

**Timur Maisak**

*(Institute of Linguistics, Russian Academy of Sciences)*

timur.maisak (at) gmail.com

## **Morphologization of matrix verbs: the case of “Verificative” in Agul**

### **1. Agul and its verbal system**

#### ❖ The language and its speakers

AGUL (also spelled AGHUL, native name *abul č'al*) is a language of the Lezgian branch within the Nakh-Daghestanian, or East Caucasian, family<sup>1</sup>.

There are more than 25,000 first-language speakers of Agul in Russia, mainly in rural areas of Daghestan.

The dialectal diversity is quite considerable (7 dialects).

Its close relatives are Tabassaran and Lezgian; other Lezgian languages are Tsakhur, Rutul, Budugh, Kryz, Archi and Udi.

#### ❖ Typological profile

Ergative language with (predominantly) agglutinative morphology and a rich case system (about 30 cases, including numerous locatives).

Unlike most Nakh-Daghestanian languages, in Agul there is no nominal class agreement (which was lost), nor person agreement.

The basic word order is SOV (though in principle the word order is rather free), dependents as a rule precede heads.

#### (1) Sample intransitive sentence

ze kitan hiš-i-ne.  
my cat(ABS) run\_away-PF-PFT  
*My cat ran away.*

#### (2) Sample transitive sentence

gada.ji šurpa ʔut'-u-ne.  
boy(ERG) soup(ABS)<sup>2</sup> eat-PF-PFT  
*The boy ate the soup.*

---

<sup>1</sup> The Agul Documentation Project is currently supported by a grant from the Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. A comprehensive grammar of the language is being prepared by Dmitry Ganenkov, Timur Maisak and Solmaz Merdanova (Moscow).

<sup>2</sup> The Absolutive, being unmarked, is not glossed in examples below.

## ❖ Core TAM system

Verbal paradigm of Agul is rich in periphrastic forms, composed of:

- a non-finite part (participle, converb or infinitive)
- and a postpositional auxiliary (copula ‘be’ or locative verb ‘be inside’).

Many such forms have undergone morphologization<sup>3</sup> and are rather tight (almost synthetic), but their original periphrastic structure is quite obvious.

Source grammaticalization patterns of core TAM forms are rather common typologically: e.g. Perfective Past has the underlying structure ‘is + having done’, the structure of Present is ‘is inside + doing’, and that of Future is ‘is + to do’; similar structures are attested in many languages of the world (Bybee et al. 1994) and are typical of other Lezxic languages (Maisak, to appear).

### (3) Examples of core TAM forms (from the HUPPUQ’ dialect)

- PERFECTIVE PAST ‘did’  
*aq’une* < *aq’-u-na e* [do-PF-CONV COP]
- EXPERIENTIAL PAST ‘has done (at least once)’  
*aq’ufe* < *aq’-u-f e* [do-PF-S COP]
- HABITUAL ‘usually does’  
*aq’aje* < *aq’-a-j e* [do-IPF-CONV COP]
- FUTURE ‘will do’  
*aq’ase* < *aq’-a-s e* [do-IPF-INF COP]
- RESULTATIVE ‘has done’  
*aq’una(j)a* < *aq’-u-na a(j)a* [do-PF-CONV IN.be.PRS]
- PRESENT ‘is doing’  
*aq’a(j)a* < *aq’-a-j a(j)a* [do-IPF-CONV IN.be.PRS]

or, with an auxiliary in the past tense:

- PAST RESULTATIVE (PLUPERFECT) ‘had done’  
*aq’unaji* < *aq’-u-na aji* [do-PF-CONV IN.be.PST]
- IMPERFECT ‘was doing’  
*aq’aji* < *aq’-a-j aji* [do-IPF-CONV IN.be.PST]
- IRREALIS ‘would have done’  
*aq’asij* < *aq’-a-s ij* [do-IPF-INF COP.PST]

...etc.

---

<sup>3</sup> In this paper, I only treat “morphologization from syntax”, i.e. the process by which previously independent word turns into a bound morphological item (vs. “morphologization from phonology”, which is a change of a phonological rule into a morphological regularity through the loss of an originally present phonetic motivational factor).

