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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.
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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. 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.
Jost Gippert

dertext but also the first grammatical account of the language, which clearly proved that CA was the ancestor (or, at least, an extremely close relative of the ancestor) 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. Just as in modern Udi, class markers only occur in fossilised (or petrified) 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 $b$-; cf., e.g., CA biyesun ‘do, make’ (Udi besun), bartesun ‘leave, let’ (Udi id.), besesun ‘search, beg’ (Udi bessun), bixesun ‘give birth, create’ (Udi bixsun), buqesun ‘love, want’ (Udi buq̄sun), or $bu$ (pres.) ‘be’ (Udi id.); $bezi$ ‘my’ (Udi id., vs. $zu = Udi$ zu ‘I’) and $be$ ‘our’ (Udi id., vs. $žan$, Udi yan, ‘we’); or $bai$ ‘full’ (Udi bui), boći (in boći-biyesun ‘to stick’) ‘dense’ (Udi boću), and $bũwi$ ‘heavy’ (Udi bĩ). Slight differences between CA and Udi occurring here

---

2 The grammar was published in the first volume of Gippert & Schulze et al. (2008).
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.
7 In the palimpsests, the vowel $u$ is always written (in agreement with Old Armenian and Old Georgian, all depending on Greek ΟΥ) 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 beʃi⁹ ‘your’ (pl.), which constrasts with Udi ɛfi ‘id.’ (vs. CA = Udi ɣan ‘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 lexic 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).


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 absolutive case: articles have no other case forms at all while the absolutive 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).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abs.</th>
<th>Masc.</th>
<th>Feminine</th>
<th>Neutre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sg.</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>aġ</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl.</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e(-e)</td>
<td>e-bur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dem.pr.</td>
<td>o(-o)$^{13}$</td>
<td>aģ</td>
<td>aģ-ur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>refer.</td>
<td>-o</td>
<td>-aģ</td>
<td>-aģ-ur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ergative</td>
<td>-o-en</td>
<td>aģ-en</td>
<td>aģ-r-o-n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>o-ya</td>
<td>aģ-ya</td>
<td>aģ-r-o-y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dative I</td>
<td>o-u</td>
<td>aģ-u</td>
<td>aģ-r-o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dative II</td>
<td>o-u-s</td>
<td>aģ-(a)s</td>
<td>aģ-r-o-s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dative III</td>
<td>o-u-x</td>
<td>aģ-(a)x</td>
<td>aģ-r-o-x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

2.1 Typical ‘referentialised’ forms that occur in the CA texts$^{14}$ are: masc.: $bēši-o$ (Jo. 8.55) ‘ours’ (God), $būqāna-o$ (Jo. 11.11) ‘the beloved one’ (Lazarus), $o\, kāći-ous$ (Jo. 9.17) ‘to the blind one’, $xōqāaray-bān‘i-ou$ (Mk. 15.39) ‘to the centurio (lit. the big one of the hundred)$^{15}$ and $kahanauqgoy-bān‘i-ous$ (Heb. 3.1) ‘to the archpriest (lit. big one of the priests)’, $barta-y-a‘r$ (2 Cor. 4.9) ‘forsaken ones’, $puři-a‘r$ (abs., 1 Cor. 15.52) and $puři-a‘x$ (dat. III, 2 Tim. 4.1) ‘the dead’; ntr.: $marqavenun-o$ (2. Petr. 1.19) ‘that of prophecy’ (word), $iĉe-ebur$ (Jo. 10.4) ‘(his) own ones’ (sheep), $bezi-edux$ (dat. III, Mt. 20.15) ‘mine’ (things), $himi-edux$ (Act. 13.35) ‘in another’

