

GILLES AUTHIER (INaLCO, Paris)

From adlocative case to debitive mood without desubordination

A finite modal form with debitive meaning is found in both Kryz and Budugh, most often ending in *-u* which seems to be the nominal adlocative case marker. Budugh uses the same form as a nominalized, non finite form, while Kryz does not. This seems to indicate that the grammaticalization process by which a case, when added to a verb stem, may come to express modality, does not necessarily imply a nominalized stage followed by desubordination.

0. Introduction: case on verbs

East-Caucasian languages make occasional use of case markers on verb forms to express various sorts of subordination or modal values. This is not a rare phenomenon cross-linguistically¹; but, as noted by AIKHENVALD (2008), nominal and verbal uses of polycategorial morphemes are not described jointly (that is, under a unified label) in grammars, because their functions are distributed along different chapters dealing with respective word classes. Even when the identity of the morphemes leaves no doubt, one needs to explain how nominal function may become verbal categories, especially on finite forms. The explanation has to be diachronic, and one should take a comparative stance: the footsteps of the semantic-syntactic drift shall be looked for and put in perspective by picking them in various related languages.

Linguists working on Australian languages (see BLAKE 1999) have proposed a grammaticalisation path that may be called ‘reanalysis’ or ‘ellipsis-postulate’ by a nominal function (case) has become a finite mood category on verb-forms *via* subordination. EVANS (2007) describes the process in more detail:

‘If a case morpheme occurs on a verb root, it starts a grammaticalisation process from marker of interclausal relation (like it acts as a marker of grammatical relation on a noun phrase headed by a nominal root) that is as a clause-linker; then, provided a further process of ellipsis and desubordination, it may end up as aspect or mood marker. When a dependent clause becomes reinterpreted as a main clause via ellipsis, the case morphemes are reinterpreted as a modality markers. If the construction is no

¹ The argument developed in this paper was presented at a conference in Paris, in December 2006, before the publication of EVANS (2007) and AIKHENVALD (2008). EVANS applies the term ‘insubordination’ to the main clause use of what formally looks like subordinate clauses; AIKHENVALD gives more examples of ‘desubordinated’ case-marked verb-forms with modal value. These studies have nurtured our reflexion with more parallel examples and theoretical elaboration and we draw on them, but we are entirely responsible for the precise facts and conclusions put forward here. I am also thankful to TIMUR MAISAK, ELENA KALININA and YURY LANDER for useful remarks and discussions.

longer elliptical (that is, if the ellipsed verb does not have to be supplied for the clause to be grammatical), new tense–aspect–mood paradigms emerge. Clausal categories of mood can thus historically originate from cases as clause-linkers.

In Lezgif, case markers, although primarily nominal morphemes indicating the function of a *noun* phrase in a clause, may likewise appear on *verbal* forms, and such ‘versatile’ cases (AIKHENVALD 2008), while expressing various dependency relationships between clauses, by way of nominalizations, may also render aspectual or modal meanings in a main clause, on finite forms. In (AUTHIER 2010), I have shown for example that the common Lezgif inessive marker *-a*’ is found suffixed to imperfective verb stems to form a simultaneous converb in Rutul, Kryz and Budugh². This converb is the same form used as an ‘eventual’ finite form with habitual or uncommitted future meanings, in Kryz and Budugh only. The present article will investigate another such case.

One of the most common semantic correspondences between the same morpheme as marker of the function of a noun phrase and as clause-linking or mood-marking device is the goal- or dative-marking on a noun phrase and purposive mood or purposive clause linker (see HASPELMATH 1989). In Lezgif, the dative morpheme *-s* has long ago been recognized as a marker of future (see Maisak, this volume). The morpheme at issue in the following pages has much in common semantically with the dative, but it belongs to the spatial subparadigm and is called ‘adlocative’. It became grammaticalised as an alternative recipient-marking case in two branches (Eastern and Southern) of Lezgif and in the two languages of the Southern sub-branch (Budugh and Kryz) it provides a debitive mood ; in Budugh only, it is also used as a nominalised, infinitive-like form.

The first section gives an overview of the adlocative marker on nominals, from its spatial adpositional origin to its grammaticalized use as a temporary recipient marking function in ditransitive predicate clauses. The second section presents the imperfective verb-forms marked with adlocative case in Budugh and their wide syntactic domain as verbal noun (*masdar*) and finite form (debitive). The third and last section shows that the same form in Kryz has only finite (debitive) value, a fact which speaks against the ‘desubordination’, ‘disembedding’ or ‘ellipsis’ hypothesis.

1. The Adlocative case in Lezgif context

² Budugh and Kryz form the Southern branch of Lezgif, and are spoken in Azerbaijan only, by at most 200 speakers for Budugh and maybe 2000 fluent speakers for the three distinct dialects of Kryz. Despite generalized bilingualism in Azerbaijani, they preserve typically Daghestanian features. All Kryz forms and examples are from the Alik dialect, for which my main informant is MAJLIS SHAMSEDDINOV; Budugh data were generously provided by ADIGOEZEL HAJIEV; both are warmly thanked for their invaluable collaboration.

Two sets of cases are found in all core Lezgian languages: grammatical cases and the spatial paradigm. ALEKSEEV (1997) offered a reconstruction of spatial cases which applies for various branches of the Daghestanian languages, and is especially convincing for the languages of the Lezgian branch. Proto-Lezgian seems to have had a system of up to eight ‘locative’ case-markers (IN: -’; SUB: -kl’; POST: -q^(w); AD: -kl^w; SUPER: -l; INTER: -q^s; CONT: -k; ANTE: -h).

The localization markers became reduced to five in Kryz (cf. Authier 2009): IN: -’; SUB/CONT: -k’; POST>APUD -χ^w; AD: -v; INTER > SUPER: -b^s).

Budugh has lost one more spatial case (SUPER) and uses the remaining ones: IN: -’; SUB: -k; APUD -χ^w; AD: -u, mostly with syntactic value (the concrete localisations are expressed by new postpositions).

The following table gives the five localisations found in Kryz (four of them shared by Budugh) and their Lezgian and Archi counterparts, after the reconstructed etyma:

	Proto-Lezgian	Archi	Agul	Lezgian	Rutul	Kryz	Budugh
IN	*-’	-a	-a’	-a	-a	-a	-a’
POST/APUD	*-q ^(w)	-q	-q	-q	-q	-χ ^w	-u/oχ
INTER/SUPER	*-q ^s	∅	-b ^s	∅	∅	-b ^s	∅
SUB	*-kl’	-kl’	-kk	-k	-k	-k	-k
AD	*-l:w	-l:u	-w	-v	-x ^(w)	-v/u	-u/o

The adlocative is found in all core Lezgian languages plus Archi with its original spatial meaning, but its functional (metaphoric) extension outside of the spatial domain varies and is dealt with in the next sub-section.

1.1. Semantic and syntactic range of the adlocative marker in Archi

Archi³, a language spoken in a single village North of the region where all other languages of the Lezgian branch are found as a compact area, is in many respects one of the most archaic of them, but is usually considered as an outlier, genetically speaking. Nevertheless, its case system has much in common with the three sub-branches which constitute ‘core Lezgian’. It has a case marker -l:u which shows a narrow range of meanings: temporary apudessive, along with comitative and instrumental interpretations:

- (1) *is gel halmaxmu-l:u ex:uli i*
 my jug(N) friend-COM N.remain.PF N.COP
 ‘My jug remained at my friend’s’.

³ Archi examples with number references are drawn from the Archi Electronic Corpus (Arkhipov *et alii*); others are from the online Archi Dictionary by TCHOUMAKINA & al, checked and revised by TCHOUMAKINA.

