Annotated Swadesh wordlists for the Lezgian group (North Caucasian family).

Languages included: Nidzh Udi [lez-udn], Vartashen Udi [lez-udv], Archi [lez-aqc], Kryts (proper) [lez-krp], Alyk Kryts [lez-kra], Budukh [lez-bdk], Mishlesh Tsakhur [lez-tkx], Mikik Tsakhur [lez-ty], Gelmets Tsakhur [lez-tkz], Mukhad Rutul [rut-rum], Ixrek Rutul [rut-ru], Luchek Rutul [rut-ru], Koshan Aghul [lez-agk], Keren Aghul [lez-age], Gequn Aghul [lez-agg], Fite Aghul [lez-agf], Aghul (proper) [lez-agp], Northern Tabasaran [lez-tan], Southern Tabasaran [lez-tas], Gyune Lezgi [lez-lzg].

Reconstruction: Proto-Lezgian reconstruction available.

DATA SOURCES

General.


Caucasian languages. Supplemented by short sketches of the verb systems in individual languages.


Koryakov 2006 = Ю. Б. Коряков. Атлас кавказских языков. С приложением полного реестра языков. Москва, 2006. // Detailed color maps of the modern areas of North East Caucasian, North West Caucasian and Kartvelian (South Caucasian) languages with excourses in history.

LEDb = S. A. Starostin. Lezgian Etymological Database. // Computerized version of the Proto-Lezgian corpus, available at http://starling.rinet.ru/cgi-bin/main.cgi?flags=eygtnnl. Includes some Proto-Lezgian etymologies (mostly basic lexicon items) that have not been included in [NCED] due to their lack of external cognates in other branches of North Caucasian.


I. Udi (Nidzh; Vartashen).

Main sources

Dirr 1903 = A. М. Дирр. Грамматика удинского языка. Тифлис, 1903 (= Сборник материалов для описания местностей и племен Кавказа, вып. 33). // A grammar of the Vartashen dialect of Udi.


Gukasyan 1974 = В. Гукасян. Удинско-азербайджанско-русский словарь. Баку, 1974. // The main (and, along with [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990], the most reliable) lexicographic source of Udi, supplemented by a grammar sketch. Covers both Nidzh (Cyrillic siglum Н) and Vartashen (Cyrillic siglum В) dialects. NB: We presume that if a form is quoted by Gukasyan without siglum, it is attested in both dialects.

Mobili 2010 = Р. Мобили. Удинско-азербайджанско-русский словарь. Баку, 2010. // A new Udi dictionary based on [Gukasyan 1974], but with a number of new entries and/or phonetical variants of dialectal nature (exclusive Vartashen forms are marked by asterisk *, but common Nidzh-Vartashen forms and exclusive Nidzh ones are unmarked).


Additional sources


Dabakov 2008 = В. В. Дабаков. Лексика ниджского диалекта удинского языка (дополнения к словарю В. Гукасяна). In: Удинский сборник: Грамматика, лексика,


II. Archi.

Southern Daghestan, Caucasus, http://www.smg.surrey.ac.uk/archi/linguists/ [Accessed on November 2011]. // Archi-Russian-English dictionary based on [Kibrik et al. 1977b], thoroughly checked and supplemented with sound files. A number of new entries is added, but, on the contrary, some lexicographic information as well as some entries (e.g., personal pronouns), quoted in [Kibrik et al. 1977b], have been omitted. It is not recommended to use the English definitions proposed in the dictionary when attempting to establish the exact meaning of an Archi word; Russian definitions must be referred to for this purpose.


Dirr 1908 = А. М. Диrr. Арчинский язык. Тифлис, 1908 (= Сборник материалов для описания местностей и племен Кавказа, вып. 39) // A grammar of the Archi language, supplemented by texts and a glossary.


III. Kryts (proper; Alyk).


IV. Budukh.


V. Tsakhur (Mishlesh; Mikik; Gelmets).

Main sources

Dirr 1913 = А. М. Дирр. Цахурский язык. [A. M. Dirr. The Tsakhur Language]. Тифлис, 1913 (= Сборник материалов для описания местностей и племен Кавказа, вып. 43). // A grammar of the Mikik dialect of the Tsakhur language, supplemented by texts and a glossary.

with excourses into the Mukhakh-Sabunchi and Suvagil dialects) and the Gelmets dialect (Gelmets group) of Tsakhur.


Kibrik et al. 1999 = А. Е. Кибрик, Я. Г. Тестелец (ред.). Элементы цахурского языка в типологическом освещении. [А. Ю. Кибрик, Я. Г. Тестелетс (eds.). Elements of Tsakhur from a typological point of view.] Москва, 1999. // A theoretical grammar of the Mishlesh dialect (Tsakh group) of Tsakhur, supplemented by texts and a glossary.

Additional sources


VI. Rutul (Mukhad; Ixrek; Luchek).


Dirr 1912 = А. М. Дирр. Рутульский язык. Тифлис, 1912 (= Сборник материалов для описания местностей и племен Кавказа, вып. 42). // A grammar of the Mukhad dialect of Rutul, supplemented by texts and a glossary (the latter also includes some forms from the Shinaz dialect under the siglum "Ш.").

dialect. Supplemented by a Russian-Rutul word-index and a grammar sketch.


VII. Aghul (proper; Koshan; Keren; Gequn; Fite).

Dirr 1907 = А. М. Дирр. Агульский язык. Тифлис, 1907 (= Сборник материалов для описания местностей и племен Кавказа, вып. 37). // A grammar of the Gequn (Burkikhan) dialect of the Aghul language, supplemented by texts and a glossary.

Magometov 1970 = А. А. Магометов. Агульский язык: Исследования и тексты. Тбилиси, 1970. // A grammar of the main Aghul dialects, supplemented by texts (unfortunately, in many cases the dialectal origin of the discussed forms is not specified by the author; it seems that normally these unmarked forms are proper Aghul).

Shaumyan 1941 = Р. М. Шаумян. Грамматический очерк агульского языка с текстами и словарем. Москва/Ленинград, 1941. // A grammar sketch of the main Aghul dialects (mostly based on the Koshan dialect), supplemented by texts and a glossary. The following sigla are used in Shaumyan’s dictionary: "дул.", "тп.", "цир." = proper Aghul dialect (sub-dialects of the villages Duldug, Tpig, Tsirkhe respectively); "арс.", "бур.", "худ." = Koshan dialect (sub-dialects of the villages Arsug, Burshag, Khudig respectively); "гекх." = Gequn (Burkikhan) dialect; "фит." = Fite (Fit’e) dialect; "ус." = Keren dialect (sub-dialects of the village Usug).


Suleymanov 2003 = Н. Д. Сулейманов. Агульско-русский (диалектологический) словарь.
Махачкала, 2003. // An Aghul-Russian dictionary of ca. 5000 entries, containing data on the Tpig sub-dialect of the proper Aghul dialect (the siglum “т.”) and the Arsug, Burshag, Khudig sub-dialects of the Koshan dialect (the generic siglum “к.”); entries without a siglum are common Tpig-Koshan; illustrative examples are normally from Tpig.


VIII. Tabasaran (Northern, Southern).

Main sources


Dirr 1905 = А. М. Дирр. Грамматический очерк табасаранского языка. Тифлис, 1905 (= Сборник материалов для описания местностей и племен Кавказа, вып. 35). // A grammar of the Tabasaran language, based on the sub-dialect of the village Khanag (Northern dialect), supplemented by texts and a glossary. It must be noted that in Dirr’s glossary some words are phonetically not Khanag, but rather originate from Southern Tabasaran.

Genko 2005 = А. Н. Генко. Табасаранско-русский словарь. Москва, 2005. // A Tabasaran-Russian dialectological dictionary, collected and prepared for publication by the author in the 1930s, but edited (by M. E. Alekseev) only in 2005. Supplemented by a dialectological sketch and several texts. The dictionary is based on the Khiv sub-dialect (Southern Tabasaran), although the Khyuryuk (Northern Tabasaran) forms are also systematically quoted, and a lot of specific forms and variants from other sub-dialects of both Southern and Northern Tabasaran are additionally provided. Khiv forms are quoted without special marks; for тайш other sub-dialects the following sigla are used: Northern dialect: “Арк.” (Arkit), “Д.” (Dyubek), “К.” (Kumi), “Там.” (Tatil),
"Урс." (Ursyug), "Х." (Khyuryuk), "Хан." (Khapil), "Чув." (Chuvek). Southern dialect: "А.Я." (Ashaga Yarak), "Дж." (Dzhikhtig), "З." (Zildik), "Кан." (Kondik), "М." (Mezhgyul), "Н." (Nitrik), "С." (Sirtych), "Т." (Tinit), "Тр./Труф." (Truf), "Тур." (Turag), "Хор." (Khoredzh), "Ч." (Chara), "Чул." (Chulat), "Э." (Eteg), "Ю.Я." (Yukhary Yarak). The initial plus sign (+) denotes that the form is attested both in Khiv and in the undermentioned sub-dialect. It must be noted that dialectal specifications are not always accurate: in a substantial number of cases the specific siglum can be omitted (i.e. the form is formally marked as Khiv) or the plus sign can be omitted or, on the contrary, erroneously typed in.


Magometov 1965 = А. А. Магометов. Табасаранский язык. Исследование и тексты. Тбилиси, 1965. // A grammar of Tabasaran, covering both northern and southern dialects. The volume is supplemented by several texts.

Uslar 1979 = П. К. Услар. Табасаранский язык. С введением и комментариями А. А. Магометова. Тбилиси, 1979. // A grammar of the Tabasaran language, mostly based on the sub-dialect of the village Khanag (Northern dialect), supplemented by texts and a glossary. The manuscript was prepared in the 1870s, but only published one hundred years later.


Additional sources

Kodzasov & Muravyeva 1982 = С. В. Кодzasов, И. А. Муравьева. Фонетика
IX. Lezgi (Gyune).

Main sources


Uslar 1896 = П. К. Услар. Кюринский язык. Тифлис, 1896. // A grammar of the Gyune dialect (Kyuri group) of the Lezgi language, supplemented by texts, a glossary and an excourse on the Akhty dialect (Samur group). The volume describes the sub-dialect of the village Mamrach/Mamrash, sometimes treated as transitional between Gyune and Yarki dialects. The manuscript is based on Uslar’s fieldwork in the 1860s.

Additional sources

Babaliyeva 2007 = A. Babaliyeva. Présentation du dialecte lezgi de Yargun (Azerbaïdjan) : grammaire, textes glosés et traduits. Mémoire principal de Master II. Ecole Pratique des Hautes Etudes, 2007. // A short sketch of the Yargun dialect (Quba group) of the Lezgi language. We refer to the pagination of the available MS Word file, which can differ from the printed version.


Ganenkov 2011 = Д. С. Ганенков. Корпус лезгинского литературного языка. // Corpus of Literary Lezgian language, based on texts of the 2nd half of the 20th - early 21st centuries. Includes ca. 800 000 wordforms. Available at: http://web-corpora.net/LezgianCorpus/search/


NOTES

I. Udi (Nidzh; Vartashen).


Two dialects of the Udi language - Nidzh and Vartashen - are closely related, but it is reasonable to treat them apart when applying lexicostatistics. The main lexicographic sources are [Gukasyan 1974] (both dialect) and [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990] (Nidzh nouns).

In the field Common Udi, the term "Proto-Udi" is sometimes used. This refers to the language that yielded the modern Nidzh and Vartashen dialects. Proto-Udi is opposed to "Proto-Caucasian Albanian-Udi" - an ancestor of the language of the Caucasian Albanian palimpsests, on the one hand, and of Proto-Udi, on the other.

I.2. Transliteration.

The following transliterational chart covers our principal sources (for all the other alphabets ever used for Udi see [Maisak 2008c: 456 ff.])

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[Gukasyan 1974], [Comrie &amp; Khalilov 2010]</th>
<th>[Kibrik &amp; Kodzasov 1990]</th>
<th>[NCED]</th>
<th>[Schulze-Fürhoff 1994]</th>
<th>[Schulze 2001], [Schulze 2005]</th>
<th>[Harris 2002]</th>
<th>[Mobili 2010]</th>
<th>GLD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Π</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ட</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>π1, π1</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p’</td>
<td>p’</td>
<td>p’</td>
<td>p’</td>
<td>p’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φ</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>υ</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>v, w</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v, w</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τ</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>η</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>т1, тI</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t'</td>
<td>t'</td>
<td>t'</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ц</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>дз</td>
<td>ʒ</td>
<td>ʒ</td>
<td>ʒ</td>
<td>ʒ</td>
<td>ʒ</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>ʒ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>цI, цI</td>
<td>č</td>
<td>č</td>
<td>č</td>
<td>č</td>
<td>č</td>
<td>s'</td>
<td>č</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>с</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>з</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ц</td>
<td>č</td>
<td>č</td>
<td>č</td>
<td>č</td>
<td>č</td>
<td>č</td>
<td>č</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ч</td>
<td>č</td>
<td>č</td>
<td>č</td>
<td>č</td>
<td>č</td>
<td>č</td>
<td>č</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>дж</td>
<td>ʒ</td>
<td>ʒ</td>
<td>ʒ</td>
<td>ʒ</td>
<td>ʒ</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>ʒ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>чI, чI</td>
<td>Ć</td>
<td>Ć</td>
<td>Ć</td>
<td>Ć</td>
<td>Ć</td>
<td>Ć</td>
<td>Ć</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ш</td>
<td>š</td>
<td>š</td>
<td>š</td>
<td>š</td>
<td>š</td>
<td>š</td>
<td>š</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ж</td>
<td>ž</td>
<td>ž</td>
<td>ž</td>
<td>ž</td>
<td>ž</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>ž</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>чъ</td>
<td>ĆI</td>
<td>ĆI</td>
<td>Ć</td>
<td>Ć</td>
<td>Ć:</td>
<td>Ć</td>
<td>Ć</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>джI, джI</td>
<td>ʒI</td>
<td>ʒI</td>
<td>ʒ</td>
<td>ʒ</td>
<td>ʒ:</td>
<td>Ć</td>
<td>ʒ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>цI</td>
<td>ĆI</td>
<td>Ć:</td>
<td>Ć</td>
<td>Ć</td>
<td>Ć:</td>
<td>Ć</td>
<td>Ć</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>шI, шI</td>
<td>šI</td>
<td>šI</td>
<td>š</td>
<td>š</td>
<td>š:</td>
<td>š</td>
<td>š</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>жI, жI</td>
<td>žI</td>
<td>žI</td>
<td>ž</td>
<td>ž</td>
<td>ž:</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>ž</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>к</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>г</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>кI, kI</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>к</td>
<td>g, gy</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Gukasyan 1974], [Comrie &amp; Khalilov 2010]</td>
<td>[Kibrik &amp; Kodzasov 1990]</td>
<td>[NCED]</td>
<td>[Schulze-Fürhoff 1994]</td>
<td>[Schulze 2001], [Schulze 2005]</td>
<td>[Harris 2002]</td>
<td>[Mobili 2010]</td>
<td>GLD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>хъ</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>къ</td>
<td>ӷ</td>
<td>ӷ</td>
<td>ӷ</td>
<td>ӷ</td>
<td>ӷ</td>
<td>ӷ</td>
<td>q:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>х</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>ӵ</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>гъ</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>ӹ</td>
<td>ӹ</td>
<td>ӹ</td>
<td>ӹ</td>
<td>ӹ</td>
<td>ӹ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>гъ</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>м</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>н</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>р</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>л</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>й</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>j</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>и</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>е</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>а</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>аь</td>
<td>å</td>
<td>å</td>
<td>å</td>
<td>å</td>
<td>å</td>
<td>å</td>
<td>å</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ы</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>Ь</td>
<td>ө</td>
<td>ө</td>
<td>ө</td>
<td>ө</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>о</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>оь</td>
<td>ô</td>
<td>ô</td>
<td>ô</td>
<td>ô</td>
<td>ô</td>
<td>ô</td>
<td>ô</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>у</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>уь</td>
<td>ü</td>
<td>ü</td>
<td>ü</td>
<td>ü</td>
<td>ü</td>
<td>ü</td>
<td>ü</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vь</td>
<td>VI, qI, śI</td>
<td>VI, qI, śI</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Our phonetic interpretation of the Nidzh dialect is based on [Kibrik &amp; Kodzasov 1990: 347].</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. According to Kodzasov’s report [Kibrik &amp; Kodzasov 1990: 347], the three-way</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
opposition of stops and affricates in Nidzh is as follows: \( t^h ~ d ~ t, c^h ~ z ~ c \) and so on. As noted by Kodzasov, the third series is pronounced with oral and glottal tenseness, but without gemination. We are not aware of any detailed phonetic description of the Modern Vartashen dialect, but according to Dm. Ganenkov (p.c.), the Vartashen three-way opposition of stops and affricates is very similar to the Nidzh one. This is supported by Gukasyan's description of Udi phonetics. In [Gukasyan 1974: 255] and other works of this author, the third series in Udi is called "preruptive", scil. fortis, without any difference between dialects. In order to avoid rare diacritics, we prefer to follow the [NCED] and UdiLang systems and transcribe the third marked series of obstruents with the sign :. For the same reason, according to common practice, we omit the non-phonological aspiration for the first series. Thus, in our notation the three-way opposition of Nidzh & Vartashen stops and affricates looks as follows: \( t ~ d ~ t : , c ~ z ~ c : \) and so on.

3. It must be noted that in a number of publications by Kartvelologists or Kartvelology-oriented authors (e.g., [Ǯeiranišvili 1971], [Fähnrich 1999], [Harris 2002]) the Udi system of stops and affricates is noted as \( t(\text{hsuper}) ~ d ~ t', c(\text{hsuper}) ~ ʒ ~ c' \) and so on. Such a notation with the third series marked as ejective is a convenient adaptation of the Georgian alphabet, on one hand, and hints at the main etymological origin of the Udi tense obstruents, on the other.

4. The difference between Gukasyan's frequent \{ц1\} and very rare \{ц´\} is unclear. We treat both as \cː\ {ц1} (according to Ganenkov's p.c., modern speakers do not perceive the difference between \{ц1\} and \{ц´\}).

5. Pharyngealization (a prosodic feature, which is anchored on vowels or, if present, on post-alveolar ĉ ǯ ĉː ść ść and/or uvular q qː ӵ ӵ obstruents in a phonetic word) can probably be noted as*(velopharyngeal friction), but we prefer to use the more common notation *. If there are no post-alveolar or uvular obstruents in a phonetic word, pharyngealization is transcribed for the first vowel. Otherwise, pharyngealization is noted after the first post-alveolar or uvular obstruent. Normally we do not discriminate between a ~ ă, o ~ ő, u ~ ū in pharyngealized words and transcribe these vowels as a, o, u.

6. Vowel length, noted in [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990], normally occurs in recently
contracted forms or loanwords.

Ia. Caucasian Albanian.

This is the language of two palimpsests, which have been recently recovered, and several short inscriptions. These texts have been elaborated and edited as [Gippert et al. 2008]. The lower (Caucasian Albanian) layers of the palimpsests are dated between 7th-10th centuries of the 1st millennium AD (see [Gippert et al. 2008: I-29 ff.] for detail).

The Caucasian Albanian language is very close to modern Udi, although it is unlikely that Caucasian Albanian is a direct ancestor of the known Nidzh and Vartashen dialects. We treat Caucasian Albanian as a close relative of the "Proto-Udi" language. Caucasian Albanian data, if available, is quoted in the Common Udi field.

The phonetic transcription of the Caucasian Albanian signs is, of course, somewhat of conventionality. In general, we follow the transliteration proposed and substantiated in [Gippert et al. 2008: II-1 ff.] with the following changes:

- "Postalveolar" sibilants (which are transcribed in [Gippert et al. 2008: II-10, 14, 15] as ś, ęż, č, ǯ, ĺ, following Schulze's system, although in modern Udi these are pharyngealized alveolar) we render as š/glottalrevsuper, ż/glottalrevsuper, č/glottalrevsuper, ǯ/glottalrevsuper, č'/glottalrevsuper;
- the sign #14 (Gippert-Schulze's ӟ) is rendered as ḟ, although its phonetic value is not entirely clear, see [Gippert et al. 2008: II-12];
  - the sign #17 (ӌ in [Gippert et al. 2008: II-11]) - as Ӳ;
  - the sign #24 (Ӈ in [Gippert et al. 2008: II-11]) - as q. Note that both Ӳ and q are often interchangeable in the palimpsests. Apparently more accurate transcription of #24 q should be the affricate q͡;
  - the sign #41 (ǵ in [Gippert et al. 2008: II-9]) - as k;
- the Greek-inspired sign combination ow [Gippert et al. 2008: II-10] - as u;
  - the sign #25 (ȧ in [Gippert et al. 2008: II-11]) - as pharyngealized o͡;
  - the sign combination #47 + #50 (uiw in [Gippert et al. 2008: II-11]) - as pharyngealized u͡. Note that #25 (o͡) and discussed #47 are actually one alphabetical sign, so the combination o͡w (= our u͡) is exactly paralleled by the combination ow (= our u).
II. Archi.

II.1. General.

The main lexicographic sources are [Kibrik et al. 1977b], [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988], [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990], [Chumakina et al. 2007].

II.2. Transliteration.

The following transliterational chart covers our principal sources (see also the comparative tables in [Kibrik et al. 1977a 1: 41] and at the site of the LangueDOC project: http://www.philol.msu.ru/~languedoc/eng/archi/alphabet.php).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>[Chumakina et al. 2007]</th>
<th>[Kibrik et al. 1977a, 1977b]</th>
<th>[Kibrik &amp; Kodzasov 1988, 1990]</th>
<th>[Mikailov 1967]</th>
<th>[Comrie &amp; Khalilov 2010]</th>
<th>[NCED]</th>
<th>GLD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>б</td>
<td>б</td>
<td>б</td>
<td>б</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>p (p&lt;sup&gt;h&lt;/sup&gt;)</td>
<td>р</td>
<td>п, пп</td>
<td>п</td>
<td>р</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p'</td>
<td>ṭ</td>
<td>ṭ</td>
<td>п, пп</td>
<td>пп</td>
<td>р:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p'</td>
<td>p'</td>
<td>п'</td>
<td>пI</td>
<td>пI</td>
<td>ṭ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>д</td>
<td>д</td>
<td>д</td>
<td>d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>t (t&lt;sup&gt;h&lt;/sup&gt;)</td>
<td>т</td>
<td>т, тг</td>
<td>т</td>
<td>т</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t:</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>т</td>
<td>тг</td>
<td>тг</td>
<td>t:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t'</td>
<td>t'</td>
<td>т'</td>
<td>пI</td>
<td>пI</td>
<td>т'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d&lt;sup&gt;w&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>d&lt;sub&gt;s&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>дзв</td>
<td>дзв</td>
<td>d&lt;sup&gt;w&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>d&lt;sup&gt;w&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t&lt;sup&gt;w&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>t&lt;sub&gt;s&lt;/sub&gt; (t&lt;sup&gt;h&lt;/sup&gt;&lt;sub&gt;s&lt;/sub&gt;)</td>
<td>тв</td>
<td>тв</td>
<td>т&lt;sup&gt;w&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>t&lt;sup&gt;w&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>ц</td>
<td>ц</td>
<td>ц</td>
<td>c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c'</td>
<td>c'</td>
<td>цI, ї</td>
<td>цI</td>
<td>цI</td>
<td>ḋ:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c'</td>
<td>ḋ</td>
<td>цI, ї</td>
<td>цI</td>
<td>цI</td>
<td>ḋ:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c:</td>
<td>ḋ</td>
<td>цI, ї</td>
<td>цI</td>
<td>цI</td>
<td>ḋ:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Chumakina et al. 2007]</td>
<td>[Kibrik et al. 1977a, 1977b]</td>
<td>[Kibrik &amp; Kodzasov 1988, 1990]</td>
<td>[Mikailov 1967]</td>
<td>[Comrie &amp; Khalilov 2010]</td>
<td>[NCED]</td>
<td>GLD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Čw Č Č</td>
<td>Č Č</td>
<td>Čw Čw</td>
<td>Čw Čw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Čw Č Č</td>
<td>Č Č</td>
<td>Čw Čw</td>
<td>Čw Čw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z Z Z</td>
<td>Z Z</td>
<td>Z Z</td>
<td>Z Z</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S: S S</td>
<td>C, Č</td>
<td>C S S</td>
<td>S: S:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S: S S</td>
<td>C, Č</td>
<td>C S S</td>
<td>S: S:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zw Z Z</td>
<td>Z V V</td>
<td>Zw Zw</td>
<td>Zw Zw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sw S S</td>
<td>S B, ČB</td>
<td>S B S</td>
<td>S: S:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sw S S</td>
<td>S B, ČB</td>
<td>S B S</td>
<td>S: S:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Č Č Č</td>
<td>Č Č</td>
<td>Č Č Č</td>
<td>Č Č Č</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Č Č Č</td>
<td>Č Č</td>
<td>Č Č Č</td>
<td>Č Č Č</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Č Č Č</td>
<td>Č Č</td>
<td>Č Č Č</td>
<td>Č Č Č</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Č Č Č</td>
<td>Č Č</td>
<td>Č Č Č</td>
<td>Č Č Č</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ž Ž Ž</td>
<td>Ž V V</td>
<td>Ž Ž Ž</td>
<td>Ž Ž Ž</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Š Š Š</td>
<td>Š B, ŠB</td>
<td>Š B Š</td>
<td>Š Š Š</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Š Š Š</td>
<td>Š B, ŠB</td>
<td>Š B Š</td>
<td>Š Š Š</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Žw Ž Ž</td>
<td>Ž V V</td>
<td>Žw Žw</td>
<td>Žw Žw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šw Š Š</td>
<td>Š V V</td>
<td>Šw Šw</td>
<td>Šw Šw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šw Š Š</td>
<td>Š V V</td>
<td>Šw Šw</td>
<td>Šw Šw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kľ k L</td>
<td>L L</td>
<td>A A</td>
<td>A A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kľ K' L'</td>
<td>Kľ K'</td>
<td>A' A'</td>
<td>A' A'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kľw k L L</td>
<td>L L</td>
<td>A A</td>
<td>A A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kľw k L L</td>
<td>L L</td>
<td>A A</td>
<td>A A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kľw k L L</td>
<td>L L</td>
<td>A A</td>
<td>A A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Chumakina et al. 2007]</td>
<td>[Kibrik et al. 1977a, 1977b]</td>
<td>[Kibrik &amp; Kodzasov 1988, 1990]</td>
<td>[Mikailov 1967]</td>
<td>[Comrie &amp; Khalilov 2010]</td>
<td>[NCED]</td>
<td>GLD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>ų</td>
<td>ɐ</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>z</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>č</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>ṭ</td>
<td>ṭ</td>
<td>h</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tː</td>
<td>čː</td>
<td>tː</td>
<td>ṭː</td>
<td>ṭː</td>
<td>hː</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tːw</td>
<td>čːw</td>
<td>tːw</td>
<td>ṭːw</td>
<td>ṭːw</td>
<td>hːw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tːw</td>
<td>čːw</td>
<td>tːw</td>
<td>ṭːw</td>
<td>ṭːw</td>
<td>hːw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>g</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>k (kʰ)</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kː</td>
<td>kː</td>
<td>kː</td>
<td>kː</td>
<td>kː</td>
<td>kː</td>
<td>kː</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kː'</td>
<td>kː'</td>
<td>kː'</td>
<td>kː'</td>
<td>kː'</td>
<td>kː'</td>
<td>kː'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kʰw</td>
<td>kʰw</td>
<td>kʰw</td>
<td>kʰw</td>
<td>kʰw</td>
<td>kʰw</td>
<td>kʰw</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gʰw</td>
<td>gʰw</td>
<td>gʰw</td>
<td>gʰw</td>
<td>gʰw</td>
<td>gʰw</td>
<td>gʰw</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kʰw</td>
<td>kʰw</td>
<td>kʰw</td>
<td>kʰw</td>
<td>kʰw</td>
<td>kʰw</td>
<td>kʰw</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kʰw</td>
<td>kʰw</td>
<td>kʰw</td>
<td>kʰw</td>
<td>kʰw</td>
<td>kʰw</td>
<td>kʰw</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>q</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qː'</td>
<td>qː'</td>
<td>qː'</td>
<td>qː'</td>
<td>qː'</td>
<td>qː'</td>
<td>qː'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qː'</td>
<td>qː'</td>
<td>qː'</td>
<td>qː'</td>
<td>qː'</td>
<td>qː'</td>
<td>qː'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qːw</td>
<td>qːw</td>
<td>qːw</td>
<td>qːw</td>
<td>qːw</td>
<td>qːw</td>
<td>qːw</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qːw</td>
<td>qːw</td>
<td>qːw</td>
<td>qːw</td>
<td>qːw</td>
<td>qːw</td>
<td>qːw</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xː</td>
<td>xː</td>
<td>xː</td>
<td>xː</td>
<td>xː</td>
<td>xː</td>
<td>xː</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kʰw</td>
<td>kʰw</td>
<td>kʰw</td>
<td>kʰw</td>
<td>kʰw</td>
<td>kʰw</td>
<td>kʰw</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xʰw</td>
<td>xʰw</td>
<td>xʰw</td>
<td>xʰw</td>
<td>xʰw</td>
<td>xʰw</td>
<td>xʰw</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xʰw</td>
<td>xʰw</td>
<td>xʰw</td>
<td>xʰw</td>
<td>xʰw</td>
<td>xʰw</td>
<td>xʰw</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notes.

1. According to Kodzasov’s report [Kibrik et al. 1977a 1: 206 ff., 226 ff.], the voiceless stops are, in fact, aspirated: \( p^h, t^h, k^h \). Following common practice, we omit the sign \( ^h \) and denote these as plain voiceless consonants: \( p, t, k \).

2. The tense series of obstruents should rather be denoted as \( Ç \), but, in order to avoid rare diacritics, we prefer to follow the common practice and mark these consonants as
geminated C:

3. Following common practice, we do not note the initial glottal-stop (ʔ), which is an automatic prothesis in the case of vocalic onset.

4. Normally we denote pharyngealization as ḫ after the first vowel or after the first uvular obstruent (if there are uvulars in a phonetic word), although the real situation is somewhat more complicated, see [Kibrik et al. 1977a 1: 250 ff.].

III. Kryts (proper; Alyk).

III.1. General.

The Kryts (Kryz) language consists of several dialects named according to the corresponding villages. It is sometimes proposed to regard these dialects as separate languages. Out of these, two idioms have been more or less systematically described: Kryts proper (the Kryts village) and Kryts Alyk (the Alyk village).

For Kryts proper the main lexicographic sources are [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988], [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990]. A less reliable source is [Comrie & Khalilov 2010] (it seems that normally forms from Kryts proper are quoted, taken from Kibrik & Kodzasov’s dictionaries, but in some cases the forms are either corrupted or originate from other dialects). Some exclusive forms are quoted after [NCED] and [LEDb], whose authors collected lexical data from Kryts proper themselves, during the MSU expedition of 1977. Some forms and grammatical information have also been taken from [Saadiev 1994].

The basic source for Alyk Kryts is the descriptive grammar [Authier 2009].

III.2. Transliteration.

The following transliterational chart covers our principal sources:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>[Kibrik &amp; Kodzasov 1988, 1990]</th>
<th>[Saadiev 1994]</th>
<th>[Authier 2009]</th>
<th>[Comrie &amp; Khalilov 2010]</th>
<th>[NCED]</th>
<th>GLD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p'</td>
<td>p'</td>
<td>p'</td>
<td>pI</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>w, v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t'</td>
<td>t'</td>
<td>t'</td>
<td>tI</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʒ</td>
<td>ʒ</td>
<td>ʒ</td>
<td>ʒ</td>
<td>ʒ</td>
<td>ʒ</td>
<td>ʒ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e'</td>
<td>e'</td>
<td>e'</td>
<td>eI</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>z</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʒ̃</td>
<td>ʒ̃</td>
<td>ʒ̃</td>
<td>ʒ̃</td>
<td>ʒ̃</td>
<td>ʒ̃</td>
<td>ʒ̃</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ě</td>
<td>ě</td>
<td>ě</td>
<td>ě</td>
<td>ě</td>
<td>ě</td>
<td>ě</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ď</td>
<td>ď</td>
<td>ď</td>
<td>ď</td>
<td>ď</td>
<td>ď</td>
<td>ď</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ž</td>
<td>ž</td>
<td>ž</td>
<td>ž</td>
<td>ž</td>
<td>ž</td>
<td>ž</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>š̃</td>
<td>š̃</td>
<td>š̃</td>
<td>š̃</td>
<td>š̃</td>
<td>š̃</td>
<td>š̃</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k'</td>
<td>k'</td>
<td>k'</td>
<td>kI</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Kibrik &amp; Kodzasov 1988, 1990]</td>
<td>[Saadiev 1994]</td>
<td>[Authier 2009]</td>
<td>[Comrie &amp; Khalilov 2010]</td>
<td>[NCED]</td>
<td>GLD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>g₀,  g'</td>
<td>g,  g'</td>
<td>g₀,  g'</td>
<td>g,  g'</td>
<td>g₀,  g'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>k₀,  k'</td>
<td>k,  k'</td>
<td>k₀,  k'</td>
<td>k,  k'</td>
<td>k₀,  k'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>k₀',  k₀''</td>
<td>k₀',  k₀''</td>
<td>k₀',  k₀''</td>
<td>k₀',  k₀''</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ĝ</td>
<td>ĝ</td>
<td>ĝ</td>
<td>ĝ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>x₀,  x₀'</td>
<td>x₀,  x₀'</td>
<td>x₀,  x₀'</td>
<td>x₀,  x₀'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td>q:⁻</td>
<td>q:⁻</td>
<td>G (q: in the initial position or before a voiceless consonant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>q</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>x₀'</td>
<td>q</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>q₀',  q₀''</td>
<td>q₀',  q₀''</td>
<td>q₀',  q₀''</td>
<td>q₀',  q₀''</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G₀</td>
<td>q:</td>
<td>q:</td>
<td>G₀,  q:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>q₀'</td>
<td>q₀''</td>
<td>q₀''</td>
<td>q₀'',  q₀''</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>ĝ</td>
<td>ĝ</td>
<td>ĝ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X₀</td>
<td>x₀</td>
<td>x₀</td>
<td>x₀</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ḥ</td>
<td>ḥ</td>
<td>ḥ</td>
<td>ḥ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ʔ</td>
<td>ʔ</td>
<td>ʔ</td>
<td>ʔ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Voiceless stops and affricates are actually aspirated: \( p^h \ t^h \ c^h \) and so on. Following common practice, we omit the sign \( ^h \) and denote these as plain voiceless: \( p \ t \ c \) and so on.

**IV. Budukh.**

**IV.1. General.**

The main lexicographic sources are [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988], [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990] and [Meylanova 1984]. Some forms and grammatical information have been taken from [Talibov 2007] and [Alekseev 1994]. An unreliable source is [Comrie & Khalilov 2010], which is generally based on the short Russian-Budukh word index at the end of [Meylanova 1984], without attention to semantic nuances of quasi-synonyms.

**IV.2. Transliteration.**
The following transliterational chart covers our principal sources:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>б</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>п</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>т</td>
<td>т</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ц</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ч</td>
<td>ч</td>
<td>ч</td>
<td>ч</td>
<td>ч</td>
<td>ч</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ж</td>
<td>ж</td>
<td>ж</td>
<td>ж</td>
<td>ж</td>
<td>ж</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ш</td>
<td>ш</td>
<td>ш</td>
<td>ш</td>
<td>ш</td>
<td>ш</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>г</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>к</td>
<td>к</td>
<td>к</td>
<td>к</td>
<td>к</td>
<td>к</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>кI</td>
<td>кI</td>
<td>кI</td>
<td>k'</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Meylanova 1984], [Comrie &amp; Khalilov 2010]</td>
<td>[Talibov 2007]</td>
<td>[Kibrik &amp; Kodzasov 1988, 1990]</td>
<td>[Alekseev 1994]</td>
<td>[NCED]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>хь</td>
<td>г</td>
<td>Υ</td>
<td>Υ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>КЫ (КЪГ)</td>
<td>КЫ (КЪГ)</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>q:</td>
<td>q:-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>q'</td>
<td>q'</td>
<td>q'</td>
<td>q'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>гь</td>
<td>гь</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>ḡ</td>
<td>ḡ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>х</td>
<td>х</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Х</td>
<td>Х</td>
<td>Х</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>й</td>
<td>й</td>
<td>й</td>
<td>й</td>
<td>й</td>
<td>й</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Г</td>
<td>Г</td>
<td>Г</td>
<td>Г</td>
<td>Г</td>
<td>Г</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>М</td>
<td>М</td>
<td>М</td>
<td>М</td>
<td>М</td>
<td>М</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Н</td>
<td>Н</td>
<td>Н</td>
<td>Н</td>
<td>Н</td>
<td>Н</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Р</td>
<td>Р</td>
<td>Р</td>
<td>Р</td>
<td>Р</td>
<td>Р</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Л</td>
<td>Л</td>
<td>Л</td>
<td>Л</td>
<td>Л</td>
<td>Л</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Й</td>
<td>Й</td>
<td>Й</td>
<td>Й</td>
<td>Й</td>
<td>Й</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>И</td>
<td>И</td>
<td>И</td>
<td>И</td>
<td>И</td>
<td>И</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Е, Э</td>
<td>Е, Э</td>
<td>Е</td>
<td>Е</td>
<td>Е</td>
<td>Е</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>А</td>
<td>А</td>
<td>А</td>
<td>А</td>
<td>А</td>
<td>А</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>АЬ</td>
<td>АЬ</td>
<td>АЬ</td>
<td>АЬ</td>
<td>АЬ</td>
<td>АЬ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>У</td>
<td>У</td>
<td>У</td>
<td>У</td>
<td>У</td>
<td>У</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>А</td>
<td>А, ā</td>
<td>ā</td>
<td>ā</td>
<td>ā</td>
<td>ā</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notes.

1. Voiceless stops and affricates are actually aspirated: $p^h$, $t^h$, $č^h$ and so on. Following common practice, we omit the sign $^h$ and denote these as plain voiceless: $p$, $t$, $č$ and so on.

2. According to Kodzasov’s report [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 345], voiced stops and affricates - $b$, $d$, $ʒ$, $g$ - become voiceless unaspirated (and apparently tense) in the initial and final position or before a voiceless obstruent, i.e. shift to $p$, $t$, $č$, $g$ (apparently $p^h$, $t^h$, $č^h$, $g^h$), but do not coincide with the voiceless aspirated series mentioned above. Following common practice (cf. Kibrik & Kodzasov’s transcription or traditional Cyrillic orthography), we do not reflect this non-phonological change and denote these phonemes as $b$, $d$, $ʒ$, $g$ in all positions. The only exception is /ʒ/ (Kibrik & Kodzasov’ G), which is transcribed as tense $q$: in the initial and final position or before a voiceless obstruent and as $g$ otherwise. As noted in [Talibov 2007: 27], however, some speakers may articulate /ʒ/ as [q:] in all positions.


V. Tsakhur (mishlesh; Mikik; Gelmets).

V.1. General.

The Tsakhur language consists of two dialectal groups [Ibragimov 1990: 12-13]: Tsakh and Gelmets. The Tsakh group is divided into the following dialects, all of which are rather close to each other: Tsakhur-Kum, Mishlesh, Dzhynykh, Mukhakh-Sabunchi, Suwagil (named according to the corresponding villages or the groups of villages). The Gelmets
group is divided into the Gelmets and Lek/Kurdul dialects. The dialect of the village Mikik is described as "transitional between Tsakh and Gelmets" in [Ibragimov 1990: 13]; in [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 4] the Mikik dialect is considered to be closer to Tsakh.

The newborn literary Tsakhur language, described in [Ibragimov & Nurmamedov 2010], is based on the Tsakh dialectal group, mostly on the Tsakhur-Kum and Mishlesh dialects [Ibragimov & Nurmamedov 2010: 13, 502] (for the most part, apparently, on Mishlesh proper).

The database includes three lists: for Mishlesh (Tsakh group), Gelmets (Gelmets group) and Mikik ("transitional") dialects. Unfortunately, only data on nouns have been systematically recorded and published for the Tsakhur-Kum (Tsakh group) dialect.

For the **Mishlesh dialect**, the main lexicographic sources are [Kibrik et al. 1999] (Mishlesh dialect) as well as [Ibragimov & Nurmamedov 2010] (literary Tsakhur). Some Mishlesh forms and grammatical information have been taken from [Ibragimov 1990]. In addition, literary Tsakhur forms from [Comrie & Khalilov 2010] (an unreliable source) are also quoted. In the notes, forms from the Tsakhur-Kum dialect (if known) are quoted after [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990].

For the **Mikik dialect**, the main lexicographic sources are [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988] (verbs), [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990] (nouns), [Dirr 1913]. It is not explicated in [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988] which dialect is described by the authors under the siglum "ЦАХ" - Mikik, Tsakhur-Kum or Gelmets. Proceeding from the fact that these verbal forms are accompanied by the tonal information, we conclude that in [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988], the Mikik dialect is represented; some phonetic peculiarities also point to the Mikik dialect; the Mikik origin of the data of [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988] is also explicitly noted, e.g., in [Kibrik et al. 1999: 70] (in [NCED: 13], however, it is presumed that the siglum "ЦАХ" in [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988] covers the Tsakhur-Kum dialect).

For the **Gelmets dialect**, the main lexicographic sources are [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990], where data on nouns from the Gelmets village are published. Gelmets verbs are quoted after [Ibragimov 1990] and, cautiously, after [Comrie & Khalilov 2010]. Grammatical information has been taken from [Ibragimov 1990].
V.2. Transliteration.

The following transliterational chart, covering our principal sources, can be presented (note that the Cyrillic orthography of [Ibragimov & Nurmamedov 2010] is very inconsistent, especially where it concerns palatalized consonants, ŋ, ʔ etc.; in [Comrie & Khalilov 2010], additionally, the orthographic systems of [Ibragimov 1990] and [Ibragimov & Nurmamedov 2010] are mixed):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[Ibragimov 1990]</th>
<th>[Ibragimov &amp; Nurmamedov 2010]</th>
<th>[Kibrik et al. 1999]</th>
<th>[Kibrik &amp; Kodzasov 1988, 1990]</th>
<th>NCED</th>
<th>GLD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>б</td>
<td>б</td>
<td>б</td>
<td>б</td>
<td>б</td>
<td>б</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>и</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>р</td>
<td>р</td>
<td>р</td>
<td>р</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ип</td>
<td>ип</td>
<td>р</td>
<td>р</td>
<td>р:</td>
<td>р:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ил</td>
<td>ил</td>
<td>р'</td>
<td>р'</td>
<td>р'</td>
<td>р'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ф</td>
<td>ф</td>
<td>ф</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>д (+ э, о, у, а, ы)</td>
<td>д (+ э, о, у, а, ы)</td>
<td>d (д + i, e)</td>
<td>d (dy + i, e)</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>д' (д + и, е)</td>
<td>д' (д + и, е)</td>
<td>d' (d + i, e)</td>
<td>dy (d + i, e)</td>
<td>d, d' (d + i, e)</td>
<td>d'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>т (т + э, 0, у, а, ы)</td>
<td>т (т + э, 0, у, а, ы)</td>
<td>t (т + i, e)</td>
<td>t (ty + i, e)</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>т' (т' + и, е)</td>
<td>т' (т' + и, е)</td>
<td>t' (t' + i, e)</td>
<td>t'y (t' + i, e)</td>
<td>t', t' (т + i, e)</td>
<td>t'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>тт (тт + э, 0, у, а, ы)</td>
<td>тт (тт + э, 0, у, а, ы)</td>
<td>t (т + i, e)</td>
<td>t (ty + i, e)</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>тт' (тт' + и, е)</td>
<td>тт' (тт' + и, е)</td>
<td>t' (t' + i, e)</td>
<td>t'y (t' + i, e)</td>
<td>т, т' (т + i, e)</td>
<td>т'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>тI (тI + э, 0, у, а, ы)</td>
<td>тI (тI + э, 0, у, а, ы)</td>
<td>t (т + i, e)</td>
<td>т (ty + i, e)</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>тI' (тI' + и, е)</td>
<td>тI' (тI' + и, е)</td>
<td>t' (t' + i, e)</td>
<td>t'y (t' + i, e)</td>
<td>т, т' (т + i, e)</td>
<td>т'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>тв</td>
<td>тв</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>т</td>
<td>т</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>тв</td>
<td>тв</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>т</td>
<td>т</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>тп</td>
<td>тп</td>
<td>т'</td>
<td>т'</td>
<td>т'</td>
<td>т'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>тп</td>
<td>тп</td>
<td>t'</td>
<td>t'y</td>
<td>т'</td>
<td>т'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>тц</td>
<td>тц</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>тц</td>
<td>тц</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>тц</td>
<td>тц</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>тц</td>
<td>тц</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Ibragimov 1990]</td>
<td>[Ibragimov &amp; Nurmamedov 2010]</td>
<td>[Kibrik et al. 1999]</td>
<td>[Kibrik &amp; Kodz asov 1988, 1990]</td>
<td>NCED</td>
<td>GLD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>цв</td>
<td>цв</td>
<td>c&lt;sub&gt;c&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>e&lt;sup&gt;o&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>e&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ц'в</td>
<td>ц'в</td>
<td>c'&lt;sub&gt;c&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>e' &lt;sup&gt;o&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>e' &lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>z (+ э, о, у, а, и)</td>
<td>i (+ э, о, у, а, и)</td>
<td>z (z&lt;sub&gt;i&lt;/sub&gt; + i, e)</td>
<td>e' (z&lt;sub&gt;y&lt;/sub&gt; + i, e)</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γ (з + и, е)</td>
<td>γ' (з + е, ё, ю, я, и)</td>
<td>z&lt;sub&gt;y&lt;/sub&gt; (z&lt;sub&gt;z&lt;/sub&gt; + i, e)</td>
<td>e' (z&lt;sub&gt;y&lt;/sub&gt; + i, e)</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>с (с + и, е)</td>
<td>с' (с + е, ё, ю, я, и)</td>
<td>s (s&lt;sub&gt;i&lt;/sub&gt; + i, e)</td>
<td>e' (s&lt;sub&gt;y&lt;/sub&gt; + i, e)</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>съ (съ + и, е)</td>
<td>съ' (съ + е, ё, ю, я, и)</td>
<td>sъ (sъ + i, e)</td>
<td>e' (sъ + i, e)</td>
<td>sъ</td>
<td>sъ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>зв</td>
<td>зв</td>
<td>z&lt;sub&gt;z&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>e' (z&lt;sub&gt;y&lt;/sub&gt; + i, e)</td>
<td>зъ:</td>
<td>зъ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>дж</td>
<td>дж</td>
<td>ḱ</td>
<td>ḱ</td>
<td>ḱ</td>
<td>ḱ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ч</td>
<td>ч</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>чI</td>
<td>чI</td>
<td>c'</td>
<td>c'</td>
<td>c'</td>
<td>c'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ч'</td>
<td>ч'</td>
<td>c'</td>
<td>c'</td>
<td>c'</td>
<td>c'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>джв</td>
<td>джв</td>
<td>ḱ</td>
<td>ḱ</td>
<td>ḱ</td>
<td>ḱ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>чв</td>
<td>чв</td>
<td>c&lt;sub&gt;c&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>c&lt;sub&gt;c&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>c&lt;sub&gt;c&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>c&lt;sub&gt;c&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ч'в</td>
<td>ч'в</td>
<td>c'&lt;sub&gt;c&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>c' &lt;sub&gt;c&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>c' &lt;sub&gt;c&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>c' &lt;sub&gt;c&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ж</td>
<td>ж</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ш</td>
<td>ш</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ц</td>
<td>ц</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>жв</td>
<td>жв</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>шв</td>
<td>шв</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>цв</td>
<td>цв</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>г (+ э, о, у, а, и)</td>
<td>г (+ о, у, а, и)</td>
<td>g (g&lt;sub&gt;i&lt;/sub&gt; + i, e)</td>
<td>e' (g&lt;sub&gt;y&lt;/sub&gt; + i, e)</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γ' (γ + и, е)</td>
<td>γ' (γ + е, ю, я)</td>
<td>g&lt;sub&gt;y&lt;/sub&gt; (g&lt;sub&gt;i&lt;/sub&gt; + i, e)</td>
<td>e' (g&lt;sub&gt;y&lt;/sub&gt; + i, e)</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>к</td>
<td>к (+ э, о, у, а, и)</td>
<td>k (k&lt;sub&gt;i&lt;/sub&gt; + i, e)</td>
<td>k (k&lt;sub&gt;y&lt;/sub&gt; + i, e)</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>к'</td>
<td>к' (к + и, е)</td>
<td>k' (k + i, e)</td>
<td>k' (k&lt;sub&gt;y&lt;/sub&gt; + i, e)</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>къ</td>
<td>къ (къ + и, е)</td>
<td>kъ (kъ + i, e)</td>
<td>kъ (k&lt;sub&gt;y&lt;/sub&gt; + i, e)</td>
<td>kъ</td>
<td>kъ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>къ'</td>
<td>къ' (къ + и, е)</td>
<td>kъ' (kъ + i, e)</td>
<td>kъ' (k&lt;sub&gt;y&lt;/sub&gt; + i, e)</td>
<td>kъ'</td>
<td>kъ'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Some entries are misspelled as in the table on p. 16.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[Ibragimov 1990]</th>
<th>[Ibragimov &amp; Nurmamedov 2010]</th>
<th>[Kibrik et al. 1999]</th>
<th>[Kibrik &amp; Kodzazov 1988, 1990]</th>
<th>NCED</th>
<th>GLD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ГВ</td>
<td>ГВ</td>
<td>Г.</td>
<td>Г.</td>
<td>Г.</td>
<td>Г.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>КВ</td>
<td>КВ</td>
<td>К.</td>
<td>К.</td>
<td>К.</td>
<td>К.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>КИВ</td>
<td>КИВ</td>
<td>Кʼ.</td>
<td>Кʼ.</td>
<td>Кʼ.</td>
<td>Кʼ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>И</td>
<td>И</td>
<td>И</td>
<td>И</td>
<td>И.</td>
<td>И.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Хь (= э, о, у, а, ы)</td>
<td>Хь (= о, у, а, и, ы)</td>
<td>Хь (x₁ + i, e)</td>
<td>Хь (xy + i, e)</td>
<td>Хь</td>
<td>Хь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Хьʼ (хь + и, е)</td>
<td>Хьʼ (хь + ё, ю, я)</td>
<td>Хь (x₁ + i, e)</td>
<td>Хь (xy + i, e)</td>
<td>Хь</td>
<td>Хь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Хьь (хьь + о, у, а, и, ы)</td>
<td>Хьь (x₂ + i, e)</td>
<td>Хьь (xy + i, e)</td>
<td>Хьь (x₂ + i, e)</td>
<td>Хьь</td>
<td>Хьь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Хььʼ (хьь + и, е)</td>
<td>Хььʼ (хьь + ё, ю, я)</td>
<td>Хьь (x₂ + i, e)</td>
<td>Хьь (xy + i, e)</td>
<td>Хьь</td>
<td>Хьь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Б</td>
<td>Б</td>
<td>Б</td>
<td>Б</td>
<td>Б</td>
<td>Б</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ЧБ</td>
<td>ЧБ</td>
<td>Ч</td>
<td>Ч</td>
<td>Ч.</td>
<td>Ч.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ЧВ</td>
<td>ЧВ</td>
<td>Чь</td>
<td>Чь</td>
<td>Чь</td>
<td>Чь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>БВ</td>
<td>БВ</td>
<td>Бь</td>
<td>Бь</td>
<td>Бь</td>
<td>Бь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>БьВ</td>
<td>БьВ</td>
<td>БьВ</td>
<td>БьВ</td>
<td>БьВ</td>
<td>БьВ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Г</td>
<td>Г</td>
<td>Г</td>
<td>Г</td>
<td>Г</td>
<td>Г</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ч</td>
<td>Ч</td>
<td>Ч</td>
<td>Ч</td>
<td>Ч</td>
<td>Ч</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ь</td>
<td>Ь</td>
<td>Ь</td>
<td>Ь</td>
<td>Ь</td>
<td>Ь</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Tsakhur-Kum & Mishlesh: c (q: in the initial position); Mikik & Gelmets: q (in the initial position).
- Tsakhur-Kum & Mishlesh: c⁺ (q⁺ in the initial position); Mikik & Gelmets: q⁺ (in the initial position).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[Ibragimov 1990]</th>
<th>[Ibragimov &amp; Nurmamedov 2010]</th>
<th>[Kibrik et al. 1999]</th>
<th>[Kibrik &amp; Kоздasov 1988, 1990]</th>
<th>NCED</th>
<th>GLD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>χχ</td>
<td>χχ</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>χː</td>
<td>χː</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>гъв</td>
<td>гъв</td>
<td>R 는</td>
<td>R 는</td>
<td>ː</td>
<td>ː</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>хъв</td>
<td>хъв</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>χː</td>
<td>χː</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χъв</td>
<td>χъв</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>χː</td>
<td>χː</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ь</td>
<td>ь</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>гь</td>
<td>гь</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>гъв</td>
<td>гъв</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>м</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>г (э + о, у, а, ы)</td>
<td>г (э + о, у, а, ы)</td>
<td>n (n + i, e)</td>
<td>n (n + i, e)</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>н’ (н + и, е)</td>
<td>н’ (н + и, е)</td>
<td>n (n + i, e)</td>
<td>n (n + i, e)</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>л (э + о, у, а, ы)</td>
<td>л (э + о, у, а, ы)</td>
<td>l (l + i, e)</td>
<td>l (l + i, e)</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>т’ (т + и, е)</td>
<td>т’ (т + и, е)</td>
<td>l (l + i, e)</td>
<td>l (l + i, e)</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>в</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>й</td>
<td>й</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>j</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>е, э</td>
<td>е, э</td>
<td>е</td>
<td>е</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>а</td>
<td>а, я</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>м</td>
<td>м</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>о</td>
<td>о, е</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>у</td>
<td>у, ю</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>вь</td>
<td>вь</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>оь</td>
<td>оь</td>
<td>ö</td>
<td>ö</td>
<td>ö</td>
<td>ö</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>уь</td>
<td>уь</td>
<td>ü</td>
<td>ü</td>
<td>ü</td>
<td>ü</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Й</td>
<td>Й</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>j</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>къ, хъ, шъ, йъ</td>
<td>къ, хъ, шъ, йъ</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>къ(в), гъ(в), хъ(в), шъ(в), йъ(в), VI</td>
<td>къ(в), гъ(в), хъ(в), шъ(в), йъ(в), VI</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>VI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes.
1. Plain voiceless stops and affricates are actually aspirated: \( p^h \), \( t^h \), \( č^h \) and so on. Following common practice, we omit the sign \(^h\) and denote these as plain voiceless: \( p \), \( t \), \( č \) and so on.

2. Voiced stops and affricates become devoiced in the initial and final position (not always) and after a voiceless fricative (/sd/ > [st], always), see [Kibrik et al. 1999: 14], [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 343]. Following common practice (cf. Kibrik & Kodzasov's transcription or Cyrillic orthography), we do not reflect this non-phonological change, e.g., /sd/ is written as sd.

3. According to Kodzasov's report [Kibrik et al. 1999: 14-15], in the Mishlesh dialect the phoneme \( {\text{G}} \) (i.e. \( g \) in IPA) occurs as \( [c] \) in the intervocalic position, whereas in the initial position \( {\text{G}} \) is normally (but not always) realized as a voiceless non-aspirated \( [q] \). For the sake of convenience, we transcribe all instances of Mishlesh initial \( {\text{G}} \) as \( qː \) (note that the proper phoneme \( qː \) occurs only in the intervocalic position), whereas Mishlesh intervocal \( {\text{G}} \) is transcribed as \( c \). Apparently the Tsakhur-Kum dialect possesses the same system. On the contrary, in the Mikik dialect (as well as, apparently, in Gelmers) Kibrik & Kodzasov's \( {\text{G}} \) occurs only in the initial position (being in complementary distribution with intervocalic \( qː \)). This initial \( {\text{G}} \) is realized as voiceless non-aspirated \( [q] \) [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 343]. We transcribe Mikik initial \( {\text{G}} \) as \( qː \).

4. Normally, in all Tsakhur dialects we denote pharyngealization as \( ^\text{\textdegree} \) after the first vowel or after the first uvular obstruent (if there is a uvular in the phonetic word), although the real situation is more complicated, see [Kibrik et al. 1999: 19] for the Mishlesh dialect, [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 344] for the Mikik dialect. Ibragimov [Ibragimov 1990: 182] reports on gradual loss of pharyngealization in the speech of younger generations in the Gelmers dialect; apparently this process is almost completed in the speech of the Gelmers informant in [Comrie & Khalilov 2010].

5. We do not note initial glottal stop \( [ʔ] \), which is automatic in vowel-initial forms. We also do not note stress and/or tone, because the dialectal systems are too poorly described and the available data are contradictory.

VI. Rutul (Mukhad; Ixrek; Luchek).
VI.1. General.

The Rutul language consists of several dialects (see [Ibragimov 1978: 13 ff.] and [Makhmudova 2001: 3]): 1) Mukhad (proper Rutul or literary Rutul) dialect; 2) Shinaz dialect; 3) Muxrek (Myukhrek) dialect; 4) Ixrek (Ikhrek) dialect; 5) Borch-Khnov (Borch-Khnov) dialect; 6) "Mixed" dialects - according to [Ibragimov 1978: 15], the villages Kala, Amsar (Asar), Vurush (Vrush), Kina & Luchek represent the results of local migrations. Dialects of these villages are close to the Mukhad, Shinaz, sometimes to Ixrek dialects. Ibragimov labels them as "mixed dialects". Out of these, the Borch-Khnov dialect is the most detached; sometimes it is considered to be a separate language [Ibragimov 1978: 226 fn. 1].

The database includes three lists: Mukhad (proper Rutul), Ixrek, Luchek ("mixed") dialects. Unfortunately, the Borch-Khnov data have so far not been systematically recorded and published (except for glosses in [Comrie & Khalilov 2010]).

For the Mukhad dialect, the main lexicographic sources are [Dirr 1912] and [Ibragimov 1978]. Some Mukhad forms and grammatical information have been taken from [Makhmudova 2001] and [Alekseev 1994a]. In addition, literary Rutul forms from [Comrie & Khalilov 2010] (an unreliable source) are also quoted.

For the Ixrek dialect, the main lexicographic source is [Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006]. Some Ixrek forms and grammatical information have been taken from [Ibragimov 1978]. In addition, Ixrek forms from [Comrie & Khalilov 2010] (an unreliable source) are also quoted.

For the Luchek dialect, the main lexicographic sources are [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988] and [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990].

VI.2. Transliteration.

The following transliterational chart covers our principal sources:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[Ibragimov 1978]</th>
<th>[Dzhamalov &amp; Semedov 2006]</th>
<th>[Comrie &amp; Khalilov 2010]</th>
<th>[Kibrik &amp; Kodzasov 1988, 1990]</th>
<th>[NCED]</th>
<th>GLD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>б</td>
<td>б</td>
<td>б</td>
<td>б</td>
<td>б</td>
<td>б</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>п</td>
<td>п</td>
<td>п</td>
<td>р</td>
<td>р</td>
<td>р</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>нI</td>
<td>нI</td>
<td>нI</td>
<td>р’</td>
<td>р’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ф</td>
<td>ф</td>
<td>ф</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>д</td>
<td>д</td>
<td>д</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>дд</td>
<td>дд</td>
<td>dd</td>
<td>dd</td>
<td>d:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>т</td>
<td>т</td>
<td>т</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>тт</td>
<td>тт</td>
<td>tt</td>
<td>tt</td>
<td>t:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>тI</td>
<td>тI</td>
<td>тI</td>
<td>t’</td>
<td>t’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>тIв</td>
<td>тIв</td>
<td>тIв</td>
<td>т’w</td>
<td>т’w</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>дЦ3</td>
<td>дЦ3</td>
<td>дÇ3</td>
<td>Ц3</td>
<td>Ц3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ц</td>
<td>Ц</td>
<td>Ц</td>
<td>Ц</td>
<td>Ц</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ЦI</td>
<td>ЦI</td>
<td>ЦI</td>
<td>ЦI</td>
<td>ЦI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ЦIв</td>
<td>ЦIв</td>
<td>ЦIв</td>
<td>ЦIв</td>
<td>ЦIв</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>з</td>
<td>з</td>
<td>з</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>z</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>С</td>
<td>С</td>
<td>С</td>
<td>С</td>
<td>С</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>СI</td>
<td>СI</td>
<td>СI</td>
<td>СI</td>
<td>СI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>СIв</td>
<td>СIв</td>
<td>СIв</td>
<td>СIв</td>
<td>СIв</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>дЖ</td>
<td>дЖ</td>
<td>дЖ</td>
<td>дЖ</td>
<td>дЖ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ч</td>
<td>Ч</td>
<td>Ч</td>
<td>Ч</td>
<td>Ч</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ЧI</td>
<td>ЧI</td>
<td>ЧI</td>
<td>ЧI</td>
<td>ЧI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ЧIв</td>
<td>ЧIв</td>
<td>ЧIв</td>
<td>ЧIв</td>
<td>ЧIв</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>дЖв</td>
<td>дЖв</td>
<td>дЖв</td>
<td>дЖв</td>
<td>дЖв</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Ibragimov 1978]</td>
<td>[Dzhambalov &amp; Semedov 2006]</td>
<td>[Comrie &amp; Khalilov 2010]</td>
<td>[Kibrik &amp; Kodzasov 1988, 1990]</td>
<td>[NCED]</td>
<td>GLD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ЧВ</td>
<td>ЧВ</td>
<td>Č</td>
<td>Čw</td>
<td>Čv</td>
<td>Čw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ЧѴВ</td>
<td>ЧѴВ</td>
<td>Č'</td>
<td>Č'w</td>
<td>Č'v</td>
<td>Č'w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ж</td>
<td>Ж</td>
<td>Ž</td>
<td>Ž</td>
<td>Ž</td>
<td>Ž</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Щ</td>
<td>Щ</td>
<td>Š</td>
<td>Š</td>
<td>Š</td>
<td>Š</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ЩВ</td>
<td>ЩВ</td>
<td>Š'</td>
<td>Š'w</td>
<td>Š'v</td>
<td>Š'w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Г</td>
<td>Г</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Gw</td>
<td>Gv</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Гί</td>
<td>Гί</td>
<td>G'</td>
<td>G'w</td>
<td>G'v</td>
<td>G'w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>К</td>
<td>К</td>
<td>К</td>
<td>Kg</td>
<td>Kg</td>
<td>Kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Кί</td>
<td>Кί</td>
<td>К'</td>
<td>К'v</td>
<td>К'v</td>
<td>К'v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ГЪ</td>
<td>ГЪ</td>
<td>ḡ</td>
<td>ḡ</td>
<td>ḡ</td>
<td>ḡ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ХЪ</td>
<td>ХЪ</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ХЪ’</td>
<td>ХЪ’</td>
<td>X’</td>
<td>X’w</td>
<td>X’v</td>
<td>X’w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>КЪ</td>
<td>КЪ</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Q:</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ХЬ</td>
<td>ХЬ</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ы</td>
<td>Ы</td>
<td>G'</td>
<td>Q:</td>
<td>Q:</td>
<td>Q:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>КЬ</td>
<td>КЬ</td>
<td>Q'</td>
<td>Q'</td>
<td>Q'</td>
<td>Q'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(q: in the initial position).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[Ibragimov 1978]</th>
<th>[Dzhalalov &amp; Semedov 2006]</th>
<th>[Comrie &amp; Khalilov 2010]</th>
<th>[Kibrik &amp; Kodzasov 1988, 1990]</th>
<th>[NCED]</th>
<th>GLD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Къв</td>
<td>Къв</td>
<td>Къв</td>
<td>$G_+$</td>
<td>$q^w$</td>
<td>$q^w$ (q.$^w$ in the initial position).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Хъв</td>
<td>Хъв</td>
<td>Хъв</td>
<td>$q_+$</td>
<td>$q^w$</td>
<td>$q^w$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Къв</td>
<td>Къв</td>
<td>Къв</td>
<td>$q_+$</td>
<td>$q^w$</td>
<td>$q^w$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Гъ</td>
<td>Гъ</td>
<td>Гъ</td>
<td>$R_+$</td>
<td>$h$</td>
<td>$h$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Х</td>
<td>Х</td>
<td>Х</td>
<td>$X_+$</td>
<td>$h$</td>
<td>$h$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Гъв</td>
<td>Гъв</td>
<td>Гъв</td>
<td>$R_+$</td>
<td>$h$</td>
<td>$h$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Х в</td>
<td>Х в</td>
<td>Х в</td>
<td>$X_+$</td>
<td>$h$</td>
<td>$h$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>М</td>
<td>М</td>
<td>М</td>
<td>М</td>
<td>М</td>
<td>М</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Н</td>
<td>Н</td>
<td>Н</td>
<td>Н</td>
<td>Н</td>
<td>Н</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Р</td>
<td>Р</td>
<td>Р</td>
<td>Р</td>
<td>Р</td>
<td>Р</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Л</td>
<td>Л</td>
<td>Л</td>
<td>Л</td>
<td>Л</td>
<td>Л</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Л’</td>
<td>Л’</td>
<td>Л’</td>
<td>Л’</td>
<td>Л’</td>
<td>Л’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>В</td>
<td>В</td>
<td>В</td>
<td>В</td>
<td>В</td>
<td>В</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Й</td>
<td>Й (ю, я, е, ё)</td>
<td>Й (ю, я, е, ё)</td>
<td>Й (ю, я, е, ё)</td>
<td>Й (ю, я, е, ё)</td>
<td>Й (ю, я, е, ё)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>И</td>
<td>И</td>
<td>И</td>
<td>И</td>
<td>И</td>
<td>И</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Е, Э</td>
<td>Э, Э</td>
<td>Э, Э</td>
<td>Э, Э</td>
<td>Э, Э</td>
<td>Э, Э</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>А</td>
<td>А</td>
<td>А</td>
<td>А</td>
<td>А</td>
<td>А</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ы</td>
<td>Ы</td>
<td>Ы</td>
<td>Ы</td>
<td>Ы</td>
<td>Ы</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>О</td>
<td>О</td>
<td>О</td>
<td>О</td>
<td>О</td>
<td>О</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>У</td>
<td>У</td>
<td>У</td>
<td>У</td>
<td>У</td>
<td>У</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Я</td>
<td>Я</td>
<td>Я</td>
<td>Я</td>
<td>Я</td>
<td>Я</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notes.

1. Plain voiceless stops and affricates are actually aspirated: \( p^h \), \( t^h \), \( č^h \) and so on. Following common practice, we omit the sign \( h^s \) and denote these as plain voiceless: \( p \), \( t \), \( č \) and so on.

2. Voiced stops and affricates become devoiced in the initial position (not always) and after a voiceless fricative (/sd/ > [st], always), see [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 342]. Following common practice (cf. Kibrik & Kodzasov’s transcription or Cyrillic orthography), we do not reflect this non-phonological change, e.g., /sd/ is written as \( sd \). An exception is /g/, which is always realized as [q] or [qː] in the initial position at least in the Luchek dialect; we transcribe initial /g/- (Cyrillic {къ}, Kibrik & Kodzasov’s {G}) as qː-

3. Palatalization of velars and l is phonological in the final position in the Luchek dialect. In some dialects, consonants can also be automatically palatalized before front vowels; we do not note this in our transcription.

4. Pharyngealization is normally a segmental feature, which distinguishes between two series of uvular and laryngeal consonants (q - \( q^s \), \( k^s \) - \( k^v \), \( ?^s \) - \( ?^v \) and so on). Adjacent vowels can also be pharyngealized, but we do not reflect this in the notation. If there are no uvulars/laryngeals in the phonetic word, we denote pharyngealization as \( \tilde{v} \) after the first vowel. We also do not mark the initial glottal-stop \([ʔ]\), which is automatic in vowel-initial forms. It seems, however, that in the Cyrillic notation of [Ibragimov 1978] and [Makhmudova 2001] initial \{ъ\} may denote not an automatic \( ?^{-}\), but \( h^{-} \) (cf., e.g., the transcriptional fluctuation \( тъадхьд \) ~ \( тьадхьд \) for \( hadč-\)id ‘high’ in [Ibragimov 1978: 151]).
5. We do not mark stress, since the dialectal systems are not systematically described; furthermore, in many cases the place of stress seems to be synchronically predictable.

VII. Aghul (proper; Koshan; Keren; Gequn; Fite).

VII.1. General.

According to [Magometov 1970: 15], [Shaumyan 1941: 12], [Suleymanov 1993: 17 ff, 203] and other authors, the Aghul language can be divided in several dialects: 1) Koshan (sub-dialects of the villages Burshag, Arsug, Khudig); 2) Keren (sub-dialects of the villages Richa, Usug and some other); 3) Gequn (the village Gequn/Burkikhan); 4) Fite (the village Fit’e); 5) Aghul proper (sub-dialects of the villages Tpig, Tsirkhe, Duldug, Kurag, Yarkug, Khpyuk and some other). Tsirkhe and Khpyuk are sometimes regarded to be separate dialects.

Out of these, the Koshan dialect is the most detached. It is reported in [Suleymanov 2003: 4] that Koshan is not completely mutually intelligible with other Aghul dialects (as far as we can judge, due to phonetic differences rather than proper lexical divergence). The newborn literary Aghul language is based on the proper Aghul dialect (for the most part, on the sub-dialect of the village Tpig). The available lexicographical data is sufficient for the compiling of five lists: Koshan, Keren, Gequn, Fite, Proper Aghul.

For Koshan dialect (Burshag village), the main lexicographic sources are [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988], [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990] (K&K’s siglum "АГБЩ"). The data from [Suleymanov 2003] are less reliable, particularly since the dictionary is generally "Tpig-oriented", the author does not discriminate between three sub-dialects of Koshan, and some specific Koshan phonemes (laryngeals and tense fricatives) are not always transcribed properly.

For Keren dialect (Richa village), the main lexicographic sources are [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988], [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990] (K&K’s siglum "АГРИ").

For Gequn dialect (Gequn/Burkikhan village), the main lexicographic sources are
For **Fite dialect (Fit'e village)**, the main lexicographic source is [Kikrik & Kodzasov 1990] (nominal forms only; K&K's siglum "АГФИ"). Additional sources are [Shaumyan 1941], [Magometov 1970], [Suleymanov 1993].

For the **proper Aghul dialect (Tpig village)**, the main lexicographic sources are [Suleymanov 2003] and [Shaumyan 1941] (some phonetically important Tpig forms are also quoted in [Kikrik & Kodzasov 1990]). Unfortunately, the dictionary [Ramazanov 2010] (ca. 5000 non-derived lexemes) is an unreliable source, containing a substantial number of incorrect semantic definitions, cases of incorrect phonetical or morphological analysis, or merely ghost words. One can suspect that [Ramazanov 2010] is based on the sub-dialect of the Kurag village (Proper Aghul dialect), which is the native idiom of the author, but in fact a number of specific terms of other dialects is also included in the dictionary - usually without any notes. Lexical data of the literary Aghul language (Proper Aghul dialect) as well as of the Koshan dialect are systematically quoted in [Comrie & Khalilov 2010], but we prefer not to use this source due to its general unreliability.

Relevant lexicographical information on specific sub-dialects from [Shaumyan 1941], [Magometov 1970], [Suleymanov 1993] is quoted in the notes. Grammatical information for various dialects has been taken from [Shaumyan 1941], [Magometov 1970], [Suleymanov 1993], [Tarlanov 1994].

### VII.2. Transliteration

The following transliterational chart covers our principal sources (in [Shaumyan 1941], the diacritical “shadda” can also be optionally used for tense consonants):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ṡ</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ṣ</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>ṗ</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>лп</td>
<td>r°</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>r:</td>
<td>r:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>пI</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ф</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f°</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>д</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>т</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>тт</td>
<td>t°</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>пI</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>д3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ц</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>цц</td>
<td>c°</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>цп</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>з</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>с</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s°</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>дж</td>
<td>đ</td>
<td>đ</td>
<td>đ</td>
<td>đ</td>
<td>đ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ч</td>
<td>č</td>
<td>č</td>
<td>č</td>
<td>č</td>
<td>č</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>чч</td>
<td>ч°</td>
<td>т</td>
<td>т</td>
<td>ч</td>
<td>ч</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>чп</td>
<td>č</td>
<td>т</td>
<td>т</td>
<td>č</td>
<td>č</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>джв</td>
<td>đv</td>
<td>đv</td>
<td>đ</td>
<td>đ</td>
<td>đ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>чв</td>
<td>ч°</td>
<td>ч°</td>
<td>ч</td>
<td>ч</td>
<td>ч</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>чпв</td>
<td>ч°</td>
<td>ч°</td>
<td>ч</td>
<td>ч</td>
<td>ч</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ж</td>
<td>ž</td>
<td>ž</td>
<td>ž</td>
<td>ž</td>
<td>ž</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ш</td>
<td>š</td>
<td>š</td>
<td>š</td>
<td>š</td>
<td>š</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>š°</td>
<td>š</td>
<td>š</td>
<td>š</td>
<td>š</td>
<td>š</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ЖВ</td>
<td>Ж’</td>
<td>Ж’</td>
<td>Ж’</td>
<td>Ж’</td>
<td>Ж’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>шв</td>
<td>ш’</td>
<td>ш’</td>
<td>ш’</td>
<td>ш’</td>
<td>ш’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ш’</td>
<td>ш’</td>
<td>ш’</td>
<td>ш’</td>
<td>ш’</td>
<td>ш’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ш’</td>
<td>ш’</td>
<td>ш’</td>
<td>ш’</td>
<td>ш’</td>
<td>ш’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>г</td>
<td>г</td>
<td>г</td>
<td>г</td>
<td>г</td>
<td>г</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>к</td>
<td>к</td>
<td>к</td>
<td>к</td>
<td>к</td>
<td>к</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>кк</td>
<td>кк</td>
<td>кк</td>
<td>кк</td>
<td>кк</td>
<td>кк</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>кк</td>
<td>кк</td>
<td>кк</td>
<td>кк</td>
<td>кк</td>
<td>кк</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>гь</td>
<td>гь</td>
<td>гь</td>
<td>гь</td>
<td>гь</td>
<td>гь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>гь</td>
<td>гь</td>
<td>гь</td>
<td>гь</td>
<td>гь</td>
<td>гь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>гь</td>
<td>гь</td>
<td>гь</td>
<td>гь</td>
<td>гь</td>
<td>гь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>гь</td>
<td>гь</td>
<td>гь</td>
<td>гь</td>
<td>гь</td>
<td>гь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>х</td>
<td>х</td>
<td>х</td>
<td>х</td>
<td>х</td>
<td>х</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>х</td>
<td>х</td>
<td>х</td>
<td>х</td>
<td>х</td>
<td>х</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>х</td>
<td>х</td>
<td>х</td>
<td>х</td>
<td>х</td>
<td>х</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>х</td>
<td>х</td>
<td>х</td>
<td>х</td>
<td>х</td>
<td>х</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>дь</td>
<td>дь</td>
<td>дь</td>
<td>дь</td>
<td>дь</td>
<td>дь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>дь</td>
<td>дь</td>
<td>дь</td>
<td>дь</td>
<td>дь</td>
<td>дь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>дь</td>
<td>дь</td>
<td>дь</td>
<td>дь</td>
<td>дь</td>
<td>дь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>дь</td>
<td>дь</td>
<td>дь</td>
<td>дь</td>
<td>дь</td>
<td>дь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
<td>хь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
<td>кь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>л</td>
<td>й</td>
<td>й</td>
<td>й</td>
<td>й</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>в</td>
<td>й</td>
<td>й</td>
<td>й</td>
<td>й</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>й (ю, я, е)</td>
<td>й</td>
<td>й</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Св</th>
<th>Св</th>
<th>Св</th>
<th>Св</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Св</td>
<td>Св</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>и</th>
<th>и</th>
<th>и</th>
<th>и</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>е, э</td>
<td>е</td>
<td>е</td>
<td>е</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>а</td>
<td>а</td>
<td>а</td>
<td>а</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>аь</td>
<td>аь</td>
<td>аь</td>
<td>аь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>у</td>
<td>у, ў</td>
<td>у</td>
<td>у</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ў</td>
<td>ў</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>q́, ..., VI</td>
<td>q́, ..., VI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes.

1. All the sources, except for [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988, 1990], provide rather inconsistent and unreliable transcriptions of Aghul. This concerns, among other things, pharyngealization, tense fricatives and especially laryngeal phonemes.

2. Some Aghul dialects display unique systems in which the pharyngeal fricatives $ʃ$ $h$ are phonemically opposed to the epiglottal fricatives $ʃ$ $h$. Such is the situation at least in the Burshag/Koshan [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 338], Richa/Keran [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 339] and Gequn [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 340] dialects. Thus, in these dialects the systems of laryngeals can include up to seven phonemes: $ʃ - h$, $ʃ - h$, ʔ, ʔ - $h$. On the contrary, certain other Aghul dialects lack the opposition between pharyngeal and epiglottal fricatives: among these are the Fite dialect [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 340] and the Tpig and Khpyuk sub-dialects of Proper Aghul (T. Maisak, p.c.). Normally, for Lezgian languages, which lack such an opposition, we transcribe pharyngeal-epiglottal fricatives as pharyngeal $ʃ$ $h$, although these are actually epiglottal $ʃ$ $h$ (according to Kodzasov’s reports). For Aghul dialects like Fite or Tpig, however, we prefer to use
epiglottal $h$ for the sake of compatibility within Aghul data.

3. The seven-partite system of laryngeal phonemes ($-h$, $h$, $?-h$, $ʔ$, $ʔ- h$) is properly described and transcribed only in [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988, 1990] (followed by [NCED]). All the other sources reduce it to a five- or three-way opposition. E.g., in the Cyrillic transcription of Koshan forms from [Suleymanov 2003], both pharyngeal & epiglottal voiced fricatives $放下$ are noted as {гI}, both pharyngeal & epiglottal voiceless fricatives $h$ are noted as [x]. In some cases, when the form, containing a pharyngeal or epiglottal phoneme, comes from a source other than Kibrik & Kodzasov, we are forced to transcribe it with the symbol $H$, which denotes an unidentified laryngeal.

4. Note the absence of the automatic prothesis $ʔ$- in vowel-initial forms.

5. Plain voiceless stops and affricates are actually aspirated: $p^h$ $t^h$ $č^h$ and so on. Following common practice, we omit the sign $^h$ and denote these as plain voiceless consonants: $p$ $t$ $č$ and so on.

6. In all Aghul dialects we denote pharyngealization as $放下$ after the first vowel or after the first uvular obstruent (if there is a uvular in the phonetic word).

7. "Woolly voice" - a specific pharyngealization-like prosodic feature of some Aghul dialects, which is described by Kodzasov as the constriction of the upper pharynx [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 319, 339] ($V$ in Kodzasov’s transcription) - has not been studied in detail yet. We do not note it in our transcription.

8. We do not mark stress, since the dialectal systems are not systematically described; furthermore, the place of stress seems to be synchronically predictable [Magometov 1970: 19 ff.].

VIII. Tabasaran (Northern, Southern).

VIII.1. General.

According to [Magometov 1965: 14] and other authors, the Tabasaran language can be
divided into two mutually intelligible dialects: Southern (or Nitrik) and Northern (or Suvak). As noted in [Alekseev & Shikhalieva 2003: 12, 15], it is possible to single out a third dialect: Eteg, which is close to Southern, but also demonstrates some Northern features; see the map in [Alekseev & Shikhalieva 2003: 12]. Literary Tabasaran (established in the 1920s) is based on the Southern dialect, although some grammar features - especially verbal class agreement - have been taken from Northern Tabasaran.

The available lexicographical data is sufficient for the compilation of two lists: Northern Tabasaran (the village Dyubek) and Southern Tabasaran (the village Kondik).

**Northern Tabasaran (Dyubek):** The main lexicographic sources are [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988] and [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990], in which the sub-dialect of the village Dyubek (or Dyuvek) is described (K&K’s siglum "ТАБД"). Additional sources are [Uslar 1979] and [Dirr 1905] - both volumes are based on the sub-dialect of the village Khanag and reflect the archaic language of the 2nd half of the 19th - early 20th centuries. A lot of words from various Northern Tabasaran dialects are contained in [Genko 2005], especially concerning the systematically quoted Khyuryuk sub-dialect (Genko’s siglum "Χ."). Several Swadesh items are missing from the available Dyubek sources (e.g., 'all', 'human skin'); in such cases it does not seem risky to fill the slot with the corresponding term from the very close Khanag sub-dialect. Some forms and grammatical information of Northern Tabasaran have been taken from [Magometov 1965].

**Southern Tabasaran (Kondik):** The main lexicographic sources are [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988] and [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990], where the sub-dialect of the village Kondik (or Kandik) is described (K&K’s siglum "ТАБК"). Additional sources, which describe the literary Tabasaran norm, are the dictionaries [Khanmagomedov & Shalbuzov 2001] and to a lesser degree [Khanmagomedov 1957], as well as several grammars: [Zhirkov 1948], [Magometov 1965], [Alekseev & Shikhalieva 2003]. An important source is the dictionary [Genko 2005], where the data of Khiv (without a specific siglum) and sporadically some other Southern sub-dialects are quoted. Several Swadesh items are missing from Kibrik & Kodzasov’s volumes (e.g., 'all', 'human skin'); in such cases we fill the slot with the corresponding term from the close Khiv sub-dialect.

Lexical data of both Northern and Southern dialects of Tabasaran are systematically
quoted in [Comrie & Khalilov 2010], but we prefer not to use this source due to its general unreliability.

VIII.2. Transliteration.

The following transliterational chart covers our principal sources (additionally, in [Genko 2005], labialization of velars and uvulars before the vowel 𝑎 is denoted as {о} for some sub-dialects, e.g. {коа} for 𝑘ʷ𝑎 instead of the standard notation {κβα}):
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Сс</th>
<th>$s^*$</th>
<th>Сс</th>
<th>Си</th>
<th>Си</th>
<th>Си</th>
<th>Си</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ж</td>
<td>ШШ</td>
<td>ШШ</td>
<td>ШШ</td>
<td>ШШ</td>
<td>ШШ</td>
<td>ШШ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ч</td>
<td>Ч</td>
<td>Ч</td>
<td>Ч</td>
<td>Ч</td>
<td>Ч</td>
<td>Ч</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ЧЧ</td>
<td>ЧЧ</td>
<td>ЧЧ</td>
<td>ЧЧ</td>
<td>ЧЧ</td>
<td>ЧЧ</td>
<td>ЧЧ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ЧІ</td>
<td>ЧІ</td>
<td>ЧІ</td>
<td>ЧІ</td>
<td>ЧІ</td>
<td>ЧІ</td>
<td>ЧІ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ж</td>
<td>Ж</td>
<td>Ж</td>
<td>Ж</td>
<td>Ж</td>
<td>Ж</td>
<td>Ж</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ш, Ш</td>
<td>Ш, Ш</td>
<td>Ш, Ш</td>
<td>Ш, Ш</td>
<td>Ш, Ш</td>
<td>Ш, Ш</td>
<td>Ш, Ш</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ЖВ</td>
<td>Ж, Ж</td>
<td>Ж, Ж</td>
<td>Ж, Ж</td>
<td>Ж, Ж</td>
<td>Ж, Ж</td>
<td>Ж, Ж</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ЧВ</td>
<td>Ч, Ч</td>
<td>Ч, Ч</td>
<td>Ч, Ч</td>
<td>Ч, Ч</td>
<td>Ч, Ч</td>
<td>Ч, Ч</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ЧЧВ</td>
<td>ЧЧВ</td>
<td>ЧЧВ</td>
<td>ЧЧВ</td>
<td>ЧЧВ</td>
<td>ЧЧВ</td>
<td>ЧЧВ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ЧІВ</td>
<td>ЧІ, ЧІ</td>
<td>ЧІ, ЧІ</td>
<td>ЧІ, ЧІ</td>
<td>ЧІ, ЧІ</td>
<td>ЧІ, ЧІ</td>
<td>ЧІ, ЧІ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ЖВ</td>
<td>ЖВ</td>
<td>ЖВ</td>
<td>ЖВ</td>
<td>ЖВ</td>
<td>ЖВ</td>
<td>ЖВ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ПВ</td>
<td>ПВ</td>
<td>ПВ</td>
<td>ПВ</td>
<td>ПВ</td>
<td>ПВ</td>
<td>ПВ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Г</td>
<td>Г</td>
<td>Г</td>
<td>Г</td>
<td>Г</td>
<td>Г</td>
<td>Г</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>К</td>
<td>К</td>
<td>К</td>
<td>К</td>
<td>К</td>
<td>К</td>
<td>К</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>КК</td>
<td>КК</td>
<td>КК</td>
<td>КК</td>
<td>КК</td>
<td>КК</td>
<td>КК</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>КІ</td>
<td>КІ</td>
<td>КІ</td>
<td>КІ</td>
<td>КІ</td>
<td>КІ</td>
<td>КІ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ГВ</td>
<td>ГВ</td>
<td>ГВ</td>
<td>ГВ</td>
<td>ГВ</td>
<td>ГВ</td>
<td>ГВ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>КВ</td>
<td>КВ</td>
<td>КВ</td>
<td>КВ</td>
<td>КВ</td>
<td>КВ</td>
<td>КВ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ККВ</td>
<td>ККВ</td>
<td>ККВ</td>
<td>ККВ</td>
<td>ККВ</td>
<td>ККВ</td>
<td>ККВ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>КІВ</td>
<td>КІВ</td>
<td>КІВ</td>
<td>КІВ</td>
<td>КІВ</td>
<td>КІВ</td>
<td>КІВ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Г</td>
<td>ГГ</td>
<td>ГГ</td>
<td>ГГ</td>
<td>ГГ</td>
<td>ГГ</td>
<td>ГГ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Хь</td>
<td>Хь</td>
<td>Хь</td>
<td>Хь</td>
<td>Хь</td>
<td>Хь</td>
<td>Хь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ХХь</td>
<td>ХХь</td>
<td>ХХь</td>
<td>ХХь</td>
<td>ХХь</td>
<td>ХХь</td>
<td>ХХь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Χь</td>
<td>Χь</td>
<td>η</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>g</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Κь</td>
<td>Κь</td>
<td>η</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>q</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΚЬ</td>
<td>ΚЬ</td>
<td>η</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>q</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΚЬ</td>
<td>ΚЬ</td>
<td>η</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>q</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΚЬ</td>
<td>ΚЬ</td>
<td>η</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>q</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΧЬ</td>
<td>ΧЬ</td>
<td>η</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>q</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΧЬ</td>
<td>ΧЬ</td>
<td>η</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>q</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΧЬ</td>
<td>ΧЬ</td>
<td>η</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>q</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Гь</th>
<th>Гь</th>
<th>η</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>η</th>
<th>η</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Χ</td>
<td>Χ</td>
<td>η</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>η</td>
<td>η</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΧΧ</td>
<td>η</td>
<td>η</td>
<td>η</td>
<td>η</td>
<td>η</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Гь</td>
<td>Гь</td>
<td>η</td>
<td>η</td>
<td>η</td>
<td>η</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Χ</td>
<td>Χ</td>
<td>η</td>
<td>η</td>
<td>η</td>
<td>η</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΧΧ</td>
<td>η</td>
<td>η</td>
<td>η</td>
<td>η</td>
<td>η</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>η</th>
<th>η</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>h</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>η</th>
<th>η</th>
<th>η</th>
<th>η</th>
<th>η</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w, v</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>v, w</td>
<td>w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>й (ю, я, е)</td>
<td>й (ю, я, е)</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>j</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notes.

1. Plain voiceless stops and affricates are actually aspirated: \( p^h \), \( t^h \), \( č^h \) and so on. Following common practice, we omit the sign \(^h\) and denote these as plain voiceless: \( p \), \( t \), \( č \) and so on.

2. In Northern Tabasaran (at least in Dyubek), voiced stops and affricates (\( b \), \( d \), \( ʒ \) and so on) become facultatively devoiced in the initial position and obligatorily devoiced after a voiceless fricative (e.g., \( /sd/ \rightarrow [st] \)), see [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 336]. Following common practice (cf. Kibrik & Kodzasov's transcription or Cyrillic orthography), we do not reflect this non-phonological change, e.g., \( /sd/ \) is written as \( sd \).

3. In Southern Tabasaran, consonants become palatalized before or after front vowels [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 337], [Alekseev & Shikhaliieva 2003: 30]. We do not note this automatic process.

4. Labialized sibilant affricates & fricatives possess specific compressed labio-dental coarticulation. The main focus can be either alveolar or postalveolar depending on the dialect, particularly alveolar \( c^w \), \( s^w \), etc. in Dyubek (Northern Tabasaran) and postalveolar \( č^w \), \( š^w \) in Kondik and Khiv (Southern Tabasaran). See [Kodzasov & Muravyeva 1982: 7] for detail. Nevertheless, following common practice, we denote
them as postalveolar ĉw, šw and so on for all Tabasaran dialects.

5. The glottal-stop (ʔ) is an automatic prothesis in the case of vocalic onset; we do not note it in our transcription.

6. Pharyngealization (a word-prosodic feature) occurs only in the syllables with back vowels: a and u [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 337]. We denote pharyngealization as ʼ after a first vowel a or u or after a uvular/laryngeal (if there is a uvular/laryngeal in the phonetic word). Pharyngealized vowels aʼ and uʼ are actually fronted: aʼ = [äʼ], uʼ = [öʼ], but we do not note this automatic feature.

7. In Southern Tabasaran (at least in Kondik), close vowels (i, ü, u) of the non-final syllable become devoiced (i̯, ü̯, u̯) in two positions: (1) after plain voiceless (i.e. aspirated) stops/affricates; (2) after voiceless fricatives, which originate from the lax series (note that after voiceless fricatives, which originate from the tense series, vowels remain voiced). This effect is noted only in Kodzasov’s transcription of Kondik, see [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 337 f.]. Actually, neither of the aforementioned rules are absolute; the exact positions of vowel devoicing require additional investigation.

IX. Lezgi (Gyune).

IX.1. General.

According to [Meylanova 1964: 43, 45 f.], [Haspelmath 1993: 20 ff.] and other authors, the Lezgi (Lezghi) language can be divided into three main dialectal groups:

- Kyuri (Küre) group, consisting of the Gyune (Güne), Yarki, Qurah dialects (each of these is divided into specific sub-dialects), as well as of the Giliar and Gelkhen dialects, which possess some features of the Samur group;
- Samur (Axceh) group, consisting of the Akhty and Doquzpara dialects (each of these is divided into specific sub-dialects), as well as of the Fiy, Jaba and Qurush dialects, which are sometimes labeled as "mixed";
- Quba (Kuba), consisting of Quba proper, Kuzun, Yargun and some other dialects.

It must be noted that Lezgi dialectological research is still in progress, and not all
known Lezgi dialects are listed above. The Literary Lezgi language is based on the Gyune dialect (for the most part on the Magaramkent sub-dialect) of the Kyuri group.

Despite the great number of Lezgi-speaking people, the relatively high sociolinguistic status of the language, its wide geographic distribution and dialectal diversity, the lexicographic description of Lezgi is modest. The available data are sufficient for compiling just one list for the Mamrach/Mamrash sub-dialect of the Gyune dialect (Kyuri dialectal group), described in [Uslar 1896]. Actually, it is stated in [Meylanova 1964: 34] that the Mamrash sub-dialect is somewhat transitional between Gyune and Yarki dialects (Gyune and Yarki, however, are quite close to each other).

Literary Lezgi (Gyune dialect) is very close to Uslar's data; therefore, we prefer to quote literary forms in the notes rather than compile an individual list. The basic lexicographic sources for Literary Lezgi are [Talibov & Gadzhiev 1966; Gadzhiev 1950] as well as [Gyulmagomedov 2004] and [Gadzhiev 1956]. Additionally, we refer to the glossary in [Haspelmath 1993]. Another important source is the Literary Lezgi corpus [Ganenkov 2011]. Grammatical information has been taken from [Gaydarov et al. 2009; Alekseev & Sheykhov 1997; Haspelmath 1993].

As for other Lezgi dialects, only the data on nouns of the Akhty dialect (Klyut sub-dialect) of the Samur group have been systematically recorded and published in the dictionary [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990]. We quote Akhty as well as some scattered forms from other dialects in the notes.

Lexical data of the Literary Lezgi language as well as of the Kuba (proper) dialect and the Mikrakh subdialect of the Doquzpara dialect are systematically quoted in [Comrie & Khalilov 2010], but we prefer not to use this source due to its general unreliability.

It must be pointed out that, despite dialectal diversity, the Lezgi language appears to be rather homogenous lexicostatistically. E.g., there are only two unmatched items between Uslar’s dialect and the literary language (‘earth’, ‘feather’) - both idioms belong to the Kyuri dialectal group. Comparison with the available nominal forms of the Akhty dialect (Samur group) yields three additional mismatches: ‘cold’, ‘leaf’, ‘rain’.
IX.2. Transliteration.

The following transliterational chart covers our principal sources:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modern literary alphabet</th>
<th>[Haspelmath 1993]</th>
<th>[Uslar 1896]</th>
<th>[Kibrik &amp; Kodzasov 1990]</th>
<th>[NCED]</th>
<th>GLD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>б</td>
<td>б</td>
<td>б</td>
<td>б</td>
<td>б</td>
<td>б</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>п</td>
<td>p, /pʰ/</td>
<td>п</td>
<td>п</td>
<td>п</td>
<td>п</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>п, [пп]</td>
<td>p, /p/</td>
<td>п</td>
<td>б</td>
<td>р:</td>
<td>п:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>пі</td>
<td>р'</td>
<td>п</td>
<td>р'</td>
<td>р'</td>
<td>р'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ф</td>
<td>ʃ</td>
<td>ф</td>
<td>ф</td>
<td>ф</td>
<td>ф</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>д</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>д</td>
<td>д</td>
<td>д</td>
<td>д</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>т</td>
<td>t, /tʰ/</td>
<td>т</td>
<td>т</td>
<td>т</td>
<td>т</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>т, [тт]</td>
<td>t, /t/</td>
<td>т</td>
<td>т</td>
<td>т:</td>
<td>т:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ті</td>
<td>т'</td>
<td>т</td>
<td>т'</td>
<td>т'</td>
<td>т'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ц</td>
<td>с, /ʦʰ/</td>
<td>ё</td>
<td>с</td>
<td>с</td>
<td>с</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ц, [цц]</td>
<td>с, /ʦ/</td>
<td>ц</td>
<td>ё</td>
<td>с:</td>
<td>с:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>цІ</td>
<td>ц'</td>
<td>ё</td>
<td>ц'</td>
<td>с'</td>
<td>с'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>з</td>
<td>з</td>
<td>з</td>
<td>з</td>
<td>з</td>
<td>з</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>с</td>
<td>с</td>
<td>с</td>
<td>с</td>
<td>с</td>
<td>с</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>щ</td>
<td>щ</td>
<td>щ</td>
<td>щ</td>
<td>щ</td>
<td>щ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ч</td>
<td>є, /ʧʰ/</td>
<td>ч</td>
<td>є</td>
<td>є</td>
<td>є</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ч, [чч]</td>
<td>є, /ʧ/</td>
<td>є</td>
<td>є</td>
<td>є:</td>
<td>є:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>чІ</td>
<td>є'</td>
<td>є</td>
<td>є'</td>
<td>є'</td>
<td>є'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ж</td>
<td>ж</td>
<td>ж</td>
<td>ж</td>
<td>ж</td>
<td>ж</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ш</td>
<td>Ш</td>
<td>Ш</td>
<td>Ш</td>
<td>Ш</td>
<td>Ш</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Г</td>
<td>Г</td>
<td>Г</td>
<td>Г</td>
<td>Г</td>
<td>Г</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>К</td>
<td>К</td>
<td>К</td>
<td>К</td>
<td>К</td>
<td>К</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>К, [КК]</td>
<td>К</td>
<td>К</td>
<td>К</td>
<td>К</td>
<td>К</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>К</td>
<td>К</td>
<td>К</td>
<td>К</td>
<td>К</td>
<td>К</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Т Ь</td>
<td>Т Ь</td>
<td>Т Ь</td>
<td>Т Ь</td>
<td>Т Ь</td>
<td>Т Ь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Х</td>
<td>Х</td>
<td>Х</td>
<td>Х</td>
<td>Х</td>
<td>Х</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(КУГ)</td>
<td>Г</td>
<td>Г</td>
<td>Г</td>
<td>Г</td>
<td>Г</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Х</td>
<td>Х</td>
<td>Х</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Х</td>
<td>Х</td>
<td>Х</td>
<td>Х</td>
<td>Х</td>
<td>Х</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Н</td>
<td>Н</td>
<td>Н</td>
<td>Н</td>
<td>Н</td>
<td>Н</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Р</td>
<td>Р</td>
<td>Р</td>
<td>Р</td>
<td>Р</td>
<td>Р</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Л</td>
<td>Л</td>
<td>Л</td>
<td>Л</td>
<td>Л</td>
<td>Л</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>В</td>
<td>В</td>
<td>В</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Й (Ю, Я, Е)</td>
<td>Й</td>
<td>Й</td>
<td>Й</td>
<td>Й</td>
<td>Й</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>С в</td>
<td>С w</td>
<td>C w</td>
<td>C w</td>
<td>C w</td>
<td>C w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>С i</td>
<td>С y</td>
<td>С y</td>
<td>С y</td>
<td>С y</td>
<td>С y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notes.

1. Obstruent stops and affricates are arranged in four series: voiced [d] / plain voiceless [t] / voiceless aspirated [tʰ] / voiceless ejective [t']. This is the situation for at least the modern Gyune dialect (Literary Lezgi) and the Klyut sub-dialect of the Samur dialectal group (see [Haspelmath 1993: 2; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 341]). The plain voiceless series [t] originates from old tense obstruents (*tː). According to [Uslar 1896: 12 ff.], however, in the Gyune dialect of the 19th century the plain voiceless series (modern [t]) was pronounced as tense [t̆] or [tː], whereas the voiceless aspirated series (modern [tʰ]) possessed weak aspiration, similar to the Russian voiceless sounds like [t]. For this reason, as well as for the sake of general compatibility within Lezgian data, we prefer to transcribe the plain voiceless series [t] as tense (i.e. t̆) and voiceless aspirated [tʰ] as plain (i.e. t).

2. The only sources that systematically discriminate between aspirated (t) and non-aspirated (tː) voiceless series, are [Uslar 1896; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990; Meylanova 1964] and the glossary in [Haspelmath 1993]. In modern Cyrillic orthography, both series are denoted with the corresponding Russian letters for voiceless phonemes, i.e. both t and tː are written as {т}. In the case of homographs, the tense series can be written with the doubled Cyrillic letter in dictionaries and other grammatical or educational
publications, e.g., \textit{tar} (rap) ‘a k. of musical instrument’, but \textit{t:\textipa{tar}} (\textipa{t\textipa{r}ap}) ‘tree’. In the same cases, in [Gyulmagomedov 2004] the aspirated series can be transcribed as either \{t\} or \{\textipa{tr}\}.

3. Note that the automatic prothesis \textipa{ʔ}- in vowel-initial forms is apparently absent (at least in main dialects).

4. At least in the Klyut sub-dialect of the Samur dialectal group, \textipa{a} is actually pharyngealized \{\textipa{a}\} in all positions. In the same sub-dialect \textipa{a} is realized as \{\textipa{o}\} after \textipa{w} or \textipa{Cw}; likewise, \textipa{e} is realized as \{\textipa{6}\} after \textipa{Cw}. See [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 342].

\section{Proto-Lezgian}

\subsection{General}

The only systematic published reconstruction of the Proto-Lezgian phonological system and etymological corpus belongs to Sergei Starostin, although, of course, the reconstruction acknowledges its debt to previous research, conducted by such Caucasologists as Nikolai Troubetzkoy, M. E. Alekseev, E. A. Bokarev, B. K. Gigineyshvili, B. B. Talibov \textit{et alii} (see the overview of Proto-Lezgian studies in [Alekseev 1985: 8 ff.]). S. Starostin’s reconstruction was included in [NCED] and published electronically as \textit{Lezgian Etymological Database} [LEDb] on the StarLing database server (Starostin’s full manuscript \textit{Lezgian Historical Phonology} still remains unpublished, but its abbreviated version has appeared in [NCED: 122-179]). It must be noted that [LEDb] only includes those Proto-Lezgian morphemes for which external North Caucasian etymology has been proposed by the authors of [NCED], and the Swadesh words of individual languages (even if these lack external North Caucasian \textit{comparanda}).

In reconstructing the Swadesh wordlist for Proto-Lezgian, we generally follow [NCED] and [LEDb], although in some cases we revise and, occasionally, even reject Starostin’s specific etymologies (this mostly has to do with new Lezgian data that have been published since the mid-1990s).
Database compiled and annotated by:

**Udi (Nidzh), Udi (Vartashen)**: A. Kassian, November 2011 (we are thankful to the UdiLang Project (http://udilang.narod.ru/index.html) team - T. Maisak, Dm. Ganenkov, Yu. Lander [all Moscow] - for a number of valuable remarks on Udi data). Updated January & March 2012 (some minor corrections concerning Azerbaijani and Iranian data);

**Archi**: A. Kassian, November 2011;

**Kryts (proper), Kryts (Alyk)**: A. Kassian, December 2011;

**Budukh**: A. Kassian, January 2012. Updated February 2012 (words for 'bark', 'fingernail', 'sand', 'to swim' have been added - all borrowed);

**Tsakhur (Mishlesh, Mikik, Gelmets)**: A. Kassian, February 2012.


**Aghul (Koshan, Keren, Gequn, Fite, proper Aghul)**: A. Kassian, April 2012.

**Tabasaran (Northern, Southern)**: A. Kassian, May 2012.

**Lezgi (Gyune)**: A. Kassian, June 2012.

**Proto-Lezgian**: A. Kassian, October 2012.
1. ALL

Nidzh Udi bütin ~ bütim (-1), Vartashen Udi bütün ~ bitun (-1), Archi m'arçi (1), Kryts (proper) vari (-1), Alyk Kryts girt (-1), Budukh pitin {numun} (-1), Mishlesh Tsakhur girgi-n {צָּוַרְנוּ} (2), Mikik Tsakhur girgi-n (2), Mukhad Rutul si-ʔin (3), Ixrek Rutul si-nebir {כֻּנְבוּרְפ} (3), Koshan Aghul wari (-1), Keren Aghul wari (-1), Gequn Aghul žala ~ žala (-1), Fite Aghul žala (-1), Aghul (proper) žala (-1), Northern Tabasaran war'i ~ war'i (-1), Southern Tabasaran w'ari {אָפוּ} (-1), Gyune Lezgi war'i (-1).

References and notes:


Common Udi: Borrowed from Azerbaijani bütin 'all (totus/omnis)'.

Caucasian Albanian: ox [Gippert et al. 2008: II-41, IV-40]. Normally means 'all (omnis), every', as opposed to ka-nay 'all (totus), whole' and lušˤu 'all (totus), whole, entire' [Gippert et al. 2008: II-41, IV-22, 41].

Archi: Kibrik et al. 1977b: 277, 354; Chumakina et al. 2007; Dirr 1908: 47. Quoted as miri ~ marți in [Mikailov 1967: 95, 193], but as marći in [Mikailov 1967: 156 (65)]. As noted in [Kibrik et al. 1977a 3: 277], miri normally refers to substantives of classes 1 and 2, scl human beings (the same in [Chumakina et al. 2007]).

Browsing through texts in [Kibrik et al. 1977b; Mikailov 1967; Dirr 1908] suggests that the adverb marći is the most common expression for 'all (omnis)', which can be used as both attributive and non-attributive, referring to human beings. Examples are numerous, e.g., "All youths like this girl" and so on [Kibrik et al. 1977b: 9, 11, 21, 27, 46, 104, etc.].

A reasonable solution should be to treat expressions for 'omnis (human beings)' and 'omnis (non-human or inanimate)' as synonyms, but the latter basic term cannot be established from available sources.

A possible candidate for 'omnis (non-human or inanimate)' could be the adverb/adjacive k'elliy-CLASS-a [Mikailov 1967: 95, 186; Dirr 1908: 48] with polysemy: 'totus / omnis'. The following examples for 'omnis' are found: "All the bull calves went home" [Mikailov 1967: 95], "All the horses" [Dirr 1908: 48], and also referring to humans: "All the women" [Dirr 1908: 48]. In more modern sources, however, this word is quoted as kelley-CLASS-u with the exclusive meaning 'entirely, wholly', i.e. 'totus' [Chumakina et al. 2007; Kibrik et al. 1977b: 264].

More rare seems to be the adjective bāt-ɛšu-tu-CLASS 'totus / omnis' [Chumakina et al. 2007] (examples: "I have filled a whole notebook with my writing", "All the sheep have come back"), [Kibrik et al. 1977b: 200] from the adverb bāt-ɛša 'completely' ← the verb bāt-ɛša 'to come true, be fulfilled (of wish); to pass, come (of time)'.

Cf. also various words for 'all (totus)'.

The adverb ik'ên [Kibrik et al. 1977b: 251, 354; Mikailov 1967: 95, 182], which normally expresses non-attributive 'all (totus)' referring to inanimate and abstract objects. E.g., "She demonstrated her hair and all (the rest, i.e. her body)", ‘Then this girl said everything’ and so on [Kibrik et al. 1977b: 32, 37, 41, 93, 94, 97, etc.]. But there is one example for attributive 'ik'ên 'all (omnis)' referring to inanimate objects: "He (the physician) cured all fractures" [Kibrik et al. 1977b: 116], and one example for attributive 'ik'ên 'all (totus)' referring to an inanimate object: "I have latched onto all of the property" [Mikailov 1967: 95].

The adjectives g'ey CLASS-u and g'ey-CLASS-u-k'omn, which are explicitly glossed as 'all (totus), whole' in [Kibrik et al. 1977b: 234, 352] and [Chumakina et al. 2007] (k'omn means 'some, any' [Kibrik et al. 1977b: 240]) with examples like "He has left all his property to the son", "The whole girl has been covered with gold", 'I was washing the dishes yesterday, but could not wash the whole lot' [Kibrik et al. 1977b: 41, 234; Kibrik et al. 1977a 2: 148]. In [Mikailov 1967: 95, 176] this
adjective is quoted as g”iy-CLASS-u with additional examples for the meaning 'all (totus)'.

More marginal seems to be the adjective hannya-CLASS-tannya ‘all (totus), whole’ [Chumakina et al. 2007; Kibrik et al. 1977b: 236, 354], consisting of hannya ‘which one’ + tannya means ‘some, any’.

The last term is the adjective obisi ‘all (totus/omnis)’, glossed as ‘all, whole, every’ in [Chumakina et al. 2007] and supplemented by two examples: “All the people [sg.] went in different directions”, "Everybody went to the fields”. This word has not been found in other sources.

Kryts (proper): Saadiev 1994: 422. Polysemy: ‘totus / omnis’. Apparently a Turkic loanword: Proto-Turkic predicative *bar ‘there is, there exists’, which shifted to ‘all (omnis or totus)’ in many Turkic languages, although Azerbaijani var ‘there is’ is probably attested only with the meaning ‘there is’.


Gemlets Tsakhur: Not attested.


Distinct from the paronymous sūyā-nā ~ sīye-nā ‘all (totus)’ [Ibragimov 1978: 76].

Ixrek Rutul: Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 230. The meaning is ‘all (omnis); it is the regular plural form from si-ne [cuse] ‘all (totus)’ [Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 230].

Distinct from the paronymous sūye-nā [caseana] ‘all (totus)’ [Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 224, 327] with the examples: “I have got it all” [Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 229b], “Everything depends upon you” [Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 23a].

An additional term is bütün [fysryas] ‘all (totus/omnis)’ [Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 43], borrowed from Azerbaijani bütün ‘all (totus/omnis)’.

Luchek Rutul: Not attested.

Common Rutul: Mukhad sī-žn, sīyā-nā and Ixrek si-ne, sīye-nā apparently represent historical derivatives from the Rutul numeral sa ‘1’.


In other subdialects: Arsug šilə, Khudig šala ‘totus / omnis’ [Shaumyan 1941: 74, 170].


Gequn Aghul: Dirr 1907: 28, 114, 170; Suleymanov 1993: 134. The form in -z is from [Dirr 1907] (in some cases Dirr transcribes Gequn ž as ž). Meaning ‘all (omnis)’.

Distinct from inherited kil-di ‘all (totus)’ [Dirr 1907: 28, 130, 169], an adverb derived from kil ‘head’ q.v.

Fite Aghul: Suleymanov 1993: 134. Two synonyms are quoted in [Suleymanov 1993]: şala and wari, both of them probably with polysemy: ‘totus / omnis’.


Common Aghul: The word wari was ultimately borrowed from Turkic; see notes on Kryts (proper).

The second term (şala ~ şala) also seems to be a loanword. The Koshan and proper Aghul forms are quoted as şila ~ şila in [Suleymanov 2003: 80]; the initial stress points to a recent borrowing (see [Magometov 1970: 20]), although the source is not entirely clear (Arabic?).

Northern Tabasaran: Uslar 1979: 145, 622, 991; Dirr 1905: 45, 159, 225. Polysemy: ‘all (omnis) / all (totus)’. This is actually the word from the Khanag subdialect; the proper Dyubek term for ‘all’ is unknown.

The same in the Khvyrıuk subdialect: warı [apu] ‘all (omnis / totus)’ [Genko 2005: 32].

Southern Tabasaran: Genko 2005: 32. Polysemy: ‘all (omnis) / all (totus)’. This is actually the word from the Khiv subdialect; the proper Kondik term for ‘all’ is unknown.

The same in Literary Tabasaran: wari [apu] ‘all (omnis / totus)’ [Khanmagomedov & Shalbuzov 2001: 93; Zhirkov 1948: 105]. There also exists the rare literary word marcı-yi [mari̇yi̇m] ‘all’ [Khanmagomedov 1957: 43] (not found in other sources; the exact meaning is unknown) - literally ‘cleanly’, derived from the adjective marcı ‘clean’ [Khanmagomedov & Shalbuzov 2001: 224] with the common adverbial suffix -yi (for which see [Magometov 1965: 327]).
Common Tabasaran: The loanword warِ / wari is the Common Tabasaran term for 'all (omnis / totus)' [Magometov 1965: 189]. The form was ultimately borrowed from Turkic, see notes on Kryts (proper).

Gyune Lezgi: Uslar 1896: 79, 366, 606. Polysemy: 'all (omnis) / all (totus)'. A close, but less frequent synonym is mix İz 'all (omnis/totus)' [Uslar 1896: 80, 507, 606].


The word warِ – warِ is ultimately borrowed from Turkic; see notes on Kryts (proper). The second term mix İz literally means 'cleanly', derived from the inherited adjective mix i 'clean' [Talibov & Gadzhiev 1966: 240] with the common adverbial suffix -z (for which see [Gaydarov et al. 2009: 220 f., 222 f.]).

Proto-Lezgian: Not reconstructible.

Distribution: In the majority of languages, the meaning 'all' (omnis or with polysemy omnis / totus) is represented by Turkic or Iranian loanwords. Inherited forms are:

1) Tsakhur girgi-n, derived from the old root for 'round' q.v.
2) Rutul si-šn, si-ne-bir, apparently derived from the old root for 'one' q.v.
3) Lezgi mix İz, literally 'cleanly' from the adjective 'clean'.
4) Tabasaran marci-qi, literally 'cleanly' from the adjective 'clean'.
5) Caucasian Albanian ceç and Archi mārē, both are etymologically unclear.

Tabasaran marci-qi and Archi mārē are indeed phonetically similar, but the affricate correspondence is irregular.

Replacements: ['round' > 'all'] (Tsakhur), ['one' > 'all'] (Rutul), ['clean' > 'all'] (Tabasaran, Lezgi).

2. ASHES

Nidzh Udi Žeq: {жечъ} (1), Vartashen Udi iq: ~ yeq {якъ ~ ъекъ} (1), Archi diq İz (1), Kryts (proper) râq (1), Alyk Kryts raq (1), Budukh req {речъ} (1), Mishlesh Tsakhur yiğ İz {иьлчъ, иьлъчъ} (1), Mikik Tsakhur yiğ İz (1), Gelmets Tsakhur yiğ İz (1), Mukhad Rutul riq İz {рилчъ} (1), Ixrek Rutul riq İz {рилчъ} (1), Luchek Rutul riq İz (1), Koshan Aghul ruq İz (1), Keren Aghul ruq İz (1), Gequn Aghul riq y İz (1), Fite Aghul ruq y İz (1), Aghul (proper) râq (1), Northern Tabasaran ruq y İz (1), Southern Tabasaran ruq İz (1), Gyune Lezgi râq (1), Proto-Lezgian *riq İz (1).

References and notes:


Common Udi: Both forms are apparently related, reflecting different treatments of Proto-Lezgian *r- (thus [NCED: 606; Schulze 2001: 286]).


Distinct from kurtül 'tobacco ashes, tobacco sediment in a pipe' [Chumakina et al. 2007].

Kryts (proper): Kibrik & Kodzassov 1990: 207; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 64.


Tsakhur-Kum Tsakhur: yiğ İz [Kibrik & Kodzassov 1990: 207].
Mikik Tsakhur: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 207; Dirr 1913: 170, 226.

Gelmets Tsakhur: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 207. In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 64], the modern depharyngealized variant is quoted: absol. yiq.

Common Tsakhur: It should be noted that the tense -qː- was eliminated in the Mishlesh paradigm which was levelled after the regular absolutive form yiqː.


Ixrek Rutul: Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 219, 343; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 64. Paradigm: rɨqː [abs.] / rɨqː [obl.]. In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 64], erroneously quoted as rɨq [ryh].


Gequn Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 207; Dirr 1907: 140, 179.

Fite Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 207.


Northern Tabasaran: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 207.


Southern Tabasaran: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 207.


The same in the Akhty dialect: Khyrut rɨq [abs.] / rɨqːedi- [obl.] ‘ashes’ [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 207].

Proto-Lezgian: NCED: 606. Distribution: One of the most stable words, retained in its basic meaning in all Lezgian lects.

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular, except for the unique (?) development *r- > ž- in Nidzh Udi.

Semantics and structure: Primary substantive root. The oblique stem is *riqː-V-.

3. BARK

Nidzh Udi q’öl {къол} (1), Vartashen Udi q’öl {къол} (1), Archi p’aq’ut (2), Kryts (proper) qabuχ ~ qabuv (1), Alyk Kryts qabuv (1), Budukh qabuv {къабуг} (1), Mishlesh Tsakhur qabix (1), Mikik Tsakhur qabix (1), Gelmets Tsakhur qabix (1), Mukhad Rutul žigal {джигал} (3), Ixrek Rutul žigal {джигал} (3), Luchek Rutul žigal (3), Koshan Aghul gal (1), Keren Aghul gužal (3), Gequn Aghul qark (4), Fite Aghul qark (4), Aghul (proper) qark (4), Northern Tabasaran yal (1), Southern Tabasaran yal (1), Gyune Lezgi čikal (3), Proto-Lezgian *ƛːal (1).
References and notes:


Common Aghul: Common Aghul

Aghul (proper):

- Fite Aghul:

- Gequn Aghul:

- Koshan Aghul:

- Luchek Rutul:

- Ixrek Rutul:

- Mukhad Rutul:

Common Tsakhur:

- Gelmets Tsakhur:

- Mishlesh Tsakhur:

- Budukh:

- Alyk Kryts:

- Kryts (proper):

- Archi:

- Caucasian Albanian: Not attested.

- Kryts (proper):

- Budukh:

- Gelmets Tsakhur:

- Mishlesh Tsakhur:

- Mukhad Rutul:

Common Tsakhur:

- Miskell Rutul:

Mukhad Rutul:

- Luchek Rutul:

Izet Rutul:

- Luchek Rutul:

Korean Aghul:

- Koshan Aghul:

- Ixrek Aghul:

- Kryts (proper):

- Common Udi:

- Common Udi:


Common Aghul: Common Aghul ‘qːol ‘bark’.

Azerbaijani complex expression ‘bark; shell’.


Borrowed from Azerbaijani gabɨg (Quba dialect ‘gabuy’) ‘bark; shell’.


Distinct from the inherited specific term lu:kʰon ‘‘tree’s bark’’ [Ibragimov & Nurmamedov 2010: 233].


Mikik Tsakhur: Kibrik & Kodzazov 1990: 97; Dirr 1913: 194, 227.

Distinct from the inherited specific term lu:kʰon ‘‘bark’’ [Kibrik & Kodzazov 1990: 97].


Distinct from the inherited specific term lu:kʰon ‘‘bark’’ [Kibrik & Kodzazov 1990: 97].

Common Tsakhur: In all dialects the generic term was borrowed from Azerbaijani gabɨg ‘bark; shell’.


It should be noted that Dirr quotes two different terms for ‘bark’: Mukhad qːabɨq [Dirr 1912: 152, 192] (borrowed from Azerbaijani gabɨg ‘bark’) and Mukhad & Shinaz qːabɨq [Dirr 1912: 181, 182, 192]. The latter can in fact mean simply ‘birch bark’, cf. the Luchek data below.


Another term for ‘bark’ is qːabɨɣ (kʰanax) [Dzhamalov & Samedov 2006: 349], borrowed from Azerbaijani gabɨg ‘bark’.


A second synonym for ‘bark’ is qːabɨq [Kibrik & Kodzazov 1990: 97], borrowed from Azerbaijani gabɨg ‘bark’.

Distinct from the more specific term č’ɨn ‘‘bark’’ [Kibrik & Kodzazov 1990: 97].

Kosha Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzazov 1990: 97. It must be noted that in [Shaumyan 1941: 187] and [Suleymanov 2003: 114] Burshag qːal is glossed only as ‘shell’, whereas in [Suleymanov 2003: 114] the meaning ‘bark’ is ascribed to the Burshag word sark.

In the Khudig subdialect ‘bark’ sounds as qːark, cf. the Luchek data below.

Keren Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzazov 1990: 97. The same root in the Usug subdialect: ʐikɨl ‘bark’, where it is opposed to qːark ‘shell’ [Shaumyan 1941: 187].

Gequn Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzazov 1990: 97. Not attested in [Dirr 1907]. It must be noted that in [Shaumyan 1941: 187], Gequn qːark is glossed only as ‘shell’.

Fite Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzazov 1990: 97.


Common Aghul: It seems that qːark can assuredly be reconstructed as the Proto-Aghul term for ‘bark / shell’. In some modern
duplicates this polysemy tends to be eliminated, with the meaning 'bark' transferred to other words - gužal ~ žigal in Keren or gal in Koshan (Burshtag).

**Northern Tabasaran:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 97.


**Southern Tabasaran:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 97.

The same in the Khiv subdialect: yəl [raə] with polysemy: 'bark / peel' [Genko 2005: 39] (the plus sign is apparently omitted by accident, although the white space between the bracket and the siglum "X." is present). The same in Literary Tabasaran: yəl [raə] with polysemy: 'bark / rolled out dough' [Khanmagomedov & Shaibulzov 2001: 96].

**Gyune Lezgi:** Uslar 1896: 589, 615. Polysemy: 'bark / peel'.

The same in Literary Lezgi: ëkal [ukal] with polysemy: 'bark / peel' [Talibov & Gadzhiev 1966: 373; Gadzhiev 1950: 308]. Somewhat differently in the Akhdy dialect: Khlyut can 'bark' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 97]. According to [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990], the second Khlyut word for 'bark' is ëkal. The difference between the two terms is unknown, but Khlyut can is clearly secondary, because its literary counterpart kan means 'dandruff; epidermis' [Talibov & Gadzhiev 1966: 149] and the external comparison proves that the semantics of 'skin' is primary [NCED: 699].

**Proto-Lezgian:** NCED: 789. Distribution: An unstable word, superseded by a loanword from Azerbaijani in Kryts, Budukh and Tsakhur and probably by a loanword from Avar in archaic Archi. Four inherited stems enter into competition: (1) *ƛːal (Udi 'bark / peel / shell', Tabasaran 'bark / peel' and Koshan Aghul 'bark'), (2) *čukːa/*kːučːa (Rutul 'bark / peel', Lezgi 'bark / peel' and Keren Aghul 'bark'), (3) *parqːulː (modern Archi), (4) *qːärkʷa (Proto-Aghul 'bark / shell').

The last of these, *qːärkʷa, is formally a Proto-Aghul innovation (Lezgian comparison suggests the development 'a k. of hide' > 'bark' [NCED: 455 f.]).

Two stems with the best distribution - ëkal and *čukːa/*kːučːa - are formally equivalent candidates, and any historical scenario would imply certain zig-zag or parallel semantic shifts.

External North Caucasian comparison suggests that the original meaning of *čukːa/*kːučːa-la was 'noodles' or 'a k. of food rising to the surface after boiling' [NCED: 439]. This semantics is retained in Budukh ('noodles'), but underwent such shifts as 'noodles' > 'sour cream' in Tsakhur, 'noodles' > 'bass, base' in Kryts and 'noodles' > 'bark, peel' in Rutul, Lezgi, Keren Aghul. The latter shift is not a genetical feature of Rutul, Lezgi and Keren Aghul, but is either an independent development or, rather, an areal isogloss between adjacent territories (see [Koryakov 2006: map 13]).

