

# On the formation of constituent questions in Karata

Jérémy Pasquereau, UMass-Amherst & Rashidat Khalidova, PSU (Russia)

April 16, 2016

## 1 Introduction

- Karata / Andic / Daghestanian
- Karata is spoken in 8 villages by approximately 10,000 people (Magomedova and Khalidova 2001)
- published material: grammatical sketch (Magomedbekova 1971), dictionary (Magomedova and Khalidova 2001)
- data come from the published material, fieldwork notes, and e-fieldwork



Figure 1: Andic languages in Daghestan

- In order to make a question in Karata, a Question particle/suffix (from now on Q-particle or Q) is needed (cf 1a and 1b)

(1) a. **hed-ol** gahała ida-b ?  
thing-Q do.INF COP-PTCP.N  
*What will you do?*

b. \***hede** gahała ida-b ?  
thing do.INF COP-PTCP.N

- Karata has 3 such Q-particles: *-(o)l(e)*, *-la*, *-di*
- I'm going to focus on *-(o)l(e)* in wh-questions
- One intriguing fact about Q is that it does not necessarily have to be on the wh-word (2b)

(2) a. **hed-ol** gahała ida-b ?  
thing-Q do.INF COP-PTCP.N  
*What will you do?*

b. **hede** gahała-**l** ida-b ?  
thing do.INF-Q COP-PTCP.N  
*What will you do?*

- Yet we will see that its placement is constrained ()

(3) \***hede** gahała id-**ole** ?  
thing do.INF COP-PTCP.N.Q

- A few words on the methodology

- E-fieldword: google doc, skype, whatsapp
- main informant: Rashidat Khalidova
- given the reduced number of informants, I try to make sure that judgements are replicable (i.e. for a given construction, I check it several times over a few different days)
- I also look into the corpus to see what constructions are attested but the corpus is small so only the presence of data is meaningful (as opposed to the absence of constructions)
- The grammars of related languages (mainly Godoberi, Kibrik (1996) and Bagvalal, Kibrik (2001)) have also been a guide

## 2 What are the rules that govern the placement of Q in constituent questions in Karata?

- Ingredients of a Karata wh-question:
  - *-(o)l(e)* (from now onwards `Q')
  - wh-word
  - main verb must be in the participial form (except in the future where the finite form is the one used)
- Karata has the following wh-words
 

– <i>hede</i> `what'	– <i>hinšda</i> `how'
– <i>heme</i> `who'	– <i>hinda</i> `when'
– <i>to</i> `who' <sup>1</sup>	– <i>hense</i> `why'
– <i>hinštob</i> `which'	– <i>heła</i> `why, what for'
– <i>hinge</i> `where/to where' <sup>2</sup>	– <i>heła</i> `what for'
– <i>hindir</i> `to where'	– <i>čami</i> `how much/many'
– <i>hingal</i> `from where'	– <i>čāc'e</i> `how many times'

### 2.1 Obligatory presence of Q

- It is not possible to ask a constituent question without Q (whether the verb is in the participial form 4b or not 4c)

- (4) a. men-a **hing-ol** ŕurmi geda idja-b ?  
 2SG-ERG where-Q life do.IPF COP-PTCP.N  
*Where do you live?*
- b. \*mena **hinge** ŕurmi geda idja-b ?  
 2SG-ERG where life do.IPF COP-PTCP.N
- c. \*mena **hinge** ŕurmi geda idja?  
 2SG-ERG where life do.IPF COP

### 2.2 Q is at the right edge of a constituent containing the wh-word

- Q must appear directly to the right of the wh-word or directly to the right of a phrase containing the wh-word

- (5) a. **hed-ol** gahała ida-b ?  
 thing-Q do.INF COP-PTCP.N  
*What will you do?*
- b. **hede** gahała-l ida-b ?  
 thing do.INF-Q COP-PTCP.N  
*What will you do?*

- but it is not the case that Q can appear to the right of any word in the constituent that contains the wh-word.

<sup>2</sup>There are two words for `who'. I haven't enquired fully into the difference between them. My elicitation so far suggests that in a suppletive paradigm: *heme* can only be in the absolutive, and all other cases are derived regularly from *to*. There is one irregular case with this form: the ergative is not the expected \**tol* but *toła*.

