

“Opaque” tense and aspect forms
in the light of intra-genetic and areal typology
(the case of Udi)

1. Lezgian tense and aspect forms: main sources

The Lezgian group within the Nakh-Daghestanian (East Caucasian) family includes nine languages –

LEZGIAN, TABASSARAN, AGUL, TSAKHUR, RUTUL, KRYZ, BUDUGH, ARCHI and UDI.

Peculiarities of the Lezgian tense and aspect systems:

- most “core” tense and aspect forms are **analytical**, at least historically, and have more or less transparent structure (although the original structures undergo morphologization and at present stage they can be morphologically rather tight);
- these forms originate from very simple grammatical patterns with **copulas** (nominal copula ‘is’ or, more rarely, locative copula ‘is inside’);
- these forms are most often based on such **non-finite** categories as CONVERBS, PARTICIPLES, and INFINITIVES.
- the non-finite forms (at least participles and converbs) are regularly marked by the **perfective** vs. the **imperfective aspect**, being derived from the corresponding verbal stems.

The most wide-spread source patterns include:

- ❖ PERFECTIVE CONVERB + COPULA (‘is’) > Resultatives, Perfects, Perfective Pasts
- ❖ IMPERFECTIVE CONVERB + COPULA (‘is’) > Progressives, General Presents, Futures
- ❖ PERFECTIVE PARTICIPLE + COPULA (‘is’) > Experiential Pasts, etc.
- ❖ IMPERFECTIVE PARTICIPLE + COPULA (‘is’) > Habituals, General Presents, Futures
- ❖ INFINITIVE + COPULA (‘is’) > Futures
- ❖ PERFECTIVE CONVERB + LOCATIVE COPULA (‘is inside’) > Resultatives, Perfects
- ❖ IMPERFECTIVE CONVERB + LOCATIVE COPULA (‘is inside’) > Progressives, General Presents

The “transparency” of a given tense and aspect system is a matter of degree, as one system may include both morphologically transparent and opaque forms. However, on the whole, the majority of indicative tense and aspect forms in the Lezgian languages are morphologically transparent (and reveal their analytical nature).

2. An example of a “transparent” system: Agul

In AGUL (spoken in central part of Southern Daghestan) all indicative tense and aspect forms are combinations of converbs, nominalized participles and infinitive with copulas. Most of these forms are at present rather tight, and are “analytical” only in the historical sense. However, their original structure is clear, and the dialectal variation helps to understand it in difficult cases.¹

The Past (Perfective) subsystem:

- the PERFECT/PERFECTIVE PAST = Perfective Converb + Present Copula ‘is’
cf. *pu-ne* ‘said’ < *pu-na* ‘having said’ + *e* ‘is’ (Tpig, Keren, etc.)
or *pu-na-j* ‘said’ < *pu-na* ‘having said’ + *i* ‘is’ (Burkikhan)
or *pu-na-w* ‘said’ < *pu-na* ‘having said’ + *wu* ‘is’ (Qushan)
- the RESULTATIVE = Perfective Converb + Present Locative Copula ‘is inside’
cf. *pu-na-a*, *pu-na-ja* ‘has said’ < *pu-na* ‘having said’ + *aa*, *aja* ‘is inside’ (Tpig, etc.)
or *pu-na a* ‘have said’ < *pu-na* ‘having said’ + *a* ‘is inside’ (Qushan)
- the EXPERIENTIAL PAST = Perfective Participle (nominalized) + Present Copula ‘is’
cf. *pu-f-e* ‘has said’ < *pu-f* ‘one who has said’ + *e* ‘is’ (Tpig, etc.)

The Present/Future subsystem:

- the PRESENT = Imperfective Converb + Present Locative Copula ‘is inside’
cf. *aka-a*, *aka-ja* ‘says’ < *aka-j* ‘saying’ + *aa*, *aja* ‘is inside’ (Tpig, Keren, etc.)
or *aka-ri-a* ‘says’ < *aka-ri* ‘saying’ + *a* ‘is inside’ (Burkikhan)
or *kaj a* ‘says’ < *ka-j* ‘saying’ + *a* ‘is inside’ (Qushan)
- the HABITUAL = Imperfective Converb + Present Copula ‘is’
cf. *aka-j-e* ‘says (habitually)’ < *aka-j* ‘saying’ + *e* ‘is’ (Tpig, Keren, etc.)
or *ka-w* ‘says (habitually)’ < *ka-j* ‘saying’ + *wu* ‘is’ (Qushan)
- the GENERIC = Imperfective Participle (nominalized) + Present Copula ‘is’
cf. *aka-f-e* ‘says’ < *aka-f* ‘one who says’ + *e* ‘is’ (Tpig, Keren, etc.)
- the FUTURE = Infinitive + Present Copula ‘is’
cf. *aka-s-e* ‘will say’ < *aka-s* ‘to say’ + *e* ‘is’ (Huppuq’)
or *pa-s-e* ‘will say’ < *pa-s* ‘to say’ + *e* ‘is’ (Tpig, etc.)
or *pa-s-u* ‘will say’ < *pa-s* ‘to say’ + *wu* ‘is’ (Qushan)