13 A disyllabic sequence (spelt -$o-ow$ in the palimpsests); the high tilde in forms like -$a‘-r$ represents the abbreviation mark, for which cf. below.
14 Instead of the absolutive 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.
16 Note that ‘hundred’ is here expressed as $5\,(×)\,20\,(xo-DAQ)$. 
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(psalm), *bura-tux* (dat., Jo. 5.38)\(^{16}\) ‘the abiding one’ (word), and *bil’ala-etu* (dat. I, 1. Cor. 15.53) and *bil’ala-eten* (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-ke*- (2 × in Lk. 2.5), erg.sg. *-hanay-aġen-ke*- (1 Thess. 2.7), abs.pl. *-hanay-aġur-ke*- (2 × Mk. 15.41), erg.pl. *-hanay-aġron-ke*- and dat. III pl. *-hanay-aġrox-ke*- (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. *agya* ‘of her’, and dat. I sg. *aġu* ‘(is) to her (sorrow)’ 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.\(^{18}\)

2.1.2 In the case of the neuter, the distribution of dative singular forms with *t* 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-ḍus* and dat. III *cex-ḍux* (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-ke* in dat. I (e.g., Lk. 2.4; Act. 13.41) and as *-hanay-ḍux-ke* 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. 13.30).

---

\(^{16}\) 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 *hūw|κeq̇ ać ̣own* instead of *hūwκnaronw* in Jo. 16.21, also *hūwk|qaćown* instead of *hūwκna|rownown* a few lines below (A24rb, 13–18).

\(^{19}\) The dat. III pl. *aġro* in the edition must be corrected.

\(^{20}\) Instead of *edux uka-z* in Jo. 5.34 read *e uka-zu*, with the demonstrative in the unextended abs. case (A97rb, 19).

erg.pl. efa-anake-edğon ‘for they (limbs of the body) have’ (Rom. 12.4), gen.pl. o-biyay-edɡoy gen.pl. ‘of the future (things)’ (Heb. 11.20), or abl. II pl. mal-mal-edɡoxoc ‘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), parisauɡoy-txoc ‘from (= than) that (righteousness) of the pharisees’ (2 × Mt. 5.20) or beɡa-etxoc ‘from (= than) what is necessary’ (Rom. 12.3) rather pertain to the singular (as abl. II forms based upon the dat. III in -t/dux) than the plural (as abl. I forms based upon the dat. I in -dgo). In the relative pronoun, we find a similar distribution, the erg.pl. always appearing as -hanay-dɡon-ḳe- (e.g. in Heb. 9.5 beside super-abl.pl. -hanay-dɡoloc-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, 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, edɡox must be a misspelling for gen.pl. edɡoy or abl. II pl. edɡoxoc (sa-al *edɡoy / *edɡoxoc ‘and one of / from them’).


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). Žeiranišvili (1971: 63–65) introduces the system under the inflection of “determining (attributive) nouns” (msazgyrel (aṭribuṭiul) saxelta) or “substantivised determining nouns” (gasubstanṭivebul msazgyrel saxel-ta, ib. n. 1), Pančviže (1974: 106–107) under “adjectival nouns with the function of a substantive” (zedsartavi saxeli substanṭivis punckiit). 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).
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-qa-ṭen ‘it shall speak’ and il’uka-anake-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-ke, in the same verse.25

2.2.2 The absolutive plural suffix -or possibly reflects the masculine suffix -å˜-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 göloun-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).

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 doubles like ḷiči-o-ṭu dat. I ‘in the little’ (2 × in Lk. 16.10) vs. ḷiči-ṭu ‘id.’ (in Lk. 7.47, Mt. 25.21 and 23); žinba-o-ṭu dat. I ‘the demoniac one’ (Mk. 9.20) vs. žinba-ṭu ‘id.’ (Mt. 9.32); yaqabi-o-ṭu dat. I ‘the sent one’ (Lk. 10.16, Jo. 5.24 and 15.21) vs. yaqabi-ṭu ‘id.’ (Mt. 10.40, Jo. 5.23, 12.44 and 45); kači-o-ṭux dat. II ‘the blind one’ (Mt. 12.22) vs. kači-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-ṭţox dat. III pl. ‘the bad ones’ (Mt. 13.48 and 49) vs. pis-ṭţox ‘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 (gölő 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 cooperation 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-ṭţoxo ‘from the old ones’ (without -o-). Vl. Pančviţe (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-t-ay vs. kalo-t-ay) but not for the plural, for which he only offers forms with -o- and elided stem-final -a such as abl.pl. kaloţţoxo. Žeiranišvili’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-ṭţo[ʃ]. Schulze (1982: 102) contrasts kalao ‘der Groß’ with the oblique stem kala-t- without mentioning the variants kala-o-t- and kal-o-t-.
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II sg. me-t-ux > mo-t-ux, dat. II pl. me-tğox > mo-tğox besides me-tuğox > mo-tuğox etc.).

