Structural and functional variations of the perfect in Lezgic languages

1. Lezgic languages: general profile
   - Indigenous language families of the Caucasus
     - West Caucasian (Abkhaz-Adyghean): Abkhaz, Adyghe etc.
     - East Caucasian (Nakh-Daghestanian): Chechen, Avar, Lezgian etc.
     - South Caucasian (Kartvelian): Georgian, Mingrelian etc.
   - East Caucasian family
     - Daghestan, Chechnya, Ingushetia, adjacent areas of Azerbaijan and Georgia.
       - Nakh (3 languages)
       - Avar-Andic (9 languages)
       - Tsezic (5-6 languages)
       - Lak
       - Dargwa (~15 languages)
       - Lezgic (9 languages)
       - Khinalug

   - Typical features: elaborate consonant inventories (ejectives, post-velars), ergative case alignment, rich case systems (including dozens of locative forms), nominal gender agreement, rich tense and aspect systems (including aspectual and evidential contrasts), dominant SOV order, etc.

2. Lezgic group
   - Southern part of Daghestan and northern regions of Azerbaijan.
     - Lezgian, Tabassaran, Agul (eastern branch)
     - Tsakhr, Rutul (western branch)
     - Kryz, Budugh (southern branch)
     - Archi (northwestern outlier)
     - Udi (southernmost outlier)

   - Among them, there are major languages with the developed literary standards (Lezgian and Tabassaran), smaller languages which became written only in 1990s, with almost no original literature (Agul, Tsakhur and Rutul), and even smaller unwritten languages (Kryz, Budugh and Archi).
Diachronic evidence

- *Udi* is the closest living relative to the extinct *Caucasian Albanian* language – the only East Caucasian language with an ancient written tradition (cf. the palimpsests found on Mt. Sinai and published in Gippert et al. 2008).
- Apart from the available written records of Old Udi (*Caucasian Albanian*), which there are no sources on older stages of Lezgic languages (before the 19th century, when the first grammatical sketches and recorded texts were published).
- The details of the evolution of grammatical patterns in Lezgic languages are far from clear; cf. the attempts to discover the origins of most prominent grammatical markers in works on comparative reconstruction, especially Alekseev 1985.

Scope of the paper

- The paper overviews the morphological structure and functions of the perfect forms in the languages of the Lezgic group.
- The origin and evolution of the perfects are considered from a comparative intragenetic perspective, and taking into account the cross-linguistic regularities observed in the *perfect* domain (esp. by Dahl, Bybee, Tatevosov, among others).
- The perfects, whose core meaning is the past time reference with ‘current relevance’, will be contrasted with the aorists, i.e. more neutral and more frequent perfective past tenses, which occur in the narrative main-line.

