

John Benjamins Publishing Company



This is a contribution from *The Genitive*.

Edited by Anne Carlier and Jean-Christophe Verstraete.

© 2013. John Benjamins Publishing Company

This electronic file may not be altered in any way.

The author(s) of this article is/are permitted to use this PDF file to generate printed copies to be used by way of offprints, for their personal use only.

Permission is granted by the publishers to post this file on a closed server which is accessible to members (students and staff) only of the author's/s' institute, it is not permitted to post this PDF on the open internet.

For any other use of this material prior written permission should be obtained from the publishers or through the Copyright Clearance Center (for USA: www.copyright.com).

Please contact rights@benjamins.nl or consult our website: www.benjamins.com

Tables of Contents, abstracts and guidelines are available at www.benjamins.com

Floating genitives and possessive framing in Northern Akhvakh

Denis Creissels
Université Lumière (Lyon2)

This paper analyzes a construction involving genitives in Northern Akhvakh, the *floating genitive construction*. In this construction, a genitive NP is related to a noun in S or P role but is not included in the NP headed by this noun. The floating genitive identifies the personal sphere of its referent as the frame within which the predication expressed by the clause holds. Functionally, this construction combines the pragmatic motivations of framing constructions with the semantic effects common to other types of external possession constructions. Parallels are proposed between the floating genitives of Northern Akhvakh and functionally comparable constructions found in other languages. This construction illustrates the development of an uncommon type of external possessors in a language family in which external possession has so far been considered relatively marginal.

1. Introduction¹

This paper establishes the specificity of a particular type of construction involving the genitives of Northern Akhvakh and analyzes it from a typological perspective. In this construction, designated here as *floating genitive construction*, a possessor and a possessee are encoded as a genitive NP and a nominative NP in S or P role respectively, but the genitive NP is not included in the nominative NP headed by the noun with which it stands in a possessive relationship. This construction has a *possessive framing* function, in the sense that the floating genitive identifies the personal sphere of its referent as the frame within which the predication expressed by the clause holds.

Akhvakh (*aš^waĹi mič^ʼi*, Russian *axvaxskij jazyk*) belongs to the Andic (sub-)branch of the Northeast Caucasian (or Nakh-Daghestanian) family.² According to Magomedova and Abdulaeva (2007), Akhvakh has approximately 20 000 speakers. Four dialects are traditionally recognized. One of them is designated as Northern Akhvakh, whereas the other three are grouped under the label of Southern Akhvakh.

Northern Akhvakh is spoken in four villages of the Axvaxskij Rajon in the western part of Daghestan (Tadmagitl', Lologonitl', Kudijab-Roso, and Izani), in recent settlements in the lowlands of Daghestan (Kamyškutan, Sovetskoe), and in Axaxdərə near Zaqatala (Azerbaijan). The Southern Akhvakh dialects are spoken in one village each (Cegob, Tljanub and Ratlub), all situated in the Šamil'skij Rajon of Daghestan.

Magomedbekova (1967) and Magomedova & Abdulaeva (2007) are the main references on Akhvakh. The analysis proposed in this paper is based on field work carried out in Axaxdərə, Tadmagitl', Lologonitl' and Sovetskoe.

Like the other Andic languages, Akhvakh has no writing tradition. The Akhvakh-Russian dictionary (Magomedova & Abdulaeva 2007) uses an adaptation of the Avar version of the cyrillic alphabet. The transcription used in this paper departs from the IPA conventions on the following points: alveolar voiceless affricate *c*; palato-alveolar fricatives *š* (voiceless) and *ž* (voiced); palato-alveolar affricates *č* (voiceless) and *ž* (voiced); lateral voiceless affricate *ɬ*; the macron is used for long vowels and strong consonants.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 presents the basics of Northern Akhvakh morphosyntax. Section 3 describes the formation and morphological properties of Northern Akhvakh genitives. Section 4 reviews the functions fulfilled by genitives in Northern Akhvakh syntax. Section 5 deals with the floating genitives of Northern Akhvakh, which constitute the main topic of this paper. In Section 6, some parallels are proposed between the floating genitives of Northern Akhvakh and functionally comparable constructions found in other languages.

2. General remarks on Akhvakh morphosyntax

2.1 Clause structure

Akhvakh clause structure is characterized by flexible constituent order. Case marking and gender-number agreement between the verb and its core arguments are consistently ergative.

Arguments whose identity is recoverable from the context can freely be omitted, and unexpressed arguments receiving an arbitrary or unspecified interpretation are common too.

Causative is the only valency-changing mechanism systematically expressed via verb morphology or grammaticalized periphrases.

2.2 Nouns and noun phrases

Three semantically transparent agreement classes of nouns are distinguished in the singular: human masculine (M), human feminine (F), and non-human (N). In the plural, the distinction *masculine vs. feminine* is neutralized, resulting in a binary

opposition *human plural* (HPL) vs. *non-human plural* (NPL). The only exceptions to the semantic rule of gender assignment are *āde* ‘person’ and *mikè* ‘child’, which in the singular trigger N agreement, whereas the corresponding plural forms *ādo* and *mikeli* trigger regular HPL agreement.

In canonical NPs, the head noun is in final position and is inflected for number and case. Number inflection of nouns is irregular and involves a considerable amount of free variation. In headless NPs (i.e. complex NPs whose head noun has been elided), gender-number and case markers attach to the noun dependent that, in the absence of an overt head noun, constitutes the last word of the NP.

Most noun dependents in canonical NPs optionally include gender-number suffixes agreeing with the head noun. In addition, some adjectives have obligatory gender-number agreement prefixes. However, not all adjectives have gender-number agreement prefixes, noun dependents other than adjectives very rarely occur with agreement suffixes in canonical NPs, and suffixal agreement of adjectives is common only in the HPL class. Akhvakh does not have case agreement.

The 1st and 2nd person pronouns show irregularities in their case inflection, but distinguish the same cases as nouns. Akhvakh has an inclusive pronoun distinct from the 1st person plural pronoun, but no 3rd person pronoun proper; demonstratives are used in the discursive function fulfilled by dedicated 3rd person pronouns in other languages.

The nominative (alias absolutive), used in the extra-syntactic function of quotation or designation, in S or P roles, and in predicate function, has no overt mark. Case suffixes may attach to a stem identical with the nominative, or to a special *oblique stem* (signaled in the glosses as ...). In the singular, the formation of the oblique stem is very irregular and involves a considerable amount of free variation. The standard ‘oblique stem markers’ added to the nominative form of nouns and expressing gender-number distinctions (M_o - $\bar{s}u$ -, F_o/N_o - \bar{h} -) are found only with some nouns, and are often in free variation with other types of oblique stem formation. In the plural, the use of the oblique stem markers HPL_o -*lo*- and NPL_o -*li*- or -*le*- is more regular. In headless NPs, the use of the standard oblique stem markers is systematic.

