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1. Introduction

Probably the majority of languages display different adnominal possessive constructions, hereafter called “genitive splits” determined by parameters such as the type of possessum, the type of the possessor and the type of the relation between both (see Koptjevskaja-Tamm 2003; Lander 2009). However, such oppositions are only very rarely conveyed by contrasting different genitive exponents. Rather, these splits usually involve variations in locus, i.e. the participant associated morphosyntactically with possessive marking are expressed by oppositions between the genitive and other constructions. A genitive morpheme or adposition is associated with the possessor (dependent-marking), and / or a possessive marker is found on the possessum (head-marking).

The most common split triggering morphosyntactic differences in possessive NPs is between different kinds of possessors. The use of a genitive marker is restricted to certain classes of nominals (animacy factor), or, more broadly, topicality features account for such splits as found, for instance, in English (preposed saxon genitive vs postposed adpositional genitive), or in Azerbaijani, where only specific possessors take the genitive suffix:

(1) \( \text{it-in} \quad \text{baş-ı} \)
\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{dog-GEN} & \text{head-POS3} \\
\end{array}
\]
‘the head of the dog’

(2) \( \text{it-ø} \quad \text{baş-ı} \)
\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{dog-ø} & \text{head-POS3} \\
\end{array}
\]
‘a dog’s head’

This paper will not deal with this frequent type of split, but will instead focus on the parameter of the possessum’s and possessive relation’s type
known as “inalienable/alienable distinction” or “inalienability split” (Chappell & McGregor 1995). This phenomenon is very rare in Eurasia, and commonly associated with remote, “exotic” languages of Latin America, where it should be set out against a background of more general systems of nominal classification.

Binary possessive classification is usually called “alienable/inalienable” possession (...) partly because it is fairly common, especially in the Americas, for one of a binary set of possessive classes to be bound, i.e. obligatorily possessed. In fact, though, possessive classification is not a semantic or grammatical category but a purely lexical classification of nouns. (...) (Nichols,

Prototypical alienability contrasts (bodyparts, part-whole and kinship relation terms vs all others) are expressed there by differential marking on the possessum, because its referent’s semantic features are accountable for the nuance of the possessive relation. Most usual is the formal split between inalienable possession unmarked or marked by possessive affixes (“head-marking”) and alienable possession dependant-marking, that is, using a proper “genitive” case or adposition.

"Most languages with head-marked possession have inalienable possession, and no language in my sample with exclusively dependant-marked possession has inalienable possession." (Nichols 1992:118).

However, contrary to Nichols’ generalization, alienability contrasts are not exclusively associated with head-marking possessive patterns, and a formal contrast matching the semantic asymmetry does not hold for at least five languages that do show an alienability contrast exclusively with dependent-marking: Krongo (Nilo-Saharan), Old French, Spoken Faroese, Kuot (Papuan) and Khinalug, an East-Caucasian language (see Koptjevskaja-Tamm (2003), Haspelmath (2006), and Lander (2009). Polynesian languages are also mentioned, but without a precise reference)

In fact not one but two languages of the East-Caucasian linguistic family convey the alienability distinction solely by means of different genitive case forms. This is also the case in Budugh, spoken in a neighbouring valleys of Northern Azerbaijan. It is separated from Khinalug by the Kryz speaking area.

Khinalug (Kibrik & al. 1972:131-132) distinguishes between alienable and inalienable genitives for some nouns (although surprisingly, relational kinship terms belong to the alienable class here), and one of the two
genitive cases (for inalienable possessors, in Khinalug) is also the ergative case marking agents of transitive verbs:

(3) $pχre$ $yuva$

boy-AL.GEN home

‘the dogs kennel’

(4) $pχri$ $q’aj$

boy-INAL.GEN tail

‘the dog’s tail’

(5) $pχri$ $zi$ $č’u-χšämä$

dog-ERG 1.NOM bite-AOR

‘the dog has bitten me’

Genitive-ergative syncretism is not a rare phenomenon: it is found in Lak, another East-Caucasian language, in Eskimo languages, and may account for the emergence of ergative alignment in Indo-Iranian languages, following nominalization of perfective predicates, see Bynon (2005); but the functional reason for it is not well studied, and the origin of this configuration in Khinalug (a language with no close relatives within the East-Caucasian family) is unknown.

In contrast, the history of case forms and functions in the Lezgic branch of East-Caucasian, to which Budugh belongs, is known sufficiently well known to allow for a diachronic investigation.

