

Caucasian Albania

An International Handbook

Edited by
Jost Gippert and Jasmine Dum-Tragut

DE GRUYTER

This publication is part of a project that has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (Grant agreement No. 101019006) and from the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) under Germany's Excellence Strategy – EXC 2176 'Understanding Written Artefacts: Material, Interaction and Transmission in Manuscript Cultures' (Project No. 390893796).



ISBN 978-3-11-079459-5
e-ISBN (PDF) 978-3-11-079468-7
DOI <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110794687>



This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License. For details go to <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>.

Creative Commons license terms for re-use do not apply to any content (such as graphs, figures, photos, excerpts, etc.) not original to the Open Access publication and further permission may be required from the rights holder. The obligation to research and clear permission lies solely with the party re-using the material.

Library of Congress Control Number: 2022948927

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available on the internet at <http://dnb.dnb.de>.

© 2023 the author(s), editing © 2023 Jost Gippert and Jasmine Dum-Tragut, published by Walter de Gruyter GmbH, Berlin/Boston

This book is published with open access at www.degruyter.com.

Cover image: © Jost Gippert

Typesetting: Meta Systems Publishing & Printservices GmbH, Wustermark

Printing and binding: CPI books GmbH, Leck

www.degruyter.com

Contents

Preface — v

I Caucasian Albania in Foreign Sources

Marco Bais

1 Caucasian Albania in Greek and Latin Sources — 3

Jasmine Dum-Tragut and Jost Gippert

2 Caucasian Albania in Medieval Armenian Sources (5th–13th Centuries) — 33

II The Heritage of Caucasian Albanian

Jost Gippert

3 The Textual Heritage of Caucasian Albanian — 95

Jost Gippert and Wolfgang Schulze[†]

4 The Language of the Caucasian Albanians — 167

Wolfgang Schulze[†] and Jost Gippert

5 Caucasian Albanian and Modern Udi — 231

Igor Dorfmann-Lazarev

5A The Udis' Petition to Tsar Peter — 261

III The Caucasian Albanian Church

Charles Renoux

6 Albanians, Armenians and Georgians: a Common Liturgy — 267

Jasmine Dum-Tragut

7 One or two? On Christological and Hierarchical Disputes and the Development of the “Church of Albania” (4th–8th centuries) — 285

Armenuhi Drost-Abgaryan

7A The Holy Covenant — 333

Yana Tchekhanovets

8 Albanians in the Holy Land – Absence of Archaeological Evidence or Evidence of Absence? — 337

IV Architecture and Archaeology

Armen Kazaryan

9 Urban Planning and Architecture of Caucasian Albania. Main Monuments and Trends of Development — 353

Patrick Donabédian

10 The Ensemble of the “Seven Churches” – an Ecumenical Monastery Ahead of Time? — 387

Hamlet Petrosyan

11 Tigranakert in Artsakh — 433

V Ethnic, Religious and Social Issues

Aleksan Hakobyan

12 The Ethnic Situation in Antique and Medieval Caucasian Albania — 475

Alison M. Vacca

13 The Rebels of Early Abbasid Albania — 489

Sergio La Porta

14 “You say Albanian, I say Armenian”: Discourses of Ethnicity and Power Around an Albanian King of Armenia — 515

Igor Dorfmann-Lazarev

15 Between the Planes and the Mountains: the Albanian-Armenian Marches in the 12th Century and David of Gandzak (c. 1065–1140) — 537

Jost Gippert

15A The Gate of Ganja — 571

Hratch Tchilingirian

16 Reverse Engineering: A State-Created “Albanian Apostolic Church” — 581

General References — 611

Indexes — 675

- 1 Persons (individuals and groups) — **675**
- 2 Place Names — **689**
- 3 Manuscripts and Inscriptions — **698**
 - 3.1 Manuscripts by designation — **698**
 - 3.2 Manuscripts by repository — **699**
 - 3.3 Inscriptions — **700**
- 4 Source Texts — **701**
 - 4.1 Bible — **701**
 - 4.2 Other texts — **704**
- 5 Terms — **706**
 - 5.1 Linguistic terms — **706**
 - 5.2 Other terms — **710**
- 6 Words — **715**
 - 6.1 Albanian — **715**
 - 6.2 Armenian — **725**
 - 6.3 Georgian — **727**
 - 6.4 Greek — **728**
 - 6.5 Iranian languages — **729**
 - 6.6 Latin — **730**
 - 6.7 Russian — **730**
 - 6.8 Semitic languages — **730**
 - 6.9 Turkic languages — **731**
 - 6.10 Udi (and other Lezgic languages) — **731**

Wolfgang Schulze[†] and Jost Gippert

5 Caucasian Albanian and Modern Udi

Abstract: The present Chapter¹ discusses the relationship between the language of the Caucasian Albanians as attested in the Sinai palimpsests and its alleged modern successor, the Udi language as spoken by a small linguistic minority in two different varieties (Nij and Vartashen Udi) in Azerbaijan, Armenia, Georgia, and elsewhere.

1 Albanians and Udis

On 20 March 1724, one year before his death, the Russian Tsar Peter I (also named the Great) received a letter in Armenian with a petition from a Christian community in the Caucasus. The letter reads:²

To the Most Worthy King

Magnificent and most glorious, praiseworthy and honourable, the crown and the pride of our nation! Raising [our] face[s] to [You, O] most worthy king, prostrating [ourselves], with tearful eyes we kiss the soles of Your feet.

With supplications and implorations we bring to Your Majesty's notice all the crimes [committed here] and the [deplorable] state of this country. For [this is] what the lawless and faithless [ones] have for so many years brought upon our heads. First, they burnt churches and caused us much evil [in acting] against our faith: they induced priests to apostasy, killing some; they took into captivity women with their sons [and] sons with their mothers. Monasteries and hermitages, rendered uninhabitable, remain [so even] today, and we, the survivors, eke out our existence in the midst of sufferings, neither alive nor dead.

1 The chapter is mostly based upon relevant publications by Wolfgang Schulze (especially Schulze 2015), with additions by Jost Gippert that are based upon the new readings of the Albanian palimpsests (cf. Chapter 3 of this Handbook, 1.5). Most regrettably, Wolfgang Schulze did not live to see the present chapter due to his untimely death on 13 April 2020.

2 The letter, preserved in the former Archive of Foreign Policy of Russia (АБПР, ф. 100, 1724 г., д. 4, л. 27 и об. Подлинник), was published as item no. 232 in Hovhannisyan (1967: 90–91). A first translation of the letter into English was kindly provided by Hasmik Sargsyan in January 2022. The present translation was worked out in May 2022 by Igor Dorfmann-Lazarev who also provided the pertinent notes and, in Chapter 5A below, a historical evaluation of the letter.

We are Albanians,³ and Udis⁴ [as regards our] stock.⁵ Through the preaching of the apostle Eliseaus, our ancestors became believers in God. The site of the holy apostle's martyrdom is near us. It is known to Your Majesty that in ancient times our people held no authority to build a sumptuous monastery on the site of the holy apostle's martyrdom. [Therefore,] our ancestors built [there] only a modest church: we lived around it.⁶ Now the lawless have burnt [it] down and have forced us into apostasy. Secretly we observe our religion, both old and young, [but] openly [the lawless ones] force us by the sword to become Turks.⁷

Now we have heard that Your auspicious⁸ foot is set to come [and] tread upon our heads: we shall beseech good tidings from Christ that he may shorten our lives and lengthen Your Majesty's, so that You may set us free from captivity and lead us to the glory of God. And with our sinful mouths we shall forever entreat the Lord [to grant Your Majesty] long life.

What other speech should we utter? We are servants of [Yours, O] most worthy king. Out of fear we cannot write everything; You will certainly learn of [our] love of Christ and of every [concern] of ours from this wretched priest and these people [attending him] who are coming [to You]. Our prayer is this: that some skilful servants of Your Majesty may come here with these people [...], that You may draw up a written document as a help,⁹ [thus procuring] a little joy to St Eliseaus the apostle, [a document to be transmitted] through these [people's] hands to [us who are] suffering here, [where] on the site of the [burnt] church a monastery may in [due] course be [erected on] the orders of [Your] heralds.¹⁰ May the deeds of those lawless be counteracted by Your Majesty's supreme command!

3 The term *Atuank'* renders in Armenian both the name of the country, 'Albania', and the collective noun 'Albanians'. In the text it is spelt *աղուվանք* (*Alu-vank'*), i.e. 'Country-of-Pleasant-Dwellings', certainly following a popular etymology: unlike highland Armenia, most of Albania's territory is characterised by a mild climate, in which livestock can winter in the open, whilst its soil is much better watered than the Armenian high plateau. Since antiquity, these climatic conditions favoured the development of husbandry and agriculture in the country. Cf. Chapter 2 of this Handbook (Dum-Tragut and Gippert), 1. with n. 3 as to the etymology of *atuank'* and 4.1.3 and 4.1.4 as to its connection with *alu* 'sweet' in earlier Armenian sources.

4 *Ռախք* (*Owtik'*). The petitioners, Udis (*udiyux* or *udiyox* in Udi, cf. Mobili 2010: 278), thus identify themselves with that ancient Armenian province situated along the Middle Kura's right bank.

5 Or 'by parentage': *ազգով* (*azgov*).

6 'Around it': *նովաւ* (*novaw*, for *znovaw*). Numerous churches dedicated to St Eliseaus are documented on both banks of the Kura. Most likely, the authors come from the region of the ancient Albanian town of Gis (often identified with present-day Kiş) on the stream Sani (a left tributary of the river Alazani) flowing down the southern slopes of the Greater Caucasus. A church of St Eliseaus near Kiş (Kish) was built in 1244; see Karapetyan (1988: 225–230).

7 The massive Islamicisation of the inhabitants of the area of Kiş is documented in scholarship; see Karapetyan (1997: 84, nos. 310–312).

8 'Auspicious': *սալալու* (*sayalu*, < Azeri).

9 *շաղաւաթ* *šalawat* < *šalawart*).

10 *դովաթ* (*dolvat* < *dovlat*).

We are a [small] remnant in [this] land,¹¹ [and] there is neither understanding in [our] heads nor light in [our] eyes. The authority belongs to Your Majesty [alone]. [Holding] little knowledge in [our] minds, we have written little, but may Your Wisdom understand much.

[May we be] a sacrifice for Your soul! Be a remedy for us, alive in our glorification.

Written in the year 1173, on the 20th of the month of March.¹²

Added to the petition is a small postscript, as well in Armenian:

We have meekly drawn up this request for solace from Your Majesty. In whatsoever manner Your Greatness should dispose [of authority], [the power] to command belongs to Your Majesty [alone]. And until the arrival of Your army, whenever You dispatch our people [who are now on their way to You] back: until their arrival we shall not lift our eyes from the road. May the heavenly King be Your protector and [that] of Your army and may Your Majesty [be the protector] of all faithful Armenians,¹³ [both] rich and poor.¹⁴

By identifying themselves as “Albanians, and Udis [as regards our] stock”, the senders suggest a peculiar relationship between the two ethnonyms, with “Udis” representing a subsection of “Albanians”. This suggestion is corroborated by linguistic observations: in the light of the linguistic materials that were brought about by the decipherment of the Sinai palimpsests (see Chapters 3 and 4 of this Handbook), it can safely be stated today that the language of the present-day Udis is a close relative, if not a direct descendant, of the Caucasian Albanian language of the Middle Ages, with an interrelation which is similar to the one between Old Armenian (Grabar) and Modern East Armenian. In the following sections, the relation between Albanian and modern Udi will be examined in more detail.

¹¹ Numerous biblical references may be recognised in the text of the Petition; e.g. Isaiah 1.7–9: “Your country is desolate, your cities are burned with fire: your land, strangers devour it in your presence, and it is desolate, as overthrown by strangers. [...] Except the Lord of hosts had left unto us a very small remnant, we should have been as Sodom”; Jeremiah 44.28: “Yet a small number that escape the sword shall return out of the land of Egypt into the land of Judah”.

¹² I.e. 20 March 1724 according to the Julian calendar (31. 03. 1724 according to the Gregorian calendar).

