Grammatical relations in Sanzhi Dargwa

1. Introduction
1.1. Sanzhi Dargwa
This chapter provides an analysis of grammatical roles in Sanzhi Dargwa. Sanzhi is a Nakh-Daghestanian language belonging to the Dargi subgroup of the family. It is spoken by 200-300 people who mainly live in the multiethnic village Druzhba in the central Daghestanian lowlands. They have left their village in the mountains starting from the 1970s. Now the language is heavily endangered because children grow up speaking only Russian. Sanzhi Dargwa belongs to the Southern Dargi varieties. It is closely related to Icari Dargwa (see Sumbatova & Mutalov 2003 for a description) and to Amukh Dargwa. There is a standard variety of Dargi based on the largest northern variety, Aqusha Dargwa (see van den Berg 2001 for a grammar). Standard Dargwa differs markedly from Sanzhi Dargwa such that mutual intelligibility is not warranted.

From a typological point of view Sanzhi can be described as dependent marking. The language has a rich case inventory comprising absolutive, ergative, genitive, dative, comitative and a number of spatial cases. Most of the cases are tightly connected with a number of semantic roles that they mark, e.g. ergative marks agents and instruments, genitive marks possession, dative marks experiencers, recipients, beneficiaries, etc.

The verbal morphology is rather complex, involving a system of spatial preverbs, an aspectual distinction of almost all verbal stems into imperfective and perfective stems and a wide array of suffixes expressing finite and non-finite verbal forms. Furthermore, verbs exhibit two independent agreement systems: person agreement and gender/number agreement (see Section 1.2). The most frequent word order at the clause level is APV, though all other logically possible word orders are also attested. In subordinate clauses the word order is more restricted since verbs are predominantly found in clause-final position and other word orders are rather rare. At the phrase level head-final order is preferred, but again exceptions are possible.

1.2. The argument/adjunct distinction
I start from the assumption that there is a need to distinguish between syntactic and semantic arguments. The syntactic argument structure as well as the morphosyntactic properties of a predicate are language-specific or even construction-specific. In contrast, I assume that the semantic argument structure of verbs is universal in the sense that verbs that refer to the same situations or events have the same semantic arguments. Taking a classical example, the English verb eat, my claim is that semantically it always has two arguments since in a situation of eating there must be an eater and there must be a something that is eaten. But syntactically the object can be omitted. Furthermore, since the argument/adjunct distinction is gradual rather than discrete, I follow the canonical approach that I have outlined in Forker (2014). By taking a number of criteria as the starting point and certain values of them as ideal endpoints of a scale, I can distinguish between canonical instances of arguments and canonical instances of adjuncts. The criteria that the argument/adjunct distinction is based on are obligatoriness, latency, co-occurrence restrictions, and iterability. To illustrate how this approach works I will compare the pronoun du ‘I’ with the noun bazar ‘market’ in the following Sanzhi example (1). According to the terminology used in this book, the pronoun is S and the noun G. The question is whether they are both arguments.

(1) du arg-ul=da bazar-re juldaš-a-š:u  
    1sg go.ipfv-icvb=1 market-spr.lat friend-pl.obl-allat
‘I go to the market to my friends.’

The pronoun is a canonical argument of the verb *arg* ‘go’ since it is semantically obligatory, though it can be omitted. If it is omitted it requires a definite interpretation. It is subject to co-occurrence restrictions since it must have a referent that is able to carry out the movement denoted by the predicate. It cannot be iterated. The noun *bazar* ‘market’ is less canonical. It is also semantically obligatory because a going situation implies that there must be a kind of goal, but the goal, if left out does not require for a definite interpretation. If the verb is used without a NP denoting the goal, then the meaning is rather ‘go away’. There are co-occurrence restrictions since only those NPs that denote spatial locations or can acquire a spatial interpretation can function as goals. But the goal can be iterated as the example above shows. In sum, the pronoun is argument beyond any doubts, but the noun is a rather non-canonical argument.

With respect to Sanzhi Dargwa this means that I assume that it is possible to identify three basic valency classes in Sanzhi based on the number of arguments found with canonical instances of these classes. Thus, there are one-place predicates, two-place predicates, and three-place predicates. These classes can be further subdivided into subclasses according to semantic roles fulfilled by the arguments of these predicates. The valency classes are described in the following subsection.

1.3. Predicate classes and valency

One-place predicates generally take one single argument in the absolutive. This argument can be agentive or patientive, depending on the semantics of the verb. The verb can be simple, derived by adding spatial prefixes (2a) or compound verbs (2b). The latter consist of a lexical verb that, however, can also function as an auxiliary and in such compounds it meaning is bleached. It is preceded by an item that makes the major contribution to the meaning of the compound, but usually does not form an independent word itself in Sanzhi.

(2) a. dučːi du a-ka-r-isː-un=da
   night 1sg neg-down-f-sleep.pfv-aor=1
   ‘At night I (fem.) did not sleep.’

   b. it qːeh-r-ik'-ul=de
   3sg cough-f-say.ipfv-icvb=pst
   ‘She coughed.’

Sanzhi Dargwa has a few intransitive constructions with monovalent predicates and a single argument fulfilling the role of aative-marked experiencer. Such constructions can be copula clauses (3a). In (3b) the verb is a compound consisting of the verbal part *-ulq*- with the meaning ‘direct’ and a nominal part *simi* ‘anger’ that functions as the frozen direct object of the verb.

(3) a. at b-uχːar-(le)=ca-b
   2sg.dat n-cold-(advz)=cop-n
   ‘You are cold.’

   b. dam simi-d-ulq-u
   1sg.dat anger-npl-direct.pfv-prs
   ‘I am angry.’
Additionally, there are a few constructions denoting weather phenomena that have one single argument marked with the ergative (4). The same phenomenon is observed in the neighbouring Icari Dargwa variety (Sumbatova & Mutalov 2003: 155), but apparently not in Standard Dargwa.

(4) marka-l b-us-ul=ca-b
    rain-erg n-rain.ipfv-icvb=cop-n
    ‘It is raining.’

Two-place verbs have an A and a P argument. The semantic functions and accordingly the case markings of A and P vary considerably depending on the semantics of the verb and on other factors. Probably the largest group of two-place verbs are canonical transitive predicates with an agentive A marked by the ergative and a patientive P marked by the absolutive (5a). However, as can be seen in (5b) there are exceptions since the A in this example is rather patientive or undergoer-like.

(5) a. aba-l qal b-ic-ib
    mother-erg house n-sell.pfv-aor
    ‘Mother sold the house.’

    b. it-i-l arc d-itaq-aq-ib
    3sg-obl-erg money npl-disappear.pfv-caus-aor
    ‘S/he lost money.’

Another clearly identifiable predicate class contains affective verbs that assign the experiencer argument the dative (or the ergative, in some TAM forms) and the stimulus argument the absolutive (6).

(6) dam han-r-ič-ib it
    1sg.dat remember-f-occur.pfv-aor 3sg
    ‘I remember her.’

There is at least one verb -et’- ‘long for, bore’ that takes a stimulus not only in the absolutive (7a), but also in a spatial case (7b). In accordance with the case marking the semantics changes. Since in (7b) none of the two arguments bears the absolutive case, they cannot trigger the gender/number agreement on the verb. Therefore, the default agreement prefix b-occurs.

(7) a. u dam (či-r)-r-et’-ib-le=de
    2sg 1sg.dat spr-abl-f-bore.pfv-aor-cvb=2sg
    ‘You (fem.) bore me.’

    b. dam a-sa-r b-et’-ib=ca-b
    1sg.dat 2sg-ante-abl n-long.for.pfv-aor=cop-n
    ‘I miss you.’

There is a predicate class that I will call ‘extended intransitive predicates’, following Dixon (1994: 122-124). They take an A argument in the absolutive that usually has rather an
agentive semantics, and a further P argument marked by the dative or a spatial case (8a, b). For more examples see (25a, b) and (28a) below.

(8) a. it dam k:ač-a-r-ič-ib
    3sg 1sg.dat touch-neg-f-occur.pfv-aor
    ‘She did not touch me.’

b. du itːa la żaq‘-n-a-sa-r uruţ-ik‘u-d
    1sg 3pl.obl-gen boar-pl-obl-ante-abl fear-say. ipfv-1
    ‘I am afraid of their boars.’

