



NATIONAL RESEARCH UNIVERSITY  
HIGHER SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS

*Alexandra Konovalova*

# QUESTIONS IN KINA RUTUL

BASIC RESEARCH PROGRAM

WORKING PAPERS

SERIES: LINGUISTICS  
WP BRP 84/LNG/2019

*Alexandra Konovalova*<sup>1</sup>

## **QUESTIONS IN KINA RUTUL**<sup>2</sup>

This paper describes different types of questions in Rutul (Lezgian, East Caucasian). Data analyzed in the work were collected during fieldwork in the Kina village (Rutul district, Republic of Dagestan, Russia) from 2016 to 2019. I provide a description of the interrogative markers and their positions in the sentence, word order, and the possibility of constituent fronting.

JEL Classification: Z.

Keywords: questions; Rutul; East Caucasian; interrogative sentences

---

<sup>1</sup> Laboratory of Formal Models in Linguistics, HSE University, Laboratory Assistant. askonovalova@edu.hse.ru

<sup>2</sup> The publication was prepared within the framework of the Academic Fund Program at the National Research University Higher School of Economics (HSE) in 2018–2019 (grant №19-04-040) and by the Russian Academic Excellence Project "5-100".

# 1. Introduction

In this paper I suggest a description of interrogative utterances in Kina Rutul.

Rutul is a Lezgian language of the East Caucasian (Nakh-Daghestanian) language family. It is spoken in the Republic of Dagestan, Russia, and in northern Azerbaijan, by more than 30,000 people in total. Kina Rutul is a variety of Rutul spoken in Kina village in Rutul district. Our data come from field sessions in Kina in the summer of 2019 and from the texts collected during the field trips in 2016-2018.

Rutul is a mostly agglutinative language with ergative alignment in verbal agreement and case marking. The basic word order is SOV.

There is not much discussion of the syntax of interrogative sentences in Rutul in the existing literature. There are some observations on syntax in (Alekseev 1994, Ibragimov 1978) and on polar questions in the Mukhad dialect (Makhmudova 2018). None of these works describes the Kina dialect.

The structure of the paper is as follows. First, I introduce a functional classification of interrogative sentences. I then provide a brief survey of word order in Rutul. In Sections 2, 3, and 4 each functional type of questions as defined in 1.1 is analysed. The main issues to explore are the general structure of interrogative utterances, the choice of the interrogative marker and its position in the sentence, word order, and the possibility of constituent fronting.

## 1.1 Interrogations: a classification

Interrogative sentences are generally divided into polar and parametric (alias yes/no vs. wh-questions, general vs. special, modal vs. dictal), depending on their syntactic and semantic properties (König & Siemund 2007).

**Polar questions** inquire about the truth or falsehood of a statement, cf.: *Are you sleeping right now?* The answer to a polar question is ‘yes’ or ‘no’. A negative proposition can be questioned as well: *Haven't you lost the money?* **Parametric questions** are sentences where a questioned element is replaced by an interrogative pronoun: *What are you doing? Where is your brother? Who invented the car?* The expected answer to a parametric question contains an expression denoting the interrogative word. Bally (Bally 1932) suggests to draw a distinction between *total* and *partial* questions depending on whether the scope includes the whole sentence or only its part. Thus, *What's happened?* is a total parametric question, *Who is coming?* is a partial parametric question, *Do you agree?* is a total polar question, and *Was it you who broke the window?* is a partial polar question.

**Tag question** is a subtype of polar questions. Tag questions are usually coded in a special construction — interrogative tag — which cross-linguistically often occurs at the end of the

sentence: *The Moon is beautiful, isn't it?* Semantically, tag questions build a bias towards one of the answers. As will be discussed below, in Rutul, it is problematic to distinguish tag questions from questions to a negative proposition (cf. section 2.4).

Another subtype of polar questions is an **alternative question**. In alternative questions, the addressee is supposed to make a choice between two or more explicit alternatives: *Are you singing or crying?* Such questions require that the addressee repeat one of the alternatives as an answer. Alternative questions have much in common with polar questions because the addressee decides which of the alternatives is true, and which is false. However, they are not polar questions because they require a different structure of an answer.

When a polar question is asked about a particular constituent and not about the whole proposition, this constituent can be emphasized by different means: prosodic (intonation, stress), syntactic (word order), etc. For example, in English *Was it you who won the prize?* the subject 'you' is in narrow focus and is emphasized both syntactically (cleft) and prosodically.

Both polar and parametric questions can be **meditative** (rhetorical), i.e. questions that the speaker asks without expecting an answer: *I wonder if he forgot about my birthday. Where has she put my cup?*

**Indirect questions** are questions embedded into another clause. The dependent clause is still a question, and can be polar, alternative, and parametric. Indirect questions are complement clauses of a verb of speech or thought, such as: *I don't know whether he will like it. She didn't say if she would drink coffee or tea.* Parametric indirect questions also contain a wh-word: *He doesn't know when he lost his pen.*

This study covers all types of questions in Kina Rutul.

## 1.2 Basics of word order in Rutul

Before proceeding to questions, several notes on word order in Kina Rutul are required. The basic word order is SOV:

- (1) za-d    tükana-la                      kanfet-bir=na                      walig-mar  
 I-ERG    shop(OBL)-SUP.EL              candy-PL=AND                      clothes-PL  
 I-e<b>č'u-r=a  
 PV-<4>move.PFV-CVB=be  
 'I have bought candies and clothes in the shop.'

In the ergative construction, the predicate is preferably clause-final, the P argument precedes the predicate. Typologically, adverbials may appear in different positions in the sentence (Polinsky 1999). From my data it seems that adverbials of time and location precede the predicate and the objects but follow the subject, but it needs further investigation. However, word order in spoken

Rutul is relatively free and is dependent on information packaging. For example, the focal position in Nakh-Daghestanian is typically before the predicate (Testelec 1998). Thereby, in (2) the locative noun moves to pre-verbal position to emphasize where the items are bought. The topical P argument moves to post-verbal position:

- (2) za-d                      tükana-la                      l-e<b>č'u-r=a  
 I-ERG                      shop(OBL)-SUP.EL                      PV-<4>move.PFV-CVB=be  
 kanfet-bir=na                      walig-mar  
 candy-PL=AND                      clothes-PL

‘It is in the shop that I have bought candies and clothes.’

