

Lak Substantival Declension: 40 cases or 50?. *The Non-Slavic Languages of the USSR: Linguistic Studies -- Second Series*. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society. 1992. 113-33.

Lak Substantival Declension: 40 cases or 50?  
Victor A. Friedman

University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill

According to the Guinness Book of World Records, Tabasaran holds the record for the largest number of cases. Second only to Tabasaran, Lak has the world's next largest number of cases, as well as the next smallest number of speakers among the five Daghestanian literary languages. The student of Lak, however, will be confronted not merely by a large number of cases, but also by conflicting figures and definitions. Thus, for example, Uslar (1890:16) sets the number at "about 50" and actually gives examples of 48 (50 if the adverbials -nu and -na- are counted). Dirr (1928:238-41) uses Uslar's 48. Hjelmslev (1935:159-83) also sets the number at 48, but his inventory differs from both Uslar's and Dirr's. From Bouda's (1949:38-53) account one can deduce 45 cases, but again some of them differ from those cited in previous works. Burč'uladze (1986:80, 117) states "42 (sometimes 41)", while Žirkov (1955:35-37) gives only 40 forms in his "complete paradigm". Both these authors cite desinences not cited in anyone else's nor in each other's work. Murkelinskij (1971:128-134, 1980:492-93) leaves out one of Žirkov's cases (the comparative -*jar*) to get 39. These last three authors also indicate that certain of the case desinences they cite are no longer in use. In addition to disagreeing on the inventory of Lak cases, authors also disagree on the classification of certain desinences, i.e. as primary or grammatical, secondary or local, and sometimes tertiary or adverbial. In this paper I hope to bring some order to this confusing state of affairs.

I shall begin with a few basic facts of Lak nominal morphology. There is a primary distinction in Lak between the nominative stem and the oblique stem. The oblique stem is often but not always characterized by an additional suffix. Vocalic and/or consonantal alternations or suppletion also occur. Some typical examples are illustrated in Table One.

TABLE ONE

meaning	nominative [class]	genitive
eagle	barzu [3]	barzu-l
game	t'urk'u [4]	t'urk'ulu-l
sister	ssu [3]	ssi-l
place	k'anu [3]	k'anttu-l
head	bak' [4]	bak'ra-l
heart	dak' [4]	dak'ni-l
side	čul [3]	čulu-l
field, steppe	čul [3]	čuldanu-l
stable	ppal[3]	ppalni-l
wool[sheep,camel]	ppal[4]	ppalu-l
wolf	barc' [3]	burc'i-l
back	barh' [3]	burh'a-l
word	maq [3]	muqqu-l
mother	ninu [2]	nitti-l
sun	barz [3]	zuru-l

Lak also has an important distinction between personal (first and second) and non-personal (third) pronouns, with suppletion in the oblique personal singular and class marking in the non-personal as well as in the emphatic/reflexive personal. Table Two gives the nominative and genitive of the personal pronouns and a typical non-personal one. Table Three gives two singular emphatic/reflexive pronouns -- first and third singular -- in enough cases to illustrate all the variants of the word-internal class markers. Also the the initial and plural markers are listed below the chart.

TABLE TWO

	singular		plural	
	nom.	gen.	nom.	gen.
first person	na	ttu-l	žu	žu-l
second person	ina	vi-l	zu	zu-l
third: class 1	ga	gana-l	gaj	gajnna-l
2		gani-l		gajnnu-l
3				
4				

TABLE THREE

case	CLASS					
	1	3	2,4	1	3	2,4
nom	na-v-a	na-v-a	na-r-a	cu-v-a	cu-pp-a	cu-rd-a
gen	ttul-ø-a	ttul-v-a	ttul-l-a	cal-ø-a	cil-ø-a	cil-l-a
dat	ttun-ø-a	ttun-m-a	ttun-n-a	can-ø-a	cin-m-a	cin-n-a
supr	ttuj-v-a	ttuj-v-a	ttuj-r-a	caj-v-a	cij-v-a	cij-r-a
	I myself			oneself		
	other class markers					
	initial: 1=ø-; 3=b-; 2,4=d-					
	plural: 1,2,3=3sg; 4=4sg					

