When person overcomes class
The case of Caucasian Albanian

by Jost Gippert

Abstract: The article examines the side-effects of the substitution of class marking by person marking in Caucasian Albanian, the only East Caucasian language attested in written form in the first millennium of our era, and Udi, its closest relative of the present. The phenomena dealt with comprise the fossilisation of class markers in verbs, pronouns and adjectives, the emergence of a threefold gender system in Caucasian Albanian, its relics in the system of referentialisers of modern Udi, and the development of clitic person markers. The material basis of the investigation is enriched by new images of the Caucasian Albanian palimpsests of Mt. Sinai which yield important new insights into the structure and wording of the original documents and the history of the language.

Keywords: Caucasian Albanian, Udi, class marking, person marking, gender, referentialiser.

For linguists working on the diachrony of languages, it is rather exceptional nowadays to be able to base their investigations on 1500 year-old written materials that they themselves have deciphered and published for the first time. Together with Wolfgang Schulze, the present author was lucky enough to have an opportunity to do so, which emerged from the detection in the 1990ies of palimpsests containing the only manuscript remains of the Caucasian Albanian language (hereafter: CA) in St. Catherine's monastery on Mt. Sinai.[1] In an extremely intense cooperation, which lasted from 2003 to 2008, manifesting itself in about 1,200 e-mails, we not only achieved the first edition of the 121 palimpsest folios containing CA un-

---

[1] First information on the detection of the palimpsests was published in Aleksidze & Mahé 1997.

dertext but also the first grammatical account of the language,[2] which clearly proved that CA was the ancestor (or, at least, an extremely close relative of the ancestor)[3] of the Udi language of today, thus providing a reliable basis for diachronic studies into the history of the North-East Caucasian language family and, especially, its Lezgic subgroup.

1. The contribution of the palimpsests to the diachrony of the North-East Caucasian language family is remarkable indeed: they prove that one of the most decisive features distinguishing modern Udi from the rest of the North East Caucasian family was already achieved in the first millennium of our era, viz. the introduction of person-marking in verbs at the expense of older class-marking.[4] Just as in modern Udi, class markers only occur in fossilised (or petrified)[5] form, and it is usually only the marker of non-animates, *b*, that has survived. This is proven by the great number of verbs, pronouns, and adjectives whose stems begin with *b-*;[6] cf., e.g., CA *biyesun*[7] 'do, make' (Udi *besun*), *bartesun* 'leave, let' (Udi id.), *besesun* 'search, beg' (Udi *bessun*), *bixesun* 'give birth, create' (Udi *bixsun*), *buq̇esun* 'love, want' (Udi *buq̇sun*), or *bu* (pres.) 'be' (Udi id.); *bezi* 'my' (Udi id., vs. *zu* = Udi *zu* 'I') and *beši* 'our' (Udi id., vs. *žan*, Udi *yan*, 'we'); or *bai* 'full' (Udi *bui*), *boći* (in *boći-biyesun* 'to stick') 'dense' (Udi *boću*), and *büwi* 'heavy' (Udi *bị*). Slight differences between CA and Udi occurring here

---

[2]   The grammar was published in the first volume of Gippert & Schulze et al. (2008).

[3]   Schulze (2009: 7) states: "Die Sprache ist eine frühe Variante des heutigen Udischen, ohne allerdings dessen unmittelbarer Vorläufer zu sein"; similarly in Schulze (2015: 381): "Caucasian Albanian and 'Early Udi' must have developed out of a common language".

[4]   Class marking was also lost in Aghul, Lezgi, and South Tabasaran; cf. Schulze 1992: 204. For the case of Batsbi (Tsova-Tush) cf. below.

[5]   This is the term used in Schulze (1992), which provides a theoretical framework for the loss of class marking.

[6]   For a full account of CA words beginning with *b-* cf. the lexicon in Gippert & Schulze et al. (2008, vol. I: IV-7–12); for the petrification of class markers in Udi verbs cf. Schulze (1992: 222–223).

[7]   In the palimpsests, the vowel *u* is always written (in agreement with Old Armenian and Old Georgian, all depending on Greek OY) as a digraph transliterated as *ow* in the edition; for the sake of clarity, it is rendered by plain *u* in the linguistic analysis provided here. If not stated otherwise, verbs are given in the form of the verbal noun (*masdar*) throughout.

and there can be taken to indicate that there was a dialect boundary involved; cf., e.g., CA *biq̇esun* 'seize' corresponding to Udi *biq̇sun* 'id.' and opposing itself to Udi *aq̇sun* 'take', which may reflect the same verb without the relic of the class marker but with the vocalism of *baq̇esun*, an ablaut variant of *biq̇esun* 'seize';[8] CA *aṗesun* 'arrive, reach', the Udi counterpart of which is *baṗesun* 'id.'; or CA *beҳ̣fi*[9] 'your' (pl.), which constrasts with Udi *eҳ̣fi* 'id.' (vs. CA = Udi *vạn* 'you' pl.). Possible remnants of the other class markers are extremely hard to find in both languages; a good candidate is CA = Udi *viči* 'brother', which corresponds to Avar *v-as* etc. with the marker of the class of male persons, *v*, in its turn contrasting with *y-as* 'sister' which, however, has no clear equivalent in neither CA nor Udi.[10]

2. A remarkable innovation of CA that can be regarded as a by-effect of the loss of class marking is the development of a threefold gender (or, rather, sexus) system which distinguishes the reference to male and female persons from anything else and manifests itself in a complex system of articles, demonstratives (which also serve as 3rd person personal pronouns), and 'referentialised' forms of adjectives (including degenitival formations), adjectival (possessive and interrogative > relative) pronouns, participles, and adverbs.[11] For the sake of easy reference, the basic elements of the paradigm as established for the CA system are illustrated in Table I,[12]

---

[8] For the *i/a* ablaut which was characteristic of CA but is no longer observable in Udi cf. Gippert & Schulze et al. (2008, vol. I: II-44).

[9] In the position of pharyngealised vowels of modern Udi, the CA script preposes a special character to the vowel in question, obviously denoting a pharyngeal consonant (cf. Gippert forthc.: 3.2.1.1 as to an historical analysis); in the plain transcription of CA used in the linguistic analysis here, this is rendered by a dot below as in the transcription of pharyngelised vowels of Udi.

[10] 'Brother' and 'sister' are systematically marked with class prefixes in North East Caucasian. For words meaning 'sister' in CA cf. the lexicon in Gippert & Schulze et al. (2008, vol. I: IV-21) s.v. *išeb-* and IV-33 s.v. *ša*; Udi has *xun-či* (cf. ib.). For the reconstruction of the relationship terms with class marking in Lezgic cf. Schulze (1992: 209–210).