## 2. Polar questions

In this section I discuss the markers used in polar questions, including alternative and tag questions.

### 2.1 Polar questions

In Kina Rutul, polar questions are formed by adding the interrogative marker *-ma* to the finite verb. It cannot be added to any other part of speech, including nouns or adjectives, even when these are in the predicative position. In this work in the glosses it is separated with a hyphen as a suffix:

- (3) nin-e                      nek                      a<w>i-r=a-ma?  
 mother-ERG                      milk                      <3>pour.PFV-CVB=be-Q  
 ‘Did mother pour the milk?’
- (4) \*nin-e-ma                      nek                      a<w>i-r=a?  
 mother-ERG-Q                      milk                      <3>pour.PFV-CVB=be  
 ‘Did mother pour the milk?’
- (5) \*nin-e                      nek-ma                      a<w>i-r=a?  
 mother-ERG                      milk-Q                      <3>pour.PFV-CVB=be  
 ‘Did mother pour the milk?’

If no verb is present in an utterance, as in echo-questions, the speaker either adds a copula with the interrogative marker or produce a question without *-ma* by rising pitch. In (6), a speaker asks about homework and the addressee produces an echo-question towards the interlocutor. There are two options: to use copula with *-ma* or to use rising pitch; it is not possible to attach *-ma* directly to the pronoun:

- (6) wa-d                      dars-bir                      hi?i-r=a-ma?  
 you-ERG                      lesson-PL                      NPL.do.PFV-CVB=be-Q  
 ‘Have you done your homework?’

za-d i-ma? /<sup>3</sup> za-d? / \*za-d-ma?  
 I-ERG COP2-Q / I-ERG / I-ERG-Q?  
 ‘Me?’

The interrogative marker *-ma* is used with all verb forms:

- (7) riš-e-ra xiw hiʔi-r=a-ma?  
 sister-OBL-ERG bread 4.do.PFV-CVB=be-Q  
 ‘Did sister make the bread?’
- (8) raisat ru<r>u-s-i-ma maxačkale?  
 raisat <2>come-INF-FUT-Q makhachkala.IN  
 ‘Will Raisat go to Makhachkala?’
- (9) wa-d ile-s-di haʔa-r-i-ma?  
 you-ERG 4.eat-INF-ATTR 4.do.IPFV-CVB-COP2-Q  
 ‘Are you cooking?’

As we saw in (6), *-ma* is also used with copula (where it functions as the auxiliary). In Rutul, there are two types of copular clauses: equative clauses, where the copula links the subject and the non-verbal predicate (10), and clauses expressing spatial location (11) (Alekseev 1994). Marker *-ma*, as always, is attached to the predicate, i.e. the copula:

- (10) riš biʔ-ra-d r-iʔi-ma?  
 girl beautiful-ATTR 2-COP1-Q  
 ‘Is the girl beautiful?’
- (11) sus xal-a a-ma?  
 bride house-IN be-Q  
 ‘Is the bride at home?’ (Lapin 2018)

In periphrastic forms, the interrogative marker is also attached to the copula. In periphrastic forms with a converb, which drop an overt copula in the affirmative, the copula is overt in interrogative forms in the form *-i*, e.g. *haʔa-r-i-ma* (4.do.IPFV-CVB-COP2-Q). Here are the examples of usage of *-ma* in questions with periphrastic forms:

- (12) riš-e-ra hiʔi-t'-i-ma xiw-bir?  
 girl-OBL-ERG 4.do.PFV-ATTR-COP2-Q bread-PL?  
 ‘Did the sister make the bread?’
- (13) gag wa-s ʁ-a<r>g<sup>w</sup>a-r-i-ma sa:kit-waldi?  
 father.in.law you.SG-DAT PV-<IPFV>4.see.IPFV-CVB-Q calm-ABSTR  
 ‘Father-in-law, I’m calm, you see?’ (Magomedshapi\_Nina\_glossed\_23\_07latin)

<sup>3</sup> hereinafter a single slash ‘/’ denotes a variability, and a double slash ‘//’ denotes a pause

If the question is based on a negative predication, then the interrogative marker *-ma* follows the negative copula *diš*. As mentioned above (see 1.2), these questions have a bias towards evaluating the proposition as true. Thus, in (14) the speaker thinks that the addressee is indeed going to the shop.

(14) wi      kijka      tükan-a      ru<r>u-s-diš-ma?  
 you      today      shop-IN      <2>come-INF-NO-Q  
 ‘Aren’t you going to the shop today?’

(15) wi      kijka      q’iq-aš-iχda      r-ixi-r-diš-ma?  
 you      today      calf-OBL.PL-SUB      2-go.PFV-CVB-NO-Q  
 ‘Didn’t you go for the calves?’

Polar questions can be expressed by intonation alone rather than by morphology or syntax. The interrogative intonation is associated with a rising pitch on the predicate. In the following examples, the symbol ↑ stands for rising pitch:

(16) χiniχ      ↑ješe-r=a?  
 child      1.cry.IPFV-CVB=be  
 ‘Is the child crying?’

(17) ha-d      ↑q-i<r>q’i-r=a      šeher-dja?  
 that-ATTR      RE-<1>come.PFV-CVB=be      town-OBL.IN.EL  
 ‘Has he come back from the town?’

Word order in interrogative sentences is the same as in their affirmative counterparts. Though some constituents can move, the movement is not obligatory, and the word order may remain the same as in the declarative sentence. Sentence (18a) is unmarked and preferred. Sentences (18b)-(18d) are also good, but they illustrate a different emphasis. In (18b), the direct object moves to the topical post-predicate position, and the subject is in focus: ‘Was it mother who made the khinkal?’ In (18c) the subject is also in focus in pre-predicative position: ‘Was it mother who made the khinkal?’. In (18d) the direct object *khinkal* is focused. Verbal initial variants, as (18e) and (18f) were rejected.