❖ Complementation strategies:

Matrix verbs and their complements tend to remain autonomous and do not merge morphologically. Cf. examples of several complementation strategies:

- complement clause of ‘see’ headed by the imperfective converb

(4) ɤ̞.ad.i-k-as            aq            sa-d            ke-j                            ag-u-ne            ti-s.  
 [ceiling-SUB-ELAT down one-S SUB.be-CONV] see-PF-PFT DEM-DAT  
*She saw that someone was hanging from a ceiling.*

- complement clause of ‘need’ headed by the perfective converb

(5) minarat = ra    q’-u-na            k:ande-a,  
 [minaret=& do-PF-CONV] need-PRS  
 mazgit.a            q:al-ar = ra    bat’ar            q’-u-na            k:ande-a...  
 [mosque(GEN) side-PL=& beautiful do-PF-CONV] need-PRS  
*We need to build a minaret, we need to embellish the area around the mosque...*

- complement clauses of ‘want’ and ‘begin’ headed by the infinitive

(6) ruš.a-s    uč.i-n            jerɣe    č’ar-ar    q’at’q’-a-s            k:ande-a.  
 girl-DAT [self-GEN long hair-PL cut\_off-IPF-INF] want-PRS  
*The girl wants to cut off her long hair.*

(7) jawaš~jawaš    fačuč’-u-ne    te    mazgit    ajč’-a-s.  
 slowly            begin-PF-PFT    DEM    mosque    [get\_out-IPF-INF]  
*Little by little, the mosque began to fall to ruin.*

The causative construction is formed by the matrix verb *aq’as* ‘do, make’, also taking the infinitive clause as a complement, cf.:

(8) baw.a            kitan    hiš-a-s                            q’-u-ne.  
 mother(ERG) [cat run\_away-IPF-INF] do-PF-PFT  
*Mother made the cat run away.*

(9) baw.a            gada.ji            šurpa    ɣut’-a-s            q’-u-ne.  
 mother(ERG) [boy(ERG) soup eat-IPF-INF] do-PF-PFT  
*Mother made the boy eat the soup.*

It is not uncommon for periphrastic causatives to become morphologically tight (with a grammaticalization of an auxiliary into a causative marker); this is the case in some of Nakh-Daghestanian languages as well, e.g. in Avar:

(10) ebelat:            was    worč’i-z-awu-na.            (<    worč’i-ze    hawu-na)  
 mother(ERG) boy    wake\_up-INF-do-PFT            wake\_up-INF do-PFT  
*Mother woke up the boy. (Mallaeva 2007: 342)*

However, in Agul matrix verbs and their complements are clearly autonomous.

One exception may be the “verificative” form, which looks like a combination of a morphologically bound matrix verb with a complement.

## 2. “Verificative” forms: meaning and structure

### ❖ Meaning and use:

“Verificative” (“verificational”, or “checking, finding out” form) expresses a rather peculiar meaning — ‘someone checks or finds out whether the situation denoted by the Verb is true’, cf.:

- (11) gada    χul.a            aj-čuk’.  
 [boy    house(IN)    **IN.be:PRS]-VERIF(IMP)**  
*Check, whether the boy is at home now.*
- (12) gada.ji    ruš    quš-u-naj-čuk’-u-ne.  
 boy(ERG) [girl    **go\_away-PF-RES:PRS]-VERIF-PF-PFT**  
*The boy checked, whether the girl has gone away.*
- (13) zun    dad.a            mus    χup:ar    uc-aj-čuk’-a-s-e.  
 I(ERG) [father(ERG) when    field    **mow-IPF:PRS]-VERIF-IPF-INF-COP**  
*I shall check, when father is going to mow the field.*
- (14) zun    me    k’ež    na            lik’-i-f-ej-čuk’-a-a.  
 I(ERG) [DEM    letter    who(ERG) **write-PF-S-COP]-VERIF-IPF-PRS**  
*I am checking, who has written this letter.*
- (15) gi            č̣a-s            a-je-χildi            up-u-n-čuk’-u-na,  
 [DEM(ERG)    you(PL)-DAT    IN.be-PART-MANNER    **say-PF-PFT]-VERIF-PF-CONV**  
 quŋ̣-a-s-e            zun.  
 return-IPF-INF-COP    I  
*I shall find out whether he told you the truth (= as it is), and then return here.*