With these basic facts in mind, I shall now attempt to synthesize as coherently as possible the various accounts of case in Lak cited above. For the time being, I shall follow all the scholars from Uslar to Burč'uladze in taking as given the meaning of the term case. The first question is whether or not to ascribe an ergative case to Lak. As is illustrated by the example sentences below, that which corresponds to the English subject can be in the nominative, genitive, ablative, or dative case, while that which corresponds to the English object is in the nominative. The subject of an intransitive verb is nominative (1). The transitive verb (here axxan 'to sell') always agrees with the object in class (here b-[v] marks čvu [3] 'horse'). In an ordinary simple transitive sentence, however, a personal pronoun will be nominative while anything else will be genitive (2 & 3). The nominative can control person agreement, but the genitive cannot (1, 2 & 4). Note that if the tense form is analytic, non-personal subjects have the option of being in the nominative and controlling the auxiliary (4b). According to Kibrik (1978:9), the different agreement patterns are used to signal degree of commitment to the statement (3 & 4), while the ablative can be used to signal unintentional performance of the action (5). The ablative is also required by verbs meaning 'be able' (7), and the dative is required by so-called 'affective' verbs, e.g. 'want' and 'see' (6).

- |                                       |                                |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 1a. na naj ura                        | I am coming                    |
| 1b. ga naj ur                         | He is coming                   |
| 2a. na baxxara čvu                    | I sell the horse               |
| 2b. ganal baxxaj čvu                  | He sells the horse             |
| 3a. na bavxxunu bur čvu               | Apparently I sold the horse    |
| 3b. ganal bavxxunu bur čvu            | Apparently he sold the horse   |
| 4a. na bavxxunu ura čvu               | I have sold the horse          |
| 4b. ga bavxxunu ur čvu                | He has sold the horse          |
| 5a. tušša bavxxunu bur čvu            | I accidentally sold the horse  |
| 5b. ganašša bavxxunu bur čvu          | He accidentally sold the horse |
| 6a. ttun va čvu baxxan ččaj bur       | I want to sell this horse      |
| 6b. ganan va čvu baxxan ččaj bur      | He wants to sell this horse    |
| 7a. ttušša va čvu baxxan bjuqlaj bur  | I can sell this horse          |
| 7b. ganašša va čvu baxxan bjuqlaj bur | He can sell this horse         |

Kibrik (1978:3) considers the ergative to be a separate case that is realized on the surface as either nominative or genitive depending on the lexical characteristics of the noun. As seen in 4 however, the semantics and shape of the tense form can also affect case choice. Kibrik's formulation obscures the fact that like many of the world's languages, Lak has a type of split ergative structure that conforms to the feature hierarchy described by Silverstein (1976).<sup>1</sup> We thus agree with Burč'uladze (1986:84) that Lak cannot be considered to have an independent ergative case.

The next question concerns the distinction between primary (grammatical, abstract), secondary (local, concrete) and tertiary (adverbial) cases. None of the Lak cases are purely grammatical in the sense that Melčuk (1986:84) uses for the Georgian ergative. All Lak cases carry some sort of semantic valence beyond that of syntactic role in the clause. Some do appear to be purely local or adverbial, but others are more difficult to classify. All scholars are agreed on at least three grammatical cases: nominative -ø, genitive -l, and dative -n. Moreover, there is a series of agglutinatively formed local cases that everyone agrees form a coherent set, although the exact number of actually occurring and semantically distinct forms varies from one account to another, with no account attesting all forms and meanings.

The local cases are formed by adding one of six morphemes to the oblique stem and one of seven morphemes (including zero) to that suffix, bringing the theoretically possible total to 42, to which we must add the fact that Bouda (1949:46) distinguishes -v from -vu, while all others treat -v as an elided variant of -vu. Bouda's claim pushes the possible total of these local cases to 43. Table Four gives the six non-terminal local case desinences, the seven terminal local case desinences, and all the possible combinations, including class agreement for -n!aj (where ! stands for the position of the class marker).<sup>2</sup>

TABLE FOUR

suffix	meaning	label (After Melčuk 1986 and Hjelmlev 1935)
-v[u]	in	in-
-j <sup>3</sup>	on	super-



15. Šatta buvkunni murxirala. (Murkelinskij 1971:130-33)

The snake crawled out from under the tree'

Here, however, are some examples with -atu where the sense of 'distance' or 'removal' is difficult if not impossible to identify:

16. Vin čatu k'ulli. (Xalilov 1976:228)

How (From where) do you know?<sup>5</sup>

17. Musijatu usttarnal k'issa buvna. (Gajdarova 1977:278)

The mastercraftsman made the ring out of gold.

18. O'nnessa č'umal ga t'annujatu žura-žurassa qqusri, kkačči-ččitri jalagu cajmi ssiḡri dullan ik'ajva. (Gajdarova 1977:278)

He made various spoons and toys and other things out of wood in his free time.

