

# The detransitive voice in Kryz<sup>1</sup>

*Gilles Authier*

## 0. Introduction

This paper deals with the detransitive voice in Kryz, an unwritten language belonging to the Lezgetic branch of the North-East Caucasian family. Nowadays three dialects of Kryz (Kryz proper, Jek, and Alik-Khaput) are spoken as a first language by at most 2000 speakers in fewer than ten localities of north-eastern Azerbaijan. Despite generalized bilingualism in Azerbaijani, Kryz preserves typical Proto-Lezgetic features. In particular, gender-number agreement with S/P (Single argument or Patient) nouns is pre- or infixes to the lexical stems of simple verbs<sup>2</sup>, which form a closed class. Person is expressed by free pronouns. Word order is strictly possessor-possessed, adjective-noun, and basically Agent-Patient-Verb; case marking and cross-referencing on the verb is generally ergative. Valency increase is expressed periphrastically, using auxiliaries ('do' or 'give'). The Kryz detransitive synthetic voice, to be described in this paper, is an unexpected singularity within Lezgetic<sup>3</sup> and the Daghestanian languages as a whole.

While the Daghestanian languages have long been believed to lack a passive construction altogether, it is beyond doubt that in Kryz there exists

---

<sup>1</sup> This article is based on first-hand data collected by myself in Azerbaijan over the last ten years. Field trips were funded by the Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique and the Institut National des Langues et Civilisations Orientales. My host in the village of Alik and main informant for this dialect is Madjlis Shamseddinov: I am indebted to him more than words can say.

<sup>2</sup> Verbal predicates are also represented by compound verbs, which are not relevant here since they switch valency by changing their auxiliary ('do' / 'become'): this valency-changing device is equipollent and belongs to syntax, not derivation.

<sup>3</sup> This branch comprises the core languages of Lezgian, Tabassaran, Aghul, Tsakhur, Rutul, Kryz, and Budugh, all located close to the watershed line of the easternmost part of the Great Caucasus range, and the outliers Udi (to the south) and Archi (to the north).

## 2 *Erreur ! Style non défini.*

a detransitive voice with various interpretations (passive, anticausative and antipassive). The use of this voice is restricted by the semantic parameters and lexical properties of individual verbs, which accounts for the fact that the few previous studies on Kryz (mainly Saadiev 1972 & 1994) do not mention any detransitivizing derivation. Indeed, the Kryz detransitive voice is rarely heard in natural speech: it is mostly employed in prescriptive discourse and technical instructions. But the derivational morphology is old and can be compared with similar detransitive forms found in some languages distantly related to Kryz.

Section 1 gives an overview of grammatical relations and the order of constituents in non-derived predication. Section 2 presents the morphology of detransitive forms. Section 3 presents the lexico-semantic restrictions of the passive voice. Section 4 gives the particulars of the aspectual and modal values associated with the anticausative and antipassive forms. Section 5 proposes comparative material and a hypothesis for the origin of this rare and residual voice phenomenon in Daghestanian.<sup>4</sup>

### **Coding of syntactic and pragmatic functions**

In Kryz, as in most Daghestanian languages, basic grammatical relations in declarative clauses are organised according to an ergative/absolutive case marking system and gender-number cross-referencing of the Single or Patientive argument on the verb. The details are described in the following subsections.

#### 1.1. Case marking

Kryz has ergative case alignment on nouns. Nouns expressing S and P are in the unmarked ‘absolutive’ case, while the Agent noun<sup>5</sup> of a transitive

---

<sup>4</sup> The new Azerbaijani alphabet is used. The diphthongs /a-u/ /e-u/ and /i-u/ are realized as [o], [ø] and [y] in closed syllables; the sounds [q:], [G] and [ǧ] (uvular fricative) are in complementary distribution and written <ǧ>. <xh> and <gh> are respectively voiceless and voiced velar fricatives.

<sup>5</sup> The pronominal system operates on a different basis from the nominal system. Speech Act Participants are expressed by free or cliticized pronouns with no ergative marking. There is also no specialized morpheme on verbs heading reflexive and reciprocal constructions, which make use of special reflexive and reciprocal pronouns. The case marking and peculiarities of Kryz pronouns are detailed in Authier (2008).

predicate is marked with ergative case (-*r* or one of its allomorphs), as illustrated in Sentence 1:

- (1) *q'al-ar-ir*      *yuva-yar*      *ğuzay.c-a*      *ğvat'ats'-re*  
mouse-PL-ERG    nest-PL      north-IN      PV.dig-PRS(NPL)

‘Mice dig their nests to the north.’

- (2) *q'al-ar*      *yuva-yar-a*      *ği-rxhar-e*  
mouse-PL(ABS)    nest-PL-IN      PV-dwell-PRS(NPL)

‘Mice dwell in nests.’

Note that in contrast with many other Daghestanian languages, including the closely related Budugh, the ergative case is never used in Kryz to mark semantic roles other than Agent (two ergative-marked nouns with different semantic roles cannot coexist in the same clause), but ergative-marked Agents can be inanimate as in example (3). While the basic order of constituents is S/A-(P)-V, these non-prototypical Agents are often postposed to a more topical Patient, as in (4) and (5):

- (3) *naq'*      *ʃa-xhr-i*      *duli.c-ir*      *xayla*      *ziyan*      *vu-yic*  
yesterday    PV-come.PF-PART    storm-ERG    much      damage      give-AOR.N

‘Yesterday’s hailstorm has caused a lot of damage.’

- (4) *yağın*      *jin*      *ğara.c-ir*      *basmiş*      *b-ar-ca-b*  
sure      4e      illusion-ERG    pressing      HPL-do-PRF-HPL

‘We are certainly victims of an illusion.’

- (5) *kaha-c*      *siy*      *babrux-ci*      *xal.id-ir*      *yi-qir-ca*  
cave-GEN    mouth    spider-GEN    roof-ERG    PV-catch-PRF

‘A cobweb covers the entrance to the cave.’

## 1.2. Indexation of S/P

While the Agent is not cross-referenced on verb forms (except for person and number in injunctive forms), Kryz verbs have the gender and number of their Patientive or Single argument cross-referenced in a pre-root (post-preverbal) slot. The gender-number system comprises five ‘gender-number classes’ of agreement: human masculine (M), human feminine and other animates (F, which also includes many inanimates and certain abstract concepts), other inanimate (N for ‘neuter’), non-human plural (NPL, which

#### 4 *Erreur ! Style non défini.*

on verbs is always homophonous with the N class), and human plural (HPL):

- (6) *buba-r riş-imbi yi-b-qir-cib*  
 father-ERG daughter-PL PV-HPL-catch-PRF.HPL

‘The father has caught the daughters.’

- (7) *riş-imbi ğa-b-qil-cib*  
 daughter-PL PV-HPL-lie-PRF.HPL

‘The daughters went to sleep.’

Only in the imperative paradigm is a nominatively aligned indexation of S/A persons added, as can be seen in the following intransitive and transitive predicates, where the human plural argument, be it Agent or Single argument, is cross-referenced as a suffix *-ay*, while the stem retains agreement with S/P:

- (8) *uca ğinahna<sup>s</sup> ğa-b-q’il-ay!*  
 here tonight PV-HPL-lie.IMP-HPL

‘(You all) sleep here tonight!’

- (9) *buluşa y-u-qr-ay!*  
 dress(F) PV-F-catch.IMP-HPL

‘(You all) catch the dress!’

Aspect is usually marked by sonorants affixed to the root, which consists of a single consonant or a consonant followed by a sonorant. The morphological structure of finite verb forms is summed up in table 1.

