



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Studies in Armenian etymology : with special emphasis on dialects and culture Indo-European heritage

Martirosyan, H.

Citation

Martirosyan, H. (2008, February 13). *Studies in Armenian etymology : with special emphasis on dialects and culture Indo-European heritage*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/12604>

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/12604>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

STUDIES IN ARMENIAN ETYMOLOGY

WITH SPECIAL EMPHASIS ON DIALECTS AND CULTURE

INDO-EUROPEAN HERITAGE

HRACH MARTIROSYAN

STUDIES IN ARMENIAN ETYMOLOGY
WITH SPECIAL EMPHASIS ON DIALECTS AND CULTURE
INDO-EUROPEAN HERITAGE

PROEFSCHRIFT

TER VERKRIJGING VAN

DE GRAAD VAN DOCTOR AAN DE UNIVERSITEIT LEIDEN,

OP GEZAG VAN RECTOR MAGNIFICUS

PROF.MR. P.F. VAN DER HEIJDEN,

VOLGENS BESLUIT VAN HET COLLEGE VOOR PROMOTIES

TE VERDEDIGEN OP WOENSDAG 13 FEBRUARI 2008

KLOKKE 15.00 UUR

door

Hrach Martirosyan

geboren te Kirovakan (Vanajor),

in 1964

Promotiecommissie

promotor: Prof.dr. J.J.S. Weitenberg
referent: Dr.habil. J. Dum-Tragut (University of Salzburg)
leden: Prof.dr. A.M. Lubotsky
Prof.dr. F.H.H. Kortlandt
Dr. U. Bläsing

To my Trinity:

my mother, Zhenya Martirosyan (Simonyan)

my wife, Satenik Gharagyozyan

my daughter, Tsovinar Martirosyan

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am indebted to my colleagues from the Department of Comparative Linguistics at Leiden University for discussions of various issues and etymologies: Robert Beekes, Michiel de Vaan, Tijmen Pronk, Rick Derksen, Alwin Kloekhorst, Lucien van Beek, Guus Kroonen, Michael Peyrot, Johnny Cheung, Peter Schrijver. Special thanks are due to Michiel de Vaan, who has read large parts of the earlier drafts of this book, for his detailed valuable comments. My special gratitude goes out to Leonid Kulikov, Slava Chirikba and Armen Petrosyan not only for endless discussions and valuable comments but also for their sincere friendship and consistent assistance in many respects.

My special thanks go to Tijmen Pronk and Leonid Kulikov who helped me to prepare the manuscript of this book and to solve many technical problems. I am also very grateful to all who helped me to obtain the relevant literature and references, Karen Amirkhanyan, Arpik Martirosyan, Tatev Martirosyan, Anush Martirosyan, Marine Torosyan, Tork Dalalyan, and especially Rafayel Martirosyan, who introduced me into the wonderful world of books. I am very much indebted to Samvel Martirosyan without whom I would not be able to come to the Netherlands. I also express my deep gratitude to Anush Martirosyan and Leonid Kulikov for their endless patience in assisting me in computer problems.

For the chapter 3.5.2 (on wolf, hyena, and ass and related issues) I received funding support from the Knights of Vartan FAS to whom I express my deep gratitude.

Finally, my deepest gratitude goes to my wife, Satenik, for her unfailing encouragement, assistance in every respect, and endless love and patience.

It goes without saying that I take full responsibility for possible mistakes and misprints.

CONTENTS

Acknowledgements

Contents

INTRODUCTION

PART I

ARMENIAN ETYMOLOGIES: INDO-EUROPEAN HERITAGE

PART II

EVALUATION AND OUTLOOK

A. Armenian dialects

- 1.1 Preliminaries: treatment of archaic features in dialects
- 1.2 5th century dialectal words
- 1.3 Dialectal words: new or old?
- 1.4 Textual replacement by dialectal synonyms
- 1.5 Interdialectal loans
- 1.6 "Ašxarhac'oyc'" (Armenian Geography): agreement between historical and dialectal distributions
- 1.7 Further issues on "Ašxarhac'oyc'"
- 1.8 Anania Širakac'i
- 1.9 Nersēs Šnorhali (12th cent., Cilicia)
- 1.10 Back loans
- 1.11 Re-borrowings in dialects
- 1.12 Internal etymology
 - 1.12.1 *brinč'*: **brō/ōš-*: **btinč'/j-* 'snowball-tree, guelder rose'
 - 1.12.2 *brut* 'potter'
 - 1.12.3 *ktrem*: **ktir-/ktur-* 'to cut'
 - 1.12.4 *xučič'*: **xu-xuč*, **xox-ič'* 'scarecrow'
 - 1.12.5 *čkoyt'(n)*: *čkoyt'*: *čkik* 'the little finger'
 - 1.12.6 *unj'*: *ganj* 'bottom', 'store, treasure'

B. Aspects of Armenian historical grammar

2.1 PHONOLOGY

- 2.1.1 PIE **e* > Arm. *a*
- 2.1.2 PIE **e* > Arm. *ē* or *i* before sibilants *š*, *ž*
- 2.1.3 PIE **o* > Arm. *a*
- 2.1.4 PIE **pe-* : **po-* > Arm. *he-* : *o-*
- 2.1.5 PIE **Hoi-* or **Hy-* > Arm. *ay-*
- 2.1.6 PIE **i-* > Arm. zero
- 2.1.7 PIE **j-* > Arm. *l-*
- 2.1.8 PIE **u*
- 2.1.9 Nasals
- 2.1.10 PIE **s* > Arm. *h*
- 2.1.11 PIE **Ns-* > Arm. *-s*
- 2.1.12 Ruki-rule
- 2.1.13 Loss of intervocalic **-t-*
- 2.1.14 The absence of palatalization
- 2.1.15 *-P* : *-w*
- 2.1.16 PIE **HV-*
- 2.1.17 Prothetic vowel
 - 2.1.17.1 Preliminaries
 - 2.1.17.2 PIE **h₁le/a-* > Arm. *lV-*
 - 2.1.17.3 PIE **h₃NV-* > PArm. **oNV-* > **(u)m- $\acute{V}$ -*
 - 2.1.17.4 Prothetic vowel *a-* with a labial vowel in the root
- 2.1.18 PIE **p/t/k* + **H*
 - 2.1.18.1 **kH* > Arm. *x* vs. **k* > Arm. *k'*
 - 2.1.18.2 **tH* and **pH*
- 2.1.19 PIE **uH(s)m* > Arm. *-ukn*
- 2.1.20 PIE **-CHC-*
- 2.1.21 PArm. **(h)o-* > dial. *fō-*
- 2.1.22 Clusters
 - 2.1.22.1 PIE **-T $\acute{t}$ -*
 - 2.1.22.2 PArm. **-c $\acute{j}$ -* > *-č-*, **-j $\acute{j}$ -* > *-j-*
 - 2.1.22.3 PIE **sk-* > Arm. *c'*, PIE **skH-* > Arm. *š-*
 - 2.1.22.4 PArm. **-cC-* > *-sC-*
 - 2.1.22.5 PIE (and/or substratum) **sCV-* > Arm. *sV-*

- 2.1.22.6 PIE $*dw-$ > Arm. $-rk-$ or $-k-$
- 2.1.22.7 PIE $*-\hat{k}r-$ > Arm. $-wr-$
- 2.1.22.8 PIE $*-ln-$ > Arm. $-t-$
- 2.1.22.9 PIE $*-tc^{\circ}$ > Arm. $-c^{\circ}$
- 2.1.22.10 PIE $*-mp-$ > Arm. $-m-$
- 2.1.22.11 PIE $*-mn$ > Arm. $-wn$
- 2.1.22.12 PIE $*-Ct-$ > Arm. $-wT$
- 2.1.22.13 PIE $*-RC-t-$ > Arm. $-R(C)t^{\circ}-$
- 2.1.23 Assimilation: $*-\partial... V_j^{\circ}- > -V_j... V_j^{\circ}-$
- 2.1.24 Dissimilation
 - 2.1.24.1 Grassmann's Law
 - 2.1.24.2 $r...r > l...r$
- 2.1.25 Assimilation and dissimilation
- 2.1.26 Metathesis
 - 2.1.26.1 Criteria
 - 2.1.26.2 Stops
 - 2.1.26.3 Nasals, resonants, spirants
 - 2.1.26.4 Vocalic metathesis
 - 2.1.26.5 Metathesis involving a cluster
 - 2.1.26.6 Miscellaneous
- 2.1.27 Anticipation
 - 2.1.27.1 Anticipation of $-i-$ (or a palatal element) or metathesis
 - 2.1.27.2 Anticipation of nasal
- 2.1.28 Perseveration
- 2.1.29 Perseveration or anticipation of nasal
- 2.1.30 Epenthesis
 - 2.1.30.1 Epenthetic nasal
 - 2.1.30.2 Epenthetic $-r-$
 - 2.1.30.3 Miscellaneous
- 2.1.31 Epithetic $-t$ after sibilants
- 2.1.32 Hiatus, glide
- 2.1.33 Loss
 - 2.1.33.1 Loss of w before r or loss of intervocalic w
 - 2.1.33.2 Loss of the initial vowel or syllable
 - 2.1.33.3 Loss of r
- 2.1.34 Haplology

- 2.1.35 Allegro
- 2.1.36 Tabu, euphemism
- 2.1.37 Folk-etymology
- 2.1.38 Semantic differentiation of phonological alternants
- 2.1.39 Ačaryan's Law
 - 2.1.39.1 Ačaryan's Law with *-o-* Łarabał
 - 2.1.39.2 Ačaryan's Law in inlaut
- 2.2 MORPHOLOGY
 - 2.2.1 Case system
 - 2.2.1.1 Vocative
 - 2.2.1.2 Nominative **-s*
 - 2.2.1.3 Nominative-accusative: syncretism
 - 2.2.1.4 Genitive
 - 2.2.1.5 Locative
 - 2.2.1.6 Instrumental *-aw*: *-ok'* in Łarabał
 - 2.2.1.7 Accusative pl. *-s*
 - 2.2.2 Paradigmatic solution for a phonological or morphological irregularity
 - 2.2.2.1 **s*-stem neuters
 - 2.2.2.2 Other type **s*-stem
 - 2.2.2.3 **n*-stem
 - 2.2.2.4 PIE HD *i*-stem
 - 2.2.2.5 **l*-stems
 - 2.2.2.6 Laryngeal stems
 - 2.2.3 Generalization (or relics) of PIE fem. adjectives in **-ih₂-* in Armenian
 - 2.2.4 Numerals
 - 2.2.4.1 Stability and replacements
 - 2.2.4.2 Collective numerals
 - 2.2.5 Pronouns
 - 2.2.6 Verbs
 - 2.2.6.1 **-je*-presents
 - 2.2.6.2 Nasal presents
- 2.3 WORD FORMATION
 - 2.3.1 Affixes
 - 2.3.2 Reduplication

C. Semantics, culture and etymology

3.1 Astral/Celestial world

3.1.1 Starry sky

3.1.2 Pleiades

3.1.3 Milky Way

3.1.4 Orion, Libra, and other asterisms

3.1.4.1 Designations for Orion and Libra

3.1.4.2 Further remarks on Hayk/Orion and related issues

3.1.5 Planets

3.2 Purple Sea

3.3 Time

3.3.1 Temporal, spatial and processual aspects

3.3.2 Seasons

3.4 Geographical terms

3.4.1 'mountain' : 'forest'

3.4.2 'to stream, flow' > 'water(ed), irrigated land' > 'island, river-shore'

3.5 Animals

3.5.1 young animals : young branches : child, generation (human, fauna and flora)

3.5.2 'chthonic beasts or insects' : 'pagan, abominable, demon' : 'grandmother, lady'

3.5.2.1 'woman, lady, (grand)mother' : 'insect, snail, frog etc.' : 'demon, spirit'

3.5.2.2 'hyena, wolf, jackal' : 'mule, ass' : 'ape' : 'heathen, abominable, outlaw'

3.5.2.3 To become a wolf

3.5.2.4 'hind, deer' : 'dragon, snake' : 'wolf' : 'devil'

3.5.2.5 'spider' : 'ass'

3.5.2.6 *čř*

3.5.2.7 Lizard : cow-milker/sucker

3.5.2.8 Eels

3.5.2.9 'weasel, mouse, etc.' : 'bride, young woman, etc.'

3.6 Plants

3.7 Body parts

3.7.1 'ceiling' : 'palate' : 'sky, heaven'

- 3.7.2 'crooked, twisting, bending' > 'a twisting/bending body-part'
- 3.7.3 'calf of leg' : 'fish'
- 3.8 Human world: social aspects etc.
 - 3.8.1 'princess, queen' > 'girl' and vice versa
 - 3.8.2 'share' > 'dowry'
- 3.9 Craft and occupations
 - 3.9.1 'to cut, divide' > 'a division of flock' > 'flock of sheep'
 - 3.9.2 Shin-bone > implement
 - 3.9.3 'weaving, plaiting' : 'multiplicity, abundance'
 - 3.9.4 'plaited, twisted' > 'felloe'
- 3.10 Miscellaneous
- 3.11 Mediterranean-Pontic substratum

D. *Place-names*

- 4.1 Preliminaries
- 4.2 Textual evidence for identifying the appellatives
- 4.3 Synonymic or contrasting place-name variants
- 4.4 'Cattle / pasturing' > 'pastureland' > place-name
- 4.5 Wild animals > place-names
- 4.6 Mountains named as 'dark' or 'black'
- 4.7 Place-name > wind-name
- 4.8 Dialectal place-names as evidence for otherwise unattested dialectal words, forms or meanings
- 4.9 Place-names attested in literature and containig dialectal words or features

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Sources

Bibliographical abbreviations

INTRODUCTION

This dissertation aims at an up-to-date description of the Indo-European lexical stock of Armenian with systematic inclusion of the new data. Being an etymological investigation with specific purposes rather than an etymological dictionary per se, it focuses on new material and ideas and, consequently, only contains relevant topics and lexical entries.

As an Indo-European language, Armenian has been the subject of etymological research for over a hundred years. There are many valuable systematic handbooks, studies and surveys on comparative Armenian linguistics: Hübschmann 1897; Meillet 1936; AčarHLPatm 1-2, 1940-51; Solta 1960; Godel 1975; Schmitt 1972-74; 1981; Ĵahukyan 1972; 1982; 1987; Lamberterie 1992; 1997; Clackson 1994; Olsen 1999; Kortlandt 2003; Beekes 2003.

Almost all of these works, with the exception of Ačaryan's fundamental studies (see below, and 1.1) and Ĵahukyan 1972 and 1987, mostly concentrate on Classical Armenian and touch the dialects only sporadically. With respect to the comparative historical evaluation of several dialectal features, the series of papers of Kortlandt and Weitenberg are particularly important. Middle Armenian is extensively studied in Karst 1901 (ModArm. transl.: 2002) and "Aknarkner mĵin grakan hayereni patmut'yan", vols. 1 and 2, Yerevan: University Press, 1972-1975 (see in particular H. Muradyan 1972 and M. Muradyan 1982).

My study intends to incorporate the lexical, phonetic, and morphological material in the Armenian dialects into the etymological treatment of the Indo-European lexicon. In this respect it is completely new.

The lexical stock heavily relies upon Ačaryan's basic etymological dictionary (HAB). No serious etymological and/or dialectological investigation should be undertaken without consulting HAB. Unfortunately, it is written in Armenian and is therefore inaccessible for many students of Indo-European linguistics.

It should be borne in mind that there are numerous misprints and omissions in the new publication of HAB (vols. 1-4, 1971-1979), many of which are corrected in HAB-Add 1982. Nevertheless, these corrections sometimes escape the attention of scholars. For an example see s.v. *garšapar* 'heel'.

Non-literary data taken from Armenian dialects have largely remained outside of the scope of Indo-European etymological considerations. These data include first of all those scattered in Armenian dialectological literature, particularly in Ačaryan's HAB and numerous descriptions of individual dialects by various authors. Furthermore, there is a considerable number of dialectal words in folklore texts and anthropological descriptions, which are almost never provided with indices. This literature, being written mostly in Armenian, largely remains unavailable or inaccessible to the scholars outside Armenia.

Apart from (potentially old) dialectal words which are not attested in Classical or Middle Armenian sources, there are many ClArm. words considered to be absent in dialects. In such cases, the newly found dialectal data frequently provide us with invaluable clues for establishing the semantics, the phonological shape, the morphological features and the geographical distribution of the words.

The dissertation comprises two basic parts. The first part represents the lexical corpus (ordered alphabetically) with philological and etymological discussion, whereas the second one lists phonological, morphological and lexico-semantic features resulting from the first part and outlines new prospects. Whenever the philological data taken from literature are not sufficient (for instance, when dealing with words with uncertain status and/or unspecified semantics), I consult the material obtained during my field work (August and September 2003), with indispensable systematic assistance of my wife, Satenic Gharagyozyan, in areas where some of the important Armenian dialects, such as Łarabał, Goris, Ararat/Loři, Van/Diadin, Sasun, etc., are still spoken properly.

Another essential bearing of my dissertation into the field of Armenian etymology is the systematic inclusion of cultural data. See Chapter C.

PART I

ARMENIAN ETYMOLOGIES:

INDO-EUROPEAN HERITAGE

agan ‘zealous (child, pupil)’.

Attested only once, in a late mediaeval song [NHB 1: 2c]: *Zi sireli ic'es mardkan, / Ler yusaneld manuk agan!* "Be zealous in your study so that you be loved by people".

●**ETYM** Clackson (1994: 223-224₉₈) ascribes a meaning ‘early’ to *agan* and identifies it to *-agan* found in *anagan* ‘late; evening (time)’ (q.v.). The latter is considered, thus, as composed of the privative prefix *an-* and *agan* ‘early’, literally *‘not-early’. This is actually proposed first in NHB 1: 101a. However, in its only attestation (see above) *agan* means, as stated by Ačāryan (HAB 1: 75a), ‘zealous (child, pupil)’ rather than ‘early’. Therefore, the connection with *an-agan* is possible only in terms of a semantic development ‘early’ > ‘quick(-minded)’ > ‘zealous, diligent’.

agarak, *a*-stem: GDSg *agarak-i*, GDPl *agarak-a-c* (Bible+) ‘landed property; estate, a house with all possessions; village’.

For the contextual relatedness with *art* ‘cornfield, tilled field’ (q.v.) cf. e.g. Isaiah 27.4: *pahel zoč artoy yagaraki*: *φυλάσσειν καλάνην ἐν ἄγρῳ*.

In Agat‘angetos §126 (1909= 1980: 73^{L6}), *agarak* is found in an enumeration of the types of dwellings or rural communities, which is represented by Thomson (1976: 139) as follows: *awan* ‘town’, *šēn* ‘village’, *geōt* ‘hamlet’, *agarak* ‘estate’. Thoroughly analyzing a number of similar lists and other attestations, Sargsyan (1967) concludes that *agarak* means ‘landed property, estate’ and is equivalent to *dastakert*.

Armenian loans: Georg. *agarak’i* ‘cornfield, estate, village’, and, without *-ak*, *agara* ‘estate, rural house’ [HAB 1: 77b].

●**ETYM** Since long, connected with Gr. *ἄγρος* ‘field’, Lat. *ager* m. ‘field’, Skt. *ájra*-m. ‘field, plain’, etc. Since these forms go back to PIE **h₂eg̑-ro-* which cannot yield Arm. **agar-ak*, Ačāryan (HAB 1: 77a) assumes a loan from a lost IE language of Asia Minor. Others (e.g. Karst 1911: 402; see also Ĵahukyan 1987: 452; cf. Olsen 1999: 246, 953) link *agarak* with Sumer. *agar* ‘field’. See s.v. *art* ‘cornfield, tilled field’.

At any case, the spread of the PIE term into Near East is possible, and Arm. *agar-ak* can be regarded as its secondary reflex and linked with other cultural loans as *burgn* 'tower' (q.v.) etc. But the ending *-ak* seems to favour an Iranian intermediation.

Greppin (1982a: 118; see also 1991b: 724, with some ECauc. forms) treats *agar-ak* as a loan from Hurr. *awari-* 'field'. He stresses that the Hurrian word would appear in Urartian as **āre*, so Arm. *agar-ak* must come from Hurrian, not Urartian. According to Ĵahukyan (1987: 425), this comparison is phonologically possible, but the other etymology is more probable.

agi, GSg *agwoy* (cf. *zagwoy* in P'awstos Buzand 3.6), ISg *agwov* (Epiphanius of Cyprus), IPI *ageawk'* or ISg *agaw* (Philo) 'tail'

Bible+.

Unēin agis əst nmanut'ean karči, ew xayt'oc' yagis noc'a (Revelation 9.10); *Agik' noc'a nmanut'iwn ōji*. (Revelation 9.19). In these passages Arm. *agi* (= Gr. *οὐρα*) refers to the tails of scorpions and snakes.

In P'awstos Buzand 3.6 (1883=1984: 13^{L-12f}, transl. Garsoïan 1989: 73): *kapec'in kaxec'in zmanukn Grigoris zagwoy jioyn* "hanged and bound [in the text: bound and hanged - HM] young Grigoris to the tail of the horse".

In these three classical passages *agi* refers to the tail(s) of scorpions, snakes, and a horse, respectively. Elsewhere *agi* denotes the tail of a lion, a dog, etc. [NHB 1: 3]. As we see, it is used also for snakes and for a dog, despite Ačāryan's statement (see HAB 1: 77b).

A meaning 'penis' can be deduced from *agat* 'whose penis is cut off' used by Grigor Tat'ewac'i in "Girk' harc'manc'" (14th cent.).

● **DIAL** Preserved in the dialects with:

initial a-: Agulis, Hačən, Aslanbek, Xarberd, Rotost'o, Akn, Sebastia, Ĵt'. [a misprint in HAB for Zt'. or Ĵt. ?], Alaškert, Suč'ava [HAB 1: 78a], Mv. [? not in the list of abbrev.], Papen, Xotrjur [HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 3b]; Svedia [Andreasyan 1967: 352a];

initial h-: Łarabař *hăk'ı, hăk'ü* [Davt'yan 1966: 299]; Goris *hăk'i, hăk'ü, hăk'ü* [Margaryan 1975: 311a, 425a], perhaps also *hăk'ün*, cf. AblSg *hăk'ünic'* (referring to the tail of a hen) [Lisic'yan 1969: 270]; Šamaxi *hăk'i, hăk'ı* [Bařranyan 1964: 185]; Metri *heğ'in* [Ałayan 1954: 260a]; Karčewan *hăğ'in* [H. Muradyan 1960: 188a]; Kak'avaberd *hăğ'in*, in the village of Gudemnis *hăk'ı* [H. Muradyan 1967: 98, 116, 164a]; Areš *hăgi* [Lusenc' 1982: 195a]; Šamšadin/ DiliĴan *hăk'i* [Mežunc' 1989: 183a].

The initial *hă-* in Šatax *hăkyi* corresponds regularly to Van *ă-* in *ăkyi* (see M. Muradyan 1962: 25, 33, 76, 172, 191a). Ačāryan (1952: 24f) does not explain this *a-* > Van *ă-* development. Bearing in mind that the Classical *y-* yields voiced *h-* in Šatax whereas it disappears in Van (see Ačāryan 1953: 76; Muradyan 1962: 24, 53), one should trace the anlaut of Šatax *hăkyi* back to *y-* rather than *h-* since the latter would have given *x-*. This perfectly suits the rule formulated by Weitenberg (1986: 92-93). Thus, at least on the basis of Van and Šatax one may restore a by-form with an initial *y-*, viz. Armenian **y-agi*. See 2.3.1 on *y-*.

For Partizak, a recent meaning 'an inseparable friend' is recorded, but the form itself is not [HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 3b].

In most of the dialects the word generally means 'tail' (as stressed by Ačāryan in HAB 1: 78a, in Suč'ava even pertaining to sheep, fish and birds), while a meaning 'lap' is attested in Van, Šatax (specifically of women's dress; see M. Muradyan 1962: 68, 76, 172, 191a), Akn and Svedia. Svedia is particularly interesting for here we have a contrast: *aka* 'tail' (< *agi*), NPl *ăkəsdu* 'tails' : *ăkăk* 'lap' (< *agi-k*) [Andreasyan 1967: 40, 42, 52, 352a]. The latter formation should be interpreted as a common development shared with Akn *ag'ik* since this too is a plural formation with the semantic shift. However, this meaning could be pretty old since it is found also in Van and Šatax, and in Alaškert we find 'edge of the spinal column'.

The by-form **ăk'û* found in Łarabał, Goris and partially in Kak'avaberd (see above) is perhaps resulted from a generalization of the oblique stem *agw-*, cf. Łarabał e.g. AblSg *hyak'van* [Harut'yunyan 1965: 94b^{Nr964g}], Kak'avaberd (Gudemnis) GDPl *hăk'vac* [Muradyan 1967: 116], etc.

●**SEMANTICS** Theoretically, the basic meaning of the word might have been 'edge' in the semantic fields of animal (partly also, perhaps, human) anatomy and dressing. This suggestion will be verified below, in the etymological section. Arm. *tutn/ttun* (q. v.) can serve as an interesting parallel for the semantic field. Cf. also ClPers. *dum* 'tail; edge/end' ('хвост; конец') [ĖtimSlovIranJaz 2, 2003: 479]. This word demonstrates semantic variety already in Bible, whereas *agi* appears in the literature only in the meaning 'tail', the other meanings being confined to the dialects; cf. also Arak'elyan 1984: 50.

●**ETYM** No acceptable etymology is recorded in HAB 1: 77-78. Listed by Olsen (1999: 940) among words of unknown origin.

Ĵahukyan (1967: 191) connects the word to Pol. *ogon* and Czech *ohon* 'tail' < IE **ag-* (= **h₂eg-*) 'to drive' (cf. s.v. *acem*) and places it in the list of aberrant words which deviate from the rules of palatalization. I would agree with Greppin (1983:

261) who considers the etymology uncertain by putting the whole entry between square brackets.

If the basic meaning of *agi* was indeed 'edge' (in the semantic fields of animal, partly also, perhaps, human anatomy, as well as dressing; see above, in the dialectological section), I would connect the word to Arm. *haw*₃ 'beginning' < perhaps *'edge' (q.v.) which may be derived from **p(e)h₂u-*. *haw* and (*h*)*agi* correspond to each other as *kov* and *kogi* (see s.v.v). The loss of the initial *h-* in *agi* is perhaps due to the unstressed position: **ph₂u-ijV-* > Arm. *(*h*)*agijV-* > *agi*. In eastern dialects the *h-*, if not from *y-*, may have been preserved because here the initial syllable is accented as a result of accent retraction.

As I tried to demonstrate in the dialectological section, a by-form **y-agi* can be restored on the base of Šatax and Van (perhaps also the others with an initial *h-*, if this goes back to Arm. **y-*). This is parallel to *haw* next to which there is a rarely attested prefixed form, that is *yaw* (q.v.).

azbn, *-bin*, *-bamb* 'weft, web, warp'.

First attested thrice (not twice, as in Astuacaturean 1895: 11b and Greppin 1983: 262) in Judges 16.13-14 (in the story of Samson and Delilah) rendering Gr. *δίασµα* 'warp/Kettenfaden': *Et ē anke es zeōt'anesin gisaks glxoy imoy and azbin <...>. Ēai zeōt'anesin gisaks glxoy nora handerj azbambn <...>. Korzeac' zc'ic'sn handerj ostayniwn ew azbambn yormoy anti.*

Next: *asbn* (Philo); *aspn* (Vark' ew vkayabanut'iwnk'); ISg *azbamb* (Nersēs Lambronac'i, 12th cent.; see NHB 1: 6b); APl *azbuns* (George of Pisidia).

The "pure" root **azb* (without *-n*) is found in two derivatives: *azb-a-xumb* 'crowd, rabble' (P'awstos Buzand 4.5: 1883=1984: 71^{L-11}) and *azboc* 'weaver's comb' (John Chrysostom). The rendering of the former as 'a grouping of the warp or weft' given by Greppin (1983: 262) is literal rather than textual. I do not understand why Bailey (1983: 2) translates the compound as 'very close'. The passage from P'awstos reads as follows: *t'rc'el anc'anel i veray azbaxumb zōrut'eanc's* "they fly over dense forces" (transl. Garsoïan 1989: 119-120). As for the renderings 'weaver's reed to separate threads' (my underlining) and 'stick' given by Bailey for *azbn* and *azboc*, respectively, one feels a tendency to stress their semantic conformity with Khot. *ysba* < *(*a*)*zba-* 'reed'; see the etymological section.

The interpretation of *azbaxumb* should be reconsidered. The first component can in fact be equated to **asp-* 'to arm', a quasi-word based on a re-analysis of *aspazēn* and a contamination with *aspar* 'shield' and (*a*)*sparapet* 'commander-in-chief'. A secondary (dialectal?) voicing of sibilants and affricates is not uncommon in

Buzand's History; cf. *Afjk' < Afc'k'* (q.v.), *Amaraz < Amaras*, *Tozb < Tosp*. So, *azbaxumb* might have been made up to mean 'armed crowd, rabble'. This suits the context: *azbaxumb zōrut'eanc'*.

●**DIAL** Preserved in numerous dialects. A trace of the final *-n*, though lacking even in Goris, Metri and other neighbouring dialects, seems to be found in Lérnayin Łarabał: *áspə* (Łarabał, Hadrut', Šařax-Xcaberd, Mehtišen) [Davt'yan 1966: 300]. In what follows I will only mention data which are relevant for the semantics.

According to HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 106b, the basic dialectal meaning of *azb(n)* is 'the movable frame of a (weaver's) loom with comb-like threads through between which the threads of the woof pass'. Interestingly enough, this thorough description suits the dialectal (noted as "*imk*") meaning cited in NHB 1: 6b: "the comb-like woof through which the *arēj-k'* (q.v.) pass; =Turk. */p'öcü, p'ücü*". Compare **aspasatr* (in many dialects) 'the comb (*satr*) of *asp* (= *azbn*), a part of the loom by which the woven fabric is pushed forward' [HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 106b], as well as *azboc* 'weaver's comb' (see above).

Orbeli (2002: 207) describes the meaning of Moks *asp'* as follows: "ремизки, четыре пары палочек с нитяными гребнями, разделяющими нити ткань". For the devoicing cf. *azg* 'nation' > Moks *ask*, oblique *ask'* (op. cit. 206).

Compounds **azbat'el* and **azbap'ayt* (with *t'el* 'thread' and *p'ayt* 'wood' as the second members, respectively) are recorded in Metri (*əzbát'il* and *əzbáp'et* [Ařayan 1954: 260]) and Łarabał (*əspát'il* and *əspáp'et*, *-áp'at*, etc. [Davt'yan 1966: 300]). Łarabał **azbap'ayt* is cited in HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 7b in the meaning 'the horizontal thin wood of a (weaver's) loom on which *azb* is based/put'. No Goris form is recorded in Margaryan 1975. However, Lisic'yan (1969: 158) mentions *aspi p'etner* (= Turk. */küju-ataji*), and the stick (*čipot*) on it - *əspap'etin čəpat* (= Turk. */küju-čubuxi*). For additional ethnographic information concerning *azb(n)* see Lisic'yan 1969: 160-161. Note also *azbel* (in a few dialects) 'to stretch the *azb*'s for the weaving', a process where *aspnkoč*, with *koč* 'beam' as a second member (only in Sebastia), is involved, too [HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 7b, 106b].

●**SEMANTICS** NHB and HAB specify the meaning of *azbn* as follows: 'initial edge-threads (glossed as *cop*) of a woven fabric'. The same is stated by Ařayan (1954: 260a) concerning Metri *azb*, but this seems to be taken from HAB and may not be used as a first-hand information. I am not sure whether there is solid textual basis to justify the particular reference to the edge-threads, but it seems to be confirmed at least by the denominative verb *azbel* (in a few dialects) 'to stretch the *azb*'s for the weaving'.

Though the textual evidence needs further examination, I preliminarily conclude that the basic meaning of the word can be formulated as follows: 'the (wooden) frame of a loom with the main threads as the basis of the fabric'. A secondary specification concentrating on the threads or the edge-threads might have taken place; cf. in Sebastia, where the word refers to 'golden and silver threads (in jeweller's art)', and just mentioned *azbel*.

As suggested by numerous parallels (*ostayn*, *stori*, *torg*, etc.), the basic meaning can easily be derived from 'wood; branch'.

●**ETYM** Ačāryan (HAB 1: 84b) considers the resemblance with Syriac **azbā* 'pubic or armpit hair' as accidental. Indeed, it is remote semantically. Then Ačāryan (AčaiHLPatm 1, 1940: 184; cf. Ĵahukyan 1985a: 367; 1987: 436-437; 1990: 63) mentions the word in the list of etymologically opaque words conjecturally of Urartian origin. Ĵahukyan does not mention any of the references cited below, although he does list Bailey 1983 and Čop 1955 in his bibliography (1987: 647, 650).

Čop (1955: 28; I cite from Greppin 1983: 262) proposed a connection with Skt. *átka-* m. 'garment, coat' (RV+); YAv. *aδka-* m. 'coat, outer garment', Gr. *ἄττοιμαι* < **ἄτ-ττοιμαι* 'set the warp in the loom, i.e. begin the web', *ἄσμμα*, more usually *δίασμμα*, -ατος n. 'warp/Kettenfaden' (cf. *διάζομαι* 'to set the warp in the loom, i.e. begin the web'), Alb. *end/ēn(d)* 'weben; anzetteln'. The Armenian form is derived from **ant-s-mn*

Though semantically attractive (*δίασμμα* corresponds to *azbn* in the above-mentioned passage from Judges 16.13-14), this etymology poses serious phonological problems. Greppin (1983: 262) argues against this derivation by stating that **ant-s-mn* "would seem to give **anjbn* rather than **anzbn* > *azbn*". To my mind, this objection is not essential. The developments -j- > -z- in such a cluster, and **-Vnz* > *-Vz* are unparalleled, but not impossible. I would even prefer to eliminate the voicing; thus: **ant-s-mn* > **ansmn* > **asmn* (for **-Vns* > *-Vs* see 2.1.11). The shift **-mn* > *-bn* (on which Greppin refers to Pedersen; cf. *sksanim* : *skizbn* 'begin') and the origin of **-s-* are more problematic. Furthermore, the relationship between the Greek, Indo-Iranian and Albanian cognates and, consequently, the existence of an etymon, are very uncertain; see Frisk 1: 183; Mayrhofer, EWAia 1, 1992: 58; Demiraj 1997: 166-167.

Olsen (1999: 369-370) suggests the same etymological connection without any reference to Čop or Greppin. She mentions only the Greek and equates *azbn* to *ἄσμμα*, assuming "an Arm. sound change **-tm-* (> **-t̥m-*) > **-sm-* (**-zm-*) as in Gk., followed by the particular development of **-m-* > *-b-* as in *skizbn*". On **-mn* > *-bn*

she too refers to Pedersen; cf. s.v. *sksanim skizbn*. I do not think **at-mn* would yield Arm. *azbn*.

The etymology proposed by Bailey (1983: 1-3; the same year as Greppin's treatment) opens more perspectives. Bailey compares *azbn* to Khot. *ysba* = **(a)zba-* 'reed' and connects them to the PIE words for 'branch' and 'bone', which are interpreted as variants of the same root with different suffixes; thus: **os-d/t-* (= **Hos-d/t-*, see s.v.v. *ost* 'branch' and *oskr* 'bone'). The Khotanese form under discussion is derived from **os-b^(h)*, and the Armenian *azbn* is considered an Iranian loan in view of its vocalism.

There seems to be no evidence for an independent **Hos-* (for Luv. *ḫāš-* n. 'Knochen, (Frucht-)Kern, (Frucht-)Stein' see Starke 1990: 120-124), so one should perhaps restore **Hos(d)-b^(h)*-. The Armenian form is not necessarily an Iranian loan. The semantic shift 'reed' > 'a part of a weaver's loom' is possible; cf. the meaning of Arm. *etēgn* in Hamšen [HAB 2: 19a; Ačaryan 1947: 227] and Sebastia [HayLezBrbBaī 1, 2001: 367b]. However, we do not know whether the word participated in the weaving terminology of any Iranian language. Furthermore, *azbn* does not mean a stick as a part of a loom (or as a weaver's instrument). So, a native origin of *azbn* should not be excluded. With a generalization of the zero grade from the genitive, *azbn* might go back directly to **h₂sd-b^(h)-m*. It is remarkable that Arm. *ost*, *-oy* 'branch' originating from the full grade form of the thematized variant of the root under discussion, that is **Hosd-o-* (cf. Gr. *ὄζος* 'bough, branch, twig'), is largely incorporated into the weaving terminology; see s. v. v. *ost* and *ostayn*.

If the Khotanese is really related, we are probably dealing with an innovation by means of the determinative **-b^(h)*- shared by Armenian and Iranian; cf. *surb* < **ku-b^(h)-ro-*, *deṭ-b*, *skiz-b-n*, etc. If PIE **H₂eb^(h)-* 'to weave' (cf. Skt. *vabh-* 'to bind, fetter', MPers. *waf-* 'to weave', etc.) is indeed an enlargement of the synonymous **He/ou-* (see Gamkrelidze/ Ivanov 1984: 581-585; Klimov 1989: 27; Mallory/ Adams 1997: 572a), one may perhaps compare this **-b^(h)*- to that of **H(o)sd-b^(h)*-.

azdr (spelled also as *astr*), *er*-stem: GDSg *azder*, AblSg *azder-ē*; later also GDSg *azder-i*, GDP1 *azder-a-c* 'thigh' (Bible+), 'shoulder(-blade) etc.' (Grigor Narekac'i, Nersēs Lambronac'i, etc.)

●**ETYM** The connection with Skt. *śakthi-* n. 'thigh' (RV+), Gr. *ἰσχίον* n. 'hip-joint, in which the thigh turns', etc. which involves a metathesis **sa-* > *as* and voicing of the stops (Meillet 1898: 277-278; Hübschmann 1899: 47; HAB 1: 86b; Jahukyan 1967: 217; M. Hanneyan 1979: 173) is highly improbable. Greppin (1983: 262) introduced the word in square brackets, as of uncertain origin.

Ĵahukyan (1983: 86-87; 1987: 142, 184) derives *azdr* from PIE **Host-* 'bone' (cf. Gr. *ὀσφῦς*, *-ύος* f. 'loin or loins, lower part of the back' etc.; see s.v. *oskr* 'bone') reconstructing **ost-dʰ-ur* > **ozdʰur* > *azdr*. Olsen (1999: 149) independently suggests the same etymology but points out that "the formal divergences are not easily overcome". The determinative **-dʰ-* is not confirmed by any cognate form, and the vowel **o-* cannot yield Arm. *a-* in a closed syllable. The latter problem might be removed if one assumes a zero grade form: **h₃st-dʰ-*.

****azn-awor***

●**DIAL** Arm. **aznawor* 'huge man, giant; supernatural being, spirit' is present in the dialects of Bulanəx, Xlat', Van, Nor Bayazet [HAB 1: 87b], Ararat [Amatuni 1912: 3], Sebastia [Gabikian 1952: 42], Alaškert [Madat'yan 1985: 206a], Svedia etc. [HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 8a]. In a fairy-tale from Goris, the village of Yayĵi, recorded in Yerevan in 1969 (HĴHek' 7, 1979: 507^{L11}): *min aznavur arĉ'* "a giant bear".

S. Avagyan (1978: 176a) records *aznaur* 'a mythical giant man' in Arĉak (close to Van). On the way Arĉak - Van there is a heap of stones called *Aznavuri kerezman* "grave of Aznavur", a few m. broad and as long as a cornfield. According to the traditional story, this is the grave of *Aznavur*, who was created by *Satana* the very same day when the Lord created *Adam* (op. cit. 106).

Commenting upon a similar grave *aznawuri gerezman* in a Kurdish village close to Manazkert, Abet'yan (1899: 71, 71₁) points out that under the word *aznawur* "die Urbewohner Armeniens" are understood, and the word is equivalent to *dew*.

For other textual illustrations see Mik'ayelyan 1980: 14a^{L16f}, 15a^{L24} (Nor Bayazet).

In Gomer *aznahur* is recorded [HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 8a]. The *-h-* instead of *-w-* is also seen in **anjnahur* (see below).

In the meaning 'nobleman': Šatax *äznävur* [M. Muradyan 1962: 208a]; Akn *aznawur* (as a personal-name) [Gabičlean 1912: 233].

●**ETYM** According to Aĉar'yan (HAB 1: 87b), Arm. *azn* 'generation, nation, tribe' (cf. *azn-iw* 'noble' in Bible+) has been borrowed into Georg. *aznauri* 'nobleman' and from Georgian re-borrowed into Arm. dial. **aznawor* 'huge man, giant; supernatural being, spirit'. Given the facts that in most of the dialects Arm. **azn-awor* is not semantically identic with Georg. *aznauri* 'nobleman', and is widespread in Armenian dialects most of them being geographically very far from Georgia, and the suffix *-awor* is very productive in Armenian, the interpretation of Arm. **azn-awor* as a Georgian loan is not probable.

The Armenian and Georgian words may be independent borrowings from Iranian. Moreover, it seems more probable that Arm. **azn-awor* 'huge man, giant; supernatural being, spirit' is not related with Georg. *aznauri* 'nobleman' and the others [though a contamination is possible; cf. also *Aznanc'-ordi* 'valiant, brave man' from *azn*, see SasCr 2/2, 1951: 821; Petoyan 1965: 380], but rather continues ClArm. *anjn-awor* 'subsistent; breathing' < 'body/soul possessing' (Eznik Kořbac'i, Philo, etc.), a derivative of *anjn* 'person, ipse; soul, spirit; body' (Bible+; dial.); cf. also Sasun *anjnāvur* 'animate, living, corporeal', Moks *anjnavur*, *anjnahur* 'animate; giant, mighty', Aparan *anjnahur* 'a mythical being', Gomer *aznahur* 'giant'. Of these forms, Ačāryan (HAB 1: 204a) mentions only Aparan *anjnahur* 'a mythical being' stating that it is a reshaped form of **aznawor* < Georgian *aznauri* 'nobleman'. As we saw, however, the form *anjnawor* is reliably attested both in old literature and in dialects, and its semantics fits well into my proposal. See further s.v. *anjn*.

Arm. dial. **azn-awor* 'huge man, giant; supernatural being, spirit', thus, together with Sasun *anjnāvur* 'animate, living, corporeal', Moks *anjnavur*, *anjnahur* 'animate; giant, mighty', etc., belongs to ClArm. *anjn-awor* 'subsistent; breathing' < 'body/soul possessing' < *anjn* 'person, ipse'; soul, spirit; body'. Typologically cf. Lat. *animus* 'soul, mind; vital power', *anima* 'air, breeze, breath, soul, life' : *animal* n. 'animal', and, especially, Arm. dial. *janavar* '(ferocious) beast' : Pers. *žān-vār* 'living, alive; animal; a fierce beast', *žān-āvar* 'alive; an imprudent man' from *žān* 'soul, vital spirit; mind; self; life; spirit, courage; the father of demons' (see Steingass 352-353). Note also Turk. *canavar* 'cruel, rude, uncivilized; hero; etc.' (Uwe Bläsing, p.c.). Ačāryan (1902: 216) treats Polis and other forms as borrowed from Turkish.

Arm. dial. *janavar* 'beast' can also refer to a small beast, as e.g. in Nor Bayazet (see Mik'ayelyan 1980: 9b, lines 8, 9, 22). In the same book (160b), *jun-janavar* is glossed as 'wild beast; huge man'. In Arčak (S. Avagyan 1978: 184a): *janavar* 'monster, imaginary ugly animal'. In a fairy-tale from Širak (HŽHek' 4, 1963: 154^{L-2f}, 155^{L7}): *mek višap, mek dew, ya uriš me janavar* "a dragon, a devil, or another *janavar*"; *oč' dew gtav, oč' višap, oč' el uriš janavar* : "He found neither devil, nor dragon, and nor another *janavar*". Thus, *janavar* refers to 'wild beast (real or imaginary)'. Note that Pers. *žān-vār* contains the same suffix as Arm. *anjn-awor*.

Turk. *aznavir* 'vengeful, cruel, fierce, big and strong' and Pers. *āznāvur* (in Steingass 45a: *aznāvur* 'a great lord') are often treated as Armenian borrowings [HAB 1: 87b; Dankoff 1995: 16; Bařramyan 1974: 163]. This view is criticized by Uwe Bläsing (p.c.) who argues that all the forms are borrowed (directly or indirectly) from MPers. *āznāvar* 'noble'.

alawunk', alawsunk' 'Pleiades'.

In "Vark' ew vkayabanut'iwnk' srboč'", Venice, 1874, vol. 1, p. 682 (apud HAB 3: 222a): *Bayc' ayl astetk' < ... > orpēs aruseakn ew mazarovt'n ew alawsunk'n ew Haykn*. Attested also in Čarəntir, as well as by lexicographers. The occurrence of 'Pleiades' beside *Hayk* 'Orion' is very common, cf. Job 9.9, 38.31; and Amos 5.8 - *bazmastetk'* and *Hayk*, next to each other. In the dialect of Van this relationship has created an interesting compound, namely: *Xek'-bazük'* (perhaps to be corrected as *päzüük'*) 'Orion/Hayk and Pleiades' (see Ter-Mkrtč'yan 1970: 182-183) < **Hayk-k'* + *Bazuk-k'*. Generally about the association 'Orion-Hayk' see A. Petrosyan 1991: 102-103; 1991a: 121; 1997: 22-23. On Orion and Pleiades see 3.1.1-2, 3.1.4.

In "Bärgirk' hayoc'" (see Amalyan 1975: 8^{Nr128}), *alawun*, var. *alasun*, is rendered by *bazmast'* or *bazum ast'* or erroneously *bazmataf* (cf. HAB 1: 9, 92a) 'Pleiades'.

●**ETYM** Ĵahukyan (1963a: 86; cf. 1987: 270, with some reservation) connects to *atawni* 'dove' deriving both from **aləu-* 'white, shiny' and comparing also **albho-*, read **h₂elb^ho-*. This etymology seems to me uncertain, since the only (cited) evidence for **-əu-n-* is taken from the Celtic onomastics, and there are no strong semantic parallels. One might reformulate the connection, deriving *alaw(s)unk'* directly from *atawni*, regardless of the ultimate origin of the latter. However, neither this would be convincing because, firstly: *-l-* instead of *-t-* is not explained. Secondly, the origin of *-s-* remains obscure. Thirdly, *atawni* 'dove' is a derivation with *-i* suffix, but the expected (folk-etymological) development would be 'dove' > 'star' and not the other way around. Finally, to the best of my knowledge, in Armenian tradition, unlike in that of Greek (cf. Scherer 1953: 144; Puhvel 1991: 1244), the Pleiades are never interpreted as doves.

H. Suk'iasyan (1979: 298-299; cf. 1986: 26-27, 69, 99, 136, 137) mentions Ĵahukyan's etymology stating that the *-s-* is a determinative, and treating the *-w-* as from the determinative **-b^h-*. See also S. Grigoryan 1988: 192. None of the authors specifies the origin of the *-s-*.

There is synonymous *atabasar* (only in P'eštBař), on which nothing certain can be based, however.

Since the semantic development 'many' > 'Pleiades' is one of the most representative patterns for naming this star cluster (see 3.1.2), one may derive *alaw(s)unk'* 'Pleiades' from *y-olov* 'many' (< **polh₁us*, cf. Gr. *πολύς* 'many', Skt. *purū-*, etc.). It is remarkable that the Iranian (YAv. APl f *paoiryaēinyas* < **parūjainī-*, NPers. *parvīn*, etc.) and the Greek (*Πλειάδες*) names seem to have been based on the same PIE word. For the discussion and other opinions I refer to

Bartholomae 1904, s.v.; Pokorny 1959: 800; Bogolyubov 1987; Puhvel 1991: 1243-1244. Theoretically, we might be dealing with an isogloss shared by Armenian, Greek, and Iranian.

This attractive etymology has been proposed by A. Petrosyan (1990: 234-236; 1991: 103; 1991a: 121; 1997: 22). However, he does not specify the morphological background and phonological developments, and involves details which seem to be improbable and unnecessary, such as the relation to *aṭawni* 'dove' (see above for the criticism) and Hurrian *allae* 'lady, queen' (pointing out that the dove is the symbol of Mother-goddess), as well as an anagrammatic connection with the IE name of the mythological snake **uel-* (cf. Russ. *Volosyni* 'Pleiades' etc., see Ivanov/Toporov 1974: 49-50, 200). Furthermore, one misses here the semantic development 'many' > 'Pleiades', which, in my opinion, is essential. The secondary correlation to the doves is based on folk-etymology and is confined to Greek. Compare other "Umdeutungen" of Pleiades to 'Schiffahrtsgestirn' (after *πλέω*), etc [Scherer 1953: 143f; 1974: 189₁₈].

Arm. *alaw(s)unk'* has *n*-stem like *harawunk'* 'arable land' (q.v.). The *-s-* is perhaps from a parallel form in the suffix IE **-ko-* by regular palatalization of **k* after **u*, cf. s.v.v. *boys*, *araws* (NB! next to the above-mentioned *harawunk'*), etc. The initial *a-* beside *-o-* of *y-olov* 'many' might be explained by the ablaut within the PIE paradigm (cf. the zero-grade of Skt. *purú-*, see also 2.1.20, 2.1.23) or by the Armenian development *o* > *a* in pretonic open syllable within the Armenian paradigm; see 2.1.3.

Celtic **lu-ūero-* 'viel' from **p₂h₁u-uer-o-* (see Zimmer 1997: 354-355) seems particularly interesting. If containing the heteroclitic suffix **-uer/n-*, it matches *alawunk'* and helps to restore a paradigm identic with that of *harawunk'*, cf. Gr. *ἄρουρα* f. 'tilled or arable land; pl. corn-lands, fields', etc.

At last, one has to take into consideration also with Karst's (1948: 79₂) brief note in which he compares *alaw(s)unk'* with Turan. Pers. *alūs*, *ulus* 'troupe, foule'. [Any etymological or contaminative relation?].

alewr, aliwr. GDSg *aler* (later also *o*-stem) 'flour'

Bible+.

● **DIAL** Ubiquitous in dialects.

● **ETYM** Belongs to the family of *atam* 'to grind' (q.v.), cf. especially Gr. *ἄλεπον* n., mostly in pl. *ἄλευρα*, also *ἄλευρος* f. 'flour' [Hübischmann 1897: 414; HAB 1: 94b].

Usually **h₂leh₁-ur* is reconstructed for the Armenian word [Beekes 1969: 234; 2003: 191; Eichner 1978: 152; Normier 1980: 20; Olsen 1999: 154, 156]. Hamp (1970: 228a) reconstructs **h₂(e)leh₁uro-*, which does not agree with Kortlandt's view on loss of *w* (see 2.1.33.1). Eichner (ibid. 153-154) derives *aliwr* 'flour', *atbiwr* 'well, spring' etc. from nominative **-ēw_ṛ* assuming a subsequent development *-iwr* > *-ewr* analogically after the genitive *-er* which in turn has been derived, he says, from **-ewros*, a replacement of an original **-ewnos*. Clackson (1994: 94) considers this explanation as entirely *ad hoc* since the oblique stem of the word for 'spring' must have been **b^hrun-*, cf. Goth. *brunna*, etc.; see s.v. *atbewr* and 2.1.33.1 for more detail. He concludes that the *-e-* of *atbewr* comes from PIE short **-e-*, and that we must seek a different explanation for the *-e-* of *alewr*.

It has been assumed that *alewr* is a borrowing from Greek; see HAB 1: 94b for the references. Hübschmann (1883: 17; see also 1897: 414) rejected this in view of Arm. *-l-* instead of *-t-*. Clackson (1994: 94-95) advocates the loan theory and argues that the palatal *-l-* can be due to the environment of a front vowel, cf. *balistr* 'catapult', etc. He concludes that "either *alewr* is a loan, or it stems from a different prototype from that ancestral to the Greek forms". Even if the two nouns do both continue the same formation with the meaning 'flour', he proceeds, it seems unlikely that this is an innovation.

The loan theory is advocated also by Greppin (1986: 288) who argues that in the Bible translation *alewr* mostly renders Gr. *ἄλευρον*, and concludes: "Clearly, the appearance of Arm. *alewr* instead of **atewr* is the result of learned tampering".

One finds hard to accept that such a common thing as is 'flour' can be a borrowing (HAB 1: 94b with references). Moreover, *alewr* is the principal word for 'flour' which is dialectally ubiquitous, so such a word would have hardly been borrowed from (or influenced by) Greek. As a last resort, one might assume a very old borrowing at the "Mediterranean" stage. In my view, the Greek and Armenian words for 'flour' continue the same protoform, viz. **h₂leh₁-u_ṛ*. If the original form was indeed *alewr* and not *aliwr*, one may posit a loss of the intervocalic laryngeal, see s.v. *yoyr*. On *-ewe-* > *-e-* in GDSg *aler* see HAB 4: 628a etc. (for more detail and references see 2.1.33.1).

axaz, GDPl *axaz-a-c* 'ermine, mustela alba'.

The only attestation mentioned in NHB and HAB is found in K'at. ar leh. [NHB 1: 14c]:

Nmanin ofj'axohk' axazac', ork' t'otun zink'eans əmbinil yorsordac' k'an t'ē šataxil "The righteous (people) resemble ermines which prefer to let themselves to be

caught by hunters rather than to sin". The source, that is *Kaṭ. ar leh.*, is missing in the bibliographies of both NHB and HAB. Its author seems to be *Simēon Lehac'i* (17th cent.), of which I find another attestation of *axaz* in 'Uṭegrut'iwn', in the meaning 'ermine-fur'; see Akinean 1936: 381^{L44}, 421 (citing the Dictionary of Step'anos Rošk'a, 17-18 cent.).

●**ETYM** The word is considered a dialectal form of *ak'is* 'weasel' (q.v.); see also HAB 1: 96b; Ĵahukyan 1967: 307. The latter mentions the pair in the context of the deviant alternation *k'/x*, but offers no explanation or etymology.

I think, *axaz* can be explained by a contamination of Arm. *ak'is* 'weasel' and Pahl. and NPers. *xaz* 'marten' (see MacKenzie 1971: 94). For a thorough discussion see s.v. *ak'is*.

acem 'to bring, lead, move, beat, pour, etc.', later also 'to cut, shave; to play (a music instrument); to lay an egg', etc.

Bible+.

●**DIAL** Widespread in dialects especially in the meaning 'to lay eggs'; in eastern peripheries (T'iflis, Łarabał, Agulis, Ĵuła, etc.): 'to pour', 'to play a music instrument' [HAB 1: 102]. See also s.v. *acu* 'garden-bed'. On the epenthetic *-r-* in **arcu* 'garden-bed' and **arceli* (vs. *ac-eli*) 'razor' see 2.1.30.2.

●**ETYM** Since Windischmann and Gosche, connected with Skt. *ájati*, Av. *azaiti*, Gr. *ἄγω* 'to lead', Lat. *ago*, etc. [Hübschmann 1896: 412^{Nr6}; HAB 1: 101-102] : PIE **h₂eg-* 'to drive, lead'.

Given the absence of the initial *h-* as the expected reflex of the laryngeal, Clackson (1994: 218₃) points out: "Kortlandt's rule that **h₂e-* goes to Armenian *ha-* does not explain *acem* 'I bring'". In fact, Kortlandt (2003 [< 1983 and 1996]: 44, 118; see also Beekes 2003: 175, 182) derived *acem* from **h₂g-es-*, cf. Lat. *gerō* 'to bring' (on which see Schrijver 1991: 18-19); see also Greppin 1983: 263. Considering this etymology problematic, Clackson (2004-05: 155) prefers to connect *acem* with the widespread thematic present **h₂egē/o-* and suggests that the initial *h-* might have been lost "through influence from compound words ending in *-ac*, which were synchronically associated with the verb *acem* (Olsen 1999:231-6)".

The meaning 'to play a music instrument' is derivable from 'to beat, sling' (cf. Skt. *aj-* 'to drive, sling', *go-ájana-* 'whip, stick for driving cattle', Arm. *gawazan* 'id.' from Iranian, etc.).

See also s.v.v. *acu* and *art*.

acu *o*-stem (lately attested); originally perhaps *ea*-stem 'garden-bed'.

Siracides 24.31/41 (= Gr. *πρασιά* 'bed in a garden, garden-plot') [Clackson 1994: 117, 225₁₂₃]; Movsēs Xorenac'i 1.3 (1913=1991: 10; Thomson 1978: 69). The only evidence for the *o*-declension comes from "Oskip'orik": AblPl *i yacuoc'* [NHB 1: 21b]. The latter is also the only testimony for the plural.

The MArm. petrified plural *acu-k'*, not recorded in HAB, is found in Smbat Sparapet (13th cent., Cilicia); see Galstyan 1958: 167. In this passage, *acuk'* (in allative *y-acuk'*) is opposed to *aygi* 'garden' and can therefore mean 'kitchen-garden'. The form *acuk'* 'kitchen-garden' is totally identic with the one found in the dialects of Zeyt'un (Cilicia), Dersim, etc. (see below). Note that Smbat Sparapet was from Cilicia.

● **DIAL** Preserved in Agulis, Van, Ozim, Alaškert [HAB 1: 102b]; in some dialects, namely Hamšen [Ačāryan 1947: 219], Dersim [Bařramyan 1960: 71b], Zeyt'un [Ačāryan 2003: 295], the plural form has been generalized: **acu-k'* 'kitchen-garden', which is attested in MArm., in the 13th century (see above). Next to *ajuk'*, Zeyt'un also has pl. *ajvənak'* [Ačāryan 2003: 152].

According to Ačāryan (HAB 1: 102b), Kesaria has *ajvik* 'kitchen-garden', though Ant'osyan (1961: 180) cites only *ajuk'* 'kitchen-garden'. The dialectal form *arcu(n)* recorded in NHB (1: 21b) is now confirmed by Nor Ĵuřa *arcu* [HayLezBrbBair 1, 2001: 100a]. Given the etymology of the word, the *-r-* should be seen as epenthetic; cf. also *ac-el-i'* 'razor' : dial. **arceli* (see 2.1.30.2).

Remarkable is the paradigm preserved in Zeyt'un: NPl *aju-k'*, GDPl *ajv-ic'* [Ačāryan 2003: 188]. The other classical words displaying such a paradigm are *batan-i-k'* 'baths', *harsan-i-k'* 'wedding', *vart-i-k'* 'trousers' and *mawru-k'* 'beard' (ibid.). All these words, except for *mawru-k'* (GDPl *mawru-ac'*), have classical *-i-k'* : GDPl *-eac'*. Since the classical diphthong *ea* regularly yields *i* in Zeyt'un (see Ačāryan 2003: 85), the classical GDPl *-eac'* can be seen as directly continued by Zeyt'un GDPl *-ic'*. This would imply that the Zeyt'un word under discussion may presuppose a variable paradigm *acu-(k')* - **acu-i-k'* (see par. XX, and *(i)*, *arcui*, etc.). I wonder whether the latter form can be supported by Kesaria *ajvik* (if this is to be understood as **ajvik'* rather than a diminutive form in *-ik*). The theoretical paradigm would be NSg. **acui-i* (> class. *acu*), NPl **acu-i-* (> class. NPl **acu-i-k'*, GDPl **acu-eac'*).

One would perhaps prefer a simpler, analogical solution, especially because the word for 'beard' (ClArm. *mawru-k'*, *mawru-ac'* - Zeyt'un *muyu-k'*, *muyv-ic'*) is irregular, too. [The postulation of an intermediary stage with a hiatus/glide *-y-* which would trigger a morphological change *mōru-ac'* > **mōru-y-ac'* (in classical terms: **mōru-eac'*) > Zeyt'un *muyv-ic'*, does not help much since I do not have supportive

material for such a hiatus in Zeyt'un or adjacent dialects]. However, the latter seems analogical after *acu-k* rather than other body-part terms, which in Zeyt'un display different GDPI endings, viz. *-uc* and *-oc* (see Ačaryan 2003: 188). The Zeyt'un paradigm of *acu-k* can therefore be viewed as old. The reason for the analogical influence could have been the similar ending of the stems of both words, namely the vowel *-u-*.

This hypothesis may be confirmed by the etymology; see below.

●**ETYM** A derivative of *acem* 'to bring; to lead; to move; etc.' (q.v.) < PIE **h₂eg-*: Skt. *ájati*, Gr. *ἄγω* 'lead' (II.), etc. [HAB 1: 101-102]. Arm. *acu* is directly compared with Gr. *ἄγυια*, pl. *ἄγυιαί* f. 'street, road' (II.) and interpreted as perfect participle **-us-ieh₂-* (see Jahukyan 1987: 241; cf. Clackson 1994: 225₁₂₄).

After a thorough examination of the Greek word, however, Szemerényi (1964: 206-208) concludes: "It seems therefore clear that the connection of *ἄγυια* and *ἄγω* is nothing more than popular etymology, probably overlying and obscuring an indigenous word". See also Beekes 1998: 25 and his Database (s.v.). How to explain, then, the similar pattern seen in Armenian *acem* 'to lead' : *acu* 'garden-bed', which are not mentioned in this context? Whatever the exact details of their origin and development, the Greek and Armenian words under discussion seem to belong to each other.

The hypothetical development of the paradigm would be as follows: NSg. **ag_{us}-ih₂-* > PArm. **acú-i* > ClArm. *acu*, NPl **ag_{us}-ih₂-es* > **acu-i-k*, oblique **ag_{us}-ieh₂-* > PArm. **acu-ia-* > GDPI **acu-eac* (see above, in the discussion of the dialectal forms). This implies that of the two plural forms, both represented only in dialects, **acu-i-k* is the original one, whereas **acu-k* is analogical after NSg *acu*.

See also s.v. *mawru*.

acut, acux (*o*-stem according to NHB 1: 21b, but without evidence) 'coal; soot'.

In Lamentations 4.8, *acux* renders Greek *ἄσβόλη* 'soot'. The passage reads as follows: *T'xac'an k'an zacux tesilk' iwreanc' : Έσκότασεν ὑπὲρ ἄσβόλην τὸ εἶδος αὐτῶν*. RevStBible has: "Now their visage is blacker than soot". In other attestations and in dialects refers mainly to 'coal'.

In Agat'angelos 219 (1909=1980: 116^{L1f}; transl. Thomson 1976: 223): *ew tesin zi t'xac'eal ēr marmin nora ibrew zacut* (vars. *zacux*, *zacutx*, *zarcui*) *sewac'eal* "and they saw that his body was blackened like coal". The place name *Acut* is found in Step'anos Tarōnec'i/Asofik (referring to P'awstos) and Vardan Arewelc'i, in the forms *Arjkaṭ-n* and *Arcuṭ-n*, respectively; for discussion see s.v. place-name *Dalari-k*.

In P'awstos Buzand 3.20 (1883=1984: 45^{L-4f}, transl. Garsoïan 1989: 97): *Atē, tesēk' acut, orov erkat' šotac'usc'uk', zi zač's xaresc'uk' zark'ayis Hayoc'. Ew andēn berin acut, orov xarēin zač'sn Tiranay*: "Now then! Bring [glowing] coals with which to heat iron to the glowing point so as to burn out the eyes of the king of Armenia'. And they immediately brought coals with which they burned out the eyes of King Tiran". For discussion of the context and the place-name *Acut* see s.v. place-name *Dalari-k'*.

Yovhan Mandakuni (5th cent.) or Yovhan Mayragomec'i (7th cent.) mentions *acut* in a list of sorceries, between *at* 'salt' and *asteni karmir* 'red thread'. This attestation is not found in NHB and HAB s.v., though NHB (1: 314b) has it s.v. *asteni*. Here the word is cited with auslaut -x. The recent edition (2003: 1262b^{L5f}), however, has *acut*.

In "Yačaxapatum" 6: *acux seaw ē k'an zstuer* "the coal is blacker than the shadow" [NHB 1: 21b].

In "Baġgirk' hayoc'" (Amalyan 1975: 9^{Nr162}), *acux* is rendered by *gorceli* 'coal' (on this word see HAB 4: 646b), *mur* 'soot', and *anjot*. On the latter see below.

The verb *acxanam* (var. *actanam*) 'to become coal or ash' is attested in Philo [NHB 1: 21a].

NHB (1: 21a) and HAB (1: 102b) record *acx-a-kēz*, the second member meaning 'to burn', attested in T'ovmay Arcruni (9-10th cent.) 2.1. However, in V. Vardanyan 1985: 126^{L20} one finds *astuac-a-kēz* instead, with *astuac* 'god', and this is reflected in the English translation by Thomson (1985: 145): *ew hur krakaranin borbok'eal, astuacakēz ararin zna yormzdakan mehenin*: "In the temple of Ormizd they had [the *marzpan*] consumed by his god in the blazing fire of the pyraeum".

●**DIAL** All the dialectal forms recorded by Ačāryan (HAB 1: 103a), except for Rodost'o *ajux*, contain an epenthetic -n-: Łarabał, Goris *ánjut*, Šamaxi *hanjut* (see also Bałramyan 1964: 185), Ararat *ánjot*, Nor Bayazet *anjox*, Hačēn *anjot*. Note also Sasun *anjux* 'coal, half-burnt wood' [Petoyan 1954: 103; 1965: 443], and Łazax etc. (see HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 63b, with textual illustrations). Apart from *ánjut* and *ánjot*, Łarabał has also *ánjotnə* [Davt'yan 1966: 301].

As is informed by Ačāryan (HAB 1: 103a), the form *anjot* is attested in Ėfīmērtē (17th cent.). He does not mention the testimony of "Baġgirk' hayoc'", where *acux* is rendered by three synonyms: *gorceli* 'coal', *mur* 'soot', and *anjot* (see above). Since **anjot* is present in limited areas, namely in the eastern (Łarabał, Ararat, etc.) and extremely south-western (Sasun and Hačēn) dialects, one may take this as an example of affiliation of "Baġgirk' hayoc'" with the eastern dialects, especially Łarabał etc.; see par. XX. Note that in an older lexicographic work (abbreviated as

HinBr), *acux* is glossed by *gorceli* and *mur* (see NHB 1: 21b), just as in "Bārgirk' hayoc'" ; only *anjot* is missing. If the original gloss indeed did not include *anjot*, this form may have been added by the compiler/redactor of "Bārgirk' hayoc'" (probably Eremia from Metri) for whom it was a living form. Note also that in manuscripts one finds not only *anjot* and *anjōt* but also *anjut*, which is reminiscent of doublet forms in Łarabał, viz. *ánjot* and *ánjut*.

●**ETYM** Since Tērvišean and Müller (see HAB 1: 103a), connected with Skt. *āṅgāra*-m. 'coal' (RV+), Lith. *anglis* m. 'coal', OCS *qglb* m. 'coal'. Hübschmann (1897: 412) rejects this etymology since he considers *acux* (with final -x), attested in Lamentations 4.8, to be the original form. Later, however, he (1904: 395, 395₁) assumes the opposite since, in cases with the alternation *t* : *x*, the form with *t* (> *y*, *x*) is the original one. Besides, the *t*-form is found in P'awstos Buzand, Agat'angelos (both 5th cent.), Yovhan Mandakuni/Mayragomec'i (5th or 7th cent.; not cited in NHB, Hübschmann, HAB) etc., and has, thus, more philological weight. Ačāryan (HAB 1: 103a) follows Hübschmann stating explicitly that the original form was *acut*, and adds that the final -x is probably due to influence of *cux* 'smoke' (see also Ĵahukyan 1987: 183). Also Kētikean (1905) takes *acut* as the original form. Nevertheless, *acux* continues to be the main cited form probably due to the biblical attestation (cf. Olsen 1999: 949), as well as the fact that the modern literary language has adopted it. Saradževa (1986: 46) operates with *acux* and dial. **anjot*, but does not even mention *acut*.

Mēnēvišean (apud Kētikean 1905: 347-348; see also Ačāryan 1967: 127) compares with Russ. *úgol* 'and Germ. *Kohle* 'coal'. Pedersen (apud Kētikean 1905: 348) is more inclined to Germ. *Kohle* and Ir. *gúal* 'coal' rather than with the Sanskrit and Balto-Slavic forms. In this case, however, the initial *a-* of Arm. *acut/x* remains unexplained, unless one assumes PIE **Hg̃(c/o)ul-*. One might assume a contamination of the two words for 'coal' which would explain the -c- (instead of -k-) and the absence of the nasal in Armenian, but this is not convincing. For Germ. *Kohle* etc. see also s.v. *krak* 'fire'.

Ačāryan (HAB 1: 103) does not accept any of the etymological attempts and treats Laz *(m)cola* 'soot' and, with reservation, Udi *cil* 'glowing coal', as Armenian loans. Olsen (1999: 949) put *acux* in her list of unknown words. Greppin (1983) did not include the word in his etymological dictionary.

The connection with Skt. *āṅgāra*-, Lith. *anglis*, etc. 'coal' seems very plausible. The scepticism of scholars is understandable since the expected Armenian form should have been **ank(V)t*. In order to solve the phonological problems, Saradževa (1986: 46) assumes a by-form of the PIE root with **-g̃-* or **-g̃ʷ-*. Ĵahukyan (1987:

141, 183) suggests **angoli-* > **angiol-*, with metathesis of *-i-*. This view cannot be maintained since: 1) **-gi-* would rather yield *-č-*; 2) the loss of the nasal in ClArm. is not explained; 3) such a metathesis is not very probable. In the following I shall offer an explanation of the apparent phonological problems, which would involve the development **HN^wg^wu-* > PArm. **an^wk^wu-* > **auk-* > **auc-*, with regular palatalization of **g* before **u*, as in *awj* ‘snake’, *awcanem* ‘to anoint’, etc.; see s.v. *awji-k* ‘collar’; cf. also 2.1.17.3.

If Lat. *ignis* m., Skt. *agní-* m. etc. ‘fire’ belong to this PIE word, they may be derived from **h₁ng^wni-* (**h₁* in view of the laryngeal colouring in Latin), whereas the Sanskrit and Balto-Slavic forms would reflect a full grade **h₁ong^w-(o/ō)l-* [Schrijver 1991: 63-64, 416, 484, 497]. I propose to treat the word for ‘coal’ as a HD *l*-stem (for the type see Beekes 1995: 177): NSg **h₁óng^w-ōl*, gen. **h₁ng^w-l-ōs*.

From NSg **-ōl* one would expect Arm. **á(n/w)cul* > **ac(u)ł*. We can assume an analogical restoration of *-u-* and/or a scenario comparable to that of *ant*: *anut* ‘armpit’ (q.v.). Alternatively: secondary thematization based on the nominative: **h₁(o)ng^w-ōl-o-*, cf. Skt. *āngāra-* (though the Sanskrit form can reflect both **-ol-o-* and **-ōl-o-*). This is attractive since it helps to explain the loss of *-w-* by the pretonic position: PArm. **a(w)cuł-o-* > *acuł*, cf. *ačem* ‘to grow’ < PArm. **aug-^{je}-mi* vs. Lat. *augeō*, etc.

Note that we are dealing with a case of anticipation of two possible labial features: 1) labiovelar; 2) labial vowel *-u-* from **-ō-*.

The nasal of dial. **anjoł* may be secondary, as Ačaryan (2003: 139) states for Hačən *anjoł* and compares with cases such as *masur* ‘sweet-brier’ > Hačən *mansuy*, *mec* ‘big’ > Zeyt’un *minj*, *šak’ar* ‘sugar’ > Zeyt’un *šank’cy*, etc. Also Šamaxi *hanjuł* is listed with examples of *n*-epenthesis [Bačramyan 1964: 65]. For Łarabał *ánju/ł* (< *acuł*), Davt’yan (1966: 77) cites the example of *koriz* ‘stone or hard seed of fruits’ > Łarabał *kəri/enj* in Martakert and north of Step’anakert vs. *kərez* and *kəreznə* elsewhere. However, this example is ambiguous since it could have resulted from **koriz-n*.

Nevertheless, **anjoł* is present in the eastern (Łarabał, Ararat, etc.) and extremely south-western (Sasun and Hačən) dialects and may therefore be archaic. Ĵahukyan (1967: 204, 313) mentions this dialectal form but does not specify the origin of the nasal. Later he (1972: 273; 1987: 141, 183, 233, 613) ascribes an etymological value to it. If indeed original, the nasal might have resulted from generalization of the full-grade nominative **h₁ong^w-ōl(-o)-*, whereas the sequence **h₁ng^wōl-* would trigger the development above. However, as already stated, the nasal can be epenthetic, though old. Besides, one also may assume an influence of *xanj-oł* ‘half-burnt wood’

(from *xanj-* ‘to scorch, singe’, q.v.) which is attested in the Bible onwards, is dialectally present in extreme NW (Trapizon, Hamšen, etc.), SW (Syria), and SE (Ħarabaġ etc.), and is, thus, quite old.

If **anjot* is original, *xanj-ot* may be treated as an analogical formation after it.

Compare also the discussion s.v. *awji-k* ‘collar’¹.

akanj, *i*-stem: LocSg *y-akanj-i* (Ephrem), ISg *akanj-i-w* (Paterica), IPl *akanj-i-w-k* (Anania Širakac’i, 7th cent., A. G. Abrahamyan 1940: 62^{L25}); *o*-stem: ISg *akanj-o-v* (Nersēs Lambronac’i); **akanj-k**, *a*-stem: NPl *akanj-k*; APl *akanj-s*, GDPl *akanj-a-c*; IPl *akanj-a-w-k* (abundant in the Bible) ‘ear’.

● **DIAL** Dialectally ubiquitous, mostly with metathesis of the nasal: **ankaĵ* [HAB 1: 104b]. On this and on Muš *anganĵ* see 2.1.29. With unclear *-o/u-* instead of the second *-a-*: Ħarabaġ *anguč*, *anjug*, Šamaxi *angōĵ*, Ĵuta *angoč*, etc. Unchanged: Van-group *akanĵ* [Orbeli 2002: 199; Ačāryan 1952: 242; M. Muradyan 1962: 191a], Akn *agōĵ*, pl. *agōž-vi* [HAB, ibid.]. The *-vi* of the latter is originally dual (see s.v. *cung-k* ‘knee’).

● **ETYM** Arm. *akanj(-k)* is originally the dual of *unkn* ‘ear’ (q.v.), and the *ĵ* is treated as taken from *ač* ‘eye’ (also a dual), with voicing after nasal [Meillet 1903: 147; 1936: 84; HAB 1: 104b].

Pisani (1950: 167) assumes **ousen-g^wŋ* > *unkn* vs. **ausp-q^w-ī* > *akanĵ*, with the dual **-ī*. Others directly posit **-n-ih_l*, without the velar between **n* and **i* (see Greppin 1983: 264 and Lindeman 1982: 39 for references; cf. also Winter 1986: 22-23). Note that **h₂(e)us-n-ih_l* (cf. e.g. Eichner 1978: 147₁₇, 151) would yield Arm. **(h)aganĵ*. The same holds for **ə₃ws-nt-yə_l* [= **h₃ws-nt-ih_l*] reconstructed by Witczak (1999: 175). Lindeman (1980; 1982: 39) assumes **awsŋ-a* (cf. Gr. *οὔατα* < **owsŋ-t-a*) > Arm. **aw(h)an-a* + *-č* from *ač* ‘eye’ with subsequent voicing after nasal. Arriving at **aganĵ*, he, basing himself upon the idea of voiced aspirates in Armenian, derives *akanĵ* from **aganĵ^h* < **ag^hanĵ^h* through dissimilation of aspirates. For other proposals/references see Ĵahukyan 1982: 222₆₀.

None of these solutions seems entirely satisfactory, and the form *akanĵ-k* is considered to be unclear by many scholars: Ĵahukyan 1982: 119; Greppin 1983: 264; Kortlandt 1985b: 10 = 2003: 58. Beekes (2003: 189) notes that the **h₂-* of **h₂us-n* (> *un-kn* ‘ear’) “perhaps lives on in pl. *ak-anĵk*”, whose further origin is unclear.

¹ I wonder if Arm. *unĵ* ‘soot’ (q.v.) can be connected with these words, deriving from **h₁ong^w-ĵV-*.

I suggest the following solution: $*h_2(e/o)us-$ > PArm. $*ag-$ (cf. s.v.v. *ayg* 'morning' and *ēg* 'female') + suffix $-k\eta$ (as in *akn* 'eye') + dual $*-ih_i = *agkanj > *ak(k)anj > akanj$.

According to Łap'anc'yan (1961: 93; 1975: 352; see also Abaev 1978: 48), Arm. *akanj* has nothing to do with *unkn* and reflects Zan $*q'wanj$ 'ear' from Kartv. (unattested) $*qwar-$, cf. Megr. *quž*, etc. He (1975: 352) also assumes that Łarabať *anguč* etc., with $-u-$, reflects the labial $-w-$ of the Kartvelian form. [Klimov (1998: 246) reconstructs GZ $*qur-$]. This is unconvincing. Rightly rejected by Ač'aryan (HAB 1: 104b). The resemblance of *akanj* with some ECauc forms is probably accidental too (Jahukyan 1987: 611).

akut' 'cookstove'.

Attested in Vardan Barjberdc'i (13-14th cent.), Canon Law, and "Yaysmawurk'" (AblSg *y-akut'-ē*). In "Bařgirk' hayoc'" (see Amalyan 1975: 141^{Nr112}), *akut'* renders *xaroyk* 'campfire' (q.v.). In Canons by Dawit' Alawkay ordi (12th cent., Ganjak/Kirovabad): *Ayl t'ē i t'ondruk' kam ar akut' merj gtani*, <...> [A. Abrahamyan 1952: 54^{L108f}].

●**DIAL** Ač'aryan (HAB 1: 110a) only cites dialect records from Ĵuľa, P'ambak, and Šamaxi. Meřri and Areš must be added here [Aťayan 1954: 260b; Lusenc' 1982: 195b]. It also seems to be found in dialects of Van-group: Šatax *h'āngyūt* '=*ōjax*' and Van *angurt* 'a portable oven made of clay' (see M. Muradyan 1962: 213a and HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 56b respectively; *akut'* is not mentioned). The Šatax form can derive from $*y-angut'$. The same holds true for Van, if the actual form has an initial *ā-*; cf. 2.3.1. The forms have an epenthetic $-n-$; Van has also an $-r-$; both are common in these dialects, cf. M. Muradyan 1962: 64; Ač'aryan 1952: 101.

I conclude that the word represents an isogloss involving the groups 6 and 7, as well as the eastern part of the group 2. This seems to be partly confirmed by the geography of literary attestations.

●**ETYM** No etymological attempt is recorded in HAB.

Ĵahukyan (1967: 151) lists *akut'* among words showing no consonant shift, linking it with the PIE word for 'oven': $*Huk^w$: OIc. *ofn*, Gr. *ἰπνός*, etc. Greppin (1983: 265) gives the entry between square brackets. The etymology is accepted in Mallory/Adams 1997: 443b. Here *akut'* is derived from the delabialized (after $*-u-$) variant $*Huk-$: Lat. *aula* 'pot', Goth. *auhns* 'oven', Skt. *ukha* 'cooking pot'. However, this is very improbable since the formal problems are hard to surmount. Ĵahukyan (1987: 472) compares to Akkad. *akukutu* 'half-burnt wood', considering the resemblance as doubtful or accidental.

For possible Caucasian parallels see Nikolayev/Starostin 1994: 522.

ataxin, *o*-stem, *a*-stem; note also NPI *ataxn-ay-k*‘, API *ataxn-ay-s*, GDPI *ataxn-a(n)c*‘ (on declension see Meillet 1936c: 73; Ĵahukyan 1959: 264; 1982: 94-95; Tumanjan 1978: 294-295) ‘female servant’.

Bible+.

●**ETYM** According to Marr, derived from *atx*, *i*-stem ‘lock; ring; furniture, possessions; group of wayfarers, crowd’ (Bible+), in Samuēl Anec‘i (12th cent.): ‘tribe’, the original meaning of which is considered by him to be ‘house’. Next to the meaning ‘possessions’, in Movsēs Xorenac‘i *atx* sometimes seems to refer to (coll.) ‘entourage/tribe’, e.g. in 1.12 (1913=1991: 38^{L5}, 40^{L1}). [See also s.v. *atk* ‘at’ ‘poor, beggar’]. Ačaryan (HAB 1: 118b) does not accept Marr’s etymology and leaves the origin of the word open.

Meillet (1936c) suggests a derivation from *atam* ‘to grind’ treating the *-x-* as a suffixal element found also in *glux* ‘head’, q.v.; see s.v. *atij* ‘virgin, girl’. In view of the otherwise unknown suffix *-axin* Greppin (1983: 266) considers this problematic and prefers the loan origin. Olsen (1999: 470, 770, 776, 836) connects with Lat. *alō* ‘to nurse, nourish’ etc., positing IE **(h₂)lh-k-ih₁no-* with the complex diminutive suffix (cf. Germ. **-ikīno-* in Germ. *Lämmchen*, Engl. *lambkin* etc.) and interpreting Arm. *-x-* from **-h-k-* by “preaspiration”. This etymology (see also s.v. *atij* ‘girl’), in particular the theory of “preaspiration” (on which see Olsen 1999: 773-775) is not convincing.

According to D’jakonov (1971: 84; 1980: 359), *atx* “agnatisch verwandte Familiengruppe” and *ataxin* are borrowed from Hurr. **all-ah₂he* ‘household’/‘хозяйское’ > *allae* ‘Herr, Herrin’ or Urart. **alā₂h₂ə* > *alae* ‘Herr, Herrin’ (cf. also Chechen *æla* ‘prince’ etc. [D’jakonov 1980: 103; Diakonoff/Starostin 1986: 50]). On the other hand, Arm. *ataxin* has been compared with Akkad. *alah₂hinu(m)* ‘miller’ (see Ĵahukyan 1987: 472) and Hitt. *al₂h₂eš₂ra-* ‘eine Priesterin bzw. Kultfunktionärin’ etc. [van Windekens 1980: 40], and *atx* - with Arab. *‘ahl* ‘family, tribe, people’ (see Ĵahukyan 1987: 486). I wonder if there is any relation with Elephantine Aram. *lhn* ‘servitor’ etc.? (on which see Degen apud Ullmann 1979: 28ff).

Ĵahukyan (1987: 425) considers the etymology of D’jakonov as semantically unconvincing. The following forms, however, seem to strengthen the semantic correspondence: Hurr. *allae-h₂hinə* ‘housekeeper’ > Akkad. *allah(h)innu* also ‘a kind of serving girl of the temple personnel’, Aram. *lə₂h₂entā* ‘serving girl, concubine’ [D’jakonov 1980: 359; Diakonoff/Starostin 1986: 50].

If the basic meaning of *atx* was indeed 'house, household, possessions, estate', the derivation of *ataxin* from *atx* (Marr; cf. also Jahukyan 1967: 121) both going back to Hurrian and/or Urartian (D'jakonov) would be the best solution. For the semantic development cf. OPers. *māniya*- n. 'household slave(s)' from **māna*- 'house': OAv. *demāna*- n. 'house', Pahl., NPers. *mān* 'house', Parth. *m'nyst'n* 'dwelling-place, monastery', Skt. *māna*- m. 'house, building, dwelling' (RV+), etc. (see Kent 1953: 202b; Mayrhofer, EWAia 2: 348). Brandenstein and Mayrhofer (1964: 132) note: "Der elam. Kontext bewahrt ein synonymes ap. Wort, **garda*". The latter word is **garda*- 'Diener, Hausgesinde, οἰκέτης' > Bab. *gardu*, Aram. *grd*', in Elamitic transliteration *kurtas*, cf. YAv. *gərəda*- m. 'house of daēvic beings', Pahl. *gāl* [g'l] coll. 'the gang, the villeins labouring on the estates of the kings, the satraps, the magnates, etc.', Skt. *grha*- m. 'house, residence' (RV+), Goth. *gards* m. 'house, housekeeping', Arm. *gerd-astan* (prob. Iran. loan), etc. [Brandenstein/Mayrhofer 1964: 120; Nyberg 1974: 80; Olsen 1999: 333, 333₂₉₀]; on *kurtas* see also Funk 1990: 9ff. This brings us to another semantic parallel for the semantic development 'house, household, estate' > 'servant' in Armenian, that is *gerd-astan* 'body of servants and captives; possessions, estate, landed property' (cf. *gerdast-akan* 'servant, female servant' etc.), q.v.

I conclude that the IE origin of Arm. *atam* 'to grind' is not probable.

ataatak, *a*-stem: GDSg *ataatak-i*, ISg *ataatak-a-w* (frequent in Bible) 'shouting'; **ataatakem** 'to shout' (Bible+); dial. ***ataat-**, interjection **atē** (Bible+).

● **DIAL** Zeyt'un *atatog* [Ačaryan 2003: 296]; reshaped: Ararat *ataat-ank* 'cry, lamentation, shout' [HAB 1: 119a], according to Amatuni (1913: 17b) - 'curse, scold'. The original verbal root **ataat-* has been preserved in Axalc'xa *atatel* 'to weep, cry, shout' [HAB 1: 119a], according to Amatuni (1913: 17-18) - 'to tear, to fill eyes with tears'.

● **ETYM** In view of the onomatopoeic nature of the word, Ačaryan (HAB 1: 119a) is sceptical about the numerous attempts of connecting with Gr. *ἀλαλά* (interjection) 'cry of war', *ἀλαλαί* pl. '(war)cries, shouting', *ἀλαλαγμός*, *ἀλαλαγή* 'shouting', Skt. *alalā*, etc. However, the onomatopoeic nature of a word does not necessarily imply that the word cannot be inherited. Positively: Jahukyan 1987: 111 (cf. 447, 451).

As is pointed out by Olsen (1999: 251₁₁₉), the complete formation of *ataatak*, *a*-stem 'shouting' may theoretically be identical with the cognate Greek noun *ἀλαλαγή* 'shouting'. Thus: Arm.-Gr. onomatopoeic **al-al-* 'to shout', **al-al-ag-eh₂-* 'shouting'.

atam, aor. *atac*‘-, imper. *ata* ‘to grind’.

Bible+.

In numerous late attestations the compound *jr-atac*‘ ‘water-mill’ occurs with loss of *-r-*: *jatac*‘, pl. *jatac*‘-*ani*, GDPI *jat(a)c*‘-*ac*‘. This form is represented in NHB 2: 669b as a dialectal form. It is widespread in dialects (see below).

See also s.v. *atawri*.

●**DIAL** Ubiquitous in dialects, mostly as *atal*. Note also Zeyt’un and Hačən *atəl*, Tigranakert *ātāl*. Łarabał and Šamaxi have *atil*.

There are also forms with *-an-* and *-ac*‘-: T’avriz *atanał*, Agulis *ətanil*, C’fna *ətanal*, Suč’ava *axc’el*, Rodost’o *axc’el*. According to Ačāryan (HAB 1: 118b), these forms arose in order to distinguish the verb for ‘to grind’ from *atem* ‘to salt’ (cf. Agulis *atil* [Ačārean 1935: 332] etc.). Then he (ibid.) states that in Łarabał the opposite process has taken place: next to *atil* ‘to grind’, *atem* ‘to salt’ has been replaced by compounded verbs *atav anil* (ISg of *at* ‘salt’ + ‘to do, make’) and *atə tnil* ‘to put into salt(-water)’.

The word *at-un* ‘wheat that is (ready to be) taken to water-mill’ (see Ačārean 1913: 80a) is attested in "Oskip’orik". In Łarabał one finds *atumnə* instead, cf. *mrjiwn* ‘ant’ > *mrjəmnə* [HAB 1: 118b], q.v.

The *r*-less form of *jr-atac*‘, viz. *jatac*‘, *jatac*‘-*k*‘ (see above), is widespread in dialects; see Amatuni 1912: 573b; Ačārean 1913: 935. The spread of this form and the operation of the Ačāryan’s Law in e.g. Łarabał, Hadrut‘, Šatax *ččtac*‘ (see Davt’yan 1966: 464) and Van, Moks, Šatax *čātac*‘, *čātac*‘ (see Ačāryan 1952: 290; M. Muradyan 1962: 164^{L9}, 204b; Orbeli 2002: 126^{Nr26}, 279) suggest an early date. In Goris, the *-r-* has been metathesized: *čatare*‘ (see Margaryan 1975: 361b).

●**ETYM** Since 1852 (Ayzovsk’i; see HAB) connected with Gr. *ἄλλω* ‘to grind’ (probably an athematic present), MInd. *ātā* ‘flour’, Av. *aša-* (< **arta-*) ‘gemahlen’, NPers. *ārd* ‘flour’, etc. [HAB 1: 118a; Hübschmann 1897: 414; Meillet 1924: 4-6; Pisani 1950a; Mayrhofer, EWAia 1: 108]; for Hindi *ātā* etc. see also Scheller 1965, for Pers. *ās* etc.: Blāsing 2000: 35-36.

Meillet (1924: 5) assumes a present nasal infix (**-ln-* > Arm. *-l-*) and treats aor. *atac*‘i as secondary. Klingenschmitt (1982: 93; see also 107, 286) points out that *atam* "kann entweder auf ein *n*-Infix-Präsens **h₂l-n-ə₁-* zurückgehen (see also Klingenschmitt apud Eichner 1978: 153₃₇) oder aus einem athematischen Wurzelpresens **h₂alə₁-/*h₂lh₁-* entstanden sein". In the latter case he restores **h₂lh₁-me* and **h₂lh₁-te* for 1PIPres *atam-k*‘ and 2PIPres *atay-k*‘, respectively, and for the former alternative he mentions Iran. **arna-*: Khot. *ār-*, Pashto *aṇəl* ‘mahlen’.

On the problem of **-ln-* > Arm. *-l-* see op. cit. 242, as well as Clackson 1994: 219₂₇ (with references). See also 2.1.22.8. Lindeman (1982: 40) argues against the derivation of *ata-* from **h₂l-n-ə₁-* stating that *ata-* "may represent a pre-Armenian (secondary) nasal present **alnā-* (of the type seen in **barjnam* > *bainam*) which has ousted an earlier athematic present formation"; see also Clackson 1994: 92, 219₂₈.

To *atam*: Gr. *ἄλέω* 'to grind' belong also *atawri* 'mill; female grinder (of corn)': Gr. *ἄλετρις* 'woman who grinds corn' and *alewr* 'flour': Gr. *ἄλευρον* 'id.' (see s.v.v.). Hamp (1970: 228) points out the remarkable agreement of Armenian and Greek in this whole family of formations of *atam* = *ἄλέω*, which recurs only in Indic and Iranian. After a thorough analysis, however, Clackson (1994: 90-95) concludes that "the Greek and Armenian derivatives from the root **al-* do not appear to represent common innovations but common survivals or parallel derivations. <...>. The scattered derivatives of this root in Indo-Iranian languages suggest that a number of formations from the root **al-* were at one time shared by the dialects ancestral to Greek, Armenian and Indo-Iranian but were subsequently lost in most Indo-Iranian languages". Apart from some details, on which see s.v.v. *atawri* and *alewr*, I basically agree with this view.

atawri, *ea*-stem: GDSg *atawrw-oy*, GDPl *atawr-eac* 'mill; female grinder (of corn)' (Bible+); [NHB 1: 48c; Clackson 1994: 92, 219₃₁]; later: 'tooth' (Grigor Narekac'i 63.2). For the possible evidence for Arm. **atawr* 'mill' see Clackson 1994: 219₃₁.

In Jeremiah 52.11: *i tun atōreac*: *εἰς οἰκίαν μύλωνος*. Clackson (1994: 92) points out that "the Armenian phrase could denote the house by its occupants". For the passages from Ecclesiastes see Olsen 1999: 443₅₁₀.

The meaning 'tooth' is found in Grigor Narekac'i 63.2 (Xaç'atryan/Lazinyan 1985: 496^{L46}; Russ. transl. 1988: 203; Engl. transl. 2001: 301): *Or tas patanekac' atawris ambošxnelis*: "Ты, что юным даешь зубы жующие": "You, who gives the chewing teeth to the young".

●**ETYM** Belongs with *atam* 'to grind' (q.v.); cf. especially Gr. *ἄλετρις* 'woman who grinds corn'. Usually derived from **h₂(e)lh₁trio-* [Hamp 1970: 228; Greppin 1983: 269]. As is shown by Greppin (1983c; 1983: 269; 1986: 288₂₇; see also Clackson 1994: 92), the frequently cited Gr. *ἄλετριος* appears to be a ghost-word. As *atawri* has an *a*-stem, one may reconstitute **h₂(e)lh₁-tr-ih₂-* (for discussion see Olsen 1999: 443-444, espec. 444₅₁₁), or, perhaps better, **h₂(e)lh₁-tr-i(H)-eh₂-*. Normier (1980: 217) posits **h₂lh₁-tr-ih₁ah₂-*, apparently with the dual **-ih₁-*. This is reminiscent of Skt. *arāṇi-* f. (usually in dual) 'piece of wood used for kindling fire by attrition' (RV+) [Mayrhofer, EWAia 1: 108]. See also s.v. *erkan*, *i-* and *a*-stem 'mill'.

The medial laryngeal followed by a consonant cluster is regularly reflected as *-a-* (see 2.1.20). Arguing against this, Lindeman (1982: 40) directly identifies *ata-* (in *atawri*) with the verbal stem *ata(-y)*, which is gratuitous.

It seems that PIE **-l-* have yielded *-l-* rather than *-t-* in **-lh₁C/R*, see s.v.v. *alawun-k'*, *alewr*, *yolov*. If this is accepted, the apparent counter-example *atawri* may be explained by the influence of the underlying verb *atam* 'to grind' (cf. Olsen 1999: 443-444, 776).

Arm. *atawri* matches Gr. *ἀλετρις* 'woman who grinds corn' perfectly. However, Clackson (1994: 92-93) derives *atawri* from an instrument noun **atawr* with PIE **-tr-* (cf. *arawr* 'plough', q.v.) as opposed to agent nouns in **-tl-* (cf. *cnawt* 'parent') assuming a semantic development 'connected with a mill' > 'one who grinds'. He concludes that the Greek and Armenian forms may be separate developments. This seems unnecessary (cf. also the objections by Olsen 1999: 444₅₁₁). I think they reflect a common protoform, viz. **h₂(e)lh₁-tr-i-*, which has developed into Armenian **h₂lh₁-tr-i(H)-ch₂-* (cf. *sami-k'*, *sameac'*, q.v.).

atbewr, atbiwr, *r*-stem: GDSg *atber*, AblSg *y-atber-ē*, API *atber-s*, GDP1 *atber-c'*, IPI *atber-b-k'*; in pl. obl. mostly *-r-a-*: GDP1 *atber-a-c'* (Bible; P'awstos Buzand 4.15, 1883=1984: 102^{L16}; Movsēs Xorenac'i 1.16, 1913=1991: 51^{L4}; Hexaemeron 4 [K. Muradyan 1984: 107^{L13}], etc.), IPI *atber-a-w-k'* (Grigoris Aršaruni, 7-8th cent.) 'fountain, spring'.

Bible+. In derivatives mostly *atber-*, cf. *atber-akn*, GDSg(PI) *-akan(c')*, ISg(PI) *-akamb(-k')*, API *-akun-s*, etc. 'fountain-head, source' (Bible+). In Hexaemeron 4, e.g., one finds *atber-akun-k'* and *atber-akan-c'* (K. Muradyan 1984: 107, lines 3 and 9).

● **DIAL** Ubiquitous in dialects. The following dialects display an initial aspiration: Nor Bayazet *haxpur*, Ozim *haxp'ur*, Moks *hāxpür* [HAB 1: 126a; Ačaryan 1952: 243; Greppin 1983: 271 (cf. 1982/83: 146)]. To this Šatax *hāxpür* [M. Muradyan 1962: 191b] should be added.

In view of Šatax etc. *hā-*, Van *ā-*, and Alaškert, Muš *h'axb'ur* (see HAB 1: 126a), Weitenberg (1986: 93, 97) reconstructs **y-atbiwr*. This may have originated from prepositional phrases such as: in/on/at/to the spring. As we shall see, the word does function mainly in such contexts.

For Moks (the village of Cap'anc') Orbeli (2002: 199) records *axpör* 'родник'; belongs to *a*-declension class: GSg *axpr-a*, DSg *axpra*, *axprin*, etc. [M. Muradyan 1982: 143, 148]. Without *h-*, thus. In the folklore texts recorded by Orbeli himself, however, we find attestations only with *h-*: *hāxpṛē čambāx woskē p'əric'in*

"рассыпали по дороге к роднику золотые" [94^{L3f}, transl. 163]; *t'əlc'in vār hāxprə* *čamp'xin* "бросили его на дороге к роднику" [95^{L11f}, transl. 164 (cf. 1982: 99)]; *nā lač tārek' trek' hāxpūr* "понесите этого мальчика, положите около родника" [98^{L5}, transl. 166].

These attestations do not come from the village of Cap'anc'. One may therefore think that the form without initial *h-* is found in Cap'anc', and Moks proper has *h-* form instead. On the other hand, all the passages have locative or allative context and can shed light on the process of the use and petrification of the preposition *y-*. Another example: a saying from Moks reads [Orbeli 2002: 120^{Nr41}]: *Mart' hāxpūrəm čūr xəmə*, *atək č'ə'k'ar t'älə' hinə*: "(When) one drinks water in a spring, it is not nice that he throws a stone into it". Clearly, *hāxpūrəm* means 'in a spring' here.

ClArm. *atber-akn*, GDSg *atber-akan* has been preserved in Muš-Bulanəx, as found e.g. several times in a fairy-tale recorded in the village of Kop' in 1908 [HŽHek' 10, 1967: 17-21]: *h'atbərakan, məj/vər* ('in/on') *h'atbərakan*, AblSg *h'atbərək-ic*. Cf. also Muš/Bulanəx or Sasun/Boṭnut *vər h'atbri akan* "on the source of the fountain" [HŽHek' 10, 1967: 65^{L-9,-13}]; Ozim *haxb'rak* [HAB 1: 109a; Ačairyan 1952: 242]; Moks (the village of Cap'anc') *axpra-ak/k'* 'источник' [Orbeli 2002: 199].

●**ETYM** Since H. Ebel, connected with Gr. *φρέαρ*, *-ατος* n. 'an artificial well; spring; tank, cistern' [HAB 1: 125-126]. Beekes (2003: 191, 206; cf. also 1969: 234) reconstructs **b^hreh₁-ur*. But is there evidence for the laryngeal? The oblique stem of the PIE word must have been **b^hrun-*, cf. Goth. *brunna*, etc. [Schindler 1975a: 8]. The original PArm. paradigm would have been, then, as follows: NSg **atbewr* (< **b^hrewr*) and GSg **atbun* (< **b^hrun-*). This paradigm has been replaced by NSg *atbewr*, GSg *atber* analogically after the type of *r*-stems like *oskr* 'bone' : *osker-* [Godel 1975: 97], and GSg *atber* is explained from **atbewer* by regular loss of intervocalic **-w-* before **-r*, or by contraction *-ewe-* > *-e-* (Meillet 1908/09: 355; HAB 4: 628a; Ĵahukyan 1959: 172-173; 1982: 31, 92, 221₂₀; Zekiyan 1980: 157; Aṭabekyan 1981: 104; Godel 1982a: 12; Clackson 1994: 94; Olsen 1999: 791). Others suggest a secondary genitive **b^hrewros* (Eichner 1978: 153-154), with the development **-ewrV-* > Arm. *-er* [Kortlandt 2003: 29-30, 103; Beekes 2003: 165]. For discussion see s.v. *alewr* 'flour' and 2.1.33.1; see also Matzinger 2005: 79-83.

For dissimilation *r...r* > *l...r* see 2.1.24.2.

atēn (GSg *atētan*) 'bow; rainbow (Bible+)'; 'a bow-like instrument used for combing and preparing wool and cotton (a card)' (Geoponica; dial.). For a thorough description of the instrument see Amatuni 1912: 30b.

●**DIAL** Widespread in dialects mostly in the meaning ‘bow’; also in the compound **net-u-atētn* ‘arrow and bow’, cf. Akn *nēdvatēṭ*, Van *netvaneṭ*, Ararat *netvaneṭ*, T’iflis *nitvaniṭ*, Zeyt’un *nidb’atēṭ*, *ləmb’atēṭ*, etc. [HAB 1: 126b; Ačāryan 2003: 296].

Of the two Zeyt’un forms, *nidb’atēṭ* represents the sound change *-dv- > -db-* (assimilation of the plosiveness), which is also seen in *astuac* ‘god’ > **as(t)pac* > Zeyt’un *asb’əj* (vs. Hačən *asvəj*), GSg *asuju* (see Ačāryan 2003: 299), and Moks *āspāc*, GSg *ās(c)u*, *āstəcu* (see Orbeli 2002: 206).

As to the other form, viz. *ləmb’atēṭ*, Ačāryan (2003: 115, 135) considers it strange, pointing out that the *ləm-* is not clear. We might be dealing with further development of *-db-*, involving, this time, dissimilation of the plosiveness: *-db- > -nb- (> -mb-)*. The process may have been strengthened by the assimilatory influence of the initial nasal *n-*, in other words, we are dealing with a case belonging to 2.1.25. Thus: **nedv- > *nidb- > *ninb- > *nimb- > *limb-*. The last step involves the nasal dissimilation (cf. *nmanim* ‘to resemble’ > Nor-Naxiĵewan, Aslanbek, Polis, Sebastia, Xarberd, Tigranakert, Maraṭa, Alaškert, Hamšen, etc. **(ə)lmanil* [HAB 3: 459b]), and/or the alternation *n-/l-*, cf. *napastak* : dial. **(a)lapastrak* ‘hare’, *nuik/nuič* : dial. **luič* ‘a plant’, etc.

Many dialects (Van, Moks, Ozim, Alaškert, Sebastia, T’iflis, Axalc’xa, Agulis [HAB 1: 126b], etc., have **aneṭ*. Unlike Goris (*hanēṭ*, *aneṭ*, *anēṭ*, see Margaryan 1975: 312a), Łarabaṭ [Davt’yan 1966: 304] has forms both with and without the final *-n*, viz. *hanēṭnə* and *(h)āneṭ*. The trace of the final *-n* can be seen in GSg *anṭan* in Van and Moks, as well as in Van *ananak* and Ozim *anəṭnal* from *atētnak* ‘rainbow’ (see Ačāryan 1952: 243). Note also the initial *h-* in Łarabaṭ and Goris.

The meaning ‘a bow-like instrument used for combing and preparing wool and cotton’ is present in Van, Lori (see Ačāryan 1913: 97a), Muš, Širak, etc. **aneṭ* (see Amatuni 1912: 30b; HayLezBrbBaṛ 1, 2001: 58a), as well as Zeyt’un *atēṭ* (see Ačāryan 2003: 296). Since the craft of combing and processing of wool was most developed and famous in the area of Van-group-speaking dialects (especially Ozim and Moks), and carders and felt-makers used to travel throughout Armenia, Caucasus, and even farther (see Orbeli 2002: 19-21, 23), one may wonder if, e.g. in Lori and Širak, the semantic shift under discussion was motivated by the spread of the Moks, Van etc. designation of the instrument, viz. *aneṭ* (GSg *anṭan*, see Orbeli 2002: 202). In this respect, a fairy-tale “in the dialect of Łazax” [Both geographically and dialectally, Łazax is between Lori and Łarabaṭ], recorded in 1894 (see HŽHek’ 6, 1973: 318-329), is particularly interesting. There lived a wool-carder (*pürt’ kyzoṭ*) in the village of Van who had to leave his city for four years, in search of a living.

His instrument is called first *net u atet* (319^{L7-8}), then *pürt' kyzelu anet* (316^{L3}). For the question of interdialectal borrowings see 1.5².

●**ETYM** Usually connected with the group of *otn* 'spine, etc.' (q.v.), see Lidén 1906: 128 (with references); HAB 1: 126b (sceptical, though without comments); Pokorny 1959: 308; Ĵahukyan 1987: 122. The details are not clear, however, so one should join Ačāryan (HAB 1: 126b), Greppin (1983: 271; 1986: 284), and Olsen (1999: 409-410) in considering the etymology unsure. Ĵahukyan (1987: 122) restores **əlel-* with a question-mark. In view of the internal laryngeal (see s.v. *otn*) the anlaut can be explained only if one assumes **HHl-el-*. If my tentative etymology of *uteł*, *o-stem* 'brain; marrow' (q.v.), which also contains *-et-*, is accepted, the connection of *at-et-n* with *otn*, *ut-et*, etc., may become more probable.

Given the semantic fluctuation in e.g. Gr. *βιός* m. 'bow' and 'bowstring', one may wonder if *atetn* 'bow' derives from *ati(-k')* 'intestine; string of musical instruments'.

atij: Timothy Aelurus (6th cent.), "Knik' hawatoy" = "Seal of Faith" (7th cent.); **atič** (*a-stem*, cf. GDPl *atič-ac'* in Anania Narkac'i, 10th cent.): Eusebius of Caesarea, Anania Narekac'i; **afjik**, *an-stem* (GDSg *afjkan*, ISg *afjkaw* or *afjkamb*, NPl *afjkunk'*, GDPl *afjkanc'*, etc.): Bible+; MArm. **afjkin** 'virgin, girl'; in Eusebius of Caesarea: **atič** 'prostitute' (see HAB 1: 129b for semantic parallels).

●**DIAL** The form **afjik** is ubiquitous in dialects. Zeyt'un *axj'gin*, *ašgi/en*, gen. *ašgənən*, Hačən *ač'gin*, Xarberd *ač'xin* (see HAB 1: 130a; Ačāryan 2003: 296), Kesaria *ač'tən*, gen. *ač'tənən* (Ant'osyan 1961: 181) continue MArm. **afjkin**. For a textual illustration of the Zeyt'un (= Ulnia) form see X. K'. 1899: 18a^{L4}.

In Muš, Ačāryan (HAB 1: 130a) records a vocative form *axj'-i*. In fact, this form is also present in many other dialects and is widely used in the territory of Armenia proper.

●**ETYM** Numerous etymologies have been proposed (see HAB 1: 129-130 and Greppin 1983: 273; Ivanov 1974: 106), none of which is unproblematic. Nor convincing is the comparison with OIr. *inalit* 'Dienerin' from **eni-(h)altih₂* (the root of Lat. *alō* 'to nurse, nourish' etc.) suggested by Olsen (1999: 448). The derivation from *atam* 'to grind' (see Meillet 1936c: 73-74 = 1978: 227-228) is possible since the labour of grinding was mainly performed by women (see e.g. T'emurčyan 1970: 88a); cf. also Gr. *ἀλετρις*, *-ίδος* f. 'female slave who grinds corn', from *ἀλέω* 'to grind', a cognate of Arm. *atam*. As pointed out by Greppin (1983: 273), the final *-ij*

² *atetn* > **anet(n)* - both assimilation and dissimilation? Cf. 2.1.25.

is unexplained. Hambarjanyan (1998: 29-33) advocates Meillet's etymology and identifies the suffix with *-ič* seen in *kaw* : *kaw-ič*, *lu* : *lu-ič*, etc. I suggest to start with **atj̥-* < **h₂l-i(e)h₂-*. In this case the form *atij̥* would be secondary. The connection with *ataxin* 'female servant' is improbable (see s.v.).

Ĵahukyan (1963a: 87-88; 1987: 145) derives **at-* from **pə-lo-* (cf. *ul* 'kid') and for *-j̥-* compares *erin̄j̥* and *oroj̥* (q.v.). This is perhaps the most probable etymology. For the *-j̥-* see above.

According to Witczak (1999: 177-178), the primitive form **at̥ji* may be related to two other Palaeo-Balkan words denoting 'young girl', namely Maced. *ἀκρεῖα* and Phryg. (Hesychius) *ἄκριστις*. He restores **akreṽā* f. 'young girl' and represents the Armenian development (which he characterizes as "quite regular") as follows: IE **akreṽā* > **arKeṽā* (metathesis) > **aRGiṽā* (lenition) > **at̥ji* (palatalization) > *atij̥*. Consequently, he derives *at̥jkn* from **akr(e)i-gon-*.

This scenario cannot be accepted. First of all, IE *-kr-* is not subject to metathesis; secondly, the assumption about palatalization meets a chronological problem (see s.v. *et̥jewr* and par. XX); thirdly, Arm. *t̥* instead of *r* is not explained. The expected form would be **awrē-* or **awri-*, so one might rather think of Arm. *awri-ord* 'virgin, young girl', q.v.

Conclusion: PArm. **atj̥-* 'girl' is an old feminine which probably derives from **h₂l-i(e)h₂-* (or **plH-i(e)h₂-*) and basically means 'female grinder' (or 'young female'). The form *atij̥* is secondary.

ati(-k'), *ea*-stem: GDSg *atw-o-y* in Siracides, Gregory of Nyssa, *ati-o-y* in Grigor Magistros, ISg *ate-a-w* in Severian of Gabala, GDPl *ate-a-c'* in Grigor Narekac'i 26.3 (Xaç'atryan/Łazinyan 1985: 346^{L68}) 'intestine' (Bible+, mostly in plural) 'string of musical instruments' (ISg *ate-a-w* in Severian of Gabala; in compounds: Bible, Agat'angelos, etc.).

● **DIAL** Widespread in dialects, as a frozen plural: **ati-k'* 'intestine'; in Agulis, Łarabał and Goris, with a nasal epenthesis: **atink'*. Ačāryan (HAB 1: 129a) records no dialectal forms reflecting the "pure" singular (i.e. *k'*-less) *ati* apart from Sebastia plural *ate-stan*. Nevertheless, one finds Ararat *sambati* 'a string of hair, or a thin leather for tying the yoke pins' [Markosyan 1989: 354b], which may be interpreted as **sam(i)-ati* "string/tie for the yoke pin (*sami*)", with an epenthetic *-b-* after *-m-* as is clearly seen also in Łarabał *sambetan*.

On Agulis *g'əratink'ə* and Łarabał *kiratē'nk'ə* 'rectum' see HAB s.v. *gēr* 'fat'.

● **ETYM** No etymology is accepted in HAB 1: 129a. Ĵahukyan (1967: 269) hesitantly connects with *olor-k'* 'twist, circle'. This is uncertain. A better suggestion can be

found in his 1987: 296, where Ĵahukyan, with reservation, treats *ati-k* as borrowed from Finno-Ugric **solijā*, cf. Finnish *suoli*, Mari *šolo* ‘intestine’.

I alternatively suggest a comparison with Slav. **jelito* ‘Weichen, Darm, Hoden’, cf. Pol. *jelito* ‘Darm’, dial. ‘Wurst’, Pl. ‘Eingeweide’, Čakavian (a SCr. dialect) *olito* ‘intestine’, etc. The Slavic points to **jelito* or **h₁elito-* (R. Derksen, p.c.). The Armenian form can be derived from **h₁oliteh₂-* (or **ioliteh₂-*).

atkatk, *a*-stem: GDPl *atkatk-a-c* (Grigor Astuacaban, Grigor Narekac’i) ‘indigent, poor, miserable’.

Grigor Astuacaban, John Chrysostom, Xosrov Anjewac’i, etc.; *atkatk-ut-iwn* in Philo, etc.

● **ETYM** Connected with Lith. *elgetauti* ‘to beg’, OHG *ilgi* ‘famine’, Gr. ἄλγος n. ‘pain, grief’, etc. [Lidén 1906: 99-100; HAB 1: 132b; Ĵahukyan 1987: 122]. For the problems see Beekes 2003: 188. According to Tumanjan (1978: 204), related with *atk* ‘at’ ‘pauper, beggar’ (q.v.); see also Greppin 1983: 271, 274. Uncertain.

***atj-** ‘darkness, fog, twilight’: **atj-ut-iwn-k** ‘darkness’, only in Grigor Narekac’i 6.4 (beg. of the 11th cent.), in an enumeration, followed by *amprop-k* ‘thunder’ [Xac’atryan/Łazinyan 1985: 269^{L84}]; translated as ‘затмение’ [Darbinjan-Melikjan/Xanlarjan 1988: 47] and ‘eclipse’ [Khachatoorian 2001: 37]; **atj-atj** ‘fog’ (AblSg *y-atj^{atj}-ē* in Gregory of Nyssa; according to HAB, GDSg *-i*), ‘dark, badly organized (church)’ (Smbat Sparapet, 13th cent., Cilicia); **atj-a-mutj**, *i*-stem or *a*-stem: GDSg *atjamtj-i* (Bible, Anania Širakac’i), ISg *atjamtj-i-w* (Yovhan Mandakuni [2003: 1161a^{L14}], Philo, Ephrem, Sargis Šnorhali), *atjamtj-a-w* (Grigor Astuacaban Nazianzac’i, Sargis Šnorhali Vardapet); also some derivatives, e.g. *atjamtj-in* ‘dark’ in Yovhan Mandakuni [2003: 1165a^{L-3}]; *tartarosk’n atjamtjink’ li xawaraw*. For *-in* cf. *mt-in* from *mut(n)* ‘dark’.

Bible+.

In Joshua 2.5: *and atjamutjs arawōtin* : ἐν τῷ σκότει. In Job 10.22: *yerkir atjamtjin yawitenakan* : εἰς γῆν σκότους αἰωνίου. In 2 Peter 2.17: *oroc’ atjamutjk’ xawari(n) yawitean paheal kan* : οἷς ὁ ζόφος τοῦ σκότους τετήρηται : "for them the nether gloom of darkness has been reserved". As we can see, in biblical passages *atjamutj* mostly corresponds to Gr. σκότος ‘darkness, gloom (of death, the nether world, etc.)’, and once (as also in Philo) to ζόφος ‘nether darkness; gloom, darkness; the West’.

The word (*aṭjamuṭṣ*, var. *aṭjamṭṣak*) also appears in Anania Širakac'i (7th cent.) as the name of the second nocturnal hour between *xawarakan* and *mt'ac'cal* (see A. G. Abrahamyan 1944: 113; Aṭayan 1986: 80-81).

● **DIAL** Ačāryan (HAB 1: 135b, 335-336) does not record any dialectal forms of **aṭj-*. In 2.1.33.2 I argue that *aṭjamuṭṣ* has been preserved in Łarabaṭ *žəmaž-en-k*. It can also be found in some western dialects: Muš, Xian, Č'enkiller **ašmuš* 'twilight' [Ačārean 1913: 115b], Sasun *ašmuš* (glossed by *aṭjamuṭṣ*) and verbal *ašmšil* [Petoyan 1954: 103; 1965: 443]. This word is reminiscent of *aṭjamuṭṣ* 'darkness, twilight' and *mšuš* 'fog' (see s.v.v. *mšuš* 'fog' and **muž* 'fog').

● **ETYM** Meillet (1898: 279) treats *aṭjamuṭṣ* as a combination of two types of reduplication, viz. *u-* (cf. *spar-spuṛ* 'entièrement' etc.) and *m-* (cf. *arh-a-m-arh*, *xarṇ-a-m-ain*, etc.) reduplications, seen also in **hetj-a-m-utj* 'drowning, suffocation', on which see s.v. *hetjamṭj-uk*. The example of *hawrut* and *mawrut* is wrong; these are Iranian loans (see HAB 3: 139-140). Meillet (ibid.) connects the root **aṭj*, found also in *aṭj-aṭj*, with Gr. *ἄχλὺς*, *-ύος* f. 'mist; darkness' and OPr. *aglo* n. (*u*-stem) 'rain'. Discussing the palatalization of the gutturals, he (1900: 392) posits **alghi-*. See also Tumanjan 1978: 88.

Petersson (1920: 124-127) explains the structure of *aṭjamuṭṣ* the same way but restores **a(l)gh-lu-* for Armenian and the cognate forms, connecting with Lat. *algeō* 'to be cold, fill chilly, endure cold' etc.

Ačāryan (HAB 1: 335-336) rejects the etymology in view of the following: 1) *arjṇ* 'black' and **aṭt-* 'dark' are not taken into account, and their relationship is not clarified; 2) **g^h* > Arm. *ḡ* is uncertain; 3) the connection between Gr. *ἄχλὺς* and OPr. *aglo* "is not accepted firmly". These arguments are not strong, however. Arm. *arjṇ* 'black' (q.v.) and probably **aṭt-* 'dark' are hardly related with **aṭj-* [Jahukyan 1967: 171₂₅; 1982: 216₆₉]. Further, Meillet's etymology is nowadays accepted by most of the scholars: Pokorny 1959: 8; Frisk 1: 201-202; Jahukyan 1982: 58; 1987: 111 (for his view on the second component of the compound see below); Kortlandt 1976: 94 = 2003: 4. See also Saradževa 1991: 171, 171₄. Others consider the connection of the Armenian word with OPr. *aglo* and Gr. *ἄχλὺς* to be conjectural [Toporov, PrJaz [1], A-D, 1975: 58-59] or difficult [Beekes/Adams apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 477a]. A connection with Norw. *gluma* 'dunkel werden' etc. has been assumed (Crepajac 1967: 196, without Armenian).

Also Pedersen (1906: 367 = 1982: 145) treats *aṭjamuṭṣ* as *m*-reduplication comparable to *arhamarhem* 'verachte'. These examples are usually compared with *sar-suṛ* 'Zittern, Beben' [this example is not clear, I think], *spar-spuṛ* 'ganz und gar', *aṭx-a-m-alx* 'Kramwaren, Trödelwaren', *arh-a-m-arh-em* 'verachten', etc. [Karst

1930: 109; Leroy 1986: 71-72]. Next to *atj̄-a-m-utj̄*, Pedersen and Karst cite also *atj̄-a-m-atj̄*. I was not able to find this form. If it really exists, one may link it directly with Łarabał **žamaž-ayn-k̄* (see above). Otherwise, **žamuž-ayn-k̄* > **žəməžayn-*, and the by-form **žəmaž-* is secondary.

Žahukyan (1967: 303) takes *attamut̄* vs. *atjamut̄* as a case of the alternation *t : j̄* giving no other examples and mentioning also *arjn* 'black', though in 171₂₅ and in later works he rightly rejects the connection with *arjn*. Žahukyan usually cites *arjn* as meaning 'black' and 'dark'. In fact, *arjn* basically means 'black' and scarcely means 'dark' in atmospheric sense; the only exception that can be found in NHB (1: 375a) is the compound *arjn-a-bolor* referring to the night in "Čarəntir". Though accepting Meillet's etymology of **atj̄-*, Žahukyan takes **mut̄j̄* and **mut̄* as independent roots and connects them with Arm. **moyg* 'dark', Russ. *smuglyj*, etc. (1967: 171; 1982: 58; see also H. Suk'iasyan 1986: 204 [see s.v. **muž*]), and later (Žahukyan 1987: 138), though with reservation, with Arm. *metc* 'soot' (q.v.). Greppin (1983: 272-273) considers Meillet's explanation of *atj̄-a-m-utj̄* as less likely and derives **amut̄j̄* from PArm. **omulgh-*: Gr. *ὀμίχλη* 'fog'; Lith. *miglà* 'fog'. This seems impossible in view of the vocalism. One might rather think of Gr. *ἀμολγός* m. 'darkness'.

The etymology of Meillet is very plausible. The metathesis of **-g^hl-* is regular, but *-j̄-* requires **g^hi-*. We have to assume, thus, either a by-form **h₂eg^hl-i-*, or confusing with the paradigm NSg **-ō(i)*, obl. **-i-* (since both **u* and **ō* yield Arm. *u*), see 2.2.2.4. Most probably, we are dealing with a frozen locative in **-i*, cf. the ingenious explanation of *ayg* 'morning' from locative **h₂(e)us(s)i* suggested by Clackson (1994: 223₉₈); see s.v. The meaning 'twilight, darkness' is frequently used in locative/adverbial meaning: "at dawn, at twilight", cf. e.g. *ənd atjamut̄j̄s arawōtin* : *ἐν τῷ σκότει* (Joshua 2.5), as well as dial. **žəmaž-ayn-k̄-in* and *axtamxt-in* 'at twilight' (see s.v. *attamut̄* 'darkness, twilight'). Thus: loc. **h₂(e)g^hl-i* > PArm. **agl-i* > **alg-i* (regular metathesis) > **atj̄-i*.

The absence of an initial *h-* may be due to time constructions with *z-* and *y-*, and generalization of the zero grade of the oblique stem; see also s.v. *ayg*.

att-a-mut̄ 'darkness, twilight'

Attested only in Ephrem/John Chrysostom, referring to the evening twilight or darkness.

● **DIAL** Preserved in some northern and eastern dialects: Ararat, Lori, Širak *attamut̄* 'morning or evening twilight', adv. *attamt̄-in* 'at twilight' [Amatuni 1912: 24a], T'iflis *axtamuxt-in*, *axt'umuxt'-in* 'at twilight', Axalc'xa *atemt̄-in* 'at dawn' [HAB

1: 336b], Łarabał *əttamuxt*, in a textual illustration: *əxtamuxt-in* 'at dawn' [HayLezBrbBair 1, 2001: 21a].

●**ETYM** See s.v.v. **atj^x*- and *buzatⁿ*.

atk'at, *a*-stem: GDSg *atk'at-i*, GDP1 *atk'at-a-c'* (abundant in the Bible); *o*-stem: ISg *atkat-o-v* (once in the Bible), GDSg *atkat-o-y* in BrsVašx (apud NHB 1: 45c) 'pauper, beggar, homeless; indigent, needy' (Bible+), 'poor, miserable' (Book of Chries, Nersēs Lambronac'i, etc.).

Bible+.

●**DIAL** Dialectally ubiquitous [HAB 1: 137b].

●**ETYM** Since Lidén (1906: 97-98), derived from PIE **(o)leig/k-* 'poor, miserable': Gr. *ὀλίγος* 'little, small; weak', *λοιγός* m. 'ruin, havoc (of death by plague; by war; of destruction of ships)', Lith. *ligótī* 'to be ill', OIr. *līach* 'elend, unglücklich', OPruss. *licuts* 'small', etc., and containing the suffix *-at* as in *hast-at* 'firm' [HAB 1: 137b; Pokorny 1959: 667; Ĵahukyan 1967: 245; 1982: 134, 183; 1987: 135, 178; Beekes 1969: 42]. On Toch. **lyāk-* see Adams 1999: 568.

I agree with Greppin (1983: 274) in considering the etymology to be weak. Basing himself upon OPruss. *licuts* 'small' etc., Witczak (1999: 178) derives Arm. *atk'at* from **ə₃likudā-*, leaving the problem of Arm. *-a-* from **-u-* without an explanation. Tumanjan (1978: 204) connects with Arm. *atkatk* 'indigent, poor, miserable' (q.v.). All uncertain.

Since Grigor Tat'ewac'i (14-15th cent.) and others (see HAB 1: 137b), interpreted as *atx*, *i*-stem 'lock; ring; furniture, possessions; entourage, tribe' (see also s.v. *atixin* 'female servant') + privative *-at* from *hat-* 'to cut, split, divide' (q.v.). Thus: **atx-hat* 'devoided of properties, having no possessions'. This etymology seems preferable. The development *x + h > k'* is possible.

ač'iwñ, *an*-stem: ISg *ač'eam-b* in Basil of Caesarea; also *i*-stem or *o*-stem: *ač'en-i* or *ač'iwñ-o-y* in Paterica, ISg *ač'iwñ-o-v* in Grigor Narekac'i, etc. 'ash'.

●**ETYM** Meillet (1908-09: 357) compared with Gr. *ἄσβολος* f. (m.) 'soot', *ἄζω* 'to wither', Goth. *azgo*, OHG. *asca* 'ashes', for Armenian posing **azg-y-* (cf. Skt. *āśa-* m. 'ashes, light dust', etc.). Bugge (1892: 445; 1893: 1) connected Arm. *azaz-* 'to become dry' to Gr. *ἄζω* etc. Accepted by Ač'aryan (HAB 1: 82). Sceptical Greppin 1981b: 3-4. Scheftelowitz (1904-1905, 2: 32) relates with Arm. *ostin* 'dry (land)' (see HAB, s.v.) to Gr. *ἄζω*, Czech *ozditi* 'darren', etc. Ač'aryan (HAB s.v.v.) accepts also this, though Meillet (1908/09: 357) is sceptical.

See also s.v. *askn* 'a precious stone of red colour', probably 'ruby'.

ačuk 'groin (the fold or depression on either side of the body between the abdomen and the upper thigh); pubis; pelvis; thigh'.

Attested only in Nersēs Palienc' (14th cent.). NHB (1: 50b; 2: 1060b) represents as a dialectal word synonymic to *eran-k'*, *c'ayl-k'*, and Turk. /*gasəg*/. The dialectal form is cited in plural: *ačuk-k'* (NHB 2: 1060b).

Now more attestations are found in MArm. sources, such as "Bžškaran jioy" (13th cent.) [Č'ugaszyan 1980: 154^{L-8}, 158^{L9}; 178 (note)] etc. [MiġHayBaġ 1, 1987: 36a].

●**DIAL** In Polis, Aslanbek, Rodost'o, Nor Naxiġewan, Axalc'xa, Hamšen, Ararat, Karin, Xarberd, Akn, Arabkir, Adana, Zeyt'un [HAB 1: 141-142]. In Muš and Alaškert, in a compound with *tak* 'under, below': Muš *ačəx-tək-ner*, Alaškert *aĵəx-dag* (HAB 1: 142a); cf. **y-ant'Vtak*, s.v. *an(u)t'* 'armpit'. See also below, on Sasun.

As is pointed out by Ačāryan (HAB 1: 142a), the meaning slightly differs in dialects; e.g. in Polis it refers to the joint of the two thighs where the genitals are located (pubis; cf. also Amatuni 1912: 1b, as synonymous to *agi-mē*), whereas for Ararat and Axalc'xa it is described as follows "the little pits at the two sides beneath the navel (i.e. groins)". Malat'ia *aĵug* denotes 'pelvis' (rendered ModArm. *konk'*) [Danielyan 1967: 185a], and Xarberd: 'thigh' [HayLezBrbBaġ 1, 2001: 46a].

Sasun *aĵug* 'the joint between the abdomen and the upper thigh, groin; armpit', *aĵt-dag* 'armpit' [Petoyan 1954: 104; 1965: 443-444].

Dersim (Berri) *aĵug əynil* 'to have pain in groins' [Baġramyan 1960: 112a].

Sebastia *ačuk* 'the upper thigh; the lower part of the abdomen (= Turk. /*gasəg*/, Fr. *aine*)' [Gabikēan 1952: 55].

●**ETYM** Ačāryan (HAB 1: 141b) does not record any acceptable etymology. Ĵahukyan (1967: 169; 1982: 58; 1987: 142) connects with Skt. *pājasyā* n. 'belly, loins', Russ. *pax* 'loins', etc. (cf. Mallory/Adams 1997: 517-519), reconstructing **pəgio-* for Armenian.

In view of the widespread belief that the groin is related with the process of growing of children, A. Abrahamyan (1958: 61-62; I cite from Ĵahukyan 1982: 216₇₃) treats *ačuk* as a participial formation in *-uk* from the verbal stem *ač-* 'to grow' (q.v.). Ĵahukyan (1982: 216₇₃) considers this less probable. M. Hanneyan (1979: 173) mentions the former etymology (from **pəgio-*) without a reference; then she represents Abrahamyan's interpretation and considers it more logical.

In favour of Abrahamyan's etymology one notes the following arguments: 1) the derivational suffix *-uk* fits in the interpretation; 2) the Armenian word is not attested in the Classical period and does not look old; 3) there are formal problems (one

expects Arm. **ha-*; the reconstruction of the PIE word does not seem very secure); 4) the above-mentioned belief is really widespread and still vivid in Armenia. If one, nevertheless, accepts the derivation from PIE **pəgio-*, the belief and its influence still must be reckoned with.

am, *a*-stem: GDSg *am-i*, AblSg *y-am-ē*, LocSg *y-am-i*, GDPl *am-a-c'*, IPl *am-a-w-k'* (widely attested in the Bible onwards) 'year; age'.

●**DIAL** Preserved in the dialects of Ararat (Lori), Łarabał and Goris in a derivative form, namely *amlík* 'a lamb or child of/ under one year aage', q.v.

It is remarkable that there is Georgian *erk'emali* 'a male sheep above one year of age; ram', attested twice in 18th century, which, according to Šaniĵe (pers. com. apud HAB 2: 67b) is borrowed from Arm. *erku* 'two' + *am* 'year', formed with the Georgian suffix *-li-*. Apparently Arm. *erkeam* 'of two year age' (Bible+) < *erki-* + *am* is meant here. In view of the existence of Arm. dial. *amlík* and bearing in mind that Arm. [only dial.?] diminutive *-l-ik* is quite productive (cf. *barak* 'thin' : dial. (Ararat) *baralik* [HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 167]; etc.), one may treat the Georgian word as wholly borrowed from Armenian. Moreover, the *-l-* of *amlík* can be old; see below.

●**ETYM** Since Hübschmann (1897: 416^{Nr17}), *am* has been connected to Skt. *sāmā-* f. 'year, season'. The other forms have shifted the semantics to 'summer': YAv. *ham-*; OIr. *sam*; etc; cf. s.v. *amařn*. The semantic relationship between *am* 'year' and *amařn* 'summer' is parallel to Russ. *let* : *leto* (cf. Saradževa 1986: 79, 88). The remarkable correspondence of the meaning and of the stems of the Armenian and the Sanskrit forms (cf. Tumanĵan 1978: 204; Širokov 1980: 82) should be explained as an archaism rather than a shared innovation for most of the cognates meaning 'summer' are derivations [**-r/n* ?], and the direction of the semantic shift seems to be 'year' > 'summer', not the other way around. An old paradigm **s(e)m-eh₂-* / **sm̥-h₂-ó-* is restored, see 1981: 13; Mayrhofer, EWAia 2, 1996: 704; Olsen 1999: 60; cf. also Frisk 1944: 32 (= 1966: 280); Tumanĵan 1978: 204. The initial *a-* is due to generalization of the oblique stem: PIE **sRHV-* > Arm. **aRV-* (compare Beekes 1988: 78).

Among derivatives Greppin (1983: 276) mentions *amanak* 'time' (q.v.), which, however, seems to be an Iranian loan.

The dialectal *amlík* (q.v.) can surprisingly be equated to the Scandinavian words with a basic meaning 'one-year-old animal', which are of the same origin: ON *simull*, Norw. *simla*, etc.; see Pokorny 1959: 905. This might be a late Indo-European innovation shared by Armenian and Germanic (cf. another

animal-name which certainly is an Armeno-Germanic isoglosse, that is *tuar*, q. v.), although one cannot perhaps exclude the possibility of independant developments. The derivational basis could be **smH-l-*, whence Arm. dial. syncopated *amlík* < **amal-ik*. Typologically compare Lat. *vitulus* ‘calf’ and Gr. *ἔταλον*, *ἔτελον* n. ‘young animal, yearling(?)’ (etymologically: ‘yearling’; cf. Gr. *ἔτος* n. ‘year’; Skt. *vatsá-* m. ‘calf’ (RV+); etc.), with the same suffixal element **-l-*. Cf. also Engl *yearling*, Germ. *Jährling* ‘a domesticated animal of one year age’.

OArm. (> Georg.) **am-a-li* is parallel to **orb-o-li* (> Georg. *oboli* ‘orphan’); see s.v. *orb* ‘orphan’. Note that **am-a-* and **orb-o-* agree with the declension classes of *am* (*a*-stem) and *orb* (*o*-stem), respectively. However, Arm. *orb* is not attested with such a suffix. See also s.v. **luc-ali* and 2.3.1.

amanak, *-i*, *-ac* ‘time’.

Attested since the 6th century (Philo, Yovhannēs Ōjnec’i, etc.).

●**ETYM** Frisk (1944: 32 = 1966: 280) connects to *am* ‘year’ (q.v.) through contamination with synonymous *žamanak*. This is accepted by Greppin (1983: 276) who mentions *amanak* among derivatives from *am*. Neither refers to Ačāryan’s etymology, according to which *amanak* is an Iranian loan; cf. Pers. *amān* ‘time’ [HAB 1: 145]. Ĵahukyan does not mention *amanak* in the list of old Iranian loans [1987: 512-549]. The reason for this might have been, I assume, the fact that the word is not attested in the oldest period of Armenian literature. L. Hovhannisyan (1990: 94-95; cf. 1991: 26) rejects Ačāryan’s etymology, arguing that the Pahl. unattested **amānak* would yield, as Ačāryan himself notes, Pers. **amāna*, which does not exist. However, this is not a solid argument since, for instance, in the case of *žaman*, *žamanak* ‘time’ Persian has both *zamān* and *zamāna*; cf. Pahl. *zamān*, *zamānak* [HAB 2: 222-223]. Further, Hovhannisyan assumes that *amanak* can be derived from Arm. *am* ‘year’ under analogical influence of *žamanak*, without any reference to Frisk or Greppin. In view of the weakness of the above-mentioned argument, I think this is unmotivated. It is hard to imagine that Arm. *amanak* ‘time’ is not connected to Pers. *amān* ‘time’.

Ačāryan rejects the Arabic origin of Pers. *amān* and treats it as a native Persian word. He does not mention, however, any Iranian or Indo-European cognate. I wonder whether it can relate to OIr. *amm* ‘time’ which is mentioned by C. Harut’yunyan (Arutjunjan 1983: 275) in a different context; cf. HAB s.v. *awr* ‘day’.

amārn, *an*-stem: GDSg *amaran* (Cyril of Jerusalem, Yovhan Mamikonean), *amāran* (according to NHB, but without evidence), APl *amaruns* (Philo)

Bible+.

●**DIAL** Dialectally widespread. An initial *h-* is found only in Ozim, *hamar* [HAB 1: 146; HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 47b], while in its closest dialects, that is Van, Moks and Šatax, it is absent; see Ačaryan 1952: 243; M. Muradyan 1962: 191b. Ĵahukyan (1985: 156) treats it as a relic of IE **s-*. According to others, however, this *h-* is simply wrong; see Hovsep'yan 1966: 234-235; cf. N. Simonyan 1979: 211, 213-214.

Łarabať *aməēinə* [Davt'yan 1966: 306] and Goris *ameinə* [Margaryan 312b] is probably due to influence of *jmein* 'winter'. This form may be seen in the place-name *Amein-a-p'or* in Syunik', Sot'k', as attested by Step'anos Őrbelean (see 9.9).

Further: note *Amarasēn*, *Anuřavan*, *Amarēšin Verin*, *Armavařēn Verin*, *Irameř/jin*, *Rameřin* - a village in Šahaponk'/Čahuk (Siwnik'); 13th century; nowadays: *Yuxarə Rameřin* (in the district of Šahbuz, of Naxiĵewan) HayTetBař 1, 1986: 208b; 3, 1991: 937c.³

●**ETYM** Since Hűbschmann (1897: 416^{Nr19}), *amain* is connected to the family of *am* 'year' (q.v.); cf. Skt. *sāmā*-f. 'year, season'; all the remaining cognates mean 'summer': YAv. *ham-*, Khot. *hamāna-*, MPers. *hāmīn*, OIr. *sam*, OHG *sumar*. The suffixal element **-r-* is present in Armenian and Germanic. The final *-n* of Armenian is explained from **-om* (cf. Pokorny 1959: 905; Ĵahukyan 1967: 212; 1982: 115; 1987: 147) or from an old IE accusative **smh₂er-m* [Kortlandt 1985: 21^{Nr7}]. The latter seems more attractive. I find the idea about the contamination of the two alternants of the original heteroclitic paradigm, i. e. **-r-* and **-n(t)-* (see Mayrhofer, KEWA 3, 1976: 437; Olsen 1999: 128, 141, 410, 855), hard to accept; cf. also Greppin 1983: 277: **sm₂-r-n-*.

Mentioning the plural forms of *jmein* 'winter' and *k'irtn* 'sweat' going back to **-on(t)h₂-*, Olsen (1999: 128) writes: "No doubt *amain* 'summer', which is accidentally not attested in the plural, is part of the same pattern". However, we do find an API *amaruns* in Philo; see NHB 1: 52b.

For the analyses of *amarayin* (adj.) and *amarani* 'in the summer, during summer' see Olsen 1999: 276-277 and 306, respectively.

ambuik', var. *ambuioyc'k'* GDPI *ambuiric'*, var. *ambuīruc'ic'* 'storm'.

Attested only in Aristotle, rendering Gr. *τυφών*: *Šunc'k' hořmoc' ew ambuiric'* (var. *ambuīruc'ic'*), *ew orotmunk'*, *ew p'aylatakunk'* [NHB 1: 57b].

³ Note dial. *amī-ac* 'aged' (Xarberd), which seems to point out a meaning 'age', like in the case of *am* 'year; age' (q. v.), *z-ai-am* 'of very old age'. However, its basic meaning is, perhaps, 'to wither'; cf. *amiel* 'to wither' (Xarberd), etc., see HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 51a.

●**DIAL** No dialectal forms are cited by Ačāryan (HAB 1: 163a). Note derivatives like *ampiuk* 'cloudy' (Muš) [HayLezBrbBaī 1, 2001: 51a], **ambīdel* 'to get cloudy'. Perhaps contaminated with **amp-or(o)tal* in Polis, Sivri-Hisar and St'anoz [Ačārean 1913: 88b; HayLezBrbBaī 1, 2001: 51a]; cf. also Xarberd **umpṛt-k-el* [Ačārean 1913: 867a], see s.v. *amporoṭ*, Ačāryan* 1913, etc. However, I am not sure whether the *-r/-* of these forms is identical to that of *ambuīk*'.

●**ETYM** In NHB 1: 57b interpreted as *uīoyc'k' ampoc'* "swellings of clouds". Ačāryan (HAB 1: 162b), too, derives it from *amp*, not specifying the second component. If the manuscript variant *ambuīuc'ic'* is reliable (and/or is not due to folk-etymology), one should note that the interpretation of NHB is quite transparent.

Regardless of the origin of *-uī*, the connection of the word to *amp* and *amprop* (see s.v.v.) seems obvious. However, Mkrtč'yan (1970: 242-243) rejects the etymology of NHB without any motivation, assuming that Ačāryan probably considered the etymology as acceptable and did not represent it in HAB, "by which", as he states, "the etymology of the word remains open". I fail to understand this reasoning: why should one deduce from the fact, that Ačāryan accepts the etymology, a conclusion that "the etymology of the word remains open"? Besides, Ačāryan, as obviously unnoticed by Mkrtč'yan, did represent the derivation of the word from *amp* in his HAB; see above. Then, Mkrtč'yan states that the word "is phonetically and semantically identical with Akkad., Assyr. *imbaru*". Here again, he does not mention that Ačāryan (HAB 1: 164a) compared this Assyr. word to Arm. *amprop*, considering the resemblance as accidental.

I conclude that there is no serious reason to abandon the traditional etymology. Moreover, Arm. *ambuī-k'* and Akkad. *imbaru* are not as identical as Mkrtč'yan claims, as far as the vocalism is concerned.

If the manuscript variant *ambuīuc'ic'* is not reliable (and/or is due to folk-etymology), one might compare *-uī* to the same PIE suffix as is seen in etymologically related *amprop* 'thunder' (q.v.) and its cognates. If the PIE word originally was an *r*-stem, one may perhaps wonder whether Arm. *ambuīk*' 'storm' reflects an archaic NPI **-ōres* (lengthened analogically after NSg **-ōr*), or, if neuter, **-ōr-h₂-*. For morphologically related problems cf. s.v. *acuī* 'coal'. The trilled *-ī-* could be due to the same folk-etymology: *amp* 'cloud' + *uī-* 'to swell'. However, this is uncertain. Alternatively, cf. the suffix *-uī* as in e.g. *cak* 'hole' : dial. *cak-o/uī*.

amik 'one-year-old male kid or lamb'.

Attested in Bible five times; once in NASg *amik* and four times in API *amiks* [Astuacaturean 1895: 55a]. Thus, no information about the declension class. The only attestation outside the Bible is Ephrem.

●**DIAL** In the dialects one finds *am-l-ik*, q.v.

●**ETYM** Obviously derived from Arm. *am* 'year' [HAB 1: 156b]; see s.v.v. *am* and dial. *amlík*.

amis, -oy, -oc'; also GDLSg (*y*)*amsean* 'month'.

Bible+.

●**DIAL** Ubiquitous in dialects.

●**ETYM** Since Hübschmann (1897: 417), derived from PIE **meh₁nsos* 'moon; month': Skt. *mās-*, Gr. *μήν*, Lat. *mēnsis* 'month', etc. See also Tumanjan 1978: 167-168; Gamkrelidze/ Ivanov 1984: 424; Ĵahukyan 1987: 138; etc.

The initial *a-* of the Armenian form is explained by the influence of *am* 'year' (q.v.) [Ačāryan 1898: 372; HAB 1: 158a]. Meillet (1936: 48 = 1988: 34) mentions the problem without an explanation. Next to *am*, Winter (1965: 101) points to another calendar unit and two names of heavenly bodies, all with an initial *a-*: *awr* 'day'; *arew* 'sun' and *ast* 'star'; cf. Hovdhaugen 1968: 120. Solta (1960: 67₆₄) thinks that the *a-* has been added in order to avoid the homonymy with *mis* 'meat' (q.v.). This resembles the explanation of Mann (1963: 19) interpreting *amis* as *am-mis* 'month of the year'; cf. Olsen 1999: 48, 820. Ĵahukyan (1967: 245) treats this *a-* as a "prothetic" vowel before sonants comparable to those found in *etbayr* and *anic* (q.v.), which is not true since there are no parallels for the position before nasals, except *anic*, which is a different case (q.v.). N. Simonyan (1979: 234-235) treats this "prothetic" vowel as an IE dialectal isogloss. Saradževa (1986: 38, 361₁₀₈) does not specify the origin of the vowel.

I think, Ačāryan's explanation is sufficient, since there is a common phoneme in *a-mis* and *am*, that is *m*. The influence of this kind in the framework of close semantic relationship is quite common in Armenian, so the statement of Greppin (1983: 279) on the "insurmountable problems" of *a-* in *amis* seems to me exaggerated.

The deviant GDLSg (*y*)*amsean* is interpreted by Tumanjan (1978: 168) from **mēs-en*, unconvincing. Olsen (1999: 48f, 386f, 772, 820) explains it as an adjective formation in **-ih₃no-* with the basic meaning 'monthly'; cf. Skt. *māsīna-*. See also Clackson 1994: 63.

According to Beekes (1969: 22-23) *a-mis* is derived from **mēns* with the recent addition of *a-*, stating that **amēns* would yield **ams*, and the traditional **amēnsos*

nowhere finds support. However, the thematic **meh₁ns-o-* seems to be confirmed by Skt. *māśa-* (RV+), Dard. etc. *māsa-*, and the *o* declension of *amis* fits the protoform.

Much has been written on reconstruction of the original paradigm of the PIE word under discussion; see Specht 1947: 9-10, 233; Scherer 1953: 61-71; Beekes 1985: 62; apud Mallory/ Adams 1997: 385a; Schrijver 1991: 159-160; Mayrhofer, EWAia 2, 1996: 352-353. Note that the Baltic evidence justifiably plays a significant role here. Basing oneself largely on these investigations and paying additional attention to Lat. *mēnsis* (*-is* rather than *-us*), one may perhaps restore the following tentative paradigm:

NSg. **meh₁n-s-s*

ASg **m(e)h₁n-és-m*

GSg **m(e)h₁n-s-ós*. This is an archaic subtype of the hysterodynamic declension which is represented by the word for 'nose', also an *s*-stem; see Beekes 1995: 175, 180. The double *s* of the original nominative has been preserved (or secondarily restored?) in Lat. *mēnsis* (cf. *nāris* 'nostril', pl. 'nose', alongside *nās(s)us* 'nose') and perhaps in Latv. *mēnesis*. In the next stage the thematic form arose, from which Arm. *a-mis*, *-oy* and Ilr. **mās-a-* have been derived. [An Arm.-Ilr. shared morphological isoglosse/innovation?]. In Indo-Aryan there seems to be a semantic opposition between **mās* 'moon; month' and **māsa-* 'month'; see Mayrhofer, EWA 2, 1996: 352; cf. Scherer 1953: 61. This is comparable to Armenian, where the thematization is combined with the loss of the original meaning 'moon'. In Iranian **māha-* the meaning 'moon' could have been restored secondarily.

It is remarkable that the further developments of the Armenian and the Latin are identical to each other. They both lost the meaning 'moon' replacing it by **louksneh₂-*; cf. Arm. *lusin* and Lat. *lūna*, as well as OCS *luna*.

I conclude, that on the basis of PIE **meh₁n-s-s* 'moon; month' (cf. Lat. *mēnsis*) a dialectal (Arm.- Ilr.) thematic form **meh₁n-s-os* 'month' arose which created a semantic opposition: A. **mēns(s)* 'moon' : B. **mēns-os* 'month'. Indo-Iranian retained both, while Armenian eliminated the variant A, replacing it by **louksneh₂-* 'moon', exactly like Latin did, though the latter is derived from the older nominative rather than from the thematic form.

amlík (dial.) 'a lamb or child of/under one year age'.

●**DIAL** The word is found in the meaning 'little (lamb, child)' in Lori (Ararat) and Łarabať; see HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 49b, as well as in Goris *āmlík* 'a new-born lamb' [Margaryan 1975: 375a]. Ačaryan (HAB 1: 156b) cites only Łarabať *āmlig* 'a new-born little lamb'. It is also used in a famous fable of a modern fable-writer,

Xnko-Aper: *amlík gar* ‘*amlík* lamb’. In the fable it is stated that this lamb is under one year of age.

It is remarkable that there is Georgian *erk'emali* ‘a male sheep above one year of age; ram’, attested twice in the 18th century, which borrowed from Arm. *erkeam* (Bible+) ‘of two year age’ < *erki-* + *am* with the same suffixal element, thus: **erki-* + **amal-*; see s.v. *am* for more detail.

●**ETYM** Ačaryan (HAB1: 156b) places the Łarabał form under Classical *amik* ‘a one-year-old male kid or lamb’ (q. v.), which is obviously derived from Arm. *am* ‘year’ (< IE **sm̥H-*), but then he adds that it seems to have been borrowed from Turk. *emlik* ‘sucking lamb’. I think this is not necessary since *amlík* can easily be derived from Arm. *am* with the suffixal element **-li(h₂)-* and diminutive *-ik*: **sm̥H-l-* > Arm. **amal-ik* > dial. *amlík* through syncope. An astonishing parallel is found in the Scandinavian words with a basic meaning ‘one-year-old animal’, which are of the same origin: OIc. *simull*, Norw. *simla*, etc.; see Pokorny 1959: 905. This might be a late Indo-European innovation shared by Armenian and Germanic (cf. another animal-name which certainly is an Armeno-Germanic isoglosse, that is *tuar* ‘cattle’, q.v.), although one cannot perhaps exclude the possibility of independent developments. See s.v. *am* for more details; cf. also Gr. *δάμ-αλις*, *δάμ-άλη* ‘young cow’ from *δάμνημι* ‘to tame, subdue’, Germ. *Jähr-ling*.

If the Turkish word is indeed related and if it is not of native Turkic origin, it may be borrowed from Armenian.

The resemblance with Arm. *amaru* ‘lamb’ (a Semitic loan) and *amnos* ‘lamb’ (< *ἀμνός*) must be accidental.

amp (spelled also as **amb**), *o*-stem: GDSg *amp-o-y*, GDPl *amp-o-c* ‘[In 2 Paralipomenon 5.13-14 (see Xalat’eanc’ 1899: 61b), one finds GDSg *amp-o-y*, but also IPl *amp-a-w-k* - next to *p’ar-a-w-k* “with glory”, so influenced by it?] ‘cloud’, later also ‘lightning; sponge’. In some derivatives perhaps ‘sky’ (see s.v. *ampar*) and ‘thunder’, see NHB 1: 24 s.v.v. *ampaharim*, *ampaharut’iwn*, *ampanman*, *ampawor*, *amporot*. See also s.v. *amporot*.

Bible (numerous attestations), Agat’angelos, etc.

●**DIAL** Widespread in the dialects mostly with *-b*, meaning ‘cloud; rain; sponge; etc.’. Note the by-form with *n*, viz. *anb* in Ararat, Dersim and Karin (next to *amb*), as well as in Rodost’o [HAB 1: 165; HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 50a]. Note also Dersim *amb*, *anb* ‘rain’ [Bařramyan 1960: 73b].

●**ETYM** Hübschmann (1897: 417) connects *amp* in the first instance to Skt. *abhra-* n. ‘thunder-cloud, rain-cloud, blanket of clouds’, Av. *aßra-* n. ‘cloud; rain’, etc., and

only thereafter mentions Skt. *nābhas-* n. 'moisture, thunder-cloud, mass of clouds', Gr. *νέφος* n. 'cloud', OCS *nebo* 'sky' and the others. See also Pokorny 1959: 315-316 (*amp* - under **mb^hro-* in close relationship with Gaul. *inter ambes* 'inter vivos' etc., both Armenian and Celtic being "ohne formantisches *r*") and Mallory/Adams 1997: 477.

The correlation with the latter group is considered by Greppin (1983: 281) as puzzling. The reason for this confusion is that the Armenian word does not have the suffix **-ro-*, and as having *o*-stem can regularly be derived from PIE *s*-stem **neb^hos* (cf. Ĵahukyan 1959: 231; Tumanjan 1978: 159; Saradževa 1986: 38-39; Olsen 1999: 45; despite Frisk, according to whom the *o*-stem can be secondary), but in the ablaut it has been influenced by the former group, viz. **nb^hro-*, which is continued in Arm. *amprop* 'thunder(bolt)' (q.v.). Thus, one might accept the explanation of *amp* from **mb^hos* (< **nb^hos*, through labial assimilation), "a compromise between **mb^hro-* and the original *s*-stem" [Olsen 1999: 45]. I alternatively propose to assume generalization of the zero-grade genitive of the PD paradigm: NSg **neb^hos*, GSg **nb^hés-s*. This may be confirmed by another atmospheric term, viz. *bark* 'lightning', and, perhaps, by *ayt* 'cheek' (see s.v.v. and 2.2.2.1).

Skt. *āmbhas-* 'water' and Gr. *ὄμβρος* 'shower' remain obscure, see Szemerényi 1964: 241f; Beekes 1969: 74, 79, 92, 93, 140; Euler 1979: 110; Schrijver 1991: 64; cf., however, Olsen 1999: 45₈₉. Despite this criticism, Clackson (1994: 133) takes Skt. *āmbhas-* as the representative cognate to Arm. *amb*, exactly like Pedersen (1906: 361 = 1982: 139) did nearly one century ago. Širokov (1980: 82) does the same, adding also Gr. *ὀμφή· πνοή* 'whiff' (Hesychius), which is semantically remote. The relation between **Hneb^h-* (but Gr. *νέφος* points to absence of an initial laryngeal) and **HVnb^h-* can be confirmed when the so-called Schwebeablaut is justified; Frisk (s.v.) and Mayrhofer (EWAia 1, 1992: 94, 101; 2, 1996: 13) are more positive in this respect. For the criticism concerning Skt. *ambu-* n. 'water' and Hitt. *alpā-* 'cloud' I refer to Mayrhofer, EWAia 1, 1992: 100 and Puhvel, HED 1, 1984: 37-38, respectively.

For further discussion of Skt. *nabh-* etc. see Sani 1994.

Lat. *nimbus* 'cloud' and Iran. **nam(b)-* 'wet, moist' (cf. Pahl. *nam(b)* 'moist' > Arm. *nam* 'id.' [HAB 3: 425], as well as Sogd. *nmp* [namp/b] 'dew', see Gharib 1995: 240a) point to **nem^hb^h-* and may be regarded as a reduplicated formation **ne-nb^h-*, or **ne-n-b^h-*, with a nasal-infix (see Szemerényi 1964: 242₁, 243₁, with ref.), or simply with a nasal-epenthesis. This is reminiscent of some forms of the PIE term for 'nit', viz. Lat. *lens* and Lith. *glinda* from **gnind-*, next to the basic **K/Gnid-* (see s.v. *anic* 'nit, louse egg').

Toch. B *eperer* 'atmosphere, sky, firmament', *iprer* 'sky, air' is said to belong to the words under discussion (though considered uncertain in Adams 1999: 65, 90). Regardless to whether this is true or not, it rather seems to be related with Skt. *ámbara-* n. 'Lufttraum' (not mentioned by Mayrhofer in the context of *abhra-* and others), and I wonder why this connection is unnoticed. The semantics is straightforward; the anlaut could be explained from **Ho-* (?); a trace of the nasal can be found, cf. van Windekens 1941: 21 ("*i < e* prouve la présence originelle de la nasale"). See also s.v. *arp* '(i).

Although Arm. *amb* is the etymologically expected variant [HAB1: 163], in reality, however, the older and main spelling is *amp* [Greppin 1983: 281; Olsen 1999: 45₈₉, cf. also 70₁₄₅, 97₂₀₃]. Szemerényi (1964: 242₂) tries to explain this due to *ampem* 'to drink', which does not seem very probable to me. According to Greppin (1983: 281), "the spelling discrepancy is based on the later erratic voicing found in *-NC-* clusters"; cf. also Pedersen 1906: 361 = 1982: 139; Olsen 1999: 70₁₄₅, 97₂₀₃. This is not entirely satisfactory either because of the absence of such a discrepancy in other cases, cf. *lamb* 'ring', *xumb* 'group', *kumb-* 'emboss', etc. It is remarkable that both Gr. *ᾠμβρος* and *amprop* (as well as Skt. *ambu-* 'water' and *ámbara-* 'Lufttraum'?; see above) point to **b* instead of **b^h*. For the Greek word this is explained by regular deaspiration after sonant in accented syllable; cf. Olsen 1999: 45₈₉ in the context of the Greek word and Arm. *amp* (referring to Schwyzler). This is often criticised, see the references above with respect to Greek. Perhaps the assumption should be hypothetically restated as follows: the voiced aspirated stops are deaspirated in the position after nasal and before **r* in Greek and Armenian; thus, **mb^hro-* > **mbro-* (> Arm. **mpro-*, since *p* is the regular outcome of **b*). Whatever the details (note also the enigmatic initial *o-* in the Greek form), if Arm. *-p-* can be explained this way, we could consider *amp* as influenced by *amprop*, which would be semantically quite plausible.

One of the basic meanings of PIE **neb^hos* is 'sky'; cf. Hitt. *nēpiš-*, OCS *nebo*, etc., as well as some forms going back to **p^hb^hro-*: Os. *arv*, Khot. LSg. *o(r)ñā*. For the semantic shift 'cloud' > 'sky' see Frisk 2, 1970: 310; Beekes apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 110; Cheung 2002: 154. The underlying root is **neb^h-* 'befeuchten' [Mayrhofer, EWAia 2, 1996: 13]. Armenian might have preserved (or developed secondarily?) this meaning; see s. v. *ampar*.

See also s.v. *ambuik*.

ampar 'planet'.

Mentioned only in Ališan 1910: 122: *ampar astetk* ‘the seven planets’, from an unspecified author which in turn is said to have taken it from Efišē, probably “Meknut’iwn groc’n cnndoc” (Commentary on Genesis), as is the previous citation of Ališan’s text.

●**ETYM** The interpretation of the word as *an-par* ‘motionless’ suggested by the same author is not accepted by Ačāryan (HAB 1: 163), who gives no comments. The inclusion of *par* into this etymology seems attractive since *par* refers to the movement of the stars, too (see NHB 1: 383b; 2: 625b), and Ališan himself is aware of that, cf. Ališan 1910: 118. However, the meaning ‘motionless’ is the opposite of what one would use describing the planets. Note also *anpar* denoting persons who cannot dance properly, in Philo apud NHB 1: 229a. Thus, if *ampar* contains *par*, the first part of the word should be identified with the prefix *am-* or something else but not with the privative *an-*.

I know of no other etymological proposals.

As we have seen, the postulation of *par* is possible. Nevertheless, I alternatively propose a connection of *ampar* ‘planet’ with *amp* ‘cloud’ and *amprop* ‘thunder’ (q.v.). In the first instance, the relation seems semantically unmotivated. However, one should bear in mind that some of the cognates both with and without **-ro-* (Hitt. *nēpiš-*, OCS *nebo*, Os. *arv*, etc) mean ‘sky’, so according to this etymology the basic meaning of *ampar* would be ‘the heavenly one’ or ‘heavenly’; cf. OIc. *himintungl* ‘Himmelskörper’, OHG *himilzungal* ‘Gestirn’, etc. (see Scherer 1953: 35-36). Formed with the suffix *-ar* (or reshaped under its influence), for which cf. especially *astetk* ‘*molark*’ ‘planets’ and *astetk* ‘*anmolark*’ ‘stars’ from *mol-ar* ‘erroneous’ (see NHB 1: 204b; 2: 293a; also *anmolar astetk* used by Vanakan Vardapet, 12-13th cent., see Xaç’ikyan 1941: 162a^{L8-9}, 166a^{L1-2}); perhaps also Pers. *axtar* ‘star; horoscope; name of a lunar station’.

Other possible (though highly hypothetical) relics of the meaning ‘sky’ might be seen in some derivatives where the meaning ‘cloud’ of *amp* makes less sense:

amp-a-goyn ‘cloud-coloured’ or ‘cloud-like’ (in Greppin 1983: 281: ‘like a cloud’). In 2 Maccabaeorum 1.22, referring to *šot* ‘ray’ of *aregagn* ‘sun’. Thus, *amp* would make sense here with a meaning ‘shiny sky’ or the like. However, the Greek text has *ἐπι-νεφής* ‘clouded, dark; bringing clouds’ (from *νέφος* ‘cloud’), and *amp-a-goyn* may be made after the Greek. For e.g. my mother, Ženya Simonyan (village Erazgavors, not far from Leninakan/Gyumri), dial. *ambaguyn* means ‘sky-blue’;

T'ovma Arcruni (9-10th cent.) 2.7: AblSg *y-amp-oy-n*, translated in ModArm. as 'from the sky' (said of falling snow) [V. Vardanyan 1985: 192/193]; this is ambiguous, of course. Thomson (1985: 187) has "from the clouds".

dial. *ampažēr* (Ararat) 'light blue' [HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 50b]; for the component **žēr* cf. *karmr-žēr* (Bulanəx of Muš), with *karmir* 'red' [S. Movsisyan 1972: 20a];

dial. *ampik* (Papen) 'a kind of bluish grape' (see HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 50b).

amprop, *a*-stem: GDPI *amprop-a-c'* in Job 38.25 [in Astuacaturean 1895: 60a - *amprap-ac*], Book of Chries, Yovhannēs Drasxanakertc'i 'thunder'.

Renders Gr. *κνδοιμός* 'din of battle, uproar, hubbub' in Job 38.25. Attested also in Grigor Narekac'i, "Čarəntir", etc.

●**ETYM** From PIE **ṇbʰro-*: Skt. *abhṛā-* n., rarely m. 'thunder-cloud, rain-cloud, blanket of clouds', YAv. *aβra-* n. 'rain-cloud', Khot. *ora-* 'sky', Lat. *imber*, GSg. *imbris* 'shower', etc. [Dervischjan 1877: 94; HAB 1: 163; Ałabekyan 1979: 47, 55; Ĵahukyan 1982: 37, 132, 218; Greppin 1983: 281-282. For the cognates and discussion, especially on the internal *-p-*, see s.v. *amp* 'cloud'. Since the relatedness with *amp* is sure and is accepted by everyone including Ačāryan, one should note that in fact the etymology was first recognized by NHB and Ĵaxjaxeān.

The thematic vowel **-o-* has been under accent [Ĵahukyan 1982: 132], and the metathesis of *r* is blocked by the preceding nasal (ibid. 218₁₀₃). Not mentioning this analysis, Olsen (1999: 72) cautiously proposed a different one: *amp* 'cloud' + IE **(h)robah₂-*. However, *-ro-* in *amprop* goes directly back to **ṇbʰro-* (a way-out for Olsen's proposal would be haplology of *-ro-ro-*).

Thus, the problem of the final *-p* remains. Perhaps it arose due to some kind of "broken reduplication" inspired by the (seeming) analogy of *andund* 'abyss' (q.v.). Furthermore, one should take into account the possible influence of another word of closer semantics with a final *-b/p*, viz. *t'utb/t'uxp* 'cloud; fog'. However, the direction of the possible influence is hard to determine in view of the etymological uncertainty of *t'utb/p*.

ayg, *u*-stem (cf. also *-oy*) 'morning'.

Attested abundantly since the Classical period, also in many derivatives, such as *aygun*, *ayguc'*, *y-ayg-u-ē*, *z-aygoyn* 'in the morning', *c'-ayg* 'night' (< "till dawn"), *z-c'ayg* 'at night' (all attested in the Bible).

The word has mainly an *u*-stem. In the Classical period a form of the *o* declension is used by Agat'angelos: *ənd aygoyn ařawōtanaln*. In P'awstos Buzand 4.10

(1883=1984: 86^{L-1}; transl. Garsoïan 1989: 131): *ənd aygs aygoyn* "at early dawn". For *z-aygoy* 'in the morning' see Weitenberg 1989: 63, and below.

●**DIAL** Dialectally preserved almost exclusively in derivatives and compounds: **ayguan*, **ayguc*, etc.; see HAB 1: 165-166; HayLezBrbBair 1, 2001: 52b. In Hamšen *äkvən*, *äkvənä*, *äkvənc'u* 'in the morning'; *ekuc*, *ek'unc* 'to morrow' [Ačaryan 1947: 220]. According to also HayLezBrbBair 1, 2001: 33a, Hamšen *akvon* means 'morning', but the textual illustration has *akvnc'u* (adv.).

In view of ClArm. *y-ayg-* and MArm. *y-eg-uc*, Եւթա *hjekuc* and Agulis *heǰg'üc*, *yeǰg'üc* (HAB 1: 165-166) may be reconstructed as **y-ayg-uc*.

The compound *aygahot* is attested in Arak'el Davrižec'i (17th cent.) and is represented in a number of dialects: Bulanəx *ek'hot*, Zeyt'un, Muš, etc. *ak'əxk* < **ayg-hot-k* 'ceremony at the next morning after the funeral' [Ačarean 1913: 90b; HAB 1: 165ab], Sivri-Hisar *ek'əxk* or *agothk* [PtmSivHisHay 1965: 454, 460a]. Composed of *ayg* 'morning' and *hot* 'earth' (HAB); cf. also MArm. and dial. *hot-k* 'cemetery' [HAB 3: 112a]. Some eastern dialects have an epenthetic *-n-*: Լարաթ *ik'nəvəet*, Ararat *ek'nəfətek* (< **ayg-n-a-hot-ay-k*), etc.

Bařramyan (1960: 110a) interprets Xarberd (K'ti) *akəxk*, *agothk* 'ceremony at the next morning after the funeral' as composed of *akn* 'eye' and *otothk* 'supplication'. This view cannot be accepted. The word is certainly identic with **ayg-hot-k* above.

The initial nasal of Եւթա *nagnaxot* (see Ačarean 1940: 79, 159, 352) is perhaps due to anticipation. Šamaxi *ink'nahot* (HAB) may be explained by anticipation and/or folk-etymological reinterpretation as containing *ink'(n)* 'himself'; the loss of the initial *in-* in *k'nahot* (HAB; Bařramyan 1964: 186) may be due to reinterpretation as composed of *k'un* 'sleep' and *hot* 'earth'.

For the epenthetic nasal also seen in Լարաթ *ik'nəvəet* 'the taking cattle to pasturing before the dawn' [HAB 1: 166a] see 2.1.30.1.

