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Abstract

This paper offers an analysis of interrogative particles in Nakh-Daghestanian languages, covering form, function and position of these particles in a wide range of languages. I show which particles occur in various question types (i.e. polar questions, disjunctive polar questions, WH-questions, etc.) and also amply illustrate the principles according to which the particles are positioned in the clause. The paper is based not only on statements in grammars but primarily on data from natural texts.
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1 Introduction

This paper offers an analysis of interrogative particles in Nakh-Daghestanian languages, covering form, function and position of these particles in a wide range of languages from this understudied family. The topic covered in this paper has been neglected so far in the literature on Nakh-Daghestanian languages, though it has been mentioned in some recent grammars (cf. Kibrik 1999, 2001). Furthermore, Chapter 92A of the online version of the ”World Atlas of language structures” (Dryer 2011) is devoted to the use of interrogative particles in polar questions and includes nine Nakh-Daghestanian languages (Chechen, Ingush, Tsota-Tush, Hunzib, Tseb, Avar, Archi, Lezgian and Khinalugh). According to Dryer (2011), only Tsota-Tush and Avar have interrogative particles, which occur in the second position, but this claim cannot be maintained. My aim, therefore, is to provide data on a large number of Nakh-Daghestanian languages showing not only that many languages of this family have interrogative particles, and that they often do not have a fixed position but because of their function as focus markers occur on the focused constituent of the clause.

The Nakh-Daghestanian language family is one of the three indigenous language families of Caucasus. It consists of around 30-40 languages spoken in southern Russia (mainly Daghestan, Chechnya, and Ingushetia), in northern Azerbaijan, and in a few speech communities in Georgia. A simplified language tree is given in (1).
Nakh-Daghestanian (North-East Caucasian) (Kibrik 1996: xi)

Nakh branch
   Chechen, Ingush, Tsova-Tush (Batsbi)
Avar-Andic branch
   Avar
   Andic
      Andi, Botlikh, Godoberi, Karata, Akhvakh, Bagwalal, Tindi, Chamalal
Tsezic branch
   Tsez, Hinuq, Khwarshi (incl. Inkhoqwari), Bezhta, Hunzib,
Dargi branch
   Akusha/Standard Dargwa, Urakhi, Mugi, Tsudakhar, Gapshima-Butri, Mjurego-Gubden, Kadar, Muiri, Mehweb, Sirkhi, Amukh-Xuduc, Qunqi, Icari, Chirag, Kajtag, Kubachi, Ashti
Lak
Khinalug
Lezgic branch
   Udi, Archi, Lezgian, Agul, Tabasaran,Tsakhur, Rutul, Kryz, Budukh

Nakh-Daghestanian languages have a rich case inventory, and can be characterized as dependent-marking. They are usually head-final at the clausal as well as at the phrasal level, though word order at the clause level is rather free and influenced by information structure. The category of gender plays an important role in the syntax of almost all Nakh-Daghestanian languages because most verbs agree in gender (and number) with their absolutive arguments. In a few languages even adverbs, certain types of adjuncts, and some particles show agreement.

Nakh-Daghestanian languages have various types of discourse particles with emphatic and intensifying meaning. They also have a number of particles and enclitics serving more specific information-structural and partially grammatical purposes. The most important of these items are (i) coordinative particles with the meaning ‘and, also, too, even’, (ii) intensifying particles used, for instance, in reflexive constructions, and (iii) interrogative particles.

The aim of this paper is to give an account of the interrogative particles in Nakh-Daghestanian languages, based not only on statements in grammars but primarily on data from natural texts. For the published texts the source is given together with the examples. The Hinuq texts have been gathered during my own fieldwork in Daghestan; and the Bezhta texts represent the memories of Šeyx Ramazan, written down by himself at the end of the last century, translated and edited by Madžid Khalilov and glossed and analyzed by myself.¹

The structure of this paper is as follows: Section 2 describes the form and the function of interrogative particles. Section 3 discusses their usage in different question types (i.e. polar questions, disjunctive polar questions, WH-questions, etc.). In Section 4 the position and the scope properties of the particles are explored, and Section 5 contains the conclusion.

¹ Until now the Hinuq and Bezhta texts are not freely available, but they will be prepared for a future online publication.
The form and function of interrogative particles

Most, if not all, Nakh-Daghestanian languages have particles that express interrogative illocutionary force. Table 1 gives an overview of the particles in all languages for which the relevant information could be obtained. As can be seen in this table, the languages under investigation have between one and five particles. These particles occur as phonologically dependent enclitics. Frequently they have allomorphs whose distribution depends on the last phoneme of their host. Since not for all languages corpus data is available, in this and the following sections I will restrict myself largely to the analysis of Ingush, Avar, Bagvalal, Tsez, Hinuq, Bezhta, Archi, Tsakhur and Akusha Dargwa.

