

# The Semantics of Verbal Categories in Nakh-Daghestanian Languages

*Tense, Aspect, Evidentiality, Mood and Modality*

*Edited by*

Diana Forker  
Timur Maisak



BRILL

LEIDEN | BOSTON

# Contents

List of Tables, Figures, and Maps IX

Abbreviations XII

Notes on Contributors XIV

Introduction 1

*Diana Forker*

1 Tense, Aspect, Mood and Evidentiality in Chechen and Ingush 26

*Zarina Molochieva and Johanna Nichols*

2 The Tense/Aspect System of Standard Dargwa 49

*Rasul Mutalov*

3 Aorist, Resultative, and Perfect in Shiri Dargwa and Beyond 80

*Oleg Belyaev*

4 The Aorist/Perfect Distinction in Nizh Udi 120

*Timur Maisak*

5 Perfective Tenses and Epistemic Modality in Northern Akhvakh 166

*Denis Creissels*

6 The Semantics of Evidentiality and Epistemic Modality in Avar 188

*Diana Forker*

7 Mood in Archi: Realization and Semantics 215

*Marina Chumakina*

8 Aspectual Stems in Three East Caucasian Languages 247

*Michael Daniel*

Index 267

# Aorist, Resultative, and Perfect in Shiri Dargwa and Beyond\*

*Oleg Belyaev*

## 1 Introduction

Shiri is a language of the Dargwa branch of East Caucasian. The majority of the Dargwa languages have long been neglected by linguists due to official Soviet language policy which considered them “dialects” of a single language, with the Akusha dialect being chosen for the standard variety. Yet the linguistic distance between Dargwa languages is very high; preliminary lexicostatistical counts show that the time depth of this taxon is comparable to Germanic (Koryakov 2013).

Shiri is spoken some 7 km from the major southern Dargwa settlement of Kubachi. It has been largely ignored in the literature on Dargwa dialectology; in the few instances where it is mentioned, it is assigned the status of a Kubachi subdialect. This seems to have no justification; apart from a few grammatical isoglosses, Shiri does not have any more similarity with Kubachi than with any other neighbouring Dargwa variety. It does seem to form a single language with the neighbouring Amuzgi, with which it shares 94% of basic vocabulary. Shiri is heavily endangered; the overwhelming majority of Shiri speakers now live in the lowlands, and the younger generation is rapidly switching to Russian. The number of speakers is difficult to estimate, but it does not seem to be more than 200.

---

\* The main results of this paper have previously been presented at the Typology of Morphosyntactic Parameters 2016 conference (Moscow). The elicited examples have been collected during field trips to Shiri, Chinari and Makhachkala (Dagestan) in 2015–2016; the non-elicited examples come from spoken texts analyzed within the DoBeS project on Shiri and Sanzhi (<http://www.kaukaz.net/cgi-bin/blosxom.cgi/english/dargwa/shirisanzhi>). I am grateful to all my Shiri consultants, especially Ali Gamzaev, Magomed Gasanov, and Bagaudin Kurbanov, and to the Ashti consultants, especially Shamil Gadzhiev and Murad Gadzhimuradov. I am also indebted to Uzlipat Gasanova for verifying the Kaitag data. Last but not least, I am grateful to Diana Forker, Dmitry Ganenkov, Timur Maisak, Vladimir Plungian, and Sergei Tatevosov for extensive discussion of the main points of this paper. All errors are mine.

Like most East Caucasian languages and all Dargwa languages, Shiri has consistently ergative case alignment and (non-rigid) SOV word order. Nominal morphology is mostly agglutinating and is characterized by an abundance of locative forms (so-called “locative cases”). Verbal morphology is complex, synthetic and in many ways idiosyncratic. The verbal system is dominated by the perfective vs. imperfective opposition, but individual forms display a much more fine-grained range of aspectual distinctions.

The aim of this paper is twofold. My main goal is to attempt a reconstruction of the diachronic evolution of the Dargwa system of past-tense perfective forms. In particular, I will demonstrate how the perfective past systems of individual Dargwa varieties, while looking quite similar to each other in overall structure, in fact go back to a rather intricate sequence of semantic extensions, displacements, and innovations. The data of Shiri are especially important for this aim, because Shiri demonstrates the highest number of aspectual oppositions in the core perfective system, which distinguishes between aorist, perfect, and resultative/evidential. Therefore, I will begin by describing the Shiri system, and then proceed to a comparative analysis of Shiri vis-à-vis other currently described Dargwa varieties, culminating in an attempt to reconstruct the proto-Dargwa system of perfective finite forms and its evolution.

The paper is structured as follows. In section 2 I provide a brief overview of the main features of Shiri verbal inflection that will prove important in the discussion to follow. In section 3 I describe the form and meaning of the core perfective past tense forms: Aorist, Perfect, and Resultative. Section 4 is dedicated to the diachrony of the perfective past subsystem in Dargwa; apart from Shiri data, I analyze textual evidence from a number of other Dargwa varieties. Finally, in section 5 I provide a short overview of my synchronic and diachronic findings.<sup>1</sup>

1 The transcription of Shiri examples generally follows common Daghestanological conventions and mostly corresponds to IPA; where it does not, the digressions are fairly well-known (/ʃ/ instead of /ʃ/, /c/ instead of /t͡ʃ/, etc.). The only major difference is the use of subscript tilde for marking pharyngealization on vowels (a̰, ṵ). This is done for two reasons. First, Shiri has two types of vowel pharyngealization, and since one of them leads to an acoustic effect akin to fronting, I prefer to mark it via umlaut (ä, ü). For symmetry, the other type of pharyngealization should also be marked by a diacritic sign. The second reason is that the rules of Shiri pharyngealization are not yet fully established, I prefer to mark it on both (uvular) consonants and vowels. Using ˤ on both would lead to visual clutter, and so I reserve this character to consonants only. In paradigms and when citing verbal roots, ɣ stands for the gender marker. Interlinear glosses follow the Leipzig rules; the “period” sign is used to show morphemic segmentation in the first line of the gloss that is omitted in the second line (usually for various morphomic phenomena such as oblique stems).

## 2 Shiri Verb Morphology: General Remarks

Apart from tense and aspect, Shiri verbs include agreement markers for gender and person. The gender system of Shiri is identical to that of other known Dargwa languages and distinguishes between human masculine, human feminine, and nonhuman (neuter) in the singular, and between human and neuter in the plural. Most verbs have a gender slot preceding the root; e.g., in *b-arq'-iž* (N-do.PFV-INF) 'to do', *b-* is the prefix marking neuter singular. Gender agreement in Shiri is always with the argument bearing the Absolutive case. The system of gender marking in Shiri is the same as in other varieties of Dargwa and is shown in Table 3.1.

TABLE 3.1 *Gender markers in Shiri*

	sg.	pl.
<b>masculine</b>	<i>w</i>	<i>b</i>
<b>feminine</b>	<i>r</i>	
<b>neuter</b>	<i>b</i>	<i>d</i>

Person agreement is marked either by clitic auxiliaries or by synthetic person affixes. The relevant auxiliaries will be described in section 2.1; the synthetic endings will be described together with the corresponding paradigms.

Shiri verb inflection involves a complex system of verbal stems. The core distinction is between the basic perfective/imperfective stems of the verb, defined lexically. There are no strict rules for deriving imperfective stems from perfective stems or vice versa; the most that can be said is that the majority of stems have the form  $\text{əV(R)C}$ , where V is a vowel, C is the root consonant, and R is a sonorant. A minority of verbal stems lack a gender slot; glide-initial (imperfective) stems of the form RVC invariably do, as well as certain V(R)C stems. A class of imperfective-only stems peculiar to Shiri has the form  $\text{əIRVC}$ , no doubt a secondary formation from RVC in order to accommodate the gender marker.

Shiri has an elaborate system of verbal prefixes but these are, for the most part, derivational (spatial and orientational preverbs), except for negation and gender agreement. The rest of the inflection is suffixal. While some of the finite

TAM forms are synthetic and possess sets of inflectional personal endings, most paradigms are periphrastic, consisting of a non-finite form (participle or converb) and an auxiliary.

### 2.1 *Auxiliaries*

The auxiliaries that feature prominently in the past-tense forms are the predicative marker and the existential verbs.

The **predicative marker**, whose 3rd person form is often called a copula, is, in addition to verbal predication, used in sentences with nonverbal (nominal, adjectival, adverbial) predicates. It is an enclitic which has a highly idiosyncratic paradigm and cannot be considered a verb proper. Its paradigm is shown in Table 3.2.

TABLE 3.2 *The clitic predicative marker*

	affirmative		negative	
	sg.	pl.	sg.	pl.
1	=da		=ak: <sup>w</sup> -i-da	
2	=di		=ak: <sup>w</sup> -i-t:i	=ak: <sup>w</sup> -i-t:-a
3	ca:i		=ak:-u	
past	=di		=ak: <sup>w</sup> -i	

The 3rd person affirmative marker contains a gender marker as an infix. In Shiri, it agrees with the absolutive argument, but in other Dargwa varieties it may agree with the ergative or dative subject (Sumbatova 2014). This marker is obligatory in most periphrastic paradigms in the 3rd person. In some paradigms (Perfect, Future) that seem to be derived from non-finite forms combined with predicative markers, the 3rd person marker is apparently not used; however, I treat such paradigms as already synthetic at the synchronic stage (this will be discussed for the Perfect in more detail in section 3.3.1).

Negative forms resemble certain synthetic verb forms, being ultimately derived from the stem *ak:<sup>w</sup>-* in a comparatively regular way, although with a few idiosyncrasies that are not important in the context of this paper. Negative forms of the predicative marker are used to negate periphrastic verb forms and sentences with nominal predicates, e.g. *rasul učitil ca(w)i* (R. teacher 3(M))

‘Rasul is a teacher’ → *rasul učitil=ak:-u* (R. teacher=NEG-PRS.3) ‘Rasul is not a teacher’. All synthetic forms discussed in this paper are negated by reduplicating the stem, replacing the vowel by /a/, e.g. *b-irq’-aj* ‘s/he used to do’ (N-do.IPFV-IPF.3) → *b-irq’~arq’-aj* (N-do.IPFV~NEG-IPF.3) ‘s/he didn’t do’.

The past-tense (or rather, “retrospective shift” following Plungian & van der Auwera 2006) form of the predicative marker is affirmative =*di*, negative =*ak:-w-i* in all persons and numbers, and it is never omitted.

In addition to the predicative marker, Shiri possesses a system of deictic **existential verbs** which denote location or existence together with indicating the spatial position of the subject relative to the speaker. Their paradigm is highly irregular. Their basic forms, used in 3rd person present, are given in Table 3.3.

TABLE 3.3 *The existential verbs*

near speaker or hearer	<i>le=</i>
far from speaker and hearer:	
horizontal plane	<i>te=</i>
above	<i>k’e=</i>
below	<i>χe=</i>

In the 1st and 2nd persons, existential verbs utilize the predicative markers =*da* and =*di* (see previous section), e.g. *le-w=da* ‘I am’, *le-w=di* ‘you are (sg.)’. In the past, they utilize =*di* throughout, e.g. *le-b=di* ‘it was’.