¹ Agul displays considerable dialectal diversity: the main distinction lies between the Qushan dialect and the “Agul proper” dialectal group, which are not mutually intelligible; the “Agul proper” group comprises Tpig, Burkikhan, Keren, Huppuq’, Tsirkhe and Fite dialects.

3. An example of an “opaque” system: Udi

The tense and aspect system of UDI (mainly spoken in Northern Azerbaijan) is, on the contrary, fairly opaque. Cf. the main finite verbal forms of the verb *bak-es* ‘be, become’ in the Nizh dialect:

The Past (Perfective) subsystem²:

- the AORIST (Perfective Past) = Perfective Converb
cf. *bak-i=ne* ‘s/he was, s/he became’ ~ *bak-i* ‘having been/become’
- the RESULTATIVE = Perfective Participle (nominalized)
cf. *bak-ijo=ne* ‘s/he has been’ ~ *bak-i-o* ‘one who has been/become’

But:

- the PERFECT = ???
cf. *bak-e=ne* ‘s/he was, s/he became’

(Schulze, to appear: suffix *-e* may reflect the same present copula *e* ‘is’, like in AGUL — cf. *pun-e* ‘said’. However, this is very dubious — the proto-AGUL form of the present copula is definitely **i* (which changed to *e* only in some dialects). Also, there is no independent evidence of the existence of a copula **e* in UDI.)

The Present/Future subsystem:

- the PRESENT = Infinitive in *-es + -a* (?)
cf. *ba=ne=k-sa* ‘s/he is, becomes’, where *bak-s-a < bak-es* ‘to be, become’ + *-a* (?)
- the FUTURE = Agent Noun in *-al* or Imperfective Participle in *-ala* (?)
cf. *bak-al=e* ‘s/he will be, become’, where *bak-al < bak-al* or *bak-ala* ‘one who does’, ‘doing’ (?)
- the POTENTIAL FUTURE = ???
cf. *ba=ne=k-o* ‘s/he will possibly be, become’, where *bak-o < ???*
(but cf. the nominalizing *-o*, like in the RESULTATIVE)
- the SUBJUNCTIVE = ???
cf. *bak-a=ne* ‘that s/he be, become’, where *bak-a < ???*

Most verbs in Udi have one and the same stem in all the forms (cf. *bak-* ‘be, become’ above). However, the behaviour of irregular verbs allows us to speak about the perfective stem, the infinitive stem and the imperfective stem, which are opposed in the following forms: see Table 1.

So, what also calls for explanation is the fact that the two Futures and the Subjunctive are all derived from the imperfective stem (whereas the Present is derived from the infinitive).

² There is an obligatory person agreement in finite clauses; personal markers can attach to verbal forms as suffixes and infixes, or they can occur on a focused constituent outside of the verb (cf. Harris 2002 for details). Below 3rd singular forms are given with the affix *=e// =ne* ‘3Sg’, whose suffixal/infixal position is determined by the preferences of particular forms.

Table 1. Three stems of irregular verbs (e.g. ‘to go’)

Stems	Forms	Meanings
Perfective, <i>tac-</i>	<i>tac-i</i> ‘having gone’ <i>tac-i=ne</i> ‘s/he went’ <i>tac-i-jo=ne</i> ‘s/he has gone’	Perfective participle/converb Aorist Resultative
Infinitive, <i>taj- ta-</i>	<i>taj-es</i> ‘to go’ <i>ta=ne=sa</i> ‘s/he is going’	Infinitive Present
Imperfective ³ , <i>tak-</i>	<i>tak-ala</i> ‘going, moving away’ <i>tak-al</i> ‘one who (usually) goes’ <i>tak-al=e</i> ‘s/he will go’ <i>ta=ne=k-o</i> ‘s/he will possibly go’ <i>tak-a=ne</i> ‘...that s/he go’	Imperfective participle Agent Noun Future Potential Future Subjunctive

