

LINCOM EUROPA

**LINCOM STUDIES IN
CAUCASIAN LINGUISTICS**

in this series

01 Helma van den Berg **A Grammar of Hunzib**
with texts and lexicon

02 ALEXANDR E. KIBRIK (ed.) **Godoberi**

forthcoming

03 MONIKA HÖHLIG **Kontaktbewegter Sprachwandel
in der Adygischen Umgangssprache
im Kaukasus und in der Türkei**
Vergleichende Analyse des russischen und
türkischen Einflusses in adygischen
adygischen Texten

Godoberi

Alexandr E. Kibrik (ed.)

Sergej G. Tatevosov

Alexander Eulenberg (assistant editors)

LINCOM Studies in Caucasian Linguistics 02

1996

LINCOM EUROPA

München - Newcastle

VII. Transitivity in lexicon and grammar

Nichols (1982) has suggested a typological distinction between languages inclined to transitivity decreasing (e.g. passive) vs. transitivity increasing (e.g. causative) derivational patterns. Along the lines of this typology, languages can be characterized as being predominantly transitivity decreasing (like Indoeuropean), transitivity increasing, or equally favoring both kinds of processes (like Kartvelian or Athabaskan, see A.A.Kibrik (1993)). Daghestanian languages are clearly on the transitivity increasing side. Usually they have no passive-type constructions, phenomena like anticausativization or verbally-marked reflexives; but they do represent prototypical transitivity increasing processes such as causativization.

Also Daghestanian languages usually have a considerable number of labile verbs allowing both transitive and intransitive usage without any verbal marking. Godoberi generally fits into this Daghestanian standard but also demonstrates some lexically and grammatically restricted transitivity decreasing processes.

0. Transitivity: preliminaries

The notion of grammatical transitivity is fairly straightforward in Godoberi. Being a semantically ergative language, it displays an Ergative NP in every transitive clause, and every transitive verb can have an Ergative argument. As in Daghestanian in general (see Kibrik (1980)), semantic roles are very transparent, that is, transparently visible through superficial cases. Transitive agent is always marked by Ergative, and Ergative always marks agent and never experiencer (though it can mark instrument too, see below). Experiential verbs have Dative, Affective, or Contessive arguments (and this distinction is probably meaningful too). Consider the basic semantic (also lexical) one- and two-place clause types:

- | | |
|--|--------------------------------------|
| (1) a. One-place intransitive patientive | b. One-place intransitive agentive |
| ʕali Rumi | ʕali čari |
| Ali.NOM fall.asleep.PST | Ali.NOM run.away.PST |
| <i>Ali fell asleep</i> | <i>Ali ran away</i> |
| c. Transitive (always agentive) | d. Experiential (Dative) |
| im-u-di ʕali č'inni | waš-u-ħi idaħi jaši |
| father-OBL-ERG Ali.NOM beat.PST | boy-OBL-DAT like.PST girl.NOM |
| <i>Father beat Ali</i> | <i>The boy liked the girl</i> |
| e. Experiential (Affective) | f. Other experiential |
| il-u-ra ʕali haʔa | ʕali-č'u b=ičā darsi |
| mother-OBL-AFF Ali.NOM see.PST | Ali-CONT N=understand.PST lesson.NOM |
| <i>Mother saw Ali</i> | <i>Ali understood the lesson</i> |

Despite the transparency of grammatical transitivity in Godoberi the notion of semantic transitivity, as defined by Hopper and Thompson (1980), is still useful here. Semantic transitivity is a gradual rather than a binary, and a complex rather than a simplex semantic parameter. It is in fact a cluster of simpler semantic features, such as features of participants, their number, aspect, modality, etc. Transitivity is viewed here as a predominantly semantic parameter for cross-linguistic reasons, and also because the processes of transitivity decrease in Godoberi, as will be seen below, favour a gradual treatment.

1. Lability

1.0. Introductory remarks

Labile verbs are verbs that allow both transitive and intransitive usage without any change in the verbal morphology.

There are two types of lability:

- patient-preserving lability** (henceforth P-lability): patient argument is always retained in the valence pattern, and the agent argument may or may not be there, as in English transitive and intransitive usages of *break* or *open*; alternatively P-lability could be called plus-or-minus-agent lability;
- agent-preserving lability** (henceforth A-lability): the agent argument is always there, and the patient argument may be present or absent — like in English transitive *eat* (smth) vs. intransitive *eat* (with no specified patient); otherwise could be called plus-or-minus-patient lability.

P-lability is usually viewed as a more interesting semantic phenomenon, but in ergative languages A-lability is also non-trivial since it implies no Ergative in the intransitive pattern.

Lability is found only in potentially transitive agent-patient verbs; that is, it does not apply to experiential, as well as totally agentless or patientless verbs.

1.1. Patient-preserving lability

1.1.1. Basic examples

Consider the following sentences:

- | | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------|
| (2) a. hincu Xabi | b. im-u-di hincu Xabi |
| door open.PST | father-OBL-ERG door open.PST |
| <i>The door opened</i> | <i>Father opened the door</i> |

In (2a) the verb *Xabi* has only one (patient) argument; in (2b) it has in addition an agent argument. This is a prototypical instance of P-lability. In both cases the patient argument is in the same case — Nominative — so the formal difference is only in the absence/presence of an Ergative NP.

The list of verbs identified as P-labile includes the following 11 lexical items: *mu=na* 'go/drive' (#22)¹, *b=aʔa* 'come/deliver' (#24), *sinaša* 'stick' (#110-111), *b=iłā* 'cook' (#133), *b=ec'i* 'fill' (#70-71), *b=aq'aši* 'hide/steal' (#8-9), *c'ata* 'burn' (#56-57), *X,abi* 'open' (#100-101), *hiši* 'close' (#103-104), *b=aXā* 'be born/give birth', *t'ibi* 'compress' (#87).

1.1.2. Tests for P-lability

Godoberi very freely allows the omission of the agent (as well as most other) NP resulting in unspecified reference. Cf.:

- (3) a. im-u-di hamaXi č'inni b. Ø hamaXi č'inni
father-OBL-ERG donkey beat.PST someone donkey beat.PST
Father beat the donkey *The donkey got beaten, they beat the donkey*

Is there a way to tell the transitive verbs like *č'inni* 'beat' from the labile verbs like *X,abi* 'open', or this distinction is simply an artifact? There are several tests helping us to distinguish between the intransitive usages of the labile verbs, and the unspecified-agent usages of the transitive verbs.

The morphological test is based on the fact that Godoberi imperatives can have two different markers *-i* and *-a* (coincidentally identical to the usual stem final vowels, but normally stressed); moreover, there is an optative in *-be* (stressed). The transitive imperative marker is always *-a*; many transitive verbs also have an optative. Most intransitive verbs have an imperative in *-i* (applicable where at least some control of the event is exercised by the participant), while some other have only an optative (cf. Saidova (1973:131-133), see also sections 2.2 and 2.3 in chapter IV). Probably in the labile verbs having a transitive imperative in *-a* the optative form has only an intransitive meaning. The differentiation of the three forms is sometimes a clue for the problem in question:

- (4) a. b=ec'-i! w=aq'aš-i! r=iłā-me!
N=fill-IMP.INTR M=hide-IMP.INTR NPL=cook-OPT
Fill up! *Hide!* *Let them cook!*
b. b=ec'-a! b=aq'aš-a! r=ił-ā!
N=fill-IMP.TR N=steal-IMP.TR NPL=cook-IMP.TR
Fill it up! *Steal it!* *Cook them!*

Of course, transitive-only verbs like *č'inni* 'beat' do not have anything like an imperative in *-i* or an intransitive optative.

However, this test does not work for all labile verbs: some of them cannot be distinguished from transitives on its basis, and other tests are needed.

The syntactic test is the placement of the reflexive pronoun *ži=b=da* '(one)self' after the only overt argument (patient) of a verb suspect to be labile. A peculiarity of this pronoun is that a construction "N *ži=b=da* V" typically means 'N does V (by/on) him/her/itself'. When such a reading is not available for semantic reasons (N cannot exercise any control) quite a different understanding emerges: 'it is N that V'. (This latter meaning is generally rendered by the order "*ži=b=da* N V", though it also tolerates the "N *ži=b=da* V" order.)

In the purely intransitive verbs, the "self-control" meaning works perfectly, even in the cases where it seems semantically dubious (6):

- (5) ustur ži=b=da b=aqā
chair self=N=EMPH N=break.PST
The chair broke by itself
(6) berkya ži=b=da č'intl'i
snake self=N=EMPH crush.PST
The snake (got) crushed by itself

If one applies the test to the labile and transitive verbs used in agentless clauses, the difference is that the former allow the "self-control" meaning as easily as intransitives, and the transitives obligatorily invoke another ("cleft") meaning.

Consider semantically close verbs labile *mu=na* 'go/drive' and transitive *b=ečā* 'take away':

- (7) a. il-u-di zini mu=na b. zini mu=na
mother-OBL-ERG cow N=drive.PST cow N=go.PST
Mother took the cow away *The cow went*
c. zini ži=b=da mu=na
cow self=N=EMPH N=go.PST
The cow went by itself
(8) a. il-u-di zini b=ečā b. zini b=ečā
mother-OBL-ERG cow N=take.away.PST cow N=take.away.PST
Mother took the cow away *The cow was taken away by somebody*
c. zini ži=b=da b=ečā
cow self=N=EMPH N=take.away.PST
*It is the cow (not, say, a donkey) that someone took away. (*The cow went by itself)*

Haspelmath (1992:289-293) dealt with the same problem of distinguishing labiles from transitives in another Daghestanian language, Lezgian. He proposed one test that can be called *semantic*, and its counterpart in Godoberi has some value too. Labile verbs, in their intransitive

¹ Here and below numbers in parentheses indicate the number of the corresponding lexical entry in the verb lexicon in this volume.

usage, allow an agent-like referent to add into the verb valence, it playing in fact not an agentive but rather a locative role. With some labile verbs the corresponding noun can appear in the Contessive case (with other verbs it is problematic):

- (9) im-u-č'u ħudi c'ata
father-OBL-CONT wood burn.PST
The wood burnt with/at father

Of course nothing like this is possible with truly transitive verbs having an obligatory agent in their valence.

1.1.3. Semantic relations between the intransitive and transitive usages of the P-labile verbs

All P-labile verbs have the valence pattern <+ Pat, ± Ag>. Most commonly, the transitive usage of a P-labile verb differs semantically from the intransitive usage only in the presence of an agent argument:

- (10) a. mak'i išqa w=a'a b. il-u-di mak'i išqa w=a'a
child home M=come.PST mother-OBL-ERG child home M=deliver.PST
The boy came home Mother brought the boy home
- (11) a. k'yar-di r=iġā b. ʿali-di k'yar-di r=iġā
khinkal-PL NPL=cook.PST Ali-ERG khinkal-PL NPL=cook.PST
The khinkals cooked Ali cooked the khinkals

However, in some cases there is a lexicalization of the different meanings of the labile verbs.