Although -un and -un!aj also have similar, sometimes near-synonymous, uses, there are also examples where they are clearly not interchangeable:

19. Na tanajin zakkana ššun bav (Xajdakov and Žirkov 1962:327)

I hit [onto] him with my fist.

20. mağujnaj uruglaj ur. (Murkelinskij 1971:131)

He is looking towards the ceiling.

21. ... o'vča vila dusturajin va mallanajin pulav bukan, ... (Xalilov 1976:205)

... invite [onto] your friends and the mullah to eat pilaf, ...

To the best of my knowledge, such examples do not exist for -a and -atu.

Of the authors whose works were available to me, only Burč'uladze identifies the series based on the terminal desinence -xč'in, which he credits Topuria (1940) with having first observed. He does not make clear how -xč'in differs from -[u]x. So far I have found only two examples, both of them super-:

22. Zu zula dua'rtajxč'in hattava qqaliqaj ara, paraqh'at ara, - kunu. (Xalilov 1976:216))

By means of your prayers make it so he doesn't come running back from the grave, make him rest in peace - she said.

23. Č'alaj buriv zuva ussurval bjavq' laj bivk'šivu va kulpatravussa dusšivu žujxč'in dušivu - kunu. (Xalilov 1976:225)

'Do y'all see that you brothers are mistaken [you brothers' being mistaken] and that the family friendship is through us [the family friendship's being through us] - she said.'

While both these examples are non-local, i.e. non-literal, such usage also occurs with the superprolative -jx, although I found only one example as opposed to twelve with local meanings.

24. Ina ura, tul muqqurtijx uvkkun, qqalmaqqallaj. (Xalilov 1976:225)

Through my words, you are disgraced.

It is not possible to comment on this case further at this time.

With regard to the remaining cases, while the post-1950 authors state that some of them are obsolete, they are all attested as distinct. There are clearly differences among dialects and between spoken and written usage in this regard. Thus while the system of local cases in Lak is undergoing change (Burč'uladze 1986:82), at this point in time the remaining cases must all be counted in a complete inventory.<sup>6</sup>

We must now return to the question of whether all these local cases are really cases or clitic postpositions. Lak has a number of non-clitic postpositions. Of this number, five correspond more or less closely to the six primary local case desinences as shown in Table Five:

TABLE FIVE

case	meaning		postposition	meaning
-vu	in-	in	viv	inside
-j	super-	on	jalu	above
-x	post-	behind	maq	behind
-lu	sub-	below	luv	below under
-č'a	apud-	near	č'arav	around, at, by <sup>7</sup>
-c'	ad-	at	"	"

Although these local cases are clearly postpositional in origin, there are several arguments in favor of analyzing them as synchronic cases.

1. Secondary local cases can be followed by postpositions and postpositions can govern more than one case:

25. qqatra-l maq

behind/at the back of the house [pl]

26. Gani-j-a maq ars vaj šanmagu zaraja maqunaj ḡunu ur. (Xalilov 1976:212)

After that [superrelative] the son swore off those three things.

2. Constructions with postpositions and their semantically related cases have different meanings:

27a. qqatlu-vu 'in the house'

27b. qqatlul viv 'inside the house'

3. Secondary local cases can have non-local meanings, postpositions are restricted to concrete meanings:

28. ... o'vča vila dustura-j-n va mallana-j-n ((≠ dustural va mallanal jalun) pulav bukan, ... (Xalilov 1976:205)

... invite [onto] your friends and the mullah to eat pilaf, ...

29. durnu dur dukra hutru - ttilik'ra-j-a (≠ ttilik'ral jala). (Xalilov 1976:219) '

They made food from the pluck [liver & lungs].

30. Tana-j-a (≠ tanal jala) rasxat lasi. (Murkelinskij 1971:131)

Get permission from him

31. qqatlu-x (≠ qqatlul maq) cij dulav? (Murkelinskij 1971:132)

What did you pay for the house?

32. tana-x-a (≠ tanal maqa) uvkkun havav? (Murkelinskij 1971:133)

Are you leaving because of him?

33. Nittil buruvxxussa huqra-v-a (≠ huqral viva) Tamaril jat'julssa huqa buvč'una. (Gajdarova 1977:277)

From the dresses sewn by mother Tamar chose a red dress.

34. Vana lax̄xu radiolu-vu-x (≠ radiolul vivux) buslaj bija dušmannal ġužum bjajššin bunny t'ij. (Gajdarova 1977:279)

Yesterday they announced on the radio that the enemy's assault had been repelled.

35. A'q' dudu-c'-a šajar čanna-c'-a (≠ a'q' dulul/čannal č'arava) xunu qinssar. (Gajdarova 1977:280)

Than deprived of reason deprived of sight (lit. light) is better.