As for *ƛːal, external North Caucasian comparison points to the original meaning 'color' with the shift 'color' > 'surface' [NCED: 789]; however, it is not particularly risky to assume the shift 'color' > 'bark, peel' for Proto-Lezgian. The meaning 'bark, peel' is retained in Udi and Tabasaran, and emerges as a secondary development in Koshan Aghul (in Proto-Aghul this root apparently meant 'shell').

The fourth inherited term for 'bark', *parqːulː, which is attested in the basic meaning in modern Archi, can be a recent introduction, if Dirr's data are correct. If so, this Proto-Lezgian stem demonstrates the shift 'burdock, plantain' > 'bark' in Archi [NCED: 865]. It is important that Lezgian *parqːulː finds Avar cognates with the meaning 'bark' [NCED: 865], but it is not clear whether *mVq'ːVr- can be reconstructed as the Proto-Avar-Andic term for 'bark' (perhaps we are dealing with independent developments in Archi and Avar). Note that in the Lezgian languages, *parqːulː demonstrates various consonants irregularities of dissimilative/assimilative nature [NCED: 865], particularly the Archi form is p'aq'ut with lax q' (not **p'aq'ut pace NCED).

**Replacements:** (a k. of hide > 'bark') (Aghul), ('shell' > 'bark') (Koshan Aghul), ('noodles' > 'bark') (Rutul, Lezgi, Keren Aghul), ('burdock, plantain' > 'bark') (Archi), ('color' > 'bark, peel') (Proto-Lezgian).

**Reconstruction shape:** Correspondences seem regular.

**Semantics and structure:** Primary substantive root, probably with Proto-Lezgian polysemy 'bark / peel'. The oblique stem is *λːole- or *λːola-.

4. BELLY

Nidzh Udi tapən {manan} (1), Vartashen Udi bukuν {boukun} (2), Archi l'agi (3), Kryts (proper) fän (4), Alyk Kryts fan (4), Budukh tapən {manan} (1), Mishlesh Tsakhur wuxun
(uxyn) (4), Mikik Tsakhir wuxin ~ wuxin (4), Gelmets Tsakhir uxun (4), Mukhad Rutul uxin {uxyn} (4), Ixrek Rutul ämräz (aƙmaƙsa) (-1), Luchek Rutul iči (-1), Koshan Aghul fun (4), Keren Aghul fun (4), Gequn Aghul fun (4), Fite Aghul fun (4), Aghul (proper) fun (4), Northern Tabasaran fun (4), Southern Tabasaran fun (4), Gyune Lezgi rufun (4), Proto-Lezgian *uo=t*in ~ *ro=t*in (6).

References and notes:


Schulze [Schulze 2001: 262] suspects a borrowing from Arabic buťcun (the plural form of Arabic bu’tun- ‘belly, stomach, womb’); the hypothesis is unconvincing both phonetically and morphologically.

Common Udi: Both terms (tapan and buku) look suspicious, although no potential sources of borrowing have been revealed up to now. If both forms are indigenous, it is rather tapan that should be postulated as the original Udi word for ‘belly’ in the light of external comparanda.


Archi: Chumakina et al. 2007; Kibrik & Kodzassov 1990: 36; Kibrik et al. 1977b: 271, 359. According to [Chumakina et al. 2007; Kibrik & Kodzassov 1990: 36; Kibrik et al. 1977b: 271, 336, 359] there are two closely synonymous terms for ‘belly, stomach’: lāği and χˤurχˤu. Browsing through texts in [Kibrik et al. 1977b], however, suggests that lāği is applied to humans, whereas χˤurχˤu normally denotes stomach of an animal. Cf. the following examples for lāği: “I have a stomach ache” (lit. ”my stomach aches”) [Kibrik et al. 1977b: 27, 28, 271, 32, 33, 38, 39], ”She is pregnant” (lit. ”a child in her belly”), ”stepbrother” (lit. ”brother with a different belly”) [Kibrik et al. 1977b: 271].

Examples for χˤurχˤu are: ”Give me the ram’s stomach” etc. [Kibrik et al. 1977b: 25, 26, 28], ”I have given him (i.e., to the child of the king of beasts) the name Full Belly” [Kibrik et al. 1977b: 336], ”A dried cow stomach” [Kibrik et al. 1977b: 336].

Two terms, lāği and χˤurχˤu, are discriminated in [Dirr 1908]: lāği is translated as ‘paunch, belly (Russian: брюхо, живот)” [Dirr 1908: 164, 207], χˤurχˤu as ‘stomach (Russian: желудок)” [Dirr 1908: 190, 207].


We fill the slot with the etymologically obscure word lāği. This resembles Lak laq’t ‘belly, stomach’, which is likewise unetymologizable, but the Archi term can hardly be a Lak loanword due to phonetic difference (for Lak loanwords in Archi see [Kibrik et al. 1977a: 1: 53 f.]). It is proposed in [NCED] that Archi lāği was borrowed from Avar lāqa ‘body part, organ; body-build, frame, figure; stature’, but this solution seems dubious due to semantic difference (cf. the late transparent Avar loanword in Archi lāga ‘body part’ [Chumakina et al. 2007; Kibrik et al. 1977b: 271]).

Distinct from kummiחlin нол' ‘stomach, gaster (Russian желудок), literally ‘food’s house’ [Kibrik & Kodzassov 1990: 36] - a loan translation from Avar (in [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 222] this is incorrectly quoted as the only Archi term for ‘stomach’).


Distinct from the more marginal term fin [фани], glossed as 'belly' in [Meylanova 1984: 143, 212] with the only example being: "to have a stomach ache".

Distinct from qursaq 'stomach' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 36], borrowed from Azerbaijani gursag 'abomasum; stomach, belly'.


Mikik Tsakhur: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 36; Dirr 1913: 144, 225. Polysemy: 'belly / stomach'.


According to [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 222], the meaning 'stomach' can also be expressed with the loanword мађада [маъдад] (< Azerbaijani мада 'stomach' or rather directly from Arabic мафд-ат- 'stomach').

Mukhad Rutul: Dirr 1912: 174, 190; Ibragimov 1978: 39, 114. Polysemy: 'belly / stomach', applied to humans and animals. It should be noted that in [Makhmudova 2001: 12, 41]; the latter is borrowed from Azerbaijani и (possessed и-i) 'entrails'. In [Ibragimov 1978: 39], however, Mukhad и is glossed as 'pluck'.


Ixrek Rutul: Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 21, 339. In [Ibragimov 1978: 198, 222], quoted as армаз. This seems to be the basic word for 'belly' in Ixrek, cf. the examples: "It became tight in the belly" [Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 88b], 'bellyaches have begun' [Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 166a], "To crawl on the belly" [Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 279b]. Ixrek âмраз ~ армаз, Mukhad армаз, Muxrek армаз 'belly' [Ibragimov 1978: 169, 186] looks like a recent loanword, although the source is not clear (cf. Arabic ларр- 'intestines').

A second (apparently less frequent) term is the inherited уфун 'belly; stomach' [Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 257].

A third candidate is лақ'ўа 'paunch, belly' [Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 178], borrowed from Lak лақъ 'belly, stomach'.

Luchek Rutul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 36. Glossed as 'belly (Russian: живот)'. Borrowed from Azerbaijani и (possessed и-i) 'entrails'.

Distinct from inherited увуун 'stomach (Russian: желудок)' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 36].

Common Rutul: The form увуун represents the Proto-Rutul term for 'belly; stomach'; it tends to be superseded by loans in the first meaning.


Distinct from сак 'stomach' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 36]. It must be noted that in [Suleymanov 2003: 115], 'stomach' is quoted as Koshan иаг и сак, but without exact specification of the subdialect.

Keren Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 36. The same in the Usug subdialect: fun 'belly' [Shaumyan 1941: 149].

Distinct from qар-fun 'stomach' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 36] (a compound of qар 'shell' + 'belly').

Gequn Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 36; Dirr 1907: 149, 173; Shaumyan 1941: 149.

Distinct from сак 'stomach (of human)' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 36], qар-fun 'stomach (of animal)' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 36] (a compound of qар 'shell' + 'belly').

Fite Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 36.

Distinct from qар-fun 'stomach' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 36].


The same in other subdialects: Tsirkhe, Khpyuk fun 'belly' [Shaumyan 1941: 149; Magometov 1970: 222-224 sentences 4, 8, 9].


The same in the Khanag subdialect: fun 'belly; offal' [Uslar 1979: 942, 989; Dirr 1905: 213]; cf. also the expression ләкри fin 'calf of the leg', literally 'belly of the leg' [Dirr 1905: 213]. The same in the Khyurryuk subdialect: fun 'belly; offal' [Genko 2005: 161].

Distinct from Khanag мафд-ан 'stomach' [Dirr 1905: 195, 228] (ultimately borrowed from Arabic мафд-ат- 'stomach').


The same in the Akhty dialect: Khlyut rifiant with polysemy: 'belly / stomach' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 36].

Proto-Lezgian: NCED: 771. Distribution: The best candidate is *uo=tʰin ~ *ro=tʰin, attested with the generic meaning 'belly' in all Nuclear Lezgian lects except for Budukh, but apparently totally lost in the outliers (Udi, Archi). External North Caucasian comparison also seems to confirm *tʰin as the Proto-Lezgian root for 'belly' [NCED: 771].

Another candidate is Nidzh Udi *tapan ~ Budukh *tapon 'belly', but these isolated forms seem very suspicious and rather look like a wandering loanword (although the source of borrowing is unknown). Vartashen Udi buqun and Archi *liği 'belly' are likewise isolated; they could only formally pretend to the status of the Proto-Lezgian term for 'belly'. It should be noted that the authors of [NCED] follow Gukasyan's typo that transcribes the Vartashen Udi form as *bukun - actually, the proposed Udi-Arci comparison [NCED: 297] should be rejected.

In some lects *uo=tʰin ~ *ro=tʰin was superseded with loanwords (Luchek Rutul < Azerbaijani; Ixrek Rutul < ?).

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular.

Semantics and structure: Primary substantive root, modified by means of class prefixes.

5. BIG

Nidzh Udi *kala {кала} (-1), Vartashen Udi *kala {кала} (-1), Archi d'вːz-u-CLASS (1), Kryts (proper) bu (2), Alyk Kryts buʔu (2), Budukh boʔlu (ʔoʔly) (2), Mishlesh Tsakhur *xe-CLASS-n {херна, хедын} (3), Mikik Tsakhur *xe-CLASS-n (3), Gelmets Tsakhur *aː класс-n (3), Mukhad Rutul qʰux-dɪ ~ qʰux-du {κυνθύλυ} (4), Ixrek Rutul qʰuːd-dɪ {ξυλιθύλυ} (5), Luchek Rutul qʷaːxːdɪ (4), Koshan Aghul ʃaba-ni-r (2), Keren Aghul bab-a-f (6), Gequn Aghul aHa-f (3), Fite Aghul aχːa-t (3), Aghul (proper) na-f (3), Northern Tabasaran aχːi (3), Southern Tabasaran aχoʔu (3), Gyune Lezgi čiʔi (7), Proto-Lezgian *pːVh'V~ *h'VpːV- (6).

References and notes:


Vartashen Udi: Gukasyan 1974: 131; Fähnrich 1999: 18; Dirr 1903: 2, 10; Schiefner 1863: 83; Schulze 2001: 288; Starchevskiy 1891: 492. Polysemy: 'big / old'. A second term for 'big' is quoted in [Fähnrich 1999: 18; Schiefner 1863: 105] and [Starchevskiy 1891: 492]: yeκa ~ yeκo 'groß, bös, bös, bös' (borrowed from Azerbaijani yeκa ~ akā 'big, large').

Common Udi: Udi *kala is an Iranian loanword: cf. Persian *kala-n 'large, great, big; elder', Judeo-Tat kılā 'big, large', etc. Pace [Schulze 2001: 288], *kala can hardly be borrowed directly from from Judeo-Tat kılā, since Judeo-Tat linguistic influence on Udi is very modest (if it exists at all) and the idea of a borrowing of such a basic term cannot be accepted.

Caucasian Albanian: boː-ni [Gippert et al. 2008: IV-11, 44], glossed as 'great, big, tall'. Apparently an important retention.


Apparently more marginal is the adjective mɛɾχbi-tu-CLASS 'big, large; worthy' [Chumakina et al. 2007] (not found in other sources).

Alyk Kryts: Authier 2009: 67, 74, 93, 179, 203, 204, 207. etc. Widely applicable.


Mikik Tsakhur: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 237; Dirr 1913: 210, 220. In [Dirr 1913], quoted as ɣa CLASS-n 'capital letter'.

Gelmets Tsakhur: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 237. In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 583], the modern depharyngealized variant is quoted: ɣa-CLASS-n (хадын').

Common Tsakhur: The stem χε- ~ χåa-represents the same root as 'many' q.v.

Mukhad Rutul: Dirr 1912: 166, 185; Ibragimov 1978: 69. Cf. Dirr's examples: 'big house', "big (= important) person", "elder brother", "My son / the tree becomes big (= grows up) rapidly'.

A second candidate is äyk-åd 'big' [Ibragimov 1978: 39, 125] with the more modern variant ek-ed [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 583; Makhmudova 2001: 95], borrowed from Azerbaijani yekä ~ åkä 'big, large'.

According to [Makhmudova 2001: 95], in the modern language the inherited form q'ux-di 'big' is applied to animated objects, whereas the borrowed eke-d - to inanimate ones (apparently Makhmudova means human beings vs. animals/inanimate objects); cf. an example for q'ux-di ~ q'ux-du: "big father" [Ibragimov 1978: 69]. We prefer to follow Dirr's norm.

Ixrek Rutul: Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 278. Glossed as 'big, large'. According to examples that could be found, this seems to be the basic word for 'big', cf. "large windows" [Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 68a], "big stones" [Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 95b], "The children became big (= grew up)" [Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 278a].

A second candidate is ek-di 'large' [Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 309], cf. such examples as: "large (court)yard" [Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 80a], "large family" [Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 272a], "You became big (= grew up) rapidly", "to do a big job", "to hold a high post" [Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 309b]. Borrowed from Azerbaijani yekä ~ åkä 'big, large'.


Common Rutul: In the Borch-Khnow dialect, only the Azerbaijani loanword åkä-di 'big' [Ibragimov 1978: 231] (quoted without specifications) is attested.

Both roots (Mukhad-Luchek q'ux-a ~ q'ux- and Ixrek q'æ-) seem to be inherited, although their etymology is unknown. Final -di / -d is the attributive suffix.


A different Burshag term for 'big' is quoted by Shaumyan: aHa-r 'big' [Shaumyan 1941: 176], and the same word in the Arsug subdialect: aHa-d 'big' [Shaumyan 1941: 176]. According to [Suleymanov 2003: 85], however, Koshan aHa-d [ахад] has the more specific meaning 'big, huge, enormous'. On the contrary, the Arsug or Khudig word for 'big' is quoted as uba-ni-d in [Suleymanov 2003: 18, 190].


It should be noted, however, that, according to [Magometov 1970: 86], the Richa term for 'big' is Ha- (ba?). The same in the Usug subdialect: xq'e-'big' [Shaumyan 1941: 176].


A second term is qaba-n- (> qaba-m-f), which is quoted in [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 237] as a neutral term for 'big', but in [Dirr 1907: 128] is glossed as 'big, huge'. In the discovered examples qaba-n- is applied to an evil monster [Dirr 1907: 83] or to a human penis, which cannot fit the fox burrow [Dirr 1907: 76].

A third term for 'big' is azzn- [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 237], borrowed from Azerbaijani azman 'huge, enormous', dialectal 'large' (ultimately from Arabic fażəm 'big').


The same adjective in other subdialects: Kurag aHa-f 'big' [Magometov 1970: 170], Tsirkhe ʔaΧˤʔf 'big' [Shaumyan 1941: 176]. Duldug aHa-f 'big' [Shaumyan 1941: 176].

Distinct from Tpig azman-f, glossed as 'big, large' in [Suleymanov 2003: 18] (an Azerbaijani loanword, see notes on Gequn Aghul).

Common Aghul: Data from Koshan and Keren dialects are rather discrepant, but it is clear that two Proto-Lezgian roots enter into competition in Aghul: *ʔaχˤʔi- and *pːVhˤV- / *h SpicerV-. Both scenarios are possible for Proto-Aghul: *ʔaχˤʔi- could be the neutral term for 'big' (retained in non-Koshan dialects, but shifted to 'huge' in Koshan), whereas *h SpicerV- acquired the generic meaning 'big' in Koshan. On the other hand, *h SpicerV- could be the Proto-Aghul term for 'big' (retained in Koshan, but lost in non-Koshan dialects), whereas *ʔaχˤʔi- meant 'huge' in Proto-Aghul, retained in Koshan, but shifted to generic in the non-Koshan dialect. External Lezgian comparison speaks in favor of the second solution.

Keren baba- is of unknown origin. It is proposed in [NCED: 316] to treat baba- as a reduplicated cognate of Koshan faba-.

On the sporadic reduction of initial ʔ in the Aghul dialectal descendants of *ʔaχˤʔi- see [Suleymanov 1993: 42 f.] with other examples of this process.

Final -l, -l, -f, -r are adjectival suffixes (fossilized class exponents) [Magometov 1970: 92; Shaumyan 1941: 45].

Northern Tabasaran: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 237. The tenseness of the uvular is obviously secondary.


Literary Lezgi: čeqʔi- with polysemy: 'big / elder' [Talibov & Gadzhiev 1966: 378; Gadzhiev 1950: 59; Haspelmath 1993: 485, 516]. A close synonym is literary yeke 'exe' 'big, large' [Talibov & Gadzhiev 1966: 117; Gadzhiev 1950: 59; Haspelmath 1993: 493; but this term is less frequent. Lezgi yeke was borrowed from Azerbaijani yekא 'ʔaχä 'big, large'.

Only the Azerbaijani loanword in the Akhty dialect: Khyluyt yeke 'big' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 237].

Cf. the inherited term for 'big' in the Yarki dialect (Kyur group): Nyutyug čeqf [Meylanova 1964: 96]. In the Yargun dialect (Quba group), čeqf means 'great; elder', whereas the generic word for 'big' is the borrowing yeke ~ yekek [Babaliyeva 2007: 38, 48, 105, 106].

The historical phonetics of Lezgi dialects requires additional investigation, but the fluctuation ʔ ~ χ (Gyne/Yarki čeqʔi- ~ literary/Yargun čeqʔi-) seems irregular. Proceeding from general premises, one can suppose that the affricate χ is primary here rather than the lenited ʔ, although external comparison speaks in favour of χ.

Proto-Lezgian: NCED: 316. Distribution: From the distributional point of view, the best candidate is Proto-Lezgian *pːVh SpicerV- ~ *h SpicerV-, which is retained in the generic meaning 'big' in Caucasian Albanian, South Lezgian (Kryts, Budukh) and Proto-Aghul, but underwent the shift 'big' > 'good' in Archi [NCED: 316].

The second candidate is *ʔaχˤʔi- [NCED: 511], attested as generic 'big' in Tsakhir, Tabasaran, non-Koshan Aghul. However, actually, *ʔaχˤʔ- might have been the Proto-Lezgian root for 'many' q.v. The assumed shift 'many' > 'big' cannot be an inherited feature of Tsakhir, Tabasaran and non-Koshan Aghul, but rather represents parallel independent innovations in Tsakhir and Tabasaran-Aghul (the Tabasaran-Aghul isogloss is apparently of an areal origin; the Proto-Aghul meaning of this root was probably something like 'huge').

The third candidate is *čeqʔ SpicerV (~ -ʔ) [NCED: 386], which means 'big (in general)' in Lezgi and 'massive' in Tabasaran. Despite some interesting external North Caucasian comparanda, this can hardly be considered a good candidate for Proto-Lezgian 'big'.

Various etymologically isolated roots for 'big' are found in Archi and the Rutul dialects; these do not look like loans, but lack Lezgian and North Caucasian cognates.

Inherited forms were superseded with loanwords in some lects (modern Udi < Iranian, Akhty Lezgi < Azerbaijani).

Replacements: [many > 'big'] (Tsakhir, Tabasaran), ['huge > 'big'] (non-Koshan Aghul), ['massive > 'big'] (Lezgi), ['big > 'good'] (Archi).

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular, but two metathetical variants have to be reconstructed.
6. BIRD

Nidzh Udi ƣuʃ (κυμι) (-1), Vartashen Udi ƣuš (κυμι) (-1), Archi noc' (1), Kryts (proper) ƣuš (-1), Alyk Kryts ƣuš (-1), Budukh ƣuʃ (κυμι) (-1), Mishlesh Tsakhur šiţy (вшмл) (2), Mikik Tsakhur ƣuš (-1), Gelmet Tsakhur ƣuš (-1), Mukhad Rutul ȵaχšir (ȵахшир) (-1), Ixrek Rutul šey (меі) (-1), Luchek Rutul šey (-1), Koshan Aghul šaqʷ (3), Gequn Aghul ȵaχšir (-1), Aghul (proper) ƣuš (-1), Gyune Lezgi ƣuš (-1), Proto-Lezgian *nicʷ (1).

References and notes:


Common Udi: Borrowed from Azerbaijani guš 'bird'.

Caucasian Albanian: Unattested.


In [Mikailov 1967: 194] noc' is glossed as 'small bird (in general); sparrow', although translated as 'bird (in general)' in the texts: "A bird is sitting on the branch" [Mikailov 1967: 60], "He, like a bird, has thrown himself upon the sea steed" [Mikailov 1967: 160, 162]. Similarly in [Dirr 1908: 170, 219] noc' is glossed as 'sparrow; small bird (in general)'. It must be noted that in [Dirr 1908: 165, 219] šiţy is quoted as 'bird (in general)', although the actual meaning of šiţy is 'a mythological bird' [Chumakina et al. 2007; Kibrik et al. 1977b: 274; Mikailov 1967: 190] (borrowed from Lak šiţu 'bird (in general)').

It is probable that in Proto-Archi the term noc' denoted a 'small/middle bird (in general)' as opposed to specific names of large predatory birds (a typologically possible lexicological situation).

Note that the Archi word is unjustifiedly labeled as 'probably borrowed' in [Chumakina 2009].

Kryts (proper): Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 86; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 141. Borrowed from Azerbaijani guš 'bird'.

In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 141] the word ƈaʂ [ҹац] is also quoted as a synonym for 'bird (in general)', apparently < Lezgian *cag' (a) 'bird, small bird', although the expected Kryts form should rather be **cag' [ҹац] (Comrie & Khalilov's error?).

Alyk Kryts: Authier 2009: 52, 76, 87, 181, 223, 259, etc. Borrowed from Azerbaijani guš 'bird'.

Budukh: Meylanova 1984: 92, 236; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 86. Borrowed from Azerbaijani guš 'bird'.

In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 141], 'bird' is glossed as şiv-ʃiv [ɬжив-ɬжив] - apparently a corrupted spelling of the onomatopoeic term ʃib-ʃib 'chicken' [Meylanova 1984: 57].

Mishlesh Tsakhur: Kibrik et al. 1999: 888, 898; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 141. In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010], quoted as šit' [ʃит], which is not an error, cf. the same form from [Ibragimov & Nurmamedov 2010] below.

Cf. examples in [Kibrik et al. 1999]: "If only a human had wings, he would fly like a bird" [Kibrik et al. 1999: 263]; "The bird ate the grain, but it was eaten itself by the hawk" [Kibrik et al. 1999: 677]; "The birds have flown away" [Kibrik et al. 1999: 218]; "Ali saw a rock, a bird was flying over it" [Kibrik et al. 1999: 391]. "The bird is sitting on the tree" [Kibrik et al. 1999: 469]; "Ali fired at the bird that was flying over him" [Kibrik et al. 1999: 649]; "When the bird caught the snake, it ate it up" [Kibrik et al. 1999: 678]. Two first instances demonstrate that šit' generally denotes 'small/mid-size bird (in general)', but can be extended to the generic meaning 'bird'.

In [Ibragimov & Nurmamedov 2010: 221], only ƣuš [Ѿуху] 'bird' (borrowed from Azerbaijani guš 'bird') is quoted as a separate entry. Examples include: "There are a lot of birds in our woods" [Ibragimov & Nurmamedov 2010: 221], "A bird flies with the help of its wings" [Ibragimov & Nurmamedov 2010: 213], "The falcon is a predatory bird" [Ibragimov &
Recently several foreign words have been borrowed for the generic Northern Tabasaran:

**Aghul**:
- Common Aghul
- Fite Aghul: 
- Gequn Aghul: 
- Keren Aghul: 
- Koshan Aghul: 

**Rutul**:
- Common Rutul
- Luchek Rutul: 
- Ixrek Rutul: 
- Mukhad Rutul: 

**Tsakhur**:
- Common Tsakhur
- Gelmets Tsakhur: 
- Kum Tsakhur: 
- Xend Tsakhur: 

---

**Naχšir** meaning 'bird'. Opposed to specific names of large predatory birds. Recently the Azerbaijani word "naχšir" has been borrowed for generic 'bird', although it should be noted that the old Tsakhur form "naχšir" seems etymologically obscure, so it could be an old loanword from an unknown source.

**Mukhad Rutul**: Dirr 1912: 162, 198; Ibragimov 1978: 53. Oblique stem: *naχšir*-di-. A borrowed term, because the oblique stem marker -di- is characteristic of loanwords [Alekseev 1994a: 221] (the source is Iranian, see notes on Tabasaran).

Distinct from the inherited *naχšir* 'bird'.

**Ixrek Rutul**: Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 302; Ibragimov 1978: 204. Polysemy: 'beast (in general) / bird (in general)'. In [Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 383], 'bird' is additionally specified as *naχšir*-di-šey [лаяв'омды шей], literally 'flying beast'. Cf. the example: "bird's wing" [Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 152], "The birds have flown from the tree" [Ibragimov 1978: 204].

Oblique stem: *shuruk*-di-. A borrowed term, because the oblique stem marker -di- is characteristic of loanwords [Alekseev 1994a: 221] (the source is Persian, see notes on Tabasaran).

A second word for 'bird' is *guš* [къуш] (which is quoted in [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 141] as a generic term for 'bird').

**Luchek Rutul**: Kibrik & Kodzасov 1990: 86. A Persian loanword, see notes on Tabasaran.

Distinct from the inherited *naχšir* 'young (of animal), nestling; small bird (in general)' [Kibrik & Kodzасov 1990: 86, 219].

**Common Rutul**: Borch-Khнов dialect: *naχšir* [Ibragimov 1978: 282] (a Persian loanword, see notes on Tabasaran).

As in some other Lezgian cases, it is likely that in Proto-Rutul the term *naχšir* denoted 'small/middle bird (in general)' as opposed to specific names of large predatory birds. Recently several foreign words have been borrowed for the generic meaning 'bird'.

**Koshan Aghul**: Kibrik & Kodzасov 1990: 86. It must be noted that in [Shaumyan 1941: 157], Burshag 'bird' is quoted as (borrowed) *naχšir*, whereas *zaqʷʷ* is glossed as 'sparrow' in [Suleymanov 2003: 80].

**Keren Aghul**: Not attested. Cf. in the Usug subdialect: *naχšir* 'bird' [Shaumyan 1941: 157].

Distinct from Richa *zaqʷʷ* 'small bird (in general)' [Kibrik & Kodzасov 1990: 86], although Magometov translates it simply as 'bird' in examples [Magometov 1970: 136].

**Gequn Aghul**: Dirr 1907: 136, 181; Shaumyan 1941: 156.

Distinct from inherited *zaqʷʷ* 'small bird (in general)' [Kibrik & Kodzасov 1990: 86; Dirr 1907: 114, 181].

**Fite Aghul**: The generic term is unknown. Cf. *zaqʷʷ* 'small bird (in general)' [Kibrik & Kodzасov 1990: 86].

**Aghul (proper)**: Suleymanov 2003: 118. A recent borrowing from Azerbaijani *guš* 'bird', which has superseded the Tpig word *naχšir* 'bird' [Shaumyan 1941: 156]. The latter is of Iranian origin. Distinct from inherited *zaqʷʷ* 'sparrow' [Suleymanov 2003: 80].

In other subdialects: Tsirkhe *naχšir*, Duldug *naχšir* 'bird' [Shaumyan 1941: 156].

**Common Aghul**: As in some other cases typical of Lezgian languages, it is likely that in Proto-Aghul the term *zaqʷʷ* denoted 'small/middle bird (in general)' as opposed to specific names of large predatory birds. It acquired the generic meaning 'bird' in Koshan (if Kibrik & Kodzасov's data is correct), while other dialects introduced the Iranian loanword *naχšir* ~ *naχšir* for 'bird (in general)' (see notes on Tabasaran).

**Northern Tabasaran**: The generic Dyubek term is unknown.
In other subdialects the loanword \textit{\texttt{ṣeq}} is used for 'bird': Khanag \textit{\texttt{ṣeq}} 'a thing; bird' [Uslar 1979: 981, 1003; Dirr 1905: 220, 240]; according to [Dirr 1905: 218], there is also a more detailed expression for 'bird' in Khanag: \textit{\texttt{ṣeq̃a}} (literally 'living/alive \textit{\texttt{ṣeq}}'), Khyuryuk \textit{\texttt{ṣeq̃a}} (\textit{\texttt{nei}}} a thing, creature, ōuvre; bird' [Genko 2005: 189]. Another loanword in the Kumi subdialect: \textit{\texttt{nićχir}} (\textit{\texttt{hauxip}}) 'bird' [Genko 2005: 126].

Distinct from inherited Dyubek \textit{\texttt{ǯaq}}-a 'small bird (in general)' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 86], Khanag, Khyuryuk, Kumi \textit{\texttt{ǯaq}}{\textit{\texttt{xe}}
\textit{\texttt{ka}}} 'small bird (in general)' [Dirr 1905: 169, 240; Genko 2005: 65].

**Southern Tabasaran:** The generic Kondik term is unknown.

In other subdialects only loanwords are attested: Khiv \textit{\texttt{nćχi}}r (\textit{\texttt{nuuxip}}), Tinit \textit{\texttt{nćχi}}r (\textit{\texttt{hauxip}}) 'bird' [Genko 2005: 126, 127]; a second Khiv term is \textit{\texttt{ṣeq}} (\textit{\texttt{nei}}} with polysemy: 'a thing, creature, ōuvre / bird' [Genko 2005: 189].

Distinct from inherited Kondik, Khiv \textit{\texttt{ǯaq}'} (\textit{\texttt{xe}}\textit{\texttt{ka}}) 'small bird (in general)' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 86; Genko 2005: 65].

A different situation in Literary Tabasaran: inherited \textit{\texttt{saq}''} (\textit{\texttt{xe}}\textit{\texttt{ka}}) 'bird (in general); sparrow' [Khanmagomedov & Shalbuzov 2001: 157], which is opposed to borrowed \textit{\texttt{nićχi}}r (\textit{\texttt{nuuxip}}) 'wild bird; wild beast' [Khanmagomedov & Shalbuzov 2001: 244]. Cf. \textit{\texttt{ṣeq}} (\textit{\texttt{nei}}} 'thing, object' [Khanmagomedov & Shalbuzov 2001: 349].

**Common Tabasaran:** As in some other cases typical of Lezgian languages, it is likely that in Proto-Tabasaran the term \textit{\texttt{saq}''} denoted a 'small/middle bird (in general)' as opposed to specific names of large predatory birds. It acquired the generic meaning 'bird' in Literary Tabasaran (if Khanmagomedov & Shalbuzov's gloss is correct), while other dialects introduced the Iranian loanwords for 'bird (in general)'.

The forms \textit{\texttt{nćχi}}r - \textit{\texttt{nićχi}}r originate from Iranian, cf. Persian \textit{\texttt{naxčir}} 'hunting, the chase; game, wild animal', Tajiki \textit{\texttt{naxčir}} 'wild animal', etc. The Literary Tabasaran meaning 'wild bird; wild beast' and the Gyune Lezgi meaning 'game' (see notes on Lezgi 'bird') directly correspond to the Iranian semantics. This term penetrated into some other Lezgian languages with the modified meaning 'bird (in general)'.

The word \textit{\texttt{ṣeq}} with polysemy: 'a thing, creature, ōuvre; bird' was borrowed from Persian \textit{\texttt{ṣay}} 'a thing, something, object' (ultimately from Arabic \textit{\texttt{ṣay}} 'a thing, something'). The semantic development 'a thing' \textit{\textit{\texttt{animal}}} can represent an internal Lezgian development. Cf. the polysemy in Ixrek Rutul: \textit{\texttt{ṣey}} 'beast (in general) / bird (in general)' and the attested full collocation for 'bird': Northern Tabasaran (Khanag) 'living/alive \textit{\texttt{ṣeq}}', Ixrek Rutul (\textit{\texttt{q}}\textit{\texttt{v}}.) 'flying \textit{\texttt{ṣey}}'.

**Gyune Lezgi:** Uslar 1896: 495, 628. Borrowed from Azerbaijani \textit{\texttt{guś}} 'bird'. Distinct from the inherited Gyune word \textit{\texttt{nćk}} 'sparrow' [Uslar 1896: 516], Distinct from the Iranianism \textit{\texttt{nićχi}}r 'game', \textit{\texttt{luwʌn nićχi}}r 'game bird' (literally '\textit{\texttt{nićχi}}r with wing') [Uslar 1896: 516]. For the Iranian origin of \textit{\texttt{nićχi}}r see notes on Tabasaran.

The same Azerbaijani loanword in Literary Lezgi: \textit{\texttt{guś}} (\textit{\texttt{kuxun}}) 'bird' [Talibov & Gadzhiev 1966: 195; Gadzhiev 1950: 671; Haspelmith 1993: 502, 516]. The second literary expression for 'bird (in general)' is \textit{\texttt{luwʌn nićχi}}r [Talibov & Gadzhiev 1966: 254; Gadzhiev 1950: 671], literally '\textit{\texttt{nićχi}}r with wing', whose original meaning was the narrower 'game bird', see Uslar's data above. Modern literary \textit{\texttt{nićχi}}r (\textit{\texttt{nuuxip}}) means 'game bird, wild bird' [Talibov & Gadzhiev 1966: 254; Haspelmith 1993: 500, 516], originating from the wider meaning 'game', see Uslar's data above.

Distinct from literary inherited \textit{\texttt{nćk}} (\textit{\texttt{nyaxd}}) 'small bird (in general), sparrow' [Talibov & Gadzhiev 1966: 255; Haspelmith 1993: 500, 516].

The same in the Akhti dialect: Khlyut \textit{\texttt{guś}} 'bird (in general)' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 86]; distinct from the inherited Khlyut word \textit{\texttt{nćk}} 'small bird (in general)' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 86].

**Proto-Lezgian:** NCED: 525. Distribution: Most of the attested Lezgian languages demonstrate the lexical opposition between a term for 'small/middle bird (in general)' and various terms for specific kinds of large (predatory) birds. There are no reasons not to project such a system onto the Proto-Lezgian level. Thus, we fill the Proto-Lezgian slot with the generic term for 'small/middle bird'.

Out of several inherited roots for 'small/middle bird', *\textit{\texttt{nći}}c(a)* possesses the best distribution: Archi 'small/middle bird (in general), Lezgi 'small bird (in general)', also Khruryuk (subdialect of Mukhad Rutul) \textit{\texttt{nic}} 'a k. of bird' [Ibragimov 1978: 135]. This root also has a good North Caucasian etymology ('small bird' or 'bird').

Cf. other roots, attested with the meaning 'small bird' in Lezgian: \textit{\texttt{čaq}''(a)} (Aghul, Tabasaran), for which external North Caucasian comparison suggests the shift 'a k. of small bird' \textgreater; 'small bird' [NCED: 1105] \textit{\texttt{St(f)ErVt}} / \textit{\texttt{StVErVt}} (Tsakhur), apparently with the shift 'a k. of small bird' \textgreater; 'small bird' [NCED: 343] \textit{\texttt{čir\texttt{a}'}(a)} (Rutul), for which the Lezgian comparandum suggests the shift 'nestling, young of birds' \textgreater; 'small bird' [LEDb: #161]; \textit{\texttt{StVpV??}} (Udi), an isolated form [LEDb: #267].
The majority of Lezgian languages have recently borrowed their generic terms for 'bird' from Azerbaijani or Persian.

Replacements: ['a k. of small bird' > 'small bird'] (Aghul, Tabasaran, Tsakhur), ['nestling, young of birds' > 'small bird'] (Rutul).

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences are regular.

Semantics and structure: Primary substantive root. The oblique stem is \( nV \)'a-.

7. BITE

Nidzh Udi kaš\textsuperscript{5} -p-sun \{kauiIncyn\} (1), Vartashen Udi kaš\textsuperscript{5} -p-sun \{kauiIncyn\} (1), Archi =eq'a- (2), Kryts (proper) k'is- (3) / k'ip- (4), Alyk Kryts k'is- (3), Budukh k'usu- \{klycy-\} (3), Mishlesh Tsakhur ac'=ak\textsuperscript{w}an- \{aţiḷaxlam-\} (5), Mikik Tsakhur ac'=ak\textsuperscript{w}an- (5), Gelmets Tsakhur ac'=ok'\on- (5), Mukhad Rutul sis a?- \{c̥c\ c̥ã\ac\} (6), Ixrek Rutul sis ha?- \{c\̣c\ gwa\̣\ḳ\u\\e\̣\m\} (6), Luchek Rutul sis a?- (6), Koshan Aghul q'ac'-ayki- (7), Keren Aghul q'ac'-ik'a- (7), Northern Tabasaran q'ac'-ar 'ax- (7), Southern Tabasaran q'ac'-ap- (7), Gyune Lezgi k'as- (3), Proto-Lezgian *eq\textsuperscript{i}e*- (2).

References and notes:

Nidzh Udi: Gukasyan 1974: 133; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 233; Mobili 2010: 162. In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010] erroneously quoted as kaš-p-sun \{kaui\,\textsuperscript{c}cy\}\u{\textsuperscript{n}}. In [LED\textsuperscript{b}] this root is quoted as kaš\textsuperscript{5}, but without references. Polysemic: 'to dig (a hole etc.) / to bite / to sting'.

Vartashen Udi: Gukasyan 1974: 133. Polysemic: 'to dig (a hole etc.) / to bite / to sting'. In [Schulze 2001: 289] attested only with the meaning 'to dig' (kaš\textsuperscript{5} -p-sun). Apparently the same verb is quoted in [Schiefner 1863: 82] as kaš-p-sun \{kaʃ\}- 'kauen' and in [Dirr 1903: 95 (l. 14)] as kaš- \{kaw\} 'to dig'.

Common Udi: Common Udi *kaš\textsuperscript{5} -p-sun* 'to dig (a hole etc.) / to bite / to sting'; in [Gukasyan 1974: 133; Mobili 2010: 162] the reduplicated Nidzh-Vartashen variant kaš\textsuperscript{5} -kaš\textsuperscript{5} -p-sun \{kaui\,\textsuperscript{c}ku\,\textsuperscript{c}n\,\textsuperscript{c}cy\}\u{\textsuperscript{n}} is also cited as a synonym. The morpheme -p- is a light verb: 'to say, to do smth. (in general)' [Schulze 2005: 565 ff. (3.4.2.2 #15 ff.); Harris 2002: 204 ff.].

Not to be confused with kac-p-esun \{k\a\i\n\un\e\cy\}\u{\textsuperscript{n}} 'to cut, split, cut down' [Gukasyan 1974: 141] = kac-p-esun \{kac\}- 'zerscheiden, zerstören, vernichten' [Schiefner 1863: 82], 'to kill, destroy, slay' [Schulze 2001: 291].

Distinct from Nidzh-Vartashen karam-p-esun 'to gnaw, gnaw round; to nag' [Gukasyan 1974: 140; Mobili 2010: 172] (translated as simply 'to bite' in [Starcheyskovy 1891: 486]).

Caucasian Albanian: Unattested.


Distinct from the complex verb ha'nič-bo- 'to bite off; to nibble grass, depasture', formed with the suppletive light verb -bo- 'to say' [Chumakina et al. 2007; Kibrik et al. 1977b: 238].


Mishlesh Tsakhur: Kibrik et al. 1999: 868, 895; Ibragimov & Nurmamedov 2010: 52. Ablaut paradigm: ac'=ok\textsuperscript{w}an- [imperf., fut.] / ac'=ak\textsuperscript{w}un [perf.]. In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 233] an enigmatic future form āngañt-as \{aānaa\,\textsuperscript{a}na\,\textsuperscript{a}as\} is quoted for 'to bite' - maybe a corrupted lettering of ac'=ak\textsuperscript{w}an-.

Mikik Tsakhur: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 159; Dirr 1913: 213, 228. Ablaut paradigm: ac'=ak\textsuperscript{w}an- [imperf., fut.] / ac'=ak\textsuperscript{w}un [perf.].


Common Tsakhur: Initial ac= is a prefix with general semantics [Ibragimov 1990: 124; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 41]. Alternatively
the Common Tsakhur verb can be analyzed as \( a=\text{c}'\text{ak}^{\prime}\text{un} \)- with the prefix \( a= \) (for which see [Ibragimov 1990: 123]), thus [LEDb].

**Mukhad Rutul:** Dirr 1912: 171, 193; Ibragimov 1978: 121; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 233.

**Ixrek Rutul:** Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 236, 351. Cf. an example: "He will not bite the finger put in his mouth" (proverb referring to a honest person) [Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 251b]. In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 233], the auxiliary verb is quoted with an error.

**Luchek Rutul:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 159.

According to [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988], one other synonym is the verb \( y\text{it} \)- 'to bite', paradigm: \( r=\text{it}^{\prime} \text{a} \text{r} \)- [imperf. 4] / \( y=\text{it}^{\prime} \text{i} \text{r} \)- [perf. 4] / \( y=\text{it}^{\prime} \) [inv. 4] (initial \( r= \) is the imperative exponent; \( y= \) is a prefix with general semantics or the fossilized class 1/4 exponent). In the Borch-Khnov dialect, the corresponding verb \( w=\text{it}^{\prime} \)- means 'to bite', applied to a snake [Ibragimov 1978: 276, 300]. This root is isolated within Lezgian, cf. [NCED: 227].

**Common Rutul:** The analytic construction sis 'incisor / canine tooth' + \( (l=)\text{a} \text{r} \)- (or \( h=\text{q}=\) ) 'to do' represents the meaning 'bite' in all dialects. See notes on 'tooth'.

Borch-Khnov dialect: \( g\text{i} \text{c} \)- 'to bite' [Ibragimov 1978: 284], literally \( g\text{i} \text{c} \)- 'to do'. The Rutul noun \( g\text{i} \text{c} \)- is unattested outside this expression, but regularly reflects Proto-Lezgian 'gamë' 'canine tooth; molar tooth' [NCED: 430].

**Koshan Aghul:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 159; Suleymanov 2003: 121; Magometov 1970: 229 (sentence 4). In [Shaumyan 1941: 136], the Burshag verb ayki 'to bite' is quoted, which seems an inaccuracy, see notes on common Aghul.

**Keren Aghul:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 159. The same in the Usug subdialect: \( q\text{a} \text{c} \)-'kën- 'to bite' [Shaumyan 1941: 185].

**Gequn Aghul:** Not attested.

**Fite Aghul:** Not attested.

**Aghul (proper):** Suleymanov 2003: 121; Shaumyan 1941: 185.

**Common Aghul:** A complex verb, consisting of the noun \( q\text{a} \text{c} \), which means 'a piece' in Koshan [Shaumyan 1941: 186; Magometov 1970: 235 sentences 3] (cf. Magometov's example "The miller gave the fox a piece of bread"; in [Suleymanov 1993: 83], however, \( q\text{a} \text{c} \) is mentioned as the common Aghul substantive 'bite') plus the verb \( z\text{ayki} \)- (Koshan) / \( ?\text{k} \text{a} \text{r} \)- (Non-Koshan) 'to put in, move into (trans.)' [Suleymanov 2003: 210].

**Northern Tabasaran:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 159. Literally \( q\text{a} \text{c} \)-'ir 'bites (pl.)' + the verb \( \text{a} \text{x} \)- 'to put'.

Similarly in the Khanag subdialect: \( q\text{a} \text{c} \)-'ax- [Dirr 1905: 201] ~ \( q\text{a} \text{c} \)-'ap- [Uslar 1979: 882], literally \( q\text{a} \text{c} \) 'a bite; a piece'; \( \text{a} \text{x} \)- 'to piece'; \( q\text{a} \text{c} \)-'ap- 'to do'.

**Southern Tabasaran:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 159. Literally \( q\text{a} \text{c} \) 'a bite' + the auxiliary verb \( \text{a} \text{p} \)- 'to do' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 129].

The same in Literary Tabasaran: \( q\text{a} \text{c} \)-'ap- [känuł anly6] 'to bite' [Khanmagomedov & Shalbuzov 2001: 209], literally \( q\text{a} \text{c} \) 'a bite; a piece' + \( \text{a} \text{p} \)- 'to do'.

A similar construction in the Khiv subdialect, but with a different noun: sanc'-'ap- [känuł anly6] 'to bite' [Genko 2005: 41], literally sanc'- 'a bite (e.g., of snake) + the auxiliary verb \( \text{a} \text{p} \)- 'to do'. Distinct from Khiv class\(<\text{is} \)- [fünc6] 'to seize; hold; to bite (said of dog)' [Genko 2005: 29].

**Common Tabasaran:** The collocation \( q\text{a} \text{c} \)-'a bite; a piece'; + an auxiliary verb can be reconstructed as the Proto-Tabasaran term for 'to bite'. The Khiv construction with sanc'- 'a bite' is an innovation from the distributive point of view.

**Gyune Lezgi:** Uslar 1896: 472, 616.

The same in Literary Lezgi: k'as- [kCow] 'to bite' [Talibov & Gadzhiev 1966: 212; Gadzhiev 1950: 326; Haspelmath 1993: 496, 516; Gyulmagomedov 2004, 1: 455]. Distinct from literary qas- [kCow] 'to hold; to seize; to bite (said of dog)' [Talibov & Gadzhiev 1966: 207].

**Proto-Lezgian:** NCED: 559. Distribution: First of all, we need to exclude analytic patterns of the shape 'tooth / a piece / a bite' + an auxiliary verb, which are attested in Rutul, Aghul, Tabasaran. These look like recent introductions of areal origin.

After that, several verbal roots enter into competition: (1) Udi kaš, isolated root; (2) *ʔeq'-i- (Archi); (3) *k intéressant (South Lezgian [Kryts, Budukh] and Lezgi); (4) the Tsakhur verb, whose morphological analysis is not entirely clear. From the distributional point of view, all of them are equivalent candidates. We choose *ʔeq'-i- (Archi, lost in the rest of Lezgian languages), since it actually stems from a good candidate for the status of the Proto-North Caucasian verb for 'to bite' [NCED: 559].

If so, the Udi polysemy kaš- 'to bite / to dig' suggests an earlier shift 'to dig' > 'to bite', or else both synchronous meanings originate from *"to break' (i.e. 'to break' > 'to dig'). Pace [LEDb: #111], the Udi root has plain k-, not tense k-, therefore,
The root *k'osʷɨ- (South Lezgian, Lezgi) is an inner Samur introduction for 'to bite', although its semantic origin is unknown, since it lacks any cognates outside South Lezgian and Lezgi. Formally *k'osʷɨ- can be reconstructed as the Proto-Nuclear Lezgian verb for 'to bite'. Cf. also the etymologically obscure Kryts form kip- 'to bite', which serves as the perfective stem in the suppletive paradigm.

Replacements: {'to dig' > 'to bite' (?)} (Udi), {'to do a tooth' > 'to bite'} (Rutul), {'to put a piece in' > 'to bite'} (Aghul), {'to put a bite' > 'to bite'} (Northern Tabasaran), {'to do a bite' > 'to bite'} (Southern Tabasaran).

Semantics and structure: Primary verbal root.

References and notes:


Common Udi: The suffixal -n is not clear; in [Schulze 2001: 298] and [Schulze 2005: 131 (3.2.2.3 #5)] this is treated as a genitive exponent, that is, the underlying Proto-Udi stem should be substantival with the meaning 'blackness' (*'of blackness' > 'black'). It is not obvious, however, that all Udi nouns with the suffix -n must be analyzed as old qualifying genitive forms.

Caucasian Albanian: Unattested.


Tsakhur-Kum Tsakhur: Kari-n [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 234].


Ixrek Rutul: Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 413; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 673. Missing from the main section of [Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006].


Common Rutul: Final -di is the attributive suffix.


Fite Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 234.


Common Aghul: Final -d, -t, -f, -r are adjectival suffixes (fossilized class exponents) [Magometov 1970: 92; Shaumyan 1941: 45].


Southern Tabasaran: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 234.


The same in the Akhy dialect: Khyut ħlan ‘black’ [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 234].

Proto-Lezgian: NCED: 748. Distribution: Four roots enter into competition here. Out of these, *laχːˤV ~ *loχːˤV seems to be the best candidate from the distributive point of view. It has been retained as the basic root for ‘black’ in Archi, on the one hand, and in South Lezgian (Kryts, Budukh) and Rutul, on the other, but got lost in other languages. Its only external comparanda is the basic Lak term for ‘black’ [NCED: 748].

The second candidate is *kər-i, attested with the meaning ‘black’ in Tsakhur, Aghul and Tabasaran. This was lost as a separate word in the rest of Lezgian languages, but survived in the compound *kərV-šim ‘charcoal’, literally ‘X pebbles’ in Aghul, Rutul, Kryts, Budukh [NCED: 719]. External North Caucasian comparison could point, however, to the original meaning ‘charcoal’ for this root (cf. Proto-Nakh ‘charcoal’), thus the Lezgian compound *kərV-šim might actually mean ‘charcoal pebbles’ rather than the more trivial ‘black pebbles’. If so, one must assume the shift ‘charcoal’ > ‘black’ that occurred independently in Tsakhur and Aghul-Tabasaran.

Two residual roots, attested with the generic meaning, should be excluded due to their distribution. The root *mičˈäi- means ‘black’ in Udi, but ‘dark’ in other Lezgian languages including Archi, thus the Proto-Lezgian semantic reconstruction ‘dark’ is very probable; external North Caucasian comparison, however, is not unambiguous, because the Khinalug cognate of this Lezgian root means ‘black’ (further to Nakh ‘yellow, orange’, Avar ‘dark grey, yellow’, Lak ‘blind’) [NCED: 819].

The fourth root is ħulV (~ ←-o-) which denotes ‘black’ in Lezgi. This got lost in other Lezgian languages except for Aghul, where it survived in the expression for ‘raspberry’, literally ‘dark/black berry’ [NCED: 556]. Actually Lezgian ħulV possesses good North Caucasian (strictly speaking East Caucasian) comparanda with the meaning ‘black’ (Proto-Nakh, Proto-Avar-Andic), but it is hard to suppose that ħulV survived with its original meaning ‘black’ only in Lezgi; we should assume the meaning ‘a k. of dark color’ for Proto-Lezgian ħulV and the late development ‘a k. of dark color’ > ‘black’ in modern Lezgi.

Replacements: ‘dark’ > ‘black’ (Udi), [‘a k. of dark color’ > ‘black’] (Lezgi), [‘charcoal’ > ‘black’] (Tsakhur, Aghul, Tabasaran).

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular, right up to the class prefix fusion in Archi.

Semantics and structure: Primary stative verbal root ‘to be black’.

9. BLOOD

Nidzh Udi pːi {nlʊ} (1), Vartashen Udi pːi {nlʊ} (1), Archi bi (1), Kryts (proper) irə-Ҭ (2), Alyk Kryts irə-Ҭ (2), Budukh ir-d {upə} (2), Mishlesh Tsakhur e-b {əðə} (3) / e=bi (1), Mikik Tsakhur e-b (3) / e=bi (1), Gelmets Tsakhur e-bi (3) / e=bi (1), Mukhad Rutul e-bir ~ ɘ-bir {əðʊp ~ aəʊp} (3) / e=bir (1), Ixrek Rutul e-bir {əʊpʊ} (3) / e=bir (1), Luchek Rutul e-bir (3) / e=bi (1), Koshan Aghul i (3), Keren Aghul i? (3), Gequn Aghul i? (3), Fite Aghul i? (3), Aghul (proper) i? (3), Northern Tabasaran i-wi (3) / i=wɨ (4), Southern Tabasaran i-fj (3) /
\(i=f'i\) (4), Gyune Lezgi \(i-w'i\) (3) / \(i=w'i\) (4), Proto-Lezgian *ʔaʔ (3).

References and notes:


Common Udi: Common Udi *\(\partial'i\).

Caucasian Albanian: \(p'i\) [Gippert et al. 2008: IV-36].


Alyk Kryts: Authier 2009: 34, 39, 67, 148, etc. A substantivized form of the adjective 'red' q.v.


Tsakhur-Kum Tsakhur: \(eb\) [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 48].

Mikik Tsakhur: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 48; Dhir 1913: 156, 228.


Common Tsakhur: Following [NCED: 497, 879], we treat Tsakhur *\(e-b(i)\) as a compound of two old roots.


Irek Rutul: Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 308, 350. In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 180], erroneously quoted as *\(eb\).


Common Rutul: Following [NCED: 497, 879], we treat Rutul *\(e-bir ~ e-bir\) as a compound of two old roots, where the second root acquired the final -\(r\) under the influence of the common plural exponent -\(b-Vr\).


Keren Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 48. The same in the Usug subdialect: *\(i\) 'blood' [Shaumyan 1941: 143].

Gequn Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 48; Dhir 1907: 122, 175; Shaumyan 1941: 143.

Fite Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 48; Shaumyan 1941: 143.

Aghul (proper): Suleymanov 2003: 90; Shaumyan 1941: 143. The same in other subdialects: Tsirkhe, Duldug *\(i\) 'blood' [Shaumyan 1941: 143].


The same in the Khanag subdialect: *\(i-f'i ~ ye-fi\) 'blood' [Uslar 1979: 738, 996; Dhir 1905: 179, 232]. The same in the Khyuruk subdialect: *\(i-f'i\) \(i\) 'blood' [Genko 2005: 77].


The same in the Khiv subdialect: *\(i-f'i\) \(i\) 'blood' [Genko 2005: 77]. The same in Literary Tabasar: *\(i-f'i\) \(v\) [Khanmagomedov & Shalbuzov 2001: 180].

Common Tabasar: Following [NCED: 497, 1064], we treat Tabasar *\(i-f'i ~ i-\(w'i\) as a compound of two old roots.


The same in Literary Lezgi: *\(i-\(w'i\) \(i\) 'blood' [Talibov & Gadzhiev 1966: 132; Gadzhiev 1950: 319; Haspelmath 1993: 493, 516].

The same in the Akhdy dialect: Khlyut *\(v\) 'blood' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 48].

Following [NCED: 497, 1064], we treat Lezgi *\(v\) as a compound of two old roots.

Proto-Lezgian: NCED: 496. Distribution: A difficult case, because formal internal reconstruction contradicts external data. There are two main roots for 'blood' in Lezgian languages: *\(p'i\) \(\sim\) *\(p'i\) [NCED: 879] and *\(\partial'i\) [NCED: 496].

The plain root *\(\partial'i\) is attested in the meaning 'blood' in Caucasian Albanian-Udi and Archi. In West Lezgian (Tsakhur, Rutul), the compound *\(\partial-i-\(p'i\) 'blood' is observed. Finally, in East Lezgian we see the compound *\(\partial-i-\(p'i\) 'blood' (Tabasar, Lezgi) and the plain *\(\partial'i\) 'blood' (Aghul). The root *\(\partial-i\) is unattested outside this compound, but its external North Caucasian comparanda clearly point to the meaning 'vein' [NCED: 1064]. Formal distribution suggests that the Proto-Lezgian root for 'blood' should have been *\(p'i\), retained in both of the outliers (Udi and Archi), whereas in Proto-
Nuclear Lezgian this was superseded with *ʔäʔ, which was normally used as an element of compounds. The problem of this solution is that the status of *pːiy in the Proto-West Lezgian compound *ʔäʔ-*pːiy appears to be unclear.

Both discussed roots - *pːiy and *ʔäʔ - possess external East Caucasian cognates with the meaning ‘blood’ [NCED: 496, 879], but it is actually *ʔäʔ which reflects the main candidate for the status of at least the Proto-East Caucasian term for ‘blood’, whereas the original meaning of *pːiy seems to have been ‘blood vessel’. If *ʔäʔ is to be posited as the Proto-Lezgian root for ‘blood’, we must assume that the root *pːiy independently shifted from ‘blood vessel’ > ‘blood’ in both of the outliers (Udi, Archi). On the other hand, both of the attested compounds for ‘blood’, *ʔäʔ-*pːiy (West Lezgian) and *ʔäʔ-*ɬːʷiy (East Lezgian), acquire the identical structure ‘blood + vein’.

In South Lezgian (Kryts, Budukh), the substantive ‘blood’ is transparently derived from the adjective *ʔirɨ (~ʔˤ-) ‘red’ q.v. [NCED: 519].

Replacements: {'red' > 'blood'} (Kryts, Budukh), {'blood vessel, vein' > 'blood'} (Udi, Archi).

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular.

Semantics and structure: Primary substantive root. The oblique stem is not reconstructible.

10. BONE

Nidzh Udi uqːˤen {γύκςεν} (1), Vartashen Udi uqːˤen {γυκςεν} (1), Archi lɛki (2), Kryts (proper) kārāp’ (3), Alyk Kryts kārap’ (3), Budukh kēre’ {klepenI} (3), Mishlesh Tsakhur barkʷ {δαρκιβ} (4), Mikik Tsakhur barkʷ (4), Gelmets Tsakhur barkʷ (4), Mukhad Rutul q’ɨrib {κьырыб} (3), Luchek Rutul q’ɨrib (3), Koshan Aghul yirk: (1), Keren Aghul irc: (1), Gequn Aghul irc: (1), Aghul (proper) irc: (1), Northern Tabasaran y’irkː-i (1), Southern Tabasaran k’ur(ab) (3), Gyune Lezgi k’ar’ab (3), Proto-Lezgian *yirƛː (1).

References and notes:


Common Udi: Common Udi *uqːˤen.


Alyk Kryts: Authier 2009: 22, 37, 49, 104, 251, etc.


In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 181], the word čanaq {чанахъ} is incorrectly quoted as a second term for ‘bone’, although in reality čanaq means ‘hip bone’ [Meylanova 1984: 151].


Distinct from cʰom {цдос} ‘bone marrow’ [Ifragimov & Nurmamedov 2010: 386].


Distinct from the more specific term ‘com’ ‘tubular bone (in general)’ [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 39].


Distinct from the more specific term ‘com’ ‘tubular bone (in general)’ [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 39].


Gequn Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 39; Dirr 1907: 122, 175; Shaumyan 1941: 142.

Fite Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 39; Magometov 1970: 45; Shaumyan 1941: 142.


Common Tabasaran: External comparison suggests that Northern yirk ‘bone’ is an archaism.


The same in Literary Lezgi: *kara ‘bone’ [Talibov & Gadzhiev 1966: 212; Gadzhiev 1950: 312; Haspelmath 1993: 496, 516].

The same in the Akhty dialect: Khlyut *kra ‘bone’ [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 39].

Proto-Lezgian: NCED: 528. Distribution: Two complementarily distributed roots for ‘bone’ enter into competition in this criss-crossing situation. The first one is *yir: [NCED: 528], attested in Udi and Caucasian Albanian on the one hand, and in some Nuclear Lezgian lects (namely Aghul, Northern Tabasaran) on the other. The second one is *kara: [NCED: 779], common in Nuclear Lezgian: South Lezgian (Kryts, Budukh), Rutul, Southern Tabasaran, Lezgi.

Since the Samur territory generally demonstrates a high number of post-split, contact-induced lexical isoglosses between Nuclear Lezgian lects, the distribution seems to speak in favor of *yir: as the Proto-Lezgian term for ‘bone’. External North Caucasian comparison clearly supports such a solution. On the contrary, *kara in the meaning ‘bone’ looks like an inner Nuclear Lezgian introduction, which further spread across the Samur territory as an areal isogloss (cf. especially the opposition *yir:/ *kara: between two Tabasaran dialectal clusters). External North Caucasian comparison suggests that the Proto-Lezgian meaning of *kara: was ‘hand bone’ [NCED: 779] (actually *kara-p: with the fossilized plural suffix, used for body parts).

In Archi, *yir: ‘bone’ was superseded with *lak, whose original meaning was probably ‘leg bone’ [NCED: 755]: cf. the meaning ‘knee’ in Caucasian Albanian (see notes on ‘knee’) and ‘foot, leg’ in Tabasaran-Aghul (see notes on ‘foot’). In Tsakhur, th meaning ‘bone’ is expressed by *palk", originating from the meaning ‘a k. of bone’ [NCED: 310] (cf. its reflexes in other Lezgian languages: ‘cheek-bone’, ‘spine’, ‘rib’).

Replacements: *leg bone > ‘bone’ (Archi), *hand bone > ‘bone’ (Kryts, Budukh, Rutul, Southern Tabasaran, Lezgi), *a k. of bone > ‘bone’ (Tsakhur).

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular.

Semantics and structure: Primary substantive root. The oblique stem is not reconstructible.

11. BREAST

Nidzh Udi šˤaq: {ulaykə ~ urəkə} (1), Vartashen Udi aqˤ {əəxə} (2), Archi χ'atum (3), Kryts (proper) maχar (4), Alyk Kryts maχar (4), Budukh maχar {maxap} (4), Mishlesh
Tsakhur koksi (кокси) (-1), Mikik Tsakhur koksi (-1), Gelmets Tsakhur koksi (-1), Mukhad Rutul mixir (мыхър) (4), Ixrek Rutul mixir (мыхър) (4), Luchek Rutul mixir (4), Koshan Aghul muxur (4), Keren Aghul muxur (4), Gequn Aghul muxur (4), Fite Aghul muxur (4), Aghul (proper) muxur (4), Northern Tabasaran muxˈur (4), Southern Tabasaran muxˈur (4), Gyune Lezgi χur (4), Proto-Lezgian *muxor (4).

References and notes:


In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 217] and [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 22] the word dōš is also quoted for 'breast, chest' (the only term in [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990], as a synonym of šaq in [Comrie & Khalilov 2010]); it is borrowed from Azerbaijani dōš 'breast, chest'.

Distinct from cːicːikː {цишькъ} 'female breast, nipple' [Gukasyan 1974: 234; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 23; Mobili 2010: 253]. In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 217], 'female breast' is translated as ʔaq {аьхъ}, which is both an incorrect translation (in fact, a Vartashen form ʔaqˤ for 'human breast'). In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 217], 'female breast' is translated as ʔaq {аьхъ}, which is both an incorrect translation (in fact, a Vartashen form ʔaqˤ for 'human breast') and incorrect spelling for {аъхъ}.


Distinct from cːicːikː ‘female breast’ [Fähnrich 1999: 12].

Common Udi: Both Nidzh šˤaqː and Vartashen ʔaqˤ seem secondary with the common semantic shift 'mountain slope' > 'breast'. Vartashen ʔaqˤ possesses Lezgian comparanda, whereas Nidzh ʔaqː is probably isolated.

Caucasian Albanian: Unattested.

Archí: Chumakina et al. 2007; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 22; Kibrik et al. 1977b: 332, 356; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 217; Mikailov 1967: 200; Dirr 1908: 188, 206. In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 217], there is also a word ik’ {икъ} quoted as a synonym for χʔatum - apparently a corrupted spelling for ik’ʷ {икъв} 'heart' q.v.

Distinct from mam ‘female breast, nipple, baby’s dummy’ [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 22; Kibrik et al. 1977b: 277] (incorrectly glossed in [Chumakina et al. 2007] as 'breast, nipple').


Distinct from yɛɣá ‘female breast’ [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 23] (maybe < Azerbaijani ɣаха 'collar, lapel, breast (metaphorical)').


Distinct from mam ‘female breast’ [Authier 2009: 49].


According to [Meylanova 1984: 55, 210], the word for 'breast (in general, both male and female)' is duš {дущь} (polysemy: 'human breast, chest / slope of mountain, plateau'). But in [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 23] duš is quoted only for 'female breast'. Borrowed from Azerbaijani dōš 'breast, chest'.


Distinct from the inherited mʬxu ‘female breast’ [Ibragimov & Nurmamedov 2010: 267].


Distinct from the inherited mʬxu ‘female breast’ [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 23; Dirr 1913: 188, 223].


Distinct from the inherited mʬx ‘female breast’ [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 23].

Common Tsakhur: In all the dialects the inherited term for 'breast (in general) mʬx ~ mʬxu was narrowed to the meaning 'female breast', having been superseded by the loanword koksì ~ koksì, borrowed from Azerbaijani ƙıks ‘breast, chest’.
**Mukhad Rutul:** Dirr 1912: 161, 189; Ibragimov 1978: 41, 114; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 217.
Distinct from *t'i* 'female breast' [Ibragimov 1978: 48].

**Ixrek Rutul:** Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 196, 334; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 217.
Distinct from *t'i* 'female breast, nipple' [Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 252, 334; Ibragimov 1978: 191].

**Luchek Rutul:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 22.
Distinct from *t'i* 'nipple' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 23].

**Koshan Aghul:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 22, Suleymanov 2003: 136; Shaumyan 1941: 152. It must be noted that in [Magometov 1970: 23] the Burshag word for 'breast' is transcribed as *muχur* - an obvious error. The same term in the Arsug subdialect: *muχur* 'breast' [Shaumyan 1941: 152].
Distinct from Burshag *bizi* 'female breast, nipple' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 23].

**Keren Aghul:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 22. The same in the Usug subdialect: *muχur* 'breast' [Shaumyan 1941: 152].
Distinct from Richa *bizi* 'female breast, nipple' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 23].

**Gequn Aghul:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 22; Dirr 1907: 135, 171; Shaumyan 1941: 152. Polysemy: 'breast / big hill'.
Distinct from *bizi* 'female breast, nipple' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 23; Dirr 1907: 107].

**Fite Aghul:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 22; Shaumyan 1941: 152.
Distinct from *bizi* 'female breast, nipple' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 23].

**Aghul (proper):** Suleymanov 2003: 136; Shaumyan 1941: 152; Magometov 1970: 195 strophe 6. According to Magometov’s example, applied to both men and women. No specific Tpig terms for 'female breast' have been found in [Suleymanov 2003].

**Common Aghul:** The common Aghul term *bizi* 'female breast, nipple' (see also the additional forms in [Shaumyan 1941: 154]) is of unknown origin; cf. [NCED: 305] with hypothetical West Caucasian *comparanda*.

**Northern Tabasaran:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 22. Distinct from the nursery word *neni'ay* 'female breast' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 22].

**Southern Tabasaran:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 22. Distinct from the nursery word *nana* 'female breast' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 22].

**Gyune Lezgi:** Uslar 1896: 578, 609. Distinct from Gyune *mam* 'female breast, teat; udder' [Uslar 1896: 501, 609].

**Proto-Lezgian:** NCED: 829. Distribution: This stem is retained in the meaning 'breast' in all Nuclear Lezgian lects, except for Tsakhur, where the basic term for 'breast' is an Azerbaijani loanword, whereas *moχor* narrowed to 'female breast'. In Archi *moχor* shifted to 'brisket' ('breast' > 'brisket' is natural, but not vice versa), having been superseded with the etymologically obscure form *χɨr*. No traces of the root *moχor* in Udi. External North Caucasian comparison confirms *moχor* as the Proto-Lezgian term for 'breast (in general)'.
In two Udi dialects, 'breast' is expressed by forms with synchronic polysemy: 'breast / mountain slope', apparently with the development 'mountain slope' > 'breast'. At least for the Vartashen Udi form *moχor* (a), both internal and external comparison suggest the original meaning 'slope' [NCED: 244] (the Nidz Udi term is etymologically isolated). It should be noted, however, that theoretically both directions of the semantic shift between 'breast' and 'slope' are possible.

**Replacements:** [mountain slope] > [breast] (Udi), [breast] > [brisket] (Archi).

**Reconstruction shape:** Correspondences seem regular.

**Semantics and structure:** Primary substantive root. Historically *moχor* with the nominal r-suffix with general semantics.
12. BURN TR.


References and notes:


Common Udi: Common Udi *bok-b-esun*, a transitive/causative from Nidzh-Vartashen *bok-(o)esun* ‘to burn (intr.)’ [Gukasyan 1974: 88; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 66; Mobili 2010: 68; Fähnrich 1999: 10; Schulze 2001: 259], formed with the light verb *-b* ‘to do’ [Schulze 2005: 569 ff. (3.4.2.2 #22 ff.)].

The root *bok*- is synchronically unsegmentable; as in many other cases with Udi roots in *b*-, Lezgian cognates suggest that *b*- is a petrified prefix (a former class exponent, see [Harris 2002: 72 ff., 215 ff.] w. lit. and discussion), thus *b=ok*-.

Caucasian Albanian: The transitive verb is unattested. Cf. *bok’-ok-esun* ‘to burn (intr.)’ [Gippert et al. 2008: IV-11]; morphologically can be analyzed as *bok’-o’-k-esun* with the light verb *-k’*- as, e.g., in *bas-k’*- ‘to lie, sleep’ q.v. (the second *-o*- is unclear in this case) or as partially reduplicated *bok’-ok’*- (cf. [Gippert et al. 2008: II-78]).


Mikik Tsakhir: Kibrik & Kodzason 1988: 95; Dirr 1913: 146. It should be noted that in [Kibrik & Kodzason 1988: 94, 95], a labile verb *gʰ=oxan* / *gʰ=oxin* ‘burn (intrans.); to burn (trans.)’ is postulated, which seems an inaccuracy; see notes on Common Tsakhir.


Common Tsakhir: The stem represents a regular causative formation from *gʰ=oxʷan* ‘to burn (intrans.),’ formed with the verb *(l=)aʔ- ‘to do’ [Kibrik et al. 1999: 58 f.; Kibrik & Kodzason 1988: 129].

Note that *xʷ* is still retained in some forms in Mishlesh and Literary Tsakhir, but it has been totally superseded by *x* in Mikik under the influence of numerous forms with the regular delabialization *oxʷ>* *ox* (the Gelmets data are unknown).

Initial *gʰ* is a prefix with general semantics [Ibragimov 1990: 124; Kibrik & Kodzason 1988: 41].

Mukhad Rutul: Ibragimov 1978: 121; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 66. Causative from *ux- ‘to burn (intrans.)’ [Dirr 1912: 176; Ibragimov 1978: 120], modified with the additional prefix *h*. It should be noted that in [Makhmudova 2001: 252] this word is quoted
as h=uxʷ. [пѣхваас] (with the labialized -xʷ- - an archaism) and treated as a labile verb 'to burn (intrans.); to burn (trans.).'

Distinct from the causative l=ikʷ-a h=uxʷ 'to set fire to' [Dirr 1912: 157; Ibragimov 1978: 120] from l=ikʷ- 'to catch fire' [Ibragimov 1978: 120; Makhmudova 2001: 159, 233].

**Proto-Lezgian:** NCED: 860. **Distribution:** Retained with the basic meaning in all the languages, except for some Nuclear Lezgian lects.

**IXREK RUTUL:** Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 339; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 66. Causative from h=uxʷ-x-är- [imperf.] / h=ux-x-är- [perf.] 'to burn (intrans.)' [Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 81].

Distinct from l=ikʷ-ä h=uxʷ 'to set fire to' (with the example: 'They lit a fire') [Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 180] from l=ikʷ- 'to catch fire' [Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 180].

Distinct from k=irš-e h=uxʷ [Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 144], which is translated by Dzhamalov & Semedov as 'to burn (trans.)', but the only example 'He has lit a splinter' points to the meaning 'to set fire to smth.' Causative from k=irš-, which is translated in [Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 144] as 'to burn (intrans.)' (examples: 'The firewood burns', 'The lamp is lit'), but such a glossing also seems an inaccuracy.

In [Ibragimov 1978: 224], both Ixrek forms, h=ux- and k=irš-, are quoted as synonyms for 'to catch fire'; they are semantic counterparts of Mukhad l=ikʷ- 'to catch fire'.

**LUCHEK RUTUL:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 95, 96. Polysemy: 'to burn (trans.) / to set fire to'. Causative from l=ikʷ- 'to burn (intrans.); to catch fire' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 94, 95].

**COMMON RUTUL:** In all the dialects the equivalents of the meaning 'to burn (trans.)' represent regular causative formations from different verbs for 'to burn (intrans.)', formed with the verb (h=)a- [h=äiq-] 'to do'. Luchek l=ikʷ- 'in the generic meaning 'to burn (intrans.)' is an innovation; external Lezgian comparison proves that the primary meaning of this root was 'to catch fire' as in Mukhad and Ixrek.

Initial h=, l= and k= are prefixes with general semantics [Ibragimov 1978: 95; Alekseev 1994a: 227; Makhmudova 2001: 165].

**KOSHAN AGHUL:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 95; Suleymanov 2003: 159. Labile verb 'to burn (intrans.) / to burn (trans.).' Derived from the verb urš-a: 'to boil (intrans., trans.)' [Magometov 1970: 18, 23]; it should be noted, however, that in [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 137] and once in [Magometov 1970: 57] the verb 'to boil' is transcribed as urš-a: with lax, not tense š. Etymologically corresponds to Keren (Richa) ruš-a: 'to boil', Proper Aghul (Tsirkhe) urš-e: 'to boil' (with the tense x!), etc. [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 137; Magometov 1970: 23, 57; NCED: 1030].

Distinct from k=urš-xː- 'to set fire to' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 96].

**KEREN AGHUL:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 95; Magometov 1970: 164. Labile verb 'to burn (intrans.) / to burn (trans.).' Note the retention of the labialized velar.

**FITE AGHUL:** Dirr 1907: 97, 145. Labile verb 'to burn (intrans.) / to burn (trans.) / to set fire to'. Note the repetition of the labialized velar.

**AGHUL (PROPER):** Suleymanov 2003: 159; Shaumyan 1941: 145. It should be noted that in [Suleymanov 2003: 160], the archaic Tpig form ugʷ-a: is also quoted as a variant of more common ug-a:.

**COMMON AGHUL:** Internal reconstruction as well as external comparison suggest that Koshan urš-a: 'to burn' is an innovation.

The labialization of gʷ in ugʷ-a: is almost eliminated in dialects due to the recent areal process of dissipilative delabialization uCʷ > nC [Magometov 1970: 26].

**Northern Tabasaran:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 95. Labile verb: 'to burn (intrans.) / to burn (trans.).'

The same in the Khaŋag subdialect: awgː- 'to burn (intrans.); to burn (trans.)' [Uslar 1979: 625; Dirr 1905: 212].

**Southern Tabasaran:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 95. Labile verb: 'to burn (intrans.) / to burn (trans.).'


**GYUNE LEZGI:** Uslar 1896: 455, 631. Ablaut paradigm: kuː-[imperf.] / kaː-[perf.] / kuː-g [redupl. inv.]. Labile verb 'to burn (intrans.) / to burn (trans.).'

In West Lezgian (Tsakhur, Rutul), this root was superseded with the synchronic causative from *ʔeɬ(ː)ʷVr-, whose original meaning is 'to get heated' [NCED: 1036]. Subsequently in Luchek Rutul, it was superseded with the synchronic causative from *ʔik'ʷa-, whose original meaning is 'to catch fire' [NCED: 632]. Koshan Aghul, 'to burn (intrans./trans.)' is a suffixal derivation from the verb *ʔVrɬːan-'to boil (intrans./trans.)' [NCED: 1030].

Replacements: {'to get heated' > 'to burn'} (Tsakhur, Rutul), {'to catch fire' > 'to burn'} (Luchek Rutul), {'to boil (intrans./trans.)' > 'to burn'} (Koshan Aghul).

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular.

Semantics and structure: Primary verbal root with the labile meaning 'to burn (trans./intrans.)'.
example the real meaning of mcɨ is 'nail, peg' [Authier 2009: 231], not 'fingernail').

**Budukh:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 33. In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 209] erroneously quoted as dɨrnɐv [дəрмəд]. Polysemy: 'fingernail / hoof'. Borrowed from Azerbaijani dɨrnɐv 'fingernail, claw, hoof'. There are no terms for 'fingernail' or 'claw' in [Meylanova 1984].

**Mishlesh Tsakhur:** Kibrik et al. 1999: 889, 896; Ibragimov & Nurmanov 2010: 381; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 209.
Distinct from xɨnɨʔ [хынъыч] 'claw' [Ibragimov & Nurmanov 2010: 381].

**Tsakhur-Kum Tsakhur:** xɨnt'x [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 33]. Apparently from *xɨba < *xibVna.

**Mikik Tsakhur:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 33; Dirr 1913: 166, 231.

**Gelmets Tsakhur:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 33; Ibragimov 1990: 186. In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 209], the plural form is quoted: xɨmm-ara (an error or sandhi bn > mn).

**Mukhad Rutul:** Dirr 1912: 141, 196; Ibragimov 1978: 115; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 209. Polysemy: 'nail / claw'.


**Luchek Rutul:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 33.


Distinct from q’amz ‘claw’ [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 33].

**Gequn Aghul:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 33; Dirr 1907: 127, 178; Shaumyan 1941: 193. Ergative form: kerk-u. As proposed in [NCED: 690], labialized kʰ in the absolutive form is secondary, due to the influence of the ergative kerk-u.

**Fite Aghul:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 33; Shaumyan 1941: 193.

Distinct from Tpig garmag ‘claw; hook’ [Suleymanov 2003: 115], ultimately borrowed from Azerbaijani garmag ‘hook’.

**Northern Tabasaran:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 33.

**Southern Tabasaran:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 33. Paradigm: šib [abs.] / šib-’u [erg.].

**Common Tabasaran:** Note the retention of tense fricative š in the Northern subdialects. The Kondik oblique stem šivu- (not **šivu-) also points to an old tense consonant, although such paradigms are expected to get levelled after the monosyllabic absolutive form.


**Proto-Lezgian:** NCED: 814 (as *šān). Distribution: This root is retained in the generic meaning ‘(finger)nail’ in Udi, on the one hand, and in some Nuclear Lezgian lects, on the other: West Lezgian (Tsakhur, Rutul) and Tabasaran. External North Caucasian comparison confirms such a semantic reconstruction for *mät [NCED: 814].
Some local substitutions are observed in individual languages. In Archi the obscure form Xqont’ol is attested. In Kryts, the old root is superseded with *nić ‘hoof’ [NCED: 819]. In Aghul and Lezgi, ‘nail’ is denoted by *kerk, whose original meaning is not clear and general antiquity is dubious [NCED: 689] (as proved by the Tabasaran data, *kerk is not the Proto-East Lezgian root for ‘nail’, but a late areal innovation).
Superseded with an Azerbaijani loanword in some Nuclear Lezgian lects.

**Replacements:** [hoof > ‘nail’] (Kryts).

**Reconstruction shape:** Correspondences seem regular up to the metathesis *mät > *šām in Proto-Nuclear Lezgian.

**Semantics and structure:** Primary substantive root. The oblique stem is *mätV-.
14. CLOUD


References and notes:


Distinct from *duman* 'fog' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 205], borrowed from Azerbaijani *duman* 'fog'.


Common Udi: Common Udi *asoy*, with a laryngeal prothesis in Vartashen (note, however, that normally in such cases the laryngeal prothesis is characteristic of the Nidzh dialect, not the Vartashen one). The suffixal -y of the Nidzh form is explained in [Schulze 2001: 282] as a result of analogy with the Nidzh word-formative suffix -ay, but actually the -y suffix is observed in some Nuclear Lezgic forms (namely Rutul), thus we rather deal with the archaic formation, not synchronic derivation (in such a case Vartashen *haso* can be interpreted as the occasional loss of the final glide).


Archi: Chumakina et al. 2007; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 205; Kibrik et al. 1977b: 222, 370; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 60; Mikailov 1967: 181; Dirr 1908: 141, 215. Polysemy: 'cloud / rain cloud'. Paradigm: *dit* [abs. sg.], *dit*-i [erg. sg.], *dik-or* [abs. pl.].

Distinct from *xea/lqi* with polysemy 'fog / light north wind' [Chumakina et al. 2007; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 205].

Kryts (proper): Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 205. Polysemy: 'sheep-flock / cloud'. In [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990], two terms for 'cloud' are quoted: *kabal* and *bili*; difference is unclear. It must be noted that *kabal* is a metaphoric expression with the main meaning 'sheep-flock' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 63], whereas *bili* is borrowed from Azerbaijani *bulut* 'cloud'.

Distinct from *diz* 'fog' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 205].

In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 60] three terms - *kabal* (sic!), *bili* and *diz* - are quoted as synonyms for 'cloud', whereas *fog* is translated as *diz*, which in fact means 'sky' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 197].


Distinct from inherited *dzif* [əдьиф], glossed as 'black cloud; fog' in [Meylanova 1984: 59] and as 'fog' in [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 205].


Another attested word is *bulut* (əbəyum) 'cloud', borrowed from Azerbaijani *bulut* 'cloud' [Ibragimov & Nurmamedov 2010: 94].

In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 60], erroneously quoted as *buput* (əbəyum).

Distinct from *čamra* 'fog' [Kibrik et al. 1999: 871] (in [Ibragimov & Nurmamedov 2010: 393]; quoted as *čamra*).


Distinct from *čamra* 'fog' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 205].


Despite the wide distribution of Rutul *kibil, it is not entirely certain that this was the basic or at least the only term for 'cloud'. Another appropriate candidate is reflected as Khnyukh (subdialect of Mukhad) asɨy 'cloud' [Ibragimov 1978: 136], Ixrek ģišˈtiy 'cloud' (see above), Shinaz asay 'cloud' [Dirr 1912: 120, 196] (final -Vy may be a frequent nominal suffix with general semantics [Ibragimov 1978: 65]). Perhaps *kibil possessed the generic meaning 'fog / rheumatism', whereas *as*Vy meant properly 'cloud'.


Fite Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 205. For the Fite dialect two words are quoted as synonyms for 'cloud' in [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 205]: qirɨ and ansar; the latter is also attested in [Taranov 1994: 240], but without dialectal provenance. Distinct from difː 'fog' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 205].


Common Aghul: The widespread Aghul term qirɨ was borrowed from some neighboring languages of the Dargi group (cf. Chirag qirɨ ‘cloud’) or, rather, both words represent a common loanword of unknown origin. This means that Fite ansar (historically ans-ar with the fossilized plural suffix) is the only candidate for the Proto-Aghul term for 'cloud'.


Differently in the Khanag subdialect: difː with polysemy: 'cloud / rain cloud / foam' [Uslar 1979: 669, 999], opposed to ans 'fog' [Uslar 1979: 584, 1008]. Both Khanag words difː and ans are glossed as 'fog' in [Dirr 1905: 156, 164, 245].


Two words for 'cloud' are quoted for the Khiv subdialect: žif [aʃxif] with polysemy: 'cloud / rain cloud' [Genko 2005: 68] and ans [asc] 'cloud' [Genko 2005: 18] (semantic nuances are unknown; the latter form is not explicitly marked as Khiv due to erroneous omission of the plus sign).

The corresponding Literary Tabasaran terms are better documented: difː [xif] with polysemy: 'cloud / rain cloud' [Khanmagomedov & Shalbuzov 2001: 149]; distinct from literary ans 'rain cloud' [Khanmagomedov & Shalbuzov 2001: 57]. According to [Khanmagomedov & Shalbuzov 2001: 149, 305a], in Literary Tabasaran 'fog' is expressed as žifin difː, literally 'earth's cloud'.

Common Tabasaran: The distribution formally suggests that difː – žif was the Proto-Tabasaran term for 'cloud', whereas ans meant 'fog'.


First, we must rule out the root *kʰapʰal, which shifted from its original meaning ‘group, heap, sheep-flock’ > ‘cloud’ in Kryts [NCED: 448].

Second, we may exclude the root *kʰomol, which means ‘cloud, fog, rheumatism’ in West Lezgian (Tsakhur, Rutul) and simply ‘rheumatism’ in Lezgi. This root has a fairly modest distribution in the meaning ‘cloud’ and can hardly reflect the Proto-Lezgian basic term. Its Proto-Lezgian or at least Proto-Nuclear Lezgian meaning can be either ‘rheumatism’ (if the shift ‘rheumatism’ > ‘cloud, fog’ is possible) or rather ‘a k. of precipitation or wet weather’ > ‘cloud’. In this case, the shift ‘a k. of precipitation or wet weather’ > ‘rheumatism’ is a late Tsakhur-Rutul-Lezgi isogloss of areal origin, or the polysemy ‘a k. of precipitation or wet weather / rheumatism’ existed already on the Proto-Nuclear Lezgian level. Additionally, the retention of the root *ʔamsː with the meaning ‘cloud’ in some Rutul dialects may indicate that the semantic development *kʰomol ‘a k. of precipitation or wet weather’ > ‘cloud’ is a late Tsakhur-Rutul process after the split of Proto-West Lezgian.

External North Caucasian comparison also proves that the original meaning of Lezgian *kʰomol was ‘a k. of precipitation or wet weather’ [NCED: 737].

The real choice consists of two Proto-Lezgian roots: *ʔamsː and *tːiɬːʷ, which are to be distributed among two specific meanings: ‘cloud’ and ‘fog’.

On formal grounds, the stem *ʔamsː [NCED: 243] has a better chance to represent the Proto-Lezgian term for ‘cloud’. It is retained as ‘cloud’ in Udi, on the one hand, and in Rutul and Aghul, on the other. The root *tːiɬːʷ [NCED: 400], whose Proto-Lezgian meaning in this case must have been ‘fog’, is retained as ‘fog’ in South Lezgian (Kryts, Budukh) and in Aghul. In Lezgi, *tːiɬːʷ expanded to ‘cloud’, having acquired polysemy ‘fog / cloud’ (whereas the old root *ʔamsː got lost). There are two difficulties with such a scenario. First, *tːiɬːʷ developed into ‘cloud’ (‘fog’ > cloud’) in Archi. Next, both roots swapped their meanings in Proto-Tabasaran, where *ʔamsː probably meant ‘fog’ and *tːiɬːʷ meant ‘cloud’; it should be noted, however, that the Proto-Tabasaran semantic reconstruction is not very certain.

The second scenario is that *ʔamsː meant ‘fog’ in Proto-Lezgian, whereas *tːiɬːʷ meant ‘cloud’. This implies that *tːiɬːʷ has been retained as ‘cloud’ in Archi and probably Proto-Tabasaran, but independently underwent the shift ‘cloud’ > ‘fog’ in South Lezgian (Kryts, Budukh) and Aghul. In its turn, *ʔamsː ‘fog’ only retained its meaning in Proto-Tabasaran, but independently shifted from ‘fog’ > ‘cloud’ in Udi, Rutul and Aghul. It should be noted that both roots swapped their meanings in Aghul.

The first scenario is much more economical; thus, we follow the formal distribution and reconstruct Proto-Lezgian *ʔamsː: ‘cloud’ and Proto-Lezgian *tːiɬːʷ: ‘fog’. The problem is that external North Caucasian comparison suggests that it should be *tːiɬːʷ that denoted ‘cloud’ in Proto-Lezgian. In any case, we must note that, due to natural reasons, both meanings, ‘cloud’ and ‘fog’, are frequently interchangeable in mountainous regions.

An additional term for ‘cloud’ is the etymologically obscure Caucasian Albanian form alʰeg. It is proposed in [Gippert et al. 2008: IV-5] that alʰeg originates from Lezgian *tːiɬːʷ, but the assumed sound shifts (not discussed by Gippert and Schulze) seem strange and irregular.

‘Cloud’ is expressed by Azerbaijani or Dargi loanwords in Budukh and Aghul.

Replacements: {‘fog’ > ‘cloud’}, {‘cloud’ > ‘fog’}, {‘group, heap, sheep-flock’ > ‘cloud’} (Kryts), {‘a k. of precipitation or wet weather; rheumatism’ > ‘cloud’} (Tsakhur, Rutul).

Reconstrucion shape: Correspondences seem regular, except for the laryngeal prothesis in Vartashen Udi.

Semantics and structure: Primary substantive root. The oblique stem is not reconstructible. Udi and Rutul reflect the suffixed variant *ʔamsːV-y.

15. COLD

Nidzh Udi čaχ {чах} (1), Vartashen Udi čaχ {чах} (1), Archi χʰ-e-tu-CLASS (2), Kryts (proper) s=аwa-y (3), Alyk Kryts qa-y (3), Budukh s=аwa [саꙊа] (3), Mishlesh Tsakhur miχ’α-n {мъкъан} (4), Mikik Tsakhur miχ’α-n (4), Gelmets Tsakhur miχ’α-n⁸ (4), Mukhad Rutul miq’-di ~ miq’-di {мъкъды} (4), Ixrek Rutul miq’-di {мъкъды} (4), Luchek Rutul

References and notes:

Nidzh Udi: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 245; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 686. Confirmed in [Ganenkov et al. 2008: 252 (23)]: 'we pour cold (aAx) water in the bath'. Polysemy: 'cold (adj.) / cold (n.), frost / ice'.

Vartashen Udi: Fähnrich 1999: 12; Bezhanov & Bezhanov 1902 (Mt. 10.42 'a cup of cold (aAx) water to drink'). Polysemy: 'cold (adj.) / cold (n.), frost / ice'.

Common Udi: Common Udi *ax’ cold (n.); cold (adj.); ice'. In [Gukasyan 1974: 236; Mobili 2010: 80; Schiefner 1863: 87] and [Schulze 2001: 266], however, Nidzh-Vartashen ax’ is inaccurately glossed only as a substantive 'cold, frost; ice' (thus polysemy 'cold, frost / ice / cold (adj.)'); there is no equivalent for English 'cold (adj.)' in these dictionaries. Cf. also the common Udi substantive mi’cold, frost' [Gukasyan 1974: 174; Schiefner 1863: 104; Fähnrich 1999: 23; Schulze 2001: 299].


Distinct from 母校-ɬe-class, which is quoted in [Dirr 1908: 172, 225] with the translation 'cold (adj.)' (‘the cold water”). A more correct translation should be rather ‘having gotten cold’, a regular participle from the verb母校- ‘to get cold’ [Chumakina et al. 2007], Kibrik et al. 1977b: 291.


Distinct from 母校-a/u [clarxa.ny] ‘cold (of weather), a participle from母校a ‘to become cold (of weather), to catch cold (of human)’ [Meylanova 1984: 46].


Tsakhur-Kum Tsakhur: mik’a- [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 245].


The assimilated variant with ɬe- comes from [Dirr 1912].


Common Rutul: Final -di / -d is the attributive suffix.

Koshan Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 245; Shaumyan 1941: 160. The same in the Khudig subdialect: mik’-le-d ‘cold’ [Shaumyan 1941: 160].

Derived from the substantive, attested as Burshag mek’ (oblique mik’-la-) ‘cold, frost’ [Shaumyan 1941: 151].

It should be noted, however, that in [Suleymanov 2003: 144], 'cold' is quoted as urdu-d [ypréya] and wuru-d ~ ururu-d [ypréya] (apparently ururu-d), which represent forms of the Arsug or Khudig subdialect, as is evident from the suffixal -d.

Keren Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 245. The same in the Usug subdialect: ruwu-f ‘cold’ [Shaumyan 1941: 160]. Cf. also the Usug substantive mek’ (oblique mek’-ala-) ‘cold, frost’ [Shaumyan 1941: 151].

Gequn Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 245; Dirr 1907: 140, 187; Shaumyan 1941: 160. Cf. two substantives with the meaning ‘cold, frost’: ruwu [Dirr 1907: 140], mek’ [Dirr 1907: 134] (oblique stem: mek’-i- ~ mek’-ila-).
Fite Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 245.


In the Tpig subdialect, cf. the substantive mek (oblique mek-i-la) 'cold, frost' [Suleymanov 2003: 133; Shaumyan 1941: 151].

Common Aghul: The distribution suggests that the Proto-Aghul adjective 'cold' was derived from the substantive 'cold, frost', attested as Gegun ruwu 'cold, frost' (see above) and ruw 'cold, frost', quoted in [Magometov 1970: 46] without dialect specification (probably proper Aghul). Cf. also the paronymous verb, which is attested in non-Koshan dialects as Keren (Richa) ruw-a- 'to feel cold' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 166], proper Aghul (Tpig) ruwa- 'to become cold' [Suleymanov 2003: 144]. For the Koshan (Burshag) dialect two synonymous verbs with the meaning 'to feel cold; to become cold' are quoted in [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 165] and [Suleymanov 2003: 144]: ur-ṣa- and urṣa-. The former Burshag stem is perhaps to be analyzed as 2-urṣ-a-, although the prefix 2- seems very rare or unique (cf. Proper Aghul (Kurag) 2-ahar xa- 'to know' q.v.); phonetically =urṣ-a- normally corresponds to non-Koshan ruṣ-a-, see [NCED: 133]. The latter Koshan stem urṣ-a- is unclear; formally, it represents the result of secondary pharyngealization.

Only in the Burshag subdialect of Koshan (but not in other Koshan subdialects) this term was superseded with a new adjective, derived from another substantive with the meaning 'cold, frost' - mek (oblique mek-i-la-), see the data above.

Final -d, -l, -f, -r are the adjectival suffixes (fossilized class exponents) [Magometov 1970: 92; Shaumyan 1941: 45].

Northern Tabasaran: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 245. Distinct from Dyubek merč'u-li 'cool, chilly' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 245] (historically me-r-c'u- with the fossilized class exponent -r-).

In the Khanag subdialect: mič'-li 'cold' [Uslar 1979: 858, 1009; Dirr 1905: 196, 246], applied to both objects (e.g., water) and weather, distinct from aqˤ'i cold (said of weather) [Dirr 1905: 152, 246].

Two words are quoted for the Khuryuyk subdialect: aqˤ'i [aλxэ] 'cold' [Genko 2005: 25], mič'-li [mэиэгэ] 'cold' [Genko 2005: 121] - application and semantic nuances of both terms are unknown.


Two words with the meaning 'cold' are attested in the Khiv subdialect: wa-irwu [раpра] [Genko 2005: 41] (historically wa-a-r-su with the fossilized class exponent -r-) and mič'-li [mэиэгэ] 'cold' [Genko 2005: 121] - both terms are applied to objects, but the semantic or pragmatic difference is unclear ('cold' and 'cool'?). Distinct from Khiv aqˤ'u [aλxэ] 'cold' [Genko 2005: 25], which is applied to weather, as may be seen from Genko's examples (cf. also an additional example in [Genko 2005: 147 sub tаqراق]).


Common Tabasaran: A tangled situation with three competing roots: (1) *ʔy²ʔa- (Northern aqˤ'i - aqˤ-li, Southern aqˤ'u); (2) *ʔirge(r)- (Southern wa-irwu); (3) *meč'-i (Northern merč'u-li - mič'-li, Southern mič'-li).

It seems that Northern me-r-c'u-li - mič'-li, Southern mič'-li can be reconstructed with the specific meaning 'cool, chilly', as retained in both Northern and Southern dialects, although in the Khanag subdialect this acquired the generic meaning 'cold'. It is confirmed by comparative Aghul data that this adjective was derived from the oblique stem of the substantive 'cold, frost' (this substantive is retained as Tabasaran mik 'wind' q.v.).

As for Northern aqˤ'i - aqˤ-li, Southern aqˤ'u, its normal meaning is 'cold (of weather)', although in the Dyubek subdialect aqˤ-li acquired the meaning 'cold (in general)' (apparently the Dyubek final -li is due to influence on the part of merč'u-li 'cool, chilly'). This term was derived from the verbal root that is retained in the prefixed form as Dyubek da-ʔaqˤ- 'to become cold' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 97], Khanag d-aqˤ- 'to become cool, chilly' [Dirr 1905: 163].

Southern wa-a-CLASS-su 'cold' (not attested in Northern Tabasaran) is the synchronic perfect participle from the Common Tabasaran verb 'to become cold'. Cf. Northern: Khuryuyk aqˤ- [aλxэ] 'to feel cold' [Genko 2005: 12], Kumi prefixed qʷ-aqˤ- [к̥аpра] 'to feel cold' or 'to get cold' [Genko 2005: 100]; Southern: Khiv aqˤ- [aрэгэ]' to feel cold; to get cold' [Genko 2005: 19], Khiv aqˤ- [yрэгэ]' to freeze (trans., intrans.)' [Genko 2005: 155], Literary Tabasaran aqˤ- [aрэгэ]' to get cold; to feel cold' [Khanmagomedov & Shalbuzov 2001: 44].

It is possible that Southern wa-аsu reflects the Proto-Tabasaran term for 'cold (in general)'.

Gyune Lezgi: Uslar 1896: 485, 638. Glossed as 'cold, cool'; applied to both objects and weather. Perfective participle from the verb riq'i- [imperf.] / qax- [perf.] 'to get cold' [Uslar 1896: 495]; cf. also the parallel participle qα-y 'cold wind, cool wind' [Uslar

Differently in the Akhty dialect: Klyut meq'i 'cold' [Kibrik & Kodzsozov 1990: 245].

It is uncertain how the Proto-Lezgi word for 'cold' should be reconstructed. According to the external data, it is likely that Akhty meq'i is an archaic form, whereas the Gyune participle qa-yi represent a late introduction of areal origin, which superseded meq'i in the meaning 'cold (of objects)'.

Proto-Lezgian: NCED: 808. Distribution: It seems that in all (or almost all) attested cases the adjective 'cold' can be interpreted as a synchronic derivative from either the substantive 'cold, frost' or the verb 'to be cold' (particle pattern).

A rigorous approach would surmise leaving the Proto-Lezgian slot empty. Nevertheless, we prefer to reconstruct Proto-Lezgian *mel- 'cold (adj.), derived from Proto-Lezgian *meq' 'cold, frost' [NCED: 808]. This seems to be the most archaic Lezgian expression for 'cold (adj.)', and indeed, the derivation 'cold, frost' > 'cold (adj.)' can theoretically be reconstructed for the Proto-Lezgian level.

The substantive *meq- 'cold, frost' is a Common Lezgian stem, since it is attested in Udi and in Nuclear Lezgian: Aghul, Lezgi (also in Tabasaran, where it shifted to the meaning 'wind (in general)'). The adjective stem *meq'i- 'cold' also displays relevant distribution. It is attested in Caucasian Albanian, on the one hand, and in West Lezgian (Tsakhur, Rutul) and Proto-Lezgi, on the other. In some East Lezgian lects - Koshan Aghul (Burshag), Southern Tabasaran (Khiv) - the adjectives for 'cold' contain the same root, but these forms represent synchronic derivatives from the substantive *meq- 'cold, frost'.

In Udi, 'cold (adj.)' is expressed with *çaxi- [NCED: 346], whose original meaning was substantival, cf. the synchronic polysemy in Udi: 'cold (adj.)' / 'cold, frost' / 'ice'.

The verbal root *içä 'to get cold' [NCED: 568] forms synchronic participles with the meaning 'cold (adj.)' in Archi and Northern Tabasaran (Dyubek).

The verbal root *käçä 'to get cold' [NCED: 649] forms synchronic participles with the meaning 'cold (adj.)' in some Nuclear Lezgian lects: South Lezgian (Kryts, Budukh), Proto-Aghul, Proto-Tabasaran, Gyune Lezgi.

The derivation 'to get cold' > 'cold' is likely to be a relatively late areal isogloss.

Replacements: ['cold, frost' > 'cold (adj.)'] (passim), ['to be cold' > 'cold (adj.)'] (passim).

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular.

Semantics and structure: Adjectival stem, derived from the primary nominal root.

16. COME
Nidzh Udi ey- ~ e- {eçun ~ eçun} (1) / har- (2), Vartashen Udi ey- ~ e- {eçun ~ eçun} (1) / ar- (2), Archi =a-li- (3) / =q'a (1), Kryts (proper) =ušč-un- (4) / =uxu- (5), Alyk Kryts =ašxa- (4) / =ašxu- (5), Budukh =ašča- {çlauhx-a} (4) / =axi- {çlauhx-i} (5), Mishlesh Tsakhur q=aʔ- {xvarıń} (2), Mikik Tsakhur q=aʔ- (2), Gelmets Tsakhur q=iʔ- (2), Mukhad Rutul CLASS=iʔi {ixi/qu, ixquyi} (2) / y=iq'-i-r (6), Ixrek Rutul CLASS=iʔi {ixquyi} (2) / y=iq'-i-r (6), Luchek Rutul CLASS=iʔi (2) / y=iq'-i-r (6), Koshan Aghul waʔ-y- (1) / arg-i- (3), Keren Aghul ad-i- (3), Gequn Aghul waʔ- (1) / ar-i- (3), Fite Aghul ad-a- (3), Aghul (proper) we-y- (1) / ad-ina- (3), Northern Tabasaran cʰ- (1) / af' (5), Southern Tabasaran v- (1) / af' (5), Gyune Lezgi qʷe- (1) / at'a- (7), Proto-Lezgian *iʔi=*mʔi (1) / *ʔWVʔV(r)- (2).
References and notes:


Vartashen Udi: Gukasyan 1974: 122; Fähnrich 1999: 15; Dirr 1903: 10, 40, 51, 56, 69, 85, 89, 94, 95; Schiefner 1863: 77; Starchevskiy 1891: 488. Glossed as ‘to come, to arrive’; but incorrectly as ‘to go, walk’ in [Schulze 2001: 275], cf. contexts like Mt. 8.9, where e(y)- ‘to come’ is opposed to taf(y)- ‘to go’; “I tell this one, ‘Go (take),’ and he goes (tanasa); and to another, ‘Come (ek),’ and he comes (enesa)” [Bezhanov & Bezhanov 1902].

In [Fähnrich 1999: 30] the variant e=esum is also quoted - an important archaisms, see notes on ‘to go’. Perfective stem.


Originally *e=iu (e = y) / ar- / *e=iu- / e=ki- with the preverb *(h)ec- ‘hither’, see notes on ‘to go’.

Caucasian Albanian: A suppletive verb le=i- (present-infective) / ar- (past) / le=kal- (imperative) [Gippert et al. 2008: II-44, 45, 51, IV-26]. With the exception of the imperative root, directly corresponds to the Udi paradigm. For further analysis see notes on ‘to go’.


As described in [Kibrik et al. 1977a 2: 72; Kibrik et al. 1977a 3: 242; Chumakina et al. 2007], a suppletive verb: =uLi-[inf., imperf.]/ =uL[perf.]/ =uLi-[inv.]. We treat =uLi- and =uL as synonyms. The latter is etymologically the same root as =uLe- ‘to go’ as in [Chumakina et al. 2007; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 75; Kibrik et al. 1977b: 188, 376; Mikailov 1967: 171].


Mishlesh Tsakhr: Kibrik et al. 1999: 68, 74, 87, 88, 897; Ibragimov & Nurmamedov 2010: 375. According to [Kibrik et al. 1999], a suppletive verb: q=al-a [imperf.]/ q=al-i [perf.]/ q=al- [inf.]/ q=al- [inv.]. Cf. synchronic forms: imperfect class 1/2/3/4 q=i, perf. 1/2 qari, 3 qab, 4 qadi, fut. 1/4 qalies, 2 qayelies, 3 qualies, inv. 1/4 qora, 2 qera, 3 qivora. Polysemy: ‘to come / to bring (animated obj.)’ in perf. & fut., although in imperfective & inimperfective the roots for ‘to come’ and ‘to bring’ are different.

There is also another suppletive verb with the more generic meaning ‘to come, arrive / to bring (animated & inanimate obj.),’ formed with the same roots al- [imperf.]/ al- [imperf., fut., inv.] and the zero prefix (or with the prefix ʔ- - an automatic prothesis for vocalic onset): all-es [Kibrik et al. 1999: 63, 869].

Mikik Tsakhr: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 75; Dirr 1913: 179, 235. The same suppletive paradigm as in Mishlesh: imperfect. q=al=a (1/2/3/4 q’=a) [perf. q=al-i (1/2 qari, 3 qab) / fut. q=al- (1 qalies, 2 qayelies, 3 qualies) [inv. q=al-a (1 qora, 2 qera, 3 qivora).]

Gelmets Tsakhr: Ibragimov 1990: 183, 195, 213. Only the form of fut. is known: q-i-class-ʔ-ez ~ q-i-class-y-ez. The paronymous verb aʔ- (formed with the zero prefix) is a close synonym: fut. aryez, abycez, prohib. maraye, mabaye ‘to come’ [Ibragimov 1990: 196]. In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 495], only the second verb is quoted: fut. a-class-ʔ-ez (a-r-ʔ-ez (apxez)).

Common Tsakhr: Initial q= is a prefix with general semantics [Ibragimov 1990: 124; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 41].


According to the data in [Makhmudova 2001] and [Ibragimov 1978], the suppletive paradigm is as follows: class=irʔ ~ class=r=irʔ-i-r [imperf.]/ y=iqʔ-i-r [perf.]/ class=iqʔ-a [inv.]. In the imperfective form, with polysemy: ‘to go / to come’ Perfective stem.

According to the data in [Dzhahalov & Semedov 2006], the suppletive paradigm is as follows: CLASS=iʔ | [imperf.] / y=iq′-i-r [perf.] / CLASS=iʔ-ā | [imv.]. In the imperfective form, with polysemy: ‘to go / to come’.Perfective stem.

**Luchek Rutul**: Kibrik & Kodzazov 1988: 75. Imperfective stem.

Suppletive paradigm: CLASS=iʔ | CLASS=aʔ- uʔ- | [imperf.] / y=iq′-i-r [perf.] / CLASS=iʔ- | [imv.]. In the imperfective form, with polysemy: ‘to go / to come’.Perfective stem.

**Common Rutul**: An irregular verb (with two synonymous stems for the imperfective), but the paradigms generally coincide in all three dialects. Two imperfective stems with polysemy: ‘to go / to come’ are genetically related. See notes on ‘to go’.

Initial y= is a prefix with general semantics [Ibragimov 1978: 95; Makhmudova 2001: 165].


**Fite Aghul**: Suleymanov 1993: 69. Only the infinitive form ad-a-s, containing the perfective stem, has been found.


**Common Aghul**: A very irregular verb, although the suppletive paradigms generally coincide in all dialects. In the imperfective and prohibitive forms, with polysemy: ‘to go / to come’; further see notes on ‘to go’. All dialectal perfective forms (arg-i, ad-i, ar-i) are etymologically related, originating from one proto-root [NCED: 422].


**Southern Tabasaran**: Kibrik & Kodzazov 1988: 75. Suppletive paradigm: ʔ- | [imperf., inf.] / aʔ- | [perf.] / wuʔ | [imv.].


**Common Tabasaran**: An irregular verb with three roots, although the suppletive paradigms coincide in both dialects. The imperfective stem Qقسم- contains the same root as ‘to go’ qǝv.


The authors of [NCED], confused by the ambiguous Cyrillic orthography, transcribe the perfective stem as ata- with a subsequent incorrect connection to the Udi verb ‘to go’ qǝv. [NCED: 423].Perfective stem.

**Proto-Lezgian**: NCED: 572. Semantics and structure: Primary verbal root, attested with several ablaut grades. Reconstructed as the imperfective stem with polysemy ‘to go / to come’. Further see notes on ‘to go’.NCED: 1016. Reconstruction shape: The exact phonetic shape of a root with such a structure is not reconstructible. According to the table of correspondences in [NCED: 150], one could expect *ʔ* > Udi p instead of observed 0, but this can hardly be an obstacle to the whole etymology.

Semantics and structure: Primary verbal root, used as the perfective stem for ‘to come’. Further see notes on ‘to go’.

17. DIE

Nidzh Udi bi-esun {διευςυν} (1) / p:u-r- (2), Vartashen Udi bi-esun {διευςυν} (1) / p:u-r- (2),
Archi =kʰa- (1), Kryts (proper) qʰay- (1), Alyk Kryts qʰay- (1), Budukh s=aqʰa- {сакъа-, саркъаr-} (1), Mishlesh Tsakhir q=ikʰ- {χьикъиאמר} (1), Mikik Tsakhir q=ikʰ- (1), Gelmets Tsakhir q=ikʰ- (1), Mukhad Rutul CLASS=iʔ-ʔ-i-r {иикъибир} (1), Ixrek Rutul CLASS=iʔ-ʔ-i-r
\{йикъин\} (1), Luchek Rutul CLASS=iq'-i-r (1), Koshan Aghul k'-i- (1), Keren Aghul kʰ-a- (1),
Gequn Aghul k'-e- (1), Fite Aghul k'-e- (1), Aghul (proper) k'-e- (1), Northern Tabasaran
yiq'- (1), Southern Tabasaran yiq'- (1), Gyune Lezgi r=áq'iq'- (1) / q'e- (1), Proto-Lezgian
*ʔIE'(1).

References and notes:


Common Udi: As noted in [Maisak 2008a: 108 f.] and [Schulze 2005: 541 f. (3.4.2.1 #23)], the paradigm is suppletive in both dialects: bi- (present-infinite, imperative, future) / psur- (past). Udi bi- is historically analyzed as b=i- with the b-prefix, see notes on 'to burn'. The second root psur- is probably to be analyzed as *psur-ar- with the past stem of the light verb -ar- 'came', thus [Gippert et al. 2008: II-44]. An expression for 'to kill' (q.v.) is based on the same synchronical root bi-.

Caucasian Albanian: A suppletive paradigm: bli'=a- (present, imperative, future) / up' (infinitive) / psur-i- (past) [Gippert et al. 2008: II-44, IV-35]. A labile verb with the polysemy: 'to die / to kill (q.v.)'. The stem bli'=a- probably corresponds directly to modern Udi bi- with a different treatment of Lezgian *X'. The noun up' ~ up'-en 'death' [Gippert et al. 2008: IV-35] is included in the verbal paradigm as the infinitive stem. Nominal up'- and verbal p'iu- are etymologically related; see notes on 'to say'.

Archti: Chumakina et al. 2007; Kibrik & Kodzassov 1988: 170; Kibrik et al. 1977b: 264, 386; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 246; Mikailov 1967: 186; Dirr 1908: 159, 225. Applied to sg. subj. As described in [Kibrik et al. 1977a 2: 74; Kibrik et al. 1977a 3: 243; Chumakina et al. 2007], a synchronically suppletive verb: =k'i-[imf.] / =k'a-[imperf., perf.] / =kim-[imv.]. The choice between two main stems, =k'i-/=k'a-, is irrelevant for the lexicostatistical procedure.

Distinct from the suppletive verb =k'i-[inf., inv.] / =k'a-[imperf. / =k'm-[imv.]. The choice between two main stems, =k'i-/=k'a-, is irrelevant for the lexicostatistical procedure.

Distinct from the suppletive verb =k'i-[inf., inv.] / =k'a-[imperf. / =k'm-[imv.]. The choice between two main stems, =k'i-/=k'a-, is irrelevant for the lexicostatistical procedure.


Alyk Kryts: Author 2009: 416. Polysemy: 'to die / to kill (q.v.)'. Etymologically the same paradigm as in Kryts proper: r=iq'i-[imperf.] / q'yq'-[perf.] / s=aq'[imv.].


Distinct from h=af'- 'to die (pl. subj.)' [Kibrik et al. 1999: 885].

Another (apparently less frequent) verb for 'to die' is k'wemis-x- [Kibrik et al. 1999: 880], which consists of the borrowed Azerbaijani adjective k'emis 'last, past' plus the Tsakhur verb i=- to become'.


Distinct from h=af'- 'to die (pl. subj.)' [Kibrik & Kodzassov 1988: 170; Dirr 1913: 165, 241].

Gelmets Tsakhur: Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 247. The future stem. In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010], quoted as q'i eaz [хъикъаз] - an error for q=i'k'az [хъикъаз].

Common Tsakhur: Initial q- and h- are prefixes with general semantics [Ibragimov 1990: 124; Kibrik & Kodzassov 1988: 41]. The verb q=q'-: 'to die (sg. subj.)' contains the same root as 'to kill (sg. obj.)' q.v., modified with another prefix; the verb h=af'-: 'to die (pl. subj.)' contains the same root as 'to kill (pl. obj.)', modified with another prefix.


Distinct from CLASS=iq'-/CLASS=q'iq'-: 'to kill (pl. obj.) / to die (pl. subj.)' [Dirr 1912: 144, 166].
Ixrek Rutul: Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 131, 407; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 247. In [Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006], only examples of sg. subj. have been found. Labile verb with polysemy: 'to kill / to die', applied to sg. obj./subj.


Distinct from CLASS=irq- / CLASS=q irq- 'to die (pl. subj.)' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 170].

Common Rutul: Proto-Rutul labile verb =iq- 'to die (sg. subj.) / to kill (sg. obj.)' with the reduplicated stem for the plural semantics. See further notes on 'to kill'.


The same in the Khudig subdialect: k'-e 'to die' [Shaumyan 1941: 183].


The same in the Usug subdialect: k'-e- 'to die' [Shaumyan 1941: 183].

Gequn Aghul: Dirr 1907: 130, 186; Shaumyan 1941: 183.

Fite Aghul: Suleymanov 1993: 77, 139.

Aghul (proper): Suleymanov 1993: 77, 139; Suleymanov 2003: 42 (sub buasma); Shaumyan 1941: 183. The same in the Kurag subdialect: k'-i 'to die; to kill' [Magometov 1970: 139].

Common Aghul: Labile verb with polysemy: 'to kill / to die' in all the dialects.

Northern Tabasaran: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 170. Synchronously suppletive paradigm: l=ik- [imperf.] / a=k'- [perf.] / yik' [inv.] / k'- [inf.]. Note the rare imperfective prefix l- and the regular perfective exponent a-. Applied to sg. subj. with polysemy: 'to die (sg. subj.) / to kill (sg. obj.)'. Distinct from Dyubek yic'- 'to die (pl. subj.) / to kill (pl. obj.)' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 170].

The same in the Khanag subdialect: l=ik- [imperf.] / qa=k'- [perf.] / yik' [inv.] / k'- [inf.] 'to die (sg. subj.) / to kill (sg. obj.)', as opposed to yic'- 'to die (pl. subj.) / to kill (pl. obj.)' [Uslar 1979: 754, 800, 1008; Dirr 1905: 180, 190, 245]. The same in the Khyuryuk subdialect: l=ik- [imperf.] / qa=k'- [perf.] / yik' [inv.] / k'- [inf.] 'to die (sg. subj.) / to kill (sg. obj.)', as opposed to yic'- [infix] 'to die (pl. subj.) / to kill (pl. obj.)' [Genko 2005: 80, 112].


The same in the Khiv and Khoredzh subdialects: yic- [infix] 'to die (sg. subj.) / to kill (sg. obj.)', as opposed to yiχ'- [infix] 'to die (pl. subj.) / to kill (pl. obj.) / to beat up (pl. obj.)' [Genko 2005: 80]. The same in Literary Tabasaran: yic'- [imperf.] / qa=k'- [perf.] [infix] 'to die (sg. subj.) / to kill (sg. obj.)', as opposed to yiχ'- [infix] 'to die (pl. subj.) / to kill (pl. obj.)' [Khammagomedov & Shalbayzov 2001: 184].

Common Tabasaran: Labile verbs with polysemy yik'- 'to die (sg. subj.) / to kill (sg. obj.)' and yiχ'- 'to die (pl. subj.) / to kill (pl. obj.)' in all the dialects.

Gyune Lezgi: Uslar 1896: 529, 636, 637. Synchronously suppletive paradigm: r=iaq'- [imperf.] / q'i- [perf.] / qi- [masdar] / yiq' [inv.]. Initial r= is the old imperfective exponent. Labile verb with polysemy: 'to die / to kill'.


Proto-Lezgian:

NCED: 661. Distribution: The Lezgian data on the verbs for 'to die' and 'to kill' can be summarized as follows (the slash sign '/' denotes lability):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TO DIE/TO KILL</th>
<th>Proto-CA-Udi</th>
<th>Archi</th>
<th>Kryts</th>
<th>Budukh</th>
<th>Tsakhur</th>
<th>Rutul</th>
<th>Aghul</th>
<th>Tabasaran</th>
<th>Lezgi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>ʔat'ʷe</em> [NCED: 661]</td>
<td><em>die</em> / <em>kill</em> imperf.</td>
<td><em>die</em> sg.</td>
<td><em>die</em> / <em>kill</em></td>
<td><em>die</em> , 'kill' sg.</td>
<td><em>die</em> / <em>kill</em> sg.</td>
<td><em>die</em> / <em>kill</em></td>
<td><em>die</em> / <em>kill</em> sg.</td>
<td><em>die</em> / <em>kill</em></td>
<td><em>die</em> / <em>kill</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ʔiƛ'é</em></td>
<td><em>ʔiƛ'é</em> / <em>ʔiƛ'é</em> imperf.</td>
<td><em>die</em></td>
<td><em>die</em></td>
<td><em>die</em> , 'kill' pl.</td>
<td><em>die</em> , 'kill' pl.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ʔat'ʷeq' [NCED: 271]</td>
<td><em>die</em></td>
<td><em>die</em></td>
<td><em>die</em> , 'kill' pl.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ʔat'ʷi</em> [NCED: 635]</td>
<td><em>die</em></td>
<td><em>die</em></td>
<td><em>die</em> , 'kill' pl.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ʔat'ʷi</em> [NCED: 271]</td>
<td><em>die</em></td>
<td><em>die</em></td>
<td><em>die</em> , 'kill' pl.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ʔat'ʷi</em> [NCED: 265]</td>
<td><em>die</em></td>
<td><em>die</em></td>
<td><em>die</em> , 'kill' pl.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The root *ʔiƛ’e can safely be reconstructed as the Proto-Lezgian labile verb for 'to die / to kill', at least with singular subject ('to die') / object ('to kill') and at least as the imperfective stem.

The only languages that suppletively discriminate between the imperfective and perfective stems are Caucasian Albanian and Udi. Formally, such a situation could reflect a Proto-Lezgian feature, but CA-Udi *p’u- (with the ablaut variant *up- ) is isolated within Lezgian and possesses rather scant external comparanda (the Khinalug verb *eb-i 'to kill' and the imperative stem *eb-i 'to die'), so it is preferable to regard Caucasian Albanian-Udi *p’u- as a secondary complication of the verbal paradigm in question.

Archi and some Nuclear Lezgian lects demonstrate the lexical opposition between verbs with singular and plural subject/object. Formally, this could be a late innovation of areal origin, but there are actually no reasons not to project such a opposition onto the Proto-Lezgian level. If so, the correspondence sg. *ʔiƛ’e / pl. *ʔilχʷe between Archi and Tabasaran should be reflecting the Proto-Lezgian situation. In many other lects *ʔiƛ’e acquired both singular and plural functions. Thus, in modern Udi 'to kill' is the synchronic causative from 'to die'. In Archi, 'to kill' is euphemistically expressed by the verb 'to perform an action most typically associated with the given object in the current situation' (*ʔarčːa-), although the synchronic causatives from 'to die (sg.)' and 'to die (pl.)' are also used for 'to kill'. In Tsakhur, 'to die' and 'to kill' are distinguished by means of different fossilized prefixes.

18. DOG

Nidzh Udi χˤa {xarə} (1), Vartashen Udi χˤa {xarə} (1), Archi gʷäči (-1), Kryts (proper) χʷar ~ χor (1), Alyk Kryts χʷar (1), Budukh χor {xopə} (1), Mishlesh Tsakhur χʷa: {xâaə} (1), Mikik Tsakhur χʷa: (1), Gelmets Tsakhur χʷayā (1), Mukhad Rutul tila {tylə} (1), Ixrek Rutul tila ~ tila {tyləb ~ tylə} (1), Luchek Rutul tila (1), Koshan Aghul χˤuy (1), Keren Aghul tula (1), Gequn Aghul χuy (1), Fite Aghul χuy (1), Aghul (proper) χuy (1), Northern Tabasaran χuy (1), Southern Tabasaran χu (1), Gyune Lezgi kic’ (2), Proto-Lezgian *χːʷäya (1).

References and notes:


Common Udi: Common Udi *χːə.

Caucasian Albanian: Unattested.


Alyk Kryts: Authier 2009: 34, 260, 268, 309, etc.


Distinct from the more specific term t’art’a {t’arpəla} ‘short-haired dog’ [Meylanova 1984: 137].

quotation as $\chi$"r [xaa].

Tsakhur-Kum Tsakhur: $\chi$"c [Kibrik & Kodzhas 1990: 73].

Mikik Tsakhur: Kibrik & Kodzhas 1990: 73; Dirr 1913: 211, 238.

Gelmets Tsakhur: Kibrik & Kodzhas 1990: 73. In [Comrie & Khaliilov 2010: 147], the variant $\chi$"nge [xaa] is quoted.


In [Comrie & Khaliilov 2010: 147], a second word for 'dog' is also quoted: $qat'ay [xaara]. This is actually the adjective $q'at'-$ [xaara] 'tailless, short-tailed (said of animals)' [Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 162] (from $q'at$ 'cut-off fragment').

Luchek Rutul: Kibrik & Kodzhas 1990: 73.

Common Rutul: Borrowed from Azerbaijani tula 'gundog' or directly from the Iranian forms (e.g., Persian tola 'gundog', Judeo-Tat tula 'gundog'), although the vowel adaptation is unclear.


Keren Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzhas 1990: 73. The same loanword in the Usug subdialect: tula 'dog' [Shaumyan 1941: 191]. Borrowed from Azerbaijani tula 'gundog' or ultimately from the corresponding Iranian forms (e.g., Persian tola 'gundog', Judeo-Tat tula 'gundog').

Gequn Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzhas 1990: 73; Dirr 1907: 150, 184; Shaumyan 1941: 191. Synchronically, with a suppletive paradigm: $\chi$uy [abs.] / $\chi$'ar-[erg.] / $\chi$ur-$ur$ [pl.].