1. *c'ata* in the intransitive usage means not only 'burn' but also 'warm up'; the corresponding transitive meaning is lacking:

- (12) a. baX_{ar} c'at-a-da b. mak'i-di baX_{ar} c'at-a-da
last.year.hay burn.PST-CONV-COP child-ERG last.year.hay burn.PST-CONV-COP
The hay has burnt The child has burnt the hay
- c. ħeni c'at-a-da d. *mak'i-di ħeni c'at-a-da
water warm.up.PST-CONV-COP child-ERG water warm.up.PST-CONV-COP
The water has warmed up The child burnt the water

2. Likewise for the verb *b=ec'i* 'fill': in the intransitive usage it also means 'eat one's fill' which is not the case with the transitive usage (the meaning 'to feed smb' is rendered by a causative verb, see 2.1.3 below):

- (13) a. vedra ħeni-Li b=ec'i b. im-u-di vedra ħeni-Li b=ec'i
bucket water-GEN N=fill.PST father-OBL-ERG bucket water-GEN N=fill.PST
The bucket filled up with water Father filled the bucket up with water

- c. ʿali w=oc'i d. *il-u-di ʿali w=oc'i
Ali M=fill.PST mother-OBL-ERG Ali M=fill.PST
Ali ate his fill Mother fed Ali full

3. *b=aq'aši* 'hide (intr)' does not have a corresponding meaning 'hide (tr)'. This meaning is reserved for a causative verb; the transitive usage surprisingly means only 'steal (tr)':

- (14) a. zini b=aq'aš-at-a-da
cow N=hide-PRS-CONV-COP
The cow is hiding
- b. ʿim-u-di in-šū=b=da zini b=aq'aši
father-OBL-ERG self.OBL-OBL.M=N.GEN=EMPH cow N=hide.PST
Father stole his (own) cow

In (14b) a meaning like 'Father hid his cow' would be perfectly natural, but it is not found. (The sentence in (14a) indeed is ambiguous, see ex. (52) below.)

1.1.4. Is there a direction of semantic derivation in the labile verbs?

A natural question arises: is it possible to find out which meaning of a P-labile verb is primary, and which one is derived? In some cases an answer is possible, and there are at least three tests allowing us to do this.

The first test is again **morphological** and is again connected with imperatives. The P-labile verbs of self-propelled movement *mu=na* 'go/drive', *b=a'a* 'come/deliver' have no imperatives (like **wuna*, **wuni*), while optatives from them have only intransitive meanings. This clearly suggests the primarity of their intransitive usage:

- (15) caXa wu=na-be!
away M=go-OPT
Go away from here!

This test, however, is of a very limited applicability since it does not qualify most P-labile verbs as having any directional relation between their two meanings: they have both kinds of imperative (see (4) above).

The second test is **lexical** and is related to causative formation. We will return to it below in section 2.1.3.

The third test is **syntactic**. It is based on the fact that in Godoberi the Ergative and the Instrumental cases are not morphologically distinguishable, and in fact can be treated as one

and the same case, having two different meanings. We, however, for a while will view Ergative and Instrumental as two homophonous forms. The verbs that are inherently transitive and have an inherent agentive argument, including non-labile transitive verbs like *č'inni* 'beat' and transitive usages of labile verbs, like *hiši* 'close', *b=itā* 'cook', *c'ata* 'burn', easily allow an Ergative and an Instrumental NPs in one clause:

- (16) mak'i-di hamaXi c'ula-di č'inni
child-ERG donkey stick-INSTR beat.PST
The child beat the donkey with a stick
- (17) im-u-di hincu rek'ula-di hiši
father-OBL-ERG door key-INSTR close.PST
Father locked the door with a key
- (18) ʿali-di k'yar-di gyaz-i-di r=ijā
Ali-ERG khinkal-PL gas-OBL-INSTR NPL=cook.PST
Ali cooked khinkals on gas

In contrast, the verbs that are originally intransitive, like *b=ec'i* 'fill', *sinaša* 'stick', do not allow an Ergative and an Instrumental NPs in one clause. This probably reflects the external (instrument-like) status of the agent in such usages:

- (19) a. ʿali-di vedra b=ec'i b. *ʿali-di vedra k'adaXu-di b=ec'i
Ali-ERG bucket N=fill.PST Ali-ERG bucket ladle-INSTR N=fill.PST
Ali filled up the bucket *Ali filled the bucket with a ladle*
- (20) a. ʿali-di kaXati (q'una-Li) sinaš-at-a-da
Ali-ERG paper wall-INTER stick-PRS-CONV-COP
Ali is sticking the paper (to the wall)
- b. *ʿali-di kaXati sini-di (q'una-Li) sinaš-at-a-da
Ali-ERG paper glue-INSTR wall-INTER stick-PRS-CONV-COP
Ali is sticking the paper (to the wall) with the glue
- c. sini-di kaXati sinaš-at-a-da
glue-ERG/INSTR paper stick-PRS-CONV-COP
The paper is sticking with the glue/The glue is sticking the paper

Above (and also in 2.1.3 below), we have been able (though not always easily) to identify the following P-labile verbs as more likely to be originally intransitive: *mu=na* 'go/drive', *b=a'a* 'come/deliver', *sinaša* 'stick', *b=ec'i* 'fill', *b=aq'aši* 'hide/steal'. The

following verbs are most likely originally transitive: *Xabi* 'open', *hiši* 'close', *b=itā* 'cook', *c'ata* 'burn', *b=aXā* 'give birth'. The verb *t'ibi* 'compress' is not clear in this respect.

Therefore one can speak about two types of P-lability: **transitivity-increasing** and **transitivity-decreasing**. Transitivity-increasing P-lability is easier to detect, since a more natural meaning of such verbs is intransitive, while they also allow a transitive usage. Transitivity-decreasing P-lability is harder to distinguish from the unspecified agent usage of transitive verbs.

There may be no absolute boundary between the intransitive usage of transitivity-decreasing P-labile verbs and the unspecified agent usage of transitive verbs. Between the clear-cut examples of the former (e.g. *Xabi* 'open X' > 'X opens') and the latter (e.g. *č'inni* 'beat X' > 'smb beats X') there can be intermediate cases where the semantic absence of an agent is unlikely but not totally ruled out, as in the verbs *b=uša* 'paint', *b=eša* 'roast' etc. that can be called "semi-P-labile verbs". The *ži=b=da*-test provides very good results for the clear-cut cases but basically fails in the intermediate cases. Consultants tend to comment: "It can happen by itself, but only in a fairy tale".

1.1.5. Motivation for P-lability

Is there an explanation why some verbs are labile and others are not? An answer to this question is beyond the scope of this volume but consider some examples of semantically close verbs that are labile vs non-labile.

	P-labile verbs	Non-labile verbs	
		Intransitive	Transitive
Originally intransitive	<i>b=a'a</i> 'come/deliver'	<i>b=ac'ā</i> 'reach'	
	<i>mu=na</i> 'go/drive'		<i>bu=q'i</i> 'drive'
	<i>sinaša</i> 'stick'	<i>q'ardi</i> 'stick'	
Originally transitive	<i>b=aq'aši</i> 'hide/steal'	<i>b=ita</i> 'disappear'	
	<i>b=itā</i> 'cook'	<i>ā:wXa</i> 'boil'	<i>b=uL'ali</i> 'roast'
	<i>c'ata</i> 'burn'	<i>b=uka</i> 'catch fire'	
	<i>t'ibi</i> 'compress'	<i>č'int'i</i> 'crush'	<i>tequ</i> 'drop'

Of course there are events that cannot be expected to be represented by labile verbs in human languages. As these Godoberi data demonstrate, events of another kind exist that are open to various conceptualizations even within one language.

1.2. Agent-preserving lability

1.2.1. Basic examples

Consider the following sentences:

- (21) a. il-u-di waša w=ali b. ila (waš-u-qi) j=ali
 mother-OBL-ERG son M=call.PST mother son-OBL-AD F=shout.PST
 Mother called up the son *Mother shouted (to the son)*

In (21a) the verb is transitive ‘to call smb’; in (21b), it is intransitive ‘to shout’; unlike P-lability, here the argument lacking in the intransitive valence pattern is patient, and agent is always there. A-lability is frequently overlooked in accusative languages since they do not display any morphosyntactic distinction besides plus or minus patient. In an ergative language like Godoberi all of the clause’s morphosyntax changes: the case frames are different and the verb agreement is with different arguments.

The list of discovered A-labile verbs includes 10 lexemes:

b=ali ‘shout/call’, *šušuk’i/šušudi* ‘whisper’ (#152), *šami* ‘whistle’ (#165), *pudi* ‘blow’, *b=a’aXa* ‘suck breast/udder’ (#174), *lami* ‘lick’ (#176), *k’yardi* ‘vomit’ (#180), *b=aXā* ‘give birth’, *Hājdi* ‘play’; also *Xami* ‘scold’ (questionable, see 3.2.1 below).

Some consultants also treated like A-labiles the verbs *Hinčidi* ‘sneeze’ (#182), *oHudi* ‘cough’ (#183), and *čabi* ‘defecate’ (#185), but the more widespread intuition is that these verbs are mere intransitives (having only a Nominative argument).

1.2.2. Tests for A-lability

A-lability is very easy to detect: a transitive usage implies an Ergative (agent) and a Nominative NP (patient); an intransitive usage has only a Nominative agentive NP. Moreover, in the class-marking verbs class agreement is sensitive to intransitive/transitive distinction.

Transitive and intransitive usages of A-labile verbs usually have different imperative forms — transitive in *-a* and intransitive in *-i*:

- (22) a. šīwu b=a’aX-a! k’e-da raša šušuk’-a!
 milk N=suck-IMP.TR two-CARD word whisper-IMP.TR
 Suck milk! *Whisper two words!*
 b. w=a’aX-i! šušuk’-i!
 M=suck-IMP.INTR whisper-IMP.INTR
 Suck! *Whisper!*

1.2.3. Semantic relations between the transitive and intransitive usages of the A-labile verbs

It is likely that in most cases the transitive usage is the semantically original one and the intransitive usage is derived by a sort of semantic incorporation of the patient. This is quite clear in the cases of ‘suck breast/udder’, ‘whisper’, ‘blow’ but less so in the pair ‘shout/call’. Evidently the most typical patient is implied in each case in the intransitive usages — lips for ‘whistle’, contents of the stomach for ‘vomit’, breast, udder, or milk for ‘suck’, etc.

Unlike the P-labile verbs, the A-labiles are more or less predictable and can be more easily found. Still, the class of A-labile is very limited and A-lability is a non-productive, lexically determined feature.

It is worth mentioning that there are two separate words meaning ‘eat’ — transitive (Ag, Pat) *ami* (#168) and intransitive *ik.ā* (#169) (Ag). These two verbs are like a suppletive A-labile pair.

1.2.4. Further examples

Since A-lability was only sketchily illustrated above, several additional examples are in order.

- (23) a. ‘ali-di šanša šami b. ‘ali šami
 Ali-ERG whistle whistle.PST Ali whistle.PST
 Ali whistled / blew a whistle *Ali whistled*
 (24) a. mak’i-di kyakya / šīwu b=a’aXa b. mak’i w=a’aXa
 child-ERG breast / milk N=suck.PST child M=suck.PST
 The baby sucked a breast/milk *The baby boy sucked*
 (25) a. im-u-di hiri k’yardi b. ima k’yardi
 father-OBL-ERG blood vomit.PST father vomit.PST
 Father vomited blood *Father vomited*
 (26) a. baṭe-di q’aq’ura Hājdi b. baṭe Hājdi
 children-ERG ball play.PST children play.PST
 The children played ball *The children played*

For a discussion of the verb *b=aXā* ‘give birth’ see section 4.3 in the current chapter.

2. Transitivity increase: Causativization

2.0. Introductory remarks

Cross-linguistically, causativization is the paramount transitivity increasing process. To our knowledge, it is the only transitivity increasing process found in Godoberi, and it is very productive and abundantly represented in the lexicon.