4. Some postpositions are formally very different from the semantically similar case

36a. qqatlu-l maq 'behind/at the back of the house [pl]'

36b. qqatlu-x 'behind/at the rear of the house'

5. Postpositions can take secondary case suffixes that differ significantly from the ones used in nominal declension

TABLE SIX

-essive	-lu	luv	-j	jaluv
-prolative	-lux	lulttu	-jx	jalttu

6. Postpositions can govern conjoined genitives, case forms are repeated each time

37. ... ššjalmah'ral va t'ajlamunil djanivgu xxjuva k'issa bišinssa k'anu bussar. (Xalilov 1976:211)

... and the distance between truth and falsehood is five fingers.

38. ... o'vča vila dustura-j-n va mallana-j-n pulav bukan, ... (Xalilov 1976:205)

... invite [onto] your friends and the mullah to eat pilaf, ...

7. Class markers are bound morphemes, not clitics, and case desinences occur before class markers in emphatic pronouns.

Clitics and postpositions follow the class marker.

39. Ga na na-va-ra (H'amzatov 1972:21)

It is I myself (I-class-am)

40. Ina-va-gu (Xalilov 1976:219)

You yourself, too (you-class-and)

41. ca-l-ø-a x̄x̄ič' 'in front of him himself' (him-gen-class + postposition) (Xalilov 1976:204)

Similarly:

ttu-č'an-ø-a - ttu-č'an-m-a - ttu-č'an-n-a 'over by me myself'

ca-č'an-ø-a - ca-č'an-m-a - ca-č'an-n-a. 'over by him himself'

8. Postpositions can occur separated from the words they govern by other parts of the sentence:

42. Ttul x̄x̄ič' murx̄, maq č'ira bur. (Murkelinskij 1983:184)

Before me is a tree, behind a wall.

The remaining cases are summarized in Table Seven. I have used the author's term wherever possible. When the author used a preposition instead of a term, I have supplied an appropriate term:

TABLE SEVEN

suffix	Murk71 <sup>8</sup>	Dirr	Žirkov55	Burč'86	Uslar90	Bouda49
-x̄	adessiv	poss'v	poss'v	poss'v	poss'v	adess'v
-x̄x̄un	dat-2	admot'v	dat-2	adlat'v	adlat'v	allat'v
-šša	elative	ablative	abl'v	elative	elative	ablative
-ššal	commit'v	comit'v	comit'v	comit'v	comit'v	comit'v
-jnu	instr'l	instr'l	caus'v	inst'l	inst'l	caus'l
-xlu[nu]	motivativ	---	motivativ	motivativ	---	---

-[ni]jar	=adv	comp'v	comp'v	comp'v	comp'v	=abl+-r
-[u]kssa	=adv	similat'v	≠case	---	equat'v	=učin
-[u]kun!a	=adv	similat'v	≠case	---	similat'v	=učin
-j	=nom[86] voc[126]	voc	≠case	---	=superes'v	≠case

Two questions are involved here. The first is which if any of these are cases? The second is whether they are to be classed as local, grammatical, or something else. Let us begin by dismissing Hjelmlev's (1935:101) claim that -gu forms a separate, similative, case. He cites the following sentence

43. Ussu-gu ssu—kssa qinssa uri

Brother is as good as sister.

In fact, however, -gu is a clitic whose basic meaning is 'and/even' not a case suffix. It can attach to any case and to any part of speech. Examples (37) and (40) show it attached to a postposition and following the class marker on an emphatic/reflexive pronoun. In example (44) it is attached to a dative and in (45) it clearly has no comparative/similative meaning and is moreover attached to oblique case suffixes:

44. Na ussi-n-ukssa ssi-n-gu dulav. (Žirkov 1955:44)

As much to brother also to sister I gave = I gave as much to sister as to brother.

45. Dak' čun dullan ivk'un ur, ussi-j-atu-gu arx uvcun, cavaj vixšala daqqassa dusta-l-gu buvnu, ... (Xalilov 1976:225)

He became arrogant and turned away from his brother, and made some faithless friends...

The suffixes -[u]kssa, 'as. like (quantity)', -[u]kun!a 'as, like (quality)' Both attach to the unaltered nominative. Moreover, as seen in example (44), they can also attach to oblique cases (ussinukssa), as well as to other parts of speech, e.g. the adjective in (46) and kuna can even stand alone as in (47):

46. Ganal arkinssa-kssa arcu dart'un, č'axxučunačun dullunu, kumag buvnu bur burž laqan. (Xalilov 1976:223)

He gathered as much money as necessary, gave it to his neighbor, and helped him to pay off his debt.

