

<p>I. Historico-comparative study of morphological categories of the verb is significant for establishing of regularities of the development of the grammatical structures of the Kartvelian and Caucasian languages.</p>	<p>II. It is rather natural to state an issue of isoglosses of Georgian and Udi (Ancient Albanian) isoglosses.</p>
<p>Causative is one of the basic and well-expressed verbal categories in Kartvelian languages. In Georgian the causative forms are presented as thus: will compel or allow, will instruct, will help (to do something), will assist, will enable, will make (smb do smth) or ask, will make (smb do smth) or assist... Causative may be both a form and a system of oppositional forms according to a certain grammatical marker. Causation implies causal conditions. The principle, governing assigning a causative status to a certain form, allows generalizations. A certain model of paraphrasing has been created for causative verbs. Such kind of paraphrase-based definitions are consistently applied. Specific causation markers will be identified within the morphological inventory, and thus a semantic category is created.</p>	
<p>The morphemes –ev, –in and –evin are identified as causation markers. “The –ev occurs only with a couple of verbs such as: č’am-s ‘s/he eats’ - ač’m-ev-s ‘s/he makes eat’, svam-s ‘s/he drinks’ – asm-ev-s ‘s/he makes drink’, icvam-s ‘s/he dresses’ – acm-ev-s ‘s/he makes dress’. The same –ev occurs in the verbs ertm-ev-s and arkm-ev-s, but they have lost the implication of causative... The –ev was more widespread in Old and Middle Georgian... The –in occurs with most of the verbs... The affix –evin is complex; it is an outcome of the merger of –ev and –in;” the reason of complication was the fact that “the suffix –ev did not appear sufficient for the formation of causative” (A. Shanidze).</p>	<p>It appeared that the causative morphemes –in and –evin are capable of conveying of nuances of causation within a masdar and a participle. Corresponding patterns were created by way of identifying of consistent features, markers. Morphologically a causative is formed by means of –in suffix that occurred in the secondary causatives since the 11-12<sup>th</sup> centuries. It was generalized and added to all kinds of stems: to the unsyllabic ones which was formed by means of –ev suffix in the secondary causatives in Old Georgian (<i>atkum-ev-s</i> &gt; <i>atkum-evin-eb-s</i>), as well the syllabic ones, which used descriptive formation to express the mentioned function (<i>ceradsca</i> "smb made smb write"). This type of descriptive formation occurs in the literary works of the 7-11<sup>th</sup> centuries, since the 12<sup>th</sup> c. it disappeared.</p> <p>With respect to all of these circumstances, the morphological status of “primary causatives” is to be questioned and there is no common position in the classification of “primary causative” forms; owing to the opposition of (non)-causative forms, there is a well-defined grammatical, morphological category.</p>
<p><b>Causative in Udi (Ancient Albanian) language</b></p>	
<p>.Udi (Ancient Albanian) evidences a specific formation of causative forms, viz. the formant –ev//–v occurs as a causative marker, functionally coinciding with the causative markers of –desun//–tesun in Udi. The mentioned marker has been noted by Anton Schiffner (A. Shiefner, Versuch über die Sprache der Uden, 1863, St. Petersburg) The scholar indicated the existence of an epenthesis –v- in the verbs before vowels. Whether Schiffner considered the insertion of –v- to be morphological occurrence or not, isn’t clear. A. Deer (А. Дирр, Грамматика удинского языка, 1903.) indicates a circumfix –v- between a verb root and ending. Hypothetical suffix can be characterized as a means of producing affix of transitiveness for intransitive verbs. It sometimes occurs as a formant of causative forms and functionally coincides with –desun // –tesun formants.</p>	
<p>In present-day Udi, the formant –ev//–v is preserved as a relic, as an organic formation of the said category (cf. more widespread forms in Old and Middle Georgian). The such formed verbs in Udi are batk’sun//*batk’esun ‘is destroyed’ - bat-ev-k’esun ‘is destroying’. bošsun ‘is sated’ – boš-ev-k’esun ‘s/he makes sated’. zeresun//zer-ev-k’esun ‘I decorate’. cisun//cis-ev-k’esun ‘s/h is bringing smb down’; čaxesun// čax-ev-k’esun ‘I am getting cold’-‘S/he is making cold.’</p>	
<p>The use of the clitic –ev, widespread in Old and Middle Georgian, shows commonalities with the Udi (Ancient Albanian) language. Moreover, the Old Georgian and Udi markers are identical.</p>	
<p>Why the morphological markers in causatives cannot be separated in the Udi verbs? I believe that in Udi a causative expresses a causative semantics. The reason for this isn’t the morphological markers, but the context of a verb. In other words, causativeness of a verb isn’t determined by the existence of a circumfix in it, but an object’s ability to fulfill the action itself. If a causative function is depended on the existence of the circumfix, than some verbs possibly can have causative function, which is not so ... Considering the fact that in the language there are functions which do not have formal expressions, thus in Udi the causatives with the causative function can be called semantic (functional).</p>	
<p>Based on the discussed data, the causation suffixes in Georgian (Old Georgian) and Udi (Ancient Albanian) make up a morpho-isogloss, substantiating contacts of these languages and, probably, reflecting the ancient genetic and areal relations.</p>	