Table 1. *Structure of synthetic verb forms in Kryz*

-3	preverb (usually with transparent spatial meaning)
-2	prefixes cross-referencing the gender-number of S/P
-1	aspect-marking sonorant ( <i>-r, -l, -n</i> )
0	root consonant
1	perfective aspect or detransitivity markers
2	Tense & Mood suffixes
3	suffixes cross-referencing the gender-number of S/P (S/A in imperatives)

### 1.3. Verb classes according to valency

Kryz has clear semantic classes of verbs, which are defined by their special morphological and syntactic properties, especially valency changing properties: strict intransitive; extended intransitive (experience predicates); strict transitive; ditransitive. Lability (ambitransitivity) is a very marginal phenomenon.

Transitive verbs have in their valency an Agentive argument which, if expressed, is in the ergative case; these all permit valency increase of the causative type by means of the auxiliary ‘give’, including those which are ditransitive like ‘give’ itself. Most but not all transitive verbs allow synthetic (morphological) detransitive derivation, a restriction which we find to have a clear semantic motivation and which will be described below.

Subsets are also observable in the class of intransitive verbs - for instance, most but not all of these have synthetic imperative forms, nor do they all have a periphrastic causative derivation with the auxiliary ‘do’. However, no clear distinction between ‘unaccusative’ and ‘unergative’ verbs has been found.

### 1.4. Order of arguments and Patient topicalization

Agents are usually topics, and their unmarked position is initial; non-topicalized Patients come after the Agent and before the verb. But, as is common for languages which express grammatical relations by means of case-marking, the order of arguments can be modified for pragmatic purposes. Focalized constituents tend to occur in preverbal position, with heavy stress, while topics are clause-initial, and topicalization of a Patient-denoting absolutive argument thus does not necessarily require the use of a special form of the verb. Like its distant relative Tsez, cited by Comrie (2008), Kryz allows the Patient to be topicalized without voice derivation, simply through alteration of the word order. This ‘functional passive’ (Givón 2004) is in fact merely a foregrounding movement. The ergative-marked Agent is backgrounded if unstressed:

- (10) *u-c*        *seksenbeş*        *san*    *a-n-ir*        *vul*        *çixe<sup>s</sup>*        *ya-u-qur-cu*  
           3-GEN<sub>H</sub>    eighty\_five    year    3-H-ERG    ewe        behind    PV-F-spend-PRF.F

‘He [lived hundred years, and] spent eighty-five of these tending the sheep.’

## 6 *Erreur ! Style non défini.*

Non-prototypical Agents are backgrounded especially often in non-initial position. The most natural translation in English is then a typical passive construction:

- (11) *a-c hiçvaxt sel.c-ir tu-ğats'-da-d*  
 3-N never flood-ERG PV-carry-NegEVT-N

‘This (bridge) will never be carried away by the flood.’

Note that with appropriate intonation on the preverbal position, the Agent can be focused instead of backgrounded. It then translates not as a passive, but as a cleft sentence:

- (12) *xinib fura-r v-a-u-q-ryu, nisi maltal.ci-r*  
 woman man-ERG F-PV-F-keep-PRS.F cheese cheese.bag-ERG

‘The woman is kept by the MAN, as cheese is kept by the CHEESE-BAG.’

- (13) *ceuhur-ci ghala-d meşa.c-a sar.id-ir ulats'-ru*  
 pear-GEN good-notN forest-IN bear-ERG eat-EVT.F

‘It is the BEAR who will get to eat the best pears in the forest.’

- (14) *ts'e<sup>l</sup>.il-kar azar-i yux yiğğaciğ ebil-ir ġirats'-re-ni*  
 goat-SUBEL milk.MP-PART milk every.day wolf-ERG drink-PRS-PAST

‘The milk drawn from the goat every day, it is the WOLF who would drink it.’

### 1.5. Omission of Agents

In Kryz predicative constructions, the expression of arguments as overt NPs is not grammatically obligatory, but at least one is encoded on the verb: minimal predicates are comprised of a single verb form on which a Single argument or a Patient is cross-referenced:

- (15) *(furar) (xhin) ġe-t'-ic* (16) *(xinib) yi-p-du*  
 man.ERG grass.N PV-strike-AOR.N woman(ABS) PV-F.go-AOR.F

‘(The man) cut (the grass).’

‘(The woman /) she left.’

Backgrounded Agents are very often left out. In the original of the following English translation the word ‘you’ is used only once, with obviously generic, non-referring value, and Kryz uses only active forms (see text in Authier 2009) whereas English has to employ the passive.

‘The cheese-bag is made to keep cheese in. You have to flay the skin to keep the cheese in without making any cuts. Then, as soon as it is flayed,

salt is poured into it to dry it out. Then it has to be worked on, and tied firmly at the fore and hind legs. If there is a great deal of wool, it is shorn, then it is washed with water while being beaten with a comb (?), then left to dry. Then it is turned inside out (the cheese is on the woolly side) and it is stored for winter.’

Non-explicitation of a generic Agent is frequent in proverbs such as the following (on ingratitude):

- (16) *tur.ud-zina*    *ula-ci*    *ci-yar-zina*    <sup>ʔ</sup>*ul*    *ǵva-ʃ-ryu*  
 spoon-INSTR    eat-SEQ    tail-INSTR    eye.F    PV.F-pull.out-PRS.F

‘One eats with the spoon and then pulls (your) eye out with the handle!’

A preliminary conclusion, then, is that in Kryz as in many other ergative languages, either genetically related to it like Tsez or unrelated like Tongan (Keenan & Dryer 2207), backgrounding through omission of the Agent NP and corollary foregrounding of the semantic Patient is possible without any change in the verb morphology. But Kryz also has a detransitive voice which shows properties commonly associated with the label ‘passive’: it is a morphological derivation which transforms transitive predicates into intransitive ones by removing the agentive NP at a syntactic level<sup>6</sup>. But let us first examine the formal manifestation of (in)transitivity on Kryz verbs.

### Marking of (in)transitivity and verb classes

Kryz synthetic verbs form a closed class comprising some 200 items. They are either transitive or intransitive, a distinction which is marked morphologically on imperfective stems only.

---

<sup>6</sup> We do not adhere to the definition of passive as a means of promoting the Patient of a transitive verb to grammatical subject, because this would presuppose that Kryz has a clear-cut definition of ‘subject’, which is not the case. Note also that Kryz detransitive forms never receive reciprocal or autocausative (reflexive) interpretations (no “grooming middles”, cf. Kemmer 1993). The fact that processes implying *subject-object coreference* are not expressed by this form of the transitive verb in Kryz has led us to discard the term ‘middle’ in favour of detransitive voice. We also discard a global appellation ‘Medio-Passive’, because a couple of detransitized verbs have an antipassive interpretation.

## 8 *Erreur ! Style non défini.*

### 1.6. Morphology of intransitive *vs* transitive verbs

Almost all of the 70 synchronically underived intransitive verbs show on their imperfective verb stem one of three allomorphs of the same suffix -*ar/-al/-an*.

*ʔa-rç'ar-* 'PV- IPF.enter.'

*ke-rxhar-* 'PV- IPF.move'

*la-lsal-* 'PV- IPF.turn'

*ha-ngvan-* 'PV-IPF.run'

Conversely, the 130 transitive synthetic verbs never show these suffixes. They are not overtly marked as transitive, but their imperfective forms should be considered zero-marked for transitivity, given the absence of the characteristic intransitive suffixation:

*ya-r-t'*- 'PV-IPF-cut'

*yi-r-q-* 'PV-IPF-catch'

*ki-l-t'*- 'PV-IPF-yoke'

*yi-n-gh-* 'PV-IPF-pull'

Overt marking of intransitivity is not to be found on perfective forms of underived intransitive verbs, which are thus indistinguishable from transitive perfectives:

intransitive verbs, PF

*ʔa-ç'*- 'PV-enter.PF'

*ke-xh-r-* 'PV-move-PF'

*la-s-l-* 'PV-turn-PF'

*ha<r>gu-n-* 'PV<M>run.PF'

cf. transitive verbs, PF

*ya-t'*- (PV-cut.PF'

*yi-q-r-* 'PV-catch-PF'

*ki-t'-l-* 'PV-yoke-PF'

*yi-gh-n-* 'PV-pull-PF'

Because of the general omissibility of overt argument NPs, transitive and intransitive predicates are hard to distinguish in the perfective tenses. Allowance of explicit ergative arguments is the only criterion available, and no distinction can be drawn by means of syntactic tests between a Single argument construction and a transitive construction in which the Agent is left out.