47. Na ta kuna jarxnu aqqara. (Murkelinskij 1971:248)

I am not as far away as he.

We thus side with Žirkov and the other scholars that do not consider these case suffixes.

The vocative is always problematic. There is the primary question of whether the vocative is a case at all in any language. In Lak, it only has a distinct form if the noun ends in a vowel other than -u, in which case the suffix is -j added to the nominative. While functional arguments against the vocative as a case are not language specific, we can add here the specific fact for Lak that cases are added to an oblique stem and are formed agglutinatively for all nouns whereas the vocative meets neither of these criteria<sup>9</sup>

One other troublesome suffix is the comparative in -jar. This suffix attaches to the oblique stem, e.g. ttujar 'than me', vijar 'than you' and in the emphatic/reflexive it comes before the class marker: vijarva 'than you yourself'. The apparently completely synonymous -nijar, however, attaches to the nominative stem. Bouda's analysis of it as the superrelative -j-a plus -r (class marker?), while tempting leaves the problem of -r unresolved. Another point that Bouda makes that seems stronger is the fact that -jar has functions that could be interpreted as broader than that of a strict comparative:

48a. Camur xullijx řunu, gana-jar řřič'un uvkkun, (Xalilov 1976:213)

Taking another road, he came out [having come out] in front of him [ahead of him]

On the other hand, consider also this use with a gerund:

49. A'q'dulc'a řajar čannac'a řunu qinssar. (Gajdarova 1977:280)

It is better to be deprived of light [=sight] than of reason (Reason-ad/elative being-than light-ad/elative having-become good-is.

Murkelinskij (1971:248) treats it as an adverbial suffix like -kun!a, although this does not explain away the oblique stem. The attachment to non-nominal forms as in (48) favors Murkelinskij's view. If we take a strictly formal view, -jar must be viewed as a case suffix because it attaches directly to the oblique stem of any noun.

The remaining cases all attach unambiguously to oblique nominal stems. Of these -jnu and -xlu[nu] are more "adverbial" while the other four form a set similar in some respects to the local series but much more highly grammaticalized. Here are some typical examples of usage of each case.

possessive/adressive -X

50. Tana-ř ttul lu bussar. (Murkelinskij 1971:129)

He has my book'

Note especially the ergative pattern with verbs of speaking:

51. Duřnil butta-ř kunu bur: -- Ina lavgun xanna-ř uča: (Xalilov 1976:211)

Daughter to father said: "You go and say to the khan:

52. Žula 15 o'l bur, amma canni-ř-ra-gu vakssa nah'ussa nak' daqqar. (Xalilov 1976:210)

We have 15 cows, but not one of them has such tasty milk.

dativ-2/admotive -XXUN

53. Muni-xxun qqulajssa tahargu dirirnu dur. (Xalilov 1976:204)

A convenient situation occurred for this.

54. Nadiršahnan ččan bivk'un bur lakral bilajat cala k'untti-xxun lasun. (Xalilov 1976:207)

Nadir Shah wanted to take the Lak country into his hands.

55. Lavsunu ččarulliv ca-canna-xxun ca-ca bullunu bur cala arsnan va ussil arsnan. (Xalilov 1976:225)

Taking the kidneys he gave one apiece to each of them - one to his own son and one to his brother's son.

ablative/involuntative/possibiliative -ŠŠA

56. Na tana-šša lu lasav. (Murkelinskij 1971:130)

I got a book from him'

57. X'uxči-šša nic bivk'unni. (Murkelinskij 1971:129)

The shepherd killed the ox by accident.

58. Va davu tana-šša qqurtal dan qqašajssar (Murkelinskij 1971:129)

This job can't be finished by him.

59. Tana-šša ca k'anttaj ac'an qqašaj. (Murkelinskij 1971:129)

He can't stand in one place.

60. Tu-šša h'isav dan bjuqunni. (Murkelinskij 1971:130)

I can solve the problem.

commitative -ŠŠAL

61. Ussu ssi-ššal bazalluvun lavgunni. (Murkelinskij 1971:130)

Brother with sister went to the bazaar.

62. Ćaraldanu-ššal mik'gu bija. (Murkelinskij 1971:130)

The town, too, was with rain'

instrumental/causative -JNU<sup>10</sup>

63. Vil kumarga-jnu ttušša zanan bjuqanssar. (Murkelinskij 1971:130)

With your help I can walk.

