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Note that the unmarked values are often left without glosses (e.g., singular, absolutive, essive). There is some variation in glossing genders. Some authors use semantic glossing by means of letters (F, M, N), others use numerical glossing by means of romance numbers 1-V, while still others prefer or glossing by means of typical exponents (J, V, B, D).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1, 2, 3</td>
<td>first, second, third person</td>
<td>CTRF</td>
<td>counterfactual conditional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-V</td>
<td>gender agreement markers</td>
<td>CVB</td>
<td>verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABL</td>
<td>ablative</td>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>dative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABS</td>
<td>absolutive</td>
<td>DEB</td>
<td>debitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADD</td>
<td>additive</td>
<td>DELIB</td>
<td>deliberative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADJIVZ</td>
<td>adjectivizer</td>
<td>DEM</td>
<td>demonstrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADV</td>
<td>adverbial</td>
<td>DETR</td>
<td>detransitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADVZ</td>
<td>adverbalizer</td>
<td>DIR</td>
<td>directional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>allative</td>
<td>DIST</td>
<td>distal demonstrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANT</td>
<td>anterior</td>
<td>DLOC</td>
<td>distal locative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOC</td>
<td>aorist convorb</td>
<td>DX</td>
<td>deixis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOP</td>
<td>aorist participle</td>
<td>EL</td>
<td>elative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOR</td>
<td>aorist</td>
<td>EMPH</td>
<td>emphatic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APUD</td>
<td>localization 'near, by, at'</td>
<td>ERG</td>
<td>ergative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASS</td>
<td>assertive</td>
<td>ESS</td>
<td>essive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td>localization 'at, by'</td>
<td>EVID</td>
<td>evidential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATTR</td>
<td>attributive</td>
<td>EXCL</td>
<td>exclusive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUX</td>
<td>auxiliary</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>feminine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE</td>
<td>existential verb</td>
<td>FIN</td>
<td>finalis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEN</td>
<td>benefactive</td>
<td>FUT</td>
<td>future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARD</td>
<td>cardinal numeral</td>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>genitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUS</td>
<td>causative</td>
<td>GNT</td>
<td>general tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL</td>
<td>clitic</td>
<td>GQ</td>
<td>general question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMIT</td>
<td>comitative</td>
<td>HAB</td>
<td>habitual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMP</td>
<td>complementizer</td>
<td>HORT</td>
<td>hortative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COND</td>
<td>conditional</td>
<td>HPL</td>
<td>human plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONJ</td>
<td>conjunction</td>
<td>HUMLOC</td>
<td>human localization ('at somebody's place')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONT</td>
<td>localization 'with contact'</td>
<td>ICVB</td>
<td>imperfective verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTR</td>
<td>contrastive</td>
<td>IMP</td>
<td>imperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COORD</td>
<td>coordinative</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>localization 'in (a container)'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP</td>
<td>copula</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Meaning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INCH</td>
<td>inchoative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INCL</td>
<td>inclusive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIC</td>
<td>indicative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INF</td>
<td>infinitive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INL</td>
<td>in-lative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INT</td>
<td>intensifier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTER</td>
<td>localization 'in (a substance)'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTJ</td>
<td>interjection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTR</td>
<td>intransitive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPF</td>
<td>imperfect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPFV</td>
<td>imperfective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IQ</td>
<td>indirect question</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRR</td>
<td>irrealis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITER</td>
<td>iterative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J, V, D, B</td>
<td>gender markers (in Chechen/Ingush)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUSS</td>
<td>jussive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAT</td>
<td>lative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC</td>
<td>locative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LV</td>
<td>light verb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>masculine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MILD</td>
<td>polite imperative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP</td>
<td>medio-passive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSD</td>
<td>masdar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>neuter / non-human</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>nominalization, absolutive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>negation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMLZ</td>
<td>nominalization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>nominalization, oblique stem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>nominative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPL</td>
<td>neuter / non-human plural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>oblique stem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPT</td>
<td>optative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORD</td>
<td>ordinal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFV</td>
<td>perfective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>plural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POST</td>
<td>posterior verb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POT</td>
<td>potential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPL</td>
<td>pluperfect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRET</td>
<td>preterite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRF</td>
<td>perfect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROG</td>
<td>progressive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROH</td>
<td>prohibitive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROX</td>
<td>proximal demonstrative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRR</td>
<td>present</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PST</td>
<td>past</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTCL</td>
<td>particle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTCP</td>
<td>participle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PV</td>
<td>preverb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>interrogative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.ALT</td>
<td>alternative question</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUOT</td>
<td>quotative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RED</td>
<td>reduplication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REFL</td>
<td>reflexive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REP</td>
<td>reportative (hearsay evidentiality)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RES</td>
<td>resultative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>singular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIM</td>
<td>simultaneous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>part of verbal stem (separated by clitics)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBJ</td>
<td>subjunctive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPER</td>
<td>localization 'on'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAM</td>
<td>tense, aspect, mood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEMP</td>
<td>temporal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOP</td>
<td>topic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR</td>
<td>transitive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UW PST</td>
<td>unwitnessed past</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VBLZ</td>
<td>verbalizer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOC</td>
<td>vocative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPST</td>
<td>witnessed past</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Introduction

Diana Forker

This book explores the semantics of tense, aspect, modality and evidentiality in Nakh-Daghestanian (North-East Caucasian) languages. From a general point of view, these verbal categories and the conceptual relations between the four semantic domains are interesting for linguists from various theoretical and areal backgrounds as well as for researchers from other fields (philosophy of language, cognition, etc.). Virtually all sentences carry information about tense, aspect, modality, and in many languages also evidentiality. Within individual languages, these domains are commonly formally and functionally interrelated. This raises questions about the categorization and the status of the forms and how we can deal with them when writing grammars of specific languages, especially when there is no established research tradition for the languages in question.