¹³ *ամենայն հաւատացեալ հայոց* (*amenayn hawatac'eal hayoc'*). The petitioners thus claim a triple identity, attaching themselves at once to ancient Caucasian Albania, to the Armenian province of Utik', and to the flock of the Armenian Christians.

¹⁴ A Russian archivist added the following “Note: Notices of Armenians, whose content is ancient, translated from their letters. This has been told [us] by the Armenian Luka”.

2 The Udis and their language

2.1 The Udis as an ethnic group

Since the Azerbaijanian-Armenian clashes of 1989–90, the only place where Udis reside compactly has been the village of Nij (also spelt Nizh; Azeri *Nic*, Udi *nəʒ/niž*), which is located in Northwestern Azerbaijan and inhabited by some 6,000 people.¹⁵ Until 1989, a second more or less compact group of ethnic Udis was present in the village of Vartashen (now Oğuz), located some 25 km northwest of Nij and inhabited by some 5,000 people until then.¹⁶ Together with the local Armenians, most of the Udis from Vartashen were forced to leave the village in 1990 and to move to various places of the former USSR, among them some hamlets in Armenia¹⁷ and the village of Zinobiani (from 1938 to 2000 named Okṭomberi) in Eastern Georgia, which had been founded by emigrants from Vartashen in 1922 in the context of the Armenian-

15 40°55'48" N, 47°39'12" E. In 2009, some 65 % of the inhabitants of Nij declared themselves to be ethnic Udis, the rest being chiefly Azerbaijanis. Məhyəddinqızı (2009: [58]) talks about 6,200 inhabitants and adds that 4,000 of them are Udis. On the other hand, Qafarlı (2012) reports that only 50 % of the Nij population belong to the Udi ethnic group. The census of 2015 mentions 3,697 Udis for the whole of the Qabala district; Maisak (2023: 55) provides a number of "ca. 3,500 Udis" for Nij. Compared to the figures given for the 1979 census (4,528 Udis, 1,109 Azerbaijanis out of a total of 5,914 inhabitants) we can thus observe a gradual decline of the portion of Udis in the village of Nij (cf. Schulze and Schulze 2016: 513). – The first mention of Nij is found in Eichwald (1834–1837: II, 16: *Nidsh* / 1838a: 180: *Ниджъ*); the latter form also appears in Yanovskiy (1846: 166).

16 41°4'23" N, 47°27'53" E. The inhabitants included roughly 40 % Armenians, 15 % Jewish Tats, 30 % Udis, 15 % Azerbaijanis, Lezgis and others; cf. Schulze and Schulze (2016: 514). – The first mention of Vartashen is found in Klaproth (1814: 177), where it is misspelt as *Waratschin*. The name was explicitly corrected to *Wartaschin* by Sjögren (1836: 118; cf. also Yanovskiy 1846: 166 with *Баптауун*). The name form *Wartaschen* appeared – alongside *Wartaschin* – first in Eichwald (1834–1837: II, 16–20); cf. also Schiefner (1863: 1), according to whom it is "more usual" ("gewöhnlicher").

17 The villages in question are Bagratashen (41°14'32" N, 44°49'2" E), Ptghavan (41°13'40" N, 44°51'34" E), Debedavan (41°16'49" N, 44°48'53" E), and Haghtanak (41°12'51" N, 44°54'36" E). Bagratashen (2,732 inhabitants in 2011) is located on the right bank of the Debed river. In Tsarist times the town was called Lambalo and inhabited mainly by Azerbaijanis. It was renamed in 1972 in honour of Bagrat Vardanyan (1894–1971), a hero of socialist labour. Since 1994, its Azerbaijani population has been replaced mainly by Armenian refugees from Azerbaijan. Ptghavan (some 900 people in 300 households) was founded in 1948 and is located some 4 km southeast of Bagratashen. Debedavan (also Debetavan, formerly Lalvar, renamed in 1978) is located on the Debed river. It is inhabited mostly by Armenians (700 people) and situated 5 km north of Bagratashen. Haghtanak, located some 6 km southeast of Ptghavan, is inhabited by some 1,200 people (cf. Schulze and Schulze 2016: 511).

Azerbaijani conflicts of 1918–1920.¹⁸ The number of Udis who have remained in the Oğuz region after 1990 is difficult to determine; Azerbaijani sources talk about 79 Udis in 2009. Even before 1989, USSR-internal migration (especially in the 1970s) had conditioned that quite a number of Udis are now to be found in scattered places of the former USSR, especially in the Russian Federation¹⁹ and in Kazakhstan (Aktay, Shakhtinsk).

In sum, we can assume that the number of ethnic Udis does not exceed 10,000 people today. This estimation, however, does not match the actual number of people who use the Udi language in every-day communication. In many places outside Nij, Udi has become an endangered variety, being replaced by the local language as a general means of communication.²⁰

Although details may be a matter of debate, it can be safely stated that the cultural traditions of the Udi people are characterised by a long-standing contact with Armenians,²¹ a fact that manifests itself nicely in the petition to Tsar Peter being written in Armenian. The “Armenian layer” in the cultural traditions of the Udis is especially determined by the historical dynamics of the religious traditions of this ethnic group. After the abolishment of a quasi-autocephalous “Albanian” bishopric in 1836 and up to 1990, most Udis had related themselves to either the Armenian Apostolic Church or the Georgian Orthodox Church; the reestablishment of a “Caucasian-Albanian Christianity” in 2002 marked the end of these relations at least among the Udis of Azerbaijan.²²

18 41°53'50" N, 45°56'10" E. Today, some 200 ethnic Udis live in Zinobiani, together with a similar number of Georgians; cf. Beridze, Archvadze and Shurghaia (2003: 110–111) for 2002 (Oktoberi), Schulze (2005b), Schulze (2011b), and Schulze and Schulze (2016: 514).

19 E.g. in Moscow, Ekaterinburg, Balabanovo (near Moscow; 56°10'34" N, 37°44'0" E), Dubovy Ovrag (near Volgograd, 48°20'3" N, 44°37'6" E), Krasnodar, Taganrog, Volgograd, and Barnaul; cf. Schulze and Schulze (2016: 515).

20 The documentation of the Udi language of Georgia was one of the objects of two projects run by Jost Gippert and Manana Tandashvili from 2002–2010 within the programmes “Documentation of Endangered Languages” (DoBeS) and “Between Europe and the Orient – A Focus on Research and Higher Education in/on Central Asia and the Caucasus” of the Volkswagen Foundation (projects “Endangered Caucasian Languages in Georgia”, cf. <https://dobes.mpi.nl/projects/svan/> and <https://titus.fkidg1.uni-frankfurt.de/ecling/ecling.htm>, and “The sociolinguistic situation of present-day Georgia”, cf. <https://titus.uni-frankfurt.de/ssgg/ssgg.htm>).

21 Cf. Schulze (2011b).

22 Cf. Schulze and Schulze (2016: 515–518) and Chapter 16 of this Handbook (Tchilingirian) for further details.

2.2 The Udi language

The Udi language as spoken today is clearly divided into two dialects, that of the community of Nij and that of the former community of Vartashen. The first material of modern Udi that was made available to the scholarly world was a list of 12 words plus one short sentence, which was compiled in Vartashen and published in Latin script in 1814 by Julius von Klaproth in his “Description of the Russian provinces between the Caspian and the Black Sea”.²³ This material comprises words like “Weib – Schuwuk” (Udi V *čubux*, N *čuhux* / *čupux* / *čuvux* ‘wife, woman’),²⁴ “Bruder – Witschi” (Udi VN *viči* ‘brother’), also in “Mein Bruder – Bis witschi” (Udi VN *bez viči* ‘my brother’), and “Brod – Schum” (Udi VN *śum* ‘bread’), also in the sentence “Iß Brod mit uns, mein Bruder – Mieeke arza schum uka his witschi” (Udi V *mia eke, arca, śum uka, bez viči*).²⁵

In order to provide material for a comparison of the Udi language with that of the (Finno-Ugric) Udmurt (or Votyak) people in Russia, an endeavour that had been suggested by Ed. Eichwald on the basis of the similarity of the ethnonyms,²⁶ a more comprehensive word list comprising c. 325 entries with a Russian translation was compiled and printed on behalf of the exarch of Georgia, Isidor (Nikol’skiy), in 1853.²⁷ Unfortunately the “Dictionary” seems not to be available for inspection; however, a short list of about 70 items that was possibly derived from it was published, in Cyrillic letters, in the same year in the journal *Кавказъ* (‘Caucasus’) and again, in Latin transcription, in 1854 by Anton Schiefner.²⁸

The latter author was then also the first scholar to provide an account of the grammar of Udi, together with a set of text specimens and a large vocabulary, in

23 Klaproth (1814: 177–178); cf. Gippert (2018b: 118–119).

24 Hereafter, “V” denotes the Vartashen dialect and “N”, that of Nij.

25 Literally, the sentence means ‘Come here, sit down, eat bread, my brother’; a Nij version would only differ in using *memiya eki* for ‘come here’. – Note that two items of the word list remain undetermined, viz. “Mädchen – *Ssengi*” (‘girl’) and “Knabe – *Galli*” (‘boy’); the usual equivalents, Udi V *xinar* / N *xüyär* and VN *gar*, are listed under “Tochter” (‘daughter’, *Chinar*) and “Sohn” (‘son’, *Gari*).

26 Eichwald (1838a: 180; 1838b: 349 and 364); cf. also Yanovskiy (1853: 81).

27 Nikol’skiy (1853); for details cf. Schiefner (1863: 2) and Gukasyan (1974: 8).

28 Schiefner (1854: 649–650). The publication in *Кавказъ* no. 61 is signed by one “A. C.” from Kutaisi who has been identified as Andrey Stepanovich Sankovskiy by Nineli Melkadze, National Parliament Library of Georgia, Tbilisi (e-mail of 12 August 2022 to Emzar Jgerenaia); our sincere thanks are due to both colleagues for solving his riddle: even Schiefner did not name the author. Unfortunately Sankovskiy gives no information as to the provenance of his list (1853: 266 note *). A similar but not identical list was published by Shopen (1866: 483); more extensive new word lists were provided by Starchevskiy (1891: 494–508) and Erckert (1895: 23–204). Cf. Gippert (2018b: 119–122).

a “Mémoire” of the Russian Academy of Sciences in 1863.²⁹ The first more comprehensive text materials in Udi were a fairy tale on a shepherd named *Rustam* published by Mikhail Bezhanov, a native speaker from Vartashen, in 1888, and the translation of the four Gospels accomplished by the same author in supporting his brother Semyon, which appeared in Cyrillic script in 1902.³⁰ The first Udi primer was published in 1934 in Latin script with several extra letters and diacritics by Theodore and Mikhaki Jeirani under the title “First Lesson” (Udi *samži dās*); it comprised an introduction into writing and 30 pages of short texts, synoptically arranged in both dialects.³¹ The first full-fledged dictionary of Udi appeared in 1974 in a Cyrillic-based alphabet, with *ʒ*, *I*, and an accent-like sign being used as diacritics; the work, authored by Voroshil Gukasyan, covers both dialects and provides translations and explanations in both Azeri and Russian.³² The Udi-Azeri-Russian dictionary by R. Mobili (2010) is mostly based on Gukasyan’s.³³

Since the 1990s, there has been a steady increase of printed materials in Nij Udi,³⁴ especially in the context of the reestablishment of an independent Christian community. Among the relevant materials, we may mention the translation of the books of Ruth and Jonah from the Old Testament³⁵ and of the Gospel of Luke from the New Testament.³⁶ Recently, a large set of further translations of biblical texts have been published online;³⁷ besides the Gospel of Luke and a new version of Jonah, they comprise the books of Exodus, Numbers, Psalms, Proverbs, the Gospels of Matthew, Mark, and John, and the Letters by James and John, all down-

29 Schiefner (1863). Later accounts of the grammar were published by Erckert (1895), Dirr (1904), Jeiranishvili (1971), Panchvidze (1974), and Schulze (1982); cf. Gippert (2018b: 120–125).