- (2) *tʷak* *u<w>χ-u-li* *ju-w* *lo* *χu* *ħanna-ħu*
 near <m>lie.down-pf-cvb this-m lad m.find.pf woman.obl-com
 ‘This lad was lying next to the woman.’ (22.117)
- (3) *noklʼ-a* *d-i-t:u-r* *qiri-li-ħu* *jamu-r* *lo*
 house-in 2-be-ATR-2 old.woman-obl-com that-2 girl
 ‘(They) would let the girl at home with an old woman (to keep her)’ (05-007)
- (4) *zari* *kʼas:a-ħu* *aklʼ* *artʼur-ši* *i*
 1.ERG knife-COM meat.N N.cut.IPF-CV N.COP
 ‘I cut the meat with a knife’.

This case, called by specialists of Archi ‘comitative’, is related to the adverb and postposition *tʷa* ‘together; with’ which can be used redundantly: *zallu ħwa* ‘with me’. It is also recognizable as a preverb on a few Archi verbs like the following:

- (5) *čʼabo-vu* *buc:ʼo-vi* *ħoχʼu*
 sheep-and cattle-and (PV=with, together)mix.PF
 ‘The sheep and the cattle mixed’.

The Archi comitative obviously continues the localization-marker found in other languages of the Lezgian family, and it is used only with concrete meaning. In the Western branch of core-Lezgian, the adlocative morpheme is a bit more elusive, but it should be recognized in the Rutul adlocative marker *-x(di)* and as a base in the comitative markers of both Rutul (*-xʷan*) and Tsakhur (*-kan*). Thus the semantic spectrum is similar to that of Archi. In other core Lezgian languages, this marker has another syntactic value (recipient-marking) which should be considered a common innovation.

1.2. Differential recipient-marking in Eastern and Southern Lezgian

Many Daghestanian languages show a rare syntactic phenomenon called ‘split Recipient alignment’ or ‘differential recipient-marking’. According to DANIEL et al. (2009) the high elaboration of space semantics in these languages accounts for the grammaticalisation of this phenomenon. Goal-distinctions are numerous enough to afford to use one of them for a special semantic type of recipient, and

‘give’-verbs in the languages of the East Caucasian family distinguish between two types of transfer by breaking down the Recipient role into two case-marking strategies which are called dative and lative, respectively, where other languages make lexical distinctions (‘give’ vs. ‘lend’). Dative vs. lative Recipients contrast ‘give forever, offer’ vs. ‘give for a while, lend to someone, hand’ types of situations, respectively [...]

The adlocative case has extended its functional value to non-permanent recipient marking in two branches of core-Lezgian: Eastern, and Southern. We now address this phenomenon as manifested in one dialect of Lezgian (Eastern branch) and in Kryz and Budugh (the two languages constituting the Southern branch).

In Lezgian dialects of Azerbaijan, the adlocative case is used as a spatial essive or lative case (we call this syncretism ‘locative’), usually with verbs showing historically related preverbs⁴. It is also found with the locational copula *gwa* ‘be close’, which is also based on the morpheme **hw-*:

- (6) *ima-n qač:q:an.di-v agat-na*
 3-and cauldron-AD approach-SEQ
 ‘He came close to the cauldron.’

- (7) *dana-ar.i-v gwaa danarqan*
 calf-PL-AD be.at.PART calf_breeder
 ‘A keeper of calves who was tending the calves.’

- (8) *röx aždahan.di-v gwaadja*
 mill dragon-AD be.at.CONSTAT
 ‘The mill is [now] occupied by a dragon.’

Secondarily, the Lezgian adlocative denotes a non-permanent recipient governed by verbs like *vigun* ‘give (not permanently)’ or *vaxk:un* < **va-χ-gun* ‘give back’, which show the same adessive morpheme frozen as preverbs:

- (9) *kul viga-na in p:up:a ruš.a-v*
 broom give-AOR this woman.ERG girl-AD
 ‘This woman gave the broom to the girl.’

- (10) *dokument-ar vaxk:a-na jesi.di-v*
 document-PL give.back-AOR owner-AD
 ‘He gave back the documents to their owner.’

In contrast, the beneficiary of permanent transfer verbs like *gun* ‘give (permanently)’ is expressed by the dative case in -z (note the absence of a preverb):

- (11) *va-z ada qizil-ar p:ara ga-na*
 2-DAT 3.ERG gold-PL much give-AOR
 ‘He gave you too many gold coins.’

⁴ Lezgian data are from BABALIYEVA (2007). In literary Lezgian this concrete notion is usually assumed by the postposition *ppattav* ‘near’, which is itself the Adessive form of a noun originally meaning ‘flank’, cf. HASPELMATH 1993.

In Southern Lezxic, preverbs are well alive, and the correlate preverb of the adlocative marker is one of them. In Kryz, the adlocative case correlates with the preverb *va-*, which retains its original spatial Adessive or Adlative meaning:

- (12) *vul-be-r* *q'il* *q'ali-v* *va-j-dži* *q:a-lt'al-e*
 sheep-PL-ERG head head-AD PV-lean-SEQ PV-stay-PRS
 'The sheep stand with their head leaning against each other.'

Like in Lezgian, the Kryz Adlocative case is also used for temporary Recipients: the same verb *vujic* 'give' denotes a permanent transfer of possession with the dative marking in *-z* and non-permanent transfer of possession with the adlocative case in *-v*:

- (13) *div.ul-ir* *sa-d* *šuša* *q:ari-v* / *q:ari-z* *vuts're*
 demon-ERG one-N bottle old.wife-AD / old.wife-DAT give-PRS
 'The demon lends / gives a bottle to the old woman'.

In Budugh, which is closely related to Kryz, the Adlocative case has not lost its concrete value, either essive or lative:

- (14) *k'ul-džo* *halma* *šej-ri* *da-d*
 house-AD such thing-PL neg-NPL
 'In the house no such things exist.'

- (15) *furi* *k'ul-džo* *čavar-da*
 man.NOM house-AD go.IPF-WHEN
 'When the man was nearing the house...'

2. Adlocative marking on verbs and the Budugh 'masdar',

The grammaticalization of oriented spatial cases or 'allative', as a variant of dative, is common to denote a purposive meaning on verbs: Indo-European infinitive-formants are famously linked to either dative-locative or accusative-allative case-markers *-i* and *-m*. (see VANSÉVEREN 1998) Dative itself is very often an abstract use of a concrete allative case, like in Germanic or Romance languages, and used with verbs to express purpose. While dative is found on verb forms in all branches of Lezxic, the grammaticalization of the adlocative marker examined on nominals in the preceding section seems much more recent: it is found on verbs in only one branch of Lezxic, the Southern one, comprized of the languages Kryz and Budugh.

In the following section, the Budugh adlocative case-marking is shown to be not restricted to noun phrases, as it affects verbs in both subordinate and main, modal clauses. Verbs are cast in this case frame as purposive or nominative complements of other predicates.

2.1 A transitivity-sensitive morphology

In most Lezgian languages, aspect is marked by vocalic or sonorant morphemes pre- or suffixed to a single root-consonant, and all forms, finite (Tense and Mood-marked) or non-finite belong to one of these two stems. Aspectual derivation is most intricate and archaic in Archi and in the Western and Southern branches, but in the Southern branch, this complexity is compensated by the fact that morphological features associated with valency properties give rise to verb-classes.

Morpho-syntactically, the Budugh masdar is an imperfective verbal noun ; its morphological shape is linked with valency properties in order to create very regular and neat verb classes. Its syntax is typical of a verbal noun: it serves in complement clauses as a sort of infinitive.

