Endoclitics (intraclitics, mesoclitics) are a rare type of clitics occurring inside words, which attracted much attention in the literature during the recent decade and a half, cf. discussion by Harris (2002), Anderson (2005), Yu (2007), Spencer & Luís (2012), Smith (2013), among others. It is often the case that endoclitics can appear inside verb forms: e.g. in European Portuguese, pronominal object clitics are places before personal inflection affixes in the future tense (1), and in Udi, a Nakh-Daghestanian language, person agreement markers can break up most finite verbs (2).

(1) mostrar-lho-emos
   ‘we shall show it to him’ (future mostraremos + -lho < -lhe ‘to him’ + -o ‘it’)

(2) ba-ne-k-i
   be₁=3SG=be₂-AOR
   ‘s/he was’ (aorist baki + -ne ‘3sg’)

The present paper aims to show that another instance of endoclitics in synthetic verb forms is attested in Andi, one of the minority languages spoken in western Daghestan (Russia). Andi belongs to the Avar-Andic branch of Nakh-Daghestanian family and remains unwritten and poorly described, although during the 20th c. several traditional grammar sketches of the language were produced (in Russian and in Georgian). The unusual behaviour of clitics which makes it possible to analyse them as endoclitics has never been discussed in the published literature, however, and the very phenomenon was discovered only recently during the author’s fieldwork.

The Andi endoclitics is described in (3). The use of the additive enclitic -lo ‘and, also’ is illustrated in (4), where it is used as a symmetric coordination device. The use of the intensifying enclitic -gu with a basic function of marking identity (‘the same’) is shown in (5) with a reflexive pronoun. Both markers are hosted by inflected forms of various words classes (and not by stems of one specific word class, like affixes), which proves that they are indeed clitics – of course, if one thinks of a clitic-affix distinction as a valid one at all.

(3) In negative verb forms, the additive clitic -lo and the intensifying clitic -gu are placed inside the verb, right before negation markers.

(4) boc’o-lo  c’ek’ir-dul-lo
       [wolf]=ADD [goatlet-PL]=ADD
   ‘The wolf and the young goats.’

(5) he-b-rihi  ži-w-gu  mukurli-do  hewe-w.
       DEM-IV-TEMP [self-M]=INT confess-HAB DEM<M>-M
   ‘Then he confesses himself.’

To show that -lo and -gu are indeed endoclitics, and not just clitics, one has to check whether the word inside which they occur is indeed a bound form, and not an incompletely morphologized periphrastic form, where the negation marker is a clitic itself. The outline of my analysis is as follows.

In examples like (6) with the negative habitual and (7) with the negative aorist we deal with finite verb forms with a standard negation marker -sːu. This marker simply follows the affirmative form, making it negative (e.g. c’ːado ‘habitually drinks’ ~ c’ːado-sːu ‘does not habitually drink’). It is prosodically deficient and is inseparable from the verb form by any other material except the two putative endoclitics.
(6) c’a-do-lo-su, k’am-mo-lo-su
drink-HAB=ADD=NEG eat-HAB=ADD=NEG
‘He neither drinks nor eats (habitually).’

(7) išːi-di zuura pudi, bisil l’ibdi-w-o w-ugon-su!
we.EXCL-ERG zurna blow.AOR you.PL dancing-<M>AFF M-come.AOR=NEG
išːi-di moco ithi, bisil w-ok’uli-gu-su!
we.EXCL-ERG weeping do.AOR you.PL M-PL.weep.AOR=INT=NEG
‘We played the flute for you, and you did not dance; we sang a dirge, and you did not cry.’ (Luke 7:32)

At the same time, the negation marker is identical to a negative copula sːu, cf. (8). Therefore, it cannot be excluded that standard negative forms like whose illustrated in (6) and (7) are not strictly speaking affixal, but rather include a semi-autonomous element (former negative copula).

(8) hajman boc’o sːu
sheep wolf COP.NEG
‘A sheep is not a wolf.’

But even if so, there are good reasons to assume that other negative verb forms in which -lo and -gu occur are really morphologically bound. Some of the negative verb forms, e.g. the negative imperative (prohibitive) and the negative future, are not derived from their affirmative counterparts by means of -sːu: although they contain -sːu, this morpheme is fused with other markers, so synchronically they are not identical to the negative copula (cf. -sːub in the prohibitive, -sːja in the future). Moreover, one of the forms, namely the negative perfective converb (syncretic with the negative finite perfect) does not contain -sːu at all, but uses a special negation marker -č’igu, which has nothing to do with the negative copula. Still, in all these forms negation markers can be separated from the rest of the verb by the additive -lo or the intensifying -gu: see (9) with the prohibitive bužudosːub ‘don’t trust’ and (10) with the negative future ruʟdosːja ‘won’t say’.

(9) ...hege.ši-lo bužu-do-lo-sːub.
DEM.M-SUPER.LAT believe-PROH+ADD
‘{Beware of him,} and also don’t trust him.’

(10) išː-l’o sebgulo ruʟ-do-gu-sːja
we.EXCL-SUPER.LAT nothing say-FUT.NEG+INT
‘He won’t tell us anything at all.’

The paper will describe the properties of the two endoclitics, as well as the morphology of negative verb forms in Andi in more detail. I will also discuss a partial parallel to the Andi endoclitics found in Bagwalal (also an Avar-Andic language), where an intensifying marker -da can also occur inside negative verb forms, but causes idiosyncratic change of a verb stem, and hence cannot be analysed as a (proper) endoclitic.
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