2. Lezgic tense and aspect systems

Aspectual distinction

- **PERFECTIVE vs. IMPERFECTIVE** stems: a distinction expressed morphologically by vocalic suffixes or other means as well (infixedes, apophony, suppletion).
- The opposition existed already in Proto-Lezgic (Alekseev 1985: 75-89); among the modern languages, it is not very clearly articulated in Udi where it can be seen only in irregular verbs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>language</th>
<th>verb</th>
<th>PF</th>
<th>IPF</th>
<th>expression</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agul</td>
<td>‘read’</td>
<td>ruχ-u-</td>
<td>ruχ-a-</td>
<td>suffixation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agul</td>
<td>‘die’/‘kill’</td>
<td>k’-i-</td>
<td>k’-e-</td>
<td>suffixation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agul</td>
<td>‘do’</td>
<td>aq’-u-</td>
<td>a-χq’-a-</td>
<td>suffixation + infix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agul</td>
<td>‘say’</td>
<td>p-u-</td>
<td>aχ-a-</td>
<td>stem suppletion + suffix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lezgian</td>
<td>‘go’</td>
<td>f-e-</td>
<td>f-i-</td>
<td>suffixation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lezgian</td>
<td>‘do’</td>
<td>aw-u-</td>
<td>ij-i-</td>
<td>stem suppletion + suffix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lezgian</td>
<td>‘say’</td>
<td>laχ-a-</td>
<td>luh-u-</td>
<td>vowel alternation + suffix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutul</td>
<td>‘sow’</td>
<td>jez-i-</td>
<td>jez-e-</td>
<td>suffixation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutul</td>
<td>‘sit down’</td>
<td>suχ’-u-</td>
<td>suχq’-a-</td>
<td>suffixation + infix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsakhur</td>
<td>‘do’</td>
<td>haχ-u-</td>
<td>haχ-a-</td>
<td>suffixation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsakhur</td>
<td>‘beat’</td>
<td>iχχ-i-</td>
<td>iχiχ-a-</td>
<td>stem reduplication + suffix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Udi</td>
<td>‘say’</td>
<td>p-</td>
<td>uk-</td>
<td>stem suppletion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Udi</td>
<td>‘come’</td>
<td>har-</td>
<td>es-</td>
<td>stem suppletion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Periphrastic forms
• Main verb: converb (PF or IPF), participle (PF or IPF), infinitive.
• Auxiliary (postpositional): copula, sometimes also the verb ‘be (inside)’.
• Auxiliary form: present or past.
• Periphrastic > synthetic: morphologization (auxiliary fusion), loss of auxiliary.

Perfective vs. imperfective main verb, present vs. past auxiliary (Agul):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Converb, PF</th>
<th>Auxiliary, present</th>
<th>Auxiliary, past</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aorist</td>
<td>(&lt; aq’-u-na e )</td>
<td>DISCONTINUOUS PAST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(do-PF-CONV COP)</td>
<td>(&lt; aq’-u-na ij )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(aq’\text{`une} ) ‘did’</td>
<td>(do-PF-CONV COP).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>((&lt; aq’-\text{`u-na} e )</td>
<td>(aq’\text{`unij} ) ‘did’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(do-PF-CONV COP)</td>
<td>(do-PF-CONV COP).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Converb, IPF</td>
<td>HABITUAL PRESENT</td>
<td>HABITUAL PAST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(&lt; aq’-a-j e )</td>
<td>(&lt; aq’-\text{`a-j} ij )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(do-IPF-CONV COP)</td>
<td>(do-IPF-CONV COP).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Aorists vs. perfects
• Both can be synthetic (Udi), both can be originally periphrastic (Agul).
• As a rule, aorists are (more) synthetic and perfects are (more) periphrastic.
• Periphrastic aorists/perfects belong to the ‘present perfective’ type.
• Corresponding forms with past auxiliaries are usually pluperfects or something like ‘discontinuous pasts’ (“past with no present relevance”, in terms of Plungian & van der Auwera 2006: 324).

3. Variations in the structure of the aorists vs. the perfects

Structures of the aorists
• predominantly synthetic:
  o synthetic aorist, syncretic with a perfective stem (Archi)
  o synthetic aorist, syncretic with a perfective converb and/or participle (Lezgian, Tsakhur, Udi, Kryz, probably also Budugh)
• originally periphrastic form <perfective converb + copula>, morphologized into a synthetic aorist (Agul, Tabassaran, Rutul, probably also Lezgian)

Structures of the perfects
• predominantly periphrastic (at least diachronically)
  o <perfective converb + copula> – in Tsakhur, Kryz, Budugh, Archi
  o <perfective converb + verb ‘be in’> – in those languages, where <perfective converb + copula> is the source pattern of aorists (Agul, Tabassaran, Rutul, probably also Lezgian)
• synthetic (suffixal), with unclear etymology – Udi