Almost all Budugh *intransitive* verbs have an imperfective stem marked with a suffix $-aR^5$ (R = r, l or n) for instance:

	MASDAR / IPF PARTICIPLE
‘sit’	<i>alq’-ál</i>
‘wrestle’	<i>anχ-án</i>
‘hang, intr.’	<i>anχ-án</i>
‘go’	<i>čaг-ár</i>

Budugh derived-from-intransitive transitive (causative) verbs end in *-i* (the trace of an incorporated verb ‘do’⁶):

	MASDAR / IPF PARTICIPLE
‘bring’ < ‘make go’	<i>čik-í</i>
‘make sit’	<i>elq’-í</i>
‘do’	<i>si-’í</i>

In contrast, The form of the masdar in the class of non causative transitive verbs looks like a case marked form. Non-derived, transitive verbs have the suffix *-u*, which can easily be identified with the adlocative case-marker, since the form serves as non-finite, verb-dependent verbal noun, a semantic and syntactic configuration which points to dative-like case-marking. A closer look at the internal structure of these transitive imperfective stems ending in *-u* allows us to draw two further dividing lines between two morphological sub-classes.

A first large sub-class of transitive imperfective verb stems ends in *-u* immediately following the root consonant, which can – but need not – be preceded by a preradical sonorant aspect marker (contrast the left column with the right one).

⁵ Originally a detransitive marker, shared with Kryz, cf. AUTHIER (2010).

⁶ For more details on the internal structure of Budugh verb-stems, cf. AUTHIER (2009), on Budugh synthetic causatives cf. AUTHIER, in preparation.

Note that in most masdar forms ending in *-u*, vowel harmony blurs the morpheme boundary:

	MASDAR / IPF PARTICIPLE		MASDAR / IPF PARTICIPLE
‘beat’	<i>at-ú</i>	‘kill’	<i>art’-ú</i>
‘plough’	<i>suz-ú < *si-z-u</i>	‘slay’	<i>sork-ú < *sa-r-k-u</i>
‘say’	<i>juʔ-ú < *ji’-u</i>	‘catch’	<i>surq-ú < *si-r-q-u</i>
‘milk’	<i>soz-ú < *sa-z-u</i>	‘hang, tr.’	<i>ʃanχ-ú</i>
‘strike’	<i>q:ut-ú < *q:i-t-u</i>	‘draw’	<i>jun-ú < *ji-n-γ-u</i>
‘mow’	<i>sux-ú < *si-x-u</i>	‘yoke’	<i>čilt’-ú < *či-l-t’-u</i>

These transitive verbs form their finite imperfective tenses and moods by appending suffixes to this stem in a perfectly invariant manner:

	MASDAR / IPF PARTICIPLE	PROGRESSIVE INDICATIVE
‘beat’	<i>at-ú</i>	<i>àtu-ra’vi</i>
‘milk’	<i>soz-ú</i>	<i>sòzu-ra’vi</i>

A smaller sub-class of transitive imperfective stems is the most important for our demonstration. It has most clearly a non-void inflectional morpheme *-u* marking nominalised forms (masdar & participle), whereas further tense & mood suffixes are added to a non-autonomous radical *without -u* (the labial-harmonic vocalism is retained on the root, analogically):

	MASDAR / IPF PARTICIPLE	PROGRESSIVE
‘take’	<i>q:on-ú < *q:a-n-u</i>	<i>q:òn-a’vi</i>
‘ask, borrow’	<i>vošul-ú < *va-ši-l-u</i>	<i>vòšul-a’vi</i>
‘eat’	<i>soʃul-ú < *sa-gvi-l-u</i>	<i>sòʃul-a’vi</i>
‘drink’	<i>soʒur-ú < *sa-ʒi-r-u</i>	<i>sòʒur-a’vi</i>

In the following example, the so-called masdar form exhibits this frozen case suffix which commutes with the suffix *-i* (< the standard copula) on the following form, making up the Future:

- (16) *zovon soʃul-ú vòšul-i*
 1.ADR eat-MSD ask-FUT
 ‘(They) will ask me for food.’

The masdar forms are derived from the imperfective stem by the adlocative marker *-u* in very much the same way as the corresponding infinitives built on the perfective stem followed by the dative case marker *-(i)z*. Two purposive forms using the two case-markers Dative and Adlocative are consequently distinguished by *aspect*.

	MASDAR < IPF+ADLOCATIVE	INFINITIVE < PF+DATIVE
‘drink’	<i>soʁur-u < *sa-xi-r-u</i>	<i>saxr-iz</i>
‘take’	<i>q:on-ú < *q:a-n-u</i>	<i>q:ejn-iz</i>
‘eat’	<i>soʁul-ú < *sa-gvi-l-u</i>	<i>saʁal-iz</i>
‘ask, borrow’	<i>voʁul-u < *va-ši-l-u</i>	<i>vaxa-z</i>
‘catch’	<i>surq-ú < *si-r-q-u</i>	<i>siqr-iz</i>
‘beat’	<i>at-ú</i>	<i>ata-z</i>
‘say’	<i>juʔ-ú < *ji-’-u</i>	<i>jipa-z</i>
‘milk’	<i>soz-ú < *sa-z-u</i>	<i>saza-z</i>

Additionally, one can assume that aspectuality was a determining factor in the distribution of the two case-markers in purposive function: dative case means permanent transfer and goes with perfective aspect, while adlocative case means non-permanent transfer and implies that the event is viewed with internal structure, that is, in its imperfective aspect.

The fact that *all* underived transitive imperfective stems (except for ‘do’) end in the vowel *-u* in the nominative form of the masdar is best explained if we suppose that these are originally case inflected purposive forms. On the contrary, intransitive and causative verbs derived from a periphrasis with ‘do’ have a masdar consisting of the unmarked imperfective stem:

	MASDAR < IPF BARE STEM
‘sit’	<i>alq-ál</i>
‘wrestle’	<i>anx-án</i>
‘hang, intr.’	<i>anx-án</i>
‘go’	<i>čax-ár</i>
‘bring’ < ‘make go’	<i>čix-í</i>
‘make sit’	<i>elq-í</i>
‘do’	<i>si-’í</i>

In Budugh masdars and debitives, the adlocative case marker attaches to the verbal stem only if the verb is underived transitive. Otherwise (that is, if the verb is intransitive or a morphological causative, plus a few others) the bare stem is used. Like in English where infinitives are marked by the lative & dative marker ‘to’, except for a small class of modal verbs, in Budugh imperfective infinitives are either nominative unmarked forms (intransitive and causative classes) or adlocative case-marked; the former category acquired the purposive interpretation by analogy, while the latter acquired nominative interpretation also by analogy:

2.2 Uses of the Budugh masdar in complementation

All three nominalized verb forms (nominative unmarked imperfective, adlocative-marked imperfective and dative-marked perfective) are used as

complements of verbs, but only the masdar became a further inflectable verbal noun, for the following reasons:

- in two substantial verb-classes (all intransitives and causatives) the masdar is unmarked for case, presenting thus a free slot for case-marking;
- while the original purposive value of the masdar is recognizable from the adlocative case-ending *-u* (on the majority of verbs: all the underived transitive class) most of these forms have developed vowel harmony and blurred the morpheme boundary. The vocalic ending /u/ thus became a suprasegmental feature, not anymore affixal and easily confounded with another origin for the same labial feature ('animate gender'-marking, originally infixes between the preverb and the root-consonant). The form ending in *-u* was then understood and used *either* as purposive *or* as a non-inflected – that is, nominative – nominalised form⁷, when embedded in S or P function, and secundarily received other case-markers if used in other functions;
- conversely, since the majority of verbs (all the underived transitive class) had one form for Single argument, Patient (Object), and purposive functions, other classes of verbs with unmarked (\emptyset ending) masdar forms came to be used both as nominative argument *and purposive* adjunct value, as a sort of functional indetermination found commonly on infinitives in more familiar European languages.

Let's now turn to examples in context.

2.2.2 Raising and absence of raising with controlling verbs

Contrary to substantive nouns, the masdar when subordinated to verbs like 'finish', 'stop', 'manage', 'know (how)', 'see' and 'want'⁸ does not always trigger neutral (abstract noun) agreement on the control verb. Instead, this very often agrees with the S/P argument of the masdar, as an instance of 'raising'. This is expected when the masdar ends in *-u*: because originally this form was not a nominative, agreement triggering form, but rather part of a complex predicate :

(17) *k'ul-dža barxuda'-džiz u-džber aborot'-ú jìbka-dži*
 house-IN master-DAT 3-HPLNOM HPL.kill-MSD HPL.want-PERF
 'The house-master wants to kill them.'