30 Both these works (Bezhanov 1888 and Bezhanov and Bezhanov 1902) appeared within the journal *Сборникъ матеріаловъ для описанія мѣстностей и племенъ Кавказа* (‘Collection of materials for the description of the localities and tribes of the Caucasus’). Further text materials were provided in the works cited in note 29 above and in Dirr (1928); cf. Gippert (2018b: 120–125).

31 Jeirani and Jeirani (1934); cf. Gippert (2018b: 124). The primer as well as most other Udi texts that were published before 2000 are available online for research at <https://titus.uni-frankfurt.de/texte/texte2.htm#udica>.

32 Gukasyan (1974); cf. Gippert (2018b: 125–126).

33 Recordings of spoken Vartashen Udi (from Zinobiani, compiled by Manana Tandashvili, Jost Gippert, Taniel Sikharulidze and others in the documentation projects of 2002–2010, cf. n. 20) are available at The Language Archive (<https://archive.mpi.nl/tla/islandora/search/udi>) and on the TITUS server (<https://titus.fkidg1.uni-frankfurt.de/ecling/ecling03.htm> and <https://titus.fkidg1.uni-frankfurt.de/texte/etce/cauc/udi/udissgg/udiss.htm>); a corpus of spoken Nij Udi was compiled by Dmitry Ganenkov, Yuri Lander and Timur Maisak in the 2000s (cf. Maisak 2021: 337).

34 Cf. Maisak (2021: 338) for a list of works comprising a total of “ca. 90,000 words”.

35 Published anonymously as *Rut’* – Iona (2009).

36 Ağacani et al. (2011); cf. Gippert (2018b: 126).

37 Cf. <http://www.udibibliya.com> (last accessed 13. 2. 2023).

loadable in PDF form and accompanied with audio recordings of the texts. A thorough analysis of these materials has not yet been possible.

In accordance with the turn from Cyrillic to a Latin-based orthography in Azeri, the writing system used in the last-named publications is Latin-based, too, with several special diacritic combinations used. In Table I, the different graphical renderings used in publications of Udi texts are contrasted with the transliteration system applied in the present treatise.³⁸

38 The Table covers the following publications: Klaproth (1814), Sankovskiy (1853), Schiefner (1854), Schiefner (1863), Shopen (1866), Starchevskiy (1891), Erckert (1895), Bezhanov (1888), Bezhanov & Bezhanov (1902), Dirr (1904), Dirr (1928), Jeirani & Jeirani (1934), Karbelashvili (1935), Jeiranishvili (1971), Panchvidze (1974), Gukasyan (1974), Schulze (1982), Mobili (2010). In order to provide a general picture, minor variants and inconsistencies in the rendering of Udi, especially in 19th-century publications, are ignored in the Table. In some cases, the actual appearance of special characters may differ. For previous comparative charts cf. Karbelashvili (1935: 273–274) and Lolua (2010: 13–15).

Tab. 1: The rendering of Udi sounds in various publications.

	a	aʳ	ä	äʳ	b	c	ç	č	č̣	č̣'	č̣'	d	e
Klaproth	a	-	-	-	b	z	-	(t)sch	-	-	-	-	e(e)
Sankovskiy	a	a	a	a	б	ц	ц	ч	ч	-	ч	-	А
Schiefner ₁	a	a	a	a	b	z	z	tsch	tsch	-	-	-	e
Schiefner ₂	a	ə	ä, ə	-	b	c	ç	č	č̣	č̣	č̣	-	e
Shopen	a	a	-	a, à	б	ц	ц	ч	ч	-	-	-	А
Starchevskiy	a	a	ə	ə	б	ц	ц	ч	ч	ч̣	ч̣	-	А
Erkert	a	a	ä, a	ä	b	c	tc	č	dč	č̣	-	-	e, ə
Bezhanov ₁	a	à	ä	ä	б	ц	ц̣	ч̣	ч̣	ч̣	-	-	А
Bezhanov ₂	a	à	ä	ä	б	ц	ц̣	ч̣	ч̣	ч̣	-	-	А
Dirr ₁	a	à	ä	ä	б	ц	ц̣	ч̣	ч̣	ч̣	-	-	А
Dirr ₂	a	à	ä	ä	b	c	c'	č̣	č̣'	č̣	-	-	e
Jeirani	a	ħa	ə	ħə	b	ɸ	ɸ	c	ɸ	e	-	-	e
Karbelashvili	a	ə	ä	ä	b	θ	t	θ	t	-	-	-	e
Jeiranishvili	ʲ	ʲə	ʲ	ʲə	ə	ʊ	ʋ	ʃ	ʃ	ʃə	-	-	ɔ
Panchvidze	ʲ	ʲə	ʲ	ʲə	ə	ʊ	ʋ	ʃ	ʃ	ʃə	-	-	ɔ
Gukasyan	a	aʲ	ab	ab	б	ц	ц̣	ч̣	ч̣	ч̣	ч̣	А	e
Schulze	a	a'	æ	æ'	b	c	ç	č̣	č̣	č̣	č̣	d	e
Mobili	a	-	ə	ə	b	ś	s'	ç	c'	č̣'	-	-	e

Tab. I (continued)

	eʳ	ə	əʳ	f	g	ǵ	h	i	iʳ	k	ḳ	l	m	n
Klaproth	oe	-	-	-	(g)	g	-	i(eh)	-	k	-	(ll)	m	n
Sankovskiy	e, ə	-	-	φ	-	ɾ	-	u, i	-	κ	κ	л	м	н
Schiefner ₁	e(i)	-	-	f	-	g	-	i(i), y	-	k	k	l	m	n
Schiefner ₂	e	(y)	(y)	f	g	ǵ	h	i	y	ḳ	k	l	m	n
Shopen	e, ə	-	-	-	ɾ	ɾ, κ	-	u	u	κ	κ	л	м	н
Starchevskiy	e	ы	ы	φ	ɾ	r(h)	h	u	u	κ(h)	κ	л	м	н
Erckert	e	ü	ü	f	g	gh	h	i	ü	kh	k	l	m	n
Bezhanov ₁	e	v	v	φ	ɾ	ɾ̣	h	i	v	ḳ	κ	л	м	н
Bezhanov ₂	è	ы	ы	φ	ɾ	ʒ	h	i	ы	ḳ	κ	л	м	н
Dirr ₁	e	ы	ы	φ	ɾ	ʒ	h	i	ы	κ	κ	л	м	н, ы
Dirr ₂	è	-	-	f	g	ɣ	h	i	i	ḳ	k	l	m	n
Jeirani	he	ь	һь	f	g	oɪ	h	i	һь	κ	κ	l	m	n
Karbelashvili	è	ə	-	f	g	ǵ	h	i	ɪ	q	k	l	m	n
Jeiranishvili	ɔ ^ə	ə	(ə ^ə)	φ	ə	ə̣	ʒ	o	o ^ə	ʒ	ʒ	л	м	н
Pandhvidze	ɔ ^ə	ə	(ə ^ə)	φ	ə	ə̣	ʒ	o	o ^ə	ʒ	ʒ	л	м	н
Gukasyan	eʳ	ы	ыʳ	φ	ɾ	ɾʳ	ɾʳ	u	uʳ	κ	κɪ	л	м	н
Schulze	eʳ	ə	əʳ	f	g	ɣ	h	i	iʳ	k	κ	l	m	n
Mobili	è	l	ḷ	f	g	ǵ	h	i	ḷ	k	kʳ	l	m	n

	o	oʳ	ö	p	p̣	q	q̣	r	s	š	ś	t	ṭ	u
Klaproth	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	r	ss	-	sch	-	-	u
Sankovski	o	o	-	-	п	x	к	p	c	w	w	τ	τ	y
Schiefner ₁	o	-	-	-	p	ch	k	r	s	sch	sch	t	t	u
Schiefner ₂	o	q̣	ö	p̣	p̣	x̣	q̣	r	s	ś	ś	ṭ	ṭ	u
Shopen	o	o	-	n	n	κ	(r)κ	p	c	w, c	w, c	-	-	y
Starचेvskiy	o	o	o	n(h)	n	x, κ	κ	p	c	w	w, c	τ	τ	y
Erckert	o	o	ö	ph	p̣	xk	q	r	s	š	š(š)	th	t	u
Bezhanov ₁	o	ó	ö	ḥ	ṇ	ḳ	q̣	p̣	c	w	ũ	ṭ	τ	y
Bezhanov ₂	o	ó	ö	ḥ	ṇ	ḳ	ḳ	p̣	c	w	ũ	ṭ	τ	y
Dirr ₁	o	ó	ö	ᵿ	ṇ	ḳ	q̣	p̣	c	w	ũ	τ	τ	y
Dirr ₂	o	ó	ö	p̣'	p̣	ḳ	q̣	r	s	š	ś	ṭ'	ṭ	u
Jeirani	o	ho	e	β	p̣	q̣	q̣	r	s	ś	f	ṭ	ṭ	u
Karbelashvili	o	q̣	ö	φ	p̣	q̣	ḳ	r	s	w	ũ	θ	ṭ	u
Jeiranishvili	o	oʳ	ö	ϣ	ẓ	ẓ	g̣	ʳ	ḅ	ṽ	ḡ	ḡ	ḡ	ṽ
Panchvidze	o	oʳ	ö	ϣ	ẓ	ẓ	g̣	ʳ	ḅ	ṽ	ḡ	ḡ	ḡ	ṽ
Gukasyan	o	oʳ	ö	n	ṇl	xḅ	κḅ	p̣	c	w	wḷ	τ	τḷ	y
Schulze	o	oʳ	ö	p̣	p̣	q̣	q̣	r	s	ś	ś	ṭ	ṭ	u
Mobili	o	ö	ö	p̣	p̣'	q̣	q̣'	r	s	ś	ś	ṭ	ṭ'	u

Tab. I (continued)

	u ^ɛ	ü	v	x	y	z	ž	ž	ž	ž
Klaproth	-	-	w	ch, k	-	s	-	-	-	-
Sankovskiy	y	ю	б	х	й	з	-	ж	-	дз
Schiefner ₁	u	-	w	ch	i	s	-	j	-	ds
Schiefner ₂	ү	ү, у	w	x, һ	j, i	z	ž	ž	з	з, ж
Shopen	y	-	б	х	-	з	ж	ж, дз	-	дж
Starchevskiy	y	-	б	х	й	з	-	ж	-	дж
Erckert	u	ü	v	x	j	z	ž	(ž), žž	-	dž
Bezhanov ₁	ý	ý	б	х	j	з	ж	ж	дз	ү
Bezhanov ₂	ý	ý	б	х	й	з	ж	ж	з	ү
Dirr ₁	ý	ý	б, w	х	й	з	ж	ж	з	ү
Dirr ₂	ú	ü	v, u	x	j, i	z	ž	ž	-	j
Jeirani	hu	y	v	x	j	z	z	z	dz	dž
Karbelashvili	ü	ü	v	q	y	z	f	t	d	d
Jeiranishvili	ɣ ^ə	ɣ̊	з	б	ɑ	ʁ	ɣ ^ə	ɣ ^ə	ɔ	ɣ ^ə
Pandvidze	ɣ ^ə	ɣ̊	з, ɣ̊	б	ɑ	ʁ	ɣ̊	ɣ̊	ɔ	ɣ̊
Gukasyan	y ^ə	y ^ə	б	х	й	з	ж	жл	дз	дж
Schulze	u'	y	y'	x	j	z	ž	ž	з	ž
Mobili	ü	ü	v	x	y	z	j	j	-	č

2.3 Udi and Albanian Gospels

The fact that we possess a considerable amount of parallel text materials in form of the Gospel translations allows us to establish a clear picture of the mutual relation of Albanian and Udi. Taking Matthew 17.1 as a first example, we can show that many words from the basic vocabulary and primary elements of grammar (verbal markers and case endings)³⁹ are more or less the same in Albanian and the Vartashen Udi version provided by the Bezhanov brothers in 1902; cf. Table II where identical words are marked in bold characters and identical grammatical elements are underlined.⁴⁰

Tab. II: Matthew 17.1 in Albanian and Vartashen Udi.