[11] Cf. Gippert & Schulze et al. (2008, vol. I: II-38, II-40, and II-29).

[12] For the full system cf. Gippert & Schulze et al. (2008, vol. I: II-29); secondary case forms can be omitted here as they rely upon the datives. In the Table, *o-u* represents

which shows that (non-attributive) demonstrative pronouns, articles and referentialisers share most forms except for those of the absolute case: articles have no other case forms at all while the absolute case forms of the (independent) demonstrative pronouns (masculine and neutre) can obviously be extended facultatively by the referentialiser (which appears assimilated from *e-o > e-e in the neutre).

		Masculine		Feminine		Neutre	
		Sg.	Pl.	Sg.	Pl.	Sg.	Pl.
Abs.	article	*o*	*e*	*aġ*	*e*	*e*	*e*
Abs.	dem.pr.	*o(-o)*[13]	*å˜-r*	*aġ*	*aġ-ur*	*e(-e)*[13]	*e-bur*
Abs.	refer.	*-o*	*-å˜-r*	*-aġ*	*-aġ-ur*	*-o*	*-e-bur*
Ergative		*o-en*	*å˜-n*	*aġ-en*	*aġ-r-o-n*	*(e)ṭ-en*	*ed-ġ-o-n*
Genitive		*o-ya*	*å˜-y*	*aġ-ya*	*aġ-r-o-y*	*(e)ṭ'a < *(e)ṭ-ya*	*ed-ġ-o-y*
Dative I		*o-u*	*å˜-a*	*aġ-u*	*aġ-r-o*	*(e)ṭ-u*	*ed-ġ-o*
Dative II		*o-u-s*	*å˜-(a)s*	*aġ-u-s*	*aġ-r-o-s*	*(e)ṭ/d-u-s*	*ed-ġ-o-s*
Dative III		*o-u-x*	*å˜-(a)x*	*aġ-u-x*	*aġ-r-o-x*	*(e)ṭ/d-u-x*	*ed-ġ-o-x*

Table I: Inflection of the CA articles, demonstrative pronouns, referentialisers

2.1 Typical 'referentialised' forms that occur in the CA texts[14] are: masc.: *beši-o* (Jo. 8.55) 'ours' (God), *buqana-o* (Jo. 11.11) 'the beloved one' (Lazarus), *o ḳaći-ous* (Jo. 9.17) 'to the blind one', *xoqåaray-bån'i-ou* (Mk. 15.39) 'to the centurio (*lit.* the big one of the hundred)'[15] and *kahanauġoy-bån'i-ous* (Heb. 3.1) 'to the archpriest (*lit.* big one of the priests)', *bartay-a˜r* (2 Cor. 4.9) 'forsaken ones', *ṗuri-a˜r* (abs., 1 Cor. 15.52) and *ṗuri-a˜x* (dat. III, 2 Tim. 4.1) 'the dead'; ntr.: *marġavenun-o* (2. Petr. 1.19) 'that of prophecy' (word), *ičē-ebur* (Jo. 10.4) '(his) own ones' (sheep), *bezi-edux* (dat. III, Mt. 20.15) 'mine' (things), *himi-edux* (Act. 13.35) 'in another'

---

a disyllabic sequence (spelt *-o-ow* in the palimpsests); the high tilde in forms like *-å˜-r* represents the abbreviation mark, for which cf. below.

[13] Instead of the absolute case of the demonstrative pronouns in the masculine and neutre, an element *-va-* occurs as the corresponding person marker; cf. Gippert & Schulze et al. (2008, vol. I: II-53) and below.

[14] For a comprehensive survey cf. Gippert & Schulze et al. (2008, vol. I: II-29–30).

[15] Note that 'hundred' is here expressed as 5 (×) 20 (*xo- q̇å*).

(psalm), *bura-ṭux* (dat., Jo. 5.38)[16] 'the abiding one' (word), and *bil'ala-eṭu* (dat. I, 1. Cor. 15.53) and *bil'ala-eṭen* (erg., 1. Cor. 15.54) 'the mortal'.

2.1.1 For the feminine, referentialised forms have only been found in relative pronouns so far; the forms are abs.sg. *-hanay-aġ-ḳe-* (2 × in Lk. 2.5), erg.sg. *-hanay-aġen-ḳe-* (1 Thess. 2.7), abs.pl. *-hanay-aġur-ḳe-* (2 × Mk. 15.41), erg.pl. *-hanay-aġron-ḳe-* and dat. III pl. *-hanay-aġrox-ḳe-* (Mk. 15.40). The forms of the (independent) demonstrative are also well attested; cf., e.g., abs.sg. *aġ* 'she (arose)',[17] erg.sg. *aġen* 'she (spoke)', dat. I sg. *aġu* 'she (heard)' and dat. II sg. *aġus* 'to her (spoke)' in Jo. 11.25–29; erg.sg. *aġen* 'she (gives birth)', gen.sg. *aġya* 'of her', and dat. I sg. *aġu* '(is) to her (sorrow[18])' in Jo. 16.21; abs.sg. *aġ* 'she (will be)' and dat. III sg. *aġux* 'her (they had)' in Mt. 22.28; and dat. I pl. *aġro* in Jo. 11.19.[19]

2.1.2 In the case of the neutre, the distribution of dative singular forms with *ṭ* and *d* is not quite clear. In the singular, we have, e.g., dat. I *eṭu* '(do you believe) this' in Jo. 11.26 and always in the frequent adverb *eṭu-axay* 'therefore, -upon', but dat. II *edus* 'in it' (house) in 2. Cor. 5.2, and dat. III *edux* 'it' (the prophetic word) in 2. Petr. 1.19, (the church) in Eph. 5.26, and 'for it' (mortality) in 2. Cor. 5.5.[20] It thus seems that *-ṭ-* only occurs in dative I forms (apart from genitives and ergatives). This is corroborated by the co-occurrence of dat. I *cex-ṭu*, dat. II *cex-dus* and dat. III *cex-dux* (besides erg. *cex-ṭen*) in 1 Cor. 13.7, all pertaining to *cex* 'all, everything'. It is further corroborated by the relative pronoun[21] which appears as *-hanay-ṭu-ḳe* in dat. I (e.g., Lk. 2.4; Act. 13.41) and as *-hanay-dux-ḳe* in dat. III (2 Thess. 2.14). In the plural, we mostly find the voiced cluster *-dġ-* as in dat. III pl. *edġox* 'these (things)' in 2 Petr. 1.16 and 'of them (sparrows)' (Mt.

---

[16] Uncertain; the reading *bowrioow* in the edition must be corrected in any case, however.