The morphological structure of Verificative is very unusual for bound verbal forms: apart from being rather long and cumbersome in itself, it includes two aspect markers (one in the “embedded” part, another in the finite ending). Such multiple aspect marking is not found in any other verbal forms of Agul.

### ❖ Properties of the embedded part (the situation whose existence is checked)

Unlike complements of standard matrix verbs, the embedded parts of Verificatives are not headed by some particular non-finite form (participle, converb, infinitive or masdar). Many variants are possible, which are semantically and structurally comparable to the main finite tense and aspect forms:

Verificative form	Related TAM form (of embedded part)
<i>aj-čuk’-</i> ‘check if is inside’	~ <i>aja</i> ‘is inside’ (Present, stative)
<i>ucaj-čuk’-</i> ‘check if mows’	~ <i>ucaja</i> ‘mows’ (Present)
<i>qušunaj-čuk’-</i> ‘check if has gone’	~ <i>qušunaja</i> ‘has gone’ (Resultative)
<i>lik’ifej-čuk’-</i> ‘check if has written’	~ <i>lik’ife</i> ‘has written’ (Experiential)
<i>upun-čuk’-</i> ‘check if said’	~ <i>upune</i> ‘said’ (Perfective Past)

It is not possible to insert any morphological material between the embedded part and the Verificative marker. If we insert the additive particle *=ra* ‘and, also’, it will separate the non-finite part of the analytical verbal form from the auxiliary in the Verificative form, like in:

- (16) *baw qaj-na = ra aj-čuk’*,  
 [mother **return.PF-CONV=& IN.be:PRS**]-**VERIF(IMP)**  
*jamak: = ra HAZURQ’-u-naj-čuk’*.  
 [food=& **prepare-PF-RES:PRS**]-**VERIF(IMP)**  
*Check both whether mother came, and whether she cooked the food.*

Here, *qaj-na = ra aj-čuk’* can be compared to the structure of (periphrastic) Resultative, i.e. *qaj-na aja* ‘return.PF-CONV + IN.be.PRS’.

#### ❖ Head properties of Verificative marker

Although *-čuk’* is morphologically bound, it manifests head properties and can be regarded as a sort of an affixal complement-taking verb:

- it introduces a new agentive argument (the noun phrase in the Ergative case), referring to the participant who actually checks or finds out, “Verifier”

In this respect Verificative serves as a valence-increasing device, though with a very peculiar additional meaning of “checking”. (It also turns out to be the only morphological valence-increasing device in Agul.)

Note that the beneficiary argument (in the Dative case) is also possible, referring to the participant for whom the checking is done, cf.:

- (17) *za-s, aB-a-j-e, hage gada fiš ej-čuk’*.  
I-DAT say-IPF-CONV-COP [DEM boy who COP]-**VERIF(IMP)**  
*Find out for me, says {the daughter to her father}, who is that guy.*

- it serves as a morphosyntactic locus and can occur in any TAM form

All standard verbal lexemes differ as to the choice of perfective and imperfective stem markers and to the Imperative formation: perfective markers can be *-u* or *-i*, imperfective markers can be *-a* or *-e*, and Imperative marker can be zero, *-e* or *-u*.

