ANNOTATED Swadesh wordlists for the Tsezic group (North Caucasian family).

Languages included: Hunzib (proper) [tsz-huz], Bezhta proper [tsz-bez], Khoshar-Khota Bezhta [tsz-bek], Tlyadal Bezhta [tsz-bet], Hinukh [tsz-gin], Kidero Dido [tsz-ddo], Sagada Dido [tsz-dds], Khwarshi proper [tsz-khv], Inkhokwari Khwarshi [tsz-khi].

Data sources.

General:


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.


TsezEDb = S. A. Starostin. Tsezian Etymological Database. // Computerized version of the Proto-Tsezic corpus, available at http://starling.rinet.ru/cgi-bin/main.cgi?flags=eygtnnl. Includes some Proto-Tsezic 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. Hunzib (proper):


**II. Bezhta (Bezhta proper, Khoshar-Khota, Tlyadal)**

Khalilov 1995 = М. Ш. Халилов. *Бежтинско-русский словарь.* Махачкала, 1995. // *A Bezhta-Russian dictionary (ca. 7000 entries), based on the Bezhta proper dialect with specific words from other dialects quoted. Supplemented with a Russian-Bezhta index and a grammar sketch.*


**III. Hinukh**


IV. Dido (Kidero, Sagada)

Main sources


Additional sources


V. Khwarshi (proper, Inkhokwari)


Khalilova 2009 = A Grammar of Khwarshi. Proefschrift ter verkrijging van de graad van
NOTES

I. Hunzib (proper)


The Hunzib (Gunzib) language consists of three dialects: Hunzib proper, Garbutli, Naxada. The three are very close to each other, see [van den Berg 1995: 348 f.; Isakov & Khalilov 2012: 337 ff.] for the main discrepancies. It seems, however, that there are several mismatches between Hunzib proper and Naxada or Garbutli within the 110-item wordlist: see ‘mouth’, ‘red’, ‘yellow’ and possibly ‘to come’.

The available linguistic sources are based on Hunzib proper. The primary lexicographic source for Hunzib proper is the dictionary [Isakov & Khalilov 2001], plus the glossaries in [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990; van den Berg 1995; Bokarev 1961]. Some forms and grammatical information have been taken from [Isakov & Khalilov 2012; van den Berg 1995; Bokarev 1959: 14-65]. Hunzib lexical data are systematically quoted in [Comrie & Khalilov 2010], but we prefer not to use this source due to its general unreliability.

I.2. Transliteration.

The following transliterational chart covers our principal sources:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>п</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>пI</td>
<td>p’</td>
<td>p’</td>
<td>p’</td>
<td>p’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Isakov &amp; Khalilov 2001]</td>
<td>[van den Berg 1995]</td>
<td>[Kibrik &amp; Kodzasov 1990]</td>
<td>[NCED]</td>
<td>GLD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>д</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>т</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>тI</td>
<td>т'</td>
<td>т'</td>
<td>т</td>
<td>t'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ц</td>
<td>ц</td>
<td>ц</td>
<td>ц</td>
<td>ц</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>цI</td>
<td>ц'</td>
<td>ц'</td>
<td>ц</td>
<td>ц'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ч</td>
<td>ч</td>
<td>ч</td>
<td>ч</td>
<td>ч</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>чI</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ш</td>
<td>š</td>
<td>š</td>
<td>š</td>
<td>š</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>лI</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Л</td>
<td>Л</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>кь</td>
<td>k'</td>
<td>L'</td>
<td>Л'</td>
<td>Л'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ль</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>г</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>к</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>кI</td>
<td>k'</td>
<td>k'</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>хь</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>хь</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>кь</td>
<td>q'</td>
<td>q'</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>q'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>гь</td>
<td>ḡ</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>r̄</td>
<td>r̄</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>х</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>χ</td>
<td>χ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. We treat geminated consonants as single long units (e.g., tː cː sː lː and so on) instead of bi-phonemic clusters (tt c’c’ ss ll and so on) in other sources. The geminates only occur in the intervocalic position in adjectives and more rarely in adverbs [van den Berg 1995: 25]; these originate from the consonant clusters with the adjective suffix -yː; note that
the available sources are rather inconsistent in their transcription of geminates and plain variants.

2. Voiceless stops and affricates (t, č and so on) as actually aspirated (tʰ, čʰ and so on).

3. Velar x and pharyngeal ŋ h are restricted to loanwords.

4. The vowels a a i are retracted, see [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 332] for details.

5. Nasalized vowels tend to denasalize in the speech of younger generations.

II. Bezhta (Bezhta proper, Khoshar-Khota, Tlyadal)

II.1. General.

The Bezhta language consists of three dialects: Bezhta proper, Khoshar-Khota (Khocharkhotin), Tlyadal (Tlyadaly, Tliadal). All three are quite close to each other.

The primary sources on Bezhta proper is the dictionary [Khalilov 1995] and the grammar [Madieva 1965]. Khoshar-Khota Bezhta vocabulary is available in [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990]. The main sources on Tlyadal Bezhta are the glossaries [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990] and two grammar sketches: [Bokarev 1959: 66-109; Kibrik & Testelets 2004].

Bezhta lexical data are systematically quoted in [Comrie & Khalilov 2010]: Bezhta proper, Khoshar-Khota, Tlyadal and additionally the Karauzek sub-dialect of Tlyadal. Since Madzhid Khalilov is a Bezhta native speaker, we sometimes resort to [Comrie & Khalilov 2010] as an additional source, despite the general unreliability of this dictionary.


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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[Khalilov 1995]</th>
<th>[Kibrik &amp; Kodzasov 1990]</th>
<th>[NCED]</th>
<th>GLD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>д</td>
<td>б</td>
<td>б</td>
<td>б</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>п</td>
<td>п</td>
<td>п</td>
<td>п</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>пI</td>
<td>п’</td>
<td>п</td>
<td>п’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>т</td>
<td>т</td>
<td>т</td>
<td>т</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>тI</td>
<td>т’</td>
<td>т</td>
<td>т’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ц</td>
<td>ц</td>
<td>ц</td>
<td>ц</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>цI</td>
<td>ц’</td>
<td>ц</td>
<td>ц’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ч</td>
<td>ч</td>
<td>ч</td>
<td>ч</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>чI</td>
<td>ч’</td>
<td>ч</td>
<td>ч’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ж</td>
<td>ž</td>
<td>ž</td>
<td>ž</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ш</td>
<td>š</td>
<td>š</td>
<td>š</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>лI</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>λ</td>
<td>λ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>къ</td>
<td>L’</td>
<td>λ’</td>
<td>λ’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>лъ</td>
<td>ʟ</td>
<td>ʟ</td>
<td>ʟ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>т</td>
<td>ɡ</td>
<td>ɡ</td>
<td>ɡ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>к</td>
<td>к</td>
<td>к</td>
<td>к</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>кI</td>
<td>к’</td>
<td>к</td>
<td>к’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>хъ</td>
<td>ɿ</td>
<td>ɿ</td>
<td>ɿ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Khalilov 1995]</td>
<td>[Kibrik &amp; Kodzasov 1990]</td>
<td>[NCED]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>кь</td>
<td>q'</td>
<td>q'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>гь</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>ᵰ</td>
<td>ᵰ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>х</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ь</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>гь</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>h</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>м</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>н</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>р</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>r</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>л</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>l</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>в</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>w</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>й</td>
<td>й</td>
<td>й</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>и</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>е, э</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>а</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>аь</td>
<td>ã</td>
<td>ã</td>
<td>ã</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>о</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>оь</td>
<td>ô</td>
<td>ô</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>у</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>u</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>уь</td>
<td>ũ</td>
<td>ũ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vⁿ</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ķ</td>
<td>Ŵ</td>
<td>Ŵ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. We treat geminated consonants as single long units (e.g., tː cː š: and so on) instead of
bi-phonemic clusters (t’t’ cc šš and so on) in other sources. In most cases, these geminates originate from contraction with suffixal y.

2. Voiceless stops and affricates (t, č and so on) are slightly aspirated (tʰ, čʰ and so on).

3. In [Kibrik & Testelets 2004], the additional front vowel æ is listed as phonologically opposed to e and ā; all other sources, including our transcription, do not distinguish between ā and æ.

4. Kodzasov describes the Tlyadal prosodic system as tonal [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 331] with several tones distinguished. Three are basic register tones: low ɬ, mid ɬ, high ɬ. Four more are rare contour tones: low-mid ɬɬ, mid-high ɬɬ, high-mid ɬɬ, mid-low ɬɬ. These tones are only marked for Tlyadal in [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990] (and also mentioned in [Kibrik & Testelets 2004: 220 f.]), and, strictly speaking, it is not entirely clear whether the Tlyadal prosodic oppositions are indeed tonal or not. We do not quote the tonal transcription.

5. As reported by Kodzasov, in the Khoshar-Khota dialect, ā ķ ii are epiglottalized vowels, causing automatic assimilation of adjacent ñ h > s h [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 331]. Apparently the same is true for the Bezhta proper dialect, where, in addition, this assimilation also affects the uvulars (q q’ k χ). In [Khalilov 1995: 390], ā ķ ii in combination with the uvulars (q q’ k χ) and the glottal stop (ʔ) are described as pharyngealized and sporadically (not always!) transcribed in Cyrillic orthography with the additional signs {ʻ} for consonants and {I} for vowel: e.g., qőqilö ‘rough, coarse, rude’ is quoted as [хъоьхъилоь] in [Khalilov 1995: 264], but as [хъʻоIхъило] in [Khalilov 1995: 390]. Ya. Testelets (p.c.) has pointed out, however, that historically an epiglottal or pharyngeal prosody or the pharyngeal fricatives should be primary in all these cases; particularly, ā ķ ii secondarily originate from a o u in such a pharyngeal context. When Khalilov’s notation with {ʻ} or {I} is available, we quote the transcription with pharyngealization ˤ in the notes.

6. Following common practice, we do not note the initial glottal stop (ʔ), which has the status of an automatic prothesis in the case of vocalic onset [Kibrik & Testelets 2004: 221]. It should be noted that in the Bezhta proper dictionary [Khalilov 1995], vocalic onset can be explicitly written as {ъV-} (not simple {V-}); this is usual for initial front vowels or onomatopoetic forms.
7. For vowel and consonant harmony, see [Kibrik & Testelets 2004: 221 ff.; NCED: 113].

III. Hinukh

III.1. General.

The primary sources on Hinukh are the dictionaries [Khalilov & Isakov 2005; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990] and the grammars [Forker 2013; Lomtadze 1963; Imnaishvili 1963], plus the grammar sketches [Isakov & Khalilov 2004; Bokarev 1959: 110-142].

Hinukh lexical data are systematically quoted in [Comrie & Khalilov 2010], but we prefer not to use this source due to its general unreliability.

III.2. Transliteration.

The following transliterational chart covers our principal sources:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[Isakov &amp; Khalilov 2004]</th>
<th>[Forker 2013]</th>
<th>[Kibrik &amp; Kodzasov 1990]</th>
<th>[NCED]</th>
<th>GLD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>б</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>пI</td>
<td>p'</td>
<td>p'</td>
<td>p'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ф</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>д</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>тI</td>
<td>t'</td>
<td>t'</td>
<td>t'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ц</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>цI</td>
<td>c'</td>
<td>c'</td>
<td></td>
<td>c'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isakov &amp; Khalilov 2004</td>
<td>Forker 2013</td>
<td>Kibrik &amp; Kodzasov 1990</td>
<td>NCED</td>
<td>GLD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>з</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ч</td>
<td>č</td>
<td>č</td>
<td>č</td>
<td>č</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>чI</td>
<td>č'</td>
<td>č'</td>
<td>č'</td>
<td>č'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ж</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>лI</td>
<td>Ł</td>
<td>Ł</td>
<td>Ł</td>
<td>Ł</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>къ</td>
<td>Ł'</td>
<td>Ł'</td>
<td>Ł'</td>
<td>Ł'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ль</td>
<td>Ł</td>
<td>Ł</td>
<td>Ł</td>
<td>Ł</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>г</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>к</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>кI</td>
<td>k'</td>
<td>k'</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>гв</td>
<td>gʷ</td>
<td>g₀</td>
<td>gʷ</td>
<td>gʷ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>кв</td>
<td>kʷ</td>
<td>k₀</td>
<td>kʷ</td>
<td>kʷ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>кIв</td>
<td>k'ʷ</td>
<td>k'₀</td>
<td>k'ʷ</td>
<td>k'ʷ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>хъ</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>къ</td>
<td>q'</td>
<td>q'</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>q'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>хъв</td>
<td>qʷ</td>
<td>q₀</td>
<td>qʷ</td>
<td>qʷ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>къв</td>
<td>q'ʷ</td>
<td>q'₀</td>
<td>q'ʷ</td>
<td>q'ʷ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>гъ</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>хъ</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>х</td>
<td>х</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>гъв</td>
<td>Xʷ</td>
<td>R₀</td>
<td>bʷ</td>
<td>bʷ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. We treat geminated consonants as single long units (e.g., \( t'ː c': š': \) and so on) instead of bi-phonemic clusters (\( t't': cc': šš: \) and so on) as is done in other sources. In most cases, these geminates originate from contraction with a suffixal consonant (normally \( y \)).

2. Voiceless stops and affricates (\( t, č \) and so on) are slightly aspirated (\( tʰ, čʰ \) and so on) [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 329; Forker 2013: 28].
3. The uvular stops (q etc.) are in fact affricates (qt etc.) [Forker 2013: 28; Isakov & Khalilov 2004: 168].

4. Fricative f is restricted to recent Russian loanwords.

5. Following common practice, we do not note the initial glottal-stop (?), which is an automatic prothesis in the case of vocalic onset [Forker 2013: 30].

6. It is reported in [Forker 2013: 23 f.] that the vowels i ü u o possess lax and tense variants (lax i y u o vs. tense i ü u o), but the same source states that this opposition is not phonemic.

7. The vowel ü is restricted to the speech of the older generation; younger speakers replace it with i (or very occasionally with u) [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 330; Forker 2013: 24].

8. The prosodic feature of pharyngealization is realized as epiglottalization (for the sake of convenience we transcribe it as pharyngealization ŋ); it is residually observed in several words [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 330], see the discussion in [Forker 2013: 26 f.].

IV. Dido (Kidero, Sagada)

IV.1. General.

The Dido (Tsez, Cez) language consists of several dialects: Kidero, Asakh, Mokok, Shayt, Shapikh and Sagada (Sahada). Out of these, Sagada is the most distinct one, so that it is sometimes stated that Dido consists of just two dialects - Dido proper (with the aforementioned sub-dialects) and Sagada.

Available lexicographic data are sufficient for the compilation of two lists for two main dialects: Kidero and Sagada.

The main sources on Kidero are the dictionaries [Khalilov 1999; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990] and the grammatical descriptions [Alekseev & Radzhabov 2004; Imnaishvili 1963; Bokarev 1959: 175-221].
The main source on Sagada is the 110-item wordlist [Abdulaev 2014], compiled in accordance with the GLD semantic specifications. This list was recorded by Arsen Abdulaev in Makhachkala, February 2014 from one informant. Name: Khizri Makhmudov (Хизрө Махмудов), male, born in Sagada village (Tsuntinsky district, Dagestan, Russia) in 1972, lives in Yurkovka village (Tarumovsky district, Dagestan), high education, Sagada native speaker, also speaks Russian, Avar, Chamalal. Some Sagada forms and grammatical information have been taken from [Imnaishvili 1963; Khalilov 1999].

For other dialects, cf. the Asakh grammar sketch [Comrie et al. 1998] and the Mokok grammar sketch [Comrie 2007]. When dialect material is available, we quote it in the notes.

Dido lexical data (Mokok, Sagada) are systematically quoted in [Comrie & Khalilov 2010], but we prefer not to use this source due to its general unreliability.

IV.2. Transliteration.

The following transliterational chart covers our principal sources:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[Khalilov 1999]</th>
<th>[Maddieson et al. 1996]</th>
<th>[Kibrik &amp; Kodzasov 1990]</th>
<th>[NCED]</th>
<th>GLD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>б</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>пI</td>
<td>p’</td>
<td>p’</td>
<td>p’</td>
<td>p’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>д</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>тI</td>
<td>t’</td>
<td>t’</td>
<td>t’</td>
<td>t’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ц</td>
<td>ts</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>цI</td>
<td>ts’</td>
<td>c’</td>
<td>c’</td>
<td>c’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>з</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Криволоков 1999</td>
<td>Маддисон et al. 1996</td>
<td>Кубрик &amp; Кодазов 1990</td>
<td>NCED</td>
<td>GLD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ч</td>
<td>тʃ</td>
<td>ċ</td>
<td>ċ</td>
<td>ċ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>чI</td>
<td>тʃ’</td>
<td>ċ’</td>
<td>ċ’</td>
<td>ċ’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ж</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>лI</td>
<td>тɬ</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Λ</td>
<td>Λ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>кь</td>
<td>тɬ’</td>
<td>L’</td>
<td>Λ’</td>
<td>Λ’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ль</td>
<td>л’</td>
<td>л’</td>
<td>Λ</td>
<td>Λ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>г</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>к</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>кI</td>
<td>k’</td>
<td>k’</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>хь</td>
<td>ʡ</td>
<td>ʡ</td>
<td>ʡ</td>
<td>ʡ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>кь</td>
<td>ʡ’</td>
<td>ʡ’</td>
<td>ʡ’</td>
<td>ʡ’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ть</td>
<td>ʞ</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>ʞ</td>
<td>ʞ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>х</td>
<td>χ</td>
<td>χ</td>
<td>χ</td>
<td>χ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>П</td>
<td>ʔ</td>
<td>ʔ</td>
<td>ʔ</td>
<td>ʔ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>хI</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>гь</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>н</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>л</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>б</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>w</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. We treat geminated consonants as single long units (e.g., tː cː šː and so on) instead of bi-phonemic clusters (t’t’ cc šš and so on) in other sources. In most cases, these geminates originate from contraction with a suffixal consonant (normally y).

2. Voiceless stops and affricates (t, č and so on) are slightly aspirated (tʰ, čʰ and so on) [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 329; Forker 2013: 28].

3. In inherited words, ʔ and ʡ are restricted to the initial position, where ʡ is an allophone of ʔ in pharyngealized (see below) forms. Following common practice, we do not note such an automatic initial ʔ.

4. Pharyngealizationˤ is a prosodic feature which spreads over the whole phonetic word. If there are no uvular obstruents in a phonetic word, pharyngealization is transcribed for the first vowel. Otherwise, pharyngealization is noted after the first uvular obstruent (q qː χ ø).

5. Labializationʷ is restricted to velar and uvular obstruents in the prevocalic position (kʷV, qʷV and so on).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[Khalilov 1999]</th>
<th>[Maddieson et al. 1996]</th>
<th>[Kibrik &amp; Kodzasov 1990]</th>
<th>[NCED]</th>
<th>GLD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>й</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>й</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Čв</td>
<td>Čw</td>
<td>Čː</td>
<td>Čw</td>
<td>Čw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Cː</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ь</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>Ь</td>
<td>Ь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>е, Ė</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>е</td>
<td>е</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>аь</td>
<td>ā</td>
<td>ā</td>
<td>аь</td>
<td>аь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>о</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>о</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>у</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>у</td>
<td>у</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ъ</td>
<td>Vː</td>
<td>Vː</td>
<td>Ъ</td>
<td>Vː</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>ĩ</td>
<td>ĩ</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Щ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. The vowel ä is described in [Khalilov 1999; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990; Imnaishvili 1963; Bokarev 1959], but specific forms with ä do not coincide between these sources (a wordform with ä in one source can correspond to a wordform with a or e in another). On the contrary, in [Maddieson et al. 1996; Alekseev & Radzhabov 2004], the phoneme ä is not identified at all.

V. Khwarshi (proper, Inkhokwari)

V.1. General.

The Khwarshi (Khvarshi, Xvarshi) language consists of five dialects: Khwarshi proper, Inkhokwari, Kwantlada, Santlada, Khwayni. Out of these, Kwantlada, Santlada and Khwayni are very close to each other, and they all are close to Inkhokwari as opposed to distinct Khwarshi proper (see [Khalilova 2009: 4] for detail). Frequently Khwarshi proper and Inkhokwari (with Kwantlada, Santlada, Khwayni) are treated as two separate languages, referred to respectively as simply Khwarshi and Inkhokwari.

The available lexicographical data are sufficient for compiling three lists: Khwarshi proper, Inkhokwari Khwarshi and Kwantlada Khwarshi. Actually, no lexicostatistical mismatches between the Inkhokwari and Kwantlada 110-item wordlists have been revealed, so we prefer to allocate Kwantlada data within the notes section on Inkhokwari rather than offer a separate wordlist for Kwantlada.

The main source for Khwarshi proper is the 110-item wordlist [Karimova 2014], compiled in accordance with the GLD semantic specifications. This list was recorded by Raisat Karimova in Oktyabrskoe village, Khasavyurtovsky district, Dagestan, Russia, February 2014 from one informant. Name: Зайнап Магомедова, female, born 1962, lives in Oktyabrskoe (before marriage, lived in Mutsalaual village, Khasavyurtovsky district), high education, Khwarshi proper native speaker, also speaks Kwantlada Khwarshi (her husband is Kwantlada native speaker), Avar and Russian. Some Khwarshi proper forms and grammatical information have been taken from grammar sketches [Sharafutdinova & Levina 1961; Imnaishvili 1963]. An additional source is [NCED], whose authors use lexical data collected by the Tsezic enthusiast Ramazan Radzhabov (incorrectly named as Radzhibov in [NCED: 6] and Nadzhipov in [NCED: 11]). Khwarshi proper lexical data are systematically quoted in [Comrie & Khalilov 2010], but we prefer not to use this source due to its general
unreliability.

The main sources for Inkhokwari Khwarshi are the noun glossary [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990] plus the 110-item wordlist [Karimova 2014], compiled in accordance with the GLD semantic specifications. This list was recorded by Raisat Karimova in Oktyabrskoe village, Khasavyurtovsky district, Dagestan, Russia, February 2014 from one informant. Name: Dzhamilya Mirzoeva (Джамиля Миразева), female, born 1973, lives in Oktyabrskoe, higher education, works as a school teacher, Inkhokwari native speaker, also speaks Avar and Russian. Some Inkhokwari forms and grammatical information have been taken from [Imnaishvili 1963; Bokarev 1959: 143-174]. Inkhokwari Khwarshi lexical data are systematically quoted in [Comrie & Khalilov 2010], but we prefer not to use this source due to its general unreliability.

The main source for Kwantlada Khwarshi is the 110-item wordlist [Karimova 2014], compiled in accordance with the GLD semantic specifications. This list was recorded by Raisat Karimova in Oktyabrskoe village, Khasavyurtovsky district, Dagestan, Russia, February 2014 from one informant. Name: Khalizha Magomedova (Халижа Магомедова), female, born 1970, lives in Oktyabrskoe, higher education, works as a school teacher, Kwantlada Khwarshi native speaker, also speaks Russian. Many Kwantlada forms and grammatical information have been taken from the grammar description [Khalilova 2009].

V.2. Transliteration.

The following transliterational chart covers our principal sources:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[Sharafutdinova &amp; Levina 1961; Karimova 2014]</th>
<th>[Khalilova 2009]</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>п</td>
<td>р</td>
<td>р</td>
<td>р</td>
<td>р</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>п'</td>
<td>п'</td>
<td>п'</td>
<td>ṗ</td>
<td>п'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ф</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>д</td>
<td>д</td>
<td>д</td>
<td>д</td>
<td>д</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Sharafutdinova &amp; Levina 1961; Karimova 2014]</td>
<td>[Khalilova 2009]</td>
<td>[Kibrik &amp; Kodzasov 1990]</td>
<td>[NCED]</td>
<td>GLD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>т</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ц</td>
<td>ц</td>
<td>ц</td>
<td>ц</td>
<td>ц</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>цІ</td>
<td>ц'</td>
<td>ц'</td>
<td>ц</td>
<td>ц'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ч</td>
<td>ĉ</td>
<td>ĉ</td>
<td>ĉ</td>
<td>ĉ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>чІ</td>
<td>ĉ'</td>
<td>ĉ'</td>
<td>ĉ</td>
<td>ĉ'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ж</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>лІ</td>
<td>λ</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>λ</td>
<td>λ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>къ</td>
<td>λ'</td>
<td>L'</td>
<td>λ'</td>
<td>λ'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>лъ</td>
<td>λ</td>
<td>Л</td>
<td>λ</td>
<td>Л</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>г</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>к</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>кІ</td>
<td>k'</td>
<td>k'</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>хъ</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>къ</td>
<td>q'</td>
<td>q'</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>q'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>гъ</td>
<td>γ</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>γ</td>
<td>γ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>х</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>х</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>НІ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Φ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Sharafutdinova &amp; Levina 1961; Karimova 2014]</td>
<td>[Khalilova 2009]</td>
<td>[Kibrik &amp; Kodzasov 1990]</td>
<td>[NCED]</td>
<td>GLD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χI</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ы</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ы</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>н</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>л</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>л'</td>
<td>l'</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>l'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>в</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>й</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>j</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Св                                         | Сண | Сṇ | Сʷ | Сʷ |
| C, CC                                      | CC | CC | CC | CC |
| i                                          | i   | i   | i   | i   |
| е, э                                       | e   | e   | e   | e   |
| a                                          | a   | a   | a   | a   |
| аь                                         | ä   | ä   | ä   | ä   |
| о                                          | o   | o   | o   | o   |
| у                                          | u   | u   | u   | u   |
| ы                                          | i   | i   | i   | i   |

| Ū                                          | Vː  | Vː  | Ū  | Vː  |
| Ъ, Vⁿ                                     | Vⁿ | Ū   | Ū  | Ū   |
| I                                          | l, Ū | l, Ū | l, Ū | l, Ū |

1. We treat geminated consonants as single long units (e.g., t': c: š: and so on) instead of bi-phonemic clusters (t't' cc šš and so on) in other sources. In most cases, these geminates originate from contraction with a suffixal consonant (normally y).

2. Voiceless stops and affricates (t, č and so on) are slightly aspirated (tʰ, čʰ and so on) [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 327].
3. Some consonant phonemes are normally or totally restricted to Tindi, Avar and Russian loanwords: f, w, x, ʕ, ħ, labialized sibilants.

4. Following common practice, we do not note the initial glottal-stop (ʔ), which is an automatic prothesis in the case of vocalic onset [Forker 2013: 30].

5. Pharyngealization (which is characteristic of non-Khwarshi proper dialects) is a prosodic feature which spreads over the entire phonetic word. If there are no uvular obstruents in the phonetic word, pharyngealization is transcribed for the first vowel. Otherwise, pharyngealization is noted after the first uvular obstruent (q qː χ ʁ).

6. Palatalized lʰ is characteristic of non-Khwarshi proper dialects. In most cases, it is an automatic variant of l. The shift l > lʰ occurs after e, after i or in pharyngealized forms [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 327; Khalilova 2009: 19 f.]. Nevertheless, there is a small number of instances of lʰ in other contexts [Khalilova 2009: 20] that makes lʰ phonemic.

7. Kodzasov describes the Inkhokwari prosodic system as tonal [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 327] with several tones distinguished. These tones are not mentioned in other Khwarshi sources, and, strictly speaking, it is not entirely clear whether the Inkhokwari prosodic oppositions are indeed tonal or not. We do not quote the tonal transcription.

8. As follows from the field records in [Karimova 2014], modern speakers tend to drop pharyngealization and nasalization of vowels, as well as labialization of consonants.

VI. Proto-Tsezic

VI.1. General.

The only systematic published reconstruction of the Proto-Tsezic phonological system and etymological corpus belongs to Sergei Nikolaev (Nikolayev), although, of course, the reconstruction acknowledges its debt to previous research, conducted by some preceding Caucasologists, of which E. A. Bokarev deserves primary mention. S. Nikolaev's reconstruction was included in [NCED] and published electronically as Tsezic Etymological Database [TsezEDb] on the StarLing database server. It must be noted that [TsezEDb] only includes those Proto-Tsezic 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 comparanda). Some further corrections and additions to Proto-Tsezic vowel reconstruction were proposed by Ya. Testelets.

In reconstructing the Swadesh wordlist for Proto-Tsezic, we generally follow [NCED] and [TsezEDb], although in some cases we revise and, occasionally, even reject Nikolaev's specific etymologies (this mostly has to do with new Tsezic data that have been published since the mid-1990s). The optional letters A or B after a Proto-Tsezic form denote a specific prosodic class [NCED: 75 f., 113 f.]. Due to unclear reasons, Nikolaev tends not to project pharyngealization onto Proto-Tsezic forms when this prosodic feature is attested in ancestral forms in daughter languages. We reconstruct Proto-Tsezic pharyngealization in such cases. The threefold opposition *ɬ / *ʫ / *l, postulated in [NCED: 110], is typologically rather problematic, but we provisionally leave it as is.

The main phylogenetic methods (Neighbor joining, UPGMA, Bayesian MCMC, Maximum parsimony) propose a twofold division into East Tsezic and West Tsezic, but differ in the topology of the West Tsezic cluster: some of the methods suggest a Hinukh-Dido unity opposed to Khwarshi (MP, UPGMA), others suggest a Dido-Khwarshi unity opposed to Hinukh (MCMC, NJ).

Below we examine the reverse lexicostatistical distances for two East Tsezic lects (Hunzib proper, Bezhta proper) and three West Tsezic lects (Hinukh, Kidero Dido, Khwarshi proper), higher percentage of the shared basic vocabulary meaning greater closeness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hunzib proper (ETs)</th>
<th>Bezhta proper (ETs)</th>
<th>Kidero Dido (WTs)</th>
<th>Khwarshi proper (WTs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hinukh (WTs)</td>
<td>62.9%</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
<td>76.4%</td>
<td>69.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunzib proper (ETs)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>86.8%</td>
<td>55.3%</td>
<td>55.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bezhta proper (ETs)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>54.3%</td>
<td>55.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kidero Dido (WTs)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>76.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If we exclude Hinukh, the lexicostatistical distances between the four remaining lects fulfil the condition of additivity: two East Tsezic lects are close to each other (86.8%),...
two West Tsezic lect are close to each other (76.2%), whereas any East Tsezic lect is equally remote from any West Tsezic lect (ca. 55%).

The configuration gets abnormal, however, when Hinukh is introduced.

First, distances between three West Tsezic lects do not fulfil the condition of additivity: Kidero Dido is equally close to Khwarshi and Hinukh (76.2% ~ 76.4%), whereas Khwarshi and Hinukh are remote from each other (69.6%). It means that there should be a number of parasitic, i.e., secondary matches either between Kidero Dido & Khwarshi or between Kidero Dido & Hinukh. Geographical distribution and a high number of specific cultural words, shared by Kidero Dido and Hinukh (Ya. Testelets, p.c.), suggest that this pair is expected to have secondary contacts. Since Sagada Dido (which is not adjacent to the Hinukh territory) demonstrates the same closeness to Hinukh as Kidero Dido does (76.2% ~ 76.4%), it is more likely that the normal direction of the influence is Kidero Dido > Hinukh rather than vice versa.

Second, comparison with East Tsezic lects also demonstrates irregular ratios. Four sets of three languages can be analyzed.

1) Hunzib proper (ETs) / Bezhta proper (ETs) / Hinukh (WTs). The configuration is normal: two East Tsezic lects are close to each other (86.8%) and equally remote from the West Tsezic lect (62.9% ~ 63.6%).

2) Hunzib proper (ETs) / Bezhta proper (ETs) / Kidero Dido (WTs). The configuration is normal: two East Tsezic lects are close to each other (86.8%) and equally remote from the West Tsezic lect (54.3% ~ 55.3%).

3) Hinukh (WTs) / Kidero Dido (WTs) / Hunzib proper (ETs). The configuration is not quite normal: two West Tsezic lects are indeed close to each other (76.4%), but not equally remote from the East Tsezic lect: Hinukh / Hunzib = 62.9%, whereas Kidero Dido / Hunzib = only 55.3% (the difference is 7.6).

4) Hinukh (WTs) / Kidero Dido (WTs) / Bezhta proper (ETs). The configuration is even more abnormal: two West Tsezic lects are indeed close to each other (76.4%), but not equally remote from the East Tsezic lect: Hinukh / Bezhta = 63.6%, whereas Kidero Dido / Bezhta = only 54.3% (the difference is 9.3).
As follows from this analysis, the lexicostatistical distances between two West Tsezic and one East Tsezic lects do not satisfy the condition of additivity. Hinukh demonstrates abnormal closeness to East Tsezic lects, both to Bezhta and Hunzib. Such a closeness should be treated as secondary, i.e., we assume a number of secondary lexical matches between Proto-Hinukh and Proto-East Tsezic. This can be explained as a result of serious influence in between Proto-Hinukh and Proto-East Tsezic, although the default direction of influence, Proto-East Tsezic > Proto-Hinukh or vice versa, cannot be established by means of such a formal analysis.

Thus, we could suppose two stages in the history of Hinukh. Initially, Hinukh entered into close contact with Proto-East Tsezic and subsequently Bezhta (the direction of influence is not entirely clear). Later, Hinukh was influenced by the neighboring Dido (especially Kidero Dido). Cf. a similar statement by Forker: “there has been and there still is extensive contact between Hinuq speakers and speakers of two other Tsezic languages, Bezhta and Tsez” [Forker 2013: 12]. Forker also attributes Hinukh-Dido contacts to the present time: “Many Hinuq men marry Tsez women, who then move to the village of Hinuq. These women often do not fully acquire the Hinuq language and sometimes simply continue to speak Tsez, at least at home” [Forker 2013: 16].

Database compiled and annotated by:

**Hunzib (proper):** A. Kassian, October 2013 / revised November 2013 (minor corrections) / revised July 2014 (minor corrections). We are thankful to Yakov Testelets (Moscow) for a number of valuable remarks on Hunzib data.

**Bezhta (Bezhta proper, Khoshar-Khota, Tlyadal):** A. Kassian, November 2013 / revised January 2014 (minor corrections) / revised July 2014 (minor corrections) / revised April 2015 (several lexical additions and corrections). We are thankful to Yakov Testelets (Moscow) & Madzhid Khalilov (Makhachkala) for a number of valuable remarks on Bezhta data.

**Hinukh:** A. Kassian, December 2013 / revised July 2014 (minor corrections).

**Dido (Kidero):** A. Kassian, January 2014 / revised July 2014 (minor corrections).

**Dido (Sagada):** A. Kassian, April 2014 (using field records by Arsen Abdullaev) / revised July 2014 (minor corrections).

**Khwarshi (Khwarshi proper, Inkhokwari):** A. Kassian, April 2014 (using field records by Raisat Karimova) / revised July 2014 (minor corrections).

**Proto-Tsezic:** A. Kassian, July 2014 / revised April 2015 (minor corrections).
1. ALL


References and notes:


There are two documented expressions for ‘all’:

1) li-der-(u) [class 1, 2, 4] / lo-der-(u) [3, 5], which is quoted as the only equivalent for ‘all (omnis)’ in [Isakov & Khalilov 2012: 161; Bokarev 1961: 173]. The plural forms ‘all (omnis)’ are given as regular li-der- [human pl.] / lo-der- [non-human pl.] in [Isakov & Khalilov 2012], but as li-der-ol in [Bokarev 1961]. This is the present participle in -der of the generic verb ‘to be’ [van den Berg 1995: 99 if.], i.e., ‘all’ as ‘whoever/whatever’ being’. It should be noted that in [van den Berg 1995: 314], li-der-ol is translated as ‘every, each’.

2) seh / set’ (with unclear distribution of variants), which is quoted for ‘all (omnis / totus)’ in [Isakov & Khalilov 2001: 148; van den Berg 1995: 332]. The examples are: “She made them take off all their upper clothes” [van den Berg 1995: 246], “All the animals have come” [Isakov & Khalilov 2001: 148].

We have to treat li-der- and seh as synonyms.[Isakov & Khalilov 2001: 148; van den Berg 1995: 332.


Several terms for ‘all’ are listed in [Khalilov 1995: 300, 401]. Out of them, the adjective q’ac’-a is the most frequently used one, as follows from browsing through [Khalilov 1995]. Cf. the examples for attributive use: “to find out all the circumstances” [Khalilov 1995: 31]. “In summer, the cattle are all in the mountains”, “All the books are mine” [Khalilov 1995: 153]. Non-attributive use: “There was room for all (of them)” [Khalilov 1995: 118], “All (i.e., everybody) have got their shares” [Khalilov 1995: 215], “All (i.e., everything) will be all right” [Khalilov 1995: 217].

A second candidate is the non-inflected form set’ [cerl] [Khalilov 1995: 228] with the following examples quoted in the main entry: “All the children have come”, “All (i.e., everybody) are singing the song”, “All (i.e., everybody) have stopped talking”.

A third candidate is the adjective gēh-iy-o [ра̃мъин] [Khalilov 1995: 59, 401; Madieva 1965: 103], but normally it is used in non-attributive function: “All (of them) have gone to the cinema”, “All (of them) have books” [Khalilov 1995: 59].

gēh-iy-o is derived from gēh-i-o ‘existing’ [Khalilov 1995: 58] with the interrogative suffix -ə (gēh-i-o ‘the participle from the auxiliary present stem gel ‘to be’ [Khalilov 1995: 59], although the vowel change e → ə is abnormal).


Khoshar-Khota Bezhta: M. Khalilov, p.c. The second Khoshar-Khota term for ‘all’ reported by Khalilov is seh / set’ (with unclear distribution of variants), but we prefer to treat it as a more marginal expression, following the Bezhta proper and Tlyadal descriptions.

Tlyadal Bezhta: Kibrik & Testelets 2004: 249; Khalilov 1995: 58. In [Khalilov 1995], treated as a synonym of Bezhta proper q’ac’-o ‘all’. Participle with the -y-suffix (l < iy) from the auxiliary present stem gel ‘to be’ [Kibrik & Testelets 2004: 255], although the vowel change e → ə is irregular.

Other candidates are seh ‘all’ [Khalilov 1995: 228] and q’ac’-o ‘all’ [M. Khalilov, p.c.], but these forms are apparently more marginal than gēh, because seh and q’ac’-o are not mentioned in [Kibrik & Testelets 2004].

Distinct from suk’a-nazu ‘each, every’ [Kibrik & Testelets 2004: 249] with interrogative suk’a ‘who’ q.v. and the special generalizing element -na-zu.

Hinukh: Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 396, 583; Forker 2013: 408. Morphologically, an adjective with k’ < ‘k’-y. Polysemy: ‘all (omnis) / all (totus) / completely, entirely’.

Kidero Dido: Khalilov 1999: 277, 312, 440. Polysemy: ‘all (omnis) / all (totus)’. Browsing through available sources suggests that the adjective c’ik’-y-u is the most frequent and generic expression for ‘all’.

A second, apparently more marginal candidate is naːsi-n [нясин] ‘all (omnis) / all (totus)’ [Khalilov 1999: 197, 312, 440;
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References and notes:

2. ASHES
Hunzib (proper) yâɬu {iwaɬly} (1), Bezhta (proper) yâɬo {iwaɬlo} (1), Khoshar-Khota
Bezhta yâɬo (1), Tlyadal Bezhta yâɬo (1), Hinukh yôɬu {iolyl} (1), Kidero Dido noɬu
{iolyl} (1), Sagada Dido noɬu {iolyl} (1), Khwarshi (proper) yâɬu {iuguɬy} (1),
Inkhokwari Khwarshi yôɬu {iuguɬy} (1), Proto-Tsezic *yòɬu A (1).

References and notes:
[Isakov & Khalilov 2001; Bokarev 1961], only the innovative denasalized form yâɬu {iwlly} is quoted.
Tlyadal Bezhta: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 207.
 Distinct from čeča [uərə] 'soot; thin crust of ice over snow' [Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 396].
 Quite differently in [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 207], where čeča is proposed as the basic word for 'ashes', whereas
noɬu (sic!) is specified as 'fine ashes (ненэлэ)'. Apparently a mass of errors.
Kwantlada Khwarshi: yôɬu {iuguɬy} 'ashes' [Karimova 2014].
Proto-Tsezic: NCED: 681. Distribution: One of the most stable Proto-Tsezic roots, retained in its basic meaning in all Tsezic lects.
 Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular, except for the occasional shift of nasalization between the
vowel and the initial glide.

Semantics and structure: Primary substantive root.

3. BARK

Hunzib (proper) $r=ič-ul \{無いルル\}$ (1), Bezhta (proper) $y=ic-al-o \{いいくら\}$ (1), Khoshar-Khota Bezhta $λeq'ä$ (2), Tlyadal Bezhta $λeq'iqī$ (2) / $qar$ (3), Hinukh $qʷul \sim q'ul \{くびル\}$ (4), Kidero Dido $q'ul \{くゆル\}$ (4), Sagada Dido $qʷul \{くびル\}$ (4), Khwarshi (proper) $qʷel \{くべル\}$ (4), Inkhokwari Khwarshi $qʷel \sim qʷel \{くべル\}$ (4), Proto-Tsezic *$qʷel$A (4).

References and notes:

Hunzib (proper): Isakov & Khalilov 2001: 144, 207; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 97; van den Berg 1995: 330; Bokarev 1961: 164, 176. In [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990], the form is transcribed as $rič-ul$ - a typo (the original field notes have $rič-ul$. - Ya. Testelets, p.c.). Polysemy: 'bark / crust'. Apparently an old deverbalive $r=ič-al$ from the verb $CLASS=ic$ $[δια]$ 'to peel, skin' [Isakov & Khalilov 2001: 41], although such a suffixal pattern is very rare, if not unique.

Distinct from $qal \{かがあ\}$ 'peel, bark' [Isakov & Khalilov 2001: 166, 207; Bokarev 1961: 167], borrowed from Avar $qal$ 'peel, bark'.

Distinct from $qeq'el$-ba $[くけっけルバ]$ 'bitch bark' [Isakov & Khalilov 2001: 98, 190], final -ba is the plural exponent; it must be noted that in [Isakov & Khalilov 2001: 101] the dialectal variant $λeq'el$-ba $[くけっけルバ]$ (village Garbutl) is quoted, which seems to be a graphical corruption (Cyrillic [я] for [а]).


There are three documented terms for 'bark':

1) derived term $y=ic-al-o$;
2) primary stem beš $[べし]$ with polysemy: 'bark / shell / skin' [Khalilov 1995: 45, 311; Madieva 1965: 150];
3) borrowed term $qal \{かがあ\}$ with polysemy: 'bark / peel / skin' [Khalilov 1995: 259, 311; Madieva 1965: 190] $<$ Avar $qal$ 'peel, bark'.

Provisionally we choose $y=ic-al-o$ as the basic Bezhta proper term, because there are two textual examples for it: "dry bark", "to peel bark from tree" [Khalilov 1995: 123]. Only one example is available for $qal$: "thin bark" [Khalilov 1995: 259], and no examples for beš. It should be noted that beš is the basic term for 'human skin' q.v.

Distinct from $λeq'$ $[けっくら]$ 'patch (a piece of cloth)' [Khalilov 1995: 163].

Khoshar-Khota Bezhta: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 97; M. Khalilov, p.c.

In [Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 412], $ricalo$ is also quoted as one of the Khoshar-Khota terms for 'bark' (directly corresponds to Bezhta proper $y=ic-al-o$).


There are two Tlyadal terms for 'bark', quoted in [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990] as synonyms: $λeq'ā$ and $qar$. Additionally, M. Khalilov (p.c.) quotes the Avar loanword $qal$ 'bark'. Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 97. Theoretically $qar$ could be a corruption of Avar $qal$ 'peel, bark'.

Common Bezhta: The stem $λeq'$ should be considered the Proto-Bezhta term for 'bark'.

Distinct from the Common Bezhta term for 'bitch bark': Bezhta proper, Khoshar-Khota $qeq'el$-ba, Tlyadal $qeq'el$-ba [Khalilov 1995: 155; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 97] (apparently -ba is the fossilized plural exponent).


A second term is the borrowing $qal \{かがあ\}$ with polysemy: 'bark / peel / layer, coat / skin' [Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 358, 456] $<$ Avar $qal$ 'peel, bark'.

Distinct from the more specific term meču [мечу] 'bark' [Khalilov 1999: 189, 334].

Sagada Dido: Abdulaev 2014. A second term for 'bark', quoted in [Abdulaev 2014], is the Avar loanword qal [χαλ].


Inkhokwari Khwarski: Karimova 2014; Bokarev 1959: 146. Differently in [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 97], where the word for 'bark' is quoted as qal (borrowing from Avar qːal 'peel, bark').
Distinct from the more specific term č'ita [чіта] 'birch bark' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 97].


Proto-Tsezic: NCED: 931. Distribution: *q'ʷˤel A is attested as the basic term for 'bark' in all West Tsezic lects and can be safely reconstructed at least as the Proto-West Tsezic word for this meaning. As proposed in [NCED: 931], this root is retained in East Tsezic as the reduplicated stem q'eq'el- 'birch bark'.
'Bark' is a less stable item in East Tsezic. The match between Hunzib r=ič-ul and Bezhta proper y=ic-al-o, derived from the verb 'to peel' (< Proto-Tsezic *CLASS=ič 'to peel, take off skin' [NCED: 265]) with the non-productive l-suffix, suggests that this deverbal should be the Proto-East stem for 'bark'. In the Khoshar-Khota-Tlyadal cluster, it was superseded with *'eq’V, whose original Proto-Bezhta meaning was 'patch' (as follows from the Bezhta proper data). Further to the suffixed Hinukh stem ḥ’iq’-n 'birch bark'. No East Caucasian etymology. In many lects, inherited forms tend to be superseded with the Avar loanword (Hunzib proper, Bezhta proper, Hinukh, Kidero Dido, Sagada Dido, Inkhokwari Khwarski).

