

Azeri morphology in Kryz (East Caucasian)

Gilles Authier

Gilles Authier 2010. Azeri morphology in Kryz (East Caucasian). *Turkic Languages* 10, xx-xx.

Abstract: The paper deals with the copying of morphemes and patterns from Turkic into the morphology of Kryz, an East Caucasian language of northern Azerbaijan. The copied morphemes in question are clitics found in the periphery of the verb system (expressing evidentiality, indefiniteness) and valency-changing morphology imported globally together with Azeri forms, as well as adjective-forming derivational suffixes. The copied structures are more diverse, and have left a mark on many areas of the morphology, in both verb and noun phrases.

Gilles Authier, 50 rue des Francs-Bourgeois, 75003 Paris, France

E-mail: gilles.authier@gmail.com

1. Introduction

Most of the data presented here are taken from (Authier 2009), which is a complete description of one of the dialects of Kryz, a language belonging to the Lezgi branch of East Caucasian. In this paper we shall discuss some of the issues related to language contact which have left traces in the grammar of Kryz, namely the *global* and *selective* copying (for these terms see Johanson 2006a) of Turkic (Azeri) morphological features.

There are some striking typological similarities between East Caucasian and Turkic languages, in contrast with other adjacent languages or language families such as North Caucasian, South Caucasian (Kartvelian) or Indo-European. For instance, the major strategies for subordinate clauses is left-branching, involving the use of non finite or low-focal elements as heads of subordinate clauses (participles in relative clauses, converbs in adverbial clauses, and masdars (nominalized verbs) in complement clauses); the unmarked word order is also rather similar (basically SOV, GN, AN) in Turkic and East Caucasian.

On the other hand, some very basic features of these two language families contrast sharply and make all the more striking these common points and other, convergence-driven phenomena connecting East Caucasian and Turkic languages. At the noun phrase level, Turkic has only a few, exclusively syntactic cases, while East Caucasian sets world records for nominal declension sizes thanks to its extensive use of spatial cases, which can even distinguish semantic nuances in grammatical relations, e.g. differential subject marking or differential recipient marking. Gender is not grammatically distinguished in Turkic, whereas the morphosyntax of the great majority of East Caucasian languages is pervaded by

gender-number agreement and complex (but mostly agglutinative) morphology, both suffixal and prefixal. Not only verbs but also adjectives tend to agree with their head in East Caucasian, while adjective agreement is never found in Turkic; and while Turkic employs person markers for the category ‘subject’ on the verb, East Caucasian verbs very rarely agree in person, and verb agreement in gender-number is always with the Single argument or the Patient, i.e. alignment is ergative.

Kryz is a small dialect continuum numbering at most 2000 speakers scattered in fewer than ten small localities of north-eastern Azerbaijan, in the region of Quba. It is unwritten; education in both elementary and intermediate school is in Azeri, which is well known by all adults and used in communication with speakers of other languages. Despite this generalized bilingualism, the grammar preserves typical East Caucasian and specifically Lezgi features. In particular, gender-number agreement with S/P (Single argument or Patient) is prefixed to the root of synthetic verbs. Person is mainly expressed by free pronouns. Word order is head-final (possessor-possessed, adjective-noun, and basically Agent-Patient-Verb); case marking and cross-referencing on the verb is ergative.

The language contact situation between Kryz and Azeri being asymmetrical, the direction of copying has been from dominant Azeri to dominated Kryz. Questions of syntax, e.g. word order, will not be dealt with here. The most obvious result of contact on Kryz morphology is the presence of Turkic morphemes at the margins of the verb phrase (clitics). Less conspicuous effects, such as changes in morpheme order, or the acquisition of morphosyntactic features and semantic distinctions, are more numerous, but demand sharp scrutiny.

We divide the paper into sections treating the two main types of copying at issue. Section 1 describes the Turkic morphemes found on Kryz verbs, verbal compounds, and adjectives, while section 2 presents morphosyntactic patterns found in Kryz and shared with Azeri for which no clear independent parallels are found in related Lezgi languages.

Azeri morphemes on Kryz verbs

In this section, we address three instances of Turkic morphemes integrated into the set of verb categories expressed morphologically in Kryz: the evidential clitic, the conditional-indefinite clitic, and the valency alternation system in compound verbs. Two denominal adjective suffixes have also been copied productively.

Evidential –mİs

The most conspicuous morphological element borrowed by Kryz is the morpheme –*mİs*, an evidentiality-marking clitic related, but to be distinguished from, to the postterminal (perfect) marker –*mİs*. Its semantics are typical of binary evidentiality systems:

- non-direct evidence in the past, not necessarily remote:

- (1) *u-cbar ʔa-b-xhr-i kʼul-ci cuxud qʼay-ca-miŝ*
 3-HPL PV-HPL-COME.PF-PART house-GEN master die-PERF-EVID
 “The master of the house where they arrived had died.”

- hearsay (gnomic):

- (2) *pis-a kar hiçvaxt kʼiy-ğar sanxan-de-d-miŝ*
 bad-a work never heart-SUPEL forget-NEGPRS-N-EVID
 “A bad deed is never forgotten.”

- inference:

- (3) *ug-ur eb-il siy yiltʼ-ciz eb-il sil*
 SELFM-ERG wolf-GENmouth bind-SIMUL wolf-GENtooth
barkan-ci siyir.c-a ʔaka-ci xhi-ca-miŝ
 horse-GEN sinew-IN stick-SEQ be-PERF-EVID
 “(He understands that) when he tied the wolf’s mouth, the wolf’s tooth had remained stuck in the horse’s sinew.”

- mirativity:

- (4) *ğancuq limird-ğar mama, sipayar-ğar an bala,*
 female donkey-SUPEL mummy young.donkey-SUPEL AN baby
mighila limird-ğar papa li-re-miŝ !
 male donkey-SUPEL daddy say-PRS-EVID
 “(The child) would call the she-donkey ‘mummy’, the donkey-foals ‘babies’ and the male donkey ‘daddy’!”

In this mirative use, it is often followed by the enclitic *ki* (itself a copied form: this was originally the Persian mirative marker and complementizer). If bearing on nominal predicates, the clitic has to attach to the indigenous Kryz copula, or to a form of the verb ‘be’:

- (5) *vun lap namussuz-a adami-ya-miŝ -ki !*
 2 very faithless-A person-COP.M-EVID KI
 “You really are a faithless person !”

- (6) *qʼva-r ŝid yaʔab-miŝ: sundu tur Salavan*
 two-M brother EXIST-HPL-EVID one-HUM.GEN name Salavan
laʼa-n tur Ğaf ŝa-re-miŝ
 other-HUM.GEN name Qaf be-PRS-EVID
 “He had two sons: one was named Salavan, the other Qaf.”

As for its combinatory properties with other TAM markers, the evidential clitic is found on most synthetic indicative verb forms and copulas but not on dedicated direct-assertion forms like the aorist, the resultative or the constative progressive. This should be compared with the situation obtaining in Azeri, where, as in Turkish, “the evidential copula *-(y)mİş* can attach to all tense-mood-aspect suffixes on a verb stem except for *-DI*, which means witnessed past” (Goeksel & Kerslake, p.80).

However, a diachronic twist ought to be mentioned: in contemporary Azeri, maybe due to the influence of Russian journalistic style, the evidential clitic is considered outdated, and even the evidential value of the perfect tense suffix is becoming obsolete: this tense is defined in grammars as a remote past or a present perfect (see Shiraliev & Sevortian, 1971 pp. 126-127). Moreover, its inflection has been largely rebuilt on the *-İb* converb (1SG *gäl-miş-äm* but 2SG *gäl-misen* or *gäl-ib-sän* and 3SG *gälib* rather than *gälmişdir*). But Kryz preserves the evidential value of the morpheme as it is still found in Turkish, with a predilection for attaching the clitic to forms of the (indigenous) perfect.