Nakh-Daghestanian languages represent an understudied language family, but during the last 20 years more and more descriptive grammars have been published. We are now in a position of having already a good understanding of the grammars of many individual languages and can start with fine-grained investigations of the semantic categories, an area not easy to master at the beginning of the investigation of a previously undescribed language. Within the study of Nakh-Daghestanian the semantics of tense, aspect, modality and evidentiality is a generally neglected topic. Up to now research has been primarily focused on the morphosyntactic properties of verbal categories (see the volume published by Authier & Maisak 2011). However, it is a promising area, not only because of its complexity, but also because Nakh-Daghestanian languages have many rare and typologically interesting semantic categories within the realm of tense, aspect, modality and evidentiality. Section 1 of this introduction offers an overview of these features in order to gain a broader picture of the semantics of verbal categories. Section 2 provides summaries of the chapters.

1 An Overview of Semantics of Verbal Categories in Nakh-Daghestanian Languages

1.1 The Nakh-Daghestanian Languages
The Caucasus is the place with the greatest linguistic variation in Europe. It is an area with high genealogical and high structural diversity. Within the Caucasus,
the Nakh-Daghestanian (also called East Caucasian or North-East Caucasian) family is the largest autochthonous language family consisting of more than 40 languages. Nakh-Daghestanian languages are spoken in the southern parts of Russia, in northern Azerbaijan and a few speech communities are found in Georgia. The largest language of this family, Chechen, with more than one million speakers, is the official language of the Chechen Republic and widely used as means of communication for every aspects of daily life in Chechnya (private communication, education, media, administration, etc.). In contrast, small languages such as Hinuq, Archi, Khinalug or many Dargi varieties are exclusively used for oral communication within one village, and normally not written and not employed for any official purposes.

There is no subclassification of Nakh-Daghestanian languages that all scholars agree upon, but one plausible family tree is given in Figure 1.1, largely following Kibrik (1996: xi).

---

**Nakh branch**

*Chechen, Ingush, Tsova-Tush (Batsbi)*

Avar-Andic subbranch

Avar

Andic

*Andi, Botlikh, Godoberi, Karata, Akhvakh, Bagvalal, Tindi, Chamalal*

Tsezic subbranch

*Tsez, Hinuq, Khwarshi, Bezhta, Hunzib*

Dargi/Dargwa subbranch

*Akusha/Standard Dargwa, Urakhi, Mugi, Tsudakhar, Gapshima-Butri, Mjurego-Gubden, Kadar, Muiri, Mehweb, Sirkhi, Amukh-Xuduc, Shiri, Qunqi, Icari, Chirag, Kajtag, Kubachi*

**Lak**

**Khinalug**

Lezgic subbranch

*Udi, Archi, Lezgian, Agul, Tabasaran, Tsakhir, Rutul, Kryz, Budugh*

---

**Figure 1.1** A family tree of Nakh-Daghestanian.
With regards to their phonology, Nakh-Daghestanian languages have three or even four-way distinctions of consonants (voiced, voiceless, ejective, and in some languages also geminates) and pharyngeals. Their morphology is agglutinating/fusional and the languages are rich in inflectional categories. Their case systems range among the most elaborate case systems around the world (Comrie & Polinsky 1998) and typically include absolutive, ergative, genitive, dative and a considerably large number of spatial cases. However, their elaborated systems of verbal morphology are even more complex and can be regarded as the most challenging topics in the grammars of these languages. For instance, Archi is reported to have no less than 12,405 basic tense/aspect/mood/evidentiality forms including non-finite verb forms (converbs, participles, infinite and masdars, i.e. deverbal nouns) for every verbal lexeme (cf. Kibrik 1998, Chumakina 2011). The basic TAME (= tense/aspect/modality/evidentiality) forms include synthetic and analytic verb forms consisting of a lexical verb and one or more auxiliaries, but not those periphrastic verb forms that show a low degree of grammaticalization and are not fully integrated into the verbal paradigm. If we also add the latter verb forms and take into consideration gender/number agreement, the number of possible forms available for each verb is much higher. Though this system is counterbalanced by the modest inventory of simple underived verbs and the fact that only a relatively small number of verbal forms is frequently used, its complexity is nevertheless striking and gives us an impression how rich and intricate verbal morphology in these languages can be. It makes us wonder how all these forms can be acquired and how speakers can learn their semantics and grasp the subtle functional differences between them.

The general morphological make-up of verbs in Nakh-Daghestanian is as follows: they obligatorily consist of a stem that is in some but not all languages marked for aspect (see Section 3.2 below). All other affixes are, in principle, optional, though it depends on the lexeme in question whether it can be really used independently in a clause. The verb may have a gender agreement prefix. In many languages verbs can have spatial preverbs preceding the gender prefixes. The meaning of the spatial preverbs can be locational or directional. Often with some verbs the spatial meaning is bleached. Languages with preverbs are Nakh languages, Dargi varieties, Lezgic, Khinalug, and Lak. The stem can be followed by derivational suffixes that often manipulate the valency class. Common derivational suffixes are causatives, antipassives and other de-transitivizing suffixes. These are followed by inflectional suffixes to build up finite or non-finite verb forms. The outermost positions occupy person markers
in those languages that have person marking or case markers added to participles or other nominalizing suffixes.

From a syntactic point of view Nakh-Daghestanian languages are predominantly dependent-marking. Head marking is largely restricted to pervasive gender/number agreement of the verb with its absolutive argument that can be found in almost all languages of the family. In contrast, person indexing is rather rare. The most commonly encountered constituent orders are SV and SOV at the clausal level and head-final at the phrasal level. Useful recent introductions to the Nakh-Daghestanian languages are van den Berg (2005) and Daniel & Lander (2011).