A number of bivalent predicates mark the P with the dative since it has experiencer semantics in addition to be patientive. One such verb is -a‘q- ‘hit, wound’ whose usage is illustrated in (9a). One can speculate that the verb is underlyingly ditransitive with an omitted object that could, for instance, denote the instrument of the hitting action. This has been shown to be the case in other Nakh-Daghestanian languages (Khalilova 2009: 332-334; Forker 2013: 476). In fact, if the same verb is used to convey the meaning ‘telephone, call’, then it obligatorily takes the nominal za‘nŋ ‘ring’ or telepun ‘telephone’ that syntactically functions as the direct object controlling the gender/number agreement on the verb (9b).

(9) a. Murad-li b-a‘q-ib Musa-j
    Murad-erg n-hit.pfv-aor Musa-dat
    ‘Murad hit Musa.’

b. ucːi-l at za‘nŋ d-a‘q-ib
    brother-erg 2sg.dat ring npl-hit.pfv-aor
    ‘Brother called you.’

However, for (9a) it is not clear whether we can always assume that there is a retrievable though omitted direct object functioning as instrument that is responsible for the agreement on the verb. In the following example (10) with the verb -erh- ‘beat’ the instrument has been added, but marked with the comitative case and thus unable to trigger agreement on the verb. The agreement trigger is not overtly present in the clause and cannot be retrieved by speakers.

(10) it-i-l dam dirx-a-c:ella d-erh-ib
    3sg-obl-erg 1sg.dat stick-obl-comit npl-beat.pfv-aor
    ‘He beat me with a stick.’

Three-place predicates include verbs like ‘give’, ‘show’, ‘tell’, etc. A number of examples can be found in (13b), (20a, b), (21a, b), and (30a).

2. Previous studies on grammatical roles in Nakh-Daghestanian

Before beginning with the examination of grammatical roles in Sanzhi a short glance on the existing literature on grammatical roles in Nakh-Daghestanian languages is useful. There some case studies of individual languages that are often centered on the question whether the investigated language(s) is only morphologically ergative, or also shows indications of

---

1 This is a rather old-fashioned way of saying ‘telephone, call’. Nowadays Sanzhi speakers use the compound pazvanit d-araq‘- consisting of the Russian loan pazvanit ‘telephone, call’ and the Sanzhi verb d-araq‘- ‘do’.
syntactic ergativity (cf. Nichols 1980, Crisp 1983, Comrie et al. 2011). Languages that have been explored in some detail are Lezgian (Haspelmath 1991, Haspelmath 1993: 294-299, Manning 1996), Agul (Ganenkov et al. 2008), Chechen (Molochieva & Witzlack-Makarevich 2008), Ingush (Nichols 2008), Tsez (Comrie 2004), and Hinuq (Forker 2011). The majority of scholars states that the ergativity is mostly restricted to morphology. Kibrik (1985, 1997, 2003) concludes that Nakh-Daghestanian languages belong to the so-called ‘role-dominated’ languages (Foley & van Valin 1984: 123) in which the marking of arguments is semantically motivated. Nichols’ (2008) paper is a notable exception because she identifies a large number of syntactically ergative traits and only very little accusative patterns in Ingush. The surveyed constructions (or argument selectors) differ from study to study so it is not completely surprising that the conclusions differ. Furthermore, since the languages belong to different branches of Nakh-Daghestanian we can expect some variation.

In this study I will investigate the following constructions: agreement, case, relativization site, conjunction reduction, complement control, addressee of imperatives, antipassive, causativization, reflexivization, and reciprocalization. I will not analyze word order because word order on the clausal level strongly depends on the information structure and there is simply no way in which certain positions in the clause are associated with certain grammatical roles. There are, of course, tendencies such as to place S or A arguments before the verb, but they can easily be overridden. Sanzhi does not have switch-reference marking or possessor ascension. And I could not identify raising constructions that can be clearly differentiated from complement control. In fact, raising seems to be not very common in the languages of the world (Givón 1997: 41).

3. Head marking: agreement

Sanzhi Dargwa has person agreement and gender/number agreement. Person agreement is rather rare for Nakh-Daghestanian languages. Among the languages that have it are Dargi languages, Lak, Tabasaran, Batsbi, Udi, and to a lesser extend Hunzib, Akhvakh and some Avar varieties (see Helmbrecht 1996, van den Berg 1999, Schulze 2007 for overviews and information about Aqusha Dargwa). The origin of the Dargi agreement systems remains opaque. Pronouns and auxiliaries have been proposed as possible sources but there are no reliable proofs (Sumbatova 2011: 147-158). In contrast to person agreement, combined gender and number agreement is attested for the vast majority of the Nakh-Daghestanian languages including Dargi. The two agreement systems act completely independently from each other and are therefore treated separately, beginning with gender/number agreement.

3.1 Gender/number agreement

Combined gender/number agreement is a pervasive feature of Nakh-Daghestanian languages including Sanzhi Dargwa. It is possible that within one clause three, four or even more linguistic items agree with one and the same agreement target. Sanzhi has three genders that have a transparent semantic basis: masculine, feminine, and neuter. To the feminine and masculine gender belong only those nouns that denote humans or are perceived as humanoids or similar to humans. Gender is normally not marked on the nouns themselves, but on the agreement targets. Agreement targets for gender/number agreement are most vowel-initial verbs, many adjectives, and some adjuncts (reflexive pronouns, locative case forms of nominals, spatial adverbs, etc.). The agreement prefixes and suffixes are given in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Agreement prefixes and suffixes in Sanzhi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masculine</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The prefix for masculine singular is \( w- \), but it is (optionally) deleted under certain circumstances and then usually accompanied by compensatory vowel lengthening. Human plural (masculine and feminine) is additionally conditioned by person: first and second person plural agreement triggers are marked with \( d \), third person with \( b \). Archi, another Nakh Dagesthanian language, has the same phenomenon which is analyzed by Chumakina, Kibort and Corbett (2007) and Corbett (2012: 239-251) as a non-canonical person feature. I prefer to interpret the data in Table 1 as an agreement split conditioned by person.

The agreement trigger is always the argument in the absolutive though it is not necessarily overtly present in the clause. If the clause does not contain an agreement trigger then default affix \( b \) is used (7b) (14a).

The selected arguments in terms of generalized semantic roles are S, As that bear absolutive case, P, and T. Since only absolutive arguments trigger gender/number agreement we have ergative alignment. This is independent of polarity, any TAM features and clause types, i.e. it is found in all finite and non-finite verb forms including various nominalized verb forms (participles, masdars). In the following examples the trigger is underlined and the target given in bold face. Examples (11a)-(11d) illustrate monovalent predicates agreeing with the S argument.

(11) \( \text{it } \) paʰ-h-le \( r \)-itaq-ib
   a. 3sg steam-advz f-disappear,pfv-aor
      ‘She disappeared like steam.’

   b. hel-ti a-b-ebč'-ib-le
      3-pl neg-hpl-die.pfv-aor-cvb
      ‘They (human) did not die.’

   c. nuš:a a-d-ebč'-ib-da
      1pl neg-1/2pl-die.pfv-aor-1
      ‘We did not die.’

   d. li<pl> il=ra ka-d-ič-ib \( \text{xun-be} \)
      all<pl>=and down-npl-occur.pfv-aor way-pl
      ‘All roads broke.’

In the following verbless clause the agreement target is a noun bearing a spatial case suffix (12). All essive cases in Sanzhi Dargwa are expressed by adding a gender/number suffix to the spatial suffix, e.g. \( -c:e \) in (12).

(12) \( χalq' \) k:uš-le=de, daʰw-i-la dus-m-a-c:e-b=de
     people hungry-advz=pst war-obl-gen year-pl-obl-in-hpl=pst
     ‘The people were hungry, during the years of war.’

