NATIONAL RESEARCH UNIVERSITY
HIGHER SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS

Timur Maisak

THE VERB PARADIGM IN KINA RUTUL

BASIC RESEARCH PROGRAM

WORKING PAPERS

SERIES: LINGUISTICS
WP BRP 95/LNG/2020

Timur Maisak [1]

THE VERB PARADIGM IN KINA RUTUL[2]

The paper presents the first description of the verb paradigm in Kina Rutul, a single-village variety of the Rutul language (Lezgic, Nakh-Daghestanian) spoken in southern Daghestan. First, I make a distinction between the stative verbs with a reduced paradigm and morphologically canonical verbs with a fuller paradigm. I present the inventory and the paradigm of statives, some of which play a key role in the derivation of periphrastic forms. For canonical verbs, I describe all the synthetic forms derived from the three main stems, namely the perfective stem, the imperfective stem and the infinitive stem (the imperative/optative forms lie outside the scope of the paper). Then I analyse the structure of periphrastic forms, which are composed of a non-finite form and an auxiliary.

JEL Classification: Z

Keywords: verb paradigm; stative verbs; auxiliary verbs; periphrastic forms; Rutul; Lezgic; East Caucasian (Nakh-Daghestanian)

[1] Linguistic Convergence Laboratory, HSE University, Leading Research Fellow; tmaisak@hse.ru

[2] The publication was prepared within the framework of the Academic Fund Program at the National Research University Higher School of Economics (HSE) in 2019–2020 (grant №19-04-040) and by the Russian Academic Excellence Project "5-100".

1. Introduction

The paper presents an overview of the verb paradigm in Kina Rutul, a variety of the Rutul language spoken in the Republic of Daghestan, Russia. The verb inflection of Rutul is relatively rich, as the paradigm includes dozens of synthetic and periphrastic forms. The focus of the paper is twofold. First, I establish the principal distinction between two different inflectional classes, a minor class of stative verbs and a major class of canonical (non-stative) verbs. Second, I describe the derivation of forms belonging to the indicative subparadigms of both classes, and of most important non-finite forms. Although I give some examples of the use of forms, a detailed account of their semantics lies outside the scope of the present paper.

Rutul is a language of the Lezgic branch of the Nakh-Daghestanian (East Caucasian) family. It is spoken in a few mountain villages in southern Daghestan and northern Azerbaijan, as well as by those who resettled from these villages to the plain. The number of speakers of Rutul living in Russia can be estimated as about 30,000. Within the Lezgic branch, Rutul is traditionally considered to be the closest relative of Tsakhur, and the two languages form a West Lezgic sub-branch.

Kina Rutul is a one-village dialect of Rutul spoken in a single village of Kina in the Rutulsky District of Daghestan. It has not been classified as belonging to any of the major dialects of Rutul, which are Mukhad, Shinaz, Myukhrek, Ikhrek and Borch-Khnov dialects (Ibragimov 1978: 14–15; 2004: 269)[3]. According to Ibragimov, the variety of Kina as well as those of a few nearby villages (Luchek, Amsar, Kala, Vurush) belong to a "mixed" group which stands close both to the Mukhad and Shinaz dialects. For Kina and Luchek, Ibragimov additionally mentions the presence of features typical of the Ikhrek dialect. Specifically the dialect of Kina has never been described in the literature, and the data for the present paper were obtained during the HSE University expeditions to Kina in 2018 and 2019.

2. Background on the verb in Rutul

2.1. Classes of verbs in Rutul

From the point of view of morphological structure, Rutul verbs fall into three groups:

- verbs with **simple**, morphologically unanalysable stem, without synchronically recognizable derivational prefixes or suffixes, e.g. *walgas* 'speak, talk', *wešes* 'cry, weep', *hɨwɨs* 'give'.
- **prefixal** verbs, which include one or more locative prefixes (a.k.a. preverbs), e.g. *suwq'as* 'sit down' (prefix DOWN), *l-uwzas* 'stand up' (prefix UP), *e-ʁ-ewč'us* 'go out, resettle' (prefixes IN and OUT).

[3] In the later work, Ibragimov (2004: 269) distinguishes between the two dialectal groups (*narečija*), namely the western one (comprising Mukhad, Shinaz and Myukhrek dialects) and the eastern one (Ikhrek and Borch-Khnov dialects).

- **complex** verbs, which consist of two components, the lexical part and the light verb, the latter being one of frequent lexical items also used independently, namely ‘do’, ‘be(come)’, ‘give’ etc., e.g. *q’ale waʔas* ‘read’, *masa hɨwɨs* ‘sell’, *hazɨr wiʔi* ‘be ready’.

In the latter group, only the light verb inflects. Beyond that, there are no differences among the three groups with respect to the inventory of forms and the structure of the paradigm. In what follows, the verb system will be described mainly on the basis of simple verbs.

From the point of view of inflection types, I distinguish between two major groups.

The first group is **stative verbs** (or statives). Semantically, they describe states in all of their forms. Morphologically, they are defective compared to canonical verbs in that they lack quite a few forms which canonical verbs do possess. In particular, statives do not have imperatives, infinitives, or any forms with perfective meaning. More generally, statives have only one stem, and lack the forms which canonical verbs derive from the perfective, the imperative and the infinitive stems. The group of simple and prefixal statives is very small, but includes some frequent items like the copula and existential verbs.

The second group comprises most of the verbal lexicon and can be labelled **canonical verbs**, as they possess the full verb paradigm (also, these verbs are non-stative, given that they are not semantically stative in all of their forms). These verbs have several derivational stems; in particular, they distinguish between the perfective and the imperfective stems.

Many Rutul verbs (including almost all the canonical verbs) agree in gender and include a morphological slot for gender agreement; the presence of this slot is a lexical property of a verb stem and has nothing to do with the meaning of the verb or any of its morphosyntactic features. The slot is prefixal or infixal; in verbs with locative preverbs the gender agreement slot comes after preverbs. The agreement in the verb is controlled by the absolutive noun phrase, i.e. the S (intransitive subject) or P (transitive object) arguments; see Morozova (2019) for details. There are four genders in the singular: masculine, feminine and two non-human genders, which are marked with Arabic numbers 1–4; in the plural, two human genders are opposed to two non-human ones (HPL vs. NPL).

In what follows, I ignore the morphology of gender agreement on verbs[4]. I also leave out case-number inflection of those deverbal derivations that inflect. These are, on one hand, masdars (action nominals) which inflect like nouns, and, on the other hand, participles which inflect according to a different declension type, like adjectives and other attributive derivations (see Maisak, in prep.).

The citation forms of verbs are infinitives for canonical verbs (with Gender 3 agreement marker, which can never be zero) and present tense for stative verbs, which do not have the infinitive.

[4] I also don’t analyse gender agreement rules, which are not always trivial in case of periphrastic forms.

2.2. Previous studies of the verb in Rutul

Although the present paper is the first detailed account of the verb paradigm of Kina Rutul, it is by no means the first description of the Rutul verb in general.

The earliest account by Dirr (1912: 52–98) is not very systematic. Although his chapter on the verb in the Mukhad dialect contains information both on verb conjugation and the use of verb forms, it mainly presents lists of verb forms and some illustrative examples. In particular, Dirr (1912: 52–55, 59) mixes in one paradigm all the forms of the copula *wiʔi* and the verb *wɨkɨs* 'be, become', treating them as belonging to one and the same lexeme 'esse' with several suppletive stems.

The two editions of Ibragimov's (1978, 2004) compendium cover five dialects, namely Mukhad, Shinaz, Myukhrek, Ikhrek and Borch-Khnov; the chapter on the Mukhad dialect is the most detailed one. In the description of the verb (e.g. Ibragimov 1978: 83–108) the focus is on formal morphology, especially the derivation of stems, gender agreement marking on the verb, verbal prefixes etc. There is almost no data on the use of forms, which are merely presented as lists with labels for each form.

Both Kibrik & Kodzasov's (1988: 38–40) short section in their comparative dictionary of Daghestanan languages, and Alekseev's (1994) extended grammar sketch are devoted to the variety spoken in Luchek, which is a village most close to Kina in geographical terms. Kibrik & Kodzasov (more precisely, A. E. Kibrik, as the section is written by him) briefly discuss the structure of verb roots, the derivation of three stems (perfective, imperfective and "potentialis") and the diagnostic verb forms (present, aorist, infinitive, imperative and prohibitive), as well as the series of gender agreement markers. Although not very long, Alekseev's (1994: 226–235) desription of the Luchek verb is very systematic and covers both formal and semantic aspects. Like Kibrik & Kodzasov, he distinguished between the three stems (durative, termimative, potential); he also presents the core indicative system as composed of two "gerunds" and the present or past tenses of two auxiliary verbs (*i* or *a*). On the whole, my understanding of the structure of Kina Rutul verb paradigm is closest to that of Alekseev.