It should be added that the category ‘evidential’ is not unknown in other East Caucasian languages. Within Lezgiç, Budugh, the language most closely related to Kryz, has a sentence-final evidential particle *q'eçik*, of uncertain origin. In Rutul, another sentence-final particle *eyxhi* can be related to a verbal root meaning ‘say’, like the evidential suffix *-lda* found in Lezgian (see Haspelmath 1993 p.150).

1.2. Indefinite marker *-sa*

Most conditional clauses in Kryz use an indigenous morpheme *-na* which corresponds closely to the Turkic suffix *-sA*; Kryz *-na* is also used in conditional relative clauses with indefinite interpretation:

(7) *hal-ir lip-na-ni mast leha-ya, ũ-ma-rğa*
 who-ERG say.PF-COND-PST yoghurt black-COP PV-PROHIB-believe
 “Whoever will say that yoghurt is black, do not believe (him).”

(8) *a-d hatan yi-xh-na, la ciga işiğ-lu şa-re-ni*
 DIST-notN to_where PV-go-COND DIST place light-with be-PRS-PST
 “Wherever he would go, the place would be illuminated.”

In particular, parametric conditional relative clauses which use the relative pronoun *harkan* ‘whoever’ (only in oblique cases; etymologically this is the copied – from Azeri and Persian – quantifier *har* and complementizer *ki*, followed by the distal demonstrative *a-*) are always headed by a form in *-na*:

(9) *harkan-ux kar yiçina zin işlamiş şa-ra*
 whoever-APUD work be.IPF.COND I working be-EVT
 “I will work for whoever has work for me.”

But Kryz also has verb forms ending in *-sa*, which are found exclusively in other parametric relative clauses to signal conditional-indefinite meaning, as well as on indefinite pronouns containing *-sa* and shaped after the Azeri model¹.

1.2.1. Indefinite relative clauses

Azeri has headless relative clauses containing a conditional verb form (with *-sa* alone or following a TAM suffix) and a question word, with meanings equivalent to those of English clauses employing ‘whatever’, ‘whoever’, etc.

- (11) *nä de-yir-sä, yalan-dir*
 what say-PRS(3)-COND lie-COP3
 “All he says is just lies.”
- (12) *kim dövät ed-ir-sä et-sin, män get-mä-yäcäm*
 who invitation do-PRS-COND(3) do-IMP3 1 go-NEG-FUT.1
 “They may all invite me, I won’t go.”
- (13) *nä tähär ed-ir-sä et-sin, o, kitab-ı al-a bil-mä-yäcäk*
 how do-PRS(3)-COND do-IMP3 DIST book-ACC take-CV can-NEG-FUT(3)
 “Whatever he does, he won’t be able to buy the book.”

This type of conditional clause is named ‘universal’ by (Goeksel & Kerslake 2005) and ‘parametric concessive-conditional’ in (Haspelmath 1993). In indefinite relative clauses, Kryz may use the same *-sa* as a clitic after *interrogative* verb forms instead of the indigenous conditional form ending in *-na*. Although these forms are rare, it is worth stating that all interrogative tenses are attested:

- (14) *şıta ũr řa-ri-sa bag ũxhir-ci ğarfar-e*
 how_much be-PRSINTERR-AZ.COND bridegroom arrive.M-SEQ appear-PRS.M
 “In one way or another, the bridegroom appears.”
- (15) *duxvar galu.c-a ři ğarç’ar-i-sa u-n galu*
 son.GEN throat-IN what IPF.go.out-INTERR-AZ.COND DIST-HUM.GEN throat(F)
seuhur-ci valt’al-yu
 PV-swell-SEQ tie.MP-PRS.F

¹ Rather exceptional are conditional forms in which the enclitic *agan* ‘if’, a remote loan from Persian through Tat, follows an assertive form, for instance:

- (10) *vaz u-bi ats’ar-de-d-agan řiz lam varca ask’va-ci-vun?*
 2.DAT PROX-NPL know-NEGPRS-N-IF why DIST high sit-PERF.INTERR-2
 “If you don’t know these, why do you perch so high (to preach)?”

“Something having got stuck in his son’s throat, it became swollen and blocked.”

- (16) *zin ği-b-ghun-i pıram hata a-skva-ci-zin-sa*
 I PV-F-begin.PF-PART shirt(F) where PV.put.F-PERF.INTERR-1-AZ.COND
za-v va-rq'var-de-b
 1-AD PV-find.F-NEGPRS-F
 “I cannot find where I (may) have put this shirt which I had begun to sew.”
- (17) *şı xhi-ci-sa kum aca'ur kuçmiş-cu*
 what become-PERF.INTERR-AZ.COND village(F) from_there moving-PERF.F
 “Then something happened, and the village moved from there.”
- (18) *hakim.ci-z an şı vu-yi-ni-sa a-n-ir*
 judge-DAT EVEN what give.PF-INTERR-PST-AZ.COND DIST-H-ERG
ta'cir-ci taraf aqa-c
 merchant-GEN side hold-AOR.N
 “Whatever he gave to the judge, the latter would keep siding with the merchant.”

In one instance, the form marked with *-sa* is added to a future interrogative form and serves to express a worry:

- (19) *zin q'ay-ca'ur çixa'an u-bi hal-iz ğismat şı-yi-sa?*
 1 die.PF-EL after PROX-NPL who-DAT fate be-FUT.INTERR-AZ.COND
 “After I die, upon whom will they be bestowed?”

1.2.2. Coalescence of indefinite pronouns

Azeri indefinite pronouns can be derived from any interrogative base, and take inflection after the morpheme *-sa* (in fact *-(y)sa*, but see below):

- (20) *ömriim-dä kim-sä-ni incit-mä-miş-äm*
 lifetime.1-LOC who-INDEF-ACC annoy-NEG-PERF-1
 “In all my life I have not hurt anybody.”
- (21) *bu-nu kim-sä-yä ver-di-m*
 PROX-ACC who-INDEF-DAT give-WPST-1
 “I gave it to someone.”

except on locative adverbs (locative arguments behave as in the other cases):

- (22) *kimsä-dä söz de-mä-yä cürät ol-m-ur*
 who-INDEF-LOC word say-INF-DAT audacity be-NEG-PRS(3)
 “Nobody dares to speak out.”
- (23) *kim-sä-dän yox heç imdad*
 who-INDEF-ABL NEG.exist ANY help

“There is no help from anybody.”

- (24) *harda-sa su ax-ıd-ıl-ır*
 where-INDEF water flow-CAUS-PASS-PRS(3)
 “There is a leak somewhere.”

- (25) *o-nu mæn haradan-sa tanı-yır-am*
 DIST-ACC I wherefrom-INDEF know-PRS-1
 “I know him from somewhere.”

In contrast, Kryz indefinite pronouns inflect for case *before* the indefinite morpheme:

- (26) *hal-ir-sa za leha lem tuğva-cu*
 who.OBL-ERG-INDEF 1.GEN black donkey bring.F-PERF.F
 “Someone will have driven my donkey away.”

- (27) *ghar çic-kar-sa şikayat.c-a ʔaxhur-cu*
 snake what.OBL-SUBEL-INDEF complaint-IN come.F-PERF.F
 “The snake had come to complain about something.”

It is assumed that in Azeri indefinite pronouns originate from conditional copular relative clauses, because the characteristic /y/ of the ancient copula appears after a vowel, for instance in:

- (28) *nä-ysä-ylä*
 what-COPCOND=INDEF-COMIT
 “with something”

Likewise in Kryz the (interrogative) copula is *yi*, and since the two nominative forms of these mixed indefinite pronouns end in a vowel they clearly show that they are based on grammaticalized conditional relative clauses:

- (29) *dahar-ci ʔadi-ğ ti-yi-sa ya^f*
 stone-GEN surface-SUPER who-INTERRCOP-INDEF EXIST(M)
 “Someone (= whoever it is) is on the rock.”