1 In Archi, there is a functional split between the full form with a copula and the reduced form syncretic with the perfective converb, see below.
Aorist vs. perfect in a single language: formal relations
- synthetic aorist ~ periphrastic perfect
  - e.g. Tsakhur AOR *iwho* ‘said’ ~ PRF *iwho wod* ‘has said’
- synthetic (former periphrastic) aorist ~ synthetic (former periphrastic) perfect
  - e.g. Agul AOR *pune* (< *puna e*) ‘said’ ~ PRF *punaa* (< *puna aa*) ‘has said’
- suffixal aorist ~ suffixal perfect
  - e.g. Udi AOR *pi* ‘said’ ~ PRF *pe* ‘has said’
- but no: *periphrastic aorist ~ synthetic perfect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>AORIST</th>
<th>PERFECT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lezgian</td>
<td><em>laha-na</em> ‘said’ synthetic, -na</td>
<td><em>laha-nwa</em> ‘has said’ periphrastic &gt; synthetic, -nwa / -nawa (&lt; PF converb + <em>awa</em> ‘be in’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(= PF converb; copula lost?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tabassaran²</td>
<td><em>hap-nu</em> ‘said’ periphrastic &gt; synthetic, -nu (&lt; PF converb + copula <em>wu</em>)</td>
<td><em>dap-na</em> ‘has said’ periphrastic &gt; synthetic, -na (&lt; PF converb + a ‘be in’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(&lt; PF converb + copula <em>wu</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agul</td>
<td><em>pu-ne / pu-naw</em> ‘said’ periphrastic &gt; synthetic, -ne / -naw (&lt; PF converb + copula <em>e / wu</em>)</td>
<td><em>pu-naa, pu-naja</em> ‘has said’ periphrastic &gt; synthetic, -naa / -naja (&lt; PF converb + <em>aa / aja</em> ‘be in’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(= PF converb or PF participle)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsakhur</td>
<td><em>iwho / iwho-jn</em> ‘said’ synthetic, ∅ or -na / -jn (&lt; PF converb or PF participle)</td>
<td><em>iwho wo-d</em> ‘has said’ periphrastic (= PF converb + copula <em>wo-d</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutul</td>
<td><em>huxur(-i)</em> ‘said’ periphrastic &gt; synthetic, ∅ or -i (&lt; PF converb + copula <em>i</em>)</td>
<td><em>huxur a</em> ‘has said’ periphrastic (= PF converb + a ‘be in’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kryz³</td>
<td><em>lipu-że</em> ‘said’ synthetic, -d/-du/-że/-dzić (&lt; substantivized PF participle)</td>
<td><em>lip-że</em> ‘has said’ periphrastic &gt; synthetic, -że/żeu/-żeb (&lt; PF converb in -że + copula <em>ja</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budugh</td>
<td><em>jipa-że</em> ‘said’ synthetic, -że</td>
<td><em>aq’uli-vi</em> ‘has sat / is sitting’ periphrastic &gt; synthetic, -vi (&lt; PF participle + copula <em>vi</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(= substantivized PF participle)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archi</td>
<td><em>bo</em> ‘said’ synthetic, ∅ (= PF stem)</td>
<td><em>bo-li (b-i)</em> ‘has said’ periphrastic &gt; synthetic (PF converb ± copula <em>b-i</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Udi</td>
<td><em>p-i</em> ‘said’ synthetic, -i (= PF converb/participle)</td>
<td><em>p-e</em> ‘has said’ synthetic, -e</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

² In Tabassaran, two different perfective prefixes are used (for non-prefixed verb), *a*- in the aorist vs. *d*- in the perfect.
³ In Kryz, gender class suffixes follow both the substantivizing marker and the copula, becoming fused with these markers.
4. Variations in the functions of the perfects

- **Perfect proper (‘current relevance’) meaning**
  - Being opposed to aorist as the main narrative tense, the perfect is predominantly found in dialogues or in the direct speech of protagonists when situations in the past relevant to the moment of speech are introduced.