Case inflection includes the following cases:

- three ‘syntactic cases’: ERG (ergative) -*de*, DAT (dative) -*La*, and GEN (genitive) \emptyset (-AGR) or - $\bar{L}i$;³
- three spatial cases: LOC (locative) -*i* or -*e*, ALL (allative) -*a*, and ABL (ablative) -*u(ne)*;
- three peripheral cases or case-like forms: COM (comitative) -*kèna*, ESS (essive) -*te* or -*t*-AGR and MDT (mediative) -*gu \bar{t} e* or -*gu \bar{t} -AGR*.⁴
- two postpositional clitics, CAUSAL -*vana* attached to the ‘dallative’ form of nouns (see further in this section), and VERS (versative) -*sa* attached to the allative.

The spatial case markers are shared by nouns and spatial adverbs. In noun inflection, they are normally preceded by *orientation markers* (OR) expressing types of spatial

configurations (in, under, etc.), which can be dropped only in particular conditions. Northern Akhvakh has five productive orientation markers (-*g*-, -*χar*- ~ -*Īir*-, -*q̄*-, -*Ī'i*-, and -*Īi*-) and vestiges of a sixth orientation marker -*r*-. A straightforward semantic characterization is possible for only two of them (-*χar*- ~ -*Īir*- 'beside' and -*Ī'i*- 'under'). The other three are polysemous in such a way that no simple semantic characterization is possible, and the use of semantically motivated labels could only give a distorted image of their meanings; this is the reason why I prefer to simply number them in the order in which they are listed above. For more details on the meanings carried by the orientation markers of Akhvakh, see Creissels (2009b). Given the topic of this paper, it is sufficient to mention here that OR₁ -*g*- can be viewed as a default orientation marker that does not specify a particular spatial configuration by itself.

The encoding of spatial relationships may involve a construction in which a noun phrase referring to the orienter combines with a spatial adverb or locational noun. This construction is functionally similar to adposition phrases found in other languages (in the sense that the spatial configuration is encoded by the spatial adverb or locational noun), but formally different in that the NP referring to the orienter and the spatial adverb or locational noun exhibit parallel spatial case inflection:

<i>q̄Ēleno-g-e geĪ-i</i>	bag-OR ₁ -LOC inside-LOC	'in the bag' (static location)
<i>q̄Ēleno-g-a geĪ-a</i>	bag-OR ₁ -ALL inside-ALL	'into the bag'
<i>q̄Ēleno-g-u geĪ-u</i>	bag-OR ₁ -ABL inside-ABL	'out of the bag'

A problematic aspect of the Akhvakh case system is the existence of a syncretic noun ending -*a* neutralizing the distinction between dative -*la* and allative₁ -*g-a*. This ending is found in contexts where it can be substituted by forms unambiguously identifiable as dative or allative₁, and is therefore analyzable as an allomorph either of the dative or of the allative₁, but it also occurs in contexts where it seems impossible to decide whether it constitutes an allomorph of the dative or of the allative₁. The existence of such contexts suggests the need to recognize an additional case, called *dallative* here, whose distribution overlaps with that of the dative and allative₁.

There are two possible constructions for NP co-ordination: either "NP₁-*k'ena* NP₂", where -*k'ena* is the suffix of the comitative case (also used for comitative adjuncts), or "NP₁-*la* NP₂-*la*", where -*la* is an additive particle (glossed ADD) also found in contexts corresponding to English 'also', 'in turn', or 'even'.

2.3 Verb inflection

Akhvakh verbs always exhibit an overt inflectional suffix, but with respect to prefixal inflection, they are divided into two morphological classes: those including a prefixal slot that cannot be left empty, and those that cannot take prefixes. The prefixal inflection of the verbs that take inflectional prefixes is limited to the expression of gender-number agreement with the nominative argument (S or P).

Suffixal inflection is identical for all verbs and expresses TAM, evidentiality/mirativity, polarity, finiteness, and gender-number agreement with the nominative argument. Person distinctions are involved in the contrast between the forms labeled here perfective₁ and perfective₂, but they follow a typologically rare pattern called “conjunct/disjunct system” in the literature. For a detailed presentation of this aspect of the verbal system of Akhvakh, which can be analyzed as a particular type of evidentiality marking rather than person marking proper, see Creissels (2008a and 2008b).⁵

The synthetic verb forms that can head independent clauses are characterized by the following paradigm of suffixes (or combinations of suffixes):⁶

- perfective₁: HPL *-iri*, other classes *-ari* or *-eri*
- perfective₂: HPL *-idi*, other classes *-ada* or *-ad(a)-AGR*
- ‘short’ perfective:⁷ HPL *-i*, other classes *-a*
- perfective negative: *-il-a*, *il-a-AGR* or *il-AGR*
- perfective₃:⁸ *-AGR-wudi*
- perfective₃ negative: *-il-AGR-wudi*
- perfective₄: *-AGR-wa*
- perfective₄ negative: *-uš-AGR-wa*
- imperfective₁: *-iri*
- imperfective₂: *-ida* or *-id(a)-AGR*
- imperfective₁ negative: *-iki*
- imperfective₂ negative: *-ika* or *-ik(a)-AGR*
- potential:⁹ HPL *-oji*, other classes *-AGR-wa*
- imperative: *-a*
- prohibitive: *-uba*
- optative₁ (general optative): *-l’a* added to the imperative (*-a*)
- optative₁ negative: *-l’a* added to the prohibitive (*-uba*)
- optative₂ (restricted to wishes that specifically involve the addressee): *-ada* followed by a gender-number suffix agreeing with the addressee irrespective of the syntactic role of the 2nd person pronoun in the clause
- apprehensive: *-gole* added to the conditional converb (*-ala*)¹⁰

The two imperfectives are used interchangeably in assertive or interrogative clauses referring to habitual or permanent events, and the imperfective₂ tends to be more frequent in this use, but the imperfective₁ also has modal uses in which it cannot be replaced by the imperfective₂.

The four perfectives do not differ in their TAM value, but only in their evidentiality/mirativity implications. The perfective₁ and the perfective₂ share the implication that the speaker has a direct knowledge of the event (s)he is relating. The perfective₂ adds the implication that the assertor (1st person in declarative clauses, 2nd person in questions) was actively involved in the event. The perfective₃ implies indirect knowledge (inference or hearsay), and the perfective₄ may encode either surprise, or a particular attitude of the speaker imposing him/herself as an epistemic authority.

Additional TAM or evidentiality/mirativity values are expressed by analytic verb forms with the copula *godi*, the verb *bik'uruLA* 'be', or the verb *mičunuLA* 'be found' in auxiliary function.

Akhvakh has no form specialized in participial function, but four of the independent verb forms listed above are also used as participles: perfective₂, perfective negative, imperfective₂, and imperfective negative₂. On the participles of Northern Akhvakh, see Creissels (2009a).

Strictly dependent verb forms include a verbal noun or "masdar" (-e), an infinitive (-*uruLA*), a spatial form (-*iṽ-i/a/u(ne)* 'at/to/from the place where ...'), a general converb, a progressive converb (-*ere*), and several specialized converbs expressing various semantic types of adverbial subordination. On the general converb of Northern Akhvakh, see Creissels (2012). On the other converbs of Northern Akhvakh, see Creissels (2010).

