The functions of a borrowed marker -sa in Nizh Udi

1. The Udi language and its contacts

The Lezgic branch of the East Caucasian (Nakh-Daghestanian) family includes nine languages – Lezgian, Tabassaran, Agul, Tsakhur, Rutul, Kryz, Budugh, Archi and Udi. They are spoken in southern Daghestan, Russia, and in northern Azerbaijan.

♦ The place of Udi

Geographically: the southernmost outlier of East Caucasian languages.
Genetically: a peripheral member of the Lezgic branch.
Typologically: quite different from the East Caucasian “prototype” (cf. the loss of gender agreement, absolutive/dative DOM, finite subordination strategies etc.).

Udi was originally spoken in northern Azerbaijan. There are two dialects, that of Vartashen (now Oğuz, center of Oğuz district) and that of Nizh (Nic, big village in Qabala district). Today, the largest Udi-speaking settlement is the village of Nizh (ca. 3,5-4 thousand speakers). Only several Udis remain in Oğuz, and there is one small Udi village Zinobiani (Oktomberi) in Kvareli district of Georgia (ca. 200 speakers). Most Udis now live in Russia, esp. concentrated in Krasnodar, Rostov and Stavropol districts in the south. The total number of speakers can be estimated at 8 to 10 thousand.

♦ Areal background

SCHULZE (2001/2): Udi contact layers and their periodization

- 1000 - 500 BC Old (Northwest) Iranian
- 500 - 300 BC Old Medic / Old Persian
- 300 - 300 AD Early Middle Persian (Pehlevi), Early Middle NW Iranian, Early Talysh(-like) variant (?)
- 300 - 800 AD Old Armenian / Jewish Tati / local Middle NW Iranian
- 800 - 1300 AD Early Azeri / Middle Armenian / Early Modern Persian, Arabic / Georgian(?)
- 800 - … AD Local Jewish Tāti varieties
- 1300 - 1800 AD Modern Persian, Modern East Armenian, residues of local Northwest Iranian dialects / Azeri
- 1800 - ….. Azeri, Russian, Modern East Armenian, Georgian (in Oktomberi)
STILO (in prep.): Udi as a member of the Araxes-Iran contact zone

The Araxes-Iran linguistic area comprises languages of the South Caucasus, eastern Turkey, Northern Iraq and Northern Iran – in particular, Kartvelian (Georgian, Mingrelian, Laz), Armenian and its dialects, Turkic (Azerbaijani of Azerbaijan, Iran and Iraq; Turkish dialects of eastern Turkey), East Caucasian (Udi), Semitic (Neo-Aramaic and Arabic dialects of northern Iraq and Turkey), and Iranian languages extending southwards to approximately the Esfahan area of central Iran.

❖ Azeri impact

Centuries of contact with Azeri (Azerbaijani) had a considerable impact on Udi, especially the Nizh dialect. Azeri is the second language of the Nizh Udis and the main source of contact-induced language change. The Azeri influence can be seen on various levels, especially in the lexicon. In grammar, however, there is also a number of morphemes and morphological patterns borrowed from Azeri:

(1) a. Suffixes

-\( (i)mǯi \) ordinal numerals e.g. \( \chiib-imǯi \) ‘third’
-\( lu \) adjectives e.g. \( tojex-lu \) ‘valuable’
-\( suz \) caritive adjectives e.g. \( i\schq-ar-suz \) ‘not having a husband’
-\( lu\kru \) abstract nouns e.g. \( gam-lu\kru \) ‘warmth’
-\( \chii \) nomen agentis e.g. \( burmu\khrur-\chii \) ‘eater of \( xa\sh \) (kelle paça)’
-\( tan \) ablative (in adverbs) e.g. \( bo\sh-tan \) ‘from inside’

b. Particles / postpositions / conjunctions

\( =ki \) complementizer e.g. \( pine=ki \ldots \) ‘s/he said that…’
\( g\or\ra \) postposition (+ DAT) e.g. \( me \ad\hat\at\g\or\ra \) ‘according to this custom’
\( jo\khsa \) ‘or, if not, else’ e.g. \( ukalnu jo\khsa \t\? \) ‘will you eat or not?’
\( \ag\ar \) ‘if’

<see below>

c. Patterns

\((C)Vp\)-reduplication on adjectives e.g. \( maci \) ‘white’ > \( mapmaci \) ‘very white’

