

Some remarkable features of negative verb forms in Andi (Nakh-Daghestanian)

TIMUR MAISAK

*Institute of Linguistics at the Russian Academy of Sciences //
National Research University Higher School of Economics
(Moscow, Russia)*

timur.maisak@gmail.com

0. Outline of the talk

- basic facts about Andi
- overview of clausal negation strategies in Andi
- 1st remarkable feature (formal): endoclititics in negative verb forms
- 2nd remarkable feature (functional): ‘Counterexpectation Present’ and its origin
- summary

1. Andi language

❖ Andi is...

- a language of the Andic group < Avar-Andic-Tsezic branch < Nakh-Daghestanian (East Caucasian) family;
- closely related to Godoberi, Botlikh, Bagwalal, Chamalal, Tindi, Akhwakh and Karata;
- spoken by about 25,000 people, mostly in a few villages of the Republic of Daghestan, Russia (letter *A* on the map);
- morphologically ergative, predominantly agglutinative, with rich case system (including many locative forms), with gender agreement (3–6 genders), left-branching, SOV...



❖ The data

- Andi is not very well documented – although Dirr (1906), Sulejmanov (1957), Cercvadze (1965), Salimov (2001) provide general overviews of phonology and morphology.
- The language is unwritten, but there two published books, the translation of a dozen of world fairy-tales and the Gospel of Luke (there is also a number of texts appended to the four aforementioned grammars).
- My data come both from texts and elicitation (fieldwork, 2015–2017).
- Also see Maisak (2018) and Maisak & Verhees (2018) for previous accounts of the phenomena related to the Andi negation.

2. Verb paradigm and the marking of negation: regular and irregular patterns

- The core of the verb paradigm includes a number of finite and non-finite synthetic forms, derived suffixally from one of the two stems. One group of forms is centered around the aorist (perfective past), the second one is centered around the infinitive; suffixes of forms of the latter group all have the initial *d-* (can assimilate to *n-*, *l-* after *n-/l-* final verb stems).
- The marking of negation, for the most part, is very regular:
 - most forms use the negative marker *-s:u*, which is simply added to the affirmative form;
 - in a few non-finite forms (perfective participle, masdar), *-s:u* precedes the inflectional suffix rather than follows it.
- There are also verb forms with ‘irregular’ negation in the sense that they are not derived from the corresponding affirmative forms:
 - in the negative PERFECTIVE CONVERB (syncretic to the finite PERFECT), alongside a standard negative form with *-s:u* a special negation marker *-č’igu* can be used, which does not occur elsewhere; the distribution between the two variants is not clear, it seems that both are available for both the converb and the perfect
 - the PROHIBITIVE (negative imperative) and the negative FUTURE are not derived from their affirmative counterparts; historically, they are both probably derived from the habitual in *-do*
 - in the FUTURE (syncretic to the IMPERFECTIVE PARTICIPLE), the negation marker *-s:u* is fused with another marker (**-ja?*), probably the participial suffix originally
 - in the PROHIBITIVE, the negation marker *-s:u* is also fused with another marker (**-b*); note that for Nakh-Daghestanian languages, it is very common to have the prohibitive form morphologically unrelated to the imperative

- The following table lists most synthetic forms of the verb ‘say’ (Rikvani dialect)