Table 1 needs a few comments. First of all, Bagvalal is typologically rather unusual because in this language two out the five interrogative particles show gender agreement with the addressee. In polar questions =išt'o: is used with male addressees (2a) and =išt'a: with female addressee. If the speaker does not want to choose one of the two variants s/he can employ the short form =iš(t) or the non-agreeing particles =ile and =ilaX. For the marking of WH-questions Bagvalal has again agreeing particles: = o: and =las:i:jo: for male addressees, =a:, =las:i:ja: for female addressees, and =i: (2b) and =las:i: as a kind of default form for all other cases. Judging from the Bagvalal corpus published in Kibrik (2001), the non-agreeing particles =ile and =i: are preferred over agreeing particles.

(2) Bagvalal (Kibrik 2001: 744)

a. [A conversation between two men]
   o- ba sami b-uh-a:la silla b-uk’a-b-o
   this-HPL together HPL-gather-CAUS.POT.INF reason N-be-N-CVB

   ek’wa=jisti:o:?
   be=Q-M
   ‘Was there a reason for them to gather together?’

b. [A teacher asks a pupil]
   a-b i:o-b=:=Rala halt’i?
   this-N who.OBL-GEN.N=Q=PRT work
   ‘Whose work is this?’

Second, in Tsova-Tush, the interrogative particle is followed by the person agreement suffixes when it is added to verbs, but it can also be attached to other parts of speech (Holisky & Gagua 1994: 208). Therefore, its status (enclitic vs. suffix) needs further investigation.

---

2 The basic generalization is: particles beginning with a consonant or consisting of a single consonant only are added to words ending in a vowel, and particles beginning with a vowel or having a CV structure are added to words ending in a consonant. There are a few exceptions to this rule, but in general Nakh-Daghestanian languages try to avoid consonant clusters, especially in word-final position.
Table 1: Interrogative particles in Nakh-Daghestanian languages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Interrogative particles</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tsova-Tush</td>
<td>-i (polar questions)</td>
<td>(Holisky &amp; Gagua 1994: 208-209)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chechen</td>
<td>=i: /=i (polar questions)</td>
<td>(Nichols 1994: 69-72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingush</td>
<td>=i: /=i (polar questions)</td>
<td>(Nichols 1994: 138-139)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Avar              | =iš: (polar questions, disjunctive polar questions);  
                     =(i)ja (tag questions, echo questions) 
                     =dai (rhetorical questions, embedded questions, disjunctive polar questions) | (Alekseev & Ataev 1998: 85-91)                |
| Bagvalal          | =išto: /=išta; /=ile; =ilaX (polar questions, disjunctive polar questions)  
                     =o: /=a: /=i; =lasi: (WH-questions, disjunctive polar questions) | (Daragan & Majsa 2001: 181,  
                                                                                         Kazenin & Skobelkin 2001: 444-456) |
| Godoberi          | =wu                                            | (Kazenin 1996: 227)                            |
| Tsez              | =(y/w)ä, -(y)ä                                | Arsen Abdulaliev, p.c.                        |
| Hinuq             | =(y)e,                                       | own field notes                               |
|                   | -i / -y / -(y)e / -iye                        |                                                |
| Khwarshi          | =(i/u)k                                        | (Khalilova 2009: 545-465)                     |
|                   | =q’e (mostly embedded questions, rhetorical questions) |                                                |
| Bezhta            | =d(i)                                         | (Kibrik & Testelec 2004: 293-294)             |
| Hunzib            | =i/=j (polar questions)                        | (van den Berg 1995)                          |
| Archi             | =(r)a (polar questions)                        | (Kibrik 1994: 361-362)                       |
|                   | =(r)i (disjunctive polar questions, partially in WH-questions) |                                                |
| Lezgian           | =n(i) (polar questions)                        | (Haspelmath 1993: 417-428)                   |
| Tsakhur           | =ne /=ni; =je/=ji;                             | (Kazenin 1999: 452-456)                      |
| Akusha Dargwa     | =w /=u (WH-questions, polar questions)         | (van den Berg 2001: 75-78)                   |
|                   | =a (WH-questions, disjunctive polar questions) |                                                |
| Icari Dargwa      | =u: /=V: (polar questions, disjunctive polar questions)  
                     =n(i) (WH-questions) | (Sumbateva & Mutalov 2003: 135-137)           |
| Lak               | =w (polar questions)                           | Rosa Eldarova, p.c.                           |

Third, the Tsezic languages Hinuq and Tsez have cognate interrogative suffixes in addition to interrogative enclitics. Suffixes and enclitics have partially divergent forms (Table 1). The suffixes obligatorily replace the witnessed past suffixes in all witnessed past tenses (3).
They are not used in any other tenses. For instance, in declarative sentences Tsez uses -s(i) for the witnessed past, but in questions this suffix is replaced by =-(iy)ä. Omitting the interrogative suffixes in questions with the tense/evidentiality meaning 'witnessed past' and replacing them with the normal suffixes otherwise used in declarative sentences leads to ungrammaticality.