3. Genitive formation in Northern Akhvakh

3.1 Genitives with and without the genitive suffix -*Li*

Morphologically, Northern Akhvakh has two variants of the genitive case: a variant in which no specific marker of the genitive case is added to the oblique stem of the noun, and a variant marked by the suffix -*Li*. The genitive marker -*Li* is homonymous with the spatial suffix -*Li-i*, where -*i* marks locative case, and -*Li-*, conventionally labeled OR₅, is an orientation marker conflating the spatial configurations 'in a filled, dense space, among the elements of a set' and 'adhering to a non-horizontal surface'.

The use of the two morphological variants of the genitive does not involve any semantic distinction in the relation between the genitive and its head. Their distribution is automatically conditioned by the gender-number of the noun in genitive function, with some amount of free variation which will be commented on below.

3.2 Zero-marked genitives

The variant of the genitive case including no specific marker is used in principle with M and HPL nouns. It corresponds to the formation of the genitive traditionally described in other Andic languages as a formation in which a gender-number suffix expressing gender-number agreement with the head of the genitive serves to mark the genitive, as in the following example from Andi (Cercvadze 1965: 331):

- (1) *Gender-number suffixes in the formation of the genitive in Andi*
- a. *ima* 'father', oblique stem *imu-*
 - b. *imu-w woči* 'the father's brother'
imu-j joči 'the father's sister'
imu-b kòtu 'the father's horse'
imu-r haq̄'u 'the father's house'

The traditional characterization of this type of genitive formation in the Andic languages is theoretically questionable. It is a common property of agreement markers to contribute to the identification of the syntactic status of the word to which they are attached, but this does not imply that they should be analyzed as markers of the syntactic role they help to identify. In the type of genitive formation illustrated in (1), the agreement marker attaches to the oblique stem of the noun, normally followed by an overt case marker. Consequently, it can be argued that the genitive marker proper is not the agreement marker, but the absence of any overt element in the morphological slot reserved for case markers. In other words, the form presented as *imu-w* above is in fact *imu-Ø-w* [father_o-GEN-M].¹¹

The need to revise the traditional analysis of this type of genitive formation is particularly obvious in the case of Akhvakh, due to a general tendency to eliminate gender-number agreement between the noun and its dependents, including attributive genitives, as shown in (2).

- (2) *Optional gender-number suffixes attached to Northern Akhvakh genitives in the absence of the genitive suffix -li*
- a. *ima* ‘father’, oblique stem *imo-*
 - b. *imo(-we) wāci* ‘the father’s brother (M)’
imo(-je) jači ‘the father’s sister (F)’
imo(-be) x^wani ‘the father’s horse (N)’

In the case of the genitive, the result of this tendency is that forms consisting of the oblique stem devoid of any overt mark can fulfill the function considered most typical for genitives (the attributive function), and are in fact much more common in this function than forms including a gender-number suffix. Consequently, the notion of zero-marked genitives coinciding with the oblique stem and to which agreement markers may be added, quite obviously provides a better account of this type of formation of Akhvakh genitives than the traditional notion of agreement marker used in the function of genitive marker.

The tendency to eliminate the gender-number markers that initially characterized the first variant of the genitive in Akhvakh has an interesting consequence for the analysis of the genitive, since it facilitates the recognition of an important functional distinction. The point is that the elimination of the gender-number markers characteristic of the first variant of the genitive depends on the syntactic function of the genitive: as will be developed in § 5.2, floating genitives (i.e., genitives in possessive framing function) show a very strong tendency to retain their gender-number suffix if they are not formed by means of the genitive marker *-li*, even for speakers who never use gender-number suffixes with attributive genitives.

In the examples, genitive forms coinciding with the oblique stem are glossed as ‘... [GEN]’, irrespective of the presence or absence of a gender-number suffix.

3.3 Genitives marked by the suffix *-Īi*

The genitive suffix *-Īi* is used in principle with F, N or NPL nouns. Its homonymy with a spatial ending is not peculiar to Northern Akhvakh: in the other Andic languages too, the formation of the genitive by means of gender-number suffixes is in competition with genitive markers either identical or at least very similar to a spatial ending close to Akhvakh *-Īi* both in form and meaning. A plausible scenario is that the original function of *-Īi* was spatial, and that it started being reanalyzed as a genitive marker with inanimate nouns, which typically occur in genitival constructions expressing whole-part relationships – see Alekseev (2003: 100–110).

3.4 Variations in the distribution of the two variants of the genitive

As already mentioned above, the distribution of the two variants of the genitive is not strict, and speakers may be more or less liberal in their judgments about genitive forms that do not respect the traditional norm. In principle, the zero-marked genitive with optional gender-number markers must be used for M or HPL possessors, whereas the suffix *-Īi* is used with F, N or NPL possessors, but this rule is not always respected. Some F nouns with an oblique stem of a non-standard type may occur in the zero-marked genitive. For example, the regular genitive form of *ak̄'i* ‘wife’ is *ak̄'Īi*, but in ex. (5) in § 4.2 below, this noun occurs in a zero-marked genitive form. But it is much more common to find M or HPL nouns with the genitive suffix *-Īi*, in particular in the case of nouns whose oblique stem coincides with the nominative. The tendency to generalize the *Īi*-marked genitive even with nouns whose oblique stem is different from the nominative seems to be characteristic of children’s speech, especially in Axaxdərə.

1st and 2nd person pronouns are the only nominals that never occur with the genitive marker *-Īi*, and for which the only possible genitive form is the zero-marked genitive with an optional agreement marker, even in the speech of children that otherwise tend to generalize the use of *-Īi* to M and HPL nouns:

<i>dene</i>	1st pers. sing.	→	oblique stem	<i>di-</i>	genitive	<i>di(-AGR)</i>
<i>mene</i>	2nd pers. sing.	→	oblique stem	<i>du-</i>	genitive	<i>du(-AGR)</i>
<i>īsi</i>	1st pers. pl.	→	oblique stem	<i>eše-</i>	genitive	<i>eše(-AGR)</i>
<i>īli</i>	incl.	→	oblique stem	<i>eĪe-</i>	genitive	<i>eĪe(-AGR)</i>
<i>ušti</i>	2nd pers. pl.	→	oblique stem	<i>ošte-</i>	genitive	<i>ošte(-AGR)</i>

4. Attributive genitives and other syntactic uses of genitives in Northern Akhvakh

4.1 Attributive genitives

By definition, the use of the genitive form of canonical NPs in noun dependent function is crucial in the notion of genitive: the recognition of noun forms as genitives

implies minimally that the forms in question can be used as noun dependents referring to an individual whose personal sphere includes the referent of the head noun (Creissels 1979: 127-176, Creissels 2006a: 141-160).¹²

Akhvakh genitives fulfill this prototypical function of genitives without any particular complication. They are not sensitive to alienability distinctions, and the same construction *genitive + noun* is used with reference to the following three types of relationships, considered central in the notion of personal sphere:

- person-bodyparts (*jašo-Īi voso* ‘the girl’s hair’),
- person-relatives (*jašo-Īi ima* ‘the girl’s father’),
- person-objects (*jašo-Īi šišaL’è* ‘the girl’s dress’).