1.2 Tense, Aspect, Evidentiality, Mood, and Modality in Nakh-Daghestanian Languages in a Nutshell

1.2.1 Tense Marking in Main Clauses

Tenses in Nakh-Daghestanian languages can typically be divided into synthetic and analytic. The number of synthetic tenses is usually rather low. In many languages they consist of one or two past tenses, one or two present tenses and one or two future tenses. The precise numbers vary a lot, e.g. Tsakhur has only two synthetic tenses, one present and one past (Tatevosov & Maisak 1999). Similarly, Khinalug has also only two synthetic tenses, a present tense and an aorist (glossed as perfective) (1a, b). In contrast, Lezgian has 12 synthetic forms of which a number are recent developments that originate in analytic verb forms (Haspelmath 1993: 127–131).

(1) a. Khinalug Simple present (Kibrik et al. 1972: 168)
   äwwäl jä hā xli, hana q’an-dâ-ž-mâ
   first 1SG.ERG that(IV) boil.PRS then eat-IPFV-IV=INDIC.COP
   ‘First I boil it, then I will eat (it).’

   b. Khinalug Aorist (Kibrik et al. 1972: 180)
   hu hin-e ŋi-gâ-r j-eccin-i; zi
   3SG.M 3SG.M-GEN home-LOC I-stay-PFV 1SG
   thâl-ty-a-ӥ\i
   LAT-go-DUR-LV.GO.PFV
   ‘He stayed at his house; I came.’

The synthetic tenses sometimes include a ‘general tense’ that expresses characteristic properties or habitual situations and does not have specific temporal reference (2).
(2) Khwarshi (Khalilova 2009: 187)

\textit{yol\'lo} \textit{obu-t'\i} \textit{\&ay xuwo:\&}

morning.SUPER father-OBL-ERG tea drink.GNT

'The father usually drinks tea in the morning.'

If there are two or more synthetic past tenses, then one is usually an aorist-like unmarked past that is opposed to another one that is a perfect (for Udi, such situation is described by Maisak, this volume). The perfect can be quasi-synthetic as in Godoberi or Dargi languages when the copula is rather an enclitic that resembles inflectional suffixes or as in Hinuq where the copula is only used with negative polarity and the affirmative counterpart is simply formed by suffixation. Within synthetic future tenses a recurrently found semantic distinction is between different degrees of certainty (cf. Godoberi, Hinuq, Tsez).

The inventory of analytic tense forms is rather large, e.g. out of the 49 tenses of Chechen 39 are analytic (Molochieva 2011; Molochieva & Nichols, this volume). However, Tsova-Tush has only four analytic tenses (Holisky & Gagua 1994: 180–181), and Udi makes a very restricted use of its analytic forms.

Analytic tenses make use of non-finite verb forms and combine these with an auxiliary. The formation of analytic tenses is usually rather productive and transparent. The nonfinite verb forms employed are participles, converbs, infinitives, (and in Hinuq even the masdar). As auxiliary often the copula is used. In some languages the auxiliary category includes person markers (Lak, Dargi varieties) and other so-called ‘predicative particles’. In Archi, Tsezic, Dargi and most Lezgic languages the auxiliary can also be a verb that does not serve as the default copula, e.g. verbs with the meaning ‘stay, remain’, ‘become, happen’, or ‘find’. The resulting verb forms are sometimes called ‘periphrastic verb forms’ in order to distinguish them from the analytic tenses based on the copula that make up the verbal paradigm (cf. Belyaev 2012). If they are counted in addition to the synthetic and analytic verb forms we end up with a very high number of verb forms as was mentioned for Archi in Section 1.1.

Typically it is the auxiliary that determines the temporal reference. The lexical verb bears the lexical meaning and can express aspect, and sometimes also temporal or modal meanings through its suffixes. The following four examples (3a–d) from the East Tsezic language Hunzib all make use of the same copula in the past tense, but the lexical verb bears various suffixes (imperfective converb, perfective converb, present and past participle).

(3) a. Hunzib (van den Berg 1995: 102)

\textit{kid-bo-l} \textit{ke\&i} \textit{i\&e-\&} \textit{zu\&u-r}

girl-OBL-ERG song sing-ICVB be-PST

'The girl had been singing a song.' (pluperfect)
b. kid-bo-l keč' ỉle-n zuq’u-r
girl-OBL-ERG song sing-CVB be-PST
'The girl had sung a song (some time ago).’ (pluperfect)

c. kid-bo-l keč' ỉle-čos zuq’u-r
girl-OBL-ERG song sing-PTCP.PRS be-PST
'The girl was (once) singing a song.’ (imperfect)

d. kid-bo-l keč' ỉle-ru zuq’u-r
girl-OBL-ERG song sing-PTCP.PST be-PST
'The girl had been singing a song (some time ago).’ (continuous pluperfect)

The use of analytic verb forms can lead to multiple occurrences of gender markers, e.g. the Avar evidential imperfect can have up to four gender markers (4). This phenomenon has been called ‘exuberant exponente’ (see Harris 2009 for an account of Tsova-Tush).

(4) Avar (Charachidzé 1981: 171)

ebel-at  y-it'-ule-y   y-ik'-un   y-igo  besdal  yas  c’t’ani
mother-ERG F-send-PTCP.PRS-F F-be-CVB F-COP orphan girl goat.pl
xiti-ize
keep-INF
'The mother was apparently sending the orphan girl to keep the goats.'

All reference grammars treat tense and there are also a few individual studies such as Friedman (1988, 1989), Maisak (2008a, 2011, 2012), Molochieva (2011), Belyaev (2012) and Mallaeva (2007) on aspect (though a number of studies also treat aspect and mood).

1.2.2 Aspect

There are two basic ways in which aspect is encoded in Nakh-Daghestanian languages: (i) through verb stems, (ii) through inflectional forms. The first way is only attested in certain subbranches of the family. The second way is found in most if not all languages.