Remarkable is Van *ek'-parew* < **ayg-barew* "dawn-greeting", which denotes the following ritual: next morning after the wedding, the just married couple and the musicians go onto the roof singing and greeting the sunrise (see HAB 1: 166a; Ačaryan 1952: 46, 244). The text of the song from the village of Artamet starts with this line: *eg barew*, *eg barew* [Haykuni 1906: 30]. The variant recorded by Ter-Mkrtč'yan (1970: 183a) reads: *eg pärew*, *a!y eg pärew*. As is explicitly explained by Ter-Mkrtč'yan (1970: 183b), this should be understood as: "O Morning/Dawn, hail!" One may therefore assume that here *eg-barew* is not a compound, and that we are in fact dealing with the only independent dialectal testimony of the word *ayg* as an archaic relic preserved in this ritual formula. The formula itself, thus, must be very old.

●**ETYM** Ačaryan (HAB 1: 165b) mentions many etymological proposals but does not accept any of them. Among them one should mention that of Patrubány (1905: 158) which suggests a connection with Gr. *αἰών* 'Leben(zeit), Zeit(dauer), lange Zeit', Skt. *āyu-* 'lifetime', etc. The phonological development seems impeccable: PIE NSg **h₂(e)jū-ōn* > Arm. **aygu(n)* > *ayg*, -u, cf. LSg *aygun* 'in the morning' (cf. Olsen 1999: 108₂₂₂; the origin of -un is not specified). However, the semantics is not clear. Though the meanings 'time' and 'day' may relate to each other (cf. Arm. *awr* 'day; (life)time' and, if cognate, OIr. *amm* 'time'), I am not sure whether the direction 'time' > 'day' is probable. Besides, *ayg* means 'morning' and not 'day'. Thus, the etymology is uncertain.

Ĵahukyan (XX) derived *ayg* from IE **ai-* (= **h₂ei-*) 'to burn, shine'. However, -g is unexplained. Later Ĵahukyan himself seems to doubt the etymology since he excludes the word from the list of the native words (1987: 111-157) and mentions it under a question-mark in p. 295 where he assumes hesitantly that Finnish *aika* 'time' could have been borrowed from Arm. *ayg*. Nor is this etymology certain.

Ačaryan compares to Gr. Att. *ἔως*, Ion. *ἠώς* 'dawn' but rejects the connection for phonological reasons. (On the other cognates and the reconstruction see s.v. *arawawt* 'morning'). Clackson (1994: 223₉₈) developed the same connection without a specific reference to Ačaryan's comparison. He derives *ayg* from the locative **h₂(e)us(s)i*, which is very plausible. One agrees with Kortlandt (2003: 119) in characterizing this etymology as "highly attractive".

However, **h₂(e)us(s)i* would yield, I think, **(h)aw*. The alternative proposed by Olsen (1999: 108) involves a complicated development: **h₂āūsōs* > **aūhu-* > **aūūu-* > (through dissimilation) > **ajūu-* > **aygu-*. This is not convincing. Perhaps a later thematization would solve the problem: PArm. **awjo-* > *ayg* seems to be easier (cf. also s.v. *ēg* and 2.1.27.1). It would also explain the *o*-stem which cannot otherwise continue a PIE **-os* since this word is not a neuter. Cf. also *(z)aygoy* 'in the morning' which seems to be a secondary locative in **-i* based on the same thematic form; thus **aygo-i* > *z-aygoy*, or simply GDP1 functioning as an "endungslos" locative without preposition *i/y*-cf. Lamberterie's explanation of *erekoy*, q.v. The influence of *erekoy* 'evening' is perhaps not excluded (cf. Olsen 1999: 108-109). Note, however, that the morphology of *z-aygoy* and *erekoy* is synchronically different since the former functions in the Classical period as an adverb while the latter does not. The more frequent *u*-stem may reflect PArm. **awuh* (> **aw-* seen perhaps in *ai-aw-awt*, q.v.) from PIE NSg (HD) **h₂éu-s-ōs*; cf. Clackson 1994: 226₁₃₆.

The absence of an initial *h-* may be due to constructions with *z-* and *y-*, and generalization of the zero grade of the oblique stem; see also s.v. **atj̥-*. The absence of an initial *h-* may be due to generalization of the zero grade of the oblique stem (cf. particularly the above-mentioned hypothetical **h₂usijō-* > Arm. **aygo-*, a thematization based on the old locative) and/or reanalysis of *z-(h)V-*, *y-(h)V-*; see 2.1.16.

I conclude:

NSg **h₂éu-s-ōs* > PArm. **awu* > **aw*, *u*-stem (cf. *ar-aw-awt*)

GSg **h₂us-s-ōs*

LSg **h₂us-s-i* > PArm. **aw(h)i* > (thematization) **awj-ō-* > **aygo-* > *ayg*, *o*-stem, >> *u*-stem, generalised from **aw-u*.

See also s.v. *anagan*.

aygi *ea*-stem (*o*-stem in 1 Macc 14.12: ISg *aygwov*, see Olsen 1999: 438₄₉₆) ‘vineyard; vine’; in the dialect of Moks, perhaps also ‘grapes’.

Bible+. Example: Deuteronomy 8.8 (Cox 1981: 112): *erkir c’orenoy ew garoy aygeac’*: *γῆ πυροῦ καὶ κριθῆς, ἄμπελοι*. For the full passage see s.v. *gari*.

In compounds - also *ayg(a)-*. Pl./coll. **aygestan** : in Movsēs Xorenac’i 2.42 (1913=1991: 167^{L8}; transl. Thomson 1978: 183).

●**DIAL** Widespread in dialects, mainly meaning ‘garden’ [HAB 1: 166b].

Next to Van *ikyī* one finds Ozim *hege* [HAB, *ibid.*; Ačāryan 1952: 244], Šatax *hikyī* [M. Muradyan 1962: 191b], Moks *hek’ə*⁹ (see below), as well as Muš *h’eg’i* (HAB, *ibid.*), Aštarak *hik’i*, which has been replaced by *bat* in the village of Ōšakan (see Bačdasaryan-T’ap’alc’yan 1971: 218). These forms seem to point to a by-form **y-aygi* (see 2.3.1).

Moks *hek’ə*⁹, GSg *hek’yü*, NPl *hek’yik’y* ‘виноградник; сад фруктовый’ [Orbeli 2002: 276]. It seems that in a Moks proverb the word refers to ‘grapes’: *Hek’yü sirun t’up’ kələzə*⁶⁹ [Orbeli 2002: 120^{Nr69}], translated by Orbeli (*op. cit.* 182^{Nr100}) as follows: “Из любви к винограду лижет и куст?”. The question-mark may be a misprint since in the earlier edition (1982: 118^{Nr100}) we find an exclamation-mark instead.

●**ETYM** Connected with Gr. *oĩn* f. ‘service-tree’, Lat. *ūva* ‘grapes’, Russ. *íva* ‘willow’, Czech *jíva* ‘willow’, SCr. *ī`va* ‘willow’, Lith. *ieva* ‘bird-cherry’, etc. [Lidén 1905-06: 500-503; HAB 1: 166b]. The BSl. forms point to **h₁eiH-ueh₂-* or **h₁eh₁i-ueh₂-* [Derksen 1996: 139]. PArm. **ayg(a)-* ‘grapes’ (cf. Ačāryan’s considerations on *ayg-a-wēt* in HAB 1: 166b, as well as the meaning ‘grapes’ in Latin and, probably, the Armenian dialect of Moks) probably goes back to PIE

**h₁h₁i-ueh₂-eh₂-* or **h₁oh₁i-ueh₂-eh₂-* or **h₁oih₁-ueh₂-eh₂-*. On the vocalism see 2.1.5. Arm. *ayg-i* ‘vineyard, garden’ is, thus, an *i*-derivaton of **ayg-* ‘grapes, vine’. Typologically compare *xatot* ‘grapes’ : **xatot-ut* > Hamšen *havōtut* ‘vineyard, garden’ (see Ačaryan 1947: 233).

For the semantic development ‘(grape)vine’ > ‘garden’ cf. NPers. *raz* ‘grapevine’ next to Avest. *razura-* ‘forest, thicket’ (< **branchy place*), Russ. *lozá* ‘vine’, etc. (see Mallory/Adams 1997: 80b); cf. Sasun *řáz* ‘vineyard’ [Petoyan 1954: 155; 1965: 521], Moks *řáz* [Orbeli 2002: 318], borrowed from Persian (or Kurdish).

ayc. *i*-stem: GDPl *ayc-i-c*’ (Bible+); **ayc-i** (Cyril of Jerusalem, Yovhan Mandakuni/Mayragomec’i, Commentary on Genesis), pl. **ayc-i-k**’ : GDPl *ayce-a-c*’ (abundant in the Bible) ‘goat’, more frequently ‘she-goat’; **ayce-amn**, GDSg *ayceman* ‘gazelle, roe’ (Bible+); **ayc-eni**’ of goatskin’ (Bible+)

GDPl *ayceac*’ is attested in the Bible more than 30 times, whereas *aycic*’ - only a few [Astuacaturean 1895: 66ab], and NSg *ayc-i* occurs only in Cyril of Jerusalem, Yovhan Mandakuni/Mayragomec’i, and in Commentary on Genesis, in all of them in apposition with *awdi* ‘sheep’. Note that these are the only attestations also for sg. *awdi*, which appears in the Bible always as pl. tant.: APl *awdi-s* and GDPl *awde-a-c*’ [Astuacaturean 1895: 1554b]. Further, **ayci-* is seen in *ayce-amn* ‘gazelle, roe’, which renders Gr. *δορκός* in the Bible and contains a suffix *-(a)mn*, used in other animal names too [Clackson 1994: 89].

For *ayc-eni*’ of goatskin’ (Bible+) cf. Moks (see below).

●**DIAL** Widespread in dialects. In Zeyt’un and Muš, as in ClArm., *ayc* refers to the female (3+ years) [HAB 1: 170a]. The same holds for Šatax *ec*, which refers to the mother-goat according to M. Muradyan (1962: 83), probably also for Moks *ec*, glossed as ‘koza = nanny-goat’ in Orbeli 2002: 224.

Moks *ecne*’ of goatskin’, found in a riddle describing the shoes (see Orbeli 2002: 126^{Nr16(44)}) is comparable with classical *ayceni*’id.’.

●**ETYM** Since NHB (1: 90b), linked with Gr. *αἶξ, αἰγός* f. ‘goat’, YAv. *īzaēna-* ‘leathern’, etc. [Hübschmann 1897: HAB 1: 169b]. Probably *ayc*, *i*-stem derives from fem. **h₂(e)ig-ih₂-*, and *ayci-k*’ (*ea*-stem) - from **h₂(e)ig-ieh₂-*; cf. Gr. (Laconian) **αἶζα*, on which see s.v. *tik* ‘*goat’s skin’. For the philological and etymological discussion I refer to Clackson 1994: 88-90. Note also Alb. *dhi* f. ‘(she-)goat’, probably from **a(i)g-ijeh₂* [Orel 1994: 358; Demiraj 1997: 160]. See also s.v. *gort* and 3.5.2.1. Note that Arm. *ayc* mostly refers to ‘she-goat’ in ClArm., and this meaning is still seen in the dialects of Zeyt’un, Muš, Šatax and Moks. The Armenian form, as the Avestan, may be derived from zero grade **h₂ig-* > **Hyg-*,

with -y- analogically after NSg **h₂eig-* (see 2.1.5). Note that we may be dealing with a *Kulturwort* (for the discussion and references see Kortlandt 1986: 38 = 2003: 68; Clackson 1994: 218₃).

ClArm. *ayc-eni* and Moks *ecnē* 'of goatskin' can be compared with YAv. *īzaēna-* 'leathern'.

ays, *o*-stem (in Irenaeus: *u*-stem) 'wind; (evil) spirit'.

Bible+.

Astuacaturean (1895: 67b) cites 46 attestations of *ays* in the meaning 'spirit' in the Bible, whereas the meaning 'wind' occurs only once, in Psalms 10.7 (omitted in Astuacaturean, *ibid.*, though the passage is cited in 257a and 258a, s.v.v. *bažak* and *bažin*): *ays mrrik bažin bažaki noc'a* (see Zōhræpean 1805, 3: 21). This passage seems to correspond to Psalms 11.6 in RevStBibl ("a scorching wind shall be the portion of their cup") and 10.6 in Septuaginta (Rahlfs): *πνεῦμα καταιγίδος ἡ μερίς τοῦ ποτηρίου αὐτῶν*.

In his commentary on Psalms, Vardan Arewelc'i (13th cent.) comments upon this passage: *ays, or ē hoṭm* "ays, that is *hoṭm* 'wind'". Elsewhere in Psalms, namely 106.25 and 148.8, the same *πνεῦμα καταιγίδος* is rendered as *hoṭm ew mrrik*. In these three passages, thus, *πνεῦμα* corresponds twice to *hoṭm* and once to *ays*. (For the parallelism between *ays* and *hoṭm* cf. also Vardan's commentary; see above).

The only other attestation of *ays* in the meaning 'wind' is found in the well-known passage from Eznik Koṭbac'i (5th cent.): *Yoržam mek' asemk' t'ē sik' šnč'ē, storneayk' asen - ays šnč'ē* "Whereas we say *sik'* blows, the lowers (i.e. southerners) say *ays* blows". On *storneayk'* 'lowers' rather than *asorneayk'* 'Syrians' see HAB 1: 172a; A. A. Abrahamyan 1994: 307-308₁₈₅. In Blanchard/Young 1998: 87, *ays* is rendered by 'spirit', vs. *sik'* 'breeze'. Indeed, in the previous sentence Eznik speaks of the fluctuation between the ideas of 'wind' and 'spirit': *aysn hoṭm ē, ew hoṭmn - ogi* "the *ays* ['evil spirit'] is *hoṭm* ['wind'], and the *hoṭm* ['wind'] is *ogi* ['spirit']". However, the rendering of *ays* as 'spirit' vs. *sik'* 'breeze' in the passage under discussion is not quite accurate since we are dealing with a lexical rather than semantic contrast, and the meaning *ays* 'wind' is reliable, though rare. Also inaccurate is their note (87₃₅): "The 'southerners', *storneayk'*, are the Syrians", which is in conflict with the form *storneayk'* (and not *asorneayk'*) they themselves cite. Note also Schmid's (1900: 75) translation: "Denn wenn wir sagen: 'Der milde Wind weht', so sagen die Syrer: 'Der Geist weht'".

This passage is a unique testimony of a dialectal feature in the 5th century; see HAB 1: 171-172; Ačāryan, HLPatm 2, 1951: 125; Jahukyan 1986: 9; Clackson

2004-05: 154. Clackson (ibid.) points out that "the Bible translation uses items from different dialects".

Given the facts that *ays* has been preserved only in Van (see below), an area that is located in the south of the Armenian-speaking territory, and Eznik was native of northerly located *Koṭh*, one may discuss this evidence as an historical testimony reflecting the dialectal contrast between groups which might be conventionally named as Muš/Alaškert/Karin-group and Van/Agulis/Larabaṭ-group (see 1.1).

Among derivatives: *ays-a-har* 'who is struck by an evil spirit' (Bible+); cf. in Vanakan Vardapet Tawuṣec'i (13th cent.) [Xač'ikyan 1941: 166b^{L12f}]: *hareal yaysoyn č'arē* "struck by an evil spirit".

See also s.v. *zaysaysem*.

● **DIAL** Preserved only in Van *seṭan-ays* (also *seṭan-ak*) 'a whirling wind-storm, twister' [HAB 1: 172a], a compound with *seṭan* 'table' as the first member. In Amatuni (1912: 585b): Van *seṭanayt* 'twister' (= *satani k'ami* 'wind of Satan'); apparently a misprint for *seṭanays*. The sailors of Van Lake considered *seṭanays* an evil spirit that comes to wreck ships when it storms [Garamanlean 1931: 512b].

On *aysahar* see s.v. *zaysaysem*.

● **ETYM** Ačāryan (HAB 1: 172a) rejects all the etymological attempts, including those relating *ays* with Skt. *ásura*- m. 'god, lord' and Etrusc. *ais* 'god'. Ĵahukyan (1983: 87-88; 1987: 450, 462-463; 1988, 1: 64) is inclined to the connection with Skt. *ásura*- m. 'god, lord, name of a group of gods', *āsura*- 'godlike; demonlike' (RV+), Av. *ahu*- m. 'lord, overlord', Hitt. *ḫaš-* 'to procreate, give birth', PGerm. **ansuz* 'Gott, Ase', etc. For Armenian he assumes **ans-jo-* (> *ays*, with regular loss of the sibilant before the nasal and with subsequent metathesis **asy-* > *ays*), though this is not confirmed by any cognate form. Then he mentions the derivation of the PIE word from **h₂enh₁-* 'to breathe' (on this see e.g. Mallory/Adams 1997: 330b) and states that this is confirmed by the semantics of the Armenian word. On the other hand, Ĵahukyan (1987: 450) also mentions Arab. *ḫanzab* 'devil'.

In the whole, the etymology is uncertain, but not impossible.

One prefers positing **h₂(e)nsu-jo-* [Olsen 1999: 958], though the expected Armenian form seems to be **asu(yo)*.

Arguing against the idea that Arm. *ays* is related with Etrusc. *ais* 'god' and should be seen as a MedPont word (on this see 3.11), Ačāryan (HAB 1: 172a) points out that the original meaning of the Armenian was 'breath', of which 'spirit, demon' has been developed. However, this does not automatically preclude the connection since, at least theoretically, the Etruscan word may have been borrowed from

Proto-Armenian, though, of course, the historical and chronological background of such a relationship has to be established.

ayt-k', *i*-stem: GDPl *ayt-i-c'* in Nersēs Lambronac'i (12th. cent.) etc. 'cheek' (Bible+); **aytnum**, aor. *ayteay* (Bible+) 'to swell'.

Note also *ayt-umn* (Bible+), *ayt-oyc'* 'swelling' (John Chrysostom, Philo), *ayt-oc'* (Mxit'ar Herac'i); later: *aytuc'anem* (caus.), etc.

●**DIAL** No dialectal forms are recorded in HAB 1: 172b. In Svedia, however, one finds *utec'/udec'* 'swelling, tumour', *utic'il/udic'il* 'to swell', which Andreasyan (1967: 265) derives from *aytoc'* (better: *aytoyc'*) and *aytoc'il*, respectively. Further: K'esab *ütēc'* and *ütēsg* (from *aytoyc'* and *aytoyc'-k'*), and verbal *ütēc'im* (< *aytuc'-*) and *utēc'əsnim* (< *aytuc'anem*) [Č'olak'ean 1986: 195b]. Ačāryan 2003 vacat.

●**ETYM** Since Lagarde, connected with Gr. *oĩdēō* 'to swell', *oĩdōs* n. 'swelling', OHG *eiz* 'abscess, boil' (from Germ. **aitaz* 'Geschwür, Gift'), OIr. *óil* 'cheek', etc., as well as (Meillet) Lat. *aemidus* 'swollen' (see HAB 1: 172; Pokorny 1959: 774). Note also OIc. *eista* n. 'testicle'; Lat. *ikstis* 'kidneys', Lith. *inkstas* 'kidney', Plb. *jaisto* 'kidneys' from **h₂(o)id-st-* [Derksen 1996: 259-261] (for the semantics see Lat. *aemidus* 'swollen' probably reflects **h₂eid-sm-* [Schrijver 1991: 38]. Arm. *ayt* may be treated as a regular *s*-stem like Gr. *oĩdōs* n. and perhaps Germ. **aitaz* 'cheek' (see Olsen 1999: 203). This can be accepted only if the *i*-declension is secondary.

For the vocalism see 2.1.5.

ayr GDSg *airn*, AblSg *y-airn-ē*, ISg *aram-b*, NPl *ar-k'*, APl *ar-s*, GDPl *aran-c'*, IPl *aram-b-k'* (abundant in the Bible) 'man; husband'.

Widely attested since the Bible. Classical derivatives based on both *ayr-* and *airn-*. MArm. *ayr-ik* 'husband'. See HAB 1: 172-173.

●**DIAL** Not preserved in dialects independently. The derivative **ayr-ik* (with diminutive *-ik*) 'husband', identical with MArm. *ayr-ik* 'husband', is present in numerous western dialects (*kə*-group), as well as in Marāṭa and Salmast [HAB 1: 174b]. Trapizon *talar* < **tal-ayr* 'husband's sister's husband' is composed of *tal* 'husband's sister' and *ayr* 'husband' [Ačārean 1913: 1008b; HAB 1: 174b]. Xarberd *airn-e/ank'*, Nor Naxiḡewan *airn-ak'* 'husband's relatives' [Ačārean 1913: 133b], and **airn-tak'* 'id.' are considered by Ačāryan (HAB 1: 174b) to be 'new words'. The fact that *airn* is not present in dialects rather suggests that these formations are relatively old.

The archaic genitive *airn* has been indirectly preserved in Łarabaṭ gen. *tē'īnə* < ClArm. *te-airn*, GDSg of *tēr* < **ti-ayr* 'master, lord' (see Davt'yan 1966: 483). For a

clear textual illustration of this Łarabał GDSg form see Grigoryan-Spandaryan 1971: 422a, proverb Nr. 188.

●**ETYM** Bugge (1890: 52-53; cf. the earlier attempts listed in HAB 1: 173-174) connected Arm. *ayr* with Gr. *ἄνθρωπος* (*ἄνδρα*, pl. *ἄνδρες*; ep. also *ἄνερ*, *ἄνερ* etc.) 'man (*opp.* woman/god/youth); husband'; cf. also Lat. *Nerō*, *neriōsus* 'strong' [Schrijver 1991: 21], Skt. *nár-* 'man, human, hero, warrior' (RV+), etc. Kuiper (1951) posits a Greek old abstract **ἄνερ*, **ἄναρ* 'vital energy' on the basis of *-ήναρ* and *ἄναρ-ος* (PIE **h₂ner-*; cf. Skt. *sū-nāra-* etc.); cf. Frisk 1: 107 ("wenig wahrscheinlich").

Meillet (1896: 151; 1900: 18; 1936: 55, 83, 143, 149) correctly rejects the alternative derivation of Arm. *ayr* from PIE **f₂sen-*: Gr. *ἄρσεν*, *-ενος* 'male' etc. (Hübschmann 1897: 417-418) and equates Arm. NSg *ayr*, GDSg *ain* and APl *ar-s* with *ἄνθρωπος*, *ἄνδρα* and PIE acc.pl. **an₂ns* respectively, assuming for *ayr* a development comparable to that of *awr* 'day' vs. Gr. *ἡμέρα*. Thus: PIE **h₂nēr* (cf. Gr. *ἄνθρωπος*) > PArm. **anir* > **aynr* or **a^yn(i)r* > *ayr* (Meillet, *ibid.*; Ĵahukyan 1967: 237; 1987: 140; cf. 1959: 183-184 and 1982: 118-119; De Lamberterie 1978: 243-244; Clackson 1994: 96; Beekes 2003: 169, 185, 205, 210). For the relative chronology of the loss of the nasals in *ayr* and *awr* see Kortlandt 1985: 20 = 2003: 64. The genitive form *ain* implies a metathesis: **h₂nr-ós* (cf. Gr. *ἄνδρα*) > PArm. **anro-* > **arno-* > *ain*. See further HAB 1: 173-174; AčarĴiak 3, 1957: 439; Hamp 1966: 12-13; Greppin 1983: 285-286; Clackson 1994: 35, 195; Olsen 1999: 171-172; Matzinger 2005: 128-131. For the metathesis see also 2.1.26.3.

For the 'prothetic' *a-* see Beekes 1969: 22, 45, 87; 2003: 182, 185; C. Arutjunjan 1983: 237; Kortlandt 1987: 62 = 2003: 76; Clackson 1994: 33-35. For the alternation *-r-* : *-i-* seen in *ayr*, *aramb* : *ain* see Ĵahukyan 1967: 312; Clackson 1994: 132.

Hamp (1966: 12-13) proposed the following scenario. Genitive **arnos* (< **anros*, cf. Gr. *ἄνδρα*) beside nominative **anēr* would have been anomalous. Therefore, the nominative **anēr* was adjusted to **arēr* > **arir*. <...>. This new nominative could have dissimilated ("perhaps aided by *hayr* etc.?") to **air* > *ayr*. This is unconvincing and unnecessary.

The connection of Arm. *ayr* 'man' with Ved. Skt. *árya-* m. 'lord, master of the house' etc. (Mann 1963: 1; for earlier attempts see HAB 1: 174) should be abandoned since it does not account for the Armenian paradigm (cf. also Greppin 1983: 286), whereas the traditional etymology is quite convincing (pace C. Arutjunjan 1983: 265-269, with a thorough but not very attractive scenario). A contamination (cf. Ĵahukyan 1982: 118; 1987: 182, 287; A. Petrosyan 2002: 85₂₉₅) is possible, though unnecessary.

ayr₂ *i*-stem (ISg *ayriw* in Genesis 23.17; see Zeyt'unyan 1985: 243) 'cave'.

Bible+.

●**DIAL** Preserved in the dialects of Ararat, Muš, Alaškert as *er* and in Van, Ozim, Mokk', Salmast as *her*, with an initial *h*-; see HAB 1: 175a; Ačāryan 1952: 101, 244. The origin of the initial *h*- is not clear. An old *h*- would have yielded *x*- in these dialects. An initial *y*- seems better. The **ya*- gives *ä*- in Van (Ačāryan's Law), with a loss of the secondary (voiced) *h*- which is usually preserved in Ozim, Moks and Šatax; see 2.3.1 on *y*-. As demonstrated by Weitenberg (1999 [2000]: 7-15), Ačāryan's Law was anterior to the development *ay* > *e*. It seems, thus, that in Van *her* < **y-ayr* the initial *h*- has been preserved because Ačāryan's Law did not operate in this case. [Can this be motivated phonetically? Would the prefix *y*- be motivated in this case? Note the same *y*- in almost synonymous *amur*].

Hačən *k'äy* is a compound with *k'ar* 'stone' as the first member.

●**ETYM** Often compared with Gr. *ἄντρον* n. 'Höhle, Grotte', assuming **antr-iV*- for Armenian; see Jahukyan 1987: 112, 258, 582-583; 1988: 150 (allegedly also seen in Urart. theonym *Airaini*). For more references and discussion see Clackson 1994: 98, who views this etymology as uncertain.

Theoretically, the basic meaning of *ayr* 'cave' might have been 'empty/abandoned/ uncultivated (land, place)'; cf. Germ. *hohl* 'empty' : *Höhle* 'cave'; Engl. *hollow*; etc. In this case Arm. *ayri* 'widow' (q.v.) should be seen as a derivative (etymologically meaning 'abandoned') from *ayr* 'cave, empty'; for the semantic field see s.v.v. *amay*, *xort*.

ayrem 'to burn'.

Bible+. Also *z-ayr-anam* 'to be/become angry'. In Deuteronomy 28.27 (Cox 1981: 184), *zayrac'cal k'osov* renders Greek *ψώρα ἄγριος* "with malignant itch/scurvy". For the passage see s.v. *k'os* 'scab'.

●**DIAL** Ubiquitous in dialects.

●**ETYM** Usually derived from **ayr*- 'fire' < **HeHter*-, cf. Av. *ātar*- / *āθr*- 'fire' (an old neuter in *-f*), perhaps also Lat. *āter* 'black, dark', OIr. *āith* 'furnace', Welsh *odyn* (< **āti*-) 'furnace', Palaic *hā*- 'to be hot', etc., see Lagarde 1854: 29/804; Hübschmann 1897: 418; HAB 1: 175; Greppin 1983: 286-287; Beekes apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 202b. On the morphology of Av. *ātar*- / *āθr*- 'fire' is see Beekes 1988: 122-124; Hoffmann/Forssman 1996: 150-152. The Armenian verb is denominative.

Jasanoff (1979: 145; see also Viredaz 2005: 85) proposed a connection with Gr. *αἶθω* 'kindle; burn (with light)' etc. from PIE **h₂eid-*. However, the sound development of Arm. *-r-* from PIE **-d-* is uncertain; see also s.v. *ur* 'where (to)'. One rather expects **ayd-* (see s.v.v. *awd* 'foot-wear', and *awd* 'air').

ayri, *ea*-stem 'widow' (Bible+), 'widower' (hapax, in Ephrem).

●**DIAL** The compound **orb-ew-ayri* 'widow' < **orphan-and-widow*, though literarily unattested, is ubiquitous in the dialects. Note also Zeyt'un *erigénég* < **ayri-knik*, as well as folk-etymological *erig-gnig* (< **ayrik-knik* 'husband-wife' or 'man(ly)-wife') 'widow' in Tigranakert [HAB 1: 176b].

Interesting is *ark'əveri* in the village of Čošara of Hamšen vs. more normal Hamšen *arp'əveri*. This can be explained through dissimilation of labiality: *p'əv* > *k'əv*. Nor Naxijewan *arfari*, *ɔfari* (older *erp'evari*) is due to haplology.

As stated by Ačaryan (HAB 1: 176b), **orb-ew-ayri* refers to women. In a fairy-tale recorded in Šuši (Łarabał) in 1926, however, one finds *arp'əveri* referring to a man (see HŽHek' 5, 1966: 59). One also finds Muš *orbevernal* (said of a man) 'to become a widower' in a fairy-tale originated in the Muš-region [HŽHek' 12, 1984: 257^{L1}]. Note also Zeyt'un *ayr-mard* 'a man whose wife has been died (= widower)' [HayLezBrbBar 1, 2001: 54a].

See also s.v. *orb* 'orphan'.

●**ETYM** Ačaryan (HAB 1: 176b) does not accept any of the etymological attempts, including the one (Ėmin) that derives *ayr-i* from *ayr* 'man, husband'. The latter idea presupposes a basic meaning like 'woman connected with a husband' [Clackson 1994: 93, 219-220₃₅]. It has been assumed that we are dealing with a privative **n*-formation based upon *ayr*, thus: 'having no husband' [*Dumézil 1940: 69; Olsen 1999: 446]. See also Ėahukyan 1987: 259, 260 (hesitantly).

If Arm. *ayr* 'cave' (q.v.) basically meant 'empty/ abandoned/ uncultivated (land, place)', *ayri* 'widow' might be seen as a derivative of it etymologically meaning 'abandoned'.

ayc' 'visit, inspection, investigation', mostly in verbal constructions as *ayc' aīnem* etc. (Bible+); in Movsēs Xorenac'i 3.27 (1913=1991: 288^{L12}), *ayc' ew xndir*. Later, verbs *ayc'em* in John Chrysostom, Hesychius of Jerusalem, etc., *ayc'-el-em* in Yovhannēs Drasxanakertc'i etc., and derivatives based on *ayc'-el-*. On *-el* see s.v.v. *argel*, *vayel*.

●**ETYM** Since Pictet, Dervischjan, et al. (see HAB) connected with OHG *eisca* 'question', OCS *iskati* 'to look for, seek', Skt. *ichatī* 'to wish, strive after, seek'

(RV+), etc. [Hübschmann 1897: 418; Scheftelowitz 1927: 225]. Ačāryan (HAB 1: 177a; 3: 32b, pace Hübschmann) correctly identifies with *hayc'em*, q.v.

According to Kortlandt (1984: 42 = 2003: 55; cf. Schrijver 1991: 38; Beekes 2003: 142, 182), *ayc'* and *hayc'* reflect *o*-grade (cf. OE *ǣsce* 'question, search') and *e*-grade (cf. Lat. *aeruscāre* 'to beg, ask for'), respectively. For discussion see Joseph 1984: 46-47.

Alternatively, *ayc'* can be derived from zero-grade; see Greppin 1983: 287; 1988: 184; cf. Kortlandt 1983: 12-13 = 2003: 42. This seems more probable. For the zero-grade cf. Skt. *ichāti* etc. One cannot reject this idea solely for the reason that the expected reflex of **h₂i-* might be Arm. **hi-*. PIE **h₂is-sk-* could be realized as **h₂is-sk-* > PArm. **ayc'-* analogically after full-grade *hayc'* from **h₂eis-sk-*; see 2.1.5.

anagan 'late; evening (time)'.

Bible+. Interesting is the adverbial *anagani* 'in the evening'; on *-i* see 2.2.1.5.

●**DIAL** Preserved in several dialects in meanings 'late' and, only in Maraš, 'evening' (as an adjective, it seems) [HAB 1: 178a]. Next to forms with an initial *a-* (Suč'ava, Xarberd, Maraš), there are particularly interesting ones the anlauts of which allow to restore a by-form **y-anagan* (see Weitenberg 1986: 92-93, 96): Van *ānkyān*, Moks *hānākyān*, Ozim *hangyān* [Ačāryan 1952: 244] (for the textual evidence see Ter-Mkrč'yan 1970: 151, 185a), Šatax *h'ānākyān* [M. Muradyan 1962: 33, 70, 192], Muš *y'ank'an* [Bačdasaryan-T'ap'alc'yan 1958: 245a]. See 2.3.1 for more detail.

●**ETYM** Ačāryan (HAB 1: 178a) leaves the origin of the word open. Ĵahukyan (1987: 113, 269) hesitantly connects to *aganim* 'to spend the night'; very uncertain.

Clackson (1994: 223-224₉₈) interprets it as composed of the privative prefix *an-* and *agan* 'early' ('not-early', thus) and connects the latter to *ayg* 'morning'. This is actually proposed first in NHB 1: 101a (*oč' agan, oč' and aygn; oč' kanux*).

However, *agan* (q.v.) is only used once, in a late mediaeval song, and, as stated by Ačāryan (HAB 1: 75a), means 'zealous (child, pupil)' rather than 'early':

Zi sireli ic'es mardkan, / Ler yusaneld manuk agan! [NHB 1: 2c] "Be a zealous cgild in learning so that you be beloved by people".

analut', GDSg *anlēt'oy, analut'oy* ("Ašxarhac'oyc'") 'a kind of deer, hind'; probably 'fallow deer'.

Deuteronomy

The oldest attestation is found in Deuteronomy 14.5 (see Cox 1981: 136), in a list of seven animals legitimate for food. The list is a part of the enumeration of clean

and unclean animals that is largely repeated in Leviticus 11. The Armenian word *analut'* corresponds to Gr. *καμηλο-πάρδαλις* 'giraffe' and Hebrew *zmr*. The latter cannot be identified with certainty. It, as well as the Peshitta equivalent, is interpreted as rupicapra/chamois (see BiblSacPolygl 1, 1657: 778; NovVulgBiblSac 1979: 266; Spinage 1968: 39). Targum Onqelos has 'mountain goat' [Drazin 1982: 158] or 'mountain sheep' [Grossfeld 1988: 50], Targum Neofiti 1: 'buffalo' or 'wild ox' [McNamara 1997: 79, 79₁₂]. Wevers (1995: 242) considers Gr. *καμηλο-πάρδαλις* 'giraffe' as an odd translation and notes: "Obviously the translator did not know the word".

If the Armenian translator were blindly rendering Gr. *καμηλο-πάρδαλις* being unaware what animal is dealt with he would have made a calque like *uṭt-inj* or *ənj-uṭt* (which we do find in later literature, including "Ašxarhac'oyc", see below), as in the following examples from the animal-lists in Deuteronomy 14 and Leviticus 11: *ὄφιο-μάχης* : *ōj-a-mart*, *μυ-γαλῆ* : *mkn-ak'is*, *χαμαι-λέων* : *getn-aṛewc*. Instead, the translator has chosen a rare and structurally/ etymologically opaque term (*analut'*), and this seems significant. One may treat this as a possible remnant of a Syriac-based translation in the Armenian Bible (on the problem see Cox 1981: 6f, 301-327; Cowe 1992: 5f, 229f, 419f).

A careful collation of the animal lists in Deuteronomy 14 and Leviticus 11 shows that Armenian Deuteronomy is "less faithful" to the Greek text available to us than Armenian Leviticus (I hope to show this elsewhere). Another interesting fact is that in four cases the Armenian translators of Deuteronomy and Leviticus have chosen different synonyms for rendering the same items, and the variants of Deuteronomy are mostly rare and opaque: *γρύψ*, *λάρος*, *κύκνος*, *κόραξ* > Deut. *korč*, *čay*, *p'or*, *ori* vs. Levit. *paskuč*, *oror*, *karap*, *agraw*, respectively. In view of these considerations as well as the analysis of the evidence from "Ašxarhac'oyc" and the etymology of the word *analut'* (see below) one may hypothetically assume that:

- 1) the translator of the Armenian Deuteronomy is different from that of Leviticus;
- 2) he was native of NW Armenia;
- 3) *analut'* reflects a term different than Gr. *καμηλο-πάρδαλις* 'giraffe'.

"Ašxarhac'oyc"

Next we encounter the word twice in the 7th century Armenian Geography ("Ašxarhac'oyc") by Anania Širakac'i. Among the animals of Ethiopia, an animal is mentioned as resembling *analut'* (Soukry 1881: 21^{L7f}; Eremyan 1972-73, A: 230): *kendani inč' nman anlət'oy*, *mardamart ew anušahot* : "a certain animal resembling *an(a)lut'*, "human-fighting" and aromatic". In the short recension one finds the following readings for *anlət'oy* : *y-analut'* [MovsXorenMaten 1865: 599],

z-analut'-oy (HAB 1: 179a, without an exact reference), *z-analut* (with an unaspirated *-t*, that is printed in a different shrift [A. G. Abrahamyan 1944: 344^{L36}]).

Attempts have been made to emend or re-interpret the passage: "un animal semblable à la girafe: ressemble au léopard; animaux belliqueux et suavéolents" [Soukry 1881: 28]; "a certain animal resembling a giraffe; [and also other] ferocious and gentle [animals]" [Hewsen 1992: 51]. The epithets *mardamart* and *anušahot*, thus, are separated from the *analut'*-like animal which is unbased and unnecessary. This is clearly confirmed by the short recension. I follow the ModArm. translation by Abrahamyan and Petrosyan (1979: 279) which take the passage as it appears in manuscripts, without any emendations: *analut'i nman mi kendani, orə mardamart ē ew anušahot*. Note that Hewsen (1992: 51A) translates the corresponding passage of the short recension in the same way, without emendation: "an animal like a giraffe, that is ferocious but aromatic".

For *anlt'oy* Hewsen (1992: 99₁₁₂) restores a NSg **analet'* which is a mistake or misprint. The correct form certainly is *analut'*.

That *analut'* does not refer to 'giraffe' is corroborated by the fact that *analut'* is also mentioned as an animal in the Armenian province of Gugark' [Soukry 1881: 34^{L-1} (French transl. "la girafe", p. 46); MovsXorenMaten 1865: 610; A. G. Abrahamyan 1944: 350^{L31}; Eremyan 1963: 110; Hewsen 1992: 65, 65A]. The 1944 edition again has *analut*, with an unaspirated *-t*.

●**DIAL** As convincingly demonstrated by Ačāryan (HAB 1: 179a; Ačāryan 1947: 12, 220; see also Eremyan 1963: 92a), Hamšen *ɔnlut'* (in Čanik: *ɔnlut*) 'hind' undoubtedly continues ClArm. *analut'*. The word belongs to the 4th declension of the dialect of Hamšen: GSg *ɔnlutɔn*, AblSg *ɔnlutä* [Ačāryan 1947: 46, 96, 220].

The GDSg form *ɔnlut'on* occurs in a tale told by Arak'si Łazaryan-P'ač'aĵyan (a survivor of the Genocide, a former inhabitant of Trapizon) and recorded by B. T'ořlak'yan (1986: 35^{L20f}) in 1966: *ɔnlut'on pes t'řav gnac' tunə* : "(he) flew like a deer and went home". Here (241b) *ɔnlut'* is glossed as *etnik, paxra, ĵeyran*.

As we have seen, *analut'* is attested in "Ašxarhac'oyc'" among others in readings *anlet'-oy*, with syncope of the medial *-a-*, and *analut*, with unaspirated *-t*. Both features coincide with Hamšen *ɔnlut*. Here, thus, we are dealing with an interesting case which can illustrate the relationship between the manuscript readings and the real dialectal forms. This is also relevant for establishing certain phonological features within the framework of absolute chronology. Particularly interesting is the metathesis, if my etymology is correct (see below).

●**SEMANTICS** Meaning: 'giraffe' or 'a kind of deer'?

That *analut'* is taken by Soukry, Hewsen (see also 1992: 99₁₁₂), and Greppin (1983a: 15) as meaning 'giraffe' is based on the Biblical attestation and seems to be wrong or has been resulted from a confusion. More probably, the unspecified animal which is said to resemble *analut'* may have been the giraffe. It can be argued against this that the giraffe does occur explicitly (*əncuṭt*) in the very same passage. However, Anania Širakac'i hardly ever saw a giraffe, and he might have been unaware that the giraffe (the denotatum of *əncuṭt*) is identic with the animal which according to his information resembled *analut'*.

Indeed, ancient authors often describe the giraffe as a typically Ethiopian animal; see Pliny, *Nat. Hist.* 8.27 (1947: 53); Spinage 1968: 51-52 et passim. Because of his extraordinary appearance the giraffe was mostly considered to be a ferocious beast, though already Pliny (ibid.) and Strabo showed this being wrong [Spinage 1968: 41f, 73; Dagg 1982: 2f]. This fits into the epithet *mardamart*. On *anušahot* see below.

Since the existence of giraffes in Armenia is excluded, the identification of *analut'* is considered problematic (see Hewsen 1992: 204₂₃₈, with references). It probably denotes a kind of deer (cf. the Peshitta and Aramaic equivalents of *analut'* in the Biblical passage) familiar to Anania Širakac'i as well as to the translator of the Armenian Deuteronomy and somehow comparable or confused with the giraffe. In this respect, the dialect of Hamšen provides us with an indispensable information.

Identification: 'Fallow deer'

The main representative of Cervidae was certainly the red deer, i.e. *Cervus elaphus maral*, which was ubiquitous in the historical Armenia and is represented by *eḡḡeru* and *etn*. Next to this, Arm. *erē* is the generic term for 'deer'. In the same list (Deuteronomy 14) next to *analut'* one finds *eḡḡeru* rendering Gr. *ἔλαφος*. In "Ašxarhac'oyc'", we encounter *erē* in several times, and *eḡḡeru* in the context of Barjr Hayk'. One may wonder, why does the author use another word for the province of Gugark'? The answer may be twofold: *analut'* denoted a different kind of deer, and/or *analut'* was dialectally confined to the area of Gugark'.

The best candidate for the denotatum of *analut'* is, to my mind, the fallow deer, *Dama dama*. The Common (European) fallow deer *Dama dama dama* is native in Europe and the northern half of Turkey up to the Pontic area, excluding almost all the territory of the historical Armenia; see Whitehead 1972: 86f, espec. maps 15 (p. 87) and 16 (p. 88). Thus, the NW margins of the historical Armenia (including Hamšen and surroundings) are the only areas where the fallow deer is native. This implies that the historical evidence from "Ašxarhac'oyc'" on the attribution of *analut'* to the province of Gugark', as well as the fact that the word has been preserved only in the dialect of Hamšen are not mere chances. Unlike the most kinds

of deer, and amongst them the red deer (maral) which normally almost do not have spots [Whitehead 1972: 71], the fallow deer is heavily spotted [Chapman/Chapman 1975: 22, 24]. This may have been one of the reasons for confusing/comparing *analut'* with the giraffe. Another remarkable thing is that in the long recension of "Ašxarhac'oyc'" (Soukry 1881: 21) *analut'* and/or the Ethiopian animal resembling *analut'* is characterized as *anušahot* 'aromatic'. This too brings us close to the fallow deer which has several scent glands [Chapman/Chapman 1975: 78-81]. Here (p. 79) we read:

"The presence of interdigital or pedal glands has long been recognised: in medieval times the fallow buck and doe were described as beasts of sweet foot (underlining mine - HM). At the base of each leg, in the mid-line immediately above the two cleaves of the hoof, is a fissure or narrow pocket in the skin. On the hind feet a pale yellow, soft waxy secretion, with a not unpleasant fatty-acid odour reminiscent of rancid butter, can be seen adhering to the hairs lining the pocket. The strength of the smell, as judged by the human nose, remains about the same throughout the year in both sexes".

One might even be tempted to emend *anušahot* to **anus'-a-ot* "(having) sweet foot"; but this is risky and cannot be verified. As for the peculiar scent of the giraffe, I refer to Dagg 1982: 72f (with lit.).

In Stefano 1996: 317 we read: "All the known representatives of the genus *Dama* prefer (or preferred) to live close to humid zones and open areas". Concerning a particular representative of the late Middle Pleistocene, namely *Dama dama tiberina*, we learn that "it is characteristic of temperate-warm and rather humid climates, similar to the environments favoured by the Clacton fallow deer. <...> it prefers deciduous and opened wooded areas with oaks, beeches and other temperate and mediterranean elements (evergreen oleander and strawberry trees); finally, this fallow deer seems to be more distributed near the coasts <...>" [Stefano/Petronio 1997: 71-72].

Being located in a coastal zone and abounding in humid forests, oaks and beeches (section 1; see espec. T'orlak'yan 1982: 25f, 31, etc.), the Hamšen area would have provided the fallow deer with these favourable conditions. The beech-tree (*hačaracař*) is mentioned in "Ašxarhac'oyc'", next to *analut'*; see below. As far as the oleander is concerned, note that Arm. *čp'ni* probably referring to 'oleander' (Galen, Geoponica, etc.) seems to be dialectally present only in Trapizon (see HAB 3: 217b).
●ETYM To the best of my knowledge, *analut'* has not received an etymological explanation as yet (see HAB 1: 179a; Olsen 1999: 938).

I propose a connection with PIE **h₁e/ol-Hn-ih₂-* 'deer, hind': OCS *alъnii* 'doe', SCr. *lane* 'doe', Russ. *lan* 'fallow deer, doe', Lith. *ėlnis* 'deer', Mlr. *ailit* f. 'doe, hind', MWelsh *elein* 'young deer, doe, hind-calf', *alanet* 'young deer, doe, hind-calf', etc. (see ÈtimSlovSlavJaz 6, 1979: 19-21; Adams 1985: 273-276; Schrijver 1995: 78-79). According to Schrijver (1995: 79), Mlr. *ailit* reflects PIE **h₁el-(H)n-t-iH-* or **h₁el-en-t-iH-*. The same dental determinative may be restored also for the Armenian, but the stem formation would be different: **-t-h₂-o-*; cf. Arm. *ort* 'calf; fawn' from **pórt-h₂-u-* vs. *ordi* 'offspring, son', *awri-ord*, *a*-stem 'virgin', Gr. *πόρτις*, *-ιος* f. 'calf, young heifer/young cow', *πόρταξ* f. 'calf', etc. (see s.v.v. and 2.1.18.2)

The development was, then, as follows: PIE **h₁(o)l-Hn-th₂o-* > PArm. **alant^ho-* > **alant^h* (apocope). The *-u-* in *analut* can be explained as an analogical restoration, as in *ant*: *anut* 'armpit' (see Ĵahukyan 1983: 88).

This etymology involves a metathesis *l...n* > *n...l*, of which a few cases can be found in the dialect of Hamšen (2.1.26.3). Remarkably, the same metathesis is seen in a word that is etymologically related to *analut*, viz. Gr. *ἔνελος* *νεβρός* 'young of the deer, fawn' (Hesychius). As I try to demonstrate in par. 2.1.26.3, in the dialect of Hamšen the phonotactics of the sonants *n* and *l* seems to be governed by three rules: 1) *n...l* > *n...l* (unchanged), cf. *anali* > *anli*, etc.; 2) *l...n* > *n...l* (cf. *šlni* > *šnlík*, etc.); 3) *n...n* > *l...n* (cf. *ananux* > *anluxk*, etc.). In all the three cases the outcome is *n...l*. The *n...l* is thus the most preferred sequence of these sonants.

In the light of what has been said, the etymology of *analut* < **alan(u)t* becomes more significant since it represents an old dialectal word with the same metathesis attested already in the Classical period.

We can see that the historical evidence from "Ašxarhac'oyc'" (i.e. the restriction of *analut* 'fallow deer' to the province of Gugark') is corroborated by dialectological (preserved only in Hamšen, very close to the western border of Gugark') and zoological (cf. the geographic distribution of the fallow deer) data. As is shown in 1.6 and 1.7, one can take "Ašxarhac'oyc'" as a reliable source for identifying this kind of old dialectal (or geographically restricted) words.

Conclusion

I conclude that *analut* (*o*-stem in "Ašxarhac'oyc'") refers to 'fallow deer', derives from PIE **h₁(o)l-Hn-th₂o-* (cf. Lith. *ėlnis* 'deer', Russ. *lan* 'fallow deer, doe', Mlr. *ailit* f. 'doe, hind', etc.) with metathesis (seen also in Gr. *ἔνελος*) that is peculiar to Hamšen and adjacent dialects and already in the Classical period was dialectal and zoologically restricted to NW of the Armenian speaking territory.

anari, *ea*-stem (GSg *anarwoy* in "Čarəntir", GPI *anareac* in Hexaemereon) ...

Attested since the 5th century.

In Eznik Koṭbac'i 1.25 (1994: 84): *jkunk' anarik' covakank'* "monstrous sea fish (pl.)".

In P'awstos Buzand 5.37 (1883=1984: 202^{L16f}; transl. Garsoïan 1989: 218): *zaynč'ap' ayn zanheded zanari* "this man of enormous size".

In Movsēs Xorenac'i 1.11 (1913=1991: 36^{L2}; transl. Thomson 1978: 87): *nizak anari* "a monstrous lance"; 1.26 (76^{L4}; transl. 116): *isk errordn zvišap anari sanjeal* "but the third rode a monstrous dragon"; 3.9 (267^{L2}; transl. 262): *anari omn skay vaŕeal* "a fearsome armed giant".

In Anania Širakac'i (7th cent.) [A. G. Abrahamyan 1944: 228^{L34f}], about a hunted wild boar: *ew vasn zi anari ēr tesleamb, kšrec'i* "and since [the boar] was *anari* by appearance, I weighed [it]".

Two later attestations quoted in NHB 1: 116b: *orj višapi anarwoy* "Lair of the enormous dragon" ("Čarəntir"); *spaŕazineal anari nizakōk'* "armed with enormous spears".

●**ETYM** The word is analysed as distinct from *an-ari* 'uncourageous', which is undoubtedly correct, and is derived from the Iranian form of 'non-Aryan', cf. YAv. *anairiia-*, Pahl. *anēr* 'non-Aryan, ignoble' [HAB 1: 181-182]. Dumézil (1997: 3-4) accepts this etymology and for the semantics compares Lat. *in-gens* 'vast, huge' : "was unserem Geschlechte nicht zustimmt, daher über die Grösse und Art unseres Geschlechtes hinausgeht" (< Fick).

I alternatively propose to treat an *anari* as *an-* + **ar-* + *-i*, with the root **ar-* that may be identical with Arm. **ar-* seen in *y-arm-ar* 'fitting', *ainem* (1SgAor *arari*) 'to make; to create', *y-arem* 'to put together', *ard* 'shape', from PIE **h₂er-* 'to fit'; cf. Gr. *ἀραρίσκω* 'to fit together, construct, equip', etc. Thus, *an-ar-i* basically means 'unshaped, deformed'; cf. *an-ard-i(l)*, where **ar-* is replaced by a derivative from the same *ard*⁴.

***angi**

●**DIAL** Łarabaṭ **angi* 'thin, emaciated', also in a compound with *ḥar* 'id.' as the first member: *ḥar-angi*. From the illustration given by himself (*Inc' ē hac' č'es utum, angi es daŕel* "Why don't you eat; you have become an *angi* !") Ačārean (1913: 95b) concludes that *angi* must have denoted a kind of unknown animal. Cf. also *angi ktrel*

⁴ Another etymology: Łap'anc'yan 1961: 161-162.

‘to become (liter.: to cut) thin’ [HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 56a]. For *ĥar-angi* compare *ĥar-mozi* (pejor., colloquial) ‘thin calf’; Van *parakik t’osun tle mi* ‘a boy (that is like a) thin /cattle/arĵar/’ in a fairy-tale [HŽHek’ 14, 999: 13-39] recorded in 1915 (p. 16).

●**ETYM** According to Ĵahukyan (1972: 308), belongs to IE **h₂(e)ng^{wh}i-* ‘snake’; cf. s.v. *awj*. He does not give any detail. The connection seems to be formally satisfactory. The labiovelar is not palatalized because of the preceding nasal; cf. **penk^we* > *hing* ‘five’, etc.

However, one has to account for the relationship between *awj* and **angi*. The strange shape of the former is usually explained by the influence of the labiovelar, as in *awcanem* ‘to anoint’. This rule may have only functioned with the zero grade. The IE word under discussion displays forms with both full (Lith. *angis*, OPruss. *angis* ‘snake’) and zero (OHG *unc* ‘snake’) grades, Lat. *anguis* ‘snake’ and OIr. *esc-ong* ‘eel’ (lit. ‘water-snake’) being ambiguous (see Schrijver 1991: 43-44, 60). One may therefore reconstruct a HD *i*-stem: NSg. **h₂éng^{wh}-ōi-*, GSg. **h₂ng^{wh}-i-ós*. The theoretical PArm. paradigm would then be as follows: NSg. **(h)angu(i)* > **ang-(i)*, GSg. **an^wgiyo-* > *awji* (= ClArm. GSg.). Then the genitive has been generalised (with a new nominative *awj*), while **ang-i* has been preserved in Łarabať. Note especially *acut* ‘coal’: Hačən - Łarabať etc. **ancut* (see s.v.).

See also s.v.v. *awji-k* ‘collar’, *əngtay-k*.

angt₁, GDSg *anget* (Job 28.7), GDPl *anget-a-c* (Job 15.23, Hexaemeron), *ang/ket-c* (Hesychius of Jerusalem, reading var. in Hexaemeron), NPl *anget-k* (Hexaemeron), IPl *ankeť-a-w-k* (“Yaysmawurk”) ‘vulture’.

Renders Gr. γύψ, γυπός m. ‘vulture’ in the Bible (Leviticus 11.14, Job 15.23, 28.7, 39.27) and Hexaemeron 9 (see K. Muradyan 1984: 273^{L16}, 278^{L6}, Greek match: 372a).

●**DIAL** Karin *angť*, Łarabať *ang* [HAB 1: 184a], Goris *ang* [Margaryan 1975: 75, 111, 313a]. Further, see below.

●**ETYM** No etymology is accepted in HAB 1: 184a. Ĵahukyan (1982: 105; 1987: 412; see also A. Petrosjan 1987: 60-61) derives from **ank/g-* (= **h₂enk-*) ‘to bend’ motivating the semantics by the form of the beak. For the **-l-* he compares Toch. A *onkalām* ‘elephant’, B *onkolmo/a* ‘id.’, Toch. A. *añcāl* ‘bow’. Different etymologies have been suggested for PToch. **onkolmo*, among them also a derivation from PIE **h₂enk-* ‘to bend’: Gr. ἄγκυλος ‘curved, bent’, OIc. *qngull* ‘fishhook’, OHG *angul* ‘fishhook, prick, hinge’, etc. [Adams 1999: 113] (for the root see also s.v. *an(u)t* ‘armpit’).

The Greek and Germanic forms are formally and semantically close to Arm. *angt* (*ankt* in Geoponica, API *angeſ-s* thrice in Paterica) ‘handle of a pot or basket’. This word is considered an Iranian loan by Ačāryan (HAB 1: 184a), cf. Pers. *angal(a)*, *angīl*, *angūl(a)* ‘button, button-hole, loop’ (for the forms see also Steingass 115ab). To my mind, Arm. *angt* ‘handle’ can better be derived from **h₂enk-u-l-* and be connected, thus, to the Greek and Germanic forms (cf. some earlier comparisons rejected in HAB). Remarkably, the Armenian dialectal forms of this *angt* lack the final *-t*, as those of *angt* ‘vulture’; cf. Zeyt’un, Arabkir, Xarberd etc. **ang* ‘handle of a pot’, Ararat *ang* ‘ring on the edge of a sack for wheat’ [HAB 1: 184b]. Important is Svedia *üngüt* ‘handle’ [HAB 3: 604a; Ačāryan 2003: 559] or *əngət* ‘the bowed handle of a pot or basket’ [Andreasyan 1967: 220, 353b].

I conclude that Arm. *angt* (API *angeſ-s* in Paterica; dial. **ang* and **angt*) ‘handle of a pot or basket’ and Arm. *angt* ‘vulture’ (Bible+; dial. **ang* and **angt*) derive from **h₂enk-u-l-*, cf. Gr. *ἀγκύλος* ‘curved, bent’, OIc. *ǫngull* ‘fishhook’, OHG *angul* ‘fishhook, prick, hinge’, etc. Pers. *angal(a)*, *angīl*, *angūl(a)* ‘button, button-hole, loop’ is semantically farther from the Armenian. It can be related if the original meaning was something like ‘ringed handle’ or ‘hinge’; cf. the meaning of Ararat *ang* above. [A contamination is possible, too]. For the semantic shift ‘curved, bent’ > ‘vulture’ (i.e. ‘having a curved beak, hook-beaked’) cf. *kor(č)* ‘curved’ > *korč* ‘gryphon, vulture’, which renders Gr. *γρυψ*, *-γρυπός* ‘gryphon, vulture’ in Deuteronomy 14.12. Note also dial. (Van) *kor-c’ənənek* ‘kite’ (see s.v.v. *korč* ‘vulture’ and *c’in* ‘kite’). The same semantics is also seen in the above mentioned Greek match of Arm. *korč*, viz. *γρυψ*, which means also ‘anchor’ or the like, and may be related or associated with *γρυπός* ‘hook-nosed, curved, hooked, aquiline’.

*angt*₂

●ETYM See s.v. *angt*₁.

angti ‘prostitute’.

Attested only in John Chrysostom: *Zangtin ew zsamti anun koč’es zbozn ew zpoīnikn*, see HAB 4: 168b (in 1: 185b - *poīnikn*). Not in NHB. In the above-cited passage, *angti* and *samti* are taken as synonyms to *boz* and *poīnik*, both meaning ‘prostitute’.

●DIAL No dialectal forms are recorded.

I hypothetically suggest a connection with Moks *āng’ūt* [Orbeli 2002: 202], *āng’ut* ‘a fruit that has fallen down the tree’ [M. Muradyan 1982 /HBrbAtl/: 137]. M. Muradyan (ibid.) treats it as composed of the suffix *-ut*, though the latter usually

expresses the idea of having sth. or abounding in sth. (see Jahukyan 1998: 35 for a list). [Could it be from *-oyt'*?]. The same root, viz. **ank-* in *ank-anim* 'to fall', has formed another synonym in the same dialect - *ang(a)uk* (see HayLezBrbBair 1, 2001: 56b), with the suffix *-uk*.

●**ETYM** No etymological attempt is known to me.

I think *angti* may be derived from *ankanim* / *anganim* 'to fall down', which also means 'to sin, prostitute' already in the classical period. The IE suffix **-ti(jo/eh₂)-* appears in Armenian as *-t'i*, *-di* (with voicing of the **-t-* after resonants) or *-ti* (under assimilatory influence of the preceding voiceless unaspirated stops; cf. *lkti* 'lewd, licentious', apparently from *lknim* 'to behave licentiously etc. (see 2.3.1, on **-ti-*). Thus, *ang-ti* (originally **ank-ti*, with secondary voicing like in *ankanim/anganim*) actually meant 'the fallen one'.

The synonymous *samti* (q.v.), also a hapax found next to *angti*, seems to be composed of the same suffix, but the root **sam-* is otherwise unknown.

and, in the Bible: mostly *o*-stem; in several times: *i*-stem (GDSg *and-i*, ISg *and-i-w*); LocSg *y-and-i* 'cornfield, arable field', dial. also 'pastureland'; **and-astan**, *a*-stem 'cornfield; estate' (Bible+). In Paterica, **hand**, with an initial *h-* (cf. the dialectal forms).

On Loc. *y-and-i* see below.

●**DIAL** Preserved mostly in northern and eastern dialects, with an initial *h-*: Karin, T'iflis, Ararat *hand*, Axalc'xa *hant*, Łarabał *händ*, etc. [HAB 1: 186b]. Ačaryan (1913: 637a) cites only the meaning 'cornfield, estate'. One finds considerable evidence pointing also to 'pastureland' (for some examples see below). This is confirmed by e.g. DialAdd apud NHB 2: 1064c as well: *hand* 'a superficial measure of pastureland that can be grazed in one day'.

Of the compounds and derivatives some deserve special attention: Łarabał *händ-ä-vär* 'estate, a landed property, house with all possessions' and Muš *hand-a-vor-ek* 'house-interior with courtyard etc.' [Ačarean 1913: 637ab; HAB 1: 186ab]. Further: Ararat, Muš, etc. (*h*)*and u* (*h*)*andastan* 'cornfields, landed property', Ararat *hand-awor* 'people working on cornfield' [Amatuni 1912: 30b, 386a]. The textual illustrations by Amatuni confirm that *hand* and its compounds mainly refer to cornfields and pastureland (see also below) rather than to fields in generic sense that are not involved in economy.

Udi *händ* 'cornfield' and *händävär* 'surroundings' are considered as Armenian loans [HAB 1: 186b]. One can be more specific: they are obviously borrowed directly from Łarabał.

The word *and* is scarcely represented in western dialects. Ačāryan records only Karin *and*, in a compound, Muš (see above). A further possible trace may be seen in Sebastia: *grotin antə* 'cornfield/pastureland of the Otherworld' [Gabikēan 1952: 60, 157] (cf. the corresponding IE notion, Puhvel 1969).

Textual illustrations for Ǝarabaš *händ-i* 'in a pastureland'. In HŽHek' 5, 1966: 538^{L16f}: *təesnum min händi min č'oban vexč'ar a ərəcc'nəm*: "sees (that) a shepherd grazes sheep in a pastureland"; in 540 and 609 - *händin*. In a riddle (Barxutareanc' 1898: 51): *Mi kov unem - handi a* "I have a cow, (which) is in pastureland". Further: HŽHek' 7, 1979: 209^{L5}, 215^{L3}, 464^{L5}. In a fairy-tale, it is told that a man goes to die in the field - *händi məəine* [NmušLernƎarab 1978: 81^{L6}].

In Lori, e.g. in a fairy-tale from the village of Šnoł (recorded by Hm. Mažinyan; see Nawasardeanc' 5, 1889: 64^{L-9}, 69^{L4}; = HŽHek' 8, 1977: 16^{L13}, 19^{L2}), where the Calf (*Mozi*) *gnum a handə racelu* "goes to the pastureland to graze".

The meaning 'pastureland' is also seen in Ǝ. Ałayan 1979: 626^{L17}: *Mi aravot, tavarə hand tanelu žamanak, <...>*: "One morning, at the time of taking the cattle to pastureland, <...>".

●**ETYM** Usually connected with Toch. A *ānt*, B *ānte* 'surface' [Lidén 1937: 89-91], Skt. *āndhas-* n. 'sprout of the Soma-plant', Gr. *ἄνθος* n. 'flower', *ἀνθέω* 'to bloom, blossom', etc., see Pokorny 1959: 40; Ĵahukyan 1963a: 89; 1987: 112, 157 (also *ənjuł* 'calf', q.v.); Illič-Svityč 1964: 4; Greppin 1983: 288; Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 873; Adams apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 207b; Matzinger 2005: 41.

However, Toch. A *ānt*, B *ānte* 'surface; forehead' is now derived from PIE **h₂ent-o-* < **h₂ent-* 'front, forehead', cf. Skt. *ānta-* 'end, limit', Hitt. *hant-*, etc. (see Adams 1999: 43, with lit.). Olsen (1999: 181-182) accepts the connection of Arm. *and* with the Tocharian < **h₂ent-o-*.

Ačāryan (HAB 1: 186a) notes that Ǝarabaš *händ-ä-vär* 'estate, a landed property, house with all possessions' and Muš *hand-a-vor-ek* 'house-interior with courtyard etc.' point to a collective meaning 'house and properties'. He (ibid.) takes *and* to be identic with *and-* 'door-frame, threshold, vestibule' (q.v.) which has also developed the meaning 'house', cf. dial. **andiwor* 'house-personal, family'.

Ačāryan's interpretation seems preferable. A semantic expansion seems to have taken place: 'door-frame, threshold, vestibule' > 'court, courtyard' > 'estate; household; family'; cf. OCS *dvorъ* 'court, courtyard', Lith. *dvāras* 'estate', Av. *duuar-* 'door, court', etc., from the PIE word for 'door' (Arm. *duin*, *dur-* 'door', cf. *i dur-s* 'outdoors, outside'). Note also Av. *aθāhuua* loc.pl. 'house' which probably derives from the PIE word for 'doorframe, doorposts' (cf. YAv. *qīθiā-* f.pl. 'door-post'). Further, note Arm. *and-i/-eay* 'cattle' (q.v.). The 'cornfield' is taken,

thus, as ‘the outer part of estate/properties’; cf. e.g. Moks *tərnart* ‘cornfields that are close to the village’ (“близкие к деревне поля”) [Orbeli 2002: 335], obviously composed of *duin* ‘door’ and *art* ‘cornfield’.

However, the word has both *o*-stem and *i*-stem, the former being dominant. Note also Arm. *und*, *o*-stem, *i*-stem, *a*-stem ‘edible seed, grain’, with initial *h*- in Nonnus etc. and in most of the dialects (q.v.), as well as Sem. **h-n-t* ‘grains’ which is usually compared with PIE **h₂end^h*-; see Illič-Svityč 1964: 4; Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 873; Jahukyan 1987: 450. Since the semantic relationship ‘cornfield’ : ‘grains’ is plausible (cf. Avest. *uruuarā-* ‘food plant’, Mlr. *arbor* ‘grain, corn’ vs. Gr. *ἄρουρα* ‘corn-lands, fields’, Skt. *urvārā-* ‘arable land, field yielding crop’, Arm. *harawunk* ‘sowing-field, arable land’, q.v.), one might suggest a conflation of two PArm. words: **and-i/-a-* ‘doorframe, vestibule’ > ‘house with landed properties’ vs. **(h)and*, *o*-stem ‘cornfield, pastureland’ and **(h)und*, *o*-stem ‘edible seed, grain’. For Arm. **(h)und* is probably from **h₂ond^h-os-*, with *h*- from zero-grade oblique stem. Alternatively: from Sem **h₂unt-*.

According to N. Simonyan (1979: 219-220), the initial *h*- of *hand* ‘cornfield’ comes from the PIE laryngeal. This cannot be excluded. The forms *hand* and *and* may reflect NSg **h₂enHt-* and obl. **h₂nt-* (or *h₂end^h*- and obl. **h₂nd^h*-), respectively. However, the vocalism of Łarabał *hānd* cannot be explained from **hand*. I suggest to treat it from **y-and* or **y-(h)and*, through Ačāryan’s Law, see 2.3.1. This form may have arisen due to generalization of the ClArm. locative *y-and-i*, seen in Łarabał *hānd-i* (see above).

***and-** ‘door-frame; threshold, vestibule’: dial. (Van, Surmalu) ***andiwor** ‘family; (euphem.) wife, spouse’; **and-astak** ‘vestibule’ (John Chrysostom); probably also dial. (Nerk’in Basen, Alaškert) ***and-kal** ‘a beam under which big pillars were put’; **dr-and** (prob. *i*-stem): NSg *drand*, API *z-dr-and-s*, GDP1 *drand-i-c* ‘(as a reading variant); **dr-and-i** (*ea*-stem): GDSg *drand-w-oy*, LocSg *at drand-w-oj*, NPI *drand-i-k*, GDP1 *drand-e-ac* ‘(all in the Bible) ‘space before a door, porch; threshold’ (Bible); dial. (Muš/Bulanəx, Hamšen, etc.) ***dr-and-i** ‘the upper horizontal part of the door-frame or at a balcony’, in Bulanəx also ***dr-and-ay** ‘id.’

Here are some of the biblical attestations of *dr-and(-i)*.

NSg *drand* is attested only in Isaiah 6.4: *verac’aw drandn i jaynēn* : ἐπὶ πύθῃ τὸ ὑπέρθυρον ἀπὸ τῆς φωνῆς (“the foundations of the thresholds shook at the voice of him”).

In Astuacaturean 1895: 414b one finds no forms indicating the *i*-stem of *drand*. The only evidence comes from Ezekiel 43.8 (NHB 1: 642c). Here, API *dr-and-s* is

found next to GDPI *drand-e-a-c'*, var. *dr-and-i-c'*. If *dr-and-i-c'* is reliable, it would point to *i*-stem. Otherwise, one has to admit that the form *drand* is not found in oblique cases.

In the same passage from Ezekiel 43.8, the word rendering Gr. *πρό-θυρον* 'front-door, porch, space before a door' is apposed with *seam* rendering *φλιά* 'doorpost, jamb'. Compare a different contrast of these words in the dialect of Muš/Bulanəx: *drəndi* 'the upper part of the door-frame' vs. *šem-k'* 'the lower part of the door-frame'; see below.

In Judges 19.26-27: *ankaw ar drandwoy dran tan ainna <.....> ew jein iwr i veray drandwoyn*: ἔπεσεν παρὰ τὴν θύραν τοῦ πυλῶνος τοῦ οἴκου τοῦ ἀνδρός <.....> καὶ αἱ χεῖρες ἐπὶ τὸ πρόθυρον ('fell down at the door of the man's house <.....> with her hands on the threshold'). As we can see, here *παρὰ τὴν θύραν τοῦ πυλῶνος* (with *πύλη* 'house-door; entrance; one wing of a pair of double gates') is translated as *ar drandwoy dran*, and in the second part of the passage *drandi* corresponds to *πρό-θυρον*.

In *ar drandwoy dran*, **dur-* 'door' appears twice. The same is also seen in dialects: Bulanəx *dran dərəndi* (see below). One may assume that the component *dur-* 'door' in the compound *dr-and-i* is petrified.

NHB and HAB give only biblical attestations for *drand(i)*. Hübschmann (1897: 419) cites also *Aristotle*, *De mundo* 620.

and-astak 'vestibule', attested only in John Chrysostom, belongs here too [HAB 1: 186b, 187-188]. According to NHB (1: 131), *a*-stem, though none of the three attestations cited in NHB provides with information on the declension class.

●DIAL Muš/Bulanəx *d'ərəndi* 'the upper part of the door-frame' [HAB 1: 186b; Amatuni 1912: 172b], Van *tərəndi* [Ačaryan 1952: 257], Hamšen *dərəndi* 'the horizontal beam at a balcony' [Ačaryan 1947: 226].

In Muš/Bulanəx one finds the following contrast: *drəndi* 'the upper part of the door-frame' vs. *šem-k'* 'the lower part of the door-frame' [S. Movsisyan 1972: 15a]. See also HayLezBrbBaṛ 1, 2001: 351b, where the meaning is represented as 'the upper wood of the door-frame'. This meaning of *drəndi* can be confirmed by textual illustrations from folklore.

In a fairy-tale told by Fidan Makaryan (native of Muš/Bulanəx, the village of Kop') in Leninakan in 1930-36, the spouses Nīno and Dīno close the door, put the key "above the *drndi* of the door" (*dṛan dərndu verew*) and leave (HŽHek' 10, 1967: 365^{L12}; cf. also 365^{L-8}). Then someone approaches the door and stretches his hand above the *drndi* (*jeṛk' gerkənc'u dərndu verew*) and finds the key (365^{L-1f}). In the glossary of this collection of fairy-tales the word is represented as follows: *dərnda* ·

dran cixni "hinge of the door". It is clear from the context, however, that the word refers to the upper wood of the doorframe, lintel'. This is clearly confirmed by a passage from another fairy-tale told by the same person (op. cit. 85^{L4f}): *es ketnim çj, kə k'ašvim drān drnden, axperd ɔr gika, zpučučak kə xet'im, meɾc'um* : "I will turn into a snake, I'll go to the *drnda* of the door. When your brother comes, I'll bite his occiput (back of the head) and kill him".

As we have seen, the word is glossed as *dərnda*. In the passages above the word occurs in GDSg *dərndu/drəndu* and NALocSg *drnde-n* (with the definite article *-n*). The former presupposes NSg **drand-i* (thus, the classical form), and the latter - **drand-ay* (that is, the form glossed in the fairy-tale collection).

Note *drān drənd-*, as in Judges 19.26-27: *ar drandwoy drān* (see above). Thus, **dur-* in the compound *dr-and(-i)* has probably been frozen. A similar passage is found in a fairy-tale told by illiterate Nanuxas Aṭekyan (< Alaškert/Garak'ilisa) and recorded by Nazaret' Martirosyan in Yerevan in 1915, [HŽHek' 9, 1968: 201, lines 15 and 21], where also the key is put onto the lintel of the door: *drān dərənt/din*.

One concludes that in Muš (Bulanəx, Alaškert) the meaning 'the upper horizontal part of the door-frame, lintel' of *drəndi* (as correctly given by Ačāryan in HAB) is reliable. A similar meaning is seen in Hamšen. As to the form, in Muš/Bulanəx one finds both **dr-and-i* and **dr-and-ay*.

Melik'ean (1964: 484b) represents the meaning of Xnus (also belonging to Muš-group) *drndi* as follows: "threshold, wooden poles at the four sides of the door (*/č'ardara/*)". The actual meaning seems to be, thus, 'door-frame'.

In HayLezBrbBaṛ 1, 2001: 350b, a nominative in *drind* is recorded, though in the textual illustration one finds NALoc/AllSg *drənti*. If reliable, NSg **drind* must be due to a wrong-restoration of *-i*.

Note also Ararat, Lori, Širak *drind*, usually described as 'the upper/inner, soft part of the hand' [Amatuni 1912: 171b; Ačārean 1913: 289a; HayLezBrbBaṛ 1, 2001: 350b], of which no etymology is known to me. Perhaps from *drandī*, by a semantic shift 'upper-door' > 'upper-surface of hand'; cf. Moks *ceṛac' tanis* 'поверхность кисти руки', lit. 'roof of hand' (see Orbeli 2002: 253).

Surmalu *andəvor* 'family', Van *andivor* 'family' > (euphem.) 'wife, spouse' [HAB 1: 186b].

In Nerk'in Basen, the building of the roof was started with the beams that were called *andkal*, under which big pillars (i.e. the doorposts? - HM) were put [Hakobyan 1974: 123]. This seems identic with Alaškert *ant'kal*, the Bulanəx equivalent of which is *ankaj*, lit. '(anatom.) ear' (see S. Movsisyan 1972: 13b, with a thorough description). I was not able to find this word in dictionaries. S. Movsisyan (ibid.)

interprets *ant'kal* as **anut'-a-kal*, composed of *anut'* 'armpit' and *kal-* 'to take, grasp, support'. This is not convincing. One may identify the first component rather with **and-* 'door-frame, door-posts'. For the typology of a compound with *kal* cf. Muš, Van Širak **erdis-kal* 'a cover for the roof-opening' [Amatuni 1912: 178a].

Čanikean (1895: 275, Nr. 893) records a phrase from Akn: *ɔxtə ond onc'av*, which he interprets as follows: "(He/she) visited many houses door by door", lit. "(He/she) passed seven *ond*-s". On *ond* Čanikean (ibid.) notes: "perhaps *and*". Unfortunately, he does not specify this *and*. The sound change *an > on* is regular in the dialect of Akn, cf. *onc'av < anc'aw* 'passed' in the very same phrase. One is tempted to assume that we are dealing with an indispensable evidence for the independent root **and* 'threshold'. [Compare also op. cit. 282^{L-7f}; unclear].⁵

●**ETYM** Connected with Skt. *ātā-* f.pl. 'door-frame, door-posts', YAv. *aiθiiā-* f.pl. 'door-post' (only pl.), Lat. *antae* f.pl. 'square pilasters, wall posts of a temple', OIc. *qnd* f 'front room, corridor' [Hübschmann 1897: 419; HAB 1: 186b; Meillet 1950: 65; Greppin 1983: 289]. The Sanskrit and the Latin point to **h₂(e)nHt-eh₂-* (see Schrijver 1991: 311; Mayrhofer, EWAia 1: 163). Here also probably Av. (Pursišnīhā 36) *aθāhuua* 'house', loc.pl. of *aθā-* 'house', with extension of 'doorposts' to 'house' [Vaan 2003: 136]. Note also Arm. dial. **dr-and-ay* (see below). Beekes (apud Vaan 2003: 136) suggests a hysterodynamic paradigm nom.sg. **h₂énHt-h₂*, acc.sg. **h₂nHt-éh₂-m*, gen.sg. **h₂nHt-h₂ós > PIIr. **ánti, *ātām, *ā^hás. YAv. *aiθiiā-* would be then a derivative **antiā*.**

In view of Skt. and Latin **ā* stems, Godel (1975: 72₅₄) points out that the *i* inflection of the Armenian "is certainly not the original one". The Armenian form seems closely related with the Iranian [Olsen 1999: 448]. For Armenian **dr-and-i-* : **dr-and-ea-* I suggest an interchange **-ih₂-* : **-ich₂-* or a hysterodynamic paradigm

⁵ In the same dialect of Akn [Čanikean 1895: 153^{L18f}], one finds a phrase *hanterk'i ε ərast eker* : "(he/she) has met *hanter-k'* (spirits)". To avoid this evil, one has to recall the Holy Trinity and cross upon one's face when passing over a threshold (ibid.). One could therefore interpret *hanterk'* as a designation for the "threshold-spirits" composed as **hand-* 'threshold' + pl/coll. *-e(a)r* + pl. *-k'*. However, I wonder whether *hanterk'* is not a misprint for **handēp-k'* 'an illness caused by spirits' found in Akn, Aslanbek, Polis, Partizak, etc., cf. ClArm. *handip-* 'to meet, occur' [Ačarean 1913: 637b; Tēr-Yakobean 1960: 508; HAB 1: 660-661; 3: 39b]. Note also Xarberd **hampert-k'* 'evil spirits living on thresholds' (see Ačarean 1913: 634), the structure of which is unclear. Somehow related with the metathesized form of *handip-* 'to meet, occur', viz. dial. *hanptel* (found e.g. in HŽHek'10, 1967: 103^{L5}; also *hambədel* in Erazgavors, my mother's village)?

NSg **h₂énHt-ih₂*, ASg **h₂(e)nHt-ieh₂-m*, GSg **h₂nHt-ih₂-ós*. Note that Arm. by-form *drand* is not found in oblique cases (except in a reading variant).

Arm. **and-* is usually said to be found only in the compound *dr-and(i)*, and the meaning of the latter is represented as 'doorposts' or 'threshold'. The dialectal material helps to induce some corrections here. Since *drand(i)* refers to either upper part of the door-frame or to the threshold (in Xnus, 'door-frame'), one may assume that the basic meaning is 'door-frame', cf. Skt. *ātā-* 'door-frame'. We have seen that PArm. **and-* is also found in other formations in dialects (perhaps even independently, in Akn), as well as in *and-astak* 'vestibule' (John Chrysostom). Furthermore, see s.v. *and* 'cornfield'.

According to Olsen (1999: 677²⁹, 768), the loss of the internal laryngeal in Armenian may be compositional. However, as we have seen, PArm. **and-* is not found only in the compound *dr-and(i)*. On the internal laryngeal see 2.1.20. For the discussion of *dr-andi-* (also with respect to the problem of *nd*) see also Clackson 1994: 36ff, 41, 56.

V. Arak'elyan (1984: 88) takes *-and* in the word *dr-and* as a suffix, which cannot be accepted.

Further, see s.v. *and* 'cornfield'.

andi, *o*-stem: GSg *and-w-o-y*, GDPl *and-w-o-c'* (Bible+), **andeay**, mostly pl. **andeay-k'**: APl *andeay-s*, GDPl *and-ē-o-c'* (Bible+), GDPl *andeay-c'* (Afrahat/Zgōn), *andē-i-c'* (Aristakēs Lastivertc'i) 'cattle; cattle herd'.

In the Bible one finds a few attestations of GDPl *andw-o-c'* (also with prepositions *y-*, *z-*); in Numbers, AblSg *y-andw-o-y* is attested many times, in the following pattern: *zuarak mi/erkus* 'one/two' (or pl. *zuarak-s*) *yandwoy* [Astuacaturean 1895: 93a]. [The latter, thus - *andi* (coll.) 'herd'?]. As for *andeay*, the following forms are attested in the Bible: NPl *andeay-k'*, APl *andeay-s*, GDPl *andē-o-c'* [Astuacaturean 1895: 92-93]. For other forms see NHB 1: 132. A collective form without the plural marker *-k'* in the meaning 'cattle herd' is found in Genesis 18.7 (Zeyt'unyan 1985: 219), in allative *y-andeay*: *yandeay ant'ac'aw Abraam ew ar' ort' mi mataf ew bari*: *καὶ εἰς τὰς βόας ἔδραμεν Ἀβραὰμ καὶ ἔλαβεν μοσχάριον ἀπαλὸν καὶ καλὸν*: "And Abraham ran to the herd, and took a calf, tender and good".

andē-ord, *a*-stem 'herdsman', usually occurring in apposition with *hoviw* 'shepherd', as in Movsēs Xorenac'i 2.38 (1913=1991: 164^{L1}), in GDPl *andēord-a-c'*.

●**ETYM** According to NHB (1: 132a), derived from *and* 'cornfields etc.'. Ačāryan (HAB 1: 188b) does not accept this and cites no other etymologies. Ĵahukyan

(1963a: 89; 1987: 112, 157) develops the etymology of NHB adding also s.v. *ənjut* and for the structure compares *vayr* ‘field, uncultivated grounds’ > *vayr-i* ‘wild’. See also s.v. *art-i*.

andruar ‘cart, wagon; horse or mule yoked to a cart’.

Attested in Agat’angelos, Łazar P’arpec’i, Severian of Gabala, John Chrysostom, etc. Spelled also as *andr(u)a**var*.

●**ETYM** Mentioning earlier attempts to explain *andruar* as containing *var-* ‘to lead etc.’, Ačaryan (HAB 1: 192b) leaves the origin of the word open. Ałayan (1974: 20-22) connects with *anur* ‘ring’, which is implausible.

L. Hovhannisyān (1991a: 147) treats as composed of Iran. *andar* ‘interior’ and *var* ‘cover’ (seen also in *žan-uar* ‘palanquin’), thus: ‘a cart with covered interior’. Being the best explanation known to me, this too is unconvincing. I propose an alternative etymology, though neither this is entirely convincing.

Whether or not related (or contaminated) with *var-* ‘to lead etc.’ or *var-* ‘to cover’, the second component **war* could be identic with that found in *žan-uar* ‘palanquin’ and *eriw/var* ‘fine horse’. As to **andr*, one might assume that it has meant ‘cart, wagon’ and is connected with Skt. *ādhvan-* m. ‘road’ (RV+), OAv. *aduan-*, YAv. *aδβan-* m. ‘road’ from PIE **h₁ndʰ-uen-*; Skt. *adhvará-* m. ‘(Soma-)sacrifice, ceremony’ (RV+) < **h₁ndʰ-uer-* (probably, an original heteroclitic noun **adhvar-/adhvan-* ‘(holy) road’); cf. OIc. *qndurr* ‘snow-shoe’ < PIE **h₁ondʰ-ur-o-*, Gr. *ἐνθεῖν* (aor.) ‘come’ < PIE **h₁ndʰ-e/o-*.

Thus, perhaps, **h₁ndʰ-ur-* ‘road’ > PArm. **and(u)r* ‘cart, wagon’. For the semantic relationship cf. PIE **uegʰ-* (see Mallory/Adams 1997: 488a). Compare especially OIc. *qndurr* ‘snow-shoe’ (< PIE **h₁ondʰ-ur-o-*), which is close to Armenian both formally (**-ur-*) and semantically, since the essential part of both snow-shoes and sleighs consists of a pair of wooden strips that enable gliding on snow.

The basic meaning of the compound would be, then, ‘(attached to) cart/wagon’.

[Van **andrac’ic’* ‘a part of the wagon’ [Ačarean 1913: 97a; HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 57b] seems to be composed as **andr* + *-a-* + *c’ic’* ‘pole’. The first component could be the same **andr* ‘cart, wagon’, unless it is identic with the prefix *andra-* (cf. *t’erac’ic’*, with *t’er* ‘side’, etc. see Ačarean 1913: 358b).

andund-k’, *o*-stem: GDPl *andnd-o-c’*, frequent in the Bible; Tumanjan (1978: 161) cites also GSg. *andnd-i*, adding that the word has an *a*-stem, too. However, she does not specify her sources, and I could not find any trace of declensions other than the

o-type (cf. NHB; HAB; Astuacaturean 1895: 93; Jahukyan 1959: 272; Olsen 1999: 28, 834). ‘abyss’.

●DIAL Preserved in a number of dialects; in some of them, as petrified plural. Some dialects show alternations in the anlaut: Muš *h’and’unt*, Alaškert *h’antut* (in HAB 3: 39a - *h’andud*), Šatax *h’ändüt’k’y*, Moks *händüt’k’*, Nor Bayazet *handund*, Agulis *ä’ändünt’k’*, Salmast, Urmia (Xoy) *ändüt’k’y* [HAB 1: 191a; Ačaryan 1952: 245; M. Muradyan 1962: 94 (the paradigm of Šatax *h’ändüt’k’y*), 192a; M. Asatryan 1962: 191b].

According to Bałdasaryan-T’ap’alc’yan (1958: 245, 245₁), Muš has *h’andundk’*, the use of which is restricted to a single expression. However, note HŽHek’ 13, 1985: 11 (*h’andundk’*) and 60 (*andund*). Next to Alaškert *h’andədel* ‘to get lost underground’ Ačaryan (HAB 3: 39a) also mentions Muš *h’andədel* ‘to calm down’, which, if indeed related, should be understood as *‘to get peace by getting rid of smth./smb.’; cf. *atak(v)el* s.v. *yatak* ‘bottom’.

Some of the dialects represent forms without the second nasal: Alaškert *h’antut* (in HAB 3: 39a: *h’andud*), T’iflis *andut’k*, Šatax *h’ändüt’k’y*, Mokk’ *händüt’k’*, Salmast, Urmia (Xoy) *ändüt’k’y* [HAB 1: 191a; Ačaryan 1952: 245; M. Muradyan 1962: 94, 192a; Asatryan 1962: 191b]. Łarabał *əndəxtə* [Davt’yan 1966: 310] may belong here, too (see below). The isogloss sets off the dialect group 7 (Van - Urmia - Łarabał area), and the northern (T’iflis) and eastern parts of the dialect group 2 (the line runs between Muš and Alaškert; cf. Muš *h’andundk’* vs. Alaškert *h’antut/h’andud*). Similar isoglosses often comprise group 6, too (I hope to discuss this issue elsewhere), but in this particular case a different development has taken place in the dialects of the Mełri area of group 6.

It has been argued that, if initial ClArm. *a-* corresponds to Šatax *h’ä-*, Van *ä-* and Muš *h’a-*, we may safely restore an old by-form with an initial **y-* (see 2.3.1). In Weitenberg’s (1986: 96) list, **y-andund-k’* is found, too. In this particular case, Van only has *andundk’* (see Ačaryan 1952: 245). However, the remaining evidence seems sufficient to confirm the reconstruction. The forms with *y-* can be explained from prefixation with *y* < PIE **h₁en* ‘in’; cf. Weitenberg 1986: 94. As regards **y-andund-k’*, this is easy to understand since *andund* and other synonyms discussed here are frequently used in allative contexts, particularly in idioms, curses and spells of the structure “may you/the Evil eye go to Black abyss/hell; he went to/disappeared in abyss/hell”. The pattern is widespread. The preverb *i/y-* (cf. Weitenberg 1986: 93-94) may also have played a role here; cf. **y-andndim* ‘to get lost underground, to get rid of smth., smb.’.

In a variant of the Armenian epic told by Kazaryan T'aro of Hayoc' jor (Van) and first published in 1909, we find *hantūt'k'* [Sasna ç'ēr 1, 1936: 1062]. More evidence is needed. If reliable, this *h-* requires a separate discussion since the *ya-* and *ha-* yield Van *ä-* and *xa-* respectively. A few such examples can be found in Ač'aryan 1952: 101. I wonder whether this issue can be discussed in terms of the twofold development of the initial prevocalic *y-* as demonstrated by Weitenberg (1997).

In some of the dialects of the Metri area belonging to group 6 one finds **dund* instead of *andund(k')*: Metri *dünd* [Ač'aryan 1954: 295]; Karčewan *dünd* [H. Muradyan 1960: 192a], Kak'avaberd *dund* [H. Muradyan 1967: 169b].

Łarabat' (Martakert, Step'anakert) *əndōxtə*, *əndōxtənə* and *əndōxnə* (see Davt'yan 1966: 56, 310).

●**ETYM** Armenian *andund-k'*, *o*-stem 'abyss' is a privative compound of PIE **b^hud^hno-* (probably from older **b^hud^hmno-* which resulted from an original paradigm NSg **b^hud^h-mēn*, GSg **b^hud^h-mn-ós*): Skt. *budhna-* m. 'bottom, ground, depth; lowest part of anything (as the root of a tree etc.)', OAv. *būna-* 'ground', Pahl. *bun* 'base, foundation, bottom', Arm. *bun* 'trunk of a tree; shaft of a spear' (Iranian loanword; see also s.v. *bun-k*), Gr. *πυθμήν*, *-έρος* m. 'bottom (of a cup or jar); base, foundation; bottom of the sea, depth; stock, root of a tree; stem, stalk', OHG *bodam*, etc., see Meillet 1903c: 430 = 1978: 171; HAB 1: 190; Pokorny 1959: 174; Solta 1960: 285-286; Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984: 488-489 = 1995: 408; cf. Lagarde 1854: 11^{L213f}. Not included in Greppin 1983.

The metathesis **-d^hn- > -nd-* may be old since it is also found in Lat. *fundus* 'bottom', OIr. *bond* 'sole', MInd., Dard., Prakr. *bundha-* n. 'root', FPerm. (< Iran.) **punta-* 'ground, bottom' [Schrijver 1991: 501; Mayrhofer, EWAia 2, 1996: 228-229; Olsen 1999: 28₅₁] (Gr. *πύνδαξ*, *-ακος* m. 'bottom of a jar, cup, or other vessel' is problematic).

Meillet (ibid.) explains the change of the initial **b^h-* to Arm. **d-* from contamination with **d^hubno-* 'deep' though there is no trace of this adjective in Armenian. With respect to this IE form cf. Pedersen 1906: 353 = 1982: 131; Ĵahukyan 1987: 161. Note especially Welsh *annwn* 'the otherworld' < **sans fond*'; see Vendryes 1914: 307-309; Ĵahukyan 1992: 20-21. For the discussion of Celt. **an-dub-no-* I refer to Lejeune 1982: 107-111; Eska 1992 (with bibl.; I am indebted to P. Schrijver for this reference); Delamarre 2001:42.

This solution cannot be ruled out. More probable is, however, the assumption on an assimilation: *b...d > d...d*, see Vendryes 1914: 309; Pokorny 1959: 174; Solta 1960: 285-286; Ĵahukyan 1987: 117. The assimilation could be triggered by the dental nasal of the privative prefix. In other words, we are dealing with an

assimilation *nb...nd* > *nd...nd*. This would imply that there was no PArm. **dund-*, and that the dialectal form **dund* (Karčewan, Kak'avaberd; see above) must be considered secondary. Instead, there were the two forms **bund-* 'bottom' versus **an-bund-* > *an-dund-k'* 'bottomless'. Subsequently, **bund-* was lost. In this respect, Olsen's (1999: 28) assumption that the "synchronically opaque" *andund-k'* is an old privative compound PIE **h₂-b^hud^hno-* comparable with Skt. *a-budhna-* 'bottomless' (RV 1.24.7; 8.77.5) seems plausible. Note also Pahl. *a-bun* ['bwn] 'baseless, bottomless' (see MacKenzie 1971: 4). However, one cannot be absolutely sure whether we are dealing with a shared innovation or independent developments in Indo-Iranian and Armenian. Compare also Gr. *ἄβυσσος* 'bottomless, unfathomed', subst. f. 'the great deep; the abyss, underworld' beside *βυθός* m. 'the depth (esp. of the sea)', *βυσσός* m. 'depth of the sea', though these forms are unclear (see below).

It is attractive to compare the dial. by-form **(y)an-dud*, without the nasal before the final *-d*, directly to Gr. *ἄβυσσος* 'bottomless; abyss, underworld' (possibly from **h₂-bud^h-io-*), cf. *βυθός* m., *βυσσός* m. 'the depth of the sea'. However, the etymological relationship of these Greek forms with the PIE word under discussion is unclear. As for the Łarabał *ən-dóxtə*, its possible protoform **an-duft-* is reminiscent of Alb. *det*, dial. [de:t] m. 'sea' (< **Meerestiefe*) < **d^heub-eto-*; cf. Goth. *diupīpa* 'depth' (see Huld 1984: 50; Beekes 1995: 261; Demiraj 2001: 68). This is risky. The absence of the nasal may be due to a dissimilatory loss, though I could not find any convincing parallel to that. Furthermore, the Łarabał form can be explained in a simpler way; see below.

The form **dund* in the Metri area is probably secondary (i.e. a back-formation from *an-dund*), since the original root-form should have been **bund*, unless one accepts the idea about the influence of **d^hub-*. I am not even sure that **dund* belongs to *andundk'*. Muradyan does not specify the meaning of the forms of Karčewan and Kak'avaberd. As regards the Metri form, Ałayan glosses it as meaning 'small hillock' (stressing that this is the root of *andund*), and I do not understand the semantic motivation. Note also Metri *dend* 'hill' [Ałayan 1954: 295].

Łarabał *əndóxtə*, *əndóx(t)nə* is explained by Davt'yan (1966: 56) by a metathesis *-ndk' > -k'dn*, which seems improbable. Besides, we need not start with the Classical form (pl. tant.) *andund-k'* since the plural marker is not lexicalized in the majority of dialects (see HAB), among them also in Šamaxi (see Bałramyan 1964: 187), which is one of the closest to Łarabał, also in Burdur (see N. Mkrtč'yan 1971: 177a), the speakers of which migrated from Łarabał in the beginning of the 17th century. (The word is not recorded in Goris; see Margaryan 1975). The alternative possibility that Łarabał **an-duft-* goes back to a PArm. form which differs from that of *andund-*

cannot be ruled out completely, but it is unlikely and even unnecessary since a much simpler solution can be offered. Łarabał **əndox(t)nə* and **əndox(t)nə* might be explained by a folk-etymological reinterpretation as **ənd oxt(n)* ‘at the seven(th layer of the Underworld)’. According to the Armenian folk-beliefs, the Underworld consists of seven layers; cf. also the curse: *getnin oxt tat’ə anc’nis* ‘may you pass into the seventh layer of the earth (= hell)’ [S. Harut’yunyan 2000: 11, 438]. The occurrence of the preposition *ənd* in connection with Underworld can be illustrated, for instance, by a prayer recorded in Šamšadin: *ənd andunden* and *ənd andunds* [Xemč’yan 2000: 246b]. The variant **əndox(t)nə* shows an additional *-n* (for which see Weitenberg 1985); cf. Łarabał *oxnə* (< *oxtə* ‘seven’) ‘funerary rite on the seventh day after the death’ (see Lisic’yan 1981: 52; Davt’yan 1966: 349). For the reflexes of *ənd* in the dialect of Łarabał see HAB 2: 124b; Davt’yan 1966: 352.

For further analysis see s.v. *yatak* ‘bottom’.

anid ‘a bird’.

Attested only in the long recension of “Ašxarhac’oyc’”, Armenian Geography of the 7th century, among the grazing birds (*hawk’ čarakawork’*) of the province of Barjr Hayk’, i. e. Upper Armenia [Soukry 1881: 30 (Arm. text), 40 (French transl.)]. The short recension mentions here only *haws pitanis* Apl ‘useful birds’ without specifications [A. G. Abrahamyan 1944: 349].

Soukry translates *anid* as ‘aside’. He seems to consider it to be a corruption for *asid*, but the latter birdname is merely a transliteration of the Hebrew word in Job 39.13 /Gr. *ἀσιδα* ‘stork’/ [HAB 1: 268b]; cf. Hewsén 1992: 59, 153₂₄: *zasid* ‘stork’. Ačairyan (HAB 1: 195), Eremyan (1963: 96a, 106a, 107b), and Ananyan (HayKendAšx 3, 1965: 29₆) do not specify the bird. Not mentioned in Greppin 1978.

●**ETYM** No etymology whatsoever is proposed for the word.

I wonder whether one can connect it to PIE **h₂(e)nHti-* ‘duck’, cf. Skt. *āti-* ‘a water bird’, Lat. *anas*, GSg *anatis* (also *anit-*) ‘duck’, Lith. *antis* ‘duck’, etc. For the discussion of other possible but problematic cognates I refer to Beekes 1969: 197; 1985: 63-64; Euler 1979: 132; Fulk 1988: 153-154, 170-171 (on PGerm. **anuđi-*); Schrijver 1991: 94-95; Rix 1991; M. Meier-Brügger 1993; Greppin apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 171; Cheung 2002: 111, 149 (on Oss. *acc/accæ* ‘wild duck’); etc. On the reconstruction of the PIE paradigm see Beekes 1985: 63-64; Mayrhofer, EWAia 1: 163. The medial laryngeal is **h₂* if Gr. *νῆσσα*, Boeot. *νᾶσσα* ‘duck’ is related.

From the zero-grade form one would expect Arm. **and-*, cf. s.v. *(dr)and-i* ‘threshold’. In the hypothetical paradigm NSg **and*, GSg **and-i*, the nominative

might have been reshaped analogically (after words like *ak'is*, GSg *ak'si* 'weasel'; *karič*, GSg *karči* 'scorpion'; etc.) to one of the possible forms, viz. **anud* or **anid*.

The semantic fluctuation between 'grazing bird' and 'water bird' can be illustrated by *araws₂* 'bustard; stork' (q.v.). If *araws₂* is indeed related to *araws*, one should note that the latter is another hapax occurring in the same passage from "Ašxarhac'oyc'" beside *anid*. It is remarkable that in Movsēs Xorenac'i 3.59 (1913=1991: 338) the numerous *hawk' čarakawork'* (see above) are mentioned in (a part of) the same province of Barjr Hayk', *gawaŕ Karnoy*, which abounds in water, marshes, reeds and grasses; see s.v. *araws* for more detail. In such an environment the above-mentioned fluctuation is even more probable.

Although all the steps involved in this tentative etymology seem reasonable, on the whole it remains uncertain.

ant', anut', *o*-stem, *i*- or *a*-stem 'armpit', dial. also 'embrace, grasp', 'bundle', 'shoulder, back', etc.

Bible+. The *o*-stem is seen in Jeremiah 38.12: *ənd ant'-ov-k'*. Next to *o*-stem, Ačāryan (HAB 1: 207b) records also *i*-stem. The following forms are attested: GDSg *ant'i*, AblSg *y-ant'-ē* (Paterica apud NHB 1: 220b); Loc/AllSg *y-ant'-i*, found in P'awstos Buzand 3.18 (1883=1984: 41^{L4}; transl. Garsoĭan 1989: 93): *mēn mi yant'i harealk'*: "each one taking one [of them] under his arm"; GDPl *ant'-ic'* in Ēwond (see NHB 2: 1044b, in the appendix).

NASg *anut'* (also in *y-anut'*) is attested in 2 Maccabaeorum 12.40, Łazar P'arpec'i, Movsēs Xorenac'i 2.85 (1913=1991: 230^{L13}), etc. In oblique cases and derivatives, as well as the verb *ant'em*, *-u-* is regularly syncopated (*ant'-*). Later (Mxit'ar Herac'i, "Čarəntir"), one finds NAPI *ant'/d-k'*, *-s*, without the *-u-*. According to Vardanean (HandAms 1922: 280, see HAB s.v.), the form *ant'* is a corruption. As correctly argued by Ačāryan (HAB 1: 207c), however, the form *ant'* is corroborated by the dialectal forms. In 1947: 35, Ačāryan states that Hamšen *ənt'* points to the original form. Note also the newly found attestation in "Kc'urdk'" by Ephrem Asori: NPI *and-k'* [L. Hovhannisyan 1987: 137].

Lately attested *ant'-a-tak* 'armpit' is represented in NHB 2: 1043c as a dialectal word. Indeed, this compound is recorded in a number of dialects; see below.

● **DIAL** Van, Moks *hünt'*, Šatax *hunt'* 'armpit', compound with *tak* 'below, under': Van (*h*)*nt'-i-tak*, *ənt'-a-tak*, verb *hənt'el*, Moks *hənt'-ə-tak* [HAB 1: 29, 130, 207-208; Ačāryan 1952: 245; M. Muradyan 1962: 192a], Bulanəx *h'ant'etak* [S. Movsisyan 1972: 71a]. According to Orbeli (2002: 226), Moks (the village of Aĭnanc') *ənt'etak* refers to 'peġpo' (= 'rib'). For a textual illustration of Van *ənt'i*

tak see Ter-Mkrtč'yan 1970: 149a. The voiced *h*'- in Bulanəx, Šatax etc. point to **y*-, see 2.3.1

Zeyt'un *ɔnt*' 'embrace', Hačən *ɔnt*' 'bundle', Maraš *ɔnt*' 'shoulder, back' [Ač'aryan 2003: 298].

Hamšen *ɔnt*', *ɔnt*' 'embrace, grasp', *ɔnt*'*u*š, *ɔntu*š' 'to embrace', *ɔnt*'-*t*/*dag*' 'armpit' (with *tak* 'below, under') [Ač'aryan 1947: 12, 35, 177, 221].

Apart from Hamšen and Van-group, the compound *ant*'-*a*/*i*-*tak* is also found in Muš (*h*'*ant*'*etak*) and Alaškert (*h*'*ant*'*etak*) [HAB 1: 208a]; according to Bałdasaryan-T'ap'alc'yan (1958: 245b): Muš *h*'*ant*'*et**ag*. In view of the correspondence between Moks and Šatax *h*'- and Muš *h*'- we may reconstruct **y*-*ant*'*Vtak* (see 2.3.1).

The vowel -*ü/u*- in Van-group needs an explanation since the vocalic development *a* > *ü/u* is exceptional for these dialects [Ač'aryan 1952: 29; M. Muradyan 1962: 34]. In Muš and Alaškert the word *an(u)t*' is found only in the compound **y*-*ant*'*Vtak* and has not been preserved independently (not in HAB, Bałdasaryan-T'ap'alc'yan 1958 and Madat'yan 1985); cf. Muš, Alaškert **ačuk*-*tak* (see s.v. *ačuk* 'groin'). I assume that the word was lost also in Van-group but then has been restored secondarily after *h*'*ant*'*Vtak*, as if reflecting NSg **yunt*' vs. oblique and compositional **y(ə)nt*'-; see 2.3.1. It is hard to say whether the -*u*- of ClArm. *anut*' has played a role here.

●**ETYM** Bugge (1893: 2) derived from the PIE word for 'axle' (cf. Skt. *ákṣ-a-* m., Lat. *ax-is*, Lith. *aš-is*, OHG *ahsa* f., etc.), assuming a development **akṣn*- > **asn-ut*'. For the semantics cf. Lat. *axilla* 'armpit', OHG *uohsana*, OEngl. *ōxn* 'armpit', etc. Though accepted by Pokorny (1959: 6) and, with some reservation, by Greppin (1983: 292-293), the etymology causes phonological and morphological problems and is rejected by Ač'aryan (HAB 1: 207b) and Ĵahukyan (1983: 88).

Ĵahukyan (1983: 88) compares with Lith. *antīs* 'bosom', *už-antīs* 'bosom; armpit', Latv. *azuōts* 'bosom', considering the -*u*- of NSg *anut*' as an analogical restoration. The Baltic has no etymology (Fraenkel 1: 12). In order to explain the aspirated dental -*t*'- of the Armenian form, Ĵahukyan restores a by-form **anthi*- (next to **anti*- > *and*) which is ad hoc. I therefore propose the following solution.

In 2.1.18 and 2.1.22.12-13 I try to demonstrate that an aspirated dental stop that follows -*n*- or -*r*- may be explained by additional factors such as the influence of a following PIE laryngeal or the reconstruction of another consonant between the sonant and the dental. The former factor would help to reformulate the etymology of Ĵahukyan by assuming a thematic formation based on fem. **h*₂(*V*)*nt*-*eh*₂-. Thus: **h*₂(*V*)*nt*-*h*₂-*o*- > PArm. **ant*'-*o*- vs. **h*₂(*V*)*nt*-*i*- or **h*₂(*V*)*nt*-*eh*₂- > **and*-*i*/*a*-; for

other examples and discussion see 2.2.2.6. On the other hand, one may take into account the latter factor and alternatively derive Arm. *ant*‘ from PIE **h₂enk-* ‘to bend, curve’: Skt. *āñcati* ‘to bend’, *anīka-* m. ‘hook, clamp’, *anīkas-* n. ‘curve’ (RV+), Gr. *ἀγκ-* ‘to curve’, *ἀγκάλη* f., mostly pl. ‘curved arm, armfull’, *ἀγκύλος* ‘curved, bent’, *ἀγκών*, *-ῶνος* m. ‘elbow’, Lat. *ancus* ‘with crooked arms’, OHG *angul* ‘fishhook’, SerbCS *okotъ* ‘hook’ f., ORuss. f. *ukotъ* ‘claw, anchor’, etc. (see Schrijver 1991: 43, 51, 60; Mayrhofer, EWAia 1: 52-53; etc.). Suffixed forms **h₂nk-ti-* or **h₂nk-to-* ‘bending, bent arm’ would yield Arm. **an(k)t^h-* > *ant*‘ regularly; see 2.1.22.13. Note that the suffix **-ti-* is frequently found in Sanskrit body-part terms, cf. *śūpti-* ‘shoulder’ (RV), etc. [Mayrhofer, EWAia 2: 647].

One wonders whether Lith. *ant̃tis* etc. point to a "pure" root **h₂en-* from which **h₂enk-* has been derived. Cf. also **h₂ens-* > Lat. *ansa* ‘handle, grip’, OPr. *ansis* ‘hook of a kettle’, Lith. *ąsa* ‘ear of a jug, eye of a needle, button-hole’, Latv. *ūosa* ‘handle, ear, eyelet’, etc. (on which see Toporov, PrJaz [1], A-D, 1975: 92-93; Schrijver 1991: 61).

The meanings ‘armpit’, ‘shoulder’, ‘elbow’, and ‘knee’ can be grouped around the idea "des gekrümmten Gelenks"; see 3.7.2.

The irregular labial vocalism of Van etc. *hünt*‘ is not explained (see above). Perhaps an influence of the form *anut*‘?

****ant’a(y)r-***

In "Bağirk' hayoc'" one finds *ant’ayr*‘spark’ [Amalyan 1975: 21^{Nr455}].

● **DIAL** No dialectal forms are recorded in HAB 1: 194a.

One may connect here dial. *ant’-r-oc*‘ (see s.v. *ant’et*‘hot coal, ember’).

● **ETYM** Probably related with Gr. *ἀνθραξ* m. ‘charcoal’, as a substrate/"Mediterranean" word. See s.v. *ant’et*‘hot coal, ember’ for more detail. We can restore Arm. **ant^h-ar-i*. For the insertion of *-i-* into *ant’ayr* compare *žayn* vs. *žani-k*‘(a-stem) ‘tusk, fang’; cf. 2.1.27.1.

***ant’et*‘hot coal, ember’**

Attested in Łazar P’arpec’i /5th cent./ (*y-ant’et*‘on ember’), Hexaemeron (loc. *y-ant’et-i*), Cyril of Alexandria (*ant’et harkanem*). NHB (1: 151b) records also dial. verbal *anttel* < *ant’etel*.

● **DIAL** Widespread in dialects; also with the suffix *-oc*‘: *ant’(-e)t-oc*‘ and *ant’-r-oc*‘ (both attested also in DialAdd apud NHB 2: 1060c). The variant *ant’-r-oc*‘ has been preserved in Bulanəx, Van, T’avrız [HAB 1: 194a], Urmia, Salmast [GwřUrmSalm 1, 1897: 546]. See also s.v. *ant’ayr*‘spark’ (probably from **ant’-ar-i*).

Łarabał has only the verb; the (ever-existing) noun **ant'et(n)* is probably responsible for the suffix of Łarabał *mrčetnə* < Arm. **murč*₋₁ 'soot' (q.v.).

●**ETYM** Ačāryan (HAB 1: 194a) treats as a Caucasian borrowing (cf. Georg. *ant-eba* 'to burn') and considers the resemblance with Gr. *ἄνθραξ* m. 'charcoal' as accidental. Vogt (1938: 333) mentions both Greek and Georgian connections. Łap'anc'yan (1961: 163-164) adds Hitt. *ant-* 'warm'.

Ĵahukyan (1987: 112, 157, 592) reconstructs **ant^h*- for Armenian and Greek and argues against Ačāryan's view, pointing out that the Georgian word has no Caucasian cognates, and adduces also Arm. *ant'ayr* 'sparkle' (q.v.). On the other hand, he (1983: 88-89; 1987: 592) alternatively treats *ant'et* as comprising the prefix *an-* and *t'et* 'pile, heap' (q.v.). This is semantically unconvincing. Besides, the etymology conflicts with the dialectal variant **ant'-r-*.

One wonders whether Hitt. *ḫandāiš* 'warmth, heat' can be connected too (see s.v. *xand* 'envy etc.').

We are possibly dealing with a Armeno-Greek(-Hittite?) word of substrate ("Mediterranean") origin. For the suffixal element *-t* cf. other semantically close examples: Lat. *candēla* 'candle', Arm. *xand-at*, *xanj-ot* 'half-burnt wood' (Bible+), etc. (see s.v.v. *xand*, *xanj-*); Gr. *αἶθ-ᾰλ-η* 'soot' from *αἶθω* 'to kindle; to burn'; Arm. *gaz-at* 'ash' vs. **gaz-* 'to burn' (q.v.). For the alternating **-r-* element seen in dial. **ant'-r-*, Gr. *ἄνθ-ρ-αξ*, and perhaps *ant'ayr*, cf. *xanj-r-* (Agat'angełos), *xanj-ar* 'spark' (Grigor Magistros, "Geoponica"); see s.v.v. *xand*, *xanj-*. Note also Muš *pj-et*, Alaškert *pej-il* 'spark' from **pec* 'spark' (see HAB 2: 507a) next to Van *pc-ar* 'spark' [Ačārean 1913: 908] : *payc-ar* 'shiny, clear, splended' (Bible+; dial.) [HAB 4: 17-18]; cf. also *acut/x*. Thus, *ant'-et* 'ember' and **ant'-r-* 'spark' may be seen as derivations from substr. **ant^h*- with alternating **-l-* and **-r-* suffixal elements as in **xand-at*: *xanj-(V)t/r-*; Muš **pc-et*: Van **pc-ar*.

anic, ISg *anc-ov* (late, once) 'nit, louse egg'.

First attested in Grigor Narekac'i 69.2 (Xač'atryan/Łazinyan 1985: 522^{L24}): *anick* 'ankerpawork' 'shapeless nits'. Next, thrice in the commentary on this text, see NHB 1: 154a. In one of these passages, which is a list of small annoying insects, *anic* (ISg *ancov*) appears after *lu* and *oĵil* and before *kic* (see s.v.v.). For the passages see also Greppin 1990: 70₆, 70₇. For the semantic discussion see below.

●**DIAL** Widespread in dialects. As opposed to the variant with an initial *a-* found in the majority of the dialects, some easterly located peripheral dialects show a "prothetic" *h-* followed by either *-a-* or *-ä-*:

initial *hā-*: Goris *hanic*, *hanec* [Margaryan 1975: 313b, 424a], Łarabał *hānic*, *hanec* [Davt'yan 1966: 310], Šamšadin and Krasnoselsk *hanic* [Mežunc' 1989: 184a], Mełri *hānic* [Ałayan 1954: 262];

initial *hā-*: Karčewan, Kak'avaberd, Hadrut' *hānic* [Muradyan 1960: 189a; 1967: 165b; Davt'yan 1966: 310], Šamaxi, Areš *hānic* [Bałramyan 1964: 187; Lusenc' 1982: 197a].

Despite N. Simonyan (1979: 222-224), this *h-* must have an etymological value; see below. (Note that in the case of *anēck'* 'curse' (q.v.), which goes back to PIE **h₃neid-* and, thus, cannot presuppose an initial *h-* of etymological value, none of the dialects has a form with *h-*). An old by-form with the prefix *y-* does not seem probable. Firstly: it would be unmotivated. Secondly: it is not yet certain whether the Arm. *y-* would yield *h-* in these eastern dialects or not. Thirdly: there is no conforming evidence neither in Muš etc., nor in Van and the related dialects, unlike in cases as *anagan* (q.v.); cf. 2.3.1. The *ā-* in Svedia *ānej* [Andreasyan 1967: 354a] and Tigranakert *ānij* is irrelevant.

I conclude that the initial *h-* in EArm. **hanic* may have preserved an archaic *h-* which requires an explanation.

● **SEMANTICS** Greppin (1990: 69-70) points out that 'nit, louse egg' "is unlikely the earliest meaning since Narekatsi clearly describes the *anic* as an insect which bites and elsewhere the *NHB* classifies it as a biting insect along with the flea and distinct from the louse".

The former argument is not decisive since *xoc'oteal ccen* "stinging they suck", appearing ten lines below, does not necessarily imply an immediate and specific reference to *anic*. Rather, *marmajotakan* 'itch-causing', which appears immediately after *anic* (in the line 26), can specify *anic* 'nit, louse egg'.

The latter argument is based on the passage *č'arč'arel* ('to torment, annoy') *luov*, *oļlov*, *ancov* (see above). Neither this is convincing since *anic* 'nit, louse egg' here forms a logical pair with *oļil* 'louse'. In both passages, thus, *anic* is represented as an annoying/tormenting (specifically: "itch-causing") insect and does not necessarily refer to a biting one.

Also the epithet *ankerpawor* 'shapeless' in the passage of Narekac'i, and *ankerp* 'id.' in the commentary, confirm the meaning 'nit'. Besides, the word clearly refers to 'nit, louse egg' in Modern Armenian (see the standard dictionaries) and dialects. Though the meaning is usually unspecified in dialectal literature, I am sure that, at least in dialects I know, it is 'nit'. This can also be confirmed e.g. by dialectal *anc-ot* 'full of nits (said of a head)', as well as other derivatives denoting a special comb or

the process of combing the head that is full of nits (see Amatuni 1912: 33a; Ačārean 1913: 101ab).

●**ETYM** Since Pictet, *anic* is connected to Gr. *κονίς*, *-ίδος* f. etc. [HAB 1: 195; Pokorny 1959: 608; Greppin 1983: 290-291]. Though undoubtedly related, the cognates present problems in the reconstruction of the anlaut; cf. Alb. *thëri/th(ë)ni* f. 'Nisse, Lausei' [Huld 1984: 118-119; Demiraj 1997: 397], Skt. *likṣā-* f. (not in Vedic) [Mayrhofer, EWAia 3, 2001: 443] (in Mallory/ Adams 1997: 357b - under a different root), Lat. *lens*, *-dis* f., Lith. *glinda*, Russ. *gnída* [Derksen 1996: 258-259; Saradževa 1986: 71-72, 370₅]; etc.

Lat. *lens* and Lith. *glinda* point to **gnind-* (see ÈtimSlovSlavJaz 6, 1979: 173-174; cf. Mallory/Adams 1997: 357b), compare Lat. *nimbus* 'cloud' and Iran. **nam(b)-* 'wet, moist' next to PIE **nebh-*, see s.v. *amp* 'cloud'.

For the alternation initial **k/gh-* cf. **p/bʰ-* in the word for 'flea' (see s.v. *lu*) [Meillet 1922g].

The Armenian anlaut too is troublesome, since **kñV-* or **knV-* would yield Arm. **nV-*.

Pedersen (1906: 343, 387= 1982: 121, 165) treats *a-* as "pro(s?)thetisch" and assumes a development **qo- > *ho- > o-*, which is uncertain; cf. 2.1.6. (For his idea about the possible folk-etymological influence of *anēc-k-* see below). Besides, in view of the Albanian form, here we have **k̂-* rather than **k-*, although Jahukyan (1982: 73, 74; in 1987: 133, with a question-mark) restores **knid-s* for Armenian. Earlier (1967: 245, 245₆₉), he assumed a loss of **k-* followed by addition of the "prothetic" *a-* before the nasal. However, there is no evidence for "prothetic" non-etymological vowels before nasals; cf. s.v. *amis*.

According to Beekes (1969: 290), the interchange *k/zero* in Greek and Armenian points to a substratum origin. Noting the anlaut variation of the cognates, Derksen (1996: 258-259) restores **H(o)nid-* for the Armenian.

The idea about the dissimilation of Arm. **s- < *k̂-* before the final affricate *-c* (see Huld 1984: 119 with ref.) or, which is practically the same, a dissimilatory loss of **s-* in **sanic < *kanid-s* [Mallory/Adams 1997: 357b] is not convincing.

Hamp (1983c: 39) suggests a complicated scenario starting with an ablauting paradigm: **kōnid-/*k̂nid- > *kōnid-/*k̂ñnid- > *kōnid-/*ñid-*. Then, **anid-* (*< *ñid-*) is contaminated with *anēc-k-* 'curse' (**aneid-s-*, sigm. aor.), as a result of which we have *anic*, *-c* instead of *-t*. The contamination may have been additionally supported by the resemblance of ASg **anid-n* with *anicanem* 'I curse'. However, I am not sure whether the Lindeman's Law operated in Armenian or not. (The contamination is already suggested by Pedersen; see below).

A similar alternation **k̂on-/*k̂n-* (the latter of which yielded **n-* regularly) is assumed by Kortlandt (1986: 39-40 = 2003: 69). Then he writes: "The zero reflex of the initial stop was evidently extended analogically to the antevocalic position in *anic*, probably at a stage when it still was a weak fricative". He implicitly suggests, I think, the following development: **θoni-* > **oni-* > **ani-*. There remain some points to be clarified. PIE **-o-* yields Arm. *-a-* in a pretonic open syllable according to Kortlandt's formulation; see 2.1.3. This may have been generalized from the oblique stem of the PArm.-PGr. paradigm (see below) rather than **k̂onidā-*, since the nominative of the paradigm was **k̂onid-s*. Further, Earm. **h-* requires an explanation.

The final *-c* is correctly interpreted by Pedersen (1905: 206; 1906: 343, 387, 424 = 1982: 68, 121, 165, 202) as coming from the nominative **-d-s* (cf. Gr. *κović* < **κovićδ-s*). The same is repeatedly stated by Jahukyan (1987: 133; 1975: 37-39; 1967: 164, 216, 245; 1978: 125, 138; 1982: 73). See also 2.2.1.2. Pedersen admits a folk-etymological influence of *anicanem* 'I curse' (see s.v. *anēck*) as well; cf. the above-mentioned scenario of Hamp.

Partly based on some of the mentioned ideas, I would suggest the following tentative scenario:

NSg **sk̂onid-s* > **c'onic* > **sanic*, analogically after the oblique stem, perhaps also due to contamination with *anicanem*,

oblique **s(k̂)nid-* (loss of **-k̂-* in the cluster, as in Irish) > **sonid-* (with analogical **-o-* from the nominative, as in Gr. Gsg *κovićδος*) > **sanítV-* (pretonic **-o-* in open syllable > *-a-*, see 2.1.3).

Arriving at **sanic*, we could assume a development to **hanic* > *anic*, with a normal loss of **s-* as in *at*, *arbenam*, *e(a)wt'n*, etc., and with a residual **h-* in the eastern peripheral dialects; see HAB s.v.v.

I must admit, however, that this too is complicated and not very credible. In any case, I disagree with N. Simonyan (1979: 223₂₂₃), who states that the addition of the initial *a-* and, consequently, that of the dialectal *h-*, is posterior to the loss of **g/k-* and must be seen, therefore, as secondary⁶.

⁶ If we have to restore a by-form with a laryngeal, as Derksen (1996: 258-259) does, or some kind of quasi-laryngeal of secondary origin (from a glottalic **g-* as in Balto-Slavic, Lubotsky, p.c.), one should bear in mind that neither **Hnid-s* nor **Honid-s* would explain EArm. **hanic* satisfactorily, unless an ablauting paradigm **h₂e/onid-s* is involved.

ankiwn, *an*-stem: GDSg *ankean*, AblSg *y-ankiwn-ē* (once), ISg *ankeam-b*, NPl *ankiwn-k'*, GDPl *ankean-c'*; later also *i*-stem; in Grigoris Aršaruni (7-8th cent.): *angiwn* 'corner'.

Bible+. In 2 Paralipomenon 9.18 *ankiwn* renders Gr. *ἄγκυον* 'elbow'. Based on this, NHB 1: 174c ascribes also the meaning 'elbow (of an arm-chair)' to Arm. *ankiwn*. According to Ačaryan (HAB 1: 200b), however, this is merely a transliteration of the Greek word; the expected form **ankon* or **ankovn* has been confused with Arm. *ankiwn* 'corner'.

●**DIAL** Łarabał *āngün* 'side'; in other dialects the following meanings are recorded: Van 'closet (in the wand)', Xian 'cellar', Salmast 'the bottom of a ground-hearth' [HAB 1: 200b].

●**ETYM** From PIE **h₂eng-*: Lat. *angulus* m. 'corner, angle', OCS *оуѣлъ* 'corner', Oic. *ekkja* 'ankle, heel', etc. The connection with Lat. *angulus* was already noted by Klaproth (1831=1823: 100a) and in NHB 1: 174c. See also Hübschmann 1897: 419-420; HAB 1: 200b (also with forms that actually derive from **h₂enk-*, on which see s.v. *an(u)t'* 'armpit').

According to Kortlandt (2003: 27), the absence of the development to **awc-* "betrays a different ablautstufe". As is pointed out by Beekes (2003: 204), however, this is irrelevant since *ankiwn* does not have a labiovelar. For the suffix see Olsen 1999: 489-490, and 2.3.1.

The Germanic, Slavic and Latin forms reflect full grade **h₂eng-*; for Lat. *angulus*, zero grade is possible, but unverifiable; Lat. *ungulus* 'ring (on the finger)' and *ungustus* 'crooked stick' derive from **h₂ong-* [Schrijver 1991: 43, 51, 60, 317]; see also Derksen 1996: 270-271. The absence of *h-* in Arm. *ankiwn* probably points to zero grade. This may be due to the derivation.

anjaw, GDSg *anjaw-i*, LocSg *y-anjawī*, *a*-stem with compound *k'ar-anjaw* 'cave; fortress; rock'.

Bible+. In the Bible: twice in LocSg *y-anjawī* (1 Kings 22.4, 5) and once in LPl *y-anjaws* (1 Maccabaeorum 9.43).

GDSg *anjawī* is attested in Movsēs Xorenac'i 1.16 (1913= 1991: 54^{L9f}, transl. Thomson 1978: 101), in the wonderful description of the rock of Van: *Isk zənddēm aregakan kołmn anjawin, ur ew oč' gic mi erkat'ov ayžm veragrel ok' karē, zayspisi karcrut' iwn niwt'oy pēs pēs tačars ew seneaks ot'ic' ew tuns ganjuc' ew vihs erkars, oč' gitē ok', t'ē orpiseac' irac' patrastut' iwn hrašakerteac'*: "Now on the side of the rock that faces the sun, on which today no one can scratch a line with an iron point - such is the hardness of the surface - [she had carved out] various temples and

chambers and treasure houses and wide caverns; no one knows how she formed such wonderful constructions".

In order to clarify the semantics one needs a special treatment of the numerous attestations (see NHB 1: 190b; 2: 996b) of *anjaw* and its compounds, especially the one with *k'ar* 'stone' as the first member, namely *k'aranjaw*. My preliminary impression is that the basic meaning should be formulated (at least tentatively) approximately as 'cliffy, precipitous place, high rocky shelter/fortress' or 'inaccessible cliff/ cave (especially as a shelter or fortress for people, natural or artificial)'. For the semantic field compare *amur*, *ayr₂* and *daran* (see HAB s.v.v). The context which unifies these three words can remarkably be illustrated by a passage where *paťanjaw* (a hapax composed of *pal/t* 'immovable rock' [HAB 4: 4a, 13, 90a], q.v., and *anjaw*) appears in an impressive description of 'inaccessible caves' (*yamur ayrs*) of Mananaťi; see Movsēs Xorenac'i 3.45 (1913= 1991: 314^{L7-19}; Thomson 1978: 307-308).

The evidence for an *a*-stem comes from the numerous attestations of GDPI *k'ar-anjawac*; see NHB 2: 996b. Note also *i sors k'aranjawac* 'in stony caves' in P'awstos Buzand 6.16 /5th cent./ (1883=1984: 230^{L-7}; transl. Garsoñan 1989: 239).

●**ETYM** Ačaryan (HAB 1: 202b) mentions the connection to *anjuk* 'narrow' (q.v.) suggested implicitly in NHB 1: 190b. Ĵahukyan (1967: 163; with a question-mark - 1987: 112; 1990: 10) and Olsen (1999: 355f, 784f) are more positive, though others (cf. Pokorny 1959: 42; Tumanjan 1978; Greppin 1983; etc.) do not mention *anjaw* next to *anjuk*.

I see no serious semantic reason to reject the etymology, since *anjuk* very often refers to mountainous (narrow, cliffy, precipitous) places which are difficult to traverse. A similar development is seen in cognate forms too, such as Germ. *Enge* and Lat. *angustum*. For the semantic field 'Angst; Bedrängnis' : 'stony/cliffy place' cf. *vax* 'fear' vs. *vax* 'precipitous/cliffy place'.

The problem of *-aw* is more intriguing. Basing herself on Skt. *amihati-* f. 'Bedrängnis, Not' and OCS *o*zota* 'Enge' and restoring an old "*s/t*-stem", Olsen (1999: 355-356, 784-785) derives *anjaw* < **anjawa-* from **(h)ang^he/ota-* through vowel assimilation *a-e/o-a* > *a-a-a*. However, the formation of Skt. *amihati-* is "ungewöhnlich" [Mayrhofer, EWAia 1, 1992: 38], and I do not know how acceptable/ reliable is the alleged old "*s/t*-stem" [it seems to me strange, and the evidence is scanty]. One would like to see more Armenian parallels of the type. Secondly, I am not yet sure about the development **-ota-* > Arm. *-awa-*; cf. par. XX. Furthermore, the explanation of Ĵahukyan (1987: 112) from **ang^həyo-* (why *-o-* ?), although with a question-mark and without discussion, seems to me more

economical and plausible since it does not separate *-w* of *anjaw* from *-u-* of *anju-k* < **h₂(e)ng^h-u-*. Later he (1990: 10) considers **-ə-* less probable and assumes the development **-ew- > -aw* with the assimilative influence of the word-initial *a-*.

Olsen, citing only the former version of J̄ahukyan, argues against this point of view with two objections: first, there is no external evidence for a root-final laryngeal; second, an intervocalic **-u-* should be continued as Arm. **-g-*. The latter statement is not correct since *-w* is the regular development in the Classical auslaut; see 2.1.8. The former is correct. However, there is no counter-evidence either, as far as I can see. The PArm. form could have been **h₂(e)ng^h-H-u-*, probably analogical after the IE antonym **plt-H-u-* ‘wide’; see s.v. *yatt*’. Next to PArm. **hatt’-u-* from **plt-H-us* there may have existed PArm. **hatt’-aw-V* from e.g. **plt-H-u-ih₂-*. QIE **h₂(e)ng^h-H-u-* would yield PArm. **anju-*, which is continued in *anjuk* (q.v.), and the oblique stem **anjəw-i/a-* may go back to QIE **h₂(e)ng^h-H-u-eh₂-*, with analogical **-Hu V- > -aw-* after unattested **hatt’-aw-V*. Compare *y-olov*, *i*-stem ‘abundant’ vs. Skt. *purú-*, f. *pūrvī-* ‘much, abundant’ (RV+). For the development of the PIE interconsonantal laryngeals into Armenian I refer to 2.1.20. Note that Armenian seems to have generalized such feminines of PIE *u*-stems in making them Armenian *i-* or *a*-stems; see 2.2.3.

A somewhat similar analysis is suggested by me for *cnawt* ‘jaw’, q.v.

anjn, GDSg *anjn*, ISg *anjam-b*, NPl *anjn-k’*, APl *anjn-s* (in Ep’rem: *anjn-s*), GDPl *anjn-c’* (cf. also *mi-anjn*, NPl *-un-k’*) ‘person, ipse’; soul, spirit; body’.

Bible+. For instance: *nk’oteal en anjink’ mer*: *νυνὶ δὲ ἡ ψυχὴ ἡμῶν κατὰξηρος* (Numbers 11.6). For the paradigm of *anjn* as well as *mi-anjn* ‘moine’, lit. ‘qui est une personne seule’ see Meillet 1903: 139ff; 1936: 77-79; Tumanjan 1978: 248, 270-271, 322; J̄ahukyan 1982: 94, 109; Beekes 1995: 113-120; Olsen 1999: 119-120.

The meaning ‘body’ is seen, e.g., in derivatives like *anjn-et* ‘large-bodied’ in John Chrysostom, and *koptar-anjn* in Movsēs Xorenac’i 2.8 (1913=1991: 114^{L12}), translated by Thomson (1978: 141) as ‘monsrous’. It has been preserved in dialects (see below).

The derivative *anjn-eay* ‘personable, large-bodied’ is attested in 1 Kings 9.2 (rendering Gr. *εὐμεγέθης*) and in Movsēs Xorenac’i 1.12 (1913=1991: 41^{L5}; transl. Thomson 1978: 91): *zayr sēg ew anjneay* “a proud and personable man” (on Sisak); also 1.10 (32^{L15}; transl. 85): *getapatšac ew anjneay* “handsome and personable” (on Hayk).

The meaning ‘ipse’ can be illustrated, e.g., by the following passages. In Łazar P’arpec’i (5th cent.) 3.82 (1904=1985: 150^{L7}; transl. Thomson 1991: 209): *oč’ tayr*

dul anjinn "he permitted himself <...> no delay". In T'ovma Arcruni 2.7 /10th cent./ (1985: 192; transl. Thomson 1985: 188): *Ew en gazanabaroyk', ariwnarbuk', ar oč'inc' hamarelov zspanumn etbarc' harazatac', na ew zanjanc' ews* "They are savage in their habits, drinkers of blood, who regard as naught the killing of their own brothers and even of themselves".

The derivative *anjn-awor* 'subsistent; breathing' (< 'body/soul possessing') is attested in Eznik Koṭbac'i, Philo, etc. In his "Refutation of the Sects", Eznik Koṭbac'i (5th cent.) frequently uses the word referring to, for instance, mythical beings (1.25; 1994: 82-86); for discussion see Abētyan 1941: 17-21.

●DIAL Preserved in numerous dialects, mainly meaning 'body' [HAB 1: 204a; Gabikian 1952: 66]. A textual illustration can be found e.g. in a fairy-tale from Łarabaṭ (HŽHek' 6, 1973: 636^{L2}).

Van *anj* means 'the vulva of a pregnant cow' [Ačāryan 1913: 104a; HAB 1: 204a] or 'the vulva of an animal' [Ačāryan 1952: 245].

Ačāryan (HAB 1: 204a) does not cite any dialectal form continuing ClArm. *anjnawor*. He only mentions Aparan *anjnahur* 'a mythical being' stating that it is a reshaped form of **aznawor* (q.v.). The form *anjnahur* is also attested in the epic "Sasna cīer". In SasCī 2/2, 1951: 821, 965a, it has been explicitly treated as resulted from a wrong interpretation as of *anjov hreten* 'fiery with body'. Note also Gomer *aznahur* 'giant' [HayLezBrbBaī 1, 2001: 8a]. This seems unnecessary in view of the following forms: Sasun *anjnāvur* 'animate, living, corporeal' [Petoyan 1954: 103; 1965: 443]; Moks *anjnavur*, *anjnahur* 'animate; giant, mighty' [HayLezBrbBaī 1, 2001: 63b]. Also **azn-awor* can be derived from *anjnawor*, with the sound development *-njn- > -zn-*. See s.v. **azn-awor* for more detail.

The internal *-h-* of the forms *aznahur* and *anjnahur* may be explained as a glide (see 2.1.32) and/or due to contamination with *huri* 'fairy', on which see HAB 3: 125b; H(asmik) Mkrtč'yan 1987: 56, 56₁₇; cf. also dial. (Adana) *hreik* 'giant' (see Ačārean 1913: 676a), *hurnik-hreten* (cf. HAB 3: 126, s.v. *hur* 'fire'). That *huri* refers to not only female but also male supernatural beings is seen from e.g. the meaning 'giant' (Adana), as well as from *Huri t'ak'avor* "the king Huri" [HŽHek' 1, 1959: *120-136, *143-148, etc.; H(asmik) Mkrtč'yan 1987: 57]. Note also Širak etc. *aĵbay-huri* (vars. *havĵa-huri*, *abra-huri*), an epithet of the rain-bringing doll *Nuri(n)* (see Mxit'areanc' 1901: 273; R. Grigoryan 1970: 325-326), obviously composed as **ačp-* or **aĵb-* 'amazement' + *-a-* + *huri* 'fairy'. This is implicitly suggested by Abētyan (1941: 91) who renders *aĵbahuri* as "wonderful fairy" (*hrašali haveržahars*); see also HayLezBrbBaī 1, 2001: 96a.

●**ETYM** Corresponds to Olc. *angi*, *n*-stem m. 'smell, scent', Dan. *ange* 'Dampf', often derived from PIE **h₂enh₁-* 'to breathe' [Lidén 1906: 38-40; HAB 1: 203b; Pokorny 1959: 43; Greppin 1983: 292; Ĵahukyan 1987: 112; Olsen 1999: 120]. It has been assumed that Osc. *afiiim* 'soul' belongs here, too (Knobloch 1974: 350; on this word see, however, Schrijver 1991: 30).

If indeed from **h₂enh₁-g^h*-, then *anjn* is another example of the loss of a laryngeal before a stop (**-RHC-*; see 2.1.20).

anjuk, *o*-stem: GDSg *anjuk-o-y* (a homily ascribed to Ełišē; "Yačaxapatum"), ISg *anjuk-o-v* (Łazar P'arpec'i, John Chrysostom, Grigor Narekac'i); *a*-stem: ISg *anjuk-a-w* in Movsēs Xorenac'i 3.68 (see below) and "Yačaxapatum" 6 (though in 10 and 11 - GDSg *anjukoy*)

adj. 'narrow; difficult'; subst. 'narrow passage; mountainous place which is hard to traverse; Bedrāngnis/affliction; desire, longing (for)'.

In Movsēs Xorenac'i 3.68 (1913= 1991: 361^{L10}; transl. Thomson 1978: 352): *Aypiseaw anjkaw hetjamťjuk eteal, vtangim* (var. *p'ťkim*) *karōtut'eamb meroy hōrn* : "Oppressed by such an affliction I suffer from the loss of our father".

For the reference to 'inaccessible, rocky place' or 'cave' cf. Movsēs Xorenac'i 3.44 (313^{L11}; transl. 307): *yanjuks Tayoc' k'aranc'* : "in the recesses of the caves of Tayk'". Compare also P'awstos Buzand 4.24 (1883=1984: 122^{L19}; transl. Garsoĳan 1989: 158).

Bible+. The evidence for the declension class comes from the substantive.

●**ETYM** Since Lagarde (1854: 15^{L352}) and Hübschmann (1897: 420^{Nr34}), derived from IE **h₂(e)ng^h-u-* 'narrow': Skt. *amihū-*, MPers. **anzūk*, Goth. *aggwu*, etc.; cf. also PIE *s*-stem: Skt. *amahas-* n. 'Angst, Bedrāngnis', Lat. *angus-tus*, etc.; see HAB 1: 204; Pokorny 1959: 42-43; Tumanjan 1978: 63, 74, 125; 156; Schmitt 1981: 48, 50, 62, 68; Greppin 1983: 292; Schrijver 1991: 43, 66; Mayrhofer, EWAia 1, 1992: 38-39; Olsen 1999: 588; etc. The reconstruction of a PIE labiovelar instead of the palatal (see Clackson 1994: 108 with lit.) seems unnecessary to me. On Armenian forms in *-uk* deriving from earlier **u*-stems see Clackson 1994: 121-122. See also s.v. *anjaw* 'cave'.

The native origin of Arm. *anjuk* is accepted almost by everyone, except for Henning (followed by Mayrhofer, Salmons apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 391a), who treats it as an Iranian loan. This is possible, but unmotivated and unnecessary, since there is no reason to abandon the traditional point of view. In this respect some words on the suffix are in order.

Meillet (1936: 29) points out that Arm. *-k* can only go back to **g* and does not correspond to the Slavic; cf. also Pokorny 1959: 42. The compromise proposed by Tumanjan (1978: 156), which presupposes a twofold reflex of **-k-* in Armenian, that is *k* and *k'*, does not seem very attractive.

The suffix *-(u)k* is found not only in Iranian loans, but also in native words of different morphological categories, e.g. *gatt-uk* 'secretly'. thus, regardless of its origin (cf. Tumanjan 1978: 74, 125; 156; Jahukyan 1987: 232, 356, 569; 1998: 33; Olsen 1999: 584-590), one cannot reject the traditional view (according to which *anjuk* is native), basing oneself solely on the suffix. Contrarily, *anjuk* mostly has an *o*-stem, while Iranian loans in *-uk* are *a*-stems; cf. Olsen 1999: 589.

anjrdi, *o-* or *ea*-stem '(adj.) arid; (subst.) arid place, desert'. '(adj.) arid; (subst.) arid place, desert'.

Abundant in the Bible onwards. In two of the Bible attestations - *anjrdin*. The only evidence for the declension class comes from AblSg *y-anjrdwoj* and LocSg *y-anjrdwoj*, each attested once in the Bible.

●**DIAL** No dialectal forms are recorded in HAB. In his 2003 (pp. 13 and 298), Ačaryan mentions Zeyt'un forms continuing *anjrdi* (*anj'əyd'a* 'thirsty', *anj'əyd'il* and *anj'əyd'nol* 'to get thirsty'), stating that the word is absent in other dialects. However, it has been preserved in Goris: *ančərdi*, *ančirdi* (see Margaryan 1975: 314a).

●**ETYM** Certainly composed of the privative prefix *an-*, *jur* 'water' (q.v.) and the suffix *-di*. Murvalyan (1955: 277) points out that this is the only example for the suffix *-di*. Cf. also *an-jur* 'օրհորոջ' and *jrem* 'to water, irrigate'. Olsen (1999: 371) hesitantly derives the suffix *-di* from IE **-tio-* or **-d^hh₁tio-* (from **d^heh₁-* 'to put'). The latter alternative does not seem very probable. As to the former, one should be more positive here on the strength of strong parallels such as *yuit'i* 'fertile, watered' < *y-* (< **h₁en-* 'in') + **ui-* + *-t'i* and *nawt'i* 'hungry' < **n-* + **aw-* + *-t'i* (q.v.). See also 2.3.1.

Compare also Svedia **an-apur-d/t* 'uninhabited (place)' (q.v.).

antari, *a*-stem (but in Job 40.17: IPl *antari-o-v-k*) 'forest'.

Widely attested in the Bible onwards. GDSg *antari*, LSg *yantari* and GDPI *antařac* are firmly attested. In Job 40.17 one finds IPl *antařovk*. To my knowledge, there is no evidence for **antařaw(k')*. Nersēs Lambronac'i (12th cent.) has *antariwk*; cf. GDPI *antarić* in Paterica.

●**DIAL** No dialectal forms are recorded in HAB and HayLezBrbBaṛ. But *antaṛ* is the principal word for the forest in the modern Armenian; is this solely based on the literary tradition? Note also Metri place-name *Ándaṛ* (< *antaṛ*) [Aṭayan 1954: 262b]; Łarabaṭ *ántaṛ* (next to a couple of synonyms) [Davt'yan 1966: 312].

●**ETYM** The component **-taṛ* has been frequently compared to IE **doru-* 'wood; tree' (see HAB s.v.v. *targal*, *tarr*, *toṛn*, *torg*, *tram*). Bugge (1890: 85-86) compares the correspondence *caṛ* 'tree' vs. *an-taṛ* 'forest' (with *an-* from **sm̥-*; see also Saradževa 1986: 367₃₅) with *cic* : (*merka*)*tít* 'teat', q.v. . Ačāryan (HAB 4: 671) connects *antaṛ* directly to Gr. *δέσπορ*, deriving the latter from **δέσπορ*. Ĵahukyan (1987: 118, 245, 258, 259; 1988, 2: 80) restores **sm̥-daru-* with a question-mark. Earlier, he (1967: 182, 303; cf. also NHB 1: 243a) equated the **taṛ* with Arm. *caṛ* 'tree' (q.v.), placing *antaṛ* in the list of words with alternation *c/t*. Neither of these etymologies explains the phonological development of the word satisfactorily.

The reconstruction of **sm̥-dVru-* would be possible if we assume a contamination with *caṛ* 'tree'. It becomes easier when the **taṛ* is directly connected to *tarr/taṛ* 'elementum' (q.v.) (which probably originates from the same **doru-* 'wood; tree'), though the latter alternant, that is *taṛ*, is postclassical. The semantic relationship between 'wood, material' and 'woods' is well-known; cf. Lat. *silva*, Engl. *wood(s)*, Russ. *les(a)*, Fr. *bois*, etc.; see also s.v. *mayri*. Arm. *antaṛ* itself is attested in the meaning 'օղի' once; see above.

Not rejecting the probability of what has just been said, I alternatively suggest an etymological connection with IE **H(o)nd-r-* 'rock; mountain': Skt. *ádri-* 'stone, rock; mountain (range)', Mlr. *ond*, *onn* (st. **ondes-*) n. 'stone, rock; also 'mountain?') [Pokorny 1959: 778; Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984: 666; Mayrhofer, EWAia, s.v.]. As stated by Beekes (apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 547b), the IE root is "poorly attested and uncertain".

If Arm. *antaṛ* is related to these words, one might interpret its meaning by the semantic shift 'mountain' > 'forest', perhaps through intermediary 'wooded mountain = Bergwald' (see 3.4.1). The auslaut of the Armenian word might have been influenced by *caṛ* 'tree'. Or else, the Armenian form, like the Irish one, is based on neuter **H(o)nd-es-*; thus: **Hnd-(e/o)s-r-eh₂-* > PArm. **antaṛa-* > Arm. *antaṛ*, *-ac*. For the combination **-s-* (stem; n.) + **-r-* cf. **k^herh₂-s-ro-* > Lat. *cerebrum* 'brain' from the *s*-stem found in Skt. *śiras* 'head'; Gr. *κέρας* 'horn' (see Schrijver 1991: 96)⁷.

⁷ Compare Hitt. *tijeszšar-* 'forest' as a possible parallel (Weitenberg, p.c.).

anun, *an*-stem: GDSg *anuan*, AblSg *anuan-ē*, ISg *anuam-b*, NPl *anuan-kʻ*, GDPl *anuan-cʻ* 'name; fame' (Bible+). In compounds: *anun(-a)-* and *anuan-a-*.

●**DIAL** Dialectally ubiquitous [HAB 1: 208-209]. With generalization of the oblique stem **anəw-*: Van *anun*, GSg *anvan*, NPl *anvəner*, Ozim *anəv-əv* 'famous' (= ISg); see Ačāryan 1952: 128, also 103, 245.

In some peripheral NE, E, SE dialects (Tʻiflis, Ararat, Łarabał, Goris, Juła [HAB 1: 209a], Agulis [Ačārean 1935: 127, 335] etc., one finds *anum* or *anəm*. Note also *anmani* 'famous' etc. (HAB, *ibid.*).

●**ETYM** Since Klaproth, NHB, etc. linked with IE forms of the word for 'name': Gr. *ὄνομα*, *-ατος* n., Lat. *nōmen*, *-inis* n., Skt. *nāman-* n. (RV+), MPers., NPers. *nām*, Goth. *namo*, OCS *ime*, etc. [Hübschmann 1897: 420; HAB 1: 208].

The Armenian form could be explained by the following paradigm: PIE PD *n*-stem NSg **h₃néh₃-mn* > PArm. **anuwn* > *anun*, obl. **h₃nh₃-mén-* > **anumVn-*, or **h₃n(e)h₃-mṇ-t-os* > **an(u)man(t)*, cf. Gr. *ὄνομα*, *-ατος*. For different views and references and discussion see Greppin 1983: 293-294; Clackson 1994: 33-34, 206₁₂; Kortlandt 1984: 42; 1987: 63; 2001: 12 = 2003: 55, 77, 132; Beekes 2003: 168, 186, 191; Olsen 1999: 132-133. For **-mn* : **-wn* compare *mṛjīwn* : *mṛjīmn* 'ant', *paštawn*, gen. *pašt-aman* 'service', etc.

Meillet (1936: 48) explains *-un* from **uwn* < **omn*, and (1903: 143) notes that "m a dû subsister dialectalement aux cas obliques et ainsi on a pu rétablir *anumn* qui existe encore dans divers dialectes, notamment celui de la plaine d'Ararat, sous la forme *anum*". According to Jahukyan (1959: 177; 1985: 157; 1987: 278; see also Davt'yan 1966: 66; N. Simonyan 1979: 230-231), too, dial. **anum* originates from **anumn* when the development **-umn* > **-uwn* > *-un* had not yet taken place. He (*ibid.*) alternatively admits the possibility of a dissimilation *anun* > **anum* which is unconvincing.

The explanation of dial. **anum* as a direct archaic reflex of **anumn* does not seem plausible. Given the fact that **-mn* yields Arm. *-wn* in final position (cf. *paštawn* vs. gen. *pašt-aman* 'service'), I propose a paradigmatic solution (cf. 2.2.2). The PArm. paradigm, nom. **anuwn* : obl. **an(V)man-*, was levelled into 1) **anuwn* : **anwan* > ClArm. *anun* : *anuan*, with generalization of **-w-*; 2) **anumn* : **anman* > *anum*, with generalization of **-m-*.

ačʻ-kʻ, GDPl *-acʻ* (Bible+) and *-icʻ* (postclass.; dial.). 'eyes', NPl of *akn* (q.v.). Bible+.

GDPl *ačʻacʻ*, also e.g. in Movsēs Xorenacʻi 3.68 (1913=1990: 361^{L8}).

Next to the classical GDPI *ač'ac'*, there is also some evidence for *ač'ic'* in the postclassical (Plato, 6th cent.) and subsequent periods.

In a chapter (Nr 54) by an unknown author, added to Arak'el Dawrižec'i (ed. Xanlaryan, 1990), we find both *ač'ac'* (452^{L20}) and *ač'ic'* (453^{L13}).

Interesting is *ač'ik'* (next to *ač'k'*) in a versified addition to PatmAtēk's: *Erek' ač'ik' xaytabteteal, / Or ač'k' mardoy bnaw č'ēr teseal*; the prose texts have *erek' ač'awk'* and *erek' ač'k'* (see Simonyan 1989: 255, 412).

●DIAL Almost everywhere NPI *ač'k'* (also NDU **ač'ui* in Zeyt'un; see Ačārean 1913: 117a; 2003: 133, 152, 298) has become singular, replacing *akn* (q.v.). The latter, in the meaning 'eye', has been preserved in Agulis and some adjacent dialects, whereas C'fna has *o*šk*, GSg, *aški* {probably **ošk*, GSg, **aški*} [HAB 1: 223a].

Hamšen **ač'ōk' anel* 'to give (a sign with) a wink' [Ačārean 1913: 117b] contains the petrified (?) IPI *ač'awk'*. GDPI *ač'ac'* is represented in Van *ač'ac'-bažin* 'a small share of food given just to ease the hunger a little bit' (lit. 'the share of the eyes') and *ač'ac'-ulnik* 'eye-bead (amulet)' [Ačārean 1913: 116b].

More abundant is the evidence for GDPI *ač'ic'* (almost everywhere - in assimilated form *ač'ič'*), mostly in petrified expressions and derivatives: Hamšen *ač'ič' hilun* 'eye-bead (amulet)' [Ačāryan 1947: 221]; Partizak *ač'ič'* 'a prayer against the evil eye'; Č'enkiller (Nikomidia) *ač'ič' əllal* 'to be struck by the evil eye'; K'fi **ač'ic'-etuk* 'stricken by the evil eye', **ač'ic'-jur* 'a kind of medicine for the disease of the eye' [Ačārean 1913: 116b]; Van *ač'ič'-ulnik* 'eye-bead (amulet)'; Moks *ač'ič' t'art'ap* 'winking, moment'; Xotorjur **ač'ič'a linel* 'to get sick being struck by the evil eye' (see also YušamXotorj 1964: 429b); Karin, Balu **ač'ič'(-)hat* (see s.v. *hat*); Xarberd **ač'ic' anel* 'to pray against the evil eye'; Sebastia **ač'ic'-crewut'-k'* 'ghost'; Łarabał **ač'ic' / ač'oc' linel* 'to get sick being struck by the evil eye' [HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 77a]; Dersim *ač'ič' əllil* 'to become free of the evil eye', *ač'ijag* 'small shell-amulets sewn on the hats of children against the evil eye', *ač'ic' / č'* 'spectacles, eye-glasses' [Bařramyan 1960: 111b]; Erzinka *ač'ič' k'ar* 'eye-bead (amulet)' [Kostandyan 1979: 151a]. Particularly rich material is recorded for Sebastia by Gabikean (1952: 74-77). Note also Xarberd **ač'ic' hanel* 'bařjank'ə katarel', see HayLezBrbBař 1: 2001: 45b.

In Van *ač'ič'* is still in the paradigm [Ačāryan 1952: 128]. Some illustrations can be found, for instance, in a fairy-tale recorded in 1915 [HŽHek' 14, 999: 13-39]: *meč' pařvu ač'ič'* (18, 19 /2X/) "into the eyes of the old woman"; *ver mer ač'ič'*, *ver mer gylxun* (35) "onto our eyes, our head". This GDPI *ač'ič'* can hardly be secondary since almost all the other examples of archaic GDPI forms of Van listed by Ačāryan (1952: 128), even those not belonging to the *a*-declension, have *-ac'*. The only

exception is ClArm. *van-k'*, *-ac'*, which has GDPl *vanic'* in the dialect of Van. For *ot-k'*, *-ic'* 'feet' (q.v.), another form continuing IE dual, I would also expect a GDPl form with *-ic'* in Van. The actual form is, however, *votac'*, probably analogical after *ceṛac'* < ClArm. *jeṛac'*.

In a Muš fairy-tale recorded in Alek'sandrapol in 1915, *ač'ic's vra* (see HŽHek' 13, 1985: 214^{L13}), *vər im ač'ic'*, *vər im glxun* (ibid. 215^{L23}).

Svedia *ašk'*, NPl *ič'va* [Ačāryan 2003: 560] (see the complete paradigms in Andreasyan 1967: 72-73). NDu **ač'ui*, continued in Zeyt'un as singular (see above), can also be found in Polis NPl *ašvəner* (next to NSg *ašk' < ač'-k'*) and in compounds like *sevašvi* 'black-eyed' etc. [Ačāryan 1941: 108]. Ewdokia **ač'u-a-gin* 'very dear' (see HayLezBrbBar 1, 2001: 77a). The form *ač'vi* is attested in a medieval folk-song recorded by Xač'gruz Ērimec'i in 1608/1620 (Matenadaran, manuscript Nr. 7709) [Mnac'akanyan 1956: 114^{L40f}]. For further dialectal and MArm. evidence and for discussion see Karst 1901 = 2002: 185-187.

●**ETYM** From PIE **h₃(e)k^w-ih₁* n. dual 'eyes': OCS *oči* n. NADu 'eyes'; Lith. *akis* 'eye'; Lat. *oculus* [m] 'eye'; Gr. *ὄσσε* n. NADu 'eyes'; Skt. *ākṣi-* n. GSg *akṣṇās* (RV+), *akṣ-ī* n. NADu 'eye' (RV+); YAv. *aši* n. NADu 'eye'.

aragast *i-* and *a-*stems 'curtain, (nuptial) canopy; bridal chamber; tent; sail', dial. 'wine-press' (< 'room for wine-pressing').

Bible+.

In Movsēs Xorenac'i 3.68 (1913=1991: 361^{L5f}; transl. Thomson 1978: 352): *yusayak' harsaneac' parel, anveher eragut'camb krt'calk', ew aragasti asel ergs* "we hoped to dance at marriages, being bold and nimble of foot, and to sing wedding songs"; cf. 2.50 (179^{L14})

For the meaning 'tent' see Movsēs Xorenac'i 2.46 (1913=1990: 172^{L13}; transl. Thomson 1978: 186).

In the atmospheric context, the verb *aragastem* occurs in "Yatags ampoc' ew nšanac'" by Anania Širakac'i, 7th cent. (A. G. Abrahamyan 1944: 306, lines 22-21 and 38).

●**DIAL** Preserved only in the dialect of Ararat: *arāk'ast* [HAB 1: 249a]. Both Ačāryan (1913: 130b; HAB 1: 249a) and Amatuni (1912: 55b) describe Ararat *aragast* as the part of a *hnjan* (wine-pressing room) or a house where the grapes are pressed to make wine from. According to Baḡdasaryan-T'ap'alč'yan (1971: 218), the word *hnjan* in the village of Ōšakan is equivalent to *arāk'ast* in Aštarak. See also s.v. *hnjan*.

●**ETYM** Composed as *ai-* + *ag-* ‘to put on (clothes)’ (see also s.v. *awt’oc*) + *-ast* [NHB 1: 281c; HAB 1: 248b; Ĵahukyan 1987: 123]. Meillet (1936: 77) and Ĵahukyan (1987: 240) derive the ending from a compound suffix **-s-ti-*, whereas Weitenberg (1980: 213, 214) assumes a suffix *-st-* which has resulted from generalization of **-u-k-ti-*.

One wonders if *ai-agast* is related with *z-gest*, *u*-stem ‘clothing’. The absence of the initial laryngeal in **ues-* (cf. Hitt. *ú-e-eš-ta* ‘wears’, Gr. *ἔννυμι, -μαι* ‘I clothe’) seems to obstruct the equation, unless one accepts the explanation given by Kortlandt (2003: 43). Contamination is possible, too. It is interesting that the *i*-stem of *aiagast* agrees with what might be expected for *zgest* (cf. Lat. *uestis* ‘cloth, garment’; Goth. *wasti* ‘garment, dress’), though in reality *zgest* has *u*-stem. On the other hand, the parallel *a*-stem of *aiagast* is reminiscent of formations like Gr. (Hesychius) *γεστία* ‘clothing’ < **ues-tih₂-* or *ἑσθής* ‘clothing’ < **ues-th₂-(?)* (cf. also *ἑσθος* n.). One may therefore propose an alternative solution: NSg **ués-t-eh₂-*, GSg **us-t-h₂-ós* (and/or NSg **ués-t-ih₂-*, GSg **us-t-ih₂-ós*) > PArm. NSg **gest-a/i-* (which would coincide with *z-gest*, *-u* after the apocope), GSg **wst-* (with a *w-* after the nominative) > **gast-* (for the anaptyctic *-a-* before the sibilant see s.v. *aiaspel*). If this is true, Gr. *ἑσθής* (with a *-θ-* from **-t + H-?*) has arisen in the same scenario as Skt. *pánthās* (NSg **pónt-eh₁-s*, GSg **pnt-h₁-ós*, see s.v. *hun*), and Gr. *εστία* goes back to **ués-t-ih₂-*. Arm. **gast* is due to generalization of the oblique stem.

The semantic development taken place in this word is remarkable. It seems to comprise two basic parts: A) ‘cover, curtain, sail, (nuptial) canopy’ > ‘bridal chamber’ [broadening]; B) ‘room’ > ‘wine-pressing room’ > ‘wine-pressing basin’ [specialization, narrowing]. The neutral meaning ‘room’ is hardly attested, but its postulation is necessary to make a start for the part B. For the development seen in part A cf. *seneak* (if my etymology is accepted; see s.v.). As to the part B, one notes that in *hnjan* (if my etymology is accepted; see s.v.) a similar development has taken place, but in the opposite direction: ‘basin, font; a kind of bathing-vessel’ > ‘a wine-press basin’ [specialization] > ‘a room for wine-pressing’ [narrowing]; the basin of a fountain; garden-basin’.

aiaspel ASg *z-aiaspel*, GSg *aiaspel-i*, LSg *y-aiaspel-i*, ISg *aiaspel-a-w*, API *z-aiaspel-s*, GDP1 *aiaspel-a-c*. **aiaspelik*, GDP1 *aiaspeleac* ‘myth, tale; fable; proverb; riddle’

Bible+. For the biblical attestations see Astuacaturean 1895: 162 and Lidén 1933: 46-47.

In plural sometimes *-lea-*, which presupposes a by-form **aiaspeli*. But such a singular is not attested. Cases where sg. *aiaspel* (without a final *-i*) co-occurs with pl.

-*lea-* in the same passages show that we are dealing with a secondary phenomenon restricted to the paradigm of the plural; cf. e.g. in the Alexander Romance (see below).

'mythic story, fiction, tale': 'a mythic untrue/unbelievable/unsensical story': 'fairy-tale = gratuitous talking': 1 Timothy 1.4: *Yāraspelac' parawanc' hražaresjir*. Agathangelos: *arāspeleac' gri*. Eznik Koṭbac'i: *Amenek'ean arāspels arkanen*.

Movsēs Xorenac'i 1.6 (1913=1991: 22^{6f}; transl. Thomson 1978: 77): *orum oč' zok' ənddimanal karcem i mits unotac'n: bayc' et'ē zčšmartut'eann ok' xorhelov k'akel zoč' yāraspels zčšmarit bans axorželov p'op'oxel p'ut'asc'ē* "I think that no right-minded person will object to this; but if anyone is planning to upset the whole system of truth, let him happily endeavor to change these true accounts into fables". Movsēs Xorenac'i 2.61 (1913=1991: 192^{L8f}; transl. Thomson 1978: 204): *Vasn oroy ew ar meroy isk žamanakaw bazumk' i darbnac', zhet ert'alov arāspelin, yawur miašabat'woj' eric's kam č'oric's baxen zsaln, zi zōrasc'in, asen, št'ayk'n Artawazday. Bayc' ē čšmartut'eamb aypēs, orpēs asac'ak's veragoyn* : "Therefore, even in our own time many smiths, following the fable, on the first day of the week strike the anvil three or four times so that the chains of Artavazd may be strengthened, as they say. But the truth of the matter is as we said above". A couple of lines further: *Ew zays noyn ergič'k'n yāraspelin asen aypēs* "This the same singers express in the fable as follows".

Movsēs Xorenac'i 2.7 (1913=1991: 111^{L2f}; transl. Thomson 1978: 138): *T'otum zāraspelac'n* (var. *zāraspeleac'n*) *bajātans, or i Hadamakertin patmin* "I omit the nonsensical fables that are recounted in Hadamakert".

In 2.8 (115^{L12}; transl. 142), the stories about the power of *Turk' Angeteay* are characterized as follows: *Oh!, kari ē arāspels, ayl ew arāspelac' arāspel* "O, this tale is too much - it is the tale of all tales".

2.24 (140^{L12}; transl. 161): *Əndēr patrimk' zruc'ōk' vatənjuc' ew paraweal arāspelōk'* : "Why do we deceive ourselves with ancient tales and old wives' fables?".

2.42 (168^{L2f}; transl. 183): *Bayc' ays kam etic'i sut ew arāspel, kam <...>* : "But this is either false and a fable or else <...>".

On the notion of *arāspel* : 'fable' in Movsēs Xorenac'i see also *Abet'yan; Thomson 1978: 10-11.

In the Alexander Romance (H. Simonyan 1989: 173-174; Wolohojian 1969: 72; Braccini 2004: 42^{V87f}, 150-154), the bard Ismenias approaches to Alexander "with devilish words" (*diwabnak baniwk'*), and Alexander becomes annoyed by all these

"fairy-tales" (*araspelawk'n*) and says angrily: *Araspels xawsis* "Are you telling fairy-tales?"

In T'ovmay Arcruni /Ananun/ 4.7 (V. M. Vardanyan 1985: 450^{L15}; transl. Thomson 1985: 352 [here: 4.6]): *stayōd banic' pačučēal araspels*: "fables elaborated from fictitious accounts".

In a poem by Arak'el Siwnec'i /14-15th cent./ [Poturean 1914: 234, stanza 117], the verb *araspel* occurs in an enumeration of pejorative designations for verbal activities: *barba[n]jel, xetkatakēl, parap nāstel araspel*.

'infamous subject for public talkings': Ar ors 4 (see NHB 292c) - *Zi araspel zis arasc'ēs i kenc'atums*.

'fable': T'ovmay Arcruni (9-10th cent., Vaspurakan) 1.10 (V. Vardanyan 1985: 108): *Ar sa inj i čax elanē k'ert'otakan araspeln or asē: bazum angam afuesk' t'agaworel xorhec'an, bayc' šunk' oč' arin yanjn*: "In this regard the poetic fable seems opportune to me, which runs: 'Often the foxes planned to reign, but the dogs did not agree'". Here V. Vardanyan (1985: 109) renders *araspel* by *arak*, which in ModArm. means 'fable'. Thomson (1985: 131) similarly translates 'fable', noting: "I have not identified this quotation".

This fable is very short and formulaic, and may be used as an illustration for the interrelationship [fable : proverb, saying]. For the meaning 'fable' in respect of the relationship with the synonymous *arak* (q.v.) cf. P'il samp's (late 5th or 6th century?) - *Sksayc' arak, oč' araspelakan, ayl or ē čšmarit arakeal*.

'proverb': 1 Kings 24.14 - *Orpēs asē hin araspeln, yanawrēn jerac' yelc'ē vnas*.

Movsēs Xorenac'i 1.12 (1913=1991: 40^{L4f}; transl. Thomson 1978: 90): *Vasn oroy t'ui ardaranal araspelin* (dativus cum infinitivo), *or asi i mēj gefjkac'*: "*t'ē k'o Šarayi orkorn ē, asen, mer Širakay ambark'n č'en*": "Therefore the proverb that circulates among the villagers seems to be justified: 'If you have the throat of Sharay, they say, we do not have the barns of Shirak'". In Plato (6th century): *P'ok'r inč' ardeawk' araspelaw varil part ē, et'ē <... >*.

'enigma, riddle': Judges 14:12, 19 [Adjectival usage in Koč' 267; cf. below in dialects].

For the meaning 'riddle' of *araspel* and *arak* (q.v.) see also S. Harut'yunyan 1960: 7f; Mnac'akanyan 1980: 6-7; Ōdabašyan 1987: 64₁₀.

Denominative verbs *araspelēm, araspelabanēm, araspelagorcēm, araspelastetcem* and numerous other derivations, like: *araspelabar, araspelaxaws, araspelakan, araspelakoc*, etc.

Some illustrations, beside the passage from Movsēs Xorenac'i 2. 61, demonstrate that the mythical tales were often performed by singing, cf. Movsēs Xorenac'i 2.50

(1913=1991: 179; transl. Thomson 1978: 192-193): *Zays teti araspelabanelov vipasank'n yergeln iwreanc' asen*: < ... >. *Doynpēs ew zharsaneac'n araspeleal ergen*, < ... >: "This episode the storytellers rehearse, as they sing their fables, in the following way: <...>. Similarly they also sing in their fables about the wedding".

Probably, the minstrels sometimes contested in such performances accompanied with laments, cf. Kaṭank* (7th or 10th century) - *Yotdōtdamit ew araspelakoc mrc'anawk' yacik' aysr andr*.