### 1.7. Detransitive morphology on transitive roots

Transitive verbs may be classified into two groups according to whether they allow morphological detransitivization. When available, detransitive

voice is formed synthetically in the imperfective through addition of the morpheme *-aR-* to the right of the verbal root; on most but not all verbs, a sonorant imperfective aspect-marker occurs before the root; *R* is thus – in the dialect described here<sup>7</sup> – always a duplicate of this pre-root aspect-marker:

	transitive IPF =>	detransitive IPF
‘catch’	<i>yi-r-q-</i>	<i>yi-r-q-ar-</i>
‘pull’	<i>yi-n-gh-</i>	<i>yi-n-gh-an-</i>
‘yoke’	<i>ki-l-t’-</i>	<i>ki-l-t’-al-</i>

The perfective is formed analytically with the auxiliary *xhiyi* ‘become’ (perfective participle) and a verbal adjective derived from the new imperfective detransitive stem:

	detransitive IPF	detransitive PF
‘catch’	<i>yirqar-</i>	<i>yirqar-a xhiyi</i>
‘pull’	<i>yinghan-</i>	<i>yinghan-a xhiyi</i>
‘yoke’	<i>kilt’al-</i>	<i>kilt’al-a xhiyi</i>

### 1.8. Prototypical transitive verbs

Most synthetic transitive verbs allow a synthetic detransitive derivation maintaining the Patient, with Agent-backgrounding semantics – ‘anticausative’ or ‘passive’ – given an appropriate context which usually implies modal or aspectual nuances. These forms are very marked, and in fact they are rare in narrative and everyday speech.

As appears from this sample, transitive verbs with passive voice share prototypical transitive (voluntary Agent, Patient-transforming) semantics:

PF	IPF		detransitive participles
<i>ğaxur-</i>	<i>ğarxv-</i>	‘knead’	<i>ğarx-ar-i</i> <i>ğarxvara xhiyi</i>
<i>na&lt;d&gt;q’un-</i>	<i>nanq’v-</i>	‘churn’	<i>nanq’v-an-i</i> <i>nanq’vana xhiyi</i>
<i>çaukva-</i>	<i>çauk(vats’)-</i>	‘mix’	<i>çaukv-ar-i</i>

<sup>7</sup> From the village of Alik; other dialects can have different sonorants, for instance in the stem *yi-l-kan-* ‘remain.IPF’ attested in Jek, while the corresponding form is *inkan* in Alik. External evidence shows that the reduplicative morphology is an innovation of Alik.

10 *Erreur ! Style non défini.*

<i>raxva-</i>	<i>raux(ats')-</i>	'shave'	<i>çaukvara xhiyi</i> <i>raxv-ar-i</i> <i>raxvara xhiyi</i>
<i>reuha-</i>	<i>reuh-(ats')-</i>	'grind'	<i>reuh-ar-i</i> <i>reuhara xhiyi</i>
<i>yixha-</i>	<i>yixh(ats')-</i>	'harvest'	<i>yixhar-i</i> <i>yixhara xhiyi</i>
<i>yiza-</i>	<i>yiz-(ats')-i</i>	'plough'	<i>yizar-i</i> <i>yizara xhiyi</i>

In contrast with English, in Kryz the Agent cannot be expressed as an oblique NP, a frequent feature of passives cross-linguistically, as in the following transformation (here the passive imperfective stem is not derived from the transitive one):

- (17) *har cum<sup>ʰ</sup>a-ca Hazratbaba.ci-r lu kel kura-ts'-ryu-ni*  
every friday-IN Hazre(?)tbaba-ERG this lamb slay-IPF-PRS.F-PAST

'Every Friday Saint Baba would sacrifice this lamb.'

- (18) *har cum<sup>ʰ</sup>a-ca lu kel kurar-yu-ni*  
every friday-IN this lamb slay.DETR-PRS.F-PAST

'This lamb was sacrificed every Friday.'

The detransitive construction in Kryz thus complies with Kazenin's (2001) or Comrie's (2008) criteria for passive voice:

- it is morphologically heavier, usually derived from the active;
- the construction is "less frequent, functionally specialized, not fully productive" (Haspelmath, 1990).
- the new subject is not a semantic Agent;
- the semantic role of the maintained argument does not change. In the case of a language with ergative case marking like Kryz, the unmarked absolutive case of the maintained Patient is also retained.

### 1.9. Transitive verbs lacking a detransitive form

Three semantically coherent classes of verbs systematically lack a detransitive form: 1) verbs of in- or ex-corporation; 2) verbs of exchange and social interaction; 3) transitive verbs of motion (for which see farther below). The following lists are exhaustive:



## 12 *Erreur ! Style non défini.*

Table 9. Verbs lacking detransitive forms (2): suppletive motion verbs

ʔağayc ‘bring’	ʔaç’ic, ʔarfic ‘enter, go down’
ʔaqric ‘take down’	ʔaxhric ‘come (down)’
ʔaʔayc ‘push into’	
aska-yc ‘put (down)’	ğıuq’ric ‘touch, intr.’
ğağayc ‘create’	ʔaç’ic, ğadfic ‘go out, escape’
ğaqric, ğaʔayc ‘take, push out’	ğaxhric ‘appear’
ğeʔayc ‘build’	ğıdfic ‘rise’
ğığayc ‘turn, intr.’	ğıxhric ‘turn, intr., live’
keʔayc ‘push under’	keç’ic ‘go under’, kedfic ‘pass under’
vaʔayc ‘push aside’	vaç’ric, vadfic ‘turn from’
vağayc ‘gather, tr.’	vaxhric ‘gather, intr.’
yaʔayc ‘push aside’	yadfic ‘stray’
yaqric ‘take over’	yaç’ic ‘pass, cross’
yatric ‘leave’	ıdknic ‘remain’

### Passive interpretation and additional values

The passive forms of transitive verbs are usually not to be understood as a mere paraphrase of the non-derived, transitive clause: not only do they downgrade the Agent and topicalize the Patient but their modal and aspectual parameters are modified. This section examines these associated effects. We found passives of transitive verbs either with habitual and deontic value in the imperfective, or with state-focusing (resultative) value in the perfective:

- (20)   ğul    ambar.c-a    (a) va-nsan-e    / (b) va-nsan-a    xhi-yic  
           corn    pent-IN        PV-weigh.DETR-PRS    PV-weigh.DETR-A    be-AOR.N

‘The grain is usually / has been weighed in *the barn*: (1) non-referential / (2) referential.’

#### 1.10. Deontic and Habitual meaning of the imperfective passive

Collective or typically feminine chores culturally entail the de-individualization of the agent, and the generic or non-referential (tabooed) status of the agent is marked morphologically by the detransitized verb form:

- (21)   cindir-a    q’vahac-ci    q’an    ke-rt’ar-e  
           worn-a    sock-GEN    bottom    PV-sew.DETR-PRS

‘When the bottom of a sock is worn out, one patches it.’

- (22) *riki yiğğaciğ va-rçar-e*  
 yard every.day PV-sweep.DETR-PRS

‘The yard is swept every day.’

There are many examples in proverbs in the ‘eventual’ mood (covering both habitual events and feebly asserted future predictions, cf. Authier 2009):

- (23) *irac irca-zina zimar-da-d*  
 blood blood-INSTR wash.DETR-NegEVT-N

‘One does not wash away blood with blood.’ (Prov.)