Negative existentials attach the negative predicative marker, e.g. *le-b=ak:-u* ‘it is not’.

## 2.2 *Participles and Converbs*

The Shiri system of non-finite forms is quite elaborate. It is used for marking the overwhelming majority of subordinate clauses. For the purposes of the present paper, however, four forms will have special importance: the simple perfective and imperfective participles and the corresponding converbs. The choice of the marker of the participle is unpredictable from the form of the verb stem and is defined lexically. Converbs are formed from participles using the suffix *-li*. Finally, participles have “short” (unmarked) and “full” forms; the latter are formed using the suffix *-zi=*. All of this is summed up in Table 3.4.

TABLE 3.4 *Simple participles and converbs*

pfv.			ipfv.		
ptcp.		cvb.	ptcp.		cvb.
short	full		short	full	
<i>-ib</i>	<i>-ib-zíʒ</i>	<i>-ib-li</i>	<i>-u</i>	<i>-u-zíʒ</i>	<i>-u-l</i>
<i>-ub<sup>a</sup></i>	<i>-ub-zíʒ</i>	<i>-ub-li</i>			
<i>-ur</i>	<i>-ur-zíʒ</i>	<i>-ur-ri</i>			
<i>-un</i>	<i>-un-zíʒ</i>	<i>-un-ni</i>	<i>-un</i>	<i>un-zíʒ</i>	<i>-un-ni</i>

- a The suffixes *-ib* and *-ub* are in complementary distribution: *-ib* appears after non-labialized root consonants, *-ub* appears after labialized ones. The rest of the forms are completely identical for both “classes” (as seen in the paradigms discussed below). Note the same observation for Chirag in Kibrik & Kodzasov (1988: 29).

The main function of simple participles and converbs without additional marking is relativization and clause chaining, respectively. They also function as components of periphrastic finite forms, which is what we are concerned with in the present paper. The form of the perfective participle marker is especially important, as it determines the inflection class of the verb; the choice of several synthetic markers such as the 3rd person Aorist and Habitual endings is fully deducible from the form of the perfective participle.

### 3 Perfective Past Tense Forms

The core TAM system of Shiri includes a wide variety of forms expressing a large number of aspectual and temporal oppositions. The majority of them are periphrastic, consisting of a non-finite verb form (participle or converb) and an auxiliary, most often the clitic predicative marker (Table 3.2), which can usually be replaced by an existential verb (Table 3.3) in order to convey a meaning of immediate vicinity. The main indicative periphrastic forms include:

- **Durative:** imperfective converb + predicative marker / existential, *b-irq'-u-l ca(b)i* (N-do.IPFV-PTCP-CVB 3(N)). Denotes all types of present (progressive, habitual, stative). In the past tense, has a more restricted meaning of past progressive.
- **Future:** potential participle + predicative marker / *-ni* in the 3rd person, *b-irq'-an-ni* (N-do.IPFV-POT-3). The only form that expresses future time reference without any modal component. In the past tense, has an irrealis meaning.



- **Prospective:** full imperfective participle + predicative marker / existential, *b-irq'-u-zi-b ca(b)i* (N-do.IPFV-ATTR-N 3(N)). In addition to the prospective meaning, is used for certain subtypes of habitual, and with obligative modality. In the past tense, has exactly the same meanings, but with a past reference time.
- **Perfect:**<sup>2</sup> perfective participle + predicative marker / zero in 3rd person, *b-arq'-ib* (N-do.PFV-PTCP[3]). This is a typical perfect form, expressing a past-tense action with current relevance.
- **Resultative:** perfective converb + predicative marker, *b-arq'-ib-li ca(b)i* (N-do.PFV-PTCP-CVB 3(N)). Combines resultative proper and evidential past.
- **Experiential:** full perfective participle + predicative marker / existential, *b-arq'-ib-zi-b ca(b)i* (N-do.PFV-PTCP-ATTR-N 3(N)).

Shiri also has a number of synthetic forms, where person-number endings are morphological and are special for each paradigm. The majority of the synthetic forms are modal. There are only two indicative synthetic paradigms:

- **Habitual:** expresses all types of present (actual) habituality.
- **Preterite:** when formed from the perfective stem, an unmarked perfective past form (aorist). When formed from the imperfective stem, past habitual.

In what follows, I will describe the core system of Shiri indicative perfective past forms, which involves a tripartite opposition of Aorist, Perfect, and Resultative.

### 3.1 Aorist

#### 3.1.1 Formation

The Aorist is formed from the perfective stem. Its marker in the 1st and 2nd persons is invariably *-a-*. Person-number marking is expressed by a set of synthetic inflection endings, shown in Table 3.5. Number is consistently distinguished in the 1st and 2nd person; there is no number distinction in the 3rd person. The choice of the 3rd person marker is based on transitivity and inflection class, as shown in Table 3.6, where the first column indicates the inflection class based on the form of the perfective participle.

2 As will be shown in section 3.3.1, synchronically the Perfect should be analyzed as a morphologized form. At the same time, it is still morphologically transparent and structurally belongs to the periphrastic subsystem; old synthetic paradigms in Dargwa have a substantially different structure of the person paradigm.

TABLE 3.5 *Personal endings of the Aorist*

	sg.	pl.
1	-a-d-i	-a-d-a
2	-a-t:-i	-a-t:-a
3	-aj, -i, -iri	

TABLE 3.6 *3rd person endings of the Aorist*

pfv. ptcp.	Preterite (3p)	
	tr.	intr.
<i>-ib / -ub</i>	<i>-aj</i>	<i>-i</i>
<i>-ur</i>		
<i>-un</i>	<i>-ini</i>	

The same person endings can be attached to the imperfective stem, yielding an imperfective past tense with the past habitual as the main meaning, although it has other imperfective functions as well, in addition to a number of peripheral irrealis functions. As they involve the same set of endings, the Aorist and this past habitual form can be treated as perfective and imperfective variants of a single Preterite paradigm; this is done for Ashti in Belyaev (2012) and should probably be done in a full descriptive grammar of Shiri. However, as the present paper deals only with perfective past-tense forms, it seems appropriate to refer to the perfective Preterite as the Aorist in order to distinguish it from the Perfect, Resultative, and Experiential.

TABLE 3.7 *Sample paradigm of the Aorist (verb ʔarq' ~ ʔirq' 'do')*

	sg.	pl.
1	b-arq'-a-d-i	b-arq'-a-d-a
2	b-arq'-a-t:-i	b-arq'-a-t:-a
3	b-arq'-aj	

## 3.1.2 Meaning

The Aorist is the standard form used in narrative texts for the main line of the narrative, if the events have been witnessed by the speaker:

- (1) *d-id.ag-a-d-a* *l.ani,* *d-id.ag-ur.ri*  
 1PL-go.out.PFV-AOR-1-PL there[LAT] 1PL-go.out.PFV-CVB  
*ka<d>ig-ib.li* *ca* *čak:w.a.li.dil*  
 <1PL>sit.down.PFV-CVB one prettily  
 ‘We came there, and having come, we sat there in a nice way.’ (spoken text)
- (2) *he.l-ka,* *he.liti* *ka<d>ig-ib* *?qni,* *ca* *x:unul*  
 that-ABL thus <1PL>sit.down.PFV-PTCP when one woman  
*r-uk:i-sa<r>uq-ini,* *bara* “bismillah”  
 F-inside[LAT]-<F>come.PFV-AOR.3 just  
*b-arq'-b=ak:w-ar.ri,* *ca* *he.l* *neg-la* *q'walsa=ra*  
 N-do.PFV-PTCP=NEG-CVB one that milk-GEN spoon=ADD  
*ha<b>ic'-iž* *ag~ag-i*  
 <N>fill.PFV-INF be.able.PFV~NEG-AOR.3  
 ‘When we were sitting like this, one woman **came in**, we didn’t even have time to say “bismillah” [start eating], we **weren’t** even **able** to fill a single spoonful of milk.’ (spoken text)

It is also used in non-narrative contexts which refer to past events without present relevance:

- (3) *balnic:a-le-w* *tuxtur* *ca<w>i,* *šäχ:-u* *kut:i*  
 hospital-IN-M[ESS] doctor 3<M> not\_know.IPFV-PRS.3 which  
*balnic:a-le-w=il,* *xar<b>ex~ax-a-d-i*  
 hospital-IN-M[ESS]=IQ <N>ask.PFV~NEG-AOR-1-SG  
 ‘He’s a doctor at a hospital, I don’t know at which one, I **didn’t** ask.’  
 (spoken text)

Shiri has a grammaticalized evidentiality distinction. The Aorist form is only used to refer to events that have been witnessed by the speaker. In such contexts the Resultative (the standard evidential form, see section 3.2.2) cannot be used:<sup>3</sup>

3 Unless the aspectual meaning of the Resultative is available, which is clearly not the case for the verb ‘to see’.

- (4) *dam*      *ʃü*      *če(w)ag-a-t-i* /      *\*če(w)ag-ib-li=di*  
 me.DAT    thou    ⟨M⟩see.PFV-AOR-2-SG    ⟨M⟩see.PFV-PTCP-CVB=2  
 ‘I saw you.’

Conversely, if the event is unwitnessed, using the Aorist is impossible:

- (5) *du*    *maskaw-le-w*    *ka.lug-u.l*,      *di-la*      *uc:i-dil*  
 I    M-IN-M      remain.IPFV-CVB    me-GEN    brother-ERG  
*x:eri-w*      *meq'*      *b-arq'-ib.li*      *ca(b)i* /      *\*b-arq'-aj*  
 Sh.-M[ESS]    wedding    N-do.PFV-CVB    3⟨N⟩      N-do.PFV-AOR.3  
 ‘When I was in Moscow, my brother **married** in Shiri.’

Formed from the perfective stem, the Aorist is also clearly a semantically perfective form. It cannot be used in sentences with temporal subordinate clauses if the time of the main clause event fully includes the time of the subordinate clause event (6); it is incompatible with length of time adverbials (7); and, quite expectedly, it does not have a past habitual reading, which is instead expressed by the imperfective version of the Preterite (8).

- (6) *du qil*      *sq.q'<sup>c</sup>-un.ni*,      *?qli*    *kaʁar-ti*    *\*ka(d)ig-aj* /  
 I    house.IN[LAT]    come.PFV-CVB    A.    letter-PL    write⟨NPL⟩-AOR.3  
*ka(d)irg-u.l=di*  
 ⟨NPL⟩write.IPFV-CVB=PST  
 ‘When I came home, Ali **was writing** letters.’