In (13a-c) bivalent predicates are presented. Example (13a) contains a canonical transitive predicate. The agreement on the verb is triggered by the P. Other predicates behaving the same with respect to agreement as canonical transitive verbs are affective predicates (see Section 1.3 for an example). Sentence (8a) above illustrates an extended intransitive predicate
whose A argument in the absolutive is the agreement trigger. In (13b) a ditransitive predicate is given that agrees with its T argument.

\[(13) \text{it-i-l t'ult' b-erkʷ-un} \]
\[\begin{align*}
a. & \quad \text{3sg-obl-erg bread n-eat.pfv-aor} \\
& \quad \text{‘S/he ate bread.’ (trigger: P)} \\
b. & \quad \text{it-i-l qu'rb-ra d-ičː-ib hel-t:i du'rh-n-a³-j} \\
& \quad \text{3sg-obl-erg pear-pl=and npl-give.pfv-aor 3sg-pl boy-pl-obl-dat} \\
& \quad \text{‘He gave pears to the boys.’ (trigger: T)}
\end{align*}\]

In complement constructions in which the complement clause functions as the absolutive argument of the matrix predicate the default agreement affix \(b\) is used in case of local agreement of the matrix predicate with the complement clause as whole (14a). Sanzhi Dargwa, as many other Daghestanian languages, has also the option for long-distance agreement in which case the gender/number agreement on the matrix verb is triggered by the absolutive argument of the complement clause. In (14b) the complement clause contains an intransitive predicate whose single argument is suppressed due to coreference with the overt argument of the main clause. Nevertheless, it triggers agreement on both predicates. The only overt argument bears the dative case and can therefore not be responsible for the gender/number agreement.

\[(14) [\text{nišːa-la baliq-e le-d-ni nišː-ala erkʷ-li-cːe-d}] \text{ b-alχ-ul=de} \]
\[\begin{align*}
a. & \quad \text{1pl-gen fish-pl exist-npl-msd 1pl.obl-gen river-erg-in-npl n-know-icvb=pst} \\
& \quad \text{‘(S/he/they) knew that there were our fish in our river.’} \\
b. & \quad \text{nišːij d-ikk-ul=de [d-isː-ij]} \\
& \quad \text{1pl.dat 1/2.pl-want.ipfv-cvb=pst 1/2.pl-cry-inf} \\
& \quad \text{‘We wanted to cry.’}
\end{align*}\]

### 3.2. Person agreement

Sanzhi Dargwa has agreement enclitics and agreement suffixes. Both suffixes and enclitics follow the same agreement rules, but differ in form and their morphosyntactic characteristics. The form of the agreement suffixes varies depending on the TAM form. There are three or four different sets, depending on the morphological analysis. They all have in common that the third person is unmarked, the first person is not differentiated for number and only the second person has two distinct suffixes for the singular and the plural. The occurrence of the suffixes is restricted to verbs. Suffixes of Set 1 that are given in Table 2 are used in the potential present, the habitual past and with the negative present tense copula.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Set 1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-d(i)</td>
<td>d(i)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-tːe</td>
<td>-tːa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Person agreement suffixes of Set 1

Table 3 displays the agreement enclitics. As can be seen in this table, only second singular has a unique marker. For the third person there are no person markers. Instead, depending on the
time reference of the clause and on the context, the third person is left unmarked, the future marker =ne appears, or the copula ca- is used, which exhibits gender/number agreement. Person agreement enclitics are widely used throughout the verbal paradigm, e.g. in the present, in the perfect, in the imperfect, in the aorist, in evidential forms, etc.

Table 3: Person agreement enclitics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>=da</td>
<td>=da</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>=de</td>
<td>=da</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The person enclitics belong to a larger set of enclitics with different semantics but a similar range of functions. To this set belong, among others, the past tense enclitic =de and the future marker =ne. These enclitics are sometimes called ‘predicative markers’ or ‘predicative particles’ and have been analyzed as finiteness markers (Kalinina & Sumbatova 2007).

Person agreement enclitics are normally added to the predicate. In verbless clauses the predicate can be a nominal, an adjective or an adverbial. In clauses containing verbs they are encliticized to the verbal predicate. I will first present some examples of verbless clauses. The agreement triggers which are always S arguments in this clause type are again underlined. (15a) and (15b) illustrate clauses with first person agreement. In (15c) the trigger is a noun and thus third person. Therefore, the copula appears instead of a person enclitic.

(15)  du k:uš-le=da
     a. 1sg hungry-advz=1
     ‘I am hungry.’

     b. sunglan-te=da d-ik’-ul=da nuš:a
        Sanzhi-attr.pl=1 1/2,pl-say.ipfv-icvb=1 1pl
     ‘We are Sanzhi, we say.’

     c. rursːi aba-j miši-l=ca-r
        girl mother-dat similar-advz=cop-f
     ‘The daughter is similar to her mother.’

Person agreement enclitics can be used to express term focus. In this case they are encliticized to the item in focus which can be an argument or adjunct (cf. Kalinina & Sumbatova 2007, Sumbatova 2013 for more details).

Person suffixes and person enclitics are subject to the same syntactic rules. Only S, A, P, and T trigger person agreement. In clauses with bivalent predicates only A or P trigger agreement, never other roles such as recipients or addressees. Person agreement is freely combinable gender/number agreement. In clauses with monovalent predicates the only argument S triggers person agreement.

(16)  du ha’ha’ Ø-ik’-u-d
     a. 1sg laughter i-say.ipfv-prs-1
     ‘I (masc.) laugh.’

     b. celij d-aqil k’e-d, či-d-uʁq’uʁ-tːal
        whole npl-much exist-npl spr-1/2.pl-go.pfv-cond.2pl
‘There is much there (i.e. the graveyard is large), if you go there.’

c. čina arg-ul=de?
   where go.ipfv-icvb=2sg
   ‘Where are you going?’

d. čina it arg-ul=e?
   where 3sg go.ipfv-icvb=q
   ‘Where is s/he going?’

In clauses with bivalent verbs A, P and T can control person agreement, but only one argument at the time can trigger the agreement. This means that the alignment is neutral. Person agreement always follows the hierarchy 2 > 1 > 3 which means that scenario is condition affecting the agreement. In clauses with two third person arguments no agreement suffixes or enclitics are found since there are no overt forms (17).

(17) it-i-j it či-w-igu
   3sg-obl-dat 3sg m-see.ipfv
   ‘S/he sees him.’

In clauses with one third person argument and one first or second person argument only the latter triggers the agreement, independent of any other factors (e.g. case marking, position, definiteness, TAM, etc.). All examples in (18) are illustrated with the potential present and the suffixes of Set 1.

(18) dam it či-w-iži-d
   a. 1sg.dat 3sg m-see.ipfv-1
      ‘I will see him.’
   b. at it či-w-iži-t:e
      2sg.dat 3sg m-see.ipfv-2sg
      ‘You will see him.’
   c. it-i-j du či-w-igu-d
      3sg-obl-dat 1sg m-see.ipfv-1
      ‘S/he will see me (masc.).’
   d. it-i-j u či-w-igu-t:e
      3sg-obl-dat 2sg m-see.ipfv-2sg
      ‘S/he will see you.’

In clauses with two speech act participants it is always the second person argument controlling the agreement as can be seen in the following two examples (19a, b).

(19) dam u či-w-igu-t:e
   a. 1sg.dat 2sg spr-m-see.ipfv-2sg
      ‘I will see you.’
   b. at du či-w-igu-t:e
‘You see me.’

The hierarchy remains unchanged for predicates with three arguments. Remember that addressees and beneficiaries and other arguments that are not A, P or T can never trigger person agreement. Thus, in (20a, b) the agreement trigger is always the A argument. In (20a) the verb also has a gender/number agreement prefix that is controlled by the absolutive argument. Thus, we can clearly see that person and gender/number agreement function independently.

(20) du-l ği-r-iž-aq-an=da at Madina
   a. 1sg-erg spr-f-see.ipfv-caus-ptcp=1 2sg.dat Madina
       ‘I show Madina to you.’
   b. hel-t:i arc-li-j luk:-an=de? Ø-ik'-ul=ca-w
       3sg-pl money-erg-dat give.ipfv-ptcp=2sg=q m-say.ipfv-icvb=cop-m
       ‘Will you give (i.e. sell) them for this money”‘, he said (asked). “I will sell them”, he said.’

In (21a) the P argument controls the person agreement since the A is a third person nominal. In (21b) the verb lacks agreement and instead encliticizes the copula because both A and P are third person. The copula exhibits gender agreement triggered by the P argument in the absolutive.