A number of Nakh-Daghestanian languages distinguish aspect through stem allomorphy: all three Nakh languages, almost all Lezgic languages (though Udi has lost it apart from a few suppletive verbs, see Schulze-Fürhoff 1994: 477 and Maisak 2008b: 107–111), Dargi languages, and Lak. In these languages, many
or even most verbs come as aspectual pairs in the sense that a verbal lexeme has an imperfective and a perfective stem. For Archi it has been proposed that the opposition is rather unmarked vs. marked imperfective (Daniel 2013). The same analysis can probably be applied to Lak that has underived verb stems vs. derived durative and iterative stems. The latter carry imperfective aspectual semantics. For the first comparative study of the formal relationship between imperfective and perfective stems see Daniel (This volume).

There are always defective verbs that have only one stem with one aspectual value, e.g. stative verbs like 'know', 'want' or 'be located'. Sometimes there are verbs whose imperfective and perfective stem are formally identical.

The two stems are formally connected via several morpho-phonological processes:

- ablaut (e.g. Nakh, Lezgic, Dargi)
- infixes (e.g. Dargi, Archi and more generally Lezgic)
- suffixes (e.g. Lak, Khinalug, Lezgic)
- suppletion, usually restricted to a few verb (e.g. Khinalug, Dargi, Udi)
- presence vs. absence of gender affix (Tsoda-Tush, Dargi)
- preverbs (Tsoda-Tush, Tabasaran)

If there is a clear direction of derivation, than it is usually the imperfective stem that is derived (e.g. via suffixation) from the perfective stem (Daniel, this volume). The following verbs illustrate a typical Dargi system (5). The gender marker is b- for neuter singular in all agreeing verbs.

(5) Icari Dargwa (Sumbatova & Mutilov 2003: 60–61)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>perfective</th>
<th>imperfective</th>
<th>translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b-ax'us</td>
<td>lues</td>
<td>'get warm'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b-erett-</td>
<td>b-utt-</td>
<td>'mow'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b-erxx-</td>
<td>rurxx-</td>
<td>'paint, dye'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b-ax-</td>
<td>b-alx-</td>
<td>'feed'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>akk-</td>
<td>ikk-</td>
<td>'hit (the mark)'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sa-k</td>
<td>sa-b-ik-</td>
<td>'bring (somebody)'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>b-iss-</td>
<td>'cry'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>ruq-</td>
<td>'boil'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ilkʷ-</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>'calm down'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the case of preverbation it is the perfective stem that contains a preverb that is absent from the imperfective stem as it is attested in Tabasaran and
Tsoma-Tush. Preverberation in Tsoma-Tush is mostly but not exclusively found with verbs borrowed from Georgian that already contain a Georgian preverb (Holisky & Gagua 1994: 179). Often a Tsoma-Tush preverb is used in addition to the Georgian preverb.

It is usually the case that the two stems cannot attach all available inflectional suffixes or occupy all cells of the verbal paradigm. Instead, certain verb forms are exclusively formed from the imperfective stem and others solely from the perfective stem. For example, in Standard Dargwa the aorist is only formed from perfective stems whereas the imperfect (past) and the (synthetic) future are only available for imperfective stems (van den Berg 2001: 38; Mutalov, this volume). Similarly, in Chechen the perfective stem can only occur in synthetic tenses with past time reference, whereas the imperfective stem is not restricted and occurs with synthetic past, present, and future tenses (Molochieva 2011: 32).

Languages that do not express aspect through verbal stems are Avar, most Andic and the Tsezic languages. In these languages aspect is exclusively conveyed through periphrastic verb forms. This means that the languages usually have marked imperfectives with progressive or habitual meaning.

The languages having aspectual stem allomorphy also make use of (mostly periphrastic) inflection with combined temporal and aspectual meanings. This leads to intriguing interactions between the two systems and, as was just mentioned, often there are restrictions on which aspectual stem can inflect for which verb form.

With regard to common aspectual values, we can state that

- progressive is usually marked periphrastically through converbs/participles that are combined with a copula or some other auxiliary (e.g. a verb with the meaning ‘stay’)
- habitual is marked through specialized suffixes (e.g. Godoberi, Hinuq, Icari Dargwa) or by means of auxiliaries with habitual semantics (Khwarshi, Ingush)
- resultative is often one meaning of a perfect-like verb form (e.g. Avar, Khwarshi, Bagvalal) or the language has specialized suffixes (Tsez, Hinuq) (see Section 3.3 on evidentiality below)
- iterative is rather rare and may be expressed through reduplication (Khalilova 2009: 200–201 mentions it in the Section on aspect) or through the stem (Chechen, Lak)
Examples of the first three categories from the Tsezic language Hinuq are (6a–c).

(6) a. Hinuq (Forker 2013a: 289)
\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{crow.pl lowlands-OBL-SUPER around NPL-turn-ICVB NPL-stay-PRS} \\
&y\text{wadbe awllaq-mo-x'}\acute{o} \quad sot'\acute{i} \quad r\text{-ut'i-yo} \quad r\text{-i\diers\-i-yo}
\end{align*}
\]

‘Crows are flying around in the lowlands.’ (progressive)

b. Hinuq (Forker 2013a: 288)

[Talking about the speaker’s habits]
\[
\begin{align*}
d&\text{e y-ix-x'os got hasaqo itra-x'0} \\
&\text{1sg ii-get.up-HAB cop morning six.OBL-SUPER}
\end{align*}
\]

‘I (fem.) get up at six o’clock in the morning.’ (habitual)

c. Hinuq (Forker 2013a: 215)
\[
\begin{align*}
d&\text{e nekwe-s got} \\
&\text{1sg starve-res cop}
\end{align*}
\]

‘I am hungry.’ (resultative)

In general, the perfective aspect is not marked or less marked than the imperfective (Daniel, this volume). For those languages that have stem allomorphy, both aspects may be equally marked, or, as has been argued for Archi, Bagvalal and Lak, only the imperfective is marked and the second stem is aspectually neutral. With regard to the expression of perfectivity through the verbal inflectional system, many of the verb forms are described as having general perfective readings, and aorists (past perfectives) can be said to solely function as grammaticalized perfectives.