- (7) *di-la*      *uc:i*      *?qab*    *bari*    *meq'*      *\*b-arq'-aj* /  
 me-GEN    brother    three    day    wedding    N-do.PFV-AOR.3  
*<sup>OK</sup>b-irg'-u.l=di*  
 N-do.IPFV-CVB=PST  
 ‘My brother **married** for three days.’ (i.e. ‘the wedding proceeded for three days’)

- (8) *w-ižik'a-q:il*      *du ušk'ul-le*      *\*w-qrq'<sup>c</sup>-q-d-i* /  
 M-small-CVB.TEMP I    school-IN[LAT]    M-go.PFV-AOR-1-SG  
*<sup>OK</sup>w-ax-a-d-i*  
 M-go.IPFV-PRET-1-SG  
 ‘When I was a child, I **used to go** to school.’

The use of the Aorist in narratives and the lack of the set of meanings typical for perfect forms (present relevance, hot news, etc.) makes it a rather clear

example of the cross-linguistic category of Aorist as it is defined in Dahl (1985), albeit with an additional witnessed component. The aorist meaning for unwitnessed events is expressed by a different form: the Resultative.

### 3.2 Resultative

#### 3.2.1 Formation

The Resultative series is based on the Perfective Converb. It attaches the predicative markers in a fairly regular way, as seen in Table 3.8.

TABLE 3.8 *Inflectional endings of the Resultative*

	sg.	pl.
1	-ib-li=da	
2	-ib-li=di	
3	-ib-li ca=i	

In negative forms, the final *-i* of the converb marker combines with the initial *a-* of the negative to give either /e/ or /a/ (apparently, free variants): \**b-arq'-ib-li=ak:-u* → *b-arq'-ib-l=ek:-u* / =*ak:-u*.

Like most periphrastic forms in Shiri, the Resultative has two additional variants: the “retrospective” Resultative (a kind of pluperfect), where the auxiliary is replaced by its past tense form (retrospective shift marker) =*di*, and the “existential” Resultative, where one of the existential verbs is used as the auxiliary.

TABLE 3.9 *Sample paradigm of the Resultative*

	present		past	
	sg.	pl.	sg.	pl.
1	<i>b-arq'-ib-li=da</i>		<i>b-arq'-ib-li=di</i>	
2	<i>b-arq'-ib-li=di</i>			
3	<i>b-arq'-ib-li ca(b)i</i>			

TABLE 3.10 *Sample paradigm of the existential Resultative*

	present		past	
	sg.	pl.	sg.	pl.
1	b-arq'-ib-li le-b=da		b-arq'-ib-li le-b=di	
2	b-arq'-ib-li le-b=di			
3	b-arq'-ib-li le-b			

### 3.2.2 Meaning: Present Resultative *Resultative Proper*

The main meaning of the Resultative when used with the “present-tense” auxiliary is resultative: a verb form that “express[es] a state implying a previous event” (Nedjalkov & Jaxontov 1988: 6).<sup>4</sup> This meaning is especially apparent in the case of a set of predicates meaning a change of spatial position (‘to sit down’, ‘to lie down’, ‘to stand up’, etc.), which, in Shiri, are always inchoative. Therefore, the meaning ‘X is (now) sitting’ is expressed as ‘X has sat down’ with the verb in the Resultative:

- (9) *murad kejj-ib.li ca⟨w⟩i*  
 M. M;sit.down.PFV-CVB 3⟨M⟩  
 ‘Murad is **sitting**.’ (lit. ‘has sat down’)
- (10) *?q̣li kejs:-un.ni ca⟨w⟩i karawat-le-w*  
 A. M;lie.down.PFV-CVB 3⟨M⟩ bed-IN-M[ESS]  
 ‘Ali is **lying** in bed.’

The form is of course also used in other contexts where a persistent state resulting from a prior event is involved, such as in (11) and (12).

4 I distinguish between resultative in the narrow sense and perfect, as is common in aspectological literature. On the differences between resultative and perfect, see, among others, Dahl (1985), Maslov (1988), Dahl & Hedin (2000), Tatevosov (2001). In short, while resultative refers to the state that the subject or object has attained as the result of an event, perfect describes the event itself with the additional component of present relevance. In terms of Parsons (1990) and Kratzer (2000), resultatives refer to the *target state* of the event, while perfects refer to the *resultant state*. This implies that true resultatives can only be formed from a lexically restricted subset of verbs.

- (11) *mašina b-elq'-un.ni ca(b)i*  
 car N-break.PFV-CVB 3(N)  
 'The car is broken.'
- (12) *q'uren.ni-ci-b b-elk'-un.ni ca(b)i s:unkub ha.ʔ-iž*  
 Q.-INTER-N[ESS] N-write.PFV-CVB 3(N) deceit say.PFV-INF  
*arg-u.l=ak:-u*  
 be\_allowed.IPFV-CVB=NEG-PRS.3  
 'It is written in the Quran that one should not deceive.'

The distinction between subject and object resultative of Nedjalkov & Jaxontov (1988) does not seem to be relevant for Shiri. Most frequently, it is the state of the absolutive argument (S/P) that is denoted by the resultative verb, but this is not a grammatical constraint. If the A argument is sufficiently affected by the event, the resultative can also denote its state, as in (13), where the verb 'it is drunk' denotes the state of the head as a result of having drunk its share of life, rather than having been drunk itself.

- (13) *bek' b-uc:-ur.r=ak:-u di-la, b-erč:-ib.li=ca(b)i*  
 head N-work.PFV-CVB=NEG-PRS.3 me-GEN N-drink.PFV-CVB=3(N)  
*aba-ž*  
 mother-DAT  
 'My head is not working anymore, it is drunk, my son.'<sup>6</sup> (spoken text)

This example is also remarkable in having another resultative form, *buc:urrak:u* 'is not working', which illustrates the stative use of the resultative – the verb 'to work' clearly does not denote a change of state, but is lexically defined as a stative verb taking the Resultative in the function of the present tense.<sup>6</sup>

The resultative in its primary aspectual function is, naturally, incompatible with verbs not denoting change of state of S/P:

5 'My son' is the translation of *aba-ž* (mother-DAT), which is a contraction from the widespread idiomatic *aba-ž w-ik:-an* (mother-DAT M-love.IPFV-PTCP.POT) 'mother's beloved, beloved by mother'.

6 One could also assume that the verb 'to work' is inchoative, actually meaning 'start working'. While this might be true diachronically, there is nothing to support this assumption at the synchronic level.

- (14) \**du-dil kinišk:a b-elč'-un.ni=da*  
 I-ERG book N-read.PFV-CVB=1  
 'I have read the book.'

In this case, the Perfect must be used instead to convey the relevance of the action at speech time, see below.

#### *Evidential Past*

In addition to its core aspectual meaning, the Resultative is also the standard perfective evidential form, expressing an unwitnessed perfective action in the past. It is standardly used in narratives where the speaker has not been witness to the events described:

- (15) *ha(r)ex-ib.li ca(r)i ca x:unul hin-ne*  
 <F>reach:up.PFV-CVB 3<F> one woman water-IN[LAT]  
 'One woman came to the water.' (spoken text)
- (16) *b-arq'-ib.li xula-zi-b ḥurmat, č̣i(b)ix-ib.li ak'i-lla dex*  
 N-do.PFV-CVB big-ATTR-N respect <N>put.on.PFV-CVB grain-GEN pack  
*b-at-gu.r.ha.t:ax-ib.li ca(b)i*  
 HPL-on.the.way-send.PFV-CVB 3<HPL>  
 'They paid them their respects, put them [on their horses] a pack of grain and sent them on their way.' (spoken text)

#### 3.2.3 Meaning: Past Resultative

##### *Resultative Pluperfect*

The main function of the past Resultative is resultative in the past, i.e. a state that holds at the reference time in the past as a result of an event prior to that reference time. This is especially well illustrated by the behaviour of the inchoative verbs:

- (17) *nus:a sala(d)ik-ib.li kat:ag-a-d-a, nus:a*  
 we <1PL>come.first.PFV-CVB go.down.PFV-AOR-1-PL we  
*sala(d)ik-ib.li, ka(d)ig-ib.li=di nus:a*  
 <1PL>come.first.PFV-CVB <1PL>sit.down.PFV-CVB=PST we  
 'We came first and went on our way, we were sitting after we came first.'  
 (spoken text)

The meaning of (17) is 'having come first, we were sitting', but the sense 'were sitting' is expressed by the past resultative form, i.e. 'had sat down'. This reflects



a state that held at reference time in the past. If the present resultative form were used, the meaning would have been present-tense ‘we are sitting’.

### *Evidential Pluperfect*

Just like the resultative meaning proper can be shifted to a past reference time, the evidential meaning can also be retrospective. This is nicely illustrated by (18).

- (18) *du qil hejɁ-ib.q:il di-la ruc:i*  
 I house.IN[LAT] M;go.up.PFV-CVB.TEMP me-GEN sister  
*gur-r-grq<sup>ɕ</sup>-un.ni=di*  
 again-F-go.PFV-CVB=PST  
 ‘When I came home, my sister **had gone** away.’

#### 3.2.4 Meaning: Existential Resultative

The meaning of the Existential Resultative is pretty much the same as the aspectual meaning of the simple Resultative. The contribution of the existential is that it reinforces the resultative meaning and entails that the resultant state holds in a location relative to the speaker/deictic centre specified by the existential verb.

- (19) *?qli kejs:-un.ni te-w karawat-le-w*  
 A. M;lie.PFV-CVB be\_there-M bed-IN-M[ESS]  
 ‘Ali is lying in bed **over there**.’

- (20) *mašina b-elq'-un.ni le-b*  
 car N-break.PFV-CVB be\_here-N  
 ‘The car is **over here, broken**.’

The existential resultative can attach the retrospective shift marker just like the present resultative, with the meaning of pluperfect.

#### 3.2.5 Conclusions on the Resultative

The Resultative in Shiri possesses two distinct meanings. The first, and core, meaning is resultative proper: the target state of the event holding at reference time (present in present-tense forms and past in forms with the retrospective shift marker). The second meaning is past evidential: an unwitnessed event that occurred before reference time (again, either in the present or in the past, depending on the auxiliary). As far as both elicited and spoken-text data demonstrate, the Resultative lacks any further functions, including, remarkably, the perfect function, which is expressed by a separate paradigm.

### 3.3 *Perfect*

#### 3.3.1 Formation

The Perfect is formed from the Perfective Participle by attaching the predicative markers. In the 3rd person affirmative form, the predicative marker is never used.

TABLE 3.11 *Personal endings of the Perfect*

	sg.	pl.
1	<i>-ib-da</i>	
2	<i>-ib-di</i>	
3	<i>-ib</i>	

In spite of the (affirmative) Perfect forms being morphologically transparent as combinations of the participle with the clitic person marker set, I treat them as synthetic, or completely morphologized, at the synchronic level. There are several reasons for this. First, the omission of the 3rd person marker is irregular and is only encountered, apart from the Perfect, in the Future, which itself also has several morphological idiosyncrasies.