Makhmudova's (2001: 127–131) comprehensive description of the Mukhad Rutul verb, in particular, provides the most extended list of finite periphrastic forms with the auxiliaries *i* and *a* (including those forms in which the auxiliary itself takes a periphrastic form). In total, she lists 15 past tenses (10 perfective and 5 imperfective), 2 present tenses, 2 futures and 2 "general" ("atemporal") tenses. The use of past tenses is not described in the book, which is however compensated by an earlier paper (Makhmudova 1991).

3. Stative verbs

3.1. The inventory

The group of statives is not homogeneous. Its core includes the following lexical items (see also Table 1):

- the copula *wiʔi*,
- six historically prefixal existential verbs *a* ‘be (inside)’, *χa* ‘APUD.be’, *ʁa* ‘SUPER.be’, *ki* ‘CONT.be’, *gi* ‘SUB.be’, *qu* ‘POST.be’,
- the verb *ma‹b›a* ‘stay, remain, still be’ and six prefixal verbs with this root, namely *ama‹b›a* ‘IN.remain’, *χama‹b›a* ‘APUD.remain’, *ʁama‹b›a* ‘SUPER.remain’, *kima‹b›a* ‘CONT.remain’, *gima‹b›a* ‘SUB.remain’, *quma‹b›a* ‘POST.remain’.

Besides, the inventory of statives is augmented with:

- deadjectival complex verbs which consist of a predicative form of an adjective and a copula (e.g. *hɨχ-a wiʔi* ‘be well’, see Maisak, in prep.),
- the verb *hɨgara* ‘want, love’, which is intermediate between a stative verb and a canonical verb.

In what follows, I first focus on the core statives and then return to the verb *hɨgara*.

Table 1. The inventory of ‘be’- and ‘remain’-statives

prefix	‘be’	‘remain’
NO	–	*ma‹b›a* remain<3>
IN	*a* [IN.]be	*a-ma‹b›a* IN-remain<3>
APUD	*χa* APUD.be	*χa-ma‹b›a* APUD-remain<3>
SUPER	*ʁa* SUPER.be	*ʁa-ma‹b›a* SUPER-remain<3>
POST	*qu* POST.be	*qu-ma‹b›a* POST-remain<3>
CONT	*ki* CONT.be	*ki-ma‹b›a* CONT.remain<3>
SUB	*gi* SUB.be	*gi-ma‹b›a* SUB-remain<3>

3.2. The synthetic paradigm

Statives have only one stem, from which all forms are derived. In general, they possess the following synthetic forms:

- present tense, which is unmarked (i.e. identical to the stem)
- past tense, marked with a suffix *-j*,
- participle (attributive form) with an attributive marker *-d* / *-di*,
- general converb, marked with a suffix *-na*,
- a number of specialized converbs, with suffixes *-de*, *-deqa*, *-ga*, *-ijden*, *-naqus* / *naqun* and, possibly, some others.

Interrogative forms are derived from the two finite synthetic tenses by means of a marker *-ma*, see Konovalova (2019). Meditative questions ('I wonder if...') are formed by means of a marker *-jden*, or its short form *-j*, added to the interrogative marker.

Unlike canonical verbs, statives lack the perfective, the imperative and the infinitive stems and all the forms which canonical verbs derive from these stems, namely imperative, optative, infinitive and all perfective forms. They also express negation in a special way. Statives do not mark negation by means of a prefix/infix *ǯ-*. Instead, the copula has a suppletive present negative tense *diš*, and the other statives have a negative suffix *-diš* attached to the stem. The negation marker precedes all other markers, including the past tense suffix. Otherwise, the inventory of negative forms is the same as that of the affirmative forms[5]; see Table 2.

3.3. Periphrastic forms

Both 'be'-statives and 'remain'-statives have periphrastic forms based on a converb, with the copula as auxiliary verb (in the present or the past tense). In these forms, the converb takes a special variant *-ni* instead of *-na*, e.g. *a-ni w-iʔi* / *a-ni w-iʔi i* [be-CVB 3-COP1] / [be-CVB COP2], *ma‹b›a-ni wiʔi* / *ma‹b›a-ni i* [remain<3> 3-COP1] / [remain<3> COP2]. The copula itself does not have this periphrastic form. The periphrastic forms of statives are attested only in the affirmative and are functionally largely equivalent to the synthetic present tense.

Another, more peripheral, periphrastic form is based on a participle, e.g. *a-d w-iʔi* [be-ATTR 3-COP1] / *a-d i* [be-ATTR COP2] / *a-t'-i* [be-ATTR-COP2] from the verb 'be'. It also occurs in periphrastic forms as an auxiliary.

[5] In the negative, there is no temporal converb derived from the bare negative stem (e.g. **diš-ga*), only the converbs based on the participle.

Table 2. The paradigm of statives

Form	**COP** (gender 1/4)	**'be'**	**'remain'** (gender 3)
AFFIRMATIVE			
Present	*jiʔi / i*	*a*	*ma˂b˃a*
Past	*jiʔi-j*	*a-j*	*ma˂b˃a-j*
Participle (attributive form)	*jiʔi-d*	*a-d*	*ma˂b˃a-d*
Temporal converb	*jiʔi-d-ga*	*a-d-ga*	*ma˂b˃a-d-ga*
Conditional 1	*jiʔi-de*	*a-de*	*ma˂b˃a-de*
Converb in *-deqa*	*jiʔi-deqa*	*a-deqa*	*ma˂b˃a-deqa*
	jiʔi-na	*a-na*	*ma˂b˃a-na*
Converb (auxiliary form)	–	*a-ni*	*ma˂b˃a-ni*
Conditional 2	*jiʔi-naqus / jiʔi-naqun*	*a-naqus / a-naqun*	*ma˂b˃a-naqus / ma˂b˃a-naqun*
Temporal converb	*jiʔi-ga*	*a-ga*	*ma˂b˃a-ga*
Irrealis converb	*jiʔi-jden*	*a-jden*	*ma˂b˃a-jden*
NEGATIVE			
Present	*diš*	*a-diš*	*ma-b-diš*
Past	*diš-ij*	*a-diš-ij*	*ma-b-diš-ij*
Participle (attributive form)	*diš-di*	*a-diš-de*	*ma-b-diš-de*
Temporal converb	*diš-di-ga*	*a-diš-di-ga*	*ma-b-diš-di-ga*
Conditional 1	*diš-de*	*a-diš-de*	*ma-b-diš-de*
Converb in *-deqa*	*diš-deqa*	*a-diš-deqa*	*ma-b-diš-deqa*
Converb	*diš-na*	*a-diš-na*	*ma-b-diš-na*
Conditional 2	*diš-naqus / diš-naqun*	*a-diš-naqus / a-diš-naqun*	*ma-b-diš-naqus / ma-b-diš-naqun*
Irrealis converb	*diš-ijden*	*a-diš-ijden*	*ma-b-diš-ijden*
PERIPHRASTIC			
Periphrastic Present	–	*a-ni jiʔi / i*	*ma˂b˃a-ni jiʔi / i*
Periphrastic Past	–	*a-ni jiʔij / ij*	*ma˂b˃a-ni jiʔij / ij*
Participial Present	–	*a-d jiʔi / i, a-t'-i*	*ma˂b˃a-d jiʔi / i, ma˂b˃a-t'-i*

Participial Past	–	*a-d jiʔij / ij,* *a-t'-ij*	*ma‹b›a-d jiʔij / ij,* *ma‹b›a-t'-ij*

Below, I summarize the idiosyncratic inflectional properties of the statives and provide examples of their use.

3.4. The copula

The copula (COP1) has a prefixal gender agreement slot which can be filled by the "weak series" of gender agreement markers, i.e. ∅~r~w~∅: 1 *jiʔi*, 2 *r-iʔi*, 3 *w-iʔi*, 4 *jiʔi*. A short form of the copula *i* (COP2) exists for *jiʔi*, the unmarked 1/4 gender variant[6].

The copula is used in (i) non-verbal predicates and (ii) deadjectival complex verbs like *hɨχa wiʔi* 'be well'. In complex verbs, only the copula is inflected. The functional equivalent of the copula in all the syntactic and semantic contexts which are not covered by the existing inflectional forms of the copula (e.g. inchoative or future) is a canonical verb *wɨkɨs* 'be, become, happen'.