The range of functions of analytic verb forms that formally resemble progressive forms is often not identical to what we know for European languages, i.e. in Nakh-Daghestanian these verb forms can normally be used with stative verbs such as ‘love’ or ‘know’ and should therefore more generally be called ‘duratives’. For instance, in Chechen the ‘durative continuous’ is obtained from the imperfective verb stem to which a simultaneous converb suffix is added, and a copula functions as auxiliary (Molochieva 2011: 35). The durative continuous resembles in its formal and functional properties progressives, but it can be used with the verb ‘love’ (7). According to Molochieva (2011: 109), example (7) means “that the situation is in progress starting from some point in the recent past, e.g. Seda probably started to love him [= Musa] not long ago, and at the moment she is still in love. The situation may stretch over a longer period of time.”
(7) Chechen (Molochieva 2011: 109)
Seeda Muusa v-iez-ash j-u
Seda Musa m-love.IPFV-CVB.SIM F-COP.PRS
'Seda (fem.) loves Musa (masc.).'

In a number of Nakh-Daghestanian languages (e.g. Avar, Hizuq, Bezhta, Hunzib) the antipassive has a durative/habitual/iterative meaning, which is common cross-linguistically (Polinsky 2005, Tatevosov 2011). Since these are typical aspectual values, the antipassive is sometimes interpreted as belonging to the aspectual system of the language (cf. the account of Avar by Charachidzé 1981: 140–141). In fact, the imperfective stem suffix in Lak originates from the antipassive (Schulze 2011).


1.2.3 Evidentiality
Evidentiality is commonly defined as the linguistic encoding of the information source (cf. Aikhenvald 2004: 3). Arguably all languages have their means to express the source of information, e.g. they make use of lexemes such as allegedly or apparently or of complement constructions. But only around one fourth of the languages worldwide encode evidentiality within the grammar (Aikhenvald 2004: 1). In Europe the Caucasus is prominent for being the home of many languages with (grammaticalized) evidential systems.

Nakh-Daghestanian languages express evidentiality through verbal inflection and by means of enclitics and suffixes (cf. hearsay and narrative enclitics in Hizuq, Tsez, Khwarshi, Avar, and Mehweb Dargwa). Verbal evidentiality mainly shows up in two ways: (i) as one meaning of the perfect series, and as (ii) periphrastic verb constructions. Furthermore, two languages have special constructions not attested in any other languages of the family (evidential copula auxiliary in Chechen, past participle in Avar). Udi seems to be an exception among the languages of the family in lacking any grammaticalized means of evidentiality encoding.

The constructions usually express indirect evidentiality, predominantly hearsay (also called reported) and inference from sensory evidence. Occasionally, one can find examples illustrating inference from general knowledge or pure reasoning. Example (8) from Godoberi illustrates hearsay. It is part of a historical account of events that happened before the lifetime of the speaker. The employed verb form is part of the perfect series.
Evidential systems belonging to (i), this means systems having at least a formal connection with the perfect, are often evidential strategies since they have also non-evidential readings (resultative/perfect).¹ Most of the systems share a couple of properties such that we can speak of typical Nakh-Daghestanian verbal evidential systems. These systems are small with an opposition between marked indirect vs. neutral (i.e. unmarked) verb forms. They are confined to the past tenses and conflated with the tense system (see, e.g., Molochieva & Nichols, this volume, Mutalov, this volume, Belyaev, this volume, Forker, this volume). Usually they are restricted to main indicative clauses (though in Ashti Dargwa conditionals and in Chechen relative clauses, adverbial clauses, conditionals and even imperatives can contain indirect evidentials, see Belyaev 2012 and Molochieva 2011: 227–239 for examples). Evidential constructions are formally and functionally distinct from epistemic modals. Indirect evidentials normally do not imply any doubts on part of the speaker concerning the truth of the proposition, and the speaker is not less committed to his/her utterance when s/he used an indirect evidential. They show interaction with person, the so-called ‘first-person effect’: a first person subject referent that is used together with an indirect evidential is interpreted as involuntary or unconscious agent that finds out about his/her actions only afterwards (9). Negation has always the proposition in its scope, not the evidential. In questions, the same evidentials as in assertions are available and it is always the information source of the addressee that is at issue.

¹ By resultative I mean reference to the state that obtains as a result of a preceding action, and by perfect I mean reference to a past action that is relevant at the moment of speech.
The second way of how verbal evidentiality is frequently expressed in Nakh-Daghestanian is through periphrastic constructions with an auxiliary or light verb meaning ‘find, come across, discover’ (Andic, Tsezic, Avar, and Archi) (Forker, this volume) or ‘become, be, be at, stay, remain, stand’ (Dargi, Agul, and Tsakhur). Typically, the construction expresses inference from direct, visible evidence, which is probably due to the literal meaning of the auxiliaries (10). This means that the speaker directly observed or discovered the result of an event and then made an inference about that event. In some languages such as Bagvalal this construction can therefore not be used for hearsay evidentiality. It is possible that the observation or discovery of the evidence and the connected inference correlates with surprise on part of the speaker.

(10) Archi (Kibrik 1977: 239)

\[ w-\textit{ir}y\textit{r}^{\textit{w}i}n-\textit{\textsc{si}} \quad \textit{xu-t\text{u}} \]

M-work.IPFL-CVB find.PFL.m-NEG

‘(It turned out that) he did not work.’

The same auxiliary is often also used in epistemic probability constructions and in conditionals and concessives (e.g. Archi, Hinuq, Tsez, Bezhta, Avar, and Bagvalal).

In general, speakers are highly aware of the evidential semantics and comment on it (see the remark in Nichols 2011: 243 on Ingush, Molochieva & Nichols, this volume). Evidentials are found in various speech styles though some forms also function as genre markers for traditional folktales. The origins of the evidentials vary and include perfects, the past participle (Avar), and complement constructions in case of the inferential construction with auxiliaries. An important source for hearsay markers are verbs of speech. The markers based on ‘say’ often show up as enclitics; however, they may be morphologized to a degree that they can be treated as suffixes. For example, Haspelmath (1993: 148) describes the Lezgian hearsay marker -\textit{lda} as a suffix resulting from the contraction of the present habitual form \textit{luhuda} ‘(one) says’. This suffix can follow various indicative verbal forms, but is never added to non-verbal items.