Verb *araspelēm*: in "Ašxarhac'oyc'" (Soukry 1881: 42).

In "Baṛgirk' hayoc'" (see Amalyan 1975: 31^{Nr724}): *araspel · hrašaban, kam sut patmut'iwn*.

●**DIAL** Preserved in some dialects without any relevant phonological deviation: Juṭa 'licentious story'; Rodost'o, Tigranakert, Nor Naxiṭewan, etc. 'immoral, indecent', e.g. *Araspel baner mi asil* "Do not say indecent (or unbelievable?) things/words"; Karin, Sebastia, T'iflis 'stubborn'. The Turkish-speaking Armenians of Angora use the word in meanings 'immoral word' and 'fairy-tale' (if Ačāryan's rendering *hēk'eac* is a misprint for *hēk'eat*).

Sebastia *araspel* 'extraordinary (blasphemy); licentious (girl)' [Gabikēan 1952: 80].

●**ETYM** The word is composed of the prefix *ar-* (rather than *ara-* as suggested in Olsen 1999: 72), the anaptyxis *-a-* before *s* (cf. Greppin 1983: 297; Jahukyan 1987: 243; see s.v.v. *arastat* and *ar-*), and otherwise unattested root **spel-*, which is derived from PIE **spel-*. (In Hovhannisyan 1990: 65, *a-* is a "prothetic vowel", which is not quite accurate).

This etymology has been proposed by Lidén (1933: 46-49) and is accepted generally (HAB 1: 253-254; Pokorny 1959: 985; Solta 1960: 288; Klingenschmitt 1982: 169f; Mallory/Adams 1997: 536; Olsen 1999: 72; etc.). Compare Goth. *spill* 'story, fable', Alb. *fjalë* f. (Sg, Pl) 'word' (Demiraj 1997: 134, in passing), Gr. *ἀπειλή* 'threat; promise', *ἀπειλέω* 'to threaten', cf. Beekes 1969: 50, 85; Mallory/Adams 1997: 536 ("if from **ḡ-pelno-*"). The appurtenance of Toch. B *pāl-* 'to praise, commend' is uncertain [Adams 1999: 376-377]. According to Ačāryan (HAB 1: 253-254), Tumanyan (1978: 204) et al., only the Germanic words are related to the Armenian. Greppin (1981b: 3) notes that the correlation Arm. *araspel* 'boastful' : Gr. *ἀπειλή* 'fable' should not be rejected though there is some semantic unbalance. (It seems that in this passage the meanings of the Armenian and the Greek words are confused with each other). The formation of Arm. *araspel* is parallel to that of OE *bi-spell* 'fable'. Compare also Arm. *arac* (HAB s.v.).

See also s.v. *paṭatim*.

arastat *a*-stem (GDPl *arastat-a-c* in Ephrem) 'ceiling, roof' (Bible+); later (also dial.): 'sky; palate'.

For the biblical attestations see Astuacaturean 1895: 162-163 and Lidén 1933: 41.

NHB and HAB record also the meaning 'sky', attested in "Meknut'iwn Awetaranin Yohannu" by John Chrysostom (2.1): *Kami?tes tanel zgetec'ik arastats; yoržam gišern žamanē, tes zardareal zerkins astetōk* "Do you want to see the beautiful ceiling? When the night arrives, see the adorned sky with stars!" As Gohar Muradyan (to whom I express my gratitude) kindly informs me, the corresponding part of the Greek text probably has not been preserved. However, she points out to another similar passage of the Greek text (PG vol. 59: 102.8) where too the sky is metaphorically associated with the ceiling. Thus, we seem to be dealing with a metaphory or comparison rather than lexicalization of the meaning 'sky'; cf. a similar metaphory with the synonymic *jetun* (q.v.). Note also the remarkable association 'ceiling' : 'starry sky' in some dialects (see below).

The meaning 'palate' appears in several late attestations: Abusayid (12th cent.; Cilicia) [S. Vardanyan 1974: 131^{L12}, 194^{L13}; in the glossary: 223]; "Bžškaran jioy ew arhasarak grastnoy" (13th cent.): *arastax-k* [Č'ugaszyan 1980: 148^{L9}; in the glossary: 180]. For other attestations (Mxit'ar Herac'i, "Oskip'orik", Amirdovlat' Amasiac'i) see NHB 1: 293c; MiġHayBaġ 1, 1987: 77a.

● **DIAL** Preserved in SW dialects: Akn *arəsdax* [HAB 1: 255a], Zeyt'un *ayəsdəx* [Ačāryan 2003: 299], Aramo *arəstə*, NPl *arəstəna*, K'abusie *arəstux* [Laribyan 1958: 28, 59a, 120b], Malat'ia *arəstat* [Danielyan 1967: 186b], K'esab *arəstəx/x/k* [Č'olak'ean 1986: 196b], Svedia *arəsdut*, loc./all. *earəsdaut* < **y-arastat* [Andreasyan 1967: 33, 354b]. In these descriptions the semantics of the word is not specified. Only Ačāryan (HAB 1: 255a), citing the forms from Akn, Zeyt'un, and Svedia, records the meanings: 1) 'ceiling'; 2) 'palate'.

Borrowed into the Turkish dialects of Evdokia, Karin (Erzrum), Kesaria, Sebastia, Tarente, Adana [HAB 1: 255a]. For the dialect of Sebastia, Arm. *arastat* is glossed in Gabikean 1952: 80 by Turk. *arəstat*.

On Persian see below.

In the Armenian dialects of Syria, *arastat* 'ceiling' seems to have been contaminated with *astt* 'star' (q.v.); for the association 'ceiling' : 'palate' : 'sky' see 3.7.1. A curious word is found in the dialect of Šatax (Van-group): *asttunk'y*, glossed as *katik, šnč'ap'oł*, that is 'uvula, windpipe' [M. Muradyan 1962: 209a], with no reference to the origin or ClArm. correspondence. Formally, this word is identical with Van pl. *asttunk* 'stars' (see s.v. *astt* 'star'). A semantic shift (or

confusion) between ‘palate’ and ‘uvula, windpipe’ seems conceivable. Thus we seem to be dealing with the development ‘starry sky’ > ‘palate etc.’. Alternatively (and, perhaps, more probably), *asthunk* ‘y’ ‘uvula, windpipe’ may be derived from *arastat* ‘palate’ with loss of *-i-* and/or contamination with *asthunk* ‘stars’. In either case, the word should be discussed within the framework of ‘ceiling’ : ‘palate’ : ‘(starry) sky’ (see 3.7.1).

●**ETYM** Another case of the composition of the prefix *ar(a)-* and an independently unattested root (cf. s.v.v. *ar-* and *araspel*), that is **stat*. The latter is connected (Dervischjan 1877: 40₁ and Lidén 1933: 41-42, 45, independently) to OCS *stelja* ‘roof’ and the like, which can be seen under Pokorny’s **stel-*₂ ‘ausbreiten, flach hinbreiten’ (see from. Everyone accepts this (Pokorny 1959: 1018-1019; Solta 1960: 225ff; Tumanjan 1978: 204-205; Greppin 1983: 297-298; Ĵahukyan 1987: 151; Olsen 1999: 208; etc.) without mentioning the alternative etymology proposed by Ačāryan (HAB 1: 254), who prefers deriving Arm. **stat* from what is presented in Pokorny 1959: 1019-1020 as **stel-*₃.

Both Ačāryan and Pokorny (“wohl”) point out the possibility that these two PIE roots may be related to each other. However, we will continue dealing with the “Wurzel-etymologie” until we recognize the direct association of Armenian **stat* with Gr. *στῆλη* ‘block or slab used as a memorial; monument; gravestone; post, pillar; boundary-post’ and OHG *stollo*, MHG *stolle* ‘Stütze, Gestell, Pfosten’. The protoform of the Greek, and, according to O. Haas (1961: 80), Phryg. *starna*, is **st₁neh₂-*, which is perfectly suitable for Arm. **stata-* (*arastat* has an *a*-stem). On the development **-ln-* > Arm. *-l-* see 2.1.22.8.

The basic meaning of Arm. *arastat* ‘roof’ would then be ‘(that is leaned) on the pillar’, cf. also s.v.v. *arik*, **arormi*, dial. **ar-zei* (Ačārean 1913: 132b).

In NHB 1: 293c, *arastat* is glossed by Pers. *arast’ag*, Gr. *ὀροφος*, Lat. *tectum* ‘roof’. The Persian word, the meaning of which is not specified, seems interesting. When reliable, it might be an Armenian loan. However, in Steingass (32a) I only found *ārāstagī* ‘ornament, embellishment, decoration; order, arrangement’. Whether or not this word is somehow related with Arm. *arastat* ‘ceiling’ is uncertain. The semantic relationship seems possible, cf. *a(w)čār* ‘roof, ceiling’ vs. *a(w)čār* ‘equipment, harness, make-up, ornament, material’.

arawawt, *i-* and *u-* stems ‘morning’.

Bible+. Also: adj. *arawawt-in* (*-tn-oc*) ‘matutinus’, *arawawt-u(n)*, *-uc* ‘in the morning’ (Bible+).

●**DIAL** Widespread in dialects. Many forms display contraction or allegro, e.g. Nor Naxiĵewan *aradun* (next to *aravdun*), Van *aratun*, *arat-man*, etc., Polis *ardu*, etc. Šamaxi *ar̄ot* or *ar̄r* reflects a contraction peculiar to this dialect, cf. *baxtawor* 'lucky' > Šamaxi *baxt̄r*, etc. [Baġramyan 1964: 35].

The Aġtial forms show an irregular absence of the second *-w-*: *arvadu(n)* (Suč'ava, Hungary) and *arvadanc'* (Romania) [Ačāryan 1953: 50, 259]. Ačāryan glosses these forms as corresponding to ClArm. (Loc. adverb?) *arawawtu*. He does not cite any Aġtial reflex of the "pure" form *arawawt*.

●**ETYM** Ačāryan (HAB 1: 256) does not accept any of numerous etymological proposals, of which only that of Patrubaŋy (*1906: 341//HAmS) is worth of consideration. He analyzes the word as *ar-* + **aw-* + *-awt* and compares the root **aw-* with Lat. *aurōra* f. 'dawn', Gr. *ἔως, ὄως* f. 'dawn', Skt. *uṣās-* f. 'morning light, morning, dawn' (RV+), etc. This etymology is advocated by Dumézil (see Greppin 1983: 298 for references), and, with some reservation, by Ĵahukyan (1987: 114, 159, 383); cf. also Eichner 1978: 152₃₄; Clackson 1994: 223₉₇, 224₉₈; Olsen 1999: 959₄₄. See also s.v. *ayg* 'morning'.

Aġayan (1974: 24-27) derives **aw-* from the root of PIE **sāu-el-* 'sun'. This is improbable since, as stated by Ĵahukyan (1987: 159) the "pure" root **sāu-* is not attested in any cognate language. Aġayan (ibid.) identifies the *-aw-awt* with the hapax *awōt* (meaning 'time' according to Ačāryan [HAB 1: 363a], and 'the time of sun-rise' according to E. Aġayan), also found in *šaġ-awōt* (with *šaġ* 'dew' as the first member) and *kam-awōt* attested in Anania Širakac'i (7th cent.) as the names of the 4th and 5th nocturnal hours respectively, *ar-awōt* itself being the 10th (see Aġayan 1974: 24-26; 1986: 80-81, 83; see also Greppin 1983: 298). For the list of the hour-names in Anania Širakac'i see A. G. Abrahamyan 1944: 113. For the suffix *-awt* see 2.3.1.

arawušt 'urinary bladder; watery pustule, blister'.

Only one attestation is cited in NHB 1: 298a and HAB 1: 256a: Nemesis of Emesa (or Gregory of Nyssa), "Yaġags bnūt'ean mardoy", in the meaning 'urinary bladder'.

I find another attestation in "Saks bac'ayaytut'ean t'uoc'" by Anania Širakac'i (7th cent.), published by A. G. Abrahamyan (1944: 237-250) on the basis of the Matenadaran manuscript Nr 3710. Here 245^{L24}) *arawušt ĵroy* (*ĵroy* = GSg of *ĵur* 'water') is mentioned as one of the 7 kind of excrements of the body and probably means 'watery pustule, blister'.

●**ETYM** NHB (1: 298a) considers as identic with (*noyn ənd*) *p'amp'ušt* 'urinary bladder'. Dervischjan (1877: 80) treats as containing the prefix *ara-* and compares the second component with Skt. *vas-ti-* 'Blase, Harnblase'. Ačāryan (HAB 1: 256a) does not accept these suggestions and leaves the origin of the word open.

As far as the second component is concerned, the suggestion by NHB can be revived. The word *p'amp'ušt* contains *bušt* 'urinary bladder; blotch, pustule' (q.v.). The same holds for *arawušt*, since the intervocalic **-b^h-* yields Arm. *-w-*. As for the first part, see s.v. *bušt*.

***ar-zeł** (dial.)

●**DIAL** In DialAdd apud NHB (2: 1060c): *arzel* "a bed for workers made at the ceiling (*ar jetunn*) or with straw (*cetiwk*) in stables or cattle-sheds". This is identified with Muš, Aparan *arzel* [Amatuni 1912: 57a], or Van, Muš *arzel*, Aparan, Bulanəx *arcel* [Ačārean 1913: 132b]. This dialectal word mainly refers to a high wooden bed between two posts. According to Ačāryan (1913: 132b), it also means 'a small and crooked chamber under the ceiling, = Fr. mansarde', though in this case the dialectal area is not specified.

Here belongs also Sasun *ärzel* 'an immovable wooden bed (*t'axt*)' (see Petoyan 1954: 104; 1965: 203, 444). The *-č'-* in Sasun *arč'el* [HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 99b] must be a misprint for *-z-*.

●**ETYM** NHB implicitly suggests an interpretation as *ar jetunn* 'at the ceiling' (see above). This is probable. ClArm. *jetun* 'ceiling', also with a *o*-vocalism, *jotunk* in Severian of Gabala etc. and in dialect of Akn, contains **je/ol* 'log; pole', cf. Georgian *jeli* 'log' and Arm. *joł* 'log; pole', perhaps also **jil* (in the verb *jlem* 'to plough'). For the pattern of naming the ceiling or another wooden structure with the prefix *ar* and a word that means 'log, pole etc.' see e.g. s.v. *ar-a-stat* 'ceiling'. For *-řj-* > *-řz-* cf. *arjak* 'free, loose etc.' > Łarabał *härzäk* etc.

arogem : Paterica+, *aroganem* : Agat'angelos (5th cent.), Yovhannēs Drasxanakertc'i (9-10th cent.), etc., *orogem*, *oroganem* (Bible+)

'to water, wet, sprinkle, irrigate'. Once as a noun: *arog* 'well, irrigating water', in "Knik' hawatoy" ("Seal of faith", 7th cent.).

In Agat'angelos 103 and 111 (1909=1980: 62^{L9}, 65^{L15}), *orog-* and *arog-* appear as reading variants.

In Grigor Narekac'i 9.2.34 (Xač'atryan/Łazinyan 1985: 278): *erkir orogeal c'awtov*: "the earth sprinkled by dew".

For *aroganem* Greppin (1983: 301) also cites the meaning 'to pronounce carefully', and among derivatives mentions *aroganut'íwn* 'prosody, pronunciation'. These, however, belong to *ogem* 'to speak, etc.' (see HAB 3: 549a; A. Muradyan 1971: 139, 304-305; Weitenberg 2003: 421, 424).

●**ETYM** From PIE **srou-* 'to stream, flow': Skt. *srav-* 'to stream, flow', OHG *stroum* 'stream', Lith. *sravėti* 'to seep, flow slowly', Gr. *ρέω* 'to flow, stream', Gr. *πόος* (Cypr. *πόφος*) 'stream', etc. [Bugge (1892: 451-452; HAB 1: 263, 264]. According to Witczak (1999: 184), *a/oroganem* "seems to be a denominative formation", which is improbable and unnecessary. For the morphological discussion see Klingenschmitt 1982: 204. See also s.v. *arū* 'brook, channel, ditch'.

The initial *a-* is prothetic, though this (together with *arū*) is the only unambiguous case of a prothetic vowel before the trilled *r*; *arēwc* 'lion' (q.v.) is probably of onomatopoeic origin. The absence of a prothetic vowel in *irungn* 'nose, nostrils' suggests a loan or substrate origin. It has been suggested that *arū* derives from **erū* (see Greppin 1983: 301), and the *o-* of *orogem* is due to assimilatory influence of the root vowel, see Klingenschmitt 1982: 204₅₂; Beekes 2003: 160-161 (from **e-rogem*). The variant *orog-* is attested much better than *arog-*, so one might think it is due to the influence of *arū*. On the other hand, a prothetic vowel *a-* with a labial vowel in the root is confirmed by *aroyr* 'brass' < Iran. **rōδ* (see 2.1.17.4). The fluctuation *a...o* and *o...o* is reminiscent of that seen in *oroč-* vs. dial. **aroč* (q.v.). However, **aroč* is found in SE dialects (Agulis, Łarabał, etc.), where the prothetic vowel is *a-* even when the Classical Armenian and the other dialects have *e-*. On these problems see also 2.1.23 (vocalic assimilation) and 2.1.17 (prothetic vowel).

arū, *i*-stem, *o*-stem, *a*-stem 'brook, tributary; channel; ditch, trench, furrow, passage'.

Bible+.

In Movsēs Xorenac'i 2.62 (1913=1991: 194^{L9f}): *ew zaygin mec, yor mtanēr arun get, haneal i covēn Gaylatuay*. Thomson (1978: 206) translates the passage as follows: "and the great vineyard wick is irrigated by the canal that branches out from the lake of Gaylatu". Jihanyan (1991: 231) adheres to the view that *arun*, though unattested otherwise as such, is a river-name. The verb *hanem* 'to take out etc.' is transitive, however, and is never used, to my knowledge, as 'to come out' or the like. It seems therefore more probable that *arū(n) get* refers to a large artificial irrigating channel that is taken/drawn out from the lake of Gaylatu (nowadays - Balək'č'ay); this is exactly how Malxasyanc' (1990: 126) translates the passage.

●**DIAL** Preserved in numerous dialects: Nor Naxijewan, Aslanbek, Hamšen, Zeyt'un, Muš, Van, Agulis, Łarabał, Juł, etc. Xarberd has *arun* (, with an additional *-n*. In all

the dialects the meaning is 'brook', and only in Nor Naxiĵewan: 'the path of rain or flood water' [HAB 1: 265a].

Some dialectal forms point to a prefixed formation, viz. **y-āru* : Muš, Alaškert *h'āru*, Van *āru*, Ozim *hāru* [HAB 1: 265a; Ačāryan 1952: 247], as well as Moks *hāru*, GSG *hārvə* 'канава, арык'; see Orbeli 2002: 275; a textual illustration: 118^{L15} (Russ. transl. - p. 179).

●**ETYM** Since Bugge (1892: 451-452; see also HAB 1: 263, 264), derived from PIE **sr(e/o)u-* 'to stream, flow': Gr. *ῥέω* 'to flow, stream', Gr. *ῥόος* (Cypr. *ῥόφος*) 'stream', Skt. *śrav-* 'to stream, flow', OHG *stroum* 'stream', Lith. *sravėti* 'to seep, flow slowly', etc. See also s.v. *a/oroganem* 'to water, wet, sprinkle' (from **srou-*). The Armenian form presupposes **sr(o)u-i-o/eh₂-* (cf. Lith. *srauja*, Latv. *strauja* 'stream', Russ. *strujá* 'stream', etc.), or **sru-ti-* (cf. Skt. *srutí-*, *ῥύσις*, etc.), or **sru-to-* (cf. Gr. *ῥυτός* 'flowing'), or **sroutos-* n. (cf. Skt. *srótas-* n. 'stream, current' /RV+/, OPers. *rautah-* n., Pahl., NPers. *rōd* 'stream'). Witczak (1999: 184) derives *āru* from **srōwos* m., which is formally improbable. For the prothetic vowel see s.v. *ārog(-)* and 2.1.17.4. According to Ačāryan (HAB 1: 265a), Georg. *ru*, *ruvi* 'brook, channel' was borrowed from Armenian before the addition of the prothetic vowel.

The dialectal prefixed **y-āru* (with *y-* from **h₂en-* 'in') can be understood as 'in-flux, in-flow', cf. Lat. *in-flūxio* 'influx, tributary' etc.

As we saw above, Ĵihanyan (1991: 231) treats the word in the passage from Movsēs Xorenac'i as a river-name *Arūn*, with an etymological *-n*, and derives it from PIE **sruno/a-* (cf. Avest. *ravan-* etc.). The form would correspond to Xarberd *arūn*. However, in that passage we seem to be dealing with the article *-n*, and the Xarberd form can be characterized as having an additional *-n*, on which see 2.2.1.3.

See also s.v. *getar(u)*, GSG *getāru-i* in Łazar P'arpec'i.

asetn GSG *astan* (Bible), ISg *astam-b* (Ephrem), APl *astun-s* ("Čarəntir") 'needle'.

Bible+. Derivatives based on *astan-*, *asetn-*, *astn-*, etc. Also without *-n* : *ast-a-ktuc* 'akind of sea bird', literally: '(having a) needle-beak', in Anania Širakac'i, 7th cent. (see A. G. Abrahamyan 1944: 308^{L26}; A. G. Abrahamyan and G. B. Petrosyan 1979: 362₉); MArm. *asex*, *aset* [MiĵHayBař 1, 1987: 81a]; perhaps also *ast-ani* 'thread' (Bible+) [Weitenberg 1985: 104], or *ast-eni*, which is attested in Yovhan Mandakuni/Mayragomec'i (2003: 1262b^{L5f}), in a list of sorceries: *asteni karmir* 'red thread', between *acut* 'coal' and *erkat* 'iron'. Compare *astanik'n kaxardac* "the threads of sorcerers" in John Chrysostom.

●**DIAL** Dialectally ubiquitous. All the forms lack the final *-n* except for Agulis *āysātnə* (next to *āysāṭ*) [Ačārean 1935: 35, 337], Łarabaṭ *asetnə* (next to *aset*)

[Davt'yan 1966: 317]. Next to *ásut* (see below), Metri has a trace of *-n* in the derivative *əsətnávur* < *aseṭnawor* (see Ałayan 1954: 263a). Other compounds, viz. *əst-á-ben* and *əst-á-man* (loc. cit.), lack the *-n*. Moks usually preserves the final *-n* of this type in the oblique stem, but in this particular case no trace is found: NSg *ásēf* or *āsif* / *ásəf*, GSg *ásēf* (see Orbeli 2002: 205-206).

The vocalism of Agulis *áysät(nə)* is irregular with respect to both vowels of the word (see Ačārean 1935: 35, 49). For the initial vowel one may assume anticipation of the front vowel *e/i* in the following syllable, as in *calel* 'to fold' > Agulis *cáyil*, etc. However, the vowel *-ä-* remains unclear. One therefore may also think of vocalic metathesis (see 2.1.26.4): **asiñ* (if this form is reliable; see below) > **isat(n)*. That **isat(n)* would yield Agulis *áysät(nə)* is seen from e.g. *cicat* 'laughter' > Agulis *cáycät* (see Ačārean 1935: 60).

Interesting is Nor Ĵuła *asut* 'needle' (attested since 1788), the *-u-* of which is irregular and is only paralleled by *tašet* 'woodshaving' > Nor Ĵuła *tašut* (see Ačāryan 1940: 61). The third example is *utet* 'brain' > *ətut* (next to *ətef*). One should reckon with rounding effect of the final *-t* on the preceding front vowel (Weitenberg, p.c. and research in process). But it is unclear why we have doublet forms next to each other, for the other words containing *-et(n)* yielded *-et* (see Ačāryan 1940: 61). A similar case is found in Metri, Karčewan, and Kak'avaberd, where we have *ásut* [Ałayan 1954: 263a; H. Muradyan 1960: 190a; 1967: 166b]. Next to *ase/it* 'needle' (see above), Moks has *asut*, GSg *ásutēf* in different semantics, viz. 'two small planks that tie the handle of a plough with the pole' (see Orbeli 2002: 206) [According to Amatuni (1912: 60b), Moks (the village of Knekanc') has *asot' arōri mac'*]. That this is identic with the word for 'needle' is seen from Nor Bayazet **aset* which denotes the same part of a plough (see Ačārean 1913: 138-139 s.v. *aset* 'needle', with a detailed semantic description), as well as Muš (see HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 104a). For the semantic development cf. *t'ur* 'sword' which in some dialects seems to denote the same or a similar part of a plough (see Amatuni 1912: 219b; Ačārean 1913: 379a; Bdoyan 1972: 209a, 218a, 220b, etc., especially 223ab). Note that Ačāryan (1913: 140a) records Van **asot* 'a part of the plough which elsewhere is called *t'ur*'; then he questions: "that is *aset*?". Ĵahukyan (1972: 281) is more positive and represents Van **asot* (not mentioning the others) as a dialectal by-form of *asetn* 'needle'. Note also *net* 'arrow' > Moks *nit* 'the pole of a plough' (see Orbeli 2002: 299).

●**ETYM** Since de Lagarde (1868: 14) and others, connected with Lat. *aciēs*, *-cē* f. 'edge, point', *acus* 'needle', etc. [HAB 1: 268]. For **-l-* cf. OCS *osla* 'whetstone', Sloven. *ósła* 'whetstone', OEng. *egle* 'awn', Germ. *Achel* 'tip of an ear'. The explanation according to which the Armenian comes from an older **asitan* (> NSg

asetn, GSg *astan*), which is allegedly confirmed by Slavic **os-i-la-* (see Jahukyan 1987: 157), cannot be maintained since, in fact, the Slavic has no **-i-*; cf. Kortlandt 1985: 22 = 2003: 65. Thus, Hübschmann (1897: 421^{Nr40}) and Ačaryan (HAB 1: 268) are right in reconstructing **ak̂-l-* (= **h₂ek̂-l-*).

Since Arm. *asetn* appears in Agulis and Łarabał with and without *-n* (see above, also Weitenberg 1985: 104) whereas neighbouring dialects such as Ĵuta, Metri, etc. (as well as Moks) have *asut̃*, and since an original *-e-* would not disappear in the oblique cases, one might offer the following solution. The IE word may be treated as having a HD *l*-stem (for the type see Beekes 1995: 177): NSg **h₂ek̂-ōl* > **h₂k̂ōl*, with zero grade in the root analogically after the oblique stem, > Nor Ĵuta, Metri group, and Moks dial. *asut̃* (see also s.v. *acut̃* 'coal'), ASg **h₂k̂-el̂-m* > *asetn*, GSg **h₂k̂-l-ós-*. This is reminiscent of the well-known case of the word for 'milk', where Metri group and Agulis reflect the old, archaic form with nominative **-s* (**kat̃c*), whereas all the remaining dialects and Classical Armenian have the form derived from the PIE accusative, viz. *kat̃n* (q.v.). Remarkably, *asetn* and **asut̃* are both represented in Moks, but with semantic differentiation: *ase/it̃* 'needle' : *asut̃* 'two small planks that tie the handle of a plough with the pole'.

The vocalic loss in gen. *astan* and compositional *astn-* presupposes an analogical nominative by-form **asutn* (cf. dial. **asut̃*) or *asitn* (in HAB 1: 268a, as a spelling variant of *asetn*). For **asitn* see also above, on Agulis.

asem, aor. *asac̃'i*, Imper. *asa* 'to say, tell, speak'.

One of the principle verbs for speaking. Also refers to the singing of birds, cf. *i žam hawun aseloy* 'in the time of speaking of the bird' (Łazar P'arpec'i), cf. dial., also the meaning s.v. *aspučak*; (or *haw* here means 'cock'?, see s.v. *haw₁*). Cf. *haw-a-xōs* [Ałayan 1986: 83, 85], dial. *hav-xus-oc̃* (see Srvanjtyanc' 1, 1978: 145), *xoroz-xos* [Lalayan 1, 1983: 249, cf. 243], etc.

● **DIAL** Ubiquitous in dialects.

The meaning 'to sing' is attested in the earlier versions (1890 and 1896) of the poem "Łorec'i Sak'on" by H. T'umanyan (3, 1989: 174^{L88}, 186^{L157}), a speaker of the Lori sub-dialect (the village of Dseł), which belongs to the dialect of Ararat. The poet himself noted in his glossary: *asel- ergel* (to sing) [ibid.: 180].

The dialectal form *asmunk̃* 'phrase, word, speech' (see Ačarean 1913: 140a) has developed a religious meaning: 'rite' (in Urmia) [Asatryan 1962: 212b], 'religious service' (Ararat, Łarabał, Muš, Van) [HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 106a], and 'magic formula' in Svedia (*ε/asmənk̃*, see Andreasyan 1967: 219, cf. 354b).

The Hamšēn aorist formation is remarkable *as-t-i*, *as-t-ir*, *as-t-av*; *as-t-ak*′, *as-t-ik*′, *as-t-in* (see Ačāryan 1947:134-135); e.g. *mek*′ *astak*′ ‘we said’ [Ačāryan 1947: 245]. According to Ačāryan (1947: 74, 134-135), the *-t-* is an epenthesis of phonetic nature; see 2.1.31. It is not clear, however, why it only functions in the aorist, therefore a phonetic explanation does not seem satisfactory. The paradigm is irregular in three respects: 1) the "additional" *-t-* is enigmatic; 2) for a verb of *e*-class one would expect the following paradigm: *-ec*′*i*, *-ec*′*ir*, *-ec*′; *-ec*′*ak*′, *-ec*′*ik*′, *-ec*′*in* (Hamšēn Class 1); 3) the 3Sg *-av* is not at home in this paradigm.

In order to solve problem we should start with the fact that *asem* is irregular already in Classical Armenian, thus 3SgAor. is not **asec*′*i* but *asac*′*i*. This implies that the verb could have been incorporated into Class 3A, the type *xatam* -- *xat(a)c*′*i*, *xat(a)c*′*ir*, *xatac*′; *xat(a)c*′*ak*′, *xat(a)c*′*ik*′, *xat(a)c*′*in*. The syncopated variant of the aorist paradigm of *asem* would then be as follows: **asc*′*i*, **asc*′*ir*, **asac*′; **asc*′*ak*′, **asc*′*ik*′, **asc*′*in*. For an attestation of, e.g. 3Pl. *asc*′*in* in MArm see Yovhannēs T′lkuranc′i (14-15th cent.) [Mnac′akanyan 1941: 180a; Pivazyan 1960: 165^{L19f}] Assuming a phonological development *-sc*′- > *-st-* (desaffrication?), which is conceivable, we arrive at the actual paradigm, that is *as-t-i* etc. The only exception is 3Sg *as-t-av* instead of **asac*′. The reason for this could have been that after phonologization of the *-t-* the paradigm *asti*, *astir*, **asac*′ would be odd, thus **asac*′ has been replaced by *astav* after the second subtype of Class 3. The imperative forms *asä*, *as-t-ek*′, as well as the past participle *as-t-aj*, can similarly derive from **as-a*, **as-(a)c*′*ek*′ and **as-(a)c*′*ac*, respectively; cf. *xat-a*, *xat-(a)c*′*ek*′ and *xat-(a)c*′*aj*. Compare MArm. *asc*′*ac* in, e.g., "Datastanagirk'" (1265 AD) of Smbat Sparapet [Galstyan 1958: 137a].

For the development *-sc*′- > *-st-* (desaffrication?) one can compare *šč* > *št* found in *šičuk* > Muš, Alaškert *šdug* (see HAB s.v.). The distribution in Muš is remarkable: *šijug* and *šdug*. Thus, the *-d-* is found only in the syncopated form, where it immediately follows the *šč*.

●**ETYM** Usually compared with Gr. *ῥῆ* (athematic imperfect) < **h₁ce-h₁eg-t* ‘he said’, Lat. *aiō* ‘I say’, etc. Probably from earlier perfect formations. The *-s-* from **-g̃-* is problematic (cf. also s.v. *arac*). For literature and the discussion of phonological and morphological problems I refer to HAB 1: 266; Klingenschmitt 1982: 135, 137-138; Lamberterie 1980: 223; 1982: 26f and passim; Ĵahukyan 1982: 55, 190; Greppin 1983: 302-303; Schrijver 1991: 26-28; Clackson 1994: 81.

askn ‘a precious stone of red colour’, probably ‘ruby’.

Attested only in Severian of Gabala, twice, in a list of precious stones. After discussing the list, Ačāryan (HAB 1: 269) concludes that *askn* is equivalent to *sutak* of the corresponding list in Exodus 48.17 (a misprint for 28.19; cf. also 39.12), which is a kind of *karkehan*, found in both lists. Greppin (1983: 303) translates *askn* as ‘garnet’. See also HAB s.v. *sutak(n)*.

●**ETYM** The only etymology I know of is that of Ałayan (1974: 29^{Nr13}) who derives it from PIE **h₂eHs-* ‘hearth; ash’. For the cognates see s.v. *azazim* and *ačīwn*. With the exception of Greppin (1983: 303), this etymology is unknown to the western scholars. Even in Armenia proper it remained unnoticed, except for Ałabekyan 1979: 63. The word is absent in Ĵahukyan 1987 and Olsen 1999. Greppin gives the whole entry between square brackets.

Though not very clear, the etymology is, nevertheless, worthy of consideration. For the semantics cf. *kayc* ‘spark’ vs. ‘ruby’, Gr. *ἀνθραξ* ‘charcoal’ vs. ‘ruby, carbuncle, etc.’. The absence of an initial *h-* is perhaps due to the zero-grade form and the possible influence of *ačīwn* ‘ash’ (if this is indeed related), where the initial syllable of the historically polysyllabic form was unstressed. The suffixal element *-k-* can go back to PIE **-g-* which is probably attested in OIc. *aska* ‘ash’, Gr. *ἄσ(γ)βολος*, maybe also in *ačīwn* < **aščiwn* ‘ash’. See also s.v. *asči*.

For *-n* see 2.2.1.3.

The hypothetical preform of *askn* would then be **h₂Hs-g-m*. For **-g-* cf. the Germanic forms: Goth. *azgo*, OHG. *asca* ‘ashes’.

asči ‘food’. ‘food’.

Attested only in John Chrysostom: *T’ēpētew kerakreac’, ayl aštuč hac’iw ew jkambk’*: *naew k’atak’in ayn isk hanapazord asči*.

●**ETYM** No etymology.

I wonder whether it can go back to IE ‘ash’; cf. OIc. *aska* ‘ash’; Arm. *askn* prob. ‘ruby’ < **ember, spark* (q.v.), *ačīwn* < **aščiwn* ‘ash’ (q.v.). If this is true, *asči* may be derived from **h₂Hs-g-ijV-* ‘of ash’ and referred originally to food (bread?) prepared (baked?) by burying it under ashes. The underlying practice is parallel to that reflected in Arm. *nkan* ‘a kind of bread’ < Iran. **ni-kan-* ‘buried’, cf. Khwar. *kand* ‘bread’, etc.; see HAB 3: 455-456.

If the loss of *-s-* in *ačīwn* ‘ash’ is conditioned by pretonic position, we have a discrepancy in *asči*. Therefore it would perhaps be better to treat *asči* as a late derivation from **ask* ‘ash’ with the productive suffix *-i*, or else as a (derivation based on the) petrified Locative; cf. s.v. *ayg* ‘dawn’.

However, this word will remain uncertain until further textual support is found.

astt, *t*-stem: ISg *astet-b*, NPl *astet-k*ʹ, GDPl *astet-c*ʹ (George of Pisidia), IPl *astet-b-k*ʹ, etc.; *a*-stem: GDPl *astet-a-c*ʹ, IPl *astet-a-w-k*ʹ 'star'.

Bible+. *Asttik*, GSg *Asttkan* (in "Patmut'iwn srboč' Hrip'simeanc'" : *Asttkay*) 'the planet Venus; the goddess of love', see theonym. section s.v.

● **DIAL** Ubiquitous in dialects.

Some dialects display a final *-ə*: Axalc'xa, Ararat, Polis [HAB 1: 279a]; for Polis this is not confirmed in Ačāryan 1941: 74, 90, 204: *asx*. This *-ə* probably betrays an old *-n*, cf. especially Ararat *asttə*: pl. *asttner*. The same holds for GSg *astt-an* in Van [Ačāryan 1952: 124], though this is not confirmed by data from Moks: NSg *astət*, GSg *astt-ə*ʹ, NPl *astt-ir* (see Orbeli 2002: 206; a textual illustration for NPl: 74^{L6}). Šatax has GSg *astt-i* [M. Muradyan 1962: 94], though NPl is *astət-ner* (op. cit. 87). A direct reflex of *-n* in the nominative is seen in Goris: *astətnə* alongside with *astət* [Margaryan 1975: 315a]. Clear traces of *-n* at least in Goris, Lori and Van allow to postulate **astt-n* before 1000 AD [Weitenberg 1985: 102].

For other possible traces of the *-n*, apart from the *-ə* in Axalc'xa etc., note also Muš *asttān catik* 'a kind of flower'; Arabkir *asttntik*ʹ 'étoile filante = falling-star'; Van etc. pl. *asttunk*ʹ (see Ačārean 1913: 140b). Arabkir *asttntik*ʹ is cited by Ačāryan as *astt-ntik*ʹ. The component *-ntik*ʹ is unclear, however. I prefer to interpret the word as a petrified plural *asttñ-ti-k*ʹ (cf. below on Hamšen).

In some dialects the dental has dropped: Polis *asx* [Ačāryan 1941: 74, 90, 204], Zeyt'un *as̥t*, Hačən *asx* [Ačāryan 2003: 137, 299], Malat'ia *asəx* [Danielyan 1967: 187a], Salmast *ast*ʹ [HAB 1: 279a], Maratā *ask* [Ačārean 1926: 106, 123, 385; Davt'yan 1966: 318], etc. The sound change *t > k* is apparently due to the assimilatory influence of the preceding plosive *t*.

Remarkably, Hamšen has GDPl *asttēc*ʹ, though NPl *astet-k*ʹ has been petrified into NSg *astəxk*ʹ [Ačāryan 1947: 93, 221]; cf. above on Arabkir.

Xarberd and Dersim have a variant with diminutive *-ik* [HAB 1: 279a; Baṭramyan 1960: 73b]. Compare the name of the goddess *Asttik* (q.v.), as well as the female personal name *Asttik*, e.g. Polis *Asxīg* [Ačāryan 1941: 74, 90, 204]. For diminutives forms in Svedia etc. see the following.

For Svedia, next to *usdt*, Ačāryan (2003: 431, cf. 560) records a curious form, *arəsdtāg*, which, as he points out, is unclear ("ori inč' lineleḡ haytni č'ē"). For *astt* in this dialect Andreasyan (1967: 354b) has *usdt*, but also *arəstīg* from *astt-ik*, with the same "epenthetic" *-r-*. Note also K'esab *arəstətək* [Č'olak'ean (1986: 227], K'abusie *arastək*, pl. *aras(ə)ṭənnir* or *-nnɔyr* [Łaribyan 1958: 121a]. In Aramo, Łaribyan

(1958: 59a) records sg. *ast̥a* and pl. *ar̥st̥əir*. The same author has also sg. *ust̥*, pl. *ast̥əyr* (op. cit. 27).

One notes that the *-r̥* appears in suffixed formations and the plural but not in the "pure" NSg form corresponding to *ast̥*. This is reminiscent of other cases when the epenthetic *-r-* is inserted (before sibilants and affricates) only in derivatives; see 2.1.30.2. One may also assume that in this particular case the epenthesis may have been prompted by contamination with *ar̥ast̥a* 'ceiling', taken metaphorically as 'starry sky'; see 3.7.1. Remarkably, Č'olak'ean (1986: 227) derives K'esab *ar̥əst̥ətek* 'star' from **ar̥ast̥a-ik*, though he does not mention explicitly that the word for 'ceiling' is meant.

The idea about contamination may be corroborated by the fact that this epenthesis in the word for 'star' has taken place only in the dialects situated in the territory of Syria (Svedia, K'esab, K'abusie, Aramo), and Arm. *ar̥ast̥a* has been directly recorded only in and around the same area, viz. Syria and Cilicia. Thus, the co-existence of forms like e.g. K'esab *ar̥əst̥ətek* 'star' vs. *ar̥əst̥uət* 'ceiling', or of such plurals like e.g. Aramo *ar̥st̥ə-əir* 'stars' vs. *ar̥st̥ə-na* 'ceilings' is hardly a mere chance.

On Šatax *ast̥unk̥* 'y'uvula, windpipe' see s.v. *ar̥ast̥a* 'ceiling; palate'.

Also the final *-a* of Aramo NSg *ast̥a* is interesting (unless it is a misprint). It cannot go back to old **-a-* since **ast̥-a-* would yield Aramo **ast̥ou* or **ast̥uə*, cf. *baklay* 'bean' > *pagluə*, *t̥ay* 'child' > *dt̥ou*, *p'esay* 'son-in-law' > *p'isou* (see Łaribyan 1958: 59b, 72b, 73a). Instead, it can reflect **ast̥-i*, cf. *agi* 'tail' > *akka*, *aygi* 'garden' > *əkka*, *mak* 'i'ewe' > *māk* 'a', *oski* 'gold' > *əska*, etc. [Łaribyan 1958: 20].

●**ETYM** Since Klaproth (1823=1831: 105b) and NHB (1: 319c), compared with Gr. *ἀστὴρ*, *-έρος*, Skt. NPl *tārāḥ* (the absence of the *s-* unexplained), instr. *stṛ-bhiḥ*, Av. *star-*, Pahl. *stārag*, Pers. *sitāra*, Goth. *stairno*, Lat. *stella* < **stēr-lā* or **stēl-nā*, etc. [Hübschmann 1897: 421; HAB 1: 278-279]. Hitt. *hasterza* /*hsterz*/ (see Watkins 1974a: 12-14) clearly points to PIE **h₂ster-* 'star', and the "prothetic" *a-* in Greek and Armenian is the regular outcome of PIE **h₂-* [Olsen 1999: 763; Kortlandt 2003: 76; Beekes 2003: 185]. Therefore, this word cannot be interpreted as a Greek-Armenian isogloss [Clackson 1994: 33-35, 183].

For the *t̥*-stems and the paradigm of Arm. *ast̥* see Meillet 1936: 81; Godel 1975: 96; Ĵahukyan 1982: 92, 137; Olsen 1999: 159-161.

The *r-l* fluctuation (cf. Lat. *stēlla* and Arm. *ast̥*, pl. **ast̥ə-a-*) has been interpreted in different ways. Following Meillet, Ačaryan (HAB 1: 278b; see also Bonfante 1937: 19) rejects **stēr-lā-* and accepts **stēl-nā-*, with addition of **n-* as in Goth. *stairno* and Bret. *sterenn*. This view is accepted by Watkins (1974a: 10-11, 13). One

might compare with **louk-s-neh₂* ‘moon’, see s.v.v. *lusn* and *lusin*. Jāhukyan (1982: 104-105) is inclined to an old athematic *l*-stem (**əstēl-*, GSg **əstel-os*, NPI **əstel-es*, cf. Gr. ἄστὴρ, ἀστέρος, ἀστέρες, respectively), though he does not exclude the alternative of **əstēl-na-*, noting (221₃₃) the development **-ln- > Arm. -l-* seen in **pelnumi > hetum* ‘to pour’. Later, he (1987: 152, 195) seems to prefer, though with hesitation, **əster-l-*. As for the twofold plurals, cf. GDPI *astet-c* vs. *astet-a-c*, the one with *-a-* is usually traced back to an old collective, cf. Gr. ἄστροα [Meillet 1936: 81; Watkins 1974a: 10; Jāhukyan 1982: 105; 1987: 255; cf., however, Olsen 1999: 160₃₀₂].

Olsen (1999: 159-160, 843) assumes “analogical influence from (the nom.acc. of) the word for ‘Sun’” (cf. Lat. *sōl* etc.), but she does not exclude the alternative of **-ln- > -l-*, with a secondary addition of **-n-* as in Germanic etc. (160₃₀₃). For the influence of the word for ‘sun’ see also Tumanjan 1978: 289₁₄₂.

As we see, scholars often find hard to choose between **h₂ster-l-* and **h₂stel-n-*. Apart from the references already cited see also Tumanjan 1978: 46, 289; Aṭabekyan 1979: 98. Since the PIE word clearly had an original **-r-*, I prefer the former alternative, viz. **h₂ster-l-*. This solution is also advocated by others: Mayrhofer 1952: 316; Bomhard 1986: 191 (Lat. < **ster-elā*). For the discussion see also Scherer 1953: 25-27. One may restore **h₂stēr-l-*, a nominative analogical after PIE **seh₂ul* ‘sun’, and **h₂ster-leh₂-*. For the influence from the nominative of the word for ‘sun’ cf. the view of Olsen, though she assumes a substitution of original **r* with **l* rather than **-rl-*. Next to this, however, she (op. cit. 159) prefers deriving the Latin from **h₂ster-leh₂-*. This would separate the Armenian and Latin from each other, which does not seem probable.

The derivation of Lat. *stēlla* and Arm. **astet-a-* from **h₂ster-leh₂-* may be corroborated by Lat. *anguilla* ‘eel’ and Arm. *əngt-ay-k* (q.v.), possibly from IE **H(V)ng^hur-leh₂-*.

Arm. dial. **astet-n* (see above) may represent old accusative **-m*, see Weitenberg 1985; Kortlandt 1985: 21, 23 = 2003: 65, 67; Beekes 2003: 142-143.

PIE **h₂ster-* ‘star’ has been compared with the Semitic word for ‘deified Venus’, cf. *Ištar* etc. [Illič-Svityč 1964: 6-7; Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 685-686, 875, 876, 967]. On the other hand, it has been derived from PIE. **āś-* (= **h₂eHs-*) ‘to burn’, with the suffix of nomina agentis **-ter/l-*; thus: ‘the burning/glowing object’. This view has more successors; for the discussion see Scherer 1953: 23, 26; Bomhard 1986; Beekes, Adams and Mallory apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 543; cf. Watkins 1974a: 13-14 (suffixes **-er-* and **-el-*, with the same variation as in agentive **-ter/l-*). According to Gamkrelidze/Ivanov (1984, 2: 875₁, 876), the Semitic word

may be borrowed from the IE one. This, if true, would reconcile the two etymologies. The postulation of the suffix **-ter/I* (see also Tumanjan 1978: 289₁₄₂) would make the restoration of **h₂stel-* stronger.

aragil, GSg *aragli* (Psalms 103.17 according to Astuacaturean 1895: 204b, cf. NHB 1.337c and HAB 1: 292b; perhaps to be corrected - 104.17 CHECK!), GDPI *araglac* (Philo) 'stork'.

It renders Gr. *ἐρωδιός* 'heron' in Deuteronomy 14.15; Leviticus 11.19; Psalms 103[104].17, see s.v. *arat* for the discussion; ; and Galen (see NHB; Greppin 1985: 43 and 1988: 172. For the other attestations (Philo etc.) see Greppin 1978: 17-22.

In the native Armenian tradition, including also the dialects, *aragil* refers only to the stork, mostly to the White Stork (*Ciconia ciconia*): the Black Stork (*Ciconia nigra*) is more secretive and less common especially in contemporary Armenia, cf. Ananyan, HKendAšx 3, 1965: 460-461; Greppin 1978: 16f. For the semantic interrelationship between 'heron' and 'stork' see par. XX. Perhaps the Classical Armenian did not have a special term for 'heron', so the translators of Bible and Galen used *aragil* for its rendering. It is remarkable that in Psalms (as well as in Deuteronomy and Leviticus?) the Hebrew is rendered as 'stork', see s. v. *arat*. However, *jknak'at* is thought to be the word for the heron (Greppin 1978: 13-14; apud Mallory/ Adams 1997: 268).

●**DIAL** Preserved in a few dialects, closely related to each other both linguistically and geographically: Van, Mekk', Ozim, Šatax **arak'el* 'stork', with an unexplained *ř* [Ačaryan 1952: 88, 247; Muradyan 1962: 58, 192]; for the problem of *ř* cf. Salmast *arōs* 'stork' < *araws₂* 'bustard' (q.v.); see Greppin 1978: 104, the source of which is unknown to me.

T'ovma Kilikec'i (15th cent.?): *arkil* (see Hewsens 1992: 323). If not a misprint, it may represent the unpreserved form of the dialect of Svedia. The syncope of the medial *-a-* is regular for both Svedia and Zeyt'un (see Ačaryan 2003: 30-37, 363-367). Also the devoicing *-g-* > *-k-* is regular for Svedia according to the description of Andreasyan 1967.

●**ETYM** Ačaryan (HAB 1: 292-293) connects *aragil* 'stork' to Gr. *πελαργός* 'stork' (< **πε/αραργός* reinterpreted through folk-etymology as composed of *πελός* 'black' and *αργός* 'white') and derives both from a language of the Asia Minor. He marks this etymology as his own. In the "historical" section, however, he mentions the (practically) same interpretation suggested much earlier by Lagarde and rejects it. The same contradiction is repeated at the end of the section. The etymology is accepted by A. Meillet (p. c. apud HAB). Nowadays, however, it is considered

uncertain, cf. Greppin 1978: 21; 1983: 307. Jahukyan (1967: 153) lists *aragil* among aberrant words with the absence of consonant shift, in p. 102 he connects the Greek word to another Armenian bird-name, namely (*haw*)*p'al*, q. v. Later (1987: 311) he assumes that if the Greek is indeed a compound, namely - 'blackish white', there are two possibilities: either the resemblance is accidental, or the Armenian is a very old borrowing from Greek. Olsen (1999: 938) places *aragil* in the list of words of unknown origin and mentions the Greek word hesitatingly ("perhaps somehow connected").

Ananyan (HKendAšx 3, 1965: 442), being himself not a philologist, points out the conformity of this etymology to the actual appearance of the stork. In 448₁ he seems to favour another suggestion, that is Hiwnk'earpēyēntean's unacceptable connection with Arm. *arāk'ini* 'virtuous'. In the Armenian riddles the white and black colours play a significant role in the description of *aragil*, see S. Harut'yunyan 1965: 75^{Nr 760}; S. Movsisyan 1972: 121^{Nr 25}. In the latter the red is added, probably referring to the red large beak and the long, strong legs (see Ananyan's description in p. 441). However, this seems to be a sort of cliché used also in the context of other birds, see Harut'yunyan 1965: 76f, including even the cock (70^{Nr 711}). [Could *aragil* be the starting point of the analogical spread of the pattern?].

Even if we accept the assumption about **paraglos* as the protoform of the Greek word, Arm. *aragil* will still remain uncertain. One rather expects **paratg* (cf. Ľap'anc'yan 1945_b: 139₁) or, more probably, **haratg*. One must note, moreover, that the origin of Gr. *πελαργός* is not established. Within the context of the sound change of the so-called Japhetiten-Sprachen, Bleichsteiner (1928: 8₁₇) compares the ethnonym *pelasg* unsuccessfully to *πελαργός*, assuming that the stork "vielleicht das Totemtier dieses Volkes war". Recently Witczak (*1991; Kaczor/Witczak 1991; Witczak 1999: 182^{Nr20}; see also Greppin apud Mallory/ Adams 1997: 548) proposed to derive the second component of the word from IE **sṛǵós*, cf. Olc. *storkr* 'stork', Skt. *śṛjaya-* 'wading bird'. He relates *aragil* alternatively, but with less confidence, to Gr. *ὀρχιλος* 'a kind of bird', probably 'the golden-crested wren' [Witczak 1999: 182^{Nr20}].

I wonder whether there is any connection with Arm. *rak'il* 'a bird of India', which is a late hapax of unknown origin; see HAB 4: 444a; Greppin 1978: 246.

Pedersen (1906: 343 = 1982: 121) compares *aragil* to Skt. *krakara-* 'partridge'. However, the latter is not old, has itself no reliable etymology, and is semantically remote. Furthermore, the phonological problems seem to me insurmountable. The etymology is rightly viewed by Clackson 1994: 233₂₆₁ as very uncertain.

It has been suggested also that *aragil* is borrowed (through intermediation of Urartian or Hurrian) from Sumerian *arikgilim* ‘a kind of bird having long legs’; see HAB for references, also Łap’anc’yan 1945: 138f (folk-etymologically reshaped after the Armenian theonym *Aray*).

For now, I think, only the latter proposal can serve as a probable candidate for the true etymology. However, the following Armenian bird-names, all of them of unknown origin, seem to me comparable to *aragil* and suggest to start from the internal reconstruction:

*araws*₂ ‘bustard’: not in the Classical Armenian; in the dialects of Van, Ozmi, Muš, Salmast, and Xarberd - ‘stork’;

*arawr*₂ ‘a kind of water-bird’: hapax (12th century); preserved in the dialects of Van, Ozmi, Šatax, Muš;

arawš ‘a kind of grazing bird’: hapax (7th century); probably preserved in the dialect of Xotrjur.

All the four bird-names, basically representing the same dialectal areas (except for *arawš*), contain **araw-*. The denotata of these four bird-names are somehow related to each other; see s.v.v. *araws*₂, *arawr*₂, *arawš*. In *aragil* **w* became *g* in intervocalic position. Having an *a*-stem, the word may be explained as **araw-* + **-leh*₂-. The normal outcome of this would be **arawł*. However, the word might perhaps have been reshaped after the suffix *-il*; cf. especially above-mentioned *rak’il* and the other bird-names with a similar ending. For a bird name composed as **-u-l-* I would compare Russ. *žuravl’* ‘crtane’, see s.v. *krunk*.

The external etymology of the hypothetical **araw-* is more obscure. [Perhaps one can think of **h₁(e/o)rH-* (whether or not identifiable with the word for ‘bathe’), the possible root of ‘heron; stork’; see s.v. *arat* for the discussion].

aracem (trans.) ‘to pasture’ (Bible+), **aracim** (intrans.) ‘to browse, graze’ (Bible+); **arawł**, *i*-stem (GDSg *arawł-i* in the Bible, GDPl *arawł-i-c’* in Yovhannēs Drasxanakerc’i /9-10th cent./) ‘pastureland’.

●**DIAL** Both *arac-* and *arawł* are widespread in dialects.

●**ETYM** Usually linked with Gr. *τρώγω* ‘to gnaw, nibble (especially of herbivorous animals)’, *τράγος* m. ‘he-goat’ [Lidén 1906: 33-35; HAB 1: 293-294], perhaps also Toch. *trāsk*, *tresk* ‘to chew’ (from **trek-sk*); see Frisk 2: 939. Lidén also connects with Arm. *t’urc* ‘cheek’, which is rejected by Ačaryan (HAB 2: 210a) but accepted by Frisk (ibid.), and, with some reservation, Jahukyan (1987: 153, 197). The latter (p. 197) alternatively points out to Lat. *turgeō* ‘to swell out, become swollen or tumid’. This idea has been first proposed by Ałayan (1974: 74) and seems most

acceptable (see s.v. *t'urc*₁). The Ałayan's (op. cit. 25) analysis of *arac-/arawt* (as if containing the suffix *-awt*) is improbable, however. Hambarjumyan (1995: 234-235; 1998: 42-45) identifies *arawt* 'pastureland' (< **trəg-*) with a non-existent *art* 'to graze; pastureland', distinct from *art* 'field' (he refers to AčarLiak 3, 1957: 37, but here only *aracel* is mentioned), and **art* and **arc-* appearing in *xaw-art* and *xawarci* in a mysterious passage from Movsēs Xorenac'i 1.30 (see H. Martirosyan 1996), which cannot be accepted.

The equation of Arm. *arac-* with Gr. *τρώγω* and *τράγος* would be possible if one assumes **treh₂g-* for Armenian (with a prothetic *a-* as in *artawsr* 'tear', q.v.; see also 2.1.17.4), **trh₂g-* for *τράγος*, and **troh₂g-* for *τρώγω*. Beekes (1973: 98) is against the laryngeal in this root. According to Greppin (1983: 307), the etymology is "invalid phonetically since IE **tre-* should yield Arm. **erd-* or, perhaps, **ert'-*"; see also Greppin 1987: 395. This objection cannot be maintained because, unlike **Dr* and **D^hr*, PIE **Tr* is never metathesized, and the actual outcome of **trV-* is Arm. **VrV-*, cf. **treies* > *erek* 'three', etc.

Some scholars try to separate *arac-/arawt* from Gr. *τρώγω*. Klingenschmitt (1982: 153) interprets as composed of an unattested **ar-* < **pr-* (cf. *ai-*) and **h¹auti-* 'flock of sheep etc.' (see s.v. *hawt*). Olsen (1999: 92-93, 775, 811) derives from PIE **srHu-d-ie/o-* (cf. Lat. *servō* 'to serve, preserve; to protect; to keep, observe; to look after', Avest. *hauruua-* 'aufpassend', etc. Both etymologies are improbable since neither the nature of **-d-* nor the alternation *c - wt* is explained. Furthermore, a **-d_i-*, I think, would yield Arm. *-č-* rather than *-c-*. See 2.1.22.1 for more detail.

[For another, highly hypothetical alternative see s.v. *oroč-* 'to chew, ruminate'].

Whatever the etymological details, *arac-* and *arawt* cannot be separated from each other. An economic explanation of the alternation *-c-* / *-wt-* would treat *arawt*, *i*-stem, as a deverbative noun in **-ti-* based on verbal *arac-*. If, e.g., one prefers the connection with Gr. *τρώγω*, Arm. *arac-* derives from **treh₂g-*, while *arawt* (*i*-stem) would imply **trh₂g-ti-* (cf. Gr. *τρώξις* f. 'gnawing, biting'; or *πτερο-τρώκτις* f. 'gefräßig?'). This mechanism helps to explain many unclear cases of this and similar types; see 2.1.22.12-13.

arahet, *i*-stem: IPl *arahet-i-w-k* 'in Yovhannēs Ōjnec'i (7-8th cent.) 'road; path'.

Eznik Kołbac'i (5th cent.), Yovhannēs Ōjnec'i (7-8th cent.), John Chrysostom, etc.

●**ETYM** Ačaryan (HAB 1: 295a) treats as composed of *ayr* 'man' (in oblique cases and in derivatives: *ar-*), conjunction *-a-* and *het* 'trace' (q.v.). Łap'anc'yan (1945: 106₂, 106-107) argues against this etymology that in compounds *ayr* appears

unchanged (which is true but not essential) and interprets the compound as "the trace of Aray (the god)". The same: G. Vardumyan 1991: 97b.

Perixanjan (1993: 9, 22) notes that Ačāryan's analysis is reminiscent of folk-etymology and treats *arahet* as borrowed from unattested Iran. (MMed) **arahēt(i)*, an old compound of **raḡa-/raḡai-* 'car' and **iti-/yāti* (from **yā-/i-* 'to go'). She points out that the Armenian word has preserved the Iranian thematic vowel *-i* in the declension. L. Hovhannisyan (1990: 262-263, 287₇₉, 287₈₀) mentions this etymology and notes that it is not clear whether *arahet* is of Iranian or native origin.

While P'erixanyan's etymology is not impossible, I see no crucial reason to abandon that of Ačāryan. A clear typological parallel to the compound *ar-a-het* 'path of men/people' is Šamšadin (Ēarabaṭ-group) *mərt'əḱəḱecan* 'path' < **mard-a-kacan* which is found in a fairy-tale (HŽHek' 1980: 58^{L-6}) and is composed of *mard* 'man' and *kacan* 'path'. Even if the Iranian etymology proves more acceptable, the compound **mard-a-kacan* still must be viewed as an important parallel, though in this case on folk-etymological level.

arastoy (*arazdoy*, *erastoy*), AblPl *arastoy-s*, AblPl *i yarastoy-c'*; NHB 1: 338c has GDPl *arastoy-i-c'*, but without evidence Prob. 'rock, stone'.

Occurs always as a specifier to *vēm* 'hard stone'. AblPl *arastoy-s* is found in Agat'angelos § 767 (1909=1980: 398^{L10f}; transl. Thomson 1976: 307): *i glxoy leṛnēn areal vēms arastoys, antašs, ankop's, yaṭt's*, <...> : "From the summit of the mountain he took solid stones, unworked, unhewn, immense, <...>". In Book of Chries: AblPl *i yarastoy-c' vimac'*. In Philo: *arazdoy vēm*. Ačāryan (HAB 1: 297a) cites also Eznik Erēc' (7th cent.) without the passage.

In Yovhannēs Drasxanakertc'i (9-10th cent.) one finds *erastoy vimōk'* [NHB 1: 671b], with an initial *e-*.

●**ETYM** No etymology is accepted in HAB 1: 297.

I propose to interpret the word as composed of the suffix *-oy-k'*, on which cf. *erek-oy*, *amōt'-oy-k'*, *bar-oy-k'*, etc. [Ĵahukyan 1987: 356; 1998: 30; Greppin 1975: 122; Olsen 1999: 239-240, 511-515], and the root **arast-* (**erast-*) 'rib, mountain(-ridge)', which may be identified with Arm. *erast-an-k'* 'buttocks', Skt. *prṣṭhā-* n. 'back, mountain-ridge, top'(RV+), *prṣṭī-* f. 'rib', etc. See s.v. *erastan-k'* for more detail. That a noun meaning 'mountain, rock, etc.' functions as an attributive 'solid, hard (rock)' is not uncommon; cf. *leṛn* 'mountain' : dial. (Ararat) *leṛ k'ar* 'hard stone' [Amatuni 1912: 246a]; *pal/t* 'rock, stone' : *pal pal k'arer* [HAB 4: 4a, 13a], etc. The word-combination *leṛ k'ar* is also found in folklore of different

regions, e.g. in Širak, in a fairy-tale narrated by Garegin Harut'yunyan (migr. from Kars region) and recorded by V. Bdoyan in 1946 (HŽHek' 4, 1963: 182-183, thrice).

arat, GSg *aratay* 'stork'?

Attested only in Vardan Arewelc'i (13th cent.), in the commentary on Psalms 103[104].17:

Boyn aragli: Simak'os (asē) ariovd aratay tun ē nora. - "(The) nest of a stork: Simak'os/Symmachos (says) *ariovd aratay* is his home".

The corresponding passage of Psalms reads as follows (Rahlfs 1931: 259) :

¹⁶ *χορτασθήσεται τὰ ξύλα τοῦ πεδίου,*

αἱ κέδροι τοῦ Λιβάνου, ἃς ἐφύτευσεν.

¹⁷ *ἐκεῖ στρουθία ἐννοσσεύσουσιν,*

τοῦ ἐρωδίου ἢ οἰκία ἡγεῖται αὐτῶν.

The Armenian translation: <... >, *boyn aragli apawēn ē noc'a.*

Identifying *ariovd* with 'the fir tree' of the Hebrew text, Ačāryan (HAB 1: 316b) interprets *aratay* as GSg of *arat* 'stork' (= *aragli*, GSg of *aragil* 'stork'), though in 1: 298a he puts a question-mark and characterizes the word as uncertain. The declension with GDSg *-ay* and GDPl *-ac'*, apart from proper names and some foreign words, is absent in Armenian (see AčarLiak 3, 1957: 470-480; Ĵahukyan 1959: 281-282; Weitenberg 1989: 57-58). So *aratay* is puzzling (hardly a corruption for GPI *aratac*?). According to Ĵahukyan (1965: 251), it points to the borrowing character of the word.

In the Greek text *τοῦ ἐρωδίου* (GSg) disagrees with *αὐτῶν* (GPl) in number. The Armenian translation faithfully reflects the Greek. Modern translators usually put both singular: "(as for) the stork, the junipers/firs are her/its home"; cf. Dahood 1970: 32; Rosenberg 1991: 395; Bratcher/Reyburn 1991: 883. This is what one finds in Vardan's commentary, see above. Allen (1983) makes it plural: "storks whose homes are the firs".

Ačāryan's cautious suggestion concerning *ariovd* is not based on any evidence. I suppose there is no such a tree-name neither in Hebrew nor in Greek. The actual solution can be simpler. I think *ariovd* is a mere transliteration of Gr. *ἐρωδιός* 'heron' which in the passage under discussion, as well as in Deuteronomy, Leviticus and Galen, corresponds to Arm. *aragil* 'stork' (q.v.). In Codex Alexandrinus and the commentary of Hesych of Jerusalem the Greek word is spelled with *αρ-* [Rahlfs 1931: 259]. The *-i-* in *ariovd*, if not a mere corruption, might have arisen in the following way: Vardan knew also the variant of the Greek word with a iota subscript

(-φ-), though not attested in Septuagint (see Frisk 1, 1960: 572), inserted an -i- erroneously not after but before *ov=ω*.

Thus, *ariovd* turns out to function here in meaning 'stork', and this makes the interpretation of *arat*, which is moreover a hapax and has a strange genitive form, even more complex. Apposition of the foreign term and its native equivalent?

●**ETYM** The only etymological attempt known to me is that of Jahukyan (1965: 251; 1967: 207, 305; 1987: 113) who derives the word from IE **arəd-* (**arōd-*) with some hesitation; cf. Gr. *ἐρρῶδιός* 'heron', Lat. *ardea* 'heron', SCr. *róda* 'stork', OIc. *arta* f. 'kind of teal, garganey' (see Pokorny 1959: 68). Then he mentions *araws* 'bustard' as a possibly related word although the phonology is not quite clear to him; cf. s.v. *araws*₂. For the connection of the Greek between the Latin see Łap'anc'yan 1945: 140 (without the Armenian).

Schrijver (1991: 65) considers the Germanic semantically remote. Further, he assumes that the Slavic may be a loan from Latin. For a different etymology of Lat. *ardea* (= **hardea*, cf. Span./Portug. *garza*, etc.) see Vennemann 1998: 353₁₉. The IE forms have been compared with Turkic. **örd/täk* 'duck' [Šervašidze 1989: 82]. For the criticism of this view see Tatarincev 1993, 1: 122. Sometimes Hitt. *arta-* 'a bird' is added, too; see Puhvel, HED 1-2, 1984: 175-176. Puhvel, as well as Greppin (apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 268b) reconstruct a medial laryngeal (according to Puhvel - **h*₂), whereas Schrijver does not. Thus, the reconstruction of the PIE word under discussion cannot be viewed as established. According to Beekes (2000: 27): "clearly non-IE".

If Arm. *arat* is indeed related, it can go back only to **h₁reh₂d-*, since neither **h₁(e)r(ō)d-* nor **h₁rHd-* would yield *arat*. In this case one may posit **h₁r(e/o)h₂d-*. If we eliminate the less reliable cognates, the geographical distribution might point to a Mediterranean source.

[Can the word be interpreted as **h₁r(e/o)h₂-u/d-* and thus connected to *araws*₂ 'bustard', dial. 'stork'; *aragil* 'stork' and others? See especially s.v. *aragil*. The possible connection to *araws* is suggested by Jahukyan (1965: 251); see above. Typologically compare **k₁erh₂-* 'horn' : **k₁erh₂-u-d-*: OHG *hiruz* 'hart', etc.; cf. Fulk 1988: 164-165. The root may be identified with **h₁(e/o)rh₂-*: Hitt. *arr-* 'wash', Toch. A *yär* 'bathe', on which see Oettinger 1979: 437-438; Puhvel, HED 1-2, 1984: 111-116; Penney 1988: 369; Seebold 1988: 510; Mallory/Adams 1997: 108b. Lindeman (1989: 289) sees no reason to believe that the Hitt. *-rr-* presupposes **-r +H-*. Thus, Arm. **ara-w-* 'a wading/aquatic bird' (for **-u-* in bird-names see s.v.v. *agrāw* 'crow', *k₁runk* 'crane') and **ara-t* 'stork' (cf. Gr. *ἐρρῶδιός*, etc.) might be derived from a verbal root **ara-* 'to bathe'. Uncertain].

arawš ‘a kind of bird identic with or resembling bustard’.

Attested only in the long recension of "Ašxarhac'oyc'", Armenian Geography by Anania Širakac'i (7th century), among the grazing birds (*hawk* 'čarakawork') of the province of Barjr Hayk', i.e. Upper Armenia, which moreover has *žermuks ew atts ew zamenayn parartut'iwns erkri* "des thermes et des salines, et toute l'abondance de la terre" [Soukry 1881: 30 (Arm. text), 40 (French transl.)].

The short recension mentions here only *haws pītanis* 'useful birds' without specifications [A. G. Abrahamyan 1944: 349].

●**DIAL** Probably preserved in Xotorjur; see below.

●**ETYM** Soukry (ibid.), followed by Hewsens (1992: 59, 153₂₃), translates the word as 'outarde' (= Engl. 'bustard'), identifying it, thus, with *araws*₂. The same do Eremyan (1963: 92a, 96a, 106a, 107b) and Ananyan (HayKendAšx 3, 1965: 29, 257₁).

The word is used in ASg *zarawš*, whence the ambiguity of the nominative form: *zarawš* (cf. NHB 1: 722c: 'a kind of naive, gray bird, bigger than the hen', with no reference to the passage under question) or *arawš*? Ačaiyan (HAB 1: 348-349) is inclined to the latter variant, basing himself upon dial. (Xotorjur) *earoš* (= /*yaroš*/ or /*äroš*/) 'a kind of bird with very tasty flesh, which sings in whistling voice, big partridge'. He mentions no etymology for *arawš*. The Xotorjur form is also recorded in YušamXotorj (1964: 442b): *earoš* 'bird'. Hewsens (1992: 153₂₃) still cites the word with *z-*.

If the Xotorjur form is really related, one notes that the description of *arawš* fits that of *araws*₂ (q.v.), which is also a grazing bird with very tasty meat. Note also the remarkable whistling of the nestlings of the bustard when separated from the family (see Ananyan, HayKendAšx 3, 1965: 267). Furthermore, Ačaiyan's description of Xotorjur *earoš* as 'a big partridge' which has very tasty meat one is reminiscent of the passage from Xenophon, Anabasis 1.5.3 (2001: 90-93):

τάς δὲ ὀτίδας ἅν τις ταχὺ ἀνίστη ἔστι λαμβάνειν. πέτονταί τε γὰρ βραχὺ ὥσπερ οἱ πέρδικες καὶ ταχὺ ἀπαγορεύουσι. τὰ δὲ κρέα αὐτῶν ἡδιστα ἦν :
"The bustards, on the other hand, can be caught if one is quick in starting them up, for they fly only a short distance, like partridges, and soon tire; and their flesh was delicious". [For the passage see also Greppin 1978: 104].

I conclude that *arawš* can indeed be identical with (or somehow related to) *araws*₂ 'bustard'. However, the anlaut of the Xotorjur form is obscure.

The passage from Ašxarhac'oyc' is reminiscent of Movsēs Xorenac'i 3.59 (1913=1991: 338) [cf. also 2.6, p. 109], considered to be based on the description of Ayrarat in Łazar P'arpec'i (see Thomson 1978: 52, 332₂; cf. Hewsens 1992: 2). Here

practically the same area, named here *gawar Karnoy* 'district of Karin = Erzurum' (in the province of Barjr Hayk', i.e. Upper Armenia), is described as follows: <...>, *ur Ep'ratay masinn inč' btxen atbiwrk' ew handart gnac'iwk' yaraĵac'eal covanan maw*rabar erewut'iwk': yorum anbawut'iwk' jkanc' ew zanazan hawuc' čarakaworac', yoroc' i juoc'n miayn kerakreal linēin bnakič'k'n. Ew zezerb maw*rin šambk' ew bazmut'iwk' efeganc': ew dašt'k'n unin zt'anjrut'iwk' xotoc' ew zk'aĵaberut'iwk' sermanawor ptoc'.* - "<...> where the sources of part of the Euphrates gush forth and advancing in their gentle course grow into a sea with the appearance of a marsh. In it are innumerable fish and various feeding (or grazing? - HM) birds, from whose eggs alone the inhabitants are nourished. Along the edge of the marsh are canes and a multitude of reeds; the plains have an abundance of grass and are prolific in citrus (? - HM) fruit" (transl. by Thomson 1978: 332).

As we can see, the area is quite suitable for both grazing and water-birds, so the grazing birds of the very same water-abounding area such as *araws* and *anid* (q.v.), which are mentioned next to "innumerable fish", could be feeding on both grass and fish and frogs. Note that *araws* can be identified with *araws*₂ 'bustard' (see above, and s.v.), which in several dialects means 'stork', thus a wading-bird. [For the total identification there is perhaps a problem: according to Xorenac'i, the inhabitants are nourished from eggs of these birds alone, whereas the bustard is particularly favoured for its delicious meat]. Similarly, my tentative etymology of *anid* from IE **h₂nHti-* 'a water-bird; duck' should not be rejected solely for semantic reasons.

That the area of Karin/Erzurum extremely abounds in birds is also testified by a European traveller (see Zatikyan 1992: 42).

The relatedness of the words under consideration may be explained in two ways: either *araws* derived from OArm. **araw-* which underlies *araws*₂, *arawr*₂ and *aragil* (all of them having been formed with different suffixes), or it is to be identified to *araws*₂ with the dialectal substitution of *š* for *s*. [Note also *arōšš'i*, one of the readings in Galen; see Greppin 1985: 121]. The alternation *s/š* may perhaps be illustrated in another pair of bird-names, namely *salam* and *šalam*. Further see s. v. *aragil* 'stork'.

It is remarkable that the only place where *araws* seems to be present is Xotrĵur which is very close to Karin (Erzurum). The author of *Ašxarhac'oyc'*, that is Anania Širakac'i, was native of Širak. All these areas roughly represent the territory where the dialect of Karin was/is spoken. So, one may treat *araws* as an old dialectal word geographically confined to those areas. If this is accepted, we are dealing with another example for the agreement between the data of "Ašxarhac'oyc'" to the dialectological evidence; see 1.6-1.7.

araws₁ 'virgin soil'.

Mentioned only in "Arjein bararan", in the meaning 'unploughed soil'. The verb *arōsanam* is attested in John Chrysostom, and in homilies attributed to Yovhannēs Mandakuni (5th cent.) or Yovhannēs Mayragomec'i (7th cent.).

●**DIAL** Preserved in the dialects of Alaškert, Axalk'alak' (*arōs*), and Baberd (*harōs*), in the meaning 'a field that is left uncultivated for 5-6 years for strengthening' [HAB 1: 349a].

●**ETYM** No acceptable etymology is recorded in HAB 1: 349a. The connection with *arawt* 'pasture-land' (q.v.) suggested with some reservation by Ĵahukyan (1967: 184; 1972: 251) is formally problematic.

N. Simonyan (1979: 220) suggests a connection with Gr. *ἀροῦρα* f. 'tilled or arable land; pl. corn-lands, fields'; Mlr. *arbor* (< **arur*), NPl *arbanna*, OIr. gen. *arbe* (< **arūens*) 'corn'; and Arm. *harawunk* 'arable land' (q.v.), from an old *r/n*-stem noun based on the PIE verb **h₂erh₃-* 'to plough'. She derives Arm. *araws* from **arəw-ns-* (though the nature of *-s- is not specified), with regular loss of the sibilant after the *-n-. As to the semantics, N. Simonyan mentions the Lithuanian cognate meaning 'superficially ploughed soil'. This word is not specified, but, certainly, *armenā* 'oberflächlich gepflügte Erdschicht' (see Pokorny 1959: 62) is meant. According to Derksen (1996: 154), Lith. *armenā* means 'aufgepflügte Schicht der Erdoberflächen' (cf. also *Armenā* 'right tributary of the Nėmunas') and comprises the verbal root of *arti* 'to plough' (from the same PIE **h₂erh₃-*) and the suffix *-menā-. One may also point to the semantic development seen in Arm. dial. *c'el* 'uncultivated soil that has been ploughed for the first time and left for the next year' from *c'el-* 'to tear' (see HAB 4: 452-453).

On the whole, the etymology of N. Simonyan seems probable. The origin of the *-s- is uncertain, however. I wonder if it can be from the suffixal element *-k- wich, after the *-u-, would regularly yield Arm. -s-, see s.v. *alaw(s)unk*'. The pair *araws* - *harawunk*' matches that of **alaws* - *alawunk*'.

araws₂ GSg -i according to HAB 1: 349a [attested??] 'bustard; stork'.

Attested in later literature in the meaning 'bustard'; see Greppin 1978: 104-105 for more detail. It renders Gr. *ὄρις* 'bustard' in Galen [Greppin 1985: 121; 1988: 176^{Nr6}; 1998^{Nr28}]. Ačairyan (HAB 1:349a) describes it as a kind of water-bird, but then he specifies it as 'bustard' (Fr. 'outarde'), which is not a water-bird. Perhaps identical to *araws* (q.v.).

●**DIAL** Preserved in the dialects of Baŕeš, Xotŕjŕ (here also *-ik*), Karin, Sebastia, Sasun - 'a field-bird; cricket'; Xarberd, Muš, Ozim, Van - 'stork' [HayLezBrbBaŕ 1, 2001: 133b; Mkrtč'yan 1952: 124b]; Šatax [Muradyan 1962: 193a], Alaškert, Ararat [HAB 1: 349a] - unspecified; Salmast *lāylāng'-arō*s* 'stork' [HAB 1: 349a] (the first component must be *laglag* 'stork'), also *arōs* 'stork' according to Greppin 1978: 104, the source of which is unknown to me. For the irregular *ř* cf. the dialectal forms s. v. *aragil*. The initial *h-* of the Karin (Erzrum) form cited by Greppin (1978: 104) is not based on the Armenian evidence but appears actually in the Turkish dialect of Erzrum as a loan from Armenian; see HAB 1: 349a.

I do not know how reliable is the meaning 'stork' for Van (see above; not specified in Ač'aryan 1952: 248). In a part of Van, namely Arčak (see Avagyan 1978: 88-89), it refers to a bird, which is heavy (this is suitable for both the bustard and the stork), habitates on rocks (perhaps suitable for the bustard than the stork), is worshipped by the local population and is a desperately self-obliviant parent; cf. also Ananyan, HayKendAšx 3, 1965: 267, 271, concerning the bustard. This is comparable to the stork, which is notorious for his familial piety in many respects and is considered sacred, too; see Łap'anc'yan 1945_a: 140f; Ananyan 3, 1965: 430ff; Łanalanyan 1969: LV, 51-52^{Nr132}; Greppin 1978: 17f. Thus, here we perhaps deal with an intermediate in the semantic development 'bustard' : 'stork'. The birds resemble also in having long and strong legs; see Ananyan 260, 267 and 441-442, respectively.

●**ETYM** NHB (1: 386b-c) writes: "Perhaps a kind of the bird *arawt*", and further refers to the plant-name *arawsi* 'Sorbus'. The latter seems to be, however, a ghost-word, see HAB 1: 349. Ač'aryan does not accept the connection with the synonymous Russ. *drofa*, Germ. *Trappe*, etc. It seems phonologically impossible.

I think *araws* might be derived from a hypothetical PArm. **araw-* 'a wading and/or grazing bird'; see s.v.v. *aragil*, *arawš* and *arawt*₂. *araws* can be formed with the PIE productive suffix **-ko-*. One should bare in mind that **k* after **u* is automatically palatalized in Armenian, cf. **b^heu-ko-* > Arm. *boys* 'plant' (q.v.); **leuko-* > Arm. *loys* 'light' (q.v.); etc.

The external etymology is more obscure; for a tentative suggestion of mine see s.v.v. *aragil* and *arat*.

Being a very heavy bird, the bustard is compared with the sheep in "Govank' t'řč'noc'" [Mnac'akanyan 1980a: 245^{L17}]: *Arawsən mec ēr k'an zoč'xar* "The Bustard was as big as a sheep" [Greppin 1978: 105]. In the Ararat Plain, the bustard is called *t'oy-t'otli* (< Azeri), which literally means 'lamb of a wedding' [Ananyan, HayKendAšx 3, 1965: 259₂]; cf. Turk. *toy* 'bustard' > Arm. dial. (Polis) *t'cy*

‘béjaune, sans expérience, naïf’ [Ačarean 1902: 139]. Bearing this in mind, one may alternatively derive Arm. *arōs* ‘bustard’ from Iranian, cf. Pers. (Xurāsānī) *aros* ‘ein Schaf, das einen weissen Fleck auf der Stirn hat’, which is borrowed from Arab. ‘*arūs* ‘bride’, since “diese hat stets ‘‘une petite pièce d’or collée au milieu du front’’” (see Monchi-Zadeh 1990: 10^{Nr21}). This may also concern to *arōš*. Another Iranian candidate would be Wa(khi) *rūš* ‘wild mountain sheep’, Khot. *rūs(a)* ‘ovis Poli (?)’ (cf. Skt. *ṛśya-* ‘male antelope’). In this case, the initial *a-* of the Armenian would be prothetic, cf. *aroyr* ‘brass’ (Bible, Ephrem) from Iran. **rōδ* (see 2.1.17.4).

arawr₁ (Bible+), ***harawr*** (Ephrem+), *o*-stem ‘plough’.

● **DIAL** In dialects: with an initial *a-*: Aslanbek, Sebastia, Ararat, Van (in the city); with an initial *h-*: Xarberd, Karin, Hamšen, Alaškert, Muš, Zeyt’un; as well as with *x-* (from an earlier *h-*) in Van-group: Šatax [M. Muradyan 1962: 193a], Moks, Ozim, and in villages of Van [HAB 1: 350b; Ačaryan 1952: 249; Greppin 1983: 308]. The evidence for the *h-* (also attested in literature since Ephrem) is, thus, quite solid.

● **ETYM** Since Hübschman (1897: 423^{Nr47}; see also HAB 1: 350a), connected with Gr. *ἄροτρον* n., Lat. *arātrum*, Mir. *arathar*, Welsh *aradr*, OIc. *arðr*, Lith. *árklas*, OCS *ralo*, etc.

According to Kortlandt (2003: 42, 55, 73-74), the absence of the initial *h-* in Arm. *arawr* (vs. *harawunk* ‘arable land’, q.v.) and Gr. *ἄροτρον* point to the zero grade **h₂rh₃trom* (the zero grade of this type being showed by Lith. *irklas* ‘oar’ from **h₁rh₁-*), and the variant *harawr*, as Lith. *árklas* and Lat. *arātrum*, adopted the *e*-grade of the verb. This is accepted by Beekes (2003 1183, 193). [Earlier, Beekes (1969: 140, 231) assumed a full grade. According to Lindeman (1982: 40-41), Lat. *arāre* and PArm. **arā-* (unpreserved) may reflect an iterative in **-ā-* with zero grade in the root syllable: **h₂rH-eh₂-ye-*]. Olsen (1999: 35, 765-769, 846) disagrees with this view and restores a full grade of the root. One wonders whether we can dismiss Celtic (from **h₂erh₃-tro-* in Schrijver 1991: 108) and Germanic forms as evidence for the full grade.

At any rate, Kortlandt’s explanation is preferable since it shows a motivated distribution between the Armenian forms with and without the initial *h-*. If *harawr* ‘plough’ (with the *h-* the stability of which would be synchronically supported next to *harawunk*, q.v.) were the original form, there would be no solid reason for the loss of its initial *h-*, unless one assumes that *araws*₁ ‘virgin soil’ (q.v.) was sufficient to cause such a loss. Thus, the assumption of N. Simonyan (1979: 220) about direct continuity of the PIE laryngeal in Arm. dial. **harōr* should be reformulated as follows: *arawr* ‘plough’ is the original form, and the initial *h-* of the variant *harawr* is

due to influence of the unpreserved verb and *harawunk*’, which indeed reflects the PIE laryngeal.

arawr₂ ‘a kind of water-bird, a red duck’.

Attested only in fable 143 of Mxit’ar Goš (12-13th cent.).

Arawr ew kwiw i kłzis hanen zjags, anerkeł snuc’anelov. - "The *arawr* and the Lapwing hatch their young on islands where they raise them without fear", transl. by Greppin (1978: 105).

NHB (1: 387a) describes *arawr* as a kind of big bird, resembling the duck and having reddish (*šaragoy*n) feathers, perhaps identical with Turk. */eapan ēōrtēki/*; obviously *yaban ördeği* ‘wild duck’ is meant. It is identified with the coot or the moorhen, which are grey on the underside, and reddish brown on top [Greppin 1978: 105-106]. An interesting folk-song from Bulanəx of Muš is relevant here [S. Movsisyan 1972: 102b^{Nr 15}]:

*Havk’uk vər covun, anunn ēr aror,
Vzikn ēr karmir, srtik sewavor.*

"A bird on the sea, named aror, his little neck was red, (the) little heart - black (literally: 'having black')". For the reddish colour see below.

● **DIAL** Preserved in the dialects of Van, Ozim [Ačaryan 1952: 249], Šatax [Muradyan 1962: 193a] (unspecified), Muš; the latter, as well as *arorik* (Van), is described as a barelegged and longbeaked water-bird [HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 134a].

Note *šinarōr* and *šənorawr/ šnofor* in a poem by Yovhannēs T’lkuranc’i (14-15th cent.), next to other wading/ water-birds: *aragil* ‘stork’, *sag* ‘goose’ and *bat/t* ‘duck’ [Mnac’akanyan 1941: 178, 180] = Turk. */antut/* [HAB 1: 350b]. By the latter obviously Turk. *angit* ‘a kind of duck with brick-coloured feathers, Tadorna ferruginea’ (see Eren 1999: 13; cf. also Amiryan 1985: 150) is meant; cf. dial. *aṅḡidī* ‘a kind of reddish duck’ and *angut*, which refers to other birds of red colour [DerSöz 1, 1963: 265, 268]. The relevance of the red colour is shown by the Latin name, as well as by Germ. *Rostgans*, Engl. *ruddy sheld duck*, Russ. *krasnaja utka*, etc. [Boehme/Flint 1994: 36^{Nr 683}]. [For the references I am indebted to Uwe Bläsing].

The Turkish word has been borrowed, I think, in the Armenian dialect of Karin (Erzrum), *antut* ‘small wild duck’ (see HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 64a), which is geographically close to Bulanəx, that is historical Hark’. The presence of the bird in Karin (Erzrum) is testified by Radde (see Ananyan, HayKendAšx 3, 1965: 357). Note that *gawai Karnoy* was an ideal place for wading birds; cf. s.v.v. *anid* and especially *arawš*, which is perhaps etymologically related to *arawr*₂. For the

description of the bird and some general information I refer to Ananyan, HayKendAšx 3, 1965: 357-373.

The variant *arorik* seems to be known in the contemporary Armenia, too (cf. Ananyan, HayKendAšx 3, 1965: 366). In some folk-songs (Mnac'akanyan 1956: 443-444, 450) one can see the equivalence of *arōr* to *čayek* (see s.v. *čay*).

●**ETYM** No etymology known (cf. HAB 1: 350b; Greppin 1978: 106).

Probably somehow connected to some Armenian words denoting water and/or grazing birds; see s.v.v. *aragil*, *araws₂*, *arawš*.

argand *a*-stem (later also *o*-) 'womb'.

Bible+.

●**DIAL** Akn, Juŋa *arg'and'*, Alaškert *arkant* (according to HayLezBrbBaŋ 1, 2001: 121b, also *argan*, Madat'yan 1985 vacat), Agulis, T'iflis, Šamaxi *ark'and* (also with an initial *h*-, see also Baŋramyan 1964: 59, 189), Axalc'xa *ark'ant'* [HAB 1: 303a]. Further, Łarabaŋ *argand* (Mehtišen *argánd*) [Davt'yan 1966: 319]. The *d*-less form of Alaškert is also seen in another dialect of Muš-group, viz. Bulanəx (the village of Kop'), as found in a fairy-tale recorded in Leninakan/Gyumri in 1930-36 [HŽHek' 10, 1967: 96^{L15}]: *im argan-en* 'from my womb'; glossed as *argan· argand* (op. cit. 604a).

In Łarabaŋ one would expect **ärk'änd*, through Ačäryan's Law and subsequent change *-rg-* > *-rk'-*, that was probably antierior to the consonant shift (*g* > *k*) as is clear from the reflexes of e.g. the derivatives of *ard* 'shape, order' in Van and related dialects who participate in Ačäryan's Law; cf. also examples in 2.1.39.2 One might therefore consider *argand* as resulted from literary influence. These thoughts may indeed be confirmed by *ärk'än* which is found twice in a tale told in Berd (Šamsadin) in 1981 by Lewon Virabyan (see Xemč'yan 2000: 144a). In this tale, a mare says to her foal: <...>, *ēt kyngä* [probably a misprint for *kngyä*] *ärk'änəmn ēl mi tta*, *im ärk'änəmn ēl mi k'urak*: "<...>, in the womb of that woman (there is) also a boy, in my womb, too, (there is) a foal". Next to this archaic *ärk'än*, the literary *argand* is used in another story told in 1984 by Sumbat' Melik'yan, in the very same village of Berd (see Xemč'yan 2000: 169a^{L12}).

●**ETYM** Liden (1906: 21; cf. Pedersen 1982 [< 1907]: 297b) derives from IE **arkʷ-*, cf. Welsh *arffed* 'gremium, Schoss', Gael. *arcuinn* 'udder of a cow'. This is accepted by Ačäryan (HAB 1: 303a), who also adds *argahatem* 'to pity, to feel sorry (for)' as composed of **arg-* 'belly, intestines' and *hat-* 'to cut', and, with some reservation, by Ĵahukyan (1987: 113, 159, and, for the suffix, 240). Earlier, as well as later,

Ĭahukyan (1982: 71; 1983: 90; 1990: 5) connected **arg-* to Gr. *ὀρύα* 'intestine', restoring **(o)rwnt-*.

Pedersen (1949: 1-2) proposed a connection with the Slavic **gr̥dъ* 'breast': Russ. *grud'* etc., adducing parallels for the semantic relation between 'belly; womb' and 'breast' such as Fr. *sein* etc. [Pedersen presents the Slavic form with an *a*. Is this correct?]. A protoform like **g^{wh}r(V)nd^h*- could indeed yield Arm. *argand* or, perhaps better **ergand* (see below). This etymology has much success, cf. Solta 1960: 406-407; Godel 1975: 75, 79; Hanneyan 1979: 183; Hamp 1983: 7 (conflation with **g^hroud^h*- 'flesh'); Olsen 1999: 189; Beekes apud Kortlandt 2003: 207. For various attempts to add more cognates see Mann 1963: 122-123, 142; Toporov, PrJaz 2 (E-N), 1979: 286. As pointed out by Greppin (1983: 309), cognates like Gr. *βρέvθος* 'arrogance' and Lat. *grandis* 'great' (see Pokorny 1959: 485) make Pedersen's etymology problematic since **g^wra-* would yield Arm. **erka-*. However, the Greek and Latin are semantically remote. In ÈtimSlovSlavJaz 7, 1980: 149, the connection of the Slavic word with Arm. *argand*, Gr. *βρέvθος* and others is rejected since the Slavic represents a lexico-semantic innovation.

Also not clear is the "prothetic" vowel *a-* of Arm. *argand*. Although Pedersen adduces the example of *artasu-k'* 'tears', *erkan-k'* 'millstone' seems to be a strong counter-example since *erkan* and *argand* are both bisyllabic, with an *-a-* as the root vowel, and the protoform of *erkan* and the alleged protoform of *argand* both contain a labiovelar stop. Thus, one wonders, why *argand* and not **ergand* (see also 2.1.17).

The most recent etymology known to me is that proposed by Witczak (1999: 183) who compares *argand* with Hitt. *šarḫuwant-* c./n. 'uterus, placenta' < IE **srHu-wnt-h₂*, literally 'full of sausages', cf. Gr. *ὀρύα* 'sausage' (or 'intestine'). [As far as the Greek is concerned, this etymology in fact coincides with that of Ĭahukyan, which he seems to have abandoned later (see above)]. However, **rHu-* would yield **-araw-*, cf. *haraw* and *harawun-k'* (q.v.); see 2.1.20; cf. also Arm. *orovayn*.

I conclude that the etymology of *argand* remains uncertain. I present some thoughts which might argue in favour of **-nt-* rather than **-nd^h-*.

How to explain the loss of the final *-d* in Šamšadin *ärk'än*? One might think that this is because the final became weak as a result of the accent retraction. According to HayLezBrbBar 1, 2001: 121b, however, a *t*-less variant *argan* is found also in Alaškert, where we do not have a penultimate accent. Alternatively, **argan* is the archaic nominative with the loss of the final **-t* in auslaut: NSg **argan*, obl. and pl. **argandV-*. It is tempting to restore NColl. **-nt-h₂*, obl. **-nt-eh₂-*, which would explain both the *a*-stem and the loss of the **-t-* in the nominative. For **-ntH* > Arm.

-n cf. *hun* and *-sun*. Olsen (1999: 189), too, though with reservation, assumes a collective **-ch₂*. For **-nt-h₂* compare the solution of Witczak (1999: 183) above.

argat 'superfluous branches cut off from vine and used for kindling'.

MArm. word according to Norayr. MiġHayBař vacat. In "Bařgirk' hayoc'" it glosses *uř* 'branch': *uř · čit kam argat* [Amalyan 1975: 261^{Nr233}].

In DialAdd apud NHB 2: 1060c: *argat · uř hateal yort'oy; čiwť yateal; yōt*.

●**DIAL** Preserved only in the dialect of Ararat [HAB 1: 304a], according to Amatuni (1912: 75a), also in Muř: *ark'at*, *ark'ad*, and used by modern Armenian writers Perč Prořyan (1883-1918) and Step'an Zoryan (1889-1967), born in Ařtarak and Łarak'ilisa (later called Kirovakan, nowadays Vanajor), respectively [HayLezBrbBař1, 2001: 137]. For these and some other textual illustrations see Amatuni 1912: 75a. Further: Vaxťang Ananyan (the village of Poťosk'ilisa, Diliġan) (see HayKendAřx 3, 1965: 432); Xařak Gyulnazaryan (1984: 85), all of them being native speakers of the Ararat dialect. For K'anak'er *ark'ad* see G. D. Asatryan 1990: 54.

●**ETYM** No etymology in HAB 1: 304a.

Łap'anc'yan (1961: 166) connects with Hitt. *ark-* 'to cut off, divide', treating *-at* as the suffix seen in *arm-at* 'root' etc. Given that the Hittite verb is glossed nowadays as '(Land) zerteilen, aufteilen' rather than 'to cut off, divide', Greppin (1981a: 496) considers the etymology to be unconvincing.

A. A. Abrahamyan (1958: 63-64; I cite from Greppin, *ibid.*) interprets it as **arg-* (cf. *z-arg-anam* 'to grow, improve' + *-at* < *-(h)at* 'cut', basically something like 'removed from growth'; cf. *ken-at* 'that which cuts the life').

Aťayan (1974: 30-31) derives *argat* from PIE **ureh₂d-* 'branch; root', cf. Gr. *ῥᾱδίξ* 'branch', Lat. *rādx* 'root', *rāmus* 'branch', MWelsh *gwreid* < **urh₂d-jo-* 'roots', OIc. *rōt*, Goth. *waúrts* 'root', Alb. *rrēnjē*, *-a* (Tosk.), *rrā(n)jē* (Gheg.) 'root' [Demiraj 1997: 350-351], Toch. B *witsako* (if from **urdi-k-eh₂-*, see Mallory/Adams 1997: 80; Adams 1999: 604-605), etc. For the discussion of OIr. *frén* 'root', Welsh *gwrysg* 'branches', Gr. *ῥάδαμνος* 'twig' and others see especially Schrijver 1991: 182-183; 1995: 173-175.

This etymology is the most probable one though the evidence for **urV-* > Arm. **VrgV-* is scanty and inconclusive; see also Ĵahukyan (1978: 135; 1982: 71; 1987: 156, 199, 263). However, it is almost never cited by scholars outside Armenia, except for Greppin 1983: 309, with some reservation (putting the entry between brackets). Discussing Arm. *armat* (next to *armn*) 'root', Olsen (1999: 335-337, 368-369, 496-497) suggests a contamination with **ureh₂d-* not mentioning Arm. *argat*.

The prothetic vowel *a-* in *argat* is remarkable since it is the expected variant in eastern dialects vs. *e-* in Classical Armenian and majority of dialects, cf. PIE **g^wr(e)h₂-n-* > *erkan* ‘hand-mill’ (Bible+; widespread in dialects) : EArm. (Agulis, Ľarabať, Ĵuťa, etc.; but Ararat itself has *e-*); see Aťayan 1965. See also 2.1.17.4.

argel, uninflected [in Greppin 1983: 309, *-i*, *-oy*; I do not know what is this based on] ‘hindrance, obstacle’ (Agat’angelos, John Chrysostom, etc.), ‘ward, prison’ (Revelation 18.2, rendering Gr. *φυλακή* ‘watching, guarding; ward, prison’); more frequent with verbs such as *ainem* ‘to make’, *linim* ‘to be’, *tam* ‘to give’, etc. (Bible+); **argelum** ‘to forbid, obstacle, hinder, etc.’ (Bible+), **argelem** ‘id.’ ((John Chrysostom, Paterica, etc.), **argilel** ‘id.’ (Paterica), **argelanim** ‘to be obstructed, hindered, held’ (Bible+), etc. Dial. ***arg**, see below.

●**DIAL** The verb **arge/il-el* has been preserved in Suč’ava, Sebastia, Tigranakert, Alaškert, Ozim, Ararat, Šamaxi. In Akn the meaning is ‘to prison (a person, dog, etc.)’. The noun *ark’el* is found in Suč’ava [HAB 1: 305a]. Western dialects have **argil-*, which is reminiscent of *argilel*, which is attested in Paterica and is considered to be a dialectal spelling fpm [NHB 1: 345a].

Amongst the dialects of the Van-group Ač’aryan (1952: 248) records only Ozim *arg’ilil*. M. Muradyan 1962: vacat (on Šatax). I think one does find a relic of the word in Moks *šəřāk’lk^o* ‘задержание мочи’ (= ‘retention of the urine’); e.g. *šəřāk’lk^o* *ə* ‘у него задержание мочи’ (see Orbeli 2002: 302), which must be interpreted as **šř-a(r)gil-k’* = *šř* ‘urine’ + *argel-k’*, with loss of *-r-* (2.1.33.3) and with regular reflex of Ač’aryan’s Law (2.1.39.2).

The root ***arg** is found in dial. *bk’-arg* recorded in DialAdd apud NHB 2: 1061a and interpreted (ibid.) as *argeleal i bk’oy* ‘held/obstructed by snow-storm’. This compound is present in Ararat, Nor Bayazet [Ač’arean 1913: 212b; HAB 1: 304b], according to Amatuni (1912: 121b), also in Muš. Amatuni (ibid.) also records Ararat, Muš *bk’-argel* ‘id.’.

●**ETYM** Since long, connected with Lat. *arceo* ‘to keep off, prevent; to protect’ (NHB 1: 344a, etc.), Gr. *ἀρκέω* ‘to ward off, keep off; to defend; to suffice’, *ἄρκος* n. ‘defence’, OHG *rigil* ‘bolt’, Lith. *rāktas* ‘key’, Hitt. *ḫar(k)-zi* ‘to hold, have, keep’, etc. [Osthoff 1898: 54-64, 65; HAB 1: 304-305; Pokorny 1959: 66; Ĵahukyan 1967b: 69; 1987: 113; Klingenschmitt 1982: 236-238]. On Hittite see Kloekhorst 2007, 1: 355-357.

Ač’aryan (HAB 1: 304b) treats *-el* as a suffix comparable to *-il*. Greppin (1975: 79; 1983: 309) compares with Lat. *arcula* ‘small box, casket’. Ĵahukyan (1987: 113) reconstructs **arkelo-*, directly comparing with the suffix seen in OHG *rigil* ‘bolt’ etc.

However, the appurtenance of the Germanic (as well as Hittite, Baltic, etc.) is not overall accepted; see Hübschmann 1897: 423 (mentions only the Greek and Latin cognates); Klingenschmitt, *ibid.*; Mallory/Adams 1997: 270b; Schrijver 1991: 66-67; Beekes, Greek Database. One assumes that Arm. *arg-el* has been created on the model of *awelum* 'to add, increase' [Klingenschmitt 1982: 235-238; Viredaz 2005: 94]. One may rather compare with *-el* found in *ayc'-el* 'visit' and *vay-el* 'proper', *vayel-em* 'to enjoy' (see s.v.v.).

Kortlandt (1983: 12; 1986: 42 = 2003: 42, 71; see also Beekes 2003: 183, 188) explains Arm. *arg-* (without an initial *h-*) from **h₂rk-* with Greek and Latin, contrasting with **h₂rek-l-* seen in German *Riegel* 'bolt', cf. Lith. *rãktas* 'key'. On Germanic see Lindeman 2003. On discussion of the zero grade form **h₂rk-* with respect to Greek and Latin see Schrijver 1991: 66-67; cf., however, Lindeman 2003: 96-97₂.

Kortlandt (1975: 44 = 2003: 11; see also Beekes 2003: 177) explains the absence of palatalization of the velar by the analogy of a noun cognate to Gr. *ἄρκος*. Arm. dial. **arg* may corroborate this assumption. Alternatively, *-el-* is relatively recent (cf. *ayc'-el-* and *vay-el-* above).

ard₁, *u*-stem 'shape, order'; ***ard(i)**, *ea*-stem 'work': *ardea-w-k* 'indeed' (instrumental); **ardiwn-k**, APl *ardiwn-s*, GDPl *ardeanc*, IPL *ardeam-b-k* 'deed, work; (earth) products' (on which see Olsen 1999: 490) [cf. dial. ***ard(i)umn** 'earth goods, harvest'], *ardeamb* 'indeed' (instrumental).

All the forms: Bible+. Numerous old derivatives [HAB 1: 306-307], such as *z-ard* 'ornament', *ard-ar* 'righteous', *z-ard-ar-em* 'to adorn', etc. Note *ardak* 'flat (adj.)' Philo+, which formally coincides with dial. adverbial **ardak*. From the etymologically related *ard₂* '(just) now' (q.v.). The *u*-declension of *ard* (Ezrik, GoldArm.) is confirmed by *z-ard* 'ornament', which has *u*-stem, too.

● **DIAL** The forms *ardar* and *zardar-* are widespread in dialects. In some of them (Łarabał *ärt'är* [Davit'yan 1966: 319], Van *ärtär* [Ačaryan 1952: 248], etc.; Van, Moks, Šatax *zärtär-* [Ačaryan 1952: 259; M. Muradyan 1962: 195b], etc.; cf. Łarabał *zərt'är-* [Davit'yan 1966: 350]) we can discern the effect of Ačaryan's Law in inlaut with subsequent assimilation: *ardar* > **artär* > *ärtär*. Interestingly, Moks and Šatax (see Ačaryan 1952: 248; M. Muradyan 1962: 192b) did not share the assimilation with Van, having preserved the intermediate form **arärtär* intact. The form is also confirmed by genuine data of Orbeli (2002: 208) taken on the very Moks area in 1911-1912. See also 2.1.39.2.

Ačaryan does not cite dialectal forms for *ard* and other derivatives. According to Davt'yan (1966: 319), here belongs Łarabał, Hadrut' *árt'/ďák* 'completely'. Margaryan (1975: 315b) glosses *ardak* as Goris *ärt'ák* not specifying the semantics. In Łarabał there is *təten-ärt'ák* 'completely' (see HŽHek' 7, 1979: 736b). The same expression is found in Metri, in a different meaning: *təten ärdák* 'immediately, on the spot' (see Ałayan 1954: 292); see *ard₂*. Their possible synchronic identity (or contamination?) may be seen in Šamšadin/Dilijān *ärt'(n)ák* 'completely; immediately' (see Mežunc' 1989: 201b).

The form *ardiwn-k'* has been preserved in Tarente **ardiwnk' gal* 'to serve to something, be of use, be useful' [Ačarean 1913: 145b; HAB 1: 309b]. Ararat *ardum* 'earth goods, harvest' (see HAB 1: 309b) points to **ard(i)umn*. For *-wn* : *-mn* see 2.1.22.11.

●**ETYM** From PIE **h₂r-tu-* and **h₂r-ti-* based on **h₂er-* 'to fix, put together': Skt. *ṛtú-* 'correct time; order'; Gr. *ῥτῦς* 'σύνταξις' (Hes), *ῥτῦω* 'to equip, prepare'; Lat. *artus* 'joint, limb' [Hübschmann 1897: 423^{Nr52}; HAB 1: 307-308; Mallory/Adams 1997: 362b; 410]. For other alleged cognates see Van Windekens 1980: 41. Arm. **ard(i)* 'work' seems to go parallel with Lat. *ars*, Gsg *artis* 'art, manner'. On Arm. *ard-ar* 'righteous' (cf. Skt. *ṛtá-* 'truthful; (world-)order') see Hübschmann 1897: 423-424^{Nr53}. Olsen (1999: 338₃₀₃, 868) assumes that *ard-ar* more probably is "a loanword from a Mlr. counterpart of Av. *arədra-* 'getreu, zuverlässig'", which seems unnecessary. Besides, I wonder if an Iran. *-dr-* would not develop into *-θr-* > *-hr-*. For another attempt to interpret Arm. *ardar* as an Iranian loan (from **arta-δā-*) see Considine 1979: 226₁₂ (though with a sceptical conclusion).

The absence of the initial *h-* may be due to zero grade seen in various **-t-* formations from **h₂er-* 'to fix, put together' (see Schrijver 1991: 68).

Arm. *ardiwn-k'*, GDPl *ardeanc'* '(agricultural) products; deed' may be seen in the place-name *Ardean-k'* (q.v.).

ard₂ '(just) now'.

Bible+. Also **ardi** 'now (adv.); nowadays (adj.)' (Bible+), *ard-a-cin* 'new-born' (Cyril of Alexandria), etc.

●**DIAL** No dialectal records in HAB 1: 309a.

Here may belong, I think, Metri <particle of time> *ärdák*, cf. *təten ärdák* 'immediately, on the spot' (see Ałayan 1954: 292); Karčewan *árdák'* 'immediately' (see H. Muradyan 1960: 210a). Both forms are represented only in glossaries of purely dialectal words. They may reflect **ard-ak*, for the adverbial suffix cf. *he/ēm* 'now' - dial. (Polis, Akn, Sebastia) **himak* [HAB 3: 78b; Ačaryan 1941: 179;

Gabikéan 1952: 341]. Thus, it may be identical with *ardak* 'flat (adj.)' from *ard₁*, since the latter is etymologically related with *ard₂*. For the semantics cf. Germ. *eben* 'flat' and 'just now'. The Metri expression *tētēn ärdāk* 'immediately, on the spot' is also found in Łarabał, in a different meaning: *tētēn-ärt'āk* 'completely' (see HŽHek' 7, 1979: 736b); see *ard₁*.

H. Muradyan (1960: 16, 190a; see also 219b) glosses *ardi* as Karčewan *hārdā* not specifying the semantics. This is identical with Metri *hārdā* 'now' (see Ałayan 1954: 313, in the glossary of dialectal words). Note also Areš *ärt'ā* 'early' [Lusenc' 1982: 199a]. If Karčewan *h-* does reflect Class. *y-* (see H. Muradyan 1960: 62-63), we can restore **y-ard-ay*; cf. *i ver-ay* 'on, above'. For the adverbial *-a(y)* compare also *him-ay* 'now'; *(h)ap-a* 'then, (immediately) afterwards'. Note the parallelism *him-ay*, **him-ak* and **ard-ay*, **ard-ak*.

Ardak: In a Łarabał fairy-tale recorded by Arak'el Bahat'ryan in 1860 (HŽHek' 6, 1973: 699^{L7}): *šemk'in ärt'āk nstac* "seated upright on threshold".

●**ETYM** Since NHB (1: 345c, 349a), compared with Gr. *ἄρτι* 'just now' etc. [Hübschmann 1897: 423^{Nr51}; HAB 1: 309a]. From IE **h₂(e)rti*: Gr. *ἄρτι* 'just now'; Lith. *arti* 'near' (referring to proximity of space rather than time). Probably, an ancient locative formation from the root **h₂er-* 'to fix, put together' (see *arīnem*, *ard₁*) with the original meaning 'fittingly'. For the discussion I refer to C. Arutjunjan 1983: 271 and especially to Clackson 1994: 103-104 and, on Lithuanian, 223₈₉. The comparison with the Greek is first suggested in NHB 1: 345c. [Greppin (1983: 310) writes: "Adjarian (HAB) speculates that Arm. *ard(i)* might be of Greek origin". However, I cannot find such a thought in HAB].

The absence of the initial *h-* may be due to zero grade possibly seen in *ardi* < **ardīyoh* < **h₂rtijōs*: Gr. *ἄρτιος* 'suitable; ready' (see also Olsen 1999: 435) and in derivatives. If we are dealing with the suffix **-ti-* rather than the *i*-locative form from **h₂er-t-*, then the problem becomes easier since derivatives in **-ti-* generally have a zero grade root. Also other **-t-* formations from **h₂er-* 'to fix, put together' show zero grade in the root [Schrijver 1991: 68]. The compound *ard-a-cin* (hapax) that is frequently cited as a match to Gr. *ἄρτιγενής* 'new-born', can be a calque from Greek.

ariwn, *an*-stem: GDSg *arean*, AblSg *y-aren-ē*, ISg *aream-b*, GDPl *arean-c* 'blood'.

Bible+. Note *ariwn xałotoy* 'wine', lit. 'blood of grapes' (Bible), *ariwn ort'oy* 'wine', lit. 'blood of vine' (Ephrem). In compounds: *ariwn-*, *arean-*, and *aren-*.

●**DIAL** Dialectally ubiquitous.

Note *ērieriwn* in a folk-song (Mnac'akanyan 1956: 639^{L-3}) which seems to mean 'blood'; it corresponds to *arun* or *ērun* in other variants [if not *erēr-* 'to shake'].

●**ETYM** Connected with Gr. *ἔαρ* (also *ἐῖαρ*, *ῆαρ*) n. 'blood', Skt. *ásrj-* n., NSg *ásrk* (RV+), GSg *asn-ás* (AV+) 'blood', etc. by Tērvīsean and, independently, Bugge (1889: 24), who compares with *garun* 'spring' (q.v.) for the loss of the medial **s-*. The following development has been assumed: **esar-* > **char-* > **ear-* > **ar-* [Hübschmann 1899: 44; HAB 1: 317a] or **esar-* > **char-* > **ahar-* > **ar-* [Jahukyan 1990a: 11]. See also Kortlandt 2003 (< 1996): 118; Olsen 1999: 490-491. Later, Kortlandt (2001 = 2003: 131-132; see also Beekes 2003: 160) assumes vocalization of the medial laryngeal: **esHr* > **esar* > **ar-*. Therefore, as he points out, the epenthetic vowel in **wesar* 'spring' must be of analogical origin. Obviously, the influence of *ašun* 'autumn' (q.v.) is meant here. This is quite possible since the other names of seasons too show an influence: *amairn* 'summer' and *jmeirn* 'winter'. [Note also Łaraba† **ameirn*].

Jahukyan (ibid.) alternatively suggests **əsṛ-* (if, as he points out, Gr. *ῆαρ* is an ancient form), and, for the word for 'spring', **wəsṛ-*, with the shwa secundum **ḷ*. Hitt. *ēšḫar* n., GSg *išḫanāš*, points to **h₁esh₂r*. What Jahukyan is suggest in fact is **h₁sh₂r*, though such a form is not found elsewhere. Latin. *asser* cannot be used as evidence for **h₁s-* (see Schrijver 1991: 29). But the Armenian form contains a suffix, and the derivational basis in zero grade is not excluded. [Or perhaps from old oblique stem **h₁sh₂n-*]. Kortlandt (2001: 12 = 2003: 132) rejects **ahar-* > **ar-* because vocalized **h₁-* yielded Arm. *e-*. For an extensive discussion see Viredaz 2000.

In order to explain the suffix *-iwn* here, Olsen (1999: 491) suggests a contamination of **-r-* and **-n-* stem from the original heteroclitic paradigm, and a contamination with almost synonymous root **kreuh₂-*, cf. Gr. *κρέατ-ος* < **kreuḡht-*.

The best solution seems to be: **h₁esh₂r* > **char* > **ar-* + *-iwn*, though the function/origin of the suffix is not certain.

arm-anam 'to be stounded' (P'awstos buzand etc.), **z-arm-anam** 'id.' (Bible+), **ənd-armanam** 'to be astounded, stricken with amazement; to render senseless, benumb, deaden' (Bible+).

●**ETYM** Ačaryan (HAB 1: 327) derives from *armn* 'root' (Bible+), cf. ModArm. *p'ayt/k'ar ktril* 'to be petrified' < 'to render wood/stone'. Though not impossible, this interpretation is not evident since *armn* refers to 'root' (etymologically perhaps 'branch') rather than 'wood as material'. I therefore propose an alternative etymology.

The verb may be regarded as a derivative of PArm. **arm-* ‘to bind fast, tie, fit’ seen in *y-arm-ar* ‘fitting’, cf. Gr. *ἄρμος* ‘joint’, pl. ‘fastenings of a door’, *ἄρμωζω* ‘to join, fit together; to bind fast’, etc. from PIE **h₂er-* ‘to fit’. For the semantics cf. *papanjim* ‘to grow dumb, speechless’: **panj-* from QIE **b^hnd^h-s-*.

armukn, *an*-stem (GSg *armkan*, ISg *armkamb*, NPl *armkunk*’, GDPL *armkanc*’) ‘elbow’.

Bible+. Spelled also as *armunkn*, *armuk*, etc.

●**DIAL** Widespread in dialects, mostly as **armunk*; a few SW peripheral dialects have preserved the older, nasalless form **armuk(n)*: Tigranakert *ārmug*, Zeyt’un *aymɔg*, Hačən *aymug* [HAB 1: 330a; Haneyan 1978: 183a; Ačaryan 2003: 300].

●**ETYM** Since Hübschmann (1897: 425^{Nr59}; see also Osthoff 1898: 60; HAB 1: 329b), connected with Skt. *īrmā-* m. ‘arm, shoulder (joint)’ (AV+), Oss. *arm* ‘arm; shaft’ (see Cheung 2002: 153); Lat. *armus* m. ‘arm, shoulder, forequarter (of an animal)’, Goth. *arms* ‘arm’, etc. ; OPruss. *irmo* ‘arm’, Lith. *irm-ėdė* f. ‘gout’ (literally ‘arm-eating’); SCR. *rā me* ‘shoulder’; etc. (from PIE **h₂(e)rH-mo-*).

The circumstances of the loss of the internal laryngeal in Armenian are disputed (see Winter 1965: 106; Hamp 1970: 228b; 1982: 187-189; Beekes 1988: 77; 2003: 192-193; Kortlandt 2003: 120; see 2.1.20 for more detail). It has been assumed that *armukn* is structurally closer to *y-ar-m-ar* ‘fitting’ belonging to PIE **h₂er-* ‘to fit (together), to put together’ (cf. Arm. *ar-nem* ‘to make, prepare, create’, q.v.; Gr. *ἄρθρον* ‘joint; limb’, *ἄρθρος* ‘union, friendship’, *ἄρμη* ‘junction’; etc.), and, thus, has nothing to do with the PIE word for ‘arm’ or represents a synchronically different formation of the same **h₂er-* ‘to fit’ (see Hamp 1982; Ĵahukyan 1987: 112). A similar view is expressed by Adams (Mallory/Adams 1997: 26b) who, commenting upon the PIE word for ‘arm’, writes: “Arm. *armukn* ‘elbow’ has also been placed here; however, it is probably an independent creation”. However, I do not see serious reasons to separate (synchronically or ultimately) *armukn* from the PIE word for ‘arm’.

Ĵahukyan (1987: 112) restores **ar-mo-* [= **h₂er-mo-*], with a full grade in the root and without an internal laryngeal. In view of the absence of an initial *h-*, however, the Armenian form reflects the zero grade (see also Beekes 1988: 77, 78), which is also found in Sanskrit and Baltic. The Germanic and Slavic forms reflect *o-* grade, and Latin comes from either **h₂rHmo-*, or, more probably, **h₂erHmo-* (see Hamp 1982; Schrijver 1991: 313-314, 318).

To explain the second part of the Armenian form, viz. *-ukn*, scholars usually treat *armukn* as a compound with *mukn* ‘mouse’ (Klingenschmitt 1982: 68₁₁; Beekes 1988: 78; Olsen 1999: 590, 681₃₈, 768), and the loss of the initial laryngeal is

ascribed to the compositional loss (Olsen). Hamp (1990: 22) proposes the following scenario: **AorHmo-muHsm* > **AerHmo-muHsm* > **aramomuH(s)m* > **aramumuHn* > **arumukn* (syllabic haplology) > *armukn* (regular syncope). Then he notes: "Because the **A* here fails to appear as Arm. *h*- it must have been IE **h* = *h*⁴; this did not colour an adjacent **o*, and therefore the **e* vocalism is to be assumed".

Some nuances need clarifying. A compound like 'arm-mouse' (cf. 'Arm-Maus' in Klingenschmitt 1982: 68₁₁) does not seem very probable. It becomes easier if one cites here *mukn* 'muscle' and *mkan* 'back' rather than *mukn* 'mouse', though etymologically they are identic, of course. As pointed out by Olsen (1999: 681₃₈), Hübschmann was first to involve *mukn* in the explanation of *armukn*. But Hübschmann (1897: 425^{Nr59}) did not treat the word as a compound. He writes: "*armukn* ist im Suffix vielleicht von *mukn* (gen. *mkan*) 'Maus, Muskel' (s. unten) beeinflusst". Such an influence is probable. Greppin (1983: 314) suggests a contamination from *mukn*. We can even postulate that *armukn* is simply composed of Arm. **arm-o-* 'arm' and the suffix *-ukn*. This is exactly what Ačāryan (HAB 1: 329b) suggests. The structure goes parallel with *krukn* 'heel' (Bible+; widespread in dialects), probably composed of **kur* '*angled/curved body part, joint' and *-ukn* (though the etymological details are not clear, see s.v.). For the suffix *-ukn* see Olsen 1999: 208, 590-592; cf. the variant *-kn* which is found in body-part terms like the above-mentioned *mu-kn* 'muscle', *un-kn* 'ear', etc. [Jahukyan 1987: 238]; see also s.v.v. *akn* 'eye'; *cung*, dial. **cunkn* 'knee'.

arjasp (spelled also *arjasp*), **arjaspn**, *i*- and *a*-stem in HHB, *o*-stem in NHB; the following forms are attested: ISg *arjasp-o-v* in Yovhannēs Erzñkac' (Pluz), 13th cent.; AblSg *y-arjaspn-ē* in Mxit'ar Aparanc'i (15th cent.) 'vitriol, sulphate of iron or copper, used especially as black ink'

Attested since the 7th century, in Vrt'anēs K'ert'oł, in an enumeration of scribal liquids: *deł groc' ē arjasp*, *ew gxtor*, *ew kriz* [NHB 1: 375a]. Also in compounds: *arjasp-a-nerk* 'painted with vitriol' in "Tōmar", *arjaspn-a-goyn* 'vitriol-coloured' in Grigor Tat'ewac'i (14-15th cent.), etc.

●**DIAL** Alaškert *arčasp*, Moks *arčāsp*, Salmast *ārčasp*, Ozim *arjaps*, Muš *arčaps* [HAB 1: 335b; Ačāryan 1952: 248], Šatax *arčāps* [M. Muradyan 1962: 64, 193a]. According to Orbeli (2002: 208), also Moks has metathesized forms: *arčāp's*, *arčāfs* "купорос (медный). Употреблялся как краска (для кожи и шерстяных материалов). Из него получали черный и синий цвета".

●**ETYM** Contains *arj-n* 'black' (q.v.) [HHB and NHB]. Ačāryan (HAB 1: 335ab) accepts this and compares Lat. *āter* 'black' > *ātramentum* 'writing-ink; blacking',

noting that the component **asp* is unknown. See also Ĵahukyan 1981: 21-22; 1987: 517, 609. Georgian *arĵasp* 'i and Tušian *arĵam* 'vitriol' are considered Armenian loans (see HAB 1: 335b).

Since Arm. *arĵasp(n)* denotes 'vitriol, sulphate of iron or copper', I propose to treat **asp(n)* as borrowed from the Iranian word for 'iron': Sogd. **spn-* 'iron' [MacKenzie 1970: 47], Shughni *sipin* 'iron' < **āspanya-* [Morgenstierne 1974: 74b], Pashto *ōspana*, *ōspīna* 'iron', Khwarezm. **spny* 'iron', Avest. **hu-safna-* 'steel', a metathesized form from **hu-spana-*, Oss. *æfsæn* 'ploughshare; iron', Pahl. *āsīn*, *āsen* and Pers. *āhan* 'iron' (< **ā-sana*), etc., from Iran. **spana-* < Ar. **syana-* (see Abaev 1985: 12-13; Cheung 2002: 156-157). Abaev (ibid.) compares the Iranian word with Gr. *κρύατος* 'dark-blue enamel; lapis lazuli; blue copper carbonate; sea-water; the colour blue', etc., from **kew-* 'to shine' (cf. Pokorny 1959: 594). According to Laufer (1919: 515), the Iranian word is connected with Chinese *pin* 'iron'.

The Armenian word can be derived from Parth. **span-* (with anaptyctic *a* in Armenian, cf. s.v.v. *arāspel* 'myth, tale, fable' and *arastat* 'ceiling') or **ā-span-*. The form *arĵaspn* should be considered the original, so we are dealing with loss of the final *-n* in the 7th century.

arĵn

'black'. Independently attested only in P'awstos Buzand 3.14 [HAB 1: 335b; Hovhannisyan 1990a: 151]; not in NHB. The passage reads as follows (1883=1984: 32^{L-2}; transl. Garsoïan 1989: 87): *yankarcōrēn jiwnn c'amak' arĵn linēr arāĵi nora* : "the snow suddenly became black earth before him". Also found in several compounds. See also s.v. *arĵasp(n)* 'vitriol'.

The compound *arĵn-a-bolor* 'very dark' refers to the night in "Čarəntir" (see NHB 1: 375a) and is the only case in NHB where *arĵn* appears in the atmospheric sense.

No dialectal forms of *arĵn* are recorded in HAB 1: 336b.

I wonder whether Van **arĵ-a-plo* and **arĵ-a-pap-o* 'bogy' contain *arĵn* 'black' or *arĵ* 'bear' (see s.v. **bo/u-* 'spider; ghost').

●**ETYM** Ačāryan (HAB 1: 335-336; cf. AčārlHPatm 1, 1940: 181) connects with **atĵ-* and **att-* 'dark' and treats as borrowed from North Caucasian languages: Chechen *ārĵi*, Ingush *arĵi*, Tušian *arĵi*, *arĵi* 'black', etc. These are considered of Iranian origin (see Ĵahukyan 1981: 21-22; 1987: 517, 609). The appurtenance of **atĵ-* and **att-* is improbable (see s.v. **atĵ-*).

Any relation with Pers. *arĵavān* 'purple, deep red' (see Steingass 35a)?

art, *o*-stem 'cornfield, tilled field'.

Bible+. In Psalms 106.37 (APL *art-s*) renders Gr. *ἀγρός* 'field'. It occurs with the synonymous *agarak* (q.v.) in Isaiah 27.4: *pahel zoč artoy yagarakī : φυλάσσειν καλάμην ἐν ἀγρῷ*. Coll. **art-or-ay**, mostly with plural *-k*' (Bible+); GDPI *artoray-oc*' is attested in Łazar P'arpec'i (5th cent.) 3.81 (1904=1985: 148^{L35}; transl. Thomson 1991: 208): *ew kamec'ealk' yezer hetetatin ar vayr mi hangč'el, ur ew hnjoťk'n artorayoc'n šurj ztetōk'n gorcēin* : "they wished to rest for a while at the edge of the ravine where the harvesters were working in the fields round about". Later also *arto/ōreay(k')*.

●**DIAL** Widespread in dialects. All the dialectal material (including also derivatives and compounds; see Ačārean 1913: 154-155; HAB 1: 337b; Amatuni 1912: 74b; HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 135-136) known to me points to the meaning 'cornfield, tilled field'. This is confirmed by endless illustrations from folklore, whereas one can hardly find unambiguous evidence for the meaning 'uncultivated field'. Here are some examples.

Moks *art/ait* is glossed by 'поле, нива, пашня' in Orbeli 2002: 205. Textual illustrations: *ait vārəc'in* "вспахали поле" (58^{L-7}, transl. 133); *taran c'anic'in aitē meč'* "понесли, посеяли на ниве" (59^{L2f}, transl. 134); *ait xaser er; məšakun esac' : k'ənā ait ənjē'* - "Поле поспело, он сказал батраку: 'пойди сожни поле'" (80^{L6f}, transl. 152).

For attestations with clear reference to ploughing or sowing or mowing/harvesting see e.g. HŽHek' 6, 1973 (Łarabał/Tavuš region): 184^{L11f}, 289^{L4} (*mi tap' a varum, art anum* "ploughs a field and makes it a cornfield"), 529^{L12f}, 584^{L14}, etc.;

●**SEMANTICS** The meaning of Arm. *art* is usually given as 'field'. More precisely, it means 'cornfield, tilled field, arable land'. Greppin (1987: 394-395) discusses only two attestations of the meaning 'tilled field', in John Chrysostom and Grigor Narekac'i, treats them as not reliable and concludes: "Arm. *art* is clearly a rare word of the fifth century only". In fact, more attestations of the meaning (also in compounds) are cited in HAB. Note also the passage from Łazar P'arpec'i (5th cent.) above. More importantly, the dialectal evidence, usually ignored by scholars, undoubtedly proves the meaning 'cornfield, tilled field'.

●**ETYM** Meillet (1896: 150) connects *art* 'cornfield' with Gr. *ἀγρός* 'field' ("avec *t* énigmatique au lieu de *c*") and treats Arm. *art-ak'*- 'dehors/outside' (Bible+) as a locative of it, as Lith. loc. *laukė* 'draußen, im Freien, außerhalb' from *laukas* 'field'. Ačāryan (HAB 1: 337a [the missing part added in HAB-Add 1982: 4], 338a) accepts this etymology and for the derivation of *art-* 'outside' from *art* 'cornfield' compares also OIr. *mag* 'cornfield', *im-maig* 'outside', etc. See also Ĵahukyan 1990a: 11.

A **h₂eg-ro-* (cf. also Skt. *ájra-* m. 'field, plain', Lat. *ager* m. 'field', etc.) would yield **harc-*. The absence of the initial *h-* is perhaps due to influence of etymologically related *acem* 'to lead' and *acu* 'garden-bed, kitchen-garden' which probably reflect **h₂g-* (see s.v.v.). The QIE (analogical) proto-form of Arm. *art* might have been then **h₂gro-*. On the problem of derivation of **h₂eg-ro-* from **h₂g-* 'to drive' see Pokorny 1959: 6; Frisk 1: 16; Euler 1979: 109-110; Saradževa 1980a: 55; Mayrhofer, EWAia 1, 1992: 52; Anttila 1986: 15ff; Greppin 1987; Levin 1995: 86₁₆₃.

The final *-t* instead of *-c* is unclear. Perhaps **-cr-* (= *tsr-*) > *-tr-* (see Schmidt 1964: 89, with references; Hamp 1983c: 38); typologically cf. Normier 1981: 22₆ (?). Sceptical: Greppin 1987: 395₂. [Note, however, PIE **meg^h(s)r-i* > Gr. *μέχρι* and Arm. *merj* 'near', q.v.]. The same anomaly is seen in *barti* 'poplar' (q.v.) from PIE **b^h(e)rHg-* 'birch'. In both cases, thus, we are dealing with **rc* > *rt*, with **c* originally following the laryngeal (if one accepts what has been said above on QIE **h₂gro-*): **rHg-* or **Hgr-* > Arm. **art*. It is difficult to ascertain, however, whether the neighbouring **r* and **H* played a role here or not. For a different kind of **c* : *t* alternation see 2.1.22.12. If **art-* in the above-mentioned *art-ak-* 'outside' has a different origin, the *t* of *art* 'cornfield' may be due to contamination with *art-ak-* 'outside'; for the semantic association 'outdoors' : 'cornfield' see s.v. and 'cornfield'.

On (alleged) Semitic parallels and Sumer. *agar* 'field' see Levin 1995: 86-93. Compare Arm. *agarak* 'landed property, estate' (q.v.).

artawsr (uninflected), NPl **artasu-k^t**, *a*-stem (GDPl *artasu-a-c*) 'tear'.

Bible+.

● **DIAL** Ubiquitous in dialects, all reflecting **artasu-n-k^t* [HAB 1: 345a].

● **ETYM** Since Hübschmann (1897: 425-426; see also HAB 1: 344-345; Greppin 1983: 316-317), derived with the PIE word for 'tear': Gr. *δάκρυ* n., OHG *zahar* (beside *trahan*), etc., and without initial consonants: Skt. *ásru-* n., YAv. *asrū-* n. pl., Lith. *āšara*, *ašara* f., Toch. A *ākār*. As pointed out by Greppin (1983: 317), one would expect an additional prothetic *e-* rather than *a-*, cf. *erkan* 'handmill' (q.v.). On the case of *artewanunk* see Clackson 1994: 109. For a suggestion see 2.1.17.4. For the nominative *-r* in words derived from PIE **u*-stem neuters see Clackson 1994: 126; Olsen 1999: 166-169, and on the plural stem **artasu-a-* reflecting an old neuter plural **drakū-h₂* see Clackson 1994: 47-48, 208₅₂, 229₂₀₂; Olsen 1999: 167-168.

Klingenschmitt (1982: 153-154) treats the *-w-* of *artawsr* as an "*u*-Epenthese nach betontem *a* der ursprünglichen Pānultima", thus: *artawsr* 'tear' < **drakūr* vs.

artasu-k' (pl.). A better alternative is suggested by Kortlandt (1985a = 2003: 60-62) who restores the following paradigm: sg. **drakru-* > **artawr* (cf. *mawru-k'* 'beard' next to Skt. *śmāsru-* n. 'beard'), pl. **drakū-* > *artasu-k'*. The form **artawr* seems to have adopted the *-s-* of the plural.

arti, artik 'wild sheep'.

Attested twice only:

In Hexaemeron 9 [K. Muradyan 1984: 306]: *Aycak'atk' ew artikk' bazum angam erkuoreaks cnanin*: "Goats and sheep frequently beget twins". Arm. *artik* renders Gr. *προβάτιον* 'little sheep' (op. cit. 372b) and is probably a diminutive as is the Greek equivalent; cf. *etn* 'hind' : dial. *etn-ik*.

In "Ašxarhac'oyc'", the 7th century Armenian Geography [Soukry 1881: 30 (Arm. text), 40 (French transl.)]: *Uni erēs, efferu, ayc ew k'ats, ain ew arti*: "Parmi les animaux, on y voit le cerf, la chèvre, le bouc et le mouflon, la brebis", in the context of the province of Barjr Hayk' = Upper Armenia. The corresponding passage in the short recension has only *erēs* (API) *bazum* 'many kinds of deer'; see A. G. Abrahamyan 1944: 349. As *ain* means 'wild male sheep', it seems that the pair *ain* and *arti*, like that of *k'ats* (API) and *ayc*, represents a contrast between the male and the female, respectively. Consequently, *arti* is usually interpreted as 'wild female sheep' [Soukry, *ibid.*; Eremyan 1963: 92a; Hewsén 1992: 153₁₈]. This seems attractive since there are some other designations of female animals formed with the suffix *-i* < **-ieh₂-*, see s.v.v. *-i*, *ayc(i)*, *mak'i*, etc. In view of the lack of other attestations of the word under discussion, the idea can be verified only by means of etymology.

●**ETYM** The word is derived from *art* 'arable land, cornfield' in NHB 1: 382b ("sheep of *art*, that is wild"), which does not cite the attestation of Armenian Geography. Ačaryan (HAB 1: 343) mentions this interpretation without comments and leaves the question of the origin of *arti(k)* open.

In view of the idea that in prehistoric stages the semantics of *art* may have been generic (cf. Skt. *ájra-* m. 'Ebene, Fläche, Flur' (RV) etc., see s.v. *art* for the discussion), the derivation *art-i* could actually mean 'wild, undomesticated' (exactly like the Greek cognate *ἄγριος* 'wild' < *ἀγρός* 'Feld, Acker'; see Frisk 1: 16), referring particularly to animals for hunting, cf. *vayr* 'field' : *vayri* 'wild' > 'wild sheep', dial. (Zeyt'un) 'hind' [HAB 4: 300-301], also *verik* 'wild sheeps' in the epic "Sasna čer". Note in Psalms 103[104].11 [Rahlf's 1931: 258]: *τὰ θηρία τοῦ ἀγροῦ* 'wild animals', literally 'beasts of the field'; see Dahood 1970: 38.

Typologically cf. also Hitt. *gimraš hūitar* ‘animals of the fields’ [Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 469].

Thus, the interpretation of NHB according to which *arti(k)* is derived from *art* ‘field’ and basically means ‘wild sheep’ is still valid. The formation with **-io-* might be parallel to that of Gr. *ἄγριος* ‘wild’, which is moreover etymologically related. However, one cannot be sure whether we are dealing with the suffix *-i* derived from **-io-* (cf. *kogī*, *-woy*, *-wov* ‘butter’ : Skt. *gāvya- gavyā-* ‘aus Rindern bestehend’; etc.) or **-ieh₂-* (cf. **h₁oiHu-ieh₂ > aygī*, *-woy*, *-eac* ‘grape-vine; grape-garden’, etc.) unless new evidence is found. The above-mentioned parallel *vayr-i* represents the latter, in view of GDP1 *vayreac*. Another important parallel is **and-i/and-eayk* ‘cattle’ (q.v.) from *and* ‘field’, a synonym of *art*, so we have an interesting contrast between domesticated and wild animals within the framework of the semantic expression ‘animals of the (household/wild) field’.

The semantic development under discussion can also be traced in a few dialectal expressions (HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 135b) in which *art* functions in the basic meaning of ‘(animal) of *art*, belonging to *art*’, that is ‘wild, undomesticated (animal)’:

artn ankac řun (Łarabař) lit.: ‘a dog that wanders in *art*’, refers to an indecent, wandering, undomesticated woman;

arti xoroz (Sebastia) ‘dragon-fly’, lit. ‘cock of *art*’ (cf. Lat. *agrion virgo* ‘damsel-fly’);

arti muk (dialectal area not indicated) ‘field-mouse’.

Note also in a curse: *tunt-teřt art əlla* ‘may your house and place become field/wilderness’.

ark‘ay, *i*-stem ‘king’ (Bible+).

More than thousand attestations in the Bible (see Astuacaturean 1895: 234-241, derivatives 241-243). The root ***ark-** is found in derivatives such as *ark‘uni* ‘royal’, *ark‘un-akan*, *ark‘-akan* ‘id.’, etc. (HAB 1: 346a; see also Matzinger 2000: 285).

● **DIAL** Akn, Xarberd *ark‘eni* ‘strong/broad limbed’; cf. *ark‘eni* ‘well-grown (plant)’ in Geoponica (13th cent.). The derivative *ark‘ay-ut‘iwn* ‘heavenly kingdom’ (literary loan) is widespread [HAB 1: 347a].

Further, see below.

● **ETYM** Since long (Acoluthus /1680/, Schröder, Klaproth, NHB, etc.), linked with Gr. *ἄρχος* m. ‘leader’, *ἄρχή* f. ‘beginning, origin’, *ἄρχων*, *-ovros* m. ‘commander, archon’, *ἄρχω* ‘to be the first’ (see HAB 1: 346-347; Ačaryan himself rejects the etymology). Jahukyan (1987: 272) points out that the IE origin of Arm. *ark‘ay* is

highly doubtful. Matzinger (2000) posits **h₂er-s-ke/o-* ‘Akt des Fügens’ which is formally uncertain (I would expect Arm. **arc-* from **h₂rsk-*) and semantically unattractive.

In view of *-ay*, *ark’ay* is considered to be a Greek loan via Syriac (Schmitt 1980: 14₁₂; see also Ĵahukyan 1987: 439₂₂, 463; Olsen 1999: 612, 931).

One may alternatively assume that Arm. *ark’ay* and its Greek match, which has no established etymology, reflect a common borrowing from a Mediterranean source: **ark^h-* or **arχ-*. For Arm. *-ay* Patrubány (1906-08 /1908/: 152a) compares Arm. *caray* ‘servant’. Other examples of *-ay* referring to age, size and other characteristics of persons can be found in Pedersen 1906: 398 = 1982: 176 (cf. Matzinger 2000: 288-289).

Arm. **ark-un* may be equated with *ἀρχων, -οντος*, from **ark^h-ont*. Compare Arm. *cer-un* ‘old’ (also *cer-un-i*): Gr. *γέρων* ‘old man’ (see s.v. *cer* ‘old’).

According to Ačaiyan (1913: 155b; not in HAB 1: 347a), Gr. *ἀρχ-* ‘to begin’ can be connected to Łarabał **arc-* ‘the beginning of a weaving’, **arc-el* ‘to begin weaving’ from older **arj-*. For the phonological correspondence cf. Arm. *orj* > Łarabał *væerc-* vs. Gr. *ὄρχις* ‘testicle’. Neither the semantics is problematic, cf. the semantic field of *ἀρχή*: ‘beginning, origin; first principle, element; end, corner, of a bandage, rope, sheet, etc.; origin of a curve’. It is theoretically possible that Gr. *ἀρχή* and Arm. **arj-a-* (survived in Łarabał) derive from QIE **arg^h-eh₂-* ‘beginning’, whereas Arm. **ark^h-* belongs with the same Greek root at a younger period⁸.

awaz, *o*-stem (later also ISg *-aw*) ‘sand; dust’.

Bible+.

●**DIAL** Widespread in dialects. Łarabał has *hávaz*, with an initial *h-* [HAB 1: 351b; Davt’yan 1966: 322].

●**ETYM** Connected with Gr. *ἄμθος* f., *ψάμμος* f. ‘sand’, Lat. *sabulum* ‘sand’, OHG *sant*, MHG. *sampt* ‘sand’, etc. (see HAB 1: 351; Normier 1980: 19; Ĵahukyan 1987: 116; Olsen 1999: 24, 782; Witczak 1999: 184-185; Viredaz 2005: 85). Probably of non-IE origin [Beekes apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 499b]. Ĵahukyan (1987: 601) points out the correspondence between IE and WCauc. forms (Abkhaz *saba* ‘dust’ etc.). For the problem of the initial *h-* in Łarabał as a reflex of IE **s-* see Ačaiyan, HLP 2, 1951: 411 (with a question-mark); N. Simonyan 1979: 211, 213 (sceptical).

⁸ I wonder if Metri *hărg aril* ‘to finish, make an end’ (recorded in Ałayan 1954: 312, in the glossary of dialectal words) reflects **y-arg* ‘(at/in) end’.

However, the connection of Arm. *awaz* is reasonably considered uncertain (see Greppin 1983: 317-318; 1989: 167; Beekes apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 499b). For the problem of *z* see also s.v. *ezr* 'edge'. I think, *awaz* may be an Iranian loan, cf. Sogd. (Man.) 'wzy 'Seen, Teich', NPers. *āwāze* 'swamp' (see Bailey 1979: 478-479; Colditz 1987: 282), if the semantic shift 'swamp' > 'silt' > 'sand' is possible. If this is accepted, *awaz* is connected with *awazan*, *a*-stem 'Wasserbehälter, Teich, Badewanne, Taufbecken' (Bible+), which has probably been borrowed from the same Iranian word through Syriac (*avzānā* 'font = Taufbecken') intermediation; cf. also NPers. *āb-zan* 'a particular kind of bathing-vessel; the basin of a fountain'. (see Hübschmann 1897: 111-112; HAB 1: 352; and, especially, Jahukyan 1987: 517, where Sogd. /*āwaza*/ 'lake' is mentioned, too)

I wonder if these words are related with Arab. (> Turk.) *havz* 'basin', borrowed into Arm. dialects: Polis *havuz*, Łarabał *hɔvuz*, Van *avuz* (see Ačarean 1902: 210). Even if not, a contamination seems probable, cf. Juła *havizaran* 'font = Taufbecken' next to *hɔvz* 'garden-basin' (see HAB 1: 352b; Ačaryan 1940: 355a). The initial *h*- in Łarabał *havaz* 'sand' may also be explained in a more or less similar way. We arrive, then, at a theoretically possible form **ha/ovzan*, which can be confirmed indirectly by Arm. *hnjan* 'wine-press' (q.v.).

awd₁, *o*- and *i*-stem 'foot-wear'.

John Chrysostom, Romance of Alexander, etc. For the generic semantics 'foot-wear' as opposed with the specific *kawšik* 'shoes' cf. T'ovma Arcruni 2.7 /10th cent./ (1985: 192; transl. Thomson 1985: 187): *awd otic'n hnaraworen zjew kawškac* 'for footwear they use a form of boot'.

●**ETYM** Apparently related with Lith. *au̯tas* 'foot-cloth, rag', Latv. *au̯ts* 'cloth, bandage' [HAB 4: 607b-608a; Jahukyan 1987: 123, 159]; see s.v. *aw-t'-oc* 'cover, coat, garment; blanket'. The underlying verb is seen in Arm. *ag-anim* 'to put on' and several cognate forms meaning 'put on footwear': Lith. *au̯ti*, OCS *obuti*, Lat. *induere*. Arm. *awd* goes back to IE **H(V)u-dʰ-*. If from **audʰ-*, Avest. *aoθra-* 'foot-wear' represents the only testimony for the voiced aspirated suffixal element. The form, however, is usually derived from **Hou-tleh₂-* (cf. Lat. *subūcula* 'woolen undertunic', Lith. *au̯klė* 'shoe-lace, cord, foot-cloth', etc.; see Mallory/Adams 1997: 109a). It has been assumed that Arm. *awd* contains the suffix **-dʰ-* also found in Gr. *ἔσθος* n. (cf. *ἔσθής* f.) 'clothing' [Klingenschmitt 1982: 173-174; Clackson 1994: 224₉₉].

If reliable, this explanation of *d* can serve as a counter-example for the sound development Arm. *-r-* < PIE **-dʰ-* (see s.v. *ayrem* 'to burn'). The same holds also for *awd* 'air' (q.v.).

awd₂, *o*-stem: GDPI *awd-oc* in Bible; Hexaemeron [K. Muradyan 1984: 195^{L6}]; frequently in "Yatags ampoc ew nšanac'" by Anania Širakac'i, 7th cent. (A. G. Abrahamyan 1944: 304ff); later also *i*-stem 'air'; dial. also 'breath' and 'wind'.

Bible+.

● **DIAL** Preserved in Axalc'xa, Karin, Muš, Alaškert, Juša, etc. (also in the compound **ōd-u-hava* 'weather'); cf. also Van **tak-ōd-k* (with *tak* 'warm') 'fever', Nor Bayazet **ōd kpnil* 'to catch a cold' [HAB 4: 609a], Łarabaš *hōt'k* (erroneously printed *čōt'k*, see HAB-Add 1982: 19) < **y-ōd-k* 'the warm breath/expiration of the mouth' [Ačārean 1913: 807a; HAB 4: 609a]. Juša *h'ōt* (see Ačārean 1940: 98-99, 161, 390) may continue the prefix *y-* 'in' seen in the reflex of the Łarabaš form. This by-form **y-awd* would have meant basically 'inhalation' with a subsequent development to 'breath'.

The compound **bal-ōd* preserved in Bulanəx *b'alot* 'wind accompanied by snow(-storm)' (HAB 1: 383b; see s.v. *bal* 'fog') seems to comprise the word *awd* 'air' as the second component. The latter functions here in the meaning 'wind'.

● **ETYM** Since Klaproth (1823=1831: 103a), compared with IE forms going back to **aw-* (**h₂ueh₁-*, cf. Gr. *ἄνμι* etc.) 'to blow' (see HAB 4: 608-609). Patrubány (1906?-1908// 1908: 214b) points to the dental determinative **-t-* found in Gr. *ἀντιμή* f., *ἀντιμήν*, *-ένοσ* m. 'breath; scent'. Petersson (1920: 66) restores **aud^ho-* comparing with Lith. *áudra, audrā* 'storm (usually accompanied by rain or snow)' < **aud^h-rā-*, Oic. *vedr* n. 'Wind, Luft, Wetter', OHG *wetar* 'Wetter, Witterung, freie Luft' (< **ued^h-ro-*), etc., and suggests a connection with Oss. *ud/od* 'spirit, soul'. The etymology of the Ossetic is considered uncertain (see Cheung 2002: 233). On the Armenian form Cheung (ibid.) notes: "borrowing?".

The reconstruction **aud^ho-* (= **h₂eu(h₁)-d^h-o-*) is commonly accepted [HAB 4: 608; Ĵahukyan 1982: 48]. Olsen (1999: 56) points out that the thought of relating Arm. *ōd* (= *awd*) with the root **h₂ueh₁-* 'to blow' seems inevitable, but "the derivational process is rather obscure". Then she suggests a proto-form **h₁su-h₂uh₁-to-*. This seems, however, unnecessary.

If Av. *aodar* 'Kälte', probably a neuter, *r*-stem (on the morphology of the word see Beekes 1988b: 122-124; Hoffmann/Forssman 1996: 150-151), Lith. *áudra, audrā* 'storm', etc. are related, they may contain **-dʰ-* (as the above-mentioned Germanic)

rather than **-d-*, providing us with more evidence for the reconstruction **h₂eu(*h₁)-d^h-*. For the problem of the internal laryngeal see par. 2.1.20.

One may restore a neuter *s*-stem **h₂eud^h-os* (yielding regularly Arm. *awd*, *o*-stem) beside the *r*-stem neuter represented in Iranian, cf. the case of *get*, *o*-stem 'river' (q.v.) from **uedos-* vs. PIE **ued-r/n-*.

On the problem of the *-d* see also s.v. *awd* 'foot-wear'.

awji-k' pl. tant., *ea*-stem: APl *awji-s*, IPl *awje-a-w-k'* (Bible+), GDPl *awje-a-c'* in Nersēs Lambronac'i; **awj**, *i*-stem: IPl *awj-i-w-k'* only in Yovhannēs Erznkac'i/Corcorec'i (13-14th cent.) 'collar'.

Bible, Ephrem, etc.

● **DIAL** No dialectal forms in HAB 4: 612b.

According to Andriasyan (1967: 389b), Svedia *anjənāk'* represents ClArm. *awjik'*. Note also K'esab *anjnek*, glossed by *ōjik'* [HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 63b].

● **ETYM** No etymology is accepted in HAB 4: 612b.

Adontz (1937: 10; see also Pisani 1950: 188-192) connects with Gr. *αῦχῆν*, *-έως* m. 'neck, throat; isthmus' (Il.), Aeol. literary *ἄμφην*, *-εως* 'neck'. The relationship between these words has been disputed. The following solutions have been proposed: 1) all the three words stem from a root **ang^hw-* or **ang^{wh}-* (for the phonological development see e.g. s.v. *acut* 'coal'); 2) Arm. *awj-i-k'* is a derivation of *awj* 'snake'; 3) Gr. *ἄμφην* may be connected to OHG *anka*, *anca* 'back of the head, limb' etc.; 4) the two Greek words may be borrowings from a lost source. For discussion I refer to Clackson 1994: 107-109, 224₁₀₆.

The derivation from *awj* 'snake' (see NHB 2: 1026c; Hiwnk'earpēyēntean apud HAB 4: 612b) is uncertain [Clackson 1994: 108].

Lagarde (1854: 26^{L682}) and Scheftelowitz (1927: 249) connected Arm. *viz* (< **vēc^h-*) 'neck', gen. *vz-i*, with Gr. *αῦχῆν*. This etymology is largely forgotten, and *viz* is still considered to be a word of unknown origin [HAB 4: 337-338; Ĵahukyan 1990: 71, sem. field 4]. However, it is worth of consideration. Note also dial. **xiz-* in Agulis *xayzak* 'back of the head', and, in compounds, **xiz* or **xuz* in Łarabař etc., **xoyz* or **xiwz* in Ĵuřa **xuz-a-tak*. See s.v. *viz*.

I tentatively suggest to treat Gr. *αῦχῆν* and Arm. *awj-i-k'* and *viz* (dial. also **xiz*, **xuz/xoyz/xiwz*) as words of substratum origin, tentatively reconstructing something which in Indo-European terms would be represented as NSg **h₂uēc^h-*, obl. **h₂ug^h-*. The form **h₂ug^h-* (>> **h₂wg^h-*, with **-w-* analogical after the nominative) would explain Gr. *αῦχῆν* and Arm. *awj-i-k'* (perhaps also dial. **xuz*, via an unknown language) whereas Nom. **h₂uēc^h-* may have yielded Arm. *viz* through an unknown

intermediary source (note the loss of the initial laryngeal in this position in most of IE languages). Another form with a faryngeal fricative (an unattested Anatolian form?), something like **h₂ēz*, may be responsible for **xiz* and **xoyz*. For the vocalic fluctuation cf. *višāp*: **yušāp* ‘dragon’, etc. See also s.v.v. *yogn-*, *xonj* ‘tired’.

The relation with Aeol. *ἄμφων*, *-ενος* ‘neck’ remains unclear. One is tempted to derive it from **ang^{wh}-en-* connecting with Arm. dial. (Svedia, K’esab) **anj-Vn-*. Arm. *j* points to **g^h*, however. One may tentatively reconstruct the following paradigm: nom. **h₂eng^{wh}-*, obl. **h₂ng^{wh}-*; the latter (zero grade) developed into **h₂n^wg^{wh}-* > PArm. **aug^h-* (with regular palatalization of the velar after *-u-*) > Arm. *awj-*, whereas the former retained the nasal and can be seen in Gr. *ἄμφων* and Arm. **anjVn-*. Arm. *-j-* is analogical after **awj-*. This is reminiscent of Arm. *acuť* ‘coal’ < **aucuťo-* from **h₁(o)ng^w-ōl-o-* (cf. Skt. *āṅgāra-* etc.) vs. dial. **anjot* (see s.v. *acuť* ‘coal’). If Gr. *ἄμφων* and Arm. **anjVn-* are not related with Gr. *αὐχὴν* and Arm. *awji-k’*, Arm. *j* can be explained by contamination.

awriord, *a*-stem: GDSg *-i* in EpArm.; GDPl *-ac’* in Nersēs Šnorhali (12th cent.); IPl *-aw-k’* in Grigor Skewrac’i (12-13th cent.) [NHB 2: 940c, s.v. *p’esawē*] ‘virgin, young girl’.

Bible+. In fact, the oldest attestation is found twice in pre-Christian epic songs (GDSg *ōriord-i*), recorded by the greatest Armenian historian Movsēs Xorenac’i (2.50: 1913=1991: 178^{L20}, 179^{L4}; transl. Thomson 1978: 192).

●**ETYM** Łap’anc’yan (1961: 121-122, 134) interprets as composed of **awri-* ‘lord’ (< Urart. *eurī* ‘lord’) and **ord-* ‘offspring, son/daughter’ (see s.v. *ordī*). Ačāryan (HAB 4: 619b) rejects this and other etymologies leaving the origin of the word open. Jahukyan (1987: 424, 428; 1988: 142) represents Łap’anc’yan’s etymology with hesitation. Positively: Diakonoff 1971: 84.

According to Olsen (1999: 531), the second component in *awri-ord* is the suffix *-ord* (verbal noun/adj.), and **awri-* may derive from **ātrijo-* ‘fire-’ as a parallel of Lat. *ātriensis* ‘house servant’ from *ātrium*. The composition would correspond, as she points out, to Avest. *ātrə-kərət-* ‘der sich mit dem Feuer zu tun macht, dabei tätig ist’.

As far as the second component is concerned, Łap’anc’yan’s etymology seems semantically more probable. As for the first component **awri-*, one may suggest an old borrowing from Iran. **ahur-i-* ‘lordly’ (cf. YAv. *āhūiri-* adj. ‘with regard to Ahura(mazdā), stemming from Ahura(mazdā)’ vs. *ahura-* m. ‘god, lord’: **ahur-i-* ‘lordly’ or GSG **ahurīyo-* ‘of lord’ > OArm. **a(h)uri-* > Arm. **awri-*. The Urartian

comparison should not be excluded; for *e* : *a* see 2.1.1. In either case, the basic meaning of the compound is 'lordly offspring'.⁹ For the semantic shift see 3.8.1.

ak'is, *i*-stem 'weasel', dial. also 'rat'.

Bible+. In Lev 11.29, where it is listed among unclean animals, it renders Gr. *γαλῆ* 'weasel'; cf. also Lev 11.30 - *mkn-ak'is*, the exact match (perhaps a calque) for *μυγαλῆ* 'field mouse' in the corresponding Greek passage (see Wevers 1986: 131; 1997: 154). The counter-part of the latter in the Hebrew and Aramaic Bibles is interpreted, it seems, as 'gecko' and 'hedgehog', respectively. On this list see par. XX. In Galen, *ak'is* stands for *γαλέη* [Greppin 1985: 29].

The only evidence for the declension class is GDAbIPi (*y-*)*ak's-i-c*, found in John Chrysostom: *Zmardik i kroc', ew yak'sic', ew i kokorditosac' zercuc'anel*. As stated in NHB 1: 398b, *ak'is* corresponds to 'cat' in the Greek original. For the semantic relationship between the cat and the mustelids cf. Arm. *kuz* (HAB s.v.).

Ereweal oĵ, kam mukn, kam ak'is (Nonnus of Nisibis).

In "Baġirk' hayoc'" (see Amalyan 1975: 44^{Nr1068}), *ak'is* is glossed as follows: *titeġn, kam mknak'is, kam getnariwc, kam xlurd*. Surprisingly, this is in fact a section of the text of Leviticus 11.30 which follows *ak'is* 'weasel' and *mukn* 'mouse' containing names of animals certainly different from *ak'is*, and not an interpretation of the meaning of *ak'is* by means of synonyms.

Attested also in a fable of Olympian, see 3.5.2.9.

● **DIAL** Preserved in a few dialects: Van *ak'yis*, Moks *ak'is* 'weasel' [Acaġryan 1952: 25, 249]; with a final *-t*: *ak'ist* 'weasel' (Xotorĵur), 'rat' (Axalc'xa) [HAB 1: 370a; YušamXotorĵ 1964: 432a; HayLezBrbBaġ 1, 2001: 140b] (for the epithetic *-t* see 2.1.31).

In Turkish-Armenian dictionary (c. 1720 AD) by Eġia Mušetġyan Karneġ'i (Karin/Xotorĵur) one finds *agist* rendering Turk. *xaxum* [Č'ugaszyan 1986: 52^{Nr14}]. Č'ugaszyan (op. cit. 97) points out that *ak'ist* is found in the dialect of Axalc'xa. One should also add Xotorĵur (see above). Note that Eġia Mušetġyan was born in Karin, and that Axalc'xa is closely related to the Karin dialect. However, Eġia's father was from Xotorĵur, and in this dialect the word denotes 'weasel' rather than 'rat', as in Axalc'xa. Therefore one may directly identify this recording with the Xotorĵur form. For Turkish *qāqum* and the Iranian forms see below.

⁹ Alternatively, **awri-* may be derived from **h₂ekr(e)i-* 'young girl': Maced. *ἀκρεία* and Phryg. (Hesychius) *ἄκριστις*. On these words see also s.v. *atġ*.

For the semantic relationship 'mouse; rat' : 'weasel' (the latter is the smallest of all the mustelids; it is smaller than the rat [Ananyan, HayKendAšx 1, 1961: 164-166, 168]; see below; also s.v. *č'asum !].

●**ETYM** Ačāryan (HAB 1: 370a) does not accept any of the etymologies he mentioned. No etymology has been proposed in recent times either, so the word is not mentioned at all in Tumanyan 1978, Greppin 1983 and Olsen 1999. On account of the *i*-stem, Ĵahukyan (1987: 440) listed it among the theoretically possible candidates for Uartian loans, which is unnecessary, since the declension class *i* is firmly represented in the native heritage of Armenian.

Arm. *ak'is* 'weasel' can be compared with Skt. *kaśīkā* f., which is attested in RV 1.126.6 in the meaning 'Ichneumonweibchen' [Geldner 1951, 1: 175; Elizarenkova 1989: 158, 622] or 'weasel' (see Monier-Williams 1899/1999: 265a; Mayrhofer, EWAia 1: 330), and is considered a derivation from **kaśī*- f. [Wackernagel/Debrunner 1954: 428f]. Here belongs also *kāśā*- 'weasel'.

The connection of the Sanskrit words to Lith. *šėškas* 'Iltis' [Zupitza 1904: 401, 402, 404; Scheftelowitz 1929: 196] is viewed as uncertain; see Pokorny 1959: 543 (with a question-mark); Fraenkel 2, 1965: 976-977; Mayrhofer, EWAia 1, 1992: 330. More positively in Mallory/Adams 1997: 439b.

The existence of and the relation to Toch. **kis*, the alleged source of Turk. **kış*/*kıl* 'Zobel' is quite doubtful [Šervašidze 1989: 85].

If Arm. *ak'is* is related, one might reconstruct (late IE or substrate) **Hkeĥ-ih₂*-. The initial laryngeal can be neither verified nor disproved since there are no Greek and Hittite cognates. The absence of palatalization of **k*- before a front vowel is perhaps due to dissimilative influence of the palatal **k̑*-. **k* - *k̑* > *k* - *s* (instead of *č* - *s*); see 2.1.14.

The feminine suffix is reflected in the *i*-stem; cf. s.v.v. *ayc* 'goat', *gort* 'frog'.

[Concerning the gender of *kaśīkā*-, Prof. Lubotsky points out to me that the word must refer to the male, since only the male produces odour. However, in Elizarenkova's translation there is nothing about odour: "The one, who trembles like *kaśīkā*-, when ...". It is about a young woman, and the context is certainly erotic. So, I wonder if the word can simply refer to the weasel. For the relationship 'weasel' : 'young woman, bride' see s.v.v. *nert'akn, tal*, and 3.5.2.9].

The only phonological problem is the medial *-i-* instead of *-e-*. This can be explained by reconstructing NSg **Hkeĥ-s* alongside of the oblique **Hkeĥ*-. The former has been generalized in Armenian, while Indo-Aryan has chosen the latter. For the mechanism cf. the word for 'fox'; see Clackson 1994: 95-96.

The similar problem of Arm. *iž* 'viper' (q.v.) can be solved in the same way. [Note that both *ak'is* and *iž* have *i*-stems, so the rise of **e* to *i* may (partly?) also be due to generalization of Genitive **-io-*, cf. *mēj* 'middle'; see also 2.1.2. Thus, *ak'is* may be traced back to monosyllabic root nouns (cf. Beekes 1995: 189-190): NSg **Hkēk-s*, obl. **Hkek-*. See also s.v. *iž* 'viper'.

Whether the **-k-* of the word was a suffixal element or was reanalyzed as such at a certain stage is hard to assess. This probable correspondence may be discussed as a late IE substratum word. Note particularly other animal-names confined to Armenian and a few IE and/or non-IE languages which contain **-k-* or **-g^h-*, especially those which are to some extent comparable to mustelids, or are chthonic; see s.v.v. *atuēs* 'fox', *lusan-* 'lynx', *inj* 'panther' (Arm.-IAr. **sing^ho-*), *kuz* 'cat; marten', *moł-ēz* 'lizard', *xl-ēz* 'lizard', etc.; see 2.3.1.

Bearing in mind these considerations, one might have a fresh look at Arm. *axaz* 'white weasel = *mustela alba*', a late hapax (q.v.), which is considered a dialectal form of *ak'is*. If the two are indeed related, one can postulate a non-IE source, approximately reconstructable as **Hk^hVk/g^h-*, from which Arm. *ak'is* and Indo-Ar. **kas-* derive according to the normal phonological developments, whereas *axaz* may reflect a lost form of some IE or non-IE language of Balkans or Asia Minor or East Europe where the initial **H-* yielded so-called "prothetic" *a-*, the aspirated **-k^h-* (cf. s.v. *t'uz* 'fig') is spirantized to **-x-*, and the medial vowel became *-a-*. Jahukyan (1967: 307) mentions the pair *ak'is* and *axaz* in the context of the deviant alternation *k/x*. He does not offer any etymology or explanation. It seems important to note that there is a certain alternation *k/x* in words of Iranian or Caucasian origin, e.g. *xoč* : *koč* 'pig', and next to Arm. *kngum*, *k'ak'um*, and Pahl. *kākom* etc. there is Turk. *qāqum* recorded by Etia Karnec'i as *xaxum* (see below). Thus, in an Iranian or other language, next to Indo-Ar. **kas-* there may have existed **xaz-* '(a kind of) weasel' from which Arm. *a-xaz* has been borrowed. The initial *a-* is perhaps due to contamination with *ak'is*. Indeed, one finds Pahl., NPers. *xaz* 'marten' (see MacKenzie 1971: 94), which seems to confirm my etymology.

If the word is derived from a **H(e)k^h-*, one may wonder whether this is somehow related with Tsez. **ʔāq^wV* 'mouse' (see Nikolayev/Starostin 1994: 523), Skt. *ākhū-* 'mole (RV +); mouse (Lex.)', Hebr. 'aqbār 'mouse' (cf. Arm. *ak'bak*, in "Baḡirk' hayoc"; see s.v.), etc. In theory, *ākhū-* could be a reduplication of the type *babhru-* 'a kind of ichneumon', also 'a reddish-brown cow' from PIE **b^he-b^hru-* (see s.v. **bor*), thus: **He-Hk-u-* > *ākhū-*. The semantic relationship 'mouse, rat' : 'weasel' is impeccable, cf. above, on the dialect of Axalc'xa; Gr. *γαλέη* 'weasel', Skt. *giri(kā)-*

‘mouse’ (Lex.), etc.; see also below on *č‘*asum*. The whole idea, however, is very hypothetical.

To my knowledge, Pahl. *kākom* [*k’kwm*] ‘stoat = the European ermine especially in its brown summer coat’ (cf. *kākom ī spēd* ‘ermine, white weasel’; see MacKenzie 1971: 48) has not been yet discussed in this context; cf. Arm. *kngum* (only in P’awstos Buzand 6.2: *kngmeni* ‘fur of *kngum*, Hermelinpelz’) and unattested *k’ak’um* [Hübischmann 1897: 278^{Nr166}; HAB 2: 607; 4: 568b]. For Turk. *qāqum* recorded by Eḥia Karnec’i as *xaxum* see above. The initial *kn-* in *kngum* is puzzling; contamination with Iran. **gauna-ka-* ‘haarig, farbig’ > Gr. *γ/καυννάκης* “Bezeichnung eines persischen Pelzes”, Assyr. *gunakku* “N. eines Kleidungsstückes”, etc. (see Frisk 1, 1960: 292; Toporov, PrJaz (I-K) 1980: 280)? Or, perhaps, it is a mere nasal epenthesis, on which see 2.1.30.1.

In my opinion, Pahl. *kākum* can be derived from a centum form of the hypothetical **Hkek-Vm*. Amazingly, the existence of such a proto-form and, consequently, the reconstruction of this late IE (of substratum origin) animal-name may be confirmed by its regular satəm reflex in Iranian **ča/āsum*, hypothetically restored by me on the basis of Arm. *č‘*asum* (prob.) ‘mole-rat’, q.v.

The nature of *-um* is not very clear. This is reminiscent of the Armenian *-mn* in several animal-names, see s.v.v. *ayc*, *lusan-*, and 2.3.1. As for the vocalism of the suffix, J. Cheung points out to me that the *-u-* in this environment can go back to **-e/o-*. One may also think of the final *-ū* in NPers. *rāsū* ‘weasel’, as well as the Armenian *u*-stem which is very productive in animal-names (cf. *atuēs*, *-es-u* ‘fox’ etc.).

bal, *i*-stem, *o*-stem (both attested late) ‘mist, fog’, dial. also ‘white fleck’.

