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1. Introduction: adverbs and postpositions in East Caucasian

This paper aims at describing the system of spatial adverbs and postpositions (with spatial and other meanings) in Kina Rutul, a variety of Rutul (< Lezgic < East Caucasian), spoken in the village of Kina, Rutulsky District, Russia. As I show, these classes of lexemes intersect, but I suggest some criteria of distinguishing adverbs from postpositions.

The data for this study was collected during the field trips to Kina in 2017-2019. All the examples in this paper are either taken from the texts collected in Kina or elicited.

In East Caucasian languages, postpositions can be underived or derived. Underived postpositions are either identical to spatial adverbs (see below) or borrowed. Sources of the derived postpositions are verbs or nouns.

Cross-linguistically, it is often an analytic question how to distinguish an adposition from a case marker. There is no such problem in East Caucasian languages. The difference between case markers and postpositions is that case markers are attached to the oblique stem (1b), while postpositions combine with a noun in a specific case form, not the nominative identical to the stem (1c).

Kina Rutul

(1)  
   a. \textit{lec’}  
       river
   b. \textit{lec’-ur-a}  
       river-OBL-IN  
       ‘in the river’
   c. \textit{lec’-ur-di} \quad \textit{bejda}  
       river-OBL-ATTR  
       near  
       ‘near the river’

(elicited)

In his Lezgian grammar, Haspelmath (1993: 213) writes that “postpositions are easily distinguished from case suffixes: they are written separately, are longer, and generally have internal structure. In addition, postpositions generally combine with inflected forms of nouns”. Forker (2013: 377) lists additional criteria to distinguish postpositions from case markers in Hinuq (< Tsezic), but her conclusion is the same: “Postpositions are easily distinguished from case markers. (...) (i) Nouns with spatial case marking can be followed by postpositions. (ii) Several postpositions govern more than one case (...) (iii) Constructions with postpositions and their semantically related spatial cases can have different meanings”.

In descriptions of East Caucasian languages, postpositions are usually considered together with adverbs and are often called “adverbs-postpositions” (наречия-послелоги). This is
because the majority of East Caucasian postpositions can be used both with and without a dependent — the latter cases are considered to be adverial usages. E.g. in (2), the postposition ǯibra ‘after’ is used with a dependent pronoun; the postposition governs the attributive form of its dependent. In (3), the same postposition does not have a dependent and is used adverbially.

**Kina Rutul**

(2)  
*ha-biš-di  ǯibra ul  ʔa-na*
  
that-ΟBL.PL-ATTR  after  eye  SUPER.be-CVB
  
‘(He) keeps an eye on them.’ (lit. ‘There is an eye after them.’)

(3)  
*ǯibra  daʔwi=xa  la-w-i<ｒ>1’i-r=a*
  
after  war=ADD  PV.3-<IPFV>end.IPFV-CVB=be
  
‘Then the war was over.’

It is typical for East Caucasian languages to have a clearly distinguishable class of underived spatial adverbs. Many of these adverbs have relational semantics — e.g. ‘behind’ should be behind in relation to something, even if this something is not overtly referred to. That is why such adverbs are often used with nouns. Such uses can be or not be postpositional depending on a language.

In contexts where noun and adverb appear linearly together, adverb may or may not govern a noun. If there is no subordinate relation between the noun and the adverb, I consider such use adverbal. If the adverb does have a subordinate relation to the noun, e.g. governs its case, such use is considered postpositional. If the spatial adverb does not have postpositional uses, I do not consider it a postposition.

Kina Rutul is an example of a language where spatial adverbs are always used adverbially and are (almost) never used postpositionally. There are two main criteria by which spatial adverbs differ from postpositions in Kina Rutul: (i) spatial adverbs can be used both before and after the noun, while postpositions appear only after nouns (see (4a, b) vs. (4c, d)) and (ii) spatial adverbs appear with nouns in any form, while postpositions govern one (sometimes two) specific case.

