☼ WORKSHOP ON NAKH-DAGHESTANIAN LANGUAGES ☼
University of Bamberg, April 15-16, 2016

**Timur Maisak**
*Institute of Linguistics, Russian Academy of Sciences*
timur.maisak@gmail.com

# Relativization targets in Agul: a corpus-based perspective

## 0. Goals of the talk

- to give an overview of relative clauses in Agul, with special reference to relativization targets
- to present the results of (pilot) corpus counts of relativization targets in the two Agul subcorpora – a translated written text in Literary Agul (Tpig dialect) and a subset of spontaneous texts collection in the Huppuq' dialect
- to compare these results with the available corpus counts of relativization targets in other Nakh-Daghestanian (mostly Lezgic) languages

## 1. Relative clause constructions in Agul

❖ **General characteristics:**

- headed by participles
- (no relative pronouns, restricted use of reflexives as resumptive pronouns)
- participles are clause-final, with rare exceptions
- relative clauses precede their heads, but postposition is also attested in spontaneous speech (ca. 10% in the analysed oral corpus)

Preposed modifying clause, perfect/resultative participle

(1) *te* *c'aje* *χul-ar.i-s* *qu-ʕʷ.a-j-e* *me-wur,*
DEMT new house-PL-DAT RE-go/come.IPF-CONV-COP DEMM-PL

*c'ajindi* *alix.i-naje* *χul-ar.i-s.*
[newly {SUPER}put.PF-PT:PRF] house-PL-DAT

'They come to that new houses, to the recently built houses.'

Postposed modifying clause, perfect/resultative participle

(2) *aχir* *puč* *x.u-raj* *dad.a-n=na* *baw.a-n*
end <waste> become.PF-JUSS father-GEN=и mother-GEN

*zun* *ha-mi-štɪ* *ačik.i-na* *mi-s-ar.i-ʔ* *at.u-naje (…)*
[I EM-DEMM-ADV {IN-LAT}drive.PF-CONV DEMM-LOC-PL-IN {IN}let.PF-PT:PRF]

'Damn the parents who brought me and left here this way.'

❖ **Constraints on targets**

It is well-known that...

> East Caucasian relativization is hardly subject to any syntactic constraint. Grammars have to provide long lists of syntactic positions which are all perfectly relativizable. Moreover, in some cases it is problematic to 'reconstruct' a finite clause corresponding to the relative one.
>
> (Lander & Daniel 2013)

> Indeed, the role of the relativized argument cannot be deduced from the form of the predicate of the relative clause, neither can it be unambiguously recovered on the basis of any other grammatical properties of the construction.
>
> (Lander & Kozhukhar 2015)

> The precise nature of the relationship between the null and the head NP is determined by semantic linking rules which are probably language-specific. (...) The hearer has to assign a plausible interpretation to the association between the head NP and an unexpressed constituent in the attributive clause. (...) If a plausible interpretation can be assigned (...) then the resulting relative clause construction is judged acceptable.
>
> (Comrie & Polinsky 1999)

But at the same time:

> In the vast majority of text occurrences such clauses do not violate any constraints, looking like well-behaving relative clauses. Central arguments are relativized much more frequently than peripheral ones, in full conformity with Keenan-Comrie's predictions.
>
> (Lander & Daniel 2013)

Relative clauses in these languages are rather what is known as "Generalized Noun-Modifying Clause Constructions" (GNMCCs), in which a head noun is modified by a dependent clause "with no explicit indication of the constituents"[1].

## 2. Relativization targets

The following examples illustrate the range of what is possible in Agul (with examples mostly from Maisak 2008).

What is more and what is less frequent, will be discussed in section 4 below.