The oldest appearance in the compound *bal-a-jīg* ‘fog-bringing’ (Hexaameron, see K. Muradyan 1984: 195^{L21}). Independently attested in the Alexander Romance, Sebēos (7th cent.), Yovhannēs Erznkac’i (13th cent.) [A. G. Abrahamyan/Petrosyan 1987: 61, 76], etc.

In the earliest edition of the Alexander Romance, AblSg *i balēn* (see H. Simonyan 1989: 439^{L15}): *i balēn oč’ karēak’ tesanel zmimeans* “because of the fog we could not see each other”. A similar attestation is found ibid. 439^{L-6}. In the next page (440^{L8}), the very same context is represented by synonymous *vasn šamandatin*.

According to NHB and HAB, *bal* has an *i*-stem: GDPl *bal-i-c’* in Aristakēs Lastivertc’i (11th cent.), Chapter 10 [Yuzbašyan 1963: 56^{L2}]; cf. AblSg *i bal-ē* in the Alexander Romance. One also finds GDSg *bal-o-y* (*o*-stem, thus) in a chapter title by

Anania Širakac'i (7th cent.): *Yatags baloy* "On the *bal*" (see A. G. Abrahamyan 1944: 319^{L32}).

In Gregory of Nyssa (translated by Step'annos Siwnec'i in the 8th cent.): *bal-a-jew*, var. *bať-a-jew* 'fog-like' (with *jew* 'shape').

In the dictionary by Rivola (1633: 52, see HAB 1: 383a): *bal-ēš* 'humidity originated from (or caused by) fog'. For the suffix cf. perhaps *xarteaš* (Bible+), *xarteš* (John Chrysostom), *xartēš* (Łazar P'arpec'i) 'light brown, fallow' (see also s.v. **law/p*- 'flat'). I wonder whether there is an etymological or a folk-etymological connection with the place-name *Batēš*. According to a traditional story, the place-name has been named **pať-ēš*, literally "frozen donkey" (and later > *Batēš*), after a donkey which was stuck and frozen in snow (see Łanalanyan 1969: 160^{Nr411}). For the alternation *-l/-* cf. *bať-a-jew* next to *bal-a-jew* (see above). Since *bal* 'fog' also functions in the context of the snow-storm (see below for the testimony from Bulanəx), the motif of the donkey which was frozen in snow can be significant. One may be tempted to speculate that the story originally implied a folk-etymological play with **bal/tēš* 'fog, foggy weather' and only later was re-interpreted as "frozen donkey". A similar folk-etymological traditional story is found in Łanalanyan 1969: 153-154^{Nr395B} on *Muš*, as if named after the fog (*mšuš*, *muž*) made by the Goddess *Asttik*.

In "Bārgirk' hayoc'" *bal* is glossed by *gišer* 'night' (see Amalyan 1975: 46^{Nr49}).

● **DIAL** Preserved in Alaškert *b'al* 'eye-fog', Van *pal* 'white dirt on one's tongue when one is ill' (for the semantics cf. dial. *man* 'fog' and 'white dirt on one's tooth') [HAB 1: 383b; Ačāryan 1952: 249], Sebastia *bal* (and *bať*) 'white dirt on one's tongue when one's stomach is disordered' [Gabikēan 1952: 101]. Ačāryan (1952: 19) mentions Van *pal* as one of the few exceptions to Ačāryan's Law. One expects **pāl*. The compound **bal-ōd* preserved in Bulanəx *b'alot* 'wind accompanied by snow(-storm)' (see HAB 1: 383b) seems to comprise the word *awd* 'air' (q.v.) as the second component.

As we can see, the forms are restricted to western (mostly to Muš and Van) areas, and the atmospheric context has not been preserved in dialects independently. In this respect particularly interesting the newly-found testimony from *K^šark^šanj* (Šamaxi), in the extreme east of the Armenian-speaking territory, where we have *pal*, as well as *pāl* (with Ačāryan's Law), see Baťramyan 1964: 190. Here the semantics is not specified. In a small dialectal text, however, we find *pāl* four times clearly referring to the fog or cloud, and glossed by Baťramyan (op. cit. 283) as *t'utb* 'rain-cloud' and *amp* 'cloud'.

●**ETYM** Since Patrubany (HandAms 1903: 150) and Scheftelowitz (1904-05, 2: 37), connected with Gr. *φάλος· λευκός* ‘white’ (Hesychius), *φάλιος* ‘having a patch of white’, Lith. *bālas* ‘white’, Latv. *bāls, bāls* ‘pale’, Lith. *bāltas* ‘white’, OCS *blato* ‘swamp’ (from **b^holH-*), OCS *bělъ*, Russ. *bélyj* ‘white’ (from **b^hēlH-*, see also s.v. *bil* ‘light blue’), Lith. *balà* ‘swamp’ (from **b^holH-eh₂-*), Bel. *bel’* ‘swampy meadow’, etc. For the semantic relationship ‘white, pale’ : ‘swamp’ see Pârvulescu 1989: 294.

The etymology is accepted by Ačāryan (HAB 1: 383) and Ĵahukyan (1987: 115, from **bheli-*). Arm. *bal* (*i*-stem) goes back to PIE **b^hlH-i-*. If the *o*-stem is old, it may be interpreted as a by-form from **b^hlH-o-*.

Arm. *bal* and the cognates are mentioned sometimes in connection with Skt. *bhāla-* ‘shine; forehead’ (cf. *bhāti* ‘to shine, be bright’ from PIE **b^heh₂-*), see HAB (ibid.); in more recent times, e.g., Springer 1987: 376-377. This would imply that Arm. *bal* must be traced back to PIE **b^h(e)h₂l-i/o-*. However, **b^heh₂-* seems to be a different root (see HAB s.v. *banam*). Note that Arm. *bil* cannot be derived from a root with an internal **-h₂-*.

See also s.v. *bil*.

baxem ‘to beat (said of breast, wave, etc.); to knock (at a door); to strike’

Bible+. Also reduplicated *babax-* (Bible+). The noun *bax* ‘stroke’ is attested only in Sokrates.

Movsēs Xorenac’i 2.61 (1913=1991: 192^{L9f}, transl. Thomson 1978: 204): *bazumk’ i darbnac’*, <...> *baxen zsaln* ‘many smiths, <...> strike the anvil’.

Ačāryan (HAB 1: 389b) argues that the late spelling *batx-* reflects an emphatic */baxx-/*, where *-t-* corresponds to */y/* rather than to **l*. Compare dial. (Łarabať) *uxay*, interjection of joy (Ačārean 1913: 866b), which is found in the form *Utxay* numerous times in e.g. HŽHek’ 6, 1973: 633-636.

●**ETYM** Ačāryan (HAB 1: 389b) does not accept any of the etymological suggestions and leaves the origin open. Schultheiß (1961: 221) compares with Hitt. *uallh-* ‘schlagen’. Ĵahukyan (1987: 317) rightly rejects the comparison since the initial *y-* does not correspond to Arm. *b-*, and the *-t-* of the Armenian form is recent and has no etymological value (see above).

Strangely enough, the obvious onomatopoeic origin of *bax-* (suggested in NHB 1: 423c) is largely ignored. Onomatopoeic are perhaps also Laz and Mingr. *bax(-)* ‘to beat’, though Ačāryan (HAB 1: 389b) treats them as Armenian borrowings. Łap’anc’yan (1975: 353) considers this view to be unverifiable and points out the onomatopoeic character of the word. Note also Russ. *bac, babax(-)*, Engl. *bang*, etc.

bay, according to NHB 1: 431a, *i*-stem; but there is only LSG. *i bayi* (12th cent.) 'den, lair (especially of bear)'.

In "Oṭb Edesioy" of Nersēs Šnorhali (12th cent., Cilicia) [M. Mkrtč'yan 1973: 73^{L466}]: *Ariwc goč'ēr i yantarin, ew gišaxanj arjn - i bayin* "A lion was roaring in the forest, and the flesh-longing bear - in the lair ". Spelled *bah* in Vardan Aygekc'i (13th cent., also Cilicia). Older attestations: *bay-oc'* 'lair (of a bear)' (Eznik Koṭbac'i, 5th cent.).

●**DIAL** According to NHB 1: 431ab and Jaxṭaxeān - dial. *bay* and *bah*. Ačāryan (HAB 1: 402b) does not report any dialectal material. Now we can introduce Xotorjūr *bayil* 'to hibernate (of bear)', *bayoc'* 'hibernation place of bear' (see YušamXotorj 1964: 433a; HayLezBrbBaṛ 1, 2001: 156, 157). Note that the latter form is completely identic with *bayoc'* of Eznik Koṭbac'i (of Koṭb). Further: Sasun *pāh* 'den, lair, cave of a bear' [Petoyan 1954: 152; 1965: 516].

Since both "pure" - root forms *bay* and *bah* (considered dialectal!) are attested by authors from Cilicia, and *bayoc'* (Eznik of Koṭb) has been preserved in Xotorjūr, we may hypothetically assume that *bay* is an old dialectal word restricted to the western (*kə*) speaking areas.

●**ETYM** No acceptable etymology is recorded by Ačāryan (HAB 1: 402b).

V. Arak'elyan (1979: 37; 1981: 77) assumes that *bay-oc'* is identic with dial. (Ararat) *bay!* 'hushaby' and means 'sleep' rather than 'den, lair'. This is improbable. Moreover, *bay-oc'* 'den, lair' is directly confirmed by the dialect of Xotorjūr (see above).

Aṭayan (1974: 35-36) connects the word with OIr. *both* 'hut', Welsh *bod* 'dwelling'; Lith. *butas* 'house', etc. from **b^h(e)uH-* 'to be'; see s.v.v. *boyn* 'nest; den, lair; hut', *boys* 'plant', etc. According to Jahukyan (1987: 116, 160), the IE proto-form may have been **b^huā-t-* (= **b^hueH-t-*), and the closest cognate - Alb. *bot'ë*, -a f. 'Lehmsorte (zum Polieren); Boden; Erde; Welt' (< **b^hueā-tā-*). On the latter see Demiraj 1997: 107.

Not all the formal details are clear. For the semantic field cf. etymologically cognate Arm. *boyn* 'nest; den, lair; hut', Skt. *bhūvana*-n. 'Wesen; Welt' (RV+), etc.

bark 'bitter' (Agat'angelos), 'angry' (John Chrysostom+), 'loud (about talking, especially laughing' - John Chrysostom+; on MArm. attestations see Łazaryan/Avetisyan, MiṭHayBaṛ 1, 1987: 117b), 'lightning' (Bible+), 'fiery, very hot' (Geoponica+); **barkanam** 'to be angry' (Bible+), etc.

●**DIAL** Widespread in dialects (mostly of the *kə*-class) especially in the meaning 'strong, hot, ignite (fire, sun)' [Amatuni 1912: 92; HAB 1: 425; HayLezBrbBaṛ 1,

2001: 171a]. A textual illustration can be found in a lullaby from Akn: *bark arewik* (the latter word mans ‘little sun’) [Palean 1898: 602a^{L-12} = R. Grigoryan 1970: 54^{Nr23}]. Note also Xarberd *barkank* ‘passion, strong desire’ [Ačarean 1913: 178b], Sebastia *bark* ‘very hot, strong, bitter (vinegar, peper etc.)’ [Gabikean 1952: 110].

Papen *barak* ‘(strong) desire’, *barak-barak* ‘with a strong desire’ (see HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 167b), if not a secondary creation based on *barak(a)c’aw* ‘tuberculosis’, lit. ‘thin illness’ (on which see HAB 1: 418a; HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 167b), this word may belong here, though the second *-a-* is not clear (see below on *barak* ‘lightning’).

●**ETYM** The connection with Skt. *bhrāji-* ‘to shine, to beam, to sparkle’ and Gr. *φλέγω* ‘entzünden, verbrennen, erleuchten; brennen, flammen, leuchten, glänzen’ and many other etymological attempts are rejected by Ačaryan (HAB 1: 424-425). Lidén (1906: 57-60) compares with Gr. (Cretan) *φάγρος* ‘whetstone’. Clackson (1994: 182) and Salmons/Niepokuj (apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 510a) are sceptical about this etymology, though Frisk (2: 980) is more positive. (This could be promising if one assumes ‘thunderbolt’ as the basic meaning).

Scheftelowitz (1904-05, 1: 307) proposed to derive *bark* from PIE **bh(o)rgʷ-* ‘unfriendly’, cf. OIc. *berkja* ‘poltern, toben’ (< Germ. **barkjan* ‘prahlen, poltern’), Latv. *barġs* ‘streng, hart, unfreudlich, unbarmherzig’, etc., for the semantic development comparing with Engl. *rough* ‘rauh, unsaft, streng, scharf, herb’. This etymology is accepted by Pokorny (1959: 163); Mallory/Adams (1997: 22b), as well as, though with some reservation, by Jahukyan 1987: 117, 161. He seems to separate *bark* ‘hot, angry etc.’ from *bark* ‘lightning’, since the latter is treated by him (op. cit. 476, 483) as a loan from early Aramaic *barqā* ‘lightning’. The Aramaic word is cognate with Hebrew *bārāq* ‘lightning’ (cf. also Arab. *barq* ‘lightning’) which is reflected as *barak* in the encomium on Maštoc’ by Karapet Sasnec’i (12th cent.): *barak yarp’woyn* (for *arp’i* see s.v.), interpreted in the margin as *p’aylakn* ‘lightning’ (see HAB 1: 418-419; the missing part of the text of HAB is added in HAB-Add 1982: 5). Obviously, we are dealing with Sem. **b-r-q* ‘glänzen, blitzen’ (cf. also HAB s.v. *zmruxt* ‘emerald’).

There are no strong reasons to treat *bark* ‘hot, angry etc.’ and *bark* ‘lightning’ as separate words. We are dealing with a natural semantic development ‘hot, ignite, fiery, shining’ > ‘angry’ (in other words, transition from physical to emotional aspect, as in *ayrem* ‘to burn’ - *z-ayr-anam* ‘to be angry’, etc. The basic semantics of *bark* could have been ‘(heavenly) light, fire; shining, fiery’ (see also s.v. *šant*). I propose to involve Skt. *bhārgas-* n. ‘radiance, splendour, light’ (RV+), which may be connected with OEngl. *beorht* ‘Glanz, Helligkeit, Licht’. The neuter *s*-stem can

belong to a PD paradigm with NSg **b^hérg^(w)-os* and oblique **b^hrg^(w)-és-*. Arm. *bark* may have generalized the zero-grade of the oblique stem, exactly like in the case of another *s*-stem neuter (PD) also with atmospheric semantics, almost synonymous *amp/b* ‘cloud; (late) lightning (and/or ‘thunder?’)’, q.v. A similar case may be seen in *ayt* ‘cheek’ (cf. Gr. *οἶδος* etc.; see s.v.); see 2.2.2.1.

According to an alternative etymology, Skt. *bhārgas-* n. ‘radiance, splendour, light’ belongs with Lat. *fulgur*, *-uris* n. *s*-stem ‘lightning’. This brings the semantics of the Armenian word even closer, but the **-l-* is an obstacle. One cannot rule out the possibility of early Aryan borrowings into Armenian (H. Martirosyan 1993, unpublished). In this case, Indo-Aryan **b^hargas-* might have been borrowed into Arm. *bark* regularly. The consonant shift (unvoicing) is seen, e.g., in some old Iranian borrowings like *partēz* ‘garden’.

I wonder if Indo-Aryan **b^hargas-* ‘radiance, splendour, light’ and Sem. **b-r-q* ‘glänzen, blitzen’ may be related. Perhaps an old Armenian - Aryan - Semitic correlation?

barti ‘poplar’

Nersēs Šnorhali (12th cent., Cilicia; see below on *Arevordik*) +.

In Amirdovlat’ Amasaiaç’i (medical scholar, 15th cent.) *barti* ‘poplar’ is equated with *č’inar* ‘plane’ (see Vardanian 1990: 91, 268, 466); on the correlation between the poplar and the plane see below.

● **DIAL** Preserved in Alaškert, Muš, Ararat, Van group, Xarberd, Zeyt’un; in some of the dialects refers to built materials cut off from the poplar (see HAB 1: 430b, 540a); see s.v. **joť(-a)-har-*. [Note some passages of *hagni*, allegedly meaning (also?) ‘poplar’ (see below), where a reference is made to *joť* ‘pole’ cut off these trees].

● **ETYM** Lidén (1905-06: 490-491) compares with Slav. **bersto-* ‘elm’ (cf. Russ. *bérest*, etc.) and derives *barti* from **b^hṛstijā-* assuming a development *-rst-* > *-rt-*. He does not cite any parallel for this development, however. Ačaryan (HAB 1: 430) rejects the connection. I think, PIE **-rst-* would rather yield Arm. *-rt-*; see 2.1.22.13 and s.v. *yur’t’i*. One might start from **b^hrHg^{-t}-*, since Slav. **bersto-* is considered a derivation from PIE **b^h(e)rHg⁻* ‘birch’: Skt. *bhūrja-* m. ‘a kind of birch’ (KS+), Oss. *bærz/bærzæ* ‘birch’ (on this and other Iranian forms see Morgenstierne 1974: 20b; Oranskij 1975; 1977; Mayrhofer 1979 (< 1971): 128; Cheung 2002: 173), Lith. *béržas*, Russ. *berëza*, SCr. *brëza* ‘birch’, OHG *birka* ‘birch’, MoHG *Birke* ‘birch’, etc. According to the material represented in 2.1.22.13, however, **R(H)g^{-t}-* would produce *-arct-* > *-ar(c)t’*. Ĵahukyan (1975: 35; 1982: 57; 1987: 116 /with a question-mark/, 299) directly derives from **b^hrg^{-ijo-}*, listing the word with other

examples with an aberrant *-t-* (instead of *-c-*) from PIE **-ǧ-*, cf. *art* 'arable land, corn-field' (q.v.), etc. On *barti* see also Saradževa 1981: 165-166; 1986: 67-68; Normier 1981: 26-27; Peters 1988: 377.

The problem of the dental stop of the Armenian form may be due to contamination with other tree-names from Mediterranean and Near East areas: Gr. *βράθυ* n. 'savin, Juniperus sabina; Juniperus foetidissima' (also *βόρατον* n., *βορατίνη*); Lat. *bratus* (Pliny) 'an Anatolian cypress'; Aram. *b̄rāt*, Hebr. *b̄rōš*, Assy. *burāšu* 'cypress' < Proto-Semitic **brāthu* (see Huld 1981: 303). See also 1.12.1 on *b̄rinč* 'snowball-tree'.

The semantic shift in Lat. *fraxinus* 'ash' (for the etymological discussion see Szemerényi 1959/60: 225-232; Schrijver 1991: 106-107, 186-188, 489), like the total loss in Greek, was possibly due to the relative scarcity of the birch in Mediterranean climes (except in some highland niches), see P. Friedrich 1970: 29; Mallory 1989: 161; P. Friedrich apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 65b-66a. The semantic shift can also be seen in Alb. *bredh*, *-i* m. 'Tanne, Pinus abies', dial. also 'Fichte; Lärche; Buche' (see Demiraj 1997: 107-108). Given the abundance of the Mediterranean (Greeks, Italic, and Armenian) botanical terms, Arm. *barti* with its shifted meaning may be treated as a part of the Mediterranean "negative isogloss".

For the semantic fluctuation between 'birch; elm; linden' and 'poplar; aspen' cf. *t̄'eti* 'elm' (q.v.), Gr. *πελέε-α*, Ion. *-η* 'elm, Ulmus glabra', Lat. *tilia* 'linden' > Gr. (Hesychius) *τιλίαι· α ἱγειροι* 'poplar' (see HAB 2: 171b); Bolgar. dial. *jasika* 'aspen; a kind of poplar; birch' (see Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984: 626). See also s.v. *karb* 'aspen'.

In order to broaden the semantic field around the poplar, aspen, linden, and the like, one should include the plane. It must be remembered, first of all, that the semantic fluctuation between 'poplar, aspen' and 'plane' is frequent, see s.v.v. *kaṭamaxi*, *op'i*, *čandari*, etc. For the testimony of Amirdovlat' on *barti* see above. These trees seem also to display a similar etymological pattern involving a semantic derivation from ideas like 'shiny, bright' and 'pure'. For the possible association with **b̄reHǧ-* 'to shine' (cf. Skt. *bhrāj-* 'to shine, to beam, to sparkle', etc.) I refer to Mayrhofer, EWAia 2, 1996: 270, 280 (with literature). The connection is based on the bright whiteness of birchbark. A similar semantic development may be seen also in my tentative etymologies of *čandari* 'plane-tree; poplar' and *saws(i)*, which I shall present elsewhere. See also below, on the cultural data demonstrating an association of the poplar with the ideas 'shining, purity, virginity, innocence, holiness' and the Sun. The association 'Sun' : 'poplar' indirectly seen in the cult of *Arewordik* (see below) can be compared with *Heliades*, the daughters of the Sun in Greek

mythology, which have been transformed into poplars (Ovid. Met. 2: 340-366; see Taxo-Godi apud MifNarMir 1, 1980: 271a).

[According to NHB 2: 2b, the Armenian tree-name *hagni* denotes 'poplar (*barti*, Turk. */gavag/*)'. I do not know on what is this based. The word is taken from Gr. *ἄγνος* m. f. 'willow-like tree, chaste tree (*Vitex agnus castus*); withy' in translating the Bible. The initial *h-* is due to contamination with *ἅγιος* 'holy'. Note that Gr. *ἄγνος* has been compared with OCS *jagneďъ* 'black poplar' (see Lidén 1905/1906: 506-507; P. Friedrich 1970: 151). If Arm. *hagni* indeed refers to the poplar, it may be another case illustrating the association 'poplar' : 'holy'].

Both the aspen and the plane are considered demonic trees. A reason for this could be the fact that the leaves of these trees tremble in the slightest wind (note the English expression *to quake/tremble like an aspen leaf*). For the famous passage from Movsēs Xorenac'i on *saws*₁ see s.v. On the association of the aspen, and, in particular, its reddish wood and trembling leaves, with the demonic and chthonic (especially female) personages see Toporov apud MifNarMir 2, 1982: 266-267. On the medieval sect in Armenia called *Arew-ordi-k* 'Children of the Sun' in general and on the demonic association of *barti* 'poplar' in their beliefs in particular see Ališan 1910: 79-80, 100-104; Karst 1848: 69-70; Bartikjan 1967; Russell 1987: *-530-. Does the same hold for the linden, too? Compare the following Armenian dialectal expression from Keyve (Nikomidia): *t'mbiġ [oxlamurġ] terew ε, mišt kə dārnay* "(he) is a very unsteady[-minded] person", literally: "he is a leaf of a linden" [Ačařean 1913: 1025b].

As noted by P. Friedrich (1970: 157-158₁; apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 65b), in some IE traditions the birch, the poplar/aspen, the linden, and the willow are feminine grammatically, lexically, and culturally, and the birch also figures as a symbol of young, virginal femininity. There are fixed phrases in Baltic folklore where the word for 'birch' is taken to express the meaning 'purity, innocence' (of maidens and young men): e.g. Latv. *brūte vēl bērza galā* "bridegroom and top of birch tree" (see Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984: 620; English transl. 1995: 532). [Or "bridegroom (is/still) by/of top of birch tree"?]. Russian *častuški* about the birch reflect almost all the nuances of feelings and emotions of girls [Kulagina 1999: 98]. The following *častuška* (ibid.) can be compared with the above-mentioned Latvian phrase:

*Ja na beluju berezku
Sjadu pokačajusja.
S kotoroj miločkoj guljaju -
S toj i povenčajusja.*

In Armenian tradition, too, there may be found relics of similar association of the poplar with the ideas of virginity, purity, motherhood, etc. It is told (see Ōdabašyan 1987: 70) that in Zeyt'un there was a huge protective poplar close to the church of the Holy Mother, and the Holy Mother with Jesus on her lap has been seen on top of the tree. Note also the motif of the bride on poplar or plane in fairy-tales. In a fairy-tale from Lori (Noyemberyan) [HŽHek' 8, 1977: 651-669], the bride of a prince, which was born in a forest, in a hollow of a tree and was protected by a bear (*arj*) and the Holy Mother Mary (*Mayram astvacacin*), loses her eyes and is cured by the Holy Mary who visits the bride first in a dream, then in a tree-garden, near a spring under poplar-trees (*bardi caġer*). Again, we are dealing with the motif /bride and the tree *barti*/.

This preliminary discussion shows that the semantic relationship between the poplar and some other trees, as well as the derivation of Arm. *bart-i* 'poplar' from PIE **b^hrHg-* 'birch', should be viewed in a larger culturological framework.

bbġēč 'owl' (according to Greppin - 'horned owl').

Attested in a poem ascribed to Yovhannēs Vardapet (16th cent.) but probably written by Kirakos Episkopos /13-14th cent./ (Mnac'akanyan 1980a: 246^{L53}; see also Ė. Avetisyan 1989: 126). Ačāryan (HAB 1: 434a) cites the passage from Amatuni 1912: 94b and identifies the word *bbġēč* (written *bəbġēč*) with *bu* and *buēč* 'owl' (q.v.). Greppin (1978: 154) treats the word as an orthographic variant of *buēč* and cites the passage from the manuscript Nr 3595 of Yerevan Matenadaran. NHB vacat.

The bird is described in the poem as a bird with *č'atar* eyes which goes around at night and does not see the sunlight. Greppin (1978: 154) translates *č'atar* as 'weak'. I cannot find any testimony for such a meaning. In fact, this word means 'bluish/greenish (said of eyes)' in MArm. (*č'atar*, see MiġHayBaġ 2, 1992: 246b) and in dial. e.g. Łarabaġ *čatar* (see Ačārean 1913: 702a; see also below).

The bird-name *bbġēč* is described also in a medieval riddle written by Nersēs Šnorhali (12th cent., Cilicia) [Mnac'akanyan 1980: 273^{Nr135}].

● **DIAL** Probably connected to dial. **bbġēč* 'with dishevelled hair'; see below.

● **ETYM** As we have seen, both Ačāryan (HAB 1: 434a) and Greppin (1978: 154) equate the word with *bu*, *buēč* 'owl' (q.v.). However, they add no comments upon the form. The dialectal forms **bubu* (Sebastia, etc.) and especially **bubru* (Karin/Ėrzrum) [HAB 1: 479a; HayLezBrbBaġ 1, 2001: 218] seem to be relevant; for the latter cf. Laz. *burbu* 'owl'. (Note that Lazistan is quite close to Ėrzrum). Thus, next to *bu* and *bu-ēč*, we have **bub-r-* and **bbġ-ēč*.

Ačaryan mentions the comparison with dial. **bbṛēč* ‘with dishevelled hair’ suggested by S. Movsisyan in a letter from 1928, but he does not clarify his opinion about it. I think this connection is worth of consideration. The word **bbṛēč/bṛbēč* ‘with dishevelled hair’ often characterizes the old female witches; cf. Łanalanyan 1969: 89^{Nr234}; HŽHek’ 13, 1985: 28; Markosyan 1989: 249^{L7}, 352b; HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 175a. Note also the expression *bṛpeř sadana* which my mother used. For the suffix cf. also *xuč-ič* ‘scarecrow’ (see 1.12.4 and s.v. *boxoxič*).

An episode from a late Byzantine text involving the possession of a woman by an Armenian-speaking demon in the form of a woman with dishevelled hair (see Russell 1998/2000: 64-65 = 2004: 990-991) is of particular interest. Compare H. T’umanyan 3, 1989: 179, where the female demons *alk’-er* are described as *gis-a-xiřiv* ‘with dishevelled hair’.

The relationship between the bird (especially the owl) and the witch is conceivable. Note especially that Łarabař *čatar* ‘bluish/greenish (said of eyes)’ is frequently found in negative (sometimes magic or demonic) context, see NmušLeřnŁarab 1978: 81^{L-1} (the skull of a *čatar* man has magic/medical power), 173 (proverb Nr 369, advising to fear from *čatar*).

bil ‘light-blue’ (?).

Attested only in Step’annos Siwnec’i (8th cent.), denoting a kind of fish.

●**ETYM** NHB (1: 489b; cf. 2: 652c) takes the word to mean ‘light-blue’ and compares it with Arm. dial. *pluz* ‘blue’, Ital. *blu*, etc. Abet’yan and Ačaryan (see HAB 1: 450) refuse the meaning ‘light-blue’. After an extensive discussion, however, Ałayan (1974: 44-47) advocates the basic meaning ‘light-blue’, which has developped into the fish-name (cf. the fish-name *kapoyt* which follows *bil* in the list). Then he connects *bil* with OCS *bělъ*, Russ. *běl’ij* ‘white’, etc. from PIE **b^hēlH-*, see also s.v. *bal* ‘mist, fog; (dial). white fleck’. The same etymology has been proposed independently by Saradževa (1976: 191; 1980c; 1986: 97-98). The etymology is accepted by Ĵahukyan (1987: 115, 160, 270). For the semantics cf. *lurt’j* ‘light, shiny; light-blue’. Saradževa (1986: 375₁₈) wonders if Arm. *pluz* ‘blue’ (Ararat *pliz*, Agulis *ploz*, see HAB 4: 87b) is related with Engl. *blue* etc.; cf. the idea of NHB above.

Compare also **bt-ēt* (see HAB 1: 456a).

blit, *a*-stem in NHB, but without evidence ‘a roundish soft bread’ (Bible+); ***blit’-ak*** ‘lobe of the ear’ (Bible); ‘lobe of the liver’ (Gregory of Nyssa). In Dawt’ak (7th cent.) apud Movsēs Kařankatuac’i 2.35 (1983: 228^{L23}): *blit’aks oč’xarac* ‘soft meat of of

sheep" (*oĉ'xameri p'ap'uk mis*) [V. Arak'elyan 1969: 178]] or "choice morsels of sheep" [Dowsett 1961: 147].

●**DIAL** Preserved in the dialects of Xarberd, Xotorĵur, T'iflis, Axalc'xa (*b'lint'*), Ērabaġ, Van, Moks, etc., basically meaning 'a kind of cake' [HAB 1: 454]. The meaning in Moks (*pəlit'*, GSg *pəlt'ə*) is thoroughly described in Orbeli 2002: 312. Remarkably, Ararat, Moks etc. have also the meaning 'a small swelling' [Amatuni 1912: 105a].

●**ETYM** No acceptable etymology is recorded in HAB 1: 454a. Ĵahukyan (1987: 117, 161) derives from PIE **b^hl-ci-* 'to swell' (cf. Gr. *φλιδάω* etc.). This proto-form would yield Arm. **e-tbi-*, however. Olsen (1999: 244, 948) places in the list of words of unknown origin, not mentioning any etymology.

The semantics of *blit'* ('a roundish soft bread; lobe of the ear or the liver; (dial.) swelling') is remarkably close to that of *boy-t'* 'lobe of the ear or the liver; thumb; hump'; 'young of a frog' (q.v.). The basic meaning is 'a soft lump of something; swelling; a roundish projecting part of the body' < 'swollen, grown'. One may therefore derive *bl-it'* from **bul* < PIE **b^huH-l-*, from the root **b^heuH-* 'to grow'. The full grade is reflected in *boył* (q.v.). Note that both *bl-it'* and *boyt'* (if from **bu-it'*) contain the suffix *-it'* (see 2.3.1). Since *boył* has an *i*-stem comparable with Iran. **b^hūr-i-* 'abundant'), one wonders whether the vocalism of the suffix in *bl-it'* can be explained by the same **-i-*; thus: **bul-í-l^h V- > blit'*.

***bt-** 'to shout' (dial.): Van ***btal** 'to cry loudly (said of children)' [Ačarean 1913: 195a], Ērabaġ, Ararat, etc. ***bt-bt-al**, ***bt-t-al**, ***bt-aw-el** 'to shout (said of animals and people)' [Amatuni 1912: 106-107; Ačarean 1913: 195ab].

●**ETYM** No etymology is known to me.

See s.v. *bot-ok'* 'loud complaint, cry'. The form **bt-aw-* is reminiscent of Ērabaġ, Ararat onomatopoeic *kī-av-el* 'to croak' (said of crows) vs. dialectally widespread *kī-kī-al* 'id. (said of birds, particularly crows, as well as of frogs, snakes, buffalos, etc.)'; see HAB s.v.v. *agraw* 'crow', *ka(r)kač'*, and *kīunk* (q.v.).

***boxoxič**

In "Baġgirk' hayoc'" (Amalyan 1975: 113^{Nr95}), *ənkičēal* (unclear word, see HAB 2: 129) is glossed as follows: *xrtuilak*, *kam xočič*, *kam boxoy xēž* (var. *xič*). As is clear from the equivalents *xrtuilak* and *xočič* (also as a separate gloss: Amalyan 1975: 145^{Nr224}), *boxoy xič* must have meant 'scarecrow'.

●**ETYM** Ačaryan (HAB 1: 462b) posits **boxoxič* and does not record or offer any etymology of the word.

I propose to interpret it as composed of **bo-* ‘bogy’ and **xoxič*. The latter is reminiscent of *xočič* ‘scarecrow’, mentioned in the same gloss. This is linked with *xučič* attested in Evagrius of Pontus. The by-form **xox-ič* may be corroborated by Sebastia *xxχj*. See 1.12.4 for more detail.

boť ‘a kind of plant’ (Galen etc.)

●**DIAL** In several dialects, in the meaning ‘a kind of bitter field-plant, = Turk. /č’ašur/’ [HAB 1: 464b]. The plant plays an important role in the epic song “Karos xac’” (see Harut’yunyan/Xaç’atryan 2000, passim). In a Moks version: *pote xac’* [Yovsēp’eanc’ 1892: 12]. In Orbeli 2002: 315, Moks *pöt* is glossed in square brackets as ‘րթ’ = ‘hornbeam’. This seems to be due to confusion with **boxi* ‘hornbeam’ (q.v.).

●**ETYM** See s.v. *botk*.

botk ‘radish’ ‘radish’.

In later literature: Galen (= Gr. ῥαφανίς [Greppin 1985: 95]), Geoponica, etc.; see NHB 1: 504a; Ališan 1895: 98-99; Norayr Biwzandac’i 1923: 503-504 (according to him: = Fr. raifort).

The oldest appearance of the root is seen in **botk-uk**, with diminutive *-uk*, attested in Hexaemeron (K. Muradyan 1984: 304^{L5}): *botkukk’ efjerac’ ort’uc’ kam garanc’* “little horns of calfs or lambs”. Here *botkukk’* has no correspondent form in the Greek text; *botkukk’ efjerac’* renders Gr. τὰ κέρτα [NHB 1: 504a; K. Muradyan 1984: 372b]. Arm. *botk-uk* should be interpreted as ‘newly grown horn’ (as is suggested by Ačāryan [HAB 1: 465a]) rather than ‘radish-like small horn’ (as in NHB 1: 504a). This might imply an etymological meaning ‘*growing’.

●**DIAL** *botk* ‘radish’ is ubiquitous in dialects. In Muš and Alaškert one finds *b’ot*, without the final *-k* [HAB 1: 465a; Madat’yan 1985: 185a]. Łarabať *pəxxk/pöxxk* and *pexk* (see HAB and Davt’yan 1966: 328), Moks *pötk* (see HAB; Ačāryan 1952: 251; Orbeli 2002: 315), etc. point to Ačāryan’s Law and subsequent consonant shift (see 2.1.39.1).

●**ETYM** Ačāryan (HAB 1: 464-465) derives from **bot* ‘plant, sprout’ (see s.v.v. *bot* and *botboj*), which he connects with Lat. *folium* n. ‘leaf’, *flōs*, *-ōris* m. ‘blossom, flower’, etc., for the semantic development comparing with Fr. *radis* ‘radish’ etc. from Lat. *rādīx* ‘root’. He (op. cit. 465) points out that the resemblance with Syriac *pūglā* is accidental and treats Georg. *bolok’i* ‘radish’, Oss. *bulk* ‘id.’ etc. as Armenian loans. H. Suk’iasyan (1986: 90,146-147) interprets *-k* as a determinative, but the etymological treatment of most of her examples is not convincing.

Adonc' (1938: 457 = 1972: 391) hesitantly compares the Armenian and Georgian words with Akkad. *puglu* 'radish'. On the other hand, he points out that Arm. *botk* can be originally identic with Gr. *βολβός* m. 'onion; purse-tassels, Muscari comosum' and Lith. *bumbulỹs* 'Steckrübe, Wasserblase, Kalbsauge'. The latter etymology is represented in Pokorny 1959: 103. Ĵahukyan (1987: 115, 461-462, 467) accepts Ačaryan's etymology, but also mentions the Semitic parallels. Then (p. 462) he questions: "is it possible to suggest a Semitic loan from Armenian?".

Further, see s.v. *bot*.

botok', *o*-stem: GDSg *botok'-o-y*, ISg *botok'-o-v* in Łazar P'arpec'i; *ba*-stem: GDPI *botok'-a-c* in "Ganjaran" 'loud complaint, cry' (Bible+); **botok'em** 'to cry, complain loudly' (Bible+), 'declamation of a herald' (Athanasius of Alexandria); dial. (Hamšen) ***botok'-** 'to shout loudly' (with *-l-*).

●**DIAL** Ararat *botok'el* 'to complain', Ozim *b'otək'-ič'* 'complainer', etc. [HAB 1: 466a].

In his CIArm. > Hamšen glossary, Ačaryan (1947: 223) does not record *botok'em*. In the glossary of purely dialectal words in Hamšen, he (op. cit. 259) records Hamšen *polkuš* 'to shout loudly (said of both people and animals)' deriving it from **botok'el* (with *-l-*), with no further comment. The appurtenance to *botok'em* seems obvious to me.

●**ETYM** Connected with OIc. *belja* 'to roar', OHG *bellan* 'to bark, resound', etc.; see Meillet 1900: 391-392; Petersson 1920: 74-75 (together with *batba(n)j* 'delirious talking'). Ačaryan (HAB 1: 465-466) does not accept the comparison and leaves the origin open. Ĵahukyan (1987: 115) is positive, representing *botok'*, *batba(n)j*, and dial. **bl-bl-al* 'to babble' under the entry **b^hel-* of Pokorny 1959. One also might think of Arm. dial. (Van, Łarabał, Ararat, etc.) **bt-*, **bt-bt-*, **btaw-* 'to shout', q.v.

***bo(y/v)**, ***bu(y/v)** 'spider, tarantula; ghost': Łarabał **bov* 'spider' [Ačarean 1913: 202b]. Next to *bov* - also *bo*, see HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 211a (with a textual illustration). Davt'yan (1966: 392) represents Łarabał, Hadrut', Šatax, Marała *böv* as equivalent to CIArm. *karič* 'scorpion'; cf. Areš *böv*, *bövā* 'an animal resembling the scorpion' [Lusenc' 1982: 201b]. One may also add Polis *pü* (spelled *piw*) 'ghost' = Nor Naxiĵewan *pi* 'a poisonous spider' (see HAB 2: 229b, 369a);

***b/polo**: Van **p(o)lo* 'insect, bogy, monster', **arj-a-plo* 'ghost', Surmalu **boloy* 'insect'. Next to **arj-a-plo*, Van also has **arj-a-pap-o* 'bogy' [Ačarean 1913: 154a]. Ačaryan does not specify **arj-* and **pap-*. The former is, apparently, identic with *pap*

‘grandfather’, cf. **pap-uk* ‘old man’ > Van, Alaškert ‘an insect’ (see Ačārean 1913: 896b). The component **arj-* can be equated with *arjn* ‘black’ or *arj* ‘bear’.

***bol/tol-**: Van **bololan*, T’iflis **botolay* ‘bogy, ghost’;

***bo-bo**: Ararat, Igdir, Bateš, Nor Bayazet *bobo* ‘bogy, ghost’;

***bo-bol/t**: Alek’sandrapol, Širak *bobol*, T’avriz, Juŋa *bobox* ‘ghost’, Ganjak **bobot* ‘insect’ [Ačārean 1913: 197b, 200-201; HAB 2: 229b, 369a; 4: 95a] (according to HayLezBrbBaŋ 1, 2001: 192b, 204a: Łarabaŋ, Ganjak *biboŋ*, *boboŋ*, *bobox* ‘silkworm’); cf. also Tigranakert *babula* ‘bogy’ (see Haneyan 1978: 202).

***b/p(o)loč**, ***b/p(o)toč**: Ararat, Astapat **bloŋ*, Širak *boloč*, Lori, Muš **botoč* [Amatuni 1912: 105b], Akn **ploč*, Bateš, Van **poloč*, Łarabaŋ **ptoč* ‘insect, beetle’, Nor Naxiĵewan **poŋtoč* ‘bogy’ [Ačārean 1913: 913a, 919a].

All these forms are dialectal, except for *poloč* ‘insect, worm’, which is attested in “Lucmunk’ sahmanac’ n” [HAB 4: 95a].

A trace of **bo-* ‘scarecrow’ may be seen in **bo-xoxič* (q.v.).

● **ETYM** According to Ačāryan (HAB 4: 95a; cf. also 2: 229a and Ačārean 1913: 201a), the root is **bol-* which is a Caucasian loan; cf. reduplicated forms Georg. *boboli* ‘a large worm’, Laz *boboli* ‘insect’.

This solution is too narrow and unsatisfactory. First of all, **bo/u-* ‘spider, tarantula; scorpion; ghost’, ranging from Polis and Nor Naxiĵewan to Łarabaŋ, areš etc., which Ačāryan mentions only as a semantic parallel, seems to be related too. Note also reduplicated **bo-bo* which is not necessarily a reduced form of **bo-bol/t*. Secondly, the spread of this word in neighbouring languages, as we shall see, is much wider.

Klimov (1998: 145) represents Kartvel. **oboba-* ‘spider’: Georg. *oboba-* ‘spider’, Megrel. *bo(r)bolia-* < **bo(r)bo-*, with dimin. *-ia*, Laz *bobončva-* < **bobo-*, Svan **opopa*, *wopopä*, etc.

Amirdovlat’ Amasiac’i (15th cent.) mentions Turk. */pō/* as equivalent to Arm. *mor* ‘tarantula, phalangium’ (see S. Vardanyan 1990: 134, §616). This Turkish word is compared with Arab. *bū*, *abū* ‘tarantula’ [S. Vardanyan 1990: 613, note 616/2].

Slav. **boba*: Bulgar. *buba* ‘a worm; bug; bogy’, dial. ‘cocoon of the silkworm’, Maced. *buba* ‘insect’, etc. (see ÈtimSlovSlavJaz 2, 1975: 229-230), Lith. *bam̃balas* ‘May-bug’, Latv. *bam̃bals*, *bambala* ‘beetle’, Gr. *βομβυλός*, *βομβύλιος* m. ‘buzzing insect, humble-bee, gnat, mosquito; cocoon of the silkworm’, Gr. *βόμβυξ*, *-υκος* m. ‘silkworm’, *βομβύκιον* ‘cocoon of the silkworm’, etc.

Further, see Nocentini 1994: 401 ff.

For the semantics see 3.5.2.1.

*boyt'*₁, *a*-stem (Bible), *o*-stem (Ephrem); *boyt'n*, GDSg *but'in*, AblSg *i but'anē*, ISg *but'amb* ("Maštoc'" of Ĵahkec'i, 14th cent.) 'thumb'; **boyt'* 'a soft lump of flesh, lobe', in *lerd-a-boyt'* 'lobe of the liver' (Bible+), *unkan-a-boyt'* 'lobe of the ear' (Cyril of Jerusalem).

●**DIAL** Widespread in dialects, in the meaning 'thumb'; only in Agulis (*büt'*) and Kak'avaberd (*b/püt'*) - 'finger' (for Kak'avaberd see H. Muradyan 1967: 167b). Ararat and ĴuĴa have *b'it'*; note also T'iflis *bit'* next to *but'*, as well as Xotorĵur *bit'* [YušamXotorĵ 1964: 434b]. The form *boyt'n* can be traced in ĴarabaĴ *püt'nə* and in Akn *b'ət'n-üg* (see HAB 1: 466b). Commenting upon ĴuĴa *b'it'*, Ačāryan (1940: 87; see also 356b) states that there is no other example with *-oyt'*. Note, however, *čkoyt'* 'little finger' > ĴuĴa *ck-ik*, rural *čfkit'* [HAB 3: 205a; Ačārean 1940: 375a].

Bearing in mind the classical meaning 'a soft lump of flesh, lobe', one may add more dialectal evidence: Muš *but'-ik gdal* 'young of a frog' (with *gdal* 'spoon'); 'Ararat, ĴarabaĴ *but'* 'hump', Ararat, Ĵazax *but'-ik* 'hump-backed' (see Ačārean 1913: 204a).

●**SEMANTICS** The semantic range ['lobe (of the ear or the liver)'; 'thumb'; 'hump'; 'young of a frog'] suggests a basic meaning like 'a soft lump of flesh; a roundish projecting part of the body', which usually derives from 'swollen, grown'.

●**ETYM** Meillet (1903c: 431 = Meye 1978: 171-172) links with *boyl*, *i*-stem 'group'. Basically meaning 'swollen, grown, fat, strong', *boyt'* can easily be derived from PIE **b^heuH-* 'to grow'. For the meaning 'thumb' cf. Olc. *pumall*, OHG *dūmo*, etc. 'thumb' from PIE **teuH-* or **teHu-* 'to swell; crowd, folk; fat; strong'. Ačāryan (HAB 1: 466b) is sceptical and leaves the origin of the word open. Ĵahukyan (1965: 252-253; 1987: 114-115) accepts the etymology mentioning cognates with dental determinatives such as Engl. *pout* 'to thrust out or protrude the lips, esp. in expression of displeasure or sullenness' etc., and Arm. *poyn* 'pot', though these forms presuppose **b-*. See also s.v.v. *boyt'₂* 'felloe' and *boyl* 'group'.

The suffixal element **-t-* is also found in Gr. *φῦτόν* n. 'plant', Skt. *bhū-ti-*, *bhū-tí-* f. 'Wohlsein, guter Zustand, Gedeihen', *prā-bhūta-* 'abundant, much, considerable, great', etc. On the other hand, one may consider also the synchronic suffix *-t'* in body-part terms like **kuṛ-t'-n* 'back' next to *kuṛn* 'back; arm' (see 2.3.1). Note especially *bl-it'* 'a roundish soft bread; lobe of the ear or the liver; (dial.) swelling' (q.v.), with a similar semantic field and perhaps of the same origin: **b^huH-l-* + *-it'*. Similarly, *boyt'* is probably composed of **bu-* (from **b^huH-*) and *-it'*. The same suffix is also found in *čkoyt'* 'the little finger' next to *ck-ik* etc. (see 2.3.1, 1.12.5).

*boyt*₂ 'felloe'.

Attested only in Step'anos Siwnec'i (8th cent.), as a synonym to *hec* 'felloe' (q.v.).

●**ETYM** No etymology is recorded in HAB 1: 467a. According to Ĵahukyan (1965: 252), the word may have resulted from semantic development of *boyt*₁, though he does not specify the motivation. For a suggestion see 3.9.4.

boyl, *i*-stem (MArm. *a*-stem) 'group (of people, deers, stags, etc.)'; MArm. *boyl-k* 'Pleiades'.

5th century onwards. In Łazar P'arpec'i (5th cent.): *bulic' eĴeruac* "of groups of stags". A MArm. *a*-stem is seen in *bulk' i bul-a-c'*; see Łazaryan/Avetisyan, MiĴHayBař 1, 1987: 130a.

●**DIAL** Akn *b'ol* 'group' <<Maxud.....>>; Alaškert, Ararat, Tigranakert, Xarberd, Širak, etc. **boylk* 'Pleiades' (see also Amatuni 1912: 80b), Zeyt'un *b'li* 'a star' [HAB 1: 468a]; Širak *bulk* 'Ursa Major' [Mxit'areanc' 1901: 308; Amatuni 1912: 116a], Sasun *pulk* 'Pleiades or Ursa Major' [Petoyan 1954: 153; 1965: 340, 518], Xotorĵur **boylk* 'a group of stars' [YušamXotorĵ 1964: 435a]; Hamšen *pulk*, *pulk* (from *boyl-k*), GSg *pəlkən* 'shrub' [Ačāryan 1947: 73, 223], Muš, Alaškert, Bulanəx *b'ul* 'shrub' [HAB 1: 468a].

The astral term *boylk* is reflected in the dialect of Malat'ia as *p'ork*, with regular developments *b-* > *p'-* and *-oy-* > *-o-* [Danielyan 1967: 43, 188b]; see also HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 220a (*burk*). The only irregularity is the *-r-*. As pointed out by Danielyan (op. cit. 63), this is the only case for the development *l* > *r* in this dialect. According to the same author, the meaning is 'constellation'.

According to Ačāryan (1913: 204b), Ararat *bulk* 'avalanche' belongs here, too. He mentions this form also in HAB 1: 468a (s.v. *boyl*), but derives it from *p'ul* 'fall, ruins', *p'blanim* 'to fall' (q.v.).

●**SEMANTICS** The meanings 'group', 'shrub' (< *'growing'), perhaps also 'avalanche' (< 'a mass of snow') suggest a basic semantics like 'mass, abundance; growing'.

●**ETYM** Meillet (1903c: 431 = Meye 1978: 171-172) links *boyl*, *i*-stem with Skt. *bhūri-* 'much, abundant, numerous, great, mighty' (RV+) (cf. OAv. *būiri-* 'abundant'), and Goth. *uf-bauljan* 'aufblasen', as well as Arm. *boyt* 'thumb' (q.v.). Petersson (1916: 276-277) accepts this etymology and adds also Lith. *būrys* 'multitude, crowd', Latv. *būris* 'heap, mass'. Ĵahukyan (1987: 114) follows Meillet, though Ačāryan (HAB 1: 466b, 467-468) is sceptical.

The semantics of Arm. *boyl* in general and the meaning 'shrub' of dial **boyl(k)* in particular agree also with OCS *bylĳe* 'herbs, plants, grass', Czech. *bylí* 'weed',

SCr. *bīlje* ‘plants, grass’ (Slav. < **b^hHu-l-io-*) and Gr. *φῦλον* n. ‘race, tribe, class’, *φύλη* f. ‘*Stamm, Stammverein, Gemeinde’, as the *-l-*suffixation of PIE **b^heuH-* or **b^hHu-*, cf. Gr. *φύομαι* ‘I grow, I become’, *φῦτόν* n. ‘*Gewächs, Pflanze’ < **b^hHu-to-*; Arm. *boyn*, *o*-stem ‘nest; den; hut’, *boys*, *o*-stem ‘plant’ (q.v.) from **b^heuH-ko-*; etc. For the problem of the laryngeal in this root see Schrijver 1991: 512-518, 534. Arm. *boyl*, *i*-stem derives from **b^heuH-l-i-*. The diphthong *oy*, seen also in *boys* and *boyn*, points to **b^heuH-* rather than **b^hHu-*.

If indeed from PIE **teuH-* ‘to swell, abound’, Arm. *t’up* ‘shrub’ (dial. also ‘flourishing, thriving’) provides us with another example of the semantic development ‘to grow, swell’ > ‘plant, shrub’.

For the semantic development ‘many’ > ‘Pleiades’ see 3.1.2; among other examples, note Skt. *bahula-* ‘thick; many’, f. pl. ‘Pleiades’, which also shows a formal resemblance with Arm. *boyl*. The resemblance is, however, accidental.

Zeyt’un *b’li* is glossed by Ačāryan (HAB 1: 468a) as ‘a star’. The semantics of *boyl* suggests, however, that it denotes ‘Pleiades’ or a constellation. It may be derived from **b^huH-l-i(e)h₂-* or **b^hHu-l-i(e)h₂-*. The zero grade is also represented by *bl-it*’ (q.v.); see also s.v. *boyt*’. For other asterisms in the suffix **-l-ih₂-* see 2.3.1 on *-(a)li*, and s.v.v. *luca[t]li*, *sayl*.

The *-r-* in Malat’ia *p’ork*’ < **boyr-k*’ ‘*Pleiades’ is remarkable. Since it cannot be explained within the dialect, one may ascribe an etymological value to it. There are two possibilities: 1) in contrast with *boyl* < **b^heuH-l-*, **boyr-k*’ reflects an old **-r-*suffixation seen also in Lith. *būrys* ‘multitude, crowd’, Latv. *būris* ‘heap, mass’; 2) **boyr-k*’ is borrowed from Mİran. **būr-*, cf. OAv. *būiri-* ‘abundant’. The latter alternative seems more probable.

***boyc-** *bucanem* ‘to feed’ (Bible+); **-boyc** (as the second member of a number of compounds, e.g. *ənd-a-but*, which see s.v. *und*); **but** ‘food’ (Bible+), on which the denominative *btem* ‘to feed’ (Ephrem+) is based. Also *but* is found as the second member of a number of compounds, e.g. *ənd-a-but*, which see s.v. *und* ‘edible seed, grain’.

●**DIAL** Ačāryan (1953: 193) mentions Airtial *bužanel* ‘to feed’ < **pužanel*, which, as he points out, agrees with *bucanem* semantically but disagrees formally.

The form *but* has been preserved in the dialects of Moks and Bulanəx, meaning ‘hibernal food for domesticated animals’ [HAB 1: 487b].

●**ETYM** Since Hübschmann (1897: 430), derived from PIE **b^heug-* ‘to enjoy’: Skt. *bhoj-* ‘to (make) enjoy’ (RV+), *bhóga-* m. ‘Genuß, Freude, Nutzen’ (RV+), *bhukti-* f. ‘Genießen’ (Br.+), OAv. *būj-* f. ‘penalty’, Khot. *hambujs-* ‘to enjoy’, *būjsana-*

‘feast’, Lat. *fungor* ‘to enjoy; to suffer’. Mayrhofer (EWAia 2, 1996: 275-276) does not mention the Armenian form, though the connection of the latter is formally impeccable. As for the semantics, note that the Sanskrit verb too is largely used in respect to eating; see EWAia (ibid.); Cardona 1987: 65, 68-69. For the semantic relationship cf. also Skt. *bhakṣā-* m. ‘Essen, Trank, Speise, Genuß’ (RV+).

As I try to demonstrate in 2.1.22.12, *but* ‘food’ (vs. *boyc-* ‘to feed’ < **b^heug-*) is best explained by **b^hug-ti-*, cf. Skt. *bhukti-* f. ‘Genießen’ (Br.+).

I wonder whether Airtial **pužanel* ‘to feed’ (see above) may be considered an old Iranian loan with a consonant shift.

boyn, *o*-stem: GDSg *bun-o-y*, LocSg *i bn-i* (Bible) ‘nest; den, lair; hut’.

Bible+.

● **DIAL** Widespread in dialects.

● **ETYM** Since long, connected with words deriving from PIE **b^heuH-* ‘to be, grow’, see HAB 1: 470 (Ačaryan himself does not accept the etymology); Pisani 1934: 186; Ĵahukyan 1987: 116. Note Skt. *bhūvana-* n. ‘Wesen; Welt’ (RV+), etc.; see s.v.v. *bay* ‘lair’, *boys* ‘plant’, *boyt* ‘thumb; a soft lump of flesh, lobe’, etc.

boys, *o*-stem: ISg *bus-o-v*, GDPl *bus-o-c* (Hexaemeron) ‘plant’

Bible+; **busanim** ‘to grow, germinate, originate, be produced’ (Bible+).

● **DIAL** Widespread in dialects, especially as a verb, with or without the nasal infix: **bus-n-* (Polis, T’iflis, Hamšen, Cilicia, Łarabał, Van, etc.) : **bus-* (Ararat, Muš, Alaškert, Ozim). Next to verbal *b’usnil*, Xarberd has participle *buss-aj* ‘grown’, with a geminate -ss- [HAB 1: 470b].

● **ETYM** Since NHB (1: 505b), connected with *φύομαι* ‘to grow, become’, *φυτόν* ‘plant’, etc. from PIE **b^heuH-ko-* (see Hübschmann 1899: 47; HAB 1: 470; Ĵahukyan 1987: 116). Perhaps, PIE **(-)VuHC* > Arm. *-VūC* rather than with vocalization of the laryngeal (see s.v.v. *boyl*, *boyn*).

***bor** ‘brown animal’; ‘brown or motley/spotted’ (> ‘leprosy’)

This word is not attested independently. I tentatively restore it on the basis of some dialectal evidence (see below) and its hypothetical connection with *bor* ‘leprosy’ and *boreni* ‘hyena’ (q.v.).

● **DIAL** Karin *borek* is described by Ačaryan (1913: 203b) as “*t’ux*, *čermak goynov kov*”, that is, a cow, which is dark-complexioned (*t’ux*), but also of white colour (*spitak goynov*). It is not quite clear what he means exactly; perhaps ‘a dark-complexioned cow with white spots’.

Lōri *borex-a-muk* ‘mole’ [Amatuni 1912: 115a]; the second member of the compound is *mukn* ‘mouse’. According to the description of Ananyan (HayKendAšx 1, 1961: 90-91), the mole has dark-complexioned plushy fur.

Muš *bor hort’ik*, *Bor ez* (HŽHek’ 13, 1985: 161ff).

●**ETYM** One may connect with **bor-i* ‘a brown, dark-complexioned animal’ > ‘hyena’ (see s.v. *boreni* ‘hyena’). The form *borek* ‘dark-complexioned or motley cow’ comes from **boreak* < **bori-ak*.

Compare Iranian **bōr-*: Pahl. *bōr* [bw] ‘reddish-brown, bay, chestnut (horse)’ [MacKenzie 1971: 19], also referring to cattle (cf. *Bōr-gāv*), *bōrak* ‘borax, nitre’ [Nyberg 1974: 48b] (> Arm. *borak* ‘nitre’, see HAB 1: 475), Kurd. *bōr* ‘grey; brown’ [Cabolov 1, 2001: 206-207], Pers. *bur* ‘blond, reddish brown, bay-horse’, Sogd. *βwr* [βōr] ‘blond’ [Gharib 1995: 115a], etc. (see Maciuszak 1996: 29), cf. YAv. *baβra-* m. ‘beaver’, Skt. *babhrū-* ‘reddish brown, brown; a kind of ichneumon; a reddish-brown cow’ < PIE **b^heb^hru-*: OHG *bibar* ‘beaver’ < PGerm. **beβru-*; OHG *brūn* ‘brown’ (< PIE **b^herH-no-*); for **b^her-u-* or **b^her-o-* cf. also Lith. *bėras* ‘brown’, OHG *bero* ‘bear’, etc. For the Iranian forms and etymology see ÈtimSlovIranJaz 2, 2003: 151-154.

Further, see s.v. *boreni* ‘hyena’.

bor ‘leprosy’

Lately attested. Much older and widespread is *bor-ot* ‘leprous’ (Bible+) > ‘bad; unpure, dirty; heretic’ (for the semantic field see 3.5.2.2).

●**ETYM** Considered to be a loan from Iran. **bor* ‘leprosy’, only preserved in Sogd. *βr’wk’/βarūkə/* ‘leprous’ [HAB 1: 474b; Jahukyan 1987: 520]. Bearing in mind the Iranian alternation *b-* : *v-* (cf. e.g. the word for ‘violet’ - see 2.3.1 on *-awš*, see also s.v. *mṛjiwn* ‘ant’), one may assume that Arm. *uruk* ‘leprous’, which, to my knowledge, has not received an etymological explanation, is borrowed from Iran. **vorūk-* through an intermediary **wuruk*.

It seems that the forms are related with **bor* ‘brown or motley/spotted’ (q.v.). For the semantics cf. Arm. *pisak* ‘spotted; leprous’, dial. of Van and Łarabał *p’is* ‘dirty’ : Pers. *pīs* ‘leprous; dirty’ (see HAB 4: 84b; Ačārean 1902: 352); cf. also Gr. *ἀλφός* m. ‘dull-white leprosy’ (Hes.) from ‘white’ (cf. Lat. *albus* ‘white, pale, bright, clear’, etc.). The above-mentioned Sogdian form may be derived from **b^her-u-* (or **b^he-b^hr-u-*?). For more detail see s.v.v. **bor* ‘brown animal’, *boreni* ‘hyena’.

boreni, *wo*-stem: GDSg *borenwoy* in Jeremiah 12.9; AblSg *i borenwoy* (Paterica); **borean**, *i*-stem: GDPl *borenic* in P'awstos Buzand 4.13, etc.; later: **borē** (Grigor Magistros etc.), **boray** (Physiologus). 'hyena'

Bible+. In P'awstos Buzand 4.13 (1883=1984: 95^{L8f}): *ew dadark' gazanac' ew orjk' gazanac' ew orjk' borenic* "lairs and dens for wild beasts and hyenas", translated by Garsoïan (1989: 138^{L4f}).

●DIAL Ararat *bor-ani* 'coat of a fur of hyena' [Ačarean 1913: 203a; HAB 1: 477b; HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 211b].

●ETYM Ačaryan (HAB 1: 477) and, independently, Ĵahukyan (1965: 253; see also 1987: 116, 160) derive the word from the *o*-grade of PIE **b^her-* 'brown' (also characterizing animals), cf. Lith. *bėras* 'brown', OHG *bero* 'bear', etc. The only cognate in *o*-grade cited by Ačaryan and Ĵahukyan is Slav. **bobr-* 'beaver', but this in fact is a reduplicated form. Ĵahukyan (1972: 284; 1987: 116) adds here also dial. (Karin) **borek** 'grey, white cow' (see s.v. **bor* 'brown animal, etc.').

Ĵahukyan (1987: 160; cf. Olsen 1999: 414) alternatively suggests the Iranian origin of *boreni*, cf. YAv. *baβra-* m. 'beaver'. As is pointed out by Ĵahukyan, the Iranian is semantically remote. However, this is not a serious problem since the other meanings may have been lost in Iranian. It will be remembered that Skt. *babhru-* refers to other animals too, cf. 'a kind of ichneumon', 'a reddish-brown cow' (compare the meaning of Arm. dial. *borek* 'a dark-complexioned cow'), etc. For other possibly related Armenian forms see s.v. **bor*.

P. de Lagarde derived *bor-eni* 'hyena' from *bor* 'leprosy' (q.v.) for the semantics mentioning Hebr. *šābō* 'a hyena' < 'coloured' (see HAB 1: 477b; Ačaryan does not accept the idea). Ĵahukyan (1965: 253) rejects this etymology for the reason that *bor* 'leprosy' is of Iranian origin. This is a strange argument. For the semantic relatedness between *boreni* 'hyena' and *bor* 'leprosy' cf. Sarikoli *pis*, Wakhi *pəs* 'leopard', which is compared with Skt. *pīśā-* 'deer', *pīśāṅga-* 'tawny' (RV+), Av. *paēsa-* 'scab', Kurd. *pīs* 'dirty' (see Morgenstierne 1974: 61b), with the basic meaning 'spotted, multicoloured' (see HAB 4: 84-85, s.v. *pisak* 'spot; leprosy'). For the interchange between designations of the hyena and the leopard or panther or the like see s.v. *lusan* 'lynx; marten; hyena'. But in the case of **bor-* **brown animal; brown or motley/spotted* (q.v.) (> *bor* 'leprosy'(?)) > *boreni* 'hyena', the semantic development probably went through the idea of '(reddish) brown' rather than 'spotted', since the spotted hyena seems to have been present in Armenia only in the Tertiary period (see Ananyan, HayKendAšx 1, 1961: 420).

Since the animal-names are often used to denote the fur of that animal (see HAB e.g. s.v.v. *samoyr*, *tik*, etc.), one may assume that *bor-eni* contains the "skin/fur-

suffix" *-eni* (cf. Olsen 1999: 414) and originally meant 'fur of hyena'. This may be corroborated by the dialectal evidence (see above). Moreover, *borē* and *boray*, though lately attested, can represent the original name for the hyena. In view of cases like *aštē*, *ašteay* < from Iran. **a(r)šti-* (cf. Av. *aršti-* f. 'spear, lance', Ved. *ṛṣṭi-* 'id.'), *bazē* vs. *bazay* 'falcon', *kray* vs. dial. **kur-i* 'tortoise' etc., *borē* and *boray* presuppose an earlier **bor-i*.

To my knowledge, NASg *borean* is only attested in Paterica. We have better evidence for GDPl *borenic* (P'awstos Buzand+), which I tentatively interpret as a form with the plural/collective suffix *-an(i)*: **borean-k* = **bori-* + *-an(i)* - cf. *iš-an-k* (APL *iš-an-s*), though GDPl of this is *iš-an-c* (Łazar P'arpec'i) rather than **iš-an-ic*. [Or else, cf. *lus-an* 'lynx'? q.v. For *-eni* cf. also *k'awt'ai* and *k'ōt'ar-inē* in "Baigirk' hayoc'", both meaning 'hyena', Amalyan 1975: 58^{Nr367}, 337^{Nr212}]. Thus, NASg *borean* can be either a back formation after *borenic*, or a misinterpretation of *boreni*.

I conclude, that the original name for the hyena was **bor-i* (> *borē* and *boray*), and *bor-eni* meant 'fur of hyena' (cf. Ararat dial. *bor-ani* 'coat of a fur of hyena'); or else, a petrified adjective like Avest. *bawraini-* 'of beaver', cf. Jahukyan 1987: 160; Olsen 1999: 414.

Of some interest may be also Oss. *bi/eræǵ* 'wolf'. It has a certain resemblance "with Turkic 'wolf', cf. Chagatay, Turkm. *böri*, etc., but final *-æǵ* does not have a reflex in any Turkic language" [Cheung 2002: 173]. Abaev suggested borrowing from Khotanese *birgga* < PIr. *urka-*. However, the Khotanese *-gg-* = [g] does not agree well with Oss. fricative *-ǵ-* (ibid.).

Conclusion: Iranian **bōr-* 'brown, multicoloured, etc.' (< PIE **beb^hru-*) has been borrowed into Armenian **bor* 'brown animal; brown or motley/spotted', *bor* 'leprosy', and *bor-eni* or **bor-i* 'hyena'. The Iranian form from which Arm. *bor* 'leprosy' is derived (cf. Sogd. *βr'wk* / *βarūkə* 'leprosy') does not explain Arm. *-o-* (unless one assumes Sogd. **baru-* from **bauru*). There is no vocalic problem in all the forms within Armenian. If, nevertheless, Arm. *bor* 'leprosy' is originally distinct from Armenian **bor* 'brown animal' and *boreni* 'hyena', in explaining the vocalism one should reckon with the possible influence of those Armenian words. Note also what has been said above on 'fur of hyena'.

[Is the Sogdian form reliable? In Gharib 1995 I could find only *βr'wk* [*brūk*] 'eyebrow' (p. 107a) and *βwr* [*βōr*] 'blond' (p. 115a).]

brdoi 'lammergeyer / Gypaetus barbatus' (Greppin).

Attested only in Vanakan Vardapet Tawušec'i (13th cent.): *Ayl haw kay, brdoṛ asen, or zayn jagn (ənkec'eal yarcuoy) ainu ew snuc'anē* [NHB 1: 518b] : "They say there is another bird, the *brdoṛ*, which takes in and nourishes the young (which the Eagle casts out)." [Greppin 1978: 40]. Or rather - "There is another bird, which is called *brdoṛ*, <...>".

●**ETYM** Greppin (1977: 206-207; 1978: 40-42, 47; 1978b: 153; 1979: 215-216) introduces parallels and specifies *brdoṛ* as 'lammergeyer'. For the synonym *ephenē* = Gr. *ἡ φήνη* appearing in the relevant passage from Hexaemeron see also Hübschmann 1897: 349^{Nr124}; HAB 2: 73a; K. Muradyan 1984: 272, 360₅₀, 373b.

Greppin (1978: 41, 42; cf. also 1979: 216) suggests a derivation from *brdem* 'to shutter, crumble'. Then he notes that the suffix *-oṛ* is unknown, and *brdoṛ* should be derived "from the unknown Armenian substratum". (Against this: Hovsep'yan/Simonyan 1981: 220b). Elsewhere, he (Greppin 1977: 205-206; 1983: 663₃) suggests a comparison with Rum. *barzā* 'stork'.

These suggestions seem unnecessary since *brdoṛ* is transparently composed of *burd* 'wool' and *oṛ* 'buttocks', meaning actually 'having a wooly buttocks'; see HAB 1: 489a, 3: 564a.

buzat'n

Only in "Baṛgirk' hayoc'", glossed by *aṭjamuṭj* 'darkness' (see Amalyan 1975: 58^{Nr373}). Ačāryan (HAB 1: 479a) identifies it with *bazox* 'darkness' (P'ēštəmalčean's dictionary) and another gloss from "Baṛgirk' hayoc'", viz. *bazuṭ* · *aṭjamuṭj*. For the latter, the reading *bazux* is preferred in the critical edition (Amalyan 1975: 46^{Nr35}).

●**ETYM** Ačāryan (HAB 1: 479a) wonders if these are misreadings of *balut* 'foggy' (see s.v. *bal* 'mist, fog'), and records no other etymological attempts.

The same "Baṛgirk' hayoc'" has also *bazekac*, *bezek*, and *buzi* (var. *bozi*), all glossed by *aregahn* 'sun' (see Amalyan 1975 s.v.v.). According to Ačāryan (HAB 1: 435b, 460a), these forms are linked with *bezak* 'lightning, sun' (Evagrius of Pontus, Grigor Magistros) and Hebrew *bāzāq* 'lightning'. Łap'anc'yan (1975: 368-369; see also Ĵahukyan 1987: 594, 597) treats *bozi* as a West-Kartvelian borrowing, cf. Megr. *bža-*, Georg. *mze-*, etc. 'sun'. Note also Georg. dial. *bze-* (see Klimov 1964: 133-134; 1998: 121).

Whatever the origin of *bo/uz-* 'sun', one may interpret *buzat'n* as composed of **bo/uz-* 'sun, light' and **aṭt-* 'darkness' (on which see s.v. *aṭt-a-muṭt*). In this case

we are dealing with a compound of the type *mut'-u-lus* (dial.) 'twilight', lit. 'dark-and-light'.

bušt, *o*-stem (GDSg *bšt-oy* in Yakob Ĵahkeç'i), cf. also GDSg *p'atap'st-i* in Abusayid (see below) 'urinary bladder; blotch, pustule, abscess; bubble':

'urinary bladder' (Plato); 'blotch, pustule' (Kirakos Ganjakeç'i, 13th cent., Ganjak [Melik'-Ohanĵanyan 1961: 40^{L8}] = Russ. 'прыщ' [Xanlarĵan 1976: 59]; etc.); 'bubble' (Yakob Ĵahkeç'i); **bštīm** 'to swell' in Arak'el Davrižec'i (17th cent., Tabriz); **p'ošt** 'the inner bag of testicles' (LcNiws etc.).

In the 5th century, only in the composite **p'amp'ušt**, **p'amp'ušt** 'urinary bladder' (Eznik Kořbac'i, Anania řirakac'i, etc.), next to which there is a lately attested synonym in numerous spelling variants: **batab/p'ušt**, **p'al'abušt**, **p'al'tap'ušt** 'urinary bladder'. Of this term three attestations are cited in NHB 1: 426c and HAB 1: 485a: Nersēs Palianc', 14th cent. (*batabušt*), "Oskip'orik" (*batap'ušt*), Grigor Tat'ewac'i (*p'alabušt*). Older attestations may be found in Abusayid (12th cent.; Cilicia), see S. Vardanyan 1974: 134^{L18}, 164 (*p'atap'ušt*, GDSg *p'atap'sti*), 205 (*p'alap'ušt*, GDSg *p'alap'ušt*), in the glossary: 230; see also S. Vardanyan 1971: 209. In Grigoris one finds *p'atap'bušt* (see MiřHayBař 2, 1992: 410a).

Still another variant (unknown to NHB and HAB) of the compound is attested in two works of Amirdovlat' Amasiac'i (15th cent.; Amasia): **halabušt**, GDSg *halabšt-i* 'urinary bladder' [MiřHayBař 2, 1992: 5a]. The word is also attested in "Bžřkaran ęntreal tarrakan maxc'i" by Yovasap' Sebastac'i (16th cent., Sebastia): *halabušt*, GDSg *halabšt-i* (see D. M. Karapetyan 1986: 306; in the glossary: 313, marked as "Armenian"). This variant seems thus to be confined to the extreme NW of the Armenian speaking territory (Sebastia, Amasia), which is corroborated by the dialectal testimony from Sebastia (see below).

On **arawušt** 'urinary bladder; watery pustule, blister' see below and s.v.

●**DIAL** Numerous dialects preserve *bušt* 'abscess, swelling' and *bštīm* 'to swell'. T'iflis *bušt* means 'urinary bladder'. Remarkable is Muř *p'alamp'ušt* 'urinary bladder' [HAB 1: 485b]. On Hamřen *pšt-ig* 'abscess' see Ačāryan 1947: 14.

Neither *p'amp'ušt* nor *p'alap'ušt* (etc.) are recorded in dialects. However, Muř *p'alamp'ušt* remarkably combines the features of these synonymical compounds, namely the nasal of the former and the *-la-* of the latter. One also finds Balu *balabušt* [Sargisean 1932: 366].

Among new dialectal words, Ačāryan (HAB 1: 485b) also mentions *alabušt*, not specifying the meaning, the location, the source.

Among new derivatives Ačāryan (HAB 1: 485b) mentions *alabušt* not specifying the meaning, the dialectal area and the component *ala-*. The word must be identified with Sebastia *alabušt*, Ewdokia *alap'ušt* 'a blister caused by burning' (see Gabikēan 1952: 43; HayLezBrbBair 1, 2001: 11b). Note also Sebastia *halabušt* 'urinary bladder' (see Gabikēan 1952: 324) which is totally identic with the above-mentioned literary *halabušt* 'urinary bladder' not only formally and semantically, but also geographically, since *halabušt* is attested in medical literature (15th cent. onwards) by authors that are native of Sebastia and Amasia; see above.

●**ETYM** Arm. *bušt* and *p'amp'ušt* have been compared with Lith. *bum̃buras*, *bum̃bulas* 'Knospe, knotenartige Verdickung, Kugel', *bumbulỹs* 'Steckrübe, Wasserblase, Kalbsauge', *bum̃bulis* 'Pupille', *bũrbulas* 'waterbubble', Latv. *bum̃burs* 'eine harte Hervorragung der Höcker, Auswuchs, Ball', Pol. *bąbel* 'Wasserblase', Gr. **βουμβυλίδας· πομφόλυγας* (Hesychius) 'waterbubbles', Lat. *bullā* 'waterbubble', etc., and, on the other hand, Lith. *pãm̃pti* 'to swell', CS *pup̃* 'navel', SCr. *pūp* 'kidney'; Lat. *pustula* 'blister, pimple, pustule', etc. (see HAB 1: 484; 4: 475; Ĵahukyan 1967: 61, 94, 255-256; 1987: 114, 159). On Baltic see Derksen 1996: 276, 281. These words mainly denote round, globular objects. The exact reconstruction is impossible in view of the expressive and onomatopoeic nature, and perhaps also of reduplication. Arm. *p'amp'ušt* is interpreted as **p'amp' + bušt* (HAB; Saradževa 1986: 134).

According to Ačāryan (HAB 1: 485b), Georg. *bušti* 'urinary bladder; bubble' and Laz *busti* 'urinary bladder' are borrowed from Armenian.

Arm. *arawušt* 'urinary bladder; watery pustule, blister' (q.v.), I think, belongs with *bušt*, with intervocalic *-b-* yielding Arm. *-w-*. The first component is perhaps identic with the prefix *ar-a-*. One alternatively might assume: 1) an old variant with **-r-* as in Lith. *bũrbulas* 'waterbubble'; 2) an Iranian or Caucasian form **arabušt* as a rhotacized variant of Arm. **(h)alabušt*, with **-ara-* > Arm. *-arā-* as in Iranian loans such as *paṛaw* 'old woman' (cf. Pers. *pārāv*), etc. In this case, we might be dealing with a back loan. But this all is uncertain.

Compare also *pt̃p̃jak* 'bubble'.

burgn, GDSg *brgan* (Grigor Narekac'i, "Čarēntir"), API *brguns* (Bible) 'tower; pyramis'.

Bible+.

●**ETYM** For the etymology and discussion see s.v. *durgn* 'potter's wheel'.

***galoroč**

●**DIAL** Sebastia *galoruč* ‘small shell that is used to adorn the horse or mule harness’ [Gabikéan 1952: 131].

●**ETYM** No etymological attempt is known to me.

Probably composed of **gal-* or *galar-* ‘winding, twisting’ + *oroč* ‘shell-bead’ (q.v.): **galar-oroč* > **gal-oroč* (-*ro-ro-* > -*ro-* through haplology). Originally, thus, it had referred to the shell-fish with a spiral shell. See also s.v. *gattakur*.

gatjn ‘a kind of convolvulus’.

Agat’angelos, Yovhan Mandakuni, etc.

●**ETYM** See s.v. *getj* ‘id.’.

gattakur, LocSg *i gattakr-i* in Čarəntir ‘shell-fish’ (Alexander Romance, Gregory of Nyssa, Eusebius of Caesarea, Philo; **gattakray**, AblSg *i gattakray-ē* in Sargis Šnorhali Vardapet (12th cent.), GDPl *gattakray[i]c* ‘in Gregory of Nyssa ‘shell-fish’; **gattakr-akan** ‘pertaining to the shell-fish’ (said of the pearl) in John Chrysostom.

In the oldest manuscript (Nr 10151 of Matenadaran; 13th cent.), which is the initial edition of the Alexander Romance (see H. Simonyan 1989: 426^{L-14}): *berin inj ew erku gattakur, yoroy meĵ lini margaritn* “they also offered me two shell-fish in which the pearl is (produced)”. In the corresponding passage from the other edition (297^{L8}; engl. transl. Wolohojian 1969: 131): APl *gattakurs*.

●**ETYM** According to Ačāryan (HAB 1: 506-507), contains *gaft* ‘hidden, secret’. He does not specify the second component. I think, **kur*, **kray* ‘shell’ is identic with **kray* found in *kray-a-kir* ‘a kind of mollusc’ (Grigor Magistros) etc., and *kray* ‘tortoise’. As to the first component (**ul-d-*, cf. dial. **gl-t-or-em* ‘to roll’, also Germ.), cf. Sebastia *galoruč* ‘small shell that is used to adorn the horse or mule harness’ [Gabikéan 1952: 131], which may have been composed of **gal-* or *galar-* ‘winding, twisting’ (etymologically related with *gil*, **gltoem*) + *oroč* ‘shell-bead’, see s.v. **gal-oroč*. Originally, thus, it referred to the shell-fish with a spiral shell.

gari, *ea*-stem: GDSg *garw-o-y* (or *garoy*, see below), ISg *gare-a-w*, GDPl *gare-a-c* ‘(abundant in the Bible); *o*-stem: ISg *garw-o-v* (once in the Bible), GDPl *garw-o-c* ‘(as a measure, in Anania Širakac’i, 7th cent.) ‘barley’.

Attested in the Bible (see Astuacaturean 1895: 322c; Olsen 1999: 439), Eusebius of Caesarea (*garwoy*), etc.

In Deuteronomy 8.8 (Cox 1981: 112): *erkir c’orenay ew garoy aygeac’ ew nīnēneac’*: γῆ πυροῦ καὶ κριθῆς, ἄμπελοι, συκαῖ, ῥόαι.

●**DIAL** Widespread in dialects [HAB 1: 522b].

Next to the regular Łarabał *kʰari*, one finds *kʰre/i*, with an irregular labial vowel, in the village of Tʼatot [HAB 1: 522b], as well as, according to Davtʼyan (1966: 24, 28, 332), in most of the villages of Hadrutʼ. Not mentioned in Połosyan 1965: 16, in the list of Hadrutʼ words displaying an irregular development *aʼ > ɔ*. The same inexplicable labial vowel is found in Ĵuta *gʼori* [Ačarean 1940: 52, 357b].

●**ETYM** Connected with Gr. *κπιθ-η* f. ‘barley-corns’, usually pl. ‘barley’, from an original root noun **κπιθ* > Ep. *κπι* n. (Awgerean, Klaproth etc., see HAB 1: 522), probably also Alb. *drithë* ‘cereals, wheat’, Lat. *hordeum* ‘barley’, OHG *gersta* ‘barley’ [Bugge 1893: 5; Hübschmann 1897: 432; Frisk 2: 18-19], and Hitt. *karaš* n. ‘wheat, emmer-wheat’ (see Kloekhorst 2007, 1: 515 for references and discussion). The Armenian word is not mentioned in Pokorny 1959: 446 and Mallory/Adams 1997: 51a.

Further, compared with Basque *gari* ‘wheat’, *garagar* ‘barley’ and Georg., Megrel. etc. *kʰeri* ‘barley’, see Bugge 1893: 5; Marr apud HAB 1: 522b; Uhlenbeck 1942: 339 (the Armenian is not mentioned); Ĵahukyan 1987: 598; V. Sargsyan 1988: 70b; Furneʼe 1989: 116-117; Braun 1998: 33, 53, 85, 98. For possibly related North-Caucasian forms see Chirikba 1985: 101-102^{Nr74}.

The Armenian and Greek forms presuppose something like **gʰriV-/gʰrīdʰ-* whereas the rest of cognates are usually derived from **gʰersdʰ-* or **gʰerdʰ-* (see the above references, also Ĵahukyan 1982: 133; 1987: 128, 310; Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 656). Arm. *gari* is explained from the Lindeman variant **gʰriom* [Olsen 1999: 439], through depalatalization **gʰr- > gʰr-* [Gamkrelidze/Ivanov, *ibid.*]. In view of formal difficulties, one may assume a Mediterranean substratum word¹⁰.

garš, *i*-stem: GDPI *garš-i-c* in John Chrysostom ‘abominable’ (Bible+), pl. ‘abominable thing or person’ (Philo, John Chrysostom); **garšim** ‘to abominate, be disgusted’ (Bible+).

●**ETYM** Dervischjan (1877: 78) compares *garšel* ‘horrere’ with *gagaš-* ‘wahnsinnig, geil (Greis)’ and Skt. *harṣ-* ‘sich freuen; geil werden’. Meillet (1894b: 280; 1936: 39-40) accepts this meaning also the Sanskrit by-form *ghṛṣu-* ‘excited’, and adds Lat. *horreo* ‘to bristle; to have a rough appearance; to shiver, tremble; to shudder at’. In 1896: 151, he mentions Lith. *garssus* with a question-mark. Pedersen (1906: 413 = 1982: 191) explains Arm. *-rš-* from **-rṣj-* (: Skt. *hrṣyati*), comparing *tʼarš-* : Skt. *tṛṣyati* (see s.v.). This is accepted by Meillet (1950: 85). See, however, 2.1.12.

¹⁰ According to Ĵahukyan (1987: 310, with references): ‘wanderword’ of Aegean origin.

In view of formal (Arm. *g* instead of *j*) and semantic problems, Hübschmann (1897: 432) considered the connection with the Sanskrit and the Latin as uncertain. Ačaryan (HAB 1: 523b) agrees with this and links these forms with Arm. *jaṛ* 'curved, ugly'. According to Pokorny (1959: 445) these forms belong with Arm. *jar* 'hair', whereas Arm *jaṛ*, though with reservation, is linked with Skt. *hīra-ḥ* m. 'Band', *hīrā* f. 'Ader', Gr. *χορδή* f. 'guts, tripe'. As to *garšim*, Ačaryan (ibid.) accepts the connection with Lith. *garssus* (Meillet; see above) and with Germ *garstig*, suggested by Bugge (1893: 35). The same is seen in Pokorny 1959: 445. For discussion see also Ĵahukyan 1987: 171.

The formal argument against the connection of *garšim* with the Sanskrit and the Latin is not crucial. In Indo-Iranian one finds **j^harš-* and **g^harš-*, probably as resulted from conflation of two roots; cf. Skt. *harṣ-* vs. *ghṛṣ-*; Av. *zarəšiama-* 'excited', Pashto *ziṛ* 'rough, stiff' and Khot. *ysīra-* 'rough' vs. Parth. *gš-* 'to be happy' and Sogd. *wyš* 'to be glad' [Mayrhofer, EWAia 2: 807-808].

The Sanskrit verb (*harṣate*, *hṛṣyati*) displays the following semantic range: 'to be delighted, excited or impatient; to thrill with rapture, rejoice, exult, be glad or pleased; to become erect or stiff or rigid, bristle (said of the hairs of the body etc.); to excite violently', *harṣaṇa* 'causing the hair of the body to stand erect, thrilling with joy or desire; bristling, erection'. In RV 10 it refers to excitement of two kinds, i.e. produced by fear and by lust (see Kulikov 2001: 492).

I conclude that Arm. *jaṛ* and *garšim* are native words originating from conflated **g^hrs-* and **g^{h(w)}rs-*, respectively.

As we have seen, Iranian displays a semantic distribution: **z*-variant: 'rough, stiff' vs. **g*-variant: 'to be glad, happy'. If a reversed distribution, viz. Mİran. **garš-* 'rough, stiff', is also possible, one might treat it as the source of **garš-* seen in the compound *garš-a-par* 'heel' (q.v.).

For ruki-rule in Armenian see 2.1.12.

garšapar, *a*-stem 'heel, footstep'.

Bible+.

●**ETYM** No acceptable etymology is recorded in HAB 1: 524a. But in HAB-Add 1982: 5, the component **par* is taken as a loan from Iranian word for 'foot', and **garš-* is left without an explanation. The same etymology is independently proposed by Perixanjan (1993: 43-45) and Ĵahukyan (1995: 183) who identify **par* with Parth. *pāḍ* 'foot'. For the meaning 'footstep' Ĵahukyan (ibid.) compares Av. *paḍa-* 'footstep'. He leaves the origin of **garš* open.

For the component **garš-* Perixanjan (1993: 43-44) suggests a comparison with Mİran. hypothetical **garš-* 'rough, stiff' on which see s.v. *garš* 'abominable'. The basic meaning of the compound would be, then, "the rough/hard part of the foot".

gelum 'to twist; to squeeze' (Bible+).

In Agat'angelos 69 (1909=1980: 39^{L5}): *gel-oc'* and *gel-aran*, GDPI *gelarana-ac'*, 'rack'; see HAB 1: 530; 2: 404).

In T'ovmay Arcruni /Ananun/ 4.7 (V. M. Vardanyan 1985: 450^{L-16f}): *zi ayr arcāt'asēr orov gelul zparanoc'n lawagoyn hamari, k'an et'ē dang mi tužel yarcāt'oyn*. Thomson (1985: [4.6] 353) translates the passage as follows: "An avaricious man considers it preferable to be decapitated than to pay one penny of his silver as a fine". In published editions the word *orov* (so is in the manuscript) that means 'with/by which' has been replaced by *srov*, as ISg of *sur* 'sword'. Thomson departs apparently from this reading and therefore renders *gelul* as "to decapitate", omitting the word *paranoc* 'neck'. However, the verb *gelum* refers to 'twist, squeeze', and *paranoc* 'neck' should not be left out of consideration. I therefore follow V. Vardanyan's (1985: 451, 528₁₁) translation: "to twist the neck".

●**DIAL** The verb has been preserved in Muš *gelel* 'to press/squeeze something putting it between two hard things', and *gelaran* is found in *gelərnak* (see DialAdd apud NHB 2: 1061b) = *gelaran-ak* (Norayr, = Fr. 'bille'), and Moks *k'ālārān* [HAB 1: 531a].

●**ETYM** Arm. *gelum*, and *g(i)l* 'to roll' (q.v.) are compared with Gr. *ἐλύνω* 'to roll round', *εἰλύνω* 'to enfold, enwrap', 'to press, squeeze', *εἰλῶ* 'to press; to contract his body, draw himself together' (said of a man or animal, e.g. *asp in Ilias 20.278), *εἰλῶμα* 'wrapper', Lat. *volvō* 'to roll, roll over; to cause to roll, wrap up; to turn around', *con-volvō* 'to roll together or round, writhe', *con-volvulus* 'bindweed, convolvulus', etc. [Meillet 1894: 163; Hübschmann 1897: 433, 435; HAB 1: 530-531, 555; Pokorny 1959: 1141]. Lat. *volvō*, as the Armenian and Greek, reflects *e*-grade **uelHu-* [Schrijver 1991: 470]. Note also Gr. *εἰλέω* 'to wind, turn round; to roll up tight; to bind fast', *εἰλεός* m. 'intestinal obstruction; lurking place, den, hole', *ἑλιξ, -κος* f. 'anything which assumes a spiral shape; whirl, convolution; tendril of the vine, or of ivy (a climbing evergreen shrub, *Hedera Helix*); coil of a serpent; convolution of a spiral shell', *ἐλίκη* 'winding; convolution of a spiral shell; of the bowels', in Arcadia: 'crack willow, *Salix fragilis*'.

Arutjunjan (1983: 278, 342₂₃₉) takes Arm. plant-name *gefj* 'bindweed, convolvulus; yew-tree' (q.v.) and Gr. *ἑλιξ, ἐλίκη* as a Greek-Armenian lexical isogloss noting four correspondences: 1) *e*-grade; 2) stem-formant **-i-*; 3) suffixal

guttural; 4) semantics. Clackson (1994: 181) is sceptical since he considers the etymology to be doubtful.

None of the correspondences noticed by Arutjunjan is convincing: 1) the *e*-grade is the basic form of the verb not only in Greek and Armenian but also in other cognates (see HAB, Pokorny); 2) I fail to see a trace of the **i-* in Arm. *geťj*. Arutjunjan (1983: 342₂₃₈) notes that *gayl*, *gayl-uk* 'bindweed' confirms the reflection **li* > Arm. *ť* in *geťj*. However, a trace of **i* in *gayl* would not necessarily imply its presence also in *geťj* since they can be different formations. Besides, and more importantly, *gayl* found in *gayluk* and other plant-names is obviously identic with *gayl* 'wolf' [Ališan 1895: 106-108, Nrs. 409-418; HAB 1: 512a]; 3) the suffixal elements differ; on Arm. *-j-* see below; 4) the verb formed plant names also in other cognate languages (see HAB).

One may, thus, share Clackson's scepticism as far as the idea of the isogloss is concerned. The etymological connection of the words, however, should not be rejected, as long as they belong to the same root 'twisting (plant)'. The Armenian suffix *-j-* (or *-z-*) is found in many plant-names; see 2.3.1. QIE **uel-gʰ-* may be corroborated by the Germanic word for 'willow'; see s.v. *geťj* 'bindweed, convolvulus; yew-tree'.

For *gelumn* = Lat. *volūmen* = Gr. *εἰλῶμα* see Olsen 1999: 595-596.

geť, *o*-stem

'beauty' (Bible+); '(beautiful) appearance, look' in Yovhannēs Drasxanakertē'i (9-10th cent.) and Grigor Narekac'i, as well as in compounds. E.g., in Movsēs Xorenac'i 2.8 (1913=1991: 114^{L12}), *Turk* is described as *xožōr-a-geť*, translated by Thomson (1978: 141) as 'deformed'. Then the historian states that *Turk* was called *Angeteay* because of his great ugliness (*vasn arawel žahadimut'cann*), and from this the name of his family (*Anget tun* 'the house of *Angť*') derives. Movsēs assumes, thus, an appellative *an-geť* 'not beautiful'. Further on this see below.

In Yovhan Mandakuni/Mayragomec'i (5th/7th cent.) [2003: 1164b^{L15f}]: *zvayelč'ut'awn getoyn*.

Movsēs Xorenac'i has another compound (also a hapax): *bare-geť* 'good-looking' (1.12: 41^{L5}).

In Sebēos/Ananun 1 (Abgaryan 1979: 51^{L4f}): *yoyž tǐp'eal ēr i véray anjin ew getoy nora getec'kut'cann* : (literal transl.) "[The queen Šamiram] very much lusted for his [of Aray Getec'ik] person/body and for the look of his handsomeness".

●**ETYM** Ačāryan (HAB 1: 532-533) derives from PIE **uel-* ‘to see’, cf. Lat. *vultus*, *vultus*, *-ūs* m. ‘countenance, facial expression; face; looks, features’, Bret. *guellet* ‘la vue’, etc. See also Olsen 1999: 51.

As we have seen, Thomson (1978: 141₁₇) considers Movsēs’ etymology of *Angeteay* as “fanciful”. However, mythical creatures and giants are often characterized as ‘unshaped, deformed’ or the like, containing the privative prefix *an-*, cf. e.g. s.v. *ard*. The basic meaning of **get* is ‘appearance, shape; seeing’ (cf. PIE ‘to see’), and the interpretation of *Angeteay* as ‘shapeless, deformed’ or ‘not having an appearance’, whether etymological or folk-etymological, is not necessarily a product of Movsēs’ fantasy.

The formation of **an-get* may also be understood as ‘the Un-seen’ (or ‘not-seeng’?); cf. Gr. *’Αἰδής*, etc. For further discussion see s.v. *Angeteay*.

**get-* ‘to sing’: *get-awn* ‘song’ (John Chrysostom); *getgetem* ‘to sing beautifully, quiver, vibrate’ in Hexaameron (said of *čpuin*, next to the participle *getget-eal*, see K. Muradyan 1984: 279, lines 12, 14-15), Severian of Gabala, Vardan Arewelc’i, etc.; participle *getget-eal* in Hexaameron 4, referring to singing and musicians: *jaynk’ ergč’ac’n pēspēs nuagawk’ getgetealk’* (K. Muradyan 1984: 101^{L5f}), other passages - see above, as well as in 132^{L3}. For the passage from P’awstos see below; nouns *getget*, *o*-stem: ISg *getget-o-v* in Canon Law; *getget-an-k’*, *a*-stem: GDP1 *getget-an-a-c’* in John Chrysostom.

A passage from P’awstos Buzand 4.15 (1883=1984: 103^{L18f}; transl. Garsoïan 1989: 144), not cited in NHB and HAB: *jayniwk’n mrmnjoc’n i veray spaneloyñ i meč’ kocoyñ barbarēin getgeteal xandatut’eamb*: “They sang with moaning voices in the midst of their laments, quavering with compassion over the victim”.

●**ETYM** Ačāryan (HAB 1: 534) derives from PIE **g^hel-* comparing with OIc. *gala* ‘to call, sing’, OHG *galan* ‘to sing’, *naht-gala* ‘nightingale’, etc. Accepted in Jahukyan 1982: 172; 1987: 127. On the other hand, the Armenian word has been considered a Hittite loan, cf. *galgal-ināi-* ‘to make a musical sound’ (see Greppin 1981b: 8, with refer.).

Native origin seems more likely. The absence of palatalization may be due to onomatopoeic nature of the word; cf. *gl-gl-*. See 2.1.14.

getj ‘bindweed, convolvulus; yew-tree’

Attested in Nahum 1.10 rendering *σμίλαξ* ‘yew, or bindweed, or holm-oak’, and in Book of Chries. According to Béguinot/Diratzouyan 1912: *getj* ‘convolvulus’ (81,

Nrs. 385-386), *getj-i* 'yew-tree, *Taxus baccata* L.' (30^{Nr15}), *getj barjrajig* 'Smilax excelsa L.' (34^{Nr55}).

●**ETYM** From PArm. **gel-* 'to twist; to squeeze' (q.v.) < PIE **uel-* 'to twist, wind, turn', cf. Lat. *con-volvulus* 'bindweed, convolvulus' etc. [Hübschmann 1897: 433]; also Arm. *gafjn* 'id.'; see s.v., and HAB 1: 505-506, 534b. On the semantics see V. Arak'elyan 1984a: 146-147. For the discussion, in particular on *-j-* see s.v. *gelum* 'to twist'. QIE **uel-g⁷*- may be corroborated by the Germanic word for 'willow': MDutch *wilghe* (13th cent.), Dutch *wilg*, OLG *wilgia*, OEngl. *welig*, NEngl. *willow*, etc., derived from the same root **uel-* 'to twist, wind, turn' (see Vries/Tollenaere 1993: 430a).

getj-k 'glands'.

Attested only in Gregory of Nyssa (twice).

●**ETYM** Connected with Slav. **želza* 'gland' and Lith. *gẽležuonys* 'submaxillary gland' (Bugge 1892: 448-449; 1893: 5-6; Hübschmann 1897: 433; 1899: 45; HAB 1: 535ab; Saradževa 1986: 132-133; Ĵahukyan 1987: 127). Meillet (1900: 392-393) points out that this etymology is impeccable both semantically and phonologically except for the absence of the palatalization of the initial guttural. Then he adds that any such correspondence that involves only two cognate languages cannot be considered as certain. Later (1905-06: 243-245) he explains the phonological problem by dissimilation of the two palatalized occlusives (for other examples and references see 2.1.14).

Sometimes connected with *getj* 'strong desire' and *gel-* 'to twist; to squeeze' (see Bugge 1893: 6; Hübschmann 1897: 433; 1899: 45; HAB 1: 534b); see s.v.v. Against the connection with *getj-k* 'glands': Arutjunjan (1983: 342₂₃₉).

get, *o*-stem 'river'.

Bible+.

For *getoray* 'rivers' (only in Sokr*, 696 AD <<but I also find *getorayk*' in PtmAlek's [Simonyan 1989: 475] {{G bnagir}}) see below. See also s.v. *getar*.

●**ETYM** From PIE **wed-os-* n. 'water': Gr. *ὕδωρ* n. 'water', cf. Skt. *utsa-* m. 'spring, fountain' (RV+) < **ud-s-o-* [Meillet 1894: 154; 1936: 74; Frisk 2: 958-959; Ĵahukyan 1959: 232; 1982: 130; Tumanjan 1978: 64, 159, 334; Euler 1979: 210; Olsen 1999: 45-46]. With relation to the stem-formation of the Armenian, Phryg. *βεδν* (see Ĵahukyan 1982: 223₆₉; cf. Tumanjan 1978: 170-171; Saradževa 1986: 27, 357₅₀) seems irrelevant to me. As to the *e*-grade, cf. also CLuv. adj. *uida(i)-* 'nat' [Starke 1990: 567-568]; etc. (see below).

The PIE root is mainly represented in heteroclitic **uod-r*, GSg **ued-n-s*. Hitt. *uātār/ūeten-* n. [Starke 1990: 565-568], Gr. *ὕδωρ -ατος*, etc. In this respect Arm. *getoray*, though a hapax, seems interesting to me since, if from **ued-or-eh₂-*, it can shed some light upon the origin of Arm. coll. *-oray(-k')* (q.v.).

getar(u), GDSg *getar-i*, *getaru-i* 'river-bed; river-shore; outbranching river'.

Not in NHB. Ačāryan (HAB 1: 537) only cites Step'anos Orbelean 42 (1250/60-1304): *i Halēic' getar'in*. Amatuni (1912: 129a) translates *getar* as 'the former river-bed which is ploughed', which coincides with his record for the dialects of Muš and Ošakan. This is accepted by Ačāryan (HAB 1: 537). Elsewhere, Ačāryan records other semantic nuances in Ararat (and Juṭa); see below. "Arjein baṛaran" interprets as *get-ezr* 'river-shore'. This agrees with the testimony from the dialects of Ararat and Meṭri (see below). A. A. Abrahamyan (1986: 211) translates as *jor-a-hovit* 'ravine-valley'.

In "Baṛgirk' hayoc'" (Amalyan 1975: 183^{Nr222}), *getar* glosses the otherwise unattested word *hawari* (vars. *hawar*, *hawari*, *hawareli*; see 396²²²). Here, Ačāryan (HAB 3: 69a) points out that in the dialects of Ararat and Juṭa *getar* means 'a mother river of which a brook/rivulet branches out'.

The earliest attestation of the word (not mentioned in NHB and HAB; see L. Hovhannisyan 1990a: 156) is found in Łazar P'arpec'i (5th cent.) 3.82 (1904=1985: 150¹⁹; transl. Thomson 1991: 209): *karcēr i tefisn urek' anyayts getaruin* (var. *getar*) *t'ak'č'el* - "he planned to hide in some concealed spot beside the river". B. Ulubabyan (1982: 365) renders by ModArm. *get-a-vtak* 'tributary of a river'.

There are several place-names (one of them being attested in Ptolemy as *Γαιτάρρα*) which obviously contain this word; see s.v. *Getar(u)*.

● **DIAL** Ararat *getar* 'river-shore' [Ačārean 1913: 224a]; Meṭri *getainə* 'river-shore' (see Ačāryan 1954: 293, in the glossary of purely dialectal words); Muš, Ošakan *getar* 'the former river-bed which is ploughed'; Ararat and Juṭa *getar* 'a mother river of which a brook/rivulet branches out' (see above).

Both literary (since Łazar P'arpec'i, 5th cent.) and dialectal attestations are confined to the eastern area. Thus, we may be dealing with a word dialectally restricted to Eastern Armenia since the 5th century.

In DialAdd apud NHB (2: 1061b) one finds *getril*, *getaril*, a verb that refers to darkening or confusion of eyes when one crosses a river. The *-ar-* here is different from that found in *get-ar* and probably derives from *ainum* 'to take', as is suggested in NHB (*ainul getoy zač's*).

●**ETYM** There can be no doubt that *getar* derives from *get* 'river' (q.v.). Ačāryan (HAB 1: 537) does not specify the component *-ar*. All the meanings can theoretically presuppose a basic semantics 'to flow, stream'. A river-bed is the bed or channel in which a river flows; a river-shore is the land that is watered by the river; an outbranching "mother-river" is a river that makes flow a rivulet from itself. The component *-ar* can be derived from PIE **sr(o)u-* 'to stream, flow', cf. Skt. *srav-* 'to stream, flow', Russ. *strujá* 'stream', Lith. *sraujá*, Latv. *strauja* 'stream', etc. In this case, it is identic with Arm. *arū* 'brook, tributary; channel; ditch, trench, furrow, passage' (q.v.). The fact that in the oldest attestation we find *getarū*, with final *u-*, makes the connection even more transparent. The semantic development 'to stream, flow' > 'irrigated, watered land' is also seen in Russ. *ostrov* 'island' from the same PIE **sr(o)u-*.

The ORuss. river-name *Дѣнѣстръ* (cf. *Δάναστρις* etc.) has been interpreted as of Iranian origin, containing the word for 'river', cf. Avest. *dānu-* f. 'river, stream', Oss. *don* 'river; water' [Abaev 1949: 162; Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 671]. I wonder if the second component can be identified with PIE **sr(o)u-*. In this case, the pattern (with the etymologically identic second component) would be comparable to that of PArm. **wed(V)-sru-*.

The word *haw-ar-i* which is represented in "Bağirk' hayoc'" as synonymous to *getar* (see above) seems to follow the same pattern, with the same **ar*. I hypothetically suggest to derive the first component **haw* from PIE **h₂ep-* 'river, water': Luw. *hāpa/i-* 'river', Skt. *āp-* 'water' (cf. *dvīpā-* 'island, island in a river, sandbank' (RV+) < **dui-h₂p-o-*, lit. 'having water on two sides'), Toch. AB *āp* f. 'water, river, stream', etc.

Note also *kawar* 'brook, canal' (Cyril of Alexandria; several dialects [HAB 2: 561b]), if composed of *kaw* (= the word for 'clay'?) and **ar-*.

geran, *a*-stem (later: ISg *geran-i-w*) 'beam, log' (Bible), 'a kind of meteorological phenomenon' (Philo+). For the latter meaning Ačāryan (HAB 1: 540a) only cites Philo, but it seems to be present also in two other later attestations cited in NHB (1: 545b) without semantic specification: *du geraniwd kurac'eal es* 'you have become blind by that *geran*' (Yovhannēs Erznkac'i); *ibrew zgeran hretēn* 'like a fiery *geran*' (Vardan Arewelc'i). For the semantic shift cf. *hecan* 'log, beam', later 'a kind of meteorological phenomenon'; note the same ending *-an*.

●**DIAL** Widespread in dialects.

●**ETYM** Lidén (1905/06: 485-487) connects with Celt. **vernā-* (cf. Bret. f. *gwern* 'mast; alder', Mlr. *fern* 'alder', Nlr. *fearn* 'mast; alder', etc.) and Alb. *verrë* f. (<

**uērnā-* ‘white poplar’. Petersson (1916: 290-291) connects with *geran-di* ‘scythe; sickle’ and derives the words from PIE **uer-* ‘krümmen’; see also s.v. *gerandi*.

The etymology of *Lidén* is commonly accepted; see HAB 1: 540a; Pokorny 1959: 1169; Ĵahukyan 1987: 156; Olsen 1999: 297. In order to explain the Armenian *-a-*, unclear forms are restored: **uer-ḡnā-*, **uērnā-*. Probably reshaped under the influence of the suffix *-an* (on which see Ĵahukyan 1998: 11-12; Olsen 1999: 287-301).

gerandi, *a*-stem (ISg *gerandeaw* in Łazar P’arpec’i /5th cent./) ‘scythe; sickle’.

Bible+. Yovhannēs Drasxanakerc’i (9-10th cent.) has IPl *gerandiwk’* (1912=1980: 310^{L-5}), which formally presupposes NSg **gerand* (*i*-stem), but is probably a contracted form of **gerandeaw-k’*. Note that the *-i* form is attested by the same author (223^{L-10}).

●**DIAL** Widespread in dialects: Hamšen, Axalc’xa, Muš, Van, Salmast, Łarabał, etc. [HAB 1: 540b].

According to Bałramyan (1961: 177b), Kırzen *k’ārānt’i* is a back loan from Azerbaijani. Similar explanations can be offered for some other forms below. For back loans see 1.10.

Hamšen has *gerāndi* and *k’erēndi*. On the former see 1.5, and the latter (that is, the variant with an initial aspirated *k’*-) can be compared with Laz *k’erēndi*, which is considered to be an Armenian loan [HAB 1: 540b].

Łarabał has *k’ārāndi* and *kerāndu*, with a final *-u* [Davt’yan 1966: 333]; according to Ačāryan (HAB 1: 540b): *kerāndú*. Compare Ĭjewan/Šamšadin *mārāndu* vs. Arm. dial. *mārāndi* ‘the biggest kind of sickle’ (see below). The *-u* may be analogical after the oblique stem, cf. the case of *agi* ‘tail’ in Łarabał (see s.v.).

●**SEMANTICS** Originally, *gerandi* probably referred to a cutting, mowing implement in general, either a sickle or scythe. Later, the semantics became specific: ‘scythe’, as opposed to *mangāt* ‘sickle’. This specification is seen already in the 5th century, cf. Łazar P’arpec’i 88 (1904=1985: 159^{L8f}): *mangataw ew gerandeaw zxot harkanic’en*. In dialects, *gerandi* always refers to the scythe (see Bdoyan 1972: 364-368).

●**ETYM** NHB (1: 545c) suggests a derivation from *geran* ‘beam’. The same idea has been developed by Petersson (1916: 290-291) who assumes a basic meaning ‘krumm’ and derives the words from PIE **uer-* ‘krümmen’. Ačāryan (HAB 1: 540b) does not accept these and other etymologies and leaves the origin of *gerandi* open. Ĵahukyan (1987: 156) does not mention *gerandi* next to *geran*, and takes *gerandi* as of unknown origin (1990: 72, sem. field 8).

Olsen (1999: 439) compares with Gr. *χεράς, χέραδος* n. 'Geröll, Kies, Geschiebe' (in Liddell/Scott/Jones 'silt, gravel, and rubbish, brought down by torrents') and restores **g^herēt-iom* for Armenian, assuming "a substantivized adjective of material". This etymology is semantically improbable. Also the absence of palatalization of the velar is problematic (cf. 2.1.14).

In my view, the derivation of *gerandi* 'scythe; sickle' from *geran* 'beam, log' is plausible. Similarly, *hecanoc* 'a kind of winnowing-fan' (Bible+), which has no acceptable etymology in HAB 3: 76a, may be derived from *hecan* 'log, beam; a kind of meteorological phenomenon' (with the ending *-an* as in *geran*), as is suggested by Jahukyan (1979: 27-28).

As for the second component *-di*, I suggest a comparison with Ilr. **daH-* 'to mow, cut off' (presumably from PIE **deh₁-*): Skt. *dā-* 'to mow, cut off', *dātra-* n. 'scythe, sickle' (RV+), Bengali *dā* 'sickle', Pahl., NPers. *dās* 'sickle' (< SWIran **dāça-* < Iran **dāθra-*), Parači *dēš* 'sickle' (< Iran **dāθrī-*), etc.; see Mayrhofer, EWAia 1: 716; ÈtimSlovIranJaz 2, 2003: 438-441. A PIE **deh₁-V-* would yield Arm. **ti-V-* > **ti*. The Ilran. root may be identical with Skt. *dā-* 'to divide, to distribute, to cut' [Kulikov 2001: 494-503]. In this case, the words are ultimately related with PIE **d(e)h₂-i-*: Gr. *δαίωμα*, Skt. *dāyate* 'divide', OE *tīma*, OIc. *tīme* 'hour, time', Arm. *ti* 'old age, time', etc. In PArm. **geran-ti-*, *-t-* may have become voiced due to the preceding nasal, cf. *ank-/ang-* 'to fall'.

Alternatively, one might suggest an Iranian loan: **dāθrī-* 'sickle' > **da(h)i* : **geran-da(h)i* > *gerandi*. But this is less probable.

The basic meaning of Arm. *geran-di* would be, thus, 'log/stick-sickle', that is 'a mowing implement with wooden handle'.

The word *gerandi* is reminiscent of a rhyming synonymical word in Arm. dialects, *mārāndi* 'the biggest kind of sickle' (Iġewan and Šamšadin *mārāndu*), which is considered to have been introduced by Persian Armenians (see Bdoyan 1972: 348b₂₁, 352, 356-357, 367a).

gerdastan, *a*-stem 'body of servants and captives' (Luke 12.42; John Chrysostom), 'possessions' (Cyril of Jerusalem), 'estate, landed property' (Yovhannēs Drasxanakertc'i); **gerdast-akan**, **gerdastan-ik** 'servant, female servant' (John Chrysostom). Ačāryan (HAB 1: 541a) records EArm. **gerdastun** and explains its vocalism by folk-etymological reshaping as if composed of *tun* 'house'.

In Luke 12.42 the word renders Gr. *θεραπεία* (in coll. sense) 'body of attendants, retinue': *i veray gerdastani iwroy: ēpī tēs therapείας* (Nestle/Aland 203).

●**DIAL** Alaškert, Axalc'xa *g'erd'astan*, etc.; according to Ačāryan (HAB 1: 542a), from the literary language.

●**ETYM** Ačāryan (HAB 1: 541) derives from PIE **gʰerdʰ-*: Skt. *gr̥há-* m. 'house, residence' (RV+), YAv. *gərəda-* m. 'house of daēvic beings', Goth. *gards* m. 'house, housekeeping', etc. As he points out, the absence of palatalization of the initial guttural is problematic (on this see 2.1.14), and *-stan* (of Iranian origin) is also found with native roots, cf. *and* 'cornfield' : *and-astan*, etc.

It has been assumed that Arm. *gerd-astan* derives from the same PIE word but via Iranian intermediation [Brandenstein/Mayrhofer 1964: 120; Nyberg 1974: 80; Ĵahukyan 1987: 171, 272, 520; Olsen 1999: 333, 333₂₉₀]. For the semantic development 'house, household, estate' > 'servant' cf. especially OPers. **garda-* 'Diener, Hausgesinde, οἰκέτης', Pahl. *gāl* [g'l] coll. 'the gang, the villeins labouring on the estates of the kings, the satraps, the magnates, etc.'; see s.v. *aṭaxin* 'female servant'.

geĵ, *o*-stem adj. 'moist; lascivious', subst. 'moisture' (LocSg *i giĵ-i*). In the verb *giĵanam* and in the compound *giĵ-akn(-cay)* refers to eye-pus.

Bible+.

In Movsēs Xorenac'i 2.6 (1913=1991: 108^{L5}; transl. Thomson 1978: 135): *i giĵin ew i maraxlut tetis mayreac' ew i lōrawēts* "to the wet and foggy regions of forests and moss".

●**DIAL** Muš, Bulanəx, T'iflis, Łarabał, Moks, Hačən: 'moist'. Łazax *geĵ* means 'very dirty', and Xian *geĵiril* 'to mould' [Ačārean 1913: 227b; HAB 1: 551a].

●**ETYM** From QIE **gʷʰe/oidʰ-io-*, cf. Russ. *židkij*, SCr. *židak*, etc. 'liquid, watery' [Lidén 1906: 74-75; HAB 1: 551a; Ĵahukyan 1982: 62; 1987: 128]. The connection with Gr. *δεῖσα* f. 'slime, filth' is phonologically problematic and is therefore disputed (cf. Frisk s.v.; Ĵahukyan 1987: 172). Pokorny (1959: 469) and Adams (apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 490a) do not mention the Armenian form next to the Greek, Slavic and Germanic cognates. A completely different etymology is offered by Woodhouse (1994), see s.v. *erkir* 'earth'. Note also Russ. *žiza* < **židjā*, as well as several dialectal forms with the root *žid-* referring, as the Armenian cognate, to dirtiness; see SloVRusNarGov 9, 1972: 168-169. I wonder if Russ. dial. *židi* pl. 'forest demons; heretics' (ibid. 169a) is related. too. The basic meaning is, thus, 'liquid; (liquid) dirtiness; moral dirtiness'.

For the Armenian word usually an *e*-grade is restored, see Ĵahukyan 1975: 39; 1982: 62; 1987: 128; Kortlandt 1994: 27 = 2003: 104; Olsen 1999: 811. An *o*-grade (see HAB) would better explain the absence of palatalization of the initial guttural,

unless one assumes dissimilation as in *geŋj-k* ‘glands’, *ak’is* ‘weasel’, *keč’i* ‘birch’ (see 2.1.14), which seems plausible.

Armenian **žiz-* in *žžak* (T’ovmay Arcruni 1.3 - 9-10th cent.), *žžmak*, *ž(i)žmunk*; **žžuank* ‘insects, worms; hallucination, mirage; nightmare’ and *žži* ‘dragon-fly’ is considered to have onomatopoeic origin by Ačāryan (HAB 2: 229-230). I tentatively propose an alternative etymology. If *gēj* indeed reflects an *o*-grade, one may assume that **žiz-* is related and goes back to **g^{wh}(e)idⁱ-i(e)h₂-*. For the *ž* cf. *iž* ‘viper’ etc. (see s.v. and 2.1.2). Note also the semantic field discussed in 3.5.2 (**čipi*, *čpuir* ‘eye-pus’: *čpuir* ‘dragon-fly’, etc.),

gil, *a*-stem: IPI *gl-a-w-k* in Yovhan Mamikonean; API *gil-s* in 1 Maccabaeorum 2.36 ‘stone for throwing’; ***gil*** ‘rolling’ (Grigor Narekac’i etc.); ***glem***, ***gl-or-em*** ‘to roll, stumble’ (Bible+); ***gayt’-a-gt-im*** ‘to roll, fall down; to err’ (Bible+); ***gl-an*** ‘cylinder’ (Aristotle). Also ***get-a-hmay-k*** ‘a kind of sorcery’, attested in Yovhan Mandakuni/Mayragomec’i (5th/7th cent.), is considered to belong here, as a sorcery by throwing stone/dice. The word is usually represented as *gitahmay-k*, with *-i-* [NHB 1: 552a; HAB 1: 555a; A. Petrosjan 1987: 57]. The actual form is, however, *getahmay-s*, as in NHB 2: 475b, s.v. *šēŋjxtirk*, as well as in the recent edition (2003: 1264a^{L-16}).

In “Baŋgirk” hayoc’ (Amalyan 1975: 66^{Nr179}): *gil* *virg.* Amalyan (op. cit. 357¹⁷⁹) notes that the gloss is found in this form in a number of old manuscripts.

●**DIAL** The verb *glor-* ‘to roll’ is widespread in dialects. In some of them (Polis, Rodost’o, Aslanbek, Xarberd, Zeyt’un, Salmast) one finds an epenthetic *-d-*, **gl-d-or-* from **gl-t-or-* [HAB 1: 555a, 556a]. Note also Łarabał **gl-an* ‘a wooden cylinder for transporting stones by rolling upon it’, Hamšen **gl-il* ‘to glide’ [HAB 1: 556a]. For the latter cf. *gayt’-a-gt-im* ‘to roll, fall down; to err’ (Bible+).

Ačāryan (HAB 1: 556a), with reservation, mentions also Van **gil* ‘a kind of soft stone’. (Ačāryan 1952: 253 vacat). Note also Kŕzen *g^vil* ‘a stone to wash with’ [Baŋramyan 1961: 177b], Areš *gil* ‘id.’ [Lusenc’ 1982: 202a], both represented as from ClArm. *gil*. Ačāryan (HAB 1: 556a) alternatively compares with Pers. *gil* ‘clay’. This is more probable since V. Ananyan (1978: 105; 1984: 447-448, 456, 463), native of Dilijan region, repeatedly and thoroughly describes *gil* as a sticky, clayey substance which serves as soap.

●**ETYM** Probably belongs with *gelum* ‘to twist etc.’ (q.v.); for the semantics cf. Russ. *valun* ‘boulder’ [Hübschmann 1897: 435; HAB 1: 555]. Olsen (1999: 954, 954₃₈) is sceptical concerning the derivation of *gil* (1 Macc. 2.36 -s) ‘stone for throwing’ from

the root for 'roll' and takes as an isolated word of unknown origin. I see no solid reason for this.

According to M. Muradyan (1975: 57), the root is also seen in *əngtayk* (q.v.), which is improbable. A. Petrosjan (1987: 57) mentions *getahmay-k* as belonging to the root **uel-* to which he ascribes an exaggerated value.

gišer 'night' (Bible+). For parallelism of *o-* and *a-*stems see below. Genitive *gišer-oy* vs. Locative *gišer-i* [Clackson 1994: 63; Olsen 1999: 179]; adverb *gišer-i* 'in the night' [Olsen 1999: 179₃₃₁].

●DIAL Widespread.

Metri *k'šan-raku* 'morning-evening', *k'šan-k'serav* 'early morning', *k'šanə*, *k'šanac* 'in the morning' [Aṭayan 1954: 335-336], practically the same in Karčewan [H. Muradyan 1960: 234a], Kak'avaberd *k'išanac* 'in the morning' [H. Muradyan 1967: 208b].

●ETYM Connected with Gr. *ἔσπερος* m. 'evening; evening-star, Venus; of or at evening; western', *ἑσπέρα*, Ion. *-ρη* f. 'evening; the Western Empire', Lat. *vesper*, *-eris*, *-erī* 'evening; evening-star; west', *vesper-e*, *vesper-ī* 'in the evening', *vespera* f. 'evening', Lith. *vākara* m. 'evening', OCS *večerъ*, etc. [Klaproth 1831: 99a (*kšer*); Hübschmann 1897: 435; HAB 1: 559-560; Mladenov 1937: 99].

It has been assumed that Welsh *ucher* derives from **woiksero-*, which, as far as the **s-* is concerned, is compared to BSL. **veskeras*, reconstructed as such in view of Bulg. dial. (Vinga) *uščer* (see Loewenthal 1928, with refer.). According to Winter (1966: 207), precisely the same source form can be reconstructed for Arm. *gišer*. However, Schrijver (1995: 159-160) restores **ue(k)speros* for Welsh etc. and shows that there is no solid evidence for **-i-* apart from Arm. *gišer*. The Armenian vocalism can be explained through the secondary development **geš-* > **geiš-* (see Beekes 2003: 203). The vocalic development *e* > *i* has been explained by the following palatal *š*, see 2.1.2. However, the *š* remains unexplained. Earlier Beekes (2000: 24, 27) mentioned the irregular correspondence **-sp-* : **-k-* and derived Arm. *gišer* from **ue/oik-* (with a question-mark).

One also assumes **-ksp-* > **-kš(p)-* comparing with *veštasan* 'sixteen' [Normier 1981: 23-24₁₇; Beekes 2003: 201]. However, this would result in Arm. *-šp-*, as the very same *veštasan* shows; see 2.1.12. I therefore assume **ueksepero-* through contamination with **ksep-r/n-* 'night' (cf. YAv. **xšapar-*, *xšafn-*, Skt. *kṣāp-* f., Hitt. *ispant-* 'night', etc.), thus: **ueksepero-* > PArm. **we(k)še(w)ero-* > **geišero-* > *gišer*.

The postulation of a compound (see Olsen 1999: 179₃₃₂ with ref.) comprising **ueik/g-* ‘Wechsel, unit of time’ and **ksperos* ‘night’ is improbable. Against the **-i-* see above.

The parallelism of *o-* and *a-* stems of *gišer* is comparable with that of Gr. *ἔσπερος* : *ἑσπέρα* and Lat. *vesper* : *vespera* [Olsen 1999: 179]¹¹.

giwt, *j/i*-stem [see below] ‘village’.

Widely represented in all the stages of Armenian.

Much has been written about the anomalous paradigm and the variety of the spellings (*giwt*, *gewt*, *geawt*, *geōt*, *gut*, *geṭ*) of the word; cf. A. A. Abrahamyan 1976: 57; Schmitt 1981: 95, 108; Ĵahukyan 1982: 96, 118, 119; L. Hovhannisyan 1991: 16-17; etc. In general, I accept the paradigm restored by V. Arakelyan (1984: 25-26) based on solid textual evidence (cf. also Meillet 1913: 58; Olsen 1999: 172): NSg *ge(a)wt*, GSg *geṭj*, GDPl *giwtic*’, though I do not agree with his diachronic interpretation of *-e-* in *geṭj* and *-iw-* in *giwtic*’ directly from the *-eaw-* of the nominative form, as well as with **gewet-j* > *geṭj* suggested by Ačaryan (HAB 4: 628a) and Ĵahukyan (1982: 119), and *gewt* > *geṭ* assumed by S. Avagyan and H. Muradyan (see below).

The *-a-* of *geawt* must be of secondary (phonetic or orthographic?) origin, as is clear from another similar case, namely IE **septm̥* > *e(a)wt’n* ‘seven’ (q.v.), so the idea of H. Muradyan (1982: 149) about the sound shift *-eaw-* > *-ew-* in pretonic position is not relevant here. One should perhaps assume that *geawt/geōt* is merely a spelling variant of what was pronounced as */gūt/*. A question arises, however, why all the dialectal forms derive from *geṭ*, whereas in the case of the word for ‘seven’, *eawt’n* seems to be exclusively the only form present in dialects. The reason for this may be, as we shall see, that the *-w-* in *gewt* did not originally belong to the etymon.

I agree with V. Arak’elyan in that *giwt* is analogical after GDPl *giwtic*’. According to Astuacaturean (1895: 332), the latter is attested in the Bible four times rather than thrice, as Arak’elyan says, though in the fourth attestation, namely Acts 4.34, one finds *gewtic*’ cited in NHB 1: 559a. It is important to note that, except for this ambiguous case, **gewtic*’ is not attested in the Bible, so *giwtic*’ seems to be the actual Classical form for GDPl. The pair *gewt* : *giwtic*’ leads to an opposition

¹¹ Does Georg. *gušin* ‘yesterday’ have an etymology? Perhaps from PArm. loc. **wiš-én-l?* Compare Metri *k’san-*, from **wiš-*, cf. *aygu-an*, unless an allegro-form from **gišer-han-*.

-*ew*/-*iw*-(*ʿ*) on which see Meillet 1913: 17-18; Weitenberg 1993a: 67. Compare e.g. *arēwc* vs. oblique *ariwc*- 'lion'. See also s.v. *ewt* 'oil'. If GDPl *getic* is reliable (see below), it could have been older than *giwtic*: *getic* > **gewtic* (analogically after NSg *ge(a)wt* > *giwtic*).

It is commonplace to treat *geṭ* as dialectal. However, in NHB 1: 534c one finds a special entry *geṭ*, with six attestations (*gets*, *getic*ʿ, *getiwk*ʿ, etc.), two of them already from the Classical period (Eḥišē and Eusebius of Caesarea). I wonder why these data are neglected; are the readings not reliable? Besides, according to Astuacaturean (1895: 332a), *geṭ* is found twice in the Bible, namely in Nehemiah 6.2 (*i geṭ*) and Mark 11.2 (*i geṭ-d*). V. Arakʿelyan (1984: 26) notes this, not specifying the locations, and states that this *geṭ* is dialectal. The latter attestation seems to have a reading variant *i geawṭ-d*, see NHB 1: 559a, where, moreover, Luke 13.22 is cited too, with variants *and gets*/ *gewṭs*/ *geawṭs*.

More examples can be added. Movsēs Xorenacʿi 2.57 (1913=1991: 187) has IPl *getiwk*ʿ, next to GDPl *giwtic*ʿ (2.56: 186) and nom/loc. *geōṭ* = *geawṭ* (*i geōṭn Tʿordan* "in the village of Tʿordan", in 3.11: 269^{L15}). IPl *geṭ-i-w-k*ʿ is also attested in Eḥišē (1989: 138^{L4}). In the oldest manuscript (Nr 10151 of Matenadaran; 13th cent.) of the Alexander Romance, which is the initial edition, one finds NPl *geawṭ-k*ʿ and IPl *geṭ-iw-k* in one and the same sentence (see H. Simonyan 1989: 384). For the description of this important, hitherto unpublished manuscript see op. cit. 14-16, 49-50. In the Alexander Romance one also finds examples for the opposition between *ge(a)wt* and *giwtic*ʿ (H. Simonyan 1989: 126, 128).

Note also some derivatives:

*getakʿatak*ʿ: *κωμόπολις* (Mark 1.38); *kʿatakʿaget-j*ʿ (GSg), composed of the same components as the previous compound, but with the opposite order: *ew anun kʿatakʿagetjn kočʿečaw Tʿəmnis* "and the name of the *κωμόπολις* was called Tʿəmnis" (in "Patmutʿiwn srbočʿ Hripʿsimeancʿ"; see MovsXorenMaten 1843: 300); *getastaneayk*ʿ (Movsēs Kaṭankatuacʿi); *geṭōrēk*ʿ (Mxitʿar Goš, Law Code, 12th cent.; cf. dial. (Goris) *kʿūt-ar-ank*ʿ etc.; see below). A number of derivatives with *geṭ* is found in MArm; see MjḥHayBaṛ 1, 1987: 141-143.

*geṭ-a-bnak*ʿ 'villager', lit. 'dwelling in a village' (Paterica 19).

I shall try to bring these data into a coherent set after the etymological discussion.

● **DIAL** Dialectally ubiquitous. Remarkably, almost all the forms (including also, I think, Tpʿtis *giṭ* and Tigranakert *kʿiṭ*) derive from *geṭ*, showing no traces of the *-w-*. Svedia *gʿiṭ* (or *kiṭ*), too, represents *geṭ*, since *giwt* would not develop into **giṭ*, cf. *čiwṭ* 'branch' > *jeuṭ*, *šiwṭ* > *šeṭ* (note also *iwt* 'oil' > *iṭ*, q.v.) [Ačarʿyan 2003: 399; Andreasyan 1967: 26, 32, 357a]. The form **gūt* is found only in some extreme

eastern dialects: Goris *k'ūt*, *k'ūtaran* (see Margaryan 1975: 320a), Areš *gyutarank* [Lusenc' 1982: 202a], Šamaxi *k'ūt* [Bałramyan 1964: 192]. According to S. A. Avagyan (1973: 201), *gut* is present also in Ĭjewan-Šamšadin, though for this subdialect Mežunc' (1989: 186a) has only *k'et*. In Ĭarabał, Hadrut', and Šatax, *giwt* has been replaced by *šen*, whereas Č'aylu, Marała and Mehtišen have *k'et* [Davt'yan 1966: 335]. See also s.v. *gut*. Goris *k'ūtaran* seems to be a collective form (cf. *getōrēk* above).

The variant *get*, attested in inscriptions since the late 10th century (also in the Classical literature; see above), is considered a secondary development from *gewt* due to simplification of the diphthong *ew* or the triphthong *eaw* [S. A. Avagyan 1973: 203-204; H. Muradyan 1972: 106-107; 1982: 148-149, 193-196]. This is not satisfactory since the complete loss of the labial element of the diphthong is irregular; cf. H. Muradyan 1982: 187f; Haneyan 1985; see also HAB s.v.v. *e'iw* (q.v.), *č'iw*, *hiwt* and *xut*.

In Zeyt'un, the classical AblSg *i getjē* has been preserved as *g'etj'en* [Ač'aryan 2003: 190].

●**ETYM** Since Gosche (1847: 64₉₈), Dervischjan (1877: 65^{Nr62}), and others (see HAB 1: 563), *giwt* has been repeatedly connected with the words going back to PIE **u(e/o)ik-*: Skt. *vís-* f. 'settlement, dwelling-place, community, tribe', OCS *vъsъ* f. 'village, terrain', Lat. *vīcus* 'village; district of Rome; street' (from **uoiċ-*; see Schrijver 1991: 471), and especially *vīlla* 'rural dwelling with associated farm buildings'. It is not certain whether Lat. *vīlla* reflects **ueik-s-leh₂-* (cf. Goth. *weihs*, *s*-stem neuter 'village') or **ueik-s-leh₂-* [Casaretto 2000: 222-223]. See also s.v. place-name *Gis*.

Ač'aryan (HAB 1: 563; cf. also Saradževa 1986: 400₁₁₉) rejects the etymology without any comments and leaves the origin of the word open. Tumanjan (1978: 295) states that the IE origin of the word is dubious.

Ĭahukyan (1982: 222₅₉; cf. also 1985: 158; 1987: 272, 413) considers the derivation of *gewt* from **uoiċ-s-lā-* doubtful because of the *-w-*, though the latter, as he adds, might be epenthetic like in some other cases. [In Ĭahukyan 1990: 72 (sem. field 19): of unknown origin]. However, the development **-k̂(s)l-* > *-wt* is not irregular; see s.v.v. *mawruk* 'beard' and 2.1.22.7. In the case one accepts this etymology, Arm. *giwt*, in view of the *i*-stem, should be derived from fem. **ue/oik̂(s)-l-ih₂-*.

Pedersen (1906: 456-458 = 1982: 234-236; cf. Peters 1980: 39, 41) suggests a connection to Gr. *αὐλή* f. 'open court before the house, courtyard; steading for

cattle; hall, court (also of a temple); any dwelling, abode, chamber', $\alpha\tilde{\upsilon}\lambda\iota\varsigma$, $-\iota\delta\omicron\varsigma$ f. 'tent or place for passing the night in'; see s.v. *aganim*₂ (q.v.).

Arm. *gewt* has also been treated as an East-Caucasian borrowing, cf. Tabasaran *r/къл* 'village', Agul *гъл* 'id.' [Šaumjan 1935: 423; Ĵahukyan 1987: 609, 609₁₃]. If *gewt* is of native origin, the direction of the borrowing might be reconsidered. The resemblance with Finn. *kyla* 'village' is probably accidental; cf. Ĵahukyan 1987: 296. The connection to Oss. *qaw/gaw* 'village, settlement', Skt. *ghoṣa-* 'village', etc. (see Cheung 2002: 214; see s.v. *gawar* 'region') is uncertain (one expects Arm. **je-*).

The problem with all these etymologies is that no satisfactory and economical explanation is offered to explain the isolated paradigm and the phonological problems of *gewt*. [With respect to the connection to $\alpha\tilde{\upsilon}\lambda\iota\varsigma$, Schindler (p.c. apud Peters 1980: 39) prefers restoring PArm. **uesetlī*, **uesetlīās*].

Meillet (1894: 157-158) explains Arm. *geṭj* from **gewlyos* treating the *i*-stem as a relic of the old locative (see also Clackson 1994: 213₃₇). He (1911: 210) considers the origin of the *w* to be obscure and points out: "on est tenté de l'attribuer à l'influence de *t*", which, he admits, is obscure too. This view had been developed by Pedersen (1906: 402-403 = 1982: 180-181). The etymology of the word is considered by Meillet (1936: 85) to be unknown. Godel (1975: 88) points out that the epenthetic *-w-* in *gewt* and some other words still awaits an explanation. Feydit (1979: 60) assumes gen. **gyet*, with a hiatus, with a subsequent addition of *j* "for the sake of clearness". Neither this analysis is convincing.

The isolated paradigm *ge(a)wt*, *geṭj*, *giwtic* is ingeniously interpreted by Klingenshmitt (1982: 154) and, independently, by Rasmussen (1985 [1987]: 31-34 = 1999: 105-109) as coming from a PIE HD *i*-stem with an old NSg in **-ōi*, gen. **-i-ós*. Thus, Arm. gen. *geṭj* easily derives directly from **gelyo-* rather than **gewlyos* as Meillet had to assume. See also Clackson 1994: 64, 68, 127, 213₃₇; Kortlandt 1996: 57; Olsen 1999: 172, 828 (see s.v. *caṭr* 'laughter'). For other possible examples of the type see 2.2.2.4 and s.v. *tal*. For the discussion of the epenthetic *w* and the morphology of the word see also Olsen 1999: 799-800, 828.

Rasmussen derives the word from IE **uel-* 'zusammendrängen': Gr. *εἰλέω* 'zusammendrängen, -drücken, -ziehen, einengen, einschließen' (cf. s.v. *gelum*), *ἀλίη*, Dor. *ἀλία* 'assembly of people', (F)*άλις* adv. 'in crowds, in plenty' (< **ul-i-s*, vocalized according Lindeman's Law, or, as Hamp assumed, due to a Laryngeal), *ἰλη*, Dor. *ἰλᾱ* 'band, troop of men', Russ. *válom* 'in Menge' (see Frisk 1, 1960: 71-72, 74, 117, 456-457, 722). Thus: NSg **uel-ōi* > **gelu(i)* > *gewt*, GDSg **uel-i-ós* (with analogical full grade) > *geṭj*. Developing this etymology, Hamp (1994) restores a **-Hei-* suffix.

The etymology is plausible, though, to my knowledge, the existence of the etymon is not well-established. The semantic shift ‘crowd’ > ‘village’ is possible, cf. Skt. *grāma-* m. ‘procession, military host, village community, inhabited place’, Gr. *ἀγείρω* ‘to gather’, Russ. *gromáda* ‘big heap’, Pol. *gromada* ‘multitude, heap, village community’, etc. [Mayrhofer, EWAia 1, 1992: 507-508]; Kurd. *gund* ‘village’ vs. Pers. *gund* ‘crowd, army’ (see Cabolov 1, 2001: 404) and Arm. *gund* ‘id.’ [HAB 1: 594-595]; etc.

If the etymology is true, one may perhaps revive the connection of *gewt* to Urartian *ueli* ‘crowd, detachment of an army’ (see Meščaninov 1978: 322) proposed by Łap’anc’yan (1961: 139; cf. also A. Petrosyan 1987: 66₆₀; Ĵahukyan 1987: 429; 1988: 143). In this case the Urartian, which remarkably represents an intermediate stage in the semantic development of *gewt* coming from IE ‘assembly of people’, should be seen as borrowed from PArm. **wel-i-* at a very early stage of the relationship between Armenians and Urartians before the sound change **u-* > Arm. ¹²*g-* (cf. *Uelikuni*: *Getak’uni*), that is, before the 8th century BC).

For another possible trace of the archaic semantics see s.v. *gut* ‘army’.

Regardless of the ultimate origin of PArm. **wel-i-*, the following original paradigm can be established:

NSg **wel-ōi* > **getu* or **getʷ* > allophonic variants A. *get* and B. *gewt* (through metathesis)

GSg **wel-i-ōh* > *getj*

GDPl **wel-i-sko-* > *getic*

IPl **wel-i-bʰi-* > *getiwk*

All the forms without asterisks are attested. At some point, the *-w-* of the nominative form was perhaps a facultative feature of the final *-t*. Later it was phonologized and spread throughout the paradigm. One may assume that this process was minly confined to the learned tradition. This scenario can account for the variety of the forms, as well as the remarkable fact that almost no trace of *-w-* is found in the dialects. If Rasmussen’s etymology is accepted, PArm. **wel-i-* with the original meaning ‘crowd’ (cf. also *gut* ‘army’, if reliable) might have been borrowed into Urartian *ueli* ‘crowd, detachment of an army’.

***git-** in *gtanem* (aor. *gt-i*, *e-git*) ‘to find’ (Bible+); **giwt**, *i*-stem ‘finding, invention’ (Bible+); **git** ‘finding, gift’ (IPl *gt-i-w-k* ‘in Hamam Arewelc’i, 9th cent.; hapax).

¹² **u(o)ik-s-l-i(h₂)-* > *gi/ewt*: oblique **gewet* > *get* remains, perhaps, an alternative possibility.

The *i*-stem of *giwt* is based on: GDSg *giwt-i* (Agat'agetos, Łazar P'arpec'i), GDPl *giwt-i-c'* (Agat'agetos), IPl *giwt-i-w-k'* (Agat'agetos, Philo).

●**DIAL** The verb *gtanem* is widespread in dialects.

In the Van-group one finds **gntn-*.

According to Ačaryan (HAB 1: 564b), here belongd also Akn *gīt* 'the abundant time of food, when everything is found abundantly'. Gabriēlean (1912: 251) records *gīt* in the same dialect, as the root of *gtanem*, "more original than the form *giwt*". It appears in *gīt ē* "is found", referring to *ptut'* 'fruit' (ibid.).

●**ETYM** From PIE **u(e)id-*: Skt. aor. *ávidat* (= *e-gīt* 'he found'), pres. *vindāti* 'to find' (RV+), Pahl. *wind-* 'to find; to desire', Lat. *uidēre* 'to look, to see', etc. [Hübschmann 1897: 437; HAB 1: 564; Schmitt 1981: 49, 54].

According to Meillet (1936: 44), *giwt* (*i*-stem) derives from **uind-*. For this and "epenthetical" explanations I refer to Clackson 1994: 108, 221₅₅ and, especially, 155. Olsen (1999: 182-183) relates the *u*-epenthesis to **uid-tu-* continued in Lat. *vīsus* 'look'. Beekes (2003: 205) points out that *giwt* "clearly belongs to the root *gīt-*, and it is quite possible that the epenthesis was caused by a following *u*, but it cannot be demonstrated".

Winter (1962: 261) explains *giwt* from PIE **uid-ti-*, with a development of **-dt-* to *-wt-*. Clackson (1994: 155) considers this explanation as the most preferable. See 2.1.22.12 more detail. In this case, Arm. *an-giwt* adj. 'not found' (Koriwn, P'awstos, Łazar P'arpec'i, Ešišē) would match Skt. *á-vittī-* f. 'not-finding' (AV).

It is tempting to compare Arm. dial. **gntn-* with Skt. *vindāti* 'to find' (RV+), Pahl. *wind-* 'to find; to desire', etc. More probably, however, it is due to anticipation of the nasal of *gtanem*.

gom, *a*-stem: AblPl *i gom-a-c'* in 1 Paralipomenon 17.7; *o*-stem: AblPl *i gom-o-c'* in John Chrysostom. (Note also *Gomoc' vank'* [Petoyan 1965: 33-34]) 'fold/stall for sheep or cattle' (Bible+; dialect of Hamšēn); later restricted to 'stall for cattle'.

Astuacaturean (1895: 354c) cites five attestations, of which once NPl *gom-k'* and four times APl *gom-s*. The only biblical evidence for the declension class (mentioned in HAB; unknown to NHB and Astuacaturean) is found in 1 Paralipomenon 17.7 (Xalat'eanc' 1899: 33a): *i gomac' i makatetē xašanc'*: ἐκ τῆς μάγδρας ἐξόπισθεν τῶν ποιμνίων.

In Movsēs Xorenac'i 2.6 (1913=1991: 108^{L9}; transl. Thomson 1978: 135), *gom* seems to refer to some flat and wooded areas with mountains which the king Vařarřak arranges as hunting places. I therefore wonder whether the semantics of the word was confined within the human activities. [Note also, perhaps, *goms i lerins* :

μάνδρας ἐν τοῖς ὄρεσιν, in a passage from Judges 6.2 which is translated in RevStBible as follows: "And the hand of Midian prevailed over Israel; and because of Midian the people of Israel made for themselves dens which are in the mountains, and the caves and the strongholds ". However, this is ambiguous since the people may have simply used mountainous sheep-folds for their dwelling. According to Hübschmann (1904: 382), in Movsēs Xorenac'i *gom* refers to 'Gehege'].

As a component in place-names: see Hübschmann 1904: 382 (also s.v.v.); Ĵahukyan 1987: 414-417.

●**DIAL** Widespread in dialects. Hamšen *kum* is a generic term for all kinds of stall/fold [HAB 1: 574-575].

●**ETYM** Usually derived from IE **g^hom-*, only with Germanic (gemination presumably from **-mn-*): Dan. *gamme* 'sheepfold', Swed. dial. *gamme* 'crib, manger', Olc. *gammi* m. 'Lappenhütte, Erdhütte', Swiss *gämmeli* 'Viehhütte', etc. [Liden 1906: 14-16; HAB 1: 574-575; Pokorny 1959: 452; Ĵahukyan 1987: 128].

The etymology has been doubted since the expected reflex is **gun* (Ĵahukyan 1987: 171, cf. 254) or **gum* (Olsen 1999: 198). Olsen (ibid.) reconsructs **g^hos-mo-/-eh₂-* connecting with Skt. *ghas-* 'to eat' etc., assuming an original meaning 'eating place'. [For the phonetic development see s.v. *hoyn/hon* 'cornel-tree'].

One may assume that the vocalic development has been blocked by gemination (**-mn-* > **-mm-*?), as in **pen-nu-mi* > *henum* (see s.v. **hin-* 'to weave'), or by the lowering influence of the *a* in the following syllable: **g^hom-eh₂-* > PArm. **goma-*, cf. *don* 'a kind of bread', if from PArm. **dona-* < PIE **d^hoH-neh₂-* 'grain; bread' (see s.v.). Of borrowings, note *com* 'fasting, abstinence from food' < Syriac *šōm* or *šōmā*.

On possible Armenisms in Caucasian and other languages see HAB 1: 575a; Ĵahukyan 1987: 602, 602₁₀.

[Ĵap'anc'yan (1961: 155) connects Arm. *gom* and, with reservation, also the Germanic forms with Hitt. *humma-* (loan-gloss) 'pigsty'; on the latter see Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 594-595].

govem 'to praise', **govim** 'to boast' (Bible+); **gov**, *i*-stem: GDPl *gov-i-c'* in Paterica and Gregory of Nyssa 'praise' (Philo, Plato, etc.).

●**DIAL** The verb is widespread in dialects. The noun: Adana (Turkish-speaking Arm.) *ḥv* 'praise' [HAB 1: 583a].

●**ETYM** Meillet (1894b: 280) connected with Lat. *faveō*, *favēre* 'to favour, befriend' and OCS *gověti* 'to revere, live a god-fearing life'; cf. also Russ. *govet'* 'to fast',

Czech *hověti* 'to satisfy, show indulgence', etc. (see ÈtimSlovSlavJaz 7, 1980: 72-73). Latin *favēre* probably reflects **g^{wh}ou-eie-* [Schrijver 1991: 441-442].

Pedersen (1905: 199 = 1982: 61) is sceptical about the appurtenance of the Armenian. Then he notes that one can, "wenn die Gleichung überhaupt richtig sein sollte, von dem Subst. *gov* 'lob' ausgehen". The reason for this is that, according to his rule (op. cit. 196 = 1982: 58), the intervocalic **-w-* "erscheint als arm. *v* wo es auslautend geworden ist, sonst aber als *g*" (see also 2.1.8). Following Pedersen, Kortlandt (1993: 10 = 2003: 102) treats the verb *govem* as a derivative of *gov*. Pedersen (ibid.) adds that the Slavic perhaps belongs to Lat. *gaudeō* and Gr. *γαίωv*. Elsewhere (1906: 389 = 1982: 167) he suggests a connection with *goh* 'satisfied', comparing with the case of *aruest* vs. *arhest* 'art' (q.v.).

All these suggestions must be abandoned since, as is convincingly shown by Ačāryan (HAB 1: 582b), Arm. *govem* is an Iranian loan; cf. Pahl. *guftan*, *gōb-* 'to say, tell, utter, pronounce, recite', OPers. *gaub-* 'sich nennen, sich feierlich bekennen', Sogd. *γwβ* 'rühmen, preisen', etc. On the Iranian forms see Brandenstein/Mayrhofer 1964: 121; MacKenzie 1971: 38; Nyberg 1974: 85. For the semantics of the Armenian cf. Sogd. *γwβ* 'to praise', Khwarezm. *γwβ(y)-* 'to boast', *γw(y)* 'to praise' (on which see MacKenzie 1970: 56). Accepted by Jahukyan (1987: 521).

Unfortunately, Ačāryan's etymology has remained beyond the scholarly attention, and Arm. *govem* is still frequently linked with Lat. *faveō*, *favēre* 'to favour, befriend' and OCS *gověti*, see Schrijver 1991: 442; Mallory/Adams 1997: 418a; Olsen 1999: 789 (though in 416-417 and 873 *govest* 'praise' is treated as an Iranian loan); etc. The Armenian is rightly excluded in Pokorny 1959: 453; Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984: 803-804.

gort, *i*-stem, *o*-stem (both Bible+); later also *u*-stem, e.g. GDSg *gort-u* in Step'annos Siwnec'i /8th cent./ (see Adonc 1915: 186^{L20f}); MArm. **gortn**, GSg *gortan*, NPI *gortun-k* (Mxit'ar Goš etc.) 'frog'; in MArm.: **gort** (in a compound: **gortn-**) 'the roundish part of the hoof', **gortn** 'a swelling or fold under the tongue' [Č'ugaszyan 1980: 187], **gortan-burd/t** 'a plant' (lit. 'frog's wool'), **gortan mamui** 'green moss on the surface of morass' (lit. 'frog's moss'), **gortn-uk** 'wart' [MiġHayBaġ 1, 1987: 154-155].

Frequent in the Bible [Astuacaturean 1895: 363b], rendering Gr. *βάτραχος*. In Exodus 8 one finds both *i*-stem (ISg *gort-i-w* : 8.2) and *o*-stem (GDSg *gort-o-y* : 8.12). GDPI *gort-o-c* is found in Sapientia 19.10, as well as in later literature:

Yovhannēs Ōjnec’i (8th cent.) and Nersēs Lambronac’i (12th cent.). ISg *gort-i-w* : also in Psalms 77.45. Note also GDSg *gort-i* in a homily ascribed to Etišē.

●**DIAL** Widespread in dialects; in eastern dialects (ĻarabaĻ, Goris, Agulis, etc.), as well as in extreme SW (Zeyt’un) : **gortn-uk* [HAB 1: 585b]. For this **gortn-* cf. MArm. evidence above, as well as several compounds in various dialects [Ačārean 1913: 252-253; HAB 3: 244b], and genitive of dialectal forms in the Van-group: Van *kyört*, gen. *kyört-an* [Ačāryan 1952: 125], Moks *k’ürt/k’ört*, gen. *k’ürtan* or *k’örtē* [Orbeli 2002: 272].

Note the formal identity between MArm. *gortn-uk* ‘wart’ and dial. **gortn-uk* ‘frog’. This is seen even synchronically: ĻarabaĻ *kert’nuk* means both ‘frog’ and ‘wart’ (see Ačārean 1913: 252b). Compare especially the folk-belief/saying recorded by L. Harut’yunyan (1991: 161^{Nr5}): *kyert’nuk spanoten cerk’en kyert’nuk ver kkya* : ‘a wart will appear on the hand of the one who kills a frog’.

Ačāryan (1913: 252b) records Manisa (close to Zmürnia/Izmir) *korcnc’uc’* ‘a wart on the hand’ which he derives from **gortn-c’oyc’*, apparently assuming *c’oyc’* ‘show’ as the second member. (Assimil. *t > c* or influence of *kocic*?). If this is the case, one can compare with the folk-practice of the curing the warts by spells and and “showing” the moon to the person (see S. Movsisyan 1972: 55b). If the underlying form is rather **gortn-cuc*, then it can be compared with Dersim (K’ti) *körtənjjj* ‘wart’ [BaĻramyan 1960: 146a], which seems to derive from **gortn-cic* ‘frog-nipple’. For the semantics cf. Germ. *Warze* ‘wart’ : ‘nipple’.

Dersim (K’ti) *kördənpurt* and *kördənp’ərp’ur* ‘water-plant’ [BaĻramyan 1960: 145b] are from *gortn-burd* lit. ‘frog’s wool’ and **gortn-p’rp’ur* lit. ‘frog’s foam’.

●**ETYM** Since Lagarde (1854: 29^{Nr780}), connected with Lith. *varlė*, *varlė* ‘frog’, Latv. *varde* ‘id.’ and Gr. *βάτραχος* m. ‘frog’. The appurtenance of the Greek word is rightly rejected in Hübschmann 1897: 437 (earlier, in 1883: 25, with a question-mark); see also HAB 1: 585; Fraenkel 2, 1965: 1200-1201; Ĵahukyan 1987: 157; Saradževa 1991: 173; Olsen 1999: 182. The acute tone in Latvian is probably original because of Winter’s Law and points to IE **uord-*, and the Lithuanian circumflex can be explained by positing a formation **vard-liaH* [Derksen 1996: 58].

The derivation of Arm. *gort* from the PIE word for ‘water’ (cf. Skt. *udrā-* m. ‘fish otter’, YAv. *udra-* m. ‘otter’, Gr. *ὕδρος* m. ‘watersnake’, *ὕδρα* f. ‘watersnake’, OHG *ottar* ‘otter’, etc.) suggested by Dervischjan (1877: 89) would be possible if one posits **uod-rV-*. However, the other etymology seems preferable.

It has been assumed that Arm. *gort*, *i*-stem ‘frog’ (note ISg *gort-i-w*) and *ayc* ‘goat’ (q.v.) derive from IE feminine in **-iē* or **-iā-*, and that Arm. **gort-i-* corresponds to Latv. *varde* even with respect to the stem [Meillet 1896: 150; 1936:

76; Jahukyan 1982: 125; Clackson 1994: 48, 88-90]. Thus: **vord-iH* > *gort*, *i*-stem. For the feminine connotation of *gort* 'frog' within the cultural framework see 3.5.2.1.

Adams (apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 214b, 523a) connects these words with the word for 'wart' or 'abscess': OEngl. *wearte* etc. 'wart', Latv. *ap-vīrde* 'abscess', Russ. *véred* 'abscess, ulcer', Pers. *balū* 'wart', reconstructing **uorHd-* and referring to the popular association of warts and frogs. However, at least some of these forms may rather belong with Skt. *vardh-* 'to grow, increase, become big' etc. (see Vasmer s.v.). Note especially Pers. *balū* 'wart' vs. Pers. *bālīdan*, MPers. *wālīdan* 'to grow, to prosper'.

For the association 'frog' : 'wart' note, for instance, the well-known passage from 'Tom Sawyer' by Mark Twain (1993: 53): *I play with frogs so much that I've always got considerable many warts*. On the association in Armenian tradition see Abeghian 1899: 31; see also above, on Łarabał.

Olsen (1999: 182) notes: "The original derivational type underlying *gort* is obscure (root noun?)". Jahukyan (1987: 157) mentions only the *o*-stem and reconstructs **uordo-*.

According to Kipšidze, Megrel. *gordi* 'frog', Tuš. **γ/q'wart'i* 'frog' and Georg. *my/q'ari* 'toad' are borrowed from Arm. *gort* (see HAB 1: 585b).

In view of the absence of cognates outside Armenaian and Baltic, Łap'anc'yan (1975: 354; 1961: 80, 320) considers the IE etymology of *gort* as unconvincing, argues against Ačāryan's (in fact, Ačāryan refers to Kipšidze) view according to which the Kartvelian forms are borrowed from Armenian, and treats all these words as of Caucasian origin and of onomatopoeic character.

[*gut* 'army']

Attested only in Ehišē 3 (5th century): *gutn Hayoc* 'the Armenian army'; see Ter-Minasyan 1989: 142-143. In this critical edition no variant readings are given, thus the word seems to be reliable. [Hardly a misprint for *gum* 'group', which itself is unreliable; but maybe *gugaz* or *gund*? I checked Orbeli/Juzbašjan 1971: 74 (Russ. transl.), the New York publication (WArm. and Engl. transl., 1952: 82-83), and the English translation of Thomson (1982: 121) - all simply translate 'the Armenian army/troops', without any comment or note. This would imply that they were dealing with some "normal" word, perhaps *gund*? Thus, *gut* is a misprint for *gund*?]. Not mentioned in NHB, HAB or anywhere. Not included in the list of newly found (absent from NHB) words from Ehišē [L. Hovhannisyan 1990a: 154-155].

●**ETYM** I wonder if this word is identical with *giwt* 'village' (q.v.), which is derived by Rasmussen (1985 [1987]: 31-34 = 1999: 105-109) from IE NSg **uel-ōi*, GSg

**u(e)l-i-ós*, cf. Gr. *ἀλήνη*, Dor. *ἀλία* ‘assembly of people’, etc. Arm. *gut* ‘army’ < ‘assembly of people’, if reliable/related, can be seen as an important intermediary in the semantic development of *gewt* ‘village’. The latter is attested in many spelling variants, among them *gut* in inscriptions and colophons since the 13th century (see S. A. Avagyan 1973: 194, 200; H. Muradyan 1972: 107; 1982: 194; MijHayBar 1, 1987: 156a); note also compounds in inscriptions: *gut-a-k’atak’* (T’alin, 941 AD), *gotawag* < *giwt-awag* ‘village-elder’ (Haṭbat, 1210 AD) [S. A. Avagyan 1973: 200, 204]. One should perhaps assume that *gut* is merely a spelling variant of what was pronounced as */gūt/*. Note also Urartian *ueli* ‘crowd, detachment of an army’, which could have been borrowed from PArm. **wel-i-* at a stage prior to the sound change **u- > Arm. g-*.]

***d(e)t-ez** ‘bee; bumble-bee’

●**DIAL** Muš, Van, Sip’an *dtez* ‘bee; bumble-bee (“wild bee”)’ [Amatuni 1912: 166-167]. According to Ačaryan (1913: 1033b): Van *dtez* ‘stinged bee; bumble-bee; spider; (secret language) gold’, with a regular shift *d > Van t*.

One expects voiceless *t* also in Šatax. However, M. Muradyan (1962: 209b) records Šatax *detēz-išametu* ‘bumble-bee’ in her glossary of purely dialectal words.

Van/Arčak (the village of Šahgeldi) *dtez* occurs e.g. in the following saying (V. Ananyan 1980: 379^{L8}): *Matd mi tana dtezi ponin* : “Do not take/put your finger (on)to the bee-nest”. In a footnote, the author (379₁) renders *dtez* by ModArm. *metu* ‘bee’.

●**ETYM** No etymology is known to me.

I wonder if the word derives from **det-* ‘yellow’ (see s.v.v. *detin*, *deṭj*). For the semantics cf. Šatax *zəi-ket* ‘bumble-bee’ and dial. *zi-kēc* ‘yellow bumble-bee’, if containing *zai* ‘yellow’ (see s.v. *kēc*). The suffix *-ez* may be compared with the *-j* found in *det-j* ‘yellow’ and many other words, as well as with *-(ē)z* in animal- and plant-names (see 2.3.1).

***di-di-k?** ‘newborn, child’.

●**DIAL** Sivri-Hisar *tetik* ‘‘newborn, child; pupil of the eye’ [Ačarean 1913: 1025a; N. Mkrtč’yan apud PtmSivHisHay 1965: 455].

●**ETYM** N. Mkrtč’yan (PtmSivHisHay 1965: 455) compares with Russ. *temu* (written in Armenian characters) ‘children’. Obviously, this form is a misprint for Russ. *deti* = *дети*, caused by the formal similarity of the manuscript variants of the Russian characters *т* and *и* with Latin *m* and *u*. Note the shift *d > Sivri-Hisar t*. N. Mkrtč’yan

(ibid.) notes that the word cannot be considered a Russian loan and derives directly from Indo-European.

PSlav. **dětę* (: Russ. *ditja* 'child', Czech *dítě*, Bulg. *dete* 'id.', etc.) goes back to **d^heh₁-t-*, from PIE **deh₁-* 'to suck'; cf. Latv. *dēls* 'son', Lat. *filius* 'id.', etc. [ĒtimSlovSlavJaz 5, 1978: 12-13]; see s.v. *diem* 'to suck'. IE **d^heh₁-t-* would yield PArm. **di*, with loss of **-t-*. Sivri-Hisar *tetik* 'newborn, child', if related, may be interpreted as reduplicated **di-di-* with the diminutive suffix *-ik* and/or due to influence of *pepek* (Nor Naxiĵewan) 'child' < Turk. *bebek* (on which see Ačařean 1902: 291). [Alternatitevely, an onomatopoeic formation].

diem, caus. *di-ec* '-uc'anem 'to suck, drink mother's milk'

●**ETYM** Since Bötticher (de Lagarde), connected with Skt. *dhāyati* (RV+), etc.; also Arm. *da(y)l* 'beestings', *dayeak* 'nurse, tutor' [Hübschmann 1883: 26; 1897: 437; HAB 1: 668. Godel (1975: 88-89₇₅) directly equates *diem* with the Sanskrit verb and writes: "The parallel implies divergent developments of the PIE present stem **dhəye-*. I assume that PA **ə* changed to *i* before **y*, by progressive assimilation, while in Skt. it opened to *a* through the opposite process. This enables us to account for the puzzling etymological relation of Arm. *ji* (I) 'horse' to Skt. *hāya-* 'id' by positing a prototype **ghəyo-*".

However, Skt. *dhāyati* may be derived from **d^heih₁-e-* (see Mayrhofer, EWAia 1, 1992: 776), and there is no laryngeal in the root of *hāya-* (see s.v. *ji* 'horse'). Armenian has more possibilities, such as **d^heh₁-*, **d^heh₁-i-*, **d^hih₁-*, etc. (see HAB 1: 668b). Ĵahukyan (1987: 119) restores **dhēje-* = **d^heh₁-ie*.

See also s.v. **di-di-k*?

di-k, GDPI *di-c*, IPI *di-a-w-k* 'god'.

●**ETYM** Since Müller, compared with Gr. *θεός* 'god' [HAB 1: 672-673]. Arm. *di-k* (< pl. **d^hēsēs*) derives from full-grade **d^heh₁s-*: Lat. *fēriac* < OLat. *fēsiae* 'festival days', *fēstus* 'festive', Osc. *FĪISNŪ* 'templum', Umbr. *FESNAF-E* < **fēsna* 'in templum', whereas Gr. *θεός* 'god', compositional *θεσ-*, Lat. *fānum* < **fas-no-m* 'hallowed place', and Skt. *dhīś-nīya-* 'Götter geneigt machend' represent the zero-grade **d^həs-* = **d^hh₁s-*, see Hübschmann 1899: 45 (earlier, 1897: 438-439, he was sceptical); Pokorny 1959: 259; Rix 1969/1972: 179-180; Mayrhofer 1986: 127; Schrijver 1991: 92, 139; Mallory/Adams 1997: 231a]. On Lindeman's (1982: 45; 1987: 104) scepticism see below.

As is pointed out by Lubotsky (1988: 129), Greek has preserved the athematic noun in compounds (*θεσ-*), so that *θεός* is a Greek denominal formation. The PIE

may be interpreted as an original HD *s*-stem (cf. Schrijver 1991: 92; see also below), or as a HD root-noun (for the type see Beekes 1995: 189-190): NSg **d̥ēh₁s-s*, GSg **d̥h₁s-ós*. Note that both **d̥ēh₁s-s* and **d̥eh₁s-s* would result in Arm. *di-k*'.

The derivation of the Greek and the Armenian from **d̥(e)ues-* 'to dissipate, blow' (cf. Lith. *dvasiā* 'breath, spirit, soul' etc.; see Pokorny 1959: 269; Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984: 466; see also references apud Frisk, s.v.) must be abandoned, in particular, because of Myc. *te-o* [Schwartz 1992: 392]. As far as the Armenian is concerned, Lindeman (1982: 45) is positive on this etymology and explains Arm. *di-k*' as reflecting the lengthened grade **d̥wēs-*. He admits, however, that the Greek is not likely to belong here. This would imply a separation of Arm. *di-k*' from Gr. *θεός* which is improbable and unnecessary.

According to Georgiev (1974: 11-14; 1975: 19, 35; see also Blažek 2001: 355), Thracian *δεσα-, δισα-, διζα-* 'god', as well as the second component of the Thracian name *Ζηλν-δηζην* f. belong to the Greek and Armenian words. He (1974: 12) is inclined to the derivation of Gr. *θεός* from **d̥weso-s* and treats Arm. *di-k*' and Thracian *δεσα-* as a contamination of **d̥weso-* and **diw-* (on which see s.v. *tiw* 'day'). In general, this is implausible (see above on Myc. *te-o*) and unnecessary since the paradigm **d̥eh₁s-s*, GSg **d̥h₁s-ós* offers a satisfactory explanation.

However, a similar contamination might be viable with respect to Arm. compositional *diwc*-. According to Hübschmann (1897: 439), the epenthetic *-w-* in *diwc*- is due to contamination of *dic*- 'god-' with *diw-* 'demon-', cf. e.g. *diwc*-*a-pašt* vs. *dic*-*a-pašt* 'Götter-verehrer' : *diw*-*a-pašt* 'Dämonen-verehrer'. If the PIE word had an original *s*-stem with NSG **d̥eh₁s-ōs*, the "epenthetic" *-w-* of Arm. *diwc*- could somehow reflect PArm. hypothetical NSG **di(h)-u*. One might also think of contamination with PArm. **tiw* 'god' (see s.v.v. *tiw*, **t(u)kořin*, *astuac*).

It has been assumed that Arm. *di-k*' 'god' is reflected in the Urartian theonym *Aršibe-di-ni* (see s.v. *arcui* 'eagle').

don 'a kind of bread'.

Attested only in "Yaysmawurk". In "Bargirk' hayoc'" *don* renders *pak'simat* [Amalyan 1975: 273^{Nr227}]. In this form, the word has been preserved only in the dialect of Łazax (see below).

In "Knik' hawatoy" = "Seal of Faith" (7th cent.) one finds *doniw hac'iwk*', where *hac'iwk*' is IPl of *hac*' 'bread'. Ačaryan (HAB 1: 683b), with some reservation, identifies this *don-i-w* as the instrumental form of *dun* (John Chrysostom, Philo, etc.) or *doyn* (Grigor Narekac'i +) 'little, few'. However, *dun* or *doyn* would yield *dn-* or *dun-* in oblique cases, though this is not crucial (see s.v. *hoyn* 'cornel'). One wonders

if *doniw* is rather the instrumental of *don* 'a kind of bread', which here specifies *hac* 'bread'; thus: *doniw hac'iwk'* would be translated as "with *don*-breads, with breads of the type of *don*". If this is accepted, we are dealing with the oldest attestation of the word and with the only evidence for the declension-class (ISg *don-i-w* would point to *i*-stem).

●**DIAL** Łazax *don* [Amatuni 1912: 173b], Širak *donik* 'a longish thick bread' (= *matnk'aš hac*) [Mxit'areanc' 1901: 311], Muš, Bulanəx *donik* 'a kind of longish bread with a hole in the middle' [HAB 1: 679b], Šatax *tonik* (M. Muradyan 1962: 216b, in the glossary of dialectal words; explained as *t'onran bok'on*), Sasun *donig* 'soft, fresh bread' [Petoyan 1965: 461].

Amatuni (1912: 173b) records Van *dotik* 'a kind of longish bread with a hole in the middle' (mentioned as *tōtik* by G. Srvanjtyanc' in his "Groc'u broc'" 1874: *27 = 1, 1978: 40). As far as the semantics is concerned, this form is reminiscent of Muš, Bulanəx *donik*. However, *dotik* derives from Van *doť* 'frame around a wheel' [Ačārean 1913: 282-283].