Virtually every verb can undergo causativization (for some exceptions see 2.5 below). The derivational suffix of the causative is *-ali*. The following morphophonemic rules apply:

(27) Nasalized thematic vowel effect: $-\tilde{a}_{\text{them}} + \text{ali} \rightarrow \text{ani}$

(28) Non-nasalized thematic vowel elision: $-V_{\text{them}} + \text{ali} \rightarrow \text{ali}$

The final *-i* of the causative suffix is a thematic vowel in all causative verbs, and obeys general rules.

Here we are looking primarily at the synthetic causatives formed with the *-ali* suffix, and pay very little attention to the analytic causatives formed with the help of separate verbs meaning ‘make’, ‘cause’, ‘say’ (cf. section 2.4 below). This is because the central intent of this chapter is to reveal the semantic derivations in the verbal lexicon rather than to cover all possible ways of transitivity marking.

2.1. Causatives from various valence types

In this section we will look at how the causative semantics interacts with the original semantics of verbal lexemes.

2.1.1. Causatives from intransitives

The class of simple **intransitive patientive** verbs is the largest verb class in Godoberi. All such verbs allow causativization. Consider the following: *b=ita* ‘be lost, disappear’ (#6), *b=isā* ‘be found’ (#11), *bu=ki* ‘fall’ (#38), *b=ic’i* ‘melt’ (#54), *k’ič’ā* ‘bend’ (#88), *Rumi* ‘fall asleep’ (#194).

Morphosyntactically, the only difference between the causativized clause and the original intransitive clause is the addition of an extra argument in the Ergative case, and the addition of the causative suffix to the verb:

- (29) a. (im-u-č’u-ru) di=b arsi b=ita
(father-OBL-CONT-EL) I.OBL=GEN.N money N=be.lost.PST
(My father) lost my money (guiltlessly); lit. (From (my) father) my money was lost
- b. im-u-di di=b arsi b=it-ali
father-OBL-ERG I.OBL=GEN.N money N=be.lost-CAUS.PST
My father lost my money (blamefully)

2. Transitivity increase: Causativization

- (30) a. (di-ḥi) arsi b=isā
(I.OBL-DAT) money N=be.found.PST
(I) found the money (by chance); lit. (To me) the money was found
- b. den arsi b=is-ani
I.ERG money N=be.found-CAUS.PST
I found the money (as a result of a search)
- (31) a. be:r-qi-ru anča hiL’i b=uḱi b. ʕali-di anča b=uḱ-ali
in.mountains-AD-EL rock downwards N=fall.PST Ali-ERG rock N=fall-CAUS.PST
The rock fell down from the mountain Ali dropped the rock
- (32) a. anzi b=ic’i b. allaha-š-ḥi anzi b=ic’-ali-be!
snow N=melt.PST God-OBL.M-ERG snow N=melt-CAUS-OPT
The snow melted May God melt the snow!
- (33) a. c’uli k’ič’ā b. ʕali-di c’uli k’ič’-ani
stick bend.PST Ali-ERG stick bend-CAUS.PST
The stick bent Ali bent the stick
- (34) a. ʕali Rumi b. wrač-aš-ḥi ʕali Rum-ali
Ali fall.asleep.PST doctor-OBL.M-ERG Ali fall.asleep-CAUS.PST
Ali fell asleep The doctor put Ali to sleep (e.g. by giving a medicine)

Note that four out of the six verbs given in the examples above are semantically different from their English counterparts; the latter are either originally transitive (*lose*, *find*) or labile (*melt*, *bend*). (Of course such a discrepancy between Godoberi and English is by no means general.)

All of the verbs listed above are non-labile; that is, only intransitive. For instance, (35) makes no sense:

- (35) *ʕali-di anzi b=ic’i
Ali-ERG snow N=melt.PST

All **intransitive agentive** verbs are equally easy to form causatives from, cf. the verb *k’yanc’i* ‘jump’ (#34):

- (36) a. ʔani k’yanc’i b. rasul-di ʔani k’yanc’-ali
horse jump.PST Rasul-ERG horse jump-CAUS.PST
The horse jumped Rasul had the horse jump

More complex is the behavior of the verbs of **mental, emotional and sensory states**. Those of them that have in their case frame only Nominative and the locative cases present no

surprise: *tibi* ‘get scared’ (#204) (Nom, Contelative); *b=uži* ‘believe’ (#207) (Nom, Contessive); *žabi* ‘hurt’ (#63) (Nom) / ‘be in pain’ (Contessive); *b=eʔuča* ‘forget’ (#209) (Contessive, Nom); *b=ičā* ‘understand’ (#209) (Contessive, Nom).

- (37) a. ^ʔali waš-u-čʔu b=uži b. ho-š-ī ^ʔali waš-u-čʔu b=už-ali
 Ali son-OBL-CONT N=believe.PST he-OBL.M-ERG Ali son-OBL-CONT N=believe-CAUS.PST
Ali believed his son He made Ali believe his son

- (38) a. di-čʔu zadača b=ičā
 I.OBL-CONT problem N=understand.PST
I understood the problem

- b. wač-u-di di-čʔu zadača b=ič-ani
 brother-OBL-ERG I.OBL-CONT problem N=understand-CAUS.PST
Brother explained to me the problem

Consider now the verbs having in their case frame Affective or Dative case as a marker of the central experiencer argument: *haʔa* ‘see’ (#200), *anla* ‘hear’ (#198), *b=iʔa* ‘know’ (#208), all (Aff, Nom), *idaŋi* ‘like, love’ (#203) (Dat, Nom). All affective verbs, under causativization, optionally replace Affective by Contessive. In the Dative verb ‘to like, love’ the change of Dative into Contessive is obligatory:

- (39) a. di-ra (*di-čʔu) ^ʔajšati j=iʔa
 I.OBL-AFF I.OBL-CONT Aishat F=know.PST
I got acquainted with Aishat

- b. im-u-di di-ra / di-čʔu ^ʔajšati j=iʔ-ali
 father-OBL-ERG I.OBL-AFF / I.OBL-CONT Aishat F=know-CAUS.PST
(My) father introduced me to Aishat

- (40) a. di-ŋi (*di-čʔu) ^ʔajšati idaŋi
 I.OBL-DAT I.OBL-CONT Aishat love.PST
I fell in love with Aishat

- b. ho-š-ī di-čʔu (*di-ŋi) ^ʔajšati idaŋ-ali
 he-OBL.M-ERG I.OBL-CONT I.OBL-DAT Aishat love-CAUS.PST
He made me fall in love with Aishat

This case shift is just like in the transitive verbs (see 2.1.2 below) where under causativization the original agent-Ergative turns into causee-Contessive. This syntactic behavior of the Affective and Dative verbs possibly demonstrates that they are treated by the language as quasi-transitives.

2.1.2. Causatives from transitives

Godoberi is not among those numerous languages where causativization is restricted to intransitives: all transitive verbs easily form causatives, though the semantic difference between the two forms not always amounts to regular causative meaning (see 2.2.1 below). Under causativization of the transitives, a new Ergative argument (causativizer) appears, and the former Ergative (causee) is coded by Contessive in -čʔu.

Consider the verbs *čʔinni* ‘beat’ (#73), *b=ali* ‘put on’ (#143), *iŋi* ‘give’ (#12), *maŋi* ‘teach’ (#212). The first two of them are simple transitive two-place verbs, and the last two are three-place verbs with a Dative and Affective arguments, respectively.

- (41) a. jaš-u-di hamaXi čʔinni b. im-u-di jaš-u-čʔu hamaXi čʔinn-ali
 girl-OBL-ERG donkey beat.PST father-OBL-ERG girl-OBL-CONT donkey beat-CAUS.PST
The girl beat the donkey Father made the girl beat the donkey

- (42) a. waš-u-di izu r=ali
 son-OBL-ERG clothes NPL=put.on.PST
The son put on the clothes

- b. il-u-di waš-u-čʔu izu r=al-ali
 mother-OBL-ERG son-OBL-CONT clothes NPL=put.on-CAUS.PST
Mother dressed her son in the clothes

- (43) a. wač-u-di di-ŋi arsi iŋi
 brother-OBL-ERG I.OBL-DAT money give.PST
The brother gave me the money

- b. im-u-di wač-u-čʔu di-ŋi arsi iŋ-ali
 father-OBL-ERG brother-OBL-CONT I.OBL-DAT money give-CAUS.PST
Father made the brother give the money to me

- (44) a. wač-u-di ^ʔali-qi q,ard-i maŋi
 brother-ERG Ali-AD write-INF teach.PST
The brother taught Ali how to write

- b. im-u-di wač-u-čʔu ^ʔali-qi q,ard-i maŋ-ali
 father-OBL-ERG brother-OBL-CONT Ali-AD write-INF teach-CAUS.PST
Father made the brother teach Ali how to write

Apparently, all cases in the original frame, except for Ergative, remain intact in the causative clauses. The same principle basically holds when there is a Contessive argument in the original verb; though some speakers have troubles producing and processing clauses with

two Contessives other speakers are quite clear about their meanings; for some examples see 2.4 below.

2.1.3. Causatives from patient-preserving labiles

The question of how P-labile verbs form causatives is one of the most intriguing in the whole domain of transitivity grammar. The problem is that P-labile verbs have a non-agentive and an agentive usage on their own. Which usage of a labile verb undergoes causativization, and if it is a non-agentive usage then what is the semantic difference between the causative and the agentive usage of the original verb? There is no general answer to these questions since different P-labile verbs behave differently.

In section 1.1.4 above we discussed the issue of which usage of a labile verb, if any, is primary. Causative formation provides another piece of information pertaining here. Apparently there is a distinction between the P-labile verbs as to which one of their usages serves as a basis for a causative form. Data from causative formation supplement and in most cases agree with the other sorts of data discussed in 1.1.4.

Originally clearly intransitive verbs *mu=na* 'go/drive', *b=a'a* 'come/deliver' can be causativized only in their intransitive usage. Thus, *mu=nali* means only 'drive, take away' but not 'make to drive, take away':

- (45) a. zini ži=b=da caXa=b=a mu=na b. ho-š-ŭi zini caXa=b=a mu=na
cow self=N=EMPH away=N N=go.PST he-OBL.M-ERG cow away=N N=go.PST
The cow went away by itself He took the cow away from here
- c. ho-š-ŭi zini caXa=b=a mu=n-ali
he-OBL.M-ERG cow away=N N=go-CAUS.PST
He drove the cow away from here

The transitive usage of the labile verb and the causative are both derivative from the intransitive usage, and have the same propositional semantics and case frame. Still, they are not strictly synonymous, and there is a slight difference in their senses. This difference is exactly what is known as causative meaning. Unlike (45b), (45c) implies an external causer applying some kind of force to make the internal event (going away) to take place. This kind of difference is present in other similar cases.

Two other verbs that appear to be of the same type of originally intransitive patient-preserving labile verbs are *sinaša* 'stick' and *b=aq'aši* 'hide/steal'. They allow causativization only from their intransitive usages.

Originally clearly transitive P-labile verbs *X,abi* 'open', *hiši* 'close' form causatives only in their transitive usages.

Thus, *hišali* means only 'make to close' but not 'close (tr)':

- (46) a. hincu ži=b=da hiši b. il-u-di hincu hiši
door self=N=EMPH close.PST mother-OBL-ERG door close.PST
The door closed by itself Mother closed the door
- c. im-u-di il-u-č'u hincu hiš-ali
father-OBL-ERG mother-OBL-CONT door close-CAUS.PST
Father made mother close the door

According to the data from causative formation, to this class of originally transitive verbs also belongs the verb *b=aXā* 'give birth'; it will be discussed at some length in 4.3 below.