(21) Madina-l ği-w-iž-aq-ul=de u dam
    a. Madina-erg spr-m-see.ipfv-caus-icvb=1sg 2sg 1sg.dat
       ‘Madina shows me to you.’
    b. Madina-l ği-w-iž-aq-ul=ca-w Musa dam
       Madina-erg spr-m-see.ipfv-caus-icvb=cop-m Musa 1sg.dat
       ‘Madina shows Musa to me.’

The hierarchy is typical for southern Dargi varieties and also found in the neighbouring Dargi varieties Icari, Kajtag, Qunqi and Amukh. In northern Dargi varieties such as Aqusha, on which the Standard language is based, and Urakhi the hierarchy is 1, 2 > 3 and some other conditions also apply (Sumbatova 2011: 133-136). Person agreement does not interact with polarity. However, the form of the verb and therefore the form of the agreement marker may change, e.g. in a copula clause with a first or second person subject and present time reference the person enclitics (Table 3) are used (15a); if the same clause is negated, the negative forms of the copula to which person suffixes (Table 2) are added occurs (22).

(22) du k:uš-le ak:“a-di
    1sg hungry-advz cop.neg-1
    ‘I am not hungry.’
Person agreement is subject to clause-level conditions because not all verb forms of main clauses have person agreement suffixes. Certain forms with past time reference (e.g. the past progressive, the evidential past and the evidential pluperfect) make use of the past enclitic that is in complementary distribution with the person enclitics. Thus, these verbs forms do not exhibit person agreement. Another factor is finiteness: only verb forms in finite main clauses can be marked for person agreement. Thus, the masdar, converbs and participles when used in subordinate clauses do not contain agreement markers.\(^2\) For example, the adverbial clause in (23) headed by a converb lacks agreement marker which is only found on the finite verb in the main clause.

(23)  [hel-t:i d-ič:-ib-le] qili sa-ač'-ib=da
3sg-pl npl-give.pfv-aor-cvb home hither-come.pfv-aor=1
‘(They) gave them (to me) and (I) went home.’

The only exceptions are certain complement clauses. They can be headed by an infinitive or alternatively by the subjunctive which has the suffix -tːaj for the second person and -araj for the third person. There is no suffix for the first person. Relevant examples are:

(24) nišːij b-ikk-ul=de [d-is:-ij]
a. 1pl.dat n-want.ipfv-cvb=pst 1/2pl-cry-inf
‘We wanted to cry.’

b. ašːij b-ikk-ul=de [d-is:u-tːaj / d-is:-ij]
2pl.dat n-want.ipfv-cvb=pst 1/2pl-cry-2subj / 1/2pl-cry-inf
‘You wanted to cry.’

c. il-tːa-j b-ikk-ul=de [b-is:u-araj / b-is:-ij]
3sg-pl.obl-dat n-want.ipfv-cvb=pst hpl-cry-3subj / hpl-cry-inf
‘They wanted to cry.’

4. Dependent marking: case
Sanzhi Dargwa has a rich case system. There are four grammatical cases: absolutive, ergative, dative, and genitive, and 16 semantic cases. Most of the latter are spatial cases. The following cases are decisive for the discussion of grammatical relations:

- absolutive: unmarked
- ergative: -l (allomorph -li after consonants, undergoes assimilation after -r and -n)
- dative: -j (except for first and second person singular pronouns that have suppletive forms)
- IN-lative: -cːe

Case marking is the same for all nominals independently of the referential type. In other words, not only nouns but also all pronouns are marked for case. This is worth noting since in a number of Nakh-Daghestanian languages first and second person pronouns do not distinguish absolutive from ergative case.
The absolutive case marks S (11a-d), (15a) (22), P (13a), (18a-d), T (13b), (20a, b) and certain A arguments (see also (8a) above):

\(^2\)Though some of these verb forms are used for the formation of periphrastic finite forms that show agreement.
The ergative marks A (26a), P arguments in the antipassive construction (26b), and some other semantic functions such as instruments or professions. The antipassive is treated in more detail in Section 9.

(26) Zalimχan-ni=ra Q'ampaj-li=ra d-uc-ib baliqː-e
   a. Zalimkhan-erg=and Kampaj-erg=and npl-catch, pfv-aor fish-pl
      ‘Zalimkhan and Kampaj caught fish.’
   b. du baliqː-a-l uk-un=da
      1sg fish-obl.pl-erg eat, pfv-aor=1
      ‘I ate fish.’

The dative marks certain S and A arguments that fulfill the semantic role of experiencer.\(^3\) Example (3a) above shows a copula construction in which the S bears the dative. (27) illustrates a bivalent predicate belonging to the rather small class of affective predicates requiring the A to take the dative (see also (6) above).

(27) dam il χabar b-alχa-d
    1sg.dat dem story n-know, pfv-1
    ‘I know this story.’

Furthermore, various types of Gs with bivalent and trivalent predicates take the dative, e.g. recipients (with the verb ‘give’, etc., see example (13b) above), other non-spatial goals (‘believe’, ‘be angry’) (28a), spatial goals, and occasionally addressees (28b) and, and some other semantic roles (beneficiaries, expressions of time spans periods, or points in time, price, etc.). For the expression of the addressee normally the IN-lative is preferred, but under certain circumstances that still need further clarification the dative is also possible (28b).

(28) du at r-iχ-či-a-argu-d
   a. 1sg 2sg.dat f-be, pfv-spr-neg-go, pfv-1
      ‘I (fem.) do not believe (in) you.’
   b. il-i-l dam / dicːe b-urs-ib …
      3sg-obl-erg 1sg.dat / 1sg.in.lat n-say, pfv-aor
      ‘S/he said to me …’ (addressee)

The expression of spatial goals with the dative is not very frequent, but possible and a number of times attested in the corpus. It seems that it is optional in most of the cases and can be

\(^3\) But note that not all experiencers are marked with the dative. Other cases can also be used to express experiencers.
replaced by the SPR-lative. Thus, the noun *k:alk:i* ‘tree’ in (29) can either be marked with the dative or with the SPR-lative.

(29) čaˁkʷa k:alk:i-le / k:alk:i-j či-ka-b-iẓ-ib=ca-b
card tree-spr.lat / tree-dat spr-down-n-sit.pfv-aor=cop-n
The bird has sat down on the tree.

Finally, the IN-lative marks some more Gs that are either addressees (28b), or recipients (30a) or causees (30b) or spatial goals (30c).

(30) nišːi-cːe kʷel macːa d-ičː-ib
a. 1pl.obl-in.lat two sheep npl-give.pfv-aor
   ‘(They) gave us two sheep.’

   b. aba-l rursːi-cːe paltar d-irc-aq-ib
      mother-erg daughter-in.lat clothes npl-wash.pfv-caus-aor
      ‘The mother made the girl wash the clothes.’

   c. či-ha-w-q-un=ca-w hel k:alk:i-l-cːe
      spr-upwards-m-go.pfv-aor=cop-m dem tree-obl-in.lat
      ‘(He) climbed onto /into the tree.’

Case marking is independent of polarity, scenario or referential specifications of arguments. It can be altered by causativization and antipassivization, but these operations also alter the semantic roles, and only as a consequence of this alternation the case marking is changed, i.e. these processes do not have a purely syntactic function. They are treated in Sections 8 and 9. Furthermore, case marking is partially influenced by TAM features and the nature of the clause.

5. Imperatives
The addressee of an imperative can be the S or the A, never P, T or G. It is always second person. The addressee can be overt or left implicit.

(31) u-l Murad qːurt w-arq’-a!
   a. 2sg-erg Murad push m-do.pfv-imp.sg
      ‘You push Murad!’

   b. ma-d-is:-ut:-aj, ma-d-irh-ut:-aj!
      proh-1/2.pl-cry-proh-imp.pl proh-1/2.pl-wrestle-proh-imp.pl
      ‘Do not cry, do not fight!’

The evidence for affective predicates is contradictory. Repeatedly informants reject imperatives with affective verbs and suggest that the affective verbs need to be causativized first. However, if speakers accept such constructions, the addressee is unequivocally the A argument. (32) is an example from the corpus in which the addressee is left implicit, but it is clear from the preceding sentences that it is the second person singular.