[17] For *hayz-ari-ne aġ* in Jo. 11.29 read *hayz-ari-n-aġ*.

[18] Read *hüw|ḳeḳaċown* instead of *hüwḳ|narown* in Jo. 16.21, also *hüwḳe|ḳaċown* instead of *hüwḳna|rownown* a few lines below (A24rb, 13–18).

[19] The dat. III pl. *aġrox* in the edition must be corrected.

[20] Instead of *edux uḳa-z* in Jo. 5,34 read *e uḳa-zu*, with the demonstrative in the unextended abs. case (A97rb, 19).

[21] Cf. Gippert & Schulze et al. (2008, vol. I: II-40) for the inflection of the relative pronoun in general.

10.29),[22] erg.pl. *efa-anaḳe-edġon* 'for they (limbs of the body) have' (Rom. 12.4), gen.pl. *ọ-biyay-edġoy* gen.pl. 'of the future (things)' (Heb. 11.20), or abl. II pl. *mal-mal-edġoxoc* 'from the small(est) (commandments)' (2 × Mt. 5.19); in contrast to this, ablative forms like *cex-txoc* 'from (= than) all' (1 Tim. 2.1), *parisauġoy-txoc* 'from (= than) that (righteousness) of the pharisees' (2 × Mt. 5.20) or *beġa-etxoc* 'from (= than) what is necessary' (Rom. 12.3) rather pertain to the singular (as abl. II forms based upon the dat. III in *-ṭ/dux*)[23] than the plural (as abl. I forms based upon the dat. I in *-dġo*). In the relative pronoun, we find a similar distribution, the erg.pl. always appearing as *-hanay-dġon-ḳe-* (e.g. in Heb. 9.5 beside super-abl.pl. *-hanay-dġoloc-ḳe-*), whereas the form *-hanay-txoc-ḳe-* (e.g., Act. 13.38; Heb. 13.10) has to be analysed as an abl. II of the singular.

2.2 In comparison to this, the corresponding Udi system, which has been touched upon in different ways in the existing grammars,[24] is much less differentiated. Here, the distinction between three genders has been given up totally, and we find no more articles and independent demonstrative pronouns corresponding to the referentialiser suffixes so that the latter can be illustrated alone as given in Table II.

---

[22] In the given context, *edġox* must be a misspelling for gen.pl. *edġoy* or abl. II pl. *edġoxoc* (*sa-al *edġoy* / **edġoxoc* 'and one of / from them').

[23] Cf. Gippert & Schulze et al. (2008, vol. I: II-34) for the formation of secondary case forms.

[24] Schiefner (1863: 20) treats the system under the inflection of adjectives and participles but omits the *-o* suffix. In Dirr (1904: 11), the latter is mentioned as part of the word formation of adjectives but the other forms appear under the inflection of adjectives and pronouns (ib.: 28). Ჳeiranišvili (1971: 63–65) introduces the system under the inflection of "determining (attributive) nouns" (*msazġvrel (aṭribuṭiul) saxelta*) or "substantivised determining nouns" (*gasubsṭanṭivebul msazġvrel saxelta*, ib. n. 1), Pančviʒe (1974: 106–107) under "adjectival nouns with the function of a substantive" (*zedsartavi saxeli subsṭanṭivis punkciit*). W. Schulze (1982: 102) was the first to speak of a "pronominal stem extension" ("pronominale SE") but also uses terms like "nominalizer" (Schulze 2016: 3571).

	Sg.	Pl.
Absolutive	*-o*	*-or*
Ergative	*-(o)ṭ-in*	*-(o)ṭ-ġ-o-n*
Genitive	*-(o)ṭ-ay*	*-(o)ṭ-ġ-o-y*
Dative I	*-(o)ṭ-u*	*-(o)ṭ-ġ-o*
Dative II (< III)	*-(o)ṭ-u-x*	*-(o)ṭ-ġ-o-x*
Table II: Inflection of the Udi referentialisers		

2.2.1 It is clear from the Table that most of the paradigm is equal to that of the neutre in CA. If we consider that in the referentialiser system of CA, the form of the abs. singular masculine and neutre coincide (in *-o*), this may have triggered the merger into one paradigm. In addition, we observe even in CA a certain inconsistency in the distribution of masculine and neutre reference. E.g., in Jo. 16.13, the dat. I form *eṭu* 'it (will hear)' refers to the 'spirit of truth', the 'neutral' reference also manifesting itself in *pē-ġa-ṭen* 'it shall speak' and *il'uḳa-anaḳe-ṭen* 'for it speaks' in the given context; in contrast to this, the dat. III *edux*, which in Heb. 2,14 stands for the satan ('him who has the power of death'), competes with the co-referential masculine form of the relative pronoun, *hanay-oen-ḳe*, in the same verse.[25]

2.2.2 The absolutive plural suffix *-or* possibly reflects the masculine suffix *-å̃-r* of CA, provided the abbreviation hides something like *-åar* < **-oar*, with *-ar* being the usual abs. plural ending of quantifiers and numerals in CA.[26] This analysis seems to be corroborated by the abs. pl. form *gölöun-oar* 'many' appearing in Lk. 1.14 in the Udi Gospels translated by the Bežanov brothers (1902).[27] This form, however, is likely to be a misprint, given that in all other occurrences of the word in the Gospels, it is

---

[25] Cf. also Lk. 4.34 where the neutral erg. *-ṭen* 'it' refers to an 'unclean demon'; in Jac. 1.3–4 the agents introduced by erg. *-ṭen* are 'faith' and 'patience', and in Jac. 1.11, it is the 'sun'.

[26] Analysis first proposed by W. Schulze (personal communication, 2008).

[27] The newly translated Gospel of Luke in the dialect of Nizh (Ağacani et al. 2011) has *gele amdar* 'many people' instead.

spelt *gölöunor*,[28] and there are no other attestations of *-oar* in the whole corpus of Udi texts available on the TITUS server.[29]