(1) *mi-d* *iz-dɨ* *riši* ***r-iʔi***
this-ATTR(ABS) I-ATTR sister(ABS) 2-COP1
'This is my sister.'

(2) *iz-dɨ* *χɨl* *ir-a* ***jiʔi***
I-ATTR hand(ABS) red-ADJ 4.COP1
'My hand is (looks) red.'

In the auxiliary function, the copula is used (iii) in periphrastic verb forms (see section 5) and (iv) in the focus construction (see section 4.3.4).

A negative conditional form of the copula *diš-de* 'if (it is) not' can be used as a kind of a clause-initial conjunction 'or else', 'if not'.

The imperfective stem of a motion verb *wiʔi* 'go' is homophonous with the copula; thus, in the affirmative present tense the two lexical items are identical. The same motion verb also derives an irregular (not present in canonical verbs) imperfective converb, identical to that of the copula, i.e. *wiʔi-na*.

[6] Some speakers seem to allow the short variant with all genders. As an auxiliary in periphrastic forms and in the focus construction, the short form *i* is the default one for all genders (see section 5).

3.5. 'Be'-statives

All 'be'-statives are historically derived from the root *a-* 'be' by adding locative prefixes. The semantics of the prefixes is largely the same as with canonical prefixal verbs (see Nasledskova, in prep.). However, with statives, the prefix *q-* has its original meaning of the localization POST ('behind') rather than the repetitive meaning; also the prefix *ʁ-* has the meaning of the localization SUPER ('on'), while with canonical prefixal verbs its meaning is that of motion from (OUT). The verb *a* 'be', which is the most frequent stative of this group, can be regarded either as a non-prefixed verb, or as a verb with a partly desemanticized prefix of the localization IN (historically, the marker of this localization is *ʔ-*, see Alekseev 1985: 119). Given that the verb *a* synchronically does not have any special association with this particular localization, we gloss it as 'be', not 'IN.be'.

'Be'-statives are used in existential and locational predications, as well as in predicative possession constructions. The verb *a* 'be' is also used in the auxiliary function in a number of periphrastic verb forms, and the verb *ki* 'CONT.be' occurs in the Progressive construction (see section 5.3.2).

(3) *ha-d* *χal-a* ***a*** ***(a-ni*** ***jiʔi).***
that-ATTR(ABS) house-IN be be-CVB 1.COP1
'He is at home (now).'

(4) *za-χda* ***a-ni*** ***w-iʔi*** *mašin.*
I-SUB be-CVB 3-COP1 car(ABS)
'I have a car.'

3.6. 'Remain'-statives

The stem of the verb 'stay, remain, still be' has an infixal gender agreement slot which can be filled by the "strong series" of gender markers, i.e. r~r~b~d: 1 *ma‹r›a*, 2 *ma‹r›a*, 3 *ma‹b›a*, 4 *ma‹d›a*.

In negative forms, the stem is shortened and the final *-a* is dropped, e.g. *ma‹b›-diš*. With the gender marker *-d-*, the combination *-dd-* is simplified, cf. *ma-diš* (< **mad-diš*).

'Remain'-statives are mainly used in locational contexts. The non-prefixed verb *ma‹b›a* is also used in the auxiliary function in continuative constructions (see section 5).

(5) *ha-d* *hele* *χal-a* ***ma‹r›a.***
that-ATTR(ABS) still house-IN <1>remain
'He is still at home.'

This verb stem ‘stay, remain’ is cognate with an adjective *mad-di* ‘another’ and the adverb *ma(ː)da* / *maː* ‘again, more’. Both the adjective and the adverb lack the gender agreement slot in Kina Rutul.

3.7. Verb ‘want, love, need’

Judging from the data from related languages (in particular, Lezgian and Agul), one might expect to find, among the stative verbs of Rutul, such lexical items as ‘know’, ‘want, love’, ‘ache, be ill’, ‘be afraid’ and the like. However, among these verbs, only *hɨgara* which can mean ‘want’, ‘love, like’ and ‘need’, can be identified as a stative verb. Whereas the other candidate verbs all have an inventory of stems typical of canonical verbs (e.g. IPFV / PFV distinction in *hac’a-* / *hac’i-* ‘know’, *gič’e-* / *gič’i-* ‘be afraid’, *jedda-* / *jeddi-* ‘ache, be ill’, etc.), the verb *hɨgara* only has the imperfective stem. From this stem, the same forms are derived as in the paradigm of canonical verbs, i.e. an attributive imperfective form *hɨga-d*, an imperfective converb *hɨga-r(a)* and a few others, and also a number of periphrastic forms; see sections 4–5 on canonical verbs. Unlike the statives, it does not have a converb in *-na* or suffixal negation. In other words, *hɨgara* is a kind of semantically stative, but morphologically “imperfectivum tantum” canonical verb.

The verb *hɨgara* has a prefixal gender agreement slot which can be filled by the “prefixal series” of gender agreement markers, i.e. ∅~r~w~∅.

(6) *rasul-ɨ-s* ***r-ɨga-r=a*** *fat’ima*
Rasul-OBL-DAT 2-love-CVB=be Fatima(ABS)
‘Rasul loves Fatima.’

(7) *za-s* *k’at’* *l-e‹w›šu-s* ***w-ɨga-r=a***
I-DAT hen(ABS) PV-<3>take-INF 3-want-CVB=be
‘I want to buy a hen.’

The lack of certain grammatical forms of the verb *hɨgara* is compensated by the combinations of the converb with the auxiliary verb wɨkɨs ‘be, become’ in a particular verb form, cf. the perfective past *r-ɨga-ra r-iši-r* [2-love-CVB 2-become.PFV-CVB] ‘fell in love (with a girl)’, the future *hɨga-ra hɨkɨ-s-ɨ* [4.want-CVB 4.become-INF-COP] ‘will want (later)’, etc.

4. Canonical verbs: synthetic paradigm

4.1. Overview

Canonical verbs are canonical in the sense that they possess the full set of inflectional stems and the full synthetic paradigm in comparison to morphologically defective, one-stem stative verbs. Semantically, canonical verbs are non-stative in the sense that in some of their inflectional forms they describe events (namely, entry into a state, completion of an event, ongoing telic or atelic process etc.), and not only states, like the statives.

All the synthetic forms of canonical verbs are non-finite forms. The exceptions are the affirmative perfective past (aorist) which is syncretic with the perfective converb, and the affirmative present tense which is syncretic with the imperfective converb. Otherwise, all the indicative forms of canonical verbs are periphrastic and will be described in section 5.

4.2. The stems of canonical verbs

Canonical verbs possess several inflectional stems, from which the synthetic forms are derived. For the description of the indicative subparadigm, we will need to distinguish between the following three stems:

- perfective (PFV) stem, e.g. *hiši-* '4.become.PFV-'
- imperfective (IPFV) stem, e.g. *ruʔu-* '4.become.IPFV-'
- infinitive (INF) stem, e.g. *hɨkɨ-* '4.become.INF-'[7].

None of the stems is predictable from the other two stems, although one of the aspectual stems and the INF stem can be identical. Formally, the stems can be distinguished by a number of morphological means, including the suffixal vocalic marker (e.g. *-i*, *-ɨ* or *-u* in the PFV stem, *-a*, *-e* or *-u* in the IPFV stem), the series of gender agreement marker, or additional infixation (in the IPFV stem). The relation between the stems can also be suppletive, like with the verb 'be, become' illustrated above. See also Table 3 for more examples. For details on the morphological classification of Kina Rutul verb stems, see Daniel et al. (in prep.).

A few non-indicative forms, namely imperative, optative, prohibitive (negative imperative) and negative optative are derived from their own inflectional stems, which cannot be derived from the three stems mentioned above (for details, see Dobrushina, in prep.).

4.2.1. Prefixal negation. Each of the three stems has a negative counterpart, from which all negative synthetic forms are derived. Negative stems are derived by means of a prefix *ǯ-* / *ǯ(V)-*; in prefixal verbs, the negative prefix occurs after the locative preverb. Like gender

[7] Note that in the glosses below, I only mark the PFV and the IPFV stems and do not mark the INF stem as such, as it is always followed by the infinitive suffix *-s*.

prefixes, the negative *ǯ-* ousts the initial *h-* or *j-* of simple verb stems; see examples of negative stems of a few simple verbs in Table 3.

4.2.2. Repetitive prefixation. The repetitive prefix *q-* / *q(V)-* expresses the meaning of repetition proper ('again'), motion backwards and continuation. It can potentially be added to any canonical verb stem, although the meaning is not always predictable (thus, the repetitive verb 'do again' also means 'repair, heal').