**Kina Rutul**

(4)  

a.  
*hele  la?-  siw-a  1-e<1>i-r=a*
  
then  up-LAT mount-(OBL)SUP  UP-<HPL>fetch-CVB=be
  
‘Then we go up to the mountains.’

b.  
*sul-a  la?-  la-c’i<ｒ>xi-ne*
  
window-IN  up-LAT UP-EXPR-<1>go,PFV-COND
  
‘(He) climbs up the window.’
c.  

\[
\text{kitab-i-d bejda}
\]

book-OBL-ATTR near

‘near the book’ (elicited)

d.  

\[
*\text{bejda kitab-i-d}
\]

near book-OBL-ATTR

Intended meaning: ‘near the book’ (elicited)

In addition to these, Polinsky (2015) mentions other criteria such as ability to be separated from the noun (adverbs can while postpositions cannot) or the ability of the adverb to be dropped. Adverbs can be dropped without significant change of meaning of a sentence and without the change in the form of the noun they appear with. Postpositions are not expected to behave this way. Thus, in (5a), the adverb \(\lambda 'iri\) ‘up’ can be dropped without any changes in the form of the adjacent noun \(\gamma\text{uno}\lambda 'on a tree’ and in the meaning of a sentence. In (5b), the same adverb is separated from the noun \(\gamma\text{uno}\lambda 'on a tree’ by another noun \(\text{ayi} \) ‘bird’. Both facts indicate that the adverb does not have any syntactic relation to the noun ‘tree’, which means that this adverb does not have properties of a postposition.

Tsez

(5)  

a.  

\[
\gamma\text{un-o-}\lambda ' (\lambda 'iri) \text{ayi} \text{\lambda 'iri} \text{c'iwl'i-x.}
\]

tree-OBL-SUPER.ESS up bird.ABS chirp-PRS

‘A bird is chirping up on a tree.’

b.  

\[
\gamma\text{un-o-}\lambda ' \text{ayi} \lambda 'iri \text{c'iwl'i-x.}
\]

tree-OBL-SUPER.ESS bird.ABS up chirp-PRS

‘A bird is chirping up on a tree.’

(Polinsky 2015: 109, 111)

If, according to the criteria discussed so far, spatial adverbs in a language do not show the same properties as other postpositions, it indicates that they do not form a constituent with a noun they appear with linearly.

East Caucasian postpositions derived from nouns are usually fossilized spatial or other case forms of their source noun. Thus, the Kina Rutul postposition \(\text{jibra} \) ‘after’ is a regularly formed in-locative form of the noun \(\text{jibir} \) ‘tail’. In most cases, postpositions derived from nouns are only weakly grammaticalized:

- they govern the genitive or attributive form, which is the form of a noun that is a dependent of another noun (therefore, postpositions behave like noun heads);
- they sometimes inflect for number (adverbs do not usually inflect for number in East Caucasian).
Lezgian

(6) a. wi \textit{pataw}  
you.SG:GEN to  
‘to you’

b. \textit{duxtur-r.i-n patariw}  
doctor-PL:GEN to  
‘to doctors’

(Haspelmath 1993: 218)

No instances of postpositions inflecting for number were attested in Kina Rutul so far.

The fact that it is possible to use the majority of postpositions without a dependent is also an indication of their low degree of grammaticalization, as nouns but not postpositions normally do not require a dependent.

In the next sections, I am going to give an overview of Kina Rutul spatial adverbs (Section 2), adverbial postpositions (Section 3) and postpositions proper (Section 4). In Section 5, I describe syntactic properties of these three classes of lexemes. In Section 6, I draw conclusions.

2. Spatial adverbs

Kina Rutul spatial adverbs are mainly underived lexical items. They inflect for directionality, which takes one of the three values: essive (absence of motion), lative (motion towards the landmark), elative (motion from the landmark). Unlike some other East Caucasian languages, spatial adverbs do not have gender agreement slots. The list of spatial adverbs attested in Kina Rutul is shown in Tab. 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Essive</th>
<th>Lative</th>
<th>Elative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘here’</td>
<td>mij</td>
<td>mi-?, mij-?</td>
<td>mij-a:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘there’</td>
<td>haj</td>
<td>haje-?</td>
<td>haj-a:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘there (yonder)’</td>
<td>tin$^\text{e}$</td>
<td>ti-?, tin$^\text{e}$-?</td>
<td>tin$^\text{i}$-a:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘above (the speaker)’</td>
<td>el$^\text{e}$</td>
<td>(la-?)</td>
<td>el-a:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘on top of’</td>
<td>u:</td>
<td>la-? (up)</td>
<td>u:-la</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Spatial adverbs
| 'below'    | a: | sa-ʔ (down) | a:-la |
| 'around'   | a:-u: | NA | NA |
| 'behind'   | NA | qu-ʔ (back) | NA |
| 'in front' | xur-a | xu-ʔ | xur-a: |
| 'inside'   | ar-a | a-ʔ | ar-a: |
| 'outside'  | xa-a | xa-ʔ | xa-a: |

Essive forms are either bare stems (mij ‘here’, a: ‘below’, u: ‘above’), forms derived with the in.essive marker -e (tin/e ‘here’, el/e ‘above the speaker’, which is the realization of -a after palatalized consonants) or forms in -ra (xura ‘in front’, ara ‘inside’, xara ‘outside’). The etymology of -ra is not clear.