- (30) *şi-yi-sa u-nda-ux sa-b fikir ya^fu*
 what-INTERRCOP-INDEF DIST-HPL-APUD one-F thought(F) EX-F
 “Whatever it is they have some idea.”

- (31) *uca şi-yi-sa sa-d sir ya^f*
 here what-COPINTERR-EVER one-N secret COPEX
 “There is some mystery here, whatever it is.”

(here *t'il* 'finger' and *miq'e* 'near') to which the Turkic verbalizers *-lA-* (transitive) (ex. 36) or *-lAş-* (intransitive) (ex. 37) are added:

- (36) *molla-r* *yit* *t'il-le-miş* *yi-ra* *ul-e*
 mulla-ERG honey(N) finger-TR.VBLZ-PERFPART do-MANNER eat-PRS.N
 "Mulla eats the honey, taking it with his finger."
- (37) *zaz* *miq'e-laş-miş* *sak!*
 1.DAT near-INTR.VBLZ-PERFPART be.IMP.M
 "Come near me!"

These participial forms based on a Kryz word are rare, and they are not part of a verbal paradigm (they never appear without an auxiliary).

1.3.2. Syntactically mixed compound verbs

In contrast, compound verbs involving Azeri participles in *-miş* are productive and represent the most important source of new lexical verbs, constantly flowing into the language. The Azeri participles may undergo just a few phonetic adaptations (the suffix *-miş* is not vowel harmonic, and some consonant clusters are simplified).

Some of them are transitive only, and use the auxiliary *aric* 'do'.

- (38) *riş-ir* *ic* *cihiz* *hazıramış* *ar-i*
 girl-ERG REFL.F(GEN) outfit preparing do-OPT
 "Let the girl prepare her nuptial outfit." (Az. *hazırlamış*)

Intransitive compounds select *xhiyic* 'be(come)' as their auxiliary, for instance:

- (39) *ta'ciblanmış xhiyic* 'to wonder'
yarvarmış xhiyic 'to implore'
dil(len)mış xhiyic 'to speak up'
evlenmiş xhiyic 'to marry'
artmış xhiyic 'increase', etc.

There are a few exceptions to the preceding rule: some intransitive action verbs (such as *uzmuş aric* 'swim', lit. 'swimming do') select the transitive auxiliary 'do'.

All these verbs are tending to become more frequent in the language of younger speakers, and can sometimes replace a genuine verb, e.g. *ürğuric* (believe) is being replaced by *inanmış xhiyic*.

Many of these verbs can switch valency. To do so, they not only have to change their auxiliary, but the Azeri participle also changes, in conformity with the original valency-modifying morphology. In most valency-alternating pairs of compound verbs the transitive is unmarked, and the intransitive is derived. The derived intransitive (anticausative or passive) adds *-l* or *-n*, e.g. *yaymış aric* 'spread, tr.' / *yay-il-miş xhiyic* 'spread, intr.':

- (40) *musulmançuluğval yay-miş ar-iz sa-r Ğarab Ğaxhir-ca*
 Islam spread(TR)-PERFPART do-INF one-MArab come-PERF.M
 “An Arab had come to spread Islam.”
- (41) *ahali-c araca azar-bi yay-il-miş xhi-ca*
 people-GEN amongillness-PL spread-ANTICAUS-PERFPART become-PERF
 “The illnesses had spread among the people.”
- (42) *u-ndar Peyğamber-ci haqina yaz-il-miş xhi-ci*
 PROX-HPL.ERG prophet-GEN about write-PASS-PERFPART be-PERFPART
kitab-ar uxvats'-re
 book-PL read-PRS.N
 “They would read the books about the Prophet.”

This derivation is also very productive with denominal Azeri verbs: the frequential property of the copied feature is retained here, contrary to what was observed for the evidential clitic.

Since instances of auxiliarized forms derived from Kryz indigenous lexemes can be found (see the aforementioned *t'illemiş, miq'eleşmiş*), we may assume conversely that a number of nouns, for instance *yağ* ‘oil’, must have made their way into the Kryz nominal lexicon by means of this Trojan horse, given examples like the following:

- (43) *va siupel-bi çic-zina yağ-la-miş ar-ci-vun ?*
 2.GEN moustache-PL what-INST butter-VBLZ(TR)-PERFPART do-PERF.INTERR-2
 “What have you greased your moustache with?”
- (44) *va siubel-bi çic-zina yağ-la-n-miş xhi-yic ?*
 2.GEN moustache-PL what-INST butter-VBLZ-INTR-PERFPART be-AOR.N
 “What is your moustache greased with?”

Some verb pairs have a derived causative in *-t* or *-r*, like *işla-miş xhiyic* ‘work’ / *işla-t-miş aric* ‘make work’ or *kuçmiş xhiyic* ‘change places’ / *kuç-ur-miş aric* ‘help to change places’:

- (45) *yif yiğ işlemiş xhi-yic lazim-e*
 night day work-VBLZ-PERFPART be-MASD necessary-COP
 “It is necessary to work night and day.”
- (46) *zin a-cib işla-t-miş yi-ra-b-zin*
 1 DIST-HPL work-CAUS-PERFPART do-EVT-HPL-1
 “I will make them work.” (Az. *işlätmiş*; compare the non-causative verb in ex. 9)
- (47) *şib fura k'ul-ibe kuç-ur-miş yi-re-b*

three(F) husband.GEN house-PL.IN move-CAUS-PERFPART do-PRS-HPL
 “He arranged the moving of each of his three (daughters) to their husbands’
 houses.” (Az. küçürmüş; for the intransitive counterpart, see ex. 17)

Finally, some verb pairs are equipollent: both verbs are derived from a non-verbal base, one with a valency-increasing (causative) suffix, the other with a valency-decreasing suffix, e.g. *duz-at-miş aric* ‘fix’ / *duz-al-miş xhiyic* ‘get fixed’:

- (48) *i-d-kn-i* *şay-ri zin* *duz-at-miş* *yi-yiya*
 PV-N-remain.PF-PART thing-PL 1 right-TRANS-PERFPART do-FUT-N
 “The remaining things I will fix by myself.” (Az. düzältmiş)
- (49) *u-c* *duz-al-miş* *şi-yi* *kar da-d*
 prox right-intrans-perfpart be-futpart work negcop-n
 “This is something which cannot be fixed.” (Az. düzälmiş)

The resulting mixed verb phrases are never found to show errors in the selection of the auxiliary or the participial form, and they are used abundantly, with remarkable flexibility:

- (50) *a-c-kar* *bala* *turamiş* *şi-u-de-b (...)* *halazan*
 DIST-NOTH-SUBEL young being_fertile be-F-NEGPRS-F therefore
da-ux-ts’-i, *turatmiş* *diyi* *ğatir misal* *ya^ε-u*
 NEG-bear-IPF-PART producing NEG.do.IPF.PART mule proverb(F) EXIST-F
 “No child is ever born of it... therefore, “a non-procreating, not-giving-birth mule” is proverbial.”

1.3.3. Mixed coalescent verb forms

The integration of Azeri verbs through the integration of their *-miş* participle is a continuing process, in which the forms involved show more and more signs of adaptation to the preexisting Kryz morphological frame, not only derivational but also inflectional. Consequently, some TAM markers can – albeit rather exceptionally – be added directly to the borrowed participle. These inflection markers are always associated with a perfective stem in Kryz verbal morphology. Attested in such a position are

the sequential converb marked with *-ci*:

- (51) *furi* *şayal-ci* *sayağ* *şaqıldamiş-ci* *işa-re*
 man child-GEN like weeping-SEQ cry-PRS.M
 “The man cries, weeping like a child.”
- (52) *u-n-var* *ara-la-n-miş-ci* *kum-xvan* *şaxha-re*
 PROX-H-ADEL interval-VBLZ-INTR-PERF.PART-SEQ village-DIR arrive-PRS.M

“Taking leave of this one, he arrives near the village.”

the perfect marked with *-ca*:

- (53) *va sus azaramiş-cu*
 2.GEN bride(NOM) getting_ill-PERF.F
 “Your bride has fallen ill.” (see also ex. 17)

and hortative (1st person imperative) forms marked with *-dam*:

- (54) *zin an q’ay-iz-karta ya-zina yaşamiş-dam.*
 1 AN die-DAT-UNTIL 2PL-INST living-HORT1
 “As for me, I will live with you both until I die.”