- (24) *ʕu-du-fa riki ġe-tʿar-da-d*  
 PV-Neg-close.PF(PART) door PV-strike.DETR-NegEVT-N

‘An open door is not knocked at.’ (Prov.)

- (25) *d-işar-i ʕayal.ci-z maxar vutsʿar-da-b*  
 Neg-cry.IPF-PART child-DAT breast.F give.DETR-NegEVT-F

‘A child who does not cry is not given the breast.’ (Prov.)

A debitive nuance can also be present in many cases:

- (26) *qʿusi.c-a ʕayal ʕa-ltʿal-e / ġi-rqar-e*  
 cradle-IN child PV-bind.DETR-PRS PV-hold.on.DETR-PRS

‘The child is (= should be) firmly tied up / held in the cradle.’

- (27) *heyvanat yif.un-a qʿacil-a ʕa-rğvar-e*  
 cattle night-IN everyday PV-push.in.DETR-PRS

‘Cattle is / has to be penned during the night.’

- (28) *ğurux.c-aʕar barkan-bi hu-rtʿar-e*  
 garden-INEL horse-PL PV-expel.DETR-PRS

‘Horses should be banned from gardens.’

These habitual and deontic values are present on the overwhelming majority of passive forms; but passive voice can also be found when the precise Agent of an action is unknown in the context. [A generic interpretation is then preferred??], especially in future time-reference:

- (29) *a-n-iz ʕarkʿa caza vutsʿar-iyā*  
 3-H-DAT heavy punishment give.DETR-FUT

‘He will be given a severe punishment.’

14 *Erreur ! Style non défini.*

1.11. Resultative meaning of the perfective passive

While imperfective passive forms have habitual and deontic readings, the corresponding perfective forms have a resultative reading. Not the event itself but the resulting state is described. This is a way to convey the fact that the event was not witnessed by the speaker:

- (30) *riki cigaç-a 'a-rt'ar-a xhi-yic*  
 door place-IN PV-fit.in.DETR-A be-AOR.N

‘The door has been put back in place.’

- (31) *dauğa q'um-uğ ğva-xvar-a xhi-d-u*  
 doogh ground-SUPER PV.F-pour.DETR-A be-AOR-F

‘Doogh has been spilt on the ground.’

- (32) *zin lu yaş.in-iz karta hiçvaxt atar-a xhi-de-r*  
 I this year-DAT until never beat.DETR-A be-NEGPREF-M

‘Right up to my current age, I have never been beaten up.’

1.12. Stylistic variation?

The passive marking of verbs is often optional, and passive forms can coexist in the same text as unmarked active forms. In the following text, the first few forms are passive, and set the general ‘deontic’ tone of the whole passage. Most forms later in the passage are left unmarked, probably because active forms are ‘lighter’ and systematic passive-marking would be redundant (recall that the Agent can also be omitted in transitive constructions):

- (33) *vul sina q'va-d safar vu-dar-yu*  
 ewe year.IN two-N time PV-shear.DETR-PRS.F  
*ğarayaz-ca vudar-i yis.a-ğar yapağu li-re*  
 springtime-IN PV.shear.DETR-PART wool-SUPEL spring.wool say-PRS  
*u-c-kar ği-uxvar-a xhi-yi xiy-ar-kar q'vahac xirats'-re*  
 3-nH-SUBEL PV-spin.DETR-A be.PF-PART thread-PL-SUBEL sock knit-PRS  
*ic-kar an xi-xar-a xhi-yi şay-ri*  
 SELFF-SUBEL AN RED-plait.DETR-A be.PF-PART thing-PL  
*mahkam şare; çixe'an yis yanxuc-a vudats'-ryu*  
 solid be-PRS after-a wool.F autumn-IN shear-PRS.F  
*lu safar vu-da yis ğit şa-re*  
 this time PV-shear.PF(PART) wool.F few be-PRS  
*u-c-kar ği-ux-i xiy davam-suz şı-u-ryu*  
 3-nH-SUBEL PV-spin-PART thread.F continuity-without be-F-PRS.F

The wool of the sheep is shorn (PASS) twice a year. The wool shorn (PASS) in spring is called ‘yapaghu’. With the spun (PASS) threads, one knits

(ACT) socks, and objects knitted (PASS) from them are solid. The second wool is collected (ACT) in the autumn; This time the wool shorn (ACT) is not abundant; the thread spun (ACT) from it does not hold.

Note also that morphologically active sequential converbs, which usually imply coreferent subject in the linked clauses, can be followed by a passive form, as in the next example:

- (34) *gugarti yi-t'a-ci har adami-c buşq'ab.ci-ğ ği-yts'ar-e*  
 greens PV-cut-SEQ every person-GEN plate-SUPER PV-pour.DETR-PRS

'The salad is cut and served on everyone's plate.'

Kibrik (1997) refers to this property of sequential converbs in his statement that Daghestanian languages generally lack any clear 'syntactic pivot' (cf. Dixon 1994). But in Kryz at least imperfective stems show diathetic distinctions which point to pivot properties of the accusative type. Passive imperfective predicates promote Patients to the status of syntactic subjects. In the following example, coreference of subjects would not have been obtained if the imperfective coordinating converb heading the first clause had been kept in the active unmarked voice :

- (35) *lu ğuyi yiğğaciğ ğvat'-ar-a, halu ʕaranxhin-a xhi-cu*  
 this well everyday PV.dig-DETR-Manner this depth-IN be-PRF.F

'This well being dug every day, it became this deep.'

### 1.13. Orientation of relative participles

The participles found in Daghestanian languages are 'contextually oriented' (Haspelmath, 1994) through instantiation of their arguments which retain ergatively aligned case marking in relative clauses. In (), Patient-orientation is indicated by ergative marking on an NP and the absence of an absolutive NP in the relative clause; in (), Agent-orientation is inferred from the absence of an ergative-marked NP:

- (36) *xinib.ci-r hala da-b-cir-i xaşul*  
 woman-ERG yet Neg-F-bake.PF-PART stew.F

'the stew that the woman has not yet cooked'

- (37) *hala xaşul da-b-cir-i xinib*  
 yet stew.F Neg-F-bake.PF-PART woman

'the woman who has not yet cooked the stew'

16 *Erreur ! Style non défini.*

But Kryz uses also derived, specifically negative passive participles, made up of a transparently detransitive form (A is for verbal Adjective) and the auxiliary ‘be(-come)’. These analytic forms imply a nuance of possibility:

- (38) a) *ğ̃a-da-xi* *xamir-bekar* *fuv* *cirar-de-d*  
 PV-NEG-knead.PPF dough-PL.SUBEL bread bake.DETR-NEGPRS-N  
 b) *ğ̃a-rxar-a da-xha*  
 PV-knead.DETR-A NEG-be.PPF

‘Bread made of unleavened dough does not bake.’

- (39) a) *reudeuha* *q’el* *sifra.c-a* *amasku !*  
 NEG.grind.PPF salt table-IN PV-PROH-put  
 b) *reuhar-a dauxha*  
 grind.DETR-A Neg.be. PPF

‘Do not put underground salt on the table!’

- (40) a) *ğ̃a-dauxvi* *xamir.ci-kar* *fu* *şa-dad*  
 PV-NEG.knead.PPF dough-SUBEL bread be-NEGDEB  
 b) *ğ̃a-rxvar-a dauxha*  
 PV-F.knead.DETR-A NEG.F.be.PPF

‘Dough does not make bread unless it is kneaded.’

In some instances, the choice of a passive participle seems to imply habitual aspect:

- (41) *ğ̃e<sup>s</sup>* *azar-i* *yux* *ğ̃unşi-z* *vuts’-iya* *zin*  
 today (N)milk.DETR-PRT milk(N) neighbour-DAT give-FUT(N) 1

‘The milk milked by the woman (every day).’[This doesn’t seem to be the right translation here. And why (N)milk the first time and milk(N) the second time?]