2.2.4 Under these premises, it seems more appropriate to compare the corresponding 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. eten 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-eten ‘this mortal’ in 1 Cor. 15.54; in contrast to this, we have -ten where the pronoun is included in a verbal clitic chain as in čo-bodal-biyay-qa-ten ‘it (the comforter) will confront’ (Jo. 16.8), xaš-luğa-ten ‘it (candle) gives light’ (Mt. 5.15), and qari-biyay-anaqe-ten ‘for it (the sun) dries out’ (Jac. 1.11), but also in eten cex-ten ‘by all this’ in Rom. 8.37 and simple cex-ten ‘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-hanayoke-etu ‘what it (the spirit) hears’, which contrasts with pē-qa-ten ‘it will speak’ and bicexa-ten ‘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 eša ‘after this’ (resuming abs.sg. ee ‘this’ in Jo. 11.11), and the frequent conjunction et’ėn ‘therefore’ is likely to stand for et’a gåen ‘because of that’ (with postpos. gåen). On the other hand, we always have -t’a- in the relative pronoun as in il’u-al-hanay-t’a-gåen-ke-zu-pē ‘because of which I have also spoken’ (2 Cor. 4.13) or šad-aha-hanay-t’a-gåen-ke-žan ‘because of which we are generous’ (2 Cor. 5.9). In the plural, we find the independent gen. edğoy ‘of these (things)’, followed by the referentialised participles aana-edğoy ‘of the knowing (ones)’ and seržexay-edğoy ‘of the fixed (ones)’ in 2 Petr. 1.12, similarly we have o-biyay-edğoy ‘of the

---

33 et’ėn gåen in 2 Cor. 9.14 must then be a misspelling for *et’a gåen. Instead of et’a gåen in Jo. 15.18 (A30rb, 10) and, possibly, Jo. 9.23 (A18vb, 5) we must read et’ėn gåen 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. edgoxoć ‘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-edgon ‘with those (knees) having become weak’ in Is. 35.3; or comit.pl. helin-edgoxoś ‘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. zarzar-ka-hanay-dgon-ke ‘(cymbals) which tinkle’ in 1 Cor. 13.1; xod’i-ba-hanay-dgon-ke-hē ‘(cherubs) which were overshadowing’ in Heb. 9.5, or superabl. pl. nut-hanay-dgoloc-ke ‘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 ε 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

35 Knowing ones’ and ἐστηριγµένους ‘(you) established ones’); this may be due to the Armenian model which has the unspecified genitives gitakac’n and hastateloc’n. Cf. Gippert (2008: 170–172) for a short overview. Examples are d-eč̣o-s ‘I (-s, 1st person sg.) am spinning it’ (d-, IIIrd class) vs. ħal-y-eč̣o-s- ‘I (-s-, 1st person) am spinning it (-y-, IVth class, kec = ‘wool’)’ or koçol y-epco-s ‘I (-s, 1st person sg.) am weaving a plait (y-, IVth class, koçol = ‘plait’)’ vs. ěxindri d-epco-tx ‘we (-tx, 1st person pl.) are knitting stockings (d-, IIIrd class, ěxindur = ‘stocking’).
3.1 For Udi, the emergence of the person markers from cliticised variants of the personal pronouns and / or former focus particles was the basis for the development of the most characteristic feature of the language, viz. the system of “endoclitics” 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-aґn-ʔi:w-bi:š-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-akē ‘he did not see’ (Act. 13.37), and even a sequence of several clitics is possible in that position as in te-n-oen-zA:x-bartay ‘he did no leave me (alone)’ (Jo. 8.29) or te-zu-ʔa:s-ʔe ‘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-ʒan-hē ‘we were not seeking’ (1.Thess. 2,6). In compound verbs containing nominal elements, the latter can follow as in nu-ba-aːgen-huːkel ‘she does not remember’, lit. ‘she does not do on heart’ (Jo. 16,21) or ma-ih-a-nan-lamen ‘do not be similar’ (Rom. 12,6), or remain in its pre-root position as in nu-oːṭan-bita-oːen ‘he does not honour’ (Jo. 5,23) or ma-haypē-iha-nan ‘do not be arrogant’ and ma-iːkiya-iha-nan ‘do not be wise’ (Rom. 12.16). Preverbs cannot be separated from the verbal root by a clitic; so we have ta-baːhe-ne ‘he went away’ (Jo. 19.17; Lk. 2.1), ta-biːfe-na-va ‘he (God) was preached’ (1 Tim. 3.16), ta-biːta-ʒan-Vːax-hē ‘we were preaching to you’ (1.Thess. 2,9), ē-teːga-ṭen ‘it (charity) hopes (lit. looks out)’ (1 Cor. 13.7), ē-teːbok-e-n-āːn ‘they thrust (him) out’ (Lk. 4,29), or baha-baːhe-nan ‘you went inside’ (Jo. 4.38). However, the sequence can be split by the hortative marker -qɑ- as in ta-ʔa-n-daːɡe ‘he will