2.2.3 What is less clear in Udi, is the distribution of the oblique forms with and without the leading vowel, *-o-*. According to W. Schulze (2001: 3.2.1.6), this vowel represents a secondary development which has remained restricted in its usage: "In the speech of some Udi, the absolutive marker -o tends to be extended to the oblique. Thus we may observe forms like **kala-o-t'-a(y)** 'of the big one', **kala-o-t'-uxo** 'from the big one' etc. (even **kala-o-t'-g/-o(y)** 'of the big ones')." This statement is doubtful, however. First, the "extension" cannot be an idiolectal phenomenon "of some Udi", given that even within the Bežanov Gospels, we find doublets like *ḳiçi-o-ṭu* dat. I 'in the little' (2 × in Lk. 16.10) vs. *ḳiçi-ṭu* 'id.' (in Lk. 7.47, Mt. 25.21 and 23); *ǯinba-o-ṭu* dat. I 'the demoniac one' (Mk. 9.20) vs. *ǯinba-ṭu* 'id.' (Mt. 9.32); *yaq̇abi-o-ṭu* dat. I 'the sent one' (Lk. 10.16, Jo. 5.24 and 15.21) vs. *yaq̇abi-ṭu* 'id.' (Mt. 10.40, Jo. 5.23, 12.44 and 45); *ḳaći-o-ṭux* dat. II 'the blind one' (Mt. 12.22) vs. *ḳaći-ṭux* 'id.' (Mk. 8.22); *baki-o-ṭux* dat. II 'what had happened' (Lk. 8.35 and 23.48) vs. *baki-ṭux* 'id.' (Mt. 27.54 and Lk. 24.35); or *pis-o-ṭ̇gox* dat. III pl. 'the bad ones' (Mt. 13.48 and 49) vs. *pis-ṭ̇gox* 'id.' (Mt. 21.41). Second, the assumption that the *-o-* appearing in forms like *kala-o-ṭay* 'of the big one' reflects the absolutive marker (as in *kala-o* 'the big one'[30]) is contradicted by the demonstrative pronouns of (Vartašen) Udi which exhibit a stem extension (*-n-*) in the absolutive forms (e.g., sg. *me-n-o > mo-n-o* 'this one', pl. *me-n-or > mo-n-or* 'these ones') but no such extension in the oblique forms (e.g., dat.

---

[28] Sometimes in two words (*gölö unor*); 12 occurrences: Mt. 8.11; 15.30; 24.5.10; Mk. 2.2; 13.6; 15.41; Lk. 21.8; Jo. 8.30; 10.41.42; 11.19.

[29] Cf. http://titus. uni-frankfurt.de/texte/texte2.htm#udica; the corpus was built in co-operation by W. Schulze, M. Tandashvili and the present author.

[30] The form appears, e.g., in the Bežanov Gospels in Mt. 2.6 alongside the abl. pl. form *kala-ṭ̇goxo* 'from the old ones' (without *-o-*). Vl. Pančviʒe (1974: 106–107), who illustrates the "adjective inflection" with *kala* 'big', offers both the paradigms with and without *-o-* side by side for the singular (with form doublets like *kala-ṭ-ay* vs. *kalo-ṭ-ay*) but not for the plural, for which he only offers forms with *-o-* and elided stem-final *-a* such as abl.pl. *kaloṭgoxo*. Ǯeiranišvili's example is *šel* 'good' (1972: 64), for which he only gives forms with *-o-* such as gen.sg. *šel-o-ṭa[y]* and dat. pl. *šel-o-ṭgo[x]*. Schulze (1982: 102) contrasts *kalao* 'der Große' with the oblique stem *kala-ṭ-* without mentioning the variants *kala-o-ṭ-* and *kal-o-ṭ-*.

II sg. *me-ṭ-ux* > *mo-ṭ-ux*, dat. II pl. *me-ṭġox* > *mo-ṭġox* besides *me-ṭuġox* > *mo-ṭuġox* etc.).[31]

2.2.4 Under these premises, it seems more appropriate to compare the cor-
responding forms of the neutre paradigm of CA, which exhibit a similar
alternation of the suffix-initial vowel in the oblique forms. E.g., we find the
erg.(-instr.) sg. *eṭen* as the independent form of the demonstrative pronoun
'by it (the holy way)' in Is. 35.8 and as a referentialiser of the participle
bil'ala 'mortal' in *bil'ala-eṭen* 'this mortal' in 1 Cor. 15.54; in contrast to
this, we have *-ṭen* where the pronoun is included in a verbal clitic chain[32]
as in *ćo-bodal-biyay-ġa-ṭen* 'it (the comforter) will confront' (Jo. 16.8),
xaš-luġa-ṭen 'it (candle) gives light' (Mt. 5.15), and *ġari-biyay-anaḳe-ṭen*
'for it (the sun) dries out' (Jac. 1.11), but also in *eṭen cex-ṭen* 'by all this' in
Rom. 8.37 and simple *cex-ṭen* 'by everything' in 2 Cor. 4.8 and Heb. 2.7.
The assumption that the cliticisation always invokes the shorter forms is
contradicted by *iha-hanayoḳe-eṭu* 'what it (the spirit) hears', which con-
trasts with *pē-ġa-ṭen* 'it will speak' and *bicexa-ṭen* 'it informs' in Jo. 16.13.
In the gen.sg., we always find the 'full' form *eṭ'a* when used independently
(e.g., 'of it (the grass)', 2 × in Jac. 1.11), also with postpositions as in *eṭ'a
eśa* 'after this' (resuming abs.sg. *ee* 'this' in Jo. 11.11), and the frequent
conjunction *eṭ'˜n* 'therefore' is likely to stand for *eṭ'a gåen* 'because of
that' (with postpos. *gåen*).[33] On the other hand, we always have *-ṭ'a-* in the
relative pronoun as in *il'u-al-hanay-ṭ'a-gåen-ḳe-zu-pē* 'because of which I
have also spoken' (2 Cor. 4.13) or *šad-aha-hanay-ṭ'a-gåen-ḳe-žan* 'be-
cause of which we are generous' (2 Cor. 5.9). In the plural, we find the
independent gen. *edġoy* 'of these (things)', followed by the referentialised
participles *aana-edġoy* 'of the knowing (ones)' and *serʒexay-edġoy* 'of the
fixed (ones)' in 2 Petr. 1.12;[34] similarly we have *o-biyay-edġoy* 'of the

---

[31] Cf. Žeiranišvili (1972: 63), Pančviʒe (1974: 85) and Schulze (1982: 131) for para-
digms.

[32] Cf. Gippert & Schulze et al. (2008, vol. I: II-60–64) as to clitic chaining in CA.

[33] *eṭ'˜n gåen* in 2 Cor. 9.14 must then be a misspelling for **eṭ'a gåen*. Instead of *eṭ'a
gåen* in Jo. 15.18 (A30rb, 10) and, possibly, Jo. 9.23 (A18vb, 5) we must read
eṭ'˜neš as in Jo. 5.18 and elsewhere.