T'emurčyan (1970: 86b and 92b₁₀, respectively) records Sebastia *donpik* 'a kind of bread' and Arabkir (rural) *doni* 'cooked and dried juice of mulberry or grape' (= Kyurin *k'esme*). The former is found also in Gabikean 1952: 170: *dompik·nkanak, pztik sōmin*. Besides, Gabikean (ibid.) represents separately Sebastia *don* 'thick liquid food for the dogs of a shepherd made of flour of barley'. Are these words related with each other and with *don* 'a kind of bread'?

●**ETYM** Ačāryan (HAB 1: 679-680) connects with Skt. *dhānā́*- f. pl. 'roasted grains' (RV+), Khotanese *dānā́*- 'corn', MPers. *dān, dānag* 'seed, corn', NPers. *dāna* 'seed, corn' (> Arm. dial. *dan* 'grain'), Lith. *duona* 'bread, corn, grain', Latv. *duōna* 'slice of bread', etc. (from PIE **dʰoH-neh₂-*). Note also Toch. B *tāno* n.f. 'seed, grain' [Adams 1999: 286].

Ĵahukyan (1987: 162-163) presents three objections to this etymology: 1) PIE **dʰōnā-* would yield Arm. **dun*, 2) the Armenian meaning is remote, 3) the word is attested only in late texts. The third objection is not essential. Also the second is surmountable in view of the Baltic semantics. The only serious problem is the vocalism. A potentially similar case is found with *gom* 'fold for sheep or cattle' (q.v.). Ĵahukyan (1987: 254) interprets these two and some other words as reflecting an old dialectal variation next to the regular development **e/oN* > Arm. *i/uN*. He also compares *don* with Hurr. *tuni* (see below).

I wonder if the development **-ōn-* > Arm. *-on-* may be explained by lowering under the influence of the *-a-* if the following syllable: PArm. **duna* > **dona-* > *don*. Compare also *gom*, *a*-stem 'sheepfold, stall', if from **gʰom(m)ā-* (see s.v.). Since

Arm. *don* is not attested in the oldest period of Armenian literature, one may alternatively place *don* in the list of words showing an unclear substitution *ay/a* : *o*. In this case, the proto-Armenian reconstruction would be **dan-*, from the zero grade **d^hH-neh₂-*, probably found also in Toch. B *tāno* n.f. 'seed, grain' [Lubotsky, p.c.].

PIE **d^hoH-neh₂-* 'grain; bread' has been compared with Sem. **duḥn-* 'millet' (see Illič-Svityč 1964: 5; Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984: 873; Jahukyan 1987: 450; cf. Cuny 1937: 229-231).

Pârvulescu (1988: 51) derives the PIE word from **d^heh₁-* 'to put', with the basic meaning 'wealth, treasure' from earlier 'what is put, deposited'. Thus: **d^hoh₁-neh₂-*. This idea has been considered to be semantically unlikely [Mallory/Adams 1997: 237a; Adams 1999: 286]. However, see s.v. *dnem* 'to put'.

Jahukyan (1987: 426) points out that Arm. *don* resembles Hurr. *tuni* 'a kind of bread', but is sceptical to this comparison since: 1) Ačāryan is inclined to ascribe native (< IE) origin to Arm. *don*, 2) Hurr. *tuni* may be derived from *tuni* 'Fußschemel'; thus: "baked in the shape of *tuni*". He refers to Haas/Wilhelm 1974, not indicating the page. This work, however, is missing in Jahukyan's bibliography. I assume that he meant the same Haas/Wilhelm 1974 as is found in the bibliography of my present study. In this book one finds Hitt. *tūni-* 'ein bestimmtes Brot', ^{NINDA}*dūni-* c. 'ein Gebäck' (pp. 12, 104, 106₁, 150-151, 179, 286b) and Hurr. *tūni* 'Fußschemel' (104, 106₁). There is also Hitt. ^{NINDA}*tunik* n. / *tunink-*, which is interpreted as (*n*)*k*-derivation from ^{NINDA}*duni-* [Neu 1970: 57₃₇; Haas/Wilhelm 1974: 179].

Jahukyan's objections are not decisive. Firstly: the meaning 'a kind of bread' could be original. Then, *tūni* 'Fußschemel', if indeed related, may be seen as "shaped as *tuni*-bread". Remarkably, next to the very Arm. *don* 'bread' one finds *don* 'an architectural ornament/detail', probably 'architrave', attested twice in Zak'aria K'anak'erc'i (17th cent.), in the description of the monastery Yovhannavank'. Ačāryan (HAB 1: 680) treats this word as metaphorically belonging to *don* 'a kind of bread'. This can serve as a (typological, at least) parallel to *tūni* 'Fußschemel' < *tūni* 'a kind of bread'. Secondly, the relatedness of Arm. *don* 'a kind of bread' with Hitt. ^{NINDA}*dūni-* c. 'ein Gebäck' does not necessarily contradict to the native origin of the Armenian word. Secondly: if one accepts the IE origin of Arm. *don*, then Hitt. ^{NINDA}*dūni-* might, at least theoretically, be considered as a loan from Armenian. I admit, however, that the question of such loans is very far from established.

I conclude: the relationship between the Armenian and the Hittite/Hurrian words may be explained in three ways: 1) Arm. *don*, dial. **donik* 'a kind of bread' derives from PIE **d^hōnā-* 'grain; bread' (though the problem of Arm. *-o-* needs further examination), and Hitt. ^{NINDA}*dūni-*, ^{NINDA}*tunik* 'ein Gebäck' is borrowed from

Armenian; 2) Arm. *don/donik* derives from PIE **dʰōnā-*, but its resemblance with Hitt. ^{NINDA} *dūni-/tunik* is accidental; 3) Arm. *don/donik* has been borrowed from Hitt. ^{NINDA} *dūni-/tunik* and has nothing to do with PIE **dʰōnā-* (note that the Hittite cannot be derived from the IE word in view of the vocalism). At this stage of research it is hard to choose between these possibilities. The second one does not seem probable to me.

dust-, GDSg *dster*, NPI *dster-k'*, GDPi *dster-c'* or *dster-a-c'*, IPI *dster-aw-k'* 'daughter'. Bible+.

●**DIAL** In almost all the dialects, replaced by *aḥḥ-ik* 'girl'. Preserved only in Suč'ava: *d'ustrə*, GSg *d'əsder*, or *d'rusd*, GSg *d'ərəsder* 'daughter' [HAB 1: 686b].

●**ETYM** Since Klaproth (1831: 105b), equated with the PIE word for 'daughter': Skt. *duhitār-*, Gr. *θυγάτηρ* f., Lith. *duktė* f., etc.; NSg **dʰugh₂-tēr* > PArm. **dust(i)r*, NPI **dʰugh₂-ter-es* > *dster-k'* [Hübschmann 1897: 440; HAB 1: 686]. For the declension see also s.v. *k'oyr* 'sister'. For the loss of the laryngeal see Hamp 1970; Matzinger 1997: 11; Olsen 1999: 148, 148₂₈₀; see also 2.1.20. For the problem of *-st-* see 2.1.22.12.

dur-, *o*-stem (best attested in IPI *dr-o-v*); note also GSg *dr-i* in Ephrem, as a reading variant '(carpenter's) chisel'.

Once in the Bible, rendering Gr. *τέρετρον* = Lat. *terebrum* : *drov gorceac'*, *ew drōšēac' zna* (Isaiah 44.13), said of a carpenter.

ISg *drov* is also found in the corresponding passage of Gēorg Vardapet's commentary to Isaiah, as well as in Geoponica*; both in 13th century. In the latter there is another attestation, which says that the tool should be made of oak: *Bayc' lawn ayn ē, or i katni p'aytē šines zdurn*. Twice in Ephrem: GDSg *dr-i*, *i*-stem (var. *droyñ*), and *dr-o-y* [NHB 1: 640a].

●**DIAL** Widespread in dialects.

●**ETYM** Hiwnk'earpēyēntean compares to Pers. *durāy* '(carpenter's?) file'. Gabriēlean (1910: 117//HAmS) connects to Arm. *dīwr* 'plane' (q.v.). Ačāryan (HAB 1: 687a) rejects both comparisons without comments. However, they deserve some remarks. The semantic relationship involved in the latter comparison is weak, but not impossible; cf. English *plane* 'plane (surface)'; 'to make smooth or even especially with a plane'; 'a tool for smoothing or shaping a wood surface'. The etymology would presuppose a zero-grade thematic form (**dʰur-o-* > Arm. *dur*, *o*-stem) of **dʰeur-* (> Arm. *dīwr*, *i*-stem). However, such an etymon is unknown, and I prefer a different etymology for *dīwr*, see s.v. The Persian *durāy* seems even more

interesting. Is there an etymology? Cf. also Arm. dial. *durgar* 'carpenter' [HayLezBrbBaïr 1, 2001: 362a], which seems to reflect an Iranian compound with **kār-* 'to work' as the second member.

Ĵahukyan (1967: 152) derives *dur* from IE **der-* (cf. Skt. *dāra-* etc.; see s.v. *terem*), placing it in the list of words which did not participate in the consonant shift. This is uncertain. Later he (Ĵahukyan 1987: 265) mentions *dur* among non-native designations of the semantic field of craft without any further specification.

I suggest a tentative comparison to Iir. **d̥ārā-* f. 'Klinge, Schneide': Skt. *dhārā-* f. 'Schneide (des Schwertes, des Messers), Klinge' (RV+), YAv. f. *dārā-* 'Klinge', Khot. *dārā-* 'Schneide', etc.; see Mayrhofer, EWAia 1, 1992: 789; ÈtimSlovIranJaz 2, 2003: 451. According to Mayrhofer, the Iir. word "ist wohl als **Guß* (> 'Klinge', beim Erkalten des Kupfers) mit *dhārā-*¹ [f. 'Strom, Strahl, Guß'] identisch". The latter is "vielleicht" from **d̥h̥Hreh₂-*. This etymology, however, does not seem very probable. One might connect Iir. **d̥ārā-* f. 'Klinge, Schneide' to Arm. *dur* '(carpenter's) chisel', reconstructing IE **d̥oH-r-eh₂-* or **d̥eh₃-r-eh₂-*. The *o*-stem of *dur* could reflect a later thematization: **-r-h₂-o-* or simply **-r-o-*. If GSg *dri* is reliable (see above), it can be seen as the normal Genitive form of the archaic *a*-stem.

The connection of Skt. *dhārā-* to Gr. *θοός* 'pointed, sharp' < **d̥ə-yos* and OHG *tart* 'Spieß' < **d̥ə-ro-* (see Pokorny 1959: 272) is considered uncertain by both Frisk (1: 678) and Mayrhofer (op. cit.). If, nevertheless, they are cognate, we should establish an IE verbal root **d̥eh₃-* 'to sharpen' (cf. Pokorny) or adjectival **d̥eh₃-* : **d̥oH-* 'sharp'.

durgn, GSg *drgan*, AblSg *drganē* 'potter's wheel'.

Bible+.

In "Bargirk' hayoc'" one finds *drgan* glossed as *brti č'arx* "potter's wheel" [Amalyan 1975: 82^{Nr274}]; formally identic with the genitive of *durgn* (cf. Amalyan 1975: 362²⁷⁴).

●**DIAL** According to Ačāryan (HAB 1: 687b), Ganjak *turg* perhaps belongs here, though its exact meaning is not known. It occurs in Mamikonean 1895: 80, where it is told that the channel (*āru*) turned the water-mill, then *šur ēr talis ankanə u turgə banec'not p'irənə u čaxarakə* "turned the *ankan* and *p'irən* which makes the *turg* work, and the *čaxarak* ('spinning-wheel')". The word *ankan* here is identified with that meaning 'mortar' [HAB 1: 197]. Or else, it denotes a kind of spinning implement or a part of it, probably derived from *ank-* 'to fall etc.; to spin, weave, plait' (on which see HAB 1: 198b) with the "instrument-suffix" *-an*, cf. *top'-an* 'beetle for beating clothes' from *top'em* 'to beat' (q.v.), as well *p'ir'-an* which

appears in the same sentence we are discussing. The latter in Łarabaŋ means ‘scraper’ (= *šrnc’an, fərəltax*; see Ačārean 1913: 1086b). Also *turg* probably denotes a kind of turning implement.

To this Ačāryan does not add any other dialectal evidence.

Now the word is found in extreme NW and SW. Xotorjūr has *durg* ‘the main tool of a potter’ (see YušamXotorj 1964: 442a, with the names of its parts). Č’olak’ean (1986: 200a) glosses ClArm. *durn* by K’esab *dōrg*, not specifying the meaning.

●**ETYM** Related with Gr. *τροχός* m. ‘wheel; potter’s wheel’ and OIr. *droch* ‘wheel’, cf. also Gr. *τρέχω* ‘to run’, Arm. *darj-*, *dainam* ‘to turn’, etc. [NHB 1: 156b (s.v. *aniw*); Hübschmann 1897: 440; HAB 1: 687; Windekens 1986: 222]. Arm. *durn* is formally problematic. In order to explain it, a form with lengthened grade has been assumed, with a subsequent metathesis: **d̥rōgʰ-* > **drug-* > **durg-* (Hübschmann; HAB; Makaev 1974: 57). However, such a metathesis is difficult to explain [Meillet 1894: 155]. **dru-* > **dur-* is not probable for Armenian. One would rather expect **dru-* > **(V)rdu-*. To avoid this problem, Hamp (1982a: 145-146; 1983b: 65) restores nom. **d̥rōgʰ-s* > **Vrdu*, acc. **d̥rogʰ-m* > **Vrdogn* > **Vrdugn* (analogically after the vocalism of the nominative), gen. **d̥rgʰ-os* > **darg-*, assuming that a subsequent metathesis of *ru* > *ur* “would have both preserved the parallelism of **darg-* and avoided the paradigmatic anomaly of metathesis of initial **dr-*”.

The best option seems to be the **d̥ōrgʰ-*, see Clackson 1994: 209₆₃; cf. also Ĵahukyan (1987: 120, 253-254), who hesitantly tries **d̥ōrgʰ-* and **d̥rgʰ-*. For the vocalic problem and the “Gutturalwechsel” in the context of the obvious parallel of *burgn* ‘tower’ : **berj* ‘high’, *bařnam* ‘to lift’ see Eichner 1978: 147₁₉; *Letoublon/Lamberterie 1980: 315; Lamberterie 1980; Clackson 1994: 209₆₃, 226₁₄₆, 233₂₇₃; Olsen 1999: 950-951, 954-955. The word is considered an extended grade form from an earlier root noun (see Eichner 1978: 147₁₉; Clackson 1994: 209₆₃). Trying to reconcile this view with that of Hamp, one may treat the word as a consonant stem of HD declension, of the type **k̂ēr-d* ‘heart’, GSg **k̂r-ed-s* (see Beekes 1995: 190). Thus: NSg **d̥ōr-gʰ*, GSg **d̥r-ogʰ-s*. The nominative is seen in Arm. **durg-*, whereas Greek and Celtic have generalized the oblique stem.

Starostin (1985: 85-86) compares PNcauc **tirungV-* ‘spindle’ (cf. Darg. *durug* ‘spindle’, PLesg. **tinug* ‘axis of a spindle’, Abxaz *a-dardə*, etc.) with PIE **te/ork-* ‘to turn’ (cf. Skt. *tarku-* ‘spindle’ from *tark-* ‘to turn, to move to and fro’, Lat. *torquēre* ‘to turn, twist; to spin, whirl; to wind (round)’, Hitt. *tarku-* ‘to turn oneself; to dance’, etc.). I wonder if the Caucasian is rather related with PIE **d̥ōrgʰ/*d̥rogʰ-* ‘wheel’. [The Caucasian reconstruction looks suspicious. If Darg. *durug* ‘spindle’ is not related with the other Caucasian forms, one might treat it as an Armenian loan.

Note that Arm. dial. *turg*, possibly meaning ‘spinning-wheel’ or the like, is represented in Ganjak (Kirovabad), geographically not Far from East Caucasian languages of Daghestan]. Nikolaev (1985: 72) considers Gr. *ἄτρακτος* m. (f.) ‘spindle’ and Skt. *tarku-* ‘spindle’ as borrowed from the same Caucasian word.

Arm. *burn* (GSg *brgan*) ‘tower; pyramis’ (Bible+) is compared with Gr. *πύργος* m. (also *φύργος*) ‘tower’ (NHB and Petermann; see HAB 1: 488b). Adonc’ (1938: 465 = 1972: 389-390) compares Arm. *burn* with Urt. *burgana* ‘fortress’ and assumes a word of “asianic” origin that has been penetrated into the Mediterranean area. On the other hand, Arm. *burn* is considered as borrowed from Aram. *būrgā* ‘tower’, see Hübschmann 1897: 392-393 (with reservation); HAB 1: 488. In view of the final *-n*, Ĵahukyan (1985a: 366; 1987: 430-432 and espec. 432₁₃, 466 /with reservation/; 1988: 141, 141₂₄, 141₂₆) prefers tracing *burn* to Urt. *burgana* ‘fortress’; see also D’jakonov 1983: 165. Diakonoff (1971: 84₈₉) also mentions Udi *buruh*, *bury* ‘Berg’.

However, the very same argument of the final *-n* speaks rather in favour of the opposite direction of the borrowing. As we have seen, *burn* is related with **bar(j)-nam* exactly as *durn* with **dar(j)-nam*. The strange vocalism of *burn* is comparable with irregular *-u-* in Gr. *πύργος* and *φύργος* ‘tower’. These circumstances suggest that we are dealing with a ‘Wanderwort’ in IE and Sem. languages, and Urt. *burgana* may be treated as borrowed from Arm. *burn* (GSg *brgan*).

Mediterranean?

ezn, GDSg *ezin*, NPl *ezin-k*’, APl *ezin-s*, GDPl *ezan-c*’, IPl *ezam-b-k*’ ‘bullock, ox’.

Bible+.

●**DIAL** Widespread in dialects. Traces of the final *-n* are seen in Łarabał etc. *yéznə*, Agulis *íznə*, Hamšen *yiz*, gen. *ezənə*, T’iflis *yízə*, etc.

Łarabał **astucoy ezn* ‘Lady-bug’. Names of the Lady-bug usually display a feminine connotation (see 3.5.2.1 and s.v. *zatic*). In this respect, Łarabał **astucoy ezn* seems peculiar. One might suggest that *ezn* earlier had feminine (or generic) semantics. This might be supported by Van, Moks **le/izn* ‘female buffalo’ (if my interpretation is accepted; see 2.1.7) and by the etymology (see below).

It has been assumed that Hamšen *ezni* is a dual form, ‘a pair of bullocks’, that is (Artasēs Ēk’suzean, p.c. apud Ačāryan 1947: 86).

●**ETYM** Since long (Lagarde, Müller, etc.; see HAB 2: 5-6), connected with Skt. *ahī-* f. (*vrkī*-inflection) ‘cow, female of an animal’ (RV), Av. *azī-* (*devī*-inflection) ‘milking (of cows and mares)’; the appurtenance of OIr. *ag* n. ‘cow, cattle’ (<

**ag^hes-*) is uncertain; see Mayrhofer, EWAia 1: 156, without the Armenian, though it is mentioned in KEWA 1: 68.

Hübschmann (1899: 47) points out that the Sanskrit word is uncertain, and Av. *azr-* is only an epithet of the cow, meaning something like 'milchend'. Positive: Meillet 1898: 278; HAB 2: 5-6.

The IE cognates appear to designate the female bovine animal. For possible dialectal relics of the older feminine semantics of *ezn* see above.

The vocalism of the Armenian does not match that of Celtic; cf. Greppin 1980: 133; Hamp 1986a: 64₁. Olsen (1999: 121) assumes a lengthened grade of the root **h₂eġ^h-(V)-* > **iz-V-* (Eichner's Law) with subsequent dissimilatory umlaut **izin-* > **ezin-*, which is not convincing. In view of the development *CHC* > Celt. *CaC* and *HHC* > *aC* (see Beekes 1988: 93), one may hypothetically assume the following original paradigm: nom. **h₂h₁eġ^h--* (> Ilr. and Arm.), obl. **h₂h₁ġ^h-* (> Celt.).

Arm. *ezn*, ge. *ezin* may be seen as a frozen accusative **(H)h₁eġ^h-ih₂-m* (*devī*-inflection).

ezr, *r*-stem: numerous attestations in the Bible: NomSg *ezr*, GDSg *ezer*, AllSg *y-ezr*, LocSg *y-ezer*, IPl *ezer-b*, APl *ezer-s* [Astuacaturean 1895: 422ab]; note also IPl. *ezer-a-w-k'* in Gregory of Nyssa and Vardan Arewelc'i, *ezer-o-v-k'* in Sargis Šnorhali Vardapet, which point to *a*- and *o*-stems respectively 'edge (of cloth, ravine, city, sea, river, etc.)'.

That *ezr* refers to various (watery and non-watery) objects can be seen from the attestations in the Bible (see Astuacaturean, ibid.). In Movsēs Xorenac'i, e.g., it mostly (but not always) has "watery" semantics: 1.16 (1913=1991: 51^{L11}; transl. Thomson 1978: 99): *y-ezr covakin atwoy*; <...> *ar ezerb covun* "at the edge of the salt lake. On the shore of the lake <...>", also *y-ezr covun* (51^{L16}), *zezerb covakin* (53^{L12}); in 1.12 (39^{L16} and 42^{L3f}; transl. 90 and 92): *ar ezerb getoyn* "on the bank of the river"; in 2.50 (178^{L12}): *y-ezr getoy* "to the river-shore"; 3.59 (338^{L15}; transl. 332): *zezerb mōrin* : "along the edge of the marsh"; 3.32 (296^{L10f}): *ar ezerb p'osoyn* "by the edge of the ditch".

In 2.8 of the same author (114^{L10}, 115^{L7}; transl. 141), *ezr* refers both to the edge of the world and to the sea-shore. Note also the compound *cov-ezer-eayk'* "those who dwelt by the sea" (2.53: 182^{L18}; transl. 195). Referring to 'plain': *ar* <...> *ezerōk' daštin* : "at <...> edges of the plain" (1.12: 39^{L2}).

In Łazar P'arpec'i (5th cent.) 3.81 (1904=1985: 148^{L35}; transl. Thomson 1991: 208): *yezer hetetatin* "at the edge of the ravine" (for the full passage see s.v. *art* 'cornfield').

●**DIAL** Preserved in several dialects. In some of them, with metathesis: Marāṭa, Salmas *yerz*, Ararat *yerzə* [HAB 2: 6b]. Both watery and non-watery aspects are seen in derivatives (see Ačārean 1913: 292a; HAB 2: 6-7).

In a folk-prayer from Muš/Bulanəx (S. Movsisyan 1972: 55a, 130a^{Nr10}), *h'ezr* refers to the edge of the world (*ašxark* 'axšark').

●**ETYM** Since de Lagarde (1854: 35^{L983f}), connected with Lith. *ežia* 'boundary(-strip)', etc. [Meillet 1898: 282; Hübschmann 1899: 47; HAB 2: 6b; Beekes 2003: 181]. The BSL forms derive from **h₁eg^h*- 'balk, border': Lith. *ežė* 'border, frontier', Latv. *eža* 'boundary(-strip)', Russ. *ěz*, ORuss. *ězъ* 'fish weir', Czech *jez* 'mill-pond, dam, weir, dike', SCr. *jāz* 'drain (at a dam or weir), mill-pond, dike', etc.

Beekes (apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 343b) considers the connection between BSL **h₁eg^h-er-* (not mentioning Arm. *ezr*) with Lith. *ežia* etc. to be uncertain. There seem to be no solid reasons for this. Meanings such as 'mill-pond', 'drain, canal' and 'brook' form a semantic link between **jēž-/jež-* 'dam, wier' and **jezero* 'lake'. Besides, the Armenian word is an intermediary form since it is semantically identic with Lith. *ežia* but formally closer to Lith. *ėžeras* 'lake', OCS *jezero* n. 'lake', etc. [Pokorny 1959: 291-292; Toporov, PrJaz [1], 1975: 131-133; ÈtimSlovSlavJaz 6, 1979: 33-34, 59-60; Saradževa 1986: 26-27; Ĵahukyan 1987: 163; Olsen 1999: 146-147].

The connection with the Greek mythological river *Ἀχέρον* seems very uncertain [Beekes apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 343b]. The basic meaning of Arm. *ezr* must have been 'edge of lake, river, etc.'

Alternatively, Arm. *ezr* has been connected with Germ. *edara-* 'edge (etc.)' etc. [Normier 1980: 19; Viredaz 2005: 85]. It has been assumed that the regular outcome of the intervocalic **-d^h-* is Arm. *-z-* (see Normier 1980: 19; Olsen 1999: 782; Viredaz 2005: 85). Some of the examples (*suzanem*, *eluzanem*) are better explained from the sigmatic aorist (see Kortlandt 2003: 80-81, 115; see also Viredaz 2005: 85₂); on *awaz* 'sand' see s.v. Besides, as Rémy Viredaz points out to me (p.c.), the German match for Arm. *ezr* is semantically inadequate (the German word originally meant 'plank', see Kluge/Seebold 1989, s.v. *Etter*).

I conclude that there is no serious reason to abandon the traditional etymology.

***e(h/y)am** or ***i(h/y)am** 'to go'.

●**DIAL** Akn, Van, T'iflis *əhal*, Partizak *iyal* (see also Tēr-Yakobean 1960: 498), Aslanbek, Byut'ania, K'ti, Moks *ial* 'to go' [Ačārean 1898: 32a, 35a; 1913: 396a;

HAB 2: 54a]. For numerous textual illustrations from Aslanbek see Ačārean 1898: 85ab, 87a.

It seems that Moks has **ya-*. In folklore-texts from Orbeli 2002 one finds the following forms: inf. *yāl* (123^{Nr142}), *yä* (66^{L9}, 78^{L-2}); pres. *yä* (93^{L1}); subjunctive present: 1sg *yām* (93^{L-12}, 95^{L-14}, 96^{L17}, 99^{L5}), 2sg *yās* (97^{L-9}, 98^{L-4}), 3sg *yä* (55^{L17}, 58^{L4}, 63^{L17}, 64^{L-4}, 80^{L7}), 1pl *yānk*^o (58^{L-4}, 62^{L18}, 66^{L3}, 68^{L12}, 70^{L13}, 86^{L-14}), 3pl *yān* (86^{L14}, 95^{L14}); subjunctive past: 1sg *yām* (74^{L9}), 3sg *yēr* [from **yayr*] (66^{L10,11}, 93^{L-3}), 3pl *yēn* [**yayin*] (62^{L19}); with particles: 1sg *tə-yām* (58^{L11}, 60^{L4}, 68^{L10}, 81^{L-15}, 97^{L10,-11}, 120^{Nr64}), 2sg *tə-yās* (68^{L8}, 75^{L1}, 96^{L3}), *kə-yās* (74^{L-15}), 3sg *kə-yä* (86^{L5}), *təx-yä* (58^{L4}), 3pl *tə-yān* (86^{L8}); pres.: 3sg *kə-yä* (86^{L4}), 1pl *kə-yānk*^o (57^{L-11}), 3pl *kə-yān* (57^{L12}, 67^{L8}); neg. 1sg *čə-yām* (77^{L-7}).

With particles (especially with *təx* 'let' and neg. *čə*) one often finds forms with a vowel *-i-*: *təx-iyä* (56^{L1}), 3sg *k-iyä* (91^{L-9}, 93^{L11,-4}, 127^{Nr45,47}), 3pl *k-iyān* (95^{L16}), 1sg *čəm iyä*, 2sg *čəs iyä* (81, lines -6 and -8, cf. 1sg *čəm ért'a*, in line -13), 3sg *čə-iyä* (127^{Nr36,47}). This usage cannot be used as evidence for the form **ial* since this *-i-* hardly belongs to the verbal stem; see par. XX. Thus, the verb in Moks is **ya-* rather than **i(y)a-*.

In Moks, the synonymic verb *ért'am* is often used in the same texts with **ya-*, sometimes even in the same or in neighbouring sentences, e.g. 56^{L1} (3sg *təx-ért'a* 'let him go' vs. *təx-iyä* 'id.' in the same sentence); 57^{L-10f} (1pl *k-ért'ank*^o vs. *kə-yānk*^o in the same sentence); 67^{Nr40} (3pl *k-ért'an* in line 4 vs. *kə-yān* in line 8); 81^{L-6,-13} (1sg *čəm iyä* vs. *čəm ért'a*); etc.

Neither *ért-* nor **ya-* is used to make aorist in Moks; *gam* 'to come' (in the dialect: 'to go'; see s.v.) is used instead; e.g. in a tale (op. cit. 70, lines 2, 13, 15) one finds 3pl.pres. *k-ért'an* and 1pl.subj. *yānk*^o vs. 3pl.aor. *k'ác'in*.

Ačāryan (1898: 35a) points out that Aslanbek *ial* is pronounced as *iħal* or *iyal* which resulted from the combination of the two vowels. He suggests, thus, a hiatus-glide, on which see 2.1.32.

T'iflis *ēħal* 'to go' is attested by the 18th century famous poet Sayat'-Nova, who spoke and wrote in the dialect of T'iflis (see K'oč'oyan 1963: 71). The form suggests **ēħam*, cf. *erkat* 'iron' > T'iflis *érkat*, *eraz* 'dream' > *eraz* (see Ačārean 1911: 53).

I conclude that the verb appears in the following basic forms: **e(h/y)am*, **i(h/y)am*, **yam*. The *-h/y-* is a hiatus-glide.

●**ETYM** Ačāryan (HAB 2: 54a) places the word s.v. *ért'am* 'to go'. The same he did earlier in his study on the dialect of Aslanbek (1898: 32a, 35a; see also Vaux 2001: 51, 61^{7,11}, 63⁹³). Tomson (1890: 33, § 61.1) cites T'iflis *k-ēħam* 'I shall go' as belonging to *ért'am*.

On the other hand, Ačaryan (HAB 2: 54a; see also 1913: 396a) mentions the etymology suggested by Tervišyan (in "Lezu" 1887: 91) linking **ial* with Skt. *éti* 'to go' etc., but does not specify his opinion. Elsewhere (HAB 4: 12b), he, though with a question mark, mentions *ert'al* > *ehal* as a parallel for *partēz* 'garden' > *pahēz*. The development *-rt'-* > *-h* or *zero* is uncertain, however. (*pahēz* - perhaps, a back loan? see 1.10).

The etymology of Tervišyan deserves more attention. This dialectal word may be derived from PIE **h₁ei-* 'to go': Skt. *éti* 'to go', Gk. *εἶμι* 'to go', Lith. *ėiti* 'to go', etc. See s.v. *ēj̃*, *ījanem* 'to go down'. Note also PIE **h₁i-eh₂-* (derived from **h₁ei-*): Skt. *yā-* 'to go, drive (fast), speed', 3sg.act. *yāti* (RV+), 3sg.med. *īyate*, Lith. *jóti* 'to drive, to go', ToA *yā-* 'to go, to travel', etc. Armenian, as Sanskrit and Baltic, shows reflexes of both **h₁ei-* (T'iflis *ehal* etc.) and **(h₁)i-eh₂-* (Moks **yal*). The former is probably represented in two variants: **e-am* from **h₁ei-eh₂-* > **e(i)ami* (with loss of intervocalic **-i-*, see e.g. s.v. *erek'* 'three'); **i-am* from **ē-am* < **h₁ei-*, with a regular change of unstressed *ē* (< **ei*) to *i*.

I conclude that Tervišyan's etymology is worth of consideration, and Armenian may have preserved both **h₁ei-* and **(h₁)i-eh₂-* (cf. Skt. *éti* vs. *yāti*), though, admittedly, one needs further philological evidence and discussion for the establishing and precise reconstruction of the Armenian by-forms.

etbayr, GSg *etbawr*, NPl *etbar-k'*, GDPl *etbar-c'*, etc. 'brother'.

Bible+.

●**DIAL** Ubiquitous in dialects. Practically all the dialect forms (not just many, as is put in Viredaz 2003: 76) go back to **atbayr*, with initial *a-*. To the forms recorded in HAB 2: 16b (and Greppin 1981: 138) we can now add also: Dersim *axp/bar*, *a(t)bar*, Mirak' *atbār* [Baṭramyan 1960: 78a], Malat'ia *axp'ar* [Danielyan 1967: 190a], Svedia *axb'ar* [Ačaryan 2003: 565]. Beekes (2003: 143) notes that "Class. *etbayr* stands against *axpar* of all modern dialects". In reality, not all the dialects have *axpar*, but all the dialectal forms can be derived from **atbayr* (see also Greppin 1981: 138; Clackson 2004-05: 157).

The form **atbayr* (*atbayr*, *atbar*, *atbēr*) is attested since 12th century in MArm. sources [HAB 2: 16b], as well as since 11th century in colophons and inscriptions [S. A. Avagyan 1973: 103-104; H. Muradyan 1982: 127].

The only dialect representing the form *etbayr*, with the initial *e-*, is Zeyt'un: *exb'ay* (cf. also Maraš *exper* [Galustean 1934: 377]), vs. Hačən *axb'ay*, GSg *axb'ey* [HAB 2: 16b; Ačaryan 2003: 39, 80, 307]. This *e-* of the Zeyt'un/Maraš form seems to be secondary (see 2.1.17.4 for the prothetic vowel).

●**ETYM** Since Petermann, derived with the PIE word for ‘brother’ with regular metathesis, dissimilation *r...r* > *l...r* (2.1.24.2) and subsequent addition of prothetic *e-* before *t*: Skt. *bhrā́tar-*, Lat. *frāter* ‘brother’, Gr. *φράτηρ* ‘member of a brotherhood’, etc., [Hübschmann 1897: 441-442; HAB 2: 16a]. Nom. **b^hreh₂tēr* > *etbayr*, gen. **b^hreh₂tr-ós* > *etbawr*.

etcamn, *an*-stem (GSg *eteman*, ISg *etemamb*) ‘hoarfrost’.

Bible+. In "Yačaxapatum" and Vardan Arewelc'i (13th cent.): dial. *etemn*.

●**DIAL** Hamšen *etim* ‘icicle’, Łazax *etm-a-kal-el* ‘to be covered by hoarfrost’ [HAB 2: 17a]. Also Dersim *yeťyam* [Bałramyan 1960: 78b].

●**ETYM** No acceptable etymology is recorded in HAB 2: 16-17. Ałayan (1980: 142) analyzes as **eti-amn* for the formation comparing with *ayceamn* ‘gazelle, roe’ < **ayci-* + *-amn* (see s.v. *ayc(i)* ‘goat’ and 2.3.1). Olsen (1999: 376, 943) mentions as a word of unknown origin containing the suffix *-eamn*.

I propose to compare Arm. **eti-* with Balto-Slav. **h₁iH-ni-* ‘hoar-frost, rime’ (cf. Beekes apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 287a): Russ. *ínej*, Czech *jíní*, SCr. *īnje*, Bulg. *ínej*, Lith. *ynis* (dial.), etc. The full grade of the word, viz. **h₁eiH-ni-*, may have yielded PArm. **eiəni-* > **e(i)eni-* > **eni-*, with assimilation (see 2.1.23) and subsequent loss of **-ə-*. Alternatively, one may assume a zero grade root: **h₁iH-ni-* > PArm. **ini-ámVn* > **(i)tiamn* (with dissimilation *n ... n* > *t ... n*, and loss of word-initial pretonic *i-*, see 2.1.33.2) > *e-teamn*, with a regular prothetic *e-* before *t*. For the suffix cf. *sāramanik* ‘ice’. Thus: **eni-am(a)n* > *etcamn* with nasal dissimilation.

erastan-k, *a*-stem: GDPl *erastan-a-c* ‘‘buttocks’.

Several attestations in the Bible, rendering Gr. *ἔδραι* : *ἔδρα* ‘seat; rump’. Singular usage: in Philo.

●**ETYM** Compared with Gr. *πρωκτός* m. ‘anus’, Skt. *pr̥sthā-* n. ‘back, mountain-ridge, top’ (RV+), *pr̥sthī-* f. ‘rib’ (RV+), cf. YAv. *paršta-* m. ‘back, spine, support in the back’, *parštī* ‘back’, etc. [Bugge 1889: 12-13; Osthoff 1898: 60; Hübschmann 1897: 443; HAB 2: 41-42; AčarHLPatm 1, 1940: 86b; Meillet 1936: 142; Hanneyan 1979: 182; Arutjunjan 1983: 280; Olsen 1999: 320]. For other references see below.

The IIr. forms may also be derived from PIE **pr-sth₂-* and be, thus, incompatible with at least the Greek. Most of the scholars, therefore, focus on the Armeno-Greek correspondence. Jahukyan (1967: 165₁₀) accepts the connection between the Armenian and Aryan but changes his view to the opposite in 1987: 145. A

contaminaton is possible. Compare also Skt. *pársu-* f. 'rib' (RV+), etc.; see s.v. *y-ors-ay-s*.

Different proto-forms have been suggested: **prōkto-* : **prākto-* [Pokorný 1959: 846; Frisk 2: 608; Ĵahukyan 1987: 145]; nom. **proHkt-* vs. obl. **prākt-*, type **pōnt-eH-*; Arm. *-n* from acc. **-m* (see Hamp 1983b; 1991); **prōkt-s* : **prkt-ós* [Beekes 1969: 247]; **perh₃kt-* [Beekes 1988: 77]; **preh₂kt-* : **proh₂kt-* [Beekes 2003: 152, 166, 171, 173, 191, 195]. Hamp (1991) argues against **perh₃kt-* in view of the absence of Arm. initial *h-*, and alternatively assumes **pr(e)Okt-* (= **pr(e)h₃kt-*). Noting that **prh₃kt-* would yield rather Arm. **(h)arast-* (cf. *haraw* 'south' etc.), Olsen (1999: 320) assumes an influence of *eran-k'* 'thigh, loins'. Clackson (1994: 167) argues against Hamp's analysis of the final *-n* pointing out that one would expect **erastun-k'*, and prefers to compare *-an-k'* with *eran-k'* 'thigh, loins', and *srb-an* 'anus'. The latter is attested in Zgōn (Afrahat), and is found in a number of dialects, as a frozen plural: **srban-k'* 'placenta; prenatal liquid of a cow' (see s.v. *surb* 'pure; holy'). For further analysis and references I refer to Clackson 1994: 166-167.

There can be no serious objection to the following paradigm: nom. **pre/oHkt-* : **prHkt-* > PArm. **erust-* : **(h)arast-* (or **erast-* : **(h)arast-*, if it was **-e/oh₃-*). From here one easily arrives at *erast-an-k'* by levelling, and influence of *eran-k'*. The form **(h)arast-* may be seen, I think, in *arastoy* (also *erastoy*) 'solid, hard stone', q.v.

erbuc, *o*-stem 'breast of animals'.

Frequent in the Bible, referring to the breast of sacrificial animals and rendering Gr. *στηθύνιον* (dimin.) 'breast'. For apposition with *βραχίον* = *eri* 'shoulder of animals' see there.

●**ETYM** No etymology is accepted in HAB 2: 42b.

Lidén (1937: 92) derives from IE **b^hrugō-* or **b^hrugō-* with Gr. *φάρυγξ*, gen. *-υγος*, *-υγγος* 'throat; dewlap of a bull', and Lat. *frūmen* 'throat' < **frūg-smen*. He is sceptical about Goth. *brusts* 'breast', Russ. *brjúxo* 'belly', etc. The etymology is accepted in Ĵahukyan 1987: 116, 262; Olsen 1999: 49. The metathesis **b^hr-* > Arm. *erb-* is regular, see par. XX.

Olsen (ibid.) derives *erbuc* from nom. **b^hrug/g^h-s* assuming that **g^h* and **g^s* would coalesce in Arm. *c*. If the *-c'* in *erēc'* 'elder' (q.v.) reflects **sg^w*- (cf. Gr. *πρέσβυς*), the *-c* of *erbuc* should rather be explained by non-nominative forms. In view of the absence of other examples, however, this must be viewed as yet uncertain.

The Greek is considered to be of non-IE origin (see Beekes 1969: 197, with refer.). We may be dealing with a Mediterranean (or, if the Germanic and Slavic words are related, European, see 3.11) substratum word.

Any relation with *eri* 'shoulder of animals'? (q.v.).

erek, inflected only in plural: API *eri-s*, GDPI *eri-c*, IPI *eri-w-k* 'three'.

Bible+. The form ***eri-** is found in e.g. *eric's* (or *eric's angam*) 'thrice' (Bible+). In Movsēs Xorenac'i 2.61 (1913=1991: 192^{L10}; transl. Thomson 1978: 204): *eric's kam ē'oric's baxen zsaln* "strike the anvil three or four times". Compare *erkic's* from *erku* 'two', q.v.

On *erir* 'third; for the third time' (Bible+) and *erek'-kin* 'threefold, triple, thrice' (Bible+) see below, also s.v. *krkin*.

In later compounds: *ēr-* < *err-* (Movsēs Xorenac'i, Philo, etc.), e.g. *ēr-a-yark* in Movsēs Xorenac'i 1.16 (1913=1991: 53^{L5f}; transl. Thomson 1978: 100): *aparans <...> krknayarks ew ērayarks* "palaces <...> of two and three stories". The form *ēr-* is derived from *err-*, as in *tarr* 'element' > *tar* [HAB 2: 50b]. I wonder if it is not analogical after *k'ai-* (q.v.).

●**DIAL** Ubiquitous in dialects. Note Antiok' *ərək'* and Hačən *žək'* (cf. Nor Naxijewan *žək'*) vs. Zeyt'un *iyik'* [Ačāryan 2003: 307]. The Hačən form is exceptional since there are no other examples of the development *VrV* > *žV* (cf. *erēk* 'yesterday' > Hačən *iyeg*, etc.) [Ačāryan 2003: 130], whereas it is regular in Nor Naxijewan (see Ačārean 1925: 53, 154-155).

Sivri-Hisar *šek/šek'* 'three' (see PtmSivHisHay 1965: 469a; N. Mkrtč'yan 1995: 207, 210). N. Mkrtč'yan (1995: 210) takes this as one of the isoglosses shared by the dialects of Nor Naxijewan and Sivri-Hisar.

On Moks *irik' in* 'for the third time' (apparently a relic from ClArm. *erek'-kin* 'thrice') and *irik' ir* 'id.' see s.v. *krkin*.

ClArm. *erek'in*, *erek'ean* 'all the three' (Bible+) has been preserved in Łarabat *ərək'an*, *irək'an* [Davt'yan 1966: 347], Mełri *irik'k'ēn* [Ałayan 1954: 179-180, 268a], Karčewan *irik'ēn* [H. Muradyan 1960: 110, 192b], Kak'avaberd *irək'kan* [H. Muradyan 1967: 127-128, 170a]. See also AčārLiak 1, 1952: 325-326]. On these forms see 2.2.4.2.

●**ETYM** From PIE **treies* m. 'three': Skt. *trāyas*, Gr. *τρεῖς*, Lat. *trēs*, Lith. *trỹs* 'three', etc.; cf. also Arm. API *eris* < **trins*: Goth. *þrins*, instr. **eri-w-* < **tri-b^hi-*: Skt. DAbIPI *tribhyās* [HAB 2: 50-51]. PIE **trins* > Arm. *e-ris* shows that the addition of the prothetic vowel was posterior to the loss of the vowel of the last syllable [Meillet 1900: 394; Beekes 2003: 153-154].

It has been assumed that *erir* 'third' continues the inherited **triyo-* influenced by **(kʷ)turo-* 'fourth', i.e. a contaminated **tri-ro-* [Szemerényi 1960: 95; Kortlandt 2003: 101]. On *erkir* 'second', *erir* 'third' etc. see also Meillet 1911-12c: 294 (comparing with Tocharian *r*); Ĵahukyan 1982: 223₆₆, and s.v. *krkin*.

erēc', GDSg *eric'-u*, AblSg *eric'-u-ē*, NPl *eric'-un-k'*, GDPl *eric'-an-c'* [Astuacaturean 1895: 460ab]; *a*-stem: ISg *eric'-a-w* as a reading variant in Movsēs Xorenac'i 3.63 (1913=1991: 347^{L22}); *o*-stem: GDPl *eric'-o-y* in Elišē and Łazar P'arpec'i [NHB 1: 683a]; pl. *eric'-unik'*, *-un-eac'* in Canon Law [HAB 2: 52b]; for the *-u/-n* declension (cf. the type of *k'ar*, *-i*, *-in-k'*, *-an-c'* 'stone') see Meillet 1913: 56-57; Tumanjan 1978: 295; Ĵahukyan 1982: 95, 122; Olsen 1999: 105, 124, 163, 166, 170, 186. '(adj.) elder; presbyter'.

Bible+.

●**DIAL** Preserved in several dialects [HAB 2: 53a]. Note Moks *erēc'*, gen. *iric'-u* 'священник, поп' [Orbeli 2002: 224]; Hamšen *erēc'*, *eric'*, gen. *eric'-u* [Ačāryan 1947: 91, 227].

●**ETYM** Connected with Gr. *πρέσβυς* m. 'old man; the elder; the elder; ambassador; president', perhaps also Lat. *priscus* 'ancient' [Bugge 1889: 12; Meillet 1894b: 296; Hübschmann 1897: 444; HAB 2: 52-53; Ĵahukyan 1982: 72, 122; 1987: 143, 186 (the Greek is considered doubtful); Olsen 1999: 166, 170. (On Greek see also Bloomfield 1908). For the philological and etymological discussion I refer especially to Clackson 1994: 165. For the problem of *-c'* see also s.v. *erbuc* 'breast of animals'.

ert'(an)am 'to go; to set off'. The indicative of the aorist is supplied by *č'ogay*, but the moods are formed from *ert'*, see Meillet 1936: 135; Szemerényi 1964: 5₅.

Bible+. The substantive **ert'**, *i*-stem 'going, journey' is attested in John Chrysostom (GDSg *ert'i*), Łazar P'arpec'i (GDPl *ert'ic'*), Movsēs Xorenac'i, and Grigoris Aršaruni [NHB 1: 683a].

●**DIAL** Widespread in dialects.

Karin *ert'-u-gal* 'the going and the coming' (see HayLezBrbBař 2, 2002: 34b; HŽHek' 4, 1963: 120).

See also s.v. **e(h/y)am*.

●**ETYM** Usually linked with Gr. *ἐρχομαι* 'to set out; to walk; to come or go', for which different proposals have been made: **h₁er-* or **h₁r-tʰ-sk-* or **ser-* + **-tʰ-*, **-dʰ-*, **-gʰ-*, or **-kʰ-* (see Meillet 1898: 276-277, 278; 1936: 135; Hübschmann 1899: 47; HAB 2: 53-54). For **h₁r-sk-* cf. Skt. *rcchāti* 'to reach, to come towards, to meet with', Hitt. *ar-šk-* iter. 'wiederholt gelangen, Einfälle machen', etc. Since the

sequence **-rt-* yields Arm. *-rd-*, for Arm. *ert'am* usually a **-tʰ-* suffix is restored. For the etymological details and other views see HAB 2: 53-54; Frisk 1, 1960: 572; Barton 1963; Szemerényi 1964: 4-5; Klingenschmitt 1982: 96-104; Ĵahukyan 1982: 68; 1987: 165; Matzinger 2000: 285. However, there are no cognate forms with a dental suffixal element **-tʰ-*. Besides, such a phoneme is commonly considered to be absent from the standard PIE phonemic inventory. The etymology is, then, problematic. No wonder that Clackson (1994: 181) considers it as doubtful.

I propose to treat *ert'am* as a denominative verb derived from *ert'*, *-i* 'going, journey', which in turn may be a **-ti-* suffixed form based upon **h₁r-sk-* (originally, perhaps, iterative or inchoative): **h₁r-sk-ti-* > PArm. **er-c'-t'i* > *ert'*, *-i*. For the phonological development of the consonant cluster see 2.1.22.13. Many scholars would expect **HrC-* to yield Arm. **arC-*. It is possible, however, that the laryngeal **h₁* is regularly reflected as Arm. *e* especially when the following syllable contains a front vowel (cf. 2.1.17).

eri, *ea*-stem: GDSg *erw-oy* thrice in the Bible, IPI *ere-a-w-k'* in Philo [Astuacaturean 1895: 465b; NHB 1: 683c]; GD *ere-a-c'* according to HAB 2: 54b, but without evidence 'shoulder of animals' (dial. also for humans); **at'eri** (also **y-eri**) 'near, at the side' ("Ašxarhac'oyc'", Eusebius of Caesarea).

In Deuteronomy 18.3, the priest shall receive the following parts of a sacrificed ox or sheep: *eri*, *cnōt-k'*, *xaxac'oc'* (see Cox 1981: 149) = Gr. *βραχίων* 'upper arm; shoulder of beasts', *σιαγόνια* 'the parts under or near the jaw', *ἔνυστρον* 'fourth stomach of ruminating animals', respectively. In some passages on the sacrificial instruction a reference is made to the right *eri* = *βραχίον*: Exodus 29.22, Leviticus 7.32, 33, 8.25, 26, 9.21, Numbers 18.18.

In Exodus 29.27, Leviticus 9.21, and Numbers 18.18, *eri* = *βραχίον* occurs in apposition with *erbuc* = *στηθύσιον* (dimin.) 'breast'.

● **DIAL** Ararat *eri*, ĴarabaĴ, MaraĴa *heri*, Salmast *neri* (sic! *n-* is reliable? - HM); ĴarabaĴ *hərat'at'* < **er-a-t'at'*, with *t'at'* 'arm, paw' as the second member [HAB 2: 55a]. For ĴarabaĴ *hrət'at'umə* 'in/on the back, shoulder-blade' see Ĵaziyan 1983: 146b^{L-18}, glossed as *hərat'at'* 'shoulder-blade, back', *hərt'at'-en* (186b). In another illustration from this book (85a^{L-17}), a man puts the *yaba* (a pitchfork) onto his **hrat'at'* (*hərt'at'-en*). Here the word clearly refers to 'shoulder(-blade)'. The same is found in L. Harut'yunyan 1991: 33^{L-8}, where the hero sitted *hrət'at'en* of a dragon.

In a story written in 1884, Ĵ. Aĵayan (1979: 623^{L-6f}) describes their buffalo named Dursun as having horns stretching along the neck and reaching the *ērat'at'-s*.

Probably, Xotorjur **erelt'at'* 'shoulder-blade' [YušamXotorj 1964: 447b] belongs here too, though the nature of the internal *-l-* is obscure.

●**ETYM** Ačairyan (HAB 2: 54-55) derives from **perə-* (in modern terms: **p(e)rh₂-*) 'before, in front'. Lidén (1937: 88-89) prefers a connection with Lith. *rietas* m. [o] 'thigh, loin', Latv. *riēta* f. [ā] 'thigh, haunch', CS *ritb* 'buttocks', Czech *řít* 'id.', ORuss. *ritb* 'hoof', etc., reconstructing **rēito-*, **rēitā-*. This etymology is largely accepted: Pokorny 1959: 863; Solta 1960: 418; Jahukyan 1987: 145, 189; Olsen 1999: 444.

If the initial *h-* in Łarabał etc. has indeed an etymological value, one should give preference to Ačairyan's etymology.

erinj, *o*-stem: GDPl *erinj-o-c'* (5x in the Bible), IPl *erinj-o-v-k'* (in Genesis 41.3, see Zeyt'unyan 1985: 339); *u*-stem: GDSg *erinj-u* (4x in the Bible), GDPl *erinj-u-c'* (once in the Bible, also in the Commentary upon Judges ascribed to Ehišē); *a*-stem: ISg *erinj-a-w* (Philo); see also **erinjnak** 'a thorny edible plant'. 'heifer, young cow; cow; bride'.

Bible+. In Isaiah 7.21: *erinj mi yarjaoc'* "one young cow from/of bovinds" : *δράμαλιν βοῶν*. See also s.v. *arjār*.

●**DIAL** Widespread in dialects. With initial *ε-*: Nor-Naxijewan, Axalc'xa, Hamšen, Karin, Ararat, Alaškert, Muš, Van, Moks (see also Orbeli 2002: 225), Šatax (see M. Muradyan 1962: 195b), Salmast; diphthomgized *ye-*: Ozim, Šamaxi, Juła; *he-*: Łarabał, Goris, Mužambar (a village of T'avriz/Tebriz) [HAB 2: 56b]; *he-* is also found in Kırzen [Bałramyan 1961: 180b], Metri [Ałayan 1954: 268a], Karčewan [H. Muradyan 1960: 192b], Kak'avaberd [H. Muradyan 1967: 170a], though Agulis, closely associated with the Metri group, has *árinj* [HAB 2: 56b; Ačarean 1935: 44, 349].

In all the dialects *erinj* refers to 'two-year old male or female calf' [HAB 2: 56b], Ararat *erinj* also to 'a three-year-old sprout of grapes which is replanted separately' (see Amatuni 1912: 182a; HAB 2: 56b). For the semantic shift see 3.5.1.

●**ETYM** Patrubány (1906-08 /1908/: 152a) derives from QIE **qrendʰjo-* connecting with OHG *hrind* 'neat, any bovine animal', Germ. *Rind* 'id.', etc. See also Adontz 1937: 7-8. Ačairyan (HAB 2: 56b) rejects this etymology (as well as all the others) because the Germanic derives from the PIE word for 'horn', with initial **k̑-*. This is not a decisive argument since the initial palatovelar in **k̑rV-* would be depalatalized (see 2.1.22.7), and **krV-* would yield PArm. **(w)ri-* or **(u)ri-* and, with a subsequent addition of a prothetic vowel *e-* before anlaut *r*, **e-ri-*. [It is possible that

both **krV-* and **kr̥V-* are merely simplified to **rV-*. Jahukyan (1987: 132) posits **krent̥io-*.

Petersson (1916: 257-258) links *erinj* with Gr. *ἔριφος* m. f. 'kid', Lith. *éras*, dial. *jéras* m. 'lamb', Latv. *jēre* 'one year old sheep, mother lamb', OIr. *heirp* f. 'deer', *er̥b* 'cow' < **er-bʰ-*, Lat. *ariēs*, *-etis* m. 'ram', etc. For Arm. *-j* he compares *oroj* 'lamb' (probably belonging to the same etymon, assimilated from **eroj*) and *aloj* 'female kid' (q.v.). This etymology found more acceptance, see Pokorny 1959: 326; Frisk, s.v. *ἔριφος*, Eilers 1974: 18; Schrijver 1991: 65; Mallory/Adams 1997: 511a; Olsen 1999: 185. Lat. *ariēs*, *-etis* m. 'ram', with unexplained *a-*, and Umbr. ASg *ERIEITU* 'arietem' may reflect **h₁riet-* [Schrijver 1991: 65-66].

In view of the acute, the Baltic forms may be separated from these words and go back to **ieh₁-ro-*, cf. ORuss. *jara* 'spring', OHG *jār* 'year', Av. *yar-* n. 'year', Gr. *ὥρᾱ* 'time, season', etc. (Derksen, Baltic Database; see also Toporov, PrJaz (2), E-H, 1979: 72-75).

Arm. *erinj* may be derived from QIE fem. **h₁eri-nih₂-* [Olsen 1999: 185] or **h₁ri-Hn-jeh₂-*, composed as **h₁ri-* (seen in Gr. *ἔρι-φος* m. f. 'kid' and Lat. *ariēs*, *-etis* m. 'ram') + **-Hn-i(e)h₂-*, exactly like PIE **h₁e/ol-Hn-ih₂-* 'deer, hind': OCS *alъnii* 'doe', SCr. *lane* 'doe', Russ. *lan* 'fallow deer, doe', Lith. *élnis* 'deer', MWelsh *elein* 'young deer, doe, hind-calf', etc. (see s.v. *analut* 'deer').

For *-nj* cf. other animal-names, *xtunj-n* 'snail', dial. **mormonj* 'ant', etc., all probably original feminines (cf. s.v.v. *morm* 'tarantula', *mrj̥iwn* 'ant', and 3.5.2.1; on *xtunj-n* 'snail' see also 2.3.1, under the suffix *-j/z*).

Megrelian *oriji*, *orinj* 'neat', *orji* 'cow' are considered to be Armenian loans (see HAB 2: 56b with ref.). If this is true, and if the labial initial does not have an inner-Megrelian explanation, one is tempted to compare it with OArm. hypothetical **u/wrinj-* (see above).

The initial *h-* in eastern dialects may be explained through contamination with *heru* 'last year' which underlies a few derivatives meaning 'a male or female calf between one and two years' mostly in Van and adjacent dialects (see Ačařean 1913: 657b).

[Alternative 1): Ararat *erinj* 'a three-year-old sprout of grapes which is replanted separately' is reminiscent of Gr. *θριρία ἄμπελος ἐν Κρήτῃ* 'vineyard' (Hesychius), perhaps from **trisinjeh₂-*, cf. Alb. *trische* < **trisjeh₂-* 'offshoot, seedling, sapling' and SCr. *trs* < **triso-* 'grapevine, reed' (see Mallory/Adams 1997: 644b). A word of substratum (Mediterranean/Pontic) origin? The Armenian may be identic with the protoform of the Greek: **trisinjeh₂-* > Arm. **e-rinj* is formally impeccable.

Alternative 2): Arm. *erinj* ‘young cow’ belongs with the above-mentioned Lith. *éras* ‘lamb’ etc. and may be derived from **h₁(e)Hr-injē₂*, cf. Skt. *paryāriṇī-* (Kath+) f. ‘cow which has its first calf after a year’].

erkan, *i*-stem, *a*-stem : GDSg *erkan-i* (Bible), GDPl *erkan-i-c* (Yovhannēs Erzñkac’i, 13-14th cent.), ISg *erkan-a-w* (Vardan Arewelc’i, 13th cent.), *erkan-a-c* (Grigoris Aršaruni, 7-8th cent.) ‘(hand-)mill’ (see Clackson 1994: 92).

Bible+.

●**DIAL** Preserved in numerous dialects; everywhere as a frozen plural **e/arkan-k*, except for Agulis *arkan* [HAB 2: 61b; Ačarean 1935: 349]. The *a*- is found only in E and SE margins, Agulis, Łarabał, Ʒuta, etc.

●**ETYM** Since Bugge (1889: 15), connected with Skt. *grāvan-* m. ‘pressing-stone, stone used to press Soma’ (RV+), Toch B *kārweñe* ‘stone’, OIc. *kvern* ‘hand-mill’, Lith. *girma*, *girmos* ‘millstone’, OCS *žrny*, Russ. *žernov* m., *žerna* f. ‘hand-mill’, Czech *žernov*, *žerna*, etc. [Hübschmann 1897: 444-445; HAB 2: 61].

Meillet (1894: 159-160) suggested a complicated scenario: **g^werwnā* > Arm. **kergan* > **kerkan* > *erkan*. Later he rejects this view (p.c. apud HAB 2: 61a) and derives *erkan* from **g^wrāwana* with development **-awa-* > *-a-* [Meillet 1908-09: 354-355]. Arm. **erkawan* is unnecessary since, in view of Lith. *girma* etc., Arm. *erkan* can go back to PIE **g^wr(e)h₂-n-*. On the prothetic vowel see 2.1.17.4.

Arm. *erkan* has *i*-stem and/or *a*-stem. I wonder if it can be derived from PIE dual **-ih₁-* dual. See also s.v. *aƿawr(i)*.

erkayn, *i*-stem (GDPl *erkayn-i-c* in Philo) ‘long’ (in both temporal and spatial aspects).

Bible+. Both aspects are illustrated by passages from the Bible, e.g.: *erkayn paranaw* : *σχοινίῳ μακρῷ* (Isaiah 5.18); *erkayn awurbk* : *μακρότητα ἡμερῶν* (Psalms 20.5).

In Movsēs Xorenac’i 1.16 (1913=1991: 51^{L11f}; transl. Thomson 1978: 99): *erkaynajew blur mi* “a long hill”; *hovit imm daštajew ew erkaynajig* “a wide meadow like a plain”.

●**DIAL** Ubiquitous in dialects. Šatax *herken* [M. Muradyan 1962: 195b], Moks, Ozim *herken*, and Muš, Alaškert *h’ergen* [HAB 2: 61a; Ačaryan 1952: 258; Orbeli 2002: 277 (textual illustrations from folklore: 96^{L18}, 125, Nrs. 1, 11, 13)] point to **y-erkayn*; see 2.3.1. None of the dialects (including Łarabał etc.) has an initial (voiceless) *h-*.

●**ETYM** See s.v. *erkar* ‘long’.

erkar, *a*-stem according to NHB, with no evidence; Ačaryan (HAB 2: 61b) cites two late attestations (both in Elias, comment. on Aristotle): ISg *erkar-i-w* (*i*-stem), GDPI *erkar-a-c* (*a*-stem) 'long' (in both temporal and spatial aspects).

Bible+. In Lamentations 5.20 (and not 7.20 as in NHB and HAB): *minč'ew erkar žamanaks*: εἰς μακρότητα ἡμερῶν.

For the spatial aspect cf. the following passages from Movsēs Xorenac'i: *vihs erkars* "wide caverns" (1.16 - 1913= 1991: 54^{L9f}; transl. Thomson 1978: 101; see s.v. *anjaw* for the full passage); *merj i leaṇ mi erkar yerkrē barjrut'eamb* "near to a mountain that rose high from the earth" (1.26: 75^{L11}; transl. 115); *andamovk' erkar* "with long limbs" (2.5: 107^{L6}).

y-erkar 'long time' (Bible+). In Movsēs Xorenac'i 3.12 (1913=1991: 270^{L14}; transl. Thomson 1978: 265): *yerkar hiwandac'eal vaxčānec'aw*: "after a long illness he died".

● **DIAL** Ararat, T'iflis, Rodost'o *ergar* 'long', Haštārxan *erkar* 'far away', Juṭa *y'etkar* or *yetkar* 'far away' [HAB 2: 61b; Ačārean 1940: 361a]. Ačāryan does not account for the abnormal *-t-* in the Juṭa form. In 1940: 55, he compares the development *ye-* > *y'e-* to that found in *yet* 'back, behind' > *y'et*, but does not specify the origin of *-t-*.

● **ETYM** Since Meillet (1924: 1-4), connected with Gr. *δῆρός*, Dor. *δᾶρός* 'lasting long', Lat. *dūrō* 'to make/become hard; to endure, last out, survive', Skt. *dūra-* 'far; distance, remoteness (in space and time)' (RV+), etc., through the sound change **dw-* > Arm. *-rk-* (< **duh₂-ro-*); also related with *erkayn* 'long' (see HAB 2: 60-61; Jahukyan 1982: 75), cf. Gr. *δῆν* 'long, far' < **δῆν* [Lamberterie 1992: 257]. However, the sound change is uncertain (see 2.1.22.6), and *-ar* and *-ayn* are said to possibly reflect the Armenian suffixes; for the discussion see also Clackson 1994: 112-115; Olsen 1999: 198-199, 204, 280-284, 772 (who considers the etymology indisputable and prefers restoring **duh₂-ro-*); Kortlandt 1989: 47-50 = 2003: 92-95; Harkness 1996: 13-14; Beekes 2003: 199-200; Viredaz 2003: 63₁₃ (who, like Olsen, prefers **duh₂-ro-*; see also s.v. *tew* 'duration').

Szemerényi (1985: 794-795) derives Arm. *erkar* from **eri-dwāros* (cf. Gr. *ἐπι-* 'very', etc.). See also s.v.v. *tew* and *tok* 'duration'. The other etymology which connects *erkar* with Lith. *er̃dvas* 'wide, spacious' (Meillet 1896: 150) is favoured by Kortlandt 2003: 95 (the addendum to the paper from 1989). However, the etymology is uncertain since the Lithuanian accent and Skt. *ārdha-* 'side, part, region' point to a **-d^h-* [Clackson 1994: 113; Beekes 2003: 200].

Pisani (1934: 184; 1950: 178₃) derives Arm. *erkar* and *erkayn* from **grā-* (cf. Lat. *grandis*) and compares the formation of *erkayn* with that of *layn* 'broad' (q.v.). Sceptical: Clackson 1994: 113. Cf. also Kortlandt 2003: 93, 95. The irregular *-t-* in

Ḵuṭa *y'etkar* or *yetkar* 'far away' strikingly reminds the initial **d-* of the PIE proto-form. However, there can hardly be any relation with it. The *-t-* should be rather interpreted as secondary (perhaps contamination with *y-et* 'back, behind').

erkiwt, *i*-stem: ISg *erkiwt-i-w*, GDPl *erkiwt-i-c'*, etc. 'fear'.

Bible+. There are spelling variants with *-i-w/ew* alternation, or without *-w-*. For instance: ISg *erkiṭiw* (vars. *erkiwtiw*, *erkewtiw*) in Deuteronomy 28.22 (Cox 1981: 184): *harc'ē zk'ez t[ē]r <...> ew xt'iwk' ew erkiṭiw* (vars. *erkiwtiw*, *erkewtiw*) *ew xoršakaw*: *πατάξαι σε κύριος <...> καὶ ἐρεθισμῶ καὶ φόβῳ καὶ ἀνεμοφθορίᾳ*. For the full passage see s.v. *xēt* 'bite, pain'. Here Arm *erki(w)t* seems to render Gr. *φόνος* 'murder, slaughter; death as a punishment' and, therefore, implies a meaning like 'death threat, fear for death/murder, etc.'.

●**DIAL** Salmast *yerkut*, Ḵuṭa *yergut*, Ararat *yergut*, T'iflis *yirgut*, Muš *y'ergut*, Ozim *yerkot* [HAB 2: 65b; Ačāryan 1940: 361a; 1952: 258]. (Some of) the dialect forms may be literary loans, as is suggested for e.g. Ḵuṭa *yergut* (see Ačārean 1940: 56).

●**ETYM** Belongs to *erkn* 'labour pains; fear' (q.v.). Klingenschmitt (1982: 79, 82₂₃) derives *erkiwt*, *i*-stem 'fear' from **dwi-tl-i-*, and ; Lamberterie (1992: 257) - from **dwi-tlo-*, whereas Olsen (1999: 101-102, 270₁₆₄) prefers reconstructing **du(e)i-plo-* or **dui-pli-* (cf. the Germanic word for 'doubt': OHG *zwīfal* etc.), which is more attractive.

See also s.v. *erku* 'two' and 2.1.22.6.

erkn, mostly pl.: NPl *erkun-k'*, APl *erkun-s*, GDPl *erkan-c'* 'labour pains, pang (of childbirth); fear, grief, sorrow'; *erknem* 'ὠδίνω'; *erknč'im* 'to fear' (aor. *erkeay*, imper. *erkiṛ*); *erk-č'-ot* 'coward'. See also s.v. *erkiwt* 'fear'.

Bible+. For the two basic meanings of *erkn* cf. e.g. the following passages: *orpēs erkn yṭwoy*: *ὁσπερ ἡ ὠδὶν τῇ ἐν γαστρὶ ἐχούσῃ* (1Thessalonians 5.3); *šurj eṭen zinew erkunk' mahu*: *περιέσχον με ὠδίνες θανάτου* (Psalms 17.5).

Apart from the passage from 1Thessalonians 5.3 (see above), the singular form *erkn* is found, together with the verb *erknem*, in the famous epic song (with wonderful alliteration of the sequence *erk-*) on the birth of Vahagn recorded by Movsēs Xorenac'i (1.31: 1913=1991: 85-86; transl Thomson 1978: 123): *Erknēr erkin, erknēr erkir, erknēr ew covn cirani; erkn i covun unēr ew zkarmrikn eṭegnik*: "Heaven was in travail, earth was in travail, the purple sea was also in travail; in the sea travail also gripped the red reed".

●**ETYM** As is shown by Ačāryan (HAB 2: 65a), all these words contain a root **erk-* which he, following Dervischjan (1877: 68), connects with Gr. *δέος* n. 'fear', *δεινός*

‘fearful’, *δεῖδω* ‘to fear’, Lat. *dīrus* ‘fearful’, Skt. *dvēṣṭi* ‘to hate’, Av. *dvaēθā* ‘threat’, MPers. *bēš-* ‘grief, sorrow, enmity’, etc. For *-nč-* cf. *mart-nč-im* ‘to fight’ vs. *mart* (*i*-stem) ‘fight, war’ (both Bible+), etc. On the verb morphology see Tumanjan 1971: 337; Ĵahukyan 1982: 182; Klingenschmitt 1982: 78-79.

Pedersen (1906: 398-399 = 1982: 176-177) rejects the connection and derives *erkn-č-im* from PIE **pergʷ-*, cf. OHG *furhten* ‘to fear, be frightened’. This is accepted by Kortlandt (2003: 7, and, with hesitation, 95). The anlaut **pe-* would yield Arm. **he-*, however (cf. Clackson 1994: 224-225₁₁₈, with references; Harkness 1996: 14; Viredaz 2003: 63-64₁₇).

Frisk (1966: 259-262 = 1944: 11-14) and Shindler (1975; see also Arbeitman/Ayala 1981: 25₁; Klingenschmitt 1982: 238-239; Lamberterie 1992: 257) connect Arm. *erkn* with Gr. *ὀδύνη* ‘pain’ and OIr. *idu* ‘pain’. Sceptical: Beekes 2003: 199; for the discussion see Clackson 1994: 123-124; Harkness 1996: 14; Viredaz 2003: 63₁₄. The search for alternative etymologies seems unnecessary. PIE **dyei-* ‘to fear’ is considered a derivation of the word for ‘two’; similarly, Arm. **erk(-n-)* ‘fear; labour pains’ is best derived from *erku* ‘two’ (q.v.); see references at HAB 2: 64-65, as well as Meillet 1894a: 235; Kortlandt 1989: 47, 51 = 2003: 91, 95; Clackson 1994: 116; cf. Viredaz 2003: 62₁₂. Note also numerous Armenian formations meaning ‘to doubt’ which are derived from *erku* ‘two’ (see s.v.). Further, cf. Toch. AB *wi-* ‘to frighten’ [Schindler 1966a; Adams 1999: 599].

Clackson (1994: 116) states that Ačāryan (HAB 2: 64-65) connected the nouns *erk*, *o*-stem ‘work, labour’ (Bible+) and *erkn* ‘(labour) pains’. In reality, Ačāryan (HAB 2: 58a, 64-65) rejects this connection suggested by NHB, Bugge, Pedersen, and Frisk, and treats the latter as an Iranian loan, cf. Pahl. *rk* ‘work, labour’, etc. (see also Szemerényi 1985: 795; Ĵahukyan 1987: 163, 525; Viredaz 2003: 65₂₇). However, the connection is semantically possible; cf. Lat. *labor*, Engl. *labour*, *travail*, etc. Viredaz (ibid.) suggests the same origin also for Arm. *herk* ‘tilth’ (q.v.).

erku (NPl *erku-k*‘, APl *erku-s*, GDPl *erku-c*‘, IPl *erku-k*‘) ‘two’.

Bible+.

Numerous derivatives, some of them meaning ‘to doubt’: *y-erkuanam* ‘to doubt, hesitate’ (Bible+), *y-erku-umn* ‘doubt’, (*y-*)*erku-an-k*‘ ‘doubt’ (John Chrysostom), *y-erku-akan* ‘doubtful’ (Eznik Koṭbac’i), *erk-mt-em* ‘to doubt, hesitate’ = *erk-* ‘two’ + *mit* ‘mind’ (Bible+), etc. One might consider these forms with the meaning ‘doubt’ to be calqued from Gr. *δισταῶ* ‘to hesitate, be uncertain, doubt’ (cf. Skt. *dvi-ṣṭh-a-* ‘double’, etc.); cf. e.g. Matthew 28.17: *yerkuac’an* = *ἐδίστασαν* = *dubitaverunt* [Nestle/Aland 87]. However, the evidence is rich, and the forms are also attested in

non-translational works (Eznik Koṭbac'i, Movsēs Xorenac'i, etc.), and we are rather dealing with the same semantic pattern. The same *erk-* is also found in *erkewan* 'fearful doubt' (John Chrysostom, Philo, etc.), and, probably, *erknč'im* 'to fear', *erkiwt* 'fear', etc. (s.v.v.). The meaning 'fearful doubt' unifies the meanings of the two sets of words, viz. 'doubt' and 'fear'. Note also *y-erkuan-ōk' erkiwtali* "with fearful doubts" (John Chrysostom [NHB 2: 358b]).

In derivatives: **erko-* in *erko-tasan* 'twelve'; **erki-*, cf. *erkeam* < **erki-am* 'two years' (Bible+), *erkeriwr* < **erki-hariwr* 'two hundred' (Bible+), *erkewan* (see above), etc.

On *erkic's* 'twice, again' (Bible+) see s.v. *kic'* 'conjoined'. On *erkir* 'second' (Dionysius Thrax, Philo; the dialect of Moks?) see s.v. *krkin*.

For *erk-ti* and *erk-ōr* see s.v. *ti* 'day'.

●**DIAL** *erku* is ubiquitous in dialects. When declining, the western dialects use *erku-k'*, and the eastern ones - *erku-s* [HAB 2: 67b]. For Maraš, Mēlik'-Dawit'pēk (1896: 230a) records *erku* 'two', *irkušabt'i* 'Monday', as well as *harku*, which he considers to be "another distortion (*atawatumn*) of the numeral *erku*".

In definite usage: Łarabał **erku-n-*; e.g. in HŽHek' 5, 1966: 425^{L1f}: *ink' ai' im t'ep'urneras erkunə* "take two of my feathers".

On Moks *erkvin* (and **erkir*?) 'for the second time' see s.v. *krkin*.

ClArm. *erkok'in*, *erkok'ean* 'both' (Bible+) has been preserved in Łarabał *ərkoḱ'an*, *ε/urkoḱ'an*, Metri *ərkoḱ'en* [AčarLiak 1, 1952: 325-326; Davt'yan 1966: 348; Ałayan 1954: 179-180, 268a]. Karčewan has *yərkeḱen* [H. Muradyan 1960: 110, 193a]. On these forms see 2.2.4.2.

●**ETYM** From the PIE word for 'two': Gr. *δύο*, Skt. *dva-*, etc.; the final *-u* points to a dual form **duo-h₁*, cf. Skt. NADu *dvā* m. 'two' (RV+), or **duōu*, cf. Skt. NADu *d(u)vāu* m. 'two' (RV+); **erko-* (in *erko-tasan* 'twelve', *erkok'in* or *erkok'ean* 'both') and *erki-* (see above) go back to **duo-* and **dui-* respectively [HAB 2: 66-67; Ĵahukyan 1959: 253; 1982: 75, 127; 1987: 119]. On *erko-* see also Meillet 1903: 227; Viredaz 2003: 62₁₀. Weitenberg (1981: 87-88) assumes that *erko-* is an inner-Armenian development from **erku-tasan*, as *əntocin* from **əntucin* (see s.v.).

The development of PIE **dw-* in Armenian has received a large amount of discussion; see 2.1.22.6. Bugge (1889: 42; 1890: 121₁; 1892: 457; 1899: 61; positively: Meillet 1894: 160) assumed that PIE **duō* yielded Arm. **ku*, to which *er-* from *erek'* 'three' was added; see also Pisani 1934: 185; Szemerényi 1985: 790-792, 794. Meillet (ibid.) also connects *krkin* 'double, again' and *kuł* 'Doppelung, das Doppelte' (q.v.). Others postulate a sound change **dw- > Arm. -rk-* with subsequent regular addition of prothetic *e-*, assuming that in *krkin* a metathesis *-rk- > kr-* (or a

dissimilation) took place [Meillet 1900: 393-394; 1908/09: 353-354; 1936: 51; HAB 2: 66-67, 681].

Kortlandt severely criticizes this view and advocates **dw-* > **k-*. Viredaz (2003: 63₁₆) points out, however, that ‘two’ hardly ever undergoes contamination from other numerals. On the discussion see 2.1.22.6; see also s.v.v. *erkar*, *erkn*, *kēs*, *koyš₂*, *krkin*, *krtser*, *kuš*, *kic*’.

On *erkic* ‘s ‘twice, again’ and *erkir* ‘second’ see s.v.v. *kic*’ and *krkin* respectively.

***ernjak** ‘spider’

● **DIAL** In dialects: Axalc’xa **ernjak* ‘spider’ [Amatuni 1912: 149b], Karin *ernjak* ‘id.’ [HayLezBrbBaṛ 1, 2001: 392a]; cf. also Erzinka *erunjek* ‘spider-web’ [Kostandyan 1979: 152b].

● **ETYM** Ačāryan (HAB 2: 68b) cites s.v. *erinj* ‘heifer, young cow’ (q.v.) not specifying the semantic motivation.

If indeed from *erinj*, **ernj-ak* ‘spider’ may refer to the Mother Goddess *Anahit-Astlik* (q.v.), which was associated with heifers, probably also, like the Greek Athena, with weaving; cf. the Lydian Arachne, metamorphosed into a spider by Athena (see e.g. Weinberg/Weinberg 1956; Taxo-Godi apud MifNarMir 1: 98b); Arm. dial. **mam-uk* ‘spider’, derived from *mam* ‘mother; grandmother’ (see 3.5.2.1).

[Alternative: PArm. **erVnǰ-* ‘spider’ from Mediterranean substratum, cf. Gr. *ἀράχνη* f. ‘spider; spider’s web’, Lat. *arāneus* m. ‘spider’, *arānea* f. ‘spider; cobweb, spider’s web’, perhaps also OEngl. *reng*, *rynge* ‘spider; spider’s web’ < **rəknia* (on these forms see Beekes 1969: 34). One reconstructs substr. **(a)rVk^hn-(i)eh₂-* or **(a)rVk(s)n-(i)eh₂-*. Arm. **e-rVnǰ* may be from **raKn-jeh₂-* > **ra(K)nǰ-* > **e-ranǰ*, with regular prothetic *e-* before initial *r-*. Attractive but risky].

[Other alternatives: Compare Pahl. *ēraxtan*, *ēranǰ-* ‘to inflict damage, or loss; to blame, condemn, damn’, *ērang* ‘blame, condemnation; error, heresy’ (see MacKenzie 1971: 30; Nyberg 1974: 71-72). The spider may be seen as ‘harmful’ or ‘heathen, demonic, abominable’, see 3.5.2.

Compare Xotorjur **xranǰ* ‘spider etc.’, see 3.5.2.5].

ernj(n)ak (spelled also as *ernjay*, *ernjan*, *ernčnak*, *erinčan*, *erinčak*, *eriznak*) ‘a thorny edible plant’. MArm. medical literature (see HAB 2: 68; MišHayBaṛ 1, 1987: 203-204).

● **DIAL** Relatively widespread in dialects, mostly reflecting the forms **ernjn-ak* and **ernjn-uk* (Ararat also *erənjjanuk*), see HAB 2: 68b; also Moks *erənjjanak* ‘съедобное

колючее растение' [Orbeli 2002: 225]. For the semantic description see Amatuni 1912: 184 (also 177a, s.v. *eršnak* ?); HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 392a. On Axalc'xa *erñjak* 'spider' see s.v. **erñjak*.

●**ETYM** Ačaryan (HAB 2: 68b) derives from *erinj* 'heifer, young cow' introducing semantic parallels from Turkish and Megrelian. Compare also Gr. *ἐρίφιον* (gloss) 'Rubus agrestis' [blackberry or the like], dimin. of *ἐρίφος* 'kid', possibly related with Arm. *erinj* (q.v.).

ewt, *o*-stem: GDSg *iwt-oy* 'oil' (Bible+); dial. almost exclusively ***et**

Some biblical attestations taken from critical or diplomatic editions (first I cite the form represented in the basic text of these editions, then the reading variants come):

Genesis: ASg *iwt* in 28.18 (var. *ewt*, 3x *et*) and 35.14 (2x *et*), see Zeyt'unyan 1985: 274, 311.

Deuteronomy: ASg *et* in 28.51 and 32.14 (vars. *ewt*, *iwt*), *z-ewt* in 7.13 and 11.14 (vars. *z-iwt*, *z-ewt*), GSg *et-u* in 8.8 (var. *iwtoy*, once *etwu*), *z-etoy* in 14.22 (vars. *zewtoy*, *zewtway*, *ziwtoy*, *ziwto*) and 18.4 (vars. *zetway*, *zewtoy*, *ziwtoy*), ISg *itov* in 28.40 (vars. *ewtov*, *iwtov*), see Cox 1981: 187, 205, 109, 124, 112, 137, 149, 186, respectively.

Daniel: ISg *ewtov* in 10.3 [Cowe 1992: 209].

It appears that Deuteronomy is more inclined to NASg *et* and GSg *et-u* or *etoy*. In view of the form ***et** in almost all the dialects, one is tempted to treat *et* as archaic. But one is not sure whether the manuscripts which underly the basic text of Cox are reliable. It is remarkable, for instance, that the basic text in Cox 1981: 214-215 has *iwr* 'his own' in Deuteronomy 33.24, though the reading variant allative *y-iwt/y-ewt* appears to be the original one since it exactly corresponds to *ἐν ἐλαίῳ* of the Greek text. Further, note the conflicting evidence within the same text: gen. *et-u* vs. gen. (*z-*)*et-o-y* and instr. *it-o-v*. The only occurrence of *et-u* is in 8.8 (Cox 1981: 112): *erkir jit'eneac etu ew metu* : γῆ ἐλαίας ἐλαίου καὶ μέλιτος. One might think of the influence of *met-u* 'of honey' of the same passage. Gen. *et-u* is also found in Nersēs Šnorhali (12th cent.).

The classical paradigm is usually reconstructed as follows: nom. *éwt*, gen. *iwtóy* [Meillet 1913: 18, 180a; 1936: 63; Matzinger 2006: 72]. See also s.v. *giwt* 'village'. For discussion of related orthographic problems see Weitenberg 1993a: 67; 2006.

●**DIAL** Dialectally ubiquitous. All the forms represent ***et**, apart from Ĵuta *ut* [HAB 2: 252].

●**ETYM** Since NHB, Petermann, Windischmann and others, connected with Gr. *ἐλαία*, Att. *ἐλαῖα*, Ion. *ἐλαίη* f. 'olive-tree; olive', *ἐλαιος* m. 'wild olive', *ἐλαιον*

n. 'olive-oil; anointing-oil; any oily substance' and Lat. *olīva* [HAB 2: 252a]. Hübschmann (1897: 393-394; see also Olsen 1999: 954) places this correspondence in the list of loans of uncertain origin pointing out that the Armenian cannot have been borrowed from the Greek. Then he adds: "Gehören sie überhaupt zusammen und wie?"

Usually regarded as a Mediterranean word [HAB 2: 252a; Frisk 1: 480; Ĵahukyan 1985: 158]. Ačāryan (1937: 3) treats the Armenian and the Greek as borrowed from Phrygian or from the Aegean civilization. Mentioning the Mediterranean theory, Ĵahukyan (1987: 307, 307₉, 466, with ref.) also notes Akkad. *ulu(m)* 'fine oil, butter'.

As is shown by Lat. *olīva*, the Greek word must be reconstructed as **ēλαίῃ-* [Frisk 1: 480]. One wonders, thus, if the Armenian can derive from something like **el(e/a)iw-* through metathesis or anticipation. [See also Beekes 2003: 205 and Clackson 2004-05: 157].

Matzinger (2006) rejects the connection with Gr. *ἐλαίον* and derives the Armenian from QIE **se/oib-lo-*, a derivative of PIE **seib-* 'to pour, rain, sift', cf. Gr. *εἶβω* 'to drop', Toch. A *sep-*, *sip-* 'to anoint' and especially *sepāl* 'Salbe, Fett'. On this root see also s.v. *hiwt* 'moisture'. However, one might expect metathesis **-bl-* > Arm. *-tp-*, though all the known examples of such metathesis are with **-r-* (see Ĵahukyan 1982: 73-74; Beekes 2003: 206-207). It is easier to assume **se/oip-lo-* relying upon the IE by-form **seip-* (see Pokorny 1959: 894).

Kortlandt (forthcoming, to be published in the second volume of "Aramazd: Armenian journal of Near Eastern studies") identifies *ewt* with Gr. *ἐλπος*, Alb. *gjalpe* 'butter', Skt. *sarpīṣ-* n. 'molten butter, lard', Germ. *Salbe* 'ointment', Toch. A *śālīp*, B *śalype*, "with regular loss of **p* before **o*" between stages 10 and 12 of his chronology (Kortlandt 2003: 28f). However, I know of no secure examples for the development **po* > *o* in non-initial position.

On the whole, the Mediterranean origin (with Gr. *ἐλαίον* 'oil') of Arm. *ewt* seems more plausible, though details are unclear.

zaysaysem 'to fear'.

Attested only in Timot'ēos Kuz (Timothy Aelurus). According to Ačāryan (HAB 2: 78a), identical with *zaysel*, which is found in "Bārgirk' hayoc'" rendered as *zangitel*, *kam apšil*, *kam yimarił* (see Amalyan 1975: 98^{Nr21}). This implies that *zaysaysem* is a reduplicated form.

●ETYM No etymological attempt is known to me.

I think, *zaysem* and *zaysaysem* are composed as follows: *z-ays-em* and *z-ays-ays-em*, respectively. The root can be identified with *ays* 'an evil spirit, demon' (q.v.). This is confirmed by *z-ays-ot*, that is glossed in "Bārgirk' hayoc'" by ClArm. *diw-a-har* 'struck by a demon' (see Amalyan 1975: 98^{Nr24}), and *ays-a-har* 'id.', *ays-ot*, glossed as *div-a-har* and *diw-ot*, respectively (ibid. 17^{Nr353f}). That the striking by a demon causes fear is clearly seen from, e.g., Srvanjteanc' 2, 1982: 389. The very word *ays-a-harim* 'to be struck by a demon' (ClArm.), though not recorded in dialectological dictionaries and Ararat/Lori glossaries that are available to me, is still in use in Lori and in colloquial Armenian of, for example, Kirovakan (nowadays named Vanajor), in the meaning 'to be frightened'. See also s.v. **t'it't-ot*.

zāram, *a*-stem: GDPl *zāram-a-c'* 'senile' (Book of Chries, Paterica, "Čarəntir"). Derivatives: in Ephrem, Yovhannēs Ōjnec'i, Alexander Romance, etc.

●**ETYM** Interpreted as prefix *z-* + prefix *ar-* + *am* 'year, age' (q.v.); similarly: *zāranc'em* 'to delire (of drunkenness or especially of senility)' = *z-* + *ar-* + *anc'* 'to pass' [HAB 1: 143a, 213a; 2: 80b; Ĵahukyan 1987: 243].

It is possible that *zāram* contains *am* 'year; age'. Similarly, *zāranc'* may contain *anc'* 'to pass, surpass, be destroyed, etc.' (Bible+; dialectally ubiquitous); typologically cf. *anc'cal zawurbk'* 'become old, aged', rendering Gr. *προβεβηκότης ἡμερῶν* in Genesis 18.11, *προβεβηκνῖα ἐν ἡμέραις* in Luke 1.18 and 2.36. Besides, next to *zāranc'* there are also other formations such as *z-anc'* and *ar-anc'* (see HAB 1: 213a).

Nevertheless, the first part **zār* (especially in *zāram*) is unlikely to be a combination of the prefixes *z-* and *ar-*. It could rather mean 'old'; cf. *cer-awurc'* 'of old days/age' (Ephrem, see NHB 1: 1014b). One may therefore revive the old attempts (rejected in HAB 2: 80b) interpreting Arm. *zāram* as borrowed from the Iranian word for 'old, senile, decrepit', cf. Pahl. *zarmān* 'old man; old age, decrepitude', Oss. *zæronð* 'old', etc. Probably, the Armenian forms underly that Iranian word but have been reinterpreted as containing the prefixes *z-* and *ar-*.

zāranc'em 'to delire (of drunkenness or especially of senility)', attested in P'awstos Buzand, Philo, John Chrysostom, etc.).

In P'awstos Buzand 5.35 (1883=1984: 200, lines 2ff; transl. Garsoïan 1989: 216): *k'aj' arbeal ic'ē ew mtōk' zāranc'cal yarbec'ut'enē <...>. Ew etew ibrew anc'in zāranc'in i ginwoyn, øst č'ap' anc'anelov, <...>.*

●**ETYM** See s.v. *zāram*.

zatic, *a*-stem: GDSg *zatic-i*, abundant in the Bible [Astuacaturean 1895: 508-509]; only in Cyril of Jerusalem: GDPl *zatic-a-c* ‘sacrifice; Passover; Resurrection feast, Easter; feast’; dial. also ‘ladybug’.

Bible+. According to Ačaryan (HAB 2: 82b), the original meaning is ‘sacrifice’, attested in John Chrysostom. L. Hovhannisyan (1990: 240) accepts this, though his textual illustrations are not convincing.

●**DIAL** Widespread in dialects, also in the meaning ‘ladybug, *Coccinella septempunctata*’. The general meaning ‘feast’ seems to be present in Aynt’ap (Turkish-speaking Arm.) **sarp’inayi zatic* (see Ačarean 1913: 958b).

●**SEMANTICS** For a deeper understanding of the semantic field of *zatic*, one should consider the following two patterns of the formation of ladybug-names: 1) ‘cow of God’: Russ. *bož’ja korovka*, Lith. *diėvo karvūtė*; Roman. *vaca domnului*, etc. 2) ‘(bug of the) Virgin Mary’: Lith. *diėvo mar’ytė*; Germ. *Marienkäfer*, Engl. *ladybug*, etc. (see Toporov 1979; 1981; and Toporov apud MifNarMir 1: 181-182).

Both patterns are represented in Armenian dialects: 1) Łarabał **astucov kov/eznak* [Ačarean 1913: 141]; 2) Arčak (Van) *mayram xat’un* ‘the Lady Mariam’ [Ser. Avagyan 1978: 150].

Concerning the evidence from Łarabał the following must be taken into account. The expression **astcu kov/ezn* is recorded by Lalayan (2, 1988: 23, 169). First, he mentions *astcu kov*, *astcu ezn*, *zatic* in his list of insect(-names) (p. 23). One would follow from this that these are different insects, but they are not. Then (p. 169), he states that the insect called *astcu kov* or *zatic* is venerated, and noone kills it. Here the Russian equivalent (*bož’ja korovka*) is mentioned, too. Since Lalayan’s work is first published in 1897-1898, one might wonder whether the expression has been calqued by Lalayan himself, and Ačaryan has taken it from Lalayan. This is improbable. Besides, note the variant with *ezn* ‘bullock’. Finally, there is also Łarabał *kavkav* [Martirosyan/Łaragyozyan, FW 2003].

Comparing these data with the semantic field of *zatic* and bearing in mind the well-known sacred heifers of Anahit, I conclude that the Armenian word originally meant ‘sacrificial animal (particularly - cow or heifer) devoted to / representing the Goddess; spring festival of the cow sacrifice’. In earlier times *zatic* was indeed a public *matał*, cf., e.g., Lisic’yan 1969: 272.

●**ETYM** Since Anania Širakac’i (7th cent.), associated with *zat(an)em* ‘to divide, separate’ (a *z*-prefixation of *hatanem* ‘to cut’, q.v.), with different semantic motivations such as: separating from the heathen; passover; etc.; see HAB 2: 82-83. Olsen (1999: 459, 459₅₄₅) advocates this etymology, treating *zatic* as a verbal noun (/“gerundial derivative”) with the suffix *-ik*; cf. *martik*, *a*-stem ‘fighting / contesting

place, stadium (John Chrysostom); fighter, warrior' from *martnč'im* 'to fight'. I accept this analysis, though the type is rare. However, the semantic development is not explained properly. No wonder that Ačaryan leaves the origin of the word open. I accept the interpretation of Ĵahukyan (1991: 38-39) who compares to the semantic field of *tawn* 'feast' < *'sacrificial animal/meal' (q.v.).

According to Hovhannisyan (1990: 240), *zatik* 'sacrifice' is an Iranian borrowing; cf. Pahl. *zadan*, *zan-* 'to hit, beat, strike, smite', the present stem *zan* of which is seen in Arm. *zenum* 'to slaughter an animal, to sacrifice'. (Is that so? In HAB, a different etymology for *zenum*: YAvest. *ziiānā*- f. 'Schaden', Pahl. *zyān* 'loss, harm, damage' (on these see MacKenzie 1971: 100; Mayrhofer, EWAia 1, 1992: 602-603).

zign 'a kind of marine predator'.

Only in Hexaemeron; see K. Muradyan 1984: 245, 257₇₀, 373b.

●**ETYM** Ĵahukyan (1967: 183, 308) derives it from IE **ǵʰiǵ-* (as opposed to **ǵʰiǵ-*; cf. s.v. *jukn* 'fish') in the context of a deviant development of the PIE palatal **ǵʰ* into Armenian fricative *z*. However, *zign* is merely a transliteration of its equivalent in the Greek original, namely: *ζύγαινα* (see K. Muradyan 1984: 373b). Thus, the etymology must be abandoned.

ēg, *i*-stem: GDSg *ig-i*, several times in the Bible; GDPl *ig-i-c* in Ephrem, Plato; *a*-stem: GDPl *ig-a-c* in "Šarakan"; note that GDSg *ig-i* presupposes *i*- or *a*-stem, and GDPl *ig-i-c*, pointing to *i*-stem, is better attested 'female'.

Bible+.

●**DIAL** Widespread in dialects. Note also T'iflis **eg hac* 'a kind of ritual bread for New Year' [HayLezBrbBair 2, 2002: 7b], Van *ek'y*, gen. *ek'yu* or *ik'yu* 'female buffalo' [HAB 2: 116a; Ačaryan 1952: 119, 259].

●**ETYM** Considered to be a word of unknown origin [HAB 2: 116a; Ĵahukyan 1990: 71 (sem. field 2); Olsen 1999: 946].

I suggest a comparison with Skt. *yōṣā*- f. 'girl, young woman' (RV+), *yōṣīt*- f. 'id.' (RV), MInd., Prakrit etc. *yosiā*- f. 'woman'; of unclear origin (connected with *yūvan*- 'young' - doubtful; see Mayrhofer, EWAia 2: 421). PArm. **eig-i*- can be derived from **ieus-i(e)h₂-* or **ieus-it-*: > **yew(h)-i-* > **yeyw-i-* > **eyw-i-* > *ēg*, *ig-i*, with anticipation of **i-*; see s.v. *ayg*. For loss of the initial **y-* see 2.1.6.

ēj, *o*-stem 'going down; page (of a book)'; **ijānem** 'to go down' (1SgAor *ijī*, 3SgAor and imper. *ēj*).

●**DIAL** Dialectally ubiquitous. Kusget (Motkan) *išvil* means ‘to go’, since the area is mountainous, and going is equivalent to going down [HAB 2: 119b; 4: 655b].

●**ETYM** From PIE **h₁ei-g^h*- or **h₁ei-d^h*- ‘to go’: Gr. *οἶχομαι* ‘to go’; Lith. *eiga* ‘Gang, Verlauf’; OCS *iti* ‘to go’, isg *idę*; cf. Skt. *éti* ‘to go’; Gk. *εἶμι* ‘to go’; Lith. *ėiti* ‘to go’; etc.; see Pedersen 1982: 203 (=1906: 425; 1907: 146); Scheftelowitz (**BB 28: 311); HAB 2: 119a, 4: 655b; Klingenschmitt 1982: 207-208; Jahukyan (Džaukjan) 1982: 59; 1987: 121, 436. See also s.v. **eham* ‘to go’. {{NOTE - Olsen (1999: 17₂₉) alternatively suggests a connection with Skt. *sídhya*ti ‘to succeed, be successful’, which is semantically remote, however. - ENDNOTE}}.

Armenian demonstrates a semantic shift ‘to go’ > ‘to go down’, cf. the above-mentioned dialectal (Kusget) meaning. If it has not preserved the original meaning, this dialect represents the result of a twofold semantic shift: PIE ‘to go’ > Arm. ‘to go down’ > ‘to go’.

əngtay-k ‘a sea-monster or -devil’ (probably female) or ‘eel’, ‘water-snake’.

The only attestation is found in John Chrysostom: *Ibrev zdews halacakans: ibrew zəngtayk covu vnasakars*. The word renders Gr. *Ἐρινύες*, the name of well-known female furious avenging chthonic deities.

●**ETYM** NHB (1: 764b) and others (see HAB 2: 122a) suggest a connection with *ənktmem*, *ənknnum* ‘to sink into the water’ (q.v.), which is perhaps possible but not attractive. Ačāryan leaves the origin of the word open. The root is considered identic with *gil/git-* ‘to roll, stumble’ (q.v.) by M. Muradyan (1975: 57). A. Petrosyan (Petrosjan 1987: 59, 61, 70) sees in *əngtay* the theonym **Get-* (see also s.v. *Anget*) which is restored by Petrosyan himself. According to Łap’ancyan (see Kapancjan, IRL 2, 1975: 365) - from Akkad. *Nik(k)al* (a goddess), which is improbable.

I propose to revive the comparison with Lat. *anguilla* ‘eel’ (possibly from **angulla*, influenced by *anguis* ‘snake’), suggested by Dureau (1933: 118) in passing, with a question-mark. Compare Gr *ἔγχελυς*, *ἰμβηρίς*, Lith. *ungurys* m. ‘eel’, Russ. *úgor* m., etc. For the discussion of this etymon I refer to Walde/Hofmann 1, 1938: 48; Toporov, PrJaz 1, 1975: 88f; Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984: 526₁ = 1995: 444₄₃; Mallory/Adams 1997: 176; Katz 1998. Note also Georg. *an̄kara-* ‘grass-snake’ (Orbeliani) which has been compared with this IE word (Klimov 1994: 169-170, with a refer.). For the semantic association between ‘grass-snake’ and ‘water-snake’ cf. *lortu*. If the initial vowel was **a-* = **h₂(e)-*, the *ə-* of the Armenian is parallel to *ənkenum*, next to *ankanim* (q.v.). If **h₁e-* or **Ho-*, note that the loss of a pretonic *i/u* is completely regular: **inguta-* or **unguta-* would both yield **əng(ə)ta-*. Preciser, perhaps, NSg **h₂ong^{wh}-ur/-* > PArm. **ung(u)t-*, pl./coll. **ung(u)t-ay-k* > *əngt-ay-k*.

. The *r-l* fluctuation can perhaps be solved by assuming IE **H(V)ng^hur-leh₂-*, cf. Lat. *stēlla* and Arm. *astł* 'star' (q.v.), probably from **Hster-l(-)eh₂-*, cf. Arm. Pl **astet-a-*. Otherwise - substrate vacillation **-r/l-?*

Arm. *əngtayk* 'can be explained either as a collective formation in *-ay-k* ' on the basis of **a/ungut-*, or as an archaic fem. plural like *kanayk* 'women', see s.v. *kin*. The latter alternative is risky, but attractive. First of all, *əngtayk* ' renders Gr. *Ἐρινύες*, the name of well-known female furious chthonic deities, so it might denote female sea-monsters. Next, in the Armenian folk tradition recorded in Łarabał [Lalayan 2, 1988: 170], the eel is the metamorphosed pipe of *Gabriel hreštak*, so these fish swim around fluiting, and the fishers listen to the voice of their fluits and hunt them. [Note *p'otoš* 'muraena, moray eel' (Step'anos Lehač'i), which may be derived from *p'ot* 'pipe'; see 2.3.1, on the suffix *-aws*]. The feminine nature is not explicit here. However, the association with the sirens is quite obvious. Furthermore, in Roman tradition the eel was believed to be purely female [Mallory/Adams 1997: 176a]. It is interesting that when migrating from the Atlantic Ocean, the females actively penetrate rivers upstream, males mostly remaining in the brakish water of the estuary.

For the singing peculiarity ascribed to 'eel' see 3.5.2.8 (on *atanak* etc.).

One might ask whether the Armenian word can have been borrowed from Latin. This seems less likely, though possible. However, would the Armenian translator use the Latin word for 'eel' to render Gr. *Ἐρινύες*? Note that the Greek *Ἐρινύες*, to my knowledge, do not have anything to do with water. They are female furious chthonic deities with "snaky-hair" (and sometime metamorphosing into a snake), patronizing the Motherhood. This reminds the Armenian (< Iran.) *al-k* ' , which too are female furious chthonic deities with "snaky-hair", also connected with the idea of Motherhood, though they, on the contrary, are hostile to mothers and new-born children.

***ənt/d-o-cin*, *a*-stem (later also *o*-stem)**

'a slave that is born in the house of his master' (rendering Gr. *οἰκογενής*), opposed to *arc'at'-a-gin* '(slave) bought with money' in Genesis [Weitenberg 1981], and to *ek* 'outsider' (< 'comer') in Movsēs Xorenac'i 1.10 (1913=1991: 33^{L7f}; transl. Thomson 1978: 85): *ew aylovk' əndocnōk' ew ekōk'* "and [with] other domestic servants and the outsiders".

●**ETYM** Composed of **ənd-* (cf. Gr. *ἐνδον* 'within') and **cin-* 'to give birth; to be born' (q.v.); for a thorough philological and etymological analysis I refer to Weitenberg 1981.

t'an, *i*-stem according to NHB, without evidence 'pottage, porridge; a milk product'.

Bible+.

●**DIAL** Widespread - in the meaning 'buttermilk', that is described in Ačairean 1913: 347a as follows: 'the liquid (*jraxain*) *macun* [*macun* is 'sour clotted milk'] left after the butterfat has been churn (from milk)'. See also NHB 1: 794c. Other meanings: 'sour clotted milk' (Agulis, Juŕa); 'soup made of buttermilk' (Akn); 'sour clotted milk diluted with water as refreshing drink in summer' (Ararat, Łarabaŕ). The latter two, as well as other foods made of milkproducts are represented by various compounds that often contain *t'an*, see Ačairean 1913: 347b-349b; HayLezBrbBaŕ 2, 2002: 76b-79b.

●**ETYM** Ačairyan (HAB 2: 149b) treats *t'an* as derived from *t'anam*, 1SgAor. *t'ac'i* 'to make wet' (q.v.), as has already been suggested in NHB 1: 794c. Accepted by Jahukyan 1987: 152; Olsen 1999: 197.

The etymology may be correct. However, the semantic development should be examined more closely. To establish the basic meaning of *t'an* as 'wet, liquid food', Ačairyan introduces an interesting parallel - dial. **t'ac'an* 'from *t'ac* 'wet', that is a generic term for milk products, but also denotes 'anything to eat with bread'. This seems to be a secondary derivation referring to any additional food which in combination with bread would make a simple meal. Compare also **hac'(-u)-t'ac* 'food' [Ačairean 1913: 648b]. The semantic motivation here is, thus, not exactly the same as in the case of *t'an*, which in literature refers to pottage, and in dialects - to milk products and food made of milk products. Therefore, not denying the probability of the traditional etymology, I propose an alternative, which would involve a more reasonable (at least in my view) semantic development and, more importantly, introduce cognate forms referring to milk products.

The word might be derived from PIE **t(e)nk-* 'to coagulate, to pull oneself together, to condense' (see s.v. *t'anjr*): Skt. *takra-* n. 'buttermilk mixed with water', MPers. *taxl* 'bitter' < Iran **taxra-*, NIS *9ēl* n. 'buttermilk' < **tnk-ló-*; Skt. *tañc-* (YV+) (*tanak-ti*) 'to pull together, to coagulate, to solidify', *ātāñcana-* n. 'coagulating agent, coagulated milk' (TS+).

t'arām 'withered' in Łazar P'arpec'i (5th cent.) and Sargis Šnorhali (12th cent.), **an-t'arām** 'unwithered, evergreen' in the Bible (thrice) onwards, **t'arāmim** 'to wither', late attestations, apart from participle *t'arameal* (1x in the Bible, and in Paterica) and caus. *t'aramec'uc'*- (1x Bible); ***t'aršam** - unattested, priv. **an-t'aršam** (in older period - only Agat'angetos), **t'aršamim** 'to wither' (Bible 3x, Łazar P'arpec'i,

Movsēs Xorenac'i, Paterica, Nilus, et.); *t'ormil* 'id.' (Geoponica, 13th cent.), *t'o[r]š(o)mil* 'id.' (Mandakuni, Geoponica).

A textual illustration: In Movsēs Xorenac'i 3.68 (1913=1990: 363^{L6f}; transl. Thomson 1978: 353): *et'ē zis, eraštac'eal ew t'aršameal pask'ut'eamb arbuc'manc' xratu* "Or myself, dried out and dessicated by thirst for the waters of his advice?".

●**DIAL** **t'āram-* (Hačən, Tigranakert, Xarberd, Agulis, Šamaxi), **t'ōrom-* more widespread: Polis, Axalc'xa, Hamšen, Sebastia, Karin, Muš, Van, Moks, Ararat, Marała, etc. 'to wither' [HAB 2: 156b]; *an-t'āram* 'a flower' in Zeyt'un, Ararat [Ačārean 1913: 98a], Muš [Amatuni 1912: 31], etc. The by-form **t'aršam-* is not recorded.

In a praying formula from Ĵavaxk', one finds an adjectival *an-t'ai-akan* (see Lalayanc' 1892: 10^{L8} = 1, 1983: 340). Formally, this represents the pure root **t'ai-*, though one cannot be sure that it is not a recent analogical formation. Note that formulae can have preserved archaisms.

●**ETYM** Since long, connected with Skt. *tarṣ-*: *trṣyant-* 'to be thirsty, to crave', YAv. *taršu-* 'dry, not fluid', Gr. *τέρσομαι* 'to become dry', Hitt. *tarš-* 'to dry', etc. (see HAB 2: 155-156).

Pedersen (1906: 413 = 1982: 191) explains Arm. *-rš-* from **rsj-* (: Skt. *trṣyati*), comparing *garš-* : Skt. *hrṣyati* (see s.v.). This is accepted by Meillet (1950: 85). See, however, 2.1.12.

The twofold reflex of PIE **rs* in *t'aršamim* : *t'āramim* 'to wither' is considered to be one of the oldest traces of early dialectal diversity. In order to evaluate this reflex, one should try establishing the phonological background of the distribution.

The adjective *t'āram* and *ant'āram*, as well as the verb *t'aršamim* are reliably attested since the 5th century, whereas the adjective *an-t'aršam* is found only once in the old period, **t'aršam* is not attested at all, and the verbal *t'āram-* is found only in participle and causative, each of them - once in the Bible. That the verb *t'aršamim* is old and archaic may be indirectly confirmed by its disappearance from modern dialects and replacement by *t'āram-*. We may hypothetically restore the following original distribution: PArm. **t'āram* (adj.) : **t'aršam-emi* (verb). This seems to fit into my reformulation of the ruki-rule in Armenian, see 2.1.12.

t'arp' 'a large wicker fishing-basket, creel', in Anania Širakac'i (A. G. Abrahamyan 1944: 228^{L23}): allative/directive *i t'arp'* (alongside of *uikan* 'fishing-net'); *t'arb'* 'a framework of wooden bars, a wooden trellis-work', in Movsēs Kaťankatuac'i/Dasxuranc'i 2.51 (V. Aťak'elyan 1983: 283^{L17f}, with no reading variants): ASg *t'arb* and AblSg *t'arb-ē*. For the latter passage, its translation and

semantic discussion with references see HAB 2: 162b; Dowsett 1961: 183, 183₃; V. Arak'elyan 1969: 220.

●**DIAL** Muš, Alaškert, Ararat (see also Nawasardeanc' 1903: 39-40), Marata, Xoy *t'arp'* 'a large wicker fishing-basket, creel' (for a thorough description see Amatuni 1912: 206b; Ačarean 1913: 352a), Zeyt'un *t'ɔyp'* 'a hunting basket or net (for fish, fox etc.)' [HAB 2: 162b; Ačaryan 2003: 131, 310]. It is practically impossible to determine whether the forms point to *t'arb* or *t'arp'* since the voiced *b* is usually aspirated after *r*. Only Zeyt'un seems to be relevant since here *rb* mostly yields *yb'* (though the evidence is not entirely straightforward, see Ačaryan 2003: 91). This dialect, thus, probably points to *t'arp'*.

As we have seen, the word is attested only twice in literature, and one of the attestations comes from Anania Širakac'i, native of Širak. The dialectal dictionaries do not record the word in Karin-speaking areas (Karin, Širak, Axalk'alak', etc.). Nevertheless, it seems to have been present in Nerk'in Basen; see Hakobyan 1974: 143, where the author, describing fish-catching baskets, brackets the word *t'arp'*. One might postulate, thus, the presence of the word in Karin/Širak speaking areas for at least 13 centuries.

●**ETYM** Ačaryan (HAB 2: 162b) connects with Gr. *τάρπη* 'large wicker basket', also *ταρπός*, *τερπός* m., *ταρπόνη* f. 'id.'. The Greek and Armenian are usually derived from PIE **tṛ(e)r-p-* : **tṛerH-* 'to grab, enclose', cf. Lith. *tvérti* 'to seize, form', OCS *tvoriti* 'to do, make'; see Pokorny 1959: 1101 (without Armenian); Ĵahukyan 1987: 154, 302. According to Clackson (1994: 183), we are probably dealing with a common borrowing from a lost source.

The QIE cluster **-rp-* regularly yields Arm. *-rb-*. In this case, the by-form *t'arp'* presents us with the problem of *-p'*. One might assume a non-IE **tarp^h-*, with aspirated **-p^h-*, or assimilation *t'...b > t'...p'*, especially after *r* (on the latter circumstance see above). However, the by-form with *-b* seems to be reliable. I therefore propose an alternative solution which can explain the allophones *p'* : *b*.

Gr. *τάρπη* derives from QIE **t(a)rp-eh₂-*. If we may posit a HD laryngeal-stem, the paradigm would have been as follows: nom. **torp-eh₂-* (or **terp-eh₂-*, if the vocalism of *τερπός* is old), gen. **tṛp-h₂-ós*. This would yield PArm. **^hVrb-a-*, gen. **^harp^h-ó-* 'large wicker basket'. Then the oblique stem **^harp^h-* would be generalized. One might also posit a thematic **tṛpH-ó-*, as in Gr. *ταρπός*; however, Arm. abl. *t'arb-ē* precludes the *o*-declension. For this kind of paradigmatic solution see 2.2.2.6. I must admit that this analysis is highly hypothetical.

In view of the limited geographical distribution and the cultural character of this lexeme, one should consider it to be a non-IE word of Mediterranean origin (cf. the

above-mentioned assumption of Clackson). In this case, the vowel **a* and the Armenian vacillation *p/b* may be seen as substratum features, although the non-IE origin does not automatically exclude the paradigmatic solution proposed by me. Should the borrowing be ascribed to a very early period of the development of Proto-Armenian and Proto-Greek, the word may have been adjusted into the corresponding morphological system inherited from Indo-European.

t'etawš 'holm-oak; cedar, pine'.

NHB, HAB and Astuacaturean (1895: 568a) cite only two attestations: Isaiah 44.14 and 2 Paralipomenon 2.8. On the latter see also Xalat'eanc' 1899: 57a.

The word is also attested in Agat'angelos §644 (1909=1984: 330^{L11}), in an enumeration of tree-names, between *yakri* and *katamax*. In "Bžškaran" (apud NHB 2: 995a; cf. S. Vardanian 1990: 86, §356), where *k'araxunk* is described as *t'etōš ca'royñ xiž patuakan* "valuable pitch of the tree *t'etōš*". It is remarkable that in the 7th-century Armenian Geography ("Ašxarhac'oyc'" by Anania Širakac'i), *k'araxunk* is the only product mentioned for the province of Arc'ax which roughly represents the territory of Łarabał, and it is not mentioned in none of the other provinces, and that the word *t'etawš* has been preserved only in Łarabał.

In "Bařgirk' hayoc'" (see Amalyan 1975: 118^{Nr100}), which seems to show special affinities to the dialects of Łarabał and adjacent areas (as I hope to show elsewhere), *t'etōš* is used to gloss *t'eti* 'elm-tree': *t'eti ca' anptuť*, or *ē t'etōš* "a fruitless tree that is *t'etōš*".

In Turkish-Armenian dictionary (c. 1720 AD) by Etia Mušetyan Karnec'i (Karin/Xotorjur), Turk. *č'am yemiši* is glossed by *t'etōšea*, *t'etōši* [Č'ugaszyan 1986: 72^{Nr65}].

● **DIAL** Ačaryan (1913: 357b; HAB 2: 172a) records only Łarabał *t'etūši* 'a kind of mountainous tree'. Davt'yan (1966: 356) cites Łarabał *t'etūši* and *t'etōši*, as well as *t'etūši* in Hadrut' and Šatax-Xcaberd (other dialects in the territory of Łarabał). He, too, does not specify the meaning. HayLezBrbBař (2, 2002: 99a) has Łarabał *t'etmši* 'a kind of mountainous tree'. This seems to reproduce the entry *t'etōši* in Ačaryan 1913: 357b, with a misprinted *-m-* instead of *-ō-*. In this case, however, the alphabetical order would be disturbed. If *t'etmši* is correct (which is very uncertain), one would be tempted to compare it with Georg. *Ეelamuši* 'elm', on which see below.

I express my gratitude to Armen Sargsyan for supplying further information. His informants were Step'an Dadayan (born in Šuši in 1946), the pro-rector of Step'anakert University, whose parents are born in Zardarašen (a small village in the

district of Martuni, close by T'atavard) where they lived by 1945, and Hāt'ām, the forest-guard of the village Kusapat, who in 2003 was ca. 55 years old. According to them, Łarabał *t'ətuš'* denotes a kind of *t'eti* 'elm-tree' (q.v.) with yellowish wood (which is good as fuel) and leaves that are smaller than those of the *t'eti* and, when green, serve as fodder for goats. It is present in Xcaberd, T'atavard, Martakert. Armen Sargsyan himself saw one near by the spring called *Čiraknə* (5-6 km up from Kusapat).

In the dictionary by Malxaseanc' (2: 96a-b), *t'etōš* is identified with *Quercus Pontica*, and is described as follows: "a beautiful tree belonging to the genus of the oak, with very hard, unrottable, heavy, elastic wood and dark green longish oval leaves; it is long-lived, and grows slowly; produces big non-edible acorns".

●**SEMANTICS** The tree-name seems to have, thus, two basic meanings: 1) a kind of oak, the holm-oak or the evergreen oak (*Quercus Ilex*), a native of Italy and other Mediterranean countries; 2) cedar, pine.

●**ETYM** "Bargirk' hayoc'" (see above), NHB (1: 806a), and Ufuricean (see HAB 2: 172a) treat *t'etawš* as identical with or a kind of *t'eti* (note also the description of *t'etōš* by informants from Łarabał as a kind of *t'eti*), assuming, apparently, an etymological identity. This is accepted by Jahukyan (1987: 145) with some reservation, and by P. Friedrich (apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 178b), where *tetōš* is represented as meaning 'wood', which is not true. Ačaryan (HAB 2: 172a), however, leaves the origin of *t'etawš* open. Olsen (1999: 938) represents *t'etōš* as meaning 'oak' or 'pine' and as a word of unknown origin.

Jahukyan (1987: 380) mentions *t'et-awš* as the only example of the suffix *-awš*, and represents a separate entry for the suffix *-oš* found in the adjective *dandal-oš* vs. *dandał* 'slow', etc.

Perhaps *pteləw-* + *-š-i* (cf. Myc. *pte-re-wa*), see s.v. *mori/*mo(r)-š*. For this and for the suffix *-awš* in general see 2.3.1.

t'eti 'elm'

Lately and poorly attested (see HAB 2: 171; Greppin 1982: 350; 1985: 93). The variant **t'et-eni* (preserved in the dialects of Ararat and Zeyt'un) appears in the place-name *T'etenik'* (11th cent.+), see Hübschmann 1904: 430.

●**DIAL** Preserved in the dialects of Hamšen, Ararat, Łarabał, Van, Muš, Zeyt'un [HAB 2: 171b].

●**ETYM** Bugge (1893: 39) connected *t'eti* 'elm' with Gr. *πελέα*, Ion. *-η* 'elm, *Ulmus glabra*'. Ačaryan (HAB 2: 171b) considers the anlaut problematic (see also Hübschmann 1897: 449) and prefers linking *t'eti* with Lat. *tilia* 'linden'. The sound

change **pt-* > Arm. *tʻ-*, however, seems to be valid [Greppin 1982; Clackson 1994: 169]. Some scholars are more positive for the Greek correspondence (see Solta 1960: 420; Greppin 1982: 350; C. Arutjunjan 1983: 286; Ĵahukyan 1987: 145, 188, 302 - with some reservation), though others (Ałabekyan 1979: 65; Clackson 1994: 169; Beekes 2003: 171-172) include Lat. *tilia* too.

Hübschmann (1897: 374-375, 449) is said to consider *tʻehi* as a Greek loan. However, Hübschmann, in fact, considers only Arm. *pt(e)t-* 'elm' (HAB 4: 111b) a Greek loan, and mentions the connection of Arm. *tʻehi* with Gr. *πελέα* not accepting it. Although Ačāryan (HAB 2: 171b) already showed the misunderstanding, the idea still remains ascribed to Hübschmann (as in P. Friedrich 1970: 89; Greppin 1982: 350; Ĵahukyan 1987: 188; Clackson 1994: 234₂₈₃). According to P. Friedrich (1970: 89) both the Latin and Armenian forms are borrowed from the Greek. Pokorny (1959: 847) only accepts the Greek-Latin connection and treats Arm. *tʻehi* as borrowed from Greek. The latter point is correctly rejected by Ĵahukyan (1967: 96₂₃). Probably we are dealing with a common borrowing from a lost Mediterranean source, see Clackson 1994: 169, 183, 234₂₈₃; Beekes 2003: 171-172; cf. Greppin 1982: 350 ("from the Aegean substratum").

According to Bugge (1893: 39), Georg. *tʰela* and Tush *tʰel* 'elm' are borrowed from Armenian. Ačāryan (HAB 2: 172a) adds Georg. *tʰelamuši* 'elm'. See also s.v. *tʻetawsʻ*.

****tʻetik***

●**DIAL** Only in Zeyt'un *tʻətək* 'snow-pile, avalanche' [Allahvērtean 1884: 186; Ačārean 1913: 368b].

●**ETYM** Ačāryan (2003: 287) hesitantly restores **tʻetik* and treats the word as of completely unknown origin.

I think Zeyt'un **tʻetik* reflects an *-ik* suffixation of Arm. *tʻet* 'pile' (see HAB).

****tʻen*** (dial.) 'the vulva of a cow'.

●**DIAL** Sebastia *tʻen* 'the vulva of a cow' [Ačārean 1913: 363a; Gabikēan 1952: 202]; Gor. *tʻin*, *tʻän* 'the vulva of female animals' [Margaryan 1975: 392a].

●**ETYM** Ačāryan (1913: 363a) does not mention any etymology. Ĵahukyan (1972: 310) derives from IE **tu-ēn-* (from **tēu-* 'to swell') comparing with Gr. *σάθη* f. 'penis', *σάβιον* 'id.' and Lith. *tvainytis* 'scharwenzeln, buhlen; sich unkeuschen Gelüsten hingeben'. Hanneyan (1979: 174) accepts the etymology and takes it as an Armeno-Greco-Baltic isogloss.

However, the word is probably a Persian (or Turkish?) loan. [Gabikeyan (1952: 202) questions: "Turkish?", not specifying the details]. I propose a connection with Pers. *tan* 'body, person'; cf. YAv. *tanū-* f. 'body, person', Skt. *tanū-* f. 'body, self' (RV+), etc. (see OsnIranJaz-Sr 1981: 29; OsnIranJaz-Nov 1, 1982: 59). Note also Arm. dial. (Hamšen) *t'en* 'body', which, according to Ačaryan (1947: 189, 267b), is borrowed from Turkish. For the semantic shift cf. Arm. *marmīn* 'body' > dial. 'vulva' (Karin), 'the vulva of an animal (Nor Bayazet)', *anjn* 'person; body' > Van *anj* 'the vulva of a pregnant cow', etc.

***t'er** (dial., widespread) 'leaf (also of dough)', ***t'el** (dial.) 'id.'; ***t'er** earlier probably also *'wing, feather'; **t'ert'**, *i*-stem: ISg *t'ert'-i-w* in Vardan Arewelc'i, IPl *t'ert'-i-w-k'* (var. *t'it'-o-v-k'*) in Paterica, GDPl *t'ert'-i-c'* in Grigor Magistros 'leaf of a flower, plant; plate, etc.' (Philo, Paterica, etc.)

**t'er* 'leaf' is found in the compound *mi-a-t'er-i* 'having one leaf or petal' - "Bargirk' hayoc'" [Amalyan 1975: 215^{Nr307}].

● **DIAL** Hamšen, Trapizon *t'ir* 'leaf' ***t'el** 'leaf', Łarabał. Ararat, Juła *t'er* 'petal, leaf', Axalc'xa *t'er* 'petal, leaf of paper or dough', Ewdokia, Sebastia *t'er* 'leaf of dough' [HAB 2: 176a]. There is also a variant with *-l*: Agulis *bxkat'il* 'leaf of radish' < **bołk-a-t'el*, which corresponds to Łarabał *pxkat'er* [HAB 2: 176a] and Ararat *bołkat'er* 'id.' (see Amatuni 1912: 112b). Note also Nor Naxijewan **t'el-bac'* 'thin leaf of dough' (see Tigranean 1892: 111; Amatuni 1912: 209a; HAB 2: 176a).

The form *t'ert'* is present in: Alaškert *t'ert'* 'petal', Ararat *t'ert'* 'leaf of paper', Xarberd *t'ert'* 'leaf of cabbage', etc. [HAB 2: 176a].

● **ETYM** Together with *t'er* 'side', *t'ir-* 'to fly', and *t'it'el'in* 'butterfly' (see s.v.v.), from PIE **pter-* 'feather; wing', probably derived from **pet-* 'to fly' (see Bugge 1893: 40; Ačaryan 1918: 161; HAB 2: 175-176, 183, 184-186; Pokorny 1959: 826; Greppin 1982: 348-349; Jahukyan 1987: 144), cf. Gr. *πτερόν* n. 'feather (mostly in pl.); bird's wing; wings of a bat and of insects; any winged creature, as the Sphinx; a beetle', *πτερυξ* f. 'wing of a bird; winged creature, bird', Gr. *πέτ-ο-μαι, πτ-έ-σθαι* 'to fly', etc. The meaning 'wing', which is dominant in Greek, is absent in Armenian. However, *t'er* 'side', to my mind, presupposes an earlier meaning 'wing', cf. the semantic field of Engl. *wing*, as well as of Arm. *kuin* 'back', dial. also 'arm', 'side'. See also HAB 2: 185a on this. Further, note that, according to Ałayan (1974: 70-71), and, independently, to Olsen (1999: 51-52, also citing a suggestion by Rasmussen), Arm. *t'ew* (*o*-stem) 'wing; arm; etc.' (q.v.) is derived from the same **pet-*. Accepted, though with some reservation, by Jahukyan (1987: 144, 187).

In view of the semantic field 'feather; leaf' : 'wing' represented by this set of words, one wonders whether *t'ew* 'arm, wing' is somehow related with Moks *t'av*, gen. *t'av-əʃ*, pl. *t'av-ir* 'лист = leaf', *äkäñjəʃ* *t'av* 'барабанная перепонка = ear-drum' (see Orbeli 2002: 199, 228). For textual illustrations see Orbeli 2002: 61, Nr. 26 (referring to leaves of pumpkin) and Nr. 27; Yovsēp'eanc' 1892: 12^{L5}, gloss: 12₂. Also in Van, Sasun, Muš (Ačārean 1913: 352b).

t'er, *i*-stem according to NHB 1: 806a, but only AblSg *i t'er-ē* (Eznik Koṭbac'i, Cyril of Alexandria) is attested 'side'. Numerous compounds (Bible+).

●**DIAL** Widespread in dialects [HAB 2: 174-175].

●**ETYM** See s.v. **t'er* 'leaf'.

t'ew, *o*-stem: GDPl *t'ew-o-c'* (very frequent), ISg *t'ew-o-v*, IPl *t'ew-o-v-k'* (Bible); also IPl *t'ew-ō-k'* (formally: *a*-stem - *t'ew-a-w-k'*), twice in the Bible, as well as in Grigor Narekac'i etc. 'wing; arm'.

●**DIAL** Widespread in dialects [HAB 2: 177-178].

t'ew 'shoulder': in a Moks version of the epic (SasCř 1, 1936: 61^{L65f}):

Jenöv Hövan thi anun idi Davit';

Tšen aric', idi t'orben, et'al t'iv.

"Jenöv Hövan named the child Davit'; he put the child into the bag and threw (the bag) onto his shoulder". The word *t'iv* here clearly means '(onto the) shoulder', as have correctly translated Melik'-Ohanjanyan (SasUdal 2004: 56a^{L5}: "через плечо") and L. Petrosyan (1968: 37: *usin*).

In a Łarabał fairy-tale recorded by Arak'el Bahat'ryan in 1860 (HŽHek' 6, 1973: 658^{L12}), the king of Underworld pulls out one of the *t'ev*-s of *Hndk-a-hav*, lit. 'Indian bird', and gives it to the hero. Then, the bird takes the hero out of the Underworld. Here, *t'ew* cannot refer to 'wing' since the bird cannot fly with one wing. It must mean 'feather'.

●**ETYM** See s.v. **t'er* 'leaf' etc.

t'it'eth, 'leaf of metal'.

Bible+ (NSg *t'it'eth*, APl *t'it'tuns*). Greppin (1982: 349) points out that the meaning of *t'it'eth* is obscure but it might mean 'gold leafing, gold', and the word is from the Middle Armenian lexicographers. However, the word does occur in the Bible (Exodus 28.36, 29.6; Leviticus 8.9; etc.) clearly rendering Gr. *πέταλον* n. 'leaf; leaf of metal'.

●**ETYM** See s.v. *t'it'eth*.

t'it'etn, *t'it'ein* 'butterfly'.

The only attestation mentioned by Ačāryan (HAB 2: 183a) comes from the fables by Mxit'ar Gōš (12-13th cent.). Here the word is used in NPI *t'it'funk* which, as Ačāryan points out, presupposes NSg **t'it'etn* [and/or **t'it'itn*, cf. the problem of *asetn* 'needle'].

Now we find this form in poems by Yovhannēs T'lkuranc'i (14-15th cent.; T'lkuran - in Mesopotamia, between Amid and Hromkla): *zēt/k'an əzt'it'et/xn* 'like the butterfly' (see Pivazyan 1960: 132^{L13}, 155^{L40}). The two passages (Mxit'ar Gōš and Yovhannēs T'lkuranc'i) are cited in MiġHayBaī 1, 1987: 259a.

Attested also in a medieval riddle written by Nersēs Šnorhali (12th cent., Cilicia) [Mnac'akanyan 1980: 279-280^{Nr149f}]. Mnac'akanyan (ibid. 499a) correctly glosses *t'it'etn* as 'butterfly'. Further - in a poem by Arak'el Siwnec'i (14-15th cent.); see Poturean 1914: p. 206, stanza 10.

The form *t'it'ein* (with *-i-*) is found only in "Baġgirk' Hayoc'", where *t'it'etn* is glossed as follows: *t'it'ramay*, *kam t'it'ein*, or *ē t'it'einik* (see Amalyan 1975: 120^{Nr155}; MiġHayBaī 1, 1987: 259a). This is mentioned by Greppin (1982: 349₆) as the only evidence for *t'it'etn* 'butterfly' (with *-i-*), which is not true.

The anthroponym *T'it'einik* (11th cent.; see below) is in fact the oldest attestation of the word.

Greppin (1990: 70) cites *t'it'fum* 'butterfly', the source of which is unknown to me.

●DIAL There are two basic forms for 'butterfly' in dialects: **t'it'ein* and **t'it'etn*.

**t'it'ein*

The unsuffixed form **t'it'er* is present in Muš [Amatuni 1912: 6b; Baġdasaryan-T'ap'alc'yan 1958: 255a]; Alaškert [Madat'yan 1985: 189b]; Hamšen [Ačāryan 1947: 229; Blāsing 1992: 78^{Nr137}]; Ararat [HAB 2: 183b]; Karčewan [H. Muradyan 1960: 193b]; Kak'avaberd (here - *t'it'einə*) [H. Muradyan 1967: 171b]; Burdur [N. Mkrtč'yan 1971: 182a].

The suffixed forms are:

**t'it'ein-uk*: Agulis *t't'ārnük* [Ačāryan 1935: 57 (§ 57), 353]; Dersim *t'ət'əinug* [Baġramyan 1960: 14]; cf. Xarberd *t'əit'ərug* [HAB 2: 183b];

**t'it'ein-e/ik*: Muš and Alaškert *t'it'einek/g* [Amatuni 1912: 6b; HAB 2: 183b; Baġdasaryan-T'ap'alc'yan 1958: 255a; Madat'yan 1985: 189b]; Dersim *t'it'einig* [Baġramyan 1960: 80b]; Erzinka *t'it'e*inik* [Kostandyan 1979: 134a]; Ararat *t'it'einek* [Markosyan 1989: 301b]; Ozim *t'ət'əineyk*, cf. Van *t'əit'əinek* [Ačāryan 1952: 261], Šatax *t'ərt'ənek* [M. Muradyan 1962: 196b]; Svedia *t'it'əinäg* [Ačāryan

2003: 379, 567]; Adana *t'ət'ėrník* (meaning 'light-minded person') [HAB 2: 183b; Ačaryan 2003: 310]; Sasun *t'it'ėrník* 'a kind of sheep-illness, when worms arise in the liver of sheeps' [Petoyan 1954: 122].

**t'it'ėrn-ak*: Č'aylu and Marała (in Łarabał) *t'it'ėrnāk* [Davt'yan 1966: 357].

Dersim *t'it'gīna* [Bařramyan 1960: 80b] probably reflects a metathesis of the *i* and *g*. Perhaps this has been supported by the folk-etymological association with *gəřnag* (see Bařramyan 1960: 88a) from *kuřn* 'back', dial. also 'arm', 'side'. For the auslaut cf. also Dersim (K'hi) *t'it'xna* (see below).

****t'it'ėm***

Zeyt'un *t'it'ėx* [Ačaryan 2003: 13, 122, 310]; Svedia *t'it'ix* 'butterfly of silkworm' [Andreasyan 1967: 224, 361b]; K'esab *t'it'ix* [HayLezBrbBař 2, 2002: 110a]; Akn *t'ət'ėx* [HAB 2: 183b; Gabriėlean 1912: 268]; Xarberd [HayLezBrbBař 2, 2002: 110a] and Xotorjur *t'it'et* [YuřamXotorj 1964: 451b] (both meaning 'a lung-illness of animals'); Čenkiler (Nikomidia) *t't'et* [HAB 2: 183b] (meaning 'butterfly of silkworm' [Ačarean 1913: 363a]); Mehri *t'et'axnə* < *t'it'ėm* [Ařayan 1954: 92, 269b].

The ending of Dersim (K'hi) *t'it'xna* [HayLezBrbBař 2, 2002: 110b] is not clear to me; cf. also Dersim *t'it'gīna* (see above).

With the suffix *-e'ik*: Muř *t'it'ėtnik*, cf. the form recorded by Rivola, viz. *t'it'xnik* [HAB 2: 183b]; Aparan, Moks *t'it'xnek* [Amatuni 1912: 6b]; Tigranakert *t'et'etig* [HAB 2: 183b; Haneyan 1978: 186b].

On the meanings 'a kind of illness' and 'spirit' and on *t'it'ot* see below.

It is remarkable that some dialectal areas (Svedia, Xarberd, Muř, Agulis and Kak'avaberd vs. Mehri, etc.) represent both the *i*- and *t*-forms side by side. The *i*-variant (Ararat, Agulis, etc.) may have once been present in Łarabał and adjacent dialects, too; cf. also Burdur (*t'it'et*), the speakers of which have migrated from Łarabał in the 17th century. It has been preserved in **t'it'et-mati*: Łarabał *t'it'irmāte*, *t'ət'ərmāti/ε*, in Mehtiřen : *t'ət'ərmāti* [Davt'yan 1966: 357], Goris *t'it'rimati*, *t'ət'ərmati*, *t'it'ilmati* [Margaryan 1975: 327a], Karčewan and Kak'avaberd *t'it'irmati* with semantic nuance 'a butterfly that turns around the light' [H. Muradyan 1960: 214a; 1967: 192b]. Particularly transparent is Ararat *t'it'etmati* [Markosyan 1989: 301b]. Ačaryan (HAB 2: 183b) treats **t'it'et-mati* as a folk-compound containing *t'it'et* 'butterfly' and *mat-* 'to sift' and compares it with Łarabał etc. **aliwr-mat(ik)* 'butterfly' = *aliwr* 'meal' + *mat-* 'to sift' (see Ačaryan 1913: 51-52, 365a; HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 18a). Note an interesting word-play found in a folk-song of the type *řangyulum* (see Grigoryan-Spandaryan 1971: 105^{Nr612}):

*Amañ a t'ət'ərməti,
 Axci er allür matī,
 K'u fäšängy türür kyälət
 Sirof səerts kədati.*

"It is summer, (there is) butterfly,
 Girl, get up (and) sift meal;
 Your beautiful shaking
 Will burn my loving heart".

The semantic motivation is, he explains, the "flour-like" dust on the wings of butterflies. This is quite conceivable. [Compare Russ. *pekel'ek* 'butterfly', if from *peklevat'* 'to sift'; cf. also Russ. *pépel* 'ash'; Gr. *πάλη* 'the finest meal; any fine dust', *παι-πάλη* (redupl.) 'the finest flour or meal' which may be (folk-)etymologically related with reduplicated designations of the butterfly like Lat. *papiliō* etc., and Arm. dial. **pipeṛnak* etc.]. For the examination of *t'it'irmati* and the like particularly interesting is *t'it'ramay* which is used in "Baḡgirk' Hayoc'" alongside of *t'it'ēn(ik)* to render *t'it'ēn* (see Amalyan 1975: 120^{Nr155}). Another trace might be Łarabał (Ganĵak) *t'it'ra*, used as an epithet to *tuš* 'bird' in meaning 'light' (see HayLezBrbBaṛ 2, 2002: 110b) or 'fluttering' and the like.

On the other hand, given the existence of *t'it'ēn* in Meṛi (*t'et'axnə*), one might look for traces of the form also in Łarabał. [Goris *t'it'ilmati* seems interesting in this respect. However, the -l- instead of r- could be secondary]. Indeed, on a cross-stone in the vicinity of the village of Dahrav there is an inscription from 1071 AD (ŠI/520 + 551 = 1071) where one finds a female anthroponym *T'it'etnik* (see M. Barxutareanc' 1995 < 1895: 101; DivHayVim 5, 1982: 144^{Nr486}): *Es Ohan kangnec'i zxač's inj ew amusin im T'it'etnikay: aławt's yišec'ēk'* "I, Ohan [= Yovhannēs/John - HM], erected this cross to myself and to *T'it'etnik*, my spouse; remember/mention in your prayers".

Moks *t'əxt'əmurik/k'* (GSg *t'əxt'əmurkə*, NPl *t'əxt'əmurkətir* (-*kənit*) [Orbeli 2002: 231]) is considered by Ačāryan (HAB 2: 183b; cf. also Ačāryan 1952: 261) as isolated and independent. Ačāryan does not specify its structure. Given the association between the butterfly and meal (*alíwr*), one may suggest that *t'əxt'əmurik* is a folk-etymological reshaping of an underlying **t'ət'ər-mat-ik* or **t'ət'ət-mat-ik* under the influence of Moks *t'əxt'əmur* 'дрожжи, закваска теста' = 'yeast, leaven' (see Orbeli 2002: 230-231). Here it is difficult to give preference to one of the variants **t'ət'ər-* and **t'ət'ət-*. The latter explains the anlaut better (**t'ət'ət-* > *t'əxt'*, with the same contact metathesis as is seen in *t'əxt'əmur* 'yeast, leaven' < *t'txmər*). Alternatively, one may assume the following scenario: **t'ət'ər-mat-ik* >

**t'ət'ətmarik* (with distant metathesis of *r* and *t*, cf. *utarkem* 'to send' > Moks *hōrōtkil*, *hōretbayr* 'father's brother' > Łarabał *tōrp'et*, *pttor* 'dirty' > Łarabał, Goris, Agulis **prtōt*, etc.) > **t'xt'əmorik*. For **t'ət'ət-* cf. also Goris *t'it'ilmatī*. One should also bear in mind that the form with *-t-* does occur in Moks (*t'it'xnek* [Amatuni 1912: 6b]), though both Orbeli and Ačāryan record only *t'əxt'əmurik/k'*.

Despite the variation seen in the forms of such closely related dialects as are Van (*t'əit'əinek*), Ozim (*t'ət'əineyk*), Šatax (*t'ərt'ənek*) and Moks (*t'it'xnek*, *t'əxt'əmurik/k'*), two features seem common in all these forms: they have the suffix *-ek*, and they all represent the *-i-* variant of the word (in this respect Moks is ambiguous, see above). Nevertheless, here too one can find relics of the form with *-t-*. To my knowledge, Van, Ararat **t'it'xot* 'angry, quick-tempered' (see Amatuni 1912: 165-166; Ačārean 1913: 365b; HayLezBrbBař 2, 2002: 110b) has not received an etymological explanation. Compare Xotorĵur *t'it'xot* 'a kind of poisonous herb that is harmful to the lungs of animals' [YušamXotorĵ 1964: 451b], from *t'itet'* 'a lung-illness of animals'. The form obviously contains the suffix *-ot* which is usually used in adjectives "especially describing physical diseases <...>, or, mostly unpleasant, moods or spiritual qualities" (see Olsen 1999: 520; see also Ĵahukyan 1998: 30-31). The same suffix is seen in synonyms *diw-ot* and *k'aj'-ot* mentioned by Amatuni (1912: 165-166) next to *t'it'xot*. These formations contain the words *dew* and *k'aj'* (both meaning 'spirit, demon'), respectively. Note also Łarabał **k'aj'k'-ot* 'angry, quick-tempered; lunatic' (see Ačārean 1913: 1099a). For a textual illustration see Ananyan 1978: 359 (*k'aj'kot*). In "Bařgirk' Hayoc'" one finds *ays-ot* and *z-ays-ot* glossed as *diw-ot* and *diw-a-har* 'stricken by a demon', respectively (see Amalyan 1975: 17^{Nr354}, 98^{Nr24}). The forms are composed of *ays* 'an evil spirit, demon' and the same suffix *-ot*. All these examples suggest that *t'it'x-ot*, too, can contain a root that means 'spirit, demon'. Bearing in mind the semantic field expressed by words like Arm. *xipilik* 'a (night-)spirit; nightmare; butterfly' and Gr. *ψυχή* 'soul; departed spirit, ghost; butterfly or moth', one may safely interpret *t'it'xot* (< **t'it't-ot*) as an *ot*-suffixation based on **t'it'et(n)* 'butterfly', here meaning 'spirit, demon'.

According to Norayr (s.v. French *douve*; see HAB 2: 183b), *t'it'et'*, *t'it'nek* means 'a wingless worm that arises in the heart or the liver [it will be remembered that the female evil spirits named *al-k'* (see Ačāryan 1913: 53b) threaten the hart and the lungs of an embryo] of sheeps as resulted from eating too much trefoil'. Ačāryan (HAB 2: 183b) compares this form to Mush *t'it'etnik*. The link is semantic, too, since Muš *t'it'etnik*, *t'it'tenek* also means 'a kind of worm in the liver of sheeps' according to HayLezBrbBař 2, 2002: 110a. Cf. also Sasun *t'it'etnik* 'a kind of sheep-illness, when worms arise in the liver of sheeps', Xarberd and Xotorĵur *t'it'et'*

'a lung-illness of animals'. The information reported by Norayr (see above) may help to understand why in the dialect of Hamšen (see HAB 2: 369b; Ačaryan 1947: 234) the word *xipilik* 'a (night-)spirit; nightmare; butterfly; beautiful girl; doll' refers to the trefoil. For the semantic field cf. Slavic **motyl'*, which displays meanings like 'moth; butterfly; a tapeworm in the liver of sheeps; sheep-illness; *Cyperus flavescens*' (according to a folk-belief, this plant is harmful to sheeps) [ÈtimSlovSlavJaz 20, 1994: 84ff]. Note also Gr. *ψυχή* 'soul; departed spirit, ghost; butterfly or moth; sea-starwort, *Aster Tripolium*' (mentioned also by Ačaryan [HAB 2: 369b]).

In Sip'an, **t'it'etn* is found in the compound *maškat'it'et* 'butterfly' (see Amatuni 1912: 6b). See s.v.v. *maškat'ew* and **maškat'it'et/rn*.

●**ETYM** The lexicographers and scholars usually cite *t'it'ein* ignoring *t'it'etn* 'butterfly'. Whenever they mention the form *t'it'etn*, they mean the one which means 'leaf of metal' (see *t'it'etn*₁). Of the two forms meaning 'butterfly' only the latter, viz. *t'it'etn* is attested in literature. The form *t'it'ein* is a reduplication on the basis of **t'er-* < **pter-* 'feather; wing'; see there for discussion and references.

The etymological relation between *t'it'ein* 'butterfly', *t'it'* 'to fly', and *t'er(t')* 'leaf' and Gr. **πτερ-* 'wing of a bat, birds and insects' is obvious, as is the reduplicated nature of *t'it'ein*. In the Armenian dialects of Van and Xarberd the reduplication has become complete, viz. **t'it'i-* [HAB 2: 185a]. The use of *t'r/tt'i-* 'to flutter, tremble, vibrate' (see Malxaseanc' 2, 1944: 127c, 130-132) referring to birds or butterflies is common in dialects and Modern Armenian. A couple of random illustrations will suffice. In a story recorded in Šuši (Łarabał) we read: "<...> the heart of Simon <...> is fluttering like a bird (*tuši mnan t'ert'etəm*)" [Grigoryan-Spandaryan 1971: 307^{L25}]. In the variant of the famous fairy-tale "Hazaran Blbul" written by Xnko Aper, *t'rt'al* appears alongside of *t'it'et* 'butterfly'.

A question arises: what about *t'it'etn*? Ačaryan (HAB 2: 182ff) admits the etymological identity of *t'it'etn* 'leaf of metal' and *t'it'ein/t'it'etn* 'butterfly'. Further, he (HAB 2: 183ab) twice states that **t'it'etn* 'butterfly' (derivable from NPI *t'it'tunk*) is secondary. Similarly, Ĵahukyan (1984: 36, 42) treats the anthroponym *T'it'etnik* (11th cent.) as a dialectal (SW) variant of *t'it'einik* reflecting the sound-change *i* > *ĭ*. However, the female anthroponym *T'it'etnik* is also attested in Łarabał at the same period (see above), and the sound-change *i* > *ĭ* is not specified any further. The priority of *t'it'ein* seems to function even in such an earlier attempt as that of Gabričlean (1912: 268), who assumes that Akn *t't'ex* comes from older **t'rt'-ex*, with the suffix *-ex* also found in other animal-names. To my knowledge,

t'it'etn 'butterfly' is nowhere else mentioned when *t'it'ein* is discussed, see (apart from references already cited) Pedersen 1982: 126-145 (= 1906: 348, 145); Tumanjan 1978: 257-258; Greppin 1981b: 5; Jahukyan 1982: 72; 1987: 144; H. Suk'iasyan 1986: 163; etc.

The dialectal spread of *t'it'etn* 'butterfly' is not smaller than that of *t'it'ein*. Moreover, *t'it'etn* is the only variant attested (though lately) in literature. In NHB we find neither *t'it'ein* nor *t'it'etn* 'butterfly'. Only the former is recorded in the addendum of dialectal words, s.v. *t'it'ein(ik)* (see NHB 2: 1062b). For NHB, thus, the *-i-* variant is dialectal. I therefore fail to see criteria which would demonstrate that *t'it'etn* is secondary. The only argument in favour of the priority of *t'it'ein* seems to have been the etymological relatedness with **t'i-* 'to fly'. However, the very fact that the relation was and still is transparent suggests that *t'it'ein* (though not necessarily) can be secondary whereas *t'it'etn* cannot since there is no synchronically vivid basis for such a reshaping, in other words, there are neither a verbal **t'et-* 'to fly, flutter' nor **t'et-* 'wing'. Instead, one finds some sporadic evidence for **t'el* 'wing' and **t'el* 'leaf'; see s.v. **t'er/l* 'leaf (also of dough)'. The obvious parallelism between **t'er* 'leaf' and **t'el* 'leaf' is comparable with that of **t'er* 'leaf of dough' and **t'el* 'id.' (ibid.). These are rather archaic relics which, together with the cognates in **/-* such as Gr. *πίλον* (mentioned also by Ačāryan himself) and others strengthen the status of *t'it'etn*.

For *t'it'etn* 'butterfly' we have to mention first Gr. *πίλον* n. 'soft feathers, down; wing (properly of insects); the wing-like membrane in a kind of serpents', probably with the hypocoristic *-ίλο* suffix, which may be linked with the Armenian suffix *-il/* (on which see e.g. HAB 2: 479a). However, this suffixation on the verbal basis **pt-* is not probable (Beekes, Lubotsky, p.c.). In that case, one may treat **ptilom* as a word of substratum origin (cf. *siwn* etc.) that has consequently been contaminated with the native PArm. **t'er-* < PIE **pter-*. The form **ptilom* would yield Arm. **t'etn* (from **t'itn*, cf. *asetn* 'needle' from older **asitn*) and, with subsequent reduplication, **t'i-t'etn*. Note that both formally and semantically *t'it'etn* corresponds to *πίλον* just like *t'it'ein* does to *περόν*. In the case the second component of Lat. *vespertiliō* 'bat' is cognate, the semantics of the etymology would become much stronger since very often the denotations of the butterfly and the bat are related with each other (see s.v. **maškat'it'ei/tn*). Note also Gr. *τίλα* f. 'plucking; (pl.) flocks or motes floating in the air', *τιλ[λ]ά · περα* (Hesychius).

Ačāryan (HAB 2: 182ff) identified *t'it'etn* (API *t'it'ituns*) 'leaf of metal' with *t'it'et/in* 'butterfly'. Petersson (1916: 259) derives *t'it'etn* from IE **tel-* 'flat, flat ground, board', cf. Gr. *τηλία* f. 'board or table with a raised rim or edge, baker's

board, etc.', Lat. *tellūs*, *-ūris* f. 'Erde', etc.. Pokorny (1959: 1061) is sceptical about the etymology ("sehr unsicher"), but Ĵahukyan (1987: 153, 186-187) accepts it. Earlier, he (1982: 112) was inclined to the etymology proposed by Bugge (1893: 40) who brought *t'it'etn* into connection with Gr. *πέταλον* n. (also *πέτηλον*) 'leaf; leaf of metal'. The Greek word, as well as OHG *fedel-gold* 'Blattgold', are represented in Pokorny 1959: 824 under the root **pet-* 'ausbreiten'. Olsen (1999: 410) suggests that *t'it'etn* "may once have been an instrument noun **pt(h)etlo-* deformed by such factors as dissimilation, reduplication (cf. *titeṛn* 'lizard', *siseṛn* 'chick-pea') and secondary *n*-stem inflection".

I prefer Ačaryan's etymology. The semantics of *t'it'etn* 'leaf of metal' is close to that of *t'er-t'* 'leaf of a flower, plant; leaf of metal, etc.', dial. (widespread) **t'er* 'leaf (also of dough)', and *t'it'etn* is formally identic with *t'it'etn* 'butterfly', so there is no need to separate these words.

Arm. *t'it'etn*₁ 'leaf of metal' (q.v.) occurs several times in the Bible rendering Gr. *πέταλον* n. 'leaf; leaf of metal'. Remarkably, in Leviticus 8.9 one finds the Georgian *p'ep'ela-*, which is the usual word for 'butterfly': *p'ep'eli igi okrojsaj* 'golden butterfly' (see Klimov 1964: 153); cf. Arm. *zt'it'etnn oski*. The passage, in fact, refers to the golden plate (see RevStBible, p. 83a) and has nothing to do with the butterfly. One can offer two explanations for this confusion: 1) there was a Georgian word for 'plate, leaf (of metal)' homonymous to the butterfly-word; 2) the Georgian translator has consulted the Armenian Bible (or translated the Bible from Armenian?) and confused the Armenian *t'it'etn* 'leaf (of metal)' with the homonymous and etymologically identic word for 'butterfly'. If the former alternative is accepted, the Georgian provides us with a parallel for the twofold semantics of Arm. *t'it'etn*, whereas the latter alternative would imply that the meaning 'butterfly' of Arm. *t'it'etn* was already present in the time of the Georgian translation (5th cent.?).

We encounter a similar problem in a medieval song entitled "Govanut'iwn Sołomoni tačarin" : "Praise of the Solomon's temple", known from an 18th century manuscript (Matenadaran Nr 2939: 438b; see K'yoškeryan 1981: 18, 232-234, 279). Here (ibid.: 233^{L20}) we read: *Haw t'it'funs aīnēr zayn margartašarern*. We obviously are dealing with APl *t'it'funs* of *t'it'etn* 'plate, leaf (of gold)' which indeed is attested thrice (3Kings 6.22, 32, 35) in the description of the building of the Solomon's temple, referring to (golden) plates. But what does the word *haw* ('bird') have to do with the above-mentioned passage from the medieval song? Probably, *t'it'etn* 'plate' has been confused with *t'it'etn* 'butterfly' which in a certain way is associated with the compounded designation of the bat, cf. *mašk-a-t'it'er* 'bat' (q.v.). It is remarkable

that *mašk-a-t'it'er* occurs in a folk version of the story about the building of the temple (here - a fortress to be made of feathers) by Solomon, see Łanalanyan 1969: 343-344^{Nr794F}.

Lith. *peteliškė, peteliušė, peteliuška, pateliškė* 'butterfly' (also 'flatterhaftes, leichtsinniges Mädchen') and Latv. *petelīgs* 'beweglich, lebhaft, flatterhaft' are usually derived from **pel-tel-* (with the root **pel-* 'to fly, flutter'). On the strength of the pair **pet-Vr-* (cf. Skt. *pātra-* n. 'wing (of a bird), feather', LAV. *patarə-ta-* 'winged', Hitt. *pattar* n. 'wing', gen.sg. *paddan-aš*, Arm. *p'etur* 'feather', with phonological problems; from NSg n. **-ōr* ?) next to **pter-* (cf. Arm. *t'er(t')*, Gr. *περόν, πτέρυξ*), one might perhaps revive the derivation of the Baltic form from **pet-el-*. In this case, Lith. *peteliškė* 'butterfly' would be an important cognate of Arm. *t'it'etn* 'butterfly'.

***t'it'tot** 'angry'.

●**DIAL** Van *t'it'xot* (see Ačārean 1913: 365b), Ararat (HayLezBrbBař 2, 2002: 110b), etc.

●**ETYM** See above, s.v. *t'it'etn*, *t'it'erin* 'butterfly'. For the suffix cf. **diw-ot* 'mad' from *dew* 'demon' [Ačārean 1913: 279b], 'zayrac'kot, c'askot, dyurargir, xelar' (Van, Muš, Ararat, Nor Bayazet, etc. [HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 336a]), *k'ajk'-ot* 'id.' from *k'ajk'* 'demon', (*z*)*ays-ot* from *ays* 'demon' (q.v., see also s.v. *zaysaysem*). Further: Van **ayc-ot-im* 'to be angry', lit. 'to become "goaty"' (from *ayc* 'goat') [Ačārean 1913: 92a].

On 'butterfly' : 'soul; spirit', see HAB s.v. *xipilik*.

***t'it'-** 'to fly', independently only in Step'anos Őrbelean: *t'it'* (noun) 'flying'; **t'it'-č'-im** 'to fly' (Bible+), **t'it'-an-im** 'id.' (Proverbs etc.), **t'it'-n-um** 'id.' (Cyril of Alexandria, etc.)

●**ETYM** See s.v. **t'er* 'leaf' etc.

t'ik'i, dtk'i 'maple'.

Spelled also as *t'ik(en)i, t'xki, dtk'i, txki* [Ališan 1895: 190^{Nr794}]. According to Béguinot/Diratzouyan (1912: 66, Nrs 303 and 304), *t'iki/txki* (with synonymous *bich*) denotes 'Acer campestre', whereas 'Acer platanoides' is represented by **kat'n-terew/b-i*, on which see 2.1.15. See also Malxaseanc' 4: 418a.

NHB (2: 1061c) has only in the dialectal addendum: *dtki* 'a tree with valuable wood of which lapels are made'.

According to Ačāryan (HAB 2: 188b), attested in "Yatags caroc" ("On trees"), in the form *ḏḥk'i*. I cannot identify this source since it is absent from the bibliography of HAB.

●**DIAL** Lori, Łazax, Łarabał, Łaradał *t'xki*, Łazax *t'ḥk-eni*, Muš, Bulanəx *ḏxki* 'maple' (with an initial *d*- rather than *d'*-, as Ačāryan points out) [HAB 2: 188-189], Dersim *t'əłzi* (perhaps a misprint for *t'əłgi*), *t'əłki*, *t'əkt'i* [Bařramyan 1960: 80b].

Though almost unattested in literature and more widespread in eastern dialects (cf. also Ališan 1895: 190^{Nr794}), the word is also present in the western dialectal area (Muš-Bulanəx and Dersim) and may be thus old.

●**ETYM** No etymological attempt is recorded in HAB 2: 188-189.

The word may be analyzed as **t'i/ut-* + the tree-suffix *-k'i/-ki* (cf. *hačar-k/k'-i* 'beech', dial. *kařnək'i* vs. class. *kařni* 'oak', etc.). For the semantic association cf. Oss. *wis-qæd* 'maple' from PIE **qing-* 'elm' (see P. Friedrich apud Mallory/Adams 1987: 178b; see also s.v. *knjni* 'elm'), if the connection is accepted. The root resembles **t'eł-* found in *t'ełi* 'elm' and *t'eławs* (see s.v.v.).

In this case, Dersim *t'əkt'i* (next to *t'əłki*) would be considered to be a metathesized from *t'ḥk'i*, which seems strange. Therefore, one may alternatively assume that *t'ḥk'i* is a metathesized form of **t'k-y/xi*, preserved intact only in Dersim. Bearing in mind that the maple belongs to the family Aceraceae, one can think of Babcian *stagar* and Chechen *stajr* 'Acer platanoides', which have been connected with Hurr. *taškar-innə* 'box-tree' (see Diakonoff/Starostin 1986: 25). Perhaps a Caucasian form of the type **təgər/-* is responsible for the Armenian. The latter may have been formed with the suffix found in tree-names like *kařamaxi*, *tawsax(i)*, etc. (see 2.3.1).

The alternation *t'-/d-* is reminiscent of the cases of *t'awt'ap'em* and *p'łanim* (see Weitenberg 1992).

Alternatively, *t'ḥk'i* 'maple' can be compared with Oss. *tułz/tołxæ* 'oak' and Hung. *tölgy* 'oak' (on which see Cheung 2002: 232). For the semantics cf. Basque *azkar*, which, depending on the dialect, denotes 'maple' or 'oak' (see P. Friedrich 1970: 66).

t'uz, *o*-stem: GDSg *t'z-o-y*, AblSg *i t'z-o-y* (Bible); *i*-stem: GDPl *t'z-i-c'* (Plato) 'fig' (Bible+), 'a fig-like tumour' ("Bžškaran" apud NHB 1: 820c) [cf. Gr. *σῦκον* 'fig; a large wart on the eyelids, also tumours in other places']; dial. also 'vulva', see below; **t'zeni**, *ea*-stem: GDSg *t'zenw-o-y*, AblSg *i t'zenwoy*, LocSg *i t'zenwoj*, ISg *t'zene-a-w* 'fig-tree' (Bible+).

●**DIAL** Widespread in dialects. With *-n*: T'iflis *t'uzə*, gen. *t'zan*, Agulis, Łarabał etc. *t'oznə*. The *-n* is seen in *t'z-n-eni* 'fig-tree', attested in 1788 [HAB 2: 202a]. Note also Lori *t'z-(e)n-k'-i* 'fig-tree' e.g. in a fairy-tale from the village of Šnot (recorded by Hm. Mažinyan; see Nawasardeanc' 5, 1889: 67, lines 9, 15 = HŽHek' 8, 1977: 17^{L-2}, 18^{L3}): *t'znk'u terew* "leaf of fig-tree".

No trace of *-n* in the Van-group; see Ačaryan 1952: 261 (not listed in 124-126, under *an*-declension); M. Muradyan 1962: 196b, cf. 102; Orbeli 2002: 232.

In Aslanbek and Ozim, *t'uz* also means 'vulva'; cf. Gr. *σῦκον* 'fig; pudenda muliebria', Germ. *Feige*.

●**ETYM** Since de Lagarde (1854: 30^{L820f}), compared with Gr. *σῦκον*, Boeotian *τῦκον* n. 'fig; a large wart on the eyelids, also tumours in other places; *pudenda muliebria*, female genitals', *σῦκῆ*, Dor. *σῦκέα*, Heracleian Dor. *σῦκία* f. 'fig-tree, Ficus Carica'. The Armenian and the Greek cannot be separated from Lat. *ficus*, *f* and *ūs*, f. 'fig-tree' and, in view of phonological irregularities, are treated as words of Mediterranean (or Asia Minor) rather than Indo-European origin [Meillet 1908-09b: 163; Meillet/Vendryes 1924: 17; HAB 2: 202a; Frisk 2: 818; P. Friedrich 1970: 150 (also with Burushaski *pfāk*); Ĵahukyan 1987: 307, 309, 466; Mallory/Adams 1997: 433b; Olsen 1999: 936 ("a cultural loan")].

Patrubańy (1908: 278a) derives the Armenian and the Greek (as well as Slav. **tyky*, cf. Russ. *tykva* 'pumpkin') from PIE **tū-* 'to swell' and presents Lat. *ficus* separately (previous entry), from PIE **dʰē-* 'to suck'. [A misunderstanding seems to have taken place in HAB 2: 202a, in the representation of Patrubańy's etymology]. This view cannot be maintained. The connection with Gr. *σίκυς* 'cucumber', Slav. **tyky* 'pumpkin' etc. (on which see s.v. *sex* 'melon') is untenable; see also Walde/Hofmann 1, 1938: 492. Gr. *σῦκῆ* and Mycenaean *su-za* < **sukya* have been compared with Hitt. *šigga-* 'a plant' without a mention of Boeotian *τῦκον* and the Armenian and the Latin forms (see Hoffner 1967: 43₅₈). This is not convincing, either.

The phonological correspondences, in particular Arm. *-z* vs. Gr. and Lat. **-k̂-*, and Lat. *fī-* vs. Arm. and Gr. **tu-*, are not easily explicable. De Lagarde (1854: 30^{L820f}) compares with the case of Arm. *xoz* 'pig' vs. Pers. *xūk* 'id.'. Patrubańy (1908: 278a) assumes that Arm. **t'us-* yielded *t'uz* under the influence of *ənkoyz* 'walnut'. The correspondence Gr. *τ-* : Lat. *f-* betrays a "phonème étranger" also found in Gr. *λίτρα* 'pound; a silver coin of Sicily' : Lat. *libra* < **līfrā* 'Roman pound; level; balance; scales' [Meillet 1908-09b: 163]. Morani (1991: 175) treats Arm. *t'uz* next to Lat. *ficus* etc. as borrowed from a substratum and posits an initial **p-*. [One may posit a **tʰ-* with facultative voicing (and aspiration?). Uncertain].

Ĵahukyan (1987: 307) points out that Arm. *t'uz* cannot be derived from Greek, and it implies another source form of the type **tug^h*-, with combination of a voiceless stop with a voiced aspirated one which is not characteristic for Indo-European, unless **-g^h*- is a determinative. He (op. cit. 466) also mentions the Semitic parallels (Akkad. *tīttu(m)*, Aram. *tēn/ttā*, Arab. *tīn*, etc.; cf. Adonc' 1938: 460-461 = 1972: 385-386) considering them to be formally remote.

In view of the Latin vocalism, one may tentatively reconstruct Mediterr. **t^huōīk-* or **tū(i)k-*. The final voiced *-z* of Arm. *t'uz* points to (or has been influenced by) the suffixal element *j/z* which abounds in plant-names, animal-names etc. (see 2.3.1).

Arm. dial. (T'iflis, Lori, Agulis, Łarabał etc.) **t'uzn* probably reflects **t'uz-(o)m* 'fig' (the fruit), cf. Gr. *σῦκον* n. 'fig' (the fruit) vs. *συκῆ*, *σῦκέα*, *σῦκία* f. 'fig-tree'. See also s.v. *mor* 'blackberry'.

t'umni

"Baġgirk' hayoc'": *t'umni* 'darkness' (var. *t'urmn*), *t'umnanal* 'to become dark' (see Amalyan 1975: 123^{Nr223f}); cf. also *t'uz* 'night' or 'dark', *t'usi* 'darkness' (ibid. Nrs. 216, 227; see also p. 373).

●**ETYM** Ačairyan (HAB 2: 210b) only records the existence of Pers. *tum* 'dark' and leaves the origin of the Armenian open.

Probably from PIE **te/om-(e)n-* 'dark'; see s.v. place-name *T'əmnis*.

t'uš *a*-stem 'cheek'.

13th century onwards.

●**DIAL** Ubiquitous in dialects, in the meaning 'cheek'. In Xarberd, Polis and Suč'ava: 'the soft part of the chin'; in Tigranakert: 'the cheek from inside' [HAB 2: 207b].

The Tigranakert meaning, I think, allows to consider another possible cognate, viz. Moks *t'uš* 'bite, biting' (= 'прикус, откус'), on which see Orbeli 2002: 233; a textual illustration is found in 101^{L-16}. Note that one of the possible meanings of *t'ur* 'cheek' (q.v.) is 'bite = a piece bitten off to eat; a mouthful'.

In ModArm., *t'uš* also refers to the soft part of the buttocks (*ori t'uš*); see Ałayan 1974: 73 (footnote), 74.

●**ETYM** No etymology is mentioned in HAB 2: 207-208.

Ałayan (1974: 71-74) connects *t'uš* with *t'ur* (q.v.), pointing out that the basic meaning is 'swelling', exactly like in *ayt* 'cheek' (q.v.). Then, he derives them from **tu-r-so-* (cf. Gr. *σωρός* m. 'heap, especially of corn', etc.) < PIE **teuH-* or **teHu-* 'to swell; crowd, folk; fat; strong', for the semantics mentioning especially Olc. *þjō*

‘Oberschenkel, Arschbacke’. For the twofold development of **-rs-* as *-r̥* and *-(r)š* Ałayan mentions *t’arām-/t’aršām-* (see s.v. and 2.1.12).

In order to approach the semantic development, one needs a closer look at Balto-Slavic **tu(o)rH-*: ORuss. *tvorъ* ‘appearance’, Pol. *twór* ‘creation, creature’, Lith. *ãptvaras* ‘fence’, etc.; OCS *tvoriti* ‘do, make’: Russ. *tvorít*, Czech *tvoriti* ‘to create, do’, etc.; Lith. *tvirtas* ‘strong, firm, solid’; OCS *tvръdъ* ‘firm, solid’ < **turH-dʰo-*; **tuōrH-eh₂-*: OCS *tvarъ* f., SCr. *tvār* ‘creation, creature’, Sln. *tvār* ‘matter’, Lith. *tvorà* ‘fence’, etc. Note the remarkable semantic identity of Czech *tvář*, Pol. *warz*, Slk. *tvár* ‘face, cheek’ with Arm. *t’ur̥*, *t’uš* ‘cheek’.