Attributive genitives are also productively used with reference to the following types of relationships:

- whole-part relationships (*mašina-Īi ič’ò* ‘the door of the car’),
 - members-group relationships (*x^wanale-Īi rexet’i* ‘a herd of horses’),
 - material-object relationships (*ič’è-Īi q’èda* ‘stone wall’),
 - object/person-quality relationships (*īē-Īi t’āsa* ‘the taste of the water’, *jašo-Īi sama* ‘the girl’s personality’),
 - quality-object/person relationships (*koša t’āsa-Īi īē* ‘bad-tasting water’, lit. ‘water of bad taste’),
 - time-event relationships (*čibero-Īi žaho* ‘winter cold’),
 - place-object relationships (*beča-Īi čiči* ‘mountain flower’),
 - destination-object relationships (*jašo-Īi šišaL’è* quoted above with the meaning ‘the girl’s dress’ is in fact ambiguous between this meaning and ‘a dress for girls’),
 - author-creation or origin-phenomenon relationships (*jašo-Īi kava* ‘the letter written by the girl’, *čiči-Īi š^wani* ‘the smell of the flower’),
 - product-origin relationships (*seče-Īi ruša* ‘apple-tree’)
- etc.

The genitive may also be used with reference to substance-measure relationships, as in *keda mina raži-Īi* ‘two cloves (lit. heads) of garlic’, but in this construction, the genitive *raži-Īi* follows *mina* ‘head’ which might be analyzed as its head (in uncontroversial cases of attributive genitives, the only possible order is *genitive – head noun*). Moreover, in this construction, the noun referring to the substance measured is not necessarily in the genitive: *keda mina raži*, lit. ‘two head garlic’ is possible with the same meaning.

4.2 Other syntactic uses of genitives in Northern Akhvakh

In Northern Akhvakh, the use of genitives in a function similar to the canonical function of other cases, i.e. as verb dependents denoting participants in the event encoded by the verb, is very marginal. Genitive NPs in verb modifier function are not attested

at all, and the only verbs with argumental genitives I am aware of are *mačunULA* ‘speak about’, *beč’urULA* ‘be full of’, *beč’orULA* ‘fill with’, *boLURULA* ‘form from’, *boLōrULA* ‘create from’, and *gūrULA* ‘make’ in the sense of ‘create from’.

Like other noun dependents (adjectives or determiners), genitives can nominalize, i.e. they can constitute headless NPs by themselves. If a nominalized zero-marked genitive occupies a role requiring the nominative case, the gender-number suffix, optional in noun dependent function, is obligatory. Nominalized *Li*-marked genitives in roles requiring the nominative case may take a gender-number suffix too, but this is not obligatory. In syntactic roles requiring a case other than the nominative, the oblique stem of nominalized genitives, like that of other nominalized noun dependents, is formed by adding an oblique stem marker:

<i>waša</i>	‘boy’	→	<i>wašo(-be) t’ale</i>	‘the boy’s hat’
			<i>wašo-be</i> , obl. stem <i>wašo-ḥi-</i>	‘that (N) of the boy’
<i>mašina</i>	‘car’	→	<i>mašina-Li t̄c’o</i>	‘the door of the car’
			<i>mašina-Li(-be)</i> , obl. stem <i>mašina-Li-ḥi-</i>	‘that (N) of the car’

In ex. (3), the nominalized genitives *eše-be* ‘ours (N)’ and *eše-re* ‘ours (NPL)’ are interpreted as the reduced form of the full NPs *eše(-be) boč’o* ‘our moon’ and *eše(-re) c̄^wariba* ‘our stars’, respectively.

- (3) *ošte boč’o-la eše-be-gula godi,*
 AXD¹³ 2PL_o[GEN] moon-ADD 1PL_o-N-like COP.N
 ‘Your moon is like ours,
ošte c̄^wari-ba-la eše-re-gula gedi.
 2PL_o[GEN] star-PL-ADD 1PL_o-NPL-like COP.NPL
 and your stars are like ours.’¹⁴

In example (4), taken from an anecdote in which the miller sees Molla taking wheat from other people’s bags to put it into his own bag, *du-ḥi-g-une* ‘from yours’ and *ek’o-ḥi-g-a* ‘into other people’s’ are nominalized genitives, interpreted in this context as the reduced form of the full NPs *du(-be) qēLeno-g-une* ‘from your bag’ and *ek’o(-be) qēLeno-g-a* ‘into other people’s bag’, respectively.

- (4) *mene hu-šte řadada w-ūč-ala,*
 AXD 2SG DIST-thus mad M-be.found-COND
 ‘If you are as mad [as you pretend to be],
du-ḥi-g-une ek’o-ḥi-g-a
 2SG_o[GEN]-N_o-OR₁-ABL other.people[GEN]-N-OR₁-ALL
čugu t’.ōš-a-wa?
 why put.NEG-N-PF₄¹⁵
 why didn’t you put [wheat] from your [bag] into [the bag] of other people?’

As illustrated by ex. (5) & (6), genitives can take a predicate function in a construction in which they immediately precede the non-verbal copula *godī* or the copulative verb *bik'urula* 'be'. This can be viewed as a particular use of nominalized genitives, since nouns in the nominative case take a predicate function exactly in the same way.

- (5) di-be goLe, aḱ'ò-be g^wede.
 AXD 1SG_o[GEN]-N COP.NEG.N wife_o[GEN]-N COP.N
 'It is not mine, it belongs to my wife.' (lit. 'it is my wife's')
- (6) eše č'eko-Ĺ'-i-še ũši eše-be g^wede.
 TDM 1PL_o[GEN] foot_o-OR₄-LOC-ADJZ soil 1PL_o[GEN]-N COP.N
 'The soil under our feet is ours.'

The uses of Northern Akhvakh genitives examined so far are cross-linguistically common. Floating genitives, which will be described in the following section, are less common. An interesting peculiarity of Northern Akhvakh is that variations in the use of gender-number suffixes in the different possible functions fulfilled by genitives contribute to make the distinction between floating genitives and other uses of genitives relatively easy to recognize.

5. Floating genitives

5.1 The notion of floating genitive

Examples (7) to (10) provide a first illustration of what I call floating genitives. This term is motivated by the fact that, semantically speaking, there is clearly a possessive relationship between the genitive and another word in the same sentence, but this possessive relationship is not encoded as a head-dependent relation in the construction of a noun phrase.