Second, the Perfect, unlike all other paradigms consisting of a non-finite form with a clitic person marker, has no retrospective form. This has no clear functional explanation, as there is nothing semantically contradictory in a “perfect in the past” or pluperfect meaning. Such forms are attested in related languages, e.g. see Maisak (this volume) for Udi. A more plausible scenario is that the Perfect forms have already undergone reanalysis in Shiri and the endings are no longer viewed as forms of the predicative marker; hence, its retrospective variant is also unavailable.

The only complication is the behaviour of negative Perfect forms. Here, Shiri uses the negative auxiliary, which has its normal paradigm:

TABLE 3.12 *Negative Perfect paradigm*

	sg.	pl.
1	<i>-b-ak<sup>w</sup>-i-d</i>	<i>-b-ak<sup>w</sup>-i-d-a</i>
2	<i>-b-ak<sup>w</sup>-i-t:i</i>	<i>-b-ak<sup>w</sup>-i-t-a</i>
3	<i>-b-ak<sup>w</sup>-u</i>	

The personal endings are regularly replaced by corresponding negative forms, identical to those used in non-verbal predication and in other periphrastic forms. This seems to suggest that these endings, in turn, are the same clitic elements that appear in those contexts. Such a pattern of negation is, after all, unavailable for “true” synthetic paradigms such as the Aorist.

However, all synthetic paradigms do not have to behave in a uniform way. Clearly, the Perfect has become a synthetic form much later than forms such as the Aorist or the Habitual. It is thus no wonder that its inflection still remains rather close to that of coexisting periphrastic forms; in fact, such “layering” of elements belonging to different stages of morphological development is a typical trait of grammaticalization processes.

Furthermore, the negative inflection of the Perfect is itself not without irregularities. This is immediately seen in Table 3.12, where the participle marker has the form *-b* instead of *-ib*, as if the vowel has been syncopated. The same process occurs with *-un*: *b-elč'-un* ‘s/he has read’ → *b-elč'-n-ak:-u* ‘s/he has not read’. But this is no longer a purely phonological process, because the participle marker *-ur* also yields *-b* instead of the expected *-r*: *b-at-ur* ‘s/he has left’ → *b-at-b-ak:-u* ‘s/he has not left’. This kind of irregularity is not attested anywhere else in Shiri inflection and also points to the Perfect paradigm being already morphologized.

Finally, even if negative markers are considered clitics, it is in principle not impossible for different parts of a paradigm to morphologize at a different pace. The affirmative clitic person markers are phonetically shorter and are also somewhat similar in form to the synthetic agreement suffixes, while the negative verb is similar to lexical verbs in its inflection. Again, a situation exactly analogous to this hypothetical system is found in Udi (Maisak, this volume), where the Perfect with postposed negation is still analyzable as a combination of a converb/participle and a negative verb, while other variants no longer resemble any non-finite forms.

TABLE 3.13 Sample paradigm of the Perfect

	affirmative		negative	
	sg.	pl.	sg.	pl.
1	<i>b-arq'-ib-da</i>		<i>b-arq'-b-ak:ʷ-i-d</i>	<i>b-arq'-b-ak:ʷ-i-d-a</i>
2	<i>b-arq'-ib-di</i>		<i>b-arq'-b-ak:ʷ-i-t-i</i>	<i>b-arq'-b-ak:ʷ-i-t-i-a</i>
3	<i>b-arq'-ib</i>		<i>b-arq'-b-ak:-u</i>	

## 3.3.2 Meaning

*Present Relevance*

The form is used in a number of contexts cross-linguistically typical for perfects. These include past actions whose consequences are relevant in the present.

- (21) *du-dil arc d-ikʔ-aʃ ilsan-ni di-la arc*  
 I-ERG money NPL-give.PFV-PTCP man-ERG me-GEN money  
*čer-d-arqʔ-b-akʔ-u*  
 back-NPL-do.PFV-PRF-NEG-3  
 ‘The man I gave money to **has not returned** it.’

In (21), the Perfect is used because the non-return of the money is still relevant at the moment of speech. One might add ‘yet’ to the second half of the sentence; the use of the Aorist in this case is only possible if one implies that the man never returned the money and is not expected to do so.

- (22) *di-la juldaš-li il xabar ha(b)urs-ib*  
 me-GEN friend-ERG that story ⟨N⟩tell.PFV-PRF[3]  
 ‘My friend **has (already) told** this story.’

The sentence in (22) is significant in that the native speaker has used ‘already’ in translating it, which is exactly the meaning component provided by the use of the Perfect.

- (23) *ci.le cʔaqʔ.li w-arcʔ-ur.ri dʒʔ.li=di? du saʔqt aʔw-le-w*  
 why strongly M-tire.PFV-CVB alike=2 I hour four-IN-M[ESS]  
*aq.kejɕ-ur-da*  
 M;stand\_up.PFV-PRF-1  
 ‘Why do you look so tired? I **woke up** at 4 a.m.’

The use of the Perfect in (23) shows that this form in Shiri does not observe the restriction on the use of definite past-time adverbials that is observed, for example, in English; note that ‘I have woken up’ seems to be impossible here.

- (24) *mašina b-id.ag-ur ʔurkabe-ka bari*  
 car N-go.out.PFV-PRF[3] K.-ABL sun  
*ha(b)ulq-na-b-q*  
 ⟨N⟩rise.IPFV-CVB.LOC-N-DIR  
 ‘The car **has left** Kubachi towards the east (and is still heading there).’

The function of the Perfect in (24) is clear: it denotes the fact that the car is still on its way, it has not reached its destination. This is not a resultative use of the perfect because leaving a village does not constitute a change of the subject's state.

Spoken-text examples (25)–(26) are relatively rare due to the narrative nature of most texts. Crucially, all of them are either said by the speakers outside of the narrative or used in quotations. Forms of the Perfect are (almost) never used in the narratives themselves.

- (25) *he-l*                      *χabar-ri*                      *q:ax-r-arq'-ib-da*                      *du*  
 EMPH-that    story-ERG    dizzy-F-do.PFV-PRF-1    I  
 'This story [that the other speaker has just told] has made me dizzy.'<sup>7</sup>  
 (spoken text)

- (26) *r-uc:-ur.ri*                      *r-erc:-ib.li,*                      *r-erx-ub.li,*                      *urcul-la*                      *q'aca*  
 F-work.PFV-CVB    F-roast.PFV-CVB    F-dry.PFV-CVB    wood-GEN    stick  
*ag-ur.ri,*                      *tegenek-la*                      *?as:a*                      *r-iχ-ub.li,*  
 become.PFV-CVB    tegenek-GEN    stick    F-become.PFV-CVB  
*t:ura-sa(r)uq-un-da*  
 EX[LAT]-⟨F⟩come.PFV-PRF-1  
 'I have worked a lot, I have been fried, dried out, I have become a wooden stick, I have become a *tegenek*<sup>8</sup> stick, and now I **have come out here**.'  
 (spoken text)

The example in (27) is especially illustrative: it quotes the thoughts of the narrator when he witnesses a crowd of villagers heading towards him, as he thinks, hungry for retribution.

- (27) *na*                      *ag-ur,*                      *ik'-u.l*                      *ca⟨w⟩i,*  
 now    happen.PFV-PRF[3]    [M]say.IPFV-CVB    3⟨M⟩  
*arg-an*  
 happen.IPFV-PTCP.POT  
 'Now, he says, what was supposed to happen **has happened**.' (spoken text)

7 Of course, the Resultative is also grammatical in this context, but note the subtle difference: (25) means 'has made me dizzy', describing the event itself, while the Resultative form would mean 'I am dizzy (because of this story)', denoting the target state. See more on the non-stative nature of the Shiri Perfect below.

8 A kind of tree (*Paliurus aculeatus*).

The following example (28) is contrasted with (14): the Resultative is not available with the verb ‘read’, because reading a book does not lead to a change of state, but the Perfect is compatible, because the action of reading a book can have continuing relevance in the present.

- (28) *du-dil kinišk:a b-elč'-un-da / \*b-elč'-un.ni=da*  
 I-ERG book N-read.PFV-PRF-1 N-read.PFV-CVB=1  
 ‘I have read the book.’

#### “Hot News”

A cross-linguistically typical context for the perfect, the “hot news” context (which is of course a particular version of the current relevance reading), is also attested in Shiri, as the following examples show.

- (29) *hari χabar=ak:w-ar.ri putin sejk-ib nisi:š:u!*  
 look news=NEG-CVB P. come.PFV-PRF[3] us-APUD[LAT]  
 ‘Look, Putin **has** suddenly **come** to us!’

- (30) *na bara aminat-li ca.ibil kaj ha.ʔ-ib*  
 now just A.-ERG first word say.PFV-PRF[3]  
 ‘Aminat [a child] **has** just **said** her first word.’

- (31) *hara kətu-dil hylk:a b-erk:-un!*  
 look cat-ERG chudu N-eat.PFV-PRF[3]  
 ‘Look, the cat **has eaten** the *chudu*!’

#### Experiential

Generally, the experiential meaning in Shiri is expressed by a separate Experiential paradigm, which I do not describe in this paper as it has a rather specific meaning and is not part of the core TAM system. But the experiential reading is also in principle available for the Perfect, and is attested in a few examples. In (32), the first variant form is the Perfect while the second is the Experiential.

9 The *chudu* is one of the main Daghestanian national dishes: a closed pie with various stuffings.

- (32) *di-la ruci čī(r)ag-ib-di=w / čī(r)ag-ib-zi-w=di=w*  
 me-GEN sister ⟨F⟩see.PFV-PRF-2=GQ ⟨F⟩see.PFV-PTCP-ATTR-M=2=GQ  
*řāt?*  
 thee.DAT  
 ‘Have you (ever) seen [i.e. met] my sister?’

*Present/Immediate Future*

A marginal function of the Perfect is to mark situations that are starting to happen in the present or are bound to happen in the very nearest future. This seems to be limited to a narrow range of specific verbs and contexts. For example, the following phrase was uttered by a man to his wife when he was leaving the house to go to a neighbour’s home:

- (33) *kat.ag-ur-da*  
 go.down.PFV-PRF-1  
 ‘I am going down.’ (lit. ‘I’m gone down.’)

This is similar to the use of the past tense for immediate future in Russian (*Ja pošel* ‘I’m going’, lit. ‘I’ve started going’).

*Lack of Resultative Reading*

While the current relevance reading is usually viewed as an extension of the resultant state semantics, the Shiri Perfect does not have the latter meaning, which is instead expressed by a separate Resultative paradigm, described in section 3.2.2. The fact that the Perfect does not express a current state is especially clear if one tries to attach it to the inchoative verbs, which typically use the Resultative. For example, when speakers are presented with the verb ‘to sit’ in the Perfect, they can only produce contexts like the following:

- (34) *kejg-i heř.tu! – kejg-ib-da*  
 M; sit.down.PFV-IMP here[LAT] M; sit.down.PFV-PRF-1  
 ‘Sit down here! – I have sat down (= I have obeyed your order).’