The same in other subdialects: Kurag, Duldug $\chi$uy 'dog' [Magometov 1970: 41; Shaumyan 1941: 191]; Tsirkhe $\chi$uy 'dog' [Magometov 1970: 215 sentence 14; Shaumyan 1941: 191].

Common Aghul: Note the retention of tense $\chi$ in Magometov's forms from Koshan (Burshag) and Proper Aghul (Tsirkhe).

Northern Tabasaran: Kibrik & Kodzhas 1990: 73.

The same in the Khanag subdialect: $\chi$uy 'dog' [Uslar 1979: 958, 1006; Dirr 1905: 216, 242]. The same in other subdialects: Khyuryuk $\chi$uy $\chi$uy (xuy), Kum $\chi$uy $\chi$uy 'dog' [Genko 2005: 166, 168].

Southern Tabasaran: Kibrik & Kodzhas 1990: 73. Paradigm: $\chi$uy [abs.] / $\chi$y-$y$-[erg.].


Common Tabasaran: Note the retention of tense fricative $\chi$ in the Northern subdialects. The Kondik oblique stem $\chi$uy- (not $^{**}\chi$uy- ) also points to an old tense consonant, although such paradigms are expected to get levelled after the monosyllabic absolutive form.


The same in the Akhty dialect: Khyut $kic$ 'dog' [Kibrik & Kodzhas 1990: 73].

Proto-Lezgi: NCED: 1073. Distribution: A rather stable root, retained in Udi and Proto-Nuclear Lezgian. In Lezgi, superseded with *$kic$ / $tik$, whose original meaning was 'puppy', as proved by its Lezgian and external North Caucasian cognates [NCED: 692].

Superseded with loanwords in Archi (< Lak), Rutul and Keren Aghul (< Azerbaijani or Iranian).

Replacements: ['puppy' > 'dog'] (Lezgi).

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular.

Semantics and structure: Primary substantive root. The oblique stem seems to have been $\chi$"y-$r$-$V$.

19. DRINK

Nidzh Udi nʁ$^\prime$-sun (yugcyur) (1), Vartashen Udi nʁ$^\prime$-sun ~ nʁ$^\prime$-esun (yugcyur) (1), Archi c$^\prime$a-bu- (2), Kryts (proper) q$^\prime$ir- (1), Alyk Kryts q$^\prime$ir- (1), Budukh $s$=e$vir$- {seg$\#$ir-, seg$\#$yur}
(1) Mishlesh Tsakhur ilʰ=ov- (илёбъий, илёбъий) (1), Mikik Tsakhur ilʰ=ov- (1), Gelmets Tsakhur ilʰ=ov- (1), Mukhad Rutul CLASS=ra⁴- (разъин, разъин) (1), Ixrek Rutul CLASS=ra⁵- (разъин, разъин) (1), Luchek Rutul CLASS=ra⁵- (1), Koshan Aghul uχ-a- (3), Keren Aghul uχ-a- (3), Gequn Aghul uχ-a- (3), Fite Aghul uχ-a- (3), Aghul (proper) uχ-a- (3), Northern Tabasaran uc-’ (1), Southern Tabasaran uc-’ (3), Gyune Lezgi qʰa- (4), Proto-Lezgian *HVq:VR- (1).

References and notes:


In [Mobili 2010: 151-152] χuʷ, χuⁿ-sun are also translated into Russian as ‘to drink’, ‘to drink water’, but their Azerbaijani glosses rather mean something like ‘to suck up (water) slurping’.


Common Udi: Common Udi *uχ-esun.


Kryts (proper): Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 157; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 276. Synchronically, the paradigm is suppletive: qʰiː ~ qʰiːr- [imperf.] / qʰiːr- [perf.] / sʰa dár- [imv.]. Initial sʰ = is a prefix with general semantics, initial qʰ = is the prefix ‘down’ [Saadiev 1994: 424]. The imperfective stem is analyzed as reduplicated in [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 45], which is unnecessary if we assume the prefix qʰ =.


It must be noted that in [Kibrik et al. 1999: 878, 897] this root is quoted with a labialized uvular as ilʰ=ov-ʷ, cf. imperf. class 4 ilʰ-ov-ʷ-a, fut. class 4 ilʰ-ov-ʷ-as (also perf. class 4 ilʰ-ov-ʷ-a). This labialization contradicts data from other sources and looks strange from the synchronic viewpoint: according to Tsakhur morphophonology, Cʰ normally dissimilates into C after labial o, u, b, w, cf. e.g., Mishlesh imperf. 2 hōčʷan ← [h-o-y-y-Cʷan], but 3 hōčan < *hōcʷan ← [h-o-w-y-Cʷan], 1/4 hōyellowan < *holýellowan ← [h-o-y-Cʷan] ‘to press’ [Kibrik et al. 1999: 72, also 70], see the same statement for Mikik in [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 41 fn. 116]. It might be suggested that Kibrik et al.’s transcription ilʰ=ov-ʷ reflects some sporadic and irregular progressive assimilation, e.g., -ov-ʷ > -ovʷa-?


Common Tsakhur: Initial ilʰ ~ ilʰʷ is a prefix with general semantics [Ibragimov 1990: 123; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 41].

Mukhad Rutul: Dirr 1912: 166, 197; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 276.

Paradigm: CLASS=ra⁴-a-r- [imperf.] / CLASS=ra⁴-i-r- [perf.]. In [Ibragimov 1978: 121], an additional pharyngealized variant CLASS=ra⁴- is quoted: an error or an archaism.


Common Rutul: Note the archaic pharyngealized form CLASS=ra⁵- ‘to drink’ in other dialects: Shinaz [Ibragimov 1978: 158], Borch-Khnoev [Ibragimov 1978: 234].


The same basic verb in the Khanag subdialect: wuqː-wuqː ‘to drink’ [Uslar 1979: 627, 1001]. It should be noted that in [Dirr 1905: 212, 237], this verb is transcribed as wuː- or wuː-[Vr] ‘to drink’ - the form either actually represents some specific Southern Tabasaran subdialect or the beginning of the phonetic process qː > w in Khanag during the 2nd half of the 19th century between Uslar’s and Dirr’s records.

The same in the Khyuryuk subdialect: wuqː ‘to drink’ [Genko 2005: 33].


The same in the Khiv subdialect: uχ chromatic] [imperf., perf., infinit., impersonal] ‘to drink’ [Genko 2005: 157].

In some subdialects another root is attested: Chara uqː [masdar] uqː ‘to drink’ [Genko 2005: 157, 198].

The same in Literary Tabasaran: uqː ‘to drink’ [Khanmagomedov & Stalbuzov 2001: 291].

Common Tabasaran: Three phonetically similar, but nevertheless distinguishable roots for ‘to drink’ are attested in the Tabasaran dialect cluster: uχ, u ʰ/wuqː, uqː.

The latter one, uqː ‘to drink’, is clearly an innovation in some Southern subdialects (Chara, Sirtych, also Literary Tabasaran); the external Lezgian etymology points out that its original meaning was ‘to suck’ [NCED: 222], and this semantics is still retained in such prefixed Tabasaran verbs as Khyuryuk, Khiv kʷ-huqː [kχuχuχuχu, kχuχuχuχ] ‘to suck’ [Genko 2005: 96, 97]. It should be noted, however, that this proto-root also acquired the generic meaning ‘to drink’ in the Lezgi language.

The choice between u ʰ/wuqː ‘Northern ‘to drink’, lost in Southern] and uχ ‘Northern ‘to sip’, Southern ‘to drink’) is not so easy. The former verb originates from the best candidate for the status of the Proto-Lezgian root for ‘to drink’ (*HVqːVr-), but the latter one, uχ, corresponds to the basic Aghul verb uχ-a ‘to drink’. In all likelihood, the Northern verb u ʰ/wuqː represents an archaisms, whereas local Southern uχ - is a recent innovation (perhaps of areal origin, cf. the Aghul term).


Proto-Lezgian: NCED: 616. Distribution: *HVqːVr- can safely be postulated as the Proto-Lezgian root for ‘to drink’. It is retained in its original meaning in Caucasian Albanian and Udi, on the one hand, and in Nuclear Lezgian, on the other: West Lezgian (Tsakhur, Rutul), South Lezgian (Kryts, Budukh), Proto-Tabasar (Northern dialect). In Archi, this root has survived in the substantive ‘a gulp’.

Three other roots, attested with the generic meaning ‘to drink’ in Lezgian lects, are clear innovations from the distributive point of view.

In Archi, ‘to drink’ is expressed with *7VcV (~ -c’-). This root seems isolated within Lezgian, but external North Caucasian comparison seems to point to the original meaning ‘to gulp (vel sim.)’ [NCED: 1017].

The root *7χ’a has acquired the basic meaning ‘to drink’ in Aghul and some Southern Tabasaran subdialects (an areal isogloss); its original Proto-Lezgian meaning is likely to have been ‘to gulp’ (further to North Caucasian ‘to suck’) [NCED: 1027]. Similarly, *7qːa- has become the basic root for ‘to drink’ in Lezgi and some Southern Tabasaran subdialects (an areal isogloss); its original Proto-Lezgian meaning was ‘to suck’ [NCED: 222].

Replacements: {‘to gulp’ > ‘to drink’} (Archi, Aghul, Southern Tabasaran), {‘to suck’ > ‘to drink’} (Lezgi, Southern Tabasaran), {‘to drink’ > ‘a gulp’} (Archi).

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular, except for vocalic fluctuations.

Semantics and structure: Primary verbal root.

20. DRY
Nidzh Udi qari {kərap} (1), Vartashen Udi qari {kərap} (1), Archi q'ur'e-tu-CLASS (1), Kryts (proper) sāf-y (2), Alyk Kryts saə (2), Budukh saə {cəə} (2), Mishlesh Tsakhur quru-n {kərənp} (1), Mikik Tsakhur quru-n (1), Gelmets Tsakhur quru-n y (1), Mukhad Rutul quru-d {kərənd} (1), Ixrek Rutul qurə-dii {kərəndii} (1), Luchek Rutul quru-d (1), Koshan Aghul urqa-r (1), Keren Aghul ruqə-f (1), Gequn Aghul ruqə-f (1), Fite Aghul ruqə-t (1), Aghul (proper) ruqə-f (1), Northern Tabasaran yiz'i (3), Southern Tabasaran ke=y'ecu (3), Gyune Lezgi q'ur-a-y (1), Proto-Lezgian *ʔiq':'ar- (1).

References and notes:


Vartashen Udi: Gukasyan 1974: 154; Fähnrich 1999: 28; Dirr 1903: 2, 100; Schiehner 1863: 80; Schulze 2001: 312; Starchevskiy 1891: 495.

Common Udi: Common Udi *qari.

Caucasian Albanian: Attributive term is unattested. The old Lezgian root is known from the compound verb q'ari-biy-esun 'to (let) wither' [Gippert et al. 2008: IV-31] with the verb biy-esun 'to do, make' [Gippert et al. 2008: IV-8].

Archi: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 242; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 684; Dirr 1908: 178, 223. Regular participle from the verb 'to become dry, to dry out'. As described in [Kibrik et al. 1977a 2: 73; Kibrik et al. 1977a 3: 242; Kibrik et al. 1977b: 305; Chumakina et al. 2007], this verb has two etymologically related stems: =q'urə- [inf., perf.] / q'arə- [imperf.]. Prefixes forms of Class IV, as well as the partially reduplicated imperative =q'urə·q'a, prove that the initial uvular of the root is phonologically tense (ʔ-).


In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010], the paronymous adjective sāfī is also quoted as a synonym. It must be noted that the correspondence Kryts (proper) ʔ / Alyk Kryts ʔ looks suspicious; this could be a borrowing from an unknown source.


Distinct from qurah {kərəpəri} 'dry (unknown application); dry (of weather) [Meylanova 1984: 91].


Tsakhur-Kum Tsakhur: aru-n [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 242].

Mikik Tsakhur: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 242; Dirr 1913: 198, 239.

Gelmets Tsakhur: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 242. In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 684], quoted as quri-n (an error?).

Common Tsakhur: Inherited forms, whose vocalism was influenced on the part of the Azerbaijani word guru 'dry'.


A second candidate is s=qu-d or s=q'u-d 'dry', quoted in [Dirr 1912: 172, 201] with the example "dry firewood" (note that Dirr's notation rather speaks in favour of s=q'u-d with ejective -q-). This is the participle from the verb 'to get dry', which is quoted in [Makhmudova 2001: 245] as s=ʔə [cəxəxəc] with -ə (sicl). Its counterpart in the Borch-Khnov dialect sounds as s=q'u- [cəxəxəxə] 'to get dry' [Ibragimov 1978: 268, 272], with -q- in the root. The exact phonetics, as well as the etymology of this Rutul verb is unclear.


Common Rutul: Inherited forms, whose vocalism was influenced by the Azerbaijani word guru 'dry'. Final -di / -d is the attributive suffix.

Koshan Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 242. In [Suleymanov 2003: 144], the morphological variant urq'-i'or 'dry' is quoted.

For the Khudig subdialect, the unclear form arka-d 'dry' is quoted in [Shaumyan 1941: 160]; apparently a corrupt
spelling.


Gequn Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 242; Dirr 1907: 140.


Distinct from Tpig qurahu (къар'ану) 'drought; arid' [Suleymanov 2003: 118], borrowed from Azerbaijani guru 'drought; arid'.

Common Aghul: Final -d, -t, -f, -r are adjectival suffixes (fossilized class exponents) [Magometov 1970: 92; Shaumyan 1941: 45].


Northern Tabasaran: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 242. Actually y'i-a-san with the fossilized class exponent -w-.


Differently in other subdialects: Khanag qurir 'dry' [Dirr 1905: 189, 244] (not found in [Uslar 1979]), Khyuryuk qurir [къурри] 'dry' [Genko 2005: 102].

Southern Tabasaran: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 242. Actually w-yi-class-cu; initial w- is the verbal perfective exponent.

The same in Literary Tabasaran: w-yi-r-cu [гъерццу] ~ w-yi-r-cu [гъерццу] 'dry', found in such examples as "withered flowers" [Khanmagomedov & Shalbuzov 2001: 155a], "dry leaves rustled in the breeze" [Khanmagomedov & Shalbuzov 2001: 439a] (with the fossilized class infix -r-). Distinct from Literary Tabasaran qur'al [къаръал] 'dry (of climate)' [Khanmagomedov & Shalbuzov 2001: 207], borrowed from Azerbaijani guru 'drought; arid'.

Three words for 'dry' are quoted for the Khiv subdialect, with no known difference: qur' [къур] 'dry' [Genko 2005: 102], uur' [угър] 'dry' [Genko 2005: 45] and w-yi-r-cu [гъерццу] 'dry' [Genko 2005: 42] (with the fossilized class infix -r-). The Khiv opposition qur' / uur' is very suspicious (Genko's error?); it should be noted that the etymologically correct variant is qur'.

Common Tabasaran: The adjective qurir, retained in some subdialects (both Northern and Southern), represents an archaism and must be posited as the Proto-Tabasaran term for 'dry'. The etymologically primary verb 'to get dry' is attested as Southern Tabasaran qurː-: Khiv w-r-qː- [укулкы] 'to get dry (of soil, hide, spring)' [Genko 2005: 155] (with the fossilized class infix -r-), Literary Tabasaran w-qː- [укулкы] 'to get dry (of bread, clay)' [Khanmagomedov & Shalbuzov 2001: 291].

In many subdialects (including Dyubek and Kondik), however, 'dry (adj.)' is expressed as a synchronic perfective participle from the verb 'to dry (trans., intrans.)' modified with the class infixes and normally with the perfective prefix qʷ = w- (for which see [Magometov 1965: 222]). Cf. Northern: Khanag eu- [гъуру] 'to dry (trans., intrans.)' [Dirr 1905: 168] (not found in [Uslar 1979]), Khyuryuk icː- [ициму] 'to dry (intrans.)' [Genko 2005: 73]; Southern: Khiv ecː- [егъьэ] 'to dry (trans., intrans.)' [Genko 2005: 196], Literary Tabasaran yecː- [ицин] 'to dry (trans., intrans.)' [Khanmagomedov & Shalbuzov 2001: 155].

Gyune Lezgi: Uslar 1896: 532, 634. Participle from the verb qur'-aː- 'to dry (intrans.)' [Uslar 1896: 532].

The same in Literary Lezgi: qur'ə-y [къапат] 'dry' [Talibov & Gadzhiev 1966: 208; Gadzhiev 1950: 831; Haspelmath 1993: 504, 518], participle from the verb qur'ə- [къапу] 'to dry (intrans.)' [Talibov & Gadzhiev 1966: 208]. A second literary term for 'dry' is the synonymous qur'ə [къапу] [Talibov & Gadzhiev 1966: 208; Gadzhiev 1950: 831; Haspelmath 1993: 504] - an inherited form, whose vocalism may have been influenced by the Azerbaijani word guru 'dry'. The difference between qur'ə-y and qur'ə is unclear. Distinct from literary qur'ah [къар'а] 'dry (of climate)' [Talibov & Gadzhiev 1966: 208; Haspelmath 1993: 504], ultimately borrowed from Azerbaijani guru 'drought; arid', but influenced by the inherited qur'a.

For morphology cf. also the literary substantive qur [къар] 'dryness' [Talibov & Gadzhiev 1966: 208].

Morphologically different in the Akhyt dialect: Khyuty qur-qər 'dry' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 242]; this is a reduplicated formation from the same Lezgi root.

Proto-Lezgian: NCED: 631. Distribution: The primary verbal root ḳihː-qər- 'to get dry' is attested in Archi, on the one hand, and in East Lezgian (Aghul, Tabasaran, Lezgi), on the other. Its adjective derivatives of a participial nature with the meaning
'dry' have survived in all attested Lezgian lects, except for South Lezgian (Kryts, Budukh) and some Tabasaran subdialects. In a number of Lezgian languages, inherited adjectival forms were phonetically influenced by the Azerbaijani word *guru* 'dry', but there are no reasons to consider these to be loanwords, since *ʔiqːʷar* is deeply rooted in Lezgian and possesses reliable North Caucasian comparanda [NCED: 631]. In South Lezgian (Kryts, Budukh), 'dry' is a participle from the etymologically obscure verbal root *saʔV-* or *aʔV-*, unattested elsewhere [LEDb: #251]. In many Tabasaran subdialects, the original participle has been superseded with the participle from another verb for 'to dry (intrans.)': ecː-, see notes on Common Tabasaran. Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular up to Azerbaijani influenced forms. Semantics and structure: Primary verbal root 'to be dry, get dry'.
Common Tsakhur: Etymologically isolated word. May be a borrowing, but the source is unidentified.


Common Rutul: Historically ub-ur, with a fossilized plural suffix.

Koshan Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 12; Suleymanov 2003: 86; Shaumyan 1941: 142.

Keren Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 12; Dirr 1907: 120, 187; Shaumyan 1941: 142.

Luchek Rutul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 12; Shaumyan 1941: 142.


Common Rutul: Historically ub-ur, with a fossilized plural suffix.

Koshan Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 12; Dirr 1907: 120, 187; Shaumyan 1941: 142.

Fite Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 12; Shaumyan 1941: 142.


Northern Tabasaran: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 12.

The same in the Khanag subdialect: ew 'ear' [Uslar 1979: 677, 1009; Dirr 1905: 166, 245]. The same in the Kumi subdialect: iw {ив} 'ear' [Genko 2005: 73].

Southern Tabasaran: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 12.

The same in other subdialects: Khiv eb {эб}, Chara ib {иб} 'ear' [Genko 2005: 73, 193]. The same in Literary Tabasaran: ib {иб} 'ear' [Khanmagomedov & Shalbuzov 2001: 172].

Proto-Lezgian: NCED: 239. Distribution: *ʔˤamːis retained as the basic root for 'ear' in all Lezgian lects, except for Tsakhur, where the etymologically obscure word k'ɨrɨ [LEDb: #202] is observed.

In many languages, synchronic forms are modified with fossilized plural suffixes.

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular.

Semantics and structure: Primary substantive root.

22. EARTH


References and notes:

Nidzh Udi: Ganenkov et al. 2008: 240 (8), 254 (34, 41); Gukasyan 1974: 185; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 29; Mobili 2010: 223. It should be noted that in [Gukasyan 1974; Comrie & Khalilov 2010; Mobili 2010] this word is quoted as očˤal {очъал} - apparently Gukasyan’s error was repeated (as in some other cases) by posterior authors. According to T. Maisak’s and Dm. Ganenkov’s field records, non-tense očˤal is phonologically clearly opposed to the word očˤi (чъал) ’dirt, mud’ [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 201]; similarly, the variant očˤal {очъал} is also normally used in the modern literary orthography (cf., e.g., G. Keçari’s volume Наха өөл = “Native land”).

Distinct from kʊl {кɪл} ’earth’ [Gukasyan 1974: 146; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 199; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 29; Mobili
All sources quote kəł and očːˤal as synonyms for ‘earth, soil’, except for [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990]. The latter dictionary gives only kəł as the translation for ‘earth, soil’ (with polysemy: ‘earth, soil / territory, plot’). On the contrary, text evidence from [Ganenkov et al. 2008: 240 (8), 254 (34, 41)] confirms očːˤal as the most generic and common word for ‘earth, soil’, as well as ‘land’: “There is a place named so-and-so ... which existed on the Nidzh land (očːˤal) as early as 2400-2500 years ago”. “The soil (očːˤal) cleans it (just prepared vodka) of its odours ... We take it (a buried jug with vodka) out from the ground (očːˤal)”. According to Dm. Ganenkov’s p.c., in Nidzh kəł indeed means ‘soil’, but this word is very rare in the collected corpus. The default expression for all the meanings is currently očːˤal.

Vartashen Udi: Gukasyan 1974: 146; Fähnrich 1999: 21; Dirr 1903: 28; Schiefler 1863: 83; Schulze 2001: 293; Starchevskiy 1891: 499. Cf. some examples for the meaning ‘soil’, like “they threw/scattered the earth”, “order to deliver some soil from his fatherland!”, “the elder sisters covered their urine with earth in order not to let it foam” [Dirr 1903: 28, 46, 89], “a handful of earth” [Schiefler 1863: 54]. In [Bezhanov & Bezhanov 1902] kəł normally means ‘land’ or ‘soil’, e.g., Mt. 13.5 “Others fell on rocky ground, where they didn’t have much soil (kəł), and immediately they sprang up, because they had no depth of earth (očːˤal)”. Distinct from the term očːˤal (očːˤal) ‘earth’ [Gukasyan 1974: 185; Fähnrich 1999: 25; Dirr 1903: 19, 26; Schiefler 1863: 78; Schulze 2001: 303; Starchevskiy 1891: 499]. In [Gukasyan 1974: 185] this is quoted as očːˤal [očːˤal] (apparently an error, see notes on Nidzh Udi); in [Fähnrich 1999: 25] the word is quoted as simply očːˤal - apparently for očːˤal; also quoted as očːˤal in [Schulze 2001], despite the fact that Bežanovs’ [t] may cover ć, ě and Ć; graphical [ć] in [Schiefler 1863], [t] in [Dirr 1903] and [t] in [Starchevskiy 1891] can hardly clarify the phonetical nature of the sibilant. It should be noted that normally this term is graphically opposed to očːˤi ‘dirt, mud’ (e.g., [Fähnrich 1999: 25; Dirr 1903: 18; Schiefler 1863: 78]).

Vartashen očːˤal means ‘earth, ground’, not ‘soil’, cf. some contexts: “to the ground”, “he saw, as a mouse got out of the ground”, “the earth quakes” (= ‘earthquake’) [Dirr 1903: 19, 64], “the silver ingot melted and split on the ground” [Schiefler 1863: 68]. In [Bezhanov & Bezhanov 1902] [očːˤal] normally means ‘earth’ as opposed to ‘heaven’ (‘I thank you, Father, Lord of heaven and earth’, etc.) or ‘ground’ (cf. above Mt. 13.5, where two terms are opposed).

Common Udi: Common Udi *kəł ‘earth, soil’ (as opposed to *očːˤal ‘earth, ground, land’). In Modern Nidzh kəł is currently being superseded by očːˤal ‘earth, ground, land’ under the influence of the polysemy in Azerbaijani and Russian. Udi kəł, however, lacks any etymology; in [Schulze 2001: 293] kəł is treated as a borrowing from Azerbaijani kiił ‘ashes’, but it is not very likely due to semantic difference.

It is proposed in [Schulze 2001: 303] that očːˤal ‘earth, ground, land’ can be derived from očːˤi ‘dirt, mud’, which seems unsuccessful both phonetically (ć vs. Ć) and semantically (derivation ‘mudd’ > ‘soil’ is typologically normal, whereas ‘mudd’ > ‘land, ground’ is odd). The relationship between Udi očːˤal ‘ground, land’ and Caucasian Albanian ašˤal ‘world, land, ground’ is uncertain, see below. The external Lezgian etymology of Udi očːˤal is also not entirely clear (cf. Lezgian *čːil ‘earth, floor’).

Caucasian Albanian: The only candidate is ašˤal ‘earth’ (as opposed to heaven); world; land, country; ground (“he was thrown down on the ground”) [Gippert et al. 2008: IV-7], although ašˤal is unattested in the specific meaning ‘soil’. As proposed in [Gippert et al. 2008: II-10, IV-7], ašˤal can be cognate with Udi očːˤal ‘earth, land, ground’ (the Udi word is erroneously quoted as očːˤal in [Gippert et al. 2008: II-10]). Despite the semantic exactness of the comparison, this remains phonetically problematic: see [Gippert et al. 2008: II-76] for a couple of instances of the correspondence CA a ~ Udi o, but the correspondence CA ĺ ~ Udi Ć seems unique and irregular.


Archí: Chumakina et al. 2007; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 199; Kibrik et al. 1977b: 302] (from *q’a-’ down’ [NCED: 616] with the adjective suffix -tu) and dunil with polysemy ‘sky / world / life’ [Chumakina et al. 2007; Kibrik et al. 1977b: 224] (the latter was borrowed from Avar dunil ‘world / life / weather’, ultimately from Arabic dunya ‘earth, world’).

Alyk Kryts: Authier 2009: 34, 56, 212, 230, etc. This word means 'earth, soil', distinct from qum 'ground; earth (as opposed to heaven)' [Authier 2009: 38, 181, 206, etc.].


A second term for 'earth, soil' is qum [kəym] [Meylanova 1984: 96]. Semantic or pragmatic details are unknown.

Mishlesh Tsakhur: Kibrik et al. 1999: 871, 894; Ibragimov & Nurmamedov 2010: 403. Polysemy: 'earth, soil / ground'. Cf. examples: "The boy digs the earth" [Kibrik et al. 1999: 574], "This girl used to sit down on the ground and stain her clothes" [Kibrik et al. 1999: 781].

A second candidate is the more marginal term torpa [Kibrik et al. 1999: 888, 894; Ibragimov & Nurmamedov 2010: 342], which means both 'earth, plot' (cf. Ibragimov & Nurmamedov's example 'ground landlord') and 'earth, soil' (cf. torpašənas 'soil scientist, pedologist'). Borrowed from Azerbaijani torpa 'earth (soil, plot, land, ground)'.

Distinct from Richa rug.


Common Tsakhur: The Proto-Tsakhur term was no doubt nỳaqʷ, already with polysemy: 'earth, soil / grave, tomb'; in Early Proto-Tsakhur the meaning was simply 'earth, soil'; in modern Mishlesh this has been narrowed down to 'grave', having been superseded by Proto-Tsakhur čiye 'earth, ground' > 'earth, ground; earth, soil' (under the influence of generic terms for 'earth' in Azerbaijani, Russian and Avar?). This scenario follows from the fact that the shift 'soil' > 'grave' is logical and typologically normal, whereas vice versa can hardly be imagined. The noun čiye denoted 'earth floor' in Proto-Tsakhur.


In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 29], a second term for 'earth' is quoted: čir [čir], which actually means 'grass-covered place' [Dirr 1912: 181] (cf. its Ixrek Rutul counterpart čir 'pasture, common' [Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 297]).

Distinct from čiy 'earth floor' [Ibragimov 1978: 117].

Ixrek Rutul: Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 200, 342; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 29. Specified as 'earth, soil' in [Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006]. In [Ibragimov 1978: 195], quoted as nỳaqʷ [nỳaqʷ] 'earth; clay'.


Distinct from the more specific Burshag term neqʷ with polysemy: 'black soil / grave, tomb' in [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 190, 199] (the two meanings are formally discriminated in the ergative form).


Distinct from Richa rug 'dust' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 200].
Distinct from ʒil 'earth, ground; floor' [Dirr 1907: 115].


A second candidate is Tpig ʒil, but the gloss 'earth, soil' in [Suleymanov 2003: 81] seems an inaccuracy; one would expect the meaning 'ground'.
Distinct from Tpig qarmanat 'land (opposed to water)' [Suleymanov 2003: 123].

Common Aghul: The Proto-Aghul term for 'earth, soil' was neqʷ, probably already with polysemy: 'earth, soil / grave, tomb'. Currently neqʷ in its first meaning tends to be superseded by the word rug, which is originally the Common Aghul term for 'dust' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 200] (an areal process influenced on the part of Tabasaran rug 'soil' q.v.).

Northern Tabasaran: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 199. 'Dust' is expressed as biši rugu, literally 'soft soil' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 200].
Distinct from Dyubek ʒil'Is' place' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 218].

The same in the Khanag subdialect: rug 'earth, soil' [Uslar 1979: 898, 994; Dirr 1905: 203, 229] (specified as 'soil' by both authors). Distinct from Khanag ʒil'Is' place; land, region' [Uslar 1979: 755; Dirr 1905: 180].


Southern Tabasaran: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 199. 'Dust' is expressed as bušu rug, literally 'soft soil' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 200].
Distinct from Kendik ʒil'Is' place' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 218].

The same in the Khiv subdialect: rug ~ rugʷ [pyr(ə)] 'earth, soil' [Genko 2005: 133] (specified by Genko as 'soil'; the variant with qʷ is etymologically unclear). Distinct from Khiv ʒil {жил} 'ground; floor; field' [Genko 2005: 68] and from Khiv ʒil'Is' [ʔ̌imʔim] 'place; land, region' [Genko 2005: 81].


Common Tabasaran: The word rug can safely be reconstructed as the Proto-Tabasaran term for 'soil', opposed to ʒil 'ground' and ʒil'Is' 'place'. In Literary Tabasaran, ʒil has undergone secondary broadening into the meaning 'soil' under the influence of similar polysemy in Azerbaijani and Russian.

Gyune Lezgi: Uslar 1896: 541, 613. Paradigm: rug [abs.] / ʁukʷ-ạdi-. [obl.]. Polysemy: 'earth, soil / dust'. Examples: "I threw some soil on the grain", "The earth of this village is good (= fertile)" [Uslar 1896: 541], "The mouse throws soil down from the ceiling" [Uslar 1896: 526], "Human eyes are filled with contentment or with earth (a person must be satisfied or dead)" [Uslar 1896: 349], "You have put a lot of earth over this roof" [Uslar 1896: 353].

Distinct from Gyune չիլ [Uslar 1896: 594, 613], which means 'earth, ground, earth floor' rather than specific 'soil', according to Uslar's examples: "The earth trembled (= earthquake)", "The earth is covered with grass", "He has the earth as his mattress, the sky for cover" [Uslar 1896: 594], "I have smoothed the earth" [Uslar 1896: 411], but also "The earth of this village is fertile" [Uslar 1896: 594].

The expected Gyune word **ная" is not documented by Uslar.


The external comparison strongly suggests that ная" was the Proto-Lezgi term for 'earth, soil'. The word rug originally meant 'dust', but has acquired the additional meaning 'soil' - an areal isogloss shared with Aghul and Tabasaran (q.v.). Lezgi չիլ denoted 'ground', but currently tends to broaden into the meaning 'soil' under the influence of similar polysemy.
in Azerbaijani and Russian.

Proto-Lezgian: NCED: 848. Distribution: This stem is retained with the specific meaning 'earth, soil' in Archi, on the one hand, and in almost all Nuclear Lezgian languages (except for Tabasaran, and some dialects of Tsakhur, Aghul and Lezgi), on the other.

In the Udi branch, however, "näq" has been lost, and 'earth, soil' is now expressed with the etymologically obscure form kul. Furthermore, in Nidzh Udi, the word ocęl, whose Proto-Udi meaning was 'earth, ground', has acquired the second meaning 'earth, soil'.

In Mishlesh Tsakhur, "näq" was superseded with *çarä (~ -o-) [NCED: 555], accompanied with the shift 'clearing, uncultivated land' ~ 'earth, ground'.

In East Lezgian, "näq" tends to be superseded with *ruk; whose original meaning was 'dust' [NCED: 603]. This is not a Proto-East Lezgian replacement, but a late areal isogloss (probably Tabasaran-induced): *ruk: became the default root for 'earth, soil' in Tabasaran, many Aghul dialects (Koshan, Gequn, Fite, proper Aghul) and some Lezgi dialects (Gyune).

Reconstruction of the Proto-Lezgian term for 'earth, ground' is less obvious.

The root *čiIl [NCED: 342] can be reconstructed with the Proto-Nuclear Lezgian meaning 'earth floor' (thus Tsakhur, Rutul, Aghul, Tabasaran, Lezgi). In East Lezgian (Aghul, Tabasaran, Lezgi), however, this word also denotes 'earth, ground', as opposed to various terms for 'soil'. External North Caucasian comparison suggests that *čiIl could theoretically be reconstructed as the Proto-Lezgian root for 'earth, ground'.

On the other hand, in Proto-Caucasian Albanian-Udi, the word for 'earth, ground' originates from Lezgian *yo(m)čV (~ -ʔ-) [NCED: 684]: Proto-Udi ocč-Il 'earth, ground', Caucasian Albanian aš-ƛ Il earth, ground' (the correspondence Udi ĩ ~ CA ƛ is unique, but may represent different treatments of the Proto-Lezgian consonant cluster). In the rest of Lezgian, the root got lost. Lezgian *yo(m)čV (~ -ʔ-) possesses good external comparanda with the semantics of 'earth' [NCED: 684]. Thus, the easiest solution is to reconstruct *yo(m)čV (~ -ʔ-) with the Proto-Lezgian meaning 'earth, ground' and *čiIl with the Proto-Lezgian meaning 'earth floor'.

If so, *yo(m)čV 'earth, ground' must have been lost in Archi (where there is only a new adverbial formation 'on the ground') and in Nuclear Lezgian. Various terms for 'earth, ground' are attested in Nuclear Lezgian: in Proto-Tsakhur, *čarä [NCED: 555] (with the semantic shift 'clearing, uncultivated land' ~ 'earth, ground'); in South Lezgian (Kryts, Budukh), etymologically obscure q'um; in East Lezgian (Aghul, Tabasaran, Lezgi), *čiIl (with the shift 'earth floor' ~ 'earth, ground').

It should be noted that in some East Lezgian lects (Literary Tabasaran, Literary Lezgi), *čiIl has further shifted from 'earth, ground' ~ 'earth, soil'.

Some additional meaning shifts to be noted are: "näq" 'earth, soil' ~ 'land' in Archi; *näq" 'earth, soil' ~ 'grave, tomb' in Tsakhur and Aghul (Koshan, Gequn, Fite, proper Aghul); *näq" 'earth, soil' ~ 'earth, ground / land' in Rutul; *näq" 'earth, soil' ~ 'clay' in Ixrek Rutul.

In all the aforementioned cases, the bidirectional shifts between 'earth, soil' and 'earth, ground' can be explained as influenced by Azerbaijani or Russian polysemy.

Replacements: [‘earth, ground’ ~ ‘earth, soil’] (Nidzh Udi, Literary Tabasaran, Literary Lezgi), [‘clearing, uncultivated land’ ~ ‘earth, ground’ ~ ‘earth, soil’] (Mishlesh Tsakhur), [‘dust’ ~ ‘earth, soil’] (Tabasaran, Aghul, Lezgi), [‘earth, soil’ ~ ‘grave, tomb’] (Tsakhur and Aghul), [‘earth, soil’ ~ ‘earth, ground / land’] (Rutul), [‘earth, soil’ ~ ‘land’] (Archi), [‘earth, soil’ ~ ‘clay’] (Ixrek Rutul), [‘earth floor’ ~ ‘earth, ground’] (Aghul, Tabasaran, Lezgi).

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular.

Semantics and structure: Primary substantive root. The oblique stem is "näq"-i.

23. EAT

Nidzh Udi uk-sun {yxscnt} (1) / käy-(1), Vartashen Udi uk-sun {yxscnt} (1) / käy-(1), Archi =kəan-(1), Kryts (proper) üšî- (2), Alyk Kryts uI- (2), Budukh s=оʔuI- {sotųl} (2), Mishlesh Tsakhur oxan- ~ oxən- {oxʃan-, эйхвант} (3), Mikik Tsakhur oxan- (3), Gelmets Tsakhur oxan- {oxʃan-aʃ} (3), Mukhad Rutul CLASS=ʔIil- {ʔilawc} (2) / liʔ- (2), Ixrek Rutul il-
{λιӱнн} (2) / liʔ- (2), Luchek Rutul CLASS=il- (2) / liʔ- (2), Koshan Aghul Ɪuł'-ala- (2), Keren Aghul Ɪuł'-a- (2), Gequn Aghul Hal-di (2) / ut'-una- (2), Fite Aghul Hut'-a- (2), Aghul (proper) ḇal-di (2) / Ɪuł'-una- (2), Northern Tabasaran Ɪuł̣- (2) / Ɪuł'- (2), Southern Tabasaran ip'- (2), Gyune Lezgi ne- (2) / tʽū- (2), Proto-Lezgian Ʞikʷun- (1).

References and notes:


Common Udi: According to [Maisak 2008a: 108 f.] and [Schulze 2001: 328], with a suppletive paradigm in both dialects: uk- (present-ininitiative, imperative, future) / kâ(y)- (past). The synchronic roots uk- and kâ(y)- are etymologically related, see notes on 'to say'.

Caucasian Albanian: uk- (present-ininitiative) / kây- (past) [Gippert et al. 2008: IV-35].


Synchronically distinct from the suppletive verb 'to eat' (subj. = animal): Ꭓun̩- [imperf., invv.] / Ꭓun̩- [inf., perf.], see [Kibrik et al. 1977a 2: 72; Kibrik et al. 1977a 3: 242; Kibrik et al. 1977b: 259; Chumakina et al. 2007] (perfective Ꭓun̩ probably < Ꭓun-t'e, for the nasal sandhi see [Kibrik et al. 1977a 1: 304; Kibrik et al. 1977a 2: 69]). As correctly proposed in [Kibrik et al. 1977a 2: 73 fn. 51] and [NCED: 207], all the stems of both verbs originate from the "Proto-Archi" root Ꭓan (or rather Ꭓan̩ / Ꭓen̩).

Distinct from ḇah-bo- 'to want to eat smth.' [Chumakina et al. 2007; Kibrik et al. 1977b: 271] (complex verb, formed with the suppletive light verb ḇo- 'to say').


In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 271] 'to eat' is glossed as ḇa̱e̱ yixər, lit. 'flat cake, scone' + 'to be, exist' apparently due to an inaccurate Russian question to a Budukh informant: Russian collocation of the type ḇa̱e̱ tʃe̱ 'to eat bread' and 'there is bread'.


Common Tsakhur: Labialized -xʷ- is still retained in some forms in the Mishlesh dialects (cf. fut. class 2 ex̮̩an-as < *o-y-x̮̩an-as [Kibrik et al. 1999: 883] and causative class 4 o-t-x̮̩an-at-u [Kibrik et al. 1999: 110], but the variant o-t-xan-at-u [Kibrik et al. 1999: 165] is also attested); in other forms (like imperfect class 4 o-t-xan) xʷ has been superseded by x. In Mikik the delabialized -x- was totally levelled across the paradigm under the influence of the frequent forms with the regular development oC'C > oC, pC'C > pC.


Synchronically, a suppletive paradigm: CLASS=ʔil-ā-r- [imperf.] / liʔ- [perf.] / CLASS=il-ā [imv.]. In [Makhmudova 2001: 70, 94, 98, 114, 147, 158, 209, 247], the perfective and imperative stems are consistently quoted as ul-ɛ- - contracted forms of class 3 (*w=) in [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 271], the perfective stem is quoted as liʔ-ɛ- with unclear pharyngealization.

Synchronously, a suppletive paradigm: il-e-ɾ- [imperf.] / ɾil-ɾ- [perf.] / ɾil-e [inv.]. Perfective stem.

Synchronously, a suppletive paradigm: CLASS=il-e-ɾ- [imperf.] / ɾil-ɾ- [perf.] / CLASS=il-i [inv.]. Perfective stem.

Common Rutul: Historically, the perfective stem ɾil- is a metathetical variant of the imperfective one ʔil-.


Fite Aghul: Shaumyan 1941: 181.


The same in other subdialects: Kurag, Tsirkhe ʔut’a- 'to eat' [Magometov 1970: 142, 206 sentence 11, 215 sentence 22]; Duldug Hut’a- 'to eat' [Shaumyan 1941: 181]. It should be noted that for the Tsirkhe subdialect the infinitive form Hal- a- 'to eat' is quoted in [Shaumyan 1941: 181]. Perfective stem.

Common Aghul: Note the forms that retain etymological -i-: Gequn and Proper Aghul ʔal-di, Hal-a- and eventually Koshan ʔulla-ala-.

Northern Tabasaran: Kibrik & Kodzazov 1988: 155. Synchronously, a highly irregular suppletive paradigm: ‘ibil-e-: (i.e. ‘il-ild-e-: with the l-infix) [imperf.] / ‘u’lp- [perf.: class 2 sg.] / ‘u’lp- [perf.: class pl.] / ‘u’lp- [inv.: class 2 sg.] / ‘u’lp- [inf.: class 2 sg.] / ‘u’lp- [inf.: class pl.]. Class 2 sg. factually means singular object, class pl. - plural object.

Similar paradigm in the Khanag subdialect: ‘il-ld- [imperf.] / ‘u’lp- [perf., inv., inf.: class 2 sg.] / ‘u’lp- [perf., inv., inf.: class pl.] 'to eat' [Uslar 1979: 938; Dirr 1905: 211, 247]. Some interesting Khanag aorist forms (class 2) are also quoted by Dirr: el-, ʰil-, where medial ʰi- is the imperfective prefix.

The same in the Khyryuk subdialect: ‘il-ld- [imperf.] / ‘u’lp- [perf., inf.] / ʰu’λyəa ‘to eat’ [Genko 2005: 159]; Dyubek perfective stem of the class 2 sg. (i.e. singular object).


Common Tabasaran: As proposed in [NCED: 625 f.], the variety of modern forms is explained by suggesting assimilation of the Tabasaran class infixes -b- (class 2 sg.), -d- (class pl.) with the old root glottal-stop, i.e. ip-~ ai’-~ ʰi’lp-~ ʰi’lp-~ ‘ibil-e ‘obil-e- ‘ibil-e- < ʰi-b-ʔ-~ ʰi-b-ʔ-~ ʰi- < ʰi-ʔ-d-ʔ-: Infixed -d- is retained in the Northern imperfective stem ʰi-ld- < ʰi-ld-< ʰil-d-?]. In the Southern dialect the paradigm has been levelled after the class 2 forms (ip-), although in Literary Tabasaran the class agreement has secondarily been restored: ip- / ʰi-.


Proto-Lezgian: NCED: 207. Distribution: This root has survived only in the two outliers: Caucasian Albanian-Udi and Archi, where it still retains its basic status. Besides the formal distribution, external North Caucasian comparison also proves that ‘ʰik’- was the Proto-Lezgian root for ‘to eat’.

In Proto-Nuclear Lezgian, ‘ʰik’-Vn- was superseded by the verbal root ‘ʰi’al- [NCED: 625], whose original meaning is not entirely clear (cf. its Archi cognate with the meaning ‘to want to eat smth.’, and further North Caucasian comparanda which mean ‘to bite’ or ‘to feed on smth.’).

Additionally, in Tsakhir, ‘ʰil’- was superseded by ‘ʰi’al’-V(n)- [NCED: 516], which originally meant ‘to graze, pasture’ in Proto-Lezgian.

Replacements: [ ‘to graze, pasture’ > ‘to eat’] (Tsakhir).

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular.

Semantics and structure: Primary verbal root with several Ablaut grades.
24. EGG

Nidzh Udi qokːla ~ qoqːla ~ qːoqla {χοκʔλα ~ χοκʔλα ~ κοκʔλα} (1), Vartashen Udi qoqːla ~ κοκʔλα ~ qoqːla ~ qːoqla ~ kokla ~ kɔkʰla {χοκʔλα} (1). Archi q’enuk- (-1), Kryts (proper) kusunt’ (2), Alyk Kryts kusxud {χυςχυδ} (2), Mishlesh Tsakhur q’uq’ {χυκʔ} (3), Mikik Tsakhur q’uq’ (3), Gelmets Tsakhur q’uq’ (3), Mukhad Rutul k’ilik {γυλικ} (1), Ixrek Rutul k’ilik {γυλικ} (1), Luchek Rutul k’ilik (1), Koshan Aghul ʕuraʕa {χυρʔαʔα} (-1), Keren Aghul ʁˤaraʁa {γυρʔαʔα} (-1), Gequn Aghul ʁaraʁi {γυρʔαʔι} (-1), Fite Aghul ʁˤaraʁi {γυρʔαʔι}, Aghul (proper) ʁuraʁa {χυρʔαʔα} (-1), Northern Tabasaran ʁəlɨʁ {χυρʔαʔα} (-1), Southern Tabasaran murt’a (-1), Gyune Lezgi kːakːˈa (5), Proto-Lezgian *qːVlVqː (1).

References and notes:


Distinct from Vartashen qːˤaqːapun {χυκʔαχυκʔαução} 'fried eggs' [Gukasyan 1974: 156]; according to [NCED: 932], qːˤaqːa-pun with an unclear suffix -pun, but such an analysis is uncertain.

Common Udi: Common Udi *QoQla with various assimilative/dissimilative variants.

Caucasian Albanian: Unattested.


Tsakhur-Kum Tsakhur: q’uq’ [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 123]

Mikik Tsakhur: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 123; Dirr 1913: 198, 243.


Luchek Rutul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 123.


compound, whose first element is *paʔ-a, obl. paʔ-li- 'hen' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 75].

Differently in the Khanag subdialect: *pel'ıwaw ~ pelur'ıwaw ~ penur'ıwaw 'egg' [Uslar 1979: 874, 1010; Dirr 1905: 199, 247]. According to [Uslar 1979: 875], the non-compressed expression *pel'ın li'ıwaw 'egg' was occasionally used as late as the 2nd half of the 19th century - literally 'hen's white' (pe, gen. pe-či-n ~ pe-či-n 'hen'; li, class 2 li'ıw-w 'white' q.v.).


Superseded with the loanword in the Kumi and Chuvak subdialects: murt'a [mypra] 'egg' [Genko 2005: 123].

**Southern Tabasaran**: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 123.


**Common Tabasaran**: Northern Tabasaran forms of the shape *pel'ıwaw represent the recent neologism 'hen's white' (see above). Dyubek pelux'aw ~ pelix'aw is a compressed compound of the same kind: 'hen's X', although its second part is not clear.

The forms murt'a and yumurt'a represent a borrowing from Azerbaijani yumurt'a 'egg'.

Khiv *gugu seems to be the best candidate for the status of Proto-Tabasaran 'egg', although its external etymology is rather weak (Lezgi kaka 'egg' q.v.).

**Gyne Lezgi**: Uslar 1896: 453, 639.


The same in the Akhyt dialect: Khlyut kaka 'egg' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 123].

**Proto-Lezgian**: NCED: 906. **Distribution**: According to [NCED], two phonetically similar roots for 'egg' enter into competition here. Both demonstrate rather irregular reflexes of assimilative or dissimilative nature.

The first one is reconstructed as *q'oloq' in [NCED: 906]. This stem means 'egg' in Udi, on the one hand, and Rutul and Aghul, on the other. In the rest of Lezgian, the root has been lost.

The second one is reconstructed as *q'oloq' in [NCED: 932]. This stem means 'egg' in Tsakhur (q'ıw'q), 'testiculus' in Budukh, Rutul and Tabasaran (these three forms have only been found in [NCED]), 'fried eggs' in Vartashen Udi.

In three languages, both of the roots have survived. The reflexes are opposed as follows:

- Udi: qokla ~ qoqla ~ qːoqla ~ qːˤaqːapun / q'oloq' / *q'oloq' / qːˤaqːapun (q'ıpaq-pun?) 'fried eggs'.
- Rutul (Khnyukh): kilīw 'egg' / q'ilīq 'testiculus'.
- Tabasaran (Dyubek): xili 'egg' / q'erq'-ar 'testiculus' (with the fossilized plural suffix).

It should be noted, however, that Vartashen Udi q'ıpaq-pun is morphologically obscure (q'-pun is a unique suffix) and too irregular phonetically (normally Lezgian *q' yields a zero reflex in Udi). It seems better to separate the Udi form from these roots: we prefer to treat q'ıpaq-pun as a word of unknown origin.

If so, the descendants of the hypothetical *q'oloq' mean 'testiculus' in all three Nuclear Lezgian subbranches, but 'egg' in Tsakhur. The semantic derivation 'testiculus' > 'egg' is extremely rare cross-linguistically; thus, Tsakhur q'ıw'q would rather seem to originate from *q'oloq' 'egg', but it must have been influenced by *q'oloq'. The second solution is to unite all the aforementioned forms (excluding the Udi 'fried eggs') under one proto-root *QIVIQ 'egg' with very irregular reflexes. If so, in Proto-Nuclear Lezgian, *QIVIQ divided into two phonetic shapes - one retained the meaning 'egg', the other acquired the meaning 'testiculus' (the shift 'egg' > 'testiculus' is normal).

It is also likely that the discussed words for 'egg' have been influenced by various onomatopoeic forms for hen cackling, cf., e.g., Budukh qaʔa čidani 'cackling, clucking' [Meylanova 1984: 94], etc.

In Proto-Tabasaran and Lezgi, 'egg' is expressed by *kakay [NCED: 429], not observed in other languages. The primary meaning of this root is unclear. It cannot be posited as the Proto-East Lezgian term for 'egg', since the Aghul language retains *q'oloq' for this meaning. In fact, however, both Khiv Tabasaran gugu and Lezgi kaka may represent independent introductions of onomatopoeic nature.

In Northern Tabasaran, two recent compounds are attested with the meaning 'egg', both with *paʔ 'hen' [NCED: 865] as the first element (one of them literally means 'white of hen').

In South Lezgian (Kryts, Budukh), the obscure forms *kusununct ~ kuskunct ~ kusxud 'egg' are attested. Their first element kus- also looks similar to the word for 'hen'.
Superseded with loanwords in Archi (< Lak) and some Tabasaran dialects (< Azerbaijani).

Replacements: ['white of hen' > 'egg'] (Northern Tabasaran), ['X of hen' > 'egg'] (Northern Tabasaran).

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences are rather irregular, due to various assimilative/dissimilative processes and vowel syncop.

Semantics and structure: Primary substantive root, maybe of onomatopoeic origin.

25. EYE

Nidzh Udi *pul* {ny₳} (1), Vartashen Udi *pul* {ny₳} (1), Archi l-ur (1), Kryts (proper) *fiul* (1), Alyk Kryts *fiul* (1), Budukh *fiul* {ly₳} (1), Mishlesh Tsakhur *ulʰ* {y₳} (1), Mikik Tsakhur *ulʰ* (1), Gelmets Tsakhur *ulʰ* (1), Mukhad Rutul *ul* {y₳} (1), Ixrek Rutul *ul* {y₳} (1), Luchek Rutul *ul* (1), Koshan Aghul *il* (1), Gequn Aghul *ul* (1), Fite Aghul *ul* (1), Aghul (proper) *ul* (1), Northern Tabasaran *ul* (1), Southern Tabasaran *ul* (1), Gyune Lezgi *wil* (1), Proto-Lezgian *ʰwil* (1).

References and notes:


Common Udi: Common Udi *pul* with an irregular paradigm in both dialects: *pul* [abs.] / *p-* [obl.] (the oblique stem is explained by the historically normal loss of -lₗ- in the intervocalic position, [NCED: 130]).


Alyk Kryts: Authier 2009: 34, 39, 49, 82, etc.

Tsakhur-Kum Tsakhur: *ulʰ* [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 11].

Mikik Tsakhur: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 11; Dirr 1913: 207, 222.
Gelmets Tsakhur: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 11; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 190.
Koshan Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 11; Suleymanov 2003: 161; Shaumyan 1941: 144. The same in the Arsug subdialect: *il* 'eye' [Shaumyan 1941: 144].
Keren Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 11. The same in the Usug subdialect: *ul* 'eye' [Shaumyan 1941: 144].
Fite Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 11; Shaumyan 1941: 144.


Northern Tabasaran: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 11.

The same in the Khanag subdialect: *ul* 'eye' [Uslar 1979: 927, 991; Dirr 1905: 209, 226]. The same in the Khyuryuk subdialect: *ul* {y₳} 'eye' [Genko 2005: 152].

Southern Tabasaran: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 11.

The same in the Khiv subdialect: *ul* {y₳} 'eye' [Genko 2005: 152]. The same in Literary Tabasaran: *ul* {y₳} 'eye'


The same in the Akhty dialect: Khlyut 'eye' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 11].

Proto-Lezgian: NCED: 250. Distribution: One of the stablest Proto-Lezgian roots, retained in its basic meaning in all Lezgian lects.

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem quite regular.

Semantics and structure: Primary substantive root. The oblique stem is *ʔʷile-

26. FAT N.

Nidzh Udi bošin=čäyin (1), Vartashen Udi čäin (1), Archi may ~ miy (2), Kryts (proper) maʔ (2), Alyk Kryts maʔ (2), Budukh maʔ {maʔ} (2), Mishlesh Tsakhur maʔ {maʔ} (2), Mikik Tsakhur maʔa (2), Gelmets Tsakhur maʔ (2), Mukhad Rutul maʔ {maʔ} (2), Koshan Aghul hul (3), Keren Aghul maw (2), Gequn Aghul maw (2), Fite Aghul maw (2), Aghul (proper) yav (4), Northern Tabasaran χˤul (3), Southern Tabasaran χˤul (3), Gyune Lezgi maq' (2), Proto-Lezgian *maʔˤ(2).

References and notes:

Nidzh Udi: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 122. A collocation: bošin čäyin = literally 'internal (bošin) butter (čäyin)'. Expressions for 'fat' have not been found in [Gukasyan 1974] and [Mobili 2010]. In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 310] 'grease, fat' is glossed as Nidzh zeyt {зеит}, which is an error, cf. in [Mobili 2010: 296]: Nidzh zeyt / Vartashen zet 'vegetable oil', zeytun 'olive'; a wide-spread Semitic (in our case Arabic) word with the meaning 'olive, olive oil'.


Distinct from the specific term pi 'goat’s fat' [Dzheiranishvili 1971: 217, 255; Fähnrich 1999: 26] (glossed simply as 'fat' in [Schiefner 1863: 98] and [Starchevskiy 1891: 499]), which is borrowed from Azerbaijani piy 'fat, lard' or directly from Persian pīh 'fat'.

Distinct from zeyt ~ zet 'vegetable oil', zet 'olive oil' [Schiefner 1863: 90, 93] (an Arabic loanword, see notes on the Nidzh dialect).

Common Udi: Common Udi čäin 'fat; animal oil'.

Caucasian Albanian: Unattested.


In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 310] the form šeľeškula [шеleşкун] is also quoted for 'fat, grease' - a corrupted spelling of the masdar in -kul from the stative verb šeľeš 'to be fat (normally of food)' [Kibrik et al. 1977b: 320; Chumakina et al. 2007].

Distinct from tenˈe 'layer of fat on soup; ointment' [Kibrik et al. 1977b: 322; Chumakina et al. 2007] (quoted for 'dissolved grease' in [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 121]).


Missing from [Kibrik et al. 1999].

Distinct from yɨχˤ dissolving grease (Russian: ая ц) [Ibragimov & Nurnamedov 2010: 184] and ēz ~ ēz 'visceral fat, suet' [Ibragimov & Nurnamedov 2010: 399].

**Mikik Tsakhur**: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 122; Dirr 1913: 186, 225.

Distinct from *yiʃ'ʷ* 'dissolved grease' and *ʔoː* 'visceral fat, suet' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 122].

**Gelmets Tsakhur**: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 122. In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 310], quoted as *maš*.

Distinct from *yiʃ'ʷ* 'fat on meat' (an error for 'dissolved grease?') and *ʔoː* 'visceral fat, suet' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 122].

**Mukhad Rutul**: Ibragimov 1978: 17, 27, 63, 117. Glossed by Ibragimov as generic 'fat, rendered fat (Russian: жир, сало)'.

A second candidate is *yiʃ'ʷ* 'lube, machine oil' (there is no generic term for 'fat' in [Suleymanov 2003]).

A second term, incorrectly quoted in the generic meaning 'fat' in [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 310], is *kūk-di yאk* - actually a normal attributive construction with the direct meaning 'fatty meat' [Dirr 1912: 151].

**Ixrek Rutul**: Not attested; only several specific terms have been found: *maš* [maš] 'visceral fat, suet' [Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 339], *qiʃ* [қыш] 'dissolved grease' [Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 167], *qiʃir* [қыджир] 'dissolved grease' [Ibragimov 1978: 224].

In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 310], *qiʃ* is quoted in the generic meaning 'fat'.

**Luchek Rutul**: Not attested. In [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 122], only two specific terms are quoted: *maš* 'visceral fat, suet', *yiʃ'ʷ* 'dissolved grease; pitch, resin'.


Distinct from *muːləy* 'dissolved grease' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 121] of Arabic origin.

**Keren Aghul**: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 121.

Distinct from *muːlə* 'dissolved grease' of Arabic origin and inherited *yiʃ* 'fat on meat' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 122]. In the Usug subdialect superseded with *yaχ* 'fat (in general)' [Shaumyan 1941: 147]. The old term is retained as *maν* 'visceral fat, suet' [Shaumyan 1941: 150].

**Gequn Aghul**: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 122. Not attested in [Dirr 1907].

Distinct from *muːlə* 'dissolved grease' of Arabic origin and inherited *yiʃ* 'fat on meat' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 122]. Labialized uvular in abs. *yiʃ* 'apparently secondary, having appeared under the influence of the ergative form *yiʃ*-u (as in some similar Burlikhan cases, e.g., "kerk > kerkʷ", erg, kerk-u 'nail' q.v.).

**Fite Aghul**: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 122.

Distinct from *dəɾc* 'dissolved grease' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 122].

**Aghul (proper)**: Shaumyan 1941: 147. Specified as 'fat (in general)'). It should be noted that in [Suleymanov 2003: 91], Tpig *yaɾ* is glossed as 'lube, machine oil' (there is no generic term for 'fat' in [Suleymanov 2003]).

Distinct from *Tpig maν* 'visceral fat, suet' [Suleymanov 2003: 130; Shaumyan 1941: 150].

**Common Aghul**: We reconstruct Proto-Aghul *maν* as 'fat (in general)' (retained in some non-Koshan dialects) and *yaχ* as specific 'fat on meat' (lost in Koshan).

The original generic meaning of *maν* is suggested by the external Lezgian comparison. In Koshan (Burshag) *maν* was superseded with *ʔul* under the influence of the neighboring Tabasaran language, where the same shift occurred. The exact proto-meanting of *ʔul* cannot be reconstructed with certainty - 'a k. of fat'. Cf. also Keren Aghul (Richa) *hɑl*, Gequn Aghul (Burlikhan) *hɛl* quoted in [NCED: 1081] as 'fat' without semantic specifications (apparently based on the unpublished field records of the MSU expedition, cf. [NCED: 13]).

Aghul forms of the shape *yaχ*, *yaχʷ*, *yaɾ* seem inherited (thus in [NCED: 948]), but influenced on the part of the basic Azerbaijani term *yaɾ* 'fat (in general)'. This concerns both phonetics (the voiced fricative in Proper Aghul *yaɾ*) and semantics: the shift from 'fat on meat' to the generic meaning 'fat' in Keren Aghul (Usug) and Proper Aghul (Tpig).


**Southern Tabasaran**: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 121. Paradigm: *χʰil* [abs.] / *χʰʰil*-i [erg.]. Distinct from Kondik *dəɾc* 'dissolved grease'


Gyune Lezgi: Uslar 1896: 501, 611. A second generic term for 'fat', closely synonymous to the former one, is pi [Uslar 1896: 517, 611], borrowed from Azerbaijani piɣ 'fat, lard' or directly from Persian pisḥ 'fat'. Distinct from the more specific Gyune ser'i 'animal oil, vegetable oil' [Uslar 1896: 385], č'em 'butter, animal oil' [Uslar 1896: 597].

In Literary Lezgi the same two terms compete with each other: the inherited maq' [маъ] 'fat (not dissolved)' [Talibov & Gadzhiev 1966: 229; Gadzhiev 1950: 201] (glossed as 'fat' in [Haspelmath 1993: 498, 519]) and the borrowed pi [пи] 'animal fat' [Talibov & Gadzhiev 1966: 264; Gadzhiev 1950: 201] (glossed as 'fat' in [Haspelmath 1993: 500, 519]).


For the Akhty dialect two terms are quoted as synonyms for 'fat (in general)': Khlyut maʔ and qu's [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 122]. Distinct from Khlyut q'ac'ɪr 'dissolved grease' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 122].

The form maʔ / maʕ must be posited as the Proto-Lezgian term for 'fat'.

Proto-Lezgian: NCED: 794. Distribution: Retained as the generic term for 'fat' in Archi, on the one hand, and in most of the Nuclear Lezgian lects, on the other. External North Caucasian comparison also confirms such a semantic reconstruction for Proto-Lezgian *maʔ. In Udi, *maʔ has been lost, superseded by *צ'אח [NCED: 624], whose original meaning was 'butter', as proven by both the Nuclear Lezgian and external North Caucasian cognates, as well as the synchronic Udi polysemy 'fat / butter'.

In Keren Aghul (Usug) and Aghul proper, *maʔ shifted to the specific meaning 'visceral fat, suet', superseded as the generic term by *yimχː [NCED: 948]. The original Proto-Lezgian meaning of *yimχː is likely to have been 'butterfat' vel sim. (cf. its Archi and South Lezgian cognates with the meanings 'butter' and 'milk'), but for Proto-Aghul *yimχː can be reconstructed with the specific meaning 'fat on meat'.

In Tabasaran and, secondarily, in the neighboring Koshan Aghul dialect, *maʔ has been lost, superseded by *ʔχˤul (ʔχˤ - o-, -ː) [NCED: 1081]. The root *ʔχˤul apparently denoted a specific kind of fat in Proto-Lezgian, but exact semantic reconstruction is impossible (Lezgian ʷχˤul seems unattested outside Tabasaran-Aghul area, but external comparison points to the semantics of 'fat').

Replacements: [butter'] > 'fat' (Udi), [butterfat'] > 'fat on meat' > 'fat' (Keren Aghul).
Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular.
Semantics and structure: Primary substantive root.

27. FEATHER

Nidzh Udi maʔ [маʔ] (1), Varshagen Udi kuk (2) / posposkal (3), Archi cal (4), Kryts (proper) kʷak (2), Alyk Kryts kuk (2), Budukh qənaʔ (քենառ) (-1), Mishlesh Tsakhir wusun (վուսուն) (5), Mikik Tsakhir kuk-ra (2), Gelmets Tsakhir wisin (5), Mukhad Rutul maʔ'aq ~ mac'ag [մաարգ] (6), Ixrek Rutul piɣ (псы) (-1), Luchek Rutul maʔ'aq (6), Koshan Aghul purc' (7), Keren Aghul pinc' (7), Gequn Aghul murc' ~ purc' (7), Fite Aghul murc' (7), Aghul (proper) murc' (7), Northern Tabasaran kik (8), Southern Tabasaran cik (9), Gyune Lezgi c'ap-ur (7), Proto-Lezgian *kʷik ~ *kʷimk (2).
References and notes:

Nidzh Udi: Guksasyan 1974: 171; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 216; Mobili 2010: 204. In the Vartashen dialect this stem means 'bunch of grapes' [Guksasyan 1974: 171; Mobili 2010: 204] and, more generally, 'tassel' [Schiefner 1863: 103]. A second term is gänäd 'feather; wing' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 45], which was borrowed from Azerbaijani qanad 'wing' and underwent the areal isogloss of polysemy: 'wing / feather'.

Vartashen Udi: Schiefner 1863: 15, 84; Starchevskiy 1891: 505. It is not specified which 'feather' is meant (anatomic term or pen), but this word is distinct from qaläm-ux 'feather pen' [Schiefner 1863: 72] (< Azerbaijani qalăm 'id.', ultimately from Arabic qalam).

A second Vartashen term for 'feather', which is currently used in the Zinobiani (Oktomberi) village, is posposkal [Fähnrich 1999: 26], confirmed by Yu. Lander’s field records on 2011. In [Guksasyan 1974: 189] and [Mobili 2010: 235], however, this word is explained as a kind of wild plant (Azerbaijani: xumuxma, Russian: нерпыт).

In [Schulze 2001: 312] the word qänäd 'wing; feather' is quoted (an Azerbaijani loanword, see notes on Nidzh Udi), although in Бе́занов’s text it is attested only with the meaning 'wing'. Fähnrich 1999: 26; Yu. Lander’s field records.

Common Udi: In the light of Lezgian comparanda, it is Vartashen kuk that has a better chance to have been the Proto-Udi term for 'feather'. In this case, it is necessary to postulate the meaning shift 'tassel' > 'feather' in Nidzh нра and similarly 'a k. of plant' > 'feather' in Vartashen posposkal.

Caucasian Albanian: Unattested.


In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 216] the term qum {χυμ} is also quoted for 'feather', but its actual meaning is 'down' [Chumakina et al. 1977b: 298; Chumakina et al. 2007].


Budukh: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 45. Polysemy: 'wing / feather'. In [Meylanova 1984: 83] glossed only as 'wing'. Borrowed from Azerbaijani qanad 'wing' and subject to the areal isogloss of polysemy: 'wing / feather'.

Distinct from pisi {миш}, which is glossed in [Meylanova 1984: 119, 230] as 'feather, small feather' (repeated in [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 216] as a basic term for 'feather'), but Meylanova’s examples rather suggest the specific meaning 'down': "downy pillow", "down appears on chickens".

Mishlesh Tsakhur: Ibragimov 1990: 175; Ibragimov & Nurmamedov 2010: 107. Missing from [Kibrik et al. 1999]. In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 216], the Literary Tsakhur word for 'feather' is quoted as kuk-ra {кърп}.


Mikik Tsakhur: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 45; Dirr 1913: 174, 233. Final -ra is a fossilized plural marker. It is noted in [Dirr 1913: 215] that 'feather' can also be expressed by the collocation "bird’s hair" (with ĕr ‘hair’ q.v.).

Gelmets Tsakhur: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 45. In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 216], quoted as wisin '{вийсыр}.

Common Tsakhur: From the distributive viewpoint it seems slightly more natural to assume that the Proto-Tsakhur term for 'feather' was wisin (~ wusan), which is retained both in the Takh and Gelmets dialectal groups, whereas kuk-ra is an innovation of some Tsakh dialects (Tsakhur-Kum, Mukhakh-Sabunchi & Suvagil) and "transitional" Mikik. External Lezgian etymology, however, speaks in favor of kuk-ra; in turn, wisin seems to be an interdialectal innovation of unclear origin.

Mukhad Rutul: Dirr 1912: 159, 197; Ibragimov 1978: 223, 282; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 216. The variant with q comes from [Dirr 1912]; other sources give c(к).

Ixrek Rutul: [Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 210; Ibragimov 1978: 223]. Borrowed from the neighboring Arakul dialect of Lak: puy 'feather' [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 216] (or, rather, both words represent a common loanword of unknown origin).

A second term is p'eru {п'еро} (нле), glossed simply as 'feather' in [Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 211, 372], but we suspect that p'eru rather means 'feather pen', borrowed from Russian p'erо 'feather (anatomic); feather pen'.

In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 216], 'feather' is apparently erroneously glossed as ma at {макъалкъ}.

Luchek Rutul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 45.

Common Rutul: In the Borch-Khnov dialect the word for 'feather' is къи (джыгъа) [Ibragimov 1978: 282], apparently borrowed from
Azerbaijani ʧiya ‘lock, tress; plumage (e.g., of pheasant).

The Mukhad-Luchek word maʧaq is of unknown origin, but may represent the Proto-Rutul term.

Koshan Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 45; Suleymanov 2003: 136; Shaumyan 1941: 152. The same in the Khudig subdialect: purc ‘‘feather’’ [Shaumyan 1941: 152].

In [Suleymanov 2003: 136], two additional Koshan words for ‘‘feather’’ are also quoted: murc’ and c’urc’um (both without exact dialectal prevenance).

Keren Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 45.

In the Usug subdialect: purc ‘‘feather’’ [Shaumyan 1941: 152].

Gequn Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 45; Dirr 1907: 135, 180; Shaumyan 1941: 152. In [Dirr 1907] and [Shaumyan 1941], only the variant murc’ is quoted; in [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990], both are given.

Fite Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 45; Shaumyan 1941: 152.

Aghul (proper): Suleymanov 2003: 136; Shaumyan 1941: 152. The same in the other subdialects: Tsirkhe, Duldug murc’ ‘‘feather’’ [Shaumyan 1941: 152].

Common Aghul: Etymologically obscure forms, for which the Lezgian prototype *pinc’ is proposed in [LEDb].

Northern Tabasaran: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 45. Distinct from Dyubek zik ‘‘down’’ [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 45].

Differently in the Khanag subdialect: χil ‘‘feather’’ [Uslar 1979: 951, 1001] (missing from [Dirr 1905]); distinct from Khanag zik ‘‘down’’ [Uslar 1979: 701, 1003]. It should be noted that in [Dirr 1905: 171, 237] zik is glossed as ‘‘feather’’ - apparently an inaccuracy.


Southern Tabasaran: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 45. Polysemy: ‘‘feather / down’’.


Differently in Literary Tabasaran: zık ‘‘feather’’ [Khannagomedov & Shalbuzov 2001: 169]; ‘‘down’’ is expressed as ʃiʃiʃi zik [ʃiʃiʃi zik] ‘‘feather’’ [Khaburzeda 2001: 169], literally ‘‘fine feather’’.

Common Tabasaran: An unclear situation. Formally, the external comparison (cf. the Lezgi suffixed cognate ʧik-ul ‘‘feather’’) could suggest that ʧik~ – zük~ – zük ~ zik is to be reconstructed with polysemy: ‘‘feather / down’’ for Proto-Tabasaran. This polysemy was retained in some Southern subdialects (Kondik, Tinit), but reduced to ‘‘down’’ in Northern Tabasaran as well as in some Southern subdialects (Khiv). Out of several new words for ‘‘feather’’, Northern χil ‘‘feather’’ apparently goes back to the local meaning ‘‘wing’’ [NCED: 1070], Dyubek zik is etymologically obscure, for Khiv c’upur see below.

On the other hand, Khiv c’upur ‘‘feather’’ can be analyzed as the fossilized plural formation c’up-ur, whose root etymologically corresponds to Aghul (the closet Tabasaran relative) *pinc’ ‘‘feather’’ via consonant metathesis (for the nasal cluster simplification cf. Tabasaran p’iʃ ‘‘angle, corner’’ < Lezgian *p’ilmp’ ‘‘knee’’). In this case Khiv c’upur continues the Proto-Tabasaran term for ‘‘feather’’, whereas ʧik~ – zük~ – zük ~ zik originates from Proto-Tabasaran ‘‘down’’ (the semantics ‘‘down’’ was extended to ‘‘feather, down’’ in some Southern subdialects, like Kondik, Tinit, as well as Literary Tabasaran). On the contrary, in Northern Tabasaran *pinc’ ‘‘feather’’ was lost, superseded with χil (< ‘‘wing’’) or obscure zik.

The second scenario seems more preferable. Its main flaw, however, is that the Tabasaran plural exponent is -ur, harmonized -er, -ir [Magometov 1965: 93 ff.], not -ur, as in the assumed c’up-ur.

Note that it is also possible to treat Khiv c’upur as a borrowing from the neighboring Lezgi language, cf. Lezgi c’ap’ur ‘‘feather’’ (q.v.).


There are two words for ‘‘feather’’ in Literary Lezgi. The most frequent one is čik-ul [tlaʃxal] ‘‘feather’’ [Talibov & Gadzhiev 1966: 360; Gadzhiev 1950: 534; Haspelmath 1993: 484, 519]. The second, more marginal, term is čap-ul [tlaʃx] with polysemy: ‘‘feather / propeller blade’’ [Talibov & Gadzhiev 1966: 361]. Distinct from literary tük [tųx] ‘‘down’’ [Talibov & Gadzhiev 1966: 319; Gadzhiev 1950: 674], borrowed from Azerbaijani tük ‘‘hair, fur, down’’.

In the Yarki dialect (the same Kyuri group): Nyutyug čap-ur ‘‘feather’’ [Meylanova 1964: 79].


An unclear situation, with two terms in competition: c'ap-ur (in the Kyur and Samur dialectal groups) vs. c'ak-ul (Samur). Both words are present in Literary Lezgi. The available dialectal data are too scant for a full-fledged distributive analysis, but c'ap-ur seems more preferable from the etymological point of view: cf. Aghul *pinc*” ‘feather’, Tabasaran (Khiv) c'ap-ur ‘feather’ q.v.

The rare substantive suffix with generic semantics -al is both denominal [Haspelmath 1993: 107] and deverbal [Gaydarov et al. 2009: 131]. Final -ur looks like a fossilized plural exponent, but it must be noted that synchronic Lezgi plural suffixes are either -ar or -er [Haspelmath 1993: 71; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 291].

**Proto-Lezgian**: NCED: 707. **Distribution**: An unstable word, often superseded by etymologically obscure forms or loans. Distributively the best candidate for the Proto-Lezgian term ‘feather’ is *k'ii(m)k*. It has been retained with the meaning ‘feather’ in Vartashen Udi, on the one hand, and in two Nuclear Lezgian languages (Kryts and Tsakhur), on the other, having been lost in the rest of languages.

The modern Vartashen Udi word for ‘feather’ is, however, posposkal, which primarily denotes a kind of plant. In Nidzh Udi, *k'ii(m)k* was superseded with the etymologically unclear word maţa, whose original Proto-Udi meaning is likely to have been ‘tassel, bunch’.

In Archi, the root *c'ali* [NCED: 1090] with polysemy ‘wing / feather’ is observed. This root is isolated within Lezgian, but if the North Caucasian etymology, proposed in [NCED], is correct, this implies the shift ‘fist’ > ‘wing’ > ‘feather’ in Archi.

In some Tsakhur dialects (Mishlesh, Gelmets), ‘feather’ is expressed by the etymologically isolated root *weis- (~ -o-*) [NCED: 1058]. In Mikik Tsakhur, the neologism ‘bird’s hair’ is also attested for ‘feather’.

In Rutul, the etymologically obscure form maq’al ‘feather’ occurs.

As for East Lezgian (Aghul, Tabasaran, Lezgi), the best solution here is to postulate *pinc*” [LEDb: #145] as the Proto-East Lezgian root for ‘feather’ (however, without any further etymology). It has been retained in Aghul, Southern Tabasaran (Khiv), Lezgi (Gyune, Yarki, Fiy). In Northern Tabasaran (Khanag, Khyuryuk), *pinc*” was superseded by *c'ala* (~ -l-) [NCED: 1070], whose local meaning could be ‘wing’ (thus ‘wing’ > ‘feather’). On the contrary, in Southern Tabasaran (Kondik, Tinit) and some Lezgi dialects (Akhty, Literary Lezgi), the root *c'anka / *ka:mc'ana: ‘down’ [NCED: 1091] has acquired the meaning ‘feather’ (sometimes with synchronic polysemy ‘feather / down’).

Out of a number of etymologically obscure terms for ‘feather’, attested in Lezgian lects, in several cases the source of borrowing can be established: Budukh (< Azerbaijani), Borch-Khnov Rutul (< Azerbaijani), Ixrek Rutul (< Lak?).

**Replacements**: [‘a kind of plant’ > ‘feather’ (Vartashen Udi), [‘tassel, bunch’ > ‘feather’] (Nidzh Udi), [‘bird’s hair’ > ‘feather’] (Mikik Tsakhur), [‘down’ > ‘feather’] (Southern Tabasaran, Lezgi), [‘wing’ > ‘feather’] (Northern Tabasaran), [‘fist’ > ‘wing’ > ‘feather’?] (Archi).

**Reconstruction shape**: Correspondences seem regular.

**Semantics and structure**: Primary substantive root.

28. FIRE

Nidzh Udi ar-uχ {apyx} (1), Vartashen Udi ar-uχ {apyx} (1), Archi oc’ (1), Kryts (proper) c‘a (1), Alyk Kryts c’a (1), Budukh c’e ~ c’a {u:le ~ u:la} (1), Mishlesh Tsakhur c’a {u:la} (1), Mikik Tsakhur c’a (1), Gelmets Tsakhur c’a (1), Mukhad Rutul c’ay {u:laul} (1), Ixrek Rutul c‘a {u:lav} (1), Luchek Rutul c’ay (1), Koshan Aghul c’a ~ c’ay (1), Keren Aghul c’a (1), Gequ Aghul c’a ~ c’ay (1), Fite Aghul c’ay (1), Aghul (proper) c’a ~ c’ay (1), Northern Tabasaran c’a (1), Southern Tabasaran c’a (1), Gyune Lezgi c’ay (1), Proto-Lezgian *c’ay (1).
References and notes:


Common Udi: Common Udi *-u-aX, where -aX is a fossilized plural exponent.

Caucasian Albanian: c’I [Gippert et al. 2008: IV-23]. An etymological cognate of the Udi term (note that the ejective is still retained in Caucasian Albanian).


Kryts (proper): Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 206; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 63. Paradigm: c’i [abs.], / c’-i=[gen.].

Alyk Kryts: Authier 2009: 33. Paradigm: c’a [abs.], / c’-i= [gen.].


Tsakhur-Kum Tsakhur: c’a [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 206].


Ixrek Rutul: Dzhamalov & Smedev 2006: 286. Paradigm: c’i [abs.], / c’i-[obl.]. In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 63], erroneously quoted as c’a [ula].


Koshan Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 206; Suleymanov 2003: 194; Shaumyan 1941: 166. The more archaic variant c’ay comes from [Shaumyan 1941]. Paradigm: c’a [abs.], / c’-i-[obl.].


Gequ Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 206; Dirr 1907: 151, 178; Shaumyan 1941: 166. The more archaic variant c’ay is from [Shaumyan 1941]. Paradigm: c’ay [abs.], / c’-i-[obl.].

Fite Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 206; Shaumyan 1941: 166. Paradigm: c’ay [abs.], / c’-i-[obl.].

Aghul (proper): Suleymanov 2003: 194; Shaumyan 1941: 166. In [Suleymanov 2003], only the former variant is quoted. Paradigm: c’ay [abs.], / c’-i-[obl.]. The same in the other subdialects: Tsirkhe, Duldug c’ay ‘fire’ [Shaumyan 1941: 166].


The same in the Akhty dialect: Khlyut c’ay [abs.], / yic’-u-[obl.] ‘fire’ [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 206]. The Akhty oblique stem is historically the result of metathesis < *c’uy-.

Proto-Lezgian: NCED: 354. Distribution: One of the most stable Lezgian roots, retained with its basic meaning in all Lezgian lects.

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular, assuming the metathesis *c’V(y)V > yVc’V) that occurred in several lects (Archi, Akhty Lezgi). The Udi form contains the fossilized plural suffix (which seems somewhat surprising from a semantic point of view).

Semantics and structure: Primary substantival root. The oblique stems are *c’oyɨ- and *c’o(y)-rV- (functional difference is unclear, but the latter is attested in Udi, Archi and Nuclear Lezgian, therefore, is more likely to represent an archaism).

29. FISH

Nichzh Udi čäli {чаьли} (1), Vartashen Udi čäli {чаьли} (1), Archi χˤabχi (2), Kryts (proper) balik (-1), Alyk Kryts balik (-1), Budukh balik {балуғъ} (-1), Mishlesh Tsakhur balik {балуғъ} (-1), Mikik Tsakhur balik (-1), Gelmets Tsakhur balik (-1), Mukhad Rutul balik (-1), Ixrek Rutul bålɨʁ ~ balik {балугъ} ~ balik (-1), Luchek Rutul balik (-1), Koshan Aghul bålɨʁ ~ balik (-1), Keren Aghul č’ek’ (3), Gequn Aghul č’ek’ (3), Fite Aghul balik (-1), Aghul (proper) č’ek’ (3), Northern Tabasaran čič’-i (3), Southern Tabasaran čič’ (3), Gyune Lezgi wed (4), Proto-Lezgian *χ’-an: (4).

References and notes:


Common Udi: Common Udi *čäli.

Caucasian Albanian: Unattested.


Tsakhur–Kum Tsakhur: baluʁ [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 87].

Mikik Tsakhur: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 87; Dirr 1913: 140, 237.

Gelmets Tsakhur: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 87; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 150.

Common Tsakhur: The term was borrowed from Azerbaijani balig, dialectal (e.g., Quba) baluy ‘fish’.


A second (apparently less frequent) term is marʃux [мурджух] ‘fish’ [Dzhhamalov & Semedov 2006: 194, 389] (no examples found).


Common Rutul: The basic term for ‘fish’ in Rutul dialects normally represents a borrowing from Azerbaijani balig, dialectal (e.g., Quba) baluy ‘fish’.

The inherited form, which reflects the Proto-Lezgian word for ‘fish’, is retained in the Shinaz dialect as χ’at [xafr] ‘fish’ [Ibragimov 1978: 163].
There also exists a bulk of specific dialectal forms with the meaning 'fish': Ixrek мурух (see above), Shinaz мишрух [Dirr 1912: 11, 160, 199], Muxrek мишрух [Muxrux] [Ibragimov 1978: 187]. These look like loanwords, but the source of borrowing is not identified.

**Koshas Aghul:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 87; Suleymanov 2003: 38, 201; Shaumyan 1941: 167. The variant in -s is from [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990].

**Keren Aghul:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 87. The same in the Usug dialect: ĉek 'fish' [Shaumyan 1941: 167].

**Gequn Aghul:** Dirr 1907: 153, 182; Shaumyan 1941: 167.

In [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 87], only the loanword balus is quoted for 'fish'.

**Fite Aghul:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 87; Shaumyan 1941: 167.

**Aghul (proper):** Suleymanov 2003: 201; Shaumyan 1941: 167.

**Northern Tabasaran:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 87.

For the Khiv subdialect two words are known: the borrowing balurχ: 'fish (in general)' [Uslar 1979: 605, 1004] and the inherited term čič' with polysemy: 'small fish / locust' [Uslar 1979: 967, 1004]. Dirr, however, quotes only čič' 'fish (in general)' [Dirr 1905: 218, 241].


**Southern Tabasaran:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 87.


**Common Aghul:** Cf. also ĉek, čč' 'fish' [Magometov 1970: 72, 74], without dialect specification. Note the ejective dissimilation in the Richa form čč'.

In some dialects the inherited term čč' has been superseded with the Azerbaijani borrowing balig, dialectal (e.g., Quba) baluy 'fish'.

**Common Tabasaran:** An unclear situation. Upon first sight, čč' ~ čč' (re underrated in both Northern and Southern Tabasaran) čč' 'fish' < Lezgian 'čč'. [NCED: 333].

On the other hand, local Southern χˤad 'fish' (characteristic of the Eteg group of subdialects [Genko 2005: 223], but also having penetrated in Literary Tabasaran) originates from the best candidate for the status of the Proto-Lezgian term for 'fish': Lezgian χˤan: [NCED: 1078]. We suppose that Southern χˤad goes back to the Proto-Tabasaran word for 'fish', whereas the widespread Tabasaran term čč' ~ čč' 'fish' reflects later influence on the part of the neighboring Aghul language (this isogloss did not affect the Eteg group of Tabasaran subdialects, which is the most remote from the Aghul area). In such a case the original Proto-Tabasaran meaning of čč' ~ čč' could be 'locust', as proved by the Northern Tabasaran polysemy.

In some subdialects, inherited forms tend to be superseded with the borrowing from Azerbaijani balig, dialectal (e.g., Quba) baluy 'fish'. Northern Tabasaran balurχ: is a corruption of the same Azerbaijani word, although the phonetic development is unclear.

**Gyune Lezgi:** Uslar 1896: 385, 630. Paradigm: wet/ [abs.]/ wet-re-[obl.]/ wet-er [pl.].

In Literary Lezgi the generic term for 'fish' is balurχ: [όαηρμθς] 'fish' [Talibov & Gadzhiev 1966: 58; Gadzhiev 1950: 737; Haspelmath 1993: 482, 519], borrowed from Azerbaijani balig, dialectal (e.g., Quba) baluy 'fish'. The inherited term wet/ [abs.]/ wet-re-[obl.] [τςεα] shifted to the more specific meaning 'large fish' [Talibov & Gadzhiev 1966: 93; Gadzhiev 1950: 737] (glossed simply as 'fish' in [Haspelmath 1993: 490, 519]).

Only the loanword is attested in the Akhty dialect: Khlyut balus 'fish' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 87].

**Proto-Lezgian:** NCED: 1078. Distribution: An unstable term, superseded by the Azerbaijani loanword in many Nuclear Lezgian lects.
From the distributive point of view, three roots enter into competition.
1) *χːan [NCED: 1078]. This root is retained in several Nuclear Lezgian languages: Proto-Rutul (attested in Shinaz), Proto-Tabasaran (attested in Eteg), Proto-Lezgi (attested in Gyune). Since *χːan is descended from the best candidate for the status of the general North Caucasian term for 'fish', we reconstruct this Lezgian root with the meaning 'fish'.
2) *χˤawχay [LEDb: #262]. This root denotes 'fish' in Archi, but 'snail' in Tabasaran; no further etymology. In Proto-Lezgian, it could have denoted 'snail' vel sim.
3) *eʰliː- [NCED: 533]. This root denotes 'fish' in Udi, but 'green', 'blue' and 'wet' in Nuclear Lezgian. It can actually be considered the best candidate for Proto-Lezgian 'green' (the shift 'green, blue' > 'fish' seems more natural than *vice versa*).

A fourth inherited root, also attested with the meaning 'fish', is *č'ǣl [NCED: 333] (the variant *č'ǣl: is apparently unnecessary, because dialectal fluctuations in Aghul and Kryts seem local and late). It means 'fish' in Aghul and, secondarily, in the neighboring Tabasaran dialects (the original Proto-Tabasaran meaning of this root was, quite likely, 'locust'). Its suffixed Kryts cognate means 'green', whereas external North Caucasian comparanda suggest the meaning 'lizard' or 'frog'. An unclear situation. Maybe the Proto-Lezgian meaning of *č'ǣl was indeed 'a k. of reptile' with a later shift to 'green' in Kryts, 'fish' in Aghul and 'locust' in Tabasaran.

In Rutul dialects, the forms murطبع - miضبع - mیببع 'fish' have no clear origin.

Replacements: ['green' > 'fish'] (Udi), ['a k. of reptile' > 'fish'] (Kryts), ['snail' > 'fish'] (Archi), ['locust' > 'fish'] (Tabasaran). See also notes on 'star'.

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular.

Semantics and structure: Primary substantive root.

30. FLY V.


References and notes:

Nidzh Udi: Gukasyan 1974: 190, 191 (sub pur & purpesun); Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 482; Mobilii 2010: 236 (sub pur & purpesun). In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010], there is instead a syncopated form pur-p-sun (ncpyncyn). Polysemy: 'to fall, collapse, to go to ruin / to fly, hover'.

Vartashen Udi: Gukasyan 1974: 190, 191 (sub pur & purpesun); Fähnrich 1999: 26; Dirr 1903: 69; Schiefler 1863: 99; Schulze 2001: 308; Starchevskiy 1891: 486. Polysemy: 'to fall, collapse, to go to ruin / to fly, hover'.

Common Udi: Common Udi *pur-p-esun, formed with the verbal prefix -p- 'to say, to do smth. with the mouth; to do smth. (in general)' [Schulze 2005: 565 ff. (3.4.2.2 #15 ff.); Harris 2002: 204 ff.].

Caucasian Albanian: Unattested.

Archi: Chumakina et al. 2007; Kibrik & Kodzazov 1988: 82; Kibrik et al. 1977b: 292, 365; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 482; Mikailov 1967: 196; Dirr 1908: 174, 212. According to [Mikailov 1967], with polysemy: 'to fly / to fly up'. Complex verb, formed with the suppletive light verb -bo- 'to say'. The root pʰarχː- is borrowed from Avar pʰarχː-ne ‘to flit, flutter, take wing’. The old root for 'to fly' could be retained in the Archi complex verb pʰar-bo- 'to stream, fly (of flag); to flash (of lightning)’ [Kibrik et al. 1977b: 292; Chumakina et al. 2007]. In [NCED: 875] Archi pʰarχː- is analyzed as an indigenous form influenced by the Avar verb, but from the formal viewpoint we prefer to treat this as a loanword.

Alyk Krys: Author: 2009: 405. Paradigm: q=anqʷ'um- [imperf.]/ q=anqʷun- [perf., inv.]. Obviously corresponds to the Krys proper verb, although morphophonological details are not entirely clear.

Budukh: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 82. Missing from [Meylanova 1984] as a separate entry, but attested in examples, e.g., [Meylanova 1984: 41 (sub hadulur), 54 (sub durna), 157 (sub ēngule), etc.]. In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 482] quoted as "učmiši sīlī [ywxmyan çarq]. Borrowed from Azeri uč-mag (perfect stem uč-muš) 'to fly', plus the Budukh verbs yixo- ~ yixo:/ saxa- 'to be come' or sīlī- 'to do'.

Distinct from pir-pir sīlī 'to fly up, take wing', literally 'to make pir-pir' [Meylanova 1984: 120]. Further cf. pir-pir 'propeller blade; may-bug' [Meylanova 1984: 120].


Mikik Tsakhur: Dirr 1913: 185, 228. Future stem.

In [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 82], however, only the loanword učmiš-x- 'to fly' is quoted, borrowed from the Azeri perfect stem uč-muiš (infinitive uč-mag) 'to fly', plus the Tsakhur verb ix- 'to become'.

Gelmets Tsakhur: Ibragimov 1990: 197. Imperfect stem. Labialization of χ is quite unclear. In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 482], the future stem is quoted as alβ=ix-: alβ=ix- u- χ- a (a:nuxax) (this form of the class 3 does not permit to distinguish between χ and other).

Common Tsakhur: Initial VV is a prefix with general semantics [Ibragimov 1990: 123; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 41].


Ixrek Rutul: Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 176, 352. Polysemy: 'to jump / to jump to one's feet / to fly'. It must be noted that in [Ibragimov 1990: 194], this verb is quoted as l=âič- [na=nuŋŋ] 'to jump'.

Luchek Rutul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 81, 82. Polysemy: 'to jump / to fly'.

Common Rutul: In the Muxre dialect, l=âič- 'to jump' is attested [Ibragimov 1990: 185, 187].

Forms with -â- and -âç- are apparently related; the irregular shift ɨ > š seems to be due to the expressive nature of the root. Initial l= is a prefix with general semantics [Ibragimov 1978: 95; Alekseev 1994a: 227; Makhmudova 2001: 165].


It must be noted that in [Suleymanov 2003: 62], Koshan f-alga-na- or f-alga-na- [raa=raa] (without subjunctive specification) is translated as 'to fly'. Cf. the same verb, modified with another prefix: Burshag h-alga-na- 'to run away' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 82; Suleymanov 2003: 62].

Keren Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 82; Magometov 1970: 136. The collocation zaw-u-šo ba- 'to go (q.v.) across the sky (zaw-)'.

Gequn Aghul: Not attested.

Fite Aghul: Not attested.

Aghul (proper): Suleymanov 2003: 62. Polysemy: 'to run, run away / to fly'. Pace [NCED: 491], may be analyzed as the prefixed stem h=âič- with the spatial prefix h='before' (for which see [Magometov 1970: 158 ff.]).

Common Aghul: Unstable and poorly documented verb. Proto-Aghul reconstruction is impossible. It should be noted that all attested forms are based on the verbs for 'to go' or 'to run'.

Northern Tabasaran: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 82.


Southern Tabasaran: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 82.


Cf. Literary Tabasaran p'urr ap- 'to fly up, take wing', literally 'to make p'urr' [Khanmagomedov & Shalbugov 2001: 256].

Common Tabasaran: Initial t(V)= is the intensive spatial prefix.

Gyune Lezgi: Uslar 1896: 499, 616. Two expressions for 'to fly' are quoted by Uslar: luw âu-, literally 'to give (q.v.) wing (luw)' [Uslar...
The verb 'to fly' cannot be reconstructed with certainty.

The best candidate seems the root *ʔiiχV [NCED: 582], which means 'to fly' in two Nuclear Lezgian languages: Tsakhur, Tabasaran, but got lost in the rest of the lects. External North Caucasian comparison may confirm the Proto-Lezgian reconstruction *ʔiiχV ‘to fly’.

The second candidate is the expressive root *pVr [NCED: 874]. It is encountered as part of complex verbs in two outliers: Udi ('to fly') and Archi ('to make, fly (of flag)'; the generic meaning 'to fly' is expressed by the Avar loanword). Cf. also Nuclear Lezgian expressions for 'to fly up, take wing': Budukh 'to make *ʔäča- 'to make p'urr', Lezgi 'to make p'urr', which should rather be analyzed as onomatopoeic. Lezgian *pVr- also possesses external North Caucasian comparanda with the meaning 'to fly', although verbs of the shape p'ur are rather frequently attested as expressions for 'to fly' among the world's languages, and normally it is impossible to discriminate between etymological cognates and new onomatopoeic formations. For this reason we prefer to exclude Lezgian *pVr- from the list.

In Kryts, 'to fly' is expressed by the etymologically isolated =alqon- ~ wngʷan-. [LEDb: #234].

In Rutul, the old root was superseded with *ʔiɡъala-, whose Lezgian cognates, discussed in [NCED: 283], are semantically dubious, but the original Proto-Rutul meaning of this root should be 'to jump', judging by the synchronic Rutul polysemy to fly / to jump' (i.e. 'to jump' > 'to fly up' > 'to fly').

In Aghul dialects, the meaning 'to fly' is expressed by various prefixed roots with the original meanings 'to go' or 'to run' (the full collocation 'to go across the sky' = 'to fly' is also attested).

In Lezgi, two collocations for 'to fly' coexist: 'to give wing' and 'to go across the sky'.

In Budukh, superseded with the Avarian loanword.

Replacements: 'to jump' > 'to fly' (Rutul), 'to go' > 'to fly' (Aghul), 'to run' > 'to fly' (Aghul), 'to go across the sky' > 'to fly' (Aghul, Lezgi), 'to give wing' > 'to fly' (Lezgi).

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular.

Semantics and structure: Primary verbal root.

31. FOOT

Nidzh Udi tur {mypl} (1), Vartashen Udi tur {mypl} (1), Archi aq (2), Kryts (proper) qil (3), Alyk Kryts qil (3), Budukh qil {κωλι} (3), Mishlesh Tsakhur qelv {κελλ} (3), Mikik Tsakhur qelv (3), Gelmets Tsakhur qelv (3), Mukhad Rutul kil {γυλι} (3), Ixrek Rutul kil {γυλι} (3), Luchek Rutul kil (3), Koshan Aghul lek (4), Keren Aghul lak (4), Gequ Aghul lek (4), Fite Aghul lik (4), Aghul (proper) lik ~ lek (4), Northern Tabasaran lik (4), Southern Tabasaran lik (4), Gyune Lezgi kʷuafa (5), Proto-Lezgian *qel (3).

References and notes:

Nidzh Udi: Gukasyan 1974: 206; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 30; Mobili 2010: 269. Polysemy: 'leg / foot / paw'. In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 210], however, tur is glossed only as 'leg'.

There exists a separate specific Nidzh term for 'foot': čil [vulx] 'foot' [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 213] (glossed as 'foot'), [Gukasyan 1974: 256] (glossed as Russian 'iora' (i.e. leg with foot); missing from the main section of the dictionary). The origin of čil is unclear.

Common Udi: Common Udi *tʊɾ* 'leg / foot / paw'. Schulze's suspicions [Schulze 2001: 325] that Udi *tʊɾ* could be a Georgian loanword are unjustified not only from a sociolinguistic point of view, but also factologically (there is, in fact, no such word as Old Georgian *tʊɾ* 'foot').

Caucasian Albanian: *tʊɾ* 'foot' [Gippert et al. 2008: IV-18]. Distinct from *sɛqɛl* 'leg' or more specifically 'shank' [Gippert et al. 2008: IV-22] ('Then came the soldiers, and brake the legs of the first, and of the other').

Archi: Chumakina et al. 2007; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 30; Kibrik et al. 1977b: 190, 369; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 210, 212; Mikailov 1967: 172; Dirr 1908: 126, 215. Polysemy: 'leg (of human) / foot (of human) / hind leg (of animal)'. For the meaning 'leg' cf. "I have broken an arm and leg (aq)" [Dirr 1908: 126], "to break a leg (aq)" [Kibrik et al. 1977b: 191; Chumakina et al. 2007] (sub *aqlas*).

Distinct from the bound term *moːk*-ɑl 'foot', used in some idiomatic expressions [Kibrik et al. 1977b: 281; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 30; Chumakina et al. 2007]. Etymological evidence [NCED: 309] points to the primary meaning 'support'.

Kryts (proper): Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 30; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 210. Polysemy: 'foot / leg / step of staircase'. 'Foot' can also be expressed as *qɨl*-i ɨqɨn, literally 'bottom of *qɨl*' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 31].

Alyk Kryts: Authier 2009: 25; 34, 71, 237, etc. Polysemy: 'foot / leg'.


Distinct from the more specific term * ćeřeč* ['leple'] 'shinbone; shin; leg' [Meylanova 1984: 158].


In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 213], 'foot' is glossed as *mɪk?i* (mâxâmî) - an enigmatic form (cf. *mɪk* 'dance; kick' [Ibragimov & Nurmamedov 2010: 268]).

Tsakhur-Kum Tsakhur: *el* [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 30]. Polysemy: 'foot / leg'. 'Foot' can also be expressed as *el*-i *xan*e, literally 'bottom of *el*' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 31].

Mikik Tsakhur: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 30; Dirr 1913: 150, 231. Polysemy: 'foot / leg'. The meaning 'foot' can also be expressed as *sɛl*-i *xan*e, literally 'bottom of *sɛl*' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 31].

Gelmets Tsakhur: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 30; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 210. Polysemy: 'foot / leg'. The meaning 'foot' can also be expressed as *sɛl*-i *xan*e, literally 'bottom of *sɛl*' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 31].

In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 213], 'foot' is erroneously glossed as *kʊt yaşama* [klyɾ'mɪ] in fact *kʊt nhu* [klyɾ'mɪ] means merely 'end, tip', at least in Literary Tsakhur [Ibragimov & Nurmamedov 2010: 205].

Mukhad Rutul: Dirr 1912: 132, 196; Ibragimov 1978: 115. Polysemy: 'foot / leg'. In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 212], 'foot' is erroneously quoted as *sɨi*-di xuɨdɨli [xъылды хаъъды], which literally means 'of foot' (gen.) + 'front' (adj.).

Ixrek Rutul: Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 66, 364. Polysemy: 'foot / leg / paw'. 'Foot' can also be expressed as *sɨi*-di ɨqɨn, literally 'bottom of *sɨi*' [Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 66].

In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 212], 'foot' is erroneously quoted as *qɨl* [qъыл], which actually means 'foreleg (of animal)' [Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 58].


Keren Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 30. Polysemy: 'foot / leg'. 'Foot' can also be expressed as *tʊɾe lak*, literally 'flat *lak*' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 30].

Gequn Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 30; Dirr 1907: 133, 178; Shaumyany 1941: 158. Polysemy: 'foot / leg'. 'Foot' can also be expressed as *tʊɾe lak*, literally 'flat *lak*' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 31].

Fite Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 30; Shaumyany 1941: 158. Polysemy: 'foot / leg'.

Aghul (proper): Suleymanov 2003: 128; Shaumyany 1941: 158. Apparently with polysemy: 'foot / leg'. *Tpiŋ* ɬːɭ is glossed by Suleymanov and Shaumyany as Russian 'нога', which can mean 'foot', 'leg' or 'foot / leg'. Cf. the following examples for the meaning 'foot': "My foot fell into the mud" [Suleymanov 2003: 68], "Hit the ball with a foot!" [Suleymanov 2003: 104], "My foot stuck in the mud" [Suleymanov 2003: 161, 211], "A snake has crawled near my foot" [Suleymanov 2003: 165], "Don't move your feet quickly" [Magometov 1970: 196 strophe XVII]. However, no unambiguous examples for the
meaning 'leg' have been found.

Two additional (more marginal) words are glossed as 'nora' in [Suleymanov 2003]: *murk* 'nora; hoof' [Suleymanov 2003: 135] and *tur* 'furniture leg; nora (disparaging)' [Suleymanov 2003: 159].

**Northern Tabasaran**: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 30. Polysemy: 'foot / leg'. 'Foot' can also be expressed as lik-r-in kan, literally 'bottom of lik' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 30].


**Southern Tabasaran**: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 30. Polysemy: 'foot / leg'. 'Foot' can also be expressed as lik-r-in kan, literally 'bottom of lik' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 30].


**Gyune Lezgi**: Uslar 1896: 474, 619. Polysemy: 'foot / leg'. This is the most generic and basic term, cf. some examples for the meaning 'foot': 'I have blisters on my foot (due to chafing boot)' [Uslar 1896: 466], "The dog is lying at its master's feet" [Uslar 1896: 488], "I got my foot wet in this boot" [Uslar 1896: 526], "His foot slipped and he fell" [Uslar 1896: 586], "The boots pinch my feet" [Uslar 1896: 592], etc. A second word for 'foot' is q'ül with polysemy: 'foot / dance, dancing' [Uslar 1896: 534, 634], but it is less frequent in the anatomic meaning than k'ʷač. Two examples for q'ül 'foot' have been found: "He got under my foot (= I trod on him)", "I kicked him with my foot" [Uslar 1896: 534]. Cf. also the expression k'ʷač k'an 'sole of the foot', literally 'bottom of k'ʷač' [Uslar 1896: 471].


The same in the Akhty dialect: Khlyut k'ʷač 'foot / leg' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 30]. The meaning 'foot' can also be expressed as k'ʷač-k'an 'bottom of k'ʷač' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 31].

**Proto-Lezgian**: NCED: 455. Distribution: First of all, it must be noted that the attested basic terms display the polysemy 'foot / leg' in all languages, except for Caucasian Albanian (the latter may be due to chance); the same polyseme should be reconstructed for Proto-Lezgian.

Three Lezgian roots are equal candidates for the status of the Proto-Lezgian term for 'foot / leg' from the distributive point of view: (1) *ya(m)tur* [NCED: 674], meaning 'foot / leg' in Udi; (2) *ʔaqː* [NCED: 244], meaning 'foot / leg' in Archi; (3) *qːel* [NCED: 455], meaning 'foot / leg' in South and West Lezgian.

Out of these, *ya(m)tur* denotes 'thigh, hip' in Nuclear Lezgian, and its external North Caucasian comparanda also point to the meaning 'thigh, hip' [NCED: 674]. Thus, it is natural to posit *ya(m)tur* as the Proto-Lezgian root for 'thigh, hip' and assume the shift 'thigh, hip' > 'foot / leg' in the Udi branch (in Caucasian Albanian this root is attested for 'foot').

The second root, *ʔaqː*: [NCED: 244], is attested with the polysemy 'leg (of human) / foot (of human) / hind leg (of animal)' in Archi and as narrower 'hind leg (of animal)' in some Nuclear Lezgian lects. The most economic solution is to reconstruct its Proto-Lezgian meaning as 'hind leg (of animal)' (with further developments in Archi).

The third competing root is *qːel* [NCED: 455], which is retained in South Lezgian (Kryts, Budukh) and West Lezgian (Tsakhur, Rutul), where it means 'foot / leg'. Distributively this should be posited as the Proto-Nuclear Lezgian term for 'foot / leg', and there is no counter evidence for the same semantic reconstruction on the Proto-Lezgian level.

In East Lezgian, *qːel* was probably superseded with other roots. In Aghul and Tabasaran, 'foot / leg' is expressed by *lik* [NCED: 755], whose original Proto-Lezgian meaning is likely to have been 'leg bone' (see notes on 'bone'). In Lezgi, the root *k'ʷarč* [NCED: 733] is used for 'foot / leg'; the original meaning of *k'ʷarč* is not entirely clear, but it could be 'heel, sole' (shifted to 'hoof' in Rutul-Tsakhur), as suggested by the external North Caucasian comparanda.

Cf. also recent semantic developments into 'foot' in individual lects: 'hooft' > 'foot' in Aghul Proper (*murk*); 'furniture leg' > 'foot / leg' in Aghul Proper (*tir*); 'kick; dance, dancing' > 'foot' in Gyune and Literary Lezgi (q'ül). In many Nuclear Lezgian lects, the collocations 'bottom of leg/foot' (Kryts, Tsakhur, Rutul, Tabasaran, Lezgi) or 'flat leg/foot' (Aghul) can also be used for the specific meaning 'foot'.
32. FULL

Nidzh Udi $b=uy$ {ɗỳū} (1), Vartashen Udi $b=uy$ {ɗỳū} (1), Archi ‘$ac'u-t:u$-CLASS (1), Kryts (proper) $ʕac'ä$- (1), Alyk Kryts $ʕac'a$ (1), Budukh $s=ac'a$ {caçla} (1), Mishlesh Tsakhur $g^y=ac^yi-n$ {ŋiãoiuni} (1), Mikik Tsakhur $g^y=ac^yi-n$ (1), Gelmets Tsakhur $g^y=āc^yi-yi-n$ (1), Mukhad Rutul $ac'i-d$ {ŋiulοd} (1), Ixrek Rutul $l=ec'i-d$ {ŋiulοd} (1), Luchek Rutul $ac'i-d$ (1), Koshan Aghul $ʔ=ac'i-r$ ~ $ac'a-r$ (1), Gequn Aghul $ac'u-f$ (1), Fite Aghul $ac'u-t$ (1), Aghul (proper) $ʔ=ac'u-f$ ~ $ac'u-f$ (1), Southern Tabasaran ‘$ac'u$ [ŋiły] (1), Gyune Lezgi $ac'a$- (1), Proto-Lezgian *$ʰac'ɨ*$- (1).

References and notes:


Common Udi: Common Udi *$b=uy$, historically = *$b=uy$ with the fossilized class prefix $b$; see notes on ‘to burn’.

Caucasian Albanian: $bai$ ‘full; fulfilled, complete, perfect’ [Gippert et al. 2008: IV-7]; an etymological cognate of the modern Udi term.

Arch: Chumakina et al. 2007; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 612; Dirr 1908: 130. In [Chumakina et al. 2007] (sub $ővćütu$) erroneously transcribed with short initial vowels, although vowel length is proven by the sound files. Polysemy: ‘full, filled / satiated’.

Regular participle from the verb ‘$ac'u$- to fill (trans.) to be filled to satiate oneself’ [Kibrik et al. 1977b: 195; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 101; Chumakina et al. 2007; Mikhailov 1967: 173; Dirr 1908: 130].


Budukh: Meylanova 1984: 78 (sub $kdi$). In [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 241], $s=ac'a$ is quoted as ‘thick, portly; satiated’ (intervocalic gminated -$c$- is either a typo or the influence of the same sporadic phenomenon of the Azerbaijani language, cf., however, [Alekseev 1994: 294]). Polysemy: ‘full / satiated’. Participle from the verb $s=ac'a$- [caçla] ‘to become filled’ [Meylanova 1984: 125; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 101]. Initial $s$- is a prefix with general semantics [Alekseev 1994: 271 f.].

Distinct from $dulu$ [ŋiły] ‘full’ [Meylanova 1984: 54], whose application is unknown; borrowed from Azerbaijani $dulu$ ‘full’.

In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 612], ‘full’ is glossed as $tənamu$ [$təmamy$, but in fact $tənam$ means ‘finished; comprehensive’ [Meylanova 1984: 132], borrowed from Azerbaijani $tənam$ ‘full (in abstract sense), ultimately from Arabic.


Distinct from $bikiri-n$ ‘full (in abstract sense), whole; finished’ [Kibrik et al. 1999: 870].

Tsakh-Kum Tsakhur: cf. $g^w=ac'i-n$ ‘satiated’ [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 241].

Mikik Tsakhur: Dirr 1913: 146, 234. In [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 241], $g^w=ac'i-n$ is glossed as ‘thick, portly; satiated’. Polysemy: ‘full / satiated’.

Gelmets Tsakhur: Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 612. In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 612], erroneously spelled as $g^w=či-yi-n$ ['təməəm']. In [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 241], $g^w=āc^yi-n$ is glossed as ‘thick, portly; satiated’. Polysemy: ‘full / satiated’.

Mukhad Rutul: Dirr 1912: 120, 198; Makhmudova 2001: 167; Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 179; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 612. In [Dirr 1912: 175], the class 3 form ac'ɪ-d is also quoted as a separate entry. A prefixless participle from the labile verb h=ac'ɪ- ['sateca'] ‘to fill; to become filled’ [Makhmudova 2001: 252].


Common Rutul: Shinaz dialect: l=ac'ɪ-d ‘full’ [Dirr 1912: 156].

Koshan Aghul: Suleymanov 2003: 209; Shaumyan 1941: 139. The prefixless form is from [Shaumyan 1941]; according to [Shaumyan 1941] and [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 241], ac'ɪ-r displays polysemy: ‘full / satiated’. Suleymanov’s ṭ=ac'ɪ-r is a regular derivative from the verbs ac'ɪ- ~ ṭ=ac'ɪ- ‘to fill (intrans.); to satiate oneself’ [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 101; Suleymanov 2003: 35, 209; Shaumyan 1941: 139] (in [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988] and [Shaumyan 1941], only the prefixless stem is quoted; Suleymanov gives both verbs; incorrectly glossed as ‘to fill (trans.)’ by Shaumyan). Kibrik & Kodzasov’s and Shaumyan’s ac'ɪ-r ‘full’ is less clear because of the thematic -а-.


The same in the other subdialects: Tsirkhe, Duldug ac'а-f ‘full / satiated’ [Shaumyan 1941: 139].

Common Aghul: Initial ṭ= is the spatial prefix ‘in’ [Magometov 1970: 158 ff.].

Northern Tabasaran: Not attested in any Northern Tabasaran sources. Cf. Dyubek a-CLASS-e‘i ‘satiated’ [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 241], which, apparently, possesses the basic meaning ‘full’.


Common Tabasaran: Participle from the Common Tabasaran verb ‘to fill (trans., intrans.)’: Khyuryuk, Khiv, Literary Tabasaran, etc. ‘а-’ [Genko 2005: 12, 21; Khamagomoev & Shalbuzov 2001: 45].


For the Akhty dialect (Khlyut), inherited ac’a-y is documented only in the meaning ‘satiated’ [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 241].

Proto-Lezgian: NCED: 525. Distribution: One of the most stable Lezgian roots, retained in its basic meaning in all Lezgian lects. The root is originally verbal - ‘to be full, to fill (intrans.). In all the languages, the adjectival meaning ‘full’ is expressed by participial formations. Just like the plain verb ‘to be full’, this root has survived in Archi and the most Nuclear Lezgian languages, but has been lost in Udi and Kryts (where ‘to fill (trans.)’ is a secondary factitive formation from ‘full’).

This basic adjective displays the polysemy ‘full / satiated’ in all or almost all the languages; the same polysemy ‘to be full / to be satiated’ should be reconstructed for the Proto-Lezgian verb (the Proto-Lezgian development ‘full’ > ‘satiated’).

In some Nuclear Lezgian lects the development ‘full’ > ‘thick’ is attested as well (Budukh, Tsakhur, Aghul).
33. GIVE

Nidzh Udi *tad-* {maθ- ~ macmlum} (1), Vartashen Udi *tad-* {maθ- ~ macmlum} (1), Archi =λ- (1), Kryts (proper) v=uc'ɛn- (2) / vu- (1), Alyk Kryts v=uc'ɛ- (2) / vu- (1), Budukh yuc'ui-
\{uyuɬy]- (2) / yiʃə- {үүүа}- (1), Mishlesh Tsakhur h=el- {гүүлес, гүүле} (1) / h=ɨw- (1), Mikik Tsakhur h=el- (1) / h=ɨw- (1), Gelmets Tsakhur h=ɨl- {ъылес} (1), Mukhad Rutul CLASS=ɨw=iɛ'- {榆u} (2) / CLASS=ɨw-i-r (1), Ixrek Rutul CLASS=ɨiɛ'- {榆u} (2) / CLASS=ɨw-i-r (1), Koshan Aghul ic'-aɾ-di- (2) / i-na-ɨw (1), Keren Aghul i-ne (1), Gequn Aghul ic'-an-di- (2) / i-na (1), Fite Aghul ic'-aɾa (2) / i-na (1), Aghul (proper) ic'-aɾ-di- (2) / i-na ~ ɨi-ne (1), Northern Tabasaran l-iɛ'- (2) / d= alignments (1), Southern Tabasaran =ɨw- ~ t=ɨw- (1), Gyune Lezgi ɨu- (1), Proto-Lezgian *ʔiƛːɨ- (1).

References and notes:

Nidzh Udi: Gukasyan 1974: 258; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 528. In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010] the masdar form is erroneously quoted as *tad:un {Hacrľyn} for *tast:un {Hacrľyn}. The masdar *tast:un originates from *tad:un with the regular metathesis ds > st: (for which see [Maisak 2008a: 151 ff.; Schulze 1982: 90; Gukasyan 1974: 258]).


Common Udi: As is traditionally suggested (e.g., [Schulze 2005: 542 (3.4.2.1 #24)]) and now proven by the Caucasian Albanian data, Udi *tad- is to be analyzed as *tad- with the preverb *tad- ‘thither’ and the old root d- ‘to give’. The latter lost its meaning in modern Udi and currently only functions as a light verb with general semantics [Schulze 2005: 572 ff. (3.4.2.2 #28 ff.)]. In all likelihood, Udi d- goes back to *day- < Proto-Caucasian Albanian-Udi *daw- (with the shift θ > ɨ in the intervocalic position before front vowels or before consonants), which was further reanalyzed as *d-a- and levelled up across the paradigm. Quite a different analysis has tentatively been proposed in [NCED: 1034] (whose authors were actually not aware of the Caucasian Albanian data): Udi ta-d- with the hypothetical root ta- ‘to lack’, lacking East Caucasian comparanda.

Note also that in Caucasian Albanian the root of the present stem ‘to give’ is ɨw-, but it did not survive in modern Udi (as opposed to Caucasian Albanian, the Udi present forms are apparently secondary, originating from the infinitive; [Maisak 2008b: 164 ff.; Maisak 2008a: 115]).

Caucasian Albanian: A suppletive paradigm ɨw- (present) / ɨɗa- (infinitive, past, imperative) with polysemy: ‘to give / to deliver, hand over’ [Gippert et al. 2008: II-44, 45, 51, IV-13]. Besides these, prefixed variants ta-lu俸a- / ta=lu俸a- are attested, which are closely synonymous to the plain forms in the palimpsests [Gippert et al. 2008: IV-17]. For the prefix/preverb ta- ‘thither’ see notes on ‘to go’.


Alyk Kryts: Authier 2009: 156 ff., 416. Paradigm: *v=uc'ɛ- [imperf.] / vu(y)- [perf.] / vɨt [inv.]. It must be noted that, as opposed to
Kryts proper, there is no nasal imperfective in this Alyk verb. Authier 2009: 156 ff., 416. Perfective stem.


**Mishlesh Tsakhur:** Kibrik et al. 1999: 74, 77, 877, 893. Supposedly missing from [Ibragimov & Nurmamedov 2010]. In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 528], erroneously quoted as h=ep-e Constraint. Suppletive paradigm: h=el/-e [imperf.] / h=ɪw-o [perf.] / h=ɪl/-e [fut., impv.].


**Gelmets Tsakhur:** Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 528. In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010], erroneously quoted as h=ɪy- [trans]. The future stem.

**Common Tsakhur:** Both Tsakhur stems, h=el/-e (imperfective) and h=ɪw-o (perfective), apparently represent one proto-root. Initial h= is a prefix with general semantics [Ibragimov 1990: 124; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 41].


Suppletive paradigm: CLASS=ɪr=i-t-c-a-r. [imperf.] / CLASS=ɪr=i-r [perf.] / CLASS=ɪy [imv.]. In [Ibragimov 1978], the imperfective stem is quoted with regular *-a- instead of *-ə-. The imperative form is a result of secondary reanalysis, see notes on Mukhad Rutul. Perfective stem.


Suppletive paradigm: CLASS=ɪ=-r-c-a-r [imperf.] / CLASS=ɪ=-r [perf.] / CLASS=ɪy [imv.]. In [Ibragimov 1978], the imperfective stem is quoted as the class 3 exponent. In [Dirır 1912], the imperfective and perfective stems are quoted with the assimilated sequence *-aw- instead of *-ər-. Perfective stem.

**Luchek Rutul:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 68. Imperfective stem.

Suppletive paradigm: CLASS=ɪ=-r-c-a-r [imperf.] / CLASS=ɪ=-r [perf.] / CLASS=ɪy [imv.]. Perfective stem.

**Common Rutul:** The suppletive paradigms generally coincide in all dialects. Note the rare imperfective inflected *-t- in Mukhad and Luchek. Initial *w= in the imperfective stem (Mukhad, Luchek) seems a rare (or unique) case of the prefix *w= (cf. the same prefixal morpheme in the Kryts imperfective stem).

**Koshan Aghul:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 68; Suleymanov 2003: 94.

Suppletive paradigm: *iː-t-an-di [imperf.] / i-na [inf.]; t-il [imv.]; ma=ɪt-i-c-a [prohib]. Final *-a- in the imperfective (aorist) form looks like a fossilized class exponent; *l= in the proformative form is a spatial prefix (Magometov 1970: 158 ff.). Perfective stem.

**Keren Aghul:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 68. Suppletive paradigm: imperf. not attested / i-ne [perf.]; i-s [inf.]; t-in [imv.]; ma=yc-a [prohib].

A somewhat different paradigm in the Usug subdialect: *cː-ɪy- [imperf.]; *g=ɪ-ne [perf.]; c-a-s [inf.]; t-in [imv.] 'to give' [Shaumyan 1941: 147]. Initial *g- in the perfective form is apparently a rare spatial prefix.


**Fite Aghul:** Magometov 1970: 185. Suppletive paradigm: ic-ada [imperf.]; i-na [perf.]; ic-a-s [inf.]; t-in [imv.]. Perfective stem.

**Aghul (proper):** Suleymanov 2003: 94; Shaumyan 1941: 147. Suppletive paradigm: ic=an-di [imperf.]; i-na ~ yi-ne [perf.]; ye-s [inf.]; t-in [imv.]. Perfective stem.

**Common Aghul:** A very irregular verb with three roots: ic-, i-, t-, although the suppletive paradigms generally coincide in the dialects.

**Northern Tabasaran:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 68. Synchronically, a very irregular verb: d=we=ɪy- ~ laic' [imperf.] / du=ɪw-a- ~ ɪy- [inf.].

Southern Tabasaran: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 68. Regular paradigm.

Similarly in the Khiv subdialect: tː=ʁuː ~ tː=ʁw- {тэўүү, тэасүү} 'to give' [Genko 2005: 146]. The same in Literary Tabasaran: tː=ʁuː ~ tː=ʁw- {тэўүү} 'to give' [Khanmagomedov & Shalbuzov 2001: 282].

Common Tabasaran: Initial dV= / tː= / t= and l= are desemanticized spatial preverbs.

Historically, a suppletive verb with two stems: l=ic'- [imperf.] / TV=a'uy- [perf.]. This paradigm was totally levelled in Southern Tabasaran and is being currently eliminated in the Northern dialect. The manifold Northern forms with y and w (< y) illustrate the complicated reflection of Proto-Lezgian *ʔiː depending on the position, see [NCED: 134].


The same in Literary Lezgi: gu- [imperf.] / gu- [perf.] / ce [imv.] [тэвыүү] 'to give' [Talibov & Gadzhiev 1966: 89; Gadzhiev 1950: 157; Haspelmath 1993: 489, 520; Gyulmagomedov 2004, 1: 194]. Pace [NCED: 626], the imperative stem is ce (i.e. c'e), not ce, as proved by both Uslar’s and Haspelmath’s transcription.

Proto-Lezgian: NCED: 640. Distribution:

This root has survived as the basic equivalent for ‘to give’ in all Lezgian lects. In Caucasian Albanian and especially in modern Udi, the reflexes of *ʔiːː are not fully transparent. Following [Schulze 2005: 542 (3.4.2.1 #24); Gippert et al. 2008: II-71], we analyze the Proto-Caucasian Albanian-Udi paradigm *lːːuː- [imperf.] / *dːːaː- [perf.] ‘to give’ as *lu=: / *da=:, where the original root ‘w is modified by two unique prefixes lu=: and da=: (at least for *lu=: there is an interesting comparandum in Khinalug: łaː=kʰʷi ‘to give’; łaː is the Khinalug preverb ‘from the speaker’). Due to phonetic mutations and morphological levellings, in modern Udi the paradigm *lu=: / *da=: has been transformed into a unified stem taːː, historically taːː, where taːː is the rare prefix ‘thither’.