[34] The neutre is remarkable in the two latter formations as it contradicts the person
reference of the Greek text which is directed towards the readers (εἰδότας '(you)

future (things)' in Heb. 11.20. Other 'full' forms in the plural are, e.g., abl. II pl. *edġoxoc* 'from (= than) these (three: faith, hope, charity)' (reference introduced by abs.pl. *ebur*) in 1 Cor. 13.13 and 'from these' (things) in Eph. 5.27; erg.(-instr.) pl. *rara-hē-edġon* 'with those (knees) having become weak' in Is. 35.3; or comit.pl. *helin-edġoxoš* 'with the spiritual ones (gifts)' in 1 Cor. 14.1; in contrast to these, we have the vowelless suffix in the relative pronoun again, in forms like erg.pl. *ʒarʒar-ḳa-hanay-dġon-ḳe* '(cymbals) which tinkle' in 1 Cor. 13.1; *xod'i-ba-hanay-dġon-ḳe-hē* '(cherubs) which were overshadowing' in Heb. 9.5, or superabl. pl. *nut-hanay-dġoloc-ḳe* 'about which (we can)not (speak)' following in the latter verse. Even though this picture is not fully consistent and needs further elaboration, it suggests *a priori* that the alternation we find in modern Udi is a relic of the alternation of CA, with only the leading vowel having been assimilated (from *e* to *o*) by influence of the vocalism of the absolutive forms.

3. As was stated above, the loss of class marking coincided in the prehistory of CA with the emergence of a system of person marking; a process that must have been accomplished before the development of CA literacy. This process did not mean a mere replacement, however; instead we may state that it came along with a turn away from the absolutive- (or patient-) based system of the class-marking in North East Caucasian towards a subject- (or agent-) based system of person marking, with subjects occurring in the ergative (as agents of transitive verbs), the absolutive (as agents or undergoers of intransitive or passive verbs), or the dative (as experiencers of *verba sentiendi* and the like). A similar process can be observed in the Tsova-Tush (or Batsbi) language of today; here, however, the absolutive-based class marking is still intact, functioning alongside the newly developed subject-based person marking.[35]

---

knowing ones' and ἐστηριγμένους '(you) established ones'); this may be due to the Armenian model which has the unspecified genitives *gitakacʿn* and *hastatelocʿn*.

[35] Cf. Gippert (2008: 170–172) for a short overview. Examples are *d-ečo-s* 'I (-s, 1st person sg.) am spinning it' (*d-*, IIIrd class) vs. *ḥal-y-ečo-s-* 'I (-s-, 1st person) am spinning it (-y-, IVth class, *ḳeč* = 'wool')' or *ḳoçol y-epco-s* 'I (-s, 1st person sg.) am weaving a plait (y-, IVth class, *ḳoçol* = 'plait')' vs. *čxindri d-epco-tx* 'we (-tx, 1st person pl.) are knitting stockings (*d-*, IIIrd class, *čxindur* = 'stocking')'.

3.1 For Udi, the emergence of the person markers from cliticised variants of the personal pronouns and / or former focus particles[36] was the basis for the development of the most characteristic feature of the language, viz. the system of "endoclitics"[37] which yields doublets such as *ba-ne-ke* vs. *ba-ke-ne* '(he/she/it) became, was' (vs. *te-ne-ba-ke* 'was not') of the verb *bak-sun* 'be(come)', with the clitic *-ne-* "floating" between a root-internal and other positions. In CA, clitics inserted into roots are not yet observable; however, they do appear (as in Udi *te-ne-ba-ke*) between the negation *te* and the verbal stem as in *te-ne-biyay* 'he (Abraham) did not do' (Jo. 8.40), *te-n-å˜n-q̇üw-biš-ar-i* 'they were not afraid' (Heb. 11.23), *te-zu-ari* 'I have not come' (Mt. 5.17), *te-zu-aana-biyay* 'I did no make (it) known' (Gal. 1.16), *te-zu-zaun-hē* 'I was not taught (it)' (Gal. 1,12), or *te-n-ou-aḳē* 'he did not see' (Act. 13.37), and even a sequence of several clitics is possible in that position as in *te-n-oen-zax̣-bartay* 'he did no leave me (alone)' (Jo. 8.29) or *te-zu-vạs-pē* 'I did not tell you' (Jo. 16,4). In contrast to this, the negations *n(u)-* and *ma-* cannot attract the personal clitics, which follow after the verbal stem in these cases; cf., e.g., *n-aa-va* 'do you not know' (Jo. 19,10), *n-aa-za* 'I do not know' (Jo. 9,12.25; 20,2), *n-aa-ža* 'we do not know' (Jo. 9,21), or *nu-besa-žan-hē* 'we were not seeking' (1.Thess. 2,6). In compound verbs containing nominal elements, the latter can follow as in *nu-ba-aġen-hüwḳel* 'she does not remember', *lit.* 'she does not do on heart' (Jo. 16,21) or *ma-iha-nan-lamen* 'do not be similar' (Rom. 12.6), or remain in its pre-root position as in *nu-oṭan-biṭa-oen*[38] 'he does not honour' (Jo. 5,23) or *ma-haypē-iha-nan* 'do not be arrogant' and *ma-ikiya-iha-nan* 'do not be wise' (Rom. 12.16).[39] Preverbs cannot be separated from the verbal root by a clitic; so we have *ta-båhē-ne* 'he went away' (Jo. 19.17; Lk. 2.1), *ta-biṭē-na-va* 'he (God) was preached' (1 Tim. 3.16), *ta-biṭa-žan-vˤax̣-hē* 'we were preaching to you' (1.Thess. 2.9), *če-beġa-ṭen* 'it (charity) hopes (*lit.* looks out)' (1 Cor. 13.7), *če-boḳē-n-å˜n* 'they thrust (him) out' (Lk. 4,29), or *baha-båhē-nan* 'you went inside' (Jo. 4.38). However, the sequence can be split by the hortative marker *-q̇a-* as in *ta-q̇a-n-daġē* 'he will

---

[36] Cf. Gippert & Schulze et al. (2008: vol. I, II-52–54) for a survey of the forms in question and their usage.

[37] Term first introduced in Harris (2002).

[38] Thus to be corrected for *nu-oṭan-ba-oen* (A97va, 13).

[39] Cf. Gippert & Schulze et al. (2008, vol. I: II-54–56) for the CA negators and (ib.: II-64) for the principles of "host movement" in CA.

deliver' (Mt. 10.21) vs. *ta-daġē-hačin-oen* 'as he gave away' (Eph. 5.25) or the negator *te* (carrying the clitic *-ne-*) as in *baha-te-ne-båhē* 'he did not go in' (Jo. 20.5), in a context with a strong focus on the 'inside'.[40] Considering that the remnant of the CA preverb *baha-* is *ba-* in Udi as in *baysun* 'go inside' ~ CA **baha-iġesun*, an unattested synonym of *baha-båhesun* 'id.' (cf. also Udi *taysun* 'go (away), walk' ~ CA **ta-iġesun*,[41] unattested synonym of *ta-båhesun* 'id.', Udi *če(y)sun* 'go out' ~ CA **če-iġesun*, unattested synonym of *če-båhesun* 'id.', or Udi *tasṭun < tadesun* 'give away' ~ CA *ta-daġesun* 'id.'), with *ba-* being indistinguishable from *ba-* in *baksun* 'be(come)',[42] we may suppose that a metanalysis of preverbs as parts of a root was the trigger of the Udi system of "endoclitics": *ba-ne-sa* 'he goes inside', *ta-ne-sa* 'he goes (away)', *če-ne-sa* 'he/she/it goes out' and *ta-ne-sṭa* 'he/she/it gives' have the same relation to *ba-ysun*, *ta-ysun, če-(y)sun* and *tasṭun* as *ba-ne-ksa* 'he/she/it becomes' has to *baksun*.