- (42) *xinib.ci-r* *v-az-i* *zir* *yux*  
 woman-ERG F-milk.IPF-PRT cow.G milk(N)

‘The milk of the cow which the woman milks.’

A degree of Agent-orientedness inherent in imperfective participles is probably the reason why, in the following example, a specifically passive participle has to be used, because the active participle would be Agent-oriented and prevent recovery of the dative semantic role for the head:

- (43) *caza* *\*vu-ts’-i /* *vuts’ar-i* *adami*  
 punishment give-IPF-PRT give.DETR-PRT person

‘The man who is given a punishment.’

#### 1.14. Preliminary conclusion on the Kryz passive voice

The passive voice is restricted to Kryz among the Daghestanian languages, which more commonly have some derivations with anticausative or antipassive readings. The passive reading probably became prevalent only recently, under the influence of Azerbaijani: it first appeared with verbs for which the event encoded cannot come about without an external causer (i.e. which are semantically Agent-oriented, cf. Haspelmath 1993) and as a result cannot be cast in the anticausative (with a Patient-oriented meaning component), and then it became an option with most other transitive verbs in Kryz.

The main Kryz passive-forming device is formally linked to imperfective aspect, with either *habitual* nuance or deontic modality. The perfective form is analytically derived from the imperfective, but in synchrony, perfective periphrastic passive forms occur just as often in texts as imperfective ones, because they offer interesting new aspectual nuances (inceptive or resultative).

#### Anticausative and antipassive readings

More ‘authentic’ or archaic than the passive use appear to be those cases to which we now turn, in which the detransitive is used as an anticausative voice (associated with Patient-oriented meaning), or as an antipassive (with a few Agent-oriented verbs like ‘eat’).

#### 1.15. Anticausative

The same detransitive morphology is used with a number of other verbs in contexts in which the Agent is not only backgrounded, but semantically suppressed, that is with anticausative value, for instance:

PF	IPF		DETR PF & masdar[again, xhiyi or xhiyic?]
<i>ugv-a-</i>	<i>ugv-(a-ts’)-</i>	‘burn’	<i>ugv-ar-ugvara xhiyi</i>
<i>cir-a-</i>	<i>cir-a-ts’-</i>	‘cook’	<i>cirar-i cirara xhiyic</i>
<i>ʕuf-a-</i>	<i>ʕuf-(a-ts’)</i>	‘close’	<i>ʕufar-i</i>

<i>şaku-r-</i>	<i>şarkv-</i>	'trim'	<sup>4</sup> <i>ufara xhiyic</i> <i>şarkvar-i</i> <i>şarkvara xhiyic</i>
<i>ğet-a-</i>	<i>ğet-</i>	'beat (carpet)'	<i>ğetar-i</i> <i>ğetara xhiyic</i>
<i>surh-a-</i>	<i>suç- / sudha-ts'-</i>	'drag'	<i>surhar-i</i> <i>surhara xhiyic</i>

When the detransitive derivation is applied to these verbs/events, only one participant remains in the situation. Unlike in the passive, where a non-expressed agent is implicit, here the agent is *conceptually* removed, and the event is presented as spontaneous, often – but not always – with significant semantic modification of the verb. The semantic role of the absolutive argument is also retained in the anticausative construction, but note that two distinct interpretations may coexist, with or without an Agent:

- (44) *zang* *ğe-rt'ar-a* *xhi-yic-zina* *duz* *k'ul.c-a* *ha-r-gun-d*  
bell PV-strike.DETR-A be-MSD-INSTR right house-IN PV-M-run-AOR.M

'The bell a) (passive) was rung b) (anticausative) rang, and he ran home.'

While the passive interpretation of detransitive forms is slightly more prevalent in narrative texts, the anticausative or 'spontaneous' meaning is found in idiomatic and obviously old expressions:

- (45) *ç'ebic* *ği-yts'ar-e*  
rain PV-pour.DETR-PRS

'The rain is pouring / \*starts to pour.'

- (46) *palas* *ğe-tar-e*  
carpet PV-beat.DETR-PRS

'The carpet slaps / \*starts to slap (in the wind).'

Contrary to what we noted for the passive use, the process shows no aspectual (habitual) or modal (deontic) semantic bias:

- (47) *zin* *a-n* *kil.a-k* *rib* *çu-nq'v-unyu*  
1(ERG) 3-HG arm-SUB needle(A) PV-F-stick-PRS.F

'I stick a needle in my arm.'

- (48) *za* *kil.a-k* *rib* *çu-nq'van-yu*  
1.G arm-SUB needle(F) PV-F-stick.DETR-PRS.F

'A needle sticks itself in my arm.'



20 *Erreur ! Style non défini.*

- (56) *a-c-iz amr v-ar-izma<sup>δ</sup>an k'ul va-rçaryu-ni*  
 3-NH-DAT order.F F-do-Before room.F PV-sweep.DETR-PRS.F-PAST

‘(She had a magic ring:) as soon as she would order it, the room was swept.’

- (57) *div-ci k'ul.c-a yis icic-iğan ğa-har-e-ni*  
 demon-GEN house-IN wool SELFF(E)SELFF-EQU PV-card.DETR-PRS-PAST

‘In the house of the demon, the wool would card itself.’

The analytic perfective detransitive form serves also to express imperative modality with spontaneous and inceptive meaning. For instance in addressing his own instrument, a bard says:

- (58) *ça-rt'ar-a sak, ay saz!*  
 PV-strike.DETR-A be.IMP Oh lute

‘Start playing, my lute!’

1.19. Instantiation of the semantic role of ‘force’

While the passive interpretation, which preserves semantic roles, does not allow any oblique expression of the backgrounded agent, the anticausative, semantically intransitive interpretation of the detransitive voice is compatible with the expression of an argument in the semantic role of ‘force’. If this force is external, it is given in the subrelative case, and normally appears in initial position:

- (59) *(kulak.ci-kar) riki <sup>5</sup>u-f-ar-a xhi-yic*  
 wind-SUBEL door PV-close- DETR-A be-AOR.N

‘The door was closed by the wind.’

- (60) *(varağ.ci-kar) za <sup>5</sup>iç ug<sup>v</sup>-ar-a xhi-yic*  
 sun-SUBEL 1.GEN skin burn-DETR-A be-AOR.N

‘My skin was burned by the sun.’

The corresponding transitive clauses are not ungrammatical, but seem awkward to speakers:

- (61) *? kulak.ci-r riki <sup>5</sup>u-fa-c*  
 wind-ERG door PV-close-AOR.N

‘The wind closed the door.’

- (62) *? varağ.ci-r za <sup>5</sup>iç ug<sup>v</sup>a-c*  
 sun-ERG 1.GEN skin burn-AOR.N

‘The sun burned my skin’

A force affecting the subject internally may be expressed in the sublocative case in the following example (technical):

- (63) *vun*    *ğe<sup>s</sup>*    *yiğ-in.a<sup>s</sup>ar*    *sehirçi*    *azar.ci-k*    *yi-rqar-iya-vun*  
 2    today    day-INEL    magical    illness-SUB    PV-catch.DETR-FUT-2

‘From today, you will be affected with a magical disease.’

### 1.20. Anticausative imperfectives & labile perfectives

A couple of transitive verbs seem to distinguish two perfective intransitive forms, one unmarked – ‘labile’ – for the anticausative reading, the other, derived, for the passive interpretation:

PF participles		IPF participles
<i>çu&lt;d&gt;q'un-i</i>	stick, intr.	<i>yart'-ar -i</i>
/passive: <i>çunq'van-a xhiyi</i>	stick, tr.	<i>yat'-i</i>
<i>yat'-i</i>	cut, intr.	<i>yart'-ar -i</i>
/passive: <i>yat'-ar-a xhiyi</i>	cut, tr.	<i>yat'-i</i>

- (64) a) *rib*    *halav.ci-k*    *çu-b-q'un-du*  
 needle    dress-SUB    PV-F-stick.AOR.F
- b) *rib*    *halav.ci-k*    *çu-nq'van-a*    *xhi-du*  
 needle    dress-SUB    PV-stick.DETR-A    be-AOR .F

a) ‘The needle has stuck in her dress.’ b) ‘The needle has been stuck (by someone) in her dress.’

