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0. PRELIMINARIES


Typological features: ergative alignment; class (+number) agreement.

Rich nominal inflection: two subsystems differentiated on formal grounds. Syntactic cases include nominative (absolutive), ergative, genitive, dative plus other cases, depending on the specific language. Locative subparadigm is produced by combining a localization marker locating an object regarding a landmark (on, under, behind...) and orientation marker conveying the notion of movement (essive, lative, ablative...). Some languages, however, lack this system (Khinalug, Nakh languages)

Nominal Inflection Inventories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Khwarshi</th>
<th>Archi</th>
<th>Bagvalal</th>
<th>Chechen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominative</td>
<td>Nominative</td>
<td>Nominative</td>
<td>Nominative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ergative</td>
<td>Ergative</td>
<td>Ergative</td>
<td>Ergative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dative</td>
<td>Dative</td>
<td>Dative</td>
<td>Dative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive 1</td>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>Genitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive 2</td>
<td>Comitative</td>
<td>Affective</td>
<td>Instrumental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>Substitutive</td>
<td>Substitutive</td>
<td>Comparative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1 This common project has been conceived and started during the first author’s stay at EVA MPI in Spring of 2007.
1. **VARIATION IN RECIPIENT CODING: ‘GIVE’**

two markings available for Recipient, contrasting ‘give’ vs. ‘pass, let have’ situations

1. **Chechen**

   zāra-s hū-na/hoe-ga knīga j-ella.

   Z.-ERG you.SG.OBL-DAT/you.SG.OBL-ALL book(NOM) 2-give.PRF

   ‘Zara gave you a book.’ (permanently ~ temporarily)

2. **Hinuq**

   de hajł-o-z/hajł-o-qo t’ek toł-iš

   I.ERG he.OBL-DAT/he.OBL-CONT book(NOM) give-PST

   ‘I gave him a book.’ (permanently ~ temporarily)

3. **Tsez**

   di nesi-r/nesi-qo-r t’ek teł-si

   I.ERG he.LAT/he-POSS-LAT book(NOM) give-PST

   ‘I gave him a book.’ (permanently ~ temporarily)

4. **Bagvalal**

   den ʕali-la/ʕali-la as iči

   I.ERG Ali-DAT/Ali-HUMLOC money(NOM) give

   ‘I gave the money to Ali.’ (permanently ~ temporarily; probably, less salient here)

   We will call the ‘less spatial’ marking dative strategy and the ‘more spatial’ marking locative strategy.

**GIVE OR PASS?**

temporary vs. permanent recipient? as in (5)

5. **Archi** – situation of transfer to a mediator

   han edī wa-ra-k lo-ți-t heł’ana

   what(NOM) 4.be.PF you.SG.OBL-CONT-LAT 4.give.PF-ATR-4 thing(NOM)

   ‘What was the thing given to you (for transfer to a third party)?’

   But:

6. **Bezhta** – situation of giving back

   do hogco-qa t’ek nit-ijo

   I.ERG he-POSS book(NOM) give-PST

   ‘I gave his book back to him’
7. **Archi** – situation of transfer from a mediator to a third party

waj aman madad i-t’u za-ɬu lo-t’u za-ra-k
waj EXCLAM EXCLAM 4.be-NEG 1.OBL-COMIT 4.give.PF-NEG 1.OBL-CONT-LAT

‘Oh, I don’t have it, (they) didn’t give it to me!’

(The wife denies that the mediator brought her an object sent by her husband)

Thus, transfer of rights of possession (provisionally, give vs. pass) is relevant rather than temporary vs. permanent recipient.

**STRUCTURAL POSITIONS AND ROLES**

Same or different roles?