3.2 Different from Udi "endoclitics", the clitic chain of CA can contain more than one clitic pronoun; cf. the above-mentioned examples *te-n-oen-zax-bartay* 'he did no leave me (alone)' (Jo. 8.29) with the erg. pronoun *oen* 'he' and the dat. III pronoun *zax* 'me', or *te-zu-vạs-pē* 'I did not tell you' (Jo. 16,4) with the erg. pronoun *zu* 'I'[43] alongside the dat. II pronoun *vạs* 'you (pl.)'. In such cases, it is not always clear whether a given pronoun still pertains to the clitic chain or not if it stands at its end; cf., e.g., the frequent formulae *pē-n-oen å̃s* 'he spoke to them' (Jo. 8.23 etc., also *pē-n-aġen ous* 'she spoke to him' Jo. 20.15) or *iľu-ḳor-biyay-n-oen å̃a* 'he answered them' (Jo. 9.27 etc.), with a dative pronoun following after the

---

[40] Cf. the Armenian word order which shows the focus by fronting the equivalent of 'inside', *i nerkʿs*: *i nerkʿs očʿ emowt* 'inside he did not go'.

[41] The form *ta-acē-å̃r-hē* 'they had gone away' of **ta-iġesun* in Jo. 4.8 does not exist; we have to read *acē-anaḳe-å̃r-hē* 'for they had gone' instead.

[42] The etymology of Udi *baksun* 'become' remains unclear. The identification with CA *båhesun* 'go' (cf. Gippert & Schulze et al. 2008, vol. I: IV-11) is doubtful as the latter only occurs with preverbs and a correspondence of CA *h* and Udi *k* is hard to motivate. Instead we might think of CA *batkesun* 'turn around, return', with the same semantic shift as in German *werden* in relation to Lat. *vertere* 'turn' etc. Udi *batksun* 'perish' must in this case be kept distinct (possibly a borrowing from Azeri *batmaq* 'id.'?).

[43] Note that the personal pronouns of the 1st and 2nd persons do not distinguish ergative and absolutive forms.

ergative clitic, or *heġa-va zaxu* 'he comes to me' (Jo. 6.45) with a directive case pronoun following the absolute 3rd person clitic *-va*. This question notwithstanding, it seems that in such combinations it is always the subject pronoun (in the ergative or absolutive) that comes first, before more "oblique" actants. However, verbs with an experiencer subject in the dative suggest another interpretation. In *nut-aa-z-vạ* 'you do not know me' (Jo. 8,19), we clearly have the (absolutive) object of knowing (*-z-* < *-zu-* 'me') first, before the dative I indicating the experiencer (*-vạ* 'you (pl.)'). In a similar way, *ahun-za* 'I know you (sg.: Jesus)' in Lk. 4.34 can be interpret- ed as consisting of *aa-un-za*,[44] with *-un-* reflecting the 2nd person singular pronoun *vun* in the absolutive case, followed by the dat. I of the 1st person singular pronoun, *za*. This interpretation would be contradicted by the form *aa-ža-na-va* 'we know (scil. it)' appearing in Jo. 4,42 in the edition, with the absolutive 3rd person singular clitic *-va* following the dat. I experiencer *ža* 'we'. This reading can no longer be upheld, however, as a new type of images provided by the Sinai Palimpsest Project[45] proves: instead of *aa-ža- na-va oo-ne ṭẹgen karxesbaalo ayzin* 'we know it, he is the true saviour of the world', the text (in B18va, 9) reads *aa-ža o-anaḳe ṭẹgen karxes-baalo ayzi* 'we know that he is the true saviour of the world', with only the expe- riencer clitic attached to *aa-* 'know'. The supposition that datives cannot procede absolutive or ergative markers in the clitic chain even if they rep- resent experiencer subjects thus remains valid.

4. The new images that have been made available through the Sinai Pal- impsest Project have a big potential indeed for improving our knowledge on the CA language. They not only bring about corrections for many pas- sages that were read with uncertainty or could only be guessed at so far[46] but also a small set of new fragments (counted as fols. 56 to 78 of Sin.georg. N 55) that enable us to complete our picture of the original co- dices. As a matter of fact, there are only very few improvements as to the wording of the CA lectionary (chaps. VI and VII of the edition); in the case of the Gospel manuscript (chap. V), however, a large amount of new read-

---

44 For the spelling with "hypercorrect" *-h-* cf. Gippert & Schulze et al. (2008, vol. I: II-8).

45 Cf. http://sinaipalimpsests.org.

46 The corrections indicated in footnotes of the present article are based on the new images.

ings can be established for about one half of the pertinent folios, due to the new technique of "transmissive backlight" imaging.[47] In this way, the original codex can be reconstructed with great confidence as illustrated in Table III, including the only bifoliate that had to be left unidentified in the edition[48] (consisting of fols. 1 and 5 of Sin.georg. N 55)[49] and that has now be determined: it contains the passage from Jo. 20.30–21.15, the readable part of which is established in an appendix below. The new piece of text is valuable not only because of some hitherto unknown words (e.g., *šu* 'fish' and *et* 'net') or the remarkable vigesimal expression of the number 153 it contains (*vu̯q̊å xibeçar*, lit. '7 (×) 20 (+) 13') but also because of the form *aḳē-n-å̃n* 'they saw' which yields the first example of the experiencer verb *aḳesun* 'to see' used with an ergative subject (instead of regular *aḳē-n-å̃a* with dat. I subject), thus reminding of the doublet of *a-ne-ḳsa* vs. *a-ṭu-ḳsa* 'he sees' in the Niż and Vartašen versions of the text on the "Fox in the henhouse" in the first Udi primer, *Samǯi däs*.[50] The new evidence will have to be brought together in a revised edition of the palimpsests; a task that will hopefully lead to a new phase of close cooperation with Wolfgang Schulze.