(8) *iz-dɨ* *babaj* *ile-s-dɨ* ***q-ile-r=a***
I-ATTR granny(ABS) 4.eat-INF-ATTR(ABS) RE-4.eat.IPFV-CVB=be
'Our Granny eats again (after a period when she was ill and didn't eat.)'

(9) *isk'am-a-la* *jaʁmiš* *q-aʔ,* *je-d* ***q-ile-r=a-diš***
table-OBL(SUP)-EL gather RE-4.do.IMP we-ERG RE-4.eat.IPFV-CVB=be-NEG
'Clean the table, we are not eating any more.'

For the present purposes, the details of the derivation of negative and repetitive stems are not relevant. One thing worth mentioning, however, is a possible idiosyncratic change in the verb stem to which these prefixes attach. In particular, the IPFV stem of the verb 'become' is *ruʔu-*, but with the prefixal negation it looks like *ǯu-ʁuˁ-*, and with the repetitive prefix *qu-ʁuˁ-*.

Table 3. The stems of canonical verbs (examples, Genders 1/4)

Verb	**PFV**	**PFV.neg**	**IPFV**	**IPFV.neg**	**INF**	**INF.neg**
'do'	*hɨʔɨ-*	*ǯ-ɨʔɨ-*	*haʔa-*	*ǯ-aʔa-*	*haʔa-*	*ǯ-aʔa-*
'be, become'	*hiši-*	*ǯ-iši-*	*ruʔu-*	*ǯu-ʁuˁ-*	*hɨkɨ-*	*ǯ-ɨkɨ-*
'eat'	*liʔi-*	*ǯi-li-*	*ile-*	*ǯ-ile-*	*ile-*	*ǯ-ile-*
'give'	*hɨwɨ-*	*ǯ-ɨwɨ-*	*wɨlc'a-*	*ǯi-wɨlca-*	*hɨwɨ-*	*ǯ-ɨwɨ-*
'know'	*hac'ɨ-*	*ǯ-ac'ɨ-*	*hac'a-*	*ǯ-ac'a-*	*hac'a-*	*ǯ-ac'a-*
'say'	*huxu-*	*ǯ-uxu-*	*ruxʷa-*	*ǯu-ruxʷa-*	*huxu-*	*ǯ-uxu-*

4.3. The inventory of forms

There are about two dozens of non-finite forms derived from the three main verb stems (see Table 4). Compared to the paradigm of the statives (Table 2), there are no finite synthetic present and past, and the converb markers are different. However, a number of specialized converbs are the same, and there are also attributive forms from each of the stems.

There are no verbal markers which can be combined with all three verb stems. Some markers can be used only with a particular stem, e.g. the masdar is derived from the PFV stem, and the limitative converb is derived from the IPFV stem. Some markers can be combined both with the PFV and IPFV stems, with a corresponding aspectual distinction between the resulting forms. From the INF stem, only the infinitive proper is derived which is the base for a number of other forms of the paradigm.

Table 4. The synthetic paradigm of canonical verbs (verb ‘do’, Genders 1/4)

Form	**PFV**	**IPFV**	**INF**
Stem	*hɨʔi-*	*haʔa-*	*haʔa-*
General converb	*hɨʔi-r*	*haʔa-r(a)*	–
Temporal converb	*hɨʔi-ga*	*haʔa-ga*	*haʔa-s-dɨ-ga*
Participle (attributive forms)	*hɨʔi-d*	*haʔa-d*	*haʔa-s-dɨ*
Conditional 1	*hɨʔi-de*	*haʔa-de*	*haʔa-s-de*
Converb in *-deqa*	*hɨʔi-deqa*	*haʔa-deqa*	*haʔa-s-deqa*
Anterior converb 1	*hɨʔi-di-la (quʔ)*	*haʔa-di-la (quʔ)*	*haʔa-s-di-la (quʔ)*
Anterior converb 2	*hɨʔi-dʲ-a (quʔ)*	*haʔa-dʲ-a (quʔ)*	*haʔa-s-dʲ-a (quʔ)*
Conditional 2	*hɨʔi-naqun / hɨʔi-naqus*	*haʔa-naqun / haʔa-naqus*	*haʔa-s-naqun / haʔa-s-naqus*
Conditional	*hɨʔi-jne / hɨʔi-ne*	–	–
Concessive	*hɨʔi-jne=xa / hɨʔi-ne=xa*	–	–
Masdar	*hɨʔi-n*	–	–
Possibilitive	*hɨʔi-na*	–	–
Limitative	–	*haʔa-ma*	–
Infinitive	–	–	*haʔa-s*
Limitative 2	–	–	*haʔa-s-nejis / haʔa-s-nes*

In what follows, I comment on the main groups of synthetic forms of canonical verbs.

4.3.1. General converbs. The perfective converb is derived from the PFV stem, and the imperfective converb is derived from the IPFV stem. Their markers are different from that of the stative converb (*-na*). The perfective converb marker is *-r*, while the imperfective is *-ra* in the

autonomous use of the converb and *-r* in periphrastic forms. Both converbs head subordinate adverbial clauses and occur in bound periphrastic forms (see section 5). They are also attested in complements of a few verbs (see Morozova, in prep.). On syntactic properties of general perfective converbs, see Netkachev (2019).

(10) *č'iri-d* *pax^{w}* ***li‹w›i-r***, *χɨnɨχ* ***jiq'i-r=a***
wrong-ATTR mushroom(ABS) <3>eat.PFV-CVB child(ABS) 1.die.PFV-CVB=be
'The boy ate a bad mushroom and died.'

(11) *ma^{ʕ}ʔni* ***haʔa-ra*** (*$^{??}$haʔa-r*) *jiʔi*
song(ABS) 4.do.IPFV-CVB 4.do.IPFV-CVB 1.go.IPFV
'He's walking, singing a song.'

4.3.2. Infinitive. The infinitive is the only form derived from the INF stem. Its suffix is *-s* which is a Proto-Lezgic infinitive/purposive marker ultimately going back to the dative case (Alekseev 1985: 100). The infinitive heads purposive clauses, occurs in complementation and in bound periphrastic forms. It can also head independent clauses with adhortative meaning. The adhortative infinitive seems to be the only synthetic form in the paradigm of canonical verbs which can attach an interrogative marker *-ma*[8].

(12) *na^{ʕ}χa^{ʕ}n* *zɨ* ***jiq'a-s-ma***, ***ǯ-iq'a-s-ma****?*
in.the.evening I(ABS) 1.come-INF-Q NEG-1.come-INF-Q
'Shall I come in the evening, or shall I not?'

4.3.3. Masdar. The masdar is an action nominal. It inflects like a noun, although oblique forms of the masdar are very rare. The masdar occurs in nominalized clauses, including complements of a few verbs and purposive postpositional phrases with *badana* 'for, in order to'.

(13) *p'ap'rɨs* ***d-iʔi-n*** *hɨχ-a* *diš*
cigarette(ABS) 4-pull.PFV-MSD good-ADJ COP.NEG
'Smoking is not good.'

4.3.4. Participles (attributive forms). There are three participles (attributive forms), all derived with an attributive marker. The perfective and the imperfective participles are derived

[8] As such, this property is a side-effect of the "insubordination" (in the sense of Evans (2007: 366)), which resulted in the use of the infinitive in independent clauses: there seems to be simply no other synthetic forms in Rutul which have undergone this kind of development.

from the PFV and IPFV stems, respectively, by means of the marker *-d*. The prospective participle is derived from the infinitive by means of the marker *-dɨ*. When headless, participles inflect according to the attributive declension. Participles head relative clauses and also occur in periphrastic forms. In focus constructions, the predicate takes the participial form.

(14) *ha-nowu-s* ***ǯ-ac'a-d*** *dawar-ar* *ʁ-e‹l›gü-r*
that-OBL.H-DAT NEG-NPL.know.IPFV-ATTR cattle-PL(ABS) PV-<APL>see.PFV-CVB
'He met some unknown cows.'

(15) *huš* *i* ***q-irq'i-d****?*
who(ABS) COP2 RE-1.come.PFV-ATTR
'Who (exactly) arrived?'

4.3.5. Specialized converbs. The main function of specialized converbs is to head subordinate adverbial clauses. Most converbs specify a temporal relation between a secondary situation referred to in the subordinate clause and the main situation described in the main clause. Some specialized converbs can be derived from both aspectual stems and the infinitive, whereas the others are only derived from a single stem. For details on the meaning of specialized converbs, see Netkachev, in prep.