(6) a. \*mena **hinge** řurmi-l geda idja-b ?  
 2SG.ERG where life-Q do.IPF COP-PTCP.N

b. mena **hinge** řurmi geda-l idja-b ?  
 2SG.ERG where life do.IPF-Q COP-PTCP.M

*Where do you live?*

### 2.3 Q cannot be at the right edge of the matrix clause

- Q can never be at the right edge of a matrix clause

(7) a. **hed-ol** hořul dija bek-o-b ?  
 thing-Q DEM.M<sub>0</sub>.ERG 1SG<sub>0</sub>.DAT N.give-PF.PTCP-N

*What did he give me?*

b. \***hede** hořul dija bek-o-b-ol ?  
 thing DEM-M<sub>0</sub>-ERG 1SG<sub>0</sub>-DAT N.give-PF.PTCP-N-Q

- But if a clause is embedded, Q can take it as a complement

(8) [**hede** hořul inřja beke-l'e]-l idja-j hoj ?  
 thing DEM.M<sub>0</sub>.ERG LOG.F<sub>0</sub>.DAT N.give.PF-QUOT-Q COP-PTCP.F DEM.F

*She thinks that he gave her what?*

### 2.4 the wh-word may be contained inside an island iff Q is outside the island

- relative clause

(9) a. řumarja [[**hede** bal'idoj] jaře]-l l'ab-o-j  
 Omar.DAT thing N.wear.IPF.PTCP.F girl-Q love-PF.PTCP-F

*Omar loves the girl who is wearing what?*

b. řumarja [[**hede** bal'idoj]-ol jaře] l'ab-o-j  
 Omar.DAT thing N.wear.IPF.PTCP.F-Q girl love-PF.PTCP-F

*Omar loves the girl who is wearing what?*

c. \*řumarja [[**hed-ol** bal'idoj] jaře] l'abe  
 Omar.DAT thing-Q N.wear.IPF.PTCP.F girl love.PF

- antecedent of conditional

(10) a. [**hede** bo-libar]-ol men k'ās?  
 thing N.happen.COND-Q you call.FUT

*In which conditions should one call you? (lit. If what happens, one will call you?)*

b. \***[hed-ol bo-libar]** men k'ās?  
 thing-Q N.happen.COND you call.FUT

- rationale clause

(11) a. [**hede** gahaļa]-l men woġa-w ?  
 thing do.INF-Q 2SG M.come.PF.PTCP-M

*You came here to do what?*

b. \***[hed-ol gahaļa]** men woġa-w ?  
 thing-Q do.INF 2SG M.come.PF.PTCP-M

c. \***[hed-ol gahaļa]** men woġa ?  
 thing-Q do.INF 2SG M.come.PF

It does not look like this is due to a morphological incompatibility

- (12) a. [hede gahaḥa]-la men woḥa?  
 thing do.INF-Q<sub>2</sub> 2sg M.come.PF

*What have you come to do?*

- b. \* [hed-ola gahaḥa] men woḥa ?  
 thing-Q<sub>2</sub> do.INF 2sg M.come.PF

• time adverbial

- (13) a. men [heme hinir woḥala]-l χidi woʔ-ā-w ?  
 2SG person inside.ALL M.come.SPCVB-Q away M.go-PF.PTCP-M

*You went away when who came in?*

- b. \*men [hem-ol hinir woḥala] χidi woʔā?  
 2SG person-Q inside.ALL M.come.SPCVB away M.go.PF.PTCP-M

- c. \*men [hem-ol hinir woḥa-w-la] χidi woʔā?  
 2SG person-Q inside.ALL M.come-PTCP.M-SPCVB away M.go.PF.PTCP-M

## 2.5 Position of the Q-marked constituent: left of the main predicate

- (14) a. \* [q'amaṣ] hed-ol mena aḷi ? \*V O S  
 eat.FUT thing-Q 2SG.ERG tomorrow

*Intended: What will you eat tomorrow?*

- b. \*mena [q'amaṣ] hed-ol aḷi ? \*S V O

- c. \* [q'amaṣ] mena hed-ol aḷi ? \*V S O

- d. mena hed-ol [q'amaṣ] aḷi ? S O V

- e. hed-ol mena [q'amaṣ] aḷi ? O S V

• Those orders are possible in declaratives

- (15) a. [q'amaṣ] χink'a mena aḷi. V O S  
 eat.FUT khinkal 2SG.ERG tomorrow  
*You will eat khinkal tomorrow.*

