

## Tanti Dargwa locative forms: ordering the spatial categories

Northeast Caucasian languages are well-known for their richness of nominal locative forms (see Comrie and Polinsky 1998; Kibrik 2003; Daniel and Ganenkov 2008; Daniel and Lander, to appear *inter alia*). These forms usually involve several markers of localization and orientation, as in (1) from Archi. This example demonstrates the standard order of suffixes in locative forms, namely LOCALIZATION-ORIENTATION, which apparently can get a compositional interpretation and hence be described as derived by layers. While not denying the relevance of scope (implied by this approach), using the data of Tanti Dargwa I will argue that at least sometimes this order cannot be simply considered a result of layering.

Tanti Dargwa, an idiom which belongs to the Dargwa branch of the Northeast Caucasian family and is spoken by about a thousand people, primarily in Daghestan (Russia), possesses a variety of nominal locative forms (in this language the number of locative forms may exceed eighty). The make-up of these forms includes three series of affixes (LOCALIZATION-ORIENTATION-DIRECTIVES) shown in (2). As (3) demonstrates, their interpretation is normally compositional. Yet there is evidence that they are not attached to the stem in a uniform matter. In relation to this, I argue for three points:

(i) Orientation is an inflectional category of localization, not of the whole noun. In fact, the orientation category is found not only in nominal locative forms but also in toponyms and locative adverbs/postpositions. Given the similar syntactic and morphological properties of nominal locative forms, toponyms and locative adverbs, it is tempting to bring them into a single class of locatives. Members of this class obligatorily include an orientation morphological position (and not an orientation layer). The existence of such a position is justified by the fact that there is an orientation meaning that is expressed by a meaningful null and by the fact that this position can assign orientation semantics to noun class markers which originally lack it. Thus, orientation cannot represent a kind of layer morphology and its position is strongly tied with the locative morpheme that precedes it.

(ii) The structural relations between localization and the stem are similar to incorporation. Albeit regular, localization markers closely interact with the lexical semantics of the stem. Moreover, for many nouns we observe non-regular 'default' localizations which are hardly analyzed morphologically and may be considered a result of lexicalization. Both properties are similar to incorporation (at least if we do not restrict incorporation to noun incorporation into verbs, but also consider incorporation of nouns into adpositions etc.; cf. Gerdtz 2001). In fact, there is synchronic evidence that the construction of localization forms is similar to incorporation: some morphemes may appear both as independent postpositions and as localization markers; cf. (4).

(iii) Directives show properties of layer morphology. The function of directives is to specify the kind of movement, hence they semantically select only already inflected locative and elative forms. For locatives, they are optional, for elatives they are usually obligatory (although some grammaticalized uses of elatives do not require directive suffixes), which typologically can be compared, for example, with the obligatory uses of prepositions with Locative in Russian. I propose that directives serve as a kind of morphological adjuncts.

To conclude, even though the order localization-orientation-direction may at first glance reflect the semantic scope of the categories and represent layered morphology, the organization of this morphological zone in Tanti Dargwa is more complex and displays an intriguing case of interaction of layered morphology and positional morphology. It seems that the order of affixes in it may reflect not only the relations between affixes and their bases but also the relations between different affixes. We thus find that the purely semantic account of the affix order may be apparent only even where it works.

## Data

- (1) č'eledi-L'-iš 'from under the stone' Archi (Lezgian, Northeast Caucasian)  
stone-sub-relative (Kibrik 2003: 45)

- (2) Basic markers found in Tanti Dargwa locative forms

Localization	Orientation	Directives
SUPER (-ja) 'on'	LATIVE (-Ø)	UP (-ha(le))
SUB <sub>1</sub> (-gu) 'under'	'movement to'	DOWN (-ka(le))
ANTE (-sa) 'front'	ELATIVE (-r)	HITHER (-se(le) / -
APUD <sub>1</sub> (-š:u) 'at'	'movement from'	sale)
APUD <sub>2</sub> (-hira) 'near'	ESSIVE	THITHER (-de(le) / -
IN <sub>1</sub> (-c:e) 'in'	(-CLASS.MARKER)	dale)
IN <sub>2</sub> (-he) 'inside'	'being in'	
	[TRANSLATIVE	
	(-ti) 'through']	

- (3) četi-d-at-ur q'uš-me = ra qa<sup>h</sup>b-li-ja-r-kale  
put-N.PL-LV:PF-PRET foot-PL(ABS)=ADD neck-OBL-SUPER-ELATIVE-DOWN  
'(Literally:) And he put his feet **from the top of the (other's) neck down.**'

- (4) a. dila hi-ti b. damži-hi-ti  
I:GEN after-TRANSLATIVE I:OBL-AFTER-TRANSLATIVE  
'behind me'

## References

- Comrie, B. & M. Polinsky.** 1998. The great Daghestanian case hoax. In A. Siewierska & J.J. Song (eds), *Case, Typology and Grammar*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins. P. 95–114.
- Daniel, M. & D. Ganenkov.** 2008. Case marking in Daghestanian: limits of elaboration. In A. Malchukov & A. Spencer (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Case*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. P. 668–685.
- Daniel, M. & Yu. Lander.** To appear. The Caucasian Languages. In J. van der Auwera and B. Kortmann (eds), *The Field of Linguistics: Europe*. Berlin, N.Y.: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Gerdts, D.** 2001. Incorporation. In A. Spencer & A.M. Zwicky (eds), *The Handbook of Morphology*. Oxford: Blackwell. P. 84–100.
- Kibrik, A.** 2003. Nominal inflection galore: Daghestanian, with side glances at Europe and the world. In F. Plank (ed.), *Noun Phrase Structure in the Languages of Europe*. Berlin, N.Y.: Mouton de Gruyter. P. 37–112.