(3) Tsez (Abdulaev & Abdullaev 2010: 274)

"best'alaw-ni kid y-exur-iyä?"=lin esir-no nesi-q.
step-DEF girl(II) II-kill=QUOT ask-UWPST he.OBL-AT

"y-exur-si"=lin=gon žawab nesä=n teλ-no
II-kill-WPST=QUOT=PRT answer 3sg.ERG=and give-UWPST

"(They) asked him “Did you kill the stepdaughter?” He answered “(I) killed her.”"

If the verb is negated, the interrogative suffix precedes the negation suffix in Hinuq, and in Tsez it is added to the negation suffix.

In some of the languages the occurrence of interrogative particles may be restricted by the verb form in the clause, that is, the particles exhibit co-occurrence restrictions in relationship to certain verb forms. As just mentioned, such restrictions are found in Tsez and Hinuq where interrogative particles cannot co-occur with overt suffixes of the witnessed past, but rather replace those suffixes. In Icari Dargwa the interrogative particles are incompatible with the third person affirmative marker ca- (Sumbatova & Matalov 2003: 135).

The five interrogative particles in Bagvalal not only differ in their meaning but also in their combinability with certain TAM forms, e.g. =iš tòa=/=iš toa cannot be used in clauses containing verbs in the synthetic future (Kazenin & Skobelkin 2001: 446). Additionally, in Bagvalal clauses with an interrogative particle the copula can be optionally admitted. This concerns not only copula clauses but clauses with periphrastic verb forms consisting of a non-finite lexical verb and a copula. In fact, it is common for Nakh-Daghestanian languages to omit the copula in interrogative copula clauses with present time reference and affirmative polarity.

In Tsakhur, there are restrictions on the co-occurrence of interrogative particles with the so-called 'non-attributive' form of the copula wo-GM, but not with the 'attributive form' wo-GM-on (Kazenin 1999: 453-454; GM=gender marker). Furthermore, in the same language the particles =ji: and =je: can co-occur only with 'non-attributive' synthetic verb forms.

The occurrence of interrogative particles in questions is in some languages by and large obligatory (e.g. in polar questions in Akusha Dargwa and Archi) and in other languages optional though preferred (e.g. Bagvalal, Tsakhur), depending also on the question type. Usually only one particle per clause is allowed. The only exceptions are disjunctive polar questions and occasionally questions formulated in the witnessed past in Tsez or Hinuq, which may contain not only the obligatory interrogative particle on the verb, but an additional interrogative particle on a focused constituent:

---

3 This is to say that in the other tenses the interrogative particles are optionally used, but do not replace the TAM morphology on the verb, e.g.

(i) Tsez (Abdulaev & Abdullaev 2010: 126)

"hoboy elu-λ o-r oz nesx-o=wa?"=lin
now 1pl.OBL-SPR-LAT army come-PRS=Q=QUOT

‘Is the army now coming towards us?’
Interrogative particles serve three functions: (i) they mark interrogative illocutionary force, and also tag questions and rhetorical questions, (ii) they serve as complementizers in embedded questions, and (iii) they express focus.

The first function is illustrated in examples (2a, b), (3) and (4) and in many more examples in this paper. Because of this function they are normally incompatible with markers of conflicting illocutionary force types such as imperative suffixes. The only exceptions are reported speech contexts that have a special illocutionary force marker in the quote. For instance, the sentence in (5) represents a polar question marked with the particle =jile on the verb in the quote. The same verb has the imperative verb form because the quote represents a command.

Nakh-Daghestanian languages frequently mark complement clauses by means of non-finite verb forms in the complement clause, e.g. infinitive, participles, converbs and masdars (i.e. deverbal nouns). The use of complementizers is rather uncommon, though attested. Yet embedded questions are often marked with question particles which in this case serve as complementizers. Two examples are found in (14b) and (15).

Interrogative particles are not only used in real questions with which the speaker asks the addressee for new information, but also in tag questions and rhetorical questions to which the speaker does not expect an answer. In Ingush, rhetorical questions and tag questions often contain not only the interrogative particle but also the emphatic particle my (6a), (7c) and sometimes the mirative pronoun hwuona, which normally signals that the information is unexpected but new and important to the hearer. The ubiquitous discourse interjection dili hwuona ‘you know’ is a rhetorical polar question in form with the literal translation ‘be=Q 2sg.DAT’ (Nichols 2011: 715). In Hinuq, tag questions are expressed by the negated form of the copula, gome (6b).4

4 The general form of the negated copula is gom. The form gome (gom plus interrogative enclitic ~e) is used in questions and tag questions, and also occasionally in declarative clauses. In the latter case it seems to have a greater emphasis than then normal form gom.
Some of the sentences containing gome are even hard to interpret as tag questions. Rather gome can be used as a general emphatic particle stressing the negative polarity of the sentence (7a). Similarly, in Tsez (7b) and Ingush (7c) interrogative particles occasionally occur in declarative clauses. Most probably they are, as in Hinuq, used only as focus marker, without turning the clause into a question. In both examples (7b) and (7c) they directly follow focus/emphatic particles. Judging from the grammar by Nichols (2011), this use of interrogative particles in Ingush is quite common.