❖ **Intransitive verb**

- S (= absolutive SUBJECT)

(3) *qatːk'.a-s* *ad.i-naje* *uʁri*
[steal.IPF-INF come.PF-PT:PRF] thief
'the thief, who (Absolutive) came to steal'

[1] Cf. https://www.eva.mpg.de/lingua/conference/2013_ALT10/files/theme_sessions.html#session1

❖ **Transitive/ditransitive verb**

Cf. *ic'as* 'give <ERG, ABS, DAT>'

- A (= AGENT, ergative subject)

(4) *šünük:.i-s* *q:enfet-ar* *i* *xir*
[child-DAT candy-PL give:PF] woman
'the woman who (Ergative) gave candies to a child'

- P (= PATIENT, absolutive object)

(5) *ge* *xir.a* *šünük:.i-s* *i* *q:enfet-ar*
[DEMG woman(ERG) child-DAT give:PF] candy-PL
'candies that (Absolutive) the woman gave to the child'

- RECIPIENT

(6) *ge* *xir.a* *q:enfet* *i* *šünük:*
[DEMG woman(ERG) candy give:PF] child
'the child to whom (Dative) that woman gave candies'

❖ **Experiential verb**

Cf. *ag$^{w}$as* 'see <DAT, ABS>'

- EXPERIENCER (= dative subject)

(7) *šahar* *ag.u* *šünük:*
[city see.PF] child
'the child who (Dative) saw a city'

- STIMULUS (= absolutive object)

(8) *wa-s* *ag.u* *šahar*
[you-DAT see.PF] city
'the city that (Absolutive) you saw'

❖ **Possessive (< locative) construction**

Cf. *qaa* 'have, permanently', *faa* 'have, temporarily'

- POSSESSOR: post-essive (permanent), apud-essive (temporal)

(9) *kitab-ar* *qa-je* *ruš*
[book-PL {POST}be-PT] girl
'the girl that (Post-essive) has books'

- POSSESSUM (= S)

(10) *ruš.a-q* *qa-je* *kitab-ar*
[girl-POST {POST}be-PT] book-PL
'the books that (Absolutive) the girl has'

## ❖ Other roles

- ADDRESSEE

Cf. a standard naming construction ‘whose name is X’, ‘called X’, etc.

(11) *lemert=na ǯumart aʁ.a ʔu ču*
[Lemert=and Dzhumart say.IPF] two brother
‘two brothers who (Dative) are/were called Lemert and Dzhumart’

In the original construction, X is conceptualized as the Addressee, i.e. “they say N (name) to X (person)”.

(12) *fi ʁ.a-f-e te baba lampa.ji-s?*
what say.IPF-N-COP DEMT big lamp-DAT
‘How the big lamp is called (= what do they say to the big lamp)?’

- INSTRUMENT

(13) *dad.a jak: jarʜ.a jak’ʷ*
[father(ERG) meat beat.IPF] axe
‘the axe with which (Super-lative) father chops meat’

- COMITATIVE

(14) *xe gada-jar uq:.u ruš*
[our:INCL boy-PL fight.PF] girl
‘the girl with whom (Comitative) our boys fought’

- LOCATIVE

NB: a very frequent type, especially with prefixal statives

General structure of finite stative locative clauses: $NP_{LOC}$ $NP_{ABS}$ $V_{STAT}$
(cf. also “possessive construction” above)

(15) *ulud a-je dar*
[hole {IN}be-PT] tree
‘a tree in which (In-essive) there is a hole’

(16) *čuwal χup:aq qa-je dar*
[sack behind {POST}be-PT] tree
‘a tree behind which (Post-essive) there is a sack’

But not necessarily with prefixal verbs:

(17) *ja suw-ar, hawa suw-ar, ǯejran-ar gul.u suw-ar…*
VOC mountain-PL high mountain-PL [gazelle-PL get_lost.PF] mountains-PL
‘Oh mountains, high mountains, mountains where gazelles got lost…’ {from a song}

(18) *č:em at’.u-nde aš e sara.*
[butter {IN}pour.PF-PT:AOR] pilaw COP PTCL
‘This is pilaw where one pours butter, you see.’

- TEMPORAL

NB: a very frequent type

(19) *me* *st:alin* *p:ač:ah* *x.u* *ara.ji...*
DEMM [Stalin governor become.PF] period(TMR)
'(It all happened) in the period when Stalin was a ruler...'