- (65) *a-n-ir*    *rib*    *halav.ci-k*    *çi-b-q'un-du*  
 3-H-ERG    needle    dress-SUB    PV-F-stick-AOR .F

‘He stuck the thorn[needle?] in her dress.’

- (66) *ç'ebic*    *ya-rt'ar-e*  
 rain    PV-cut.DETR-PRS

‘The rain stops.’

- (67) *xhad*    *yiğ.in-a*    *sa-d*    *sa<sup>s</sup>at*    *ya-rt'ar-e*  
 water    day-IN    one-N    hour    PV-cut.DETR-PRS

‘The water is cut off / stops for one hour a day.’

- (68) *a-n-ir*    *xhad*    *ya-t'-ic*  
 3-H-ERG    water    PV-cut-AOR.N

‘He has cut off the water.’

- (69) *xhad*    *ya-t'-ic*    / *ya-rt'ar-a*    *xhi-yic*  
 water    PV-cut(labile)-AOR.N    PV-cut.DETR-A    be-AOR.N

## 22 *Erreur ! Style non défini.*

‘The water has stopped / has been cut off.’

- (70) *va siy-ğar yux-a ne<sup>ŝ</sup> ya-t'-de-d*  
 2.G mouth-SUPEL milk-GEN smell PV-cut-NEGPERF-N

‘You still have the smell of milk on your mouth.’

Three such verbs referring to destruction processes have no passive interpretation, and show detransitive (strictly anticausative) derivation in the imperfective only. The only perfective form is labile:

PF		PIPF
	‘cut’ intr.	<i>ya-r-t'-ar-</i>
<i>yat'- &lt;</i>	‘cut’ tr.	<i>ya-r-t'-</i>
	‘break, intr.’	<i>qaç-ar-</i>
<i>qaça- &lt;</i>	‘break’ tr.	<i>qaç-</i>
	‘die’	<i>riq'-ar-</i>
<i>q'ay- &lt;</i>	‘kill’	<i>riq'-</i>

### 1.21. Antipassive with ‘eat’, ‘drink’, and other verbs

The detransitive forms of the two verbs ‘eat’ and ‘drink’ are ambiguous and can be interpreted as both Patient- or Agent-preserving, i.e. as anticausative or (more usually) as antipassive. Passive use is found in gnomic and Agent-backgrounding contexts:

- (71) *lem-ird yak ugval-de-d, yux ği-ğar-de-d*  
 donkey-GEN meat eat.DETR-NegPRS-N milk RED-drink.DETR-NegPRS-N

‘The meat of the donkey is not eaten, nor is its milk drunk.’

- (72) *ugval-a daxha yak xvar-imez sa-<sup>ŝ</sup>a-c*  
 eat.DETR-A Neg-be.PF(PART) meat dog-PL.DAT PV-throw-AOR.N

‘The meat which was not eaten has been thrown to the dogs.’

- (73) *dauğa ği-ğar-a xhi-d-u*  
 doogh RED-drink.DETR-A be-AOR-F

‘The doogh has been drunk.’

Antipassive use has a technical flavour:

- (74) *u-be-k ibe bala-yar ği-ğar-e*

3-NPL-SUB SELFNPPLG child-PL RED-drink.DETR-PRS

‘Their foals drink under them.’

(75) *vul-bi ugval-ciz...*  
ewe-PL eat.DETR-simul

‘While the sheep were grazing...’

The perfective antipassive is inceptive (there is no passive reading of the perfective form of these verbs):

(76) *vul-bi maʿan halu huq'-a ugval-a xhi-yic*  
ewe-PL again this meadow-IN eat.DETR-A be-AOR.N

‘The sheep started to graze in the meadow again.’

(77) *leh-ar ġi-ġar-a xhi-yic*  
calf-PL RED-drink.DETR-A be-AOR.N

‘The calves have started to drink.’

Other spontaneous or quasi-reflexive (non-passive) readings of the detransitive voice are also found, which preserve *non-controlling* Agents such as animals or the radio, in processes involving the body or voice:

(78) *hava-yar ghira xhi-yic-zina kis-ar ġi-nghan-e*  
air-PL warm be-MSD-INSTR hen-PL PV-lay.DETR-PRS

‘As soon as the weather becomes warm, the hens start laying eggs.’

(79) *pirennik uxvar-e / uxvar-a xhi-yic*  
radioset recite.DETR-PRS recite.DETR-A be-AOR.N

‘The radio is on / started to play.’

(80) *a) vul-be-r ib-ib ça-ç-re = b) vul-bi ça-rhar-e*  
ewe-PL-ERG SELFNPPL(E)-SELFNPPL PV-soil-PRS ewe-PL PV-soil.DETR-PRS

‘Sheep get dirty.’

Table 13. Detransitive verb forms with antipassive reading

PF	IPF tr.	DETR (PIPF & Masdar)
<i>ġira-</i> ‘drink’	<i>ġiġ-</i>	<i>ġiġar- / ġiġara xhiyi-</i> 1) ‘be drinkable; 2) ‘start / be made to drink’
<i>u(gu)la-</i> ‘eat’	<i>ul(ats’)-</i>	<i>ugval- / ugvala xhiyi-</i> 1) ‘be edible’ ; 2) ‘pasture’
<i>ġighn-</i> ‘lay (an) egg(s)’	<i>ġingh-</i>	<i>ġinghan-</i> <i>ġinghana xhiyi-</i>

<i>çaha-</i> 'soil'	<i>çaç-</i>	<i>çarhar-</i> <i>çarhara xhiyi-</i>
<i>uxva-</i> 'read, sing'	<i>uxv-(ats')-</i>	<i>uxvar-i</i> <i>uxvara xhiyi-</i>

This tripartite morphology, with a 'labile' perfective form opposed to the imperfective transitive/detransitive pair, certainly reflects an archaic state of the language, as parallels from other Daghestanian languages of non-Lezgcic branches will now show.

### Daghestanian origins of the detransitive voice

How do we account for the fact that the main – passive – use of the suffix *-aR-* in Kryz cannot be found in any other Daghestanian language? The answer to this question is only partially accessible through internal reconstruction, and we have to turn to external clues, from distant relatives of Kryz. The same detransitive marker seems to be attested as such in nearly all branches of the Daghestanian family, and although these languages have no passive constructions, they do have other detransitive voices with comparable morphology.

#### 1.22. Tsezic, Avar and Dargi detransitives

In other branches of the Daghestanian family, we find only a couple of instances of a (non-productive) detransitive voice provided by recent grammatical descriptions of Tsezic languages (and one Dargic language), and traces of the same phenomenon in Avar. Avar is well known for having derived intransitive verbs with 'iterative' or 'durative' meaning, which show the same association of *-a+R*:

*Table 15. Transitive and iterative detransitive stems in Avar (Charachidzé 1982)*

'mow' :	<i>b-ec-ize</i>	'busy oneself with mowing' :	<i>w-ec-ar-ize</i>
'sew' :	<i>b-uv'-ize</i>	'busy oneself with sewing' :	<i>w-uv'-ar-ize</i>
'slay' :	<i>qver-ize</i>	'slay cattle for the winter' :	<i>qveqar -ize</i>
'sting' :	<i>as-ine</i>	'dance, frolic' :	<i>w-as-and-ize</i>
'drink' :	<i>heq'e-ze</i>	'busy oneself with drinking' :	<i>heq'old-ize</i>
'tell' :	<i>b-ic-ize</i>	'reproach' :	<i>bic-ard-ize</i>
'praise' :	<i>b-ecc-ize</i>	'praise oneself' :	<i>v-ecc-ar-ize</i>

() *he-sl*      *he-sda*      *b-ic-anila*      50      *tumen*      *b-it'-i*

this-f/n.erg this-m.loc n-tell-pstevid 50 toman n-send-msd

‘She told him about the 50 tomans.’