(18) a) nin-e      χink’al      hi?i-r-i-ma?  
 mother-ERG      khinkal<sup>4</sup>      4.do.PFV-CVB-COP2-Q  
 b) nin-e      hi?i-r-i-ma      χink’al?  
 mother-ERG      4.do.PFV-CVB-COP2-Q      khinkal  
 c) χink’al      nin-e      hi?i-r-i-ma?  
 khinkal      mother-ERG      4.do.PFV-CVB-COP2-Q  
 d) χink’al      hi?i-r-i-ma      nin-e?

<sup>4</sup> A traditional Daghestanian dish, a kind of dumplings served with boiled meat and meat broth.

khinkal	4.do.PFV-CVB-COP2-Q	mother-ERG
e) <sup>??</sup> hiʔi-r-i-ma	nin-e	χink'al?
4.do.PFV-CVB-COP2-Q	mother-ERG	khinkal
f) <sup>??</sup> hiʔi-r-i-ma	χink'al	nin-e?
4.do.PFV-CVB-COP2-Q	khinkal	mother-ERG

‘Did mother make khinkal?’

## 2.2 Meditative polar questions

There is a special strategy for meditative questions, such as ‘I wonder whether...’. Meditative questions are formed by markers *-jden* or *-j* which following the interrogative form of the finite verb or the copula. Marker *-jden* is identical to the verbal clitic used in counterfactual conditional clauses, but *-j* is never used in conditionals (Dobrushina 2019). Cf. example (19a), with an ordinary polar question without *-jden/-j*, and (19b). Variants *-ma + -jden* (20) and *-ma + -j* (21) are equally possible:

- (19) a) nin-e      nek      χinime-š-is      a<w>i-r=a-ma?  
mother-ERG    milk    child.PL-OBL.PL-DAT      <3>pour.PFV-CVB=be-Q  
‘Did mother pour the children some milk?’
- b) nin-e      nek      χinime-š-is  
mother-ERG    milk    child.PL-OBL.PL-DAT  
a<w>i-r=a-ma-jden      /      a<w>i-r=a-ma-j?  
<3>pour.PFV-CVB=be-Q-MED      /      <3>pour.PFV-CVB=be-Q-MED  
‘Did mother poured the children some milk, I wonder.’

My consultants describe the difference between (19a) and (19b) in the following way. In (19a), you ask if the mother poured milk or not, while in (19b) you ask yourself as if you doubt or you do not really know whether the mother did it or not. Constructions with *-ma + -jden* and *-ma + -j* are semantically equivalent, and both opposed to *ma*. For meditative questions, I suggest that *-j* is a shorter realization of *-jden*, though their distribution in other contexts is different. As indicated above, *-jden* is used in conditionals, while *-j* is not.

Meditative question can be asked based on negative predications:

- (20) mij      uble      a-diš-ma-jden?  
here(ESS)    wolf.PL      be-NO-Q-MED  
‘Are there no wolves here, I wonder.’



### 2.3 Focus in polar questions

In questions, a constituent can be in narrow focus, i.e. it is the main topic of the question. The answer to the question that only includes one constituent was used as a diagnostic for what is in focus and what counts as new information. For instance, I suggested a Russian stimulus *On v gorod idet (ili kuda-to eše)?* ‘Is it a town where he goes to (or somewhere else)?’ (21), the consultant translated the sentence and answered *šeherde* ‘town’. I conclude that *šeherde* ‘town’ is in narrow focus:

- (21) FOC[šeher-d-e]            ruʔu-r=a-ma            ha-d?            —            šeher-d-e  
 town-OBL-IN            1.go.IPFV-CVB=be-Q            that-ATTR            —            town-OBL-IN  
 ‘Is it a town where he goes to (or somewhere else)? — To a town.’

There are three strategies of focusing. First, the questioned constituent remains in situ, so that a rising pitch is the only way to indicate the focused constituent:

- (22) mama-ra            ↑FOC[sa χinime-š-is]            hiʔi-t’-i-ma  
 mother-ERG    one    boy.PL-OBL.PL-DAT            4.do.PFV-ATTR-COP2-Q  
 χinkal? — waʔ,            riš-biš-es=xa            hiʔi-r  
 khinkal — no            girl-OBL.PL-DAT=ADD            4.do.PFV-CVB  
 ‘Did mother make khinkal only for the boys? — No, for the girls, too.’

Second, the focus may be fronted:

- (23) ↑FOC[χinkal]    mama-ra            hiʔi-t’-i-ma?            —            waʔ,    čej.  
 (khinkal)            mother-ERG    4.do.PFV-ATTR-COP2-Q            —            no    tea.  
 ‘Was it khinkal that the mother made? — No, it was tea.’

Third, the focus part is fronted, followed by the copula, the rest of the clause follows with the lexical verb in the attributive form:

- (24) FOC[χink’al]    i-ma            mama-ra            hiʔi-d?            —  
 khinkal            COP2-Q            mother-ERG    4.do.PFV-ATTR            —  
 waʔ,    čej    hiʔi-r=a.  
 no    tea    4.do.PFV-CVB=be  
 ‘Was it khinkal that mother made? — No, she made tea.’

This construction resembles a cleft construction attested in some other East Caucasian languages. A cleft sentence is a simple sentence expressed by a main clause and a subordinate clause, typically resembling a relative structure. There is an opposition between cleft and pseudo-cleft sentences, but in this paper the term cleft will be used, as this difference is irrelevant to Rutul.

An example of such a construction is found in Lezgian (Haspelmath 1993:352):

- (25) Tezetdin.a-n            k’wal-e            awa-j-di            q’we    kiisr    tir.  
 [Tezetdin-GEN            house-INCESS    be.in-PTP-SBST]            two    chair    COP:PST

‘What was in Tezetdin’s house were two chairs.’

In (25), the focus, *two chairs*, is followed by the copula and preceded by the background, a substantivized predicative participle and its dependents. In (24), we also can see a cleft construction: the focused part *χink’al* ‘khinkal’ followed by the copula moves to the sentence initial position.