1.2.4 Mood
(Sentence) mood is a category associated with the sentence and its illocutionary force, i.e. its conventional use in a conversation. It represents the semantic side of the opposition among clause types (assertions, questions, commands, etc.).

Nakh-Daghestanian languages typically have at least three different moods: imperative, prohibitive (in functional terms the negative counterpart of the imperative, but formally Nakh-Daghestanian prohibitives are usually not derived from imperatives and instead belong to different morphological subsystems), and optative (11a) (used to express wishes, hopes, blessings, damnations, or curses, e.g. 'May X happen!'). In Ingush and Icari Dargwa there are special 'mild imperatives' used for polite requests (11b) (Nichols 2011: 275; Sumbatova & Mutalov 2003: 95 call this form 'precative').

(11) a. Akhvakh Optative (Dobrushina 2011: 115)
   sayt̊ila b-ik'−ūča(λ'a)!
   health N-be-OPT
   'Be healthy!'

   b. Ingush Mild imperative (Nichols 2011: 275)
   niw hwa-jielal
   door DX-J.open.IMPmild
   'Would you open the door?' or 'Please open the door!'

Some languages have more than one optative (cf. Ingush, Nichols 2011: 276–278; and Avar, Charachidzé 1981: 109). The jussive (for expressing orders and commands or exhortations to third person agents) is found in Ashti Dargwa (Belyaev 2012) and Tsakhir (Dobrushina 1999a: 281–283) (12). In other languages such as Lezgian (Haspelmath 1993: 151), Agul, Udi and Hinuq (Forker 2013: 231), there is only one verb form covering both optative and jussive functions.

(12) Tsakhir Jussive (Dobrushina 1999a: 281)
   dakḳe: dawar ali(w)š-e-že
   father-ERG sheep(III) buy(III)-IMP-JUSS
   'Let father buy the sheep!'

The hortative (for mutual encouragement to take part in some action, e.g. 'Let's do X!') is another rather common mood in Nakh-Daghestanian. It is attested in Bagvalal, Tsakhir, Lezgian (13), Archi, Kryz, Udi, Ingush, and Ashti Dargwa. As shown in (13), hortatives are regularly accompanied by the grammaticalized
verb ‘come’ in the imperative. In some languages lacking morphological hortatives, a construction consisting of ‘come’ plus a lexical verb is used as a hortative (e.g. in Agul ‘come’ in the imperative and verb in the infinitive, as in example (13)). The Archi hortative is also used as polite imperative (see the examples in Kibrik 1977: 222–223).

(13) Lezgian Hortative (Haspelmath 1993: 150)
\[ \text{ša gila čun či qarmax-ri-z kilig-in} \]
\[ \text{come now 1PL 1PL GEN hook-PL-DAT look-HORT} \]
‘Now let’s look at our hooks.’

Finally, individual languages have typologically rare moods such as irrealis imperative and irrealis jussive in Tsakhr (see Section 3.5 below for an example), the non-curative (‘Let him/her do X, I don’t care.’) in Icari Dargwa (Sumbatova & Mutalov 2003: 98) and the deliberative in Ashti Dargwa (Belyaev 2012) and Khwarshi (Khalilova 2009: 255–256) that is exclusively used for questions with first person subjects asking for permission (‘May I do X?’) (14).

(14) Ashti Dargwa Deliberative (O. Belyaev, p.c.)
\[ \text{b-uc'-ida?} \]
\[ \text{N-read.1PFV-DELIB} \]
‘May I read?’

The Archi grammars by Kibrik (1977, 1994) and the Lezgian grammar by Haspelmath (1993) mention ‘interrogative’ as a special mood. However, in most of the Nakh-Daghestanian languages interrogative clauses are simply marked by enclitics or particles that are not part of the verbal inflectional system (cf. Forker 2013b for an overview; Chumakina, this volume, for Archi).

Apart from Dobrushina (2011), a comparative study on the optative in Nakh-Daghestanian, Friedman (2013) who investigates the morphology of imperative in Lak, and Chumakina (This volume) there are no further individual studies, though the topic is at least partially covered in reference grammars.

1.2.5 Modality

Modality involves linguistic reference to situations or worlds that are not real. Following Nuyts (2001), we can distinguish three semantic subdomains of modality:

- dynamic modality that is concerned with capacities/potential and needs/necessity
deontic modality that is concerned with permission and obligation

- epistemic modality that has to do with knowledge, belief, and the degree of certainty or speaker commitment to the truth of the proposition

Within the verbal system, modality is expressed through inflection and by means of modal auxiliaries. Furthermore, the languages have modal lexemes (adverbials, particles, enclitics). Since the constructions differ greatly in their forms and their meanings it is not easy to make generalizations and to describe a typical Nakh-Daghestanian modality system.

Dynamic modality is often expressed through auxiliaries. Many languages have special modal verbs with the meaning 'can, be able', or they employ an auxiliary originally meaning 'become' (e.g. Khinalug, Lezgic, Hinuq). Alternatively, some languages make use of a detransitivizing suffix that expresses capacity or ability, depending on the context, the valency frame of the base verb and the case marking.

(15) Tsez (Comrie 2004: 117)

\[ k'et'u-q \quad \gamma'iay \quad \text{hal}u-t-xo \]
\[ \text{cat-AT milk drink-POT-PRS} \]

'The cat can drink the milk.'