Like Khinalugh, Budugh shows this very rare type of inalienability split on possessive NPs in which alienable vs inalienable possessors are marked by different cases. Both cases have also predicate-dependant, originally spatial functions, respectively called inlocative (in) and adlocative (ad):

(6) *$zo$ / $za’$ q’il

1.AD 1.IN head

‘my head’

(7) *$za’$ / $zo$ k’ant

1.IN 1.AD knife

‘my knife’

The morphological expression of these inalienability splits may look familiar or at least straightforward, but the fact remains that such a device
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for this function is almost a typological hapax, going against iconicity or frequency related rules of economy in grammar.

In order to explain the emergence of the differential case marking on Budugh possessive NPS, we will first have to illustrate some general features of possessive NPs found in East-Caucasian languages. The second section will introduce the notion of possessive classification, as found in Kryz language, the closest relative of Budugh, and describe in some detail the contrast of the two genitive cases involved in the Budugh alienability split. The third section introduces the semantically related phenomenon of differential case marking of recipients. The fourth and final section will link both splits (recipient marking and possessor marking) by supposing a process of “possessor internalization”.

2. **Nominal possessive marking in East-Caucasian**

East-Caucasian languages are very predominantly dependant-marking, and possessive NPs are always marked on the possessor, by a genitive case ending.

2.1. Genitive marking in other branches of East-Caucasian

It is well known that genitive markers may simultaneously express other categories, like number and gender of the possessor in Latin or Greek, but this is not really the case in East-Caucasian, where nominal inflection is concatenative, and rarely shows fusional processes. Plural and gender are, if expressed on the noun in the genitive case, marked by other, preceding (“oblique”) morphemes: thus in Avar:

(8) \[ \text{vas} \quad \text{ču} \]  
    boy(NOM)(M)  horse(NOM)(N)

(9) \[ \text{vas-} \quad \text{ču-yal} \]  
    boy-PL.NOM  horse-PL.NOM

(10) \[ \text{vas-} \quad \text{ču-} \quad \text{ul} \]  
    boy-M-GEN  horse-N-GEN

(11) \[ \text{vas-} \quad \text{ču-} \quad \text{ul} \]  
    boy-PL.OBL-GEN  horse-PL.OBL-GEN
But in a number of East-Caucasian languages of the Andic and Tsezic branches the choice of a genitive marker depends on the case of the possessum (direct or oblique): For instance in Khwarshi (Tsezic, Khalilova 2009), direct genitive is found with the nominative possessum, while the oblique genitive occurs with the possessum in other (‘oblique’) cases:

(12)  
\[
\begin{array}{llll}
\text{hada} & \text{žik’o-s} & \text{e’s} & \text{b-ut’-x-in} & \text{b-eč-in.}
\end{array}
\]
\[
\begin{array}{llll}
\text{one.OBL} & \text{man-GEN1} & \text{ox(N)} & \text{N-divide-caus-pf.cv N-be-UWPST}
\end{array}
\]

‘The ox of one man was stolen.’

(13)  
\[
\begin{array}{llll}
\text{y-uq’b} & \text{u} & \text{y-ek’l-un} & \text{čamassek’-lo} & \text{hast’ina-ma-li.}
\end{array}
\]
\[
\begin{array}{llll}
\text{F-big} & \text{F-fall-UWPST} & \text{date-GEN2} & \text{trough.OBL-IN-LAT}
\end{array}
\]

‘The eld one fell into the trough of dates.’

2.2. Genitive marking in other branches of Lezgic

The Lezgic branch of East-Caucasian comprizes some ten languages, of which some are among the best well known of the whole family. Possessive NPs in Lezgic are rather diverse, and reflect the accepted genetic classification into a Western, Eastern, and Southern branch (we do not include Udi and and Archi ‘outsiders’ into the discussion).

In Lezgic as in other branches of East-Caucasian, the genitive case is usually derived of the form used for ergative case (also called ‘oblique base’, which shows considerable allomorphy in all languages).

2.2.1. Head-case sensitive genitive marking in Western Lezgic

Western Lezgic Languages (Rutul and Tsakhur) include possessor-nouns in the more general category “attributive” (cf. Kibrik and al. 1997). Nouns in their attributive function agree with head nouns in a less straightforward way than in Tsezic.