The verb *t'ibi* 'compress' apparently does not have any direction of derivation between the labile usages — both of them are equally original and form causatives. As a result, the causative from this verb is polysemous. In the following set of examples (47c) is a causative from (47a), and (47d) from (47b):

- (47) a. hunč'a t'ibi b. 'ali-di hunč'a t'ibi
hay compress.PST Ali-ERG hay compress.PST
The hay compressed Ali compressed the hay
- c. 'ali-di hunč'a t'ib-ali
Ali-ERG hay compress-CAUS.PST
Ali compressed the hay
- d. im-u-di 'ali-č'u hunč'a t'ib-ali
father-OBL-ERG Ali-CONT hay compress-CAUS.PST
Father made Ali compress the hay

The picture is more complex with the other verbs of this group, for the reasons of their semantic peculiarities mentioned in 1.1.3 above. The verbs *b=ec'i* 'fill' and *c'ata* 'burn' are not labile in all of their meanings. The structure of the meanings of *b=ec'i* and its causative *b=ec'ali* is represented on the following chart where lines 0 and 1 designate the original and the causative propositional structures respectively, and columns I and T represent the intransitive and the transitive usages (of the original verb):

		I	T	
0	A.	'fill (intr)	A. 'fill (tr)	<i>b=ec'i</i>
	B.	'eat one's fill'	B. —	
1	A.	'fill (tr)	A. 'make fill (tr)	<i>b=ec'ali</i>
	B.	'feed full'	B. —	

So here, the meanings of the causative correspond isomorphically with the meanings of the original verb. Cf. examples illustrating all combinations of the chart (48):

- (49) 0IA. wedra ĩeni-Li b=ec'i
 bucket water-GEN N=fill.PST
The bucket filled up with water
- 0IB. den w=oc'i
 I M=fill.PST
I ate my fill
- 0TA. il-u-di wedra ĩeni-Li b=ec'i 0TB. *il-u-di den w=oc'i
 mother-OBL-ERG bucket water-GEN N=fill.PST mother-OBL-ERG I M=fill.PST
Mother filled the bucket up with water
- 1IA. il-u-di wedra ĩeni-Li b=ec'-ali
 mother-OBL-ERG bucket water-GEN N=fill-CAUS.PST
Mother filled the bucket up with water
- 1IB. il-u-di den w=oc'-ali
 mother-OBL-ERG I M=fill-CAUS.PST
Mother fed me full
- 1TA. im-u-di il-u-č'u wedra ĩeni-Li b=ec'-ali
 father-OBL-ERG mother-OBL-CONT bucket water-GEN N=fill-CAUS.PST
Father made mother fill the bucket up with water
- 1TB. *im-u-di il-u-č'u den w=oc'-ali
 father-OBL-ERG mother-OBL-CONT I M=fill-CAUS.PST

The structure of meanings of the verb *c'ata* 'burn, warm up' and its causative *c'atali* is still more complex since one of the expected meanings of the causative indeed is not present:

- | | | | | | |
|------|----|------------------|----|------------------|----------------|
| (50) | | I | | T | |
| 0 | A. | 'burn (intr)' | A. | 'burn (tr)' | <i>c'ata</i> |
| | B. | 'warm up (intr)' | B. | — | |
| 1 | A. | — | A. | 'make burn (tr)' | <i>c'atali</i> |
| | B. | 'warm up (tr)' | B. | — | |

This picture seems quite rational: there is no inconvenient synonymy between the original and the causative forms like in the case of *b=ec'i*, and very little homophony of forms. Consider examples:

- (51) 0IA. ĩudi c'ata 0IB. ĩeni c'ata
 wood burn.PST water warm.up.PST
The wood burnt The water warmed up

- 0TA. mak'i-di ĩudi c'ata 0TB. *mak'i-di ĩeni c'ata
 child-ERG wood burn.PST child-ERG water warm.up.PST
The child burnt the wood
- 1IA. *mak'i-di ĩudi c'at-ali 1IB. mak'i-di ĩeni c'at-ali
 child-ERG wood burn-CAUS.PST child-ERG water warm.up-CAUS.PST
The child warmed up the water
- 1TA. im-u-di mak'i-č'u ĩudi c'at-ali
 father-OBL-ERG child-CONT wood burn-CAUS.PST
Father made the child burn the wood
- 1TB. *im-u-di mak'i-č'u ĩeni c'at-ali
 father-OBL-ERG child-CONT water warm.up-CAUS.PST

The last verb, *b=aq'aši*, as was already stated above, means 'hide (intr)' and 'steal (tr)', but not 'hide (tr)'. The latter meaning is rendered by the causative from the intransitive usage, and the same causative form also means 'make steal (tr)'.

Consider two ambiguous clauses covering all of these meanings:

- (52) a. zini b=aq'aš-at-a-da b. Ø zini b=aq'aš-at-a-da
 cow N=hide-PRS-CONV-COP someone cattle N=steal-PRS-CONV-COP
The cow is hiding The cattle is being stolen
- c. rasul-di ĩali-č'u arsi b=aq'aš-ali
 Rasul-ERG Ali-CONT money N=hide/steal-CAUS.PST
 1) Rasul hid the money with Ali
 2) Rasul made Ali steal money

In (52a) and (52b) the singular form *zini* is used in count and mass meanings, respectively, and in (52b) there is a zero indefinite agent. The first interpretation of (52c) illustrates a locative usage of Contessive, while under the second reading Contessive is the case of the causee.

2.1.4. Causatives from agent-preserving labiles

Causative formation provides no evidence regarding the direction of semantic derivation between the intransitive and transitive usages of A-labiles. For instance, the verb *šami* 'whistle', when causativized, remains polysemous:

- (53) a. ĩali šami b. ĩali-di šanša šami
 Ali whistle.PST Ali-ERG whistle whistle.PST
Ali whistled Ali whistled a whistle

- c. rasul-di ʕali šam-ali d. rasul-di ʕali-č'u šanša šam-ali
 Rasul-ERG Ali whistle-CAUS.PST Rasul-ERG Ali-CONT whistle whistle-CAUS.PST
Rasul made Ali whistle *Rasul made Ali whistle a whistle*

Similar is the verb *pudi* 'blow':

- (54) a. muču pudi b. ʕali-di zurma pudi
 wind blow.PST Ali-ERG zurma blow.PST
The wind blew *Ali played the zurma*
- c. ventilator-di muču pud-ali d. omar-di ʕali-č'u zurma pud-ali
 fan-ERG wind blow-CAUS.PST Omar-ERG Ali-CONT zurma blow-CAUS.PST
The fan made the wind *Omar made Ali play the zurma*

The causative derived from *b=aʔaXa* 'suck breast/udder', on the other hand, most typically traces back only to the intransitive usage:

- (55) a. mak'i (il-u-č'u) w=aʔaXa
 child mother-OBL-CONT M=suck.PST
The baby boy sucked (at his mother's)
- b. mak'i-di (il-u-Li) kyakya b=aʔaXa
 child-ERG mother-OBL-GEN breast N=suck.PST
The baby sucked (his mother's) breast
- c1. il-u-di mak'i w=aʔaX-ali
 mother-OBL-ERG child M=suck-CAUS.PST
Mother nursed the baby boy
- c2. im-u-di (il-u-č'u) mak'i w=aʔaX-ali
 father-OBL-ERG mother-OBL-CONT child M=suck-CAUS.PST
Father made the baby boy suck (at his mother's)
- d. ʔil-u-di mak'i-č'u kyakya b=aʔax-ali
 mother-OBL-ERG child-CONT breast N=suck-CAUS.PST
Mother nursed the baby with her breast

Note that in (55a,c2) Contessive is used in its locative meaning. Unfortunately we have not checked the possibility of Contessive (in the place of Genitive) in (55b) but we assume that awkwardness of (55d) is due to the fact that in the frame of this verb Contessive is closely associated with the breast-feeding participant, and when used with a sucking participant

appears to be hard to process. If so, this is an interesting example of a syntactic-pragmatic block to causativization of one of a labile verb's usages.

For some notes on the causativization of the verbs *b=ali* 'shout/call' and *b=aXā* 'give birth' see 2.5 below and Appendix.

2.1.5. Causatives from variable-valence verbs

As in many other languages, in Godoberi there are variable-valence verbs other than labile verbs. Different usages of such verbs present different perspectives on the situation in question, like English *He smeared the wall with blue paint* vs. *He smeared blue paint on the wall*: in the first case the clause includes the roles of patient (wall) and instrument, in the second patient (paint) and location. Exactly the same variability is found in the Godoberi verb *b=uša* 'smear, paint', and it is preserved under causativization:

- (56) a. il-u-di (hanq'u-č'u) čarta b=uša
 mother-OBL-ERG house-CONT clay N=smeat.PST
Mother smeared the clay (on the house)
- b. il-u-di hanq'u (čarta-di) b=uša
 mother-OBL-ERG house clay-ERG N=smeat.PST
Mother smeared the house (with clay)
- c. im-u-di il-u-č'u čarta b=uš-ali
 father-OBL-ERG mother-OBL-CONT clay N=smeat-CAUS.PST
Father made mother smear clay
- d. im-u-di il-u-č'u hanq'u b=uš-ali
 father-OBL-ERG mother-OBL-CONT house N=smeat-CAUS.PST
Father made mother smear the house

2.2. Semantics of the causatives

Below we will briefly review the regular and productive meanings of the causative (2.2.1), and then proceed to the observed cases of irregular and unpredictable semantic differences between the original verbs and their causatives (2.2.2).

2.2.1. Regular semantic relations between the original verb and its causative

The most common variation of the causative meaning is what Nedjalkov and Sil'nickij (1968:28) called factitive meaning: the causer acts consciously and voluntarily and uses force or authority to get the event to take place. It is usually physical force when the causee is non-human — see ex. (31), (33), (36), (45). When the causee is human the force applied is normally the force of authority and order, though it can be physical force as well — see for instance (41),

(43), (46), (53). The situation seems ambivalent in (34). The contrast between the two kinds of force can be best seen with P-labile verbs — see e.g. (47c) vs. (47d).

Another frequent type of causative meaning is assistive causative: the causer helps or does not prevent the causee to make the event take place. Again, the causee can be non-human, cf. (29), (30), and human, as in (42). Examples (30) and (42), though, might be claimed intermediate between the factitive and assistive meanings. It also seems impossible to distinguish these two meanings in the case of the verbs of mental, emotional and sensory states — see ex. (37-40).

2.2.2. Irregular semantic relations between the original verb and its causative

When formed from the transitive verbs, causatives sometimes do not imply an extra participant; rather, the original agent gets reinterpreted as a causer, and the action gets intensified. This kind of semantic derivation is on the verge of being productive.