4. Making Udi system (more) transparent

I suggest the following scenario for the development of the Present/Future system of UDI:

- the PRESENT has developed on the basis of the Locative model (‘be located in doing’) from the locative case of the Infinitive;
- the FUTURE and the POTENTIAL FUTURE are former presents which had totally or partially lost all other uses except the expression of future time reference;
- the SUBJUNCTIVE is also a former present which has lost any indicative uses and has remained only in non-assertive sentential complements.

In formulating these hypotheses I rely on:

- the knowledge of UDI morphology;
- the functions of corresponding tense and aspect forms in modern UDI;
- the typology of grammaticalization paths in tense and aspect domain;
- the existing intra-genetic (Lezgi) and areal (Transcaucasian) parallels of development.

4.1. The origin of the Present from a Locative source

The Present in *-sa* is a very general present tense with a wide distribution: it can describe on-going processes and states, habitual processes and states, planned actions, and is frequently used as a narrative tense (“historical present”).

- (1) be^ʕκ-a, he osʃahar i^ʕʒ^ʕ=e ej-sa mähäl-e.
look-Imp what strong snow=3Sg come-Prs outdoors-Dat
Look, what a heavy snow is falling outdoors!

³ The manner converb in *-a* is also derived from this stem; see 4.2.3 below (this form has lexical restrictions and does not exist from the verb ‘to go’).

(2) jan sa kala ajiz-e=jan bak-sa.
 we one big village-Dat=1Pl be-Prs
We live in a big village. [Aydınov, Keçaari 1996: 26]

(3) eκ-ala samži ɛi jan äš=te=jan=þ-sa.
 come-Part first day we work=Neg=1Pl=LV-Prs
We do not work next Monday.

(4) {From a fairy-tale.} A girl stays alone in the forest.
 šujen-χo e=ne=sa, ič-u diriš u=fun=k-sa,
 bear-Pl come=3Sg=ST+Prs Refl-Dat whole eat=3Pl=ST-Prs
 izi u^ʕqen-χo man=e=sťa řetiĵa...
 Refl:Gen bone-Pl stay=3Sg=ST+Prs there
(Then) bears come, they eat her whole, and her bones remain there.

Previous suggestions:

- Jeiranišvili 1971, Schulze 1982, Schulze, to appear: the final *-a* in *-sa* goes back to the locative copula **a*, and the form in *-sa* had been a future tense with the structure “Infinitive + Copula” (cf. the Future in AGUL) before it became the Present

But:

- there is no independent evidence that the locative copula **a* had existed at all in UDI
- infinitives in the Lezgcic languages do not co-occur with locative copulas (only with simple nominal copulas, like in the AGUL Future)
- it is not clear how a future tense can become a pure General Present

My suggestion:

- the Present *bak-sa* < the Dative of the Infinitive **bak-es-a*, meaning ‘is inside V-ing’ (most probably, this form was used with a nominal copula, which was later lost)

The arguments:

- the Present and the Dative of the Infinitive are formally identical (for all verbs, except the verb *p-es* ‘say’ which has a suppletive Present with the stem *neχ-* without *-sa* suffix)

Cf. the use if the Dative of the Infinitive in purpose clause and in complement clause of the verb *burq-es* ‘begin’:

(5) čäläj-e tärängü gir-b-s-a taκ-al=jan.
 forest-Dat brushwood gather-LV-Inf-Dat go-Fut=1Pl
We will go to the forest to gather brushwood. [Keçaari 2001: 122]

(6) bur=jan=q-sa gärgür-b-s-a aruκ-o laχ-i.
 begin=1Pl=ST-Prs mix_up-LV-Inf-Dat fire-Dat put_on-Aor
{After we have put all the ingredients into the pan,} we start to mix up, having put (the pan) on fire.

The arguments (continued):

- the Dative in *-a* is originally a locative case (Proto-Lezgcic in-essive), cf. its use with locative meanings in (1), (2) — so it is quite naturally to assume that one of the Dative of the Infinitive’s meanings might have been the location inside the process, cf. for example **uk-es-a* <eat-INF-DAT> as ‘inside eating’.
- in modern Udi there exists a peripheral form in *-saχ* which definitely goes back to the Infinitive in the (now almost obsolete) Second Dative in *-aχ*, also a locative case historically (apud-essive):

(7) nana-n boqoj š^ʕar-p-saχ=e.
 mother-Erg dough knead-LV-Inf:Dat2=3Sg
Mother is (now) in the process of kneading the bow.