(1) Agul (Maisak & Merdanova 2016)

\[
\text{wa... ge k"al-as } \text{s.\text{-}nāa} \text{ ze fi-jē, no that in\_memory-ELAT go\_away.PF-PRF my what-INDEF } \\
\text{aq\text{\text{-}\text{-}s-e } zun gi-n tur. after say.IP-INF-COP I that-GEN name } \\
\text{[And his name was...] ‘No, I have forgot, how... I will tell you his name later.’}
\]

(2) Tabassaran (Magometov 1965: 261)\(^4\)

\[
\text{uwu lā\text{\text{-}\text{-}nh} \text{d-ap\'-na-wa, hamus \text{\text{-}\text{-}arax } sejir ap\'-in! } } \\
\text{you work PV-do-PRF=2SG now go\_away:IMP walk do-IMP ‘You have done your work, now go and take a walk!’}
\]

(3) Lezgian (Haspelmath 1993: 143)

\[
\text{ži pul na aq\text{\text{-}\text{-}ud-nawa! } } \\
\text{I:GEN money you:ERG take.away-PRF ‘YOU have stolen my money!’ [the theft has just occurred]}
\]

(4) Rutul (Makhmudova 2001: 145)

\[
\text{did-e wa-s u\text{\text{-}\text{-}xun } lüw\_šur ?a! } \\
\text{father-ERG you-DAT dress <CL>buy.PF.CONV be.PRS [A:] ‘Father has bought you a dress!’ [B: Oh, I can hardly believe that!]}
\]

(5) Tsakhur (Tatevosov & Maisak 1999: 218)

\[
\text{ma\text{\text{-}\text{-}h\text{\text{-}\text{-}ammad}-\text{-}ē } x\text{\text{-}an } il\text{\text{-}\text{-}od\text{-}\text{-}k-u wo-d } } \\
\text{Mohammed-ERG water <CL>drink-PF COP-CL [A: Could you give me to drink? B: No, I’m sorry!] ‘Mohammed has drunk the water.’}
\]

(6) Kryz (Authier 2009: 260)

\[
\text{mad xin ka\-č\_ʒa } \\
\text{again grass PV-grow-PRF ‘The grass has grown (so the poor won’t starve any more).’}
\]

(7) Budugh (Alekseev 1994: 279)

\[
\text{an\_ir mitkeri-z pitin ťey hazir si\text{\text{-}\text{-}iri-vi } } \\
\text{he-ERG wedding-DAT all thing ready do.PF.PTCP-COP ‘He prepared everything for the wedding.’}
\]

\(^4\) The situation is not homogeneous across different dialects; cf. also Bogomolova 2013.
(8) Udi (Maisak 2016)

\[ \text{ne\=x-tun, "\=u, ek-i, \=covak-i tac-e-ne qizilqu\=u\=s".} \]

say:PRS=3PL VOC:M come-IMP pass-AOC go.away-PRF=3SG vulture

[The barnyard birds are looking for a rooster, who escaped during a vulture’s attack; they explain that there is no danger.] ‘They tell him: Hey, come here, the vulture has left!’

(9) Archi (Paperno 2006)

\[ \text{\textit{\=lanna gelg\=o\=c' o \=cu\=c\=e bo-s orqa-li}} \]

woman dishes wash-INF go.PF-PRF

[A: Where is the woman? – B: ] ‘The woman has gone to wash the dishes.’

\[ \diamond \text{ Resultative meaning} \]

\[ \text{• In most languages, the resultative meaning of the perfect is well represented, especially with posture verbs like ‘sit down’, ‘stand up’ (or ‘stop’), ‘lie down’, etc. While the entry into a state (‘sat down’, ‘lied down’ etc.) is expressed by the aorist, the current state (‘is sitting’, ‘is lying’ etc.) is expressed by the perfect; in the latter case, adverbials like ‘still’ can be used to emphasize that the state holds.} \]

(10) Agul (Maisak & Merdanova 2016)

a. \[ \text{\=uc \textit{aluq'.u-naa degi-l...}} \]

self SUPER.sit.PF-PRF donkey-SUPER

[Walking down the road.] ‘He is sitting on a donkey...’ [and his son walks by foot.]

b. \[ \text{wuri nek: \=yx.u-naa.} \]

all milk drink.PF-PRF

[There is no milk at home.] ‘All the milk has been drunk.’

c. \[ \text{gi \=yx.u-naa.} \]

that(ERG) drink.PF-PRF

[He cannot work now.] ‘He is drunk.’