Tsakhur for instance has three genitive markers: it adds –n, –na, or -ni according to the gender and obliqueness of the head (See Kibrik and al. 1997). (Southern) Rutul (personal field data) adds –d to the attributive element if the head is neuter (fourth gender) or plural nominative, and –di if the head is Male, Female, Animate (third class) nominative singular or oblique:
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(14)  yixy-id  naq‘ \(^{\text{fr}}\)
\[1\text{-GEN.N} \text{dream(N)(NOM)}
\]
‘my dream’

(15)  yixy-di  muq \(^{\text{fr}}\)
\[1\text{-GENnom.sg} \text{village(A)(NOM)}
\]
‘my village’

(16)  yedüš-id  muq \(^{\text{fr}}\)-bu
\[1\text{pl-GEN.PL} \text{village-PL.NOM}
\]
‘our villages’

(17)  yixy-di  naq‘ \(^{\text{fr}}\)-ıkla:
\[1\text{-GEN.sg.OBL} \text{dream-SUBEL}
\]
‘from my dream’

(18)  yedüš-di  muq \(^{\text{fr}}\)-ma:
\[1\text{pl-GEN.OBL} \text{village-PL.OBL.IN}
\]
‘in our villages’

This is of course comparable to the Tsezic system shown above on Khwarshi.

2.2.2. Simple genitive split in Eastern Lezgic

Like most languages of the world that display various strategies of genitive marking, Eastern Lezgic (Lezgian, Agul, and Tabassaran) divides between pronominal and non-pronominal possessors, where the former have suppletive or more grammaticalized forms. For instance in Lezgian (Haspelmath 1993), all nouns, and 3rd person pronouns, form their genitive by adding the morpheme \(-n\) to the form of the ergative-oblique stem, whereas the genitive forms of personal pronouns are not derived of either the nominative or the ergative, and show more simple phonological structure (the bare stem:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1sg</th>
<th>2sg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>zun</td>
<td>wun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERG</td>
<td>za</td>
<td>(wu)na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>zi</td>
<td>wi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Possessive semantic classes in Southern Lezgic

The Southern branch of the Lezgic group, which includes Budugh and Kryz, constitutes a notable exception to some of the most pervasive features of genitive marking in East-Caucasian.

3.1. Kryz possessive classification of nouns

First of all, contrary to nearly all its relatives, which use the ergative form as an oblique base on which all other cases, including the genitive, are formed with additional morphemes, Kryz uses the oblique base as a genitive, and derives the ergative with an invariant additional marker.

Plus, as shown in detail in (Authier 2009), Kryz has a genitive case with a very high degree of allomorphy, reflecting oblique stems of the other branches, and downright semantic classes. Genitive-marking morphemes are: zero, apophony, -a, -d, -n, -l, -r, -i, -rd, -ci.
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One of the numerous genitive markers of Kryz (−a) is one of the two found in Budugh, namely the one marking inalienable possession, and on words which do have other genitive markers, this (−a)marker expresses Inessive location (also illative in one dialect). It is thus not a syncretism, but an instance of complementary distribution, semantically motivated.

It is paralleled by an ergative-inessive distribution in related languages, both belonging to the Lezgic branch like Tsakhur (see Kibrik 1997) or to other branches of East-Caucasian like Tsez (Comrie 2009)). In Tsakhur and Tsez, nominals ranking highest in the hierarchy of animacy and topicality features are never used with reference to the inessive location but use the same morpheme to mark their role as agents. The use of this marker as a genitive case in Kryz and Budugh is thus not the reinterpretation of an adverbial function, but part of a split possessor-and-agent marking system of nominal classification.

Non-binary semantic possessive classification as it is found in Kryz is rare, and certainly rarer than binary oppositions. In fact, binary possessive classification as it is found in Khinalug or Budugh to mark an alienability contrast is rather common, but outside Eurasia. Whatever its – probably
multifactorial – origin, the complex classificatory system as it is still found on Kryz possessive NPs was not matched by equivalent systems in surrounding – and socially dominant – Iranian (Tat) and Turkic (Azerbaijani) languages. Probably due to the pressure of more intense language contact and more pervasive bilingualism in Budugh than in Kryz, it has collapsed in Budugh to a binary system, whereas it probably has influenced Khinalug, spoken in the nearby valley and in close cultural contact with Kryz.