(32) ala ca-w=da du, b-aç-e!
2sg.gen cop-m=1 lsg n-know.pfv-imp
‘I am yours, you know!’

Though the addressee of imperatives this is often included in the list of subject properties, it is rather a semantic criterion Dixon (1994: 131) claims that independently of other alignment types that a language may have, the imperative addressee will always follow the accusative alignment.

6. Conjunction reduction

The standard way of expressing clausal conjunction is by means of combining an adverbal clause with a main clause. Sanzhi has a number of non-finite verb forms occurring in adverbal clauses. In constructions that semantically correspond to clausal conjunction, the converb -le (allomorphs -re, -ne) is used. Co-referent arguments are omitted whereby the zero commonly occurs in the subordinate clause. Therefore, cataphora is very frequent. In example (33) the omitted argument in the first clause corresponds to the agent in the second clause.

(33) [bari-la gʷana-dex-li-j šak-ič-ib-le] il-i-l bari-li-j
sun-gen warm-nmlz-obl-dat feel-occur.pfv-aor-cvb 3sg-obl-erg sun-obl-dat

barkalla b-ay-aq-ur
thanks n-know.pfv-caus-aor
‘When he felt the warmth of the sun, he thanked the sun.’ (A=A)

But anaphora is also attested (34). In this example we find G=S=S=A, with only the first G argument being a full noun phrase and all other occurrences of the same argument left implicit.

(34) [hitːi b-uq-un-ne č'aka χʷe-j=ra hel-i-j=ra]
after n-go.pfv-aor-cvb eagle dog-dat=and this-obl-dat=and

[sa-r-b-uq-un-ne, sa-r-b-uq-un-ne] [waˁw
hither-abl-n-go.pfv-aor-cvb hither-abl-n-go.pfv-aor-cvb call

b-ikʷ-ul] b-arčː-ib-le=kːu ?aʔ'a
hpl-say.ipfv-icvb n-find.pfv-aor-cvb=neg frog
‘The bird run (i.e. flies) after him and his dog, and they run and run, and shout, but they did not find the frog.’

Another strategy commonly employed is to have the co-referent NP in clause initial position, but syntactically belonging to the main clause. So we have center embedding with anaphora in terms of word order, but cataphora in terms of structure. In (35) the adverbal clause contains an intransitive predicate, therefore the pronoun dul ‘1SG.ERG’ must be part of the main clause. If both clauses have the same valency frame then it is, in principle, impossible to decide to which of the two clauses the overt argument belongs.

(35) du-l [ag-ur-re wac'a-e:c] ka-d-iq:-an=da qix-be
1sg-erg go.pfv-aor-cvb forest-in.lat down-npl-carry.ipfv-ptcp=1 nut-pl
‘I will go to the forest and bring nuts.’ (S=A)
In general, arguments which referents the speaker assumes to be known to the hearer are left implicit such that often none of the clauses contains an occurrence of the shared arguments. Though shared arguments are very common, this is not a grammatical necessity. In (36) the first adverbial clause contains an overt S, *Istalin*, that is not shared in the subsequent adverbial and main clause.

(36) [w-eɓɛ'-ib-le *Istalin] [mašin-te pojezd-e t'aš-as-ib-le]
m-die.pfv-aor-cvb Stalin, car-pl train-pl stop-do-aor-cvb
t-u:i:-d-ik'-ul …
tut-npl-say.ipfv-icvb
‘Stalin died, and the cars, the trains were stopped, and making tuuut …’

Mostly the adverbial clause precedes the main clause, but the other order is also attested. Shared S and A arguments in either order are frequently attested in texts (33), (35) and easily provided in elicitation (37a, b). The situation gets more complicated if Ps are also involved. An overt S argument in the first clause can correspond to a covert P in the second clause but not with the converb *-le*. Instead, the more specific temporal/causal converb *-qːella* must be used such that the first clause is not only syntactically but also semantically an adverbial clause (37c). According to my Sanzhi consultant the more general converb *-le* can only be used if the S in the converbal clause corresponds to an S or A in the main clause.

(37) [aba i sa<r>e-ib-le] i Madina r-aχː-un
a. mother come<F>-aor-cvb erg Madina f-feed-aor
‘Mother came and fed Madina.’ (S = A)

b. [Murad-li-j Madina či<r>aż-ib-le] ag-ur
Murad-obl-dat Madina see<F>-aor-cvb abs go-aor
‘Murad saw Madina and went away.’ (A = S)

c. [rursːi sa<r>ee-ib-qːella] aba-l r-aχː-un
daughter come<F>-AOR-TEMCVB mother-ERG ABS F-feed-aor
‘When the daughter came, the mother fed (her).’ (S = P)

If the first clause contains two arguments A and P, then an implicit S in the second clause can in principle be coreferent with any of these two arguments. However, coreference with P is less preferable, i.e. in example (38) the S argument in the second clause can be coreferent with P in the first clause, or with another argument previously established in the context. In natural texts the coreferent argument would rather be expressed as S in the main clause and left implicit in the adverbial clause. In (37b) coreference between the A in the first clause and S in the second clause is the preferred reading, and coreference with a third person is rather unlikely.

(38) [atːa-j Madina či<r>aż-ib-le] razi r-iyː-ub
father-DAT Madina see<F>-AOR-CVB ABS happy f-become-aor
‘Father saw Madina and (she) got happy.’ (P = S)

4 Coreference with A in the first clause is excluded due to the female agreement on the verb in the second clause.
If we exchange the predicate in the second clause in (37c) with a transitive predicate, we have again the same situation. If the shared argument occurs as P in the adverbial clause, the whole sentence becomes rather marginal because out of context the referent of the omitted A in the main clause could be either the mother or the daughter. Therefore, speakers prefer to express the shared argument as A in the main clause (39).

(39) [aba-l až-aq-ur-re] rurs:i-l qal qʷaʔrš-b-arqʷ-ib
mother-erg go.pfv-caus-aor-cvb girl-erg house sweep-n-do.pfv-aor
‘Mother called her daughter and she (=daughter) swept the house.’ (P=A)

Thus, there is some evidence that shared arguments are preferably expressed as S or A instead of P. However, coreference is never a grammatical necessity. In each of the sentences an implicit argument can always be coreferent with other referents in the contexts that do not occur in the sentence to which the omitted argument belongs. Therefore, conjunction reduction is not a reliable means to identify grammatical relations in Sanzhi Dargwa. There are no further clause-level conditions.

7. Complement control
Complement constructions in Sanzhi show a heterogeneous behavior with respect to control of the omitted argument. Complements of the verb -aʔašš- ‘begin’ can be headed by the imperfective converb or by the infinitive. The controller, i.e. the one who begins something, must be in the absolutive. The controlee can be S or A as the following examples show:

(40) Madina r-aʔašš-ib [ _ haʔhaʔ<ř>ič’-ul] ‘Madina began to laugh.’ (controlee = S)
    a. Madina f-begin-aor ABS laugh<ř>-ICVB
    b. Murad w-aʔašš-ib [ _ maʔlun-te kerx-ul] ‘Murad began to kill snakes.’ (controlee = A)
    c. Murad w-aʔašš-ib [ _ maʔaʔlim či:ʁ-ij] ‘Murad began to understand the teacher.’ (controlee = A)

The controlee can never be P (41a, b).

(41) *maʔlun-te d-aʔašš-ib [Murad-li _ kerx-ul] (Intended meaning: The snakes began to be killed by Murad.)
    a. snake-PL NPL-begin-aor Murad-ERG ABS kill-CVB
    b. *maʔaʔlim w-aʔašš-ib [Murad-li-j _ či:ʁ-ij] (intended meaning: The teacher began to be understood by Murad.)

But if we look at bivalent complement-taking predicates the situation is slightly different. With the matrix verb -ik- ‘want’ the complement clause contains either an infinitive, or a subjunctive. The controlee can be S (see the examples (14a) and (24a) above), or A or P. With S and A controlees the embedded verb takes the infinitive suffix (14a), (24a), (42).
However, if the controlee is P then the verb form in the complement clause cannot be the infinitive, but must be the same converb that is also used in adverbal clauses with conjunctive semantics (43a, b). The reason is that the infinitive can only occur when the experiencer of ‘want’ is controlling an S or A argument. Thus, in (43b) all arguments have different arguments and the embedded verb cannot bear the converb suffix.