- b. mena [q'amaṣ] χink'a aḷi. S V O

- c. [q'amaṣ] mena χink'a aḷi. V S O

- d. mena χink'a [q'amaṣ] aḷi. S O V

- e. χink'a mena [q'amaṣ] aḷi. O S V

• This pattern is confirmed by my (admittedly) small corpus:

Table 1: The pre-predicate position of Q-marked constituents in constituent questions

	constituent questions containing an overt predicate	of such sentences, those in which the Q-marked c. precedes the predicate
Texts 1971	14	14
Dictionary 2001	70	70

### Something special about the post-predicate position?

- One might think that the reason the Q-marked constituent cannot appear to the right of the verb is because it somehow cannot be to the right of it.
- One could imagine that the post-predicate position is reserved for nouns that have certain properties which wh-words/Q-marked constituents happen to lack
- It could be that only nouns interpreted as definites can follow the verb and since wh-words are indefinites they are not allowed there
- but indefinites are allowed to the right of the verb

(16) mena qamaš hede-bik'u.

2SG.ERG eat.FUT thing-INDEF

*I'll eat anything.*

- so it looks like Q-marked constituents need to be close to the left edge of the clause

Moreover the pre-Q-marked constituent position seems to be topical

- There is a tendency for the wh-phrase to be at the left edge of the question

Table 2: The initial position of wh-words in Karata wh-questions

	constituent containing and a second, non-predicate phrase	questions of these, those in which the wh-word is initial in the clause
Texts 1971	13	7
Dictionary 2001	67	57

- There is reason to think that the phrase preceding the wh-phrase is interpreted as a topic

(17) dandeteriĭl hadoŋašul bač'ē ida: men **henš-ol** galeč'-o-w ?

party<sub>0</sub>.GEN head.M<sub>0</sub>.ERG N.ask.PF COP 2SG why-Q speak.PF.NEG-PTCP-M

*The head of the meeting asked: why did you not speak?*

*Выдующий собрания спросил: ты почему не говорил?*

*(text 2 in Magomedbekova (1971))*

(18) duwa **hem-ol** L'ab-o-b?

2SG<sub>0</sub>.DAT who-Q love-PF.PTCP-N

*You, who do you love?*

*Ты кого любишь?*

*(Magomedova and Khalidova 2001)*

## TAKING STOCK

1. Q is obligatory in constituent questions
2. Q must be at the right edge of a constituent containing the wh-word
3. the constituent can vary in size:
  - (a) minimally it is the wh-word itself
  - (b) maximally it is the whole sentence (as seen in embedded constituent question)
4. BUT in matrix questions, Q cannot be at the right edge of the matrix clause

(19) Schematically:

a. [ ... [ ... wh-word ... ] -Q ... ]

b. \* [ ... [ ... wh-word ... ] ..... ] -Q

5. sometimes the minimal size of the constituent to which Q may be suffixed is constrained: islands
6. the Q-marked constituent/phrase must occur to the left of the predicate

## Digression

- one way of understanding those generalizations is as follows
- the Q-marked constituent must be as close as possible to the left edge of the clause
- in the case of a wh-word in an island, the only way for a Q-marked con-

stituent not to cross the island boundary and to be close to the left edge of the clause is for the Q-marked constituent to be the whole island itself

(20) Schematically:

- a. \* [ ... [ ... [ ... wh-word ... ]-Q ... ] ..... ]
- b. [ ... [ ... [ ... wh-word ... ] ..... ]-Q ... ]

## 2.6 How do you question NP's headed by P, D, and NP?

### 2.6.1 Straightforward case: PP's

- $\times \langle \text{wh-NP Q P} \rangle$ ,  $\checkmark \langle \text{wh-NP P Q} \rangle$  ( $\langle \rangle$  encode generalizations concerning linear order (not constituency))

- (21) a. bišdi **ɬo-k'el-ol** hudir ba?-a-maj ?  
 2PL who-COM-Q there.ALL H<sup>+</sup>.go-PF.PTCP-H<sup>+</sup>  
*Who did you go there with?*
- b. \*bišdi **ɬo-l-k'el** hudir ba?-a-maj ?  
 2PL who-Q-COM there.ALL H<sup>+</sup>.go-PF.PTCP-H<sup>+</sup>

- It could be that *-l* just cannot separate bound morphemes
- But even with morphologically separate postposition, Q cannot be suffixed to the complement of P, it has to be on the edge of PP