(20) *jac-ar* *da-q-ǯik'.i* *waχt:.una,* *baw.a* *ʁ.a-j-e,* *wa?...*
[bull-PL NEG-RE-find.PF] time(TMR) mother(ERG) say.IPF-CONV-COP not

*mič'e* *x.u* *waχt:.una* *hat.a-a* *ʔu-d=ra* *šünük:-ar* *uč.i-n.*
[dark become.PF] time(TMR) send.IPF-PRS two-N=ADD child-PL REFL-GEN
'When (= in the time when) they did not find the bulls, the stepmother says: "No!"… and when (= in the time when) it became dark, she sends away her both children.'

## ❖ Argument of the dependent clause

- ARGUMENT OF A COMPLEMENT CLAUSE

Cf. a transitive clause as a complement of the verb 'want':

(21) *ʒa-s* *gada.ji* *q:unši-s* *k'eǯ* *lik'.i-na* *k:ande-a.*
I-DAT [boy(ERG) neighbour-DAT letter write.PF-CONV] want-PRS
'I want the boy to write a letter to our neighbour.'

Complement-internal Agent NP relativized

(22) *ʒa-s* *q:unši-s* *k'eǯ* *lik'.i-na* *k:ande-je* *gada*
[I-DAT neighbour-DAT letter write.PF-CONV want-PT:PRS] boy
'the boy whom I want to write a letter to our neighbour'

Complement-internal Patient NP relativized

(23) *ʒa-s* *gada.ji* *q:unši-s* *lik'.i-na* *k:ande-je* *k'eǯ*
[I-DAT boy(ERG) neighbour-DAT write.PF-CONV want-PT:PRS] letter
'the letter which I want the boy to write to our neighbour'

Complement-internal Addressee NP relativized

(24) *ʒa-s* *gada.ji* *k'eǯ* *lik'.i-na* *k:ande-je* *q:unši*
[I-DAT boy(ERG) letter write.PF-CONV want-PT:PRS] neighbour
'the neighbour to whom I want the boy to write a letter'

- ARGUMENT OF AN ADVERBIAL CLAUSE

Cf. a subordinate transitive clause (with temporal semantics):

(25) *wun* *me* *jamak* *ʕut'.u-guna,* *ʕan* *it:ar-x.a-a.*
[you DEMM food eat.PF-TEMP] bowels ill-become.IPF-PRS
'When you eat this food, your bowels will ache.'

Complement-internal Patient NP relativized

(26) *wun* *ʕut'.u-guna,* *ʕan* *it:ar-x.a-je* *jamak*
[you eat.PF-TEMP bowels ill-become.IPF-PT:PRS] food
'a food such that when you eat it, your bowels ache'

❖ **"Contextual" semantic relation**

(27) *k'.i-nde* *küče.ji-l-di*
[die.PF-PT:AOR] street-SUPER-LAT
'to the street where the dead person lived (= to the dead street)'

(28) *xilik'.i* *jakː-ar* *fatq.a-f-ij* *wow-mi-sa-q…*
[die(of.animals).PF] meat-PL throw.IPF-N-COP:PST EM-DEMM-LOC-POST
'They used to throw here meat of dead animals (= dead meat).'

(29) *ʁarx.a* *darman-ar=ra*
[fall_asleep.IPF] medicine-PL=ADD
'soporific (= sleeping medicine)'

(30) *jakː* *ug.a-je* *niʔ*
[meat burn.IPF-PT:PRS] smell
'a smell of burning meat'

(31) *dad* *qaj.i* *un*
[father RE:come.PF] sound
'the sound of the father coming'

## 3. The system of participles in Agul

- There is no (single) "participle marker".
- Stative have a single participle with a suffix *-e* (*-je*, *-de*, *-re*).
- Non-stative verbs have two participles identical to the two aspectual stems.
- A series of derived participles is based on "converb + auxiliary" combinations.
- As NP modifiers, participles do not take any special ("attributive") markers. As NP heads, they take nominalization markers and inflect like nouns.