The synthetic formations are restricted: other TAM specifications require the use of an auxiliary (see ex. 60 and 71 below).

The Azeri forms in *-miş* are also unavailable for use in attributive function without the Kryz auxiliary (our gloss ‘PERFPART’ thus applies to the Azeri form, not to the analysis of the Kryz verb phrase!), perhaps because their orientedness (in contrast with Kryz participles, which are unoriented, see Authier 2009, p.345) demands further explicitation of the valency:

- (55) *duxrar işta-t-miş ar-i şamal*
 son.PL.ERG work.VBLZ-CAUS-PERFPART do.PF-PART trick
 “The trick used by the sons.”
- (56) *şad-da-n-miş xhi-yi Fati*
 happy-VBLZ-INTR-PERFPART be.PF-PART F.
 “happy Fati.” (Az. *şadlanmış*)

1.4. Denominal adjectives

Denominal adjectives in *-lu* and privative adjectives in *-suz* are globally copied, without vowel harmony, from Azeri adjectives in *-li* and *-siz*, for instance *işiğ-lu* in example 8, and *namus-suz* in example 5. Often they are copied in pairs like *salağlu* ‘tidy’ / *salağasu* ‘untidy’.

The copied adjectives inflect for Kryz cases if substantivized:

- (57) *varlu-n rike^f*
 rich-HUM.GEN farm.IN
 ‘at the farm of the rich’
- (58) *Allah ta’alacir girt şaq’ilsuz-ar-iz şaq’il vu-tir*
 God High-ERG all unintelligent-PL-DAT intelligence give-JUSS

'May God give intelligence to all those who lack it!'

They can also constitute the base for native derivational affixes: ^saq'ilsuz-val 'lack of intelligence'.

1.4.1. Endowment adjectives in –Lu

Other items attested in our corpus are *idda^salu* 'pretentious', *varlu* 'rich', *insaflu* 'just', *terbiyalu* 'educated', *yaşlu* 'old', *xayirlu* 'propitious', ^samallu 'clever', *farasatlu* 'skilled', *aralu* 'distant', *xayla aylalu* 'with a large family', *ğamlu* 'sad', *tilsimlu* 'magic', *yaralu* 'wounded', *uzaklu* 'long', *buylu* 'handsome', *imkanlu* 'affluent', *yaharlu* 'saddled', *uddu alavlu* 'incensed', *guclu* 'strong', ^saq'illu 'intelligent'.

When the nominal base is an abstract noun of Arabic origin in *-at*, the derived Kryz adjective disallows the cluster [tl] and a geminated suffix appears in *ihdiyattu* 'cautious', ^sadalattu 'just', *barakattu* 'blessed', *ğiyattu* 'precious', *lazzattu* 'delicious', *ğabiliyattu* 'talented', *hurattu* 'honored'. These geminated sequences contribute to the integration of the copied adjectives in the Kryz native stock, because gemination is a characteristic feature of a (small) class of them, like *q'iç'ç'a* 'solid'; *q'illa* 'thin'; *q'yilla* 'salted'; *ç'ut't'a* 'pricky', *luzzu* 'white'; as an ideophonic expressive feature, gemination restricted to the word class of adjectives is also found in the Tsezic branch of East Caucasian, for instance in Hunzib, see (van den Berg 1994).

Geographic origin is also expressed by this suffix when relating to non-Kryz locations, for instance *kusnattu* 'person from Kūsnet', *şamaxulu* 'person from Shamakhi'.

Most interestingly, a couple of mixed copies also occur, like *çam-lu xab* 'oily = dirty hand', parallel to the native derivation *çam-a xab* 'greasy = rich hand', both formed on the Kryz noun *çam* 'butter'.

1.4.1. Privative adjectives in –suz

The privative suffix is found on adjectives in adverbial use:

- (59) *xabar-suz* 'unknowingly'
had-suz 'immensely'
sas-suz samur-suz 'without the faintest noise'
- (60) *zin Nardan Xatun-suz yaşamiş şa-va-yda-b zin*
 I Nardan Khatun-without living be-F-FUTNEG-F I
 'I will not be able to live without Nardan Khatun.'

When used attributively (ex. 61 & 62) or substantivized (ex. 63), these adjectives take the final attributive *-a* morpheme which is added as a rule to any adjective whose stem ends in a consonant²:

(61) *dardsuz-a adami-yar* ‘people without worries’

farsuz-a nukar ‘an unskilled servant’

(62) *furi-suz-a xinib, q’iq’en-suz-a barkan*

husband-less-a wife saddle-without-a horse

‘woman without a husband, horse without a saddle.’ (Prov.)

(63) *farru na farsuz-a-n-iğ sa-d ğiyimat ğiy-iz şa-*
da-d

skilled and unskilled-ADJ-H.GEN-SUPER one-N value put-INF be-
NEG.EVT-N

‘The same value shall not be given to the skilled and unskilled.’ (Prov.)

The use of these two copied derivations prevails in moral genres (proverbs and edifying tales): we may assume that the linguistic material was imported together with the cultural context.

2. Kryz morphology based on Azeri patterns (structural copying)

Apart from global copying of morphemes, a relatively large number of morphological features found in Kryz grammar are unexpected or peculiar to this language as a member of East Caucasian, but can be explained by its long-lasting contact with Azeri. These are:

- instances of vowel harmony on both case-inflected nouns and gender-inflected verbs;
- the internal structure of two converb formation patterns, expressing respectively manner and immediacy;
- the very frequent use of subject pronouns as enclitics on finite verb forms and the development of a person-sensitive injunctive paradigm;
- the frequent use of a genitive instead of the expected nominative form on NPs in the syntactic position of subject of a nominalized (intransitive) verb;
- a genitive definiteness marking split on possessor NPs.

2.1. Vowel harmony

² This feature seems to be originally Lezgian; in languages which have it, it seems to be a trace of more elaborate NP internal agreement paradigms as can still be found in Tsakhur and Southern Rutul. But the *-a* attributive morpheme has also been massively copied in Tat, where almost all preposed attributive adjectives evince it, including adjectives in *-lū* copied from Azeri: *ye fehmlū-ye odomi* ‘a clever person’.

First a caveat: dissolution of consonant clusters and corollary vowel harmony is well documented in Lezgian languages (see Haspelmath 1993 pp. 56-58 for instances of front / back harmony on the plural marker and labial harmony on oblique stem markers in Lezgian) as well as in other branches of East-Caucasian, like Tsezic, with much less or even no contact with Turkic languages. Thus vowel harmony could well be an inherited feature of the family, structurally linked to the disproportion of consonants versus vowels in the phonological inventory, to the fact that more generally East-Caucasian is clearly a member of the North-Eurasian area which Jakobson (1931) found to display secondary correlations on consonants, and to the tendency to have suprasegmental features like pharyngealization spreading from consonants to adjacent vowels. So vowel harmony as a feature of genuinely Kryz affixes might as well not be a result of language contact... It affects both verbal and nominal inflections, but in rather different ways.