Replacements: {'bark' > 'crust'} (Hunzib proper), {'to peel' > 'bark'} (Hunzib proper, Bezhta proper, Khoshar-Khota Bezhta), {'skin' > 'bark'} (Bezhta proper), {'patch' > 'bark'} (Khoshar-Khota Bezhta, Tlyadal Bezhta).

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem quite regular.
Semantics and structure: Primary substantive root.

4. BELLY
Hunzib (proper) āχ ~ aχ {анх} (1), Bezhta (proper) ŧχ {ょχ} (2), Khoshar-Khota Bezhta ɕχ (2), Tlyadal Bezhta ŧχ (2), Hinukh aχ {αχ} (1), Kidero Dido aχ {αχ} (1), Sagada Dido aχ {αχ} (1), Khwarshi (proper) āχ {αχ} (1), Inkhokwari Khwarshi āχ {αχ} (1), Proto-Tsezic *ʔǎχː (1).

References and notes:

Hunzib (proper): Isakov & Khalilov 2001: 27, 200; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 36; van den Berg 1995: 284; Bokarev 1961: 150, 174. Polysemy: 'belly / stomach'. According to [Isakov & Khalilov 2001], however, āχ means only 'belly', whereas 'stomach' is expressed by the collocation q’am-is āχ, literally 'head of belly'. In [van den Berg 1995; Bokarev 1961], there is a different polysemy, glossed as 'belly / food'; it is not confirmed by other sources.


Tlyadal Bezhta: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 36.


Proto-Tsezic: NCED: 594. Distribution: Retained as the basic adjective for 'big' in all lects, except for Hinukh and Dido. In Dido, *CLASS=uiqˤV shifted to the meaning 'many' q.v., having been lost in Hinukh.

In Hinukh and Dido, *CLASS=uiqˤV was superseded by *CLASS=ezː́-y [NCED: 653], whose original meaning was something like 'many, numerous' vel sim. cf. sub 'many'. Apparently, parallel contact-driven introductions in Hinukh and Dido may be suspected.

Replacements: '{big > 'many'} (Kidero Dido, Sagada Dido).

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular except for the root vowel in Hunzib.

Semantics and structure: Primary adjective root.

5. BIG

Hunzib (proper) CLASS=iq’-u ~ CLASS=iq’-u {уікъу} (1), Bezhta (proper) CLASS=uiq’-o {уіқъо} (1), Khoshar-Khota Bezhta CLASS=uiq’-ö (1), Tlyadal Bezhta CLASS=uiq’-ö (1), Hinukh CLASS=ezː́: ~ CLASS=ezː́-y {делжий, делжий} (2), Kidero Dido CLASS=ezː́ {делж, елкел} (2), Sagada Dido CLASS=ezː́ {делж} (2), Khwarshi (proper) CLASS=uiq’-u ~ CLASS=uiq’-u {лукъкъу} (1), Inkhokwari Khwarshi CLASS=uiq’-u ~ CLASS=uiq’-u {л’укъкъуI} (1), Proto-Tsezic *CLASS=uiq’V (1).

References and notes:


Distinct from the more specific term iχ-y-u {ихйу} 'large, massive' [Khalilov 1999: 130].


Distinct from the more specific term iχ-a-w {uxaw} 'large, massive' [Abdulave 2014].


Kwantlada Khwarshi: CLASS=uiq’-u ~ CLASS=uiq’-u {лукъкъуI} 'big' [Karimova 2014; Khalilova 2009: 16].

Proto-Tsezic: NCED: 594. Distribution: Retained as the basic adjective for 'big' in all lects, except for Hinukh and Dido. In Dido, *CLASS=uiq’V shifted to the meaning 'many' q.v., having been lost in Hinukh.

In Hinukh and Dido, *CLASS=uiq’V was superseded by *CLASS=ezː́-y ~ ɛːzː- B [NCED: 653], whose original meaning was something like 'many, numerous' vel sim. cf. sub 'many'. Apparently, parallel contact-driven introductions in Hinukh and Dido may be suspected.

Replacements: '{big > 'many'} (Kidero Dido, Sagada Dido).

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular except for the root vowel in Hunzib.

Semantics and structure: Primary adjective root.

6. BIRD

Hunzib (proper) čeq {челъ} (1), Bezhta (proper) mihna {мигъна} (2), Khoshar-Khota Bezhta mihna (2), Tlyadal Bezhta mǐnā (2), Hinukh mihna {мигъна} (2), Kidero Dido avī
References and notes:

Hinukh: Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 266, 506; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 86. Polysemy: 'small bird / young of animal'. No generic terms for 'bird' or 'large bird'.

Kidero Dido: Khalilov 1999: 24, 366; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 85. In [Khalilov 1999], glossed as generic 'bird'; in [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990], as 'small bird'.
Common Dido: Mokok Dido let'ü 'bird' [Khalilov 1999: 170, 366]; it is not clear from Khalilov’s gloss whether this is a generic Mokok term for 'bird' or a specific one for 'a k. of bird'.

Inkhokwari Khwarshi: Karimova 2014; Khalilova 2009: 7; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 85; Bokarev 1959: 147. The variant kɨca is from [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990; Bokarev 1959].
Kwantlada Khwarshi: k'ıca ~ k'ica [k'ıya] 'bird' [Karimova 2014; Khalilova 2009: 7]. In [Karimova 2014], only k'ıca is quoted.

Proto-Tsezic: Distribution: At least several of the attested Tsezic languages display the lexical opposition between a term for 'small/middle bird (in general)' and various terms for specific kinds of large (predatory) birds. It is very likely that such a system is to be projected onto the Proto-Tsezic level.

The formal match between Bezhta mihna 'bird' and Hinukh mihna 'small bird / young of animal' makes *mihnV the main candidate for the status of Proto-Tsezic. In Hunzib, this stem is reflected as mına 'young of animal (incl. nestling)' [Isakov & Khalilov 2001: 123]. Probably one should reconstruct *mihnV with Proto-Tsezic polysemy: 'small bird / young of animal', retained in Hinukh, but eliminated in different ways in Bezhta and Hunzib. No North Caucasian external etymology for Proto-Tsezic *mihnV is available. It must be noted that theoretically *mihnV with the meaning '(small) bird' can only be an East Tsezic feature, whereas Hinukh mihna 'small bird / young of animal' arose under the influence of East Tsezic.

In other languages, three different forms for '(small) bird' are used; each of them seems to be isolated in Tsezic:
1) Hunzib č'eq < Proto-Tsezic *č'eq < North Caucasian 'a kind of small bird' [NCED: 1105].
2) Dido aʁi with a very weak external (Avar) comparandum [NCED: 511]; pace [NCED: 511], Hunzib aχ 'bird' does not exist.
3) Khwarshi k'eca < Proto-Tsezic *k'ıca (~ -i-) < North Caucasian 'a kind of small bird' [NCED: 442].

Replacements: ['a kind of small bird' > 'bird'] (Hunzib, Khwarshi).
Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular.

Semantics and structure: Primary substantive root with polysemy: 'small bird / young of animal'.

7. BITE
Hunzib (proper) sila n=iya: (1), Bezhta (proper) sila gul {сила гулал} (1), Khoshar-Khota Bezhta sila gul (1), Tlyadal Bezhta sila r=əwo (1), Hinukh hil- {ъилал} (2), Kidero Dido han (xla'na) (2), Sagada Dido χan {кап’на} (2), Khwarshi (proper) han {хам’на} (2), Inkhokwari Khwarshi han {к’ап’на} (2), Proto-Tsezic *he’n- ~ *he’I- (2).

References and notes:
Hunzib (proper): Isakov & Khalilov 2001: 148 sub sinlo; van den Berg 1995: 332. Applied to both humans and animals (e.g., a dog). Literally 'to beat the tooth to/for smth.' with *sila 'tooth' q.v. and CLASS-*/yːə: 'to beat' [Isakov & Khalilov 2001: 190; van den Berg 1995: 307] (for denasalization CLASS=U. > CLASS=V... see [van den Berg 1995: 31]).

Distinct from gɑžu *yːətu 'to bite', applied specifically to dogs [van den Berg 1995: 297], literally 'to take away the fang' with *gɑžu 'animal fang' and CLASS-*/yːətu 'to take away, take off, seize' [van den Berg 1995: 284].

Bezhta (proper): Khalilov 1995: 230, 313; Madieva 1965: 185. Literally 'to put the tooth' with *sila 'tooth' q.v. and gVl 'to put, set' [Khalilov 1995: 64]. 

Cf. the parallel expression *sila yːətu [sila ʔaːgʊya] 'to bite off' [Khalilov 1995: 230], literally 'to take out the tooth' with CLASS-*/yːətu 'to take out' [Khalilov 1995: 105].

Khoshar-Khota Bezhta: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 159. Literally 'to put the tooth' with *sila 'tooth' q.v. and gVl 'to put' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 89].

Tlyadal Bezhta: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 159. Literally 'to take away the tooth' with *sila 'tooth' q.v. and CLASS-*/yːətu 'to take away' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 70].

Hinukh: Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 143, 459. Polysemy: 'to bite / to bite off / to sting'.


Kharwshi (proper): Karimova 2014; Sharafutdinova & Levina 1961: 116. Applied to both humans and animals (e.g., a dog).

Inkhokwari Khwarshi: Karimova 2014.

Kwantlada Khwarshi: han [ʔaːgʊya] 'to bite' [Karimova 2014; Khalilova 2009: 255]. Applied to both humans and animals (e.g., a dog).

Proto-Tsezic: NCED: 625. Distribution: Retained as the basic term in West Tsezic (Hinukh, Dido, Khwarshi), but lost in East Tsezic (Hunzib, Bezhta). In East Tsezic, this verb was superseded by descriptive constructions with *sːil 'tooth' q.v. and the verbs 'to beat' and 'to put', which are apparently secondary.

Replacements: {'to beat the tooth to/for smth.' > 'to bite'} (Hunzib); {'to put the tooth' > 'to bite'} (Bezhta).

Reconstruction shape: The irregular correspondence -l (Dido, Khwarshi) ~ -l (Hinukh) remains inexplicable, although there is little doubt that the attested West Tsezic forms are related to each other. If the external etymology proposed in [NCED: 625] is correct (< North Caucasian *=*ʔalV), *heːl- is the original Proto-Tsezic variant retained in Hinukh, although it is actually *heːln- that shows a broader distribution (Dido, Khwarshi).

Semantics and structure: Primary verbal stem.

8. BLACK


References and notes:


Common Bezhta: Final -l is a historical suffix.


Kwantlada Khwarshi: *kaˤba* {каIба} ‘black’ [Karimova 2014; Khalilova 2009: 8].

Proto-Tsezic: NCED: 379. Distribution: Two forms enter into competition:
1) *c'ə V {-l* [NCED: 379], meaning ‘black’ in East Tsezic (Hunzib, Bezhta), lost in West Tsezic;
2) *kaˤba*, meaning ‘black’ in West Tsezic (Hinukh, Dido, Khwarshi), lost in East Tsezic.

Since *c'ə V{-l* has promising external comparanda (Andian ‘blackberry’, Dargi ‘black’), whereas *kaˤba* has no North Caucasian etymology, *c'ə V{-l* can be postulated with more probability as the Proto-Tsezic term for ‘black’.

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular.

Semantics and structure: Adjective stem with the common l-suffix.

9. BLOOD

Hunzib (proper) *hãy* {гьаynı} (1), Bezhta (proper) *hẽ* {гьеым} (1), Khoshar-Khota Bezhta *hẽ* (1), Tlyadal Bezhta *hẽ* (1), Hinukh *iː* {ӣ} (1), Kidero Dido *e* {э} (1), Sagada Dido *iyo* {ийо} (1), Khwarshi (proper) *ĩq’ʷa ~ iq’ʷa* {иъкъа} (1), Inkhokwari Khwarshi *ẽq’ˤo* {эъкъо} (1), Proto-Tsezic *hˁy A* (1).

References and notes:


Common Khwarshi: Historically *i-qʷa*, *ē-qʷo*.

Proto-Tsezic: NCED: 496. Distribution: One of the most stable Proto-Tsezic roots, retained in its basic meaning in all Tsezic lects.

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular except for the unclear element *-qʷa ~ -qʷo* in Khwarshi, which is either a unique suffix or an unknown root, compounded with *hˁy*.

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

10. BONE

Hunzib (proper) *λõra* {λο dispro} (1), Bezhta (proper) *λõwā* {λооъбъ} (1), Khoshar-Khota Bezhta *λõrā* (1), Tlyadal Bezhta *λõrā* (1), Hinukh *λužey* {лъжей} (1), Kidero Dido *qʷaq’u ~ qʷaʔu* {къалъуъ} (2), Sagada Dido *λurza* {лъръза} (1), Khwarshi (proper) *λazal* {лъазал} (1), Inkhokwari Khwarshi *λozol* {лъозол} (1), Proto-Tsezic *AʷIrVB* (1).

References and notes:


Tlyadal Bezhta: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 38.
Common Bezhta: The loss of Bezhta proper -r- is normal [Bokarev 1959: 71 ff.]


A second candidate is q′ʷaq′u [χəkaχə] 'bone' [Khaliilov & Isakov 2005: 213, 457]; the difference between Ausëy and q′ʷaq′u is unclear, but the latter seems more marginal, because it is missing from [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990]. The same word with loss of labialization is documented as q′aq′u [χəkaχə], which is glossed as 'collarbone' in [Khaliilov & Isakov 2005: 211] and as 'round end of bone' in [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 38].

Kidero Dido: Khalilov 1999: 147, 335; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 38. In [Khalilov 1999], quoted as q′aq′u, a generic term with polysemy: 'bone / cabbage stalk' (the generic semantics follows from such textual examples as "phalanx", "forearm bone", "The dog gnaws at a bone"). In [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990], quoted as q′aq′u and specified as 'non-tubular bone in general'.

Distinct from Ausa, obl. Ausa- [xlysa], glossed in [Khalilov 1999: 180] as generic 'bone', but marked as rarely used; on the contrary, in [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 38], Ausa is quoted as a generic term for 'tubular bone'.

It is likely that the analysis in [Khalilov 1999] is more correct, implying that in Proto-Dido, Ausa was the basic term for 'bone', but currently it is being superseded by q′ʷ/aq′u.


Kwantlada Khwarshi: Iozol (Iozol) 'bone' [Karimova 2014; Khalilova 2009: 5].

Proto-Tsezic: NCED: 528. Distribution: One of the most stable Proto-Tsezic roots, retained in its basic meaning in all Tsezic lects, although in Kidero Dido it is obsolete, being superseded by *q′ʷ/aq′u [NCED: 907], whose original Proto-Tsezic meaning was 'a kind of bone', perhaps 'tubular bone (in general)'.

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular, except for the consonant metathesis in the oblique stem.

Semantics and structure: Primary substantive root. The oblique stem is *ʾirV-z-V-, which was eliminated, i.e., levelled after the direct stem in East Tsezic (Hunzib, Bezhta). In West Tsezic (Hinukh, Dido, Khwarshi), oblique *ʾirV-zV- was metathesized > *ʾizV-rV-, whereupon the direct stems in individual lects were levelled: Hinukh Ausëy, Kidero Dido Ausa are back-formations; Khwarshi proper Iozol, Inkhokwari Khwarshi Iozol continue oblique *ʾizV-rV-. It is interesting that due to the Sagada Dido direct stem Ausa, which directly goes back to oblique *ʾirV-zV-, this metathesis in the oblique stem *ʾirV-zV- > *ʾizV-rV- cannot be projected onto the Proto-West Tsezic level - more likely, we are dealing with late contact-driven rebuildings of the paradigm in individual West Tsezic lects. Cf. similar rebuildings of the original paradigm in the words for ‘eye’, ‘hand’ q.v.

11. BREAST

Hunzib (proper) keru (q̄epery) (1), Bezhta (proper) keyo (q̄eio) (1), Khoshar-Khota Bezhta kero (1), Tlyadal Bezhta verø (1), Hinukh ḥemn ~ ḥemn-rokve (खेमा-रोकवेल) (2), Kidero Dido ḥamori ~ ḥamro-ku (खेमयोरी, खेमरोकिलु) (2), Sagada Dido ḥamro-ku (खेमरोकिलु) (2), Khwarshi (proper) hele-lōkwa (खिलेलोकिला) (1), Inkhokwari Khwarshi humay-lok′o (हुमयूँ-माइलोको) (2), Proto-Tsezic *χimV ~ *χimV-rV(2).

References and notes:


Distinct from the more rare term ḥomn (होमन) glossed as ‘breast, thoracic cage’ in [Khalilov 1995: 256], not quoted in [Madieva 1965].

Common Bezhta: The loss of Bezhta proper -r- is normal [Bokarev 1959: 71 ff.].


Common Dido: The compound hano-rok’š literally means ‘breast-heart’.


Distinct from nursery kaka ‘female breast’ [Bokarev 1959: 147].

Inkhokwari Khwarshi: Karimova 2014. In [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 22; Bokarev 1959: 149], only the loanword niχi ‘breast’ is quoted (< Tindi nixi ‘breast’).
Distinct from the nursery word koko ‘female breast / nipple’ [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 22; Bokarev 1959: 147, 149, 151].


Common Khwarshi: The second element of the compounds (-lok’a, -lok’o) means ‘heart’ q.v.

Proto-Tsezic: NCED: 829. Distribution: Attested with or without the r-suffix as the basic term in all West Tsezic lects, except for Khwarshi proper. Normally ‘breast’ is expressed by synchonous compounds of χimV(-rV) and the word for ‘heart’, although plain χimV(-rV) is also attested in West Tsezic (the compound pattern looks like a late West Tsezic areal isolosso). This stem is also present in East Tsezic as Hunzib proper χimor ‘brisket’ and Bezhta proper χoma: ‘thoracic cage’.
It is unclear whether χimor and χoma: represent borrowings from West Tsezic or inherited forms. Initial χ speaks in favor of borrowed origin, because normally Proto-Tsezic χ > Proto-East Tsezic v [NCED: 112]. On the other hand, no compatible West Tsezic forms that could be the source of hypothetical borrowing are attested, whereas the vowels of East Tsezic χimor and χoma: suggest an inherited origin (this is especially true of i in χimor).
Additionally, in Hinukh, the form somo ‘udder’ is attested [Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 131]; it is probably related to the discussed forms and therefore could represent borrowing in the opposite direction: Bezhta > Hinukh (although no such forms are attested in Bezhta).
A second candidate for Proto-Tsezic ‘breast’ is χeru A [NCED: 465], which means ‘breast’ in all East Tsezic lects (can be safely postulated as the Proto-East Tsezic term for this meaning) and in one of the West Tsezic lects, namely Khwarshi proper, where the compound hele-lok’a, literally ‘χeru-heart’ is used. At first sight, χeru has the advantage over χimV(-rV) from the distributional point of view, but in fact it is hard to suppose that χeru was the Proto-West Tsezic term for ‘breast’, which only survived in Khwarshi proper, having been superseded in the rest of the lects.
Since χimV(-rV) possesses very good external North Caucasian comparanda with the meaning ‘breast’ [NCED: 829], we fill the Proto-Tsezic slot with χimV(-rV). The Proto-Tsezic or at least Proto-West Tsezic meaning of the competing term χeru is unclear. Its ‘non-breast’ semantics is attested in Dido proper (hiro ‘shoulder’); on the other hand, external North Caucasian comparanda point to a meaning like ‘udder’ [NCED: 465]. The use of χeru in the Khwarshi proper compound for ‘breast’ remains inexplicable, but we suppose that it is a secondary phenomenon.
Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular.
Semantics and structure: Primary substantive root, optionally modified with the suffix -rV.

12. BURN TR.

Hunzib (proper) CLASS=ek’e-k’ {δεκλεκτα} (1), Beztha (proper) CLASS=ek’e-l {ιεκελαλ} (1), Khoshar-Khota Bezhta CLASS=ek’e-l (1), Tlyadal Bezhta CLASS=ek’e-l (1), Hinukh CLASS=ek’e-ro {δεκλαφα} (1), Kidero Dido CLASS=i’u-r {ιυκλυπα} (1), Sagada Dido CLASS=i’u-r {φυκυπα} (1), Khwarshi (proper) CLASS=ak’w ~ CLASS=ak’w-χ {λακλα, λακλαχα} (1), Inkhokwari Khwarshi CLASS=ok’ ~ CLASS=ok’-χ {λοκλα, λοκλαχα} (1), Proto-Tsezic *CLASS=ek’wV ~ *CLASS=ek’wV-I B (1).
References and notes:


Cf. the more specific verb ɬehe [лъегьа] 'to burn (intrans.)' [Isakov & Khalilov 2001: 197; van den Berg 1995: 315; Bokarev 1961: 160, 173], application is unknown.


Common Bezhta: Regular causative from the Common Bezhta verb CLASS=ek'e 'to burn (intr.)' [Khalilov 1995: 115; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 94].


Kidero Dido: Khalilov 1999: 105 sub ɣlам. Found in only one example: "to burn charcoal".


Common Dido: Regular causative from Kidero CLASS=ik'ι, Asakh CLASS=ik'ⁿ [бикIа, бикIва] 'to burn (intr.)' [Khalilov 1999: 57].


Inkhokwari Khwarshi: Karimova 2014.

Kwantlada Khwarshi: CLASS=ok' ~ CLASS=ok'-χ [локIа, локIха] 'to burn' [Karimova 2014; Khalilova 2009: 85, 246, 275, 338].

Common Khwarshi: Simple =ak'ʷ, =ok' are labile verbs with polysemy: 'to burn (intrans.) / to burn (trans.)'. The parallel stems in -χ are regular causative formations 'to burn (trans.)'; for the causative suffix -χ see [Khalilova 2009: 272].

Proto-Tsezic: NCED: 632. Distribution: One of the most stable Proto-Tsezic roots, retained in the meaning 'to burn (intrans.)' in all Tsezic lects. The transitive meaning is expressed by synchronic causative forms (with different causative suffixes in individual lects), although in Khwarshi dialects plain "CLASS=ek'ⁿ" additionally functions as a labile verb.

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular.

Semantics and structure: Either the labile verbs "CLASS=ek'ⁿ", with polysemy 'to burn (intrans.) / to burn (trans.)' already in Proto-Tsezic, or the causative "CLASS=ek'ⁿ-l is to be reconstructed for Proto-Tsezic (later, the Proto-Tsezic causative exponent -l was replaced by synchronic causative suffixes in Hunzib and Khwarshi).

13. CLAW (NAIL)


References and notes:


Proto-Tsezic: NCED: 814. **Distribution:** One of the most stable Proto-Tsezic roots, retained in its basic meaning in all Tsezic lects.

**Reconstruction shape:** Correspondences seem regular except for the nasal assimilation \( l > n \) in Inkhokwari Khwarshi and the vowel \( i \) in Bezhta due to influence of the oblique stem.

**Semantics and structure:** Primary substantive root. The oblique stem is \(^*\text{m}l\text{ʔə}A\).

14. CLOUD

Hunzib (proper) \( \text{has} \sim \text{has-mus} \{\text{мас, мъасмус}\} \) (1), Bezhta (proper) \( \text{has-mus} \{\text{мъас-мус}\} \) (1), Khoshar-Khota Bezhta \( \text{has-mus} \) (1), Tlyadal Bezhta \( \text{has-mus} \) (1), Hinukh \( \text{as} \{\text{ас}\} \) (1), Kidero Dido \( \text{as} \{\text{ас}\} \) (1), Sagada Dido \( \text{as} \{\text{ас}\} \) (1), Khwarshi (proper) \( \text{as} \{\text{ас}\} \) (1), Inkhokwari Khwarshi \( \text{as} \{\text{ас}\} \) (1), Proto-Tsezic \( ^*\text{has}: \) (1).

**References and notes:**

**Hunzib (proper):** Isakov & Khalilov 2001: 63, 217; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 205; van den Berg 1995: 301; Bokarev 1961: 153. Apparently, \( \text{has} \) with polysemy: 'sky / cloud / fog'; \( \text{has-mus} \) with polysemy: 'cloud / fog'. According to [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990], \( \text{has} \) means 'sky / fog', whereas \( \text{has-mus} \) is a specific term for 'cloud'. In [van den Berg 1995], \( \text{has-mus} \) is glossed as 'horizon'. The second element \( \text{mus} \) is unattested outside this compound (its original meaning was 'a k. of smoke' \( \text{vel sim.} \), see [NCED: 836]).

**Bezhta (proper):** Khalilov 1995: 321; M. Khalilov, p.c. However, in the main section of the dictionary [Khalilov 1995: 74] \( \text{has-mus} \) is glossed with polysemy: 'universe / fog'.

**Khoshar-Khota Bezhta:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 205.

**Tlyadal Bezhta:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 205. Polysemy: 'sky / cloud / fog' in all the dialect. The form \( \text{has-mus} \) is a compound of Common Bezhta \( \text{has} \) 'sky' (in Bezhta proper polysemy 'sky / fog') [Khalilov 1995: 74; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 197] + \( \text{mus} \) 'smoke with soot' (see sub 'smoke').


Distinct from the specific term \( \text{жанри} \) \{\text{жанъи}\} 'fog' [Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 166, 535].

Cf. also \( \text{kut}^\prime \), which is glossed with polysemy 'fog / smoke' in [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 205], but only as 'smoke' in [Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 208].

**Kidero Dido:** Khalilov 1999: 30; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 205. Polysemy: 'sky / cloud / fog / walleye'. Cf. the attested example: "[He is like] a white cloud before the sun" [Khalilov 1999: 298].

Cf. also \( \text{gut}' \), which is glossed with polysemy 'fog / smoke' in [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 205], but only as 'smoke' in [Khalilov 1999: 87].

**Sagada Dido:** Abdulaev 2014.

**Common Dido:** Mokok Dido \( \text{as-kot'u} \) 'cloud' [Khalilov 1999: 30], literally 'sky beard / sky tow', a compound with \( \text{kot'u} \) 'long beard / tow prepared for spinning (кудель)' [Khalilov 1999: 141].

**Khwarshi (proper):** Karimova 2014.

**Inkhokwari Khwarshi:** Karimova 2014; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 205. Polysemy: 'cloud / fog'.

**Kwantlada Khwarshi:** as \{\text{ас}\} with polysemy: 'cloud / sky' [Karimova 2014; Khalilova 2009: 110, 265].

**Proto-Tsezic:** NCED: 243. **Distribution:** One of the most stable Proto-Tsezic roots, retained in its basic meaning in all Tsezic lects.

**Reconstruction shape:** Correspondences seem regular.

**Semantics and structure:** Primary substantive root.

15. COLD

Hunzib (proper) \( \text{CLASS=а}^\text{c·}-\text{u} \{\text{бълтилул}\} \) (1), Bezhta (proper) \( \text{CLASS=а}^\text{c·}-\text{o} \{\text{буулулуб}\} \) (1), Khoshar-Khota Bezhta \( \text{а}^\text{c·}-\text{iy-o} \) (1), Tlyadal Bezhta \( \text{CLASS=а}^\text{c·}-\text{o} \) (1), Hinukh \( \text{CLASS=о}^\text{c·}-\text{u} \{\text{бълулул}\} \) (1), Kidero Dido \( \text{CLASS=о}^\text{c·}-\text{y-u} \{\text{бълулиу}\} \) (1), Sagada Dido \( \text{CLASS=о}^\text{c·}-\text{a-w} \{\text{бълураб}\} \) (1), Khwarshi (proper) \( \text{CLASS=уyc·a} \{\text{ъуулла}\} \) (1), Inkhokwari Khwarshi \( \text{CLASS=уc·-u} \{\text{ъуулул}\} \) (1), Proto-Tsezic \( ^*\text{CLASS=xa·y-A} \) (1).
References and notes:


**Khoshar-Khota Bezhta:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 245. Class inflection is not noted in [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990].

**Tlyadal Bezhta:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 245.

**Hinukh:** Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 103, 544; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 245. Applied to both objects and weather.

**Kidero Dido:** Khalilov 1999: 70, 393; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 245. Applied to both objects and weather.

**Sagada Dido:** Abdulaev 2014.

**Common Dido:** The same in other dialects: Asakh CLASS=öč'-i-y [Khalilov 1999: 70], Mokok CLASS=öč'-i-w [Khalilov 1999: 70].

**Khwarshi (proper):** Karimova 2014.

**Inkhokwari Khwarshi:** Karimova 2014; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 245; Bokarev 1959: 158, 159.

**Kwantlada Khwarshi:** CLASS=uc'ː-u [Khalilova 2009: 104, 301]. Applied to both objects and weather.

**Common Khwarshi:** -yc', -c'ː < *c'-y. Past participle in -y- from the verb that is documented as Kwantlada Khwarshi CLASS=uc' 'to be(come) cold' [Khalilova 2009: 321].

**Proto-Tsezic:** NCED: 393. Distribution: One of the most stable Proto-Tsezic stems, retained in its basic meaning in all Tsezic lects.

**16. COME**

**Hunzib (proper) CLASS=ãq'e {макъа} (1), Bezhta (proper) CLASS=õq'o {йо
килъ} (1) / goh {говал} (2), Khoshar-Khota Bezhta CLASS=õq'o (1) / go: (2), Tlyadal Bezhta CLASS=õq'o (1), Hinukh CLASS=aq'e {бакъа} (1) / noχ {ноха} (3), Kidero Dido CLASS=ayi {байа} (1) / neχ {неха} (3), Sagada Dido CLASS=aq'i {бакъа} (1), Khwarshi (proper) CLASS=at'iq' {атIикъа} (4) / CLASS=iχʷ {лихва} (3), Inkhokwari Khwarshi CLASS=ot'q' {отIкъа} (4) / CLASS=uχ {уха} (3), Proto-Tsezic *CLASS=ãq'V (1).**

References and notes:

**Hunzib (proper):** Isakov & Khalilov 2001: 117; van den Berg 1995: 284; Bokarev 1961: 150, 179. Polysemy: ‘to come / to arrive / to ripen (of fruit) / to go to smb.’s head (of alcohol)’. According to numerous examples found in [Isakov & Khalilov 2001], this is the basic verb for ‘to come’ at least in the Hunzib proper dialect.


Semantic or pragmatic difference between CLASS=ãq'e and n-ɛ is unclear, the latter seems to be missing from the main section of [Isakov & Khalilov 2001].

Cf. with another directional prefix: g=ɛ [1] / g=ɛc [4, pl.] [рььа] ‘to come down (of precipitation)’ [Isakov & Khalilov 2001: 56; van den Berg 1995: 299, 353]; < *gV=CLASS=ə, g= is a fossilized directional prefix ‘down’ [van den Berg 1995: 353]. It should be noted that for the Nasada dialect, g= is glossed as generic ‘to come (here)’ [van den Berg 1995: 299, 353].

Distinct from the imperative t=as [1] / t=is [2] / t=us [4, pl.], ‘come with me! / come to me!’ [van den Berg 1995: 336, 353;
Bezhta (proper): Khalilov 1995: 329; M. Khalilov, p.c.; Madieva 1965: 180. Polysemy: ‘to come / to bring / to marry’. It should be noted that in the main section of the dictionary [Khalilov 1995: 133], the meaning ‘to come’ is not quoted.

There are two verbs for ‘to go’ quoted in [Khalilov 1995: 329]: =oq’o and g=Vh. We treat them as synonyms.Khalilov 1995: 62, 329. Synchronously, with an ablaut paradigm: prs. g=V- [class 1] / g=V- [2] / g=V- [3]; inv. g=oh [1] / g=ih [2] / g=uh [3]. Originates from something like *g(V)=CLASS=oh; initial g= is a fossilized directional prefix.

Khoshar-Khota Bezhta: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 75. Polysemy: ‘to go / to come / to reach, get to / to flow’. Morphophonologically =oq’o, for old nasalization cf. the class 3 form n=oq’o. We are obliged to treat them as synonyms.Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 75. Synchronously, with an ablaut paradigm: g=V- [class 1] / g=V- [2, 5] / g=V- [3, 4]. Originates from something like *g(V)=CLASS=oh; initial g= is a fossilized directional prefix.

Tlyadal Bezhta: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 75. Polysemy: ‘to come / to reach, get to / to get, receive’.

Hinukh: Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 54, 503. There are two verbs for ‘to come’ quoted in [Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 503]: CLASS=aq’e and noχ. The exact difference between them is unknown; browsing through available sources confirms that both are used quite frequently. We are obliged to treat them as synonyms.Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 281, 503. Polysemy: ‘to come / to fly here’. Historically n=oχ, where initial n= is a fossilized directional prefix.


Inkhokvari Khwarshi: Karimova 2014. The difference between two documented verbs for ‘to come’, =at’iχ & =iχ“n, is unclear; we have to treat them as synonyms.

Kwantlada Khwarshi: CLASS=ot’iχ [or1kwa] ‘to come’ [Karimova 2014; Khalilova 2009: 181]. As in other Khwarshi varieties, there are two known verbs for ‘to come’: CLASS=ot’iχ and CLASS=uiχ [xaxa] [Karimova 2014; Khalilova 2009: 32, 43]. Browsing through textual examples in [Khalilova 2009] suggests that (1) =ot’iχ and =uiχ are complete or almost complete synonyms in the meaning ‘to come’; (2) =ot’iχ is used much more frequently than =uiχ.

Cf. an example in which two verbs are used in parallel constructions: ‘...the Bagwalas came (=ot’iχ), the Echedas came (=uiχ), other people also came (=uiχ) from around from other villages …’ [Khalilova 2009: 95].

Other attested examples for =ot’iχ ‘to come’ are e.g., “That man came to our village” [Khalilova 2009: 42]: “My children came” [Khalilova 2009: 44]: “The manual machine gunner who was in Manchuria came back having hurt his legs” [Khalilova 2009: 75]: “The giant came there while they were sitting under the tree” [Khalilova 2009: 77]: “The wolf came near the apple tree” [Khalilova 2009: 87]: “When he came near the house, and before going inside, he …” [Khalilova 2009: 90]: “The eldest (girl) came” [Khalilova 2009: 99]: “There, the man who sells watermelon came” [Khalilova 2009: 116].

On the contrary, available examples for =uiχ ‘to come’ are rather scant; cf. “Hey people, come, there is something in my eye, take it out!” [Khalilova 2009: 73]: “Put the food over there, I will come to eat” [Khalilova 2009: 116]: “Then the wolf went from there to the donkey” [Khalilova 2009: 118]: “When (donkey) went from uphill down the hill, (donkey) met a horse” [Khalilova 2009: 120; Karimova 2014; Imnashtvili 1963: 26; Bokarev 1959: 163, 167.

Common Khwarshi: The morphological structure of *V=iχ ‘to come’ is unclear.

Proto-Tsezic: NCED: 611. Distribution: Retained in the basic meaning ‘to come’ in all Tsezic lects except for the Khwarshi dialects, where *CLASS=V=iχ was superseded by the verb class *CLASS=V(i)=h‘, which is unclear both morphologically and etymologically.

Apparently, already in Proto-East Tsezic *CLASS=aq’V started to compete with the non-standard verb *DIR=CLASS=VH [NCED: 1016], where *DIR= is a directional prefix. In modern East Tsezic lects both verbs for ‘to come’ function as synonyms with unclear distribution, although *CLASS=aq’V- seems to be more common. In West Tsezic, *=VH is not attested; the original Proto-Tsezic meaning of *=VH is unclear.

A similar situation is observed in the West Tsezic group. Apparently, already in Proto-West Tsezic *CLASS=aq’V- began to compete with the verb *CLASS=uiχ. B [NCED: 666], which is sometimes attested with the fossilized directional n-prefix (Hinukh, Dido). In modern West Tsezic lects, both verbs for ‘to come’ function as synonyms with unclear distribution, although *CLASS=aq’V- seems to be more common. In East Tsezic, *=uiχ- is not attested; the original Proto-
Tsezic meaning of *uχʷ* is unclear.

**Reconstruction shape:** Correspondences seem regular, except for some vocalic peculiarities.

**Semantics and structure:** Primary verbal root.

17. DIE

Hunzib (proper) 
**CLASS=uhu** ~ **CLASS=uh** {δύσα} (1), Bezhta (proper) 
**CLASS=υο** {ιγγαλ} (1), Khoshar-Khota Bezhta 
**CLASS=υο** (1), Tlyadal Bezhta 
**CLASS=υο** (1), Hinukh 
**CLASS=υε** {δύσα} (1), Kidero Dido 
**CLASS=εχυ** {δέξα} (1), Sagada Dido 
**CLASS=εχυ** ~ **CLASS=εχʷ** {δέχα} (1), Khwarshi (proper) 
**CLASS=ιχ** {δύσα} (1), Inkhokwari Khwarshi 
**CLASS=υη** {γγα} (1), Proto-Tsezic 
*CLASS=ιχʷV* (1).

**References and notes:**


**Bezhta (proper):** Khalilov 1995: 135, 343; Madieva 1965: 187. Polysemy: 'to die / to get spoiled / to get finished', applied to humans, animals, objects, time periods.

**Khoshar-Khota Bezhta:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 170.

**Tlyadal Bezhta:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 169. Polysemy: 'to die / to get spoiled'.

**Hinukh:** Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 104, 539. Polysemy: 'to die / to get spoilt'.

Distinct from euphemistic **CLASS=ιχ’ε-ɬ** {бикъелъа} with polysemy: 'to get lost, disappear / to die' [Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 84].

**Kidero Dido:** Khalilov 1999: 48, 390. Polysemy: 'to die / to get spoilt'.

Distinct from rarer, stylistically marked synonyms: rude **геg** {гега} with polysemy: 'to get squashed / to get broken / to die' [Khalilov 1999: 81], rude **тынъа** with polysemy: 'to dry (intrans.) / to die' [Khalilov 1999: 175], rude **ъугъа** 'to die (only of animals?)' [Khalilov 1999: 94], polite **кеча** with polysemy: 'to lie / to sleep / to die' [Khalilov 1999: 138].

**Sagada Dido:** Abdulaev 2014.

**Common Dido:** The same in other dialects: Asakh Dido **CLASS=εχʷV** {δέξα} 'to die' [Khalilov 1999: 48].


**Inkhokwari Khwarshi:** Karimova 2014; Bokarev 1959: 163.

**Kwantlada Khwarshi:** 
**CLASS=υη** {γγа} 'to die' [Karimova 2014; Khalilova 2009: 6, 26].

**Proto-Tsezic:** NCED: 635. Distribution: One of the most stable Proto-Tsezic verbs, retained in its basic meaning in all Tsezic lects.

**Replacements:** '{to die'} > '{to get spoilt'} (Hunzib proper, Bezhta proper, Tlyadal Bezhta, Hinukh, Kidero Dido); '{to die'} > '{to get finished'} (Bezhta proper).

**Reconstruction shape:** Correspondences seem regular.

**Semantics and structure:** Primary verb; polysemy: 'to die / to get spoilt' can be reconstructed for Proto-Tsezic.

18. DOG

Hunzib (proper) **вο** {оа} (1), Bezhta (proper) **вο** {оа} (1), Khoshar-Khota Bezhta **вο** (1), Tlyadal Bezhta **вο** (1), Hinukh **вε** {γγε} (1), Kidero Dido **вάι** {γγελъа} (1), Sagada Dido **вάι** {γγεлъа} (1), Khwarshi (proper) **вε** {γε} (1), Inkhokwari Khwarshi **вάε** ~ **вάε** {γγε} (1), Proto-Tsezic *κ.ʷʔy* (1).

**References and notes:**

Paradigm: wo [abs.] / wəy-[gen.].

Distinct from the loanword bahli [6axLaɪ] 'hunting dog' [Isakov & Khalilov 2001: 33; van den Berg 1995: 286; Bokarev 1961: 150], borrowed from Avar bahri 'stray dog'.


Distinct from the loanword bahri [6axLaɪru] 'stray dog' [Khalilov 1995: 42], borrowed from Avar bahri 'stray dog'.

**Khoshar-Khota Bezhta:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 73. Paradigm: wo [abs.] / wəy-[gen.].

**Tlyadal Bezhta:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 73. Paradigm: wo [abs.] / wəy-[gen.].

**Hinukh:** Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 127, 523; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 73. Paradigm: xɐ'e [abs.] / xɐ'ey(i)-[gen.]. Polysemy: 'dog / prickly burdock flowerhead that clings to animals and clothes'.

**Kidero Dido:** Khalilov 1999: 90, 377; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 73.

Distinct from the loanword bahri [6axLaɪru] 'hunting dog / stray dog / vagrant' [Khalilov 1999: 40], borrowed from Avar bahri 'stray dog'.

**Sagada Dido:** Abdulaev 2014.

**Khwarshi (proper):** Karimova 2014; Sharafutdinova & Levina 1961: 96.

**Inkhokwari Khwarshi:** Karimova 2014; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 73; Bokarev 1959: 146. The nasalized variant is from [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990].

**Kwantlada Khwarshi:** xɐ'e [xæel] 'dog' [Karimova 2014; Khalilova 2009: 16].

**Proto-Tsezic:** NCED: 1073. Distribution: One of the most stable Proto-Tsezic roots, retained in its basic meaning in all Tsezic lects.

**Reconstruction shape:** Correspondences seem regular.

**Semantics and structure:** Primary substantive root.

19. **DRINK**

**Hunzib (proper)**  χu-Ł {x韏Ia} (1), **Bezhta (proper)**  χu-Ło- {x韏IaI} (1), **Khoshar-Khota Bezhta**  χu-Ło- (1), **Tlyadal Bezhta**  χu-Ło- (1), **Hinukh** ga: {zǎs} (2), **Kidero Dido** ha-Łu {xIaIaI} (1), **Sagada Dido** ha-Łu {xIaIva} (1), **Khwarshi (proper)**  χi-Ła {xIaI} (1), **Inkhokwari Khwarshi**  χu-Ł {xIaI} (1), **Proto-Tsezic** Ɡ-V(1).

**References and notes:**


Distinct from the compound s6-Łe [co附加值] 'to sip' [Isakov & Khalilov 2001: 149].

**Bezhta (proper):** Khalilov 1995: 258, 325; Madieva 1965: 190. Polysemy: 'to drink / to smoke', with both transitive and intransitive usage.

**Khoshar-Khota Bezhta:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 157.

**Tlyadal Bezhta:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 157.

**Common Bezhta:** Historically, a compound χu-Ło, where the second element Ło is a *verbum dicendi* ꞬIAv-(> Bezhta proper iŁe 'to call, cry' [Khalilov 1995: 307; Madieva 1965: 163]). For Bezhta complex verbs in -Ło-Łe denoting sounds, see [Kibrik & Testelets 2004: 273].

**Hinukh:** Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 116, 490. Polysemy: 'to drink / to sip'.

A synonym is found in the compound verb hi-Ł [ra皿Ia] 'to drink / to sip' [Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 143, 490], marked by Khalilov & Isakov as a rarely used form. Historically, a compound: hi-Ł, where the second element Ł is the *verbum dicendi* ꞬIAv-(> Hinukh eŁi 'to call, cry / to say' [Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 405]). For Hinukh complex verbs in -Łe denoting sounds, see [Forker 2013: 322]. Note the morphological difficulty with the final vowel: the independent verb is eŁi, the second element of sound denoting verbs is -Łe, the second element of the aforementioned verb 'to drink' is -Ł.

**Kidero Dido:** Khalilov 1999: 262, 357.

**Sagada Dido:** Abdulaev 2014.
Common Dido: The same in other dialects: Asakh ha-As [xɔa;lɔa] ‘to drink’ [Khalilov 1999: 262].

Historically, a compound verb: ha-As, where the second element As is a *verbum dicendi* ḥAV- (> Kidero Dido eli ‘to say’ q.v.). For Dido complex verbs in -A ≤ -As denoting sounds, see [Bokarev 1959: 204; Alekseev & Radzhabov 2004: 147]. Note the morphological difficulty with the final vowel: the independent verb is eli, the second element of sound-denoting verbs is -A ≤ -As, the second element of the aforementioned verb ‘to drink’ is -As.

Khwarsì (proper): Karimova 2014; Bokarev 1959: 148. The stem is ʁ̪i-A, cf. the diagnostic present form ʁ̪i-Aa- [Sharafutdinova & Levina 1961: 117]. Apparently, this is the basic verb for ‘to drink’ in Khwarshi proper; cf. two attested instances: “The rich man began to drink water” [Imnaiashvili 1963: 249]; “The horses came to the river to drink water... But they failed to drink water” [Imnaiashvili 1963: 298].

A second candidate is c'ol [uIɔa] ‘to drink’ [Karimova 2014] without examples.


A second Inkhokwari candidate is c'ol [uIɔa] ‘to drink’ [Karimova 2014; Imnaiashvili 1963: 187, 240]. No textual instances were found either for ʁ̪i-A or for c'ol, but, through analogy with other Khwarshi dialects, we suppose that ʁ̪i-A is the basic verb.