## 2.4 Tag questions

In Kina Rutul, tag questions are formed with a copula marked with *-ma*. There are two tags, the positive *i-ma* (*jiʔi-ma*) and the negative *diš-ma*. The negative *diš-ma* is only used following positive sentences. The positive *i-ma* (*jiʔi-ma*) can be used following both positive or negative sentences. A tag is placed at the end of the sentence:

(26) ha-d                    q-i<r>q’i-r-i                    šeher-d-ja                    //  
       that-ATTR        RE-<1>come.PFV-CVB-COP2    town-OBL-IN.EL            //  
       diš-ma?        /        i-ma?            /        jiʔi-ma?  
       NO-Q            /        COP2-Q        /        1.COP1-Q  
       ‘He’s come back from the town, hasn’t he?’

(27) ha-d                    q-i<r>q’i-r-diš                    šeher-d-ja                    //  
       that-ATTR        RE-<1>come.PFV-CVB-NO        town-OBL-IN.EL            //  
       \*diš-ma?        /        i-ma?            /        jiʔi-ma?  
       NO-Q            /        COP2-Q        /        1.COP1-Q  
       ‘He hasn’t come back from the town, has he?’

The copula attaches to the verb, and the predicate is often placed at the end of the sentence. In examples like (28), one can distinguish a tag question from a regular polar question by a pause before the tag:

(28) a) wi                    ɤijɤa    tukan-a                    ru<r>u-s-i-diš-ma?  
       you.SG            today    shop-IN                    <2>come-INF-FUT-NO-Q  
       ‘Aren’t you going to the shop?’  
       b) wi                    ɤijɤa    tukan-a                    ru<r>u-s-i                    //        diš-ma?  
       you.SG            today    shop-IN                    <2>come-INF-FUT        //        NO-Q  
       ‘You are going to the shop, aren’t you?’

## 2.5 Answers to polar questions

Typical answers to polar questions are *ej* ‘yes’ or *waʔ* ‘no’, or the positive or negative copula, *jiʔi* and *diš*, respectively. Although they do not express preferences as to using yes/no vs. answering by the, the consultants usually first suggest yes/no. Sometimes, the predicate (the finite verb or the copula) is repeated:

- (29) geči r-iši-r=a-ma? — ej / wa?  
 tired 2-become.PFV-CVB=be-Q — yes / no  
 ‘Are you tired? — Yes/no.’ (kna\_2018\_17\_gljh\_1942latin)
- (30) riš-e-ra xiw hi?i-r=a-ma? — (ej), hi?i-r=a.  
 girl-OBL-ERG bread 4.do.PFV-CVB=be-Q — (yes), 4.do.PFV-CVB=be  
 lit.: ‘Did the sister make the bread? — (Yes), she made / no, she didn’t make it.’

The polarity of the answer depends on the polarity of the question. If the question contains a negation, the positive answer ‘yes’ expresses agreement with the positive proposition, and the answer ‘no’ — disagreement:

- (31) wi κijka q’iqaši-χda r-ixi-r-diš-ma? —  
 you.SG today calf.PL-SUB 2-go.to.PFV-CVB-NO-Q —  
 ej // (r-ixi-r=a)  
 yes // 2-go.PFV-CVB=be  
 ‘Haven’t you gone for the calves today? — Yes, I have gone.’
- (32) wi κijka q’iqaši-χda r-iχi-r diš-ma? — wa? //  
 you.SG today calf.PL -SUB 2-go.PFV-CVB NO-Q — no //  
 (r-iχi-r-diš)  
 2-go.PFV-CVB-NO  
 ‘Didn’t you go for the calves today? — No, I haven’t gone.’

As with other polar questions, answering polar questions with a narrow focus, one can say ‘yes/no’. Sometimes, the focused constituent is repeated in the answer:

- (33) FOC[χinχ-i-ra] ji?i-ma xed ji<d>q’i-d? —  
 child-OBL-ERG 4.COP1-Q water <4>bring.PFV-ATTR —  
 ej // (χinχ-i-ra)  
 yes // (child-OBL-ERG)  
 lit.: ‘Was it a boy who brought the water? — Yes, (it was) a boy.’
- (34) FOC[χinχ-i-ra] ji?i-ma xed ji<d>q’i-d? —  
 child-OBL-ERG 4.COP1-Q water <4>bring.PFV-ATTR —  
 wa? // (ris-e-ra)  
 no // (girl-OBL-ERG)  
 lit.: ‘Was it a boy who brought the water? — No, a girl.’

## 2.6 Alternative questions

Alternative questions include a polar interrogative clause. The alternatives are separated by conjunctions *dišde* ‘or’ or a Russian loanword *ili* ‘or’. *Diš-de* consists of the negative copula *diš* and

the conditional suffix *de*, so the meaning of the conjunction is originally ‘if not’. The first alternative remains in situ, and the other(s) is usually placed at the end of the sentence. Here are some examples of alternative questions, where the alternatives are arguments (a), locative adverbs (b), and attributives (c):

(35) a) arguments

mašina-ra	č’i	gj-i<w>i-r=a-j-ma	diš-de	/	ili
car.OBL-ERG	sheep	UNDER-<3>throw-CVB=be-PST-Q	NO-COND	/	or(R)

zer?  
cow

‘Did the car run over a sheep or a cow?’

b) locative adverbs

ha-d	mixtab-a	ji<r>q’i-r-i-ma	diš-de	/	ili
that-ATTR	school-IN	<1>come.PFV-CVB-COP2-Q	NO-COND	/	or(R)

bal’nica-j-e?  
hospital-OBL-IN

‘Did he go to school or to the hospital?’

c) attributives

maʔlim	mi	si-d-e	jiq’i-r-i-ma	diš-de	/
teacher	this	year-OBL-IN	1.die.PFV-CVB-COP2-Q	NO-COND	/

ili šes?  
or(R) last.year

‘Did the teacher die this year or last year?’

An alternative question with predicates as alternatives consists of two (or more) polar interrogative clauses where each predicate is marked with the interrogative marker *-ma*. The conjunctions *dišde / ili* can be omitted:

(36) χiniχ ješe-r=a-ma (diš-de) / (ili) jaʔq  
child 1.cry.IPFV-CVB=be-Q NO-COND / or(R) laughter  
haʔa-r=a-ma?  
4.do.IPFV-CVB=be-Q

‘The child is crying or laughing?’