	AFFIRMATIVE	NEGATIVE
Aorist and related forms		
Aorist	<i>ruli</i>	<i>ruli-s:u</i>
Perfect (= Perfective Converb)	<i>ruli-d</i>	<i>ruli-d-s:u / ruli-č’igu</i>
Perfective participle	<i>ruli-b</i>	<i>ruli-s:u-b</i>
Masdar (action nominal)	<i>ruli-r</i>	<i>ruli-s:u-r</i>
Progressive present	<i>rul-rado</i>	<i>rul-rado-s:u</i>
Imperative	<i>rul-o</i>	–
Infinitive and related forms		
Infinitive	<i>rul-du</i>	<i>rul-du-s:u</i>
Present	<i>rul-duq</i>	<i>rul-duq-s:u</i>
Prospective	<i>rul-dulq</i>	<i>rul-dulq-s:u</i>
Intentional	<i>rul-dubojd</i>	<i>rul-dubojd-s:u</i>
Habitual present	<i>rul-do</i>	<i>rul-do-s:u</i>
Prohibitive	–	<i>rul-do-s:ub</i>
Future (= Imperfective Participle)	<i>rul-dja</i>	<i>rul-do-s:ja</i>
Counterexpectation Present	<i>rul-david</i>	<i>rul-david-s:u</i>

- The main negator *-s:u* thus occurs in negative verb forms as an agglutinative right-periphery marker (in most forms), as a suffix preceding the suffixal inflection (in two non-finite forms), as a former suffix now fused with other morphemes in a single negative complex (in the prohibitive and the future).
- Also, *s:u* is a negative copula and a constituent negation marker, cf.:

(1) *iš’il he-w-ul=g^{wa} burt’-ol s:u*
 we.EXCL DEM-M-PL=DEGR rich-PL COP.NEG
 ‘We are not so rich as they are.’ (Tales)

(2) *imu-d ril’-s:u b-iχ:i (lurla r-iχ:i)*
 father-ERG [meat]=NEG IV-take.AOR butter V-take.AOR
 ‘It was not meat that father bought (, but butter).’

- Historically, the negative copula and the constituent negation marker, as well as the verbal negator(s) probably all go back to one and the same morpheme, but on a synchronic level, these are rather separate morphemes (at least two, the suffixal *-s:u* and the clitic *-s:u*).

- Cf. verb forms with the ADD or INT clitics inside (verb ‘say’):

Forms	+ ADD	+ INT
Aorist	<i>ruli-lo-s:u</i>	<i>ruli-gu-s:u</i>
Perfect (= perfective converb)	<i>ruli-lo-č'igu</i> <i>ruli-d-lo-s:u</i>	<i>ruli-gu-č'igu</i> <i>ruli-d-gu-s:u</i>
Progressive present	<i>rul-rado-lo-s:u</i>	<i>rul-rado-gu-s:u</i>
Present	<i>rul-duq-lo-s:u</i>	<i>rul-duq-gu-s:u</i>
Intentional	<i>rul-dukojd-lo-s:u</i>	<i>rul-dukojd-gu-s:u</i>
Counterexpectation present	<i>rul-david-lo-s:u</i>	<i>rul-david-gu-s:u</i>
Habitual present	<i>rul-do-lo-s:u</i>	<i>rul-do-gu-s:u</i>
Future (= imperfective participle)	<i>rul-do-lo-s:ja</i>	<i>rul-do-gu-s:ja</i>
Prohibitive	<i>rul-do-lo-s:ub</i>	<i>rul-do-gu-s:ub</i>

- How come the two clitics became endoclitics in Andi negative verb forms? We do not have any historical evidence, but it might be that endoclitic placement of *-lo* and *-gu* before the regular negator *-s:u* reflects the incomplete morphologization of (originally) periphrastic verb forms with the negative copula as an auxiliary.
- The endocclisis in the negative future and the prohibitive either reflects an early stage when the (now fused) markers *-dos:ja* and *-dos:ub* still represented transparent combinations of morphemes. Otherwise, the word-internal position of clitics in these forms may have been triggered by analogy with the regularly negated forms in *-s:u*.
- Only analogy can possibly explain the occurrence of *-lo* and *-gu* before the perfective converb / perfect marker *-č'igu*, because as a negator, it is isolated in just one form, and there is no evidence for its autonomous status.