The concept 'need' is sometimes conveyed through an uninfllected lexical item, often a loan with the meaning 'need' plus a light verb. For 'must' many languages have specialized auxiliaries. In a few cases these derive from a verb with the meaning 'come (upon), fall (into), hit' (e.g. Bagvalal, Hinuq). Harris (2003) describes the case of 'want' to 'must' shift in Agul analyzing it as clause fusion. Some languages have a debitive inflection (see below). With regard to 'want', most languages have auxiliaries that when used as the head of main clauses mean also 'like, love'. Furthermore, some inflectional forms convey an intentional meaning that is close to 'want' (see below).

In any case, these constructions mostly require non-canonical case marking of the subject-like argument (cf. Comrie 2004, Ganenkov 2006, 2013, Ganenkov et al. 2008, Forker 2013c, Comrie et al. in press).

In most Nakh-Daghestanian languages there are also inflectional verb forms with modal meaning. All languages have realis conditionals that are often part of a larger system of converbs used as heads of adverbial clauses. Another common category is irrealis forms used as heads of main clauses or in irrealis conditionals (counterfactual, hypothetic). These are often simple inflectional suffixes, but in a few languages (e.g. Hinuq, Hunzib, Bezhta) the inflected verbs are accompanied by special particles (16a). A third widespread category
is future-in-the-past forms that combine an inflected lexical verb with a copula or copula-like element that bears a past tense marking. The future-in-the-past forms fulfill functions similar to the irrealis, e.g. they occur in counterfactual conditionals (16a, b).

(16) a. Bezhta

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{hâl} & \quad \text{öz-di-l} & \quad \text{okko} & \quad \text{y-ūqo-na} & \quad \text{zuq′o-yo} & \quad \text{q′oda;}
\end{align*}\
\text{yesterday boy-OBL-DAT money(IV) IV-get-CVB be-WPST IRR}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{hogco} & \quad \text{kibba-l} & \quad \text{kirkat′} & \quad \text{b-ox-ca} & \quad \text{gâ;}
\end{align*}\
\text{he.ERG girl.OBL-DAT ball(III) III-buy-PRS SUBJ}
\]

‘If the boy would have gotten the money yesterday, he would have bought a ball for the girl.’

b. Udi (Maisak 2008a:190)

[Fortunately, he went away soon.]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{čur-p-iʃi-nwi} & \quad avuzin & \quad \text{exlät gele bak-abe-j}
\end{align*}\
\text{stand-LV-CTRF=2/3SG-PST redundant talking much be-FUT-3SG-PST}
\]

‘If he stayed, there would have been too much unnecessary talking.’

Other categories are rarer. Some languages have intentionals that convey the meaning ‘want’ and/or future time reference (e.g. Hinuq, Tsakhur, Archi). In a few languages (e.g. Chechen, Icari Dargwa) the subjunctive expresses either purpose when heading complement clauses or it functions as a modal future. In other languages the meaning of ‘should’ and/or future time reference are both parts of the semantics of one verb form called ‘hypothetical’ in Icari Dargwa and ‘potential’ in Standard Dargwa (Mutalov, this volume). A deitative modal form with the meaning ‘must’ or ‘be supposed to’ is found in Archi, Kryz (17) and Budugh. In the latter two languages this suffix originates from the allocative case marker (Authier 2011).

(17) Kryz (Authier 2009: 230)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{āyal} & \quad \text{q′içiš′a} & \quad \text{qusi.ci-gi} & \quad \text{g′i-rqar-u}
\end{align*}\
\text{child firmly cradle-SUPER PV-hold.on.MP-DEB}
\]

‘The child should be / must be firmly tied to the cradle.’

In Hinuq and Tsez the masdar, which is normally used as nominalized verb form in complement clauses or other constructions, can sometimes mean ‘still not’ (Comrie et al. 2016). Finally, Tsakhur has an irrealis imperative (18) and an irrealis jussive. The meaning of the irrealis imperative resembles the meaning of irrealis verb forms in other languages.
Epistemic modality occurs in a number of different constructions. Within the verbal paradigm some irrealis verb forms or future-in-the past forms have epistemic meanings. In Hinuq, Bagvalal, Avar, and Chechen epistemic necessity can be expressed with the modal auxiliary ‘must’. A great number of Nakh-Daghestanian languages have epistemic probability constructions with a light verb/auxiliary ‘find’. Northern Akhvakh and Zaqatala Avar have egophoric marking, i.e. different suffixes depending on person and epistemic modality/evidentiality (Creissels, this volume; Forker, this volume). Finally, some specialized constructions are only attested in one or two languages. For instance, Lak (19) and Avar have so-called ‘assertive’ forms used when the speaker emphatically asserts the utterance and/or vouches for its truth (see Friedman 2007, Bokarev 1949: 69–80).

(19) Lak (Friedman 2007: 354)
\[\text{na } \text{čavar } \text{čiča-jssar-a}\]
\[\text{ISG letter write-ASS-1SG}\]
‘I do write a letter.’

2 Summaries of the Chapters

The present volume contains the papers presented during the workshop on tense, aspect, modality and evidentiality in Nakh-Daghestanian languages, which was hosted by the Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology in Leipzig (Germany) in August, 2013. Map 1.1 shows the location of the Nakh-Daghestanian languages with the languages treated in this book given in boxes.

---

2 In some languages, the same verb is also used in the inferential (indirect evidential) construction, see Section 1.2.3.
The first chapter, written by Zarina Molochieva and Johanna Nichols and entitled *Tense, aspect, modality and evidentiality in Chechen and Ingush* provides an account of these verbal categories in the Nakh languages Chechen and Ingush. Both languages have very elaborate tense, aspect, mood and evidentiality systems with large numbers of synthetic and periphrastic verb forms and a number of aspectual oppositions. These raise two important questions. (i) Tense/mood/aspect in both languages has a compositional character. Most of the verb forms are periphrastic tenses formed by combining one of the conversbs with different auxiliaries. At first glance, the periphrastic tenses seem to be predictable and able to have an open number of combinations. However, there are semantic and also morphological restrictions in the progressive and habitual series. How can such an elaborate system with more than forty TAM forms be analyzed? As a part of morphological paradigm or as the syntactic properties of a clause or even as a part of clause linkage? It is argued that the forms are morphological, but instead of a canonical paradigm they form an open-ended system like the form sets of polysynthetic languages, and like
those are produced on-line rather than selected from a set of forms listed in
the lexicon. (2) Chechen and Ingush have evidential and evidential-like cat-
gerities such as inferential, non-witnessed, quotative, mirative, addressee-
directed, and hearsay. Do these make up a single broad evidential category?
The chapter shows that their semantic properties justify putting them in dif-
ferent categories.