2.1.1. Vowel harmony on inflected nouns

Nouns inflect for a rich case paradigm in all East Caucasian languages, distinguishing nominative *vs* ‘oblique’ cases derived from an oblique stem which is usually the form also used for the ergative. In Kryz, oblique cases are based on the form with genitive meaning, and the suffixes used for this genitive-oblique derivation display considerable allomorphy. Among these genitive marking morphemes, *-l*, *-n*, and *-rd* must, for phonotactic reasons (East Caucasian disallows most consonant clusters) take a buffer vowel before the sonorant. The default timbre is [i], but the vowel must be [u] if the root already contains a [u] or any labial (*v*, *b*, *m*) or labialized consonant root-finally. A few contrasting examples are given here:

(64) *liʃ* ‘lice’ > *liʃ-ird*
tʰuʃ ‘badger’ > *tʰuʃ-urd*

(65) *tur* ‘name’ > *tur-un*
yiʒ ‘day’ > *yiʒ-in*

(66) *gvag* ‘shred’ > *gvag-ul*
ʔaq ‘sweat’ > *ʔaqʰ-il*

All oblique cases derived from the genitive then show the same harmonic vowel.

2.1.2. Vowel harmony on inflected verbs

Kryz verbs have the gender and number of their Patientive or Single argument cross-referenced in a pre-root (post-preverbal) slot³. The most frequent (‘weak’)

³ Verbal roots consist of a single consonant, and most of them have preverbs (such as *yi-* and *ʒa-*). The gender-number system comprises five ‘gender-number agreement classes’. The

conjugation type has a [u] prefix for feminine indexation, and if a (perfective-marking) sonorant follows the root, its buffer vowel is likewise [u]:

- (67) *yi-q-ir* ‘take him!’
 y-u-q-ur ‘take her!’
- (68) *yi-gh-in* ‘go (masculine)!’
 y-u-gh-un ‘go (feminine)!’
- (69) *ğ̣a-q’-il* ‘lie down (masculine)!’
 ğ̣va-q’-ul ‘lie down (feminine)!’

Other verb affixes like (past tense) *-ni* tend to be pronounced *-nü* in labial contexts, but this is not as systematic as the preceding cases, and we in fact consider [ü] as an allophone and not a phoneme.

2.2. Manner converbs

The widespread use of converbs in adverbial subordinate clauses is a common feature of Turkic and East Caucasian (see Haspelmath & Koenig 1996). Two of the numerous Kryz converbs have lookalike counterparts in Azeri, both formally and semantically.

2.2.1. The simple and reduplicated manner converbs

The simple manner converb is a depictive form parallel to Azeri forms in *-A*:

- (70) *ik-ra* *riş.i-xvan* *işar-r-e-ni*
 look-Manner girl-DIR cry-PRS-PST
 ‘He was crying while looking at the girl.’ (Az. *bax-a* ‘looking’)
- (71) *sa-b* *ghar* *surunmiş* *şava* *ġa-şxhva-ryu*
 one-F snake crawling be.F.Manner PV-come.F-PRS.F
 ‘A snake comes crawling towards him.’ (Az. *sürün-ä* ‘crawling’)

If reduplicated, the manner converb acquires an affective nuance (the same applies in Azeri):

- (72) *işar-a* *işar-a* *li-re ki*
 cry-Manner cry-Manner say-PRS KI
 ‘She said, crying pitifully...’ (Az. *ağla-ya ağla-ya*)

“feminine” gender-number includes single human female referents and all other animates, as well as many inanimates, plus some abstract concepts.

- (73) *u-bi div.ci-r ats'ar-a ats'ar-a duru li-p-ca*
 PROX-NPL demon-E know-Manner know-Manner lie PV-say-PERF
 “The demon lied on purpose.” (Az. *bil-ä bil-ä*)

2.2.2. The doubled & negated (immediacy) converb

In Azeri as in Turkish, the juxtaposition of the positive and negative eventual⁴ stems of the same verb equates to a converb form yielding the meaning ‘as soon as’: *gäl-är gäl-müz* (come-EVT come-NEGEVT) ‘as soon as he comes’. In the same manner, Kryz uses a converb composed of two consecutive forms of the same verb, the first of which is homonymous with the Kryz ‘eventual’ tense-mood form:

- (74) *furi ĩa-şxha-ra ĩa-da-şxha-ra xvar ğa-p-d-u*
 man PV-come- EVT=MANNER PV-NEG-come-MANNER dog PV-F-go.out-AOR-F
 “As soon as the man had arrived, the dog jumped out.”

- (75) *halu kalma u-n siy-a ĩar ğa-rfar-a*
 this word PROX-H.GEN mouth-INEL PV-go.out-MANNER
ğa-da-rfar-a dahar zir-ğan la-sl-ic
 PV-NEG-go.out-MANNER stone cow-EQU PV-turn-AOR.N
 “As soon as this word came out of his mouth, the rock changed into a cow.”

But note that in Kryz, the second form is non-finite, having infix negation, whereas the eventual negative forms would be *ĩa-şxha-da-r*, *ğarfar-da-r*, with the suffixed negation characteristic for finite assertive verb forms. This is a recent discrepancy. The Kryz forms with suffixed negation are more recent, as demonstrated by external comparison. In the neighbouring language Budugh, where the same copied converb of immediacy is used, both manner converbs and the eventual forms have infix negation, and both positive and negative forms of the eventual are still segmentally identical with the converb, and also share the same pitch accent on the negative infix. The difference in Budugh is prosodic: the positive eventual has initial pitch, like all finite verb forms, while the positive converb has final pitch (for the Budugh data and a detailed reconstruction, see Authier 2010a and 2010b). The development of the Kryz converb copied from the Turkic one is thus more ancient than one of the finite verb forms of the language: it goes back to the stage at which finite and non-finite forms were distinguished only by the position of the pitch accent, as is still the case in Budugh, and not yet by the externalization of the negation morpheme in final position.

2.3. Person marking on finite verb forms

⁴ Following a seminal article by Lazard 1975 on this category in Iranian languages, I use the term ‘eventual’ for the non-focal imperfective (intraterminal) TAM category found both in Turkic and in many East Caucasian languages such as Kryz.

In Lezgian languages, as in most branches of East Caucasian, persons involved in the predicate frame are not indexed on verb forms as is the case in South or North Caucasian, but expressed by free pronouns. Exceptions to this rule are found on one hand in Dargwa languages, in Lak, and in Akhwakh, where the emergence of person marking systems is apparently not related to the free pronominal system, and on the other hand in Tabasaran and Udi (two languages which have had intense contact with Azeri for a very long time), where personal markers are clitics closely related to the free pronouns. In Kryz, the influence of Azeri verb morphology is probably responsible for two patterns of person marking attached to the verb: firstly the extensive use of pronominal clitics to the right of finite verb forms, and secondly the parallel inflection paradigms for injunctive forms.

2.3.1 Person clitics on finite verb forms

Finite verb forms in Kryz are very often followed by a personal pronoun. Since there are no other exceptions to the rule that every finite clause must be ended by a verb (the only exception to SOV order is in non-finite, sequential clauses: see Authier, 2009, p.325), these pronouns have to be considered clitics, for instance:

- (76) *vun duxtur-e: dard vats'ar-yu-vaz, darman vuts'-ryu-vun*
 2 doctor-COP.M illness(F)F-know-PRS.F-2.DAT medicine(F) give-PRS.F-2
 “You really are a doctor: you know the illnesses, you give the medicines.”

The cliticization of a personal pronoun is not at all prevented by previous instances of the same pronoun in the same function within the same clause:

- (77) *zin-a-d zi-vaz ŷaǧvats'-ru-zin*
 1-dist-notn 1-2.dat bring-evt.f-1
 “I will bring it to you.”

In particular, repetition of the pronoun in postverbal position is quite systematic when its first instance is placed in (preverbal) focus, after a topicalized object:

- (78) *lam ğizil-bi zin sa'ā-ca-zin*
 DIST gold-PL 1 throw-PERF-1
 “It is I who threw these golden coins.”

Multiple exponence of person marking is a very current phenomenon in Kryz, and all the more striking a feature since explicit arguments are never obligatory.