(37) wa-d ile-s-di haʔa-r-i-ma (diš-de) /  
you.sg-ERG 4.eat-INF-ATTR 4.do.IPFV-CVB-COP2-Q NO-COND /  
(ili) čej haʔa-r-i-ma?  
or(R) tea 4.do.IPFV-CVB-COP2-Q

‘Are you cooking or making tea?’

The interrogative markers on the predicates as alternatives cannot be omitted, even if there is a conjunction. The markers should be attached to all the predicates, asymmetrical marking is not possible. Cf. (38) and (39):

- (38) a) \*wa-d      ile-s-di                      haʔa-r-i                      (diš-de)      /  
 you.SG-ERG    4.eat-INF-ATTR            4.do.IPFV-CVB-COP2    NO-COND      /  
 (ili)    čej    haʔa-r-i?  
 or(R)    tea    4.do.IPFV-CVB-COP2  
 ‘Are you cooking or making tea?’

- (39) b)\*wa-d      ile-s-di                      haʔa-r-i-**ma**                      (diš-de)      /      or(R)    tea  
 you.SG-ERG    4.eat-INF-ATTR    4.do.IPFV-CVB-COP2-**Q**            NO-COND      /      (ili)    čej  
 haʔa-r-i?  
 4.do.IPFV-CVB-COP2  
 ‘Are you cooking or making tea?’

Alternatives are focused constituents. As a result, they can be fronted in the same way as focused constituents in polar questions (cf. section 2.3):

- (40) FOC[č’i]                      mašina-ra                      gj-i<w>i-r=a-j-ma                      ili      zer?  
 sheep                      car.OBL-ERG    UNDER-<3>throw-CVB=be-PST-Q            or      cow  
 ‘Was it a sheep that the car ran over, or a cow?’

Alternative questions can also be meditative. Markers *-jden/-j* should be attached to all the predicates, asymmetrical marking is not possible:

- (41) wa-d                      ile-s-di                      haʔa-r-i-ma-j(den)                      ili      čej  
 you.SG-ERG    4.eat-INF-ATTR            4.do.IPFV-CVB-COP2-Q-MED            or(R)    tea  
 haʔa-r-i-ma-j(den)?  
 do.IPFV-CVB-COP2-Q-MED  
 ‘I wonder, are you cooking food or making tea.’

Another type of alternative questions is a question with positive and negative forms of the same predicate. The verb is marked with the interrogative marker *-ma*, then the same verb is repeated in the negative form, again with the interrogative marker.

- (42) χinime-r                      qiči<d>qi-r-i-ma                      qiči<d>qi-r-diš-ma?  
 child.PL-PL    <HPL>fight.PFV-CVB-COP2-Q                      <HPL>fight.PFV-CVB-NO-Q  
 lit.: ‘Children did fight or didn’t fight?’

Consultants reject examples where the predicate in the negative precedes the positive form. Just as in the other cases of predicates as alternatives (see examples 40, 42), the interrogative marker cannot be omitted on either predicate.

To answer an alternative question, one repeats the true alternative:

- (43) ha-bir            d-irxa-ra                            du-ruʔu-s-i-ma            ili            mašina-kan?  
 that-PL            HPL-go.to.IPFV-CVB                            HPL-go-INF-FUT-Q            or(R)    car-COM?  
 —            mašina-kan.  
 —            car-COM  
 ‘Will they go on foot or by car? — By car.’

### 3. Parametric questions

#### 3.1 Structure of parametric questions

Parametric questions are formed by question words *huš* ‘who’, *šiw* ‘what’, *mis* ‘when’, *hile* ‘where’, *hileʔ* ‘where.to’, *hilʔa* ‘where.from’, *šuwna* ‘how’, *šuwdi* ‘what’, *hijildi* ‘which’, *hijis* (*his*) / *jiʔiχda* ‘why’, *jiʔid badana* ‘what for’, *šumdi* ‘how many’, *šudda* ‘how much’, *šuddadis* ‘what price’ and probably other (Mukhin 2018).

- (44) zer            mis            li<w>i-r=a?  
 cow            when            <3>eat.PFV-CVB=be  
 ‘When did they eat the cow?’

Interrogative marker *-ma* cannot be used in parametric questions:

- (45) \*mis            li<w>i-r-i-ma                            zer?  
 when            <3>eat.PFV-CVB-Q            cow  
 ‘When did they eat the cow?’

In parametric questions wh-words are focused. They may be fronted, be a part of a cleft construction (see section 2.3), but may also remain in situ:

- (46) a) did            hile-ʔ            haʳrɣi-r            /            haʳrɣi-tʻ-i?  
 father            where-LAT            1.go.PFV-CVB /            1.go.PFV-ATTR-COP2  
 lit.: ‘Father where went?’  
 b) hile-ʔ            did            haʳrɣi-r            /            haʳrɣi-tʻ-i?  
 where-LAT            father            1.go.PFV-CVB /            1.go.PFV-ATTR-COP2  
 lit.: ‘Where father went?’  
 c) hile-ʔ            i            /            (jiʔi)            did            haʳrɣi-d?  
 where-LAT            COP2 /            (1.COP1)            father            1.go.PFV-ATTR

Consultants insist that there is no difference between examples (46a)-(46c). Probably, the most unmarked position for a wh-word is in situ. Fronting is frequent as well, but this position may have been provoked by Russian stimuli where question words were fronted.

To determine the position of the question word not influenced by Russian, I conducted an experiment. The consultants were offered an answer and a situation or context, and had to invent a question matching the answer for the situation. For example, I suggested the context:

(47) mu<sup>ʕ</sup>G<sup>w</sup>-a        hiki-s-i                    praznik.  
 village-IN        4.become-INF-FUT    holiday  
 ‘There will be a celebration in the village.’ —

and an answer *viška* ‘today’. The four consultants out of four suggested the same question (48), where the question word is in situ:

(48) mu<sup>ʕ</sup>G<sup>w</sup>-a        mis    hiki-s-i                    praznik?  
 village-IN        when 4.become-INF-FUT    holiday  
 ‘When there will be a celebration in the village?’