CA	<i>űwɣar ġiown eša heqayne I(sow)sen Petrosax own Jakobax own Yohananax ...</i>
Udi V	<i>u'q ġi çebakiɣo oša, Isusen aneqi Petrax, Jakovax va' Ioanax ...</i>
	<i>"After six days, Jesus took Peter and James and John..."</i>

Identical are the word for 'day', *ġi*, and the name of Jesus if its Albanian sounding is reconstructed correctly from the abbreviation. Identical are the case endings *-en* for the ergative marking the agent, Jesus, and *-ax* for the dative marking the three object persons, Peter, James and John. Near to identical are the numeral 'six', *űwɣ* vs. *u'q*, with the pronunciation of the Albanian digraph *űw* remaining uncertain,⁴¹ and the postposition 'after', *eša* vs. *oša*, where only the initial vowel differs; the sound change involved is regular in the position before a retroflex consonant such as *ś*.⁴² The verbal forms for 'he took' illustrate a more severe development in the history of Udi: in Albanian *he-qay-ne*, the 3rd person marker *-ne* is still attached after the ending of the past, *-y*, whereas Udi *a-ne-qi* shows the same element inserted between *a-*, the remnant of the preverb *he-* 'hither', and the verbal root *q*; in addition, the formation of the past changed from a stem in *-a-* (*-q-a-y*) into a stem in *-e-* (**-q-e-y > -qi*).⁴³

³⁹ Cf. Chapter 4 of this Handbook, 5.1 for a survey of lexical correspondences between Albanian and Udi, 3.1.3 for the case endings and 3.5.2 for the personal markers of Albanian.

⁴⁰ In the following specimens, the Cyrillic spelling of the Udi Gospels of 1902 has been replaced by a rendering in Latin script; "CA" stands for Caucasian Albanian. Note that in the Albanian script, the vowels *u* and *ű* are rendered by digraphs (*ow* and *űw*, see Chapter 4 of this Handbook, 2.1).

⁴¹ Cf. Chapter 4 of this Handbook, 2.2.1 as to the Albanian digraph *űw*.

⁴² Cf. Gippert (2018b: 130).

⁴³ Cf. Chapter 4 of this Handbook, 3.5.3, and 3.2.3 below on the past formation in Albanian and Udi.

Other differences are caused by the fact that the Udi translation by the Bezh-anov brothers was based on the Russian Bible, which was printed together with it verse-by-verse in parallel, whereas the Albanian text most probably relied upon a Graeco-Syro-Armenian model;⁴⁴ this is obvious from the names of Peter, James and John being *Peṭr-*, *Iaḱov-* and *Ioan-* in Udi vs. *Peṭros-* (maintaining the Greek nominative ending as in Arm. *Petros-*), *Yaḱob-* (corresponding to Syriac *Yaqōb* vs. Arm. *Yakovbos-* which mirrors Greek *Ἰάκωβος*),⁴⁵ and *Yohanan-* (corresponding to Syriac *Yōḥanān* vs. Arm. *Yovhannēs* which mirrors Greek *Ἰωάννης*).⁴⁶ An influence of Russian on the Udi text is also manifest in the rendering of ‘after six days’ by *uʹq ġi čebakiṭxo oša*, which literally means ‘after six days had passed’ with a nominalised form of *čebaksun* ‘pass by’ in the ablative depending on the postposition *oša*⁴⁷ and which clearly reflects the Russian *no prošestvii dnei šesti* ‘after the passing of six days’; in contrast to this, the Albanian directly translates Arm. *յետ վեց ամուր* (*yet vec’ awowr*) ‘after six days’, in its turn matching Syr. *bāṭar šittā yawmīn* (rather than Greek *μεθ’ ἡμέρας ἕξ* with a different ordering of the numeral and the head noun). The genitive ending *-own* in Albanian *ġiown* is regularly triggered by the postposition *eša* following it,⁴⁸ and the use of the plural marker *-ar* with the numeral (*üwḫ-ar*) is an intrinsic feature of Albanian that is no longer met with in Udi.⁴⁹

With the new translation of biblical texts into Nij Udi, we can now even contrast the Albanian Gospels with both dialects of the language. In the Nij version, Matthew 17.1 reads: *Uʹq ġinaxun oša Isusen Ičuxun Peṭera, Iaḱova saal iz viči Ioana exti*,⁵⁰ which can be rendered as ‘After six days, Jesus himself took Peter, James and also his brother John’. Leaving aside the explicative additions *ičuxun* ‘(from) himself’ and *iz viči* ‘his brother’ and the conjunction *saal* ‘and again’,⁵¹

⁴⁴ Cf. Chapter 3 of this Handbook, 2.2.

⁴⁵ In the Greek New Testament, *Ἰάκωβος* is the name form used for the apostle while *Ἰακώβ* is only used for the Old Testament patriarch (e.g., Matthew 1.2, 1.16, 8.11).

⁴⁶ Cf. Chapter 3 of this Handbook, 3.3 as to the two forms of the name of John occurring in the Albanian palimpsests.

⁴⁷ Actually, *čebakiṭxo* is the ablative of the referentialised form of the past of *čebaksun*, lit. ‘from the passed one’ (cf. Chapter 4 of this Handbook, 3.2 as to comparable forms in Albanian).

⁴⁸ The Udi (V) equivalent would be *ġinun* as appearing in *ġinun baxṭin* ‘for the day’ in Luke 23.17.

⁴⁹ Cf. Chapter 4 of this Handbook, 3.4 as to the Albanian numerals.

⁵⁰ Cf. <https://www.udibibliya.com/en/matthews-gospel/> for the Nij version of the Gospel of Matthew. The rendering of Udi in Latin characters was adapted to the system used in the present Chapter.

⁵¹ *N saal* is likely to consist of *sa* ‘one, but’ and the additive particle *-al* ‘also’; it does not occur in the Vartashen Gospels. In Albanian, *sa-al* is only attested in I John 1.5 (Sin. georg. NF 13 = A104va, 21) in the sense of ‘even one’ (hereafter, A stands for Sin. georg. NF 13 and B, for Sin. georg. NF 55). Cf. Chapter 4 of this Handbook, 3.8 as to conjunctions in Albanian.

the main differences consist in the reduction of the dative ending (-a instead of -ax), in the ablative ending -xun relating *gina*- ‘day’ directly to the postposition *oša* ‘after’, without addition of ‘passing by’, and in the verbal form, *ex̣ti* ‘he took’, which reveals no person marking and whose relation to Albanian *heqesown* and Vartashen Udi *aq̣sun* remains unclear.⁵²

As a second example, we may take Luke 4.16–18 which is among the best readable passages of the palimpsests⁵³ and provides a telling picture. For the sake of clarity, the verses are divided into phrases in Table III, and literal translations are given for all three versions. Note that the two Udi versions differ from the Albanian one in placing the phrase “he started to read” not in the middle of Luke 4.17 but at the end of the preceding verse, a divergence that is already observable between different Greek and Syriac witnesses of the New Testament;⁵⁴ the Russian Bible, on which the Vartashen translation is based, follows the more widespread Greek text version.

It will be immediately clear that the Nij version is again more explicative than the Vartashen version or the Albanian text, in adding “the town” (*šāhār*, a loan from Persian via Azeri) to Nazareth, “from the holy scriptures” in 4.16, and “these words” in 4.17; on the other hand, the Vartashen version introduces several phrases with *va* ‘and’ (a loan from Arabic via Azeri) mirroring Russian *i* ‘id.’ where the two other versions have no conjunction. A more salient feature of the Nij version consists in the use of participial constructions instead of relative clauses as in *Iz kalabaki Nazareṭ šāhāre*-, lit. ‘to (His) own having-grown-up Nazareth town’, contrasting in Luke 4.16 with *nazarētaḥ bāni-hamayke-va-hē* in Albanian and *Nazareta, maate kalanebakei* in the Vartashen Gospels, both displaying a relative construction with finite verbs;⁵⁵ the preference for participial phrases in Nij Udi may be taken to indicate a strong influence of Turkic (Azeri) syntax (if not even a translation via Azeri).⁵⁶

⁵² The verb in question is listed as *ēxst’un* = *e’xstun* in Mobili (2010: 106).

⁵³ In the “Lectionary” part of the Albanian palimpsests, the following lections from Luke are preserved: Lk. 1.57–80 (lection for the Nativity of John the Baptist, A35vb–A36rb); Lk. 2.1–7 (Nativity of Jesus Christ, A36vb–A35vb); Lk. 4.14–22 (Prophet Isaiah; A37ra–A44va); Lk. 4.25–36 (Prophets; A44va–A44rb); Lk. 7.1–10 (Kings; A8rb–A42vb); cf. Chapters 3 (Gippert) and 6 (Renoux) of this Handbook for more details. The given passage covers A34vb, l. 2 – A37rb, l. 15.

⁵⁴ Cf. Chapter 3 of this Handbook, 3.3 with Table VI showing the divergent arrangements.

⁵⁵ Cf. Gippert (2011b) and 3.3 below as to relative clauses in Albanian and (Vartashen) Udi. The verbs for ‘grow up’ incorporate different words for ‘big, tall’, CA *bān’i* and Udi *kala*; the former seems not to have left a trace in the modern language.

⁵⁶ With the name of Peter appearing as *pyotr* throughout in the Nij version of Luke (Ağacani et al. 2011), a Russian text can be proven to have been the underlying basis of this translation; in the new online version of the same book (<https://www.udibibliya.com/en/luke-gospel>), the name has been replaced by *pēter*- (e.g., in Lk. 8.45) as also in the Gospel of Matthew.

Tab. III: Luke 4.16–18 in Albanian and both dialects of Udi.

CA	<i>Ari-na-va nazarëtaḡ bân'i-hamayke-va-hē :</i> He came to Nazareth where he had grown up (<i>lit.</i> become tall).
Udi V	<i>va^f arine Nazareta, maate kalanebakei</i> And he came to Nazareth where he had grown up (<i>lit.</i> become tall)
Udi N ⁵⁷	<i>Isus Iz kalabaki Nazareṭ šähärene hari</i> Jesus came to the town of Nazareth where he himself had grown up (<i>lit.</i> become tall)
CA	<i>baha-bähē-na-va zahown-anke-va-hē šambaṭown ġiya e ž̃daḡ :</i> He entered, as he was used (<i>lit.</i> taught), on the day of Sabbath into the synagogue.
Udi V	<i>va^f baineci, ič hammašanun vārdiša görä, šamaṭ ġena mečita,</i> And he entered, according to his overall habit, on the Sabbath day into the synagogue,
Udi N	<i>saal Iz ädäten U'qu'mži ġine sinagogane taci.</i> And according to (<i>lit.</i> by) his habitude, he entered on the Sixth day into the synagogue.
Udi V	<i>va^f aynezeri kalpesan.</i> and he started (<i>lit.</i> stood up) to read.
Udi N	<i>Šo ə'vël Camurxoxun kalpseynaḡ turele hayzeri.</i> He started (<i>lit.</i> stood up on [his] foot) to read from the holy Scriptures.
CA	<i>dağē-n-ooxow d'iṗ isai marġavenown :</i> (They) gave him the book of Isaiah the prophet.
Udi V	<i>šoṭu taḡundi Isai pexambari kăğzax</i> To him they gave the book of Isaiah the prophet
Udi N	<i>Šoṭo Isaya xavartašali ġirkăṭun tadi.</i> To him they gave the book of Isaiah the prophet.
CA	<i>hay-zari-na-va owpesa :</i> He started (<i>lit.</i> stood up) to read (<i>lit.</i> speak).
CA	<i>aḡay-pē-anke-oen e d'iṗ baḡē-n-oox e xown' cam-pē-hamay-ke-hē</i> When he opened the script, he found the place where (it) was written:
Udi V	<i>va^f šeṭinal, qaypi kăğzax, bo'ġanebi ganux, maate camnei:</i> and he, having opened the book, found the place where (it) was written:
Udi N	<i>Isusen ġirkă qaypi me äyitmox cameci ganune bäh'ğă'bi:</i> Jesus, having opened the book, found the place where these words were written:
CA	<i>hel ž̃ē zal hala</i> “The spirit of the Lord is upon me” (Is. 61.1).
Udi V	<i>elmux bixoğoy bez laxone</i> “The spirit of God is upon me”.
Udi N	<i>Qonžugoy Uruf Bez loxole.</i> “The spirit of the Lord is upon me”.