❖ Marker \( =sa \) in Nizh Udi

The particle (enclitic) \( =sa \) is one of clear examples of morphemes borrowed in Udi from Azeri, cf. the Azeri conditional marker \( =sA \). This borrowing seems to be comparatively recent, and it is confined to the Nizh dialect. This Udi marker has been completely ignored by the researchers – probably, due to its recent appearance and also to the concentration on Vartashen/Oktomberi data in earlier studies. It is mentioned only by SCHULZE (2012: 20), who notes the use of \( =sa \) in modern Udi texts as a “Subjunctive marker” on verbs and “Subjunctive copula” on pronouns:

Bemerkenswert ist auch die schon in dem Jona-Text auftretende Form \( =sa \) im Sinne einer Konjunktiv-Markierung (‘MOD2’), die durch Reanalyse des Azeri-Morphems \( =sA \) (Konjunktiv usw.) gewonnen ist und im heutigen Nizh gerne als konjunktive Kopula verwendet wird, vgl. etwa \( k\hats-\ne-\hsa \) (was-3SG-MOD2) ‘was es sein mag’ (= was auch immer).
In Udi, -sa is used with several functions:
- as an enclitic on finite predicates in conditional protases;
- as an enclitic on finite predicates in certain dependent clauses with wh-words;
- as an enclitic on noun phrases expressing the standard of comparison;
- (in combination with 3SG clitic) as a marker of indefinite pronouns, derived from wh-words.

Udi is not the only language that has incorporated Azeri conditional -sA into its grammatical system. Another such language is Kryz (also Lezgic, spoken in Quba district of northern Azerbaijan), in which -sa is used on the verb in indefinite relative clauses and on wh-words to derive indefinite pronouns, cf. AUTHIER 2010.¹

In Vartashen dialect of Udi (and, probably, in earlier Nizh Udi) -sa does not correspond to any other element with the same function, but just to the absence of any marker for the respective function².

NOTE: Apart from a borrowed -sa, there are two native homophonous morphemes in Udi, that are not historically related to each other nor to Azeri conditional -sa.

↓ numeral ‘one’ ↓ present tense suffix
(2) sa amdar bas-e-k-sa.
   one man sleep=3SG=ST-PRS
   ‘One man (or: a man) sleeps.’

2. -sa in conditional clauses

   ✗ Udi native conditional forms
   There are two suffixal forms of conditional mood in Udi. The use of the conjunction ägär ‘if’ is optional in both cases.

   o the Hypothetical Conditional in -aji-/aj-

(3) (ägär) bašlaj mejv-in-ä uk-aji-n, vi tapan qač:l-k-al-e.
   if rotten fruit-O-DAT eat-COND=2/3SG your.SG stomach ache-LV-FUT=3SG
   ‘If you eat rotten fruit, your stomach will ache.’

(4) (ägär) äjčːa vaχtː bak-aji-n, ek-i beš toʾsoʾl.
   if tomorrow time become-COND=2/3SG come-IMP our near
   ‘If you have time tomorrow, come to us.’

¹ Similar copying of the Turkish conditional marker is attested in some Iranian languages of Turkey, e.g. Kurmanji and Dimli (Zazaki), cf. Bulut 2006, Dorleijn 2006, Haig 2006, Todd 2008.
² E.g., judging from the Gospels translation made in 1890s, see Bežanov 1902.
the Counterfactual Conditional in -iji-/ij- (with an obligatory past clitic -j)

(5) (ägär) zu paččas bak-ij-zu-j, bito käsib-χo kömäj-ez-b-o-j.
   if I king become-CTRF=1SG=PST all poor-PL help=1SG=LV-POT=PST
   ‘If I were the king I would help all the poor.’

❖ =sa in Udi conditional clauses
   The particle =sa following the finite predicate is used to describe “real” conditions
   with the past, present or future time reference. The conjunction ägär ‘if’ is also optional.

   if father come-PERF=3SG=SA we see-FUT=1PL DIST-NO-DAT house-DAT
   ‘If father has already come, we will see him at home.’

(7) (ägär) ašla-ne ej-sa=sa, k:oj-a mand-al-jan.
   if rain=3SG come-PRS=SA house-DAT stay-FUT=1PL
   ‘If it is raining, we will stay at home.’

(8) (ägär) busa-nu=sa, χoraj-αχun uk-a.
   if hungry=2SG=SA soup-ABL eat-IMP
   ‘If you are hungry, eat some soup.’

