Table elx B. Optative paradigm, cf. Khačikjan 1998:50.

pers.	example	glossing	translation
1s	*hi-h-na*	dedicate-1s.PFV-OPT	may I dedicate
2s	*kata-k-ti-ni*[137]	live-PFV.ITR-2s-OPT	may you live
3p	*pi=rappa-k-na*	3p=bind-PFV.ITR-OPT	may they be bound
3p	*hutta-hši-ni*	do-3p.PFV-OPT	may they do

Questionnaire

1 12 /p, t, k, ts, (f?), s, x/h[138], m, n, r, ɾ[139], l/

2 3 /i, a, u/, cf. Khačikjan 1998:5. Maybe /i u/ were centralized, /e/ occurs rarely, but it was probably a writing for either /ai/ or /i/.

3 none cf. Khačikjan 1998:9f.

4 no cf. **1**

5 yes cf. **1**

6 none cf. **2**

7 no [ŋ]

8 /r/ no?
/ɾ/ yes?[140]
/l/ yes

9 CVCC? writing can only show up to 2 consonants but some alternations lead to the assumption that there might have been complex codas, cf. Khačikjan 1998:10.

10 no no evidence

11 yes seems to be phonemically for some consonants (at least /l/, as shown in Khačikjan 1998:9), but only between vowels

12 10 verbs inflect for plurality of some argument, agreement to the subject,

[137] *–ni* is a variant of *–na* in spelling. Either it was just /-n/ with an inserted schwa sound if a phonotactically ill-formed consonant cluster evolves, or it was an alternation of /-na/ → /-ni/ / +Ci__. The first alternative seems to me more likely since there seem to be other vowel insertion processes in the language.

[138] Khačikjan 1998:6 notes that there were two series of obstruent consonants, but it is unclear if the distinction was voicing or length or something else or if there even was really a distinction. The most likely assumption is that it was a distinction in length only.

[139] Clear evidence has been provided by Khačikjan 1998:8f.

[140] Only one of the two R-phonemes occur in word-initial position, likely the flap.