(43) Murad-li-j b-ik:-ul=ca-b [Madina-j _ či<w>až-ib-le]
   a. Murad-OBL-DAT N-want-CVB=COP-N Madina-DAT ABS see<M>-AOR-CVB
      ‘Murad, wants Madina to see him.’ (controlee = P)
   
      b. it-i-j b-ik:-ul=ca-b [du-l kāsar b-elk'-un-ne /
         3sg-obl-dat n-want.ipfv-icvb=cop-n 1sg-erg letter n-write.pfv-aor-cvb /
         *b-elk'-ij]
      n-write.pfv-inf
      ‘He wants that I write the letter.’

The same phenomenon is observed with another complement-taking predicate, uruxle ca-‘fear’. If the controlee is S or A, the complement clause is headed by an infinitive. Otherwise a different verb form containing the attributive suffix is employed:

(44) χamis urux-le=ca-r [s:i ka či-b-až-ijj]
   a. Khamis fear-advz=cop-f bear spr-n-see.pfv-inf
      ‘Khamis fears to see the bear.’ [controlee = A]
   
   b. χamis urux-le=ca-r [Madina-l q:urt r-irq'-an-ce]
      Khamis fear-advz=cop-f Madina-erg push f-do.ipfv-ptcp-attr
      ‘Khamis fears that Madina pushes her.’ [controlee = P]
   
   c. ?ā'li urux-le=de [Madina-j a-w-ay-ur-ce]
      Ali fear-advz=pst Madina-dat neg-m-know.pfv-aor-attr
      ‘Ali was afraid that Madina would not recognize / know him.’ [controlee = P]

It seems that with three-place matrix verbs there is no such difference between the treatment of S/A controlees on the one hand side and P controlees on the other hand side. Both types are allowed and the embedded verb forms are identical (45).

(45) at:ā-l rurs:i universitet-le [r-uč'-ijj] r-ataš-ib
   a. father-erg girl university-spr.alt f-learn-inf f-let.pfv-aor
      ‘Father sent the daughter to the university to study.’ [controlee = S]
   
   b. aba-l durhuʃ w-ataš-ib [urcul d-als-ijj]
      mother-erg boy m-let.pfv-aor wood npl-cut.pfv-inf
      ‘Mother sent the son to cut firewood.’ [controlee = A]
However, this again can be interpreted as a difference in the treatment of S/A vs. P, but now regarding the controller, not the controlee. If the controller is S or A, then the verb form in the complement clause depends on whether the controlee is P or S/A. If the controller is P, then, in contrast, no such difference in the verb form is noticed. To sum up, in complement control we have some indication for an S/A pivot. There are no clause level conditions and at least for the tested complement-taking predicates no difference in the treatment of embedded predicates could be observed. The predicate class of the embedded verb is possibly a feature that needs to be studied in more detail in the future since for other Nakh-Daghestanian languages it has occasionally been observed that intransitive, canonical transitive and affective verbs are treated differently in some complement constructions. But this does not need to touch upon the question of grammatical roles.

8. Reflexives and reciprocals

Reflexive and reciprocal constructions in Nakh-Daghestanian languages show interesting peculiarities that have been described in a number of papers (Kibrik 1997, 2003; Ljutikova 1997, 1999a, 1999b, 2001; Yamada 2013; Comrie et al. 2011; Forker in press). Sanzhi Dargwa is no exception to this rule. The data presented in this section confirms what has been noted for other languages of that family.

The editors of this volume did not include reflexivization (and reciprocalization) in the list of argument selectors for grammatical roles, because the traditional assumption on which reflexivization as subjecthood test has been based (‘anaphors are bound by subjects’) has long been shown to give the wrong results. However, for Sanzhi Dargwa reflexivization and reciprocalization are valid argument selectors because not every argument position in the clause can be filled by reflexive and reciprocal pronouns.

8.1. Reflexive constructions

Sanzhi Dargwa has simple reflexive pronouns and two types of complex reflexive pronouns (Table 4). The simple reflexive pronouns occur in local and non-local reflexivization (including logophoric contexts) and can even establish reference across clausal boundaries. In reflexive constructions the reflexive pronouns refer only to third person. For first and second person reflexivization ordinary personal pronouns are used. Reflexive pronouns are marked for gender (in the absolutive only), for number and for case. Both types of complex reflexive pronouns consist of a reduplicated form of the simple reflexive (Table 4). For the first variant of the complex reflexive pronouns one part of the reflexive undergoes case-copying from the controller (in Table 4 exemplified with an ergative controller), and the second part takes the appropriate case-marking. In the second variant the first part is invariably genitive. The second variant, the complex genitive reflexive, lacks a form for the genitive case, so it can never occur as possessor.

Table 4: Reflexive pronouns in Sanzhi Dargwa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Simple reflexives</th>
<th>Complex reflexives (only singular)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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The reflexive pronoun is interpreted as a bound variable (46a). The reflexive pronouns pass the standard genitive test by which genitive controllers are excluded. In examples such as (46b) the genitive can never bind the reflexive, but the reflexive must be bound by the A.

(46) haril-li-j cin-na ca-w či<i\w>až-ib
   a. every-obl-dat REFL-GEN REFL-M see<M>-AOR
      ‘Everybody saw himself.’

   b. Madina-laₐ abₐₐ cinij ca-r<i\j> či<i>r>ig-ul=ca-r
      Madina-gen mother refl-dat refl-f see<f>-cvb=cop-f
      ‘Madina’s mother sees herself<i\j>.’

The controller of a reflexive pronoun in a clause-bound reflexive construction can be A thereby taking various case suffixes (absolutive, ergative, dative). The pronoun occurs as P (47a-c).

(47) Rašid ca-w cin-i-j er-či-w-ik’-ul=ca-w
   a. Rashid refl-m refl-obl-dat look-spr-m-look.at.ipfv-icvb=cop-m
      ‘Rashid is looking at himself.’

   b. Rasul-li cin-ni ca-w / cin-na ca-w gap.w.irq’-ul=ca-w
      Rasul-erg refl-erg refl-m / refl-gen refl-m praise.m-cvb=cop-m
      ‘Rasul is praising himself.’

   c. Madina-j cin-i-j ca-r r-ik:-ul=ca-r
      Madina-dat refl-obl-dat refl-f f-love.ipfv-icvb=cop-f
      ‘Madina loves herself.’

However, the controller as well as the pronoun can switch places in some positions, namely A vs. P with As of canonical transitive and affective predicates. This means that the case marking of controller and controlee is flexible in such cases. Note that there are a few restrictions on the position of the reflexive pronoun under certain circumstances, but in general the position is quite free, i.e. it can also precede the controller (see Forker In Press for an analysis, more details and examples):

(48) Rasul ca-w cin-ni / cin-na cin-ni gap.w.irq’-ul=ca-w
   a. Rasul refl-m refl-erg / refl-gen refl-erg praise.m-cvb=cop-m
      ‘Rasul is praising himself.’

   b. Madina cin-i-j ca-r r-ik:-ul=ca-r
      Madina refl-obl-dat refl-f f-love.ipfv-icvb=cop-f
      ‘Madina loves herself.’
This is impossible with extended intransitive predicates which allow only the A to function as controller of the reflexive in P position:

(49) *Rašid-li-j  cin-i-j  ca-w  er-či-w-ik'-ul=ca-w  
Rashid-oblique-datum  reflexive-oblique-datum  reflexive-m  look-speech-m-look.at.ipfv=control-M  
(Intended meaning: Rashid is looking at himself.)

Within a ditransitive construction the P or the G can function as binder (though simple reflexive pronouns would be preferred in such examples). Thus, in (50a) the complex genitive reflexive occurs as G and is controlled by P. In (50b), in contrast, the positions of controller and controlee have been reversed: now the controller takes over the P position and the reflexive appears as P. Note that the second part of the reflexive in (50b) copies the dative from its controller whereas the first part bears the absolutive required by its syntactic position in the clause.