   In the case of future, the use of =sa with the future tense is synonymous to the use of
   the Hypothetical Conditional:

(9a) hun k:no-j-a tax-al-nu=sa, zu-al tax-o-z.
    you.SG cinema-O-DAT go-FUT=2SG=SA I=ADD go-FUT=1SG

(9b) hun k:no-j-a tax-aji=n, zu-al tax-o-z.
    you.SG cinema-O-DAT go-COND=2/3SG I=ADD go-FUT=1SG
   ‘If you go to the cinema, I’ll go as well.’

   The particle =sa cannot modify the conditional forms (*tasajin=sa ‘if s/he goes’), only
   the indicative forms.

   In conditionals, =sa is optional, though if is not present, ägär should be used. In the
   late 19th c. Gospels, in all the contexts like (10a) where conditional =sa occurs in the
   modern Nizh translation, the plain indicative forms are used, cf. (10b).

(10a) ägär hun jevrej-χo-j padčcas-nu=sa, va čark-es-t-a.
    if you.SG Jew-PL-GEN king=2SG=SA you.SG.DAT be.saved-INF-CAUS-IMP

(10b) ägänä un ţuhut-so pasčcas-nu, čark-es-t-a un vacž.
    if you.SG Jew-PL-GEN king=2SG be.saved-INF-CAUS-IMP you.SG you.SG.DAT
    ‘If You are the King of the Jews, save Yourself!’ (Luke 23:37)
Conditional -sa in Azeri

In Azeri, the conditional marker -sa/-se (vowel harmony variants) is used, according to SEVORTYAN & SHIRALIEV (eds) 1971: 121-122, 399-400:

- as a suffix of the Hypothetical Conditional (preceding person markers)
  \( al\)-sa-\( m \) ‘if I take’ \( al\)-sa-\( q \) ‘if we take’
  \( al\)-sa-\( n \) ‘if you.SG take’ \( al\)-sa-\( niz \) ‘if you.PL take’
  \( al\)-sa ‘if s/he takes’ \( al\)-sa-\( lar \) ‘if they take’

- as a suffix of the Counterfactual Conditional (with the auxiliary \( idi\)- > -\( ydi\)-)
  \( al\)-sa \( idi\)-\( m \) > \( al\)-sa-\( ydi\)-\( m \) ‘if I took’
  \( al\)-sa \( idi\)-\( n \) > \( al\)-sa-\( ydi\)-\( n \) ‘if you.SG took’
  \( al\)-sa \( idi \) > \( al\)-sa-\( ydi \) ‘if s/he took’, etc.

- as a conditional particle (reduced copula) with various finite tense-aspect forms:
  \( ald\)-sa ‘if s/he took’ (< preterite \( ald\))
  \( al\(ird\)-sa ‘if s/he used to take’ (< imperfect \( al\(ird\))
  \( al\(aca\)-sa ‘if s/he takes’ (< future \( al\(aca\)), etc.

Thus, the function of -sa in Udi is the same as that of -sA in Azeri, but it is optional and its occurrence is more restricted:

- Udi -sa has invariable form (without vowel harmony variants)
- Udi -sa is used only as an external marker attaching postpositionally to a fully inflected finite verb form (not as a suffix)
- Udi -sa is not used in counterfactual clauses

The system, where conditional marker co-occurs with indicative forms (so that many or even all indicative forms have direct counterparts in conditional mood) is quite common for other Lezgic languages:

- in Archi, conditional marker -\( en\(č\)i\(š\) can combine with almost every indicative form (Kibrik 1977: 277-289);
- in Tsakhur, conditional marker -x\(ë\) can combine with all the three core indicative forms, as well as with non-verbal predicates (Kibrik (ed.) 1999: 551-552);
- in Lezgian, conditional marker -\( t\(a\) can combine with all indicative forms in non-future conditionals (Haspelmath 1993: 132, 394-395);
- in Agul, most indicative forms contain the copula, and their conditional counterparts use the conditional form of the copula, etc.

From this perspective, the use of a regular conditional marker -sa makes Udi more like its Lezgic relatives.

---

3. *sa* in clauses with wh-words

- **Indirect wh-questions**
  
  (The default strategy is to use indicative forms.)

  (11)  
  \[
  \text{te-z ava he-tː-ajnakː-e pr-sa=}sa, \text{ ama pr-sa-ne.}
  \]
  
  \[
  \text{NEG=1SG know [what-NO-BEN=3SG do-PRS=SA] but do-PRS=3SG}
  \]
  
  ‘I don’t know why he does that, but he does.’