Consider the verbs *čibi* ‘splash’ (#69), *mafi* ‘teach’ (#212), and *b=aXi* ‘take’ (#14) (note than none of them is labile):

- (57) a. mak'i-di ĩeni čibi
child-ERG water splash.PST

The child splashed the water (perhaps involuntarily)

- b. mak'i-di ĩeni čib-ali
child-ERG water splash-CAUS.PST

The child splashed the water (voluntarily and repeatedly)

- (58) a. wač-u-di ʕali-qi q.ard-i maĥi
brother-OBL-ERG Ali-AD write-INF teach.PST

The brother taught Ali how to write (Ali studied voluntarily)

- b. wač-u-di ʕali-qi q.ard-i maĥ-ali
brother-OBL-ERG Ali-AD write-INF teach-CAUS.PST

The brother taught Ali how to write (overcoming his resistance)

- (59) a. den ʕali-č'u-ru quča b=aXi b. den ʕali-č'u-ru quča b=aX-ali
I.ERG Ali-CONT-EL book N=take.PST I.ERG Ali-CONT-EL book N=take-CAUS.PST

I took the book from Ali

I seized the book from Ali

Interestingly, the first two verbs allow also the normal causative semantic derivation implying an extra participant, while the last one seems to have only the irregular meaning, cf.:

- (57) c. im-u-di mak'i-č'u ĩeni čib-ali
father-OBL-ERG child-CONT water splash-CAUS.PST

Father made the child splash the water

- (58) c. im-u-di wač-u-č'u ʕali-qi q.ard-i maĥ-ali
father-OBL-ERG brother-OBL-CONT Ali-AD write-INF teach-CAUS.PST

Father made the brother teach Ali writing

- (59) c. *im-u-di di-č'u ʕali-č'u-ru quča b=aX-ali
father-OBL-ERG I.OBL-CONT Ali-CONT-EL book N=take-CAUS.PST

Father made me take the book from Ali

An unexpected effect is observed in the causative from the verb *kinni* ‘lose (at play)’ (#20) — it appears to mean ‘win’:

- (60) a. abulajsan kinni (paizula-š'u-č'u-ru)
Abulaisan lose.PST Paizula-OBL.M-CONT-EL

Abulaisan lost (to Paizula) (e.g. at chess)

- b. pajzula-š-ĩi abulajsan kinn-ali
Paizula-OBL.M-ERG Abulaisan lose-CAUS.PST

Paizula won over Abulaisan

Thus ‘win’ literally means ‘cause to lose’ (there is also a verb stem *b=išā* (#21) originally meaning ‘win’).

The causative from *L'ohidi* ‘burst (intr)’ means not only ‘burst (tr)’ but also ‘shoot’ (where gun is the patient):

- (61) a. mašina-di q'aq'ura L'ohid-ali
car-ERG ball burst-CAUS.PST

The car burst the ball (by having hit it)

- b. ʕali-di tumagi k'yanL'alu-č'u L'ohid-ali
Ali-ERG gun hare-CONT burst-CAUS.PST

Ali shot the gun at the hare

The causative from *žabi* ‘hurt (intr), be in pain’ (#63), developed the meaning ‘beat’ from the predictable meaning ‘hurt (tr)’:

- (61) a. mak'i žab-u-da b. ho-š-ĩi mak'i žab-ali
child hurt.PST-CONV-COP he-OBL.M-ERG child hurt-CAUS.PST

The child is sick

He beat the child

The most interesting semantic shift occurs under the causativization of the P-labile verb *b=aʔa* ‘come/deliver’ (#24): the original verb’s meaning contains a deictic component ‘toward the speaker’, which is altogether missing from the causative (derived from the intransitive

usage). As a result, the transitive usage of the original verb and the causative, being identical in the participant structure, have radically different senses, and even tend to be opposed semantically:

- (62) a. il-u-di zini iʃqa b=aʔa
 mother-OBL-ERG cow home N=come.PST
 Mother brought the cow home (I being at this home)
- b. il-u-di zini iʃqa b=aʔ-ali
 mother-OBL-ERG cow home N=come-CAUS.PST
 Mother brought the cow home (I not being at this home)

Though it is questionable that the causative has a deictic component 'in the direction from the speaker' (more plausibly, the deictic component is simply erased from the verb's meaning) the causative form tends to be interpreted so due to polarization with the quasi-synonymous transitive usage of the original verb.

For one example of an unpredictable obscene meaning of a causative that has supplanted other meanings see 2.5 below.

2.3. Quasi-causatives

As was mentioned above, in this study, by “causatives” we mean ‘morphological causatives’. Below we will look at verbs that are causatives formally but not semantically (2.3.1), and verbs that are causatives semantically but not formally (2.3.2).

2.3.1. Fossilized causatives?

There are two homophonous stems that look formally like causatives: *b=eRali* 1) 'dilute' 2) 'be in heat, be possessed'. The first verb is transitive, the second even intransitive. Any stem like *b=eRi* or *b=eRa* (the only two stems from which a causative like *b=eRali* could be derived) is absent in Godoberi. Cf.:

- (63) il-u-di hat'i b=eRali (64) bac'-e r=eRal-u-da
mother-OBL-ERG flour N=dilute.PST wolf-PL NPL=be.in heat.PST-CONV-COP
Mother made the dough *Wolves are in heat*

The verb stem $b=uL'ali$ 'roast' (#135) does not correspond to any stem like $b=uL'i$ or $b=uL'a$:

- (65) il-u-di Hažinka b=uL'ali
mother-OBL-ERG corn N=roast.PST
Mother roasted the corn

2.3.2. Lexical causatives?

Causativization is an extremely productive process in Godoberi. However, there seem to be some cases when two verbs with a causative-like semantic relation have entirely different stems, for instance *b=ič* 'a' 'die' (#195) and *k.anni* 'kill' (#196). On the other hand, even the semantic relation between these two verbs is not exactly causative: there is a real causative from 'die' — *b=ič ali*. Its meaning is more transparently analyzed as 'cause to die':

- (66) di=w wač-u-di tušman k̄,anni
I.OBL=GEN.M brother-OBL-ERG enemy kill.PST
My brother killed the enemy (in a prototypical way — with a dagger or another weapon)
- (67) di=w wač-u-di tušman w=uč°-ali
I.OBL=GEN.M brother-OBL-ERG enemy M=die-CAUS.PST
My brother killed the enemy (e.g. choked)

Unlike 'die' and 'cause to die', 'kill' is not applicable to animal patients.

Another lexical group behaves similarly — *bu=ǰã* 'stay, remain' (#4) — *bu=ǰani* 'cause to stay, keep' — *b=eta* 'leave, allow to stay' (#5).

Evidently, morphological derivation iconically represents semantic derivation in Godoberi, and there are no grounds to speak of suppletive causatives.

2.4. Double causatives

Like many other Daghestanian languages, Godoberi regularly allows double causativization. The second causative's marker is again *-ali*, so verbs with the thematic vowel *-ā* have double causatives in *-anali*, while all the rest in *-alali*.

When presented double causative forms, consultants regularly recognize their correctness, though it is not easy either to find such forms in natural discourse or to elicit them. As for semantics, consultants easily interpret double causatives from **one-place patientive** verbs, like *b=išā* 'die out (of a fire)' (#60), *b=ic'i* 'melt (intr)' (#54), *b=aqā* 'break (intr)' (#75) etc. For example:

- (68) a. *LirLi* *b=iç'i* b. *mak'i-di* *LirLi* *b=iç'-ali*
 butter N=melt.PST child-ERG butter N=melt-CAUS.PST
 The butter melted *The child melted the butter*
- c. *il-u-di* *mak'i-ç'u* *LirLi* *b=iç'-al-ali*
 mother-OBL-ERG child-CONT butter N=melt-CAUS-CAUS.PST
 Mother made the child melt the butter

As is obvious from this example, syntactically double causatives are formed from simple causatives just as normal causatives are formed from transitives (section 2.1.2 above).

When the original verb has an agentive participant, consultants frequently have troubles with interpreting double causatives. They also vary in the ability to correlate such forms with mental images of real situations. This concerns especially originally transitive verbs, but also one-place agentive verbs, like *k'yanc'i* 'jump' (#34). Consider the following:

- (69) a. \bar{X}_{ani} *k'yanc'i* b. *rasul-di* \bar{X}_{ani} *k'yanc'-ali*
 horse jump.PST Rasul-ERG horse jump-CAUS.PST
 The horse jumped *Rasul made the horse jump*

- c. $^?rasul-di$ \bar{X}_{ani} *k'yanc'-al-ali*
 Rasul-ERG horse jump-CAUS-CAUS.PST
 Rasul made the horse jump

- (70) a. *waš-u-di* *hincu* X_{abi}
 son-OBL-ERG door open.PST
 The son opened the door

- b. *im-u-di* *waš-u-č'u* *hincu* X_{ab-ali}
 father-OBL-ERG son-OBL-CONT door open-CAUS.PST
 Father made the son open the door

- c. $^?im-u-di$ *waš-u-č'u* *hincu* $X_{ab-al-ali}$
 father-OBL-ERG son-OBL-CONT door open-CAUS-CAUS.PST
 Father made the son open the door

Examples like (69c), (70c) are typically composed by consultants when they are requested to illustrate the usage of the double causative forms like *X_{abalali}*. Note that these examples are interpreted as having the same propositional structure as simple causatives, e.g. (69c) is claimed to have the same set of participants as (69b), and no extra causer. Consultants usually remark that double causative clauses imply a more intensive causation and/or overcoming the causee's resistance. For example, a consultant suggested that in the situation described in (70b) the son did what he was asked to voluntarily while in (70c) father insisted that he opens the door using threats or repeated reminders. Thus it seems that all cases of double causatives from agentive verbs semantically are not regular causatives but rather fall under the rubric of action intensification discussed in 2.2.2 above.

However, this interpretation appears to dominate only due to insufficient insight into linguistic form and meaning. One of our consultants, Ubaidula Magomedov, a person of outstanding linguistic intuition, was fully aware of the most complex propositional structures of double causatives. We taught him to draw pictures representing all participants of given clauses. For example, a picture corresponding to (69a) includes one horse, (69b) a man and a horse, and (69c) two persons and a horse. (69c) properly should be translated as 'Rasul made someone make the horse jump'. A full clause representing all participants of this verb would be:

- (69) d. *im-u-di* *rasul-č'u* \bar{X}_{ani} *k'anc'-al-ali*
 father-OBL-ERG Rasul-CONT horse jump-CAUS-CAUS.PST
 Father made Rasul make the horse jump

As Ubaidula remarked once, it may seem "on the surface" that a sentence like (69c) means that it was Rasul who applied force to make the horse jump, while in reality Rasul acted through some other person.

A double causative from a transitive verb *č'inni* 'beat' was reported to include four participants:

- (71) a. *jaš-u-di* *hamaXi* *č'inni*
 daughter-OBL-ERG donkey beat.PST
 The daughter beat the donkey

- b. *il-u-di* *jaš-u-č'u* *hamaXi* *č'inn-ali*
 mother-OBL-ERG daughter-OBL-CONT donkey beat-CAUS.PST
 Mother made the daughter beat the donkey

- c. *im-u-di* *il-u-qi-la* *hiL'-u* *jaš-u-č'u*
 father-OBL-ERG mother-OBL-AD-AND say.PST-CONV daughter-OBL-CONT
 hamaXi *č'inn-al-ali*
 donkey beat-CAUS-CAUS.PST
 Father told mother to make the daughter beat the donkey

A double causative from a three-place verb *iķi* 'give' includes five participants. Ubaidula came up with a situation where a bank and a cashier were involved:

- (72) a. *il-u-di* *waš-u-ḥi* *arsi* *iķi*
 mother-OBL-ERG son-OBL-DAT money give.PST
 Mother gave the money to the son

- b. *im-u-di* *il-u-č'u* *waš-u-ḥi* *arsi* *iķ-ali*
 father-OBL-ERG mother-OBL-CONT son-OBL-DAT money give-CAUS.PST
 Father made mother give the money to the son

- c. *im-u-di* *il-u-qi-la* *hiL'-u* *kašira-š-u-č'u* *waš-u-ḥi*
 father-OBL-ERG mother-OBL-AD-AND say.PST-CONV cashier-OBL.M-CONT son-OBL-DAT
 arsi *iķ-al-ali*
 money give-CAUS-CAUS.PST
 Father told mother to make the cashier give the money to the son

Note that (71c), (72c) are not usual one-clause constructions; rather, a polypredicative construction with a past converb has been used here. This is because of the aforementioned problem of two Contessives that would appear otherwise. Since a simple causative from transitive already contains one Contessive (corresponding to Ergative of the original verb), a standardly-formed double causative would require two Contessives. This is consistently avoided by the speakers, and when presented such structures they have difficulties in interpreting them.