57 The orthography used for the Gospel of Luke as well as other publications in Nij Udi since the 1990s differs in many points from the Latin transcription used here, which is aimed to match that of Vartashen Udi and Albanian.

Beyond this, both Udi versions show a clear tendency towards using different lexical items especially for concepts that do not pertain to the basic vocabulary. A striking example is the word for ‘synagogue’, which the Nij version renders as such (*sinagog-*, corresponding to Russian *sinagoga*) while the Bezhanovs’ choice was *mečit*, which represents Arab. *masğid* ‘mosque’ (probably via Russian *мечеть*, vs. Azeri *məscid*). In contrast to this, the abbreviation *ẓ̌d* appearing in the Albanian text clearly represents Armenian *žolovowrd* ‘crowd, congregation’, which is used elsewhere, too, in referring to the building. To express the ‘habitude’ of Jesus, the Albanian text uses the verb *zahown-ihesown* which literally means ‘being taught’, while the translators of the Udi versions recur to different loan words again, namely, *vārdiš* < Azeri *vərdiş* (< Middle Persian *wardišn* ‘turning, change’) and *ādāt* < Azeri *adət* (< Arabic *‘adat*), even though the underlying term, *zahown* ‘teaching’, has been preserved in both dialects in *zom-baksun* ‘be taught’ and *zom-besun* ‘teach’. The word for the ‘book’ in Albanian is *d’ip*, a remarkably old loan from Iranian (Old Persian *dīpī*), while Vartashen Udi uses *kāğz* ~ Azeri *kağız*, lastly an Arabic word meaning ‘paper’;⁵⁸ the Nij version has *girk-*, which obviously reflects Arm. *girk* ‘book’, a *plurale tantum* based on *gir* ‘letter’. The ‘prophet’ is named *marğaven* in Albanian, a Middle Iranian compound literally meaning ‘bird-seer’ (alongside Arm. *margarē*, with a different verbal element),⁵⁹ while the Vartashen Gospels use *pexambar*, another Iranian term originally denoting a ‘message-bearer’ which occurs in Azeri as *peyğəmbər* and, in an older form, in Arm. *patgamawor*;⁶⁰ the Nij version has a hybrid formation with a similar notion, *xavartašal*, lit. ‘news-bearer’, with *xavar* representing Azeri *xəbər* (< Arab. *ḥabar*) ‘news’ and *tašal*, a participle of *tašsun* ‘carry, bring’.⁶¹ In some cases, the Vartashen Gospels show a wording that is still closer to the Albanian text, with only the Nij version deviating; this is true, e.g., for the denomination of the ‘spirit’, Albanian *hel*, which persists in Vartashen in the *plurale tantum*

58 Wehr (1985: 1079) notes *kāğid* (كاغد) for Tunisia and *kāğit* (كاغت) for Morocco; the same Arabic word has also yielded Persian *kāğiz/kāğid*, Azeri *kağız*, Turkish *kāğıt*, and Georgian *kağald-i* ‘paper’. The Azeri form is used in both varieties of Udi today (*kağız* in Gukasyan 1974: 131; *kağız / q’ağız* in Mobili 2010: 160).

59 Cf. Chapter 4 of this Handbook, 5.2.1.

60 E.g., in Lk. 7.10 (*patgawor-* in the Ejmiacin Gospels, fol. 129v is a spelling error); for the Iranian etymon cf. Hübschmann (1895: 222–223, no. 512).

61 Cf. Alb. *il’owx-hečal-* ‘messenger’, lit. ‘words-bringer’, which renders Arm. *patgamawor-* in Lk. 7.10 (A45ra, 21–22); Udi *tašsun* represents the same verb as *-hečal* but with a different preverb, quasi **ta-č-esown* ‘bring thither’ vs. **he-č-esown* ‘bring hither’. The Vartashen Gospels and the Nij version have *yaqabakior* ‘the sent ones’ and *yaqabi amdarxo* ‘the sent persons’ in Luke 7.10, both matching the Russian participle *посланные* which in its turn reflects Greek *ὀποστρέψαντες*.

elmux, whereas Nij Udi uses *uruf*, obviously rendering Azeri *ruh* (< Arab. *rūḥ*).⁶² A remarkable idiosyncrasy of the Nij version is the replacement of the ‘Sabbath’ by the ‘sixth’ day, with *u^qqu^mžī* representing the inherited numeral, *u^qq* ~ CA *üwχ*, in combination with the Azeri ordinal suffix *-ncI* (as in *altī-ncī* ‘sixth’).

It will be clear from these observations that there is no textual interrelationship between the Albanian and the two Udi versions of the Gospel of Luke: the latter were both translated anew, independently of each other and independently of the Albanian text as preserved in the palimpsests. Wherever the three versions agree in their wording – more exactly, in the lexical and grammatical material used –, this is due to the persistence of the given elements across the centuries, which is typically observable in verbal forms and concepts such as, e. g., CA *ari* ‘came’ (in *ari-na-va* ‘he came’ ~ V *ari-ne* and N *hari* ‘(he) came’ with secondary *h-*); CA *hay-zari* ‘stood up’ (in *hay-zari-na-va* ‘he started’ ~ V *ay-ne-zeri* and N *hay-zeri* ‘id.’); CA *aχay-pē* ‘opened’ (in *aχay-pē-anke-oen* ‘when he opened’ ~ VN *qay-pi* ‘(he) opened’); *cam-* ‘writing’ (in CA *cam-pē-hamayke-hē* ‘where was written’ vs. V *cam-ne-i* ‘it was written’, quasi **cam-ne-hē*, and N *cameci* ‘written’, quasi **cam-ne-acē*; *dağē-* ‘gave’ (in CA *dağē-n-oowxow* ‘(they) gave him’ vs. V *ta-ğun-di* ‘they gave’, quasi **ta-edğon-dağē*, and N *tadi*, quasi **ta-dağē*, with additional preverb *ta-* ‘thither’); possibly also *baχē* ‘found’ (in CA *baχē-n-oow* ‘he found’, vs. V *bo^gga-ne-bi*, quasi **baxa-ne-biyay*, and N *bä^ggä^g-bi*, quasi **baxa-biyay* ‘(he) found’, lit. ‘(he) made found’). ‘Reading’ is expressed by *owpesown* in Albanian, a word usually meaning simply ‘speak’ which consists of the light verb *-pesown* with a petrified preverb *ow-*;⁶³ the Udi versions use the same light verb in *kal-psun*, lit. ‘call’, with *kal-* probably representing CA *kal* ‘voice’. As to preverbs cf. also CA *baha-* ‘into’ in *baha-bāhē-na-va* ‘he entered’ ~ V *bai-* in *bai-ne-ci*, quasi **baha-ne-acē* ‘id.’, vs. N *ta-* in *ta-ci*, quasi *ta-acē* ‘(he) went thither’.

Less consistent is the preservation of nouns but we may again note CA *ği* ‘day’ with the dative form *ğiya* ‘on the day’, contrasting with V *gena* and N *gine* with secondary stem augmentation,⁶⁴ or CA *ž[~]ē*, probably standing for **žowğē*, genitive of **žowğ* ‘lord’, vs. N *qon-žuğ-*, quasi **kod’in-žowğ* ‘house-lord’,⁶⁵ and V *bixog-* ‘God’, quasi **bixa-žowğ-* ‘creating lord’. Well preserved are pronominal stems such as *z-* ‘I’ in CA *zal* ‘on me’ (superessive) and VN *bez* ‘my’ (CA *bezi*), or *ma-* ‘where’ in CA *hamay-* and V *maa-* ‘id.’; in contrast to this, the Albanian

⁶² In the Nij version of Luke, *elmux* does appear, too, but only in the meaning of ‘soul’ (Luke 12.19 and 23).

⁶³ Cf. Chapter 4 of this Handbook, 3.5.9 as to the preverbs of Albanian.

⁶⁴ Cf. Chapter 4 of this Handbook, 3.1.4 as to stem augmentation in Albanian.

⁶⁵ In the Nij version of Luke, the word is spelt with *q^ˈ* = *q̇*- throughout; other sources show the expected *k̇*- instead (Panchvidze 1974: 188; Gukasyan 1974: 144). The variation is well reflected in Mobili (2010: 176).

demonstrative pronoun *e/o*, often also used as an article, has no direct successor in Udi, which has developed a more variegated system of deictic elements comprising the stems *še-/šo-* (in the dative forms V *šoṭu*, N *šoṭo* ‘him’ and the ergative form N *šetin* ‘he’) and *me-/mo-* (probably built upon the CA adverb *eme* ‘here’).⁶⁶

3 Survey of the differences between Albanian and Udi

3.1 The sound systems

In general, the sound system of the two Udi dialects matches that of Albanian well. This includes the distinction of alveolar-palatal and postalveolar-retroflex fricatives and affricates (here transcribed *š*, *č* etc. vs. *ś*, *ć* etc.),⁶⁷ which is a peculiar trait among the East Caucasian languages. On the other hand, Udi has given up the series of palatalised dentals of CA (here transcribed *d'*, *t'*, *n'* etc.), which have merged with alveolar-palatals as in CA *ḵod* ‘house’ ~ Udi *ḵoṣ* ‘id.’, CA *xod'i* ‘shadow, shade’ ~ Udi *xoṣi/xoṣi* ‘id.’, CA *d'ed'er* ‘lip’ ~ Udi *žēžer* ‘id.’, CA *aqat'i* ‘naked’ ~ Udi *aqač'i* ‘id.’, CA *l'aq* ‘way, road’ ~ Udi *yaq* ‘id.’, CA *bil'a* ‘kill’ ~ Udi *biya* ‘die’, CA *pon'e* ‘then’ ~ Udi *poy* ‘id.’, or the conditional marker *-en'e* ~ Udi *-iyi*.⁶⁸

A notable difference between Albanian and modern Udi consists in the manifestation of pharyngealisation. Whereas in Udi pharyngealisation must be regarded as a secondary articulatory correlation of vowels (*a'*, *o'*, *i'* etc.), Albanian still seems to attest a consonantal value of this feature, with a special character denoting a discrete, most probably voiced pharyngeal consonant (here transcribed as *ʕ*); cf., e. g., CA *ʕaxi* ‘far, distant’ ~ Udi *a'xi'l* ‘id.’ (superessive?) and CA *ʕi* ‘ear’, pl. *ʕi-mowx* ~ Udi V *i(mux)*, N *u'mu'x* (plur.tant.) ‘id.’ with the pharyngeal in word-initial position, or CA *vʕan* ‘you’ (pl.) ~ Udi *va'n* ‘id.’, CA *bʕefi* ‘your’ (pl.) ~ Udi *e'fi* ‘id.’, CA *bʕeg* ‘sun’ ~ Udi *be'g* ‘id.’ or CA *pʕa* ‘two’ ~ Udi *pa'* ‘id.’ with the pharyngeal in post-consonantal position.⁶⁹

⁶⁶ Cf. Chapter 4 of this Handbook, 3.3.2.

⁶⁷ Cf. Chapter 4 of this Handbook, 2.2.2 for the consonant system of Albanian.

⁶⁸ Cf. Schulze (2015: 154–156) for details.

⁶⁹ Note that in the Udi primer of 1934, the pharyngealisation is still indicated by an individual letter (*h*) placed before the vowel as in *bheoi* ~ *bʕeg* ‘sun’ or *pha* ~ *pʕa* ‘two’ (Jeirani and Jeirani 1934: 34 / 41; cf. Table I above). In Albanian, there is a certain inconsistency in the use of the character in question; e.g., *bʕefi* ‘your’ is once written without the *ʕ* (John 8.56: A51rb, 12), and *ihâl* ‘cross’, once with initial *ʕ* (Matthew 23.34: B3va, 12). The latter term might be the basis for Udi *i've'l* ‘holy’ which has replaced CA *mowç'owr* ‘holy, pure’.