- **Correlatives**
  
  (12)  
  \[
  \text{oša kːä b-al-nu=}sa, \text{ šo-tː-in ič-in va ukː-}al-e.}
  \]
  
  \[
  \text{[then what:NA do-FUT=2SG=SA] DIST-NO-ERG self-ERG you.G:DAT say-FUT=3SG}
  \]
  
  ‘He will tell you himself what you should do.’ (Ruth 3:4)

  The protasis contains a *wh-word* and is linked to a nominal/adverbial *correlate* (demonstrative) in the main clause.

  Examples below are from the modern Gospel of Luke translation.

  (13)  
  \[
  \text{ši bu=}ne–sa, \text{ šo-tː-o samal-}al \text{ gele tad-}ek-\text{al-e.}
  \]
  
  \[
  \text{[whose be=3SG=SA] DIST-NO-DAT a.little=ADD much give-DETR-FUT=3SG}
  \]
  
  ‘Whoever has, to him more shall be given.’ (Luke 8:18)

  (14)  
  \[
  \text{iona ninevi-n ğamaat-a he-}tār \text{ sa nišlan bak-e}–ne–sa,}
  \]
  
  \[
  \text{[Jonah Nineveh-GEN people-DAT what-ADV one sign become-PERF=3SG=SA]}
  \]
  
  \[
  \text{insan–}i \text{ bar–al me nāsil-}ejnakː \text{ me–}tār \text{ bak-}al-\text{e.}
  \]
  
  man-GEN son=ADD PROX generation-BEN PROX-ADV become-FUT=3SG

  ‘For just as Jonah became a sign to the Ninevites, so will the Son of Man be to this generation.’ (Luke 11:30)

  The use of *sa* is optional in this context, cf. another version of (13):

  (16)  
  \[
  \text{šu-stːa bu=}ne, \text{ šo-tː-o samal-}al \text{ gele tad-}ek-\text{al-e.}
  \]
  
  \[
  \text{[who-AD be=3SG] DIST-NO-DAT a.little=ADD much give-DETR-FUT=3SG}
  \]
  
  ‘To everyone who has, more shall be given.’ (Luke 19:26)
Universal⁴ / parametric conditionals

The parameter in the protasis is presented as irrelevant to the main clause.

(17) šu-χun  eكسر(al-nu-sa,  ek-i.
[who-ABL come-FUT=2SG=SA] come-IMP
‘Come here with whoever you want (lit. with whom if you will come).’

(18) kːä  nекс=nu-sa,  hamija  up-a.
[what.NA say.PRS=2SG=SA] here  say-IMP
‘Whatever you want to say (lit. what if you say), say here.’

* * *

In Lezgian, conditional forms are also used in indirect questions, correlatives and in “parametric concessive-conditional” clauses based on conditionals (Haspelmath 1993: 345-347, 398-399, 425-427). In Agul, Tabassaran, and Tsakhur conditionals are used in at least some of these contexts.

4. **zsₐ in comparative constructions**

Both Udi, like many other East Caucasian languages, and Azeri, like many other Turkic languages, use the locational comparative strategy where the standard of comparison is marked as the source of a movement (cf. Stassen 2011 for a typology):

\[ Y-ABL \quad X \text{good} = 'X \text{is better than } Y' \]

- **zsₐ on the standard of comparison**
  - standard NP is a verb in the “masdar” (action nominal)

(19) za-jnak:  manst=un-=$((a)\chiun-sa,  bi-sun  şaat=\text{-e}.
I-BEN stay+MSD-ABL=SA  die-MSD  good=3SG
‘For me it is better to die than to stay (alive).’ (Jonah 4:3)

- standard NP is a noun

(20) kʋartir-in-=$((a)\chiun(=sa)  mähāl-in-e  kƣuz  şaat=\text{-e}.
flat-O-ABL=SA  yard-O-LOC  house  good=3SG
‘A house in the countryside is better, than a flat (in the city).’

The use of =sa is optional here.
No data about similar uses of conditional in other Lezgic languages.

---

⁴ The term used in (Göksel & Kerslake 2005) for a subtype of Turkish conditional causes with wh-phrases.
-sA on the standard of comparison

Azeri clitic -sA is also used on infinitives in the comparative construction:

(21) ev-de otur-maq-dan-sa, çix-ib göz-mayı-ı üstün tut-ur-am.\(^5\)
    house-LOC sit-INF-ABL-SA go.out-CONV walk-INF-ACC prefer-AOR-1SG
    ‘Rather than sit at home, I prefer to go out for a walk.’