In (34), the Perfect form does not refer to the state of sitting, but to the actual event of sitting down on the chair, acceding to the demand of the other interlocutor. This effect is consistent with Tatevosov’s (2001) observation that the anterior reading (perfect reading, in our terminology) produces two types of interpretations: “the speaker accepts/rejects a request invitation, or communicates information that requires the hearer’s immediate attention” – in (34), we clearly see the former interpretation.

### 3.3.3 Conclusions on the Perfect

Overall, it seems that the Shiri Perfect is a purely past-tense form, while possessing the additional semantic component of current relevance. For instance, it cannot denote continuing situations; the Present should be used instead:

- (35) *du maskaw-le-w le(d)žu.d ʔamru ʔar.irɣ-u.l=da /*  
 I M.-IN-M[ESS] all(NPL) life M; live.IPFV-CVB=1  
*#ʔarɣ<sup>w</sup>-a-d-i / #ʔarɣ-ub-da*  
 M; live.PFV-AOR-1-SG M; live.PFV-PRF-1  
 ‘I have lived in Moscow all of my life.’

The Aorist and Perfect are grammatical in (35), but would imply that the situation has already been terminated, i.e. that the speaker is no longer living in Moscow.

The Perfect in Shiri is thus cross-linguistically somewhat unusual in having a very narrow functional area, in most cases overlapping with the Aorist: since the Aorist is the unmarked perfective past form, it is almost never *obligatory* to present an action as “currently relevant”, surprising, or recent. The experiential function, while being available for the Perfect, has a dedicated paradigm which is used far more widely. The immediate future function is rather marginal, and here the Perfect competes with three forms at once: Present, Prospective, and Future. We can therefore say that the Perfect is largely redundant in the TAM system of Shiri; and, as we will see in the next section, this redundancy actually correlates rather well with what we find in other varieties of Dargwa.

## 4 Perfective Past: Perfect, Resultative, Aorist, and Evidential

The Shiri system is very remarkable from a comparative Dargwa point of view, as it does not fit into any of the configurations attested elsewhere in this branch. The dialects that are structurally closest to Shiri, Kubachi and Ashti, have roughly the same TAM system, but with no counterparts to the Shiri Perfect. A great majority of Dargwa languages, however, do have a counterpart to this form, but it rather has an aorist meaning; morphological counterparts to the Shiri Aorist are lacking in most varieties.

Such a discrepancy calls for a diachronic explanation. It is clear that a superficial analysis will not suffice to establish the pre-history of the Shiri system; an in-depth cross-dialectal comparison is required. In this section, I will provide an attempt at reconstructing the Proto-Dargwa system of perfective past-tense



forms in order to explain these puzzling correspondences between the individual varieties.

#### 4.1 *A Note on Abbreviations*

A constant problem that one faces when comparing TAM categories across Dargwa languages is a remarkable stability of form combined with very wide diversity of meaning. In other words, the inventory of morphological paradigms is roughly the same in each dialect, but their functions are often drastically different. This makes it very difficult to use labels like Aorist, Perfect, etc., to speak of a given paradigm: one dialect's Perfect may well be another's Aorist or Resultative. It therefore seems useful to devise a set of labels which would identify a paradigm solely on its formal structure. Four abbreviations seem to be sufficient for the present purposes of describing the core perfective past-tense system (as illustrations I will use the Shiri forms of the verb *ʔarq' ~ ʔirq' [-ib]* 'do'):

- **PPST<sub>1</sub>**, for “**Participial Past 1**”: the paradigm whose 3rd person form is segmentally equivalent to the perfective participle, and whose 1st and 2nd person forms utilize the clitic person markers (1p. *ʔarq'-ib-da*, 3p. *ʔarq'-ib*).
- **PPST<sub>2</sub>**, for “**Participial Past 2**”: the paradigm that is identical to PPST<sub>1</sub> except for the use of the “copula” *ca=i* in the 3rd person; as we will see, some dialects distinguish between PPST<sub>1</sub> and PPST<sub>2</sub> (1p. *ʔarq'-ib=da*, 3p. *ʔarq'-ib=ca=i*).
- **RES** for “**Resultative**”: the paradigm based on the perfective converb (*-ib-li* etc.) with the clitic person markers<sup>10</sup> (1p. *ʔarq'-ib-li=da*, 3p. *ʔarq'-ib-li=ca=i*).
- **SPST** for “**Synthetic Past**”: the synthetic perfective past-tense paradigm which corresponds to the Shiri Preterite, with the 3rd person endings *-aj, -i, -ini, -iri* (1p. *ʔarq'-a-d-i*, 3p. *ʔarq'-aj*).

#### 4.2 *A Cross-Dialectal Overview*

In this section, I will provide a survey of the use of past perfective forms in those dialects for which I could find enough reliable data. These are Ashti (Belyaev 2012), Kubachi<sup>11</sup> (Magometov 1963, Tatevosov 2001; texts in Abakarova

10 In some dialects, such as Ashti, the 3rd person marker is not used in declarative forms, but this does not seem to ever play a role in distinguishing between TAM paradigms, so I will not take this parameter into consideration.

11 In the table, “Ashti” stands for both Ashti proper and Magometov’s (1963) and Tatevosov’s (2001) description of the Kubachi system, as these seem to be identical. In contrast, “Kubachi” stands for the system that we find in separately published texts (Abakarova 1996; Šamov 1994).

1996, Šamov 1994), Icari (Sumbatova & Mutalov 2003), Akusha (van den Berg 2001),<sup>12</sup> Tanti (Sumbatova & Lander 2015), and Kaitag (Temirbulatova 2004, including texts). My findings are summarized in Table 3.14 (“idealized” forms are given in the leftmost column).

TABLE 3.14 *Functions of the perfective paradigms in Dargwa varieties*

	Shiri	Ashti	Kubachi	Icari	Akusha, Tanti	Kaitag
PPST <sub>1</sub> (- <i>ib</i> )	perf.	–	–	aor.	aor.	aor. <sup>a</sup>
PPST <sub>2</sub> (- <i>ib</i> =AUX.3)	–	–	evid.	perf. evid.	–	evid.
RES (- <i>ib-li</i> =AUX.3)	res. evid.	perf. res. evid.	perf. res.	res.	perf. res. evid.	perf. res.
SPST (- <i>aj</i> )	aor.	aor.	aor.	–	–	–

a The 2nd person Aorist forms in Kaitag seem to be borrowed from SPST.

The notions of perfect, aorist, and resultative have been explained while describing the Shiri system above. Since the descriptions of Ashti, Icari, Akusha and Tanti that are cited above are modern and typologically oriented, it is not problematic to identify the functions of the paradigm, and I will not provide additional examples. But other dialects deserve special comment, because the explanations provided in the grammatical descriptions are either insufficient or contradict textual evidence. I will only be looking at the core meanings as they can be discerned from the available texts, which means that my descriptions can only be preliminary and incomplete. However, the texts do provide a general picture.

#### 4.2.1 Icari

The Icari system is described in Sumbatova & Mutalov (2003). However, the only text provided as an appendix to this grammar appears to contradict the description contained in the main text. In particular, it is stated that PPST<sub>2</sub>, the Perfect in the authors’ terminology, apart from its primary function, “is also

<sup>12</sup> The TAM system of Standard Dargwa as described in Mutalov (this volume) seems to be identical to the system described by van den Berg. In that article, PPST<sub>1</sub> is called “Preterite”, and RES is called “Perfect”. The so-called “Resultative” is in fact a counterpart to the Shiri Experiential.

widely used in narrative texts with reference to the point in time that is actual for the events in the narrative" (p. 88). The evidential function is rather assigned to the Evidential Past paradigm, i.e. the past-tense version of RES (the Resultative itself is said not to have any evidential function). However, in the text in the appendix, *all* of the perfective finite forms that belong to the main (unwitnessed) narrative are in PPST<sub>2</sub>. It therefore seems more plausible to assign an evidential function to PPST<sub>2</sub> rather than speak of any "actual" point in time. Such an interpretation is especially strange for (36), which serves as a concluding sentence to the narrative.<sup>13</sup>

- (36) *c'il he.l.t:u-r.t:al gu(w)al he.l-il xan š:a*  
 then there-ABL down(M) that-ERG Kh. village.IN[LAT]  
*w-at.gʁʔ-ib.li arbaχ: elʁ-un=ca-w zamen.ni-j*  
 M-send.PFV-CVB A. stay-PTCP=3-M replacement-DAT  
 'Then Arbakh sent Khan down to the village and **stayed behind** to replace him.' (Sumbatova & Mutalov 2003: 213)

In the grammar itself, the examples that are provided are too few and out of context to assess the validity of the description. Perhaps the generalization has been done based on other texts. However, at this point the data are in favour of an evidential interpretation of PPST<sub>2</sub>.

#### 4.2.2 Kaitag

In Kaitag, judging from the texts provided in Temirbulatova (2004),<sup>14</sup> PPST<sub>1</sub> is used only for perfective witnessed past (37)–(38).

- (37) *ej, ašna, i w-ih-ni a-b-ah-ur-da=q'ali*  
 hey friend thou M-be.PFV-NMLZ NEG-N-know.PFV-AOR-1=PTCL  
 'Hey, mate, I **didn't recognize** it was you!' ("The cost of 20 kopecks", Karacan, sentence 3, Temirbulatova 2004: 277)

13 A reviewer notes that in such a context, the form may refer to the present. This might have been true if all prior sentences in the text had used a different form, such as the Evidential Past. However, the Perfect is used throughout, thus this interpretation is unlikely.

14 At least, this is true for the Dzhibrichi, Karacan, and Sanchi texts. All examples and contexts have also been checked with Dr. Uzlipat Gasanova (Daghestan State University), a speaker of the Shilyagi dialect. Some of the other texts seem to have a considerably different grammar that requires further analysis (the morphological structure is difficult to establish based on Temirbulatova's description).

- (38) *he.že-li dam q<sup>w</sup>qant'-e q<sup>w</sup>qāš b-erh-iβ*  
 this-ERG me.DAT lip-IN[LAT] fist N-hit.PFV-AOR[3]  
 'This one **hit** me in the lip.' (ibid., sentence 6)

While some of these examples could be treated as perfects, it is clear from the texts that a separate perfect function cannot be singled out for this form.

PPST<sub>2</sub> is used as a past evidential in narratives, such as in (39). It does not seem to have any perfect functions; none are found in texts, and I have not been able to elicit this form in perfect witnessed contexts either (RES is used instead).

- (39) *hap'⟨b⟩ar-iβ.li, šuške=ra ca-j=ra, r-us-un.ni*  
 ⟨N⟩snatch.PFV-CVB sabre=ADD self-M=ADD F-sleep.PFV-CVB  
*ka⟨r⟩is:-un ric:i.l-sa k.ag-ur=ca-j il*  
 ⟨F⟩lie.down.PFV-PTCP sister-ANTE[LAT] go.down.PFV-PTCP=3-M that  
 'He snatched the sabre and **came down** to the sleeping sister.' ('Brother and sister', Dzhibirbachi, sentence 12, Temirbulatova 2004: 274)

Finally, RES has a resultative function (40). In the grammar of Temirbulatova (2004), it is not described as a separate paradigm, but there is one non-naturally occurring example (either elicited or provided by the author herself, who is a native speaker) that seems to suggest that RES also has a perfect function (41).