(            *ros*            *he-lde*            *kveş*            *bicard-anila*  
              husband    this-f/n.lat    bad            reproach-pstevid

‘The husband reproached her bitterly.’

Instances of the detransitivation with reflexive interpretation are rare:

Tsez (Comrie 2000) has an antipassive with a morpheme *-na-*:

()    *Pat’aa*            *uji*            *esa-yxo*  
       Fatima.ERG   boy.ABS(M) (M)wash-PRS

‘Fatima washes the boy.’

()    *Pat’i*            *ker-aa*            *y-esa-na-yxo*  
       Fatima.ABS(F)   river-IN       F-wash-DETR-PRS

‘Fatima does the laundry in the river.’

Bezhta (van den Berg 2005, quoting Dr. Majid Khalilov, a native speaker) has the same detransitivizing derivation with a morpheme *-la-*, by which some verbs (ex.???) become antipassive (with the original absolutive-marked object expressed in the instrumental case in the new derived construction), while others lose any ability to express a Patientive argument. Note the aspectual shift in the English translation:

()    *öjdi*            *qarandi*            *y-ö:t’ö-yö*  
       boy.ERG   hole.ABS(N)   N-dig-PST

‘The boy dug the hole.’

()    *öjö*            *qarandi-yad*            *ö:t’ö-lä:-yo*  
       boy.ABS(M)   hole-INSTR   (M)-dig-DETR-PST

‘The boy was digging at the hole.’

()    *kid-ba*            *häk’ä*            *tl’eq’e-yo*  
       girl-ERG   boots       sew-PST

‘The girl sewed boots.’

()    *kid*            *tl’eq’e-laa-yo*

26 *Erreur ! Style non défini.*

girl(ABS) sew-DETR-PST

‘The girl was sewing.’

Hunzib (van den Berg 1994) is even more interesting in that it shows two possible interpretations of the morpheme *-la-*, antipassive and anticausative:

- ( ) *oslul bex koše*  
he.ERG grass mow

‘He mows the grass.’

- ( ) *eg koše-laa*  
he.ABS mow-DETR

‘He mows (often, usually).’

- ( ) *iyul q’utilaa zinkl’ay m-utsu-r*  
mother.ERG trunk.DAT ring(A) A-hide-PST

‘Mother hid the ring in the trunk.’

- ( ) *kid q’utilaa y-utsu-laa-r*  
girl trunk-DAT F-hide-DETR-PST

‘The girl hid in the trunk.’

Let us recapitulate the detransitive derivations attested in Tsezic:

	transitive	Patient-preserving : anticausative	Agent-preserving : antipassive
Tsez ‘wash’	-esa-		-esa-na-
Bezhta ‘sew’	-ö:t’ö-		-ö:t’ö-lä:-
Bezhta ‘dig’	tl’eq’e-		tl’eq’e-laa-
Hunzib ‘hide’	-utsu-	-utsu-laa-	
Hunzib ‘mow’	koše-		koše-laa

Thanks to the excellent description of Sumbatova and Mutalov (2006), Icarí is the best described language of the Dargic branch. Like Kryz, it systematically marks intransitivity on underived stems as well as on detransitive (anticausative) stems with the allomorphs *-ar-*, *-al-*, *-an-*:

	transitive	intransitive
‘rot’		
PF	∅	<i>er’-ar-</i>
IPF	∅	<i>u’-ar-</i>
‘break’		
PF	<i>elq’w-</i>	<i>elqw-an-</i>
IPF	<i>luq’w-</i>	<i>luqw-an-</i>

Unfortunately, the grammar provides no examples of sentences showing the possible contexts in which this detransitivation may take place. Intransitive verbs in Kryz or Icarl look like detransitive verb forms with no corresponding non-derived form, i.e. ‘deponents’ or ‘*media tantum*’ in the grammar of classical languages. The great productivity of this derivational marker in these two languages is probably a recent, parallel phenomenon.

### 1.23. Lezgian languages and the nominal hypothesis

The detransitive derived stem seems to be relatively old in Kryz itself: often it is not derived from the transitive imperfective stem currently in use. Transitive forms seem younger than their detransitive counterparts, as they contain a recent imperfective morpheme *-ts’-*:

	thematic PF	IPF	DETR. IPF
‘cook’	<i>cir-a-</i>	<i>cira-ts’-</i>	<i>cir-ar-</i>
‘slay’	<i>kur-a-</i>	<i>kura-ts’-</i>	<i>kur-ar-</i>
‘shear’	<i>vud-a-</i>	<i>vuda-ts’-</i>	<i>vud-ar-</i>
‘weave’	<i>xir-a-</i>	<i>xix- / xira-ts’-</i>	<i>xir-ar-</i>
‘wash’	<i>zim-a-</i>	<i>zima-ts’-</i>	<i>zim-ar-</i>
compare, athematic:			
‘tie’	<i>vat’l-</i>	<i>valt’-</i>	<i>valt’-al-</i>

Furthermore, in some instances the detransitive verbal adjective retains strong gender agreement on the stem, whereas strong forms of agreement are normally found only on perfective stems:

	PRS.F	AOR.F	DETR PRS.F	DETR AOR.F
‘yoke’	<i>kilt’ilyu</i>	<i>ki&lt;b&gt;t’ildu</i>	<i>kilt’al-yu</i>	<i>ki&lt;b&gt;t’ala xhidu</i>

As for the analytic perfective detransitive, this is obviously a recent creation in Kryz, prompted by the influence of the highly productive

passive found in Azerbaijani. The anticausative voice, with labile perfective, is certainly older, since the closely related Budugh language shows no traces of a passive construction, but has a couple of anticausative imperfective forms directly comparable with those of the corresponding verbs in Kryz:

Table 19. *Budugh detransitive imperfective stems*

	PF (labile)	IPF	DETR. IPF
'cut'	<i>ya-t'-</i>	<i>ya-r-t'-</i>	<i>yart'-ar</i>
'catch'	<i>st-q-r</i>	<i>st-r-q-</i>	<i>sirq-ar</i>

Tsakhur intransitive verbs and causatives historically deriving from intransitive verbs or detransitive forms show the same *-aR-* suffix:

Table 20. *Tsakhur detransitive imperfective stems*

	intransitive	causative :
'make stand'	<i>ilyozw-ar-</i>	<i>ilyozw-ar-a'-</i>
'distribute'		<i>it'-al-a'-</i>

The relationship of the suffix *-aR-* to imperfective aspect and nominal (collective) plural markers is obvious in many different branches of the Daghestanian family. All branches have plurals in *-r-*, *-l-*, *-n-*; in synchrony, Kryz shows that the three sonorants have to be considered polycategorical plurality/iterative morphemes.