(18) *zo riž ug-u duxoruz q:orun-ú jìrka-džni*
 1.AD girl Self-AD son.DAT F.take-MSD F.want-PERFPST

⁷ The drift from purposive adjunct meaning to direct argument-marking 'infinitive' or verbal noun is certainly trivial. Note also that contrary to the perfective dative-marked form in *-z*, the imperfective 'infinitive' has become a real verbal noun, also called 'masdar' in descriptions of East-Caucasian languages, that is a verbal noun which inflects for most of the cases of the Budugh declension, allowing a large array of argument-like (in the Ergative or Absolutive cases) or oblique complementation.

⁸ With 'want' and 'know (how to...)' the subject is in the dative case *-z*.

‘He wanted to take my daughter for his son.’

- (19) *ma'lla'-džíz lem q:uvot-ú hàvats'ar-da-b*
 Mullah-DAT donkey A.beat-MSD A.know-PRSNEG-A
 ‘Mullah doesn’t know how to beat the donkey.’

By analogy, the same raising phenomenon may apply with causative masdars and verbal locutions involving the verb ‘do’, which is non case-marked, because these are felt as typical parts of complex predicates:

- (20) *u-n-uz yin yuxlemi sibʔi yibka-dži*
 PROX-H-DAT 1PL trying HPL.do.MSD HPL.want-PERF
 ‘He wants to try us.’

But with *intransitive*, non case-marked masdars, no raising phenomenon is found. They are always felt as clause-heading predicates because they are unmarked, and as such *nominative* agreement-triggering verb forms (in the following example, the verb ‘want’ take neutral, unmarked agreement, not human plural agreement):

- (21) *ye-z q:àbčabzar yika-dži /*yibka-dži*
 1PL-DAT HPL.leave.IPF(MSD) want-PERF *HPL.want-PERF
 ‘We want / have to go.’

Reversely, the case marked masdars in *-u*, can also control *neuter* agreement on controlling verbs. We are then dealing with embedding in nominative function. The *absence* of raising phenomenon, which was expected with etymologically unmarked masdars, was extended by analogy with intransitive and causative verbs. Thus absence of raising is also possible with transitive masdars ending in *-u*, because this morpheme has now lost its proper case-marking function and the form can hold the syntactic position of a nominative (unmarked), agreement triggering abstract noun⁹:

- (22) *ve ada-z vìn džam-iz yurts'-u yika-dži*
 2PL father-DAT 2(F) bridegroom-DAT F.give-MSD N.want-PERF
 ‘Your father wants to marry you off.’

- (23) *ve-z [jin abort']-ú jika-dži*
 2PL-DAT 1PL HPL.kill-MSD(N) N.want-PERF
 ‘You want to kill us...’

- (24) *bišq'ab-dža soful-ú èje-dži*

⁹ It becomes in fact a marker of transitivity, in equipollent relation with *-aR*, for instance in pairs like ^ʔ*anx-u* / ^ʔ*anx-an* ‘hang tr.’ / ‘hang, intr.’.

plate-IN eat-MSD N.put-PERF
 ‘He put food (lit. ‘to eat’) in a plate.’

- (25) *boŋlu rij-ez köduχ q’axuts’-u četin-i*
 big girl-DAT son-in-law find-MSD difficult-COP
 ‘It is difficult to find a son-in-law for the older daughter.’

2.2.1 Nominative complementation

The forms in *-u* came to be interpreted as non-inflected, or ‘nominative’ like the ones ending in *-i* or \emptyset in nominal predicates like:

- (26) *sordobut’ vodo’-ú č’ov-i*
 berries PV.gather-MSD enough-COP
 ‘Enough with gathering berries!’

- (27) *dard q:aq-u řari-vi,*
 worry PV.N.tell-MSD good-COP
 ‘It is good to tell one’s worries.’

- (28) *a-dž džidir si-ři haram-i*
 3-N hidden PV.N-do.MSD forbidden-COP
 ‘To hide it is bad.’

2.2.3 Dative inflected purposive masdars

Once flagged as nominative forms, masdars of any type can be inflected and reactivate purposive meaning by creating forms in the dative case *-z*. These may depend on a verb :

- (29) *gerek vın k’ul-dža χal-a’ q:us-u-jiz avajoχun čakar,*
 NEED 2 house-IN house-IN cover-MSD-DAT wood.DIR M.go.DEB
 ‘You have to go for wood to cover the roof.’

an adjective:

- (30) *q:uřun čabkar-džiz řazır saxa.*
 army.N/HPL HPL.go.MSD-DAT ready N.be.OPT
 ‘The army should be ready (for them) to go.’

and even a noun, like in the following example, in which the masdar is inflected for dative case and depends on the following noun:

- (31) [*a-d řalq’ol-džuz*] *k’ul yuko-dži.*

DIST-NOM.A A.sleep.MSD-DAT house.A A.want-PERF
 ‘She wants a place (for her) to sleep.’

This fact shows that masdars, for all their morphological heterogeneity, form a syntactic category not clearly marked for purposivity, even those which are marked for it etymologically. These dative-marked masdars are imperfective counterparts to dative-inflected (perfective) infinitives:

(32) *vin gerek jiχda’ džiqa’-dža řasil-iz čakar!*
 2 NEED far place-IN M.walk.INF-DAT M.go.DEB
 ‘You have to go and explore faraway countries.’

2.2.4 From noun-dependent purposive masdars to prospective participles

All masdars – not only the adlocative-marked ending in *-u* – may also be used as a preposed complements of nouns, thus giving rise to the *imperfective participle* with basically prospective or simply ‘virtual’ value:

(33) *q:uř-ulur dan sořul-ú vaχt-i.*
 bird-ERG corn eat-IPFPART time-COP
 ‘It is time for the bird to eat corn.’

(34) *k’ul-dža χal-a’ čuraq’ar avadž q’aχw!*
 house-IN roof-IN N.reach.IPF(PART) wood.N N.find.IMP
 ‘Find enough wood for the the roof of the house!’

(35) *a-d [χin sux-ú džiqa’-dža] (= vuq’-a) q’àχuts’u-ri.*
 3-M grass mow-IPFPART/MSD place-IN meadow-IN PV.N.find-PRS
 ‘They find him at the place for grass-mowing = the meadow.’

(36) *hedž-ir řodoχ-ú k’ul*
 woman-ERG NEG.A.demolish-IPFPART house.A
 ‘A house which a woman does not destroy (will stand for ever)...’

(37) *č’uval řovoq-u q’örü*
 sheep A.keep.IPF-PART shepherd
 ‘a shepherd tending the sheep’

These forms can be used without a head noun as substantivized participles, mainly in the nominative case. They are often lexicalized:

(38) *xad juts’-u-ndari zo bař xad-siz eve-dži*
 water give-IPFPART-HPL.ERG I.AD garden water-without A.put-PERF
 ‘The water-providers have left my garden without water.’

- (39) *filan* *šeher-dže* *sa-r* *aza'n* *juts'-ú-vi*
 a.certain city-IN one-M call.to.prayer give-IPFPART -COP
 'In a certain city there is a ('call-to-prayer-giver' =) muezzin.'

2.3. The debitive mood : as desubordinated masdar?

When the masdar is marked for adlocative case, the grammaticalization of lative into purposive has a good parallel in related languages and elsewhere with the grammaticalization of dative into hortative and future meaning¹⁰. Similarly, the adlocative case was used in Budugh on transitive verb stems with purposive value to create an imperfective infinitive (the masdar), and the Budugh debitive mood seems to have emerged from de-subordinated masdars - prosodically modified - since both are always homonymous. The debitive mood, used as a finite predicate in both independent and dependent clauses, bears a falling accent on the first syllable, while the oxytonic variant is a verbal noun or 'masdar'. This is in fact rather common cross-linguistically, but rarely as systematic as in Budugh. EVANS describes the process in the following manner:

A number of languages use de-subordinated clauses to express various deontic meanings. In Latin, Italian, french, etc., the independent subjunctive can have a hortative meaning, while in several Baltic languages necessity is expressed by 'debitive' verbal nouns or infinitives. [...]