Lative adverbs are formed by means of the suffix -ʔ. Usually they are derived from the same stem as the essive and the elative forms. Three adverbs have a suppletive stem in the lative: laʔ ‘up’, saʔ ‘down’ and quʔ ‘back’. Spatial adverbs are the only class of lexemes in Kina Rutul that have a dedicated lative form. Lative forms are diachronically related to verbal prefixes, e.g. saʔ ‘out’ and seč’us ‘to move out’, saʔ ‘down’ and seč’us ‘to move down’.

Elative forms are derived by means of the elative affixes -a: (mija: ‘from here’, haja: ‘from there’, tin/a: ‘from there’, el/a: ‘from above the speaker’), -la (u:la ‘from above’, a:la ‘from below’) or lengthening of the final vowel of the essive form (xura: ‘from the front’, ara: ‘from inside’, xara: ‘from outside’). All of these means are used to form elatives from lexemes of other classes, e.g. nouns.

Deictic adverbs mi- ‘here’, ha- ‘there’ and ti- ‘there’ are formed from the same roots as the corresponding demonstrative pronouns.

In some contexts, spatial adverbs form a unit with the verb that follows them (the adverb cannot be omitted, no lexemes can be put between the adverb and the verb).

(7) edemi ɣuk-a dal-iri s-uq’u-d ʒig-ij-a: man tree-SUP branch-SUP PV-1.sit-ATTR place-OBL-IN.EL *(sa-ʔ)  s-i<b>xu-r down-LAT DOWN<-3>appear.PVF-CVB

‘The man fell from the branch of the tree.’ (elicited)
The conditions under which such units emerge are yet unclear, this topic need further investigation.

3. **Adverbial postpositions**

Adverbial postpositions are the lexemes that can be used both with a dependent noun (such uses are considered postpositional) and without it (such uses are considered adverbial). Adverbial postpositions with spatial meaning have two directional forms: essive/lative and elative.

The list of the adverbial postpositions attested in Kina Rutul is given in Tab. 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>meaning</th>
<th>Essive/Lative</th>
<th>Elative</th>
<th>Form of dependent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'near, by the side of'</td>
<td>begida</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>attributive, dative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'near, by the side of'</td>
<td>bejda (begida)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>attributive, dative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'following, after'</td>
<td>źibra</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>attributive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(spatial)'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'between, among'</td>
<td>ji̞q’a</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>attributive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'behind'</td>
<td>ji̞q’aχda</td>
<td>ji̞q’aqla</td>
<td>attributive, dative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'till'</td>
<td>ji̞χir</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>attributive, super.essive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'under, below'</td>
<td>q’aneχda</td>
<td>q’aneqla</td>
<td>attributive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'in front'</td>
<td>ulix’dé</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>attributive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'in front, facing'</td>
<td>garšuja</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>attributive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'except'</td>
<td>ɾajre</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>super.elative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'among'</td>
<td>arie</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>attributive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In what follows, I am going to describe adverbial postpositions in more detail.
### 3.1. *begida* and *bejda* ‘beside’

The postposition *begida* is derived from the noun *beg* ‘rib, side’ (*beg-i-da* rib-OBL-APUD). The postposition *bejda* is likely to be a phonoetically contracted variant of *begida*. Nikolaev and Starostin (1994) alternatively suggest that it is derived from the proto-Lezgic *p:eƛ:V*, which was historically derived from the proto-East-Caucasian noun *büg_a* meaning ‘side (of the body), waist’. According to them, the postposition *bejda* is the only reflex of this noun in the modern Rutul and in other modern Lezgic languages as well. In Nikolaev and Starostin’s opinion, the noun *beg* descends from another root: proto-Lezgic *p:ak:ʷ* ‘side’. If their suggestions are true, it is unclear why it is possible to isolate APUD marker -da in *bejda*.

Both postpositions take dependents in the attributive and in the dative case: no differences in the meaning are attested, and the attributive form of the dependent is attested more frequently. The postpositions are interchangeable in all the contexts, but *bejda* is a more frequent option than *begida*. No instances of *begida* are found in the corpus, *bejda* is used instead. The first response to the stimuli with the meaning ‘near’ is also *bejda*. It is possible that *begida* is a Mukhad variant of the postposition. Mukhad Rutul being viewed as standard, *begida* is known to the speakers of Kina but is not used by them spontaneously.

Both postpositions can be used with animate and inanimate dependents.