The scenario:

- the Dative of the Infinitive (probably, with the nominal copula) became the center of a typical Locative model ‘X is located inside the process P’, which is a common source for progressives cross-linguistically [Bybee et al. 1994: 129-133]. The Udi “locative” progressive in *-sa* has later become a general Present (this hypothesis explains both the form and the meaning of the Present).

4.2. The origin of the Futures and the Subjunctive from “old presents”

The general path of development: from the Present to the Future or the Subjunctive (cf. Bybee et al. 1994, Haspelmath 1998, Tatevosov 2005 for details):

[PROGRESSIVE >] HABITUAL > ABILITY > ROOT POSSIBILITY > EPISTEMIC POSSIBILITY >...
 ... > PREDICTIVE FUTURE > GENERAL FUTURE
 or ... > SUBJUNCTIVE (in non-assertive complements)

4.2.1. Potential Future as an “old present”

The Potential Future in *-o* is mainly used to refer to possible events in the future, the realization of which can be expected, although without certainty (the verb *bak-es* ‘be, become’ has been lexicalized in the 3Sg form of the Potential Future with the meaning ‘maybe, probably’). It also occurs in generic statements, mostly in proverbs, and as a “historical present” in narratives — although the two latter uses are rather marginal.

(8) *Two brothers share a house. Brother living on the ground floor begins to destroy his part of a house. His brother from the upper floor asks:*
 þoj bezi kož ala čur=e=κ-o?
 Ptlcl my house above remain=3Sg=LV-Pot
Well, and will my upper house remain (~ is it possible that it remains)? [Keçaari 2001: 130]

(9) *Two fellow-villagers, at odds with each other, found themselves near the rapid river. One of them suggests to cross the river holding hands, in order not to be taken away by the current:*

xe-n-aχun čer-i-ĩ-uχun oša p̃urun oro=jan=bak-o.
 water-O-Abl go_out-Aor-N-Abl after again quarrel=1Pl=LV-Pot
 And after we come out of water, we **will** (be able to) **quarrel** again. [Keçaari 2001: 137]

(10) *After a cow had been lost, father tells his son to go to the marker place and search there:*

ba=ne=k-o, čur řakaj=e tac-e.
 be=3Sg=ST-Pot cow there(Lat)=3Sg go-Perf
 Maybe it is there where the cow went. [Keçaari 2001: 129]

(11) taj-nuĩ xod-en xoži te=ne sak-o.
 branch-without tree-Erg shadow Neg=3Sg drop-Pot
 {Proverb.} A tree without branches **does not throw** a shadow. [Keçaari 2001: 106]

My suggestion:

- the Potential Future is an “old present”, as this gives a natural explanation to the ‘potential future’/‘generic present’/‘narrative present’ polysemy
- its marker *-o* can be compared to is the nominalizing adjective/participle suffix *-o*, cf. *busa* ‘hungry’ ~ *busa-o* ‘a hungry one’, *batk-es* ‘to sink, disappear’ ~ *batk-i-o* ‘one who has sank or has disappeared’ (perfective participle), or *avabak-es* ‘to know, to learn’ ~ *avabak-al-o* ‘a knowing person, an expert’ (imperfective participle)
- given that the Potential Future of irregular verbs is derived from the imperfective stem, the original form **bak-o* (or **bak-a-o* with the imperfective marker *-a*) might have been a nominalized participle — this would constitute a structural parallel to the Resultative *bak-i-o* in the perfective domain, which is also a nominalized participle.

The scenario:

- the nominalized Imperfective participle in *-o* (probably, with the nominal copula) was at some stage the general present form, which has developed the possibilitive meaning and the potential future meaning; later it has lost the “core” present uses, and now it is just the Potential Future with marginal generic and narrative uses.

4.2.2. Future as a former present

The Future in *-al* is the main means to describe future time reference; it is neutral with respect to modality and does not have any other uses.

(12) p-i=ne, tak-al=nu, ak-al=nu.
 say-Aor=3Sg go-Fut=2Sg see-Fut=2Sg
 He said: you’ll go and you’ll see.