---

37 Term first introduced in Harris (2002).
38 Thus to be corrected for nu-oːṭan-ba-oːen (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.
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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’. Considering that the remnant of the CA preverb baha- is ba- in Udi as in baysun ‘go inside’ ~ CA *baha-iģesun, an unattested synonym of baha-båhesun ‘id.’ (cf. also Udi taysun ‘go (away), walk’ ~ CA *ta-iģesun, unattested synonym of ta-båhesun ‘id.’, Udi čet(y)sun ‘go out’ ~ CA *če-iģesun, unattested synonym of če-båhesun ‘id.’, or Udi tastaţun < tadesun ‘give away’ ~ CA ta-daģesun ‘id.’), with ba- being indistinguishable from ba- in baksun ‘be(come)’, 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-sta ‘he/she/it gives’ have the same relation to ba-ysun, ta-ysun, če-(y)sun and tastaţun 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 not leave me (alone)’ (Jo. 8.29) with the erg. pronoun oen ‘he’ and the dat. III pronoun zaţ ‘me’, or te-zu-vas-pē ‘I did not tell you’ (Jo. 16.4) with the erg. pronoun zu ‘I’ alongside the dat. II pronoun vas ‘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 ås ‘he spoke to them’ (Jo. 8.23 etc., also pē-n-agen ous ‘she spoke to him’ Jo. 20.15) or ilu-kor-biyay-n-oen åa ‘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 oč ʿ emowt ‘inside he did not go’.

41 The form ta-acē-âr-hē ‘they had gone away’ of *ta-iģesun in Jo. 4.8 does not exist; we have to read acē-anāke-âr-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 heğa-va zaxu ‘he comes to me’ (Jo. 6.45) with a directive case pronoun following the absolutive 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-va ‘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 (-va ‘you (pl.’)). In a similar way, ahun-za ‘I know you (sg.: Jesus)’ in Lk. 4.34 can be interpreted 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 Project45 proves: instead of aa-ža-na-va oo-ne ņegen karxesbaalo ayzi ‘we know it, he is the true saviour of the world’, the text (in B18va, 9) reads aa-ža o-anake ņegen karxes-baalo ayzi ‘we know that he is the true saviour of the world’, with only the experiencer clitic attached to aa- ‘know’. The supposition that datives cannot precede absolutive or ergative markers in the clitic chain even if they represent experiencer subjects thus remains valid.

4. The new images that have been made available through the Sinai Palimpsest Project have a big potential indeed for improving our knowledge on the CA language. They not only bring about corrections for many passages that were read with uncertainty or could only be guessed at so far46 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 codices. 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-

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.\textsuperscript{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\textsuperscript{48} (consisting of fols. 1 and 5 of Sin.georg. N 55)\textsuperscript{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., \textit{šu} ‘fish’ and \textit{et} ‘net’) or the remarkable vigesimal expression of the number 153 it contains (\textit{vụğâ xibeçar}, lit. ‘7 (×) 20 (+) 13’) but also because of the form \textit{aḳē-n-ān} ‘they saw’ which yields the first example of the experiencer verb \textit{akesun} ‘to see’ used with an ergative subject (instead of regular \textit{aḳē-n-āa} with dat. I subject), thus reminding of the doublet of \textit{a-ne-kṣa} vs. \textit{a-tu-kṣa} ‘he sees’ in the Niź and Vartašen versions of the text on the “Fox in the henhouse” in the first Udi primer, \textit{Samži dās}.\textsuperscript{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.