The same problem arises with double causatives from the intransitive verbs that have a Contessive in their original case frame, like *k'ut'ā* 'touch' (#90), *obadi/ubadi* 'kiss' (#177), *b=aʔaXa* 'suck breast/udder' (#174), *b=ičā* 'understand' (#210), as well as those verbs of mental, emotional or sensory state that don't have a Contessive originally but get one in simple causative (for a list of them see 2.1.1 above). For example:

- (73) a. *ho-šū=b* *lela* *di-č'u* *k'ut'ā*
 he-OBL.M=GEN.N hand I.OBL-CONT touch.PST
 His hand touched me
- b. *ʔali-di* *di-č'u* (lela) *k'ut'-ani*
 Ali-ERG I.OBL-CONT hand touch-CAUS.PST
 Ali touched me (with his hand)
- c. *ʔim-u-di* *ʔali-č'u* *di-č'u* *k'ut'-an-ali*
 father-OBL-ERG Ali-CONT I.OBL-CONT touch-CAUS-CAUS.PST
 Father made Ali touch me

Sentences like (73c), when presented to a consultant, usually get rejected at first, but then accepted after a lengthy reflection.

In several cases consultants, though confirming the grammatical correctness of the double causatives, suggested that an analytic causative would be more appropriate. Analytic causatives are made with the infinitive of the source verb plus a finite form of the verb *t'ami* 'cause':

- (74) a. *zini* *b=aq'aši* b. *rasul-di* *zini* *b=aq'aš-ali*
 cow N=hide.PST Rasul-ERG cow N=hide-CAUS.PST
 The cow hid *Rasul hid the cow*
- c. *ʔim-u-di* *rasul-č'u* *zini* *b=aq'aš-al-ali*
 father-OBL-ERG Rasul-CONT cow N=hide-CAUS-CAUS.PST
 Father made Rasul hide the cow

- d. *im-u-di* *rasul* *zini* *b=aq'aš-al-i* *t'ami*
 father-OBL-ERG Rasul cow N=hide-CAUS-INF cause.PST
 Father made Rasul hide the cow

There are two adjacent Nominatives in (74d) since one of them belongs to the case frame of the internal verb *baq'ašali*, and the other to the external verb *t'ami*.

2.5. Constraints on causativization

As was mentioned above several times, causativization is a perfectly regular process in Godoberi. There are, however, several factors that can sporadically block causativization.

Phonological block concerns only double causatives and applies to verbs whose original stems end in *-ali*. When two causative markers are added, a phonemic sequence *-alalali* (Simple Past or Infinitive) arises. Such sequences are very hard for morphological processing, and consultants get confused when presented them. Cf. the verb stem *b=ali* 'put on': *izu rali* 'put on the clothes' — *izu ralali* 'dressed someone in clothes' — *ʔralalali*. An analytic causative should be used here.

Several verbs display what can be called **lexical block** — a unique inability to form a causative. For instance, an agent-preserving labile verb *b=ali* 'shout/call' lacks a (first) causative in both intransitive and transitive usages. The reason could be complex homophony of this stem with the stems meaning 'put on' (see previous paragraph) and 'read' (see 4.4. below).

One example of a **syntactic-pragmatic** constraint we have seen in 2.1.4 above is the verb *b=aʔaXa* 'suck breast/udder'.

Finally, one verb demonstrates a complex **phonological-pragmatic** block: the P-labile verb *b=iā* 'cook' that has no apparent reasons to lack a causative. Still some of our consultants firmly maintained that the forms from the expected stem *b=iāni* are tabooed since they sound similar to the forms of the obscene verb *b=iāli* 'copulate'. This latter verb, in turn, is a causative from *b=iāi* 'spill, pour (tr)'.

3. Transitivity decrease

3.0. Introductory remarks

Godoberi, like Daghestanian in general, lacks most of the cross-linguistically common pathways of transitivity decrease.

Passive and anticausative are absent altogether, reflexivity is marked by reflexive pronouns and has nothing in common with transitivity marking. However, Godoberi displays two processes that are related to the realm of transitivity decrease — binominative construction and antipassive. They will be reviewed in 3.1 and 3.2, respectively.

3.1. Binominative construction

There is one exception in Godoberi to the standard ergative construction of the transitive clause. All tense forms derived from the present converb in *-ata* allow agent marking by both

Ergative and Nominative cases. In the latter case the binominative construction arises since both agent and patient are coded Nominative. Most frequently the binominative construction arises in the present tense which is actually formed as present converb plus copula (*i*)*da*, usually occurring as an enclitic *-da*.

Consider examples with the verb *b=iḱi* 'grasp, catch' (#19):

- (75) a. *waš-u-di* *RuR-e* *r=iḱ-at-a-da*
 boy-OBL-ERG pigeon-PL NPL=grasp-PRS-CONV-COP

The boy is catching pigeons

- b. *waša* *RuR-e* *r=iḱ-at-a-da*
 boy pigeon-PL NPL=grasp-PRS-CONV-COP

The boy is catching pigeons

Obviously in the present tense binominative construction retains the class agreement pattern: the verb still agrees with the patient NP.

In other tenses formed from such a converb the picture is more complex. These tenses are formed analytically with the help of the auxiliary verb *bu=k'a* 'be'; this auxiliary can appear in any of the synthetic and quasi-synthetic tenses itself thus forming a whole series of analytic tenses. In all of these tenses a normal transitive clause requires that both the lexical (non-finite) and auxiliary (finite) verbs agree with the Nominative, that is, patient. In the binominative construction the lexical (non-finite) verb, if it has an agreement slot, still agrees with the patient while the auxiliary (finite) verb necessarily agrees with the agent:

- (75) c. *waš-u-di* *RuR-e* *r=iḱ-at-a* *ru=k'a*
 boy-OBL-ERG pigeon-PL NPL=grasp-PRS-CONV NPL=be.PST

The boy was catching pigeons (but never succeeded)

- d. *waša* *RuR-e* *r=iḱ-at-a* *wu=k'a*
 boy pigeon-PL NPL=grasp-PRS-CONV M=be.PST

The boy was catching pigeons (but never succeeded)

Consultants consistently comment regarding the semantic difference between the transitive and binominative constructions that a binominative construction clearly is an answer to the question about what the agent is doing or where the agent is located. (As a result, once a consultant said that in (75a) the agent is visible to the speaker while in (75b) he is not.) To put it in different terms, binominative construction represents an essentially transitive situation not as an action of the agent on the patient but rather as an agent's activity where patient is deindividuated.

Deindividuation of the patient is one of Hopper and Thompson's (1980) transitivity-decreasing factors. This process is related to patient incorporation typical of some languages (see e.g. Givon (1990:626)) or Turkic unmarked Accusative (Nilsson (1978)).

Since the patient argument loses some of its prototypical features and becomes semantically more integrated into the verb, the verb detransitivizes and the agent assumes the Nominative case.

Probably something happens semantically to the agent too — its topical properties become more relevant than its agentive properties — hence the loss of the Ergative marking. A discourse-based study would be needed to inquire into this issue more deeply.

Nor is the fact that the binominative construction is found only in present tenses with imperfective meaning accidental. Imperfective is an inherently detransitivizing factor, and it is also included in the Hopper and Thompson's list; cf. the Kartvelian situation where ergative construction is found only in aorist while in the present, imperfect, future etc., tenses transitive clauses follow an accusative pattern (see e.g. Harris (1981)).

The binominative construction is a general and uniform phenomenon in Godoberi, and there seems to be no need for further examples.

3.2. Antipassive

Godoberi has a more radical means of patient deindividuation and suppression than binominative construction, namely antipassive. Under antipassivization, transitive verbs lose their patients altogether, agent is coded Nominative and triggers class agreement on the verb:

- (76) a. *ʔali(-di)* *q'iru* *b=el-at-a-da* b. *ʔali* *w=ol-a-da*
 Ali(ERG) wheat N=thresh-PRS-CONV-COP Ali M=thresh-AP.CONV-COP
Ali is threshing wheat *Ali is threshing*

Of course, in the analytic constructions with the auxiliary verb *bu=k'a* 'be', class-number agreement on both the lexical and the auxiliary verbs is also controlled by the Nominative agent.

Antipassive is an interesting and complex phenomenon both morphologically and semantically, and we will inquire into these aspects of it in the following sections.

3.2.1. Morphology

The **antipassive morpheme -a** is in fact a marker of the antipassive converb. It can occur with the copula (*i*)*da*, as well as with all tense forms of the auxiliary verb *bu=k'a* 'be'. Below let us limit our attention to only the simplest forms with (*i*)*da*, or rather *-da*, and will term the quasi-synthetic forms in *-a-da* simply antipassives. These forms generally have a present temporal meaning.

Approximately 60 Godoberi verbs have been attested to have antipassive forms. Besides certain semantic limitations, there is one **formal constraint** on antipassive formation: it can be derived only from the verbs with the *-i* thematic vowel. There is a clear morphological explanation for this fact. The past converb has endings *-a* and *-ā* in the verbs with thematic *-a* and *-ā*, respectively, and *-u* in the verbs with thematic *-i*. If the antipassive marker *-a* were added to a verb in *-a* or *-ā*, the resulting form would be indistinguishable from the past converb.

This morphological constraint is very strict, and, for example, the finite forms in *-ada* (from verbs with thematic *-a*) and *-anda* never can be understood as antipassives but only as perfects.

Compare *Āanni* ‘mow’ and *b=ak,a* ‘reap’: *Āann-a-da* is antipassive (cf. perfect *Āann-u-da*), and *b=ak,-a-da* is perfect; the latter verb has no antipassive although its semantics would favor it. It should be noted that verbs in *-a* constitute about 12% of Godoberi verbal vocabulary, and verbs in *-ā* about 10%, so this morphological constraint touches a minor part of the vocabulary.

The addition of the *-a* marker is not the only morphological process that can happen to verbs under antipassivization. Some of the verbs undergo various operations on their stems, including **reduplication** and **addition of suffixes**. These operations are quite irregular in nature, and it is impossible to predict the form of the antipassive from the form of the original stem. In this respect antipassive sharply differs from the rest of verbal inflection which is very regular (cf. chapter IV).

We will return to the issues of reduplication and other operations on the stem in 3.2.3 below.

3.2.2. Semantics

The semantics of (present) antipassive constructions is close to that of binominative (present) constructions. The meaning of (76b) above, contrasted to (76a), could be rendered through a translation like ‘Ali is busy with threshing (having quit all other activities)’, or even ‘Ali is at the threshing-floor’. As with binominative constructions, speakers consistently comment that antipassive clauses are readily interpretable as answers to questions of the type “What Ali is doing? Where is Ali?” What happens in antipassives in terms of both semantic derivation and grammatical marking is that **patient is altogether suppressed** and **agent is highlighted**, both semantically (becomes the sole distinct participant of the situation) and referentially (is the topic).