- (22) a. **ɬo-č'o** ka?a-**l** q̄<sup>w</sup>apa idja-b ?  
 who-TPL<sub>1</sub>[LOC] on-Q hat COP-PTCP.N  
*Who is the hat on?*
- b. #**ɬo-č'o-l** ka?a q̄<sup>w</sup>apa idja-b ?  
 who-TPL<sub>1</sub>[LOC]-Q on hat COP-PTCP.N

- Example b gets a # instead of \* because the string can be parsed in two ways because *ka?a* is both a postposition and an adverb
- The string is bad if you parse *ka?a* as a preposition
- But it is good if you parse it as an adverb (*č'o* is a case used to express possession)

- (23) **ɬo-č'o-l** ka?a q̄<sup>w</sup>apa idja-b ?  
 who-TPL<sub>1</sub>[LOC]-Q on hat COP-PTCP.N  
*Who has a hat on?*

- in conclusion:  $\checkmark \langle \text{wh-NP P} \rangle$ -Q

### 2.6.2 Not so straightforward cases

- $\checkmark \langle \text{wh-NP}_{\text{possessor}} \text{ Q NP}_{\text{possessed}} \rangle$ ,  $\checkmark \langle \text{wh-NP}_{\text{possessor}} \text{ NP}_{\text{possessed}} \text{ Q} \rangle$

- (24) a. **ɬob** χ<sup>w</sup>aj-**l** duk'el bahoda idja-b ?  
 who[GEN].N dog-Q 2SG.COM play-IPF.CVB COP-PTCP.N  
*Whose dog is playing with you?*
- b. **ɬob-ol** χ<sup>w</sup>aj duk'el bahoda idja-b ?  
 who[GEN].N-Q dog 2SG.COM play-IPF.CVB COP-PTCP.N  
*Whose dog is playing with you?*

- When possessor is separated from possessee, possessor must bear Q

- (25) a. **ɬob-ol** duk'el χ<sup>w</sup>aj bahoda idja-b ?  
 who.N-Q 2SG<sub>0</sub>.COM dog N.play.IPF COP-PTCP.N  
*Whose dog are you playing with?*
- b. \***ɬob** duk'el χ<sup>w</sup>aj-**l** bahoda idja-b ?  
 who.N 2SG<sub>0</sub>.COM dog-Q N.play.IPF COP-PTCP.N

- I think that we can conclude: ✓ [ **wh-NP**<sub>possessor</sub> NP<sub>possessed</sub> ]-Q
- There is reason to believe that NP<sub>possessed</sub> can be pronounced outside the constituent in general (i.e. it's not something that is proper to questions) (see below)

• ✓[D-Q NP], ✓[D NP]-Q

(26) a. **hinštob** qoča-**l** hošul Muhadja beḱ-o-b ?  
 which.N book-Q DEM.M<sub>0</sub>.ERG Muhad.DAT N.give-PF.PTCP-N

*Which book did he give Muhad?*

b. **hinštob-ol** qoča hošul Muhadja beḱ-o-b ?  
 which.N-Q book DEM.M<sub>0</sub>.ERG Muhad.DAT N.give-PF.PTCP-N

*Which book did he give Muhad?*

- there is evidence that D does not have to be linearly adjacent to NP.

(27) a. **čami** rešin-**ol** idja-b hošub ?  
 how\_many year-Q COP-PTCP.N DEM.M<sub>0</sub>[GEN].N

*How old is he?*

b. **čami-l** idja-b rešin hošub ?  
 how\_many-Q COP-PTCP.N year DEM.M<sub>0</sub>[GEN].N

*How old is he?*

c. **čami-l** hošub rešin idja-b ?  
 how\_many-Q DEM.M<sub>0</sub>[GEN].N year COP-PTCP.N

*How old is he?*

d. ?**čami-l** rešin idja-b hošub ?  
 how\_many-Q year COP-PTCP.N DEM.M<sub>0</sub>[GEN].N

*How old is he?*

- When D is separated from NP, D must bear Q.

(28) a. **čami-l** dub gordi idja-b ?  
 how\_many-Q 2SG[GEN].N dress COP-PTCP.N

*How many dresses do you have?*

b. \***čami** dub gordi-**l** idja-b ?  
 how\_many 2SG[GEN].N dress-Q COP-PTCP.N

- Can NP precede D when they're separated? Yes.