4. ‘Counterexpectation Present’: grammaticalization path atypical of Daghestan

- One of the forms listed in the table in section 2 is the form in *-david* which seems to have a negative meaning by itself, without any negation marker (e.g. *rul-david* means ‘doesn’t say’).
- This form has a regular negative equivalent in *-s:u*, whose meaning is quite expectedly affirmative (e.g. *rul-david-s:u* ‘says’, i.e. ‘it’s not true that s/he doesn’t say’).

(8) *musa-d wocɥ-l'o kavar q^war-david-sɥ*
 Musa-ERG brother-SUPER.LAT letter write-UNEXP.PRS-NEG
 ‘Musa does write his brother a letter.’ (In reply to another speaker who doubts that this is the case.)

- However, it is clear from other examples that the form *-david* does not simply express negative meaning, it rather signals counterexpectation on the part of the speaker (e.g. not just ‘doesn’t say’, but ‘s/he still doesn’t say, although I expected him/her to say it’).

(9) *anzi r-el-david*
 snow V-GO-UNEXP.PRS
 ‘It still doesn’t snow.’ (even though it is already January)

(10) *djo hege-b c'in-navid*
 I.AFF DEM-III know-UNEXP.PRS
 ‘I still don’t quite understand that.’ (although you explain this to me)

(11) *w-ukun-nu žil'i-d, amma w-ukun-navid*
 M-eat-INF want-PRF but M-eat-UNEXP.PRS
 ‘He wants to eat, but he still doesn’t eat.’ (e.g. he is too shy)

- A dedicated verb form with a ‘counterexpectation’ meaning is not typical of the languages of the family, functionally it rather resembles ‘not-yet’ tenses in Africa, also known under the labels *cunctative*, *tardative*, etc. Cf. Comrie’s (1985: 54–55) characterization of one of the verb forms of Luganda, a Bantu language:

...the ‘not yet’ tense, as in te-tu-nna-genda ‘neg-we-not:yet-go’, i.e. ‘we have not yet gone’. The meaning of this tense is that a certain situation (in the example given, our going) did not hold in the past and does not hold in the present, i.e. that it still is the case that a certain situation does not hold.

- But how this form grammaticalized in Andi? There must be some kind of an unusual auxiliary involved, which is responsible for the ‘negative’ semantics. Dialectal comparison helps to see that the Counterexpectation Present, which is morphologically bound in most dialects, has probably originated in a periphrastic construction with an auxiliary *b-abi* (with gender agreement prefix), cf. the less morphologized form in the Zilo dialect: “habitual + auxiliary verb *b-abi*”.

(12) *he-w k'am-me-b-abi*
 DEM-M eat-HAB-IV-UNEXP.PRS
 ‘He does not (want to) eat.’

- In other dialects, the original structure “habitual *-do* + auxiliary verb *b-awid*” fused into a single morpheme *-dawid*.
- The form of the auxiliary verb in the Counterexpectation Present (*-dawid* in most dialects, *-b-awij* in Zilo Andi) is the perfect in *-d* / *-j* which in Andi also has resultative meaning expressing a current state (e.g. ‘is sitting’ or ‘is standing’ is expressed with the resultative form of the verbs ‘sit down’ and ‘come to a stop’, respectively).
- Although attested almost exclusively in the perfect/resultative form, the ‘counterexpectation’ auxiliary can also appear in the unmarked aorist (perfective past). The meaning of such forms is something like a ‘Counterexpectation Aorist’, i.e. ‘did not do (as expected)’.

(13) *sun* *wošu-d* *ruli-b* *ži-dawi* (// *žij-su*)
 yesterday boy-ERG say-PFV.PTCP do-UNEXP.AOR do.AOR-NEG
 ‘Yesterday, the boy did not do what [he] was told.’

- It is still unclear what was the original meaning of the auxiliary verb *b-awi*. In modern Andi, this verb stem is used as a lexical verb only with the meaning ‘get tired’. So, we either have ‘get tired’ as the grammaticalization source, or maybe the verb has changed its original semantics.
- In other Andic languages, cognate lexical verbs seem to be lacking, except for Bagwalal, where a rare verb *b-awi* (just three occurrences in texts from Kibrik 2001, and not mentioned in other sources) is attested with the meaning ‘resist, refrain from doing’.