In Proto-Nuclear Lezgian, the paradigm became suppletive, with the additional root *ʔiːːa- involved: *ʔiːːa- [imperf.] / *ʔiːːi- [perf.]. The original meaning of *ʔiːːa- is not clear; external North Caucasian comparison suggests something like ‘to compensate’ [NCED: 626]. It must be noted that in Tsakhur, Lezgi and some Tabasaran dialects, this suppletive paradigm was levelled backwards in favor of the root *ʔiːːi-.

Replacing: *to compensate > ‘to give’? (Proto-Nuclear Lezgian).

Semantics and structure: Primary verbal root with the Ablaut grade *ʔoːː.

33. GIVE

Northern Tabasaran du=ʔuːw- (1).

References and notes:

Northern Tabasaran: Perfective stem.

34. GOOD

Nidzh Udi šahatː ~ šavatː ~ šəvatː ~ šətː: {шəвəтI ~ шəвəтI ~ шəвалI ~ шəвалI} (1), Vartashen Udi šel {үэл} (2), Archi hib’a-tu-CLASS (3), Kryts (proper) wala (4), Alyk Kryts yala (4), Budukh Sari {запу} (5), Mishlesh Tsakhir yugu-n {нəгүн} (6), Mikik Tsakhir yugu-n (6), Gelmets Tsakhir yugu-n* {нəгүн*} (6), Mukhad Rutul y=q’-di {иык’ды} (7), Irrek Rutul h=q’-di {ык’ды} (7), Koshan Aghul iʒe-r (8), Keren Aghul iʒe-f (8), Gequn Aghul iʒe-f ~ iʒe-f (8), Fite Aghul iʒi-t (8), Aghul (proper) iʒe-f (8), Northern Tabasaran iʒi (8), Southern Tabasaran uʒu {ыэшү} (8), Gyune Lezgi qis’e-n (9), Proto-Lezgian *yuk’i- (6).
References and notes:


Common Udi: Both terms, šâhat ~ šêat: and şêl, are of unknown origin. The relative antiquity of Vartashen şêl is proven by Caucasian Albanian şêl-thesun ‘to be good, apt for smth., to suit’. Schulze [Schulze 2001: 320] suspects an Azerbaijani loan in şêl (< Azerbaijani gizâl ‘beautiful, nice’; incorrectly quoted as gizel ‘good, nice’ by Schulze), which is unjustified.

Caucasian Albanian: ey [Gippert et al. 2008: IV-14]; perhaps an important archaism (thus [Gippert et al. 2008]). Cf. also another root in şêl-thesun ‘to be good, apt for smth., to suit’ (“it (the salt) is thenceforth good for nothing”) [Gippert et al. 2008: IV-33] with the generic verb ih-esun ‘to be, become’ [Gippert et al. 2008: IV-19].

Arch: Chumakina et al. 2007; Kibrik et al. 1917b: 239, 387; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 715; Mikailov 1967: 178; Dirr 1908: 151, 225. Regular participle from the stative verb hibî ‘to be good’ [Kibrik et al. 1917b: 239; Chumakina et al. 2007].

Kryts (proper): LEDb; Saadiev 1994: 418; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 715. In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010] the variant yâlî is also quoted. Looks like a loanword (the fluctuation x ~ y is particularly irregular, cf. also the Alyk Kryts form yâla), but the source in unidentified.

Alyk Kryts: Authier 2009: 38, 64, 75, etc. See notes on Kryts proper.

Budukh: Meylanova 1984: 45, 249; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 715. Looks like a loanword, but the source has not been identified.


Luchek Rutul: Not attested.


Initial y= and b= are fossilized class 1/4 exponents. Final -di/-d is the attributive suffix.


The same in the other subdialects: Khudig, Arsug ije-d ‘good’ [Magometov 1970: 48, 92, 231 sentence 10, 234 sentence 27]. Cf. Magometov’s examples: Khudig “A good man has killed the wolf”, ’Ibragim is a good boy’, Arsug “Nowadays, roads are good”.

Keren Aghul: Magometov 1970: 105, 144. Cf. Magometov’s example: ’My hat is good’, “Books which I have read are good”.

The same in the Usug subdialect: ije-f ‘good’ [Shaumyan 1941: 143].

Gequn Aghul: Dirr 1907: 120, 187; Shaumyan 1941: 143. Cf. Dirr’s examples: “good man”, “good (= tasty) pilau”.

Fite Aghul: Magometov 1970: 48, 93.


The same in the other subdialects: Tsirkhe, Kurag ije-f ‘good’ [Magometov 1970: 49, 94, 122] (cf. Magometov’s example for Tsirkhe: “I know that you are a good man”).

Common Aghul: Final -d, -t, -f, -r are adjectival suffixes (fossilized class exponents) [Magometov 1970: 92; Shaumyan 1941: 45].

Northern Tabasaran: Uslar 1979: 729, 1009; Dirr 1905: 175, 246. The form is actually from the Khanag subdialect; the proper Kondik term for ‘good’ is unknown. Polysemy: ‘good / nice’. Cf. Uslar’s and Dirr’s examples: “Make this cart good (= repaired!)”, “He is a good mullah”, “good man”, “good water”. The same in the Khyuryuk subdialect: iji [ijجي] ‘good’ [Genko 2005: 74].

Distinct from the more specific Khanag term χûş ‘good, nice, pleasant’ [Uslar 1979: 955, 1009; Dirr 1905: 215, 246] (“a very nice man”, “this food is pleasant for me”, “nice weather”, “welcome!”), borrowed from Azerbaijani χoş ‘nice’.
**Southern Tabasaran:** Genko 2005: 151. The form is actually from the Khiv and Tinit subdialects; the proper Kondik term for 'good' is unknown.

The same in Literary Tabasaran: ḥevi [χεβ] 'good' [Khanmagomedov & Shalbuzov 2001: 293].

**Gyune Lezgi:** Uslar 1896: 479, 638. Distinct from the more specific Gyune term iy'er 'nice, beautiful; good' [Uslar 1896: 439] (according to Uslar's examples, 'nice' is the basic meaning).


Final -n in qise-n ~ qa-n is an adjectival suffix, see [Gaydarov et al. 2009: 139 f.]; historically it is a genitive exponent that modifies the substantive stem.

**Proto-Lezgian:** NCED: 643. Distribution: A highly unstable word; the Proto-Lezgian term cannot be reconstructed with certainty.

The root *yuki-* [NCED: 643] denotes 'good' in Tsakhur and 'right (spatial)' in Shinaz Rutul (according to NCED: 643, based on the unpublished MSU recordings), having been lost in the rest of Lezgian. We prefer *yuki-* as the Proto-Lezgian equivalent for 'good' for two reasons. First, it finds reliable North Caucasian cognates with the meaning 'good'. Second, the Caucasian Albanian form ey could originate from *yuki-, if we assume the development *-k- > -y-, as in modern Nidzh Udi (but not in Proto-Udi) [NCED: 125]. The latter argument is, however, weak, since Caucasian Albanian historical phonetics requires additional investigation.

In Rutul, the meaning 'good' is expressed by the root *HV(Property: *VNN)* [NCED: 620], whose original meaning must have been something like 'kind, beautiful' (this follows from its cognates in other Lezgian languages: 'kind' in Archi, 'handsome, beautiful' in Aghul).

In Lezgi, 'good' is derived from the substantive root *qis(a) 'part, property' [LEDb: # 48] (cf. its meaning 'goods, possessions' in Archi, 'part' in Aghul).

In Archi, superseded by *pVhV- ~ *hVpV- 'big' (see notes on 'big').

In Vartashen Udi, šel 'good' apparently originates from the meaning 'good for smth., apt for smth.', as suggested by its Caucasian Albanian cognate.

In Aghul-Tabasaran, 'good' is expressed by *hčV-, which is missing from the rest of Lezgian (some hypothetical external North Caucasian comparanda are proposed in [NCED: 248]).

Etymologically obscure forms include: Nidzh Udi šahat ~ šat ~ šat; Vartashen Udi šel, Kryts salá ~ yala, Budukh fari.

**Replacements:** (big) > 'good' (Archi), ('kind, beautiful' > 'good') (Rutul), ('good for smth., apt for smth.' > 'good') (Vartashen Udi), ('part, property' > 'good') (Lezgi), ('good' > 'right (spatial)') (Shinaz Rutul).

**Reconstruction shape:** Tsakhur-Rutul correspondences are regular.

**Semantics and structure:** Primary stative verbal root 'to be good'.

35. **GREEN**


**References and notes:**

Distinct from dây(i) [dây(i)] ‘unripe; raw; green’ [Gukasyan 1974: 109; Mobili 2010: 97] (this is, however, not the basic Nidzh term for ‘green’, according to data in [Kibrik & Kodzazov 1990; Comrie & Khalilov 2010]).


Two other (inherited) terms for ‘green’ found in the sources are:
2) dây ‘green / blue’ [Schieffer 1863: 96; Starchevskiy 1891: 492, 493], ‘green’ [Fāhrīnch 1999: 14].

The exact difference between goğ-in, dây and dây is unclear.

Common Tsakhur: Not reconstructible.


Kryt (proper): Kibrik & Kodzazov 1990: 235; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 675. In [NCED: 333] the variant čuk-nu is also quoted. The suffix -nuV is attested in some other nominal stems, but its synchronic semantics and function are unclear.


In [Meylanova 1984: 70, 214; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 675] ‘green’ is quoted as yaşıl [yaşıl], borrowed from Azerbajiani yaşıl ‘green’.


In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 675], the word kâti-pe [kâti-apanese] is also quoted as a synonym - an error for the presumed kâti-le-n [kâti-apanese], cf. Tsakhur-Kum Tsakhur below.


Common Tsakhur: It is unclear how the Proto-Tsakhur term for ‘green’ should be reconstructed. Tsakhur-Kum kâti-le-n and literary kâti-le-n can represent an archaism, because the development ‘wet’ > ‘green’ is attested cross-linguistically, whereas ‘green’ > ‘wet’ seems less normal (in this case čiwa-n is the Proto-Tsakhur word for ‘wet’). On the other hand, kâti-le-n and kâti-le-n are isolated and etymologically obscure forms; therefore, they could reflect a loanword of unknown origin.


Common Rutul: Shinaz dialect: šil-di [Dirr 1912: 183]

Final -di / -d is the attributive suffix.

Koshan Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzazov 1990: 235; Suleymanov 2003: 53; Shaumyan 1941: 191. It must be noted that in both [Suleymanov 2003] and [Shaumyan 1941], this word is quoted as suze-r [ruze-ep].


Fite Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzazov 1990: 235; Shaumyan 1941: 191. The same in the other subdialects: Tsirkhe suze-f ‘green’, Duldug suzi-f
'green' [Shaumyan 1941: 191].

Common Aghul: Derived from a substantive, attested as Proper Aghul (Tpig) qaz 'green color; green dye; green yarn' [Suleymanov 2003: 53].


The same in the Akhby dialect: Khlyut qac'i 'green' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 235]. Derived from an old substantive, attested as Gyune qay [abs.] / qac- 'corn shoots' [Uslar 1896: 484] and Literary Lezgi qax [abs.] / qac-u ~ qac-ad- [obl.] 'green corn shoots' [Talibov & Gadzhiev 1966: 175; Gyulmagomedov 2004, 1: 384] (there is also a literary substantive qaz [abs.] / qaz-di- [obl.] 'green color; green dye; green yarn' [Talibov & Gadzhiev 1966: 175; Gyulmagomedov 2004, 1: 384], which possesses more generic semantics, but nevertheless looks like a late back-formation due to secondary -z- in the oblique stem).

Proto-Lezgian: NCED: 532. Distribution: An unstable word. Several equivalent (from the distributional point of view) candidates enter into competition. Out of these, we choose *čwɨlɨː-[NCED: 532] as the most likely Proto-Lezgian root for 'green'. It retains the basic meaning 'green' in West Lezgian (Tsakhur, Rutul). Note the polysemy 'green / wet' in Tsakhur (implying a recent shift 'green > 'wet'). In Udi, *čwɨlɨː has produced the basic term for 'fish' (see notes on 'fish'). In Budukh, *čwɨlɨː has shifted to the meaning 'dim, muddy'; in Aghul, to the meaning 'blue'. An important advantage of *čwɨlɨː over its competitors is that *čwɨlɨː possesses good North Caucasian cognates with the meaning 'green'.

In archaic Udi, dʒɨ 'green' and dəy 'green / blue' are likely to have been derived from the verbal root *təhər- 'to be wet, soaked' [NCED: 277]. Note the additional shift of dəy to 'unripe; raw' in Nidzh Udi.

In Kryts, 'green' is a suffixal derivation from the root *čɛh [NCED: 333], whose original meaning is likely to have been 'a k. of reptile', see notes on 'fish'.

In Aghul and Lezgi (this could be either a Proto-East Lezgian feature or a late areal isogloss) 'green' is derived from the substantive *qac: [obl. *qaci-] [NCED: 464], whose original Proto-Lezgian or at least Proto-East Lezgian meaning is unclear: in Aghul, it denotes 'green color; green dye; green yarn', but specifically 'corn shoots' in Lezgi, whereas external North Caucasian comparison suggests the initial meaning 'dirt'.

In Tabasaran, the old root was superseded with *təʁːː-[NCED: 554], which originally denoted 'a k. of light color' (cf. its meaning 'blond, red-haired' in Aghul and 'variegated', 'yellow', 'grey' and so on in other groups of the North Caucasian family). Etymologically unclear forms include: Archi ołow - ułow 'to be green' (cf. [NCED: 537]), Tsakhur-Kum Tsakhur kətʃə-n 'green'.

In modern Udi and Budukh the old word is superseded with the Azerbaijani loanwords. Replacements: ['wet > 'green'] (archaic Udi), ['a k. of reptile > 'green'] (Kryts), ['dirt > 'green'] (Aghul, Lezgi), ['a k. of light color > 'green'] (Tabasaran), ['green > 'wet'] (Tsakhur), ['green > 'fish'] (Udi), ['green > 'dim, muddy'] (Budukh), ['green > 'blue'] (Aghul), ['green > 'unripe; raw'] (Nidzh Udi).

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular.

Semantics and structure: Primary stative verbal root 'to be green'.

36. HAIR

Nidzh Udi pop {non} (1), Vartashen Udi pop {non} (1), Archi čɐr'i (2), Kryts (proper) čər (2), Alyk Kryts čər (2), Budukh čər {ulep} (2), Mishlesh Tsakhur čər {ulalp} (2), Mikik
Tsakhur čer (2), Gelmets Tsakhur čar (2), Mukhad Rutul čar {ulap} (2), Ixrek Rutul čer ~ čär {ulap ~ ṭulap} (2), Luchek Rutul čar (2), Koshan Aghul čar (2), Keren Aghul čar (2), Gequn Aghul čar (2), Fite Aghul čar (2), Aghul (proper) čär (2), Northern Tabasaran čar (2), Southern Tabasaran čär (2), Gyune Lezgi čar (2), Proto-Lezgian *čař (2).

References and notes:


Common Udi: Common Udi *pop 'human's head hair / animal's fur'

Caucasian Albanian: ik' [Gippert et al. 2008: IV-21].


Distinct from qam-ta 'woman's hair, long hair' [Kibrik et al. 1977b: 301; Chumakina et al. 2007] from qam 'forelock; mane' [Kibrik et al. 1977b: 301].

Kryts (proper): Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 42; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 178. Polysemy: 'head hair / a single hair / (goat's) fur'.

Alyk Kryts: Authier 2009: 78, 178, 180, 205, 286, 300, etc. Polysemy: 'head hair / a single hair / fur (of human or animal)'.


Tsakhur-Kum Tsakhur: čar [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 42].

Mikik Tsakhur: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 42; Dirr 1913: 215, 221.

Gelmets Tsakhur: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 42; Ibragimov 1990: 182; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 178. In [Ibragimov 1990], the variant čär is also quoted.

Mukhad Rutul: Dirr 1912: 145 (sub ĭdi); Ibragimov 1978: 114. Polysemy: 'hair / a single hair'.

In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 178], 'head hair' is glossed with two synonyms: čar, qulid {ulap, қыулулд}. The second word is, in fact, the genitive form of qul 'head'.


Luchek Rutul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 42. Polysemy: 'head hair / a single hair / (goat's) fur'.

Koshan Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 42; Suleymanov 2003: 201; Shaumyan 1941: 167. Polysemy: 'head hair / a single hair / (goat's) fur'.

Keren Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 42. Polysemy: 'head hair / a single hair / (goat's) fur'.

The same in the Usug subdialect: čar 'hair' [Shaumyan 1941: 167].

Gequn Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 42; Dirr 1907: 153, 170. Polysemy: 'head hair / a single hair / (goat's) fur'.

Fite Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 42; Shaumyan 1941: 167. Polysemy: 'head hair / a single hair / (goat's) fur'.


The same in the other subdialects: Tsirke, Duldug čar 'hair' [Shaumyan 1941: 167].

Northern Tabasaran: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 42. Polysemy: 'head hair / a single hair / (goat's) fur'. Distinct from Dyubek kuš 'long woman hair (sg., pl.)' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 42].

The same in the Khanag subdialect: čar 'hair' [Uslar 1979: 972, 990; Dirr 1905: 218, 225]. The same in the Khyuryuk subdialect: čar {ulap} 'hair' [Genko 2005: 185].

Southern Tabasaran: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 42. Polysemy: 'head hair / a single hair / (goat's) fur'. Distinct from Kondik kuš 'long woman hair (sg., pl.)' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 42].

The same in the Khiv subdialect: čar {ulap} 'hair' [Genko 2005: 185]. The same in Literary Tabasaran: čar {ulap} 'hair'


The same in the Akhty dialect: Khlyut čar with polysemy: ‘hair / goats’s fur (pl.)’ [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 41, 42].

Proto-Lezgian: NCED: 378. Distribution: This root is retained as the basic expression for ‘head hair / a single hair’ in Archi, on the one hand, and in all Nuclear Lezgian lects, on the other. Apparently in all the aforementioned languages, this word also denotes ‘human body hair’. The polysemy ‘human hair / goat’s fur’ is either a Proto-Nuclear Lezgian feature or a late areal isogloss. External North Caucasian comparison confirms ‘čar’ as the Proto-Lezgian term for ‘head hair’.

In Udi, ‘čār’ was superseded with ‘pVpV’, whose original meaning was something like ‘soft, fluffy hair’ [NCED: 865]. On the contrary, in Caucasian Albanian, ‘hair’ is expressed by the etymologically obscure stem iku̯.

Replacements: ‘soft, fluffy hair > ‘hair’ (Udi), [‘human hair’ > ‘goat’s fur’] (Nuclear Lezgian).

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular.

Semantics and structure: Primary substantive root with polysemy ‘head hair / a single hair’. The oblique stem is *čāra-.

37. HAND


References and notes:

Nidzh Udi: Gukasyan 1974: 137; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 26; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 207; Mobilii 2010: 168. It is not clear from the gloss in [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990] whether this term denotes ‘hand’ only, or ‘hand / arm’. Quoted only as ‘hand’ in [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 207]. Glossen as ambivalent ‘pyka (= hand + arm)’ in [Gukasyan 1974; Mobilii 2010].

There also exists a separate term ωm [ωm] ‘arm; wing’ [Gukasyan 1974: 58; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 26; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 204; Mobilii 2010: 115].


Vartashen Udi: Gukasyan 1974: 137; Fähnrich 1999: 19; Dirr 2003: 15, 22, 28; Schieffner 1863: 84; Schulze 2001: 290; Starchevskiy 1891: 506. Polysemy: ‘hand / arm’. Explicitly glossed only as ‘hand’ in [Schieffner 1863; Fähnrich 1999] (there is no separate term for ‘arm’ in these two sources), [Schulze 2001] (although the texts from [Bezhanov & Bezhanov 2002] demonstrate the generic meaning ‘hand / arm’), and as ambivalent ‘pyka (= hand + arm)’ in [Gukasyan 1974; Dirr 2003].

Distinct from ωm, which is translated as ‘wing; shoulder; side’ in [Schieffner 1863: 76] and incorrectly as ‘arm; pole; thills; door wing’ in [Schulze 2001: 251] (in fact, the meaning ‘arm’ is unattested in [Bezhanov & Bezhanov 2002]; the only anatomic meaning of ωm attested in this source is ‘shoulder’).


Distinct from χaβ ‘arm / branch (of tree)’ [Chumakina et al. 2007; Dirr 1908: 190, 220]. The latter is explicitly glossed as...
'arm' in the aforementioned sources. In turn, in [Kibrik et al. 1977b: 333, 379; Mikailov 1967: 200] χol is translated as ambivalent 'pyxa' (i.e. 'hand + arm'). It is interesting that in [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 26] χol is explicitly quoted with the meaning 'arm + hand'.

Note also that in [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 204, 207] it is kel which is proposed both for 'hand' and 'arm' (χol is not quoted in [Comrie & Khalilov 2010] at all).

Browsing through available texts clearly suggests that kel is the default term for 'hand' in Archi (e.g., 'Don't touch it with your hand' [Kibrik et al. 1977b: 36] and so on). The only found context for 'arm' contains the word χol: "I have broken an arm (χol) and leg" [Dirr 1908: 126].

Kryts (proper): Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 26, 27. Actually, two terms enter into competition: χib and kil, and Kibrik & Kodzasov's data is somewhat equivocal. Both χib and kil are explicitly treated as generic terms for 'hand + arm' in [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 26], but in the specific entry 'hand' (Russian: кисть руки) only Kryts χib is quoted [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 27]. Keeping in mind some peculiarities of this dictionary concerning the discussed anatomic terms (cf., e.g., notes on Archi), we provisionally prefer to assume χib as the default Kryts word for 'hand'. In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 204, 207] only χib is proposed both for 'arm' and 'hand' (kel is not quoted in [Comrie & Khalilov 2010] at all).

Alyk Kryts: Authier 2009: 33, 55, 68, 82, 118, 120, etc. This is opposed to kil 'arm' [Authier 2009: 34, 59, 106, 119], although there are some contexts, where χib demonstrates the meaning 'arm': "to break an arm" [Authier 2009: 344].


According to [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 26], another word for 'hand' is kil (κυς) with polysemy: 'arm / hand / sleeve / handle'. An example in [Meylanova 1984: 80] confirms the meaning 'hand' for kil: "to take one's hand", literally "getting hand in hand". It seems, however, that kil is a statistically less frequent expression for 'hand' than χib. Cf. several examples for χib 'hand' in [Meylanova 1984: 143] as well as in other sources, e.g., 'The stick hurt my hand' [Talibov 2007: 76], "The human right hand is bigger/stronger/longer than the left one" [Talibov 2007: 97, 118, 185], "Mother pulled her child's hand" [Talibov 2007: 181], 'A human looks at the face, an animal looks at the hand' [Talibov 2007: 276], 'Hand of an arrogant man creates nothing" [Talibov 2007: 283].

In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 204, 207], χib is erroneously quoted as 'arm', whereas 'hand' is erroneously glossed by two "synonyms": kurk'ūč and kil. In fact kurk'ūč means 'brush, tassel' [Meylanova 1984: 99], and the underlying expression of Comrie & Khalilov's gloss "kurk'ūč, kil" was apparently a genitive construction 'tassel of arm' - a mechanical translation of Russian кисть руки 'tassel of arm', which is the designation of 'hand' in scientific Russian.


In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 207], 'hand' is quoted as patak [патақ] - an error for pataqˤ [патаqˤ] or pataχˤ [патаχˤ] (cf. data from other dialects). Apparently the same term is reflected as partʰaʔ [партʰаʔ] (sic!) 'paw' in [Ibragimov & Nurmamedov 2010: 285].

There also exists a specific term for 'forearm': guč [Kibrik et al. 1999: 875; Ibragimov & Nurmamedov 2010: 124].

Tsakhur-Kum Tsakhur: χɨlʸ [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 26]. The specific term for 'hand' is pataqˤ, with the polysemy: 'paw / hand' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 27]. There also exists a specific term for 'arm': guč [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 26].

Mikik Tsakhur: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 26; Dirr 1913: 211, 237. Polysemy: 'hand / arm'.

The specific term for 'hand' is pataqˤ, with the polysemy: 'paw / hand' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 27] (in [Dirr 1913: 193] only with the meaning 'paw').

There also exists a specific term for 'arm': guč [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 26]. According to [Dirr 1913], however, guč denotes 'forearm' [Dirr 1913: 149], whereas 'upper arm' is expressed as kir [Dirr 1913: 178] (the exact phonetic shape of the latter word is unknown).

Gelmets Tsakhur: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 26; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 207. Polysemy: 'hand / arm'.

The specific term for 'hand' is pataqˤ, with the polysemy: 'paw / hand' [Kibric & Kodzasov 1990: 27]. There also exists a specific term for 'arm': guč [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 26].


Distinct from perx [перхъ] with polysemy 'hand / paw' [Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 207] (this is quoted in [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 207] as the only term for 'hand').


There also exists a specific term for 'hand': pelt [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 27] of unclear origin.


There also exists a more specific term for 'hand': gap [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 27], which etymologically corresponds to the words for 'palm of hand' in some other Aghul dialects: Gequn gap, Fite ga phosphorus [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 28]. External Lezgian etymology could confirm that 'palm of hand' is the primary meaning of this word. In Bursahg, the meaning 'palm of hand' is expressed analytically as kal aniq', literally 'back (anatomic) of kal' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 28].


Distinct from the specific term bai 'child’s hand' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 27].


Fite Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 26; Shaumyan 1941: 191. Polysemy: 'hand / arm'.

Aghul (proper): Suleymanov 2003: 55; Shaumyan 1941: 191. Tpig ϱil is glossed by Suleymanov and Shaumyan as Russian "рука", which can mean 'hand', 'arm' or 'hand + arm'. The standard Aghul polysemy 'hand / arm' of ϱil is proved by the following examples: "to run one's hand over the horse" [Suleymanov 2003: 21], "I have five fingers on my hand" [Shaumyan 1941: 54], "there is a bracelet on woman's arm" [Shaumyan 1941: 35].


The same in the Khanag subdialect: χːil 'hand, arm' [Uslar 1979: 957, 1004; Dirr 1905: 216, 241]. The same in other subdialects: Khyuryuk, Kumχːil {χхил} 'hand, arm' [Genko 2005: 168].


The same in the Khiv subdialect: χil {χил} 'hand, arm' [Genko 2005: 164]. The same in Literary Tabasaran: χil {χил} 'hand, arm' [Khanmagomedov & Shalbuzov 2001: 316].

Common Tabasaran: Note the retention of tense fricative χ in the Northern subdialects.

Gyune Lezgi: Uslar 1896: 386, 630. Polysemy: 'hand / arm'. 'Palm' is expressed analytically as ϱilin čːin 'face of ϱil' [Uslar 1896: 386].

The same in Literary Lezgi: ϱil {гъил} 'hand / arm' [Talibov & Gadzhiev 1966: 94; Gadzhiev 1950: 735; Haspelmath 1993: 490, 520]. There are also two specific literary terms for 'hand': kːap with polysemy: 'hand / handful / chunk of bread' [Talibov & Gadzhiev 1966: 150] (inaccurately glossed as 'palm of the hand' in [Haspelmath 1993: 494]) and paronymous kːap-⌊aʃ with polysemy: 'hand / handful' [Talibov & Gadzhiev 1966: 150]. 'Palm' is expressed analytically as kːapan yuq' 'centre of kːap' [Talibov & Gadzhiev 1966: 150].

The same in the Akhty dialect: Khlyut χil 'hand / arm' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 26]. There is also a specific Khlyut term kːap-ˈač with polysemy: 'paw / hand' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 27].

Proto-Lezgian:

NCED: 706. Distribution: There are three main roots attested with the meaning 'hand' in Lezgian languages. The data can be summarized as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAND’</th>
<th>Udi</th>
<th>Archi</th>
<th>Kryts</th>
<th>Budukh</th>
<th>Tsakhur</th>
<th>Rutul</th>
<th>Aghul</th>
<th>Tabasaran</th>
<th>Lezgi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*kʷiλ</td>
<td>hand/arm</td>
<td>hand</td>
<td>hand/arm</td>
<td>arm / hand / sleeve / handle</td>
<td>elbow (suffixed)</td>
<td>branch, cluster</td>
<td>twig, vine</td>
<td>branch, cluster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*χːiλ</td>
<td>arm</td>
<td>hand/arm</td>
<td>hand / arm</td>
<td>hand / arm</td>
<td>hand / arm</td>
<td>hand / arm</td>
<td>hand / arm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*mːaχː</td>
<td>handful / palm of hand</td>
<td>hand/arm</td>
<td>hand</td>
<td>armful</td>
<td>armful</td>
<td>handful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although there can hardly be any doubt about *kʷiλ as the main Proto-Lezgian root for 'hand', the exact details are not entirely clear. The easiest solution is to propose the lexical opposition 'hand' / 'arm' for Proto-Lezgian, despite the fact that such an opposition is atypical for the attested Lezgian lects and that the reconstructed syncretism 'foot / leg' (see notes on 'foot') could contradict the opposition 'hand' / 'arm'. The aforementioned roots can be reconstructed with the following meanings:

1) *kʷiλ 'hand';
2) *χːiλ 'arm';
3) *mːaχː (metathesized *χːam: in Proto-Nuclear Lezgian) ‘handful’.
The root *χːɨl was lost in Udi, where *kʷil acquired the additional meaning ‘arm’ (‘hand’ > ‘arm’); in Caucasian Albanian, *kʷil denotes ‘hand’, but no word for ‘arm’ is attested.

In the second outlier, Archi, the opposition *kʷil ‘hand’ / *χːɨl ‘arm’ is retained (the third root *mːaχː was lost).

Apparently, the opposition *kʷil ‘hand’ / *χːɨl ‘arm’ / *χːam: ‘handful’ was still retained in Proto-Nuclear Lezgian as well, but was subsequently eliminated in individual subgroups in different ways.

In Proto-South Lezgian (Kryts, Budukh), *kʷil acquired the additional meaning ‘arm’ (‘hand’ > ‘arm’), whereas the old root for ‘arm’, *χːɨl, got lost - the same process as in the Udi branch. The root *χːam: in the meaning ‘hand’ seems to have been a relatively recent introduction (‘handful’ > ‘hand’); we suppose that it is an areal isogloss, which is currently affecting Kryts and Budukh dialects. It is very likely that the new term *χːam: ‘hand’ tends to completely supersed the old term *kʷil in modern Kryts and Budukh. As a result, *χːam: acquires the additional meaning ‘arm’ (‘hand’ > ‘arm’). Note also the development ‘arm / hand’ > ‘sleeve’ and ‘arm / hand’ > ‘elbow’ in Budukh.

In Proto-West Lezgian (Tsakhur, Rutul) and Proto-East Lezgian (Aghul, Tabasaran, Lezgi), the old opposition *kʷil ‘hand’ / *χːɨl ‘arm’ was eliminated in favor of the latter root, i.e., *χːɨl started to denote ‘hand / arm’ (‘arm’ > ‘hand’). It must be noted, however, that the tree topology and certain semantic shifts (for which see below) suggest that such an elimination was an independent development in Proto-West Lezgian and Proto-East Lezgian or, rather, an areal isogloss, which affected both protolanguages.

The old root *kʷil ‘hand’ survived in West Lezgian as the suffixed form ‘elbow’ (Rutul); such a semantic shift seems, however, somewhat surprising. The anatomic semantics of *kʷil was lost in Proto-East Lezgian, where this root acquired the meaning ‘branch, cluster’ (with the further shift > ‘twig, vine’ in Tabasaran).

External North Caucasian comparison confirms the Proto-Lezgian reconstructions *kʷil ‘hand’ [NCED: 706] and *mːaχː ‘handful’ [NCED: 819]. As for Proto-Lezgian *χːɨl ‘arm’, its Lak cognate denotes ‘wing’ [NCED: 896]; it seems that typologically the semantic shift between ‘arm’ and ‘wing’ can occur in both directions.

Finally, some peculiarities should be noted. In Shinaz Rutul and Koshan Aghul, ‘hand’ can be expressed by the root *kːap ~ *kːapː, whose Proto-Lezgian meaning is likely to have been ‘palm of hand’ [NCED: 298]. In Tsakhur and Rutul dialects, the words for ‘paw’ can acquire the specific meaning ‘hand’. Udi köyi ~ köy ‘sleeve’ provides an additional instance for the development ‘hand / arm’ > ‘elbow’.

Replacements: {‘arm’ > ‘hand / arm’} (West Lezgian, East Lezgian), {‘handful’ > ‘hand’} (Kryts, Budukh), {‘palm of hand’ > ‘hand’} (Shinaz Rutul, Koshan Aghul), {‘paw’ > ‘hand’} (Tsakhur, Rutul), {‘hand’ > ‘hand / arm’} (Udi, Kryts, Budukh), {‘wing’ > ‘arm’} (Proto-Lezgian), {‘arm / hand’ > ‘sleeve’} (Udi, Budukh), {‘arm / hand’ > ‘handle’} (Budukh), {‘hand’ > ‘elbow’} (Rutul), {‘hand’ > ‘branch, cluster’ > ‘twig, vine’} (East Lezgian).

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular.

Semantics and structure: Primary substantive root. The oblique stem is *kʷilɨ.

38. HEAD

Nidzh Udi bul {ǝb̥a} (1), Vartashes Udi bul {ǝb̥a} (1), Archi karʃi (2), Kryts (proper) q’il (1), Alyk Kryts q’il (1), Budukh q’il {kʰuɬ} (1), Mishlesh Tsakhur kalːe {kalle} (-1), Mikik Tsakhur wuk’ulv (1), Gelmets Tsakhur wuq’ulv (1), Mukhad Rutul q’ul {kʰuɬ} (1), Ixrek Rutul huq’ul {gʰuɬ} (1), Luchek Rutul huq’ul (1), Koshan Aghul k’il (1), Keren Aghul k’il (1), Gequn Aghul k’il (1), Fite Aghul k’il (1), Aghul (proper) k’il (1), Northern Tabasaran k’ul (1), Southern Tabasaran k’ul (1), Gyune Lezgi q’il (1), Proto-Lezgian *woːɬul (1).

References and notes:


**Common Udi:** Common Udi *bul with an irregular paradigm in both dialects: *bul [abs.]/ *bilo [-obl.] (the oblique stem is explained by the historically normal loss of -l-in the intervocalic position, [NCED: 130]).**

**Caucasian Albanian:** *bul [abs.]/ *bil(o)- [obl.] 'head / top / beginning / self' [Gippert et al. 2008: IV-12].

**Arch:** Chumakina et al. 2007; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 10; Kibrik et al. 1977b: 257, 355; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 185; Mikailov 1967: 184; Dirr 1908: 157, 206. 'Head of man'.

**Kryts (proper):** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 10; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 185. Paradigm: *q'il [abs.]/ *q'il- [obl.]. Polysemy: 'head / ear (of wheat etc.)'.

**Alyk Kryts:** Authier 2009: 34, 49, 54, etc. Paradigm: *q'ii [abs.]/ *q'il- [obl.].

**Budukh:** Meylanova 1984: 97, 209; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 10; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 185. Polysemy: 'head / chief / top (of mountain, tree, etc.); lid, cover'.

**Mishlesh Tsakhur:** Kibrik et al. 1999: 880; Ibragimov & Nurmanmedov 2010: 185; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 185. Borrowed from Azerbaijani *killa* 'head' (ultimately from Persian *kalla* 'head'). According to examples in [Kibrik et al. 1999], this is currently the default word for 'human head' in Mishlesh.

Additional synonyms include the inherited *wuk'uyl* [neydy.ry/] [Kibrik et al. 1999: 889, 892; Ibragimov & Nurmanmedov 2010: 107] and the borrowed *bəs* 'head' [Kibrik et al. 1999: 870] (< Azerbaijani *bəs* 'head').

**Tsakhur-Kum Tsakhur:** *wuk'uyl* [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 10]. Distinct from *kalʻe* 'head (of animal)' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 10], borrowed from Azerbaijani *killa* 'head'.

**Mikik Tsakhur:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 10; Dirr 1913: 144, 223.

Distinct from *kalʻe* 'head (of animal)' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 10], borrowed from Azerbaijani *killa* 'head' (ultimately from Persian *kalla* 'head').

**Gelmets Tsakhur:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 10; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 185.

Distinct from *kalʻe* 'head (of animal)' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 10], borrowed from Azerbaijani *killa* 'head' (ultimately from Persian *kalla* 'head').

**Mukhad Rutul:** Dirr 1912: 166, 188; Ibragimov 1978: 114; Makhmu dov a 2001: 39, 46, 95; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 185.

Distinct from *killa* 'head' [Ibragimov 1978: 123] (without specification) ~ *kelə* 'head (of animal)' [Makhmu dov a 2001: 95], borrowed from Azerbaijani *killa* 'head' (ultimately from Persian *kalla* 'head').

**Ixrek Rutul:** Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 81, 333; Ibragimov 1978: 197, 222; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 185.

**Luchek Rutul:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 10.

Distinct from *kalə* 'head (of large catttle)' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 10], borrowed from Azerbaijani *killa* 'head' (ultimately from Persian *kalla* 'head').

**Common Rutul:** Muxrek dialect: *wuq'ül* 'head' [Ibragimov 1978: 169, 186].

Borch-Khnov dialect: *yuq'ul* 'head' [Ibragimov 1978: 234, 239, 281]. For the Borch-Khnov dialect, an unclear word *gül* [ral.r] 'head' is also quoted in [Ibragimov 1978: 228].

All the dialectal forms ~ *q'ul, luq'ul, wuq'ul* - are etymologically related.

**Koshan Aghul:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 10; Suleymanov 2003: 126; Shaumyan 1941: 184. The same in the Arsug subdialect: *k'il* 'head' [Shaumyan 1941: 184].

**Keren Aghul:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 10. The same in the Usug subdialect: *k'il* 'head' [Shaumyan 1941: 184].

**Gequn Aghul:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 10; Dirr 1907: 130, 171; Shaumyan 1941: 184. Polysemy: 'head / hill'.

**Fite Aghul:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 10; Shaumyan 1941: 184.

**Aghul (proper):** Suleymanov 2003: 126; Shaumyan 1941: 184. The same in the other subdialects: Tsirkhe, Duldug *k'il* 'head' [Shaumyan 1941: 184].

**Northern Tabasaran:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 10.

The same in the Khanag subdialect: *kal* with polysemy: 'head / ear (of cereals) / nipple, teat / hill, top (of mountain)'

**Southern Tabasaran**: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 10.


**Gyune Lezgi**: Uslar 1896: 528, 608.

The same in Literary Lezgi: q'il {кьил} with polysemy: 'head / chief / ear (of cereals)' [Talibov & Gadzhiev 1966: 203; Gadzhiev 1950: 144; Haspelmath 1993: 503, 521]. Distinct from the rude word kelːe {келле} 'head' [Talibov & Gadzhiev 1966: 155; Gadzhiev 1950: 144; Haspelmath 1993: 521], borrowed from Azerbaijani källä 'head' (ultimately from Persian kalla 'head').

**Proto-Lezgian**: NCED: 1041. Distribution: This stem is attested as the basic term in Caucasian Albanian-Udi, on the one hand, and in all Nuclear Lezgian languages, on the other. The locative form of *woƛ'ul* is also retained as the Archi adverb 'under one's head'.

In Archi, *woƛ'ul* was superseded by *kʷɨlt* - ~ *k'ʷɨlt* [NCED: 695], which is a good candidate for the status of the Proto-Lezgian term for 'temple'. This word means 'temple' or 'cheek' in Nuclear Lezgian (thus 'temple' > 'cheek'); external North Caucasian comparison could also point to the meaning 'temple'.

Note some specific semantic shifts of *woƛ'ul* 'head', reflected as synchronic polysemy in individual lects: 'point, spike' (Nidzh Udi), 'beginning', 'button', 'north' (Vartashen Udi), 'top', 'self' (Caucasian Albanian), 'ear (of cereals)' (Kryts Proper, Northern Tabasaran, Lezgi), 'lid, cover' (Budukh), 'hill' (Gequn Aghul, Tabasaran), 'nipple, teat' (Tabasaran).

The inherited term tends to be superseded with Azerbaijani or Persian loanwords in some Tsakhur, Rutul and Lezgi dialects.

**Replacements**: {'temple' > 'head'} (Archi), {'head' > 'point, spike'} (Nidzh Udi), {'head' > 'beginning'} (Vartashen Udi), {'head' > 'button'} (Vartashen Udi), {'head' > 'north'} (Vartashen Udi), {'head' > 'top'} (Caucasian Albanian), {'head' > 'self'} (Caucasian Albanian), {'head' > 'ear (of cereals)'} (Kryts Proper, Northern Tabasaran, Lezgi), {'head' > 'lid, cover'} (Budukh), {'head' > 'hill'} (Gequn Aghul, Tabasaran), {'head' > 'nipple, teat'} (Tabasaran).

**Reconstruction shape**: Basic correspondences seem regular, except for the sporadic syncope of the first syllable in some languages.

**Semantics and structure**: Primary substantive root. Historically *woƛ'ul* with the common nominal l-suffix. If Udi ber 'pillow' does indeed originate from *woƛ'ul* (thus in [NCED: 1041]), the suffix -l can be singled out on the Proto-Lezgian level.

39. HEAR

Nidzh Udi i-bak-sun {ибаксун} (1), Vartashen Udi i-bak-sun {ибаксун} (1), Archi =k'o- (2), Kryts (proper) ix- (1), Alyk Kryts ixa- (1), Budukh ixi- {ихыл} (1), Mishlesh Tsakhur qː=i-x- {къийхьый} (1), Mikik Tsakhur k=iyx- (1), Gelmets Tsakhur k=iyx- (1), Mukhad Rutul un y=ik- {ун иикис} (3), Ixrek Rutul un y=iɣ- {ун иылхьун} (3), Luchek Rutul un eɣʷ- (3), Koshan Aghul dax xi- (4), Keren Aghul un xa- (3), Gequn Aghul un-i xa- (3), Aghul (proper) un xa- ~ un-i xa- (3), Northern Tabasaran yik-' (2), Southern Tabasaran yex-' (1), Gyune Lezgi wan že- (3), Proto-Lezgian *ʔeɬiː-~*ʔeɬːiː- (1).

References and notes:


Vartashen Udi: Gukasyan 1974: 127; Fähnrich 1999: 17; Dirr 1903: 16, 18, 53, 55, 63, 65; Schiefler 1863: 78; Schulze 2001: 284;
Starchevskiy 1891: 488.

**Common Udi**: Common Udi *i-bak-esun*; derived from the root *i* plus the light verb *-bak-* 'to become' [Schulze 2005: 561 f. (3.4.2.2 #10); Schulze-Fürhoff 1994: 474]. The Udi verb corresponds to Caucasian Albanian *ib-esun* 'to hear'. Both CA *ih* and Udi *i* go back to Proto-Caucasian Albanian-Udi *iX(i)*- with the shift *X > h > 0* in the intervocalic position before front vowels or before consonants. The Udi morpheme *i* is quoted as a separate word with the meaning 'hearing, ability to hear (Russian: слышать)' in [Gukasyan 1974: 127; Mobili 2010: 152], although it is unclear whether this *i* can function as an independent item or if it has been extracted from the verb 'to hear' by Gukasyan.

Expressions for 'to hear' and 'to listen' are clearly opposed in modern Udi, as well as in Caucasian Albanian. Verbs for 'to hear' contain the old verbal root *teri- (~ -A-): Udi *i-bak-sun, CA *ih-esun*, both forms regularly without pharyngealization. Expressions for 'to listen' are based on the word for 'ear': Udi *umux*/*imux* *layesun*; lit. 'to put the ear' [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 665; Gukasyan 1974: 166; Starchevskiy 1891: 488]. CA *fi-biq'esun*, lit. 'to take the ear', normally with pharyngealization (for the Caucasian Albanian secondary fi- instead of expected *fi*- see notes on *ear*).

**Caucasian Albanian**: *ib-esun* [Gippert et al. 2008: IV-21], a cognate of the Udi term. Distinct from *fi-biq'esun* 'to listen to / to obey / to follow, observe, endure, take on' [Gippert et al. 2008: IV-22], which is based on the secondary morpheme *fi- 'ear' (q.v.) plus the light verb *-biq-* 'to seize' [Gippert et al. 2008: II-43, IV-10].


Distinct from *oy ‘ača-‘ to listen; to obey*, lit. 'to use the ear' [Chumakina et al. 2007; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 173; Kibrik et al. 1977b: 287; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 665] and *’txa-‘ to be silent; to listen’ [Chumakina et al. 2007; Kibrik et al. 1977b: 290].


Distinct from *ibir qasu*: 'to listen; to obey', literally 'to put ear, to cover with ears' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 173; Meylanova 1984: 63; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 665].

In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 664], 'to hear' is incorrectly glossed as *ibir qusu* (ібира касу) - an error for *ibir qusu* 'to listen'.

**Mishlesh Tsakhur**: Kibrik et al. 1999: 875, 899; Ibragimov & Nurmanmedov 2010: 210; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 664. Ablaut paradigm: *q=ixq-es* < *q=ugxq-es* [imperf.] / *q=axq-i* [perf.] / *q=axq-es* [fut.]. In [Kibrik et al. 1999: 875], the imperf. stem is incorrectly quoted as *q=ixq-es* [imperf.] with short -i-; the correct form with -i- can be found in examples in [Kibrik et al. 1999: 572, 692].

Distinct from *k’ir g’axq- ‘to listen; to obey*, literally 'ear + to show' [Kibrik et al. 1999: 881; Ibragimov & Nurmanmedov 2010: 127].

**Mikik Tsakhur**: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 172; Dirr 1913: 150, 238. Ablaut paradigm: *w=iyq-ix* [imperf.] / *w=iyq-i* [perf.] / *w=iyq-ix* [fut.].

Distinct from the expressions for 'to listen: k’iri g’axq-, literally 'ear + to show', k’iri hel-, literally 'ear + to give' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 173].

**Gelmets Tsakhur**: Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 664. The future stem.

**Common Tsakhur**: Initial *w- (Mishlesh *q-*) is a prefix with general semantics [Ibragimov 1990: 124; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 41].

**Mukhad Rutul**: Dirr 1912: 174, 200; Makhmudova 2001: 149, 167, 251. Literally 'sound happens to X' with *un* 'sound' + the suppletive verb CLASS=i- / CLASS=ii- / CLASS=ii- + *‘to become’ (yun is the class 4 exponent). In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 664], erroneously quoted as *un *y*i*i*- [yun máyam] (literally un’ *eye’ + ‘to become’).

Distinct from *un *y*i*i*- [yun máyam] ‘to hear about, find out (Russian: прослушать)’ [Makhmudova 2001: 99], literally *un* ‘sound’ + the verb *y*i*i*- ‘?’.

Distinct from *q=a-uns- ‘to listen’ [Dirr 1912: 153; Makhmudova 2001: 244].

**Ixrek Rutul**: Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 255, 394; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 664. Literally *un* ‘call, appeal’ + the verb *y*i*i*- ‘?’ (the exact syntactic construction is not documented).
Distinct from ƣás-u- {хасун} ‘to listen’ [Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 277, 394].

Luchek Rutul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 172. Literally un ‘sound’ + the verb ƣé¨- ‘?’ (the exact syntactic construction is not documented).

Common Rutul: All the dialects demonstrate an analytic construction with un ‘sound’ and an auxiliary verb. In Mukhad this verb is the common ‘to become’ (‘sound happens to X’), whereas the meanings of Ixrek ƣ=ɨi and Luchek ƣé¨- are unknown. Ixrek ƣ=ɨi formally coincides with the verb ƣ=ɨi ‘to strike, hit’ (see notes on ‘to kill’), where ƣ= is a prefix with general semantics, but the semantics of hearing is strange in this case; on the other hand, Ixrek ƣ=ɨi may consist of the class 4 exponent ƣ= attached to the verb ɨi ‘?’.

Initial ƣ= in the verbs for ‘to listen’ is a prefix with general semantics [Ibragimov 1978: 95; Alekseev 1994a: 227; Makhmudova 2001: 165]. Mukhad ƣ=ற- and Ixrek ƣás-u-, Luchek ƣ-as- are obviously related (for the deaffricativization in Rutul dialects cf. [NCED: 138], although this problem still awaits more detailed research). The Mukhad and Ixrek data point to labialized ƣ, thus the link between this Rutul root and Proto-Lezgin *ʔasV ‘to be silent’ seems unlikely, pace [NCED: 262].


Gequn Aghul: Dirr 1907: 146, 184; Shaumyan 1941: 144. Literally un ‘sound’ + the verb xa- ‘to become’ [Dirr 1907: 119] (the exact syntactic construction is not documented).

Fite Aghul: Not attested.


Common Aghul: Both of the Aghul analytical expressions for ‘to hear’ (daχ xi-, un xa-, literally ‘sound happens to X’) are innovations of areal origin.


The same in the Khanag subdialect: yik- ‘to hear’ [Uslar 1979: 751, 1006; Dirr 1905: 166, 242]. The same in other subdialects: Khuyryuk yik- {инхүү}, Kumi yik- {инхүү}, Arkit ik- {инхүү} ‘to hear’ [Genko 2005: 73, 79].

Differently in the Chuvek subdialect: yix-’ {инхүүн} ‘to hear’ [Genko 2005: 79].

Distinct from the verbs for ‘to listen’: Khiv q-əw-iq-: ‘to listen’ [Uslar 1979: 809, 1006; Dirr 1905: 166, 242]. Khuyryuk q-əw-iq- {хийнүүн} ‘to listen’ [Genko 2005: 171]. These forms look like a compound of ɨw ‘ear’ q.v. and the verb iq- ‘?’ plus the spatial prefix q= ‘behind’, which modifies the whole expression. In Dyube, ‘to listen’ is simply q=iq-. [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 173] (i.e. the spatial prefix + the verb), which can be a compression of the aforementioned compound.


The same in the Khiv subdialect: yeç- {ырхүү} ‘to hear’ [Genko 2005: 64]. The same in Literary Tabasaran: yeç- {эхэлүү} ‘to hear’ [Khanmagomedov & Shalbuzov 2001: 154].


**Common Tabasaran:** Two verbs with the meaning ‘to hear’ enter into competition here: yak- (Northern Tabasaran) and yex- (Southern Tabasaran). The external Lezgian comparison speaks in favour of Southern yex- as Proto-Tabasaran ‘to hear’, rather than Northern yak-.


Several similar expressions for ‘to hear’ are documented for Literary Lezgian: yam ze- / xa- [yan xyn], literally ‘sound (wam) happens to X’ [Gadzhiev 1950: 784; Haspelmath 1993: 510, 521], wam qʷe- / ata-, literally ‘sound (wam) comes to X’ [Gadzhiev 1950: 784], sae qʷe- / ata-, literally ‘sound (ses) comes to X’ [Talibov & Gadzhiev 1966: 291].

Distinct from the literary expressions for ‘to listen’: yab gu- [aŋ yyn], literally ‘to give ear’, and yab akali- [aŋ akalynn], literally ‘to string/attach the ear’ [Talibov & Gadzhiev 1966: 35, 399; Gadzhiev 1950: 784; Haspelmath 1993: 480, 522].

**Proto-Lezgian:** NCED: 411. **Distribution:** This stem is retained as the basic verb for ‘to hear’ in Caucasian Albanian-Udi, on the one hand, and in some Nuclear Lezgian lects, on the other. More precisely, *ʔet(ː)ɨ*- is to be reconstructed as the Proto-Nuclear Lezgian verb ‘to hear’; it means ‘to hear’ in South Lezgian (Kryts, Budukh), Tsakhur and Southern Tabasaran, but shifted to the meaning ‘to keep silence’ in Rutul. External North Caucasian comparison confirms the meaning ‘to hear’ for Proto-Lezgian *ʔet(ː)ɨ*-.

The second candidate is *ʔi(r)kɨ(r)*- [NCED: 650], which means ‘to hear’ in Archi and, surprisingly, in Northern Tabasaran, but got lost in the rest of languages. The exact Proto-Lezgian meaning of this root cannot be established (it should be noted that some of its external North Caucasian cognates also demonstrate the meaning ‘to hear’). The Tabasaran situation, when two main dialects possess different verbs for ‘to hear’ (*ʔet(ː)ɨ*- vs. *ʔi(r)kɨ(r)-*) can only be explained as an independent semantic development *ʔi(r)kɨ(r)-’? > to hear’ in Archi and Northern Tabasaran.

In Rutul, Aghul, Lezgi, ‘to hear’ is expressed by analytic constructions ‘sound happens to X’ with different words for ‘sound’ and different auxiliary verbs. This is a late areal isogloss that affected the central part of the Lezgian territory.

**Replacements:** ‘sound happens to X’ > ‘to hear’ (Rutul, Aghul, Lezgi), ‘to hear’ > ‘to keep silence’ (Rutul).

**Reconstruction shape:** Correspondences seem regular.

**Semantics and structure:** Primary verbal root.

---

40. HEART

Nidzh Udi uk: ~ ūk: {ykI ~ ybklI} (1), Vartashen Udi uk: {ykI} (1), Archi ikʷ (1), Kryts (proper) yik’ (1), Alyk Kryts yik’ (1), Budukh yik’ {iukI} (1), Mishlesh Tsakhur yik’ {iukI} (1), Mikik Tsakhur yikʷ (1), Gelmets Tsakhur yikʷ (1), Mukhad Rutul yik’ {iukI} (1), Ixrek Rutul yik’ {iukI} (1), Luchek Rutul yikʷ (1), Koshan Aghul yikʷ (1), Keren Aghulirkʷ (1), Gequn Aghul irkʷ (1), Fite Aghul yirkʷ (1), Aghul (proper) yirkʷ (1), Northern Tabasaran y’uk’-u (1), Southern Tabasaran yuk’ (1), Gyune Lezgi rik’ (1), Proto-Lezgian *yirkʷ*(1).

---

References and notes:

**Nidzh Udi:** Gukasyan 1974: 212; Kibrik & Kodzassov 1990: 34; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 219; Mobilı 2010: 278.

**Vartashen Udi:** Gukasyan 1974: 212; Fähnrich 1999: 33; Dirr 1903: 88; Schiefner 1863: 79; Schulze 2001: 328; Starchevskiy 1891: 506.

**Common Udi:** Common Udi *uk-.*

**Caucasian Albanian:** húk’ [Gippert et al. 2008: IV-27]. The alphabetical sign for a pharyngealized vowel u’ apparently reflects the influence of the following ejective or the front vowel i.


Alyk Kryts: Authier 2009: 33, 373, etc. Note the retention of the archaic paradigm (levelled up in Kryts proper): yik’ [abs.] / k’-y [gen.].


Distinct from baːrɨr ‘heart (figurative)’, baːrɨ ‘heart, breast (figurative), soul’ [Ibragimov & Nurmanov 2010: 66], borrowed from Azerbaijani bayir ‘liver (anatomic); breast, heart (figurative).’

Tsakhur-Kum Tsakhur: yik’[y] [Kibrić & Kodzasov 1990: 34]. Polysemy: ‘heart / stone (of fruit).’

Mikik Tsakhur: Kibrić & Kodzasov 1990: 34; Dirr 1913: 170, 238.

Gelmets Tsakhur: Kibrić & Kodzasov 1990: 34; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 219. Polysemy: ‘heart / stone (of fruit).’


Keren Aghul: Kibrić & Kodzasov 1990: 34; Shaumyan 1941: 148. The same in the other subdialects: Tsirkhe, Duldug yirk’ʷ ‘heart’ [Shaumyan 1941: 148].

Gequn Aghul: Kibrić & Kodzasov 1990: 34; Dirr 1907: 122, 183.

Fite Aghul: Kibrić & Kodzasov 1990: 34; Shaumyan 1941: 148. Polysemy: ‘heart / stone (of fruit).’

Northern Tabasaran: Kibrić & Kodzasov 1990: 34. Regular paradigm.


Southern Tabasaran: Kibrić & Kodzasov 1990: 34. Regular paradigm.


Common Tabasaran: Note the retention of the archaic paradigm in some subdialects: yik’ʷ [abs.] / k’”-a- [obl.].


The same in the Akhty dialect: Khlyut rik’ ‘heart’ [Kibrić & Kodzasov 1990: 34].

Proto-Lezgian: NCED: 678. Distribution: One of the most stable Lezgian roots, retained in its basic meaning in all Lezgian languages.

The following semantic shifts, reflected as synchronic polysemy in individual lects, can be noted: ‘stone (of fruit)’ (Tsakhur, Rutul), ‘soul’ (Rutul).

Replacements: {’heart’ > ‘stone (of fruit)’} (Tsakhur, Rutul), {’heart’ > ‘soul’} (Rutul).

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular.

Semantics and structure: Primary substantive root. The oblique stem is “yik”-e-

41. HORN

Nidzh Udi muqːˤa {мүъкъаъ} (1), Vartashen Udi muqːˤa (1) / qːˤanc: {къаъанц} (2), Archi b’atː- (3), Kryts (proper) käč (4), Alyk Kryts karč (4), Budukh karč {капч} (4), Mishlesh Tsakhur gač {гаъ} (4), Mikik Tsakhur gač (4), Gelmets Tsakhur gač (4), Mukhad Rutul kač {каъ} (4), Ixrek Rutul kač {каъ} (4), Luchek Rutul kač (4), Koshan Aghul karč (4), Keren Aghul karč (4), Gequn Aghul karč (4), Fite Aghul karč (4), Aghul (proper) karč (4),
Northern Tabasaran \(k'arč\) (4), Southern Tabasaran \(k'arč\) (4), Gyune Lezgi \(karč\) (4), Proto-Lezgian \(\text{*kalč} \sim \text{*k'alč} \sim \text{*kalč}(4)\).

References and notes:


Vartashen Udi: Djheiranishvili 1971: 205, 247; Schiefler 1863: 105; Schulze 2001: 301; Starchevskiy 1891: 506. The word is written with tense \(qː\) as \{k\} in [Bezhanov & Bezhanov 1902: Lk. 1.69], although this Bežanovs' form was mistranscribed with plain \(q\) in [Schulze 2001: 301] (with further speculations about such a deglottalization).

The sources vary in this case. Modern dictionaries [Gukasyan 1974: 157; Mobili 2010: 190] quote \(qːˤa\) \{къаъ\} as the Vartashen term for 'horn', whereas sources of the 19th century show \(muqːˤa\). Apparently there has been a lexical replacement over the course of the last century (note that [Djheiranishvili 1971] reflects the archaic norm). Vartashen \(qːˤa\) originates from Lezgian \(\text{*qːˤa}[n](a)\)'hook' [NCE D: 462]. We treat both words as synonyms. Gukasyan 1974: 157; Mobili 2010: 190.


Caucasian Albanian: Unattested.


Tsakhur-Kum Tsakhur: \(gač\) [Kibrik & Kodzassov 1990: 46].


Keren Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzassov 1990: 46. The same in the Usug subdialect: \(k'arč\) 'horn' [Shaumyan 1941: 183].

Gequn Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzassov 1990: 46; Dirr 1907: 130, 182; Shaumyan 1941: 183.

Fite Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzassov 1990: 46; Shaumyan 1941: 183.

Aghul (proper): Suleymanov 2003: 125; Shaumyan 1941: 183. The same in the other subdialects: Tsirkhe, Duldug \(k'arč\) 'horn' [Shaumyan 1941: 183].

Northern Tabasaran: Kibrik & Kodzassov 1990: 45. Polysemy: 'horn / woman's plait'.

The same in the Khang subdialect: \(k'arč\) with polysemy: 'horn / woman's plait / handle, grip' [Uslar 1979: 798, 1004; Dirr 1905: 190, 241]. The same in the Khuryuk subdialect: \(k'arč\) \{klapš\} 'horn' [Genko 2005: 111].

Southern Tabasaran: Kibrik & Kodzassov 1990: 46. Polysemy: 'horn / woman's plait'.

The same in the Khiv subdialect: \(k'arč\) \{klapš\} with polysemy: 'horn / woman's plait / handle, grip' [Genko 2005: 111]. The same in Literary Tabasaran: \(k'arč\) \{klapš\} 'horn' [Khammagomedov & Shalbuzov 2001: 213].


The same in Literary Lezgi: \(karč\) [abs.] / \(k'arč\)-\text{-ini}\} [obl.] \{kapi\} 'horn' [Talibov & Gadzhiev 1966: 152; Gadzhiev 1950: 730; Haspelmath 1993: 35, 494, 521]. The tense non-aspirated \(\text{č}\) in the Gyune and Literary oblique stems is explained by the synchronic rule, according to which the lax aspirated \(T\) yields \(T\); after a voiceless segment, see [Haspelmath 1993: 47, 55] (such an interesting example as \(k'arč\) \(k'arč\)-\text{-ini} should be added to Haspelmath's illustrative lists).
The same in the Akhbyt dialect: Khlyut karč [abs.] / krč-a- [obl.] ‘horn’ [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 46].

**Proto-Lezgian:** NCED: 723. **Distribution:** This word has been retained in its basic meaning in all Nuclear Lezgian lects, but has been completely lost in both outliers (Udi, Archi). The following semantic shifts, reflected as synchronic polysemy, should be noted: ‘corner, edge’ (Tsakhur), ‘woman plait; handle, grip’ (Tabasaran).

A second candidate is *paːlː* [NCED: 285], which means ‘horn / top of the head’ in Archi and ‘forehead’ in Nuclear Lezgian. Since the shift ‘top of the head’ > ‘horn’ is typologically more normal than vice versa, we assume that the Proto-Archi meaning was ‘top of the head’ (correspondingly, the Proto-Lezgian meaning of *paːlː should be ‘top of the head’ or ‘forehead’).

The Proto-Udi substantive ‘horn’ was derived from *meːrːl* ‘deer’ [NCED: 300]. In modern Vartashen Udi, it was superseded with *qːa[n]č(a), whose original Proto-Lezgian meaning was ‘hook’ [NCED: 462].

**Replacements:** [deer’ > ‘horn’] (Udi), (hook > ‘horn’) (Vartashen Udi), (top of the head > ‘horn’) (Archi), (horn > ‘corner, edge’) (Tsakhur), (‘horn’ > ‘woman plait’) (Tabasaran), (‘horn’ > ‘handle, grip’) (Tabasaran).

**Reconstruction shape:** Correspondences seem regular except for the unclear fluctuation of the initial stop: *‘k*’ in Kryts, Budukh, Rutul, Lezgi, *‘k*’- in Aghul, Tabasaran, *‘k*’- in Tsakhur. External North Caucasian comparison proposed in [NCED: 723] speaks in favor of ‘k’-.

**Semantics and structure:** Primary substantive root. The oblique stem is *Kalčː*.

---

42. I,

Nidzh Udi zu {zy} (1), Vartashen Udi zu {zy} (1), Archi zo-n (1), Kryts (proper) zi-n (1), Alyk Kryts zi-n ~ zi (1), Budukh zi-n {zən} (1), Mishlesh Tsakhur zi {zən} (1), Mikik Tsakhur zi (1), Gelmets Tsakhur zi (1), Mukhad Rutul zi {zən} (1), Ixrek Rutul zi {zən} (1), Luchek Rutul zi (1), Koshan Aghul zu-n (1), Keren Aghul zu-n (1), Gequn Aghul zu-n (1), Fite Aghul zu-n (1), Aghul (proper) zu-n (1), Northern Tabasaran iz'u (1), Southern Tabasaran uz'u (1), Gyune Lezgi zu-n (1), Proto-Lezgian *zo-n ~ *zo (1).

---

**References and notes:**


**Common Udi:** The suppletive paradigm coincides in both dialects. The genitive form is to be analyzed as *b-ez-i* with the fossilized class prefix and the nominal genitive ending -i.

**Caucasian Albanian:** zu [abs., erg.]/ bezi [gen.]/ za-[obl. [Gippert et al. 2008: II-37, IV-16].


**Kryts (proper):** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 221; Saadiev 1994: 420; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 116. Paradigm: zi-n [abs., erg.]/ zii [gen.]/ zii-s [dat.]. In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010] the absolutive variant zu-n is also quoted (an error?).

**Alyk Kryts:** Author: 2009: 43. Paradigm: zi-n ~ zi [abs., erg.]/ za [gen.]/ za-z [dat.].


Mikik Tsakhur: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 221; Dirr 1913: 32. Paradigm: zi [abs.]/za-s-s'[erg.]/yiz-izin [gen.]/za-s [dat.].


Common Rutul: In the Borch-Khnov dialect T has the phonetic shape yí [Ibragimov 1978: 258], which originates from 'we (incl.)' (see notes on 'we').


The same in the Khudig subdialect: zu-n [abs., erg.]/za-s [dat.]/yaz [gen.].


Common Aghul: The historical shape Vz: of the genitive form is retained only in Koshan; in other dialects the genitive has been levelled after the rest of the paradigm.


The same in the Khanag subdialect: iz'u [abs., erg., obl.]/yaz [gen.]

Southern Tabasaran: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 221. Paradigm: uz'u [abs., erg., obl.]/yiz [gen.].

The same in the Khiv subdialect: uz'u [abs., erg., obl.]/yiz [gen.]/yz [gen.]

The same in Literary Tabasaran: uz'u [abs., erg., obl.]/yiz [gen.]/yz [gen.]


The same in Literary Lezgi: zu-n [abs.]/za [erg., obl.]/zi [gen.]


Proto-Lezgian: NCED: 1084. Distribution: Retained as the independent personal pronoun for the 1st p. sg. in all lects except for Borch-Khnov Rutul, where T originates from the personal pronoun 'we (incl.)'.

Replacements: [we (incl.)] > T (Borch-Khnov Rutul).

Reconstruction shape: Basic correspondences seem regular.

The absolutive form is to be reconstructed as *zi-n ~ *zo. The status of the suffix -n is unclear. It is attested in Archi and in most Nuclear Lezgian languages: South Lezgian (Kryts, Budukh) and East Lezgian (Aghul, Lezgi); it must be noted that in Tabasaran *zo(-n) has not survived, having been levelled after the oblique stem). On the contrary, -n is absent from Caucasian Albanian-Udi and West Lezgian (Tsakhur, Rutul). Finally, Alyk Kryts shows synchronic doublets zi-n ~ zi. In all these cases the nasal suffix could be explained as influence on the part of the 2nd p. sg. pronoun *p-n 'thou' q.v., although it must be noted that the external North Caucasian comparanda also demonstrate fluctuation between forms with and without -n.

The oblique stem can be safely reconstructed as *za- (retained in Caucasian Albanian-Udi, Archi and Proto-Nuclear Lezgian).

It is unclear how we should reconstruct the Proto-Lezgian ergative form. In Caucasian Albanian-Udi and many Nuclear Lezgian lects (Kryts, Budukh, Mishlesh Tsakhur, Ixrek Rutul, Koshan Aghul, Gequn Aghul, Fite Aghul, Proper Aghul), the ergative form coincides with the absolutive one (*zo-n ~ *zo). On the contrary, in Archi and the rest of Nuclear Lezgian (Mikik Tsakhur, Gelmets Tsakhur, Mukhad Rutul, Luchek Rutul, Keren Aghul, Lezgi), the ergative form is based on the oblique stem *za- (implying the Proto-Lezgian suffix-free ergative form *za).

The genitive stem is to be reconstructed as *Class=iz. The class prefixation has been retained as a living pattern in Archi.
and as a fossilized prefix in Caucasian Albanian-Udi, but has been lost in Nuclear Lezgian. In some lects, the old genitive form can be additionally modified with the synchronic genitive suffix: Caucasian Albanian-Udi, Tsakhur (cf. also Rutul). In South Lezgian (Kryts, Budukh), non-Koshan Aghul, Lezgi, the old genitive form was eliminated, having been levelled after the $zV$-pattern of the rest of the paradigm. The irregular voiceless fricative in Archi CLASS=is is inexplicable.

Additionally, a specific dative form *CLASS=ez could be theoretically reconstructed, based on Archi CLASS=ez (no traces in other Lezgian languages).

Semantics and structure: Primary pronominal root. Suppletive paradigm: *zo-[abs.]/ *zo-[obl.]/ *CLASS=iz-[gen.]/ (?) *CLASS=ez-[dat.].

42. I

Nidzh Udi bezi ~ bez {ðesu ~ ðes} (1), Vartashen Udi bezi {ðesul} (1), Archi CLASS=is (1), Mishlesh Tsakhur yiz-in {ɨɨɨɨɨn} (1), Mikik Tsakhur yiz-in (1), Mukhad Rutul yiz-di (1), Ixrek Rutul yiz-dɨ (1), Luchek Rutul iz-dɨ (1), Koshan Aghul yaz (1), Northern Tabasaran yas (1), Southern Tabasaran yiz (1), Proto-Lezgian *CLASS=iz (1).

References and notes:

Nidzh Udi: Genitive form.
Vartashen Udi: Genitive form.
Archi: Genitive form.
Mishlesh Tsakhur: Genitive form.
Mikik Tsakhur: Genitive form.
Mukhad Rutul: Genitive form.
Ixrek Rutul: Genitive form.
Luchek Rutul: Genitive form.
Koshan Aghul: Genitive form.
Northern Tabasaran: Genitive form.
Southern Tabasaran: Genitive form.
Proto-Lezgian: Genitive form.

43. KILL

Nidzh Udi be-s-b-esun {ðescoseyn} (1), Vartashen Udi be-s-b-esun {ðescosyn} (1), Archi =ača- (2), Kryts (proper) qʾay- (1), Alyk Kryts qʾay- (1), Budukh atʾu- {amly-} (3), Mishlesh Tsakhur gʾ=ik- {iʾukləs} (1), Mikik Tsakhur gʾ=ik- (1), Gelmets Tsakhur gʾ=ik- {iʾukləs} (1), Mukhad Rutul CLASS=iqʾ-i-r {ɨɨɨɨɨn} (1), Ixrek Rutul CLASS=iqʾ-i-r {ɨɨɨɨɨn} (1), Luchek Rutul y=ɨχʾ-i-r (4), Koshan Aghul kʾ-i- (1), Keren Aghul kʾ=ə (1), Gequn Aghul kʾ-e- (1), Fite Aghul kʾ-e- (1), Aghul (proper) kʾ-e- (1), Northern Tabasaran yikʾ- (1), Southern Tabasaran yikʾ- (1), Gyune Lezgi r=āqʾi- (1)/ qʾe- (1), Proto-Lezgian *ʔiƛʾe (1).

References and notes:

Nidzh Udi: Gukasyan 1974: 78; Mobili 2010: 54. In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 248] 'to kill' is translated as be-p-sun {ðenlcyn} -
apparently a typo for *bes-p-sun* [fecncleyu], the latter originally from syncopated *be-s-b-sun* with the regular development bs > ps (for which see [Maisak 2008a: 149]).

**Vartashen Udi:** Gukasyan 1974: 78; Fähnrich 1999: 9; Dirr 1903: 2, 70, 96; Schiefler 1863: 101; Schulze 2001: 255; Starchevskiy 1891: 489. In [Dzheiranishvili 1971: 265] 'to kill' is translated as *bes-p-s-esun* ~ *be-s-b-s-esun* (the former variant apparently stays for syncopated *be-s-p-sun* with bs > ps).

**Common Udi:** Common Udi *be-s-b-esun*. A transitive/causative from *be-s*, formed with the light verb -b- 'to do' [Schulze 2005: 569 ff. (3.4.2.2 #22 ff.)]. As accepted in [NCED: 662], *be-s* is apparently a contracted form of the infinitive *bi-es* from the verb *bi-esun* ~ *bi-sun* 'to die' q.v. The change i > e is not entirely clear, however.

**Caucasian Albanian:** A labile verb with the suppletive paradigm: *bil*-a- (present, imperative, future) / *pu*ur-i- (past) and polysemy: 'to die / to kill' [Gippert et al. 2008: II-44, IV-35]. See notes on 'to die'.

**Archi:** Chumakina et al. 2007; Kibrik & Kodzhasov 1988: 170; Kibrik et al. 1977b: 185; Kibrik et al. 1977a: 3; 234; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 248; Mikailov 1967: 173; Dirr 1908: 131, 224. The main meaning of this frequent verb is generic: 'to perform an action most typically associated with the given object in the current situation', an additional specific meaning is 'to kill', obj. = human or animal, sg. or pl. For the pl. object cf. examples like "Who can kill them (= two lovers) in the presence of the people?" [Kibrik et al. 1977b: 11].

More marginal are two complex causative verbs, which literally mean 'to make to die':

1) *kiš-a-* from the verb *kiš-a- 'to die (sg.)' q.v. Found in some texts, e.g., [Kibrik et al. 1977b: 61, 85, 88]. Apparently used with sg. obj. only.

2) *gyiš-a-* with polysemy 'to kill / to beat up (obj. = people) / to scold severely, condemn / to wear out' [Chumakina et al. 2007] from the verb *gyiš-a- 'to die (pl. subj.)'. This is not specified in [Chumakina et al. 2007], but apparently *gyiš-a-* is applied to pl. obj. only.

**Kryts (proper):** Kibrik & Kodzhasov 1988: 171; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 248. Polysemy: 'to die / to kill'. See notes on 'to die'.

**Alyk Kryts:** Authier 2009: 416. Polysemy: 'to die / to kill'. See notes on 'to die'.

**Budukh:** Kibrik & Kodzhasov 1988: 171. Missing from [Meylanova 1984] as a separate entry, but attested in examples, e.g., [Meylanova 1984: 26 sub barat, etc.].

In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 248] 'to kill' is glossed as *ilum* sīrī (uxxum cūrat), literally 'death' + 'to do', which could be a neologism on the authors' part (note that *ilum* is an error for *ilūm* 'death' [Meylanova 1984: 140]).


**Gelmets Tsakhur:** Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 248. In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010], erroneously quoted as *gəi* e [ɣi:xas].

**Common Tsakhur:** Initial *gə* is a prefix with general semantics [Ibragimov 1990: 124; Kibrik & Kodzhasov 1988: 41]. The verb *gəik*- 'to kill (sg. obj.)' contains the same root as 'to die (sg. subj.)' q.v., modified with another prefix; the verb *gəsat-* 'to kill (pl. obj.)' contains the same root as 'to die (pl. subj.)', modified with another prefix.

**Mukhad Rutul:** Dirr 1912: 144, 202; Ibragimov 1978: 121; Makhmudova 2001: 71, 116, 252; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 248. Labile verb with polysemy: 'to kill / to die (q.v.), applied to sg. obj./subj.

A second candidate is *yəiχa*-i, glossed as 'to kill' in [Makhmudova 2001: 107] with the example: "Matsay killed his own chicken" [Makhmudova 2001: 176-177]. But the main meaning of *yəiχa*- is 'to strike, hit; to wound', as it is glossed in [Dirr 1912: 163] (with examples) and [Ibragimov 1978: 121]; cf also two additional examples: "The raising sun touched (lit. struck the mountain top)" [Makhmudova 2001: 73]; "Beat the drum!" [Makhmudova 2001: 210].

**Ixrek Rutul:** Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 405. Labile verb with polysemy: 'to kill / to die (q.v.). It must be noted that in the main section of the dictionary [Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 131] this verb is only glossed as 'to die', whereas in [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 248] 'to kill' is translated as *yəiχa*-e =aːlː- - causative from CLASS=ïq-i-r.

A second candidate is *yəiχa*-i-r [iːna:xduː] to strike, hit; to wound (with a weapon), kill; to push, shove [Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 136, 405], with the example: "We have killed a bear" [Ibragimov 1978: 213].

**Luchek Rutul:** Kibrik & Kodzhasov 1988: 171. Synchronously irregular verb with three parallel imperfective stems: *yəiulːχa*-a-ːr ~
Common Rutul: The Proto-Rutul verb for 'to kill (sg. obj.)' was the labile =iq'- to die (sg. subj.) / to kill (sg. obj.). The verb for 'to die (pl. subj.) / to kill (pl. obj.), attested in Mukhad and Luchek, is etymologically related, formed with reduplication. There is a tendency in Rutul dialects to restrict =iq'- to the meaning 'to die' and ascribe the meaning 'to kill' to the verb y=xɪˤ- 'to strike, hit', which is derived from i⧼x- 'to strike, hit' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 102] with the prefix y=. This process is currently finished in the Luchek dialect. It must be noted that the semantic development 'to hit' > 'to kill' is normal, whereas vice versa is typologically odd.


Gequn Aghul: Dirr 1907: 130, 186; Shaumyan 1941: 183.

Fite Aghul: Suleymanov 1993: 77, 139.

Aghul (proper): Suleymanov 1993: 77, 139. The same in the Kurag subdialect: k'-i- 'to die; to kill' [Magometov 1970: 139].

Common Aghul: Labile verb with polysemy: 'to kill / to die' in all the dialects.


Southern Tabasaran: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 171.

Common Tabasaran: Labile verb with polysemy: 'to die (sg. subj.) / to kill (sg. obj.)', further see notes on 'to die'.

Gyune Lezgi: Uslar 1896: 529, 636, 637. Imperfective stem. Labile verb with polysemy: 'to die / to kill', for further notes, see 'to die'. Imperfective stem.

Proto-Lezgian: NCED: 661. Distribution: Preserved in the majority of Lezgian languages. The complete Proto-Lezgian system is reconstructed as ?ilχ- 'to die / to kill' (sg.), *ilχ- 'to die / to kill' (pl.). Further see notes on 'to die'.

Replacements: {'to perform an action most typically associated with the given object in the current situation' > 'to kill'} (Archi), {'to cut' > 'to kill'} (Budukh), {'to cut' > 'to die / to kill'} (Tsakhur), {'to strike, hit' > 'to kill'} (Rutul).

44. KNEE

Nidzh Udi kaľkap: {κλακλανων} (1), Vartashen Udi keθkip: {κλεκλευν} (1), Archi poṭmr (2), Kryts (proper) pip (2), Alyk Kryts pip (2), Budukh pep {nen} (2), Mishlesh Tsakhir q'araca {κβαρακα} (3), Mikik Tsakhir q'araca (3), Gelmets Tsakhir q'araca (3), Mukhad Rutul qʷaq' {κβακκ} (4), Ixrek Rutul qʷaq' {κβακκ} (4), Luchek Rutul qʷaq' (4), Koshan Aghul q'iq' (4), Keren Aghul qʷaq' (4), Gequn Aghul qʷaq' ~ q'iq' (4), Fite Aghul qʷaq' (4), Aghul (proper) qʷaq' (4), Northern Tabasaran q'amq'-a (4), Southern Tabasaran q'amq' (4), Gyune Lezgi met (5), Proto-Lezgian *p'iŋm ~ *p'įŋm' (2).

References and notes:


Common Udi: Common Udi *ƙɛlkɛp: with a fossilized plural suffix.

Caucasian Albanian: Poék, attested once in Is. 35:3 [Gippert et al. 2008: VII-23] (missing from the dictionary in [Gippert et al. 2008: IV]). Possesses reliable Lezgian cognates (Lezgian 'läk 'a part of the leg' [NCED: 755]).

Proto-Lezgian: LEDb: #230. Distribution: An unstable word. From the distributional point of view, the best candidate is "pɨˤmp / *pɨˤmp which denotes ‘knee’ in Archi, on the one hand, and in South Lezgian (Kryts, Budukh), on the other. The meaning shifted to ‘angle, corner’ in Tabasaran and Lezgi. The Proto-Lezgian reconstruction is not entirely clear phonetically and morphophonologically (see below); external North Caucasian etymology of this root is unknown.

The second candidate is "q'amq' [NCED: 907], which is attested in the meaning ‘knee’ in some West Lezgian (Rutul) and some East Lezgian lects (Aghul, Tabasaran). Formally, "q'amq' and *pɨˤmp occur with criss-crossing distribution within Nuclear Lezgian. As in some other cases, we suppose that "q'amq' in the meaning ‘knee’ is an areal introduction, shared by some languages (including Proto-Dargi "q'aq'"a ‘knee’ in the adjacent Dargi lects!) after the split of Proto-Nuclear Lezgian.

Various replacements occurred in individual languages.

Udi: 'kâlh' (-e-, -er-) [NCED: 720], modified with the fossilized plural suffix. The exact meaning of Proto-Lezgian 'kâlh'- cannot be established with certainty. Outside Udi, this root is attested as ‘calf of leg’ (Lezgi) and ‘top of boot’ (Aghul). The attested meanings suggest something like ‘a part of leg between knee and ankle’.

Caucasian Albanian: ‘läk [NCED: 755], whose original meaning seems to have been ‘leg bone’ (shifted to ‘bone’ q.v. in Archi and into ‘foot, leg’ q.v. in Tabasaran-Aghul).

Tsakhur: "q'araCay / *Caraq'ay [LEDb: #204], this root means ‘shin’ in Rutul. Unattested outside West Lezgian.

Lezgi: ‘wenč’ [NCED: 1042]; this root denotes ‘lower corner of sack or bag’ in Archi. External North Caucasian comparison points to the primary anatomic semantics (‘a part of leg’).


Reconstruction shape: Correspondences are not quite regular due to fluctuation of the ejective ~ plain stops: *p-p in
45. KNOW

Nidzh Udi a-va-bak-sun {ава́даксын} (1), Vartashen Udi a-ba-bak-sun {а́да́даксын} (1), Archi s’ini (2), Kryts (proper) CLASS=āć’a- (1), Alyk Kryts CLASS=ac’a-ra ša-r- (1), Budukh hać’r- {зву́л/п-} (1), Mishlesh Tsakhur CLASS=ac’a {аушля} (1), Mikik Tsakhur CLASS=ac’a-x- (1), Gelmets Tsakhur CLASS=ac’a-x- (1), Mukhad Rutul CLASS=ac’- {ваушля, вуашля} (1), Ixrek Rutul CLASS=āić’- {зву́лунли} (1), Luchek Rutul CLASS=ac’- (1), Koshan Aghul aha xi- ~ aha-r xi- (3), Keren Aghul hu-y-e (3), Gequn Aghul ha-r xa- (3), Fite Aghul aχ’i-r xa- (3), Aghul (proper) y=aʔa-r xa- (3), Northern Tabasaran aχ’a-di x- (3), Southern Tabasaran aχ’u š- (3), Gyune Lezgi či- (4), Proto-Lezgian *ʔac’a- (1).

References and notes:


Common Udi: Common Udi *a-ba-bak-esun, derived from *a-ba (Nidzh ava, Vartashen aba) ‘knowing, knowledgeable, competent’ [Gukasyan 1974: 31] with the light verb -bak- ‘to become’ [Schulze 2005: 561 f. (3.4.2.2 #10); Schulze-Fürhoff 1994: 474]. The adjective *a-ba contains the common adjectival suffix -ba, on which see [Gukasyan 1974: 272; Schulze 2005: 222 f. (3.2.9.1 #7)]; for the sporadic fricativization b > v in the Nidzh dialect see [Dzheiranishvili 1971: 277; Maisak 2008a: 150 f.]. In [Gippert et al. 2008: II-76] Nidzh ava ~ Vartashen aba are not segmented, but incorrectly treated as primary roots originating from Lezgian *ача’- (with *c > ṛb).

Caucasian Albanian: a-[Gippert et al. 2008: IV-4]. Phonetically, apparently a라도 with ṛ in the place of the lost Lezgian ‘c’. Distinct (although in some contexts very close semantically) from the less frequent verb čač’-esum ‘to know, realize’ [Gippert et al. 2008: IV-36], which corresponds to modern Udi čač’-esum ‘to recognize, know, experience, make the acquaintance of smb.’ [Gukasyan 1974: 236; Schulze 2001: 265].

Archi: Chumakina et al. 2007; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 177; Kibrik et al. 1977b: 314, 360; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 727. In [Mikailov 1967: 197; Dirr 1908: 181, 209] and also [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 727] ‘to know’ is quoted as s’in-ke-, although the actual meaning of this paronymous complex verb is ‘to find out, learn; to recognize; to feel (pain)’ [Chumakina et al. 2007; Kibrik et al. 1977b: 314].

Distinct from bőč’a- ‘to be able to; to know how’ [Chumakina et al. 2007; Kibrik et al. 1977b: 201].


Alyk Kryts: Authier 2009: 249. Deverbal adjective =ac’a-ra plus the verb ša-r-[imperf.]/xi-[perf.] ‘to become’.

Budukh: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 177. Polysemous: ‘to know / to be able’. A complex expression hać’r- yix’a-r- can also be used (participle plus the verb yix’a-/ sax’a- ‘to become’). Missing from [Meylanova 1984: 40], where only the participle hać’r ‘knowledgeable, understanding’ is quoted.

In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 727] ‘to know’ is incorrectly glossed as baladu (бала́ду), which means something like ‘to be acquainted (with a person)’, cf. [Meylanova 1984: 25].

Mishlesh Tsakhur: Kibrik et al. 1999: 67, 868, 894; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 727. In [Ibragimov & Nurmamedov 2010: 52], quoted as CLASS=ac’ir-x-, see below.

Distinct from the complex verb CLASS=ac’ir-x- ‘to get to know’ [Kibrik et al. 1999: 868] (the second element is the verb ix-


'\textit{to become}).

Distinct from $\textit{aχˤu}-'\textit{to be able to}' [Kibrik et al. 1999: 869].

\textbf{Mikik Tsakhur:} Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 177. The second element is the verb $\textit{ix}-'\textit{to become}'. In [Dirr 1913: 138, 226], quoted as the simple stem \textit{CLASS=aχˤu}-.

Distinct from Mikik $\textit{aχˤu}-'\textit{to be able to}' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 183].

\textbf{Gelmets Tsakhur:} Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 727. The second element is the verb $\textit{ix}-'\textit{to become}'.


\textbf{Ixrek Rutul:} Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 74. In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 727], quoted as \textit{CLASS=aχˤu} [-tsauqan].


\textbf{Koshan Aghul:} Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 177; Suleymanov 2003: 92; Shaumyan 1941: 146. Polysemy: 'to know / to get to know'. An analytic construction with the verb $\textit{xi}-'\textit{to become}' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 62]. The variant $\textit{aha}$-$r$ is from [Suleymanov 2003].

\textbf{Keren Aghul:} Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 177. Irregular verb with the synthetic present form $\textit{hu}$-$r$; the rest of the paradigm is formed analytically as $\textit{ha}$-$r$ $\textit{xi}$. The auxiliary verb $\textit{xi}$- in Kibrik & Kodzasov's gloss may be an error for $\textit{xa}$- = the verb $\textit{xa}$- 'to become' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 62].

The same root in the Usug subdialect: $\textit{Ha}$-$r$ $\textit{waˤ}$-'to know' [Shaumyan 1941: 146, 197]; the auxiliary verb $\textit{waˤ}$- means 'to go' q.v.

\textbf{Gequn Aghul:} Dirr 1907: 118, 173; Shaumyan 1941: 146. An analytic construction with the verb $\textit{xa}$- 'to become' [Dirr 1907: 119].

\textbf{Fite Aghul:} Shaumyan 1941: 146. An analytic construction with the verb $\textit{xa}$- 'to become'.

\textbf{Aghul (proper):} Suleymanov 2003: 92; Magometov 1970: 202 (sentence 10); Shaumyan 1941: 146. Polysemy: 'to know / to get to know'. An analytic construction with the verb $\textit{xa}$- 'to become'.

The same root in the Kurag subdialect: $\textit{aHa}$-$y$-$e$ - $\textit{ya}$-$aΧˤ-y$-$e$ [imperf.] / $\textit{r=Ha}$-$r$ $\textit{xa}$-$-\textit{aHa}$-$r$ $\textit{xa}$- [other forms] 'to know / to get to know' [Magometov 1970: 167, 181, 188, 209 sentence 9]. Magometov's inconsistent transcription of the root fricative is obviously wrong, but the picture is similar to the Keren (Richa) dialect: the synthetic imperfect (presence) and the analytic rest of the paradigm.

The analytic construction in other subdialects: Duldug $\textit{aHa}$-$r$ $\textit{xa}$-, Tsirkhe $\textit{aΧˤo}$-$r$ $\textit{xa}$- 'to know; to get to know' [Shaumyan 1941: 146].

Initial $\textit{y}$- and $\textit{z}$- look like desemanticized preverbs.

\textbf{Common Aghul:} A poorly documented verb, both phonetically and paradigmatically. In all the dialects, the proper verbal forms tend to be superseded with the analytic construction $\textit{aha}$-$r$ + the auxiliary verbs 'to become' or 'to go'. The nominal form $\textit{aHa}$-$r$ - $\textit{Ha}$-$r$ represents the old participle or gerund.

\textbf{Northern Tabasaran:} Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 177.

The same in the Khanag subdialect: $\textit{aΧˤa}$ $\textit{x}$-$-\textit{to know}' [Dirr 1905: 151, 229].

\textbf{Southern Tabasaran:} Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 177.

The same in the Khiv subdialect: $\textit{aΧˤa}$ $\textit{x}$-$-\textit{aΧˤh}$ $\textit{x}$-$\{-\textit{аχˤххьте}\} 'to know' [Genko 2005: 23].

\textbf{Common Tabasaran:} In all dialects the equivalent for 'know' is an analytic construction: the participle from the lost verb $\textit{aΧˤ}-'\textit{to know} + the suppletive auxiliary verb 'to become', for which see [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 62].

\textbf{Gyune Lezgi:} Uslar 1896: 191, 193, 594. Literally 'to be-known to X'. The analytic construction with the participle $\textit{ci}$ $\textit{xe/xsa}$- or simple $\textit{ci}$ $\textit{xe/xsa}$- can also be used, literally 'to become (xe/ xs) known to X'.

Similarly in Literary Lezgi: $\textit{ci}$- with polysemy: 'to know / to know how', literally 'to be-known to X' [Haspelmath 1993: 139, 484, 522]. Used in the imperfective; for the perfective, the analytic construction with the participle $\textit{ci}$-$r$ $\textit{xa}$- 'вирхуна' is used, literally 'to become (xa) known to X' [Gadzhiev 1950: 248; Haspelmath 1993: 139]. Not attested in [Talibov & Gadzhiev 1966].

\textbf{Proto-Lezgian:} NCED: 262. Distribution: Retained as the basic root for 'to know' in Caucasian Albanian-Udi, on the one hand, and in most Nuclear Lezgian lects, on the other: West Lezgian (Tsakhur, Rutul), South Lezgian (Kryts, Budukh). It must be noted that in Udi, the verb got lost, whereas the root survived in the suffixed adjective as an element of the complex verb (literally 'to be knowing'). Similarly, the old verb tends to be superseded with the analytic construction participle + 'to be(come)' in Nuclear Lezgian. The original meaning of $\textit{?aχˤa}$- shifted to 'to be able to; to know how' in Archi.

In Aghul and Tabasaran, the old root was lost, superseded with $\textit{ʔaΧˤa}$- [NCED: 565] (as in the case of $\textit{ʔaΧˤa}$-, the most frequent construction is participle + 'to be(come)'). The exact Proto-Lezgian meaning of $\textit{ʔaΧˤa}$- is not clear, apparently
something like 'to get to know, to learn' (cf. its meanings 'teaching, lesson' in Archi, 'to be able to' in Tsakhur).

In some lects, the basic meaning 'to know' is expressed with etymologically obscure roots: Archi (sˈini), Lezgi (či-).

Replacements: ['to know' > 'to be able to; to know how'] (Archi, Budukh).

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular.

Semantics and structure: Primary verbal root.

46. LEAF
Nidzh Udi չազալ {չազալ} (-1), Vartashen Udi չազալ {չազալ} (-1), Archi kˈaći (1), Kryts (proper) beš (2), Alyk Kryts յարպաղ (-1), Budukh յարպաղ {յարպաղ} (-1), Mishlesh Tsakhur տ潴եղ {բլեղ} (3), Mikik Tsakhur տ潴եղ (3), Gelmets Tsakhur տ潴եղ (3), Mukhad Rutul գիռւակ {կրիււկյա} (4), Ixrek Rutul գիռւակ {կրիււկյա} (4), Luchek Rutul գիռւակ (4), Koshan Aghul կճափ (5), Gequn Aghul պիազ (2), Fite Aghul կաբ (5), Aghul (proper) կաբ (5), Northern Tabasaran կաժ-ա (1), Southern Tabasaran կաժ (1), Gyune Lezgi beš (2), Proto-Lezgian *ƛˈača (1).

References and notes:


Common Udi: As correctly proposed in [Schulze 2001: 333], an Azerbaijani loanword. Borrowed from Azerbaijani dialectal (Zaqatala) չազալ 'leaf', literary չազալ 'fallen dry leaves' (ultimately from Persian).

Caucasian Albanian: ʒeeup [Gippert et al. 2008: IV-36]. The form is not fully reliable and etymologically obscure; it is attested only in the plural meaning 'leaves' = 'foliage'.


Distinct from the more specific term չխալ {չխալ}I 'large leaf (e.g., of burdock)' [Meylanova 1984: 144].


In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 402], 'leaf' is glossed as յարպաղ {յարպաղ}, borrowed from Azerbaijani յարպաղ 'leaf'.

Distinct from the collective չազալ {չազալ} 'foliage' [Ibragimov 1990: 66], borrowed from Azerbaijani dialectal (Zaqatala) չազալ 'leaf', literary չազալ 'fallen dry leaves'.

Tsakhur-Kum Tsakhur: տ潴եղ [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 97].

Mikik Tsakhur: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 96; Dirr 1913: 206, 229.


It is surprising, however, that in the only Burshag example found for the meaning 'leaf' it is the word k'ez that is used: "In autumn, leaves fall down from the trees" [Shaumyan 1941: 40].


**Gequn Aghul**: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 96; DIRR 1907: 137, 176; Shaumyan 1941: 153. The variant p'aʰz is from [DIRR 1907]. Applied to trees.

Distinct from c'aw 'leaf of herb' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 96].

Distinct from k'ez ~ k'iz 'paper, sheet of paper; letter (message)' [DIRR 1907: 130; Shaumyan 1941: 183] (the latter form is from [DIRR 1907]).

**Fite Aghul**: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 96. Applied to both trees and herbs.

**Aghul (proper)**: Suleymanov 2003: 194. According to Suleymanov's examples, Tpig c'ab is applied to both trees and herbs. In [Shaumyan 1941: 153], however, the Tpig word for 'tree leaf' is quoted as p'ez.

Distinct from k'ez 'paper, sheet of paper; letter (message)' [Suleymanov 2003: 125; Shaumyan 1941: 183]. It is interesting, however, that in the only Tpig example found in Shaumyan's work for the meaning 'leaf' the word k'ez is used: "In autumn, leaves fall down from the trees" [Shaumyan 1941: 40].

**Common Aghul**: A rather unclear situation here, with three candidates for the meaning 'leaf': p'aʰz, c'ab and k'ez. The word c'ab (c'aw) has a cognate in Tabasaran (the closest relative of Aghul); c'ab ~ c'aw 'herb leaf', suggesting that it is possible to reconstruct the opposition 'tree leaf' vs. 'herb leaf' (c'aw) for Proto-Aghul; in such a case the former term would be superseded with the latter one (c'ab) in some dialects, where this typologically rare semantic opposition was eliminated.

It is uncertain how the Proto-Aghul word for 'tree leaf' should be reconstructed. Upon first sight, p'aʰz is the best candidate ('tree leaf' in Keren and Gequn), but first, it should be noted that k'ez, which everywhere means 'sheet of paper', might be attested in the meaning 'tree leaf' in Koshan and Proper Aghul (if Shaumyan's examples are valid); second, the semantic development 'leaf' > 'sheet (of paper)' is typologically possible, whereas vice versa looks odd. These facts could point to k'ez as the Proto-Aghul term for 'tree leaf'. Both k'ez and p'aʰz possess external Lezgian cognates with the meaning 'leaf', but k'ez seems a more preferable candidate for the status of this basic Proto-Lezgian term. It should be noted that, as plausibly proposed in [NCED: 298], p'aʰz acquires the shape p'aʰz in some Aghul dialects under the influence of k'ez. This can additionally confirm that the main Proto-Aghul word for 'tree leaf' was k'ez, whereas p'aʰz denoted some specific kind of leaves.

**Northern Tabasaran**: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 96. Apparently applied to both trees and herbs.


The same in the Khyuryuk subdialect: k'ez [klax] 'leaf of tree' [Genko 2005: 110], as opposed to c'aw [itla] 'leaf of herb, plant tops' [Genko 2005: 176] (the dialectal origin of c'aw is not specified by Genko, but phonetically the form is Northern Tabasaran; Khyuryuk is the most probable variant).

**Southern Tabasaran**: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 96. Apparently applied to both trees and herbs.


**Common Tabasaran**: The typologically rare opposition k'ez 'tree leaf' / c'ab 'herb leaf' is to be reconstructed for Proto-Tabasaran.

**Gyune Lezgi**: Uslar 1896: 359, 616. Applied to trees (at least).


Differently in the Akhty dialect: Khyurt ri'q-ây 'leaf' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 96] (applied to both trees and herbs). Final -V- is a rare desemanticized suffix.

In is unclear how the Proto-Lezgi term for 'leaf' should be reconstructed. Note the different treatment of Lezgian *p* in Gyune (θ) and Literary Lezgi (φ).
Proto-Lezgian: NCED: 773. Distribution: An unstable word. Three roots enter into competition with each other in this "criss-crossed" situation. Tentatively, we fill the slot with "*λαχά- [NCED: 773], which has the best distribution among the candidates. The root "*λαχά- means 'leaf' in Archi, on the one hand, and in Tabasaran (specifically 'tree leaf') and apparently Proto-Aghul, on the other. Additionally, this root means 'grain' in Udi (< "husk"?), 'stem, stalk' in Lezgi, Kryts, 'pod, seedpod' in Tsakhur, 'straw' in Budukh (cf. also Rutul 'qač' 'grain' quoted in [NCED], not found in other sources). However, external North Caucasian cognates of Lezgian "*λαχά are fairly scant and dubious.

The second candidate is "*ριλ’ (reduplicated "*λ’"") [NCED: 784]. It is attested as 'leaf' in Rutul and Akhty Lezgi, but has been lost in the rest of languages (in [NCED], cf. also Budukh k’uruk ‘bud’ is quoted, not found in primary sources). Lezgian "*ριλ’ ~ "*λ’" has a weak distribution, and there are no internal reasons to reconstruct this root as the basic Proto-Lezgian term for 'leaf'. Nevertheless, "*ριλ’ ~ "*λ’" has very good external North Caucasian cognates that point to the meaning 'leaf'.

The third candidate is "*ρα’ša [NCED: 297], attested as 'leaf' in Kryts, Gyune Lezgi, some Aghul dialects (but probably not Proto-Aghul). In Budukh, this stem means 'bud, gemma'. It is unclear how the exact meaning of Proto-Lezgian "*ρα’ša should be reconstructed.

In Tsakhur, 'leaf' is expressed by "*t’ela [NCED: 1006], whose original Proto-Nuclear Lezgian (and Proto-Lezgian?) meaning was no doubt 'twig, rod' (with a further shift to 'rib' in some lects).

Cf. also c’ab, which means specifically 'herb leaf' in Proto-Aghul-Tabasaran (without further etymology?).

Inherited terms for 'leaf' were superseded with Azerbaijani loanwords in Udi, Alyk Kryts, Budukh.

Replacements: {twig, rod} > 'leaf' (Tsakhur), {herb leaf} > 'petal' (Literary Tabasaran), {leaf} > 'grain'? (Udi), {leaf} > 'stem, stalk'? (Lezgi, Kryts), {leaf} > 'pod, seedpod'? (Tsakhur), {leaf} > 'straw'? (Budukh).

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular, except for the dissimilative deglottization in Aghul and Tabasaran.

Semantics and structure: Primary substantive root. The oblique stem is "*λαχά-.

47. LIE

Nidzh Udi bas-k-sun  (ätäcIcyn) (1), Vartashen Udi bas-k-sun ~ bas-k-esun  (ätäcIcyn) (1), Archi =aχa- (2), Kryts (proper) c=uq’äl- (3), Alyk Kryts q=aq’äl- (3), Budukh q=aq’al-{k’ak’äl, k’al’kal} (3), Mishlesh Tsakhur q=il’=ex- {k’alaIkhac} (4), Mikik Tsakhur il’=ex- (4), Mukhad Rutul l=uk- {lukyc ~ lycac} (5), Ikrek Rutul ow=l=uk- {ow lukycun} (5) / k=ut’- (6), Luchek Rutul l=uk- (5), Koshan Aghul aχ-a- (2) / ut=ark-i- ~ q=ark-i- ~ q=ark-i- (7), Keren Aghul fa=t=ix-a- (4) / a=q=ux-a- (4), Gequn Aghul aχ-a- (2) / q=ux-a- (4), Aghul (proper) a=q=ux-a- (4), Northern Tabasaran da=q= (8), Southern Tabasaran d=aq- (8), Gyune Lezgi q=at=x’i- (5), Proto-Lezgian *ʔaχär- (2).

References and notes:

Nidzh Udi: Guksayan 1974: 71, 93 (sub ‘y); Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 561; Mobili 2010: 49, 74. Polysemy: 'to lie / to lie down / to sleep / to fall asleep'. This currently serves as the default expression for 'to sleep' q.v. in Nidzh.

Vartashen Udi: Guksayan 1974: 71, 93 (sub ‘y); Fähnrich 1999: 8; Schiefer 1863: 100; Schulze 2001: 254; Starchevskiy 1891: 486. Polysemy: 'to lie / to lie down'. According to texts in [Bekhanov & Bekhanov 1902], in the past tenses this verb acquires an additional meaning 'to sleep' q.v.; in [Dirr 1903: 42, 43] the masdar is also quoted with the meaning 'to sleep'.

Common Udi: Common Udi "bas-k-esun 'to lie; to lie down', formed with the aid of the light verb -k- 'to let?' [Schulze 2005: 561 f. (3.4.2.2 #14, 21); Schulze-Fürhoff 1994: 474]. The synchronic root bas- is to be analyzed as "bas- with a fossilized class prefix ([NCED: 1038], followed by [Gippert et al. 2008: II-71]). Alternatively (thus [Schulze 2001: 254]) and less likely - as "bas- with the locative preverb ba(y)- 'in', for which see [Maisak 2008a: 156; Harris 2002: 69; Schulze 2005: 580 ff. (3.4.3)] (for unknown reasons, this preverb
is glossed as 'down' in [Schulze 2001: 254]).

**Caucasian Albanian:** The verb bas-k' is, in fact, attested only in the past tense with the meaning 'to sleep, to fall asleep' [Gippert et al. 2008: IV-8] (the same situation as in archaic Vartashen, see above). This is, however, probably not the basic expression for 'to sleep' q.v.

**Archi:** Chumakina et al. 2007; Kibrik & Kodzasoasov 1988: 88; Kibrik et al. 1977b: 235; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 561; Dirr 1908: 129, 212. Perfective stem: *iχu*. Polysemy: 'to lie / to lie down / to sleep'; applied to animated subj. The meaning 'to sleep', proposed in [Mikailov 1967: 172] and [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 235], is proven by the example "He is still asleep (lit. lying down)" [Chumakina et al. 2007], although this is probably not the default expression for 'to sleep' q.v. In [Mikailov 1967: 172] *iχu*- is incorrectly translated as simply 'to sleep'. The same verb is used in the expression for 'to sleep' q.v. (*iχu*-ke-).

Distinction from *=rfa*- 'to lie (inanimate subj.); to put' [Chumakina et al. 2007; Kibrik et al. 1977b: 229].

**Kryts (proper):** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 88; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 561. Ablaut paradigm: *c=–u*-l=q'al- [imperf.] / *c=–u*q'ul- [perf., inv.]. Initial *c= is the preverb of general semantics, -l- is the imperfective infix. Polysemy: 'to lie / to lie down' (in the aforementioned sources quoted for 'to lie down'; the stative meaning 'to lie' is given in [NCED: 265]).

**Alyk Kryts:** Authier 2009: 139, 393, 405. Ablaut paradigm: *q=–a*-l=q'al- [imperf.] / *q=–a*q'il- [perf.] / *q=–a*q'il-[inv.]. Corresponds to the Kryts proper verb, but modified by another prefix. Polysemy: 'to lie / to lie down'.


**Mishlesh Tsakhur:** Kibrik et al. 1999: 68, 875; Ibragimov & Nurmamedov 2010: 211; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 561. Ablaut paradigm: *q'ilb=–ex–a* [imperf.] / *q'ilb=–ix–u* [perf.] / *q'ilb=–ix–as* [fut.]. Thematic -a- in perf. can hardly serve as an unambiguous indication of labialized -x- in the root. More important evidence for -x- is the negative masdar class 1/2 *q'ilb=–r–x=a*, quoted in [Ibragimov & Nurmamedov 2010: 211]; it is not clear, however, whether this form is reliable. Cf. the positive masdar 1/2 with plain -x- in the same source: *q'ilb=–r–x=x* (i.e. -x has been levelled across the paradigm after forms of class 3, where -px= > -px- or -xx= > -cx- (a regular dissipilative process), but such forms are not numerous, thus it is strange to regard them as the source of levelling.

Polysemy: 'to lie / to lie down' (for the stative meaning ct., e.g., an example in [Kibrik et al. 1999: 220]). Applied to sg. subj.

Distinct from *q'ilb=–ak=x*- 'to lie; to lie down' (pl. subj.) [Kibrik et al. 1999: 68, 875; Ibragimov & Nurmamedov 2010: 211].

In [Ibragimov & Nurmamedov 2010], *q'ilb=–ex–a* and *q'ilb=–ak=x*- are quoted with polysemy: 'to lie / to sleep', which frequently occurs in the Tsakhur dialects, but this is not the Mishlesh case, where 'to sleep' is expressed by a specific verb (q.v.).


Distinct from *s’ilb=–ek=x*- 'to lie; to lie down; to sleep' (pl. subj.) [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 88].

**Gelmets Tsakhur:** Not attested. In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 561], 'to lie down' is glossed as sowkanish-x- [sowkanishxes], which looks like an Azerbaijani loanword: the Azerbaijani verbal root sowka- + the Azerbaijani perfect suffix -miš + the Tsakhur verb ix- 'to become', although the actual source of sowka- has not been identified (the possible candidate is Azerbaijani sőykä-mäk 'to lean against, rest against', if one assumes a dialectal development in Azerbaijani into *sőökä- 'to lie (down)').

Cf. *s’ilb=–ix–u*- 'to sleep' q.v.

**Common Tsakhur:** Initial n=V?a (Mishlesh *q=V?a*) is a double prefix with general semantics [Ibragimov 1990: 125; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 41].

**Mukhad Rutul:** Ibragimov 1978: 32, 120; Makhmudova 2001: 71, 96, 243. In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 561], erroneously quoted as l=ux- [uxux]. Polysemy: 'to fall (subj. = only human?), go sprawling / to lie'. Cf. an example: "Anuts is lying" [Makhmudova 2001: 71]. In [Dirr 1912: 158], only attested with the meaning 'to fall' (no expressions for 'to lie' are provided by Dirr). Regular paradigm: l=uk-a-r- [imperf.] / l=uk-a-r- [perf.].

In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 561], a second term for 'to lie down' is also quoted: k=ut- [uxxyn] (not found in other sources), on which see below.

**Izrek Rutul:** Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 181, 203, 352. A collocation ('to lie, rest'), which consists of the adverb ow 'down' and the verb luk- 'to fall (subj. = only human?)' with the regular paradigm: l=uk-á-r- [imperf.] / l=uk-u-r [perf.].
A second candidate is ʁ=ark- {ʁ=xry1nu} 'to lie / to be ill' [Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 148], with the examples: 'He (or it?) is lying on the ground", 'I have been ill for many days'. In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 561], 'to lie down' is quoted as ow ʁ=ark- with the same adverb ow 'down'.

The difference between ow l=uk- and ʁ=ark- is unclear; we treat both as synonyms.Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 148.

**Luchek Rutul:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 88. Regular paradigm: l=uk-ʁ=ark-a-r- [imperf.] / l=uk-ʁ [perf.]. Polysynemy: 'to lie / to lie down'. This verb is quoted in the meaning 'to lie down' in [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988], but the lexical opposition 'to lie' : 'to lie down' is atypical for this region; hence, we assume the aforementioned polysynemy for Luchek l=uk-.

**Common Rutul:** Shinaz dialect: in [Ibragimov 1978: 163] the verb k=ut- is quoted with the meaning 'to get into bed, lie down into bed'.

It is unclear how the Proto-Rutul verb for 'to lie' should be reconstructed, because the available lexicographic information is very scarce. The widespread verb l=uk- rather represents the Proto-Rutul term for 'to fall, go sprawling', which has latter acquired the meaning 'to lie' in some dialects (cf. the analytic Ixrek construction "down + to fall"). On the contrary, k=ut- 'to lie' may be an archaism.

Initial l-, k= are prefixes with general semantics [Ibragimov 1978: 95; Alekseev 1994a: 227; Makhmudova 2001: 165].

**Koshan Aghul:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 88. Polysynemy 'to lie (down) / to sleep (q.v.)'.

In [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988], three verbs are quoted as synonyms for 'to lie down' (scll. 'to lie'): a=ʁ=ark-a, ut=ark-i- and ʁ=ark-i-; semantic and pragmatic nuances are unknown.Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 88; Shaumyan 1941: 141. The two former stems are from [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988]; the latter one ʁ=ark-i- is from [Shaumyan 1941: 141] (with explicit polysynemy: 'to lie / to lie down'). Note the Burshag stem ʁ=ark-i- 'to sleep' q.v., modified with another prefix.

The same root in the Khuđig subdialect: H=ark-i- 'to lie' [Shaumyan 1941: 133 f., 149] ("He [the third son of the king] used to lie in ashes") and ʁ=ark-i- 'to lie; to lie down' [Shaumyan 1941: 141] ('He lay on the bed').

**Keren Aghul:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 88.

In [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988], two verbs are quoted as synonyms for 'to lie down' (scll. 'to lie'): fa=t=ix-a- and a=q=ux-a-; semantic and pragmatic nuances are unknown.

A different root in the Usug subdialect: ʁ=ark-a- 'to lie; to lie down' [Shaumyan 1941: 141] ("He lay on the bed").Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 88.

**Gequ Aghul:** Dirr 1907: 104, 175. Polysynemy: 'to lie / to lie down / to sleep (q.v.)'. Cf. the example for the stative meaning 'to lie': "We will lie near this she-donkey" [Dirr 1907: 77]Shaumyan 1941: 141. Polysynemy: 'to lie / to lie down'.

**Fite Aghul:** Not attested.

**Aghul (proper):** Shaumyan 1941: 141. Polysynemy: 'to lie / to lie down'. Shaumyan's example for the stative meaning: "He lay on the bed". It must be noted that in [Suleymanov 2003: 35], a=q=ux-a- is more specifically translated as 'to lie down for a short time (Russian: присидей)'. Probably no expressions for the generic 'to lie (animated subj.)' in [Suleymanov 2003].

Differently in the Tsirke subdialect: q=arx-a- 'to lie; to lie down' [Shaumyan 1941: 141].

**Common Aghul:** We presume that Koshan and Keren verbs, which are quoted in [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988] for the concept 'to lie down', actually possess the polysynemy: 'to lie / to lie down'.

In sum, four or five verbal roots, sometimes modified with various spatial prefixes, are attested in Aghul dialects with the meaning 'to lie (down)'; 1) a=ʁ- 'to lie (down); to sleep'; 2) =ark-i- 'to lie (down); to sleep'; 3) =arx-a- 'to lie (down); to sleep'; 4) =ix-a- 'to lie (down)'; 5) (a)q=ux-a- 'to lie (down)'. The areal isoglosses of polysynemy 'to lie / to sleep' and derivation 'to fall' → 'to lie (down); to sleep' are rather strong in Aghul, which makes the reconstruction of the Proto-Aghul verbs for 'to lie' and 'to sleep' difficult.

It seems that the prefixed =arx-a- has secondarily acquired the meanings 'to lie' (Tsirke subdialect of Proper Aghul) and 'to sleep' (Keren, Proper Aghul, Fite), because the main synchronic meaning of (=)arx-a- is 'to fall' [Magometov 1970: 164], and external Lezgian comparison confirms this [NCED: 602].

The root =ark-i-, modified with various spatial prefixes, seems to be a recent introduction in the generic meanings 'to lie (down)' (Koshan, Usug Keren) and 'to sleep' (Burshag Koshan). The basic meaning of the prefixless stem ark-i- is retained in Burshag Koshan as 'to fall down' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 84]; various verbal prefixed stems from this root in Aghul dialects also demonstrate the semantics of 'falling' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 84; Shaumyan 1941: 137, 138]. This Aghul root originates from Proto-Lezgian *ʔarkiɾ- / *ʔerkiɾ- 'to fall; to let fall' [NCED: 266].
Similarly, Keren (Richa) fa=t=ix-a- is secondary in the generic meaning ‘to lie (animated subj.)’, because in other Aghul dialects the standard meaning of this prefixed stem is ‘to throw, let fall; to be ill in bed, be laid up’ [Shaumyan 1941: 149; Suleymanov 2003: 165]. External Lezgian comparison suggests that the primary meaning of Proto-Lezgian *ʔeɬːʷɨ - from which Aghul =ix-a- originates) was ‘to put; to lie (inanimate subj.)’ [NCED: 279].

The expressions aqux-a- (Richa Keren, Tpig), qux-a- (Gequn) ‘to lie (down)’ must apparently be analyzed as prefixed a=q=ux-a-, q=ux-a-, where a= is the spatial preverb ʔa= (ʔ is often dropped in modern Aghul dialects, T. Maisak, p.c.). If so, the verbal root =ux-a- must be regarded as an ablaut variant of =ix-a-, discussed above. Theoretically, however, one can treat (a)qux-a- as the analytic construction aqu xa-, where aqu is the regular past participle from the verb aq- ‘ʔ’ and xa- is the common auxiliary verb ‘to become’. In this case, Gequn qa(-)xa- is the result of sporadic vowel reduction, on which see [Suleymanov 1993: 42 f.]. Indeed, the Tabasaran (closest relative of Aghul) data can speak in favour of the postulation of the Aghul verb aq- ‘to lie’ (thus [NCED: 264]), but all Aghul sources (including [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988] and [Suleymanov 2003]) quote (a)qux-a- as one synthetic stem. Because of this, we prefer to follow the prefixed analysis (following [NCED: 279]).

No verb for ‘to lie (animated subj.)’ can be assuredly reconstructed for Proto-Aghul, but the prefixless verb aχ-a- is safely reconstructible as the Proto-Aghul term for ‘to sleep’ q.v. (aχ-a- ‘to sleep’ is retained in Burshag Koshan, Gequn and the Tsirkhe subdialect of Proper Aghul). Maybe the Burshag Koshan and Gequn situation is primary (aχ-a- with polysemy: ‘to lie; to sleep’), and aχ-a- was also the basic Proto-Aghul verb for ‘to lie (animated subj.)’.

**Northern Tabasaran:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 88. Apparently applied to both sg. and pl. subject.

The system in the Khanag subdialect is more complicated: d=ˈaq- ‘to lie; to lie down’ (sg. subj.) [Uslar 1979: 656, 997; Dirr 1905: 163, 232], as opposed to d=ix- ‘to lie; to lie down’ (pl. subj.) [Uslar 1979: 659, 997; Dirr 1905: 162, 232].

**Southern Tabasaran:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 88.

The same in the Khiv subdialect: d=qa- <qaxayɨ> ‘to lie; to lie down’ [Genko 2005: 59]. The same in Literary Tabasaran: d=qa- <qəxɨyɨ> ‘to lie; to lie down’ [Khanmagomedov & Shalbuzov 2001: 137]. Apparently all Southern verbs are applied to both sg. and pl. subject.

**Common Tabasaran:** We presume that Tabasaran verbs which are quoted in [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988] for the concept ‘to lie down’ actually possess polysemy: ‘to lie / to lie down’.

The Khanag opposition d=qa- ‘to lie (sg. subj.)’ / d=ix- ‘to lie (pl. subj.)’ can be either a Proto-Tabasaran archaism, lost in other subdialects, or a local introduction.

Initial d= is a spatial prefix.


The fluctuation k(ː) ~ x seems strange, but these verbs should hardly be kept apart from each other. One possibility might be a sporadic dissipilative fricativization tk > tx in the cluster.

Initial qat(ː) (i.e. qat=ʔ=ʔ?) are desemanticized spatial prefixes.

**Proto-Lezgian:**

NCED: 273. **Distribution:** The verbs for ‘to lie’ and ‘to sleep’ must be analyzed together with each other. The basic data can be summarized as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proto-CA-Udi</th>
<th>Archi</th>
<th>Kryts</th>
<th>Budukh</th>
<th>Tsakhur</th>
<th>Rutul</th>
<th>Aghul</th>
<th>Tabasaran</th>
<th>Lezgi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>ʔalas(ʔ)ʷin-</em></td>
<td>lie/sleep</td>
<td>lie, sleep (complex verb)</td>
<td>sleep</td>
<td>sleep</td>
<td>sleep</td>
<td>li/sleep</td>
<td>sleep</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ʔaxər-</em></td>
<td>[NCED: 273]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ʔitxəl</em></td>
<td>[NCED: 619]</td>
<td>sleep</td>
<td>(complex verb)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
First of all, attention should be paid to two semantic isoglosses, which seriously obscure the picture. The first isogloss is the polysemy 'to lie / to sleep' (usually with the shift 'to lie' > 'to sleep', but not obligatory). It seems ancient, since it affects all of Lezgian (including Caucasian Albanian) as well as some other Dagestani languages. The second isogloss is the derivation 'to fall' > 'to lie' (> 'to sleep'), which affects the Samur territory (Nuclear Lezgian) and seems relatively recent.

Two main candidates for the Proto-Lezgian meanings 'to lie' and 'to sleep' are *ʔaχär- and *ʔaχär-. Before discussing them in details, some clearly innovative formations should be ruled out.

In the Caucasian Albanian-Udi branch, 'to sleep' can be expressed analytically as 'to be in sleeping', in conjunction with the Common Proto-Lezgian noun *ʔaχär 'dream, sleeping' [NCED: 619]. This formation competes with the verb bas=k-esan (< *ʔaχär=*in-) 'to lie / to sleep' in both Caucasian Albanian and modern Udi, but apparently such an analytical construction is a relatively early innovation of the Caucasian Albanian-Udi branch.

In South Lezgian (Kryts, Budukh), the meaning 'to lie' originates from 'to fall, go sprawling' (cf. synchronic polysemy in Budukh). The original meaning of *ʔaχär- [NCED: 264] was something like 'to dangle, shake', as follows from the same semantics in Aghul-Tabasaran, on the one hand, and in some other North Caucasian groups, on the other.

In Tsakhur, 'to lie (animated subj.)' is expressed by *ʔeɬːʷɨ [NCED: 278], whose original labile meaning was 'to put / to lie (inanimate subj.)', as follows from its Lezgian cognates. Additionally, this root can acquire the polysemy 'to lie / to sleep' in some Tsakhur dialects.

In Rutul, the original verb for 'to lie' seems to be k=ut', without further etymology. This stem tends to be superseded with the root *ʔikʷän- (~ -l) [NCED: 644] 'to fall, go sprawling' in modern Rutul dialects.

In Aghul dialects, the most complicated situation is observed with four or five verbs for 'to lie', three of which are also attested in the meaning 'to sleep'. It seems that the most economic scenario is to reconstruct *ʔaχär- with Proto-Aghul polysemy 'to lie / to sleep'. Other verbs are recent dialectal introductions: *ʔarkɨr [NCED: 266] 'to fall' > 'to lie', 'to sleep'; *ʔarkir- / *ʔerkir- [NCED: 266] 'to fall down' > 'to lie', 'to sleep'; *ʔeqi- [NCED: 278] > 'to lie'.

In Tabasaran, 'to lie' is expressed with *ʔaχär- [NCED: 264], whose original meaning could be 'to fall' vel sim., this root looks rather problematic etymologically: pace [NCED]. Archi *ʔaχa- 'to lie' can be satisfactorily etymologized as *ʔaχär-, whereas Aghul aq'a xa- 'to lie' should rather be analyzed as prefixed a=mq=aux-a.

In Lezgi, *ʔikʷän- (~ -l) [NCED: 644] 'to fall, go sprawling' shifted to the meaning 'to lie' (the same development as in Rutul).

Finally, we can return to *ʔaχär=*in- [NCED: 1037] and *ʔaχär- [NCED: 273]. The first one, *ʔaχär=*in-, denotes both 'to lie' and 'to sleep' in Caucasian Albanian and Udi. It also survived in two Nuclear Lezgian languages (Tsakhur, Lezgi), where it means 'to sleep'.

The second one, *ʔaχär-, means 'to lie' in Archi (with the synchronic derivative 'to sleep'), but 'to sleep' in the bulk of Nuclear Lezgian.

In such a mirror situation, external North Caucasian comparison should be involved. The external data point to the primary meaning 'to sleep' or 'to dream' for Lezgian *ʔaχär=*in-, thus we postulate this root as the Proto-Lezgian term for 'to sleep'. This stem acquired the polysemy 'to lie / to sleep' in the Caucasian Albanian-Udi branch (due to the common areal isogloss), but survived as 'to sleep' in some West Lezgian (Tsakhur) and East Lezgian (Lezgi) languages.