The conditional-temporal converb in *-jne* / *-ne* is derived from the PFV stem. It expresses hypothetical conditional ('if V happens') and the temporal meaning of precedence ('after V happened'). There are three temporal converbs in *-ga*, derived from the PFV and the IPFV stems and also from the prospective participle. The perfective temporal converb expresses the meaning of precedence ('after V happened'), the imperfective one expresses the meaning of simultaneity ('when V is/was happening'), and the prospective temporal converb has the prospective meaning ('when V is/was going to happen').

(16) *rak* *ačiχ* ***hiši-jne****,* *huš-gade=xa* *eč'u-s-ɨ*
door(ABS) open 4.become.PFV-COND who-INDEF(ABS)=ADD IN.1.move-FUT-INF
'If/when the door is open, anyone will (be able to) come in.'

The converbs in *-ma* (derived from the IPFV stem) and in *-nejis* / *-nejs* (derived from the infinitive) both invoke the idea of a temporal limit, 'until V happens'.

(17) *wa-d* ***ile-ma*** *za-d* *güzet* *haʔa-s*
you.SG-ERG 4.eat.IPFV-LIM I-ERG wait 4.do-INF

‘Let me wait while you eat.’

The converbs in *-dila* and *-dʲa* are typically followed by an adverb/postposition *quʔ* ‘after’ and are originally postpositional phrases: *-dila* is the super-elative and *-dʲa* is the in-elative case of attributive forms (with a non-human oblique stem). Each of the two forms is derived from all three participles. Both forms express the meaning of precedence (‘after V happened’), as well as realis conditional meaning.

(18) ***ile-d-ʲa*** ***quʔ***, *ile*
4.eat.IPFV-ATTR(OBL)-IN.EL after eat.IMP
‘If/Since you already started eating, eat.’

The converbs in *-de*, *-deqa* and *-naqus* / *naqun* are each derived from both aspectual stems and the infinitive, but are marginal and rarely used. All of them express a general temporal meaning (‘when V happened/happens/will happen’), as well as hypothetical conditional meaning. The converb in *-de* can also attach the similative marker *=ka(l)*, in which case the combination the meaning of accordance (‘as V happened/happens/will happen’).

(19) *zer* ***w-eza-s-de***, *r-irɬχ* *weza* *waʔ*
cow(ABS) 3-milk-INF-COND1 2-go.IMP 3-milk.IMP 3-do.IMP
‘If you intend to milk the cow, go and do it.’

The “possibilitive form” in *-na* is only attested in dependents of the impersonal predicate *beliki* ‘it is possible that’.

Note that canonical verbs do not have an irrealis converb form in *-(i)jden*; all irrealis (counterfactual) forms of canonical verbs are periphrastic.

5. Periphrastic forms and constructions

5.1. Overview

The indicative system of Kina Rutul consists of periphrastic forms, i.e. forms which include two components, a lexical verb and a postposed auxiliary. Alternatively, one can label the same range of forms as auxiliary verb constructions in the sense of “a mono-clausal structure minimally consisting of a lexical verb element that contributes lexical content to the construction and an auxiliary verb element that contributes some grammatical or functional content to the construction” (Anderson 2006: 7).

Lexical verbs occur in periphrastic forms in one of the following forms:

- general perfective and imperfective converbs,
- infinitive,
- perfective, imperfective and prospective participles.

The main auxiliary verbs are

- the copula (in the short form) *i* and
- the stative verb *a* ‘be (inside)’,

each of which can potentially occur in a periphrastic form in any of its forms. In finite indicative periphrastic forms, *i* and *a* occur either in the present or in the past tense (affirmative or negative); *a* can also occur in its periphrastic forms (*ani wiʔi* etc.).

Besides, a number of peripheral periphrastic constructions are attested with the following auxiliaries:

- the stative verb *ma‹b›a* ‘remain’,
- the stative verb *ki* ‘CONT.be’,
- the canonical verb *hɨkɨs* ‘be, become’.

Only some of the potentially possible combinations of lexical verb forms and auxiliaries are available (e.g. the infinitive does not co-occur with the auxiliary *a*). The forms most commonly used in periphrastic forms and constructions are the two general converbs.

In what follows, I make a distinction between

- bound periphrastic forms, i.e. forms with the auxiliaries *i* and *a*, in which the auxiliaries are more tightly fused with the lexical verb and, as a rule, make one (phonological, morphological) word with the lexical verb[9],
- and looser periphrastic constructions, comprising the other combinations.

To summarize, in my approach to Kina Rutul, I subsume under periphrastic verb forms all those grammatical forms in which a lexical part (non-finite form) and an auxiliary verb are two clearly distinguishable components. Although definitions of prototypical (or canonical) periphrasis commonly assume that the two components should be two different words[10], my approach does not demand this. Individual periphrastic forms occupy different positions along a periphrasis-to-synthesis cline, so some of them can stand quite close to purely synthetic forms. Even being morphologically bound, or almost bound, such forms are still different from those found in the synthetic paradigm, as the latter are not composed of a lexical part and an auxiliary, even diachronically (at least this is no more discernible at the synchronic stage).

[9] This type is similar to what Anderson (2006: Ch.6) calls “complex verb forms from fused auxiliary verb constriuctions”.

[10] Cf. Haspelmath (2000: 655): “*Periphrasis* refers to a situation in which a multi-word expression is used in place of a single word in an inflectional paradigm” or (2000: 660) “A periphrastic expression is simply one which expresses a grammatical meaning in a multi-word construction”.

5.2. Bound periphrastic forms

Bound periphrastic forms consist of a converb, infinitive or participle of a lexical verb and a postposed auxiliary *i* or *a*. The auxiliary is always bound (i.e. encliticized/suffixed) to the verb; I did not manage to find any contexts where any other material, including other clitics, could intervene between the lexical part and the auxiliary.

The finite forms of auxiliaries that occur in periphrastic forms are summarized in Table 5. The copula is used in the short form irrespective of gender. It can occur in the form of the present or the past tense, affirmative or negative. In questions, the question marker also attaches to the auxiliary. The same is true of the auxiliary verb 'be', which has the same forms as in the independent use as a lexical item. Besides synthetic forms, *a* can occur in its periphrastic present or past tense based on converbs. The forms with the present auxiliary *a* are largely equivalent to the forms with *a-ni wiʔi* / *ani i*, and the forms with the past auxiliary *aj* are largely equivalent to the forms with *a-ni wiʔij*/ *ani ij*.

There also seem to exist periphrastic forms with an auxiliary verb *a* in its periphrastic forms based on a participle, i.e. *a-d wiʔi* / *a-d i* / *a-t'-i*. However, they are very marginal, and we do not include them into the paradigm. More research is needed to prove the existence and find out the meaning of these forms.

Table 5. Tense-aspect forms of auxiliary verbs *i* and *a*

Form	**Copula**	**'Be'**
AFFIRMATIVE		
Present	*i*	*a*
Present, interrogative	*i-ma*	*a-ma*
Past	*i-j*	*a-j*
Past, interrogative	*i-j-ma*	*a-j-ma*
NEGATIVE		
Present	*diš*	*a-diš*
Present, interrogative	*diš-ma*	*a-diš-ma*
Past	*diš-ij*	*a-diš-ij*
Past, interrogative	*diš-ij-ma*	*a-diš-ij-ma*
PERIPHRASTIC		
Periphrastic Present	–	*a-ni wiʔi* / *a-ni i*
Periphrastic Past	–	*a-ni wiʔi-j* / *a-ni i-j*

The auxiliary *i* can combine with converbs, infinitive and participles of a lexical verb. The auxiliary *a* can only combine with converbs. Thus, the main periphrastic "series" with the two auxiliaries, and their general meanings, are as follows:

- perfective converb + *i* ‘COP’ AORIST SERIES
- perfective converb + *a* ‘be’ PERFECT SERIES
- imperfective converb + *i* ‘COP’ HABITUAL SERIES
- imperfective converb + *a* ‘be’ PRESENT SERIES
- infinitive + *i* ‘COP’ FUTURE SERIES
- perfective participle + *i* ‘COP’ EXPERIENTIAL SERIES
- imperfective participle + *i* ‘COP’ GENERIC HABITUAL SERIES
- prospective participle + *i* ‘COP’ PROSPECTIVE SERIES

Depending on the form of the auxiliary verb, one can distinguish between the present-tense and the past-tense subsystems of periphrastic forms. In the present-tense subsystem, i.e. when the auxiliary takes the present tense form, all these forms express the meaning which give a name to the series (i.e. aorist, present, perfect, etc.). In the past-tense subsystem, i.e. when the auxiliary takes the past tense form, the resulting forms shift their temporal reference to the past, e.g. the perfect becomes the pluperfect, the present becomes the imperfect, etc. As an example, cf. Table 6 for the list all the finite periphrastic forms belonging to the Aorist, Perfect, Habitual and Present Series. For the full periphrastic paradigm of finite forms, see Table 7.