The same use is common in Turkish, cf. an example from Kornfilt (1997: 75):

(22) geç kal-mak-tan-sa hiç git-me-meg-i tercih ed-er-im.
    late stay-Inf-ABL-rather never go-Neg-Inf-Acc prefer-Aor-lsg
    ‘Rather than be late, I prefer not going at all.’

5. Indefinite pronoun marker based on =sa

Indefinite pronouns in Nizh Udi are derived from the interrogative pronouns by means of the marker =esa (after consonants) / =nesa (after vowels).

(23) šu-nesa har-e-ne.
    who=INDEF come-PERF=3SG
    ‘Someone came.’

(24) he-tː-u-nesa maja-nesa laχ-e-ne.
    what-NO-DAT=INDEF where=INDEF put.on-PERF=3SG
    ‘He has put something somewhere {and cannot find it now}.’

(25) he-tː-ajnakː=esa za p-i te-ne.
    what-NO-BEN=INDEF I.DAT say-AOR NEG=3SG
    ‘For some reason, he didn’t tell me that.’

The marker is added to the fully inflected forms: in (24) and (25), hetu and hetajnak: bear case inflections (hetajnak: ‘why, what for’ is a lexicalized benefactive of ‘what’).

In Azeri, indefinite pronouns are derived from the interrogative ones by means of the conditional copula isə, usually reduced to -sa: kim ‘who’ (nom.) > kim isə / kimsə ‘someone’, kima ‘to whom’ (dat.) > kima isə / kimsə ‘to someone’, nə ‘what’ (nom.) > nə isə / nəsə ‘something’, etc. (Sevortyan & Shiraliev (eds) 1971: 90-91).

Given that =e / =ne are allomorphs of the Udi 3SG marker, it is clear that Udi has calqued the use of the Azeri conditional copula as the indefinite pronoun marker:

(26) Azeri      kım    >     kım isə    >     kım-sə
    who          who COP-COND     who-INDEF

Udi         šu       >     šu-ne-sa       >     šu-nesa
    who          who=3SG=SA     who=INDEF
    ‘who’        ‘whoever it may be’ ‘someone’

\(^5\) I am grateful to Ayten Babalieva for this example.
Indefinites based on interrogatives are the most common cross-linguistic type (cf. Haspelmath 2011). Interrogative-based indefinites with conditional or concessive marker are quite common in East Caucasian languages, e.g.:

- in Agul and Tabassaran, indefinites are derived from interrogatives by means of the conditional copula ejči resp. wuš, cf. Agul fiš ejči / fiš-či ‘someone’, etc.;
- in Khinalug, one of the indefinite pronouns series is derived from interrogatives by means of the conditional marker -q’i, cf. kla-q’i ‘someone’;
- in Tsakhur, -xēˑd is a concessive marker and also derives indefinites from interrogatives, cf. hiǯō-xēˑd ‘something’;
- in Archi, -šaw is a concessive marker and also derives indefinites from interrogatives, cf. hani-išaw / han-šaw ‘something’.

The use of conditional-based INDEF marker again makes Nizh Udi more like its relatives. Before the use of this marker, Udi seems to have employed only indefinites based on the numeral ‘one’ and generic nouns (another common cross-linguistic type); this can be see in the 19th c. Vartashen translation of the Gospels (27a) as compared to a recent Nizh translation (27b):

(27a) amma  isus-en  p-i-ne:  so  laf-ne=d-e  za…
   but Jesus-ERG say-AOR=3SG one.NA touch=3SG=ST-PERF I.DAT

(27b) ama  isus-en  p-i-ne:  za  šu-nesa  laf-e=d-i…
   but Jesus-ERG say-AOR=3SG I.DAT who=INDEF touch=3SG=ST-AOR
   ‘But Jesus said, “Someone did touch Me…”’ (Luke 8:46)

6. The use of the full Azeri conditional copula isā

Apart from -sa which is copied from a shortened form of Azeri conditional copula, the full variant of the copula is also used in Udi.

isā as a variant of -sa

In the modern translation of the Gospel of Luke, isā sometimes occurs after predicates in the same function as -sa. If is not clear, why “verb + isā” is used instead of “verb + -sa”; one reason for that can be a stronger orientation on Azeri in this translated text.