(11) Tabassaran (Xanmagomedov & Šalbuzov 2001: 137-138)

\[ \text{bar\=x.l-i-in mu\=x da-b\=x-na.} \]

carpet-SUPER barley <CL>pour-PRF

‘There is barley (lit. barley is poured) on a carpet.’

(12) Lezgian (Haspelmath 1993: 92)

\[ \text{ali stol.di-q acuq'-nawa.} \]

Ali table-POST.ESS sit-PRF

‘Ali is sitting at (lit. ‘behind’) a table.’

(13) Tsakhur (Tatevosov & Maisak 1999: 220)

\[ \text{ma'hammad hale-r cajsin-o-r} \]

Mohammed still-CL fall.asleep.PF-COP-CL

‘Mohammed is still sleeping.’

(14) Rutul (Makhmudova 2001: 71)

\[ \text{anuc \textit{lur-kur} za.} \]

Anuc <CL>lie_down.PF.CONV be.PRS

‘Anuc is lying.’
(15) Kryz (Authier 2009: 380)

\[ ik-re \ ki \ sa-r \ načirći \ sunği \ vaja-ž \ q’an-ik \ a-sqʷa-ža... \]

look-PRS KI one-CL cowboy one.OBL cliff-GEN base-SUB PV-sit-PRF

‘He sees: a cowboy is sitting at the foot of a cliff...’ [and his cows are walking around and grazing.]

(16) Budugh (Talibov 2007: 229)

\[ zoχ \ gira \ k’udosu \ χor \ vip’t’il-i-vi. \]
I.AD in_yard <NEG>bite.PTCP dog tie.PTCP-COP

‘In my yard, the dog is tied which is not angry (lit. which does not bite).’

(17) Udi (Maisak 2016)

\[ beⁿ-neⁿ-s-i, \ sa \ ostahar \ darvaz-in \ bo-n-a \]
look=3SG=ST-AOR one strong gate-GEN inside-O-DAT

\[ nu-ak-ec-i, \ sa \ šavat: \ chiijär-e \ arc-e. \]
NEG=see-DETR-AOP one good girl=3SG sit-PRF

\[ izi \ ka’kca’p-el-al \ sa \ ma’ji’n \ dev-e \ bask-e. \]
own knee-SUPER=ADD one black dev=3SG sleep-PRF

‘He looked (into a cave) and saw: behind a strong gate a wonderful, beautiful girl is sitting. And a black dev (= a giant monster) is sleeping at her lap.’

- In Archi, there is a dedicated periphrastic resultative form (PF converb + copula) which is opposed to the perfect / unwitnessed past lacking a copula (see below). Still, according to Paperno 2006, as well as certain examples in Kibrik 1977: 230-231, the synthetic form does not exclude the resultative reading.

(18) Archi (Paperno 2006)

\[ łonnol \ jonsaw \ arχu-li \ (d-i) \]
woman still lie.PF-CONV/PRF CL-COP

‘The woman is still sleeping.’

- In Kryz, a non-fused (or at least less fused) periphrastic construction “PF converb in -ʒi + copula ja-” is used as a dedicated resultative, which normally occurs without an agent NP (Authier 2009: 168).

(19) Kryz (Authier 2009: 168)

\[ sa-b \ śajara \ riš \ č’iq’-rime-var \ ke-u-čuń-ʒija-u \]
one-CL beautiful girl plait-PL-AD.ELAT PV-CL-hang-RESULT-CL

‘[They see:] a beautiful girl is hanging (= hang herself) on her plait.’

- Experiential meaning

(20) Udi (Maisak 2016)

\[ bez \ kalba \ ak-e-nu \ (*a-n-k:-i) \ sal? \]
my grandfather(DAT) see-PRF=2SG see=2SG=ST-AOR at.all

‘Have you ever seen my grandfather?’
(21) Kryz (Authier 2009: 85)
za _pek’rimi va-var uajra hičan-ıs vi-d-q’u-de-d
1.GEN lip-PL 2-AD.ELAT excepted nobody-SUPER PV-CL-reach-PRF.NEG-CL
‘My lips have never touched anyone except you.’