(13) gam-ek-aji=n äraqi, řijär bak-al=e, jal tünd
 be_warm-LV-Cond=2/3Sg vodka muddy be-Fut=3Sg or strong
 te=ne bak-al.
 Neg=3Sg be-Fut

If vodka becomes warm (during the distillation), it will become muddy and won’t be strong.

(14) *{The foreteller tells the king about the fate of his kingdom.}*

ře ä’χil ölki-n-ä bak-ala sa naχirči-n var-en
 that far_away country-O-Dat be-Part one shepherd-Gen boy-Erg
 vi pačcaβluk-a e’χ-ř-al=e.
 your(Sg) kingdom-Dat take-LV-Fut=3Sg

A shepherd’s son living in a far-away land will seize your kingdom. [Keçaari 2001: 115]

My suggestion:

- the fact that the Future is derived from the imperfective stem permits us to suggest that it is also a former “old present” — possibly, even older than the Potential Future, as the Future in *-al* had lost any other (“pre-future”) uses
- the Future marker *-al* is identical to the Agent noun in *-al*, a productive derivative used to describe occupations, permanent qualities, etc. (many agent nouns are lexicalized):
 - referring to people: *ašb-al* ‘worker’, *bašq-al* ‘thief’, *oçapk-al* ‘mower’, *camk-al* ‘writer’, *amdar-uk-al* ‘man-eater’ (< *amdar uk-es* ‘to eat man’), *o’ne’k-al* ‘cry-baby’
 - referring to animals: *pi-čumk-al* ‘leech’ (< *pi čump-es* ‘to suck blood’), *χod-řapk-al* ‘woodpecker’ (< *χod řap-(p)-es* ‘to hit tree’)
 - referring to objects: *ři-gom-b-al* ‘black grapes’ (< *ři gomb-es* ‘to colour wine’), *bujk-al* ‘a jug for churning butter’ (< *bujp-es* ‘to churn butter’), etc.
- the path leading from the Agent noun to Habitual is attested cross-linguistically, cf. the data from ENGLISH (*-er* form), KARACHAY-BALKAR, IMBABURA QUECHUA, SUSU, etc. in [Шлуинский 2005]

[A problem:

- in Vartashen dialect, there is in addition a simultaneity/sequence participle in *-al*, and Harris (2002) suggests it as a source for the Future; however, in Nizh dialect there is no trace of such form (simultaneity/sequence being expressed by the Imperfective participle in *-ala*), so I prefer to rely on the Agent noun instead.]

The scenario:

- the Agent noun in *-al* (in combination with the nominal copula) had probably become the Habitual form, cf. a putative source structure **mono oçapk-al=e* ‘he is a mower’ (from the verb *oçap-p-es* ‘to mow’) > ‘he usually mows / he can mow’
- later the Habitual has become the general Future, and has lost any other uses — probably having been ousted from habitual contexts by more “young” present tenses

4.2.3. Subjunctive as a former present

The Subjunctive is used in irrealis (non-assertive) complement clauses of such predicates as ‘be possible’, ‘be necessary’, ‘want’, ‘be afraid’, ‘let (something happen)’, etc., and in certain types of irrealis adjunct clauses, describing situations whose realization is not implied, but is only stated as possible.

- (15) bava-n čur=e=sa ki zu insititut-a **bak-a=z.**
 father-Erg want=3Sg=LV+Prs Comp I institute-Dat **enter-Subj=1Sg**
Father wants me to enter (...that I enter) the institute.
- (16) te=z bar-ķ-o bez viči **bij-a=ne!**
 Neg=1Sg allow-LV-Pot my brother **die-Subj=3Sg**
I won't let my brother die (...that my brother die)! [Keçaaru 1996: 15]
- (17) q̄i^s=za=b-sa (ki) nana za **ve^s=nu=bak-a=ne.**
 be_afraid=1Sg=LV-Prs Comp mother I:Dat **believe=Neg=LV-Subj=3Sg**
I am afraid that mother won't believe me.
- (18) hiḱal čaḱ šej bu=te=ne ki, oša šo
 nothing hidden thing Cop=Neg=3Sg Comp after that(Abs)
nu=qaj-ek-a=ne.
Neg=open-LV-Subj=3Sg
There is nothing secret, that later won't become known.