The semantic basis of *t’uš* might have been ‘appearance’ (cf. ORuss. *tvorъ* ‘appearance’), which would then have developed into ‘face’ (cf. Arm. *eres* ‘face’, if indeed related with *erewim* ‘to appear’) > ‘cheek’. However, the whole semantic field seems to be as follows: ‘to grow, to swell; to be(come) solid, firm, strong; to make solid, strengthen, fasten; to create’. Thus: ‘a swollen part of the body’. This may be corroborated by other Armenian possible cognates, viz. *t’or̥* ‘lobe of the ear’ and *t’ort’os̥* ‘ripened; fat; swollen’ (q.v.). For the semantic field see s.v. *boyt’* ‘lobe (of the ear or the liver); thumb; hump; young of a frog’, suggesting a basic meaning like ‘a soft lump of flesh; a roundish projecting part of the body’.

It is difficult to establish the exact protoform(s) of the Armenian words. The proto-form **tu-r-so-* suggested by Ałayan (ibid.) and accepted by scholars from Armenia proper (Suk’iasyan 1986: 164; Ĵahukyan 1987: 154), to the best of my knowledge, is not confirmed by cognates. However, such a proto-form might have been made at an early stage of Armenian as follows: from verbal **tuHr-* (or **turH-*) ‘to swell, etc.’ an *s*-stem neuter was formed meaning ‘swelling; cheek’ (cf. Gr. *oĩdōs* n. ‘swelling’, Arm. *ayt* ‘cheek’ from verbal *oĩdēō* ‘to swell’ and Arm. *ayt-n-um* ‘to swell’). From this **tuHr-os* n. a form with **-s-o-* was created as in Skt. *útsa-* m. ‘spring, fountain’ < **ud-s-o-* from PIE **ǵed-os-* n. ‘water’ (cf. Gr. *ũdōs* n. ‘water’, Arm. *get*, *o*-stem ‘river’, q.v.). Thus: **tuHr-so-*.

Alternatively, *t’ur̥* (but not *t’uš*) may have been formed by the suffixal element **-r-* on the basis of **t(o)uH-s-* (cf. Skt. *tāvīṣī-* f. ‘strength, power’, etc.). Thus: **t(o)uH-s-r-* > *t’ur̥* (and, perhaps, **touH-s-r-* > PArm. **to(w)ēr̥* > *t’or̥*). For other possible cases of such formation see s.v.v. *antair̥*, *getair̥*.

t’ur̥ probably ‘cheek’ and/or ‘bite, a mouthful’, ‘swelling, fullness’.

Attested in Philo. In compounds: *t’r̥-a-lir̥* (with *lir̥* ‘full, replete’) and *hask-a-t’ur̥* (with *hask* ‘ear (of corn)’), both in Agat’angelos. For the philological discussion I

refer to HAB 2: 208a; Aṭayan 1974: 71-74. In "Baṙgirk' hayoc'": *t'ur's* *t'ušs* (see Amalyan 1975: 123^{Nr225}). Here, thus, *t'ur* is taken as synonymous to *t'uš* 'cheek'.

Some lexicographers represent *t'ur* as meaning (also) 'a bite = a piece bitten off to eat; a mouthful' (see HAB, *ibid.*). Here again, there is parallelism with *t'uš*, note the semantics of Moks and, partially, in Tigranakert.

●**ETYM** No etymology in HAB (2: 208a).

See s.v. *t'uš*.

t'urc₁ *o*-stem in NHB, but without evidence 'cheek'.

The oldest attestation is found in P'awstos Buzand 5.37 (1883=1984: 204^{L18}; transl. Garsoïan 1989: 219).

●**ETYM** Usually linked with *arac-* 'to browse, graze' and Gr. *πρώγων* (see s.v. for more detail). More probably, *t'urc* 'cheek' is comparable with Lat. *turgeō* 'to swell out, become swollen or tumid' and the other Armenian words for 'cheek', viz. *t'uš* and *t'ur* [Aṭayan 1974: 74; Ĵahukyan 1987: 197], q.v. (see also s.v. *t'urc₂*). For the semantic development 'swollen' > 'cheek' see above s.v. *t'uš* 'cheek'.

t'urc₂ 'to burn bricks or pots of clay to make them stiff'.

The verb *t'rcem* is attested from the Bible onwards. In Genesis 11.3: *t'rcesc'uk' zayn hrov* = *ὁπτήσωμεν αὐτὰς πυρί*. StRevBible translates: "let us <...> burn them (i.e. the bricks) thoroughly". Independently attested in John Chrysostom+, as adjective: *t'urc* 'stiffened (in fire)'.

●**DIAL** The verb is widespread in dialects.

●**ETYM** No acceptable etymology is recorded in HAB 2: 210a.

I hypothetically propose a connection with Lith. *tvirtas* 'strong, firm, solid', OCS *tvръдъ* 'firm, solid', etc., from PIE **turH-t/d^h-*. The Armenian form would require, then, **turH-d-s-* (from the sigmatic aorist?) or **turH-g^h-*, cf. Lat. *turgeō* 'to swell out, become swollen or tumid'. In the latter case, *t'urc-* is identical with *t'urc₂* 'cheek' (q.v.).

t'uk' *o*-stem 'spit, saliva'; ***t'k'anem*** 'to spit'

Bible+.

●**DIAL** Dialectally ubiquitous.

●**ETYM** Compared with Lat. *spuō*, Goth. *speiwan*, Gr. *πτύω*, etc. 'to spit', the proto-form of which is difficult to establish (see HAB 2: 212; Pokorny 1959: 999-1000; Mallory/Adams 1997: 538a). Discussing the anlaut correspondence between Arm. *t'-* and Gr. *πτ-* (see also s.v. *t'eti* 'elm'), Greppin (1982: 351)

introduces also Arm. *t'uk'* and Gr. *πτυω*. According to Clackson (1994: 169), however, "the two languages have most likely made separate onomatopoeic creations or reformations".

iž, *i*-stem 'viper' (Bible+).

For philological discussion see s.v. *k'arb* 'basilisk, asp'.

●**DIAL** Alaškert *iž* 'poisonous (snake)', Sebastia *iž* 'a malicious person' [HAB 2: 239a].

●**ETYM** Related with Gr. *ἔχις*, *-εως*, GPI *ἔχων* m. (f.) 'viper' [GSg *ἔχιος*; plural: dat. *ἐχίσσι*, gen. *ἐχίων*, acc. *ἐχιας* (also *ἔχεις*); cf. also *ἔχιδνα* f.] 'viper; name of a monster', Skt. *āhi*- m. 'snake, adder' (RV+), YAv. *aži*- m. 'snake, dragon', MP *až* 'dragon' (LW from Avestan), etc.; cf. also Gr. *ὄφις*, gen. *ὄφεως*, *-εος*, Dor. and Ion. *ὄφιος* m. 'serpent' [Hübischmann 1897: 450; HAB 2: 238-239; Meillet 1936: 75; Pokorny 1959: 44; Ĵahukyan 1987: 112].

Compared with Gr. *ἔχις* first by de Lagarde 1854: 29^{L779}. For the problem of **ē* vs. **o* in Arm. *iž* vs. Gr. *ὄφις* see Schindler 1994: 398.

Hardly of Iranian origin (see L. Hovhannisyan 1990: 215).

In view of the Armenian *ž*, the PIE root probably had labiovelar **-g^{hw}*- rather than palatovelar **-g^h*-. The association with *ozni* 'hedgehog' can be secondary then. The sibilant *-ž-* of Arm. *iž* instead of the expected affricate *-č-* is troublesome. The vocalism is considered to point to lengthened grade: **h₁ēg^{hw}-i-* (see the references above). This is possible, cf. the alternation **-ē-* : **-e-* seen in the following animal-names: Gr. *ἄλωπηξ*, *-εκος* f. 'fox' vs. Arm. *atuēs* 'fox', obl. *atues-*; Arm. *ak'is* 'weasel' vs. Skt. *kaśikā* f. 'Ichneumonweibchen' or 'weasel', *kaśa-* 'weasel' (see s.v.v.).

One may explain QIE **h₁ēg^{hw}-i-* by positing an older monosyllabic root noun (cf. Beekes 1995: 189-190): nom. **h₁ēg^{wh}-s*, obl. **h₁eg^{wh}-*. This is uncertain, however. Besides, the actual evidence points to PIE *i*-stem. I therefore propose a hypothetic scenario which seems to explain both the vocalism and the *ž*. [It should be borne in mind, however, that designations for 'snake' are liable to tabu-changes; see 2.1.36].

We may be dealing with a PIE HD *i*-stem: nom. **h₁ēg^{hw}-(ō)i-*, gen. **h₁(e)g^{hw}-i-ós*, cf. Gr. gen. *ἔχιος*. The PArm. paradigm would have been nom. **ēj-i(h)*, gen. **ēj-yó-* > **ež-ó-*, with assibilation of the affricate before **-y-* [Compare also Avest. *aži-*?]. 1) PArm. nom. **ēj-i* became **eij-i* as in **med^h-io-* > Arm. *mēj*, cf. Lat. *medius* 'mid, middle'; 2) **eij-i* became **eiz-i* > **ež-i* analogically after the genitive; 3) **ež-i* yielded *iž* due to the following hushing sibilant, as in cases like *gišer* 'night' from **geišero-* < **we(š)šero-*, etc. (see 2.1.2). This scenario must be partly modified if it

turns out that the first and third steps are in fact synchronically identic, which would imply that the rule involved in the third step applies not only before hushing sibilants but also before hushing affricates. In this case, the explanation of Arm. *i* in *iž* is not complete. Perhaps additional fronting caused by the secondary nominative: **eiž-s* > **eižž* > *iž*, cf. **atues-s* > *atues* 'fox', etc. (see 2.2.1.2).

il, *o*-stem (Proverbs 31.19 = Gr. ἄτρακτος 'spindle'), *il-ik* (ISg *il-k-aw* in Kanonagirk') 'spindle'.

●**DIAL** Widespread in dialects, mostly in the form *il-ik*. The root seems to be present in the Łarabał compound (ə)ləpútik tal 'to walk continuously' < **il-a-putik tal* 'to twist like a spindle' [HAB 2: 239b].

According to Ĵahukyan (1972: 282; 1987: 122, 214, 277), Maraš {{NOTE - Written with a misprint - "Marafa". - ENDNOTE}} *illel* 'to twist' (see Ačārean 1913: 396b; Galustean 1934: 387^{L-4}) belongs here too, as an archaism. Note also K'esab *illil* 'to wind, reel; to turn', *ilvil* 'to turn around oneself' [Č'olak'ean 1986: 241]. Č'olak'ean (ibid.), however, derives *illil* from **ol-el*, not specifying the latter form. He probably means *olorem*, which, indeed, is reflected regularly as *illel* or *illil* in dialects of Cilicia and Svedia, see HAB 3: 552a; Ačāryan 2003: 66, 332, 383, 582. Andreasyan (1967: 226-227, 378a), however, represents *illil* 'to twist' and its derivatives in the purely dialectal glossary, rendering ClArm. *olorel* as Svedia *uləril*, cf. Maraš *olre* [Danielyan 1967: 204a].

Several dialects have homonymical *ilik* in meanings 'spine', 'marrow', etc.: Polis 'marrow/moelle d'un os', Łarabał (*iligy*) 'spinal column' [Ačārean 1902: 141], Ararat, Karin, Xarberd, etc. 'spinal column', Hamšen 'stomach' [HayLezBrbBař 2, 2002: 166a]. Note also Van *xarām-ilik* 'moelle épinière' [Ačārean 1902: 141].

The Armenian dialects of Polis and Akn have *ilikə-clikə* 'the essence of the subject (with all the subtle details)' (see Ačārean 1913: 396b; HayLezBrbBař 2, 2002: 166). Ačāryan (ibid.) does not specify the components. In view of the existence of the synonymical *uṯn u cucə* 'the true nature, the essence' (Modern Armenian; see Malxaseanc', HBB 3: 597a), literally "the brain and marrow" (see *uteḥ*), one may identify the components of *ilikə-clikə* as *ilik* 'spine, marrow' and *cl-ik* 'clitoris' (see Ačārean 1913: 516b). The latter is a diminutive form of *cil* 'sprout, shoot, bud'. In the corresponding expression from Sebastia (see Gabikean 1952: 216), one finds *ilə cilə* 'every detail'. The semantic shift 'marrow' > 'essence; basis' is well-known, cf. Engl. *marrow*, Germ. *Mark*, Fr. *moelle*.

According to N. Mkrtč'yan (1971: 202), the second meaning of Burdur *ilik* 'spindle' is 'marrow' (*otnacuc*). Ačāryan (1902: 141; see also HAB 3: 594b),

however, considers Arm. *ilik* ‘marrow/moelle’ as a loan from Turk. *ilik* ‘marrow/moelle’. See also below.

●**ETYM** Lidén (1906: 130-131) compares *il* with Lith. *lenkti* ‘bend, walk around’; Skt. *āṇī-* m. ‘axle-pin, linch-pin; part of the leg above the knee’ (RV+); Gr. *ῥακάτη* f. ‘spindle’, and connects *il* ‘spindle’ with *otn* ‘spine, etc.’ and *uln* ‘neck’ (q.v.). Comparing with the semantic development seen in Gr. *σφόδρῶλος* m. ‘vertebra; (pl.) backbone, spine; neck; joint; circular whorl which balances and twirls a spindle’, etc., he points out that the older meaning of *il(ik)* could have been ‘spine, spinal column’. Pokorny (1959: 307-309, s.v. **el-* ‘to bow, bend; elbow’) and Jahukyan (1987: 122, 437) accept this etymology. Others are mostly sceptical to it, see HAB 2: 239; *Frisk 1: 628; Olsen 1999: 955. It is remarkable that next to Arm. *ilik* ‘spindle’, there is also another *ilik* (in a number of dialects; see above) in the meanings ‘marrow’, ‘spinal column’, etc., which is considered as a loan from Turk. *ilik* ‘marrow/moelle’ (Ačāryan 1902: 141; HAB 3: 594b). Is the resemblance accidental? Turk. and Azeri *ilik* cannot be an Armenian borrowing because it is a native Turkic word - PTurk. **jilik* ‘marrow’, cf. OTurk. *jilik* (OUygh.), Turkm. *jilik*, Uzb. *ilik*, Bashk. *jelek*, etc. (see EtymDictAltLang 2003, 2: 865).

The connection of *il* ‘spindle’ with *otn* ‘spine, etc.’ and *uln* ‘neck’ can be accepted only if the internal laryngeal of the PIE root (see s.v. *otn*) is a **h₁-* (**Hch₁l-* > Arm. *il*), which is uncertain.

itj *i*-stem: GDPI *ətj-i-c* in Daniel 2.27 (Cowe 1992: 160); *a*-stem: ISg *ətj-a-w* in Eusebius of Caesarea ‘desire’ (Movsēs Xorenac’i 1.18, Book of Chries, etc.), ‘witch, sorcerer’ (Bible+); **ətjam**, **ətjanam** ‘to desire, pray; to cast a spell’ (Bible+).

For the semantic shift of *itj* cf. Skt. *yā-* ‘to request, implore’ > *yātu-* m. ‘sorcery, witchcraft’ (RV+), Arm. *jatuk* ‘sorcerer’ (Iranian loan).

●**DIAL** Ačāryan (HAB 2: 241a) questions whether Łarabał **itj-ot-v-il* ‘to be angry with someone’ belongs here.

●**ETYM** Ačāryan (HAB 2: 240b) rejects all the etymologies including those comparing *itj* with Skt. *eh-* ‘to strive for, desire’ (AV+), YAv. *iziieiti* ‘to desire’, *aēzah-* n. ‘desire’, Gr. *ἰχάινω*, etc. This etymology is worth of consideration. Arm. *itj*, *i*- or *a*-stem ‘desire’ may be derived from **Hig^h-l-* > PArm. **(h)ij-l-* > *itj* through regular metathesis. The absence of cognates with **-l-* is not a decisive argument against the etymology since *itj* may have been influenced by synonymous *batj* (also *i*-stem) and *gefj*.

**law-/lap-*, **la/ow-* **lup* ‘flat (hand, stone, etc.)’ (dial.), MArm. *lawš* ‘a thin flat bread’ (Geoponica+, see MiġHayBaġ 1, 1987: 315), dial. **law(a)š* ‘a thin flat bread’

●DIAL The forms for ‘palm, flat of the hand’: Muš **lup*, Ozim **lap*, Akn **lov-az*, etc. [Ačarean 1913: 439b].

Širak *lap’uk*, Ararat *lep’(uk)* ‘a flat, polished stone for playing’ [Amatuni 1912: 243a], Kotayk’/Elkavan *lep’uk* < **lap’uk* ‘a palm-sized flat stone’ (see V. Arak’elyan 1984a: 147), etc.

Van **law-az*, **lawaz-ik* ‘very thin’ [Ačarean 1913: 414a], Moks *lāvāzik/k* ‘хворый, исхудалый, тощий’ = ‘ailing, gaunt, barren’ [Orbeli 2002: 237].

Both **lawš* and **lawas* ‘a thin flat bread’ are widespread in dialects. In some of these, **lawš* also refers to ‘broad (ear)’ [HAB 2: 308b].

●ETYM Ačaryan (1913: 439-440; see also Saradževa 1986: 130) connects **lup’/lap’* and **lov-az* ‘palm’ with Goth. *lofā* ‘flat of the hand’, OHG *lappo* ‘palm, blade of an oar’, Lith. *lōpa*, Latv. *lāpa* ‘paw’, Russ. *lāpa* ‘paw’, etc. (see ÈtimSlovSlavJaz 14, 1987: 26-27), Kurd. *lap* m. ‘lap’, Zaza *lap/b*, etc. (see Cabolov 1, 2001: 577). Ĵahukyan (1972: 297; 1987: 136, 276) adds **lap’-uk* ‘flat stone’ here. Also **law-az* ‘very thin’ may belong here, though Ĵahukyan (1987: 135) represents it separately. Note the same suffix in **lov-az* ‘palm’.

As for **law(a)š* ‘a thin flat bread’, Ačaryan (HAB 2: 308a) notes that the form **lavaş* is found in Persian, Kurdish, Turkish, Georgian, etc. It is unknown, he proceeds, whether Arm. **lawas* or Pers. *lavāš* is the source of all these. According to Cabolov (1, 2001: 595), Kurd. *lōš/lavāš* and Pers. *lavāš* (the Armenian forms are not mentioned) are loans from Turk. *lavaş*. No etymological attempt of this term is known to me.

I tentatively suggest a derivation of **law-aš* from **law-* ‘flat’ connecting with our dialectal words above. Semantically this is conceivable since this bread is specifically flat and thin. For the suffix cf. *matł-aš* from *matał* ‘young, fresh’, etc. (see HAB 3: 267b). Note that both **law-aš* and *matł-aš* are attested since Geoponica (13th cent.) and are represented in dialects.

If this interpretation is correct, the Armenian should be regarded as the source of the others. This is probable since, as Ačaryan (HAB 2: 308a) informs, **lavaş* is considered to be Armenian bread in both Yerevan and Iran (being opposed with *sangak* for Turks and Persians), and in Tehran this bread is called *nūn-i armanī* ‘Armenian bread’. Similar data can be found also for other regions. In Dersim, for instance, *lavaş* is seen as characteristic for Armenian hospitality whereas the Kurdish entertain with *sači hac* [Halajyan 1973: 294b].

Almost all of the Armenian forms seem to point to PArm. **lo/aw-/lapʼ* ‘flat’, and Muš has **lupʼ*. European cognates point to PIE **loH₂p-eh₂-* or **leh₃p-eh₂-*. One may hypothetically restore a HD *h₂-*stem: nom. **loH₂p-eh₂-* or **leh₃p-eh₂-*, gen. **lHp-h₂-ós*. This would yield PArm. nom. **luv-*, obl. **lapʼ-*. Of these, analogically: **lupʼ*, **law-*, etc.

For the phonological treatment of the alternation *-w/pʼ-* see Weitenberg 1992. See also 2.1.15.

leard, *i-* or *a-*stem: GDSg *lerd-i* in Grigor Narekac’i and Grigor Magistros, AblSg *i lerd-ē* in Bible and Gregory of Nyssa; *o-*stem: GDSg *lerd-o-y* twice in Plato ‘liver’ (Bible+); derivatives, e.g. *lerd-a-boytʼ* ‘lobe of the liver’ (Bible+); see s.v. *boytʼ*₁. In a list of gems by Anania Širakac’i (7th cent.) one finds a compound that is not recorded in NHB and HAB, namely *lerd-a-goyn* ‘having colour of liver’ (A. G. Abrahamyan 1944: 260^{L12}). Here the gem called *etungn* (cf. Gr. *ὄνυξ*, see s.v. *etungn* ‘nail’) is described as *spitak* (‘light, white’) *lerdagoyñ*. Compare the dialectal meaning ‘light, bright red’ of *leard*.

●**DIAL** Widespread in dialects, in the meanings ‘liver’ (Muš, Alaškert, T’iflis), ‘light, bright red’ (Van, Xarberd; cf. *lerd-a-goyn* above), and, especially, ‘clot of blood’ [HAB 2: 271a]. For the semantics cf. Russ. *pečén* ‘liver’ : dial. ‘clot of blood’, pl. ‘internal organs of the body (heart, lunges, liver)’; see SIRusNarGov 26, 1991: 348-349.

In Karin, *lertʼ* refers to clotted blood [HAB, *ibid.*; H. Mkrtč’yan 1952: 146a]. According to HayLezBrbBar 2, 2002: 222a (with two textual illustrations), in this dialects it is also a body-part term meaning ‘back’. Another textual illustration can be found in a folk prayer from Ĵavaxk’ [Lalayeanc’ 1892: 7 = 1, 1983: 336], where Mary is described as having *Xač’m srtin*, *xač’m lerdin* : “a cross on her breast, a cross on her back”.

For the semantic shift from an internal body-part to an external one cf. *sirt* ‘breast’ < ‘heart’ in the passage just mentioned.

●**ETYM** Since Petermann, de Lagarde, Dervischjan et al. (see HAB), connected with Skt. *yákr-/yakn-* n. (RV+), NASg *yákr̥t* (AV) ‘liver’, YAv. *yakarə* n. ‘liver’ (on the vocalism see de Vaan 2003: 68-69), NPers. *ĵigar* ‘id.’, Gr. *ἥπαρ, -ατος* n. ‘liver’, OCS *ikra* ‘roe’, Russ. *ikrá* ‘roe, spawn, caviar; calf of leg’, etc. [Hübschmann 1897: 452; HAB 2: 270-271]. [For the semantic relationship ‘roe, spawn’ : ‘calf of leg’ see 3.7.3]. The PIE word is heteroclitic: **Hiekʷr(-t)*, gen. **Hiekʷn-ós*.

On the final **-t* see Clackson 1994: 55-56. On the loss of the intervocalic **kʷ* see Kortlandt 1980: 102 = 2003: 30.

The initial *l-* is troublesome. It is reminiscent of the problem of *luc* 'yoke'. The phonetic solution (see 2.1.7) is not convincing. It has been suggested that *leard* is connected or has been contaminated with Gr. *λιπαρός* 'oily, shiny with oil, anointed; fatty, greasy', *λιπαρία* f. 'fatness', OIc. *lifr* 'liver' etc., and *luc* 'yoke' has been influenced by *lucanem* 'to loosen' (see Hübschmann 1893: 32^{Nr120}; HAB 2: 271a; Ĵahukyan 1982: 40; Clackson 1994: 210₉₇; Kortlandt 1998: 15-16 = 2003: 122; Beekes 2003: 162]. Arm. *leard* is also compared with Hitt. *lišši* n. 'liver' [Schindler 1966; Olsen 1999: 191-192].

Alternatively, one may explain the initial *l-* of *leard* by influence of *lefi* 'gall, bile', though the origin of this word is obscure, and/or *lanj* 'breast', etymologically 'lung'.

lerk (*i*-stem in ErzN^Ker) 'hairless', dial. 'smooth'.

Bible+. In "Adamgirk'" (Ar'ak'el Siwnec'i, 15th cent.): *lek* (with loss of *-r-*; cf. dial.).

●**DIAL** Alaškert *lerk* '*smooth (leather or mountain)'; Alaškert, Xotorĵur, Xoy, Van *lek* 'thin, smooth skin of sheep, leather'. For the semantic development cf. Alban. *l'akur* 'naked' : *l'kur* 'leather' [HAB 2: 277b].

●**ETYM** Together with *otork* (*i*-stem in Philo) 'smooth, polished' (Bible+), derived from PIE **le/org^w*-, cf. Mlr. *lerg* f. 'sloping expanse, hill-side, bank, plain, surface' < **lergā*, *less-lergg* 'pasture', Nlr. *learg* 'a plain; field', MWelsh *llwrw* 'track, trail, path', etc.; the initial *o-* in *otork* is traced to **po-* [Lidén 1906: 60-64; HAB 2: 277; 3: 556; Pokorny 1959: 679; Ĵahukyan 1987: 136]. Makaev (1974: 59-60) considers the correspondence "more than doubtful" and proposes a derivation from **(s)leg^w-ro-* < PIE **sleig-* 'slimy; to glide' (on which see Pokorny 1959: 663-664).

The fact that the word occurs only in Armenian and Celtic casts doubt on the etymology. Admittedly, one needs a third cognate to consider the connection as certain. However, I see no other significant reasons to abandon the etymology. The semantic relationship 'smooth, polished' : 'flat surface, plain, pastureland, field' is unobjectionable, cf., e.g., *tap* (-) 'flat, plain, smooth' : 'field, plain', 'pastureland' (cf. *tuarac-a-tap**, dial. *naxr-a-tap**, etc.; see s.v. place-name *Tuaracatap*). Note that one of the semantic nuances of the Mlr. word is 'sloping expanses, hill-side', which is practically identical with 'pastureland' (at least for Armenia, where pasturelands are always on sloping fields, hill-sides). Mlr. *lerg* may be separated from the Celtic word for 'track', as suggested by Schrijver (1995: 62), but the correspondence between Arm. *lerk* /*otork* 'smooth' and Mlr. *lerg* f. 'sloping expanse, plain, pastureland, surface' deserves consideration.

The only formal problem with *otork* is the initial *o-*. Lidén's explanation is uncertain (Makaev, Schrijver). The fact that the *o-* occurs only in the form with *o*-ablaut suggests me the following idea. If Arm. *lanj-k* 'breasts' (q.v.) is connected with Gr. *ἐλαχύς* and *ἐλαφρός*, one can assume that in the PIE initial cluster **h₁l-* the initial **h₁-* drops in Armenian when followed by a non-labial vowel, and yields *o-* (through assimilation) when followed by a labial vowel (in this case the **l* is realized as a dark lateral *ʎ*; see 2.1.17.2. The reconstructed form would be, then, **h₁lerg^w*. This is, of course, hypothetical.

See also s.v. *merk* 'naked'.

***loyc** (seen in imperative and 3sg.aor. *e-loyc*, as well as in a number of compounds) : *luc-anem* 'to unbind, loosen; to dissolve, liquidate; to absolve' (Bible+); *loyc* 'liquid, soft, dissolute' (Eznik Kořbac'i, Łazar P'arpec'i, Hexaemeron, etc.).

Illustration: In Łazar P'arpec'i 1.16 (1904=1985: 27^{L15f}; transl. Thomson 1991: 63): *i loyc ařařnordac* 'through dissolute leaders' (see the passage s.v. *metk* 'soft, weak, slack').

●**DIAL** Եւթա *luceł*, Axalc'xa, Ararat *luceł* (verb; said of the stomach); in Turkish-speaking Adana: 'to melt in water' [HAB 2: 294b].

●**ETYM** Since NHB 1: 894c, compared with Gr. *λύω* 'to unbind, unfasten; to unyoke, unharness; to release; to resolve', *λύσ(ι)-* etc., Lat. *luō*, perf. *lūī* 'to pay, acquit oneself', *so-luō* 'to loosen, unbind; to dissolve; to melt; to release', etc. The determinative **-g-* is considered to be found only in Armenian [HAB 2: 293-294]. The cognates point to a root with laryngeal [Schrijver 1991: 246, 517-518, 523-524]. Klingenschmitt (1982: 184) accepts the connection and posits a nasal present **lu-n-g-* seen in Celt. **lung-* 'loslassen freilassen' (cf. the structure of Skt. *yunáj-* : *yuj-* 'to yoke, harness, join'; see also s.v. *luc* 'yoke').

On the other hand, Arm. **loyc* has been derived from PIE **leug-*: Skt. *rujāti* : *roj-* 'to break (open)', Lith. *laužti* 'to break', etc. (see Pokorny 1959: 686; Ĵahukyan 1987: 136, 178; cf. Pederssen 1906: 359 = 1982: 137). Ĵahukyan (1987: 178) points out that a contamination is possible.

losdi 'salmon'

Unattested. According to Norayr, a MArm. word (see HAB 2: 297a, without any further data or comment). Aliřan (1920: 53) mentions *losdi* 'saumon' as a man-sized fish which enters up to the rivers Kur and Eraxs/Arak's from the Caspian Sea.

●**ETYM** No etymological attempt is recorded in HAB 2: 297a.

According to Mann (1963: 3), derives from the PIE word for the salmon(-trout): OIc. *lax*, Lith. *lašis*, etc.; cf. also Toch. B *laks* 'fish'. For Oss. *læsæg* (D.) see Cheung 2002: 200-201. The Armenian word is included into Mallory/Adams 1997: 497a (cf. also Lane 1970: 86). Absent in Ĵahukyan 1987. The PIE form is reconstructed with either **-a-* (see Pokorny 1959: 653; Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 536) or **-o-* (see Mallory/Adams 1997: 497; Adams 1999: 544).

PIE **lok̑s-* would yield Arm. **loc̑-*, and before a dental stop, **los-* or, perhaps better, **loš-*, as in *vešasan* 'sixteen'. The element *-di* is identified by Mann with Arm. *di* 'body'. However, I do not see the motivation of such a compound. Besides, Arm. *di* rather means 'corpse'. It is likewise uncertain whether the component *-di* has any relation with that of *aw-di* 'sheep' (q.v.). I conclude, that the IE origin of Arm. *losdi*, which is, moreover, unattested, is questionable.

lor, *i*-stem according to NHB 1: 892c, but without evidence 'quail' (Hexaemeron, Aristakēs Lastivertc'i, etc.); **lor-a-marg**, *i*-stem (ISg *loramarg-i-w* (Zak'aria Kat'otikos, 9th cent.); *o*-stem: GDSg *loramarg-o-y* (Philo), **lor-a-marg-i** 'a quail-like bird' (both Bible+).

In Hexaemeron (NPl *lor-k̑*), rendering Gr. *ὄρνις* m. (f.), *-ὄρνις* 'quail, Coturnix vulgaris' (see K. Muradyan 1984: 137^{L16}, index 374a). The compound *lor-a-marg(-i)* renders Gr. *ὄρνις-μήτρα* f. 'a bird which migrates with quails, *perhaps* corncrake, landrail, *Rallus crex*' in the Bible. For attestations and philological discussion see Greppin 1978: 79-82.

It has been assumed that *loramarg(i)* refers to 'quail' and is thus synonymous to *lor* [HAB 2: 297b; Greppin 1978: 79-80]. The compound *loramarg(i)* has been interpreted as 'meadow-quail', containing, thus, *marg* 'meadow' [NHB 1: 892c; Greppin 1978: 79]. One expects **marg-a-lor*, however. More probably, as has been shown by Ačāryan (HAB 3: 276a; see also Olsen 1999: 689), the second component is **marg* 'bird' (Iranian loan, cf. YAv. *mərəya-*, Oss. *marg̃*, etc. 'bird', see Cheung 2002: 202-203) found also in *síramarg* 'peacock'. The actual meaning of the compound is then 'a quail-like bird' or 'a bird that is associated with the quail'. Typologically compare Pers. *ušurmury*, *šuturmury* 'ostrich' < 'camel-bird', cf. Arm. *ištrmut̑* 'id.' (13th cent.+) [HAB 2: 247-248], Khwar. *šmy* [**ušmuy*], etc. [Teubner 1974: 301-302].

● **DIAL** Widespread in dialects [HAB 2: 298a].

In a number of eastern dialects, with "prothetic" (*(h)ü-* or (*(h)ə-*: Areš *hülör* [Lusenc' 1982: 210b]; Šamaxi *həlör*, (Meysari) *hülör* [Bařramyan 1964: 201]; Goris *lör*, *əlör*, *ülör* [Margaryan 1975: 330a].

[On *orlor* see V. Arak'elyan 1984a: 145-146].

●**ETYM** Related with Gr. *λάρος* m. 'a ravenous sea-bird, *perhaps* sea-mew, gull', *λαρίς*, *-ίδος* f. 'id.', cf. also *σισίλαρος* *πέρδιξ*. *Περγαῖοι* (Hesychius) 'partridge'; considered to be of IE, onomatopoeic origin, related with Arm. *lam* 'to weep, cry'; see Lidén 1906: 49-50; HAB 2: 297-298 (*lam* - separately); Pokorny 1959: 650 (the Armenian: "unklar"); Ĵahukyan 1987: 134, 260 (with a question-mark). Clackson (1994: 182) considers the etymology to be doubtful.

The IE origin of Arm. *lor* and Gr. *λάρος*, *λαρίς* is indeed improbable. Most probably we are dealing with a Mediterranean word (see Greppin 1978: 82, with ref.). For the vocalic fluctuation *a* : *o* compare another Mediterranean animal-name, viz. Arm. *karič* 'scorpion', dial. also 'crayfish' : Gr. *κᾶρίς* 'Crustacea' vs. Arm. *kor* 'scorpion' : Gr. *κουρίς*, *κωρίς* 'Crustacea' (see s.v.v.).

Hitt. *larīš* has been interpreted as a designation of 'gull' and linked with Gr. *λάρος* by Watkins (1995: 141₁₆).

EArm. **(h)ülör*, **(h)əlor*: Lusenc' (1982: 159) mentions the Areš form in the list of very archaic words deriving it from **olor* but he does not offer any motivation. Bařramyan (1964: 65) lists the Šamaxi form amongst cases showing additional *h*-before an initial vowel. However, there is no vocalic anlaut in *lor*. Margaryan (1975: 106) assumes that the addition of the initial *ə/ü-* of the Goris form is due to the "much softening" of the *l-*. Neither is this convincing since it is not clear why this did not happen in other similar cases.

The problem may be solved, I think, by contamination with *oror* 'gull', *urur* 'kite', cf. especially Malat'ia *ulurik*, with dissimilation *r...r > l...l*. [Is the vocalism of *lor* also due to contamination with *oror* ?]. In view of the Greek, the etymological meaning of Arm. *lor* may be 'sea-gull', thus the contamination may have taken place at a relatively old period when *lor* denoted 'sea-gull'. Since we are dealing with a Mediterranean word, it is attractive to assume that Armeno-Greek **lor/lar-* referred to 'sea-gull', and the Armenian has shifted the meaning to a non-aquatic bird in relation with the migration of Proto-Armenians to their historical homeland with no sea-borders.

luc, *o*-stem (Bible+); *a*-stem: ISg *lc-a-w* in Cyril of Alexandria, IPl *lc-a-w-k'* in Plato; *i*-stem: IPl *lc-i-w-k'* in Ephrem 'yoke; burden; beam of the balance of which the scales are suspended' (Bible+), 'the constellation Libra' (Zak'aria Kat'otikos, 9th cent.), 'pair' (Geoponica); **lcem** 'to yoke' (Bible+).

luc-l-il-k' 'a pair of veins of brains' ("Oskip'orik")

●**DIAL** *luc* ‘yoke’ and *lcem* ‘to yoke’ are dialectally ubiquitous. In Łarabał, *luc* also refers to ‘the beam of a balance of which the scales are suspended’ [HAB 2: 301b].

●**ETYM** Since long, linked with Skt. *yugā-* n. ‘yoke, team, race, tribe’ (RV+), Gr. ζυγόν n. (also ζυγός m.) ‘yoke of a plough of a carriage; beam of the balance; the constellation Libra’, Lat. *iugum* n. ‘yoke (for oxen), team; pair (of horses etc.)’, etc. (see HAB 2: 301). The initial *l-* has been explained by influence of **loyc-*: *luc-anem* ‘to unbind, loosen; to dissolve, liquidate; to absolve’, q.v. [Bugge 1893: 8-9; Ĵahukyan 1982: 40-41, 57, cf. 213₃₉; 1987: 173]. See also s.v. *leard* ‘liver’ and 2.1.7.

Some of cognate languages have derivatives in **-lo-* or **-leh₂-*: Skt. *yugala-* m., *yugalā-* f. ‘pair, couple’, Lat. *iugula* f. ‘a part of the constellation Orion, Orion’s belt, a short line of three bright stars across the middle of Orion’ [Scherer 1953: 222-223], Gr. ζεύγλη f. ‘loop attached to the yoke, through which the beast’s heads were put’, etc. These derivatives have been compared with Kartvelian **uy-el-* ‘yoke’: Georg. *uyel-*, Megr. *uyu-*, Svan *u/ūywa*, *uywal*, cf. also the derivatives Georg. *uyleul-*: Megr. *uyul-* ‘team of oxen’, Georg. *me-uy-l-e* ‘spouse’; see Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 723, 723₁; Klimov 1994: 68-72 (with references and discussion, treating the IE and Kartvel. **l-*formations as independent); cf. Klimov 1998: 196.

Arm. *luc-l-il-k* ‘a pair of veins of brains’ (“Oskip’orik”) with double *l* is reminiscent of Georg. *uyleul-* ‘team of oxen’. Compare Arm. suffixes *-il* (*kat’-il* ‘drop’ etc.) and *-(a)li-* (*am-li-k* ‘one-year-old child or lamb’, *tam-a-li* ‘roof’, etc.), see 2.3.1.

On the strength of all these data, one may interpret Arm. *luc-a[t]li* ‘the constellation Orion’ (q.v.) as composed of *luc* ‘yoke’ and the suffix *-(a)li*, possibly from fem. **-lih₂-*, cf. Lat. *iugula* f. ‘a part of the constellation Orion, Orion’s belt’, with fem. **-leh₂-*. Note that another asterism, viz. *sayl*, *i-stem* ‘wagon; Ursa Major and Minor, Arcturus’: Hesychian σάτιλλα (perhaps Thracian), probably contains the same suffix **-lih₂-*; compare also Georg. *etli* (see s.v. *sayl*).

luca[t]li ‘the constellation Orion=Hayk’

●**DIAL** Only in “AĴjeĴn baĴaran” (a dictionary published in Venice in 1865), see HAB 2: 301b.

●**ETYM** According to AĴarıyan (HAB 2: 301b), composed of *luc* ‘yoke; Libra, Orion’ and unknown *-atli*.

In view of the resemblance between the Armenian characters *a* and *t*, *lucatli* may be hypothetically emended into **luc-alı*, as composed of *luc* ‘yoke’ and the suffix *-(a)li* perhaps from fem. **-lih₂-*, cf. Lat. *iugula* f. ‘a part of the constellation Orion, Gürtelsterne’; see s.v. *luc* ‘yoke’.

****lusan-n*** or ****lus(e)amn*** ‘lynx; hyena; marten’

Attested only in the final edition of the Alexander Romance (NPI *lusanunk*), in a list of wild animals, after *varazk* ‘wild boars’ and followed by *injk* ‘panthers’, *vagerk* ‘tigers’, etc. (see H. Simonyan 1989: 287^{L1}). In the corresponding passage (op. cit. 423) the earliest edition has no animal-name in the corresponding place, that is, between *varazk* and *injk*. The English translation of the passage see in Wolohojian 1969: 126: boars, lynxes, leopards, tigers. According to Ačāryan (HAB 2: 302-303), the NSg must have been **lusan-n*, and the word corresponds to *λύγξ* ‘lynx’ of the Greek text.

Treated as synonymous to *k’awt’ar* ‘hyena’ (see HAB 2: 302b; Dashian p.c. apud Hübschmann 1897: 454). The textual correspondence with Gr. *λύγξ* ‘lynx’ and the etymology presuppose rather ‘lynx’. Nevertheless, there seems to be dialectal testimony for ‘hyena’ too.

● **DIAL** Łazax *lisam* ‘a fox-like animal with whitish fur, black round spots and a long thin tail’ [Amatuni 1912: 249b], Łarabał *lusemnə* ‘marten’ [HAB 2: 303a]. According to Ačāryan (HAB, ibid.), Łazax *lisam*, apart from ‘marten’ (for this meaning he cites Amatuni, but the description of the latter seems to point rather to ‘lynx’), also means ‘a white quick mythical beast which kills people by cutting their throats’. Goris *lisemnə* ‘a wild animal smaller than the fox’ [Margaryan 1985: 398a].

In a tale written by V. Ananyan (1984, 3: 69^{L9}), *lisam* seems to refer to ‘lynx’; in the footnote, glossed by *lusan* ‘lynx’.

Alongside of ‘lynx’ and ‘marten’, the word seems to refer also to ‘hyena’ (see also above). The vocalism of the form *lisam* may be due to contamination with *lis* < *loys* ‘light’. Compare a fairy-tale from the village of Ak’ori (Lori, district of Alaverdi) told by Gyozał Xač’atryan and recorded by E. Pezazyan in 1915 (HŽHek’ 8, 1977: 318-323), where *lisam* refers to a cannibal beast living in a cave and having a fur that *lis a tali* “gives light/shine”. It was the mother (see 322^{L1f}) of the fairy named *Gyulp’eri* (or *Soylamaz*) *xanum* living in *Sew cov* = ‘Black sea’. We are probably dealing, thus, with “hyena : female devil”, cf. **k’awt’ar* etc. (see 3.5.2).

The meaning ‘hyena’ is clearly confirmed by the following. In the tale “Bruti tñan” (“The potter’s son”) written in 1931/1933 by Aksel Bakunc’ (1976: 225, 229), a native speaker of the Goris dialect, *lisemnə* is represented as an animal with curly hair, walking like a wolf and laughing like a man.

In Turkish-Armenian dictionary (c. 1720 AD) by Etia Mušetyan Karnec’i (Karin/Xotorjur), *lusam* renders Turk. *varşat* (*vāshak*) [Č’ugaszyan 1986: 81, 118-119].

Ačaryan (ibid.) derives Łarabał *lúsemnə* from **lus-emn* < **lus-amn*. Compare Łarabał *xašemnə* vs. Lori, Łazax *xašam* ‘dry leaves’ (see Amatuni 1912: 266a).

●**ETYM** Related with Gr. *λύγξ*, GSg *λυγξός* (-γγός) ‘lynx’, Lith. *lūšis*, dial. (Žem.) *lūnšis*, *lūnši*, Russ. *рысь*, Mir. *lug*, OHG *luhs* ‘id.’, etc.; perhaps also Khowar *rušk* ‘marten’ and Yidgha *luū*, *lū* ‘marten’ [Hübschmann 1897: 454; HAB 2: 303a; Mallory/Adams 1997: 359-360]. For the meaning of the latter forms (on which see also Bailey 1968:159), viz. ‘marten’, cf. the dialectal meaning in Łarabał and Łazax. Ačaryan (ibid.) derives Łarabał *lúsemnə* from **lus-emn* < **lus-amn*. Compare Łarabał *xašemnə* vs. Lori, Łazax *xašam* ‘dry leaves’ (see Amatuni 1912: 266a). According to Łap’anc’yan (1961: 330), here we are dealing with the same suffix as is seen in *ayceamn* < **ayci-amn* (see s.v. *ayc* ‘goat’ and 2.3.1).

It has been suggested that the Armenian *n*-formation is somehow connected with the nasal infix seen in Gr. *λύγξ* and Lith. (Žem.) *lūnšis* (Frisk, s.v.). If the Armenian reflects the original **luk̂-(V)n-*, the literary *lusanunk* must be treated as the original *n*-stem plural form, and EArm. **lus(e)amn* is a recent creation after animal-names in *-mn*. However, this is not a productive suffix in eastern dialects but rather an old Armenian heritage (see 2.3.1). Besides, the spread of the suffix over the animal-names must have started from somewhere. One may therefore look for an alternative scenario.

In case the PIE **nk̂-* yielded *-s-* in Armenian, as **ns-* did, one may also restore **lunk̂-* for Armenian. The best alternative seems to be starting with QIE **lunk̂-mn-* or **luk̂-mn-*, with loss of the **m-* everywhere but in EArm. **lisamn*. Compare the case of **b^hud^h-men-* : **b^hud^h-(m)no-* (see s.v. *andund* ‘abyss’). For an archaic *-m*-preserved in EArm. dialects but lost in CIArm. as well as in all the remaining dialects cf. EArm. **anu/ənm* versus CIArm. *anun* ‘name’ (q.v.).

It has been suggested that the PIE word for ‘lynx’ derives from PIE **leuk-* ‘to see’, which itself may be a semantic specialization of **leuk-* ‘to shine, illuminate’ (see Mallory/Adams 1997: 360a, 505a; cf. Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 512). Arm. **lusamn* may reflect, then, the **men*-form also found in Skt. *rukma-* m. ‘golden or silver plate which is worn as an ornament’ (RV+), *rukmant-* ‘glänzend’, OIc. *ljōmi* ‘Glanz, Licht, Schwert, Zwerg’ < **leuk-mVn-*, etc., or Lat. *lūmen* ‘light, daylight; lamp, torch; glory’ < **leuk-s-men-*. The latter can be linked with Avest. *raoxšna-* adj., n. ‘light’, Lat. *lūna* f. ‘moon’, OCS *luna* ‘moon’, Gr. *λύχνος* ‘lamp’ which would then be derived from **louk-s-(m)neh₂-* and **luk-s-(m)no-*.

It can be argued that the guttural **k-* of the verbal root **leuk-* conflicts with the palatal **k̂-* of the word for ‘lynx’. Note, however, the fluctuation seen in Skt. *rusant-* ‘shining, brilliant, bright, light’. Besides, the association might have been

folk-etymological (especially if one accepts the Nostratic origin of the animal-name, see Illič-Svityč 1976: 34-35). Formally, such a contamination would be very easy for Armenian, cf. *lusn* 'a white spot on eye' < *'white(ness), white/shining (thing)' next to *loys* 'light', Gr. *λευκωμα* 'whiteness; a white spot in the eye', etc.; cf. also the bird-name *haw-a-lusn* 'pelican' (see s.v. *lusn*). Compare further the Armenian dialectal evidence above, on *lisam* the fur of which *lis a tali* "gives light/shine". A similar contamination is seen in Russ. *ryś* 'lynx' the initial *r-* of which is explained by the influence of **rys* 'blond, light brown'.

I conclude that the lynx is considered to be an animal with shining eyes or a shining fur, and this is probably reflected in the (etymological or folk-etymological) association of its designation with the word for 'light, shine'.

xayt' 'sting, bite' (only in 2Cor 12.7), **xayt'em** 'to bite (of insects and snakes)', **xayt'oc'** 'bite, sting' (Bible+).

● **DIAL** The verb *xayt'em* 'to bite' is widespread in dialects (in Moks, in the meaning 'to torment') [HAB 2: 325a]. Note also Sasun *xet'ug* 'bitten by a snake', *xit'uc'* 'bite (of a snake)' (see Petoyan 1954: 129, 130; 1965: 481, 483). The latter continues ClArm. *xayt'oc'*.

● **ETYM** Since Scheftelowitz (1904-05: 312), connected with Lat. *caedō* 'to cut; to hew, lop, fell; to slaughter; to murder', as well as MHG *heie*, *hei* f. 'Rammblock', MDutch *heien* 'schlagen, rammen', perhaps also Skt. *khidāti* 'to press down' [HAB 2: 325a; Pokorny 1959: 917; Ĵahukyan 1987: 147, 191; Clackson 1994: 224₁₁₂]. The initial *x-* of the Armenian points to IE **kH-* (see Kortlandt 2003: 1). The etymological connection, though considered "not compelling" by Olsen (1999: 211), seems to be acceptable (see Schrijver 1991: 266-267, who restores **kh₂ei-* and excludes Skt. (*s*)*khidāti*).

There are other Armenian words which are undoubtedly related with *xayt'*, though the ablaut alternations are not quite clear (see HAB 2, s.v.v.; Ĵahukyan 1987: 147, 191; on *xit'* see also Olsen 1999: 210), viz.:

xit', *o*-stem 'pain, colic, twinge; rock, reef; (Paterica+) crocodile', *xt'em* 'to bite; to goad, push, shove' (Bible+), dial. 'to poke, shove';

xet'em 'to bit; to pushn shove' (Ephrem), *xet'* 'scowling gaze' (Bible+), *xet'-k-em* 'to bit; to bite; to butt' (Bible; Eznik), *xet'umn* 'bite of conscience';

xēt', *i*-stem 'bite of conscience (Buzand+); pain in stomach (Bible+); doubt, fear (Ephrem); scowling gaze, spite, hate (Bible+); danger, obstacle, impediment (Agat'angelos+)', dial. 'scowling (gaze)', *xit'am* 'to worry, fear' (Bible+);

xawt' 'ill, sick (of body, eye, or ear)' (Bible+), dial. **xōt'-ik* 'a kind of wound';

xot'(ot)em 'to look with a scowling gaze; to bite, shove' (Philo, Ephrem, Eusebius of Caesaria, etc.), dial. 'to poke';

xut', *o*-stem 'impediment (under feet); reef' (Bible+), *xoyt'* 'crocodile' (Paterica), Łarabał *xūt'* (< *xoyt'*) 'hillock'. See s.v.v.

The meaning 'crocodile' (Paterica+) of *xit'* and *xoyt'* is confirmed by Georgian *xvit^hk^hi* 'crocodile; lizard', which is considered an Armenian loan, and by the same semantic relationship seen in Gr. *κροκόδιλος* 'lizard, crocodile', composed of (or folk-etymologically reinterpreted as such) of *κρόκη* 'Kies' und *δρίλος* 'Wurm' (thus, "Kieswurm", see Frisk, s.v.), perhaps also in Skt. *kṛkalāsa* m. 'a lizard, chameleon' [HAB 2: 364a, 365a, 414ab, 619b]. Another clear example is *k'ar-a-t'ot'oš* (or *k'ar-a-t'oš*, *k'ar(-a)-t'oš*) 'lizard' (see HAB 2: 192), which contains *k'ar* 'stone'.

In view of the *-t'* of *xayt'*, scholars usually postulate a protoform with the determinative **-t-* (vs. **-d-* seen in Lat. *caedō*), which is nowhere else attested. This would be unnecessary, however, if one assumes a solution similar to that of *mañt'em*, *p'ut'am*, etc. (see 2.1.22.12-13), according to which *xayt'* (with an unknown declension class), *xit'* (*o*-stem), *xēt'* (*i*-stem), and *xut'* (*o*-stem) can be interpreted as verbal nouns in **-ti-* and **-to-*, and *xayt'em* is a denominative verb based on *xayt'* etc., or, alternatively, the old verb **xaytem* became *xayt'em* by the influence of *xayt'* etc. Thus: **kh₂eid-t* > PArm. **xay(t)-t'V* > *xayt'*; **kh₂id-to* > PArm. **xi(t)-t'o* > *xit'* (*o*-stem). The ablaut degrees of the other forms are difficult to explain. Compare also pairs like *mayri* : *mori* 'forest'. One wonders if *xawt'* in a way derives from **kh₂(e)d-t*.

Skt. *(s)khidāti* 'tears, presses' is considered unrelated since it seems to belong to Skt. *khād-* 'to chew, to bite, to eat, to digest' (see Schrijver 1991: 266-267; otherwise: Klingenschmitt 1982: 210-211) and Arm. *xacanem* 'to bite' (q.v.). In view of the identic semantics and formal similarity, one may tentatively connect **keh₂-d-*/**kh₂ed-* with **keh₂-i-d-*, assuming, thus, parallel **-d-* formations based upon the forms with and without the present suffix **-i-* (on the latter see Beekes 1995: 229). This reminds the problem with *sut-ak(n)* (q.v.), etc.

The words *xayt'em* 'to bite (of insects and snakes)' and, especially, its ablauted form *xit'*, *o*-stem 'pain, colic, twinge' can be connected also with **šit'(-)* 'bite; wound' (q.v.), cf. *šit'-ot'* (present participle) 'biting' (5th or 7th cent.+), *šit'eal* 'biten' (Paterica), *šit'-oc'* 'bite (of a bee)' (11th cent.+), *šit'* *'pain of a (swollen) wound' ("Bärgirk' hayoc'" and the dialect of Łarabał). On the alternation *š-* / *x-* cf. 2.1.22.3. If this is true, *šit'* comes from **skh₂i(d)-t-*, as *xit'* (*o*-stem) - from **kh₂i(d)-to-*.

xand, *i*-stem in Movsēs Xorenac'i (see below); later *o*-stem 'a strong emotion (with love, mercy, envy or other passions)'; **xandam** 'to envy, be jealous' (John Chrysostom, Movsēs Xorenac'i)

Mostly in derivatives including also those based on **xand-at-** and **xand-at-at-** (Bible+); for *-at* cf. *xanj-at-em* 'to burn' (Bible), *hr-at* 'bonfire' from *hur* 'fire' (Bible+). Spelled also as *xant*.

GDPI *xand-i-c* 'of the affection' is attested in Movsēs Xorenac'i 3.68 (1913=1990: 363^{L4}; transl. Thomson 1978: 353).

Verbal *xandam* : Movsēs Xorenac'i 2.53 (1913=1991: 183^{L10}; transl. Thomson 1978: 195); *ənd or xandayrn Artawazd* "Artavazd became jealous at this".

In P'awstos Buzand 4.15 /5th cent./ (1883=1984: 103^{L18f}; transl. Garsoïan 1989: 144): *getgeteal xandatut'eamb* : "quavering with compassion"; see the full passage s.v. *get-* 'song'.

See also s.v. *xanj*.

●**DIAL** Dialectal forms only with *xanj* (q.v.).

●**ETYM** Usually connected with Gr. *κάρδαρος*· *ἄνθραξ* 'charcoal' (Hesychius), Skt. *cand-* (also *ścand-*) 'to shine, glitter', *candra-* adj. 'shining, light', Lat. *candor*, *-ōris* m. 'dazzling whiteness, brightness; beauty; candour, brilliancy', *candeō* 'to be of brilliant whiteness, shine; to become/be hot', *candēla* 'candle', *in-cendō* 'to set fire to, kindle; to inflame; to aggravate', *incendium* n. 'fire, fiery heat; passion', etc., see Dervischjan 1877: 29 (with *šant*, which see s.v.); HAB 2: 330a.

Ĵahukyan (1987: 130, 318) represents this etymology with a question-mark, pointing out that the aspirated **k^h*- is nowhere attested, and comparing *xand* with Hitt. *ḫandāiš* 'warmth, heat', though not specifying the relationship. On the Hittite word see s.v. *ant* 'et.

The final *-j* of *xanj* is difficult to explain. Theoretically, it may have resulted from **-d^h-s-*. Lat. *candor*, *-ōris* is masculine, thus it may belong to PIE HD *s*-stem (on this see Beekes 1995: 180; for the early intrusion into the nominative *-s* of *-r-* developed from intervocalic *-s-* see Szemerényi 1996: 175): NSg **k^h Vnd-ōs* > PArm. **x Vnd-u*, GSg **k^h nd-s-ōs* > PArm. **xanjō-*. But *xand* has an *i*-stem.

See also s.v. *šant* 'd.

xanjem 'to scorch, singe', **xanj-ot** 'half-burnt wood' (Bible+), **xanj-r-** (Agat'angelos), *xanj-ar* 'spark' (Grigor Magistros, "Geoponica")

See Olsen 1999: 633.

●**DIAL** Ubiquitous [HAB 2: 331].

For *xanj-ot*, Ačaryan (1913: 451a; HAB 2: 331) records only Łarabał compounds **xanjot-a-kot* ‘half-burnt wood one edge of which is not yet burnt’ (with *kot* ‘handle’) and **xanjot-a-mayr* ‘ember buried in ashes to be used for making fire next day’ (with *mayr* ‘mother’/‘wood, material’, q.v.), and Merteköz (a village of Nikomidia), Trapizon **xanjot-at* ‘half-burnt wood’, with *-at* as in *xand-at-at*. Though not recorded in Ačaryan 1913 and 1947, **xanjotat* seems to be present also in Hamšen: *xonjotod* ‘scorched wood’ (glossed in JaynHamš 2, 1979: 220a). One also finds independent testimony for *xanjot* in various dialects: Łarabał *xanjut(nə)* [Davt’yan 1966: 370], Goris *xanjut* [Margaryan 1975: 331a]; K’esab *xēncūt* [Č’olak’ean 1986: 204b]. Thus: *xanjot* (Bible+) is dialectally present in extreme NW (Trapizon, Hamšen, etc.), SW (Syria), and SE (Łarabał etc.).

On Łarabał *-j-* see s.v. *xonj* ‘low, down; inside’.

●ETYM See s.v. *xand*.

xawt‘ (*i*-stem according to NHB, but without testimony) ‘ill, sick (of body, eye, or ear)’.
Bible+.

●DIAL Akn, Arabkir *xot’ig* ‘a kind of wound’ [HAB 2: 432b], apparently from **xōt’-ik*.

●ETYM See s.v. *xayt*’.

xaws-k‘, *i*-stem ‘speech; words’, ***xawsim*** ‘to speak, say, tell; to sing (of cock)’.
Bible+.

●DIAL Widespread in dialects. In Van, Marała and Nor Naxijewan refers only to singing of cock [HAB 2: 434b]. Note also Sivri-Hisar **xōs-ot* ‘cock’ and, with an initial *k-*, Zeyt’un **kus-ot* ‘id.’ (see Ačarean 1913: 161b, 607b).

In Łarabał etc., next to the normal privative **an-xōs* ‘not speaking’ (Ačarean 1913: 100b) there is **a-xaws*.

●ETYM The etymological attempts implying IE origin (see HAB 2: 434; Frisk 1, 1960: 803-804; Olsen 1999: 90) are not satisfactory.

According to Ĵahukyan (1995: 183), borrowed from Iran. **vaxša-* ‘speech’, with metathesis *v - x > x - v* (cf. Sogd. *γuš, γwoš* ‘to speak’) and with the (Scythian?) change *š > s*. The possible interpretation of Łarabał *axus* as deriving from **a-xaws* (with Iran. privative *a-*) confirms an Iranian origin indirectly. Note also above the alternation *x-/k-*.

****xet***‘-: ***xet’em*** ‘to bit; to pushn shove’ (Ephrem), ***xet***‘ ‘scowling gaze’ (Bible+),
xet’-k-em ‘to bit; to bite; to butt’ (Bible; Eznik), ***xet’umn*** ‘bite of conscience’.

●DIAL See s.v.v. *xēt'* and *xayt'*.

xet' 'mutilated, lame (Bible+); sore (eye); abominable'. Numerous derivatives: *xetut'iwn* 'mutilation', *xetat'iwr* 'crooked (also morally)', *xetandam* 'mutilated', *xet(a)katak* 'mime, buffoon, etc.

●DIAL In dialects, mostly in verbal usage: 'to become spoilt, undisciplined' (Akn, Xotorjur), 'to make silly jokes' (Č'arsančak' *xetkta*), 'to scoff, ridicule grimacing' (Zeyt'un) [HAB 2: 356b]. Though not recorded in HAB, also the adjective *xet* seems to be present in dialects, cf. in the epic "Sasna crer" (compiled 1989: 379)..... . Note also Sasun *xet-aj* 'crookedly sewed cloth' (see Petoyan 1954: 130; 1965: 482); the second component, viz. *-aj*, is not clear to me.

●ETYM See s.v.v. *šet'* 'slanting, crooked, oblique' and **ket'* 'crooked'.

xēt', *i*-stem [oblique stem variants: *xit'*-, *xēt'*-, *xet'*-] 'bite of conscience (P'awstos Buzand+); pain in stomach, irritation (Bible+); doubt, fear (Ephrem); scowling gaze, spite, hate (Bible+); danger, obstacle, impediment (Agat'angelos+)', ***xit'am*** 'to worry, fear' (Bible+).

In Deuteronomy 28.22 (Cox 1981: 184): *harc'ē zk'ez t[ē]r tarakusanōk' ew jermamb ew sarsrov; ew xt'iwk' (vars. xet'iwk', xēt'iwk') ew erkitiw (vars. erkiwtiw, erkewtiw) ew xoršakaw ew gunov : πατάξαι σε κύριος ἀπορία καὶ πυρετῶ καὶ ῥίγει καὶ ἐρεθισμῶ καὶ φόνῳ καὶ ἀνεμοφθορία καὶ τῇ ὄχρᾳ* [RevStBible has: "The Lord will smite you with consumption, and with fever, inflammation, and fiery heat, and with drought, and with blasting, and with mildew"]. Arm. *xēt'* (or *xit'*, as *xt'iwk'* presupposes) renders Gr. *ἐρεθισμός* 'irritation, provocation'.

In Canticum 1.5/6: *vasn zi xet'iw hayec'aw yis aregagn : ὅτι παρέβλεψέν με ὁ ἥλιος*. Here *xet'iw hayim* 'to scowl, look/regard with hate, suspicion, etc.' renders Gr. *παράβλεπω* 'to look aside, take a side look; to see wrong; to overlook; to despise'. The same is also found e.g. in Movsēs Xorenac'i 3.43 (1913=1991: 312^{L12}; transl. Thomson 1978: 306): *and orum xet'iw hayēr Aršak* : "Aršak regarded him [Sahak] with suspicion".

In P'awstos Buzand 3.17 [and not in 4.17, as is misprinted in NHB 1: 943a] (1883=1984: 39^{L-8f}): *holaneal gorcēin zmets hamarjakut'eamb, aranc' xit'i yamenayn č'aris darjealk'* : "they committed sins openly and insolently" (transl. Garsoïan 1989: 92). Here *xēt'* clearly refers to "bite/sting of conscience", as is correctly given in NHB and HAB, and in ModArm. translation of P'awstos by Malxasyanc' (1987: 73): *xtči xayt'*.

Looking through the attestations of the word in NHB 1: 942-943, one notes that nom.-acc. mostly occurs with $-\bar{e}-$ ($x\bar{e}t'$, $x\bar{e}t'-k'/s$), whereas the oblique stem chiefly appears as xet' . This reminds cases like $atu\bar{e}s$, $n\bar{e}r$, etc. (2.2.1.2). Thus: nom.acc. $x\bar{e}t'$, obl. xet' . Since the classical pattern is $-\bar{e}- : -i-\bar{V}$, obl. $*xet'-i-$ is sometimes replaced by analogical $xit'-i$ (as e.g. in the passage from P'awstos Buzand 3.17 cited above).

●**DIAL** $\check{J}u\check{t}a$ xet' 'spite, vengeance'; $\check{J}u\check{t}a$, T'iflis, Axalc'xa, Ararat, Łarabał, Šamaxi, Salmast $*xet'$ 'scowling (gaze)'; T'iflis $xit'il'$ 'to scowl' [HAB 2: 361-362].

●**ETYM** See s.v. $xayt'$.

xit' , o -stem 'pain, colic, twinge; rock, reef; (Paterica+) crocodile', $xt'em$ 'to bite; to goad, push, shove' (Bible+), $xt'-an$ 'goad' (Bible+).

On IPl $xt'-i-w-k'$ in Deuteronomy 28.22 see s.v. $x\bar{e}t'$.

In Grigor Narekac'i 26.3 (Xač'atryan/Łazinyan 1985: 346^{L67}): $xit'-k' c'awoc'$ "twinges of pains".

●**DIAL** Xian xit' 'pain in flank or waist', T'iflis $xit'-k'$ 'pain in stomach', Van $xt'el$ 'to poke, shove', etc. [HAB 2: 364-365].

●**ETYM** Related with $xayt'$ 'sting, bite' (see HAB 2: 364b; Olsen 1999: 210), q.v. For $xt'-an$ see Clackson 1994: 112, 224₁₁₂.

$xot'(ot)em$ 'to look with a scowling gaze; to bite, shove' (Philo, Ephrem, Eusebius of Caesaria, etc.).

●**DIAL** Widespread in dialects, in the meaning 'to poke' (also 'to eat to much') [HAB 2: 384b].

●**ETYM** See s.v. $xayt'$.

$xonj_1$ 'tired, exhausted', $xonjim$ 'to be tired' (Bible+), $xonj$ 'tiredness, fatigue' (Yovhannēs Drasxanakertc'i), $xonj-an-k'$ 'id.' (Grigor Magistros), etc.

●**DIAL** The verb has been preserved in Arabkir, Xarberd, Manisa $xonjenal$, Tigranakert $xonjenāl$ [HAB 2: 394a; Haneyan 1978: 188a]. Next to $xonjenal$, Dersim also has $xonjēl$ (verb) and $xonj$.

●**ETYM** No etymology is accepted in HAB 2: 394a. Considered to be of unknown origin [Olsen 1999: 963].

One wonders whether $xonj_1$ 'tired, exhausted' can be derived from $xonj_2$ 'low, down' (q.v.). For the semantic development see s.v. $nk't'em$ 'to starve, faint from hunger'.

Karst (1911: 425) compares *xonj* with *yogn*- 'to be tired' (q.v.). This is possible if one assumes a non-IE source such as **h/xog^hn-*. Of this: 1) **xog^hn-* > **xong-yV-* (with metathesis) > *xonj*, 2) **y-(h/x)og-Vn-* > *y-ogn*, pl. *y-og-un-k*'.

***xonj*₂** 'low, down' (attested only in Eusebius of Caesarea), 'inside' (only in "Arjein bararan", 1865, without textual evidence).

●**DIAL** No dialectal evidence in HAB 2: 394a.

According to Davt'yan (1966: 375), Łarabał, Hadrut', Šatax *xəŋj*/'č'-ə-*xārav* 'roasting inside' is composed as *xonč* 'inside' + *-a-* + *xorov* 'roast'. This is attractive but risky. The first component may rather be identified with *xanji-* 'to scorch, singe' (q.v.). Though, according to HAB (2: 328-331), the root *xanji-* displays literary and dialectal (amongst others, also in Łarabał-area and surroundings) forms only with (or derivable to) *-j-*, one does find *-j̣-* forms in the Łarabał area, cf. Hadrut' *xəŋjəŋ-ā-vəet* 'smell of roasting/barbecue', with *vəet* < *hot* 'smell' as the second member [A. Połosyan 1965: 69; Davt'yan 1966: 370], Łarabał **xəŋj̣r-n-a-vet* 'id.', **xəŋj̣-p'ut'ut'* 'strong burning' [HayLezBrbBaŋ 2,2002: 342b].

In DialAdd apud NHB 2: 1063b one finds dial. *xunc*' 'trunk of a tree'. In view of the semantic field of e.g. PIE **b^hud^hno-*: Gr. *πυθμήν* 'bottom; base, foundation; depth; stock, root of a tree; stem, stalk', Skt. *budhna-* m. 'bottom, ground, depth; lowest part of anything (as the root of a tree etc.)', Pahl. *bun* 'base, foundation, bottom', Arm. (< Iran.) *bun* 'trunk of a tree; shaft of a spear' (see s.v. *andund-k* 'abyss'; cf. also some Iranian forms referring the trunk of root of a tree [ĖtimSlovIranJaz 2, 2003: 187-189]), one may identify *xunc*' 'trunk of a tree' with *xonj* 'low, down'.

●**ETYM** No etymology is accepted in HAB 2: 394a.

See s.v. *xonj*₁ 'tired, exhausted'.

Hardly related with *xonarh* 'low, down; humble; miserable, poor' (Bible+; widespread in dialects), an Iranian loanword [Nyberg 1974: 101b; Ĵahukyan 1987: 527; Olsen 1999: 885].

xort *o*-stem, *i*-stem, *u*-stem 'stepson, adulterine' (Movsēs Xorenac'i, Ephrem, John Chrysostom, etc.), '(adj.) counterfeit' (Dawit' Anyaŋt', Plato), 'hard, rough, stony' (in this meaning, also ****xort-***, see below).

Evidence for declension: GDPI *xort*'-*o-c*' in Movsēs Xorenac'i 3.68 (1913=1991: 359^{L10}); GDPI *xort*'-*i-c*' in Severian of Gabala (see the attestation in NHB 2: 381c, s.v. *yōray*); GDSg *xort*'-*u* ("Naxadrut'iwnk'" Leviticus).

The meaning 'hard, rough, stony', recorded only in "Arjein bararan", is confirmed by *xort-a-bort-k* 'hard, rough, stony places' in Movsēs Xorenac'i 3.55 (1913=1991: 330^{L17f}; transl. Thomson 1978: 324): *aršawel ənd xortaborts ew ənd vimut tetis* "rode into difficult and rocky parts". See below.

Among derivatives: *ōtar-a-xort* 'foreign/alien and step-', in Etišē (5th cent.), Ephrem, Sargis Šnorhali Vardapet (12th cent.).

●**DIAL** Widespread in dialects, mostly in adjectival meaning 'step-'. In Ararat and Łarabał: *xort* '(-u)-p'ort' 'step-' [Ačārean 1913: 485-486; HAB 2: 408a; HayLezBrbBař 2, 2002: 361a]. Clear textual illustrations can be found in a fairy-tale recorded in Debed, a village in Lori, in 1978 (T'. Geworgyan 1999: 45a, lines 15-16 and 31), where *xort* '(-u)-p'ort' refers to 'step-(sisters), not from the same mother or father'.

Marala *xurt'əbər* 'rough' [Ačārean 1926: 63-64, 400; HAB 2: 408a; Davt'yan 1966: 376] is identic with *xort-a-bort-k* 'hard, rough, stony places' (Movsēs Xorenac'i 3.55; see above). The compound **xort'-bort* appears in dialects, thus, in both meanings: 'rough, stony' and 'step-'.

I wonder if we can also add the following: Muš, Xian *xort* 'young (man)', Sasun *xort* 'a brave, valiant, heroic, heroic person' (see Ačārean 1913: 486a; in Petoyan 1954: 132; 1965: 486: Sasun *xort* 'young'). This connection is in fact already suggested by Bałdasaryan-T'ap'alc'yan (1958: 258b) who glosses ClArm. *xort* by Muš *xort* 'orphan; courageous'. In Moks we find 'daring, courageous, valiant, violent': *xort* 'самоуныащій, смелый, дерзкий', *xor/rtut* 'in 'насиліе, беззаконіе', *xortut'növ* 'насиліно' [Orbeli 2002: 249]. A textual illustration: *mek xort t'äk'äworəm* 'один сильный царь' (op. cit. 98^{L18}, transl. 166^{L-5}).

●**SEMANTICS** The dialectal meanings 'orphan', 'young (man)', are remarkable. The basic semantics is 'rough, stony, uncultivated, abandoned (place)', from which two meanings are developed: 'step-, alien'.

●**ETYM** No acceptable etymology is recorded in HAB 2: 407b.

Ĵahukyan (1967: 117) proposed a connection with OIc. *skratti* 'Zauberer, Troll', *skrydda* 'alte Lederjacke', Germ. **skrattaz* 'Schrat, Waldteufel', Lith. *skriaudūs* 'beleidigend, kränkend, klagend; reißend, fließend; rauh, steil', etc., from PIE **(s)ker-* 'schrumpfen, runzeln, Schorf, Kruste, vertrocknet, mager', which is uncertain. From the same root he (op. cit. 146-147) derives also *kord* 'unploughed (land, ground)' (q.v.). In 1987: 317, Ĵahukyan rejects the comparison with Hitt. *ħartuwa-* 'generation' in view of the semantic difference.

Since the meaning ‘step-, alien’ derives from ‘hard, rough, etc.’, and Movses Xorenac’i has *xort*’ for the former and **xort-* for the latter, one may explain *xort*’ from **xor(t)-t*’. See 2.1.22.13.

xstor, *i*-stem: ISg *xstor-i-w* (Zgōn/Afrahat); *o*-stem: ISg *xstor-o-v* (Nersēs Lambronac’i); attested also in Numbers 11.5 and Mxit’ar Gōš; later: ***sxtor***, attested in Geoponica (13th cent.) and Galen [NHB 1: 988c; 2: 718b; Greppin 1985: 102] ‘garlic’.

In Numbers 11.5: *zsox ew zsxtor*: τὰ κρόμμυα καὶ τὰ σκόρδα.

●**DIAL** The later form, viz. *sxtor*, marked in NHB and HAB as ‘dialectal’, is widespread in dialects, whereas the older form *xstor* is restricted to Aslanbek (extreme NW) and Łarabał, Goris (extreme SE) [HAB 2: 428a].

●**ETYM** Ačāryan (HAB 2: 428a) connects with Gr. σκόρ(ο)δον n. ‘garlic’ and Alb. *húrdhë*, also *húdhër* (Schriftsprache) f. ‘garlic’. As Ačāryan points out, the comparison with the Greek seems to be suggested already in NHB 1: 988c; 2: 718b. According to Ĵahukyan (1987: 302), we may be dealing with common (probably independent) borrowings.

Ačāryan’s etymology has largely remained unknown to Indo-Europeanists, with a few exceptions (e.g. Mann 1963: 172). The Greek and Albanian are usually taken together, without a mention of the Armenian [Frisk 2: 738; Pokorny 1959: 941; Demiraj 1997: 204-205]. Similarly, Beekes (2000: 21) states that the word occurs only in Greek and Albanian.

Pokorny (ibid.) derives the Greek and Albanian **skor-d-* from PIE **(s)ker-* ‘to cut’, “nach den gespaltenen Wurzelknollen”. The Armenian form is troublesome, however, and one agrees with Olsen (1999: 936) in that Arm. *xstor/sxtor* “cannot simply be derived from **ske/ord-*, so we are probably faced with a cultural loan”. This seems to be a word of Mediterranean origin.

Ačāryan (ibid.) reconstructs **skodoro-* > **sxtor* (if reliable, Alb. *húdhër* too points to this form) with subsequent metathesis to *xstor* and then back to *sxtor*. This cycling double-change is not economical and does not seem very probable. Nevertheless, it can be true. I propose the following scenario.

First, Mediterranean **skodoro-* or rather **sk^hodoro-* yielded PArm. **k^hs(o)doro-* with a metathesis which is probably seen e.g. in another Mediterranean word, viz. Arm. *sunkn* vs. Gr. σπόγγος etc. (q.v.). For the metathesis cf. also e.g. **šetb-ik* > Cilicia *xšbig* (see s.v. *šetb* ‘knife-blade’). Then *xstor* became *sxtor* probably due to association with *sox* ‘onion’ (cf. e.g. the biblical passage above, and proverbs with *sox* : *sxtor* in e.g. Čulartean 1880: 147; Łanalanyan 1960: 21a, 144a), but has been

preserved in the opposite corners of the Armenian-speaking territory, viz. Aslanbek and Łarabał.

Alternative: the form *sxtor*, though late and poorly attested, is present in the overwhelming majority of dialects and can be treated as archaic. In this case, the metathesis *xs-* > *sx-* has taken place independently in Aslanbek and Łarabał. Though economical, this solution seems less probable.

xt-*it ‘to tickle; to excite’: **xt-*t-em*** (Ephrem), **xt-*t-t-em*** (Bible/Siracides 43.18/20, Eznik Kołbac’i, Eusebius of Caesarea, etc.), **xtt-*t-k-im*** (Grigor Magistros), **xt-*t-t-em*** (Jacob of Nisibis/Afrahāt, John Chrysostom, Ephrem, Yovhannēs Drasxanakertc’i /9-10th cent./), **xt-*t-t-ot-em*** (Jacob of Nisibis/Afrahāt, etc.; also deverbative nouns in **-an-*k*** and **-umn**. The stem ***xt(-t)-*it*** is seen in a compound with *akn* ‘eye’, **akn-a-xtit** (Book of Chries, T’ovmay Arcruni, Step’anos Ōrbelean), and in the noun ***xt(t)it**, *o*-stem (ISg *xtt-ov* and *xt-t-t-ov* in Ephrem).

The only biblical attestation (Siracides 43.20) reads as follows: *getec’kut’iwn spitakut’ean nora xttē zač’s*: *κάλλος λευκότητος αὐτῆς ἐκθαυμάσει ὀφθαλμός*.

The compound *akn-a-xt-it* and some dialectal forms (see below) point to a *t*-less stem ***xi/ut-**.

According to Ačāryan (HAB 2: 428b), Udi *xitił* ‘tickling’ is an Armenian loan.

● **DIAL** Widespread in dialects. Verbal: Ararat, Xarberd, Polis, Hačən ***xt-xt-**, Suč’ava *xototel*, Aslanbek, Sebastia ***xt-t-il**. Nominal: Ararat *xut-ut*, T’iflis *tut-ut*, Muš, Alaškert, Nor Naxiĵewan ***xt-i(k)**, Šamaxi *təd-ət*, Łarabał *łdi*, *łdik*, Agulis *łdik* [HAB 2: 428b]. Note also Salmast *t’di t’di* and Polis *gədəgədə* (ibid.), which seem to be “tickling-interjections”, as I frequently hear in e.g. my native city Kirovakan (nowadays Vanajor): *xətətətə* or *tədətədə*. On Polis *g-* see below.

It is not always easy to determine whether the formations like ***xtxt-** represent reduplicated ***xt-xt-** or *t*-formation ***xtt-t-**. Still there are forms that reliably point to a *t*-less stem ***xit-** or ***xut-**.

One wonders if Łarabał, Agulis *łdi(k)* can be explained as follows: ***xtt-i** > ***xtl-i** (cf. *mařaxl-* vs. *mařaxut* ‘fog’, etc.) > ***xlt-i** (late metathesis) > *łd-i*, through voicing, on which cf. ***šil-ti(k)** > Łarabał etc. *šildi(k)* (see s.v. *šil* ‘squint-eyed’).

Next to *xədxədəl*, Polis also has *gədəg ənel*, which is reminiscent of Turk. *gədəq-lamaq*.

● **ETYM** No acceptable etymology is recorded in HAB 2: 428b.

Together with *kt-t* ‘burning desire’ and *katařim* ‘to fury’ Ĵahukyan (1967: 140, 306) connects with Oİc. *hvata* ‘anreizen, sich eilen’ etc. from ***k^wed-**. The comparison with *kt-t* is possible, though that with *katařim* is highly improbable.

More attractive is PGerm. **kit-l-* 'to to tickle'. For further discussion see s.v. **kic-* 'to bite'.

*xut**, *o*-stem 'impediment (under feet); reef' (Bible+); *xoyt** 'crocodile' (Paterica). See also s.v. place-name *Xoyt*/**Xut*.*

●**DIAL** Łarabał *xūt** 'hillock' [HAB 2: 414b; Davt'yan 1966: 376]. The *-ū-* points to *xoyt**.

●**ETYM** See s.v. *xayt**.

***cat-** 'flower, blossom' (see on dialects); **catik**, *an*-stem: GDSg *catk-an*, NPl *catk-un-k**, GDPl *catk-a-n-c** in Agat'angelos 643, 645 (1909=1980: 329-330) etc.; *a*-stem: AblSg *i catk-ē* and IPl *catk-a-w-k** in Bible, etc.; *o*-stem: GDPl *catk-o-c** in Cyril of Alexandria 'flower, bloom'.

●**DIAL** Dialectally ubiquitous [HAB 2: 438-439]. In Nor Naxiĵewan, Crimea: 'ash' [Amatuni 1912: 301a]; already in DialAdd apud NHB 2: 1063b, glossed as the word for *moxir* 'ash' among the Armenians of K'erson. The same meaning is present also in Zeyt'un [Ačarean 1913: 504b, 505b; 2003: 316].

Łarabał *catk**, *caxk** 'the blossoming of fruit-trees' is interpreted by Davt'yan (1966: 380) as **cat-k**. Compare Metri *caxk* 'blossom (only of a tree)' (see Ałayan 1954: 304). Ałayan (ibid.) derives this word from **cat-k** not specifying the root **cat*-. This might be an important evidence for the root **cat-* 'to blossom' unless it is a back-formation after *cax/tkel* < *catkel* (**catik-el*) 'to blossom', thus **cax(k)-k**.

Further possible traces for the root **cat-*. Goris *xənjati/xənjata*, Łarabał *xənjata* 'snowdrop' is derived from *jn-catik* 'id.', lit. 'snow-flower', through *c-* > *x* by assimilatory influence of *t* [Margaryan 1973: 133-134]. (I prefer positing a simultaneous process of assimilation and dissimilation; see 2.1.25). The older, non-assimilative form is seen in Goris *c'ənjati* 'snowdrop' [Margaryan 1975: 487a]. Margaryan (1973: 133-134) assumes a loss of the final *-k*, and a vocalic change *-i* > *-a*, which (especially the latter) are uncertain.

Muš *ałberanc' catu* 'a flower', literally: 'flower of the brothers' [Amatuni 1912: 20a].

●**ETYM** NHB (1: 1003c, 1015c) suggested a connection between *catik* 'flower' and *catr*, *cicat* 'laughter'. In NHB 1: 1001c (s.v. *catik* 'flower') we read: *orpēs t'ē cicatik*; *orpēs vardn yayl lezus ē ibr catrik*: "as *cicatik* (dimin. of *cicat* 'laughter'); as the rose in other languages is *catr-ik* (dimin. of *catr* 'laughter')".

Petersson (1916: 289-290), too, argued for the connection of *cat-ik* 'flower' with **cat-* 'laugh' (see s.v. *catr* 'laughter') by comparing the Hesychius gloss *γελεῖν*

λάμπειν, ἀνθελν: 'shine', 'bloom'; see also Pokorny 1959: 366; Ĵahukyan 1967: 160 (in 210, an alternative connection with *dalar* 'green, fresh' etc., which is gratuitous); 1982: 56; 1987: 125, 167; Clackson 1994: 128; Olsen 1999: 459.

catr, GSg *cat-u* (later also *cafer* and *catr-u*)

'laugh, laughter; joke, mockery' (Bible+); **catrem** (Łazar P'arpec'i, Movsēs Xorenac'i), **catr ainem** (Bible+) 'to deride, mock, ridicule, laugh at; to joke'.

See also s.v.v. *catracu* 'mime, buffoon; mocking (words)' and *ci-cat* 'laughter'.

The compound **k'm-catrel** 'to smirk, simper', attested in Smbat Sparapet [Mi]HayBaġ 2, 1992: 445b) and "Vark' Ilarioni", contains *k'im-k* 'palate' as the first member and actually means 'to smile/laugh in the palate, under the nose'; cf. *k'm-cicat* 'smirk, simper' in ModArm. [HAB 4: 579b] and dialectal forms below. Compare *k'm-a-ciril* 'to smile, simper', with *cġ-* 'to curve', found in Turkish-Armenian dictionary (c. 1720 AD) by Etia Muřetġyan Karnec'i (Karin/Xotorġur), and *k'm-cġ-el* 'to grimace mockingly' in the dialect of Manisa [C'ugaszyan 1986: 42^{Nr22}, 173].

In Arak'el Siwnec'i (14-15th cent.) one finds the compound with reversed order of the component: 3pl.pres. **catr-a-k'am-in** (see Poturean 1914: 235^{L123.1}). This form is present in the dialect of Moks; see below.

***k'mk'-a-cicat**: In a fairy-tale from Łarabaġ recorded by Arak'el Bahat'ryan in 1860 (HŽHek' 6, 1973: 80^{L-6f}), *k'mk'ecicat* refers to a smile with opening of the teeth. Further, of a woman who tries to seduce: *xuselis tetn el k'amk'ececat talav*: "and smiling while speaking" (rec. by M. Mxit'aryan in 1961; see HŽHek' 6, 1973: 192^{L22}).

●**DIAL** While *cicat(-)* is dialectally ubiquitous (see s.v.), *catr* is recorded in several dialects only: Van-group [Ačaryan 1952: 267; M. Muradyan 1962: 198a], Muř, Alařkert, Ararat, Axalc'xa [HAB 2: 440a]. In Łarabaġ etc. found in the compound *catr-a-tet* 'an object of derision, mockery' (Łarabaġ, Łazax, Ararat), with *tet* 'place, spot' as the second member [Ačarean 1913: 505b]. Independently: Łarabaġ *caġer* 'mockery' [Davt'yan 1966: 380], Goris *catrə* [Margaryan 1975: 334a].

In DialAdd apud NHB 2: 1063b, one finds a bird-name *catrik haw* ("bird *catr-ik*", dimin. of *catr*), glossed as *azg čayi* "a kind of mew-gull", and by Turk. */mart'i, mart'ə guřu/*. (The final *-ō* of *mart'iō* in Amatuni 1912: 301a referring to NHB must be a misprint). On */mart'i/* 'mouette' see HAB 3: 372a, s.v. *mrtimn*. Ačaryan (1913: 505b) has exactly the same: **catrik haw* "a kind of mew, */mart'i/*", but specifying the dialect: Muř. In HAB 2: 440a he translates it as 'martin-pêcheur', i.e. 'halcyon, kingfisher'.

For the above-mentioned *k'm-catrel* 'to smirk, simper' and ModArm. *k'm-cicať* 'smirk, simper, ironical smile' note the following forms: Ararat and Łarabať **k'mcicať*, **k'mk'acicať* [Amatuni 1912: 675a], Goris *k'əmk'əcicäť* [Margaryan 1975: 371b]; Muš *k'njttal* = Axalk'alak', Axalc'xa, Alek'sandrapol (Leninakan/Gyumri), Širak *k'əməc'əxtal* < **k'm-cicať-ot-* 'to smirk, smile ironically' [HAB 2: 456a; 4: 580a].

The opposite, viz. *caťr-a-k'əm-* (Ařak'el Siwnec'i; see above), is present in Moks: *cāťrāk' əmē* 'улыбка, насмешка', *cāťrāk' əmil*, aor. *cāťrāk' əm-av* 'улыбаться' (see M. Muradyan 1982: 137; Orbeli 2002: 252).

See also s.v. *caťracu*.

●**ETYM** Since Brosset, connected with Gr. *γελάω* 'to laugh', *γέλως* m. 'laughter', *γέλασμα* 'laughing', *γελαστός* 'laughable', *γαλήνη* f. 'stillness of the sea', *γαληνός* 'still', etc., and with Arm. *ci-cať* 'laughter' [Hübschmann 1897: 455; HAB 2: 439-440; Ĵahukyan 1982: 120; 1987: 125].

One may reconstruct an animate *s*-stem for Greek and Armenian: NSg **gēlh₂-ōs* (cf. Gr. *γέλως* m.), GSg **gēlh₂-s-ōs* (cf. Gr. **γελασ-*); see Klingenschmitt 1982: 147; Kortlandt 1996 = 2003: 117-119; Olsen 1999: 169; Beekes 2003: 193-194; cf. also Pokorny 1959: 366; Frisk 1: 295; Francis (unpublished thesis) 1970: 181, as cited in Clackson 1994: 129. The original PArm. paradigm can be reconstructed as follows: NSg **cēl-u*, obl. **cal-ah-*. Arm. **catu-* must have generalized the vocalism of the oblique stem.

For an extensive philological and etymological discussion I refer to Clackson (1994: 126-132), who, however, suggests an old *u*-stem with NSg **-ōu(s)*.

Gr. *γαλήνη* 'calm' and *γλήνη* 'eyeball', perhaps also *γελάω* 'to shine' as in Iliad 19.362-3, may point to an original root meaning 'shine'; for the semantic connection between 'shine' and 'laugh' cf. Latin verb *renideō* 'shine' : 'laugh', and Engl. *beam* [Clackson 1994: 131]. Here we may be dealing with a synaesthetic transfer from the visual perception to the aspect of hearing or mood (cf. Arutjunjan 1983: 290; the appurtenance of some cognates mentioned here is uncertain).

The root **cať-* is seen in *catel* 'to deride, laugh at' (HHB), *cať-k-u* 'buffoon' (John Chrysostom), *cať-bast* 'laughable', if these forms are reliable, as well as in *ci-cať* 'laughter' (q.v.) [HAB 2: 439a]. NHB (1: 1001c, 1003c, 1015c) suggested a connection between not only *caťr* and *cicať*, but also with *catik* 'flower' and *jať* 'derision, mockery' (see s.v.v.). For a possible dialectal evidence for the root **cať-* 'to blossom' see s.v. *catik*.

caťracu 'mime, buffoon'; dial. 'mystery, riddle'.

(John Chrysostom+). In expressions like *catracu bank*‘, the word seems to have adjectival meaning ‘mocking (words)’; cf. *katak* ‘play, ridicule, joke’, which in P’awstos Buzand 3.19 refers to ‘buffoon’ (see Garsoïan 1989: 94); see also s.v. *šišat*.

●**DIAL** No dialectal forms are recorded in HAB 2: 440a.

In a fairy-tale recorded by V. Bdoyan in the village of Oġaberd (in Kotayk’) in 1945 (see HŽHek’ 1, 1959: 561-571), where the king wants to find out why the fish laughed, *catracu* is found several times referring to the mystery/riddle of the laughing fish: the king says: *Ari es jkan catracun xan* ‘Come (and) solve (literally: take out) the *catracu* of this fish!’ (567^{L-16}); *t’ot gan, jkan catracun xanen* ‘let them come (and) solve the *catracu* of the fish’ (567^{L-13}); *jkan catracun dus beri* ‘(that he) solves (literally: takes out) the *catracu* of the fish’ (568^{L7}); *es kpatmem jkan catracun* ‘I will tell you the *catracu* of the fish’ (569^{L10}); *et jkan catracun jer k’aša* ‘give up the *catracu* of that fish’ (569^{L-8f}). The meaning of the word can be, then, ‘mystery, riddle’ or ‘riddle-solution’ or ‘(the reason of the) laughter’.

●**ETYM** Composed as *catr* ‘laughter; ridicule, mockery’ + *-ac-* ‘to bring’ + *-u*, thus: ‘laughter/ridicule bringing person or words’. For the structure and semantics see **ar-ark-ay/u* ‘subject, argument’. For the semantic development ‘joke, ridicule’ : ‘riddle’ cf. dial. **han-ak*.

***can-** ‘to know, be acquainted’: caus. *can-uc’-anem* (Bible+), *canawt’*, *i*-stem ‘known person, acquaintance, relative; known, acquainted, aware’ (Bible+), ‘pupil’ (Philo); *čanač’em* (< **canač’em*), aor. *caneay*, imper. *canir* ‘to know, be acquainted, aware’, q.v.

For biblical references see Astuacaturean 1895: 722c, 940-942; Olsen 1999: 98₂₀₇.

●**DIAL** The verb *čanač’em* (q.v.) is dialectally ubiquitous, whereas *canawt’* is recorded only in Marāṭa. In this dialect, the synonyms *čananč’* and *canot’* ‘acquainted’ make a contrastive pair: *čananč’* ‘acquainted (with a Turk)’ vs. *canot’* ‘acquainted (with an Armenian)’ [Ačārean 1926: 410; HAB 3: 182b]. Ačāryan (HAB 3: 182b) points out that this distinction is also present in the local Turkish.

●**ETYM** PIE **ǵnh₃-sk-je-* > **canač’em* > *čanač’em* (see Meillet: 1936: 109; Clackson 1994: 40); on *canawt’* cf. 2.1.22.12.

Possible traces of the meaning ‘sign, omen’ (cf. Russ. *znak* ‘sign’ etc.):

ciacan, *a*-stem: GSg *ciacan-i* (Łazar P’arpec’i), ISg *ciacan-a-w* (Cyril of Alexandria) ‘rainbow’; oldest attestation: Revelation 10.1, rendering Gr. ἵρις. Probably from **ti-a-can* ‘divine sign’ {{for **ti(w)* ‘god’ see s.v. **dieus*}}, through assimilation. Compare *nšanak* ‘sign, omen’ (in Genesis 9.13: said of the rainbow), which in the dialect of Akn means ‘rainbow’.

can-ak(-) ‘disgrace’ (Bible+; dialect of Alaškert), probably from **can-* ‘sign, spot’; for the semantics cf. *xayt* ‘spotted’ : *xayt-arak* ‘disgrace’, *niš* ‘sign, spot’ : *nšawak* ‘disgrace’.

canak-

See s.v. **can-* ‘to know, be acquainted’.

cer, *o*-stem ‘old man; old’ (Bible+), **cer-un** (Book of Chries), **cerōn** (Philo) ‘old’, **cer-uni** (*ea*-stem) ‘old’ (Bible+), **cer-anam** ‘to become old’ (Bible+).

●**DIAL** Widespread in dialects.

●**ETYM** Since Klaproth, Brosset and NHB, connected with Gr. *γέρων* ‘old man’ etc., from **gerH-* [Hübschmann 1897: 452; HAB 2: 457-458]. For *cer-un* : Gr. *γέρων* cf. **ark’un* : Gr. *ἄρχων* (see s.v. *ark’ay* ‘king’).

cic ‘bosom’ (Geoponica etc.), **cuc** ‘substance to be sucked’ (Bible+), dial. ‘marrow’, **ccem** ‘to suck’ (Bible+).

●**DIAL** *cic* and *ccem* are widespread in dialects; *cuc* - in the meaning ‘marrow’ [HAB 2: 472a].

●**ETYM** According to Ačāryan (HAB 2: 471b), a Caucasian borrowing; cf. Georg. *juju* ‘teat’ etc. See, however, s.v. *tīt* ‘teat’.

***cicať** ‘laughter’ (in dialects, see below); **cicatim** ‘to laugh’ (Bible+).

The noun *cicať* is practically unattested in literature. I only find it in Grigor Narekac’i (10-11th cent.), in the alliterative play with *cov* ‘sea’ and *cawal* ‘spreading’ [K’yoškeryan 1981: *jur manuacoy cicať cawal* (69^{L43}); *cawal cov cicať* (114^{L15}).

●**DIAL** According to Ačāryan (HAB 2: 456a), the verb *cicatim* is dialectally ubiquitous, whereas the noun *cicať* is present in several dialects only. On *k’m-cicať* ‘smirk, simper, ironical smile’ and comparable forms, as well as on synaesthesia see s.v. *catr* ‘laughter, mockery’.

●**ETYM** On the etymology see s.v. *catr* ‘laughter; mockery’. On the type of reduplication cf. Latv. *paipala* ‘Wachtel’ from **pelpalo*, etc. (see Meillet 1903b: 217₁; Klingenschmitt 1982: 147-148; Clackson 1994: 127-128). Note also aquatic bird-names of onomatopoeic nature such as Lith. *gaĩgalas* ‘Enterich, Erpel’, Latv. *gaigals* ‘mew’, etc., which are structurally (and etymologically?) comparable with Arm. *ci-cať* ‘laughter’ (cf. Meillet 1903b: 217₁; Toporov, PrJaz 2, 1979: 188). Note

also *catrik haw* 'a kind of mew/gull' (see s.v. *cat-r* 'laughter'). For another bird-name of the same type of reduplication cf. Arm. *ci-ce/ain* 'swallow' (q.v.).

As we have seen, the noun *cicat* is practically unattested in literature and is present in several dialects only (note also that *cicat* is represented in NHB 1: 1015b as a dialectal [*ramkōrēn*] word), whereas the verb *cicatim* is widely attested since the oldest period of the classical literature (e.g., 25x in the Bible; see Astuacaturean 1895: 733-734) and is dialectally ubiquitous. However, the reduplication of the type *Ci-Ce/aR* is found mostly with nouns (see 2.3.2), and one would rather expect *cicat* to be original. This seems to be corroborated by the fact that the noun *cicat* is represented in northern (*kə*-class: Suč'ava, Nor Naxijewan, Axalc'xa; *um*-class: T'iflis), eastern (*um*-class: Ararat, Łarabał, Šamaxi, Agulis, Ĵuła), and south-western (*kə*-class: Hačēn) peripheries and should be treated as an archaism.

cicain 'swallow'.

For attestations see Greppin 1978: 180-182.

● **DIAL** Widespread.

Perhaps also **cicVtnik*. Note *cictnik*, in a children song rhyming with *t'it'tnik* 'butterfly'; see R. Grigoryan 1970: 165^{Nr273} (from XX); cf. 163^{Nr266} (*t'it'er'nik* - *cice'nik*; from Muš). The form with *-t-* can be due to rhyming influence of *t'it'tnik* (on which see s.v. *t'it'er'tn*). For such rhyming variants of this pair see s.v. **pipe'nak*. No independent evidence is known to me. Note, however, MArm. *ctni* 'a kind of sea-bird resemblig swallow: alcyon' (Norayr 41a apud HAB 2: 463b), of which no evidence and etymology is known to me. It may reflect **c(i)ctni*.

● **ETYM** Usually connected with Gr. *γῆρυς* f. 'voice, speech', etc.. For the typo of reduplication (**gōi-gār-n-*) see AčarLiak 3, 1957: 91, with parallels. Note *čič'runk* 'twittering of swallows', with *c* : č [Ĵahukyan 1967: 307]. Greppin (1978:182) notes that Solta (1960: 164-165) considers the reduplication pattern as typically IE but can offer no other example of IE origin in Armenian. Nevertheless, the pattern does exist in PArm. cf. *t'it'er'n* 'butterfly' (note *cice'rn* 'swallow' vs. *cicain*), *cicat* 'laughter' (q.v.) and perhaps dial. **titrak* from 'turtle-dove'. Elsewhere Greppin (1981b: 6-7) is positive on the example of *sise'rn* 'chickpea' vs. Lat. *cicer* etc. Here (p. 5) he notes that **gōi-gār-n-* is possible, "though it smacks root etymology". Against the etymology he (ibid.) also argues that "swallows are perhaps not best known for their lung power". One may disagree with this.

Note *čič'runk* 'twittering of swallows', with *c* : č [Ĵahukyan 1967: 307].

cil, verbal *clem* (Geoponica etc.), *cil*, *o*-stem, *i*-stem (Step'anos Tarōnec'i /10-11th cent./) 'sprout, bud, haulm', *ct-awt*, *i*-stem, *u*-stem 'haulm' (Dawit' Anyalt' etc.), *ciwt* (in Eṯiṣē, as a reading variant, and with uncertain meaning), *anc/jiwt* 'blossom, sprout', *anci(w)tem* etc. 'to germinate' (Bible+).

In Eṯiṣē 2 (Ter-Minasyan 1989: 104^{L23f}, ModArm. transl. 105; Engl. transl. Thomson 1982: 104) : *ciwk*' (vars. *ciwtk*', *ciwrk*', *civk*', *cirtk*') *ew k'akork' i krak mi ekesc'en* : "Excrement and dung shall not be thrown into fire". The word *ciw* 'dung' is also found in "Baḡirk' hayoc'" (*ciw · c'an*, see Amalyan 1975: 152^{Nr65}) and is considered a loan from Georg. *c'iva* 'dried dung' [HAB 2: 461a]. But the alternative reading *ciwt* found in the passage from Eṯiṣē is taken as an independent word meaning 'brushwood' [HAB 2: 455a]. The existence of the form may be corroborated by Juṭa *cut* 'a piece of straw' (as Ačāryan stresses in HAB 2: 455b), and, if related, by *an-c/jiwt* 'blossom, sprout' and *čiw* 'branch' (q.v.). Further, the following entry of the same "Baḡirk' hayoc'" (Amalyan 1975: 152^{Nr66}) one finds *ciwt · xot kam čet* "grass or branch".

●ETYM IE proposals are not convincing (see HAB s.v.). On possibly related Caucasian forms see Jaḥukyan 1987: 597, 611 (with hesitation).

On the ending of *ctawt* see Olsen 1999: 93-94.

**cin*:- *cnanim*, 3sg.aor. *cn-aw* 'to give birth, procreate; to be born' (Bible+); *cin*, *i*-stem 'birth, origin; base; womb; spot, sign' (Bible+): IPl *cn-i-w-k*' in Movsēs Xorenac'i 1.12 (see below); in Bible: AblSg *i cn-ē* [Astuacaturean 1895: 734a; Olsen 1999: 99²⁰⁹]; *cnōt* or *cnawt*, *a*-stem 'parent' (Bible+); *cn-und*, *o*-stem, also *cnnd-can* 'birth, origin, generation' (Bible+); *-cin* as the second member of numerous compounds.

In the meaning 'base', *cin* (IPl *cn-i-w-k*') is attested in Movsēs Xorenac'i 1.12 (1913=1991: 39^{L2}; transl. Thomson 1978: 89): *ai sahmanōk' noc'a, cniwk' lerambk' ew ezerōk' daštīn* : "At the borders by the base of the mountains and edges of the plain".

ent/d-o-cin, *a*-stem (later also *o*-stem) 'a slave that is born in the house of his master' (rendering Gr. *οἰκογενής*); see s.v.

●DIAL The verb is widespread in dialects: **cnil* (without a trace of *-an-*). The transition **cnanim* > **cnim* can hardly have been motivated by syncope of *-a-* because: 1) there are no western forms with geminated *-nn-* (cf. *spananem* 'to kill' > **spannel*, *klanem* 'to swallow' > **klnel* > **kllel*, etc.); 2) at least some of the eastern dialects might have preserved the internal *-a-*; e.g. in *ankanim* 'to fall' most of the dialects have the syncopated form **enknil*, but some eastern dialects have preserved

the *-an-*, cf. Meṭri *nānil* [Aṭayan 1954: 262a], Areš *ənganel* [Lusenc' 1982/197a], Juṭa *ənganel* [1940: 353a], Agulis (*h*)*əng'ānil* [Ačarean 1935: 335; HAB 1: 199b].

In ClArm. *cnanim* has both transitive and intransitive meanings; 3sg.aor. *cnaw* means, thus, 'he was born' or 'he gave birth' (see AčarLiak 4b, 1961: 315); cf. e.g. Polis *jnil* which has both transitive and intransitive meanings [Ačaryan 1941: 220] whereas e.g. in Juṭa we see a formal distinction: trans. *cnel* (aor. *cn-ec'i*) vs. intransitive *cn-v-el* (aor. *cn-v-ec'-i*) [Ačarean 1940: 367b].

●**ETYM** Since NHB (1: 1016b), linked with Skt. *jan-* 'to be born; to produce, create' (spelled in NHB as *čan-*), Gr. *γένεσις*, etc. [Hübschmann 1897: 456; HAB 2: 457-458]. The noun *cin* is usually derived from PIE **gēnh₁os*, *s*-stem n. 'birth, origin, race': Gr. *γένος*, Lat. *genus*, Skt. *jānas-* [Jahukyan 1982: 35, 56; 1987: 125; Beekes 2003: 167, 175, 192]. The *i*-stem of Arm. *cin* instead of the expected *o*-stem is treated as secondary, see Jahukyan 1982: 127. Olsen (1999: 99-100) suggests an equation with Gr. *γένεσις* (full-grade **gēnh₁-ti-*, thus) or, alternatively, an influence from a compositional *i*-stem, cf. *mi-a-cin* = Gr. *μνογενής*. However, *miacin* has an *a*-stem: GDSg *miacn-i* (Bible), ISg *miacn-a-w* (John Chrysostom, Yovhannēs Ōjnec'i); cf. also *ənt/docin* (see above, and s.v.).

Arm. *cnawt* 'parent' is usually derived from **gēnh₁/ə-tlo-* [Jahukyan 1987: 125, 240; Matzinger 1997: 11]. The word has an *a*-stem, however, and presupposes **gēnh₁t(o)l-eh₂-*. In this case, it may have originally been feminine referring to 'mother'. As to the variation *-awt* and *-ot*, it has been noticed that, in our oldest texts, agent nouns have *-awt*, and adjectives show *-ot* (see Weitenberg 1996: 95, with lit.). Jahukyan (ibid.) points out that the variants *-awt* and *-ot* may be due to early monophthongization of *-aw-* or a conflation of **-ātlo-* > *-awt* and **olo-* (cf. Gr. *-ολης*). I alternatively propose to derive the forms *cnot* and *cnawt* from a single paradigm: acc. **gēnh₁te/ol-* (**-əte/o-* > Arm. *-o-*, with a regular loss of the intervocalic non-inlaut **-t-*) vs. gen. **gēnh₁tl-* (**-ətl-* > Arm. *-awt*).

For **-tl-* cf. Gr. *γενέ-θλη* and *γενε-θλον* 'lineage'. For **-tel-* see also s.v. *droyl* 'yard-keeper'.

cung-k' (pl.), *a*-stem (Bible+); later *o*-stem: IPl *cnk-ov-k'* twice in Grigor Narekac'i, 10-11th cent. (in his famous "Matean": 14.2 [1985: 297^{L21}]); uninflected **cunr** (Bible+; later also *cundr*); dial. also **cungn** (GSg *cngan*), seen in late attested compounds as well (HAB 2: 472b; MiġHayBaṛ 1, 1987: 370a); MArm. and dial. pl. (< dual) **cn(k)vi** 'knee'.

Spelled also *cunk-k'*. It is hard to determine which of the two (viz. *cung-* vs. *cunk-*) is the original spelling (see Meillet 1903: 147). According to the Bible

Concordance (Astuacaturean 1895: 742ab), the attested forms mainly display the following distribution: NPI *cunk-k*˘; API *cunk-s*˘; GDPI *cng-a-c*˘. In this case, *cung-* is the original form, and the devoicing of *-g-* is due to the influence of *-k*˘/*-s* (see also Pedersen 1906: 341 = 1982: 119; HAB 2: 473a).

GDPI *cnk-a-c*˘: P˘awstos Buzand 5.3 (1883=1984: 160^{L-7}; transl. Garsoïan 1989: 189): *i nerk˘oy cnkac˘ nora* "under his knees". In Anania Širakac˘i, *cng-a-c*˘ (A. G. Abrahamyan 1944: 329^{L28}).

In "Bžškaran jioy" (13th cent.): pl. *cnkvi* [Č˘ugaszyan 1980: 93^{L-4f}].

● **DIAL** Widespread [HAB 2: 473b]. The final *-n* is seen in Łarabał, Goris etc., as well as in the paradigm of Van *cungy*, GSg *cngyān* [Ačāryan 1952: 125], Moks *cung*^y, GSg *cəng˘ān*, NPI *cəng˘nir* [Orbeli 2002: 255], Šatax *cungy*, GSg *cəngyān* (M. Muradyan 1962: 198b; the genitive is not recorded here, but it is found e.g. in a folk-song in 163^{L9}).

Zeyt˘un *jung*, NPI *jəngvə(nə/a)* [Ačāryan 2003: 152]. Polis *jung*, NPI *jəngvəner* [Ačāryan 1941: 108].

Sebastia *cunk*, also *cuy* - in the expression *cuy mə, ērku cunk atōt˘k*˘ 'a few prayers', *glxun-cəywun cecel* 'to lament', lit. 'to beat one's head and knees' [Gabikean 1952: 279-280]. The latter expression presupposes a dual **cəywi*.

Next to *cúndər* < *cunr*, and *cung*^y, in Agulis one finds *céynə* [HAB 2: 473b; Ačārean 1935: 361]. Ačāryan (1935: 111) derives *céynə* from *cunkn*, though this development is exceptional; cf. *etungn* 'nail' > *étunk*˘, *sunk/gn* 'mushroom' > *səngən*. In p. 73 he notes that the development *u* > *ε* is found only in *cunk* > *céynə*, and *p˘unĵ* 'stalk; bunch' (Genesis 41.5, 22, etc.; dial.) > *p˘enĵ*. The vocalism of the latter may be due to the influence of the hushing affricate *ĵ*, cf. examples with *č*˘, *š*˘, *ž*˘, etc. (Ačārean 1935: 77). Besides, it may somehow be compared with that of *p˘inĵ* 'stalk, stem', as well as Skt. *pinĵu/ūlām* 'a bunch of stalks or grass' next to *puñjīlam* 'id.' and *puñja-* 'a heap, mass, quantity, multitude', though the etymology of the Sanskrit (see Mayrhofer, KEWA s.v.v.) and Armenian (HAB, s.v.v.) words is uncertain. Note also Turk. *pinçak* etc., considered to be Armenian loans (Dankoff 1995: 152), Tat *p˘enĵak* 'heap of 5 or 10 bundles' (Ananyan 1978: 96, deriving the word from *p˘enĵ* 'five'); Łarabał Arm. *p˘āñjak*˘ (L. Harut˘yunyan 1991: 10^{L22}).

Thus, Agulis *p˘enĵ* does not seem to be a good parallel to *céynə*. Note also that *cunkn* 'knee' and *sunkn* 'mushroom' yielded Łarabał *cōngnə/cúynə* and *sōngnə/sōynə*, respectively [Davt˘yan 1966: 385, 472], thus Agulis *céynə* 'knee' vs. *səngən* 'mushroom' may be remarkable, though one must admit that here we are on shaky grounds, and other explanations may be possible too. As for *etungn* 'nail' > Łarabał *tēngnə/tēynə* (see Davt˘yan 1966: 344), we are dealing perhaps with

metathesis *e...u > u...e*. Here Agulis has *éʔunkʰ* rather than **(u)ʔeng(n)*, so the vocalism of *ceʔynə* can hardly be interpreted by the influence of an unattested Agulis **ʔeynə*.

●**ETYM** Since the dictionary by Gēorg Dpir (publ. in 1826) and NHB, compared with Pers. *zānū*, Gr. *γόνυ*, etc.; cf. Skt. *jānu-*, MPers. *zānūg*, Lat. *genū*, Goth. *kniu* ‘knee’, etc. (see Hübschmann 1897: 457; HAB 2: 473). Meillet (1903: 147; 1936: 84) derives **cung-* from PIE nom.acc. dual neuter **ḡonu-i-* or **ḡonu-ī-* (that is, **ḡonu-ih₁*). See also AčarLiak 3, 1957: 442; Eichner 1978: 147₁₇, 151; Clackson 1994: 47, 125. The idea that Arm. *-k/g-* comes from a guttural determinative (cf. Gr. *γνύξ* ‘with bent knee’, MPers. *zānūg*, etc.) is unconvincing and unnecessary. Note e.g. the vocalic differences of the compared Greek and Iranian forms [Jahukyan 1987: 168].

According to Meillet (1903: 147-148), MArm. and dial. dual **cnu-i* is composed of **cnu-* (< **ḡonu-* + coll. *-i* and can be regarded as the starting point of the dual ending *-ui*. On the other hand, one also thinks of the final **-u* of Skt. NADu *d(u)vāu* m. ‘two’ (RV+) and Arm. *erku* ‘two’ (q.v.); cf. Karst 1901: 191-192, §246; Meillet 1903: 146; Jahukyan 1987: 375.

Arm. *cunr*, Gr. GSg **γόνυ-ατος* (if from **ḡonu-ḡt-*) and Skt. GDu *jānunoḥ* seem to point to heteroclitic declension (see Meillet 1903: 144), though in PArm. rather than PIE level since the *-r* is found only in Armenian. One might assume that dial. GSg **cngan* reflects the same PIE oblique stem in **-n*. The theoretical PArm. paradigm would have been then: NSg **cun(u)r*, GSg **c(u)ngán*. Then the old NSg *cunr* has been replaced by analogical **cungn*. Alternatively, **cungn* merely contains an additional *n-* after body-part terms like *armukn*, GSg *armkan* ‘elbow’, etc.

If Agulis *ceʔynə* ‘knee’ reflects an old *e* (which is very uncertain; see above), one may compare it with Hitt. ^U*zū* *genu-* ‘knee’ and Lat. *genū*.

katʰn, GDSg *katʰin*, AblSg *i katʰan-ē*, ISg *katʰam-b* (all in Bible) ‘milk’.

Bible+.

●**DIAL** Ubiquitous in dialects. The nasal is seen in Sučʰava *gatʰə*, gen. *gatʰni*, Tʰiflis *katʰə*, gen. *katʰni*, Łarabał, Goris, Šamaxi *katʰnə* [HAB 2: 481a], Lori *katʰə* [M. Asatryan 1968: 80, 184b].

Remarkable are Agulis *kaxcʰ* (also in a number of compounds: *kxcʰ-*), Havarik *kaxs* [HAB 2: 481a; Ačarean 1935: 362], Areš *kaxs* [Lusencʰ 1982: 214a], Metri *kaxcʰ* [Ałayan 1954: 81, 274b], Karčewan *kaxcʰ* [H. Muradyan 1960: 196b]. In Kakʰavaberd, *kaxcʰ* is found only in the village of Varhavar, whereas the other three villages have *katʰnə* [H. Muradyan 1967: 80, 174b].

●**ETYM** Since long connected with Gr. γάλα, γάλακτος n. 'milk', Lat. *lac, lactis* n. 'milk' (see HAB 2: 480-481). Baṅgāṇī *lakt* 'milk' (Zoller 1989: 198; see also Schrijver 1991: 480) is unreliable [Driem/Sharmā 1996: 135]. The various reconstructions with initial **ġ-* (based on Nūristāni **dzara* 'milk', see Mallory/Adams 1997: 381-382), or **d* (see Hamp 1998: 242), or **m-* (Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 1: 98₁) should be rejected particularly in view of the Armenian, which is neglected in these works.

One reconstructs **ġlt-*, without an internal laryngeal; see Schrijver 1991: 479-480. The appurtenance of Hitt. *galaktar* n. 'soothing substance, balm, nutriment' (see Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 568; Mallory/Adams 1997: 381-382) is uncertain. [On the etymology of this Hittite word see Kloekhorst 2007, 1: 496-497]. The peculiar structure of **ġlt* 'milk', as well as its restriction to Greek, Latin and Armenian point to Mediterranean origin.

The *-x-* of some SEArm. dialects (Agulis, Metri, etc.) is remarkable. Gr. Vanc'ean (1899-1901, 1: 149a; see also N. Simonyan 1979: 199₂₄) assumed that Agulis *katc'* is older than ClArm. *kat'n*, but he does not offer an explanation. H. Muradyan (1960: 55, 67) interprets the *x* of the Karčewan form as an epenthesis before dentals, as in *ewt'n* 'seven' > *γxt*, etc., and assumes *xt'* > *xt* > *xc'*. However, in these cases we are dealing with the development *-aw-* > *-ox-* before a voiceless dental stop or a dental affricate (see Weitenberg 1996), which is not the case in *kat'n*. The correct explanation of the *-x-* is given by Ačāryan (1935: 23; HAB 2: 480-481; AčārHLPatm 2, 1951: 430-431). He convincingly showed that the development *a* > Agulis *ɔ* has been blocked in position before *t*, and Agulis *kaxc'* derives from **katc'*; otherwise we would have **kɔxc'*. He correctly treats the *t* as an archaic relic of the IE **-l-* seen in the Greek and Latin forms; see also Ĵahukyan 1972: 272; 1985: 157; 1987: 126, 254; N. Simonyan 1979: 232; A. Xač'atryan 1982: 51.

The development *t' > c'* is exceptional in these dialects (see Ačāryan 1935: 99; H. Muradyan 1967: 80). Ačāryan (HAB 2: 480-481; AčārHLPatm 2, 1951: 431) assumes **kat't' > *katc'* comparing with cases like *xayt*: *xayc* (q.v.) etc.; see also N. Simonyan 1979: 232. Ĵahukyan (1987: 126), with reservation, reconstructs **galktj-*. However, **-tj-* would probably yield Arm. *č'* rather than *c'*. One therefore prefers the ingenious explanation of Weitenberg (1985: 104-105; see also Kortlandt 1985: 22 = 2003: 65; Schrijver 1991: 480; Beekes 2003: 166) who derives ClArm. *kat'n* and EArm. dial. **katc'* from acc. **ġlt-m* and nom. **ġlt-s* respectively.

It remains unclear why the **l* has been preserved in **katc'* but dropped in *kat'n*. Kortlandt (1987a: 52₁ = 2003: 81₁) takes *kat'n* as a case with loss of *-l-* before an aspirate. I tentatively propose the following solution. In 2.1.22.13 I argue that **RCt*

yields Arm. *Rtʿ*. Next to this, there is some (though scanty and uncertain) material that points to the loss of **l* before affricate *cʿ* (see 2.1.22.9). If these developments are correct, the word for 'milk' would have had the following PArm. paradigm: nom. **głkt-s* > **kacʿ* vs. acc. **głkt-m* > **kattʿ-n*. In ClArm., the paradigm **kacʿ*: **kattʿ-n* was levelled into **kacʿ*: **katʿn*, and the accusative was generalized, whereas in the SE periphery the opposite development has taken place: the paradigm was levelled into **katcʿ*: **kattʿn*, and the nominative was generalized.

***kakał(ay)** (dial.) 'walnut; testicle; etc.'

● **DIAL** **kakał* 'walnut (together with the shell)': Karin, Xotorǰur, Hamšen, Tʿiflis (in Tʿiflis - also 'eye-ball') [Ačārean 1913: 540a], also Ararat, Urmia, Sebastia [HayLezBrbBař 3, 2004: 21a].

**kakałay*: 'walnut; testicle' (Karin) [Ačārean 1913: 540a]; 'testicle' (Polis, Kʿti, Amasia), 'unripe fruit' (Sebastia), etc. [HayLezBrbBař 3, 2004: 21-22].

● **ETYM** Ačāryan (1913: 540a) compares with Georg. *kaḡali* 'piece' and Kurd. */kake/* 'the kernel of the walnut', not specifying the nature of the relationship. According to Łapʿancʿyan (1961: 90; 1975: 369), the Armenian has been borrowed from Laz-Megrelian.

Arm. **kakał* and the Kartvelian forms (Georg. *kaḡal*- 'walnut', Laz *kaḡal*- 'walnut', Megr. *kaḡal*- 'grain; piece', etc.) may be treated as a reduplication of **kał*-; cf. dial. **popokʿ*, see also s.v. *kokov*-. In that case, **kał*- 'round small object; walnut, etc.' may be related with the PIE word for 'acorn' (**gʷlh₂-(e)n*-; cf. Alb. *gogēl* f. 'acorn; small and round object', if indeed belonging to this IE word); see s.v. *kałin* 'acorn'.

Since the form **kakał* is found in a number of dialects mostly in the meaning 'walnut' whereas **kakał-ay* mainly refers to 'testicle', one may treat the latter as a dual or collective in *-ay*.

Perhaps unrelated with dial. (Agulis, Łarabał, Lori, Łazax) **katał* 'unripe, green walnut to make sweets with', q.v.

katał, *i*-stem or *a*-stem according to NHB 1: 1036c, but only LocSg *i katał-i* (Movsēs Xorenacʿi 2.77) is cited 'den, lair'.

Movsēs Xorenacʿi, Philo, Irenaeus, Aristakēs Lastivertcʿi, etc. Often in apposition with synonymous *orǰ* etc. (see NHB 1: 1036-1037).

In Movsēs Xorenacʿi 2.77(1913=1991: 216^{L1f}; transl. Thomson 1978: 224): *orǰacʿeal yamurn Ani, ibr i katałi handartutʿean tōteal*: "He had ensconced himself in the fortress of Ani, as if hidden in a tranquil lair". Attested also in Chapter 23 of the

"History" of the 11th century author Aristakēs Lastivertc'i (see Yuzbašyan 1963: 129^{L11f}).

●**ETYM** Probably with the suffix *-at* (cf. *kenc'-at* 'living' etc.) and the root **kał-* connected with Lith. *guõlis* 'den, lair, (coll.) bed', *gułtas* 'bed, lair', *gułti* 'to lie down, fall ill', Latv. *guõļa* 'nest, den, lair, (coll.) bed', etc., probably also Gr. *γωλεός* m. 'hole' [Liden 1906: 48-49; Petersson 1916: 280; HAB 2: 492a; Pokorny 1959: 402; Ĵahukyan 1987: 126, 169]. Arm. **kał-* is usually derived from a zero grade **gbl-*. Perhaps better - **guol-*, with the loss of **u* (cf. *ĵayn*, *i*-stem 'voice, sound' vs. OCS *zvонъ* 'sound') and the development **o* in open syllables > Arm. *a* (on which see 2.1.3).

See also s.v. *koł* 'rib, side'.

***kałat** (dial.) 'unripe, green walnut to make sweets with'.

●**DIAL** Agulis, Łarabał [Ačarean 1913: 541b], also Łazax and Łori [Amatuni 1912: 326a].

●**ETYM** No etymological attempt is known to me.

It is hard to determine whether there is a relation with *kałin* 'acorn' and/or **kakał* 'walnut' (see s.v.v.).

Perhaps more promising is to compare with Pers. *čayāla* 'unripe fruit' (on which see Monchi-Zadeh 1990: 12^{Nr27}).

kałamax (Isaiah 41.19, 2 Paralipomenon 2.8), **kałamax-i**, *ea*-stem: GDPl *kałamax-eac* (Hosea 4.13), NPl *kałamaxi-k* (Hexaemeron)

'white poplar, *Populus alba*; aspen, *Populus tremula*', probably also 'pine'.

In Isaiah 41.19 and Hosea 4.13, Arm. *kałamax(i)* renders Gr. *λεύκη* 'white poplar, *Populus alba*'.

In 2 Paralipomenon 2.8 (Xalat'eanc' 1899: 57a): *Ew tac'es berel inj p'ayts saroyñ mayr ew kałamax i Libanan leinē* : 2.7 *καὶ ἀπόστειλὸν μοι ξύλα κέδρινα καὶ ἄρκευθινα καὶ πεύκινα*. Thus: Arm. *saroy*, *mayr*, and *kałamax* match Gr. *κέδρος* 'cedar-tree', *ἄρκευθος* 'juniper, *Juniperus macrocarpa*', and *πεύκη* 'pine', respectively. If this set of correspondences is original, Arm. *kałamax* here refers to 'pine', thus. This seems to be corroborated by Hexaemeron (K. Muradyan 1984: 142^{L17}, cf. also 144^{L8}) where *kałamaxi*, according to the editor's comment (K. Muradyan 1984: 340₅₇), corresponds to Gr. *πεύκη* 'pine'.

In Agat'angełos §644 (1909=1984: 330^{L11}), *kałamax* (vars. *kałamał*, *kałmax*, *kamałax*) is found in an enumeration of tree-names, between *gi* 'juniper' and *uri* 'willow'.

Further: *katamah/x* in Galen (rendering Gr. *λεύκη*, see Ališan 1895: 285-286; Greppin 1985: 71), and *katmxi* (syncopated) in Geoponica.

● **DIAL** Muš *katmxi*, Xotorjur *gaxmxi* [HAB 2: 492b]. Ararat *kalama caṛ*, *k'alambəṛ* [Markosyan 1989: 305a].

● **ETYM** Ačāryan (HAB 2: 492) treats as borrowed from an unattested Urartian source and mentions Salmast Turk. *k'ālāmbār* or *k'ālāmbur* 'aspen', T'avriz/Tebriz Turk. *qālāmā* 'poplar', as well as in Daghestan languages: Lak *kalaxi*, Rutul *kalax* 'aspen'. Then he notes that the homeland of this tree is not known, and posits an eastward spread in view of Tehran Persian *tābrizi* 'aspen', lit. 'of/from Tebriz'.

Now we can add two Hesychian glosses: *καλαμίνδαρ· πλάτανος ἡδονιεύς* 'plane', obviously with **dar* 'tree', *καλαδία· ῥυκάνη* 'plane', see Saradževa 1981a (referring to Ĵahukyan p.c. for *καλαμίνδαρ*). See also Ĵahukyan 1987: 310, 437, 612 (Lesg. *кѡавах* 'aspen' etc.). For the possible tree-suffix *-ax* see 2.3.1.

Olsen (1999: 936) cites no etymology and considers *katamax* to be of unknown origin.

For the semantic relationship 'poplar, aspen' : 'plane' cf. *čandar* 'poplar', 'plane' (see HAB 3: 183-184), which obviously contains the same component **dar* 'tree' we saw above, and *op'i* 'poplar, aspen' : Łarabał **hop'i* 'plane' (see HAB 3: 619-620). I hope to discuss this issue elsewhere.

That *καλαμίνδαρ* contains **kalam-* and **dar* 'tree' is seen in Arm. Ararat *kalama caṛ*, which is taken as equivalent to *k'alambəṛ* (see above). The form must be closely linked with Salmast Turk. *k'ālāmbār* or *k'ālāmbur* 'aspen'. Probably an assimilation has taken place: **kalam-dar* > **kalam-bar*.

Conclusion: *katam-ax(-i)* 'white poplar, aspen' is a Mediterranean/Pontic tree-name composed of **kalam-* (cf. Hesychian *καλαμίνδαρ* 'plane', Turk. *qālāmā* 'poplar', etc.) and the tree-suffix *-ax*.

katin, *o*-stem 'acorn' (Bible+); **katn-i** 'oak-tree' (Bible; P'awstos Buzand, etc.).

Note *ark'ayakan katin* (Cyril of Jerusalem), *ark'a-katin* (Galen) 'hazel-nut', literally 'royal acorn'; *xoz-katin* *'pig-acorn', in Asar Sebastac'i (16-17th cent.), see D. M. Karapetyan 1993: 211; in the glossary: 349. See also Ališan 1895: 65-66, 287-288.

● **DIAL** Widespread in dialects [HAB 2: 496a].

Next to *katin* 'acorn', which is usually considered *xoz-katin*, that is acorn for pigs, in the dialect of Łarabał one finds *tkōten* 'hazel-nut' (and metathesized *ktōten*, cf. Łaradał *t'akutnə*), with an unexplained *t-* and with irregular change of *a* to *o* (see

HAB, *ibid.*; Ališan 1895: 342, 611, treating Łarabał *tkotin* as synonymous to *ark'akatin*, on which see above). Also Hadrut' *təkoten* 'id.' [Połosyan 1965: 16].

●**ETYM** Since Ayvazovsk'i, Pictet, et al., connected with Gr. *βάλανος* f. 'acorn', Lat. *glāns, glandis* f. 'acorn, beach-nut; missile discharged from a sling', Russ. *žēlud'*, SCr. *žēlūd* 'acorn', Lith. *gīlė*, dial. *gylė* 'acorn', Latv. *zīle* 'acorn', etc. [HAB 2: 495-496].

Arm. dial. **kakal* 'walnut; testicle' (q.v.) must be related with Georg. *kaḳal*- 'walnut', Laz *kaḳal*- 'walnut', Megr. *kaḳal*- 'grain; piece' (Russ. 'штука'), etc. (on which see Klimov 1964: 105). If we are dealing with reduplication of **kal*-, one wonders if it can be connected with PIE **g^wlh₂-* 'acorn' (cf. Alb. *gogēl* f. 'acorn; small and round object'). Note, however, Georgian *kaḳa*- 'grain, kernel (of fruit)', etc. from Georgian-Zan **kaḳa*- 'stone, kernel (of fruit)', which is "a sound symbolic designation of a solid and, as a rule, round article" (see Klimov 1998: 85). For both Kartvelian words Klimov assumes a derivation from **kaḳ-* 'to knock, pound'. For the semantic field see s.v. *hat* 'grain, piece' etc.

The *l*-less form seems to be found also in Armenian dialects (Ararat, Alaškert, T'iflis, Van, Sebastia, Partizak, etc.): *kaka* 'fruit; eye; etc.' (see Amatuni 1912: 325b; Ačarean 1913: 540a; HayLezBrbBar 3, 2004: 21a).

The connection of *kakal* etc. with the PIE word for 'acorn' is thus possible, but yet unclear. Note that, at least in the case of **kaka*, we are dealing with a Lallwort.

For a possible trace of Arm. **čeł-* from **g^welh₂-* (cf. Russ. *žēlud'*, SCr. *žēlūd* 'acorn', etc.) see s.v. **čtopur* 'walnut'.

It has been assumed that the initial *t*- of Łarabał *tkotin* 'hazel-nut' reflects *ti*- 'big' (Ĵahukyan 1972: 278; cf. 281). This etymology should be abandoned since the hazel-nut, in the contrary, is smaller, and the vocalic change remains unexplained. Ĵahukyan (1985: 155; Ĵahukyan 1987: 129, 255) treats **tkotin* as an old dialectal variant with a different ablaut. On the archaic nature of the form see also N. Simonyan 1979: 194 (without an explanation).

I assume that the form reflects PArm. **tukatin* > **tukutin* (vocalic assimilation, on which see 2.1.26.4) and can be derived from QIE **diuos-g^wlh₂-eno-* 'divine acorn', cf. Gr. **διὸς βάλανος* 'chestnut' and Lat. *iūglāns* 'walnut' (on which see Walde/Hofmann 1, 1938: 727; Schrijver 1991: 273). On **tu/tw-* see HAB s.v. *tiw* 'day'. As is pointed out by Laufer 1919: 369, 369₁, the pattern of Gr. *Διὸς βάλανος* "acorn of Zeus" is comparable to that of Pers. *šāh-bal(l)ūt* 'the edible chestnut' < "acorn of the Shah, royal acorn"; cf. Pahl. *šāh-balūt* 'id.', Arm. *šahpalut* 'id.', an Iranian loan, Łarabał *šmbálut* 'chestnut' [Hübschmann 1897: 272; HAB 3: 486a]. Compare also *ark'a-katin* above. For vocalic assimilation **tukatin* > **tukutin* cf.

erdumn ‘oath’ > Łarabał *úrťümnə*. Unlike in **tukatín*, with voiceless stops, here we are dealing with voiced *d*, consequently, with Ačarıyan’s Law: *rdu* > *rdü* > *rt’ü* (see 2.1.39.2).

kaťjin (vars. *kaťčín*, *kaťč’in*) ‘Mörtel/mortar, a kind of clayey soil’.

Attested only in Geponica (13th cent.).

●**DIAL** Preserved in the dialects of Muš, Alaškert, Karin, Van, Ozim, Moks; with some deviations: Xarberd *gaťji* (cf. Dersim *gaťji* ‘yellow clayey soil’ and [Berri] verbal *gaťjel*, Bałramyan 1960: 85b; 119b), Nor Bayazet and Šatax *kavčín*, Marała *karčėnkav* (a compound with *kaw* ‘clay’), Salmast *karčín*. In Akn we have *gaťjin* and *gap’jin* (> Turk. dial.) as names for different types of soil.

Note the meaning ‘clay’ of Kurd. *kaxčín*, which is considered a loan from Armenian (see HAB 2: 496b).

The form *kavčín* is due to contamination with *kaw* ‘clay’ and *kawič* ‘chalk’. The meaning of Šatax *kavčín* is ‘white clay of which pots are made’ [M. Muradyan 1962: 212b].

Dersim

●**ETYM** No etymological attempt is known to me.

The word may have been composed of an otherwise unattested root **kaťj-* and the suffix *-in* (in Xarberd one finds *-i*). For the latter compare parallels, also pertaining to the concept of soil: *ostín* ‘(adj.) arid; (subst.) arid place, soil’ (as an adjective - also in the dialects of Ararat, Van, Muš); *anjrdi(n)* ‘id.’ (q.v.); *jrarbi(n)* ‘well-watered’ in Hexaameron [K. Muradyan 1984: 162] and Šatax *čəräripin* ‘irrigated soil’ [M. Muradyan 1962: 213b]. As regards the root **kaťj-*, it might originate from PIE **gl-i(e)h₂-* ‘sticky stuff, clay’; cf. Gr. *γλία* f. ‘glue’, next to the more common *γλοιός* m. ‘any glutinous substance, gum’, Ukr. *glej* ‘glue; clay’, OEngl. *clæg* (< Germ. **klaijaz*), etc. (see Pokorny, Frisk, s.v.). There are forms in the nasal suffix **-neh₂-*, too: Russ. *glína* ‘clay’, Gr. *γλίνη* ‘any glutinous substance, gum’. Therefore, one might even consider the suffix *-in* of the Armenian form as being original, too. If we assume that the Armenian, exactly like the Greek and the Slavic, had forms both with and without the nasal suffixal element, that is **kalin-* and **kaľj-*, it would be possible to explain *kaťjin* as a contaminated form. Strictly speaking, the IE **gli-neh₂-* would develop into PArm. **atkin*. However, a contamination presupposes a mutual influence. Thus, the anlaut of PArm. **kalin* is perhaps influenced by **kaľj*.

I cannot offer an explanation to *-r-* of the dialectal (Salmast, Marała) form **karčín*. Perhaps cf. Lat. *crēta* ‘white clay; chalk’, Fr. *craie*, Germ. *Kreide*.

kamurj, *a*-stem: GDSg *kamrj-i* : Bible+, GDPl *kamrj-a-c* : Agat'angelos 33, *kamurj-a-c* : T'ovmay Arcruni 2.3 (10th cent.) 'bridge'.

Bible+. In 2 Kings 23.21 *kamurj* seems to denote a construction of wood (see Clackson 1994: 227₁₅₃). Later also *karmunj*/č and *karmuj*.

In Agat'angelos 33 (1909=1980: 22-23) one finds several attestations of *kamurj*, including GDSg *kamrj-i*, and, twice, GDPl *kamrj-a-c* (see the passages s.v.v. *xel* and place-name *Tap'er*). In a few manuscripts *kamurj* has been replaced by *karmuj* and *karmunj*.

In T'ovmay Arcruni 2.3 (1985: 150^{L17f}; transl. Thomson 1985: 161): *Ew Xosrov ark'ay p'axstakan gnac', ew anc'eal zDektat'aw i Vehkawat, hramayeac' zlar kamurjac'n ktrel* : "King Xosrov fled. Crossing the Tigris at Vehkawat he ordered the rope of the bridge to be cut".

●**DIAL** Widespread in dialects (Sebastia, Muš, T'iflis, Ararat, Łarabał, Agulis, Juła, Moks, etc.), only in the form **karmunj* (see HAB 2: 503b), with an anticipation of the *r* and an epenthetic *-n-*. Rare exception: Kak'avaberđ, where, next to *karmunj*, H. Muradyan (1967: 104, 175a) records also *karmij* in the village of Varhavar. It is tempting to treat *karmij* as an archaic, non-epenthesised form, though an internal explanation seems possible, too. The vowel *-i-* instead of the *-u-* may be explained by anticipative influence of the palatal *j* : **karmuj* > **karmujj* > *karmij*, cf. PIE **medh^h-io-* > PArm. **mej-* > *mēj* (see 2.1.2).

Xotorjur *kamurj* is described (YušamXotorj 1964: 468a) as follows: "a wood in water that serves as a base for the wheel".

●**ETYM** Since Müller, connected with Gr. *γέφυρα* f. (Boeot. *βέφυρα*, Cret. *δέφυρα*, Lac. /Hesychius/ *δίφουρα*) 'bridge' [HAB 2: 503]. According to Ačaryan (HAB 2: 503a), the development **g^web^h-* > Arm. **kam-* (instead of **kew-*) involves an unknown change **-b/w-* > *-m-*, as well as the change *e* > *a* by the influence of the *u* in the following syllable, cf. **vet'sun* > *vat'sun* 'sixty' (vs. *vec* 'six'). In view of PIE **peruti* > Arm. *heru* 'last year', however, Kortlandt (2003: 118; see also Beekes 2002 [2004]: 19) rejects this rule; see also 2.1.1. Elsewhere, Ačaryan (AčarLiak 6, 1971: 722) explains the phonological irregularity by tabu, which is unlikely (cf. 2.1.36); cf. also Clackson 1994: 135.

Ĵahukyan (1987: 308, 310) treats the Armenian and Greek words as belonging to the Mediterranean substratum and containing the alternation *φ/m*, which is "peculiar to Mediterranean", and considers the IE origin less convincing. For the alternation *φ/m*, he (see also Ĵahukyan 1967: 127, 291-292; cf. 1994: 15) compares with *awr* 'day' : Gr. *ἡμᾶρ* n. 'day', which is, however, a different case (see Clackson 1994:

96-97). Thus, the sound correspondence, as Jahukyan (1987: 308) admits, is difficult to explain. Feydit (1980: 47) posits an intermediary **kamburj*. For the discussion of phonological problems I refer to C. Arutjunjan 1983: 293-294; Clackson 1994: 134-135; Olsen 1999: 66; Beekes 2002 [2004]: 19-20. For a survey of etymological attempts see HAB 2: 503; Clackson 1994: 227¹⁵⁴; Beekes 2002 [2004]. See also Hooker 1979; Hamp 1997. For **-rj-* > Arm. *-rj-* see already Bugge 1889: 22. Further, see Jahukyan 1987: 128, 171-172.

Also Beekes (1969: 194; 2002 [2004]; see also 2003: 153) assumes that Gr. *γέφυρα* and Arm. *kamurj* are of substratum origin. Showing that the older meaning of *γέφυρα* is 'beam', he puts forward Furnée's (1972: 223) suggestion about the connection with Hattic *hamuru(wa)* 'beam'. In order to explain the nasal *-m-* in the Hattic and Armenian forms, Beekes invokes the phenomenon of 'nasalization' in Greek substratum-words. As pointed out by Olsen (1999: 66), a by-form in **-mb^h-* would yield Arm. *-m-* as in *camem* 'to chew'.

On the other hand, Hatt. *hamuru(wa)* 'beam' (see Dunaevskaja 1961: 88) has been connected with CABkhaz **q^wə(m)bələ-ra* 'beam over the hearth; cross-beam' [Ardzinba 1983: 170; Chirikba 1996: 423], cf. Abkhaz (Bzyp) *a-x^wblarə*, *a-x^wbərlə*, *a-x^wbəlrə*, Abaza (Tapanta) *q^wəmbələ*, Abaza (Ashkar) *q^wəblə*, etc. (Chirikba, p.c.). To my knowledge, this comparison remained beyond the scope of the scholars who have been concerned to the problem of Gr. *γέφυρα* and Arm. *kamurj*. With the basic meaning 'beam' and with the *-mb-*, the Abkhaz form, probably derived from something like **q^wəmbər-*, can be crucial for the discussion.

In the Imeretian and Rachan dialects of West Georgian there is a word, viz. *k'ip'orc'i* 'a log that serves as a bridge', which is compared with Arm. *kamurj* [Beridze 1912: 23a]. According to Ačaryan (HAB 2: 503b), *k'ip'orc'i* is borrowed from an older form of Arm. *kamurj* with the labial stop. This involves the development **g^wəb^h-* > Arm. **kam-* (see above), which is problematic. In view of what has been said above, one may prefer the postulation of doublets with and without the nasal *-m-*. Next to **g/q^wəmb^hər* > PArm. **kəm(m)ur-j* > *kamurj*, there was perhaps a by-form **g/q^wəb^hər* > PArm. **kəbur-j* > Georg. **kəpurj* > dial. *k'ip'orc'i*. Alternatively, one might think of Turkic **köpür* / **köp(ü)rüg* 'bridge' (treated as borrowed from Gr. *γέφυρα*, see Šervašidze 1989: 79; sceptical - Tatarincev 1993, 1: 126). The affricate *-č-* of the Georgian dialectal form, however, seems to confirm the Armenian origin.

I conclude: Gr. *γέφυρα* 'beam; bridge', Arm. *kamurj* 'bridge' (perhaps of wood, cf. 2 Kings 23.21; cf. also dial. Xotorjuri 'a wood in water that serves as a base for the wheel'), Hattic *hamuru(wa)* 'beam', Abkhaz **q^wəmbər-* 'beam', and West-

Georg. *k'ip'orč'i* 'a log that serves as a bridge' have a common origin and point to a Mediterranean/Pontic cultural term. Whether the ultimate source is one of these languages or an unknown language of Asia Minor or neighbouring areas is uncertain. One may posit doublet forms with and without the nasal *-m-* side by side. The former, viz. **g/q^wəmb^hər*, developed the Hattic, the Armenian, and the Abkhaz forms, whereas the latter represents the Greek. Abkhaz has forms both with and without the nasal *-m-*. Armenian also had the nasalless variant, if West-Georg. *k'ip'orč'i* 'a log that serves as a bridge' is indeed an Armenian loan. The Greek and the Armenian seem to represent a common borrowing since they agree in both semantics ('beam' > 'wooden bridge') and morphology (**-ih₂-*, see Olsen 1999: 66). Thus, **g/q^wə(m)b^hər* 'beam' > PGr. and PArm. **g^wə(m)bur-ih₂-* 'beam, log serving as a bridge' > Gr. *γέφυρα* 'beam; bridge' and Arm. *kamurj* 'wooden bridge'.

kayt prob. 'mark on marble'

Attested only in Barseġ Maškeronc'i/Čon (13-14th cent.): NPI *kayt-er*.

●**ETYM** In NHB 1: 1046c, a connection with *kayc* 'spark' (q.v.) is suggested. Ačaryan (HAB 2: 509b) mentions this suggestion with a question-mark and leaves the origin of the word open.

I propose a connection with *xayt* 'mark; spotted' and *kēt* 'point, dot', q.v. The above-mentioned *kayc* 'spark' may be related, too. For further discussion see s.v. **kic-* 'to bite'.

kask 'chestnut' in Evagrius of Pontus; T'ovmas Vardapet (of Cilicia, see Ališan 1895: 303), **kask-eni** 'chestnut-tree' in Fables by Mxit'ar Goš (12th cent.); see HAB 2: 533b; MiġHayBaġ 1, 1987: 385ab.

●**ETYM** The comparison with Gr. *κάστανον* n. 'chestnut', *κάστανέα* f. 'chestnut-tree' (de Lagarde 1886: 51; for other references to Lagarde see HAB 2: 533b) is considered uncertain (see Hübschmann 1897: 166, 394; HAB 2: 533b). More positively: Laufer 1919: 369₁; P. Friedrich 1970: 149^{Nr7}; Ĵahukyan 1987: 310 (with ref. - as a common borrowing from a language of Asia Minor).

An obvious reason for scepticism is the internal *-k-* which is, however, easily explicable. In my view, *kask-eni* is composed as **kast-(u)k-eni* > **kas(t)keni*, cf. Łarabaġ, Lori **hačar-k-i* 'beech-tree' from *hačar-uk* (see 2.3.1).

A plausible case of Mediterranean/Pontic plant-name.

karb 'aspen'

Attested in a medical work [Ališan 1895: 306, Nr 1358; HAB 2: 547b].

●**ETYM** No etymological attempt is recorded in HAB 2: 547b.

I tentatively propose a connection with Russ. *grab* 'hornbeam', Lith. *skruóblas* 'hornbeam', *skirpstas* 'elm', Lat. *carpinus* 'hornbeam', etc.; perhaps also Hitt. ^{GIS}*karpina-* 'a kind of tree' (see P. Friedrich 1970: 99-106; P. Friedrich apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 273; Schrijver 1991: 430). If Lith. *skirpstas* 'elm' is indeed related, it can help to elucidate the semantic shift seen in the Armenian, cf. Slav. **bersto-* 'elm' and Arm. *bart-i* 'poplar/aspen' (q.v.) from PIE **b^hrHg-* 'birch'.

In view of anomalous correspondences and limited spread, this tree-name may be of substratum origin.

Alternatively, Arm. *karb* can be linked with Hitt. ^{GIS}*haraw-* 'poplar, aspen' (on which see Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 636, with refer.). This is semantically better, but formally very difficult.

kardam 'to shout, call, recite loudly' (Bible+), 'to read' (Łazar P'arpec'i+).

●**DIAL** Widespread in dialects, in the meanings 'to read' and 'to learn' [HAB 2: 549b]. Note Łarabať *kárt'a/il* 1. 'to sing (said of birds)' [HAB 2: 549b]; 2. 'to sing a religious song for magic purpose'; cf. **ganj kardal*: *hanc'u sadanan hürt'ävə tūs kya/k'yinā*: "so that the Satan goes away through the roof-window" [HŽHek' 7, 1979: 359]; 3. 'to recite a magic spell to revive a dead man /"without a paper"/' [HŽHek' 5, 1966: 372, 374].

Airtial *g'ard'al* 'to read', *g'ard'alu* (Pol.), *kardal* (Hung.) 'to sing' [Ačāryan 1953: 272]. This is interesting with respect to 'sing' : 'dance'. For bird-singing see also Srvanjtyanc' 1, 1978: 259.

●**ETYM** Meillet (1896: 150) compares with Pr. *gerdaut* 'dire'. Hübschmann (1897: 458) adds Lith. *gĩrsti* 'vernehmen' and *girdėti* 'to hear', but treats the etymology as uncertain. Ačāryan (HAB 2: 549) points out that OLith. *gerdas* 'rumour, prank, messenger' and other cognates corroborate the etymology. Nevertheless, Klingenschmitt (1982: 105) still considers *kardam* as etymologically unclear referring to Hübschmann.

We are dealing with PIE **g^w(e)rH-* 'to praise; to sing; to shout, recite': Skt. *gar* 'to praise, to honour, to welcome' (RV+), *gĩr-* f. 'song of praise, invocation' (RV+), OAv. *gar-* f. 'song of praise', Lith. *giriu*, *gyriau*, *gĩrti* 'to praise, boast', etc. Arm. *kardam* probably derives from **g^wrH-d^hh₁-*, cf. Skt. *gĩró dhā-*, OAv. *garō dā-* 'to offer songs of praise', Celtic **bar-do-* 'poet' [Watkins 1995: 117].

Łarabať - Airtial; if the meaning 'to sing' is directly comparable to the IE cognates, one should treat this as a semantic archaism preserved in Łarabať and Airtial rather than a shared innovation.

kart' *i*-stem 'fish-hook; leg'.

Bible+. It corresponds to Gr. *σκέλος* 'leg' in Leviticus 11.21 (in Zōhrapēan edition: 11.31): *Ayl zayn utic'ēk' i zeṛnoc' t'ṛč'noc' or gnayc'en i č'ors, oroy ic'en kart'k' i veroy k'an zotsn, ostostel nok'ōk' yerkrē*. For this contextual meaning of the Greek word see Wevers 1997: 150. Arm. *kart'* probably functions here as 'a hook-like projection on the legs of birds or insects'. Later (Gregory of Nyssa, Ephrem, etc.): 'tendons of the leg; leg, shank'. This meaning is also supported by Georgian *k'art'i*, *k'arsi* 'tendon; calf of leg', which is considered an Armenian loan (see HAB 2: 550b).

●DIAL Preserved in the dialect of Ozim: *kart'* 'fish-hook' [HAB 2: 550b].

●ETYM Since Lidén (1906: 36-38), treated as a **-ti-* formation of the verbal root **ger-b-*, cf. Lith *garbana*, *garbanà* 'Haarlocke', Russ. *gorb* 'hump', dial. 'back', *górbit'* 'to arch, hunch, become bent', Czech *hrb* 'hump, mound, lump', Sln. *grb* m., *grba* f. 'hump; back; wrinkle', OHG *krampf* 'Haken, Krallen, Krapfen, Widerhaken', etc., thus: **gr(b)-ti-* > Arm. **kar(p)t'i-* > *kart'*, *i*-stem; see also HAB 2: 550; Ĵahukyan 1987: 125 (next to *keṛ* and **koṛ* 'curved', q.v.); Pokorny 1959: 387; Fraenkel 1, 1962: 135; Olsen 1999: 81. On Slavic forms and their connection with Ic. *korpa* 'wrinkle, fold' etc. see ÈtimSlovSlavJaz 7, 1980: 187-200. See also s.v. *krt'unk'* 'back'.

On the reflex of the consonant cluster see 2.1.22.13.

karič, *a*-stem: GDSg *karč-i*, GDPl *karč-a-c'*, IPl *karč-a-w-k'* (Bible+) 'scorpion' (Bible+), 'the zodiacal constellation Scorpio' (Ezrik Kotbac'i, Hexaemeron, Nonnus).

●DIAL Widespread in dialects. Łarabał *kāri/ēč* (see also Davt'yan 1966: 392) refers also to 'crayfish' [HAB 2: 551b]. For the distribution of synonymous *karič* and *kor* see 1.8.

●ETYM According to Ačāryan (HAB 2: 551; 1937: 4), borrowed from a language of Asia Minor, cf. Gr. *καρίς*, *-ίδος*, *-ῖδος* (also *κουρίς*, *κωρίς*) f., probably a general term for small crustaceans, incl. shrimp (Crangon) and prawn (Palaemon); cf. the meaning 'crayfish' in Arm. dialect of Łarabał. For the semantics cf. Arab. '*aqrab* 'scorpion': '*aqrab-al-ma* 'crayfish' = 'water-scorpion', Lat. *nepa* 'scorpion; crayfish', etc. (Ačāryan ibid.). The etymology is accepted by Meillet (letter from 08.12.1930 to Ačāryan, see HAB 2: 551b). Arm. *č* is probably from **-dž-* (see Ĵahukyan 1978: 128-129; 1982: 64).

Olsen (1999: 939, cf. 462) places *karič* in her list of words of unknown origin not mentioning any etymological suggestion.

Bearing in mind that Gr. *καρίς*, *-ίριδος* is feminine, and Arm. *karič* has *a*-stem, as well as that Arm. *-č-*, in view of Gr. *-δ-*, points to **-d̥i-*, one can reconstruct PArm. fem. **karid-jech₂-*. For the structure compare another Mediterranean insect/bogy-name: **mormon-* (cf. Gr. *Μορμών*, *-όνος* f. ‘she-monster, bogy’) > Arm. dial. **mormonj* ‘ant’ < **mormon-jech₂-*, next to *morm* ‘tarantula’: Gr. *Μορμω* ‘bogy, bugbear’ etc. See s.v. *morm* ‘tarantula’ and 3.5.2.1.

See also s.v. *kor*. For *a/o* fluctuation in animal-names of non-IE origin see par. 2.1.3.

karkut, *i*-stem: GDSg *karkt-i*, ISg *karkt-i-w* (Bible+); later *o*-stem: ISg *karkt-o-v* in Nersēs Lambronac’i (12th cent.) ‘hail’; verbal *karkt-č’-em* (Philo).

● **DIAL** Dialectally ubiquitous. On Aslanbek *gargünd* see below.

● **ETYM** Since Klaproth (1831: 101b), connected with OCS *gradъ* ‘hail’, SCr. *grād* ‘id.’, Lith. *gruodas* ‘frozen dirt or earth’, Lat. *grandō*, *-inis* f. ‘hail, hail-storm’, etc.

Tervišeian (see HAB) and Meillet (1898: 280) independently interpreted the Armenian form from reduplicated **ka-krut* < **ga-grōdo-* (cf. *mamul* etc., see 2.3.2), through regular metathesis. This is largely accepted, see HAB 2: 556a; Pokorny 1959: 406; Ĵahukyan (1987: 126, from **gə-grōdo-*). Hübschmann (1899: 48) is sceptical about **ka-krut* > *karkut* for unspecified reasons. Rasmussen (1999: 153-154) assumes **gr-grōhd-i-* > **kar-k(r)ut-i*, through dissimilation rather than metathesis.

The PIE root is reconstructed with an internal laryngeal: **groHd-* or **greh₃d-*; the Latin may be derived from **grH-n-d-* or **greh₂-n-d-*, with a nasal infix [Schrijver 1991: 223]. Rasmussen (1999: 153) assumes **grād-n-*.

The root structure with two voiced stops is impossible in PIE. In this particular case this restriction is perhaps invalid since we may be dealing with an onomatopoeia. One can also consider the following alternative. Skt. *hrādūni*- f. ‘hail-stones, hail’ (RV+), Sogd. *žyδn* ‘hail’, etc. are formally problematic. If related, they point to **g^hroHd-* or **g^hreh₃d-*. The initial **g^h-* would be depalatalized due to the following **r* as in *mawru-k* ‘beard’ and Lith. *smākras*, *smakra* ‘chin’ vs. Skt. *śmāśru-* n. ‘beard’ (see s.v.). The only remaining problem is that an IE **g^h* would yield Arm. *g*. Neither this obstacle is crucial, however. The root of the structure **g^h...d-* might yield **g...d-* in Armenian through assimilation, cf. e.g. Arm. *kacan* ‘path’: Skt. *gāhate* ‘to wade in’, SCr. *gāziti* ‘to step, trample, wade’, etc. Besides, a reduplicated word in the meaning ‘hail’, even if not originally onomatopoeic, could

be realized as such, and *k...t* should not be considered problematic; compare also Arm. onomatopoeic *k(n)t-nt-oc* ‘plectrum, fiddlestick’ (Philo, Gregory of Nyssa, Yovhannēs Draxanakertc’i, etc.; see HAB 2: 611a), dial. *kt-kt-* (see Amatuni 1912: 376a; Ačārean 1913: 619a; Malxaseanc’, HayBac’Bar 2: 497b; Aṭayan 1976, 1:769) and **kt-kut-* (HayLezBrbBar 3, 2004: 180-181) ‘sound of intensive beating’.

Aslanbek *gargünd* with *-n-* is reminiscent of the Latin form. Ačāryan (HAB 2: 556b) considers the resemblance accidental and explains the Aslanbek form through folk-etymological association with *gund* ‘ball’.

Any relation with Pers. *tegarg* ‘hail’? One wonders if it can be derived from Arm. **t’ak-kark(ut)*, an unattested compound with *t’ak* ‘beat’; cf. Łarabaṭ **karkt-a-t’ak*, **karkut t’akel*, etc. (see Ačārean 1913: 558a), with reversed order of the same components.

ket, *o*-stem: GDSg *ket-o-y*, ISg *ket-o-v* (Bible+). Later: IPl *ket-ō-k* (Sargis Šnorhali /12th cent./ and "Taṭaran"), which formally presupposes *a*-stem (*-a-w-k*) ‘wound, sore, ulcer’ (Bible+); **ketem** ‘to torment, torture, afflict’ (Bible+); renders Gr. *κατοδυνάω* ‘to afflict grievously’ in Exodus 1.14; **ket-ek’-em** ‘to tear, rend’ (Bible+); renders Gr. *διασπάω* ‘to tear asunder’ in Hosea 13.8.

In Deuteronomy 28.27 (Cox 1981: 184): *harc’ē zk’ez t[ē]r ketov egiptac’ocn* : *πατάξαι σε κύριος ἐν ἔλκει Αἰγυπτίου*. Arm. *ket* renders Gr. *ἔλκος* ‘wound; sore, ulcer’.

The compound *č’ar-a-ket* is mentioned in P’awstos Buzand 4.13 (1883=1984: 95^{L-15f}) as synonymous to *žant* : *Ew sksaw hatanel zor č’arakeṭn immn koč’en, isk kēsk’n žand anuanēn; elanēr i veray mardkann ew anasnoc’n* "What some call evil pustules and other plague began to strike, and they appeared on men and beasts"; translated by Garsoïan (1989: 138).

For *-ek’-* Ačāryan (HAB 2: 567b) compares *barek’-* (< *bari* ‘good’ + *-ak’-*) and *armat-ak’-i* (with *armat* ‘root’). Note especially *bot-ok’-em* ‘to complain’, *ot-ok’-em* ‘to supplicate’.

●**DIAL** According to Ačāryan (HAB 2: 567b), preserved in Łarabaṭ *kəet* ‘the outer hard part of a wound’, *kəṭ-ə-kalel* ‘to become covered with *ket*’. [No relation with *ketew* ‘cortex, shell’? Note the explanation of *ket* as *xatawart ketewawor* in NHB 1: 1081a].

●**ETYM** Since Meillet (1894: 165; 1894b: 283), connected with Lith. *gėlti* ‘to hurt severely’, *gėla* ‘acute pain’, *gelonis* ‘der verhärtete Eiter im Geschwür’, Russ. *žal’* ‘pity’, Czech *žal* ‘grief, pain’, OHG *quēlan* ‘Schmerz empfinden, leiden’, OS *quāla* ‘pain, torture’, etc. [Hübschmann 1897: 459; Pokorny 1959: 471]; cf. also, perhaps,

Gr. βέλος, -εος n. 'missile, *especially* arrow, dart; weapon; the sting of a scorpion', βέλεμνον 'arrow, javelin', βελόνη 'needle', βλήμα 'throw, throwing weapon; wound', βάλλω 'to throw, hit', etc. [HAB 2: 567b; Toporov, PrJaz 2, 1979: 142-145, 335-336].

Lith. *gėlti* points to a laryngeal after *-l-. If the Greek forms are related, one assumes *g^welh₁- 'hit by throwing'. For the semantic development 'to hit, strike' > 'wound' see s.v.v. *xayt'*, *xit'*, etc. Note also *hatanem* 'to strike', pertaining to č'ar-a-keṭ in the above-mentioned passage from P'awstos Buzand 4.13.

Arm. *keṭ*, o-stem, may be derived from IE s-stem neuter, cf. Gr. βέλος, -εος. If from *-lh₁- one expects Arm. *l* rather than *t*, one may explain the -*t*- as analogical after the verb *keṭem* from a nasal present *g^wel-n-H-, cf. Ion.-Att. βάλλω and Arc. δέλλω, with geminate -λλ-. (For *-ln- > Arm. -*t*- see 2.1.22.8). See also Olsen 1999: 52.

According to Jahukyan (1963a: 91; 1967: 197; 1982: 60 [misprinted as *keter*]; 1987: 128 [with a question-mark]), **keterj* 'complaint, grievance, pain' (q.v.) belongs here too. For the semantics he compares Russ. *žaloba* 'complaint, grievance' vs. *žaleť* 'to begrudge, pity' and *žalit'* 'to bite, sting'. If indeed related, *keṭ-erj* may be derived from *g^welH-r-i(h₂)- or *-r-*ieh₂*-.

For the meaning of Łarabaṭ *kəṭ* 'the outer hard part of a wound' cf. Lith. *gelonis* 'der verhärtete Eiter im Geschwür'.

The absence of the palatalization of the initial velar in Armenian, however, makes the etymology problematic. Jahukyan (1982: 59-60), however, considers the palatalization of *g and *k to be facultative.

Earlier attempts treating *keṭ* as borrowed from Gr. κήλη, Att. κάλη 'tumour, *especially* rupture, hernia; hump' are rightly rejected by Ačāryan (HAB 2: 567b). A word which is richly attested in a variety of forms (*keṭ-ek*-, **keṭ-erj*, etc.) and has been preserved in an extremely eastern dialect can hardly be a Greek loan.

***keṭ** 'crooked'.

Only in the compound *keṭ-a-karc* 'doubtful', attested in Yovhannēs Ōjneg'i (8th cent.) onwards. Spelled also as *kaṭ-a-karc*.

●**ETYM** According to NHB (1:1081b), *keṭ-a-karc*, *kaṭ-a-karc* is composed of *kaṭ* 'lame' (cf. *xet* 'mutilated, lame, crooked') and *karc* 'opinion, supposition': *xet kam kaṭ karceōk*. Basically the same is assumed by Ačāryan (HAB 2: 490-491), who treats the compound as containing **keṭ* 'crooked', identic with *kaṭ* 'lame' and etymologically perhaps related with *xet* and *šet* (see s.v.v.), and *karc*. For the vocalic difference he mentions Georg. *k'eli* 'lame' which he takes as a loan from Armenian

kať 'lame' and **keť* 'crooked'. Viredaz (2003: 64₂₂) does not mention this view. He points out that the first element of the component is of unknown meaning, and questions: "cf. *keťc* 'false'?"

Pedersen (1906: 379 = 1982: 157), with reservation, identifies **keť* with the PIE word for 'two' with the sound change **dw-* > *k-*. This is accepted by Kortlandt (2003: 92, 95) who restores **dweł-*. However, there is no trace of Arm. **keť* 'two' or 'double' elsewhere, and PIE **dweł-* is not confirmed by any cognate form. The "internal" etymology (NHB, Ačarian), therefore, seems preferable.

See also s.v. *erku* 'two' and 2.1.22.6.

[Any relation with NPers. *kul* 'crooked' (cf. Hübschmann 1897: 457)? The latter is now connected with Skt. *kr̥dhu-* 'mutilated, short, small' etc., see Mayrhofer, EWAia 1, 1992: 393].

***keterj** probably 'complaint, grievance, pain': only in *keterj-akan*, which is frequent in Grigor Magistros (11th cent.).

●**ETYM** See s.v. *keť* 'wound, sore'.

***keč'i** 'birch'.

As a dialectal word in DialAdd apud NHB 2: 1064a. In Galen, *keci/keč'i* corresponds to Gr. *λαρίξ* 'larch, Larix europaea; Venice turpentine; coagulum' (see Ališan 1895: 310; Greppin 1985: 69).

●**DIAL** Ararat, Lori, Łarabať (*kič'i*), Širak, Muš [Amatuni 1912: 337b; Ačarian 1913: 563b]. See also Ališan 1895: 310 (also *keci*).

●**ETYM** Ĵahukyan (1987: 296, cf. 264) considers **keč'i* to be a loan from a Finno-Ugric source, cf. Finn. dial. *kaski* 'offshoot of birch', Carel. *kaški* 'birch', Udmurt. *kyž-*, etc. This is uncertain, though perhaps not impossible.

I alternatively propose a derivation from PIE **g^wetu-* 'resin': Skt. *jatū-* n. 'lac, gum', NPers. dial. *žad* 'gum', Pashto *žāwla* 'resin', Lat. *bitūmen* (< dial.) 'a kind of mineral pitch found in Palestine and Babylon', PWGm. **k^weđu-*: OEngl. *cwidu* 'resin', Germ. *Kitt*, etc. (see Pokorny 1959: 480; Mayrhofer, EWAia 1, 1992: 565; Mallory/Adams 1997: 500a), and especially OIr. *beithe* 'box-tree' [Kelly 1976: 115] < **betujā*, MWelsh *bedw* 'birches' < **betūa* < **betujā* (Pokorny ibid.; Schrijver 1995: 326), Welsh *bedwen*, Breton *bezvenu* 'birch', Lat. (< Gaul.) *bētul(l)a* 'birch', Alb. *bléteze* (meaning?) (see P. Friedrich 1970: 149).

Arm. **keč'-i* may derive from QIE **g^wet(u)-jēh₂-*, cf. the Celtic form. For **-tj-* Arm. **-č'-* see 2.1.22.1; for the absence of palatalization of the initial labiovelar - 2.1.14. The Armenian form is close to the Celtic both formally and semantically.

Compare also *kiw* ‘tree pitch, mastic, chewing-gum’ which too 1) comes from an old **u*-stem; 2) belongs to the same semantic sphere; 3) is related with Celtic (and Slavic) closely (see s.v.).

Sasun *ǰedu* ‘pitch produced on the stalk of a thorny plant called *pʰšagaz* which is gathered, dried and used as glue’ [Petoyan 1954: 154; 1965: 519] may be a recent borrowing from Persian (see above) or Kurdish.

[Any relation with Finno-Ugrian **kečje* or **kăč3* ‘juniper’ (on which see Campbell 1990: 155)?].

keṛ ‘curved, crooked’, in MArm.; cf. also *ki-a-cag* ‘with curved edge (of a beak)’ in Grigor Narekac’i, and *ki-a-poz* ‘with curved horns’ in Grigor Magistros), etc. [HAB 2: 574a], which presuppose **kiṛ* or **kuṛ*.

●**DIAL** Widespread in dialects [HAB 2: 574a].

●**ETYM** See s.v. *kor* ‘curved, crooked’.

kēs, *o*-stem: GSg *kis-o-y*, GPI *kis-o-c*ʼ, LSg *i kis-um* (Eznik Koṭbac’i, 5th cent.); later also *i*-stem: GDPI *kis-i-c*ʼ (Grigor Magistros, 11th cent.). ‘half’.

Bible+.

●**DIAL** Ubiquitous in dialects. In Havarikʼ, Marāṭa, Čʼaylu: *kəṣōr* < *kēs-ōr* ‘midday’ [HAB 2: 582b; Davtʼyan 1966: 395], with a vocalic assimilation.

●**ETYM** Pedersen (1906: 398, 400 = 1982: 176, 178) derives from the PIE word for ‘two’ restoring **dwoi̯ko-*, next to **dwou̯kā-* > Arm. *koys* ‘side’. This is not accepted by Ačʼaryan (HAB 2: 582a), and the word is mostly viewed as of unknown origin [Ĵahukyan 1987: 269; 1990: 72 (sem. field Nr 13); Olsen 1999: 963]. Kortlandt (1989: 48, 50 = 2003: 92, 95) is more positive and takes the word as another case reflecting the development **dw-* > Arm. *k-* (on this see 2.1.22.6).