To provide a more illuminating account of the difference between the binominative and antipassive constructions (or, to put it differently, between the present and antipassive converbs) one needs to look into the contextual and discourse factors, which remains for future research.

A problem with the label “antipassive” is that the form in question can be derived not only from transitive but also from quite a few intransitive verbs (as well as some A-labile verbs).

For instance:

- | | | | |
|-------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|
| (77) a. mat'u | girgis-at-a-da | b. mat'u | girgis-a-da |
| glass | shake-PRS-CONV-COP | glass | shake-AP.CONV-COP |
| <i>The glass shakes</i> | | <i>The glass shakes</i> | |

These two constructions are very similar in meaning, though sometimes consultants emphasize a more actual present meaning in antipassives (‘shakes at this very time’) as opposed to a more general present in the *-atada* forms (note, however, that there is a synthetic form in

-ida, which is by all means a genuine habitual tense). Further, antipassives sometimes acquire a semi-lexicalized additional meaning; for instance, *girgisada* frequently means ‘is feverish’. Some verbs reveal a certain aspectual difference between the two forms:

- | | | | |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|--|------------------------------|
| (78) a. ho=w | Rum-at-a-da | b. ho=w | RumRud-a-da |
| he=M | fall.asleep-PRS-CONV-COP | he=M | fall.asleep(Red)-AP.CONV-COP |
| <i>He is falling asleep</i> | | <i>He is sleepy, falling asleep and awaking all the time</i> | |

It is not impossible, however, that in the latter example the aspectual meaning is due to reduplication, see below.

Is it justifiable to use the term “antipassive” given that this form can be inflected from intransitive verbs? It is an open question but in the approach to transitivity as a semantic phenomenon (Hopper and Thompson (1980)) it is sensible to think of the degrees of transitivity in the grammatically intransitive verbs too. Also, it is likely that transitive verbs constitute the nucleus of the whole of antipassive-forming verbs, even though they are not statistically prevalent (see below).

The question of **which verbs can form antipassives** is in no way an easy one. Semantically, the majority of these verbs can be characterized as follows: they tend to be activities (implying no natural limit), have animate agents as their primary arguments, and inanimate patients (if transitive). More specifically, the set of antipassive-forming verbs breaks down into four groups, as represented below (the list includes as many lexemes as we were able to find).

A. Verbs of work activities (all transitive; 11)

īhi ‘do, make, build’ (#115), *Ā.ardi* ‘dig’ (#116), *b=eL'i* ‘plough’ (#117), *b=eli* ‘thresh’ (#122), *quqabi* ‘saw’ (#78), *kanni* ‘plane (wood)’ (#83), *Āanni* ‘mow, shave’ (#120), *kanni* ‘milk’ (#119), *ganni* ‘drag’ (#93), *č'anni/č'anč'adi* ‘tie’ (#107-108), *k.ardi* ‘knead’ (#137).

B. Verbs of self-propelled/spontaneous movement (all intransitive; 12)

t'ari ‘run’ (#32), *čari* ‘run away’ (#33), *k'yanc'i* ‘jump’ (#34), *žurdi* ‘crawl’, *k.ardi* ‘swim’, *burdi* ‘fly’ (#35), *gergeč-* ‘dangle’, *girgisi* ‘tremble’ (#188), *Āaradi* ‘whirl’ (#36), *šurdi* ‘slide’ (#39), *t'urdi* ‘drip’ (#69), *hiġut'i* ‘leak’.

The following verbs assignable to groups A or B perhaps have antipassives, though it is not absolutely certain: *susuk'i* ‘sift’ (#124), *harqi* ‘mill’ (#125), *b=eLut'i* ‘cut out’ (#129), *šarami* ‘rock’ (#98). The verb *gergeč-* ‘dangle’ appears to have a defective paradigm with no synthetic and quasi-synthetic finite forms other than antipassive *gergečada*; also there is no causative attested from *gergeč-*. Similar situation is the one with the verb *Āam-* ‘scold’ of group C (see below) that is used by most consultants only as an antipassive (*Āamada*) while simple past (*Āami*) and other synthetic and quasi-synthetic forms are almost out of use.

C. Verbs of sound production (intransitive/transitive/A-labile; 27 and more)

gulati 'talk' (#151; intr), *Ḫam-* 'scold' (intr), *b=ali* 'shout/call' (A-I), *šušuk'i/šušudi* 'whisper' (#152; A-I), *šami* 'whistle' (#165; A-I), *pudi* 'blow' (A-I), *qarqadi* 'scratch' (#66; tr), *qardi* 'comb' (#140; tr), *q'irdi* 'shear, crumble' (#141; tr), *Ḫudi* 'drink' (#171; tr), *q'ardi* 'gnaw' (#173; tr), *q'ami* 'bite' (#175; tr), *lami* 'lick' (#176; A-I), *obadi/ubadi* 'kiss' (#177; tr?), *tudi* 'spit' (#179; tr), *k'yardi* 'vomit' (#180; A-I), *Hinčidi* 'sneeze' (#182; intr), *oHudi* 'cough' (#183; intr), *čabi* 'defecate' (#185; intr), *qadi* 'weep' (#190; intr), *ḷunq'idi* 'sob' (#191; intr), *b=etiki* 'laugh' (#192; intr), *Rumi* 'sleep' (#194; intr), *šunni* 'sniff' (#202; tr), *č'anč'adi* 'chew' (#172; tr), *Hapi* 'bark' (#159; intr), *wōwōdi* 'howl' (161; intr)...

This verb class is rather heterogeneous. First, it includes the verbs of purposeful speech/sound production. Further, it embraces a large group of verbs where sound is a side effect of some other acts, including ingestion and other physiological activities. Finally, it contains a set of animals' sound production verbs which is open since speakers differ in their intuitions about the number and the form of most of these verbs. The vast majority of the C group verbs have a historic derivational suffix *-di* that is a general Andic marker of ideophonic verbs (note morphophonemic processes: *-ndi* > *-nni*, *-mdi* > *-mmi* > *-mi*). Apparently many of the verbs of groups A and B could be moved into C group on the basis of having this suffix and being interpretable as sound production verbs — for instance *Xardi*, *kanni*, *šurdi*, *žurdi* etc.

Below when speaking about the *-di*-verbs we will use the term "root" implying 'stem minus *-di*'. For the *-di*-less verbs "root" means 'stem minus thematic vowel'.

D. Other verbs

Hājdi 'play' (intr), *hališi* 'look' (#201; intr)

In this latter group could also be included the verbs *b=ali* 'read' and *rali* 'study', both historically derived from the stem *b=ali* 'shout/call' listed in group C above (for more on these verbs see 4.4 below).

The fact that some of the antipassive-forming verbs are A-labile verbs emphasizes the difference between the two phenomena. Of course, there is something shared by the two: both imply patient suppression and agent promotion into the roles of the sole participant, the only available topic, and class agreement trigger. It is of course no accident that many verbs have semantics inclined to presenting both antipassive and A-lability. However, the two phenomena must be clearly contrasted. All finite antipassive forms are based on a single synthetic inflectional form (antipassive converb in *-a*) while A-lability implies the doubling of the whole inflectional paradigm in both valence patterns.

Naturally, when antipassivized, two meanings of an A-labile verb neutralize.

3.2.3. Reduplication and other operations on the stem

Antipassive-forming verb stems, when antipassivized, can: a) remain intact; b) undergo reduplication; c) acquire a special suffix, usually along with reduplication. We will look at these options successively, but first a more general note on reduplication is due.

Reduplication appears to be an important process in Godoberi verb stem morphology. There are stems that inherently (at least in synchrony) contain a reduplicate fragment, like *girgisi* 'tremble', *šušuk'i/šušudi* 'whisper', *č'anč'adi* 'chew' and others.

All of these verbs apparently designate iterative situations, thus reduplication is being used as an iconic device. A number of verbs exist in two variants — simplex and reduplicate, with the corresponding difference in the meaning (multiplicity of action and/or the most involved participant):

<i>q'ami</i> 'bite'	<i>q'amq'adi</i> 'bite all over'
<i>Rumi</i> 'fall asleep'	<i>RumRadi</i> 'many people fall asleep'
<i>q'ardi</i> 'stick'	<i>q'arq'adi</i> 'many objects stick'
<i>hik'uši</i> 'urinate'	<i>hik'uk'aši</i> 'many people urinate'

There is a similar relation between the verbs *qardi* 'comb' and *qarqadi* 'scratch' listed above (group C) as separate lexemes.

The general pattern of reduplication in a non-antipassive stem evidently is insertion of a sequence *-Ca-*, *C* being usually (but not always) the first consonant of the stem.

Now let us look at three possibilities in antipassive stem formation.

a. No change. All antipassive-forming verbs that contain an inherent reduplication retain their stem intact (that is, reduplicate) in the antipassive: *girgisada*, *šušuk'ada*, *č'anč'adada*, etc., and the same is done by almost all of the verbs with the stem including three consonants (initial glottal stop, class marker slot, and *-d-* of the *-di* suffix count): *obadada*, *hikut'ada*, *gulatada*, *b=etikada*, *harqada*, *Hājdada*, *kannada*, etc. Also remaining intact are some of the verbs with roots of CVC or even simpler structure: *Hapada*, *qadada*.

If a verb inherently has simplex and reduplicate variants, antipassive sometimes is formed only with reduplication, and sometimes in both ways. Examples of the first case are:

<i>č'anni</i> 'tie' / <i>č'anč'adi</i> 'tie', 'chew'	<i>č'anč'adada</i> 'tie', 'chew'
<i>qardi</i> 'comb' / <i>qarqadi</i> 'comb all over, scratch'	<i>qarqadada</i>
<i>Rumi</i> 'fall asleep' / <i>RumRadi</i> 'plural persons fall asleep'	<i>RumRudada</i>

Example of the second possibility are:

<i>q'ardi</i> / <i>q'arq'adi</i> 'gnaw'	<i>q'ardada</i> / <i>q'arq'adada</i> 'gnaw, scold'
<i>q'ami</i> 'bite' / <i>q'amq'adi</i> 'bite all over'	<i>q'amada</i> 'scold' / <i>q'amq'adada</i> 'scold awfully'

b. Reduplication alone. Most of the verbs with the roots of the form C_1VC_2 undergo reduplication under antipassivization, and it is usually done according to the following common scheme. The stem has the shape C_1VC_2di , and when reduplicated it takes the form $C_1VC_2C_1Vdi$. Reduplication seems the obligatory and the only means of antipassive stem modification in the following verbs:

<i>Xardi</i> 'dig'	<i>XarXadada</i>
<i>k'yardi</i> 'vomit'	<i>k'ark'adada</i>

² Note that both antipassive variants in this case have only metaphorical meanings.

<i>t'urdi</i>	'drip'	<i>t'urt'udada</i>
<i>kanni</i>	'milk'	<i>kan'kadada</i>

Reduplication is optional in the following verbs:

<i>īhi</i>	'do, build'	<i>īhada/īhīhada</i>	(distributed by different speakers)
<i>Ḫanni</i>	'mow'	<i>Ḫannada/ḪanḪadada</i>	(no clear distribution)
<i>šunni</i>	'sniff'	<i>šunnada/šunšudada</i>	(the latter implies iterative sniffing and smelling, as in the work of a degustator)
<i>žurdi</i>	'crawl'	<i>žurdada/žuržudada</i>	(the latter implies many crawling actors, say snakes, or multidirectional crawling of a single actor)

One verb with the root structure CV is attested in this category:

<i>Ḫudi</i>	'drink'	<i>ḪuḪudada</i>	'drink alcohol regularly'.
-------------	---------	-----------------	----------------------------

There is an interesting stem *k̄,ardi* meaning (1) 'swim' (intr) and (2) 'knead' (tr). These two meanings are probably historically related but synchronically can be viewed as homophones. They have different antipassive forms: reduplicate *k̄,arḲ,adada* 'knead (a lot)' and simplex *k̄,ardada* 'swim'. Both antipassives are unambiguous.