2.3.1 Deontic and purposive modalities

Deontic modalities¹¹ in general are often expressed by bound morphemes in the Eurasian area and nuances of the optative domain are especially rich in the languages of the Caucasus. These moods denote either a wish of the speaker with or without any commitment to act by himself (injunctive and optative¹²), or the conscience of an external necessity or moral obligation (debitive). Thus Azeri has not two but three deontic paradigms. These are as regular as the rest of the verbal inflection. All are met in subordination as dependent of volition predicates. (Note that the Azeri optative paradigm is made on a verb-stem ending with the dative case-marker *a/ə*¹³):

¹⁰ In Lezgian languages, the inherited dative marker *-s* is used on verbs to produce purposive forms and infinitives and the purposive form has become a future tense in languages like Rutul or Tsakhur (see MAISAK, this volume, and AUTHIER, to appear).

¹¹ We opt for this general term to qualify a general modal category of 'wanting' spanning all nuances of the English verb 'want'.

¹² In fact there is an additional temporal nuance in the first person: *gerek gedim* is present wish for the present time-reference, while *gerek gedəm* is a wish situated in the future.

¹³ On the origin of Turkic optatives as dative-marked forms, see AUTHIER, in preparation.

	INJUNCTIVE	OPTATIVE	DEBITIVE
1	<i>ged-im</i>	<i>ged-əm</i>	<i>ged-məli-yəm</i>
2	<i>get</i>	<i>ged-ə-sən</i>	<i>ged-məli-sən</i>
3	<i>get-sın</i>	<i>ged-ə</i>	<i>ged-məli</i>
1PL	(<i>ə</i> , <i>ged-ək</i> <=>	<i>ged-ə-k</i>	<i>ged-məli-yik</i>
2PL	<i>ged-in</i>	<i>ged-ə-siz</i>	<i>ged-məli-siz</i>
3PL	<i>get-sınlər</i>	<i>ged-ə-lər</i>	<i>ged-məli-lər</i>

2.3.2 The prosodic finiteness marking of Budugh verbs

Kryz and Budugh also have three paradigms of deontic moods, but quite different morphologically from European conjugations. Only the injunctive has clear distinctions according to the person of the ‘subject (= Single or Agentive argument).

	INJUNCTIVE ‘SLAY’ (P: MSG)	INJUNCTIVE ‘BE’ (S: MSG)	INJUNCTIVE ‘GO’ (S: MSG/PL)
1	<i>sekirden</i>	<i>saxadan</i>	<i>vičden</i>
2	<i>sekir</i>	<i>sax</i>	<i>vič</i>
3	<i>sekire</i>	<i>saxa</i>	<i>vixe</i>
1PL	<i>sekirden</i>	<i>sabkadan</i>	<i>vibkeden</i>
2PL	<i>sekirde</i>	<i>sabkada</i>	<i>vičde</i>
3PL	<i>sekire</i>	<i>sabka</i>	<i>vibke</i>

Optative and debitive are only inflected for gender and number agreement with the Single or Patientive argument. Optative forms are either homophonous with the perfective participle, or derived from the second person injunctive (imperative) with an open vowel *-a/e*:

OPTATIVE ‘SLAY’	OPTATIVE = PPF ‘BE’	OPTATIVE ‘GO’
<i>sekir-e</i>	<i>saxa</i>	<i>vixe</i>

But what is of interest for the discussion is the perfectly constant homophony of the Budugh debitive, a finite form, with the masdar, a non-finite form, as in the following examples:

DEBITIVE = MSD ‘SLAY’	DEBITIVE = MSD ‘BE’	DEBITIVE = MSD ‘GO’
<i>sorku</i>	<i>yıxar</i>	<i>çakar</i>

Like in Azeri, injunctive forms can sometimes be clause-linking (subjunctive) moods, with only weak desiderative value and appear in the same context as an optative or a debitive forms. So the link, or the grammaticalization path, between non-finite nominalized forms and deontic finite forms might be just ellipsis, at least in Budugh, with prosodic adaptation only.

2.3.3 Prosodic morphological marking of the debitive

In AUTHIER (in press) I have shown that the Budugh imperfective stems have two syntactic uses distinguished by prosody only: respectively a verbal noun or adjective (masdar / participle) and the finite debitive mood. These forms are used either as predicates of independent clauses or as embedded, nominalized predicates according to the position and quality of stress (falling or rising). Two forms are distinguished by stress and syntactic insertion:

	MASDAR IMPERFECTIVE PARTICIPLE	/	DEBITIVE MOOD
'slay'	<i>sork-ú</i>		<i>sòrk-u</i>
'beat'	<i>at-ú</i>		<i>àt-u</i>
'hang' tr.	<i>ʃanχ-ú</i>		<i>ʃànχ-u</i>
'kill'	<i>art'-ú</i>		<i>àrt'-u</i>
'yoke'	<i>čilt'-ú < *čilt'-u</i>		<i>čìlt'-u</i>
'draw'	<i>yun-ú < *yiny-u</i>		<i>yùn-u</i>
'slay'	<i>sork-ú < *sark-u</i>		<i>sòrk-u</i>
'strike'	<i>q:ut-ú < *q:it-u</i>		<i>q:ùt-u</i>
'catch'	<i>surq-ú < *sirq-u</i>		<i>sùrq-u</i>
'plough'	<i>suz-ú < *siz-u</i>		<i>sùz-u</i>
'mow'	<i>sux-ú < *six-u</i>		<i>sùx-u</i>
'give'	<i>yuts'-ú < *yits'-u</i>		<i>yùts'-u</i>
'say'	<i>yuʔ-ú < *yiʔ-u</i>		<i>yùʔ-u</i>
'milk'	<i>soz-ú < *saz-u</i>		<i>sòz-u</i>
'take'	<i>q:on-ú < *q:an-u</i>		<i>q:òn-u</i>
'borrow'	<i>vošul-ú < *vašil-u</i>		<i>vòšul-u</i>
'eat'	<i>soʃul-ú < *saʃvil-u</i>		<i>sòʃul-u</i>
'drink'	<i>soʒur-ú < *saʒir-u</i>		<i>sòʒur-u</i>

2.3.4 Syntax of the debitive form

The debitive expresses obligation. This additional modal meaning may be conveyed by the adlocative ending *-u* on transitive verbs, while it needs have been extended by analogy to all other imperfective verb stems which do not have any ending.

2.3.4.1 Independent debitive

Hereafter a couple of examples of transitive imperfective verb-stems marked by the adlocative with debitive use:

- (40) *k'ik'en boflu rij-ez köduχ q'əχuts'-u*
 first big girl-DAT son-in-law M.find-DEB
 'One has to find a son-in-law for the older daughter first.'
- (41) *za'a-džber džam-iz yùbts'-u*
 1.ERG.DIST-HPL.NOM bridegroom-DAT HPL.give-DEB
 'I have to marry them off.'
- (42) *vin a-dir sundžu ka'sib-džu duχoruz jùrt-u*
 2 3-F one.OBL poor-AD son.DAT F.give-DEB
 'Then you have to marry her off to the son of a poor.'

2.3.4.2 Semi-dependent debitive? the particle *gerek*

The debitive is often found with the particle *gerek*, which is a loan from Azeri, also with any sort of masdar.