A second Kwantlada candidate is c'ol [uIɔa] [Karimova 2014], but examples from [Khalilova 2009] suggest that its real meanings are more specific, e. g. ‘to drink alcohol’ etc. Cf. the examples: “When everybody smoked (c'ol) the cigarettes, this devil began to choke” [Khalilova 2009: 165]; “Our neighbor had been drinking beer after year” [Khalilova 2009: 201]; “The doctor made the mother make the boy drink the medicine” [Khalilova 2009: 347]; “the horses went to the river to drink water” [Khalilova 2009: 401]; “Once they were drinking and eating” [Khalilova 2009: 449]; “There was nothing. What, did we go there for drinking?” [Khalilova 2009: 457].

Common Khwarshi: Historically, a compound: ʁ̪i-A(a), where the second element A(a) is a *verbum dicendi* ḥAV- (> Khwarshi iI ‘to say’ q.v.). For Khwarshi complex verbs in -A(V) denoting sounds, see [Khalilova 2009: 267]. It should be noted that in Khwarshi proper, the stem for ‘to drink’ is ʁ̪i-Aa, whereas ‘to say’ is iI, not *iI (in other dialects, the CVC pattern was generalized and we have ʁ̪i-A and iI).

The competing verb c'ol might be an Andian loanword, cf. Andi c'adi ‘to drink’, Tindi ca- (< *ca-) ‘to drink’, although the vowel -o- in Khwarshi is unclear.

Proto-Tsezic: NCED: 221. Distribution: Retained in its basic meaning in all Tsezic lects, although in Hinukh, the form is obsolete, superseded by the unclear verb ga.

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular except for the Dido form with irregular hr- (which is a normal outcome of *∲, not *∲ and -e. Despite this, the Dido verb can hardly be separated from other Tsezic forms.

Semantics and structure: Originally a compound of *-'i- ‘say’ and the *verbum dicendi* ḥAV (cf. sub ‘to say’). Strictly speaking, the original meaning of *-'i- remains unclear. Outside of this compound, the suffixed root *-'i- is attested at least in Hunzib with the meaning ‘to drink (alcohol), get drunk’ that should point to Proto-Tsezic meaning ‘to drink’. On the other hand, the Tsezic compound pattern of -AV is characteristic just for sound denoting ("ideophonic") verbs; *-'i-AV ‘to drink’ is the main exception from this semantic group.

20. DRY


43
References and notes:


**Bezhta (proper):** Khalilov 1995: 264, 339; Madieva 1965: 190. Contraction *qoq* < *qoq*-y-o.

**Khoshar-Khota Bezhta:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 242.

**Tlyadal Bezhta:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 242.

**Common Bezhta:** Regular past participle in -r- from the verb (Bezhta proper) *qoq* {њњъа} ‘to get dry’ [Isakov & Khalilov 2001: 168, 236; van den Berg 1995: 327].

**Hinukh:** Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 365, 530; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 242. Polysemy: ‘dry / withered (of arm etc.)’. Past participle from the verb *quqe* {њњъа} with polysemy: ‘to get dry / to be hungry’ [Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 365].

**Kidero Dido:** Khalilov 1999: 258, 382; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 242. In [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990], apparently erroneously transcribed as *quqː-ä*-si. Past participles from the simple verb *quqi* {њњъа} ‘to get dry / to thirst’ and the causative *quqi*-r {њњъира} ‘to dry (trans.)’ [Khalilov 1999: 258].

**Sagada Dido:** Abdulaev 2014.

**Khwarshi (proper):** Karimova 2014.

**Inkhokwari Khwarshi:** Karimova 2014; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 242.

**Kwantlada Khwarshi:** *qoq*-i ‘dry’ [Karimova 2014].

**Common Khwarshi:** Past participles from the verb ‘to dry (intrans.)’, documented as Kwantlada Khwarshi *qoq* [Khalilova 2009: 27].

**Proto-Tsezic:** NCED: 631. Distribution: One of the most stable Proto-Tsezic stems, retained in its basic meaning in all Tsezic lects.

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular.

Semantics and structure: *qoqV is the verb ‘to be(come) dry’, the adjectival meaning ‘dry’ in modern lects is expressed by various synchronous participles.

21. EAR

Hunzib (proper) āṟa {аъвна} (1), Bezhta (proper) āṟā (1), Khoshar-Khota Bezhta āṟā (1), Tlyadal Bezhta āṟā (1), Hinukh aṟča {лъхъа} (1), Kidero Dido ahya {лъхъа} (1), Sagada Dido aṟa {лъхъа} (1), Khwarshi (proper) āḥi {аъвна} (1), Inkhokwari Khwarshi āḥa ~ āḥa {лъхъа} ‘ear’ [Karimova 2014; Khalilova 2009: 16, 17]. The pharyngealized variant āḥa is from [Khalilova 2009].

**Proto-Tsezic:** NCED: 239. Distribution: One of the most stable Proto-Tsezic roots, retained in its basic meaning in all Tsezic lects.

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular.

Semantics and structure: Primary substantive root; the West Tsezic forms go back to *ʔäχa-ya with a fossilized plural
suffix. External North Caucasian comparison suggests that the Proto-Tsezic root is to be analyzed as *ʔä-χa, where final -χa is apparently a fossilized plural exponent.

22. EARTH
Hunzib (proper) mɨzə {мызə} (1), Bezhta (proper) mizo {мизо} (1), Khoshar-Khota Bezhta mizo (1), Tlyadal Bezhta mizo (1), Hinukh čodzi {чодо} (2), Kidero Dido čedo {чедо} (2), Sagada Dido čedо {чедо} (2), Khwaremshi (proper) čida {чидо} (2), Inkhokwari Khwaremshi čido {чидо} (2), Proto-Tsezic *čüdV(2).

References and notes:


Distinct from the more marginal čabar {чабар} with polysemy: ‘soil / clay / earth floor’ [Isakov & Khalilov 2001: 178, 202], borrowed from Avar čabár ‘earth floor’.


Distinct from mäče {маьче} ‘earth, land / plot of land’ [Khalilov 1995: 193; Madieva 1965: 176].


Distinct from nöl {нөу} ‘earth, plot of land’ [Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 269].


Distinct from nöl {нөу} ‘earth, plot of land / place’ [Khalilov 1999: 192].


Kwantlada Khwaremshi: čido {чидо} with polysemy: ‘soil / ground / territory’ [Karimova 2014; Khalilova 2009: 93, 396]. Cf. the example: "When they could not bear the hunger, they began to eat the earth" [Khalilova 2009: 396].

Proto-Tsezic: NCED: 385. Distribution: Two roots enter into competition:


There is neither internal Tsezic nor external North Caucasian evidence for making a choice between the two. Provisionally we fill the Proto-Tsezic slot ‘earth’ with *čüdV; in any case, neither choice would be relevant for further
23. EAT

Hunzib (proper) \textit{CLASS}=$\ddot{u}q$ \{мьхъа\} (1) / \textit{CLASS}=е$\ddot{s}$ \{дьуша\} (2), Bezhta (proper) \textit{CLASS}=$\ddot{u}q$ \{\textit{у}гъ\textit{в}хъа\} (1) / \textit{CLASS}=е$\ddot{s}$ \{\textit{г}е\textit{с}а\} (2), Khoshar-Khota Bezhta \textit{CLASS}=$\ddot{u}q$ (1) / \textit{CLASS}=е$\ddot{s}$ (2), Tlyadal Bezhta \textit{CLASS}=$\ddot{u}q$ (1) / \textit{CLASS}=е$\ddot{s}$ (2), Hinukh \textit{CLASS}=\textit{a}\textit{c}' \{дьа\textit{ц}а\} (3) / \textit{CLASS}=и$\ddot{s}$ \{дьуша\} (2), Kidero Dido \textit{CLASS}=\textit{a}\textit{c}' \{дьа\textit{ц}а\} (3) / \textit{CLASS}=и$\ddot{s}$ \{дьуша\} (2), Sagada Dido \textit{CLASS}=\textit{a}\textit{c}' \{дьа\textit{ц}а\} (3), Khwarshi (proper) \textit{CLASS}=\textit{a}\textit{c}' \{дьа\textit{ц}а\} (3) / \textit{k}u\textit{k} \{кь\textit{к}а\} (4), Inkhokwari Khwarshi \textit{CLASS}=\textit{a}\textit{c}' \{дьа\textit{ц}а\} (3) / \textit{k}o\textit{k} \{кь\textit{к}а\} (4), Proto-Tsezic *\textit{CLASS}=$\ddot{u}q$ *\textit{CLASS}=\ddot{i}q'' (1) / *\textit{CLASS}=е$\ddot{s}$ A (2).

References and notes:


Khoshar-Khota Bezhta: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 155. Morphophonologically =\textit{u}q, for old nasalization cf. the class 3 form \textit{m}=\textit{u}q-< \textit{b}=\textit{u}q-.Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 156.

Tlyadal Bezhta: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 155. Morphophonologically =\textit{u}q, for old nasalization cf. the class 3 form \textit{m}=\textit{u}q-< \textit{b}=\textit{u}q-.Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 156.

Common Bezhta: There are two verbs for 'to eat' in Bezhta (all dialects): transitive =\textit{u}q and objectless intransitive =е$\ddot{s}$/е$\ddot{s}$.

Hinukh: Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 61, 439. There are two verbs for 'to eat' in Hinukh: transitive =\textit{a}c' and objectless intransitive =и$\ddot{s}$.

Kidero Dido: Khalilov 1999: 40, 322. There are two verbs for 'to eat' in Kidero Dido: transitive =\textit{a}c' and objectless intransitive =и$\ddot{s}$.

Sagada Dido: Abdulaev 2014. Surprisingly, according to Abdulaev's examples ('He is eating bread', 'I need to eat and drink to stay alive', 'When he lived there, he ate and drank plenty'), =\textit{a}c' is the only Sagada verb for 'to eat', used both transitively and intransitively.

Khwarshi (proper): Karimova 2014.Karimova 2014; Sharafutdinova & Levina 1961: 115, 117; Khalilova 2009: 6; Bokarev 1959: 172. There are two verbs for 'to eat' in Khwarshi dialects: transitive =\textit{a}c' and objectless intransitive =кь\textit{к}а. We treat them as synonyms.


k\textit{k} (k\textit{к}а) 'to eat (intrans.)' [Karimova 2014; Khalilova 2009: 6, 182]. Cf. some examples: "Put the food over there, I will come to eat" [Khalilova 2009: 116], "One time the father of these girls was eating at one man's (place)" [Khalilova 2009: 146], "Aminat's son does not eat at all" [Khalilova 2009: 201].Karimova 2014; Bokarev 1959: 165, 168. The variant k\textit{k} is from [Bokarev 1959].

Common Khwarshi: There are two verbs for 'to eat' in Khwarshi dialects: transitive =\textit{a}c' and objectless intransitive k\textit{k}(\textit{а}) ~ k\textit{k}. We treat them as synonyms.

Proto-Tsezic:

NCED: 559. Distribution: All Tsezic lects, except for Sagada Dido, lexically discriminate between 'to eat (trans.)' and 'to eat (intrans.).' The same opposition is to be reconstructed for Proto-Tsezic. The roots attested in the meaning 'to eat' in
modern Tsezic lects can be summarized in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TO EAT</th>
<th>Hunzib</th>
<th>Bezhta</th>
<th>Hinukh</th>
<th>Kidero Dido</th>
<th>Sagada Dido</th>
<th>Khwarshi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*CLASS=*eš A</td>
<td>intrans.</td>
<td>intrans.</td>
<td>intrans.</td>
<td>intrans.</td>
<td>trans.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The verb *CLASS=*eš A (absent in [NCED; TsezEDb]) can be safely reconstructed as the Proto-Tsezic equivalent for ‘to eat (intrans.).’ It was superseded by *=ac’ to eat (trans.)’ in Sagada Dido and by *=č’ekV’ in Khwarshi.

The original meaning of *=č’ekV, only attested in Khwarshi as ‘to eat (intrans.),’ is unclear. Pace [NCED: 207], it must be separated from Hinukh kiki [кика] ‘to feed / to rear, raise’, kikzi [кикзи] ‘rearing’ [Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 202; Forker 2013: 334], Kidero Dido kiki [кика] ‘to rear, raise’ [Khalilov 1999: 139], Bezhta proper kikzi [кикзи] ‘rearing’ [Khalilov 1995: 146], which represent a borrowing from Avar xixi, inf. xixi-ze ‘to feed / to rear, raise’.

Reconstruction of Proto-Tsezic ‘to eat (trans.)’ is more problematic, because there are two equal candidates for this proto-meaning:

1) East Tsezic *CLASS=*āq - "CLASS=*īq”; lost in West Tsezic.
2) West Tsezic *CLASS=*ac’; lost in East Tsezic.

There is no internal evidence for making a choice, but external North Caucasian comparison speaks in favour of *=āq - "īq” (its external cognates mean ‘to eat’ or ‘to bite’, whereas the more scarce cognates of *=ac’ mean ‘to drink’).

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular.

Semantics and structure: Primary verbal stem, meaning ‘to eat (trans.).’

24. EGG

Hunzib (proper) qõqla ~ qoqla {хъохъла} (1), Bezhta (proper) četivc’ {чєтєгӏ} (2), Khoshar-Khota Bezhta četivc’ (2), Tlyadal Bezhta četivc’ (2), Hinukh q’imac’ {къимацӏ} (2), Kidero Dido k’eneč’ {кIенечI} (2), Sagada Dido k’enač’i {кIеначIи} (2), Khwarshi (proper) k’eneč’ {кIенечӏ} (2), Inkhokwari Khwarshi k’imač’ {кIимачӏ} (2), Proto-Tsezic *qòq-IV(1).

References and notes:

Khoshar-Khota Bezhta: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 123.
Proto-Tsezic: NCED: 906. Distribution: A non-trivial case with two competing terms:
1) *qòq-IV, retained in Hunzib, but lost in the rest of lects;
2) *c’VnVc’ - *c’VnVc’ - q’VnVc’ - k’VnVc’ - k’VnVc’ in other languages. These forms are obvious related to each other, but phonetic correspondences are absolutely abnormal.

The latter has the clear advantage in terms of distribution, but in fact its phonetic irregularity and absence of external North Caucasian etymology could suggest that we deal with a late introduction, which spread as an interdialectal borrowing. The exact source of *c’VnVc’ - *c’VnVc’ - q’VnVc’ - k’VnVc’ - k’VnVc’ is obscure, but it resembles certain Andian words for ‘egg’, cf. Chamalal proper čąč’a, pl. čąč’a-me, Gigatl Chamalal k’uč’on pl. k’uč’a-mi, Tindi k’èk’ama. The Tsezic
forms could be a distortion of some Andian words with metathesis and various consonant assimilations/dissimilations.

On the other hand, *qõq-IV, which is only documented for one peripheral language, Hunzib, possesses important external comparanda with the same meaning 'egg' that speaks in favour of its antiquity. Consequently, we fill the Proto-Tsezic slot with *qõq-IV.

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular.
Semantics and structure: Primary substantive root with the common l-suffix.

25. EYE

Hunzib (proper) hare {гьапел} (1), Bezhta (proper) häy {гьывк} (1), Khoshar-Khota Bezhta häре (1), Tlyadal Bezhta häre (1), Hinukh ižey ~ üžey {үжей, үжей} (1), Kidero Dido ozuri {ожур} (1), Sagada Dido ozur {ожур} (1), Khwarshi (proper) ezal {эзал} (1), Inkhokwari Khwarshi ezol {эзол} (1), Proto-Tsezic *hore B (1).

References and notes:


Common Bezhta: The loss of Bezhta proper -r is normal [Bokarev 1959: 71 ff.].


Proto-Tsezic: NCED: 250. Distribution: One of the most stable Proto-Tsezic roots, retained in its basic meaning in all Tsezic lects.

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular except for secondary interactions between the direct and oblique stems in individual lects.

Semantics and structure: Primary substantive root. Three oblique stems are reconstructible: *h2- (as follows from East Tsezic data) and *h2z-V-, *h3rV-zV- (as follows from West Tsezic data). It remains unclear which one reflects the original Proto-Tsezic paradigm. It should be noted that the oblique stem *h3rV-zV- has undergone metathesis > *h2zV-rV-, which has further spread into the direct stem in Dido and Khwarshi. Cf. similar rebuildings of the original paradigm in the words for 'bone', 'hand' q.v.

26. FAT N.

Hunzib (proper) tala {мана, мад} (1), Bezhta (proper) coco {цепол} (2), Khoshar-Khota Bezhta coco (2), Tlyadal Bezhta coco (2), Hinukh mi?i ~ mi?i {мий, мий} (1), Kidero Dido mo {мо} (1), Sagada Dido riɬ {рилу} (3), Khwarshi (proper) mu {му} (1), Inkhokwari Khwarshi mu {му} (1), Proto-Tsezic *mühVB (1).

References and notes:


Hinukh: Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 266; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 121. Glossed as generic ‘fat’ in [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990], but specified as ‘visceral fat’ in [Khalilov & Isakov 2005]. In [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990], the phonetic variant mihi is also quoted - apparently an error, influenced by mihi ‘tail, fatty tail of sheep’ q.v.

Distinct from the more specific or borrowed terms, listed in [Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 441]:
1) ččęččę [чечечч] ‘butter / fat’ (apparently ‘dissolved fat’ is mentioned) [Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 390];
2) q'ălu [къалъу] ‘horse’s fat’ [Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 211];


Distinct from the more specific terms:
1) q'ăli [къали] ‘horse’s fat / fat’ (‘fat’ in general?) [Khalilov 1999: 145];
2) rři [рри] ‘butter / fat’ (apparently ‘dissolved fat’ is meant) [Khalilov 1999: 218].


Proto-Tsezic: NCED: 794. Distribution: Retained in its basic meaning in all Tsezic lects except for Bezhta and Sagada Dido.

In Bezhta, ‘mᵩV shifted to the specific meaning ‘internal fat’, having been superseded by *cəci’i (Hunzib cəcu, Bezhta cəco, Hinukh ččęččę), whose original meaning was probably ‘dissolved fat’.

In Sagada Dido, ‘mᵩV was superseded by *ref B ‘butter’ [NCED: 949].

Replacements: [‘butter’ > ‘fat’] (Sagada Dido).

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular except for some vocalic peculiarities.

Semantics and structure: Primary substantive root.

27. FEATHER

Hunzib (proper) pole {поде} (1), Bezhta (proper) məčə {мачъа} (2), Khoshar-Khota Bezhta mačə (2), Tlyadal Bezhta pudo (1), Hinukh bumbuli {бумбули} (-1), Kidero Dido bumbuli {бумбули} (-1), Sagada Dido huli {хIули} (-1), Khwarshi (proper) huli {хIули} (-1), Inkhokwari Khwarshi huli {хIули} (-1), Proto-Tsezic *pîd'V(1).

References and notes:


Distinct from pudo [pudɔ] 'down (fine feathers)' [Khalilov 1995: 220, 331; Madieva 1965: 182].

Khoshar-Khota Bezhta: M. Khalilov, p.c.

Distinct from pudo 'down (fine feathers)' [M. Khalilov, p.c.], despite the fact that pudo is glossed in [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 45] as generic 'feather'.

Tlyadal Bezhta: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 45; M. Khalilov, p.c. Expression for 'down' is not documented.


Sagada Dido: Abdulaev 2014. Borrowed from Avar ħuli 'down / feather'.


Inkhokwari Khwarshi: Karimova 2014. The second, also borrowed, expression for 'feather' is pirtiŋ [pirtiŋ] [Karimova 2014] ~ pirtiŋ [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 45], which ultimately goes back to Georgian prta 'wing / feather'.


Common Khwarshi: Khwarshi ħuli 'feather' is borrowed from Avar ħuli 'down / feather'.

Proto-Tsezic: NCED: 874. Distribution: Retained in East Tsezic, probably with polysemy: 'feather / down' at least on the Proto-East Tsezic level. In some Bezhta dialects, *pɨ ʷV was superseded by the unclear form mäč'ä ~ mač'a 'feather', but retained in the meaning 'down'.

In West Tsezic, the only documented inherited form is Mokok Dido lel 'wing / feather'; in other West Tsezic lects, it only means 'wing' < *tir(V) (~ *l-, -l-) [NCED: 762]. The Mokok polysemy is a transparent innovation. In the rest of West Tsezic lects, 'feather' is expressed by Georgian and Avar loanwords.

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular.

Semantics and structure: Primary substantive root.

28. FIRE

Hunzib (proper) c'ə {цIə} (1), Bezhta (proper) c'o {цIо} (1), Khoshar-Khota Bezhta c'o (1), Tlyadal Bezhta c'o (1), Hinukh č'e {чIе} (1), Kidero Dido c'i {цIи} (1), Sagada Dido c'i {цIи} (1), Khwarshi (proper) c'a {цIа} (1), Inkhokwari Khwarshi c'o {цIо} (1), Proto-Tsezic *c'ə A (1).

References and notes:


29. FISH

Hunzib (proper) *bɨsə {бысə} (1), Bezhta (proper) *bisa {буса} (1), Khoshar-Khota Bezhta *bisa (1), Tlyadal Bezhta *bisa (1), Hinukh besuro ~ besure {бесуре} (1), Kidero Dido besuro {бесуро} (1), Khwarshi (proper) čuʕa ~ čoʕa {чугIа, чогIа} (1), Inkhokwari Khwarshi čuʕa {чугIа} (1), Proto-Tsezic *bɨsːʷə A (1).

References and notes:

Tlyadal Bezhta: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 86.

Common Khwarshi: Khwarshi čuʕa 'fish' is borrowed from Avar čːuʕa 'fish'.

Proto-Tsezic: NCED: 319. Distribution: Retained in its basic meaning in all Tsezic lects, except for Khwarshi, where it was superseded by an Avar loanword.

30. FLY V.

Hunzib (proper) CLASS=ek'ec' {бекIечIа} (1), Bezhta (proper) CLASS=ogic' {богIуяIа} (1), Khoshar-Khota Bezhta CLASS=ok'ic' (1), Tlyadal Bezhta CLASS=ok'ic' (1), Hinukh CLASS=iʔi ~ CLASS=ɬiʔi {бикьа} (2), Kidero Dido CLASS=ik'i {букIа} (3), Sagada Dido boržizi CLASS=ow {боржизи бохъва} (-1), Khwarshi (proper) etw {этва} (-1), Inkhokwari Khwarshi et ~ etw {этва} (-1), Proto-Tsezic *CLASS=Vk'ič' (1).

References and notes:

Khoshar-Khota Bezhta: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 82.
Tlyadal Bezhta: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 82.
Common Bezhta: Polysemy: 'to jump / to fly' in all the dialects. Of note is the occasional dissimilative k’-c’ > g-c’ in Bezhta proper.
Hinukh: Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 83. Apparently the verb CLASS=ik’i ‘to go’ q.v. is the normal way to express the semantics of flying as applied to birds (thus polysemy: 'to go / to fly'). Cf. the examples with asab=ik’i, literally 'to being in the sky (as)': “A bird flies in the sky” [Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 44], “The crow flies (in the sky)” Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 129].

Another verb, which can be used in the same meaning, is kөl(e) ‘to jump’ [Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 235] (thus, with polysemy: 'to jump / to fly'). E.g., in combination with hawa ‘air: hawa-ko l(e) ‘to fly’, literally 'to jump in the air' [Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 132].

Cf. also the verb neχ ‘to come / to fly here’ q.v.

Distinct from boržizi CLASS=ik ‘to fly’, applicable to aircraft, literally ‘to become boržizi’ [Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 99], borrowed from Avar b=orž-ize ‘to fly’.

Kidero Dido: Khalilov 1999: 57, 338. Apparently the verb CLASS=ik ‘to go’ q.v. with the optional locative form hawa-‘ in the air’ is the normal way to express the semantics of flying as applied to birds (thus, with polysemy: 'to go / to fly'). Cf. the attested examples: "The bird is flying (b=ik’i-χ) low" [Khalilov 1999: 78], "The swallow flies (hawa-‘ b=ik’i-χ)" [Khalilov 1999: 89], "The butterfly flies (hawa-‘ b=ik’i-χ)" [Khalilov 1999: 156].

Cf. also the verb CLASS=oxi (sọxal) ‘to run away, go away’ [Khalilov 1999: 69], used for the meaning 'to fly away' as in "The fledgeling, fly (away)!" [Khalilov 1999: 296], and the verb neχ ‘to come / to fly here’ q.v.

Additionally, the collocation CLASS=et’u-n Khọli [gerlinya:lona] with polysemy: 'to jump / to fly' is quoted in [Khalilov 1999: 48], where et’u-n is the past tense form of CLASS=et to tear off (intrans.)’ [Khalilov 1999: 47] and the inflected verb Khọli [kọlan] ‘to run’ [Khalilov 1999: 164]. Apparently et’u in the collocation for 'to fly' has nothing to do with Tindi et’- ‘to fly’ and cognate verbs in other Andian languages.

Sagada Dido: Abdulalev 2014. Literally 'to become boržizi', borrowed from Avar b=orž-ize ‘to fly’.

Khwarshi (proper): Karimova 2014; Sharafutdinova & Levina 1961: 90, 103, 104. Cf. the example: "Birds are flying across the sky" [Sharafutdinova & Levina 1961: 104].

Inkhokwari Khwarshi: Karimova 2014; Bokarev 1959: 146, 164. The more archaic labialized form et’ is from [Bokarev 1959].

Kwantlada Khwarshi: et’ [xta] ‘to fly’ [Karimova 2014; Khalilova 2009: 18, 181]. Cf. the example: "Now this boy turned into a pigeon, this boy flew away" [Khalilova 2009: 147].

Common Khwarshi: Khwarshi et’ ‘to fly’ is very likely borrowed from Tindi et’- ‘to fly’; although inherited Tsezic origin of this verb cannot be excluded either.

Proto-Tsezic: NCED: 717. Distribution: Retained in East Tsezic with polysemy 'to jump / to fly'; lost in West Tsezic.

In West Tsezic lects (Hinukh, Kidero Dido) 'to fly' is expressed by various verbs for 'to go' and 'to come', which differ between languages. Theoretically, one of these verbs for 'to go', namely *CLASS=č-, or *CLASS=č-, can be reconstructed with the additional meaning 'to fly' at the Proto-Tsezic level, but it is more likely that we deal with a late innovation 'to go / to fly' in Hinukh, Kidero Dido.

In Sagada Dido and Khwarshi, inherited forms are superseded by Avar and Tindi loanwords.

Replacements: ['to go / to fly'] (Hinukh, Kidero Dido).

Reconstruction shape: Occasional dissimilative deglottalization k’ > g in Bezhta proper, irregular c’ for expected c’ in Tlyadal Bezhta (or, if the protoform was *CLASS=Vx‘ic’, irregular c’ for expected c’ in Hunzib).

Semantics and structure: Primary verbal stem; polysemy 'to jump / to fly' can be reconstructed at least for Proto-East Tsezic.

31. FOOT

Hunzib (proper) hale {tvåle} (1), Bezhta (proper) čiibā {kawdaab} (2), Khoshar-Khota Bezhta čiibā (2), Tlyadal Bezhta čiibā (2), Hinukh røre {popel} (1), Kidero Dido rori {popul} (1), Sagada Dido čo’tö [xomlò] (3), Khwarshi (proper) lolø {loa} (1), Inkhokwari Khwarshi lolø {{loa} (1), Proto-Tsezic *lọla A (1).

References and notes:

Distinct from *čunali* [дьумал], whose exact meaning is, however, uncertain; glossed as 'shin, leg' [Isakov & Khalilov 2001: 180], 'leg from knee till foot' [van den Berg 1995: 293], generic 'leg' in [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 30]; Russian 'нора', which can mean 'foot', 'leg' or 'foot + leg' in [Bokarev 1961: 169].


Khoshar-Khota Bezhta: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 30. Meaning specifically 'foot'.

Distinct from *čunali* (a typo for *čunali*), which is quoted in [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 30] as a generic term ('foot + leg'), but actually seems to specifically denote 'leg'.


Distinct from *čunali*, which is quoted in [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 30] as a generic term ('foot + leg'), but actually seems to specifically denote 'leg'.


Distinct from *koonču* [кюончу] 'leg' [Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 236; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 30], although in [Khalilov & Isakov 2005] this word is glossed as 'нора (сна)', i.e., 'leg + foot'?.

Distinct from other words, quoted in [Khalilov & Isakov 2005] with the non-specified gloss 'нора'.

1) *or* ~ *ool* [ор, ол] [Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 283] with polysemy 'leg / thigh, hip / trouser leg' (apparently not 'foot').

2) *hoba* [хобы] 'foot' [Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 144]; the specific meaning 'foot' is seen from the illustrative examples: "to kick with the foot", "to hit with the foot".

Distinct from *bula* [була] 'leg of animal / hoof' [Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 107].


Distinct from *koonču* [кюончу] with polysemy: 'leg / furniture leg' [Khalilov 1999: 165; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 30]; it should be noted that in [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 30] this word is glossed as generic 'foot + leg'.

Distinct from several more marginal or specific terms:

1) *os* [ор, ол] [Asakh *оl*] [Khalilov 1999: 110] with polysemy: 'leg / thigh, hip' (apparently not 'foot');

2) *sol* [сол] 'foot' or 'leg', glossed as Russian 'нора' [Khalilov 1999: 92], rarely used;


*χοτ’о* with polysemy: 'foot / sole (of the traditional footwear)' [Khalilov 1999: 257];

4) *oło* [оло] 'heel (of human) / leg (of animal)' [Khalilov 1999: 257];

5) *bul’ala* ~ *bula* [була, була] 'leg of animal / hoof' [Khalilov 1999: 73, 76].


Inkhokwari Kwarshi: Karimova 2014; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 30; Bokarev 1959: 151. Meaning specifically 'foot'.

Distinct from *к’ак’а* 'leg' [Bokarev 1959: 144].


Proto-Tsezic: NCED: 759. Distribution: Retained in its basic function in all Tsezic lects, except for Bezhta and Sagada Dido.

In all Bezhta dialects it was superseded by *чообы A* [NCED: 454] with polysemy 'foot / leg'. The original meaning of *чообы* is unclear, the only Hunukh cognate means 'foot', but it is not the basic Hunukh term for this meaning. In Bezhta proper, *чообы* is still documented as an obsolete word for 'foot'.

In Sagada Dido, the default term for 'foot' seems to be *чообы* - a form of unclear origin, it is also attested in Kidero Dido with the same meaning 'foot', but it is not the basic Kidero term for this meaning.

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular.

Semantics and structure: Primary substantive root, meaning specifically 'foot'.

32. FULL

Hunzip (proper) CLASS=оć’-a-r-u [a-$u$lapy] (1), Bezhta (proper) CLASS=оć’-iyor-o [iuui otroo] (1), Khoshar-Khota Bezhta CLASS=оć’-ir-o (1), Tlyadal Bezhta CLASS=оć’-ir-o (1), Hunukh
References and notes:

**Hunzib (proper):** Isakov & Khalilov 2001: 44 sub baco 'moon', 76 sub doki 'jug'. Polysemy: 'full / satisfied'. Regular past participle from the verb CLASS=əc' 'to be filled, get filled' [Isakov & Khalilov 2001: 51; van den Berg 1995: 346; Bokarev 1961: 171].

**Bezhta (proper):** Khalilov 1995: 130, 327. Past participle from the verb CLASS=oc' with polysemy: 'to fill (intrans.) / to be sated' [Khalilov 1995: 130; Madieva 1965: 180].

**Khoshar-Khota Bezhta:** Comrie & Khalilov 2010: 612. Polysemy: 'full / satiated' (in [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 241], quoted for the latter meaning). Past participle from the verb CLASS=oc' 'to fill (intrans.)' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 241], quoted as CLASS=ic'ː-ä-si with the meaning 'satiated'. Past participle from the verb CLASS=ic' 'to fill (intrans.) / to become satiated' [Khalilov 1999: 63].


**Sagada Dido:** Abdulaev 2014. Final -r is the participle exponent.

**Khwarshi (proper):** Karimova 2014.

**Inkhokwari Khwarshi:** Karimova 2014; Bokarev 1959: 145, 148, 158. Polysemy: 'full / satiated' (in [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 241], quoted with the meaning 'satiated'). Past participle from the verb CLASS=oc' 'to fill (intrans.)' [Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 92], with yc', c'ː < *c'-y.

**Proto-Tsezic:** NCED: 525. Distribution: One of the most stable Proto-Tsezic stems, retained in its basic meaning in all Tsezic lects.

Reconstruction shape: The vocalic correspondence between Proto-East and Proto-West forms is irregular.

Semantics and structure: *CLASS=əc'* is the verb 'to be(come) full'; the adjectival meaning 'full' in modern lects is expressed by various synchronic participles.

### 33. GIVE

**Hunzib (proper) niλ {нλал} (1), Bezhta (proper) niλ {нπλал} (1), Khoshar-Khota Bezhta niλ (1), Tlyadal Bezhta niλ (1), Hinukh neλ {нελα} (1) / тελ {тελа} (1), Kidero Dido neλ {нελα} (1) / тελ {тελа} (1), Sagada Dido neλ {нελа} (1) / тελ {тελа} (1), Khwarshi (proper) iλ {иλа} (1) / тιλ {тιλа} (1), Inkhokwari Khwarshi iλ {иλа} (1) / тιλ {тιла} (1), Proto-Tsezic *ţiλ ~ *DIR= şiA (1).**

References and notes:

**Hunzib (proper):** Isakov & Khalilov 2001: 134, 198; van den Berg 1995: 322; Bokarev 1961: 162, 174. Historically, a prefixal formation n=ɨ, where initial n= is either a spatial/directional prefix, cf. [van den Berg 1995: 353], or a fossilized person exponent, thus in [NCED: 641].

**Bezhta (proper):** Khalilov 1995: 206, 303; Madieva 1965: 178.

**Khoshar-Khota Bezhta:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 67. Two parallel present forms should be noted: niλ-ca and (with occasional assimilation) nic-ca.

**Tlyadal Bezhta:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 67.
Common Bezhta: Historically, a prefixal formation $n=ɨ$, where initial $n=$ is a fossilized directional prefix.


The Hinukh verb for 'to give' is suppletive in respect of recipient person: $neɨ$ is used with $1^\text{st}/2^\text{nd}$ p. of the recipient 'to give to me, us, you' / $teɨ$ is used with $3^\text{rd}$ p. of the recipient 'to give to him, her, it, them' [Forker 2013: 484 f.]. It must be noted that the distribution is not absolutely strict; browsing through [Forker 2013] provides some aberrant examples among a great number of regular instances: cf. $neɨ$ in the constructions 'he to them' [Forker 2013: 319, 395], 'I to him' [Forker 2013: 250]. We treat $neɨ$ and $teɨ$ as synonyms, although historically they represent paronymous formations $n=ɨ$ and $t=ɨ$ with fossilized directional prefixes.Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 330, 433.


The Kidero Dido verb for ‘to give’ is suppletive in respect to the recipient person: $neɨ$ is used with $1^\text{st}/2^\text{nd}$ p. of the recipient ‘to give to me, us, you’ / $teɨ$ is used with $3^\text{rd}$ p. of the recipient ‘to give to him, her, it, them’. We treat $neɨ$ and $teɨ$ as synonyms, although historically they represent paronymous formations $n=ɨ$ and $t=ɨ$ with fossilized directional prefixes.Khalilov 1999: 234, 318. Polysemy: ‘to give / to give as a gift’.

Sagada Dido: Abdualev 2014. Elicited in contexts with $1^\text{st}/2^\text{nd}$ p. of the recipient: “The father is giving me a stone”, “I am giving you a stone”.Abdualev 2014. Elicited in the context with $3^\text{rd}$ p. of the recipient: “I am giving my father a stone”.


Common Khwarshi: It is claimed in [Khalilova 2009: 327] that the Kwantlada Khwarshi verb for ‘to give’ is suppletive in respect to the recipient person: $iɨ$ is used with $1^\text{st}/2^\text{nd}$ p. of the recipient to ‘give to me, us, you’ / $tiɨ$ is used with $3^\text{rd}$ p. of the recipient ‘to give to him, her, it, them’. [Khalilova 2009] contains multiple Kwantlada Khwarshi textual instances of $iɨ$ and $tiɨ$. Thorough analysis shows that (1) $iɨ$ is more frequently used than $tiɨ$; (2) $iɨ$ is used independently of the recipient person, whereas $tiɨ$ is indeed restricted to $3^\text{rd}$ p. of the recipient. Scant Khwarshi proper instances in [Sharafutdinova & Levina 1961] demonstrate the same tendencies. Almost no relevant textual data from Inkhokwari Khwarshi are available.

We treat $iɨ$ and $tiɨ$ as synonyms, although historically they represent paronymous formations ($t=ɨ$ with a fossilized directional prefix).

Proto-Tsezic: NCED: 640. Distribution: One of the most stable Proto-Tsezic roots, retained in its basic meaning in all Tsezic lects.

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular except for the strange alternation ‘$i$’ in the plain form vs. ‘$ɨ$’ in the prefixed forms.

Semantics and structure: Primary verb. The plain root ‘$ɨ$’ is only retained in Khwarshi. Normally we find the prefixed stems ‘*$n=ɨ$-’ and ‘*$t=ɨ$-’ (in East Tsezic, only ‘*$n=ɨ$-’ is used).

In West Tsezic, the usual situation is the grammatical opposition between two stems in respect to the recipient person: stem-A with $1^\text{st}/2^\text{nd}$ p. vs. stem-B with $3^\text{rd}$ p. In Hinukh-Dido, this opposition looks as follows: ‘*$n=ɨ$-’ / ‘*$t=ɨ$-’. Somewhat differently in Khwarshi: ‘*$n=ɨ$-’ / ‘*$t=ɨ$-’. Because of such a material difference, it is hard to project the described grammatical opposition onto the Proto-West Tsezic level. More likely, we deal with a later grammatical introduction that has affected neighboring West Tsezic lects.

We prefer to treat ‘*$n$’ and ‘*$t$’ as old directional prefixes (a normal pattern for the verb for ‘to give’), which probably got desemanticized and fossilized already in Proto-Tsezic. The competing reconstruction of ‘*$n$’ and ‘*$t$’ as unique recipient person exponents does not find additional confirmation.

34. GOOD

Hunzib (proper) $ḵ'it$-u ~ $ḵ't$-u {klomly} (1), Bezhta (proper) $ḵt$'-o {klemlo} (1), Khoshar-Khota Bezhta $ḵt$'-o (1), Tlyadal Bezhta $ḵt$'-ő (1), Hinukh $CLASS=egɨ$-y ~ $CLASS=egɨ$: {ðezɨɨ, ðezɨ} (2), Kidero Dido $CLASS=ig$-u {ðɨ$u$yɨ} (2), Sagada Dido $CLASS=ig$-u {ðɨ$u$yɨ} (2), Khwarshi (proper) $CLASS=ag$-u {ãzy} (2), Inkhokwari Khwarshi $CLASS=og$-u {õy} (2), Proto-Tsezic
References and notes:

Khoshar-Khota Bezhta: M. Khalilov, p.c.
   Distinct from adverbial aχ-o [ахо] ‘good, in the proper way / very’ (Ya. Testelets, p.c.).
   Distinct from two more marginal words:
   1) zap'anaw [запIанав] with polysemy: ‘beautiful / good / lucky / strong’ [Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 171], looks like an Avarism, but the source form has not been found;
   Distinct from less common words:
   1) zap'ana [запIана] ‘beautiful / good’ [Khalilov 1999: 121] (a loan?);
Inkhokwari Khwarshi: Karimova 2014; Bokarev 1959: 158.
Proto-Tsezic: NCED: 643. Distribution: Two roots enter into competition:
   1) East Tsezic *k'oTV [NCED: 724]; lost in West Tsezic;
   2) West Tsezic *CLASS=igV (~ -o) [NCED: 643]; lost in East Tsezic.
   There is no internal Tsezic evidence that would allow us to make a single choice. External comparison, however, clearly suggests that the Proto-Tsezic term for ‘good’ was *CLASS=igV, its cognates mean ‘good’ or ‘right’ in Nakh, Avaro-Andian, Dargi, Lezgian. On the other hand, Tsezic *k'oTV is either unetymologizable or originates from the meaning ‘soft’.
   Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular.
   Semantics and structure: Primary adjectival stem.

35. GREEN
Hunzib (proper) nič-d-u [ничду] (1), Bezhta (proper) nič-d-iy-o [ничдиийо] (1), Khoshar-Khota Bezhta nič-d-iy-o (1), Tlyadal Bezhta nič-d-iy-ö (1), Hinukh iši-y-o-s ~ iš-y-o-s ~ iš-o-s [ипийос, ипйос, ипйос] (2), Kidero Dido eč-y-a-si [эчйаси] (3), Sagada Dido c'ic'i-r-a [цIицIира] (4), Khwarshi (proper) λib-la-yl-i [λиблъилъи] (5), Inkhokwari Khwarshi qayiːle ~ qayle [хъайилъе] (-1), Proto-Tsezic *ničV- (1).

References and notes:

   A second term for ‘green’ is heλ-at-co-ʔos [тελъатъос] [Khalilov 1995: 80], derived from the noun heλ-at-co ‘green
color', further to he:le 'walnut (a fruit)'. Cf. the attested example: "green dye (paint)" [Khalilov 1995: 281]. This adjective is apparently more marginal than nič-d-iy-o, because he:x-af-co-šo is not quoted in [Madieva 1965].


Common Bezhta: Polysemy: 'green / blue' for nič-d-iy-o in all the dialects.


Distinct from the loanword žurčinaw [рэціна] 'green (applied to plants)' [Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 158] < Avar, žurčina-'u 'green (of plants)'.


Sagada Dido: Abdulaev 2014. Corresponds to Kidero Dido cica-i-r-a 'red, vermilion (а.ни)' [Khalilov 1999: 278]. Actually, Sagada cica-i-r-a with the meaning 'green' could be an error due to inaccurate question to a Sagada informant.

Kharwi (proper): Karimova 2014. Derived from Aib 'leaf q.v. (-la- is the oblique stem exponent?) with the common adjectival suffixes -i & -a (qš < *qš).


Kwantlada Khwarshi: the same loanword qa:le [кҺалIе] 'green' [Karimova 2014].

Proto-Tzezic: NCED: 592. Distribution: Retained only in East Tsezic with the standard adjectival suffixes; polysemy 'green / blue' is to be reconstructed at least for the Proto-East Tsezic level. Pace [NCED: 592], the root was apparently lost in West Tsezic. A possible external comparandum is the Nakh adjective 'unripe'.

In West Tsezic, expressions for 'green' normally represent various denominative stems (the attested starting nouns are 'first spring grass' and 'leaf'). Such adjectives should be regarded as relatively recent formations.

In Inkhokwari Khwarshi, an Andian loanword is attested.

36. HAIR

Hunzib (proper) kera {кепал} (1), Bezhta (proper) kēyā {кэйA} (1) / müč' {мушI} (2), Khoshar-Khota Bezhta müč' (2), Tlyadal Bezhta müč' (2), Hinukh mus-be {мусbe} (3), Kidero Dido kodì {кодI} (4), Sagada Dido kodì {кодI} (4), Khwarshi (proper) čoda {чода} (4), Inkhokwari Khwarshikode {кodE} (4), Proto-Tzezic *müč'B (2).

References and notes:


Bezhta (proper): Khalilov 1995: 146, 299; Madieva 1965: 166. Polysemy: 'head hair / a single hair'. For the collective meaning 'head hair', see examples in [Khalilov 1995: 146] and additionally "There is hair around the forehead" [Madieva 1965: 76].

A second candidate is nič' 'head hair', quoted in [Khalilov 1995], but missing from [Madieva 1965]. We treat kēyā and müč' as synonyms.Khalilov 1995: 202, 299.

Khoshar-Khota Bezhta: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 42. Specified as 'head hair'.

Distinct from kera 'a single hair' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 42].

Tlyadal Bezhta: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 42. Specified as 'head hair'.

Distinct from kera 'a single hair' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 42].

Hinukh: Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 271, 423; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 42. Plural from the generic term mus 'a single hair'.

Distinct from the more marginal borrowed term kočori [кочорI] 'head hair / forelock' [Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 206].
Georgian ქოლორი 'topknot, tuft of hair'.

Distinct from the specific term ჭუღ 'mane / forelock, long head hair' [Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 392], which is, however, quoted in [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 42] as the generic term for 'head hair'.

Distinct from specific ჭაბ 'pubic hair' [Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 292].

**Kidero Dido**: Khalilov 1999: 141, 311; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 42. Denotes collective 'hair'.

Distinct from მუჭ 'a single hair' [Khalilov 1999: 194, 311; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 42].

**Sagada Dido**: Abdulaev 2014. Elicited in the context 'He pulled him by his hair'.

Distinct from مس [msy] 'a single hair' [Khalilov 1999: 147, 152, 156].

**Khwarshi (proper)**: Karimova 2014; Sharaftutdinova & Levina 1961: 92. Denotes collective 'hair'.

Distinct from қа 'a single hair' [Sharaftutdinova & Levina 1961: 113; Bokarev 1959: 147, 152, 156].

**Inkhokwari Khwarshi**: Karimova 2014; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 42. Denotes collective 'hair'.

Distinct from Inkhokwari қо ~ қо 'a single hair' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 42; Bokarev 1959: 147, 148, 150, 152].

Distinct from specific қо 'head hair' [Abdulaev 2014]. Elicited in the context 'He pulled him by his hair'.