64. Tana-jnu davu qqurtal xunssa. (Murkelinskij 1971:130)

Through him the job will be completed'

motivative -XLU[NU]

65. Ttul ussu buttal k'anttu-xlu o' eq' i but'laj ussija. (Murkelinskij 1971:130)

My brother shed blood for the fatherland.

66. Ina tana-xlu arcu dula. (Murkelinskij 1971:130)

Pay the money for him.

67. Ta ttu-xlu uvkunni. (Murkelinskij 1971:130)

He acted for me.

As can be seen from the foregoing examples, if we eliminate those suffixes that attach to the nominative stem and leave to one side the problematic -jar, the remaining six suffixes divide into two types which could be called pseudo-local and, following Burč'uladze (1986), postpositional. The so-called possessive, dative-2, and ablative clearly are more grammatical than local in their functions. The commitative, while clearly etymologically related to these first three, does not appear to have the same types of purely grammatical functions. The last two cases both look rather adverbial; in fact, -nu is the derivational suffix for forming adverbs. Moreover, the functions of -xlu can also be performed by the postposition c'ani. Still, their syntagmatic features, i.e. attachment to the oblique stem of any noun, as well as their semantics appear to be declensional. Žirkov's (1955) separation of the possessive/addressive and dative-2 into a seventh, defective series of local cases on a par with the more strictly local cases does not seem justified in view of their primary functions to indicate possession and indirect objects of verbs of speaking and giving. The so-called ablative has important grammatical functions, and the commitative can be placed with the other three fairly easily. Murkelinskij's treatment is reminiscent of Žirkov's, but Gajdarova and Burč'uladze clearly do not consider any of these cases part of the strictly local case series. Burč'uladze's description of all these cases as "postpositional" appears to be too extreme. It seems more justifiable to consider the etymologically related possessive/addressive, dative-2, ablative and commitative as part of a (perhaps secondary) grammatical series, leaving two or three (depending on the status of -jar) cases as postpositional or adverbial. With regard to the distinction local/grammatical, while it is clear that the possessive/addressive and dative-2 have non-local meanings/uses, it is equally clear that some of the so-called local cases have important non-local functions. If what sets the local cases apart is

the formal criterion of their use with the secondary suffixes that are also added to postpositions, then  $-\underline{x}$ ,  $-\underline{x}\underline{xun}$  does look like a "defective" series. The suffix  $-\underline{\text{šša}}$  could even fit here, but not  $-\underline{\text{ššal}}$ . If on the other hand the semantics are taken into account, then these last are grammatical,

It would appear that the potential inventory of these Lak local cases is restricted in three ways: one does not occur at all ( $-\underline{\text{č'aa}}$ ), some appear to be facultative variants of others ( $-\underline{v}$  ~  $-\underline{vu}$ ,  $-\underline{a}$  ~  $-\underline{atu}$ , possibly  $-\underline{x}$  ~  $-\underline{x}\underline{\text{č'in}}$ ), and some are or are said to be no longer productive (some or all of the ad-, apud- and/or directive cases [ $-\underline{c}$ ',  $-\underline{\text{č'a}}$ , and  $-\underline{n!aj}$  and the sublative  $-\underline{lun}$ ], depending on the author). Apparently, as Burč'uladze states (1986:82), the system of local cases in Lak is in the undergoing change. Nonetheless, I would say that taking the formal criterion of oblique stem formation as primary, a keeping in mind arguments against postpositional treatment of the local series, Lak can be said to have 10 grammatical and adverbial cases (including  $-\underline{\text{jar}}$ ) and, rejecting the differentiation of  $-\underline{v}$  and  $-\underline{vu}$  and  $-\underline{a}$  and  $-\underline{atu}$  but reserving judgment on  $-\underline{x}$  and  $-\underline{x}\underline{\text{č'in}}$ , 30 or 36 local cases for a total of 40 or 46.

#### NOTES

<sup>1</sup>On the other hand it can be argued that since  $\underline{na}$  and  $\underline{tanal}$  have the same agreement pattern in (3), they must be treated as realizing the same case, which would have to be the ergative. In Mel'čuk's (1986) sense, the ergative is a case 2 whose case 3 realizations are identical with either the nominative or genitive.