- (40) *et=gina e-b-et'-iβ.li=w?*  
 thee.DAT=only NEG-N-bore.PFV-CVB=GQ  
 'Aren't you **bored** with being alone?' ('The fox and the bear', Sanchi, sentence 7, Temirbulatova 2004: 159)

- (41) *du-li kitaβ b-elč'-un.ni=da*  
 I-ERG book N-read.PFV-CVB=1  
 'I **have read** the book.' (Temirbulatova 2004: 159)

#### 4.2.3 Kubachi

The system of Kubachi as it emerges from the folklore texts in Abakarova (1996) and the Mullah Nasruddin stories in Šamov (1994) is remarkably different both from the closely related Ashti and from the Kubachi system as described in Magometov (1963) or Tatevosov (2001).<sup>15</sup> The most important difference is the

15 For translating the examples, I have used the Kubachi dictionary in Magomedov & Saidov-Akkutta (2010).

existence of PPST<sub>2</sub>, which seems to be a specialized evidential form (42). There is no such form in Magometov's Kubachi or Ashti; RES is used in evidential contexts instead.

- (42) *ʔu:ɛʔbug.an-t.a-ti:ij      b-ɯlh-ɯn=sa-b      nadir-ʃah.li-j      ʃ:e*  
 Kubachi.people-PL-DAT    N-see.PFV-PTCP=3-N    N.-Sh.-DAT    village  
*ha<b>alč-ij      b-ikɔ-u.l*  
 <N>take.PFV-INF    N-want.IPFV-CVB  
 'The people of Kubachi saw that Nāder-Shāh wanted to capture the village.' ("The *muchals*", Abakarova 1996: 175)

Otherwise, there seem to be no differences between the two Kubachi systems. In both variants RES, in addition to resultative proper (43)–(44), has a perfect meaning (45).

- (43) *du    ijal      lum      b-us-ib.li=da*  
 I    today    mouth    N-hold.PFV-CVB=1  
 'I am fasting today.' [lit. 'I have held the mouth'] ("The wolf and the fox", Abakarova 1996: 223)

- (44) *nalla    b-ibč'-ib.l=a-da*  
 yet    N-die.PFV-CVB=NEG-1  
 'I am not dead<sup>16</sup> yet.' ("The death-hour", Abakarova 1996: 146)

- (45) *e:ɣ-ib.l=a-de      itɔ:ij      at:a-la      wasijat*  
 understand.PFV-CVB=NEG-2    thee-DAT    father-GEN    testament  
 'You have not understood your father's testament.' ("The father's testament", Abakarova 1996: 172)

The sentence in (43) requires some commentary. It is a resultative context, because the verb 'to fast' in Kubachi and other varieties is based on the metaphor of 'holding' / 'catching' the mouth. A fasting person is said to have 'held the mouth' and continuing to be in that state until the fast is broken, hence the use of the Resultative.

Example (44) is actually ambiguous between perfect and resultative, depending on whether 'being dead' is treated as a state or not. This is not very important for Kubachi, however, because RES has perfect uses anyway.

16 The neuter gender agreement in this example is inexplicable. Perhaps it is due to a typo in the original text.

In witnessed past-tense contexts, including witnessed narratives, SPST (46)–(47) is used.

- (46) *suq k'abk'aj-li-j siṣ-u-zi-w*  
 once Vladikavkaz-IN-EL M;reach.IPFV-PTCP-ATTR-M  
*sax-a-d du mažalis-le*  
 M;reach.PFV-AOR-1 I Madzhalis-IN[LAT]  
 'Once, when returning from Vladikavkaz, I **reached** Madzhalis.' ('What happened to me', Abakarova 1996: 170)

- (47) *wallah, ijal xʷal.le ʔače b-a:q'-ib nus:a haka-l*  
 by.God today a.lot work N-do.PFV-PTCP we very  
*d-a:c-i-d-a, li(b)il qu b-ax-un taman*  
 1PL-tire.PFV-AOR-1-PL all(N) field N-plough.PFV-PTCP end  
*b-a:q'-a-d-a*  
 N-do.PFV-AOR-1-PL  
 'By God, we who have worked a lot today **are** very **tired**, we **finished** ploughing a whole field!' ('The peasant and the fly', Abakarova 1996: 226)

The system of Kubachi as it is found in Magometov (1963) seems identical to the Ashti system described in Belyaev (2012); the way RES functions in Ashti and in the texts in Magometov (1963) is also consistent with Tatevosov's (2001) description. Since the basic narrative evidential form in Abakarova (1996) is PPST<sub>2</sub>, and not RES, it is impossible to say whether RES has evidential meanings in this variant. If it does, it is certainly not the main evidential form.

### 4.3 Discussion

Even though the survey provided above is still preliminary, and more detailed examination of the textual evidence as well as elicitation are required, there are still several basic conclusions that can be drawn concerning the diachrony of the Dargwa perfective past system and the place of Shiri in the whole picture.

#### 4.3.1 Resultative

The Resultative in *-ib-li(=ca-i)* can without a doubt be reconstructed for Proto-Dargwa: cognate paradigms are found in all varieties, and it is improbable that the combination of the converb with the clitic person marker has created a resultative meaning independently in each of them.<sup>17</sup> The extensions of this

<sup>17</sup> As observed by a reviewer, this statement is arguable given the cross-linguistic frequency of this grammaticalization pathway. However, *for a given language*, even frequent

original resultative to perfect (in Ashti, Akusha, Tanti and Kaitag) and evidential (in Shiri, Ashti, Akusha, and Tanti) contexts seem to be later innovations in the respective dialects.

This scenario seems to presuppose that RES in Shiri has developed its evidential meaning directly from resultative, bypassing the perfect stage. While the development of evidentials from resultatives was assumed in Bybee et al. (1994: 95–97), Tatevosov (2001) has argued, based on the data of East Caucasian, that a perfect stage is a necessary step in the diachronic development of a resultative into an evidential form. However, it seems improbable that the Shiri Resultative has lost an earlier perfect function: there are no traces of this meaning, and there is, furthermore, a separate Perfect paradigm, which appears to be relatively old (see section 4.2.3). Apparently, we have to assume a direct evolution from resultative to evidential for Shiri.

#### 4.3.2 Aorist

It can be easily seen from Table 3.14 that the major division among Dargwa dialects is in the forms that are used for the Aorist, i.e. perfective witnessed past. In the majority of dialects, PPST<sub>1</sub> is used in this function. These include, apart from Icari, Akusha, Kaitag, and Tanti, also a number of varieties not included in my survey, in particular, Khuduts (own fieldwork), Qunqi (own fieldwork), Megeb (Magometov 1982), and Chirag (Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 29).

In a geographically restricted area encompassing Kubachi, Ashti and Shiri, it is rather SPST that performs the aorist function. In this group of dialects, the PPST<sub>1</sub> is either absent (Ashti, Kubachi) or used for perfect (Shiri).<sup>18</sup>

The question is thus whether we can reconstruct any of these forms as the original Aorist. From a purely quantitative perspective, it seems plausible to reconstruct PPST<sub>1</sub> as the original Aorist paradigm. But if so, SPST in Shiri, Kubachi and Ashti must be an innovation, as it is absent in all other known dialects. I believe that the latter scenario is highly unlikely, for the following reasons.

First, if the original meaning of the PPST<sub>1</sub> is aorist, it is not clear how exactly the Shiri form could have acquired a perfect meaning. This involves a shrinking of the original meaning rather than the more typical extension. Such change typically occurs through displacement, as in the well-known case of

---

grammaticalization paths are rather improbable to actually occur, and the probability of the same grammatical development happening *in all varieties* and based on the same converbs seems negligibly low.

18 Kubachi as per Abakarova (1996) does have PPST<sub>2</sub>. In my view, this paradigm is not related to PPST<sub>1</sub>; I will return to it in the next section.

old presents (Haspelmath 1998). In that scenario, a newly grammaticalized form displaces the original present-future form in a narrow function, leading to the “old present” possessing two meanings (e.g. habitual and future) not directly related to one another via semantic shift. But in the case of Shiri, we would deal with a situation where a new general form (the Aorist) displaces an equally general old form. This could perhaps lead to full replacement, but not to the displacement of the old Aorist to the perfect function. Such a change is also unattested in the literature.

Second, it does not seem that the Shiri, Kubachi and Ashti SPST is an innovation. It is a synthetic paradigm with its own set of endings and a nontrivial lexical distribution in the 3rd person, which means that it belongs to the older layer of Dargwa paradigms (like the Habitual, Optative, Imperative, Prohibitive, etc.), unlike the PPST<sub>1</sub>, whose structure is morphologically transparent.

While most dialects do not have a counterpart to the perfective Synthetic Past, similar endings do exist in the majority of Dargwa varieties in the function of past habitual endings. Consider the Icari Habitual Past paradigm of the verb *ɤuc ~ ɤurc* ‘catch’ [-ib] (Sumbatova & Mutalov 2003: 91) in Table 3.15.

TABLE 3.15 *The Icari Habitual Past*

	sg.	pl.
1	<i>ɤurc-a-d-i</i>	
2	<i>ɤurc-a-t-i</i>	<i>ɤurc-a-t-a</i>
3	<i>ɤurc-iri, ɤurc-aj</i>	

We clearly deal with the same set of endings as SPST, in particular, the Shiri Preterite.<sup>19</sup> Therefore, this form cannot be viewed as an innovation in Shiri, Kubachi and Ashti.

One may, however, consider the Icari semantics of this form, i.e. past habitual, to be the original meaning. But it seems highly unlikely that a rather specialized form like this would be extended to a very general past perfective context, especially if we assume that PPST<sub>1</sub> was already available for the aorist function in Proto-Dargwa.

19 Shiri does not have the ending *-iri*, but this is apparently a relatively recent development. The corresponding *-ini* is still found in the *-un*-conjugation.



Furthermore, the morphological structure of SPST requires us to include the perfective function in the range of its original meanings. The main piece of evidence here is the ending *-aj*. This ending is identical to a peripheral but productive perfective participial suffix *-aj* attested at least in Shiri and Tanti (Sumbatova & Lander 2015: 130–132), e.g. Shiri *meq' b-arq'-aj insan* 'the man who married'. If this similarity is not accidental (which is unlikely), it seems highly probable that the 3rd person SPST ending has developed out of the predicative use of this participial form. But unlike the corresponding finite form, the *-aj*-participle can only be formed from the perfective stem. The idea that a perfective participle was incorporated into a past habitual paradigm, with the stem shifting from perfective to imperfective, appears totally implausible. And yet this is what must have happened if we want to maintain that SPST originally only had a past habitual usage: the *-aj* 3rd person form is also found in dialects like Icari, where there the function of SPST is limited to past habitual.