In comparison with Albanian, the vowel system of Udi has been extended by the addition of an open *ā*, a fronted *ö*, and a centred *ə* vowel, most probably under the influence of Azeri (*ə*, *ö* and *ɪ*). On the other hand, the Albanian vowel transcribed as *â* has merged with *o*, mostly with a pharyngeal co-articulation as in Udi *to'xa'n* 'fig tree' ~ CA *tāxan'in* 'id.'. ⁷⁰ Possibly, both *ā* and *ü* (spelt *üw*) were already pharyngealised (inherently) in Albanian as suggested, e.g., by CA *üwɣ* 'six' ~ Udi *u'q* 'id.' or CA *hüwqen* 'bone' ~ Udi V *u'qe'n* (vs. N *üqen*) 'id.'. ⁷¹

As the latter example shows, CA *h* was usually lost in Udi; other examples illustrating this are CA *hel* 'spirit, soul' ~ Udi *el(-mux)* 'id.' and CA *zahown-* 'teaching' ~ Udi *zom-*. ⁷² In word-initial position before *a*, *h-* seems to have been preserved in Udi N *hay-zeri* 'stood up' ~ CA *hay-zari* vs. Udi V *ay-zeri* 'id.', but this may also be secondary as in Udi N *hari* 'came' vs. CA and Udi V *ari* 'id.'. The frequent verbal form CA *hē* 'was, became', also used as an auxiliary of the imperfect tense, has yielded the imperfect suffix *-i* in Udi; in a similar way, the diphthong *-ey-* represented by *ē* in Albanian developed to Udi *-i* in other past tense forms as in *qay-pi* 'opened' ~ CA *aɣay-pē*, as well as in the possessive pronoun Udi VN *vi* ~ CA *vē*. The loss of an initial *a-* in an open syllable as in *qay-pesun* 'open' is also attested elsewhere; cf., e.g., the preverb CA *aci-* 'down, under' in *aci-pesown* 'pour down, bend down' ~ Udi *ci-psun* 'id., shatter'. The same loss even applies to initial *ha-* in CA *hamay-* 'where' ~ Udi *ma(y)-a* 'id.', CA *hašow* 'who' (< **ha-išow* 'what a man') ~ Udi *šu-a* 'id.' (vs. *išu* ~ CA *išow* 'man, husband'), and *hala* 'on, upon' ~ Udi *la-xo* / *lo-xo* 'id.' (vs. *ala* 'upward'). ⁷³

Another salient diachronic change is the syncopation of vowels in word-internal open syllables. This is typically met with in infinitive (masdar) formations such as *aci-pesown* ~ *ci-psun* 'pour down' (see above); cf., e.g., CA *owkesown* 'eat' ~ Udi *uksun* 'id.', CA *efesown* 'hold, have' ~ Udi *efsun* 'id.', or CA *karxesown* 'live, be saved' ~ Udi *karxsun* 'id.'. In some cases, this process can be seen in connection with other changes as in the case of Udi *besun* 'do, make' ~ CA *biyesown* 'id.' where *e* seems to have merged with the *i* of the first syllable; Udi *taysun* 'go' ~ CA *ta-* 'thither' + *iğesown* 'go' and Udi *-desun*, light verb forming causatives, ~ CA *dağesown* 'give' with loss of intervocalic *ğ*; or Udi *aksun* 'see' ~ CA *aķesown* 'id.' where the syncope seems to have prevented the loss of the initial *a-* by leaving a closed syllable. Consonant clusters that resulted from the syncope are often sub-

⁷⁰ Cf. Chapter 4 of this Handbook, 2.2.1 for further materials.

⁷¹ Cf. Chapter 4 of this Handbook, 2.2.1 for further materials.

⁷² The loss of intervocalic *h* is likely to have begun early as frequent misspellings such as *zaown* instead of *zahown* in the Albanian palimpsests show (Galatians 1.12: B24rb, 6).

⁷³ Probably the later form without initial *h-* is already attested in the inscription on the pedestal of Sudağilan (see Chapter 3 of this Handbook, 4.1).

ject to further changes as in Udi *bis̱un* / *bi̱sun* which corresponds to both CA *bi̱tesown* ‘sow’ and *bitesown* ‘fall’. The frequent Udi verb *baksun* ‘be, become’, which has replaced CA *i̱hesown* ‘id.’, is thus likely to represent CA *batkesown* ‘turn’.⁷⁴

3.2 The morphological systems

Within the morphological system, the most striking divergences between Albanian and modern Udi concern the appearance and distribution of deictic elements, the reduction of the inventory of nominal cases and, in the verbal domain, the reconfiguration of the present and past tenses and the positioning of personal clitics.

3.2.1 Deictic elements

Contrary to Udi, Albanian possesses a sort of gender classification that shows up in a system of definite articles, which are alien to Udi. The system comes close to the three-gender systems of other East Caucasian languages, e.g. Avaro-Andian, even though we do not deal with a typical system of noun classification here that would manifest itself in class prefixes or suffixes appearing as agreement markers for subjects or objects in verbal and adjectival forms; as a matter of fact, the typical East Caucasian class markers have only been preserved in petrified form in verbs such as, e.g., CA *bi̱yesown* ~ Udi *besun* ‘do, make’ (with *b-* representing the former marker of a non-human or pluralic object).⁷⁵ Instead, Albanian marks male, female and non-human (or, rather, non-rational) referents with a system of sexus-specific demonstrative pronouns that are also used as definite articles (*o*, *a̱g*, *e* etc.).⁷⁶ In Udi, there are no traces of this system except for *o* having been preserved in the function of a nominaliser (or referentialiser); cf., e.g., *kala-o* (> *kalō*) ‘the big one’. Obviously, Udi has undergone a stage of reducing the system to the male and/or neuter variant before dropping it except for its use as a nominalising suffix. In terms of deixis, Udi has replaced the Albanian system, which did not differentiate between degrees of distance, by a system of demonstratives

⁷⁴ Cf. German *werden* ‘become’ ~ Latin *vertere* ‘turn’ etc. The connection of CA *batkesown* with Udi *batsun* ‘sink, drown, vanish’ is less probable as the latter shows a *ḵ* in other forms (*batḵalo* ‘sinking’, *batḵio* ‘sunk’; cf. Gukasyan 1974: 71).

⁷⁵ Cf. Chapter 4 of this Handbook, 3. and Gippert (2018a: 26–27) for examples.

⁷⁶ Cf. Chapter 4 of this Handbook, 3.3.2 with Table IX for details as to the case forms.

that indicate proximity to the speaker (*me-*), the hearer (*ka-*), and distance (*te-/še-*);⁷⁷ while *me-* and *te-* can be traced back to adverbials in Albanian (*eme* ‘here’, *eṭe/eṭiš* ‘there’),⁷⁸ the origin of *ka-* and *še-* remains obscure.⁷⁹

3.2.2 The case system

To a much greater extent than Udi, Albanian has preserved the inherited East Caucasian two-storey system of case formation distinguishing between grammatical (absolutive, ergative, genitive, and three datives) and locative cases, most of which are built upon one of the datives. Of the total of 19 distinct case formations attested in the Albanian palimpsests,⁸⁰ Udi has only preserved the primary ones (absolutive, ergative, genitive, and datives I and II, but no vocative) and a few locative cases such as an ablative in *-xo* (Vartashen Udi, built upon the dative II and corresponding to the CA ablative II in *-xoc*), superessives in *-l* (~ CA superessive I in *-l*) and *-xol* (~ CA superessive III in *-xol*), and an adessive in *-č* (~ CA adessive II in *-č*); the Nij comitative in *-xun* seems as well to be built upon the dative II but its actual origin remains unclear.⁸¹

In contrast to the scope of the inventory, the functional distribution of the cases has remained by and large the same from Albanian into modern Udi. This is especially true for the marking of direct objects in either the absolutive or the dative II, depending on definiteness, with the remarkable peculiarity of *verba sentiendi* combining with both the subject (the experiencer) and the object of perception in a dative case form (with the dative I for the experiencer and the dative III for the object).

3.2.3 The tense-aspect system

Albanian knew only two basic tense-aspect categories, namely a non-past and a past (derived from an aspectual distinction between imperfective and perfective), both originally nominal (participial) formations. The non-past is marked by a stem in *-a*, whereas the past stem knows two variants, in *-a* (“weak” stem) and *-e*

⁷⁷ Cf. Schulze (1982: 129–130).

⁷⁸ Cf. Chapter 4 of this Handbook, 3.3.2.

⁷⁹ A connection of *ka-* with CA *kanay* ‘each, every, all’ is improbable because of the different semantics.

⁸⁰ Cf. Chapter 4 of this Handbook, 3.1.3 for details.

⁸¹ Cf. Schulze (2015: 161–162) with Table 3.

or \emptyset (“strong” stem), and adds a suffix $-y/-i$; cf., e. g., present *heqa-* ‘taking’ vs. past *heqa-y-* (weak) ‘having taken’, present *beḡa-* ‘looking’ vs. past **beḡe-y-* (strong, > *beḡē-*) ‘having looked’, or present *bowra-* ‘standing’ vs. past *bowr-i-* ‘stood’. The alternation of the two stems could include ablaut (cf., e.g., present *baqa-* ‘seizing’ vs. past *biqa-y-* ‘seized’, present *aha-* ‘be(com)ing’ vs. past **he-y-* > *hē-* ‘been’, and present *owka-* ‘eating’ vs. past *ka-y-* ‘eaten’), infixation (cf., e.g., present *boc-e-ka-* ‘washing’ vs. past *bocka-y-* ‘washed’ or present *i-l’e-ga-* ‘striking’ vs. past **ige-y-* > *igē-* ‘struck’), and suppletion (cf., e.g., present *iḡa-* ‘going’ vs. past **ace-y-* > *acē-* ‘gone’, present *heḡa-* ‘coming’ vs. past *ar-i-*, present *owka-* ‘speaking’ vs. past **pe-y-* > *pē-* ‘spoken’, or present *lowḡa-* ‘giving’ vs. past **daḡe-y-* > *daḡē-* ‘given’); the verb *bow-* ‘being, existing’ was defective as it had no past stem of its own. Secondary tense formations were an imperfect and a pluperfect (built with the auxiliary *-hē* ‘been’ added to the present and the past, resp.) and a future (built upon the present stem with a suffix *-l*). In addition, Albanian possessed an imperative with a stem usually matching the past stem but ending in *-a* as in *biqa-* ‘seize!’ or *beḡa-* ‘look!’; peculiar formations are, e.g., *owpa-* ‘speak!’, *iha-* ‘be!’, *owpar-* ‘kill’, and *hekal* and *owkal* ‘come!’ and ‘go!’. A fourth stem was the basis for the formation of nominal derivatives; it was characterised by an *-es*-suffix (originally a stem in *-e* with a dative ending) yielding infinitives in *-es-a* such as *biy-es-a* ‘to do, make’ and verbal nouns (masdars) in *-es-own* such as *biye-s-own* ‘doing, making’. The modal categories of an optative and a conditional as well as negation were built upon a system of clitic particles.⁸²

This system has only partly been preserved in Udi. The most salient change was the replacement of the former present by the infinitive in *-sa* as in *uksa* present (vs. CA *owkesa* infinitive) ‘eat’, which obviously represents a copular construction in the sense of ‘be at/in eating’ as indicated by its extension *-sa-i* forming imperfects as in *uksa-i*, with *-i* representing former *-hē* ‘been’. This development exactly matches that of modern East Armenian where a present in *-um* (originally a locative form) + copula has replaced the Old Armenian finite present as in *utum em / ēi* ‘I am / was (lit. at/in) eating’ replacing older *owtem* ‘I eat’. A second striking parallel to Armenian diachrony consists in the fact that the simple present of Albanian developed into a subjunctive, Udi *uka-z(u)* ‘I may eat’ matching Arm. *utem* ‘id.’ (vs. CA *owka-z(ow)* ‘I am eating’) or *uḡa-z(u)* ‘I may say’, Arm. *asem* ‘id.’ (vs. CA *owḡa-z(ow)* ‘I say’). For the latter verb, Udi exceptionally provides a present tense that is not based on the infinitive, with the stem *ex-* ‘saying, speaking’; this might reflect the CA verb *zexesown* ‘put, fix’ if the initial *z* was not preserved⁸³ and the former present stem *ze-le-xa-* lost its infix. Another present

⁸² Cf. Chapter 4 of this Handbook, 3.5 for further details.