Note that like Azeri conditional forms in *-sA*, Kryz conditional forms ending in *-na* take personal clitics, although they are not strictly finite (independent) forms:

- (79) *a-xir-çina-vun fura sak, fura yi-çina-vun ibur kiy!*
 PV-sleep-PERF.IF-2 awake be.M.IMP awake cop-IPF.IF-2 ear put.IMP

“If you are asleep, wake up, if you are awake, listen!”

Another interesting phenomenon, with nice parallels in Tabasaran (see Khanmagomedov 1970 p.70f.), is that most syntactic functions (not only verb arguments, but also adjuncts) with their afferent case marking can be found on these enclitic personal pronouns – for instance apudlocative in possessive predicates, or superlocative in spatial situations:

(80) *sa-b kis sucu-zaux*
 one-F hen exist.F-1.APUD
 “I only have one hen.”

(81) *na ʔul, namaʔan qʔil i-b-kin-de-b-ni-zağ*
 neither eye(F) nor head(F) PV-F-remain-NEGPREF-PST-1.SUPER
 “Neither eye nor head would have remained on me.”

Note that unlike Tabasaran, Kryz cannot index genitives on these cliticized pronouns: the syntactic domain remains strictly clause-bound.

2.3.2 Person distinctions in the injunctive paradigm

Injunctive forms in ‘canonical’ East Caucasian – for instance in Avar – can be used with any person in subject position (this must be expressed by a free pronoun if it is to be made explicit in the clause). They agree only in gender-number with the S/P argument, like any other verb form.

But Kryz, and to various degrees other Lezgian languages like Budugh or Rutul, have injunctive paradigms in which different forms are dedicated to first, second and third person. This specialization is coupled with formal heterogeneity: the distinct segments have various origins, and are unrelated to the free pronouns.

If we compare these paradigms with the situation prevailing in Azeri, the parallel is obvious: Azeri, like other Turkic languages, also has a heteroclititic injunctive paradigm, with person endings much less transparently related to free pronouns than in the other finite verbal paradigms. It shows interference with the optative paradigm (suffix *-A*).

The following table gives the Azeri verb *käsmäk* in parallel to Kryz *kurayc* ‘slay’ in the injunctive forms:

	Az.	Azeri injunctive & optative	Kryz injunctive
1	<i>män</i>	<i>käs-im / käs-ä-m</i>	<i>kura-da-m</i>
2	<i>sän</i>	<i>käs / käs-ä-sän</i>	<i>Mpatient: sakur / Fpatient: saukur</i>
3	<i>o</i>	<i>käs-sin / käs-ä</i>	<i>kura-tir</i>
1pl	<i>biz</i>	<i>ø / käs-ä-k</i>	<i>excl. kura-da-m / incl. kura-da-y</i>
2pl	<i>siz</i>	<i>käs-in / käs-ä-siz</i>	<i>Mpatient: sakur-ay / Fpatient: saukur-ay</i>
3pl	<i>onlar</i>	<i>käs-sin-lär / käs-ä-lär</i>	<i>kura-tir</i>

The corner most resistant to copying in the Kryz paradigm is the second person, where we find a preverb (*sa-*), a characteristically non-Turkic device in imperative marking, and consequently a pre-radical slot for gender agreement with the patient. But note that Kryz, like many Lezgian languages, has plural agreement with the subject (S/A) in the second person imperative, a clear case of alignment split (Northern branches of East Caucasian do not show any similar infringement on the ergative verb-indexing system).

The third person marking (see ex. 89) is obviously recent, and its origin is relatively straightforward. The morpheme *-tir* is the outcome of the coalescent permissive auxiliary, to be compared with the root of the verb *ya-tir-ic* ‘leave’. The resulting mood is a mild optative, and its integration in the injunctive paradigm balances the fact that two other deontic categories (debitive and optative) are found not only with third person subjects but also in the first and second person. All the material here is native, and so far we have no clear copying phenomenon except for the diversification of the paradigm along Turkic outlines (person marking must be an instance of selective, structural copying).

In contrast, the origin of the hortative (first person injunctive) marker *-dam* will certainly be the most interesting one for Turcologists. The marker *-dam* is composed of two elements: *-da-* is an irrealis marker found in Lezgian with future and habitual meanings (non-focal intraterminal, cf. Johanson, 2006b, p.172). In the Kryz dialect of Jek, it is a hortative as in Alik, but it bears suffixal agreement:

- (82) *zin vul kura-da-v*
 1 sheep(F) slay-HORT-F
 “I will slay the sheep.”

Since the final element *-m* in the Alik dialect form commutes with *-y* in *-day* in the first person plural exclusive, this *-m* must be interpreted as a first person marker.

It has a double Turkic origin. At first sight, it looks like a copied person marker, but cases of bound affix copying are particularly rare in the domain of person marking. I would suggest instead that this morpheme *-m* entered the Kryz injunctive paradigm as another, discourse-based category, and that it should be related to the Turkic yes/no question clitic *ml*.

The yes/no question clitic *ml* has been borrowed globally by Tat (see Authier to appear (c)), and in a shortened form *-m* in at least two Lezgian languages. It is found in some Rutul dialects, such as Ixrek, Borch, and Luchek, cf. Alekseev 1994. Kryz, in its Alik dialect, uses it systematically in non-parametric questions:

- (83) *vun q'ay-i-yi-m ? sağa-d-i-m ?*
 2 die.PF-PART-interrCOP-Q safe-notN-INTERRCOP-Q
 “Are you dead or alive?”

- (84) *va-z lam leha cif di-rqar-i-m ?*

2-DAT that black fog NEG-see.IPF-INTERR-Q
 “Don’t you see this black cloud?”

Since hortative forms are especially frequent in deliberative questions:

(85) *kura vul hata-r vu-dam -zin ?*
 slay(PART) sheep where-from give-HORT1 1
 “How could I sell an already slain sheep?”

We may assume that the *-m* marker was copied from Azeri as a global question marker and then became further grammaticalized as a first person marker in the injunctive paradigm.

2.3. Genitive subjects of participles

In East Caucasian languages, as in all Turkic languages with the exception of Kashkay and Gagauz, the major strategy for relative clauses is the embedding of a specific, non-finite verb form called the participle, with gapping of the shared argument in the RC, whatever its syntactic function.

But unlike Turkic embedded relative clauses, East Caucasian participles are not oriented, and the same participles can be used to relativize both the ‘subject’ (Single argument of intransitive / Agent of transitive / experiencer of affective predicates) and other syntactic positions. This is made possible by the fact that in East Caucasian relative clauses, the nominal arguments of embedded verbs retain their case marking. In (ex. 86), the embedded verb being transitive, its subject remains in the ergative case, while in the following (ex. 87), the verb ‘know’ being semantically affective, its subject is an experiencer expressed in the dative case, as it would be in the corresponding independent clause:

(86) *a-n-ir v-ar-i har ixtilat.ci-ğ ũ-ma-rğ-a !*
 DIST-H-ERG F-do.PF-PART each story-SUPER PV-PROH-trust-M
 “Do not believe every tale he tells!”

(87) *va-z ba-d-ats’ar-i adami-yar yiq’iça pis-a-cbar şabareb*
 2-DATHPL-NEG-know-PART person-PL inside bad-A-HPL be.PRS.HPL
 “Among the people you don’t know, some are bad.”

The possibility also remains of dropping the transitive subject altogether although it is not indexed on the participle (which is hardly possible with a transitive participle in Turkic):

(88) *yi-di-xha xhin diyar şa-rçar-a*
 PV-NEG-mow.PF-(PART) grass late PV-rot-EVT
 “Unmown grass rots later.”

In other words, East Caucasian has no argument downgrading.

In contrast, Turkic embedded subjects become adnominal dependents of some nominalized verbs, like the *-DIK-* form heading either complement or relative clauses, and as such they take genitive case marking (like many other RC strategies using the participle in other linguistic families like Indo-European or Uralic), or are at least referenced on the verb by possessive markers.