In Hinuq, the interrogative particle is occasionally used in declarative disjunctive clauses instead of the loan disjunctions ya, yagi or yałuni (8). A similar multifunctionality of

---

(6) a. **Ingush (Nichols 2011: 503)**

\[ghalghaazhta\ jiq\’ie\ vaaxazh\ my\ vi=i\ hwo?\]

Ingush.PL.DAT among live.I.CVB EMPH be.V=Q 2sg

‘You (masc.) live among the Ingush after all, (don’t you?)’

b. **Hinuq**

\[hoboz\ hayloqo\ eser-ho\ gom=e,\ ‘me\ sira\ haw\ beł.’\]

now 3sg.M.AT ask-PRS be.NEG=Q 2sg why that sheep
tok=ı?’

sell=Q

‘Now (he) asks him, doesn’t he, “Why did you sell those sheep?”’

Some of the sentences containing gome are even hard to interpret as tag questions. Rather gome can be used as a general emphatic particle stressing the negative polarity of the sentence (7a). Similarly, in Tsez (7b) and Ingush (7c) interrogative particles occasionally occur in declarative clauses. Most probably they are, as in Hinuq, used only as focus marker, without turning the clause into a question. In both examples (7b) and (7c) they directly follow focus/emphatic particles. Judging from the grammar by Nichols (2011), this use of interrogative particles in Ingush is quite common.

(7) a. **Hinuq**

\[hag\ očerk-be\ ya\ bibliotekaza:\ ya\ q’uyža\ močaza:\ those\ report-PL\ or\ library.PL.IN\ or\ other.OBL\ place.PL.IN\]

\[r-aši-yo\ gom=e\]

NPL-find-ICVB be.NEG=Q

‘Those reports where NOT found in the libraries or in other places.’

b. **Tsez (Abdulaev & Abdullaev 2010: 100)**

\[nela-s\ kuc=kin=wa\ b-igu\ anu.\]

3sg.OBL-GEN form(III)=even=Q III-pretty be.NEG

‘She doesn’t even LOOK PRETTY.’

c. **Ingush (Nichols 2011: 266)**

[An elder, on how he tries to convince his younger relatives to pass on cultural traditions.]

\[dwa-vuo\ ha,\ jaax\ aaz,\ vai=m\ dwa-dolxazh\]

PREV-M.go 2sg say 1sg.ERG 1pl.INCL=FOC PREV-PL.go.CV

\[my\ dii\ EMPH\ D.AUX.Q\]

‘You’ll leave (=die), I tell them, and we (=my generation) are already going (=dying).’

In Hinuq, the interrogative particle is occasionally used in declarative disjunctive clauses instead of the loan disjunctions ya, yagi or yałuni (8). A similar multifunctionality of
interrogative particles covering polar and WH-questions as well as in declarative disjunctions and some other contexts is also attested in other languages (e.g. Japanese and Malayalam, see Slade 2011: 2). Slade explains the multifunctionality through a certain semantic similarity, because all these contexts involve alternatives. In disjunctions alternatives are expressed. Similarly, focusing a constituent at the same time implies that there are alternatives to the focused referent. WH-words can be analyzed as denoting sets of alternative referents, and polar questions have two alternative answers.

(8) Hinuq
\[
\begin{array}{llllllll}
\text{o̱̱ra}=\text{ye} & \text{be̱̱ra}=\text{ye} & \text{de} & \text{gola} & \text{tok} & b\text{-aq}'e\text{-s} \\
\text{seven.OBL}=\text{Q} & \text{eight.OBL}=\text{Q} & 1\text{sg} & \text{be.PTCP} & \text{electricity(III)} & \text{III-come-WPST} \\
\end{array}
\]
\text{a̱̱l\text{-a-r}}
\text{village-IN-LAT}

‘When I was in the seventh or eighth grade, electricity came to the village.’

Interrogative particles added to other than verbal constituents mark argument focus. They occasionally can co-occur with other argument focus markers. For instance, in Bezhta the focus enclitic =zu can be attached to the same item as the interrogative particle in the order =FOC=Q (9a), or it can be encliticized to the WH-word and the focus particle is attached to a different item which is emphasized (9b).