❖ **Stative verbs: suffixal participles**

| | present tense | participle |
|---|---|---|
| copula | *e* (< **i*) | *i-de* |
| 'be inside' | *aja* | *a-je* |
| 'be on, above' | *aldea* (Hp.) / *aldeja* (Tp.) | *al-e* |
| 'want, love' | *kːandea* (Hp.) / *kːandeja* (Tp.) | *kːan-e* |

NB: in the Tpig dialect, a few verbs have suffixal imperfective participles:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 'become' / 'go' | *weja* | *we-re* |

❖ **Non-stative verbs: unmarked participles**

- perfective participle – identical to the perfective stem
- imperfective participle – identical to the imperfective stem

| | perfective participle | imperfective participle |
|---|---|---|
| 'get out' | *ajč'u* | *ajč'ʷa* |
| 'do' | *aq'u* | *aq'a* (Hp.) / *arq'a* (Tp.) |
| 'say' | *pu* | *aʁa* |

## ❖ Non-stative verbs: derived participles

TPIG DIALECT:

- perfect/resultative participle < perfective stem + *-na*
  (NB: syncretic with the perfective converb)
- present participle < imperfective stem + *-ja*
  (NB: syncretic with the finite present)

| | perfect/resultative participle | present participle |
|---|---|---|
| 'get out' | *ajč'u-na* | *ajč'$^{w}$a-ja* |
| 'do' | *aq'u-na* | *arq'a-ja* |
| 'say' | *pu-na* | *aʁa-ja* |

In the Tpig dialect, derived participles are less frequent (ca. 23% of all clauses).

HUPPUQ' DIALECT:

- derived participles follow the same periphrastic models, as finite forms
- synchronically, they are morphologically bound

The models:

- present < imperfective converb + auxiliary 'be inside'
- habitual < imperfective converb + copula
- perfect/resultative < perfective converb + auxiliary 'be inside'
- aorist < perfective converb + copula

In finite forms, auxiliaries take finite tense forms (present or past); in participles, auxiliaries take participial forms (*ide* for the copula, *aje* for the locative verb).

| | perfective stem | imperfective stem |
|---|---|---|
| converb + 'be in' | *aq'u-naje*<br>< *aq'una aje*<br>(perfect/resultative participle) | *aq'a-je*<br>< *aq'aj aje*<br>(present participle) |
| converb + copula | *aq'u-nde*<br>< *aq'una ide*<br>(aorist participle) | *aq'a-jde*<br>< *aq'aj ide*<br>(habitual participle) |

In the Huppuq' dialect, derived participles are very frequent (ca. 56% of all clauses).

## ❖ Nominalization

When nominalized, any participle takes the nominalization suffix (*-ƒ* in the ABS.SG, *-ʈ-* in oblique cases and in the plural) and inflects like a noun.

(32) *nu* *šeher.di* *a-je-ʈ.i* *lik'.a-j-e* *mi-s...*
PTCL [city(IN) {IN}be-PT]-N(ERG) write.IPF-CONV-COP DEMM-DAT
'So, the one who lives in a town writes him...'

Apart from argument positions, nominalized participles are used in periphrastic forms, they also head adverbial and complement clauses, etc.

Only headed relative clauses are considered below.

## 4. Relativization targets in the two subcorpora

### ❖ Data

CORPUS 1: Tpig dialect, written

- Translation of the Luke's Gospel (*Инджил: Лукайин Китаб Месигь Iисайихъас Иджe Хабар*. / Тарджума акьуф З. К. Магомедова. Редакторар С. Н. Гасанова, Ш. А. Мазанаев М.: Институт перевода Библии, 2005.)
- Ca. 18,600 words, ca. 460 relative clauses.

CORPUS 2: Huppuq' dialect, oral

- Stories by Mutalib Guseynov, recorded in 2008 (a fragment of *The Agul Text Corpus*, by Dmitry Ganenkov, Solmaz Merdanova & Timur Maisak)
- Ca. 19,400 words, ca. 300 relative clauses.

✓ NB: in the Tpig subcorpus, relative clauses are used more frequently.