There are a few examples of another pattern of reduplication — the last consonant of the stem is repeated with a vocal element *a* or *i*: *k'yanc'i* 'jump' — *k'yanc'ac'ada*; *b=ali* 'shout/call' — *b=alilada/b=ajlada*. In the last verb an idiosyncratic morphophonemic process similar to haplology is attested: *lil*) *jl*. Some speakers recognize only one of the two variants of this antipassive, others approve both. A similar stem *b=eli* 'thresh' is considered usually as belonging to the no change category (*b=elada*); one consultant suggested a reduplicate form *b=elilada*.

c. Special suffix (and/or reduplication). Several special suffixes are attested. The most common one is *-(a)luq*; it never is the only way of antipassive marking — it either varies with some other (simplex or reduplicate) variant or is combined with reduplication. A regularity can be observed that this suffix, when combined with reduplication, supplants the *-di* suffix, and when going alone, preserves the *-di* suffix:

<i>burdi</i>	'fly'	<i>burdada/burdaluqada</i>
<i>šurdi</i>	'slide'	<i>šursudada/šurdaluqada</i>
<i>k'anc'i</i>	'jump'	<i>k'anc'ac'ada/k'anc'aluqada</i>
<i>lami</i>	'lick'	<i>lamada/lamlaluqada</i> ³
<i>tudi</i>	'spit'	<i>tutuluqada</i>
<i>t'ari</i>	'run'	<i>t'art'aluqada</i>
<i>čari</i>	'run away'	<i>čarčaluqada</i>
<i>ganni</i>	'drag'	<i>gangadada/gangaluqada</i> ⁴ .

³ The second form usually means 'flatter' while the first one merely 'lick all over'.

One verb displays a more elementary suffix *-uq*: *čabi* 'defecate' — *čabuqada* 'plural persons defecate'.

The last attested suffix *-es* is found in two verbs and supplants the *-di* suffix: *Hinčidi* 'sneeze' — *Hinčesada*, *ḷunq'idi* 'sob' — *ḷunq'esada*.

In order to find a motivation behind the diversity of the means of antipassive formation, if it is possible at all, additional study is needed. It is more than likely that reduplication is a fully meaningful though unproductive mechanism (of some iconic function).

3.2.4. Antipassive infinitive

In the grammatical positions where infinitive must be used (primarily predicate of a complement clause) antipassives take a special form in *-a-Li* (where *-a* is the antipassive converb marker, and *-Li* coincides with the Genitive marker; this form was discovered by Martin Haspelmath). Consider the following examples with an analytic-causative verb *t'ami* 'cause, make', and with a modal verb *q'ara'anda* (perfect of *q'ara'ā* 'need, want'):

- (79) mak'i-di X,aji b=ajl-a-Li t'ami
child-ERG dog N=shout(Red)-AP.CONV-GEN cause.PST

The child made the dog cry

- (80) Ḫ,ani-li k'anc'ac'-a-Li q'ara'ā-an-da
horse-DAT jump(Red)-AP.CONV-GEN be.necessary.PST-CONV-COP

The horse wants to jump

The verb 'scold' that, according to some consultants, has no synthetic forms other than antipassive converb, displays only an infinitive in *-aLi*:

- (81) im-u-li Ḫam-a-Li q'ara'ā-an-da
father-OBL-DAT scold-AP.CONV-GEN be.necessary.PST-CONV-COP

Father wants to scold

4. Complex cases

This section contains brief lexical and grammatical discussions of some Godoberi verbs that present exceptions to regularities in the domain of transitivity or are especially complicated in their grammatical behavior.

⁴ Both forms can have iterative and reciprocal meanings, but the first one also a metaphorical meaning 'is going to die' (lit. 'is being pulled').

4.1. *obadi/ubadi* ‘kiss’ (#177)

This verb has an Ergative in its case frame, that is, it seems transitive. However, it is the only such verb with which it proved to be impossible to elicit any overt patient (in the Nominative case). Both the addressee of a kiss and the goal are marked with Contessive:

- (82) waš-u-di jaš-u-č'u ubadi
boy-OBL-ERG girl-OBL-CONT kiss.PST

The boy kissed the girl

- (83) waš-u-di jaš-u-Li k'ilu-č'u ubadi
boy-OBL-ERG girl-OBL-GEN cheek-CONT kiss.PST

The boy kissed the girl on her cheek

There may be some covert patient in this verb (lip? air?), since in the analytic tenses the auxiliary verb agrees with a non-human singular participant:

- (84) waš-u-di jaš-u-č'u ubad-u bu=k'a
boy-OBL-ERG girl-OBL-CONT kiss.PST-CONV N=be.PST

The boy has kissed the girl

Compare a verb that also typically does not express patient but easily allows it when needed — *tudi* ‘spit’ (#179):

- (85) ʿali-di rasul-č'u (tata) tudi
Ali-ERG Rasul-CONT (saliva) spit.PST

Ali spat (saliva) at Rasul

Another verb that is possibly like ‘kiss’ in not allowing an overt patient is *q'ami* ‘bite’ (#175).

4.2. *Ḫudi* ‘drink’ (#171)

This is the only verb we encountered that has a form that can be called resultative. This form is like perfect morphologically but implies a valence change — detransitivization:

- (86) a. ʿali-di ʿaraq'i Ḫudi b. *ʿali Ḫudi
Ali-ERG vodka drink.PST Ali drink.PST

Ali drank vodka

- c. ʿali-di ʿaraq'i Ḫud-u-da d. ʿali (ʿaraq'i-la) Ḫud-u-da
Ali-ERG vodka drink.PST-CONV-COP Ali vodka-AND drink.PST-CONV-COP

Ali has drunk vodka

Ali is drunk (with vodka)

The verb *Ḫudi* can of course mean any kind of drinking but the form *Ḫududa* implies only drunkenness from alcohol. In the resultative, as in the antipassive, patient gets semantically incorporated into the verb and yields its grammatical position (Nominative) to agent. But the aspectual semantics of the two forms is very different, cf. *ḪuḪudada* ‘drink alcohol regularly’.

Another verb of the same semantic domain — *gyanni* ‘smoke, drag, pull’ — does not have a resultative: *how gyannuda* does not mean ‘he is intoxicated from smoking’ (of course it can mean ‘smb. has dragged him’). Evidently being smoked is less rooted in the Godoberi culture than being drunk.

4.3. *b=aḪā* ‘give birth’

This verb is outstanding in being both P- and A-labile:

- (87) a. pat'imati-di waša w=aḪā b. pat'imati j=aḪā
Patimat-ERG son M=give.birth.PST Patimat F=give.birth.PST

Patimat gave birth to a son

Patimat was born

- c. pat'imati j=aḪā
Patimat F=give.birth.PST

Patimat gave birth

In (87b) Patimat is implied to be a newborn, in (87c) the mother, and the two are homophonous. Probably it should be suggested that the underlying meaning of this verb is the transitive one, ‘give birth’, since otherwise it would be difficult to propose a path of semantic derivation.

The causative *b=aḪani* has only an obscene sense ‘give her a child (through copulation)’, and can be semantically traced back to both the transitive (88) and the A-labile (89) usages:

- (88) rasul-di pat'imati-č'u waša w=aḪ-ani
Rasul-ERG Patimat-CONT son M=give.birth-CAUS.PST

Rasul gave Patimat a son

- (89) rasul-di pat'imat j=aḪ-ani
Rasul-ERG Patimat F=give.birth-CAUS.PST

Rasul gave Patimat a baby

In the last example feminine class agreement on the verb is with Patimat; gender of the baby is not represented here.

The causative meaning like ‘give assistance in giving birth’ can be rendered only analytically:

- (90) wrač-aš-ti pat'imati-ti kumaki t̃hi j=aX-t̃
 doctor-OBL.M-ERG Patimat-DAT help make.PST F=give.birth-INF
The doctor helped Patimat give birth

4.4. *b=ali* 'shout/call'; 'read' (#215); *rali* 'study'

This is the most complicated tangle of polysemy and semantic and grammatical derivation encountered in Godoberi lexicon. From the outset it should be mentioned that the verb *b=ali* is homophonous also with the transitive verb *b=ali* 'dress' (#143) which is probably unrelated to the group in question, is rather regular and will not be mentioned subsequently.

First, as was noted above, *b=ali* 'shout/call' is an A-labile verb:

- (91) a. budun w=ali
 muezzin M=shout.PST
Muezzin cried (e.g. calling for a prayer)
- b. budun-aš-ti Ribdi-di b=ali
 muezzin-OBL.M-ERG Godoberian-PL HPL=call.PST
Muezzin called Godoberians (for a prayer)

This verb in both meanings does not allow causativization: *b=alali* means neither 'make shout' nor 'make call'. However, *b=ali* has a frequently occurring reduplicate antipassive *b=alilada/b=ajlada*, already discussed in 3.2.3 above:

- (92) budun w=alil-a-da w=ajl-a-da
 muezzin M=call(Red)-AP.CONV-COP M=call(Red)-AP.CONV-COP
Muezzin is calling

Some consultants tried to suggest a semantic distinction between the two variants, associating the *-lil-* form with a more intensive and iterative action than the *-jl-* form. Perhaps this can be interpreted as a sign of a still alive semantic function of reduplication.

Second, the verb *b=ali* has a distinct transitive meaning 'read'. It clearly emerged historically from 'shout/call' referring to the traditional Moslem reading the Koran aloud. However, it is synchronically very different from 'shout/call' since it has as its patient a text read, e.g. a book:

- (93) ʕali-di quča b=ali
 Ali-ERG book N=read.PST
Ali read a book

Unlike 'shout/call', 'read' easily allows causativization:

- (94) im-u-di ʕali-ʕ'u quč-ibe r=al-ali

father-OBL-ERG Ali-CONT book-PL NPL=read-CAUS.PST

Father made (=taught) Ali read books

Again unlike 'shout/call', it does not allow an antipassive, in other words, the antipassive from *b=ali* (e.g. *wajlada*) does not have a meaning related to reading.

Third, the further development of this stem was fossilization of the neutral plural class marker *r=* as the initial of the stem: *rali* 'study' (intransitive). The plural class marker probably comes from the patient 'books', so the evolution is likely to have been: *hošti qučibe r=ali* 'he books them-read' → *how rali* 'he them-read' → 'he studied'. Consider an example:

- (95) ʕali madrasa-ʔo rali
 Ali madrasah-LOC study
Ali studied in a madrasah

A causative is perfectly acceptable:

- (96) im-u-di ʕali ral-ali
 father-OBL-ERG Ali study-CAUS.PST
Father made Ali study

Antipassive is again possible, and in two forms, as in 'shout/call':

- (97) ʕali madrasa-ʔo ralil-a-da / rajl-a-da
 Ali madrasah-LOC study(Red)-AP.CONV-COP study(Red)-AP.CONV-COP
Ali studies in a madrasah