- (7) ič'ò č'or-ere b-ik^w-a-wi če ek^wa-š^w-e moĹa rasadi-be.
 AXD door knock-PROG N-be-N-PF₃ one man-M_o-ERG Molla Rasadi[GEN]-N
 'A man knocked at Molla Rasadi's door.'
 lit. 'The door was hit by a man, of Molla Rasadi.'
- (8) čaka keha b-ol'-ere godi di-be.
 AXD much eye N-ache-PROG COP.N 1SG_o[GEN]-N
 'My eye is giving me much pain.'
 lit. 'The eye is giving much pain, of me.'
- (9) č'ek'-i vad-e q^w.ēne r-ik^w-a-wi hu-šu-re.
 AXD leg-PL on.the.ground-LOC reach-PROG NPL-be-N-PF₃ DIST-M_o[GEN]-NPL
 'His legs reached the ground.'
 lit. 'The legs reached the ground, of him.'

- (10) *ʁe-ḷi jaše-ḥi-q̄-e k'eha b-uḫ-ari ha-ṣu-be.*
 AXD neighborhood-GEN girl-F_o-OR₃-LOC eye N-fall-PF₁ PROX-M[GEN]-N
 'He noticed a young girl from the neighborhood.'
 lit. 'The eye fell on a girl, of him'

The fact that such genitives can freely occur at the beginning or at the end of the sentence, irrespective of the position of the noun to which they are semantically related, is particularly significant in a language like Akhvakh, in which the extreme flexibility of constituent order at clause level sharply contrasts with the rigidity of noun phrase structure.

5.2 Agreement properties and syntactic status of floating genitives

In Northern Akhvakh, gender-number agreement of zero-marked genitives supports the recognition of floating genitives as involving a specific construction.

As already explained, Akhvakh has two morphological types of genitives: zero-marked genitives and *ḷi*-marked genitives. In attributive function, zero-marked genitives may express agreement with their head, but I have no unambiguous example of attributive genitives with gender-number suffixes in the texts I collected in Axaxdərə, and very few examples in my texts from Tadmagitl'. By contrast, zero-marked genitives in the construction illustrated by ex. (7) to (10) above invariably show gender-number suffixes.¹⁶

Additional evidence that floating genitives involve a specific type of construction comes from the fact that they are found only in clauses where the possessee is the nominative argument, i.e. the NP in the nominative case (P in transitive constructions and S in intransitive constructions) governing the gender-number agreement of the verb.¹⁷

An extraction analysis of floating genitives remains of course possible from a formal point of view, at least from the perspective of theories that allow syntactic movement operations, but it requires positing conditions on extraction that can be viewed as equivalent to the recognition of a separate construction:

- the extraction of genitives is extremely productive, whereas the extraction of other types of noun dependents is exceptional, or not attested at all;
- the extraction of zero-marked genitives implies overt gender-number agreement;
- genitives can be extracted from NPs in S/P role only.

At this point, it is important to mention that Northern Akhvakh has several cases of 'adverbial concord', i.e. of adjunct phrases agreeing with the nominative argument of the clause. This is the case, for example, for many manner adverbs, such as *ihahime* (M *ihahimo*, HPL *ihahimi*) 'slowly', *hušte* (M *hušto*, HPL *hušti*) 'thus', *č'ige* (M *č'igo*, HPL *č'igi*) 'how?', etc.

- (11) a. čʷig-o me-de hu-du ekʷa tʷabal-o w-ukʷ-ada?
 TDM how-M[ADV] 2SG-ERG DIST-SL man bury-M[ADV] M-be-PF₂
 'How(M) did you bury that man?'
 b. čʷig-i me-de hu-du ād-o
 ELIC how-HPL[ADV] 2SG-ERG DIST-SL person-PL
 tʷabal-i b-akʷ-idi?
 bury-HPL[ADV] HPL-be-PF₂-HPL
 'How(HPL) did you bury those people?'

Consequently, the fact that floating genitives agree with the nominative argument cannot be viewed as evidence supporting the extraction analysis, since Akhvakh has uncontroversial cases of agreement between the nominative argument and another term of the clause that cannot be analyzed as extracted from the NP in S or P role.

5.3 Semantic properties of floating genitives

In addition to the morphosyntactic evidence presented above, an analysis of floating genitives that does not recognize them as a specific construction would be problematic from the point of view of the syntax-semantics interface. Floating genitives do not differ from attributive genitives in their contribution to denotative meaning, but they carry different implications with respect to information structure and/or the way they emphasize particular aspects of the denotative meaning.

Unlike attributive genitives, which have a much broader range of values (see Section 4.1 above), floating genitives are overwhelmingly found with animate possessors involved in one of the varieties of possessive relationships commonly considered prototypical (person-bodyparts, person-relatives and person-objects relationships). Floating genitives referring to whole-part relationships and object/person-quality relationships are attested too, though much less frequently, and the other types of relationships to which attributive genitives can refer are not attested in the floating genitive construction.

In addition, Akhvakh has no systematic expression of definiteness contrasts at NP level, but floating genitives may contrast with attributive genitives from this point of view. As illustrated by ex. (12), NPs including an attributive genitive that clearly refers to a specific individual tend to be interpreted as definite descriptions, whereas no such implication is carried by the floating genitive construction.

- (12) a. di ištuda lāgi b-uq-ari.
 AXD 1SG_o[GEN] five sheep N-get.lost-PF₁
 'My five sheep got lost' (attributive genitive)
 b. ištuda lāgi b-uq-ari di-be.
 five sheep N-get.lost-PF₁ 1SG_o[GEN]-N
 'Five of my sheep got lost'
 lit. 'Five sheep got lost, of me.' (floating genitive)

The obvious function of attributive genitives is to restrict the denotation of their head, and the explanation of the definiteness effects often observed cross-linguistically for attributive genitives is that, in terms of discourse strategy, the optimal situation is one in which the presence of a restrictive modifier uniquely determines the referent of its head. Consequently, the fact that floating genitives trigger no definiteness effect can be accounted for by positing that, in terms of discourse strategy, they do not operate directly on the denotation of an NP, but rather on the scope of the predication.

This hypothesis is consistent with the empathy effects triggered by floating genitives. Let us consider the following minimal pair:

- (13) a. eše-je ila j-iL'-e gida.
 AXD 1PL_o[GEN]-F grandmother F-die-F[ADV] COP.F
 lit. 'Of us, a/the grandmother has died.' (floating genitive)
- b. eše ila j-iL'-e gida.
 1PL_o[GEN] grandmother F-die-F[ADV] COP.F
 'Our grandmother has died.'

At least for speakers that never use gender-number suffixes with attributive genitives (which was in particular the case for my main informant in Axaxdərə), this is unambiguously an instance of the contrast between floating and attributive genitive (For speakers who sometimes use gender-number suffixes with attributive genitives, a variant of sentence (a) with the genitive in final position would unambiguously involve a floating genitive: *ila jil'è gida ešeje*).