As another counterargument, consider the Kaitag perfective past paradigm of the verb *ar(q') ~ ir(q')* 'do' (Temirbulatova 2004: 155) in Table 3.16, which I have provisionally assigned to PPST<sub>1</sub> in Table 3.14 above.

TABLE 3.16 *The Kaitag Aorist (PPST<sub>1</sub>)*

	sg.	pl.
1	<i>ar-iβ-da</i>	
2	<i>ar-a-t:-i</i>	<i>ar-a-t:-a</i>
3	<i>ar-iβ</i>	

The paradigm is highly idiosyncratic and seems to be an amalgamation of PPST<sub>1</sub> and SPST (cf. Mutalov 2002: 97). The 1st and 3rd person forms are from PPST<sub>1</sub>, while 2nd person forms are from SPST. Again, the idea that the 2nd person endings were somehow imported into the perfective past from the Habitual Past paradigm (how and why?) can be discarded from the outset.

According to the description in Uslar" (1892: 158–159), a similar, but even more mixed, system is found in Urakhi. In this dialect, the Aorist inflection generally follows the PPST<sub>1</sub> pattern, but the 2nd person ending is *-ib=ri* (i.e. from PPST<sub>1</sub>, with the regular correspondence /d/ ~ /r/) if the 2nd person argument is the Patient and *-a-di* (regularly corresponding to Shiri, Kubachi, Ashti and Kaitag SPST *-a-t:i*) if the 2nd person argument is the Agent. Clearly,

more research on Urakhi is needed in order to establish the exact distribution of forms. For our purpose it is enough to establish that Urakhi has a mixed paradigm.

To conclude, it seems that all facts point to the existence of SPST as a perfective<sup>20</sup> finite form (i.e. Aorist) at the Proto-Dargwa level.

#### 4.3.3 Perfect

Since we have established that SPST was the original Proto-Dargwa Aorist, we have to propose a different function for PPST<sub>1</sub>.<sup>21</sup> I believe that the most economical solution is to reconstruct PPST<sub>1</sub> in Proto-Dargwa as a Perfect form. Therefore, the meaning it has in Shiri is the original meaning. This conclusion also agrees rather well with typological data: the extension of perfect forms to more general aorist contexts is very well-attested, while it would be difficult to propose a plausible scenario of how the Shiri form has become specialized in the perfect function from an originally broader distribution.

I should note that, by all accounts, the PPST<sub>1</sub> paradigm is not an innovation in any of the dialects; it must be reconstructed for Proto-Dargwa. First of all, it is improbable that the perfective participle in predicative position has independently acquired the same meaning in almost all of the dialects. If it was the original perfect form, however, the extension to aorist is natural.

Second, in the 3rd person, the form lacks the auxiliary *ca=i*. Except for some of the dialects where even RES is used without the 3rd person marker (such as Ashti), using a non-finite form in predicative position without an additional marker is generally impossible, and the loss of this marker would be a rather major change that is improbable to have happened all across the Dargwa area in only one particular paradigm. Also observe the morphological idiosyncrasies noted in section 3.3.1.

Third, Sumbatova & Lander (2015: 123) have discovered stress differences between Tanti 3rd person Aorist forms (corresponding to the Shiri perfect) and the perfective participles. While the participles always have stress on the last syllable (i.e. the participle/secondary stem marker), stress in the 3rd person is lexically defined: for most verbs it is on the base stem (e.g. 3p. *árc̣i-ib* 'found'

20 A similar or identical paradigm with past habitual or past imperfective function must also be reconstructed. But it is not clear whether the perfective SPST and Past Habitual were a single paradigm at the proto-language level, or that this is the result of analogical leveling in Shiri and Kubachi. I leave this question for future elaboration, as it is not relevant to the main point I am making.

21 In principle, a non-aspectual contrast could be proposed, e.g. an evidentiality distinction. But there is no evidence for this in the synchronic data.

vs. ptcp. *arč-ib*), but for some verbs, it is also on the suffix (e.g. ptcp., 3p. *ax'-ín* 'fed'). We can conclude that at least the 3rd person Perfect form is morphologically distinct from the participle, and cannot be viewed as periphrastic. This naturally extends to the 1st and 2nd persons, where the person markers cannot be detached anyway. Since using non-finite verb forms or nominals in predicative position without an auxiliary is no longer possible in any Dargwa variety, this stress pattern may plausibly be assumed to be a vestige of an earlier system.<sup>22</sup>

Lastly, the fact that Kaitag and Urakhi have mixed SPST-PPST<sub>1</sub> paradigms supports the proto-language existence not only of SPST (as shown in the previous section), but also of PPST<sub>1</sub>: clearly, for an amalgamation to occur both components to be amalgamated must already exist in the language. It is completely implausible that Kaitag and Urakhi, and a few other dialects, e.g. Muira (Mutalov 2002: 97), not being in close contact, have independently innovated mixed paradigms of the same type without there having already been both SPST and PPST<sub>1</sub> in Proto-Dargwa.

Finally, a paradigm that I have so far neglected is PPST<sub>2</sub>. It seems tempting to consider it to be just a variant of PPST<sub>1</sub>. However, this is an illusion, as it presupposes that the 3rd person auxiliary has somehow started to attach to the already finite 3rd person form, which has in this context acquired new meanings – a highly unlikely scenario for which I fail to see any formal or semantic motivation. PPST<sub>2</sub> forms are rather independent innovations in Icari, Kubachi (*apud* Abakarova 1996) and Kaitag, owing to the fact that the *-ib/-ub/-ur/-un* forms are still synchronically participles and nothing prevents their predicative use; they are indeed used in this way in focus constructions (cf. Sumbatova & Mutalov 2003 for Icari). Therefore, in Icari this form is simply a new perfect reinnovated after the original perfect had been extended to aorist.

What has happened in Kubachi and Kaitag is less clear: while it is possible that PPST<sub>2</sub> forms do have perfect uses in Kubachi, but these are simply not attested in the extant texts,<sup>23</sup> the Kaitag paradigm does seem to be limited to

22 It must be added, however, that this stress pattern is not observed in Shiri, which makes this point significantly weaker unless similar patterns are found in other Dargwa varieties.

23 I find the difference between the Kubachi grammar and texts in Magometov (1963) and the texts in Abakarova (1996) and Šamov (1994) especially mysterious. A new evidential form could not have been innovated in such a short timespan, and yet there is not a single trace of it in the older book. Perhaps this form has appeared due to influence from other Dargwa varieties?

evidential function, according to the data I've been able to elicit. We have to assume that either PPST<sub>2</sub> has been directly innovated as an evidential, or that its erstwhile perfect functions have at some point been taken over by RES. At present there is no evidence for either of these scenarios.

#### 4.4 *Reconstruction*

Summing up the previous sections, I propose the following reconstruction of the Proto-Dargwa perfective past subsystem:

form (3p.)	abbreviation	PD meaning
<i>-ib</i>	PPST <sub>1</sub>	perfect
<i>-ib-li caɿi</i>	RES	resultative
<i>-aj</i>	SPST	aorist

None of these forms possessed an evidential meaning, which is clear from the synchronic diversity of evidential paradigms, and the varying degree to which they are grammaticalized. The system also seems to have been rather unstable: the Perfect was encroaching on the Aorist, while the Resultative, in its turn, was encroaching on the Perfect. This created a cyclic situation of sorts, and the tendencies that led to its disintegration in most dialects could have already been present at the proto-language stage.

This apparent instability of the original system is also noticeable from the fluid nature of the perfect in Shiri, where it has a rather narrow domain of its own and is often interchangeable with the Aorist. In fact, while the overwhelming majority of speakers consistently use the Aorist for witnessed and the Resultative for unwitnessed narratives, in one text, the Perfect is used throughout instead of the Aorist, apart from a few sentences:

- (48) *d-id.ag-ur-da*      *het:u*      *ke(d)erχ-ur-da*      *het:u*      (...)  
 1PL-go.PFV-PRF-1    there    ⟨1PL⟩employ.PFV-PRF-1    there[LAT]  
*ʔaki-le*      *či.kat:ax-ib-da*    *bicl-umi*    *d-arq'-iž*    (...)  
 work-IN[LAT]    cause.PFV-PRF-1    toilet-PL    NPL-do.PFV-INF  
*na*    *d-id.ag-ur-da*      *arc*      *ha(b)alč-iž*  
 now    1PL-go.PFV-PRF-1    money    ⟨N⟩take.PFV-INF  
 'We went (Pf.) there. We got employed (Pf.) for a job. They made us (Pf.)  
 build toilets. (...) Now we've gone (Pf.) to take our money.' (spoken text)

This certainly seems to be an example of a rather special narrative strategy, somewhat similar to the historical present. In fact, native speakers comment that (48) represents a rather “involved” style of narration, which seems to transpose the events to the present. This is further confirmed by the use of *na* ‘now’ in the last sentence: something which should be impossible in a true aorist context. Nevertheless, the very fact that such a narrative style is available<sup>24</sup> suggests that even in Shiri, there are already certain preconditions for the extension of the Perfect to a simple past function.

I will now examine each of the dialects surveyed above and show how their systems have evolved from the Proto-Dargwa state.

#### 4.4.1 Shiri

The Shiri system seems to be the most archaic, and its data have been crucial in the reconstruction. The only change from Shiri to Proto-Dargwa seems to have been the acquisition of an evidential function by the old Resultative:

<b>PD meaning</b>	res.	perf.	aor.
<b>PD form</b>	RES	PPST <sub>1</sub>	SPST
<b>changes</b>	+evid.		

#### 4.4.2 Kubachi *apud* Magometov, Ashti

In Kubachi *apud* Magometov (1963) and Ashti, RES was extended to perfect and, further, to the evidential meaning, thereby completely displacing the old Perfect:

<b>PD meaning</b>	res.		perf.	aor.
<b>PD form</b>	RES	→	PPST <sub>1</sub>	SPST
<b>changes</b>	+perf.			
	+evid.			

#### 4.4.3 Kubachi *apud* Abakarova (1996)

The Kubachi system as seen in Abakarova (1996) seems to have taken a slightly different route. RES has not, in this variety, acquired an evidential meaning;

24 Such usage is also sporadically observed in languages with an otherwise clear-cut distinction between perfect and simple past. For example, “Narrative Present Perfect” in English seems to be characteristic of certain subgenres, such as football reports; it is not clear whether this usage reflects an ongoing grammatical change or is due to the intrinsic vagueness of the distinction between aorist and perfect (Walker 2011). In any case, the use of the Perfect in the Shiri narrative in (48) seems a lot more consistent than any examples of English narrative perfects.

a new form (PPST<sub>2</sub>) was grammaticalized for this purpose. The result is also the displacement of the old PPST<sub>1</sub>.