The consultants were asked to repeat the question twice. For the second time, they sometimes suggested a question with fronting: *mis mu<sup>ʕ</sup>G<sup>w</sup>-a hiki-s-i praznik?* However, their first reaction was always a question with the wh-word in situ.

As another experiment, a question word in the Russian stimulus was in situ: *Prazdnik kogda budet?* lit. ‘A celebration when will be?’, a marked possible alternative to the more usual fronting variant in Russian. Two out of three consultants translated this sentence as (48), with the question word in situ. One consultant used fronting.

One of these consultants allow moving the question word to the end of the sentence, but most consider it odd or even ungrammatical:

(49) ??mu<sup>ʕ</sup>G<sup>w</sup>-a                    hiki-s-i                    praznik                    mis?  
 village-IN                    4.become-INF-FUT    holiday                    when  
 ‘When there will be a celebration in the village?’

I conclude that question words are not necessarily fronted, and a more natural position for them is in situ, while fronting probably results from carrying over word order of the Russian stimulus.

Parametric questions can be asked to any constituent. Here are some examples of questions to the subject:

(50) huš    s-*uq*’u-r=a                    mirij-e-da?  
 who    PV-1.sit.PFV-CVB=be    stream-OBL-APUD  
 ‘Who is sitting by the river?’

(51) hal                    č’abal w-iq’-e                    ha<w>i-r=a?  
 who.OBL.ERG    sheep 3-die-IMP                    <3>do.PFV-CVB=be  
 ‘Who killed the sheep?’

An example of question to the P-argument is (52):

(52) ismail-a                    šuw    liʔi-r=a?  
 Ismail-ERG    what 4.eat.PFV-CVB=be  
 ‘What did Ismail eat?’

Examples of questions to some other constituents follow:

(53)  $\gamma$ ar-ar            hile    ruʔu-r=a?  
snake-PL            where 4.become.IPFV-CVB=be  
'Where do snakes live?'

(54)  $\gamma$ ar-ar            uq'-um-a        mis    ruʔu-r=a?  
snake-PL            grass-OBL-IN    when 4.become.IPFV-CVB=be  
'When are there snakes in the grass?'

Parametric questions can contain several question words:

(55) hal                hali-s            šuw    hiwi-r=a?  
who.OBL.ERG    who.OBL-DAT    what 4.give.PFV-CVB=be  
'Who gave whom what?'

The order of the question words in a multiple parametric question is variable:

(56) hali-s            hal                šuw    hiwi-r=a?  
who.OBL-DAT    who.OBL.ERG    what 4.give.PFV-CVB=be  
'Who gave whom what?'

### 3.2 Parametric meditative questions

Parametric meditative questions are formed by markers *-jden/-j*. In (56), a meditative question is combined with clefting:

(57) hal                i-j(den)        rak    jeda-d?  
who.OBL.ERG    COP2-MED        door 4.knock.IPFV-ATTR  
'I wonder, who is it who is knocking at the door'.

The interrogative marker *-ma* cannot be used in parametric questions. Expectedly, a combination of markers *-ma + -jden / -ma + -j* cannot be used in meditative parametric questions either:

(58) \*hal                i-ma-j(den)    raʔq    jeda-d?  
who.OBL.ERG    COP2-Q-MED        door 4.knock.IPFV-ATTR  
'I wonder who is knocking the door'.

Marker *-jden/-j* can also be used in parametric questions based on negative predication:

(59) hile     $\gamma$ ar-ar             $\chi$ e-ži-<d>q'i-r-i-jden?  
where snake-PL        PV-NEG-<NPL>catch.PFV-CVB-COP2-MED  
'Where don't they catch snakes?'



### 3.3 Answers to parametric question

Answers to parametric questions are formed by a constituent corresponding to the interrogative pronoun (ex. 59). Optionally, the predicate or the whole sentence can be repeated.

- (60) iz-di                    kıl-ij-di-bır                    hile    ji?i?                    —    (wi-di)  
 I-ATTR                    leg-OBL-ATTR-PL                    where NPL.COP1                    —    you.SG-ATTR  
 kıl-ij-di-bır                    mij    ji?i.                    /    mij    ji?i.                    /    mij.  
 leg-OBL-ATTR-PL                    here    NPL.COP1                    /    here    NPL.COP1                    /    here  
 ‘Where are my shoes? — (Your) shoes are here. / Here. / Here.’

As was mentioned before, meditative questions semantically do not require an answer, but there is an example, already described in section 3.2, where the consultant provided an answer to it. The consultant explained that there is a special emphasis on the word *hal* ‘who’, as if the speaker really wanted to know who did that:

- (61) hal                    i-jden                    rak    jeda-d?                    —    riş-be                    d-i?i.  
 who.OBL.ERG    COP2-MED                    door    4.knock.IPFV-ATTR                    —    girl-PL                    HPL-COP1  
 ‘I wonder, who is knocking at the door. — Girls.’

Availability of an answer may be explained by the presence of cleft which emphasizes the interrogative constituent.

## 4. Indirect questions

### 4.1 Indirect polar questions

Indirect polar questions may be formed in the same way as independent polar questions, by attaching the interrogative marker *-ma* to the verb:

- (62) za-s    hac’a-r-diş                    ged-ir-di                    g<sup>w</sup>alaχ  
 I-DAT    4.know.IPFV-CVB-NO    cat-OBL.PL-ATTR                    work  
 gul    χ-o<w>q’u-n                    w-i?i-ma.  
 mouse PV-<3>catch.PFV-NMLZ                    3-COP1-Q  
 ‘I don’t know whether catching mice is a cat’s work.’