8. **Bezhta** – presence of both locative and dative strategies

do öždi-qa okko ado-ɬ ni-ɬo
1.ERG boy-POSS money(NOM) father-DAT give.PF

‘I gave the money for the father to the boy’

9. **Archi**

tu-w-mu za-ra-k wež arsi lo
that-1-OBL(ERG) 1.OBL-CONT-LAT you.pl.DAT money(NOM) give.PF

‘He gave me the money for you’

10. **Chechen**

as k’anta-ga die-na axč d-iel-ira
1.ERG boy-ALL father.OBL-DAT money(NOM) 3-give-WP

‘I gave the money for the father to the boy’

In 11, Dative might be understood in the sense of 8 – 10 even in the absence of the locative strategy.

11. **Archi**

tu-w-mu el arsi lo-li
that-1-OBL(ERG) 4.we.DAT money(NOM) 4.give-EVID

‘He gave (sent) money for us, they say’ (through someone)

**POSSESSIVE PREDICATION**

Cf two types of ‘give’-situations correlates with similar effects in ‘have’-situations.

12. **Chechen**

a. soe-h top j-u.
1.OBL-LOC gun(NOM) 2-COP

‘I have a gun with me.’

b. san top j-u.
1.GEN gun(NOM) 2-COP

‘I have (possess) a gun.’
However, there is not necessarily a full formal parallelism; cf. Archi (same in Bagvalal)

13. Archi

a. za-ɬu tumank b-i
   I.OBL-COMIT gun(NOM) 3-be
   ‘I have a gun with me.’

b. za-ra-k tumank bo-ɬo
   I.OBL-CONT-LAT gun(NOM) 3-give.PST
   ‘(He) gave me a gun’

2. Outside ‘give’
creation verbs do not allow variation

15. Khwarshi

de isu-l aq l-ij-i
   I.ERG he.OBL-LAT house(NOM) 4-do-PST
   ‘I built a house for him.’

‘buy’ behaves similarly:

16. Hinuq

de hajɬu-z šel’u r-ux-iš
   I.ERG she.OBL-DAT clothes(NOM) 5-buy-PST
   ‘I bought her clothes.’

Other may display this variation with a similar semantic effect.

17. Khwarshi

a. de isu-ʃo-l tarpa l-ot’ok’-i
   I.ERG he.OBL-APUD-LAT bag(NOM) 4-carry-PST
   ‘I brought him a bag’

b. de isu-l tarpa l-ot’ok’-i
   I.ERG he.OBL-LAT bag(NOM) 4-carry-PST
   ‘I brought a bag to him’ (for a while)
   (also ‘throw’ in Archi – pass by throwing vs give by throwing; but cf. below)

3. Verbs of speech

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Chechen</th>
<th>Ingush</th>
<th>Bezhta</th>
<th>Hinuq</th>
<th>Khwarshi</th>
<th>Tsez</th>
<th>Archi</th>
<th>Bagvalal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>say</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Poss(Ess)</td>
<td>Cont(Ess)</td>
<td>ContLat</td>
<td>PossLat</td>
<td>ContAll</td>
<td>SupLat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ask</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Poss(Ess)</td>
<td>Cont(Ess)</td>
<td>Cont(Ess)</td>
<td>Poss(Ess)</td>
<td>ContAll</td>
<td>SupLat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tell</td>
<td>Da/All</td>
<td>Dat/All</td>
<td>Poss(Ess)</td>
<td>Cont(Ess)</td>
<td>Cont(Ess)</td>
<td>Poss(Ess)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>SupLat</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
18. Chechen
zāra-s tūira sū-na/soe-ga d-ic-ira.
Z.-ERG tale(NOM) I.OBL-DAT/I.OBL-ALL 3-tell-WP
‘Zara told me a tale’
‘Ask’ and ‘say’ do not show this variation.

19. Chechen
as mas sahat d-alla xiett-ira cun-ga
I.ERG what time(NOM) 3-come.PF ask-WP this-ALL
‘I asked him what time it was’

Tsezic differ only in the choice of localization, plus separate treatment of ‘tell’, ‘ask’ in Khwarshi and Tsez.