(50) Pat’imat-li  Rašid,  surratic:e-w  cin-na  cinij,  
a. Patimat-erg  Rashid  picture.in-M  reflexive-gen  reflexive-dat  
či<w> ĺiṣaq-ul-de  
show<M>-CVB-PST  
‘Patimat showed Rashid, to himself, in the picture.’  

b. Pat’imat-li  či<w> Ļiṣaq-ul-de  Arsen-nil-j  surrat-le-w  či-wi  
Patimat-erg  show<M>-CVB-PST  Arsen-oblique-datum  picture-speech-M  on-m  

cinij  ca-w  
reflexive-dat reflexive-m  
‘Patimat showed to Arsen, himself, on the picture.’

If we take simple reflexive pronouns then we can still have controllers in A position (51a-b). However, the simple reflexives are not obligatorily clause-bound but can also function as logophorics depending on the context. So the following examples have two readings: a reflexive reading and a non-reflexive reading in which the pronoun refers to a referent available in the context.

(51) itilca-w  gap.w.irq’-ul=ca-w  
a. 3sg.erg  reflexive-m  praise-M=control-M  
‘Hei is praising himselfi,’ or ‘Hei is praising himi.’  

b. itija-w  či<w> ėg-ul=ca-w  
3sg.dat reflexive-m  see<M>-CVB=control-M  
‘Hei sees himselfi,’ or ‘Hei sees himi.’

c. it  cin-i-j  er-či-w-ik’-ul=ca-w  
this reflexive-oblique-datum  look-speech-m-look.at.ipfv=control-M  
‘He is looking at himselfi / at him.’
With simple reflexive pronouns only experiencer As can change case marking with the stimulus-Ps in the same clause, agentive As and patientive or goal-like Ps are excluded. Thus, only (51b) has a variant in which the reflexive appears as A marked by the dative and is controlled by an NP in the absolutive serving as P argument (52). For (51a) and (51c) a reversal of the case marking leads to ungrammaticality.

(52) it cinij či<w>ig-ul=ca-w
3SG REFL.DAT see<M>-CVB=COP-M
‘He, sees himself,’ or ‘He, sees him.’

To sum up, controllers of reflexives can take over A, P and G positions. The same is true for the reflexive pronouns themselves, they appear as A, P and G. However, for reflexive pronouns the possibility of taking over P positions is conditioned by the predicate class of the verb: only affective predicates allow an unrestricted change of the case marking for reflexives and their antecedents. Canonical transitive predicates restrict it to those instances in which the reflexive is morphologically complex. Extended intransitive predicates are subject to the strongest restrictions since they only allow reflexives in P position. Thus, there is weak evidence for an S/A pivot in reflexive constructions, though it depends on the predicate class, and also on person since it applies only to third person. There are no further clause level conditions.

8.2. Reciprocal constructions
Reciprocal pronouns are very similar to complex reflexive pronouns in form as well as in morphosyntactic behavior. They consist of a reduplicated form of the numeral ‘one’. The pronouns are written as separate words in the following examples in order to explicitly indicate the case marking of each component. The language makes also use of plural reflexive pronouns, but these constructions behave as reflexive constructions with compound reflexive pronouns and will not be treated here.

Sanzhi Dargwa has three types of reciprocal pronouns. Two of these pronouns always consist of the reduplicated numeral ‘one’ ca. Except for the genitive they fully inflected for case, but do not distinguish gender. One type of reciprocal pronouns is the equivalent of the genitive reflexive because its first part is always in the genitive. The second reciprocal has always one part in the absolutive. The third variant, ca<b>a, is also based on ca ‘one’ to which a plural suffix that exhibits gender/number agreement is added. It is also reduplicated and inflects for all cases. All reciprocals are shown in the partial paradigm in Table 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>‘each other’ (‘genitive variant’)</th>
<th>‘each other’ (‘absolutive variant’)</th>
<th>‘each other’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Absolutive</td>
<td>calla ca</td>
<td>calli ca</td>
<td>ca&lt;b&gt;a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ergative</td>
<td>calla calli</td>
<td>calli ca</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>calla ca</td>
<td>ca&lt;b&gt;ala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dative</td>
<td>calla callij</td>
<td>callij ca</td>
<td>ca&lt;b&gt;alij</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reciprocal pronouns behave syntactically similar to complex reflexive. They are always locally bound. Thus, in (53a) only the NP atu-aba ‘parents’ (lit. father-mother) can function as antecedent for the reciprocal pronoun because it belongs to the same clause as the reciprocal. The complex NP in the matrix clause cannot control the reciprocal. Reciprocal pronouns are bound variables since the controller can be a quantified NP (53b).
Pat'imat-li-ʃ=ra  Murad-li-ʃ=ra  b-ik-ː-ul=ca-b
  a. Patimat-obl-dat=and Murad-obl-dat=and n-want.ipfv-icvb=cop-n

  [at:a-abā-l  calli-ʃ ca  as:-ib-le  q'amplit'-e]
  father-mother-erg one.obl-dat one buy.pfv-aor-cvb chocolates-pl
  ‘Patimat and Murad want that their parents buy sweets for each other (= for the parents).’

  b. li<i>il-li-ʃ  callij  ca  b-alχ-u
     all<HPL>-obl-dat  one.DAT  one  HPL-know-PRS
  ‘All know each other.’

In a clause with a bivalent predicate the antecedent of the pronoun can be the A controlling the pronoun in P position. This is possible for canonical transitive (54a), affective (54b), and extended intransitive (54c) predicates:

(54) Madina-ʃ=ra  Dinara-ʃ=ra  calli  ca /  calla  ca
  a. Madina-erg=and Dinara-erg=and one.erg one / one.gen one
     gap.b.irq'-i
     praise.hpl-hab.pst
     ‘Madina and Dinar praised each other.’

  b. Musa-li-ʃ=ra  Murad-li-ʃ=ra  callij  ca  b-alχ-u
     Musa-DAT=and Murad-OBL-DAT=and one.DAT one  HPL-know-PRS
     ‘Musa and Murad know each other.’

  c. Madina=ra  Pat'imat=ra calli-ʃ ca  er-çi-b-ik'-u
     Madina=and Patimat=and one.obl-dat one look-spr-hpl-say.ipfv-prs
     ‘Madina and Patimat look at each other.’

Again the case marking can be reversed with canonical transitive and affective predicates in which case the pronouns in A position are controlled by an NP in P position (55a, b). With extended intransitive predicates such a reversal is impossible (55c).

(55) Murad=ra  Rašid=ra  calli  ca /  calla  calli
  a. Murad=and Rashid=and one.erg one / one.gen one.erg
     q:urt.b.ik'-ul=ca-b
     push.hpl-cvb=cop-hpl
     ‘Murad and Rashid are pushing each other.’

  b. Musa=ra  Murad=ra  callij  ca  b-alχ-u
     Musa=and Murad=and one.DAT one  HPL-know-PRS
     ‘Musa and Murad know each other.’
In short, reciprocal constructions, just like reflexive constructions, show an A vs. P opposition only with extended intransitive predicates. Otherwise there are no indications for reciprocal constructions to function as an argument selector in Sanzhi Dargwa.

9. Causativization
Sanzhi has a very productive derivational process for the formation of causativized predicates. There are also other possibility (auxiliary change, suppletion), but I will restrict myself to causativization by means of the suffix -aq. This suffix can be added once or even twice to a predicate. When it is added to the predicate, usually the valency frame of the predicate is augmented by one. This means that monovalent predicate becomes a two-place predicate whereby S changes to P. Bivalent predicates become three-place predicates when they are causativized, and the former As become G whereas Ps are unaffected (56).

(56) waq d-err-ub
  a. cup npl-dry.pfv-aor
     ‘The cup dried.’
  b. Madina-l waq d-err-aq-ub
     Madina-erg cup npl-dry.pfv-caus-aor
     ‘Madina dried the cup.’
  c. Madina-l kaš b-uk-un-ne=de
     Madina-erg porridge n-eat.ipfv-caus-aor
     ‘Madina was eating porridge.’
  d. aba-l Madina-cːe kaš b-erk-aq-un
     mother-erg Madina-in.lat porridge n-eat.pfv-caus-aor
     ‘Mother made Madina eat porridge.’

With affective predicates there are two possibilities: either the experiencer (the former A) becomes G without changing its case marking, but an additional A is added to the clause because the verb is a three-place predicate.