(14) *kʷan-di* *haddiḱir* *qʷerLʷeri* *din* *b-ihira*
 Kvanada-PL long struggle.AOR religion N-take-IPFV.INF
b-awi-b-o

N-resist-N-CVB

‘The people from Kvanada struggled for a long time, resisting to accept the religion.’

- I am not aware of any Daghestanian grammaticalizations involving an ‘inherently negative’ verb like ‘resist, refuse’ (or ‘be tired’), although there are cross-linguistic parallels. As Givón (2001: 382–383) puts it,

Inherently negative modality verbs such as ‘fail’, ‘lack’, ‘refuse’, ‘decline’, or ‘avoid’ commonly grammaticalize as negation markers. In the process, their more specific semantic features are bleached out, leaving only their negative inference:

(40) a. *He failed to pass > He didn’t pass*
 b. *She avoided doing it > She didn’t do it*
 c. *They refused to come > They didn’t come*

5. Summary

- In Andi, most verb forms derive negative equivalents by simply adding a negation marker *-su*.
 - (but:) There are some non-finite forms, in which *-su* does not follow the inflectional suffix, but precedes it.
- There are two negative forms historically comprising the same marker *-su*, but fused with other affixes:
 - the negative future / imperfective participle is probably derived from the habitual present
 - the negative imperative (prohibitive) has a dedicated form unrelated to the imperative (this morphological asymmetry is a general feature of Nakh-Daghestanian)
- There is one form, perfect / perfective converb, which employs a totally different negation marker *-č'igu*.
- What is not only intragenetically, but cross-linguistically remarkable, is:
 - the fact that synthetic negative forms (and only them) can be 'broken up' by clitics = the phenomenon of endoclitisis
 - the existence of a 'negative' form without negation marker, which seems to have a comparatively recent origin: both the 'counterexpectation' semantics of the form and its putative grammaticalization path (from an 'inherently negative' auxiliary) are atypical of Daghestan and are rather associated with Africa

References

- Cercvadze, I. I. 1965. *Andijskij jazyk* [The Andi language]. Tbilisi: Mecniereba.
- Comrie, Bernard. 1985. *Tense*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dirr, A. M. 1906. Kratkij grammatičeskij očerk andijskogo jazyka [A short grammatical sketch of Andi]. *Sbornik materialov dlja opisanija mestnostej i pleměn Kavkaza* 36. Tbilisi.
- Givón, Talmy. 2001. *Syntax: An introduction*. Vol. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Harris, Alice C. 2002. *Endoclitics and the origins of Udi morphosyntax*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kibrik, A. E. et al. (eds.). 2001. *Bagvalinskij jazyk. Grammatika. Teksty. Slovare* [The Bagvalal language. Grammar. Texts. Dictionary]. Moscow: Nasledie.
- Maisak, Timur. 2018. *Endoclitics in Andi*. Paper presented at the 18th International Morphology Meeting, May 10-13, Budapest, Hungary.
- Maisak, Timur & Samira Verhees. 2018. *Counterexpectation Present in Andi: Discerning the grammaticalization source*. Paper presented at Chronos 13, June 4-6, University of Neuchâtel, Switzerland.
- Salimov, X. S. 2010. *Gagatlinskij govor andijskogo jazyka* [The Gagatli dialect of the Andi language]. Maxačkala: IJaLI RAN. {based on the author's 1968 dissertation}
- Sulejmanov, Ja. G. 1957. *Grammatičeskij očerk andijskogo jazyka (po dannym govora s. Rikvani)* [A grammatical sketch of Andi based on the variant spoken in Rikvani]. Kand. diss., Institut jazykoznanija AN SSSR.