(9) Bezhta
a. \text{ungo=zu=d} \text{di\text{-}qa\text{-}s} \text{holo dena=na} \text{y\text{-}ayo\text{-}s}?
   \text{really=}\text{FOC=}\text{Q} \text{1sg.OBL\text{-}AT\text{-}ABL} \text{2sg.f back=}\text{and} \text{II\text{-}take\text{-}PRS}
   ‘Do you really take her away from me?’

b. ‘\text{lo\text{-}qa=d} \text{wodi\text{-}ʔ} \text{sid=zu} \text{zamalli\text{-}ʔ}’
   \text{who.OBL\text{-}AT=Q} \text{day.OBL\text{-}IN} \text{one=}\text{FOC} \text{time.OBL\text{-}IN}
   \text{giyā\text{e}\text{-}šʔ?’=λo}
   \text{look.II\text{-}PRS=}\text{QUOT}
   ‘At whom do you look daily at ONE AND THE SAME time?’

In contrast, Tsakhur does not allow the co-occurrence of interrogative particles and other focus particles in one and the same clause (Kazenin 1999: 587).

3 Interrogative particles in various question types

All languages make at least use of interrogative particles in simple polar questions and disjunctive polar questions, but some of the languages use them also in WH-questions. It is possible to formulate two implicational hierarchies between the question types:

1. All those languages that have a specialized particle reserved for WH-questions also have another particle for polar questions. The reverse does not hold, i.e. the existence of
an interrogative particle reserved for polar questions does not imply the existence of a further particle used for WH-questions.

2. WH-questions > disjunctive polar questions > polar questions
This hierarchy reads like this: all languages that mark a question type on this hierarchy by using one or more particles also mark all other question types to the right by the same or other particle(s).

Languages with particles used only in polar questions are the Nakh languages (Tsova-Tush, Chechen, and Ingush), Avar, Bagvalal, Hunzib (10a), Archi, Lezgian (10b), Akusha Dargwa, and Icari Dargwa.

(10) a. Hunzib (van den Berg 1993: 273)
y-êƛ′e-çò=j bolu-u mə?
II-go-PRS=Q 3sg.M.OBL-DAT 2sg‘Are you going with him?’

b. Lezgian (Babaliyeva: 96)
in sirü ava-s=ni, in čpp.i-n ada-n, xazyayin.di-n?
this flock be-NEG=Q this REFL-GEN this-GEN chief-GEN
‘This flock, isn’t it his, the chief’s?’

I have found only one language with a particle exclusively reserved for WH-questions, namely Icari Dargwa (11). This language has an interrogative enclitic =ni that does not occur in polar or disjunctive polar questions, but only in questions containing a WH-word.

(11) Icari Dargwa (Sumbatova & Mutalov 2001: 208)
ča b-ik’=an=ni it-i-j?
who N-say.IPFV-OBLG=Q this-OBL-SPR.LAT
‘What was his name?’

A number of languages have particles used in WH-questions and disjunctive polar questions, for example Bagvalal and Archi (12). I treat disjunctive polar questions as a separate question type because just like normal polar questions they do not contain a WH-word. But like WH-questions they require a ‘content answer’; a simple ‘yes/no’ answer is not possible. Therefore, they are recurrently marked similarly to WH-questions. For instance, Archi that has two interrogative particles =ra and =ri. The particle =ra is reserved for simple polar questions, and =ri marks disjunctive polar questions (12a) and optionally WH-questions lacking a verb (12b).

(12) Archi5 (6.051)
a. “was bellī qert-’er-ma-ši=ri l’an” bo-li
2sg.DAT spade.ERG dig-IPFV-LOC.CVB-ALL=Q want say.PFV-EVID

5 All Archi examples are from the Archi online corpus that can be found at http://www.philol.msu.ru/~languedoc/rus/archi/corpus.php. The reference number of the sentence in the online corpus is given in parenthesis.
“muk:ulli e<r>l’u-r-ma-ši=ri l’an?” bo-li
broom.ERG <IPFV>sweep-IPFV-LOC.CVB-ALL=Q want say.PFV-EVID
“Do you want to where the spade digs or to where the broom sweeps?” they said.

b. “MallaNasurřin” bo-li jeb adam-čaj “un daši=ri?”
Malla Nasurtin say.PFV-EVID this.PL person-PL-ERG 2sg where=Q
“Mulla Nasredin”, said the people, “where are you going?”

Another example of the similarity of disjunctive polar questions and WH-questions is provided by Akusha Dargwa that has a particle =a occurring in WH-questions (13a) and in disjunctive polar questions (13b).

(13) a. Akusha Dargwa (van den Berg 2001: 192)
ħuni it=ħeli se b-ir-id=a?
2sg.ERG this=when what N-do-FUT2=Q
‘What will you do then?’

b. Akusha Dargwa (van den Berg 2001: 202)
b-erk-un=a=ra it-d-a-ni di-la pulaw
N-eat-AOR=Q=and that-NPL-OB-ERG 1sg.OBL-GEN pilaf
he-b-erk-un=a=ra?
NEG-N-eat-AOR=Q=and
‘Will they have eaten my pilaf or won’t they?’