In English, it is difficult to find a satisfactory translational equivalent of sentence (13a). By contrast, equivalents of this sentence can be proposed for French (*Nous avons notre grand-mère qui est morte* vs. *Notre grand-mère est morte*), Spanish (*Se nos ha muerto la abuela* vs. *Nuestra abuela se ha muerto*), Basque (*Hil zaigu amona* vs. *Gure amona hil da*) or Russian (*У нас бабушка умерла* vs. *Наша бабушка умерла*). We will return to this point in Section 6, but note that such translations correctly reflect the fact that, in Akhvakh, an empathy effect follows from the fact that sentence (a) considers the situation from the point of view of the possessor, whereas sentence (b) can be viewed as a matter-of-fact way to inform about the grandmother's death.

To summarize, floating genitives have in common with attributive genitives that they encode possessors related to a possessee overtly expressed in the same clause. They differ from them in that attributive genitives restrict the denotation of their head without any particular implication for information structure, whereas floating genitives express that the situation to which the clause refers is the personal sphere of their referent.

5.4 Possessive predication, a particular case of the floating genitive construction

Possessive predications are constructions that, if no particular discourse device is applied, are interpreted as attributing to an individual (the possessor) the presence of an entity (the possessee) in their personal sphere.

As illustrated by ex. (14) to (18), Northern Akhvakh has a predicative construction expressing possession in which the NP representing the possessor shows genitive marking (a type of possessive predication also found for example in Turkic languages).¹⁸

- (14) *če x^wani-ĭunu di-be b-ik'-il-a.*
 SOV one horse-RESTR 1SG_o[GEN]-N N-be-NEG-PF
 'I had only a horse.'
- (15) *di-be b-ik'-il-a ači.*
 SOV 1SG_o[GEN]-N N-be-NEG-PF money
 'I had no money.'
- (16) *hu muḥamadibi-ṣu-be b-ik^w-a-wi boq'oda mikē.*
 TDM DIST Muhamadibi-M_o[GEN]-N N-be-N-PF₃ four child
 'That Muhamadibi had four children.'
- (17) *čami reše g^weda du-be?*
 AXD how.much year COP.N 2SG_o[GEN]-N
 'How old are you?'
 lit. 'Of you, how many years exist?'
- (18) *ha-de-štada-be taḡa di-be-la g^wede.*
 DIC PROX-SL-such-N bag 1SG_o[GEN]-N-ADD COP.N
 'I too have such a bag.'

There has been a lot of debate among scholars about the analysis of possessive predications of this type, either as constructions involving two distinct core NPs, or as constructions in which a single core NP representing the possessee includes a genitival dependent representing the possessor (something like 'X's Y exists'). However, whatever the arguments invoked in the analysis of similar constructions in other languages, what is crucial for Northern Akhvakh is that here, possessive predication is very clearly a particular case of the floating genitive construction, in which the floating genitive behaves exactly in the way described in the preceding sections, and consequently can be analyzed syntactically as an adjunct having a particular relationship (concretized by an agreement mechanism) with the S argument of the clause.

5.5 Conclusion

Before turning to typological considerations, let me briefly summarize the main conclusions of the analysis of the floating genitives of Akhvakh. I have presented evidence, both morphological and syntactic, that floating genitives are involved in a specific type of construction, not amenable to the other constructions in which genitives can be found. In this construction, the floating genitive is syntactically in adjunct function. In addition, the recognition of a specific floating genitive construction straightforwardly accounts for semantic properties of floating genitives that would not be expected if

they were simply attributive genitives in non-canonical position. The observations on the meaning of the floating genitive construction can be summarized by saying that floating genitives have a framing function: they restrict the scope of the predication to the personal sphere of their referent, implying that an element of the personal sphere of their referent is involved in the predication in S or P role.

In other words, the floating genitives of Akhvakh are a particular subtype of the general category of frame adjuncts. In the literature, the notion of frame adjunct has mainly been applied to spatial or temporal expressions,¹⁹ but Akhvakh supports the recognition of other subtypes of frame adjuncts, in particular, of genitival adjuncts fulfilling a function of possessive framing.

6. The floating genitives of Akhvakh in typological perspective

From a functional and typological point of view, floating genitives constitute a particular variety of external possession, since the floating genitive construction implies that the referent of the genitive in frame adjunct function is a possessor whose personal sphere includes the referent of the nominative argument of the clause.

Constructions in which a possessor is encoded by a dative NP in the same way as participants assuming a role of recipient/beneficiary in the event are the most common type of external possession constructions.²⁰ Their functional motivation is essentially semantic. As argued by Creissels (1979: 535-551),²¹ the explanation of the cross-linguistic variation between attributive genitives and dative NPs in external possession constructions is that a possessor is always at least to some extent concerned by events involving entities belonging to his/her personal sphere, and consequently can be conceptualized as a participant in beneficiary/maleficiary role.

Possessive framing, like other types of framing, has a pragmatic motivation. A separate statement of restrictions on the scope of the predication contributes to limit the complexity of the information that must be encoded within the predicative construction proper, and allows one to make more explicit the way the utterance relates to the preceding discourse. In addition, by identifying the scope of the predication to the personal sphere of an individual, possessive framing highlights the involvement of this person in an event in which (s)he does not fulfill a core participant role, resulting in effects similar to those produced by other types of external possession, as already suggested by the parallelism proposed in Section 5.4 between the floating genitive construction of Akhvakh and the dative constructions of Spanish and Basque.

There do not seem to be very many languages that widely use a possessive framing construction similar to the floating genitive construction of Akhvakh. However, interesting parallels can be proposed with other languages that have possessive framing constructions in which the person whose personal sphere delimits the domain of predication is encoded like the possessor in possessive predication. Russian and French are two cases in point.

In Russian, *u* is a spatial preposition expressing location of the figure in the vicinity of the ground, as in ex. (19). Interestingly, this preposition is mainly used with human nouns, expressing ‘at N’s place’, as in ex. (20). Preposition phrases headed by this preposition are also used to encode the possessor in possessive predication, as in ex. (21). Russian also has a widely used framing construction in which a preposition phrase headed by *u* shows all properties typical of preposition phrases in frame adjunct function, as in (22), to be compared with (23), which conveys the same denotative meaning with the possessor encoded as an attributive genitive NP.

- (19) Dom stoit u reki.
house.SG stand.PRS.3SG by river.SG.GEN
‘The house stands by the river.’
- (20) On ostalsja u nas.
3SGM remain.PFV.PST.SGM by 1PL.GEN
‘He stayed at our place.’
- (21) U nego est’ mašina.
by 3SGM.GEN there.is car.SG
‘He has a car.’
- (22) U nego zagorelis’ glaza.
by 3SGM.GEN light.up.PFV.PST.PL eye.PL
‘His eyes lit up,’ lit. ‘By him lit up the eyes.’
- (23) Ego glaza zagorelis’
3SGM.GEN eye.PL light.up.PFV.PST.PL
‘His eyes lit up.’

The possessive predication of Russian can be analyzed as a variety of existential predication, whose domain is the personal sphere of the referent of the *u*-phrase, and where the notion of possessive framing provides a more general characterization of *u*-phrases in frame adjunct function.