3.2. Binary classification in Budugh: the alienability contrast

Budugh, like Khinalug, has a possessum-determined (alienability) split according to which a consistent class of nouns characteristically consisting of body part, some part-whole terms and some kinship terms require the use of a different (inalienable) possessive marking: the possessor is marked by a different case than if the possessee does not belong to this class.

The two cases involved in the Budugh system of possessive marking are syncretic: they express both nominal and predicate dependency. These two genitive cases will hereafter be called by the labels indicating their predicate dependent, spatial function: inlocative (marker –a), and adlocative (marker –u). Possessors are marked by the inlocative case when they depend on inalienable items, body-parts and other body-related types of possession, including part-whole relationship:

(19) za’ yab za’ q’il za’ sa’s
    1.IN hand 1.IN head 1.IN voice
    ‘my hand’ ‘my head’ ‘my voice’

(20) za’ guc za’ dard za’ ya’s
    1.IN strength 1.IN sorrow 1.IN funeral
    ‘my strength’ ‘my sorrow’ ‘my funeral’

(21) dar-a’ q’ala’
    tree.IN head.IN
    ‘at the top of the tree’

(22) malla.c-a’ cib
    mulla.IN pocket
    ‘Mulla’s pocket’
(23) fu-ye tike
bread.IN piece-PL
‘pieces of bread’

In contrast, possessors of “alienable” items bear the Adlocative case:

(24) zo k’ant zo yurt
1.AD knife 1.AD country
‘My knife’ ‘My country’

(25) jo uspor zo kıda
1PL.AD quarrel 1.AD work
‘our quarrel’ ‘My work’

(26) huv-o ğaye / vis-o xad / ꝟab-o t’il-imer
mill.AD stone  spring-AD water hand-AD finger-PL
‘millstone’ ‘spring water’ ‘the fingers of the hand’

Kin terms are evenly distributed along both types, due to self-evident cultural biases:

(27) za’ ada za’ furi
1.IN father 1.IN man
‘my father’ ‘my husband’

(28) zo hec zo diʃ
1.AD woman 1.AD son
‘My wife’ ‘My son’

4. Differential recipient-marking

The explanation for the distribution of the two syncretic case inlocative and adlocative along the alienability dividing line is to be found in another syncretism typical of many East-Caucasian languages: predicate dependant possessors are usually marked contrastively for permanent vs non permanent possession, using a dedicated dative case for the former, and a syncretic spatial case for the latter.
4.1. Spatial Cases in East-Caucasian and Lezgic

M. Alekseev (1997) has offered a reconstruction of spatial cases which convincingly applies for various branches of the East-Caucasian languages, and is especially for the languages of the Lezgic branch.

Proto-Lezgic seems to have had a system of up to eight ‘locative’ case-markers. It became reduced to five in Kryz (in: *-a’; sub/cont: -ky; post>apud -χw; ad: -v; inter > super: -ɣˤ). Budugh has lost one more spatial case (super, replaced by a postposition) and uses the remaining ones (in: *-a’; sub: -k; apud -uχ; ad : -u) with mostly syntactic value, the concrete localisations expressed by postpositions.

The following table gives localisations found in both Kryz and Budugh and their Archi and Agul counterparts (two very conservative languages in respect to case marking), after the reconstructed etyma:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Proto-Lezgic</th>
<th>Archi</th>
<th>Agul</th>
<th>Kryz</th>
<th>Budugh</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>in</td>
<td>*-a’</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>-’</td>
<td>-aˤ</td>
<td>-’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>post/apud</td>
<td>*-q(w)</td>
<td>-q</td>
<td>-q</td>
<td>χw</td>
<td>-ωχ/u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sub</td>
<td>*-kl’</td>
<td>-kl’</td>
<td>-kk</td>
<td>-k</td>
<td>-k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ad</td>
<td>*-l:w</td>
<td>-l:u</td>
<td>-w</td>
<td>-v/u</td>
<td>-ω/o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

East-Caucasian spatial cases tend to encroach on the functional domain of core argument-marking. The inlocative is found in all core Lezgic languages plus Archi with its original spatial meaning (location inside a loose, open space), but it is restricted to non animates referents in this function. On nouns of animate referents and personal pronouns, it tends to mark their role as agents (ergative), with considerable variation across languages and even dialects.

4.2. The common-Lezgic adessive

The adlocative (marker -v/u < -l:w) is also found in all core Lezgic languages plus Archi with its spatial meaning (location near, in deictically underspecified contact), but in only a part of the domain has it undergone a functional (metaphoric) extension outside of the spatial domain to mark higher animates in the role of non-permanent possessors.