Avar has a particular rich inventory of interrogative particles. Apart from one particle used in polar questions, there is a particle =ja/=ija occurring as an enclitic or a phonologically free word in tag and echo questions, and a particle =daj for rhetorical (14a) and embedded questions (14b), and occasionally for disjunctive polar questions.

(14) a. Avar (Akhlakov & Khalilov 1976: 16)
[A fool is posing a rhetorical question to his king]
‘he-b mexal dir ſ:ib=daj b-uk’-ina?’=jan
this-N time.IN 1sg.GEN what=Q N-be-FUT=QUOT
‘What would I become during this time?’

b. Avar (Charachidzé 1981)
Budaŋ urv-ule-w w-uго [ki-sa=daj b-ač’-ara-b]
Budagh think-PTCP-M M-be where-ABL=Q N-come-PTCP-N
hab nakk’]
this cloud
‘Budagh thought, where this cloud might come from.’

In Nakh-Daghestanian languages there is no clear-cut distinction between direct and indirect speech (cf. Aikhenvald 2008). All verb forms occurring in independent main clauses can normally also be used in reported speech. Consequently, all interrogative particles freely occur
in quotes of reported speech. Furthermore, they also mark embedded interrogatives in various types of complement clauses with matrix verbs such as ‘know’, ‘think’, ‘care’, etc. (14b), (15).

(15) Bezhta

\[ huli \ O\-u\gamma\-yo=d \ O\-u\gamma\-e\?e\=di \] hollos uryel zuq \?-e\?e\=sh

3sg.M 1-die-WPST=Q 1-die-WPST.NEG=Q 3pl.GEN sorrow be-WPST.NEG

hollo biloqan-la;l these.OBL hunter-OBL.PL-DAT

‘The hunters did not care whether he died or not.’

Though none of the investigated languages has an interrogative particle exclusively reserved for embedded questions, Khwarshi and Avar have in addition to their normal particles other particles predominantly used in embedded questions. Thus, the Khwarshi particle \(=q’e\) can occur in regular questions just as the particle \(=(i/u)k\) (Khalilova 2009: 454ff.). However, corpus data from Khalilova (p.c.) makes it clear that the latter is preferred in ordinary questions whereas \(=q’e\) primarily occurs in embedded and rhetorical questions.

It is probably not due to chance that in Avar and Khwarshi embedded questions and rhetorical questions are marked alike and normal questions are marked differently. In contrast to normal questions, embedded questions and rhetorical questions do not require an answer from the addressee, that is, they do not have the illocutionary force of questions, but exhibit at most structural similarities with questions.

4 Position and scope properties of interrogative particles in questions

Interrogative particles usually occur on the focused constituent. In simple polar questions this is commonly the verb (cf. (2), (3), (4a, b), (6a), (10a, b)), but some languages such as Hinuq, Tsez, Bezhta, Bagvalal (16a) and Tsakhur (16b) also allow interrogative particles to attach to other constituents if these represent the focus of the question. These constituents must precede the verb. This amounts to a general rule on the placement of interrogative particles in polar as well as in WH-questions: they are either added to the verb or to another item which obligatorily precedes the verb.

(16) a. Bagvalal (Kibrik 2001: 758)

[A: We do not have a place (to sit for you). B answers:]

den he\l’i “istol=la q’o\=sh:ta=la=jle bi\=sh:di-b

1sg.ERG say table=and chair=and=Q 2pl-GEN

wo\=c’-u-b?

be.NEG-PTCP-N

‘I said, “Don’t you have A TABLE AND A CHAIR?”’
b. Tsakhur (Kibrik 1999: 805)

\[ Xizan \ jiq\-'ba=ne \ wo-b-na? \]

family(III) heavy-ADV.III=Q be-III-AA

‘Do you have a LARGE (lit. ‘heavy’) family?’

As can be seen in example (16b), in Tsakhur it is allowed to add the interrogative particle to the modifier in a phrase if it is the modifier which is focused. In Hinuq, Tsez, Bezhta, Avar and Bagvalal this is also possible, but Bagvalal makes the additional requirement that the modifier must be in the absolutive case (Kazenin & Skobelkin 2001: 445). In Tsova-Tush, the focusing of a modifier within a noun phrase by means of the interrogative particle is generally not allowed (Holisky & Gagua 1994: 208-209). For the other languages this question does not apply (e.g. the Ingush and the Akusha Dargwa interrogative particles are only attached to verbs) or the relevant data is lacking.

