev M. 1988. *Sravnitel'no-istoričeskaja morfologija avaro-andijskix jazykov*. Moscow: Nauka.
- Arkad'ev P., Lander Ju., Letučij A., Sumbatova N. 2009. *Vvedenie. Osnovnye svedenija ob adygejskom jazyke*. Arkad'ev P., Letučij A., Sumbatova N., Ja. Testelec (eds.). *Aspekty polisintetizma: očerki po grammatike adygejskogo jazyka*. Moscow: Rossijskij gosudarstvennyj gumanitarnyj universitet. P. 17–120.
- Boeder W. 2005. *Depictives in Kartvelian*. Himmelmann, Nikolaus P., Eva Schultze-Berndt (eds.). *Secondary Predication and Adverbial Modification. The Typology of Depictives*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. P. 201–236.
- Čikobava A., *Cercvadze I.* 1962. *Xundzuriena [The Avar language]*. Tbilisi: Tbilis Saxelmc'ipo Universit'et'i, K'avk'azjur enata k'atedris šromebi.
- Creissels D. 2006. *Suffixes casuels et postpositions en hongrois*. *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 101-1. P. 225–272.
- Daniel M., Dobrušina N., Sosenskaja T., Tatevosov S. 2001. *Derivacionnaja morfologija*. Kibrik A. (ed.). *Bagvalinskij jazyk*. Moscow. P. 186–197.
- Daniel M., Ganenkov D. 2009. *Case marking in Daghestanian: limits of elaboration*. Malchukov A., Spencer A. *The Oxford Handbook of Case*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. P. 668–685.
- Ebeling C. 1966. *The grammar of literary Avar (Review Article)*. *Studia Caucasica* 2. P. 58–100.
- Grünthal R. 2003. *Finnic adpositions and cases in change*. Helsinki: Société finno-ougrienne.

- Harris A. 1991. Overview of the history of the Kartvelian languages. Harris A. The indigenous languages of the Caucasus. Vol. 1: the Kartvelian languages. Delmar — New York: Caravan books. P. 8–69.
- Haspelmath M. 1993. A grammar of Lezgian. Berlin — New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Haspelmath M., Buchholz O. 1998. Equative and similative constructions. van der Auwera, Johan (ed.). Adverbial constructions in the languages of Europe. Mouton de Gruyter. P. 277–334.
- Hualde J., Ortiz de Urbina J. 2003. A grammar of Basque. Berlin — New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Karlssohn F. 1999. Finnish: An Essential Grammar. London — New York: Routledge.
- Khalilova Z. 2009. A grammar of Khwarshi. Utrecht: LOT.
- Lelkes I. 1967. Manuel de hongrois. Budapest: Tankönyvkiadó.
- Magomedova P. 1999. Čamalinsko-russkij slovar' [Chamalal-Russian dictionary]. Maxačkala: Dagestanskij Naučnyj Centr Rossiskoj Akademii Nauk.
- Magomedova P. 2003. Tindinsko-russkij slovar' [Tindi-Russian dictionary]. Maxačkala: Dagestanskij Naučnyj Centr Rossiskoj Akademii Nauk.
- Magomedova P. 2004. Bagvalinsko-russkij slovar' [Bagvalal-Russian dictionary]. Maxačkala: Dagestanskij Naučnyj Centr Rossiskoj Akademii Nauk.
- Magomedova P., Abdulaeva I. 2007. Axvaxsko-russkij slovar' [Akhvakh-Russian dictionary]. Maxačkala: Dagestanskij Naučnyj Centr Rossiskoj Akademii Nauk.
- Magomedova P., Xalidova Š. 2001. Karatinsko-russkij slovar' [Karata-Russian dictionary]. Maxačkala: Dagestanskij Naučnyj Centr Rossiskoj Akademii Nauk.
- Mikkelsen L. 2011. Copular clauses. Maienborn C., Heusinger K. von, Portner P. (eds.). Semantics: An International Handbook of Natural Language Meaning. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. P. 1805–1829.
- Musaev M.-S. M. 1987. Slovoizmenitel'nye kategorii darginskogo jazyka (kategorii grammatičeskix klassov, abstraktnye padeži). Makhachkala.
- Riese T. 1993. Der Translativ in den uralischen Sprachen 2. *Linguistica Uralica* 29. P. 1–20.
- Rose F. 2011. Grammaire de l'émérillonteko, une langue tupi-guarani de Guyane française. Louvain: Peeters.
- Saidova P. 2006. Godoberinsko-russkij slovar' [Godoberi-Russian dictionary]. Maxačkala: Dagestanskij Naučnyj Centr Rossiskoj Akademii Nauk.
- Saidova P., Abusov M. 2012. Botlixsko-russkij slovar' [Botlikh-Russian dictionary]. Maxačkala: Dagestanskij Naučnyj Centr Rossiskoj Akademii Nauk.
- Seki L. 2000. Gramática do Kamaiurá, língua Tupi-Guarani do Alto Xingu. Campinas: Editora da Unicamp.
- Vogt H. 1971. Grammaire de la langue géorgienne. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.