Verificative marker has its own perfective stem (*-u*), imperfective stem (*-a*) and Imperative (zero) markers, which are independent of the corresponding markers of embedded verbs, e.g.:

- |                                   |                                  |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| <i>lik’-i-n-čuk’-u-ne</i>         | <i>up-u-n-čuk’-a-a</i>           |
| write-PF-PFT-VERIF-PF-PFT         | say-PF-PFT-VERIF-IPF-PRS         |
| ‘(X) found out whether (Y) wrote’ | ‘(X) finds out whether (Y) said’ |

❖ Verificative forms are biclausal formations:

- semantically they refer to two distinct situations — the situation of checking and the situation whose existence is checked
- both clauses have their own arguments: the Verificative marker introduces the Verifier (Ergative NP), the complement retains the coding of its arguments
- some adverbial modifications can have either the matrix or the complement clause in their scope (depending on the word order and phrase intonation)

(18) a. ruš waxt:una quŕ-aj-čuk'.  
 [girl in\_time **return-IPF:PRS**]-**VERIF(IMP)**  
*Check, whether the girl will return in time.*

b. waxt:una ruš quŕ-aj-čuk'.  
 in\_time [girl **return-IPF:PRS**]-**VERIF(IMP)**  
*Check in time, whether the girl will return.*

(19) a. gi gada ara at'aj ŕ-aj-čuk'-a-j-e  
 DEM(ERG) [boy from\_time\_to\_time **go-IPF:PRS**]-**VERIF-IPF-CONV-COP**  
 Habaw.a-l k'il du-a-s.  
 [grandma-SUPER head pull-IPF-INF]  
*He checks, whether the boy from time to time goes to see his grandma.*

b. gi ara at'aj gada.ji dars  
 DEM(ERG) from\_time\_to\_time [boy(ERG) lesson  
 ruχ-aj-čuk'-a-j-e.  
**read-IPF:PRS**]-**VERIF-IPF-CONV-COP**  
*From time to time he checks, whether the boy is learning the lesson.*

- two adverbials can independently modify each of the clauses, cf. two different time references in (20):

(20) zun jaŕa gada.ji naq' dars ruχ-u-naj-čuk'-a-s-e.  
 I(ERG) today [boy(ERG) yesterday lesson **read-PF-RES:PRS**]-**VERIF-IPF-INF-COP**  
*I shall check today, whether the boy has learnt his lesson yesterday.*

- both the matrix and the complement clause can be negated

In finite forms (which are historically analytical) negation is expressed by a negative auxiliary; cf. (21), where the matrix clause is in the scope of negation.

(21) zun gi dars-ar ruχ-u-naj-čuk'-a-s-t:awa,  
 I(ERG) [DEM(ERG) lesson-PL **read-PF-RES:PRS**]-**VERIF-IPF-INF-COP.NEG**  
 uč.i-n dad.a ruχ-u-naj-čuk'-u-raj.  
 [self-GEN father(ERG) **read-PF-RES:PRS**]-**VERIF-PF-JUSS**  
*I won't check whether he has read his lessons, let his father check it!*

Non-finite forms are negated by means of the prefix *d-* || *da-*, cf. its use in (22) where only the complement is under negation:

- (22) *gada.ji dars-ar ruχ-u-naj-čuk'*,  
 [boy(ERG) lesson-PL **read-PF-RES:PRS**]-**VERIF(IMP)**  
*da-ruχ-u-naj-čuk'*.  
 [**NEG-read-PF-RES:PRS**]-**VERIF(IMP)**

*Check, whether the boy has read his lessons or (check whether he) has not.*

### 3. “Verificative” and Conditional: a possible source pattern

The structure of “verificative” forms becomes more transparent if we assume that it is historically related to conditional forms.

❖ Structure of Conditional forms:

Like the core TAM forms, conditional forms in Agul are periphrastic in origin, the only difference being that auxiliary verb ‘be’ or ‘be inside’ takes the Conditional form *-čĭ*, cf.:

(23) Examples of Conditional forms

- PERFECTIVE PAST CONDITIONAL ‘if s/he did’  
*aq'unčĭ* < *aq'-u-na ejčĭ* [do-PF-CONV COP.COND]
- PRESENT CONDITIONAL ‘if s/he does’  
*aq'ajčĭ* < *aq'-a-j ejčĭ* [do-IPF-CONV COP.COND]
- RESULTATIVE CONDITIONAL ‘if s/he has done’  
*aq'unajčĭ* < *aq'-u-na ajčĭ* [do-PF-CONV IN.be.COND]