(29) a. qoča hošul **hinštob-ol** Muhadja beḱ-o-b ?  
 book DEM.M<sub>0</sub>.ERG which.N-Q Murad.DAT N.give-PF.PTCP-N

*Which book did he give to Murad?*

b. \*qoča-**l** hošul **hinštob** Muhadja beḱ-o-b ?  
 book-Q DEM.M<sub>0</sub>.ERG which.N-Q Murad.DAT N.give-PF.PTCP-N

### Digression

- it seems that:
  - (i) the fact that D can be separated from NP is related to the fact that D can bear Q
  - (ii) the fact that the possessor can be separated from the possessee is related to the fact that the possessor can bear Q
- in turn, those phenomena may be related to another phenomenon known in Andic languages as 'floating genitive' (Creissels 2013))
- note that the floating genitive story does not extend (at least straightforwardly) to the cases where NP appears separated from D (but I think 'floating D's' are attested in Karata (quantifiers): I just thought of this, I need to make sure)

- if 3 is analyzed as optional NP movement out of a constituent headed by D/possessorNP, then we would predict not only the place of Q (on either D/possessorNP or edge of constituent) but also the floating genitive cases
- we can summarize the fact as follows

- (30) a. [ NP P ]-Q  
 b. .... [ D NP ]-Q  
 .... [ D ... ]-Q NP  
 NP [ D .... ]-Q  
 c. .... [ possessor possessee ]-Q  
 .... [ possessor ..... ]-Q possessee  
 possessee [ possessor ..... ]-Q

## 2.7 An asymmetry between matrix and embedded questions

- in (31), the patient *χink'a`khinkal* sits between the wh-word and Q

- (31) ✓[wh-A P V]-Q<sup>3</sup>  
*łola χink'a gahał-a-1 idja-b ?*  
 who.ERG khinkal do.INF-Q COP-PTCP.N  
*Who will prepare khinkal?*

- In this section I want to show two things

1. it is not the case that any argument can sit between the wh-word and Q
2. there is an asymmetry between matrix and embedded questions

<sup>3</sup>This example has been judged acceptable repeatedly on different occasions. But the acceptability of this configuration is subject to variation nevertheless. More on that below.

### 2.7.1 Restriction on what can be between wh-word and Q (work in progress)

- in (), an agent cannot sit between a wh-P and Q

(32) ✗[wh-P A V]-Q

- a. \**hede hošul gahał-a-1 idja-b ?*  
 what DEM.M<sub>0</sub>.ERG do.INF-Q COP-PTCP.N  
*Intended: What will he prepare?*
- b. *hed-ol hošul gahał idja-b ?*  
 what-Q DEM.M<sub>0</sub>.ERG do.INF COP-PTCP.N  
*What will he prepare?*
- c. *hošul hede gahał-a-1 idja-b ?*  
 DEM.M<sub>0</sub>.ERG what do.INF-Q COP-PTCP.N  
*What will he prepare?*

- likewise, an oblique cannot sit between a wh-S and Q

(33) ✗[wh-S OBL V]-Q

- a. \**heme hošuq anduke-1 idja-b?*  
 who DEM.M<sub>0</sub>.TPL<sub>5</sub>.LOC hear.CVB-Q COP-PTCP.N
- b. *hem-ol hošuq anduke idjab?*  
 who DEM.M<sub>0</sub>.TPL<sub>5</sub>.LOC hear.CVB-Q COP-PTCP.N  
*Who listens to him?*
- c. *hošuq heme anduke-1 idjab?*  
 who DEM.M<sub>0</sub>.TPL<sub>5</sub>.LOC hear.CVB-Q COP-PTCP.N  
*Who listens to him?*



- however note that a P and a S can sit between a wh-oblique and Q

## (34) ✓[wh-OBL P V]-Q

mena **hinda** χink'a gahaḷa-1 idja-b?  
 you.ERG when khinkal make.INF-Q COP-PTCP.N  
*When will you make khinkal?*

## (35) ✓? [wh-OBL S V]-Q

**hindir** men woḡāḷa-1 idja-w?  
 where you M.go.INF-Q COP-PTCP.M  
*Where will you go?*

Actually I've sometimes gotten \* judgments on such constructions. Maybe I should refine my search to semantic roles.