The next two chapters are based on the data from the Dargwa (Dargi) lan-
guages. In Chapter 2, entitled, The intricacies of the Standard Dargwa tense
and aspect system, Rasul Mutalov presents the first thorough and system-
atic account of tense and aspect categories and their meanings in Standard
Dargwa. From a formal point of view the temporal and aspeclual forms of the
Standard Dargwa verb consist of the root plus a number of prefixes and suf-
fixes. Aspect is manifested within the verbal root and as part of the inflec-
tional paradigm. The root can be imperfective or perfective. Aspeclual categories ex-
pressed via inflection are, for example, habitual or resultative. Tense is only
expressed through analytic and synthetic verb forms. The Standard Dargwa
data support observations of correlations between tense and aspect because
perfective aspect goes along with past tenses and imperfective aspect with fu-
ture and present tenses. In addition to forms expressing the basic distinctions
between past, present and future, the chapter discusses tense forms that have
an additional modal meaning such as the possibilitive and the prospective.

Chapter 3 written by Oleg Belyaev analyzes aorist, resultative and per-
fert in Shiri Dargwa and beyond. Despite the formal similarities between the
tense affixes used in different varieties of Dargwa, the functions of the corre-
sponding paradigms are surprisingly varied. The chapter focuses on the form,
semantics, and prehistory of the perfective past tense forms in Shiri, one of
the less-studied varieties of Dargwa. Shiri possesses one of the most elaborate
systems of perfective forms, the core of which consists of the Aorist, Perfect,
and Resultative. The data of Shiri prove to be very important for understanding
the origin and development of perfective past tense forms in Dargwa (Dargi)
in general. The chapter provides a tentative reconstruction of the evolution
of perfective past in Dargi, paying particular attention to the extension and
renewal of resultative and perfect forms, and the rise of evidentiality.

The problem of past tense semantics and diachronic evolution is contin-
ued in Chapter 4 by Timur Maisak, who treats the aorist/perfect distinction
in Nizh Udi. It is argued that the two most frequent synthetic past tenses in
Udi should be identified as the aorist (‘perfective past’) and the perfect (‘past
with present relevance’); while the former is the main means of foreground-
ing in discourse, the latter has the prototypical ‘current relevance’ meaning,
and is also used with experiential and resultative functions. The perfect is also
the source for the pluperfect, derived by means of the “retrospective shift”
enclitic. The hypothesis put forward in the paper deals with the putative grammaticalization paths of the two forms: most probably, the aorist was based on the perfective converb, and the perfect on the construction with the perfective participle. The evidence for such a development is both typological and comparative (especially stemming from the data of genetically related languages), and language-specific. In particular, it is the perfect that has a special negative construction with a perfective participle and a postpositional negation, which may point at the participle as a diachronic source of this particular form.

The following two chapters discuss data of the Avar-Andic subbranch of the family. Denis Creissels analyzes epistemic modality in the perfective past tenses of Northern Akhvakh in Chapter 5. The verbal inflection of Northern Akhvakh includes five synthetic tenses that equally describe events as having occurred before the time of utterance or some other reference point on the time scale. They do not differ in terms of distance in time, current relevance, or aspectuality, but only in their epistemic implications: e.g. two of the forms constitute the unmarked way to describe past events as witnessed vs. not witnessed by the speaker. Epistemic marking in Northern Akhvakh also includes less common types of epistemic modality. Thus, there is a form used in assertive clauses to emphasize the fact that the speaker not only witnessed the event, but also played an active role in it, another form constitutes the unmarked way to question about past events, and there is still another form, whose use is restricted to the following two contexts: in interrogative clauses, this form encodes that the speaker considers surprising the event in question, whereas in assertive clauses, it implies that the speaker imposes him/herself as an epistemic authority and excludes possible contradictions.

In Chapter 6 Diana Forker treats the semantics of evidentiality and epistemic modality in Avar. Avar has a complex system of verb forms used for the expression of tense, aspect, modality and evidentiality. The chapter explores the category of evidentiality that is expressed through the verbal system and by means of the evidential enclitic «ila. Based on available descriptions and a corpus of natural texts, the semantic range of five constructions is discussed, paying close attention to the type of indirect evidentiality that they express (e.g. indirect based on results, inferential based on general knowledge, hearsay, etc.). The chapter shows how Avar fits into the evidential systems attested in the Caucasus and how its evidential system relates to epistemic modality.

Chapter 7 by Marina Chumakina concerns mood in Archi, focusing on the delimitation of the category ‘verbal mood’ in this language. It starts with the discussion of the category of mood as it is presented in the grammatical description of Archi by Kibrik (1977). Based on this, the core of the category is defined. Using both canonical criteria and the new data collected in the field,
the author suggests that some moods should be excluded from the core and some should be thought of as representing a sub-feature.

Finally, in Chapter 8 Michael Daniel discusses aspe
tual systems of Nakh-
Daghestanian languages in a morphological rather than semantic perspective. The formal relation between two aspectual stems, perfective and imperfective, is considered in three languages belonging to different branches of the family: Archi, Mehweb and Khinalug. What is being analyzed is the derivation of the two stems, their relative structural markedness and how identical are the sets of affixes they attach. The survey shows that the relation between the two stems varies from language to language, from roughly equal in Archi to the structural markedness of the imperfective stem in Mehweb to the clear derivational primacy of the perfective stem in Khinalug.
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