**Kwantlada Khwarshi**: қәд [қәд] [Karimova 2014; Khalilova 2009: 34]. It denotes collective 'hair'. Cf. the attested examples: 'The girl cut (her) hair by accident' [Khalilova 2009: 324], 'As soon as the girl fell asleep, the neighbor tied her hair to the tree' [Khalilova 2009: 87, 403].

There are also two other Kwantlada terms: қо 'hair' [Khalilova 2009: 57, 263] and միս 'hair' [Khalilova 2009: 64, 65, 135]. Their exact meanings are unknown, at least to қо is expected to mean 'a single hair'. Cf. the found example for միս 'hair': "When the man sat on the top of the yoke bending, (his) hair had fallen" [Khalilova 2009: 135].

**Proto-Tsezic**: NCED: 805. Distribution: The relevant Tsezic forms can be summarized in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAIR</th>
<th>Hunzib</th>
<th>Bezhta (proper)</th>
<th>Bezhta (other)</th>
<th>Hinukh</th>
<th>Dido</th>
<th>Khwarshi (proper)</th>
<th>Inkhokwari</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*ке B [NCED: 697]</td>
<td>single hair / head hair</td>
<td>single hair / head hair</td>
<td>single hair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*муц B [NCED: 805]</td>
<td>head hair</td>
<td>head hair</td>
<td>neck</td>
<td>neck</td>
<td>neck</td>
<td>neck</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*мос: (~ -чо, -чо) [NCED: 805]</td>
<td>single hair / head hair</td>
<td>single hair / body hair (pl.)</td>
<td>hair</td>
<td>hair (unspecified)</td>
<td>hair (unspecified)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*кӏ ди V A [NCED: 705]</td>
<td>чу hair</td>
<td>ჭოд long head hair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*чо A [NCED: 347]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Proto-East Tsezic system can be reconstructed as *қә 'a single hair' / *муц 'hair (collective), head hair'. In Hunzib, the system became simplified: *муц was eliminated and қә acquired the polysemy 'head hair / body hair / a single hair'. In Bezhta proper, қә acquired the polysemy 'head hair / a single hair' (perhaps independently from the same process in Hunzib).

The Proto-West Tsezic system can be reconstructed as *қә 'a single hair' / *кӏ ди 'head hair'. In Hinukh & Dido, қә 'a single hair' got lost, having been superseded by *мос (the original semantics of *мос was 'a kind of hair'; more exact specification is difficult, but the proto-meaning 'body hair, fur' is very probable, cf. its meaning in Dido); such a replacement should be treated as contact-driven homoplasy between Hinukh & Dido. Additionally, in modern Hinukh, 'head hair' is secondarily expressed as the pl. form of *мос. In Khwarshi proper, *кӏ ди 'head hair' was phonetically influenced by *чо 'horsehair', having substituted initial k- for ч- (the similar hybrid form ჭაღ is observed in Hinukh, but its meaning 'long head hair' suggests that we more probably deal with a reverse process, when ყо 'mane' > 'long head hair' was influenced by *кӏ ди 'head hair').

External comparison (first of all, the Andian comparanda) suggests that the East Tsezic system must be projected onto the Proto-Tsezic level: қә 'a single hair' / *муц 'head hair'. In Proto-West Tsezic, *муц 'head hair' shifted to the meaning 'neck', having been superseded by *кӏ ди in the meaning 'head hair'. The original Proto-Tsezic semantics of *кӏ ди is unclear; its North Caucasian etymology (if correct!) suggests the meaning 'bush, crown of a tree'.

Replacements: {'a single hair' > 'head hair'} (Hunzib, Bezhta proper, Hinukh); {'head hair' > 'neck'} (Proto-West Tsezic).

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular.

Semantics and structure: Primary substantive root.

37. HAND

Hunzib (proper) ხორო {ხოპო} (1), Bezhta (proper) ხო: {ხო} (1), Khoshar-Khota Bezhta ხორო
(1) Tlyadal Bezhta koro (1), Hinukh {kʰwɛzey} (1), Kidero Dido reli {reli} (2), Sagada Dido reli {reli} (2), Khwarshi (proper) leli {leli} (2), Inkhokwari Khwarshi ili {ili} ~ li {li} (2), Proto-Tsezic *kʷiɾV(1).

References and notes:


Common Bezhta: The loss of Bezhta proper -r- (ko) is normal [Bokarev 1959: 71 ff.].

Hinukh: Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 197, 515; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 26, 27. Paradigm: kʰwɛzey [abs.]/kʰwɛz-r- [obl.]. In [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990], specified as a generic term for ‘hand + arm’; the same follows from the textual examples in [Khalilov & Isakov 2005].


and seldom as \textit{li\textlprime a}. Numerous textual instances for the meaning 'hand' are available in [Khalilova 2009], but no examples for 'arm' are known, however.

Distinct from Kwantlada \textit{qot} 'palm of hand' [Khalilova 2009: 14, 32].

Distinct from \textit{ge\textlprime a} 'shoulder' [Khalilova 2009: 45].

\textbf{Proto-Tsezic:}

NCED: 706. Distribution: The relevant forms can be summarized in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>'HAND'</th>
<th>Hunzib</th>
<th>Bezhta</th>
<th>Khwarshi (proper, Inkokhwarshi)</th>
<th>Kwantlada Khwarshi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>\textit{k\textlprime ir\textlprime V} [NCED: 706]</td>
<td>hand</td>
<td>hand</td>
<td>hand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{b\textlprime \textlprime} A [NCED: 307]</td>
<td>arm</td>
<td>arm</td>
<td>arm / sleeve</td>
<td>arm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{ri\textlprime a} A [NCED: 779]</td>
<td>sleeve / foreleg</td>
<td>sleeve / foreleg</td>
<td>hand</td>
<td>hand / arm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{g\textlprime x\textlprime a} (~ -e-, -e-) [NCED: 448]</td>
<td>arm</td>
<td>shoulder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We posit \textit{k\textlprime ir\textlprime V} as the Proto-Tsezic term for 'hand'. In the Dido-Khwarshi cluster it was superseded by \textit{ri\textlprime a}.

Theoretically, however, the opposite solution is also possible: \textit{ri\textlprime a} was the Proto-Tsezic term for 'hand', which was superseded by \textit{k\textlprime ir\textlprime V} in Proto-East Tsezic and secondarily in Hinukh under the influence of East Tsezic.

External comparison speaks in favour of Proto-Tsezic \textit{k\textlprime ir\textlprime V} 'hand' (its cognates mean 'hand' in Avar, Nakh, Lak, Lezgian, Khinalug [NCED: 706]). But, strictly speaking, we are in a situation of semantic criss-crossing, since external cognates of \textit{ri\textlprime a} mean 'hand' in Andian [NCED: 779].

From the geographical point of view, Proto-Andian \textit{ri\textlprime a} 'hand' / Dido-Khwarshi \textit{ri\textlprime a} 'hand' is an areal isogloss, which affects the Andian languages together with neighboring Dido & Khwarshi. Thus we suppose that \textit{ri\textlprime a} was the Proto-Andian term for 'hand' (an Andian introduction), which has later influenced the adjacent Tsezic lects (namely Dido & Khwarshi with all their dialects). The original Proto-Tsezic meaning of \textit{ri\textlprime a} is unknown (cf. its meanings 'sleeve / foreleg' in East Tsezic).

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular, except for the consonant metathesis in the oblique stem.

Reconstruction: Primary substantive root, meaning specifically 'hand'. Two oblique stems can be reconstructed. The first one is \textit{k\textlprime V}, its antiquity is beyond doubt since it is retained in East Tsezic and adverbially in Hinukh. The second oblique stem is \textit{k\textlprime ir\textlprime V-z\textlprime V}, metathesized to \textit{k\textlprime ir\textlprime Vra}; this one is reflected in the Hinukh paradigm \textit{k\textlprime ezey [abs.]} / \textit{k\textlprime eze-ra-[obl.]}, where the abs. stem is a back formation. Apparently the oblique stem \textit{k\textlprime ir\textlprime V-z\textlprime V} is a secondary Proto-West Tsezic or even Proto-Hinukh introduction, cf. the same pattern in the words for 'bone', 'eye' q.v.

38. HEAD

Hunzib (proper) \textit{q\textlprime am} {къ\textlprime ам} (1), Bezhta (proper) \textit{q\textlprime am} {къ\textlprime ам} (1), Khoshar-Khota Bezhta \textit{q\textlprime am} (1), Tlyadal Bezhta \textit{q\textlprime am} (1), Hinukh \textit{q\textlprime in\textlprime u} {къ\textlprime иму} (1), Kidero Dido \textit{q\textlprime in\textlprime m} {къ\textlprime им} (1), Sagada Dido \textit{q\textlprime in\textlprime m} {къ\textlprime им} (1), Khwarshi (proper) \textit{q\textlprime em} {къ\textlprime им} (1), Inkokhwarshi Khwarshi \textit{q\textlprime em} {къ\textlprime им} (1), Proto-Tsezic \textit{*q\textlprime 5m} B (1).

References and notes:


39. HEAR

Hunzib (proper) nîd [nûdal] (1), Bezhta (proper) tuq [tuq] (2), Khoshar-Khota Bezhta tuq (2), Tlyadal Bezhta tuq (2), Hinukh toq [toq] (2), Kidero Dido teq [teq] (2), Sagada Dido teqʷ [teqʷ] (2), Khwarshi (proper) tuq (2), Proto-Tsezic *tuqʷ"B (2).

References and notes:

**Hunzib (proper):** Isakov & Khalilov 2001: 134, 233; van den Berg 1995: 322; Bokarev 1961: 162, 180. The model: absolutive (sound) + dative (recipient). Theoretically can be analyzed as *n=ɨd or *n=ɨd with a fossilized directional prefix, for which see [van den Berg 1995: 353].

Distinct from the more marginal verb tuq [ty̱k], which is glossed as 'to hear' in [Isakov & Khalilov 2001: 155, 233] (with only one example: "He has heard the news") and as 'to listen' in [van den Berg 1995: 336].

Distinct from the analytic expressions for 'to listen': äəna-tuq-le, äəna-tuq-ke [aŋŋatuq̱a, aŋŋatuq̱a] [Isakov & Khalilov 2001: 25, 233; van den Berg 1995: 283], literally 'to put the ear on' with äəna 'ear' q.v. and tuq-le, tuq-ke 'to lean on, put on'. Additionally, the compound äən-rex [aŋŋaperxa] 'listen' in quoted in [Isakov & Khalilov 2001: 25, 233] with rex 'ʔ'.


Distinct from enekzi CLASS=eq [enekxiq̱a] with polysemy: 'to listen / to obey' [Khalilov 1995: 292, 336], literally 'to become enekzi', the latter is borrowed from Avar fenekizə 'to listen'. See [Madieva 1965: 114] for this complex verb pattern, typical of loanwords.

Distinct from čoq [čōq] 'to hear of, be aware of' [Khalilov 1995: 277], čeʃ [čeʃ] 'to hear that, be aware of' [Khalilov 1995: 279].

Distinct from ašā-k-ː [aʃaːk] 'to hear out / to overhear' [Khalilov 1995: 290], derived from ašā 'ear' q.v. with the denominative (factitive, causative) suffix -k'[Kibrik & Testelets 2004: 270; Madieva 1965: 113] and iterative -ā.

**Khoshar-Khota Bezhta:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 172.


**Tlyadal Bezhta:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 172.

Distinct from fenekzi CLASS=eq 'to listen' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 172], literally 'to become fenekzi', the latter is borrowed from Avar fenekizə 'to listen'.

**Hinukh:** Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 331, 521. The model: absolutive (sound) + dative (recipient).

Distinct from fenekzi CLASS=eq - fenekzi CLASS=eq [enekxe, enekxe] with polysemy: 'to listen / to obey' [Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 155], literally 'to become fenekzi', the latter is borrowed from Avar fenekizə 'to listen'.

**Kidero Dido:** Khalilov 1999: 235, 376. Polysemy: 'to hear / to understand'. The model: absolutive (sound) + dative (recipient).
Distinct from the expressions for 'to listen':
1) teq-er [техъа] with polysemy: 'to listen / overhear' [Khalilov 1999: 235, 376], causative from teq 'to hear';
2) ʡenekizi CLASS=оq [гIенекизи охъа] with polysemy: 'to listen / to obey' [Khalilov 1999: 108, 376], literally 'to become ʡenekizi', the latter is borrowed from Avar ʡenekiz 'to listen'.

Khwarshi (proper): Karimova 2014. Formally, a causative stem with the causative suffix -χ.
Inkhokwari Khwarshi: Karimova 2014; Bokarev 1959: 146, 173. Polysemy: 'to hear / to listen'. The model for the meaning 'to hear': absolutive (sound) + dative (recipient) [Bokarev 1959: 153].

Kwantlada Khwarshi: tuq [тук] 'to hear' [Karimova 2014; Khalilova 2009: 77, 82, 84, 190, 305]. Polysemy: 'to hear / to listen'. The model for the meaning 'to hear': absolutive (sound) + lative (recipient); the model for the meaning 'to listen': ergative (recipient) + absolutive (sound) [Khalilova 2009: 305].

Proto-Tsezic: Distribution: Retained in its basic meaning in all Tsezic lects, although in Hunzib this word is obsolete, being superseded by nid (not attested elsewhere). Both *tuq* and *n(=)id ~ *n(=)id lack external North Caucasian etymology.

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular.
Semantics and structure: Primary verbal stem, meaning 'to hear' with the model "absolutive (sound) + dative (recipient)".

40. HEART

Hunzib (proper) rakʿu {пакIу} (1), Bezhta (proper) yakʾo {iakIo} (1), Khoshar-Khota Bezhta rakʾo (1), Tlyadal Bezhta rakʾo (1), Hinukh rokʷe ~ rok′e {рокIе, рокIе} (1), Kidero Dido rokʿu {покIу} (1), Sagada Dido rokʿu {покIу} (1), Khwarshi (proper) lokʷa {локIва} (1), Inkhokwari Khwarshi lokʾo {локIо} (1), Proto-Tsezic *rɔkʾə A (1).

References and notes:

Khoshar-Khota Bezhta: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 34.
Tlyadal Bezhta: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 34.

Common Bezhta: The loss of Bezhta proper -r- is normal [Bokarev 1959: 71 ff.].
Hinukh: Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 305, 518; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 34. Polysemy: heart / soul / core / root (of plant, tree) (the synchronic polysemy with heart is secondary from the historical point of view).

Khwarshi (proper): Karimova 2014; Sharafutdinova & Levinia 1961: 120.

Inkhokwari Khwarshi: Karimova 2014; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 34; Bokarev 1959: 144.
Kwantlada Khwarshi: lokʾo {локIо} 'heart' Karimova 2014; Khalilova 2009: 45.

Proto-Tsezic: NCED: 678. Distribution: One of the most stable Proto-Tsezic roots, retained in its basic meaning in all Tsezic lects.

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular.
Semantics and structure: Primary substantive root.

41. HORN

Hunzib (proper) šelu {иелу} (1), Bezhta (proper) šelo {иело} (1), Khoshar-Khota Bezhta šelo (1), Tlyadal Bezhta šelō (1), Hinukh tama ~ tami {тама, тами} (2), Kidero Dido šilu {иилу} (1), Sagada Dido šilu {иилу} (1), Khwarshi (proper) šeru {иеру} (1), Inkhokwari Khwarshi šelʾu {иелʾу} (1), Proto-Tsezic *šelu ~ *šelu A (1).
References and notes:


Khoshar-Khota Bezhta: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 45.

Tlyadal Bezhta: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 45.


Inkhokwari Khwarshi: Karimova 2014; Bokarev 1959: 45; 327; Bokarev 1959: 150.


Distribution: Retained as the independent personal pronoun of the 1st p. in all Tsezic lects. Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular.

Semantics and structure: Primary pronominal root.

42. I

Hunzib (proper) да {да} (1), Bezhta (proper) да {до} (1), Khoshar-Khota Bezhta да (1), Tlyadal Bezhta да (1), Hinukh де {дель} (1), Kidero Dido ди {ди} (1), Sagada Dido ди (1), Khwarshi (proper) да {да} (1), Inkhokwari Khwarshi да (1), Proto-Tsezic *дə (1).

References and notes:


Khoshar-Khota Bezhta: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 221. Oblique forms are not documented.


Common Dido: The same in other dialects: Asakh ди [abs., erg.]/ де [gen.]/ ди- [obl.]; Mokok ди [abs., erg.]/ де [gen.]/ ди- [obl.]; Shaytl ди [abs., erg.]/ де [gen.]/ ди- [obl.]; Shapikh ди [abs., erg.]/ де [gen.]/ ди- [obl.]


Kwantlada Khwarshi: ди [abs.]/ ди [gen.]/ ди- [obl.]


Semantics and structure: Primary pronominal root. The oblique stem is ‘ди-’.

43. KILL

Hunzib (proper) CLASS=iλ’е {дугьял} (1), Bezhta (proper) CLASS=iλ’е {йукъал} (1), Khoshar-Khota Bezhta CLASS=ию-л (2) / CLASS=iλ’е (1), Tlyadal Bezhta CLASS=iλ’е (1), Hinukh CLASS=уке-р {дугьера} (2), Kidero Dido CLASS=еху-у-р {дехура} (2), Sagada Dido CLASS=еху-у-r
{δεχυπα} (2). Khwarshi (proper) $\text{CLASS}=\text{iyaχ} \sim \text{CLASS}=$ $\text{ihαχ}$ {ιώαχα, ιγβαχα} (3). Inkhokvari Khwarshi $\text{CLASS}=\omega χ$ {δαχα} (3), Proto-Tsezic *$\text{CLASS}=\text{iΑV}$ (1).

References and notes:

Hunzib (proper): Isakov & Khalilov 2001: 39, 239; van den Berg 1995: 306; Bokarev 1961: 156, 181. Examples in [Isakov & Khalilov 2001] make it clear that this is the basic verb for 'to kill'.

Distinct from $\text{CLASS}=\text{uha}$- [иwaχa] 'to spoil / to kill', $\text{CLASS}=\text{uha}$- [иbъuла] 'to spoil / to destroy / to kill' [Isakov & Khalilov 2001: 45, 239; van den Berg 1995: 337; Bokarev 1961: 166, 181] - causatives from $\text{CLASS}=\text{uha}$ 'to die / to get spoilt' q.v.

Bezhta (proper): Khalilov 1995: 121, 342; Madieva 1965: 162. Polysemy: 'to kill / to throw, hurl / to shoot' (rather two homonymous verbs 'to kill' & 'to throw, to shoot').

Khoshar-Khota Bezhta: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 170. Regular causative from $\text{CLASS}=\text{uha}$ 'to die' q.v. The second synonym for 'to kill' is the primary verb $\text{CLASS}=\text{iV}$, quoted by M. Khalilov, p.c.M. Khalilov, p.c.


Hunzib: Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 104, 536. Polysemy: 'to kill / to spoil'. Regular causative from $\text{CLASS}=\text{uhe}$ 'to die / to get spoilt' q.v.


Distinct from the causatives from the more rare verbs for 'to die': $\text{tiq}-r$ [тиаιпа] with polysemy: 'to finish (trans.) / to kill' [Khalilov 1999: 175], $\text{tiq}-r$ [тиухйяхура] with polysemy: 'to dry (trans.) / to kill' [Khalilov 1999: 175], $\text{in}-\text{er}$ [раярлпа] 'to kill' (only of animals?) [Khalilov 1999: 94].


Common Dido: $\text{CLASS}=\text{εχα}-r$ is a regular causative from $\text{CLASS}=\text{εχα}$ 'to die / to get spoilt' q.v.


A second equivalent for 'to kill' is $\text{CLASS}=\text{ihαχ}$ [ираχα] 'to kill' [Sharafutdinova & Levina 1961: 115] with the example "The wolf said: 'Should I kill you?" [Sharafutdinova & Levina 1961: 117] - regular causative from $\text{CLASS}=\text{ii}^\text{'}{\text{O}}$ 'to die' q.v.

Distinct from the more specific verb $\text{CLASS}=\text{iχ}-\text{ad}$ 'to slaughter' [Sharafutdinova & Levina 1961: 119; Bokarev 1959: 148].

Inkhokvari Khwarshi: Karimova 2014.

Distinct from the more specific Inkhokvari verb $\text{CLASS}=\text{uχ}-\text{ad}$ 'to slaughter' [Bokarev 1959: 148].

Kwantlada Khwarshi: $\text{CLASS}=\text{uoχ}$ [уоохα] 'to kill' [Karimova 2014; Khalilova 2009: 70]. The contracted variant $\text{CLASS}=\text{εχα}$ is also attested [Khalilova 2009: 191]. Cf. some examples: "Having fallen, the post killed the man" [Khalilova 2009: 70]; "When they were killed in Finland, and when there was a treaty with them, ..." [Khalilova 2009: 191]: 'He was going to kill her' [Khalilova 2009: 195]: "If you like, kill me" [Khalilova 2009: 414]: "Magomed killed Mesedo at the place where she was sleeping" [Khalilova 2009: 420]: "his raven had been killed" [Khalilova 2009: 422]; and so on.

A second Kwantlada candidate is the verb $\text{a}^\text{'}{\text{h}}$ (i.e., $\text{CLASS}=\text{a}^\text{'}{\text{h}}^?$), quoted with the gloss 'to kill' in [Khalilova 2009: 17], but no examples have been found.

Distinct from the more specific Kwantlada verb $\text{CLASS}=\text{ueχ}-\text{ad}$ ~ $\text{CLASS}=\text{ueχ}^\text{'}-\text{ad}$ 'to slaughter' [Khalilova 2009: 307, 315, 393, 423].

Common Khwarshi: It is likely that $\text{ιωαχ}$ (Khwarshi proper) / $\text{ιαχ}$ (Inkhokvari) / $\text{ωαχ}$ (Kwantlada) represent the lengthened grade of the root $\text{iχ}^\text{'}$ (Khwarshi proper) / $\text{iχ}$ (Inkhokvari, Kwantlada), attested in the suffixal stems 'to slaughter', quoted above ($\text{iχ}^\text{'}-\text{ad}$ / $\text{ωαχ}-\text{ad}$). Cf. similar, although not identical, root lengthening in general tense [Sharafutdinova & Levina 1961: 116; Bokarev 1959: 166; Khalilova 2009: 185]. The main difficulty is that the Khwarshi proper form is $\text{ιωαχ}$ 'to kill', not the expected labialized $\sim\text{ιωαχ}$, although in modern data, collected by Karimova, labialization is often lost.

Proto-Tsezic: NCED: 661. Distribution: Retained as the basic verb for 'to kill' only in East Tsezic, except for Khoshar-Khota Bezhta; lost in other lects.

In the majority of West Tsezic lects plus Khoshar-Khota Bezhta, the meaning 'to kill' is expressed by synchronic causative stems from the verb 'to die' q.v. (*$\text{CLASS}=\text{iχ}^\text{'}\text{V}$ [NCED: 635]). In Hunzib, it coexists with *$\text{CLASS}=\text{iAV}$. In Khwarshi, 'to kill' is derived from the verb 'to slaughter' (*$\text{CLASS}=\text{iχ}^\text{'}\text{V}$ [NCED: 635], although the causative stem from 'to die' is also present.

External comparison definitely suggests that the Proto-Tsezic verb for 'to kill' was *$\text{CLASS}=\text{iAV}$, whereas causative stems from 'to die' represent late introductions (formally, such a causative pattern can be reconstructed for the Proto-West Tsezic level, but it is clearly secondary in Khoshar-Khota Bezhta & Hunzib).
44. KNEE

Hunzib (proper) *mična (мицна) (1), Bezhta (proper) *micsa (мица) (1), Khoshar-Khota Bezhta *aga (2), Tlyadal Bezhta *aga (2), Hinukh *bečnu (бедны) (1), Kidero Dido *bečni (бедни) (1), Sagada Dido *q‘ontu (къонты) (3), Khwarshi (proper) *q‘ontu (къонты) (3), Inkhokwari Khwarshi *gurtu (гурту) (4), Proto-Tsezic *bičnV(1).

References and notes:


In [NCED: 594], Hunzib *ãga ‘knee-cap’ is quoted, not found in other sources.


Distinct from the more specific term *aga [a'na] ‘knee-cap, patella’ [Khalilov 1995: 34], which is quoted, however, in [Madieva 1965: 148] as the basic equivalent for 'knee'.


Distinct from *micna ‘shin (part of leg from knee to foot)' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 31].

Tlyadal Bezhta: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 32.

Distinct from *mična ‘shin (part of leg from knee to foot)' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 31].

Hinukh: [Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 77, 454. In [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 32], erroneously glossed as 'knee-cap, patella'.

Distinction of the more specific *q‘ontu (къонты) ‘knee-cap, patella’ [Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 220]. In [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 32], erroneously glossed as generic 'knee'.


Distinct from specific *q‘ontu (къонты) ‘knee-cap, patella’ [Khalilov 1999: 152], which is transcribed as *q‘ontu and erroneously glossed as generic 'knee' in [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 32].


A second Inkhokwari term for 'knee' is *Xehenu (хехену) [Karimova 2014; Bokarev 1959: 145, 150]; according to [Karimova 2014], *gurtu and *Xehenu are full synonyms, but the latter one is less frequently used.


Proto-Tsezic: NCED: 1042. Distribution: In many lects the lexical opposition 'knee' (i.e., an external body part) / 'knee-cap' (i.e., a specific bone) is attested, and the same should be reconstructed for Proto-Tsezic. Unfortunately, these two concepts are sometimes not distinguished by field linguists, which is why we observe some confusion in the data listed above.

Nevertheless, *bičnV [NCED: 1042] can be safely reconstructed as Proto-Tsezic 'knee'. It is retained in its basic meaning in some East Tsezic (Hunzib, Bezhta proper) and some West Tsezic (Hinukh, Kidero Dido) lects.

In Khoshar-Khota Bezhta & Tlyadal Bezhta, *bičnV was superseded by *ʔãgV, having shifted in the meaning ‘shin (part of leg from knee to foot)’. The original meaning of *ʔãgV [NCED: 594] is unclear, but it could be the Proto-East Tsezic term for 'knee-cap' (it means this in Bezhta proper).

In Sagada Dido and Khwarshi proper, the basic term for 'knee' was superseded by *q‘ontV (if the field records are correct). The original Proto-West Tsezic meaning of *q‘ontV was 'knee-cap', as it is retained in Hinukh and non-Sagada Dido. In any case, *q‘ontV with the generic meaning 'knee' is a secondary match between Sagada Dido and Khwarshi proper.

In Inkhokwari Khwarshi, the basic term for 'knee' was superseded by two unclear forms: *gurtu (cf. [NCED: 434]) and
'exemu.

Replacements: {'knee' > 'shin (part of leg from knee to foot)'} (Khoshar-Khota Bezhta, Tlyadal Bezhta).
Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular except for the nasal assimilation b-n > m-n in East Tsezic.
Semantics and structure: Primary substantive root.

45. KNOW

Hunzib (proper) \textit{CLASS}=iq'e \{δικτα\} (1), Bezhta (proper) \textit{CLASS}=iq'e \{ιιικτα\} (1), Khoshar-Khota Bezhta \textit{CLASS}=iq'e (1), Tlyadal Bezhta \textit{CLASS}=iq'e (1), Hinukh \textit{CLASS}=eq'i \{δεκτα\} (1), Kidero Dido \textit{CLASS}=iya \sim \textit{CLASS}=iy \{διι\α\} (1), Sagada Dido \textit{CLASS}=eq'i \{δεκτα\} (1), Khwarshi (proper) \textit{CLASS}=iq'e \{λικτα\} (1), Inkhokwari Khwarshi \textit{CLASS}=iq' \{λικτα\} (1), Proto-Tsezic \textit{*CLASS}=iq'\textit{V} (1).

References and notes:

\textbf{Hunzib (proper):} Isakov & Khalilov 2001: 39, 202; van den Berg 1995: 306; Bokarev 1961: 156, 175. Polysemy: 'to know / to be able'.
\textbf{Bezhta (proper):} Khalilov 1995: 120, 308; Madieva 1965: 162.
\textbf{Hinukh:} Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 67, 446. Polysemy: 'to know / to feel (e.g., odor, cold)'.
\textbf{Kidero Dido:} Khalilov 1999: 55, 328. Polysemy: 'to know / to feel (e.g., cold)'.
\textbf{Distinct from} č'aɬ \{чIальа\} 'to get to know' [Khalilov 1999: 285].

\textbf{Sagada Dido:} Abduluev 2014.
\textbf{Kwantlada Khwarshi:} \textit{CLASS}=iq' \{лик\а\} 'to know' [Karimova 2014; Khalilova 2009: 27, 152, 181]. Cf. the present form \textit{CLASS}=iq'-še [Khalilova 2009: 152].

\textbf{Proto-Tsezic:} NCED: 646. Distribution: One of the most stable Proto-Tsezic roots, retained in its basic meaning in all lects.
Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular.
Semantics and structure: Primary verbal root.

46. LEAF

Hunzib (proper) \textit{λιβυ} \{λιυ\ο\γ\} (1), Bezhta (proper) \textit{λιβο} \{λιυ\ο\δ\} (1), Khoshar-Khota Bezhta \textit{λιβο} (1), Tlyadal Bezhta \textit{λιβο} (1), Hinukh \textit{λεβυ} \{λιε\ο\γ\} (1), Kidero Dido \textit{λεβ} \{λιε\ο\δ\} (1), Sagada Dido \textit{λεβ} \{λιε\ο\δ\} (1), Khwarshi (proper) \textit{λιβ} \{λιυ\ο\δ\} (1), Inkhokwari Khwarshi \textit{λιβ} \{λιυ\ο\δ\} (1), Proto-Tsezic \textit{*A}i\textit{b} \sim \textit{*A}i\textit{b}u A (1).

References and notes:

\textbf{Distinct from} the more specific term \textit{λαπα} \{κανα\} 'large leaf' [Isakov & Khalilov 2001: 101, 210].
\textbf{Distinct from} \textit{λαπα} \{κανα\}, which is glossed as 'leaf (of tree or plant)' [Khalilov 1995: 161, 314]; not quoted in [Madieva 1965]. Apparently \textit{λαπα} is a more marginal term than \textit{λιβ}, because all the attested examples for the meaning 'leaf' contain the word \textit{λιβ}: "to rustle the leaves" [Khalilov 1995: 37], "Leaves are stirring" [Khalilov 1995: 176]. "Stirring

Proto-Tsezic: NCED: 571.

Distribution: One of the most stable Proto-Tsezic roots, retained in its basic meaning in all Tsezic lects.
Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular except for *a in Kidero Dido and loss of final *-u in some West Tsezic lects.
Semantics and structure: Primary substantive root.

47. LIE

Hunzib (proper) CLASS=ut' {δωμλα} (1), Bezhta (proper) CLASS=ut' {уймлa} (1) / CLASS=äko CLASS=ä' skeptical 'to lie / to sleep'. Koshar-Khota Bezhta CLASS=ut' (1) / CLASS=ako CLASS=ä' skeptical (2), Tlyadal Bezhta CLASS=ut' (1) / CLASS=äko CLASS=ä' skeptical (2), Hinukh CLASS=ut' {бóмлa} (1), Kidero Dido CLASS=aˤ 'u {бáкьa} (3) / kec {кецa} (4), Sagada Dido pur-Λ'or c'ɔxʷ {пуркьор улòцa} (5), Khwarshi (proper) CLASS=aq {ахьa} (6), Inkhokwari Khwarshi CLASS=aqʰ ~ CLASS=aq {алкьaл, ахьa} (6), Proto-Tsezic *CLASS=ítʷ(1).

References and notes:

Hunzib (proper): Isakov & Khalilov 2001: 46. Polysemy: 'to lie / to sleep'.
Bezhta (proper): Khalilov 1995: 136, 314; Madieva 1965: 188. Polysemy: 'to lie / to lie down / to sleep'. Also, as noted by M. Khalilov (p.c.), CLASS=ut' is rarely used as 'to sleep', it is not a basic verb for this meaning.
Two synonymous expressions for 'to lie' are quoted in [Khalilov 1995]: primary =ut' and complex =äko =ä' skeptical. Both with polysemy: 'to lie / to lie down'.Khalilov 1995: 111, 314.
Two synonymous expressions for 'to lie down' are quoted in [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988]: primary =ut' and complex =äko =ä'. We assume that both actually possess the polysemy: 'to lie / to lie down'; the former one, =ut', possesses the full polysemy: 'to lie / to lie down / to sleep'.Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 88. Morphophonologically =äko; for old nasalization cf. the class 3 form m=äko < *b=äko.
Two synonymous expressions for 'to lie down' are quoted in [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988]: primary =ut' and complex =äko =ä'. We assume that both actually possess the polysemy: 'to lie / to lie down'; the former one, =ut', possesses the full polysemy: 'to lie / to lie down / to sleep'.Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 88.
Common Bezhta: The Common Bezhta collocation CLASS=äko CLASS=ä' skeptical consists of the verb =ä' skeptical 'to go' q.v., regularly inflected with TMA suffixes, and the uninflected element =äko, whose meaning is unknown, because =äko is not attested outside of this expression. Formally, =äko is an adjectival.
Hinukh: Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 99, 460. Polysemy: 'to lie / to lie down / to sleep'.
Kidero Dido: Khalilov 1999: 42, 338. Polysemy: 'to lie / to fall (in general) / to go sprawling'.
Two synonymous expressions for 'to lie' are quoted in [Khalilov 1999] and illustrated with a number of textual examples: =ä' skeptical (also means 'to fall') and kec (also means 'to sleep'). We have to treat them as synonyms.Khalilov 1999: 138, 338. Polysemy: 'to lie / to lie down / to sleep / to die'.
Sagada Dido: Abdulaev 2014. Elicited in the contexts "Man can stand, sit, or lie", "Why are you lying in bed?", Literally 'to stick in, being in the lateral position' with lative pur-Λ'or from pu, obl. pur- 'side (anatomic)' and the verb c'ɔxʷ", which corresponds
to Kidero čọχ 'to get in, stick in' [Khalilov 1999: 279].

**Khwarshi (proper):** Karimova 2014. Polysemy: 'to lie / to sleep'.

**Inkhokwari Khwarshi:** Karimova 2014; Bokarev 1959: 164, 166, 170. Polysemy: 'to lie / to sleep'. In [Bokarev 1959: 163], once transcribed as "aq" [ахъа] (a typo).

**Kwantlada Khwarshi:** CLASS=aq' [алчам] with polysemy: 'to lie / to lie down' [Karimova 2014; Khalilova 2009: 16, 180].

**Proto-Tsezic:**

NCED: 1035. Distribution: Tsezic verbs for 'to lie' and 'to sleep' can be summarized in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hunzib</th>
<th>Bezhta</th>
<th>Hinukh</th>
<th>Kidero Dido</th>
<th>Sagada Dido</th>
<th>Khwarshi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'LIE', 'SLEEP'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLASS=it&quot; [NCED: 1035]</td>
<td>lie / sleep</td>
<td>lie / sleep</td>
<td>lie / sleep</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLASS=a documentos missing</td>
<td>lie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLASS=ɑlɑ</td>
<td>lie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*včč</td>
<td>lie / sleep</td>
<td>sleep</td>
<td>lie / sleep</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLASS=ɑqˤ(V)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>CLASS=ɑqˤ(V)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>lie / sleep</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>CLASS=ɑqˤ(V)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>be in the lateral position = lie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>CLASS=ɑqˤ(V)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>'be in the lateral position' = lie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>CLASS=ɑqˤ(V)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The verb "CLASS=it" can be safely postulated as the Proto-East Tsezic basic term with polysemy 'to lie / to sleep'. The same meaning in Hinukh could theoretically be explained as the result of secondary influence from East Tsezic, but actually all other West Tsezic verbs for 'to lie' and 'to sleep' can be analyzed as later introductions in individual lects. Thus, the easiest solution is to reconstruct Proto-Tsezic "CLASS=it" 'to lie / to sleep', which was retained in East Tsezic and Hinukh, having been superseded by various (sometimes obscure) verbs in the majority of West Tsezic lects.

It should be noted that Khwarshi 'to sleep' is of unclear origin. The idea that it could be a compound of two verbs 'to sleep' [NCED: 619] and 'to sleep' [NCED: 1037] (both are not attested elsewhere in Tsezic, although both possess appropriate North Caucasian comparanda) does not look apt.

**Replacements:** {'to fall' > 'to lie'} (Kidero Dido); {'to be in the lateral position' > 'to lie'} (Sagada Dido).

**Reconstruction shape:** Correspondences seem regular.

**Semantics and structure:** Primary verbal stem with polysemy: 'to lie / to sleep'.

**48. LIVER**

Hunzib (proper) šebu (шебу) (1), Bezhta (proper) šebo (шебо) (1), Khoshar-Khota Bezhta šebo (1), Tlyadal Bezhta šebö (1), Hinukh žubo (жубо) (1), Kidero Dido žubi (жуби) (1), Sagada Dido žubi (жуби) (1), Khwarshi (proper) žuba ~ žiba (жуба) (1), Inkhokwari Khwarshi žubu (жубу) (1), Proto-Tsezic *žebu B* (1).

**References and notes:**


**Khoshar-Khota Bezhta:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 35.

**Tlyadal Bezhta:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 34.

**Hinukh:** Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 168, 489; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 34.


**Kidero Dido:** Khalilov 1999: 120, 356; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 34.
Inkhokwari Khwarshi: Karimova 2014; Bokarev & Kodzasov 1990: 34. In [Bokarev 1959: 146], an unclear form čiγq ‘liver’ is quoted.

Proto-Tsezic: NCED: 1106. Distribution: One of the most stable Proto-Tsezic roots, retained in its basic meaning in all Tsezic lects.
Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular except for the form metathesis in e-u > u-e in Proto-West Tsezic.
Semantics and structure: Primary substantive root.

49. LONG
Hunzib (proper) CLASS=iχːɔl-u {баχала} (1), Bezhta (proper) CLASS=iχːɔl-o {вуχала} (1), Khoshar-Khota Bezhta CLASS=iχːɔl-o (1), Tlyadal Bezhta CLASS=iχːɔl-o (1), Hinukh CLASS=оχːɔr-u {баχору} (1), Kidero Dido CLASS=ɛχːora {бешора} (1), Sagada Dido CLASS=ɛχːora {бешора} (1), Khwarshi (proper) CLASS=ɛχːora {бешора} (1), Inkhokwari Khwarshi CLASS=iχːala ~ CLASS=iχːala {вуχала} (1), Proto-Tsezic *CLASS=iχːɔIV(1).

References and notes:
Kidero Dido: Khalilov 1999: 48, 320; Bokarev & Kodzasov 1990: 236. Polysemy: 'long (spatial) / long (temporal) / tall (of person)'.
Inkhokwari Khwarshi: Karimova 2014; Bokarev & Kodzasov 1990: 236; Bokarev 1959: 145, 158, 159. The variant =iχala is from [Bokarev & Kodzasov 1990; Bokarev 1959]. Polysemy: 'long (spatial) / long (temporal) / tall (of person)'.

Proto-Tsezic: NCED: 550. Distribution: One of the most stable Proto-Tsezic roots, retained in its basic meaning in all Tsezic lects.
Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular except for some vowel peculiarities.
Semantics and structure: Primary substantive root with polysemy: 'long (spatial) / long (temporal) / tall (of person)'.

50. LOUSE
Hunzib (proper) naco {нαцо} (1), Bezhta (proper) naco {нαцо} (1), Khoshar-Khota Bezhta naco (1), Tlyadal Bezhta naco (1), Hinukh noce {нοцε} (1), Kidero Dido noci {нοци} (1), Sagada Dido noci {нοци} (1), Khwarshi (proper) nica {нigkeit} (1), Inkhokwari Khwarshi nico {нοци} (1), Proto-Tsezic *naco A (1).

References and notes:
Distinct from kākā {калк), enigmatically glossed as ‘small louse’ in [Khalilov 1995: 144] (a nursery word?).
Tlyadal Bezhta: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 93.
   Distinct from kaki (каки), enigmatically glossed as ‘small louse’ in [Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 192] (a nursery word?).
   Distinct from banti (бант), enigmatically glossed as ‘small louse’ in [Khalilov 1999: 263].
Common Dido: The same in other dialects: Mokok noca (ноца) ‘louse’ [Khalilov 1999: 200].
   Distribution: One of the most stable Proto-Tsezic roots, retained in its basic meaning in all Tsezic lects.
   Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular.
   Semantics and structure: Primary substantive root.

51. MAN
Hunzib (proper) suk‘u (сукIу) (1), Bezhta (proper) abo (аbо) (2), Khoshar-Khota Bezhta bixinči (-1), Tlyadal Bezhta bikinči (-1), Hinukh rek‘e (рекIе) (1), Kidero Dido žek‘u (жекIу) (1), Sagada Dido baħarči (бахIарчI) (-1), Khwarshi (proper) žik‘ʷa (жикIва) (1), Inkhokwari Khwarshi hik‘o (гьикIо) (-1), Proto-Tsezic *žik‘ʷə ~ *zik‘ʷə A (1).

References and notes:
   A second candidate is the loanword bikinči (бикинчи) with polysemy: ‘man / brave man, fine young man’ [Khalilov 1995: 46, 317]. This word seems more marginal in the meaning ‘man’ than the inherited form abo, because in almost all the attested examples for ‘man’, Bezhta uses abo: “Men have come to see us” [Khalilov 1995: 24], “brave man” [Khalilov 1995: 83]. “The men talked until the midnight” [Khalilov 1995: 107], “Quarrel is not man’s matter” [Khalilov 1995: 124], “The men were walking around” [Khalilov 1995: 172].
   Distinct from the inherited form abo ‘father’ [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 59].
   Distinct from the inherited form abo ‘father’ [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 59].
Common Bezhta: The Common Bezhta terms bikinči ‘man’, bikinab ‘male’, bet‘erhan ‘husband’ represent borrowings from Avar bixinči ‘man’, bixina-b ‘male’, bet‘erhan ‘husband / Lord’. It should be noted that Avar χ (missing from the Bezhta system) is replaced by Bezhta k, not by Bezhta χ.
   The Bezhta proper meaning ‘man’ of the inherited form abo ‘father’ is not obligatorily a Proto-Bezhta feature. Polysemy ‘father / man’ can be a recent Bezhta proper introduction, as is the parallel case of Bezhta proper polysemy ‘mother / woman’ for Common Bezhta iyo ‘mother’ (see notes on ‘woman’).


There is also a borrowed term: bikinči [бикинчи] with polysemy: ‘man / brave man’ [Khalilov 1999: 56] (< Avar bikinči ‘man’).


Distinct from two terms for ‘husband’: inherited ḥayq’o ~ ḥayq’u [χαιχι, χαιχι] ‘husband / master / Lord’ [Khalilov 1999: 48] (< Avar bet'erhan ‘husband / Lord’).


Distinct from ḥol ‘husband’ [Sharaufutdinova & Levina 1961: 95].

Inkhokwari Khwarshi: Karimova 2014; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 59; Khalilova 2009: 8. Polysemy: ‘man / person’. We assume that Inkhokwari hiko was borrowed from or at least phonetically influenced by Tindi hek“a ‘man / person’.

Distinct from Inkhokwari ḥol ‘husband’ [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 59]. It should be noted that in the only instance in [Bokarev 1959: 161], ḥol is used in the meaning ‘man’.

Kwantlada Khwarshi: žik’o [жико] ‘man’ [Karimova 2014; Khalilova 2009: 8, 14, 42].

Distinct from Kwantlada ḥol ‘husband’ [Khalilova 2009: 15].

Proto-Tsezic: NCED: 336, 579. Distribution: Generally well preserved, although it tends to be superseded by various loanwords. Normally attested with polysemy ‘man / person’, which should be reconstructed for Proto-Tsezic.

In Bezhta proper, retained in the meaning ‘person’, but superseded by the inherited ‘ʔebu A ‘father’ [NCED: 217] in the meaning ‘man’.

Replacements: (‘father’ > ‘man’) (Bezhta proper).

Reconstruction shape: Although all the forms are obviously related, reflexes of the initial consonant are quite irregular: ‘z’- in East Tsezic, ʔ- in West Tsezic, besides that, r- in Hinukh and b- in Inkhokwari Khwarshi (in the latter case, the laryngeal onset can be explained by Andian influence).

Semantics and structure: Perhaps a primary substantive root with polysemy: ‘man / person’.

Differently in [NCED: 336, 579], where it is analyzed as a compound (‘z-ik”o ~ ‘z-ik”o’), which consists of two words for ‘man’ (both with North Caucasian etymology). The root ‘z- ~ ‘z- is not attested elsewhere in Tsezic, but according to [NCED: 579], Hinukh rek”e and Inkhokwari Khwarshi hiko only reflect the second part of the compound < Proto-Tsezic *rik”o ~ *hik”o (< Pre-Proto-Tsezic *hik”V). However, such a scenario faces serious difficulties: besides strange phonetic development, it is unclear how plain *hik”o could survive in Inkhokwari Khwarshi, when other Khwarshi dialects have *žik”o; the same objection is applicable to *rik”o in Hinukh.

52. MANY

Hunzib (proper) telí {тели} (1) / laχi {лаххи} (2), Bezhta (proper) telí {тели} (1), Khoshar-Khota Bezhta telí (1), Tlyadal Bezhta CLASS=ʔḷí’ (3), Hinukh aši ~ ʔaši {аши, ʔлаши} (4), Kidero Dido CLASS=ʔq”u {баликъу} (5), Sagada Dido ʔaši {глаши} (4) / CLASS=ʔq”u {паликъу} (5), Khwarshi (proper) fežažaš ~ fezižaš {зэзашан, зезисан} (6), Inkhokwari Khwarshi fežažaš ~ fezižaš ~ ezəšan {зезаишан} (6), Proto-Tsezic *telí (1).