## (36) Summary

- a. ✗[wh-NOM ERG/OBL V]-Q  
 b. ✓[wh-ERG/OBL NOM V]-Q

- But those restrictions do not hold in embedded questions!

## 2.7.2 Asymmetry between matrix and embedded questions

- We just saw that the configuration where an ERG argument or an oblique sits between a wh-S/wh-P and Q leads to unacceptability

## (37) ✗[wh-NOM ERG/OBL V]-Q

- However this does not hold in embedded clauses

(38) a. [hede hošul inḷja beke-ḷ'e]-1 idja-j hoj ?  
 thing DEM.M0.ERG LOG.F0.DAT N.give.PF-QUOT-Q COP-PTCP.F DEM.F  
*She thinks that he gave her what?*

b. men [heme hinir woḡala]-1 χidi woḡ-ā-w ?  
 2SG person inside.ALL M.come.SPCVB-Q away M.go-PF.PTCP-M  
*You went away when who came in?*

- Why this asymmetry? Here's an idea
- I think the asymmetry is due to a difference in the necessary size of the Q-marked constituent:
  - \* with embedded clauses, the Q-marked constituent is necessarily the whole embedded clause
  - \* but in non-embedded clauses, there is no such constraint: the Q-marked constituent can be as small as containing just the wh-word

## Digression

- Imagine that at some level of representation Karata has a basic word order and it is as in ()

(39) ...(wh-)ERG/OBL ...(wh-)NOM ...V ...

1. in non-embedded clauses
  - \* Of course, the Q-marked constituents can be as small as the wh-word themselves
  - \* If the question is **wh-ERG/OBL**, the next minimally bigger constituent is [wh-ERG/OBL NOM V]-Q
  - \* If the question is wh-NOM, the next minimally bigger constituent is [wh-NOM V]-Q, crucially it cannot be \*[wh-NOM ERG/OBL V]-Q
2. in embedded clauses, the minimal Q-marked constituent is the whole embedded clause

- this idea relies on the notion that Q-marked constituents are somehow pressured into being as small as possible (by default, i.e. in the absence of specific communicative pressure?)
- I think this would explain some variation I have encountered in non-embedded clauses with the configuration [**wh-A** P V]-Q
- indeed, constructions following this pattern are sometimes judged unacceptable ('artificial' in Rashidat Khalidova's words)
- this may have to do with this pressure to make the Q-marked constituent as small as possible and a solution is to pronounce P somewhere else so as to get P out of the way (i.e. P [**wh-A** V]-Q or [**wh-A** V]-Q P)

## 2.8 Constituent questions with multiple wh-words

- What happens with 2, 3 wh-words?

(40) With 2 wh-words

- a. [**ɬola**]-1 [**hed**]-ol bahaɬa idja-b?  
 who.ERG-Q what-Q N.buy.INF COP-PTCP.N  
*Who will buy what?*
- b. [**ɬola hed**]-ol bahaɬa idja-b?  
 who.ERG what-Q N.buy.INF COP-PTCP.N  
*Who will buy what?*
- c. [**ɬola hede bahaɬa**]-1 idja-b?  
 who.ERG what N.buy.INF-Q COP-PTCP.N  
*Who will buy what?*
- d. \* [**ɬola**]-1 [**hede bahaɬa**]-1 idja-b?  
 who.ERG-Q what N.buy.INF-Q COP-PTCP.N

(41) With 3 wh-words

- a. [**hinda**]-1 [**ɬola**]-1 [**hed**]-ol bekaɬa idja-b?  
 when-Q who.ERG-Q what-Q N.give.INF COP-PTCP.N  
*Who gave what when?*
- b. [**hinda ɬola**]-1 [**hed**]-ol bekaɬa idja-b?  
 when who.ERG-Q what-Q N.give.INF COP-PTCP.N  
*Who gave what when?*
- c. [**hinda**]-1 [**ɬola hed**]-ol bekaɬa idja-b?  
 when-Q who.ERG what-Q N.give.INF COP-PTCP.N  
*Who gave what when?*
- d. [**hinda ɬola hed**]-ol bekaɬa idja-b?  
 when who.ERG what-Q N.give.INF COP-PTCP.N  
*Who gave what when?*
- e. [**hinda ɬola hede bekaɬa**]-1 idja-b?  
 when who.ERG what N.give.INF-Q COP-PTCP.N  
*Who gave what when?*

## 3 Conclusion

- the placement of Q with respect to the wh-word is constrained
- and it is constrained in part by syntactic configurations that are known to block certain syntactic dependencies (e.g. islands)
- it turns out that the Karata facts greatly resemble what is found in Tlingit (Na Dene, Cable (2010))
- there are a few, minor differences which would be interesting to investigate (e.g. in Tlingit, Q cannot be at the right edge of the participle in relative clauses but it can in Karata)

– I wonder now to what extent those facts are similar to what is found in other Daghestanian languages ...