⁸³ It is unclear whether Udi possesses the affricate *ʒ*, i.e. *dz*, at all. Gukasyan (1974: 119) notes two words with initial *ðʒ*, namely, *ðʒabʒuri* = *ʒaburi* (V, vs. *цӀаӀиӀури* = *çäp̄iri* N) ‘funnel’ and *ðʒax* =

Tab. IV: Verbal categories in Albanian and Udi contrasted.

	Albanian	Udi	
Verbal noun	<i>biqesown</i>	<i>biqsun</i>	Verbal noun
Infinitive	<i>biqesa</i>	<i>biqsa-</i> <i>biqsa-i</i> (< <i>*biqesa-hē</i>)	Present
Present	<i>biqā-</i>	<i>biqā-</i>	Imperfect
Imperfect	<i>biqā-hē</i>		Subjunctive
Future	<i>biqā-l</i>	<i>biqā-l</i>	Future
		<i>biqo</i>	Optative
Imperative	<i>biqā-</i>	<i>biqā-</i>	Imperative
Past	<i>biqay</i>	<i>biqē-</i>	Perfect
Pluperfect	<i>biqay-hē</i>	<i>biqē-i/y</i> (< <i>*biqay-hē</i>)	Pluperfect
		<i>biqī-</i> (< <i>*biqē-y?</i>)	Aorist

stem that has survived in its function is the defective verb Udi *bu* ‘being, existing’ which continues CA *bow* ‘id.’.

Further changes concerned the formation of the past tense. Obviously, the (functionless) distinction of weak and strong past stems was abandoned as such in Udi. Instead it seems to have yielded the dichotomy of two different past tenses usually named “aorist” and “perfect”, with the former being marked by an *-i*-suffix that is likely to represent both CA *-i* and *-ē* (< *-e-y*), and the latter, with a suffix *-e* that might represent CA *-ay*. So we find, e.g., Udi V *ar-i-* / N *har-i-* ~ CA *ar-i-* ‘came’ (aor.) alongside Udi *ar-e-* / *har-e-* ‘id.’ (perf.), which must be an innovation, or, on the other hand, Udi *biq-e-* (perf.) ~ CA *biq-a-y-* ‘seized’ alongside Udi *biq-i-* ‘id.’ (aor.), in its turn an innovation.⁸⁴ Remarkably, some irregular and suppletive forms have survived; note, besides Udi V = CA *ari* ‘came’ (N *hari*), Udi *pi* ‘spoken’ ~ CA *pē* < **pe-y* or Udi *käy* ‘eaten’ ~ CA *kay* ‘id.’. Probably, the irregular imperatives Udi V *eke* / N *eki* ‘come!’ and V *take* / N *taki* ‘go!’ reflect CA *hekal* and *owkal* ‘id.’, at least partially.⁸⁵ The main correspondences between the verbal categories of Albanian and Udi are summarised in Table IV using the verb *biqesown* / *biqsun* ‘seize’ as an example.

⁸³ *ax* (only V) ‘left (hand)’; both are noted with *z-* instead in Mobili (2010: 295). Cf. Schulze (1982: 83) for a discussion.

⁸⁴ Cf. Schulze (1982: 154–155) as to the difficulty of differentiating the aorist and the perfect functionally in Udi; cf. n. 87 below as to some observations.

⁸⁵ *Take* / *taki* obviously contain the preverb *ta-* ‘thither’. Cf. Schulze (2015: 165) for further discussion.

3.2.4 Clitic person marking

Udi is notorious for its system of “endoclititics”, i.e. personal markers that appear inserted into the verbal form;⁸⁶ typical examples are *bu-za-ḡsa* ‘I want’ (of *buḡsa*, present of *buḡsun* ‘want, desire’), *bi-ne-ḡe* ‘he/she/it seized’ (of *biḡe*, perfect of *biḡsun* ‘seize’), or *ta-ne-di* ‘he/she/it gave’ (of *tadi*, aorist of *tastun* ‘give’). In Albanian, this type of incorporation is not yet attested; here, the clitics always follow either the verbal form or another meaningful element. So we have *bowḡa-za* ‘I want’ (present, of *bowḡesown* ‘love, want’) and *biḡay-ne* ‘he/she/it seized’. Even combinations with preverbs cannot be split; so the equivalent of *ta-ne-di* is *ta-daḡē-ne*. However, there are several constellations where the Albanian and the Udi rules of clitic positioning match. One is the combination with monosyllabic verbal stems as in Udi *pi-ne* ‘he/she/it said’ ~ CA *pē-ne* ‘id.’⁸⁷ Another telling constellation is found in forms with the imperfect auxiliary, CA *-hē* ~ Udi *-i*, which is usually placed at the end of the verbal complex, with personal clitics preceding it; thus, a form like Udi *bu-ne-i* ‘he/she/it used to be’ is an exact match of CA *bow-ne-hē* ‘id.’, and the correspondent of Udi *uka-zu-i* ‘I might eat’ would be the imperfect **owka-zow-hē* ‘I was eating’ in Albanian. The other constellation is the one with a negator introducing the verbal complex; here, clitics usually stand in the second place as in Udi *te-ne-bu* ‘he/she/it is not’ ~ CA *te-ne-bow* ‘id.’ or in Udi *te-z-are* ‘I have not come’ ~ CA *te-z(ow)-ari* ‘id.’. It seems likely that cases like these induced a preference for the clitic to enter into a position after the first accented syllable of the verbal complex, which was then generalised. This process may have been triggered by the existence of infixated presents of the type of *ḡe-le-xa* ‘fixing’ (vs. past *ḡexa*- etc.) in Albanian.

3.3 Syntactical properties

As was noted above, the most striking syntactical difference between the Gospel versions in the two dialects of Udi consists in the regular use of finite relative clauses that are introduced by relative pronouns in the translation of the Bezhan-

⁸⁶ Cf. Harris (2002) for a detailed account of endoclititics in Udi; when the book appeared, there was no knowledge of the Albanian data available yet.

⁸⁷ With 867 attestations in the Gospels of 1902, the aorist *pi-ne* reveals itself as the most probable successor of CA *pē-n(e)* which has been secured about 110 times in the palimpsests; in contrast to this, the Udi perfect *pe-ne* occurs only 26 times, usually when prophets are cited (e.g., Isaiah in John 1.23). The same picture is provided by the Nij version of the Gospel of Luke, where 210 attestations of *pi-ne* contrast with only one of *pe-ne* (Luke 20.42–43, citing king David).

ov brothers and by participial constructions of a “Turkic” type in the new translations from Nij. In this respect, there is a noteworthy agreement between Vartashen Udi and Albanian, which displays the same strategy regularly in the biblical texts that have been preserved in the palimpsests. However, there is a difference in the linguistic material used: in both Albanian and Vartashen Udi, the relative pronouns consist of interrogative pronouns that are combined with a general subordinator (or complementiser), but the actual subordinators differ: in Albanian, it is *-ke-* as in *-hamay-ke-* ‘where’ in Luke 4.16, obviously a loan element from Middle Iranian (cf. Middle Persian *kē*, Parthian *kē* ‘who, which’),⁸⁸ whereas in Vartashen Udi, we find *-te* as in *maa-te* ‘where’, in its turn probably a borrowing of Armenian *(e)t’e* ‘id.’.⁸⁹

4 Outlook: the genetic affiliation of Albanian and Udi

As we have seen, many divergences between Caucasian Albanian and the modern Udi language can easily be explained as diachronic changes that were induced either by system-internal factors or by the influence of neighbouring languages, and Albanian may thus well be regarded as an ancestor of Udi.⁹⁰ This implies that for the question of their affiliation with other East Caucasian languages, Albanian must be taken as the starting point. However, with the abandonment of class agreement, the introduction of a system of person markers, the abundant use of clause subordination including relative clauses, and many other features, Albanian had already moved away considerably from what can be assumed to have been the common linguistic basis of the Lezgian subgroup of East Caucasian before the translations of biblical texts that we find in the palimpsests were accomplished.

⁸⁸ The frequent particle *ki* of Nij Udi meaning ‘that’ (complementiser), ‘as’ or ‘like’ is probably a secondary borrowing from Azeri *ki* ‘id.’, in its turn a loan from New Persian.

⁸⁹ Cf. Gippert (2011b) for details as to the relative clauses in Vartashen Udi.

⁹⁰ If the pronouns of the 1st person plural in Albanian (*žan*) and Udi (*yan*) reflect an older differentiation of exclusive and inclusive ‘we’ as recently proposed by G. Authier (2021: 217), this would speak in favour of an early dialectal split; however, there are not many other indications of such a split.

References

- Ağacani, Racik, Richard Danakari, Robert Mobili & Naida Rzaeva. 2011. *Luk'an exlatbi Mûq Xavar*. [The Gospel authored by Luke]. Baku: Ləman nəşriyyat poligrafiya.
- Authier, Gilles. 2021. Clusivity and the history of personal pronouns in East Caucasian. *Folia Linguistica Historica* 42/1. 205–222. <https://doi.org/10.1515/flin-2021-2019>.
- Beridze, Teimuraz, Ioseb Archvadze & Omar Shurghaia (eds.). 2003. თეიმურაზ ბერიძე, იოსებ არჩვაძე & ომარ შურგაია (სარედაქციო კოლეგია). საქართველოს მოსახლეობის 2002 წლის პირველი ეროვნული საყოველთაო აღწერის ძირითადი შედეგები. II. საქართველოს სოფლების მოსახლეობა. [Main results of the first national census of the population of Georgia in 2002. II. Population of Georgian villages]. Tbilisi: State Department of Statistics of Georgia. <http://census.ge/files/2002/geo/II%20tomi%20.pdf>.
- Bezhanov, Mikhail. 1888. Рустам (удинская сказка). Сообщилъ завѣдующій Варташенскимъ двухкласснымъ училищемъ, Михаилъ Бежановъ. [Rustam. (An Udi Tale). Communicated by the head of the two-class school of Vartashen, Mikhail Bezhanov]. *Сборникъ матеріаловъ для описанія мѣстностей и племень Кавказа* [Collection of materials for the description of the localities and tribes of the Caucasus] 6. Приложение [Supplement] 7–28. https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:CMOMPK_1888_06.pdf; https://rusneb.ru/local/tools/exalead/getFiles.php?book_id=001908_000036_457B8F29-662E-4BF6-86E3-EF3BF2B369B7.
- Bezhanov, Semyon & Mikhail. 1902. Семень & Михаилъ Бежановъ. Господа нашего Иисуса Христа Святое Евангеліе отъ Матѳея, Марка, Луки и Іоанна на русскомъ и удинскомъ языкахъ. [The Holy Gospels of Our Lord Jesus Christ by Matthew, Mark, Luke and John in the Russian and Udi Languages]. Tiflis: Caucasian Educational District. = *Сборникъ матеріаловъ для описанія мѣстностей и племень Кавказа* [Collection of materials for the description of the localities and tribes of the Caucasus] 30. <https://books.google.de/books?id=2S5sBgAAQBAJ>; https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:CMOMPK_1902_30.pdf.
- Dirr, Adolf. 1904. *Грамматика удинскаго языка*. [Grammar of the Udi language]. Tiflis: Caucasian Educational District. = *Сборникъ матеріаловъ для описанія мѣстностей и племень Кавказа* [Collection of materials for the description of the localities and tribes of the Caucasus] 33/IV. https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:CMOMPK_1904_33.pdf.
- Dirr, Adolf. 1928. Udische Texte. *Caucasica. Zeitschrift für die Erforschung der Sprachen und Kulturen des Kaukasus* 5. 60–72.
- Eichwald, Eduard. 1834–1837. *Reise auf dem Caspischen Meere und in den Caucasus, unternommen in den Jahren 1825–1826*. I/1: *Periplus des Caspischen Meeres*. 2: *Reise in den Caucasus*. Stuttgart/Tübingen: Cotta. <https://books.google.de/books?id=nttfAAAAcAAJ>; <https://books.google.de/books?id=1TsEAAAAyAAJ>; <https://www.digitale-sammlungen.de/de/view/bsb10430657>.
- Eichwald, Eduard. 1838a. Путешествіе профессора Эйхвальда къ каспійскому морю и по кавказскому краю. [Voyage of professor Eichwald to the Caspian Sea and through the Caucasian region]. *Библиотека для чтенія* [Library for reading] 26. 127–212. <https://dspace.nplg.gov.ge/handle/1234/266507>; https://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/7/7a/Библиотека_для_чтения_1838_том_26.pdf.
- Eichwald, Eduard. 1838b. *Alte Geographie des Caspischen Meeres, des Kaukasus und des südlichen Russlands. Nach Griechischen, Römischen und anderen Quellen erläutert*. Berlin: Morin. <https://opacplus.bsb-muenchen.de/Vta2/bsb10430926/bsb:BV001572421>.
- Erckert, Roderich von. 1895. *Die Sprachen des Kaukasischen Stammes*. Wien: Hölder. <https://books.google.de/books?id=20g6QAAMAAJ>.
- Gippert, Jost. 2011b. Relative Clauses in Vartashen Udi. Preliminary Remarks. *Iran and the Caucasus* 15. 207–230. <https://www.academia.edu/20005654>.