All examples of polar interrogatives so far discussed in this paper contain particles on the verb (cf. (2), (3), (4a, b), (6a), (10a, b)) or in the second position (16a, b). However, this does not need to be the case. Though there is a clear tendency to encliticize interrogative particles to the first constituent if they are not encliticized to the verb, it is possible to find counterexamples in Hinuq, Tsez, Bezhta, Avar, Bagvalal (in the latter language at least in verbless clauses) and in Tsakhur (with the particle =je/=ji):


\[ wahr, \ he-b \ hed\'an \ ujesl \ kkeze \ kkara-b \ zo-yi\=s: \]

aha this-N this.much thought fall.INF fall-PTCP-N thing=Q

\[ b-uge-b?\]”

N=be.PTCP-N

‘“Aha, therefore you are so thoughtful?” said the guest.’

b. Tsakhur (Kibrik 1999: 821)

\[ jis\,\jej-ra \ ham-na \ istar \ balkan-i\,\=li\,:=xe \]

old-ADV.II this-AA bride(II) horse-OBL-SPR=Q=HAB

\[ qaje\,:l\,\=e \ mislesh\,-b-i\=s\,-e? \]

bring-IPFV Mishlesh-PL-OBL.PL-ERG

‘In the old times the people from Mishlesh brought the bride on a horse?’

In disjunctive polar questions, the constituents that are in focus take the particles. If the disjunctive propositions are fully-fledged clauses then the particles occur on the verbs (12a), (13b), but in case of nominal or adjectival or other disjuncts the particles are attached to the respective words. For example, in (18a) the interrogative particles are attached to the two contrasted adjectives that make up the focus part of the disjunctive question. In the following example (18b) two genitive modifiers are contrasted, and the particles follow the modifiers, not the head noun \textit{hält}i ‘work’.
(18) a. Tsakhur (Kibrik 1999: 830)

wa-k’le hama-na na’Xo-b=e: Goːʒ-e, jug-un=e: kar
2sg.OBL-AFF this.III-AA how-III=Q see.III-IPFV good-A=Q thing(IV)

pis-in=eː?
bad-A=Q
‘How do you see it (i.e. the fact that the Tsakhur language has gained some attention)? Is it a GOOD or a BAD thing?’

b. Bezhta

hodo hält’i malaik-laːs=di gey, yana do=na
this work angel-OBL.PL-GEN=Q be or 1sg=and

maxsallil Ø-owax-na šayt’anlaːs=di b-aq-iyö?
joke.LAT 1-keep.PL-CVB devil.PL-GEN=Q III-happen-WPST
‘Is this an ANGEL’S work, or a DEVIL’s, making a joke with me?’

In WH-questions the particles are encliticized to the head of the interrogative phrase, which can be a WH-word or another word, or to the verb. In Archi, and Akusha Dargwa (13a) only verbs as hosts for the particles are allowed,6 and Hinuq and Tsez require interrogative suffixes on verbs with the tense/evidentiality value ‘witnessed past’.

In the languages that allow non-verbal hosts there are various possibilities for placing the enclitics, though WH-phrases are the preferred hosts. If the interrogative phrase consist of a single WH-word such as ‘when?’, ‘why?’ or ‘who?’ the particle is directly attached to the WH-word itself (2b). If, in contrast, the interrogative phrase is more complex, e.g. ‘Which X?’ or ‘How much X?’, then there are in principle two possibilities: (i) the particle is encliticized to the leftmost element of the interrogative phrase, which is usually the head if the interrogative phrase is continuous (19a), or (ii) the particle is encliticized to the WH-word if the interrogative phrase is discontinuous, e.g. if the head is separated from the WH-word by other material (19b). Thus, in (19a) the head of the interrogative phrase, suk’o ‘person’, directly follows the WH-word la ‘how many’ and bears the particle. This example can be contrasted with (19b), in which the head suk’o is separated from the WH-word la by the copula gey (and the modifier becêdab ‘rich’). If only an adjectival modifier intervenes between the WH-word and the head then the particle nevertheless occurs on the head since the interrogative phrase is still continuous.

(19) Bezhta

a. [la suk’o]=d gey y-ıįq-aļ žo găč’el
how many person=Q be IV-eat-INF thing(IV) be.CV.B.NEG

mähäː-ƛ’a b-ok’-da-ba-s?
yard.PL.OBL-SPR HPL-demand-ANTIP-PL-PTCP
‘How many persons are there without anything to eat, begging in the yards?’

6 Nevertheless, Akusha Dargwa and Archi have verbless WH-questions in which the WH-words function as the enclitic host (12b).
b. \( la=d \) \( \text{gey bečedab su}k'o \ šahar-ba-?? \)
how.many=\( Q \) be rich person town-OBL-IN
‘How many rich persons are there in town?’

Things get more complicated if the head has an additional genitive modifier. The unmarked order in the genitive phrase is genitive noun - head noun. If this order is kept then the WH-word and the genitive precede the head to which the interrogative particle attaches. But it is also possible to change the order of genitive and head. Normally, such an order is reserved for contrastively interpreted genitives (Testelec 1998, see also the Bezhta example (18b)). In this case, the interrogative particle is added to the genitive. Both variants can be illustrated by the following sentences, which basically have the same meaning.