References and notes:

There are two synonymous adverbs in Hunzib, both with polysemy: ‘many / much / often’ - \textit{teli} and \textit{laɬi}.

Cf. the discovered examples for \textit{teli} ‘many’: “many errors” [Isakov & Khalilov 2001: 58], “Many goods were delivered in the store” [Isakov & Khalilov 2001: 153], “there were many people from Tladal” [van den Berg 1995: 180].

Cf. the discovered examples for \textit{laɬi} ‘many’: “there are many goats on our mountain” [Isakov & Khalilov 2001: 27], “there are many people” [Isakov & Khalilov 2001: 56], “We heard many songs” [Isakov & Khalilov 2001: 134], “They took many things in the warehouse” [Isakov & Khalilov 2001: 149].

We treat \textit{teli} and \textit{laɬi} as synonyms.

A third candidate is \textit{класс=ивец’} with the same polysemy: ‘much / many / often’ [van den Berg 1995: 307; Bokarev 1961: 156], but this one seems more marginal. The only discovered example is “We don’t often (\textit{=ивец’}) eat beef” [Isakov & Khalilov 2001: 178]. Historically, \textit{=изе-’} although the suffixal pattern is not entirely clear.Isakov & Khalilov 2001: 109, 213; van den Berg 1995: 314; Bokarev 1961: 159, 177.


There are multiple Bezhta equivalents for the meanings ‘many’ or ‘much’ listed in [Khalilov 1995: 316]. Browsing through the source demonstrates that \textit{teli} is definitely the most frequent word for the meaning ‘many’. Cf. some examples: “The woodcutter has chopped a lot of wood” [Khalilov 1995: 31], “There are many anxieties in the soul” [Khalilov 1995: 50], “People have a lot of cattle” [Khalilov 1995: 51], “There are many people in the railway station” [Khalilov 1995: 53], “a lot of clothes” [Khalilov 1995: 55], “a lot of smoke” [Khalilov 1995: 63], “to prepare many bundles of wood” [Khalilov 1995: 64], “There were many mistakes in the dictionary” [Khalilov 1995: 66], “many pebbles” [Khalilov 1995: 67], “many children”, “Many years have passed” [Khalilov 1995: 237], and so on.

Out of the other expressions for ‘many’, one should mention:

1) \textit{элл’-ас} [\textit{аслаш}] with polysemy: ‘many / rural, of village’ [Khalilov 1995: 32]; the examples: “many people”, “many books”; derived from \textit{эл} ‘village, \textit{asul} many people, crowd’, i.e. ‘many’ as ‘crowd-like’;

2) \textit{ил-л’} [\textit{илл’ош}] [Khalilov 1995: 212]; the examples: “I have a lot of books (lit: There are a lot of books of mine)”, “There is a lot of earth tilled with tractor”; regular past tense from \textit{ил} ‘to be sufficient’ [Khalilov 1995: 211].

3) \textit{ladi} [\textit{лаш}] [Khalilov 1995: 316; Madieva 1965: 173], missing from the main section of [Khalilov 1995].


Out of a substantial number of more specific or marginal Hinukh terms for ‘many’ and ‘much’ (both inherited and borrowed), one should also mention \textit{рафал} [\textit{рааш}] with polysemy: ‘sea / many’ [Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 299] (< Avar \textit{рафа} ‘sea’).


Distinct from more marginal or specific terms:

1) \textit{тақо-сы} [\textit{таалок}] with polysemy: ‘many / rural, of village’ [Khalilov 1999: 105], derived from \textit{таль} ‘village, \textit{асул} many people, crowd’, i.e. ‘many’ as ‘crowd-like’;

2) \textit{чуну} [\textit{чоми}] ‘much’ [Khalilov 1999: 249];


Two different Sagada words for ‘many’ are offered in [Abdulaev 2014]: \textit{гаси} in the context “There are many stones on the ground” and \textit{класс=q’у} in the context “I have many friends”. We have to treat both forms as synonyms, although it should be noted that Abdulaev’s \textit{гаси} in the context “There are many stones on the ground” could actually express a concept of a \textit{thick} layer of stones.Abdulaev 2014.


A second, apparently more marginal, expression for ‘many’ is \textit{дака-н} [\textit{дакан}] [Karimova 2014], which is quoted as \textit{дака-н} ‘completely, in full’ in [Sharaftudinova & Levina 1961: 121].


A second, apparently more marginal Inkhokwari expression for ‘many’ is \textit{доко-н} [\textit{докан}] [Karimova 2014].


A second, apparently more marginal, Kwantlada expression for ‘many’ is \textit{доко-н} [\textit{докан}] [Karimova 2014; Khalilova
2009: 283]. Cf. the example: "many mullahs from villages" [Khalilova 2009: 283].

**Common Khwarshi:** The Common Khwarshi form for 'many / much' originates from something like "eʔz-yaʔan, although the suffix -ʔan is not entirely clear.

The competing adverb *daco-n, daco-n* is derived from the interrogative pronoun 'how many?': Khwarshi proper *dayci (< *daco-V*) [Sharafuddinova & Levin 1961: 109]. Kwantlada *daco* [Khalilova 2009: 153].

**Proto-Tsezic:** Distribution: An unstable word with many (quasi)-synonyms in individual lects.

In East Tsezic (Hunzib, Bezhta), 'many' is expressed by the form *telI. Formally, *telI can be reconstructed as the Proto-East Tsezic term for this meaning. It must be noted, however, that East Tsezic *telI lacks any etymology and therefore represents a potential loanword. In Tlyadal Bezhta, *telI was superseded by CLASS=*liʔ 'many', which looks inherited, but seems to lack any Tsezic etymology.

In Hinukh and the Dido dialects two words with the meaning 'many' occur in a "criss-crossed" interdialectal situation: CLASS=aq'ˤu and (ʔaši. In both cases, 'many' is a secondary meaning; CLASS=aq'ˤu originates from Proto-Tsezic *CLASS=aq'ˤV 'big' q.v. (ʔaši < Proto-Tsezic *qaš- 'thick (2D)' [NCED: 608] (*qaš- retains the meaning 'thick', e.g., in Kidero Dido).

Topologically, the best candidate for the Proto-Tsezic status is *CLASS=IəʔI V ~ *ʔI V B [NCED: 653], which is attested as the plain stem 'big' in Hinukh and Dido and as the suffixed stem 'many' in Khwarshi (*eʔz-yaʔan) and Hunzib (CLASS=ɪɛʔ- ʔa). But the fact that Khwarshi and Hunzib demonstrate different suffixal patterns suggests that we deal with late independent introductions in Khwarshi and Hunzib. The original meaning of *CLASS=IəʔI V remains unclear (Hinukh & Dido 'big' q.v. is likewise secondary).

From the external point of view, the best candidate for the Proto-Tsezic status is *laɛçi (~ -ɛçi), attested as isolated Hunzib *laɛçi 'many', but having possible North Caucasian comparanda with the meaning 'many'. However, it is hard to suppose that *laɛçi survived with its original meaning 'many' only in Hunzib.

Formally, we fill the Proto-Tsezic slot with East Tsezic *telI, which lacks North Caucasian comparanda. Replacements: ['village, crowd > 'many'] (Bezhta proper, Kidero Dido); ['to be sufficient > 'many'] (Bezhta proper); ['sea > 'many'] (Hinukh); ['thick (2D) > 'many'] (Hinukh, Sagada Dido); ['big > 'many'] (Kidero Dido, Sagada Dido); ['how many? > 'many'] (Khwarshi proper, Inkhokwari Khwarshi, Kwantlada Khwarshi).

**Reconstruction shape:** Correspondences seem regular.

**Semantics and structure:** Probably an adverb form.

53. MEAT

Hunzib (proper) χo {xo} (1), Bezhta (proper) χo {xo} (1), Khoshar-Khota Bezhta χo (1), Tlyadal Bezhta χo (1), Hinukh χu {xy} (1), Kidero Dido reλ {peλI} (2), Sagada Dido reλ {peλI} (2), Khwarshi (proper) liλ {auiI} (2), Inkhokwari Khwarshi liλ {auiI} (2), Proto-Tsezic *rIλ ~ *lIλ A (2).

**References and notes:**


Distinct from cis {με} 'meat', specified as a nursery word in [Khalilov 1995: 267].

**Khoshar-Khota Bezhta:** Bikrib & Kodzasov 1990: 121.

**Tlyadal Bezhta:** Bikrib & Kodzasov 1990: 121.

**Hinukh:** Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 356, 468; Bikrib & Kodzasov 1990: 121.

**Kidero Dido:** Khalilov 1999: 215, 343; Bikrib & Kodzasov 1990: 121.

**Sagada Dido:** Abdulaev 2014.

**Khwarshi (proper):** Karimova 2014.

**Inkhokwari Khwarshi:** Karimova 2014; Bikrib & Kodzasov 1990: 121; Bokarev 1959: 145, 158.

**Kwantlada Khwarshi:** liλ {auiI} 'meat' [Karimova 2014; Khalilova 2009: 84].

**Proto-Tsezic:** NCED: 945. Distribution: Two forms enter into competition in this "criss-crossed" configuration:

1) *χo A [NCED: 1081], meaning 'meat' in East Tsezic plus Hinukh (lost in other West Tsezic lects);
2) *riA ~ *liA A [NCED: 945], meaning ‘meat’ in West Tsezic except for Hinukh (lost in East Tsezic).

The stem *χːo as a Proto-Tsezic term for ‘meat’ has an advantage in terms of distribution, since it is attested in both East Tsezic and West Tsezic branches. External comparison, however, clearly speaks in favor of the meaning ‘meat’ for Proto-Tsezic *riA. Since some secondary contact-driven East Tsezic-Hinukh matches are expected, we prefer to reconstruct *riA for Proto-Tsezic ‘meat’.

In Proto-East Tsezic it was superseded by *χːo, whose Proto-Tsezic semantics is unclear, although external North Caucasian comparison suggests the meaning ‘a k. of fat’ [NCED: 1081]. In Hinukh, *χːo also acquired the meaning ‘meat’ under the influence on the part of East Tsezic.

Replacements: ‘a k. of fat’ > ‘meat’ (Proto-East Tsezic).

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular.

Semantics and structure: Primary substantive root.

54. MOON

Hunzib (proper) boco {боцо} (1), Bezhta (proper) boco {боцо} (1), Khoshar-Khota Bezhta boco (1), Tlyadal Bezhta boco (1), Hinukh buce {δύμε} (1), Kidero Dido buci {δύμε} (1), Sagada Dido buci {δύμε} (1), Khwarshi (proper) buca {δύμα} (1), Inkhokwari Khwarshi buci {δύμε} (1), Proto-Tsezic *bocV A (1).

References and notes:


Common Khwarshi: Polysemy: ‘moon / month’ in all dialects.

Proto-Tsezic: NCED: 1044. Distribution: One of the most stable Proto-Tsezic roots, retained in its basic meaning in all Tsezic lects.

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular.

Semantics and structure: Primary substantive root. The oblique stem is *bicV- A.

55. MOUNTAIN

Hunzib (proper) maru {мапу} (1), Bezhta (proper) mā: {мā:} (1), Khoshar-Khota Bezhta māro (1) / bizo (2), Tlyadal Bezhta mārō (1), Hinukh χʷин {χвин} (3), Kidero Dido hon {χλων} (3), Sagada Dido hon {χλων} (3), Khwarshi (proper) hun {γυ̯̂ν, γυ̯̂ν} (3), Inkhokwari Khwarshi hun {γυ̯̂ν, γυ̯̂ν} (3), Proto-Tsezic *maˤru (1).

References and notes:

Distinct from *bizo ~ *biza [biza] 'hill' [Isakov & Khalilov 2001: 46; van den Berg 1995: 288; Bokarev 1961: 152, 182]. However, in [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 191], *bizo is quoted as the basic term for 'mountain' with polysemy: 'mountain / hill'.

Bezhta (proper): Khalilov 1995: 194, 302; Madieva 1965: 175. Polysemy: 'mountain / alpine pasture used in summer'. Nasalization is due to nasal assimilation *mVrV > *mVqV > *mV̯V > *mV̯O:.

Distinct from *bizo [bizo], glossed as 'mountain, small mountain' [Khalilov 1995: 46] and as 'hill' in [Madieva 1965: 150].

Khoshar-Khota Bezhta: M. Khalilov, p.c. According to Khalilov, there are two Khoshar-Khota words for 'mountain': *märö and *bizo.

Note that only the latter is quoted in [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 191], but it is possible that we deal with a lexicographic flaw, cf. notes on Tlyadal Bezhta. We treat *märö and *bizo as synonyms.

Distinct from *güh 'hill; heap' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 192], borrowed from Avar goh 'hill'.Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 191).

Tlyadal Bezhta: Ya. Testelets, p.c.; M. Khalilov, p.c. The second Tlyadal term for 'mountain' is *bizo [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 191; M. Khalilov, p.c.]. Note that in [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990], *bizo is quoted as the basic Tlyadal term with this meaning that is an error according to Testelets.

Distinct from *güh = *güh 'hill; heap' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 192], borrowed from Avar goh 'hill'.


Distinct from several terms for 'hill': inherited *gup' [ryyl] [Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 123], *guz [ryxa] [Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 122], and borrowed guh [ryxl] [Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 124] (< Avar goh 'hill').


A second candidate is *maIli [sələm], which is also glossed as generic 'mountain' in [Khalilov 1999: 185], but this term is more marginal, only two textual examples have been discovered: "... to another mountain" [Khalilov 1999: 185], "high mountain" [Khalilov 1999: 202].

Cf. also a compound of the two: *həm-maIli 'alpine pasture' [Khalilov 1999: 267]

Distinct from the terms for 'hill': inherited *šem [tewə] [Khalilov 1999: 393] and borrowed guh [ryxl] [Khalilov 1999: 87] (< Avar goh 'hill').

Sagada Dido: Abdulat 2014.


Distinct from Kwantlada *maʂə 'cliff' [Khalilova 2009: 15, 17].

Proto-Tsezic: NCED: 834. Distribution: The Proto-East Tsezic system can be reconstructed as *maʂə 'mountain' [NCED: 834] / *bizo 'hill' [NCED: 288]; in Bezhta dialects, *maʂə tends to be superseded by *bizo in the meaning 'mountain', although this could be an error in the field records.

The Proto-West Tsezic term for 'mountain' is *χʷen A [NCED: 425], retained in all lects (in East Tsezic it got lost). The stem *maʂə, however, is also present in West Tsezic with the meaning 'cliff' in Khwarshi and marginal 'mountain' in Dido; it is possible that *maʂə should be reconstructed with the Proto-West meaning 'cliff'.

It is impossible to choose between *maʂə and *χʷen proceeding from the internal Tsezic data, but external comparison clearly speaks in favor of *maʂə (its cognates mean 'mountain' in Avar and Nakh). On the other hand, North Caucasian cognates of *χʷen rather point to the original meaning 'northern slope of mountain' vel sim.

Reconstruction shapes: Correspondences seem regular except for assimilation *m-r > *m-n in Kwantlada Khwarshi.

Semantics and structure: Primary substantive root. In all Tsezic lects, where *maʂə 'mountain' is retained, synchronic forms demonstrate the homonymy 'mountain' / 'nose' (q.v.). Since direct semantic shifts between these two meanings are typologically unlikely, we follow the solution in [NCED: 825, 834] and suppose that two different North Caucasian roots phonetically merged in Proto-Tsezic *maʂə, yielding the homonymy 'mountain' / 'nose' already on the Proto-Tsezic level.
Hunzib (proper) šik’u (шикку) (1), Bezhta (proper) sik’o (сикко) (1), Khoshar-Khota Bezhta sik’o (1), Tlyadal Bezhta šik’ö (1), Hinukh haqu (гвакь) (2) / hut’ (гвымъ) (3), Kidero Dido haqu ~ haqa (гвакь) (2) / hut’ (гвымъ) (3), Sagada Dido haqu (гвакь) (2) / hut’ (гвымъ) (3), Khwarshi (proper) hut’ ~ hit’ (гвымъ) (3), Inkhokwari Khwarshi mał’u ~ mał’u (макъ) (4), Proto-Tsezic *haqu ~ *hãqu (2) / *šik’u ~ *šːik’u (1).

References and notes:

Hunzib (proper): Isakov & Khalilov 2001: 182, 230; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 14; van den Berg 1995: 334; Bokarev 1961: 170, 180. Polysemy: ‘mouth / bottle-neck’. In [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990], šik’u is explained as ‘external part of mouth’ as opposed to qãšu ‘internal part of mouth’. Other sources, however, regard šik’u as the basic generic term ‘mouth’. It should be noted that in the Garbutli dialect, šik’u means ‘face’ [Isakov & Khalilov 2001: 182] (a separate Garbutli word for ‘mouth’ is unknown).

Distinct from qãšu ~ qāšu [xə’aʃ], which is explained as ‘internal part of mouth’ in [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 14], but as ‘throat, maw, pharynx’ in [Isakov & Khalilov 2001: 167; van den Berg 1995: 326] and ‘palatum’ [Bokarev 1961: 167]. In the Garbutli dialect, qãša [sic!] means ‘mouth of animal’ [Isakov & Khalilov 2001: 221].


There are two Hinukh terms for ‘mouth’: haqu and hut’. According to [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 14], haqu denotes ‘internal part of mouth’, whereas hut’ means ‘external part of mouth’. As may be seen from the entries in [Khalilov & Isakov 2005], haqu is more frequently used than hut’. Nevertheless, we treat both words as synonyms.


There are two Kidero Dido terms for ‘mouth’: haqu and hut’. According to [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 14], haqu denotes ‘internal part of mouth’, whereas hut’ means ‘external part of mouth’. As may be seen from the entries in [Khalilov 1999], haqu is more frequently used than hut’. Nevertheless, we treat both words as synonyms.


Sagada Dido: Abdulaev 2014. Two Sagada words for ‘mouth’ are offered in [Abdulaev 2014]: haqu and hut’; we treat them as synonyms. Abdulaev 2014.


Inkhokwari Khwarshi: Karimova 2014; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 14; Bokarev 1959: 145, 146. Polysemy: ‘mouth / lip / beak’. In [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990], mał’u is explained as ‘external part of mouth’ as opposed to zize ‘internal part of mouth’. Actually, zize should be a locative adverb ‘in the mouth’, see notes on Kwantlada Khwarshi.


Distinct from the Kwantlada locative adverb zize ~ zize ‘in the mouth’ [Khalilova 2009: 112, 113], derived from the lost noun *zize(V) with the specific suffix -e.

Proto-Tsezic: NCED: 526. Distribution: West Tsezic lects demonstrate the lexical opposition ‘internal part of mouth’ / ‘external part of mouth’, although it is not clear whether the same opposition should be projected onto the Proto-Tsezic level.

The Proto-East Tsezic generic term for ‘mouth’ is *šik’u (~ *şːk’) [NCED: 978]; in West Tsezic this root was lost.

The Proto-West Tsezic opposition can be reconstructed as ‘haqu (~ -ã)’ ‘internal part of mouth’ [NCED: 526] / ‘hút’ ‘external part of mouth’ [NCED: 496]. Such a system is retained in Hinukh & Dido. In Khwarshi proper, ‘hút’ became the only generic term for ‘mouth’. In Inkhokwari Khwarshi & Kwantlada Khwarshi, both terms were superseded by ‘hõl’V A, whose original Proto-Tsezic meaning was ‘beak’ [NCED: 1041].

West Tsezic *hút’ ‘external part of mouth’ corresponds to the meanings ‘wart, verruca’ in East Tsezic (Hunzib hút’
'wart, verruca' ~ hət’ ‘nipple’ [Isakov & Khalilov 2001: 68-69]) that implies the original Proto-Tsezic meaning ‘wart, verruca’ or ‘excrecence’ with the Proto-West Tsezic semantic development > ‘lip’ > ‘external part of mouth’.

If we reconstruct the opposition ‘internal part of mouth’ / ‘external part of mouth’ for Proto-Tsezic, *haqu, according to the ‘leftover principle’, can be posited as Proto-Tsezic ‘internal part of mouth’ (retained only in Hinukh & Dido), whereas *šɨk’u - as Proto-Tsezic ‘external part of mouth’ (retained only in East Tsezic).

If we proceed from the single generic term ‘mouth’ in Proto-Tsezic, it is impossible to make a choice between *haqu and *šɨk’u, because external comparison does not provide any help here.

We prefer to fill the Proto-Tsezic slot with two roots.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Replacements</th>
<th>‘mouth’ &gt; ‘face’</th>
<th>Garbutli Hunzib</th>
<th>{ца}н (1)</th>
<th>Bezhta (proper)</th>
<th>caːro (1)</th>
<th>Tlyadal Bezhta</th>
<th>caro (1)</th>
<th>Hinukh</th>
<th>ce {үə} (1)</th>
<th>Kidero Dido</th>
<th>ci {үə} (1)</th>
<th>Sagada Dido</th>
<th>ci {үə} (1)</th>
<th>Khwarshi (proper)</th>
<th>ca ~ cä {үə} (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Replacements</td>
<td>‘beak’ &gt; ‘mouth’</td>
<td>Inkhokwari Khwarshi</td>
<td>{цо} (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacements</td>
<td>‘wart, verruca’ &gt; ‘external part of mouth’</td>
<td>Proto-West Tsezic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular.

Semantics and structure: Primary substantive root, meaning ‘internal part of mouth’.

NCED: 978.

Distribution: Retained in East Tsezic.

57. NAME

Hunzib (proper) cäru \{ца\н\} (1), Bezhta (proper) cäː \{ца\н\} (1), Khoshar-Khota Bezhta caːro (1), Tlyadal Bezhta caːro (1), Hinukh ce \{үə\} (1), Kidero Dido ci \{үə\} (1), Sagada Dido ci \{үə\} (1), Khwarshi (proper) ca ~ cä \{үə\} (1), Inkhokwari Khwarshi co ~ cō \{үə\} (1), Proto-Tsezic *cʷə A (1).

References and notes:


**Khoshar-Khota Bezhta:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 212.

**Tlyadal Bezhta:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 212.

**Common Bezhta:** The loss of Bezhta proper -r- is normal [Bokarev 1959: 71 ff.].

**Hinukh:** Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 376, 449; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 212. Paradigm: ce [abs.] / cero- [obl.] (in [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990], the oblique stem is erroneously quoted as ce-mo-).

**Kidero Dido:** Khalilov 1999: 272, 329; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 212. Paradigm: ci [abs.] / ciro- [obl.] (in [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990], the oblique stem is erroneously quoted as cire-).

**Sagada Dido:** Abdulaev 2014.


**Inkhokwari Khwarshi:** Karimova 2014; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 212; Bokarev 1959: 147, 150. Paradigm: cō [abs.] / cō- ~ cō-da- [obl.].

**Kwantlada Khwarshi:** co \{цо\} ‘name’ [Karimova 2014; Khalilova 2009: 14, 75].

**Proto-Tsezic:** NCED: 1098. **Distribution:** One of the most stable Proto-Tsezic roots, retained in its basic meaning in all Tsezic lects.

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular.

Semantics and structure: Primary substantive root. The oblique stem is ‘cʷərW-’ (in Proto-East Tsezic, the direct stem was leveled after the oblique one).

58. NECK

Hunzib (proper) bolo \{бөлө\} (1), Bezhta (proper) boɬo \{бөлъо\} (1), Khoshar-Khota Bezhta boɬo (1), Tlyadal Bezhta boɬo (1), Hinukh moc’ \{мөл\} (2), Kidero Dido meč’ \{мөл\} (2), Sagada Dido meč’ \{мөл\} (2), Khwarshi (proper) mič’ \{мөл\} (2), Inkhokwari Khwarshi
muč’ {myul} (2), Proto-Tsezic *boko A (1).

References and notes:


Distinct from the more specific term k'iceri {кицери}, glossed as 'neck, thick neck' in [Khalilov 1995: 172], borrowed from Georgian k'iseri 'neck'.


Distinct from rês ~ ris {рес} with polysemy: 'throat, gullet / front part of neck' [Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 302, 549; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 18].


Proto-Tsezic: Distribution: Two terms enter into competition:

1) *boʫo A [TsezEDb], which means 'neck' in East Tsezic and 'bead necklace' in West Tsezic;
2) *muč’ B [NCED: 805], which means 'neck' in West Tsezic and 'head hair' in East Tsezic.

Since the shift 'neck' > 'necklace' is much more natural than in the opposite direction, whereas *muč’ is the good candidate for the Proto-Tsezic meaning 'head hair' q.v., we can safely postulate *boʫo as the Proto-Tsezic term for 'neck' despite the fact that *boʫo seems to lack external North Caucasian etymology.

Replacements: ('neck' > 'necklace') (Proto-West Tsezic); ('head hair' > 'neck') (Proto-East Tsezic).

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular.

Semantics and structure: Primary substantive root.

59. NEW

Hunzib (proper) ɨc’ː- {ыңуңылы} (1), Bezhta (proper) ɨc’ː-o {уңуңлo} (1), Khoshar-Khota Bezhta ɨc’ː-y-o (1), Tlyadal Bezhta ɨc’ː-o (1), Hinukh ec’en-d-i-y-u {эцIендиууy} (1), Kidero Dido ec’n-u {эцIунy} (1), Sagada Dido ec’n-u {эцIунy} (1), Khwarshi (proper) ec’n-u {эцIунy} (1), Inkhokwari Khwarshi uc’n-u ~ ɨc’n-u {уңуңy} (1), Proto-Tsezic *ɨc’n- A (1).

References and notes:

Hunzib (proper): Isakov & Khalilov 2001: 185, 217; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 245; van den Berg 1995: 308; Bokarev 1961: 170, 178. In [Isakov & Khalilov 2001], the innovative denasalized form ɨc’ː-u {ыңуңuly} is also quoted.


Tlyadal Bezhta: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 245.

Common Bezhta: Geminated ɨː < ɨ-.


Kwantlada Khwarshi: uc'n - u ~ ɨc'n - u {уцIн, ыцIн} 'new' [Karimova 2014; Khalilova 2009: 15, 28, 313].
Proto-Tsezic: NCED: 357. Distribution: One of the most stable Proto-Tsezic roots, retained in its basic meaning in all Tsezic lects.
Semantics and structure: Primary adjective root. In East Tsezic, modified with the common adjective suffix -y (c'-y > c').

60. NIGHT

Hunzib (proper) niše {нише} (1), Bezhta (proper) niše meχ {нише мех} (1), Khoshar-Khota Bezhta niše (1), Tlyadal Bezhta niše (1), Hinukh nesaː s zaman {неса с заман} (1), Kidero Dido bogol {богол} (-1), Sagada Dido nešo-ħ {нешохI} (1), Khwarshi (proper) reɬa {релъа} (-1), Inkhokwari Khwarshi reɬa {релъа} (-1), Proto-Tsezic niš:e (1).

References and notes:


Bezhta (proper): Khalilov 1995: 195, 320. Literally 'time at night' with meχ 'time' and the adverb niše {нише} 'at night' [Khalilov 1995: 208]. In [Madieva 1965: 179], however, niše is simply glossed as 'night'.

Khoshar-Khota Bezhta: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 211. Listed in the meaning 'at night', but apparently with polysemy: 'night / at night'.

Tlyadal Bezhta: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 211. Listed in the meaning 'at night', but apparently with polysemy: 'night / at night'.


Distinct from the paronymous temporal adverb neši {неши} 'at night' [Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 277], inaccurately glossed as generic 'night' in [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 211]. It is likely that neši was the original Hinukh word for 'night' with the regular essive form nes-a 'at night' or 'in the evening' (the essive ending -a), the latter, however, has spread across the paradigm and serves now as the direct and oblique stems.

Cf. also the borrowing bogole {боголе} 'late evening (10-12 p.m.)' [Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 95] < Avar dial. bogola 'evening, supper time'.

Kidero Dido: Khalilov 1999: 66, 348. Borrowed from Avar dial. bogola 'evening, supper time'. In [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 211], the Kidero word for 'night' is erroneously quoted as inherited neširu, which actually means 'in the evening' [Khalilov 1999: 199].

Sagada Dido: Abdulaev 2014. Final -h is the essive ending, thus the original meaning of nešo-h should be adverbial 'at night'.


Common Khwarshi: Common Khwarshi reɬa 'night' is borrowed from Tindi reɬa 'night'.

Proto-Tsezic: NCED: 524. Distribution: A rather stable stem, attested in almost all the lects, although in West Tsezic, it tends to be superseded by Avar or Tindi loanwords, although it is retained in the locative adverbialized forms 'at night'.
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Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular.

Semantics and structure: Primary substantive stem. At least for the Proto-East Tsezic level, the polysemy: 'night / at night' can be reconstructed.

61. NOSE

Hunzib (proper) maru {mapy} (1), Bezhta (proper) māː {mān} (1), Khoshar-Khota Bezhta mārō (1), Tlyadal Bezhta mārō (1), Hinukh mali {malu} (1), Kidero Dido mali {mali} (1), Sagada Dido mali {mali} (1), Khwarshi (proper) mani {mani} (1), Inkhokwari Khwarshi mane ~ maˤne {мане} (1), Proto-Tsezic *maˤru (1).

References and notes:


Distinct from Xošo {кьошо} ‘snout (of pig etc.)’ [Isakov & Khalilov 2001: 103].


Common Bezhta: The loss of Bezhta proper -r- is normal [Bokarev 1959: 71 ff.]; nasalization is due to nasal assimilation mVrV > mVyV > mVỹV > mVЮː.


Kwantlada Khwarshi: mane ~ maˤne {мане} ‘nose’ [Karimova 2014; Khalilova 2009: 15, 17].

Proto-Tsezic: NCED: 825. Distribution: One of the most stable Proto-Tsezic roots, retained in its basic meaning in all Tsezic lects.

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular except for assimilation m-r > m-n in Khwarshi.

Semantics and structure: Primary substantive root. For the Proto-Tsezic and synchronic homonymy ‘mountain’ / ‘nose’, see notes on ‘mountain’.

62. NOT

Hunzib (proper) =at’ (1) / =is (2), Bezhta (proper) =aʔa-s ~ =aʔa ~ =aʔ (3) / =aʔa=s (2), Tlyadal Bezhta =aʔa ~ =aʔ (3), Hinukh =m-e (4), Kidero Dido anu {anu} (5) / =ɛV (6), Sagada Dido yat’ (7) / =a (3), Khwarshi (proper) =ate (8) / =ay (3), Inkhokwari Khwarshi =ate (8) / =bi (9), Proto-Tsezic *=V ~ *=ʔV ~ *=ʔV? (3) / *=ɛ'(6).

References and notes:

Hunzib (proper): Isakov & Khalilov 2012: 210 ff.; van den Berg 1995: 77, 84-87, 89-92; Bokarev 1959: 60. The system of Hunzib verbal exponents of negation of assertion is complex. The suffix -at’ is used for the present tense (both finite forms and participles) and finite intentional; the related suffix -it’ is used for past gerund. The suffix -is is used for past tense (both finite forms and participles) and masdar; the related complex suffix -o-ys is used for finite aorist and finite future. We fill the slot with -at’ and -is, treated as synonyms.

Additionally, the negative present copula go-ɛ’ (in Garbutli and Naxada: go-ɛ) ‘it is not’ plus gerund, participle or infinitive can form a complex predicate with negative meaning.

Prohibitive is formed with the suffix -acʔo [Isakov & Khalilov 2012: 211; van den Berg 1995: 87; Bokarev 1959: 60]. Additionally, in [van den Berg 1995: 99], the prohibitive suffix -Vdor is mentioned.
Bezhta (proper): Khalilov 1995: 406; Madieva 1965: 132. As noted in [Khalilov 1995: 406; Madieva 1965: 132], negation of assertion is normally expressed with the suffixes -aʔa ~ -aʔ (present) and -eč'e ~ -eč (preterite). Statistical correlation between the full forms of the suffixes (in -s/ʔ- and the simple one is not described. Alternatively, negation can be expressed with the negative copula gəʔ [Khalilov 1995: 59, 414; Madieva 1965: 143]. Other than that, the past participle is negated with the suffix -eč'e [Khalilov 1995: 406; Madieva 1965: 134].

The prohibitive exponent is the suffix -aʔa [Khalilov 1995: 406; Madieva 1965: 126].

Khoshar-Khota Bezhta: Not documented.

Tlyadal Bezhta: Bokarev 1959: 106; Kibrik & Testelets 2004: 258. Negation of assertion is normally expressed with the suffixes -aʔa ~ -aʔ (present) and -eč ~ -eč (past); alternately, negation can be expressed with the negative copula: present gəʔ(ə)i and preterit ziʔeʔ [Bokarev 1959: 106; Kibrik & Testelets 2004: 258]. Besides that, the past participle is negated with the suffix -eč'e / -eč'e [Kibrik & Testelets 2004: 264; Bokarev 1959: 106].

The prohibitive exponent is the suffix -aʔa [Bokarev 1959: 106; Kibrik & Testelets 2004: 259].


The prohibitive exponent is the same suffix -m, attached to the imperative suffix -o [Forker 2013: 230; Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 588; Lomtadze 1963: 154; Imnaishvili 1963: 202 f.]

Kidero Dido: Khalilov 1999: 443; Alekseev & Radzhabov 2004: 145; Bokarev 1959: 215 ff.; Imnaishvili 1963: 197 ff. As described in the aforementioned sources, negation of assertion can be expressed either synthetically or analytically (in some categories, synthetic and analytic forms may co-occur). In present and past non-evidential, the negative copula amu attached as a suffix or enclitic is used. In general tense, past evidential, future, either the suffix -čV (it has the free variant -mcV, which is probably more rare) or the negative suffixed copula amu-čVu-s are used. We treat amu and -čV as synonyms.


Sagada Dido: Imnaishvili 1963: 201 f. As described by Imnaishvili, in the present tense, negation of assertion is expressed by the enclitic yəf (instead of Kidero amu); this negative copula yəf is related to the positive copula yəf (historically y-erf) ‘to be’ [Imnaishvili 1963: 215]. In the general tense, the suffix -a is used; in the future, the suffix -čVu; in the past, either -čVu or -či. We treat yəf, -a and -čV as synonyms.

Khwarshi (proper): Sharafutdinova & Levina 1961: 117-118; Bokarev 1959: 170-171. As described in [Sharafutdinova & Levina 1961: 117-118; Bokarev 1959: 170-171] (confirmed by [Karimova 2014]), negation of assertion is expressed synthetically with the help of several suffixes: present, general tense -ate; witnessed past -ay; unwitnessed past -bi; in the future the negative copula go-bi is used. We treat -ate and -ay as synonyms.


As described in [Bokarev 1959: 170-171] (confirmed by [Karimova 2014]), negation of assertion is expressed synthetically with the help of several suffixes: present -ate; general, future -bi, witnessed past -bu; unwitnessed past -ay. We treat -ate and -bi as synonyms.

The prohibitive exponent is the suffix -bo / -ba [Bokarev 1959: 170].


Proto-Tsezic: NCED: 541. Distribution: The synchronic systems of negation exponents in the attested lects are rather well developed and complicated. Apparently, a similar complexity is to be supposed for the Proto-Tsezic system, which can hardly be revealed in all details. We can safely reconstruct at least two morphemes that functioned as primary negation exponents in Proto-Tsezic:

1) present *-V ~ *-IV ~ *-ʔV [NCED: 541]. In East Tsezic, it is used for present (Bezhta); in West Tsezic, for general tense (Dido).

2) preterit *-ʔ [NCED: 1101]. In East Tsezic, it is used for the negative copula (Hunzib) or for past participle (Bezhta); in West Tsezic, for general tense (Dido), past (Dido, Khwarshi) or the negative copula (Dido, Khwarshi).

The Proto-Tsezic prohibitive exponent is likely to have been the suffix -m, retained as -m in Hinukh, but with unexplainable mutations > -n in Dido and > -b in Khwarshi; superseded by *-VʔV in East Tsezic. It should be noted that this prohibitive exponent also spreads to negation of assertion in Hinukh and Inkhokwari Khwarshi.
Reconstruction shape: The unspecified vowel $V$ was most likely a.

62. NOT
Sagada Dido =\text{č}'V (6).

63. ONE
Hunzib (proper) $h\text{ős} \{\text{zvö}'c\}$ (1), Bezhta (proper) $h\text{ős} \{\text{zvö}'c\}$ (1), Khoshar-Khota Bezhta $h\text{ős}$ (1), Tlyadal Bezhta $h\text{ős}$ (1), Hinukh $h\text{es} \{\text{zvëc}\}$ (1), Kidero Dido sis \{cuc\} (1), Sagada Dido sis \{cuc\} (1), Khwarshi (proper) $h\text{as} \{\text{zvëc}\}$ (1), Inkhokwari Khwarshi hos \{zvëc\} (1), Proto-Tsezic *$h\text{ős}$: (1).

References and notes:

**Hunzib (proper):** Isakov & Khalilov 2012: 152; Kibrik & Kodzazov 1990: 247; van den Berg 1995: 69; Bokarev 1959: 44. Suppletive paradigm: $h\text{ős}$ [abs.] / $s\text{ɨ}$ [obl.].


**Khoshar-Khota Bezhta:** Kibrik & Kodzazov 1990: 247. Paradigm is not documented.

**Tlyadal Bezhta:** Kibrik & Kodzazov 1990: 247. Suppletive paradigm: $h\text{ős}$ [abs.] / $s\text{ɨ}$-[obl.]

**Hinukh:** Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 579; Kibrik & Kodzazov 1990: 247; Fokker 2013: 395. Suppletive paradigm: $h\text{es}$ [abs.] / $s\text{饯}$- [obl.].


**Sagada Dido:** Abdulaev 2014; Imnaishvili 1963: 84, 87. Suppletive paradigm: sis [abs.] / $s\text{ɨda}$-[obl.].

**Khwarshi (proper):** Karimova 2014; Sharafutdinova & Levina 1961: 111. Suppletive paradigm: has [abs.] / $h\text{ǣda}$-[obl.].

**Inkhokwari Khwarshi:** Karimova 2014; Kibrik & Kodzazov 1990: 247; Bokarev 1959: 161. Suppletive paradigm: hos [abs.] / $h\text{ǣda}$ [obl.]

**Kwantlada Khwarshi:** hos [abs.] / $h\text{ǣda}$-[obl.] 'one' [Karimova 2014; Khalilova 2009: 169, 173].

**Proto-Tsezic:** NCED: 323. Distribution: One of the most stable Proto-Tsezic roots, retained in its basic meaning in all Tsezic lects.

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular except for the onset $s$- instead of expected $h$- in Dido due to contamination with the oblique stem.

Semantics and structure: Primary numeral root. The oblique stem is *$s\text{ɨ}*-.

64. PERSON
Hunzib (proper) insan \{u과학\} (-1), Bezhta (proper) su$k\acute{\text{o}} \{c yoklо\}$ (1), Khoshar-Khota Bezhta su$k\acute{\text{o}}$ (1), Tlyadal Bezhta su$k\acute{\text{o}}$ (1), Hinukh rekwew \{pekIе\} (1), Kidero Dido $\text{žek\acute{\text{i}}}u$ \{жекIы\} (1), Sagada Dido $\text{žek\acute{\text{i}}}u$ \{жекIы\} (1), Khwarshi (proper) $\text{žik\acute{\text{w}}}a$ \{жикIо\} (1), Inkhokwari Khwarshi hik$\acute{\text{o}}$ \{zvuklо\} (-1), Proto-Tsezic *$\text{žik\acute{\text{w}}}\partial$ ~ *$\text{zik\acute{\text{w}}}\partial$ A (1).

References and notes:

**Hunzib (proper):** Isakov & Khalilov 2001: 84, 243; van den Berg 1995: 306. The form *$\text{şadam}$ \{pIадам\} 'person' is also attested [Isakov & Khalilov 2001: 70; van den Berg 1995: 344]. Both terms represent diffused Oriental (originally Arabic) words for 'person, human being'.

Additionally, the inherited term *su$k\acute{\text{o}}$ 'man' q.v. can be glossed with polysemy: 'man / person' in some sources.

**Bezhta (proper):** Khalilov 1995: 233, 346; Madieva 1965: 185. In [Khalilov 1995: 233], the parallel variant su$q\acute{\text{o}}$ \{c yoklо\} is also quoted.
Other attested terms for ‘person’ represent the wandering Oriental (originally Arabic) words: ääm [аъдам] [Khalilov 1995: 31; Madieva 1965: 146], insan [инсан] [Khalilov 1995: 102; Madieva 1965: 163].

**Khoshar-Khota Bezhta**: M. Khalilov, p.c. The second term for ‘person’ is ääm (M. Khalilov, p.c.).

**Tlyadal Bezhta**: M. Khalilov, p.c. The second term for ‘person’ is ääm (M. Khalilov, p.c.).


Additionally, two Oriental wandering words (originally Arabic) are used: insan [инсан] ‘person (sg.)’ [Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 183], hadam [гъадам] ‘person’ (rarely), ‘persons, people’ [Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 149].


The Oriental Wanderwort (originally Arabic) insan [инсан] ‘person’ is also used [Khalilov 1999: 128].

**Kwantlada Khwarshi**:

65. **RAIN**

**Hunzib (proper)** wə ə {вəдə} (1), **Bezhta (proper)** wodo {вəдə} (1), Khoshar-Khota Bezhta **wodo** (1), **Tlyadal Bezhta** wodo (1), **Hinukh** qema {χъема} (2), **Kidero Dido** qema {χъема} (2), **Sagada Dido** qema {χъема} (2), Khwarshi (proper) qema {χъема} (2), Inkhokwari Khwarshi kodo {γъодо} (1), **Proto-Tsezic** *ʁəːdə* (1).


**Khoshar-Khota Bezhta**: Khalib & Kodzasov 1990: 203.

**Tlyadal Bezhta**: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 203.

**Common Bezhta**: Homonymy ‘rain’ / ‘day’ in all dialects, see notes on Proto-Tsezic.


**Sagada Dido**: Abdulave 2014.

**Khwarshi (proper)**: Karimova 2014; Sharafutdinova & Levina 1961: 97, 102.


**Kwantlada Khwarshi**: kodo {γъодо} ‘rain’ [Karimova 2014; Khalilova 2009: 46].

**Proto-Tsezic**: NCED: 1010. Distribution: Retained in its basic meaning in East Tsezic and some West Tsezic lects (Inkhokwari Khwarshi, Kwantlada Khwarshi). The external North Caucasian data are in perfect agreement with this. In the rest of West Tsezic, namely Hinukh, Dido and Khwarshi proper, ‘rain’ is expressed by *qima A ~ *qima B [NCED: 737]. Such a replacement should be treated as an independent introduction in Hinukh, Dido and Khwashe proper. The original meaning of Proto-Tsezic *qima is not entirely clear. Its East Tsezic cognates point to the meaning ‘cloudy, dull’: the adjectives Khoshar-Khota Bezhta qima-r-o [χъимаро] = Bezhta proper qima-y-o ~ qima: [χъимао, χъима] ‘cloudy,
dull’ [M. Khalilov, p.c.], modified with the adjective/participle suffix -r-. Additionally, according to M. Khalilov, qima-r-o and qima-y-o can be substantivized with the meaning ‘cloudiness, assemblage of clouds’. Unattested Bezhta *qima (an adjective or substantive) served as the basis of inchoative and causative verbs: Bezhta proper qima-r- ‘to gloom, be overcast’, qima-k- ‘to cause to gloom, cause to be overcast’ [Khaliilov 1995: 262] (for the verbal suffixes -r and -k, see [Madieva 1965: 113]). It is likely that Bezhta retains the original substantival meaning ‘cloudiness’ or the adjectival meaning ‘cloudy, dull’, whereas in some West Tsezic lects, *qima has shifted to ‘cloudiness / cloudy’ > ‘rain’. This agrees with the external comparison [NCED: 737], which suggests something like ‘a k. of cloudy or rainy weather, fog, etc.’ for Proto-Tsezic *qima.

Distinct from the homophonous Proto-Tsezic *ʁːʷə ə ‘day’ [NCED: 481] (which causes the secondary homonymy ‘rain’ / ‘cloud’ in East Tsezic). That we are dealing with two different roots, which coincided in Proto-Caucasian with the external comparison [NCED: 737], which suggests something like ‘a k. of cloudy or rainy weather, fog, etc.’ for Proto-Caucasian *ʁːʷə. Correspondences seem regular.

Semantics and structure: Substantive stem, which represents a Pre-Proto-Tsezic deverbative from an extinct verb ‘to rain’.

66. RED
Hunzib (proper) c’un-d-u {uIyddo} (1), Bezhta (proper) c’ud-o {uIyddo} (1), Khosar-Khota Bezhta c’ud-iy-o (1), Tlyadal Bezhta c’un-d-iy-o (1), Hinukh c’ud-ə {uIydda} (1), Kidero Dido c’uda ~ c’uda-ni {uIyda, uIydanu} (1), Sagada Dido c’uda {uIyda} (1), Khwarshi (proper) ut’e-y {ymleu} (2), Inkhokwari Khwarshi ut’a-n-a {ymlanu} (2), Proto-Tsezic *c’udV- (1).

