

DMITRY GANENKOV (Institute of Linguistics, Russian Academy of Sciences)
YURY LANDER (Institute of Oriental Studies, Russian Academy of Sciences)
TIMUR MAISAK (Institute of Linguistics, Russian Academy of Sciences)

“Placeholders” in Agul and Udi spontaneous narratives

In this paper we discuss some discourse-specific uses of pronominal elements in two Lezgian languages, Agul and Udi. In both languages certain pronouns can function as hesitation markers which signal production difficulties on the part of the speaker (such have been called “preparative substitutes”, or “placeholders” in literature, see Podlesskaja 2006); cf:

(1) Agul

sa jaR.a, xibu-d-pu fi-ṭ.i-s, jaR.a-s, un-ar aq'.u-ni
one day:Erg three-A-Ord WHAT-A-Dat day-Dat sound-Pl do.Pf-Pft

aRat'i paluba.di-l-di

Cit deck-Super-Lat

‘One day, on the third WHAT... day, he called (him) to the deck.’

(2) Udi

ko beš samž'i he=ne=j, variant'=e=j.
that our first WHAT=3Sg=Pst variant=3Sg=Pst

‘This was our first WHAT, variant.’

To the best of our knowledge, these uses have not been noticed before, an omission motivated by the partly artificial nature of texts used in most descriptions of Northeast Caucasian languages. Such texts often do not represent spontaneous speech, but are written down by native speakers, linguists with some subsequent normalization (like avoiding “redundant words” and adjusting “incorrect forms” and “wrong word order”). We will show, using the example of the hesitation function of pronouns, that spontaneous narratives, on the other hand, present us with a number of features that deserves special attention from both purely descriptive and typological points of view.

The item serving as a placeholder in Udi in our texts is used for the most part as an indefinite pronoun with predicative function (similar to English *one*):

(3) Udi

durut'-aXun häzir-ba-j sa he=ne
log-Abl be.prepared-Lv-Aor one WHAT=3Sg

‘... (this is) something made from the log’

From the diachronic perspective, however, the Udi placeholder is an apparent cognate of interrogative pronouns in most Northeast Caucasian languages (cf. Nikolaev & Starostin 1994: 491-492). This links it with Agul placeholders, whose basic function is that of interrogative pronouns. In general, in Agul the pronoun ‘who’ is used as a placeholder for human nominals, and ‘what’ for non-human nominals. Notably, however, the Agul ‘what’ can also be used for humans as a sort of “default” placeholder for NPs (4). Together with the fact that the Udi placeholder is not specified for such features as animacy, this suggests that this “metalinguistic” function of pronouns may favor the lack of specification.

(4) Agul

| | | | | | | |
|--------------|---------------|------------|-----|------------|------|-----|
| qa-j | x.u-ne | pāčah.di-q | sa | ru... | fi, | sa |
| Post:be-Conv | become.Pf-Pft | king-Post | one | dau(gther) | WHAT | one |
| ruš, | bat'ar | ruš] | | | | |
| daughter | beautiful | daughter | | | | |

‘The king had a dau... WHAT, a daughter, beautiful daughter.’

In both Udi and Agul nominal placeholders take any morphology required by the context. Moreover, in this function placeholders may even have syntactic dependents (5), which is at least not typical for interrogative pronouns and can be considered a piece of evidence in favor of the claim that the placeholder function leads to more morphosyntactic freedom.

(5) Udi

| | | | | |
|-----|------|------|--------|--------|
| o, | vi | he | maja | išq'ar |
| hey | your | WHAT | here+Q | man |

‘Hey, where is your WHAT, husband?’

A further consequence of the distributional freedom of placeholder is that together with the roots ‘do’ and ‘be’ they may form a kind of “pro-verb” replacing VPs (6-7), which in some Agul dialects even display phonological reduction. Interestingly, in Agul the pro-verb derived from the transitive root ‘do’ turns out to be intransitive.

(6) Agul

| | | | | | |
|----|---------|------|--------------------|--------|--------------------|
| zu | wun | fi | q'.a-s-ṭawa, | pašman | aq'.a-s-ṭa... |
| I | you(Sg) | WHAT | do.Ipf-Inf-Cop:Neg | sad | do.Ipf-Inf-Cop:Neg |

‘I will not DO SO with you, offend...’

(7) Udi

| | | | |
|------------|----------------|-------------------|------------|
| meč-a | čapažaR-en=jan | člak' ...he-b-sa, | k'ac'-e. |
| nettle-Dat | knife-Erg=1Pl | press WHAT-do-Prs | cut-LV:Prs |

‘With a knife we press the nettle... DO SO, cut.’

Thus, in both languages some pronominal items have undergone pragmatization accompanied by an increase in combinatorial possibilities and occasionally even by phonological reduction, a development which in the literature is sometimes subsumed under the general concept of grammaticalization.

However, there are further uses of placeholders that may somewhat disturb the picture. Thus, in both languages placeholders also participate in the “similative plural” construction (meaning ‘X and such’; see Daniel & Moravcsik 2005); cf. (8). Given the fact that a similar construction is found with pro-verbs (9), it is more likely that this function is derived from that of signaling hesitation. This, however, seems to provide an instance of depragmatization.

(8) Udi

| | | | | |
|-----------------|-------------------|--------------|--------------|------------------|
| eX=jan=st'a | k'rafink'-oR-o, | žürdäk'-X-o, | he-t'-u | |
| take=1Pl=LV+Prs | carafe-Pl-Dat | jug-Pl-Dat | WHAT-Nmz-Dat | |
| ba-p-i | la=jan=X-sa | q'onaR-in | beIš, | uI=ne=R-sa. |
| put_into-LV-Aor | put.on=1Pl=\$-Prs | visitor-Gen | in_front_of | drink=3Sg=\$-Prs |

‘We take it, fill carafes, jugs AND SUCH (with it), put (it) in front of the visitor – and he drinks (it).’

(9) Udi

ã, jan mema usen jõni jäšäjñš-e=jan, he-b-e=jan.
hey we so_many year well live-Perf=1Pl WHAT-do-Perf=1Pl
'Hey, we lived AND SUCH well so long!'

To conclude, in Agul and Udi we observe a development of interrogative/indefinite pronouns which resulted in a new metalinguistic hesitation function. The details of this development are partly motivated by the grammatical peculiarities of these languages, yet in general it follows evolutionary tendencies observed cross-linguistically. Consequently, we expect that similar phenomena can be found in other Northeast Caucasian languages as well.

References

1. Daniel, M. & E. Moravcsik. 2005. The associative plural. In M. Haspelmath et al. (eds), *The World Atlas of Language Structures*. Oxford.
2. Nikolaev, S. L. & S. A. Starostin. 1994. *A North Caucasian Etymological Dictionary*. Moscow.
3. Podlesskaja V. I. 2006. Disfluency, cataphora or serialization: pro-verbs as discourse markers of hesitation. In B. Comrie et al. (eds), *The grammar and pragmatics of complex sentences in languages spoken in Europe and North and Central Asia. Book of abstracts*. Tomsk.