- Aorist is the preferred or the only possible means (e.g. Lezgian, Tsakhur)

(22) Tsakhur (Tatevosov & Maisak 1999: 223)
ma’hammad.i-s-qa ma-na qızax-i-na (*qızax-i wo-r(-na))
Mohammed-AD-ALL this-ATR CL.meet-PF-ATR CL.meet-PF COP-CL-ATR
[A: Did Magomed know the late Rasul? B: Yes,] ‘Mohammed has met him.’

(23) Lezgian (Haspelmath 1993: 309)
za-z st’al sulejman aku-na-č...
I-DAT St’al Sulejman see-AOR
‘I have not seen St’al Sulejman... {but every day I go to his monument on the shore of the Caspian sea in Maxačkala}.’

(24) Tabassaran (Marina Gasanova, p.c.)
uvu-z jaz aba zat ba’r-q’re-un-uz?
you-DAT I.GEN grandfather at_all <CL>see-AOR=2SG:DAT
‘Have you ever seen my grandfather?’

- A dedicated experiental form exists, based on a perfective participle (Agul, Rutul).

(25) Agul (Maisak & Merdanova 2016)
aw, zun sa ximu-gala žan-ar žuč.u-f-e gi-sa-ʃ.
yes I one how_much-time body-PL wash.PF(PTCP)-S-COP that-LOC-INTER
[A: Can you swim in this lake? B:] ‘Yes, I have bathed there several times.’

(26) Rutul (Svetlana Makhmudova, p.c.)
za-s vi-di did.i-k’l-laa un qi’či’-d i,
I-DAT your-ATR father-CONT-ELAT hearing beat.PF-ATR COP
již sadaki hagu-d diš.
however never see.PF-ATR COP:NEG
‘I have heard much about your father, but I have never seen him.’

❖ Evidential meanings
- In Agul, the perfect/resultative has evolved into an inferential/unwitnessed past, without losing the resultative and perfect uses.

(27) Agul (Maisak & Merdanova 2016)
ʔiš.i usal us.u-naa.
night(TMR) rain rain.PF-PRF
[It is morning. A wakes up, looks out of the window and sees that the courtyard is wet. A:] ‘It seems it rained during the night.’
• The Agul perfect is regularly used as a narrative tense describing non-witnessed events, e.g. in fairy-tales, legends, stories about recent events in which the narrator did not participate, etc. This is also the main narrative tense in the Gospel of Luke translation (2005; the only piece of the Bible available in Agul).

(28) Agul (Maisak & Merdanova 2016)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{me } & \text{un-x.u-naa} \quad \text{me } \text{dak’ar.i} \quad \text{k’en.a-k-as} \quad \text{ti-č} \\
\text{this sound-become.PF-PRF this window(GEN) bottom-SUB/CONT-ELAT that-LAT} \\
\Sigma^w.a-je \quad & \text{sa } \text{kas.ti-s.} \quad \text{mi-ra } \text{ şuš.u-na} \quad \text{uč.i-n} \\
\text{go.IPF-PT:PRS one person-DAT this(ERG)=}\text{ADD take.PF-CONV self-GEN} \\
\text{košel’ok.ti-?} \quad & \text{ik’.i-naa } \text{jaq’uqa-n-na} \quad \text{c’ejarč”w a manat,} \\
\text{purse-IN} \quad & \text{IN.put.PF-PRF 80=and } 19 \text{ rouble} \\
\text{fatx.i-naa} \quad & \text{kürmeš.i-as } \text{aq } \text{malla } \text{nesredil.a-s.} \\
\text{throw.PF-RES} \quad & \text{chimney-(IN)ELAT down Mullah Nasreddin-DAT} \\
\text{aha?} \quad & \text{p.u-naa } \text{malla } \text{nesredil.a,} \quad \text{ze-f } \text{ad.i-ne.} \\
\text{INTJ} \quad & \text{say.PF-PRF Mullah Nasreddin(ERG) my-S come.PF-AOR} \\
\end{align*}
\]

[Once Mullah Nasreddin was praying: ‘Oh Allah, send me on e thousand roubles!’]