Transitive masdars in -u

- (43) (*gerek*) *zin ulu kida za'va' q:ùrok-u*
 NEED 1 this work 1.ERG.2.IN entrust-DEB
 'I should entrust you this task.'
- (44) *hulu saŕat gerek vın a-d q'əχuts'-u.*
 this hour NEED 2 DIST-M M.find-DEB
 'You have to find him right now.'
- (45) *gada gerek dünja-dža idankan, a-d gerek řanχ-u*
 boy NEED world-IN M.NEG.remain-DEB DIST-M NEED hang-DEB
 'The boy cannot remain alive, he has to be hung.'

Intransitive masdars with no ending:

- (46) *gerek duz jits'i-b mana't jùxor.*
 NEED exactly ten-A manat(A) A.be-DEB
 'It has to be exactly hundred manats.'
- (47) *gerek haške saxa-n řa'riřat-džekir ħàraq'ar.*
 NEED whatever N.be.OPT-FOC shariat-SUBEL M.talk-DEB
 '(You) should say something about the shariat.'

Causative masdars in -i and the verb 'do':

- (48) *vin izga-n-ikir gerek jin q:orumi si?i.*
 2 other-H-SUBEL NEED 1PL protecting M.do.DEB
 ‘We should protect you from others.’

The use of *gerek* is not a criterium for non-finiteness, because it is optional, and because the stress on the verb form remains initial and falling. Additionally, in Budugh (not in Kryz, see below) this particle is also found with injunctive and optative forms, which are even more clearly finite (they are never found functioning as arguments or relative clauses, or adjuncts):

- (49) *vin vi?de, gerek ka?al zin-zaz zin ?rot'-u (/ ?t'u-dan)*
 2PL go.IMP.PL NEED bald 1-1.DAT 1 M.kill-DEB M.kill-HORT
 ‘You go, I have (/ want) to kill the bald myself.’

- (50) *gerek zo bada dard doru sa-r idmi q:u?ko-da.*
 NEED 1.AD near worry NEG.M.PART one-M person bring-IMP.PL
 ‘You(PL) have to bring a man without worries.’

- (51) *a-ndari j?pa ?el-iber gerek ju?lami si?ir-e*
 DIST-HPL.ERG say.PF.PART word-PL NEED checking do-OPT
 ‘One must check their words.’

Note also that in some rare instances, the Budugh debitive form with *gerek* has not prescriptive but predictive value:

- (52) *gerek xin sudox-u, lem gerek miz unkon.*
 NEED grass NEG.mow-DEB donkey NEED hungry A.remain.DEB
 ‘He will be incapable to mow the grass, and the donkey will have to stay hungry.’

2.3.4.3 Deliberative debitive in (rhetoric) questions

Obligative modality can also be questioned. Thus the debitive mood can be used in deliberative independent questions:

- (53) *zin za' dard haniz q:aq-u?*
 1 1.IN worry who.DAT N.tell-DEB
 ‘To whom should I tell my worries?’

- (54) *ma' ivez ši inša'llah jù'-u?...*
 then this.DAT what inshallah say-MSD
 ‘Why should one say Inshallah for this?’

2.3.4.4 Dependent debitive in indirect questions

Obligative questions can also depend on a verb. The clause-heading verb, if morphologically marked by final (nominal) stress, has to be placed before the controlling verb, as any complement in a language with basically SOV constituent order:

- (55) *je-z ts'eŋ (šima) sork-ú hàvats'ar-da-b*
 1PL-DAT goat how (A.)slay-DEB A.know-PRSNEG-A
 'We do not know how to slay a goat.'

But the subordinate verb may also be postposed after the main verb. Since this main verb is finite, it is felt as *final* – signaling the end of a sentence – the non-finite form tends to become 'stranded', and forcibly acquires syntactic autonomy, and, the masdar shifts its rising final stress to initial and falling, like a typical of finite forms, thus becoming a *debitive*:

- (56) *je-z ts'eŋ havats'ar-da-b (:) šima sork-ú?*
 1PL-DAT goat A.know-PRS.NEG-A how (A.)slay-MSD
 'We do not know how a goat should be slain'

- (57) *ts'eŋ halma sòrk-u!*
 goat this.way slay-DEB
 'A goat should be slain this way!'

The preceding examples have shown the close similarity of masdar and debitive mood on a transitive verb with *-u* ending. Intransitive and causative verbs likewise, as well as 'do', have debitive unmarked for adlocative case, that is, identical with masdar forms but for the stress shift:

agreement	MASDAR	DEBITIVE
'sit' M/N/NPL/F A HPL	<i>alq'ál</i> <i>olq'ól</i> <i>abalq'ál</i>	<i>àlq'al</i> <i>òlq'ol</i> <i>àbalq'al</i>
'bring' < 'make go' M/N/NPL F A HPL	<i>čiví</i> <i>čirví</i> <i>čüvü</i> <i>čibví</i>	<i>čivi</i> <i>čirvi</i> <i>čüvü</i> <i>čibvi</i>
seat < 'make sit' M/N/NPL/F A HPL	<i>elq'í</i> <i>ölq'ü</i> <i>ebelq'í</i>	<i>èlq'i</i> <i>`ölq'ü</i> <i>èbelq'i</i>

‘do’		
M/N/NPL	<i>siʔi</i>	<i>siʔi</i>
F	<i>sirʔi</i>	<i>sirʔi</i>
A	<i>süʔü</i>	<i>süʔü</i>
HPL	<i>sibʔi</i>	<i>sibʔi</i>

It seems that analogy has extended both embedded (subordinate) and independent (sentence-final) use with modal ‘debitive’ value to all imperfective stems, including those not ending in *-u*:

(58) *padšah-džo idmer gerek řaq’allu yibkar*
king-AD person.PL NEED clever HPL.be.DEB
‘The king’s men should be intelligent.’

(59) *vin gerek jixta’ džiga’-dža čakar,*
2 NEED faraway place-IN M.go.DEB
‘You have to go and see faraway places.’

(60) *řali-z jika-dži ki, meřlim-džir ug k’ensëñxi*
a.-DAT N.want-PERF KI teacher-ERG SELF forget.caus.DEB
‘Ali wants his teacher to forget him.’

Note that Budugh has also an obligative periphrastic form consisting of the masdar form followed by the enclitic copula. An alternative explanation for the use of the same form as both non-finite and finite verbs could then be that a predicative use of the masdar as a debitive participle with the copula obtains also without it, provided that the rising stress shifts to the first syllable and becomes falling:

(61) *zin a-novon sa-d čel juʔ-ú-vi/ jùʔ-u*
1 3-H.ADR one-N word tell-IPF.PART-COP tell-DEB
‘I have something to tell him.’

2.4. The debitive mood in Kryz

Although the Budugh data seem to fit very well in the desubordinating scenario, this is not confirmed by the Kryz data (see AUTHIER 2009). In Kryz, the same ‘debitive’ form also exists, but it is never used as a non-finite form.

As can be seen in the following Kryz example, the debitive in Kryz like in Budugh is an ‘imperfective optative’:

(62) *řitařar džudur v-ar-dam ki a-n-van an duru*
how hidden F-do-HORT1 ki 3-H-ADR AN lie
lidip-dam vun an sař iunkan-u
NEG.say-HORT1 2 AN safe F.remain-DEB

‘How could I (I wish) hide you and not lie, so that you remain safe?’

But the aspectual distinction seems here to be reinterpreted in terms of different illocutionary force and more or less direct inducement to create a ‘strong’ vs a ‘weak’ optative¹⁴. Compare the two moods or aspects in the following examples:

- (63) *šiš-ri iuru xi-jizkarta ìnkan-u/ ≠ ìdkn-i!*
 skewer-PL red be-until remain-DEB N.remain-OPT

‘The skewers have to remain.’ ≠ ‘Let the skewers remain until they are red!’

- (64) *čam kulqa.dž-ik asik ki jìdits’r-i/ jìdirts’ar-u*
 butter shade-SUB put.IMP ki NEG.melt-OPT NEG.melt-DEB

‘Put the butter in a shadowy place, so that it does not melt / so that it would not melt.’