Verificative forms are semantically and structurally comparable to Conditional forms — even more than to core TAM forms (see bottom of p. 4). This may be the clue to the origin of *-č-* in *-čuk'*:

Verificative form		Related Conditional form	
<i>aj-čuk'</i>	‘check if is inside’	<i>aj-čĭ</i>	‘if is inside’
<i>ucaj-čuk'</i>	‘check if mows’	<i>ucaj-čĭ</i>	‘if mows’
<i>qušunaj-čuk'</i>	‘check if has gone’	<i>qušunaj-čĭ</i>	‘if has gone’
<i>lik'ifej-čuk'</i>	‘check if has written’	<i>lik'ifej-čĭ</i>	‘if has written’
<i>upun-čuk'</i>	‘check if said’	<i>upun-čĭ</i>	‘if said’

❖ Use of Conditional forms:

- protases of conditional sentences:

- (24) *ruš ad-i-naj-čĭ, qatin li-l-di kitab.*  
 girl **come-PF-RES:PRS-COND** give\_back(IMP) DEM-SUPER-LAT book  
*If the girl has come, give her the book.*

- (25) ma-ajč’-a           χul.a-as,           uɤal   uɤ-aj-či.  
 PROH-go\_out-IPF   house-IN.ELAT   rain   **fall\_out-IPF:PRS-COND**  
*Do not leave the house if it’s raining.*

- dependent clauses in indirect questions (embedded interrogatives), both *yes/no* and *wh*-questions:

- (26) čp:i-s           ha-dawa = ɤaj,           hal   fišt:i   ɤ-aj-či.  
 self:PL-DAT   know-PRS:NEG=CIT   [now how   **go-IPF:PRS-COND**]  
*They do not know, how to go further.*

- (27) fiš   k’-i-naj-či,                   uč.i-s   ha-dawa...  
 [who **kill-PF-RES:PRS-COND**] self-DAT know-PRS:NEG  
*He does not know himself, whom he killed...*

- (28) za-s   ag-a-s-e,           uɤal   uɤ-u-naj-či.  
 I-DAT   see-IPF-INF-COP   [rain   **fall\_out-PF-RES-COND**]  
*I will see, whether it will have rained.*

- (29) wa-s           fi   χijal-ar   š-u-n-či           we   jurk’ura-as,  
 [you(SG)-DAT what thought-PL **go-PF-PFT-COND** your(SG) heart-IN.ELAT]  
 za-s   up.  
 I-DAT   say(IMP)  
*Now tell me, what thoughts flashed across your mind.*

❖ Possible source pattern for Verificative

An embedded interrogative headed by the Conditional form, dependent on some (formely autonomous) matrix verb like \*uk’- ‘check, find out’, which later became fully contracted with its dependent clause (cf. Maisak, Merdanova 2004).

- (30) “Normal” autonomous matrix verb ‘look’ with a complement  
 gada.ji   ɤut’-u-naj-či           χut:urf.  
 [boy(ERG) eat-PF-RES:PRS-COND] look(IMP)  
*Look, whether the boy has eaten.*

- (31) Verificative form with an affixal matrix verb  
 gada.ji   ɤut’-u-naj-čuk’.  
 [boy(ERG) **eat-PF-RES:PRS]-VERIF(IMP)**  
*Check, whether the boy has eaten.*

- (32) A putative reconstructed underlying structure for Verificative  
 \*gada.ji   ɤut’-u-naj-či           uk’.  
 [boy(ERG) **eat-PF-RES:PRS-COND**] **check(IMP)**  
*Check, whether the boy has eaten.*



(37) malla-nasratin alkuč'-u-ne sa ke hawa ɤ<sub>o</sub>.ad.i-l-di,  
 Molla-Nasredin climb-PF-PFT one very high roof-SUPER-LAT  
 hana-n ɣal.a-ʔ-as kum ʔata:ʔ<sub>o</sub>-a-j aj-čuq'-a-s.  
 [who-GEN house-IN-ELAT smoke go\_out-IPF-CONV **IN.be:PRS**]-**VERIF-IPF-INF**  
*Molla Nasredin climbed the highest roof, to see from whose house the smoke rises.* (Text from Magometov 1970)

