

## Remarks on so-called “conjunct/disjunct” systems

Denis Creissels  
University of Lyon  
denis.creissels@univ-lyon2.fr

Morphological variations of verbs involving a binary choice with a 1 vs. 2/3 person contrast in declarative clauses and a 2 vs. 1/3 person contrast in questions have been labeled *conjunct/disjunct systems* by Hale 1980, and have been first described for Tibetan, Newari, and a few other Tibeto-Burmese languages (Hale 1980, DeLancey 1986, DeLancey 1990, DeLancey 1992, Genetti 1994, Hargreaves 2005, Bickel 2008, Tournadre 2008). Similar patterns have also been found in the Mehweb dialect of the Nakh-Daghestanian language Dargwa (Magometov 1982), in Awa Pit, a Barbacoan language spoken in Colombia and Ecuador (Curnow 2002), and in the Papuan language Oksapmin (Loughnane 2007).

In my talk at SWL3, after reviewing the literature on conjunct/disjunct systems, I will present my own findings on Akhvakh, a Nakh-Daghestanian language belonging to the Andic branch of the Avar-Andic-Tsezic family, spoken in the western part of Daghestan and in the village of Axaxdərə near Zaqatala (Azerbaijan).

In the perfective positive (and only in this tense), Akhvakh verbs show variations expressing person distinctions, morphologically distinct from variations in gender-number and following a different alignment pattern. There are two possible endings for this tense, with basic allomorphs *-ada* and *-ari*. The following chart summarizes the rule governing the choice between *-ada* and *-ari* in Axaxdərə Akhvakh:

	declarative clauses	questions
1st person A / S <sub>A</sub>	<i>-ada</i>	<i>-ari</i>
2nd person A / S <sub>A</sub>	<i>-ari</i>	<i>-ada</i>
3rd person A / S <sub>A</sub>	<i>-ari</i>	<i>-ari</i>
no A / S <sub>A</sub>	<i>-ari</i>	<i>-ari</i>

The choice between *-ada* and *-ari* expresses a *1st p.* (*-ada*) vs. *2nd/3rd p.* (*-ari*) contrast in declarative clauses, but *2nd p.* (*-ada*) vs. *1st/3rd p.* (*-ari*) contrast in questions, and follows a split intransitive pattern: transitive verbs agree with A, whereas intransitive verbs divide into S<sub>A</sub> verbs agreeing with S in the same way as transitive verbs with A, and Sp verbs invariably showing the ending *-ari*. This division of Akhvakh intransitive verbs into two classes transparently reflects the degree of control of the participant encoded as S. Consequently, the function of *-ada* is to encode coincidence between the controller of the event and the SAP responsible for the assertion (the speaker in declarative speech acts, the addressee in questions). A plausible historical hypothesis is that this pattern emerged from the reanalysis of a former tense distinction.

In conclusion, I will discuss the relationship between so-called ‘conjunct/disjunct’ systems, evidentiality marking, and person agreement.

## References

- Aikhenvald, A. 2004. *Evidentiality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bickel, B. 2008. Verb agreement and epistemic marking: a typological journey from the Himalayas to the Caucasus. In Huber, B., M. Volkart, & P. Wildmer (eds.), *Chomolangma, Demawend und Kasbek: Festschrift für Roland Bielmeier zu seinem 65. Geburtstag*. 1-14. Halle: IITBS.
- Corbett, G. 2006. *Agreement*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Curnow, T. 2002. 'Conjunct/disjunct marking in Awa Pit'. *Linguistics* 40-3. 611-627.
- DeLancey S. 1986. 'Evidentiality and volitionality in Tibetan'. In Chafe, W. & J. Nichols (eds.), *Evidentiality : the Linguistic Coding of Epistemology*. Norwood NJ: Academic Press. 203-213.
- 1990. 'Ergativity and the cognitive model of event structure in Lhasa Tibetan'. *Cognitive Linguistics* 1-3. 289-321
- 1992. 'The Historical status of the conjunct/disjunct pattern'. *Acta Linguistica Hafniensa* 25. 39-42.
- Genetti, C. 1994. *A descriptive and historical account of the Dolakha Newari dialect*. Tokyo: Institute for the Study of Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa.
- Hale, A. 1980. Person markers: finite conjunct and disjunct forms in Newari. In Trail R. (ed.), *Papers in Southeast Asian Linguistics* 7. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics. 95-106.
- Hargreaves, D. 2005. Agency and intentional action in Kathmandu Newar. *Himalayan Linguistics* 5. 1-48.
- Kibrik, A. E. 1985. 'Towards a typology of ergativity'. In Nichols, J. & A. Woodbury (eds.), *Grammar inside and outside the clause*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 268-324.
- Loughnane, R. 2007. 'Expanding the typology of evidentiality: the participatory/factual in Oksapmin'. Paper delivered at the ALT 7 conference. Paris.
- Magomedbekova, Z.M. 1967. *Axvaxskij jazyk (grammatičeskij analiz, teksty, slovar')*. Tbilissi: Mecniereba.
- Magomedova, P & I. Abdullaeva. 2007. *Axvaxsko-russkij slovar'*. Maxačkala: Dagestanskij Naučnyj Centr Rossiskoj Akademii Nauk.
- Magometov, A. 1982. *Megebskij dialect darginskogo jazyka*. Tbilissi: Mecniereba.
- Siewierska, A. 2004. *Person*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tournadre, N. 2008. Arguments against the concept of 'conjunct'/'disjunct' in Tibetan. In Huber, B., M. Volkart, & P. Wildmer (eds.), *Chomolangma, Demawend und Kasbek: Festschrift für Roland Bielmeier zu seinem 65. Geburtstag*. 281-308. Halle: IITBS.