(8)  
\[ s-uku-r \quad ru?u=r=a \quad kow\chi-a-ji-d \quad bejda \]
\begin{align*}
& PV-1.head.to.PFV-CVB \quad 1.go.IPFF-CVB=BE \quad elder-OBL-ATTR \quad beside \\
& ‘(He) goes straight to the elder.’ \\
& ‘Идёт прямо к старшине.’
\end{align*}

(9)  
\[ kitab \quad ji?i \quad televizor-a-d \quad bejda \]
\begin{align*}
& book \quad 4.cop1 \quad TV-OBL-ATTR \quad beside \\
& ‘The book is near the TV.’ \\
& ‘Книга лежит возле телевизора.’ (elicited)
\end{align*}

For some speakers, the dependent in the dative is less felicitous than in the attributive; there are speakers who consider the dative dependent ungrammatical. For some speakers, the dative dependent is grammatical in some contexts while less grammatical or ungrammatical in the others.

(10)  
\[ χal-i-s \quad bejda \quad χuk \quad ba-ni \quad w-i?i \]
\begin{align*}
& house-OBL-DAT \quad beside \quad tree \quad UP.be-CVB \quad 3-COP1 \\
& ‘There is a tree near the house.’ \\
& ‘Возле дома дерево стоит.’ (elicited)
\end{align*}

(11)  
\[ za-d \quad χal-di/’χal-i-s \quad bejda \quad uq’ \]
\begin{align*}
& I.OBL-ERG \quad house-ATTR/house-OBL-DAT \quad beside \quad grass
\end{align*}
s-eji-r=a
PV-4.mow.PFV-CVB=BE
‘I mow the grass near the house.’
‘Я кошу траву возле дома.’ (elicited)

For the same speaker, it is felicitous to use the dative in (10), while they were hesitant about its use in (11). At the present stage of research, it is unclear what is the reason for this divergence.

According to native speakers, it is grammatical to use bejda without a dependent, but there are no instances of such usages either in the corpus or in my elicited data. The only controversial example of adverbial usage is (12).

(12) raˁq b-eʔe-r a-ni i, lec-ur-da bejda
road 3-pull.IPFW-CVB be-CVB COP2 river-OBL-APUD beside
tiʔ yonder-LAT
‘There was a road along the river.’
‘Дорога проходила мимо реки.’

Here, the noun lec ‘river’ is in the APUD, and the APUD meaning is doubled by the postposition. I assume that the postposition does not govern the form of the noun.

3.2. โรbra ‘following, after (spatial)’
The postposition โรbra ‘following, after (spatial)’ is derived from the noun โรbir ‘tail’ (โรbir-a tail-IN). It governs the attributive form of the noun. The postposition is only used with animate (animal or human) dependents.

(13) ix-di โรbra q-i<b> xu-r=a t’il a
our-ATTR following RE-<3> appear.PFV-CVB=be dog
‘The dog ran after us.’
‘За нами бежала собака.’ (elicited)

Adverbial uses of โรbra are very frequent in the corpus. When used adverbially, it can have temporal meaning and is used as ‘then, next’ in sequences of actions or characters.

(14) sifda wuš hixi-r=a jevrej hixi-r=a <...> โรbra
at.first who 1.go.PFV-CVB=be Jew 1.go.PFV-CVB=be following
wtaraj gruzin hixi-r=a <...> โรbra=xas
second[R] Georgian 1.go.PFV-CVB=be following=ADD
xibi-r=xus-d scrutiny hixi-r a-ni i
three-1-ORD-ATTR Russian 1.go.PFV-CVB be-CVB COP2
‘At first who came, the Jew came <...> then the second came the Georgian <...> then the third came the Russian.’

‘Сначала кто пошёл, еврей пошёл <...> потом второй грузин пошёл <...> потом третьим пошёл русский.’

When used postpositionally, ġibra cannot have temporal meaning; for temporal ‘after’, ʔuʔ is used (see below).

3.3. ǧi’q’a ‘between, among’

The postposition ǧi’q’a ‘between, among’ is derived from the noun ǧi’q’ ‘back (body part), middle’ (ǧi’q’-a back-IN). It governs the attributive form of the noun. The postposition can be used both with animate and inanimate dependents.