The adlocative case has thus extended its functional value to non-permanent recipient marking in two branches of core-Lezgic: Eastern, and Southern, whereas more archaic Archi and the Western branch (Tsakhur
and Rutul) have this case, but not as part of a contrastive possessor marking system.

Nevertheless ‘split recipient alignment’ or ‘differential recipient-marking’ may be an areal feature in East-Caucasian languages. Many of them show this rare phenomenon. According to Daniel & al. (2009) the high elaboration of space semantics in these languages accounts for the grammaticalisation of this phenomenon. Goal-distinctions are numerous enough to afford to use one of them for a special semantic type of recipient, and ‘give’-verbs in the languages of the East Caucasian family distinguish between two types of transfer by breaking down the Recipient role into two case-marking strategies which are called dative and lative, respectively, where other languages make lexical distinctions (‘give’ vs. ‘lend’). Dative vs. lative Recipients contrast ‘give forever, offer’ vs. ‘give for a while, lend to someone, hand’ types of situations, respectively [...]

We now address this issue as manifested in the dialect of Lezgian (Eastern branch) spoken near the Budugh and Kryz speaking areas, and in Kryz, genetically the closest relative of Budugh.

4.3. Differential recipient-marking in the Lezgian dialect of Azerbaijan

In the Lezgian dialect of Azerbaijan as investigated by (Babaliyeva, 2007), the adlocative case is used as a spatial essive or lative case (we call this syncretism ‘locative’) with verbs showing the historically related preverbs -(a)g(w)- and with the locational copula gwa ‘be close’, which both also contains the same morpheme *łuw ‘near, close, with’:

(29) ima-n q:aćğan.di-v agat-na
3-and cauldron-AD approach-AOR
‘He came close to the cauldron.’

(30) dana-ar.i-v gva: danarqhan
calf-PL-AD be.at.part calf_breeder
danarghan
‘A keeper of calves who was tending the calves.’

Secondarily, the Lezgian adlocative denotes a non-permanent recipient depending of verbs like vīguń ‘give (not permanently)’ or vařk:un < *va-ř- gun ‘give back’, which both show the adessive morpheme frozen as a preverb:
In contrast, the beneficiary of permanent transfer verbs like gun ‘give (permanently, without the characteristic preverb)’ is expressed by the dative case in -z:

(33) \( \text{va-z ada q:izil-ar p:ara ga-na} \)
\[ \begin{array}{l}
2-\text{DAT} \quad 3-\text{ERG} \quad \text{gold-PL} \quad \text{much give-AOR} \\
\end{array} \]
‘He gave you too many gold coins.’

4.4. Differential recipient-marking in Kryz

Like in Lezgian of Azerbaijan, the Kryz Adlocative case is used for both locative adjuncts, and correlates to the preverb va-:

(34) \( \text{sus-ar ic siy.i-v va-r-e} \)
\[ \begin{array}{l}
\text{bride-ERG} \quad \text{SELF.F(GEN)} \quad \text{mouth-AD} \quad \text{PV-pushPRS} \\
\end{array} \]
‘The bride draws (her veil) in front of her mouth.’

and for temporary recipients: the same verb vuyic ‘give’ denotes a permanent transfer of possession with the dative marking in -z and non permanent transfer of possession with the adlocative case in -v:

(35) \( \text{div.ul-ir şuşa ġari-v / ġari-z vuts'-re} \)
\[ \begin{array}{l}
\text{demon-ERG} \quad \text{bottle old.wife-AD} \quad \text{old.wife-DAT} \quad \text{give-PRS} \\
\end{array} \]
‘The demon lends / gives the bottle to the old woman’.

It is not surprising that Budugh, spoken in Azerbaijan in close contact with Kryz and Lezgian shares the same morpho-semantic split, which will finally explain the emergence of the other, nominal-possessive split.
5. Three dative-like cases in Budugh:

We saw in introduction that Budugh has for any noun denoting a potential possessor, two forms (in –a, and ad –u, consistently used according to the alienability feature carried or not by the possessum, are employed in genitive function. Both these contrasting genitive-like cases have also non-adnominal, constituent-marking functions; they encroach upon the functional domain of the proper dative marker –z inherited from Proto-Lezgic, which we have just observed marking permanent recipients in Kryz and Lezgian. Budugh is thus richly endowed with three indirect-object-marking cases: inlocative –a’, adlocative –u/o and the dative case in –z, all inherited from Proto-Lezgic.