‘One man, who walked by his window, heard this. He put into his purse 99 roubles and threw the purse to Mullah Nasreddin through a chimney. – Oh, said Mullah, this is mine.’

(29) Agul (Lukajin Kitab, 4:38–39)

Дуьг I ебур хура ушуная I иса Симонан хулади. Симонан хьеджарбаб уттай ахъуна I ёл I исайис талаб ачъуна I гис кумак акъас. Агъүкъуна гилди, Иисай сакин ачъуна уттал. Иттал айчъуна гис. Дишагьли гьеге селемти гъайшина, агъийинан суфра.

‘Jesus left the synagogue and went (ušunaja) to the home of Simon. Now Simon’s mother-in-law was suffering (itaj axunaja) from a high fever, and they asked (t’alab aq’unaja) Jesus to help her. So he bent over her and rebuked (sakin aq’unaja) the fever, and it left (ajč’unaja) her. She got up at once and began to wait on (ahijinaja) them.’

• In Archi, a ‘split’ occurred and the ‘full’ resultative construction is opposed to a ‘reduced’ perfect/unwitnessed past, syncretic with the PF converb in -li. This form is also widely used in non-first-person narratives.

(30) Archi (the Archi text corpus\(^5\), originally from Kibrik 1977)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{χιtrackeda } \text{os } \text{t’innna } \text{če’em.li-ũ-ũ} \quad & \text{jamu-r } \text{ţonol } \text{da-k’a-li} \\
\text{then} \quad & \text{one a.little} \quad \text{time-SUPER-ELAT that-CL woman CL-die.SG.PF-PRF} \\
\text{ju-w } \text{bošor.mu} \quad & \text{bonč’iš} \quad \text{jaři-k } \text{ţonol } \text{ořka-li } \text{<...>} \\
\text{this-CL} \quad & \text{man(ERG) so.to.say up-LAT woman } \text{<CL>take.away.PF-PRF} \\
\text{os } \text{iq.n-a } \text{jamu-r } \text{țanna } \text{bo-li} \quad & \text{bošor.mu-r-ši} \\
\text{one day-IN} \quad & \text{that-CL woman(ERG) say.PF-PRF man-CONT-ALL} \\
\end{align*}
\]

[There lived a husband and a wife; they had a daughter] ‘Then after some time, the wife died. The husband remarried.’ [But his new wife didn’t like his daughter.] ‘Once she said to her husband: <...>’

\(^5\) http://www.philol.msu.ru/~languedoc/eng/archi/corpus.php
• Not being dedicated evidential forms, but being perfects/resultatives at the same time, the Agul and Archi forms freely co-occur with the 1st person subjects.

(31) Agul (Maisak & Merdanova 2016)

\[ o, \text{ sa-d qara faqaj-naa zun, as.a-j-e mi. } \]

INTJ one-S more RE:bring:PF-PRF I say.IPF-CONV-COP this(ERG)

[The wife tells her husband that she sold the magic egg.] ‘Oh, and I’ve brought another one, – says he.’

(32) Archi (Paperno 2006)

\[ kanana zon qʷa-li \]

here I come.PF-PRF

‘Here I am (lit. Here have I come).’