- Gippert, Jost. 2018a. When person overcomes class. The case of Caucasian Albanian. *International Journal of Diachronic Linguistics and Linguistic Reconstruction* 15. 25–43. <https://www.academia.edu/37069670>.
- Gippert, Jost. 2018b. Sound systems in diachrony: Sibilants and affricates in Udi. In Klaus Beyer, Gertrud Boden, Bernhard Köhler & Ulrike Zoch (eds.), *Linguistics across Africa. Festschrift for Rainer Vossen*, 113–132. Köln: Rüdiger Köppe Verlag. <https://www.academia.edu/40687120>.
- Gukasyan, Voroshil. 1974. Ворошил Гукасян. *Удинчә-азәрбајҹанча-русча лүғәт* / Ворошил Гукасян. *Удинско-азербайджанско-русский словарь*. [Udi-Azeri-Russian Dictionary]. Baku: Elm. https://mobili.az/pdf/Udince-azerbaycanca-rusca_luget-G-Voroshil.pdf.
- Harris, Alice C. 2002. *Endoclititics and the Origins of Udi Morphosyntax*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <https://books.google.de/books?id=i3zjnQEACAAJ>.
- Hovhannisyan, Ashot (ed.). 1967. *Հայ-ռուսական հարաբերությունները XVIII դարի առաջին երեսնամյակում. Փաստաթղթերի ժողովածու. II/2. Խմբագրությամբ Աշոտ Հովհաննիսյանի / Армяно-русские отношения в первой трети XVIII века. Сборник документов. 2/2. Под редакцией Ашота Иоаннисяна. [Armenian-Russian Relations in the First Third of the 18th Century. Collection of documents. 2/2]. Yerevan: Academy of Sciences. http://serials.flib.sci.am/openreader/nyut_hay_jogh_patm_13/book/Binder1.pdf.*
- Hübschmann, Heinrich. 1895. *Armenische Grammatik*. I. Theil. *Armenische Etymologie*. I. Abtheilung: *Die persischen und arabischen Lehnwörter im Altarmenischen*. Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel. <https://archive.org/details/ArmenischeGrammatik>.
- Jeirani, Theodore & Mikhak Jeirani. 1934. Çejrani Təder, Çejrani Mixaki kəməgen. *Samçi das*. [First Lesson]. Sukhumi: Abgiz. <https://titus.uni-frankfurt.de/texte/etcs/cauc/udi/sd/sd.htm>.
- Jeiranishvili, Egnate. 1971. ეგნატე ჯეირანიშვილი. *უდიური ენა*. [The Udi language]. Tbilisi: Tbilisi State University. <https://dspace.nplg.gov.ge/handle/1234/341861>.
- Karapetyan, Samvel. 1988. Самвел Карапетян. Памятники средневековой архитектуры в гаварах Шаки и Капалак Собственно Албании [Medieval Architectural Monuments in the Districts of Shaki and Kapalak of Albania Proper]. *Кавказ и Византия / Чыңлыш и Ғылым* [Caucasus and Byzantium] 6. 223–252. <https://disk.yandex.ru/d/SZnXJQamvTUKd>.
- Karapetyan, Samvel. 1997. Սամվել Կարապետյան. *Բուն Աղվանքի հայերեն վիմագրերը* / Самвел Карапетян. *Армянские лапидарные надписи собственно-Алуанка / Armenian Lapidary Inscriptions of Voan-Aghvank*. I. Yerevan: Science. <https://raa-am.org/բուն-աղվանքի-հայերեն-վիմագրերը>.
- Karbelashvili, D. P. 1935. Д. П. Карбелашвили. К фонетике удинского языка [On the Phonetics of the Udi Language]. *Язык и мышление [Language and Thought]* 3–4. 259–276.
- Klaproth, Julius von. 1814. *Beschreibung der russischen Provinzen zwischen dem Kaspischen und schwarzen Meere*. Berlin: Maurer. <https://www.digitale-sammlungen.de/de/view/bsb10782876>.
- Lolua, Roman. 2010. რომან ლოლუა. *უდიური ენა (გრამატიკული ანალიზი, ტექსტები, ლექსიკონი)*. [The Udi language (grammatical analysis, texts, lexicon)]. Tbilisi: Arnold Chikobava Institute of Linguistics. http://www.ice.ge/new/pages/samples/books/cavcas/6_r_lolua_udiuri_ena.pdf.
- Maisak, Timur. 2021. Numeral classifiers in Udi: a unique contact-induced development among Nakh-Daghestanian? *Journal of Language Contact* 14. 331–368. <https://www.academia.edu/73941965>.
- Maisak, Timus. 2023. The Udi language: its history and modern development / Udi dili: tarihi ve modern gelişimi. *Journal of Endangered Languages* 22/13 [Special Issue: *Linguistic Diversity in Azerbaijan. Present State and Future Challenges*, ed. by Jala Garibova & Elisabetta Ragagnin]. 55–72.
- Məhyəddinqızı, Şəlalə. 2009. *Qəbələ qafqazın incisi*. [Qabala, the Pearl of the Caucasus]. Baku: Oğuz Eli. <https://www.ebooks.az/view/ZUreajL9.pdf>.

- Mobili, Robert. 2010. *Udi-azerbaycanin-urusin ayitluğ / Udiç-azərbaycanca-rusca lüğət / Удинско-азербайджанско-русский словарь*. [Udi-Azeri-Russian Dictionary]. Baku: Qrifli nəşr. <https://www.ebooks.az/view/V1bfRCch.pdf>.
- Nikol'skiy, Yakov Sergeevich (Isidor). 1853. [Исидор, экзарх Грузии]. *Словарь общепонятельных терминов кавказских удиновъ съ переводомъ на русский языкъ*. [Dictionary of the most common terms of the Caucasian Udis with a translation into Russian]. Saint Petersburg (non vidimus).
- Panchvidze, Vladimer. 1974. *კვლადმერ ფანჯიძე. უღუური ენის გრამატიკული ანალიზი*. [Grammatical analysis of the Udi language]. Tbilisi: Metsniereba.
- Qafarlı, Əfqan. 2012. Dağlar arxasında üç xalq: Nic kəndinin dinc sakinləri. *Modern.az*. 17. 02. 2012, 23:41. <https://web.archive.org/web/20120220002634/http://modern.az/articles/21274/1/>.
- Rut' – Iona. 2009. *Rut' – Iona*. Samci šam. Orijinalaxun me girk Udi muzane tarayeše. [Ruth – Jonah. First edition. This book was translated from the original into the Udi language]. Chambersburg, PA: Words of Truth.
- S[ankovskiy], A[nndrey Stepanovich]. 1853. A[ндрей] С[анковский]. Обь удилахъ обитающихъ въ Нухинскомъ уездѣ Шемахинской губерніи. [On the Udis living in the Nukha district of the province of Shemakha]. *Кавказъ [Caucasus]* 1853/61. 265–266. <https://dspace.nplg.gov.ge/handle/1234/215469>.
- Schiefner, Anton. 1854. Etwas über die Udiner, ein Volk des Caucasus. (*Erman's Archiv für wissenschaftliche Kunde von Russland* 13. 649–652. https://gdz.sub.uni-goettingen.de/id/PPN332924793_0013).
- Schiefner, Anton. 1863. *Versuch über die Sprache der Uden* (Mémoires de l'Académie Impériale des Sciences de St.-Petersbourg, VII^e série VI/8). St Petersburg: Academy of Sciences. <https://www.digitale-sammlungen.de/de/view/bsb10522445>.
- Schulze, Ilona & Wolfgang Schulze. 2016. *A Handbook of the Minorities of Armenia. A Sociocultural and Sociolinguistic Survey*. Hamburg: Dr. Kovač.
- Schulze, Wolfgang. 1982. *Die Sprache der Uden in Nord-Azerbajdžan*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Schulze, Wolfgang. 2005b. Towards a History of Udi. *International Journal of Diachronic Linguistics* 1. 55–91.
- Schulze, Wolfgang. 2011b. A brief note on Udi-Armenian relations. In Jasmine Dum-Tragut & Uwe Bläsing (eds.), *Cultural, Linguistic and Ethnological Interrelations in and around Armenia*, 151–170. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing. <https://books.google.de/books?id=EbbkDwAAQBAJ>.
- Schulze, Wolfgang. 2015. From Caucasian Albanian to Udi. *Iran and the Caucasus* 19. 149–177. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/43899193>.
- Shopen, Ivan. 1866. Иванъ Шопень. *Новыя замѣтки на древнія исторіи Кавказа и его обитателей*. [New remarks on the ancient history of the Caucasus and its inhabitants]. St Petersburg: Tiblen. <https://books.google.de/books?id=8th7rInK5gkC>.
- Sjögren, Anders Johan. 1836. Extrait d'une lettre adressée à M. Fraehn par M. Sjoegren de Piatigorsk le 27 avril (lu le 27 mai 1836). (Conclusion). *Bulletin scientifique publié par l'Académie Impériale des Sciences de Saint-Petersbourg* 1. 118–119. <https://books.google.de/books?id=7oE-AAAAcAAJ>.
- Starchevskiy, Albert Vikent'evich. 1891. A[льберт] В[икентьевич] Старчевскій. *Кавказскій толмачъ. Переводчикъ съ русскаго на главнѣйшіе кавказскіе языки*. [Caucasian translator. Interpreter from Russian into the main Caucasian languages]. St Petersburg: Skorokhodov. https://rusneb.ru/local/tools/exalead/getFiles.php?book_id=004191_000025_4731C23C-2116-458D-8E12-903BA3AC003B&name=Кавказский_толмач&doc_type=pdf

- Wehr, Hans. 1985. *Arabisches Wörterbuch für die Schriftsprache der Gegenwart*. 5th edn. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. <https://archive.org/details/26387126HansWehrArabischesWorterbuchTextArabic>.
- Yanovskiy, Aleksandr Grigor'evich. 1846. А[лександръ Григорьевич] Яновскій. О древней Кавказской Албаніи. [On the ancient Caucasian Albania]. *Журналъ Министерства Народнаго Просвѣщенія* [Journal of the Ministry of National Education] 52/2. 97–136 & 161–203. <https://books.google.ru/books?id=BRAFAAAAAYAAJ>.
- Yanovskiy, Aleksandr Grigor'evich. 1853. А[лександръ] Г[ригорьевич] Яновскій. [Сообщѣніе о существованіи въ Нухинскомъ уѣздѣ Шемахинской губерніи остатка... народа Уди, или Ути]. [Report on the existence in the Nukha district of the Shemakhy province of a remnant... of the Udi or Uti people]. *Вѣстникъ Императорскаго Русскаго Географическаго Общества* [Bulletin of the Imperial Russian Geographical Society] 7/1. IX: 25–26; 7/2. I: 80–81; 8. IX: 5–6. <https://books.google.de/books?id=mkk9AQAAAAJ>.