References and notes:


Differently in the Garbutli dialect, where ‘red’ is expressed as hak’a-s {naslac} [Isakov & Khalilov 2001: 61, 208], literally ‘of flower, floral’ from hak ‘flower’. In Hunzib proper, hak’a-s means simply ‘floral’ and additionally either ‘yellow’ (thus [Isakov & Khalilov 2001: 61], although the basic Hunzib proper expression for ‘yellow’ q.v. is an Avar loanword) or ‘pink’ (thus [van den Berg 1995: 300, 349]). In the Naxada dialect, hak’a-s means ‘yellow’ [van den Berg 1995: 300, 349].


Tlyadal Bezhta: Kirik & Kodzassov 1990: 234. For the suffix chain, cf., e.g., niI-d-iy-o ‘green’ q.v.

Common Bezhta: All forms are obviously related; however, the Proto-Bezhta morphological reconstruction is not entirely clear.


Distinct from more specific c’ic’-r-a ‘red, vermilion (aIaiI)’ [Khalilov 1999: 278].


Kwantlada Khwarshi: ut’a-n-a [yIlasa] ‘red’ [Karimova 2014; Khalilova 2009: 34, 71, 100].

Proto-Tsezic: Distribution: Retained in its basic meaning in East Tsezic and some West Tsezic (Hinukh, Dido) lects.

In Khwarshi, *c’udV- was superseded by *ʔut’V- (~ *h-) [NCED: 541], whose original Proto-Tsezic meaning is unclear, since it is not preserved outside Khwarshi dialects.

It is interesting that *c’udV- lacks a North Caucasian etymology, whereas *ʔut’V- has some very promising North Caucasian comparanda, meaning ‘red’ in Lak and Dargi. Unfortunately, distribution clearly prevents *ʔut’V- from being posited as the basic Proto-Tsezic term for ‘red’.
Replacements: ['of flower, floral' > 'red'] (Garbutli Hunzib).

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular, except for medial -n- in some East Tsezic forms.

Semantics and structure: Primary adjectival stem. The only difficulty is -n-, which appears in this adjective in two adjacent lects: Hunzib proper *c'und-u, Tlyadal Bezhta *c'und-iy-o. It is possible that Hunzib *c'und-u originates from *c'ud-du with the occasional dissimilation dd > nd, where final -du is the well-known adjectival suffix. In turn, Tlyadal Bezhta *c'und-iy-o can be explained in the same way < *c'ud-d-iy-o. It is natural to suppose that such a dissimilation appeared in one of the lects, which further influenced its neighbor.

67. ROAD

Hunzib (proper) huni {гьуни} (1), Bezhta (proper) hino {гьино} (1), Khoshar-Khota Bezhta hino (1), Tlyadal Bezhta hino (1), Hinukh hune {гьуне} (1), Kidero Dido huni {гьуни} (1), Sagada Dido huni {гьуни} (1), Khwarshi (proper) huni {гьуни} (1), Inkhokwari Khwarshi hune {гьуне} (1), Proto-Tsezic *hunVA (1).

References and notes:


Kwantlada Khwarshi: hune {гьуне} 'road' [Karimova 2014; Khalilova 2009: 5, 24, 88].

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

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular, except for the vowel metathesis o-i > i-o in Bezhta.

Semantics and structure: Primary substantive root.

68. ROOT

Hunzib (proper) χυτιχ {хумух} (1), Bezhta (proper) χετιχ {хемух} (1), Khoshar-Khota Bezhta χετιχ (1) / b isa (2), Tlyadal Bezhta χετιχ (1), Hinukh rok'e {покле} (3), Kidero Dido ʔarXel {запкел} (-1), Sagada Dido rok'o {покло} (3), Khwarshi (proper) rokʷa {покла} (3), Inkhokwari Khwarshi rok'o {покло} (3), Proto-Tsezic χ'ετιχ: - *вемук (1).

References and notes:


Two Khoshar-Khota terms for 'root' are quoted in [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990]: original χετιχ and innovative b isa. We treat them as synonyms.Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 97. Polysemy: ‘root / foundation, building base’.


Common Bezhta: The noun b isa {биса} is the Common Bezhta term for ‘foundation, building base’ [Khalilov 1995: 45; Madieva
1965: 150; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 175]; it has secondarily acquired the meaning 'tree root' in Khoshar-Khota.


A second, more marginal candidate is ʿarʿel [ʾəɾʾel] 'root (of tree)' [Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 153], borrowed from Avar ʾarʾel 'branch' (sic).

Kidero Dido: Khalilov 1999: 106, 334. Polysemy: 'root / branch'; applied specifically to trees or represents a generic term. Borrowed from Avar ʾarʾel 'branch'.

Distinct from the more specific inherited term rok'o [rok'o] 'root (of plant)' [Khalilov 1999: 220] (in Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 97, it is quoted as a basic word for 'root'). Cf. rok'u 'heart' q.v.


Proto-Tsezic: NCED: 827. Distribution: Two stems enter into competition:

1) *χːemuχː (~ r-...r) [NCED: 827], meaning 'root' in East Tsezic, lost in West Tsezic;
2) *rɔk'v [NCED: 745], meaning 'root' in West Tsezic, lost in East Tsezic.

It is impossible to make a choice based only on Tsezic data itself. External comparison, if correct, suggests Lak and Dargi cognates with the meaning 'root' for *χːemuχː which makes *χːemuχː an overall better candidate.

In Hinukh and Dido, the word tends to be superseded by an Avar loanword.

Replacements: {'foundation, building base' > 'root'} (Khoshkar-Khota Bezhta).

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular, except for vocalic assimilation e-u > u-u in Hunzib.

Semantics and structure: Primary substantive root.

69. ROUND

Hunzib (proper) ger-d-u {герду} (1), Bezhta (proper) gey-d-iy-o {геидуию} (1) / gomor-d-iy-o {гомордийо} (1), Khoshar-Khota Bezhta ger-d-iy-o (1), Tlyadal Bezhta ger-d-iy-ò (1), Hinukh gemen-d-iy-u {гемендиу} (1), Kidero Dido gelma-č'u {гелмачIу} (1), Sagada Dido gurginaw {гургинав} (-1), Khwarshi (proper) k'ork'olu {кIоркIолу} (-1), Inkhokwari Khwarshi girma ~ girma {гirma} (1), Proto-Tsezic *gVr- (1).

References and notes:


Apparently, gerdu is an inherited adjective, unrelated to Azerbaijani giri 'round' and other Turkic forms, because, first, Hunzib gerdu has a reliable Tsezic etymology [NCED: 447], second, Turkic loanwords normally penetrate into Hunzib via Avar mediation [Isakov & Khalilov 2012: 289 ff.], whereas, to the best of our knowledge, there are no similar forms in Avar.

Bezhta (proper): Madieva 1965: 153. Apparently with polysemy: 'round 3D / round 2D'. In Khalilov 1995: 59, gey-d-iy-o is glossed as 'oval' (the example: "oval stone"). Khalilov 1995: 63, 312. This adjective is quoted in Khalilov 1995 as the basic term for 'round' (examples show polysemy: '3D / 2D'). Because of -r-, it does not look like a normal Bezhta proper form. A more regular shape of this word is quoted in Madieva 1965: 154 as gemay-d-iy-o, glossed as 'round apple, grapes, bread, nuts, head, pumpkin, egg'.


Tlyadal Bezhta: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 236.


There are also two other documented terms for 'round':

1) *gugur-ı* [γυγυρ] with polysemy: 'round / hilly, raised' [Khalilov 1999: 85], the only example is "round stone" [Khalilov 1999: 85].

2) *qolho*-rte [κολχορτέ] 'round' [Khalilov 1999: 152], literally 'ball-like' from *qolho* 'ball'; the only example is "round stone" [Khalilov 1999: 152].

Sagada Dido: Abdulaev 2014. Borrowed from Avar *gurgina*-w 'round'.

Khwarshi (proper): Karimova 2014. Borrowed from Tindi *kirkalı* 'round'.

The inherited Khwarshi proper word for 'round' is quoted in [Khalilova 2009: 7]: *germa*, although its exact synchronic meaning is not explained.


Kvantlada Khwarshi: *gurma* = *girma* [γύρμα, γύρμα] 'round' [Karimova 2014; Khalilova 2009: 7].

Common Khwarshi: Apparently with polysemy: 'round 3D / round 2D' in all the dialects.

Proto-Tsezic: NCED: 447. Distribution: This root is always modified with suffixes, which, however, differ among languages. For Proto-East Tsezic, we can reconstruct *ger-d-(iy)-a* 'round' with the common adjectival suffixes *-d- and *-y- (the stem in -d- is attested in all East Tsezic lects). For Proto-West Tsezic, we reconstruct *girma* 'round' with a rare and non-productive m-suffix.

In Hinukh *gener-d-iy-a* 'round', we see the synchronic root *gener-*, which is to be explained via occasional metathesis < *gen'm- < *ger-m- (the additional suffix chain -d-iy- is standard for Hinukh adjectives).

Bezhta proper *gomer-d-iy-o* 'round' looks like a borrowing from Hinukh (cf. especially the retention of -r- that is typical of recent loanwords). A more archaic loanword from the same source should be Bezhta proper *gomey-d-iy-o* 'round object (apple, grapes, bread, etc.)' which penetrated into Bezhta before the shift r > y. The main obstacle for the Hinukh > Bezhta scenario is the vowel discrepancy between the Hinukh (e-e) and Bezhta (o-o) forms.

Replacements: ['ball > round'] (Kidero Dido).

Reconstruction shape: Vocalic correspondences are irregular: East Tsezic data point to the root vowel *-e*, West Tsezic - to *-i-. For the metathesis *mr > mr* in Hinukh, see above.

Semantics and structure: It is unclear which suffix should be reconstructed for this stem in Proto-Tsezic: *-d- (as in East Tsezic) or *-m- (as in West Tsezic). Polysemy: 'round 3D / round 2D' in Proto-Tsezic.

70. SAND

Hunzib (proper) *kebu* {ке́бу} (1), Bezhta (proper) *miso* {ми́со} (2), Khoshar-Khota Bezhta *miso* (2), Tlyadal Bezhta *miso* (2), Hinukh *mese* {месе́} (2), Kidero Dido *gibu* {гу́й} (1), Sagada Dido *gimu* {гиму́} (1), Khwarshi (proper) *gebu* {гебу́} (1), Inkhokvari Khwarshi *gebu* {гебу́} (1), Proto-Tsezic *kebu* A (1).

References and notes:


A second, probably more marginal or specific, term is *missu* [мысы], glossed with polysemy: 'sand / gravel' in [Isakov & Khalilov 2001: 128, 221], but only as 'crushed stone, road metal' in [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 199; van den Berg 1995: 320]. In [Bokarev 1961: 162, 178], however, *missu* is glossed with the generic meaning 'sand'.


Distinct from *gebu* 'dust' [Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 117].


Sagada Dido: Abdulaev 2014. Corresponds to Kidero *gibu* 'sand', with medial -m- influenced by Azerbaijani *guna* 'sand', widespread among languages of Dagestan as a wandering word.

Khwarshi (proper): Karimova 2014. In [Sharafutdinova & Levina 1961: 102], the loanword *sel(V)* is translated as 'sand' (borrowed
from Tindi selu ‘gravel, road metal’.


Proto-Tsezic: NCED: 713. Distribution: Two stems enter into competition:

1) *kebu A [NCED: 713], which means ‘sand’ in East Tsezic (Hunzib proper) and West Tsezic (all lects except for Hinukh). In Hinukh, it means ‘dust’;

2) *mɨsːV A [NCED: 794], which means ‘sand’ in East Tsezic (Bezhta) and West Tsezic (Hinukh). In Hunzib proper, it means ‘gravel, road metal’.

    Formally, this is a “criss-crossed” situation, but actually *mɨsːV, which appears in the meaning ‘sand’ in two contacting lects, should be treated as an areal innovation. Apparently, *mɨsːV acquired the meaning ‘sand’ in Proto-Bezhta (since it is present in all Bezhta dialects), then Bezhta influenced Hinukh, where *këbu ‘sand’ subsequently shifted to the meaning ‘dust’.

    The original Proto-Tsezic meaning of *mɨsːV can be ‘gravel, road metal’, as attested in Hunzib proper.

    It is interesting that it is Proto-Tsezic *mɨsːV which possesses external cognates with the meaning ‘sand’ (Chadakolob Avar), but unfortunately the principles of internal reconstruction do not permit us to postulate Proto-Tsezic *mɨsːV ‘sand’.

Replacing: {sand} > {dust} (Kidero Dido, Hinukh).

    Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular, except for the assimilative voicing k-b > g-b in Proto-West Tsezic.

Semantics and structure: Primary substantive root.

71. SAY

Hunzib (proper) nɨsə ~ nɨs {ныса} (1), Bezhta (proper) nıso {нукал} (1), Khwarshi (proper) iə {илIа} (3), Inkhokwari Khwarshi iə {илIа} (3), Proto-Tsezic *ʔiƛV (3).

References and notes:

Hunzib (proper): Isakov & Khalilov 2001: 134, 232; van den Berg 1995: 322; Bokarev 1961: 162, 180. Historically, *n=ɨs(ə) or *n=ɨ s(ə) with the directional prefix n=, for which see [van den Berg 1995: 353].

    Distinct from āgas ~ āg-i-ə-: ‘to talk, speak’ [Isakov & Khalilov 2001: 25, 196; van den Berg 1995: 283; Bokarev 1961: 150]. The element āgas ~ āgɨs is morphologically unclear; in [Isakov & Khalilov 2012: 323], it is explained as onomatopoeic, but this is not highly likely.

    Distinct from iə {илIа} ‘to call, cry, ring’ [Isakov & Khalilov 2001: 202; van den Berg 1995: 306].

    Distinct from the particle Ax {илIа}, which serves as a quotative marker [Isakov & Khalilov 2012: 224; van den Berg 1995: 134].


    A second verb for ‘to say’ is CLASS=ek’ [икълат] [Khalilov 1995: 115]. The semantic difference between nıso and CLASS=ek’ is unclear, but, as noted by M. Khalilov (p.c.), the latter is marginal (correspondingly, only nıso is quoted in the glossary [Madieva 1965]).

    Distinct from CLASS=i iq’laše {йикълашал} ‘to speak’ [Khalilov 1995: 120; Madieva 1965: 162], whose morphological structure is not entirely clear. Looks like the stem =iq’e-l ‘to get to know; to let know; to teach’ [Khalilov 1995: 120] (regular causative from =iq’e ‘to know’ q.v.) plus unique suffix =aše.

    Distinct from iə {илIа} ‘to call / to sing / to talk’ [Khalilov 1995: 18, 307].

    Distinct from the particle Ax {илIа}, which serves as a quotative marker [Khalilov 1995: 187, 409].


Distinct from mār-lā to ‘speak’ [Kibrik & Kodzason 1988: 148; Khalilov 1995: 55]. Historically, a compound, where the second element lā is a *verbum dicendi* *ʔAV* (- Bezhta proper *lē to call, cry* [Khalilov 1995: 307; Madieva 1965: 163]). For Bezhta complex verbs in -lā-lā with the semantics of ‘mouth’, see [Kibrik & Testelets 2004: 273].

Common Bezhta: Historically, *n-iso or *n-ino with the fossilized directional prefix.


Distinct from cāli [ɑsla] with polysemy: ‘to call, cry / to say / to sing’ [Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 405]; cf. the quoted examples with the meaning ‘to say’: “To say a word”, “To say incorrectly”, although it is not the default verb for this meaning.


Distinct from ėsi [ɑsa] ‘to say, report, inform’ [Khalilov 1999: 297]; it is not the default verb for ‘to say’. In Asakh Dido, the corresponding verb is ės’iV [ɑsä] [Khalilov 1999: 298] (apparently with the same meaning) that implies a Proto-Tsezic labialized sibilant.

Distinct from CLASS=si [bākṣa] with polysemy: ‘to talk / to abuse, swear / to gossip, tittle-tattle / to be mistaken in smth.’ [Khalilov 1999: 36, 315].


Distinct from ana [yena] ‘to speak, talk’ [Sharafutdinova & Levine 1961: 115].

Inkhokwari Khwarshi: Karimova 2014; Bokarev 1959: 164, 167. Cf. the attested examples: ”He has said (it) to the woman” [Bokarev 1959: 157], ”He has said (it) to this woman” [Bokarev 1959: 158], ”He has said (it) them” [Bokarev 1959: 160]. ”The teacher said that tomorrow…” [Bokarev 1959: 174].

A second Inkhokwari candidate is the verb īs [ɑsa] ‘to say (skhâata)”’ [Bokarev 1959: 146, 164, 167, 169, 170, 171]. Its meaning seems to be very close to īl, but since īs is not attested in the available textual instances, it should be more marginal than common īl.

A third Inkhokwari verb is ēsa [ɑsa] ‘to say (skhâata)” [Bokarev 1959: 163], without any additional information. It is likely that īs and ēsa represent different transcriptions of one Inkhokwari verb.

Kwantlada Khwarshi: īl [u-īl] ‘to say’ [Karimova 2014]. This is the most generic and common verb for ‘to say’. Cf. some of the numerous instances: “the (other) woman who was there said that the boy was born…” [Khalilova 2009: 44], “Give this thing for four (rubles), the tradesman said” [Khalilova 2009: 76], ”They said to one man to put the head into the pit where the bear was” [Khalilova 2009: 78], ”You tell (is) me, where is your most tasty meat?” the wolf said (īl)” [Khalilova 2009: 84], ”There is blood on your lip, the witch said” [Khalilova 2009: 86], ”The older one said to the younger one, What was written in the letter?” [Khalilova 2009: 106], ”He said nothing” [Khalilova 2009: 160], ”If the girl had told (iīl), the boy would have thrown the ball from the roof” [Khalilova 2009: 194].

The second Kwantlada candidate is is ‘to say’ [Khalilova 2009: 29, 37], but it is less common and its meaning is closer to ‘to tell’. Cf. some examples: ”You tell (is) me, where is your most tasty meat?” the wolf said (iīl)” [Khalilova 2009: 84], ”He said right” [Khalilova 2009: 123], ”If mother had said, the daughter would have milked the cow” [Khalilova 2009: 195], ”Our father used to tell us riddles” [Khalilova 2009: 199], ”This girl did not say to anyone that she had been left in the forest by this neighbor” [Khalilova 2009: 211].

Distinct from Kwantlada un ‘to speak’ in the example ”The woman did not say a word, she did not speak (un)” [Khalilova 2009: 202].


1) *iːs’iV ~ *iːs’iV (− *ʔi ~ *t) A [NCED: 642] (for the traces of a labialized sibilant, see notes on Kidero Dido). This one is attested as the basic verb ‘to say’ in all East Tsezic lects and can be safely reconstructed with this meaning for Proto-East Tsezic. Already in Proto-East Tsezic, it was linked with the fossilized directional prefix *w*, a development unparalleled by West Tsezic data. This verb is also present in West Tsezic as a basic term for ‘to say’ in Hinukh, and residually in the Dido and Khwarshi dialects, where it means ‘to say’, but does not function as the most basic expression for this meaning.

2) *ʔAV [NCED: 572]. This one is attested as the basic verb ‘to say’ in some West Tsezic languages, namely Dido and Khwarshi (all dialects). Residually it is present in Hinukh, where it means ‘to say’, but does not function as a basic expression for this meaning. In East Tsezic, *ʔAV normally means ‘to call, cry’ and ‘to talk’, but both in Hunzib and Bezhta, this root is also retained as a quotative clitic (typologically, ‘to say’ is the most natural source of a quotation exponent). In all Tsezic languages, *ʔAV is used as the second element of complex verbs denoting sound (the pattern: sound + *ʔAV, see notes on ‘to drink’) that additionally could speak in favor of the original meaning ‘to say’ for *ʔAV.
From the formal distributive point of view, "ic=V has some advantage over *iHV. The situation changes if we look at external North Caucasian etymology. Proto-Tsezic *iHV possesses very good comparanda with the basic meaning 'to say': Andian *hiː 'to say', Nakh *hiː 'to say' [NCED: 572]. On the other hand, the external cognates of Proto-Tsezic *ic=V mean something like 'to tell' [NCED: 642]. Because of this, we prefer to posit *iHV as the main Proto-Tsezic verb for 'to say', which was superseded in its basic function by *ic=V in Proto-East Tsezic. In such a case, "ic=V with the meaning 'to say' in Hinukh is either an independent introduction or a result of influence on the part of East Tsezic.

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular.

Semantics and structure: Primary verbal stem.

72. SEE

Hunzib (proper) CLASS=ak= (мацла) (1), Bezhta (proper) CLASS=egac {лєца} (2), Khoshar-Khota Bezhta CLASS=egā: (2), Tlyadal Bezhta CLASS=egāh (2), Hinukh CLASS=ike ~ CLASS=ike {іука, бітка} (2), Kidero Dido CLASS=ika {іукада} (2), Sagada Dido CLASS=uka {дукада} (2), Khwarshi (proper) CLASS=ak=a (аква) (2), Inkhokwari Khwarshi CLASS=ak ~ CLASS=ak=a {лака, бікава} (2), Proto-Tsezic *CLASS=ega "A (2).

References and notes:


Distinct from the verbs for 'to look', which consists of the root =ac= and fossilized directional prefixes (without semantic difference between the resulting stems): nV=CLASS=ac=, lV=CLASS=ac=, and specifically in the Naxada dialect: gV=CLASS=ac= [van den Berg 1995: 299, 322, 336, 348, 353].

Cf. the mirroring set of verbs with the same root: r=CLASS=ac=, l=CLASS=ac=, g=CLASS=ac= 'to show up, emerge' [van den Berg 1995: 298, 331, 355, 353].

It is possible that =ac= and =ac= are related, although the total denasalization in =ac= is not clear, because there are no regular denasalization after g (cf., e.g., gâxu 'animal fang') or after t (cf., e.g., lâhe 'water tube at the mill'), whereas the sequence r-V should yield nV as follows from the class prefix n= < r= [van den Berg 1995: 31].

Bezhta (proper): Khalilov 1995: 114, 298; Madieva 1965: 160. Polysemy: 'to see / to be seen, visible'. The model: absolutive (object) + dative (recipient).

Distinct from gV=CLASS=ac= 'to look' [Khalilov 1995: 62; Madieva 1965: 154].

Distinct from g=VcVq [roułoxa] 'to look' [Khalilov 1995: 64]; g=oc= [class 1] / g=iieq [class 2] / g=uc= [class 3].


Distinct from gV=CLASS=ac= 'to look' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 174].


Distinct from g=VcVq 'to look' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 174]; g=oc= [class 1] / g=iieq [class 2, 5] / g=uc= [class 3, 4].

Common Bezhta: Initial g(V)= in the verbs for 'to look' is a fossilized directional prefix. It is likely that gV=CLASS=ac= 'to look' and g=VcVq 'to look' are related, but final -q in the latter verb remains unclear.

Hinukh: Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 81, 420. Polysemy: 'to see / to be seen, visible'. The model: absolutive (object) + dative (recipient).

Distinct from CLASS=ace (беза) 'to look' [Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 66, 522].

Kidero Dido: Khalilov 1999: 56, 309. Polysemy: 'to see / to be seen, visible'. The model: absolutive (object) + dative (recipient).

Distinct from CLASS=ezu (беза, эева) 'to look' [Khalilov 1999: 45, 295, 377].


Common Dido: The same in other dialects: Asak CLASS=ik= (біквада) 'to see' [Khalilov 1999: 56], CLASS=ezu (беза, эева) 'to look' [Khalilov 1999: 45, 295]. Mokok CLASS=uka (ьукада) 'to see' [Khalilov 1999: 56].


Distinct from Inkhokwari gič 'to look' [Bokarev 1959: 157].

Kwantlada Khwarshi: CLASS=ak=a (лаква) 'to see' [Karimova 2014; Khalilova 2009: 18, 79, 97].
Distinct from Kwantlada gić’ ~ guc’ ‘to look’ [Khalilova 2009: 84, 90].

Common Khwarshi: The model: absolutive (object) + lative (recipient).

Proto-Tsezic: NCED: 255. Distribution: Retained in its basic meaning 'to be seen, to see' in all Tsezic lects except for Hunzib, where it was lost.

The original meaning of the verb *CLASS=ãc’V [NCED: 262], which means 'to be seen, to see' in Hunzib, is unclear. It is not very likely that it is the same root as 'to look', attested in East West Tsezic (further see notes on Hunzib).

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular except for the first vowel a in Khwarshi (apparently an occasional assimilation: e-a > a-a). As proposed by S. Nikolaev, indexed *d1 & *g1 are specific Proto-Tsezic phonemes, which yield voiced reflexes in East Tsezic and voiceless ones in West Tsezic [NCED: 111].

Semantics and structure: Primary verbal stem, meaning 'to be seen'. The model absolutive (object) + dative (recipient), attested in the majority of modern lects, is to be reconstructed as the Proto-Tsezic pattern for 'to see'.

73. SEED

Hunzib (proper) ĩžu {иңжү} (1), Bezhta (proper) ĩzo {иңзо} (1), Khoshar-Khota Bezhta ĩzo (1), Tlyadal Bezhta ižö (1), Hinukh ak’ {акI} (2), Kidero Dido ak’ {акI} (2), Sagada Dido ak’ {акI} (2), Hinukh ak’ {акI} (2), Kidero Dido ak’ {акI} (2), Sagada Dido ak’ {акI} (2), Khwarshi (proper) ‘et’u {кьетIу} (-1), Inkhokwari Khwarshi ĩžu (1), Proto-Tsezic *tɪž-u ~ *tɪž.-u A (1).

References and notes:


The paronymous verb is CLASS=ĩže {йиңзэл} 'to sow' [Khalilov 1995: 124].

Distinct from hak’, which is glossed as ‘seeds’ in [Khalilov 1995: 72] with the only example: "seeds of flower'. The exact meaning of Bezhta proper hak’ is unclear, but obviously it is not the basic term for 'seed' (in Tlyadal Bezhta and Hunzib, this word means 'flower').


Tlyadal Bezhta: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 111.

Hinukh: Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 39, 518. Polysemy: 'seed / stone of fruit'. In [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 111], the Hinukh word for 'seed (семя)' is erroneously quoted as haq’u {гьакъу}, which actually means 'family (семья)' [Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 135]. Cf. the verb eziː 'to sieve' [Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 405; Forker 2013: 189]. Since it does not attach class prefixes, whereas the etymologically expected Hinukh form should be with -ž- not -z-, it is likely that eziː represents a borrowing from Bezhta with the Hinukh vowel shifts.

Kidero Dido: Khalilov 1999: 28, 374. Polysemy: 'seed / stone of fruit'. In [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 111], the Kidero word for 'seed' is quoted as ẽži, not found in [Khalilov 1999]; the initial pharyngeal looks strange.


Common Dido: Two terms are attested in other dialects: Asakh ak’ʷa {акIва} 'seed' [Khalilov 1999: 28], Mokok eži {эжи} 'seed' [Khalilov 1999: 295].


Cf. the verb CLASS=ɛź ‘to sow’ [Khalilova 2009: 5].

Inkhokwari Khwarshi: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 111.

A second Inkhokwari term for 'seed' is the non-inherited term ereço {кьерелы} [Karimova 2014; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 111].

Kwantlada Khwarshi: ereço {кьерелы} 'seed' [Karimova 2014]. Cf. the verb CLASS=ɛź ‘to sow’ [Khalilova 2009: 5, 72, 347, 415].

Common Khwarshi: Common Khwarshi ereço ‘seed’ is borrowed Tindi ԑt’u ‘seed’.

Proto-Tsezic: NCED: 279. Distribution: A non-trivial case. In the majority of the lects, the noun *tɛz-u ‘seed’ is used, derived from the
verb *class=�v (~-�-) 'to sow' (the verb itself is well-attested in Tsezic languages). Deverbatives with the suffix -u are not a productive pattern, although these are more or less scarcely attested in various Tsezic lects and such a morphological model can be reconstructed for the Proto-Tsezic level.

In Hinukh and many, although not all, Dido dialects, the meaning 'seed / stone of fruit' is expressed by the form *hak`w* [NCED: 508]. Its East Tsezic cognates are: Hunzib proper *hak`* 'flower' [Isakov & Khalilov 2001: 61], Tlyadal Bezhta *hak`* 'flower', Bezhta proper *hak`* 'seeds' [Khalilov 1995: 72] (further connection to Khwarshi ak`'dough' is semantically unlikely). It is theoretically possible that *hak`w* is the Proto-Tsezic term for 'seed', retained in Hinukh and Dido, but superseded by independent new formations from 'to sow' in other lects (including Mokok Dido). However, since *ʔɛz-*u demonstrates a non-productive morphological pattern and should be treated as an archaic stem, it is more likely that *hak`w* with the meaning 'seed' represents a late innovation of the central Tsezic area. The original Proto-Tsezic semantics of *hak`w* is unclear.

In Khwarshi dialects, the inherited forms tend to be superseded by the Tindi loanword.

**Semantics and structure:** Nominal deverbative stem.

**Distribution:** In all the lects, except for Kidero Dido, 'to sit' is expressed analytically as the adverb *q`id`a* 'down' and the generic verb *class=ece* {къуду эча} 'to be / to stand / to stay, remain, dwell / to stop to do'. In Kidero Dido, the adverb *q`id`a* 'down' was lost and *class=ece* acquired the polysemy 'to stand / to sit'.

References and notes:


**Bezhta (proper):** Khalilov 1995: 116, 155; Madieva 1965: 169. Polysemy: 'to sit / to sit down'.

**Khoshar-Khota Bezhta:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 87. Quoted in the entry 'to sit down', but apparently with polysemy: 'to sit / to sit down'.

**Tlyadal Bezhta:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 87. Quoted in the entry 'to sit down', but apparently with polysemy: 'to sit / to sit down'.

**Common Bezhta:** Literally 'to stay/stand down' with the local adverb *q`ere* (Bezhta proper regular *q`ey*) 'down to the ground, on the floor' and *class=ece* {къеу иєцал} 'to stand' q.v.

**Hinukh:** Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 91, 519. Polysemy: 'to sit / to sit down'. Literally 'to be down' with the adverb *q`idi* ~ *q`iidii* 'down, on the ground / afoot' [Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 216; Forker 2013: 347] and the generic verb *class=ic`i* 'to be / to stand / to stay' (see 'to stand').

**Kidero Dido:** Khalilov 1999: 63, 374. A generic verb with polysemy: 'to stand / to sit / to sit down / to stay, remain, dwell / to stop to do'.

**Sagada Dido:** Abdulaev 2014. Literally 'to be down' with the adverb *q`ida* 'down' and the generic verb *class=ic`i* 'to be'.

**Khwarshi (proper):** Karimova 2014.

**Inkhokwari Khwarshi:** Karimova 2014. C.f. the attested example: "I am sitting near the spring water" [Bokarev 1959: 158].

**Qwantlada Khwarshi:** *q`id`a class=ec`v* {къуду эча} with polysemy: 'to sit / to sit down' [Karimova 2014]. C.f. the attested examples: "He ... poured out the flour into the barrel and sat down" [Khalilova 2009: 87]. "When (they) came to the waste land, (they) sat down under the pear tree" [Khalilova 2009: 124].

**Common Khwarshi:** In all the dialects, the basic expression for 'to sit' is the local adverb *q`id`a* 'down' [Khalilova 2009: 124] plus the inflected copula *class=ec`v* 'to be'. C.f. the similar construction for 'to stand'.

**Proto-Tsezic:** NCED: 616, 1025. Distribution: In all the lects, except for Kidero Dido, 'to sit' is expressed analytically as the adverb *q`ee*-'down' [NCED: 616] (modified with different suffixes, which possibly represent old spatial case endings: *-re in East Tsezic and *-DV in West Tsezic) plus the verb *class=ec`v* 'to be / to stand' [NCED: 1025].
**Replacements:** ['to be down' > 'to sit'] (Proto-Tsezic).

**Reconstruction shape:** Correspondences seem regular.

**Semantics and structure:** Analytical construction, literally 'to be down'.

75. **SKIN**

**Hunzib (proper)**: beš {ōeu} (1), Bezhta (proper): beš {ōeu} (1), Khoshar-Khota Bezhta: bes (1), Tlyadal Bezhta: beš (1), Hinukh: qal {χαλ} (-1), Sagada Dido: hoši {χλου} (2), Khwarshi (proper): qolů {χολυ} (3), Inkhokwari Khwarshi: qolů ~ qˤolů {χˤоIу} (3).

**References and notes:**


**Bezhta (proper):** Khalilov 1995: 45, 311; Madieva 1965: 150. Polysemy: 'bark / shell / human skin / hide of large cattle'.

**Distinct from:**
1) řäše {гъаьше} 'hide of small cattle' [Khalilov 1995: 68, 311];
2) tasma {тасма} 'skin' or 'hide' (not specified) [Khalilov 1995: 236, 311] (a Turkic loanword?);
3) qal {χαл} with polysemy: 'bark / peel / skin or hide (not specified)' [Khalilov 1995: 259, 311; Madieva 1965: 190], borrowed from Avar qːal 'peel, bark'.

**Khoshar-Khota Bezhta:** Ya. Testelets, p.c.; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 41. Polysemy: 'human skin / hide of large cattle' (in [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990], only the latter meaning is mentioned).

Distinct from: řäše 'hide of small cattle' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 40]; lepa {лепа} 'skin' or 'hide' (not specified) [Khalilov 1995: 178, 311].

**Tlyadal Bezhta:** Ya. Testelets, p.c.; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 40. Polysemy: 'human skin / hide of large cattle' (in [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990], only the latter meaning is mentioned).

Distinct from: řäše 'hide of sheep', qä ø 'hide of goat' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 40].

**Hinukh:** Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 358, 454. Polysemy: 'bark / peel / layer, coat / skin'. The only attested example for the meaning 'human skin' contains this word: "skin (qal) of the hands has chapped" [Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 358]. Borrowed from Avar qal 'peel, bark'.

Distinct from several inherited terms:
1) χʷiši ~ χuši {хвиши, хуши} 'hide of small cattle' [Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 349; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 40];
2) bik {бик} 'hide of large cattle' [Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 81; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 40];
3) qˤo u ~ qˤo u 'sheep hide' [Forker 2013: 32, 117; Lomtadze 1963: 41] (the etymologically expected variant qˤo u is from [Lomtadze 1963]), not found in other sources.

**Kidero Dido:** No expressions for 'human skin' have been found in the available sources. Apparently one of following words must be used for this meaning:
1) hoši {χλου}, xolůnů 'hide of small cattle' (including 'sheep hide') [Khalilov 1999: 268; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 40];
2) bik {бик} 'hide of large cattle' [Khalilov 1999: 56; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 40];
3) borrowed term qal {χαл} 'bark / peel / layer, coat / skin' [Khalilov 1999: 251], as in the examples "The skin got thin" [Khalilov 1999: 251], "to strip the skin off" [Khalilov 1999: 251]; < Avar qal 'peel, bark'.

**Sagada Dido:** Abduluev 2014.

**Khwarshi (proper):** Karimova 2014.

**Inkhokwari Khwarshi:** Karimova 2014; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 40. Polysemy: 'human skin / hide of large cattle / goat hide'.

Distinct from Inkhokwari hēše 'sheep hide' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 40].

**Kwantlada Khwarshi:** qolů {χоIу} with polysemy: 'human skin / animal hide' [Karimova 2014; Khalilova 2009: 83].

**Common Khwarshi:** In all the dialects, 'human skin' can also be expressed as qal {χαл} [Karimova 2014], ultimately borrowed from Avar qal 'peel, bark'.

**Proto-Tsezic:** Not reconstructible.

Distribution: Various terms for 'human skin' normally display the polysemy 'human skin / a k. of animal hide' in attested Tsezic languages, and it seems that the meaning 'human skin' always represents a secondary development from 'a k. of hide' in any individual lect or a group of lects (e.g., 'beš: hide of large cattle / human skin' can be formally
reconstructed for Proto-East Tsezic).

References and notes:


Reference shape for Tsezic. Finally, Tlyadal Bezhta =iʔe {бервей} and is not entirely clear. =iʔe can be due to contraction with the iterative infix -a-. =iʔe is formed with the iterative suffix -läh [Kibrik & Testelets 2004: 273], but =iʔe itself is not a very typical root shape for Tsezic. Finally, Tlyadal tūl-əe 'to fall asleep' / Bezhta proper tūl-lō 'to wake up' [Khalilov 1995: 184] is formally a complex verb, where -AV is the morpheme expressing the semantics of "sound" or "mouth" [Kibrik & Testelets 2004: 273], although tūl as an onomatopoeic element looks strange (under such an analysis, one should expect an ergative model for tūl-əe).

Hunzib: Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 99, 525. Polysemy: 'to lie / to lie down / to sleep'.

Kidero Dido: Khalilov 1999: 138, 379. Polysemy: 'to lie / to lie down / to sleep / to die'.


A second verb for 'to sleep' is CLASS=aq [aļxaI, aļxa] with polysemy: 'to lie / to sleep' as follows from the example 'I will sleep' in [Bokarev 1959: 168].

Inkhokwari Khwarshi: Karimova 2014.

The second Inkhokwari verb for 'to sleep' is CLASS=aq ~ CLASS=aq [aļxaI, aļxa] with polysemy: 'to lie / to sleep' as follows from the gloss 'to sleep' in [Karimova 2014; Bokarev 1959: 166, 168, 169, 170, 171].

Kwantlada Khwarshi: Āus ~ Āis {аIыца} 'to sleep' [Karimova 2014; Khalilova 2009: 28, 33, 36, 43, 67, 204].

Proto-Tsezic: NCED: 1035. Distribution: See notes on 'to lie'.

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular.

Semantics and structure: Primary verbal stem with polysemy: 'to lie / to sleep'.

References and notes:

Hunzib (proper) CLASS=ut' {дымла} (1), Bezhta (proper) CLASS=iʔe, e {йуʔчъбъхаъл} (2), Khoshar-Khota Bezhta CLASS=ut' (1), Tlyadal Bezhta CLASS=ut' (1), Hinukh CLASS=ot' {дымла} (1), Kidero Dido kec {кеъл} (3), Sagada Dido kec {кеъл} (3), Khwarshi (proper) əes {лецал} (4), Inkhokwari Khwarshi əis {луца} (4), Proto-Tsezic *CLASS=it'w* (1).

77. SMALL

Hunzib (proper) CLASS=ilə-r-u {діуьрпь} (1), Bezhta (proper) it'in-o {утлуно} (-1), Khoshar-Khota Bezhta it'in-o (-1), Tlyadal Bezhta CLASS=īwō-r-ō ~ CLASS=ewe-r-o (1), Hinukh CLASS=egʷe-y {дөгвей} (2), Kidero Dido CLASS=evẽ ~ CLASS=ewe {делцв} (3), Sagada Dido 94
CLASS=ɐʁʷe (регъве) (3), Khwarshi (proper) ak'ey (аклеу) (4), Inkhokwari Khwarshi mic'ik'-i (мичуклу) (5), Proto-Tsezic *CLASS=ɨbʷV ~ *CLASS=ɨb':V (3).

References and notes:


Distinct from inherited CLASS=üwe-r-o [йуьверо] 'younger' [Khalilov 1995: 137], past participle from the verb CLASS=üwö 'to lose, to sustain a defeat' [Khalilov 1995: 137], although the retention of r (instead of expected y) is unclear.


Tlyadal Bezhta: Khalilov 1995: 224. Historically, a participle, see notes on Bezhta proper.


In [NCED: 573], also the adjective iʁa(y) 'small' is quoted.

Inkhokwari Khwarshi: Karimova 2014; Sharafutdinova &levina 1961: 113, 120. Polysemy: 'small / a few'.

In [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 237; Bokarev 1959: 158, 159], only the suffixal stem mic'k-a-re ~ mic'k-i-ri 'small' is quoted.

Kwantlada Khwarshi: mic'ik'-i [мичуклу] 'small' [Karimova 2014].

Differently in [Khalilova 2009: 106, 415, 445], where only the Kwantlada form ik'sew with polysemy: 'small / younger' has been found. Cf. the best example: "Though the garden on the hen's neck was small, I went there to plough and sow" [Khalilova 2009: 415].

Common Khwarshi: All three attested forms, ak'ey, mic'ik'-i and ik'sew, are etymologically obscure. E.g., mic'ik- directly coincides with Nidzh Udi micːikː [мицIикI] 'small', although the hypothetical common source of the borrowing is unclear.

Proto-Tsezic: NCED: 573. Distribution: For East Tsezic, *CLASS=ihV-r [NCED: 256] can be reconstructed as the term for 'small'; it is a participle from a verb that is attested only in Bezhta with the meaning 'to lose, to sustain a defeat'; the root is apparently lost in West Tsezic (Hinukh ehe-nnu, quoted in [NCED: 257], does not exist).

In West Tsezic, several different terms are used, all of them with weak etymologies or even without any whatsoever. If Khwarshi proper iʁa(y) 'small' does indeed exist, its match with Dido CLASS=ex'e 'small' makes *CLASS=ixː'V [NCED: 573] the best candidate for Proto-West Tsezic 'small'.

Provisionally we fill the Proto-Tsezic slot with *CLASS=ixː'V (attested in West Tsezic), since the morphologically transparent participle *CLASS=ihV-r (attested in East Tsezic) has a better chance to be a secondary formation.

In Bezhta dialects, the inherited term was superseded by the Avar loanword.

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular.

Semantics and structure: Primary adjective stem.

78. SMOKE

Hunzib (proper) qo {хъо} (1), Bezhta (proper) qo {хъо} (1), Khoshar-Khota Bezhta qo (1), Tlyadal Bezhta qo (1), Hinukh kut'i {кымлу} (2), Kidero Dido gut' {зымл} (2), Sagada Dido gut' {зымл} (2), Khwarshi (proper) gut' {зымл} (2), Inkhokwari Khwarshi gut' {зымл} (2), Proto-Tsezic *qʷi ~ *qo (1).

References and notes:

Oblique stem: *qʷə-. Distinct from *goʔ [roÍ] 'dust' [Isakov & Khalilov 2001: 56].


A second candidate is *goʔ [roÍ] with polysemy: 'dust / smoke' [Khalilov 1995: 63; Madieva 1965: 154]. This one seems more marginal in the meaning 'smoke' than *qə, because, first of all, examples for *goʔ 'smoke' are less numerous, second, they are not observed outside the main entry *goʔ in [Khalilov 1995: 63] ("a lot of smoke", "The smoke has cleared", "to emit smoke", "The house is full of smoke").

**Khoshar-Khota Bezhta:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 207. Paradigm: *qə [abs.] / *qəʔi-s [gen.]. Polysemy: 'smoke / dust'.

**Common Bezhta:** Distinct from the more specific term: Khoshar-Khota, Tlyadal *mus* 'smoke with soot' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 207] and Bezhta proper *mus* [-src], which is glossed as 'smoke above the fire' in [Madieva 1965: 177], but simply as 'soot' in [Khalilov 1995: 200].


**Sagada Dido:** Abdulaev 2014.

**Khwarshi (proper):** Karimova 2014.

**Inkhokwari Khwarshi:** Karimova 2014; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 207; Bokarev 1959: 150.

**Kwantlada Khwarshi:** *gut* [trv] 'smoke' [Karimova 2014].

**Proto-Tsezic:** NCED: 738. Distribution: A non-trivial case with two terms entering into competition:

1) *qʷi ~ *qə [NCED: 738], which represents the main term for 'smoke' in East Tsezic lects, lost in West Tsezic;
2) *got'(V) A [TsezEDb], which means 'smoke' in West Tsezic (with polysemy 'smoke / dust' in Kidero Dido), as well as in one East Tsezic lect: Bezhta proper with polysemy 'smoke / dust', although it is not the main Bezhta term for 'smoke'. In Hinukh, it means simply 'dust'.

Despite its narrower distribution, the root *qʷi ~ *qə has very good external North Caucasian comparanda with the meaning 'smoke', which is why we prefer to posit it as the Proto-Tsezic term for this meaning.

On the other hand, *got'(V) lacks an external North Caucasian etymology. Its meaning 'dust', attested in both East and West Tsezic, suggests that *got'(V) can be reconstructed as the Proto-Tsezic term for 'dust', whereas the development 'dust' > 'smoke' is a late innovation, probably not even of Proto-West Tsezic age, since in Kidero Dido the compound 'dust (gut') + air' is still used as a more rare expression for 'smoke'. It must be noted that Bezhta proper *got' 'dust / smoke' cannot be a direct Hinukh loanword, because in Hinukh this root has the shape kut'i (with irregular k- instead of q-).

Replacements: ('dust > 'smoke') (Bezhta proper, Dido, Khwarshi); ('dust + air > 'smoke') (Bezhta proper).

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular.

Semantics and structure: Primary substantive root.

---

79. STAND

Hunzib (proper) CLASS=éče {ðev차} (1), Bezhta (proper) CLASS=eco-ƛ'a CLASS=éče {ίεζοκъа ίεζαλ} (2), Khoshar-Khota Bezhta CLASS=éče (1), Tlyadal Bezhta CLASS=éče-noc' (1), Hinukh CLASS=íči ~ CLASS=íči {ðиа, ðила} (1), Kidero Dido CLASS=íči {ðича} (1), Sagada Dido ečker CLASS=íči {эчкеп ðича} (3), Khwarshi (proper) CLASS=ah-a CLASS=eč {латъа эча} (4), Inkhokwari Khwarshi CLASS=ah-a CLASS=eč {латъа эча} (4), Proto-Tsezic *CLASS=éčV (1).