On the contrary, Lezgian *ʔaχär- originates from the Proto-North Caucasian root with the meaning 'to fall'. Thus, we postulate *ʔaχär- as the Proto-Lezgian root for 'to lie', assuming the shift 'to fall' > 'to lie' in Proto-Lezgian. It was lost as a verb in the Udi branch after the verb 'to sleep' acquired the polysemy 'to sleep / to lie'. In most Nuclear Lezgian lects, *ʔaχär- primarily meant both 'to sleep / to lie' (the isogloss of polysemy), but currently 'to lie' is normally expressed by various verbs for 'to fall' (a more recent semantic isogloss). Additional evidence for the original meaning 'to lie' is the
Vartashen Udi adjective b-arx ‘transversal, horizontal’ (< "lying") [Gukasyan 1974: 71] with the fossilized class prefix. Such a scenario is not straightforward, but seems the most economic one.

Replacements: ‘to lie’ > ‘to sleep’ (Tsakhur), ‘to fall’ > ‘to lie / to sleep’ (Aghul), ‘to fall, go sprawling’ > ‘to lie’ (Kryts, Budukh, Rutul, Lezgi), ‘to lie (inanimate subj.)’ > ‘to lie (animated subj.)’ (Tsakhur, Aghul).

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular.

Semantics and structure: Primary verbal root with polysemy ‘to lie / to lie down’.

48. LIVER

Nidzh Udi məˈyin=papaš {məˈyin nanaw} (1), Vartashen Udi maˈin=pušˈpuš (1), Archi dilik (-1), Kryts (proper) lähä=lähkän (2), Alyk Kryts taχul ~ leha=taχul (3), Budukh läq’ {laʔkəb} (2), Mishlesh Tsakhur k’ilʔk’am {kIwɨʔkIam} (2), Mikik Tsakhur k’ilʔk’am (2), Gelmets Tsakhur q’alq’am (2), Mukhad Rutul laq’ {lakb} (2), Ixrek Rutul leq’ {lekb} (2), Luchek Rutul laq’ (2), Koshan Aghul lek’ (2), Keren Aghul lek’y (2), Gequn Aghul lek’y (2), Fite Aghul lik’y (2), Aghul (proper) lek’y (2), Northern Tabasaran ˈɪk’-i (2), Southern Tabasaran ˈkər’u=liq’ (2), Gyune Lezgi lāq’ (2), Proto-Lezgian *läʔ/ˈɪ’(2).

References and notes:


Another term for ‘liver’ may be zizam, which is translated as ‘spleen’ in [Fähnrich 1999: 35] and only as ‘liver’ in [Dzheiranishvili 1971: 204, 247] (there is no term for ‘spleen’ in [Dzheiranishvili 1971]). However, the latter glossing seems erroneous, because zizam is consistently glossed only as ‘spleen’ in other sources [Gukasyan 1974: 118; Mobili 2010: 298; Schiefner 1863: 93; Starchevskiy 1891: 506], and, furthermore, this word originates from the Proto-Lezgian term for ‘spleen’.

A third hypothetical candidate for ‘liver’ is šigär, which is glossed in [Schulze 2001: 272] as ‘liver; courage’, although this is unattested in the direct anatomic meaning in [Bezhanov & Bezhanov 1902]. The Udi word was borrowed from Azerbaijani *šigär (Modern ši̞gər) ‘liver, lung; courage’, ultimately from Persian ši̞gər ‘liver; courage’. It is interesting that ši̞gər [ši̞gər] is cited in [Gukasyan 1974: 245] as a synonym for a word ti̞x’ [ti̞x], although the entry ti̞x’ is missing from [Gukasyan 1974]. Additionally, in [Dabakov 2008: 359] there is a word ti̞x’mi̞x [ti̞x’mi̞x] ‘entrails, pluck’ (the same term is quoted as ti̞xmix ‘entrails, pluck’ in [Mobili 2010: 266]). An uncertain situation.

Common Udi: No candidates except for *maˈiru papaš – puʃˈpuʃ, literally ‘black entrails’. Nidzh papaš and Vartashen puʃˈpuʃ ‘entrails’ are obviously related, but details are obscure; this looks like a reduplicated formation or a loanword from an unknown source.

Caucasian Albanian: Unattested.


Kryts (proper): Kibrik & Kodzakov 1990: 35; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 220. A collocation, with the literal meaning ‘black lähän’.


A second term for ‘liver’ is ši̞gər [Authier 2009: 101], borrowed from Azerbaijani *ši̞gər (Modern ši̞gər) ‘liver, lung; courage’, ultimately from Persian ši̞gər ‘liver; courage’.
v 2010: 221], 'liver' is enigmatically glossed as k'arˈu-

Gelmets Tsakhur: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 35. In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 221], 'liver' is enigmatically glossed as basir opk’a (bərgər opka); the first word could indeed denote 'liver', borrowed from Azerbaijani laq’'ir 'liver', whereas the second one is the modern depharyngealized variant of opk‘a 'lung' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 34].

Mukhad Rutul: Ibragimov 1978: 115; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 221. Not attested in [Dirr 1912]. In [Ibragimov 1978], the variant liχ’di laq’ 'liver' is also quoted, literally 'black laq’.

Izrek Rutul: Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 179; Ibragimov 1978: 194. In another passage, Ibragimov transcribes the Izrek form as laq' [Ibragimov 1978: 222], which seems an error (cf. the Shinaz form below). In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 221], erroneously quoted as laq' [laq‘].


Southern Tabasar: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 35. The collocation k’ar’u lik’ literally means 'black (k’ar’u q.v.) clot of coagulated blood'.

In the Khiv subdialect: lek’ - lik’ [lɛkɛl, lɛkɛ] with polysemy: 'liver / lung' [Genkő 2005: 114]. The same in Literary Tabasar: lik’ [lɛkɛ] 'liver' or k’ar’u lik’ 'black lik’ = 'liver' [Khanmagomedov & Shalbuzov 2001: 218] (the collocation liz’i lik’ 'white lik’ denotes 'spleen').

Common Tabasar: After the Azerbaijani pattern 'black X' = 'liver' was introduced in Southern Tabasar, the plain lik’ acquired the meaning 'clot of coagulated blood' in Kondik.


Proto-Lezgian: NCED: 586. Distribution: Retained as the basic term for 'liver' in all Nuclear Lezgian languages (except for Alyk Kryts), therefore can be safely reconstructed as 'liver' in Proto-Nuclear Lezgian. External comparison confirms that 'lǎlč’ was the Proto-Lezgian term for 'liver' as well.

The Azerbaijani analytical pattern 'black X' = 'liver', as opposed to 'white X' = 'lung', has been introduced in many languages (Udi, Kryts, Budukh, Rutul, Tabasar).

Under the influence of such a construction, Lezgian *χultul / *χultul 'lung' [NCED: 901] acquired the meaning 'liver' in Alyk Krys. Similarly, in Southern Tabasaran, *lǎlč’ 'liver' acquired the meaning 'clot of coagulated blood' in isolated use.

In Udi, the old root was superseded with obsolete forms papaš ~ puʔpəš (cf. [NCED: 868] sub hypothetical Proto-Lezgian *pVrš~: (~-l-)) with the semantics of 'bubble').

In Archi, the word for 'liver' was borrowed from Lak. Additionally, in Udi, Kryts and, perhaps, in some other languages, the Azerbaijani-Persian loanword may occur.

Replacements: 'lung' > 'liver' (Alyk Kryts), ['liver'] > 'clot of coagulated blood' (Southern Tabasar).
49. LONG

Nidzh Udi *boχo-y {ðoxoi} (1), Vartashen Udi *boχo {ðoxo} (1), Archi 'aqa-tu-class (2) / *lɑːχa-tu-class (3), Kryts (proper) *fɑχ-ty (1), Alyk Kryts *fɑqa (4), Budukh *hapχi ~ *hapχi {lanxy, ɬaɔxy, ɬanxy} (1), Mishlesh Tsakhur *χilːy-i-n ~ *χilːy-i-n {χɪλɨiɨɨɨ} (3), Mikik Tsakhur *χilːiː-n (3), Gelmets Tsakhur *χilːiː-yi-n’y (3), Mukhad Rutul *χilːuχ-ɗi {xylaxeɗy} (3), Ixrek Rutul *χuEiː-ɗi {xylaxeɗy} (3), Luchek Rutul *χuleχ-ɗi (3), Koshan Aghul *yɛɾχ-e-r (3), Keren Aghul *yɛɾχ-e-f (3), Gequn Aghul *yɛɾχ-e-f (3), Fite Aghul *yɛɾχ-t (3), Aghul (proper) *iɾχ-e-f (3), Northern Tabasaran *yɛɾχ-i (3), Southern Tabasaran *yɛɾχ’i (3), Gyune Lezgi *yår’i (3), Proto-Lezgian *hɑlχa- (3).

References and notes:


Common Udi: Common Udi *boχo; originally *b=ɔχo with a fossilized class prefix.

Arch.: Chumakina et al. 2007; Kibrik et al. 1977b: 190; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 584. In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010] a corrupted variant aqa-tu-class is also quoted. After the static verb 'aqa 'to be long' [Chumakina et al. 2007; Kibrik et al. 1977b: 190]. Polysemy: 'long (spatial) / long (temporal)'; widely applicable according to examples in [Chumakina et al. 2007] and [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 190]. 'Long road', 'long street', 'long dress', 'long beard', 'long report'.

Another common adjective is *lɑːχa-tu-class with polysemy: 'long (spatial) / long (temporal) / tall (of person)' [Chumakina et al. 2007; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 236; Kibrik et al. 1977b: 273, 357; Mikailov 1967: 190; Dirr 1908: 164, 207], a participle from the static verb *lɑːχa 'to be long, tall' [Chumakina et al. 2007; Kibrik et al. 1977b: 273]. It is claimed in [Chumakina et al. 2007] that *lɑːχa-tu-class in the spatial meaning is applied to horizontal objects only, although examples in [Kibrik et al. 1977b: 273] and [Chumakina et al. 2007] contradict this: 'long road', 'long fingers', 'long neck', 'long dress', 'long life', 'long lesson', 'long sound', 'tall person'. We prefer to treat both terms as synonyms. Chumakina et al. 2007; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 236; Kibrik et al. 1977b: 273, 357; Mikailov 1967: 190; Dirr 1908: 164, 207.


Tsakhur-Kum Tsakhur: *χilːiː-n [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 236].

Mikik Tsakhur: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 236; Dirr 1913: 211, 224.

Common Tsakhur: Looks like an old masdar in -y from the lost stative verb ‘to be long’. Note the gemination of -l- in the Gelmets and Tsakhur-Kum forms (for which cf. [Ibragimov 1990: 203-204]), influenced by the same sporadic phenomenon in the Azerbajani language.


In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 584], ‘long’ is glossed with the unclear form q’ai- [qai].

Izrek Rutul: Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 273, 336; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 584. Note the gemination of -l-, influenced by the same sporadic phenomenon in the Azerbajani language.


Common Rutul: An interesting counterpart is observed in the Borch-Khno dialect: fili- ‘long’ [Ibragimov 1978: 234].

Note the pharyngealization, which is retained only in the Mukhad form (if Ibragimov’s transcription is correct). The Rutul root χ'iVχ- seems morphologically non-analyzable. Possibly represents a partially reduplicated stem (although the pattern of reduplication is strange).

Final -di / -d is the attributive suffix.


Keren Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 236. The same in the Usug subdialect: yarχ-e-f (i.e. yarχ-e-f) ‘long’ [Shaumyan 1941: 142].


Fite Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 236.


Common Aghul: Final -d, -l, -f, -r are adjectival suffixes (fossilized class exponents) [Magometov 1970: 92; Shaumyan 1941: 45].

Northern Tabasaran: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 236.


Southern Tabasaran: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 236.


The same in the Akhty dialect: Khlyut yars i ‘long’ [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 236].

Proto-Lezgian: NCED: 550. Distribution: As proposed in [NCED: 550], there were several Proto-Lezgian verbal roots with similar phonetic shapes and close meanings, which partially contaminated in individual languages. Two of them are main candidates for the status of the Proto-Lezgian term ‘(to be) long’.

The first one is ‘hlədɨɑ- [NCED: 550], which means ‘to be long’ (> ‘long’) in Archi, on the one hand, and ‘long’ in the bulk of Nuclear Lezgian, on the other: West Lezgian (Tsakhur, Rutul), East Lezgian (Aghul, Tabasaran, Lezgi). It should be noted that the Tsakhur form is morphologically an old masdar from the lost verb. In Udi and Budukh, however, this root is attested in the meaning ‘up, on top’.

The second is ‘h[al]χV- [NCED: 420], whose adjectival derivatives are attested with the meaning ‘long’ in Udi, on the one hand, and in South Lezgian (Kryts, Budukh), on the other. In Archi and the rest of Nuclear Lezgian, this stem means ‘to be high’ or ‘to rise, raise’.

Two roots mirror each other in this “criss-crossed” situation. External comparison, however, strongly suggests that ‘hlədɨɑ- [NCED: 550] is to be reconstructed with the Proto-Lezgian meaning ‘to be long’, whereas ‘h[al]χV- [NCED: 420] meant ‘to rise, be high’.

The second Archi verb ‘to be long’ originates from ‘yaqːV- [NCED: 275], whose original meaning was ‘(to be) high’ vel sim. In Alyk Kryts, the etymologically unclear word faqa ‘long’ occurs.

Replacement: ‘to rise, be high’ > ‘long’ (Udi, Kryts, Budukh, Archi), ‘(to be) long’ > ‘up, on top’ (Udi, Budukh).

Reconstruction shape: Exact reconstruction of the initial laryngeal is unclear; metathesis of l and χ is observed in several lects.

Semantics and structure: Primary stative verbal root ‘to be long’.
50. LOUSE

Nidzh Udi *nec:* {neŋ} (1), Vartashen Udi *nec:* {neŋ} (1), Archi *n'acː'- (1), Kryts (proper) *liš* (2), Alyk Kryts *liš* (2), Budukh *liš* {liš} (2), Mishlesh Tsakhur *wixʰ* {ωuxʰ'} (2), Mikik Tsakhur *wixʰ* (2), Gelmets Tsakhur *wixʰ* (2), Mukhad Rutul *lix* {λιχ} (2), Ixrek Rutul *lixʰ* (2), Koshan Aghul *net:* (1), Keren Aghul *net:* (1), Gequn Aghul *net:* (1), Fite Aghul *nit:* (1), Aghul (proper) *net:* (1), Northern Tabasaran *n'icː-i* (1), Southern Tabasaran *nic:* (1), Gyune Lezgi *net:* (1), Proto-Lezgian *nācː* (1).

References and notes:


Common Udi: Common Udi *nec.*

Caucasian Albanian: Unattested.


Tsakhur-Kum Tsakhur: *wixʰ* [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 94].


Gelmets Tsakhur: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 94. In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 160], erroneously quoted as *wix* [ωux].


Luchek Rutul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 94.


Fite Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 94.


Northern Tabasaran: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 93.


Southern Tabasaran: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 94.


Gyune Lezgi: Uslar 1896: 514, 607. Paradigm: *net* [abs.]/ *netː-ɾ/'-ː obl.*/ *netː-ɾ* [pl.].

- The same in Literary Lezgi: *net* [abs.]/ *netː-ɾ/'-ː obl.* [pl.]/ *netː-ɾ* [pl.]/ *ner* 'louse' [Talibov & Gadzhiev 1966: 252; Gadzhiev 1950: 104; Haspelmuth 1993: 500, 522].

- The same in the Akhyt dialect: Khlyut *net* [abs.]/ *netː-ɾ/'-ː obl.* [pl.]/ *netː-ɾ* [pl.]/ *ler* 'louse' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 94].

- In the Usukhchay subdialect of the Doquzpara dialect (Samur group) *net* shifted to the meaning 'nit' [Meylanova 1964: 225], but the new Usukhchay word for 'louse' is not documented.
Proto-Lezgian: NCED: 846. Distribution: This stem is retained as the root for 'louse' in both of the outliers (Udi, Archi) and in East Lezgian (Aghul, Tabasaran, Lezgi), having been lost in the rest of Nuclear Lezgian.

In South Lezgian (Kryts, Budukh) and West Lezgian (Tsakhur, Rutul), *buat* was superseded with *buat* [LEDb: #162]. Further etymology of the latter is unclear. It must be noted that *buat* 'louse' is not a Proto-Nuclear Lezgian replacement, but represents a more late introduction of Proto-South Lezgian and Proto-West Lezgian (perhaps of areal nature).

Replacements: 'louse' > 'niit' (Dochzpara Lezgi).

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular.

Semantics and structure: Primary substantive root. The oblique stem is "nVc' - rV".

51. MAN

Nidzh Udi *iš-qar (ішкъар) (1), Vartashen Udi *išu (ішу) (1), Archi bošor (2), Kryts (proper) *firi (1), Alyk Kryts *furi (1), Budukh *furi (фурь) (1), Mishlesh Tsakhur *adam: (адами) (1), Mikik Tsakhur *adam: (1), Gelmets Tsakhur *adam: (1), Mukhad Rutul *wiyil (выйил) (3), Ixrek Rutul *wiyil-di (выйилдын) (3), Luchek Rutul *wiyil-di (3), Koshan Aghul ile-r (4), Keren Aghul *idemi (1), Gequn Aghul eremi (1), Fite Aghul edim (1), Aghul (proper) *idemi (1), Northern Tabasaran *qar (1), Southern Tabasaran *qar (1), Gyune Lezgi *tim (1), Proto-Lezgian *ә:̂йy (1).

References and notes:


Distinct from әркәй 'male (n.)' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 220; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 72], borrowed from Azerbaijani erki (male (n.), man).

Vartashen Udi: Gukasyan 1974: 130; Mobili 2010: 155; Fähnrich 1999: 18; Dirr 1903: 14, 16, 25, 51, 63, 93; Schiefner 1863: 77; Schulze 2001: 286. Polysemy: 'man / husband'. In [Dirr 1903], as in some other cases, consistently transcribed with ә (išu [išiy]); also sporadically with ә in [Bezhanov & Bezhanov 1902], although the normal spelling is ә, see [Schulze 2001: 286].

Common Udi: Common Udi *išu (sg.) / *iš-qar- (pl.). The plural form is apparently an old compound. Its second element qar is unattested elsewhere in Modern Udi, but corresponds to Caucasian Albanian qar 'tribe / clan, kin / nation, people / seed (botanic) (q.v.)' [Gippert et al. 2008: IV-30]. The plural stem iš-qar- spread into singular forms in Nidzh (a normal process for such words), but became lost in modern Vartashen. The most archaic situation is apparently attested in archaic Vartashen, where iš-qar- is retained for plural (see [Schiefner 1863: 77] and [Bezhanov & Bezhanov 1902: Mk. 6.44], although in [Dirr 1903: 25] a "regular" paradigm of išu is quoted). Contamination with Azerbaijani kiši 'man' (as proposed in [Schulze 2001: 287]) is improbable and unnecessary.

Caucasian Albanian: *išu [Gippert et al. 2008: IV-21, 48]. Suppletive paradigm with the following polysemy: išu 'man; person' [sg.]; žin 'men; people' [pl.], see [Gippert et al. 2008: IV-17, 21, 48].


Distinct from miyil (male (n.).) [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 220; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 72].

Alyk Kryts: Authier 2009: 31, 39, 68, 69, 74, etc. Specified as 'married man' in [Authier 2009: 30, 34]. The borrowed term adami 'person' q.v. can also be used in the meaning 'man', e.g., [Authier 2009: 73].

Distinct from *vili* ~ *vuli* 'male (n.); stallion' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 69; 220; Meylanova 1984: 34; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 72].


Another loanword, *kšši* 'man' (< Azerbaidjani *kšši* 'man'), can also be used [Kibrik et al. 1999: 880].


Distinct from the inherited *wɨɣɨl-na ~ wɨɣɨl₅-na* 'male (n.)' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 220].


Common Tsakhur: The term represents the wandering Oriental (originally Arabic) word for 'person, human being'.


Common Rutul: Final -di is the attributive suffix.

Koshan Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 59. Final -r is the attributive suffix (fossilized class exponent) [Magometov 1970: 92; Shaumyan 1941: 45].

Strictly speaking, Kibrik & Kodzasov’s Burshag form ile-r ‘man’ looks either like a recent introduction or an occasional formation, because both in [Shaumyan 1941: 142] and [Suleymanov 2003: 87] ile-r is translated as ‘male (n.); male (adj.)’ (this is the Common Aghul adjective for ‘male’, see Shaumyan’s data), whereas for ‘man’ it is the wandering loanword that is quoted in these sources: Burshag *armi*, Khudig *almi* ‘man; person’ [Shaumyan 1941: 143; Suleymanov 2003: 86].


Distinct from Burshag *šʷy-r* ‘male (n.)’ [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 220].


Distinct from the inherited Richa *šųq* ‘husband’ [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 59] and *uʃar-f* ‘male (n.)’ [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 220] (--- *uʃar* ‘ram’).

Gequn Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 59; Dirr 1907: 113; Shaumyan 1941: 143. Cf. the example: “If you are a man, stay until he comes in the city” [Dirr 1907: 51].

Distinct from the inherited *šųq* ‘husband’ [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 59; Dirr 1907: 155; Shaumyan 1941: 164]; glossed as ‘husband; man’ by Dirr and Shaumyan), *uʃar-f* ‘male (n.)’ [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 220] and ile-f ‘male (adj.)’ [Shaumyan 1941: 142].

Fite Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 59.

Distinct from the inherited *šuy* ‘husband’ [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 59; Magometov 1970: 39; Shaumyan 1941: 164]; glossed as ‘husband; man’ by Shaumyan and *il-e* ‘male (n.); male (adj.)’ [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 220; Shaumyan 1941: 142].


Distinct from Tpig inherited *šųq* ‘husband’ [Suleymanov 2003: 205; Shaumyan 1941: 164]; glossed as ‘husband; man’ by both Suleymanov and Shaumyan) and ile-f ‘male (n.); male (adj.)’ [Suleymanov 2003: 87; Shaumyan 1941: 142].

Common Aghul: It is likely that *šʷųq* (*šųq, xšųq*) must be posited as the Proto-Aghul term for ‘man (male human being)’, with polysemy: ‘man / husband’. Synchronously, *šųq* is frequently glossed as ‘man; husband’ [Dirr 1907; Shaumyan 1941;
Suleymanov 2003], despite the fact that in all found textual examples, $šuy$ specifically means 'husband' rather than generic 'man'. Aghul $šuy$ also serves as an ethnonymical suffix [Magometov 1970: 89], which also confirms the proto-meaning 'man'.

In modern dialects the wandering Oriental (originally Arabic) term has been introduced for the meaning 'man': idemi with the rhotacized variant eremi (for the rhotacism in Aghul and Tabasaran dialects see [Suleymanov 1993: 69 f.; NCED: 125]), further armi and even almi. On the contrary, in the Koshan dialect the old word for 'male' ($ile$-r) shifted to the meaning 'man'.

**Northern Tabasaran:** Kibrik & Kodzash 1990: 59. Paradigm: $z³i$ [abs.] / $z³uw$- [obl.]. Distinct from Dyubek $žiši$ 'male (adj.)', with class exponents: $žilu$-'w [žilwụpe] 'male (n.)', $žišu$-'r 'husband' [Kibrik & Kodzash 1990: 59, 220].

The situation in the Khanag subdialect is almost identical: $ži$ [abs.] / $žuw$- [obl.] 'man' [Uslar 1979: 686, 998; Dirr 1905: 168, 234]. Opposed to $žiši$ 'male (adj.)', with the class exponents: $žilu$-'w 'male (n.)', $žišu$-'r 'husband' [Uslar 1979: 686, 998; Dirr 1905: 168, 234]. The additional Khanag term is $ši$ [abs.] / $šuw$- [obl.] 'husband' [Uslar 1979: 987, 998] (not quoted in [Dirr 1905]).


**Southern Tabasaran:** Kibrik & Kodzash 1990: 59. A wandering Oriental (originally Arabic) term. Distinct from inherited Kondik $žiši$-r 'husband' [Kibrik & Kodzash 1990: 59].

Somewhat differently in the Khiv subdialect: $žil$ ['žišu'] 'male of male sex', with class exponents: $žil$-b ['žišub'] 'male (n.)', $žiši$-'r ['žišub'] 'husband' [Genko 2005: 65] (these forms are not marked by Genko as Khiv due to accidental omission of the plus sign). 'Man' is expressed as Khiv $žiši$-$žuw$ ['žišu'] 'man' ['žišu'] in literary 'male $žuw$' [Genko 2005: 65]; Khiv $žuw$ ['žišu'] also serves as an ethnonymical suffix [Genko 2005: 69]. There exists an additional Khiv term for 'husband': $ši$-'w ['šuw'] - the oblique stem, used only in the expression 'to marry', literally 'to go to the husband' [Genko 2005: 193].

The simplest system is attested in Literary Tabasaran: $žiši$ ['žišu'] 'male (adj.)', with class exponent: $žiši$-r ['žišur'] with polysemy: 'man / husband' [Khanmagomedov & Shalbuzov 2001: 163]. The old term $ži$ [abs.] / $žuw$- [obl.] ['žišu'] shifted to the meaning 'strong young guy, daring fellow' [Khanmagomedov & Shalbuzov 2001: 160]; literary $ži$ / $žuw$- also serves as an ethnonymical suffix [Khanmagomedov & Shalbuzov 2001: 160] and is retained with the meaning 'man' in the compound $ahli$-$ži$ 'elderly man' [Khanmagomedov & Shalbuzov 2001: 49]. Two loanwords with the meaning 'man' are also present in Literary Tabasaran: $adm$ ['adm'] 'person (q.v.); man' [Khanmagomedov & Shalbuzov 2001: 50], ultimately borrowed from Arabic; $erk$ ['erk'] 'man; male (n.)' [Khanmagomedov & Shalbuzov 2001: 356], borrowed from Azerbaijani $erk$ ['male (n.), man'].

**Common Tabasaran:** The terms $ži$ (obl. $žuw$-) 'man' and $žil$- 'male (adj.)'; male (n.); husband' can safely be reconstructed for Proto-Tabasaran. The Northern dialect is the most archaic; in the Southern subdialects $ži$ 'man' tends to be superseded with $žiši$- or with loans.

The Southern absolutive form $žuw$ was levelling after the oblique forms (the original paradigm is retained in the Northern dialect).

The main problem is the word $ši$ (obl. $šuw$- ~ $šuw$-) 'husband', attested in some Northern and Southern subdialects (see the data above; $ši$ / $šuw-$ is also mentioned in [Khanmagomedov & Shalbuzov 2001: 348] as 'dialectal'). Both $ži$ 'man' and $ši$ 'husband' originate from Proto-Lezgian *ši* 'man', but $ši$ 'husband' apparently represents a wandering loanword, which ultimately originates from a certain Tabasaran dialect (or even a distinct Lezgian language), where such a reflex of *ši* is regular.

**Gyune Lezgi:** Uslar 1896: 559, 617. Distinct from inherited $šil$ 'husband' [Uslar 1896: 388].


Lezgi $itim$, $yetem$ and the syncopated variant $tim$ represent a wandering Oriental (originally Arabic) term for 'man; human being'.

\textbf{Proto-Lezgian:} NCED: 336. \textbf{Distribution:} This stem is attested with the meaning ‘man’ in Caucasian Albanian-Udi, on the one hand, and in some Nuclear Lezgian languages, on the other: West Lezgian (Kryts, Budukh), Proto-Aghul, Tabasaran. In Lezgi, this root has survived as a male ethnonymical suffix.

In Archi, the meaning ‘man’ is expressed by *\textit{wv(r)ə}-* [NCED: 1043], which was lost in the rest of Lezgian (although cf. the Caucasian Albanian plural stem \textit{u-b-a} ‘husbands’ [Gippert et al. 2008: IV-35]). Therefore, its original semantics cannot be established, but external North Caucasian comparison points to the meaning ‘male’ or, more narrowly, ‘bull-calf’.

In Rutul, the root *\textit{morkil} / *\textit{work'il} ‘male (n.)’ [NCED: 830] has acquired the meaning ‘man’.

Similarly, in Koshan Aghul and Literary Tabasaran, *\textit{kə?y} ‘man’ was superseded with *\textit{λəiV}-. [NCED: 749], whose original meaning was ‘male’ at least on the Proto-East Lezgian level.

Superseded with Arabic or Azerbaijani loanwords in Tsakhur, Aghul and Tabasaran dialects.

\textbf{Replacements:} [‘male’ > ‘man’] (Rutul, Koshan Aghul, Literary Tabasaran), [‘man’ > ‘strong young guy, daring fellow’] (Literary Tabasaran), [‘man’ > ‘ethnonymical affix’] (Southern Tabasaran, Lezgii).

\textbf{Reconstruction shape:} Basic correspondences seem regular. Metathesis in Caucasian Albanian-Udi; fossilized plural suffix in West Lezgian (Kryts, Budukh).

\textbf{Semantics and structure:} Primary substantive root. The oblique stem is *\textit{kə?yə-}. It is possible to reconstruct the Proto-Lezgian polysemy ‘man / person’, see notes on ‘person’.

52. \textit{MANY}

\textit{Nidzh Udi gele (келе, гёле) (1)}, Vartashen Udi gёlō (көлө, өүлө) (1), Archi *n’axq’ukan ~ n’oxq’ukan ~ n’oxq’ukun - nu\textsc{-class} (2), Kryts (proper) parā (-1), Alyk Kryts \textit{χayla} (-1), Budukh lāh-ki ~ lāh-ki-že (лъхИку ~ лъхИкдже) (3), Mishlesh Tsakhur \textit{χe-class-adv.class} \textit{xeppa} (3), Mikök Tsakhur \textit{χe-class-adv.class} (3), Gelmets Tsakhur \textit{χa-class-adv.class} (3), Mukhd Rutul \textit{bala (бәла) (4)}, Ixrek Rutul \textit{bala (баала) (4)}, Luchek Rutul \textit{bala (4)}, Koshan Aghul \textit{para (1)}, Keren Aghul \textit{para (1)}, Gequn Aghul \textit{para (1)}, Fite Aghul \textit{para (1)}, Aghul (proper) \textit{para (1)}, Northern Tabasaran \textit{aχʷɛ诅wa (5)}, Southern Tabasaran \textit{aχʷɛ诅wI (5)}, Gyune Lezgi \textit{gizəf (1)}, Proto-Lezgian *\textit{ʔaχˤi'} (3).

\textbf{References and notes:}


\textit{Common Udi:} Common Udi *\textit{gele} or *\textit{гёл}. A possible etymology is proposed in [NCED: 410 f.] - a suffixal formation \textit{ge-le} from the Lezgian verb *\textit{ʔekV}: ‘to grow’ (with the reduction of the first vowel). The root *\textit{ʔekV} is actually very rarely attested as an independent verb in Lezgian languages, but the parallelism Udi \textit{ge-le} ‘many’ ~ Tsakhur \textit{ge-class} ‘much, very’ is important. On the other hand, Udi forms might be borrowed, but no appropriate sources have been revealed up to now (cf. Azerbaijani dialectal \textit{kalan} ‘many, numerous’). It is claimed in [Schulze 2001: 279] that the Udi terms were borrowed from Iranian (namely \textit{<} Kurdish \textit{gala(κ)} ‘much, very’), which does not seem very likely from a sociolinguistic point of view, since Kurdish linguistic influence on Udi is very modest (if it exists at all) and the idea of a borrowing of such a basic term from Kurdish can hardly be accepted.

\textbf{Caucasian Albanian:} \textit{avel} ‘many, much; more; enough’ [Gippert et al. 2008: IV-7]. Gippert & Schulze’s idea [Gippert et al. 2008: II-80, IV-7] that \textit{avel} is borrowed from Armenian \textit{aveli} ‘exceeding, superfluous; more’ is improbable both from a semantic (the Armenian term does not mean ‘many’) and sociolinguistic point of view (Armenian influence on Caucasian
Albanian was apparently very weak, since there are only one or two reliable Armenian loans in the known Caucasian Albanian lexicon, see [Gippert et al. 2008: Il-80 f.]. Distinct from het'ən 'so much, so many' [Gippert et al. 2008: IV-27].


There are three standard ways to express the semantics of 'many' in Archi, and the available sources do not permit to establish the formal difference between them.

1) The uninflected adjective/adverb ˈnəqˈukan ~ ˈnəqˈukan ~ ˈnəqˈukan and inflected adjective ˈnəqˈukan-ne-CLASS.

Browsing through texts suggests that these words are the most frequent expressions for 'many'. That is why we prefer to fill the slot with these forms.

Examples with countable objects: "The king gave many gifts to the children and let them go" [Kibrik et al. 1977b: 95]; "Many goods were spent on this" [Kibrik et al. 1977b: 104]; "Many of Muha Muhammad's sheep have perished" [Kibrik et al. 1977b: 113]; "We have gathered many stones" [Chumakina et al. 2007]; "Many people were killed during the war" [Chumakina et al. 2007]; "Many people have come" [Kibrik et al. 1977b: 285]; "There are a lot of partridges around Archi" [Mikailov 1967: 148]; "There are many birthmarks on her face" [Mikailov 1967: 149]; "When she cries, many tears fall down" [Mikailov 1967: 112].

Examples with uncountable objects: "Her husband just arrived and brought a lot of riches from Azerbaijan" [Kibrik et al. 1977b: 46]; "I have plenty of troubles besides this" [Kibrik et al. 1977b: 97]; "I have a lot of money" [Kibrik et al. 1977b: 117]; "There is plenty of stone in Archi" [Mikailov 1967: 146]; "In winter there is a lot of snow here" [Mikailov 1967: 149]; "After that, a lot of food appeared before them" [Mikailov 1967: 156, 158]; "We have stayed there for a long time (= much time)" [Kibrik et al. 1977b: 106]; "The husband became sad, he was very much worried" [Kibrik et al. 1977b: 39].

Two other expressions for 'many' seem statistically less frequent.

2) The stative verb ˈləbəxan 'to be many, be much, to be a lot' and the derived adverb ˈləbəxan-ʃi 'much, many' [Chumakina et al. 2007; Kibrik et al. 1977b: 270, 367; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 609; Mikailov 1967: 190].

Examples with countable objects:

"To provide many sheep for the state..." [Kibrik et al. 1977b: 117]; "At that time there were many sheep" [Kibrik et al. 1977b: 113]; "There are many fruits here" [Kibrik et al. 1977b: 270]; "I have more text books than exercise books" [Kibrik et al. 1977b: 270]; "many people" [Kibrik et al. 1977b: 112]; "The rich man had a few children, whereas the poor man had a lot" [Kibrik et al. 1977b: 69].

One example with uncountable objects: "The Russians had much (war) force" [Kibrik et al. 1977b: 170-171].

3) The adverb ˈdunələ ~ ˈdunələu 'many, much, often' and the derived adjective ˈdunələ-ti-CLASS [Chumakina et al. 2007] [Kibrik et al. 1977b: 224; Dirr 1908: 142, 213]. These are probably normally applied to intensive or repetitive actions or abstract objects, as in, e.g., "He was beaten a lot" [Dirr 1908: 142]. Although there is a number of instances with countable objects: "Many houses" [Kibrik et al. 1977b: 112]; "Many quarrels", "Many scuffles" [Kibrik et al. 1977b: 113, 114]; "Formerly there were not many diseases" [Kibrik et al. 1977b: 116 f.]; "At that time many poor men were in the kolhoz" [Kibrik et al. 1977b: 116]; "Many men", "Many women", "Many rams" [Dirr 1908: 142]. It is claimed in [Chumakina 2009] that Archi ˈdunələu is borrowed from Arabic dunya 'earth, world', but this solution is improbable from the semantic point of view.

In one example ˈnəqˈukan and ˈdunələ function as virtual synonyms: "We frequently (ˈdunələ) went to Şura, Džungutay, Kumukh for trading, frequently (ˈnəqˈukan) went" [Kibrik et al. 1977b: 115 f.]


Polysemic: 'many, much / very'. A Wanderwort, attested in several Lezgian languages with irregular sound correspondences. Apparently a loanword of Iranian origin.

In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010] also a synonym ˈxeyli 'many' is quoted, borrowed from Azerbaijani ˈxeɔli 'much, many, quite a lot, quite a few' (ultimately from Persian ˈxeɔli: 'much; very').

Alyk Krys: Authier 2009: 107. Glossed as 'many, much, very'. Borrowed from Azerbaijani ˈxeɔli 'much, many, quite a lot, quite a few' (ultimately from Persian ˈxeɔli: 'much; very').


A close synonym is ˈxeɔli ˈxeɔli 'many, much' [Meylanova 1984: 146, 221; Talibov 2007: 154], borrowed from Azerbaijani ˈxeɔli 'much, many, quite a lot, quite a few' (ultimately from Persian ˈxeɔli: 'much; very').
Distinct from artuːx [artu:x] 'more; too much' [Meylanova 1984: 21].


A less frequent word is čiːčje 'many, much (countable & uncountable obj.), enough' [Kibrik et al. 1999: 109, 152], borrowed from Azerbaijani xeːliː-jːi 'much, many, quite a lot, quite a few' (ultimately from Persian xeːliː 'much; very').

Cf. also non-frequent gʷeː-class ~ gʷeː-class [reːtɪ, reːtɑ] 'much; very' [Kibrik et al. 1999: 117, 874, 895; Ibragimov & Nurmamedov & Khalilov 2010: 112] (applied only to uncountable objects?).

Tsakhur-Kum Tsakhur: χˤa-class-ADV.class-bi [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 233]. Applied to countable objects (final -bi is the plural marker; for uncountable objects the simple χˤa-class-ADV is used).


A second candidate is gʷeː-class 'many, much (countable & uncountable obj.), very' [Dirr 1913: 146, 229].

Gelmets Tsakhur: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 233. In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 609], the modern depharyngealized variant is quoted: χˤa-class-ADV.class [xartra]. Applied to countable and uncountable objects.

Common Tsakhur: Tsakhur χˤ- (~ χe-) represents the same root as 'big' q.v.


Ixrek Rutul: Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 32, 355, 434; In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 609], quoted as bala. Applied to both countable and uncountable objects. Polysemy: 'many / much / very'.


Common Rutul: Term of unclear origin; possibly an Iranian loanword?

Koshan Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 233; Suleymanov 2003: 141; Shaumyan 1941: 153. According to [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 233], para is applied to countable objects, distinct from aːc'una 'much (uncountable obj.).' In [Shaumyan 1941: 130-131], however, there is an example where Burshag para is applied to an uncountable object: 'This merchant had a lot of riches'.


Gequn Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 233; Dirr 1907: 28, 137, 176; Shaumyan 1941: 153. According to Dirr's examples, applied to both countable and uncountable objects with polysemy: 'many / much / very': 'many houses', "much money", "a very big house". It is noted [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 233], however, that para is applied only to countable objects, whereas for 'much (uncountable obj.)' the inherited form aːc'una is used.


Common Aghul: Initial pː- in para points to a non-inherited form; apparently a loanword of Iranian origin. A Wanderwort in this region.

The form aːc'ina ~ aːc'una 'much (uncountable obj.)' is the past participle from the verb aːc'iː- ~ aːc'ana- 'to fill (intrans.)' (see the entry 'full').


Common Tabasaran: Dyubek ʔaːc'ːnu and Kondik ʔaːc'ːnu ʔaːc'ːnu contain the adjective ʔaːc'ː- 'big' q.v., whereas the second element is apparently the substantive 'heap', attested as Northern (Dyubebek) ʔaːc'ː-ʔe 'heap, hill' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 193], Southern (Khiv) ʔaːc'ː [ɾiːkaː] 'heap, pile' [Genko 2005: 183], - i.e. 'many' as 'a large heap'. Formally, this expression should
be reconstructed as the Proto-Tabasaran term for 'many'. Another inherited form is Khiv ‘aːg-naː’ (literally ‘filled’), but its exact meaning - ‘many’ or ‘much’ - is unknown. In most dialects the inherited terms were superseded with the loanword *gizaːf*, borrowed from Persian *gizaf* very much, innumerable, extreme*. In [Magometov 1965: 330], *gizaf* is quoted as the main Tabasaran word for ‘many’.


Another loanword in the Akhty dialect: Khlyut *paːr’a* ‘many’ [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 233] (applied to both countable and uncountable objects). The form is also attested in some other Lezgian languages; probably of Iranian origin.

**Proto-Lezgian**: NCED: 511. **Distribution**: This word is quite prone to borrowing among Lezgian lects. The Proto-Lezgian term cannot be reconstructed with certainty. The best candidate is *ʔaχˤɨ* [NCED: 511], which means ‘many’ in Tsakhur and ‘to be enough’ in one of the outliers, Archi (*발=אχˤ*). It is also proposed in [NCED] that Budukh *läh-ki* ‘many’ contains the same root, but the origin of initial *l-* is unclear. In Tsakhur, Tabasaran, non-Koshan Aghul, this root forms the adjective ‘big’ q.v. - it seems, however, to be a late areal innovation: ‘many’ > ‘big’.

The second candidate, which is actually not significantly weaker than the first one, is *l[ʔa]wχ* [NCED: 754]. It means ‘many’ in Archi (although it is not the most basic expression for this meaning) and ‘to a large extent’ in Lezgi. Both competing roots, *ʔaχˤɨ* and *l[ʔa]wχ*-, possess external North Caucasian cognates with the meaning ‘many’.

In Tabasaran, ‘many’ is expressed analytically as ‘a large heap’. Additionally, in Khiv Tabasaran, the participle from the verb ‘to be full’ (*חʕאːן‘ many*) can be used for ‘many’.

A morphologically unclear form *nʔaːq’akan* ‘many’ (with vowel fluctuation) occurs in Archi (cf. the etymological proposal in [NCED: 594]). Caucasian Albanian *avɛl* ‘many’ is, likewise, unclear etymologically.

In some lects, ‘many’ is expressed with words that look like loanwords, although the source of borrowing has not been identified (Iranian?): Udi *gele ~ gölö* (cf., however, its etymology proposed in [NCED: 410]), Krys, Aghul *parā ~ para*, Rutul *bala ~ balā*.

In Kryts, Tabasaran, Lezgi, only loanwords of Azerbaijani-Persian origin are attested.

**Replacements**: [‘a large heap’ > ‘many’] (Tabasaran), [‘filled’ > ‘many’] (Khiv Tabasaran), [‘many’ > ‘enough’] (Archi), [‘many’ > ‘big’] (Tsakhur, Tabasaran, non-Koshan Aghul).

**Reconstruction shape**: Correspondences seem regular.

**Semantics and structure**: Primary stative verbal root ‘to be many’.

53. MEAT

**Nidzh Udi** *yeq: *{үэκə} (1), **Vartashen Udi** *eq: *{эκə} (1), **Archi** *aɿ* (1), **Kryts** (proper) *yek* (1), **Alyk Kryts** *yak* (1), **Budukh** *yək* *{үəк} (1), **Mishlesh** **Tsakhur** *čura* *{ɤyptə} (2), **Mikik Tsakhur** *čuru* (2), **Gelmets** **Tsakhur** *čuroy* (2), **Mukhad Rutul** *yak* *{үək, як} (1), **Ixrek Rutul** *yak* *{үək} (1), **Luchek Rutul** *yak* (1), **Koshan Aghul** *yak* (1), **Keren Aghul** *yak* (1), **Gequn Aghul** *yak* (1), **Fite Aghul** *yik* (1), **Aghul** (proper) *yak* (1), **Northern Tabasaran** *yək-a* (1), **Southern Tabasaran** *yik* (1), **Gyne Lezgi** *yak* (1), **Proto-Lezgian** *yəɿ*: (1).

**References and notes**:


Common Udi: Common Udi *yeq*.
Caucasian Albanian: Unattested.


Tsakhur-Kum Tsakhur: čuru [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 121].


Keren Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 121. The same in the Usug subdialect: yakː 'meat' [Shaumyan 1941: 147] (erroneously transcribed as yak').

Gequn Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 121; Dirr 1907: 123, 177; Shaumyan 1941: 147. In [Shaumyan 1941], erroneously transcribed as yak'.

Fite Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 121; Shaumyan 1941: 147.

Aghul (proper): Suleymanov 2003: 92; Shaumyan 1941: 147. In [Shaumyan 1941], erroneously transcribed as yak'.

The same in the other subdialects: Tsirkhe, Duldug, Kurag yakː 'meat' [Shaumyan 1941: 147; Magometov 1970: 206 sentences 11-12] (the Tsirkhe form is erroneously transcribed as yak in [Shaumyan 1941]).

Northern Tabasaran: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 121.


Southern Tabasaran: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 121.


The same in the Akhty dialect: Khlyut yak [abs.] / yak'-ɨ- [obl.] 'meat' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 121].

Proto-Lezgian: NCED: 945. Distribution: Retained as the basic term for 'meat' in all the lects, except for Tsakhur, where čurV 'meat' may originate from 'a k. of meat (e.g., beef), if the comparison with Udi čur 'cow' is reliable [LEDb: #197] (without further etymology). _ Replacement: [beef, meat of cow > 'meat'] (Tsakhur).

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular.

Semantics and structure: Primary substantive root. The oblique stem is *yoƛːɨ-.

54. MOON

Nidzh Udi χaš {xauu} (1), Vartashen Udi χaš {xauu} (1), Archi bac (2), Kryts (proper) væz (2), Alyk Kryts vaz (2), Budukh vaz {baʃ} (2), Mishlesh Tsakhur væz {baʃ} (2), Mikik

References and notes:

Nidzh Udi: Gukasyan 1974: 220; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 198; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 52; Mobil 2010: 143. Polysemy: ‘moon / month / light, shine (e.g., of sun)’.


Common Udi: Common Udi *χaš* ‘light; moon; month’. As suggested by the attested polysemy, the Udi term for ‘moon’ was derived from ‘light’ (derivation ‘light’ > ‘moon’ is typologically common, whereas *vice versa* is odd). Caucasian Albanian data confirm this solution. Note, however, that Caucasian Albanian-Udi *χaš* ‘light’ lacks any etymology.

Alternately, it is proposed in [Schulze 2001: 27 f., 333] that *χaš* ‘moon’ is etymologically unrelated to *χaš* ‘light’ and represents a phonetic variant of Udi *χač* ‘cross’ (< Armenian *χačʰ* ‘cross’). According to Schulze’s idea, an old (unattested) Udi term for ‘moon / Moon-god’ was superseded by a new term for ‘cross’ (a symbol of Jesus Christ, the second member of the Trinity) in the course of Christianization. Indeed, in many traditions around the world the words for ‘sun’ and ‘moon’ are syncretized with names of the Sun and Moon deities, and therefore these terms are potentially subject to replacement with loanwords, as the local cult changes. However, this hypothesis is currently refuted by Caucasian Albanian data. It should be noted that, pace [Schulze 2001], such modern Udi words as *χaš-desun* ‘to be christened’, *χaš-tul* ‘priest’ etc. do not confirm that *χaš* could mean ‘cross’ or ‘Christ’, but represent the same semantics of ‘light’ (as plausibly pointed out in [Gippert et al. 2008: II-10], these words were created under the influence of the corresponding Georgian Christian terminology).


According to [Kibrik et al. 1999], however, currently the ablaut paradigm was almost eliminated (*vuz- is retained in the pl. form *vuz-ar* ‘horseshoes’).


Medial -r- in the absolutive form wɔːr̥ (wɔːr̥) is etymologically unclear. As proposed in [NCED: 1044], wɔːr̥ could represent the old oblique stem (with the metathesis *c-r > r-c). It should be noted that morphophonologically, the synchronic Lezgi oblique stem wɔːr- can be analyzed as [wɔːr-ːna] with regular simplification rCR > CR [Haspelmath 1993: 63].

Proto-Lezgian: NCED: 1044. Distribution: Retained as the basic term for 'moon' in all the lects, except for Caucasian Albanian-Udi, where *wɔːr̥ was lost, superseded with the root for 'light, shine; bright, shining' (the latter, however, lacks any etymology).

Replacements: ['light, shine; bright, shining' > 'moon'] (Caucasian Albanian, Udi).

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular.
Semantics and structure: Primary substantive root. The oblique stem is *wɔːr-ːna- ~ *wɔːr-ːna-.

55. MOUNTAIN

Nidzh Udi b-ur-ʊχ {δύπυς} (1), Vartashen Udi b-ur-ʊχ {δύπυς} (1), Archi mul (2), Kryts (proper) bel (3), Alyk Kryts daχ (-1), Budukh daχ {даръ} (-1), Mishlesh Tsakhur siwa {ϲѡа} (1), Mikik Tsakhir siwa ~ suw {ϲѡа} (1), Gelmets Tsakhir siwa (1), Mukhad Rutul siw ~ suw {ϲѡа} ~ cyb (1), Ixrek Rutul siw {ϲѡа} (1), Luchek Rutul siw (1), Koshan Aghul su (1), Keren Aghul su (1), Fite Aghul suw (1), Aghul (proper) su (1), Northern Tabasaran siw (1), Southern Tabasaran siw (1), Gyune Lezgi daχ (-1), Proto-Lezgian *siwa (1).

References and notes:

Common Udi: Common Udi *bʊr-ʊχ, with a transparent fossilized plural suffix -ʊχ. As proposed in [NCED: 1053] and now proven by Caucasian Albanian data, -ur-is, in fact, to be analyzed as another plural suffix, thus *b(u)-ur-ʊχ (for the synchronic Udi plural in -ur-ʊχ, which is normally restricted to monosyllabic roots, see [Schulze 2005: 151 f. (3.2.5.4 #2)].
Caucasian Albanian: bu 'mountain, hill' [Gippert et al. 2008: IV-111].

Distinct from sob ‘alpine pasture used in winter’ [Kibrik et al. 1977b: 314; Mikailov 1967: 197; Dirr 1908: 181] (according to [Chumakina et al. 2007], the modern meaning is ‘field (used as pasture or kept for hay making) that belongs to one family’).
Distinct from mocør 'alpine pasture used in summer’ [Kibrik et al. 1977b: 280] (in [Chumakina et al. 2007] apparently incorrectly transcribed as mocror), although this is glossed as ‘mountain; alpine pasture used in summer’ in [Mikailov 1967: 193] and [Dirr 1908: 168].

Distinct from y’arχː ‘pass in mountains, head of mountain pass’ [Chumakina et al. 2007; Kibrik et al. 1977b: 253], although this is glossed simply as ‘mountain’ in [Dirr 1908: 155].

Distinct from q’un ‘shoulder; protruding part of mountain’ [Chumakina et al. 2007; Kibrik et al. 1977b: 300]; in [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 32], this term is incorrectly quoted as qun ~ q’un [χゅун ~ χィュン] ‘mountain’ (the former variant is a corrupted spelling for {χゅュン} = q’un).

Krys (proper): Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 192; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 32. Polysemy: ‘mountain / rock, cliff’. In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010], two loanwords are also quoted as additional synonyms: das ‘mountain’ (< Azerbaijani day ‘mountain’) and tāpā ‘hill’ (erroneously spelled as tārā [тарə]: < Azerbaijani таpа ‘hill’).

Alyk Krys: Authier 2009: 49, 85, 87, 88, 94, etc. Borrowed from Azerbaijani day ‘mountain’.


Tsakhur-Kum Tsakhur: śūwa [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 192].


Gelmets Tsakhur: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 192; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 32.


A second term for ‘mountain’ is ban ‘mountain; alpine pasture’ [Dirr 1912: 14, 17, 18, 84, 103, 124, 188; Ibragimov 1978: 118; Makhmudova 2001: 15, 73, 80, 82, 192; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 32]. According to Dirr’s and Makhmudova’s example, both words were equally frequent in the early 20th century, but the inherited śiw has been almost superseded by ban in the modern language.


A second term is ban ‘mountain; slope’ [Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 33, 333; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 32].


Common Rutul: The word ban, attested in Mukhad & Ixrek, looks like a recent loanword, although the source has not been identified (cf. Talyshe bänd ‘mountain, hill’; final clusters such as -NT are prohibited in Rutul).


Koshan Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 191; Suleymanov 2003: 149; Shaumyan 1941: 162. Oblique stem: suw-. In [Suleymanov 2003], transcribed as su / saw-.

The same in the Arsug subdialect: su / saw- ‘mountain’ [Shaumyan 1941: 162].


The same in the Usug subdialect: su / saw- ‘mountain’ [Shaumyan 1941: 162].

Gequ Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 191; Dirr 1907: 142, 171; Magometov 1970: 70. Oblique stem: suw-. Dirr transcribes this word as su / saw-.

Fite Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 191; Magometov 1970: 70; Shaumyan 1941: 162.


The same in the other subdialects: Tsirkhe, Duldug, Kurag, Khpyuk su, suw- ‘mountain’ [Shaumyan 1941: 162; Magometov 1970: 155, 223 strophes III].

Common Aghul: It is proposed in [NCED; 1053] that the transcription of the Koshan (Burshag) form su with tense s is a misspelling in [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990]. This is indeed likely from the etymological point of view, but it should be noted that the tenseness of s is suspiciously confirmed by Dirr’s transcription of archaic Gequ, and see also the Tabasaran form səw.


The same in the Khanag subdialect: səw ‘mountain’ [Uslar 1979: 907, 992; Dirr 1905: 204, 226].

**Southern Tabasaran:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 191. Paradigm: siw [abs.] / siw-[i] [erg.].

Differently in the Khiv subdialect, where two terms are opposed: siw [cwa] 'mountain (not big); upland' [Genko 2005: 139]; distinct from Khiv daʁ [daɾ] 'big mountain' [Genko 2005: 57], borrowed from Azerbaijani daɣ 'mountain'.

Only the loanword is represented in Literary Tabasaran: daʁ [daɾ] 'mountain' [Khanmagomedov & Shalbuzov 2001: 138].

**Common Tabasaran:** Note sporadic tense sː in Northern Tabasaran, as well as the Southern (Kondik) ergative siw-[i] - in the case of the etymological lax sibilant, one could rather expect the devoiced vowel in **siwi-** (on the other hand, it is natural to suppose that **siwi-** was levelled to siwi- after the regular absolutive form siw). Cf. also the tense sː in some Aghul forms (q.v.).

**Gyune Lezgi:** Uslar 1896: 400, 609. Borrowed from Azerbaijani daɣ 'mountain'.

The same loanword in Literary Lezgi: daʁ [daɾ] 'mountain' [Talibov & Gadzhiev 1966: 105; Gadzhiev 1950: 146; Haspelmath 1993: 485, 523]. This is the default term for 'mountain' in the modern language. Distinct from the inherited suw [cwa] 'mountain' [Talibov & Gadzhiev 1966: 297; Haspelmath 1993: 506, 523], specified by Talibov & Gadzhiev as "poetic".

The same loanword in the Akhty dialect: Khlyut daʁ 'mountain' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 191]. Distinct from the inherited Khlyut term sɨw 'alpine pasture used in summer' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 191].

**Proto-Lezgian:** NCED: 1053. Distribution: Retained as the basic term for 'mountain' in Caucasian Albanian-Udi, on the one hand, and in most of Nuclear Lezgian languages, on the other: West Lezgian (Tsakhur, Rutul), East Lezgian (Aghul, Tabasaran, archaic Lezgi). Shifted to the meaning 'alpine pasture used in winter' in Archi, but was lost without a trace in South Lezgian (Kryts, Budukh).

In Archi, the meaning 'mountain' is expressed with *muhˤVl (~ -ʔ-) [NCED: 834] (lost in the rest of languages), which actually possesses better external North Caucasian comparanda with the meaning 'mountain' than *siwa, but the distribution suggests that the Archi meaning is innovative.

In Kryts, the old word was superseded with *pːaˤl(a) (~ -l-) [NCED: 292], whose original meaning is unclear: its only Rutul cognate means 'rock, cliff'.

In many Nuclear Lezgian lects the inherited forms for 'mountain' are superseded with loanwords of Azerbaijani or, possibly, Iranian origin: Alyk Kryts, Budukh, Rutul dialects, Tabasaran dialects, Lezgi.

**Replacements:** ['mountain'] > 'alpine pasture used in winter' (Archi, Akhty Lezgi).

**Reconstruction shape:** Basic correspondences seem regular; with metathesis, > *swaa in Caucasian Albanian-Udi; reflexes of tense *s in Aghul and Tabasaran are unclear.

**Semantics and structure:** Primary substantive root. The oblique stem is *siw-.**

56. MOUTH

Nidzh Udi ž’omo {жлъмо} (1), Vartashen Udi ž’omo-χ {жлъмъхъ} (1), Archi sɔb (2), Kryts (proper) siw (2), Alyk Kryts siy (2), Budukh siv [cua] (2), Mishlesh Tsakhur yalˤ {злъхъ} (3), Mikik Tsakhur yalˤ (3), Gelmets Tsakhur yalˤ (3), Mukhad Rutul yal {злъхъ} (3), Ixrek Rutul yal {злъхъ} (3), Luchek Rutul yal (3), Koshan Aghul siw (2), Keren Aghul sib (2), Gequn Aghul siw (2), Fite Aghul siw (2), Aghul (proper) siw (2), Northern Tabasaran 'užʷ-u (2), Southern Tabasaran ušʷ (2), Gyune Lezgi siw (2), Proto-Lezgian *siw (2).

References and notes:

Vartashen Udi: Gukasyan 1974: 114; Fähnrich 1999: 35; Mobili 2010: 159; Schiefer 1863: 93; Schulze 2001: 337; Starchevskiy 1891: 506. In [Fähnrich 1999: 13, 35] two additional corrupted variants are quoted: ʾČomā / ʾāmā. In [Bežanov & Bezhanov 1902] the stem variant ʾāmā is also attested, used synonymously with ʾāmā- (e.g., Mt. 12.34 ‘For out of the abundance of the heart, the mouth (ʾāmā-n) speaks’, etc.). In [Schulze 2001: 337] Bezhanov’s ʾāmā is interpreted as ‘lip’, a glossing that is supported neither by Nidzh data (cf. Nidzh plain ʾāmā ‘mouth’) nor by textual evidence - there are no words for ‘lip’ in the canonical Russian Gospel text, from which Bezhanov’s text was translated. The normal word for ‘lip(s)’ is Nidzh šišir, Vartashen ʾarap [Gukasyan 1974: 245] (etymologically obscure, somewhat resembling Georgian dial. ʾarap ‘lips’, Laz ʾarap ‘lips’).

**Common Rutul:**

Common Udi *ʾāmā*. The final -ā in the Vartashen form is the common plural suffix -ux.

**Caucasian Albanian:** ʾāmā-q ~ šāmā-q [Gippert et al. 2008: IV-23]. The final -q is the common plural suffix -uq.

**Arch:** Chumakina et al. 2007; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 14; Kibrik et al. 1977b: 316; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 197; Mikailov 1967: 198; Dirr 1908: 180, 220. Polysemy: ‘mouth’ / fast (abstinence from food) / edge / end / bank, shore’ (the meanings ‘mouth’ and ‘edge; bank’ are opposed in oblique forms within the paradigm and, therefore, synchronically represent two different lexemes). Paradigm for the meaning ‘mouth’: ʾābob [abs.] / ʾābob-li [erg.] / ʾābob-e [loc.]; the locative forms with the meanings ‘edge’ and ‘bank’ are regular: ʾābob-ši-t or ʾābob-ta.

**Kryts (proper):** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 14; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 197. In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010] the variant ʾābob is also quoted.

**Alyk Kryts:** Authier 2009: 34, 39, 91, 220, etc. Applied both to humans and animals.

**Budukh:** Meylanova 1984: 126, 238; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 14; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 197.

Distinct from kyf [kylf] ‘mouth (of animal)’, which can sometimes be applied to a human (polysemy: ‘mouth of animal / toe of shoes / kiss’) [Meylanova 1984: 99].


Distinct from ʾābob [cer] with polysemy ‘end, point / fast (abstinence from food)’ [Ibragimov & Nurmamedov 2010: 314] (the meaning ‘fast’ points to the old semantics of ‘mouth’).

**Tsakhur-Kum Tsakhur:** ʾalp [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 14].

**Mikik Tsakhur:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 14; Dirr 1913: 150, 237. Polysemy: ‘mouth / boot-top, bootleg’.

As follows from Dirr’s data, however, the archaic Mikik Tsakhur word for ‘mouth’ was ʾābob. This was glossed as ‘mouth’ by R. von Eckert (*apul* [Dirr 1913: 201]) in the late 19th century, whereas in the early 20th century, ʾābob ‘mouth’ was retained in the expression for ‘fast (abstinence from food)’ [Dirr 1913: 199]. According to [Dirr 1913: 201], the synchronic meaning of Mikik ʾābob was ‘end, edge’ already in the early 20th century.

**Gelmets Tsakhur:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 14; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 197.

**Common Tsakhur:** It is very likely that the Proto-Tsakhur term for ‘mouth’ was ʾābob (the development ‘mouth’ > ‘fast’ is frequent in Lezgian), which has been recently superseded with ʾalp under the influence on the part of Rutul (the original Tsakhur meaning of ʾalp is unclear).

**Mukhad Rutul:** Dirr 1912: 131, 199; Ibragimov 1978: 62, 115. In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 197], erroneously quoted as *sp* [гааы].

**Ixrek Rutul:** Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 87, 389; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 197. In [Ibragimov 1978: 231], quoted as ʾalp’n’. Applied to both humans and animals.

Distinct from ʾābob [cer] ‘fast (abstinence from food)’ [Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 228] (this meaning points to the old semantics of ‘mouth’).

**Luchek Rutul:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 14.

**Common Rutul:** Cf. the secondary pharyngealization in Borch-Khnow ʾalp ~ ʾalp ‘mouth’ [Ibragimov 1978: 231]; in [Ibragimov 1978: 237, 282], however, this word is quoted simply as ʾalp.

The word ʾalp can be formally reconstructed as the Proto-Rutul term for ‘mouth’, but the attested Ixrek form ʾābob ‘fast’ should point that in Pre-Proto-Rutul ʾābob meant ‘mouth’. It is also possible that ʾābob ‘mouth’ is attested in the word for ‘face’: Mukhad xe-su-m ‘face’ [Dirr 1912: 141], Ixrek xe-xi-m ‘face’ [Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 282], if analyze it as a compressed compound *xe-xi(ʾ)-m*, literally ‘nose’ (xe-xi) + ‘mouth’ (thus [NCED: 584]), although the postulated suffix -m seems unclear.


**Keren Aghul:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 14. The same in the Usug subdialect: ʾābob ‘mouth’ [Shaumyan 1941: 162].
Common Aghul: The Keren (Richa) form sib with b is somewhat strange, because it should point to Proto-Aghul *b rather than *w
(for the behaviour of Proto-Aghul *b in modern dialects see notes on 'to go').

The same in the Khanag subdialect: uš* [us] 'mouth' [Uslar 1979: 936, 1004; Dirr 1905: 211, 241] (note Uslar's plural form uš*- -
'ar with tense š*). This word is opposed to Khanag muč'*muc' 'mouth' [Uslar 1979: 894, 1004; Dirr 1905: 197, 241]; according
to Uslar's examples, muč'*muc' does not denote the anatomic 'mouth' per se, but rather 'mouth' as an organ of speech: "His
muč'muc' is very loquacious', 'He got in trouble due to his muč'muc', 'What comes from one's muč'muc', hits one in the
forehead", etc.

The same in the Khyuryuk subdialect: uš* [us] 'mouth' [Genko 2005: 158] (erg. uš*-awu, but note the plural form uš*- -
'ar [yamnap] with tense š*). This basic term is opposed to Khyuryuk muč'*muc' [myl'mcul] 'mouth' [Genko 2005: 123],
which is probably specified by Genko as a "rude word", although theoretically this stylistic gloss may concern only the
 corresponding Khiv form, for which see below.


The same in the Khiv subdialect: uš* [us] with polysemy: 'mouth / fast (abstinence from food)' [Genko 2005: 158]. This
 basic term is opposed to Khiv muč'*muc' [myl'mcul] 'mouth' [Genko 2005: 123], which is specified by Genko as a "rude
 word".

The same in Literary Tabasaran: uš* [us] with polysemy: 'mouth / fast (abstinence from food)' [Khanmagomedov &
2001: 235].

Common Tabasaran: The default term for all dialects is uš* (uš*-, uš*-u). As for the reduplicated muč'-muč', it seems that its original
meaning was plural: 'lips (of animal) ← muč' *lip (of animal)'. In Literary Tabasaran muč'-muč' acquired the singular
semantic 'lip (of animal)', whereas the plain form muč' was retained in the Northern Tabasaran (Khanag, Khyuryuk)
expression muč' ap'- 'to kiss', literally 'to make me cu' [Dirr 1905: 197; Genko 2005: 123]. Southern Tabasaran (Khiv) muč'-muč'
as a rude term for 'mouth' fits such a scenario. The most interesting semantic development of muč'-muč' is observed in
Khanag: 'mouth as an organ of speech'.

It should be noted that muč' cannot be postulated as the basic Proto-Tabasaran term for 'human lip', since the Proto-
Tabasaran word with this meaning originates from Proto-Lezgian *k*ent' 'lip' [NCED: 733] > Northern Tabasaran
(Dyubek) k'ant'-a 'lip', Southern Tabasaran (Konid) k*ant' 'lip' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 14].


523]. This is the default term for 'human mouth' in Literary Lezgi, distinct from k'uf [ldvy] 'mouth (of human and animal),
beak, snout' [Talibov & Gadzhiev 1966: 218; Haspelmath 1993: 496, 523], whose original meaning was apparently 'mouth
of animal' or rather 'beak' (cf. the Akhty data below).

The same in the Akhty dialect: Khlyut siw 'mouth' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 14]. Distinct from Khlyut k'uf 'beak' [Kibrik
& Kodzasov 1990: 13].

Proto-Lezgian: NCED: 584. Distribution: This stem is retained as the basic root for 'mouth' in Archi, on the one hand, and in
the bulk of Nuclear Lezgian languages, on the other: South Lezgian (Kryts, Budukh), West Lezgian (Proto-Tsakhur and
probably Proto-Rutul), East Lezgian (Aghul, Tabasaran, Lezgi).

In Archi, *scis* means 'mouth / fast (abstinence from food) / edge, end / bank, shore'; the synchronic regular paradigm of
the meanings 'edge; bank' could imply that these meanings are recent Archi introductions. Similarly, this root shifted to
the meaning 'edge, end' in Udi (qis') as well as in modern Tsakhur (siw). In modern West Lezgian (Tsakhur, Rutul), *scis*
is also retained with the meaning 'fast (abstinence from food)' and perhaps in the expression for 'face' (< 'nose' + 'mouth').

In modern West Lezgian (Tsakhur, Rutul), the basic term for 'mouth' is expressed with *ƛːal [NCED: 589], whose
original meaning is unclear, because this root is not attested in the rest of Lezgian. It must be noted that such a
replacement does not seem to be a Proto-West Lezgian feature, but rather represents an areal Rutul-induced introduction.
The old root *scis* has also survived in Tsakhur and Rutul, see above.
In Caucasian Albanian-Udi, the old root was superseded with *čːʷVm-[NCED: 1103], modified with the fossilized plural suffix; thus, its original meaning could indeed be something like 'lip' or even 'edge'. This root seems to have been lost in the rest of Lezgian, although it is possible that Caucasian Albanian ǯˤumo-, Udi ǯˤomo- 'mouth' are somehow related to Proto-Tabasaran muć' 'animal lip(?)' (for which see notes on 'mouth') via metathesis; the affricate correspondence is, however, irregular.

In Tabasaran and Lezgi dialects, the basic word for 'mouth' tends to be superseded with certain vulgar forms with the original meaning 'animal lip' or 'beak'.

Replacements: {'animal lip' > 'mouth'} (Tabasaran), {'beak' > 'mouth'} (Lezgi), {'mouth' > 'fast (abstinence from food)'} (Archi, Tsakhur, Rutul, Tabasaran), {'mouth' > 'end, point, edge'} (Udi, Archi, Tsakhur), {'mouth' > 'bank, shore'} (Archi), {'mouth' > 'mouth of river'} (Tsakhur), {'mouth' > 'boot-top, bootleg'} (Tsakhur).

Reconstruction shape: Basic correspondences seem regular; Udi and Tabasaran demonstrate the metathesized variant *ʔɨsːʷ.

Semantics and structure: Primary substantive root. The oblique stem is *sːɨwɨ.

57. NAME

Nidzh Udi c:i {u.lu} (1), Vartashen Udi c:i {u.lu} (1), Archi c’or (1), Kryts (proper) tir (1), Alyk Kryts tur (1), Budukh tur {mypl} (1), Mishlesh Tsakhur do {dol} (1), Mikik Tsakhur do (1), Gelmets Tsakhur do (1), Mukhad Rutul dur {dyp} (1), Ixrek Rutul dur {dyp} (1), Luchek Rutul dur (1), Koshan Aghul tur (1), Keren Aghul tur (1), Gequn Aghul tur (1), Fite Aghul tur (1), Aghul (proper) t:ur (1), Northern Tabasaran ʒur (1), Southern Tabasaran ɛː.ur (1), Gyune Lezgi t’ar (1), Proto-Lezgian *cː”er (1).

References and notes:

Common Udi: Common Udi *ci.
Caucasian Albanian: c’i [Gippert et al. 2008: IV-23].
Alyk Kryts: Authier 2009: 23, 35, 61, 76, etc.
Tsakhur-Kum Tsakhur: do [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 212].
Mikik Tsakhur: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 212; Dirr 1913: 155, 226.
Gelmets Tsakhur: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 212; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 769.
Luchek Rutul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 212.
Keren Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 212. The same in the Usug subdialect: tur 'name' [Shaumyan 1941: 165].
Gequn Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 212; Shaumyan 1941: 165. Not attested in [Dirr 1907].
Fite Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 212.

Northern Tabasaran: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 212.


Southern Tabasaran: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 212.

The same in other subdialects: Khiv $zːur$ ~ $cːur$ [жүр, цүр, чүур], Chara $zːur$ [жүр], Tinit $zːur$ [циур, чүур], Turag $zːur$ [циур], Khoredzh $uːzːur$ [уциур], Zildik $čːur$ [чүур] 'name' [Genko 2005: 69, 70, 72, 151, 176, 183]. The variability of the Khiv and Tinit forms is obviously due to Genko's (or his editor M. E. Aleskseev's) errors - inaccurate dialect specifications of the entries, but the real picture is undiscoverable.


The same in the Akhty dialect: Khyuty $tːar$ 'name' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 212].

Proto-Lezgian: NCED: 1098. Distribution: One of the most stable Lezgian roots, retained in the basic meaning in all attested leacts.

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular.

Semantics and structure: Primary substantive root. The oblique stem is "čːeri".

58. NECK

Nidzh Udi ozan [əzən] (1), Vartashen Udi ozan [əzən] (1) / $qːoːq$ [къокъ] (2), Archi o$čː$-ləki (3), Kryts (proper) gardan (-1), Alyk Kryts gardan (-1), Budukh gardan [ zarən] (-1), Mishlesh Tsakhir gardan [ zarən] (-1), Mikik Tsakhir gardan (-1), Gelmets Tsakhir gardan (-1), Mukhad Rutul gardan [ zarən] (-1), Ixrek Rutul gardan [ zarən] (-1), Luchek Rutul gardan (-1), Koshan Aghul gardan (-1), Keren Aghul gardan (-1), Gequ Aghul gardan (-1), Aghul (proper) gardan (-1), Northern Tabasaran gardən (-1), Southern Tabasaran gardən (-1), Gyune Lezgi gardən (-1), Proto-Lezgian *χːaw (4).

References and notes:


Two terms are in competition:

1) ozan [əzən] 'neck' [Gukasyan 1974: 182; Schulze 2001: 305]; glossed as 'back of the head, back of the neck' ('Nacken') in [Fähnrich 1999: 25; Schiefner 1863: 78] and as 'back (anatomical)' (in fact, contextually 'shoulders') in [Dirr 1903: 19].


In fact, e.g., in [Bezhanov & Bezhanov 1902], both terms function as virtual synonyms for 'neck' and may occur in identical context (like 'it would be better for him that a huge millstone be hung around his neck, and that he be sunk in the depths of the sea'). Fähnrich 1999: 28; Dirr 1903: 16, 23; Schiefner 1863: 80; Schulze 2001: 314; Starchevskiy 1891: 508.
Common Udi: Common Udi *ezan 'neck', opposed to *qːoq: 'throat'. It is also possible that there was no single term for 'neck' in Proto-Udi, and this lexical opposition should be reconstructed as *ezan 'back part of the neck' vs. *qːoq: 'front part of the neck'.

Alternatively, because Udi *ezan lacks any etymology, one can treat this as a late borrowing from an unknown source and reconstruct *qːoq as the indigenous Udi term for 'neck; throat'. It must be noted that the Caucasian Albanian verb qːoq-esan 'to ingest, swallow, devour' [Gippert et al. 2008: IV-31] points rather to the meaning 'throat' for Udi qːoq.

Caucasian Albanian: Unattested.

Archi: Chumakina et al. 2007; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 18; Kibrik et al. 1977b: 290; Dirr 1908: 173, 226. The second element is leki 'bone' q.v.; the first one could be the 'Proto-Archi' term for 'neck', cf. the substantive oːci 'collar' and the locative adverb oːqay 'round the neck' [Chumakina et al. 2007; Kibrik et al. 1977b: 290].

Kryts (proper): Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 18; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 201. Ultimately borrowed from Persian gardan 'neck'.


Mishlesh Tsakhur: Kibrik et al. 1999: 873, 901; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 201. Not attested in [Ibragimov & Nurmamedov 2010] as a separate entry, but attested in examples in [Ibragimov & Nurmamedov 2010: 30 sub ayṭalas, 87 sub birčak]. A second candidate is the inherited term χˤow 'neck; collar' [Ibragimov & Nurmamedov 2010: 371], but the dialectal source of the meaning 'neck' is unknown.

Tsakhur-Kum Tsakhur: Gardan [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 18].

Mikik Tsakhur: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 18. In [Dirr 1913: 141, 243], 'neck' is glossed as another loanword: bosuz < Azerbaijani boyaz 'throat'.

Gelmets Tsakhur: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 18. In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 201], 'neck' is glossed as another loanword: bosuz (бʊζ) < Azerbaijani boyaz 'throat'.

Common Tsakhur: The term gardan was ultimately borrowed from Persian gardan 'neck'.


According to [Makhmudova 2001: 22], gardan is applied to humans, whereas the word for 'animal's neck' is utum-ay. The latter corresponds to Issyk Rutul utum-ay 'nape, back of the neck (said of humans)' [Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 257] and Borch-Khnov Rutul utum-ay 'person with hunchback' [Ibragimov 1978: 282] — Borch-Khnov Rutul utum 'hump, kyphosis'. The origin of utum is unclear.


Common Rutul: The term gardan was ultimately borrowed from Persian gardan 'neck'.


Gequn Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 18; Dirr 1907: 109, 188; Shaumyan 1941: 189.

Fite Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 18; Shaumyan 1941: 189.


Common Aghul: The term gardan was ultimately borrowed from Persian gardan 'neck'.


Common Tabasaran: The term gardan (yardan) was ultimately borrowed from Persian gardan 'neck'.

The basic Literary Lezgi term for 'neck' is the loanword garðan [rąʔan] [Talibow & Gadzhiev 1966: 82; Gadzhiev 1950: 940; Haspelmath 1993: 488, 523]. Distinct from the inherited literary word χew [ʃən], which is glossed as 'neck, nape; collar' in [Talibow & Gadzhiev 1966: 343] and as 'neck; collar' in [Haspelmath 1993: 512, 523]. It is unclear whether χew can be applied to humans or only to animals, and whether its actual meaning is 'neck (in general)' or just 'back of the neck', cf. the only example in [Talibow & Gadzhiev 1966]: "To get callosities on the neck (said of draft animals)". Distinct from literary q'am [kəm] 'nape (said of human)’ [Talibow & Gadzhiev 1966: 197].

Two synonymous words for 'neck' are quoted for the Khlyut subdialect of the Akhty dialect in [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 18]: inherited q'am and borrowed garðan. But for the Qurush dialect of the same Samur group the word χew with polysemy: 'neck / collar' is documented in [Ganieva 2008: 224].

The available data are too scant for a Proto-Lezgian reconstruction. The attested inherited terms are χew and q'am; both of them demonstrate fluctuation between 'neck' and 'nape'.


Provisionally, we choose *χˤaw [NCED: 894]. This root means 'collar' in West Lezgian (Rutul, Tsakhur) and East Lezgian (Aghul, Tabasaran, Lezgi), although in Tsakhur and Lezgi dialects it is glossed with the additional meaning 'neck' (the default term for 'neck' is a loanword in these dialects).

Other candidates are:

1) Udi ozan 'neck', which could be a genitive formation from the Lezgian root *ʔoc- (?)[LED: #201], without further etymology.

2) Archi *Hoč'- [LED: #290], retained in the noun 'collar' and the adverb 'round the neck', whereas the synchronic expression for 'neck' is the compound *Hoč- + 'bone'. This root, however, lacks any etymology.

In Nuclear Lezgian, the default words for 'neck' represent borrowings from Persian or Azerbaijani.

The fact that loanwords are mostly used for such a basic term as 'neck' (Nuclear Lezgi, Udi) could indicate that there was no generic word for 'neck' in Proto-Lezgian as well as Proto-Nuclear Lezgian, but that there were two opposed terms: 'front part of neck' and 'back part of neck'. The situation can be the same as in the case of 'bird' q.v., where the generic term 'small/middle bird' and several names of specific large birds are reconstructible for Proto-Lezgian, whereas in modern lects the recently introduced concept 'bird (in general)' is expressed by Azerbaijani or Iranian loanwords.

If so, Archi *Hoč'- could originally have meant 'front part of neck' in Proto-Archi with a later compound 'front part of neck + bone' for generic 'neck'; a similar opposition can be proposed for Udi (see notes on Udi 'neck'); and finally, *χˤaw should be reconstructed as 'collar' in Proto-Nuclear Lezgian (with secondary sporadic polysemy 'collar / neck' in some lects).

Replacements: ('throat' > 'neck'?) (Vartashen Udi), ('neck-bone' > 'neck'?) (Archi), ('neck' > 'collar'?) (Rutul, Tsakhur, Aghul, Tabasaran, Lezgi).

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular.

Semantics and structure: Primary substantive root. The oblique stem is *χˤowa-.

59. NEW

Nidzh Udi tǎzâ {мавзаб} (-1), Vartashen Udi ini {ину} (1), Archi mac"a-t:u-CLASS (1), Kryts (proper) c'iyâ (1), Alyk Kryts taza (-1), Budukh toza {маза} (-1), Mishlesh Tsakhur c"e-CLASS-n {үледың} (1), Mikik Tsakhur c"e-CLASS-n (1), Gelmets Tsakhur c"e-CLASS-n (1), Mukhad Rutul c'in-di {үйндү} (1), Ixrek Rutul c'in-di {үйндү} (1), Luchek Rutul c’in-di (1), Koshan Aghul c’eye-r (1), Keren Aghul c’aye-f (1), Gequn Aghul c’eye-f (1), Fite Aghul c’ayi-t (1), Aghul (proper) c’eye-f (1), Northern Tabasaran c’ey’i (1), Southern Tabasaran c’iy’i (1), Gyune Lezgi c’ey’i (1), Proto-Lezgian *c’en-CLASS-ā- (1).

References and notes:


Common Udi: Common Udi *tini.

Caucasian Albanian: The attributive term is actually unattested. The old Lezgian root is known from the compound verb enˈi-bat-k-esun ‘to be renewed’ [Gippert et al. 2008: IV-15], literally ‘to turn new’ with the verb bat-k-esun ‘to turn around, return’ [Gippert et al. 2008: IV-7].


In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 622], the form t’yel is also quoted as a synonym, borrowed from Azerbaijani таза ‘new; fresh’.

Tsakhur-Kum Tsakhur: c’e-CLASS-n [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 245].

Mikik Tsakhur: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 245; Dirr 1913: 213, 231.


Common Rutul: Final -dI / -d is the attributive suffix.


Fite Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 245; Shaumyan 1941: 167. In [Shaumyan 1941], transcribed as c’ey-t.


Common Aghul: Final -d, -t, -f, -r are adjectival suffixes (fossilized class exponents) [Magometov 1970: 92; Shaumyan 1941: 45].

Northern Tabasaran: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 245.


Southern Tabasaran: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 245.

The same in the Khiv subdialect: c’ey-t = c’iy-t [улеi̯n, улеi̯n] with polysemy: ‘new / fresh’ [Genko 2005: 177, 178]; a close synonym to the aforementioned inherited term is Khiv таза [rasa] ‘fresh; new’ [Genko 2005: 141], borrowed from Azerbaijani таза ‘new; fresh’.


The same in the Akhty dialect: Khlyut c’iy ‘new’ [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 245].
Proto-Lezgian: NCED: 357. Distribution: One of the most stable Lezgian stems, retained with the basic meaning in almost all of the lects. In Nidzh Udi, Alyk Krys, Budukh, superseded with the Azerbaijani loanword.

Replacements: ['new' > 'fresh'] (Tabasaran).

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular. We follow [NCED] and explain the Udi and Nuclear Lezgian forms as *c'en-y-ā- (with fossilized -y-), whereas the Archi form goes back to *c'en-w-ā- (with further metathesis).

Semantics and structure: Primary stative verbal root 'to be new'.

60. NIGHT

Nidzh Udi šū {uwy} (1), Vartashen Udi šū {uy} (1), Archi 'iš- (1), Krys (proper) yif (1), Alyk Krys yif (1), Budukh yuš-a-n-šif {uýdžandžidž, úýdženđidž} (1), Mishlesh Tsakhur č'am {xaľm} (2), Mikik Tsakhur č'am (2), Gelmets Tsakhur č'am (2), Mukhad Rutul wiš ~ wuš {wuš ~ wuš} (1), Ixrek Rutul yuš ~ yuš {ůýuyu ~ úyuľ} (1), Luchek Rutul wiš (1), Koshan Aghul iš-šo (1), Gequn Aghul ñuš (1), Fite Aghul ićy (1), Aghul (proper) ñuš (1), Northern Tabasaran yįžʷ-i (1), Southern Tabasaran yįžʷ (1), Gyune Lezgi yif (1), Proto-Lezgian *išːʷ(1).

References and notes:


Common Udi: Common Udi šu ~ šű 'night', *ši 'at night' (both words are etymologically related). In the light of Lezgian etymology, resemblance to Judeo-Tat šāp 'night', Persian šāb 'night' is accidental.

Caucasian Albanian: šu [Gippert et al. 2008: IV-33].


Alyk Krys: Authier 2009: 35, 39, 113, etc.

Budukh: Meylanova 1984: 73, 226; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 211; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 640. In [Meylanova 1984: 73, 226] the variant yuš-a-n-šif {uýyandžidž} is also quoted. Suffixal -n- is not entirely clear. For the temporal suffix -šif cf. qešen 'day' ~ qešen-šif 'noon' [Meylanova 1984: 86], rašən ara' 'evening' ~ rašən ara-šif 'in the evening' [Meylanova 1984: 120]. Distinct from (although etymologically related to) adverbs 'at night': archaic yuš-a (old dative) and reanalyzed yuš-a [uš, ušen] [Meylanova 1984: 73, 226].


Tsakhur-Kum Tsakhur: č'am [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 211].

Mikik Tsakhur: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 211; Dirr 1913: 209, 231.

Gelmets Tsakhur: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 211. In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 640], the modern depharyngealized variant is quoted: čam [xam].

In [Dirr 1912: 162], the word naχʕ is also glossed as 'evening, night', but apparently the exact meaning of naχʕ is just 'evening', thus in [Ibragimov 1978: 19, 27, 118, 122].


Luchek Rutul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 211. In [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990], two parallel absolutive forms are quoted: wiš and huš. The rest of the paradigm is suppletive: wiš-i-r [erg.], huš-biř [abs. pl.]. It seems that huš- represents a borrowing from the neighboring Borch-Khnov dialect.

Common Rutul: In the Borch-Khnov dialect 'night' has the phonetic shape huš [Makhmudova 2001: 11].


Northern Tabasaran: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 211; Genko 2005: 79. In [Genko 2005], erroneously quoted as yūš-


Common Tabasaran: Note the retention of tense fricative šˤ in the Northern subdialects.


Regular paradigm in the Akhbt dialect: Khlyut yiʃ 'night' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 211].


Proto-Lezgian: NCED: 524. Distribution: One of the most stable Lezgian roots, retained with the basic meaning in all the languages except for Tsakhur.

In Tsakhur, superseded with *χʔəm: *χʔəm [LEDb: #211], whose original meaning is likely to have been 'evening' (cf. 'evening' in Aghul & Tabasaran, and 'dimming of eye-sight' in Archi).

Semantics and structure: Primary substantive root. The oblique stem is *riš-e.

61. NOSE

Nidzh Udi box̂tov {bx̂təməsə} (1), Vartashen Udi box̂tov {bx̂təməsə} (1), Archi mıč (2), Kryt (proper) mıel (3), Alyk Kryt maṭal (3), Budukh meṭel (mevel) (3), Mishlesh
Tsakhur qow {χьов} (4), Mikik Tsakhur quš (5) / qow (4), Gelmets Tsakhur qow (4), Mukhad Rutul xex {χьехь} (6), Ixrek Rutul xex {χьехь} (6), Luchek Rutul xex'y (6), Koshan Aghul q'uq (7), Keren Aghul q'uq (7), Gequn Aghul qʷeqʷ ~ qiiqʸ (7), Fite Aghul qʷeqʷ (7), Aghul (proper) qeqʷ (7), Northern Tabasaran q'aq (7), Southern Tabasaran q'uq (7), Gyune Lezgi ner (3), Proto-Lezgian *muʔel (3).

References and notes:


Vartashen Udi: Gukasyan 1974: 92; Fähnrich 1999: 10; Schiefer 1863: 102; Starchevskiy 1891: 504.

Common Udi: Common Udi *boχˤmoʁ; as suspected in [NCED: 1054], this may be a compound with the original meaning 'sheep’s tail'.

Caucasian Albanian: Unattested.

Archí: Chumakina et al. 2007; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 13; Kibrik et al. 1977b: 281, 370; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 195; Mikailov 1967: 194; Dirr 1908: 169, 215. Polysemy: ‘nose / beak / toe of footwear / mountain peak, crest’ (the latter meaning is opposed to others in some forms within the paradigm). In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 195], the variant mup {муп} is also quoted; this is an erroneous transmission of Cyrillic cursive handwriting.


Alyk Kryts: Authier 2009: 37, 49, 85, etc.


Gequn Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 13; Dirr 1907: 127, 178; Shaumyan 1941: 198. The more archaic variant qʷeqʷ is from [Dirr 1907].


Common Aghul: Note various dialectal assimilative-dissimilative process in the sequence "qʷ- q".


Common Tabasaran: Note various dialectal assimilative/dissimilative processes in the sequence "qʷ- q".


In the Akhty dialect: Khlyut iler ‘nose’ [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 13], Khuryug ler ~ iler ‘nose’ [Meylanova 1964: 287]. It must be noted that for the Khuryug subdialect of Akhty, the form *tškₕːpʰlɨɾ ‘nose’ is also quoted in [Meylanova 1964: 314] - an unclear compound, whose first element is tš = literary tɨš ‘muzzle, snout’.

As proposed in [NCED: 826], both Gyune ner and Akhty (iler are related, representing the plural formation *t*-iler with the fossilized exponent -Vr. The shift l > n in Gyune n-er is irregular, although there are a few parallel cases of such a development.

Proto-Lezgian: NCED: 825. Distribution: The word is fairly unstable in Lezgian. Three stems are equivalent candidates from the distributive point of view.

1) *nuːl [NCED: 825]. This stem means ‘nose’ in South Lezgian (Krys, Budukh) and in Lezgi. Formally, this is at least the Proto-Nuclear root for ‘nose’. It shifted to ‘beak’ in Aghul, whereas in one of the outliers - Archi - it denotes ‘snot’. We choose *nuːl as the Proto-Lezgian term for ‘nose’ because of its North Caucasian cognates with the same semantics.

2) *nuːlːč: [NCED: 816]. This root is retained only in Archi with polysemy: ‘nose / beak / toe of footwear / mountain peak, crest’. External North Caucasian comparison points to the meaning ‘edge, tip’. The Proto-Archi development could be either edge, tip > ‘nose’ > other attested meanings or ‘peak’ > ‘nose’.

3) In Udi, a compound is used in the meaning ‘nose’; it could be analyzed as *wV(r)č-mVu (~ p-) ‘sheep’s tail’ (thus [NCED: 1045]).

Some local replacements of *nuːl took place in individual Nuclear Lezgian lects.

In Aghul and Tabasaran, ‘nose’ is expressed by *qʷˤaqʷ(a) [NCED: 894]; this stem means ‘cheek’ in Lezgi, but was lost in the rest of languages; the exact Proto-Lezgian meaning of *qʷˤaqʷ(a) is unclear. It must be noted that in many Dargi languages, ‘nose’ is expressed by forms that are not only etymologically cognate with Lezgian *qʷˤaqʷ(a), but also fairly close phonetically to the Aghul-Tabasaran forms; thus, the meaning ‘nose’ could be an areal Dargwa-Aghul-Tabasaran isogloss, if not an early interdialectal borrowing (note that *qʷˤaqʷ is apparently not the Proto-Dargi term for ‘nose’).

In Rutul, ‘nose’ is expressed with *tër [NCED: 1061]; its Lezgian cognates as well as external North Caucasian comparison point out that the original Proto-Lezgian meaning of *tër was ‘snot’ or ‘saliva’.

In Tsakhur dialects, the etymologically obscure forms qow and quš ‘nose’ also occur.

Replacements: [‘snot’ > ‘nose’] (Rutul), [‘sheep’s tail’ > ‘nose’?] (Udi), [‘nose’ > ‘corner’] (Krys, ‘nose’ > ‘beak’] (Aghul), [‘nose’ > ‘snot’] (Archi).

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular, except for l > n in Gyyne Lezgi.

Semantics and structure: Primary substantive root.

62. NOT


References and notes:


Common Udi: Common Udi *te*, a verbal proclitic.

Caucasian Albanian: *nu*- [Gippert et al. 2008: II-55]. A verbal proclitic, normally used with non-past finite forms. Distinct from the morpheme te (particle or proclitic), which is normally used as a negative copula or with verbs in the past tense [Gippert et al. 2008: II-55]. Distinct from the prohibitive proclitic *ma*- [Gippert et al. 2008: II-51]. A fourth, more marginal, negative morpheme is *nu-t* (apparently < *nu + te*) [Gippert et al. 2008: II-52].


Kryts (proper): Saadiev 1994: 425-427. Negation of assertion is expressed by the copula ɗ-ɗ-CLASS or by the simple prefix d-. The prohibitive exponent is the prefix m- [Saadiev 1994: 429].

Alyk Kryts: Authier 2009: 149 ff. Negation of assertion is expressed by the copula ɗ-ɗ-CLASS or by the simple prefix d-. The prohibitive exponent is the prefix m- [Authier 2009: 152].


Mishlesh Tsakhur: Kibrik et al. 1999: 81-84; Ibragimov 1990: 131, 136; Ibragimov & Nurmamedov 2010: 523. Negation of assertion is expressed by the prefix d*- ~ id*- or by the encliticized copula d*e-š. The latter (analytic) pattern is more frequent [Kibrik et al. 1999: 81]. The prohibitive marker is the prefix m- ~ im- [Kibrik et al. 1999: 84].

Tsakhur-Kum Tsakhur: negation of assertion is expressed by the prefix d*e- or by the encliticized copula d*e-š; the prohibitive marker is the prefix mV- [Schulze 1997: 65].

Mikik Tsakhur: Not attested.

Gelmet Tsakhur: Ibragimov 1990: 197. According to [Ibragimov 1990], negation of assertion can be expressed by the prefix d*- ~ id*- or by the copula d*ги/г- whereas the prohibitive marker is the prefix m- ~ im-.

Mukhad Rutul: Dirr 1912: 91 ff.; Alekseev 1994a: 233 ff.; Makhmudova 2001: 146 ff. According to the aforementioned sources, negation of assertion is expressed by the encliticized copula -di-š in finite forms, whereas in non-finite forms (e.g., in adverbial participles) negation of assertion is expressed by the prefix yV-. In [Ibragimov 1978: 103], the Mukhad system is described in a similar way.

The prohibitive exponent is the prefix mV- [Alekseev 1994a: 234; Ibragimov 1978: 103; Makhmudova 2001: 146; Dirr 1912: 91].

Ixrek Rutul: Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 439. In [Ibragimov 1978: 214 ff.], no specific Ixrek peculiarities are described, that is, the Ixrek system of negations is identical to the Mukhad one: -di-š in finite forms, yV- in non-finite forms, mV- in the prohibitive. As noted in [Ibragimov 1978: 197], the prefixal morpheme yV- has two variants: yV- in the initial position, ~чV- in the intervocalic position.

Luchek Rutul: Not attested.

Koshan Aghul: See common Aghul notes.

Keren Aghul: See common Aghul notes.

Gequn Aghul: Dirr 1907: 54 ff. See common Aghul notes.

Fite Aghul: See common Aghul notes.

Aghul (proper): See common Aghul notes.

Common Aghul: The system of Aghul negations is described in [Magometov 1970: 148 ff.; Suleymanov 1993: 141 ff., 154; Tarlanov 1994: 237 ff.; Shaumyan 1941: 109 ff.] with examples from various dialects. The verbal negation of assertion is expressed with the encliticized copula -да-ву/-да-ʔ / -да or with the verbal prefix dV-. The verbal prefix mV- is the prohibitive exponent. All the aforementioned authors note no principal discrepancies between Aghul dialects.


Southern Tabasaran: Magometov 1965: 292, 306. Verbal affix. This is actually a morpheme from the Khiv subdialect; the proper Kondik form is unknown.

Common Tabasaran: The system of Tabasaran negations is described in [Magometov 1965: 290 ff.] with examples from various dialects. The verbal negation of assertion is expressed with the suffix *dV-, harmonized *dur / *der / etc. (in Northern Tabasaran it mutates into *tar or *gar in some positions; final -r can get lost in some forms). Tabasaran *dV- is used as either a prefix or a suffix, depending on the grammatical form. This morpheme originally represents the cliticized negative copula da*-r with the fossilized class exponent -r. In some participle forms the negative exponent is simply *-d (with the dialectal variants -śi, -ir, -i) without the class exponent [Magometov 1965: 305].

In Southern Tabasaran, verbal stems, modified with certain prefixes, create the negated forms via reduplication of the prefix; this is a secondary analogical pattern [Magometov 1965: 301 ff.].

The verbal affix (prefix or suffix) *mV- is the Common Tabasaran prohibitive exponent [Magometov 1965: 310 ff.].

Gyune Lezgi: Usłar 1896: 161. According to Usłar's sparse data, the Gyune system is very similar to the modern literary one: suffixal *-č (or *-č-r with the additional participle suffix -r) in finite forms, and prefixal *t(V)-, *t(V)-, d(V)- in non-finite forms, see below for details. The distribution between t- - t- - d- seems non-existent, with some verbs possessing parallel forms with two of the listed variants; the general system was apparently described during a period of restructuring (see [Usłar 1896: 177-178, 208-210] for the lists of examples). Nevertheless, some patterns can be observed, e.g., verbs with the root ejective consonant normally attach dV-.

In Literary Lezgi, the basic verbal negation is the suffix *-č [u] (or *-č-r), which is used in finite indicative forms; the second negative exponent is the prefix *t(V)- [t], restricted to participle, masdar and infinitive forms; see [Gaydarov et al. 2009: 206 ff.; Alekseev & Sheykhov 1997: 53; Talibov & Gadzhiev 1966: 582 ff.; Haspelmath 1993: 5, 133, 135]. According to Dm. Ganenkov's p.c., a couple of verbs with the ejective root consonant attach the negative prefix d(V)- [a] in the literary language instead of common *t(V)- [t], but actually, in natural speech the negative forms of these verbs are normally pronounced with *t(V)-. It should also be noted that the majority of verbs in Literary Lezgi possess analytic negated forms, derived with the help of cliticized negated auxiliary verbs.

All the dental prefixal exponents, listed above, apparently originate from the main Lezgian negation *t(V). One can suppose that initially the Gyune variants *t(V)-, *t(V)-, d(V)- were distributed according to the root consonant. As a parallel, cf. the Jaba dialect (Samur group), where two prefixes for non-finite forms coexist: *t(V)- and *t(V)-; according to examples in [Ganieva 2007: 131], *t(V)- is attached to the verbs with an ejective root consonant (e.g., *ač'ù 'to fill' - *t=ac'ù 'not to fill'), whereas *t(V)- is used elsewhere (e.g., *awũ 'to do' - *t=awũ 'not to do'). The consonantal harmony is thus similar to the nominal oblique stem suffix -či- / -či- / -či- / -či-, where the allomorphs are determined by the root consonant in Literary Lezgi [Haspelmath 1993: 63].

In Literary Lezgi, prohibitive is formed with the suffix -mi plus the participle suffix -r [Alekseev & Sheykhov 1997: 53; Haspelmath 1993: 5, 23].

Proto-Lezgian: NCED: 404. Distribution: The proclitic *tV- is retained as the default exponent of negation of assertion in finite verbal forms in Udi, on the one hand, and in most Nuclear Lezgian languages (except for Lezgi), on the other. In Nuclear Lezgian *tV- is normally attached to the copula, constituting a negative particle.

In Caucasian Albanian, *tV- is restricted to past (perfective) forms, whereas present (imperfective) forms are negated with the help of the proclitic *nc- of unclear origin (theoretically possessing some scant cognates in Tsezian).

In Archi, negation of assertion is expressed with the suffixal morpheme *t'u, which does not regularly correspond to *tV- from the phonetic point of view. Theoretically, this could be an inner Archi innovation of unknown origin, but it is more likely that Archi *t'u originates from *tV- with the change of the morphosyntactical status and irregular glottalization (the expected Archi reflex should be **dV- or **=tV). Cf. also the possible explanation proposed in [NCED: 404].

In Lezgi, *tV- is restricted to non-finite forms, whereas the main finite negative exponent is the suffix *čV [NCED: 1101]. The latter possesses some Lezgian cognates: in Rutul the prefix *čV expresses negation of assertion in non-finite forms; in Archi, the suffixal chain -ču-gu expresses the dubitative mood ('the speaker wishes to know whether the fact is true') [Kibrik et al. 1977a: 2: 91].

The Proto-Lezgian prohibitive exponent can be safely reconstructed as the proclitic *mV- [NCED: 797]: this morpheme is retained in both Caucasian Albanian-Udi and Nuclear Lezgian. In Archi, however, prohibitive is expressed with the suffix -di-gi or simple -gi. The origin of Archi -gi is not entirely clear, whereas -di could be somehow related to the main negative morpheme *tV-.

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular except for the Archi morpheme.
63. ONE

Nidzh Udi *sa {ca} (1), Vartashen Udi *sa {ca} (1), Archi *asː- (1), Kryts (proper) *sa-CLASS (1), Alyk Kryts *sa-CLASS (1), Budukh *sa-CLASS {ca-} (1), Mishlesh Tsakhur *sa ~ *sa-CLASS-lˤe {ca, caalː} (1), Mikik Tsakhur *sa ~ *sa-CLASS-lˤe (1), Gelmets Tsakhur *sa ~ *sa-CLASS-lˤä (1), Mukhad Rutul *sa {ca} (1), Ixrek Rutul sā {cab} (1), Luchek Rutul *sa (1), Koshan Aghul *sa-r (1), Keren Aghul *sa-d (1), Gequn Aghul *sa-d (1), Fite Aghul *sa-d (1), Aghul (proper) *sa-d (1), Northern Tabasaran *sa-CLASS (1), Southern Tabasaran *sa-CLASS (1), Gyune Lezgi *sa (1), Proto-Lezgian *sːa (1).

References and notes:

Common Udi: Common Udi *sa.


Mishlesh Tsakhur: Kibrik et al. 1999: 154; Ibragimov & Nurmamedov 2010: 300, 517; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 598. The complex forms *sa-CLASS-lˤe are rarely used.


Mikik Tsakhur: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 247; Dirr 1913: 51.


Ixrek Rutul: Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 222, 366; Ibragimov 1978: 211. In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 598], erroneously quoted as *sa {ca}.


Common Aghul: Final -d, -r are adjectival suffixes (fossilized class exponents) [Magometov 1970: 92; Shaumyan 1941: 45].


The same in the Khanag subdialect: *sa-CLASS ‘one’ [Uslar 1979: 151; Dirr 1905: 42]. The same in the Khyuryuk subdialect: *sa-CLASS {ca}-lˤ ‘one’ [Genko 2005: 136].


Gyule Lezgi: Uslar 1896: 86. In the non-attributive function, the variant sa-d is used.


The same in the Akhty dialect: Khlyut sa-d 'one' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 247]. Final -d is the old class exponent.

Proto-Lezgian: NCED: 323. Distribution: One of the most stable Lezgian words, retained with its original meaning in all the lects.

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular, except for the metathesis *sːa > ?as within the Archi paradigm.

Semantics and structure: Primary numeral root.

64. PERSON

Nidzh Udi amd-ar {амдар} (-1), Vartashen Udi adam-ar {адамар} (-1), Archi ad'am (-1), Kryts (proper) admi (-1), Alyk Kryts adami (-1), Budukh idmi {и́дми} (-1), Mishlesh Tsakhur insan ~ išan (инсана) (-1), Mikik Tsakhur insan (-1), Gelmets Tsakhur insan (-1), Mukhad Rutul edemi ~ ädämi {эдеми ~ аьдами} (-1), Ixrek Rutul edemi (эдеми) (-1), Luchek Rutul edemi (-1), Koshan Aghul insan (-1), Gequn Aghul insan (-1), Aghul (proper) insan (-1), Northern Tabasaran erno {ёрьи} (-1), Southern Tabasaran edmi {эдми} (-1), Gyune Lezgi ins'an (-1), Proto-Lezgian *ʔasː’iy (1).

References and notes:


Vartashen Udi: Guksayan 1974: 36; Mobilb 2010: 19; Fährnich 1999: 6; Dirr 1903: 12, 14, 16, 18, 26, 50, 93, 96; Schiefner 1863: 75; Schulze 2001: 246; Starchevskiy 1891: 508. In [Starchevskiy 1891] the variant amd-ar is also quoted (cf. the Nidzh form above).

Common Udi: An Oriental (originally Arabic) "Wanderwort" for 'person, human being'. Forms in both dialects contain the fossilized plural suffix -ar. Note the vowel reduction and the subsequent metathesis dm > md in the Nidzh form.

Caucasian Albanian: išu [Gippert et al. 2008: IV-21, 48], Suppletive paradigm with the following polysemy: išu 'man; person' (sg) / żin 'men; people' (pl.), see [Gippert et al. 2008: IV-17, 21, 48].


Distinct from qar 'tribe; clan, kin; nation, people; seed (botanic)' [Gippert et al. 2008: IV-30].

Archi: Chumakina et al. 2007; Kibrik et al. 1977b: 186, 388; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 70; Mikailov 1967: 171; Dirr 1908: 125, 226. A close synonym of ad-am is the word ins'an 'person; somebody' (with the latter meaning used only in negative constructions as 'nobody') [Chumakina et al. 2007; Kibrik et al. 1977b: 247, 388; Mikailov 1967: 182; Dirr 1908: 153, 226]. Both words represent Oriental (originally Arabic) "Wanderwort" terms for 'person, human being'.


Alyk Kryts: Authier 2009: 54, 70, 94, etc. See notes on Kryts proper.
Budukh: Meylanova 1984: 64, 250; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 70. A second term for 'person' is insan [инсан] [Meylanova 1984: 65, 250; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 70]. Both words represent wandering Oriental (originally Arabic) terms for 'person, human being'.


Gelmets Tsakhur: Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 70.

Common Tsakhur: The term represents the wandering Oriental (originally Arabic) word for 'person, human being'.


A second term for ‘person’ is insan [Dirr 1912: 144], also borrowed.


A second borrowed term for ‘person’ is insan [Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 125], also borrowed.


Common Rutul: Both attested terms represent the wandering Oriental (originally Arabic) words for ‘person, human being’.


In the Arsug subdialect: insan [Magometov 1970: 232 sentences 1-9].


Gequn Aghul: Dirr 1907: 121, 187.

Fite Aghul: Not attested.


In the Kurag subdialect: insan ‘person’ [Magometov 1970: 211 sentences 23, 29], idemi ‘person’ [Magometov 1970: 208 sentence 7].

Common Aghul: Both of the attested terms (insan, idemi) represent the wandering Oriental (originally Arabic) words for ‘person, human being’.


For the Khanag subdialect three loanwords are known: armi ‘person’ [Uslar 1979: 588, 1009; Dirr 1905: 154, 246], insan ‘person’ [Uslar 1979: 734, 1009; Dirr 1905: 176, 246], kas ‘man; person’ [Uslar 1979: 779, 1009; Dirr 1905: 183, 246].


Southern Tabasaran: Genko 2005: 194. This form is actually from the Khiv subdialect; the proper Kondik term for ‘person’ is unknown.


Common Tabasaran: Totally superseded with various loanwords. Two of them, admi (~ edmi ~ arni ~ erni) and insan, represent the wandering Oriental (originally Arabic) words for ‘person, human being’; for the dialectal rhotacism d > r see [Magometov 1965: 61]. The third term, kas, was borrowed from Persian kas ‘person’.


The same loanwords for ‘person’ in Literary Lezgi: insan [инсан] [Talibov & Gadzhiev 1966: 139; Gadzhiev 1950: 927; Haspelmath 1993: 494].

Proto-Lezgian: NCED: 336. Distribution: Hardly reconstructible, because inherited forms were completely superseded with wandering terms of Arabic or Persian origin in all the lects except for Caucasian Albanian. In Caucasian Albanian, the meaning ‘person’ is expressed with the same word as ‘man’ (< Proto-Lezgian *šːʷiy ‘man’ (q.v.) or with the ‘poetic’ expression ‘living-man’s son’. We follow formal evidence and reconstruct Proto-Lezgian *šːʷiy with polysemy ‘man / person’. Further see notes on ‘man’.
On the other hand, the overwhelming amount of cases with borrowed terms for 'person' could point to the fact that Proto-Lezgian lacked a separate lexical item with this meaning. See similar situations with 'bird' and 'neck'.

65. RAIN


References and notes:


Common Udi: Common Udi ‘a ula-ː, derived form the old verbal root ‘to rain’ with the Proto-Lezgian suffix ː.

Caucasian Albanian: Unattested.


Alyk Kryts: Authier 2009: 37, 40, 51, etc. See notes on Kryts proper.


Mishlesh Tsakhur: Kibrik et al. 1999: 874, 893; Ibragimov 1990: 101, 206. In [Ibragimov & Nurmamedov 2010: 115], the Literary Tsakhur term is quoted as gʰ=ʊɾɨː-ɣ [rɨɾɨː] with polysemy: ‘atmospheric precipitation / appearance (e.g., Christ’s appearance)’ (the same form in [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 61]).

The second, apparently less frequent term is ʊɾa-l [ɣɾaː] [Ibragimov 1990: 30; Ibragimov & Nurmamedov 2010: 348], which contains the same root.

Tsakhur-Kum Tsakhur: gʰ=ʊɾɨː [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 203].


Gelmets Tsakhur: In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 61], quoted as gʰ=ʊɾɨː-ɣ (an error?).

The second, apparently less frequent term is ʊɾa-l [ɣɾaː], which contains the same root.

Common Tsakhur: The term for ‘rain’ normally represents the synchronic masdar in-ɣ from the verb gʰ=ʊɾɨː ‘to rain, snow’ [Kibrik et al. 1999: 874; Ibragimov & Nurmamedov 2010: 115]. Initial gʰ= is a prefix with general semantics [Ibragimov 1990: 124; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 41]. The more archaic formation is ʊɾa-l (Mishlesh, Gelmets), derived from the same root with the old l-suffix; this form must be reconstructed for Proto-Tsakhur.


Common Rutul: Shinaz dialect: \(y=\text{usa}-l\) 'rain' [Dirr 1912: 148]; Borch-Khnov dialect: \(y=\text{usat}-l\) 'rain' [Ibragimov 1978: 234].

An old derivative from the verbal root 'to rain', retained in Rutul as \(\text{usta}-\) (see notes on Mukhad). Initial \(h=y=0\) are the class 1/4 exponents; final -l is the Proto-Lezgian suffix.
Marginal Ixrek \(\text{maf}\) 'rain' is an innovation, perhaps under the influence of some other Lezgian languages.

Koshan Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 203; Suleymanov 2003: 160; Shaumyan 1941: 145. Cf. the paronymous verb \(\text{u}d\text{-a-}'\) to rain' [Suleymanov 2003: 160; Shaumyan 1941: 145].

The same in other subdialects: Arsug \(\text{uHa}-l\) 'rain' [Shaumyan 1941: 145], Arsug or Khudig \(\text{uv}^{\prime}\text{a}-\) 'to rain' [Suleymanov 2003: 160].

Keren Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 203. The same in the Usug subdialect: \(\text{uwa}-l\) 'rain' [Shaumyan 1941: 145].

Gequn Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 203; Dirr 1907: 145, 172; Shaumyan 1941: 145. Cf. the paronymous verb \(\text{us}-\) 'to rain' [Shaumyan 1941: 145].

Fite Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 203. Two synonyms for 'rain' are quoted in [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990]: \(\text{uwa}-l\) and \(\text{marf}\); the difference is unknown.Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 203.


Common Aghul: An old derivative from the verbal root 'to rain', retained in some Aghul dialects as \(\text{uw}^{\prime}\text{a}-\) or \(\text{us}-\) (with the dialectal dissimilation \(u\text{C}^{\prime} > u\text{C}\), on which see [Magonmetov 1970: 26]). Final -l is the Proto-Lezgian suffix.
Marginal Fite \(\text{marf}\) 'rain' is an innovation under the influence on the part of the Tabasaran language.

Northern Tabasaran: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 203. Distinct from the more specific Dyubreks term \(\text{caw}^{\prime}-\text{ul}'\) drizzle' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 203] < \(^*\text{caw}-ul < ^*\text{cad}-ul\).

The same in the Khanag subdialect: \(\text{marx}\) 'rain' [Uslar 1979: 847, 993; Dirr 1905: 194, 227]. Distinct from Khanag \(\text{cad}^{\prime}\) or \(\text{cad}^{\prime}-\text{ur}'\) drizzle' [Dirr 1905: 216], glossed as 'dew' in [Uslar 1979: 959]. Khanag \(\text{cad}^{\prime}\) < \(\text{cad}-\), cf. in Northern Tabasaran: Kumi \(\text{car}^{\prime}-\text{ul}'\) 'dew; a drop' < \(^*\text{cad}-ul\) [Genko 2005: 177], in Southern Tabasaran: Tinit \(\text{cad}^{\prime}-\text{al}'\). Khiv \(\text{cad}^{\prime}-\text{al}'\) 'a drop' [Genko 2005: 176, 178].

The same in the Khyuryuk subdialect: \(\text{marx}\) [\(\text{marp}\)] 'rain' [Genko 2005: 117]. Distinct from Khyuryuk \(\text{cad}^{\prime}-\text{ur}^{\prime}\) [\(\text{ta}\text{lgu}\)] 'dew' [Genko 2005: 177], for which see above.

Southern Tabasaran: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 203.

The same in the Khy subdialect: \(\text{marf}\) [\(\text{map}\)] 'rain' [Genko 2005: 117]. Distinct from the more specific Khiv terms: \(\chi\text{g}^{\prime}\) [\(\text{u}\)] 'drizzle' [Genko 2005: 181], \(\chi\text{mul}\) [\(\text{x}m\text{u}\)] 'autumn rain' [Genko 2005: 165].

The same in Literary Tabasaran: \(\text{marx}\) [\(\text{marp}\)] 'rain' [Khanmagomedov & Shalbuzov 2001: 224].

Common Tabasaran: Cf. the old verb for 'to rain', which is retained as Northern (Khanag) \(\text{wup}^{\prime}\) [\(\text{uyk\text{u}}\)] 'to rain, snow' [Genko 2005: 33], Southern (Khiv) \(\text{uw}^{\prime}\) [\(\text{yrju}\)] 'to rain' [Genko 2005: 151].

Gyune Lezgi: Uslar 1896: 502, 610. Cf. the verb \(\text{q}^{\prime}\text{a}-\) 'to rain, snow' [Uslar 1896: 494].

The same in Literary Lezgi: \(\text{marf}\) [\(\text{map}\)] 'rain' [Talibov & Gadzhiev 1966: 231; Gadzhiev 1950: 178; Haspelmather 1993: 498, 525]. This is the basic term for 'rain' in the literary language. A second, more rare word with the meaning 'rain' is \(\text{q}^{\prime}\text{a}-\) [\(\text{xaw}\)] [Talibov & Gadzhiev 1966: 184; Gunmagomedov 2004, 1: 401] (not found in other sources). Cf. the verb \(\text{q}^{\prime}\text{a}-\) [\(\text{khu}\)] 'to rain, snow' [Talibov & Gadzhiev 1966: 193; Gadzhiev 1950: 253; Haspelmather 1993: 502].

In the other dialects of the Kyuri group: Qurah (Kyuri group) \(\text{q}^{\prime}\text{a}-\text{l}'\) 'rain' [Meylanova 1964: 169].
In the Samur group: Khlyut (subdialect of Akhty) \(\text{yuqa}-\text{l}'\) 'rain' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 203], Khuryug (subdialect of Akhty) \(\text{q}^{\prime}\text{a}-\text{l}'\) 'rain' [Meylanova 1964: 302, 315], Migrah (subdialect of the Doquzpara) \(\text{q}^{\prime}\text{a}-\text{l}'\) 'rain' [Meylanova 1964: 262], Jaba \(\text{q}^{\prime}\text{a}-\text{l}'\) 'rain' [Ganieva 2007: 122, 133], Qurush \(\text{q}^{\prime}\text{a}-\text{l}'\) 'rain' [Ganieva 2008: 67, 144].

But in the Quba group: Yargun \(\text{marf}\) 'rain' [Babaliiyeva 2007: 60, 68, 79, 91].

The common form \(\text{q}^{\prime}\text{a}-\) and Khlyut \(\text{yuqa}-\) are derived from the verb for 'to rain' (see above) with the rare and archaic suffix -l. External comparison suggests that this deverbal noun must be posited as the Proto-Lezgian word for 'rain', whereas Gyune/Quba \(\text{marf}\) in the generic meaning 'rain' represents an innovation of areal origin. The Khlyut form \(\text{yuqa}-\) is, however, morphologically suspicious; maybe it represents a borrowing from the neighboring Mukhad dialect of Rutul, cf. Mukhad \(\text{h}^{\prime}\text{w}^{\prime}\text{a}-\text{l} ~ \text{uwa}-l ~ \text{y}^{\prime}\text{wa}-l\) 'rain' q.v. (if the Rutul shift \(\text{q}^{\prime} > \text{u}\) is a late process).

Proto-Lezgian: NCED: 1010. Distribution: Attested as the basic term for 'rain' in Udi, on the one hand, and in many Nuclear Lezgian lects, on the other: West Lezgian (Tsakhur, Rutul) and the most East Lezgian lects (Aghul, Lezgi).
This is a Proto-Lezgian derivative from the verb *ʔoqʷ*- 'to rain' with the suffix *-l*, which forms deverbal abstract nouns [Alekseev 1985: 108 ff.]. The verb *ʔoqʷ*- 'to rain' was retained in West Lezgian (Tsakhur, Rutul) and East Lezgian (Aghul, Tabasaran, Lezgi). It should be noted that in modern Tsakhur dialects, it is the synchronic masdar from this verb that is mostly used for 'rain', whereas *ʔoqʷ*-l is obsolete.

A second candidate is *marf* [NCED: 795], which is the basic term for 'rain' in Tabasaran, Fite Aghul, Ixrek Rutul, Gyune Lezgi (a Tabasaran-induced areal innovation), on the one hand, and in Budukh, on the other (apparently an independent introduction). The original meaning of *marf* is unclear; outside of the aforementioned Nuclear Lezgian lects, it is attested in Archi as 'foam', whereas external comparison points to the meaning 'a k. of cloud'.

In Archi, the deverbal formation for 'rain' was replaced with *χːˤil* [LEDb: #307], whose Proto-Lezgian meaning is likely to have been 'sky': this stem means 'sky' in West Lezgian (Tsakhur, Rutul) and in Proto-Archi, as suggested by the Archi locative adverb ʰχːˤo' in the sky, up in the air' [Chumakina et al. 2007; Kibrik et al. 1977b: 340], which reflects (with Ablaut) the archaic oblique stem of *χːˤel* (χːˤe in the secondary meaning 'rain' possesses a regular paradigm).

In Kryts, 'rain' is expressed by the synchronically substantivized adjective 'wet' (*чIаран* [NCED: 385]).

Replacements: ['to rain'] > ['rain'] (Common Lezgian), ['sky'] > ['rain'] (Archi), ['wet'] > ['rain'] (Kryts).

Semantics and structure: Correspondences seem regular.

References and notes:


**Vartashen Udi**  [Gukasyan 1974: 241; Fähnrich 1999: 14; Schiefner 1863: 90; Schulze 2001: 267]. In [Fähnrich 1999], correctly quoted with pharyngealization: čočə. In [Gukasyan 1974: 241], apparently quoted erroneously as čočə [ɛlvəl] (see notes on Nidzh Udi). The exact phonetic nature of affricates can hardly be established from old records of Schiefner and the Bežanovs (note that Bežanovs' ɛːčə (Mt. 16.2) is incorrectly transcribed as čočə in [Schulze 2001: 267]).

**Common Udi**: Common Udi *čočə*.

**Caucasian Albanian**: A good candidate is čočə [Gippert et al. 2008: IV-29], which renders the word 'purple' in Jo. 19.5, but it should be noted that the passage is damaged and the reading is not reliable.

**Archi**: Chumakina et al. 2007; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 234; Kibrik et al. 1977b: 255, 364; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 674; Mikailov 1967: 184; Dirr 1908: 156, 211. Quoted as ɣɨɾ'əm-nu-CLASS in [Mikailov 1967]. A regular participle from the stative verb ɣɨɾ'ən 'to be red', borrowed from Lak ɣɨɾ'-al- 'red' (as proposed in [NCED: 541]), probably from some Lak dialect that possessed not the -al-, but the -am-suffix); in [Chumakina 2009] labeled only as "perhaps borrowed" without the source.

**Kryts (proper)**: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 234. An adjective in -i. In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 674], quoted as iri-ʃ - a reformed stem in -u with further vowel harmony i-u > u-ii; -ʃ is a class exponent. The term iri-ʃ 'blood' q.v. is derived from this adjective.
Both in [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 234] and [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 674], the loanword girmizi is also quoted as a synonym (< Azerbaijani girmizi 'red').

**Alyk Kryts:** Authier 2009: 67, 112, 265. A reformed stem in -u, see notes on Kryts proper (Alyk ik normally corresponds to ü of other dialects).

**Budusk:** Meylanova 1984: 18, 218; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 674. Borrowed from Azerbaijani al' 'red, vermilion, purple'.

In [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 234], 'red' is glossed as girmizi, which is translated as 'dark red' in [Meylanova 1984: 93] (borrowed from Azerbaijani girmizi 'red').

**Mishlesh Tsakhur:** Kibrik et al. 1999: 871, 894; Ibragimov 1990: 83, 88; Ibragimov & Nurmamedov 2010: 403; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 674. It must be noted that ĺara-n comes from [Kibrik et al. 1999], whereas in [Ibragimov 1990; Ibragimov & Nurmamedov 2010] and [Comrie & Khalilov 2010] the word is consistently transcribed with pharyngealization: ĺara-n [slalp]. According to Kodzasov's report [Kibrik et al. 1999: 19], ĺara-n is one of the instances of the so-called epiglottalization (emphatic palatalization) - a specific prosodic feature of Mishlesh Tsakhur, not studied in detail yet and therefore not noted in Kibrik et al.'s transcription. Epiglottalized ĺara-n is incorrectly treated as a pharyngealized form by Ibragimov and other authors.

**Tsakhur-Kum Tsakhur:** ĺara-n [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 234].

**Mikik Tsakhur:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 234; Dirr 1913: 215, 228.

**Gelmets Tsakhur:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 234; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 674.

**Mukhad Rutul:** Dirr 1912: 145, 193; Ibragimov 1978: 119; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 674.

**Ixrek Rutul:** Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 126, 349; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 674.

**Luchek Rutul:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 234.

**Common Rutul:** Final -di / -d is the attributive suffix.

**Koshan Aghul:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 234; Suleymanov 2003: 88.

**Keren Aghul:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 234; Dirr 1913: 215, 228; Shaumyan 1941: 142.

**Gequn Aghul:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 234; Dirr 1907: 122, 175; Shaumyan 1941: 142.

**Fite Aghul:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 234.

**Aghul (proper):** Suleymanov 2003: 88. The same in the Tsirkhe subdialect: ire-f 'red' [Shaumyan 1941: 142].

**Common Aghul:** Final -d, -t, -f, -r are adjectival suffixes (fossilized class exponents) [Magometov 1970: 92; Shaumyan 1941: 45].

**Northern Tabasaran:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 234.

The same in the Khanag subdialect: erì 'red' [Uslar 1979: 684, 996; Dirr 1905: 168, 232]. The same in the Khyurryuk subdialect: erì [apu] 'red' [Genko 2005: 196]; distinct from Khyurryuk etv'en 'light red' [Genko 2005: 194]. The latter term was borrowed from Azerbaijani alwan 'many-colored, gaily colored' or from Persian alvan 'of various colors' (ultimately of Arabic origin).