- BURSHAG (the dialect, standing apart from all others): the connection with *ag<sub>o</sub>*-‘see’ is probable, but the complex *-mag<sub>o</sub>*- is unanalysable because of the initial *-m-* (the Conditional marker is *-t'en*, so something like *-t'enag<sub>o</sub>*- could be expected)

(38) jaša iš.uj, p-u-naw, fi q'-aj-mag<sub>o</sub> ʃuč.a.  
 today night(ERG) say-PF-PFT [what **do-IPF:PRS**]-**VERIF(IMP)** [wolf(ERG)]  
*This night, he said, look what the wolf will do.*

❖ The pros of ‘see’-as-source hypothesis:

- semantically, ‘see’ would be quite natural for a verificative marker
- in some Agul dialects, the marker looks similar to the root *ag<sub>o</sub>*- ‘see’, contracted with Conditional suffix

❖ The cons of ‘see’-as-source hypothesis:

- phonetic correspondences (*g<sub>o</sub> ~ k'*, *g<sub>o</sub> ~ q'*, *g<sub>o</sub> ~ w*) are not regular
- the “verifier” in the Verificative form is encoded by the Ergative case (a case of the agent); however, the verb *ag<sub>o</sub>as* ‘see’ as experience verbs in general, encodes its subject with a Dative case, not Ergative, cf. (4), (28), and:

(39) za-s we ruš ag-u-ne.  
 I-DAT your(SG) daughter see-PF-PFT  
*I saw your daughter.*

❖ A typological (and genetic?) parallel: Archi<sup>4</sup>

Archi is also a language of the Lezgian branch of the Nakh-Daghestanian family; however, it is a very distant relative of Agul, and for thousands of years the two languages developed separately. They are also disjunct geographically, and probably have never been in contact.

According to Kibrik (1977: 291-292), in Archi there is a purposive converb in *-k<sub>rus</sub>* with a meaning, which is close to verificational: ‘in order to find out whether the situation is true’.

---

<sup>4</sup> I thank Michael Daniel and Marina Chumakina for bringing my attention to the Archi data and for useful discussion.

Unlike Verificative in Agul, in Archi the embedded verb takes the interrogative form in *-a* || *-ra*, used in yes/no-questions, and not the conditional form, cf. (40) with a present copula *w-i*:

- (40) zon, halmaxdu w-i-r-k:us, uq<sup>ʕ</sup>a-li e-w-di.  
 I [friend M-COP-Q]-*k:us* go.PF-CONV COP-M-PST  
*I went to find out whether the friend is there (at home).*

Different TAM forms are possible in the embedded clause:

- (41) zon, to-w owxu-k<sub>o</sub>e-r-k:us, sowk:u.  
 I [DEM-M M.sleep-become.PRS-Q]-*k:us* look.PFT  
*I looked to find out whether he is falling asleep.*
- (42) zon, to-w owxu-ewt:i-l-la-k:us, sowk:u.  
 I [DEM-M M.sleep-become.PFT-EVID-Q]-*k:us* look.PFT  
*I looked to find out whether he has fell asleep.*
- (43) zon to-w-murak uq<sup>ʕ</sup>a-li e-w-di,  
 I DEM-M-CONT.LAT go.PF-CONV COP-M-PST  
 to-w w-irx<sub>o</sub>:nat'u-r-k:us.  
 [DEM-M M-work.FUT.NEG-Q]-*k:us*  
*I went to him to find out, whether it's true that he will not work.*

According to Kibrik's (1977: 290) proposal, marker *-k:us* goes back to the verb *ak:us* 'see' in the Infinitive form. (Note that Archi *ak:us* 'see' and Agul *ag:as* 'see' are clearly cognates and have a reliable Proto-Lezgian etymology.)