<b>PD meaning</b>	res.		perf.	aor.
<b>PD form</b>	RES	→	PPST <sub>1</sub>	SPST
<b>changes</b>	+perf.		PPST <sub>2</sub>	evid.

#### 4.4.4 “Narrow Dargwa”<sup>25</sup> (Akusha, Tanti, Icari, etc.)

A change shared by all the other known Dargwa dialects, including Akusha, Tanti and Icari, is the extension of PPST<sub>1</sub> to Aorist and its complete displacement of SPST.

<b>PD meaning</b>	res.	perf.	aor.
<b>PD form</b>	RES	PPST <sub>1</sub>	→ SPST
<b>changes</b>		+aor.	

In each of the individual languages that I have considered in this paper, the vacant perfect “slot” has been filled, but in different ways. In Akusha and Tanti, RES has acquired additional perfect and evidential meanings:

<b>PD meaning</b>	res.	perf.	aor.
<b>PD form</b>	RES	→ PPST <sub>1</sub>	→ SPST
<b>changes</b>	+perf. +evid.	+aor.	

Icari has preserved the original meaning of RES, but has innovated a new perfect and evidential paradigm:

<b>PD meaning</b>	res.	perf.	aor.
<b>PD form</b>	RES	PPST <sub>1</sub>	→ SPST
<b>changes</b>		↑ PPST <sub>2</sub> perf. evid.	

25 This term does not in any way imply that Shiri and Kubachi (incl. Ashti) form a closely-related group that was the first to branch off from Proto-Dargwa. However, the morphological evidence does strongly suggest this conclusion.

#### 4.4.5 Kaitag and Urakhi

Kaitag can broadly be included in the previous group, but with the small variation in that the SPST paradigm has not completely disappeared, instead merging with the extended PPST<sub>1</sub>. RES was then extended to a perfect to fill in the missing slot. Kaitag has also developed PPST<sub>2</sub> as a new evidential form.

<b>PD meaning</b>	res.		perf.		aor.
<b>PD form</b>	RES	→	PPST <sub>1</sub>	←	SPST
<b>changes</b>	+perf.		-perf. PPST <sub>2</sub> evid.		

The same merger has occurred in Urakhi (see above), although the details of the system are yet to be established.

## 5 Conclusions

In this paper, I have made two contributions to the study of TAM in Dargwa. In section 3, I have provided a brief overview of the core aspectual distinctions among the Shiri perfective indicative forms. While the central three-way distinction between Aorist, Perfect and Resultative is cross-linguistically not very unusual, the distribution of certain functions, such as evidentiality, between these forms does present some interest.

The second aim of the paper was to provide a diachronic explanation of the otherwise puzzling form-functional distribution of perfective past indicative paradigms across Dargwa languages. The Shiri data are crucial in this respect, because they provide the “missing link” between the seemingly irreconcilable Kubachi/Ashti and “narrow Dargwa” systems. The diachronic scenario proposed in section 4.3, although preliminary due to the lack of reliable data on many languages, provides important insights into the nature of the Proto-Dargwa TAM system and its subsequent evolution.

I have demonstrated that the original system was tripartite (Aorist, Perfect, Resultative) and displayed no grammaticalized evidentiality marking. This configuration seems to have been rather unstable, which has led to its modification in most Dargwa idioms except Shiri, which has retained the original system. The only change from Proto-Dargwa to Shiri in this area was the extension of Resultative to evidential functions. In this respect, the Shiri data seem to contradict Tatevosov’s (2001) assertion that the evolution from resultative has to pass through an anterior (perfect) stage. More research is needed in order to determine possible mechanisms of such a change.

The rest of the Dargwa varieties have progressed along two different routes. One route, attested in Kubachi and Ashti, was to expand the original Resultative to perfect functions, thereby eliminating the original Perfect. The other route was to expend the original Perfect to aorist contexts, thereby eliminating the original Aorist. This is schematically represented in Table 3.17.

TABLE 3.17 *The two scenarios of the development of perfective past forms*

Proto-Dargwa, Shiri	Resultative	Perfect	Aorist
Kubachi, Ashti	Resultative → Perfect		Aorist
“Narrow Dargwa”	Resultative	Perfect → Aorist	

Both routes, while fundamentally different, have led to bipartite systems consisting of the Perfect (in Kubachi and Ashti) or Resultative (in the rest of Dargwa) and the Aorist (of varying origin, but semantically identical). While the Kubachi-Ashti system has not undergone any major changes except for the development of evidentiality (either as an additional function of the Perfect or as a new grammatical paradigm), the rest of the Dargwa languages have evolved in various ways. In Icari, a new perfect was grammaticalized, taking on evidential functions and leading to a tripartite Perfect/Evidential – Resultative – Aorist system reminiscent of Proto-Dargwa and Shiri. Akusha and Tanti have instead chosen to expand the Resultative to an evidential perfect, making the system formally identical to the Kubachi/Ashti system.

A mixed scenario is found in Kaitag, which involves the amalgamation of the old Perfect and Aorist into a single Aorist paradigm, the expansion of the old Resultative to perfect functions, and the grammaticalization of a new evidential paradigm.

The diachronic evolution of the Dargwa TAM system as presented herein provides a remarkable illustration of how the parallel evolution of closely related languages can involve cyclic innovation and renewal through the constant reshuffling of a limited set of morphological forms.

## References

- Abakarova, Fatima O. 1996. *Kubačinskij fol'klor: ètno-lokal'nye osobennosti* [Kubachi folklore: local ethnic characteristics]. Makhachkala: Dagestanskoe knižnoe izdatel'stvo.



- Belyaev, Oleg I. 2012. Aspektual'no-temporal'naja sistema aštynskogo darginskogo [Tense and aspect in Ashti Dargwa]. *Acta Linguistica Petropolitana* 8 (2), 181–227.
- van den Berg, Helma. 2001. *Dargi folktales: Oral stories from the Caucasus with an introduction to Dargi grammar*. Leiden: Research School of Asian, African, and Amerindian Studies.
- Bybee, Joan & Östen Dahl. 1989. The creation of tense and aspect systems in the languages of the world. *Studies in Language* 13 (1), 51–103.
- Bybee, Joan, Revere Perkins & William Pagliuca. 1994. *The evolution of grammar: Tense, aspect and modality in languages of the world*. Chicago & London: University of Chicago Press.
- Dahl, Östen. 1985. *Tense and aspect systems*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Dahl, Östen & Eva Hedin. 2000. Current relevance and event reference. In: Östen Dahl (ed.), *Tense and aspect in the languages of Europe*, 385–402. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 1998. The semantic development of old presents. *Diachronica* 15 (1), 29–62.
- Kibrik, Alexander E. & Sandro V. Kodzasov. 1988. *Sopostavitel'noe izučenie dagestanskix jazykov. Glagol* [A comparative survey of Daghestanian languages. The verb]. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Moskovskogo universiteta.
- Kratzer, Angelika. 2000. Building statives. *Proceedings of BLS* 26, 385–399.
- Magomedov, Amirbek Dž. & Nabigulla I. Saidov-Akkutta. *Kubači: jazyk i fol'klor* [Kubachi language and folklore]. Makhachkala: Nauka DNC.
- Magometov, Aleksandr A. 1963. *Kubačinskij jazyk (Issledovanie i teksty)* [Kubachi language: A study and texts]. Tbilisi: Izdatel'stvo Akademii nauk Gruzinskoj SSR.
- Maisak, Timur. The Aorist / Perfect distinction in Nizh Udi. This volume.
- Maslov, Jurij S. 1988. Resultative, Perfect and Aspect. In: Vladimir P. Nedjalkov (ed.), *Typology of resultative constructions*, 63–86. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Mutalov, Rasul O. 2002. *Glagol darginskogo jazyka* [The Dargwa verb]. Makhachkala: Izdatel'sko-poligrafičeskij centr DGU.
- Mutalov, Rasul O. The tense / aspect system of Standard Dargwa. This volume.
- Nedjalkov, Vladimir P. & Sergej Je. Jaxontov. 1988. The typology of resultative constructions. In: Vladimir P. Nedjalkov (ed.), *Typology of resultative constructions*, 3–62. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Parsons, Terence. 1990. *Events in the semantics of English: A study in subatomic semantics*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Plungian, Vladimir A. & Johan van der Auwera. 2006. Towards a typology of discontinuous past marking. *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung* 59, 317–349.
- Sumbatova, Nina. 2011. Person hierarchies and the problem of person marker origin in Dargwa: Facts and diachronic problems. In: Gilles Authier & Timur Maisak

- (eds.), *Tense, aspect, modality and finiteness in East Caucasian languages*. Bochum: Brockmeyer.
- Sumbatova, Nina R. 2014. V poiskax podležaščego: kontrol' klassnogo soglasovanija i priznaki grammatičeskogo prioriteta v darginskom jazyke [Looking for the subject: Control of gender agreement and subject features in Dargwa]. In: Vladimir A. Plungian, Michael A. Daniel, Olga V. Fedorova, Ekaterina A. Lyutikova & Sergei G. Tatevosov (eds.), *Jazyk. Konstanty. Peremennye. Pamjati Aleksandra Evgen'eviča Kibrika* [Language: Constants and variables. In memoriam A. E. Kibrik], 499–517. Saint Petersburg: Aletheia.
- Sumbatova, Nina R. & Yury A. Lander. 2015. *Darginskij govor selenija Tanty. Grammatičeskij očerk. Voprosy sintaksisa* [The Dargwa dialect of Tanti: A grammar sketch and syntactic issues]. Moscow: Jazyki slavjanskoj kul'tury.
- Sumbatova, Nina R. & Rasul O. Mutalov. 2003. *Icari Dargwa*. München: LINCOM EUROPA.
- Šamov, Ibragim A. *Pritči o mulle Nasredine / Malla Sit:alaχabarte* [Stories about Mullah Nasruddin]. Makhachkala: Jupiter, 1994.
- Tatevosov, Sergei G. 2001. From resultatives to evidentials: Multiple uses of the perfect in Nakh-Daghestanian languages. *Journal of Pragmatics* 33, 443–464.
- Temirbulatova, Sapijaxanum M. 2004. *Xajdakskij dialekt darginskogo jazyka* [The Kaitag dialect of Dargwa]. Makhachkala: Izdatel'stvo tipografii DNC RAN.
- Uslar", Pëtr" K. (Baron). 1892. *Ètnografija Kavkaza. Jazykoznanie* [Ethnography of the Caucasus. Linguistics]. Vol. V. *Xjurkilinskij jazyk*" [Urakhi language]. Tiflis: Tipografija kanceljarii Glavnonačal'stvujuščago graždanskoju čast'ju na Kavkazě.
- Walker, Jim. 2011. The emergence of the narrative present perfect in British English: reality or illusion? *GAGL: Groninger Arbeiten zur germanistischen Linguistik* 53 (2). URL: <http://gagl.eldoc.ub.rug.nl/root/2011-53.2/> (accessed 29.07.2016)