(57) Madina-j jangi kurt:i či-b-az-ib
  a. Madina-dat new dress spr-n-see.pfv-aor
     ‘Madina saw a new dress.’
  b. Pat'ima-l Madina-j jangi kurt:i či-b-iz-az-ib
     Patima-erg Madina-dat new dress spr-n-see.pfv-caus-aor
     ‘Patima showed Madina a new dress.’

Another possibility is to not have any change in the argument structure of the predicate such that both grammatical relations as well as semantic roles remain unchanged, but only the semantics of the predicate changes slightly when the verb is causativized:
(58)  aba-j  durhuʰ  w-ik:-u
a.  mother-dat  boy  m-want.ipfv-prs
   ‘Mother likes /wants her son.’

b.  Murad-li-j  Madina  r-iːː:-aq-ib
   Murad-obl-dat  Madina  f-want.ipfv-caus-aor
   ‘Murad loved Madina.’

If three-place predicates are causativized, then A becomes the causee with the appropriate case suffix (IN-lative) and a new causer in the ergative is added to the clause (59).

(59)  at:a-l  it-i-c:e  dam  xun  či-b-až-aq-aq-ib
   father-erg  3sg-obl-in.lat  1sg.dat  way  spr-n-see.pfv-caus-caus-aor
   ‘Father made him show me the way.’

In any case it is never the P that is affected when two-place or three-place predicates are causativized such that causativization can perhaps be taken as a further indicator of an S/A pivot.

10. Relativization
Relativization does not single out any syntactic position or grammatical relation, because basically almost all positions can be relativized by making use of the same participial strategy, including S, A, P and G, etc. This is in fact typical for Nakh-Daghestanian languages (cf. Daniel & Lander 2012).

(60)  [_  kːalkːi-le-r  či-r  kajɛ-ib-il]  durhuʰ
a.  ABS  tree-SPR-ABL  on-ABL  fall.M-AOR-PTCP  boy
   ‘the boy who fell from the tree’ (S)

b.  [_  t’amsːa  b-arq’-ib-il]  rursːi
   ERG  carpet  N-make-aor-PTCP  girl
   ‘the girl who made the carpet’ (A)

c.  [rursːi-l  _  b-arq’-ib-il]  t’amsːa
   girl-ERG  ABS  N-make-aor-PTCP  carpet
   ‘the carpet made by the girl’ (P)

d.  [it  _  er-či-w-erɛ’-ib-il]  rursːi
   3sg  dat  look-spr-m-look.pfv-aor-ptcp  girl
   ‘the girl that he looks at’ (G)

11. Antipassive
Sanzhi Dargwa has an antipassive that is formed by reversing the case marking of A and P in a clause with a canonical transitive predicate (61a, b). The verb remains unmarked, but the gender/number agreement on the verb changes.

(60)  it-i-l  kurtːi  b-urχ-u
a.  3sg-obl-erg  dress  n-sew.ipfv-prs
   ‘S/he sews a dress.’
b. it kurt:i-l r-ury-u
   3sg dress-erg f-sew.ipfv-prs
‘She is a dressmaker.’ or ‘She habitually sews dresses.’

Syntactically the antipassive is a detransitivizing operation. The A argument is demoted to S and P is demoted to an oblique, non-core participant, similar to instruments that are also marked with the ergative. However, the use of antipassives is rather semantically than syntactically motivated. It has habitual semantics, which is typical for antipassives in general and antipassives in Nakh-Daghestanian languages in particular (60b). Apart from being restricted to only one predicate class, canonical transitive verbs, the antipassive is additionally constrained in some other ways: (i) Only a limited number of TAM forms such as the present progressive, the complex present progressive and the habitual past allow for it. Other TAM forms, e.g. the aorist or the evidential resultative, cannot be used for antipassive constructions. (ii) Not all transitive verbs allow for the antipassive construction. With verbs that do not easily allow for a resultative reading because it is unclear what precisely the result of the action that they denote would be (61b).

(61) Rašid-li mašin qːurt b-irq'-ul=ca-b
   a. Rashid-erg car push n-do.ipfv-icvb=cop-n
   ‘Rashid is pushing the car.’

   b. Rašid mašin-ni qːurt irq'-ul=ca-w
      Rashid car-erg push do.ipfv-icvb=cop-m
   ‘The car is pushing Rashid.’ NOT: Rashid is pushing the car.

(iii) It is not available with first or second person patients. There are no person restrictions on the agent, but the patient must be third person. (iv) There are animacy restrictions: It is impossible for both A and P to be animate or inanimate. The last two constraints are not really syntactic in nature since the resulting clauses are normally grammatical. However, the meaning would not be what is intended. The outcome is simply a normal clause in which A and P have been reversed.

(62) aždaha-l du uk:-un-ne=da
   a. monster-erg 1sg eat.ipfv-aor-cvb=1
      ‘The monster ate me.’

   b. du-l aždaha b-uk:-un-ne=da
      1sg-erg monster n-eat.ipfv-aor-cvb=1
      ‘I ate the monster.’ NOT: The monster ate me.

12. Summary
Table 6 summarizes the analyzed grammatical roles in Sanzhi Dargwa. We can identify three alignment types in Sanzhi Dargwa: ergative alignment, accusative alignment, and neutral alignment. Additionally, there are a number of constructions for which Sanzhi does not make use of grammatical roles. The most important constraint is semantic predicate class, i.e. the distinction between canonical transitive, affective, extended intransitive, etc. verbs. Semantic classes of verbs are tightly connected with case assignment patterns of verbs to their
argument. Thus, Sanzhi Dargwa confirms once more the fact that the semantic impact of cases for Nakh-Daghestanian languages cannot be underestimated.

Table 6: Grammatical roles in Sanzhi Dargwa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Grammatical role</th>
<th>Constraints</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Person agreement</td>
<td>S=A=P</td>
<td>TAM forms, person hierarchy 2&gt;1&gt;3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender/number agreement</td>
<td>S=P vs. A (but not really because of case)</td>
<td>case (only absolutive)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case</td>
<td>S=P vs. A (but not really)</td>
<td>semantic predicate class, clause type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperative</td>
<td>S=A vs. P</td>
<td>semantic predicate class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complement control</td>
<td>S=A vs. P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflexivization,</td>
<td>S=A=P</td>
<td>semantic predicate class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocalization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conjunction reduction</td>
<td>tendency for S=A vs. P</td>
<td>no known constraints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relativization</td>
<td>no GR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antipassive</td>
<td>no GR</td>
<td>semantic predicate class, TAM form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causativization</td>
<td>S=A vs. P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ergative alignment is only found in the morphology, namely in the agreement and the case marking. Though predicate class has a decisive influence, there is a large number of two-place and three-place verbs that assign ergative case to their A. And there are even more verbs whose S and P arguments trigger gender/number agreement because the arguments bear the absolutive case. Outside the realm of morphology there are no indications for ergativity, but accusative alignment, neutral alignment and no alignment are found. Person agreement and reflexivization / reciprocalization are neutral since S, A, and P are not distinguished, but behave differently from G. In contrast, relativization largely depends on pragmatics and a suitable context and does not make use of grammatical roles. Accusativity is found with imperatives. As mentioned above, this is not surprising and should not be taken as an indicator of grammatical roles. Furthermore, complement control and conjunction reduction show some accusative traits and causativization also distinguishes between S/A on the one side and P on the other side.

Abbreviations
ABL ablative, ADVZ adverbializer, ALLAT allative, ANTE location ‘in front’, AOR aorist, ATTR attributive, CAUS causative, COM comitative, COND conditional, COP copula, CVB converb, DAT dative, DEM demonstrative, ERG ergative, F feminine, GEN genitive, HAB habitual, HPL human plural, ICVB imperfective converb, IMP imperative, IN location ‘in’, INF infinitive, IPFV imperfective, LAT lative, M masculine, MSD masdar, N neuter, NPL neuter plural, NEG negative, OBL oblique stem, PFV perfective, PL plural, PROH prohibitive, PRS present, PST past, PTCP participle, Q question enclitic, REFL reflexive, SG singular, SPR location ‘on’, SUBJ subjunctive, TEMPCVB temporal converb
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