5.1. Inlocative in Budugh

The inlocative is employed (more commonly than in Kryz the corresponding forms) as a verb-dependant case, either retaining its original meaning as a spatial locative (essive/lative) case

\[(36) \text{kaçal-cir } \text{fu-ye}\text{r } \text{acgan-ca } \text{ats’a-ci} \]
\[
\text{bald-ERG bread-PL cauldron-IN pour-PERF}
\]

‘The bald put the bread into the cauldron’.

or metaphorically employed in dative-like function:

\[(37) \text{za’ ina’m } \text{go-ci} \]
\[
1.IN trust(A) A.brin\text{g-PERF}
\]

‘He [brought trust to me =] trusted me’.

or as a genitive marker, not merely on personal pronouns as in the Alik dialect of Kryz, but also further down the nominal hierarchy

\[(38) \text{za } \text{ma’lla’-ca } \text{acgan} \]
\[
1.IN mulla-IN cauldron
\]

‘my / the mulla’s cauldron’.

The intermediary stage of the functional extension of this basically locative case into a general genitive marker can be observed in the Jek
dialect of Kryz, where not only personal pronouns but other (third person) pronouns and some high ranking nominals have a genitive ending -a:

(39)  
\[ a-n-a \quad / \quad u-g-a \quad / \quad m-a'll-a'-'ca \quad h-a-y-a-g \]
\[ 3-\text{human-GEN} \quad \text{REFL-M-GEN} \quad \text{mulla-GEN} \quad \text{cauldron} \]
\[ \text{‘his / the mulla’s cauldron’}. \]

Compare in the more archaic dialect of Alik:

(40)  
\[ a-n \quad / \quad u-g-a \quad / \quad m-a'll-a'-'ci \quad h-a-y-a-g \]
\[ 3-\text{human-GEN-IN} \quad \text{REFL-M-GEN} \quad \text{mulla-GEN} \quad \text{cauldron} \]
\[ \text{‘his / his own / the mulla’s cauldron’}. \]

5.2. Dative proper in Budugh

The old Lezgie dative serves in Budugh for permanent recipients with verbs of giving, and is never used on nominals depending of another nominal:

(41)  
\[ \text{gʊnɪ]-ci-r} \quad M-a'll-a'-'cɪz \quad ʔa'cɣa\n\quad yuts'u'-ri \]
\[ \text{neighbour} \quad \text{Molla-DAT} \quad \text{cauldron} \quad \text{give-prs} \]
\[ \text{‘The neighbour gives the cauldron to Mulla’}. \]

(42)  
\[ vɪn \quad zaz \quad k'ant \quad yɪv-a-ci \]
\[ 2.\text{NOM} \quad 1.\text{dat} \quad \text{knife} \quad \text{give-perf} \]
\[ \text{‘You gave me (dative) the knife (as a present, permanently)’}. \]

This dative marker can be moved to preverbal focus position:

(43)  
\[ \text{gʊnɪ]-ci-r} \quad ʔa'cɣa\n\quad M-a'll-a'-'cɪz \quad yuts'u'-ri \]
\[ \text{neighbour} \quad \text{cauldron(a)} \quad \text{Molla-DAT} \quad \text{give-PRS} \]
\[ \text{‘The neighbour gives the cauldron to MULLA’}. \]

(44)  
\[ vɪn \quad k'ant \quad zaz \quad yɪv-a-ci \]
\[ 2.\text{NOM} \quad \text{knife} \quad 1.\text{DAT} \quad \text{give-PERF} \]
\[ \text{‘You gave the knife (as a present, permanently) to ME (dative)’}. \]
5.3. Adlocative in Budugh

The Budugh adlocative case has not lost its concrete value, either essive or lative:

(45) \[ k’ul-co \ halma \ şey-ri \ da-d \]
    house-AD such thing-PL NEG-NPL
    ‘In the house no such things exist.’

(46) \[ furi \ k’ul-co \ çağar-da \]
    man.NOM house-AD go.IPF-WHEN
    ‘When the man was nearing the house...’