My suggestion:

- the fact that the Subjunctive is derived from the imperfective stem permits us again to suggest that it is a former “old present”, which had left the indicative domain altogether
- the Subjunctive in *-a* is formally identical (excluding person agreement) to the manner converb in *-a*, with a typical imperfective meaning, cf.:
 - *išqaren axš^sumk-a pi=ne* ‘the man said **laughing**’
 - *o^snek-a hari pa=ne=pi koja* ‘he returned home **weeping**’
 - *išqaren=al aj žan uk-a äč^si=ne=pi* ‘and the man danced **crying** «Ay džhan!»’
 - *turmuḱo suna taḱk-a pi=ne* ‘he said, **hitting** one leg with the other’
 - *uluḱḱo karamk-a žovab=e tadi* ‘he answered **gritting** his teeth’
 (from [Keçaari 2001])

The scenario:

- the manner converb in *-a* (in combination with the nominal copula) has probably become the progressive and later the general Present, cf. a putative source structure **mono uk-a=ne* ‘he is saying’ > ‘he says’
- like other “old presents”, this form had obtained a modal (possibilitive) meaning — but its subsequent evolution led not to the Future, but to the Present Subjunctive

4.3. Intra-genetic and areal parallels

Presents based on locative forms of the Infinitive

- are not usually found in other Lezgian languages
- the inflection of the Infinitive for case is not typical of the Lezgian languages (the Proto-Lezgian infinitive marker *-s is a case suffix itself, namely the Dative)

But:

- in AZERBAIJANI (Turkic) the “durative present” has the same structure: the locative case of the infinitive + personal markers, cf. *yaz-maq-da-yam* ‘I am writing’, where *-maq* is the infinitive marker, *-da* is the Locative case and *-yam* is the 1Sg affix [Ширалиев, Севортян (ред.) 1971: 134-135, 137]
- in SOUTHERN TAT (Iranian) the present tense is also based on the Infinitive plus the prefix *bä-* or *mi-*, cf. *bä-bâftän* or *mi-bâftän* ‘weaves, is weaving’; note that *bä-* is related to the preposition *bä* marking direction and location [Грюнберг 1963: 68-69; Грюнберг, Давыдова 1982: 274-275]
- so, the UDI Present based on a locative form of the infinitive may reflect an areal feature

“Old presents” becoming futures

- numerous examples can be found in other Lezgian languages, cf. the forms based on the Imperfective converbs or participles:
 - LEZGIAN form in *-da*, South TABASSARAN form in *-ru* (= ‘habitual’ + ‘future’)
 - AGUL form in *-afe* (= ‘generic’ + ‘hypothetical future’),
 - KRYZ and BUDUGH forms in *-aš*, “l’éventuel” (= ‘hypothetical future’ ± ‘generic’)
 etc. (see Haspelmath 1997, Authier, to appear, Maisak, to appear for details)
- similar examples can be found in other languages of the area, cf. the Old Turkic present in *-ar* which is ‘future’ + ‘habitual’ in modern AZERBAIJANI and TURKISH.

“Old presents” becoming subjunctives

- subjunctives as such (i.e. special finite verbal forms used in complements with irrealis modality) are not found in other Lezgian languages — normally, non-finite forms like infinitives, converbs or masdars are used in such contexts
- the very appearance of a “subjunctive mood” in the verbal paradigm of UDI is thus probably contact-induced, and is due to Iranian and/or Armenian influence
- both in Iranian (PERSIAN, TAT) and in ARMENIAN “old presents” had become subjunctives, cf. the discussion in [Bybee et al. 1994: 230-236; Haspelmath 1998: 41-45]

5. The Present/Future subsystem of Udi: a general overview

SOURCES >

PRESENTS >

FUTURES, SUBJUNCTIVES

AGENT NOUN > cf. * <i>tak-al</i> [+ COPULA] 's/he is one who (usually) goes, s/he is a goer'	HABITUAL (?) > cf. * <i>tak-al</i> [+ COPULA] 's/he goes habitually'	GENERAL FUTURE cf. <i>tak-al=e</i> [+3Sg] 's/he will go'
IMPERFECTIVE CONVERB > cf. * <i>tak-a</i> [+ COPULA] 's/he is (in the process of) going'	GENERAL PRESENT (?) > cf. * <i>tak-a</i> [+ COPULA] 's/he goes'	SUBJUNCTIVE cf. <i>tak-a=ne</i> [+3Sg] 'that s/he go'
IMPERFECTIVE PARTICIPLE > (nominalized) cf. * <i>tak(-a)-o</i> [+ COPULA] 's/he is one who is (now) going'	GENERAL PRESENT (?) > cf. * <i>tak-o</i> [+ COPULA] 's/he goes'	POTENTIAL FUTURE (+generic, narrative uses) cf. <i>ta=ne=ɣ-o</i> [+3Sg] 's/he will possibly go'
DATIVE OF THE INFINITIVE > cf. * <i>taj-es-a</i> [+ COPULA] 's/he is inside going'	GENERAL PRESENT cf. <i>ta=ne=sa</i> [+3Sg] 's/he goes'	