DATA CODED:

- participle type
- relativization target
- verb type
- whether the relative clause is postposed

### ❖ The distribution of participles

- In both corpora, stative verbs are very frequent in relative clauses (ca. 1/3 of all clauses)
- In the Huppuq' corpus, unmarked participles (= syncretic with the aspectual stems) are very rarely used

| ***Participle*** | ***Tpig, written*** | ***Huppuq', oral*** | **TOTAL** |
|---|---|---|---|
| STATIVE | 125 (27%) | 104 (34%) | 229 |
| IMPERFECTIVE (total), incl.: | 195 (42%) | 112 (37%) | 307 |
| unmarked imperfective | 176 | 19 | |
| habitual | – | 74 | |
| present | 19 | 19 | |
| PERFECTIVE (total), incl.: | 141 (31%) | 86 (28%) | 227 |
| unmarked perfective | 55 | 9 | |
| aorist | – | 36 | |
| perfect/resultative | 86 | 41 | |
| *TOTAL* | 461 (100%) | 302 (100%) | **763** |

## ❖ The distribution of targets

- The only significant difference between the two corpora is the A/P ratio, cf. A=P vs. A<P
- In both corpora, S is the most frequent target
- Even together, A and P are less frequent targets than S
- Addressee in the naming constructions is unexpectedly frequent (ca. 10%)
- Locative and temporal relativization is very prominent

| **Target** | ***Tpig, written*** | ***Huppuq', oral*** | **TOTAL** |
|---|---|---|---|
| S | 147 (32%) | 96 (32%) | 243 |
| A, including:<br>dative experiencer<br>apud-elative subject | 58 (13%)<br>10<br>3 | 20 (7%)<br>1<br>– | 78 |
| P, including:<br>absolutive stimulus | 67 (15%)<br>6 | 55 (18%)<br>13 | 122 |
| Addressee (esp. naming) | 45 (10%) | 26 (9%) | 71 |
| Locative, incl.<br>locative argument (statives) | 90 (19%)<br>40 | 64 (21%)<br>29 | 154 |
| Time | 25 (5%) | 26 (9%) | 51 |
| Other | 29 (6%) | 15 (5%) | 44 |
| *TOTAL* | 461 (100%) | 302 (100%) | **763** |

## ❖ S-preference (over A and P)

The preference for S-relativization is statistically significant for both corpora, both if S vs. A are compared and if S vs. P are compared.

## ❖ P-preference (over A)

The preference for P-relativization over A-relativization is statistically significant for the Huppuq' corpus and for the aggregated corpus, but is not significant for the Tpig corpus alone.

(NB: significance does not change if exeriential verbs are omitted from the counts)

(33) Some typical examples of A-relativization in the Luke's Gospel:

a. *šejt'an-ar* *adik.a* *sa* *insan*
[demon-PL expel.IPF] one person
'a man driving out demons'

b. *naluk-ar* *zawal* *arq'.a* *insan*
[tax-PL <collect> do.IPF] person
'tax collector'

c. *uc.a* *insan-ar* *čuq'* *a-ja*
[reap.IPF] person-PL a.little {IN}be-PRS
'the laborers (= people who reap) are few'

The use of the participle construction here is also related to the problem of multi-word lexical equivalents (see below): in Agul, there is no regular derivation of *nomen agentis*. In the Udi translation of the Luke's Gospel, for example, suffixal derivatives are used in cases like (33b) or (33c), cf. *nalog-girb-al* 'tax collector' [tax-collect-AG] or *äšp:-al* 'laborer' [work-AG].

❖ **S/A/P-preference**

The three core arguments are the most frequent targets, although the preference is not too big – only 58% in the aggregated corpus (vs. 42% for non-core arguments).

The ratio of non-core argument relativization in other languages for which the counts are available is much lower (14 to 34%, see below).

❖ **Locative (and possessive) relativization**

Among non-core arguments, locative agruments account for a high number of relativizations (ca. 1/5 of all cases), in particular due to the existence of frequently used locative prefixal verbs. Things (and people) are often described through what is located in (on, near, etc.) them, or what they have.

(34) Some typical examples of locative relativization

a. *čeχir a-ja kuruška*
[wine {IN}be-PT] cup
'a cup with (= having in it) wine'

b. *p:ara ʜa k'en kːi-dawa muq'*
[much big bottom {SUB}be-NEG(PT)] place
'an abyss (= a vast place without bottom)'

c. *baha kun-ar al-e insan*
[expensive clothes-PL {SUPER}be-PT] person
'a person in (= having on him) expensive clothes'

d. *degi fa-je sa ǯahut'*
[donkey {APUD}be-PT] one Jew
'a Jew who has a donkey'

❖ **Relative clauses and grammaticalization**

In some cases, it is not totally clear whether something should be counted as a relative clause, because the participle or the head noun is on its way to grammaticalization.