20. Khwarshi
same as Bezhta

21. Bezhta
same as Khwarshi

22. Bezhta
same as Bezhta

23. Hinuq
same as Bezhta

24. Archi
same in Bagvalal

25. Bezhta marking of the Causee

26. Bezhta ‘ask about’ verbs – Causee is treated as Addressee

A NOTE ON ‘ASK ABOUT’ VERBS
Bezhta, Tsez and Khwarshi: ‘to ask about’ = ‘cause to tell’
Bezhta: treats the second participant of ‘ask’ as Addressee of a speech verb (PossEss) rather than Causee of a causative verb (instrumental).

25. Bezhta marking of the Causee

26. Bezhta ‘ask about’ verbs – Causee is treated as Addressee

The father asked the boy when he would come’
27. Tsez
di nesi-q žawab esi-r-si
I.ERG he-POSS answer(NOM) ask-CAUS-PST
‘I asked him for the answer’

Nakh languages and Archi: ‘ask’ is not a causative, Addressive marking

28. Chechen
as niena-ga xiatt-ira čuorpa ha-j-all-i ael.
I.ERG mother-ALL ask-WP soup(NOM) DX-2-finish-INTER QUOT
‘I asked (my) mother whether the soup was ready.’

29. Ingush (Nichols 1994)
āz mas saha d-eanna-d xaett-ar con-ga
I.ERG what time(NOM) 3-came-PF ask-WP him-ALL
‘I asked him what time it was.’

European-type Addressees – a metaphor or vestiges of the dative’s locative prehistory?

4. VERBS OF CONTACT
‘throw’ – dative vs. locative alternation

30. Bezhta
do öždi-l/josoli-l kirkat b-i-le-jo
I.ERG boy-DAT/wall-DAT ball(NOM) 3-throw-PST
‘I threw a ball at the boy / against the wall.’

31. Bezhta
do öždi-qa kirkat b-i-le-jo
I.ERG boy-POSE ball(NOM) 3-throw-PST
‘I threw a ball to the boy’ (so he can catch it)

32. Chechen
mūsa-s sū-na/soe-ga bürk qoess-ira.
M-ERG I.OBL-DAT/I.OBL-ALL ball(NOM) throw-WP
‘Musa threw a ball at me / to me.

33. Archi
b-ez č’ele ca<b>xa
3-I.DAT stone(NOM) 3<3>throw.IMP
‘Throw a stone at me!’ (if I did anything wrong)

34. Archi
nac’-a a’nš cax-u-li ju-w-mi-s
bird-OBL(ERG) apple(NOM) 4.drop-PF-EVID this-1-OBL-DAT
‘A bird threw an apple at him (dropped an apple on him)’

Dative strategy ‘less recipientive’ than the locative strategy?
Dative is used in its locative function; cf. examples with ‘hit’, ‘push’:
35. Chechen
as hū-na p’elg tüox-na
I.ERG he.OBL-DAT finger(NOM) hit-PF
‘I tapped you with my finger.’

36. Archi
ju-w gurži-li-n os gon qIeč+ bo-li o-b-qla-li to-r laha-s
this-1 Georgian-OBL-GEN one finger(NOM) push SAY.PF-CVB go.PF-EVID thot-2 lad.obl(ERG)-DAT
‘This Georgian pushed her with his finger’

The dative marking with ‘throw’ has nothing in common with the dative in ‘give’-constructions. Locative marking with ‘throw’, on the contrary, is in principle identical with the locative ‘give’ strategy – in both cases the concept of physical transfer from one person to another is in focus (‘pass’), without any assumption regarding the transfer of possession (‘give’). Locative marking with ‘throw’ or ‘give’ are variants of Animate Goal marking.

CONCLUSIONS:
Too many goals... Nakh-Daghestanian languages are extremely rich in locative morphology, and can afford distinguishing many goals (true Recipient, Animate Goal, Addressee...) which other languages often combine in one marker.

Disrupt dative. Dative covers a variety of meanings which are not obviously due to any kind of extension or metaphor – they may well be different ex-metaphors inherited from the dative’s spatial pre-history. One of the arguments is a conceptually discontinuous marking where locative strategy of marking Animate Goal seems to cut between Target and Recipient. (The same might be true of Addressee marking in those languages that use dative).