\textsuperscript{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.”

\textsuperscript{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 \textit{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.


\textsuperscript{50} Cf. Çeyrani 1934: 51; http://titus.uni-frankfurt.de/texte/etcs/cauc/udi/sd/sd051.htm#SD_51.
Table III: The CA Gospel manuscript reconstructed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I</th>
<th>1.1–25</th>
<th>1.25–45</th>
<th>1.45–2.15</th>
<th>2.15–3.9</th>
<th>3.9–26</th>
<th>3.27–4.11</th>
<th>4.11–31</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A40r</td>
<td>A40v</td>
<td>A6r</td>
<td>A6v</td>
<td>A7r</td>
<td>A7v</td>
<td>A41r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A47v</td>
<td>A47r</td>
<td>A1v</td>
<td>A1r [A0v</td>
<td>A0r</td>
<td>A46v</td>
<td>A46r</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B18r</td>
<td>B18v</td>
<td>B69v</td>
<td>B69r</td>
<td>A100v</td>
<td>A101v</td>
<td>B73r</td>
<td>B73v</td>
<td>A99v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B21r</td>
<td>B21v</td>
<td>A97v</td>
<td>A97r</td>
<td>A96v</td>
<td>A96r</td>
<td>A107v</td>
<td>A107r</td>
<td>A98v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A98r</td>
<td>B60r+75r</td>
<td>B60v+75v</td>
<td>B22v</td>
<td>B22r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B68v</td>
<td>B68r</td>
<td>A19r</td>
<td>A19v</td>
<td>A50r</td>
<td>A50v</td>
<td>A51r</td>
<td>A51v</td>
<td>A18r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B71r</td>
<td>B71v</td>
<td>A20v</td>
<td>A20r</td>
<td>A55v</td>
<td>A55r</td>
<td>A54v</td>
<td>A54r</td>
<td>A21v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A21r</td>
<td>A102v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A102v</td>
<td>B72r</td>
<td>B72v</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A65r</td>
<td>A65v</td>
<td>B12r</td>
<td>B12v</td>
<td>B11r</td>
<td>B11v</td>
<td>B54v</td>
<td>B54v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A60v</td>
<td>A60r</td>
<td>B9v</td>
<td>B9r</td>
<td>B10v</td>
<td>B10r</td>
<td>B55v</td>
<td>B55r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A59v</td>
<td>A59r</td>
<td>A66v</td>
<td>A66v</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A30r</td>
<td>A30v</td>
<td>A31r</td>
<td>A31v</td>
<td>A25v</td>
<td>A25r</td>
<td>A24v</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B40r</td>
<td>B40v</td>
<td>A61v</td>
<td>A17r</td>
<td>A17v</td>
<td>B13r</td>
<td>B13v</td>
<td>B14r</td>
<td>B14v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B35v</td>
<td>B35r</td>
<td>A64v</td>
<td>A22v</td>
<td>A22r</td>
<td>B8r</td>
<td>B7v</td>
<td>B23v</td>
<td>B23r</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix: Editio princeps of Sin.georg. N 55, fol. 1va + 5ra

| Jo. 21.8 | 4 | {***}<****** en’ég ašar>- | ... ... ... The other disciples, however, were coming by boat because they were not far from the land, about 200 cubits. They dragged the net with the fish. |
| Jo. 21.9 | 10 | T[a]-båh[ē]<hamočke-ā r ḡaria a>- | When they reached the land, they saw a fireplace of coal and one fish on it and bread. |
| Jo. 21.10 | 13 | P<ē>-{n-ā’s} <y’n heqa-nan šowa>- | Jesus said to them, bring from the fish that you have just caught. |
| Jo. 21.11 | 15 | Baha-båhæ-ne simon ṗeṭ- | Simon Peter went inside, (and) dragged the net on the land, |