References and notes:
Hunzib (proper): Isakov & Khalilov 2001: 37, 236. Polysemy: 'to be / to stand / to stay'. In [van den Berg 1995: 295], CLASS=ččè is only glossed as 'to stay, be, live', there is no expression for 'to stand' in this glossary. The expression for 'to sit' q.v. consists of CLASS=ččè with a spatial adverb.

Distinct from CLASS=рцè ([пара] 'to stand up' [Isakov & Khalilov 2001: 31, 194; van den Berg 1995: 282]. This can additionally be modified by the adverb ιαq 'up' [Isakov & Khalilov 2001: 102; van den Berg 1995: 68] (ιαq is not attested outside this expression).

Bezhta (proper): Khalilov 1995: 116, 339. The collocation consists of the adverb CLASS=єкс-л̆ьа 'upright' [Khalilov 1995: 116] (л̆ьа is the locative ending, which frequently modifies locative or spatial adverbs) and the verb CLASS=ččè (т̆ьета) 'to stop to move / to stop to do / to take one’s stand / to stay, dwell' [Khalilov 1995: 116; Madieva 1965: 160]. Apparently, =єкс-л̆ьа and =єččè are etymological cognates (c < č due to word harmony).


Khoshar-Khota Bezhta: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 86. Polysemy: 'to stand / to remain, stay'. According to M. Khalilov, p.c., there also exists the full collocation CLASS=єкс-л̆ьа CLASS=чčè 'to stand', which corresponds to the Bezhta proper expression.

Distinct from CLASS=чčè-н̆ьс 'to remain, stay' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 62].

Common Bezhta: CLASS=чčè can be safely postulated as the Proto-Bezhta verb for 'to stand'. The semantic development towards abstract meanings in Bezhta dialects has conditioned the use of an additional adverb.

The element -н̆ьс is unclear. It looks like a verbal root =н̆ьс '?' that has been modified with the fossilized directional prefix н̆ь.

Hinukh: Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 90, 528. Polysemy: 'to be, become / to stand / to stand up / to stay / to stop to move / to stop to do'.

The expression for 'to sit' q.v. consists of CLASS=йчи with a spatial adverb.

Kidero Dido: Khalilov 1999: 63. A generic verb with polysemy: 'to stand / to sit / to sit down / to stay, remain, dwell / to stop to do'.

Additionally, the full collocation лиц̆ьер CLASS=йчи [лиц̆ьер йч] 'to stand' is used [Khalilov 1999: 97, 381], which contains the spatial adverb лиц̆ьер = eč'ker (Asakh лиц̆ьер) [лиц̆ьер, лиц̆ьер] 'vertically' [Khalilov 1999: 97].

Distinct from specific CLASS=йчи [лиц̆ьа] 'to stand up / to raise' [Khalilov 1999: 54].

Sagada Dido: Abdulaev 2014. Literally 'to be vertically' with the adverb eč'ker 'vertically' and the generic verb CLASS=йчи 'to be'.

Khwarski (proper): Karimova 2014. Apparently, the situation is the same as in Kwantlada Khwarshi (q.v.): the basic expression for 'to stand' is the infinitive CLASS=ах-a plus the inflected copula CLASS=чčè 'to be'.

Inhokwari Khwarshi: Karimova 2014. Apparently, the situation is the same as in Kwantlada Khwarshi (q.v.): the basic expression for 'to stand' is the infinitive CLASS=ах-a plus the inflected copula CLASS=чčè 'to be'.

Simple CLASS=ах means 'to stand up' [Bokarev 1959: 163, 165] (according to Bokarev, this verb has the suppletive present stem ах-).

Kwantlada Khwarshi: CLASS=ах-a CLASS=чčè [ага ыча] with polysemy: 'to stand / stop' [Karimova 2014; Khalilova 2009: 17]. This is the basic expression for 'to stand': the infinitive CLASS=ах-a plus the inflected copula CLASS=чčè 'to be'. Cf. some examples: "The girl was standing (=ах-a in the center of the street" [Khalilova 2009: 139], 'People who are working are standing (=ах-a)" [Khalilova 2009: 213], "At night I had a dream that I and Musa, Saydula and their Xadi, who was standing (=ах-un), were trying to pen (drive in) the buffalo calves" [Khalilova 2009: 225], "You have reached that place, stop!" [Khalilova 2009: 231].

Without the copula =чčè, the fully inflected CLASS=ах can be used in the meaning 'to stand up' as in "Malla-rasan got up (=ах-un) from the place where he was" [Khalilova 2009: 229], "The clever one got up (=ах-un) early in the morning hiding himself behind the door" [Khalilova 2009: 134]; in the meaning 'to become' as in "I became glad", "He became glad" [Khalilova 2009: 223]; or in the meaning 'to be, be situated" as in "He became ill there and was (=ах-) in bed for six months" [Khalilova 2009: 72].

Common Khwarshi: Cf. a similar construction for 'to sit'.

Proto-Tsezic: NCED: 1025. Distribution: *CLASS=чčèV is a Common Tsezic verb for 'to be'. The plain verb is also used as the basic expression for 'to stand' in East Tsezic and some West Tsezic languages (Hinukh, Dido) that allow us to reconstruct *CLASS=чčèV with the Proto-Tsezic polysemy 'to be / to stand'.

Sometimes, especially in Bezhta and Khwarshi, *CLASS=чčèV with the meaning 'to stand' is modified by various
adverbial additions, which are not entirely clear synchronically and do not coincide between languages diachronically (the underlying meaning of these should be something like 'vertically'). Such constructions ('to be vertically') mirror the Common Tsezic construction *q'ˤe CLASS=čV 'to sit' q.v., lit. 'to be down'.

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular.

Semantics and structure: Primary verbal stem with polysemy: 'to be / to stand'.

80. STAR

Hunzib (proper) ca {çal} (1), Bezhta (proper) cā {çal} (1), Khoshar-Khota Bezhta ca (1), Tlyadal Bezhta ca (1), Hinukh ca {çal} (1), Kidero Dido ca {çal} (1), Sagada Dido ca {çal} (1), Khwarshi (proper) ca {çal} (1), Inkhokwari Khwarshi ca ~ cā {çal} (1), Proto-Tsezic *cā (1).

References and notes:


Tlyadal Bezhta: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 198. Oblique stem: ca- li-

Hinukh: Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 374, 445; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 198. Oblique stem: ca- ~ ca-mo-. The variant cān, proposed in [NCED: 1099], is not confirmed by other sources. In [Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 379], the phonetic variant cān [čal] 'star' is also quoted, apparently the result of influence on the part of Avar čnw 'star'.

Kidero Dido: Khalilov 1999: 269, 327; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 198. Oblique stem: caye- ~ ca-dara-. In [Khalilov 1999: 274], the phonetic variant cān [čal], obl. ča- 'star' is also quoted; this is apparently the result of influence on the part of Avar čnw 'star'.


Kwantlada Khwarshi: ca {çal} 'star' [Karimova 2014].

Proto-Tsezic: NCED: 1098. Distribution: One of the most stable Proto-Tsezic roots, retained in its basic meaning in all Tsezic lects. Correspondences seem regular.

Semantics and structure: Primary substantive root.

81. STONE

Hunzib (proper) L’alu ~ L’al {kvaly} (1), Bezhta (proper) L’alo {kvalo} (1), Khoshar-Khota Bezhta L’alo (1), Tlyadal Bezhta L’alo (1), Hinukh čemtu {čemtu} (2), Kidero Dido L’ul {čyl} (3), Sagada Dido L’ul {čyl} (3), Khwarshi (proper) D’ur {čyp} (3), Inkhokwari Khwarshi D’ur {čyp} (3), Proto-Tsezic *kur ~ *kur ~ *bor ~ *bul (3).

References and notes:


specified as 'big stone' in [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 201] (< Avar *gamˈač' 'stone').

Distinct from *himu [ɬɪmʊ] 'gravestone' [Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 144] in [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 191], the word for 'gravestone' is quoted as *χemu - an error?.

Distinct from *χal [кал] 'stone throwing' [Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 224].


A more marginal synonym is the borrowed term *gamač' [гамач] 'stone' [Khalilov 1999: 80] < Avar *gamˈač' 'stone'.

Distinct from aḥin [ахин] 'boulder, big stone' [Khalilov 1999: 32], which is glossed as generic 'stone' in [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 201].


Distinct from *ɬa [лъад] 'cliff, rock' [Abdulaev 2014].

Common Dido: The same in the other dialects: Shapikh ʡul [гIул] 'stone' [Khalilov 1999: 94].


Proto-Tsezic: NCED: 467. Distribution: An unstable word with three competing roots:

1) *'Vlu [NCED: 773], which can be reconstructed as the Proto-East Tsezic term for 'stone'; in West Tsezic it means 'stone throwing' (Hinukh) and 'trap' (Dido, Khwarshi).

2) *χemu A [NCED: 466], meaning 'stone' in Hinukh; in the rest of Tsezic lects it means 'gravestone' or 'boundary stone' (although details of the coexistence of two Hinukh variants: χemu 'stone', *χemu 'gravestone', are unclear);

3) *χur (~ ɪr, -ər, -ə) [NCED: 467], which means 'stone' in Dido and Khwarshi, lost in the rest of languages.

Distribution-wise, *'Vlu is the best variant, since its Hinukh meaning 'stone throwing' could point to the generic meaning 'stone' in Proto-West Tsezic. On the other hand, this root means 'trap' in Dido and Khwarshi, which implies the original meaning 'flat stone, stone lid' rel sim. Such a meaning is in accordance with Avaro-Andian (closest relative of Tsezic) data, which also show the meaning 'lip' for the cognates of Tsezic *'Vlu. So it is likely that Tsezic *'Vlu originally meant 'flat stone, stone lid', having developed into the generic meaning 'stone' in Proto-East Tsezic; Hinukh *'al 'stone throwing' is thus either borrowed or seriously influenced by East Tsezic.

The original meaning of *χemu was apparently 'gravestone', as proven by the majority of languages; its meaning 'stone' in Hinukh is thus secondary.

Ultimately, the noun *χur, retained only in Dido and Khwarshi, appears to be the best candidate for the status of Proto-Tsezic 'stone'. External etymology supports this solution: Nakh cognates of *χur can be safely posited as the basic Proto-Nakh term for 'stone'.

Replacements: ['flat stone, stone lid' > 'stone'] (Hunzib, Bezhta); ['gravestone' > 'stone'] (Hinukh).

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular.

Semantics and structure: Primary substantive root.

82. SUN

Hunzib (proper) *boq {бoχъ} (1), Bezhta (proper) *boq {бoχъ} (1), Khoshar-Khota Bezhta *boq (1), Tlyadal Bezhta *boq (1), Hinukh *boq {бoχъ} (1), Kidero Dido *boq {бoχъ} (1), Sagada Dido *boq {бoχъ} (1), Khwarshi (proper) *boq {бoχъ} (1), Inkhokwari Khwarshi *biq ~ *biq {биχъ} (1), Proto-Tsezic *boq (1).

References and notes:


Hinukh: Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 110, 524; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 197. Paradigm: *boq [abs.] / *biq-e-s [gen.] in [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990], the oblique stem is quoted as *boq-no-].


Inkhokwari Khwarshi: Karimova 2014; Bibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 197; Bokarev 1959: 148, 152. The variant *biq* is from [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990; Bokarev 1959]. Paradigm: *biq* [abs.] / *beqi*- [obl.].

Kwantlada Khwarshi: *buq* ~ *buq* ~ *biq* [bukan] 'sun' [Karimova 2014; Khalilova 2009: 16, 130]. The unexpected pharyngealized variants *buq* ~ *biq* are from [Khalilova 2009].

Proto-Tsezic: NCED: 1051. Distribution: One of the most stable Proto-Tsezic roots, retained in its basic meaning in all Tsezic lects.

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular, except for the Inkhokwari Khwarshi vowel, influenced by the oblique stem.

Semantics and structure: Primary substantive root. The oblique stem is *biqV*.

83. SWIM

Bezhta (proper) ɬi ɣ=awo {ɬьи уаɣвa} (1) / ɭχe ɣ=awo {ɭьe уаɣвa} (2), Khoshar-Khota

Bezhta ɭχo ɣ=awo (2), Tlyadal Bezhta ɭχo r=awo (2), Hinukh te r=iw {ɭьe pьuɣвa} (1) / iχu y=iw {iχь уиɣвa} (2), Kidero Dido ɬi r=ow- {ɬьи погвa} (1), Sagada Dido ɬesə-na {ɬeɣaɣaда} (3), Khwarshi (proper) kʷani l=iw {квани льoвa} (-1), Inkhokwari Khwarshi kʷani l=iɣ {квани лиiвa} (-1), Proto-Tsezic *ɭ:ɭ r=ik:V*(1).

References and notes:

Hunzib (proper): Not reliably documented in the available sources and probably missing from the language (at least, as a separate lexical root). Cf. the collocation ɭχu y=ahu 'to swim across the river' with ɭχu 'river' and the verb CLASS=ahu 'to cross' [Isakov & Khalilov 2001: 33, 184]. In [van den Berg 1995: 296], ɭχu y=ahu and ɭχu y=ɪɭe (literally 'to kill the river?') are simply glossed as 'to swim', which looks like an inaccuracy.


Distinct from ɬi-ycɭ (ɬьиыйаллa) 'to bathe (intrans.)' [Khalilov 1995: 181; Madieva 1965: 174]. Khalilov 1995: 293. Literally 'to take out/ off the river’, where ɭχe = ‘river’. This is a second equivalent for the meaning ‘to swim’ found in [Khalilov 1995]. In [Madieva 1965: 195], another auxiliary verb is used: ɭχe y=ɭɭeɭ, literally ‘to hit the river’.

Khoshar-Khota Bezhta: M. Khalilov, p.c. Literally 'to take out/ off the river’.

Tlyadal Bezhta: M. Khalilov, p.c. Literally 'to take out/ off the river’.

Hinukh: Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 245, 490. Apparently the most neutral expressions for ‘to swim’ are te r=iw and iχu y=iw, literally ‘to take out/ off the water’ and ‘to take out/ off the river’ with CLASS=ix ‘to take out’ [Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 79], te ‘water’ q.v. and iχu ‘river’ [Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 185].


A second candidate is ɬesə-na {ɬeɣaɣaда} with polysemy: 'to wash (oneself) / to wash, launder / to bathe / to swim’ [Khalilov 1999: 298]; -na is the iterative suffix.

Sagada Dido: Abdulaev 2014. Unexpected initial ɭ- can be a transcriptional error.


Inkhokwari Khwarshi: Karimova 2014.

Kwantlada Khwarshi: kʷani l=iy {квани лиiвa} 'to swim' [Karimova 2014].


Proto-Tsezic: NCED: 1060. Distribution: Barely reconstructible. For the most part, only analytic expressions for ‘to swim’ are attested in Tsezic languages; the main element that carries the lexical meaning is ‘water’, ‘river’ or the borrowed stem ‘swimming’. A formal match between Bezhta, Hinukh and Dido allows us to posit *ɭ:ɭ r=ik:V* ‘to take out/ off the water’ as the Proto-Tsezic expression for ‘to swim’. 100
The coincidence between Bezhta proper ɬɪɬ y=arow 'to swim' (literally 'to take out/off the river') and Hinukh ɬɪɬ y=ir 'to swim' (literally 'to take out/off the river') is therefore secondary.

Replacements: {'to take out/off the water' > 'to swim'} (Bezhta proper, Hinukh, Kidero Dido); {'to take out/off the river' > 'to swim'} (Bezhta proper, Hinukh); {'to bathe' > 'to swim'} (Sagada Dido).

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular.

Semantics and structure: Analytic expressions 'to take out/off the water'; *r= is the class exponent, which agrees with 'water'.

84. TAIL

Hunzib (proper) mik {микъ} (1), Bezhta (proper) mik {микъ} (1), Khoshar-Khota Bezhta mɪk (1), Tlyadal Bezhta mɪk (1), Hinukh mihi {мыхъ} (1), Kidero Dido məhi {мыхъ} (1), Sagada Dido məhi {мыхъ} (1), Khwarshi (proper) mihe ~ mihe {миgъ} (1), Inkhokwari Khwarshi mɪhe ~ mɪhe {миgъ} (1), Proto-Tsezic *mɪx ~ *mɪxe A (1).

References and notes:


Tlyadal Bezhta: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 25. Polysemy: 'tail / fatty tail of sheep (курдюк) / plait (hair)'.


Khwarshi (proper): Karimova 2014; Sharafutdinova & Levina 1961: 97. The variant mihi is from [Sharafutdinova & Levina 1961]; mihi is from [Karimova 2014].

Inkhokwari Khwarshi: Karimova 2014; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 25; Bokarev 1959: 149. The variant mihe is from [Karimova 2014].

Distinct from the Inkhokwari compound k'ic'-mihe 'fatty tail of sheep (курдюк)' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 25] (the first element k'ic' is not attested independently).

Kwantlada Khwarshi: mihe ~ mihe {мыхъ} 'tail' [Karimova 2014; Khalilova 2009: 15]. In [Khalilova 2009: 27], an unclear form k'ızi 'tail' is also quoted.

Proto-Tsezic: NCED: 801. Distribution: One of the most stable Proto-Tsezic roots, retained in its basic meaning in all Tsezic lects.

Replacements: {'tail' > 'handle, grip'} (passim in Tsezic).

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular.

Semantics and structure: Primary substantive root.

85. THAT

Hunzib (proper) a=g (1) / a=g (2), Bezhta (proper) hu-gi (1) / hu=gi (2), Khoshar-Khota Bezhta hu-gi (1) / hu=gi (2), Tlyadal Bezhta hu-gi- (1) / hu=gi- (2), Hinukh iza=ha=go ~ iza=go (2) / iza=ha=w ~ iza=w (3), Kidero Dido že ~ žo {жe, жo} (4), Sagada Dido ol=šo {олшо} (4), Khwarshi (proper) o=CLASS=žu {овжу, овежу} (4) / o-CLASS-žu (1), Inkhokwari Khwarshi o=CLASS=nì {овну, овено} (5) / o-CLASS-nì (1), Proto-Tsezic *hV=gV (2).

References and notes:

According to [van den Berg 1995: 60], the Hunzib system of demonstrative attributive pronouns is ternary: bo-d, bo-du 'this (near the speaker)' / bo-l, bo-lu 'this (near the addressee)' / ə-g, o-gu 'that (far from the speaker and addressee)'. However, as noted in [van den Berg 1995: 60], the medial member bo-l [class 1, 3, 5], bo-lu [2, 4] is "used considerably less than the other two", whereas in [Bokarev 1959: 43], bo-l, bo-lu is not quoted at all. Because of this, we regard the synchronic Hunzib system to be binary: bo-d, bo-du 'this' / ə-g, o-gu 'that'.


According to [Khalilov 1995: 399-400], the Bezhta proper system of demonstrative attributive pronouns is ternary: hu-di 'this (near the speaker)' / hu-li 'this (near the addressee)' / hu-gi 'that (far from the speaker and addressee)'. The parallel emphatic set is modified with the proclitic wa= and irregular vowel reduction: wa=h-di / wa=h-li / wa=h-gi.

It should be noted that hu-li 'this (near the addressee)' is not mentioned in [Madieva 1965: 100-103] at all. This should imply that hu-li is rarely used in the language, and, actually, the Bezhta proper system is binary: hu-di 'this' / hu-gi 'that'. Nevertheless M. Khalilov (p.c.) has informed me that in the modern language, hu-li is a full-fledged and normally used pronoun. Technically, we treat hu-di 'this (near the speaker)' and hu-li 'this (near the addressee)' as synonyms for the slot 'this'.

Khoshar-Khota Bezhta: M. Khalilov, p.c. Khalilov (p.c.) preliminarily reports the binary opposition: hu-di 'this' / hu-gi 'that', although actually the whole system is expected to be ternary.


According to [Kibrik & Testelets 2004: 247], the Tlyadal system of demonstrative attributive pronouns is ternary: hu-di 'this (near the speaker)' / hu-ni- 'this (near the addressee)' / hu-gi- 'that (far from the speaker and addressee)'. The parallel emphatic set is modified with the proclitic wa= and irregular vowel harmony: wa=ha-di- / wa=ha-ni- / wa=ha-gi-.

In [Bokarev 1959: 95], a similar picture is reported, although the author fails to describe the difference between hu-di- and hu-ni- (these function as close synonyms, according to Bokarev).

Technically, we treat hu-di- 'this (near the speaker)' and hu-ni- 'this (near the addressee)' as synonyms for the slot 'this'. It is possible, however, that hu-ni- 'this (near the addressee)' is actually a marginal pronoun and this word should be excluded from the list.

Hinukh: Forker 2013: 139; Lomtadze 1963: 106. Suppletive paradigm: iza=(ha)=go [abs. class 1] / iza=(ha)=w [abs. 2, 3] / iza=(ha)=g [abs. 4, 5, pl.].

As described in [Forker 2013: 132 ff.], the system of Hinukh demonstrative pronouns is very complex, despite the fact that the basic opposition is binary: ə-do 'this' / ə-go 'that'. Three binary series are distinguished in [Forker 2013], which mainly differ by prefixal elements. Out of them, iza=(ha)=do 'this' / iza=(ha)=go 'that' seems to satisfy the Swadesh list semantics, "[that] these pronouns solely occur when directly pointing at some person or object, i.e. they serve only deictic functions" [Forker 2013: 139].

Two other series are: ha-do 'this' / ha-go 'that', which are "predominantly used as third person personal pronouns, as anaphoric pronouns, and as definite articles in noun phrases" [Forker 2013: 134]; and hi=ba=(ha)=do 'this' / hi=ba=(ha)=go 'that', which "occur only when the reference is immediately given" [Forker 2013: 136 f.]. All three series possess suppletive paradigms in respect to case and class. Class 2 & 3 form.


The system of Kidero Dido demonstrative pronouns has not yet been properly described, but, according to [Alekseev & Radzhabov 2004: 129 f.], the basic opposition is binary: əda 'this' / əe 'that'. Three paradigms of 'this' are distinguished in [Alekseev & Radzhabov 2004], which mainly differ by means of prefixal elements, and two paradigms of 'that'. Out of those, əda 'this' / əe 'that' seem to suit the Swadesh list semantics; cf. Alekseev & Radzhabov's remark that əe=da is usually accompanied with a deictic gesture.

Other demonstratives are: ə=da 'this', ə=da=da 'this', ə=əe 'that'. All paradigms are suppletive in respect to case and sometimes to class.


Sagada Dido: Abdulaev 2014. Details are not documented.

Khwarshi (proper): Karimova 2014; Sharafutdinova & Levina 1961: 108. As shown in [Karimova 2014], the basic opposition is
binary: \( a=\text{CLASS}(e)=dV \) 'this' / \( o=\text{CLASS}(e)=\ddot{z}u \) 'that'.

Besides these, there are two additional pairs of demonstrative pronouns mentioned in [Sharafutdinova & Levina 1961: 108]: i-\( dV \) 'this' / \( \ddot{z}u \) 'that'; ho-bo-\( dV \) 'this' / ho-bo-\( \ddot{z}u \) 'that'.

**Inkhokwari Khwarshi**: Karimova 2014; Bokarev 1959: 160. As shown in [Karimova 2014], the basic opposition is binary: \( a=\text{CLASS}(e)=dV \) 'this' / \( o=\text{CLASS}(e)=\text{nu} \) 'that'.

A second demonstrative pair is i-\( dV \) 'this' / yu 'that' [Bokarev 1959: 160]. See notes on the similar, if not completely identical, Kwantlada Khwarshi system, which is described in more detail.

**Kwantlada Khwarshi**: \( a=\text{CLASS}=\text{nu} \) [obny] 'that' [Karimova 2014; Khalilova 2009: 149]. Suppletive paradigm: 
\[ a=\text{CLASS}(e)=\text{nu} \] [abs.] / \( \ldots(n)(e)\text{so}, \ldots(n)(e)\text{su} \) [obl. class 1] / \( \ldots(n)(e)\text{fe} \) [obl. class 2-4].

It is not easy to properly understand the Kwantlada system based on [Khalilova 2009: 143-150], but in all likelihood, the basic opposition is binary: \( a=\text{CLASS}(e)=dV \) 'this' / \( o=\text{CLASS}(e)=\text{nu} \) 'that' [Karimova 2009: 147 ff.], both have suppletive oblique stems. The data in [Karimova 2014] suggest the same.

Besides these, there are also two other pairs of demonstrative pronouns. The first one is i-\( dV \) 'this' / i-\( \text{nu} \) 'that' [Karimova 2014: 143, 146 ff.]. The second pair is ho-bo-\( dV \) 'this' / ho-mo-\( \text{nu} \) [assimilated < *ho-bo-\( \text{nu} \)] 'that' [Karimova 2014: 143, 149 ff.].

Additionally, there are specific pronouns, whose function is probably anaphoric: \( \ddot{z}u \) 'that (sg.)'; i-\( z(\ddot{z})u \) 'that (proximal, pl.)', \( \ddot{z}i-\text{du} \) 'that (distal, pl.)' [Karimova 2014: 143-146].

The aforementioned pairs suggest that in the absolute case \( =dV \) is the main exponent of the proximal deixis 'this', whereas \( =\text{nu} \) is the main exponent of the distal deixis 'that'. Nevertheless, in the oblique cases these suppletive pronouns are only discriminated by the initial vowel morphemes, e.g., ergative class 1: \( a=\text{CLASS}(e)=\text{se} \) 'this' / \( o=\text{CLASS}(e)=\text{se} \) 'that'. Because of this, we treat \( a=\text{CLASS}(e)=dV \) 'this' and \( o=\text{CLASS}(e)=\text{nu} \) 'that' as compounds from a lexicostatistical point of view.

**Proto-Tsezic**: NCED: 442, 486. Distribution: In East Tsezic (Hinukh, Bezhta), the system of demonstrative attributive pronouns is ternary: 'this (near the speaker)'; 'this (near the addressee)'; 'that (far from the speaker and addressee)'. For West Tsezic, the binary system is characteristic: 'this' / 'that'. It remains unclear what kind of system is to be reconstructed for Proto-Tsezic ternary or binary.

The Proto-Tsezic proximal deictic pronoun 'this' or 'this (near the speaker)' can be safely reconstructed as \( *hV-dV \) [NCED: 404, 486]. This compound is retained everywhere except for Hunzib (where the first element was replaced by \( *hV \) [NCED: 321]) and perhaps Kidero Dido (where the first element was either replaced or contracted).

The distal deictic pronoun 'that' or 'that (far from the speaker and addressee)' is less stable. The compound \( *hV-gV \) [NCED: 442] can be posited as the Proto-East Tsezic distal deictic pronoun. With the same function, \( *hV-gV \) is also attested in Hinukh, which formally allows us to reconstruct \( *hV-gV \) as the Proto-Tsezic pronoun with this basic meaning.

In the rest of the West Tsezic lects, different distal deictic pronouns are used. In Dido and Khwarshi proper, it is \( *V \) [NCED: 1087] or the compound \( *hV-zV \). In Kwantlada Khwarshi, \( *hV-zV \) was superseded by \( *hV-nV \) [NCED: 858].

Despite the fact that Hinukh \( *hV-gV \) can theoretically be a result of East Tsezic influence, we prefer to follow formal distribution and reconstruct the Proto-Tsezic distal deictic pronoun 'that' or 'that (far from the speaker and addressee)' as the compound \( *hV-gV \).

In conclusion, we propose the following principal opposition for Proto-Tsezic: \( *hV-dV \) 'this' or 'this (near the speaker)' / \( *hV-gV \) 'that' or 'that (far from the speaker and addressee)'. The second elements \( *dV \) and \( *gV \) have to be treated as meaningful morphemes, whereas \( *hV \) was apparently an auxiliary unit.

Reconstruction shape: Vocalic correspondences are irregular; loss of initial \( *h \) in Hunzib and Khwarshi is irregular.

Semantics and structure: Primary pronominal morphemes.

86. THIS

Hunzib (proper) \( b\ddot{a}-d \) (1) / \( b\ddot{a}=d \) (2), Bezhta (proper) \( hu-di \) (3) / \( hu=di \) (2), Khoshar-Khota Bezhta \( hu-di \) (3) / \( hu=di \) (2), Tlyadal Bezhta \( hu-di \) (3) / \( hu=di \) (2), Hinukh \( iza=ha=do \sim iza=do \) (2), Kidero Dido \( ey=da \) [эйда] (2), Sagada Dido \( ehe=du \) [эгьеду] (2), Khwarshi (proper) \( a=\text{CLASS}=dV \) [эгьеду, эгьеду] (2) / \( a=\text{CLASS}=dV \) (3), Inkhokwari Khwarshi \( a=\text{CLASS}=dV \) [эгьеду, эгьеду] (2) / \( a=\text{CLASS}=dV \) (3), Proto-Tsezic \( *hV=dV \) (2).
References and notes:


**Khoshar-Khota Bezhta**: M. Khalilov, p.c. See notes on ‘that’.


**Hinukh**: Forker 2013: 139; Lomtadze 1963: 106. Suppletive paradigm: iza=(ha)=do [abs. class 1] / iza=(ha)=du [abs. 2, 3] / iza=(ha)=d [abs. 4, 5, pl.] / iza=(ha)=lo- [obl. 1] / iza=(ha)=(d)-z- [obl. pl.]. Further see notes on ‘that’.


**Sagada Dido**: Abdulaev 2014. Details are not documented.

**Khwarshi (proper)**: Karimova 2014; Sharafutdinova & Levina 1961: 108.

**Inkhokwari Khwarshi**: Karimova 2014; Bokarev 1959: 160.

Kwantlada Khwarshi: a=CLASS=du [abdu] ‘this’ [Karimova 2014; Khalilova 2009: 148]. Suppletive paradigm: a=CLASS=(e)=du [abs.] / ...=se, ...=so, ...=su- [obl. class 1] / ...=de [obl. class 2-4].

Common Khwarshi: See notes on ‘that’.

**Proto-Tsezic**: NCED: 404, 486. **Distribution**: See notes on ‘that’.

**Reconstruction shape**: Vocalic correspondences are irregular; loss of initial *h* in Khwarshi is irregular.

**Semantics and structure**: Primary pronominal morphemes.

86. **THIS**

Bezhta (proper) *hu=li* (4), Tlyadal Bezhta *hu=ni-* (5).

References and notes:


87. **THOU**

Hunzib (proper) *mə {мо}* (1), Bezhta (proper) *mi {мн}* (1), Khoshar-Khota Bezhta *mi* (1), Tlyadal Bezhta *mi* (1), Hinukh *me {ме}* (1), Kidero Dido *mi {мн}* (1), Sagada Dido *mi {мн}* (1), Khwarshi (proper) *ma {мн}* (1), Inkhokwari Khwarshi *mo {мн}* (1), Proto-Tsezic *mə* (1).

References and notes:


de-bə [gen.].


**Sagada Dido**: Abdulaev 2014; Imnaishvili 1963: 94. Paradigm: mi [abs., erg.]/ de-bi [gen.]/ de-b- [obl.].

**Khwarshi (proper)**: Karimova 2014; Sharafutdinova & Levina 1961: 109. Paradigm: na [abs.]/ mi [erg.]/ de-b- [obl.].

**Inkhokwari Khwarshi**: Karimova 2014; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 222; Bokarev 1959: 159. Paradigm: mo [abs.]/ me [erg.]/ du-b- [obl.].

**Kwantlada Khwarshi**: mo [abs.]/ me [erg.]/ du-b- [obl.].

**Proto-Tsezic**: NCED: 1014. Distribution: The Proto-Tsezic suppletive paradigm can be safely reconstructed as *mə [abs., erg.]/ *ɨ-bə A [gen.]/ *du- [obl.]. It is retained in East Tsezic, although perhaps already in Proto-West Tsezic, the oblique stem acquired the shape *ɨ-b- by analogy with the genitive form.

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular except for i in Bezhta in mi.

Semantics and structure: Primary pronominal morphemes.

87. **THOU$_2$**

**Hunzib (proper)** di-bə (2), **Bezhta (proper)** di-bo (2), Khoshar-Khota Bezhta di-bo (2), Tlyadal Bezhta di-bo (2), Hinukh de-be (2), Kidero Dido de-bi (2), Sagada Dido de-bi (2), Khwarshi (proper) de-b- (2), Inkhokwari Khwarshi du-b- (2), Proto-Tsezic *di-bə A (2).

References and notes:

Hunzib (proper): Genitive form.
Bezhta (proper): Genitive form.
Khoshar-Khota Bezhta: Genitive form.
Tlyadal Bezhta: Genitive form.
Hinukh: Genitive form.
Kidero Dido: Genitive form.
Sagada Dido: Genitive form.
Khwarshi (proper): Oblique stem.
Inkhokwari Khwarshi: Oblique stem.

88. **TONGUE**

**Hunzib (proper)** mɨc {мыц} (1), **Bezhta (proper)** mɨc {миц} (1), Khoshar-Khota Bezhta mɨc (1), Tlyadal Bezhta mɨc (1), Hinukh mec {мец} (1), Kidero Dido mec {мец} (1), Sagada Dido mec {мец} (1), Khwarshi (proper) mec {мец} (1), Inkhokwari Khwarshi mɨc ~ mɨc {миц} (1), Proto-Tsezic *mɨc A (1).

References and notes:

Tlyadal Bezhta: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 15.
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Inkhokwari Khwarshi: Karimova 2014; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 15; Bokarev 1959: 149. The variant mic is from [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990; Bokarev 1959].
Proto-Tsezic: NCED: 802. Distribution: One of the most stable Proto-Tsezic roots, retained in its basic meaning in all Tsezic lects.
   Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular.
   Semantics and structure: Primary substantive root.

89. TOOTH

Hunzib (proper) silə {сылə} (1), Bezhta (proper) sila {сила} (1), Khoshar-Khota Bezhta sila (1), Tlyadal Bezhta sila (1), Hinukh k'ęcu {кючы} (2), Kidero Dido k'icu {кIицу} (2), Sagada Dido k'icu {кIицу} (2), Khwarshi (proper) sel {сел} (1), Inkhokwari Khwarshi sil ~ sɨl (1), Proto-Tsezic *sil ~ s:il A (1).

References and notes:

   Distinct from k'acu ~ k'acu {кIачы} ‘canine tooth’ [Isakov & Khalilov 2001: 105; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 16; van den Berg 1995: 312] (the form k'acu is from [Isakov & Khalilov 2001], where it is glossed as ‘human canine tooth / animal fang’.
   Distinct from qəɾin {хъа гъин} ‘animal fang’ [Isakov & Khalilov 2001: 167] - not found in other sources; the form suspiciously resembles χαɾin {ха гъин}, discussed above.


   Distinct from the more specific term gəţu {гагъу} with polysemy: ‘molar / fang’ [Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 115; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 17].

   Distinct from the specific term gəţi {гагъи} (Asakh gəţi – гагъи, Mokok goţu) ‘fang’ [Khalilov 1999: 80] (in [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 17], this word is quoted as gəţu ‘molar’).


Inkhokwari Khwarshi: Karimova 2014; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 16; Bokarev 1959: 147; Khalilova 2009: 7. The variant sil is from [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990; Bokarev 1959].
   Distinct from the specific terms koţu ‘fang’ [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 16] and səţes sil ‘molar’, literally ‘dog’s tooth’ [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 17].

Kwantlada Khwarshi: sul ~ sil {сул, сиэл} ‘tooth’ [Karimova 2014; Khalilova 2009: 7, 484].

Proto-Tsezic: NCED: 326. Distribution: Two terms enter into competition:
   1) *sil (~ s-) A [NCED: 326], meaning ‘tooth’ in East Tsezic and some West Tsezic (Khwarshi) lects, lost in the rest of West Tsezic;
2) *k'əcu* [NCED: 430], meaning 'tooth' in some West Tsezic lects (Hinukh, Dido) and 'canine tooth, fang' in some East Tsezic lects (Hunzib).

Inner Tsezic distribution as well as external etymology speak in favour of *sɨl* (it goes back to the main candidate for the status of the Proto-North Caucasian term for 'tooth'). As for *k'əcu*, external comparison clearly suggests that the meaning 'canine tooth, fang' (as attested in East Tsezic) should be primary for this stem. The match between Hinukh *k'iču* / Dido *k'icu* 'tooth' is, however, to be treated as secondary.

**Replacements:** ('canine tooth, fang' > 'tooth') (Hinukh, Dido).

**Reconstruction shape:** Correspondences seem regular.

**Semantics and structure:** Primary substantive root. The oblique stem is *s(ː)ɨla*.

90. TREE

**Hunzib (proper)** ḥõχe {хоχе} (1), **Bezhta (proper)** ḥōχō {хохо} (1), **Khoshar-Khota Bezhta** ḥōχō (1), **Tlyadal Bezhta** ḥōχō (1), **Hinukh** aže ~ ažey {аже, ажей} (2), **Kidero Dido** wun {гъун} (3), **Sagada Dido** wun (3), **Khwars**hi (proper) ᵇʷan {гъван} (3), **Inkhokwari Khwarshi** won {гъон} (3), **Proto-Tsezic** ṭː./weather

**References and notes:**


**Bezhta (proper):** Khalilov 1995: 257, 303; Madieva 1965: 189. Polysemy: 'tree / bush, shrub'.

**Khoshar-Khota Bezhta:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 95.

**Tlyadal Bezhta:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 95.

**Common Bezhta:** Distinct from two Common Bezhta terms:


**Hinukh:** Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 36, 435; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 95. Polysemy: 'tree / shrub / stalk (of plant) / plant tops (of root crop)'.


**Kidero Dido:** Khalilov 1999: 93, 319. As may be seen from the entry in [Khalilov 1999], it is the basic word for 'tree' in Kidero Dido.

A second candidate is *ažu* [ажу] with polysemy: 'tree / shrub, bush / plant tops (of root crop)' [Khalilov 1999: 26], but this one is apparently more marginal in the meaning 'tree'. In [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 95], however, it is transcribed as *ažo* and quoted as the basic Kidero term for 'tree'.


**Sagada Dido:** Abduluev 2014.

**Khwars**hi (proper): Karimova 2014; Sharafutdinova & Levina 1961: 89, 97. Polysemy: 'tree / forest' (for the meaning 'forest', see [Sharafutdinova & Levina 1961: 104, 114]).

In [NCED: 549], also the word *aža* 'tree' is quoted, which is apparently a more marginal term for this meaning.

Distinct from *lida* ['firewood'] [Sharafutdinova & Levina 1961: 92].

**Inkhokwari Khwarshi:** Karimova 2014; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 95; Bokarev 1959: 145. Polysemy: 'tree / forest / pole'.

Distinct from Inkhokwari *lido* 'firewood' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 162].

Distinct from Inkhokwari *aža*-'shrub, bush' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 95].

**Kwantlada Khwarshi:** *won* [гъон] 'tree' [Karimova 2014; Khalilova 2009: 23, 68].

Distinct from Kwantlada *ludo* ~ *lido* ['firewood'] [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 74; Khalilova 2009: 36].
Proto-Tsezic: NCED: 483. Distribution: Three distributionally equiprobable terms enter into competition:

1) ʷχːɡːɛ (1) [NCED: 887], meaning ‘tree’ in East Tsezic, lost in West Tsezic;
2) ṭaːzːə (~ ṭaːzːə) [NCED: 549], which means ‘tree’ or ‘tree / shrub’ in Hinukh, Dido and Khwarshi proper (but in the two latter varieties it is not the main term for ‘tree’) and ‘shrub’ in Inkhokwari Khwarshi; lost in East Tsezic.
3) ʷxːm [NCED: 483], which represents the basic word for ‘tree’ in Dido and Khwarshi (in Khwarshi with polysemy ‘tree / forest’), meaning ‘forest’ in East Tsezic.

It is likely that ṭaːzːə can be reconstructed with the Proto-West Tsezic meaning ‘bush, shrub’, since this meaning is attested in all West Tsezic lects that are sufficiently documented (Hinukh, Kidero Dido, Inkhokwari Khwarshi). External Andian comparanda also suggest that ‘bush, shrub’ can be the original semantics. In modern West Tsezic lects, ṭaːzːə tends to acquire the additional meaning ‘tree’, even becoming the basic term for ‘tree’ in Hinukh.

If so, ʷxːm should be posited as the Proto-West Tsezic word for ‘tree’. Its meaning ‘forest’ in East Tsezic and Khwarshi is thus a homoplastic match.

There is insufficient evidence to make a single choice between ʷχːɡːɛ (‘tree’ in East Tsezic) and ʷxːm (‘tree’ in West Tsezic). Provisionally we fill the Proto-Tsezic slot with ʷxːm.

Replacements: (‘tree’ > ‘forest’) (Khwarshi); (‘bush, shrub’ > ‘tree’) (Hinukh, Dido, Khwarshi).

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular.

Semantics and structure: Primary substantive root.

91. TWO

Hunzib (proper) qʾanu {къани} (1), Bezhta (proper) qʾona {къона} (1), Khoshar-Khota Bezhta qʾona (1), Tlyadal Bezhta qʾona (1), Hinukh qʾono {къона} (1), Kidero Dido qʾano {къално} (1), Sagada Dido qʾano {къално} (1), Khwarshi (proper) qʾuni {къуни} (1), Inkhokwari Khwarshi qʾune {къуине} (1), Proto-Tsezic *qʷmV-nVA (1).

References and notes:


Proto-Tsezic: NCED: 924. Distribution: One of the most stable Proto-Tsezic stems, retained in its basic meaning in all Tsezic lects.

Reconstruction shape: Consonant correspondences are regular, although vowels can hardly be reconstructed.

Semantics and structure: Numeral stem. The suffix -nV seems unique, it can be singled out on the basis of the noun *qʷmV-V ‘twin(s)’, attested in Hinukh and Dido.

92. WALK (GO)

Hunzib (proper) CLASS=ѐл’e {меъл} (1), Bezhta (proper) CLASS=ѐл’e {иуeкъал} (1),
References and notes:


Khoshar-Khota Bezhta: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 73. Polysemy: 'to go / to go away'. Morphophonologically = ò=ɪ'ɛ; for old nasalization cf. the class 3 form m=ò=ɛ< -ò=ɛ<.<.

There are two verbs for 'to go' quoted in [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988]: ð=ɛ< and ò=ò'ø, both with additional polysemy. We treat them as synonyms.Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 73. Polysemy: 'to go / to come / to reach, get to / to flow'. Morphophonologically = ò=ò'ø< for old nasalization cf. the class 3 form m=ò=ò<.< -ò=ò<.<.

Tlyadal Bezhta: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1988: 73. Polysemy: 'to go / to flow'. Morphophonologically = ò=ɪ'ɛ; for old nasalization cf. the class 3 form m=ò=ɛ< -ò=ɛ<.<.


Kidero Dido: Khalilov 1999: 57, 328. Polysemy: 'to go / to go away / to fly'. Besides inv. ɔl', the suppletive imperative form òò [tʃon] 'go' can be used as well [Khalilov 1999: 100].


Kwarshi (proper): Karimova 2014; Sharafutdinova & Levina 1961: 95, 114. Polysemy: 'to go / to go away'. Browsing through [Sharafutdinova & Levina 1961] suggests that it is the most general and frequently used verb for 'to go'. Cf. the attested examples: "I'm going to the river with my friends" [Sharafutdinova & Levina 1961: 103], "The farmers go through the field" [Sharafutdinova & Levina 1961: 104], "I go towards the school" [Sharafutdinova & Levina 1961: 106], "I have followed (ò=ɛ<) the cow" [Sharafutdinova & Levina 1961: 108], "The schoolboy goes towards the school" [Sharafutdinova & Levina 1961: 117], "The brother has gone away" [Sharafutdinova & Levina 1961: 95], "He has gone towards the village" [Sharafutdinova & Levina 1961: 106], "Today the shop manager has come to the village Vedeno to bring goods" [Sharafutdinova & Levina 1961: 119].

A second candidate is ò=ð'< [ɑ'kɔl'a] 'to go' [Karimova 2014; Sharafutdinova & Levina 1961: 94, 101]. This one, however, seems less frequent and its meaning is closer to the abstract 'to depart' or 'to arrive'. Cf. the attested examples: "Next year, I'll go to the village Botlikh" [Sharafutdinova & Levina 1961: 102], "We will not go to work today" [Sharafutdinova & Levina 1961: 117], "I was caught in hail, when I went from the village Vedeno" [Sharafutdinova & Levina 1961: 104], "He took a hair from each of the three horses, and went home" [Sharafutdinova & Levina 1961: 113], "They have gone to the village Zirkhu" [Sharafutdinova & Levina 1961: 109], "The clever sons have gone to the forest to chop wood" [Sharafutdinova & Levina 1961: 114].

A third candidate is ò=î'ɛ [iɾxa] 'to go', which is a marginal verb according to [Karimova 2014], only two textual examples have been found in the available source: "If you want, I'll go with you" [Sharafutdinova & Levina 1961: 117], "Get out of the house, the bear is coming (=î'<)" [Sharafutdinova & Levina 1961: 116].

Inkhokwari Khwarshi: Karimova 2014; Bokarev 1959: 166. This verb is quoted as a basic one in [Karimova 2014]. Cf. two attested examples: "He has gone to trade two chicken heads for one ram head" [Bokarev 1959: 162], "He has taken it and gone away" [Bokarev 1959: 174].