<sup>2</sup>The markers are the same as those given for the dative emphatic/reflexive pronouns in Table Three above. In simple sentences, the verb will agree with the nominative to which it refers, i.e., the subject of an intransitive or (facultatively) analytic transitive and the object of a transitive (obligatory if synthetic) as in the following examples based on Kibrik (1978:10-11):

- |      |   |                                    |
|------|---|------------------------------------|
| 8a.  | ppu qqatluvun- $\emptyset$ -aj naj $\emptyset$ -ur                | father goes into the house         |
| 8b.  | ninu qqatluvun-n-aj naj d-ur                                      | mother goes into the house         |
| 9a.  | nittil qqatluvun-m-aj ččat'[3] la-v-sun naj b-ur                  |                                    |
| 9b.  | *nittil qatluvun-n-aj ččat' la-v-sun b-ur/d-ur                    | mother brings bread into the house |
| 10a. | ppu qqatluvun-m-aj ččat' la-v-sun naj $\emptyset$ -ur             |                                    |
| 10b. | ppu qqatluvun- $\emptyset$ -aj ččat' la-v-sun naj $\emptyset$ -ur | father brings bread into the house |
| 11a. | ninu qqatluvun-m-aj ččat' la-v-sun naj d-ur                       |                                    |
| 11b. | ninu qqatluvun-n-aj ččat' la-v-sun naj d-ur                       | mother brings bread into the house |

In 10/11a the focus is on the bread, in 10/11b on the parent.

<sup>3</sup>If the oblique stem ends in  $-\underline{u}$ , this will front and unround to  $-\underline{i}$  before the suffixes of this series. The  $-\underline{j}$ - will disappear except in final position (Zđirkov 1955:40). This is characteristic of the dialect Kumux (the basis of literary Lak) as opposed to that of Vicxli (the basis of earlier descriptions) (Burč'uladze 1986:80).

<sup>4</sup>An entirely separate issue is the fact that certain nouns can form the inessive (and other local cases) on an a base other than the oblique as derived from the genitive. Thus, for example, the genitive of  $\underline{C'ada}$  is  $\underline{C'adallal}$  but the inessive is  $\underline{C'adav}$  in (17) and (20). Consider also the following:

- |               |              |  |
|---------------|--------------|--|
| ppal 'stable' | gen. ppalnil | but ppalav baq'in 'to drive into the stable'     |
| rat' 'cliff'  | gen. rat'nil | but inessive rat'uv (Murqčilinskij 1989)         |
|               |              | also rat'ux han 'to fall off a cliff, to perish' |

Uslar (1890:38) gives a number of similar examples. It is difficult to tell at this point if this is a manifestation of a tendency to shift the local cases to a simpler stem or is a lexical/adverbial phenomenon limited to toponyms and similar nouns. All the examples I have seen that are not toponymic are either buildings or topographical features. Consider also the phenomenon of the occasional loss of the genitive  $-\underline{l}$  in compounds, e.g.  $\underline{\text{lasnaussu}}$  'brother-in-law' <  $\underline{\text{lasnal}} \underline{\text{ussu}}$  'husband's brother'

<sup>5</sup>There also exists  $\underline{\text{ča}}$  'whence'.

<sup>6</sup>The post-1950 authors agree that the apudprolative ( $-\underline{\text{č'ax}}$ ) is virtually obsolete. Burč'uladze (1986:82) states that it only occurs with a few nouns, e.g.,  $\underline{\text{qqatta}}$  'house' but not  $\underline{\text{č'ira}}$  'wall' (cf. also Xajdakov and Zđirkov 1962:403; usually the postposition  $\underline{\text{č'arax}}$  is used), and Murkelinskij (1971:133) omits it from his inventory and description of cases based on  $-\underline{\text{č'a}}$ . These authors also state that the adessive ( $-\underline{\text{c}}$ ') is archaic or obsolete in literary Lak (Zđirkov (1955:42), Murkelinskij (1971:126), Gajdarova (1977:280), and Burč'uladze (1986:82). Gajdarova specifies that it only occurs with  $\underline{\text{č'ira}}$  'wall',  $\underline{\text{nex}}$  'river',  $\underline{\text{bak}}$  'head',  $\underline{\text{ččan}}$  'leg',  $\underline{\text{dak}}$  'heart',  $\underline{\text{nik}}$  'knee', and  $\underline{\text{xxullu}}$  'road', although, e.g. in the Vicxi dialect it also occurs with other nouns, e.g.,  $\underline{\text{qqatta}}$  'house',  $\underline{\text{murx}}$  'tree' (Uslar 1890:44). Zđirkov (1955:42) states: "In Kumux spoken usage the cases of this (the apud-,  $-\underline{\text{c}}$ ') series are little used, but they occur not infrequently in texts." Gajdarova (1977:280) also lists the sublative ( $-\underline{\text{lun}}$ ), apudprolative ( $-\underline{\text{č'ux}}$ ), and all the directive ( $-\underline{\text{n!aj}}$ ) cases as unproductive. Burč'uladze (1986:82) includes  $-\underline{\text{č'a}}$  with  $-\underline{\text{c}}$ ' as being rarely heard today, their work being done by adverbs.