‘Treat others the same way you want (čurnansa isā: Present + isā) them to treat you. If you love (čurnansa isā: Present + isā) those who love you, what credit is that to you? For even sinners love those who love them. If you do good (balnan(sa: Future + -sa) to those who do good to you, what credit is that to you? For even sinners do the same. If you lend (borǯ tastːa(sa: Present + -sa) to those from whom you expect to receive, what credit is that to you? Even sinners lend to sinners in order to receive back the same amount.’
isä as a contrastive topic marker

Only isä, and not -sä is attested as a postpositional contrastive topic marker.

(29) čupuχ-χo-j sun-t-aj ci orpa,
wife-PL-GEN one-NO-GEN name Orpah
te sun-t-aj ci isä rut:=e-j.
DIST one-NO-GEN name PTCL Ruth=3SG=PST
‘{They took for themselves Moabite women as wives;} the name of the one was Orpah and the name of the other Ruth.’ (Ruth 1:4)

(30) iona isä gämi-n oq:in otaɾ-a cir-i
Jonah PTCL ship-GEN bottom-GEN room-DAT go.down-AOC
ostːahar nepːax|=e bak-sa.
strong sleepy=3SG become-PRS
‘{Then the sailors became afraid and every man cried to his god, and they threw the cargo which was in the ship into the sea to lighten it for them.} But Jonah had gone below into the hold of the ship, lain down and fallen sound asleep.’ (Jonah 1:5)

In Azeri, both conditional copula isǝ and clitic -sA are common as contrastive topic markers. Cross-linguistically, this is a well-known path of development, as conditionals themselves set a framework within which the following sentence is valid (“conditionals are topis”, cf. discussion in Podlesskaya 2001).

In the Azeri linguistic tradition, isǝ is treated as one of adversative conjunctions.

(31) Hami bu tǝklifi bǝyǝndi.  Rizvan isǝ razı olmadı.
‘Everyone liked this suggestions, but Rizvan (“as for Rizvan”) did not agree.’ (Sevortyan & Shiraliév 1971: 171)

(32) O getdi,  mǝn isǝ qaldım.
‘He went away, and I (“as for me”) stayed.’ (Tağıyev et al. 2006, II: 585)

In Turkish, -(y)sA / ise indicate both “direct contrast with what has been said about the previous topic” and “a rather striking, perhaps even surprising, further development of the same theme” (Göksel & Kerslake 2005: 348-349).

(33) Kitap-lar-sa hala kutularda duruyor.
‘I have only managed to tidy up the papers.} ‘As for the books, they are still in their boxes.’

(34) ben ise (ben-se) patates hiç yemiyorum.
‘As for me (lit. if it is I), I don’t eat potatoes at all.’ (Lewis 1967: 217)
7. Conclusions: Udi ≠sa and its Azeri source

- Azeri conditional suffix -sA has not been copied to Udi (there are no conditional forms with this suffix preceding person markers, like in al-sa-m ‘if I take’).

- Azeri enclitic (reduced conditional copula) -sA has been copied to Udi where it is used on predicates with a number of functions.

  Like its Azeri source,
  - Udi ≠sa is used as an enclitic (attaching postpositionally to a fully inflected indicative verb form, or to a non-verbal predicate)
  - Udi ≠sa is used in conditional protases and in certain dependent clauses with wh-words

  Unlike its Azeri source,
  - Udi ≠sa has invariable form (without vowel harmony variants)
  - the distribution of Udi ≠sa is more restricted (e.g. it is not used in counterfactual clauses)
  - Udi ≠sa is optional in (most of) the contexts where it can occur

  NB: It is quite typical of other Lezgic languages to use conditional markers (and not plain indicative forms) in the functions that ≠sa fulfils now in Udi.

- Azeri enclitic -sA has been also copied to Udi as an optional marker on the standard NP in comparative constructions. This use does not have obvious parallels in other Lezgic languages.

- Azeri indefinite pronoun series marker (interrogative base + conditional copula) has been calqued in Udi by using the 3SG clitic with a borrowed conditional ≠sa.

  NB: It is quite typical of other Lezgic languages to have the interrogative-based strategy with conditional markers (or conditional copulas).

- Azeri conditional copula (in its full form) isə has been copied to Udi as a contrastive topic marker.
  (In translated texts, it is also attested as a variant of conditional ≠sa, which may reflect the influence of written Azeri, or the existence of a less frequent variant.)

* Though the use of ≠sa seems to fill certain functional “lacunae” in Udi grammar, in some cases it leads to the (re)emergence of patterns that are quite common for East Caucasian languages. The difference is that in Udi, the morphological material now recruited for the corresponding functions is borrowed and not native.
Abbreviations
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