**Southern Tabasaran:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 234.


Somewhat differently in the Khiv subdialects, where, according to Genko's glosses, ürłu [yspy] means specifically 'dark red, brown-red' [Genko 2005: 159], as opposed to etv'en 'light red' [Genko 2005: 194] (the latter term is a loanword, see notes on Northern Tabasaran).

**Gyne Lezgi:** Uslar 1896: 446, 615.


The same in the Akhty dialect: Khlyut erì 'red' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 234].

**Proto-Lezgian:** NCED: 519. Distribution: This stem is attested with its basic meaning in the bulk of Nuclear Lezgian lects (Kryts, Rutul, Aghul, Rutul, Lezghi), although it has been lost without a trace in both of the outliers (Udi, Archi). In Budukh, it was superseded with Azerbaijani loanwords in the meaning 'red', but retained in the substantivized expression for 'blood' q.v. In Tsakhur, the etymologically obscure word ĺara- (‘Čār-’/Čār-) 'red' occurs.

In Udi, the word for 'red' is čéčf. An etymologically isolated (in Lezgian) adjective, whose Lezgian protoform could be čéčf. [NCED: 348]. The Udi stem is incorrectly derived from the reduplicated *čar-čar- (with further connection to the Tsakhur term) in [Gippert et al. 2008: II-72].
Since in Archi, 'to be red' is expressed with the Lak loanword, Nuclear Lezgian *ʔɨrɨ* and Udi *čːVčːV* appear to be equal candidates for the status of the Proto-Lezgian term for 'red' from the distributive point of view. External North Caucasian comparison, however, speaks in favor of *ʔɨrɨ* [NCED: 519]. It should be noted that, as proposed in [NCED: 348], *čːVčːV* could possess some scant Andian comparanda that also mean 'red'.

**Replacements:** {'red' > 'blood'} (Kryts, Budukh).

**Reconstruction shape:** Correspondences seem regular, except for some assimilative-dissimilative vowel fluctuations in Tabasaran and Lezgi.

**Semantics and structure:** Primary stative verbal root 'to be red'.

67. ROAD

Nidzh Udi *yaqː* {йакъ} (1), Vartashen Udi *yaqː* {йакъ} (1), Archi *d'eqˤ* (1), Kryts (proper) *riχ* (2), Alyk Kryts *riχ* (2), Budukh *riχ* {пux} (2), Mishlesh Tsakhur *yaqː* {үалхv, үалхxv-} (1), Mikik Tsakhur *yaqː* (1), Gelmet Tsakhur *yiqː* (1), Mukhad Rutul *raqː* {palxv} (1), Ixrek Rutul *raqː* {palxv} (1), Luchek Rutul *raqː* (1), Koshan Aghul *raqː* (1), Fite Aghul *raqː* (1), Aghul (proper) *riхъ* (1), Northern Tabasaran *raqː-a* (1), Southern Tabasaran *raqː* (1), Gyune Lezgi *rāq* (1), Proto-Lezgian *rāqː* (1).

**References and notes:**


Vartashen Udi: Gukasyan 1974: 124; Fähnrich 1999: 18; Dirr 1903: 16, 21, 63, 72, 84, 85, 92, 93, 94; Schiefner 1863: 105; Schulze 2001: 283; Starchevskiy 1891: 498.

Common Udi: Common Udi *yaqː*.

**Caucasian Albanian:** *pāq* 'road, way, path; journey' [Gippert et al. 2008: IV-24]; an etymological cognate of the Udi term with a different treatment of initial Lezgian *r*-.

Archi: Chumakina et al. 2007; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 189; Kibrik et al. 1977b: 221, 357; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 511; Mikailov 1967: 180; Dirr 1908: 141, 207.

Distinct from *sahria* 'wide road, highway' [Chumakina et al. 2007; Kibrik et al. 1977b: 317], borrowed from Avar *şahria* 'highway'.


Alyk Kryts: Authier 2009: 45, 104, 203, etc.


Distinct from *jıra* [джыргъа] 'pathway (narrow road)' [Meylanova 1984: 58], borrowed from Azerbaijani dialectal (Quba) *şıra*, literary *şıqın* 'pathway'.


Tsakhur-Kum Tsakhur: *yaqː* [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 189].

Mikik Tsakhur: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 189; Dirr 1913: 169, 224.

Gelmets Tsakhur: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 189. In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 511], the modern depharyngealized variant is quoted: abs. *yeq [ieexs]*.


Luchek Rutul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 189. Ablaut paradigm: *raqː* [abs.] / *riqː-i-r* [erg.].

Common Rutul: Note the loss of tense articulation of -q- in Mukhad.
Koshan Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 189; Suleymanov 2003: 142; Shaumyan 1941: 159. The same in the other subdialects: Arsug, Khudig ʁäqˤ ~ raqˤ 'road' [Magometov 1970: 231 sentence 10, 236 sentence 22; Shaumyan 1941: 159].


Fite Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 189.


It is interesting that in [Magometov 1970: 205 sentence 15] this word is quoted as räqˤ in the collocation mašini-n räqˤ 'highway' - apparently a cultural borrowing from another Aghul dialect. Likewise in [Suleymanov 2003: 142], 'road' is quoted with pharyngealization: raqˤ (rakˤ).

Northern Tabasaran: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 189.


Southern Tabasaran: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 189.


The same in Literary Tabasaran: raqˤ [paʁ𝐊] 'road (in general); path, narrow road' [Khanmagomedov & Shalbuzov 2001: 264]; distinct from the more specific term rïχ [pɪχ] 'path, narrow road; fence, railings' [Khanmagomedov & Shalbuzov 2001: 261].


Proto-Lezgian: NCED: 603. Distribution: Retained with the basic meaning in all the lects (including Caucasian Albanian), except for South Lezgian (Kryts, Budukh).

In South Lezgian (Kryts, Budukh), this was superseded with the phonetically similar root *riχ [NCED: 606]. The exact original meaning of *riχ is unclear, because outside South Lezgian, its seems attested only in Tabasaran with the specific meaning 'path, narrow road; fence, railings'.

Replacements: {'road > 'journey'} (Caucasian Albanian).

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular.

Semantics and structure: Primary substantive root. The oblique stem is *ʁeqˤːi-.

68. ROOT

Nidzh Udi tum ~ tüm {myːm} (1), Vartashen Udi tum {myːm} (1), Archi m'arχːu (-1), Kryts (proper) kuk (-1), Alyk Kryts kuk (-1), Budukh kuk {kuːk} (-1), Mishlesh Tsakhur kok {kɔkː} (-1), Mikik Tsakhur kok- (-1), Gelmets Tsakhur kok (-1), Mukhad Rutul ʁʷab {ɾʷɑːbː} (2), Ixrek Rutul ʁʷab {ɾʷɑːbː} (2), Luchek Rutul ʁʷab (2), Koshan Aghul marʔ (3), Keren Aghul marqˤ (3), Gequn Aghul märʔ (3), Fite Aghul marʔ (3), Aghul (proper) märʔ (3), Northern Tabasaran ʒuːw (4), Southern Tabasaran čːw (4), Gyune Lezgi duːwul (5).

References and notes:

Vartashen Udi: Guksayan 1974: 206; Fähnrich 1999: 31; Schiefner 1863: 95; Schulze 2001: 325; Starchevskiy 1891: 501. Polysemy: 'root / lineage, kin, clan / bottom'. In [Schulze 2001], tum is glossed as 'root; seed; gender', although in the texts from [Bezhanov & Bezhanov 1902] this word means only 'root (the underground part of tree/plant)', but not 'seed' q.v. and not, a fortiori, 'gender'.

Common Udi: Common Udi 'tum. Originally borrowed from Azerbaijani tum 'seed (botanic); posterity' or directly from the corresponding Iranian terms, but the semantic derivation 'seed' > 'root' seems to be inner Udi, therefore we treat tum 'root' as a full-fledged item (further see notes on Proto-Lezgian 'seed').

Caucasian Albanian: Unattested.

Archi: Chumakina et al. 2007; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 97; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 401. Borrowed from Azerbaijani kök 'root'.

Kryts proper: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 97. Borrowed from Azerbaijani kök 'root'.


A second term for 'root', apparently inherited, comes from [Ibragimov 1990: 20, 37]: midli ~ mufl'i (semantic nuances are unknown).


Common Tsakhur: The term kök was borrowed from Azerbaijani kök 'root'.


A second term for 'root' is kuk [Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 147, 349] ~ küik [Genko & Khalilov 2010: 401], borrowed from Azerbaijani kök 'root'.


Gequn Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 97; Dirr 1907: 134, 175; Shaumyan 1941: 151.

Fite Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 97.


Common Aghul: The Keren (Richa) form marqʷˤ is irregular (one could expect something like **marqʷˤ with the ejective uvular or even even **marʔ ~ **marʔ). It is proposed in [NCED: 827] to treat Richa marqʷˤ as the result of contamination with another, poorly attested Proto-Lezgian root ('marqʷˤ'), but we prefer to regard Richa marqʷˤ as a sporadic phonetic deviation.

Northern Tabasaran: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 97.


Southern Tabasaran: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 97.


Gyune Lezgi: Uslar 1896: 408, 615. Distinct from pun [pun] with polysemy: 'root / lower part, base / fortune, property' [Uslar 1896: 521], which is ultimately borrowed from Persian bun 'root (botanic); basis, foundation'.


The same in the Akhty dialect: Khyut duwil 'root' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 97]. Distinct from the more specific Khyut term čaraxʷ 'small root' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 97].

Proto-Lezgian: Not reconstructible.
Distribution: A highly unstable term, frequently superseded with loanwords. We prefer not to reconstruct the Proto-Lezgian root at all. The following inherited forms are attested in Nuclear Lezgian lects; all these roots are equal candidates for the status of the Proto-Lezgian term for 'root'.

1) *malqʷ* [NCED: 809], meaning 'root' in Aghul. The only Lezgian cognate is the word for 'sprout, shoot; nail, stud' in Archi (it could be tempting to connect this root to the not entirely clear Mishlesh Tsakhur word *m misd*’i ~ *mild*’i 'root' via metathesis *lQ > Qi*, but the uvular and vowel correspondences are irregular). Since the meaning shift between 'root' and 'sprout' is typologically possible in both directions, the original meaning of Proto-Lezgian *malqʷ* cannot be established. External North Caucasian comparison rather points to the semantics of 'sprout'.

2) *qʷar* [NCED: 571], meaning 'root' in Tabasaran, isolated in Lezgian, but possesses Avaro-Andian cognates with the meaning 'root'.

3) *qʷap* [NCED: 464], meaning 'root' in Rutul, lost in the rest of Lezgian. Possible external North Caucasian *comparanda* mean 'pit' or 'foundation, base'.

4) Lezgi *dwa*ui, without etymology.

In other lects, inherited forms were superseded with loanwords: Archi (< Lak), Kryts, Budukh, Tsakhur (< Azerbaijani).

In Udi, 'root' is expressed with the form *tum* which originally meant 'seed', ultimately borrowed from the Azerbaijani or Iranian word for 'seed' q.v.

Finally, it should be noted that in [NCED: 827], there is a Proto-Lezgian root *marqʷ*, based on Archi *maq* 'stake, picket' and Keren Aghul (Richa) *marqʷ* 'root' (with irregular pharyngealization). This root does indeed possess good North Caucasian cognates with the meaning 'root', but the internal Lezgian data are insufficient for reconstruction, since the Keren Aghul (Richa) form can hardly be separated from other Aghul words for 'root', which originate from *malqʷ* (see above).

Replacements: ['seed' > 'root'] (Udi).

69. ROUND

Nidzh Udi *kankoroy* {кандкорой} (1), Vartashen Udi *kakanik: {каканыкі} (1), Archi *guk:i-t:u-CLASS* (-1), Kryts (proper) *gurgu-m* (1), Alyk Kryts *beambelecʷa't*a (2), Budukh *gungu-r'i - gungu-lu'-i* {гүңүңлү} (1), Mishlesh Tsakhur *gilgi³e-n* {гыйлгылён} (1), Mikik Tsakhur *girgara-n* (1), Gelmets Tsakhur *top-x³i³i³-n³* (3), Mukhad Rutul *ruw-ud* {руьылд} (4), Ixrek Rutul *girg-i-n-di* {гыргындү} (1), Luchek Rutul *ruwu-d* (4), Koshan Aghul al=arc-ni-r (5) / t'ařlič (6), Keren Aghul *gilg-e-n-f* (1), Gequn Aghul *gilg-e-n-f ~ girge-n-f* (1), Fite Aghul *gug-mi-t* (1) / al=urcu-t (5), Aghul (proper) *girg-e-n-f* (1), Northern Tabasaran *c'i=gurgu-m* (1), Southern Tabasaran *gerg-m'i* (1), Gyune Lezgi *el=qʷe-y* {элкъёй} (4), Proto-Lezgian *girg*³V (1).

References and notes:


Common Udi: Common Udi *'kank-' with the cluster simplification in Vartashen. Different suffixal formations in the dialects, although morphological details are not entirely clear.

Caucasian Albanian: Unattested.
Archí: Chumakina et al. 2007; Kibrik & Kodzhasov 1990: 236; Kibrik et al. 1977b: 232, 364; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 593; Mikhailov 1967: 177. In [Kibrik & Kodzhasov 1990], quoted with a typo: g'uki-tu-class. Polysemy: 'round 3D / round 2D'. A regular participle from the stative verb g'uki 'to be round', probably borrowed from Lak karuki- 'round' (cf. notes in [NCED: 438]; in [Chumakina 2009] labeled as ‘clearly borrowed from Lak kaki- ‘round’, although such a form seems non-existent in Lak). Reasons for the cluster simplification VrV > VrV in Archí are not clear, but note that in archaic Archí the medial cluster was still retained: gurki, gurki-tu-class '(to be) round' [Dirr 1908: 138, 211].


Alyk Kryts: Authier 2009: 68. Quoted without semantic specification; morphologically and etymologically unclear.

Buđukh: Meylanova 1984: 37; Alekseev 1994: 283. In [Meylanova 1984: 79, 219], additional forms kunga-lu-ti ~ kunga-r-li [kunyaγutu, kunyaγ Sur] 'round' are also quoted (the only forms in [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 593]), which could be errors or expressive variants. Polysemy: 'round 3D / round 2D'.

Note that in [Kibrik & Kodzhasov 1990: 236] 'round' is glossed as q'aːqal, not found in other sources (for this form see [NCED: 933]).


In [Ibragimov & Nurmamedov 2010: 121], the variant gongaːqe is also quoted.

In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 593], 'round' is glossed as ginyaːn - apparently the Tsakhur-Kum form, see below.

Tsakhur-Kum Tsakhur: gijrikaːn [Kibrik & Kodzhasov 1990: 236]. The exact application is not specified; apparently, 'round 2D / 3D'.

Mikik Tsakhur: Kibrik & Kodzhasov 1990: 236. The exact application is not specified; apparently, 'round 2D / 3D'.

Gelmeț Tsakhur: Kibrik & Kodzhasov 1990: 236; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 593. The exact application is not specified; apparently, 'round 2D / 3D'. Derived from the noun top-, attested with the meaning 'ball' in the Mishlesh dialect [Kibrik et al. 1999: 888] and Literary Tsakhur [Ibragimov & Nurmamedov 2010: 341] or 'wheel' in the Mikik dialect [Dirr 1913: 204], borrowed from Azerbaijani top- 'ball; hub (of wheel)'. The morphological derivation, however, seems to be inner Tsakhur (the second element -xilɨ- from the verb ix- 'to become?), therefore we treat top-xilɨnt/-round' as a full-fledged item.

Mukhad Rutul: Dirr 1912: 29, 168, 193; Ibragimov 1978: 118, 225; Makhmudova 2001: 182; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 593. Examples for 'round (3D)' have been found in [Dirr 1912]: 'round stone', 'round (= plump) woman'.

Ixeř Rutul: Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 58, 350; Ibragimov 1978: 225; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 593. This is quoted by Ibragimov as the basic Ixeř term for 'round' (without discrimination between the '2D' and '3D' meanings?).

Two additional (apparently less frequent) words for 'round' are quoted by Dzhamalov & Semedov, but without any specifications: 1) rwaː-di [pyryaːda] [Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 217]; 2) tuk-di [Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 248]. The latter seems to reflect internal Ixeř derivation from an unattested *tup 'ball', borrowed from Azerbaijani top 'ball' (the same is observed in Gelmeț Tsakhur top-xilɨnt/-round').

Luchek Rutul: Kibrik & Kodzhasov 1990: 236.

Common Rutul: Borch-Khnow: giŋi-i-n-d [ŋiŋaiwada] [Ibragimov 1978: 284]. The stem giŋi-i-n, retained in Ixeř and Borch-Khnow, must be posited as the Proto-Rutul expression for 'round (2D/3D)'. This is confirmed by external comparison.

The stem ru-class-n/-round' is a Mukhad-Luchek innovation (marginally attested in Ixeř), derived from a verbal root which is attested as Mukhad ruː- 'to become round' [Makhmudova 2001: 182, 243], Ixeř ruː- 'to walk around, hang around' [Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 217], Ixeř suːruː- 'to turn (intrans.)' (initial suː is a prefix with general semantics). The initial consonant r- in ruː- belongs to the root, but can sometimes become contaminated with the class 1/2 exponent r-.

Final -di / -d is the attributive suffix.

Koshan Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzhasov 1990: 236. Meaning: 'round 3D'. Probably dissimilated from *əw=ark-riːr - a regular past participle from the verb 'to turn', see common Aghul notes.

Distinct from ləliːč, which is quoted in [Kibrik & Kodzhasov 1990: 236] for the meaning 'round 2D'. There also exists a third Bursagh term: ček- 'round' [Shaumyan 1941: 189] (glossed simply as 'round'); actually it seems to be an error on the part of Shaumyan, because this form is to be read as the substantive čeŋ- 'skew, hank' [Kibrik & Kodzhasov 1990: 145].

Cf. in other subdialects: Arsug or Khudig kqurː-neːd, əwalːniːd 'round' [Suleymanov 2003: 51] (both glossed simply as 'round', application and exact dialectal provenance are unknown). Kibrik & Kodzhasov 1990: 236. Meaning 'round 2D'.


The same in the Usug subdialect: *gilg-e-n-f 'round' [Shaumyan 1941: 189] (glossed simply as 'round', application is unknown).

Gequn Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 236; Suleymanov 1993: 65; Dirr 1907: 109, 175; Shaumyan 1941: 189. The former form is quoted in [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990] as 'round 3D' and in [Suleymanov 1993] without specifications; the latter one is from [Dirr 1907] and [Shaumyan 1941] with an example for 'round 2D': "round table" [Dirr 1907: 109].


Common Aghul: The semantic opposition 'round 3D' / 'round 2D' is highly atypical for Dagestanian languages. The emergence of such an opposition is obviously a recent innovation of the Koshan, Fite, and possibly some other dialects of Aghul.

The non-Koshan dialects retain the basic Proto-Lezgian root *gilgʷ'V -round (3D, 2D)' [NCED: 438], although its phonetical reflexes are rather unstable and irregular (as in other Lezgian languages as well). Koshan kurt-ne-t 'round' may theoretically continue the same Proto-Lezgian root *gilgʷ'-round'.

In Koshan and Fite the past participles from the verb 'to turn' have been introduced for 'round 3D' (Koshan al=arc-ni-t - al=alc-ni-t) and 'round 2D' (Fite al=arc-a-t). The proper verbal stem is attested as Koshan al=arc-ana- 'to turn (trans., intrans.)' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 82; Suleymanov 2003: 27], Keren (Usug) al=arc-a- 'to turn (trans.)' [Shaumyan 1941: 137], Gequn al=arc-a- 'to go round smth.' [Dirr 1907: 101], Proper Aghul (Tpig) al=arc-a- 'to turn (trans.)' [Shaumyan 1941: 137; Suleymanov 2003: 27] (al= is an old spatial prefix).

Koshan (Burszag) t'ar'lic 'round 2D' is an obscure form.

Final -d, -t, -f, -r are adjectival suffixes (fossilized class exponents) [Magometov 1970: 92; Shaumyan 1941: 45].

Northern Tabasaràn: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 236. The accent pattern indicates that the form is a recent compound, although the first element ci= is unclear.


Southern Tabasaràn: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 236.


Common Tabasaran: Apparently with polysemy: 'round (2D, 3D)' in all the dialects.

Gyune Lezgi: Talibov & Gadzhiev 1966: 393; Gadzhiev 1950: 320; Haspelmath 1993: 525. This is actually the Literary Lezgi word; the proper Gyune term for 'round' is not documented in [Uslar 1896]. Polysemy: 'round 3D / round 2D'. Participle from the literary verb el=qʷ-r- [элькъвуьн] 'to turn (intrans.)' [Talibov & Gadzhiev 1966: 393; Haspelmath 1993: 487] = Gyune el=qʷ-e- 'to turn (intrans.)' [Uslar 1896: 352] (el= is an old spatial prefix).

The same participle in the Akhty dialect: Khlyut el=qʷ-ʔ-ɣ 'round 3D/2D' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 236].

Proto-Lezgian: NCED: 438. Distribution: This stem is retained with the basic meaning in Udi, on the one hand, and in almost all nuclear Lezgian dialects, on the other. Normally, the polysemy 'round 3D / round 2D' is observed, although some Aghul dialects introduce the lexical opposition 'round 3D / round 2D'.

In Aghul dialects and Lezgi, 'round' (3D/2D, 3D or 2D) represents a synchronic participle from the verb 'to turn': *tirqʷ [NCED: 649] or *tirqʷ-ʔ- (~ -e~) [NCED: 650]. Similarly in some Rutul dialects (Mukhad, Ixrek, Luchek), 'round' is synchronically derived from the verb 'to be round; to walk around, hang around': the same Proto-Lezgian root *tirqʷ-ʔ- (~ -e~), as in Lezgi, but with slightly different synchronic meaning.

In Gelmets Tsakhir, Ixrek Rutul, 'round' is derived from the noun for 'ball' or 'wheel'.

Etymologically unclear forms include Nidzrh Udi quruc, Alyk Kryts bembele čatl'a, Koshan Aghul gár'likč. In Archi, superseded with the Lak loanword.

Replacements: [ball; wheel > 'round'] (Gelmets Tsakhir, Ixrek Rutul), [to turn > 'round'] (Aghul, Lezgi).
Reconstruction shape: Particular correspondences are not regular, especially in the case of the medial resonant. Despite this, most of the listed forms can hardly be kept apart from each other.

Semantics and structure: Primary nominal or stative verbal root with polysemy: ‘round 3D / round 2D’.

70. SAND

Nidzh Udi qːum {κοουμ} (-1), Vartashen Udi ša {уал} (1), Archi s’arsi (2), Kryts (proper) qːum (-1), Alyk Kryts qːum (-1), Budukh qːum {κοουμ} (-1), Mishlesh Tsakhur qːum {κοουμ} (-1), Mikik Tsakhur qːum (-1), Gelmets Tsakhur qːum (-1), Mukhad Rutul šim ~ šum {уим} (1) / sec’ {сец} (3), Ixrek Rutul qːum {κοουμ} (-1), Luchek Rutul qːum (-1), Aghul (proper) qːum (-1), Northern Tabasaran ţum (-1), Southern Tabasaran ţum (-1), Gyune Lezgi qːum (-1), Proto-Lezgian *ṣːäm (1).

References and notes:

Nidzh Udi: Gukasyan 1974: 161; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 199; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 31; Mobili 2010: 196. Borrowed from Azerbaijani gum ‘sand’. A second term for ‘sand’ quoted in [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 31] is šum {шум}, which at first sight looks like an etymological retention, but is, in fact, a graphical confusion between Nidzh qːum and Vartashen ša (Dm. Ganenkov, p.c.).


Common Udi: Common Udi *ša.

Caucasian Albanian: Unattested.


Distinct from qum ‘sand; down, small feathers’ [Chumakina et al. 2007; Kibrik et al. 1977b: 298, 373; Mikailov 1967: 203], specified as ‘seaside sand’ in [Chumakina et al. 2007]. In the meaning ‘sand’ represents an Azerbaijani loanword.


Tsakhur-Kum Tsakhur: am [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 199].


Common Tsakhur: The word qːum was borrowed from Azerbaijani gum ‘sand’.

Mukhad Rutul: Dirr 1912: 183, 197; Ibragimov 1978: 118. The assimilated variant šum is attested in [Dirr 1912] as well as in [Ibragimov 1978: 138] (as a toponymical element); glossed by Dirr as ‘sand, fine gravel’. In [Ibragimov 1978: 118], two Mukhad synonyms are quoted for ‘sand’: šim and sec’. In [Makhmudova 2001] and [Comrie & Khalilov 2010], only the latter word has been found. Ibragimov 1978: 118; Makhmudova 2001: 28; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 31.

Ixrek Rutul: Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 158, 372. It must be noted that in [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 31], ‘sand’ is glossed as sec’ [сец].


External Lezgian comparison suggests that the Proto-Rutul term for 'sand' was *šim, retained in the Mukhad and Borch-Khnov dialects. The Mukhad (and Ixrek?) word sec 'sand' is of unknown origin. Ixrek and Luchek qːum was borrowed from Azerbaijani gum 'sand'.

**Koshan Aghul:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 199; Suleymanov 2003: 117; Shaumyan 1941: 188.

**Keren Aghul:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 199.

For the Usug subdialect, two words are glossed as 'sand' in [Shaumyan 1941: 160, 188]: borrowed qːum and inherited rug. The difference between the two terms is unknown.

**Gequn Aghul:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 199; Dirr 1907: 129, 180; Shaumyan 1941: 188.

**Fite Aghul:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 199.

**Aghul (proper):** Suleymanov 2003: 117; Shaumyan 1941: 188.

**Common Aghul:** In all dialects the Azerbaijani loanword has been introduced in the meaning 'sand' (qːum < Azerbaijani gum 'sand'), except for Usug Keren, where the inherited rug 'sand' is attested instead. Usug rug represents the Common Aghul word for 'dust' (shifted to 'earth' in some Aghul dialects, see notes on 'earth'). Theoretically, one can reconstruct Proto-Aghul *rug with polysemy: 'dust / sand', but alternatively, this could be an Usug innovation or even an inaccurate gloss on the part of Shaumyan.

**Northern Tabasaran:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 199.

The same loanword in the Khanag subdialect: qːum 'sand' [Uslar 1979: 831, 1001] (not attested in [Dirr 1905]); distinct from Khanag sims (сним) 'gravel' [Uslar 1979: 908]. The same in the Khyuryuk subdialect: qːum (къум) 'sand' [Genko 2005: 102]; distinct from Khyuryuk sims (сним) 'coarse (i.e. river) sand' [Genko 2005: 139].

**Southern Tabasaran:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 199.

The same loanword in the Khiv subdialect: qːum (къум) 'sand' [Genko 2005: 102]. Distinct from the more specific Khiv terms: sims (сним) 'coarse (i.e. river) sand' [Genko 2005: 139] and šim (шим) 'shale sand, hazel (used to cover the roof)' [Genko 2005: 190].


**Common Tabasaran:** In all the dialects the basic term represents a borrowing from Azerbaijani gum 'sand'. Common Tabasaran sims 'coarse (i.e. river) sand' also looks like a loanword, although the source is unclear. In contrast, Southern šim 'shale sand, gravel' is an inherited form.

**Gyune Lezgi:** Uslar 1896: 494, 623. Borrowed from Azerbaijani gum 'sand'. Distinct from inherited Gyune šim 'gravel, coarse sand' [Uslar 1896: 602, 623].


The same loanword in the Akhty dialect: Khlyut qːim 'sand' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 199]. Khlyut im < um is a late process, cf., e.g., inherited gɨm 'smoke'.

**Proto-Lezgian:** NCED: 340. **Distribution:** Inherited words for 'sand' were almost totally superseded with the Azerbaijani loanword in Lezgian lects, although *šäm is retained with the basic meaning 'sand' in Vartashen Udi and Rutul (Mukhad, Borch-Khnov). This root is also attested in many Nuclear Lezgian lects in such specific meanings as 'road metal', 'coarse sand'. Formally, available Nuclear Lezgian evidence allows us to reconstruct Proto-Lezgian *šäm with polysemy: 'sand / fine gravel / road metal'.

In Keren Aghul (Usug), *ruk: 'dust' [NCED: 603] can secondarily acquire the meaning 'sand'.

Etymologically unclear forms for 'sand' are Archi šarsi, Mukhad Rutul sec.

**Replacements** [('dust > 'sand') (Keren Aghul)].

**Reconstruction shape:** Correspondences seem regular.

**Semantics and structure:** Primary substantive root, perhaps with polysemy: 'sand / fine gravel / road metal'. The oblique stem is *šimV-.
71. SAY

Nidzh Udi neχ- {nex-} (1) / p- (3), Vartashen Udi eχ- {ex-} (2) / p- (3), Archi bo- (3) / wa-r- (3), Kryts (proper) l=ũ- (3) / l=ip- (3), Alyk Kryts l=i-yi (3) / l=ip- (3), Budukh yuʔu- {yũyũ} (3) / yip- {ũwa} (3), Mishlesh Tsakhir eh- {əwec, əwec} (3) / iũh- (3), Mikik Tsakhir ih- (3) / iũh- (3), Gelmets Tsakhir ih- {ũwe} (3), Mukhad Rutul CLASS=ux- {yũxũxũ} (4), Ixrek Rutul CLASS=ux- {yũxũyũ} (4), Luchek Rutul CLASS=ux- (4), Koshan Aghul k-ə-a- (5) / p-una- (3), Keren Aghul a_k-a-yə (6) / p-una- (3), Gequn Aghul a_k-a- (6) / p-una- (3), Fite Aghul a_k-a- (6) / up-una- (3), Aghul (proper) a_k-a-yə (6) / p-una- (3), Northern Tabasarān k’- (7) / p- (3), Southern Tabasarān k’- (7) / p- (3), Gyune Lezgi l=uh’u- (3), Proto-Lezgian *ğiʔwʰi- (3).

References and notes:

Nidzh Udi: Maisak 2008a: 108-110; Maisak 2008b: 163; Schulze 2005: 539 (3.4.2.1 #22). In [Gukasyan 1974: 188; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 765; Mobili 2010: 232] only the masdar pesun [recyn] is quoted. According to [Maisak 2008a: 108 ft., 149], the verb has a suppletive paradigm: neχ- (present) / up- (imperative) / un-a- (future). In the present forms the variant ne- is normally used, when it is followed by a group of clitical markers that contains a person exponent; in other cases, the variant neχ- is used (T. Maisak’s p. c., see also [Maisak 2008a: 109, 149]). The variant neχ- is apparently primary, whereas ne- demonstrates secondary reduction. The infinitive variants up- and p- are distributed as follows: p- in the infinitive p-es-um; the variant up- is used in the masdar up-s-un and in the oblique stem of the infinitive up-s- [Maisak 2008a: 108 ff.].


Common Udi: The general suppletive pattern is the same in both dialects, although some important details differ. The main difficulty is in the discrepancy between present tense roots Nidzh neχ- and Vartashen eχ-, which do not correspond to each other. Currently, we do not see any phonetic or morphological way to compare these morphemes etymologically. It must be noted that it is possible to propose some Lezgian comparanda for Vartashen eχ-, but probably not for Nidzh neχ-.

The reconstruction of Proto-Caucasian Albanian-Udi paradigm is a more intricate question, because both neχ- and eχ- lack cognates in known Caucasian Albanian lexicon. On one hand, the Udi present (n)ex- looks like a pure archaism, since this is the only Udi verb whose present tense forms are not derived from the infinitive [Maisak 2008a: 109] (on the secondary origin of the modern Udi present pattern see [Maisak 2008b: 169 ft.]). On the other hand, the Caucasian Albanian present stem uk’-a- directly corresponds to the modern Nidzh conjunctive uk’-a-, cited, e.g., in [Maisak 2008b: 206 (ex. 92)] (the hypothesis that the modern Udi conjunctive with thematic -a-originates from the old present has perspicuously been proposed in [Maisak 2008b: 208 ff., 216] and is now proven by Caucasian Albanian data). In the light of the latter, the modern Udi present tense morphemes (n)ex- look like a recent innovation that superseded old uk’- in the present forms, whereas uk’- is still retained in the conjunctive and the al-participle (on the basis of which the future tense is formed in modern Udi).

In fact, the situation is quite unclear. Note also a likely hypothesis that in the verb system the general proto-opposition was imperfective (= present) with thematic -a- vs. perfective (= past) with thematic -i- (or -e-?) [Maisak 2008b: 208]. Another issue to be discussed is the variation of the morphemes up- - p-, which are used for the infinitive, past and imperative both in Caucasian Albanian and modern Udi. It must be noted that the distribution of the variants with and without u- is not fully the same in Caucasian Albanian, Nidzh and Vartashen. In the light of the Caucasian Albanian data,
it is natural to suppose that the modern Udi infinitive-masdar forms with p- (p-es, p-esun) are secondary (these are probably leveled up after the past stem p(e)-).

Thus, we have at least three archaic verbs with the fluctuation between uC- and CV- within the paradigm, namely:
1) ‘to die’ q.v.: up’ infinitive, death, dying (CA) / p’u-r- past stem (CA, Udi);
2) ‘to eat’ q.v.: uk’- present, infinitive, imperative, future stem (CA, Udi) / k(ə)y past stem (CA, Udi);
3) ‘to say’: up- infinitive, imperative (CA, Udi) / p(ə)- past (CA, Udi).

It is obvious that we deal with the remnant of some kind of ablaut: *V(C) in the infinitive, imperative and present(? > CA-Udi uC-) vs. *V(C) in the past (> CA-Udi CV- with reduction of the initial vowel). For Ablaut in Proto-Lezgian, see some preliminary observations in [NCED: 166 ff.]. Out of several supposed patterns the best traced one is ‘i (the infinitive and terminative stems, scil. imperative). This could be the Caucasian Albanian-Udi case, although Proto-Lezgian TMA oppositions as well as segmental vocalic reconstruction have not yet been sufficiently elaborated.

Summing up, the following Proto-Caucasian Albanian-Udi suppletive paradigm for ‘to say’ can be reconstructed with relative safety: *uk’-a- (imperfective) / *up- (infinitive, imperative) / *p(ə)- (perfective). The origin as well as the paradigmatic status of the modern present roots, Nidzh nek-, Vartashen ek- are obscure.

**Caucasian Albanian:** uk’-a- (~ k’-a-) (present, al-participle) / up- (infinitive, imperative) / p- (past) [Gippert et al. 2008: II:44, 51, IV-35].

The present stem appears in two variants: uk’-a- and k’-a-. The general distribution is as follows: uk’-a- in plain forms / k’-a- as a second root in verbal compounds (although with minor exceptions in both directions). Obviously, uk’- is the original variant, whereas k’- represents a secondary syncope of the first vowel (apparently caused by vocal contraction at the morpheme boundaries).


Synchronically suppletive verb: yułu-r- [imperf.] / yip- [perf., invm.] / yu-ru-ta [prohib]. We treat yułu- and yip- as synonyms (although both synchronic morphemes are etymologically related). Initial y- could theoretically be the prefix ‘across’ [Alekseev 1994: 271].


Distinct from yišon (b)ah- ‘to tell, speak’ [Kibrik et al. 1999: 880], a formation from yišo ‘a k. of poem’ with the verb (h)ah- ‘to do’ [Kibrik et al. 1999: 58 f.] Perfeective stem.


Distinct from yišen (b)ah- ‘to tell, speak’ [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 148; Dirr 1913: 172] from yuše ‘word’ [Dirr 1913: 172] with the verb (h)ah- ‘to do’. Perfeective stem.

**Gelmets Tsakhir:** Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 765. Only the future stem ih-čez is attested.


Common Rutul: The original root is axw-. (as proved by the thematic -i after in the imperative stem), although the imperative and prohibitive forms have been secondarily delabialized in the modern dialects (a common Rutul process of the delabialization of verbal roots).

Initial r= is the imperative exponent.

Koshan Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 148; Magometov 1970: 228 sentences 7, 9, 13. Suppletive stem: k=a-[imperf.] / p=una-w [perf.]/ p= [inf.], prohib.]. The imperative stem is missing from [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988], but attested in the Burshag text from [Magometov 1970]. The imperative stem k=a- ‘to say’ is also attested in the Arsug and Khudig subdialects, see [Magometov 1970: 230 sentences 9, 10]; 234 sentences 17, 18, 18; 236 sentences 6, 12; 236 sentences 17, 25. Distinct from Burshag w=aKx=a- ‘to speak’ [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 148; Suleymanov 2003: 56].Perfective stem.


In the Usug dialect: v= -[imperf.]/ v=a- [inf.], ‘to say’ [Suleymanov 1993: 147; Shaumyan 1941: 156.]

Distinct from Richa su=s=a- ‘to speak’ [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 148].Perfective stem.

Gequn Aghul: Dirr 1907: 137, 183. Suppletive paradigm: ax-a- [imperf., prohib.] / p=una- [perf.] / p= [inf.]/ up [imv.].

Distinct from su=s=a- ‘to speak’ [Dirr 1907: 111].Perfective stem.


Aghul (proper): Suleymanov 2003: 139; Shaumyan 1941: 156. Suppletive paradigm: ax-a-y- [imperf.] / p=una- [perf.] / p= [inf.]/ up [imv.].

Distinct from Tpig su=s=a- ‘to speak’ [Suleymanov 2003: 56].Perfective stem.

Common Aghul: The Koshan and non-Koshan dialects differ as to the imperative stem: Koshan k=a/- non-Koshan ax-a-. The Lezgian etymology of both imperative roots is not entirely clear.


Common Tabasaran: Except for some fluctuations in the infinitive form, the suppletive paradigms are identical in all the dialects.


The same in Literary Lezgi: b=ul-[imperf.] / b=ul-[perf.]/ b=uh ~ b=uh [imv.]. ‘to say’ [Talibov & Gadzhiev 1966: 225; Gadzhiev 1950: 769; Haspelmath 1993: 497, 525; Gyulumagomedov 2004: 2, 21]. Distinct from literary mYya-.

**Proto-Lezgian:** NCED: 625. **Distribution:** This stem is retained as the basic root for 'to say' in all the lects, except for Rutul. The suppletive paradigm of 'to say' with two etymologically different roots for the imperfective and perfective stems is only attested in Caucasian Albanian-Udi and two East Lezgian languages: Aghul, Tabasaran. In these languages, *ʔiʔʷˤɨ* - 'to say' is restricted to the perfective stem, whereas the imperfective stems contain various roots that differ even within dialects of one language (because of this, there are no reasons to postulate the suppletive opposition between perfective and imperfective stems for Proto-Lezgian).

In Caucasian Albanian, the imperfective root is *ʔiʔʷˤan* [NCED: 634], whose original meaning was 'to talk, speak' vel sim.

In Udi, two present (imperfective) roots are attested: neʔ- (Nidzh), ɛχ- (Vartashen), whose etymological origin is unclear. Formally, Vartashen ɛχ- can be compared to the scantily attested Nuclear Lezgian verb *ʔerχʷa* 'to ask; to read' [NCED: 604].

In Tabasaran, the root *ʔɛlˈwV* [NCED: 413] acquired the imperfective function within the paradigm 'to say'. The exact protomeaning of *ʔɛlˈwV* cannot be reconstructed, 'a k. of verbum dicendi'.

In Aghul, two different roots were introduced for the imperfective stem: k-ɛχ- (Koshan dialect), ɛχ-ɛχ- (non-Koshan dialects). Their etymology is not entirely clear.

Finally, in Rutul, *ʔiʔʷˤɨ* - 'to say' was totally superseded with *ʔɛlˈw*- [NCED: 1011], whose original meaning was 'to be silent' vel sim, as proved by both the Lezgian cognates and the external North Caucasian comparanda. The direct shift 'to be silent' > 'to say' does not seem possible; thus, the hypothetical chain 'to keep silent' > 'to listen' > 'to cause to listen' > 'to say', proposed in [NCED], appears to be a good solution.

**Replacements:** ['to be silent' > 'to say'] (Rutul).

**Reconstruction shape:** Basic correspondences seem regular, although reflexes in individual languages are seriously tangled because of the class infix *p*, which is especially typical for the perfective variant of the root. Caucasian Albanian-Udi *p*- can be either the direct reflex of *p* (thus [NCED]) or rather a trace of the same infix.

**Semantics and structure:** Primary verbal root.

72. SEE

Nidzh Udi ak-sun (əkˈʃun) (1), Vartashen Udi ak-sun (əkˈʃun) (1), Archi ʔɛʔu- (1), Kryts (proper) ʔɾiʔ- (2), Alyk Kryts ʔɾiʔ- (2), Budukh ʔɾiʔ- (ʂɾʰˈu-) (2), Mishlesh Tsakhur ʔɛʔəz- (ʂɾʰˈadʒəɾəc) (3), Mikik Tsakhur ʔɛʔɛz- (3), Gelmets Tsakhur ʔɛʔəz- (3), Mukhad Rutul ʔɛʔəz- (3), Ixrek Rutul ʔɛʔəz- (ʂɾʰˈadʒəɾəc) (1), Luchek Rutul ʔɛʔəz- (1), Koshan Aghul ʔɾaqːəʔ- (1), Keren Aghul ʔɛʔəz- (1), Gequ Aghul ʔɛʔəz- (1), Fite Aghul ʔɛʔəz- (1), Aghul (proper) ʔɛʔəz- (1), Northern Tabasaran ʔɾaqːəʔ- (2), Southern Tabasaran ʔɾaqːəʔ- (2), Gyune Lezgi ak-ə́ʔ- (1), Proto-Lezgian ʔɾakːə́ʔ- (1).

References and notes:


Distinct from bevːsun 'to look, observe' [Schiefner 1863: 101; Schulze 2001: 257].
Common Udi: Common Udi *ak-esun ‘to see’ as opposed to *behr-esun ‘to look’ (historically *bewak- with the fossilized class prefix). The complex verb ‘to find’ is based on the ablauted variant of the latter root: Nidzh b=aw-ap-sun, Vartashen b=ow-ap-sun [Gukasyan 1974: 74] (i.e., p- is a light verb with general semantics; note the assimilative lalabialization a > o in Vartashen).


Mishlesh Tsakhur: Kibrik et al. 1999: 875, 892; Ibragimov & Nurmamedov 2010: 208; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 668. According to [Ibragimov & Nurmamedov 1998], with an ablaut paradigm in Literary Tsakhur: q=aj-e [imperf.]/ q=aj-i [perf.]/ q=aj-es [fut.]; but for Mishlesh, a non-ablaut paradigm q=aj- (q=aj-e: [imperf.], fut.) / q=aj-i [perf.] is recorded in [Kibrik et al. 1999].

It should also be noted that in [Ibragimov & Nurmamedov 2010] some forms are quoted that can point to old labialized -ɛ-. (masdar 1/4 q=aj-ɛ [къаждый], neg. masdar 1/4 q-id-ɛj-ɛ, 2 q-id-e-ɛj-ɛ), although the perfective stem is q=aj-i, not *q=aj-ɛ.

Gelmets Tsakhur: Ibragimov 1990: 46; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 668. The future stem q=aj-ez is attested, as well as the variant q=aj-εz-in the negative future (q=ajεz-es) [Ibragimov 1990: 197].

Common Tsakhur: Note sporadic -ɛ- in Mishlesh. Initial ɛ= (Mishlesh q=ɛ) is a prefix with general semantics [Ibragimov 1990: 124; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 41].


Distinct from q=aj- [рахьас ‘to look’ [Ibragimov 1978: 96, 97] (apparently an error for expected *q=aj-].


Distinct from q=aj- [to look’ [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 174].

Common Rutul: Initial h-, w, q= are prefixes with general semantics [Ibragimov 1978: 95; Alekseev 1994a: 227; Magometov 2001: 165].

Koshan Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 173; Suleymanov 2003: 15; Shaumyan 1941: 140; Magometov 1970: 229 sentences 8, 14. All the sources quote this root with tense q, except for [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988], where the lax (aspirated) q is transcribed. The external Lezgian comparison also speaks in favour of the tense uvar [NCED: 547]. Apparently a typo in Kibrik & Kodzasov’s dictionary.

The same in other subdialects: Arsug, Khudig naq:\'a- ‘to see’ [Magometov 1970: 234 sentence 36; 236 sentence 39; 237 sentence 49; Shaumyan 1941: 140].


Keren Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 173. The same in the Usug subdialect: q=aj-a- ‘to see’ [Shaumyan 1941: 140].

Distinct from q=aj=q=aj-a- ‘to look’ [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 174].

Gequn Aghul: Dirr 1907: 99, 169; Shaumyan 1941: 140. Infixed imperfective stem: a-r-q=aj-a-.

Distinct from q=aj=q=aj-a- ‘to look’ [Dirr 1907: 131, 184].
Fite Aghul: Shaumyan 1941: 140.

Aghul (proper): Suleymanov 2003: 15; Shaumyan 1941: 140. Infixed imperfective stem: a-r-gʷ'-a-

The same in other subdialects: Tsirkhe, Dulder agʷ'-a- 'to see' [Shaumyan 1941: 140].

Distinct from Tpig qʷ=a-raqːˤ-ana- 'to look' [Suleymanov 2003: 183].

Common Aghul: The Koshan dialect (raqː Spicer) is opposed to the non-Koshan ones (agʷ'-a- 'to see'). The Koshan (Burshag) etymological cognate for the latter verb is agʷ'-a- ~ agʷ'-a- 'to seek' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 66]. Although both of the meanings ('to see' and 'to seek') can theoretically originate from one root for 'to watch' vel sim., the external Lezgian etymology suggests that the Proto-Aghul verb for 'to see' was agʷ'-a-, whereas raqː Spicer originally expressed a controlled action, such as 'to look, watch'. The shift of the Koshan verb raqː Spicer to the meaning 'to see' was influenced on the part of the Tabasaran language (q.v.), where the same semantic development occurred. It is interesting that in the Kryts-Budukh subbranch the etymological cognates of Aghul raqː Spicer also demonstrate the meaning shift to generic 'to see' - apparently an independent innovation.

Note the rare case of retention of the Lezgian imperfective infix -r- in the Gequn and Proper Aghul imperfective stem a-r-gʷ'-a- (cf. [Suleymanov 1993: 138 f.]).


The same in the Khanag subdialect: agʷ'-i- 'to see' [Usler 1979: 595, 990; Dirr 1905: 152, 225]; distinct from Khanag liyː- 'to look' [Usler 1979: 839, 1006; Dirr 1905: 193, 242].

In the Khyuryuk subdialect the paradigm is synchronically suppletive: raqː Spicer- [imperf.] / agʷ'-i- [perf., inf.] [اَرْكَِیُوء] 'to see' [Genko 2005: 22]; distinct from Khyuryuk liyː- [لیْهَیْع] 'to look' [Genko 2005: 114].


In the Khoredzh subdialect: arqː Spicer- [آَرْقَِیُوء] 'to see' [Genko 2005: 24].

Common Tabasaran: Both shapes, AQ- (Northern) and RAQ- (Southern), are etymologically related and originate from the metathetical variants *ARQ- and *RAQ- respectively (< Lezgian *taqː Spicer). The cluster *RQ was simplified in Northern Tabasaran, but retained in the Southern (Khoredzh) form arqː Spicer-, unless it is to be analyzed as a-r-gʷ'- with the fossilized class infix -r-. The Northern (Khyuryuk) suppletive paradigm raqː Spicer- / agʷ'-i- might be the most archaic; in the rest of the subdialects one of the variants has spread across the paradigm.


Proto-Lezgian: NCED: 255. Distribution: This stem is retained as the basic root for 'to see' in both outliers (Caucasian Albanian-Udi and Archi) and in some Nuclear Lezgian lects: Rutul, non-Koshan Aghul, Lezgi. In Tabasaran and Koshan Aghul, *aqː Spicer-shifted to the meaning 'to search' (a Tabasaran-induced isogloss), whereas in Tsakhir, this acquired the meaning 'to show' (in Tsakhir, 'to see' is expressed with an etymologically obscure root, whose protoform could be *aqː Spicer-[LEDb: #207]). In Luchek Rutul, *aqː Spicer- modified with another prefix, also means 'to find': aqː Spicer-[Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 67].

The second root, well attested with the generic meaning 'to see', is *taqː Spicer- [NCED: 547]. It means 'to see' in South Lezgian (Kryts, Budukh), on the one hand, and in Tabasaran and Koshan Aghul, on the other. Apparently we deal with two independent Nuclear Lezgian shifts (the latter case represents a Tabasaran-induced isogloss). The exact meaning of *taqː Spicer- is not entirely clear, but actually, this is the best candidate for the basic Proto-Lezgian verb, denoting controlled action (to look), because *taqː Spicer - is reflected as 'to look' in Caucasian Albanian-Udi (bekː Spicer-; also as 'to find' in Udi), on the one hand, and in Rutul (gː Spicer-), on the other.

A second, weaker candidate for 'to look' is *akː Spicer- / *akː Spicer- [NCED: 598], which is attested as 'to look' in Archi and in Alyk Kryts. In other Nuclear Lezgian, *akː Spicer- / *akː Spicer- means 'to find' (Kryts Proper, Tsakhir), 'to ask' (Aghul), 'to ask' (Rutul).
In Proto-East Lezgian, the old root for 'to look' (\*ʔarqʰˤa / \*ʔakʰa) was superseded with \*liʔa[a] [NCED: 209]. This stem is attested as 'to look' in Koshan Aghul, Tabasaran, Lezgi, but was lost in the rest of Lezgian languages.

In non-Koshan Aghul, \*liʔa[a] was replaced with certain prefixed forms, whose root is reconstructed as \*ʔVrʰ(ː)\*Vn in [NCED: 1031]; this Aghul root lacks Lezgian cognates, but may possess external North Caucasian correspondenda.

Finally, in individual Nuclear Lezgian lects, several verbs for 'to look' are attested, whose etymology is not entirely clear: Kryts (proper) koʔiː, Budukh irʰaː, Tsakhur ilʰakː-

Replacements: ['to look' > 'to see'] (Kryts, Budukh, Tabasaran, Koshan Aghul), ['to see' > 'to search'] (Tabasaran, Koshan Aghul), ['to see' > 'to show'] (Tsakhur), ['to see' > 'to find'] (Luchek Rutul).

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular.

Semantics and structure: Primary verbal root.

73. SEED

Nidzh Udi cil (ʨuːa) (1), Vartashen Udi cil (ʨuːa) (1), Archi tʰːinː (2), Kryts (proper) tum (-1), Alyk Kryts tum (-1), Budukh tum (myːm) (-1), Mishlesh Tsakhur toχum {tɔxʏm} (-1), Mikik Tsakhur dʰenʲe (-1), Gelmets Tsakhur dʰenʲe (-1), Mukhad Rutul suk {cyc} (3), Ixrek Rutul tuxum {tuxym} (-1), Luchek Rutul tuχum (-1), Koshan Aghul tum (-1), Keren Aghul tum (-1), Gequn Aghul tum (-1), Fite Aghul tum (-1), Aghul (proper) tum (-1), Northern Tabasaran tum (-1), Southern Tabasaran tum (-1), Gyune Lezgi fin (2), Proto-Lezgian *ʧːʰiːn (2).

References and notes:


Vartashen Udi: Gukasyan 1974: 233; Fährni 1999: 11; Schiefner 1863: 89; Schulze 2001: 265. There are two additional words, glossed in [Schulze 2001] as 'seed: bitum 'seed' [Schulze 2001: 138 fn. 5, 259] and tum 'root; seed; gender' [Schulze 2001: 325]. However, neither of them means 'seed (botanic)' in the texts included in [Bezhanov & Bezhanov 1902] (for tum see notes on Udi 'root' and Proto-Lezgian 'seed').

Common Udi: Common Udi *cil. Apparently a Proto-Lezgian word, see [Alekseev 2008: 317]. Schulze proposes that the Udi term was borrowed from Old Armenian čel ~ cil 'branch, bough; stump, stock, stem; finger' (thus [Schulze 2001: 265]) or Old Armenian čel 'tribe, caste, race, branch' (thus [Gippert et al. 2008: II-68]). Both hypothetical sources of borrowing are unlikely, from semantic and sociolinguistic points of view.

Caucasian Albanian: qar with polysemy 'tribe / clan, kin / nation, people / seed (botanic)' [Gippert et al. 2008: IV-30]. Cf. also rus 'clan, kin, posterity / fruit' [Gippert et al. 2008: IV-37], which is not attested in the meaning 'seed (botanic)'.pace [Gippert et al. 2008: II-68] (because of the initial r, rus should be a borrowing from unknown source).

Arch: Chumakina et al. 2007; Kibrik & Kodzhasov 1990: 111; Kibrik et al. 1977b: 345, 380; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 391; Mikailov 1967: 191. Polysemy: 'seed / sperm'. Paradigm: tʰːinː [abs.] / tʰːnː- [erg.] / tʰːnː-ːt [loc.]. Oblique forms like tʰːnːi could alternatively be analyzed as tum-+ the common oblique suffix -li (with the regular assimilation nl > n), but this suffix is always unaccented [Kibrik et al. 1977a 2: 16 f.], which is not the case here. An unclear situation, because Lezgian and North Caucasian comparison strongly predicts the lax -ːn-.

Kryts (proper): Kibrik & Kodzhasov 1990: 111; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 391. Borrowed from Azerbaijani tum 'seed (botanic); posterity' or directly from the corresponding Iranian terms.

Alyk Kryts: Authier 2009: 263. Borrowed from Azerbaijani tum 'seed (botanic); posterity' or directly from the corresponding Iranian terms.

Buduk: Meylanova 1984: 136, 239; Kibrik & Kodzhasov 1990: 111. Polysemy: 'seed / clan, kin'. Borrowed from Azerbaijani tum 'seed (botanic); posterity' or directly from the corresponding Iranian terms.


In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 391] ‘seed’ is incorrectly glossed as kap [klan] and čič [čič] [čič], which actually mean ‘stone (of fruit, berry)’ [Meylanova 1984: 98] and ‘small black seeds in rice’ [Meylanova 1984: 151] respectively.


In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 391], ‘seed’ is quoted as tum (another Azerbaijani loanword).

Tsakhur-Kum Tsakhur: d'en'e [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 111]. Polysemy: ‘seed / a grain’. Borrowed from Azerbaijani dänä (a) grain’.

Mikik Tsakhur: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 111. Polysemy: ‘seed / a grain’. Borrowed from Azerbaijani dänä (a) grain’.

Gelmets Tsakhur: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 111. Polysemy: ‘seed / a grain’. Borrowed from Azerbaijani dänä (a) grain’.

In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 391], ‘seed’ is quoted as tum (another Azerbaijani loanword).


It should be noted that in [Dirr 1912: 173, 202], ‘seed’ is quoted as tom (borrowed from Azerbaijani toxum ‘seed’ (botanic); posterity’ or directly from the corresponding Iranian terms).

Ixrek Rutul: Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 391; Ibragimov 1978: 223, 225. It must be noted that in [Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 249] toxum is glossed only as ‘clan, kin’. Borrowed from Azerbaijani toxum ‘seed’ (botanic); sperm; posterity’.

A second term for ‘seed’ is tum [rys] with polysemy: ‘clan, kin / seed (botanic)’ [Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 248]. Borrowed from Azerbaijani tum ‘seed (botanic); posterity’ or directly from the corresponding Iranian terms.

In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 391], ‘seed’ is erroneously quoted as suk, which actually means ‘wheat; grain’ in Ixrek [Ibragimov 1978: 205, 225].


Common Rutul: The Proto-Rutul term for ‘seed’ cannot be reconstructed with certainty, because Mukhad suk ‘seed’ seems a recent introduction (not yet noted in [Dirr 1912]), derived from the meaning ‘grain’, cf. Khnyukh Rutul (subdialect of Mukhad) suk ‘grain’ [Ibragimov 1978: 136], Shinaz Rutul suk ‘grain’ [Dirr 1912: 171], Ixrek Rutul suk ‘wheat; grain’ [Ibragimov 1978: 205, 223, 225]. Luchek Rutul suk ‘a grain’ [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 111], Borch-Khnov Rutul suk ‘a grain’ [Ibragimov 1978: 292], further to Tsakhur suk ‘wheat’ [Dirr 1913: 203].

Cf. also the old root for ‘seed’, which is retained as Borch-Khnov xin (ﳋิน) ‘wheat’ [Ibragimov 1978: 283], Ixrek xin-če (骧 numérique) ‘beverage of barley flour (home brew)’ [Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 282].


Distinct from Burshag dil ‘stone (of fruit)’ [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 109].


Fite Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 111.

Distinct from Fite dil ‘stone (of fruit)’ [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 109].


Common Aghul: The Aghul word was borrowed from Azerbaijani tum ‘seed (botanic); posterity’ or directly from the corresponding Iranian terms. The form dil can be posited as the Proto-Aghul term for ‘stone (of fruit)’.


The same loanword in the Khanag subdialect: tum ‘seed; grain’ [Uslar 1979: 916, 1005]; distinct from inherited dil ‘stone (of fruit), seed (of vegetable, berry)’ [Uslar 1979: 668, 1005] (neither of the words is attested in [Dirr 1905]).

Similarly in the Khnyryuk subdialect: tum [rys] ‘seed; grain’ [Genko 2005: 144]; distinct from inherited dil [ʣڕ] ‘seed’ [Genko 2005: 60]; the difference between the two terms is not specified by Genko, but, most likely, dil denotes specifically ‘seed (of vegetable, berry), stone’, since the Russian gloss “сема” possesses both meanings.

Southern Tabasaran: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 111.

The same loanword in the Khiv subdialect: tum [rys] with polysemy: ‘seed / grain / ferment (for milk)’ [Genko 2005: 144]; distinct from Khiv cil [ʨɬɪ] ‘seed’ [Genko 2005: 176], the difference between the two terms is not specified by Genko, and in reality cil should rather denote ‘seed (of vegetable, berry), stone’ (see notes on the Khanag and Khnyryuk subdialects above). It must be noted that phonetically Khiv cil is apparently a borrowing from Lezgi cil ‘stone (of fruit), seed (of vegetable, berry)’, rather than an etymological counterpart of inherited Northern Tabasaran dil, see [Genko 2005: 233].
Similarly in Literary Tabasaran: *tum* [rynx] with polysemy: 'seed / grain / ferment (for milk)' [Khanmagomedov & Shalbuzov 2001: 283]. Distinct from literary *dil* 'stone (of fruit)', seed (of vegetable, berry)' [Khanmagomedov & Shalbuzov 2001: 148], which could, in fact, be a Northern form.

**Common Tabasaran:** The Tabasaran word *tum* was borrowed from Azerbaijani *tum* 'seed (botanic); posterity' or directly from the corresponding Iranian terms.

**Gyune Lezgi:** Uslar 1896: 568, 634. An important archaism which synchronically competes with *tum* 'seed (botanic); posterity' [Uslar 1896: 555, 634], borrowed from Azerbaijani *tum* 'seed (botanic); posterity' or directly from the corresponding Iranian terms. Distinct from Gyune *cil* 'stone (of fruit), seed (of vegetable, berry)' [Uslar 1896: 582].

The basic term for 'seed' in Literary Lezgi is the loanword *tum* [rynx] [Talibov & Gadzhiev 1966: 315; Gadjiev 1950: 761; Haspelmath 1993: 508, 526], although the inherited word *fin* [qim] 'seed' also exists [Talibov & Gadzhiev 1966: 335]. Distinct from literary *cil* [çil] 'stone (of fruit), seed (of vegetable, berry)' [Talibov & Gadzhiev 1966: 358; Haspelmath 1993: 483].

Only the loanword in the Akhty dialect: Khlyut *tim* 'seed' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 111]. Khlyut *im < um* is a late process, cf., e.g., inherited *gim* 'smoke'. Distinct from Khlyut *cil* 'stone (of fruit)' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 109].

**Proto-Lezgian:** NCED: 1021. Distribution: Retained as the basic term for 'seed' in Archi, on the one hand, and in one Nuclear Lezgian lects (Lezgi), on the other. This word is also attested in Rutul with the meaning 'wheat' or 'barley' and in Kryts with the meaning 'flax' (Kryts *xin* 'flax' is quoted in [NCED: 1022]). From the distributional point of view, *tɛ'in* is the best candidate for the status of Proto-Lezgian 'seed'. External North Caucasian comparison supports such a reconstruction.

In Udi, *tɛ'in* was superseded with the form *cil*. Its Nuclear Lezgian cognates imply the Proto-Lezgian stem *til* with the original meaning 'stone (of fruit), seed (of vegetable, berry)' (> Gyune Lezgi *cil* 'id.', Northern Tabasaran *dil* 'id.', Aghul *dil* 'id.'), see [Alekseev 2008: 317].

In Caucasian Albanian, the word *qar* is attested for 'seed' with polysemy: 'tribe / clan, kin / nation, people / seed (botanic)'. Its only Lezgian cognate is the second component of the Udi compound *iš-qar* 'men' (where *iš* is the singular form 'man' q.v.). The original meaning of Caucasian Albanian-Udi *qar* is not clear; it should be noted that the shift 'tribe, clan' > 'seed (botanic)' does not seem normal, whereas the opposite direction of semantic development is quite common.

In Mukhad Rutul, *suk* 'seed' is a recent introduction; the Proto-Rutul meaning of *suk* was apparently 'grain, a grain'.

In the bulk of Nuclear Lezgian lects, 'seed' is expressed with forms that have the general shape of *tum, txum, or dene*. The latter two are transparent Azerbaijani loanwords, whereas *tum* requires additional comments.

The most widespread shape of the word for 'seed' in Lezgian is actually *tum*, which means 'seed' in Nuclear Lezgian, but 'root' q.v. in Udi. Apparently proceeding from this fact (the semantic opposition between the Nuclear Lezgian and Udi meanings could be explained as a result of semantic evolution during long separate language development) and from some East Caucasian comparanda (first and foremost, Proto-Nakh *tium* 'corn-cob; core of a plant'), the authors of [NCED] postulate the Proto-Lezgian term *tum(a) 'seed' and, further, the Proto-East Caucasian root *tʰ *tʰV 'seed', considered to be an early borrowing from Iranian (Proto-Iranian *tauvmah - tawxman 'seed', Avestan *tawxan 'seed'; kin', Persian *txum 'seed; sperm; egg', etc.). As a particular result of this, there are two closely synonymous terms in Modern Azerbaijani: *txum* 'seed (botanic); sperm; posterity' and *tum* 'seed (botanic); posterity'. The former represents a borrowing from Persian *txum 'seed; kin', whereas the latter was borrowed from Lezgian languages. See [NCED: 991 f.]. Such a scenario faces several difficulties:

1) the hypothetical Proto-East Caucasian *tʰ *tʰV 'seed' is too scantily attested in known languages, and its presumed original meaning 'seed' is only retained in Lezgian;
2) it is hard to reconstruct the Proto-Lezgian term for 'seed' because of the 'criss-crossed' situation where two roots enter into competition: *tɛ'in* (Archi, Lezgi) and *tum(a) (various Nuclear Lezgian lects);
3) both Azerbaijani words, *tum* and *txum*, possess a number of derivative stems and do not look like recent introductions;
4) the normal direction of lexical borrowing is Azerbaijani/Iranian → Lezgian, but not vice versa. This particularly concerns the terms for 'seed' in Lezgian, which frequently represent Azerbaijani loanwords (*txum, dana*). The idea of borrowing of such a term from Lezgian into Azerbaijani is unlikely not only sociolinguistically, but also economically;
5) there are phonetically similar words for 'seed' in the neighboring Modern Iranian languages: Judeo-Tat, Muslim Tat tum 'seed (botanic)'; Talysh tüüm 'seed (botanic); seedling; clan, kin'. These forms regularly originate from Iranian *tauxman ~ *täuxman, there is no need to treat them as Lezgian or Azerbaijani loanwords.

In the light of these points, the following scenario seems more likely:

1) both Azerbaijani toxum 'seed (botanic); sperm; posterity' and tum 'seed (botanic); posterity' have been borrowed from Iranian languages; the former is a Persian loanword (Persian toxum 'seed; sperm; egg'), the latter is more recent, originating from Judeo-Tat, Muslim Tat tum 'seed (botanic) or Talysh tüüm 'seed (botanic); seedling; clan, kin' (note that in Northern Talysh the sound ü has a free variant u, thus it is not difficult to deduce Azerbaijani tum from Talysh). It is proposed in [Schulze 2001: 325] that the shape tum emerged as an inner Azerbaijani contraction of toxum, but such a solution is ad hoc;

2) Lezgian words for 'seed' of the shape tum originate from Azerbaijani tum 'seed (botanic); posterity' or directly from modern Iranian tum 'seed (botanic)';

3) Udi tum 'root (botanic); lineage, kin, clan; bottom' originates from the same source, although the semantic shift 'seed' > 'root' is an internal Udi innovation. The new Udi word for 'seed', cil, has been developed from the term for 'stone of fruit'.

**Replacements:** ['stone (of fruit), seed (of vegetable, berry)'] > 'seed' (Udi), ['grain, a grain' > 'seed'] (Mukhad Rutul), ['tribe, clan'] > 'seed' (Caucasian Albanian).

**Reconstruction shape:** Correspondences are regular except for the tense n: in Archi (which could be the result of secondary morphological reanalysis).

**Semantics and structure:** Primary substantive root in Proto-Lezgian, but a deverbative in Proto-North Caucasian (the starting point is the verb 'to sow'). The oblique stem is not reconstructible.

74. SIT

Nidzh Udi arc-esun {арцесун} (1), Vartashen Udi arc-esun {арцесун} (1), Archi qʷېړۍ- (2), Kryts (proper) ās=qʷan- (2), Alyk Kryts as=qʷan- (2), Budukh aq̌ol- {alk̿ol-, ak̿ul-} (2), Mishlesh Tsakhur gʰ=iʔar {ғарбак} (3), Mikik Tsakhur gʰ=iʔar ~ gʰ=ʔor (3), Gelmets Tsakhur gʰ=ʔor- (3), Mukhad Rutul s=ɪqʷ- {сукъис ~ сукъас} (2), Ixrek Rutul s=ɪqʰ- {сикъун} (2), Luchek Rutul s=ɪqʷ- (2), Koshan Aghul a=wqʰ-a- (2), Keren Aghul ɪqʷ-a- (2), Gequn Aghul ɪqʷ-a- (2), Fite Aghul ʊqʷ-e- (2), Aghul (proper) ɛqʷ-a- (2), Northern Tabasaran deʔɛʔ- (3), Southern Tabasaran č=ɛʔ- (3), Gyune Lezgi aʔ=ˈuʔ̌- (2), Proto-Lezgian *ʔɪqʷ-â- (2).

References and notes:

**Nidzh Udi:** Gukasyan 1974: 48; Mobili 2010: 33. Polysemy: 'to sit / to sit down'. There exists also the syncopated masdar arstun {арстун} [Gukasyan 1974: 47; Mobili 2010: 33; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 560], which originates from *arc-sun with the regular development Cc-s > Cst: see [Maisak 2008a: 151 f.].

**Vartashen Udi:** Gukasyan 1974: 48; Fähnrich 1999: 6; Dirr 1903: 55, 59, 60, 69, 71, 90; Schiefner 1863: 76; Schulze 2001: 249; Starchevskyi 1891: 488. Polysemy: 'to sit / to sit down'.

**Common Udi:** Common Udi *arc-esun. As is accepted in [NCED: 282] (now followed by [Gippert et al. 2008: II-44]), the medial -r- in *arc- is to be interpreted as a fossilized durative/iterative infix infiltrated into the original root *ac-. Caucasian Albanian data confirm this analysis.

In [Schulze 2001: 249], the stem arc- is unlikely analyzed as *ar- 'to come (the past tense)' + *c 'to sit' (i.e. 'to sit' < *'he came and sat down'), based on an incorrect analysis of the Nidzh masdar arstun (< *ar-д-sun, according to Schulze, but in fact regularly from *arc-sun, see above).
Caucasian Albanian: A synchronically suppletive paradigm: *arec-a* (present) / *ac-are* (past) 'to sit / to sit down' [Gippert et al. 2008: IV-7]. The element -r(e)- in the present stem is a durative/iterative infix, the suffix -ar- is the past stem of the light verb -ar- 'come', see [Gippert et al. 2008: II-44].

Archí: Chumakina et al. 2007; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 87; Kibrik et al. 1977b: 303; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 560; Mikailov 1967: 97; Dirr 1908: 175, 221. Polysenmy: 'to sit / to sit down / to stay, remain / to live (in general)'. Synchronically, a very irregular paradigm [Kibrik et al. 1977a 2: 74; Kibrik et al. 1977a 3: 243], although all the variety of forms apparently originates from one archaic root.

As plausibly proposed in [Kibrik et al. 1977a 2: 74 fn. 52], can be analyzed as the relict preverb q’ä ‘down' (cf. the adverb q’ä-tu 'down there etc.) plus the verb *laq-i-* "to sit", which lost its generic semantics in Modern Archí and narrowed its original meaning to 'to get onto a horse; to ripen' [Chumakina et al. 2007; Kibrik et al. 1977b: 288]. Alternatively and less likely it is possible to treat q’ëyq’- as a reduplicated formation from the same verb *qj-‘, thus [NCED: 648].

Kryts (proper): Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 87; Saadiev 1994: 431, 434; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 560. Initial *is= is apparently a fossilized rare spatial preverb. Polysenmy: 'to sit / to sit down'. Distinct, however, from paronymous *q=aq‘ir- 'to sit down' [Saadiev 1994: 433] with the preverb g’y= 'above, down'.

Alyk Kryts: Authier 2009: 408. Paradigm: *as=q‘im- [imperf.]/ as=q‘ir- [perf.]. Polysenmy: 'to sit / to sit down'. It must be noted that in the Alyk verb the secondary suffix -n- is still restricted to the imperfective stem, whereas in Kryts proper it spread across the paradigm.


Both sources quote this verb as 'sit down', but the static meaning 'to sit' is proved by textual examples, e.g., [Meylanova 1984: 95 sub qamik; Talibov 2007: 79], etc. Also glossed as static 'to sit' in [Meylanova 1984: 197; Talibov 2007: 229].

In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 560], 'to sit' is glossed as gišeǯi [gišędži], which in fact is the aorist form qûše- [kûšedži] from the verb q=ûš- ~ q=ûši- ‘to get onto a horse; to get on smth.' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 88; Meylanova 1984: 89]. Apparently Comrie & Khalilov's gišeǯi 'to sit' is a mechanical citation of [Gišeǯi] - the first form quoted in [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 88] in the list of Budukh forms sub 'to get onto a horse' (actually, initial [G-] denotes q- in Kibrik & Kodzasov's transcriptions).

Mishlesh Tsakhur: Kibrik et al. 1999: 65, 875, 898; Ibragimov 1990: 31; Ibragimov & Nurmamedov 2010: 126; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 560. Irregular ablaut paradigm: *g=ûšar < *g=ûš-i-ûšar [imperf.] / 1/4 g=ûšur, 2/3 g=ûšir [perf.] / 1/4 g=ûšar-as, 2/3 g=ûšar-as [fut.]/ g=ûšir-e [invv.]. Polysenmy: 'to sit / to sit down'.

Distinct from the rare verb *g=îx- [išac] 'to sit down' [Kibrik et al. 1999: 874; Ibragimov & Nurmamedov 2010: 119] (the only example found: 'The eagle sat down on the rock' [Ibragimov & Nurmamedov 2010: 119]) and the frequent ilb=eq]- [ašac] 'to get on (horse, motorcycle); to fly (v.v.)' [Kibrik et al. 1999: 869; Ibragimov & Nurmamedov 2010: 38].

Mikik Tsakhur: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 87; Dirr 1913: 147, 238. In [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988], the ablaut paradigm is aduced with contracted forms: 1/2 g=ûqar [imperf.]/ 1/4 g=ûcr- [perf.], fut.]. In [Dirr 1913: 147-148], the archaic non-contracted stems with -r- are quoted: 1 g=ûqar [imperf.]/ 1 g=ûqar-as [fut.]/ 1 g=ûqar-e [invv.]. Polysenmy: 'to sit / to sit down'.

Gelmets Tsakhur: Ibragimov 1990: 197; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 560. The following forms are attested: fut. 2(?) g=ûqar-az [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 560] / inv. 1 g=qar=a [Ibragimov 1990: 197].

Common Tsakhur: Initial *= is a prefix with general semantics [Ibragimov 1990: 124; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 41].

Mukhad Rutul: Dirr 1912: 172, 200; Ibragimov 1978: 95, 121; Makhumudova 2001: 73, 96, 209, 222; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 560. Archaic paradigm in [Dirr 1912]: *s=aq‘-a-r- [imperf.], perf.]/ *s=aq‘-a [invv.]; innovative paradigm in the modern sources: s=aq‘-a [invv.]. Polysenmy: 'to sit / to sit down'.

Izrek Rutul: Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 229, 389; Ibragimov 1978: 194. Paradigm: *s=îq‘-a-r- [imperf.], perf.]/ *s=îq‘-as [inf.]/ *s=îq‘-i [invv.]. It should be noted that in [Ibragimov 1978: 194], an archaic infinitive form *s=îq‘-as with *q”- is quoted. In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 560], erroneously quoted as *s=aq‘- [sakûn]. Polysenmy: 'to sit / to sit down'.

Luchek Rutul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 87. Paradigm: *s=û-ûq‘-a-r- [imperf.]/ *s=ûq‘-a-r- [perf.]/ *s=ûq‘- [invv.]. Polysenmy: 'to sit / to sit down'. This verb is quoted with the meaning 'to sit down' in [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988], but the lexical opposition 'to sit': 'to sit down' is atypical for this region, thus we assume the aforementioned polysenmy for Luchek *s=îq‘-.

Common Rutul: Note the secondary loss of labialization of *q” in the Modern Mukhad and Izrek paradigms, due to analogical levelling after the regular perfective form *s=îq‘-a-. 
Initial s= is a prefix with general semantics [Ibragimov 1978: 95; Alekseev 1994a: 227; Makhmudova 2001: 165].

Koshan Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 87; Suleymanov 2003: 217; Shaumyan 1941: 142. Polysemy: 'to sit / to sit down'. Initial a= (< ḡ)= is a spacial prefix [Magometov 1970: 158 ff.].


The same in the Usug subdialect: uq'=− 'to sit' [Shaumyan 1941: 142].

Gequn Aghul: Dirr 1907: 121, 183; Shaumyan 1941: 142. Polysemy: 'to sit / to sit down'. Infixed imperfective stem: i-r-qa=r.


The same in the other subdialects: Tsirkhe, Duldug iq'=−, Khpyuk uq'=− 'to sit' [Suleymanov 1993: 138; Shaumyan 1941: 142].

Common Aghul: Note the rare case of retention of the Lezgian imperfective inflix – in the Gequn and Proper Aghul imperfective stem V-r-q=− (cf. [Suleymanov 1993: 138 f.]).


The same in the Khanag subdialect: d=ɛt− 'to sit, sit down' [Uslar 1979: 665, 1005; Dirr 1905: 164, 242]. Cf. the class 2 form d=ɛt'−. The Khanag prefixless verb ɛt− possesses a more specific meaning: 'to sit in smth., sit down in smth. (e.g., in cart, boat, nest)' [Uslar 1979: 684]. Distinct from Khanag d=us−, glossed as 'to stand (said of thing) / to squat, sit squatting (said of human) / to sit (said of bird)' in [Dirr 1905: 165], as 'to kneel / to stand (said of thing or animal)' in [Uslar 1979: 672].


Southern Tabasaran: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 87. Two Kondik verbs are quoted in [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988] as synonyms for 'to sit down': ɛt− and d=us−, the difference is not explicated. Apparently d=us− means specifically 'to sit down', whereas ɛt− possesses a more generic meaning, see Common Tabasaran notes.


The same in Literary Tabasaran: d=ɛt− [ýeũ] 'to sit, sit down' [Khanmagomedov & Shalbuzov 2001: 146, also 52 sub ayaran, 249 sub parta, etc.]. Distinct from literary d=us− [ýcuous] with polysemy: 'to stand smth. vertically (e.g., pole) / to squat down / to sit down (dialectal)' [Khanmagomedov & Shalbuzov 2001: 150].

Common Tabasaran: We presume that Tabasaran verbs which are quoted in [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988] for the concept 'to sit down' actually possess polysemy: 'to sit / to sit down', although it is very likely that Kibrik & Kodzasov's Kondik d=us− means only 'to sit down', as proven by data from other Southern subdialects.

Initial d(V)r, ɛ= ~ ɛt− are spatial prefixes.

Gyne Lezgi: Uslar 1896: 329, 634. Polysemy: 'to sit / to sit down'. Initial a= is a spatial prefix.


Proto-Lezgian: NCED: 647. Distribution: Retained as the basic root for 'to sit, to sit down' in Archi, on the one hand, and in most Nuclear Lezgian lects, on the other. This root was lost in Udi and Tsakhir, whereas in Tabasaran, it survived as Khiv ut=ʔac=− 'to squeeze in(to); to prop up' [Genko 2005: 157], Literary ut=ʔac=− 'to stick in, sink in' [Khanmagomedov & Shalbuzov 2001: 300].

In Caucasian Albanian-Udi, the root for 'to sit / to sit down' is ac−. As proposed in [NCED: 281], this form originates from *ʔosːV−, which is also attested in Tabasaran as d=us− 'to squat (down), sit squatting; to sit down; to kneel'. For the sporadic affricate reflexes of the Proto-Lezgian tense fricatives in Udi see [NCED: 146]: Tabasaran lax s is, however, irregular in any case (the expected Northern Tabasaran reflex of *s: is s). Such phonetic deviations, together with scant attestation of this root among Lezgian languages, makes the reconstruction of *ʔosːV− highly dubious. We prefer to regard Caucasian Albanian-Udi ac− and us− as unrelated forms, whose etymology is unclear.

In Tsakhir and Tabasaran, the old root for 'to sit' was supersedes with *ʔt(آخر)\vr− [NCED: 409] - apparently an independent development in two individual Nuclear Lezgian languages. The exact original meaning of *ʔt(آخر)\vr− is
unknown, because it seems lost in all other Lezgian lects; external North Caucasian comparison points to semantics of 'sitting' or similar states.

**Replacements:** '{to sit' > 'to stay, remain' > 'to live (in general)'} (Archi), '{to sit' > 'to squeeze in(to); to prop up'} (Khiv Tabasaran), '{to sit' > 'to stick in, sink in'} (Literary Tabasaran).

**Reconstruction shape:** Correspondences seem regular except for the -\(n\) and -\(l\) root extensions in Kryts and Budukh, respectively. The following Ablaut grades are attested in various languages:

\[*ʔiq'ʷä / *ʔäq'ʷä / *ʔoq'ʷä\]

**Semantics and structure:** Primary verbal root with polysemy: 'to sit / to sit down' (this polysemy is retained in all or almost all the lects).

### 75. SKIN

**Nidzh Udi** \(tːol\) \(\{mIol\}\) (1), **Vartashen Udi** \(tːol\) \(\{mIol\}\) (1), **Archi** \(qal\) (2), **Kryts (proper)** \(leʕ\) (3), **Alyk Kryts** \(ʕič\) (4), **Budukh** \(lāʔ\) \(\{mawI\}\) (3), **Mishlesh Tsakhur** \(qːekʷä\) \(\{kəəkə\}\) (5), **Mikik Tsakhur** \(bekʷä\) (5), **Gelmets Tsakhur** \(q'abɨχ\) \(\{kəəbɨχ\}\) (6), **Mukhad Rutul** \(liʔ\) \(\{mI\}\) (3) / \(qːɨdɨq'\) \(\{kɡɨdɨkь\}\) (7), **Ixrek Rutul** \(q'ɨdiq'\) \(\{kьdɨkь\}\) (7), **Keren Aghul** \(χam\) (8), **Gequn Aghul** \(χam\) (8), **Northern Tabasaran** \(q'iriq'\) (7), **Southern Tabasaran** \(χam\) \(\{χam\}\) (8), **Gyune Lezgi** \(χam\) (8).

**References and notes:**


**Common Udi:** Common Udi \(*tːol*.

**Caucasian Albanian:** Unattested. Cf. \(*t'ol* 'hide (of sheep, goat)' [Gippert et al. 2008: IV-40].

**Archi:** Chumakina et al. 2007; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 177; Kibrik et al. 1977b: 295, 363; Mikailov 1967: 202. Polysemy: 'human skin / peel (of fruit)'; in [Dirr 1908: 162] only with the meaning 'peel, shell, bark'; in [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 97] apparently only with the meaning 'peel' (but there are no terms for 'human skin' in [Dirr 1908] and [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990]). Distinct from various terms for 'hide', see [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 40 f.; Kibrik et al. 1977a 1: 145, 160]. In the 19\(^{th}\) century probably with polysemy: 'skin / bark / peel', see notes on 'bark'.

It has been proposed by S. A. Starostin that Archi \(qal\) was borrowed from Avar \(qal\) 'peel, shell, bark', but this scenario requires additional investigation. In any case, the meaning shift 'peel, bark' > 'skin' seems to be an inner Archi development; therefore, we treat \(qal\) 'skin' as a full-fledged item.

**Kryts (proper):** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 41; NCED: 756. Polysemy: 'human skin / hide of large cattle'. In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 177] 'skin, hide' is glossed as \(nɨč\) \(\{rɨν\}\), which is an incorrect spelling for \(ʕič\) \(\{gIч\}\) 'hide of small cattle' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 40].

**Alyk Kryts:** Authier 2009: 229, 264, 268, etc. Polysemy: 'human skin / animal hide'.


**Tsakhur-Kum Tsakhur:** Not attested, cf. \(ek'ä\) 'hide of small cattle' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 40].

**Mikik Tsakhur:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 40; Dirr 1913: 150, 227. Polysemy: 'human skin / hide of small cattle'.

**Gelmets Tsakhur:** Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 177. Polysemy: 'bark (q.v.) / skin'. The word is borrowed from Azerbaijani \(qabîg\) 'bark; shell', but it seems that the meaning 'skin' is an inner Gelmets development, therefore, we treat \(q'abɨχ\) 'skin' as a full-fledged item (note that in principle the form is not very reliable, since it is attested only in [Comrie & Khalilov 2010]).
Cf. əčək’ta ‘hide of small cattle’ [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 40].

Mukhad Rutul: Dirr 1912: 157, 192; Ibragimov 1978: 186. Quoted as the generic term for ‘skin’ in [Dirr 1912] and [Ibragimov 1978: 186], although in [Ibragimov 1978: 143, 222] Mukhad liʔ is specified as ‘hide’ or ‘hide of large cattle’ [Ibragimov 1978: 114, 117. According to Ibragimov’s glosses, this seems to be the generic term for both human and animal skin (polysemy: ‘skin / water-skin’), although in [Dirr 1912: 165] q’ difíc’ is translated as ‘hide of ram’.

Izrek Rutul: Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 166, 348; Ibragimov 1978: 197, 222. Polysemy: ‘human skin / animal hide / water-skin’ (note that in the main section of the dictionary [Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006] q’ difíc’ is glossed only as ‘hide’).

Luchek Rutul: Not attested.

Common Rutul: Muxrek dialect: both liʔ and q’ difíc’ are glossed as ‘skin’ without additional specifications [Ibragimov 1978: 186]; Shinaz dialect: liʔ ‘hide’ [Ibragimov 1978: 143]; Borch-Khnov dialect: liʔ ‘skin’ without additional specifications [Ibragimov 1978: 237, 239].

A poorly documented term; it is unclear how the Proto-Rutul word for ‘skin’ should be reconstructed. Note the dissimilation q’ > qː in Mukhad q’ difíc’.

Koshan Aghul: Not attested.


Distinct from q’ difíc’ ‘sheep hide’ [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 40].


Fite Aghul: Not attested.

Aghul (proper): Shaumyan 1941: 186. Shaumyan does not provide the dialectal provenance, but apparently the quoted form is Tpig. Missing from [Suleymanov 2003].

Distinct from q’udaq’ ‘sheep hide’ [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 40; Shaumyan 1941: 186].

Common Aghul: A poorly documented term; it is unclear how the Proto-Aghul word for ‘skin’ should be reconstructed.


The proper Dyubek term for ‘human skin’ is unknown; cf. Dyubek q’iʔiʔ-i, which is glossed only as ‘hide of small cattle’ in [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 40] and ‘hide of ram’ in [Genko 2005: 106] (erroneously quoted as q’iʔiʔ by Genko).

Southern Tabasaran: Genko 2005: 163. This form is actually from the Khv subdialect; the proper Kondik term for ‘human skin’ is unknown. Polysemy: ‘human skin / hide of goat and wild animals’. The same in Literary Tabasaran: χαμ [χаъ] ‘human skin / hide (e.g., of donkey)’ [Khanmagomedov & Shaltuzov 2001: 313].

Distinct from Kondik q’iʔiʔ ‘hide of small cattle’ [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 40]. Tirit q’iʔiʔ ‘skin (not specified), hide’ [Genko 2005: 106] (quoted by Genko as q’iʔiʔ [кырдияъ], apparently a typo for [кырдияъ]).

Common Tabasaran: It is unclear how the Proto-Tabasaran term for ‘human skin’ should be reconstructed: q’iʔiʔ (Northern dialect q’iriq’ or χαμ (Southern dialect).)"
76. SLEEP

Nidzh Udi bas-k-sun (1), Vartashen Udi nepː-aχ-e-sun [nənIaIæUyn] (2), Archi 'aχu-ke- (3), Kryts (proper) aχar- (3), Alyk Kryts ayar- (3), Budukh aχar- [arpax-, exup-] (3), Mishlesh Tsakhur qː=iṣan- {kʰiIiIaIn-} (1), Mikik Tsakhur b'il=vex- (4), Gelmets Tsakhur b'al=vex-{tʰalIhβas} (4), Mukhad Rutul s=aχ- {caxac} (3), Ixrek Rutul s=aχ- {caxin} (3), Luchek Rutul s=aχ- (3), Koshan Aghul aχ-ar- (3) / s=ark-i- (5), Keren Aghul ɾ=arx- (6), Gequn Aghul ɾ=arx- (6), Aghul (proper) ɾ=arx- (6), Northern Tabasaran qaʔ=ɾaχ- (3), Southern Tabasaran aχ-ɾ (3), Gyune Lezgi k=us'u- (1), Proto-Lezgian *ʔas*-'in- ~ *ʔas*:*in*- (1).

References and notes:

Nidzh Udi: Dm. Ganenkov & T. Maisak, p.c.; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 235. Polysemy: 'to lie / to lie down / to sleep / to fall asleep'. For lexicographic and morphological information see notes on 'to lie'. According to the textual corpus of the UdiLang project (http://udilang.narod.ru/index.html), the verb 'to lie' is the most frequent and default expression for 'to sleep' in Modern Nidzh.

There also exists a specific archaic expression nepː-aχ-e-sun [nənIaIæUyn], which is translated as 'to sleep, to fall asleep' in [Gukasyan 1974: 179; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 235; Mobili 2010: 219]. However, according to T. Maisak (p.c.), the complex verb nepː-aχ-e-sun rather means 'to fall asleep', whereas for the stative meaning 'to sleep, be asleep' the lexicalized adverb nepː-aχ-, modified with personal exponents and other verbal clitics, is used as predicate.

Vartashen Udi: Gukasyan 1974: 179; Dirr 1903: 20, 46; Schulze 2001: 302. Polysemy: 'to sleep / to fall asleep'. Glossed only as 'to fall asleep' in [Fähnrich 1999: 24; Schiefner 1863: 97; Starchevskiy 1891: 485]. The verb bas-k-esan 'to lie' can also be used in the meaning 'to sleep', see notes on 'to lie'.

Common Udi: Common Udi *nep:-aχ-PERSON, *nep:-aχ-e-sun, containing the Nidzh-Vartashen noun nep: 'dream; sleeping' [Gukasyan 1974: 179] and the light verb -e- 'to become' [Schulze 2005: 562 ff. (3.4.2.1 #11 ff.); Schulze-Fürhoff 1994: 474]. As was plausibly proposed in [Schulze 2001: 302], -aχ is the dative-2 ending, modifying the noun nep; Caucasian Albanian data support this solution. On the contrary, in [NCED: 273] -aχ- is interpreted as a verbal root, originating from the Proto-Lezgian verb *aχar- 'to sleep'; such an analysis should currently be rejected. In any case, synchronically nep: is the main meaningful morpheme in this verbal stem.

Caucasian Albanian: nep:-aq bu-, literally 'to be (bu-) in sleeping (nep:-aq)', -aq is the dative-3 ending, modifying the noun nep: [Gippert et al. 2008: IV-32]. The verb bas-k-esan 'to lie' can also be used in the meaning 'to sleep', see notes on 'to lie'.

Archi: Chumakina et al. 2007; Kibrik & Kodzasan 1998: 169; Kibrik et al. 1977b: 194, 382; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 235; Dirr 1908: 129, 222. Formed with the perfective stem of the verb 'aχar- 'to lie' q.v. [Kibrik et al. 1977a 1: 102] and the light verb ɾ=ke- 'to become' [Kibrik et al. 1977a 1: 100 ff.; Kibrik et al. 1977a 2: 78]. The literal meaning of ɾ=aχu-ke- is something like 'to become lying'. The plain verb ɾ=aχa- 'to lie' can also be used in the meaning 'to sleep', see notes on 'to lie'. Pace [NCED: 264], ɾ=aχa- 'to lie' and ɾ=aχu-ke- can hardly represent two etymologically different roots.


Distinct from qː=ex- 'to lie' q.v.

Mikik Tsakhur: Kibrik & Kodzasan 1988: 169; Dirr 1913: 151, 239. Polysemy: 'to lie / to lie down / to sleep'. See notes on 'to lie'. Applied to sg. subj.
Distinct from \textit{sal}b=\textit{ek}='to lie; to lie down; to sleep' (pl. subj.) [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 169].

**Gelmets Tsakhur:** Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 235. The future stem is \textit{sal}b=\textit{ix}-\textit{az}; other forms are unknown.

**Common Tsakhur:** The external Lezgian etymology suggests that Mishlesh \textit{q}=\textit{is}an- reflects the Proto-Tsakhur verb 'to sleep', whereas the primary meaning of \textit{sal}b=\textit{ex}- (Mikik, Gelmets) was 'to lie, lie down (sg. subj.)'; afterwards, this verb underwent the areal isogloss of polysemy: 'to lie / to sleep'.

Initial \textit{q=} and double \textit{v}=\textit{I}= are prefixes with general semantics [Ibragimov 1990: 125; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 41].

**Mukhad Rutul:** Dirr 1912: 169, 201; Ibragimov 1978: 121; Makhmudova 2001: 16, 97, 244; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 235. Paradigm: \textit{s=v}\textit{a}=	extit{r}=\textit{a}-\textit{r}- [imperf.] / \textit{s=v}\textit{a}=	extit{r}- [perf.].

**Izrek Rutul:** Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 222, 397; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 235. Paradigm: \textit{s}=\textit{a}=	extit{r}=\textit{a}-\textit{r}- [imperf.] / \textit{s}=\textit{a}=	extit{r}- [perf.].

**Luchek Rutul:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 169. Paradigm: \textit{s}=\textit{a}=	extit{r}=\textit{a}-\textit{r}- [imperf.] / \textit{s}=\textit{a}=	extit{r}- [perf.].

**Common Rutul:** Initial \textit{s=} is a prefix with general semantics [Ibragimov 1978: 95; Alekseev 1994a: 227; Makhmudova 2001: 165].

**Koshan Aghul:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 169; Suleymanov 2003: 54. Polysemy: 'to lie (down) / to sleep'.

In [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988], two verbs are quoted as synonyms for 'to sleep': \textit{a}\textit{χ}-\textit{a}- and \textit{v}ark-i-; semantic and pragmatic nuances are unknown.Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 169; Suleymanov 2003: 54; Shaumyan 1941: 190. Note Burshag \textit{a}\textit{r}k- 'to lie (down) q.v., modified with other prefixes.

**Keren Aghul:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 169.

The same in the Usug subdialect: \textit{n}=\textit{arx}-\textit{a}- 'to sleep' [Shaumyan 1941: 190].

**Gequn Aghul:** Dirr 1907: 104, 184; Shaumyan 1941: 190. According to [Dirr 1907], polysemy: 'to lie / to lie down / to sleep'.

**Fite Aghul:** Shaumyan 1941: 190. Erroneously quoted as \textit{n}=\textit{arx}-\textit{a}- by Shaumyan.

**Aghul (proper):** Suleymanov 2003: 54; Shaumyan 1941: 190.

The same in the Dulduk subdialect: \textit{n}=\textit{arx}-\textit{a}- 'to sleep' [Shaumyan 1941: 190] (apparently an error for \textit{n}=\textit{arx}-\textit{a}-).

Differently in the Tskirkhe subdialect: \textit{a}\textit{χ}-\textit{a}- 'to sleep' [Shaumyan 1941: 190].

**Common Aghul:** The prefixless verb \textit{a}\textit{χ}-\textit{a}- is the likeliest Proto-Aghul term for 'to sleep' (retained in this meaning in Burshag Koshan, Gequn as well as the Tsirkhe subdialect of Proper Aghul), perhaps with polysemy: 'to lie / to sleep' (as in Burshag Koshan and Gequn). Other attested verbs for 'to sleep' are secondary prefixed formations on the basis of verbal roots for 'to fall'. Further see notes on 'to lie'.

**Northern Tabasaran:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 169.

The same root in the Khanag subdialect: \textit{a}\textit{χ}-' 'to sleep' [Uslar 1979: 570, 1006; Dirr 1905: 155, 243]. The same in the Khvuryuk subdialect: \textit{a}\textit{χ}-' [\textit{a}\textit{χ}yan, \textit{axxya}] 'to sleep' [Genko 2005: 12] (tense \textit{χ}: (xx) is Genko's typo under the influence of the following entry).

**Southern Tabasaran:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 169. Morphologically \textit{n}=\textit{ar}-.

The same in the Khiv subdialect: \textit{a}\textit{χ}-' [\textit{axy}]{\textit{g}}] 'to sleep' [Genko 2005: 21]. The same in the Literary Tabasaran: \textit{a}\textit{χ}-' [\textit{a}\textit{χ}yan] 'to sleep' [Khanmagomedov & Shalbuzov 2001: 45].

**Common Tabasaran:** Initial \textit{a}\textit{v}(=) (i.e. \textit{a}=\textit{v}(=)), \textit{a}= (i.e. \textit{a}=\textit{v} (=)) are spatial prefixes.

**Gyune Lezgi:** Uslar 1896: 466, 633. Ablaut paradigm: \textit{k}=\textit{su}={\textit{v}}- [imperf.] / \textit{k}={\textit{v}}={\textit{v}}={\textit{v}}- [perf.] / \textit{k}=\textit{su}={\textit{v}}- [redupl. inv.] . Initial \textit{k}= is a spatial prefix.

The same in the Literary Lezgi: \textit{k}=\textit{su}={\textit{v}}- [imperf.] / \textit{k}={\textit{v}}={\textit{v}}={\textit{v}}- [perf.] / \textit{k}=\textit{su}={\textit{v}}- [redupl. inv.]. \textit{k}=\textit{su}={\textit{v}}] 'to sleep; to fall asleep' [Talibov & Gadzhiev 1966: 164; Gadzhiev 1950: 806; Haspelmeh 1993: 495, 526; Gyulmagomedov 2004, 1: 365].

**Proto-Lezgian:** NCED: 1037. \textit{Distribution}: Retained in the Caucasian Albanian-Udi branch and two Nuclear Lezgian languages: Tsakhur, Lezgi. Further see notes on 'to lie'.

**Replacements:** ['to lie' > 'to sleep'] (Tsakhur), ['to fall' > 'to lie / to sleep'] (Aghul).

**Reconstruction shape:** Correspondences seem regular; the root is poorly attested, therefore, the exact shape of the protoform cannot be reconstructed: the first vowel ('a?') and the sibilant tenseness are unclear. Note the fossilized class prefix \textit{b}= in Caucasian Albanian-Udi.

**Semantics and structure:** Primary verbal root.
77. SMALL

Nidzh Udi *micːi* {мичи} (1), Vartashen Udi *kici* {кичи} (2), Archi *t'i-t'u-Class* (3), Kryts (proper) *silā* (4), Alyk Kryts *sila* (4), Budukh *mike* {мике} (5), Mishlesh Tsakhur *k'il-i-n* {к'илун} (6), Mikik Tsakhur *k'il-i-n* (6), Gelmets Tsakhur *k'il-i-n* (6), Mukhad Rutul *k'a-di* {к'ады} (6), Ixrek Rutul *k'a-di* {к'ады} (6), Luchek Rutul *k'ɨ-di* (6), Koshan Aghul *ic'i-r* (7), Keren Aghul *bic'i-f* (7), Gequn Aghul *bic'i-f* (7), Fite Aghul *bic'i-t* (7), Aghul (proper) *bic'i-f* (7), Northern Tabasaran *bic'ʷi* (7), Southern Tabasaran *bic'i* (7), Gyune Lezgi *v'ax'i* (8), Proto-Lezgian *#kiʔ#V* (6).

References and notes:


Distinct from *mal* {ма}l *few, a few* [Gukasyan 1974: 169; Mobili 2010: 205]: Gukasyan and Mobili gloss this as 'small; a few', although the Azerbaijani translation and examples cited point to the meaning 'few, a few' (in [Gukasyan 1974: 271], however, *mal* is quoted as a Nidzh counterpart of Vartashen *kici* 'small'); glossed as 'few, a little' in [Schulze 2001: 296b]; glossed as 'wenig' in [Schiefner 1863: 104] (thus a Nidzh-Vartashen form); this cannot be a recent borrowing from Russian *malъ* 'small; malо 'a few' because of the presence of Caucasian Albanian *mal* 'small'.

Distinct from the less generic term *xuri ~ хуру* {хур, хүрү} 'small in size (Russian: мелкий)' [Gukasyan 1974: 226; Mobili 2010: 152; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 237] (an Azerbaijani loanword?).

Distinct from marginal *patar* {палт} 'small, little; a few' [Gukasyan 1974: 192; Mobili 2010: 238] (application of this adjective is unknown) < Modern Georgian *p'at'ar* 'small'.


In fact, there also exists the word *micık* 'small' [Fähnrich 1999: 23; Starchevskiy 1891: 493], which corresponds to the Nidzh term.

Common Udi: An unclear situation. Nidzh-Vartashen *micık* is etymologically obscure, whereas Vartashen *kici* is compared to Lezgian and North Caucasian words for 'puppy' in [NCED: 692]. It is quite unclear, however, whether the semantic shift 'puppy' > 'small' is possible.

A different solution is proposed in [Schulze 2001: 292]. According to Schulze, Vartashen *kicke* was borrowed from Persian *kuchak* 'small; young' (which, in fact, originates from a certain descendant of Turkic *kičik* 'small'); afterwards, the final consonant of *kicke* was reanalyzed as the Iranian diminutive suffix -k and lopped off; the word *kici* emerged as a result of this transformation. First, it should be noted that, from a phonetic point of view, Azerbaijani *kičik* 'small' (< Proto-Turkic *kičik*) could be a more appropriate source of borrowing of the Udi word (although the substitution Azerbaijani ğ > Udi ğ seems illogical). Next, in the case of morphological re-analysis of a loanword, this process is normally based on the grammatical patterns of the target language; re-analysis according to the grammatical patterns of the source language is typologically quite rare. Furthermore, Schulze explains the Nidzh (in fact Nidzh-Vartashen) form *micık* as the second element of an unattested rhyming reduplication ***kicık-*micık**, which seems ad hoc. We prefer to treat both Nidzh-Vartashen *micık* and Vartashen *kicit* as unetymologizable formations of unknown origin.

Caucasian Albanian: A good candidate is *mal* [Gippert et al. 2008: IV-29], which is attested in the meaning 'a few' (Jo. 6.7 "Two hundred pennyworth of bread is not sufficient (*mal*) for them"); as temporary 'a little while' (Jo. 12.35, etc.), in the meaning 'young, junior' (Mt. 10.42 "And whosoever shall give to drink unto one of these little ones (*mal*) a cup of cold water only", Mk. 15.40 "Mary the mother of James the Less (*mal*) and of Joses, and Salome") and in the following context, which is the most significant: Mt. 5.19 "Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least (*mal*) commandments, and shall teach so, he shall be called the least (*mal*) in the kingdom of heavens". No other candidates for generic 'small' are known from the palimpsests.
Archii: Chumakina et al. 2007; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 237; Kibrik et al. 1977b: 326, 366; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 583; Mikhailov 1967: 199; Dirr 1908: 185, 213. In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010], there is also a corrupted variant 'tǐ-du-class [tildut]. Regular participle from the stative verb 'tî 'to be small'. Widely applicable.

Distinct from the less generic and less frequent term muq'u 'to be small in size, fine (Russian: мелкий)' [Chumakina et al. 2007; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 237; Kibrik et al. 1977b: 282].

Distinct from hok'o 'small' [Chumakina et al. 2007] and hok'o-tu-class [Kibrik et al. 1977b: 243, 366; Chumakina et al. 2007] (both are apparently rare, at least the latter is considered a nursery word).


Distinct from the less generic term gũgil, glossed as 'small in size (Russian: мелкий)' in [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 237].

Allyk Kryts: Authier 2009: 69, 71, 72, 204, 287, 298, 311, 393. Widely applicable. A close synonym is sinkala [Authier 2009: 69, 119, 180, 356]. The semantic difference between two adjectives is unclear, but the former is less frequent according to examples in [Authier 2009].


Distinct from the less generic term gorla ['гола'] 'small in size (Russian: мелкий), fine' [Meylanova 1984: 35; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 237] (an Azerbaijani loanword?).


The second, less generic and less frequent term is čuri-n 'small in size; younger' [Kibrik et al. 1999: 890] (not found in [Ibragimov & Nuramedov 2010]: an Azerbaijani loanword?).

Tsakhur-Kum Tsakhur: Kini'i-n [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 237]. Occasional assimilation < *kili-n. Distinct from the less generic term čuna-n, glossed as 'small in size (Russian: мелкий)' in [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 237] (an Azerbaijani loanword?).

Mikik Tsakhur: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 237; Dirr 1913: 178, 229. Polysemy: 'small / younger / a few'. Cf. examples for the meaning 'small': 'There is a flowing small spring' [Dirr 1913: 20], 'small garden' [Dirr 1913: 25], "The young one must keep silent, when elders speak" [Dirr 1913: 32], 'small man, small woman, small horse, small house" [Dirr 1913: 178], "Your small village is very small" [Dirr 1913: 210].

Distinct from the less generic term čura-n, glossed as 'small in size (Russian: мелкий)' in [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 237] (an Azerbaijani loanword?). According to the data in [Dirr 1913], čura-n is an infrequent term, and the two attested examples point to the meaning 'young' rather than 'small': "small/young snakes" [Dirr 1913: 127, 130], "Children of my friends are still young/little" [Dirr 1913: 212].


Distinct from the less generic term čuru-n, glossed as 'small in size (Russian: мелкий)' in [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 237] (an Azerbaijani loanword?).


Distinct from the less generic term ǯul-di 'small in size (Russian: мелкий), fine, comminuted' [Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 109].


Distinct from the less generic term ǯul-di, glossed as 'small in size (Russian: мелкий)' in [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 237].

Common Rutul: Final -di / -d is the attributive suffix.

Koshan Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 237; Magometov 1970: 170. In [Suleymanov 2003: 42], however, this Burshag adjective is quoted as uci'-r.

Cf. the forms from other subdialects: Arsug uci'-d 'small' [Magometov 1970: 231 sentences 2, 19], Khudig aci'-d 'small' [Magometov 1970: 48] (both forms are also quoted in [Suleymanov 2003: 42] without subdialectal specification).

In [Shaumyan 1941: 155], Burshag, Arsug and Khudig words for 'small' are quoted as uci'-r, uci'-d, but this seems to be an inaccuracy.


Note the form in the Tsirkhe subdialect: k'i-f 'small' [Magometov 1970: 214 sentence 18; Shaumyan 1941: 155].

Common Aghul: The relationship between forms with b- (the bulk of the dialects) and without b- (all Koshan subdialects and the neighboring Tsirkhe subdialect of Proper Aghul) is unclear. The inconsistency of the forms in three Koshan subdialects is also rather suspicious.

Nevertheless, all the aforementioned forms are most probably related. It is possible that b- is an old fossilized class exponent, absent in Koshan, cf. [NCED: 287].


Common Tabasaran: Labialization of the Dyubek affricate č’-č’- is etymologically unclear.


The same in the Akhty dialect: Khlyut x’ač’i 'small' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 237]. Distinct from the less generic Khlyut term č’ilü, glossed as 'small in size (Russian: мелкнүн)' in [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 237].

Proto-Lezgian: NCED: 726. Distribution: This word is very unstable. The Proto-Lezgian terms cannot be reconstructed with certainty. Cf. the following roots attested in individual languages with the meaning 'small'.

*kil’V- [NCED: 726]: this root means 'small' in Rutul and probably in Tsakhur, if Tsakhur kil’- is indeed to be analyzed as suffixed k’il’- (not a productive pattern). It is proposed in [NCED] to compare *k’il’V- with the Archi nursery word hoko 'small' via metathesis, but the Archi reflex of the laryngeal is quite irregular (the expected Archi form should be **hoko’i). Cf. also the Budukh adverb k’be-k’ibe 'a bit' [Meylanova 1984: 98] (if to be analyzed as suffixed k’il’-).

*t’- [NCED: 1001]: the Archi stative verb 'to be small', it is also attested in Lezgi as the adverb t’il ‘a few’. As proposed in [NCED], the Nidzh Udi form t’ilin with the presumable meaning 'small', attested in the expression t’ilin k’aša ‘little finger' [Gukasyan 1974: 209] ('little finger' is normally expressed as 'small + finger' among the Lezgian languages), might contain the same root *t’-. This could be decisive evidence for the reconstruction of Proto-Lezgian *t’il ‘small', but the morphological analysis of the Udi form as t’il-n with a double suffix does not seem reliable (the suffix -n is very rare, if it exists at all). Synchronously, Udi t’ilin k’aša looks like a genitive compound 'finger (k’aša) of t’il' (for this morphological pattern see [Schulze 2005: 131 (3.2.2.3 #5)]). The meaning of the hypothetical til is, however, unclear; it cannot be a cognate of Proto-Nuclear Lezgian *t’il (~ *c’il) ‘finger’ [NCED: 1002], because the Udi form is expected to be **t’ul in such a case.

*šil’- [NCED: 963]: means ‘small’ in Kryts; its Proto-Lezgian meaning was ‘light (in weight)’.

*nič’V- (~ *c’-) [NCED: 821]: means ‘small’ in Buduk; its Proto-Lezgian meaning could be 'young' (as suggested by the Rutul cognate and external North Caucasian comparanda).

The Aghul and Tabasaran terms for 'small' go back to *pac’V-y [NCED: 287], whose original meaning could indeed have been 'goatling' or 'small sheep' (retained in Lezgi, Rutul, Tsakhur). Thus, the development 'goatling' > 'small' is to be postulated for Aghul-Tabasaran (it should be noted that the Koshan Aghul forms without the initial labial are inexplicable).

In Udi and Caucasian Albanian, etymologically unclear terms nicik, kici, mal are attested in the meaning 'small'. Vartashen Udi kici ‘small’ is compared to Proto-Lezgian *bic’/ *c’ik in [NCED: 692], whose original meaning was 'puppy'; the shift 'puppy' > 'small' could be the same as in Aghul-Tabasaran ('goatling' > 'small').
In Lezgi, the etymologically unclear form ʁʷač'i 'small' is attested. Tentatively, we choose *k'ɨʔʷV as the Proto-Lezgian stem for 'small'.

**Replacements:** {light (in weight)} > 'small' (Kryts), {puppy} > 'small'(?)(Vartashen Udi), {goatling} > 'small'(?)(Aghul, Tabasaran).

**Reconstruction shape:** Metathesis and the pharyngeal fricative in the Archi nursery word are irregular.

**Semantics and structure:** Primary stative verbal root 'to be small'.

### 78. SMOKE


**References and notes:**

- **Nidzh Udi:** Gukasyan 1974: 146; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 207; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 64; Mobili 2010: 179. The assimilated variant kʊyiɪn comes from [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990] and [Comrie & Khalilov 2010].
- **Common Udi:** Common Udi *kʊiɪn. In [Schulze 2001: 293] analyzed as a qualifying genitive kai-n from an unattested noun/adjective kʊ(i) ?; the explanation is ad hoc and etymologically unnecessary.
- **Caucasian Albanian:** Unattested.
- **Archi:** Chumakina et al. 2007; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 207; Kibrik et al. 1977b: 241, 358; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 64; Mikailov 1967: 179; Dirr 1908: 151, 208. Paradigm: huq' [abs.] / huq'-ra [obl.]. The morphophonological nature of the final uvular is unclear: either weak q' or tense q'; In [Kibrik et al. 1977b] this is explicitly analyzed as weak q', although in [NCED: 251] a diagnostical form with an enclitic is quoted, which confirms the tenseness of q', but without references.
- **Kryts (proper):** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 207; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 64.
- **Alyk Kryts:** Authier 2009: 36, 40, 199, etc.
- **Budukh:** Meylanova 1984: 27 (sub bafa), 186; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 207; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 64.
- **Mishlesh Tsakhur:** Kibrik et al. 1999: 880, 893; Ibragimov & Nurmanov 2010: 197; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 64.
- **Tsakhur-Kum Tsakhur:** kʊma [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 207].
- **Mikik Tsakhur:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 207; Dirr 1913: 175, 224.
- **Gelmets Tsakhur:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 207; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 64.
- **Mukhad Rutul:** Dirr 1912: 143, 190; Ibragimov 1978: 118; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 64.
- **Ixrek Rutul:** Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 283, 337. In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 64], erroneously quoted as fʊm [фым].
- **Luchek Rutul:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 207.
- **Common Rutul:** Khnov dialect (subdialect of Borch-Khnov): fʊm [фым] [Ibragimov 1978: 233],
- **Koshan Aghul:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 207; Suleymanov 2003: 104.
- **Keren Aghul:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 207. The same in the Usug subdialect: kʊm 'smoke' [Shaumyan 1941: 193].
- **Gequn Aghul:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 207; Dirr 1907: 128, 172. Polysemy: 'smoke / dust'.
- **Fite Aghul:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 207.
- **Aghul (proper):** Suleymanov 2003: 104; Shaumyan 1941: 193. Polysemy: 'smoke / soot / dust'.

The same in the Kurag subdialect: kʊm 'smoke' [Magometov 1970: 206 sentence 9].
Northern Tabasaran: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 207.
The same in the Khanag subdialect: *kum* 'smoke' [Uslar 1979: 787, 993; Dirr 1905: 185, 228]. The same in the Khyuryuk subdialect: *kum* [кум] 'smoke' [Genko 2005: 89].

Southern Tabasaran: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 207.

The same in the Akhty dialect: *kɨm* [кум] 'smoke' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 207].

Proto-Lezgian: NCED: 738. Distribution: There are three different Lezgian roots for 'smoke' in the three main branches: Udi, Archi and Nuclear Lezgian. From the distributional point of view, these are equal candidates, but the Udi root possesses reliable North Caucasian comparanda with the same basic meaning, thus, *kːunː* can be safely posited as the Proto-Lezgian term for 'smoke'. The vocalic development in Udi (*kːuin*) is indeed somewhat strange, but this can hardly discredit the proposed etymology. Lezgian *kːunː* shifted to the meaning 'dust' in Archi, (*gun*) having been lost in Nuclear Lezgian.

In Archi, the meaning 'smoke' is expressed with *ʔʷɨq'ː* [NCED: 251], an isolated form within Lezgian, but with external North Caucasian comparanda in the meaning 'fumes, stink'.

In Proto-Nuclear Lezgian, *kːunː* was superseded with *ƛuma* (~ *ƛʷi*) [NCED: 590], which is retained with the meaning 'smoke' in all Nuclear Lezgian lects. Its original Proto-Lezgian meaning cannot be established, because it was lost in Udi and Archi, but external North Caucasian comparison suggests semantics of 'wind' or 'air'.

Replacements: {'smoke' > 'dust'} (Archi).

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular except for the Udi diphthong.

Semantics and structure: Primary substantive root.

79. STAND

Nidzh Udi čur-p-sun {чырпсун} (1), Vartashen Udi čur-p-esun (1), Archi =əci- (2), Kryts (proper) q=qət'əl- (3), Alyk Kryts q=qətəl- (3), Budukh q=qətəl- {къатлал, къалтлал-} (3), Mishlesh Tsakhur il'il=ozar ~ il'il=ozʷar {илёйзар-} (2), Mikik Tsakhur il'il=ozar (2), Gelmets Tsakhur il'il=ozar-az (2), Mukhad Rutul l=uz- {люзак} (2), Ixrek Rutul l=uz- {люзүн} (2), Luchek Rutul χˤɨʁ=ɨχ (4), Koshan Aghul a=ʢ=z-a- (2), Keren Aghul ψ=uz-a- (2), Gequn Aghul ψ=uz-a- (2), Aghul (proper) ψ=uz-ana- (2), Northern Tabasaran di=ʔ'iɣ- (5), Southern Tabasaran di=yik- (5), Gyune Lezgi aq:\'=w=az- (2), Proto-Lezgian *ʔecːʷär- (2).

References and notes:


Common Udi: Common Udi čur-p-esun; formed with the light verb -p- 'to say, to do smth. with the mouth; to do smth. (in general)' [Schulze 2005: 565 ff. (3.4.2.2 #15 ff.); Harris 2002: 204 ff.]. Apparently related to čur-esun 'to walk' (see notes on 'to go'), but semantic details are uncertain.
Caucasian Albanian: *bur-esun* with polysemy ‘to stand (of humans, things) / to be at hand / to be, remain / to remain, stay / to dwell’ [Gippert et al. 2008: IV-12]. As plausibly analyzed in [Gippert et al. 2008: II-45, IV-12], this is a secondary verb based on the nominal form *buri* ‘having come to be’ (< *bu-ar-i*), a stative past participle from the generic verb *bu* – ‘to be’ [Gippert et al. 2008: IV-11].


Distinct from the nursery word *wet’-bo* – ‘to stand’ [Kibrik et al. 1977b: 311, 383; Chumakina et al. 2007] (complex verb, formed with the suppletive light verb -be- ‘to say’).

Distinct from *x-ːa*- ‘to stand up; to grow; to be in heat (of animals)’ [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 85; Kibrik et al. 1977b: 337, 354] and *yʾati =xʕa*- ‘to stand up’ [Kibrik et al. 1977b: 254, 354] (*yʾati* ‘up’).

**Kryts (proper)**: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 86; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 561. Initial *q*- is the preverb ‘above’ [Saadiev 1994: 424].

Distinct from *q=uzur*- ‘to stand up’ [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 85].


Distinct from *a=H=zɾa=yš* [Shaumyan 1941: 191]. Distinct from *Richa a=w*gš-a*- ‘to stand up’ [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 85].

The same in the Usug subdialect: *x=w*ur-z-a*. Polysemy: ‘to stand / to stand up’.

**Gequn Aghul**: Dirr 1907: 110. Infixed imperfective stem: *w=xur-z-a*. Polysemy: ‘to stand / to stand up’.

**Fite Aghul**: Not attested.
Aghul (proper): Suleymanov 2003: 55; Shaumyan 1941: 191. Infixed imperfective stem: \textit{a}=u-\textit{r}-z\texttt{-a}-v-. Polysemy: ‘to stand / to stand up / to stop moving’.

Common Aghul: Initial \textit{a}= (< \textit{ʔa}=), \textit{u}= and \textit{v}= are spatial prefixes [Magometov 1970: 158 ff.].

Note a rare case of retention of the Lezgian imperfective infix \textit{ʕ}- in the Gequn and Proper Aghul imperfective stem \textit{a}=u-\textit{r}-z\texttt{-a}- (cf. [Suleymanov 1993: 138 ff.]).

Northern Tabasaran: Kibrik & Kodzason 1988: 86. Morphologically \textit{di}=\texttt{-}Class- \textit{a}. Distinct from Dyubek \textit{a}=iː\texttt{ʒ}=\texttt{ʔ} ([imperf.] / \textit{a}=iː\texttt{ʒ} ([perf.]) to stand up’ [Kibrik & Kodzason 1988: 85].

The same in the Kumi subdialect: \textit{d}=\texttt{ʔi}=\texttt{ʁ}- ([dɪ̞ːŋkəxə] to stand’ [Genko 2005: 60].

A different pattern in the Khanag subdialect: \textit{d}=iː\texttt{ŋ}-\texttt{ʔ} ([imperf.] / \textit{d}=iː\texttt{ŋ} ([perf., inf.] with polysemy: ‘to stand / to stand up / to stay at rest’ [Uslar 1979: 673, 1007; Dirr 1905: 164, 243]. The change \textit{u} > \textit{i} in the imperfective stem is synchronically regular, see [Kibrik & Kodzason 1988: 34 ff.] for the same ablaut in Dyubek.

The same in the Khyuryuk subdialect: \textit{d}=v=\texttt{ʔi}=\texttt{ʁ} ([imperf.] / \textit{d}=v=\texttt{ʔi}=\texttt{ʁ} ([perf.]) [dɨʁuʁaʁkəxə] with polysemy: ‘to stand / to stay at rest’ [Genko 2005: 61].

Southern Tabasaran: Kibrik & Kodzason 1988: 86. Distinct from Kondik \textit{a}=v=\texttt{ʔi}=\texttt{ʁ} ([imperf.] / ‘to stand up’ [Kibrik & Kodzason 1988: 85].

The same in Literary Tabasaran: \textit{d}=\textit{ɣi}=\texttt{ʔ} ([dɪ̞ːŋkəxə] to stand; to stop moving’ [Khanmagomedov & Shalbuzov 2001: 147].

Differently in the Khiv subdialects: \textit{a}=v=\texttt{ʔi}=\texttt{ʁ} ([ɣdɪ̞ːŋgəxə] to stand; to stay up’ [Genko 2005: 44]. Cf. Khiv \textit{d}=u=\texttt{ʔi}=\texttt{ʁ} ([dɨʁuʁaʁkəxə] to stop moving’ [Genko 2005: 61].

Common Tabasaran: Initial \textit{d} (\textit{V}=, \textit{4V}=\texttt{ʔ} (\textit{V}=) are spatial prefix.

Formally, it is possible to reconstruct the Proto-Tabasaran opposition =\textit{ʁ} (\textit{V}=) - \textit{a}= (\textit{ʔi}=\texttt{ʁ}-) ‘to stand’ / -\textit{i}=\texttt{ʔ} (\textit{V}=) ‘to stand up’ (retained in Dyubek and Kondik, but secondarily lost in favor of the latter root in most of the other dialects). External Lezgian comparison suggests, however, that =\textit{ʁ} (\textit{V}=) - \textit{a}= (\textit{ʔi}=\texttt{ʁ}-) should be rather reconstructed with Proto-Tabasaran polysemy ‘to stand / to stand up’; if so, Dyubek and Kondik =\textit{ʁ} (\textit{V}=) - \textit{a}= (\textit{ʔi}=\texttt{ʁ}-) ‘to stand’ is a late introduction.


For the phonetics cf. Migrah (subdialect of the Doquzpara dialect < Samur group) \textit{q}=\texttt{ʁ} ([qəʁi=ʔ] - to stand’ [Meylanova 1964: 258]. Khuryug (subdialect of the Akhty dialect < Samur group) \textit{q}=\texttt{ʁ} ([qəʁi=ʔ] - to stand’ [Meylanova 1964: 315].

Initial \textit{q}=\texttt{ʔ}, \textit{q}=, \textit{q}= are old spatial prefixes.

Proto-Lezgian: NCED: 1025. Distribution: As opposed to ‘to lie’ q.v. or ‘to sit’ q.v., where the staticative meaning ‘to lie’ (‘to sit’) is normally expressed with the same verb as the active ‘to lie down’ (‘to sit down’), the meanings ‘to stand’ and ‘to stand up’ appear to be rather frequently distinguished through lexical means among Lezgian languages.

Nevertheless, the Proto-Lezgian root *\texttt{ʔec}^{-}\texttt{ʕ}iː\texttt{ʔ}- [NCED: 1025] can be assuredly reconstructed with polysemy: ‘to stand / to stand up’. Actually, the isogloss of lexical distributions between the two meanings seems to be a recent areal innovation among Lezgian languages, because newly introduced verbs with the specific meaning ‘to stand’ or ‘to stand up’ almost never coincide between languages.

The root *\texttt{ʔec}^{-}\texttt{ʕ}iː\texttt{ʔ}- [NCED: 1025] is retained with polysemy ‘to stand / to stand up’ in some Nuclear Lezgian languages: West Lezgian (Tsakhir, Rutul), Aghul and perhaps in Proto-Tabasaran (although the latter is not certain). In one of the outliers - Archi - as well as in Lezgi, the original meaning was narrowed to ‘to stand’. On the contrary, *\texttt{ʔec}^{-}\texttt{ʕ}iː\texttt{ʔ}- was narrowed to ‘to stand up’ in the second outlier - Udi - and in South Lezgian (Kryts, Budukh). Similarly, the best formal solution for Proto-Tabasaran would be to reconstruct "\texttt{ʔec}^{-}\texttt{ʕ}iː\texttt{ʔ} with the narrow meaning ‘to stand up’.

The new verbs for ‘to stand’ are:

1) *\texttt{ʔi}=\texttt{ʔi}=\texttt{ʔ} (\textit{ʔi}=\texttt{ʔi}=\texttt{ʔ}) - attested in South Lezgian (Kryts, Budukh) as ‘to stand’, lacking further etymology;
2) in Udi, the etymologically obscure root \textit{čur} is used for the verb ‘to stand’ (formally the same root as in the Udi verb ‘to walk’);
3) in Caucasian Albanian, ‘to stand’ is derived from the generic verb ‘to be’.