---

[47] Cf. http://sinaipalimpsests.org/technologies: "Iron gall, in which the vast majority of Sinai palimpsests are written, eats into the flesh side of the parchment, leaving letter-shaped channels. Transmissive imaging backlights each folio with multiple wavelengths of light in order to turn these letter-shaped channels into legible text."

[48] For a former attempt cf. Gippert (2012: 61) where the bifoliate in question was tentatively allocated in the fourth quire as covering Jo. 11.30–47. All other allocations have remained valid, including that of the bifoliate of B40 and B35 as containing Jo. 18.16–31. In the Table, newly assigned folios are indicated by a grey-shaded background. Note that the pericope on *Jesus and the woman in adultery* (Jo. 7.53 – 8.11) cannot have been included in the missing bifoliate of quire III for the reason of missing space.

[49] Cf. Gippert & Schulze et al. (2008, vol. 2: VII-16–119).

[50] Cf. Çeyrani 1934: 51; http://titus.uni-frankfurt.de/texte/etcs/cauc/udi/sd/sd051.htm# SD_51.

I

(Title)	1.1–25		1.25–45	1.45–2.15		2.15–3.9		3.9–26	3.27–4.11		4.11–31
	A40r	A40v		A6r	A6v	A7r	A7v		A41r	A41v	
	A47v	A47r		A1v	A1r	[A0v	A0r]		A46v	A46r	

II

4.31–48		4.48–5.17		5.17–35		5.35–6.9		6.9–27		6.27–48		6.48–66		6.66–7.17	
B18r	B18v	B69v	B69r	A100r	A100v	A101r	A101v	B73r	B73v	A99r	A99v	B70v	B70r	B17r	B17v
B21v	B21r			A97v	A97r	A96v	A96r	A107v	A107r	A98v	A98r	B60r+75r	B60v+75v	B22v	B22r

III

7.17–36		7.36–8.14	8.14–31		8.32–50		8.51–9.9		9.9–27		9.27–10.6		10.7–27	
B68v	B68r		A19r	A19v	A50r	A50v	A51r	A51v	A18r	A18v	A74r	A74v	B66v	B66r
B71r	B71v		A20v	A20r	A55r	A55v	A54v	A54r	A21v	A21r	A102r	A102v	B72r	B72v

IV

10.27–11.7	11.7–30		11.30–47	11.48–12.6		12.6–26		12.26–44		12.44–13.11		13.11–28
	A65r	A65v		B12r	B12v	B11r	B11v	B54r	B54v	A66r	A66v	
	A60v	A60r		B9v	B9r	B10v	B10r	B55v	B55r	A59v	A59r	

V

13.28–14.7	14.7–24	14.24–15.13	15.13–16.5		16.5–22		16.22–17.6	17.6–25	17.25–18.16
			A30r	A30v	A31r	A31v			
			A25v	A25r	A24v	A24r			

VI

18.16–31		18.32–19.7		19.7–22		19.23–38		19.38–20.14		20.15–29		20.30–21.15		21.15–25 / Col.	
B40r	*B40v*	A61r	A61v	A17r	A17v	B13r	B13v	B14r	B14v	A16r	A16v	*B1r*	*B1v*	B39r	B39v
B35v	*B35r*	A64r	A64v	A22v	A22r	B8v	B8r	B7v	B7r	A23v	A23r	*B5v*	*B5r*	B36v	B36r

Table III: The CA Gospel manuscript reconstructed

References

Ağacani et al. 2011. Ağacani R.A.A., R.A. Danakari, R.B. Mobili & N.R. Rzaeva. *Luk'an exlətbi Mŭq Xavar*. Bakı.

Aleksidze, Z.A. & J.-P. Mahé. 1997. Découverte d'un texte albanien: une langue ancienne du Caucase retrouvée. *Comptes rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* 141. 517–532.

Bežanov, S. & M.B. Bežanov. 1902. Gospoda našego Ïisusa Xrista svjatoe evangelïe. *Sbornik" materialov" dlja opisanïja městnostej i plemen"Kavkaza* 30.

Çeyrani T. & M. Ç. (Ӡeirani). 1934. *Samçi dəs*. Suxum: Abgizin. (Electronic version by Schulze, Wolfgang & Jost Gippert: http://titus.uni-frankfurt.de/texte/etcs/cauc/udi/sd/sd.htm.

Dirr, A.D. 1904: Grammatika udinskago jazyka. *Sbornik" materialov" dlja opisanïja městnostej i plemen" Kavkaza* 33/IV.

Gippert, Jost. 2008. Endangered Caucasian Languages in Georgia. Linguistic Parameters of Language Endangerment. In: Harrison, David K., David S. Rood & Arienne

Dwyer (eds.). *Lessons from Documented Endangered Languages*. Amsterdam: Benjamins. 159–194.

Gippert, Jost. 2012. The Albanian Gospel Manuscript – New Findings. In: [no editor]. *Research Papers of the International Scientific Conference "The Place and Role of Caucasian Albania in the History of Azerbaijan and Caucasus" / Qafqaz Albani-yasının Azərbaycan və Qafqazın Tarixində yeri və rolu. Beynəlxalq elmi kon-frasnının əsərləri / Труды Международной конференции "Место и роль Кавказской Албании в истории Азербайджана и Кавказа"*, Baku: Nacional'naja Akademija Aviacii, 55–64 (printing not approved by the author; corrected version: http://titus.uni-frankfurt.de/personal/jg/pdf/jg2011j.pdf).

Gippert, Jost. forthc. Sound Systems in Diachrony – Sibilants and Affricates in Udi. To appear in a festschrift, 2017.

Gippert, Jost, W. Schulze, Z. Aleksidze & J.-P. Mahé. 2008. *The Caucasian Albanian Palimpsests of Mount Sinai*. 2 vols. Turnhout: Brepols.

Harris, Alice. 2002. *Endoclitics and the Origins of Udi Morphosyntax*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Pančviʒe (Pančvidze), Vl.P. 1974. *Uduri enis gramaṭiḳuli analizi*. Tbilisi: Mecniereba.

Schiefner, Anton. 1863. *Versuch über die Sprache der Uden*. St. Petersburg: Kaiserli-che Akademie der Wissenschaften.

Schulze, Wolfgang. 1982. *Die Sprache der Uden in Nord-Azerbaidžan*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Schulze, Wolfgang. 1992 W. How can class markers petrify? Towards a functional diachrony of morphological subsystems in the East Caucasian languages. In: Aronson, H. (ed.). *The Non-Slavic Languages of the USSR. Linguistic Studies. Second Series*. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society. 188–233.

Schulze, Wolfgang. 2001. *An Udi Online Grammar*. http://wschulze.userweb.mwn.de/udinhalt.htm.