Though the *-k:us* form was first described as an invariable form in *-s* (which is an Infinitive marker), later research has shown that Archi Verificative is possible with various TAM inflections, and the verifier NP in the Ergative can also be present:

- (44) to-r-mi to-w k<sup>ʔ</sup>a-r-k:u.  
 DEM-F-ERG [DEM-M die.PFT-Q]-VERIF.PFT  
*She (ERG) checked whether he died. (Elicited example, 2009)*

But, like in Agul, the Ergative case of the verifier does not conform to the fact that the original 'see' verb encodes its experiencer with the Dative:

- (45) w-ez wit ušdu w-ak:u-r-ši w-i.  
 M-I.DAT your(SG) brother M-see-IPF-CONV M-COP  
*I (DAT) see your brother.*

## 5. Summary of findings

- the Verificative form (or, rather, set of forms) in Agul looks like the morphological merge of a complement-taking verb with its complement

- the morphologization of such form seems quite unusual, both because of its peculiar meaning and the fact that in Agul even matrix verbs that are more apt for grammaticalization (e.g. the causative) do not show a tendency to become morphologically bound
- it is very likely that what gave rise to Verificative was a matrix verb meaning ‘check, find out’ with an embedded interrogative headed by the Conditional form
- the verb *ag<sub>as</sub>* ‘see’ is a good candidate for this source matrix verb
- at the same time, the dialectal variation shows that even if *ag<sub>as</sub>* ‘see’ was part of the original verificative construction, it had undergone reanalysis both on phonetic (-*čug-* ~ -*čuk’* ~ -*čuq’* ~ -*čuw-* ~ -*mag<sub>o-</sub>*) and syntactic level (Dative experiencer > Ergative agent)
- the Archi verificative construction involving the morphologized ‘see’ verb is a good typological parallel, though not areal or genetic in the strict sense (due to a very small possibility of contact-induced development or inheritance from a proto-language stage)
- the mismatch between the original ‘see’ subject encoding (experiencer Dative) and the verifier encoding (agent Ergative) still calls for explanation
- other similar cases of grammaticalized “verificatives” should be sought for, both in Nakh-Daghestanian languages and elsewhere

## Abbreviations

ABS – absolutive case; APUD – ‘near’ localization; CIT – citative; COND – conditional; CONV – converb; COP – copula; DAT – dative; DEM – demonstrative; ELAT – elative; ERG – ergative; EVID – evidential; FUT – future; GEN – genitive; IMP – imperative; IN – ‘inside’ localization; INF – infinitive; IPF – imperfective; JUSS – jussive; LAT – lative; M – masculine; MANNER – manner converb; NEG – negation; PART – participle; PF – perfective; PFT – perfective past; PL – plural; PROH – prohibitive; PRS – present; PST – past; PTCL – particle; Q – question; RES – resultative S – substantivizer; SG – singular; SUB – ‘under’ localization; SUPER – ‘on, above’ localization; VERIF – verificative; & – additive particle. Oblique stems of nouns are separated by dots.

## References

- Bybee J., Perkins R., Pagliuca W. 1994. The evolution of grammar: Tense, aspect and modality in the languages of the world. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Kibrik A. E. 1977. Opyt strukturnogo opisanija arčinskogo jazyka. T. 2. Taksonomičeskaja grammatika. Moskva.
- Magometov A. A. 1970. Agul’skij jazyk. Tbilisi.
- Maisak T., to appear. The Present and the Future within the Lezgi tense and aspect systems // Tense, aspect, modality and finiteness in Daghestanian languages / Ed. by G. Authier & T. Maisak
- Maisak T. A., Merdanova S. R. 2004. “Prover’atel’naja forma” v agul’skom jazyke: struktura, semantika i gipoteza o proisxoždenii // Irrealis i irreal’nost’ / Ed. by Yu. A. Lander, V. A. Plungian, A. Ju. Urmančieva. Moskva.
- Mallaeva Z. 2007. Glagol avarskogo jazyka. Makhachkala.