<sup>7</sup>Murkelinski (1971:125) observes that  $\underline{\text{č'arav}}$  or  $\underline{\text{c'arav}}$  (Vicxli, Aštikuli dialects) corresponds to both the apud- and ad- cases.



<sup>8</sup>Gajdarova's (1970) inventory corresponds to Murkelinskij's but with no mention of the vocative. Her terminology follows Zđirkov.

<sup>9</sup>Uslar (1890:39) does have the following example: Arsnaj maa't'ra. 'O son, do no weep!', where the stem for the vocative is oblique. This may be an example of stem restructuring, e.g. ppu/buttal 'father nom., gen.' becomes butta/buttal in many dialects.

<sup>10</sup>Uslar (1890:212) analyzes this suffix as superessive + adverbial -nu, e.g., h'aračatrajnu 'by dint of effort' h'aračat 'effort', h'aračatral = gen., h'aračatraj = superessive, + nu = 'adv'l.

#### REFERENCES

- Bouda, Karl. 1949. *Lakkische Studien*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- Burč'uladze, G. T. 1986. *Brunvata šedgenilobisa da arsebit saxelta brunebis p'rocesebi jiritadi sak'itxebi lak'uri enaši*. Tbilisi: Mecniereba.
- Dirr, Adolf. 1928. *Einführung in das Studium der kaukasischen Sprachen*. Leipzig: Verlag der Asia minor.
- Gajdarova, F. A. 1970. *Obrazovanie padežej v laskom jazyke*. *Lingvističeskie issledovanija*, ed. by S. D. Kacnel'son, 308-21. Leningrad: AN SSSR.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1977. "Funkcii mestnyx padežej v laskom jazyke." *Voprosy sintaksičeskogo stroja iberijsko-kavkazskix jazykov*, pp. 273-80. Nal'čik: Institut isotrii, filologii i èkonomiki KB SSSR.
- H'amzatov, Rasul. 1972. *Tul dağusttan*. Trans. fr. Avar by M. Q. A'liev. *Maxačkala: Dagestanaskoe knižnoe izdatel'stvo*.
- Hjelmslev, Louis. 1935. *La catégorie des cas: Première partie*. Universitetsforlaget. Aarhus.
- Kibrik, A. E. 1978. *Materialy k tipologii èrgativnosti: 2. Laskij jazyk*. (Problemnaja gruppa po èksperimental'noj i prikladnoj lingvistike, *Predvaritel'nye publikacii* 12.7). Moscow: AN SSSR, Institut russkogo jazyka.
- Mel'čuk, Igor. 1986. *Toward a Definition of Case*. *Case in Slavic*, ed. by Richard D. Brect and James S. Levine, pp. 35-85. Columbus: Slavica.
- Murkelinskij, G. B. 1971. *Grammatika laskogo jazyka*. *Maxačkala: Dagučpedgiz*.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1983. *O poslelogax-narečijax, vyražajuščix prostranstvennye otnošenija v laskom jazyke*. *Sistema preverbov i poslelogov v iberijsko-kavkazskix jazykax*, ed. by N. T. Tabulova and R. X. Temirova, 183-87. Cđerkessk: Karačaevo-Cđerkesskij naučno-issledovatel'skij institut istorii, filologii, i èkonomiki.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1989. *Lakku mazral orfografialul slovar'*. *Maxačkala: Dagučpedgiz*.
- Silverstein, Michael. 1976. *Hierarchy of Features and Ergativity*. *Grammatical Categories in Australian Languages*, ed. by R. M. Dixon, pp. 112-71. New Jersey: Humanities Press.
- Topuria, V. 1940. *Brunebis sist'emisatvis lak'urs enaši*. *Sakartvelos saxelmc'ipo muzeumis moambe* 10-B.
- Uslar, P. K. 1890. *Laskij jazyk*. (*E~tnografija Kavkaza. Jazykoznanie*. 4). Tbilisi: Upravlenie Kavkazskogo Učebnogo Okrug.
- Xajdakov, S. M. 1966. *Očerk po laskoj dialektologii*. Moscow: Nauka.
- Xajdakov, S. M. and L. I. Zđirkov. 1962. *Lak'ëu mazral wa o<sup>TM</sup>rus mazral slovar'*. Moscow: AN SSSR.
- Xalilov, X. M., ed. 1976. *Satira i humor narodov Dagestana*. *Maxačkala: AN SSSR, Dagestanskij filial*.
- Zđirkov, L. I. 1955. *Laskij jazyk*. Moscow: AN SSSR.