Table 6. Bound periphrastic forms of the Aorist, Perfect,
Habitual and Present Series (verb ‘do’, Gender 1/4)

Form	**Affirmative**	**Negative**
Aorist	*hɨʔir (< *hɨʔir-i)*	*hɨʔi-r-diš*
Past Aorist	*hɨʔir-ij*	*hɨʔi-r-diš-ij*
Perfect	*hɨʔir=a*	*hɨʔi-r=a-diš*
Perfect (long form)	*hɨʔir ani i (jiʔi)*	–
Pluperfect	*hɨʔir=a-j*	*hɨʔi-r=a-diš-ij*
Pluperfect (long form)	*hɨʔir ani ij (jiʔij)*	–
Present Habitual	*haʔa-r (< *haʔar-i)*	*haʔa-r-diš*
Past Habitual	*haʔa-r-ij*	*haʔa-r-diš-ij*
Present	*haʔa-r=a*	*haʔa-r=a-diš*
Present (long form)	*haʔa-r ani i (jiʔi)*	–
Imperfect	*haʔa-r=a-j*	*haʔa-r=a-diš-ij*
Imperfect (long form)	*haʔa-r ani ij (jiʔij)*	–

Before we proceed to the overview of the meanings of individual forms, three additional observations are in order.

5.2.1. The status of the verb 'be'. The auxiliary *a* is less fused with the lexical verb than the copula *i*. As a rule, *a* is encliticized to the lexical verb, which I mark in glosses with an equals sign (host-clitic boundary). Sometimes, however, *a* can be pronounced as a separate phonetic word (e.g. *haʔar adiš* vs. *haʔar=adiš* 'is not doing'). The "long" present/past with the converb *ani* is usually pronounced as a separate word, although it can be fused with the lexical verb as well. For unification reasons, I always present the auxiliary *a* in its synthetic forms as an enclitic, and in its periphrastic form as a separate word (words).

Given that the marker of the imperfective converb as the head of subordinate clauses has the form *-ra*, the periphrastic Present like *haʔa-r=a* [1.do.IPFV-CVB=be] 'does, is doing' is potentially ambiguous, because the form is syncretic with the converb *haʔa-ra* [1.do.IPFV-CVB] 'while doing'. However, I prefer to treat the affirmative Present as a periphrastic form built on the imperfective *r*-converb with the help of the auxiliary verb *a*, rather than simply as an independent use of the imperfective converb. One reason for this is that, in the other periphrastic forms, the imperfective converb only has the variant *-r*, not *-ra* (cf. e.g. the negative Present Habitual *haʔa-r-diš* [1.do.IPFV-CVB-COP.NEG] 'does', not **haʔa-ra-diš*), which makes *haʔa-r=a* a regular combination of the converb and the verb *a*, too.

5.2.2. The status of the present affirmative copula. The copula as an auxiliary verb is always encliticized/suffixed to the lexical verb. I gloss it simply with a hyphen, i.e. as a suffix. The reason for that is that the copula interacts much tighter with its environment. For example, in periphrastic forms based on (perfective and imperfective) participles, there is an optional phonetic shift from *-d-i* [-ATTR-COP= to *-t'i* in present affirmative forms. In the Future, the copula has an irregular variant *-ɨ* instead of *-i*, e.g. *haʔas-ɨ* 'will do' (< *haʔas-i*). The same variant is found in interrogative forms based on converbs, cf. *hɨʔɨr-ɨ-ma*, *haʔar-ɨ-ma*[11].

The major problem with the copula in periphrastic forms is the syncretism of the affirmative Aorist, the most frequent finite past tense of Kina Rutul, with the affirmative perfective converb. The same holds true of the Present Habitual, which however is a relatively peripheral form of the paradigm, see below. The Aorist, as well as the Present Habitual, seem to never occur with an auxiliary verb (??*hɨʔɨr-i*, ??*haʔar-i*), and attempts at the elicitation of such forms usually lead to their perception as corresponding past tenses (i.e. *hɨʔɨr-ij*, *haʔar-ij*) by our consultants. As such, the syncretism of non-finite forms, in particular converbs, with finite tenses is a common phenomenon in Nakh-Daghestanian languages (see e.g. discussion of the Lezgic past tenses in Maisak (2014)). Still, in the case of the Kina Rutul forms in question, it seems preferable to speak of the loss of the affirmative present copula (*i* proper) than of the reanalysis

[11] In forms of verbs with an aspectual vocalic marker *-u* (e.g. *lešur-ɨ-ma* 'did s/he take?', *ʁagur-ɨ-ma* 'did s/he see?'), labialization of the copula may happen in interrogative forms (cf. [lešuruma], [ʁaguruma]).

of a converb as a finite tense. The reasons for that are the following (see also examples (20) and (21)):

- negative counterparts of the Aorist and the Present Habitual include a negative auxiliary *diš*, which is not a possible negative form of a converb (which only has prefixal negation),
- interrogative present forms of the Aorist and the Present Habitual do include a copula, which takes an irregular variant *-i* (*hiʔirimi*, *haʔarimi*); if these forms were just the uses of converbs, one would expect the interrogative *-ma* to attach directly to a converb, as it happens with the infinitive in independent clauses.

(20) *did* ***q-irq'i-r-i-ma****?*
father(ABS) RE-1.come.PFV-CVB-COP-Q
ej, ***q-irq'i-r***
yes RE-come.PFV-CVB
'Did Father come?' – 'Yes, he came.'

(21) *wa-s* *timur* ***hac'a-r-i-ma****?*
you.SG-DAT Timur(ABS) 1.know.IPFV-CVB-COP-Q
hac'a-r-diš
1.know.IPFV-CVB-COP.NEG
'Do you know Timur?' – 'I don't.'

The final argument comes from dialectal comparison: for the Aorist form, most sources mention the presence of the final *i* (i.e. the copula), at least optionally. For example, Alekseev (1994: 230–231), after describing the paradigm of Luchek Rutul tenses derived from two converbs ("gerunds", in his terms) and the infinitive, states that "[t]he auxiliary verb may be omitted", providing minimal pairs of all three finite tenses with the present tense copula *i*, namely *sartar i* // *sartar* 'he leaves' (present), *satir i* // *satir* 'he left', *satas i* // *satas* 'he will leave'. For Mukhad Rutul, Dirr (1912: 54, 56, 57, 82–84) describes the past tense in *-ri* which he calls "Perfectum historicum", while the converb has simply the suffix *-r*. Makhmudova (1991, 2001) also mentions only the variant with the final *-i* for the "simple past". In Ibragimov's (1978) description, sample paradigms for all the five dialects include the past tense with the final *-i*; from the labels the author gives it is not always clear, however, which forms are structural equivalents of the Aorist.

The same holds true of the form built on the imperfective converb which I label the Present Habitual. Besides Alekseev, who notes the (optional) presence of the copula *i* in Luchek Rutul

periphrastic form, the corresponding forms in the Borch-Khnov dialect all include a copula, which has a short form with gender prefix (namely, *i* 1/4, *ri* 2 and *wi* 3). Thus, according to Ibragimov (1978: 273), Gender 1/4 forms of the verb 'beat' are *ʁixir i* (Aorist), *ʁinsänä i* (Present), *ʁixis i* (Future). Interestingly, in the Ikhrek dialect some tenses possess the suffixal gender agreement slot, which results from the fusion of a lexical verb with an agreeing copula, cf. the present tense forms *sartar-ij* 1/4, *sarartar-ir* 2, *sawartar-uw* 3 'leaves' which are composed of the imperfective converb and a suffixed copula (Ibragimov 1978: 220).

To conclude, I treat it as a peculiarity of Kina Rutul that the auxiliary verb *i* has zero realization in one particular context (namely, present affirmative) when combined with perfective and imperfective converbs.