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

The present editio princeps follows the principles outlined in Gippert & Schulze et al. (2008, vol. 1: 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\textsuperscript{viii} Šowen bai vowğq[â] full with very big fish, 7 (×) 20 (+) thirteen. Such an amount
18 xibeçar\textsuperscript{x} eṭen howtôw it was, (yet) the net was not torn.
19 bow-ne-hê te-ne-bartay\textsuperscript{e} e et Jesus said to them, come (and) dine.
21.12 20 Pê-n-âś s y’n hekal [b]aṗ-pa-n[an]\textsuperscript{xii} And not one man of the disciples dared...
21 N-al sa kowl-hê\textsuperscript{xi} išow {aś}<arḳê>-dared...

\textsuperscript{i} The reconstruction of the (erg.-)instr. sg. form n’äen (naen) ‘with a ship’ is tentative. Forms that have been detected so far are abs.sg. n’a, dat. I sg. n’au, and abs.pl. n’amux.

\textsuperscript{ii} The word for ‘cubit’ (Arm. kangown, Gk. πῆχυς) is unknown and cannot be reconstructed in the given lacuna.

\textsuperscript{iii} The word for ‘drag’ (\textit{xom-pesun}), hitherto unattested, appears again, in better readability, in l. 16; whether the first character is \textit{x} or \textit{e} remains unclear.

\textsuperscript{iv} The word for ‘net’ (\textit{et}), hitherto unattested, appears again in ll. 16 and 19 and can be reconstructed with certainty here.

\textsuperscript{v} The word for ‘fish’ (\textit{šow = šu}), hitherto unattested, appears again in l. 12 in the abs. sg. (\textit{šow-al}, with the focus particle ‘also’ attached) and in l. 17 in the (erg.-)instr. sg. \textit{šowen}; the comitative form \textit{šowaxoš} can be reconstructed with certainty here.

\textsuperscript{vi} See above as to the unexpected ergative construction of \textit{akesun} ‘to see’. The reading is beyond doubt.

\textsuperscript{vii} Neither the word for ‘coal’ (equivalent to Arm. kaycanc’) nor that for the ‘fireplace’ (Arm. krakel) 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 \textit{разложенный огонь} (cf. Gk. ἀνθρακίαν κειµένην). CA \textit{arkown} (\textit{arkun}) is likely to be a genitive singular in -\textit{un} (‘of coal’); the ‘fireplace’ should be in the dat. (*\textit{ġob-ux}?).

\textsuperscript{viii} The word \textit{begbeg} for ‘very big’ is hitherto unattested; its reduplicated form is obviously modelled upon Arm. \textit{mecamec} ‘id.’.

\textsuperscript{ix} See above as to the vigesimal expression of the number 153.

\textsuperscript{x} The past tense form \textit{barṭay} presupposes a verb \textit{bartešun} ‘tear (apart)’ (to be distinguished sharply from \textit{bartesun} ‘leave, let’) that is hitherto unattested and has no cognate in modern Udi.

\textsuperscript{xi} The 2\textsuperscript{nd} person plural imperative form \textit{baṗ-pa-nan} ‘dine!’ (equivalent of Arm. \textit{čašec’êk ‘id.’) presupposes a verb \textit{baṗ-pesun} ‘dine’ that is hitherto unattested and has no cognate in modern Udi (\textit{baṗesun} ‘reach’ seems to far away semantically and is obviously reflected in CA \textit{aṗesun} ‘id.’, see above). Instead of the initial \textit{b}, the pharyngeal \textit{ˁ} might also be read (\textit{aṗ-pesun}), which might suggest a connection with Udi \textit{aṗesun} ‘cook, boil’.

\textsuperscript{xii} The past tense form \textit{kowl-hê} presupposes a verb \textit{kul-ihesun} in the sense of ‘dare’ (Arm. \textit{išxêr}) that is hitherto unattested; as a compound based on \textit{kowl (= kul) ‘hand’}
When person overcomes class

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