Note that with animates, a postposition governing the inlocative variant of genitive has to be used:

(47) \[ rij \ *furo \ / fura \ badala \ çögor-a’vi \]
    girl(A) man.AD man.IN next A.go.IPF-PROG
    ‘The girl is getting married’

On higher animates, the adlocative also marks temporary recipient, like in Kryz and Lezgian, but contrary to the properly dative marker the adlocative is probably rarely placed in focus position to the left of the verb

(48) \[ ğunşi-cir \ ëcgan \ Ma’lla’-cu \ yûts’u-ri \]
    neighbour cauldron Molla-AD give-PRS
    ‘The neighbour lends a cauldron to Mullah.’

    Rather, it is attached to the left of the theme argument (the thing given):

(49) \[ vın \ zo \ k’ant \ yiva-ci \]
    2.NOM 1.AD knife give-PERF
    ‘You gave (for a while) the knife to me (adlocative)’.

5.4. Alienability contrast from differential recipient-marking

Languages very commonly use the same case to code adnominal possessors and core syntactic cases. We have seen that one of the two genitive cases (for inalienable possessors) of Khinalug is also the ergative case marking
agents of transitive verbs. External possessors are typically marked by a case other than genitive, but sometimes genitive appears at the clause-level, like in Avar:

(50) \[ebel-al-ul\] tso \[vas-gi\] \[v-ugo\]
    mother-F-GEN a son-also M-COP
    ‘Mother has also a son’

For a speaker of colloquial French, or other languages like Bulgarian, it comes not as a surprise that possessors might be marked like recipients. Accordingly, in non focal position, the Budugh adlocative case marker – o/u bears on a temporary recipient or possessor as either dependent of a verb of giving or of the noun denoting the alienable referents. In non-transfer contexts, it naturally came to be used with alienable items as a genitive case:

(51) \[zin\] zo k’ant eq’i-ra’vi
    1.NOM 1.AD knife sharpen-PROG
    ‘I am sharpening my (adlocative) knife’.

Following this syntactic-semantic slip, when the adlocative case came to be used as an alienable genitive the inlocative/genitive case came to be restricted to inalienable possession. We have seen that this differential recipient-marking is common in East-Caucasian; including languages in contact with Budugh. But only in Budugh has this contrast been reanalysed and become NP-internal, with a contrast not only in the semantics of the transfer (originally marked not as a case but as a locational adverb, as the preverbs in Lezgian dialectal data have shown) but between permanent or transitory possession in NPs.

6. Conclusion

In Budugh, the original dedicated genitive case forms found in closely related Kryz has disappeared because of excessive allomorphy, and possessors are now consistently marked like recipients with a trivial dative=genitive syncretism. But while grammaticalization of Locative or Goal into Possessor is given as trivial in Heine and Kuteva (2002), an alienability split marked exclusively by different and non-dissymetric genitive cases is certainly not.
Two genitive-dative cases are now functioning synchronically to mark a prototypical alienability contrast (bodyparts, part-whole and kinship relation terms vs all others). The spatial contrast in vs ad is simultaneously preserved on verbal arguments and reinterpreted in terms of ‘sphère personnelle’ (Bally, 1926) when used in nominal dependencies.

The source for this nominal possessive alienability split is the differential (permanent vs non-permanent) recipient marking, another uncommon, but more substantially attested feature of many East-Caucasian languages.

The semantic drift from location ad to non-permanent recipient role is common and straightforward. Less self-evident is the process by which permanent recipients have come to take in locative-genitive syncretic marking. In fact, permanent recipients, like possessors, or for that matter like agents, are prototypical higher animates and the inessive case form is in most East-Caucasian languages left available to mark on these semantic roles by the fact that higher animates are not conceived as possible locations of the ‘in’ type.

Notes

1. In literary Lezgian this concrete notion is usually assumed by the postposition ppattav ‘near’, which is itself the Adessive form of a noun originally meaning ‘flank’, cf. HASPELMATH 1993.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SAP, intensifiers</th>
<th>‘son’, ‘dog’</th>
<th>‘man’, kinship</th>
<th>proper names, –ar plurals, sheep</th>
<th>animals</th>
<th>place</th>
<th>mass nouns, –bi plurals</th>
<th>objects</th>
<th>body parts</th>
<th>others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>-n/Ø/-b</td>
<td>-Ø/-y</td>
<td>-Ø</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>-a (e)</td>
<td>-Ø</td>
<td>-d/-rd/-l...</td>
<td>-Ø</td>
<td>-l, r, i</td>
<td>-c(i)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in</td>
<td>-Ø</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>+a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERG</td>
<td>Ø/-n/-r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>