5.2.3. Negation on the lexical verb. Negation in periphrastic forms is expressed on the auxiliary verb. However, as described in section 3 above, every non-finite verb form has a prefixal negative counterpart. Thus, negative converbs, participles and the infinitive can also occur in periphrastic forms. All four theoretically possible combinations are indeed attested:

- affirmative lexical verb form + affirmative auxiliary, i.e. standard affirmative periphrastic forms (e.g. the Present *haʔar=a* 'is doing'),
- affirmative lexical verb form + negative auxiliary, i.e. standard negative periphrastic forms (e.g. the negative Present *haʔar=adiš* 'is not doing'),
- negative lexical verb form + affirmative auxiliary, a form which states the existence of some negatively defined situation (e.g. the Present *ǯ-aʔar=a* 'is not doing' = 'it is true that not-doing happens'),
- negative lexical verb form + negative auxiliary, i.e. a "double negative" form (e.g. *ǯaʔar=adiš* 'is really doing'='it is not true that not-doing happens').

The last two forms are very peripheral and do not occur in our corpus, although they are judged acceptable in elicitation.

(22) *mi* *χɨnɨχ* *hijis* ***ǯ-alga-t'-i*** ***(ǯ-alga-r=a)?***
this child(ABS) why NEG-1.talk.IPFV-ATTR-COP NEG-1.talk.IPFV-CVB=be
ha-nuw-da: *halga-s* *ruʔu-r-diš.*
that-OBL.H-APUD.EL 1.talk-INF 1.become.IPFV-CVB-COP.NEG
'Why is the child keeping silent (is not talking)?' – 'He can't talk.'

(23) a. *ha-now-a* *ile-s-dɨ* ***liʔi-r=a-diš***
that-OBL.H-ERG 4.eat-INF-ATTR(ABS) 4.eat.PFV-CVB=be-NEG

‘He hasn’t eaten (yet).’ {e.g. someone calls my son, and I explain that he has to eat and will be able to leave after that}

b. *ha-now-a* *ile-s-dɨ* ***ǯ-ili-r=a***
that-OBL.H-ERG 4.eat-INF-ATTR(ABS) NEG-4.eat.PFV-CVB=be

‘He didn’t eat (at all today).’ {e.g. the father the son and the son left; the mother says to her husband that the child didn’t eat anything.}

Table 7. Bound periphrastic forms (verb ‘do’, Gender 1/4)

Structure	**Perfective subsystem**	**Imperfective subsystem**	**Infinitive subsystem**
CVB / INF + *i*, prs	*hiʔi-r(-i)*	*haʔa-r(-i)*	*haʔa-s-ɨ*
CVB / INF + *i*, prs.neg	*hiʔi-r-diš*	*haʔa-r-diš*	*haʔa-s-diš*
	Aorist	**Present Habitual**	**Future**
CVB / INF + *i*, pst	*hiʔi-r-ij*	*haʔa-r-ij*	*haʔa-s-ij*
CVB / INF + *i*, pst.neg	*hiʔi-r-diš-ij*	*haʔa-r-diš-ij*	*haʔa-s-diš-ij*
	Past Aorist	**Past Habitual**	**Irrealis**
CVB + *a*, prs	*hiʔi-r=a*	*haʔa-r=a*	–
CVB + *a*, prs (long)	*hiʔi-r a-ni i (jiʔi)*	*haʔa-r a-ni i (jiʔi)*	–
CVB + *a*, prs.neg	*hiʔi-r a-diš*	*haʔa-r a-diš*	–
	Perfect	**Present**	
CVB + *a*, pst	*hiʔi-r=aj*	*haʔa-r=a-j*	–
CVB + *a*, pst (long)	*hiʔi-r a-ni ij*	*haʔa-r a-ni ij*	–
CVB + *a*, pst.neg	*hiʔi-r a-diš-ij*	*haʔa-r a-diš-ij*	–
	Pluperfect	**Imperfect**	
ATTR + *i*, prs	*hiʔi-t’-i*	*haʔa-t’-i*	*haʔa-s-dɨ i*
ATTR + *i*, prs.neg	*hiʔi-d-diš*	*haʔa-d-diš*	*haʔa-s-dɨ diš*
	Experiential	**Generic Habitual**	**Prospective**
ATTR + *i*, pst	*hiʔi-t’-ij*	*haʔa-t’-ij*	*haʔa-s-dɨ ij*
ATTR + *i*, pst.neg	*hiʔi-d-diš-ij*	*haʔa-d-diš-ij*	*haʔa-s-dɨ diš-ij*
	Past Experiential	**Past Generic**	**Past Prospective**

5.3. Periphrastic constructions

In periphrastic constructions, auxiliary verbs do not fuse with lexical verbs. Among the auxiliaries there are two more stative verbs, *ma‹b›a* ‘remain’ and *ki* ‘CONT.be’. Also, a canonical

verb *wɨkɨs* ‘be, become, happen’ can be used as an auxiliary, although constructions with this verb are not very common in Kina Rutul.

5.3.1. Continuative constructions with *ma‹b›a* ‘remain’. The combination of the imperfective converb with the auxiliary verb *ma‹b›a* ‘remain’ expresses the continuative, or “persistive” meaning ‘still does’. The construction is available with various syntactic classes of verbs.

(24) *ha-now-dɨ* *χil* ***jedda-ra*** ***ma‹d›a-ni*** ***i***
that-OBL.H-ATTR hand(ABS) 4.ache.IPFV-CVB <4>remain-CVB COP2
‘His hand is still aching.’

(25) *χɨnχ-ɨ-s* *ubl-ešij-la* ***gič’e-ra*** ***ma‹r›a***
child-OBL-DAT wolf-OBL.PL(SUP)-EL be.afraid.IPFV-CVB <1>remain
‘The child is still afraid of wolves.’

(26) *did-e* *kaʁat* *hele=xa* ***kilxe-ra*** ***ma‹r›a***
father-ERG letter(ABS) still=ADD 4.write.IPFV-CVB <1>remain
‘Father is still writing the letter.’

Combinations of *ma‹b›a* ‘remain’ with other forms of lexical verb do not yield periphrastic constructions: e.g. perfective converbs with *ma‹b›a* are perceived as subordinate clauses expressing precedence and infinitives with *ma‹b›a* are perceived as purposive clauses.

5.3.2. Progressive construction with *ki* ‘CONT.be’. Another construction with aspectual meaning includes the imperfective converb and the stative verb *ki* ‘CONT.be’. The construction has a progressive meaning and describes an ongoing process.

(27) *χal* ***haʔa-ra*** ***ki-diš****-ma?*
house(ABS) 4.do.IPFV-CVB CONT.be-NEG-Q
‘(You) are not building a house?’

(28) *did-e* *kaʁat* ***kilxe-ra*** ***ki***
father-ERG letter(ABS) 4.write.IPFV-CVB CONT.be
‘Father is (already) writing the letter.’

5.3.3. Constructions with *wɨkɨs* 'be, become'. The verb *wɨkɨs* 'be, become, happen' is a canonical existential verb. In particular, it occurs in those context where the copula could be expected, but which are not available to the copula due to its defective morphology (see above). Besides, with a complement headed with the infinitive, *wɨkɨs* has the meaning 'can, be able' and becomes a bivalent verb (with an apud-essive subject), see (22).

In general, *wɨkɨs* has the following (semi-)auxiliary uses in Kina Rutul:

- as a light verb in intransitive complex verbs (in combination with non-verbal lexical parts) like *dagul wɨkɨs* 'hide',
- as an inchoative auxiliary verb in combination with the imperfective participle, especially with verbs like 'know', 'be afraid', 'want, love' (cf. *hac'ara hišir* 'learned', *jeddara hišir* 'started aching', *gič'era hišir* 'got frightened' etc.),
- as an auxiliary verb in periphrastic constructions with tense-aspect and modal meaning.

The latter function is, however, very marginally represented in Kina Rutul in comparison to some related languages (e.g. Agul or Tsakhur). Potentially *wɨkɨs* could be expected occur as an auxiliary in any of its forms and in combination with any form of a lexical verb (i.e. converb, participle or infinitive). However, I only managed to elicit a few examples where such combinations can be interpreted as periphrastic tenses. In most other cases, combinations of two verbs are perceived as two predications; combinations with the lexical verb in the infinitive are interpreted as involving a modal verb 'can'.

The construction "imperfective converb + aorist" has a broad imperfective (progressive or habitual) meaning in the past, 'was doing' or 'used to do'. The construction describes a process within a temporally bound interval in the past ('for some time').

(29) *za-χda* *edemi* *jirq'ɨ-r=a-j,*
I-SUB man(ABS) 1.come.PFV-CVB=be-PST
zɨ *zer* ***w-eza-ra*** ***hiši-r***
I(ABS) cow(ABS) 3-milk.IPFV-CVB 1.become.PFV-CVB(AOR)
'A man came to me, and I was milking a cow (at that moment).'