The other case in point is a French construction in which the transitive verb of possession *avoir* ‘have’ combines with another verb in the way illustrated by ex. (24), to be compared with the possessive predication (25) and the encoding of the same event without possessive framing (26).

- (24) Jean a son fils
Jean have.PRS.3SG POSS3SG.3SGM son.SG
qui se marie demain.
COMP²² REFL marry.PRS.3SG tomorrow
‘Jean’s son is marrying tomorrow.’
lit. ‘Jean has his son that is marrying tomorrow.’
- (25) Jean a un fils.
Jean have.PRS.3SG one son.SG
‘Jean has a son.’

- (26) Le fils de Jean se marie demain.
 DEF.SGM SON.SG of Jean REFL marry.PRS.3SG tomorrow
 'Jean's son is marrying tomorrow.'

The French construction illustrated by ex. (24) has exactly the same function as the Russian construction with an *u*-phrase in frame adjunct function. Syntactically, however, the French construction involves an operation that is more complex than the mere fronting of a frame adjunct. A possible analysis consists in positing a parallelism with a construction in which the object NP in the construction of *avoir* 'have' is followed by an adjective in secondary predicate function (in the terminology of traditional French grammar: 'attribut de l'objet'), as in (27).

- (27) Jean a son fils malade.
 Jean have.PRS.3SG POSS3SG.3SGM SON.SG sick
 'Jean's son is sick,' lit. 'Jean has his son sick.'

It has long been observed by French grammarians that this construction belongs to a subclass of 'attribut de l'objet' constructions in which the suppression of the 'attribut de l'objet' is not possible, or implies important changes in the meaning of the construction. Using the notions of modern linguistics, this can be accounted for by a raising-to-object analysis: in the 'attribut de l'objet' construction illustrated by ex. (27), the object of *avoir* does not receive the role of possessee it would be assigned in the absence of the adjective in 'attribut de l'objet' function. The morphosyntactic slot of the object NP does not receive any role from *avoir*, and the only semantic role assigned to the NP occupying this slot comes from the adjective.

Similarly, the possessive framing construction illustrated by ex. (24) can be accounted for by positing a raising-to-object construction in which:

- *avoir* has two complements,
- *avoir* assigns the role of frame (historically derived from the role of possessor) to its subject, but has no role to assign to an object NP,
- the second complement of *avoir* is a subjectless complement clause,
- the first complement of *avoir* is an NP to which the embedded verb assigns the role that cannot be assigned to the missing subject.

There is also an interesting parallelism between the floating genitive construction of Akhvakh analyzed in this paper and the external possessors of Greek analyzed in König & Haspelmath (1997: 554–5 & 584–6). Akhvakh and Greek share the use of the same case for internal and external possessors. In the case of Greek it may be argued that this situation is in some way or other the result of the loss of the distinction between the genitive and the dative in a language from a family in which dative-marked external possessors are common. Such an explanation is excluded in the case of Akhvakh, since dative-marked external possessors do not seem to exist in Andic

languages, and there is no evidence of a possible historical connection between genitive and dative in the history of Andic languages either.

7. Conclusion

In this paper, I have tried to show that Akhvakh has a possessive framing construction that functionally combines the pragmatic motivations of framing constructions with the semantic effects common to other types of external possession constructions. In comparison with other languages that use a possessive framing construction widely, like French or Russian, the originality of Akhvakh is that it straightforwardly uses genitives in frame adjunct function, with a morphosyntactic device to prevent possible ambiguities between attributive genitives and floating genitives, since these two syntactic varieties of genitive NPs do not put into play the same rules of gender-number agreement. The floating genitives of Akhvakh, therefore, make an interesting contribution to the general typology of external possession by illustrating the development of an uncommon type of external possessors in a language family in which external possession has been so far considered relatively marginal.

References

- Alekseev, Mixail E. 2003. *Sravnitel'no-istoričeskaja morfologija naxsko-dagestanskix jazykov. Kategorii imeni* [Comparative-historical Morphology of Nakh-Daghestanian Languages. Nominal Categories – in Russian]. Moscow: Academia.
- Cercvadze, Il'ja I. 1965. *Andiuri ena* [The Andi Language – in Georgian]. Tbilisi: Mecniereba.
- Charolles, Michel and Péry-Woodley, Marie-Paule (eds). 2005. *Les adverbiaux cadratifs* (= *Langue Française* 148). Paris: Armand Colin.
- Charolles, Michel and Prévost, Sophie (eds). 2003. *Adverbiaux et topiques* (= *Travaux de Linguistique* 47). Bruxelles: De Boeck.
- Creissels, Denis, 1979. Les constructions dites “possessives”, étude de linguistique générale et de typologie linguistique. Thèse de doctorat d'état, Université Paris 4.
- Creissels, Denis, 2006a. *Syntaxe générale, une introduction typologique 1. Catégories et constructions*. Paris: Hermès.
- Creissels, Denis, 2006b. *Syntaxe générale, une introduction typologique 2. La phrase*. Paris: Hermès.
- Creissels, Denis, 2008a. Person variations in Akhvakh verb morphology: functional motivation and origin of an uncommon pattern. *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung* 61, 4, 309–325.
- Creissels, Denis, 2008b. Remarks on so-called “conjunct/disjunct” systems. Paper presented at the conference *Syntax of the world's languages III*, Berlin.
- Creissels, Denis, 2009a. Participles and finiteness: The case of Akhvakh. *Linguistic Discovery*.
- Creissels, Denis, 2009b. Non-spatial functions of spatial forms in Northern Akhvakh. Paper presented at the workshop *Non-spatial functions of spatial forms in East Caucasian*, Helsinki.

- Creissels, Denis. 2010. Specialized converbs and adverbial subordination in Axaxdərə Akhvakh. In *Clause-Hierarchy and Clause-Linking: Syntax and Pragmatics*, Isabelle Bril (ed.), 105–142. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Creissels, Denis. 2012. External agreement in the converbal construction of Northern Akhvakh. In *Clause Linkage in Cross-linguistic Perspective*, Holger Diessel and Volker Gast (eds), 127–156. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- König, Ekkehard & Haspelmath, Martin 1997. Les constructions à possesseur externe dans les langues d'Europe. In *Actance et Valence dans les Langues d'Europe*, J. Feuillet (ed.), 525–606. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Lang, Ewald, Maienborn, Claudia and Fabricius-Hansen Cathrine (eds). 2003. *Modifying Adjuncts*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Magomedbekova, Zagidat Magomedovna. 1967. *Axvaxskij jazyk (grammatičeskij analiz, teksty, slovar')* [The Akhvakh Language (Grammatical Analysis, Texts, Lexicon) – in Russian]. Tbilisi: Mecniereba.
- Magomedova, Patimat and Abdullaeva, Indira. 2007. *Axvaxsko-russkij slovar'* [Akhvakh-Russian Dictionary]. Maxačkala: Dagestanskij Naučnyj Centr Rossiskoj Akademii Nauk.
- Payne, Doris and Barshi, Immanuel (eds). 1999. *External Possession*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Endnotes