A second Inkhokwari candidate is ò=ɪ'ɛ 'to go' [Bokarev 1959: 145, 148, 163, 164, 170], but without textual examples.

There is also a number of additional Inkhokwari verbs of going offered in [Bokarev 1959] (some of them can be the result of typos): ò=ɬ'ε 'to go' [Bokarev 1959: 147, 165], ò=ɬ'ɶ 'to go' [Bokarev 1959: 163], ò=ɬ'ɛ 'to go' [Bokarev 1959: 163], ò=ɬ'ɶ 'to 'to walk' [Bokarev 1959: 163, 167, 168], ò=ɬ'ɛ 'to go here' [Bokarev 1959: 166].

Kwantlada Khwarshi: ò=ð'< [o'kɔl'a] 'to go' [Karimova 2014; Khalilova 2009: 21, 30]. Browsing through [Khalilova 2009] suggests that ò=ð'< is the most common and generic verb for 'to go'. Examples are numerous, cf. some of them:
Having done the rooms she went outside" [Khalilova 2009: 43], "The fox went to the wolf" [Khalilova 2009: 67], "The witch threw him into the pillow and began to go" [Khalilova 2009: 78]. "At about eight o’clock you were to go to work as mullah" [Khalilova 2009: 76], "Forty-five men went to the army from our village" [Khalilova 2009: 79]. "to go for hunting" [Khalilova 2009: 82], "The neighbor went to the grandmother and grandfather, asking ..." [Khalilova 2009: 82]. "... now what will I do, I do not have money to go back to the village and I could not manage with this studying" [Khalilova 2009: 86]. "This boy went near the father" [Khalilova 2009: 87], "You let us go through your road" [Khalilova 2009: 90], "I will not allow, if you go further" [Khalilova 2009: 120], "Go straight forward! (i.e. go straight on the line)" [Khalilova 2009: 124], "The wolf asked him, 'Where are you going to?'" [Khalilova 2009: 153].

A second Kwantlada candidate is CLASS=əχ '= to go' [Khalilova 2009: 14, 30], but this one is more rarely used and in many instances its meaning differs from generic 'to go'. Cf. some examples: "Hey people, come, there is (=əχ ') something in my eye, take it out" [Khalilova 2009: 73], "The grains went under the khan’s leg" [Khalilova 2009: 77], "The woman and the boy went home" [Khalilova 2009: 119], "Then the son and the father went far away" [Khalilova 2009: 120]. "They went down along the road" [Khalilova 2009: 121], "When they went, and the boy stayed behind" [Khalilova 2009: 123], "Breaking apart, the apple fell (=əχ ') down" [Khalilova 2009: 124], "When (they) came to the waste land, they..." [Khalilova 2009: 124], "When some time passed, boy sent him again..." [Khalilova 2009: 128].

A third Kwantlada candidate is the rare verb CLASS=iχ : CLASS=ɨχ : [Khalilova 2009: 21], whose meaning could be closer to ‘to walk’, as can be seen from the only instance: "Go straight! (i.e. not shaking from side to side)" [Khalilova 2009: 124].

Proto-Tsezic: NCED: 1026. Distribution: Retained in the basic meaning ‘to go’ in all East Tsezic and the majority of the West Tsezic lects, except for Kidero Dido.

In some West Tsezic lects, *CLASS=ɨχ 'tends to be superseded by *CLASS=əχ ' B [NCED: 267]. *CLASS=ɨχ ' became the basic expression for ‘to go’ in Kidero Dido, Inkhokwari Khwarshi and Kwantlada Khwarshi, although in Inkhokwari Khwarshi and Kwantlada Khwarshi *CLASS=ɨχ ' is still retained as a less common synonym for ‘to go’. It is obvious that such a homoplastic replacement is an independent innovation in the Dido and Khwarshi dialects. The original Proto-Tsezic meaning of *CLASS=ɨχ ' is unknown.

In Khoshar-Khota Bezhta, the verb *CLASS=ɨχ ' to come also acquires the generic meaning ‘to go’.

Replacements: ‘(to come’ > ‘to go’) (Khoshar-Khota Bezhta).

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular, except for some vocalic peculiarities.

Semantics and structure: Primary verbal root.

93. WARM (HOT)

Hunzib (proper) CLASS=iχ :u {пыххы} (1), Bezhta (proper) CLASS=iχ :-o {люххоло} (1), Khoshar-Khota Bezhta CLASS=iχ :-iy-o (1), Tlyadal Bezhta CLASS=iχ :-o (1), Hinukh CLASS=eχ -Λε-s {беххэб} (1), Kidero Dido tata-n-u {маманэ} (2), Sagada Dido tata-n-u {маманэ} (2), Khwarshi (proper) CLASS=eχ :-u {леххы} (1), Inkhokwari Khwarshi CLASS=iχ :-u ~ CLASS=iχ :-u {люххы} (1), Proto-Tsezic *CLASS=iχ :-y- A (1).

References and notes:
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Hinukh: Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 74, 532; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 245. Applied to both objects and weather. Past participle from the verb CLASS=eχː-ιɛ 'to become warm' [Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 74]. It should be noted that the suffix -ιɛ is apparently unique for Hinukh, cf. [Forker 2013: 197]. Despite the obscurity of the morphological pattern, CLASS=eχː-ιɛ 'to become warm' looks derived from the verb CLASS=ɛχː-ιɛ 'to become warm' [Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 74].


A second, probably less common, candidate is tutu-n-ιɛ [tyɾuɾny] with polysemy: 'warm / soft' [Karimova 2014] (only as 'soft' in [Sharafutdinova & Levina 1961: 115]).

Inkhokwari Khwarshi: Karimova 2014; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 245; Bokarev 1959: 158, 159. The variant =iɛ-ιɛ is from [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990; Bokarev 1959].

A second, probably less common, Inkhokwari candidate is tute-n-ιɛ [tyɾenə] with polysemy: 'warm / soft' [Karimova 2014].

Distinct from Inkhokwari bobo-l-ιɛ 'hot' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 245].


Distinct from Kwantlada bobo-l-ιɛ 'hot' [Khalilova 2009: 254].

Proto-Tsezic: NCED: 563. Distribution: Retained in all lects except for Hinukh and Dido. In Hinukh, it was superseded by the synchronic participle from the verb 'to become warm' (which although contains the same root). In Dido, 'warm' is expressed by the old adjective for 'soft', *tɛtV- A, which is retained with the meaning 'soft' in some East and West Tsezic lects [NCED: 205].

Replacements: [to warm up > 'warm'] (Proto-Tsezic); [soft > 'warm'] (Dido).

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular.

Semantics and structure: Participle with the y-suffix from the verb 'to warm up', attested as Hunzib CLASS=ɛɪɛ-ιɛ 'to warm up (trans.)', CLASS=ɛɪɛ-κə 'to warm up (trans.)', Hinukh CLASS=eχː-ιɛ 'to boil, cook (trans.)'.

94. WATER

Hunzib (proper) tā {lɑbʊ} (1), Bezhta (proper) tī {lɑbʊ} (1), Khoshar-Khota Bezhta tī (1), Tlyadal Bezhta tī (1), Hinukh tɛ {lɑbɛ} (1), Kidero Dido tī {lɑbʊ} (1), Sagada Dido tī {lɑbʊ} (1), Khwarshi (proper) tə ~ tā {lɑbʊ} (1), Inkhokwari Khwarshi tɔ ~ tə {lɑbo} (1), Proto-Tsezic *fɪtːɪ ʃB (1).

References and notes:


Distinct from the nursery word *mama* ['water'] [Khalilov 1999: 182].

**Sagada Dido**: Abdulaev 2014.


**Kwantlada Khwarshi**: *f* ['water'] [Karimova 2014; Khalilova 2009: 5, 49, 79]. Oblique stem: *f*-.

**Proto-Tsezic**: NCED: 1060. Distribution: One of the most stable Proto-Tsezic roots, retained in its basic meaning in all Tsezic lects.

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular.

Semantics and structure: Primary substantive root. It is not entirely clear how the oblique stem should be reconstructed (cf. the Khwarshi proper and Inkhokwari Khwarshi data).

95. WE₁

Hunzib (proper) *ile* (*łe*; 1), Bezhta (proper) *ile* (*łe*; 1), Khosher-Khota Bezhta *ile* (1), Tlyadal Bezhta *ile* (1), Hinukh *eli* (*əlɯ*; 1), Kidero Dido *eli* (*əlɯ*; 1), Sagada Dido *eli* (*əlɯ*; 1), Khwarshi (proper) *ił'ə* ~ *ila* (*lə'la*; 1), Inkhokwari Khwarshi *ił'ə* (*lə'lo*; 1), Proto-Tsezic *ʔilV* (1).

References and notes:


**Bezhta (proper)**: Khalilov 1995: 399; Madieva 1965: 98. Paradigm: *ile* [abs., erg.]/ *ilo*- [obl.]. No clusivity.

**Khosher-Khota Bezhta**: *Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 221. Paradigm: *ile* [abs., erg.]/ *ilo*- [obl.]. No clusivity.


**Sagada Dido**: Abdulaev 2014; Imnaishvili 1963: 95.

**Common Dido**: The same in other dialects: Asakh *eli* [abs.]/ *elu*- [obl.], Mokok *eli* [abs.]/ *ela*- [obl.], *we* [Imnaishvili 1963: 95]. Mokok *eli* [abs.]/ *elu*- [obl.], *we* [Imnaishvili 1963: 95]. Shayd *eli* [abs.]/ *elu*- [obl.], *we* [Imnaishvili 1963: 95]. Shapikh *eli* [abs.]/ *elu*- [obl.], *we* [Imnaishvili 1963: 95].


**Inkhokwari Khwarshi**: Karimova 2014; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 221; Bokarev 1959: 159. Paradigm: *ił'o* [abs.]/ *ił'e* [erg.]/ *ił'u*- [obl.]

**Kwantlada Khwarshi**: *ił'o* [abs.]/ *ił'e* [erg.]/ *ił'u*- [obl.]/ *ił'u*- [obl.], *we* [Karimova 2014; Khalilova 2009: 142].

Common Khwarshi: No clusivity.

**Proto-Tsezic**: NCED: 786. Distribution: Retained in its basic meaning in all Tsezic lects.

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular, except for the final vowel, where there is a discrepancy between East Tsezic and West Tsezic.

Semantics and structure: Primary pronominal stem, no clusivity. The oblique stem is *ʔilu*.

96. WHAT

Hunzib (proper) *šiyo* (*лууөл*) (1), Bezhta (proper) *siyo* ~ *siyo-d* (*циүо*) (1), Khosher-Khota Bezhta *šiyo-d* (1), Tlyadal Bezhta *šižö* ~ *šiyo* (1), Hinukh *se* (*се*) (1), Kidero Dido *šow* (*шов*) (1), Sagada Dido *šew* (*шев*) (1), Khwarshi (proper) *hiba* (*гьиба*) (2), Inkhokwari Khwarshi *hiba* (*гьиба*) (2), Proto-Tsezic *ši-~ ši- A* (1).
References and notes:


**Bezhta (proper):** Khalilov 1995: 78; 295; Madieva 1965: 156.

**Khoshar-Khota Bezhta:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 233.

---

**Hunzib (proper):** Isakov & Khalilov 2012: 163; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 228; van den Berg 1995: 62; Bokarev 1959: 44. Paradigm: šiyo [abs.] / sini-[obl.]. In [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990], the oblique stem is erroneously quoted as sa(y)'; this is actually the oblique stem of 'who' q.v.


**Khoshar-Khota Bezhta:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 228. Suppletive paradigm: šiyo-{d} [abs.] / tini-[obl.]/ tay-{d} [gen.]. Final -d is the phrasal interrogative exponent.

**Tlyadal Bezhta:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 228; Kibrik & Testelets 2004: 248; Bokarev 1959: 95. Suppletive paradigm: šiži ~ šiýo [abs.] / tini-[obl.]. The parallel absolutive form šiyo is only quoted in [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990].

**Common Bezhta:** As proposed in [NCED: 986], Tlyadal -z- in šiži is the result of the occasional assimilation š-y > š-z. Bezhta proper s is due to word harmony.

**Hinukh:** Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 582; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 228; Forker 2013: 147; Lomtadze 1963: 104. Paradigm: se [abs.] / tine-[obl.]. In [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990], the paradigm is quoted with errors.


**Sagada Dido:** Abdulaev 2014; Imnashvili 1963: 128. Suppletive paradigm: še [abs.] / tina-[obl.].


In the absolutive case, with polysemy: 'what? / who?'.

**Khwarshi (proper):** Karimova 2014; Shafarudinova & Levine 1961: 110. Suppletive paradigm: hibo [abs.] / tini-[obl.].

**Inkhokwari Khwarshi:** Karimova 2014; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 228. Suppletive paradigm: hibo [abs.]/ tene-[obl.].

**Kwantlada Khwarshi:** hibo-[abs.]/ tene-[obl.]/ [sI] 'what?' [Karimova 2014; Khalilova 2009: 151].

**Common Khwarshi:** In the absolutive case, with polysemy: 'what? / who?'.

**Proto-Tsezic:** NCED: 986. Distribution: Retained as the absolutive stem in all Tsezic lects except for Khwarshi. The suffixal modification differs across the languages: the standard adjectival exponent *-y-u* in East Tsezic, the bound pronominal morphemes *hv* [NCED: 321] or *wV [NCED: 222] in Dido, plain *śi* in Hinukh.

In Khwarshi, the absolutive stem *śi*- was superseded by the scantily attested interrogative pronominal morpheme *hi-[NCED: 491] + the bound pronominal morphemes *hV [NCED: 321].

**Reconstruction shape:** Correspondences seem regular.

**Semantics and structure:** Primary pronominal morpheme, used in the absolutive stem of the pronoun 'what?' (apparently with polysemy 'who / what' already in Proto-Tsezic). The oblique and ergative stem is *śi-nV- ~ te-nV- [NCED: 1062], retained in all lects except for Hunzib, where the interrogative morpheme *sV- [NCED: 958] is used instead.

97. WHITE

**Hunzib (proper)** hal-d-u [гъалдуй] (1), Bezhta (proper) hál-d-iy-o [гъалдиюйо] (1), Khoshar-Khota Bezhta hál-d-iy-o (1), Tlyadal Bezhta hál-d-iy-ô (1), Hinukh al-d-iy-u ~ al-du-k’a [алдиуй, алдүкIа] (1), Kidero Dido alu-k’α [алыкIа] (1), Sagada Dido alu-k’α [алыкIа] (1), Khwarshi (proper) alu-k’α [алыкIа] (1), Inkhokwari Khwarshi alu-k’α [алыкIа] (1), Proto-Tsezic *halu- (1).

References and notes:


**Bezhta (proper):** Khalilov 1995: 78, 295; Madieva 1965: 156.

**Khoshar-Khota Bezhta:** Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 233.
References and notes:

Hunzib (proper): Isakov & Khalilov 2012: 163; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 227; van den Berg 1995: 62; Bokarev 1959: 44. Paradigm: suk’u [abs.]/ sat’- [obl.]; in [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990], the paradigm is listed as regular, with the oblique stem suku’-; either this form has been levelled by analogy, or this is an error (looks like the oblique form of the homonymous suk’u ‘man’ q.v.).


Khoshar-Khota Bezhta: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 227. Suppletive paradigm: suk’o- [abs.]/ to- [obl.]. Final -d is the phrasal interrogative exponent.

Tlyadal Bezhta: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 227; Kibrik & Testelets 2004: 248; Bokarev 1959: 95. Suppletive paradigm: suk’o [abs.]/ to- [obl.].


In the absolutive case, with polysemy: ‘what?/who?’.  


Common Kwarshsi: In the absolutive case, with polysemy: ‘what?/who?’.  

Proto-Tsezic: NCED: 986. Distribution: The absolutive stem of this pronoun is unstable in Tsezic. In East Tsezic, a strange form occurs, which synchronically coincides with the noun *zik’a ‘a ‘man/person’ q.v., although the semantic development ‘person’ > ‘who’ or vice versa does not seem likely. A somewhat dubious explanation is proposed in [NCED: 998], according to which the Proto-East Tsezic pronoun contains the rare interrogative morpheme *s-V-, heavily influenced by the word for ‘man/person’.

In Hinukh, the absolutive stem šu originates from the oblique one.

98. WHO

In Dido and Khwarshi, the absolutive stems of 'who' differ, but in both cases coincide with those of 'what' (q.v.): interrogative *(šː)i- [NCED: 986] + the bound pronominal morphemes *(bV [NCED: 321] or *(wV [NCED: 222] in Dido; the scantily attested interrogative pronominal morpheme *(hi- [NCED: 491] + the bound pronominal morphemes *(bV in Khwarshi.

We suppose that Dido reflects the Proto-Tsezic situation with *(šː)i- in the absolutive stem and *(čː)i- in the ergative and oblique stem. The main advantage of such a reconstruction is that the proposed paradigm etymologically coincides with the Avar suppletive paradigm for 'who?' (*šːi-abs. / *čːi-erg., obl.).

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular.

Semantics and structure: Primary pronominal morpheme, used in the absolutive stem of the pronoun 'who?' (with polysemy 'who / what' already in Proto-Tsezic). The rest of the paradigm can be reconstructed as *(čːu- [erg., obl.] / *čːi-[gen., see [NCED: 1062]. The oblique and ergative stem *(čːu- is retained in all the lects except for Hunzib, where the interrogative morpheme *(sV- [NCED: 958] is used instead. The specific genitive form *(čːi can be reconstructed at least for Proto-West Tsezic (retained in Hinukh and Khwarshi); we prefer to project it onto the Proto-Tsezic level.

References and notes:


Cf. the paronymous adjective *aq-u ~ *aq-ar [axuy] 'female (n., adj.)' [Isakov & Khalilov 2001: 24; Kibrik & Kodzassov 1990: 220; van den Berg 1995: 282]. Another word for 'female (n.)' is *cuway 'female (n.)' [Kibrik & Kodzassov 1990: 220; van den Berg 1995: 291], borrowed from Avar *čːuya-b 'female (n.)'.


Tlyadal Bezhta: Kibrik & Kodzassov 1990: 60.

Distinct from *iyő 'mother' [Kibrik & Kodzassov 1990: 54] and from *cuway 'female' [Kibrik & Kodzassov 1990: 220] (borrowed from Avar *čːuya-b 'female').

Common Beztha: The Proto-Bezhta term for 'woman' was *aqo. For the Bezhta proper polysemy of 'mother / woman', cf. *abo 'father / man' q.v.

Hunukh: Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 48, 440; Kibrik & Kodzassov 1990: 60. However, the suffixal pattern is not entirely clear.


Kidero Dido: Khalilov 1999: 89; Kibrik & Kodzassov 1990: 60. The sg. and pl. forms are not discriminated; final -b is the plural exponent.


Distinct from acidad ‘female’ [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 220].


Common Khwarshi: In [Karimova 2014], parallel compound forms for ‘woman’ are also quoted: Khwarshi proper sini-hadam [giniyadam], Inkhokwari, Kwantlada sini-hadam [giniyadam], literally ‘woman-person’ with hadam ‘person’ q.v."

Proto-Tsezic: NCED: 530. Distribution: Two roots enter into competition:

1) *ʔaqV [NCED: 530], which can be reconstructed as the Proto-East Tsezic word for ‘woman’ (in Bezhta proper it was superseded by *ʔiyV ‘mother’ [NCED: 673]). This root, modified with the suffix -i-, also expresses the meaning ‘woman’ in Hinukh, which makes it a good candidate for the status of the Proto-Tsezic term for ‘woman’. Cf. the paronymous adjective *ʔaq-y- ‘female’ (with the common adjectival suffix), attested in East and West Tsezic.

2) *ʔinV (~ x2) [NCED: 900], which means ‘woman’ in Dido and Khwarshi, lost in the rest of the lects. We follow the formal distribution and reconstruct *ʔaqV as the Proto-Tsezic root for ‘woman’, external comparison supports it (this root has the same basic status in Andian). In Dido-Khwarshi, it was superseded by *ʔinV, whose original Tsezic meaning is unclear; external comparison suggests that *ʔinV could mean ‘women (pl.)’.

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular, except for nasalized ì in Inkhokwari Khwarshi.

Semantics and structure: Primary substantive root.

100. YELLOW

Hunzib (proper) mač’ab {mačIaIə} (-1), Bezhta (proper) uk-liʔis {yklIuIuc} (1), Khoshar-Khota Bezhta hăk’ärō (2), Tlyadal Bezhta boχala-uko-s (3) / boχala=uko-s (1), Hinukh ič’-di-y-i-

u ~ ič’-du-k’a {ułdıũũy, ułdıũkla} (4), Kidero Dido ič’-y-u {ułũyũ} (4), Sagada Dido ič’-u {ułũly} (4), Khwarshi (proper) ėçyč’-u {ułeũlyũ} (5), Inkhokwari Khwarshi eč’u-k’a {ułũkla} (4), Proto-Tsezic *ʔeč’V ~ heč’V (4).

References and notes:


A second, inherited, Hunzib proper term for ‘yellow’ could be haka-s [mačIaI] [Isakov & Khalilov 2001: 61], but in [van den Berg 1995: 300, 349], this is glossed as ‘pink’. haka’s means ‘red’ in the Garbutli dialect and ‘yellow’ in the Naxada dialect. Literally ‘flower, floral’ from haka ‘flower’, see ‘red’ for further notes.


Khoshar-Khota Bezhta: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 234. Derived from a noun, which corresponds to Bezhta proper hak’ ‘seeds’, Tlyadal Bezhta hak’ ‘flower’ [Khalilov 1995: 72]; etymologically corresponds to Hunzib hak’a-s ‘yellow’ (q.v.).

Tlyadal Bezhta: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 234. A compound possessive adjective in -s with boχa-la from boχ ‘grass / hay’ [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 100] and the second element uk-o-), which corresponds to Bezhta proper uk ‘yellow color; a k. of grass’, uk-liʔis ‘yellow’.


Common Dido: The same in other dialects: Asakh ič’-i-y [uł numérique ‘yellow’, Mokok ič’-i-w [uł numérique ‘yellow’ [Khalilov 1999: 131].


Inkhokwari Khwarshi: Karimova 2014; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 234. Final -k’a is an adjective suffix.


Common Khwarshi: Khwarshi proper *čeč’-y-u may be cognate to Inkhokwari-Kwantlada eč’u-k’a, if the initial č- is the result of some kind of reduplication.
Proto-Tsezic: NCED: 557. Distribution: Retained in its basic meaning in West Tsezic lects (except for Khwarshi proper), lost in East Tsezic. In East Tsezic, 'yellow' is expressed by various new formations from 'hay', 'flower', 'a k. of grass' or by an Avar loanword.

Replacements: {'grass, hay' > 'yellow'} (Tlyadal Bezhta), {'flower' > 'yellow'} (Khoshar-Khota Bezhta), {'a k. of grass' > 'yellow'} (Bezhta proper).

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular.

Semantics and structure: Adjectival stem, frequently modified with adjective suffixes.

101. FAR

Hunzib (proper) c'iχː-u ~ c'iχ-u {чIихху} (1), Bezhta (proper) c'iχ-o {цIихо} (1) / ata: {амāl} (2), Khoshar-Khota Bezhta c'iχ-o (1) / ata: (2), Tlyadal Bezhta c'iχ-ō (1) / ata: (2), Hinukh meqi {мехъи} (3) / bitoː ~ bitoː-zo {бито (zo)} (2), Kidero Dido maqˤi {маIхъи} (3), Sagada Dido maqˤi {маIхъи} (3), Khwarshi (proper) miqe {михъел} (3), Inkhokwari Khwarshi miqe {михъел} (3), Proto-Tsezic *miqˤV (3).

References and notes:


A second candidate is ata:, explained in [Khalilov 1995: 29] as 'far (but the object is visible)'. We treat c'iχ-o and ata: as synonyms. Khalilov 1995: 29.

Khoshar-Khota Bezhta: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 231. Two adverbs for the meaning 'far' are quoted in [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990]; we treat them as synonyms. Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 231.

Tlyadal Bezhta: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 231. Two adverbs for the meaning 'far' are quoted in [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990]; we treat them as synonyms. Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 231.

Common Bezhta: Common Bezhta c'iχ-o / c'iχ-ō is an old adjective, used as adverb and postposition.


A second candidate is bitoː-zo, explained in [Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 87] as 'far (but the object is visible)'; derived from the adverb bito 'away' [Forker 2013: 349]. We treat megi and bitoː-zo as synonyms. Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 87, 433. Historically, apparently < b-ito: with the fossilized class exponent b-. If the word corresponds to Bezhta ata:, the archaic labilized variant **bütoː is expected.


A second candidate is bita-y, explained in [Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 60] as 'far (but the object is visible)'. We treat maqˤi and bita-y as synonyms.

Distinct from specific taʔo (тАхъо) 'far behind (the object is visible)' [Khalilov 1999: 197], taeʔo (тАхъо) 'far ahead (the object is visible)' [Khalilov 1999: 234].


Common Dido: The same in other dialects: Mokok maqˤi {мАхъхъиI} 'far' [Khalilov 1999: 185].


In [Karimova 2014], also Ailo {лIило} is quoted as the second expression for 'far', cf. notes on Kwantlada Khwarshi.


In [Karimova 2014], Ailo {лIило} is also quoted as a second expression for 'far', cf. notes on Kwantlada Khwarshi.

Kwantlada Khwarshi: miqe {михъел} 'far' [Karimova 2014; Khalilova 2009: 112, 118, 120, 133]. In [Khalilova 2009], apparently erroneously transcribed as miqˤe (with the gloss 'far away'). Cf. some examples: "The school where we are going now is far away" [Khalilova 2009: 214], "Then the son and the father went far away" [Khalilova 2009: 120].

Distinct from *хиScope: 'on the plains' [Khalilova 2009: 118]; in [Karimova 2014], this adverb is quoted as a second
expression for ‘far’.

Proto-Tsezic: NCED: 644. Distribution: Two forms enter into competition:

1) *č'iχː-ő (~ -ʁ) [NCED: 269], which means ‘far’ in East Tsezic (originally an adjective), lost in West Tsezic;
2) *miqˤV [NCED: 644], meaning ‘far’ in West Tsezic, lost in East Tsezic.

There is no Tsezic evidence as such to make a single choice, but external comparison speaks in favour of *miqˤV, since its cognates mean ‘far’ in Avar. On the other hand, the North Caucasian etymology of *č'iχː-ő, proposed in [NCED: 269], seems rather weak.

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular.

Semantics and structure: Either an adverbial or an adjectival stem.

102. HEAVY

Hunzib (proper) CLASS=оq'ː-u ~ CLASS=оq'-у {бокъу} (1), Beztha (proper) CLASS=аq'-о {иапъкъу} (1), Khoshar-Khota Bezhta CLASS=аq'-iy-o (1), Tlyadal Bezhta CLASS=аq'-ү (1), Hinukh CLASS=оq'-ү {бокъу} (1), Kidero Dido CLASS=оqˤ-y-u {божъу} (1), Sagada Dido CLASS=оqˤ-а-ү {божъа} (1), Khwarshi (proper) CLASS=оqˤ-y-u {къымлъ} (2), Inkhokwari Khwarshi CLASS=ит'-ү ~ CLASS=ит'-у {лумлъ} (2), Proto-Tsezic *CLASS=оqˤ-y-u A (1).

References and notes:


Proto-Tsezic: NCED: 513. Distribution: Retained in its basic meaning in all Tsezic lects except for Khwarshi, where it was superseded by unclear *CLASS=йү-ү-у without further etymology.

Replacements: (‘heavy’ > ‘burden’) (Proto-Tsezic).

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular, except for the ə instead of a in Hunzib.

Semantics and structure: Adjectival stem.

103. NEAR

Hunzib (proper) ičo ~ ičо {иъчо} (1), Beztha (proper) hica ~ hıca {ъыча} (1), Khoshar-Khota Bezhta hıca (1), Tlyadal Bezhta hıčːа (1), Hinukh igo ~ ügo {уго, üво} (2), Kidero Dido igo {уго} (2), Sagada Dido igo-Ł' {угоъ} (2), Khwarshi (proper) ago {азо} (2),
Inkhokwari Khwarshi oge {oze} (2), Proto-Tsezic *təgV ~ *tɨgV (2).

References and notes:


Tlyadal Bezhta: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 231.


Sagada Dido: Abdulaev 2014. Final -ʔ is the essive ending.


Kwantlada Khwarshi: oge '{оге}' near [Karimova 2014; Khalilova 2009: 118].

Proto-Tsezic: NCED: 518. Distribution: Two forms enter into competition:
1) *ʔĩč - ~ *hĩč - , which means ‘near’ in East Tsezic and apparently lacks further etymology;
2) *təgV (→ -i) [NCED: 518], meaning ‘far’ in West Tsezic, lost in East Tsezic.

Since *ʔəgV possesses external cognates with the same basic meaning, it has an advantage over *ʔĩč - ~ *hĩč -.

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular, except for the i~ü instead of e in Hinukh.

Semantics and structure: Either an adverbial or an adjectival stem.

104. SALT

Hunzib (proper) cɑ {ца} (1), Bezhta (proper) cã {цан} (1), Khoshar-Khota Bezhta ca (1), Tlyadal Bezhta ca (1), Hinukh čiyo ~ čiǔyo {чийо, чийо} (1), Kidero Dido ciyo {цийо} (1), Sagada Dido ciyo {цийо} (1), Khwarshi (proper) ciyō {цийо} (1), Inkhokwari Khwarshi ciyō ~ ciyō ~ ciyō {цийо} (1), Proto-Tsezic *cɔ (1).

References and notes:


Proto-Tsezic: NCED: 371. Distribution: One of the most stable Proto-Tsezic roots, retained in its basic meaning in all Tsezic lects.

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular.

Semantics and structure: Primary substantive root. The oblique stem is *ciyo- (in Proto-West Tsezic, the direct stem was levelled after the oblique one).

105. SHORT

Hunzib (proper) CLASS=aš- -u ~ CLASS=aš- -u ~ CLASS=aš- -u {машый} (1), Bezhta (proper)
References and notes:


Distinct from k'atː-o, which is glossed as generic 'short' with two examples: "short dress", "short tail" in [Khalilov 1995: 168]. Actually k'atː-o is a rare word, meaning specifically 'dock-tailed, short-tailed (Russian куцый)'. [M. Khalilov, p.c.]


Tlyadal Bezhta: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 236.


Kwantlada Khwarshi: k'otː-u [kIотtu] 'short' [Karimova 2014; Khalilova 2009: 100].

Common Khwarshi: yt, t < *t-y.

Proto-Tsezic: NCED: 1021. Distribution: Two forms enter into competition:

1) *CLASS=ʒː-y-u [NCED: 1021], meaning 'short' in East Tsezic, lost in West Tsezic (for dubious West Tsezic cognates see notes on 'thin');

2) *k'ɔt'V A [NCED: 690], meaning 'short' in West Tsezic and 'dock-tailed, short-tailed' in Bezhta.

 provisionally we suppose that *CLASS=ʒː-y-u had the Proto-Tsezic meaning 'short (in general)', whereas *k'ɔt'V meant 'dock-tailed, short-tailed' (this meaning is still retained in East Tsezic). It should be noted that both competing stems possess external cognates with the meaning 'short': *CLASS=ʒː-y-u in Andian and Nakh, *k'ɔt'V in Lak, Dargi and Lezgian.

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular.

Semantics and structure: Adjectival stem.

106. SNAKE

Hunzib (proper) begala {бегала} (1), Bezhta (proper) bekela {бекела} (1), Khoshar-Khota Bezhta bekela (1), Tlyadal Bezhta bekelā (1), Hinukh bikore ~ bükore {биkоре, бийкоре} (1), Kidero Dido bikori {бикори} (1), Sagada Dido bikori {бикори} (1), Khwarshi (proper) bečola {бечола} (1), Inkhokwari Khwarshi bekol {бекол} (1), Proto-Tsezic *bekVIVA (1).

References and notes:


Distinct from abusive malʕun {малгIун} with polysemy: 'damned, cursed / snake' [Isakov & Khalilov 2001: 117], borrowed from Avar malmIun 'damned, cursed; devil', dial. 'snake', ultimately from Arabic.

107. THIN

Hunzib (proper) šūš-ū ~ šūš-ū {шушушу′} (1) / λαμ-ι- / λαμ-ι- {ламму} (2), Bezhta (proper) šūš-ō {шушушу} (1) / λαμ-ι- {ламмо} (2), Khoshar-Khota Bezhta šūš-iy-o (1) / λαμ-iy-o (2), Tlyadal Bezhta šūš-ō (1) / λαμ-ō (2), Hinukh dada-r-u {дадару} (3) / niš-ū {нишиу} (4), Kidero Dido dada-r-u {дадару} (3) / niš-y-u {нишую} (4), Sagada Dido dada-r-u {дадару} (3) / niši-Ka {нишикla} (4), Khwarshi (proper) zezy-u {хизу} (5) / niš-ū {нишиу} (4), Inkhokwari Khwarshi ziz-ū {зизу} (5) / niš-ū {нишиу} (4), Proto-Tsezic *dada-r- (3) / *λαμ-y- (2).

References and notes:


Additionally, the loanword †ere nab [репэао] 'thin / lean' is attested [Khalilov 1995: 244] < Avar †еrena-b 'thin 2D/1D'.

Bezhta čemeʔač [чекеао], which is glossed as 'thin' with the only example being 'thin thread' in [Khalilov 1995: 281], apparently means 'frail, since it was borrowed from Avar čemeʔa-b 'frail, fragile'.


Common Bezhta: The Common Bezhta opposition šūš-iy-o 'thin 2D' / λαμ-iy-o 'thin 1D' is partially corroded in Bezhta proper.


Also cf. the borrowed and more marginal term †ere na-w 'thin 2D / thin 1D / slender' [Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 337] < Avar †еrena-w 'thin 2D / thin 1D / slender'. Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 279, 533; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 239.
Polysemic: *thin 1D / narrow / lean, skinny / thin, sparse*. Historically *n=iš-y-u* with a fossilized spatial (?) prefix.


**Common Khwarshi**: *yə, z < *z-y*.

**Proto-Tsezic**: TsezEDb. **Distribution**: For East Tsezic, the following opposition can be safely reconstructed:

1) *ṭ(s)ːniːk-y-u* ‘thin 2D’ [NCED: 1021], for etymological discussion, see below;
2) *lːam-y-u* ‘thin 1D’ [NCED: 521], lost in West Tsezic.

The West Tsezic system was likely as follows:

1) *‘dada-r-u* ‘thin 2D’, without further etymology.
2) *‘niːk-y-u ~ *neːk-y-u* ‘thin 1D’ [NCED: 1021], for etymological discussion, see below.

The relationship between *ṭ(s)ːniːk-y-u* ‘thin 2D’ (East Tsezic) and *‘niːk-y-u ~ *neːk-y-u* ‘thin 1D’ (West Tsezic) is quite uncertain. It has been proposed in [NCED: 1021] that both contain the same root as the adjective *CLASS=3ːy-u* ‘short’ *vel sim. (q.v.*). The authors of [NCED] imply that *ṭ(s)ːniːk-y-u* is some kind of reduplication; if so, *niːk-y-u ~ *neːk-y-u* should contain the fossilized directional prefix *n* (its function in such an adjective is unclear, however); the vocalic interchanges are inexplicable. The whole picture appears to be too complex and we prefer to treat *ṭ(s)ːniːk-y-u* and *‘niːk-y-u ~ *neːk-y-u* as three unrelated items. Out of these, *CLASS=3ːy-u* finds an external etymology (see notes on ‘short’), whereas *ṭ(s)ːniːk-y-u* and *‘niːk-y-u ~ *neːk-y-u* are etymologically isolated.

The main candidate for the Proto-Tsezic meaning ‘thin 1D’ is *‘lam-y-u* (East Tsezic), since it possesses external comparanda with the same semantics.

As for Proto-Tsezic ‘thin 2D’, there is no evidence to help us choose between *ṭ(s)ːniːk-y-u* and *‘dada-r-u*. Only for the sake of symmetry, we fill the slot with *‘dada-r-u*, retained in West Tsezic.

**Reconstruction shape**: Correspondences seem regular.

**Semantics and structure**: Adjectival stems ‘thin 2D’ (*‘dada-r-u*) and ‘thin 1D’ (*‘lam-y-u*), modified with the common adjective suffixes.NCED: 521.

108. **WIND**

**Hunzib (proper) zaːle {зאלе} (1)**, **Bezhta (proper) zaːlo {зало} (1)**, **Khoshar-Khota Bezhta zaːlo (1)**, **Tlyadal Bezhta zaːlo (1)**, **Hinukh _tDaci {тлвятия} (2)**, **Kidero Dido _tDaci {тлвятия} (2)**, **Sagada Dido _tDaci {тлвятия} (2)**, **Khwarshi (proper) _tacA {тлвятия} (2)**, **Inkhokwari Khwarshi _tacA {тлвятия} (1)**, **Proto-Tsezic *ṭːacV (2)**.

**References and notes**


**Bezhta (proper)**: Khalilov 1995: 97, 298; Madieva 1965: 162.

**Khoshar-Khota Bezhta**: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 208.

**Tlyadal Bezhta**: Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 208.

**Hinukh**: Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 244, 419; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 208.


**Sagada Dido**: Abdulayev 2014.

**Khwarshi (proper)**: Karimova 2014; Sharafutdinova & Levina 1961: 97.

**Inkhokwari Khwarshi**: Karimova 2014; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 208.

**Kwantlada Khwarshi**: *haca {гъаца} ‘wind’ [Karimova 2014; Khalilova 2009: 138].
Proto-Tsezic: NCED: 767. Distribution: Two forms enter into competition:
1) *zːa V, which means 'wind' in East Tsezic and apparently lacks any further etymology;
2) *ɬːacV [NCED: 767], meaning 'wind' in West Tsezic, lost in East Tsezic.
Since *ɬːacV has an imperfect, but overall acceptable external etymology (its Andian comparanda mean 'voice, shout'), it has a formal advantage over the isolated *zːaV.

Reconstruction shape: Correspondences seem regular except for the unexplainable h instead of t in Inkhokwari Khwarshi.

Semantics and structure: Primary substantive root.

109. WORM
Hunzib (proper) *bo’ti {боти} (1), Bezhta (proper) *bo’tele {болнел} (1), Khoshar-Khota Bezhta *bo’tele (1), Tlyadal Bezhta *bo’telä (1), Hinukh *bika {бика} (-1), Kidero Dido *wimuli {вымылу} (-2), Sagada Dido *aciro {акиро} (3), Khwarshi (proper) *bečola {бечола} (4), Inkhokwari Khwarshi *bekol {бекол} (4), Proto-Tsezic *ʰ-imilV ~ *ʰ-imirV (2).

References and notes:
Polysemy: 'worm (in general) / helminth / caterpillar / insect, bug (in general)'. Paradigm: *bo’ti [abs.] / *bo’tele- [obl.]. In the absolutive form, used with additional polysemy: 'insect / snout' [Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 51; van den Berg 1995: 290], although for the meaning 'snout' the secondary regular oblique stem *bo’to- is used - perhaps a loan translation of Russian kaz’lavka 'snout', literally 'little bug'.

1) *eʔelo {ъэлэл} 'tapeworm' [Khalilov 1995: 290] (final -ba is apparently the fossilized plural exponent);
2) *p’ep’ela {пипела} 'echinococcus (tapeworm)' [Khalilov 1995: 221; Madieva 1965: 183];
3) *hatoła {гато́ла} 'helminth' [Khalilov 1995: 74; Madieva 1965: 157];
4) *lo’q’iyan {лойкиян} 'worm, which parasitizes mulberry' [Khalilov 1995: 165];
5) *balč’o {балчо}, glossed as 'small red worms' [Madieva 1965: 149], not found in [Khalilov 1995];
6) *ʁaʔko {гайако} 'worms in tree' (i.e., 'wood worms?') [Madieva 1965: 155], not found in [Khalilov 1995].


Hinukh: Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 81, 546; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 88. A generic term. As noted in [Khalilov & Isakov 2005], the specific expression for 'earthworm' is ra’-mores bika (from ra’ 'earth'). Apparently borrowed from Andian languages (Tindi bek’a 'snake / worm', etc. [NCED: 1048]).
Distinct from:
1) *biržula {биржула} 'worm (not specified) / big louse' [Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 86];
2) *hapa {хапа} 'worm (e.g., in apple)' [Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 371] < Avar hapa ‘worm (in general)';
3) *hut’ {хут} 'plant louse / worm (not specified) / silkworm' [Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 374] < Avar hut’ 'plant louse / a k. of worms / silkworm';
4) *č’ima {чима} 'nit / flyblow / worms in meat' [Khalilov & Isakov 2005: 397].

A second, probably more marginal term for 'earthworm' is acuryo {ацурыо} [Khalilov 1999: 33].


Common Dido: Differently in the Asakh dialect: *biko {вию} 'worm' [Khalilov 1999: 56], apparently an Andian loanword, see notes in Hinukh.


Kwantlada Khwarshi: bekoł {беко́л} [Kariyymova 2014].

Common Khwarshi: A generic term: 'worm', including 'earthworm'. Polysemy: 'snake / worm' in all dialects. Additionally, in
[Karimova 2014], the loanword *хапара* is quoted as a synonym for ‘worm’ in all dialects (< Avar *хапара* ‘worm (in general)’).

**Proto-Tsezic:** NCED: 817. **Distribution:** An unstable word with several Tsezic stems competing with each other:

1) *бəт’V (~ -ə-)* [NCED: 290], meaning ‘worm’ in East Tsezic, lost in West Tsezic; the suffix -lV in Bezhta is apparently due to influence of *bekela* ‘snake’; 2) *ʁʷимилV (~ -ʁːʷ-, r)* [NCED: 817], only retained in Kidero Dido; 3) unclear forms *accuro, aciro* in Dido dialects; 4) *бекvIV* [NCED: 1048], which means ‘snake’ everywhere in Tsezic, also with polysemy ‘snake / worm’ in Khwarshi.

Any of these stems could represent the Proto-Tsezic term for ‘(earth)worm’. For example, the Andian cognates of Tsezic *бекvIV* have regular polysemy ‘snake / worm’ which implies that it is theoretically possible to reconstruct this stem with polysemy ‘snake / worm’ already on the Proto-Avar level and correspondingly on the Proto-Tsezic levels (if so, Tsezic *бекvIV* independently lost its meaning ‘worm’ in Tsezic lects outside Khwarshi). On the other hand, it is equally or even more probable that the Proto-Tsezic meaning of *бекvIV* was just ‘snake’, whereas the Khwarshi polysemy ‘snake / worm’ is a late introduction under the influence of the same polysemy in neighboring Andian languages.

Since it is *ʁʷимилV* that has the best and least questionable external North Caucasian comparanda with the meaning ‘worm’, we posit this stem as the Proto-Tsezic term for ‘worm (in general, incl. earthworm)’.

The original meaning of *бəт’V* (only retained as East Tsezic ‘worm’) remains unclear.

**Replacements:** {‘snake’ > ‘worm’} (Khwarshi).

**Reconstruction shape:** Correspondences seem regular.

**Semantics and structure:** Primary substantive root.

---

**110. YEAR**

**Hunzib (proper)** *ɨ {лIы} (1), Bezhta (proper) *ɨ {лIу} (1), Khoshar-Khota Bezhta *ɨ (1), Tlyadal Bezhta *ɨ (1), Hinukh *эбу {лIэбу} (1), Kidero Dido *эб {лIэб} (1), Sagada Dido *эб {лIэб} (1), Khwarshi (proper) *ɨб {лIубо} (1), Inkhokwari Khwarshi *ɨб {лIубо} (1), Proto-Tsezic *ƛˤɨ A (1).

**References and notes:**


A more rare synonym is *тəфəл ~ тəфəл* [тарфе]l ‘year’ [Isakov & Khalilov 2001: 111; Bokarev 1961: 160, 173], borrowed from Avar *тəфəл* ‘year’.

**Bezhta (proper):** Khalilov 1995: 185, 301; Madieva 1965: 174. Oblique stem: *ət-*. Additionally, the loanword *тəфəл ~ тəфəл* ‘year’ is used [Khalilov 1995: 180, 301; Madieva 1965: 173]; the source of borrowing is Avar *тəфəл* ‘year’.


**Khwarshi (proper):** Karimova 2014; Sharafutdinova & Levin 1961: 96.

**Inkhokwari Khwarshi:** Karimova 2014; Kibrik & Kodzasov 1990: 209; Bokarev 1959: 145.

**Kwantlada Khwarshi:** *ɨb {лIубо} ‘year’ [Karimova 2014; Khalilova 2009: 80].

**Common Khwarshi:** Historically < *ə-б* with a fossilized plural suffix.

**Proto-Tsezic:** NCED: 591. **Distribution:** One of the most stable Proto-Tsezic roots, retained in its basic meaning in all Tsezic lects. In Hunzib and Bezhta, tends to be superseded by the Avar loanword.

**Replacements:** {‘year’ > ‘winter’} (Proto-Tsezic).

**Reconstruction shape:** Correspondences seem regular except for the *a* in Kidero Dido and *i* in Khwarshi.

**Semantics and structure:** Primary substantive root. The plural stem is *ƛˤɨ-лV* (in Proto-West Tsezic, the sg. stem was superseded by the pl. one).