Kryz has not developed person head-marking in subordinate clauses, but in this language the subject of an embedded participle, whatever its original case marking, can in some situations be downgraded to the status of genitive complement of the participle, thus obviously copying the Azeri case frame. This happens when at least one of the following conditions is fulfilled:

- the RC is very short and the participle is substantivized (ex. 89 & 90):

(89) *Allahci-r va i-ka-y vu-tir*
 god-ERG 2.GEN PV-want-PART give-JUSS
 “May God give you what you want!”

(90) *za ibur-zina ts'e^ʔil-ir / ts'e^ʔil li-yi i-xha-c-zaz*
 1.GEN ear-INST goat-ERG / goat-GEN say-PART PV-hear-AOR.N-1.DAT
 “I heard with my own ears what the goat has said / the goat’s words.”

- the participle is intransitive and the head noun is a name of a place or time (in this case, the non-downgraded nominative case marking is also perfectly grammatical, see ex. 91, 92 & 93):

(91) *zin q'usa-ya, za / zin riq'ar-i vaxt-yu*
 1NOM old-COP.m 1.GEN / 1NOM IPF.die-PART time(F)-COP.F
 “I am old, it is the time for me to die.”

(92) *a-nda / a-cbar kica^ʃar^ʃ a-šta vaxt-yu*
 DIST-HPL.GEN / DIST-HPL.NOM work.INEL PV-IPF.HPL.come.PARTtime(F)-COP.F
 “It is the time at which they come back from work.”

(93) *hila za / zin çi-yi ciga an ats'ar-de-d-zaz*
 now 1.GEN / 1NOM go-IPF-PART place EVEN know-NEG.PRS-N-1.DAT
 “I do not even know the place where they go.”

- the subject of the participle is a reflexive pronoun referring to the subject of the main clause (ex. 94, 95 & 96):

(94) *dil ic ğva-yn-i ciğaç-a a-sk-ryu*
 key(F) SELF.F(GEN) PV.F-PF.take-PART place-IN PV-put-PRS.F
 “She put the key back in the place from which she had taken it.”

(95) *gada-yar-iz ge yi-qr-i kici-kar reha şa-re*

boy-PL-DAT SELFHPLGEN PV-catch.PF-PART work-SUBEL confused be-PRS
 “The boys are ashamed of what they have done.”

- (96) *ug i-d-qa-y-ar xinib-ar-iz ixlat yi-ryu*
 SELF.M(GEN) PV-N-see-PART-PL woman-PL-DAT story(F) do-PRS.F
 “He tells the two wives what he has seen.”

The last condition applies if and only if the reflexive pronoun does not have the focusing function of an intensifier (*‘himself’*): in that case it must retain the case marking demanded by the original valency of the verb.

We may sum up the conditions under which subjects take genitive marking by putting forward this tentative criterion: subjects, whatever their semantic role, can or must be downgraded to the syntactic position of possessor if they are part of a presupposed situation (formally manifested by embedding) and if they are less salient than the argument expressed as a possessee.

2.4. Definiteness marking on possessive NPs

In Turkic languages, two case markers are sensitive to the definiteness or referentiality of noun phrases, namely accusative and genitive.

The best-studied is the case for ‘definite accusative’, whose use on direct objects is comparable with that of the enclitic case marker *–râ* in Persian. This property, both semantic and discursive, has been copied by Udi, an East Caucasian language very heavily influenced by Armenian as well as by Azeri and probably Persian, or its local variant (Armeno-Tat). In Udi, a dative marker is used on definite direct objects, contrasting with zero (nominative) marking on indefinite objects. No instance of the use of a special morpheme for definite objects is found in Kryz, which, like the vast majority of East Caucasian languages, instead marks *non-definite* object NPs by using an indefinite quantifier (*sa-* ‘one’).

But Kryz seems to display a case-marking contrast between definite and non-definite NPs in the role of adnominal complement or ‘possessor’. This contrast, also called ‘genitive split’ (Lander 2009) is a well-known characteristic feature of Turkic languages. The Azeri possessive NPs may take either double marking, if the possessor is referential and definite:

- (97) *it-in baş-ı-nı gör-ür-äm*
 dog-GEN head-POS3-ACC see-PRS-1
 “I see the dog’s head.”

or only head-marking. The omission of the genitive case implies an indefinite or non-referential interpretation:

- (98) *it-∅ baş-ı gör-ül-ür*
 dog head-POS3 see-PASS-PRS(3)
 “A dog’s head is seen.” =

- a) “the head of an unknown dog.” b) “a form like a dog’s head.”

As in all East Caucasian languages, Kryz possessive NPs are exclusively dependent-marking: there is no possessive marker on possessives, except for one single instance in which the Azeri morpheme *-sI* may be recognized on the contrastive adverb *la-qata-si* (DISTAL-tomorrow-AZ.POS3) “on the following day”, synonymous with the (attested) phrase:

- (99) *yig-in qata-si*
 day-GEN tomorrow-AZPOS3
 ‘On the following day’

As for the morphology of the Kryz genitive case, it is quite original if compared with related languages. These usually either have a single morpheme for all nouns in possessor function in Eastern Lezgian languages, or a set of morphemes which vary according to the gender-number and case marking of the head in Western Lezgian: Rutul and Tsakhur (for a description of the spectacular renewal of the morphosyntax and semantics of possessive noun phrases in Budugh, the other Southern Lezgian language, see Authier to appear). In Kryz, the genitive case is highly polymorphic, with grammatical variations reflecting semantic classes (for the semantic classification, which is related to the animacy hierarchy, see Authier 2009). Genitive-marking morphemes are: zero, apophony, *-d*, *-ci* (<*-di*), *-n*, *-l*, *-r*, *-i*, *-rd*, *-a*). The genitive is also the base on which all oblique cases are formed (the common situation in East Caucasian is that the oblique base is used as an ergative case).

Most nouns have only one genitive form:

- (100) *lem-ird yak*
 donkey-GEN meat
 ‘Donkey meat / the donkey’s flesh.’

The most prototypically referential nouns in Kryz have an unmarked genitive form (or nominative-genitive syncretism). This natural class comprises all proper names:

- (101) *Maclis-Ø k’ul*
 ‘Majlis’ house’
- (102) *ğuba-Ø mahal.c-a*
 ‘In the region of Kuba’

spatial-geographic terms:

<i>nik</i>	‘field’	<i>kur</i>	‘river’
<i>q’ud</i>	‘winter’	<i>q’acil</i>	‘stall’

<i>huq'</i>	'meadow'	<i>xal</i>	'roof'
<i>rix</i>	'road'	<i>kum</i>	'village'
<i>q'um</i>	'ground'	<i>huv</i>	'mill'

(103) *huv cuxud*
 mill owner
 "miller"

(104) *riş buba bigila yipdu*
 girl father(GEN) close go.F-AOR.F
 "The girl went to her father."

(105) *kur xhad va-k'va-c*
 river water PV-diminish-AOR.N
 "The river's water has dropped."

A major subclass of kinship terms can be also attached to this class; their genitive is unmarked, and among them those ranking highest have a marked nominative (ending in -y):

<i>bubay</i>	'father'	<i>bicay</i>	'wife of the maternal uncle'
<i>umay</i>	'mother'	<i>susay</i>	'wife of the paternal uncle'
<i>babay</i>	'grandfather'	<i>mamaça</i>	'midwife'
<i>daday</i>	'grandmother'	<i>sus</i>	'bride'
(as well as) <i>vul</i>	'sheep'		

(106) *sus mat'-a sa-d dilim yamiş.ci-kar ũrfi-xhici*
 bride(GEN) bosom-IN one-N slice watermelon M.enter-BECAUSE
 "Having appeared in this bride's bosom as a slice of watermelon..."

Many loans are assigned to this class with unmarked genitive. They can be either ascribed to the subcategories of salient human referents: *q'ahpa* 'prostitute', *darğa* 'judge', *ğari* 'old woman', *xunxura* 'guest', *ğunşi* 'neighbour', *gada* 'boy', *darzi* 'tailor'; or salient spatial landmarks: *pir* 'sanctuary', *kunc* 'corner'.

