Affixation within affixation in Andi

Steven Kaye
Surrey Morphology Group
stevenjkaye@gmail.com

This paper presents a micromorphological approach to the formation of the *affective case* in the nominal paradigm of Andi, a Nakh-Dagestanian language of Russia. Specifically, I will suggest that the morphology of this case form is most naturally taken to involve a single inflectional affix which is itself internally complex – consisting of two sub-units which combine in order to stand in paradigmatic opposition to other, structurally simple case affixes. The behaviour of the affective case is noteworthy in both morphological and syntactic terms, in fact, but it is far from isolated in the context of Andi and the Nakh-Dagestanian family more widely. Setting it in this context, I will justify the micromorphological account of this case form and make some suggestions on the diachronic developments which gave rise to the affixation-within-affixation that we observe in the Andi affective today.

The form involved, and its most distinctive morphosyntactic characteristics, can be seen in sentences (1a-b), where the glossing is taken from the original publication. As illustrated here, the affective case is used in Andi for the experiencer subject of certain verbs of emotion and cognition (among other functions); and the suffix realizing it shows sensitivity to the gender and number of the clause's absolutive argument. Hence the formal distinction between *Aminatiwo* in (1a), agreeing with gender I (masculine) *ima* 'father', and *Aminatijo* in (1b), agreeing with gender II (feminine) *baba* 'mother'. Andi has five genders: in Kaye (2023) the corresponding affective case markers are presented as (I) *-wo*, (II) *-jo*, (III, IV) *-bo*, (V) *-ro* (for simplicity, only singular forms are given here).

(1) a.	Aminati-**wo**	en-ƛi=gu	ima	ʒiʔ-e
	Aminat(II).SG.OBL-**AFF.I**	LOG.OBL-GEN=EMPH	father(I)[SG.ABS]	love-HAB
	'Aminat loves her father.'			
b.	Aminati-**jo**	en-ƛi=gu	baba	ʒiʔ-e
	Aminat(II).SG.OBL-**AFF.II**	LOG.OBL-GEN=EMPH	mother(II)[SG.ABS]	love-HAB
	'Aminat loves her mother.' (Kaye 2023: 52)			

Agreement for gender-number is widespread within Andi grammar (as generally across the family); but in most other circumstances it involves only an opposition between the four consonantal affixes *w j b r*, distributed over genders exactly as they are in the affective suffixes given above. That is, the affective case does not make use of an entirely novel set of suffixes to realize agreement: instead, the form required *always* consists of the expected agreement consonant followed by *o*. Seen in that light, the glosses above, which attribute gender-number and case simultaneously to a suffix taken as a whole, miss a generalization: the agreeing affective case suffix falls neatly into two parts, the consonant and the vowel, and only the former is responsible for agreement.

At the same time, however, the C+*o* sequence undoubtedly does operate as a unit: taken together it distinguishes the affective from other 'core' (i.e. non-spatial) case forms of the noun, which are marked by formally indivisible suffixes, e.g. ergative *Aminati-di*, dative *Aminati-j*. The vowel *o* by itself, in the absence of the agreement consonant, is never used to encode affective case. In all, then, the suffixes *-wo*, *-jo* seen above could be more accurately represented as *-‹w›o*, *-‹j›o*, instantiating a general suffixal template *-‹GN›o* in which the formative *o* brings with it a slot that must be filled by the specific gender-number marking affix required by the syntactic context. This is reminiscent of the internally complex attributive

prefix of Noon (Soukka 2010), consisting of a class marker + prefixal formative *i-*, which is given pride of place at the start of Stump's (2017) article inaugurating 'micromorphology'.

Strikingly, the gender-number affix on its own already plays a separate role in core case inflection, as it constitutes one way of forming the genitive case. While most nouns form their genitive by means of a suffix *-ƛi* (e.g. *Aminati-ƛi* 'Aminat's'), those belonging to gender I attach the agreement consonant instead (e.g. *Ali-GN* 'Ali's'), which is then sensitive to the gender-number of the head noun modified by the genitive expression. Formally, then, the affective case form of a masculine noun such as *Ali* consists of its genitive form followed by the vowel *o*. However, I will demonstrate that it is hard to support a synchronic analysis whereby the affective is derived secondarily from the genitive by the addition of a further suffix on an already suffixed case form (as if *-GN* > *-GN-o*): no evidence is found of any special relationship between these two core cases, and as just observed, non-masculine nouns do not possess the required genitive in *-GN* in the first place. Thus the facts of Andi invite us to adopt the micromorphological approach, whereby a single inflectional suffix is structurally relevant at the level of the core case paradigm but in turn recognizably consists of two distinct, smaller affixes combined.

What is more, the affective case marker is not alone in Andi in showing this behaviour. As a formal parallel to *-‹GN›o* we find an agreeing suffix *-‹GN›a* which characterizes numerous adverbs, commonly but not exclusively spatial in meaning, e.g. *ło-‹GN›a* 'upwards', *log-‹GN›a* 'downwards', *hud-‹GN›a* 'thither' (Salimov 2010: 213). A micromorphological analysis again suggests itself here. However, to finish on a diachronic note, I propose that the existence of an internally complex adverbial suffix *-‹GN›a* alongside an internally complex case suffix *-‹GN›o* is no coincidence. Within nominal inflection itself, specifically among the spatial case suffixes, we find two further pairings which likewise involve an opposition between final *a* and final *o*, namely (SUPER) *-la/-lo* 'on/onto' and (AD) *-χa/-χo* 'at/to', as seen in Table 1:

Table 1. The *a/o* opposition in the SUPER and AD spatial series (Salimov 2010: 105)

	ESSIVE (location)	LATIVE (movement to)	ELATIVE (movement from)
SUPER ('on')	**-la**	**-lo**	-lakːu
AD ('at, by')	**-χa**	**-χo**	-χakːu

Adducing evidence for conservative spatial functions of the affective in Andi against the background of broader usage of the *GN* agreement consonant in spatial inflection across the family (cf. Popova 2023), I suggest that what are now the Andi adverb suffix *-‹GN›a* and case suffix *-‹GN›o* historically stood in a regular morphological relationship, belonging to a third spatial case series that patterned with those seen in Table 1. On this basis I propose a diachronic pathway by which the contemporary Andi situation described above could have emerged out of the simple concatenation of spatial suffixes.

References

Kaye, Steven (2023). Agreement between arguments in Andi. In: M. Chumakina, O. Bond, S. Kaye (eds), *Agreement beyond the verb: Unusual targets, unexpected domains.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 48–90.

Popova, Rita (2023). Gender agreement slot in nominal inflectional paradigms (Maps & Data). In: M. Daniel et al. (eds), *Typological Atlas of the Languages of Daghestan (TALD), v 2.0.0*. Moscow: Linguistic Convergence Laboratory, NRU HSE.

Salimov, Xangerej (2010). *Gagatlinskij govor andijskogo jazyka* [The Gagatl variety of Andi]. Makhachkala: IJaLI.

Soukka, Maria (2000). *A descriptive grammar of Noon: A Cangin language of Senegal.* Munich: LINCOM Europa.

Stump, Gregory (2017). Rule conflation in an inferential-realizational theory of morphotactics. *Acta Linguistica Academica* 64(1), 79–124.