Remarkable features of the UDI tense and aspect system:

- the “old present > future/subjunctive” cycle has happened in UDI three times
- this lead to an amusing result: all the indicative forms originally belonging to the Imperfective domain became modal forms (neutral with respect to aspect)
- at the same time, the new Present was built on the Locative model (based on the infinitive), and does not belong morphologically to the Imperfective domain
- from the typological point of view, the evolution of UDI tense and aspect system is not unique — however, some developments have been very probably contact-induced, as they are very unusual on the Lezgetic background (esp. the Subjunctive, maybe also the Present)

An important source to check the hypotheses: OLD UDI Palimpsest (5th-8th c. AD), the publication of which is expected in the near future (cf. Aleksidze et al., to appear, and Wolfgang Schulze's talk at this meeting).

Abbreviations:

1, 2, 3 – person; Abl – ablative; Abs – absolutive; Aor – aorist (perfective past); Comp – complementizer; Cop – copula; Dat – dative; Erg – ergative; Fut – future; Gen – genitive; Imp – imperative; Inf – infinitive; Lat – lative; LV – light verb (in complex verbs); Neg – negation; N – nominalization marker; O – oblique stem; Part – imperfective participle; Perf – perfect; Pl – plural; Pot – potential future; Prs – present; Ptcl – particle; Refl – reflexive; Sg – singular; ST – part of verbal stem (separated by clitics); Subj – Subjunctive.

References

- Aleksidze Z., Gippert J., Mahé J.-P., Schulze W., Tandaschwili M. The Caucasian Albanian (Old Udi) Palimpsest from Mt. Sinai. Edition and interpretation. To appear.
- Authier G. Des cas spatiaux aux modes verbaux (1): l'inessif du verbe en kryz et en budugh // Studies in Honor of Prof. Denis Creissels. To appear.
- Aydinov Y. A., Keçaari J. A. Əlifba (Tietfir). [*Udi ABC-book.*] Bəkü, 1996.
- Bybee J. L., Perkins R., Pagliuca W. The evolution of grammar: Tense, aspect and modality in the languages of the world. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994.
- Harris A. C. Endoclitics and the Origins of Udi Morphosyntax. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Haspelmath M. The semantic development of old presents: New futures and subjunctives without grammaticalization // *Diachronica* 15-1, 1998.
- Jeiranišvili E. F. Udiuri ena. [*The Udi language.*] Tbilisi, 1971.
- Keçaari K. Orayin. [*Water-spring.*] Bakı, 2001.
- Maisak T. The Present and the Future within the Lezgetic tense and aspect systems // Authier G., Maisak T. (eds.) *Tense, Aspect, Mood & Finiteness in Daghestanian languages.* To appear.
- Schulze W. Die Sprache der Uden in Nordazerbajdzan. Studien zur Synchronie und Diachronie einer süd-ostkaukasischen Sprache. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1982.
- Schulze W. A Functional Grammar of Udi. To appear.
- Tatevosov S. From habituales to futures: discerning the path of diachronic development // Verkuyil H., De Swart H., Van Hout A. (eds.) *Perspectives on Aspect.* Dordrecht: Springer, 2005.
- Грюнберг А. Л. Язык североазербайджанских татов. Л., 1963.
- Грюнберг А. Л., Давыдова Л. Х. Татский язык // Основы иранского языкознания. Кн. 3: Новоиранские языки: западная группа, прикаспийские языки. М., 1982.
- Кечаари Ж. (сост.) Нана очьал. [*Motherland.*] Баку, 1996.
- Ширалиев М. Ш., Севортян Э. В. (ред.) Грамматика азербайджанского языка. Баку, 1971.
- Шлуинский А. Б. Типология предикатной множественности: количественные аспектуальные значения. Дисс. ... канд. филол. наук. М., 2005.