The new verbs for ‘to stand up’ are:
1) *ʔiχːa*- [NCED: 575]; this root means 'to stand up' in Luchek Rutul (theoretically, such a meaning could be reconstructed for Proto-Rutul) and in one of the outliers - Archi. The root *ʔiχːa*- was lost in the rest of Lezgian lects, so its Proto-Lezgian meaning is not reconstructible. Formally, the match between Archi and Rutul could yield the Proto-Lezgian root for 'to stand up', but we consider the available data too scant for such a reconstruction. Apparently Archi and Luchek Rutul represent independent innovations;
2) *ʔaqːV*- [NCED: 275], attested as 'to stand up' in some Tabasaran dialects (formally this should be reconstructed as the Proto-Tabasaran verb 'to stand up'); the original Lezgian meaning of *ʔaqːV*- was '(to be) high';
3) Etymologically, not entirely clear are Mikik Tsakhur *ʕaqːV*- 'to stand up' and Lezgi *q=arˤan*- 'to stand up'.

 References and notes:

Caucasian Albanian data suggest that they must be relatively recent innovations.
Common Udi:

In *[Meylanova 1984: 40, 214]* this word is quoted as *hač’* [xalavl] - apparently an error (repeated in [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 53]).

Archil: Chumakina et al. 2007; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 198; Kibrik et al. 1977b: 340, 360; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 53; Mikailov 1967: 202; Dirr 1908: 190, 209. In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010] an incorrect variant with initial χːˤ is also quoted. The first element is adverbial χːˤoʔ-s from above, from the sky’ (-s is the elative ending).


Gelmets Tsakhur: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 198. In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 53], the modern depharyngealization variant is quoted: ɣar’e.


Common Rutul: Final -ey is a common nominal suffix with general semantics [Ibragimov 1978: 65].


The same in the other subdialects: Arsug, Khudig Had ‘star’ [Suleymanov 1993: 69].


The same in the other subdialects: Tsirk ɣad ‘star’ [Suleymanov 1993: 57, 69; Shaumyan 1941: 180].


Common Tabasaran: Southern dialectal ɣiz is of unclear origin.


Proto-Lezgian: LEDb: 897. Distribution: This stem is retained as the basic term for ‘star’ in all lects (apparently including Caucasian Albanian), except for Udi and some Tabasaran dialects.

In Udi, two etymologically obscure forms for ‘star’ occur: mukucli, qabun. In Southern Tabasaran (Tinit, Dzhikhtig), ‘star’ is denoted with ɣez, whose origin is likewise unclear.

The reconstruction of the Proto-Lezgian ɣaxana ~ ɣaxan seems unproblematic, but the fact that ɣaxana ~ ɣaxan lacks any external North Caucasian cognates is suspicious.

Actually, Proto-Lezgian ɣaxana ~ ɣaxan looks like a derivative stem from the Proto-Lezgian substantive *ɣan: ‘fish’ q.v. [NCED: 1078]. Cf. the data from two dialects, where both Proto-Lezgian terms survived: Shinaz Rutul ɣat (*ɣad), Gyune Lezgi ɣed ‘fish’ vs. Common Rutul ɣat-re, Gyune Lezgi ɣed ‘star’.

Theoretically, it is possible to hypothesize a Proto-Lezgian mythologem, according to which stars are considered “sky fishes”. The modern Archi complex expression for ‘star’ might be a clue to such a reconstruction: ɣol:qan from above / from the sky. In modern Lezgian lects, ‘fish’ is a very unstable word (as opposed to ‘star’); this could be explained as the result of later attempts to avoid the homonymy ‘star’ / ‘fish’ already after the myth of “sky fishes” had disappeared. If so, the data from Eteg Tabasaran are particularly interesting, because Eteg is the third dialect among Lezgian languages which retains the old term for ‘fish’ (Tinit, Dzhikhtig ɣad), but it is exactly in Eteg where the old term for ‘star’ has been superseded with the unclear word ɣez.

Replacements: ([fish > ‘star’?]) (Proto-Lezgian).

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular, except for dissimilative q (for expected ɣ) in Archi and etymologization of the final consonant in South Lezgian (Krum, Budukh); note also the somewhat strange reflex *n > l in Caucasian Albanian. The direct stem with the final vowel ɣaxana (a rare nominal type) is reconstructed on the basis of the Tsakhur form ɣanwre [NCED: 171]; on the other hand, Tsakhur may represent the same suffixal formation as Rutul ɣad-re (with the loss of -y in Tsakhur).
81. STONE
Nidzh Udi žˤe {ʑleː} (1), Vartashen Udi žˤe {ʑleː} (1), Archi ěel’e (2), Kryts (proper) χud (3), Alyk Kryts dahar (4), Buduk qːaye {kʁwəel} (-1), Mishlesh Tsakhur qːaye {kʁwəel} (-1), Mikik Tsakhur qːaye (-1), Gelmets Tsakhur qːaya (1), Mukhad Rutul duχ-ul {dʊxul} (3), Ixrek Rutul duχ-ul {dʊxul} (3), Luchek Rutul dahar (5), Koshan Aghul wʰan (6), Keren Aghul wʰan (6), Gequn Aghul wʰan (6), Fite Aghul wʰan (6), Aghul (proper) wʰan (6), Northern Tabasaran can (6), Southern Tabasaran wʰan (6), Gyune Lezgi qːan (6), Proto-Lezgian *qːʷan (6).

References and notes:


Archи: Chumakina et al. 2007; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 201; Kibrik et al. 1977b: 214, 361; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 50; Mikailov 1967: 206; Dirr 1908: 195, 210. Glossed as ‘middle-sized stone’ in [Chumakina et al. 2007]. In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010], the word qːen is also quoted as a synonym of ěel’e, although in fact qːen means ‘rock (i.e. cliff etc.)’ [Kibrik et al. 1977b: 300; Chumakina et al. 2007]; this is apparently due to an incorrect translation of the English entry title ‘stone, rock’ as Russian ‘камень, скала’, although rock is simply the modern American equivalent of stone.

Distinct from qːan with polysemy ‘large flat stone / large frying pan’ [Kibrik et al. 1977b: 298; Chumakina et al. 2007].


Distinct from a more specific term dahar ‘big stone’ [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 201] (ultimately of Persian origin, see notes on Alyk Kryts).

Alyк Kryts: Authier 2009: 38, 173, 183, 216, 222, 258, 316, 326, etc. According to examples, with polysemy: ‘stone in general or middle-sized / big stone, boulder / rock, cliff’. A Wanderwort attested in Lezgian (see individual notes on ‘stone’ and ‘mountain’), Dargwa, Khinalugh, dialectal Azerbaijani etc. most commonly with the meaning ‘big stone, rock, cliff’. Ultimately borrowed from Persian dahar ‘grotto, cavern, cleft in a mountain’ (the semantically closest form is Lezgi dahar ‘cavern, deep cleft in a mountain’). Despite the foreign origin of the word, the meaning shift ‘big stone, cliff’ > ‘stone in general’ seems an independent inner Alyk development; therefore, we treat dahar ‘stone’ as a full-fledged Alyk item. Distinct from inherited Alyк žul ‘rock, cliff’ [Authier 2009: 25, 39, 81].


Tsakhur-Kum Tsakhur: aye [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 201].


Common Tsakhur: The term was borrowed from Azerbaijani ĝaņa ‘rock, cliff; big stone’, dial. ‘stone in general’.

A second candidate is \textit{qat} (κατ), quoted in [Ibragimov 1978: 118] as a synonym for \textit{duχul}, but not observed in other sources.

A third candidate is \textit{c"aɾ}, glossed as ’stone, small stone, gravel’ in [Dirr 1912: 37, 179, 192], but, judging by Dirr’s examples, this word seems more rare and marginal.

Cf. also non-inherited \textit{dahar} (building) stone’ [Ibragimov 1978: 27, 29, 118].


A second candidate is \textit{dahar} (jarınlıp) ’stone’ [Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 95, 346] (with the only example: ’large stones’), ultimately borrowed from Persian (see notes on Alyk Kryts). The difference between \textit{duχul} and \textit{dahar} is unclear; it is possible that \textit{dahar} specifically denotes a large stone.

In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 50], several specific terms are incorrectly quoted as synonyms for generic ’stone’.

\textbf{Luchek Rutul:} Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 201. A generic term, representing a \textit{Wanderwort} of Persian origin (see notes on Alyk Kryts), although the meaning shift to ’stone in general’ seems an independent inner Luchek development; therefore, we treat \textit{dahar} ’stone’ as a full-fledged Luchek item.

Distinct from inherited \textit{duχul} ’small stone’ [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 201] and \textit{qat} ’pebble’ [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 202].


The distribution suggests that \textit{duχul} is the Proto-Rutul term for ’stone’ (historically \textit{duχul} with the archaic suffix -).

\textbf{Koshan Aghul:} Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 201; Suleymanov 2003: 54; Shaumyan 1941: 192. In [Magometov 1970: 229 sentence 7], incorrectly transcribed as \textit{w'an}.

The same in the Arsus subdialect: \textit{H'an} ’stone’ [Suleymanov 1993: 54].

\textbf{Keren Aghul:} Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 201. The same in the Usug subdialect: \textit{x'an} ’stone’ [Shaumyan 1941: 192].


\textbf{Aghul (proper):} Suleymanov 2003: 54; Shaumyan 1941: 192. The same in the other subdialects: Duldug, Kurag, Khpyuk \textit{x'an} ’stone’ [Shaumyan 1941: 192; Magometov 1970: 206 sentences 25, 27; 224 sentence 44].

\textbf{Northern Tabasaran:} Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 201.

The same in the Khanag subdialect: \textit{qan} ’stone (in general)’ [Uslar 1979: 818, 995]; note, however, that in [Dirr 1905: 186, 230] Khanag \textit{qan} is quoted only in the expression \textit{niq'-ìn qan} ’tombstone’ (\textit{niq} ’tomb, grave’). According to [Dirr 1905: 161, 230], the generic Khanag term for ’stone’ is \textit{waz}, which is glossed as ’rock, cliff’ in [Uslar 1979: 651] - perhaps a natural semantic rebuilding during the 2nd half of the 19th century between Uslar’s and Dirr’ records.

The same in the Khyuryuk subdialect: \textit{qan} (καν) ’stone’ [Genko 2005: 99]; distinct from Khyuryuk \textit{waz} (καραζ) ’rock, cliff’ [Genko 2005: 41].

\textbf{Southern Tabasaran:} Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 201.

The same in the Tinit subdialect: \textit{q'an} (καν) ’stone’ [Genko 2005: 101] (phonetically rather a Northern Tabasaran form!).

The same in Literary Tabasaran: \textit{x'an} (γαν) ’stone’ [Khanmagomedov & Shalbuzov 2001: 110]; distinct from literary \textit{waz} (γαζ) ’rock, cliff’ [Khanmagomedov & Shalbuzov 2001: 108].

Two terms for ’stone’ are documented for the Khiv subdialect: \textit{waz} (γαζ) with polysemy: ’stone / rock, cliff / stony slope / precipice’ [Genko 2005: 41] and \textit{x'an} (γαν) ’stone’ [Genko 2005: 43]. The difference is unknown.

\textbf{Common Tabasaran:} \textit{q'an} can be safely reconstructed as the generic Proto-Tabasaran term for ’stone’, although in some dialects this is currently being superseded by \textit{waz} / \textit{waz} ’rock, cliff’.


The same in Literary Lezgi: \textit{q'an} (καν) ’stone’ [Talibov & Gadzhiev 1966: 184; Gadzhiev 1950: 278; Haspelmath 1993: 503, 527].

The same in the Akhty dialect: Khlyut \textit{q'an} ’stone (in general)’ [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 201]. Distinct from the Khlyut more specific term \textit{kert}:’κɛχ’ formless stone’ [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 201].

\textbf{Proto-Lezgian:} NCED: 490. Distribution: A rather unstable word. There are four candidates for the Proto-Lezgian term for ’stone’, with more or less equal distribution:
1) "qʷan [NCED: 490]. This is the generic term for 'stone' in East Lezgian (Aghul, Tabasaran, Lezgi), but denotes 'large flat stone; large frying pan' in Archi (qʷan [Kibrik et al. 1977b: 298; Chumakina et al. 2007]). External North Caucasian comparanda point to the meanings 'flat stone' or 'large stone';

2) "χutː (~ *χːuː) [NCED: 428]. This root denotes 'stone' in Kryts proper and Rutul (Rutul suffixed and metathesized duχ-ul), but 'rock, cliff' in Alyk Kryts. In [NCED: 428], Kryts proper χud-it 'tomb-stone' is also quoted (directly corresponds to Rutul duχ-ul 'stone'), but this Kryts form is not attested in [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 191]. The root is not attested in the rest of Lezgian. Its external North Caucasian comparanda (if correct) point to the meaning 'grave, tomb';

3-4) in both of the outliers, etymologically obscure forms are attested: Udi-Caucasian Albanian čːe (which implies Proto-Lezgian čːen ~ -čː - -čː) and Archi čːle.

 Provisionally, we fill the Proto-Lezgian slot with "qʷan.

 It must be noted that in Tabasaran dialects, "qʷan tends to be superseded with the form varz in the meaning 'stone'; the Proto-Tabasaran meaning of varz apparently was 'rock, cliff'.

 In Alyk Kryts and Luchek Rutul, the Persian loanword dabar is attested with the late semantic development 'big stone, rock, cliff' > 'stone (in general)'.

 In Budukh and Tsakhur, inherited terms were superseded with Azerbaijani loanwords.

 Replacements: ['big stone, rock, cliff' > 'stone'] (Alyk Kryts, Luchek Rutul), ['rock, cliff' > 'stone'] (Tabasaran dialects).

 Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular.

 Semantics and structure: Primary substantive root. The oblique stem is not reconstructible.

82. SUN

Nidzh Udi beʁˤ {ōɛːŋ} (1), Vartashen Udi beʁˤ {ōɛːŋ} (1), Archi barq (1), Kryts (proper) viraʁ (1), Alyk Kryts varaʁ (1), Budukh viraʁ {ɐʊɾʁŋ} (1), Mishlesh Tsakhur wiriʁ {ɐɾɾʁŋ} (1), Mikik Tsakhur wiriʁ (1), Gelmets Tsakhur wiriʁ (1), Mukhad Rutul wiriʁ {ɐɾɾʁŋ} (1), Ixrek Rutul wiriʁ {ɐɾɾʁŋ} (1), Luchek Rutul wiriʁ (1), Koshan Aghul raʃ (1), Keren Aghul raʁ (1), Gequn Aghul raʁ (1), Fite Aghul raʁ (1), Aghul (proper) raʁ (1), Northern Tabasaran rʰiː-t (1), Southern Tabasaran rʰiː (1), Gyune Lezgi raʁ (1), Proto-Lezgian *wiɾaʁ: (1).

References and notes:

Common Udi: Common Udi beɾˤ.


Alyk Kryts: Authier 2009: 36, 49, 182, etc.


Tsakhur-Kum Tsakhur: wiriʁ [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 197].

Mikik Tsakhur: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 197; Dirr 1913: 143, 238.

Gelmets Tsakhur: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 197; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 52.

Mukhad Rutul: Dirr 1912: 127, 201; Ibragimov 1978: 118. In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 52], erroneously quoted as wiriʁ {wɨɾɾʁŋ}.

Koshan Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 197; Suleymanov 2003: 142; Shaumyan 1941: 159. The same in the Khudig subdialect: raʃ ‘sun’ [Shaumyan 1941: 159].
Gequn Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 197; Dirr 1907: 139, 184; Shaumyan 1941: 159.
Fite Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 197; Shaumyan 1941: 159.

Northern Tabasaran: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 197.
The same in the Khanag subdialect: riq ‘sun’ [Uslar 1979: 896, 1006] (in [Dirr 1905: 203, 242], quoted as rey ‘sun’ - either actually a form from some Southern Tabasaran subdialect or the beginning of the phonetic process Q > E in Khanag during the 2nd half of the 19th century between Uslar's and Dirr's records).

Southern Tabasaran: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 197.


Proto-Lezgian: NCED: 1051. Distribution: One of the most stable lexical items, retained with the basic meaning ‘sun’ in all Lezgian lects. Proto-Lezgian *wirəq possesses perfect North Caucasian comparanda, therefore, W. Schulze's analysis is not only ad hoc morphologically, but also unnecessary [Schulze 2001: 257].
Replacements: ‘(sun) > sunny day (pl.)’ (Akhty Lezgi).
Reconstruction shape: Basic correspondences are regular, although the original bisyllabic structure tends to be simplified in many languages.
Semantics and structure: Primary substantive root. The oblique stem could be *wirəqV-

83. SWIM

Nidzh Udi üzmüš-sun (увзмушун) (-1), Vartashen Udi üzmüš-b-sun (-1), Archi ḫαn-a- (1), Kryts (proper) üzmüʃ xi- (-1), Alyk Kryts šina ar- (-1), Budukh üzmüʃ yičā-ri- (увзмы йихьары ~ йихьары) (-1), Mishlesh Tsakhir yuzqį haʔ- (юзги ға hh) (-1), Mikik Tsakhir yüzmuş-x- (-1), Gelmets Tsakhir uzmuš-x- (-1), Mukhad Rutul xed haʔ- (хьед гьаак) (1), Ixrek Rutul xed haʔ- (хьед гьаакьым) (1), Koshan Aghul sirnaw aq’a- (-1), Gequn Aghul samah aq’a- ~ sameh aq’a- (-1), Aghul (proper) salaw aq’a- (-1), Northern Tabasaran čučurufan ap’- (сурфав аңы) (-1), Gyune Lezgi sirnaw- (-1), Proto-Lezgian *fːən: ʔəʔa(r)-(-1).

References and notes:
Nidzh Udi: Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 479. Mophophonologically = üzmüš-b-sun with cluster simplification šbs > šs (see [Maisak 2008a: 148 f.]).
Common Udi: Borrowed from Azerbaijani üz-mük (perfect stem üz-miʃ-) ‘to swim’, plus the Udi light verb -b- ‘to do’.
Caucasian Albanian: Unattested.

Archi: Chumakina et al. 2007; Kibrik et al. 1977b: 342, 373; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 479. A complex verb, consisting of *ta*n 'water' q.v. and the light verb -*e*- 'to do' [Kibrik et al. 1977a: 100 ff.; Kibrik et al. 1977a 2: 78].

In [Dirr 1908: 188, 217] 'to swim' is quoted as *[xwa-x]*, which should be interpreted as something like *χʷ*x*k* - *χʷ*x*k* - apparently the same verb as *χʷ*x*k*a*- 'to walk around looking for something' [Kibrik et al. 1977b: 339; Kibrik et al. 1977a 3: 235; Chumakina et al. 2007].

Kryn (proper): LEDb. Borrowed from Azerbaijani *üz-mäk* (perfect stem *üz-miš*-) 'to swim', plus the Kryn verb *xi*- 'to become'.

Alyk Kryn: G. Authier, pers. com. Borrowed from Iranian (ultimately to Persian *šinâ* 'swimming'), plus the Alyk verb *ar*- 'to do'.

Budukh: Meylanova 1984: 25 sub *batm*, 50 sub *daqaz', etc. Applied to humans and swimming birds. In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 479], quoted as *üzmiš* *siši* [_xml'yiši *siši*]. Borrowed from Azerbaijani *üz-mäk* 'to swim' (the perfect stem *üz-miš*-), plus the Budukh verbs *yixe*- / *sxix*- 'to become' or *siši*- 'to do'.


Gelmets Tsakhur: Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 479.

Common Tsakhur: All of the forms represent borrowings from Azerbaijani. Usually it is the Azerbaijani perfect stem *üz-miš*- (infinite *üz-mäk*) 'to swim' with the Tsakhur verb *ix*- 'to become'. In Mishlesh the source is the Azerbaijan noun *üz-gü* 'being afloat' (from the same root *üz* - 'to swim') with the Tsakhur verb (*h=x*)- 'to do'.

Mukhad Rutul: Dirr 1912: 141, 197; Makhmudova 2001: 249; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 479.


Luchek Rutul: Not attested.

Common Rutul: In all dialects, the meaning 'to swim' is expressed with the analytic construction *xèd* 'water' + (*h=x*)- 'to do'.


Keren Aghul: Not attested. Cf. in the Usug subdialect: *sarnaw q'a* - 'to swim' [Shaumyan 1941: 161].

Gequn Aghul: Dirr 1907: 141, 180; Shaumyan 1941: 161.

Fite Aghul: Not attested.


Common Aghul: Analytic constructions with the auxiliary verb (*a*)*q*-a- 'to do' are found in all the dialects where the term is attested. Apparently, the nouns *siranaw, salaw, sanah* represent various corrupted transmissions of Iranian forms, cf. Persian *šinaw, šinah, šina*: 'swimming' (+ *kar*dan 'to do' = 'to swim'), Taýsh *sinaw* 'swimming' (+ *karde* 'to do' = 'to swim').

Northern Tabasaran: Uslar 1979: 975. The expression actually stems from the Khangan subdialect; the proper Dyubek term for 'to swim' is unknown. Literally *ču'urfan* 'swimming' + *ap*- 'to do'. This expression is applied to humans and animals, but not to fishes or boats.

For the Khyryruk subdialect only the noun *ču'urfan* [xml'ylipjau] 'swimming' is documented [Genko 2005: 187].

Southern Tabasaran: Genko 2005: 139. This expression actually stems from the Khiv subdialect; the proper Kondik term for 'to swim' is unknown. Literally *ču'urfan* + 'to do'.

Differently in the Tinit subdialect: *lep*ye- [xml'eš] 'to swim', literally 'wave' + 'to hit, beat' [Genko 2005: 114].

There also exists a more complex expression: *lep*ye kada-*li* nèw [xml'ëkda*wa*n] 'to swim' [Genko 2005: 114], literally 'to go (*xèw*), clearing away (*kada*) the wave (*lep*e*); Genko's note is not quite certain, but apparently this is a Khiv form.

Two expressions are found in Literary Tabasaran: *siranaw ap*- [xml'æn ætšy] 'to swim', literally 'swimming' + 'to do' [Khanmagomedov & Shalbuzov 2001: 272]; *lep ye*- [xml'æn ætšy] 'to swim', literally 'wave' + 'to hit, beat' [Khanmagomedov & Shalbuzov: 2001: 217].

Common Tabasaran: The Proto-Tabasaran term is not reconstructible. Southern *siranaw* 'swimming' is a phonetically corrupted transmission of the corresponding Iranian terms (see notes on Aghul); *lep* 'wave' is ultimately borrowed from Azerbaijani *lap* 'small wave'; the origin of Northern *ču'urfan* is unclear - maybe an onomatopoetic word ('swimming' as 'splashing').

Gyune Lezgi: Uslar 1896: 549, 623. Historically a complex verb 'to do swimming', consisting of *siranaw* 'swimming' (an Iranian loanword, see notes on Aghul) and *ayi*-/*ayu* 'to do'.

The same in Literary Lezgi: *siranaw mu'ur*- or compressed *siranaw*- [xml'æn æyu, xml'ænu] 'to swim' [Talibov & Gadzhiev 1966: 294; Gadzhiev 1950: 539; Haspelmath 1993: 527].
Proto-Lezgian: NCED: 1060. Distribution: Barely reconstructible. For the most part, only analytic expressions for ‘to swim’ are attested in Lezgian languages; the main element that carries the lexical meaning (swimming’ or, rarely, ‘wave’) represents an Azerbaijani or Iranian loan in most of the lects. Expressions for ‘to swim’ with non-borrowed elements are:

1) Archi analytic ɬːan-‘to do water’;
2) Rutul analytic xel hat- ‘to do water’, an exact parallel to the complex verb in Archi;
3) the verb ‘to walk around looking for something’ in archaic Archi;
4) Northern Tabasaran ɬːućːuruʃaŋ ap- ‘to do ɬːućːuruʃaŋ’; perhaps onomatopoetic.

We follow the formal Archi-Nuclear Lezgian (Rutul) match and reconstruct the virtual idiom *ɬːänː ʔaʔar ‘to do (ʔaʔar- water (*Einc) [NCED: 257, 1060] as the Proto-Lezgian expression for ‘to swim’, although it is very probable that Archi and Rutul formations represent late and independent introductions.

Replacements: {'to do water’ > ‘to swim'} (Archi, Rutul), {'to beat a wave’ > ‘to swim’} (Southern Tabasaran).

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular.

Semantics and structure: Analytic expression NOUN + AUXILIARY VERB.

84. TAIL

Nidzh Udi ožˤil ~ ožˤul {oxIwyl ~ oxIyl} (1), Vartashen Udi ožˤil {oxIwyl} (1), Archi oč (1), Kryts (proper) Ŷi (1), Alyk Kryts Ŷiy (1), Budukh Ŷi-bir {dæuðup} (1), Mishlesh Tsakhur bɨtːyː- {dnaɪm} (2), Mikts Tsakhur bɨtː (2), Mukhad Rutul Ŷibir ~ Ŷibur {dæuður ~ dæuðip} (1), Ixrek Rutul Ŷibir {dæuðup} (1), Luchek Rutul Ŷibir (1), Koshan Aghul ruž (1), Keren Aghul ruž (1), Gequn Aghul ruž (1), Fite Aghul rũg (1), Aghul (proper) ruž (1), Northern Tabasaran rũzʕ (1), Southern Tabasaran rũzʕ (1), Gyune Lezgi tːum (-1), Proto-Lezgian *hircːʷ ~ *dircːʷ(1).

References and notes:


Distinct from tʊntːuz ‘bird’s tail, rump’ [Fähnrich 1999: 32].

Common Udi: Common Udi *ožʕ-ı.

Caucasian Albanian: Unattested.


Alyk Kryts: Authier 2009: 35, 39, 55, 350, 379. This is glossed as ‘fatty tail’ in [Authier 2009: 39], but simply as ‘tail’ in [Authier 2009: 35, 55]; examples confirm the generic status of Ŷiy: “One who wants to get fish should put his tail (ſiy) on ice” (a proverb) [Authier 2009: 350], “the point of the (bull calf) tail (ʃiy) is white” [Authier 2009: 379]. According to G. Authier’s pers. com., Ŷiy is the default term for ‘tail’ in Alyk.

There exists another word for ‘tail’: qač’, quoted only once in [Authier 2009: 39]. According to G. Authier’s pers. com., this is a rare specific term, which denotes ‘long, lean tail containing bones’. Alyk qač’ resembles the basic Khinalugh term qaʔ [abs.] / qaʔ- [obl.] ‘tail’ (note that, first of all, the normal direction of borrowing is Lezgian > Khinalugh).

Mishlesh Tsakhur: Kibrik et al. 1999: 870, 901; Ibragimov & Nurmamedov 2010: 97. Applied both to beasts and birds. Paradigm: 
\[ bɨʔ\] [abs.] / bɨʔ- [obl.]. In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 183], the absolutive is quoted as bɨʔ [duːt]; note that this depalatalized variant is also attested in [Kibrik et al. 1999], e.g., [Kibrik et al. 1999: 822].

Distinct from [\textit{ji}k\textit{k}ɪrɪ] ‘tail of cloven-hoofed animal, horse’s tail’ [sic?] [Ibragimov & Nurmamedov 2010: 161] and \textit{a’nd} ‘fat tail of sheep (\textit{курдюк}; fatty meat’) [Ibragimov & Nurmamedov 2010: 62] (the latter is borrowed from Azerbaijani \textit{ard} ‘back part of body’). Ibragimov & Nurmamedov’s gloss ‘tail of cloven-hoofed animal, horse’s tail’ for [\textit{ji}k\textit{k}ɪrɪ] looks suspicious, because this word means ‘fat tail of sheep (\textit{курдюк})’ (a very different meaning) in Mikik and Gelmets, whereas in Mishlesh ‘horse’s tail’ is denoted by generic \textit{bɨʔ}(*), see examples in [Kibrik et al. 1999: 822].


Distinct from \textit{ji}k\textit{k}ɪrɪ ‘fat tail of sheep (\textit{курдюк}); handle’ [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 26; Dirr 1913: 158, 228] and from \textit{a’nd} ‘fat tail of sheep (\textit{курдюк})’ [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 26] (the latter is borrowed from Azerbaijani \textit{ard} ‘back part of body’).

\textbf{Gelmets Tsakhur:} Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 26. In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 183], the modern depharyngealized variant is quoted (with the compensatory palatalization of \textit{tʔ}: bɨʔ [fuːr]).

Distinct from [\textit{ji}k\textit{k}ɪrɪ] ‘fat tail of sheep (\textit{курдюк}); handle’ and \textit{a’nd} ‘fat tail of sheep (\textit{курдюк})’ [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 26] (the latter is borrowed from Azerbaijani \textit{ard} ‘back part of body’).


\textbf{Gequn Aghul:} Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 26; Dirr 1907: 140, 187; Suleymanov 1993: 63; Shaumyan 1941: 160. In [Dirr 1907], two variants are quoted: ruʒ / ruž.


\textbf{Aghul (proper):} Suleymanov 2003: 144; Shaumyan 1941: 160. Polysemy ‘tail (in general) / fat tail of sheep (\textit{курдюк})’.

The same in the other subdialects: Duldug, Tsirkhe, Khpyuk \textit{ɾuʃ} ‘tail’ [Suleymanov 1993: 63; Shaumyan 1941: 160].


\textbf{Gyne Lezgi:} Uslar 1896: 559, 637. Polysemy: ‘tail / handle’. As proposed in [Haspelmath 1993: 508], the word is most likely ultimately borrowed from Persian \textit{dam} ‘tail’.


The same in the Akhyt dialect: Khlyut \textit{tɪm} ‘tail’ [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 26]. Khlyut \textit{ɪm} < \textit{um} is a late process, cf., e.g., inherited \textit{gɪm} ‘smoke’.

\textbf{Proto-Lezgian:} NCED: 529. \textit{Distribution:} Retained as the basic term for ‘tail’ in Udi, Archi and most of the Nuclear Lezgian lects: South Lezgian (Kryts, Budukh), Rutul, Aghul, Tabasaran. In Tsakhur, "\textit{hɪɾɛ-}" (~ *ʔ?) was narrowed to the specific meaning ‘fat tail of sheep (\textit{курдюк})’ (if we deal with the same etymological root in the Tsakhur form \textit{ji-}k\textit{ɪrɪ}, because the second element \textit{kɪrɪ} as well as the entire morphological analysis are unclear).
85. THAT

Nidzh Udi *te {mle} (1) / *šo {luo} (4), Vartashen Udi *te {mle} (1), Archi to-CLASS (1), Kryts (proper) lä (2), Alyk Kryts la (2), Budukh a-la {ala} (2) / a-la {ala} (3), Mishlesh Tsakhur še-n ~ hoː=še-n [unep, zewuent] (4), Mikīk Tsakhur še-n (4), Mukhad Rutul ti {mu} (1), Ixrek Rutul ti-n-di {minudul} (1), Koshan Aghul ti-me (1), Keren Aghul ti (1), Gequn Aghul te (1), Fite Aghul ti (1), Aghul (proper) te (1), Northern Tabasaran du-mu (5), Southern Tabasaran du-mu (5), Gyune Lezgi a-t’a (1) / a-t’a (3), Proto-Lezgian *fV (1).

References and notes:


Common Udi: According to [Gukasyan 1974: 276, 279; Schulze-Fürhoff 1994: 469; Schulze 2008; Schulze 2005: 237 ff. (3.2.9.3), 447 ff. (3.3.7.1)], the underlying Nidzh-Vartashen system of demonstrative attributive pronouns was ternary: *me [proximal] / *ka [medial] / *te [distal]. This opposition is attested in both of the modern dialects:

Nidzh mo / ka / šo ~ *te (both forms šo and *te are used in the absolutive, whereas only *te is used in other cases);

Vartashen me / ka / *te.

On the other hand, it is calculated in [Schulze 2008: 255 ff.; Schulze 2005: 237 ff. (3.2.9.3)] that the medial demonstrative attributive ka is used significantly less frequently than proximal me and distal *te both in Nidzh and Vartashen texts. Thereby it is possible to analyze this as a system with the basic binary opposition *me ‘this’ / *te ‘that’.

The Nidzh attributive pronoun šo is probably secondary in the attributive function. The normal function of both Nidzh šo ~ šo-no and Vartashen še-no ~ šo-no is the non-attributive pronouns *(s)he, it, they’ [Gukasyan 1974: 276, 277].

Caucasian Albanian: Demonstrative attributive pronouns in the Swadesh function are too poorly documented in the palimpsests (cf. [Schulze 2008: 303 ff.; Gippert et al. 2008: II-38]).

For the sake of lexicostatistics, the list in [Gippert et al. 2008: II-66] fills the slot ‘this’ with -me and the slot ‘that’ with -te-, -še-. In actuality, -te- is a suffixal morpheme, added to the oblique stem of the neuter anaphoric pronoun [Gippert et al. 2008: II-38] and, accordingly, to nominal referentialised forms [Gippert et al. 2008: II-29]; -še- is found only in the damaged adverbial form ešol-oqoc ‘from this side’ and in the adverb e-še ‘(there?)’ [Gippert et al. 2008: II-38, IV-15] (in fact, the interpretation of the latter form is also quite uncertain, cf. [Gippert et al. 2008: VII-90 fn. 70]). In turn, -me is apparently found only in the proximal adverb e-me ‘here’ [Gippert et al. 2008: II-38, IV-15].


As described in [Kibrik et al. 1977a 2: 124] and [Kibrik 1994: 319], the system of Archi demonstrative attributive pronouns is ternary (excluding the vertical oriented forms): ya-CLASS ‘this (near the speaker)’ / ya-mu-CLASS ‘this (near the addressee)’ / to-CLASS ‘that (far from the speaker and addressee)’. Since the basic lexicon per se is not only anthropocentric, but eventually egocentric, we prefer to assume that the basic system is binary: ya-CLASS ‘this’ (near the speaker) / to-CLASS
'that (far from the speaker and addressee)'. It should be noted that, according to [Dirr 1908: 29], these two are statistically the most frequently used demonstrative pronouns.

**Kryts (proper):** Saadiev 1994: 420. According to [Saadiev 1994: 420], the basic system of demonstrative (Saadiev's "deictic") attributive pronouns is binary: li 'this' / lâ 'that'. According to [Saadiev 1994: 420 ff.], there exists another set of deictic pronouns: u-CLASS 'this' / î-CLASS 'that'. The difference between li / lâ and u-CLASS / î-CLASS is not explicated by Saadiev, but, since the pronouns of the latter set agree in class, it is likely that these are used independently, not attributively.

**Alyk Kryts:** Authier 2009: 62 f. According to the description and examples in [Authier 2009: 62 ff.], the same binary system of demonstrative attributive pronouns as in Kryts proper: lu ~ ha=lu 'this' / la ~ ha=la 'that'. Optional ha= is a Common Lezgian deictic emphatic stem.

**Budukh:** Talibov 2007: 121 f.; Meylanova 1984: 18, 192.

According to reports in [Talibov 2007: 121 f.] and [Meylanova 1984: 192], the Budukh system of demonstrative attributive pronouns is apparently ternary: ulu ~ olu 'this (near the speaker)'/ al-am ~ am 'this (near the addressee)' / ala 'that (far from the speaker and addressee)'. The medium member (al-am ~ am 'this (near the addressee)') seems marginal, and we prefer to exclude it from the list.

Kryts cognates suggest that Budukh stems ulu 'this' and ala 'that' are to be analyzed as compounds u-lu, a-la. In each case both morphemes represent meaningful elements. It should be noted, however, that in substantivized forms (i.e. modified by class-prefixes) the second morphemes can be omitted, thus u-CLASS ~ u-ulu-CLASS 'this' / a-CLASS ~ a-la-CLASS 'that' [Talibov 2007: 122; Meylanova 1984: 192].

In [Alekseev 1994: 267 ff.], the demonstrative pronouns are confused: ala is erroneously quoted for 'this', ulu - for 'that'. Talibov 2007: 121 f.; Meylanova 1984: 18, 192.


According to [Kibrik et al. 1999; Ibragimov 1990] and [Ibragimov & Nurramedov 2010], the Mishlesh and Literary Tsakhur system of demonstrative attributive pronouns is ternary: i-n 'this (near, here)' / ma-n 'that (there)' / še-n 'that (far away)' (or ha=ya-n / ha=ma-n / ha=še-n with the emphatic proclitics ha- 'here' and ha= 'there'). Browsing through texts in [Kibrik et al. 1999] suggests that ma-n (ha=ma-n) probably means 'this', but it is difficult to make a definite choice between i-n (ha=ya-n) and ma-n (ha=ma-n), so we treat them as synonyms for 'this'.

ma-n also functions as a personal pronoun of the 3rd p.

**Tsakhur-Kum Tsakhur:** according to [Schulze 1997: 39], the system of demonstrative attributive pronouns is ternary: i-n 'this (near, here)' / ma-n 'that (there, visible)' / še-n 'that (far away, invisible)'. Semantic and pragmatic nuances are unknown, however.

**Mikik Tsakhur:** Dirr 1913: 35 ff. According to [Dirr 1913], the Mikik system of demonstrative attributive pronouns is ternary: i-n 'this' / ma-n 'this' / še-n 'that' (with the emphatic variants ha=ya-n, ha=ma-n). We treat i-n and ma-n as synonyms for 'this'.

ma-n also functions as a personal pronoun of the 3rd p.

**Gelmets Tsakhur:** Not attested.


It is not easy to understand all the nuances of the Mukhad system of demonstrative attributive pronouns, based on the aforementioned sources. Apparently the basic opposition is binary: mi 'this' / ti 'that'. Both pronouns can be additionally supplemented with the emphatic morpheme ha-: he=mi / he=ti.

There also exists, however, a third pronoun ha [jna] (with the variant ha-d, where the final element seems to be a fossilized class exponent), which is used as both the personal pronoun of the 3rd p. ('s)he, it, they' and the demonstrative attributive pronoun. The exact meaning of the demonstrative ha is not entirely clear. In [Alekseev 1994a: 225], ha is glossed as 'this, that'; in [Ibragimov 1978: 81], as 'that (distal deixis)'; on the contrary, in [Makhmu dovina 2001: 170] ha is explained as 'that (near the addressee)'. In any case, ha, is, apparently, rarely used in the attributive meaning; according to [Dirr 1912: 38], the most frequent function of lu is the 3rd p. pronoun 's)he, it, they'.

**Ixrek Rutul:** Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 435.

Dzhamalov & Semedov do not provide much information, but, apparently, the Ixrek system is the same as the Mukhad one: mi-di 'this' / ti-n-di 'that', plus ha-di, which normally means 's)he, it, they', but can also be used as the demonstrative attributive 'that'. The final -di is the attributive suffix; -n- in ti-n-di 'that' originates from the oblique stem.

**Luchek Rutul:** Not attested.
Koshan Aghul: Suleymanov 1993: 128, 130. Binary system on the horizontal axis: *mi-me* ‘this’ / *ti-me* ‘that’. Additional members are *gi-me* ‘that (below)’ and *li-me* ‘that (above)’.

Similarly in the Arsug subdialect: *mi* ‘this’ / *ti* ‘that’ / *gi* ‘that (below)’ / *li* ‘that (above)’ [Suleymanov 1993: 128, 130].

Similarly in the Khudig subdialect: *me*-‘this’ / *ti*-‘that’ / *gi*-‘that (below)’ / *li*-‘that (above)’ [Suleymanov 1993: 128; Suleymanov 2003: 132].

Keren Aghul: Suleymanov 1993: 128; Shaumyan 1941: 59, 61. Binary system on the horizontal axis: *mi* ‘this’ / *ti* ‘that’. Additional members are *gi* ‘that (below)’ and *li* ‘that (above)’.

Gequn Aghul: Dirr 1907: 21; Suleymanov 1993: 128; Shaumyan 1941: 59, 61. Binary system on the horizontal axis: *me* ‘this’ / *te* ‘that’. Additional members are *ge* ‘that (below)’ and *le* ‘that (above)’.

Fite Aghul: Suleymanov 1993: 128. Binary system on the horizontal axis: *mi* ‘this’ / *ti* ‘that’. Additional members are *gi* ‘that (below)’ / *li* ‘that (above)’.

Aghul (proper): Suleymanov 1993: 128; Suleymanov 2003: 153; Shaumyan 1941: 59, 61. Binary system on the horizontal axis: *me* ‘this’ / *te* ‘that’. Additional members are *ge* ‘that (below)’ and *le* ‘that (above)’.

Common Aghul: As described in [Magometov 1970: 109 ff.; Suleymanov 1993: 128 ff.; Shaumyan 1941: 59 ff.], the basic quaternary system of demonstrative pronouns *‘this’ / ‘that’ / (below)’ / (above)’ coincides in all dialects (in the subdialects of Koshan they are supplemented with the enclitics -me(e) or -d of pronominal origin). In all the dialects these basic pronouns can be modified with the emphatic proclitic *ha* [Suleymanov 1993: 128]. The word *te* ~ *ti* ‘that’ is also normally used as the personal pronoun of the 3rd p. ‘he, she, it, they’.

It is reported in [Suleymanov 1993: 129] that in many dialects the pronouns *‘that’, ‘that (below)’ and ‘that (above)’ can be modified with the iconic proclitic *aw (~ ho=a ~ he=x* (depending on the dialect), which expresses distal deixis, e.g., Keren *ha=ti* ‘that (far horizontally)’ / *ha=gi* ‘that (far below)’ / *ha=li* ‘that (far above). Apparently these forms are rare and marginal.

Northern Tabasaran: Magometov 1965: 178. According to Magometov’s data, the Dyubek system of attributive deictic pronouns on the horizontal axis is binary: *mu ~ mu-mu* ‘this’ / *du-mu* ‘that’. Two additional “vertical” members are *ju-mu* ‘that (below)’ and *qu-mu* ‘that (above)’.

In the Khanag subdialect, the ‘horizontal’ system can be more complicated, being extended with the third member *tu*. Uslar describes the Khanag ‘horizontal’ system as ternary: *mu* ‘this (near the speaker)’ / *du-mu* ‘this (near the addressee)’ / *tu-mu* ‘that (far from the speaker and addressee). The analysis is actually not quite correct, as follows from Uslar’s own remark: ‘This explanation of *mu* / *du-mu* / *tu-mu* is undoubtedly right, because it has been adopted from various sources. But Tabasaran speakers themselves pay little attention to such semantic nuances in the natural speech” [Uslar 1979: 136]. Apparently Uslar implies that the opposition between *du-mu* and *tu-mu* is in fact desemanticized.

According to [Dirr 1905: 37 f.], however, the Khanag “horizontal” system is binary: *mu (~ mu-mu) ‘this’ / du-mu (~ tu-mu ~ du ~ tu) ‘that’. See Common Tabasaran notes on this controversy.

As described in [Kibrik et al. 1977a: 2: 124] and [Kibrik 1994: 319], the system of Archi demonstrative attributive pronouns on the horizontal axis (i.e., excluding the vertical oriented forms) is ternary: *ya-class* ‘this (near the speaker)’ / *ya-mu-class* ‘this (near the addressee)’ / *to-class* ‘that (far from the speaker and addressee). According to [Dirr 1908: 29], *ya-class* / *to-class* are statistically the most frequently used demonstrative pronouns. We prefer to assume that the basic Archi system is binary: *ya-class ‘this’ (near the speaker)’ / *to-class’ ‘that (far from the speaker and addressee); in turn, the complex demonstrative *ya-mu-class ‘this (near the addressee)’ looks like a recent formation, created for some specific semantic or pragmatic nuances.

Two additional “vertical” members are *gu-d’u* ‘that (below)’, *au-d’u* ‘that (above)’ [Kibrik et al. 1977a: 2: 124; Kibrik 1994: 319].

Southern Tabasaran: Magometov 1965: 178-179. This word is actually from the Khiv subdialect; the proper Kondik pronoun is unknown.

According to Magometov’s data, the Khiv system of attributive deictic pronouns on the horizontal axis is binary: *mu ‘this’ / du-mu (~ ha-t-mu) ‘that’*. On the variant with *h*- (ha-t-mu) see Common Tabasaran notes. Two Khiv “vertical” pronouns are: *ku-mu* ‘that (below)’ / *ku-mu* ‘that (above)’ [Magometov 1965: 178].

The Literary Tabasaran ‘horizontal’ system is also binary: *mu ‘this’ / du-mu ‘that’, as described in [Zhirkov 1948: 98 ff.]. According to Zhirkov, “vertical” pronouns ‘that (below)’ / ‘that (above)’ were lost. On the contrary, in [Khanmagomedov &
Shalbuzov 2001: 151, 282, 433] the literary "horizontal" system is evasively described as *μυ 'this' / *t-μυ 'that' with the third member *δυ-μυ 'that' (difference between *t-μυ and *δυ-μυ is not explicated).

**Common Tabasaran:** In all the dialects the aforementioned deictic pronouns can be additionally modified with the emphatic pronominal proclitic *k̡a= [Magometov 1965: 178; Zhirkov 1948: 101; Dirr 1905: 37].

It is possible that the Proto-Tabasaran system of attributive deictic pronouns on the horizontal axis was indeed ternary, as it is described by Uslar for the Khanag subdialect: *μυ 'this (near the speaker)' / *δυ 'that (near the addressee)' / *t� 'that (far from the speaker and addressee)'. In all the dialects, the absolutive forms of the two latter members are secondarily modified with the desemanticized morpheme *-μυ, i.e. *δυ-μυ and *t�-μυ.

In fact, however, the third member *t� (or *t�-μυ) seems very rare and marginal in the described Tabasaran dialects. In [Dirr 1905: 37 ff.], the forms *t� and *t�-μυ 'that' is noted only in parentheses as a variant of *δυ-μυ; in [Magometov 1965: 176 ff.], only the emphatic form *δυ-μυ 'exactly that' is observed; no forms with the morpheme *t� are quoted in [Zhirkov 1948: 98 ff.].

Thus, according to the dialectal overview in [Magometov 1965: 176 ff.], the common Tabasaran basic opposition on the horizontal axis is currently binary: *μυ 'this' / *δυ-μυ 'that'.

**Gyune Lezgi:** Uslar 1896: 69, 70. According to [Uslar 1896: 69 ff.], the Gyune system of attributive deictic pronouns on the horizontal axis is binary: i 'this (near the speaker)' / a 'this (near the addressee)' / a-č'a 'that (far from the speaker and addressee)'. Two additional "vertical" members are a-χa 'that (below)' and a-a'n'i 'that (above)'.

The Literary Lezgi system has been semantically transformed: i 'this' / a 'that' / a-č'a 'yonder' / a-a'n'i 'that (below)' / a'i-n'i 'that (above)' [Alekseev & Sheykho 1997: 46; Haspelmath 1993: 190] (somewhat differently in [Gaydarov et al. 2009: 156]). As noted in [Haspelmath 1993: 190], however, only i 'this' and a 'that' are frequent in the modern literary language, other pronouns are marginal. Thus the Literary Lezgi system is, in fact, binary.

**Proto-Lezgian:**

NCED: 993. Distribution: The Proto-Lezgian system of the demonstrative pronouns can hardly be reconstructed in all details. It is particularly unclear whether the system was binary - 'this' / 'that' - or ternary: 'this' / 'that (near)' / 'that (far)'.

Nevertheless, some general considerations can be proposed. The main data on the pronouns on the horizontal axis are summarized as follows (synchronically basic forms are bold-faced as opposed to statistically marginal ones):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THIS/THAT</th>
<th>Udi</th>
<th>Archi</th>
<th>Kryts</th>
<th>Budukh</th>
<th>Tsakhur</th>
<th>Rutul</th>
<th>Aghul</th>
<th>Tabasaran</th>
<th>Lezgi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>μV</em> [NCED: 842]</td>
<td><em>μV</em></td>
<td>με this</td>
<td>μα-μυ that (near)</td>
<td>μα-μυ that (near)</td>
<td>με this</td>
<td>με this</td>
<td>με this</td>
<td>με this</td>
<td>με that (far)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>t�</em> [NCED: 993]</td>
<td><em>t�</em></td>
<td>to that (far)</td>
<td><em>t�</em></td>
<td><em>t�</em></td>
<td><em>t�</em></td>
<td><em>t�</em></td>
<td><em>t�</em></td>
<td>ti that</td>
<td>ti that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>δV</em> [NCED: 404]</td>
<td><em>δV</em></td>
<td>t�-μα this</td>
<td>t�-μα this</td>
<td>t�-μα this</td>
<td>t�-μα this</td>
<td>t�-μα this</td>
<td>t�-μα this</td>
<td>t�-μα that (far)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>t�</em> [NCED: 214]</td>
<td><em>t�</em></td>
<td>t�-μα this</td>
<td>t�-μα this</td>
<td>t�-μα this</td>
<td>t�-μα this</td>
<td>t�-μα this</td>
<td>t�-μα this</td>
<td>t�-μα that (far)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>t�</em> [NCED: 775]</td>
<td><em>t�</em></td>
<td>t�-μα this</td>
<td>t�-μα this</td>
<td>t�-μα this</td>
<td>t�-μα this</td>
<td>t�-μα this</td>
<td>t�-μα this</td>
<td>t�-μα that (far)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>t�</em> [LEDb: #187]</td>
<td><em>t�</em></td>
<td>t�-μα this</td>
<td>t�-μα this</td>
<td>t�-μα this</td>
<td>t�-μα this</td>
<td>t�-μα this</td>
<td>t�-μα this</td>
<td>t�-μα that (far)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The demonstrative pronoun of proximal deixis 'this' can be assuredly reconstructed as *μV* [NCED: 842]; this function was retained in Udi and many Nuclear Lezgian languages (Tsakhur, Rutul, Aghul, Tabasaran). In Archi, this root forms the secondary pronoun of medial deixis ya-μυ 'near the addressee'.
Reconstruction of the distal deixis pronoun 'that' is more complicated. As one can see, forms that originate from virtual *t’V and virtual *tV are in complementary distribution among languages. Thus, it is reasonable to suppose that these go back to a single protoform with occasional sound irregularities (this is not rare in grammatical morphemes). External comparison suggests that the original shape should be *tV [NCED: 993]; if so, we deal with secondary tenseness in Udi and secondary ejectivization in Lezgi (both cases are probably iconically conditioned). The pronoun *tV (~ *tV) is the obvious candidate for the status of the Proto-Lezgian pronoun 'that' (this function was retained in Udi, Archi and the most of Nuclear Lezgian lects).

It should be noted that in [NCED: 404], the ejective forms in Udi (tx) and in Lezgi (rā) are included into the entry 'dV. First, this is not likely due to the aforementioned considerations. Second, evidence for the Proto-Lezgian demonstrative morpheme 'dV is relatively weak: this is the basic Tabasaran pronoun du 'that' and the second element of the Archi vertical pronoun gu-du 'that (below)', uu-du 'that (above). Other descendants of 'dV, listed in [NCED: 404], should be excluded: Kryts ī-d, Budukh a-d 'that' (used independently), where -d is in fact a synchronic class exponent; apparently in Rutul ha ~ ha-d 'she, it, they', the final -d represents the same fossilized grammatical morpheme.

Note also that it is theoretically possible to reconstruct *tV (~*tV) as the specific pronoun of distal deixis 'that (far)'. In such a case, *?i [NCED: 214] is the main candidate for the Proto-Lezgian pronoun of medial deixis 'that (near)'.

To sum up, the Proto-Lezgian system of the demonstrative pronouns in the horizontal row can be reconstructed as binary *mV 'this' / *tV 'that' or (with less certainty) ternary *mV 'this/ *?i 'that (near) / *tV 'that (far).

The totally restructured South Lezgian (Kryts, Budukh) system probably originates from the old "vertical" demonstrative pronouns, thus in [NCED: 775].

The morpheme *ha- [NCED: 486] is the Common Lezgian pronominal emphatic "augment" (thus Rutul ha 'that' may in fact originate from *ha-ʔa). The original Proto-Lezgian status and exact function of other demonstrative morphemes listed above are not clear.

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences are regular except for (iconic?) ejectivization/tenseness in Udi and Lezgi and vowel fluctuation among various lects (perhaps of contracted origin).

Semantics and structure: Primary pronominal root.

86. THIS
Nidzh Udi mo {mo} (1), Vartashen Udi me {me} (1), Archi ya-class (2), Kryts (proper) li (3), Alyk Kryts lu (3), Budukh u=lu ~ o=lu {улы ~ олы} (3) / u-li ~ o-li {улы, олы} (4), Mishlesh Tsakhur i-n ~ ha=y-n {ин, гыйн} (2) / ma-n ~ ha=ma-n {ма ~ гыйм} (1), Mikik Tsakhur i-n ~ ha=y-n (2) / ma-n ~ ha=ma-n (1), Mukhad Rutul mi {ми} (1), Ixrek Rutul mi-di {миди} (1), Koshan Aghul mi-me (1), Keren Aghul mi (1), Gequn Aghul me (1), Fite Aghul mi (1), Aghul (proper) me (1), Northern Tabasaran mu ~ mu-mu (1), Southern Tabasaran mu (1), Gyune Lezgi i (2), Proto-Lezgian *mV (1).

References and notes:

Common Udi: Common Udi *me. See notes on 'that'.
Caucasian Albanian: see notes on 'that'.
Kryts (proper): Saadiev 1994: 420. See notes on 'that'.
Alyk Kryts: Authier 2009: 62. Simple lu or complex ha=lu. See notes on 'that'.


Tsakhur-Kum Tsakhur: see notes on ‘that’.

Mikik Tsakhur: Not attested.


Tsakhur-Kum Tsakhur: see notes on ‘that’.

Mikik Tsakhur: Not attested.

Koshan Aghul: Suleymanov 1993: 128, 130. See notes on ‘that’.

Keren Aghul: Suleymanov 1993: 128; Shaumyan 1941: 59, 61. See notes on ‘that’.

Gequn Aghul: Dirr 1907: 21; Suleymanov 1993: 128; Shaumyan 1941: 59, 61. See notes on ‘that’.

Fite Aghul: Suleymanov 1993: 128. See notes on ‘that’.


Northern Tabasaran: Magometov 1965: 178. See notes on ‘that’.

Southern Tabasaran: Magometov 1965: 178. This word is actually from the Khiv subdialect; the proper Kondik pronoun is unknown. Further see notes on ‘that’.

Gyune Lezgi: Uslar 1896: 69, 70. Meaning ‘this (near the speaker)’. See ‘that’ for further notes.


Reconstruction shape: Correspondences are regular, except for vowel fluctuation among various lects.

Semantics and structure: Primary pronominal root.

87. THOU₁

Nidzh Udi hu-n {гъун} (1), Vartashen Udi u-n {yiŋ} (1), Archi u-n (1), Kryts (proper) vu-n ~ vi-n (1), Alyk Kryts vu-n (1), Budukh vi-n {вън} (1), Mishlesh Tsakhur ku {гъй} (2), Mikik Tsakhur ku (2), Gelmets Tsakhur ku (2), Mukhad Rutul wi {вън} (1), Ixrek Rutul ku {гъй} (2), Luchek Rutul wi (1), Koshan Aghul wi-n (1), Keren Aghul wi-n (1), Gequn Aghul wu-n (1), Fite Aghul wu-n (1), Aghul (proper) wu-n (1), Northern Tabasaran iwˈu (1), Southern Tabasaran uwˈu (1), Gyune Lezgi wu-n (1), Proto-Lezgian *уo-n (1).

References and notes:


Common Udi: A suppletive paradigm is retained in both dialects: *u-n [abs., erg.] / *vi [gen.] / *vu- [obl.]. Note the laryngeal prothesis in Nidzh huu (not infrequent phenomenon in the Nidzh dialect).


Budukh: Meylanova 1984: 192; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 222; Alekseev 1994: 267; Talibov 2007: 119; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 117. Paradigm: \(w\)-n [abs., erg.] / \(w\) [gen.] / \(w\)-z [dat.]. In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010] the absolutive variant \(w\)-n is also quoted (an error?).

Mishlesh Tsakhur: Kibrik et al. 1999: 130; Ibragimov 1990: 104; Ibragimov & Nurmakelev 2010: 518; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 117. Paradigm: \(x\) [abs., erg.] / \(yis-in\) [gen.]/ \(wa-s\) [dat.].

Tsakhur-Kum Tsakhur: \(x\)u [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 222; Schulze 1997: 37]. Paradigm: \(x\)u [abs., erg.] / \(yis-in\) [gen.].

Mikik Tsakhur: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 222; Dirr 1913: 32. Paradigm: \(x\)u [abs.]/ \(yis-in\) [gen.]/ \(wa-s\) [dat.].


Common Tsakhur: The Tsakhur absolutive form \(wu\) 'thou', which is sometimes quoted in secondary literature as a free variant for \(xu\) (thus, e.g., [Alekseev 1985: 72]), has not been found in the primary sources that are available to us.

Mukhad Rutul: Dirr 1912: 35; Ibragimov 1978: 77, 212; Makhmudova 2001: 169; Alekseev 1994a: 225; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 117. Paradigm: \(w\)i [abs.] / \(wi-di\) [gen.]/ \(wa-\) / \(wa-d\) [erg.]/ \(wa-s\) [dat.].

Ixrek Rutul: Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 434; Ibragimov 1978: 212; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 117. Paradigm: \(w\)i [abs.]/ \(wi-di\) [gen.]/ \(wa-\) / \(wa-d\) [erg.]/ \(wa-s\) [dat.].

Luchek Rutul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 222. Paradigm: \(w\)i [abs.]/ \(wi-di\) [gen.]/ \(wa-d\) [erg.]/ \(wa-s\) [dat.].

Common Rutul: Shinaz dialect: \(xu\) [abs.]/ \(wi-di\) [gen.]/ \(wu-ye\) / \(wu-y\) [erg.]/ \(wu-s\) [dat.]. [Ibragimov 1978: 153; Dirr 1912: 35].

Muxrek dialect: \(w\)i [abs.]/ \(wi-di\) [gen.]/ \(wa-d\) [erg.]/ \(wa-s\) [dat.]. [Ibragimov 1978: 177].

Borch-Khnow dialect: \(xu\) [abs.]/ \(xu-du\) [gen.]/ \(xu-\) [erg.]/ \(xu-s\) [dat.]. [Ibragimov 1978: 262].

One of the most economic scenarios presupposes reconstructing for Proto-Rutul a suppletive paradigm of 'thou' with four stems: \(w\)i [abs.]/ \(wu\) [erg.]/ \(wu-di\) [gen.]/ \(wu-\) [dat.]. In Mukhad, Muxrek & Luchek the paradigm was completely restructured after the absolutive and oblique stems \(w\)i / \(wu-\): gen. \(wu-di\) is a regular synchronic formation on the basis of abs. \(w\)i, whereas the new ergative form is based on oblique \(wu-\). In Borch-Khnow the paradigm, on the contrary, was analogically levelled after the ergative \(wu\); oblique \(xu-s\)-represents a hybrid of old \(xu-\) and the new stem \(wu-\). Similarly, the Ixrek paradigm was levelled up after ergative \(wu\), but the old genitive \(wu-di\) is still retained. The situation in Shinaz is more complicated: apparently the old genitive form was superseded with the new formation based on abs. \(w\)i (an innovation shared with the Mukhad, Muxrek & Luchek dialects, which surround the Shinaz area, see the map in [Ibragimov 1978: 14]) and subsequently Shinaz abs. \(w\)i was superseded with the ergative morpheme \(wu\).


Keren Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 222; Magometov 1970: 101. Paradigm: \(wu-n\) [abs.]/ \(wu-s\) [erg.]/ \(wu-s\) [dat.]/ \(wu\) [gen.].

Gequn Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 222; Dirr 1907: 19; Magometov 1970: 101. Paradigm: \(wu-n\) [abs., erg.]/ \(wu-s\) [dat.]/ \(wu\) [gen.].

Fite Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 222; Magometov 1970: 101. Paradigm: \(wu-n\) [abs., erg.]/ \(wu-s\) [dat.]/ \(wu-\) [gen.].

Aghul (proper): Suleymanov 1993: 125; Suleymanov 2003: 47. Paradigm: \(wu-n\) [abs., erg.]/ \(wu-s\) [dat.]/ \(wu\) [gen.].

Northern Tabasaran: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 222; Magometov 1965: 170. Paradigm: \(wu\) [abs., erg., obl.]/ \(yw\) [gen.].

The same in the Khudig subdialect: \(wu\) [abs., erg., obl.]/ \(yw\) [gen.]

Southern Tabasaran: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 222. Paradigm: \(wu\) [abs., erg., obl.]/ \(yw\) [gen.].

The same in the Khiv subdialect: \(wu\) [abs., erg., obl.]/ \(yw\) [gen.]

Gyune Lezgi: Uslar 1896: 59. Paradigm: \(wu-n\) [abs.]/ \(wu-n-a\) 'nu [erg.]/ \(wu-n\) 'nu [gen.]/ \(wu\) [obl.]. The ergative variant \(nu\) looks like a reduction of the full form \(wu-n\).

The same in Literary Lezgi: \(wu-n\) [abs.]/ \(wu-n-a\) 'nu [erg.]/ \(wu\) [gen.]/ \(wu\) [obl.]

The same in the Akhyt dialect: \(wu-n\) [abs.]/ \(wu-n-a\) 'nu [erg.]/ \(wu\) [gen.]/ \(wu\) [obl.]

Proto-Lezgian: NCED: 483, 1014. Distribution: Retained as the independent personal pronoun of the 2nd p. sg. in all lects. The detailed reconstruction, however, is not entirely clear. We prefer to reconstruct the following Proto-Lezgian suppletive
paradigm: *p- [abs.] / *su [erg.] / *CLASS=OES("") [gen.] / *p- [obl.], even though none of the known Lezgian lects has preserved this assumed paradigm intact.

In almost all the lects (except for Tsakhur, Rutul), *-forms were completely eliminated. The new ergative forms coincide with abs. *p(-n) or, occasionally, are based on obl. *p-. The new genitive forms normally represent something like *q- or *e-, although in Kryts, the genitive is based on obl. *p-, whereas Koshan Aghul and Tabasaran yaw ~ yew 'of thee' is a hybrid of old *CLASS=OES("") and the q-forms. It should be noted that the origin of the common genitive *q- ~ *e- is unclear.

The only group in which *-forms have survived is West Lezgian (Tsakhur, Rutul). In Tsakhur, the absolutive coincides with the ergative *ʁu. Many Tsakhur dialects, however, demonstrate the subsequent secondary derivation of the ergative and genitive forms from obl. *p-. The Rutul situation is more complicated, although it is possible to derive all the variety of attested Rutul systems from the Proto-Rutul paradigm *wi [abs.] / *su [erg.] / *yuv-di [gen.] / wa- [dat.], which directly continues the assumed Proto-Lezgian paradigm.

Note that pace [NCED: 483] Nidzh Udi hun has nothing to do with *su-n, but originates from Proto-Caucasian Albanian-Udi *wu-n with the (not infrequent) Nidzh prothesis h-.

As in the case of the 1st sg. pronoun T q.v., the Tabasaran absolutive-ergative-oblique stem iwu- represents a hybrid of the old absolutive and genitive forms.

The absolutive form can be safely reconstructed with the nasal suffix: *p-n. The only lects that lack the nasal element are some Rutul dialects (wi for expected *wi-n), where we probably deal with influence on the part of erg. su 'thou' and abs. zi T.

Reconstruction shape: Basic correspondences seem regular, although *q is a very rare Proto-Lezgian phoneme.

Semantics and structure: Primary pronominal root. The suppletive paradigm: *p- [abs.] / *su [erg.] / *CLASS=OES("") [gen.] / *p- [obl.].

87. THOU₂

Nidzh Udi vi (su) (1), Vartashen Udi vi (su) (1), Archi wi-t (1), Mishlesh Tsakhur yik-in (иикъинь) (2), Mikik Tsakhur wa-s-in (1), Gelmets Tsakhur yik'-in (2), Ixrek Rutul yuw-di (2), Koshan Aghul yaw-ir ~ yaw (1), Northern Tabasaran yaw (1), Southern Tabasaran yaw (1), Proto-Lezgian *su (2).

References and notes:

Nidzh Udi: Genitive form.
Vartashen Udi: Genitive form.
Archi: Genitive form.
Mishlesh Tsakhur: Genitive form.
Mikik Tsakhur: Genitive form.
Gelmets Tsakhur: Genitive form.
Ixrek Rutul: Genitive form.
Koshan Aghul: Genitive form.
Northern Tabasaran: Genitive form.
Southern Tabasaran: Genitive form.
Proto-Lezgian: Ergative form.

88. TONGUE

Nidzh Udi muz {музь} (1), Vartashen Udi muz {музь} (1), Archi mac (1), Kryts (proper) mez (1), Alyk Kryts mez (1), Budukh maż ~ mez {маъз ~ мезь} (1), Mishlesh Tsakhur miz {мизь}
(1), Mikik Tsakhur *miz* (1), Gelmets Tsakhur *miz* (1), Mukhad Rutul *miz {muz}* (1), Ixrek Rutul *miz {muz}* (1), Luchek Rutul *miz* (1), Koshan Aghul *mez* (1), Keren Aghul *mez* (1), Geqn Aghul *mez* (1), Fite Aghul *miz* (1), Aghul (proper) *mez* (1), Northern Tabasaran *milʒ* (1), Southern Tabasaran *melʒ ~ melz* (1), Gyune Lezgi *meʒ* (1), Proto-Lezgian *melc*: (1).

References and notes:


Tsakhur-Kum Tsakhur: *miz* [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 15].


Luchek Rutul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 15.


Aghul (proper): Suleymanov 2003: 133; Shaumyan 1941: 151. The same in the Duldug subdialect: *miz* 'tongue' [Shaumyan 1941: 151].

Northern Tabasaran: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 15.

The same in the Khanag subdialect: *milj* 'tongue' [Uslar 1979: 856, 1010; Dirr 1905: 195, 247]. The same in other subdialects: Khyuryuk, Kumi *milj* {милжъ} 'tongue' [Genko 2005: 120].

Southern Tabasaran: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 15.

The same in the Khiv subdialect: *melj* {мелецъ} 'tongue' [Genko 2005: 119]. The same in Literary Tabasaran: *melz* {мезъ} 'tongue' [Khanmagomedov & Shalbuzov 2001: 227].


Proto-Lezgian: NCED: 802. Distribution: One of the most stable Lezgian roots, retained as the basic term for 'tongue' in all lects. Replacements: ('tongue > language') (Caucasian Albanian, Udi, Alyk Kryts, Tsakhur).

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular.
Semantics and structure: Primary substantive root. The oblique stem is *melcː*.

89. TOOTH
Nidzh Udi *ul-uχ* {y.ulyx} (1), Vartashen Udi *ul-uχ* {y.ulyx} (1), Archi *sot:-* (1), Kryts (proper) *sil* (1), Alyk Kryts *sil* (1), Budukh *sil* {cui} (1), Mishlesh Tsakhur *sɨlɨi* {cuiu} (1), Mikik Tsakhur *sɨlɨi* (1), Gelmets Tsakhur *sɨlɨi* (1), Mukhad Rutul *sil-ab* {cui.ala} (1), Ixrek Rutul *sil-ab* {cui.ala} (1), Luchek Rutul *sis* (2), Koshan Aghul *selew* (1), Keren Aghul *sileb* (1), Gequn Aghul *selew ~ silew* (1), Proto-Lezgian *sil:* (1).

References and notes:


Common Udi: Common Udi *ul-uχ*, with the fossilized plural suffix *-uχ*.

Caucasian Albanian: Unattested.


Distinct from the specific term *gˤañži* ‘molar’ [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 17; Kibrik et al. 1977b: 230; Chumakina et al. 2007; Dirr 1908: 137].


Distinct from the specific term *saχ* ‘molar’ [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 17].


Distinct from the specific term *azu ~ azu sil* ‘molar’ [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 17; Meylanova 1984: 18], borrowed from Azerbaijani *azi diši* ‘molar’ (Budukh phonetics suggests the dialectal variant *azu*).


Distinct from *azi* ‘molar’ [Ibragimov 1990: 149; Ibragimov & Nurmandov 2010: 29], borrowed from Azerbaijani *azi diši* ‘molar’.

Tsakhur-Kum Tsakhur: *sɨli* [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 16]. Distinct from the specific term *azi* ‘molar’ [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 17], borrowed from Azerbaijani *azi diši* ‘molar’.

Mikik Tsakhur: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 16; Dirr 1913: 201, 226. Distinct from the more specific terms: *azi ~ azu* ‘fang’ [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 17] (ultimately borrowed from Azerbaijani *azi diši* ‘molar’) and inherited *xayik-in sɨli* ‘molar’ [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 17], literally ‘tooth of xayik’ (*xayik* ?).


Mukhad Rutul: Dirr 1912: 171, 191; Ibragimov 1978: 114; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 199. Regular paradigm: *sil-ab* [sg.] / *sil-ab-ir* [pl.].
* / *sil-ab-ir [pl.]. According to examples in [Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006], this is the basic term for 'tooth' (final -ab is a fossilized plural exponent).

A second candidate is *sɪs [cəc] 'tooth' [Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 236, 343]; no examples have been found, but *sɪs is used in the expression for 'to bite' q.v.: *sɪs hər-, literally 'tooth + to do'.

Distinct from the more specific term *wɨgin [u'urɪn] with polysemy: 'fang / wedge' [Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 49].


Distinct from the more specific terms: *səb-ˌ*ad *sɪs 'molar', literally 'tooth of root' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 17] and *wɨgin 'fang' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 17].


It seems that the Proto-Rutul term for 'tooth (in general)' should be reconstructed as *sil; early on, its plural form *sil-ab spread onto the singular number in all dialects, but currently the new singular form *sil-ab is being superseded by the unrelated form *sɪs. The underlying meaning of *sɪs can be 'incisor' or 'canine tooth', because in many Rutul dialects the expression for 'to bite' q.v. is based on this substantive: *sɪs + 'to do'.

Koshan Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 16; Shaumyan 1941: 162.

Distinct from *sɛxʷ 'molar' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 17] and *kænː 'fang' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 17].


Gequn Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 16; Dirr 1907: 142, 173; Shaumyan 1941: 162. In [Dirr 1907], *silew is glossed as 'incisor', see notes on common Aghul. Distinct from *sɛxʷ 'molar' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 17; Dirr 1907: 141] and *kænː 'fang' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 17].


Common Aghul: Historically *sil-əb 'tooth' with the fossilized plural exponent. It should be noted that, according to [Shaumyan 1941: 162], in all the dialects *sil-əb (~ *u) means specifically 'incisor', not 'tooth (in general)'; the same is proposed for Richa in [Dirr 1907]. Apparently 'incisor' is an inaccurate gloss, cf. the following passages, which prove the generic meaning 'tooth' for *sil-əb (~ *u): Tygic Foolhardy guys in a small room = teeth' (a riddle) [Shaumyan 1941: 123], Fite 'I have cracked a nut with my teeth' [Magometov 1970: 83].


**Common Tabasaran**: At least three Proto-Tabasaran terms can be reconstructed with exact meanings: siliβ 'tooth in general' (historically sil-db with the fossilized plural suffix; note various ways of the reduction of unaccented vowels in individual dialects), sar- 'molar', kanč- ~ kanč- 'fang'. The original meanings and status of Southern sars (shifted to 'tooth in general' in Khiv, if Genko's gloss is correct) and suχ-w (the second word for 'molar') are unclear.

**Gyune Lezgi**: Uslar 1896: 546, 613. Synchronically suppletive paradigm: sas [abs.] / sar-ːa- [obl.] / sar-ːar [pl.]. The oblique morpheme sar- originates from the old plural form *ss-ɑɾ ~ *sɨs-ɑɾ < *sas-ɑɾ. See [Haspelmath 1993: 62] for such a reduction in Literary Lezgi. This analysis is unambiguously proven by the Akhty paradigm sas [abs.] / ss-ɑ- [obl.] (see below).

Distinct from Gyune sʰɑχ [abs.] / suχ-w-ːa- [obl.] 'molar' [Uslar 1896: 546, 613]. Cf. also Gyune kʰɪɾ, which is glossed only as 'hook' in [Uslar 1896: 477].


The same in the Akhty dialect: Khlyut sas [abs.] / ss-ɑ- [obl.] / ss-ɑɾ [pl.] 'tooth' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 16]. Distinct from Khlyut kʰɑɾ, which is glossed only as 'molar' in all languages, except for several Nuclear Lezgian lects.

In some Rutul dialects (Luchek, Khnyukh, Shinaz), Southern Tabasaran (Khiv) and probably in all Lezgi dialects, this stem was superseded with *sars (~ s) [LEDb: #110] - an areal Lezgi-induced isogloss. The original meaning of *sars is unclear, because this root is not attested outside Rutul, Tabasaran and Lezgi and lacks external North Caucasian etymology (some Rutul data may point to the local meaning 'incisor' or 'canine tooth', although it is not certain).

**Proto-Lezgian**: NCED: 326. Distribution: Retained as the generic term for 'tooth' in all languages, except for several Nuclear Lezgian lects.

In some Rutul dialects (Luchek, Khnyukh, Shinaz), Southern Tabasaran (Khiv) and probably in all Lezgi dialects, this stem was superseded with *sars (~ s) [LEDb: #110] - an areal Lezgi-induced isogloss. The original meaning of *sars is unclear, because this root is not attested outside Rutul, Tabasaran and Lezgi and lacks external North Caucasian etymology (some Rutul data may point to the local meaning 'incisor' or 'canine tooth', although it is not certain).

**Proto-Lezgian** - *qʰ:at* ~ *qʰ:at*-Vy (2).

**References and notes**


Caucasian Albanian: Unattested. The restoration of the lexeme šod ‘tree’ is uncertain, see [Gippert et al. 2008: IV-22, VII-21, 90 fn. 52]. Cf. the loanword durud ‘piece of wood’ [Gippert et al. 2008: IV-13], for which see above.


Mishlesh Tsakhur: Kibrik et al. 1999: 880, 893; Ibragimov & Namamedov 2010: 188; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 403. In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010], the variant yav is also quoted.


Tsakhur-Kum Tsakhur: yva ‘tree, os ‘log, firewood’ [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 95, 162].

Mukhad Rutul: Dirr 1912: 179, 189; Ibragimov 1978: 90; 117; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 403. Distinct from us ‘(fire)wood’ [Dirr 1912: 175].


Common Rutul: An important case of polysemy is attested in the Muxrek dialect: χuk ‘tree / forest’ [Ibragimov 1978: 188].


Aghul: Suleymanov 2003: 127; Shaumyan 1941: 184. Polysemy: ‘tree / log, firewood’ (for the latter meaning see [Suleymanov 2003: 54 sub aux, 79 sub duč]).

Common Aghul: Common Aghul kür represents the Proto-Aghul term for ‘tree’. Fite dar with polysemy: ‘tree / forest’ looks like an innovation, because dar denotes ‘forest’ or ‘forest; (piece of) wood’ in Keren (Richa), Gequn (Burkikhan) and Proper Aghul.
(Tpig). It must be noted, however, that *dar should be a better candidate for Proto-Aghul ‘tree’ in the light of external Lezgian comparison.


**Gyune Lezgi**: Uslar 1896: 559, 609. Distinct from Gyune *k'ar's* ‘wood, firewood, log, billet’ [Uslar 1896: 472].


**Proto-Lezgian**: NCED: 466. Distribution: From the distributional point of view, three roots are in competition here, attested with the meaning ‘tree’ in Udi, Archi and Proto-Nuclear Lezgian respectively. We fill the slot with the Archi root, because it is the only one that possesses an external North Caucasian cognate with the meaning ‘tree’ (Avar ‘tree’, further to Nakh ‘stem, stalk’, Lak ‘bush, shrub’, Dargi ‘bush, shrub’). The stem *χːʷar* ~ *χːʷar*- *V* [NCED: 466] means ‘tree’ in Archi and ‘tree stump, stub’ in Luchek Rutul (*qːʷar* [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 98]), but was lost in the rest of Lezgian. Cf. also in other Rutul dialects: Shiniz Rutul *qːʷat*-bi-r ‘lock, doorlock’ [Ibragimov 1978: 163] (with the double plural suffix) and Ixrek Rutul *qːʷar* [kaaral] ‘mousetrap’ [Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 156]; formally, these forms contain the same root, although the semantic development is not obvious. It must be noted that Archi *qːʷar* ‘tree’ has been accidentally overlooked by the authors in [NCED] and has not been included into the dictionary (the Archi cognate permits to specify the phonetic shape of the Proto-Lezgian form).

The second candidate is *χːʷar* ~ *χːʷar*-t: [NCED: 1079] (as proposed in [NCED: 888], Lezgian *-t: < North Caucasian *-di* is a suffix, which sometimes modifies plant names). The prefixed stem *χːʷar*-t: means ‘tree’ in Udi, whereas in other Lezgian languages, *χːʷar* and *χːʷar*-t: denote ‘log, pole’, ‘ceiling’, ‘beam’. External North Caucasian comparanda (if correct) suggest that the original meaning of Lezgian *χːʷar* ~ *χːʷar*-t: could be ‘a k. of foliage tree’ (probably an endemic species, which was basically used as building wood). It must be noted that *pace* [NCED: 1079], Luchek Rutul *χːʷar-čid* ‘lime tree’ is not related here, but regularly originates from Proto-Lezgian *χːʷar i χːʷar-čid: lime tree’ [NCED: 888].

The third candidate is *tar* [NCED: 399]. This root is attested with the meaning ‘tree’ in South Lezgian (Kryts Proper, Budukh) and Lezgi, having been lost in the rest of languages (except for Aghul, see below). Formal distribution suggests that this item should be reconstructed as the Proto-Nuclear Lezgian term for ‘tree’. In non-Koshan Aghul, *tar* means ‘forest’, except for Fite Aghul, where *dar* has secondarily acquired the polysemy ‘tree / forest’. It is theoretically possible to suppose that *dar* actually represents the Proto-Aghul term for ‘tree’ and the shift ‘tree’ > ‘forest’ for *dar* is a late areal isogloss, which has not fully affected the Fite border territory. Such a solution does not seem apt, however, because the Common Aghul root for ‘tree’ is *k'ar's*, attested with this meaning in all Aghul dialects including Fite (there are two synchronic synonyms for ‘tree’ in Fite).

Several replacements of *tar* occurred in individual Nuclear Lezgian lects. The most interesting substitution took place in Alyk Kryts, where ‘tree / (piece of) wood’ is expressed with the root *kon-(ay)* [NCED: 727]. The Proto-South Lezgian
meaning of *'k'on-(ay) was (piece of) wood, firewood' (as follows from the Kryts Proper and Budukh cognates), whereas the Archi and external North Caucasian comparanda suggest that the original Proto-Lezgian meaning of this root should be 'handle, grip'.

In Rutul, *'tar was superseded with *'k'ir [NCED: 1082]. The original meaning of the latter root should be 'forest' as follows from its Archi cognate *'k'ir: 'forest' and the polysemy 'tree / forest' in Muxrek Rutul.

In Aghul, *'tar was superseded with *'k'ir (~ -i) [LED: #119]. This is a Common Lezgian root, attested in both Udi and some Nuclear Lezgian lects, where it denotes 'wooden pole', 'ladder-step', 'roofing wood'. The exact original meaning of *'k'ir (~ -i) is not reconstructible.

Unetymologizable equivalents for 'tree' are attested in Tsakhur (q'irv), Tabasaran (bar).

Replacements: {'(piece of) wood, firewood' > 'tree'} (Alyk Kryts), {'forest > 'tree'} (Rutul, Fite Aghul), {'a k. of foliage tree' > 'tree'} (Udi), {'tree > 'tree stump, stub'} (Luchech Rutul), {'tree > 'forest'} (non-Koshan Aghul).

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular.

Semantics and structure: Primary substantive root. The Archi form is modified with the common desemanticized nominal suffix -'lyy.

91. TWO

Nidzh Udi *paI {nlavl} (1), Vartashen Udi *paI {nlavl} (1), Archi qʷq'ʷe (1), Kryts (proper) qʷ'ʷa-CLASS (1), Alyk Kryts qʷq'ʷa-CLASS (1), Budukh q'a-CLASS {k'va} (1), Mishlesh Tsakhur q'o-CLASS ~ qʷo-CLASS-l'ê {k'vâI} (1), Mikik Tsakhur q'o-CLASS-l'ê (1), Mukhad Rutul qʷq'ʷa-CLASS {k'vâIâ} (1), Ixrek Rutul qʷq'ʷa-CLASS {k'vâIâ} (1), Luchek Rutul qʷq'ʷa-CLASS (1), Koshan Aghul q'u-r (1), Keren Aghul q'u-d (1), Gequn Aghul ʔa-d (1), Fite Aghul q'u-d (1), Aghul (proper) ʔu-d (1), Northern Tabasaran q'u-CLASS (1), Southern Tabasaran q'u-CLASS (1), Gyune Lezgi qʷe (1), Proto-Lezgian *qʷq'ʷa-CLASS (1).

References and notes:


Common Udi: Common Udi *paI.


Tsakhur-Kum Tsakhur: q'o-CLASS-l'ê [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 247].

Mikik Tsakhur: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 247; Dirr 1913: 51.

Gelmets Tsakhur: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 247. In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 599], the modern depharyngealized variant is quoted: q'o-CLASS-l'ê.

Proto Lezgian: See [Magometov 1965: 159 ff.] for the dialectal overview.

Proto-Lezgian: NCED: 924. Distribution: One of the most stable Lezgian roots, retained with the numeral meaning 'two' in all the lects.

Proto-Lezgian *ʔiqːʷˤä- (1) / *ʔiɬʷe- (3).

92. WALK (GO)

Nidzh Udi ta=y- {maｉec ~ майшьын} (1) / ta=c- (2), Vartashen Udi ta=y- {maｉec ~ майшьын} (1) / ta=c- (2), Archi =oqːe- (1), Kryts (proper) č=a-r- (1) / =ix- (3), Alyk Kryts č=a-r- (1) / yixi- (3), Budukh č=akʷa-r- {чакъар} (1) / v=ixi- {вихъи} (3), Mishlesh Tsakhur aʔuy=ha- {ахъуааItc} (4) / akʰin ~ h=akʰin {ахъин, xхватин} (5), Mikik Tsakhur aʔl=ha- (4) / h=akʰin (5), Gelmets Tsakhur aʔu=ha- {ахъуас} (4), Mukhad Rutul CLASS=iʔi {иыръхас, ыыхъын} (4) / CLASS=ix-i-r (3), Ixrek Rutul CLASS=iʔi {гыхъын} (4) / CLASS=ix-i-r (3), Luchek Rutul CLASS=iʔi (4) / CLASS=ix-i-r (3), Koshan Aghul waʔ-ya- (1), Keren Aghul baʔ-ya- (1) / š-une (6), Gequn Aghul waʔ- (1) / uš-una (6), Fite Aghul wɐʔ- (1) / ṣ-une (6), Aghul (proper) we-ya- (1) / uš-una (6), Northern Tabasaran aʔwaʔ- (1) / 'uš- (6), Southern Tabasaran aʔwaʔ- (1) / 'uš- (6), Gyune Lezgi šu- (3), Proto-Lezgian *ʔiqːʷˤä- (1) / *ʔiɬʷe (3).
References and notes:


Common Udi: As described in [Maisak 2008a: 108 f.], a suppletive paradigm: *ta(y)*- (present-infinitive) / *taε*- (past) / *taς*- (future) / *tak*- (imperative). For the paradigmatic distribution of the Nidzh present variants *ta* - and *taχ* - see [Maisak 2008a: 107].

Udi verbs of motion (particularly basic ‘to come’ q.v. and ‘to go’) represent a certain morphological riddle. As discussed in [Harris 2002: 68 ff., 223 ff.; Maisak 2008a: 107 ff., 154 ff.] and some other publications and now strongly suggested by data from Caucasian Albanian, the attested Udi paradigm originates from the preverb *ta* - ‘thither, away’ plus the verb ‘to go’, which is reflected as Caucasian Albanian *iε*- (present-infinitive) / *aε*- (past) / *hekal*- (imperative); that is, Proto-Udi *ta-iε* (present-infinitive) / *taa-ac* (past) / *ta=iε* (future) / *ta=k* (imperative).

The attested Udi present stem *ta(y)*- goes back to *ta=iu* with *ε* > *γ* in the intervocalic position before front vowels or before consonants, cf. [Schulze 2005: 547 (3.4.2.1 #34)]. Accordingly, as it was correctly suspected in [Schulze-Fürhoff 1994: 474] and [Harris 2002: 223 ff.], the Udi present *ta=ε-* contains the same etymological morpheme as the future *taε*-. It must be noted that in *ta(y)*- ‘to go’ and another prefixed verb from the same root, *εy* - ‘to come’ q.v., this -ε- is still sporadically retained in present and masdar forms in both Udi dialects (*taς-esun* etc.) [Schulze 2005: 547 (3.4.2.1 #34); Fähnrich 1999: 15, 30]. Alternatively it is supposed in [Maisak 2008a: 107, 145 f.]} that the present stems *ta=ε* - ‘to go’ and *εy* - ‘to come’ originate from the imperative *ta=k*, *εk*- with *k > y*, although such a phonetic development is not regular in the forms discussed (the only known instance of such a shift is the verb *bak-es* ‘to be’ [Maisak 2008a: 144]).

The preverb *ta* - ‘thither, away’ is attested in few verbs in modern Udi (*ta(y)*- ‘to go’, *taς* - ‘to carry away’ and *tak* - ‘to give’ q.v., see [Maisak 2008a: 158]), but possesses a slightly broader distribution in Caucasian Albanian [Gippert et al 2008: II-45].

The Udi and Caucasian Albanian suppletive verbs ‘to come’ q.v., Udi *ε(y)*- (present-infinitive) / *ar*- (past) / *εw*- (future) / *εk*- (imperative), Caucasian Albanian *hew*- (present-infinitive) / *ar*- (past) / *hekal*- (imperative), represent an almost exact morphological parallel to ‘to go’. As correctly analyzed in [Schulze 2005: 547 (3.4.2.1 #34); Gippert et al. 2008: II-45, 51], verbs for ‘to come’ contain the preverb (*he*)- ‘hither’ plus the plain verb ‘to go’. Thus, Udi *ε=εy* - ‘*εy*- (present-infinitive) / *ε=εw*- (future) / *ε=εk*- (imperative) ‘to come’ and Caucasian Albanian *he=εy*- (present-infinitive) / *hekal*- (imperative) ‘to come’.

The verbal prefix (*he*)- ‘hither’ is very scantily preserved in modern Udi [Maisak 2008a: 158], but is more widely attested in Caucasian Albanian [Gippert et al 2008: II-45].

Some authors (see discussions in [Harris 2002: 68 ff., 223 ff.] and [Maisak 2008a: 107 ff., 154 ff.]) suppose that the original root for ‘to come’ was *εw* / *εk*; afterwards, the initial ε- was morphologically reanalyzed in Pre-Udi as a verbal prefix ε- with the new meaning ‘hither’. Data from Caucasian Albanian, where the preverb (he)- is more productive than in the modern language, contradicts such an analysis.

Thus, we believe that the following present-infinitive-future (scil. imperfective) stems can assuredly be reconstructed for Proto-Caucasian Albanian-Udi:

1) *εk*- ‘to go (retained in CA, lost in Udi);
2) *ε=εy*- ‘to go away (to go thither) (retained in CA, broadened into ‘to go / to go away’ in Udi);
3) *he=εy*- ‘to come (to go thither) (retained both in CA and Udi).

Modern Udi demonstrates the typologically normal situation, in which the meanings ‘to go (in general)’ and ‘to go away’ merge into one verbal root, which is lexically opposed to an expression for ‘to come’.

As for the past (scil. perfective) stem, here the opposition between two main concepts ‘to go, go away’ and ‘to come’ is expressed by different roots:

1) *ac*- ‘to go (retained in CA, lost in Udi);
2) *ta=ac*- ‘to go away (retained in CA, broadened into ‘to go / to go away’ in Udi);
3) "ar- 'to come' (retained both in CA and Udi).

Note that in fact the plain *ar- survived in Modern Udi as the past stem *(e)ar- of the light verb *er-, which functions as an intransitivizer or decausative (for which see [Maisak 2008a: 139 ff.; Schulze 2005: 562 ff. (3.4.2.2 11 ff.)]).

The situation with the imperative stems is less clear etymologically. Cf. Caucasian Albanian u(-)kal- ~ e=k-er- 'to go (inv.); he=kal- 'to come (inv.)' [Gippert et al 2008: II-51] vs. Udi ta-ke 'to go (inv.); e=k-er- 'to come (inv.)' [Schulze 2005: 552 (3.4.2.1 #44)]. Schulze & Gippert might theoretically be right that Udi *k-er is an allegro variant of *u-ka[l- [Gippert et al. 2008: II-51]. At first sight, the CA form ukal- looks like u=kal- with a unique prefix u- [Gippert et al. 2008: II-51], but the initial u can also be a normal reflex of the first vowel of the proto-root, see notes on u= - 'to say'.

Quite a different analysis has been proposed in [NCED: 423] (whose authors were naturally not aware of Caucasian Albanian data): Udi *a牵挂- 'to go, to go away' is explained as a secondary formation from the unattested Udi gerund *atay and further compared to Lezgi azʷ- 'to come, arrive', which does not currently seem apt.

Caucasian Albanian: A suppletive verb ia- (present-in infinitive) / a-er (past) / ukal- (imperative) [Gippert et al. 2008: II-44, 45, IV-21]. Also attested with the preverb ta- 'thither: ta-in-esun 'to go away, thither' [Gippert et al. 2008: II-45].


Distinct from the ablaut verb u=kal- / to go; to go away constantly; to go away constantly'.

In addition, the ablaut variant u=kal- / to go, to go away / to go away constantly'.

Both verbs are probably etymologically related, representing various grades of Proto-Lezgian Ablaut [NCED: 572 f.]; the medial -r in =aʔ-ia- 'to walk' is a fossilized durative infix; initial b-, which appears in the IV class forms of =aʔ-ia-(lberaʔa-), is not entirely clear.

The same Proto-Lezgian root is retained as the perfective stem =aʔ- of 'to come' q.v.


From the etymological point of view, it seems probable that imperfective ċã-r originates from *e=cãer- (cf. its Budukh counterpart), although the loss of e seems irregular; in this case ċ= is the prefix 'next to' [Saadiev 1994: 424]. Perfective =ix- is the same root as 'to come' q.v.Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 74; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 491. Perfective stem.


According to [Kibrik et al. 1999], there are two suppletive verbs, both of them with polysemia: 'to go / to go away':

1) aʔ=ha- < aʔ=ha-a- [imperf., fut.] / aʔin- [perf.] / h=or-a [inv.]: 'to go / to go away / to depart' [Kibrik et al. 1999: 69, 868; Ibragimov & Nurmamedov 2010: 35]. In addition, the ablaut variant aʔán- is used in imperf. & fut. with the iterative meaning 'to go away constantly'.

2) iʔ=ar- ~ iʔa- [imperf., fut.] / h=akín- [perf.] / h=akín-r [inv.]: 'to go / to go away' [Kibrik et al. 1999: 879; Ibragimov & Nurmamedov 2010: 135, 355]. In addition, the ablaut variant h=akín- is used in imperf. with the iterative meaning 'to go away constantly; to go away constantly'.

Browsing through texts in [Kibrik et al. 1999] does not permit to make a definite choice between these two verbs, so we are forced to treat them as synonyms, including both imperfective and perfective stems (that is, three synonymous items are proposed for this slot: aʔ=ha-; aʔin- ~ h=akín-; iʔ- ~ iʔa-).

Distinct from the ablaut verb h=or-a- [imperf., fut.]/ h=or-a- [inv.] 'to walk' [Kibrik et al. 1999: 878];Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 979; Ibragimov & Nurmamedov 2010: 135, 355. Perfective stem.


According to [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988], the situation is similar to Mishlesh: there are two synonymous verbs for 'to go', one of them with polysemia: 'to go / to go away':

1) aʔ=ha- [imperf., fut.]: 'to go; to go away' / aʔin- 'to go away' [perf.] / h=or-a [inv.]: 'to go / aʔin-r [inv.] 'to go away' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 73, 74; Dirr 1913: 136, 164, 176].
Gelmets Tsakhir: Contrie & Khalilov 2010: 491. Only the future stem əqːˤ=ʁʷˤ is known (the modern dipharyngealized variant).

Common Tsakhir: Initial Vθ and hθ are prefixes with general semantics [Ibragimov 1990: 123-124; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 41].


According to the data in [Makhmudova 2001] and [Ibragimov 1978], the suppletive paradigm is as follows: CLASS=iʁi ∼ CLASS=r=uʔ-的技术 -r- [imperf.] / CLASS=ix-ix-r [perf.] / CLASS=riʁ [imv.] / ma=CLASS=ʁʷˤ [prohib.]. Perfective stem.


According to the data in [Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006], the suppletive paradigm is as follows: CLASS=iʁi ∼ CLASS=r=uʔ-的技术 -r- [imperf.] / CLASS=ix-ix-r [perf.] / CLASS=riʁ [imv.] / ma=CLASS=ʁʷˤ [prohib.]. In imperfect, with polysemy: ‘to go / to come’.Perfective stem.


Common Rutul: A very irregular verb with two synonymous stems for the imperfective, but the paradigms generally coincide in all three dialects. Two imperfect stems are generally related, r in =ʁʷˤ- is the old imperfective affix -r-.

The correspondence əqːˤ - .ViewModel in the perfective stems between Ixrek CLASS=r=uʔ-的技术 -r- and Mukhad/Luchek CLASS=r=uʔ-的技术 -r- (the Ixrek form is confirmed in both [Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 85] and [Ibragimov 1978: 215]). Such a correspondence is irregular; it is hard to explain Ixrek əqːˤ. Perhaps a contamination with the perfective stem y=ʁʷˤ- ‘to come’ q.v. in Ixrek?


It must be noted that for the Khudig subdialect the following paradigm is quoted in [Shaumyan 1941: 148]: Ha-γ-[imperf.] / ʁ=γ-[inf.] / yaʁ [imv.]. Shaumyan’s “ayin” in the imperfective stem probably covers ㍉ (i.e. ʁ=γ- or ʁ=γ-). This form is important for etymological analysis, see notes on Common Aghul.

Keren Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 73. Imperfective paradigm: baʔ-γ- [imperf.] / ʁ=γ-[inf.] / yaʁ [imv.] / ma=a-ʁ [prohib]. The prohibitive ma=maʔ was assimilated from *ma=baʔ ~ *ma=waʔ.

In [Suleymanov 1993: 54], the following Keren infinitive (scil. imperfective) stem is quoted: ʁ°a- ~ ʁ°a- [ʁaʔ] ‘to go’. Probably the form come from the Usug subdialect.Perfective stem.


Common Aghul: A highly irregular verb, although the suppletive paradigms generally coincide in the dialects. In all dialects (or at least in Koshan, Gequn, Contrie), with polysemy: ‘to go / to come’ in the imperfective and prohibitive forms.

The main etymological riddle is represented by the imperfective forms: Koshan waʔ- ‘to go; to come’, Gequn waʔ- ‘to go; to come’, Proper Aghul we-, but Keren baʔ- ‘to go’. At least synchronically, these stems do not contain a prefix, cf. the Proper Aghul negative forms de=we ‘you don’t go’ [Magometov 1970: 194 strophe III], de=we-s ‘not to go’ [Tarlanov 1994: 148] (with the prefixed negative morpheme dV, not infixed).

The correspondence initial Keren b- : Koshan, Gequn, Proper Aghul w- is irregular, because normally Proto-Aghul *b (< Proto-Lezgian *p; *m) yields b in all dialects in the initial position [Suleymanov 1993: 66]. Although, indeed, medial and final Proto-Aghul *b shifts to w in Koshan, Gequn, Tsirikhe (subdialect of Proper Aghul), it is normally retained as b in other subdialects of Proper Aghul as well as in the Keren dialect [Suleymanov 1993: 66; Magometov 1970: 36; NCED: 125].
The external Lezgian etymology of Proto-Aghul imperfective *wa('- to go; to come) is not entirely clear. It is proposed in [NCED: 134, 572-573] that Aghul *wa- (Keren ba-) originates from Proto-Lezgian *ʔiqˤʷä- with the unique case of the development "ʔiqˤʷ > Aghul *w (Keren b'"), which does not seem apt per se.

We assume a more complicated scenario. The Proto-Aghul imperfective stem for 'to go; to come' indeed goes back to the Proto-Lezgian root *ʔiqˤʷä-, where *ʔiqˤʷ regularly yielded a uvular or laryngeal (xʷ, ʕ or ʕ depending on a dialect, see [NCED: 132-133]). This sound is retained in the prefixless imperfective form in the Khudig Koshan, Keren, Fite and Proper Aghul dialects. In other dialects (including the Burshag subdialect of Koshan) the perfective stem was modified with a labial prefix, which supplanted the initial laryngeal/uvular, - as a result, forms of the shapes wa'- and bu'- arose in individual dialects. The origin and the phonetic nature of this labial prefix are unclear, but most probably it is additionally modified with the spatial prefix (backwards) ' to speak' (see notes on 'to say').

Such a scenario implies the following archaisms in individual Aghul dialects: the prefixless root is retained in the Khudig (subdialect of Koshan; Ha-y, i.e. ʕa-y-?), Keren (ʔa-y- + ʕa-), Fite (ʕa-y-) and Proper Aghul (Tsirkhe, Khpyuk ʕa- + ʕa-) imperfective stem, as well as in the prohibitive stem in Burshag (subdialect of Koshan; ma-wa - ma-ʕe, the loss of pharyngealization and the fluctuation w-ʕ are not clear, however).

Northern Tabasaran: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 73. Suppletive paradigm: a ʕa[- imperfect., inf.]/ ʕa[- perf.].

The same in the Khanag subdialect: aqːˤ- [imperf., inf.]/ uš- [perf.] 'to go' [Uslar 1979: 595, 631, 1002] (in [Dirr 1905: 156, 230], quoted as aʔ- [imperf., inf.]/ uš- [perf.] 'to go' - either actually a form from some Southern Tabasaran subdialect or the beginning of the phonetic process x > s in Khanag during the 2nd half of the 19th century between Uslar's and Dirr's records).


Southern Tabasaran: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 73. Suppletive paradigm: aʔa- [imperf., inf.]/ uš- [perf.]. (in [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988], the perfective root is quoted as uš-, but apparently uš- is just the regular perfective prefix)

For the Khiv subdialect two semantically close verbs are documented: aʔa- [imperf., inf.]/ uš- [perf.], where *aʔa- is related to Tabasaran ʔa- + qʕ- 'to come' q.v.; therefore, it is natural to analyze aʔaʔ as aʔaʔ with the spatial prefix aʔ- [i.e. ʔaʔ-] 'in'. Cf. also the prefixless stem ʔaʔ- in Southern Tabasaran (Khiv), if Genko's data are reliable.

Gyune Lezgi: Uslar 1896: 602. Suppletive paradigm: ša- [imperf.]/ ʃa- [perf.]/ aʔad [imv.]. Distinct from Gyune ʔaʔ-ɛ- 'to walk' [Uslar 1896: 350], ɡaʔ-ɛ- 'to walk' [Uslar 1896: 489], modified with spatial prefixes (prefixless qˤɛ- is the imperfective stem of the verb 'to come' q.v.).


Note the different treatment of Lezgian "f" in Uslar's dialect (buat before old front vowels) and literary language (f). The same development is observed in the Yarki dialect (Kyuri group): Nyutyg šu- 'to go' [Meylanova 1964: 76]. The reflex š is not noted in [NCED: 148 f.].

Proto-Lezgian: NCED: 572. Distribution: The situation with Lezgian basic verbs of motion, 'to go' and 'to come', is rather tangled. Almost all the languages possess suppletive paradigms with two etymologically different stems: imperfective and
perfective (frequently, a third imperative stem is also present). It is possible to regard this suppletion as a late innovation of areal origin, but there are actually no reasons not to project the pattern of lexical opposition between imperfective and perfective stems onto the Proto-Lezgian level.

The following protoroots are attested with the generic meaning ‘to go’ in Lezgian languages:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TO GO’</th>
<th>Proto-CA-Udi</th>
<th>Archi</th>
<th>Kryts</th>
<th>Budukh</th>
<th>Tsak</th>
<th>Rutul</th>
<th>Aghul</th>
<th>Tabasaran</th>
<th>Lezgi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*ʔiqːʷˤä-</td>
<td>imperf.</td>
<td>imperf./perf.</td>
<td>imperf.</td>
<td>imperf.</td>
<td>perf.</td>
<td>imperf.</td>
<td>imperf.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[NCED: 572]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ʔVʔV(r)-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[NCED: 1016]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ʔišä-</td>
<td>perf.</td>
<td>perf.</td>
<td>perf.</td>
<td>perf.</td>
<td>imperf./perf.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[NCED: 656]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ʔɨf'e</td>
<td>perf.</td>
<td>perf.</td>
<td>perf.</td>
<td>perf.</td>
<td>imperf./perf.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[NCED: 664]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ʔɨ(r)k'i</td>
<td>perf.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[NCED: 267]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ʔiqːʷˤä</td>
<td>imperf.</td>
<td>perf.</td>
<td>perf.</td>
<td>perf.</td>
<td>perf.</td>
<td>perf.</td>
<td>perf.</td>
<td>perf.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[NCED: 268]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following protoroots are attested with the generic meaning ‘to come’ in Lezgian languages:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TO COME’</th>
<th>Proto-CA-Udi</th>
<th>Archi</th>
<th>Kryts</th>
<th>Budukh</th>
<th>Tsak</th>
<th>Rutul</th>
<th>Aghul</th>
<th>Tabasaran</th>
<th>Lezgi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*ʔiqːʷˤä-</td>
<td>imperf.</td>
<td>perf.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[NCED: 572]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ʔVʔV(r)-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[NCED: 1016]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ʔišä-</td>
<td>imperf.</td>
<td>imperf.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[NCED: 656]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ʔarƛːe</td>
<td>imperf.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[NCED: 422]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ʔarq’är</td>
<td>perf.</td>
<td>perf.</td>
<td>perf.</td>
<td>perf.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[NCED: 268]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ʔiɬʷe</td>
<td>perf.</td>
<td>perf.</td>
<td>perf.</td>
<td>perf.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[NCED: 664]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ʔarq’är</td>
<td>perf.</td>
<td>perf.</td>
<td>perf.</td>
<td>perf.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[NCED: 268]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It must be noted that in [NCED: 268], the Udi imperfective stems of the verbs ‘to go’ and ‘to come’ are connected to Lezgian *ʔarq’är, because the authors were not aware of the Udi and Caucasian Albanian forms that retain -ʁ-. Now this etymology can be rejected. The obvious source of the Caucasian Albanian-Udi verbs for ‘to go’ and ‘to come’ is Lezgian *ʔiqːʷˤä-. Not a single Udi etymology with Lezgian *qːʷˤ has been proposed by the authors of [NCED], but the development *qːʷˤ > Udi ʁ(ˤ) is system-predictable, see the table in [NCED: 132]; further, Udi ʁ > 0 in certain positions. The main difficulty is the absence of pharyngealization in the Caucasian Albanian and Udi forms, but, as noted in [NCED: 143], the old pharyngealization can sporadically get lost in Udi (exact conditions are not clear).

The Proto-Lezgian imperfective stem can be safely reconstructed as *ʔiqːʷˤä - with polysemy: ‘to go / to come’. It retains the original meaning in both outliers (Udi, Archi) and in some Nuclear Lezgian lects. In the rest of Nuclear Lezgian languages, it got superseded with various verbs of movement. It is theoretically possible that the meanings ‘to go’ and ‘to come’ were discriminated with the help of spatial prefixes in Proto-Lezgian (cf. the relict prefix in the Caucasian Albanian-Udi imperfective stem for ‘to come’).

Reconstruction of perfective stems is less obvious. There are two formally equivalent candidates for the Proto-Lezgian perfective stem ‘to go’: (1) *ʔiɬʷe, which can be reliably reconstructed as the Proto-Nuclear Lezgic perfective ‘to go’, (2) Proto-Caucasian Albanian-Udi *ac-. The latter root seems, however, etymologically isolated within both Lezgian and North Caucasian, and therefore, we tentatively posit *ʔiɬʷe as the Proto-Lezgian perfective ‘to go’.

The best candidate for the Proto-Lezgian perfective stem ‘to come’ seems to be *ʔVʔV(r)-, which retains its basic meaning in Udi and West Lezgic (Rutul, Tsakhur).
Numerous semantic shifts between verbs of movement in individual Lezgian languages require additional investigation.

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular except for the loss of pharyngealization in Caucasian Albanian-Udi.

Semantics and structure: Primary verbal root, attested with several grades of Ablaut. Reconstructed as the imperfective stem with polysemy: 'to go / to come'. NCED: 664. Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular.

92. WALK (GO)
Mishlesh Tsakhur iq:\^ː {-ui\x{c6}x\x{e6}vac, yi\x{c6}x\x{e6}vac} (1), Mikik Tsakhur iq:\^ː (1).

References and notes:
Mikik Tsakhur: Imperfective stem.

93. WARM (HOT)
Nidzh Udi gam {zam} (-1), Vartashen Udi gam {zam} (-1), Archi si\l\''i-t-u-CLASS (-1), Kryts (proper) y\ve (1), Alyk Kryts y\ira (1), Budukh feye ~ feyi {\feyie, \feiyu} (2), Mishlesh Tsakhur q:\uma-n {\k\uyl\x{a}man} (3), Mikik Tsakhur \u\uma-n (3), Gelmets Tsakhur \u\uma-n\^ (3), Mukhad Rutul si\j\''-id {cu\z\v{b}\v{o}} (1), Ixrek Rutul si\j\''-di {cu\z\v{b}\v{b}i} (1), Luchek Rutul si\j\''-id (1), Koshan Aghul u\f\''a-r (4), Keren Aghul ib\f\''a-f (4), Gequn Aghul i\w\''a-f (4), Fite Aghul \f\''abi-t (4), Aghul (proper) ib\f\''a-f (4), Northern Tabasaran man\''i (-1), Southern Tabasaran man\''i (-1), Gyune Lezgi \c\i\''m\i (5), Proto-Lezgian *\f\''i:Vr- (1).

References and notes:
Several terms enter into competition and the sources vary in definitions. The most generic word is apparently gam {zam}; this is glossed as 'hot, warm' in [Gukasyan 1974: 105; Mobili 2010: 121] (with examples: "hot (warm) water", "hot weather"), simply as 'warm' in [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 686], but as 'hot' in [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 245].
A second candidate is the etymologically obscure k\u\u{v\i\'{a}i} 'warm' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 245] (opposed to gam 'hot') = k\u\u{v\i\'a} 'warm, not hot' [Mobili 2010: 179] (with an example: "warm, not hot water"). It seems that k\u\u{v\i\'{a}i} ~ k\u\u{v\i\'a} denotes 'warmish, tepid' rather than generic 'warm'.
Distinct from ba\ck\v{c}uk {\varlyx{d}l}, glossed as 'hot', inflamed, set on fire' in [Gukasyan 1974: 72; Mobili 2010: 43] and simply as 'hot' in [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 685] (opposed to gam 'warm').
Common Udi: Nidzh-Vartashen gam is borrowed from Persian garm 'warm, hot'.
Caucasian Albanian: Neither 'warm' nor 'hot' are attested.
Arch: Chumakina et al. 2007; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 245; Kibrik et al. 1977b: 312, 384; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 685; Mikailov 1967: 179. In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010] an incorrect variant si\l\''-u-CLASS is also quoted. Regular participle from the stative verb si\l\''i 'to be warm', borrowed from Lak si\l\''- 'warm' (the Archi term is unjustifiedly labeled as "no evidence for
borrowing" in [Chumakina 2009]). Cf. examples: "Let’s wash the heads with hot (scil. warm) water" [Mikailov 1967: 53], “This fur coat is warm” [Mikailov 1967: 71].

Distinct from ḥ'er-[noun]-CLASS ‘hot’ [Chumakina et al. 2007; Kibrik & Kodzazov 1990: 245; Kibrik et al. 1977b: 269, 356; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 685; Mikailov 1967: 189] (in [Comrie & Khalilov 2010] an incorrect variant ḥ'er-du-CLASS is also quoted), a participle of the stative verb ḥ'er ‘to be hot’. However, the only discovered example is not very representative: “A bullet from your rusty pistol will not get our hot hearts” [Kibrik et al. 1977b: 11]. As convincingly proposed in [NCED: 640], Archi ḥ'er was borrowed from Avar ḥer- ‘to be underroast; to be burned through; to burn oneself’ with expressive pharyngealization.

Distinct from k'äk'a-[noun]-CLASS ‘hot (of weather)’ [Chumakina et al. 2007; Kibrik et al. 1977b: 263], a participle of the stative verb k'äk’a ‘to be hot (of weather).’


Distinct, however, from qizizîn ‘hot’ [Kibrik & Kodzazov 1990: 245], which is translated in [Meylanova 1984: 93] as ‘burning hot’. Borrowed from Azerbaijani qizîn ‘hot’.


Distinct from isâza-n ~ hisâza-n ~ hisâza-[noun] [Kibrik et al. 1999: 433, 442, 839, 877, 892] ~ hic'âza-n [Ibragimov & Nurmamedov 2010: 144] ‘hot’. Phonetic fluctuation (cf. also Gelmets Tsakhur hic'âza-n below) could point to a loanword, although the source of borrowing is unidentified (in [NCED: 415], however, it is proposed to connect this substantive to the Tabasaran deverbal adjective ‘hot’, see notes on Tabasaran ‘warm’).


Mikik Tsakhur: Kibrik & Kodzazov 1990: 245; Dirr 1913: 152, 240.

Distinct from two borrowed terms for ‘hot’: qizîsînî-n [Kibrik & Kodzazov 1990: 245] (from Azerbaijani qizîn ‘hot’) and goyan [Dirr 1913: 195] (from Azerbaijani goyan ‘hot’).

Gelmets Tsakhur: Kibrik & Kodzazov 1990: 245. In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 686], the modern depharyngealized variant is quoted: ƛ'ana-n*.


Mukhad Rutul: Dirr 1912: 170, 202; Ibragimov 1978: 26; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 685. Applied to both objects (‘warm’) and weather (‘hot, warm’).

Distinct from biker-di ‘hot’ [Ibragimov 1978: 118].

Ixrek Rutul: Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 229, 402; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 686. Applied to both objects (‘warm’) and weather (‘hot, warm’).

Distinct from Richa kuče-f ‘hot’ [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 245].

Etymologically, the same terms in the Usug subdialect: bise-f ‘warm’, kuče-f ‘hot’ [Shaumyan 1941: 142, 194].


Distinct from kuče-f ‘hot’ [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 245].

Fite Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 245.

Distinct from kući-t ‘hot’ [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 245].


Distinct from Tpig kuče-f ‘hot’ [Suleymanov 2003: 106].

Common Aghul: Final -d, -t, -f, -r are the adjectival suffixes (fossilized class exponents) [Magometov 1970: 92], [Shaumyan 1941: 45]. Theoretically the Common Aghul term for ‘warm’ (*?təwqːˤV- as proposed in [LEDb: #150]) can be related to Tabasaran urqːˤ ‘warm’ q.v., although details are unclear. The Common Aghul terms for ‘hot’ (kuče-) is of unknown origin.


For the Khyuryuk subdialect two words with the meaning ‘warm’ (*wana ‘warm’, which actually originate from Dargi *gъюргъми (applicable only to water). Two words for ‘hot’ exist in the literary language: inherited yi-class-c-rˈu (ури) ‘hot’ (e.g., tea) [Khanmagomedov & Shalbuzov 2001: 184] and borrowed nɪzɛɪ (нызын) ‘hot’ [Khanmagomedov & Shalbuzov 2001: 112] (< Azerbaizanı gizyin ‘hot’).

Common Tabasaran: The adjective manɪ – wani is the basic Common Tabasaran term for ‘warm’. Its etymology, proposed in [NCED: 807], however, should be rejected, because Common Tabasaran wani (assimilated manɪ) most likely represents a borrowing from the neighboring Dargi lects, cf. Meusisha wana-ci, Gubden wana-y, Urari, Amuq wana-ci, etc. ‘warm’, which actually originate from Dargi *(g)ana- (not wana- puce [NCED: 807]), as proven by cognate forms from other Dargi lects, like Barshamay (Northern) / w=ursɛ-mi ‘warm’ (Southern) ‘hot’ are currently narrower than these of manɪ, although apparently urqː-u-mi / w=ursɛ-mi represent the inherited Proto-Tabasaran term for ‘warm’. These Tabasaran forms look like an old deverbal formation (cf. esp. the perfective prefix w= in the Southern form), but the original verb seems unattested elsewhere. Apparently these adjectives are cognate to the basic Aghul adjective for ‘warm’ q.v., for which the proto-form *?təwqːˤV- is proposed in [LEDb: #150]. However, the details are not entirely clear (fossilized class infix -w- is Aghul?).

The common Tabasaran expression for ‘hot’ is m=ii-class-ci-rˈi (Northern) / yi-class-c-ru (Southern). These are synchronic participles from a verb that is attested as Literary Tabasaran yiic- (инчүр) ‘to boil (intr.)’ [Khanmagomedov & Shalbuzov 2001: 184]. Initial m in the Northern form can be a rare prefix or an archaic prefixed class exponent. On the contrary, Southern (Khiv) urc-rˈu ‘hot’ (ur-c-rˈu) with the fossilized class infix -r- is synchronically derived from the verb for ‘to roast grain’, attested in Southern Tabasaran as Khiv urc- ‘(ypu)̥ ‘to boil (intr.)’, urc- ‘to roast grain’ - can be etymologically related via certain ablaut patterns, cf. [NCED: 415].

Gyne Lezgi: Uslar 1896: 589, 635. Applied to both objects and weather. No terms for ‘hot’ have been found in [Uslar 1896].

The same in the Akhty dialect: Khlyut yik‘ir 'hot' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 245]. Distinct from Khlyut yikir 'hot' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 245] of unclear origin (pace [NCED: 869], this form can hardly be paronymous to Lezgi kə / kə- 'to burn', because yikir is transcribed with aspirated -k-, not -k- by Kibrik & Kodzasov).

**Proto-Lezgian**: NCED: 640. **Distribution**: A rather unstable word. Provisionally we fill this slot with the verbal root *ʔiːːYr-, which yielded participle-like formations with the meaning 'warm' in Kryts (South Lezgian) and Rutul (West Lezgian), but was lost in the rest of the languages. The whole reconstruction, however, does not seem very reliable due to scantiness of data.

The second candidate is the verb *ʔe(-)Yr- [NCED: 1036], from which the participle 'warm / hot' was formed in Budukh. The original meaning of *ʔe(-)Yr- was something like 'to get heated' (cf. notes on 'to burn').

Etymologically unclear words for 'warm' are attested in Tsakhur (qʰeːna- ~ xʰuna-), Aghul (qʰaː ~ qʰaː- ~ wʰaː ~ wʰəби-), Lezgi (čim'i).

Superseded with loanwords in Udi (< Persian), Archi (< Lak), Tabasaran (< Dargi).

Various Lezgian terms for 'hot' normally represent either participles from verbs for 'to burn' vel sim. or loanwords (< Azerbaijani, Avar).

**Replacing**: ['to burn > 'hot'] (Kryts, Rutul), ['to boil > 'hot'] (Tabasaran), ['to get heated > 'warm / hot'] (Budukh), ['to roast grain > 'hot'] (Khiv Tabasaran).

**Reconstruction shape**: Correspondences seem regular.

**Semantics and structure**: Perhaps a primary verbal root 'to be warm'.

### 94. WATER

Nidzh Udi χe {xe} (1), Vartashen Udi χe {xe} (1), Archi tənː- (1), Kryts (proper) xəd (1), Alyk Kryts xad (1), Budukh xəd {xədə} (1), Mishleš Tsakhur xʷən {xʷəн} (1), Mikik Tsakhur xʷən (1), Gelmets Tsakhur xʷən (1), Mukhad Rutul xeˈd {xeˈdə} (1), Ixrek Rutul xeˈd {xeˈdə} (1), Luchek Rutul xeˈd (1), Koshan Aghul ʃər (1), Keren Aghul xitː- (1), Gequn Aghul xer (1), Fite Aghul xitː- (1), Aghul (proper) xetː- (1), Northern Tabasaran ʃəy (1), Southern Tabasaran ʃid (1), Gyun Aghul yad (1), Proto-Lezgian *tːənː- (1).

**References and notes:**


**Common Udi**: Common Udi: *xə [abs.] / *xən- [obl.].

**Caucasian Albanian**: χe [abs.] / χən- [obl.], see [Gippert et al. 2008: II-23, IV-22].


Distinct from the nursery word pʰaː ~ pʰəːy 'water' [Kibrik et al. 1977a: 1: 87; Chumakina et al. 2007] of unknown origin.


**Alyk Kryts**: Authier 2009: 34, 74, etc. Regular paradigm: xad [abs.] / xə-ʃ [gen.].

Mishlesh Tsakhur: Kibrik et al. 1999: 889, 892; Ibragimov & Nurmamedov 2010: 382; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 37. Paradigm: *xən [abs.] / *x̂in*-e-[obl.] (in [Ibragimov & Nurmamedov 2010] the oblique stem is quoted as *x̂in*-e-).


Mikik Tsakhur: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 202; Dirr 1913: 166, 221. Paradigm: *xən [abs.] / *x̂in*-e-[obl.].


Common Rutul: The Luchek paradigm seems to be the most archaic; in the other dialects, -ty in the oblique stem was restored after their absolute form.


The same in the other subdialects: Arsus, Khudig *şed (regular paradigm) ‘water’ [Shaumyan 1941: 178].


The same in the Usg subdialect: *xəf [abs.] / *x-ty-[obl.] ‘water’ [Shaumyan 1941: 177].


The same in the other subdialects: Duldug *xad, Tsirkhe *xer ‘water’ [Shaumyan 1941: 177-178].

Common Aghul: In Burskag and Gequn, the paradigms have been levelled after the absolute form, where Proto-Aghul *t > d in the final position.


Common Tabasaran: The Dyubek paradigm is the most archaic.


The same in Literary Lezgi: *ya:d [abs.] / *ci-[obl.], *yatl-[er-[pl.], *ya:d [pl.], *yatl-[er-[erg.], *ya:d [pl.], *yatl-[er-[erg.].

Proto-Lezgian: NCED: 1060. Distribution: One of the most stable Lezgian roots retained with the basic meaning ‘water’ in all lects.

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular.

Semantics and structure: Primary substantive root. The oblique stem is *tinci-.

95. WE₁

Nidzh Udi ya-n {iːuk} (1), Vartashen Udi ya-n {iːuk} (1), Archi ne-n / n’en-l’-u (1), Kryts (proper) źi-n (2), Alyk Kryts źi-n (2), Budukh yi-n {iːuk} (1), Mishlesh Tsakhur ši {iːuk} (2), Mikik Tsakhur ši (2), Gelmets Tsakhur ši ~ ši-bi (2), Mukhad Rutul ye ~ yu {iːuk} (1), Ixrek Rutul źi {juː} (2), Luchek Rutul ye (1), Koshan Aghul či-n (2), Keren Aghul či-n (2),
Gequn Aghul čǐ-n (2), Fite Aghul čǐ-n (2), Aghul (proper) čǐ-n (2), Northern Tabasaran ič'ũ (2), Southern Tabasaran uč'ũ (2), Gyune Lezgi ču-n (2), Proto-Lezgian *ʒi-n (2).

References and notes:


Common Udi: A suppletive paradigm is retained in both dialects: *


Gelmets Tsakhur: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 222; Ibragimov & Nuramedov 2010: 518; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 118. Final -bi is a plural marker. Paradigm is unknown. No clusivity.

Mukhad Rutul: Dirr 1912: 36; Ibragimov 1978: 77, 212; Alekseev 1994a: 225; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 118. Paradigm: ye [abs., erg.] / yix-di [gen.] / ye-s [dat.]. No clusivity. However, it is reported in [Makhmudova 2001: 169] that there are special inclusive forms of the shape ye-xa, literally ‘we’ + ‘you (pl.)’ - apparently a very recent introduction, still unknown to the previous authors.


Common Rutul: In the Shina & Muxrek dialects generic ‘we’ sounds as ži [abs.] / iš-di [gen.] [Ibragimov 1978: 153, 177, 258; Dirr 1912: 36].
In the light of external Lezgian evidence one can safely reconstruct the following clusive opposition for Proto-Rutul: *yâ 'we (incl.)' / *zâ 'we (excl.). This formal opposition was eliminated in all known dialects. Normally one of the stems -*yâ or *zâ - survived with the generic meaning 'we', although in brek both pronouns are still used as synonyms for generic 'we'.

In the Borch-Khnov dialect the semantic opposition of clusivity is retained [Ibragimov 1978: 258, 263], but the system was seriously rebuilt. Both pronouns of the 1st p. pl. are formed on the basis of *yâ 'we (incl.)'; ya-n-ur 'we (incl.)' / yu-q'n-âr 'we (excl.)' with the help of the common plural exponant -Vr. The morpheme -u- in ya-n-ur 'we (incl.)' may in fact be an old exponent; thus, the chain ya-n- - originates directly from Proto-Lezgian *i-n 'we (incl.)' [NCED: 786]. The pronoun yu-q'n-âr 'we (excl.)' additionally contains an archaic plural exponant -q'n- [Ibragimov 1978: 242, 264 f.]; the vowel -u- in yu-q'n-âr is probably the result of the reduction -q'un- > -q'n- in the adjacent syllable and, additionally, may be due to influence on the part of the 2nd p. pl pronoun uu-q'n-âr 'you'. It is interesting that after such an agglutinative pattern has been introduced in the Borch-Khnov dialect, the plain *yâ 'we (incl.)' shifted to the singular number: Borch-Khnov yi 'I'. [Ibragimov 1978: 260 ff.]