2.4.1. Morphology of the Kryz debitive

Morphologically, the Kryz debitive combines the imperfective base and a suffix *-u* on almost *all* verbs, not only the transitive ones. Nearly all intransitive verbs form their debitive form with the same suffix as transitives do:

TRANSITIVE DEBITIVE	INTRANSITIVE DEBITIVE
<i>kurats’-u</i>	<i>q:alt’al-u</i>

Corresponding debitive forms exist for the majority of verbs in Budugh, where they are marked for adlocative case if transitive only, and have a wider range of syntactic values:

	KRYZ DEBITIVE ONLY	BUDUGH MSD / IPF PTCP / DEB
‘stand’	<i>q:alt’al-u</i>	<i>q:alt’al</i>
‘sleep’	<i>arχar-u</i>	<i>arχar</i>
‘return’	<i>làlsal-u</i>	<i>alsal</i>
‘do’	<i>jij-u</i>	<i>siʔi</i>
‘catch’	<i>jirq-u</i>	<i>surq-u</i>
‘beat’	<i>àt-u</i>	<i>at-u</i>
‘take’	<i>q:àn-u</i>	<i>q:on-u</i>
‘plough’	<i>jiz-u</i>	<i>suz-u</i>
‘give’	<i>vùts’-u</i>	<i>juts’-u</i>
‘say’	<i>lij-u</i>	<i>ju’-u</i>
‘eat’	<i>ùl-u</i>	<i>soʔul-u</i>
‘milk’	<i>àz-u</i>	<i>soz-u</i>

¹⁴ For the distinction of weak and strong optatives, see DOBRUSHINA, this volume.

2.4.2. Syntax of the Kryz debitive

The syntax of the Kryz debitive is very close to that of the corresponding forms in Budugh. There is no restriction according to the person of the subject (S & A). The 1st person subject is not rare:

(65) *sa-b mislařat vatu kadam¹⁵ zin ři lij-u*
 one-F advice.F give.IMP let's.see 1 what say-DEB
 ‘Advise me on what to say.’

(66) *zin gerek zi-vun la dař.dži-ř řsk-u -vun*
 1 NEED 1-2 that mountain-SUPER put-DEB -2
 ‘I have to leave you on this mountain.’

The debitive is also often used in Kryz constructions without an identified Agent:

(67) *nimara hava.dř-var nik dři-u*
 such air-ADEL field NEG-plough-DEB
 ‘By such a (bad) weather, one should not plough one’s field.’

In Kryz like in Budugh, the modality conveyed by these forms can be more volitive or simply subjunctive (like the corresponding forms in Udi, T. Maisak p.c.) than strictly ‘debitive’ if the imperfective aspect is relevant, and should be seen as an imperfective counterpart to the (perfective) optative. They usually depend on a main verb ‘want’ and end with the particle *ki*¹⁶:

(68) *a-n k’ij-ařar ja-rč’ar-e ki, lu xidř-a čalq’al-u*
 3-GENH heart-INEL PV-cross-PRS ki this water-IN bathe-DEB
 ‘He comes up with the idea to take a bath in this water.’

(69) *u-n-ur xad q:i-jts’-re ki, xidř-ik kèř’ar-u*
 3-h-ERG water PV-put.on-PRS ki water-SUB PV-go.under-DEB
 ‘He pours water in order to wash himself.’

Remarquably, the agreement can show a raising process very similar to what was observed with the Budugh non finite (masdar) form:

¹⁵ Here *kadam* is a lexicalized form of ‘to see’. In Udi a similar form is also used as a sort of imperative/hortative particle (T. Maisak p.c.), maybe due to Azeri influence, see the similar use of *görum*.

¹⁶ This structure is a copy of similar complement clauses in Azeri, in which the subordinate clause has its verb in an optative or injunctive form

- (70) *gada-z iuka šiu-rju ki q:uš jùrq-u*
 boy-DAT F.want(PART) F.be-PRS.F ki bird F.catch-DEB
 ‘The boy wants to (try and) catch the bird.’

But the main verb can be a non-controlling one, and then all the volitive meaning is expressed by the debitive form. Chosen instead of the optative, it allows imperfective aspect marking:

- (71) *šidir u-nda ara.dž-a řàč'ar-ju ki u-džbar džura jij-u*
 sister 3-HPLg interval-IN PV-enter-PRS.F ki 3-HPL other do-DEB
 ‘The sister intervenes to (try and) separate them.’

Other examples involve the subjunctive use of the debitive in consecutive subordination:

- (72) *riř q:ahat-i-m zin zin-a-d q:vàn-u ?*
 girl(GEN) lack-INTERR-Q 1 1-3-NotN F.take-DEB
 ‘Is there a scarcity of young girls, that I should take this one?’

- (73) *za-uř ři sudž-i ki tukan q:vàn-u -zin ?*
 1-APUD what exist-INTERR ki shop.F F.take-DEB 1
 ‘What do I own to be able to buy a shop ?’

- (74) *džudur xi-jidž lazim-e-ki a-dži-z vun đırqar-u*
 hidden be-MSD necessary-COP.N-KI DIST-NOTH-DAT 2 NEG.see-DEB
 ‘You have to hide so that the demon does not see you.’

2.4.3. Unmarked Kryz debitive forms

The only Kryz verbs which do not take the affix *-u* are ‘go’, ‘be’ and a series of verbs ‘come’ with various preverbs, which all have debitive forms identical to their imperfective bare stem:

	KRYZ INJUNCTIVE, ‘GO’	OPTATIVE	DEBITIVE
1	<i>jix-dam / jip-dam</i>	<i>jix-i / yipi</i>	<i>čiyi / čava</i>
2	<i>jix / yip</i>		
3	<i>jix-tir / yip-tir</i>		
1PLEXCL	<i>jip-dam</i>	<i>yipi</i>	<i>čaba</i>
1PLINCL	<i>jip-daj</i>		
2PL	<i>jip-ař</i>		
3PL	<i>jip-tir</i>		

Compare in the following example the bare-stem vs affixal formations:

- (75) *gerek jin jif.un-a ča-ba-jin ki varak.dži-r dugvats'-u-jin*
 NEED 2PL night-IN go-HPL(DEB)-2PL ki sun-ERG NEG.burn-DEB-2PL
 ‘You have to walk by night, so that the sun does not burn you.’

	KRYZ INJUNCTIVE, ‘BE’	OPTATIVE	DEBITIVE
1	<i>xi-dam</i>	<i>iši</i>	<i>ši-ji / šava</i>
2	<i>sak / sauk</i>		
3	<i>iši</i>		
1PLEXCL	<i>xi-dam</i>		<i>šaba</i>
1PLINCL	<i>xi-daj</i>		
2PL	<i>sabkaj</i>		
3PL	<i>iši</i>		

2.4.4. The particles *gerek* and *nabada* in Kryz

In Kryz, the debitive is usually employed with the same *gerek* noted in Budugh. Note that the stress is initial and falling, so we have to deal with the finite form:

- (76) *kar hara daxa-dži qarar dùts'-u gerek*
 work aware NEG.be-SEQ decision NEG.give-DEB NEED
 ‘A decision should not be taken without knowing the affair.’
- (77) *adami q'aj-dž-ašar čixəšan čàrk-u gerek*
 person die-PERF-INEL after burry-DEB NEED
 ‘A dead person has to be burried.’
- (78) *gerék zin duz-a riḡ-eš ləlsal-u*
 NEED 1 right-a road-IN return-DEB
 ‘I should come back to the right path.’
- (79) *vún gerek šib-ud jik k'adir-dži řadi-š àsq'van-u-vun*
 2 NEED three-N day cauldron-GEN surface-SUPER sit.down-DEB-2
 ‘You have to remain seated on the cauldron for three days.’