1. This paper has benefited from comments by Michael Daniel, Martin Haspelmath, Andrej Malchukov, Wolfgang Schulze, and also by two anonymous readers and the editors of the volume.
2. The other Andic languages are Andi, Bagvalal, Botlikh, Chamalal, Godoberi, Karata, and Tindi. None of them has a particularly close relationship to Akhvakh. Andic languages are traditionally grouped with Avar and Tsezic languages into a single branch of the Northeast Caucasian family. The other branches of the Northeast Caucasian family are Lak, Dargi (or Dargwa), Lezgi, Khinalug (sometimes considered a marginal member of the Lezgi branch), and Nakh.
3. The distribution of the two variants of the genitive is discussed in Section 3.
4. Although this is not absolutely obligatory, the essive and mediative suffixes are typically followed by a suffix marking gender-number agreement with the S/P argument. The same set of agreement markers is found in several types of forms (including the general converb) fulfilling adverbial functions. Note that the mediative suffix can be decomposed as 'OR₁ (g) + ABL (u) + ESS'.
5. Morphologically, the suffixal inflection of verbs is predominantly agglutinative, with endings beginning with a vowel added to stems ending with a consonant, but there is a class of verb stems ending with an 'unstable consonant' whose deletion triggers fusion of the preceding vowel with the first vowel of the ending.
6. In cases of allomorphic variation, whenever possible I have selected a single quotation form that can be analyzed as a relatively direct representation of the underlying form. Variants are listed only in cases of allomorphic variations that do not lend themselves straightforwardly to such an analysis. AGR stands for 'gender-number agreement marker'. The inflectional forms of

the verb do not behave in a uniform way with respect to gender-number agreement, but these variations have no obvious relationship with finiteness. Note also that there are several sets of agreement markers whose distribution lends itself to no generalization.

7. This form occurs, sometimes obligatorily and sometimes optionally, in contexts in which it can be analyzed as a variant, either of Perfective₁ or Perfective₂.

8. Perfective₃ has no form expressing HPL agreement. In contexts in which Perfective₃ would be expected, the presence of a HPL nominative argument triggers the use of the perfect (an analytic tense combining the general converb of the auxiliated verb with the copula in auxiliary function).

9. The potential and perfective₄ markers are both *-wa*, but they do not have the same accentual properties, and they combine with different sets of gender-number agreement markers.

10. The conditional converb is a strictly dependent verb form, but the apprehensive derived from it by means of the addition of *-gole* may head independent as well as subordinate clauses.

11. Attributive genitives agreeing with their head are attested in other language families, for example in Bantu languages. However, the agreeing genitives of Bantu languages are easier to analyze, since the class agreement marker included in Bantu genitives can be isolated from a segment *-a-* that remains constant, and therefore constitutes the genitive marker proper. In Andic genitives of the type illustrated in (1), no overt genitive marker can be isolated from the agreement marker, which explains the traditional view according to which the agreement marker itself fulfills the function of genitive marker. Note that the analysis proposed here is consistent with the fact that case forms of nouns including an obligatory agreement marker in addition to an overt case marker are not uncommon in East Caucasian languages. For example, Andi has an “affective” case used to mark the experiencer in the construction of verbs such as ‘see’ or ‘hear’, and the marker of the affective case *-o* obligatorily combines with a suffix expressing gender-number agreement with the nominative argument of the verb, as illustrated by *imu-w-o woči haq’ido* [father_o-M-AFF|brother|see.IPF] ‘The father sees [his] brother’ vs. *imu-j-o joči haq’ido* [father_o-F-AFF|sister|see.IPF] ‘The father sees [his] sister’ (Cercvadze 1965: 332).

12. Note that this formulation takes into account the fact that, in many languages, pronouns cannot straightforwardly take the place of NPs in noun dependent function, and the semantic types of noun modification expressed by genitive NPs are encoded by means of special ‘possessive’ determiners or adjectives if the possessor is a speech act participant or a discursively salient entity that, in other syntactic contexts, would be represented by a 3rd person pronoun.

13. The origin of the examples is indicated as follows: AXD = texts collected in Axaxdərə, TDM = texts collected in Tadmagitl, SOV = texts collected in Sovetskoe, DIC = taken from the Akhva-kh-Russian dictionary, ELIC = elicited.

14. Among the abbreviations used in glossing examples, the following ones are not found in the Leipzig Glossing Rules, or are used with a different meaning: ADD = additive particle, ADJZ = adjectivizer, ADV = second formative of endings expressing adverbial agreement, HPL = human plural, IPF = imperfective (inflectional), LL = lower level (spatial deixis), N = non-human, NPL = non-human plural, ..._o = oblique stem, OR = spatial orientation marker (first formative of spatial case endings), PF = perfective (inflectional), PFV = perfective (derivational), RESTR = restrictive, SL = same level (spatial deixis), UL = upper level (spatial deixis).

15. The symbol ‘.’ signals that a morpheme boundary has been blurred by the fusion of two underlying vowels into a long vowel, as in [t’ā-uš-a-wa] → t’ōšawa. In the segmentation of

Akhvakh words, ' is conventionally written before the long vowel resulting from this process (t'.ōš-a-wa).

16. Interestingly, judging from the available texts, floating genitives are extremely frequent in other Andic languages too, and the lack of acknowledgement of their existence in the literature is certainly due to the fact that Akhvakh is apparently the only Andic language in which the agreement properties of floating genitives differ from those of ordinary attributive genitives.

17. This observation calls for two comments. First, in Akhvakh texts, floating genitives related to a possessee in S or P role are equally well attested. Second, I am not claiming here that the fact that S patterns with P in the floating genitive construction has anything to do with the ergative alignment observed in the encoding of core syntactic roles. It is well-known that some syntactic mechanisms favor ergative or accusative alignment irrespective of the type of alignment manifested in the encoding of core syntactic roles, and observations on a single language are not sufficient to propose a hypothesis about the status of floating genitives in this respect.

18. This construction expresses relatively permanent possession. For temporary possession ('have something momentarily at one's disposal'), Northern Akhvakh uses a construction in which the NP representing the possessor is in a spatial form (locative₂) whose basic meaning is proximity, as in *boq'oda teki g'wede di-χar-i* [four|acc|cop.N|1sg_o-or₂-loc] 'I have four aces'.

19. On frame adjuncts, see Charolles & Péry-Woodley (eds., 2005), Charolles & Prevost (eds., 2003), Lang & al. (eds., 2003).

20. On external possession, see Payne & Barshi (1999), König & Haspelmath (1997).

21. A summary of the discussion can be found in Creissels (2006b: 104-107).

22. Traditional French grammar would identify *qui* as a relative pronoun. However, it can be shown that, in modern French, *qui* as a relative pronoun subsists only in free (or antecedentless) relatives, whereas *qui* introducing postnominal relatives has been reanalyzed as a contextual variant of the complementizer *que*. For a summary of the discussion about the status of *qui*, see (Creissels 2006b: 233-235)