The ordering of 'endoclitics' and the structure of verbal roots in Nij Udi

Dmitry Ganenkov
d.ganenkov@gmail.com, Russian Academy of Sciences, Institute of Linguistics, Moscow
Yury Lander
yulander@yandex.ru, Russian Academy of Sciences, Institute of Oriental Studies, Moscow
Timur Maisak
timur.maisak@gmail.com, Russian Academy of Sciences, Institute of Linguistics, Moscow

Udi is a Lezgic language of the Nakh-Daghestanian family spoken in Nij and Vartashen (Azerbaijan), Zinobiani (Georgia) as well as by a large number of immigrants in southern regions of Russia. The language divides into two dialects: Nij (spoken in Nij and in Russia) and Vartashen (spoken in Vartashen, in Georgia and in Russia).

Harris (2000, 2002) showed that (the Vartashen dialect of) Udi possesses an unusual pattern of 'infixation': person markers and some other grammatical morphemes can be infixed in the simplex verbal root but in fact they display properties of clitics rather than affixes (so-called 'endoclitics'). The main evidence for the clitic status is their ability to attach to the focussed constituent within the clause, see example (1). Nevertheless, when they show up on the verb they can appear inside the verbal form, not on its right periphery like with other constituents, cf. (2). This violates the Lexical Integrity Principle and is explicitly prohibited by lexicalist theories of syntax (LFG, HPSG), which led to a number of attempts to account for this pattern from the lexicalist's perspective (Crysmann 2000, Luís and Spencer 2005, Luís 2009, Wescoat 2009).

The data for our study are from the Nij dialect of Udi. We discuss the behaviour of 'endoclitics' in Nij Udi which is quite different from the pattern described by Harris (2002). First, in contrast to Harris (2000, 2002) who describes mainly person markers we discuss the whole set of markers that may appear inside the verb as well as the interaction between them. Apart from person markers, the set of endoclitics includes the additive marker *-al* 'and, also, even', the jussive marker *q:a-*, negative markers (*ma-*, *te-*, *nu-*). We show that they do not behave in a uniform way. Moreover, we demonstrate that while some of these clitics have little autonomy and are more similar to affixes, others (particularly, negative markers) are rather autonomous grammatical words, and not clitics.

Second, closer inspection of endoclitics' behaviour allows us to demonstrate that simplex verbs in Nij Udi are bi-partite, with both parts having a certain degree of prosodic and syntactic autonomy:

(i) negative markers are independent grammatical words, not clitics. Yet, they may appear between two parts of the simplex verbal root, see (3);

(ii) if the same verb bears both the person marker and the additive particle *-al* 'and, also, even', it is the additive particle that appears inside the verb, whereas the person marker is placed on the right periphery. This looks like both parts of the verbal root are terminal nodes that can host clitics, but cannot be easily explained if we assume that the verbal root is a terminal category, see (4);

(iii) if both the additive marker *-al* and the negative marker *te-* appear inside the verb, the verb bears two lexical stresses. However, it is not otherwise attested in Udi that the single word bears two lexical stresses, see (5).

For example, simplex verbal roots like *bašq:-* 'to steal', *uk-* 'to eat', or *tac-* 'to go' behave as if they were phrasal constituents that consist of two terminal categories, [*baš q:-*], [*u k*], and [*ta c*] respectively.

Thus, simplex verbs in Udi show some properties of phrasal category which straightforwardly accounts for the behaviour of 'endoclitics' and saves the Lexical Integrity Principle. It also

has a plausible diachronic explanation: given that the overwhelming majority of verbal lexemes in Udi are complex, the phrasal properties of simplex verbs can be seen as the result of their reanalysis into a combination of a lexical 'co-verb' and a grammatical 'light verb'.

Third, the past marker *-j* displays behaviour typical of an affix. However, if a verb bears both the past marker and the person marker, the former is attached after the latter (i.e. the affix after the clitic), which is usually judged to be impossible (Zwicky and Pullum 1983: 504). This may suggest that both clitics and affixes are attached on the same level, which implies that there is no strict border between morphology and syntax (cf. Haspelmath, to appear).

Examples

(1) argument focus

oša padčaʁ=e tac-i naχɨrči-n kːoj-a.
then king=3SG go-AOR shepherd-GEN house-DAT

After this THE KING went to the shepherd's place.

(2) sentence focus

oša padčaʁ ta=**ne**=c-i naχɨrči-n kːoj-a.
then king go$_1$=3SG=go$_2$-AOR shepherd-GEN house-DAT

After this the king went to the shepherd's place.

(3)

a. u=te=ne=k-sa

eat$_1$=NEG=3SG=eat$_2$-PRS

s/he does not eat

b. u=ma=k-a

eat$_1$=PROH=eat$_2$-IMP

Don't eat!

(4) u=al=k-sa=ne

eat$_1$=ADD=eat$_2$-PRS=3SG

and s/he also eats

(5) ú=al=té=ne=k-sa

eat$_1$=ADD=NEG=3SG=eat$_2$-PRS

and s/he also does not eat

References

Crysmann Berthold. 2000. On the Placement and Morphology of Udi Subject Agreement. Paper presented at the 7th International Conference on Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar, Berkeley, July 21-23, 2000.

Harris Alice C. 2000. Where in the word is the Udi clitic? *Language* 76 (3). 593-616.

Harris, Alice C. 2002. *Endoclitics and the Origins of Udi Morphosyntax*. Oxford University Press.

Haspelmath, Martin. To appear in Folia Linguistica. The indeterminacy of word segmentation and the nature of morphology and syntax.

Luís Ana. 2009. Patterns of clitic placement: Evidence from 'mixed' clitic systems. P. Epps, A. Arkhipov (eds.). *New challenges in typology: Transcending the borders and refining the distinctions*. Berlin/New York.

Luís Ana and Andrew Spencer. 2005. Udi clitics: A Generalized Paradigm Function Morphology approach. Essex Research Reports in Linguistics, 48. Colchester.

Wescoat Michael. 2009. Udi Person Markers and Lexical Integrity. Proceedings of the LFG09 Conference. CSLI Publications, 2009.

Zwicky, Arnold M. and Geoffrey K. Pullum. 1983. Cliticization vs. Inflection: English N'T. *Language* 59 (3). 502-513.