(30) *mahaˁmad* *za-χda* ***ruʔu-ra*** ***hiši-r***,
Muhammad(ABS) I-SUB 1.come.IPFV-CVB 1.become.PFV-CVB(AOR)
hɨmiʔ *qu-ʁuˁ-r-diš*
now RE-1.come.IPFV-CVB-COP.NEG
'Muhammad used to come to me (from time to time), now he does not come.'

(31) *kumag* ***haʔa-ra*** ***hiši-r***, *q-aˁ‹r›χɨ-r*
help(ABS) 4.do.IPFV-CVB 1.become.PFV-CVB(AOR) RE-<1>leave.PFV-CVB(AOR)
'(He) helped me a bit, and then left.'

Constructions with the imperfective converb and other forms of the auxiliary express the same basic aspectual meaning, cf. (32) with the auxiliary in the temporal-conditional converb.

(32) *za-d* *gʷalaχ* ***w-aʔa-ra*** ***w-iši-jne***,
I-ERG work(ABS) 3-do.IPFV-CVB 3-become.PFV-COND
za-s *šijibɨr* *hɨwɨ-s-ɨ*
I-DAT money.PL(ABS) NPL.give-INF-FUT
'If I will be working (for some time), they will give me money.'

According to some consultants, combinations of both converbs with the auxiliary *hɨkɨsɨ* in the Future yield modal (possibilitive) interpretation.

(33) *gʷalaχ* ***w-aʔa-ra*** ***hɨkɨ-s-ɨ***
work(ABS) 3-do.IPFV-CVB 1.become-INF-FUT
'(He) is probably working.'

(34) *did-e* ***liʔi-r*** ***hɨkɨ-s-ɨ***
father-ERG 4.eat.PFV-CVB 1.become-INF-FUT
'The Father has probably eaten.'

6. Conclusion

In the paper, I have presented for the first time the description of the verb paradigm in Kina Rutul, with special reference to the indicative system. The description follows the bottom-up approach. First, I make a distinction between the stative verbs with a reduced paradigm and morphologically canonical verbs with a fuller paradigm. I present the inventory and the paradigm of statives, some of which play a key role in the derivation of periphrastic forms. For canonical verbs, I proceed from the main derivational stems to the synthetic forms derived from them. Then I describe the structure of periphrastic forms, which are composed of a non-finite form and an auxiliary, and identify the main "series" of periphrastic forms. Many periphrastic forms, in particular those including the copula *i* and the stative verb *a* 'be (inside)', are already close to synthetic forms on the periphrasis–synthesis continuum. Hence, they are labelled "bound periphrastic forms". Besides periphrastic forms with these two auxiliaries, there are a few

constructions with the auxiliaries ‘remain’, ‘CONT.be’ and ‘be, become, happen’ which mainly express aspectual meanings.

In general, the verb system of Rutul is not exceptional if compared to verb systems of the other Lezgic languages, as all of them possess an aspectual distinction between perfective vs. imperfective stems, as well as a range of synthetic and periphrastic forms. A peculiarity of Kina Rutul is that its indicative system comprises only (historically) periphrastic forms; there are no affixal indicative forms which do not go back to a periphrastic construction. Another prominent feature of Kina Rutul verb system is the syncretism of the main perfective past tense (aorist) with the perfective converb in *-r*, and the syncretism of the main present tense with the imperfective converb in *-ra*. As I argue, historically both forms included a copula, but in the modern language the present affirmative copula *i* in periphrastic forms based on converbs has zero realization.

Abbreviations

1, 2, 3, 4 – genders; ABS – absolutive; ADD – additive; ADJ – adjective (co-verbal form); AOR – aorist; APL – animate plural; APUD – localization ‘near’; ATTR – attributive; COND – conditional; CONT – localization ‘in contact’; COP – copula; CVB – converb; DAT – dative; EL – elative; ERG – ergative; FUT – future; H – human; IMP – imperative; IN – localization ‘inside’; INDEF – indefinite; INF – infinitive; IPFV – imperfective; LIM – limitative; MSD – masdar; NEG – negation; NPL – non-humal plural; OBL – oblique; PFV – perfective; PL – plural; PST – past; PV – preverb; Q – question; RE – refactive; SG – singular; SUB – localization ‘under’; SUP – localization ‘on’.

References

Alekseev, Mikhail E. 1985. *Voprosy sravnitel´no-istoricheskoj grammatiki lezginskix jazykov. Morfologija. Sintaksis* [The problems of comparative-historical reconstruction of the grammar of Lezgic languages: Morphology. Syntax]. Moscow: Nauka.

Alekseev, Mikhail E. 1994. Rutul. In Rieks Smeets (ed.), *The Indigenous languages of the Caucasus. Vol. 3. North East Caucasian languages. Part 2*, 213–258. Delmar N.Y.: Caravan.

Anderson, Gregory D. S. 2006. *Auxiliary verb constructions*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Daniel, Michael, Nina Dobrushina & Polina Nasledskova. In prep. The structure of verb stems. In Michael Daniel, Nina Dobrushina & Timur Maisak (eds), *Studies in Kina Rutul*.Dirr, Adolf M. 1912. Rutul′skij jazyk [The Rutul language]. *Sbornik materialov dlja opisanija mestnostej i plemen Kavkaza*. XLII. Tiflis.

Dobrushina, Nina. In prep. Volitional moods. In Michael Daniel, Nina Dobrushina & Timur Maisak (eds), *Studies in Kina Rutul*.

Evans, Nicholas. 2007. Insubordination and its uses. In Irina Nikolaeva (ed.), *Finiteness: Theoretical and empirical foundations*, 366–431. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Haspelmath, Martin. 2000. Periphrasis. In Geert E. Booij, Christian Lehmann & Joachim Mugdan (eds.), *Morphology: A handbook on inflection and word formation*, 654–664. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Ibragimov, Garun X. 1978. *Rutul´skij jazyk* [Rutul]. Moscow: Nauka.

Ibragimov, Garun X. 2004. *Rutul´skij jazyk: Sinxronija i diaxronia* [Rutul: Synchrony and diachrony]. Makhachkala: Narody Dagestana.

Kibrik, Aleksandr E. & Sandro V. Kodzasov. 1990. *Sopostavitel´noe izučenie dagestanskix jazykov: Imja. Fonetika* [The comparative study of Daghestanian languages: Noun. Phonetics.] Moscow: Izdatel′stvo Moskovskogo universiteta.

Konovalova, Alexandra. 2019. Questions in Kina Rutul. *WP BRP, Series: Linguistics*, 84/LNG/2019. https://wp.hse.ru/data/2019/12/06/1520810040/84LNG2019.pdf

Maisak, Timur. 2014. Glagol´nye sistemy lezginskix jazykov: struktura, semantika i puti razvitija perfektivnyx form [Verb systems of the Lezgic languages: structure, semantics and diachronic development of perfective forms]. *Vestnik Instituta jazyka, literatury i iskusstva im. G. Cadasy* 6: 26—42.

Maisak, Timur. In prep. Adjectives; Attributivization; Attributive declension.In Michael Daniel, Nina Dobrushina & Timur Maisak (eds), *Studies in Kina Rutul*.Makhmudova, Svetlana M. 1991. Sistema prošedšix vremen rutul´skogo glagola [The system of past tenses of the Rutul verb]. In Zapir Abdullaev (ed.), *Vyraženie vremennyx otnošenij v jazykax Dagestana*, 144–148. Makhachkala: IJaLi.

Makhmudova, Svetlana M. 2001. *Morfologija rutul´skogo jazyka* [Morphology of the Rutul language]. Moscow: Sovetskij pisatel´.

Morozova, Valeria A. 2019. *Klassnoe soglasovanie v kininskom dialekte rutul´skogo jazyka* [Gender Agreement in Kina Rutul]. BA term paper, HSE University.

Morozova, Valeria. In prep. Complementation. In Michael Daniel, Nina Dobrushina & Timur Maisak (eds), *Studies in Kina Rutul*.Nasledskova, Polina. In prep. Semantics of preverbs. In Michael Daniel, Nina Dobrushina & Timur Maisak (eds), *Studies in Kina Rutul*.Netkachev, Ivan. 2019. Syntax of general converb in Rutul. WP BRP, Series: Linguistics, 87/LNG/2019. https://wp.hse.ru/data/2019/12/06/1520818547/87LNG2019.pdf

Netkachev, Ivan. In prep. Semantics of converbs. In prep. In Michael Daniel, Nina Dobrushina & Timur Maisak (eds), *Studies in Kina Rutul*.

Timur Maisak
HSE University, Linguistic Convergence Laboratory, Leading Research Fellow;
E-mail: tmaisak@hse.ru