Obviously, natural referentiality plays a role in the assignment of genitive markers: the referents of nouns which remain unmarked in possessor function are cognitively most immediately accessible, and they do not need a marker to be related to.

Some nouns, all designating objects or (one, despised) animal, are situated at the opposite end of the salience scale and take an overt genitive marker only if definite or referential:

(107) *nisi-c dad ghala şa-re*
 cheese-GEN taste good be-PRS
 "The cheese is tasty."

(108) *tufang-ci sas*
 gun-GEN voice
 “The noise of the gun.”

(109) *lu gaç-id yiq'*
 PROX cat-GEN back
 “The back of this cat.”

If these nouns are used as qualifying, non-referential attributes, the unmarked (nominative) form is used instead:

(110) *nisi dad ghala şa-re*
 cheese taste good be-PRS
 “Cheese is tasty.”

(111) *tufang sas*
 gun voice
 “The noise of a gun.”

(112) *gaç yiq' q'um-uğ ğiurq'var-de-d*
 cat back ground-SUPER reach-NEGPRS-N
 “The back of a cat never touches (the) ground.”

While the Turkic overt genitive signals definiteness and bare nouns used as attributes are indefinite or unreferential, in Kryz, only a small subset of nouns for which genitive marking is optional can actually copy the Turkic contrast.

3. Conclusions

Phonological and syntactic features vary considerably in cross-linguistic availability, and both are prominent in Azeri-Kryz contact, but they have not been considered in this paper. As to lexical borrowing, including that of lexical affixes, this is the most obvious feature in morphological convergence. Morphosyntactic copying is not very often taken into consideration in descriptive grammars of small, sociolinguistically dominated languages, because its study requires both an understanding of the overall structure of the receiving language and its genetic family, and sufficient insights into the dominant donor language. This is rarely achieved in the field of Caucasian studies, owing to the sheer number and difficulty of the languages to be mastered by the linguist. Only a few native linguists with skills in more than one language of Daghestan, like M. Magomedov or Kh. Khaidakov, have attempted it.

We have seen that the number of Turkic morphemes used in Kryz inflectional or derivational morphology is very limited, but quite frequent in language use once they have been adopted. We have shown that some Azeri morphemes have made

their way into Kryz morphology, and they are not all clitics: some Azeri derivational affixes have also achieved productivity in Kryz.

Acquisition of copied structural features is a more elusive process, more or less prominent according to various sociolinguistic factors like dialect, age, sex, and level of instruction in the donor language. But we believe we have demonstrated that many more Turkic formal patterns have been copied in Kryz than the amount of globally copied morphological material. Even if less striking at first sight, probably more pervasive in Kryz grammar are Azeri morphological structures: many of the peculiarities of Kryz morphology and morphosyntax within Lezgian and East Caucasian languages as a whole are very clearly due to the copying of Azeri patterns.

The direction of influence in both lexis and syntax has been in most respects from Turkic to East Caucasian, and special studies like the present one are still needed for other East Caucasian languages which have undergone intensive contact with Turkic. But it should be stressed that the copying of morphological structures is probably not totally asymmetrical: however subordinate they may be at the present day, the East Caucasian speech communities which, like Kryz, have had contact with Azeri for many centuries were probably instrumental in its numerous deviations from the Turkic standard. But this reciprocity has been even less extensively investigated by Turcologists in studies on Azeri, and would be the matter for another study.

Acknowledgements

The topic and most of the data of this paper were presented at two conferences, in Bremen (*Morphologies in contact*, Sept 2009, and in Macerata (*Current Advances in Caucasian Studies*, Jan 2010); thanks are due to Prof. T. Stolz and V. Tomelleri for the invitations, and to the audiences for valuable remarks, especially Prof. A. Marra and Y. Lander. I am also indebted to Steven Kaye for checking my English, to Elvin Abbasbeyli for some of the Azeri examples, and to Majlis Shamseddinov, my main Kryz informant.

References

- Alekseev, M., (1994) Rutul. In: Smeets, R. (ed.), *The Indigenous Languages of the Caucasus*, vol. 4 Delmar: Caravan, 213-258.
- Authier, G., (2009) *Grammaire kryz*. Peeters, Paris
- (2010a) Inessif du verbe, subordination et modalité. In *Essais de typologie et de linguistique générale. Mélanges offerts à Denis Creissel*, éd. F. Floricic Presses de l'ENS, Lyon
- (2010b) Finite and non-finite: prosodic distinctions on Budugh verb stems. In *Clause-hierarchy and clause-linking: the syntax and pragmatics interface*, I. Brill ed. John Benjamins, Amsterdam
- Authier, G. to appear (a) The origin of two genitive cases and inalienability split in Budugh (East-Caucasian) In Verstraete, J-C, & Carlier, A. *The Genitive*, Amsterdam: Benjamins
- Authier, G. to appear (b) *Aoriste, éventuel et défocalisation temporelle*.

- Authier, G. to appear (c) *Le judéo-tat*.
- van den Berg, H. (1995), *A Grammar of Hunzib* (With Texts and Lexicon) München / Newcastle: Lincom Europa.
- Dorleijin, M., (2006a) Turkish elements in spoken Kurmandji. In: Lars Johanson & Boeschoten, Hendrik] (eds.) *Turkic languages in contact*. (Turcologica 61.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Goeksel, A. & Kerslake, C., (2005) *Turkish A Comprehensive Grammar*, Routledge, NY
- Haspelmath, M., (1993) *A Grammar of Lezgian* Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Haspelmath, M., & Koenig, E., (eds.) (1996) *Converbs in cross-linguistic perspective*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter
- Khanmagomedov, B., (1970) *Očerki po sintaksisu Tabasaranskogo jazyka*. Maxachkala
- Jakobson, Roman. 1931. 'K karakteristike evrazijskogo jazykovogo sojuza.' Selected Writings 1. The Hague: Mouton 1970.
- Johanson, L., 2005. Turkic-Persian bilateral copying. *Turkic Languages* 9: 223-228.
- Johanson, L., 2006a. Turkic language contacts in a typology of code interaction. In: Lars Johanson & Boeschoten, Hendrik] (eds.) *Turkic languages in contact*. (Turcologica 61.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. 4-26.
- Johanson, L., 2006b. On the roles of Turkic in the Caucasus area. In: McMahon, April & Matras, Yaron & Vincent, Nigel (eds.) *Linguistic areas*. London: Palgrave Macmillan. 160-181.
- Johanson, L., 2006c. Historical, cultural and linguistic aspects of Turkic-Iranian contiguity. In: Johanson, Lars & Bulut, Christiane (eds.) *Turkic-Iranian contact areas. Historical and linguistic aspects*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1-14.
- Lazard 1975 La catégorie de l'éventuel. In: *Mélanges Benveniste*, Paris
- Shiraliyev, M. & Sevortian, E. (1971) *Grammatika Azerbajdzhanskogo jazyka*. Baku

Transcription

The Azeri alphabet is used, with the following additions: /gh/ and /xh/ are velar approximants, /x/ is uvular; /q/ is an aspirated stop, /ğ/ is an intensive stop when in initial position.

Abbreviations

1,2,3	persons	H	human
ABL	ablative	INTRA	intraterminal
ACC	accusative	F	feminine
AD	adlocative	IN	locative
ADR	addressative	INTER	interrogative
APUD	APUDLOCATIVE	M	masculine human
CAUS	causative	N	neuter
COND	conditional	NEG	negative
DAT	dative	PF	perfective
DIST	DISTAL	POS	possessive
EVT	eventual (low focal intraterminal)	PV	preverb
EXIST	existential copula	SELF	reflexive pronoun
GEN	genitive	SEQ	sequential converb

SUBEL subrelative= partitive

SUPEL superrelative