The same in the Khudig subdialect: či-n [abs., erg.] / ič-a-s [dat.] / ič [gen.] 'we (excl.)' [Magometov 1970: 102].


Common Aghul: All the dialects retain the etymologically relevant clusivity opposition. The historical shape VC of the genitive forms (both exclusive and inclusive) is retained only in Koshan; in the other dialects the genitive has been levelled after the rest of the paradigm. The shape VC of the dative forms in the Koshan dialect (ič-a-s, ča-s) can also be an archaism.


The same in the Khanag subdialect: iču [abs., obl.] / ič [gen.] 'we (excl.)' [Uslar 1979: 127; Dirr 1905: 33; Magometov 1965: 170].

Southern Tabasaran: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 222. Exclusive pronoun 'we'. Paradigm: uču [abs., obl.] / ič [gen.].


No clusivity in any dialects. The genitive form či is attested at least in the Tsinit subdialect of the Yarki dialect (Kyuri group) [Meylanova 1964: 114], Qurah dialect (Kyuri group) [Meylanova 1964: 157], Khlyut and Khuryug subdialects of the Akhty dialect (Samur group) [Meylanova 1964: 299] (for the Khlyut data see above). In the bulk of Lezgi dialects či was transformed into či under the influence of other paradigmatic forms.

Genitive či can reflect the Lezgian protoform *CLASS=či [NCED: 1089] with the deaffricativization *qˤ > q in the final position and further levelling *qˤ > či after the rest of paradigm. Alternatively, it is possible to treat či as a retention of the Proto-Lezgian pronoun *i-n 'we (incl.)' (reflexes of the Proto-Lezgian voiced affricates, postulated specially for personal pronouns, are generally irregular and unique, see [NCED: 143]).

Proto-Lezgian:

NCED: 1089. Distribution: Two pronominal paradigms for the 1st p. pl. are to be reconstructed for Proto-Lezgian:

1) *i-n [abs., erg.] / gen. *CLASS=i [gen.] / *ja- [obl.] 'we (excl.)' [NCED: 1089];
It can be easily seen that the Proto-Lezgian clusive opposition is postulated on the basis of some Nuclear Lezgian lects (namely Kryts, Aghul, Tabasaran, and to a lesser degree Rutul). In the other languages only one of the pronouns has survived or, as in Caucasian Albanian-Udi, both pronouns were merged into one paradigm.

It must be noted that the synchronic clusive opposition is also observed in Archi and Mukhad Rutul. In Proto-Archi, ‘*j-i-n ‘we (excl.)’ was completely lost, and ‘*Lä-n ‘we (incl.)’ became the only pronoun ‘we (excl./incl.).’ However, clusivity has been recently reintroduced: ‘*Lä-n has acquired the exclusive meaning, whereas the modern Archi inclusive pronoun represents a compound: ‘we (*Lä-) + thou’. The same process has recently taken place in Mukhad Rutul, where the new inclusive pronoun is a compound: ‘we (*Lä-) + thou’.

The ergative form normally coincides with the absolutive in all the lects, except for Mikik Tsakhur (secondarily derived from the oblique form due to analogy with other personal pronouns) and Lezgi (secondarily derived from the absolutive form). Thus, we reconstruct the homonymy “absolutive-ergative” for Proto-Lezgian.

The majority of the lects demonstrate the suffixal -n in the abs.-erg. form. Exceptions are Tsakhur and non-Borch-Khnov Rutul: in both cases we apparently deal with secondary analogy with other personal pronouns.

In Gelmets Tsakhur and Borch-Khnov Rutul, forms of the pronoun ‘we’ can be secondarily modified with synchronic plural suffixes.

Replacements: ['we (incl.) > 'we (incl./excl.)'] (Archi, Budukh), ['we (excl.) > 'we (incl./excl.)'] (Tsakhur, Lezgi), ['we + thou > 'we (incl.)'] (Archi, Mukhad Rutul), ['we (incl.) > T'] (Borch-Khnov Rutul).

Reconstruction shape: The voiced affricates *ǯ and *Ł were specially introduced into the Proto-Lezgian reconstruction in order to explain unique consonant correspondences in the given personal pronouns [NCED: 143]. Archi abs.-erg. ne-n clearly goes back to Proto-Archi *le-n via assimilation. Note the Caucasian Albanian development *L > ž (the idea that Caucasian Albanian ž-forms originate from ‘*j-i-n ‘we (excl.)’ is less likely, because one could expect Caucasian Albanian abs.-erg., **zi-n, rather than ža-n).

Semantics and structure: Primary pronominal roots.

95. WE

Nidzh Udi beši ~ beš [õeuu ~ öeu] (2), Vartashen Udi beši [õeuu] (2), Archi CLASS=olˈo / l’a-CLASS-u (1), Kryts (proper) yi-n (1), Alyk Kryts yi-n (1), Mishlesh Tsakhur yiš-in [iũũũũũn, iũũũũũn] (2), Mikik Tsakhur yiš-in (2), Mukhad Rutul yix-di (1), Ixrek Rutul yi [ũũ] (1), Luchek Rutul ix*-di (1), Koshan Aghul ši-n (1), Keren Aghul xi-n (1), Gequn Aghul xi-n (1), Fite Aghul xi-n (1), Aghul (proper) xi-n (1), Northern Tabasaran ix’u (1), Southern Tabasaran ux’u (1), Proto-Lezgian *Lä-n (1).

References and notes:

Nidzh Udi: Genitive form.
Vartashen Udi: Genitive form.
Archi: Genitive exclusive and inclusive forms.


Mishlesh Tsakhur: Genitive form.

Mikik Tsakhur: Genitive form.

Mukhad Rutul: Genitive form.

Ixrek Rutul: The second absolutive variant.

Koshan Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 222; Magometov 1970: 101; Shaumyan 1941: 56; Suleymanov 1993: 126; Suleymanov 2003: 188. Inclusive pronoun 'we'. Paradigm: ši-n [abs., erg.] / iša-s ~ ša-s [dat.] / iš ~ iš-ir [gen.]. The dative form ša-s is from [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990], other sources quote iša-s. It must be noted that in the summary table in [Magometov 1970: 101], the Burshag absolutive-ergative form is quoted as xi-n, which is an obvious typo; other sources confirm ši-n.

The same in the Khudig subdialect: ši-n [abs., erg.] / iše-s [dat.] / iš [gen.] 'we (incl.)' [Magometov 1970: 101].


The same in the Khanag subdialect: ixˈu [abs., obl.] / ix [gen.] 'we (incl.)' [Uslar 1979: 127; Dirr 1905: 33; Magometov 1965: 170].

Southern Tabasaran: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 222. Inclusive pronoun 'we'. Paradigm: uxˈu [abs., obl.] / ixˈu [erg.] / ix [gen.]. The ergative form ixˈu can be a typo for expected "uxˈu".


96. WHAT

Nidzh Udi hi-kä {узуклав} (1), Vartashen Udi e-ka {екла} (1), Archi h’a-ni (2), Kryts (proper) ši (3), Alyk Kryts ši (3), Budukh ši {ую} (3), Mishlesh Tsakhur hi=žo: {ьноджо} (4), Mikik Tsakhur hi=žo: ~ hu=žo: ~ žo: (4), Gelmets Tsakhur ha=ži-way (4), Mukhad Rutul ši-w {уюб} (3) / ši= w (5), Ixrek Rutul ši-w {уюб} (3) / ši= w (5), Luchek Rutul ši-wi (3) / ši=wi (5), Koshan Aghul fi (6), Keren Aghul fi (6), Gequn Aghul fi (6), Fite Aghul fi (6), Aghul (proper) fi (6), Northern Tabasaran fi (6), Southern Tabasaran fu (6), Gyune Lezgi wu=č (4) / wu-č (6), Proto-Lezgian *hi (1).
References and notes:


A contracted allegro form ƚaː (klas) can also be used [Gukasyan 1974: 279; Schulze-Fürhoff 1994: 471].

Suppletive paradigm: hi-ƚaː [abs.] / he-r- [erg., obl.] (in [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 228] the oblique stem again with a probable typo: he-t-).


Common Udi: Interrogative attributive pronoun ‘e ‘which?, what kind of?’ (Nidzh he, Vartashes e [Gukasyan 1974: 119]) with an unclear element -ka in the absolutive and the pronominal stem extension -t- in oblique forms. Note a laryngeal prosthesis in Nidzh hi-~ he-.


According to [Talibov 2007: 126] and [Alekseev 1994: 269], the archaic paradigm is ši [abs.] / ča- [obl.]. Currently this is being superseded by regular ši [abs.] / ši-[g]en. [obl.], see [Talibov 2007: 126; Meylanova 1984: 193].

In [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 228] the paradigm is quoted as ši [abs.] / han-i- [erg., dat.] / han-u [gen.]; the oblique forms have been erroneously copied from the entry ‘who?’ q.v.


Distinct from Mishlesh nʔe-n ‘which?’ [Kibrik et al. 1999: 139, 883].


Distinct from Tsakhur-Kum nʔe-n ‘which?’ [Schulze 1997: 41].

Mikik Tsakhur: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 228; Dirr 1913: 39. Paradigm: hi-ʒc [abs.] / nʔi-ʃi-[g]. [obl.]. The absolutive variants hu=ʒc and ʒc come from [Dirr 1913], where a variant with -ʃi instead of -ʃ - is also attested (in [Dirr 1913] forms of this pronoun are accompanied with the interrogative enclitic -nʔe).

Distinct from Mikik nʔe-n ‘which?’ [Dirr 1913: 39].

Gelmets Tsakhur: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 228; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 754. In [Ibragimov 1990: 195], ‘what?’ is quoted as ha=ʒu [tndk], which seems suspicious (ʃ for expected ʒ). The final element -way is unclear.

Common Tsakhur: We prefer to treat initial hv= as an additional interrogative morpheme that does not represent the main meaning here (cf. the Mikik variants hi=ʒc ~ ʒc and the pronoun ‘who’ ha=ʒu ~ hu=ʒc).


Distinct from Mukhad ʃi-ʃi ‘which?’ (koropai?) and hi-di- ‘which’ (kakoish?) [Dirr 1912: 41-42].


Following [NCED: 351], we treat the direct stem *si-ːv as a compound of two pronominal morphemes.

Koshan Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 228; Suleymanov 1993: 130.


Fite Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 228.


Distinct from the Khanag interrogative pronouns ‘which?’:


Southern Tabasaran: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 228. Paradigm: fu [abs.]/ f-ːti- [obl.].


The same in Literary Lezgi: uu-ː [abs.]/ kːʊ-ː [obl.]/ nːy [abs.]; uu-ː [obl.]

The same in the Akhty dialect: Khlyut wiː [abs.]/ ěː [obl.] ‘what?’ [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 228].

See also notes on ‘who’.

Proto-Lezgian:

NCED: 491. Distribution: Detailed semantic reconstruction of the entire variety of Lezgian interrogative morpheme is hardly possible. The basic data can be summarized as follows (we exclude the prefixal “emphatic” morpheme *ha- [NCED: 486], which often modifies various pronominal stems in Lezgian lects):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHAT? / WHO?</th>
<th>CA-Udi</th>
<th>Archi</th>
<th>Kryts</th>
<th>Budukh</th>
<th>Tsakhir</th>
<th>Rutul</th>
<th>Aghul</th>
<th>Tabasaran</th>
<th>Lezgi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*ja</td>
<td>ya- / e-ka / hi-kʊ what (← which)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>who</td>
<td></td>
<td>who</td>
<td>who</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>who</td>
<td></td>
<td>who</td>
<td>who</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>who</td>
<td></td>
<td>who</td>
<td>who</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>what</td>
<td></td>
<td>what</td>
<td>what</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>who</td>
<td>who</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| *nay          | ha-ːnay which | ha-ːn [abs.]/ hiː-ː [obl.]
|              |        | who |               | who | who |
|              |        | what; hːa-nːnu-what |               | who | who |
| *uːw         |        |        |       |        |        |        |        | *uːw [abs.]
|              |        |        |       |        | *uːw [abs.]
|              |        |        |       |        | who | who |

[Primary sources cited in the document are not explicitly listed, but are implied through references and notes.]
The following intermediate reconstructions for the Nuclear Lezgian subgroups could be proposed. East Lezgian (Aghul, Tabasaran, Lezgi):

- *'ti - *'ti 'what?' (at least the absolutive form); - *'ti-ši [abs.] / *'(ha)-nay [erg., obl.] 'who?'

West Lezgian (Tsakhur, Rutul):


It must be noted that, as in the case of the demonstrative pronouns 'that' / 'this' q.v., the South Lezgian subgroup appears to be the most innovative.

The Proto-Lezgian pronoun 'who?' can be safely reconstructed as *'či [NCED: 986], at least in the absolutive form. This stem is retained as 'who?' in Caucasian Albanian-Udi, on the one hand, and in West & East Lezgian, on the other (in East Lezgian, the absolutive form of *'či is secondarily modified with the Proto-East Lezgian pronoun *'či 'who?). It must be emphasized that the etymological opposition of two interrogative morphemes *'či and *'ti [NCED: 350, 986] does not seem very reliable. Actually, these two are only opposed in Tsakhur (ba-šu [abs.], ša-w- [obl.] 'who?' vs. n-li-ši- [obl.] 'what?'), whereas South Lezgian (Kryts, Budukh) ši [abs.] 'what?' and Rutul ši-w [abs.] 'what?' can be equally well explained as the descendants of *'či.

The Proto-Lezgian morpheme *'nay-, or even the chain *'ha-nay- (with 'emphatic' ha-), is a possible candidate for the Proto-Lezgian pronoun 'which?'. On the other hand, *'ha-nay- could be reconstructed as the Proto-Nuclear Lezgian oblique stem of 'who?' (South & East Lezgian). Thus, Caucasian Albanian ha-nay 'which?' might be the secondary semantic development 'who? [obl.] 'which?'. It is proposed in [NCED: 492] (following some of M. Alekseev's ideas) that *'ha-nV- is an alternative oblique stem of interrogative *hi, but this solution seems unlikely to us (especially in the light of Caucasian Albanian ha-nay 'which?'). We prefer to treat *'nay- (not *'nV-) as an independent morpheme.

Data on the pronoun 'what?' are the most discrepant. The Proto-Caucasian Albanian-Udi pronoun was probably *'ya, which is attested in Caucasian Albanian as 'what?', but shifted to the meaning 'which?' in Udi (Nidzh he, Vartashen e; surprisingly, in modern Udi, the new expression for 'what?' is based on he = e 'which?'). This morpheme *'ya seems isolated in Lezgian; note that, pace [NCED: 492], *'ya has nothing to do with Lezgian *'hi. The Archi-Nuclear Lezgian match, however, suggests that *'hi- [NCED: 491] can be posited as the Proto-Lezgian oblique stem of *'what?'. No obvious candidate for the Proto-Lezgian direct stem 'what?' exists.

It should be noted that the morpheme *'V could actually be the oblique stem exponent, secondarily loaned from nominal paradigms.

Replacements: {'which?' > 'what?' (Udi), {'what?' > 'which?' (Udi).

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular.

Semantics and structure: Primary pronominal morpheme, used in the oblique stem of the pronoun 'what?'.

---

97. WHITE

Nidzh Udi maci {ma̱lɪ} (1), Vartashen Udi maci {ma̱lɪ} (1), Archi ĉu'b'a-tu-CLASS (2), Kryts (proper) läzi (3), Alyk Kryts luzu (3), Budukh luzu {lyuyl} (3), Mishlesh Tsakhur żag arma- [dżasvara] (4), Mikik Tsakhur żag arma-n (4), Gelmts Tsakhur żag arma-n (4), Mukhad Rutul żag arma-di [dżasvarda] (4), Ixrek Rutul żag arma-di ~ żag arma-di [dżegvaɾdya ~

References and notes:


Arch: Chumakina et al. 2007; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 233; Kibrik et al. 1977b: 216, 350; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 673; Mikailov 1967: 206; Dirr 1908: 195, 204. Regular participle from the stative verb č'uˤbˈa 'to be white'.

Archi: Chumakina et al. 2007; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 233; Kibrik et al. 1977b: 216, 350; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 673; Mikailov 1967: 206; Dirr 1908: 195, 204. Regular participle from the stative verb č'uˤbˈa 'to be white'.


Alyk Kryts: Authier 2009: 67, 71, 204, 366, etc. Distinct from č'ebu 'blond' [Authier 2009: 67] (which is opposed to Alyk kuran 'red-haired' [Authier 2009: 221], borrowed from Azerbaijani kürän 'red-haired').

Budukh: Meylanova 1984: 102, 203; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 233; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 673. Polysemy: 'white / white (of eye, egg) / mergel (a k. of white clay)'.


Tsakhur-Kum Tsakhur: žagʷara-n [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 233].

Mikik Tsakhur: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 233; Dirr 1913: 157, 221.

Gelmets Tsakhur: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 233. In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 673], the modern contracted variant žagora-nʰ is quoted.


Luchek Rutul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 233. Note the gemination of -gʷ-, influenced by the same sporadic phenomenon in the Azerbaijani language.

Common Rutul: Final -dɨ / -d is the attributive suffix.

Cf. the substantive liž, which is attested with the meaning 'thread of white color' in Ixrek [Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 180] and 'egg white' in Mukhad (Kiche subdialect) [Ibragimov 1978: 133]. From this stem was also derived Mukhad (Khyuryuk subdialect): liž-ųy [liž-ųy] 'white sheep' [Ibragimov 1978: 140].


Fite Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 233; Shaumyan 1941: 171.

Aghul (proper): Suleymanov 2003: 79; Shaumyan 1941: 171. The same in the other subdialects: Tsirkhe, Duldug žagʷar-f 'white' [Shaumyan 1941: 171].


Common Aghul: Final -d, -t, -f, -r are adjectival suffixes (fossilized class exponents) [Magometov 1970: 92; Shaumyan 1941: 45].


Common Tabasaran: The original substantive *liz 'white of eye' is apparently retained in the literary pl.t. *liz-g-ar 'white of eye' [Khanmagomedov & Shalbuzov 2001: 218], although the suffixal element *(V)g- is unclear.


The same in the Akhty dialect: Khlyut *lac'i 'white' [Kibrik & Kodzassow 1990: 233].

Cf. the paronymous substantive: Gyune Lezgi *laz [abs.] / *lac-'ini- [obl.] 'white of eye; white of egg' [Uslar 1896: 496].

Literary Lezgi *laz [abs.] / *lac-'adi- [obl.] 'kaolin, china clay; white of eye; white of egg' [Talibov & Gadzhiev 1966: 219; Haspelmath 1993: 497].


The stem *čːakːʷarV- means 'white' in Archi, but in Nuclear Lezgian it has changed its meaning: Budukh 'red-haired', Alyk Kryts 'blond' and finally Literary Lezgi 'white': Haspelmath 1993: 497, 529.

In many Nuclear Lezgian lects, 'white' represents an adjective derived from the substantive *lac', whose meaning was probably 'white of egg' or a more generic 'white color'. This substantive is attested in Rutul 'thread of bright metal', which should be rejected (although external North Caucasian *lacːV- derivative adjective of egg'), Lezgi ('white of eye; white of egg'), probably Tabasaran ('white of eye'); in Archi, only the stem *lac-ut- 'iron' [Chumakina et al. 2007; Kibrik et al. 1977b: 270] was retained, where the final -ut- is a fossilized plural exponent. The derivative adjective *lacV- 'white' is present in South Lezgian (Kryts, Budukh), Tabasaran and Lezgi - the protoform *lacV-, however, seems a phantom; rather, we are dealing with independent formations in individual lects according to a productive morphological pattern. It must be noted that in [NCED: 751], this stem is reconstructed as *lacV- with the primary meaning 'a k. of bright metal', which should be rejected (although external North Caucasian *lacːV- do indeed point to the meaning 'a k. of metal').

Finally, in Udi, 'white' is expressed with the stem *maˤrc'ːi- [NCED: 552], whose original meaning was 'clear', as proven by its Archi, Nuclear Lezgian, as well as external North Caucasian cognates.

An etymologically unclear word for 'white' is attested in Caucasian Albanian (biki).

Replacements: [white of egg] > [white] (Kryts, Budukh, Tabasaran, Lezgi), ['clear'] > ['white'] (Udi), ['white'] > [red-haired'] (Budukh), ['white'] > [blond'] (Alyk Kryts).

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular, except for the consonant metathesis in Lezgi.

Semantics and structure: Primary stative verbal root 'to be white'.

98. WHO

Nidzh Udi šu {uuy} (1), Vartashen Udi šu {uuy} (1), Archi kʷi (2), Kryts (proper) tiy ~ ti (3), Alyk Kryts ti (3), Budukh tu {my} (3), Mishlesh Tsakhir ha=šu {ʒwaçy} (1), Mikik Tsakhir hu=šiː ~ ha=šu (1), Gelmets Tsakhir ha=šu (1), Mukhad Rutul wu=š ~ wi=š {ąwu ~ ęwu} (1) / wu-š (4), Ixrek Rutul wi=š {ąwu} (1) / wi-š (4), Luchek Rutul hu=ši (1) / hu-ši (4), Koshan Aghul fu=š (1) / fu-š (5), Keren Aghul fi=š (1) / fi-š (5), Gequn Aghul fi=š (1) / fi-š (5), Fite Aghul fi=š ~ fi=ž (1) / fi-ž ~ fi-ž (5), Aghul (proper) fu=š (1) / fu-š (5), Northern Tabasaran hu=žu ~ hu=ž (1) / hu-žu (6), Southern Tabasaran fu=ž (1) / fu-ž (5), Gyune Lezgi wu=ž (1) / wu-ž (5), Proto-Lezgian *šiː (1).
References and notes:


Common Udi: The general paradigm coincides in both dialects: *šu [abs.], *ši- [erg., obl.].


In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 757], 'who?' is erroneously glossed as ści [num] (actually 'what?' q.v.).


Tsakhur-Kum Tsakhur: ha=šku [Schulze 1997: 41] (in [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 228], quoted as hi-šku, which can be a typo). Paradigm: ha-šku [abs.] / ña-u- [obl.].

Mikik Tsakhur: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 228; Dirr 1913: 39. Paradigm: hu-šːi [abs.] / ña-a- [obl.]. The absolutive variant ha-šku (or ha=šku?) comes from [Dirr 1913] (in [Dirr 1913] forms of this pronoun are accompanied with the interrogative enclitic -ne).

Gelmets Tsakhur: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 228; Ibragimov 1990: 195. In [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990], the form is accompanied with the interrogative enclitic -şi, which corresponds to the Mishlesh enclitic -şi [Kibrik et al. 1999: 138]. In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 757], erroneously quoted as ha=šu-şi [ranyrinti].

Common Tsakhur: We prefer to treat initial hv as an additional interrogative morpheme that does not represent the main meaning here (cf. hv=šːo ~ hu=šːo ~ šːo ~ ha=šːi ~ ‘what?’).


Following [NCED: 986], we treat the direct stems wi-š, hu-š (i) as compounds of two pronominal morphemes. The Proto-Rutul paradigm of ’who’ was probably *wi-š [abs.] / ha-š- [obl.]. The Borch-Khnov and Luchek absolutive from hu-š (i) looks like contraction *ha-š:i-wi (hu- has been added due to analogy with the oblique stem).

Koshan Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 228; Magometov 1970: 113; Shaumyan 1941: 71; Suleymanov 1993: 131. According to [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990], the suppletive paradigm is: fu-š [abs. sg.] / na- [obl. sg.] / fu-š-ar [abs. pl.] / še- [obl. pl.]. It must be noted that the singular oblique stem na- is quoted only in [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990]. Other sources give the following, more simple, paradigm: fu-š [abs. sg.] / še- [obl. sg.] / fu-š-ar [pl.] / fu-š-ar- [obl. pl.].


Common Aghul: Following [NCED: 986], we treat the Aghul absolute form as a compound of two interrogative morphemes.


Common Tabasaran: Absolute "ž and oblique ši- are etymologically related, originating from Lezgian *ši [NCED: 986]. This morpheme is to be reconstructed as the Proto-Tabasaran pronoun 'who?'. In the modern dialects, the absolute form is proclitically modified with additional pronominal elements: fu- (what?) and hu- (generic semantics). Nevertheless, following [NCED: 986], we formally treat the Tabasaran absolute forms as compounds of two interrogative morphemes.


In the Khuryug subdialect of Akhty, however, the system is identical to the Kyuri and Quba groups: Khuryug wi-ž 'who?' / wu-ž 'what?' [Meylanova 1964: 298].

Distribution as well as external comparison suggest that compounds like wu-ž reflect the Proto-Lezgian form for 'who?'. Samur fi is etymologically related to wu- (< Lezgian *ži [NCED: 148 f.]), but the second element of the compound was secondarily lost in some Samur subdialects. The main difficulty is why Khlyut Akhty has fi- in the pronoun 'who?' (= literary wu-), although this is apparently the same morpheme.

Usukhchay Doquzpara hi 'who?' originates from 'which?': cf. Literary Lezgi hi [rat] 'which?' [Talibov & Gadzhiev 1966: 102].

Proto-Lezgian: NCED: 986. Distribution: See notes on 'what?'.

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular except for the u- vowel in Caucasian Albanian-Udi and Tsakhur (according to [NCED: 986], this might be the reflex of the suffixal class exponent -w-).

Semantics and structure: Primary pronominal morpheme, used at least in the absolutive stem of the pronoun 'who?'.

99. WOMAN

References and notes:

Nidz Udi: Gukasyan 1974: 238, 239 (čubuχ); Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 60 (čacχ); Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 72 (čacχ, čubuχ); Mobili 2010: 84, 85 (ču, čubuχ, čupuχ, čubuχ). Polysemy: ‘woman / wife’. Apparently forms like ču-č ~ čubuχ go back to ču-b-aχ with the Nidz sporadic weakening VbV > VV (for which see [Dzheiranishvili 1971: 277; Maisak 2008a: 150 f.]) and the further loss of -u between rounded vowels. Mobili’s ču and čupuχ look like back-formations or errors.

Distinct from diši ‘female (n.)’ [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 220], borrowed from Azerbaijani diši ‘female (n.)’.


Common Udi: Common Udi či (> ču before the labial b) with fossilized plural suffixes -b and -aχ. In both dialects the word is distinct from čuni [χuχi] ‘female (n.)’ [Gukasyan 1974: 226; Mobili 2010: 151, 204].


Distinct from the paronymous term ton ‘female (n.)’ [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 220].


In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010] the word aːr is also quoted as a synonym for ‘woman’ - a loanword (with irregular sound correspondences) in Kryts & Budukh of unknown origin.


Alyk Kryts: Authier 2009: 26, 37, 39, 40, 44, 55, 56, 73, 75, 177, etc. Polysemy: ‘woman / wife’. Historically či[bi]-b with a fossilized plural suffix.

A second, significantly less frequent term for ‘woman’ is xana in several examples [Authier 2009: 56, 111, 261, 307, 375]; it is ultimately borrowed from Persian zan, pl. zana ‘woman’ (via Azerbaijani zən ‘woman’?).

A third term is heʔ ‘woman’, quoted once in [Authier 2009: 25], for which see notes on Kryts proper aːr ‘woman’.


There also exists a second word for ‘woman; wife’: zaʔiʃa [Kibrik et al. 1999: 890] ~ zaʔiʃa [Ibragimov & Nurmamedov 2010: 170], apparently borrowed from Iranian, ultimately from Arabic dīsi ‘weak’.

Distinct from xasiʃ ‘female (n.)’ [Ibragimov & Nurmamedov 2010: 381].

Tsakhur-Kum Tsakhur: xunašːe [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 60]. Suppletive paradigm: xunašːe [sg.]/ yed-ar [pl.].

Mikik Tsakhur: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 60; Dirr 1913: 167, 225. In [Dirr 1913], quoted as xunyeːce. Suppletive paradigm: xunaʃe [sg.]/ yed-ar [pl.].

Distinct from xunin-na ~ xisil-na ‘female (n.)’ [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 220].


Distinct from xin in (said of another’s wife) [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 220], xisil-na ‘female (n.)’ [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 73].

Common Tsakhur: Historically xunaʃe, where -ʃe may originate from Proto-Lezgian *-uş: ‘daughter’ (thus in [NCED: 671]).

**Mukhad Rutul:** Dirr 1912: 142, 190; Ibragimov 1978: 44, 115; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 72. Suppletive paradigm: *xidl-di* [sg.]/ *xil-ā* [pl.]. Polysemes: 'woman / wife / female (n.).'

**Ixrek Rutul:** Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 283, 339; Ibragimov 1978: 201, 209, 225; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 72. Suppletive paradigm: *xidl-di* [sg.]/ *xil-e* [pl.]. Polysemes: 'woman / wife'.

A second term for 'woman' is *zānihlī* [ざんひλ] [Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 118], which was borrowed from some Azerbaijani form, derived from Azerbaijani zān 'woman' (ultimately from Persian).

**Luchek Rutul:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 60. Suppletive paradigm: *xidl-di* [sg.]/ *xil-e* [pl.]. Polysemes: 'woman / female (n.)' in the singular number [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 220].

Distinct from *qari* 'wife' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 60] (borrowed from Turkic, cf. Azerbaijani qari 'old woman').

**Common Rutul:** Borch-Khnov dialect: *xidil-di* [sg.]/ *xil-ā* [pl.] [Ibragimov 1978: 241, 256].

The suppletive paradigms coincide in all dialects. Final -di in the singular stem is the attributive suffix. The origin of the Common Rutul plural form *xil-V* is not entirely clear. Perhaps *xil-V* goes back to **xidl-V** < **xidil-V** with reduction of the medial vowel and subsequent consonant assimilation.


The same in the Khudig subdialect:  *χewe*-d 'woman' [Shaumyan 1941: 34, 35, 36].

**Keren Aghul:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 60. Optionally suppletive paradigm: *xir* [sg.]/ *xir-ar ~ χumb-ar* [pl.].

Distinct from Richa *xidul-f* 'female (n.)' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 220].

In the Usug subdialect: *xir* 'woman' [Shaumyan 1941: 178], *χumbe*-f 'woman' [Shaumyan 1941: 196]. No known difference. Several textual examples for 'woman' have been found. Most of them contain *χumbe-f*: "The woman weaves a rug on the loom" [Shaumyan 1941: 36], "The woman winds thread on the spindle" [Shaumyan 1941: 37], and the section from the story about the bald man [Shaumyan 1941: 127]; one passage contains *χir*: "This woman knits good stockings" [Shaumyan 1941: 61].

**Gequn Aghul:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 60; Dirr 1907: 120, 173; Shaumyan 1941: 178. Polysemes: 'woman / wife'. According to [Dirr 1907], with a suppletive paradigm: *xir* [sg.]/ *χamb-ar* [pl.], levelled in the modern dialect, as follows from [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990]: *xir* [sg.]/ *xir-ar* [pl.].

Distinct from *χumbe-f* 'female (n.)' [Dirr 1907: 150, 183], which shifted to the specific meaning 'unmarried woman' in the modern dialect [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 60]. It must be noted that Gequn *χumbe-f* is glossed as 'woman' in [Shaumyan 1941: 196] - apparently an inaccuracy.

Distinct from *xidul-f* 'female (n.)' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 220] (missing from [Dirr 1907]).

**Fite Aghul:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 60. Suppletive paradigm: *xir* [sg.]/ *χamb-ar* [pl.].

Distinct from *χumb-t* 'female (n.)' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 220].

**Aghul (proper):** Suleymanov 2003: 188; Shaumyan 1941: 178. Regular paradigm: *xir* [sg.]/ *xir-ar* [pl.]. Polysemes: 'woman / wife'. Cf. the example: "This woman knits good stockings" [Shaumyan 1941: 61].

Distinct from Tpig *χumbe-f* 'female (n.)' [Suleymanov 2003: 176]. In archaic Tpig, however, *χumbe-f* meant 'woman' (probably with polysemes: 'woman / female (n.)'), as follows from the gloss and several textual examples, provided in [Shaumyan 1941: 36, 37, 85, 95, 196]: "The woman weaves a rug on the loom", "The woman winds thread on the spindle", "The woman carries water", "Stop the woman that carries water!".


**Common Aghul:** It seems that a suppletive paradigm - *xir* [sg.]/ *χamb-ar* [pl.] - can be safely reconstructed for Proto-Aghul; the Keren, Gequn and Fite dialects retain this suppletion. Probably already in Proto-Aghul, *χumbe*- acquired the additional meaning 'female (n.)' (both sg. and pl.) and currently tends to supersede *xir* in the meaning 'woman (sg.)' (this process has already been completed in the Koshan dialect).

Final *-d, -t, -f, -r* are adjectival suffixes (fossilized class exponents) [Magometov 1970: 92; Shaumyan 1941: 45].

The same in the Khanag subdialect: šiw ~ š⊆ː [sg.] / χwaw-ː [pl.] ‘woman’ [Uslar 1979: 952, 981, 993; Dirr 1905: 221, 228]; the singular form with tense š is quoted by Dirr). Distinct from Khanag χibbi ‘of female sex’, χibbi-ː ‘female (n.)’ [Uslar 1979: 950, 1005].

In the Khuryuk subdialect, only χbri-ː [χiːːu, χiːɛːɪ] ‘female (n.)’ [Genko 2005: 164] is documented.

The phonetically important paradigm šiw [abs. sg.] / šːwːu- [obl. sg.] / χwaw-ː [pl.] ‘woman’ is also quoted in [Genko 2005: 190], but it is unknown which subdialect is covered under Genko’s siglum “A.” (maybe the village Laka is mentioned, cf. [Genko 2005: 219], but Laka represents the Southern dialect, therefore the retention of tense š is rather strange).

Southern Tabasaran: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 60. Synchronously suppletive paradigm: χpː-ːr [sg.] / χpː-ːv– [pl.]. Cf. various terms for ‘female (n.)’: χpːi, applied to donkeys and bears; peːti, applied to birds, ← peʔ ‘hen’; χwːiːb (a typo for expected χwːiːb), applied to other animals, ← χwːiː ‘cow’ [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 220].


Common Tabasaran: It seems that šiw (some Northern data suggest the original variant šiːw, but it is not very reliable) can be reconstructed as the Proto-Tabasaran term for ‘woman’ in the singular number, whereas Proto-Tabasaran χub- meant ‘women [pl.]’ (with various - regular or occasional - phonetic mutations in individual dialects, such as -b > -w-, restriction of the unaccented vowel, χb > χw > χp > χpː, as well as secondary epenthesis χpː > χwː-ː). The adjective χubː-ː ‘female’ was regularly derived from the plural root. Variants of the latter stem χubː-ː, regularly substantivized by the human class suffix -ːr, tend to supersede the singular šiw with the common development ‘female (n.)’ → ‘woman’. This process is almost finished in the Southern dialect, where šiw is mostly retained as an ethnonymical suffix (see, however, the Tabasaran and Khiv data above). Cf. in Southern Tabasaran the similar shift ‘male (n.)’ → ‘man’ q.v.


Another term is attested in some dialects of the Samur group: Khuryug (subdialect of Akhty) χ🏆ub ~ χnip ‘woman; wife’ [Meylanova 1964: 315], Fiː χub ~ χnip ‘woman; wife’ [Meylanova 1964: 394]. It is unclear whether χubb ~ χniːb represents the Proto-Lezgi term for ‘woman’ or simply the old suppletive plural form for ‘women’.

Proto-Lezgian: NCED: 762. Distribution: A rather unstable word. The basic data can be summarized as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WOMAN</th>
<th>CA</th>
<th>Udi</th>
<th>Archi</th>
<th>Kryts</th>
<th>Budukh</th>
<th>Tsakhur</th>
<th>Rutul</th>
<th>Aghul</th>
<th>Tabasaran</th>
<th>Lezgi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*yWVy</td>
<td>woman [pl.]</td>
<td>woman</td>
<td>girl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ɛinc-(ol)</td>
<td>&gt; female (without the p-suffix)</td>
<td>woman [sg.] (&gt; female)</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>woman (suffixless compound)</td>
<td>woman, female</td>
<td>female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*χon-pːV</td>
<td>woman [pl.]</td>
<td>woman [sg.]</td>
<td>woman [pl.]</td>
<td>woman [pl.]</td>
<td>woman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ɛir</td>
<td>female (suffixed), another wife (suffixed)</td>
<td>woman [sg.]</td>
<td>wife (bound term)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*CLASS=уш</td>
<td>woman (compound)</td>
<td>woman [sg.]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*pap(a)</td>
<td>'mother, grandmother'</td>
<td>woman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The distributive analysis suggests that the Archi situation could be primary, that is, the following suppletive paradigm 'woman' is to be reconstructed for Proto-Lezgian: *ɛinc-ol [sg.] / *χon-pːV [pl.]. Naturally, in individual lects, this suppletive paradigm tends to be levelled in favor of one of the two stems. Additionally, in many Nuclear Lezgian languages, *ɛinc-(ol) shifted to the meaning 'female'.

In the Caucasian Albanian-Udi branch, this paradigm was totally eliminated (note the etymologically obscure Caucasian Albanian form ɣiNu 'woman [sg.]').

The Proto-Lezgian meanings of *CLASS=уш (Tabasaran 'woman') and *pap(a) (Gyune Lezgi 'woman') were 'girl, daughter' and 'mother, grandmother' respectively, as proved by the data of various Lezgian languages, see [NCED: 286, 671].

The original meanings of the sparsely attested *yWVy [NCED: 952] and *ɛir [NCED: 764] are not clear. These could denote 'female', 'female relative', 'wife', 'girl' and so on.

In many Lezgian lects, inherited terms for 'woman' and 'female' tend to be superseded with Azerbaijani, Persian or Arabic loanwords.

Replacements: [mother [pl.] > 'woman [pl.]'] (non-Gelmets Tsakhur), [mother, grandmother > 'woman'] (Gyune Lezgi), [girl, daughter > 'woman'] (Tabasaran).

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular.

Semantics and structure: Suppletive paradigm: *ɛinc-ol [sg.] / *χon-pːV [pl.]. Final -pːV is the plural exponent, whereas the final element of the stem *ɛinc-ol is a relatively frequent nominal suffix. Two Proto-Lezgian variants are proposed in [NCED: 762]: *ɛin and *ɛinc-ol. The former suffixless stem is postulated on the basis of the Udi derivative ɣun-i 'female' and the Tsakhur compound xuna-ʃe 'woman'. The Tsakhur form could actually originate from *ɛinc-ol as well, with the old suffix supplanted by the root ʃe in the recent compound pattern. On the other hand, Udi ɣun-i points out that the suffixless stem *ɛin did indeed exist in Proto-Lezgian (the exact meaning of suffixless *ɛin is, however, unclear).

100. YELLOW

Nidzh Udi ɣε̆s-um ɣε̆shlym (1), Vartashen Udi ɣε̆s-um ɣε̆shlym (1), Archi ɣaχa-ťu-CLASS (2), Kryts (proper) ɣari (3), Alyk Kryts ɣalːi (4), Budukh soza sozal (5), Mishlesh Tsakhur ẓirgiatan (1) / ɣėbīn (6), Mikik Tsakhur ɣėbīn ɣėbīn (6) / ẓirgiatan (1),
Gelmets Tsakhur *diraq'i-n' (7), Mukhad Rutul qiative {kʰərIɔdə} (6), Ixrek Rutul *diraq'-di ~ *danaq'-di {dərak'qə} ~ *danaq'-di (7), Luchek Rutul *danaq'-di (7), Koshan Aghul qeqe-r (2), Keren Aghul q'uve-f (2), Gequn Aghul qeqa-f ~ qeqe-f (2), Fite Aghul *quiq-t (2), Aghul (proper) qeqe-f (2), Northern Tabasaran carχ'i (8), Southern Tabasaran watχ'u (8), Gyune Lezgi qʰp:i (6), Proto-Lezgian *qäqV (2).

References and notes:


Common Udi: Common Udi *nesq-um, for the adjectival suffix -um see [Schulze 2005: 229 (3.2.9.1 #13)].

Caucasian Albanian: Unattested.

Archi: Chumakina et al. 2007; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 234; Kibrik et al. 1977b: 332, 358; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 676; Mikailov 1967: 200; Dirr 1908: 188, 208. In [Mikailov 1967], quoted as χaχa-CLASS; in [Comrie & Khalilov 2010] an incorrect variant χaχa-di-CLASS is also quoted. Regular participle from the stative verb χaχa 'to be yellow'.


Alyk Kryts: Authier 2009: 68. Also attested in the expression qalʔ-xin 'yolk' [Authier 2009: 78] (the second element is the masdar of the verb xi- 'to become'). As proposed by Authier, derived from the substantive qal 'mouse'. Note the consonant gemination in the intervocalic position (-l-), for which see [Authier 2009: 13], influenced by the same sporadic phenomenon of the Azerbaijani language.


Mishlesh Tsakhur: Kibrik et al. 1999: 890, 893.

There are two related color terms in Mishlesh, studied in detail in [Davies et al. 1999]:

1) borrowed zirgi-n 'yellow (in a narrow sense)', glossed as 'yellow' in [Kibrik et al. 1999: 890, 893];
2) inherited qative-n 'orange', which covers a considerable part of the color-space between yellow, red and brown. This is glossed as 'orange, of the colour of yolk' in [Kibrik et al. 1999: 876], but as 'yellow' in [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 676]. qative-n is also the only term for 'yellow' found in [Ibragimov & Nurmamedov 2010] (attested in the phrase 'Mortar of the yellow clay is like pitch' [Ibragimov & Nurmamedov 2010: 75-76]). The original substantive root qibr (with the presumed meaning 'yolk') is attested in the Mishlesh complex verb qibr ɣix- 'to become orange, to become of color of yolk' [Kibrik et al. 1999: 876].

Such a situation is not typical cross-linguistically. It seems reasonable to treat zirgi-n and qative-n as synonyms for Mishlesh Tsakhur.


Common Tsakhur: Mishlesh & Tsakhur-Kum-zirgi-n and Mikik zirgi-n probably represent an Iranian loanword (cf. Pahlavi zargen, Modern Persian zargen 'golden, yellow, green'), although details are unclear.


Common Rutul: Final -di / -d is the attributive suffix.


Keren Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 234. The same in the Usug subdialect: qeqe-f (i.e. q'eqe-f) 'yellow' [Shaumyan 1941: 198].

Fite Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 234.


Common Aghul: As noted in [NCED: 415], pharyngealization in Keren and Fite is a secondary reflexion of the formerly front vowel in the first syllable.


The same in the Khanag subdialect: qarχʔ 'yellow'; red (of hair) [Uslar 1979: 819, 993; Dirr 1905: 187, 228]. The same in the Khyuryuk subdialect: qarχʔ (къархь) 'yellow' [Genko 2005: 100] (erroneously not labeled by Genko as Khyuryuk).

Southern Tabasaran: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 234.


Common Tabasaran: Both forms - Northern aركة - qarχʔ, Southern nاتχʔу - are related, although morphological details are not entirely clear. The adjectives look like deverbal formations with the fossilized class infixes -tː- and -dː- (dқ > tқ). The assumed verbal root could be **aركة, if the initial uvulars are the regular perfective prefix: θ (Dyubek) / q= (other Northern) / ρ= (Southern), for which see [Magometov 1965: 222; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 34].

Quite differently in [NCED: 454], where Tabasaran 'yellow' is treated as an infixed derivation from the substantive for 'dried carcass of ram': Northern (Khyuryuk) qαχʔ [къаах] 'dried carcass of ram; dried pears' [Genko 2005: 100] (erroneously not labeled as Khyuryuk by Genko), Southern (Kondik) nاتχʔ 'dried carcass of ram' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 19], Literary Tabasaran: nاتχʔ [ръах] 'dried carcass (usually of ram)' [Khanmagomedov & Shalbuzov 2001: 110]. Such a solution is more difficult morphologically and is not self-evident semantically.


The same in the Akhty dialect: Khlyut ّقپːي 'yellow' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 234].

Proto-Lezgian: NCED: 414. Distribution: A rather unstable word. The stem ّقپːV- is the best candidate from the distributive point of view, since it is attested as 'to be yellow' in Archi, on the one hand, and in Aghul, on the other (having been lost in the rest of the languages). External comparison confirms this choice.

In Tsakhur, Mukhad Rutul and Lezgi, ّقپːV- was superseded with the adjective ّقپː-ي- [LEDb: #127], derived from the substantive ّقپːي 'yolk', attested in Lezgi and apparently in Mishlesh Tsakhur. Actually, ّقپː-ي- can be a late denominative formation in Tsakhur-Rutul and Lezgi, according to the productive morphophonological pattern (an areal lexical isogloss).

In Kryts proper, the meaning 'yellow' is expressed with the root 'قئري- [NCED: 554], whose exact original meaning is unidentified: 'a k. of light color' (this stem denotes 'grey', 'variegated', 'blue' in other Nuclear Lezgian lects).

In Alyk Kryts, 'yellow' is derived from the substantive for 'mouse' (ْقئريV [NCED: 935]).

There is also a Gelmet Tsakhur and Rutul term دراوق- 'yellow', which corresponds to Literary Lezgi دراوق or دراوق 'of orange color, brick-red' (the presumed Proto-Lezgian form is *دراوق, if we really deal with -e- in Lezgi). The dialectal Azerbaijani terms دراوق, دراوق 'jaundice' (e.g., Tovuz) may have a Nuclear Lezgian origin: cf. İxrek Rutul دراوق [اپاره] 'jaundice' [İbragimov 1978: 222] (although the plain uvular in the Ixrek form is quite unclear; this could be an error for **دراوق [اپاره] or a back borrowing from Azerbaijani).

Etimologically obscure terms for 'yellow' are attested in Udi (ٍمٍس), Budukh (ٍو), Tabasaran (the Proto-Tabasaran verbal root *ئات). In some Tsakhur dialects, an Iranian loanword is attested.

Replacements: {mouse' > yellow'} (Alyk Kryts), {yolk' > yellow'} (Tsakhur, Mukhad Rutul, Lezgi).

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular.

Semantics and structure: Primary stative verbal root 'to be yellow'.
101. FAR


References and notes:


Vartashen Udi: Gukasyan 1974: 294; Fähnrich 1999: 7; Dirr 1903: 30; Schiefner 1863: 76; Schulze 2001: 250. In [Fähnrich 1999: 7], a corrupted form $aχˤi$ is also quoted. Also functions as the adjective 'far, distant, remote'.

Common Udi: Common Udi *$aχˤi$-l. For the rare adjectival suffix -l (or -l?) see [Schulze 2005: 229 (3.2.9.1 #12)].


Archí: Chumakina et al. 2007; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 231; Kibrik et al. 1977b: 194, 356; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 578; Mikailov 1967: 172; Dirr 1908: 130, 207. An adverb, regularly derived from the stative verb $aχ$ 'to be far (away)'.


Mikik Tsakhur: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 231; Dirr 1913: 137, 224.

Gelmets Tsakhur: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 231. In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 578], the modern depharyngealized variant is quoted: $aqˤ-na$-CLASS.

Common Tsakhur: Cf. the paronymous adjective $aqˤ-i$-$n$ 'wide' (Mishlesh, Tsakhur-Kum, Mikik, Gelmets [Kibrik et al. 1999: 869; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 238]).


Common Rutul: Regular adverb from the adjective $χɨr$-id 'far, remote' [Ibragimov 1978: 109].


Gequn Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 231; Dirr 1907: 108. The form in -l is from [Dirr 1907].

Fite Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 231; Suleymanov 1993: 177. The form $warχa$ is from [Suleymanov 1993], apparently for $warχa$-? with the dropped glottal-stop.

Common Aghul: Historically *w-аrχa- with a fossilized prefixal class exponent. Final -ʔ is the locative ending 'in', -l is the locative ending 'on (the horizontal axis)', frequently used in local adverbs [Magometov 1970: 81, 171].

Northern Tabasaran: Kibrik & Kodzazov 1990: 231.


Southern Tabasaran: Kibrik & Kodzazov 1990: 231.


Common Tabasaran: Final -la is an old locative exponent; final -ʔ is the synchronic locative ending. Formally this stem can be derived from the Tabasaran adjective yarχi 'long' q.v., although the authors of [NCED] prefer to distinguish these roots. Historically y=аrχa-la 'far' with a fossilized prefixal class prefix.

Gyne Lezgi: Uslar 1896: 446, 609.


The same in the Akhty dialect: Khyut yarχa-la-ʔ 'far (adv.)' [Kibrik & Kodzazov 1990: 231].

Final -0, -l are locative endings; final -z is the dative ending.

Proto-Lezgian: NCED: 269. Distribution: Retained with the primary meaning 'far' in all languages except for Tsakhur, where it was superseded with a formation from the root *bəɾq'i- 'wide' [NCED: 511].

Replacements: {wide > 'far'} (Tsakhur).

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular, except for the metathesis *təɾχ- > χir- in Rutul.

Semantics and structure: Primary stative verbal root 'to be far'; the Ablaut grade χəɾχːV is attested in South Lezgian (Kryts, Budukh) and Rutul.

102. HEAVY

Nidzh Udi bi褊'i ~ bi褊hi ~ bi褊i (ɮɤɣɤy旸 ~ ɮɤɣɤy旸 ~ ɮɤɣɤy旸) (1), Vartashen Udi bi褊'i ~ bi褊'i (ɮɤ ~ ɮɤ) (1), Archi CLASS=ib˧˨-du-CLASS ~ CLASS=ib˧˨-du-CLASS (1), Kryts (proper) ʃak' (1), Alyk Kryts ʃark'a (1), Budukh ʰerki (ʐepkIu) (1), Mishlesh Tsakhur yiɣ'i-n (ɨɨIкъян, ɨɨIкъян) (1), Mikik Tsakhur yiɣ'i-n (1), Gelmets Tsakhur yiɣ'i-n (1), Mukhad Rutul yuɣ'i-dɪ (nɤɬɬdɪ) (1), Ixrek Rutul yuɣ'i-dɪ (nɤɬɬdɪ) (1), Luchek Rutul yuɣ'i-dɪ (1), Koshan Aghul beve-r (2), Keren Aghul yarqʷʷtʃ-f (1), Gequn Aghul ʔʊɾʔi-f (1) / ʔeqeq-f (2), Fite Aghul qaʔi-t (2), Aghul (proper) ʔeqeq-f ~ ʔeqeq-f (2), Northern Tabasaran æqʔi (1) / caʔi (2), Southern Tabasaran ʔaʁʔi (2), Gyune Lezgi zal'än (3), Proto-Lezgian *ʰʰʔeqʷʷi (1).

References and notes:

Nidzh Udi: Gukasyan 1974: 85; Kibrik & Kodzazov 1990: 239 (only bi褊hi); Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 683 (only bi褊i); Mobili 2010: 66. Polysemy: 'heavy / difficult'.


Common Udi: Common Udi *bi褊i, historically maybe *b-ish'i with a fossilized class-prefix.

Caucasian Albanian: bu褊 'heavy, weighty; stuttering, stumbling' [Gippert et al. 2008: IV-12]; an etymological cognate of the Udi term (note the occasional loss of the intervocal -n- already in CA).


Alyk Kryts: Authier 2009: 69, 111, 199, 310, 340, etc. Polysemy: ‘heavy / difficult / very’.


Tsakhur-Kum Tsakhur: yiq’-n [Kibrik & Kodzazov 1990: 239].


Gelmets Tsakhur: Kibrik & Kodzazov 1990: 239. In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 683], the modern depharyngealized variant is quoted: yiq’-n’ [никлын’].


Luchek Rutul: Kibrik & Kodzazov 1990: 239.

Common Rutul: Final -d / -d is the attributive suffix.

Koshan Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzazov 1990: 239; Suleymanov 2003: 116. In [Shaumyan 1941: 188], the Burshag word is erroneously quoted as qeqc-r.

Keren Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzazov 1990: 239. The same in the Usug subdialect: urq’e-f ‘heavy’ [Shaumyan 1941: 188] (the transcription is not reliable).

Gequn Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzazov 1990: 239; Dirr 1907: 147, 186; Shaumyan 1941: 188. In [Kibrik & Kodzazov 1990], two adjectives are quoted as synonyms for ‘heavy’ without additional specification, whereas in [Dirr 1907] only türlek-f has been found.

Fite Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzazov 1990: 239.

Aghul (proper): Kibrik & Kodzazov 1990: 239; Shaumyan 1941: 188. The latter form is from [Shaumyan 1941]. In [Suleymanov 2003: 116], the Tpig word for ‘heavy’ is quoted as qiq’-f, which seems an error.

Common Aghul: The distribution suggests that the Proto-Aghul term for ‘heavy’ should be qeqc- (sewe-), because it is present in both Koshan and non-Koshan dialects, but the external comparison clearly points out that Keren yarq’-e- and Gequn türlek- ‘heavy’ represent a retention.

It is proposed in [NCED: 927] that qeqc- (sewe-) ‘heavy’ is a new formation from the word ‘burden, load’: Koshan (Burshag) taf, Keren (Richa), Gequn (Burkikhan), Fite qag ‘burden, load’ [Kibrik & Kodzazov 1990: 155; Magometov 1970: 87]. In such a case the derivation ‘burden’ → ‘heavy’ is a late Tabasaran-Aghul areal isogloss (see common Tabasaran notes). The reflexes of Proto-Lezgian q’ are irregular, however (one could expect Koshan ʕ/ non-Koshan q), and the Koshan pair taf ‘burden’ ~ sewe- ‘heavy’ is particularly suspicious. The development of uvulars in Aghul dialects requires additional investigation; maybe some of the aforementioned Koshan forms are Tabasaran loanwords, cf. [NCED: 133].

Final -d, -t, -f, -r are adjectival suffixes (fossilized class exponents) [Magometov 1970: 92; Shaumyan 1941: 45].

Northern Tabasaran: Kibrik & Kodzazov 1990: 239. In [Kibrik & Kodzazov 1990], two Dyubek adjectives are quoted as synonyms: aq’i and a ‘ă, the difference is unknown.

The same two terms in the Khanag subdialect: aq’i ‘heavy’ [Uslar 1979: 599, 1008; Dirr 1905: 153, 245] and qaq’i ‘heavy’ [Uslar 1979: 817, 1008; Dirr 1905: 191, 245]; the latter is incorrectly transcribed by Dirr as qaqi. According to Uslar’s examples, both adjectives are indeed close synonyms.


Southern Tabasaran: Kibrik & Kodzazov 1990: 239.
The same in the Khiv subdialect: гъагъ یر (гъагъи) 'heavy' [Genko 2005: 40]. The same in Literary Tabasaran: қәә یر (қәәг) 'heavy' [Khanmagomedov & Shalbuzov 2001: 104].

Common Tabasaran: As in the case of Aghul (q.v.), the external comparison points out that ағ یر 'heavy' (retained as one of two synonyms in Northern Tabasaran) is an archaism, whereas the widespread adjective а а / ғәәг / ағәәг represents an innovation.

As proposed in [NCED: 927], the latter Tabasaran term was most likely derived from the substantive for 'burden': Dyubek а а 'burden, load' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 155], Khanag ғәәг 'load pack' [Uslar 1979: 816], Kumi ғәәг [қәәгқ] 'load, weight' [Genko 2005: 99], Khiv қәәг [қәәгқ] 'load, weight, burden, load pack' [Genko 2005: 40]. Such a derivation 'burden' → 'heavy' seems a late areal introduction that affected both Tabasaran and Aghul dialects (see common Aghul notes).

Gyne Lezgi: Uslar 1896: 425, 636. A term of unknown origin; looks like a loanword, although the source is unidentified. If inherited, should be analyzed as зал'и-н with the adjective suffix -n, for which see [Gaydarov et al. 2009: 139 f.] (historically a genitive exponent, modifying the substantive stem).


Only the Azerbaijani loanword is found in the Akhty dialect: Кхлыут ау'ир 'heavy' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 239].

Proto-Lezgian: NCED: 513. Distribution: Retained with the basic meaning 'heavy' in all the languages except for some Aghul and some Tabasaran dialects, as well as the Lezgi language.

In many Aghul and Tabasaran dialects, this was superseded with an adjective that is synchronically derived from the substantive 'burden, load' (*қәәг [NCED: 927]); it must be noted that Aghul forms for 'heavy' can actually be Tabasaran loanwords.

In Lezgi dialects, either the etymologically obscure form зал'и or the Azerbaijani loanword is used.

Replacements: {burden, load} > 'heavy' (Aghul, Tabasaran), ['heavy'] > 'difficult' (passim in Lezgian), ['heavy'] > 'very' (Alyk Kryts), ['heavy'] > 'offensive, slighting' (Ixrek Rutul).

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular except for the strange shift q > қ in South Lezgian (Kryts, Budukh). In [NCED: 513], the initial b- in the Udi (and Caucasian Albanian) form бәәг is explained as the result of the metathesis of labialization (*у'ир < *ғиръ-* with the subsequent regular development ~у' > Udi б-) but actually, Udi б- is more easily explainable as the fossilized class prefix - a very frequent morphological pattern in Caucasian Albanian-Udi.

Semantics and structure: Primary stative verbal root 'to be long'; the Budukh and Aghul medial -р- can either be the imperfective infix or the fossilized class exponent.

103. NEAR

Nidzh Udi иш 'къ иш 'къи (1), Vartashen Udi иш иш (1), Archi ғ иш (2), Kryts (proper) ми'о-в ~ ми'о-в (3), Alyk Kryts miq'e-f (3), Budukh бо да ~ бо да {бода, бо да} (4), Mishlesh Tsakhur d'ol'е-s ~ d'ol'е-s-wall'e ~ d'ol'е-s-CLASS {дәләс-на} (5), Mikik Tsakhur d'el'е-s (5), Gelmets Tsakhur d'ol'е-s-CLASS (5), Mukhad Rutul bе-gа-d-а ~ bе-gа-d-а ~ bе-gа-d-e (бөүдәб ~ бөүдә) (6), Ixrek Rutul bеx-d-а ~ bеx-d-e (бөүдәб ~ бөүдә) (6), Luchek Rutul bеy-d-і (6), Koshan Aghul bugу-h (6), Keren Aghul muq'у (3), Gequn Aghul bugу-li-h ~ bugу-li- во (6), Fite Aghul muq'у (3) / bagу (6), Northern Tabasaran bag'а-x (6), Southern Tabasaran bag'а-x (6) / ғор'а-q (7), Gyune Lezgi maq'а (3).
References and notes:


Vartashen Udi: Guksasyan 1974: 294; Fähnrich 1999: 18; Schiefer 1863: 77; Schulze 2001: 287; Starchevskiy 1891: 490. In [Fähnrich 1999: 18], a corrupted form is also quoted. Also functions as the adjective 'near, close'.

Common Udi: Common Udi *tiš-a; as plausibly proposed in [Sulke 2001: 287], the final -a is the dative ending.


Caucasian Albanian: ia 'near, close by' [Gippert et al. 2008: IV-19]. It is unclear whether CA ia can be an etymological cognate of Udi iš-a. On one hand, there are several reliable cases in which the Caucasian Albanian sign f renders intervocalic -š- or -rš- in loanwords [Gippert et al. 2008: II-12] (such a strange substitution is perhaps regular in loanwords, but not necessarily so, cf. [Gippert et al. 2008: II-79 f.] for the list of foreign elements in Caucasian Albanian). On the other hand, CA ia ~ Udi iš-a seems the only good instance of such a correspondence between inherited Caucasian Albanian and modern Udi forms (cf. [Gippert et al. 2008: II-78]). It must be noted that the normal correspondences for the intervocalic position are trivial: CA ~ ~ Udi -š- and, apparently, CA ~ ~ Udi ~ [Gippert et al. 2008: II, 10].


Distinct from the more specific adverb čʕəx-w 'nearby, neighboring' [Chumakina et al. 2007; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 231; Kibrik et al. 1977b: 213, 351].

Kryts (proper): Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 232; Saadiev 1994: 434. The final -v is the locative ending 'AD'.

Distinct from the more specific adverb bada-v ~ bado-v 'nearby' [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 577] with the same locative ending -v.

Alyk Kryts: Authier 2009: 82, 87, 93, 109, etc. The final -t is the locative ending 'IN'. Distinct from the more specific and less frequent adverb bigila 'nearby' [Authier 2009: 81 f., 93, 94, 102, etc.].


Distinct from several words with the more specific meaning 'nearby': qәɾәs,i², yanak,i², kәn't-e-qa, mujГләkt,i², oʕgьd(=-e) [Kibrik et al. 1999: 898].


Gelmets Tsakhur: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 231.

Distinct from the more specific adverb qәn'tә-Class 'nearby' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 231; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 578].

Common Tsakhur: Final -s is apparently the dative ending.

Mukhad Rutul: Dirr 1912: 125, 185; Ibragimov 1978: 109, 111, 122; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 578. The non-syncopated form beg-ed-ә is from [Dirr 1912].

Ixrek Rutul: Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 40, 322; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 578.


Common Rutul: Pace [NCED: 314], the Rutul forms represent the regular adverbial formation from the substantive beg 'side (anatomic)' [Ibragimov 1978: 109].

Koshan Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 231.

Distinct from the more specific adverb bug-li-h ~ bug-li-w 'nearby' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 231; Suleymanov 2003: 36].

Distinct from the more specific adverb bugu-li-ỉi `nearby' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 231].

Gequn Aghul: Dirr 1907: 107. In [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 231], quoted only as bugu-li-ỉi `nearby'. According to examples in [Dirr 1907: 107], however, `nearby' is rather expressed simply as bugu.

Fite Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 231. In [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990], two adverbs are quoted as synonyms, semantic or pragmatic nuances are unknown.Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 231.

Aghul (proper): Not attested. Cf. the more specific adverb bugu-li-ỉi `nearby' [Suleymanov 2003: 36].

Common Aghul: All the competing adverbs are derived from two nouns: bagʷ `side (spatial and anatomic)' and muqˈ `place'. Cf. Koshan (Burshag) bagʷ `side (both spatial and anatomic)' [Suleymanov 2003: 36], Keren (Richa) bagʷ `side (anatomic) of ram', Gequn (Burkikhan) bagʷ `side (anatomic)' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 22], Proper Aghul (Tpig) bagʷ `side (both spatial and anatomic)' [Suleymanov 2003: 36; Shaumyan 1941: 154]. On the other hand, cf. Keren (Richa, Usug), Gequn (Burkikhan), Proper Aghul (Tpig, Duldug) muqˈ `place' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 218; Shaumyan 1941: 152; Suleymanov 2003: 135].

Final -h is the locative ending `in front of', -w is the locative ending `near', -l- is the locative ending `on (the horizontal axis)', all of them frequently used in local adverbs [Magometov 1970: 81, 171].

The distribution suggests that the Proto-Aghul adverb `near' was probably derived from bagʷ `side', whereas adverbs based on muqˈ `place' represent more recent formations in some dialects (maybe under the influence on the part of the neighboring Lezgi language).

Northern Tabasaran: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 231.

The same in the Khanag subdialect: bagʷə-h `near (adv.)' [Uslar 1979: 424; Dirr 1905: 124, 156, 223].

Southern Tabasaran: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 231. In [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990], two Kondik expressions for `near (adv.)' are quoted as synonyms: bagə-x and səala-q.


Common Tabasaran: Final -x / -h is the locative ending `near'. Kondik səala-q is a clear innovation, representing the substantive səal `side (anatomic)' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 21], modified with the locative ending -q `behind'.


The same in the Akhty dialect: Khyut muqʷə-l `near (adv.)' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 231].

Final -o / -l are the locative endings. Distinct from the more specific literary adverb pata-w `nearby' [Talibov & Gadzhiev 1966: 260] - a locative form from the noun pad `side (spatial)' [Talibov & Gadzhiev 1966: 257].

Proto-Lezgian: Not reconstructible.

Distribution: In all the lects, the adverb `near' represents synchronic locative or adverbial forms of substantives for `place', `side', `together'. All these formations look like recent introductions (in many case of areal origin).

In Archi, `near' is the lative form from the adverb `together' (`ɛː��` [NCED: 1063]).

In Kryts dialects, `near' is represented by locative case forms of the Proto-Lezgian substantive *uniŋʷ(a) `place' [NCED: 1054] (the meaning `place' is retained in Archi and some Aghul dialects). Similarly in Caucasian Albanian-Udi, `near' represents the case form of the Lezgian noun *yis` [NCED: 683], which is attested as `place' in Aghul and Tabasaran (although *uniŋʷ(a) is the candidate for Proto-Lezgian term for `place' from the distributive point of view).

In Budukh, `near' is the locative form of the noun *paːt: [NCED: 315] (with the ending *ɛː��` [NCED: 1063]), the same locative form has the more specific meaning `nearby' in Kryts and Lezgi. The proper noun *paːt: is only attested in Lezgi as `side (spatial)'.

In Tsakhur, `near' seems to be the dative form of the presumed substantive d.Serialize("\^\ o\ l\~\ d\ e\ l\ ^\ ~\ l\ ~\ d\ e\ l\)#, unattested elsewhere.

In Rutul, `near' is the synchronic adverb from the substantive *beg `side (anatomic)', which apparently originates from Proto-Lezgian *pakʷ [NCED: 292], although the front vowel and delabialized velar in Rutul beg `side (anatomic)' and Kryts beg `side (anatomic)' are indeed irregular. But in any case, postulation of the separate root *peːʔV `near', attested only as the Rutul adverb `near' (thus [NCED: 314]), seems unjustified. Similarly, in Tabasaran and many Aghul dialects, `near' is the locative form `side (spatial and anatomic) < *pakʷ [NCED: 292]. But in Kondik Tabasaran, `near' represents the locative form of the synchronic Tabasaran substantive `side (anatomic) < *qːʷal (~ - l) [NCED: 472].
In the rest of Aghul dialects and in Lezgi, 'near' is the adverbial or locative form of the substantive 'place' < Proto-Lezgian *wɨnqʷ(a) 'place' [NCED: 1054] (the same as in the case of Kryts, see above).

Replacements: ['together > 'near'] (Archi), ['in place > 'near'] (Kryts, Aghul, Lezgi), ['side (anatomic) > 'near'] (Rutul, Aghul, Tabasaran), ['to the side (spatial) > 'near'(?)] (Budukh).

104. SALT
Nidzh Udi el {eλ} (1), Vartashen Udi el {eλ} (1), Archi ʿorχˤi (2), Kryts (proper) qʿel (1), Alyk Kryts qʿel (1), Budukh qʿel {κβελ} (1), Mishlesh Tsakhur qʿew {κβεβ} (1), Mikik Tsakhur qʿew (1), Gelmets Tsakhur qʿew (1), Mukhad Rutul qʿāl ~ qʿel {κβαλ ~ κβελ} (1), Ixrek Rutul qʿel ~ qʿāl {κβελ ~ κβαλ} (1), Luchek Rutul qʿelʳ (1), Koshan Aghul qʿel (1), Aghul (proper) qʿel (1), Northern Tabasaran qʾil (1), Southern Tabasaran qʾil (1), Gyune Lezgi qʾāl (1), Proto-Lezgian *qʾāl(1).

References and notes:

Common Udi: Common Udi *el. Despite [Schulze 2001: 274], the resemblance to Old Armenian ał 'salt' is accidental.

Caucasian Albanian: Unattested.
Archi: Chumakina et al. 2007; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 123; Kibrik et al. 1977b: 289, 382; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 311; Mikailov 1967: 195; Dirr 1908: 172, 222. Etymologically isolated; looks like a loanword, but the source has not been identified.
Tsakhur-Kum Tsakhur: qʿew [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 123].
Mikik Tsakhur: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 123; Dirr 1913: 196.
Gelmets Tsakhur: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 123; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 311.
Gequn Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 123; Dirr 1907: 138, 184; Suleymanov 1993: 28; Shaumyan 1941: 185. The form with -ā is from [Dirr 1907] and [Shaumyan 1941].
The same in the other subdialects: Tsirkhe qaːl, Khpyuk qaːl, Kurag qaːl 'salt' [Suleymanov 1993: 34, 182; Magometov 1970: 29].

Northern Tabasaran: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 123.


Southern Tabasaran: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 123.


The same in the Akhty dialect: Khlyut qaːl 'salt' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 123].

Proto-Lezgian: NCED: 912. Distribution: Retained with the basic meaning 'salt' in all the lects, except for Archi. It must be noted that the Archi adjective qaːla 'bitter', quoted in [NCED: 912], does not seem to exist (not found in the available sources).

In Archi, qaːl was superseded with the etymologically obscure form ʔəɾx'i.

Replacements: 'salt' > 'bitter' (see [NCED: 912] for examples).

Semantics and structure: Primary substantive root. The oblique stem is *q'ila-.

105. SHORT

Nidzh Udi gödäk ǯowdɑːvi (-1), Vartashen Udi gödäk ǯowdɑːvək (-1), Archi kʰuːt'a-tʃu-CLASS (-1), Kryts (proper) gʷədä (1), Alyk Kryts ɡʷada (1), Budukh godə ǯowdə (1), Mishlesh Tsakhur ʒit'a-n ǯojmlan (2), Mikik Tsakhur ʒit'a-n (2), Gelmets Tsakhur ʒit'a-nɐ (2), Mukhad Rutul ʒik-di ǯojkər (2), Ixrek Rutul ʒik-di ǯojkər (2), Luchek Rutul ʒik-di (2), Koshan Aghul ʒeʔe-r (2), Keren Aghul ʒäːq-e-f (2), Gequn Aghul ʒeq-e-f ~ ʒiʔ-e-f (2), Fite Aghul ʒaq:i-t (2), Aghul (proper) ʒiʔ-e-f ~ ʒiʔä-f (2), Northern Tabasaran ʒiʔ:i (2), Southern Tabasaran ʒiʔ:i (2), Gyune Lezgi kʰwəɾ'i (3), Proto-Lezgian *kʰ:*ʔɪʔV (1).

References and notes:


Common Udi: Borrowed from Azeri gədək 'short'.

Caucasian Albanian: Unattested.

Archi: Chumakina et al. 2007; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 237; Kibrik et al. 1977b: 260, 363; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 585; Mikailov 1967: 185; Dirr 1908: 159, 211. In [Mikailov 1967], quoted as kʰuːt'a-tʃu-CLASS. Polysemy: 'short (in general) / small in height (of person)'. Regular participle from the stative verb kʰuːt'a 'to be short', borrowed from Lak kʰuːt'a- 'short'.

Kryts (proper): Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 237; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 585. This Common Kryts-Budukh term underwent phonetical influence on the part of the Azeri word gödək 'short', but cannot be regarded as a direct Azeri loanword, because the loss of final -k is inexplicable in this case.

Alyk Kryts: Authier 2009: 19, 72. See notes on Kryts proper.

Budukh: Meylanova 1984: 36, 218. Apparently this inherited term underwent influence on the part of the Azeri word gödək 'short' (see note on Kryts proper). In [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 237], 'short' is glossed as godak, which should be formally regarded as a pure Azeri loanword.
In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 585], 'short' is erroneously glossed as *ālīḥab* (aː,ː artificially), which is in fact *ālāx* (aː,ː) 'low, small in height' [Meylanova 1984: 19], borrowed from Azerbaijani *ālāg* 'low, small in height'.


**Tsakh-Kum Tsakhur**: [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 237].

**Mikik Tsakhur**: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 237; Dirr 1913: 158, 227. Polysemy: 'short (in general) / small in height (of person)'.


**Mukhad Rutul**: Dirr 1912: 180, 192; Ibragimov 1978: 193; Conrie & Khalilov 2010: 585. In [Dirr 1912], quoted as čik-di (sic!).


**Luchek Rutul**: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 237.

**Common Rutul**: Final -di / -d is the attributive suffix.


The same in the Arsug subdialect: žev-d 'short' [Suleymanov 1993: 80]. It must be noted that in [Suleymanov 2003: 81], the Arsug or Khudig form is quoted as faː-a-d, which seems erroneous.


**Gequn Aghul**: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 237; Dirr 1907: 114, 175; Suleymanov 1993: 80; Shaumyan 1941: 171. The form with ž is from [Dirr 1907].

**Fite Aghul**: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 237; Shaumyan 1941: 171. In [Suleymanov 1993: 80], quoted as žepi-t.

**Aghul (proper)**: Suleymanov 1993: 80; Shaumyan 1941: 171. The form with -d is from [Shaumyan 1941]. It must be noted that in [Suleymanov 2003: 81], the Tpi̞g form is quoted as žiqˈe-f, which seems to be an error.

The same in the other subdialects: Tsirkhe, Khpyuk žiqˈe-f, Kurag žeqˈe-f, Duldug žaqˈe-f ‘short’ [Suleymanov 1993: 80; Magometov 1970: 42; Shaumyan 1941: 171].

**Common Aghul**: The correspondence Koshan ž- / non-Koshan q (< Lezgian *q*) suggests that the Aghul forms could actually be borrowed from Tabasaran, cf. notes on Aghul ‘heavy’.

Final -d, -t, -f, -r are the adjectival suffixes (fossilized class exponents) [Magometov 1970: 92], [Shaumyan 1941: 45].

**Northern Tabasaran**: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 237.

The same in the Khanag subdialect: žiqʰi ‘short’ [Uslar 1979: 693, 996]. In [Dirr 1905: 170, 231], transcribed as živi (and even žig) - this is actually either a form from some Southern Tabasaran subdialect or the beginning of the phonetic process *q* > *ź* in Khanag during the 2nd half of the 19th century between Uslar’s and Dirr’s records.


**Southern Tabasaran**: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 237.


**Gylene Lezgi**: Uslar 1896: 455, 615.


Etymologically the same term in the Akhty dialect: Khlyut čʰerʰi ‘short’ [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 237].

**Proto-Lezgian**: NCED: 690. Distribution: We fill the slot with the root *(kʰ)ærʰV*- [NCED: 690], which means ‘short’ in South Lezgian (Kryts, Budukh), but ‘narrow’ in Lezgi (see notes on Lezgi ‘thin’) and ‘short-eared ram’ in Aghul. External comparison supports *kʰærʰV* as the Proto-Lezgian root for ‘short’.

In West and East Lezgian a phonetically irregular root *čɨtʰV*- is used for ‘short’ (reconstructed as *čɨlʰkʰV*- in [NCED: 1108]). It is attested as *čɨtʰV*- in Tsakhur, *čɨkʰV*- in Rutul, *čiqʰV*- in Tabasaran and Aghul (note that the Aghul forms can be Tabasaran loanwords).

In Lezgi, ‘short’ is expressed with the etymologically isolated form, which points to the Proto-Lezgian shape *čʰerʰV*.

In both outliers, inherited forms were superseded with loanwords: Udi < Azerbaijani, Archi < Lak.

**Replacement**: (‘short’ > ‘narrow’) (Lezgi)

**Reconstruction shape**: The voiced reflex d of Lezgian *t* observed in South Lezgian (Kryts gʰiði, Budukh goḍa) is due to influence on the part of Azerbaijani *gʰiḍa* ‘short’.

**Semantics and structure**: Primary stative verbal root ‘to be short’.
106. SNAKE

Nidzh Udi dizik: {дизик} (1), Vartashen Udi dizik: {дизик} (1), Archi y'ar'i (-1), Kryts (proper) ilan (-1), Alyk Kryts yar (2), Budukh yer {йер} (2), Mishlesh Tsakhur чоце {чоце} (3), Mikik Tsakhur чоцë (3), Gelmets Tsakhur чоцë (3), Mukhad Rutul yar {зап} (2), Ixrek Rutul yar {lap} (2), Luchek Rutul yar (2), Koshan Aghul ilan (-1), Keren Aghul ilan (-1), Gequn Aghul ilan (-1), Fite Aghul ilan (-1), Aghul (proper) ilan (-1), Northern Tabasaran bit'-i (4), Southern Tabasaran bit’ (4), Gyune Lezgi сүлләр (5), Proto-Lezgian *ƛːær (2).

References and notes:

Common Udi: Common Udi *дизик: Morphologically and etymologically obscure; looks like a loanword, although the source has not been identified (proposals in [Schulze 2001: 270] do not seem apt).

Caucasian Albanian: boˤq [Gippert et al. 2008: IV-11]; probably an important archaism, as correctly noted by Gippert & Schulze.

Archi: Chumakina et al. 2007; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 88; Kibrik et al. 1977b: 256, 360; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 170; Mikailov 1967: 184; Dirr 1908: 156, 209. Etymologically isolated, apparently borrowed from Lak yat’i ‘worm, lavra’, although the meaning shift looks strange (this is not the main Lak term for ‘worm’).


Alyk Kryts: Authier 2009: 24, 36, 40, 82, 90, etc.


Tsakhur-Kum Tsakhur: чоцë [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 88].

Mikik Tsakhur: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 88; Dirr 1913: 211, 226.


Gequn Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 88; Dirr 1907: 121, 173; Shaumyan 1941: 142.

Fite Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 88; Shaumyan 1941: 142.

Aghul (proper): Suleymanov 2003: 87; Shaumyan 1941: 142. The same in the other subdialects: Tsirkhe, Duldug ilan ‘snake’ [Shaumyan 1941: 142].

Common Aghul: In all the dialects, the terms is a borrowing from Azerbaijani ilan ‘snake’.


The same in the Akhty dialect: Khlyut וסף 'snake' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 88].

**Proto-Lezgian:** NCED: 787. **Distribution:** There are three equally probable (from the distributional point of view) candidates for the Proto-Lezgian term for 'snake': Caucasian Albanian, Udi and Proto-Nuclear Lezgian. Out of these, Udi ツアー is etymologically unclear and should be excluded. Therefore, the choice is between two terms: Caucasian Albanian and Proto-Nuclear Lezgian.

The isolated Caucasian Albanian բոָּղ 'snake' may regularly originate from a Proto-Lezgian form like *ѡʰוֹרַאَا* (V), which, in turn, may regularly continue North Caucasian ʷʰոֹרַאَا* (V) [NCED: 1048] (or rather ʷʰוֹרַאَا* with the suffix -t- in proto-languages of individual groups). This Proto-North Caucasian stem means 'snake' in the Avaro-Ando-Tsezian branch and 'snail' in Lak; note that, *pacr* [NCED: 1048], specific Nakh forms for 'snake' originate from the word for 'mud', not from the aforementioned North Caucasian stem.

The second candidate is *ƛːər* [NCED: 787], which denotes 'snake' in South Lezgian (Kryts, Budukh) and Rutul, having been lost in the rest of the languages. In terms of distribution, it can be posited at least as the Proto-Nuclear Lezgian expression for 'snake'. Its North Caucasian comparanda are to be reconstructed as prototems for 'snake' in Nakh, Khinalugh and possibly Proto-West Caucasian.

Because North Caucasian *əhr* (> Lezgian *ƛːər*) has a wider distribution, whereas ʷʰоֹרַאَا* in the meaning 'snake' seems to be a local Avaro-Ando-Tsezian isogloss, we prefer to postulate *ƛːər* as the basic Proto-Lezgian term for 'snake'. The original meaning of Lezgian ʷʰוֹרַאَا* (> Caucasian Albanian բոָּղ 'snake', if the proposed etymology is correct) is unclear, perhaps 'a k. of snake' vel sim.

In Tsakhur, *ƛːər* was superseded with *χɝɺɬ* [NCED: 1080], whose original meaning should be 'a k. of worm' (cf. the meaning 'worm' for Archi *χ责编* q.v.).

In Tabasaran, the form բոָּղ 'snake' is attested; it is isolated within Lezgian (Lezgi բոָּղ) 'small worm' seems to be a Tabasaran loanword, see notes on 'worm'. Its Lezgian protoform is reconstructed as *pɛ(ｍ)t' (~b-)* in [NCED: 290] with possible external North Caucasian comparanda with the meanings 'snake' and 'worm'.

In Lezgi, 'snake' is expressed with the root *mulaqʷˤ* (also in Proto-West Caucasian) and 'worm' *wHoːrƛʷV* [NCED: 817].

In some lects, inherited forms tend to be superseded with borrowings from Azerbaijani դա 'snake' (Kryts Proper, Aghul). In Archi, a Lak loanword is used.

**Replacements:** ['worm' > 'snake'] (Lezgi).

**Reconstruction shape:** Correspondences seem regular.

**Semantics and structure:** Primary substantive root. The oblique stem is *ƛːər*-.

107. **THIN**

**Nidzh Udi нәāзık ~ нәāзік: {навъик ~ навъикף} (-1), Vartashen Udi нәāзık: ~ нәāзік {навъикף} (-1), Archi k'аl'-a-tu-CLASS (1), Kryts (proper) q'il (1), Alyk Kryts q'il:a (1), Budukh ki-ti {къиммі} (2), Mishlesh Tsakhur к'іwə-n ~ k'іwə-n {къіван ~ къіван} (1) / hɪkʰ-e-n {къыіван} (2), Mikik Tsakhur к'іwə-n (1) / hɪkʰ-e-n (2), Gelmets Tsakhur q'іwə-n² (1) / hɪkʰ-a-n² (2), Mukhad Rutul q'il-di ~ q'il-di {къыл-ді} (1), Ixrek Rutul q'il-di {къыл-ді} (1) / ga'd-di-di {ғылдымды} (2), Luchek Rutul q'il-di (1) / ged-di (2), Koshan Aghul k'eke-r (1) / ku-re-r (2), Keren Aghul k'ile-f (1) / ike-f (2), Gequn Aghul k'ile-f (1) / ike-f (2), Fite Aghul k'у-ri-t (2), Aghul (proper) k'ile-f (1) / ike-f (2), Northern Tabasaran 'чил'i (1), Southern Tabasaran چیل'i (1) / ku'-r'у (2), Gyune Lezgi q'елеč (1) / ժік'ү (2), Proto-Lezgian *мілā (1) / ʰɪ(m)ɪлā (2).
References and notes:


Common Udi: Borrowed from Azerbaijani nazik ‘thin 2D/1D’ (ultimately from Persian nazzuk ‘thin’).


Distinct from dar ‘narrow’ [Kibrik et al. 1999: 872], borrowed from Azerbaijani dar ‘narrow’. In [NCED: 522] (Proto-Lezgian *hˤɨ(m)ƛ’ːä), also the Kryts suffixed adjective ki-tä ‘narrow’ is quoted (not found in other sources).

Alyk Kryts: Authier 2009: 13, 69, 192. Attested in the meaning ‘thin 2D’. Note the consonant gemination in the intervocalic position (for which see [Authier 2009: 13]), influenced by the same sporadic phenomenon in the Azerbaijani language.

Distinct from dar ‘narrow’ [Authier 2009: 104], borrowed from Azerbaijani dar ‘narrow’.


In [Meylanova 1984: 113, 245], the word nazik [nazik] is also quoted in the meaning ‘thin; basic semantics is ‘thin 2D’ in all found examples. Borrowed from Azerbaijani nazik ‘thin 2D/1D’ (ultimately from Persian nazzuk ‘thin’).

Distinct from more specific tayʕa-lya ‘flat, plane, thin 2D’ [Meylanova 1984: 133, 245].

Distinct from dar ‘narrow’ [Kibrik et al. 1999: 872], borrowed from Azerbaijani dar ‘narrow’.

Mishlesh Tsakhur: Kibrik et al. 1999: 881, 900; Ibragimov 1990: 76; Ibragimov & Nurmamedov 2010: 203; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 587. The second variant kʰɛ’ta- comes from [Ibragimov 1990: 76, 82, 183, 203] and [Ibragimov & Nurmamedov 2010: 203], where this word is consistently transcribed with -i-. Polysemy: ‘thin 2D / skinny / shallow’. In the meaning ‘thin’ the word can be applied, e.g., to ‘paper’, ‘flat cake’, and, according to [Kibrik et al. 1999], to ‘thread’ (sic?).


Distinct from dari-n ‘narrow’ [Kibrik et al. 1999: 872], borrowed from Azerbaijani dar ‘narrow’.


Distinct from dari-n ‘narrow’ [Kibrik & Kodzасov 1990: 238; Dirr 1913: 154], borrowed from Azerbaijani dar ‘narrow’.


Mukhad Rutul: Dirr 1912: 166, 202; Polysemy: ‘thin 2D / shallow’.

A second term gaʕ-di is observed in [Makhmudova 2001: 95, 183] and [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 587]. Makhmudova claims that the two terms are opposed as follows: gaʕ-di is applied to animated objects (i.e. ‘lean, thin?’), and q’il-di to inanimate ones.

Cf. also q’il-di, quoted in [Dirr 1912: 166] as ‘thin’ without specification (corresponds to q’il-di ‘narrow’ in other dialects). Maybe this is the Mukhad word for ‘thin 1D’.

Distinct from \( q'ic\-di \) 'narrow' [Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 167].


Distinct from \( q'ic\-di \) 'narrow' [Kibrik & Kodzassov 1990: 238].

**Common Rutul:** Borch-Khnov dialect: \( k\hat{a}\-ti \sim k\hat{a}\-ti \) 'thin' [Ibragimov 1978: 229] (quoted without semantic specification); regularly corresponds to Mukhad-Ixrek \( g\acute{a}d\-di \) [Ibragimov 1978: 233].

In Luchek \( g\acute{e}d\)-\( di \), the front vowel has regularly lost its pharyngealization [Kibrik & Kodzassov 1990: 343].

Final \( -d / -d \) is the attributive suffix (doubled in the Ixrek form).

**Koshan Aghul:** Kibrik & Kodzassov 1990: 239; Suleymanov 2003: 126; Shaumyan 1941: 184. In [Shaumyan 1941], quoted with plain -\( l\)-: \( k\acute{e}\-le\)-. According to [Kibrik & Kodzassov 1990], with polysemy: 'thin 2D / thin 1D', although according to the explicit glosses in [Suleymanov 2003] and [Shaumyan 1941], Burshag \( k\acute{e}\-le\)- denotes just 'thin 2D'.

In [Kibrik & Kodzassov 1990], two Burshag words are quoted as synonyms for 'thin 2D/1D'; the second one is \( k\acute{u}\-re\)-\( r\). Kibrik & Kodzassov 1990: 239; Suleymanov 2003: 87, 88; Shaumyan 1941: 143. According to [Kibrik & Kodzassov 1990], with polysemy: 'thin 2D / thin 1D / narrow', although, according to the explicit glosses in [Suleymanov 2003] and [Shaumyan 1941], Burshag \( k\acute{u}\-re\)- denotes just 'thin 1D / narrow'. In [Magometov 1970: 170], erroneously quoted as \( g\acute{u}\-re\-r\). Kibrik & Kodzassov 1990: 238.

**Keren Aghul:** Kibrik & Kodzassov 1990: 239. Meaning 'thin 2D'; opposed to \( i\acute{k}e\-f \) 'thin 1D'.

The same in the Usug subdialect: \( k\acute{e}\-le\) 'thin 2D, \( i\acute{k}e\-f \) 'thin 1D' [Shaumyan 1941: 143, 184]. The Usug form \( i\acute{k}e\-\) was probably influenced on the part of the Lezgi word for 'thin 1D'. Kibrik & Kodzassov 1990: 239. Meaning 'thin 1D'.

Distinct from \( k\acute{e}\-tu\-f \) 'narrow' [Kibrik & Kodzassov 1990: 238], derived from the same root with the adjectival suffix -\( tu\).

**Gequn Aghul:** Kibrik & Kodzassov 1990: 239; Dirr 1907: 130, 186; Shaumyan 1941: 184. In [Dirr 1907] and [Shaumyan 1941], quoted with plain -\( l\)-: \( k\acute{e}\)-. Meaning 'thin 2D'. Kibrik & Kodzassov 1990: 239; Dirr 1907: 121, 186; Magometov 1970: 225 (sentence 14); Shaumyan 1941: 143. Meaning 'thin 1D'. In [Dirr 1907], incorrectly transcribed as \( i\acute{k}e\-f\).

Distinct from \( i\acute{s}\-f \) 'narrow' [Kibrik & Kodzassov 1990: 238].

**Fite Aghul:** Kibrik & Kodzassov 1990: 238, 239. Polysemy: 'thin 2D / thin 1D / narrow'.

**Aghul (proper):** Suleymanov 2003: 126; Shaumyan 1941: 184. Meaning 'thin 2D'. In [Shaumyan 1941], quoted with plain -\( l\)-: \( k\acute{e}\)-\( le\)-\( e\)-\( y\)-\( y\)-\( e\)-\( m\)-\( e\)-\( m\)-\( e\)-\( m\)-\( e\)-\( m\). Suleymanov 2003: 87; Shaumyan 1941: 143. Meaning 'thin 1D'. Distinct from Tpig \( i\acute{s}\-f \) 'narrow' [Suleymanov 2003: 88].

**Common Aghul:** The opposition \( k\acute{e}\-le\) 'thin 2D / \( i\acute{k}e\-\) (\( ku\-re\)-) 'thin 1D' can be safely reconstructed for Proto-Aghul.

Medial -\( re\)- in \( ku\-re\) in an adjectival suffix [Suleymanov 1993: 113]. Final -\( d / -d\)-, -\( t\)-, -\( r\)-, -\( r\) are adjectival suffixes (fossilized class exponents) [Magometov 1970: 92; Shaumyan 1941: 48].

Reduction of the initial -\( i\)- in the Koshan & Fite prefixed stem \( ku\-re\)- can theoretically be explained as a recent dialectal feature (see [Suleymanov 1993: 42 f.] for the sporadic vowel reduction in Aghul dialects), but the dialectal distribution of the syncopated and non-syncopated variants is atypical. Most likely \( ku\-re\)- represents a more ancient process of vowel reduction, observed for this root also in some other Lezgian languages. Note the gemination of -\( l\)- in \( k\acute{e}\-le\)-, influenced by the same sporadic phenomenon in the Azerbaijani language. The non-Koshan adjectival \( i\acute{s}\-f \) 'narrow' is quoted as \( i\acute{s}\-f\) in [Khaydakov 1973: 111] - apparently a misprint.

**Northern Tabasaran:** Kibrik & Kodzassov 1990: 238, 239. Polysemy: 'thin 2D / thin 1D / narrow'.

Differently in the Khanag subdialect: \( \acute{e}\-\acute{l}\-i \) 'thin 2D; sparse (wood, hair)' [Uslar 1979: 974, 1008], opposed to \( ku\-\acute{r}\-\acute{i} \) with polysemy: 'thin 1D / narrow' [Uslar 1979: 768, 1008; Dirr 1905: 182, 244].

The same system in the Khyuryuk subdialect: \( \acute{e}\-\acute{l}\-i \ (\acute{q}\acute{h}\acute{l}\acute{a}\acute{l}) \) 'thin 2D' [Genko 2005: 186], opposed to \( ku\-\acute{r}\-\acute{i} \ (\acute{k}\acute{h}\acute{y}\acute{p}\acute{p}) \) 'thin 1D' [Genko 2005: 96].

**Southern Tabasaran:** Kibrik & Kodzassov 1990: 239. Meaning 'thin 2D'; opposed to \( ku\-\acute{r}\-\acute{u} \) 'thin 1D'.

The same in the Khiv subdialect: \( \acute{e}\-\acute{l}\-i \ (\acute{q}\acute{h}\acute{l}\acute{a}\acute{l}) \) 'thin 2D' [Genko 2005: 186], opposed to \( ku\-\acute{r}\-\acute{u} \) [\( \acute{k}\acute{h}\acute{y}\acute{p}\acute{p} \)] with polysemy: 'thin 1D / narrow' [Genko 2005: 97].

The same in Literary Tabasaran: \( \acute{e}\-\acute{l}\-i \ (\acute{q}\acute{h}\acute{l}\acute{a}\acute{l}) \) 'thin 2D' [Khanmagomedov & Shelbuzov 2001: 343], opposed to \( ku\-\acute{r}\-\acute{u} \) [\( \acute{k}\acute{h}\acute{y}\acute{p}\acute{p} \)] with polysemy: 'thin 1D / narrow' [Khanmagomedov & Shelbuzov 2001: 200]. Kibrik & Kodzassov 1990: 238, 239. Polysemy: 'thin 1D / narrow'.

**Common Tabasaran:** The opposition \( \acute{e}\-\acute{l}\-i \) 'thin 2D / \( ku\-\acute{r}\-\acute{i} \) 'thin 1D' can safely be reconstructed for Proto-Tabasaran; the Dyubek polysemy \( \acute{e}\-\acute{l}\-i \) 'thin 2D/1D' is secondary. Final -\( r\) (-\( r\)-) in \( ku\-\acute{r}\) is an adjectival suffix.

In [Genko 2005: 77], also the Northern (Kumi, Khyuryuk) and Southern (Khiv) term \( i\acute{s}\-f \) 'narrow; cramped, small' in quoted (in [Khaydakov 1973: 111], erroneously transcribed as \( i\acute{s}\)). In Literary Tabasaran, this adjectival is only used in the expression \( i\acute{s}\-f \) dere 'narrow ravine, gorge' [Khanmagomedov & Shelbuzov 2001: 179].


The same opposition in the Akhty dialect: Khlyut q'äl'č ‘thin 2D’, škːi ‘thin 1D / narrow’ [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 239].

Proto-Lezgian:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THIN’</th>
<th>Udi</th>
<th>Archi</th>
<th>Kryts</th>
<th>Budukh</th>
<th>Tsakhur</th>
<th>Rutul</th>
<th>Aghul</th>
<th>Tabasaran</th>
<th>Lezgi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*ƛ'ɨlä-</td>
<td>1D/2D</td>
<td>1D/2D</td>
<td>2D</td>
<td>2D</td>
<td>2D</td>
<td>2D</td>
<td>2D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*hˤɨ(m)ƛ'ːä-</td>
<td>narrow(?)</td>
<td>1D/2D</td>
<td>1D</td>
<td>1D / narrow</td>
<td>1D / narrow</td>
<td>1D / narrow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*risal()-</td>
<td>narrow</td>
<td>narrow</td>
<td>narrow</td>
<td>sil narrow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*qːʷˤarV-</td>
<td>narrow</td>
<td></td>
<td>lean, emaciated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>qâč narrow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>q'ic- narrow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azerbaijani loanword</td>
<td>1D/2D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azerbaijani loanword</td>
<td>narrow</td>
<td>narrow</td>
<td>narrow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For Proto-Nuclear Lezgian, the opposition *ƛ'ɨlä- ‘thin 2D’ [NCED: 639] / *hˤɨ(m)ƛ'ːä- ‘thin 1D’ [NCED: 521] can be reconstructed with safety. It is possible to treat such an opposition as a secondary feature of Nuclear Lezgian (and only reconstruct *ƛ'ɨlä- ‘thin 2D/1D’ for Proto-Lezgian), but, since both roots possess external North Caucasian cognates with the meaning ‘thin’, we prefer to reconstruct *ƛ'ɨlä- ‘thin 2D / *hˤɨ(m)ƛ'ːä- ‘thin 1D’ for Proto-Lezgian.

In both outliers (Udi, Archi), the semantic opposition ‘thin 2D / ‘thin 1D’ has been eliminated. In the Udi case, this happened under the influence of Azerbaijani polysemy; for Archi, a similar Lak influence is probable.

**Replacements**: ‘thin 1D > ‘narrow’ (Aghul, Tabasaran, Lezgi), ‘thin 2D > ‘wiry, lean (of human, animal)’ (Literary Lezgi).

**Reconstruction shape**: For *ƛ'ɨlä-, correspondences seem regular except for pharyngealization in Tsakhur. In the case of *hˤɨ(m)ƛ'ːä-, the situation is more complicated, because this root is frequently modified with adjectival suffixes (-*tːV, -*rV) that cause reduction of the initial vowel and subsequent simplification of the cluster *mː (the Proto-Lezgian nasal phoneme is reconstructed on the basis of external evidence).

**Semantics and structure**: Primary stative verbal roots ‘to be thin 2D’ (*ƛ'ɨlä-) and ‘to be thin 1D’ (*hˤɨ(m)ƛ'ːä-).NCED: 521.

108. WIND

Nidzh Udi muš {мүү} (1), Vartashen Udi muš {мүү} (1), Archi haw'a (-1), Kryts (proper) kulak (-1), Alyk Kryts kulak (-1), Budukh kulak {къялақ} (-1), Mishlesh Tsakhur mic {мыу} (1), Mikik Tsakhur mic (1), Gelmets Tsakhur mic (1), Mukhad Rutul xibil ~ xibul
{хьыбыл} (2), Ixrek Rutul kulak {кулак} (-1), Luchek Rutul xibil (2), Koshan Aghul kulak (-1), Keren Aghul tireb (3), Gequn Aghul tireb (3), Fite Aghul kulak (-1), Aghul (proper) kulak (-1), Northern Tabasaran m'ik'-i (4), Southern Tabasaran m'ik' (4), Gyune Lezgi ýar (5), Proto-Lezgian *muč'(1).

References and notes:


Common Udi: Common Udi *muš.


Archi: Chumakina et al. 2007; Kibrik et al. 1977b: 238, 352; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 59; Dirr 1908: 148, 206. Polysemy: 'wind / air / weather'. Borrowed from Lak hava 'air; weather' or from Avar hava 'air' (ultimately < Arabic hawaʔ 'air, breeze'). In [Chumakina 2009] incorrectly treated as a direct borrowing from Arabic; for the Avar and Lak intermediation in the adaptation of Arabic words in Archi see [Kibrik et al. 1977a 1: 44].

Kryts (proper): Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 209; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 59. Borrowed from Azerbaijani küli̇k 'wind'. In [NCED: 758], also Kryts xar with polysemy 'wind / rheumatism' is quoted (< *ɬːar), not found in other sources.

Alyk Kryts: Authier 2009: 94, 229, 266, etc. Borrowed from Azerbaijani küläk 'wind'.


Mishlesh Tsak̇hur: Ibragimov 1990: 27, 39, 49, 66; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 59. Not attested in [Ibragimov & Nurmamedov 2010] as a separate entry, but attested in examples, e.g., [Ibragimov & Nurmamedov 2010: 31 sub ayćåras, 54 sub aČas, etc.].

A second term for 'wind' is kulæk [Ibragimov 1990: 55, 66; Ibragimov & Nurmamedov 2010: 196], borrowed from Azerbaijani küli̇k 'wind'.

A third term is yelkän, quoted in [Kibrik et al. 1999: 879, 892] as the only generic term for 'wind', but glossed as 'light wind, breeze' in [Ibragimov & Nurmamedov 2010: 161]. Borrowed from dialectal Azerbaijani yel-kän vel sim. from yel 'light wind' (cf. literary Azerbaijani yel-kän 'sail; fan').


Mikik Tsak̇hur: Dirr 1913: 188, 222.

A second term for 'wind' is kul'ak [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 209; Dirr 1913: 174, 222], borrowed from Azerbaijani küli̇k 'wind'.


A synonym is kulik [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 209; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 59], borrowed from Azerbaijani küli̇k 'wind'.

Mukhad Rutul: Dirr 1912: 142, 188; Ibragimov 1978: 118; Makhmudova 2001: 12; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 59. The assimilated variant xibul is from [Dirr 1912].

Ixrek Rutul: Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 147, 326; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 59. Borrowed from Azerbaijani küli̇k 'wind'.

Distinct from inherited xibil [xar'at] 'light wind, breeze' [Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 283] (this is incorrectly listed in [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 59] as the basic Ixrek term for 'wind').


Gequn Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 208. A second synonym, quoted in [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990], is the borrowing kulak. No terms for 'wind' in [Dirr 1907].

Fite Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 208.

Common Aghul: The form *kulak was borrowed from Azerbaijani külak 'wind'. The origin of *tireb is unclear (looks like a loanword from unknown source).


The same in the Khanag subdialect: *mik with polysemy: 'wind / rheumatism' [Khanmagomedov & Shalbuzov 2001: 229]. The second literary word is *kalak (or *külak) 'wind, whirl' [Khanmagomedov & Shalbuzov 2001: 203], borrowed from Azerbaijani külak 'wind'.


Southern Tabasaran: Kibrik & Kodzassov 1990: 208.

The same in Literary Tabasaran: *mik with polysemy: 'wind / rheumatism' [Khanmagomedov & Shalbuzov 2001: 229]. The second literary word is kalak (or *külak) 'wind, whirl' [Khanmagomedov & Shalbuzov 2001: 203], borrowed from Azerbaijani külak 'wind'.


Common Tabasaran: *mik can safely be reconstructed as the Proto-Tabasaran term for 'wind', probably with polysemy: 'wind / rheumatism'. It retains its basic meaning in all the dialects, except for Khiv, where *mik has been narrowed to 'rheumatism', having been superseded with xar (not attested in other subdialects). The external etymology [NCED: 758] suggests that originally xar denoted some specific kind of wind, cf. Lezgi gar 'warm (south) wind' [NCED: 786].

Gyune Lezgi: Uslar 1896: 394, 608. A generic term, according to Uslar's examples, although probably not applied specifically to 'cold/cold wind'. Distinct from specific qa-y 'cold wind, cool wind' [Uslar 1896: 485] (inaccurately glossed as 'cool, coolness' by Uslar) - a participle from the verb näği- [imperf.] / qa- [perf.] 'to get cold' [Uslar 1896: 495] (cf. the parallel participle qa-y-i 'cold' q.v.).


In the Akhty dialect: no generic term for 'wind' is documented for the Khlyut subdialect, cf. specific gar 'west wind', qa-y 'east wind' [Kibrik & Kodzassov 1990: 208]. The same in the Khuryug subdialect: gar 'south wind', qa-y 'cold wind' [Meylanova 1964: 315].

Based on available data, it is theoretically possible to reconstruct the Proto-Lezgi opposition gar 'warm wind' / qa-y 'cold wind' without a single generic term.

Proto-Lezgian: NCED: 826. Distribution: This word is retained as the basic term for 'wind' in Caucasian Albanian-Udi, on the one hand, and in Tsakhir, on the other, having shifted to the meaning 'hope' in Aghul and Tabasaran.

In Rutul, 'wind' is expressed by the stem *aŋpol [NCED: 786], which means 'rheumatism' in Lezgi. The original meaning of *aŋpol seems to have been 'a k. of wind', e.g., 'breeze'.

The third candidate is *tar [NCED: 758], which means 'wind' in Lezgi (perhaps to be reconstructed as 'warm (south) wind' for Proto-Lezgi) and in Khiv Tabasaran (but not in Proto-Tabasaran), but 'rheumatism' in South Lezgian (Kryts, Budukh). The original meaning of *tar seems to have been 'a k. of wind', e.g., 'warm wind'.

In Tabasaran, 'wind' is denoted by *mek 'cold, frost' [NCED: 808], see notes on 'cold' (apparently with the development 'cold' > 'cold wind' > 'wind in general').

Aghul *tireb 'wind' is etymologically unclear.

In many lects, inherited forms have been completely superseded with Azerbaijani loanwords (Kryts, Budukh, Ixrek Rutul, some Aghul dialects). In Archi, there is a loanword from Lak or Avar.

Replacements: 'cold, frost > 'wind / rheumatism' (Tabasaran), ['wind > 'rheumatism'] (Udi, Kryts, Budukh, Lezgi), ['wind > 'hope'] (Aghul, Tabasaran).

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular, except for the Tsakhir affricate -c (instead of expected -č).

Semantics and structure: Primary substantive root. The oblique stem is not reconstructible.
109. WORM

Nidzh Udi *meq {мехь} (1), Vartashen Udi *meq {мехь} (1), Archi *милъчъ (1), Kryts (proper) *къак (2) / *ћић (3), Alyk Kryts *ћић (3), Budukh *ћић {мичь} (3), Mishlesh Tsakhur *абравућъ {алоравуил} (4), Mikik Tsakhur *аравућъ (4), Gelmets Tsakhur *биръинъас (5), Mukhad Rutul *милъчъ ~ *милъчъ {милъчъ ~ милъчъ} (1), Ixrek Rutul *милъчъ ~ *милъчъ {милъчъ ~ милъчъ} (1), Luchek Rutul *милъчъ (1), Koshan Aghul *маљъкъ (1), Gequn Aghul *маљъкъ (1), Fite Aghul *маљъкъ (1), Aghul (proper) *маљъкъ (1), Northern Tabasaran šar (6), Southern Tabasaran šar (6), Gyune Lezgi šar (6), Proto-Lezgian *малаqъ (*малаqъ) (1).

References and notes:


Common Udi: Common Udi *meq.

Caucasian Albanian: Unattested.

Archi: Chumakina et al. 2007; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 88; Kibrik et al. 1977b: 280, 388; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 170; Mikailov 1967: 193; Dirr 1908: 167, 226. Meaning specified as 'earthworm'. There also exists another term χʷˈарши [Chumakina et al. 2007; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 88; Kibrik et al. 1977b: 334, 388; Mikailov 1967: 200], which is always glossed simply as 'worm' without further specification. It remains unclear whether χʷˈарши is a more generic term than *милъчъ, or if χʷˈарши denotes some kinds of parasites and vermin as opposed to earthworms. In such an unclear situation we prefer to follow the GLD semantic standard and fill the slot with the word for 'earthworm'.

Kryts (proper): Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 88; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 170. In [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990] two terms are quoted for 'worm', both without specification: *къак and *ћић. We are forced to treat these as synonyms.

Distinct from the compound šer-bäň, quoted in [NCED: 982] with the gloss 'worm, helminth' (the second element -bäň is not clear). Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 88.

Alyk Kryts: Authier 2009: 35, 39. Specified as 'earthworm'. There also exists another (less frequent or bound?) term for 'worm': qurd [Authier 2009: 181], borrowed from Azerbaijani гурд 'worm'.


Distinct from mulaʔ {милъчъ} 'worm in meat' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 88; Meylanova 1984: 111].


Distinct from *милъчъ {милъчъ} 'worm' (the exact meaning is unknown) [Ibragimov & Nurmamedov 2010: 270], маљъкъ ~ маљъкъ {маљъкъ, маљъкъ} 'helminth' [Ibragimov & Nurmamedov 2010: 271] and *ћић 'small worms in meat' [Ibragimov & Nurmamedov 2010: 404].
Tsakhur-Kum Tsakhur: *abrawuč* [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 88]. Distinct from *miq* 'caterpillar' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 88], although in [Schulze 1997: 16] *miq* is glossed as 'worm'.

Suvagîl Tsakhur: *abrawuč* 'earthworm' [Ibragimov 1990: 166], distinct from *miq* 'worm' (not specified) [Ibragimov 1990: 166].


In [Dirr 1913: 188, 242], the word for 'worm' is *muq*, but in [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 88] this is quoted as *miq* 'caterpillar'.

Distinct from *lasur* 'helminth' [Dirr 1913: 183, 223].

Gelmets Tsakhur: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 88; Ibragimov 1990: 199. According to [Ibragimov 1990: 199], *birqʰʷiʃːiʃ* is a generic term, meaning 'insect, worm', but the expression for 'earthworm' is based on this word: *čɪʔar ḥaːn birqʰʷiʃːiʃ*, literally 'an insect/worm that makes rings'. In actual fact, *birqʰʷiʃːiʃ* is derived from the adjective *birqʰʷ*-'blind' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 240] (this is natural for the meaning 'worm', but somewhat strange for the meaning 'insect'; thus, the semantic development must have been 'blind' → 'worm' → 'insect').

According to [Makhmudova 2001: 20], the word for 'worm' is *muqʷ* [Magometov 1970: 23].

It is very probable that the Proto-Tsakhur generic term for 'worm (incl. earthworm)' was *miq* (assimilated *muq*), which has by now shifted to 'caterpillar', having been superseded by the descriptive equivalent 'blind' in Gelmets and the obscure word *abrawuč* (= *abrawuč*) in the other dialects.

Mukhad Rutul: Dirr 1912: 161; Ibragimov 1978: 19, 117; Makhmudova 2001: 20, 21; Conrie & Khalilov 2010: 170. The variant *mɪlʊχʷ* is from [Dirr 1912]; the variant *mɪlʊxʷ* is from [Ibragimov 1978]; the variant *mɪlʊχʰ* is from [Makhmudova 2001].

According to [Makhmudova 2001: 20], *mɪlʊxʷ* 'worm' is opposed to the specific term *bɑɾcɪl* 'earthworm', but this seems to be inaccurate, since Ibragimov [Ibragimov 1978: 135] explicitly states that the word *bɑɾcɪl* (sic!) 'earthworm' is characteristic of the Khnyukh dialect (subdialect of Mukhad) without an etymological counterpart in Mukhad proper. In [Khaydakov 1973: 11] (followed by [NCED: 288]), *bɑɾcɪl* 'earthworm' is labeled simply as "Rutul".

Distinct from *sɑɾ-ak* 'helminth' [Dirr 1912: 182, 188] and *cʰɪʔ-χʰ* 'caterpillar' [Ibragimov 1978: 225].


Distinct from various terms that are more marginal or specific: *ʃɑɾ-ak* 'helminth' [Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 301], *sɛb* 'worm; cabbage white butterfly' [Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 227] (apparently more correctly glossed as 'caterpillar' in [Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 334]), *cʰɪʔ-χʰ* 'worm' [Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 288] (without specifications), *čɪʔ* [Uslar 1979: 300] [Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 413] (without specification; missing from the main section of the dictionary).


The Proto-Rutul term for 'worm in general (incl. earthworm)' was *mɪlʊxʷ*. Khnyukh *bɑɾcɪl* is an innovation.

Koshan Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 88; Suleymanov 2003: 133.

Distinct from *ʃɑɾ* 'helminth' [Magometov 1970: 23].


Northern Tabasaran: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 88. Specified by Kibrik & Kodzasov as 'earthworm', as opposed to *mɪlʊqʷ*, which is quoted in [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 88] simply as 'worm' (semantic details are unknown).

The semantic opposition in the Khanag subdialect is better documented: *ʃɑɾ* with polysemy: 'earthworm / helminth' [Uslar 1979: 985, 1009] (missing from [Dirr 1905]). Distinct from Khanag *mɪlʊqʷ* 'worm (in fruit, meat, wound)' [Uslar 1979: 865, 1009; Dirr 1905: 196, 246].

The same in the Kumí subdialect: *šar [mnap], glossed as 'worm, helminth' [Genko 2005: 192], opposed to *malˈaqʷˤ ~ *malˈaqˤ (мъляхъ в ох) 'worm' [Genko 2005: 124] (not specified semantically).

Southern Tabasaran: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 88. Paradigm: *šar [abs.] / *šar-ˈu [erg.]. Specified by Kibrik & Kodzasov as 'earthworm', as opposed to *malˈaqʷˤ, which is quoted in [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 88] simply as 'worm' (semantic details are unknown)


Differently in Literary Tabasaran, where *šar [mnap] is the basic term for 'worm (incl. earthworm and helminth)' [Khanmagomedov & Shalbuzov 2001: 347]. Distinct from literary bit'ruk (бътърук) 'worm' [Khanmagomedov & Shalbuzov 2001: 87] with two examples: "wood worm" and "to become worm eaten"; perhaps to be analyzed as bit'-ruk - the oblique stem bit'-ru- from bit' 'snake' q.v. plus the expressive suffix -k (differently in [NCED: 290], where bit'ruk is treated as a compound bit'-ruk 'snake' + 'grass-snake'). It seems that literary bit'ruk is a semantic equivalent of *malˈaqʷˤ (мъляхъ) from other dialects.

Common Tabasaran: The semantic opposition *šar (šar) 'earthworm, helminth (i.e. large worm)' / *malˈaqʷˤ (мъляхъв) 'worm in (rotten) organic (i.e. small worm)' can safely be reconstructed for Proto-Tabasaran. In Literary Tabasaran the latter term got lost, having been superseded with the new formation bit'-ru-k ← 'snake'.

Cf. also the reflex of Lezgian *kamk: Khyurvuk, Khiv kamk [къамкъ] 'wormhole, ulcer' [Genko 2005: 82].

Gyune Lezgi: Uslar 1896: 600, 638. Polysemy: 'earthworm / helminth'. Distinct from Gyune kʷakʷ 'worm (in wood, fruit, wound)' [Uslar 1896: 461, 638] and from bit'rik [abs.] / bit'rikʷ- [pl.] 'worm' (the only relevant example is 'worm in wound') [Uslar 1896: 363, 638].


In the Akhty dialect: two terms for 'worm' are documented for the Khyut subdialect, both without semantic specifications: *šar and kʷak [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 88].

In the Usukhchay subdialect of the Doquzpara dialect (Samur group) the generic term for 'worm' is p'arkʷ' [Meylanova 1964: 223].

The available data are too scant for detailed Proto-Lezgi reconstruction, but the generic opposition *šar 'earthworm, helminth (i.e. large worm)' / X 'worm in (rotten) organic (i.e. small worm)' is the same as in the neighboring Tabasaran language. It must be noted that the rare Gyune and literary word bit'rikʷ 'small worm' seems actually a Tabasaran loan, cf. Literary Tabasaran bit'-ru-k 'small worm' q.v.

Proto-Lezgian: NCED: 817. Distribution: This stem can be safely reconstructed as 'worm in general' or at least 'earthworm' for Proto-Lezgian; the meanings 'worm in general' or 'earthworm' are retained in all the languages except for some Nuclear Lezgian lects: Budukh (shifted to 'worm in meat'), Tabasaran (shifted to 'worm in (rotten) organic'), Lezgi (shifted to 'snake' q.v.), Khnyukh Rutul.

The term *šar [NCED: 982] can be reconstructed as 'helminth' at least for the Proto-Nuclear Lezgian level: 'helminth' in Kryts, Rutul, East Lezgian (Aghul, Tabasaran, Lezgi), additionally extended to mean 'worm in general' in Tabasaran, Lezgi.

The term *kamk [NCED: 206] could mean 'worm in (rotten) organic' at least at the Proto-Nuclear Lezgian level: Kryts 'worm (in general?)', Lezgi 'worm (in wood, fruit, wound)', Tabasaran 'wormhole, ulcer', Aghul 'itch, mange', Tsakhur 'grub, larva'.

The original meaning of *ĉirĉ [NCED: 348] is not clear. This is the basic term for 'worm' in South Lezgian (Kryts, Budukh), whereas the suffixed stem *ĉirĉ-Vl means 'lizard' in Tabasaran and Lezgi.
For Proto-Tsakhur, *mulaqʷˤ* can be posited as ‘worm (incl. earthworm)’, although in modern Tsakhur dialects, this stem shifted to the meaning ‘caterpillar’, having been superseded with the descriptive term ‘blind’ or the etymologically obscure abrawuč′(e) ~ abrawuč.

In Khnyukh Rutul, *mulaqʷˤ* was superseded with the etymological isolate barc’-il, which can originate from the protoform *pːalc’-* (thus [NCED: 288] with a dubious Tsezian comparandum). Actually, Khnyukh Rutul barc’-il can hardly be separated from Usukhchay Lezgi p’ark’ʷ ‘worm (in general?)’ which implies a protoform like p’alc’ʷ (~ pː- ~ r-), although the correspondence Rutul b- / Lezgi p’ is not regular (assimilation or dissimilation between two root consonants). The original meaning of this root is unclear.

**Replacements:** {'blind’ > ‘worm’} (Gelmets Tsakhur), {'helminth’ > ‘worm’} (Tabasaran, Lezgi), {'worm’ > ‘caterpillar’} (Tsakhur), {'worm’ > ‘snake’} (Lezgi).

**Reconstruction shape:** Correspondences seem regular.

**Semantics and structure:** Primary substantive root.

110. YEAR

Nidzh Udi *usen* [yceu] (1), Vartashen Udi *usen* [yceu] (1), Archi *san* (1), Kryts (proper) *sän* (1), Alyk Kryts *san* (1), Budukh *san* [cau] (1), Mishlesh Tsakhur *sᵉːn* [ceu] (1), Mikik Tsakhur *sᵉːn* (1), Gelmets Tsakhur *sᵉːn⁰* (1), Mukhad Rutul *sen* [ceu] (1), Ixrek Rutul *sen* (1), Koshan Aghul *isː* (2), Keren Aghul *is* (2), Gequn Aghul *is* (2), Fite Aghul *is* (2), Aghul (proper) *is* (2), Northern Tabasaran *y’iz-i* (2), Southern Tabasaran *yis* (2), Gyune Lezgi *yis* (2), Proto-Lezgian *sːän* (1).

**References and notes:**


Common Udi: Common Udi *usen*.

Caucasian Albanian: *usen* [Gippert et al. 2008: IV-35].


Alyk Kryts: Authier 2009: 33, 44, etc. Paradigm: *san* [abs.] / *sin* [gen.].


A second term for ‘year’ is *il*’ [Kibrik et al. 1999: 878], borrowed from Azerbaijani *il*’ ‘year’.

Distinct from yeːs ‘age, years’ [Kibrik et al. 1999: 879; Ibragimov & Nurmanedov 2010: 163], borrowed from Azerbaijani yeːs ‘age, years’.

Tsakhur-Kum Tsakhur: *sᵉːn* [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 209].

Mikik Tsakhur: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 209; Dirr 1913: 201, 223.

Gelmets Tsakhur: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 209; Dirr 1913: 201, 223.

Mukhad Rutul: Dirr 1912: 170, 188; Ibragimov 1978: 118; Makhmudova 2001: 12, 185; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 653. Synchronically supplative paradigm: *sen* [abs.] / *sid-i-ra* [erg.].

Ixrek Rutul: Dzhamalov & Semedov 2006: 228, 333; Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 653. Synchronically supplative paradigm: *sen* [abs.] / *sid-i-r* [erg.].

Luchek Rutul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 209. Synchronically supplative paradigm: *sen* [abs.] / *sid-i-r* [erg.].

The same in the Arsug subdialect: is "year" [Shaumyan 1941: 143].

Keren Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 209. The same in the Usug subdialect: is "year" [Shaumyan 1941: 143].

Gequn Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 209; Dirr 1907: 122, 171; Shaumyan 1941: 143.

Fite Aghul: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 209; Shaumyan 1941: 143.

Aghul (proper): Suleymanov 2003: 88; Shaumyan 1941: 143. The same in the other subdialects: Tsirkhe is, Duldug yiz "year" [Shaumyan 1941: 143].

Northern Tabasaran: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 209. An additional synonym is yis-q’uw (not specified semantically by Kibrik & Kodzasov).


Southern Tabasaran: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 209. An additional synonym is yis-q’ub (not specified semantically by Kibrik & Kodzasov).


Common Tabasaran: The original meaning of the expression yis-q’uav / yis-q’ub is apparently ‘the whole year’ as retained in Southern Tabasaran, although the second element q’uav / -q’ub is not clear.


Proto-Lezgian: NCED: 975. Distribution: This case is somewhat difficult, since there are several similar forms for ‘year’ and ‘old’, attested in Lezgian languages.

The first one is *sān [dir.] / *sān- [obl.] [NCED: 975], meaning ‘year’ in Archi, South Lezgian (Kryts, Budukh) and West Lezgian (Tsakhur, Rutul), lost in the rest of the languages.

The second is *yis [dir.] / *yisā- [obl.] [NCED: 968] which denotes ‘year’ in East Lezgian (Aghul, Tabasaran, Lezgi); in these languages, the derived adjectival stem *yis-Vr-V ‘old’ is also present. In Udi and West Lezgian (Tsakhur, Rutul), the paronymous adjective *yis-V ‘old’ is attested (see forms in [NCED: 968]).

Finally, the Caucasian Albanian-Udi form usen ‘year’ should originate from something like *yV/Sān.

Two internal Lezgian scenarios can be proposed, neither of them completely satisfactory.

1) The non-East Lezgian forms for ‘year’, reconstructed as *sān in [NCED: 975], actually look like the nominal derivative *yis-ā-n with reduction of the first syllable in all languages except for Caucasian Albanian-Udi. Caucasian Albanian-Udi usen ‘year’ can only originate from *yisā-n, but not from *sān (the development *y > Udi i- is attested in other roots as well, e.g., ‘bone’ q.v., ‘heart’ q.v.). The nominal word-formative suffix -n is well attested in Lezgian, see [Alekseev 1985: 44 f.]. This suffix, however, was originally the genitive ending. Thus we should suppose that two synonymous stems coexisted in Proto-Lezgian: *yis [dir.] / *yisā- [obl.] ‘year’ (retained only in East Lezgian) and *yisā-n ‘year’ < *‘of year’ (retained in all the other languages, including both outliers). The Proto-Lezgian adjective *yis-V ‘old’ was derived from the same root (*year > ‘old’); in East Lezgian, it was additionally modified with the common r-suffix: *yis-Vr-V ‘old’.

2) Two unrelated stems are to be reconstructed for Proto-Lezgian: *sān ‘year’ and *yis-V ‘old’. East Lezgian *yis [dir.] / *yisā- [obl.] ‘year’ is a back formation due to contamination of two original roots (the derivation ‘year > ‘old’ is typologically not so rare, but the opposite direction seems more problematic). After such a contamination at the Proto-East Lezgian level, the new Proto-East Lezgian adjective *yis-Vr-V ‘old’ was introduced. The situation with Caucasian Albanian-Udi usen ‘year’ (which implies a protoform like *yisān) is similar, although less obvious: usen ‘year’ could represent a contaminated hybrid of *sān ‘year’ and *yis-V ‘old’.

External comparison suggests that the second scenario is preferable: cf. Lak šin ‘year’.
Replacements: {'year' > 'old'} (Aghul, Tabasaran, Lezgi).
Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular, except for the Caucasian Albanian-Udi hybrid form usen.
Semantics and structure: Primary substantive root. The oblique stem is "sānɨ-."