5. Towards the diachrony of the Lezgic perfects

❖ Diachronic paths of the perfect, typologically

• Scheme (semantic map) illustrating paths of development leading to ANTERIOR (= perfect) and further (from Bybee et al. 1994: 105; non-relevant part of the scheme is omitted)

\[ \text{‘be’/‘have’} \rightarrow \text{RESULTATIVE} \rightarrow \text{INFERENCE FROM RESULTS} \rightarrow \text{INDIRECT EVIDENCE} \]

\[ \text{ANTERIOR} \rightarrow \text{PERFECTIVE/SIMPLE PAST} \]

• Modified version of the scheme, based on Tatevosov (2001: 462)

\[ \text{‘be’/‘have’} \rightarrow \text{RESULTATIVE} \rightarrow \text{INFERENCE FROM RESULTS} \rightarrow \text{INDIRECT EVIDENCE} \]

\[ \text{ANTERIOR} \rightarrow \text{PERFECTIVE/SIMPLE PAST} \]

• Below, I refer to a simplified scheme:

\[ \text{perfective \[1\] converb \rightarrow RESULTATIVE} \rightarrow \left\{ \begin{array}{c}
\text{perfect} \left[2\right] \\
\text{EVIDENTIAL PAST} \left[3\right] \\
\text{PERFECTIVE PAST} \left[4\right] 
\end{array} \right. \]

❖ Source pattern

• Apart from Udi (source unknown) and Budugh (periphrastic construction with a participle), the source periphrastic pattern of the resultative is “perfective converb + auxiliary ‘be’ or copula in the present tense”.
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• In four languages, the auxiliary used in the resultative construction is the morphologically defective stative existential verb ‘be inside’ (for aorists, the construction with the present copula is used).
• In three languages, the auxiliary used in the resultative construction is the element that combines BOTH the function of a copula (i.e. is used in identification and characterization clauses like ‘the one standing there is my brother’ or ‘my brother is a teacher’) and the function of an existential verb (i.e. is used in clauses like ‘there is snow in the field’); aorists in these languages are synthetic.
• I thus conclude that to be able to become a source for perfect/resultative, the auxiliary should be an existential verb, not a simple nominal copula.
• Thus, the source structure is rather “perfective converb + auxiliary ‘be’ in the present tense”.

❖ RESULTATIVE
• Stage 1 is represented by specialized periphrastic resultative constructions in Kryz and Achi, which co-exist here with (and structurally are ‘fuller’, less morphologized variants of) the more general perfects/resultatives.

❖ RESULTATIVE > PERFECT
• Stage 2 is where most of the Lezgic perfects are now: they are used with both resultative and perfect functions, but have not proceed any further (all languages except Agul and Archi).

❖ PERFECT > EVIDENTIAL PAST
• It seems that only Agul and Archi perfects have reached stage 3, although they still retain the resultative and perfect meanings.
• In both languages, perfects are quite frequent in narratives, as the main-line of certain types of stories tends to be encoded by the perfect. This makes the identification of these two perfects problematic given the negative criterion that “the perfect is not a narrative tense” (Lindstedt 2000).
• Although Lindstedt (2000: 378) also argues that “if the central or sole meaning of a gram is resultative or indirective (inferential and/or reportative), it is not yet a perfect, or no longer a perfect”, I am not sure this is the case with Agul or Archi, as both the perfect and the evidential past meanings seem to be equally ‘central’.

❖ PERFECT > PERFECTIVE PAST (aorist)?
• In some languages, the “perfective converb + present copula” construction is the source for aorists.
• The source semantics of this construction seems by and large the same as of the construction with the auxiliary ‘be’: ‘X is after having done smth.’, i.e. the situation preceding the moment of speech is referred to, and a relation (or relevance) to the moment of speech is specified.
• It is thus not excluded that the aorists going back to the construction “perfective converb + present copula” were originally perfects, which had evolved into perfective pasts (stage 4).

6 For the Archi form in -lī, the resultative meaning is clearly less central, as there is a specialized resultative construction.
Form-function correlations

- On the whole, the Lezgic perfects are originally periphrastic forms on their way to becoming synthetic forms.
- Still, some of the morphologically “mature” forms have a functional range that could be rather expected of less gramaticalized forms (cf. the suffixal Udi perfect that has only the resultative and the perfect meanings).
- On the contrary, the Agul perfect has reached the (final) stage of the evidential past without becoming totally bound: the auxiliary verb ‘be’ retains certain degree of autonomy and cannot be considered a suffix (“full” variants like aq’una a, aq’una aja ‘has done’ are still attested).
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