Table 21. *Intransitivity, imperfectivity and plurality markers in Kryz*

	nominal plurals	prefixes > IPF aspect	suffixes > intransitivity
<i>-r-</i>	<i>ğub-ri</i> 'frog-PL'	<i>yi-r-q-</i>	<i>ke-rxhar-</i> 'move.IPF'
<i>-l-</i>	Ø	<i>ki-l-t'-</i>	<i>la-lsal-</i> 'turn.IPF'
<i>-n-</i>	<i>xiy-ni</i> 'thread-PL'	<i>yi-n-gh-</i>	<i>ha-ngvan-</i> 'run.IPF'

The detransitivising suffix *-aR-* is not restricted to verbs. Lezgian has a few intransitive verbal nouns like *zw-er* 'running' or *zw-al* 'boiling' which display the same 'intransitive' suffix, be it Agent-oriented or Patient-oriented. We propose to recognise it also on a substantial set of Kryz nouns (some of them are also found in Rutul):

Table 22. *'Detransitive nouns' in Kryz*

	verbal root	derived noun
<i>-ar</i>	<i>ke-xh-r-ic</i> 'move'	<i>xh-ar:</i> 'wind'
	<i>yi-gh-nic</i> 'draw, pull'	<i>gh-ar:</i> 'snake'
	<i>ğa-ç'-ic</i> 'exit, protrude'	<i>ç'-ar:</i> 'overhang'

	<i>a-z-ayc</i> ‘milk’	<i>z-ar:</i> ‘cow’ = ‘milch cow, ger. melkende Kuh’
<i>-al</i>	<i>x-irayc</i> ‘weave’	<i>x-al:</i> ‘roof; cobweb’

We may now propose the following diachronic scenario: some of these intransitive deverbals (participles) came to be used as substantives, while others never became lexicalised. But the latter, used as predicates with semantic Patient- or subject-orientation, evolved into anticausative or antipassive forms, not only preserved in the Southern sub-branch (Kryz and Budugh) of the Lezgi languages, but also quite well distributed in a range of languages belonging to other branches. The last stage of this evolution in Lezgi is the Kryz passive use of this common Daghestanian detransitive voice (for the evolution of anticausative into passive markers, see for instance Haspelmath 1990).

### Conclusion

One of the most striking features of Kryz verbal morphology is the systematic marking of intransitivity in the subsystem of imperfective forms. Intransitivity is marked in the same way on non-derived imperfective intransitives, and on both imperfective and perfective derived detransitive verb forms. Two hypotheses can account for this: either intransitive verbs are derived forms which in the course of time have lost their original transitive counterpart (very much like the well-known ‘deponent verbs’ in Latin), or there was once a sufficiently productive detransitive derivation pattern marked by the suffix *-aR-*, and this productive suffix progressively extended to all intransitives in Kryz, including originally non-derived roots. We consider the latter the more likely.

Detransitivizing voices are not otherwise attested in the Lezgi branch of Daghestanian languages – with the exception of a few traces in Budugh, closely related to Kryz – but we may infer that it is an archaic feature retained from Proto-Daghestanian, because there are unmistakable cognate formants in some languages belonging to other branches of the family and only remotely related to Kryz: their morphology shares obvious resemblances in phonological shape.

The Kryz passive has a habitual and generally stative interpretation – this is also a typical property of antipassives, and indeed, other Daghestanian detransitive voices are not passive but antipassive in

function. All these Daghestanian detransitive voices are highly restricted in their use, even in Kryz, and they have only been brought to light by recent descriptions based on original texts. They are rare overall in the Daghestanian family, and the few instances are scattered across various branches of the family, meaning that a contact explanation is not likely. We therefore believe that this is a recessive feature inherited from Proto-Daghestanian morphology.

### Abbreviations

-a	attribute	H	human
1	1st singular	IF	conditional converb
2	2nd singular	IMP	imperative
3	3rd singular	IN	locative case
ABS	absolute	INT	interrogative
AD	adlocative	ITR	intransitive
ADEL	adelative	IPF	imperfective
ADR	adressative	MSD	masdar, on a PF stem
ALL	allative	NEG	negation
AOR	aurist, on a PF stem	nH	non-human
APUD	apudlocative	notN	(pronominal suffix) non-neutral
APUDEL	apudelative	OPT	optative
CAUS	causative	PF	perfective
DAT	dative	PL	plural
DEB	debitive	PPF	perfective participle
DIR	directive	PRF	perfect
EL	elative case	PRS	present, on a IPF stem
EQU	equative	PRT	participle
ERG	ergative	PV	preverb
EVT	'eventual mood', on a IPF stem	SEQ	sequential converb
F	singular human female, animals, plants and some animates	SUB	sublocative
		SUBEL	subelative
		SUPEL	superelative
FUT	future	SUPER	superlocative
GEN	genitive	TR.	transitive

## References

- Authier, G.  
2005 *Split Ergativity on Kryz Pronouns in Cahiers du CELIA*, 2005  
*Ergativity in Amazonia*, III : Coreference, éd. F. Queixalos  
2009 *Eléments de grammaire kryz*, Peeters, Paris
- van den Berg, H.  
1994 *Hunzib*, Lincom, Munich.  
2001 *Dargi Folktales*. Leiden: Universiteit Leiden, Research School of Asian, African and Amerindian Studies.  
2005 The North-East Caucasian Languages. *Lingua* 115(1).
- Charachidzé, G.  
1982 *Grammaire de la langue avar* Paris.
- Comrie  
2000 'Valency-changing derivations in Tsez'. In R.M.W. Dixon and Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald, eds.: *Changing Valency: Case Studies in Transitivity*, 360–374. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dixon, R.M.W.  
1994 *Ergativity*, Cambridge  
Dixon, R.M.W. & Aikhenvald, A.Y.  
2000 *Changing Valency. Cases studies in transitivity* Cambridge.
- Haspelmath, M.  
1990 The grammaticization of passive morphology in *Studies in Language* 14.1:25-71.  
1993 *A grammar of Lezgian*. Berlin – New York: Mouton de Gruyter.  
1993 "More on the typology of inchoative/causative verb alternations." In: Comrie, Bernard & Polinsky, Maria (eds.) *Causatives and transitivity*. (Studies in Language Companion Series, 23.) Amsterdam: Benjamins, 87-120.  
1994 "Passive participles across languages". In: Fox, Barbara & Hopper, Paul J. (eds.) *Voice: Form and Function*. (Typological Studies in Language, 27.) Amsterdam: Benjamins, 151-177.
- Givón, T.  
1994 The pragmatics of de-transitive voice: Functional and typological aspects of inversion. In: Givón, Talmy (ed.). *Voice and inversion*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins, 3–46.
- Kazenin, K.

32 *Erreur ! Style non défini.*

- 2001 Passive. In: Haspelmath, M., König E., Österreicher W. & Raible W. *Language Typology and Language Universals. An International Handbook*. Berlin – New York: Walter de Gruyter, 970–978.
- Keenan & Dryer
- 2007 Keenan, E. L. and M. S. Dryer. 2007. Passive in the world's languages. In T. Shopen (ed.), *Language Typology and Syntactic Description*, Volume I. [2nd edition], 325-361.
- Kemmer, S.
- 1993 *The middle voice*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam.
- Kibrik, A. E.
- 1997 Beyond subject and object: Toward a comprehensive relational typology // *Linguistic typology* 1. 1997: 279–346.
- Malchukov, A.
- 2006 Transitivity parameters and transitivity alternations: constraining co-variation". In Leonid Kulikov, Andrej Malchukov A. & Peter de Swart (eds.). *Studies on case, valency and transitivity*, 329-359. John Benjamins. ([MalchukovTransitivity\\_Benjamins.pdf](#))
- 2005 "Case Pattern Splits, Verb Types and Construction Competition." In: M. Amberber & H. de Hoop (Eds.) *Competition and Variation in Natural Languages: The Case for Case*. Amsterdam, Boston, etc.: Elsevier, 73-118 ([Malchukov2005Scan.pdf](#))
- Nichols, J.
- 1992 *Linguistic Diversity in Space and Time*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Saadiev, Sh.
- 1972 *Opyt strukturnogo opisanija kryzskogo jazyka* (dissertatsija, Tbilissi).
- 1994 *Kryts in : Indigenous languages of the Caucasus*. 4, R. Smeets (ed.). Smeet, Riexs (ed.)
- 1994 *The Indigenous Languages of the Caucasus*, vol. IV. Delmar, New York: Caravan.
- Sumbatova, N. & Mutalov, R.
- 2004 *A Grammar of Icarî Dargi*, Lincom, Munich.