\[
\begin{align*}
(15) & \quad zi & \text{rasul-di} & = & \text{na} & \text{patimat-di} & \text{ji’q’a} \\
& & I & \text{Rasul-ATTR=} & \text{AND} & \text{Patimat-ATTR} & \text{between} \\
& & s-uq’u-r & = & a \\
& & \text{pv-1.sit.pfv-cvb=} & \text{be} \\
& & ‘I sit between Rasul and Patimat.’ \\
& & ‘Я сижу между Расулом и Патимат.’ (elicited)
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
(16) & \quad \text{dam-a} & j\text{ųk-um-id} & \text{ji’q’a} & \text{jis-di} & \text{jaI} & \text{a-ni} & \text{i} \\
& & \text{forest-IN} & \text{tree-OBL.PL-ATTR} & \text{between} & \text{old-ATTR} & \text{house} & \text{be-cvb} & \text{COP2} \\
& & ‘In the forest, there is an old house among the trees.’ \\
& & ‘В лесу среди деревьев стоит старый дом.’ (elicited)
\end{align*}
\]

The postposition can be used adverbially in the same contexts where it is used postpositionally without changes in meaning. Compare (15) above and (17):

\[
\begin{align*}
(17) & \quad zi & s-u<\text{IPFV}>q’u & = & \text{na} & \text{ji’q’a} & \text{rasul-di} & = & \text{na} \\
& & I & \text{PV-<IPFV>} & \text{1.sit.IPFV-cvb=} & \text{be} & \text{between} & \text{Rasul-ATTR=} & \text{AND} & \text{patimat-da} \\
& & \text{Patimat-APUD} \\
& & ‘I sit between Rasul and Patimat’. \\
& & ‘Я сижу между Расулом и Патимат.’ (elicited)
\end{align*}
\]

In (15), the adverbial postposition is linearly after the noun phrase, the attributive form of the nouns being governed by the adverbial postposition and cannot be changed. In (17), the adverbial postposition is linearly before the noun (which is unexpected for a postposition), the noun is in the APUD case and can be changed to the dative. This suggests that, in this example,
the adverbial postposition does not govern the case of the noun it appears with. Therefore, the use of \textit{ji’q’a} in (15) is postpositional, while in (17) it is used adverbially.

3.4. \textit{jiźir} ‘till’

The postposition \textit{jiźir} ‘till’ is probably derived from the general converb form of the verb \textit{jiğas} ‘bring’. It can be used both in spatial (20) and temporal (18, 19, 21) meaning.

(18) \textit{juq’u-r-xus-diklas-a} \textit{jiźir} \textit{ma}<d>a-\textit{ni} \textit{i} \\
\textit{gdeta} \textit{rix-c’ir-xus-di sidi-mi} \\
\textit{somewhere[R]} six-ten-ORD-ATTR \textit{year.OBL.PL(SUP)} \\
\textit{jiźir} \textit{azərbaiğana pis/}menasi\textit{v} \textit{azərbaiğan} \textit{č’el-i-la-d} \\
\textit{till} \textit{Azerbaijan} writing[R] \textit{Azerbaijan} \textit{word-OBL-SUP.EL-ATTR} \\
\textit{χağ-birki}<l>xe-r=a} \\
\textit{letter-PL} \textit{PV-<IPFV>4.write.IPFV-CVB=be} \\
‘Till the fourth grade, till around 1960th Azerbaijani writing was used.’ \\
‘До четвертого класса Азербайджанский был тогда где-то до 60ого года, Азербайджанская письменность.’

(19) \textit{ra’q okt/abir-a-d} \textit{exir-a-s} \textit{[okt/abir-a-d} \\
\textit{road} \textit{october-OBL-ATTR} \textit{end-OBL-DAT} \textit{october-OBL-ATTR} \\
\textit{ji’q’a-dwazir-a} \textit{jiźir} \textit{[wazir-di jiźir]} \textit{açiğu-r} \\
\textit{middle-ATTR} \textit{month-OBL(SUP)} \textit{till} \textit{month-ATTR till} \textit{open-CVB} \\
‘The road is open till the middle of October.’ \\
‘Дорога до середины октября открыта.’

(20) \textit{miχ-a: diiz kusur-a jiźir ra’q xirida-d} \\
\textit{Rutul-EL} \textit{directly} \textit{Kusur-IN} \textit{till} \textit{road far-ATTR} \\
\textit{w-iʔ} \\
\textit{3-COP1} \\
‘The road from Rutul to Kusur was long.’ \\
‘От Рутула до Кусура дорога дальняя была.’

(21) \textit{he-mi sii-a-di jiźir} \textit{he-mi xidi-ni/w-ikan} \\
\textit{EMPH-this day-OBL-ATTR till} \textit{EMPH-this} \textit{woman-OBL-COM} \\
\textit{xiw liʔi-r} \\
\textit{bread 4.eat-CVB} \\
‘I ate bread with this woman till this very day.’ \\
‘До сегодняшнего дня с этой женой хлеб кушал.’
3.5.  *q’aneχda* ‘under, below’

The postposition *q’aneχda* ‘under, below’ is derived from the noun *q’an* ‘bottom’ (*q’an-e-χda* bottom-OBL-POST or *q’an-e-qla* bottom-OBL-POST.EL). It governs the attributive form of a noun.