E.g. the ordinal marker in Agul is the perfective (or aorist) participle of the verb 'say', *-pu* / *-punde*. I don't count cases like these as relative clauses:

(35) *qːa-n=na c'ejerxi-d-punde is.a*
20-N=and 16-N-ORD year(TMR)
'in 1936'

What about the inperfective (or habitual) participle *aʁa* / *aʁajde* in the naming constrution? I count such cases as relative clauses, but is that correct?

(36) *ašakent* *aʁ.a-jde* *нür*
[Ashakent say.IPF-PT:HAB] village
'the village called Ashakent'

Cf. also the obsolete word *-guna* 'time' which is now used only as a temporal marker, with the noun *waχtː* 'time' which, among many other contexts, occurs in exactly the same type of temporal construction:

(37) *xe-tː-ar.i* *izan-ar* *aq'.a-guna...*
we:INCL(GEN)-N-PL(ERG) ploughing-PL do.IPF-TEMP
'When our people were ploughing the field...'

(38) *zun* *škːol.i* *ruχ.a* *waχtː.una...*
[I school(IN) study.IPF] time(TMR)
'When I studied at school...'

❖ **Relative clauses and idiomaticization**

The same is true about the lexicalization of certain uses of participles. Thus, I didn't count as instances of relative clauses:

(39) *dawa* 'COP' (negative participle) as 'bad, indecent'
*dawa* *kur-ar* *dawa* *gaf*
COP:NEG(PT) affair-PL COP:NEG(PT) word
'(he did) bad things' '(he said) bad words'

(40) *qaje* '{POST}be' ('belonging to') as 'the only'
*qa-je* *gada*
'{POST}be-PT son
'(his/her) only son'

❖ **Relative clauses and complex lexical equivalents**

Especially in the Luke's Gospel translation, complex combinations with participles are used as lexical equivalents for concepts that don't have simpler way of expression in the language. Such complex lexical equivalents can be occur in the text many times, which influences the statistics.

(41) *düʕe-bur* *χur.a* *χal*
[prayer-PL read.IPF] house
'temple' = 'the house where (they) read prayers'; 18 occurences

(42) *xetː.i-ʕ* *ʕuč'.u-na –* *ʕajč'ʷ.a* *ʕedat*
[water-INTER {INTER}put.PF-CONV {INTER}get.out.IPF] rite
'christening' = 'the rite of putting in and out of water'; 10 occurences

## 5. Relativization targets in other Nakh-Daghestanian languages

Corpus counts of relativization targets were made for Archi, Udi and Lezgian, and also Avar and Bagwalal. Apart from Lezgian (2,000 clauses), the number of counted clauses is not high (~150-300).

The results are not directly comparable, as the sources include either written or spontaneous oral texts (or both), what is counted are either only headed relative clauses or both headed and headless clauses, the taxonomy of targets can also differ (only S/A/P or all tagrets; experiencer counted as S vs. A, etc.).

❖ LEZGIAN (Ganenkov, Ms.)
- Sources: random sample from CoSL (*The Corpus of Standard Lezgian*)
- Total number of relative clauses: 2000 (only headed)
- Targets distribution:
  - ✓ S – 787 (39%)
  - ✓ P – 637 (32%), incl. stimulus – 94
  - ✓ A – 296 (15%), incl. experiencer – 67
  - ✓ other (OBL) – 280 (14%)

❖ ARCHI (Daniel & Lander 2013)
- Sources: texts from Kibrik et al. (1977), complemented by those recorded in 2000s; ca. 1200 sentences in total
- Total number of relative clauses: 219 (both headed and headless)
- Targets distribution:
  - ✓ S – 97 (44%), incl. stimulus – 10, possessum – 4
  - ✓ P – 35 (16%),
  - ✓ A – 11 (5%), experiencer – 1 (<1%)
  - ✓ other – 75 (34%)