Schulze, Wolfgang. 2009. Vier neuere udische Texte (Teil 1). *Georgica* 32. 5–20.

Schulze, Wolfgang. 2015. Aspects of Udi-Iranian Language Contact. In: Bläsing, U., V. Arakelova & M. Weinreich (eds.). *Studies on Iran and The Caucasus. Presented to Prof. Garnik S. Asatrian on the Occasion of his 60th birthday*. Leiden–Boston: Brill. 373–402.

Schulze, Wolfgang. 2016. Udi. In: Müller, P.O.,I. Ohnheiser, S. Olsen, F. Rainer (eds.). *Word-Formation. An international handbook of the languages of Europe*. Vol. 5. Berlin–New York: De Gruyter. 3564–3578.

Ʒeiranišvili (Džeiranišvili), E. Ʒ. 1971. *Udiuri ena*. Tbilisi: Tbilisis Universiṭeṭis Ga-momcemloba.

Appendix: Editio princeps of Sin.georg. N 55, fol. 1va + 5ra[51]

Jo. 21.8	4	
	5	
	6	
	7	
	8	
	9	
Jo. 21.9	10	
	11	
	12	
Jo. 21.10	13	
	5ra, 14	
Jo. 21.11	15	
	16	
	17	
	18	
	19	
Jo. 21.12	20	
	21	

Table IV: Reproduction of the CA undertext of Sin.georg. N 55, 1va+5ra

21.8	4 {***}<****** en'eġ ašar>-	... ... The other disci-
	5 [ke]{t}<ow>{x n}<ˤaen[i] i heġa-å̃r>-	ples, however, were coming by
	6 -{hē} nowt-an<aḵe-å̃r-hē ˤaxi>	boat because they were not far
	7 [qa]{ri}axo[c] <viçǫo ****>[ii]-	from the land, about 200
	8 {**}-anḵe {xom-}<pē-n-å̃n[iii] e et>[iv]	cubits. They dragged the net
	9 šowa[x]<oš[v] heġala>	with the fish.
21.9	10 T[a]-bå̃h[ē]-<hamočḵe-å̃r q̇aria a>-	When they reached the land,
	11 ḵē-n-å̃n[vi] arkown ġo[b]<***>[vii]	they saw a fireplace of coal
	12 sa šow-al etal hal[a] <śowm-al>	and one fish on it and bread.
21.10	13 P<ē>-{n-å̃s} <y̆n heq̇a-nan šowa>-	Jesus said to them, bring from the
	14 xoc vˤan biq̇ay-h̆ḵe-nan i	fish that you have just caught.
21.11	15 Baha-bå̃hē-ne simon ṗeṭ-	Simon Peter went inside,
	16 ros xom-pē-n-oen e et q̇aria	(and) dragged the net on the land,

51 The present editio princeps follows the principles outlined in Gippert & Schulze et al. (2008, vol. I: I-37–38). In the Roman transcription, rectangular brackets denote hardly readable characters; curly braces, unreadable characters; and angle brackets, characters restored beyond the margins of the preserved original. In the rendering in the original script, the respective information is represented by different colourings. The first three lines of fol. 1va are cut off.

17 begbeg[viii] šowen bai vowġq̇[å]	full with very big fish, 7 (×) 20 (+)
18 xibeçar[ix] eṭen howṭown	thirteen. Such an amount
19 bow-ne-hē te-ne-barṭay[x] e et	it was, (yet) the net was not torn.
21.12 20 Pē-n-å̃s y̆n hekal [b]aṗ-pa-n[an][xi]	Jesus said to them, come (and) dine.
21 N-al sa kowl-hē[xii] išow {aš}<arḳe>-	And not one man of the disciples dared...

---

[i]   The reconstruction of the (erg.-)instr. sg. form *nˤaen* (*ṇaen*) 'with a ship' is tentative. Forms that have been detected so far are abs.sg. *nˤa*, dat. I sg. *nˤau*, and abs.pl. *nˤamux*.

[ii]   The word for 'cubit' (Arm. *kangown*, Gk. πῆχυς) is unknown and cannot be reconstructed in the given lacuna.

[iii]   The word for 'drag' (*xom-pesun*), hitherto unattested, appears again, in better readability, in l. 16; whether the first character is *x* or *x* remains unclear.

[iv]   The word for 'net' (*et*), hitherto unattested, appears again in ll. 16 and 19 and can be reconstructed with certainty here.

[v]   The word for 'fish' (*šow* = *šu*), hitherto unattested, appears again in l. 12 in the abs. sg. (*šow-al*, with the focus particle 'also' attached) and in l. 17 in the (erg.-)instr. sg. *šowen*; the comitative form *šowaxoš* can be reconstructed with certainty here.

[vi]   See above as to the unexpected ergative construction of *aḳesun* 'to see'. The reading is beyond doubt.

[vii]   Neither the word for 'coal' (equivalent to Arm. *kaycakancʿ*) nor that for the 'fireplace' (Arm. *kraketł*) has been attested so far, nor do they have cognates in modern Udi (the Bežanov Gospels have *bačuḳeci arux*, lit. 'spread-out fire', in accordance with their Russian model which has *разложенный огонь* (cf. Gk. ἀνθρακίαν κειμένην). CA *arkown* (*arkun*) is likely to be a genitive singular in *-un* ('of coal'); the 'fireplace' should be in the dat. (**ġob-ux*?).

[viii]   The word *begbeg* for 'very big' is hitherto unattested; its reduplicated form is obviously modelled upon Arm. *mecamec* 'id.'.

[ix]   See above as to the vigesimal expression of the number 153.

[x]   The past tense form *barṭay* presupposes a verb *barṭesun* 'tear (apart)' (to be distinguished sharply from *bartesun* 'leave, let') that is hitherto unattested and has no cognate in modern Udi.

[xi]   The 2nd person plural imperative form *baṗ-pa-nan* 'dine!' (equivalent of Arm. *čašecʿēkʿ* 'id.') presupposes a verb *baṗ-pesun* 'dine' that is hitherto unattested and has no cognate in modern Udi (*baṗesun* 'reach' seems to far away semantically and is obviously reflected in CA *aṗesun* 'id.', see above). Instead of the initial *b*, the pharyngeal ˤ might also be read (*ˤaṗ-pesun*), which might suggest a connection with Udi *aṗesun* 'cook, boil'.

[xii]   The past tense form *kowl-hē* presupposes a verb *kul-ihesun* in the sense of 'dare' (Arm. *išxēr*) that is hitherto unattested; as a compound based on *kowl* (= *kul*) 'hand'

(lit. 'become hand'), it is quasi the intransitive counterpart of *kul-biyesun* 'touch, take hold of' (lit. 'make hand').