(22)  

\[
\begin{array}{llll}
\text{telefon} & \text{sa-?} & s-i<b>xu-r & \text{ust’ul-a-d} \\
\text{phone} & \text{down-LAT} & \text{DOWN-<3>appear.PFV-CVB} & \text{table-OBL-ATTR} \\
\text{*q’aneχda*} & g-i<b>xu-r & \text{under} & \text{UNDER-<3>appear.PFV-CVB} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘The phone fell under the table.’

‘Телефон упал под стол.’ (elicited)

The postposition can be used without a dependent in the meaning ‘below’.

(23)  

\[
\begin{array}{llll}
\text{get} & \text{isk’am-a-d} & \text{*q’aneqla} & w-αχi-r \\
\text{cat} & \text{table-OBL-ATTR} & \text{under.EL} & \text{3-run.PFV-CVB} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘The cat ran from under the table.’

‘Кошка выбежала из-под стола.’ (elicited)

3.6.  *ulixʲde* ‘in front’

The postposition *ulixʲde* is derived from the noun *ul* ‘eye’. It is probably a borrowing from Mukhad Rutul, as it is not morphologically transparent in Kina Rutul, while it is in Mukhad: *ul-i-xʲde* eye-OBL-APUD (cf. Makhmudova 2002). There are no occurrences this postposition in the corpus, and it could be that it is not used in Kina Rutul at all.

3.7.  *ɢaršuja* ‘in front, facing’

The postposition *ɢaršuja* is borrowed from Azerbaijani. It governs the attributive form of a noun.

(25)  

\[
\begin{array}{llll}
\text{zi} & \text{jişemiš ruʔu-r=a} & \text{masdık-e-d} & \text{ɢaršuja} \\
\text{I} & \text{live} & \text{1.become.PFV-CVB=be} & \text{mosque-OBL-ATTR in.front} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘I live in front of the mosque.’

‘Я живу напротив мечети.’ (elicited)
(26) \[ zi \, riō-a \, ji\ddot{i}, \, tin\textsuperscript{1}-a: \, mi-? \, iz-di \]
I road-IN 1.COP there-EL here-LAT my-ATTR
caršuja rasul ji<r>q' i-r
in.front Rasul <1>come.PFV-CVB
‘I walked on the road and Rasul came towards me.’
‘Я шёл по дороге, а мне навстречу шёл Расул.’ (elicited)
It can be used without a dependent.

(27) \[ zi \, r-i?i \, mašina-kʷan, \, caršuja \, w-i?i \, qʷaˁ-b \, zer \]
I 2-COP1 car-COM in.front3-COP1 two-3 cow
‘I drove in a car and two cows walked towards (me).’
‘Я ехала на машине, а навстречу шли две коровы.’ (elicited)

3.8. **najre** ‘except’

The postposition *najre* is borrowed from Azerbaijani. It governs the super-elative form of a noun.

(28) \[ iz-di \, õizan \, šu-la \, najre \, muq'\textsuperscript{-}a \, jišemiš \]
my-ATTR family brother-SUP.EL except village-IN live
du-ru?u-r=a
HPL-become.PFV-CVB=be
‘My whole family except for the brother lives in a village.’
‘Вся моя семья, кроме брата, живёт в селе.’ (elicited)

3.9. **arije** ‘between, among’

The postposition *arije* is probably derived from the noun *ara* ‘gap’ that is borrowed from Azerbaijani (*ar-ij-e* gap-OBL-IN). It governs the attributive form of the noun.

(29) \[ xil-e \, žini-meš-di \, arije \, na'xarq-di \]
woman.PL-IN child.PL-OBL.PL-ATTR among inappropriate-ATTR
ištilet-bir ţa-d-a<l>gi-n
story-PL NEG-HPL-<IPFV>lead-NMLZ
‘So that they don’t speak about inappropriate things among women and children.’
‘Среди женщин и детей ненужные разговоры не вели чтобы.’

(30) \[ gima=xα \, d-ixi-jne \, ţama?at-i-d \, arije \]
godekan\textsuperscript{3}=ADD HPL-go.PFV-COND people-OBL-ATTR among

\textsuperscript{3} Godekan is a central place in Dagestani villages, where old and respectable men gather.
edemi-wali-kan  s-uq’u-r  higa-r=a
man-ABSTR-COM  PV-1.sit.PFV-CVB  1.want.IPFV-CVB=be

‘He behaved well in a public place.’
‘В общественном месте вёл себя нормально.’