The semantic relationship ‘side, part, region’ : ‘half’ is possible, cf. Skt. *árdha-* ‘side, part, region’ : *ardhā-* ‘half’ (RV+). However, this etymology is improbable in view of the absence of cognate forms which would confirm the reconstruction. Furthermore, *koys* ‘side’ (q.v.) is an Iranian loan and has nothing to do with the word for ‘two’. The same perhaps holds for *kēs*, though no Iranian correspondent is indicated [Viredaz 2003: 64₂₂]. Earlier, Ĵahukyan (1967: 143) suggested a derivation from PIE **ken-* ‘to rub, scrape off’, which is impossible.

kēt₁, *i*-stem : GDSg *kit-i* in Agatʼangetos, Plato; GDPI *kit-i-c*ʼ in Dionysius Thrax and Grigor Magistros (here, in the same passage, *-kit-o-v-k*ʼ in compounds [NHB 1: 1094c]) ‘point, dot (in various senses, such as of time, appointment)’ (Agatʼangetos,

Εἰς, etc.), ‘goal, purpose’ (Philippians 3.14 = Gr. σκοπός), ‘target’ (Book of Chries), ‘centre’ (Plato), ‘odd’ (Arak’el Vardapet, 15th cent.); **kit-uac**, o-stem ‘stigma, dotted ornament’ (IPI *kituac-o-v-k* in Canticum 1.10/11: *handerj kituacovk’ arcat’oy* : μετὰ στιγμαμάτων τοῦ ἀργυρίου); **kitak** ‘canon, rule’ (Dawit’ Anyatt’); etc.

●**DIAL** Juła *ket* ‘time’ (e.g. *č’ur es kets* ‘by now’); Łarabał *kæet*, Zeyt’un, Suč’ava *ged* (the meaning is not specified; I assume ‘point, dot’; for an illustration in Łarabał see Davt’yan 1966: 395); Akn *ket* ‘obstacle’; Bulanəx *ket* ‘odd’ (cf. *kēt* ‘odd’ attested in Arak’el Vardapet, 15th cent.), in northern and eastern dialects (T’iflis, Lori, Ganjak, Łarabał, etc.) with an epenthetic *-n-*: *kent* ‘odd’; cf. also Georgian *k’ent’i* ‘odd’ etc. [HAB 2: 583b]. Nor Naxijewan **ket-ik* ‘appointed time’ (see Ačarean 1913: 565b).

●**ETYM** See s.v.v. *kēṭ₂* ‘a kind of biting fly’ and **kic-* ‘to bite’.

kēṭ₂ ‘a kind of fly that bites donkeys and cattle’.

Attested only in the fabels by Mxit’ar Goš (12-13th cent., Ganjak).

●**DIAL** Łarabał *ket* ‘a kind of fly that chases calfs’, Łarabał, Ganjak *ket anel* ‘to run away suddenly (said of calfs)’ [Ačarean 1913: 565b; HAB 2: 583b], Goris *ket* ‘a kind of fly’ and *ket anel* ‘to run away (to avoid the bite of *ket*)’ [Margaryan 1975: 411b]. For Metri, Ałayan (1974: 275b, 307) records *kēṭtil* ‘to run away swiftly’, with geminate *-tt-*, and *kæṭtil*.

Ačaryan (HAB 2: 583b) questions: “is it identic with Muš *knet* ‘biting fly’?”

M. Muradyan (1962: 210a) records Šatax *zərket’ išametu* ‘bumble-bee’ in her glossary of purely dialectal words; see also HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 409b. I think this is a compound with *kēt* ‘a biting fly’. The first member can be identified with dial. *zər* ‘rude, uncivilized’ (HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 409b), meaning also ‘step-’ in e.g. Moks *zər-bab* ‘step-father’ (which see Orbeli 2002: 222, 250). The basic meaning of the compound would be, then, something like ‘wild or fierce bumble-bee’. [Note also dial. *zī-ik* ‘male ass’ found in Malxaseanc’, HayBac’Bař 2: 38b. If this word is relevant, the compound would parallel the synonym *iš-a-metu* ‘bumble-bee’, literally ‘ass-bee’].

Next to *zərket’* one also finds dial. *zīkēc* ‘yellow bumble-bee’, with a final *-c* (Malxaseanc’, HayBac’Bař 2: 38b). Apparently, the first component is taken by Malxasyanc’ as identic with *zār* ‘yellow’ (see s.v. **deř-ez* ‘bee, bumble-bee’). Note also *kov-a-kēc* ‘a kind of bright-coloured beetle, Buprestis mariana’ (op. cit. 473b).

●**ETYM** Found and interpreted (with the dialectal material) by Ačaryan [HAB 2: 583b]. He does not mention any etymological attempt. According to Ĵahukyan, the word belongs with *kēṭ* ‘point, dot, etc.’ and **kic-* ‘to bite’ (see s.v.v.).

Note that dial. *zikēc* ‘bumble-bee’, with a final *-c*, can be seen as an interesting intermediary between *kēṭ* ‘a biting fly’ and **kic-* ‘to bite’ (unless it has been influenced by dial. **kēc* < *kayc* ‘spark’). Note also *kic* ‘an annoying insect’.

***kt-** ‘to faint, become weak, feeble’: *kt-uc’eal* ‘weak, feeble, faint’ (Bible+), ‘to faint from thirst’ (Yovhannēs Draxanakertc’i), *kt-ot* ‘feeble, weak’ (Bible+); dial. ‘to become tired’.

●**DIAL** Marāṭa *k’it’el* ‘to become tired’ (Garegin k’h. Petrosean apud Ačarean 1926: 100 and HAB 2: 584a).

●**ETYM** No acceptable etymology (see HAB 2: 584a; Ĵahukyan 1967: 301; 1987: 262).

Perhaps related with *nk’t’em* ‘to starve, faint from hunger’ (q.v.).

***kic-, kcanem**, 3sg.aor. (*e*)*kic*, imper. *kic* ‘to bite; to sting’ (Bible+), **kcem** ‘to feel sting/pain’ (Eznik Koṭbac’i, 5th cent.), ‘to torment’ (Nersēs Lambronac’i, 12th cent.), ‘to bite, sting’ (Paterica); **kic** ‘strong itching’ (Anania Širakac’i /7th cent./, etc.), ‘an annoying insect’ (ISg *kc-o-v*, see s.v. *anic*); **-kic**, as a second member of numerous compounds; **kskic** (from reduplicated **kic-kic*) ‘pain’ (Ephrem, John Chrysostom; in verbs and derivatives - Bible+); **kc-u** ‘bitter, sharp, cruel, etc.’ (Ephrem, John Chrysostom, etc.); **z-kc-im** ‘to become angry, etc.’ (Bible+); dial. **kič** ‘sting of scorpions, serpents, etc.’ in “Baṛgirk’ hayoc’”, rendering *xayt’-oc* (see Amalyan 1975: 138^{Nr45}); MArm. **kcčmt’el** ‘to pinch’ (see s.v. *čm-* ‘to squeeze, press’); dial. **čič** ‘the sting of a mosquito’; etc.

●**DIAL** **kcel* ‘to bite’ and *kc-u* ‘bitter, sharp’ are widespread in dialects. Note also Axalc’xa, Muš, Sebastia etc. **kič* ‘sting of scorpions, serpents, etc.’. The verb **kčel* is present in Axalc’xa, Hamšen, Polis, Rodost’o, Sebastia, Zeyt’un; in Nor Naxiĵewan it means ‘to burn (e.g. by cold)’; Ararat *čič* ‘the sting of a mosquito’; etc. [HAB 2: 587ab].

●**ETYM** Ačaryan (HAB 2: 587) accepts none of the numerous etymologies, including the one suggested by Scheftelowitz (1904-05, 1: 308; 2: 31) who connected with Arm. *kit-uac*, o-stem ‘stigma, dotted ornament’ (Canticum), *kitak* ‘canon, rule’ (Dawit’ Anyaṭ’) and Germanic word for ‘to tickle’: OIc. *kitla*, OHG *kizzilōn*, Engl. *kittle*, etc.; as well as with Arm. *kayc* ‘spark’, *kaytar* ‘vivid, energetic’, OIc. *heitr* ‘hot’, *hiti*, *hita* ‘heat’, Lith. *skaidrūs* ‘hell, klar’, etc. The second set of comparison

(i.e. OIc. *heitr* 'hot' etc.) is also problematic with respect to the Armenian anlaut. On the Armenian forms with *-t* see s.v. *kēṭ₁* 'point etc.'.

Arm.-Germ. **geid-* 'stechen, kitzeln' is accepted in Pokorny 1959: 356; Ĵahukyan 1965: 256; 1967: 174, 197 (with alternative etymologies); 1972: 286; 1982: 60, 61, 64; 1987: 124; Olsen 1999: 544 (who stresses *kituac* as directly derived from **kit-* < **g^(w)id-*). All of these scholars follow Scheffelowitz also in deriving Armenian *-c* from **-dy-*, which in fact, I believe, would yield *č*, for *c* one needs **ġ* or **ds*. Thus, only *čič* and *kič* fit in this explanation (cf. Ĵahukyan 1982: 59). Theoretically, the absence of palatalization in the anlaut of *kič* might be explained by dissimilatory influence of *-č*, see 2.1.14.

According to Ĵahukyan (see the references above), here belongs also *kēṭ₂* 'a kind of biting fly' (q.v.). The connection of this word with **kic-* 'to bite' makes sense at least from the semantic point of view. Note especially dial. *zi-kēc* 'bumble-bee', with a final *-c*.

In view of the formal problems (note also the root structure - with two voiced unaspirated stops) and the absence of cognates outside Armenian and Germanic, I conclude that the etymology is uncertain, though it is worth of further consideration. I would also introduce *kt-ṭ-* 'to burn with desire' (John Chrysostom, Book of Chries, Severian of Gabala) and especially *xt-ṭ(-t)-* 'to tickle' (Bible+; widespread in dialects); see s.v.v. The *-ṭ-* of these forms may be seen as a (typological, at least) match to **-l-* of OIc. *kitla* etc. 'to tickle'. As my colleague Guus Kroonen suggests me, Proto-Germanic **kit-l-* may be "a novel root based on the *cuchy cuchy* (Dutch *kiele kiele*) speech act that is performed when people are threatening to tickle someone". The words meaning 'tickle' are often of onomatopoeic origin, cf. Engl. *tickle*, Alemannic dial. *zicklen*, etc. (a metathesized form of **kit-l-*), Gr. *γαραλίζω*, etc. This phenomenon may have played a role in forming Arm. *kt-ṭ-* and, especially, *xt-ṭ-t-* (nowadays the Armenian pronounce e.g. *xəṭəṭəṭə*! when tickling the children; see s.v. **xt-iṭ*), though it cannot explain the whole group of words, to which one also may add *kayt* 'spot' : *kayc* 'spark' : *kt-(u)t-* 'to torment' (Bible, Agat'angelos, etc.; dialects of Hamšen, Łazax, etc.).

Though some formal details are not clear, the group *kēṭ* 'point, dot' : **k(i)c-* 'to bite, sting; to torment; pain; bitter, sharp' : *kayc* 'spark' : *kt-ṭ-* 'burning desire' : *kt-(u)t-* 'to torment' : *kayt-* 'vivid, energetic' : *kayt* 'mark' : PGerm. **kit-l-* 'to tickle' seems to correspond both formally and semantically the following group: *xayt* : *xayc* : **xayt-ut-* 'spot etc.' : *xt-ṭ-* 'to tickle; to excite', dial. *xut-ut* 'tickle', etc.

According to the etymology proposed by Lide'n (1934a: 1-4) and reflected in Pokorny 1959: 356 (see also Ĵahukyan 1982: 60 and 61, representing both

etymologies), Arm. **kic-* ‘to bite’ derives from PIE **geig-*: Oss. *änyezun* ‘gären’, lith. *gižti* ‘sauer werden’, *gaižus*, *gižus* ‘ranzig, bitter, mürrisch’, *gaižti* ‘bitter werden’, etc. Neither this is totally convincing. The semantics matches *kc-u* ‘bitter’. However, this is an *u*-derivation from **kic-* ‘to bite’. On the formal side cf. what has been said above on the other etymology.

If the connection of *kēt* ‘point, dot, etc.’ with the other words is not accepted, one might treat it as borrowed from the unattested Iranian **kēt*, cf. Skt. *keta-* ‘mark, sign’, *ketu-* m. ‘appearance, mark’ (RV+). Note also Arm. *kayt* (prob.) ‘mark on marble’ (hapax, 13-14th cent.). In view of the vocalism, this form, if related, may theoretically have been borrowed from Mitanni-Aryan **kait-* (cf. *éka-* ‘one’ vs. Mitanni *aika-*). See also s.v. **kit* ‘shine’ or ‘clear’.

***kit** ‘shine’ or ‘clear, limpid’: **akan-a-kit** ‘clear, limpid (of water, pearl, star, light, words, instruction)’

5th cent. onwards. E.g., in Łazar P’arpec’i (5th cent.) 1.16 (1904=1985: 27^{L14f}; transl. Thomson 1991: 62-63): *ystak ew akanakit vardapetut’iwn srboy ew aīak’elanman hayrapetin Grigori*: “the pure and limpid instruction of the holy and apostle-like patriarch Gregory”. In Movsēs Xorenac’i 1.12 (1913=1991: 39^{L1}; transl. Thomson 1978: 89): *akanakit atbiwrk’* “limpid streams”. In “Yatags vardavarin xorhrdoy” attributed to Movsēs Xorenac’i: *akanakit atberac’* [MovsXorenMaten 1865: 328^{L-1}]

●**ETYM** The compound *akan-a-kit* is taken as ‘shiny like a jewel’ and, thus, derived from *akn* in the meaning ‘jewel, gem’ [NHB 1: 22a; HAB 1: 107b; 2: 592b], whereas the synonymous *akn-a-včit* ‘clear, limpid’, attested twice in T’ovmay Arcruni /Ananun/ referring to *atbiwr* ‘spring, fountain’ (see s.v. *akn* ‘eye; jewel; source, etc.’), is considered a derivative based on ‘spring, source’ [NHB 1: 26a; HAB 1: 107b], basically meaning, thus: ‘having a limpid source/spring’. In fact, *akan-a-kit* could also be based on *akn* (oblique *akan-*, e.g. AblSg *y-akan-ē*) ‘spring, source’. Given the structural and semantic parallelism between *akan-a-kit* and *akn-a-včit*, one may interpret them as reflecting ‘limpid as a spring’.

Ačāryan (HAB 2: 592-593) assumes that **kit* means ‘shine, reflection’ and does not offer an etymological explanation. Ĵahukyan (1967: 187) suggests a connection with Skt. *śveta-* ‘white, bright’ (RV+) etc. listing **kit* among words that, according to him, show an aberrant absence of palatalization of **k̑-*, which is not convincing.

I hypothetically propose a complete parallelism between not only the compounds *akan-a-kit* and *akn-a-včit*, but also a semantic and possibly also etymological identity of their second members **kit* ‘shiny, limpid’ and *včit*, both ‘limpid’. The latter has

been treated as an Iranian loan (cf. Pahl. *vičītak* ‘chosen’), though the etymology is uncertain [HAB 4: 346b; Ĵahukyan 1987: 510, 565]; cf. also MPers. and Parth. *wcyd* ‘chosen’, Pahl. *vicītan* ‘to separate, distinguish’; see Nyberg 1974: 211a (with Arm. *včī*); Boyce 1977: 90. Theoretically, thus, the synonyms **kit* and **čit-* may be seen as unpalatalized and palatalized reflexes of a single root.

Further, note OCS *čistъ* ‘clean, pure’, Sln. *čestiti* ‘castrate, tear off’, Lith. *skýstas* ‘thin (of liquids)’, *skaistus* ‘bright’, Latv. *šķīsts* ‘liquid, thin (of fabric), clean, clear’, etc. < **(s)kid-to-*, from **skid-* ‘to split’: Lat. *scindō* ‘to split, cleave, tear apart; to separate’, etc. (see ĒtimSlovSlavJaz 4, 1977: 121-122, with lit.); cf. Skt. *vī-chitti-* f. ‘interruption, disturbance’ (KS+), Pahl. *wsstn* ‘/wisistan/’ ‘to break, split’, etc. (on the latter see also Pērikhanian 1985: 78; Hovhannisyan 1990: 261).

Alternatively, **kit* is somehow related with Skt. *keta-* ‘mark, sign’, *ketu-* m. ‘appearance, mark’ (RV+), Arm. *kayt* ‘mark on marble’ etc. (see s.v. **kic-* ‘to bite’)? Uncertain.

kic ‘together, united, conjoined’ (Bible+), ‘close, near’ (Cyril of Alexandria); ***kc'em*** ‘to join, unite’ (Bible+). Later: ***kuc*** ‘handful, two palms joined’ (Yaysmawurk'; see also dial.).

● **DIAL** The verb is present in numerous dialects. As for *kic* and *kuc*, the former has been preserved in Hamšen, ĴarabaĴ, Ĵazax, Muš, Akn, Sebastia (in Muš: *kic* 'k', a frozen plural; ĴarabaĴ has both *kic* and **kic* -k' > *kisk*), whereas the latter - in Van, Moks, Ozim, MaraĴa, Akn, Aparan, Ĵazax. All mean ‘handful, two palms joined’ [HAB 2: 596-597].

● **ETYM** Usually (Meillet, Pedersen, Kortlandt, etc.) derived from **dui-sk-* (cf. OHG *zwisk* ‘double’); for the discussion see Kortlandt 2003: 91-95; Olsen 1999: 269-271. For objections on the semantics see Viredaz 2003: 64₂₂. Discussing the counter-evidence for the development **dw-* > Arm. *-rk-*, Beekes (2003: 200) considers *kic* < **dui-sk-* “most convincing” and takes *erkic* -s ‘twice, again’ (see s.v. *erku* ‘two’) as ‘modernized’ after the new form of the word for ‘two’ (i.e. *erku*) and points out that *kic* “therefore developed a more remote meaning (from ‘*two together’)”.

The derivation from **g^wi-sk-* [Ĵahukyan 1987: 249] < PIE **g^wei-* ‘zusammendrängen, einschließen, einpferchen’ (cf. OIc. *kvīa* ‘einpferchen’ etc.) is improbable since it is semantically remote, and the status of the PIE word is uncertain. Elsewhere (op. cit. 609-610) Ĵahukyan treats *kic* as an ECAuc borrowing, cf. Tindi *кнцлв* ‘knot’ etc.

kiw, *o*-stem 'tree pitch, mastic, chewing-gum': only *ku-oy kiēz* 'pitch of *kiw*' in a medieval dictionary; **ku-eni** 'pine-tree, larch': Galen (= Gr. *πίτυς*), Geoponica, etc. [NHB 1: 1101a, 1122ab; Ališan 1895: 335; HAB 2: 597a; Greppin 1985: 90]. Since *kiēz* means 'pitch', *ku-oy kiēz* should be interpreted as "pitch of pine-tree".

● **DIAL** Axalc'xa *kiv*, Xotorjur, Hamšen *giv* 'chewing-gum'; the tree: Hamšen *gəvəni*, Trapizon **kueni* '= Turk. /*sagəz atačə*/ [Ačarean 1913: 600-601; 1947: 238, 239]; Xotorjur *kui* 'Abies excelsa, = Turk. /*sagəz atač*/ [YušamXotorj 1964: 473a], or, more precisely, *gvi* [HAB 2: 597a]. In Xotorjur, the tar of this tree is called **p'is*, q.v.

● **ETYM** Lidén (1906: 68) derived from **gieu-* 'to chew': Slav. **žvati*, Pers. *jāvīdan* 'to chew', etc. Note especially Russ. *živica* etc. 'tree pitch, soft resin' [Saradževa 1981: 162; 1986: 64] and OIr. *bī* 'tree pitch' < **g^wiū-* [Thurneysen 1937: 301-302; Pokorny 1959: 400, 482; Jahukyan 1987: 129]. The connection of Arm. *kiw* with the Slavic and the Celtic is attractive, though it is uncertain whether they all belong with **gieu-* 'to chew'. P. Friedrich and Adams (apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 500a) assume **g^wih₃yo-* 'pitch' and note: "presumably a derivative of **g^wiēh₃-* 'live' as the tree's 'living matter'".

If an old **u*-stem (**g^wiH-u-*), note synonymous PIE **g^wet-u-* 'resin', on which see s.v. **keč'-i* 'birch'.

Jahukyan (1975: 37) mentions *kiw* among cases displaying absence of palatalization of velars. If this word is indeed related with the PIE verb for 'live', the absence of palatalization might be explained by the influence of the etymologically related (or folk-etymologically associated; note Russ. *živica* 'tree pitch, soft resin' vs. *živoj* 'living') *keam* 'to live'. Alternatively: a substratum word.

***klmp/b-**

● **DIAL** Łarabał **klmbos* (jocular) 'a rich man'; Trapizon **klmpur*, Hamšen **klinpur* 'a chain hanging down from the ceiling on the hearth'; Van *klmpoz* 'beet'.

● **ETYM** These three words are recorded by Ačaryan (1913: 574a) as separate entries. Jahukyan (1972: 287-288; 1987: 124, 275) connects them to each other, as well as with dial. **kl-or* 'spheric, ball-shaped; round' (q.v.) etc. and derives from **gel-*, 'clamp, clasp'.

[Any relation with cf. Pers. *kulunba* 'almond-cake; a ball', Afgh. Pers. *kulumba* 'dicker, dickbäuchiger Mensch', etc.? (on which see Monchi-Zadeh 1990: 63, 79).

***klor** 'spheric, ball-shaped; round'

● **DIAL** [Ačarean 1913: 575a].

●**ETYM** See s.v. **k/imp/b-*; also Ĵahukyan 1985: 153; 1990: 66. Further, compare Cabolov 1, 2001: 401-402.

knjini ‘*Ulmus campestris* L.’ (according to Béguinot/Diratzouyan 1912: 37^{Nr81}).

Attested only in Hexaameron (see K. Muradyan 1984: 144^{L7}, 374b). Ališan (1895: 320) also mentions *knj-eni* ‘elm’.

●**DIAL** Ačāryan (HAB 2: 609b) does not record any dialectal forms. There is Sasun *knjini* ‘a kind of tree with hard wood’ (see Petoyan 1954: 136; 1965: 491; according to HayLezBrbBař 3, 2004: 120b, also a shrub) which, I think, may be identic with ClArm. *knjini*. The consonant shift having taken place in Sasun (see Petoyan 1954: 13, 20ff) implies, however, that Sasun *knjini*, if reliable, presupposes an older **gnj/cni*. It is uncertain whether Havarik’ *knjin* ‘the core of an acorn or a walnut’ (see HayLezBrbBař 3, 2004: 120a) is related.

●**ETYM** Ačāryan (HAB 2: 609b) does not mention any acceptable etymology.

According to Mann (1963: 156), from **uīng-*, **uīg-* ‘elm’: Lith. *vin̄ksna*, Slav. **vęzъ* (Russ. *vjazъ*, Pol. *wiąz* ‘*Ulmus campestris*’), OEngl. *wīce* ‘Bergulme’, Alb. *vidh* (< **uīngō-*) ‘elm’, Kurd. *vīz* ‘a kind of elm’ (see Pokorny 1959: 1177; P. Friedrich 1970: 82-83), perhaps also Oss. *wis-qæd* ‘maple’ (see P. Friedrich apud Mallory/Adams 1987: 178b). Ĵahukyan (1967: 270) mentions this etymology as one of the possible cases showing an irregular reflex of PIE **u*. Ĵahukyan 1987 vacat. Ališan (1895: 320₁; see also Ĵahukyan 1967: 270₁₅₇) noted the resemblance with Irish *oinsean*, *uinsean*. [What is the origin of the Irish word? From the same **uīng-*?].

On the semantics of the Ossetic form see s.v. *t’fk’i* ‘maple’ (from ‘elm’?).

A PIE **uīng-* would yield Arm. **ginc/j*. One would expect, thus, **g(i)ncni* or **g(i)njni*. Sasun *knjini* (see above), possibly from an older **gnj/cni*, is remarkable in this respect. On the whole, the etymology seems probable, though the anlaut of the Classical form remains problematic. One may assume an assimilation **ginc-* > **kinc-* with a subsequent voicing *nc* > *nj* due to the nasal, and/or by the influence of the plant-suffix *-j/z*, on which see 2.3.1.

kogi, (w)o-stem: GDSg *kogw-o-y*, ISg *kogw-o-v* (Bible+) [in NHB - also GDPl *koge-a-c*; with no evidence]

●**DIAL** No dialectal forms are recorded in HAB 2: 613a.

In a small list of dialectal words from Partizak (in the Nikomidia region) recorded by Tēr-Yakobean (1960: 472), one finds *kogi* ‘butter’ without any comment.

●**ETYM** Derived from the word for ‘cow’ [NHB 1: 1108c], see s.v. *kov* ‘cow’. From PIE adj. **g^wou-io-* (or **g^wh₃eu-io-*): Skt. *gavya-*, *gavyā-* ‘consisting of cattle’ (RV+),

YAv. *gaoiia-* ‘coming from cattle, consisting of cattle’, Gr. *-βο(ρ)ιος*, see Hübschmann 1897: 461; HAB 2: 612-613; Pokorny 1959: 483; Euler 1979: 80; cf. Bonfante 1937: 19.

***koko(v)** (dial.) ‘testicles; round; eye; walnut; etc.’, **kokov-ank** ‘testicles’ (LcNiws according to HAB 2: 618b); **kōklvin** ‘testicles’ (Physiologus).

●**DIAL** Xarberd, Polis, Rodost’o, Sebastia, Suč’ava *gɔgɔv* ‘testicles’ (pl. *kɔyvəni* [Ačārean 1913: 588a]); without the final *-v*: *gɔgɔ* ‘testicles’ (Nor Naxiĵewan), ‘eye’ and ‘walnut’ (Akn), ‘fruit’ (Sivri-Hisar), ‘cheese’ (T’iflis), ‘round’ (Xarberd) [HAB 2: 618b]. Ačāryan (HAB, *ibid.*) points out that the meaning ‘round’ is the original one, and for the semantic development compares with *kakal* and *plor* (q.v.).

The meaning ‘walnut’ is also found in: Šatax *kɔk’ɔv* [M. Muradyan 1962: 213a], Moks *kɔk’ɔv* [Orbeli 2002: 273].

●**ETYM** Ačāryan (HAB 2: 618b) considers the resemblance with Ital. *coglioni* ‘testicles’ (NHB) as accidental and leaves the origin of *kokov* open.

One may compare with Arm. *ən-koy-z* and Pers. *gōz* ‘walnut’, interpreting them as **gou-z* = **gou-* + *-z* “plant-suffix” (on the latter see 2.3.1). [See also **koč-*]. With reduplication: **go-gou-* > *kokov*. For the semantic field (cf. also Monchi-Zadeh 1990: 11-12^{Nr2}) and reduplication see s.v. **kakal(ay)* (dial.) ‘walnut; testicle’ and below;

If the absence of the final *-v* in dial. *gɔgɔ* is not due to loss, one may treat *koko-v* ‘testicles’ as from **koko* ‘round; walnut; etc.’ with the dual suffix **-v(i)*, on which see the following.

The form *kōklvin* ‘testicles’ (attested in Physiologus) may have resulted from contamination with *kakal* ‘walnut; testicles’ (q.v.). Alternatively: **koko-* (cf. *kakal*) + dual **-vi-* > **koko(l)vi-*. Note also *kl-or* ‘round’. For the semantics cf. Pahl., NPers. *gund* ‘testicle’, Xurāsānī Pers. *gond* ‘testicle’ vs. **gund-* ‘round’ (see MacKenzie 1971: 38; Monchi-Zadeh 1990: 63), cf. Arm. *Gund*.

Further, note Alb. *gogë/f.* ‘acorn; small and round object’.

See also s.v.v. *kakal*, *katin*.

kokov-an-k, *a*-stem: IPl *kokovan-a-w-k* ‘boastful/vainglorious words’.

John Chrysostom, Gregory of Nyssa, Cyril of Alexandria. Verbal **kokov-t-el** is found in “Bārgirk’ hayoc’”, glossed as *čoxabanel* ‘to speak eloquently’ [Amalyan 1975: 169^{Nr395}].

●**ETYM** No etymological attempt is recorded in HAB 2: 618b. The comparison with Skt. *svāyati* ‘to swell, become strong’ [Jahukyan 1967: 188] must be given up.

I propose to treat *kokov-* as a reduplication of **kov-* which can be connected with Skt. *gav-* 'to call, invoke, praise' (RV+), intensive *jōguve* 'to call, to announce', *jōgu-* 'singing loudly, singing songs of praise' (RV), Germ. **kawjan* 'to call', OCS *govorъ* 'noise, shout, rumour, murmur', Russ. *gōvor* 'sound of voices, talk', etc., perhaps also Gr. *γοάω* 'to groan, weep', *γόης, -ητος* m. 'sorcerer'. For the structure cf. *t'ot'ov-*.

koł, *i*-stem 'rib; side (of a mountain etc.)' (Bible+), 'spouse' (Ephrem, Vardan Arewelc'i, etc.); *a*-stem (once in the Bible: GDPl *koł-a-c'*; see NHB 1: 1111a); later *o*-stem: *ənd koł-o-y* in Zak'aria Kat'otikos (9th cent.); ***kołm** : IPl *kołambk'* (or *kołmambk'*) in Ezekiel 34.21, APl *kołun-s* in Zak'aria Kat'otikos (9th cent.); also seen in derivatives, e.g. *an-kołin* 'bed'; **kołmn**, *an*-stem: GDSg *kołman*, AblSg *kołman-ē*, NPl *kołman-k'*, GDPl *kołman-c'*, etc. 'side, region' (Bible+), 'rib-bone' (Ephrem).

In the Bible, *koł* occurs always in plural (apart from Genesis 2.22): nom. *koł-k'*, acc. *koł-s*, gen.dat. *koł-i-c'*, instr. *koł-i-w-k'* [Astuacaturean 1895: 795c]. Renders Gr. *πλευρά* 'rib, side'. Here are some of the biblical attestations.

In Genesis 2.21 (Zeyt'unyan 1985: 154): *ew ar mi i kotic' nora ew elic' ənd aynr marmīn* : *καὶ ἔλαβεν μίαν τῶν πλευρῶν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀνεπλήρωσεν σάρκα ἀντ' αὐτῆς* "and took one of his ribs and closed/filled up its place with flesh".

In Ezekiel 34.21: *kołambk'* (or *kołmambk'*) *ew usovk' jerovk' : ēpi taiṣ pleuraṣ kai taiṣ ōmois ūmōn* "with your ribs/sides and shoulders".

For *koł* 'rib, side' : *an-kołin* 'bed' cf. the passage from Proverbs 22.27: *zankotins*, or *ənd kotiwk' k'ovk' kayc'en* : *τὸ στρώμα τὸ ὑπὸ τὰς πλευράς σου* "that bed (that is) under your ribs/sides".

● **DIAL** *koł(k')* is widespread in dialects, while *ankotin* and *kołmn* are present in a few of them [HAB 1: 201a; 2: 621a, 622b]. *Ḷuṭa koł* means both 'rib' and 'side' [Ačāryan 1940: 370b; HAB 2: 622b].

Some forms of *ankotin* are without the prefix *an-*: Karin *gōtink'*, Axalc'xa *g'ōtink'*, T'iflis *gōtenk'*, Van *g'ōtvenk'*⁹. N. Simonyan (1979: 242-243) takes these to be "root" (*armatakan*) forms as opposed with the classical one. As is demonstrated already by Ačāryan (1952: 64), however, the initial voiced *g-* clearly indicates that these forms derive from **angotin-k'*, with regular voicing *-nk > -ng*, through the loss of the prefix.

Georgian *logini* 'bed' is considered an Armenian loan [HAB 1: 201], though Ačāryan does not specify the details. If this is true, the Georgian form should be derived from **gōtin* through metathesized **tōgin*. Remarkably, such a metathesis is

indeed seen in Zeyt'un (Cilicia) *utungan* 'bed-blanket' (see Ačaryan 2003: 137, 298). The borrowing must have taken place at an old stage anterior to the development */> Arm. *t*.

●**ETYM** Meillet (1911-12c: 294) connects *koṭ(mn)* with Toch. *kalymi* 'direction'. This is accepted in HAB 2: 621a; Ĵahukyan 1987: 126, 169. However, Toch. A *kälyme*, B *kälymiye* 'direction' are now derived from PIE **kli-men-*, cf. Gr. *κλίμα* n. 'inclination, region, geographical zone' [Adams 1999: 176]. If this is correct, the etymology of the Armenian must be abandoned. (Note also that *koṭmn* is compared with Gr. *κλίμα* in NHB 1: 1112b).

Olsen (1999: 91-92, 147, 506) does not mention Meillet's etymology and relates *koṭ/koṭmn* with *koṭr* 'branch' (q.v.). This is possible if one views the correspondence within the semantic relationship '(rib-)bone' : 'stem, stalk, pole'. On the *i*-stem of *koṭ* in relation with **-i/r-* paradigm see s.v. *koṭr*.

Patrubány (in HandAms 1908: 153) derives *koṭ* from PIE **gol-*: Gr. *γωλέος* 'hole', Lith. *guōlis* 'den, lair, (coll.) bed', etc. See s.v. *kataṭ* 'den, lair'. This is accepted in N. Simonyan 1979: 242-243. This contradicts to the direction of the semantic development since the meanings 'bed' and 'to lie' are clearly secondary in Armenian: *koṭ* 'rib, side' > (*ən*)*koṭnim* 'to lie down' (John Chrysostom etc.); cf. *paraṭ* 'rib, side' > *paraṭim* 'to lie down'; note also *paraṭ* 'sheepfold' from "a place to lie in" [HAB 4: 27-28]; see also s.v. *yorsays*. Thus, the etymology can be accepted only if the following is possible: PIE **gol-* 'rib', 'branch' (Arm. and Slav.) > 'a place to lie on/in' > 'bed; den, lair' (Greek etc.; also Arm.).

koṭr, no attestations are cited for GDPl *koter-c* and *koter-a-c* [NHB 1: 1113c]; the only attested form (apart from NSg *koṭr*) is APl *koter-s* in Leviticus 23.40, "Yatags vardavarin xorhrdoy" attributed to Movsēs Xorenac'i [MovsXorenMaten 1865: 330^{L1}] and Vardan Arewelc'i (13th cent.) 'branch'.

In Leviticus 23.40: *koṭers yarmaweneac* : *κάλλυνθρα φοινίκων* "branches of palm trees". Here *koṭr* renders, thus, Gr. *κάλλυνθρον* 'sweeper, duster made of palm-leaves' (cf. *κάλλυντρον* 'broom, brush'). Astuacaturean (1895: 795c) gives the entry as *koter* which is not correct. APl *koter-s* is regular for NSg *koṭr*.

In Hexaameron, homily 5 (K. Muradyan 1984: 145^{L10f}): *armatk' ew uik'*, *koṭr ew terew*, *xawaraci ew catik*, <...> : "roots and branches, *koṭr* and leaf, *xawaraci* and blossom, <...>". Here, *uik'* and *xawaraci* render Gr. *κληματίς* 'vine-branch; branch' and *βλαστός* 'offshoot', respectively, and *koṭr* has no Greek match [K. Muradyan 1984: 374-377].

●**ETYM** Meillet (1900b: 185) connected with Slavic **golъje* (cf. Russ. *gol'já* 'twig', Sln. *golje* 'twigs without leaves', etc.) assuming heteroclitic **i/r* stem from earlier **r/n*, cf. Skt. *nákti-* vs. Gr. *νύκτωρ* etc. The only problem is, as he points out, the absence of the word in other IE languages. See also HAB 2: 624b; Pokorny 1959: 403; Saradževa 1986: 60; Ĵahukyan 1987: 126. In *ÈtimSlovSlavJaz* 7, 1980: 18, the Slavic is derived from **golъ* 'naked', and the Armenian word is not mentioned.

It has been assumed that the Armenian and Slavic words are related with Arm. *koť* 'rib, side' [Olsen 1999: 147], q.v. The *i*-stem of *koť* seems to corroborate Meillet's **-i/r-*.

[Any relation with Zaza *kōlī* 'Holz, Brennholz'? (on this word see Bläsing 2000: 39).].

***koč-**: *koš-koč-em* (< **koč-koč-*) 'to beat, break' (Bible+), *koč* 'stem of cabbage' ("Yaysmawurk"), 'ankle' (Alexander Romance, Paterica, etc.), *koč(-t)* 'beam, door-post, trunk of a tree' (Bible+), *koč-ak* 'button' (Nersēs Lambronac'i; *-ēn* in the Bible) [HAB 2: 624-626, 627-628].

●**DIAL** Widespread in dialects in various meanings: 'beam', 'trunk', 'button', 'ankle', etc. [HAB 2: 626a].

●**ETYM** Ačāryan (HAB 2: 625b) treats the resemblance with Pers. *gūzak*, Kurd. *gū/ōzak* 'ankle(-bone)' (on which see Cabolov 1, 2001: 410) as accidental and leaves the origin of the word open. The Iranian forms are derived from IE **gug-*, cf. Lith. *gūžė* 'head of cabbage' (cf. Arm. 'stem of cabbage' in "Yaysmawurk"), Latv. *gūža* 'thigh, ham', etc. The Armenian form would require **go(u)g-*j*V-*, which is uncertain. [Or, perhaps, Aryan **gauj-* > **koč*, an old borrowing with consonant shift?].

If the connection is accepted, it cannot explain the whole semantic field. One needs to establish the internal etymology first. The basic meaning is 'to beat, break'. One may therefore derive **koč-* from *koc-* 'to beat', 'to lament by beating one's breast' (both Bible+) assuming a reduplicated present in *o*-grade with the present suffix **-je-* (see 2.1.22.1 and 2.2.6.1).

koyš, *a*-stem 'side'.

Bible+.

●**DIAL** Ĵuṭa *kus* (cf. *nes-kus* < *ners koyš*) 'inside', Ĵarabaṭ *kūs*, Šamaxi *gūs*, Ĵzlar *gus* (cf. *min gus* 'aside'); also in T'iflis, only in a proverb [HAB 2: 630b].

According to Ačāryan (HAB), Ĵarabaṭ *kūs* is found only in the following pronouns: *es-kūs* 'this side' (< *ays koyš*), *en-gūs* 'that side' (*-nk-* > *-ng-*), *maš-k'ūs* 'inside' (**mēj-koyš*: *-jk-* > *-šk-*). Several illustrations from folklore show, however,

that *kūs* does exist independently; cf. *bates č'ors kyüsə vart' a* "in the four sides of my garden there is rose" [Grigoryan-Spandaryan 1971: 15^{Nr26}]. Other attestations: *č'ork' kyüsə* "the four sides" (op. cit. 15^{Nr29}, 58^{Nr305}), *čors kyüsän* "from the four sides" (427b^{Nr372}), *sarin kyüsə* "at the side of the mountain" (92⁵²⁷), *en kyüsümə* "at that side" (401b^{Nr51}).

Textual illustrations for *mač'-kyüs* 'inside': HŽHek' 6, 1973: 220^{L-14}, 693^{L2}, glossed in 761b; HŽHek' 7, 1979: 732a; Łaziyan 1983: 12a^{L-13}, 108b^{L-4}; L. Harut'yunyan 1991: 94^{L6}, 213^{L-1}. One also finds *tyus kus-an* "from outside" [Łaziyan 1983: 61b^{L-2}].

Łarabat and Šatax-Xcaberd *kūs* is recorded also by Davt'yan (1966: 399).

●**ETYM** Pedersen (1906: 398, 400 = 1982: 176, 178) derives from the PIE word for 'two' restoring **dwoukā-*, next to **dwoikō-* > *kēs* 'half'. This etymology is not accepted by Meillet (1908/09: 353) and Ačaryan (HAB 2: 630b). Kortlandt (1989: 48, 50 = 2003: 92, 95) is more positive and takes the word as another case reflecting the development **dw-* > Arm. *k-* (on this see 2.1.22.6).

However, *koys* is an Iranian borrowing, cf. Parth. *kws* [*kōs*] 'district, region, countryside' (see Nyberg 1974: 121b; Boyce 1977: 53), Sogd. *kws* 'side', etc.; see HAB 2: 630b (though Ačaryan does not accept); Benveniste 1945: 73-74; Russell 1980: 107 (= 2004: 1); Ĵahukyan 1987: 574 (though not included into the list of Iranian loans); 1995: 184; Hovhannisyan 1988: 132; 1990: 244-245, 266c; Olsen 1999: 888; Viredaz 2003: 64₂₂. See also s.v. *kēs* 'half'.

koč'em 'to call, invite, invoke'; to name' (Bible+); **koč'** 'call, invitation' (Łazar P'arpec'i, Movsēs Xorenac'i, Philo, John Chrysostom, etc.).

●**DIAL** Only in a few derivatives [HAB 2: 635b].

●**ETYM** Lidén (1906: 68-70) derives from **g^wot-j-*, connecting with PGerm. **kweþan* 'to say, speak, call, name': Goth. *qīþan*, Olc. *kveða*, OEngl. *cweþan*, etc. He (op. cit. 69) is sceptical about the appurtenance of Skt. *gādātī* 'to speak articulately, say, relate, tell' < **gad-*. Meillet (1936: 108; 1950: 110) accepts the connection and posits a **je*-present: **g^wot-je-* > *koč'em* (see 2.1.22.1 and 2.2.6.1).

Ačaryan (HAB 2: 635) rejects the etymology and treats Arm. *koč'em* as an onomatopoeic word comprising the elements *k-* and *-č'*, cf. *kanč'*, *ka(r)kač'* (q.v.), etc. However, the onomatopoeic character of a word should not automatically exclude the possibility of internal comparison.

The etymology is overall accepted [Pokorny 1959: 480-481; Ĵahukyan 1975: 38; 1982: 62, 171; Greppin 1993: 16, 19; Kortlandt 1994: 27 = 2003: 104]. The appurtenance of the Sanskrit, though accepted by Pokorny and Ĵahukyan, is

uncertain [Mayrhofer, EWAia 1, 1992: 460] or unacceptable [Greppin 1993: 22₈]; one expects **gātati*. Olsen (1999: 811) takes *koč'em* as the only serious example for **-tj-* > *-č'-* and treats it as influenced by *goč'em* 'to shout' < **uok^wje-*. For **-tj-* > *-č'-* see 2.1.22.1, however.

The noun *koč'* is "eine postverbale Bildung" (Lidén 1906: 68).

kov, *u*-stem: GDPl *kov-u-c'* 'cow' (Bible+).

● **DIAL** Dialectally ubiquitous [HAB 2: 639b].

● **ETYM** Since long, connected with Skt. *gāuḥ*, acc. *gām*, DSg *gāve*, GPI *gāvām/gónām*, etc. 'cow, bull' (RV+), Gr. *βοῦς* f.m., ASg *βῶν*, GSg *βοφός* 'bovid, cow, bull, ox', Lat. *bōs*, gen. *bovis* (a loan from an Italic language, see Schrijver 1991: 447), Latv. *gūovs* 'cow', OCS *govъ-do*, etc. [Hübschmann 1897: 461; HAB 2: 639; Pokorny 1959: 482].

The PIE form has been interpreted as PD *u*-stem [Kuiper 1942: 32-33; Beekes 1973a: 240], and the root may have been **g^weh₃-* seen in Gr. *βόσχω* 'to graze', *βοτόν* 'head of cattle'; thus: nom. **g^weh₃-u-s*, gen. **g^wh₃-eu-s* [Lubotsky 1990: 133-134; Schrijver 1991: 447; Nassivera 2000: 57]. For references to discussion of the paradigm, particularly of the accusative form, see s.v. **ti-* 'day'. The oblique stem **g^wh₃-eu-* explains Skt. *gav-V-*, Gr. *βοφ-*, etc., as well as Arm. *kov*: *kog-i* (q.v.).

The PArm. paradigm may have been: nom. **kuw*, obl. **kow-* > **kog-*. The shortening of the vowel of **kuw* to *-o-* is perhaps an inner-Armenian development (note the absence of ClArm. words ending in *-uw*), unless one assumes an influence from obl. **kow-*.

kovadiac' (Leviticus 11.30), ***kovidiac'*** (Commentary on Leviticus), 'a kind of lizard'; according to NHB 1: 1117b: = *dōdōš* etc. 'toad'; also dial. 'toad'.

In Leviticus 11.30, *kovadiac'* and *mo/utez* render Gr. *καλαβώτης* 'spotted lizard, gecko' and *σαύρα* f. 'lizard' (see Wevers 1997: 154), respectively.

In later literature (Nonnus, Galen) and dialects replaced by *kov(a)cuc* 'a kind of lizard', composed of *kov* 'cow' and *cuc* 'sucking'. In Amirdovlat' Amasiac'i (15th cent.), *kovrcuc* (with an epenthetic *-r-*), as equivalent to Turk. *k'art'ank'alay* and Pers. *sōsmar* (see Basmajean 1926: 511, Nr 3035). See below, on dialects.

● **DIAL** In dialects, replaced by *kov(a)cuc* (see above): Axalc'xa and Nikomidia-region **kov-cuc*, Muš **kov-cc-uk*, Arabkir **korcuc* 'a large greenish lizard, toad'; Karin 'a kind of harmful animal' [Ačarean 1913: 596a], Sasun *govvuj* 'a green lizard which is supposed to give poison to the snake' [Petoyan 1954: 113; 1965: 457]. In Turkish-Armenian dictionary (c. 1720 AD) by Etia Mušet'yan

Karnec'i (Karin/Xotorjūr): *k'alt'ank'araz yēšil · kōvcuc, salamandr* [Č'ugaszyan 1986: 85^{Nr36}].

According to Bläsing (1992: 50), Turkish dialect of Hamšen *govćuc* 'a kind of salamander' is borrowed from WArm. *govajuj*. A corresponding form in Arm. Hamšen, viz. *gōvjūd* 'green lizard', is recorded in Ačāryan 1947: 261. The final *-d* of the Hamšen form is printed in bold type (see s.v. *tūt* on this).

In Xotorjūr: *kopcuc* 'green lizard' [YušamXotorj 1964: 472a; HayLezBrbBař 3: 2004: 150a].

The form with an epenthetic *-r-*, viz. *kovrcuc*, is recorded in NHB 1: 1117b as a dialectal counterpart to *kov(a)cuc* and *kovadiac* 'a lizard'. Sebastia *kovrcuc*, with a "parasitic" *-r-*, as is pointed out by Gabikēan (1952: 311); Xarberd, Partizak **kovīcuc* [HayLezBrbBař 3, 2004: 154b]. Dersim *gōvāřijuj* 'a big lizard' [Bařramyan 1960: 125a]. For this form, Bařramyan (ibid.) records also a second meaning described as follows: *mi karič, kanač' motes* "a scorpion, green lizard". If this is reliable, Dersim *gōvāřijuj* denotes, thus, 'toad' and 'scorpion'.

According to Sargisean (1932: 457), Balu **kovrcuc* denotes a large poisonous lizard that jumps onto a human face and will not go away until seven buffaloes bellow. This is reminiscent of the folk-belief recorded in Łarabať on **ēš-xīanĵ* 'a poisonous insect' (see 3.5.2.5). The description seems to corroborate the meaning 'toad'. [See also Martirosyan/Łaragyozyan FW 2003 Łarabať, on jumping *kērnək'ala* 'toad'].

They say, as Sargisean (ibid.) informs, that the snake takes his poison from **kovrcuc*. Compare Sasun above. See 3.5.2.7 on this.

Arabkir **korcuc*, if reliable, derives from **kovrcuc* with loss of *-v-*.

The form **kov-r-cuc* is found, thus, in a small group of adjacent dialects: Sebastia, Partizak (migrated from the province of Sebastia beg. 17th cent., see Tēr-Yakobean 1960: 16), Arabkir, Dersim, Xarberd, Balu. It is no surprising that the form is used by Amirdovlat' Amasiac'i (15th cent.), native of Amasia, which is very close to Sebastia.

●**ETYM** A derivative of *kov* 'cow', q.v.

The compound is closely associated with Skt. *godhā-* f. 'Iguana, a species of big lizard' (RV) < '*cow milker/sucker', which has been compared with Lat. *būfō* 'toad' (see Lüders 1942: 44 = 1973: 511; Specht 1944; Mayrhofer, EWAia, s.v.). The appurtenance of Russ. *žāba* 'toad' etc. is uncertain. Compare e.g. Xurāsānī Pers. *boččoš* (= preverb *bi* + *čōš-* 'Sauger') 'eine Art Eidechse, die nach dem Volksglauben nachts in die Hürden schleicht und den Ziegen am Euter saugt'; see Monchi-Zadeh 1990: 45-46, mentioning the Sanskrit and Armenaia words, as well

as some parallels from other languages of the pattern ‘goat biter/sucker’ > ‘a kind of lizard’.

On semantic parallels and corresponding folk-beliefs see 3.5.2.7.

Arm. *kovadiac* ‘may reflect an older **kov-di-a-* < QIE **g^wou-d^heh₁-eh₂-* (cf. Skt. *godhā-* f.), reshaped after the most productive model of compounds, that with the conjunction *-a-*. One may also treat the Armenian and Sanskrit as independent, parallel creations, though this seems less probable. For the typology of *-ac* ‘cf. **di-ac* ‘see also in other compounds, perhaps also Arm. dial. **(x)m-ac-ōj*, from the same semantic sphere (see 3.5.2.7).

kor ‘curved, crooked’

Bible+. Perhaps also ***kur** ‘id.’ (see s.v. *keř*), and **korč** ‘curved, crooked, rough’ (Grammarians).

● **DIAL** **koř*, with final *-ř*, in several dialects [HAB 2: 645a].

● **ETYM** Ačāryan (HAB 2: 574a, 644-645) connects with *keř* ‘curved, crooked’ (q.v.) rejecting all the external comparisons, including that with Gr. *γῦρός* ‘round, curved’, *γῦρος* m. ‘rounding, circle’. One is more positive about the latter comparison, for Armenian positing **gou-e/oro-* [Pokorny 1959: 397; Ĵahukyan 1987: 126, 169] or **gouh₁-ro-* [Olsen 1999: 199]. For **gouh₁-ro-* > PArm. **kouəro-* > **ko(w)oro-* > *kor* see 2.1.33.1.

Ačayan (1974: 105-106) derives *keř*, *kor* and dial. *koř* from QIE **ger-s-* (cf. OHG kresan ‘to creep, crawl’ etc.; for the root see s.v. *kart* ‘fish-hook’). Ĵahukyan (1987: 125) accepts this etymology of *keř* and **koř*, but separates *kur* from these (see above). However, the Germanic cognates are remote both formally and semantically.

Uncertain. See also s.v.v. *kart* ‘fish-hook’, *kit* ‘unk’ ‘back’, etc.

See also s.v.v. *kor(č)* ‘scorpion’ and *korč* ‘vulture’.

kor, *i-* or *a-*stem: GDSg *kor-i* (Anania Širakac’i, 7th century); *u-*stem: GDSg *kor-u* (Amirdovlat’ Amasiac’i, 15th cent.); AblSg *i kor-ē* (Geoponica, 13th cent.) can belong to any of these stems: ‘scorpion’

NHB (2: 1118b) has it as a dialectal word and refers only to Geoponica (13th cent.). Ačāryan (HAB 2: 643b) cites also Fables by Vardan Aygekc’i (12-13th cent., Tluk’, Cilicia), and Anania Širakac’i (7th cent., Širak) noting that the corresponding parts of the latter seem to have been added later.

In MiĵHayBař 1, 1987: 407b one finds passages for *kor* from Geoponica (13th cent.) and Amirdovlat’ Amasiac’i (15th cent., Amasia); on the latter see also S. Vardandjan 1990: 193, §1061.

In a medieval riddle [Mnac'akanyan 1980: 261^{Nr12}] written by Nersēs Šnorhali (12th cent., Cilicia), the northern cold wind *parxar* is said to bite the eye of the man as a *kor* (*xayt'ē zmarđoyñ ač'k'n zed kor*); see the full text of the riddle in 1.9.

Mnac'akanyan (op. cit. 500b) glosses *kor* as *kuyr* (*mžtuk*) "a blind (little mosquito)". In fact, I think, this is our word for 'scorpion'.

The edition of Anania Širakac'i cited by Ačāryan is not available to me. I find *kor*, GDSg *kor-i* 'a constellation' in A. G. Abrahamyan 1944: 329^{L10}, 330^{L12}. Obviously refers to the Scorpio. But in the same as well as in the preceding and following chapters (pp. 323, 327 and 330ff) one finds *Karič* 'Scorpio'. The equivalence of *Kor* and *Karič* is also confirmed by the fact that they both (*Karič* - 323^{L13}, 330^{L18f}; *Kor* - 329^{L10}) are mentioned in the same place of the list of the zodiacal constellations, between *Kšir* 'Libra' and *Atefnawor* 'Sagittarius, Archer'. Note especially the occurrences of *Kor* and *Karič* in almost neighbouring sentences, 330^{L12}, 330^{L18}, respectively. Given the parallel occurrences of *Kor* and *Karič* in the same text, Ačāryan (1986: 90) disagrees with Ačāryan's assumption that "these parts seem to have been added later" and assumes that *Kor* was a vivid term for the constellation Scorpio in the vernacular of Anania Širakac'i who uses it in parallel with the standard *Karič*.

●**DIAL** Present in Xarberd, Zeyt'un, Hačən, Akn Arabkir, Sal[mast?] and Maraṭa. Ačāryan (HAB 2: 644a) especially calls attention to Č'arsančak' *gorč* 'not commenting upon it. Note that in Dersim one finds both *gor* 'scorpion' and *gorj* 'scorpion' (see Baṭramyan 1960: 87b, 125a).

Perhaps cf. also Urmia, Salmast *korməžik*, rendered as *šanačanč* 'bumble-bee, dog-fly' and *mžet* 'a small mosquito' [GwŕUrmSalm 2, 1898: 96], which is apparently composed of *kor* '*biting insect' and *məž-ik*, the latter being etymologically identical with *mž-et*. This *mžik* is represented in the next entry of the same glossary, rendered as *čanč* 'fly'.

Thus, *kor* 'scorpion' has been mostly preserved in some W and SW dialects: Cilicia, Svedia, Xarberd, Akn, Arabkir. This is in agreement with literary attestations which are restricted to the western and south-western areas of *kə*-dialects, from Karin/Širak and surroundings (Anania Širakac'i etc.) to Cilicia (Nersēs Šnorhali, Vardan Aygekc'i); see 1.8. Despite the dialectal restriction, the word may be archaic since it has also been preserved in extremely SE areas (Maraṭa, Salmast). Note also the derivative **kor-agi* 'scorpion' (Svedia and Łarabaṭ) below.

●**ETYM** According to Ačāryan (HAB 2: 644a), from *kor* 'crooked', a tabu-substitution of the word for 'scorpion'; compare Łarabaṭ *kəřəhač'i* 'scorpion' < **ke/or* 'curved, crooked' + *-a-* + *agi* 'tail' (cf. Pers. *kaž-dum* 'id.'). Note also Svedia *gürgür aka*

‘scorpion’ = *kor-kor agi* [Andreasyan 1967: 160]. Further: Dersim, Č‘arsančak’ **kor-č* ‘scorpion’ vs. *korč* ‘curved, crooked, rough’ (Grammarians) and *korč* ‘gryphon, vulture’ < ‘having a curved beak, hook-beaked’ (q.v.).

Ačaryan (HAB 2: 551ab) rejects the connection of *kor* ‘scorpion’ with *karič* ‘scorpion’ (Łarabał also ‘crayfish’), since the latter must be connected with Gr. *κᾱρίς, -ί/ῖδος* ‘Crustacea’ and treated as borrowed from a language of Asia Minor. However, I find it hard to separate Arm. *kor* and **kor-č* ‘scorpion’, ‘animal with a crooked body-part’, from *karič* ‘scorpion’ < **karid-ja* and Gr. *κᾱρίς, -ί/ῖδος* ‘Crustacea’, which also displays forms with a labial vowel, viz. *κοῦρίς, κωρίς* (see s.v. *karič* ‘scorpion’). The vacillation *o* : *a* is also found in other words of non-IE origin; see 2.1.3.

[If *kor* ‘scorpion’ is indeed a derivation of *kor* ‘crooked’, one may wonder whether Gr. *κοῦρίς/κωρίς* has not been borrowed from (or contaminated from) Arm. *kor*, perhaps **kor-u-* (if GDSg *kor-u* is old)].

kord, *o*-stem (only later; AblSg *i kordoy*) ‘unploughed (land, ground)’.

Bible+.

A nominal meaning ‘meadow; uncultivated ground/earth’ can be assumed by the indirect evidence from Georg. *k’ordi* and Kurd. *kord*, considered as Armenian loans (see HAB 2: 646b; Ĵahukyan 1987: 598).

●**DIAL** Preserved in Van, Moks (see also Orbeli 2002: 272: verbal *kurt’il, kurt’ vāril*), Muš, Xarberd, Salmast, Loř, Ganjak, etc., basically meaning ‘unploughed, hard (ground); hard’ [HAB 2: 646b]; also in Xotorĵur [YušamXotorĵ 1964: 472].

●**ETYM** Ačaryan (HAB 2: 646) rejects all the etymological attempts including the comparison with Germ. *hart* etc. and the place-name *Korduk* ‘(Tervišyan). Ĵahukyan (1985a: 367; 1987: 432, 598; 1990: 68.), though with hesitation, treats Arm. *kord* and its Kartvelian correspondents as borrowed from Urt. *quldi/e(ni)* ‘id.’. Olsen (1999: 953) mentions *kord* in her list of words of unknown origin.

Bearing in mind the alternation *k* : *x*, one may try a connection with *xort* ‘stepson; ‘hard, rough, stony’ (q.v.)¹³.

¹³ Alternatively, one may derive *kord* from **g^hord^h*:- cf. Lith. *gārdas* m. ‘fence, enclosure, (sheep’s) pen’, OCS *gradъ* m. ‘stronghold, town, garden’, etc.); cf. also **g^hor-t*:- Gr. *χορτος* m. ‘enclosed place; farmyard, in which the cattle were kept; pasturage; fodder’, Lat. *hortus* m. ‘garden; (pl.) pleasure-grounds’, Osc. *hurz*, acc. *húrtum* ‘lucus, Hain’ (< ‘Einzäunung’), etc. The basic meaning of the Armenian would be, then, ‘(enclosed) pasture-land, pen, etc.’. The form **g^hord^h* might give **kord*- through Grassmann’s Law (see 2.1.24.1).

In view of the vocalism it is hard to relate *kord* with MPers. *'gyrd* 'unbearbeitet, unbestellt (Land)', Manich. Parth. *'qyrd* 'verlassen, vernachlässigt, verwildert' (on which see Colditz 1987: 281). Similarly uncertain is *kor-ēk* (hapax; see HAB 2: 647-648).

korč 'gryphon, vulture'

Renders Gr. *γρῦψ*, *-γρῦπός* 'gryphon, vulture' in Deuteronomy 14.12, corresponding to *paskuč* in Leviticus 11.13 (see NHB 1: 1120b; Adontz 1927: 187-188; see also s.v. *analut* 'deer').

●**ETYM** According to NHB (1: 1120b), derived from Arm. *kor* 'curved' (Bible+; dial. *kor*); see also Ĵahukyan 1967: 146. Ačāryan (HAB 2: 652a) leaves the origin open. Adontz (1927: 188) connects to the component **kuč* of the synonymous *paskuč*, which is not convincing.

The derivation from *kor* 'curved' is worth of consideration. Compare also *korč* 'curved, crooked, rough' (Grammarians), and **kor(č)* 'scorpion', q.v. For the semantic shift 'curved, bent' > 'vulture' (i.e. 'having a curved beak, hook-beaked') cf. Gr. *γρῦψ*, *-γρῦπός* 'gryphon, vulture' : 'anchor', see s.v. *angt* 'vulture'.

Olsen (1999: 958) mentions *korč* in her list of words of unknown origin.

kīt'-un-k' (pl.), gen. *kīt'-an-c'* (anatom.) 'back' in Zeno (transl. into Armenian prob. in 6-7th cent.), Anania Širakac'i (7th cent.), etc.; dial. ***kīt'-il** 'to lean, recline, incline the body against an object for support'.

Ačāryan (HAB 2: 669b) cites only NPI *kīt'-un-k'* in "Tōnakan matean", and GDPI *kīt'-an-c'* in Anania Širakac'i (7th cent.) [A. G. Abrahamyan 1944: 329^{L6}].

Further attestations of NPI *kīt'-un-k'* are found in Zeno [Xaç'ikyan 1949: 84a^{L2}], rendered as 'спина' by Arewšatyan (1956: 325), and in "Vasn ənt'ac'ic' aregakan" ("On the course of the sun") by Anania Širakac'i [A. G. Abrahamyan 1944: 316^{L12}].

In all the attestations from Zeno and Širakac'i, *kīt'unk'* is mentioned as the body part associated with the constellation *Kše/iṛ* 'Libra'.

●**DIAL** Akn, Polis (according to Amatuni 1912: 372b, also Ararat and Nor Naxiĵewan) *kīt'-il* 'to lean, recline, incline the body against an object for support', Ararat *knt'rnil* [HAB 2: 669b].

●**ETYM** Ačāryan (HAB 2: 669b) posits an unattested nom. **kīt'n* or **kūt'n* and offers no etymology.

Next to *kīt'nel*, Amatuni (1912: 372b) cites also Lori *kīnel* and points out that the root of *kīt'nel* seems to be identic with *kuin* 'back' (q.v.). This suggestion, not mentioned by Ačāryan, is plausible. Ałayan (1974: 106-107), independently, offers

practically the same explanation. He posits **kui-t'-n* < **gōrptə*, connecting with *ker*, *koī* 'crooked', *kart* 'fish-hook', etc. (q.v.). Aṭayan's **gōrptə* is not convincing. More probably, **kui-t'-n* : *kīt'unk'* is directly comparable with *kuin* 'back', with suffixal element *-t'*, on which see 2.3.1.

ktīm, spelled also as *ktīm*- 'to burn with furious desire' (John Chrysostom, several times), **ktī-an-k'** 'burning desire' (GDPI *ktī-an-a-c'*, in Book of Chries), **ktī-uc'-k'** 'id.' (Severian of Gabala).

●**ETYM** Ačāryan (HAB 2: 677a) does not accept the connection with *kataīm* 'to fury' (Philo, Severian of Gabala, etc.; widespread in dialects) and **xtiī-* 'to tickle' (Bible+; widespread in dialects). For the etymological discussion see s.v.v. **kic-* 'to bite' and **xtiī-* 'to tickle'.

krak, *a*-stem according to NHB 1: 1132b, but only the following oblique case-forms are attested: GDSg *krak-i* (Etišē, Łazar P'arpec'i, etc.), AblSg *i -krak-ē* (Eusebius of Caesarea), LocSg *i krak-i* (Bible, see Astuacaturean 1985: 814a) 'fire'.

●**DIAL** Ubiquitous in dialects.

●**ETYM** Lidén (1906: 123-124) proposed a connection with Germ. *Kohle* 'coal' and Ir. *gūal* 'coal' (< **ge/ou-lo-*), assuming an interchange of the suffix **-lo-* : **-ro-*, or a reshaping of Arm. **kul-* to **kur-* due to influence of *hur* 'fire'; see also Pokorny 1959: 399; Ĵahukyan 1987: 126, 169 (with reservation); Kluge/Seebold 1989: 388. This etymology is improbable since the explanation of *-r-* is not convincing, and the ending *-ak* points rather to Iranian origin. Besides, the Germanic etc. are probably related with Skt. *jvar/-* 'to burn, glow': *jvāḷana-* m. 'fire', *jūrṇī-* f. 'glow, glowing fire', *jvāḷā* 'coal' [Lubotsky 1988: 38; 1992: 262-263], Pers. *zuvāl* 'a live coal, firebrand' and Oss. *ævzaly/u* 'coal' from Iran. **zuār* [Cheung 2002: 167] and, therefore, presuppose an initial **g̃-*, which would yield Arm. *c-* (see also s.v. *acut* 'coal').

More probably, *krak* is an Iranian loan, cf. Pers. *kūra* 'furnace, fire-place', etc. [Eilers 1974: 317-318, cf. 321; Ivanov 1976: 81₅₂]; on Sem. and other forms see Cabolov 1, 2001: 572, and especially HAB 4: 595, s.v. Arm. *k'(u)ray* 'furnace, oven' (John Chrysostom etc.; dialects). Especially interesting is Xotorĵur *k'urak* 'a small hearth of stone, buried in the ground', recorded by Ačāryan s.v. *k'uray* [HAB 4: 595b], as well as in YušamXotorĵ 1964: 524a (*k'urag*; in the illustration - *k'urak*), in a somewhat different and more thorough semantic description. The form is also found in Zangezür (*k'urak*), referring to a pit at the side of *t'oren* < *t'onir* (see Lisic'yan 1969: 104).

krkin, *o*-stem (ISg *krkn-o-v*, loc. *i krkn-um-n*) 'double, twice, again'; **krknem** 'to double, repeat'.

Bible+. Numerous textual passages illustrating the meaning 'again, one more time' (*krkin*, *krkin angam*) are cited in NHB 1: 1134-1135. Note e.g. in Grigor Narekac'i 71.2 (Xaç'atryan/Łazinyan 1985: 528^{L44}; Russ. transl. 1988: 225): *and kangneln - ew krkin glorim* "having hardly stood up on my feet, I fall down again" ("я падаю вновь"). In his English translation Khachatoorian (2001: 338) omitted the word 'again'.

●**DIAL** Ararat *krkin anel*, Łarabał *krknel* 'to return (of the illness)'; Xarberd *krknel* 'to roll up one's sleeve or the hem of the skirt', T'iflis 'to be suffocated' [HAB 2: 681b]. The semantic motivation of T'iflis is not clear to me.

●**ETYM** Assuming that the original Armenian form of **duō-* 'two' was **ku* which subsequently took over the initial *er-* of *erek* 'three' (see s.v. *erku* 'two'), Bugge (1890: 121₁; 1892: 457; cf. 1889: 42) restores **kir* < **dūtero-s* in *erkir* 'der Zweite' and in *krkin* < **kir-kin*. Kortlandt (2003: 98; cf. also Pisani 1934: 185) thinks "that *krkin* 'double' from **kirikin* replaced **kin* 'double' after the rise of **erikin* 'triple', which was replaced by *erek* 'kin' after syncope". Discussing the counter-evidence for the development **dw-* > Arm. *-rk-*, Beekes (2003: 200) considers *krkin* "quite convincing" noting that **kir* is also found in *erkir* 'second'. Others start with a sound change **dw-* > Arm. *-rk-* and interpret *krkin* as **erk-kin* through dissimilation (Meillet 1908-09: 353-354; 1936: 51; cf. Olsen, below) or metathesis *-rk-* > *kr-* [HAB 2: 66-67, 681; Ĵahukyan 1974: 526]. For other references and discussion see HAB 2: 67; Schmitt 1972/74: 25; Szemerényi 1985: 791-792; Leroy 1986: 67₁₉; Kortlandt 2003: 92-93, 95. Viredaz (2005: 89₂₇) points out that "other analyses are possible than **kir* < **dwis*".

Attempts have been made to start with reduplicated **dwi-dwi(s)-no-*; see Viredaz 2003: 64-65, 73 (with references). Olsen (1989: 7f; 1999: 502) interprets *krkin* as a reduplicated version of **dwis* > *erkir* suggesting the following scenario: **dwi-dwi(s)-(i)no-* > **(V)rkrkino-* > (dissimil.) *krkin*. Harkness (1996: 12) points out that this dissimilation "would be completely unremarkable". Viredaz (2003: 64₂₀) Olsen's **erki-erki-* as *krkin* has no *e*'s. The ghost word *krkn* 'twenty' in Harkness 1996: 12 must be *krkin* 'double' [Viredaz 2003: 64₂₀].

If the original meaning of *krkin* was 'again' rather than 'double', one might wonder whether *krkin* is not merely derived from *krukn* 'heel' (q.v.); cf. Lith. *péntis* 'backside of an axe, part of a scythe near the handle; (dial.) heel' : *at-pent* 'again', Russ. *pjata* 'heel' : *o-pjat* 'again', etc. (see Vasmer, s.v. *опять*). Compare also the

dialectal meaning ‘to return’ of *krknel* with Xarberd (Berri) *gəɾəŋɛl* ‘to turn back on one’s heel’ which is derived from *krukn* ‘heel’. It is hard to decide whether *krkin* contains the suffix *-(e)kin* (on which see Greppin 1975: 78; Ĵahukyan 1998: 22; Olsen 1999: 404-405, 502) or, as suggested by Olsen (1999: 502), it is the starting point of the suffix.

On *erkir* ‘second’ etc. see also s.v. *erek* ‘three’.

Moks *erkvin* ‘вторично, во второй раз’ (‘for the second time’) [M. Muradyan 1982: 137; Orbeli 2002: 225] seems remarkable. It may represent the unattested **erk-kin* > **erkin* > (reshaped after *erku* ‘two’) **erku-in*. In the same dialect one also finds *irik^ʕin* ‘for the third time’ [M. Muradyan 1982: 137], apparently from *erek^ʕ-kin* ‘threefold, triple, thrice’ (Bible+). Orbeli (2002: 236) has *irik^ʕir* ‘в третий раз’ instead, with a final *-r*. If not a misprint, *irik^ʕir* may go back to **erek^ʕ-ir*, which can be interpreted as reshaped after ClArm. *er-ir* ‘third; for the third time’ (Bible+) or analogical after *erkir* ‘second’ (Dionysius Thrax, Philo). This would imply that *er-ir* ‘third’ and/or *erk-ir* ‘second’, though not recorded in dialects, once has/have been present in (an older form of) the dialect of Moks.

krukn *an*-stem (GSg *krkan*, NPl *krkunk^ʕ*, GDPL *krkanc^ʕ*) ‘heel’.

Bible+. Spelled also as *kruk* and *krunk(n)*.

● **DIAL** Widespread in dialects, mostly as **krunk*, with anticipation of the nasal; the older, non-anticipated form *krukn* seems to have been preserved in Łarabał, which, alongside with *króynə* and *kúɾɛŋ^ʕ* (for more variants see Davt’yan 1966: 404), has also *króɟ^ʕnə* [HAB 2: 684a]; note also Akn pl. *gəɾəy-vi* (ibid.), a dual form.

Xarberd (Berri) *gəɾəŋɛl* means ‘to turn back on one’s heel’ [Bałramyan 1960: 123a].

● **ETYM** Composed of **kur* and *-ukn*. The root is compared with Gr. *γῦρος* ‘round, curved’, *γῦρος* m. ‘rounding, circle’; Arm. *kuin* ‘back’ (q.v.); etc., though the etymological details are not clear, see HAB 2: 684a (with literature); Ałayan 1974: 88-91, 102-108; Ĵahukyan 1987: 126, 169; Olsen 1999: 208.

According to Ačarıyan (HAB 2: 684b), Laz *kur* ‘heel’, borrowed from Armenian, shows that the root of *krukn* is **kur*. In view of Uart. *qurə* and Hurrian *ukrə* ‘foot’, which, according to Diakonoff/Starostin (1986: 57), are connected with Proto-East-Caucasian **kwirV* (apart from Laz *kur*, here represented with the meaning ‘foot, hoof’, cf. also Arči *kwiri* ‘animal’s foot’, etc.), the relationship between the Armenian and Laz words seems to be deeper, however.

See also s.v. *armukn* ‘elbow’.

***kul-**: *klanem* (aor. *kl-i* or *kl-ay*, 3sg *e-kul*, imper. *kul*), *kl-n-um* 'to swallow'; *ən-kl-n-um* (3sg.aor *ənklaw* etc.) 'to sink', *ən-kl-uz-anem* 'to make sink', *ən-kt-m-em* 'to sink' (all Bible+). Apart from aor. *e-kul* and imper. *kul*, the root **kul* is also found as the second part of several classical compounds, in *i kul tal* 'to swallow' (late attested), and variously in dialects.

● **DIAL** Widespread in dialects: **kul tal*, **kl(a)n-* 'to swallow'; in Łarabał, Łazax, Agulis, etc.: **kul* 'gullet, throat' [HAB 2: 655-656].

Compare also *klāt'an* 'throat' etc. See Ĵahukyan 1972: 286.

● **ETYM** Since long, connected with Lat. *gula* 'gullet, throat', Slav. **gъltъ* 'gullet', Gr. *δέλεαρ*, *-ατος* n. 'decoy', etc. [Hübschmann 1897: 460-461; HAB 2: 655]. The vocalism of the Armenian is troublesome. The following solutions have been proposed: ablaut **g^wel-* : **g^wul-*, cf. Lat. *gula* (see HAB, *ibid.*; Klingenschmitt 1982: 211-212: "lautsymbolische Wortschöpfung"); zero grade (Godel 1975: 126; Ĵahukyan 1982: 179, 215₅₃; 1987: 124). Olsen (1999: 157, 757₁₀₇, 778, 806) derives from **g^wlh₁-*, explaining *-u-* by a rounding effect of the labiovelar. However, as she admits (p. 778), this is at variance with *katīn* 'acorn' and *karik* 'need, trouble'. The other examples are not strong: *kerakur* 'food' is a kind of reduplication, and the etymology of *k'ut* 'thread' is doubtful (see s.v.).

The appurtenance of *ənktmem* 'to sink' is disputed; see Ĵahukyan 1987: 124, 167 (with references and discussion). Klingenschmitt (1982: 211₆₅) accepts the connection with **kul-* 'to swallow' and assumes a denominative to **ənd-kúl-mo-* 'hinunter verschlungen, untergetaucht'.

kuł, Gsg *khi* or *ktoy* according to NHB, but without evidence '(braided/plaited) cord, string, lace, thread'.

The word is usually taken as meaning 'fold, bend, ply' (NHB, HAB) or 'double' (Bugge: 'Doppelung, das Doppelte'; Pedersen: 'verdoppelung'; Beekes: 'double'). However, a closer look to the evidence helps to revise the semantics.

Independently the word is attested in later literature. In Grigor Narekac'i /10-11th cent./ 71.2 (Xaç'atryan/Łazinyan 1985: 528^{L43}; Russ. transl. 1988: 225; Engl. transl. 2001: 338): *ənd kułs bareac'n č'aris hiwsem* : "в крученую [нить] добра я вплетаю и зло" : "the braided thread of good I interlace with evil".

In Mxit'ar Aparanc'i (15th cent.) apud NHB 1: 1122c, *kuł* refers to the cord of a fish-hook: *kuł kart'in*.

The oldest attestation of the word is in the compound *erek'-kuł* or *erek'-kt-i*, in Ecclesiastes 4.12: *arasan erek'kuł* (vars. *erek'-kt-i*, *erek'-kin*) *oč' vatvataki xzesc'i* : *καὶ τὸ σπαρτίον τὸ ἐντρίτον οὐ ταχέως ἀποραγήσεται* : "a threefold cord is not

quickly broken". Arm. *erek'-kuť* could actually mean '(consisting of) three threads', and *arasan erek'kuť* can be understood as "a three-threaded cord". Nersēs Lambronac'i (12th cent.) seems to have understood it the same way since he rephrases the passage as follows (NHB 1: 1122c): *zayspisi šaramaneal erek' kuts oč' karē vatvataki xzel* "(one) cannot break such plaited three threads quickly".

Combining this with the dialectal evidence (see below) I conclude that the basic meaning of the word is '(braided/plaited) cord, string, lace, thread' rather than 'fold, ply'.

●**DIAL** In dialects mainly refers to 'lace of foot-wear' (Łarabať) or 'a tie/cord of plough (*samii p'ok*)'; also Łarabať *kəť-an* 'a leather strap, thong (to tie the yoke to the plough or wagon)' [Davt'yan 1966: 401], Ararat, Bulanəx, Xian *ktel* 'to fold the cord', etc. [Ačārean 1913: 578b, 603b; HAB 2: 657a; HayLezBrbBar 3, 2002: 109, 206a].

V. Arak'elyan (1979: 43-44) argues that both in literature and dialects *kuť* basically refers to 'rope, cord' rather than 'fold, twisting, plait'.

●**ETYM** Bugge (1889: 42; 1892: 457) derives *kuť* 'Doppelung, das Doppelte' from **duoplo-* (cf. Lat. *duplus* etc.). Ačāryan (HAB 2: 657a) does not accept the etymology leaving the origin of the word open. The connection is adopted by Pedersen (1906: 398 = 1982: 176), Kortlandt (1989: 48, 50 = 2003: 92, 95), Beekes (2003: 200).

Since the basic meaning of *kuť* seems to be 'rope, cord, string, etc.' (see above, also V. Arak'elyan 1979: 43-44), and in view of the resemblance with *k'ut* '(plaited) thread' (Bible+); dial. also 'cord; lace', I consider the derivation of *kuť* from **duoplo-* as improbable. The connection between *kuť* and *k'ut* has been suggested by Dervischjan (1877: 37-38). The alternation *k* : *k'* favours a loan origin.

See also s.v.v. *erku* 'two', *erkiwť* 'fear', and 2.1.22.6.

●***kumb** 'emboss (of a shield)': *kmb-eay* 'enbossed (shield)' (John Chrysostom); *oski-kmb-ē* in P'awstos Buzand 5.32 (1883=1984: 196^{L-15}; transl. Garsoñan 1989: 214): *oskikmbē vahanōk'n* "with gold-embossed shields". The compound is also attested in John Chrysostom; in published editions: IP1 *oski gmb-ē-i-w-k'*, GDP1 *oski gmb-ē-i-c'*. Further: *kmbrawor* or *kmbawor*, perhaps for **kmb-awor* 'embossed (shield)' in Mxit'ar Goš (Law Code, 12th cent.), Smbat Sparapet (Law Code, 13th cent.).

●**DIAL** Preserved only in Bulanəx *gəmb* 'hump on the neck/back of people and especially of an ox or buffalo' (S. Movsisyan, p.c. apud HAB 2: 659a). That in this

dialect a word has no "full" vowel is not uncommon; cf. *šələk* 'from *šli-k* 'neck' (q.v.).

If reliable, the reading variant in *g-* (John Chrysostom, see above) can be compared to the *Bulanəx* form. An influence of *gmbet* 'cupola' (Hexaemeron etc., widespread in dialects; Iranian loan) is possible too.

●**ETYM** Probably from **gumb^h-*: MHG *kumm(e)* f. 'rundes, tiefes Gefäß, Kufe, Napf', Germ. *Kumme* 'tiefe Schale', Pers. *gumbed* 'Wölbung, Kuppel, Becher' [Scheftelowitz 1904-05, 1: 308] (cf. Arm. *gmbet* 'cupola', see above), Lith. *gumbas* m. 'Wölbung, Geschwulst, Knorren', Latv. *gumba* 'Geschwulst', OCS *goba* 'sponge', Russ. *gubá* 'lip', Czech *houba* 'mushroom, tree-fungus', *huba* 'snout, mouth', SCr. *güba* 'mushroom, tree-fungus, leprosy, snout', etc. [HAB 2: 658-659]. For discussion see Jahukyan 1987: 169 (cf. 126).

One wonders whether we are dealing with a word of substratum origin, which can also be compared with Gr. *κῡμβάχος* 'head-foremost, tumbling; crown of a helmet', next to *κῡμβη* 'head'.

hamr, GDPl *hamer-c* 'dumb, mute' (Bible+).

●**ETYM** Of unknown origin [HAB 3: 29a; Olsen 1999: 964].

The word may have been composed of the prefix *ham-* (< **sm-*) and **mu-r* 'mute', from PIE **mu-*, see s.v. *munj* 'dumb, mute'; cf. especially Greek forms with **-r-*: *μυναρός*, *μυρικᾶς*.

[Any relation with Pahl. *xāmōš* 'silent' (see MacKenzie 1971: 93)?].

hayim 'to watch, look at, wait'

Bible+.

●**DIAL** Preserved in some W and SW dialects: Xarberd, Tigranakert, Cilicia, Van-group, etc. More widespread is the derivative *hay-eli* 'mirror' [HAB 3: 29-30]. Moks infinitive *xil*, 1sg.pres. *kə-xim* 'I see' [Orbeli 2002: 248]; for textual illustrations see op. cit. 104f (imper. *xiya*), 120^{Nr57} (3sg.pres. *kə-xə*^ε, neg. *č'ə-xə*^ε).

See also s.v. **hes-* 'to see'.

●**ETYM** Scheftelowitz (1904-05, 2: 33) compares with Skt. *pāyú-* 'guard, protector', Gr. *ποιμήν* m. 'herdsman', etc. See also s.v.v. *hoviw* 'shepherd', *hawt* 'flock, group', *hawran* 'flock of sheep or goats; sheepfold'. Ačāryan (HAB 3: 29b) does not accept this etymology and leaves the origin of the word open. Ałayan (1974: 92-93) independently proposed practically the same etymology. Jahukyan (1990: 72, sem. field 15) places *hayim* in his list of words of unknown origin. However, the derivation PIE **peh₂i-* (or **ph₃i-*) > Arm. *hay-* does not seem impossible. For the

semantics cf. Sogd. **p'y-* 'to watch, observe' (see MacKenzie 1970: 42; Mayrhofer, EWAia), Czech *pásti* 'pasture, watch'.

Patrubany (1897: 139) interprets *hay* 'Armenian' as "Wächter, Hüter" identifying it with *hayim* 'to look at, watch'. He (ibid.) derives *Hayk* from the ethnonym *hay* with the suffix *-k*. Ĵahukyan (1987: 284-285) independently suggests a semantically similar explanation, deriving *hay* 'Armenian' from PIE **pōi-/pəi-* 'to pasture, guard, keep'. Ĵahukyan based this etymology upon Herodotus 5.49 where the Armenians are characterized as "having plenty of sheep" (*πολυπρόβατοι*). The passage reads as follows: *Κιλίκων δὲ τῶνδε ἔχονται Ἀρμένιοι οἷδε, καὶ οὗτοι ἐόντες πολυπρόβατοι*. For ModArm. translation and comment. see Krkyašaryan 1986: 305, 603₃₉.

If one accepts the derivation of *hayim* 'to watch' from PIE **p(e)Hi-* 'to guard', then Ĵahukyan's etymology practically coincides with that of Patrubany.

Earlier, Ĵahukyan (1967: 106) suggested a connection with Arm. *hoy* 'fear' and *hi-anam* 'to admire' (q.v.), deriving all from PIE **k^wei-* (cf. Skt. *cay-/cāy-* 'to perceive; to observe', Gr. *τίω* 'to esteem, deeply respect', etc.). which cannot be accepted.

See also s.v.v. *y-ay-t*, *nayim*, *vayel*.

hayr, GSg *hawr*, ISg *har-b*, NPl *har-k'*, GDPl *har-c'*, *har-an-c'* 'father'.

Bible+. Numerous derivatives with *hayr* or *hawr*.

Alongside with *ham-a-hayr* 'having one father' and *ham-a-mayr* 'having one mother', there is also *ham-hawr-eay* = f. *όμο-πατρία* in Leviticus 18.11: *hamhōreay k'oyr k'o ē* : *όμοπατρία ἀδελφή σου ἐστίν*. The same structure is found in *ham-mawr-eay* (cf. *όμο-μητρία*), only in Mxit'ar Goš (Law Code, 12th cent.), apparently analogical after *ham-hawr-eay*, since the passage is identic: *hammōreay k'oyr k'o ē*.

In Mxit'ar Goš (Law Code, 12th cent.) one also finds *hawr-u* 'stepfather' (in genitive *hōru-i*).

●**DIAL** Widespread in dialects. In some dialects replaced by *pap* 'grandfather' or by recent borrowings. ClArm. *hōr-etbayr* 'paternal uncle', *hōr-a-k'oyr* 'paternal aunt', etc. are represented by variegated types of allegro-forms; see 2.1.35.

Interesting is **hayr-a-hot* 'father-like', lit. 'of paternal odour': Moks *xeräxut* [M. Muradyan 1982: 137]. Widespread in the epic "Sasna crer".

The word *hawru* 'stepfather' has been preserved in Hamšen *hōru* [Ačaryan 1947: 12, 242].

●**ETYM** From PIE **ph₂tēr* (GSg **ph₂tr-ós*) ‘father’: Skt. *pitā́*, ASg *pitarām*, NPl *pitaras*, DPl *pitṛbhyas* (RV+); Gr. *πατήρ*, GSg *πατρός*, ASg *πατέρα*; etc. [Hübschmann 1897: 463; HAB 3: 31-32].

Arm. **hawr-u* ‘stepfather’ (genitive *hōru-i*, hapax, 12th cent.) is considered analogical after *mawru* (see s.v.v. *mawru* and *yawray*); cf. Gr. *πατρώς*, *πατρνιός* m. ‘stepfather’. It has been preserved (or independently created) in the dialect of Hamšen.

See also s.v. *yawray* ‘stepfather’.

hayc’em ‘to ask, supplicate’ (Bible+), ‘look for, demand’ (John Chrysostom, etc.); **hayc’** in *hayc’ ew xndir linem* ‘to look for’ (Hexaemeron).

●**ETYM** See s.v. *ayc’*.

han (John Chrysostom’s Commentary upon Timothy, Philo; GDSg *han-o-y* in Movsēs Xorenac’i, Canon Law and “Čarəntir”), **hani** (GDSg *hanwoy/hanoy* in 2 Timothy /locative/ and Grigor Narekac’i; see below); **hanik** (Ephrem, Vardan Arewelc’i, “Yaysmawurk’”; in a colophon: GDSg *hankan*, cf. below, on the dialect of Ĵuta) ‘grandmother’.

In 2 Timothy 1.5: *bnakec’aw i hanwoy* (var. *hanoy*) *k’um* “dwelt in your grandmother” (said of the faith); locative *i hanwoy* = *ἐν τῇ μᾶμμη*.

In Grigor Narekac’i 36 (1985: 397^{L46}; reading variants: 770b): *han-oy-n*, vars. *hanwoyn*, *hangoy-n*, etc.

NHB (2: 45c) also cites Movsēs Xorenac’i 2.22 for *han-i*, GDSg *hanwoy*. In the critical edition (1913=1991: 138^{L5}), however, one finds the passage in 2.23, in the form *han-oy-n*, with no reading variants.

●**DIAL** The form *han-ik* has been preserved in the dialect of Ĵuta: *xanik* ‘grandmother’ [HAB 3: 33b], with a regular shift *h > x* [Ačarean 1940: 112]; belongs to the 4th (-an) declension class of the dialect: GSg *xang-a*, AblSg *xang-an-ic’*, ISg *xang-an-ov*, NPl *xanək-ner* [Ačarean 1940: 190, 372a]. Compare *hankan* above.

●**ETYM** Connected with Gr. *ἀννίς* ‘mother-in-law’, Lat. *anus* ‘old woman’, Lith. *anyta* ‘husband’s mother’, etc. [Hübschmann 1897: 463]. The alternative etymology linking Arm. *han* with *hin* ‘old’ as an Iranian loan (cf. YAv. *hanā-* ‘old woman’, Skt. *sāna-* ‘old’) is considered improbable [HAB 3: 33].

Arm. *han(i)* and Hitt. *ḫanna-* ‘grandmother’ point to **h₂en-* [Schrijver 1991: 45]. The by-form *han-i* may derive from **h₂en-iH-*, cf. Lith. *anyta*.

On the initial *h-* see s.v. *haw* ‘grandfather’ and 2.1.16.

For possible traces of PArm. **Han-* ‘Mother Goddess’ (cf. Hitt. *Hannahanna*) see s.v. theonym *Anahit/Asttik*.

***hang** ‘breath, rest’ (dial.); **hangč’im**, 3sg.aor *hang-e-aw* ‘to rest’; **hangī-st**, GDSg *hangst-ean* ‘rest, peace; resting place, grave’ (Bible+)

●**DIAL** Both *hangč’im* and *hangist* are widespread in dialects. The root-form is represented in Aparan, Alaškert, Araran *hank’*, Muš *hang’*, Moks *xang’*, Van *xank’*, etc. ‘breath, rest’ [HAB 3: 35-36]. The meaning ‘grave’ of *hangist* can be seen e.g. in R. Grigoryan 1970: 320^{L-7}. For the semantic shift ‘rest’ > ‘grave’ cf. e.g. *andorr* ‘quiet’ > Areš *ändörk* ‘the Otherworld’ [Lusenc’ 1982: 197a].

●**ETYM** A connection with Lat. *quiēscō* ‘to rest’ was suggested by Pedersen (1905: 219 = 1982: 81). Ačāryan (HAB 3: 35b) mentions Pedersen’s comparison but leaves the origin of the word open. Meillet (1936a) independently suggests the same comparison convincingly deriving PArm. **hangī-* from **sm-k^wiH-*, cf. Lat. *quiēs, -ētis* f. ‘rest, quiet, peace; sleep; death’, *quiēscō* ‘to rest’. For the absence of palatalization of the labiovelar after nasal he compares Arm. *hing* ‘five’ from **penk^w* e. For references and discussion on *hangī-st, -ean* see Olsen 1999: 480-482.

Lat. *quiēs, -ētis* derives from **k^wieh₁-ti-*, cf. Av. *šāiti-* f. ‘happiness’, OPers. *šiyāti-* f. ‘Glück, Glückseligkeit, Wohlfahrt’, Av. *šyātō* ‘happy’ < **-to-*, etc. [Brandenstein/Mayrhofer 1964: 143; Schrijver 1991: 140]; cf. Arm. *šat*, an Iranian loan [HAB 3: 498-499].

Remarkably, **sm-k^wiH-* is found also in Iranian languages: Oss. *æncad* ‘quiet, tranquil, quietly’ from **ham-čyāta*, Sogd. *’nc’y* ‘to stay, remain’, and Khwarezm. *hncy-* ‘to rest, repose’ (see Cheung 2002: 160). For the structure of these forms and Arm. *hangist* cf. also the Iranian source (**han-d_g-ta-*) of Arm. *handart* ‘quiet’ [HAB 3: 38-39].

hask, *i*-stem: GDPl *hask-ic’* in Book of Chries and Cyril of Alexandria; loc. *i* *hask-i* in Hexaameron (K. Muradyan 1984: 135^{L12}) ‘ear of corn’.

Many attestations in the Bible, but not in oblique cases [Astuacaturean 1895: 853-854]. The passage from Job 24.24 illustrates the semantic contrast *hask* = *στάχυς* ‘ear’ vs. *c’awtun* = *καλάμη* ‘stalk, stubble’: *ibrew zhask ink’nin ankeal i c’awtunoy: ἡ ὥσπερ στάχυς ἀπὸ καλάμης ἀντόματος ἀποπεσών*.

●**DIAL** Widespread in dialects [HAB 3: 48b]. The Van-group has with an irregular *-š-*: Van, Moks, Ozim *xašk* [Ačāryan 1952: 274], Šatax *xašk* [M. Muradyan 1962: 57, 200a]. Orbeli (2002: 243) has Moks *xäšk*, GSg *xäškə*, NPl *xäškir* ‘колос

(головка)'. Ačāryan (1952: 85) hesitantly assumes an influence of Pers. *xūšā*, Pahl. *xōšak* 'ear of corn'.

●**ETYM** No acceptable etymology is recorded in HAB 3: 48b. Ĵahukyan (1967: 241) derived from **ak̂-* 'sharp' connecting with Arm. *asetn* 'needle' (q.v.), cf. Gr. *ἀκοστή* f. 'barley', Goth. *ahs* n., OHG *ahir* n. etc. 'ear of corn', etc. Later he abandoned the etymology since it is not included in Ĵahukyan 1987, and the word is considered to be of unknown origin in 1990: 72 (sem. field 8). Olsen (1999: 953), too, lists *hask* as a word of unknown origin.

Nevertheless, the etymology is worth of consideration. The PIE root is **h₂ek̂-* 'sharp' which would yield Arm. **has-*. For the semantics cf. also OEngl. *egl* f. 'awn' < **h₂ek̂-ileh₂-*, Gr. *ἀκή* f. 'point', Lat. *aciēs* f. 'sharp edge', Lith. *akuotas* 'awn', etc. Most of these cognates are feminines, thus the *i*-declension of Arm. *hask* probably points to fem. **ih₂-*. Goth. *ahs*, OHG *ahir* n. etc. 'ear (of corn)', Lat. *acus -eris* n. 'Granne, Spreu', indirectly also Gr. *ἀκοστή* f. 'barley' reflect a neuter *s*-stem: **h₂ek̂-es-* (see Casaretto 2000: 219-221).

For the *-k-* alternative solutions can be offered: 1) derivaton on **h₂ek̂-u-*, cf. Lat. *acuō, -ere* 'to sharpen', Lith. *akuotas* 'awn; fish-bone; cutting edge' (from **ak̂u-ōt-* or **ak̂-ōt-*, R. Derksen, p.c.; the absence of palatalization is unclear), etc.; thus: **h₂ek̂-u-ih₂-* > **hask-i-*; 2) an old suffix **-k-*, cf. Lith. *šaka* 'fish-bone; bran', Russ. *osoka* 'reed grass', etc.; even the absence of cognates with **-k-* would not be a decisive counter-argument since the **-k-* functioned also in inner-Armenian creations such as *boys* 'plant' from **b^heu(H)-*; thus: **h₂ek̂-k-* > *hask*; 3) a "plant-suffix" *-k-*, cf. *tatask* 'thistle', *kask* 'chestnut', etc. (see 2.3.1). [Note that the second and third solutions may be identic].

hat, *o*-sem (later also *i*-) 'grain, seed; piece, ւրտ, fragment, section' (Bible+); **hatanem** 'to cut, split' (Bible+); **z-atem, z-atanem** 'to divide' (Bible+); **y-atem, y-atanem** 'to cut off branches from trees and especially from vine' (Bible+), **y-awt** 'cut-off branch' (Ezekiel 15.4), on which the denominativ verb *y-awtem* ("Paterica"+) is based. Later also **hawt** 'cut-off branch of vine' (Geoponica), **hawtem** ("Čarəntir"). See also s.v.v. **hawt**, *i*-stem 'flock of sheep etc.', **hawtik** 'hairless'.

hatanem 'to strike' (about plague) - in P'awstos Buzand 4.13 (1883=1984: 95^{L-15f}); for the passage see s.v. *keř*.

The meaning 'to end, expire', widespread in dialects (see HAB 3: 52a), can be seen in, e.g., Movsēs Xorenac'i 3.68 (1913=1990: 365^{L12}): *hēnk' ekeal anhatk'* "Brigands have come in abundance" (transl. by Thomson 1978: 354).

●**DIAL** Widespread in dialects in practically all the basic forms including *hat* 'grain, seed; piece' and *yawt-* (note also the curious compound **ort'-(y)awt* 'branches cut off from the vine', composed of *ort* 'vine' and *yawt* 'cut-off branch') [HAB 2: 82; 3: 52a, 386].

On expressions and anthroponyms based on *hat* 'cut, piece' see s.v.v. names *Arew(a)hat*, *Oskehat*.

●**ETYM** No etymology is accepted in HAB 3: 51-52. According to Klingenschmitt (1982: 213-214), *hatanem* is composed of the prefix **ha-* (< **sṇ*, cf. Gr. prep. *ἄτεπ* 'without, far from' < **sṇ-ter*) and **tane-* < **dā-ne/o-* 'teilen', which is unacceptable. Aṭayan (1974: 95-98) links the words with *yatak* 'bottom', (*h*)*und* 'seed' and *hunj* 'mowing, harvest(-time)' and traces **hawt-* to PIE **peu-* 'to hit', pres. **pəu-d-*, cf. Lith. *pjáuju*, *pjáuti* (**pēyūō*) 'to cut, mow', Lat. *paviō*, *-īre* 'to hit', *pavimentum* n. 'paved surface or floor', from *d*-pres., probably: *pudeō* 'to be ashamed', etc. The form **hawt* is taken, thus, as original, and the loss of the *-w-* in *hat* is not explained. Olsen (1999: 90) mentions *hatanem* as "etymologically unclear". She (op. cit. 17), like practically everyone, accepts the internal connection between *hat* 'grain, seed; piece' and *hatanem* 'to cut'.

The best etymology seems to be the one proposed by *Poetto (1976; see also Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 655; Clackson 1994: 171), and, independently, by Morani (1991: 176-178). According to it, *hat*, *o*-stem 'grain, seed' goes back to PIE **h₂edos-* n. 'sort of cereal, grain': Lat. *ador*, *-ōris* n. 'coarse grain, spelt', Goth. *atisk* (**ades-ko-*) 'cornfield', OHG *ezzisca* (pl.) 'Saat', etc., probably also Avest. **āδū-*, Sogd. (Buddh.) *'dw-k* 'grain', Hitt. *ḫat-*, if basically meaning 'dried grain'. See also (without the Armenian) Pokorny 1959: 3; *Watkins 1975; Greppin 1983a: 13; Schrijver 1991: 38; on Gothic see Ramat 1974: 77-78. Greppin (1983a: 13-14) adds Arm. *hačar* 'spelt' (Bible; Łarabał etc.).

As we explicitly pointed out by Morani (ibid.), the original meaning of Armenian *hat* is 'grain', from which the meaning 'cut, section, piece, fragment' developed secondarily.

On the other hand, *hatanem* 'to cut' is linked with Hitt. *ḫattāi-* 'to cut' either as a native word loan (see ... Beekes 2003: 182) or as a loan (see ... Ĵahukyan 1987: 314; 1988, 2: 84). { {Hitt. --- see *Oettinger 1976: 124- (MSS 34). The *-tt-* points out to PIE **-t-* rather than **-d-*. Thus, if Arm. *hat-* indeed belongs to PIE **h₂edos-*, the Hittite verb is not related (unless one considers it an Armenian loan).

Citing reliable semantic parallels for 'to cut, divide' > 'a division of the flock' > 'flock of sheep' (3.9.1), A. Xač'atryan (1993: 107) convincingly connects *hawt*, *i*-stem 'flock of sheep etc.' (q.v.) with *hatanem* 'to cut' and *y-awt* 'cut-off branch'.

Morani (1991: 178) cautiously mentions the alternative *i*-stem of Arm. *hat* in relation with Toch. *ātī* 'grass', which is usually taken as cognate to Lat *ador* and others. If the *i*-stem proves reliable, one might derive Arm. *yawt* and *hawt* (*i*-stem) from an old PIE HD paradigm: NSg. **h₂éd-ōi* (> PArm. **hatu(i)* > *hawt*), GSg. **h₂d-i-ós*. This is attractive since an original PArm. genitive **hač-* (with a regular *-č-* from **-dj-*) would also explain Arm. *hač-ar* 'spelt' (on which see above). The final *-ar* is reminiscent of *jawar* 'boiled and crushed wheat, barley or spelt' (Geoponica; numerous dialects). However, *y-awt* and *hawt* seem to be deverbative nouns. One therefore may explain the form as containing the deverbative suffix **-ti-*: **h₂d-ti-* > PArm. **hawt-i-* > *hawt*, *i*-stem (see 2.1.22.12).

I conclude: Arm. *hat*, *o*-stem 'grain, seed; piece, cut' derives from IE **h₂edōs-* n. 'sort of cereal, grain'. The verb *hatanem* 'to cut' should not be separated from *hat*. The forms *y-awt* and *hawt*, *i*-stem (both expressing the basic meaning 'cut, division') are clearly deverbative nouns. Therefore, the internal *-w*-points to a derivational pattern rather than a mere epenthesis. One may hypothetically derive *hawt* (*i*-stem) and *y-awt* from **h₂d-ti-* through PArm. **hawt-i-*.

The suffix *-awt* (*i*-stem), perhaps with a basic meaning 'division, cut', may originate from *hawt* (*i*-stem) / *y-awt*, see 2.3.1.

For the semantic field 'to cut, split, strike' : 'grain' : 'piece/Stück' cf. Georgian-Zan **kaḱ-* 'to knock, pound', Georgian *kaḱa-* 'grain, kernel (of fruit)', *kaḱal-* 'walnut', Laz *kaḱal-* 'walnut', Megr. *kaḱal-* 'grain; piece', etc. (see Klimov 1964: 105; 1998: 85); on these words see s.v. *kaḱin* 'acorn'.

See also s.v. *zatic*.

haraw, *o*-stem 'south; southern wind'. In the second meaning the word seems to have been borrowed into Georgian *aravi* 'southern (wind)' or 'NE wind' (see HAB 3: 57a).

Bible+.

●**DIAL** Preserved in the dialects of Sebastia, Muš, Karin, T'iflis, Axalc'xa, Ararat, Juḷa, Salmast, etc. [HAB 3: 56-57].

●**ETYM** No acceptable etymology is recorded in HAB 3: 56b.

Jaḥukyan (1986-1987: 30; 1987: 143, 186) suggests a connection with Skt. *pūrva-* 'being before, going in front, first, former; eastern' (RV+), OAv. *pouruuia-* 'first, initial, former', YAv. *pauruua-*, *paouruua-*, *pouruua-* 'being in front, first, former'; OCS *prъvъ* 'first'; etc. Accepted (with the note "probably") by Olsen (1999: 26). In Old Persian the word also means, as in Sanskrit, 'östlich', whereas in Young Avesta - 'südlich' (see Bartholomae 1904: 871a). The same distribution is also found in

another derivation of the same PIE root, cf. Skt. *prāñc-* 'directed towards, directed forwards; eastern' vs. Sogd. (Bud.) *βr'sš kyr'n* 'south' (see Cheung 2002: 216). In his table, Ĵahukyan (1987: 143, 186) notes the semantic identity of the Armenian and the Iranian. Elsewhere, he (1986-1987: 30) writes: "Selon certains linguistes, la signification de l'avestique *paurva-* témoignerait du déplacement des tribus iraniennes vers le sud; mais il paraît plus simple d'y voir un phénomène d'orientation: on regarde devant soi vers le point où apparaît le soleil de midi". On the discussion involving the movements of Indo-Iranian tribes see, in particular, Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984: 915, 920-921), and of Armenians - S. Petrosyan 1976: 196-197; 1977: 214-216.

Interpreting *haraw* as etymologically meaning, thus, "côté du devant", Ĵahukyan (1986-1987) treats *hiwsis* 'north' (q.v.) as "côté inverse", deriving it from PIE **seukoi-kî(y)o-*, with the basic meaning "qui se trouve à l'opposé".

On the reflex of the internal laryngeal see 2.1.20.

harawunk 'sowing, seeds; sowing-field; arable land'.

Attested (Bible+) in APl *harawun-s*. See also s.v. *haruanc*.

● **DIAL** Muš *harvčnk*; Maškert, K'ti *harmunk* 'soil that has been softened by rains in spring and autumn and can be ploughed' [HAB 3: 57a; Bałramyan 1960: 147a]. For a thorough description see Gabikyan 1952: 332 (with Turk. *hemik* as an equivalent), where the author also mentions that, in autumn, they first water the soil (if they cannot do so, they wait for a rain), slightly plough it, and then they sow.

● **ETYM** Bugge (1893: 14) suggests a connection with Arm. (*h*)*arawr* 'plough' (q.v.) and derives *harawunk* from **aramon-*, citing Lat. *aramentum* as a cognate. Ačaryan (HAB 3: 57a) does not accept this and other attempts which, too, considered a derivation from PIE **h₂erh₃-* 'to plough' (see, among others, Scheftelowitz 1904-1905, 2: 58), and leaves the origin of *harawunk* open. Ĵahukyan (1967: 241; 1987: 113), Ałabekyan (1979: 61) and N. Simonyan (1979: 220-221), however, are right in accepting the etymology. N. Simonyan (ibid.) treats it within the framework of the heteroclitic **h₂erh₃-uer/n-*, cf. Gr. *ἀροῦρα* f. 'tilled or arable land; pl. corn-lands, fields'; Skt. *urvarā-* f. 'arable land, field yielding crop', Avest. *uruuarā-* f. pl. 'food plant, plant, ground covered with plants, flora'; Mİr. *arbor*, NPl *arbanna*, Oİr. gen. *arbe* 'grain, corn'; etc. She also adds Arm. *araws* 'virgin soil' (q.v.; not mentioned by Ĵahukyan), as a semantic parallel noting Lith. *armena* 'aufgepflügte Schicht der Erdoberflächen' (cf. also *Armena* 'right tributary of the Nėmunas') from PIE **h₂erh₃-menā-* (see Derksen 1996: 154).

Apparently, the initial *h-* of *harawunk* directly reflects the PIE laryngeal (**h₂e-* > Arm. *ha-*, see 2.1.16), see N. Simonyan 1979: 220-221; Kortlandt 2003: 42, 55, 73-74; Beekes 2003: 182-183, 192-193, 195. On the development of the interconsonantal laryngeal see 2.1.20.

Stating that in Bible *harawunk* is attested in the meaning 'sowing, seed time', Lindeman (1982: 18) rejects its connection with PIE **h₂erh₃-* 'to plough'. Noting the same semantics, Olsen (1999: 613), however, correctly points out that the general meaning is 'tilled land, fields', "which makes the etymological derivation from the root **h₂arə₃-* 'plough' fairly obvious". The idea of sowing is inseparable from that of ploughing/cultivating. Note, e.g., Gr. *ἀροῦρα* f. 'tilled or arable land; pl. corn-lands, fields', which metaphorically refers also to a woman as receiving seed and bearing fruit. Even if the temporal aspect were indeed dominant in *harawunk*, it could be easily explained by the semantic passage from the spatial aspect (cf. 3.3.1). Besides, the dialectal data which seem to be neglected by everyone strongly confirm the spatial aspect. The basic meaning of the Armenian and Greek words may be, thus, 'sowing/tilled/arable-land'.

Arm. *haraw-un-k* may derive from PIE **h₂erh₃-uon-*. Olsen (1999: 613-614, 768-769) considers this equation less appealing because of "the preservation of **-u-* between homorganic vowels". Interestingly, she (ibid.) suggests a direct derivation from **h₂erh₃-mon-* (cf. Lith. *armuõ* 'arable land') instead, not citing the dialectal **har(a)munk* which would make the etymology much stronger. This is, in fact, an old suggestion, see Walde/Hofmann 1, 1938: 71: "oder aus **arā-mōn* dissilimiert?" To my knowledge, however, such a dissimilation has no parallel.

The above-mentioned argument of Olsen is not essential since *harawunk* (pl.) can be analogical after the unpreserved NSg **harawr* (cf. Gr. *ἀροῦρα*). Furthermore, the development **haramunk* > **harawunk* is not easy to explain. One might involve a comparison with the paradigm of *paštawn* - *paštamunk* 'service; religious ceremony' (perhaps also *mrjīwn*, NPl *mrj̃munk* 'ant', q.v.), but here, unlike in the case of *harawunk*, the plural (as well as the oblique forms in singular) has only *-m-*. I therefore offer the following two scenarios:

1) Arm. *harawunk* derives from PIE **h₂erh₃-uon-*, and dial. **har(a)munk* is due to a later reshaping after the paradigm of *paštawn* - *paštamunk* 'service; religious ceremony';

2) Arm. *harawunk* and dial. **har(a)munk* are parallel formations based on PIE **h₂erh₃-* 'to plough'; the former derives from PIE **h₂erh₃-uon-*, whereas the latter reflects **h₂erh₃-mon-* and implies, thus, a direct comparison with Lat. *aramentum*

and/or Lith. *armuo* 'arable land' (cf. the above-mentioned interpretation of Bugge), *armena* 'aufgepflügte Schicht der Erdoberflächen'.

Of these two explanations, the latter seems preferable. Nothing is against the postulation of by-forms with and without the suffix **-me/on-*, cf. *jer* 'warmth' vs. *jern* 'fever'.

haw 'beginning'.

In the Classical period only in a compound: *č'arahaw* 'having / being an evil beginning, origin' (*a*-stem according to NHB 2: 567c, though no evidence is cited) and a verb *č'arahawim* in Eccles 7.23 newly found by Ačāryan [HAB 3: 67]. Not mentioned in Olsen 1999.

Ačāryan (HAB 3: 67) considers *haw* an *a*-stem, basing himself, apparently, upon GDPI *hawac* (MXoren 1.4) cited by NHB 2: 71. However, this reading is not reliable. The other variant, that is *i mēn̄j hawatarmac'eals* (see Movses Xorenac'i 1913= 1991: 13^{L9}) is commonly accepted; cf. Malxasyanc' 1990; Thomson 1978: 71. Thus, no evidence for the declension class.

The second passage quoted by NHB from Xorenac'i (1.6; see 1913= 1991: 23^{L7-8}) reads as follows: *Bayc' es ayžm uraxac'ayc', haw ainelov arajikayic's imoc' banic' i sirelwoyn immē <...>. - "But now I shall be happy to begin my present account [quoting] from my beloved <...>."* [Thomson 1978: 77].

In Book of Chries: *Haw č'areac' kardac'cal*.

The remaining evidence comes from derivatives.

● **DIAL** [In the dialect of Ararat one finds *hew* 'edge of something; initial cause'; see Ačāryan 1913: 657b. The meaning of the Łarabał form, that is 'fight', is remote. Jahukyan (1972: 278) connects dial. *hew* to *haw* 'beginning' explaining *-e-* by a difference in ablaut. This, however, does not fit the etymology; see below.].

● **ETYM** Ačāryan (HAB 3: 67) derives *haw* from **pau-* (*=*p(e)h₂u-*); cf. Gr. *παύω* 'make to end; to take one's rest; to cease; to make an end of, stop', *παῦσις* f. 'stopping, ceasing', *παυσ-ωλή* f. 'rest', *παῦλα* f. 'rest, pause'; see Frisk 2: 483. Lat. *pausa* 'Pause, Stillstand, Ende' is usually considered a borrowing from Greek, though Meillet is more positive; see Ernout/Meillet/André 1985: 490b. The Balto-Slavic cognates (see Pokorny 1959: 790) are semantically remote. Both connections are treated by Frisk as uncertain. Neither Pokorny nor Frisk mention the Armenian form. Jahukyan (1987: 142, 184-185) accepts Ačāryan's etymology, reconstructing the etymon with **-s-* (as Pokorny does, apparently in view of Balto-Slavic).

Probably a Mediterranean word.

According to Ačāryan, the basic meaning was 'edge', which developed to 'beginning' in Armenian and 'end' in Greek. The latter is found also in Arm. *yaw* < **y-(h)aw*, q.v.

The meaning 'edge' is confirmed by dial. *hew*. However, Ĵahukyan's theory which explains -*e*- by ablaut difference is hard to reconcile to the etymology of *haw*₃ since both **peh₂u-* and **ph₂u-* would give the same result, that is *haw*.

See also s.v.v. *agi*, *awal(i)*, *hawasti-k'*, *yaw*.

hawaii

●ETYM See s.v. *getai(u)*.

hawasti-k' 'tassels or other parts of a belt'.

The only attestation of the word is found by Ačāryan (HAB 3: 70a). It comes from OskPō†* 1.68 (5th century):

Zcop's gōtwoyn mert' banayc'ē ew mert' cackic'ē, mert' i kurcsn acic'ē ew mert' zgawakawn acic'ē ew aysr andr šošokic'ē, bac'xp'ik nap'ortambn xatayc'ē, zi zhawastis gōtwoyn karic'ē bazmac' c'uc'anel. (Ačāryan's "underlining").

[CHECK! Gr. original -- Geerard. "Clavis patrum graecorum" --(Weitenberg)].

●ETYM No etymological attempt is known to me.

I tentatively suggest to derive the word from *haw* 'beginning' < perhaps *'edge', q. v.: *haw* + *-st-* (cf. other words from the same semantic field, such as *zgest* and *aragast*, q.v.) + *-i-k'* (see Greppin 1975: 99-100; Ĵahukyan 1987: 231; Olsen 1999: 493-499). If the IE protoform should be restored with **-s-* (see s.v. *haw*), one may propose another alternative: **haw(ə)s* < **ph₂u-s-* + *ti-k'* 'ties' (q.v.). For the epenthetic vowel *a* before *sC* see s.v.v. *araspel* and *arastat*, if the prefix is, strictly speaking, *ai-* rather than *ai-a-*. The actual etymology of the word would then be 'edge-ties of a belt'.

For the semantic development compare *vetj* 'end' : 'tassel or ornament of the edge of a dress' (Bible+) [HAB 4: 332a] and *cop-k'* 'edge-tassels of a dress' > Hamšen dial. *jup'k'* 'adorned belt of women' [HAB 2: 467-468; Ačāryan 1947: 58, 236]. [Note also *č'anč'ul* or *č'anjur* 'tassel-like dress-adornment that is tied behind' (see e.g. Čanikean 1895: 213^{Nr195}; Łanalanyan 1960: 20b)]. Note that, it seems, also in the passage under discussion *hawastik'* refers to a woman's belt. Furthermore, the equivalence (or the relation) of the Hamšen form of *cop-k'* to (with) *hawastik'* is confirmed by the same passage; cf. *zcop's gōtwoyn - zhawastis gōtwoyn*.

[Alternative: *(*H*)*ieh₃s-tV-* 'belt': Gr. ζωστός 'girded' (Hesychius), Av. *yāsta-*, Lith. *juostas* 'girded', *juosti* 'to gird, engirdle, beat', etc. The Armenian may contain

a preposition/preverb such as **h₂epo* ‘away, from’: Skt. *ápa*, Gr. *ἀπό*, *ἄπο*, etc. (or **h₂euo* ‘away’: Skt. *áva* ‘off, away, down (from)’, etc.?); cf. YAv. *aiβiiāsta-* ‘girded’, *aiβiiāghana-* n. ‘girdle, garment’; *auui.yāh-* n. ‘belt’, Khot. *yāna-* ‘belt, girdle’ (< PIr. **abi-iāhana-* = YAv. *aiβiiāghana-*), NPers. *pērāhan* ‘shirt’ (< PIr. **pari-iāhana-*), *hamyān* ‘girdle, belt’ (< PIr. **ham-iāhana-*), PSlav. **pojasъ* m. ‘girdle’ < PIE **h₂po-(H)ioh₃s-o-*: OCS *pojasъ*, Russ. *pójas*, etc., with OCS *po* ‘after, by, at’ from **h₂po*. Perhaps: **h₂epo-(H)ih₃s-ti-* > **h₂epo-iH₃s-ti-* > PArm. **hawo-(y)astí-* > **hawastí-*.

Another alternative: **He/ou-*; cf. s. v. *aganim₁*, *awd*, *awt’oc’*, *aragast*].

hawt, *i*-stem ‘flock of sheep etc.; group’.

Bible+. GDP1 *hōt-i-c’* is attested in the Bible, as well as in P’awstos Buzand 4.13 (1883=1984: 95^{L8}): *čarak hōtic* ‘“pastures for flocks” [Garsoïan (1989: 138^{L4}]. From *hawt* several designations for ‘shepherd’ have been formed: *hōt-arac* (Łazar P’arpec’i+), *hōt-erēc’* (Philo, “Vkayk’ arewelic’”, etc.), as well as dial **hōt-at*.

●**DIAL** Dialectally attested only in **hōt-at* ‘shepherd’ (see s.v. **hawt-at*).

●**ETYM** Usually derived from PIE **peh₂-* ‘to protect, keep’ with **-d-* as in Pers. *pāda* ‘flock’ and in Lat. *pecus*, *-udis* f. ‘farm animal; sheep’ (see Meillet 1903c: 430; HAB 3: 138-139, 139b); see s.v. *hawran* ‘flock of sheep or goats’. Ĵahukyan (1987: 142) put a question-mark on the reconstruction **pā-d-*. Klingenschmitt (1982: 153-154) tries to explain the obvious formal problems by starting with NSg **pah₂dō(i)*, which is not convincing; see 2.1.22.12. Olsen (1999: 95) alternatively derives *hawt* from **p_ek_u-d-* (cf. Lat. *pecus*, *-udis*) > **hawut-*, but this is improbable.

The best solution is offered, I think, by A. Xač’atryan (1993: 107), who derives *hawt* from *hatanem* ‘to cut’ (q.v.). For the semantic relationship see 3.9.1.

***hawt-at** ‘shepherd’.

●**DIAL** In the dialects of Axalc’xa, Lori, Ararat, Łarabał, Van, Alaškert, Muš [Ačārean 1913: 676-677; HAB 3: 139a], Bulanəx, Širak, Aparan [Amatuni 1912: 407-408]. Also in compounds: Baberd **hōtat-k’ar*, with *k’ar* ‘stone’ [Ačārean 1913: 677a; HAB 3: 139a]; Ararat, Sip’an **hōtat-astt*, with *astt* ‘star’ [Amatuni 1912: 408a].

●**ETYM** Ačāryan (HAB 3: 139a) derives from Arm. *hawt* ‘flock of sheep etc.’ (q.v.), which is undoubtedly correct, but does not specify the ending *-at*.

One cannot exclude the possibility that we are dealing with a suffix; cf. e.g. *kenc’-at* ‘living’. Nevertheless, I tentatively propose a derivation from PIE **peh₂(s)-* ‘to protect, pasture’, cf. OCS *pasti* ‘to pasture’, Lat. *pāscō* ‘to pasture’, Hitt. *pahš-* ‘to

protect', etc. This verbal root is found in Arm. *hoviw* 'shepherd' (q.v.). A suffixed **peh₂-lo-* (cf. Skt. *avipālā-* 'shepherd', *gōpālā-* 'cowherd') would yield Arm. **(h)at-*. Thus: **hawt-at* 'shepherd' < "sheepflock pasturer".

That the word is not attested in literature cannot mean that it must be recent. The fact that *hawt* 'sheepflock' has not been preserved in dialects independently and the dialectal spread suggest that **hōtat* is old.

hawran, *a*-stem in NHB, but without evidence 'flock of sheep or goats' (Bible+), 'sheepfold' (Philo+).

Bible+.

●**ETYM** The independently unattested **hawr-* is taken as meaning 'shepherd' and is derived from **peh₂-tro-* 'guarder, protector, keeper' < PIE **peh₂-*; cf. Skt. *pā-* 'to protect, keep', *pātār-* m. 'defender, protector' (RV+), YAv. *pāθra-uuant-* 'granting protection', Khot. *pā-*, Pahl. *pādan* 'to protect, watch', *pās* 'guard, watch', *pahrēz* 'defence, care' (see MacKenzie 1971: 62, 64), OCS *pasti* 'to pasture', etc.; also PArm. **-wa-* in *hoviw* 'shepherd' [Lidén 1906: 26-27; HAB 3: 139b; Ĵahukyan 1987: 142]. The inclusion of Arm. *hawt* 'flock, group' is not convincing (see s.v.). See also s.v. *hayim* 'to watch, look, wait'.

Smbat Sparapet (13th cent., Cilicia) used a hapax, viz. *pahran*, which seems to mean 'pastureland' ['Weide' (Karst) = 'пастбище' (Galstyan)]; see HAB 4: 12b; Galstyan 1958: 167. Ačāryan (HAB 4: 12b) mentions/offers no etymology. Ĵahukyan (1967: 305) cites *pahran* next to *hawran* as an example of the alternation *p* : *h* and supplies no explanation.

I propose to treat Arm. *pahran* as a loan from the above-mentioned Iran. **pahr-* 'protection, care'. The meaning 'to pasture' (cf. OCS *pasti* 'to pasture', etc.) is not attested with Ilr. **pāt(a)r-*, but it does appear in Arm. *hawran* 'flock of sheep and goats' derived from the same **peh₂-tro-*. Note also that both forms have a final *-an*. The basic meaning of *hawran* and *pahran* seems to be 'pasturing, pastured', whereas the suffix **-tro-* would point to 'pasturer'. This is not a decisive obstacle since the difference between the one who pastures and the one who is pastured is not significant. Besides, a pastureland might also be seen as a 'valley of the pasurer' (see s.v. *Tuarac-a-tap*). One may, thus, restore a MIran. **pahran* 'pasuring' as a semantic and formal (including not only the **-tr-* but also, perhaps, the nasal suffix) correspondence to Arm. *hawran*, and as the source of Arm. *pahran*.

hawru 'stepfather'

●**DIAL** Hamšen *hɔru* ‘stepfather’ [Ačaryan 1947: 51, 242], Xotorjur *hɔru* [YušamXotorj 1964: 479a].

●**ETYM** See s.v. *mawru* ‘stepmother’.

hecan *a*-stem ‘beam, log’ (Bible), ‘a kind of meteorological phenomenon’ (Brs.)

●**ETYM** No acceptable etymology in HAB 3: 76a.

Ĵahukyan (1979: 27-28) derives from *hecan...* (from PIE **sed-* ‘to sit’). He treats *hecan-oc* ‘a kind of winnowing-fan’ (Bible+) as a derivative of *hecan* ‘beam, log’. In my view, this is parallel to the derivation of *gerandi* ‘scythe; sickle’ from *geran* ‘beam, log’ (see s.v.v.). Note that both *geran* (*a*-stem) and *hecan* display the same suffix *-an*, and the same semantic development (‘beam, log’ > ‘a kind of meteorological phenomenon’).

Olsen (1999: 299, 951) represents *hecan* as an etymologically obscure word.

heťjamťjuk ‘drowned, suffocated, oppressed’.

Attested in Agat’angelos, Łazar P’arpec’i, Movsēs Xorenac’i, Hexaameron, etc.

In Movsēs Xorenac’i 3.68 (1913= 1991: 361^{L10}; transl. Thomson 1978: 352): *Ayspiseaw anjkaw heťjamťjuk eteal, vtangim* (var. *p’ťjikim*) *karōtut’eamb meroy hōrn* : “Oppressed by such an affliction I suffer from the loss of our father”.

In Movsēs Kaťankatuac’i/Dasxuranc’i 3.22/23 (V. Arak’elyan 1983: 339^{L9f}; transl. Dowsett 1961: 225): *bazumk’ xoršakahar ew heťjamťjuk satakec’an* : “many perished by fire and drowning”. This passage is not cited in NHB and HAB.

The suffix-less form *heťjamuťj* is attested in Kirakos Ganjakec’i, 13th cent. [HAB 3: 332b].

●**ETYM** Belongs with *heťj-* ‘to drown, suffocate, strangle’ (Bible+); cf. also *xetd-* ‘id.’ (Bible+; dialectally ubiquitous) [HAB 2: 357; 3: 78a], q.v. For the combined reduplication (*u*-type and *m*-type) cf. *aťjamuťj* ‘darkness’ etc. (see s.v. **aťj-*). If this interpretation is correct (Ačaryan is sceptical [HAB 3: 332]), the independently attested *mťj(u)k-* ‘to strangle’ (P’awstos Buzand, John Chrysostom, etc.) should be seen as resulted from re-interpretation.

***hes-**

●**DIAL** Metri *hísnil* ‘to look at’ [Aťayan 1954: 314].

●**ETYM** According to Aťayan (1954: 314; 1974: 146-147), from PIE **(s)pek-* ‘to observe, see’: Skt. *(s)pas-* ‘to see (*pas-*); to observe, to watch, to spy (*spas-*)’, *spaṣṭá-* ‘(clearly) perceived, clear, visible’, Gr. *σκέπτεται* ‘to look around, to look at’, Lat. *speciō* ‘to see’, etc. See also s.v. *p’ast* ‘proof, etc.’.

This etymology is attractive. However, I wonder if Metri *hísnil* ‘to look at’ is not simply due to contamination of *hayim* ‘to watch, look at’ (which would be contracted in Metri to **hi-*; cf. *hayeli* ‘mirror’ from the same verb > Metri *hílle* [Ałayan 1954: 277a]) with *tesanem* ‘to see’ (> Metri *tə́snil* [Ałayan 1954: 288a]).

hec, *i*-stem in NHB (only GSg *hec*’-*i* is attested) ‘felloe’.

Eznik (5th cent.), Anania Širakac’i (7th cent.), Step’anos Siwnec’i (8th cent.), etc. In Eznik, with an initial *x*:- *xec*’.

●**DIAL** Muš *hec*, Bulanəx *hec*’ ‘the first and the third of the three wooden parts of a wheel’, Salmast *xec*’ ‘the wooden rim of a wheel, felloe’ [HAB 3: 89b].

●**ETYM** No acceptable etymology is recorded in HAB (3: 89b).

The genitive *hec*’-*i* implies that the word had either *i*- or *a*-stem. If *i*-stem (as stated in NHB), one may link *hec*’ with other formations with the suffixal *-c*’ (< PIE **-sk-*) like *harc*’, *i*-stem ‘question, inquiry’ (Agat’angetos+) and *c’oyc*’ (*i*-stem) ‘show, indication, example, proof’ (Bible+). I propose a derivation from PIE **pelk-*: OHG *felga*, OEngl. *felg(e)* ‘felloe’, etc. (< Germ. **felg-* ‘to turn, wind’). It has been assumed that **pel-k-* is a form of **plek-* ‘to plait’: Gr. *πλέκω*, OHG *flehtan*, ‘to plait’; Russ. *plesti*, etc. [Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 706₁]. For the semantic shift ‘to wind, plait’ > ‘felloe’ see 3.9.4.

Arm. *hec*’ can be derived from **pelk-sk-* (for **sk-* see above) or a PArm. secondary nominative **pelk-s* (cf. 2.2.1.2). Both would result in **hefc*’. For the loss of the lateral followed by an affricate *-c*’ see 2.1.22.9.

Given the spelling *xec*’, as well as the alternation *h/x* (see par.), one might alternatively propose a connection with Arm. *xec*’ ‘pot; shell (of molluscs, etc.)’, if the basic meaning of the latter was ‘turning, twisting’; cf. *gatt-a-kur* (q.v.).

hiwt, *o*-stem: GDSg *hiwt*’-*o-y*, GDPl *hiwt*’-*o-c*’ [later also *i*-stem] ‘moisture, sap; deepness; element, matter, essence’.

Attested in the Bible, Eznik Kořbac’i, Agat’angetos, etc. For attestations, derivatives and thorough semantic discussion see Dowsett 1965: 120-124. For biblical attestations see also Olsen 1999: 53₁₁₀.

●**DIAL** Alaškert, Muš *hut*’ ‘material, substance’, said of e.g. wheat, grapes: "The wheat/grape is *p’uč*’ (‘empty’), there is no *hut*’ in it"; "The wheat has ripened, it has obtained *hut*" [HAB 3: 99a].

●**ETYM** Meillet (p.c. apud HAB 3: 99a) rejects the comparison (proposed by Těrvišcan) with Skt. *suta-* ‘pressed out’ etc. Pedersen (1906: 437 = 1982: 215) connects *hiwt*’ with OHG *fūht* ‘damp, wet’ etc.

Ačāryan (HAB 3: 98-99; cf. also Ĵahukyan 1967: 213; 1982: 39, 73, 131; 1987: 146; Kortlandt 1983: 11 = 2003: 41) derives *hiwt* from QIE **sip-to-*, from PIE **seip/b-* 'to pour, rain, sift', cf. Gr. *τρυγ-οιπος* 'straining-cloth for wine', *εἶβω* 'to drop', OEngl. *sīpian* 'durchsickern, tröpfeln', Toch. A *sep-*, *sip-* 'to anoint', etc. On this root see Pokorny 1959: 894; Frisk, s.v. *τρυγ-οιπος*. See also s.v. *ewt* 'oil'. Olsen (1999: 52) points out that **sib-to-* (> **sip-to-*) is possible too. See 2.1.22.12, however.

Not mentioning the etymology of Ačāryan, Dowsett (1965: 126) rejects Pedersen's interpretation and proposes a derivation from QIE **pi-n-t-*, cf. Skt. *pinvita-* 'swollen (with liquid)'. He assumes a phonological development as in *giwt* 'find' (allegedly) from **ui-n-d-*. On *giwt*, however, see s.v. **git-*: *giwt* and 2.1.22.12. Klingenschmitt (1982: 180) prefers another derivation of the same PIE root **pei(H)-*, viz. **pi-tu-*, cf. Skt. *pītu-* m. 'nourishment, food' (on which see Lubotsky 1988: 45), Lith. *piētūs* 'dinner', etc. This etymology is favoured in Mayrhofer, EWAia 2, 1996: 130; Olsen 1999: 52-53. Beekes (2003: 205) considers the etymology as semantically doubtful. Neither formally is it impeccable; I rather expect Arm. **hiw-* from **pi(H)tu-*.

I conclude that the best etymology is that of Ačāryan: *hiwt*, *o*-stem < QIE **sip-to-*.

For the problem of relation with *níwt* 'matter, material, etc.' see Pedersen, *ibid.*; HAB 3: 455; Ĵahukyan 1987: 245; Olsen 1999: 55; and, especially, Dowsett 1965.

[Alternative: Arm. *hiwt*, *o*-stem 'moisture' < QIE **sik^w-to-*: Skt. *sikta-* 'poured out, poured upon' (RV+), cf. OHG *sīhan* 'to strain', etc. (on these see Mayrhofer, EWAia 2, 1996: 744-745)].

hiws, *i*-stem (IPI *hiws-iw-k* 'in Bible) 'plait' (Bible+), **hiwsem** 'to weave, plait' (John Chrysostom; "Zgōn"; Movsēs Xorenac'i), **hiwsum** (Bible), **hesum** (Paterica). See also s.v. ***hiwsi(n)** 'avalanche'.

Numerous derivatives. Ephrem has *hews* and *yusanem*. The initial *y-* is also found in Paterica.

●**DIAL** Widespread in dialects. (Nor Naxĵewan *fseĴ*). Łarabał has *lūsil*, with an initial *l-*.

●**ETYM** Ačāryan (HAB 3: 101b) accepts none of the numerous etymological attempts. He (*ibid.*) explains the initial *l-* of Łarabał *lūsil* as resulted from contamination with the unpreserved **lesem* 'to weave' (< PIE **plek-*, cf. Gr. *πλέκω*, OCS *plesti*, OHG *flechtan* 'to plait', etc. According to Ĵahukyan (1987: 265), Arm. **les-* 'to plait' has been left out due to homonymy with *lesum* 'to crush, splinter,

squeeze'. It is also possible to treat Łarabał *lūsīl* as a result of contamination of *hiwsem* 'to weave, plait' with *lesum*, note especially Muš *lošel* 'to whet (a scythe and the like); to comb'. For the semantic correspondence one might compare Russ. *kosá* 'plait' which is equated by some scholars with *kosá* 'scythe'. For the anlaut alternation *y* - *l* see also 2.1.7.

Under the word *hiwsn* 'carpenter', Ačaryan (HAB 3: 102) accepts its connection with *hiwsem*, mentioning Lat. *texō* etc. (see below) for the semantic development.

Winter (1962: 262; 1983) connects with Skt. *takṣati* 'to form by cutting, to tool, to hammer; to fashion, to form, to make, to prepare' (RV+), Lat. *texō* 'to weave; to plait (together); to construct with elaborate care', etc., and Arm. *hiwsn* 'carpenter', directly equated with Skt. *takṣan-* m. 'wood-cutter, carpenter' (RV+) and Gr. *τέκτων* m. 'carpenter, artist'; see also Mayrhofer 1986: 155. For the root see s.v. *t'ek'em* 'to fashion, forge, make'. Ĵahukyan (1987: 81, 265, 436, 440) rejects the etymology and treats the Armenian words as potential Urartian loans. Olsen (1999: 126-127) revised the etymology, trying to solve the obvious phonological obstacles. Klingenschmitt (1982: 133-134, 217) treats *hiwsem* as reduplicated present (**pi-pk-e/o-*) of PIE **pek-*, cf. Gr. *πέκω*, Lat. *pectō* 'to comb', Lith. *pešu*, *pešti* 'rupfen, ausreißen, an den Haaren ziehen', etc., and then proposes an alternative derivation from PIE **peuk-*, cf. Avest. *pūs-ā-* 'Diadem', Arm. *psak* (< Iran.), Gr. *πυκνός* '*dicht, fest', etc. The latter etymology *has also been proposed (independently?) by *Lamberterie (1982*: 81) who assumes a regular development of inherited **eu-* to *-iw-* rather than *-oy-* (on this see Clackson 1994: 233-234₂₇₇).

The connection with PIE **peuk-* is the most acceptable of all the etymologies. However, I alternatively propose to derive *hiwsem* from PIE **seuk-*, cf. Lith. *sukti* 'drehen, wenden, kehren, betrogen, betören', Slav. *sukati* 'to turn', ORuss. *sъkati* 'zwirnen, aufwickeln', russ. *skatъ* (*sku*, *skešъ*) 'aufwickeln (Fäden), zwirnen', Russ. *sukatъ* 'zwirnen, drillen, spinnen', etc. This etymology seems preferable since it is semantically attractive and phonologically possible (though the ambiguity of *-iw-* still remains), and it presupposes an internal connection with another Armenian word, viz. *hiwsis(i)* 'north' (also with *-iw-*), if the etymology of this word suggested by Ĵahukyan (1986-1987) is acceptable (see s.v.). One may be tempted to explain the *-iw-* by assuming a reduplicated present, viz. **si-suk-*. The palatalization of **-k-* after **-u-* is regular in Armenian.

***hiwsi(n)** 'avalanche'.

In Movsēs Xorenac'i 2.62 (1913=1991: 194^{L12}): *ew meṛaw i čanaparhi jean hiwsoy* (vars. *zhiwsiſoy*, *hiſsoy*, *hiwsiſoy*, etc.) *kaleal*. Apparently, Thomson (1978:

206) based himself on the readings *zhiwsisoy* etc. (confused with *hiwsis* 'north') since he translates the passage as follows: "and died on a journey, overwhelmed by northern snow". The critical text, however, shows that *zhiwsisoy* and the others are not the most reliable readings, and the meaning 'avalanche' makes more sense in the context, so one should follow Ačaryan (HAB 3: 101b) in positing here the word for 'avalanche', which is attested in some later sources too (in the spelling forms *hosi(n)* etc.), and is reliably represented in dialects.

In colophons (15th cent.) one finds *usi* and *usin* (NHB, HAB) which remind the dialectal forms of the Van-group in having no initial *h-*, and those of Muš and Bulanəx in having a final *-in* [Ačaryan 1952: 65].

●**DIAL** Preserved in a number of dialects of the *kə*-class: Xotorjūr *husi* (according to YušamXotorj 1964: 478b, *hüsi* /*hiwsi*/), Muš, Bulanəx *husin*, Van *usi*, Ozim *ɔwseʷ*, Moks *usə́* (according to Orbeli 2002: 305, *usə*/*usəʃ*, GSg *usu*, NPl *usikʷ*, GPI *usə-kʷ-tir-u*) [HAB 3: 102a; Ačaryan 1952: 276], Šatax *usi* [M. Muradyan 1962: 68, 200b].

Uwe Bläsing informs me that in Hamšen there are several place-names containing the Armenian plural marker *-er*, among them *Hus-er*. I assumed that the root can be identified with Arm. **hiwsi* 'avalanche', which has been preserved in a dialect neighbouring with Hamšen, that is Xotorjūr, in the form of *husi*. Bläsing considers this idea as probable since *Huser* is an area with precipitous places abounding in snow. The place-name *Huser*, thus, can be used as a probable piece of evidence for the existence of the independently unattested Hamšen **husi* (see 4.8).

●**ETYM** No etymology is accepted in HAB 3: 101-102. NHB (2: 102a) places *hiws* 'avalanche' under the word *hiws*, *i*-stem 'plait' (q.v.) and interprets it as follows: *hiwsuac jeanc' dizac'eloc' i lerins, ew hoseloc' yankarc i vayr* "plaiting of snow having been piled in mountains and flowing/gliding down". Here, thus, a connection with both *hiwsem* 'to weave, plait' (q.v.) and *hosem* 'to make flow, pour down, winnow' (Bible+; dial.) is suggested'. The latter is interesting especially if one takes into account the forms with the *u*-vocalism in Xotorjūr etc., as well as the meaning 'snow-storm' of Ararat *łsan* (see HAB 3: 315a). However, the former alternative seems better both formally and semantically.

The idea that the abundance of snow is expressed through 'weaving, plaiting' is corroborated by the following spectacular passage from P'awstos Buzand 3.14 (1883=1984: 32^{L-4f}; transl. Garsoïan 1989: 87): *yoržam kuteal dizeal zmecut'iwn bazmut'iwn t'anjrut'ean jeanc'n kutakeal hiwseal jeanc'n i veray jmerayin leranc'n*: "when a great thickness of snow was piled on the wintery mountains". For the semantic relationship see 3.9.3.

I conclude that **hiwsi(n)* ‘avalanche’ derives from *hiws*, *i*-stem ‘plait’ (Bible+), *hiwsem* ‘to weave, plait’ (q.v.).

hiwsis, *o*- or *i*-stem, **hiwsisi** (*wo*-stem) ‘north; northern wind’.

Bible+. Spelled also as *hiwsiws(i)*, *hisis(i)*, etc.

●**DIAL** Preserved in Muš, Sebastia, Xarberd (*hisis*), Karin, Axalc’xa, T’iflis, Ararat, Salmast [HAB 3: 102a].

●**ETYM** No acceptable etymology is recorded in HAB 3: 102a.

S. Petrosyan (1977: 215) derives from PIE **seu-* ‘left’, also mentioning Russ. *sever* ‘North’ and Lith. *šiaurė* ‘North’. This etymology is uncertain, however, since no details are discussed. The Balto-Slavic forms cannot be related since Lith. *š-* presupposes PIE **k̂-*; they belong to a different PIE word (see s.v. *c’urt* ‘cold’).

Ĵahukyan (1986-1987) derives *hiwsis* ‘north’ from **seukoi-k̂i(y)o-*, a compound of PIE **seuk-e/o-* (the locative form of **seuk-o-*, cf. Lith. *sukti* ‘drehen, wenden, kehren, betrogen, betören’, Slav. *sukati* ‘to turn’; see s.v. *hiwsem* ‘to weave, plait’) and PIE **k̂ei-* ‘se trouver’ (cf. Gr. *κεῖμαι*; see s.v. *sēr* ‘love’), the basic meaning being “qui se trouve à l’opposé”. He treats it as “côté inverse”, in opposition with *haraw* ‘south’, etymologically “côté du devant” (q.v.). Olsen (1999: 960) lists *hiwsis* among the words of unknown origin and does not mention Petrosyan’s and Ĵahukyan’s etymologies.

hiwsn (*an*-stem: GSg *hiwsan*, NPl *hiwsunk*’, GDPl *hiwsanc*’) ‘carpenter’.

Bible+. MArm. *hus(n)*, pl. *huser* [Łazaryan/Avetisyan, MiġHayBaġ 2, 1992: 50a].

In Movsēs Xorenac’i 1.32 (1913=1990: 88^{L5f}; transl. Thomson 1978: 124): *Oč’ unimk’ asel, imastun kam anhančar astanōr lineł mez hiwsn, patkanawor kam oč’, zaynoc’ik ayžm uremn zkni hełuselov bans, zkareworsn ew meroys aržani šaradrut’eans* : “I cannot say whether we are here acting like a wise or like an unskilled workman, one competent or not, in adding now at the end these stories, which are important and worthy of our history”.

●**DIAL** Dial. *xus* is attested in an inscription from 1591. Present in Van *xus*, GSg *xsan*, NPl *xsner*, Ozim *xows*, Salmast *xus* [Ačāryan 1952: 108, 125, 276; HAB 3: 102b].

●**ETYM** See s.v. *hiwsem* ‘to weave, plait’.

hnjan, *a*-stem [according to Olsen (1999: 299, 956), *i*-stem, but see below for instr. *hnjan-a-w(-k’)* in Agat’angełos] ‘a basin to squeeze grapes in, a wine-press basin; a room for wine-pressing’.

Bible+. Spelled also as *hncan*.

Several attestations in Agat'angelos, referring to special wine-pressing buildings/rooms in gardens in NE side of Vafarsapat=Norak'atak' (nowadays Ejmiacin):

mtanēin i hnjanayarks aygestanwoyn, or kan šineal i hiwsisoy yarewelie' kusē (1909=1980: 85^{L15f}/§150);

gteal linēin nok'a i hnjanš šinuacoc'n (90^{L1}/§161);

hasuc'anēin ar durs hnjanin, ur ēin vank' noc'a artak'oy k'atak'in (91^{L18f}/§166);

ert'eal ar hnjanōk'n (= *hnjan-a-w-k'-ir*, vars. *hnj/canawn*), *ur ēinn isk yařař vank' iwreanc'* (104^{L9f}/§192);

ew mi omn or andēn i nerk's spanin i hnjan and, ur ēin vank' noc'a (108^{L3f}/§201);

ew amp'op'eac', ar gnac' i hnjan, ur vank'n isk leal ēin noc'a (118^{L1f}/§224).

On the ancient wine-presses of Armenia see Tiracjan 1983: 57-58.

●**DIAL** Ararat, Muš, Bulanəx *hnjan*, Agulis *ənjun*, Metri *ənjān* (see Aṭayan 1954: 243, 278a), Zeyt'un *ənjən*, all meaning 'grapes basin, wine-press'; Xarberd, Akn, Tigranakert (*h*)*ənjən* 'garden-hut'; Ararat *hnjanapat* 'ruin of a wine-pressing building' [HAB 3: 105-106]. Note that Ararat *aragast* is a part of a *hnjan*, but, according to Baḡdasaryan-T'ap'alc'yan (1971: 218), in Aštarak *arak'ast* is synonymous to Ōšakan *hənjən* (see s.v. *aragast*).

In a fairy-tale recorded by Sero Xanzadyan in Goris in 1947 (HŽHek' 7, 1979: 414^{L22f}), *hnjan* and *hovuz* are used in the same sentence, as by-forms meaning 'swimming-pool'. If reliable, this is remarkable in respect with my etymological suggestion below.

●**ETYM** Ačāryan (HAB 3: 105b) mentions only the connection with *hunj* '*mowing' suggested in NHB, pointing out that it semantically remote is, unless *hnjan* previously had a different meaning. According to Ĵahukyan (1987: 314, 315; 1988, 2: 84), borrowed from Hitt. ^{GIS}*hanza(n)* 'a kind of implement'. Olsen (1999: 299, 956) represents *hnjan* as a word of unknown origin in *-an*.

I tentatively propose to treat *hnjan* as borrowed from an Iranian or Semitic theoretical form, viz. **ha/ovzan* '*font = Taufbecken; a kind of bathing-vessel; the basin of a fountain; garden-basin' (see s.v. *awaz*), with the *n*-epenthesis (on which see 2.1.30.1).

For the semantics see s.v. *aragast*.

***hol(-an)-** ‘uncovered, naked’: **hol-ani** ‘uncovered, bare, naked’, **hol-an-e/im** ‘to bare, uncover’ (both Bible+), **hol-on-** ‘id.’ (John Chrysostom, T’ovmay Arcruni, Mesrop Erēc’, Nersēs Šnorhali); **hol-a-t’ew-em** ‘to stretch one’s arms’ (Sahak catholicos Jora/op’orec’i, 7th cent., etc.), etc.

holani renders Gr. ἀκατα-κάλυπτος ‘uncovered’ in e.g. 1 Corinthians 11.13 (referring to a woman), and the verb *holane/im* - ἀπο-καλύπτω ‘to uncover’ in 2 Kings 6.20, 22; further: *holaneal* = adv. ἀ-κάλυπτως in 3 Maccabaeorum 4.6.

The form *holaneal* ‘openly, uncovered’ is also found in e.g. P’awstos Buzand 3.17 (1883=1984: 39^{L-8f}): *holaneal gorcēin zmetš*: “they committed sins openly” (transl. Garsoĭan 1989: 92). For the full passage see s.v. *xēt* ‘bite, pain, etc.’. For *holanem* ‘to strip naked’ see e.g. P’awstos Buzand 4.58 (150^{L15}; transl. 178).

●**ETYM** Since Meillet (1894: 154), connected with OCS *polje*, Russ. *póle* ‘field’, *pól’ij* ‘open, bare, empty’, etc., and Arm. *hoł* ‘earth, ground’. See s.v. *hoł* for more detail.

hoł, *o*-stem ‘earth, ground, soil; burial plot, cemetery’ (Bible+); ‘plot, estate’ in P’awstos Buzand 5.31 (1883=1984: 194^{L-9f}; transl. Garsoĭan 1989: 212), and Step’anos Ōrbelean. MArm. derivatives in the meaning ‘cemetery’: *hoł-va(y)r-k’*, *hoł-vrd-i*, etc. [MiġHayBaġ 2, 1992: 45b].

As a component in place-names: see Hübschmann 1904: 384; Ĵahukyan 1987: 413.

●**DIAL** Dialectally ubiquitous. In Suč’ava, Karin, Sebastia, Akn, Hačən, Ararat: with initial *f*; in Van-group (Van *xoł*, gen. *xut-u* [Ačāryan 1952: 120, 276] vs. Moks *xut*, gen. *xutē*, pl. *xutir* [Orbeli 2002: 250]), Ĵuła, Salmast, Marała, Svedia, Polis, Tigranakert, Hamšen, T’iflis, etc.: initial *x*-; in Łarabał and Goris: *v*-. The rest: *h*- [HAB 3: 111b].

The *x*- in Van and adjacent dialects regularly comes from *h*-. In others: through assimilation *h...t* > *x...t*, see e.g. Ačāryan 1947: 51 and 2003: 411, for Hamšen and Svedia, respectively.

●**ETYM** Since Meillet (1894: 154), connected with OCS *polje*, Russ. *póle*, etc. ‘field’, Russ. *pol* m. ‘floor’, ORuss. *polb* m. ‘foundation’, Russ. *pól’ij* ‘open, bare, empty’, which are usually derived from PIE **pelh₂-* ‘wide and flat’, cf. Hitt. *palhi-* ‘wide’, OHG *feld* ‘field’, Lat. *palam* ‘overt, publicly’ (on this word see Schrijver 1991: 209-210), *plānus* ‘level, flat, plane, even’, Lith. *plónas*, Latv. *plāns* ‘thin, flat’, Lith. *plótis*, Latv. *plāt* ‘to flatten’, Sorbian *pton* ‘Ebene’, Sloven. *plán*, f. *plána* ‘frei von Baumwuchs’, *plánja* ‘offene, freie Fläche’, SCr. *planína* ‘Bergwald’ (< Slav. **pol-no-*), etc.; see HAB 3: 109, 111; Pokorny 1959: 805; Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984,

2: 781; Saradževa 1986: 19-20; Angela Della Volpe apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 133b (OCS *polje* and Arm. *hoť* : "distantly related"); etc. For Arm. *hoť* different protoforms have been assumed: **polo-* [Jahukyan 1987: 143]; **pólnos*, cf. Slavic [Klingenschmitt 1982: 165; Olsen 1999: 53, with ref.]; **póln₂os* (Olsen, *ibid.*).

Meillet (1894: 154), followed by Ačaryan (HAB), Saradževa and Jahukyan (*ibid.*), connected also Arm. *hol-an-i* 'uncovered, bare, naked', verbal *hol-an-* 'to bare' (both Bible+), later *hol-on-*; see s.v. **hol(-an-)*. Olsen (1999: 310) considers *holani* to be etymologically unclear.

As is clear from *het* : *otn* 'foot' (q.v.), PIE **p-* yields Arm. *h-* when followed by **e* and is lost before **o*. This makes the etymology of *hoť* problematic. Discussing this phonological development, Pedersen (1906: 370 = 1982: 148) rejects Meillet's etymology and suggests a connection with Lat. *solum*, *-īn*. 'base, foundation; earth, ground, soil; sole of the foot or shoe'. Klingenschmitt (1982: 165) independently suggests the same comparison, with a question-mark. If the Latin comes from **sue/ol-*, Arm. *hoť* cannot belong to it since **su-* would yield Arm. *k'-* [HAB 3: 111b; Olsen 1999: 53₁₁₂].

The traditional etymology may be justified if one accepts the following explanation for the problem of Arm. *h-*. Lat. *plānus* probably reflects an original **plh₂-nó-*, a *no*-adjective with a zero grade root, whereas Lith. *plónas* and Latv. *plāns* introduced full grade **pleh₂-* from the verbal forms [Mayrhofer 1987: 103, 103_{73a}; Schrijver 1991: 182, 357, 497]. The form **plh₂-nó-* would yield Arm. **halan-* as in *haraw* 'south', q.v. The absence of *h-* in *alaw(s)unk* 'Pleiades' (q.v.) may be analogical after *y-(h)olov*, q.v. Then Arm. **halan-* and **ot* 'earth' < **pol(h₂/n)-* may have become *holan-* and *hoť* through mutual influences. Compare cases like *ort* 'vs. dial. *hort*' 'calf' etc. (see 2.1.21). For *holan-i* cf. *kend-an* : *kend-an-i* 'living, alive'.

According to Ačaryan (HAB 3: 112a), Kurd. *xōl(ī)* 'soil, earth' can be an old loan from Armenian. This is improbable. The Kurdish word rather belongs to the Iranian word for 'ash', for which see Blasing 2000: 43-44.

hoy 'fright, fear', independently only in 1 Machabaeorum 3.25, with synonymous *ah* 'fear', together rendering Gr. *φόβος*. In compounds: **hoy-a-kap** 'superb, wonderfoul, famous, praiseworthy', with *kapem* 'to tie, consruct' (Bible+); **hoy-anun** 'famous', with *anun* 'name' (Book of Chries).

For the semantics of *hoy-a-kap* Ačaryan (HAB 3: 113a) compares *ah-a-gin* 'terrible; enormous' from *ah* 'fear, terror'. Note the use of *ahagin* and *hoyakap* side by side in Book of Chries.

In T'ovmay Arcruni (9-10th cent.) one frequently finds with an initial *x*- [NHB 1: 961a], e.g. in 2.1 (V. Vardanyan 1985: 128^{L17}; transl. Thomson 1985: 146): *xoyakap ew yakanawor k'ajamartut'eamb* "with splendid and outstanding bravery, fought <...>".

●**ETYM** Ačāryan (HAB 3: 113) considers the resemblance with Pers *hōy*, *hūy* 'fear, dread; breath; sigh; a word used in exciting attention' (see Steingass 1519a; cf. also *huyū* 'fearing, being afraid', op. cit. 1521b) to be accidental, noting that this word is an onomatopoeia or interjection, and leaves the origin of the Armenian word open. The Persian word, however, may be worth of consideration. Is there any etymology?

Later, Ačāryan (1937: 4) expresses his surprise by the fact that PIE **poti-s* 'master, host, owner' is unknown only to Armenian, and sees its relic in the compound *hoy-a-kap* 'superb', with *kapem* 'to tie, consruct', assuming an original meaning "bāti par un prince, princier"; cf. Germ. *herr-lich*. He (ibid.) points out that **hoy* is the regular reflex of **poti-s*. However, this is in conflict with *otn* 'foot' (vs. *het*), *ali-k* 'wave', etc. [Neither convincing are the attempts of deriving *hay* 'Armenian' from the same **poti-s*]. Furthermore, this etymology forces us to abandon the derivation of *hoy-a-kap* from *hoy* 'fear' (demonstrated by Ačāryan himself; see above), which seems improbable and unnecessary.

Ĵahukyan (1967: 106, 106₄₈) considers Ačāryan's etymology as doubtful and connects *hoy* with *hayim* 'to observe' and, with reservation, with *hi-anam* 'to admire' (q.v.), deriving all from PIE **k^wei-*: Skt. *cay-/cāy-* 'to perceive; to observe', Gr. *τίω* 'to esteem, deeply respect', etc. The connection with *hi-anam* is interesting (see s.v.), but the rest is improbable, particularly in view of *h-* and the vocalism.

According to Olsen (1999: 960), *hoy* is a word of unknown origin.

I propose a comparison with Lat. *paveō*, *pāvī* 'to be frightened or terrified at' (probably not related with Lat. *paviō*, *-īre* 'to hit'), OIr. *úath* 'fear' < **pou-to-*, Welsh *ofn* 'fear' < **pou-no-* (see Schrijver 1991: 256, 446), though the type of derivation of the Armenian is difficult to establish. QIE **peu-t-* would probably yield **hoyt* (or **hoy* is possible too?). One may hypothetically assume that the deverbative **hoyt* lost its **-t-* analogically after the unattested verb **huyem* 'to fear' which can be interpreted as a **-je*-present with zero grade in the root, of the type Gr. *βαίνω* 'to go' and Lat. *veniō* 'to come; to go' from **g^wm̥-je-* (see also 2.2.6.1); thus: **pu-je-mi* > **huyem*.

hoyl, *i*-stem: GDPI *hoyl-i-c* 'in Plato 'group (of people, animals, etc.)'.

Plato, Łewond, etc. As the second member of compounds: Hexaameron+. Later also *hol-*, *holon-* 'to collect, gather, assemble'.

●**ETYM** Scheftelowitz 1904-05, 2: 33 derives *hoyl* from PIE **plh₁-* ‘full, abundant’ (on which see s.v. *yolov*). Petersson (1916: 276-277) assumes the same for *holem*, but separates *hoyl* from *hol-* and compares it with Latv. *pūlis* ‘Haufe, Herde’ etc. The separation of *hoyl* from *hol-* can hardly be accepted. Ačaryan (HAB 3: 113-114) rejects these and other etymologies and leaves the origin open.

Olsen (1999: 778, 808) treats *holonem* ‘to collect, gather’ as a denominative from **plh₁no-* ‘full’ not making any reference to ClArm. *hoyl*. This is improbable since *holon-* is a later and poorly attested derivation from ClArm. *hoyl* ‘group’, and the assumed development (**-l_hC-* > Arm. *-oloC-*) is uncertain; see 2.1.20.

Ĵahukyan (1987: 145) links with *hewam*, *p’č’em*, etc., reconstructing **peu(s)-l-* for *hoyl*, cf. Lith. *pūslė* ‘blister, bladder’, Russ. *púxlyj* ‘chubby, pump’, Skt. *púṣyati* ‘to thrive, flourish’, etc. This is probable.

The idea about PIE **plh₁-* ‘full, abundant’ can be maintained only if one attempts a derivation from PIE feminine **plh₁-u-ih₂-* (cf. Skt. f. *pūrvī-*), assuming a metathesis. Thus: **pelh₁-u-ih₂-* > PArm. **heləw-i-* > **hewl-i-* > *hoyl* (*i*-stem); see also s.v. *yolov*.

hoviv, *a*-stem ‘shepherd’.

Bible+.

●**DIAL** Preserved in Hamšen, Svedia, Muš, Van, Ararat, etc. [HAB 3: 118a]. In Č’arsančag one finds *hovig* (ibid.; Bařramyan 1960: 90a).

In chapter 3 of the famous fairy-tale “Anahit” by Ĺ. Ařayan (1979: 349^{L4f}), the difference between *hoviv* and *naxrč’i* is explained as follows: the *hoviv* pastures only goats and sheep, whereas the *naxrč’i* – everything.

●**ETYM** Since long (see HAB 3: 117-118), derived from **h₃eui-peh₂-*, a compound of PIE **h₃eui-* ‘sheep’ (cf. Skt. *ávi-*, Luw. *hāui-*, Gr. *óĩς*, *óĩoς* and *oĩóς* ‘sheep’, Lat. *ovís*, etc.) and **peh₂(s)-* ‘to protect, pasture’ (cf. OCS *pasti* ‘to pasture’, Lat. *pāscō* ‘to pasture’, Hitt. *pašš-* ‘to protect’, etc.). For the compound cf. Skt. *go-pā-* m. ‘herdsman’ < ‘cowherd’ (Mayrhofer, EWAia 1, 1992: 499-500), *avi-pālā-* ‘shepherd’, perhaps also **hawt-at* (q.v.).

Though much debated, the etymology cannot be abandoned. Schindler (1994: 397) restores strong **h₂óui-* vs. weak **h₂áui-* (acrostatic) deriving Toch. B *ā(u)w*, *awi* ‘ewe’ from the latter form, and for the Armenian *h-* comparing the case of *hotm* ‘wind’ (q.v.). On Toch. B *ā(u)w* ‘ewe’ and *eye* ‘sheep’ see Adams 1999: 35, 92; Kim 2000.

The vocalism of *hoviv* is in contrast with the rule according to which **o* in initial **Ho-*, **so-*, *po-* becomes *a* in open syllables unless it was followed by a syllable

containing another **o* (see 2.1.3). Kortlandt (1983: 10 = 2003: 40; see also Beekes 2003: 157) adds another condition: unless it was followed by the reflex of **w*, as examples noting *hoviw* 'shepherd' and *loganam* 'to bathe'. Ĵahukyan (1990a: 5) assumes an influence of the once-existing word **hovi-* 'sheep' from **houiyo-*. However, the PIE word is represented in the form **h₃euis* and there are no cognates which would point to **h₃eui-o-*. If Ĵahukyan means the genitive form, neither this solves the problem since, in either cases, PIE **-u-* would yield Arm. *-g-*.

The paradigm of the Armenian word for 'sheep' should be reconstructed as follows: nom. **how* (orthographically: **hov*), gen. **hogi*. It seems therefore more natural to assume that the *-w-* was restored analogically after Arm. **how-* 'sheep' (on which see also Kortlandt 1993: 10 = 2003: 102) before this ceased to exist. [Alternatively: **w* > **g* was blocked by assimilatory influence of the *w* in the following syllable]. For **h₃e-* > Arm. *ho-*, with *h-* as the reflex of the PIE laryngeal, see Kortlandt 1983: 12 (= 2003: 42); Beekes 1985: 82; 2003: 183; Lubotsky 1990: 130; Schrijver 1991: 50; see also 2.1.16. For Anatolian, dissimilation of labiality has been assumed [Lindeman 1990].

hot, *o*-stem 'smell, odour'.

Bible+; **hotim** 'to smell' (Bible+); also redupl. **hotot-** 'id.' (Bible). As pointed out by Ačāryan (HAB 3: 118a), both in ClArm. and dialects, except for the dialect of Polis where the meaning is generic, the verb *hotim* refers to the bad smell. On the verbal morphology see Meillet 1916f: 175. On the noun *hot* see below.

●**DIAL** The noun is biquitous in dialects, in the generic sense 'odour (pleasant or unpleasant)'. Hamšen *he(ɔ)d* refers to 'bad smell', opposed to *hɔm* 'pleasant odour' < *ham* (q.v.); see HAB 3: 118b; Ačāryan 1947: 240-241. On the semantics of the verb see below.

●**ETYM** Since NHB (1: 123b), connected with Gr. *ὀδμή* 'smell', Lat. *odor, odōris* m. 'smell, scent, odour; perfume', etc. [HAB 3: 118; Hübschmann 1897: 468]. Earlier, Hübschmann (1883: 39) considered the etymology "fraglich" because of the initial *h-*, pointing out that one expects **ot*. It has been assumed that Arm. *ho-* reflects PIE **h₃e-* in contrast with **Ho-* > *o-*; see Kortlandt 1980b: 128; 2003 (<1983+): 42, 55, 73; Schrijver 1991: 48-49, 50; Beekes 2003: 183). See also 2.1.3.

It has been suggested that Arm. *hot* (*o*-stem) reflects an original *s*-stem seen in Lat. *odor, odōs* [Meillet 1894: 54; Hübschmann 1897: 468; Kortlandt 1980b: 128; Schrijver 1991: 48; Olsen 1999: 47]. This would be possible if the Latin was originally neuter (see Olsen 1999: 47₉₅). A neuter *s*-stem would confirm the *e*-vocalism (see Kortlandt 2003: 55; Beekes 2003: 183).

Redupl. *hot-(h)ot-*: In a paper where he rejects the IE background of Armenian reduplication, Greppin (1981b: 6) notes: "*hototim* is probably derived in the preliterate period from the noun *hot*. Otherwise we would expect **hohotim*". However, here we are dealing with the full rather than partial reduplication; cf. Gr. *ὀδωδῆ* f. 'smell' derived from the perfect. Thus: **hot-(h)ot- > hotot-*. See also 2.3.2.

hruandan *a*-stem in NHB 1: 143b, but without evidence 'rocky sea-shore' (Book of Chries), 'an open balcony' (Zak'aria Sarkawag/K'anak'erc'i, 17th cent.).

●**ETYM** Glossing the word as *hrajew gahawandk' i covap'uns*, NHB (1: 143b) suggests a derivation of *hur* 'fire', which is improbable. Ačāryan (HAB 3: 138a) does not accept the connection with Pers. *farvān* 'upper floor' and leaves the origin of *hruandan* open. He also notes that the resemblance with Gr. *πρῶν* m. '*vorspringender Felsen, Bergspitze' and Skt. *pravaṇā-* 'abfallend, geneigt, abschüssig' is accidental. According to *Karst (see M. Muradyan 1972: 281b), borrowed from Pers. *farāvand*. The meaning of *farāvand* (cf. also *farvand(a)*) is 'the bar of a door' (Steingass). L. Hovhannisyan (1990: 267b) places *hruandan* in his list of Iranian loans.

S. Petrosyan (1979: 54) suggests a connection with the mountain-name *Aruandu* (in Media) and derives both from PIE **peru-ṇ-to-*, cf. Skt. *pārvata-* 'rocky, rugged; (m.) mountain, mountain-range' (RV+), YAv. *pauruuatā-* f. 'mountain-range', etc. This is phonologically improbable; one would rather expect **hergan(d)*.

Given the shape of the word, the Iranian origin is very probable (see also Jahukyan 1987: 558), though the details are not clear. A theoretical **fr(a)wan-* 'rock' (cf. the above-mentioned Gr. *πρῶν* etc.) is thinkable. If one starts with the meaning 'balcony', one may assume an Iranian formation with the prefix **fra-* and *b/wand-* 'to bind, weave', borrowed into Arm. *vand(an)ak* 'net, basket, cage', and, especially, 'upper floor, terrace'. Note also Goris and Łarabał *čəravand* 'thick beams of the ceiling', which probably derives from **(aw)čar-a-wand*, see 2.1.33.2. A trace of Iran. **fra-band-* may be found in ÈtimSlovIranJaz 2, 2003: 71. For a designation of an upper construction in a house based upon a pillar as containing the prefix 'at, by, for, before' cf. YAv. *fra-skəmba-* m. 'porch' next to Skt. *skambhā-* m. 'prop, support, pillar' (RV+) and Arm. *pat-šgam* 'balcony' (borrowed from Iranian, cf. MPers. *pďy-škm̌b* 'space', NPers. *pa-škam* 'summer-house'), as well as Arm. *ara-stat* 'ceiling' < **at/on the pillar* (q.v.).

hu 'purulent blood'.

Once in 12th century medical literature: *Apa t'ē iwr ēut'iwinn awiri, na herje zeraksn ew i yandam min vat'i, hu ew šaraw Encayi iwrēmēn* (MxHer). Mentioned only in ArjBar.

●**ETYM** Müller proposed a comparison with Skt. *pūya-* 'pus', *pūti-* (AV) 'stinking, putrid', Lat. *pūs, pūris* 'pus', *pūteo* 'to rot', Lith. *pūti* 'to rot', etc. This etymology is accepted by Hübschmann (1897: 468). However, Ačāryan (1897: 169 and 1898: 371) considers Arm. *hu* a loan from Pers. *hū* 'pus' (cf. Kurd. *heu* 'gangrene'). Hübschmann (1899: 45) agreed with Ačāryan and revised his opinion. This revision has generally remained unnoticed by scholars (see Pokorny 1959: 849; Solta 1960: 174; Schrijver 1991: 534; Adams apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 471; Olsen 1999: 913₈₃), with the exception of Clackson (1994: 45). If the Persian and Kurdish words do not have an acceptable etymology, then one might assume that they are borrowed from Armenian, and that the latter is of native origin.