Another strategy of marking indirect questions is a combination of *-ma* plus *-jden* or *-ma* plus *-j*. In this context, *-jden* and *-j* do not have the meditative meaning. For the sake of consistency, I will use the gloss MED also in this case:

- (63) nin-i-s                    hac’a-r-diş                    χinime-r  
 mother-OBL-DAT                    4.know.IPFV-CVB-NO    child.PL-PL  
 qiçi<d>qi-r-i-ma-j                    /    qiçi<d>qi-r-i-ma-jden  
 <HPL>fight.PFV-CVB-COP2-Q-MED                    /    <HPL>fight.PFV-CVB-COP2-Q-MED

‘Mother doesn’t know whether the children fought.’

Forms ending with *-jden* without the interrogative marker *-ma* are not used in indirect polar questions:

- (64) \**nin-i-s*                      *hac’a-r-diš*                      *χinime-r*  
 mother-OBL-DAT              4.know.IPFV-CVB-NO    child.PL-PL  
*qiči<d>qi-r-i-jden*.  
 <HPL>fight.PFV-CVB-COP2-MED

‘Mother doesn’t know whether the children fought.’

Most consultants do not see difference between (62) and (63), though some consultants suggest that question with *-ma* (62) is a direct quotation.

A subordinate clause without interrogative markers is not an indirect question but a factive complement clause:

- (65) *nin-i-s*                      *hac’a-r-diš*                      *χinime-r*  
 mother-OBL-DAT              4.know.IPFV-CVB-NO    child.PL-PL  
*qiči<d>qi-r=a-j*.  
 <HPL>fight.PFV-CVB=be-PST

‘Mother doesn’t know that the children have fought.’

## 4.2 Indirect alternative questions

Indirect questions can offer alternatives. The predicate is marked either with *-ma* or with *-ma-jden* or with *-ma-j*. Again, it seems that there is no semantic contrast:

- (66) *nin-i-s*                      *κ-agu-r-diš*                      *riš*  
 mother-OBL-DAT              PV-4.see.PFV-CVB-NO    daughter  
*mixdab-a*      *ru<r>u-r-i-ma*                      /              *ru<r>u-r-i-ma-j(den)*  
 school-IN      <2>come.IPFV-CVB-COP2-Q    /              <2>come.IPFV-CVB-COP2-Q-MED  
*dišde*    *baκd-e*.  
 or      garden-IN

‘Mother didn’t see whether her daughter went to school or to the garden’.

Questions with two and more predicates can also be formed by adding either of the three markers. The same marker is obligatorily attached to all the alternatives, no asymmetrical marking is possible:

- (67) *nin-i-s*                      *κ-agu-r-diš*                      *riš-e-ra*  
 mother-OBL-DAT              PV-4.see.PFV-CVB-N              daughter-OBL-ERG  
*ile-s-di*                      *ha?a-r-i-ma / ma-j(den)*                      *diš-de*  
 4.eat-INF-ATTR              4.do.IPFV-CVB-COP2-Q/Q-MED              NO-COND

s-a<r>χi-r-i-**ma** / **ma-j(den)**.

PV-<2>sleep.PFV-CVB-COP2-Q/Q-MED

‘Mother didn’t see whether the daughter was cooking or sleeping’

Similarly to direct alternative questions (see section 2.6), indirect alternative questions can be based on a verb in the positive and then negative form:

- (68) nin-i-s                      ʁ-agu-r-diš                      riš-e-ra  
mother-OBL-DAT              PR-4.see.PFV-CVB-NO daughter-OBL-ERG  
ile-s-di                      haʔa-r-i-**ma** / **ma-j(den)**  
4.eat-INF-ATTR              4.do.IPFV-CVB-COP2-Q/Q-MED  
haʔa-r-diš-**ma**                      /                      **ma-j(den)**.  
4.do.IPFV-CVB-COP2-Q              /                      Q-MED

‘Mother didn’t see whether her daughter cooked the food or not.’

#### 4.4 Indirect parametric questions

Indirect parametric questions are formed by marker *-jden*. The marker *-j* cannot be used in this context. It is also possible to ask a question without any interrogative markers, without any contrast perceived by the consultants:

- (69) nin-i-s                      hac’a-r-diš                      riš                      mis  
mother-OBL-DAT              4.know.IPFV-CVB-NO daughter                      when  
q-i<r>q’a-s-i-(jden).  
RE-<2>come-INF-FUT-(MED)

‘Mother doesn’t know when her daughter will come back.’

## 5. Parallels in Lezgian

As was shown above, meditative questions in Rutul are formed by markers *-jden/-j*. Marker *-jden* (but not *-j*) is identical to the verbal marker used in counterfactual conditionals (Dobrushina 2019). In such examples *-jden* is glossed as ‘IRR’:

- (70) said-a                      uq’                      saxa-r-i-**jden**                      zi                      χal-a  
said-ERG                      grass                      4.mow.IPFV-CVB-COP2-IRR                      I                      home-IN  
su<r>q’u-s-i-j  
<2>stay-INF-FUT-PST

‘If Said mowed the grass, I would have stayed at home.’ (Dobrushina 2019)

The distribution of the Rutul meditative/counterfactual marker has some parallels in a genealogically related Lezgian language. In Lezgian, conditionals are formed with a marker *-t’a*:

- (71) eger                      am                      paka                      ata-na-j-**t’a**,                      za                      am

[if she:ABS tomorrow come-AOR-PST-CND] I:ERG she:ABS  
 vokzal.d-a gürüşmiš iji-da-j.  
 station-INESS meeting do-FUT-PST

‘If she were to arrive tomorrow, I would meet her at the station.’ (Haspelmath 1993:395)

Lezgian conditional *-t’a*, as well as Rutul *-jden* (cf. section 4), is also used in indirect questions:

(72) za sadra, kkal.i xa-nwa-t’a, akwa-n.  
 I:ERG PT [cow(ERG) bear-PRF-CND] see-HORT

‘Let me see whether the cow has calved.’ (Haspelmath 1993:425)

Independent questions formed by marker *-t’a* “express hesitating questions, self-addressed questions (‘I wonder...’), and statements with low probability” (Haspelmath 1993:427):

(73) jarab abur.u wuč luhu-zwa-t’a?  
 PT they(ERG) what:ABS say-IMPF-CND

‘I wonder what they are saying.’ (Haspelmath 1993:427)

Thus, the Lezgian independent questions with *-t’a* have the same function as Rutul meditative questions with *-jden*. Haspelmath says that these questions can be regarded as “indirect questions used as independent sentences”, which is a result of insubordination. Insubordination is “the conventionalised main-clause use of what, on prima facie grounds, appear to be formally subordinate clauses” (Evans 2007:367). Typologically, one of the uses of insubordination is “to express various kinds of modal meaning” (Evans 2007:394). Probably, the explanation is also valid for Rutul, and meditative questions formed by *-ma-jden* / *-ma-j* or *-jden/-j* (e.g. (74)) can be considered the result of insubordination of subordinate clause in indirect questions (e.g. (75)):

(74) za-s ɤ-agu-r-diš ubul mis  
 I-DAT PV-4.see.PFV-CVB-NO wolf when  
 ji<b>q’i-r-i-jden  
 <4>come.PFV-CVB-COP2-IRR

‘I didn’t see when a wolf came.’