4. Postpositions

There are few lexemes in Kina Rutul that cannot be used without a nominal dependent. They all have abstract meaning and do not inflect for directionality. The list of Kina Rutul postpositions is given in Tab. 3.

Table 3. Kina Rutul postpositions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>meaning</th>
<th>postposition</th>
<th>government (nominals)</th>
<th>government (verbs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>for, because of</td>
<td>badana</td>
<td>attributive</td>
<td>masdar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instead</td>
<td>jerinde</td>
<td>attributive</td>
<td>attributive^4 (absolutive)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>after (temporal)</td>
<td>quʔ</td>
<td>super.elative</td>
<td>attributive (in.elative, super.elative, post.elative)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1. badana ‘for, because of’

The postposition badana is probably derived from the proto-Lezgic noun *p:at: ‘side’ which left no other reflexes in the language (Nikolaev, Starostin 1994). However, Authier (2009: 74) suggests that formally similar postposition in Kryz is a borrowing from Arabic badalan ‘instead’. It cannot be ised without a dependent.

The meaning of the postposition used with nouns differs from its uses with verbs. With nouns (in the attributive form) it means ‘because of’. With verbs (masdar), it means ‘for, in order to’. Such polysemy is frequent among East Caucasian languages (Nasledskova 2020: 39-40).

(31)  girc-bir  si-ʒ-uč’u-n  badana  ha-bir  ližid

^4 By attributive form of the verb, I mean participle.
kürze⁵-PL PV-NEG-NPL_overboil-NMLZ for that-PL dough
hiʔ-d-a qu? qä’rki-d-kal-di xij-e-kan
4.do.PFV-ATTR-IN.EL after hot-ATTR-SIMIL-ATTR water-OBL-COM
lizid haʔa-r=a
dough 4.do.PFV-CVB=be
‘After doing that, add a little warm water to dough, so that kürze will not overboil.’
‘Чтобы вареники не разварились, после того, как всё это сделали, чуть тёплой воды в тесто добавляем.’

4.2. jērinde ‘instead’

The postposition jērinde ‘instead’ is a borrowing from Azerbaijani. It governs the attributive form of a dependent, either nominal or verbal.

(32)  [cɑb-ɪɾ q-i<;<d>xa-s]-di_jērinde zi hixi-r
dish-PL.RE-<4>wash-INF-ATTR instead I 1.go.PFV-CVB
hurxa-s
1.walk-INF
‘Instead of washing the dishes, I went out.’
‘Вместо того, чтобы мыть посуду, я пошёл гулять.’

4.3. qu? ‘after (temporal)’

The postposition qu? formally coincides with lative adverb qu? ‘back’. It is a theoretical question whether these two uses must be considered as one lexeme, but it is a descriptive fact that qu? behaves differently in postpositional vs. adverbial contexts.

Adverb qu? does not require a dependent to be used, while postposition qu? cannot be used without one.

(33)  qul-di=kal-di-bir qärs-i-da kǐ-ũ<;l>ɛ’u-r
small-ATTR=SIMIL-ATTR-PL shore-OBL-APUD CONT-<HPL>move.PFV-CVB
qu-? k̥a-ɡl/a-d-u<;b>si-r
back-LAT CONT-OUT.RE-HPL-<IPFV>move.IPFV-CVB
hişi-r=a
1.become.PFV-CVB=be
‘Small ones came out to the shore and then went back (in the water).’

⁵ Kürze is a local type of dumplings.
‘Маленькие на берег вышли и назад зашли (в воду).’

There are, however, bridging contexts where it is unclear whether quʔ behaves more like an adverb or like a postposition. It can be used with the elative of adverbs (as an adverb) in temporal meaning (the same meaning as in postpositional contexts).

(34) haj-a: quʔ za-da gʷalaχ juʔq-’di gʷalaχ qa-w-aʔa-s
there-EL after I-APUD job hard-ATTR job RE-3-do.IPFW-INF
ruʔu-r-diš
4.become.IPFW-CVB-NO
‘After that (surgery), I cannot do the hard work.’

‘После этого (после операции) я тяжёлую работу не могу делать.’

(35) qʷas-di maʔlim musa mis-la quʔ muʔaʷ-a
old-ATTR teacher Musa when-EL after village-IN
jišemiš ruʔu-r=a
live 1.become.IPFW-CVB=be
‘Old teacher Musa lives in the village for a long time.’