❖ UDI (Daniel & Lander 2013)
- Sources: modern texts in Nizh Udi, both written and spontaneous oral
- Total number of relative clauses: 306 (both headed and headless)
- Targets distribution:
  - ✓ S – 137 (45%)
  - ✓ P – 47 (15%)
  - ✓ A – 55 (18%)
  - ✓ other – 67 (22%)

❖ BAGWALAL (Barylnikova 2015)
- Sources: texts from Kibrik et al.'s (2001) grammar
- Total number of relative clauses: 144 (both headed and headless)
- Targets distribution:
  - ✓ S – 49 (34%), possessum – 1 (1%)
  - ✓ P – 31 (22%), stimulus – 11 (8%)
  - ✓ A – 16 (11%), experiencer – 12 (8%)
  - ✓ other – 24 (16%)

❖ AVAR (Polinsky et al. 2012):
- Sources: three fairy tales, vernacular stories, the translation of Luke's Gospel
- Total number of relative clauses: 158
- Targets distribution
  - ✓ S – 68 (43%)
  - ✓ P – 49 (31%)
  - ✓ A – 41 (26%)
  - ✓ other – 0 (not counted)

The results are summarized below (where relevant, I lumped experiencer with A, stimulus with P, and possessum with S).

| | S (ABS) | P (ABS) | A (ERG/DAT) | other |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| LEZGIAN | 787 (39%) | 637 (32%) | 296 (15%) | 280 (14%) |
| AGUL | 243 (32%) | 122 (16%) | 78 (10%) | 320 (42%) |
| ARCHI | 87 (40%) | 45 (20,5%) | 12 (5,5%) | 75 (34%) |
| UDI | 137 (45%) | 47 (15%) | 55 (18%) | 67 (22%) |
| AVAR | 68 (43%) | 49 (31%) | 41 (26%) | – |
| BAGWALAL | 50 (35%) | 42 (29%) | 28 (19%) | 24 (16%) |

> Do Nakh-Daghestanian languages look so different because their superficially similar structures are really syntactically different, or the source of this difference lies rather in the counting methodology (e.g. the number of occurrences taken into account, written or oral texts, the identification of targets, etc.)?

## References


Barylnikova D. V. 2015. Pričastnaja strategija reljativizacii v naxsko-dagestanskix jazykax. BA Thesis. Higher School of Economics, Moscow.

Comrie Bernard & Maria Polinsky. 1999. Form and function in syntax: Relative clauses in Tsez. In: M. Darnell et al. (eds). Functionalism and Formalism in Linguistics, vol. II: Case Studies. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1999. P. 77-92.

Daniel, Michael A. & Yury A. Lander. 2013. Neravnopravie rolej v otnositel'nyx konstrukcijax: materialy po častotnosti reljativizacii v arčinskom i udinskom jazykax. In: Semantika jazykovyx edinic raznyx urovnej. Vyp. 15. Makhachkala: DGU. P. 59–78.

Ganenkov, Dmitry. Relativization in a morphologically ergative language: a corpus study. Ms.

Lander, Yury & Michael Daniel. 2013. East Caucasian relativization: descriptive categories vs comparative concepts. Paper presented at the Association for Linguistic Typology 10th Biennial Conference (ALT 10). 2013 August 15–18, Leipzig[2].

Lander Yu. & A. Kozhukhar. 2015. Successfully looking for syntax in Mehweb Dargwa relative clause constructions Linguistics. WP BRP. НИУ ВШЭ. No. 34/LNG/2015. URL: https://publications.hse.ru/preprints/168266834

Maisak, Timur. 2008. Morphology, semantics and syntax of participles in Agul. Paper presented at the Seminar on the Noun Phrase Typology (TypoULM), 8.12.2008. École Normale Supérieure, Paris.

Polinsky, Maria, Carlos Gómez Gallo, Peter Graff, & Ekaterina Kravtchenko. 2012. Subject Preference and Ergativity. Lingua 122(3): 267-277.


[2] Cf. the book of abstracts: https://www.eva.mpg.de/lingua/conference/2013_ALT10/pdf/abstracts/Abstracts_ALT10_complete.pdf