The positive form introduced by the Persian frozen locution *nabada* ‘let it not be (that)’ expresses a negative recommendation, and if used with the second person is less mandatory than the Prohibitive :

- (80) *nabada riki ačuk jàrt-u -vun!*
 god.forbids door open leave-DEB 2
 ‘Take care not to leave the door open !’

- (81) *nabada* *sus* *q:vàn-u* *-vun!*
 god.forbid bride F.take-DEB 2
 ‘Do not think of taking a wife !’

3. Conclusion

The forms and functions of the debitive (and imperfective masdar) in Budugh and Kryz can be summed up in the following table:

	BUDUGH	KRYZ
morphology / verb classes	TR. V.: IPF+- <i>u</i> INTR.V.&CAUS.: IPF+- \emptyset	IPF+- <i>u</i> except 2 INTR.v
non-finite form: masdar (bare)	complement clauses	\emptyset
non-finite form, inflected masdar	purposive clauses	\emptyset
finite form, dependent	<i>debitive, subjunctive</i>	
finite form, independent	<i>debitive = ‘imperfective obligative’</i>	
suggested etymology	verb stem (+ adlocative - <i>u</i>)	

But seen from an etymological point of view, language internal evidence leads to reject the possibility of a fortuitous homonymy between adlocative nominal case and verbal debitive mood. The adlocative as a variant of dative is a natural marker of nominal dependency on nominalized verb-forms (the masdars), and it is found on most verbs in Budugh, and these have also the expected – debitive – independent use.

Functionally, the unicity of masdar and debitive as a single category may seem awkward, as seen from the point of view of European languages whose description relies on clear distinction between finite and non-finite forms. Nevertheless, the identity of the debitive-marking ending on transitive verbs with the same on the masdar is out of doubt, because the identity is observed not only on transitive verbs, where these forms are (adlocative) case-marked but also on intransitive verbs, where the same imperfective bare stem is also used in both (finite & non-finite) functions¹⁷. But it does not necessarily follow that the mood marker -*u* derives from the case-marker -*u* via the nominalised form.

In Kryz, almost all of verbs have a form in -*u* with debitive meaning, but there is no trace of a nominalized form with the same ending., This casts a serious doubt on the ‘de-subordinating hypothesis’ in the case of this language. Kryz in fact lacks an imperfective verbal noun altogether, while Budugh lacks a perfective verbal noun: both languages have acquired a distinct verbal noun built in either case on one only of the two aspectual stem.

¹⁷ cf. AUTHIER 2010

This discrepancy leads us to challenge the assumption recently put forward by EVANS that a non-indicative mood emerges from a case-marked subordinate form *by way of ellipsis*; it seems in fact that a case-marker can be used as a mood-marker *without ellipsis*. If the debitive mood exists in Kryz with the same adlocative *-u* suffix, while there is no adlocative-marked masdar in this language¹⁸, one has to assume that case can be used with modal value on verbs without desubordination. We rather have to posit a branching grammaticalization path:

older situation		first step (B and K)	second step (B)
non finite NOM IPF stem $-\emptyset$ (Budugh ITR., CAUS. + Kryz 2 ITR.)	<u>+u</u>	=> non finite: MSD (Budugh);	↘
			(by analogy) unmarked MSD (Budugh)
	<u>+u</u>	=> finite, modal: DEB (Budugh&Kryz)	\emptyset

Used as a marker of nominal dependency, the adlocative case ending in *-u* was seen to mark nouns as temporary recipients. Bearing on verb-stems, the same linker offers a debitive mood, that is a predicate conceived of as a debt, an obligation, a duty. It *later* became a masdar without purposive semantics, a trivial evolution for infinitive-like forms. This scenario fits well what is known of Budugh in other parts of its grammar (phonetics, gender agreement or valency alternation): it is a language which retains archaic features but also shows very strong tendency to create new, analogical forms. And in the same way, the dative-marking found on Rutul and Tsakhur hortative and future forms might originate from debitive or potential finite modalities, not indirectly from infinitive-purposive forms.

Abbreviations:

a: adjectiviser; A: ‘animate’ noun or agreement; NOM: nominative; AD: adlocative; ERG: ergative; DAT: dative; DEB: debitive mood; F: human feminine noun or agreement; HPL: human plural noun or agreement; M: human masculine noun or agreement; NPL: non human plural noun or agreement; OPT: optative mood; PERF: narrative tense; SEQ: sequential converb;

References

- AIKHENVALD, A.,
2008 *Versatile cases* in J. Linguistics 44 (2008), Cambridge University Press
ARKHIPOV A., DANIEL M., KIBRIK A., KODZASOV S.,
2009 *Archi Electronic Corpus*. - with the following link.
ALEKSEEV, M.

¹⁸ In Kryz, only the perfective stem yields a masdar, showing the substantivated participle ending *-ic*, cf. AUTHIER (2008). In Budugh, the verbal noun is the imperfective stem or is based on it.

- 1997 *Reconstruction of the Proto-East-Caucasian locative morphemes*. In van den Berg, H. *Studies in Caucasian Linguistics*, CNWS, Leiden
- AUTHIER, G.,
2008 Participes et masdars en kryz : une syntaxe mixte. In *Faits de Langues* 31, *Nominalisations*
- 2009 *Grammaire kryz*, Peeters, Paris
- 2010 Inessif du verbe, désubordination et modalité In *Essais de typologie et de linguistique générale: Mélanges offerts à Denis Creissels*, ENS Editions, Lyon
- IN PRESS *Finite and non-finite : prosodic distinction on Budugh verb stems*, in Brill, I. *Clause-hierarchy and clause-linking: The Syntax and pragmatics interface*, Benjamins, Amsterdam/Philadelphia
- TO APPEAR The Detransitive voice in Kryz in Authier, G. and Haude, K. *Ergativity, valency and voice*, Mouton DeGruyter, Berlin
- IN PREP. The Diachrony of causative introflexion in Budugh
- IN PREP. Turkic optatives as dative-marked forms
- BABALIYEVA, A.
2007 *Le dialecte lezgi de Yargun*. Mémoire de Master. EPHE, Paris
- BLAKE, B. J.,
1993 Verb affixes from case markers. *La Trobe University Working Papers in Linguistics* 6, 33–58.
- 1999 Nominal marking on verbs: Some Australian cases. *Word* 50, 299–317.
- 2001 *Case*, Cambridge: CUP.
- DANIEL M., KHALILOVA Z., and MOLOCHIEVA Z.,
2010 Ditransitive Constructions in East Caucasian: A family overview in *Studies in Ditransitive Constructions: A Comparative Handbook* ed. by Malchukov, A. / Haspelmath, M. / Comrie, B., Berlin, Mouton DeGruyter.
- DIXON R. & AIKHENVALD A. (eds.),
2006 *Complementation: A crosslinguistic typology*. OUP.
- EVANS, N.
2007 *Insubordination*. In NIKOLAEVA IRINA (ed.). *Finiteness*. OUP.
- HASPELMATH, M.,
1989 From Purposive to Infinitive – a universal path of grammaticalization, *Folia Linguistica Historica* 10
- KALININA, E. & SUMBATOVA N.,
2007 Clause structure and verbal forms in Nakh-Daghestanian languages In NIKOLAEVA IRINA (ed.). *Finiteness*. OUP.
- Maisak, Timur (2008): *Semantika i proiskhozhdenie glagol'nykh form nastojashhego i budushhego vremeni v udinskom jazyke*. In: M.E. Alekseev, T. A. Maisak, D.S. Ganenkov, Yu. A. Lander (eds.) *Udinskij sbornik: Grammatika, leksika, istorija jazyka*. Moskva: Academia.
- Tchoumakina M. & al.
2007 *Online Archi Dictionary*
- van den Berg, H.
2001 *Dargi Folktales*. Leiden: Universiteit Leiden, Research School of Asian, African and Amerindian Studies.
- Vanséveren, S.
1998 "Recherches comparatives sur l'origine casuelle des infinitifs grecs", Bruxelles, 1998