‘Старый учитель Муса давно живёт в селе.’ (elicited)

Postposition quʔ governs the super-elative form of a noun and several elative forms of the verb: in-elative (37) and post-elative (38).

(36) zi nĳsa-di-la quʔ kowʔa jiʔi xur
I today-OBL-SUP.EL after elder 1.COP1 QUOT
‘From this day, I am the elder.’

‘Я с сегодняшнего дня старейшина.’

(37) [uqʷ-’bir jasmiš hiʔi-’d]‑a quʔ
group-PL gather NPL.do.PFV-ATTR-IN.EL after
q-i>d>q ’i-r riža-r=a
RE<=4>bring.PFV-CVB 4.wash.IPFW-CVB=be
‘Having gathered the grass, we bring it back and wash it.’

‘После того, как траву собрали, приходим, моем.’

(38) semja-’bir hiši-d-a-q-la quʔ je...
family-PL 4.become.PFV-ATTR-OBL-POST-EL after we I=AND
zi=na
iz-di edemi d-ixi-r volgogradskij oblast]-a
my-ATTR man HPL-go.PFV-CVB Volgograd[R] district-IN
‘After we had a family, me and my husband went to Volgogradskij oblast.’

‘После того, как семья была, я и мой муж поехали в Волгоградскую область.’
In-relative is much more common, post-relative is attested in the speech of only one consultant.

*quʔ* also governs the super-relative form of the participle, but with shift in meaning: such combination has conditional meaning.

(39)  
\[
\begin{array}{llll}
we-s & \text{\textasciitilde}ac \text{\textasciitilde}a-d-i-la & qu? & za \\
\text{you.PL-DAT} & \text{NEG-4.know.IPFV-ATTR-OBL-SUP.EL} & \text{after} & \text{I.OBL.ERG} \\
we-k\text{\textasciitilde}an & siw & ha\text{\textasciitilde}s-di \\
\text{you.PL-COM} & \text{what} & \text{4.do.IPFV-ATTR} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘If you don’t know, what can I do with you?’

‘Если вы сами не знаете, что я могу с вами сделать?’

Examples of *quʔ* in combination with super-relative are also found in the speech of only one consultant.

5. **Telling adverbs from postpositions**

Adverbial postpositions have both properties of adverbs and postpositions. Some of them are more adverb-like, while the other are more postposition-like. In this section, I suggest several tests that help to establish whether adverb-postposition is or is not in syntactic relation to the adjacent noun. If it does, it behaves like a postposition, if it does not, it behaves like an adverb.

(i) It is possible to drop the adverb without changes in the sentence and the meaning would remain the same.

(ii) It is possible to separate the adverb from the adjacent noun.

(iii) An adverb can precede the noun.

(iv) It is possible to use an adverb without a nominal dependent.

(v) Postpositions govern specific form of a noun.

The following table shows all the syntactic properties of Kina Rutul adverbs and postpositions attested so far. More data is to be collected to fill the table.
Table 4. Syntactic properties of Kina Rutul adverbs and postpositions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(i)</th>
<th>(ii)</th>
<th>(iii)</th>
<th>(iv)</th>
<th>(v)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>spatial adverbs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>bejda</strong> ‘beside’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ǯibra</strong> ‘following’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ji’q’a</strong> ‘between, among’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>jįxir</strong> ‘till’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>q’anexda</strong> ‘under, below’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ulixʲde</strong> ‘in front’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>garšuja</strong> ‘in front, facing’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>sajre</strong> ‘except’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>arije</strong> ‘among’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>postpositions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Conclusion

This paper summarizes all the data on Kina Rutul uses of spatial adverbs and postpositions. Both adverbs and postpositions in Kina Rutul are similar to the corresponding classes of lexemes in other East Caucasian languages.

Spatial adverbs are the only class of Kina Rutul lexemes that have a dedicated form for the lative.

There are more adverbial postpositions than postpositions proper in Kina Rutul. With a view to their etymology, adverbial postpositions are mostly derived from nouns (with body-part
or relational object-part meaning); some of them are derived from verbs or borrowed. Two of the three postpositions proper in Kina Rutul are borrowed. The last is identical to spatial adverb and is less grammaticalized compared with the other two.

Syntactic behavior of spatial adverbs, adverbial postpositions and proper postpositions is to be investigated in more detail. We conclude that the true spatial adverbs cannot govern nouns, adverbial postpositions can do it and proper postpositions have an obligatory nominal dependent.

The semantics of spatial postpositions and their semantic differences from spatial cases is not known, more data is needed to establish it.
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