## References

- Cable, S. (2010). *The grammar of Q*. Oxford University Press.
- Creissels, D. (2013). Floating genitives and possessive framing in Northern Akhvakh. In A. Carlier and J.-C. Verstraete (Eds.), *The Genitive, Case and grammatical relations across languages*, pp. 333 -- 354. John Benjamins.
- Kibrik, A. E. (1996). *Godoberi*. Munchen, New Castle: Lincom Europa.
- Kibrik, A. E. e. (2001). *Bagvalinskij jazyk: grammatika, teksty, slovari (The Bagvalal language: grammar, texts, dictionaries)*. Moscow: Nas'ed'e.
- Magomedbekova, P. (1971). *Karatinskij jazyk: grammatičeskij očerk, teksty, slovar' (Karata: grammar sketch, texts, dictionary)*. Mecniera: Tbilisi.
- Magomedova, P. T. and R. S. Khalidova (2001). *Karatinsko-ruskij slovar' (Karata-Russian dictionary)*. Makhachkala: Dagestanskij Nauchnyj Centr Rossiskoj Akademii Nauk.

## -- APPENDIX --

### A The main uses of the Q-particles: overview

#### A.1 The particle *-(o)l(e)* also occurs in polar questions

– This morpheme can be on the verb or on the constituent the question is about

- (42) a.  $\bar{f}\bar{e}j$   $\bar{c}'ara\bar{s}-ol$  ?  
water drink.FUT-Q  
*Will you drink water ?*
- b.  $men$   $\bar{s}uh-one$  ?  
you be.tired-Q  
*Are you tired ?*
- c.  $ho\bar{j}ja-l$   $\bar{c}^w\bar{a}da$   $idja-b$ ,  $ho\check{s}ul$   $hede-bik'u$   $ke\bar{l}'\bar{e}-\bar{l}'e$  ?  
DEM.F<sub>0</sub>.DAT-Q think.IPF COP-N DEM.<sub>0</sub>.ERG thing\_INDEF speak[PF]-QUOT  
*Is it her who thinks that he said something ?*
- d. \* $ho\bar{j}ja-l$   $\bar{c}^w\bar{a}da$   $idja$ ,  $ho\check{s}ul$   $hede-bik'u$   $ke\bar{l}'\bar{e}-\bar{l}'e$  ?  
DEM.F<sub>0</sub>.DAT-Q think.IPF COP DEM.<sub>0</sub>.ERG thing\_INDEF speak[PF]-QUOT

#### A.2 The particle *-la*

- The particle *-la* has a very similar distribution to *-l*
- It is also used both in polar and constituent questions
- The only yet major difference with *-l* is that with *-la* the finite form of the verb is the only possibility

- (43) a. **hed-ola**  $sun\bar{i}$   $bo\bar{l}e$  ?  
thing-Q yesterday N.happen.PF  
*What happened yesterday?*
- b. \***hed-ola**  $sun\bar{i}$   $bo\bar{l}o-b$  ?  
thing-Q yesterday N.happen-PTCP.N

### A.3 The particle *-di*

– *-di* is the only particle allowed to form alternative questions

(44) suni Basirat-**di** Džahbat-**di** jeḫ<sup>w</sup>a-j ?  
 yesterday Basirat-Q Džahbat-Q F.come-PTCP-F

*Did Basirat or Džahbat come yesterday?*

– Another Q cannot be used in alternative questions

(45) \*suni Basirat-**ol** Džahbat-**ol** jeḫ<sup>w</sup>a-j ?  
 yesterday Basirat-Q Džahbat-Q F.come.PTCP-F

*Intended: Did Basirat or Džahbat come yesterday?*

– *-di* is also used with polar questions when the questioned constituent is focused

(46) suni men-**di** woḫa wuk'a-w ?  
 yesterday 2SG-Q M.come.PF.CVB M.be.PTCP-M

*Is it you who came yesterday?*