(75) ubul mis ji<b>q’i-r-i-jden?  
 wolf when <4>come.PFV-CVB-COP2-MED

‘I wonder when a wolf came.’

## 6. Conclusion

In this paper, I reviewed different types of interrogative sentences in Kina Rutul. Polar questions are formed by marker *-ma*, which can only be added to a finite verb. Parametric questions are formed by wh-words and do not allow for *-ma*. Alternative questions are a sub-type of polar

questions and require *-ma*, to be added to all finite verbs in the sentence. Meditative questions can also be polar (including alternative) or parametric. These are formed by markers *-jden/-j*. These markers have different distribution: in particular, *-jden* is also used in indirect parametric questions and counterfactual conditional clauses, while *-j* is impossible in those contexts.

Table 2 sums up all the possible ways to mark different types of questions.

**Table 2. Interrogative markers**

Marker	Direct questions				Indirect questions			
	Polar	Alternative		Parametric	Polar	Alternative		Parametric
		1 verb	2 verbs			1 verb	2 verbs	
-ma	+	+	+	*	(+) (DQ)	(+) (DQ)	(+) (DQ)	*
-ma-j	+ (QM)	+ (QM)	+ (QM)	*	+	+	+	*
-ma-jden	+ (QM)	+ (QM)	+ (QM)	*	+	+	+	*
-jden	*	*	*	+	*	*	*	+
no marking but pitch	+	*	*	+	+	*	*	+

Legend:

‘+’ — this type of question can be formed by this strategy

‘\*’ — this type of question cannot be formed by this strategy

‘QM’ — question has a meditative meaning

‘DQ’ — question has a meaning of a direct quotation

To conclude, I have presented the general types of questions in Rutul, but some issues, for example, the origins of meditative questions, need further investigation.

## List of abbreviations

1 – first gender	IN.EL – inelative
2 – second gender	INESS – inessive
3 – third gender	IN – inessive
4 – fourth gender	INF – infinitive
ABSTR – abstract noun	IRR – irrealis
ABS – absolutive	IPFV – imperfective stem
ADD – additive	LAT – lative
AOR – aorist	MED – meditative question
ATTR – attributive	NEG – negative
CND - conditional	NO – negative copula
COND – conditional	OBL – oblique stem
COM – comitative	ORD – ordinal
COP1 – full form of copula	PFV – perfective stem
COP2 – full form of copula	PL – plural
CVB – converb	POSS – possessive
DAT – dative	PST – past tense
EL – elative	PV – preverb (verbal prefix)
EMPH – emphatic	QUOT – quotative
ERG – ergative	RE - refractive
FUT – future	SG – singular
HORT - hortative	SIMIL – similitive
HPL – human plural	SUP – super
H - human	SUP.EL – superrelative
IMP – imperative	TEMP – temporal

## References

- Alekseev 1994 — Alekseev, M. 1994. “Rutul.” Pp. 213-258 in *Indigenous languages of the Caucasus, V.4, P. 2.*, edited by R. Smeets. Delmar. NY: Caravan books.
- Bally 1932 — Bally C. 1932. “Linguistique générale et linguistique française”, Berne: A Francke.
- Dobrushina 2019 — Dobrushina N. 2019. *Conditions, questions, and pronouns: several cases of combined marking in Lezgian languages*. Ms.
- Evans 2007 — Evans N. 2007. “Insubordination and its uses”, in *Finiteness: Theoretical and Empirical Foundations*, Oxford : Oxford University Press, 366-431 edited by I Nikolaeva.
- Haspelmath 1993 — Haspelmath M. 1993. *A grammar of Lezgian*. Berlin; New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Ibragimov 1978 — Ibragimov, G. X. 1978. *Rutuljskij jazyk*. Maxachkala.
- König & Siemund 2007 — König, Ekkehard, and Peter Siemund. 2007. “Speech act distinctions in grammar.” Pp. 276-324 in *Language typology and syntactic description 1* edited by Timothy Shopen.
- Lapin 2018 — Lapin, E. 2018. *Copular clauses in Rutul*.
- Makhmudova 2018 — Makhmudova, S. 2018. “Obševoprositelnye predlozheniya rutul'skogo jazyka.” Pp. 9-2 in *Filologičeskije nauki. Voprosy teorii i praktiki*.
- Mukhin 2018 — Mukhin, T. 2018. *Pronouns and numerals in Kina Rutul*. (field report)
- Polinsky 1999 – Polinsky, Maria. 1999. “Review of Information Structure and Sentence Form: Topic, Focus, and the Mental Representations of Discourse Referents by Knud Lambrecht.” Pp. 567-582 in *Language*, 75(3).
- Testelec 1998 — Testelec, Y. G. 1998. “Word order in Daghestanian languages.” Pp. 257-282 in *Empirical approaches to language typology*.
- Testelec 2001 — Testelec, Y. G. 2001. *Vvedenie v obščiy sintaksis*. Moskva: RGGU.

Konovalova, A. Laboratory of Formal Models in Linguistics, HSE University,  
Laboratory Assistant. [askonovalova@edu.hse.ru](mailto:askonovalova@edu.hse.ru)

**Any opinions or claims contained in this Working Paper do not necessarily reflect the views of HSE.**

© Konovalova, 2019