\textbf{(20)}

\begin{enumerate}
\item [a.] Tsakhur (Kibrik 1999: 817)
  [One sack of flour costs 100.000 rubles.]
  \[ xule-b-le \] \( Xo'j-na \) \( \text{maşık'}=ne \) \( \text{dawat-b-işi-s} \)
  how.many-III-CARD flour-OBL-GEN sack=\( Q \) wedding-PL-OBL.PL-DAT
  \textit{hawajk'an-na?}
  go.\textsc{III}IPFV-AA
  ‘How many sacks of flour go away for a wedding?’

\item [b.] Tsakhur (Kibrik 1999)
  [Nowadays it is very difficult to feed a family.]
  \[ xule-b-le \] \( \text{maşık'} \) \( Xo'j-na=ne \) \( q'^idim-i-s \)
  how.many-III-CARD sack(\text{III}) flour-OBL-GEN=\( Q \) winter-OBL-DAT
  \textit{was \( w-ukːan? \)}
  2sg.DAT III-need.IPFV
  ‘How many sacks of flour do you need for the winter?’
\end{enumerate}

The interrogative phrase can be even longer and more complicated. This is the case in the following Bezhta example (21); the interrogative phrase has the form of a relative clause. The relative clause contains the WH-word and the interrogative particle is encliticized to the head of the relative clause, \( žo \) ‘thing’, which functions at the same time as the head of the interrogative phrase.

\textbf{(21)}

\begin{verbatim}
Bezhta
[nito-la zamal-li-? y-aq-iyi]\( žo=d \) \( \text{gey wahlι?} \)
when-GEN time-OBL-IN IV-happen-PTCP thing(IV)=\( Q \) be this
‘At which time did this happen? (lit. ‘A thing that happened at which time is this?’)
\end{verbatim}
5 Conclusion

Most if not all the Nakh-Daghestanian languages have interrogative particles, but the languages differ considerably in the use they make of these particles. All languages, for which those particles are attested, use them at least in polar questions, but the extent to which they are used in other question types such as WH-questions, tag questions, embedded questions and rhetorical questions differs from language to language. Similarly, in all languages it is possible to encliticize the particles to the verb, but only in a few languages such as Chechen, Ingush, Akusha Dargwa and Archi the host is, at least in questions containing a verb, the only admissible host. I have also shown that, contrary to what has been stated in the literature, the second position is a common, but not the only possible position of interrogative particles in polar question. Table 2 summarizes selected properties of interrogative particles in some Nakh-Daghestanian languages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>optional / obligatory</th>
<th>host</th>
<th>position of non-verbal host</th>
<th>combination with other focus particles</th>
<th>occurrence in declaratives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Archi</td>
<td>obligatory in polar questions</td>
<td>verb (WH-word only in verb-less clauses)</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>no corpus examples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsakhur</td>
<td>optional, but frequent</td>
<td>verb or other</td>
<td>before verb</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no corpus examples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akusha Dargwa</td>
<td>obligatory</td>
<td>verb (WH-word only in verb-less clauses)</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>no corpus examples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avar (=iš)</td>
<td>obligatory</td>
<td>verb or other</td>
<td>before verb</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no corpus examples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bagvalal</td>
<td>optional, but frequent</td>
<td>verb or other</td>
<td>before verb</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>no corpus examples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinuq</td>
<td>optional</td>
<td>verb or other</td>
<td>before verb</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingush</td>
<td>optional</td>
<td>verb</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Some properties of interrogative particles

The aim of this paper was to give an overview of this rather neglected grammatical phenomenon, but in order to cover this topic more thoroughly case studies of individual languages are needed as can be easily concluded from the question marks in the table.
Abbreviations

I-V gender affixes, A attributive gender IV, AA attributive, other genders, ABL ablative, ADV adverbial representation, AFF affective, ALL allative, ANTIP antipassive, AOR aorist, AT location ‘at, by’, AUX auxiliary, CARD cardinal numeral, CAUS causative, CVB convertor, D gender marker, DAT dative, DEF definite, EMPH emphatic, ERG ergative, EVI evidential, F feminine, FOC focus, FUT future, GEN genitive, GM gender marker, HAB habitual, HPL human plural, ICVB imperfective convertor, IMP imperative, IN location ‘in’, INCL inclusive, INF infinitive, IPFV imperfective, LAT lative, LOC locative, M masculine, N neuter, NEG negation, NPL neuter plural, OBL oblique stem, OBLG obligative, PFV perfective, PL plural, POT potential, PREV preverb, PRS present, PRT particle, PTCP participle, Q interrogative particle, QUOT quotative, REFLEX reflexive, SG singular, SPR location ‘on’, UWPST unwitnessed past, WPST witnessed past
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