***jabri** 'funnel; lamp'.

●**DIAL** Ačāryan (HAB 3: 142b) mentions only T'iflis *jabri* 'funnel'. In fact, I think, the word is more widespread in Armenia proper. As Sat'enik Łaragyozyan informs me, in Hrazdan (a Van dialect speaking area) there exists **caprik* 'funnel'. Further, I find the word in a fairy-tale from Łarabał, recorded in the village of Ašan (district of Martuni) in 1967 [HŽHek' 7, 1979: 393]: *Á knegy, ēs hinč' hrašk' a? Min cāprin per tesnank' <...>; cāprin yor a ōnum*. In the glossary of the collection, *cāpri* appears in two meanings: 'funnel' and 'lamp'. Obviously, the latter is represented in the passage under quotation, which should be translated as follows: "You, wife! What a miracle is this? Fetch now the lamp (so that) we see. <...> [the wife] takes the lamp". In Łzlar one finds *zabri* 'a metallic funnel for wine' (see Geworgyan 1980: 20a).

●**ETYM** Ačāryan (HAB 3: 142b) states that T'iflis *jabri* 'funnel' is borrowed from Georgian *jabri* 'funnel' and considers their resemblance with Arm. *jagar* 'funnel' as accidental. This is possible. We saw, however, that the word is also found in other dialects. Thus, it is theoretically possible that the Georgian word is borrowed from Armenian. For further discussion see *jagar*.

jagar, *a*-stem according to NHB 2: 144c, but without evidence 'funnel'.

Agat'angelos 109 (1909=1980: 65^{L2}). For the passage see s.v. *tik*. In "Čarəntir": *Jagar edin i beran nora* "They put a funnel into his mouth".

●**DIAL** Preserved in several dialects of *kə*-class.

●**ETYM** No acceptable etymology is recorded in HAB 3: 142. Ačāryan (ibid.) considers the resemblance with Georg. *jabri* 'funnel' as accidental. According to

him, T'iflis *jabri* is borrowed from Georgian. The latter statement is possible. But the word is also found in other dialects, see **jabri*. Thus, it is theoretically possible that the Georgian word is borrowed from Armenian.

Ĵahukyan (1987: 128) derives *jagar* from PIE **g^heu-* 'to pour' (cf. *jew*, *joyl*). [For an earlier alternative see Džaukjan 1967: 185₇₁]. For the semantics cf. e.g. Lat. *in-fundibulum* 'a funnel for pouring liquids' from *in-fundō* 'to pour in', based on the same **g^heu-* 'to pour', though formally not everything is clear. Perhaps < PArm. **javar-* < **jəw-arV-* or **jow-árV-*? For the suffix see Ĵahukyan 1987: 235; 1998: 16f; Clackson 1994: 118f; Olsen 1999: 337f.

Given the remarkable formal and semantic resemblance with **jabri* 'funnel', one might speculate that the latter may have been borrowed from PArm. **javar-* through intermediation of some language of neighbouring regions (Uartian?, Iranian? Caucasian?), in which an intervocalic *-w-* would yield *-b-*.

[For *jagar* vs. **jab-r-* compare, perhaps, Pahl. *babr* 'tiger' vs. Mlr. **vagr*, Arm. *vagr*, Skt. *vyāghra-* 'tiger'].

jať (*u*-stem in NHB 2: 145b, but without evidence) 'derision, mockery' (Łazar P'arpec'i, John Chrysostom, etc.), **jať-an-k'**, *a*-stem 'id.', **jaťem** 'to deride' (Bible+), 'to conquer' (Eusebius of Caesarea).

GDPI *jaťan-a-c'* is attested in Jeremiah 51.18 (not 11.18, as is misprinted in HAB), John Chrysostom, Yovhannēs Ōjnec'i, etc., as well as (not cited in NHB) in P'awstos Buzand 5.3 (1883=1984: 160^{L4}; transl. Garsoñan 1989: 188): *t'snamans jaťanac' i berdargel pašarmann* "of his taunts during the siege of the fortress"; see the full passage s.v. **awre(a)r*.

●**ETYM** The connection with *caťr* 'laughter' etc. suggested in NHB (see s.v. *caťr*) is rejected in view of the unagreement of the initial affricate [Meillet 1898: 280]. Meillet (ibid.) prefers connecting with Gr. *χλεύη* 'joke, jest', Olc. *glaumr* 'jubilation', OE *glēam* 'jubilation, joy', OCS *glumъ* 'idle talk, boasting', Russ. (dial.) *glum* 'stupidity, mockery, joke, noise'. Ukr. *hlum* 'mockery', Pol. *gtum* 'mockery, torture, misfortune', Czech *hluma* 'mime, actor, comedian', Bulg. *gluma* 'joke', etc. On Slavic and its alternative etymologies see ĖtimSlovSlavJaz 6, 1979: 147-152.

The appurtenance of the Armenian is accepted by Hübschmann (1899: 48: from **g^hhllu-* with a question-mark), Ačāryan (HAB 3: 143b), Ĵahukyan (1987: 127: from **ghlō-* with a question-mark). In etymological dictionaries, however, the PIE form is usually reconstructed as **g^hle/ou-*, with a non-palatalized guttural, and the Armenian form is not included (see Pokorny 1959: 451; Mallory/Adams 1997: 255-256).

Ĵahukyan (ibid.), though with reservation, includes also *ĵtmem* ‘to watch’ (only in HNB and “Baġirk’ hayoc” [HAB 3: 155b; Amalyan 1975: 194^{Nr49}, 398₄₉]), which is highly improbable.

ĵayn, *i*-stem ‘voice, sound’ (Bible+); later: ‘speech, word’ (John Chrysostom etc.); dial. also ‘noise; rumour’.

●**DIAL** Dialectally ubiquitous [HAB 3: 144b]. For the semantic development cf. e.g. Moks *cen* ‘голос; шум; звук’ [Orbeli 2002: 254]. It also refers to ‘rumour’: *cen eng’āv* ‘слух дошел (до)’ (op. cit. 98^{L18}, transl. 166^{L-5}). Another textual illustration is found e.g. in a fairy-tale from Łarabał recorded by Aġak’el Baġat’ryan in 1860 (HŽHek’ 6, 1973: 687^{L7}).

●**ETYM** Numerous attempts of connecting with OCS *zvонъ* ‘sound’ are rejected on formal grounds (see HAB 3: 144b). More positive: Pokorny 1959: 490; Ĵahukyan 1982: 71-72, 75; 1987: 129 (deriving from **g^huŋ-ji-*); Olsen 1999: 100.

One may assume a **-ni-* formation as in synonymous *ban*, *i*-stem ‘speech, word’ from *ba-m* ‘to speak’ < PIE **b^heh₂-*: Gr. *φημί* ‘to say’. For the anticipation of **-i-* (cf. Ĵahukyan 1982: 71-72; Beekes 2003: 162) see 2.1.27.1. [The reason that no anticipation is seen in *ban* may be that the latter derives from **b^heh₂-sni-*, cf. OCS *basnъ* ‘tale’, Russ. *basnja* ‘fable’, etc]. For the loss of **-u-* (see Ĵahukyan 1982: 75; Kortlandt 2003: 6, 18, 86, 122; Beekes 2003: 209) cf. perhaps *katał* ‘den’, probably from **guol-*.

ĵetun, *an*-stem: GDSg *ĵetuan* in Eznik Kołbac’i, Gregory of Nyssa, Eusebius of Caesarea, etc. ‘ceiling; palate’.

In the main meaning (‘ceiling’), *ĵetun* is attested since the Bible.

ISg *ĵetmamb* (Anania Sanahnec’i, 11th cent.) presupposes a (probably the original) by-form **ĵetumn* [NHB 2: 149c; HAB 3: 148a]. For *-u/wn* : *-mn* see 2.1.22.11.

In John of Damascus, *ĵetun* refers to ‘palate’: *verin ĵetunk’ beranoy* “upper ceiling of the mouth”.

In Eznik Kołbac’i 1.3 (1994: 12), the sun is metaphorically described as *črag mi i meci tan i meĵ ĵetuan ew yataki* “a candle in the big house between the ceiling and the floor”. For *mec tun* ‘universe’ see s.v. *tiezerk’*. A similar usage is found in Gregory of Nyssa (NHB 3: 2: 149c; 1010b): *erkin <...> zōrēn ĵetuan* “the sky <...> like a ceiling”.

The by-form *jotun-k* is attested in Severian of Gabala, as well as, in APl *jotun-s* (var. *jetun-s*), in "Vark' S. Gēorgay zōrawarin". It matches the form of the dialect of Akn (see below).

●**DIAL** Akn *j'otunk* (see also Gabriēlean 1912: 309), Trapizon *c'xink* [HAB 3: 148b], Hamšen *c'xink*, gen. *c'xənk-i* [Ačāryan 1947: 35, 242]. On Trapizon/Hamšen see below.

●**SEMANTICS** For 'palate' : 'ceiling' : 'sky' see 3.7.1.

●**ETYM** The connection with. Gr. *χελύνη* 'lip, jaw' (see Adontz 1937: 9; Pokorný 1959: 436; Ĵahukyan 1987: 127, 170-171; cf. Olsen 1999: 133) is doubtful. The meaning 'palate' (< 'ceiling/roof of the mouth') is clearly secondary, see 3.7.1. I prefer the connection with Georgian *zeli* 'log, bar' [HAB 4: 657] and Arm. *joť* 'log; pole' (see Ačāryan 1974: 108-111, with ref. to Bediryan). Klimov (1998: 285) reconstructs a Georgian-Zan **z,el-* 'tree, wood', cf. also Megr. *žā-*, pl. stem *žal-* 'tree, wood', etc. See also s.v. **ar-zel*. Note the intermediary form *jotunk* (Severian of Gabala etc.; dialect of Akn). For the suffix *-un* cf. *c'awt-un* 'stalk, straw', q.v. For an attempt of reconstructing the original paradigm see s.v. *joť*.

According to Ačāryan (HAB 3: 148b), Megr. *cxve/ini* 'ceiling' is borrowed from Armenian and resembles especially the Trapizon/Hamšen form *c'xink*. The initial *c'*- and the final *-ink* of the latter form are not explained, however. One might assume a contamination with *c'u-ik* 'roof' (see s.v. *c'iw* 'ceiling, roof'), perhaps also dial. (Sasun) *arink* 'ceiling'; see s.v. *arik*.

However, the Megrelian continues a Georgian-Zan lexeme **sqwen-* 'ceiling, roof', and Arm. dial. *c'xin-k* is considered a Zan loanword (see Klimov 1998: 171-172). A Georgian-Zan borrowing from Armenian **c'ixwin-k* (a contamination of *jetun* and *c'uik*) would be impossible since Arm. *-x-* comes from *-t-* which is not compatible with Kartvelian **q* (note that the Georgian word is attested in the oldest literature, see Klimov 1964: 167). Ĵahukyan (1987: 599) compares the Kartvelian word with Arm. *seneak* 'room', q.v.

Thus, Arm. dial. (Trapizon/Hamšen) *c'xin-k* 'ceiling' should be separated from *jetun* 'ceiling' and be treated as borrowed from Megr. *cxwen(d)-*, *cxwin(d)-* 'ceiling'.

joť, *o*-stem 'log, bar; pole'. Later, in Grigor Magistros (11th cent., Bĵni) and Yovhannēs Erznkac'i (13th cent.), also 'a stripe of leather'.

Bible+. MArm. (Smbat Sparapet, 13th cent., Cilicia) ***joťi**, in ISg *joťw-o-v*, cf. the dialectal forms below.

●**DIAL** Preserved in several dialects. The meaning ‘a stripe of leather’ (Grigor Magistros+) is found in Axalc’xa, Axalk’alak’, Ganjak, Łarabał, as well as (see Ałayan 1954: 315) in Metri. Axalc’xa *j’oť* means ‘back (of the human body)’

**joti*: Ararat *joti* [HAB 3: 157b], Metri *júťe* < *joti* [Ałayan 1954: 278b].

●**ETYM** Probably connected with Lith. *žuolis* ‘dickes Stück Holz, Baumstamm’ and Skt. m. n. *hala-* ‘plough’ (Gobh+), as well as with Arm. *jlem* ‘to furrow’ (hapax; uncertain), and, especially, with *jetun* ‘ceiling’. For literature see HAB 3: 155, 157b; Fraenkel 2, 1965: 1323; Mayrhofer, EWAia 2, 1996: 808. Mayrhofer (ibid.) does not mention Arm. *joť*. Fraenkel (ibid.) is sceptical to this view, and, with some reservation, connects Lith. *žuolis* to *žalias* ‘grün, roh, ungekocht’ and *želti* ‘grünend wachsen, bewachsen, aufgehen (von Pflanzen)’. [Joachim Matzinger (p.c. apud Olsen 1999: 54) derives Arm. *joť* from the same colour root]. He judges the etymology as “unsicher”.

On the strength of the relatedness of Arm. *joť* ‘log; pole’ with *jetun* ‘ceiling’, *jetunk* (Seberianos; dialect of Akn), and, possibly, Georgian *jeli* ‘log, bar’ etc, one may tentatively propose the following reconstruction: NSg **gʰoh₁-(ō)l* (> Lith. *žuolis* ‘dickes Stück Holz, Baumstamm’; probably also Arm. **jul* ‘plough’ (> *jlem* ‘to furrow’; cf. *arawr* ‘plough’ > *arawrem* ‘to plough’); ASg **gʰh₁-el-* > Skt. m. n. *hala-* ‘plough’; Arm. **jet-* ‘log (supporting the ceiling)’, and, with *o*-grade, *joť* ‘log; pole’ (from analogical **gʰh₁-ol-*). Skt. *hala-* ‘plough’ and Arm. **jet-* ‘log’, *joť*, *o*-stem ‘log; pole’ can be interpreted as a shared innovation by means of the thematic **-o-*: **gʰh₁e/ol-o-*, cf. the cases of *erg* ‘song’ and *surb* ‘pure’. For the semantics cf. Russ. *soxa* etc., see s.v. Arm. *c’ax*.

**joť(-a)-har-i*

●**DIAL** Metri *jəthāre* ‘a kind of poplar-tree’ [Ałayan 1954: 278b, 314], Karčewan *jəthāri* ‘a tall tree of which logs/beams (*joť*) are made’ [H. Muradyan 1960: 221a].

Among the villages of the district of Ewaylax (in the province of Siwnik’) Step’anos Ōrbelean (1250/60-1304) mentions *Jahayreank**, of which no etymological explanation is known to me. It seems to reflect the above-mentioned Metri form: **jətahari* + *-an-k*.

●**ETYM** Ałayan (1954: 278b) restores **jothari* not specifying the structure and the origin.

As is implicitly suggested by H. Muradyan (see above), the compound seems to contain *joť* ‘log; pole’ (> Metri *júťe*). The second component is *har-* ‘to beat, strike’, represented in another compound, viz. Metri **tirivhāre* [Ałayan 1954: 332], Kak’avaberd *tirivhāri* ‘a sharp instrument for cutting off leaves and/or branches of

mulberry-trees' [H. Muradyan 1967: 206b] < *terew-har-i 'leaf-cutter'. As we see, in both compounds the compositional element *-har-i* demonstrates precisely the same underlying meaning, viz. 'to cut', though *terew-har-i has, unlike *joť-har-i, an agentive meaning. The actual meaning of *joť-har-i would be 'of which logs/poles are cut'. That the poplar can figure in this context is clear from *barti* 'poplar' (q.v.).

čanač'em, aor. *caneay*, imper. *canir* 'to know, recognize; to be acquainted, aware' (Bible+); see also s.v.v. *can- 'to know', *can-ak* 'disgrace', *ciacan* 'rainbow'.

●**DIAL** The verb *čanač'em* is ubiquitous in dialects. Apart from Karin, Axalc'xa *čanc'el* and Hamšen *čnc'uš*, there are two basic forms: *čananč'el (*n*-epenthesis, on which see 2.1.29, 2.1.30.1; infinitive in *-el*): T'iflis, Ararat, Łrabať, Agulis, Ĵuta, etc.; and more widespread *čanc'nal (+ *-n-*; infinitive in *-al*) in the rest. On Aslanbeg see below. T'iflis has both: *čananč'il* and *čanc'nal* [HAB 3: 182b].

The form *čanc'nal seems to represent *čanač'anal or *čanač'enal. The latter is attested in Cyril of Alexandria (see NHB 2: 169b, with a note *imk.* = 'dial.').

Dial. secondary *c'*-aorist is already attested in John Chrysostom (see NHB 2: 169b, with a note *imk.* = 'dial.').

Ačaryan (1898: 32b^{L1}, 35a, 85a) represents Aslanbek *köšnal* (aor. *köšč'a* < *čanc'c'a*) as showing exceptional developments *a* > *ε*ɔ (= *ö*), and *č* > *k*. In HAB 3: 182b, he has *gečšna[l]*. See also Vaux 2001: 41, 42, 50: *göšnal*, aor. *göšč'a*. Ačaryan does not specify the origin of the initial guttural. [Contamination with *git-* 'to know'? Dissimilatory change of the first of the affricates into an unpalatalized *k*-?].

Ačaryan (HAB, *ibid.*) notes that in this meaning (i.e. 'to recognize, be acquainted' - HM) *g'idānil* < *gitenal* 'to know' is used in Svedia.

On Maraťa *canot* see s.v. *can- 'to know, be acquainted'.

●**ETYM** Since NHB (2: 169ab), linked with Gr. *γινώσκω*, *γινώσκω* 'to come to know, perceive', Lat. *co-gnōskō* 'to learn, get to know', Skt. *jñā-* 'to know, recognize' (RV+), etc. Remarkably, Skt. *čnat'i* is mentioned in NHB 1: 1009c; obviously *jñāti*-m. 'close relative' (RV+) is meant. Meillet (1894b: 296; 1936: 29) is undoubtedly right in deriving *čanač'em* from **canač'em*, through assimilation. Hübschmann (1897: 455-456) rejects this and separates *čanač'em* from Arm. **can-*, Skt. *jñā-*, etc. However, Meillet's interpretation is commonly accepted (see HAB 2: 443-444; 3: 182; Ĵahukyan 1982: 168, 180; 1987: 125; etc.).

Meillet (1936: 109; 1950: 110) links the present *-č'-* with Gr. *-σκ-* and Lat. *-sc-* of cognate forms and assumes a combined **-sk-ye-*. Ĵahukyan (1982: 180-181) points out that the *-č'-* can go back to either **-kĵ-* nor **-tĵ-* but not to **-skĵ-*. In view of the *-t'* of *canawt'*, he is inclined to **-t-je-*. However, **ĝnh₃-sk-je-* > **canač'em* >

čanač'em seems to be the best solution (see also Kortlandt 1991: 2; 1994: 28-29 = 2003: 96, 105; Clackson 1994: 40; Beekes 2003: 194, 201).

***čto/upur** 'walnut'.

● **DIAL** Łarabał **čtopur* 'walnut (ripe, with hard shell)' [Ačarean 1913: 723a], or *čotopur* (also in Nuxi), *čtupur* [Amatuni 1912: 151a, 439a]. The actual forms are: Łarabał *čəťopur*, *čəťupur*, *čutupur*, Hadrut', Šařax *čutupur*, Mehtiřen *čəťupur* [Davt'yan 1966: 352]; Goris *čəťuper*, *čutuper* [Margaryan 1975: 433a].

● **ETYM** G. Łap'anc'yan (1961: 76, 90; 1975: 369-370) treats as a loan from Megr. *čubur-*, Laz *čubu(r)-*, *čubr-* 'chestnut' (cf. Georg. *čabl-* 'chestnut'), offering no satisfactory explanation for **č-* > **čt-*. Klimov (1964: 247; cf. also 1998: 305-306) mentions the comparison with reservation. He was more positive in 1971: 225-226.

For the addition of *-t-* one might think of contamination with unattested **čəť-* 'acorn' from **g^welh₂-*: Russ. *žėlud'*, SCr. *žėlūd* 'acorn', etc. (vs. **g^wlh₂-*: Lith. *gėlė*, Arm. *katin*, q.v.); this is highly hypothetical.

Ĵahukyan (1967: 167) mentions *čolopurt* 'opex' next to *katin*, in the list of words with alternation *k* : *č*.

čm- (< ***čim-**) 'to squeeze, press'; dial. also 'to knead', 'to trample down', etc.

čm-l-em 'to squeeze, press' (Bible+).

● **DIAL** *čm-l-em* has been preserved in Suč'ava, Moks, Tigranakert; with metathesis: Muř *člmil*. Widespread is ***čm-ř-(t'-)em** (with metathesis: Aslanbek, Sebastia, Akn **jəřmeť*, Salmast *mčřel* (for *mč-* see also below, on **čmuř*); with epenthetic *-b-*: T'iflis *čmbriľ*) [Ačarean 1913: 725-726; HAB 3: 207a]. Also widespread is the noun ***čmuř**. In Xarberd, Baberd, T'iflis, Lori, Łarabał: *čəmbuř*, with epenthetic *-b-* [Ačarean 1913: 725]. In Marařa, Moks, Rřtunik': *mčuř*, with metathesis; cf. Salmast *mčřel* above. The verb **čm-ř-el* is, then, denominative. See also below, on a secondary denominative verb Łarabał **čm-uř-el*.

Some other forms which belong here too: Łarabał ***čm-il** 'to bend down under a burden' (see below), Łazax **čm-ř-u-il* 'to stretch oneself'; Van **čmk'il* 'to be pressed'; Ararat, Łarabał, Muř *čm-l-k-(o)t-* next to Ararat, Łazax, T'iflis *člm-k-ot-* (with metathesis) 'to stretch oneself'; Łarabał **čmp'el* 'to seize, snatch something out of smb.'s hand' (on the semantics see below), etc. [Ačarean 1913: 718b, 724-726]. Compare also Van, Bulanəx etc. *kčmt/t'el* and Ararat *čmkt'el*, *čmtk'el* (Amatuni 1912: 348b) which, together with MArm. *kčmt'el*, *kčmt'el*, *kmč't'el* 'to pinch' (also *kčmtil* in Grigoris, see MiřHayBař 1, 1987: 401a), are derived from

kic-/kič- 'to bite, sting' [HAB 3: 587ab], but some of the forms, especially *čm-t'-el* and *čm-k-t'-el*, may in fact belong to (or influenced by) *čm-* 'to squeeze, press'.

Łarabał, Hadrut', Šařax, Mehtiřen *čam-el* or *čam-il* (see Davt'yan 1966: 421) represents the "pure" stem. According to HayLezBrbBař 3, 2004: 383b) the form is also found in a number of western dialects. It is still in use in Armenia proper, e.g. in my mother's village Erazgavors.

Ačar'yan (1913: 725a) records Łarabał *čmōřil* 'to trample down' as identic with **čm-i-el*, distinguished with a semantic nuance. Strictly speaking, this form reflects **čm-ur-el* (with regular development *-ō-* > Łarabał *-ō-* and is secondarily based on the noun **čm-ur*: Łarabał *čmōř(nə)* [Davit'yan 1966: 421]. Since Łarabał has both the verbs *čamirēl* (Davit'yan 1966: 421) and *čmōřil* and the noun **čm-ur*, the relationship of the forms should be explained as follows: Łarabał *čamirēl* reflects the old, dialectally widespread **čm-i-el*, which is probably a denominative verb based on **čm-ur* (also present in Łarabał) and comes therefore from **čmūr-el*, whereas *čmōřil* must be treated as due to secondary restoration of the vowel *-u-* (> *-ō-*).

●**ETYM** Pedersen (1906: 393 = 1982: 171) connects *čmlem* 'to press' and *čim*, *čem* 'Zaum' with each other and with Gr. *γέντο* 'he took', *ῥγ-γεμος* *συλλαβή*, OCS *žьmq*, *žęti* 'to squeeze, press', Mr. *gemel* 'fetter'; cf. also Oİc. *kumla* 'quetschen, verwunden', Norwegian *kumla* 'Klumpen; kneten, zusammenpressen', etc.: PIE **gem-* 'to seize, take; to squeeze, press'. Rejected by Ačar'yan (HAB 3: 207a) but accepted by Pokorny (1959: 368) and Ĵahukyan (1987: 125).

mařt', *i*-stem 'prayer, supplication' (IPl *mařt'-i-w-k'* in Plato and Nersēs Šnorhali); **mařt'em** 'to implore, prey', in Sapiaentia 13.18 (rendering Gr. *ίκετεύω*) etc.

Bible+.

In ModArm., *mařt'el* means 'to wish something to someone' [Malxaseanc' 3: 244a]. According to A. A. Abrahamyan (1970: 100-101, with discussion; 1994: 88/89), this meaning occurs in a troublesome passage from Eznik Kořbac'i 1.27. Schmid (1900: 86) renders by *begünstigen*.

●**ETYM** Bugge (1889: 15) connected with Lith. *maldyti* 'to implore'. This and other cognates which are added later (OCS *moliti* 'to ask, pray', Hitt. *ma-al-ta-i* 'to pray', OS *meldōn* 'to report, tell', etc.) point to **me/old^h*- or **-d-*; therefore for Armenian a different form is postulated, viz. **mel-th-* [Meillet 1898: 277; Benveniste 1932; Szemerényi 1954: 164-165; Solta 1960: 260-261]. According to Ĵahukyan (1967b: 71₄₇; cf. also 1987: 138, 181), the form *mařt'* beside PIE **mel-d^h*- implies that either the Armenian word is a loan, or the **-d^h*- is a determinative, and Arm. *-t'*- goes back to a parallel form with **-th-*.

However, the existence of this PIE phoneme is usually rejected, and the restoration of a determinative **-th-* is uncertain. Furthermore, the problem of the vocalism is still unsolved.

I propose to treat *maṭt'ēm* as a denominative verb based on *maṭt'*, *i*-stem, which can be explained as a **ti*-deverbative with a regular zero grade: **mld^h-ti-* > PArm. **maṭ(d)^hi-* > *maṭt'*, *-i*. See 2.1.22.13.

maškat'ew

An epithet of the bat (*č'ṭjikan*) in Hexaameron, homily 8, as an adjective describing the bat (see K. Muradyan 1984: 259^{L2}) or the wing of the bat: *t'atant'ard maškat'ew t'ewovk'* (ibid.: 276^{L11}). Later it comes to denote 'bat'. This meaning is recorded in "Bžškarān" and "Bargirk' hayoc'" (see Amalyan 1975: 209^{Nr137}, 264^{Nr38f}). Its only attestation is found, according to HAB 3: 261a, in Arak'el Siwnec'i (15th cent.). In fact, it is much older. I find it in the earliest edition of the Alexander Romance, in the oldest manuscript (Nr 10151 of Matenadaran) from the 13th century (see H. Simonyan 1989: 423^{L-3}). On this manuscript representing the hitherto unknown original edition see op. cit. 14-16, 49-50, 364. In the final edition *maškat'ew* has been replaced by the "more normal" *č'ṭjikan* (op. cit. 290^{L-3}); some verses further (op. cit. 291^{L8}): *t'ew maškē unein* "they had wings of skin". It is also attested in "Govank' t'irč'noc'" (see Mnac'akanyan 1980: 252^{L222}), written, according to Mnac'akanyan 1980, by Kirakos Episkopos (13-14th cent.):

Maškat'ewin p'etur č'kayr,

Zinč' or gorcē zsekn kawškar.

Further: in Asar Sebastac'i (16-17th cent.), see D. M. Karapetyan 1993: 211^{L9}; in the glossary: 364.

● **DIAL** No dialectal forms are given in HAB. However, the word *maṣketep* 'bat' recorded in the Turkish dialect of Hamšen, as shown by Uwe Bläsing (1992: 58^{Nr85}), allows to postulate the existence of the word in the Armenian Hamšen. Bläsing says: "Für das Armenische von Hemçin ist dieses Wort nicht belegt, <...>". However, we do find it in a fable in the form *maškənt'ew*; see Ač'aryan 1947: 213, though it is not listed in the glossary of the monograph. See also s.v. **maškat'it'er/tn*. Note also Xotorjūr *maškt'ep* 'bat' (see YušamXotorj 1964: 487a). For the final stop instead of the *-w* see 2.1.15. Compare the Turkish *-p*. As Uwe Bläsing is pointing out (p.c.), it cannot be explained within the Turkish dialects.

For the epenthetic *n* see 2.1.30.1.

●**ETYM** The compound *mašk-a-t'ew* means '(having) a wing of skin'; cf. dial. *kaš-a-t'ew* (Van) and *sek-e-muk* (Ewdokia); see Ačārean 1913: 549a and 959b, respectively.

The word seems to have been borrowed into Georgian (*mač^hk^hat^hela*) and Udi (*māškātil*) [HAB 3: 261a; AčarHLPatm 1, 1940: 206-207; Ĵahukyan 1987: 591]. Ačāryan does not explain the *-l-*. One might presume that the Georgian and Udi forms betray an Armenian **mašk-a-t'el*, with a theoretical **t'el* 'wing' instead of the regular *t'ew* 'wing'. This is probable since next to Arm. **t'er* (< **pter-*) 'wing; leaf' (q.v.) there is also a variant in **-l-*. Moreover, Sip'an *mškat'el-uk* 'bat' (see Amatuni 1912: 485a) directly proves the existence of the Armenian **mašk-a-t'el*. One can also think of **mašk-a-t'(i)t'eł*, with **t'it'etn* 'butterfly' (dial. **t't'eł*) as the second member; see s.v. **maškat'it'ei/tn*.

**maškat'it'etn* 'bat', **maškat'it'etn* 'butterfly'

●**DIAL** The word in a traditional story (see Łanalanyan 1969: 343-344^{Nr794F}). The place is not specified; the analysis of the text shows, I think, that it originates from Bulanəx. Here the bat appears in the form of *mašk-a-t'it'er*, with *t'it'er* 'butterfly' as the second member. In Sip'an one finds *maškat'it'eł* in the meaning 'butterfly' (see Amatuni 1912: 6b). For the relationship between names of the bat and the butterfly cf. Łarabał *alakuškuš* (see HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 12a, 18a). Note also that Gr. *πτερόν* n. 'feather; bird's wing' (< PIE **pter-* 'wing', see s.v. *t'er*) refers to wings of both the bat and insects.

●**ETYM** The compound **mašk-a-t'it'ei/tn* is composed of *mašk* 'skin' and *t'it'etn* or *t'it'etn* 'butterfly' (q.v.). This is reminiscent of *mašk-a-t'ew* 'bat, literally: '(having) a wing of skin' (q.v.). On Georgian *mač^hk^hat^hela* and Udi *māškātil* see s.v. *maškat'ew*.

**mayem* 'to bleat (of the sheep)'

Only in dictionaries - ĴB, P'B.

●**DIAL** Preserved in Axalc'xa, Karin, Van, as well as in the meaning 'to mew (of the cat)' - in Zeyt'un, Karin (with *-ä-*), Van (*mayuyet*), Akn (*me*yan* 'a cat that mews a lot'), Šamaxi *mäyvo*c'* 'miaow' [HAB 3: 245a]. The Van form has an initial *p-*: *payet* (see also Ačāryan 1952: 279), which represents *bayet* (cf. HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 156b) and may be linked with /sheep-imitating/ *baaa*, *beee*.

●**ETYM** Ačāryan (HAB 3: 245a) correctly treats the word as onomatopoeic. Consequently, he considers the resemblance with Skt. *mā-*: *mīmāti* 'brüllen, blöken, meckern', *amīmet* 'brüllte', *mēmyant-* 'meckernd', *māyū-* m. 'das Blöken, Brüllen'

(RV+); Gr. *μηράομαι* 'bleat (of sheep)' and others as accidental, which is not necessarily true. Cf. Mallory/Adams 1997: 394b (with the Armenian form). Note also YAv. *anu-maiia-* 'blökend (vom Schaf); Schaf'.

Despite the onomatopoeic character of the root, I tentatively restore **meh₂-i-*. From this one may perhaps derive Iran. **maišā-* 'sheep' (Skt. *meṣā-* m. 'ram, male sheep', f. *meṣī-* 'female sheep'; YAv. *mačša-* m. 'sheep'), of which no deeper etymology is recorded in Mayrhofer, EWAia 2, 1996: 380 (the cognate forms have secondary semantics: 'skin of sheep'). Iran. **maišā-* 'sheep' can reflect **meh₂i-so-*.

For a possible *k*-suffixation see s.v. *mak'i*.

mat- in *matč'im*, *matnum* (aor. *mateay*) 'to approach, come close' (Bible+) : *mawt* 'near, close', also *i mawtoy* and *mawtim* 'to approach' (Bible+). *matoyc'* (cf. caus. *matuc'anem*) is found in numerous derivatives, also as the second member of compounds, such as *džuar-a-matoyc'* 'hard to access' (Bible+). For *matoyc'* (GSg *matuc'-i*) 'access' see s.v. *matn₂*.

●**DIAL** *mōt* (= *mawt*) is widespread in dialects.

●**ETYM** Linked with OIc. *mōt* n. 'Zusammentreffen, Begegnung', OEngl. *mōt* 'Gesellschaft, Versammlung, Zusammenkunft, feindliche Begegnung', etc. [HAB 3: 266, 373]. See 2.1.22.12.

matn₁, GDSg *matin*, ISg *matamb*, NPl *matunk'*, GDPl *matanc'* 'finger; toe'.

Bible+.

●**DIAL** Dialectally ubiquitous. In Agulis, the meaning 'finger' is represented by *büt'* < *boyt'* 'thumb' (q.v.) [HAB 3: 270b].

●**ETYM** Usually compared with the Celtic word for 'thumb': Welsh *maut*, Bret. *meut* 'thumb' (see HAB 3: 270). Considered doubtful (see Makaev 1974: 58-59). The Celtic word is derived from PIE **meh₁-* 'to measure' [Pokorny 1959: *703/704]. The Armenian would require ***mh₁-d-*, which is not confirmed by any cognate. Uncertain. If it is accepted, note the shift 'finger' : 'thumb', seen also in Agulis.

matn₂ 'hill-side'; dial. 'hill; slope'.

Geoponica (13th cent.).

According to Ačaryan (HAB 3: 271a), the oldest attestation is found in Joshua 15.7: *iḵanen i Gaḡaḡ, or ē handēp matuc'in Odomimay* : *καὶ καταβαίνει ἐπὶ Γαḡαḡ, ἥ ἐστὶν ἀπέναντι τῆς προσβάσεως Αḍḍαμιν*. RevStBible here has: "turning toward Gilgal, which is opposite the ascent of Adummim". Ačaryan points out that *matoyc'* corresponds to Hebr. 'ascent' and therefore means *zariver*

‘precipice, ascent’. However, Arm. *matoyc*‘ (GSg *matuc*‘-i) renders Gr. *πρόσβασις* f. ‘access’ and belongs with Arm. *mat-č’-im* (*mat-uc*‘-) ‘to approach’, as correctly suggested in NHB 2: 215c (“*yaṛaj matč’umn*”).

●**DIAL** Preserved in Lori *mat*, Zeyt’un *məd* ‘hill’, Č‘arsančag *mad* ‘slope of a mountain’ [HAB 3: 271]. Ačāryan (2003: 13) mentions the Zeyt’un form in his list of MArm. : Zeyt’un correspondences.

●**ETYM** No acceptable etymology is recorded by Ačāryan (HAB 3: 271a). He points out that the resemblance with Arab. *matn* ‘plateau’ and Syr. *maṯā* ‘earth, land’ is accidental.

Ĵahukyan (1972: 282) compares with Avest. *mati*- ‘Vorsprung des Gebirges’, which derives from PIE **mn-t-*, cf. Lat. *mons*, GSg *montis* ‘mountain’, Alb. *mat* m. ‘Ufer; Sandstrand’ (see Demiraj 1997: 50, 256).

I wonder whether it is not identic with *matn*₁ ‘finger’ (q.v.). The semantic transfer from body-part terms into topographical ones is trivial. Note that in one of the passages from Geoponica *matn-er* occurs with *koł-er*, which actually is identic with *koł* ‘rib’, and *tap’er*. A comparable semantic relationship may be seen in PIE **pr-sth₂-* ‘standing before’: Lith. *pīštas* ‘finger’, OCS *prěstь* ‘finger’ : Skt. *pṛsthā*-n. ‘back, mountain ridge’ (RV+), YAv. *paršta*- m. ‘back, spine, support in the back’ (see s.v. *erastan-k*’).

mawru, *a*-stem: GSg *mōru-i* (Severian of Gabala, Philo), AblSg *mōru-ē* (Plato), *mōr-oj-ē* (“Yaysmawurk”), GDPl *mōru-ac*‘ (Basil of Caesarea: “T’uht’k”) ‘stepmother’.

Severian of Gabala, Eusebius of Caesarea, Plato, Aristotle, Philo, John Chrysostom, etc.

●**DIAL** Šatax *murū mer* ‘stepmother’, Muš *muri* ‘step-’, Muš, Bulanəx *xort’umuru* (< **xort’-u-mōru*) [HAB 3: 247a, 375b]. The type of the compound **xort’-u-mōru* can be seen in **orb-ew-ayri*.

As we see, all the evidence points to adjectival meaning ‘step-’. However, we do find the original form in Hamšen *mōru* ‘stepmother’ [Ačāryan 1947: 12, 246], and Xotorjur **moroy* ‘grandmother’ and *moru* ‘step-mother’ (see YušamXotorj 1964: 490b and 491b, respectively). **moroy* seems to be a “quasi-grabar” representation of the dialectal form the precise shape of which is unknown. It may reflect **mōrū*, cf. *saroy* ‘cypress’ next to Pers. *sarū* (see HAB 4: 189-190).

●**ETYM** From IE **meh₂trui(e)h₂-*, cf. Gr. *μητρυνᾶ* ‘stepmother’, OEngl. *mōdrige* (*n*-stem) ‘mother’s sister’, etc. (see Hübschmann 1897: 472; HAB 3: 246b). For the discussion I refer to Clackson 1994: 145-147.

For the element **-u-* cf. Arm. GPl *mi-a-mōr-uc* (see HAB 3: 246b).
See also s.v. *yawray* 'stepfather'.

mak'i, *ca*-stem 'ewe'.

Bible, Eznik Kořbac'i, Hexaemeron, etc.

In a 14th (or 15th - 1432?) century addendum (describing Cilicia) to "Ařxarhac'oyc'" written by T'ovma Kilikec'i we read that Cilicia has *mak'is vayri* (APl.) 'wild sheep' (see Hewsens 1992: 322). One concludes from this that for the author *mak'i* rather denoted the sheep in general. This is directly confirmed by the actual semantics of *mak'i* in the dialects of Cilicia and surroundings; see below. Also in the attestation of Eznik the general semantics is possible: *Oč' gaylk' mak'is, ew oč' mak'ik' atuēss [cnan]*.

● **DIAL** Widespread: **mak'i*. [For the *-g-* of the form of Svedia (*mag'a*) see Ačaryan 2003: 428. According to Andreasyan (1967: 374b), however, it is *maka*]. In the meaning 'ewe': Muř, Alařkert, Karin, Ararat, Ararat, Van, Ozim, řatax (see M. Muradyan 1962: 202a; for the semantics - 83), Salmast, Marařa (cf. Davt'yan 1966: 426), whereas Zeyt'un [Ačaryan 2003: 327], Svedia [Ačaryan 2003: 579], Tigranakert and Moks have the general meaning 'sheep'; see HAB 3: 291b. According to Orbeli (2002: 288), however, the Moks meaning is 'ovca dojnaja'.

In his glossary of purely dialectal words in the řamaxi dialect, Bařramyan (1964: 243) records *mak'ajin* 'female wild boar'. Is it related with *mak'i*?

● **ETYM** Since Diefenbach (see also HAB 3: 291; Pokorny 1959: 715), connected with Gr. *μηκάς*, *-άδος* f. 'bleating one; goat', *μηκάομαι* 'bleat (of sheep)'. Cf. also Skt. *makamakāy-* (Class.) 'quaken', *meka-* (Lex.), Germ. *meckern*, MHG *mecke* 'Ziegenbock', Lat. *micciō* 'meckere', etc. Outside IE: Kannařa *mē* 'the bleating of sheep or goat(s)', *mēke* 'she-goat'. The absence of palatalization of the velar in Armenian is not explained; cf. Olsen 1999: 808. The solution may lie in the onomatopoeic character of the root, see 2.1.14. Note onomatopoeic *mk(m)kal* (of goat, kid) [Ačaryan 1913: 785a; řahukyan 1972: 299; 1987: 137]. Alternatively, one may assume a feminine **meh₂k-eh₂-* (cf. Gr. *μηκάς*), gen. **mh₂k-h₂-os*. The *-i* is secondary. See also below.

Formally, Arm. *mak'i* and Gr. *μηκάς* can derive from **meh₂-k-*, whereas the others may continue **m(e)h₂-i-k-* or **mek-*. The underlying root may be **meh₂(-i)-* (see s.v. **mayem*, with parallels for the semantic development 'bleating (one)' : 'sheep or goat'). Given the onomatopoeic character of the root, however, any reconstruction is risky. řahukyan (1987: 137): **mek-* / **mekija-* > *mak'i*. Seems unconvincing.

As *mak'i* generally denotes the female sheep, it can be linked with other designations of female animals in *-i* such as *ayc(i)*, *mari*, etc. (q.v.). However, one should not exclude the alternative according to which the general meaning 'sheep' (see above) would be the original one, having subsequently developed into 'female sheep'. In this case, *mak'i* can be seen as an *i*-derivation from onomatopoeic **mVk-* 'to bleat'; thus: **'bleating one'*. Cf. typologically the *i*-derivation expressing the semantic development 'field' > 'wild animal' (see s.v.v. *art-i*, *and-i*, also *vayr-i* in Zeyt'un).

[Alternatively, *mak'i* could originally have had an (IE) **i*-stem after **hovi-* 'sheep' (see s.v. *hoviw*). The latter derives from IE HD **h₃ey-i-* 'sheep'. The old NSg. **mak'u(i)* < IE **-ōi* may also explain the absence of palatalization of the velar (see above)].

**mglamandi* 'spider-web'.

●**DIAL** I find the word only in Goris *məkləmandi* < **mglamandi* 'spider-web' [Margaryan 1975: 440a]. There are also forms with a final *-l*, see Martirosyan/Laragyozyan FW 2003, Goris and Łarabał.

●**ETYM** No etymological attempt is known to me.

I propose to treat the word as follows: **mgl-* 'mould/Schimmel' (see s.v. **mglim₁*) + *-a-* + **mandi* 'yarn or web', probably a *-di-* < **-tj_iV-* formation based on *manem* 'to spin' (class., widespread in dialects, among them also in Goris). The voicing **t* > *d* after *-n-* and *-r-* is regular; see s.v.v. *anjrdi*, *ordi*, *spand* (etc.), all being composed of the same suffix. Compare also *sard*, *i*-stem 'spider' (q.v.). The spider-web is taken to be, then, a mould-like yarn/web, which is quite conceivable.

If this etymology is accepted, one should consider **mglamandi* as archaic, since the formation is old, and Goris only has **mglim₂* 'to scorch, singe' (in the compound **mglahot*), which can eventually be connected to **mglim₁*.

Alternatively, one might think that the first component of **mglamandi* 'spider-web' is **mglim₂* 'to scorch, singe', having developed into '(sooty) spider-web'; cf. *un₃* 'soot' (q.v.), which refers to the (sooty) spider-web in Łarabał, Hin Juła, probably also Goris and Šamaxi. The semantic relationship 'soot' : 'spider-web' is also paralleled by Akn *mlul/r* [HAB 3: 352b]. However, this seems more complex and unnecessary (?).

The forms *muknumandil* etc. may be seen as folk-etymological reshaping as 'kerchief of a mouse'.

**mglim₁* 'to rot, to spoil, to mould (verschimmeln)'.

Only attested in the compounds *mglahot* (Geoponica, 13th cent.) and *mgriahot* (Arakel Dawrižec'i, 17th cent.), both meaning 'smelling like mould' (adj.). The former is also found in "Bžškaran jioy" (13th cent.) in the meaning 'smell of mould' (subst.); see Č'ugaszyan 1980: 82^{L-7}, 216; MiĵHayBaġ 2, 1992: 121. It is preserved in Muš *mək'lahod* (see Baġdasaryan-T'ap'alc'yan 1958: 264b; the meaning is not specified), and in Łarabaġ etc. in a different meaning, see s.v. **mglim*₂.

●**DIAL** Preserved in the dialects of Suč'ava, Nor Naxiĵewan, Polis, Rodost'o, Aslanbek, Sebastia, Akn, Xarberd, Hamšen, Karin, Alaškert (for Muš see above), Axalc'xa, Ararat, Zeyt'un, Hačən (*mäg'le*) [HAB 3: 293a], as well as in Arabkir, Xian and Sivri-Hisar [Ačārean 1913: 765]. For Svedia see Andreasyan 1967: 374b (the meaning is not specified). In Axalc'xa, Atap'azar, Polis, etc., one finds **mgl-ot-im* [Ačārean 1913: 765b].

In Xotrĵur one finds *aregkmeġ*, *aregmknē* 'to rot, to spoil under the sun' [HayLezBrbBaġ 1, 2001: 122a], the second component of which might be related, too; see s.v. **aregmgn-*.

Another interesting and unexplained compound is Goris *məkləmandi* < **mglamandi* 'spider-web' [Margaryan 1975: 440a]; see s.v. **mglamandi*. It may have been composed as **mgl-* 'mould/Schimmel' + *-a-* + **mandi* 'yarn or web', probably a *-di-* < **-tiĵV-* formation based on *manem* 'to spin' (q.v.). If this etymology is accepted, one should treat **mglamandi* as archaic, since the formation is old, and Goris only has **mglim*₂ 'to scorch, singe' (in the compound **mglahot*), which can eventually be connected to **mglim*₁.

In Turkish-Armenian dictionary (c. 1720 AD) by Etia Mušetĵyan Karnec'i (Karin/Xotrĵur) one finds *muk'ġ* with *borbos* 'mould' and *ort'* rendering Turk. *k'uf* 'mould, rust' [Č'ugaszyan 1986: 86^{Nr50}, 140]. Č'ugaszyan (ibid.) does not identify *muk'ġ*. I propose to treat it as a back-formation from the verb *mglim* 'to rot, mould'; for the vocalism see 2.1.17.3.

●**ETYM** According to Ačāryan (HAB 3: 293a), related to **mglim*₂ 'to scorch, singe' and **mglim*₃ 'to cloud' with the basic meaning 'to become black'. The connection with *mglim*₄ suggested in NHB 2: 234a is semantically problematic.

**mglim*₂ 'to scorch, singe'.

●**DIAL** Only in dial. compound **mglahot* 'smell of singeing': Łarabaġ [HAB 3: 293a; Davt'yan 1966: 426], Goris [Margaryan 1975: 348a, 440a], Šamšadin and Krasnoselsk [Mežunc' 1989: 212b]. For written attestations of *mglahot* with a different meaning see s.v. *mglim*₁.

●**ETYM** According to Ačāryan (HAB 3: 293a), related to **mglim*₁ ‘to rot, to spoil, to mould (verschimmeln)’ and **mglim*₃ ‘to cloud’ with the basic meaning ‘to become black’.

**mglim*₃ ‘to cloud’.

●**DIAL** Preserved in the dialects of Šulaver, Ararat, Nor Bayazet, Van, Ozim, Mokk’, Šatax, Muš, Alaškert [HAB 3: 293a; Ačāryan 1952: 280; Muradyan 1962: 6, 202a]. In some of them a dental suffix appears: **mgl-t-* (Alaškert, Nor Bayazet) and **mgl-ot-* (Muš).

●**ETYM** According to Ačāryan (HAB 3: 293a), related to **mglim*₁ ‘to rot, to spoil, to mould (verschimmeln)’ and **mglim*₂ ‘to scorch, singe’ with the basic meaning ‘to become black’. Only **mglim*₃ ‘to cloud’ has an external etymology. It is connected to *mēg* ‘fog’ (q.v.); cf. Skt. *megha-* m. ‘cloud, gloomy weather’, Av. *maēya-* m. ‘cloud’, etc. PArm. **mig-la-* ‘cloud, fog’ may be derived from IE **h₃mig^h-leh₂-*, cf. Gr. *ὀμίχλη* ‘fog’, OCS *mьgla* ‘mist, haze’, Lith. *miglà* ‘fog’, Dutch dial. *miggelen* ‘staubregnen’.

The absence of metathesis of **-g^hl-* suggests perhaps an older **mig-il* or *-ul*, perhaps from HD *l*-stem with NSg **-ōl*, see 2.2.2.5. Alternatively, one may assume that the metathesis was blocked by the sensed association with the unsuffixed form *mēg*. For the structure of the derivation cf. an example with the same semantics: Gr. *νεφ-έλη* ‘cloud’ next to *νέφος* n. ‘id.’. One also might think of the verbal *-l-* seen e.g. in *čm-l-em* ‘to squeeze, press’ (see s.v.).

The archaic nature of Arm. *-l-* is suggested by Ačāryan (HAB 3: 311b; see also N. Simonyan 1979: 241; Ĵahukyan 1987: 137, 180), who uses this, as well as the semantic difference between Arm. *mēg* and its Iranian cognates, to prove the native origin of the Armenian forms. (The semantic argument is not decisive, however, since the difference is very slight, and the meaning ‘fog, mist’ is present in Iranian, too; see Cheung 2002: 204).

According to Greppin (1983: 272-273), here belongs also Arm. **amuŋ* found in *aŋamuŋ* ‘darkness, twilight’, which is improbable; see s.v. **aŋ*.

The meaning ‘to cloud’ might have developed into ‘to become dark’. Since a loss of the atmospheric context is possible, it is not very hard to get from here the meanings ‘to rot, to spoil, to mould (verschimmeln)’ and ‘to become black (as a result of scorching, singeing, rusting)’. Compare color-based designations of the mould such as Russ. *plesen*, etc. See also s.v. *unŋ*.

[*mglim*₄ ‘to struggle’.

Only attested in John Chrysostom: *Oč' ogoric'i ew oč' janayc'ē, ew oč' mglic'i, ayl diwraw heštaw innn zmarmin t'otuc'u.*

●**ETYM** In NHB 2: 234a, the above-cited passage is represented under *mglim*₁ 'to rot, to spoil, to mould (verschimmeln)', though the connection seems to be rejected. Indeed, the semantics is problematic. Doubtful is the comparison (op. cit.) with *maglc'em* 'to climb' and *mak'arim* 'to struggle', too.]

metex, *o*-stem: ISg *metex-o-v* (Ephrem); *i*-stem in NHB 2: 247b with no evidence, but cf. AblSg *i metex-ē* (Deuteronomy 19.5, "Naxadrut'iwnk'" Ecclesiastes) which cannot belong with *o*-stem 'the handle of an axe'

In Deuteronomy 19.5 (Cox 1981: 152): *ew ankanic'i erkat'n i metexē* : καὶ ἐκπεσὸν τὸ σιδήριον ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου. Arm. *metex* renders Gr. ξύλον 'wood; piece of wood; peg, lever; cudgel, club' (here, said of ἀξίῃν = *p'aytat* 'axe') and refers thus to a 'handle of an axe'.

In Ephrem *metex* refers to the handle of a *tapar* 'axe'.

●**ETYM** No acceptable etymology is recorded in HAB 3: 299b. Jahukyan (1987: 355, 438), with reservation, treats it as comprising PIE **mel-* 'to hit grind' (cf. Russ. *mólot* 'hammer' etc.) and the Urartian suffix *-hi/ə*. However, *metex* specifically refers to the handle, wooden part of the axe rather than to the axe in general or its metallic part. I therefore propose an alternative etymology.

Arm. *metex* may reflect PArm. **met(i)* 'ash-tree' related with Gr. *μελία*, Ep. *-ίη* f. 'manna ash, Fraxinus ornus; ashen spear' from QIE **mel-ih₂*-. For the semantic development cf. the Germanic forms of the PIE term for 'ash-tree': OIc. *askr*, OHG *asc*, OEngl. *æsc* 'ash-tree; spear'; Gr. ὄξυα 'beech; spear-shaft made from its wood, spear'; see s.v.v. *hac'i*, *hoyn*, *uši/*hoši*. See especially Dumont 1992: 326₁₈.

The Greek word has no secure etymology (see Frisk 2: 201-202). PArm. **met(i)* 'ash-tree' and Gr. *μελία* 'id.' may be regarded as a Mediterranean word.

According to Dumont (1992: 325-327), Gr. *μελία* 'manna ash, Fraxinus ornus' derives from *μέλι* 'honey; sweet gum collected from certain trees, manna'. Then he (op. cit. 327) states: "whether or not ash trees and honey are related etymologically, the connection in mythology is definite". If the derivation is accepted, the Greek and Armenian may be treated as a shared innovation based on the PIE word for 'honey'; cf. Arm. *metr*.

The Armenian tradition usually relates manna with tamarisk, cf. Amirdovlat' Amasiac'i (S. Vardanjan 1990: 190, §1012). This also follows from the origin of the term *gaz-pēn* 'manna' < MPers. **tamarisk-honey*' (see HAB 1: 499b). In ethnographical descriptions of Sasun, however, we learn that there is also another

kind of manna which is set on leaves of *łɔp* 'i' 'oak-tree' and other trees [K'alant'ar 1895: 30-31; Petoyan 1965: 101-102]. Also in Dersim the *kazpe* 'manna' is said to set on oak-trees [Halajyan 1973: 57a].

metc/j probably 'soot'.

Only in hapax *yolov-a-metc/j*, with *yolov* 'much' as the first member, in Grigor Narekac'i 48.5 [Xaç'atryan/Lazinyan 1985: 435^{L140}]: *yolovametj* (vars. *-metc*, *-mitj*, *-merj*, see p. 798a) *cux*, *šogi c'ndeli* : "дым с копотью, пар испаряющийся" [Darbinjan-Melikjan/Xanlarjan 1988: 160]; "heavy smoke, evaporating mist" [Khachatoorian 2001: 229].

●**ETYM** Ačaryan (HAB 3: 300a) rejects all the etymological attempts. Later he (1937a) proposed a derivation from PIE **smerd-* 'to stink', cf. Lith. *smirdžiu*, *smirdėti* 'to stink', etc., for the phonological problems comparing with *att/atc* vs. Gr. *ἄρδα* f. 'dirt'. However, this is improbable, as is the etymology of *att/c* (q.v.). On Jahukyan's view see s.v. **atj-* 'dark'.

metk, *i*-stem in NHB, but without evidence 'soft, weak, slack': Eznik Koṭbac'i (5th cent.) onwards; *metkanam* 'to grow weak, loose, dissolute' (Bible+), rendering *ἐκ-λύω* in Jeremiah 4.31: *metkasc'i* = *ἐκλυθήσεται*; *metkim* 'id.', *metkem* 'to make loose, soft': Bible (in Joshua 18.3: *minč'ew yerb metkic'ēk* : *ἕως τίς ὥς ἐκλυθήσῃ* : "how long will you be slack?"), Łazar P'arpec'i (5th cent.), etc.; intensive *z-metkim* or *s-metkim* (Vardan Arewelc'i, 13th cent. [NHB 2: 724a].

In Łazar P'arpec'i 1.16 (1904=1985: 27^{L15f}, transl. Thomson 1991: 63): *K'anzi aha der t'ulac'eal metki i loyc araj'nordac' knik' awandoc' anarat k'arozut'ean srboyn* : "For behold, the seal of the tradition of the saint's unsullied preaching has already grown weak and slack through dissolute leaders".

Imperative *metkea* is attested in Movsēs Xorenac'i 1.11 (1913=1991: 34^{L7}; transl. Thomson 1978: 86): *ayl jeruc'eal metkea zc'rtut'iwn saruc'eal k'o hpartac'eal baruc'd* : "now warm and melt the freezing cold of your haughty conduct".

●**ETYM** Related with Skt. *mṛdú-*, fem. *mṛdvī-* 'delicate, weak, soft, mild' (AV+), Lat. *mollis* 'weak, soft' (< **moldu-i-*), etc. [Hübschmann 1897: 473; HAB 3: 300b]. As is shown by Meillet (1900: 394; 1936: 51, 184), *metk* derives from **meldwi-*; see 2.1.22.6 (see also Jahukyan 1982: 75; 1987: 137; Szemerényi 1985: 791-792; Olsen 1999: 270₁₆₄; Viredaz 2003: 64). Lat. *mollis* is explained as "Umbildung eines *u*-Stammes auf Grund des Femininums (**mld-u-ī*)" (see Solta 1966: 46). If the *i*-stem of Arm. *metk* proves reliable, we can interpret it the same way; see 2.2.3.

met(-k') *a*-stem (mostly pl. tant.) 'sin, crime'.

Bible+.

● **DIAL** Dialectally ubiquitous.

● **ETYM** Probably connected with Gr. *μέλεος* 'idle, useless; (after Homer) unhappy, miserable', *βλασφημέω* 'to speak profanely of sacred things; to slander', Lith. *mėlas* 'lie' (Žem. *mālas* 'Lüge' and Latv. *mālds* 'Irrtum' may reflect **mol-*, see Schrijver 1991: 457), OIr. *mell* 'destruction', Mlr. *mell* 'fault, sin', etc. [Bugge 1893: 18; Hübschmann 1897: 473^{Nr281}; HAB 3: 298b; Makaev 1974: 61; Klingenschmitt 1982: 81-83; Schrijver 1991: 457]. Derived from **mel-s-ch₂-* (see Olsen 1999: 64-65). Probably related with Arm. **mol(-or)-* 'to err, to be confused, mistaken; to become mad' (q.v.), as is suggested by Meillet (1894b: 279); see also HAB 3: 339b-340a (Ačāryan is sceptical about the connection with **mol-*); Jahukyan 1987: 138; Olsen 1999: 64-65, 338. For the *o*-grade cf. also the Baltic evidence.

According to Bugge (1893: 18), here belongs also *metmex/t* (q.v.). Rejected by Ačāryan (HAB 3: 301b); accepted in Jahukyan 1987: 138; Olsen 1999: 64-65.

merj 'near', **merjim**, **merjenam** 'to approach, touch' (Bible+).

For biblical attestations and philological discussion see Clackson 1994: 150, 230₂₀₇.

● **ETYM** Since Meillet and others, connected with Gr. *μέχρι* 'as far as; up to, about, nearly; until; as long as, wilt' (see HAB 3: 308-309). PArm. **merji* is seen in *merjenam* < **merji-anam* (see HAB ibid., and especially Clackson 1994: 230₂₀₇). Adontz (1937: 10-11) assumes **me-gʷr-i*, a compound of **me-* 'in' and the locative of the word for 'hand', thus 'at hand'. In view of Hitt. *keššar* 'hand' (cf. loc. *kiš(še)ri*), one has to start with **me-gʷsr-i* (Frisk 2: 222; sceptical: Hamp 1983: 7). For a thorough discussion see Clackson 1994: 150-152.

The proto-form **me-gʷsr-i* helps to explain the absence of depalatalization of **-gʷ-* before **-r-* in Armenian [Kortlandt 1985b: 10; 1986: 42 = 2003: 58, 71; Beekes 2003: 176, 207]. See also 2.1.22.7.

mēg, *o*-stem: ISg *mīg-o-v* in the Bible (thrice), Yovhannēs Drasxanakertc'i (9-10 cent.); *i*- or *a*-stem: GDSg *mīg-i* in the Bible (twice); IPL *mīg-ō-k'* [= *-a-w-k'*] (Grigor Narekac'i), if reliable, points to *a*-stem. LocSg *i mīg-i* (Bible, four times, and Grigor Magistros) does not necessarily point to *i*- or *a*-stem. For locatives in *-i*, also with *o*-stems, see 2.2.1.5. Note that in Job one finds both ISg *mīg-o-v* and LocSg *i mīg-i*. See also Olsen 1999: 183, 183₃₃₉. 'mist, fog, darkness'.

Bible+

In Movsēs Xorenac'i 2.86 (1913=1991: 232^{L11}; transl. Thomson 1978: 239): *koč'ē zmēg barbařov* "He summons the mist with [his] voice"; cf. Job 38.34: *koč'ic'es zmēg barbařov* : καλέσεις δὲ νέφος φωνῇ. Here *mēg* renders Gr. νέφος 'cloud'.

●**DIAL** See s.v. **mg-l-im*₃ 'to cloud'.

●**ETYM** Since Klaproth 1831: 103b, NHB 2: 258c, and others, linked with Skt. *meghā*-m. 'cloud, gloomy weather', Av. *maēya*-m. 'cloud', Gr. *ὁμίχλη* 'mist, fog', Lith. *miglā* 'fog', Dutch dial. *miggelen* 'staubregnen', etc. [Hübschmann 1883: 42; 1897: 474; Kern 1894: 108; Meillet 1936: 28; HAB 3: 311-312; Pokorny 1959: 712; Solta 1960: 186; Ĵahukyan 1987: 107; 137, 180]. From **h₃meig^h-o-* or **h₃meig^h-ch₂-*. Olsen (1999: 183) suggests to explain the apparent vacillation between *o-* and (probably) *a-* stems from an old pattern masculine : collective (like Lat. *locus* : *loca*).

Hübschmann (1897: 474, s.v. *mēz* 'urine') points out that Arm. *mēg* may also be an Iranian loan. Benveniste (1957-58: 60) is inclined to the Iranian origin. See also Schmitt 1983: 108, 109; L. Hovhannisyan 1990: 213 (with reservation); Olsen 1999: 183. In view of the absence of a "prothetic" vowel in Armenian (cf. Hovdhaugen 1968: 120, 130), the loan theory becomes more widespread: Austin 1941: 88; Beekes 1969: 22; 2003: 168; Beekes apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 110b. Greppin (1981a: 505) also treats *mēg* as an Iranian loan and notes that the expected form would be **amēg*.

However, dial. **mg-l-im*₃ 'to cloud' (q.v.), which is mentioned only by scholars from Armenia, favours the native origin in view of its internal *-l-* that is reminiscent of the Greek and Balto-Slavic forms. I hypothetically propose the following solution for the lack of an initial vowel in Armenian: **h₃m-* > PArm. **om-* > **(u)m-√-* (see 2.1.17.3).

mi prohibitive particle 'not'.

Bible+.

●**DIAL** Ubiquitous in dialects; Łarabał has *mí*, *mír*, *məér*, *míl*, *mél* (see Davt'yan 1966: 428), pl. *mreć*; with a final *-n* : Agulis, Metri *mán* [HAB 3: 316a].

All the forms cited by Ačaryan (HAB 3: 316a) are accented except for the *m'*-forms before words with an initial vowel.

●**ETYM** From PIE **meh₁* prohibitive particle: Skt. *mā* (RV+), Av. *mā*, Gr. *μη*, Alb. *mo*; cf. also Toch. *mā* 'not', not a prohibitive particle. (CHECK Phryg.). If the word originally meant 'not' and later obtained the function of the prohibitive, we are dealing with an Armeno-Greek-Alb.-Indo-Iranian grammatical isogloss. In the tables of Ĵahukyan (1987: 99, 137), Toch. and Phryg. or Thrac. are included, too.

mit, *a*-stem; frequently in pl. *mit-k*ʹ, GDPl *mt-ac*ʹ; NHB cites no attestations for singular oblique cases apart from loc. *i mt-i* and ISg *mt-aw* (only in *z-mtaw acem* ‘to consider’) ‘mind, intelligence’.

Bible+.

Among numerous phrases *mit dnem* ‘to consider, attend; to view or contemplate attentively’, *i mti dnem* ‘to decide, confirm in one’s mind’ < *‘to put in(to) one’s mind’ (Bible+) deserves particular attention. In MArm. we find *mitkʹ dnel* ‘to pay attention, be attentive’ in Amirdovlatʹ Amasiacʹi (15th cent.) [MiġHayBaġ 2, 1992: 138a], and in ModArm.: *mitkʹ(ə) dnel*, *mtkʹin dnel*, *mtkʹum* (loc.) *dnel* ‘to decide, intend, aim’ [Malxaseancʹ 3: 339-340; HayLezDarġBaġ 1975: 436a, 444, 445a]. See also on dialects.

●**DIAL** Ubiquitous in dialects, mainly as frozen **mit-k*ʹ. Alongside with **mit-k*ʹ, some dialects, such as Tʹiflis, Ararat, Agulis, Polis, have also *mit* [HAB 3: 325-326].

Frozen IPl *mtok*ʹ (< *mt-a-w-k*ʹ) is attested by the 18th century famous poet Sayatʹ-Nova, who spoke and wrote in the dialect of Tʹiflis (see Kʹoġʹoyan 1963: 16, 131).

Nor Naxiġewan, Polis *mitkʹə dnel* ‘to intend, decide to do smth.’ [Aċarean 1913: 782b].

●**ETYM** Related to Gr. *μηδεα* ‘counsels, plans, arts’ (pl. of the unattested **μηδος*, -εος, *s*-stem neuter), *μεδω* ‘to protect, rule over’, *μεδομαι* ‘to provide for, be mindful of; to plan, contrive, devise’, *μηδομαι* ‘to be minded, intend; to take care, keep watch’, Lat. *medeor* ‘to heal, cure’, Umbrian *mers* ‘law, justice’ < **medos*, etc. [Hübschmann 1883: 43; 1897: 474-475; HAB 3: 325]. From PIE **med-*: **mēd-* or **meh₁d-*; for the discussion see Beekes 1973: 92; 1988a: 30; Clackson 1994: 147-149. Arm. *mit(-kʹ)* has been explained fro PIE *s*-stem neuter, and the *a*-stem declension may be built upon the neuter plural-collective **mēd-es-(e)h₂-* [Hamp 1983: 5-6; Clackson 1994: 229₂₀₂].

The phrase ‘to put (in) mind’ (*mit dnem* etc.) which is present in ClArm, MArm., ModArm. and dialects, seems to continue PIE formula **mens- dʰeh₁-* ‘to put in the mind’, replacing the first member by *mit* < **mēd-*.

msušʹ ‘fog’.

A MArm. word [HAB 3: 336a; MiġHayBaġ 2, 1992: 142b]. Recorded in "Baġgirkʹ hayocʹ" [Amalyan 1975: 219^{Nr391}]. In this dictionary it is found also as *mšōš*, rendering *maṛaxut* ‘fog’ (209^{Nr147}). As is pointed out by Amalyan (1975: 405^{Nr147}),

this is a dialectal form. One may assume that *mšōš* reflects an eastern dialectal (probably Łarabał etc.) form with *u* > *ɔ*, though the word is not recorded here.

●**DIAL** Van [Ačarean 1913: 789], Ararat [Amatuni 1912: 485b], Sebastia [HAB 3: 336b]; for a possible undirect evidence in Łarabał or surroundings see above.

Note in a fairy-tale from Ijewan, the village of Uzunt'ala (A. Karapetyan < Hambarjum Karapetyan, 1959: HŽHek' 6, 1973: 421, lines 2-3, 9, p. 422, line -13).

●**ETYM** Ačaryan (HAB 3: 336b) calls attention to Syriac *miš* 'fog', Assyrian *mušu* 'night' etc. but leaves the origin of the Armenian word open. Ĵahukyan (1967: 203, 309) compares with Arm. dial. **muž* 'fog' and *mēg* 'fog' (q.v.), alternatively pointing out to IE **meis-* 'twinkling, mist' (for *mšuš*) and **smeug(h)-* 'smoke' (for **muž*). These comparisons are uncertain and are not mentioned in his 1982 and 1987. In 1990: 71 Ĵahukyan mentions *mšuš* as a word of unknown origin. See also s.v. **muž* 'fog'.

Is there any relation with Arm. dial. **ašmuš* 'twilight'? (see s.v. **atj-* 'darkness, twilight').

***mol-**

mol-im 'to become mad' (Bible+), *mol-or-im* 'to err, to be confused, mistaken; to become mad' (Bible+), in the dialect of Svedia 'to see badly', *mol-ar* 'erring, deceiving' (see Olsen 1999: 338), *mol-i* 'mad, furious' (Bible+), in Eznik Kotbac'i 1.22 (5th cent.): 'a kind of sorcerer' (see Garamanlean 1931: 646, espec. note 19, and HAB 3: 339b, referring to the ecstatic fury of the sorcerer or the prophet, *mol-ič* (prob.) 'sorcerer' (Yovhan Mandakuni; see NHB 2: 294a). In P'awstos Buzand 6.8: *Molis du, dew uremn haraw i k'ez?* "Are you mad, has some devil gotten into you?" (transl. Garsoġan 1989: 236^{L-1}). For the semantic field cf. *šišał*. On the ecstatic fury of the the prophet and/or poet see Thieme 1968 (< 1954); Schmitt 1967: 302ff; Gamkrelidz/Ivanov 1984: 835-836; Toporov 1995: 607₁₁.

In T'ovmay Arcruni (9-10th cent.) 2.1 [V. M. Vardanyan 1985: 124^{L-1f}]: *šinen* <...> *zormzdakan meheann, ew zkrakapaštut'ean molut'iwn borbok'en i nma* : "they built <...> a temple to Ormizd and lit therein the fire of their erring worship" (transl. Thomson 1985: 144). A more literal translation would go as follows: "<...> and kindled therein the erring/fury of fire-worship" (cf. the ModArm. translation in V. M. Vardanyan 1985: 125).

●**DIAL** The verb *molorim* is ubiquitous in dialects [HAB 3: 340]. For the meaning in Svedia see above.

●**ETYM** Compared with Dutch *mal* 'foolish, funny, crazy, cracked, mad', Skt. *malvā-* 'unbesonnen, töricht' (cf., however, Mayrhofer, EWAia 2, 1996: 334), etc. [HAB 3: 339-340; Finck 1903]. See also *met(-k')*.

mot-mot** or ***mut-mut** ?? 'clothes moth; moth, worm'. *mtmet**.

●**DIAL** Łarabał, Łazax *mətmət* 'moth' [Ačāryan 1908-09: 244; 1913: 787a; HAB 3: 225ab]. According to Amatuni (1912: 484a): Łarabał, Łazax, Zangezür, Łap'an *mtmot* vs. Bananc' (a village in Ganjak) *mtmut*. The latter form is also seen e.g. in a curse from Tavuš/Šamšadin [Xemč'yan 2000: 229b, Nr. 113/1051]: *Oskořnik'd mətmutn uit*: "May the *mətmut* eat your bones". From the material represented in Ačārean 1913: 787a one concludes that the concrete meaning is 'clothes moth'. In the curse from Tavuš/Šamšadin it probably refers to 'worms'.

Agulis **mtmet* 'moth' etc. see HAB s.v. *metm*.

●**ETYM** Ačāryan (see the references above) treats as a reduplication of **mot* and links with *mal-* (q.v.), for the semantics comparing OCS *molb* 'moth', Goth. *malo* 'moth', OIc. *mōlr* 'moth', etc. He (1908-09: 244) points out that Łarabał *mətmət* represents **motmot* according to the law of reduplication of Łarabał.

moš 'tamarisk; blackberry, bramble': **moš-a-vayri** 'wild tamarisk' in Jeremiah 17.6, rendering Gr. *ἄγριο-μυρική* f. 'tamarisk' (lit. 'wild-tamarisk'), also in Commentary on Genesis by Vardan Arewelc'i (in contrast with *moreni* 'bramble'), **moš vayri** 'id.' ("Girk' t't'oc'"); **moš-i** 'tamarisk' in Galen rendering Gr. *murik* = *μυρική* 'tamarisk' [NHB 2: 297a; Greppin 1985: 78], in MArm. mostly 'bramble, blackberry-bush', cf. gen. *sew mošoy* 'of black bramble' in the 13th century "Bžškaran jioy" [Č'ugaszyan 1980: 125^{L1}], and **moš** described as *mirg seaw* 'black fruit' of the thorny shrub *moši* in "Bařgirk' hayoc'" [Amalyan 1975: 219^{Nr412}]; **moš** also in Geoponica; **moš-eni**, GDP1 *mošeneac* 'bramble, blackberry-bush' ("K'art'lis c'xovreba"). See also Ališan 1895: 443; Malxaseanc' 3: 358b.

●**DIAL** Agulis, Łarabał *mōšī* 'bramble, blackberry-bush', Agulis, Łarabał, Łaradał, Łarak'ilisa, Šamaxi *mōš* 'blackberry'; Muš *mōšī* 'a bush from twigs of which besoms are made', Xarberd *mōšī* 'a kind of tree' [HAB 3: 346a]. The actual meaning in Xarberd may be identic with that of Muš, viz. 'a bush from twigs of which besoms are made' (cf. Bařramyan 1960: 154b on Dersim). Sasun *moš-i* seems to refer to 'bramble' since it is described as giving the fruit/berry *moš* (see Petoyan 1954: 146; 1965: 506).

[The frequently cited *mošay* seems to be a ghost form deduced from *moša-vayri*. Note, however, that Haneyan (1978: 193a) glosses ClArm. *mošay* by Tigranakert

mōšē. The final *-ē* in this dialect can hardly reflect ClArm. *-i*, cf. *letī* ‘gall’ > *letī*, *oski* ‘gold’ > *osgi*, *p’ošī* ‘dust’ > *p’ošī*, etc. (see Haneyan 1978: 38). It rather points to **mōšēay*. Compare also Georg. *t’ut^h-a* vs. Arm. *t’ut*, Aram. *tūtā* etc. ‘mulberry’, as well as Hamšēn *mōra* vs. *mor* ‘blackberry’ (see s.v.). Further, note the following.

Ačāryan (1925: 61-62; HAB 3: 346a) notes that Nor Naxijewan *mušay* (with final *-y*) ‘a kind of herb grazed by livestock’, though remarkable, must be a Tatar loan and has nothing to do with *mōš*, which is a bush. Is the Tatar word reliable and of Turkic origin? Since the cognates of *mōš/mor-* ‘blackberry’ mostly refer to ‘mulberry’ in Greek, Latin etc., and the leaves of the mulberry are used for livestock feed (see Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 646 = 1995: 556), one wonders if Nor Naxijewan *mušay* (and its Tatar match?) actually means ‘mulberry’ and is somehow related with this mulberry/blackberry term].

●**SEMANTICS** Since MArm. and dial. *mōš-i* refers mostly to ‘bramble, blackberry-bush’, and the meaning ‘tamarisk’ occurs practically only in the compound *mōš-a-vayri* (Jeremiah 17.6 and one or two Bible-depending texts), one might assume that the basic meaning of Arm. *mōš-i* is ‘bramble, blackberry-bush’, and the compound *mōš-a-vayri* ‘tamarisk’ should be understood as ‘wild bramble’.

Syntactically, the compound *mōš-a-vayri* is reminiscent of *iš-a-vayr-i* ‘onager’ (Eznik Koṭbac’i, Movsēs Xorenac’i, John Chrysostom, Paterica, etc.), cf. *ὄνος ἄγριος* = *ὄνος ἄγριο-μυρική*, however, reflects a reversed order of the components.

●**ETYM** No etymology is recorded in HAB 3: 345-346.

Ṭahukyan correctly connects with *mor* ‘blackberry’, q.v.

mor ‘blackberry (the fruit of bramble)’, GDSg *mor-i* in Cyril of Alexandria, ***mor-eni*** ‘bramble, blackberry (the plant, shrub)’ (Bible+), ***mor-i*** ‘bramble’, GDSg *morw-o-y* in Thomas Aquinas, *Book of virtues* (transl. into Arm. in the 14th cent. by Yakob Ṭahkeč’i); ***morm-eni*** (recorded in NHB 2: 298a as a dialectal form of *moreni*) ‘blackberry’ in Amirdovlat’ Amasiac’i (15th cent.) with equivalent designations in other languages and described as resembling the black mulberry (see Vardanian 1990: 142, §667, 322, §2030; comment: 616, 710); the meaning ‘blackberry’ is confirmed by Malxaseanc’ (3: 360c, referring also to Sepetčēan) and by dialectal evidence (see below); ***morm*** ‘strawberry’ in Simēon Kam(a)rkapc’i, 17th cent. [Ališan 1895: 445, Nr 2116; HAB 3: 347a]; according to Galen, ‘nightshade, hound’s berry, or the like’, corresponding to Gr. *σπύρχνον*, *πύχνον* (see NHB 2: 298c; Ališan 1895: 445, Nr 2117; Béguinot/Diratzouyan 1912: 82; Malxaseanc’ 3: 360c; Greppin 1985: 104, 108).

Arm. *mor-eni* (GDSg *morenw-o-y*, LocSg *i morenw-o-j*) frequently occurs in the Bible always rendering Gr. *βάτος* f., m. 'bramble, *Rubus ulmifolius*'.

In Exodus 3.2-4: *morenin* : *ὁ βάτος* and *i mojoy morenwoy* : *ἐκ τοῦ βάτου* (each: twice; cf. Acts 7.30). In Job 31.40: *p'oxanak c'orenoy busc'i etič*, *ew p'oxanak garwoy - moreni* : *ἀντὶ πυροῦ ἄρα ἐξέλθοι μοι κνίδη, ἀντὶ δὲ κριθῆς βάτος*. In Deuteronomy 33.16 (Cox 1981: 213): *i morenoj* (var. *i morenwoy*) : *ἐν τῷ βάτῳ*. In Mark 12.26: *i morenwoy* : *ἐπὶ τοῦ βάτου*. In Luke 6.44: *oč' i morenwoy kt'en xatot* : *οὐδὲ ἐκ βάτου σταφυλὴν τρυγῶσιν*. In Luke 20.37: *i morenwoy* : *ἐπὶ τῆς βάτου*. In Acts 7.35: *i morenwoy* : *ἐν τῇ βάτῳ*.

●DIAL Widespread in dialects. When the meaning is not specified, it is likely to be 'blackberry'.

Sasun *mor-i* (the plant), *mor-ig* (the fruit) [Petoyan 1965: 506].

Moks *murunik* 'blackberry', see Orbeli 2002: 294 (= 'ежевика'); M. Muradyan 1982: 136; HAB 3: 347b; Muš, Alaškert **morenuk* (HAB *ibid.*).

Ganjak, Łazax, Šuši *mər* 'blackberry', Łarak'ilisa (Loři) *mər* 'raspberry', Ararat, Goris *mərí*, Łarabał *móre* 'strawberry' [HAB 3: 347b].

Hamšen *mör*, gen. *mər-i* 'blackberry' (the berry), *mərəni* (the shrub) [Ačaryan 1947: 245]. According to HAB 3: 347b: *məra*. This form seems reliable since it is also found in a song from Trapizon (see T'orlak'yan 1986: 135, Nr 241): *Partezis mejə mora* : "In my garden (there is) *mora*". In the glossary of this folklore collection (233b), *mora* is glossed by *elak* 'strawberry'. [The final *-a* is somehow reminiscent of Georg. *l'ut* *-a* vs. Arm. *t'ut*, Aram. *tūtā* etc. 'mulberry' (see HAB 2: 202)].

Zeyt'un *muy*, *mur* 'blackberry' (the berry) vs. *məymine* (the shrub) from *mormeni* [Ačaryan 2003: 329]. The same distribution: Tigranakert *mər* vs. *mərmeni* [Haneyan 1978: 193a].

The form **mormeni* is also seen in Polis *mərmeni* which denotes both the berry and the shrub [HAB 3: 347b; Ačaryan 1941: 93, 102, 232]. The trilled *ř* of this form is strange since, as Ačaryan (1941: 93) assures, "the pronunciation of *r* as *ř* is very odd for this dialect" whereas the opposite, viz. *ř* > *r* is very common and tends to be generalized even in the position before the nasal *n*. In this particular case, Ačaryan (*ibid.*) explains *mormeni* > Polis *mərmeni* (borrowed into Turk. *mormeni*) by influence of Turk. */mər/* 'dark blue'. This is not impossible. More probably, however, one can assume that Polis had **mər* (the berry) vs. **mormeni* (the shrub) which was levelled to *mər* vs. *mərmeni* (exactly like in Tigranakert above). Subsequently, **mər* was lost in Polis. Note that *mər* seems to be the only case of *r* > *ř* in Tigranakert except for the position before a consonant (see Haneyan 1978: 51,

62, and the glossary). I posit an old **moř* since it is found in peripheral dialects from both western and eastern areas.

In Svedia, next to *mərmina* (the shrub), the form for the berry has been replaced by a compound *mərmən-t'ü'öt'* [Andreasyan 1967: 375b; Ačaryan 2003: 580], with *t'ut'* 'mulberry' as the second member.

According to Ačaryan (1941: 102), the medial *-m-* in Polis *mərmeni* is an epenthesis which originates from the influence of the initial *m-* and the *-n-* of the final syllable. This is unclear and unnecessary since the literary and dialectal forms *morm*, *mormik*, *mormorik* etc. as well as some North Caucasian forms like Lak. *mamari* 'blackberry' etc. (see below) clearly show that the second *m* has an etymological value.

Further: Atap'azar *məmlig* 'blackberry' (both the berry and the shrub), Č'enkiler (Nikomidia) **moremuk* glossed by *šn-xatot*, lit. "dog-grapes", Muš **moremuk* 'bramble' (or **morimuk*, see Amatuni 1912: 489a), Akn **morm-ik* 'raspberry', Binkean, Merteköz (Nikomidia) **mormorik* 'blackberry', Aslanbek *mərm*, *məmr* 'blackberry', *mərmi p'üş* 'blackberry, bramble (the shrub)', lit. 'thorn of blackberry' [HAB 3: 347b].

In Hamšen, also 'wild strawberrry; wild grapes' (see Ačarean 1913: 793b).

In a folk-song of the "Antuni" type from Akn (see Palean 1898a: 394a^{L1f}) one finds *moř*:

Inci ur gini pitnar,
Es tatis karsen xmei:
 <...>:
Inci ur xatot pitnar,
Es mōrs mořen k-utei.

"When I needed wine, I would drink from the jar of my grandmother; when I needed grapes, I would eat from the *moř* of my mother".

Ačaryan (1913: 793a; see also Malxaseanc' 3: 358b) considers this to be an unknown word.

I think, it belongs to the plant-name under discussion. That it pertains to (a kind of) grapes (or to a related idea) coincides with the above-mentioned testimony of Hamšen. Compare also Č'enkiler (Nikomidia) **moremuk* "dog-grapes", as well as **mori xatot* 'a kind of grapes' (see Amatuni 1912: 489a).

On Arabkir *mamuř* 'bramble, wild mulberry' see below.

●**ETYM** Since NHB 2: 298a, linked with the Greek and Latin words for 'mulberry, blackberry': Gr. *μόρον* n. 'black mulberry; blackberry', *μορέα*, *-έη* f. 'mulberry-tree, *Morus nigra*', Lat. *mōrum*, *ī*, n. 'fruit of the black mulberry', *mōrus*,

ī, f. 'black mulberry-tree', Welsh *mer-wydd* 'mulberry, blackberry', OIr. *smér*, etc., mostly as a native Armenian word; see HAB 3: 347a; Pokorny 1959: 749; Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 645-646 = 1995: 555-556; Ĵahukyan 1987: 139. Analyzing the Celtic evidence (cf. especially OIr. *smér*) as well as Romanian *zmeură* 'raspberry', Modern Greek *σμεῦρο*, etc., Hamp (1973; see also Schrijver 1991: 123-124) tentatively proposes a South European word **(s)mōr-* and a Central European (Carpathian?) **smi(i)or-*.

Ĵahukyan (1987: 72, 139, 255) adds also dial. **moš* (< **morš-*) and **moř* deriving them from **mor-s-*, but does not specify the origin of **s-* and the distribution of *ř* : *(r)š*. On this see below. It should be noted that **moš* 'tamarisk; blackberry' is not purely dialectal (see s.v.).

Arm. *mor* has been compared with Lesg. *mer* 'малина; ежевика' [Šaumjan 1935: 423]. Ĵahukyan (1987: 605) places this comparison into Nostratic context noting also (p. 588) Georg. *marçqw-*, Svan *bäsq(i)-* (< **marçqw-*). On the alleged Nostratic **marja* 'berry' see Illič-Svityč 1976: 43-44; Ĵahukyan 1987: 72, 294. On Kartv. **marçqw-* 'strawberry' see Klimov 1998: 115 where no forms are cited outside Kartvelian.

Next to the above-mentioned Lesg. *mer* 'малина; ежевика', there are other North Caucasian forms: Lak. *mamari* 'blackberry', Darg. **mVmVrV* (Chir. *mimre*) 'raspberry', Chechen *mürg* 'guelder rose, snowball-tree' < PNakh. dimin. **mor-ik* probably > Oss. *murkæ* 'guelder rose', further: Kab. *mārķ^wa* 'strawberry, blackberry', Abaz. *marak^wa* 'mulberry', etc. [Nikolayev/Starostin 1994: 804-805].

Some further possibly related forms: Hittite *mu-uri-uš* 'grape'; Finno-Ugr. **mura* 'berry', PU **mora* 'raspberry, cloudberry', FUGr. **marja* 'berry', etc. [Campbell 1990: 165-166]; Burushaski *biranč*, Basque *martsuka* 'mulberry' [P. Friedrich 1970: 150].

The appurtenance of Gr. *μopίαι* f. pl. (with or without *ἐλαῖαι*) 'the sacred olives in the Academy', generally 'olives that grew in the precincts of temples', and *μvpίκη* f. 'tamarisk' is considered to be questionable (Heubeck 1949-50: 282, 282₇₇; see Frisk s.v.v.; Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 646₁ = 1995: 556₅₄). In view of the semantic relation 'tamarisk' : 'blackberry' reliably testified by Arm. *moš*, the derivation of Gr. *μvpίκη* 'tamarisk' from QIE **mor-/mōr-* 'blackberry, black mulberry' seems probable. The aberrant vocalism of *μvpίκη* points to non-IE origin and can be compared with that of Finno-Ugr. **mura* 'berry', probably also Hittite *mu-uri-uš* 'grape'.

Structurally, Gr. *μυρ-ίκ-η* ‘tamarisk’ may be compared with PNakh. dimin. **mor-ik* ‘guelder rose, snowball-tree’ and Arm. dial., e.g. Sasun *mor-ig* ‘blackberry’ (on this diminutive plant-suffix see 2.3.1).

The reduplicated forms like Lak. *mamari* ‘blackberry’ are reminiscent of Arm. dial. **mor-mor-ik* etc. Note also Finn. *maamuurain* etc. ‘a kind of blackberry, *Rubus arcticus*’, from where Russ. *mamúra* ‘id.’ (see Fasmer s.v.). The latter has been compared with North Turk. *mamur* ‘a kind of plant’ (see HAB 3: 244ab, with ref.). From this NTurk. word Ačāryan (HAB, *ibid.*) derives Arm. dial. Arabkir *mamuř* ‘bramble, wild mulberry’ (which see also Ačārean 1913: 748b). If this is true, the corresponding meaning of the Turkish word can be considered to be certain. Regardless of the details, then, the appurtenance of these forms to our ‘mulberry, blackberry’ term is obvious.

Lat. *mōrum*, *ī*, n. ‘fruit of the black mulberry’ and *mōrus*, *ī*, f. ‘black mulberry-tree’ are regarded as ancient forms in *-m* meaning ‘fruit, berry’ and in *-s* meaning ‘tree, plant’, respectively [Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 645 = 1995: 556]. Compare also Gr. *βάρτος* f., m. ‘bramble, blackberry (the plant, shrub)’ vs. *βάρων* n. ‘blackberry’. I think, traces of this distribution may also be seen in Armenian.

The form *mo(r)š* is mostly found in derivatives (*moš-a-vayri* in Jeremiah 17.6, *moš-i*, etc.) and probably points to the tree/plant-name **morš-ia-* derived from **mor-s-ieh₂-* (ruki-rule in internal position, see 2.1.12. See also 2.3.1 on *-awš* and *-š*. [Note Gr. *μωρέα*, *-έη* f. ‘mulberry-tree’, if from **mor-es-(e)h₂-*]. The form for ‘fruit, berry’, viz. **mor-(o)m*, may be seen in dial. **moř(n)* and older **mor-m-* of which *mor-m-eni* (the plant) is formed.

The dial. **moř* might be considered to be due to contamination with the Turkish word for ‘dark blue’ (see above). More probably, however, it is old. My hypothetic analysis according to which **moř* is old and specifically denoted the berry-name rather than the plant/bush is corroborated by the following: 1) the form is found in both eastern (Ganjak, Łazax, Šuši) and western (Tigranakert, Akn) peripheries; 2) it indeed refers to the berry; 3) there is no designation for the plant based on **moř*, in other words - no **moř-i* (this confirms the original distribution: **mor-om* (or simply Arm. **moř-n*, with additional *-n*, on which see Weitenberg 1985) for the berry vs. **mor-ieh₂-* > *mor-i* and **mor-s-ieh₂-* > *moš-i* for the bush); 4) **mořn* finds possible matches in **murun-ik* and **moren-uk*. The latter forms can hardly be based on the bush-designation *mor-en-i* because: 1) the diminutive suffix is usually attached to the root (cf. *hačar-uk* ‘beech’ etc., see 2.3.1); 2) other forms have internal *-m-* instead of *-n-*, cf. **mor-em-uk* etc. Consequently, they can be regarded as diminutive forms based on **mor-n*.

Frisk (2: 256) sees Greek as a possible source for the Armenian word. This is highly improbable since the latter is widespread in dialects (unless one assumes a prehistoric borrowing). Hübschmann (1897: 394) treated the Armenian and Greek words as borrowed from an unknown source. Schrijver (1991: 123), citing also the Latin and Celtic forms, points out that this term "definitely reflects a substratum word". Mediterranean origin (see Hamp 1978 with references) seems very plausible.

The black mulberry (*Morus nigra* L.) is a common fruit tree in the Mediterranean and in southwestern Asia; its original centre of dispersal is considered to be the Near East (see Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 646-647 = 1995: 556-557, with ref.).

Conclusion:

We are dealing with a non-Indo-European plant-name **mor-/mōr-/mur-* 'mulberry; blackberry; tamarisk' (> also 'raspberry, strawberry; grapes') represented in Greek, Latin, Celtic and Armenian, probably Hittite, as well as in Caucasian and Finno-Ugric languages. The term, both linguistically and botanically, is centred in Mediterranean/Pontic areas. There are diminutive forms in both Armenian and Caucasian languages, partly also, perhaps, in Greek. The Armenian forms probably point to the following original distribution: **mor-* and **mōr-* for the berry (the latter - from neuter **mor-(o)m*) vs. fem. **mor-ich₂-* > *mor-i* and **mor-s-ich₂-* > **moš-i* for the bush; compare Gr. *μόρον* n. 'black mulberry; blackberry' vs. *μωρέα, -έη* f. 'mulberry-tree', Lat. *mōrum, ī*, n. 'fruit of the black mulberry' vs. *mōrus, ī* f. 'black mulberry-tree'.

It is remarkable that the type *mor*: *mor-m* (probably broken reduplication) is also seen in another Mediterranean word, *mor*: *mor-m* 'tarantula', q.v.

[Glossing Łarak'ilisa *mor* by ModArm. *ark'ayamor* 'raspberry', Ačāryan (1913: 793b) cites two other equivalents, viz. *malina* and *zmavula*. The former is certainly Russ. *малина* 'raspberry', but I cannot identify the latter, viz. *zmavula*. In which language is this form found? Whatever the answer would be, the form seems comparable with Romanian *zmeură* 'raspberry' and Modern Greek *σμεῦρο* (on these forms see above)].

[Burusaski *bīranč* 'mulberry' is reminiscent of Arm. *bīnč* 'snowball'. Any relation?].

mor 'tarantula, phalangium' in Amirdovlat' Amasiac'i (15th cent.), see S. Vardanian 1990: 134, §616; comment: p. 613; MiĵHayBař 2, 1992: 145b), *mor-a-har* 'bitten by a tarantula' in Geoponica /13th cent./ [MiĵHayBař 2, 1992: 145b], *mur* 'a kind of harmful insect' (Ališan 1910: 170, from an unspecified source); dial. **mori* 'spider' (see below); *morm* 'id.' in the fables by Vardan Aygekc'i /12-13th cent./ [HAB 3:

347b; MiġHayBaġ 2, 1992: 146a]. *morm* ‘a small lizard’ (Step’anos Lehač’i), mentioned in NHB 2: 298c s.v. plant-name *morm* (q.v.), probably belongs here too.

●**DIAL** Ararat *morm*, Juġa *morm* [HAB 3: 347b]. According to Amatuni (1912: 489), Ararat *morm* denotes ‘a large, black and reddish poisonous insect resembling the spider’ and is synonymous to Łzlt’amir (a village in the vicinity of Eĵmiciacin) *frišun*. The latter seems to be composed as *frī šun* ‘dog of stony places’; cf. *iric’i šun* ‘caterpillar’, lit. “dog of a priest” (see Ł. Aġayan 1979: 641^{L-4}, footnote 641₁).

Andreasyan (1967: 252) records Svedia *čičə-mura*, *ĵijə-mura* ‘spider’, *čĵičĵəmurə payn* ‘spider-web’, lit. ‘the nest (*boyn*) of a spider’. He (ibid.) reconstructs **čči-mori*, composed of *čči* ‘insect, beetle, worm’ and *mori* ‘forest’, as if based on the resemblance of the legs with forest. This interpretation is unconvincing. I posit **mor-i* > Svedia *mura* as a derivation of our MArm. *mor* ‘tarantula’. For this *i*-form cf. perhaps Georg. *morili* ‘scorpion’ which, according to G. Asatur (p.c. apud HAB 3: 347b), is borrowed from Arm. *mor* ‘tarantula’.

●**ETYM** Łap’anc’yan (1927: 108; 1961: 359-360) derives from IE **mer-* ‘to die’ linking with Pers. *mār* ‘snake’. Ačāryan (HAB 3: 347b) does not accept this etymology and leaves the origin of the Armenian word open.

As we have seen, MArm. *mor/morm* ‘tarantula’ is dialectally represented in extreme peripheries: SW (Svedia/Syria) *mor* vs. E (Ararat, Juġa) *morm*. The word may thus be old.

M. Aġabekyan (1980: 162-167) proposed a connection with *mrĵiwn* ‘ant’ (q.v.), cf. especially dialectal forms such as Lori *mormənĵ* etc. I accept this connection in terms which will be discussed further. More closely, I think, Arm. *morm* ‘tarantula’ may be linked with Gr. *Μορμώ*, *-όος -οῦς*, *Μορμών*, *-όνος* f. ‘she-monster, bogy’ (also used by nurses to frighten children), generally ‘bugbear’, and Lat. *formīdō*, *inis* f. ‘fear, terror; a thing which frightens, bogy’. For the semantic relation ‘spider, insect’: ‘bogy, ghost’ see s.v. **bo-/bu-*, and 3.5.2.1.

The Greek and Latin words are related, either etymologically or secondarily, with the word for ‘ant’, cf. Lat. *formīca* f. ‘ant’, Gr. *μύρμηξ*, *-ηκος*, Dor. *μύρμᾱξ*, *-ᾱκος* m. ‘ant; fabulous animal in India’ (by-forms: *μύρμος*, *βύρμαξ*, *βόρμαξ*, *ὄρμικας*), etc., probably also with **morā-*: OIc. *mara*, OHG *mara* ‘nightmare’, etc. (see Nocentini 1994: 399-401; cf. Frisk 2: 255). This connection or conflation becomes quite transparent in view of the following forms and meanings: *μυρμήκ-ειον* n. a species of *φάλαγγιον*, the latter being ‘a kind of venomous spider, especially Lathrodictus or malmignatte’, *μυρμήκ-ιον* n. ‘a species of spider’; note also *μόρμορος* and *μύρμος*, both glossed by *φόβος* ‘panic fear’ in Hesychius.

Arm. Polis/Stambul **moĩmoĩroz*, Crimea and Nor Naxiĵewan **mĩmĩras* ‘Easter bogy’ (see Ačarean 1913: 54a), of which no etymological attempt is known to me, strikingly resemble *μόρμωρος* ‘panic fear’. One might treat these Armenian dialectal forms as recent loans from Greek. However, *μόρμωρος* is a Hesychian gloss, and I doubt that it exists in Modern Greek. Besides, the Armenian forms have specific ritual meaning and function. The connection may be old, therefore. Arm. dial. **mor-mor-oz* can easily be interpreted as reduplication of **mor-* (identical with *μόρμωρος*, thus) + the suffix *-(e/o)z*, seen also in e.g. denotations for ‘lizard’, see 2.3.1.

Of Armenian dialectal forms of the word for ‘ant’, Šamaxi *mormorinj* (full reduplication of **mor-*, see above) and Lori *mormonj* deserve particular attention; see s.v. *mṛjīwn* ‘ant’. Since Gr. *Μορμών* is feminine, one can identify it with Lori *mormonj* which probably reflects QIE fem. **mormon-jeh₂-*. For the structure compare another insect-name of Mediterranean origin: *karič*, *a*-stem ‘scorpion’ < **karid-jeh₂-*, cf. Gr. *κάρις*, *-ί/ιδος* f. ‘Crustacea’ (q.v.).

The association ‘ant’ : ‘bogy, ghost’ is not surprising. According to e.g. Armenian folk-beliefs, the ant, sometimes called ‘devil’, is a fearful evil night-animal alongside with the snake, frog and the like, and causes the skin-disease called *mṛjīm-uk* ‘little ant’ [Abeghian 1899: 31] (cf. *mṛjīm-oc*’, on which see a thorough comment in Č‘ugaszyan 1980: 219). For the latter cf. Gr. *μυρμηκ-ία* ‘wart that spreads under the skin, also the irritation caused thereby, which was compared to the creeping of ants’ < *μύρμηξ*, *-ηκος* ‘ant’.

If the appurtenance of OIc. *mara*, OHG *mara* ‘nightmare’ etc. is accepted, Arm. *mor* ‘tarantula’, together with these words for ‘nightmare’, can be regarded as the basic form, whereas Arm. *morm*, Gr. *Μορμώ* and the rest will represent the so-called broken reduplication, for which compare another Mediterranean word, *mor* : *mor-m* ‘bramble etc.’ (q.v.). Hesychian *μόρμωρος* ‘panic fear’ and Arm. dial. **mor-mor-oz* ‘Easter-Bogy’ and **mor-mor-inj* ‘ant’ reflect full reduplication.

mĩmĩam, mṛ/mĩem ‘to murmur’ (John Chrysostom, Movsēs Kaťankatuac’i, etc.).

●**DIAL** Widespread in dialects, mostly as **mĩmĩal*, as well as **mĩ(ĩ)al* [HAB 3: 366a].

●**ETYM** Identical with Lat. *murmurō* ‘to hum, murmur, mutter; to roar’, etc. The direct connection is usually rejected in view of the onomatopoeic nature of the word [Hübschmann 1897: 476; HAB 3: 366a; Greppin 1981b: 6]. However, this view cannot be maintained since the onomatopoeic nature does not automatically preclude the etymological connection. See also Ĵahukyan 1987: 139, 448.

mr̥jiwn : NASg *mr̥jiwn* (Proverbs [twice], Philo, John Chrysostom), GDSg *mr̥jean* (Eznik Koṭbac'i, Hexaemeron, Anania Širakac'i), AblSg *i mr̥jen-ē* (Anania Širakac'i), GDPl *mr̥jean-c'* ("Čarəntir"); **mr̥jimm** : NASg *mr̥jimm* ("Oskip'orik", cf. MArm. *mr̥r̥jum*, see MiġHayBair 2, 1992: 155b, 159b), NPl *mr̥jmun-k'* (Etišē, "Ašxarhac'oyc'", Vardan Arewelc'i), APl *mr̥jmun-s* (Anania Širakac'i), GDPl *mr̥jman-c'* (Paterica) 'ant'

Bible+.

In order to reconstruct the original paradigm, one should look for a distribution of nom.acc. vs. oblique or singular vs. plural forms. NASg *mr̥jiwn* is reliably attested whereas *mr̥jimm* : *mr̥r̥jum* is Middle Armenian. On the other hand, plural forms are based exclusively on the *-mVn-*, the only exception being GDPl *mr̥jean-c'* in "Čarəntir".

The original distribution may have been, thus: sg. *mr̥jiwn* (< **mr̥jimm*, gen. **mr̥jman*, though analogically replaced by *mr̥jean*) : pl. *mr̥jmun-k'*. The obvious reason for this is that the final **-mn* yields *-wn* in Armenian, cf. *paštawn* vs. *paštamun-k'* 'service' (see 2.1.22.11).

● **DIAL** Widespread in dialects, mostly as **mr̥jiwn* or **mr̥ji/um* [HAB 3: 371b]. Next to the initial *m-*, Łarabał also has remarkable forms with *v-* (South) and *b-* (North): *və/irč'émnə*, *burč'úmnə*, *bərč'émnə* (see Davt'yan 1966: 64-65, 433). Note also *bərč'im*, NPl *bərč'imni* (next to the variant *mərmənĵ*) in a fairy-tale recorded in Šamšadin in 1979; see Xemč'yan 2000: 38a. See below for the IE comparable cognates.

Airtial (Hung.) *mərĵ'əb'un*, too, is remarkable; see HAB 3: 371b. Ačāryan (1953: 127) assumes that this word of strange formation is actually the compound *mr̥jboyn* 'ant-nest' with semantic shift to 'ant'. [I alternatively propose the following interpretation. The plural form of **br̥jimm* (present in Łarabał) was **br̥jmun-k'*. Analogically after this, a secondary nominative **mr̥jbun* have been formed, which in turn could yield Airtial *mərĵ'əb'un* through metathesis].

Zeyt'un *mərč'j'əm*, Hačən *mərĵ'im*, Adana *mərĵəm*, Svedia *mĵ'əm* are irregular [Ačāryan 2003: 88, 329, 399, 580]. They probably reflect what was pronounced as */mr̥(j)um/* rather than */mr̥jium/* or */mr̥jiwm/*. For ClArm. *-um* > Svedia *-əm* cf. *hum* 'raw' > *həm*, *ddum* 'pumpkin' > *d'əd'd'əm*, *erdumn* 'oath' > *ufd'əm* [Ačāryan 2003: 391-392]. The form under question is also seen in MArm. (see above) and in the dialects of Hamšen, Xarberd, Nor Naxiĵewan, etc. In AblSg *mr̥jumē* it is attested in a late medieval folk-song recorded by Xaç'gruz Ğrimec'i (early 17th cent., Matenadaran, manuscript Nr. 7709): *Šēk mĵumē aĵərə dəgal* [Mnac'akanyan 1956: 114^{L36}].

Further: Šamaxi *mormorinj* ‘ant’ [Baḡramyan 1964: 215], Lori *mormonj* ‘ant’ [M. Asatryan 1968: 60, 188b], Meṭri *murinj* ‘a small greyish ant’ [Aṭayan 1954: 319].

●**ETYM** Since long (see HAB 3: 371), connected with the PIE word for ‘ant’: Gr. *μύρμηξ*, -*ηκος*, Dor. *μύρμαξ*, -*ᾱκος* m. ‘ant; fabulous animal in India’ (by-forms: *μύρμος*, *βύρμαξ*, *βόρμαξ*, *ὄρμικας*), Lat. *formīca* f. ‘ant’, Skt. *vamrā* m. ‘ant’ (RV+), YAv. *maoiri*- m. ‘ant’, MPers., NPers. *mōr* ‘ant’, etc. One usually assumes tabu-forms **uorm-* : **moru-* (cf. Ĵahukyan 1982: 109). Lori *mormonj* is particularly interesting (see Aṭabekyan 1980: 162-167; Ĵahukyan 1985: 157; 1987: 139, 276). Further, see s.v. *morm* ‘tarantula’; on tabu see 2.1.36.

The triple representation in Łarabaṭ, *m-/v-/b-*, is reminiscent of e.g. the word for ‘violet’: Arm. *manuřak* < **manawřak* < MPers. **manafřak* : Zoroastrian *vanafřa*, Pahl. *vanafřag* : Pers. *bunafřa*, Kurd. *banafř* (see 2.3.1, on *-awř*). In this particular case, viz. the word for ‘ant’, note Gr. *μύρμηξ*, Arm. *mrjwn*, **mormonj* : Skt. *vamrā*, Gr. *ὄρμικας* : Gr. *βύρμαξ*, *βόρμαξ*.

***muř** (dial.) prob. from ***mutj** ‘fog’

●**DIAL** Xarberd *muř-ik* ‘fog’ [Ačarean 1913: 795a], Manisa (close to Zmürnia/Izmir) *mř-ik* ‘fog’ (op. cit. 778-779), Moks *məř-mařamux* ‘fog’ (HAB 3: 262b; see s.v. *mařaxut* ‘fog’), [*məřž/məřž*], GSg *məřžəř*, NPl *məřžir* ‘fog’ [Orbeli 2002: 290]; *məřž*, recorded in the prison of Van (T’ōxBar apud Amatuni 1912: 703a). Perhaps also Č’enkiler (Nikomidia) **mřal* ‘to rain slightly’, Xarberd **mřel*, Mařkert **mřužel* ‘to knead preliminarily and slightly (immediately after pouring water into flour)’ [Ačarean 1913: 778].

Note also Moks *məřřavil* ‘затуманиться; ослабнуть, терять остроту (о зрении)’ [Orbeli 2002: 290], according to Ačaryan (1913: 813a): Moks **mřtawil* and **nřwatil* (with initial *n-* and different order of *-w-* and *-ř-*) ‘to grow dim, gloomy (said of light, star)’. This Moks word can be explained, I think, through contamination of ***muř** ‘fog’ and *nuatim* ‘to become dim; to faint, swoon, grow weak’ (Bible+; dialects of T’iflis, Ararat, Agulis, Marafa), a metathesized form of which (**ntawil*) is found in the dialects of Lori, Łazax, řuř.

●**ETYM** H. Suk’iasyan (1986: 88, 204) connects ***muř** with ***mutj** found in *ařj-a-mutj* ‘darkness, twilight’ but treats these two words as different formations of a single root: **(s)mu-g^h-l-* (cf. Russ. *smuglyj* ‘dark’; suggested by Ĵahukyan, see s.v. **ařj-*) > **mutj* vs. **mu-s-* > ***muř**. The latter is impossible, however. Dial. ***muř** rather derives from ***mutj**, and the latter seems to be lexicalized from *ařjamutj* which is a reduplication of **ařj-* (see s.v.).

On Ĵahukyan’s view see s.v. *mřuř* ‘fog’.

Alternatively, **muž* ‘fog’ may be treated as an Iranian loan, cf. Pers. *muža* ‘eyelid, eyelash’, MPers. *mēzišn* ‘blinking, winking’, *mij(ag)* ‘eyelid, eyelash’, Skt. *meṣ* ‘to open the eyes’, etc. (on which see MacKenzie 1971: 56; Mayrhofer, EWAia 2, 1996: 379-380). For the semantic field cf. Lith. *mérkti* ‘to close one’s eyes’ vs. Russ. *mérknut* ‘to become dark, become dim, fade’, Sln. *mrkniti* ‘to become dark, darken, blink, wink’, etc. (see ÈtimSlovSlavJaz 21, 1994: 132-137); Engl. *blink* ‘to twinkle with the eye or eye-lids’, ‘to glance, cast or let fall a glance, have a peep; to look with glances (and not steadily)’ : ‘to cast a sudden or momentary gleam of light; to twinkle as a star; to shine with flickering light, or with a faint peep of light; to shine unsteadily or dimly’; *twinkle* ‘to sparkle, glitter; to shine dimly, to glimmer; to close and open the eye or eyes quickly; to wink, blink’ [OxfEnglDict].

Dersim (K’fi) *məšəzel* ‘to become dim, gloomy (of eyes)’ and *məjgil* ‘to become tired (of eyes)’ (Bařramyan 1960: 153b) are reminiscent of the above-mentioned Iranian forms.

mukn, *an*-stem: NPl *mkunk*‘, GDPL *mkanc*‘ ‘mouse’.

Bible+.

●**DIAL** Dialectally ubiquitous.

●**ETYM** From PIE **muHs-*: Skt. *mūś-* m. f. ‘mouse, rat’ (RV); Gr. *μῦς* ‘mouse’; Lat. *mūs* ‘mouse’; etc. [Hübschmann 1897: 475; HAB 3: 354-355].

Kortlandt (1985b: 9 = 2003: 57; see also Beekes 2003: 196) derives Arm. *mukn* from PIE ASg **muHs-m*. The explanation as **mu(h)-* + *-kn* (see 2.3.1) seems preferable, see 2.1.19.

For the possible relic of the Armenian name for the Milky Way containing the word for the mouse see 3.1.3.

****mutt-*** ‘fog, darkness’

Only in derivatives and compounds, as *mtt-ut-iwn* ‘darkness’ in Anania Širakac’i (7th cent.), etc. See also s.v. *att-a-mutt* ‘darkness, twilight’.

●**DIAL** See s.v. *att-a-mutt*.

●**ETYM** For the etymology see s.v. **ař-*.

yatt‘ ‘wide, large, broad spacious (land, space, territory)’ (Bible+), ‘mighty’ (Agat’angelos+); ***y’att’em*** ‘to conquer, win, defeat’ (Bible+); ***yatt’-k-u*** ‘victorious, mighty’ (Philo+), ***yatt’-u*** ‘id.’ (e.g., in Grigor Mařkuori, 12th cent.), ***an-yatt’-u*** ‘unconquerable’ (Alexander Romance - see H. Simonyan 1989: 77^{L11}).

According to NHB 2: 315c, *i-* or *o-*stem, but the only evidence is with the substantive *yatt'* 'victory': *skizbn ainu yatt'oyin i yasparizin* (Grigor Skewrac'i, 12-13th cent.).

In Deuteronomy 8.7: *tēr astuac k'o tarci zk'ez yerkirn i bari ew i yatt'* [Cox 1981: 112]: *ὁ γὰρ κύριος ὁ θεός σου εἰσάγει σε εἰς γῆν ἄγαθὴν καὶ πολλήν*. Here *yatt'* renders *πολλή*. The basic meaning seems to be 'wide, broad spacious (land, space, territory)'; cf. also *anc'in and covn yatt'* "(they) passed the broad/spacious sea" (Agat'angelos, see NHB 2: 315c), etc.

In Agat'angelos § 767 (1909=1980: 398^{L10f}), *yatt'* refers to 'immense (stones)'; see the passage s.v. *arastoy*.

In Movsēs Xorenac'i 2.37 (1913=1991: 162^{L6}), Eruand is described as *srteay ew andamovk' yatt'* "courageous and strong limbed" (transl. by Thomson 1978: 179). Here, *yatt'* may also refer to 'broad'; cf. *layn* 'broad' used next to *yatt'* in Agat'angelos § 123 (1909=1980: 71^{L12f}) describing the king Trdat: *buin oskerōk' ew yatt' marmnov*, <...>, *barjr ew layn hasakaw*, cf. also *yatt'ahasak*, *yatt'amarmin*, *yatt'andam*. Compare with *layn* 'broad' in, e.g., *layn-a-t'ikunk'* 'broad-backed' [Łazaryan/Avetisyan, MiġHayBaġ 1, 1987: 299b], etc.

In Agat'angelos § 767 (1909=1980: 398^{L10f}): *čanaparh kaleal i ver i barjr leain i Masis. Ew anti i glxoy leinēn areal vēms arastoy, antašs, ankop's, yatt's, canuns, erkayns, stuars ew mecamecs*.

●**DIAL** The verb *yatt'em* is widespread in dialects.

●**ETYM** Scheftelowitz (1904-05, 2: 27) compares *yatt'* with Skt. *pr̥thu-*, f. *pr̥thvī-* 'broad, wide, expansive, big, numerous, large, extensive', Av. *pərəθu-*, f. *pərəθβī-* 'broad, wide', Gr. *πλατύς* 'wide, broad, flat', Lith. *platus* 'broad, wide, extended', etc. Meillet (1950: 81) and Ačāryan (HAB 3: 379) are sceptical because of the semantic difference. Beekes (2003: 202) represents this etymology of *y-att'* and notes: "The analysis of the Armenian word is uncertain".

Ačāryan (HAB 4: 633-634) proposes a connection with Lat. *saltō* 'to dance, jump', *saltus* m. 'leap, spring, jump', *in-sultō* 'to leap, jump; to behave insultingly, mock (at)', *assultō* 'to jump at; to attack', *assultus* 'attack, assault', etc. Greppin (1983b) accepts the etymology and interprets the development **sl-t- > *hatt' > yatt'* as a hypercorrection, which is not probable.

Olsen (1999: 964) mentions no etymology, representing the word as of unknown origin.

I see no formal or semantic reasons to reject the comparison with PIE **plth₂-ú-*: Skt. *pr̥thu-* etc. The semantic development 'wide, broad spacious (land, space, territory)' > 'mighty, victorious' > 'to win, defeat' is more probable than 'jump' >

‘attack, assault’ > ‘victorious, mighty’ > ‘broad, spacious’ involved in Ačāryan’s etymology. The initial *y-* is the productive prefix seen also in numerous words of similar semantics, viz. ‘many, abundant, plenty, fat, etc.’ (see 2.3.1). Even if one accepts the derivation from **sl-t-*, the initial *y-* should be identified with the prefix; cf. Lat. *in-sultō*.

Though poorly attested, *yalt’-u* (and *yalt’-k-u*) may go back to PIE fem. **plth₂-u-ih₂-*: Skt. *prthivī-*, Av. *pərəθβī-*. (In Ĵahukyan 1987: 241: **-usjā-*). See 2.1.18.

yayt, *i*-stem: GDPl *yayt-i-c’* in Grigor Skewrac’i (13th cent.), "Tōnac’oyc’", Mxit’ar Aparanc’i ‘known, evident, clear, visible’ (John Chrysostom, Ephrem, etc.); **yayt ainem/acem** ‘to make public, make appear’, **yaytnem** ‘to make public, known; to inform’, etc. (Bible+). Numerous compounds.

●**DIAL** The verb *yaytnem* is present in Suč’ava, Karain, Ararat, Šamaxi, Agulis, as a literary loan, as Ačāryan (HAB 3: 382a) points out. He (ibid.) then notes Zeyt’un *ayid enel* ‘to make known/visible’. In 2003: 329 he marks it as Turkish.

●**ETYM** No etymology is accepted in HAB 3: 382a.

Ĵahukyan (1987: 245) hesitantly interprets as containing the prefix *y-* < **h₁en-* and PIE **ai-* ‘to burn, shine’, or, the root of *ayc’* ‘visit, inspection’. Olsen (1999: 208) connects with **āuis-* ‘obvious’ assuming "**en-* + **ā-uid* with secondary association to **uid-* ‘know’, or even **en-* + **āui-uid* (**iui-* > *-i-*), in both cases with dissimilation of **-u-* > *-y-*", though, as she admits, the details remain obscure.

I propose to treat the word as follows: *y-* + **hay-* ‘to see, watch’ + **-ti-*. For the semantics and the suffix see s.v. *p’ast*, *i*-stem ‘proof, argument’, and 2.3.1.

yatak, *a*-stem ‘bottom (of sea, underworld, hell)’, dial. also ‘hell; abyss’.

Bible+. A biblical attestation unknown to Astuacaturean 1895: *yatakac’ erkri* in 1 Paralipomenon 19.13 [Xalat’eanc’ 1899: 36b]; see Ačārean 1908: 25.

●**DIAL** In dialects, mostly replaced by synonymous *tak*. Preserved in Lori *atak*, Axalc’xa *hatak*, Xarberd *adag* ‘bottom’, etc. Further - see below.

According to Andreasyan (1967: 376a), *yatak* is continued by *hāndey* in Svedia. However, this seems to be the dialectal *andi(n)* ‘otherworld’ (see HayLezBrbBair 1, 2001: 57a) with the prefix *y-*, though the conditions of the development of the initial *y-* into Svedia *h-* are not clear; cf. Andreasyan 1967: 33, 376.

●**ETYM** Ačāryan (HAB 3: 386b) derives *yatak* from PIE **pe/od-* ‘foot’. This etymology does not seem convincing. The semantic relationship is not straightforward (though Ačāryan compares Gr. *δάπεδον* ‘bottom’ etc.; cf. also

Saradževa 1986: 225-226), and the formal obstacles are not easy to surmount. Neither is Aṭayan's (1973: 20-21; 1974: 95-98) derivation from the verb *hatanem/yat(an)em* 'to cut' convincing; the meaning is remote, despite the parallel development as given by Aṭayan: Lat. *pavimentum* 'a paved surface or floor, pavement' < *paviō* 'to thump, pound, strike; to ram down (earth, etc.)'. The suffix *-ak*, generally restricted to Iranian loans, also makes both etymologies dubious.

Ĵahukyan (1987: 142, 185, 551) mentions Ačāryan's etymology with a question-mark and prefers the (old) connection with *tak* 'bottom; depth; root', which is of Iranian origin. L. Hovhannisyan (1990) did not include *yatak* in his list of Iranian loans. Although not everything is clear in the Iranian material (cf. Hübschmann 1897: 110^{Nr71}; HAB 3: 386-387; Olsen 1999: 248₁₀₂), I do not see any reason to separate Arm. *yatak* from *tak*.

In order to explain the first *-a-*, Ĵahukyan and Olsen restore an Iranian form with the prefix *ā-*. I would prefer to treat the Iranian protoform as a privative compound; cf. the synonymous Pahl. *a-bun* 'bottomless'. Thus, *yatak* is composed of *y-* and Iran. priv. **a-tāk* 'bottomless', exactly like **y-an-dund-k*' (see s.v. *andund-k*).

The textual parallelism between the two Armenian synonyms is obvious. The basic meaning of *(y)andundk*' is 'abyss'. In Armenian folklore it refers to one of the lowest parts of the Underworld, as well as to the Abyssal ocean - *Sew ĵur* 'Black water' [S. Harut'yunyan 2000: 9-12, 16-17]. Moks *handū(n)d(k)*', too, appears in such contexts; see e.g. in the epic *Sasna č'rer* 1, 1936: 14, 131, 436 (in the latter passage - with *Siv ĵūr* 'Black water', for which cf. also 282), 1062 (Van *hantūt*'k'). For a similar use see HŽHek' 1, 1959: 328 (Ararat, village of Ošakan): *covi andundə* '(to) the abyss of the sea'; HŽHek' 13, 1985: 11, 60: Muš *h'anundk*'; *andund*.

Similarly, *yatak* 'bottom' can be used in relation with: 1) the Underworld, cf. *yataks džoxoc*' (with *džox-k*' 'hell') = *εἰς πύθμενα ᾗδου* in Proverbs 14.12 and 16.25; 2) a river, cf. *i yatakac*' *Yordananu* in BrsMrk apud NHB 2: 538c; 3) or a sea, see NHB 2: 538c, s.v. *yatak-a-bac*' 'of which the bottom is open; by opening of the bottom'; in two passages (Nanay, 9th cent., and "Čarəntir"), *yatakabac*' refers to *andndayin cov* 'abyssal sea'. For such a joint occurrence of the two synonyms note also *yataks andndoc*' and *anyatakeli andundk*' in Grigor Narekac'i 25.3 and 48.5 [Xaç'atryan/Łazinyan 1985: 341^{L59}, 435^{L151}]; on *an-yatakeli* 'the bottom of which cannot be found' see below. Also MArm. *atak* referred to the sea-bottom (see MiĵHayBaĳ 1, 1987: 85b).

From the dialectal data recorded by Ačāryan (HAB 3: 387a), the Zeyt'un denominative *atkenal* 'to dive' is worth mentioning; cf. also Svedia *āggil* 'to dive' < **yatakel* [Andreasyan 1967: 376a]. Further, Ačāryan says that Udi *atak* 'hell' seems

to have been borrowed from Arm. *yatak*. This can be directly confirmed by Metri *é'tak* 'underworld; hell' [Ałayan 1954: 280b] and especially Łarabał *atak* 'hell, underworld' [HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 116a] and Šamšadin-Diliĵan *atak* 'abyss' [Mežunc' 1989: 201b], which were unknown to Ačarıyan.

The Łarabał word is illustrated in HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 116a by *atakə k'ənac* 'he went to hell'; cf. also the curse: *ətaken takə k'yinis* [Łaziyan 1983: 164a] 'may you go to the bottom of the Underworld'. Here, *ətaken takə* is equivalent to *antak covi takn et'as* (see HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 67b) 'may you go to the bottom of the bottomless sea'. In a fairy-tale told by one of the most wonderful Armenian story-tellers Mrs. Łumaš Avagyan and recorded by M. Grigoryan in Šuši (1922), *səev atak* 'Black Underworld' appears in a very impressive enumeration of words denoting 'hell', next to *ĵəhāndām-gyōr* and *istibujat* (see HŽHek' 5, 1966: 37).

The verb *atak(v)el* 'to get lost (into hell)' is recorded in Łarabał and Sasun; cf. also *atakuk* 'lost, vanished' and *atakum* 'peace, riddance' [HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 116b]. (Some confusion with *atak* dial. 'leisure' seems to have taken place here; cf. Ačarean 1913: 143; HAB 1: 284b). The semantic field of this denominative is comparable with *h'andə(n)del*. Compare Russ. *za-propast-ít'sja* 'to get lost' from *própast'* 'abyss'.

Arm. dial. **an-tak* 'bottomless', with the Armenian privative prefix *an-* and the same root *tak*, is a perfect typological match of the Iranian **a-tak* 'bottomless'. It can mean both 'very deep, bottomless (sea)' (Nor Naxiĵewan, Karin, Ararat, Łarabał, Van, Muš) and 'sea-bottom; abyss' (Ararat, Van) [Ačarean 1913: 110b; HAB 1: 190b; HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 67b]; see also Harut'yunyan 2000: 20-21. With respect to the parallelism between Iranian **a-tak* 'bottomless' and Arm. dial. **an-tak* 'bottomless' particularly interesting is the curse *antak covi takn et'as* (see HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 67b) 'may you go to the bottom of the bottomless sea', which is to be compared to Łarabał *ətaken takə k'yinis* [Łaziyan 1983: 164a] 'may you go to the bottom of the Underworld'. Note the basic pattern: "the bottom (*tak*) of the Bottomless (*an-tak*) or of the Underworld/Abyss (Iran. **a-tak*, etymologically - 'Bottomless')". The same is found also with **y-an-(y)atak*: *Sew yanatəki tli takn ert'as* [Harut'yunyan 2000: 11] 'may you go under the mud of the Black-Bottomless' (*yanatak ... tak*).

Also Arm. *yatak* 'bottom' is found in a secondary privative prefixation: *an-yatak* 'bottomless' (see Nonnus of Nisibis apud NHB 1: 207b) and *an-yatakeli* 'the bottom of which cannot be found' (in Grigor Narekac'i, with *andund-k'* 'abyss'; see above); MArm. *anatak* 'bottomless', twice with *cov* 'sea' [MiĵHayBař 1, 1987: 47b]; dial. (Ararat, Ĵavaxk', Sivri-Hisar) *an-atak* 'bottomless', also *anatakə gnal*, *anatakvel* 'to

disappear' [HayLezBrbBaī 1, 2001: 55a]. Note **sew-ataak* 'Black-Bottomless' in curses of allative structure from Karin [H. Mkrtč'yan 1952: 177b] and Bulanəx of Muš [Movsisyan 1972: 131a]; cf. **sew jur* and **sew atak*.

Remarkably, **an-(y)atak* is also found with the prefix *y-*: **y-an-(y)atak* adj. 'bottomless (sea)'; subst. 'abyss; a part of the Underworld', *Sew yanatak* 'Black Bottomless' (also in curses of allative structure) [Harut'yunyan 2000: 10-12]. Note that spells and curses of allative structure (cf. *i yan(y)atak covn* 'to the bottomless sea' [Ōdabašyan 1976: 121; Harut'yunyan 2000: 12]) could have played an important role in the process of the prefixation.

yawray, *i*-stem in NHB, but only GSg *yōray-i* (Severian of Gabala) is attested 'stepfather'.

Attested in Movsēs Xorenac'i 3.68 (1913=1991: 359^{L11}), Severian of Gabala, Philo.

●**ETYM** Connected with Skt. *pitr̥vya-* 'father's brother, paternal uncle', *πάτριος* 'male relative, esp. father's brother', Lat. *patruus* 'father's brother', etc. [Hübschmann 1897: 463, 477; HAB 3: 414b].

Arm. *yawray* is treated as a native term (see Clackson 1994: 146) that has later been replaced by *hōru* (hapax, 12th cent.), analogical after *mawr-u* 'stepmother' (Hübschmann and HAB, *ibid.*); see s.v.v. *hayr* and *mawru*. The connection with *hayr* 'father' (GSg *hawr*) cannot be doubted, although, as Clackson (1994: 147) points out, "an exact morphological analysis is extremely difficult".

Two things are puzzling: the initial *y-* and the ending *-ay*. The derivation of *yawray* and Gr. *πάτρις* from **ph₂t₂-h₃i-* (Normier 1981: 27₄₀; Clackson 1994: 39) is not certain. The assumption that *y-* is an alternative reflex of *h-* is hardly probable. The semantic derivation may have been expressed by the prefix *y-* 'in' (see 2.3.1). The *-ay* can be identified with abstract and/or collective *-ay(k')* probably based on PIE **-eh₂-*. Note Gr. *πάτρις*, Ion. *-η* f. '*väterliche Abstammung, Sippe; Vaterstadt, -land, Heimat'. Thus, **hawr-ay* would have meant 'fatherhood, paternity', and *y-awr-ay* (lit. 'in fatherhood, paternity') refers then to a person who is in fatherhood (in paternal relations) with a child.

One wonders whether the *-ay* here is identic with that in *ark'ay*, *i*-stem 'king', *caray*, *i*-stem 'servant; captive', *p'esay*, *i*-stem 'bridegroom; son-in-law' (q.v.); see also 2.3.1.

yisun, *i*-stem: GDSg *yisn-i*, AblSg *i yisn-ē* (Bible), IPl *ysn-i-w-k'* (Ephrem); GDPl *yisn-i-c'* is cited in NHB 2: 361b, but without evidence; later: *yisun-c'*; etc. 'fifty'.

Bible+.

●**DIAL** Dialectally ubiquitous. The forms with *-t's-*, *-c'c'-*, *-jĵ-*, etc., as well as those with geminate *-ss-* are analogical after *vat'sun* 'sixty' and *ut'sun* 'eighty' [HAB 3: 400b].

●**ETYM** Since Petermann and others, derived from the PIE word for 'fifty' [Hübschmann 1897: 477; HAB 3: 400] - PIE **penkʷēkomth₂* 'fifty': Gr. *πεντή-κοντα*, Lat. *quīnquāgintā*, Skt. *pañcāśāt* f., etc. For discussion see 2.3.1.

yogn (spelled also *yok'n*): AP1 *yog/k'un-s* in Book of Chries, Grigor Narekac'i; GDPI *yog/k'un-c'* in Grigor Narekac'i 'numerous, much, plenty, abundant' (John Chrysostom, Xosrov Anjewac'i, etc.); derivatives: *yogn-a-goyn* 'very many' (Agat'angełos+), *yogn-a-xumb* 'with many groups' (Book of Chries+), etc.; **yognim** (spelled also *yok'n-*) 'to be/become tired, exhausted, discouraged' (Numbers 21.4, Book of Chries, Sebēos, etc.), 'to be zealous for, to pursue with zeal' (Timothy Aelurus, 6th cent.).

In Numbers 21.4: *yognec'aw žotovurdn i čanaparhin* : *ὁλιγοψύχησεν ὁ λαὸς ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ* : 'the people became discouraged on the way'. Arm. *yognim* renders Gr. *ὁλιγοψύχέω* 'to be faint; to become discouraged'.

●**ETYM** Since Lidén (1906: 76-77), interpreted as **y-o-gn* = prefix/preposition *y-* + **o-gʷh* *hon-* or **o-gʷh* *no-* (cf. Skt. *ā-hanās-* 'schwellend, üppig', Pers. *āganiš* 'full'), from **gʷh* *en-* 'to swell, abound': Skt. *ghanā-* 'compact, solid, hard, firm, dense', m. 'any compact mass or substance', Gr. *εὐθενής* 'in abundance', Lith. *ganėti* 'to suffice', OCS *goněti* 'to suffice', etc. [Pokorny 1959: 280, 491; Ĵahukyan 1967: 59, 91₁₆; 1987: 129]. This etymology is possible. For **o-* see Ĵahukyan 1987: 246. Nevertheless, the formation *y-o-gn* is not entirely clear. One therefore might seek for an alternative.

As is pointed out by Ačāryan (HAB 3: 402b), the semantic development of the Armenian is comparable to that seen in Gr. *ὄχλος* m. 'crowd, throng; mass, multitude' : 'annoyance, trouble', *ὀχλέω* 'to be crowded' : 'to move, disturb; to trouble, importune', *ἐν-οχλέω* 'to trouble, annoy; to be troubled, annoyed; to be unwell, overburdened with work'. One wonders whether the Armenian and Greek can also be related etymologically. This has been suggested by Hiwnk'earpēyēntean but rejected by Ačāryan (ibid.) without comment.

To the best of my knowledge, the origin of the Greek is uncertain. I hypothetically assume a common borrowing of substratum origin, from a **(H/w)ogʰ-* or **(H/w)ogʷh-*. The Armenian prefix *y-* < PIE **h₁en-* 'in' is frequent in words expressing the idea of 'multitude etc.' (see 2.3.1). Note the structural, semantic (and

etymological?) identity of Arm. **y-ogn* 'plenty', 'to be tired, overburdened' and Gr. *ἐν-οχλέω* 'to trouble, annoy; to be troubled, annoyed; to be unwell, overburdened with work'. [Assuming that the voicing feature of the aspirated stops was facultative in the Mediterranean substratum, one may also consider Arm. *nk'oṭim* 'to be dried, parched, tired, unwell (e.g. as resulted from hunger)' (q.v.): **h₁en-(H/w)ok/g^{wh}-ol-* (cf. Gr. *ἐν-οχλέω*) > PArm. **inuk^h/g^{wh}-ol-*, with *-u-* because of the labiovelar (cf. 2.1.17.3) or from lengthened **-ō-* > **nu-k^hol-* > *nk'oṭ-*. The labiovelar appears as voiced in *yogn* because of the following nasal. Note that *yogn* is spelled also as *yok'n*. The original distribution may have been *yogn* : *yok'un-k'/s/c'*. Uncertain].

Arm. *yogn-* 'to be tired' resembles *xonj₁* 'tired'. If they are related, this would be another argument against the IE etymology of *yogn*. See s.v. *xonj₁* 'tired'. Compare the case of *viz* : Agulis, Łarabał, Ĵuŕa etc. **xi/uz* 'neck' (see s.v. *awji-k'*).

yolov, *i*-stem: GDPI *yolov-i-c'* in Movsēs Xorenac'i (see below), Movsēs Kaṭankatuac'i/Dasxuranc'i 1.27 (see below), Grigor Astuacaban, Xosrov Anjewac'i; IPI *yolov-i-w-k'* in Book of Chries [NHB 2: 366b]; GDPI *yolov-i-c'* is also found in a colophon by Dawit' K'obayrec'i from 1178 AD [HayJerHiš V-XII, 1988: 222^{L15}] 'much, plenty, numerous; many people'.

Bible+.

In Movsēs Xorenac'i 3.67 (1913=1991: 357^{L9}; transl. Thomson 1978: 348-349): *minč'ew yolovic' mkr̥tel anhawatic'* "so that many of the unbelievers were baptized". In 3.68 (1913=1991: 365^{L12f}; transl. Thomson 1978: 354): *hēnk' ekeal anhatk' ew yolovic' koṭmanc'* "Brigands have come in abundance and from all sides". Another attestation of *yolov-i-c'*: Movsēs Xorenac'i: 2.7 (109^{L19}).

In Movsēs Kaṭankatuac'i/Dasxuranc'i /7-10 cent./ 1.27 (V. Arak'elyan 1983: 97^{L4}; transl. Dowsett 1961: 55): *Ew yolovic'n linēr bžškut'iwn i tetwojn* : "Many were healed in this place".

●**DIAL** No dialectal forms are recorded in HAB 3: 403a.

The word is found in Xotorjūr (see YušamXotorj 1964: 491b): *ɔlov* 'abundant', with the following illustration: *jern ɔlov a* "the water is abundant"; also verbal **yolovnal*, caus. **yolovc'nul*.

●**ETYM** Since, Tervišeian, Bugge, etc., connected with Skt. *puru-*, f. *pūrvī-* 'much, abundant' (RV+), *puru-* (adv.) 'often, very' (RV+), OAv. *pouru-* 'much', Gr. *πολύς* (adj.) 'much', etc. [Meillet 1894b: 280₂; Hübschmann 1899: 48; HAB 3: 402-403].

Olsen (1999: 778, 808) explains *yolov* from the zero-grade **-p_hl_hb^hi* (cf. Skt. *pūrbhis* 'in Fülle'), assuming that the vocalism *-o-* has been conditioned by the labial **p-*. This idea can hardly be accepted; cf. 2.1.20.

Meillet (1894b: 280₂) derives *yolov* from **polowi-* assuming that "l'o persiste devant v" (cf. *govem*, q.v.), and "le premier o est conservé sous l'influence du second; cf. *kotor*, *molor*, *bolor*". Similarly, Ĵahukyan (1987: 143) derives it from **pol-ou-*. Elsewhere (1990: 8), he writes that "**poleu-* should be reconstructed, **plou-* seems less plausible; in the first case progressive and in the second case regressive assimilation is present".

I propose a direct derivation from **polh₁u-s* (cf. Gr. *πολύς* 'much'): **poləw-* > PArm. **(p)oləw* > *y-olov*. For the assimilation, implied also in Meillet's and Ĵahukyan's explanations, see 2.1.20, 2.1.23. Note especially that *alawunk* 'Pleiades', which apparently derives from the zero grade of the same PIE word (cf. YAv. **parūijainī-*, NPers. *parvīn*, Greek *Πλειάδες*), confirms the idea about the dissimilation (see s.v.).

For the prefix *y-* see 2.3.1.

The *i*-stem of *yolov* may be compared with Skt. f. *pūrvī-* from PIE **plh₁-u-ih₂-*. See 2.2.3. See also s.v. *hoyl*, *i*-stem 'group'.

yotdōtēdē 'to shake, move, cause to totter, waver' (Nahum 3.10, John Chrysostom, Ephrem, etc.), **yotdōtd**, *a*-stem: GDPl *yotdōtd-a-c* (2 Peter 2.14, Alexander Romance) 'not firm, tottering, unstable, mutable, vacillating, wavering, fickle' (2 Peter 2.14, 3.16), John Chrysostom, Hesychius of Jerusalem, T'ovmay Arcruni, etc.)

●**ETYM** Ačāryan (HAB 3: 403b) treats this verb as a reduplication of the otherwise unattested **yotd-* and does not record any acceptable etymology.

The basic meaning seems to be 'to move'. Note the apposition *anšarž himn* 'immovable base' : *anyotdōtdeli vēm* 'immovable wall' in John Chrysostom apud NHB 1: 209a. Thus, *an-šarž* 'immovable' is synonymous to *an-yotdōtd-eli*. Note Agat'angelos §767 (1909=1980: 398^{L1f}), where the huge blocks of stone are said to be impossible to move (*šaržēh*); cf. dial. Ĵavaxk' *an-žarž* from the above-mentioned *an-šarž*: *anžarž k'ar* 'immovable stone' (see Lalayanc' 1892: 11^{L2} = 1, 1983: 341^{L2}).

I propose a tentative connection with Gr. *πέλομαι* (intrans.) 'to move', Skt. *ca'ratī* 'to move, wander', *vi-cālayati* 'to shake', etc. The Armenian verb may be regarded as an archaic formation with the prefix **h₁en-* 'in' based on a reduplicated present in *o*-grade. As for *-d-*, one could compare with Gr. *τέλεθω* < **k^welh₁-d^he/o-*, cf. *τέλομαι* (see Harðarson 1995: 206). We are probably dealing with another trace of the old present suffix **-d^h-*, cf. *πλήθω* 'to fill' (see Beekes 1995: 231).

yoyr, *i*-stem: GDPl *yoyr-i-c* in Dionysius Thrax 'fat'.

Attested in Movsēs Xorenac'i 3.59 (1913=1991: 338^{L19}), John Chrysostom, Dionysius Thrax.

●**ETYM** Scheftelowitz (1904-05, 2: 34) connects with Skt. **pī-* 'to swell, be fat', Av. *paēman* 'milk', etc. Not accepted in HAB 3: 405-406. The etymology is worth of consideration. I propose a close connection with Skt. *pīvan-* adj. m.n., *pīvarī-* f. 'fat, swelling' (RV+), *pīvarī-* noun f. 'fat, swelling' (RV+); Gr. *πίων* adj. m.n., *πίερα* adj. f. 'fat, fertile, rich'.

Theoretically, a feminine form with full grade in the root and zero grade in the suffix might be responsible for the Armenian word: **peih-ur-ih₂-* > PArm. **he(i)ur-i-* (loss of the intervocalic *-i-*) > **hoyr-i-* > *y-oyr*, *i*-stem. For the generalization of the feminine form in Armenian see 2.2.3. For the abundance of words with *y-* in this meaning see 2.3.1.

yorjorjem 'to name, call' (Movsēs Xorenac'i, Eusebius of Caesarea, Ephrem, etc.); *yorjorj-an-k'* (Hesychius of Jerusalem), APl *-an-s* (Severian of Gabala), *a*-stem: GDP1 *yorjorj-an-a-c'* (Eusebius of Caesarea), IPI [*> adv.*] *yorjorj-an-a-w-k'* (Cyril of Jerusalem) 'name, naming', *yorjorj-umn* 'name' (Movsēs Xorenac'i 2.63 [1913=1991: 196^{L5}], etc.), *yorjorj* 'id.' (Nersēs Šnorhali /12th cent./).

In Movsēs Xorenac'i 1.4 (1913=1991: 16^{L8}; transl. Thomson 1978: 73): *Ew əndēr ardeōk' zsa miayn ordwoy anuamb yorjorjeac'?*: "Why then did [Scripture] bestow on him alone the name of son" (concerning Noah). Further: *or Ewt'atios yorjorjēr*: "which was named Euthalius" (2.80: 219^{L16}); *oroy koč'mamb yorjorjec'an ew batanik'n*: "by which name the baths were also called" (2.88: 238^{L14f}; transl. 244).

●**ETYM** Ačāryan (HAB 3: 408b) treats this verb as a reduplication of the otherwise unattested **yorj-* and does not record any acceptable etymology. Ĵahukyan (1990: 76) points out that *yorjorj* is obviously a reduplication, but the origin of the root is unknown.

I propose a connection with Gr. *εἶπω* < **fēipō* 'to say, speak, tell' and Hitt. *uerija-* 'to call, name, summon', reflecting a *je*-present of the root **uer-* (see Pokorny 1959: 1162-1163; Frisk s.v.; Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 1: 231, 361₁; Mallory/Adams 1997: 535a). The Armenian probably contains the prefix *y-* < PIE **h₁en-* 'in'; typologically cf. Lat. *in-vocō* 'to call upon, invoke', Pr. *enwackē* 'to call, invoke' (see Toporov, PrJaz 2, 1979: 59-60); also Lat. *in-titulāre*, Engl. *en-title*, etc.

Thus: QIE **h₁en-uor-je-* > PArm. **ijgorj-* > **i(ŋ)orj-* > **yorj-*, cf. *yisun* 'fifty' (q.v.) vs. *hing* 'five' from PIE **penk^wēkomth₂* 'fifty' and **penk^we* 'five', respectively. For **je*-present in *o*-grade cf. synonymous *koč'em* 'to call, invite,

invoke' from QIE **g^wot-je-* (cf. PGerm. **kweþan* 'to say, speak, call, name': Goth. *qīþan*, OIc. *kveða*, OEngl. *cweþan*, etc.), as well as *goc'em* 'to shout' from **uok^wje-*.

Another type of reduplication in *o*-grade is represented by the following words also expressing speaking activities: *t'ot'ov-* 'to speak unclearly' < redupl. from *t'ovem* 'to cast a spell'; *kokov-an-k'* 'boastful/vainglorious words', *kokov-t-el* 'to speak eloquently' (q.v.). In this case only the first consonant of the root is reduplicated, cf. Skt. intensive *jo'guve* 'to call, to announce' from *gav-* 'to call, invoke, praise' (RV+), which, according to my etymology, may be connected with Arm. *ko-kov-*.

Further, compare verbal *koškočem* < **koč-koč-em* 'to beat, break' < **koc-koc-je-mi*, from *koc-* 'to beat; to lament by beating one's breast', probably a reduplicated present in *o*-grade with the present suffix **-je-*. See also 2.2.6.1.

yuit'i 'watered, irrigated, fertile' (Genesis 13.10, Gregory of Nyssa, Grigor Narekac'i, etc.), **yuit'anam** 'to increase' (Nersēs Šnorhali); without the initial *y-*: **uit'em** 'to sprinkle, irrigate' (Łazar P'arpec'i, 5th cent.), **uit'anam** 'to be watered, prosperous' (Anania Narekac'i, 10th cent.).

In Genesis 13.10 (Zeyt'unyan 1985: 201): *zamenayn kotmans Yordananu, zi amenayn yuit'i ēr* : *πασαν τὴν περίχωρον τοῦ Ιορδάνου ὅτι πασσα ἦν ποτιζομένη*. Arm. *yuit'i* renders Gr. *ποτιζομένη*, from the verb *ποτίζω* 'to give to drink; to water, irrigate'.

In "Baġgirk' hayoc'": *uit'i · parart* [Amalyan 1975: 261^{Nr227}]. Compare also *urdlc'eal* ['filled'] (op. cit. 262^{Nr242}); but see s.v. *urd*.

●**DIAL** Nor Bayazet *əit'ənal* 'to become fertile by watering (said of a cornfield)' [HAB 3: 410a].

●**ETYM** No etymology is accepted in HAB 3: 410a.

The word is certainly composed of the prefix *y-* 'in' and PIE **-ti-o-/-eh₂-*, found also in *an-jr-dī* 'arid, vot-watered' (with privative *an-* and *jur* 'water'), *n-aw-t'i* 'hungry, fasting' < 'not having eaten/drank', etc.; see s.v.v. and 2.3.1, on *-ti*. Typologically compare OHG *durst* 'thirst' from Germ. **þurs-ti-* 'thirst, drought'. Whether the root is identic with *ur-č-* 'to increase' (cf. Ĵahukyan 1967: 304) or *ur'* 'to swell' is uncertain.

I tentatively propose a derivation from PIE **Huers-*: Skt. *varṣ-* 'to rain', *vr̥ṣṭī-* f. 'rain' (RV+), Hitt. *varša-* 'rain-shower', Luw. *varša-* 'drips', Gr. *ἑρση, ἄρση, ἔρση* f. 'dew', *οὐρέω* 'to urinate', Mlr. *frass* 'rain-shower, torrent', etc. (see Mayrhofer, EWAia 2, 1996: 522-523). Arm. *y-ur-t'* can be derived from QIE **h₁en-h₁urs-ti-V-*; for the structure cf. Skt. *vr̥ṣ-ṭī-*, as well as Mlr. *frass* < **h₁urs-t-*

(see Schrijver 1991: 497-498). A PIE **-rs-t-* would yield Arm. *-(r)št-*. One may therefore treat *y-ur-t'i* as reshaped with the same suffix **-ti-* which remained productive at later stages (see 2.3.1).

Any relation with Arm. **var* in *vard-a-var* 'folk festivity of water-pouring' (see also s.v. *urd* 'a small canal/brook to water gardens with')?

nayim 'to look, observe; to perceive by the mind, apprehend'.

Bible+.

●**DIAL** Preserved in some extremely NW (Suč'ava, Nor Naxiĵewan, Polis, Rodost'o, Partizak, Aslanbek, Sebastia) and E (Ararat, Agulis) dialects [HAB 3: 427b].

●**ETYM** Compared with *hayim* 'to watch, look' (q.v.) since NHB (2: 404b) and Patkanov (1864: 14); see also other references in HAB 3: 427a, as well as Patrubány 1897a: 234 (from **ni-hayim*) and Dumézil 1997: 3 (from **(i)n-hayim*). Ačāryan (HAB) and Ĵahukyan (1987: 245) accept the derivation from **ni-* 'down', seen also in *ni-st*.

nawt'i, *ca*-stem according to NHB and HAB, but only API *nawt'i-s* is attested (Bible+); **anawt'i** (John Chrysostom, Paterica, etc.) 'hungry, fasting'.

Renders Gr. *νήστις* 'not eating, fasting'; for illustrations see Weiss 1994: 91.

●**DIAL** The form *anawt'i*, though attested later, is ubiquitous in dialects, whereas *nawt'i* is seen only in Ĵarabaġ *νωτ'εε* [HAB 3: 478a]. However, this form cannot be treated as a direct reflex of the archaic *nawt'i* since the pretonic vowel (and even syllable) of trisyllabic words is lost in Ĵarabaġ and adjacent dialects which have penultimate accent. A trace of the initial *a-* can be seen in the following by-forms: Ĵarabaġ *ανωτ'ι* [Davt'yan 1966: 313], Goris *ανωτ'ι* [Margaryan 1975: 314b].

●**ETYM** Ačāryan (HAB 3: 477-478) treats as composed of a root **nawt'* and the suffix *-i* (cf. also Frisk 2: 319) seen in e.g. *bar-i* 'good', and rejects all the etymologies of the word. More accurately: **-ti-o-*; see below.

Since Bugge (1889: 22), connected with Gr. *νήφω*, Dor. *νάφω* 'to be sober, drink no wine', *νήψις* f. 'sobriety', *νήπ-της* 'sober, discreet', *νήπ-τικός* 'sober' [Hübschmann 1897: 479 (with reservation); Pokorny 1959: 754; Frisk 2: 318-319]. One reconstructs **nag^{wh}-tijō-* [Ĵahukyan 1982: 43, 218₁₀₄; 1987: 140] or **nāb^htio-* (see Olsen 1999: 437, with hesitation); see also Pedersen 1906: 349 = 1982: 127.

Klingenschmitt (1982: 167) derives *nawt'i* from **n₂-h₁ťtijō-* < **n₂-h₁d-ti-*, cf. Gr. *νήστις*, *-ιος*, *-ιδος* 'not eating, fasting (of persons); causing hunger, starving'; see also Beekes 1988: 78 (with a question-mark). Sceptical: Olsen 1999: 437₄₉₃. [For possible Luwian and Iranian cognates see Meier-Brügger 1990]. This is semantically

preferable since both *nawt'i* and *νήστις* mean 'not-eating' whereas Gr. *νήφω* refers to abstaining from alcoholic drink [Clackson 1994: 155; Weiss 1994: 91] and may be derived from **ne-* + **h₁e(h₁)g^{wh}* 'not-drinking', cf. Lat. *ēbrius* 'drunk; intoxicated', Toch. AB *yok-* 'to drink', etc. (see Winter 1980a: 470; Puhvel 1985; Schrijver 1991: 45, 54, 139; Weiss 1994; Adams 1999: 510; Kim 2000), though Doric *νάφω* points to **h₂* [Schrijver 1991: 54, 139] (but on Doric see Kim 2000: 163-164). According to Seebold (1988: 506), Gr. *ā* is "wohl aus einer partizipialen Bildung **n̥-(a)g^{wh}-ont-*entwickelt", and Arm. *nawt'i* "ist unklar".

For other possible/alleged cognates (e.g. OHG *nuohturn* 'sober'), for discussion and other references or proposals see HAB 3: 477-478; Dumezil 1997: 2-3; and especially Clackson 1994: 154-156.

If the development **-dt- > Arm. -wt-*, with unaspirated dental stop (see 2.1.22.12), one can maintain the connection of Arm. *nawt'i* with Gr. *νήφω* (whether with. Lat. *ēbrius* and others or not) and derive it from **n-H(H)g^{wh}-ti-o-*.

According to Pedersen (1906: 343 = 1982: 121), the initial *a-* of the Armenian by-form *a-nawt'i* is prothetic and can be compared with that of *anic* (q.v.). Ĵahukyan (1987: 254) treats *a-nawt'i* vs. *nawt'i* (cf. *a-nawsr* : *nawsr*) as dialectal variants. In fact, *anawt'i* can be treated as analogical after the privative prefix *an-*, see Klingenschmitt 1982: 167₁₃ ("eine Verdeutlichung als negativer Begriff nach Komposita mit *an-* privativum < **n̥-*"); Clackson 1994: 155, 231₂₂₂; Beekes 1988: 78.

The derivational type in **-ti-o-/-ch₂-* finds parallel in other Armenian words of the same semantic field: *an-ĵr-di* 'arid, vot-watered' (with privative *an-* and *ĵur* 'water'), *y-ur-t'i* 'watered, irrigated, fertile', and *nay* 'moist'; see s.v.v. and 2.3.1.

[Any connection with *nk't'em* 'to starve, faint from hunger'?].

neard-k', obl. *ne(a)rd-*, *nard-* [or nom. *nēard-k'* in Agat'angelos vs. obl. *niard-* in Gregory of Nyssa]; *i*-stem: GDPI *nerd-i-c'* (twice in Plato), *nard-i-c'* (Nersēs Lambronac'i), *niard-i-c'* in Gregory of Nyssa (but here also *niard-a-c'*, which points to *a*-stem), IPI *neard-i-w-k'* (Cyril of Jerusalem) 'sinew, tendon'.

Agat'angelos+. In derivatives: Bible+.

In Movsēs Xorenac'i 2.85 (1913=1991: 230^{L11}, 231^{L1}; transl. Thomson 1978: 237), *nerd-eay* 'made of sinew', referring to a strap.

●**ETYM** Connected with Gr. *νεῦρά* f. 'string, sinew', Lat. *nervus* m. 'sinew, nerve, string' (since NHB 2: 417b, s.v. *nerd-eay*), Skt. *snāvan-* n. 'sinew' (AV+), YAv. *snāvarə.bāzura-* 'having sinews as arm', Oss. *nwar/nawær* 'sinew, tendon' (see Cheung 2002: 209), Hitt. *išḫunayar* n. 'sinew, string', etc. [Hübschmann 1883: 45;

1897: 478; HAB 3: 438b; Jahukyan 1987: 149]. From PIE neuter heteroclitic **s(h₂)neh₁ur/n-*. For *-d* see s.v. *leard* 'liver'. Thus: **sneh₁ur-t-* (cf. Olsen 1999: 34₆₀, 156, 192) > **ne(H)ur-t-* > **ne(w)r-t-* > *neard*. See 2.1.33.1. On **-ti-*, the loss of *-w-*, influence of *leard* etc. see Clackson 1994: 55, 97, 219₉₇; Kortlandt 1980: 102; 1993: 10; 2001: 11 = 2003: 30, 102, 131.

net, *i*-stem 'arrow'.

Bible+.

●**DIAL** Preserved in a number of dialects.

●**ETYM** Since de Lagarde (see HAB 3: 442b), derived from IE **nedo-* 'reed': Skt. *nada-* 'reed', etc. As pointed out in Mallory/Adams 1997: 481a, "the Armenian meaning reflects the widespread use of of certain kinds of reeds for the making of arrowshafts". For the Armenian form Luv.* *nāta(/i)-* c. 'Rohr(stengel); Pfeil (?)' (see Starke 1990: 201, 418) seems to be most interesting, since it can provide us with parallels for both the semantics and the *i*-stem. Thus, Armenian and Anatolian **ned-i-* 'reed; arrow'?

nerʿakn 'rat'.

Not attested. Only in Kʿajuni [HAB 3: 446a].

●**ETYM** No etymological attempt is known to me.

The status of the word is uncertain. Nevertheless, it seems obvious that *nerʿakn* is a compound the second member of which is *tʿakn* 'mouse'. Ačāryan (HAB 2: 142b) considers *tʿakn* to denote an unknown animal. He fails to note the fact that in one of the few attestations *tʿakn* renders Greek 'mouse' [NHB 1: 792-793]. Under this light the connection of *tʿakn* with Georgian *tʰagu* 'mouse' suggested by Mai becomes more probable.

As to the first component, it is tempting to equate it with *ner* '/tagerakin/' (q.v.). For the semantic relationship see s.v. *akʿis* and 3.5.2.9.

nēr, *i-* or *a*-stem: GDSg *nir-i* in Ruth 1.15, AblSg *i ner-ē* in Ephrem; *o*-stem: AblSg *i ner-o-y* in Ephrem 'husband's brother's wife; husband's the other wife'.

NSg *nēr* and GDSg *nir-i* are attested in Ruth 1.15, rendering Gr. *σύννυμφος* 'husband's brother's wife'. For the passage see Schmitt 1996: 22. In Ephrem one finds two conflicting ablative forms, viz. *i ner-ē* and *i neroy*. Philo has API *ner-s*. According to HAB 3: 443a, there is also a NSg reading variant *near* in Philo.

Tumanjan (1978: 165) lists *ner* under the words with *o*-stem citing GSg *ner-oy* and notes that later the word also has *i*-stem. This is not quite accurate. As we have

seen, *neroy* is attested only once, in Ephrem, whereas *nir-i* is older since it is attested in the Bible. Besides, AblSg *i ner-ē* in the very same Ephrem cannot imply *o*-stem. These two attestations point to *i*- or *a*-stem (thus, not necessarily *i*-). Though the evidence is not sufficient to reconstruct the original paradigm with safety, the attested forms seem to point to NSg *nēr* vs. oblique *ner-*. GDSg *nir-i* (as well as dial. **nir-oj*) and NSg *ner* are analogical after NSg *nēr* and oblique *ner-*, respectively.

The word *ner-t'akn* 'rat' (only in K'aḷuni) probably comprises Arm. *ner* 'husband's brother's wife' and *t'akn* 'mouse' (cf. Georgian *t'agu* 'mouse'); see s.v. and par. 3.5.2.9.

● **DIAL** Widespread in the *kə*-dialects. Zeyt'un (and Hačən) *ney* (with diphthong *e*) is irregular; one expects **niy* [Ačāryan 2003: 42]. One might derive *ney* from *nēr* rather than *ner*, though this does not solve the problem entirely since *-ēr* usually yields *-ey* and not *-ey*, cf. *gēr* 'fat' > Zeyt'un *g'ey*, *tēr* 'lord' > Zeyt'un *dēy* (ibid.).

NSg *nēr*: GSG **nir-oj*, cf. Zeyt'un *ney*: *nüyüč'*, Xarberd *ner*: *nirč'* [HAB 3: 443; Ačāryan 2003: 187].

● **ETYM** Since Tērvišean and Bugge, connected with the PIE word for 'husband's brother's wife': Gr. *εἰνότερες* f. pl. 'wives of brothers or of husbands' brothers, sisters-in-law', NSg *εἰνότηρ*, voc. *εἰνότερ*, gen. *εἰνότερος*, Skt. *yātar-* 'id.', Pers. *yārī* < **yār-ī-*, Lat. pl. *ianitricēs*, Lith. *jentė* (17th c.), *intė* 'husband's brother's wife, wife's sister, daughter-in-law', Latv. *īētaļa*, etc. [HAB 3: 443a; Pokorny 1959: 505; Huld apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 522a]. On Latin *ia-* see Schrijver 1991: 107-108.

In view of the apparent phonological problems, the appurtenance of the Armenian has been considered uncertain [Hübischmann 1897: 478; Frisk 1: 464] or forced and impossible (Łap'anc'yan 1951b: 582-583; 1961: 109; see below). Not included in Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 760. The following solution has been suggested: **yineter* > **inēy(e)r* > *nēr* [Bugge 1889: 37; HAB 3: 443a]. For other references see Ĵahukyan 1982: 214₄₂. Ĵahukyan (1982: 41, 49, 214₄₂; 1987: 130) assumes the same but with zero grade **in-* and not **yen-*. As is clear from Greek and Baltic, however, the word contained an internal laryngeal, which, in view of Greek *-α-*, must be **-h₂-* (see Beekes 1969: 195; Schrijver 1991: 97), thus one expects Arm. **nayr*, gen. **nawr*.

Schmitt (1996) independently suggests a scenario similar to that of Bugge and Ačāryan (HAB), but he derives **yenetēr* from **yematēr* assuming an assimilation. (See also Matzinger 1997: 11). Kortlandt (1997 = 2003: 120-121) treats this assimilation as ad hoc, and, basing himself upon Beekes' rule for the vocalization of medial laryngeals in Armenian before clusters (see 2.1.20), assumes the following

paradigm: nom. **indir*, acc. **inderan*, gen. **anawro*, instr. **anarbi*. Then he notes that "this paradigm could not survive", and "the loss of **t* before syllabic **r* provided a good motivation for eliminating the dental obstruent from the paradigm altogether". He therefore reconstructs **inir*, **iner-* beside **mayir*, **ma(w)r-* 'mother' and **x^weur*, *-x^we(h)r-* 'sister', and suggests a regularization of the paradigm which produced the pre-apocope NSg **ineyir*.

Kortlandt's explanation does not explain all the details satisfactorily. It is not clear, for instance: 1) why the **-w-* has survived in *mayr*, whereas it disappeared in *nēr* completely? 2) how exactly we arrive at NSg **ineyir*? 3) how to explain the actual ClArm. paradigm, which, despite the scarce evidence, seems to point to NSg *nēr* vs. oblique *ner-*? I therefore offer some considerations not pretending to give the final solution.

In 2.1.23 I try to demonstrate that an unaccented **ə* (from PIE interconsonantal laryngeal) is assimilated. [One may be sceptical about this hypothetic sound development. Note that, in this particular case, the **ə* has more chance to be assimilated since both the preceding and the following syllables contain front vowels]. Thus, Schmitt's idea on assimilation is worth of consideration. A paradigm nom. **ienh₂-tēr* (cf. Gr. *ἐνάτηρ*): acc. **ienh₂-tēr-m* would give PArm. **inētēr* > **inayr*: **inētēr* > **ine(t)ēr*, whence analogical nom. **ine(t)ēr* > **neyr* > *nēr*. This way we can understand the paradigm nom. *nēr* vs. obl. *ner-*. (GDSg *nir-i* is analogical after the well-known classical rule *-ē- : -i-Ṽ-*). The original oblique stem in **-ter-* rather than **-tr-* parallels Gr. f.pl. *εἰς τρεῖς*, gen. *-τρεος*. For *-ete-* > *-e-* cf. **treys* 'three' > *erek* 'id.

Alternative suggestions. The Armenian form had *i-* or *a-* stem, cf. GDSg *nir-i* in Ruth 1.15, AblSg *i ner-ē* in Ephrem. For a certain stage, thus, one may reconstruct (old or recent) feminine in **-ih₂-*, viz. **(H)ienh₂-ter-ih₂-*; cf. Iran. **yāθr-ī-*. [Note the unspecified **neteri-* in Hübschmann 1897: 478; Jahukyan 1959: 278a]. IE **ienh₂-ter-ih₂-* would produce PArm. hypothetical **inētēri* and would strengthen the basis for the unaccented **ə* (see above).

The evidence for the *o*-stem is meager: AblSg *i ner-o-y* in Ephrem next to AblSg *i ner-ē* (which suits *i-*, *a-* or others stems but not *o-*) in the same passage. If, nevertheless, reliable, it can be related with the feminine *o*-stem seen e.g. in *nu* and *ataxin*.

Nom. *-ē-* vs. obl. *-e-* is reminiscent of the paradigm of *atūēs*, obl. *atues* 'fox' etc. One may also assume a secondary compensatory lengthening caused by the nominative marker **-s*, cf. 2.1.2 and 2.2.1.2.

In view of phonological problems, Łap'anc'yan (Kapancjan 1951b: 582-583; 1961: 108-110) rejects the IE etymology of Arm. *ne/ēr* and compares it with Hurr. ^{SAL}*ne-e-ra*, which he interprets as a common noun meaning 'husband's brother's wife' rather than an anthroponym, as well as with Lyc. *nere/i-*, a term of relationship. The fact that Arm. *ne/ēr* is mainly represented in western and southern dialects confirms, he claims, the Minor-Asian origin of the word. Ĵahukyan (1985a: 366; 1987: 423, 425) is justifiably sceptical about this connection. Since *ner*, despite the scepticism of Łap'anc'yan, is certainly of PIE origin, the resemblance with the Hurrian word should be treated as accidental. [Theoretically, the Hurrian word might be seen as an Armenian loan. This is improbable, however, since the loss of pretonic **i-* and intervocalic **-t-* could hardly be that old, and the meaning 'husband's brother's wife' is arbitrarily ascribed to the Hurrian by Łap'anc'yan].

nk't'em 'to starve, faint from hunger'.

Bible+. For instance, in Genesis 25.29-30 (Zeyt'unyan 1985: 258): *Ew ēr ep'eal Yakobay t'an, ew ekn Esaw i daštē nk't'eal*. <...>. *Tur inj čašakel i šikat'anēd jaydmanē, zi nk't'eal em* : ἡψησεν δὲ Ἰακωβ ἔψεμα. ἦλθεν δὲ Ἡσάυ ἐκ τοῦ πεδίου ἐκλείπων. <...> Γεῦσόν με ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐψέματος τοῦ πυρροῦ τούτου, ὅτι ἐκλείπω. Here *nk't'eal em* renders Gr. ἐκλείπω 'to leave out; to die; to faint'.

●**DIAL** No dialectal forms are recorded in HAB 3: 477a.

According to V. Arak'elyan (1979: 38), here belongs Ararat (Abovyan, the village of Kotayk') **nəxt(ə)*, as the root of *nk't'em*, occurring in the expression *nəxtə kədərvel* 'to faint, become weak from hunger', lit. "one's **nəxt* be cut". This could be possible only if **nik't'-* or **nuk't'-* have basically meant something like 'vital power, strength, essence' or the like, but this is improbable. [Typologically cf. a different kind of semantic shift: *oyž* 'power' : **z-oyž* > *žoyž* 'endurance']. Dial. *nəxt-* can rather be derived from Arm. *níwt'* 'element, material, subject, properties', dial. 'sap; nourishment; subject; essence'. This is corroborated by Urmia/Xoy *nüt'ə kətərvel* 'to be/become exhausted' (see M. Asatryan 1962: 229b) which is identic with Kotayk' *nəxtə kədərvel* 'to faint, become weak from hunger'.

●**ETYM** Meillet (1908-09: 356) connects *nk't'em* 'to starve, faint from hunger' with *nk'ořim* 'to be dried, parched, tired, unwell (e.g. as resulted from hunger)' deriving them from PIE **nī-k-*: Skt. *nīcā* 'downwards', OCS *nicъ* 'face downwards', ORuss. *ničati* 'to bend, bow, droop', Beloruss. dial. *nícy* 'болезненный, слабый' = 'ailing, sickly, weak' (see ÈtimSlovSlavJaz 25, 1999: 109-110). Not accepted in HAB 3: 477ab, and not included in Ĵahukyan's monographs and Olsen 1999.

The etymology is worth of consideration. For the semantics cf. the Belorussian; see also Arm. *xonj* 'tired, exhausted' vs. *xonj* 'low, down' (see s.v.v.). Formally Arm. *nk't'em* can be interpreted as **nik^h-t-* (with intensive *-t-*) > **nik't-* through assimilation.

On the other hand, *nk't'em* can be regarded as containing the prefix **ni-* and **k't-*, the latter being related with **kt-* 'to faint, become weak, feeble' (q.v.); cf. *n-k'ot-* if from **ni-* + **suol-* (see s.v.).

[Hardly cf. *nawt'i* 'hungry', q.v.].

nk'otim 'to be dried, parched, tired, unwell (e.g. as resulted from hunger)'

In Numbers 11.6: *nk'oteal en anjink' mer; ew oc' urek', bayc' miayn i mananayn en ac'k' mer* : *vvni δὲ ἡ ψυχὴ ἡμῶν κατάξηρος, οὐδὲν πλὴν εἰς τὸ μαννα οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ ἡμῶν*. Here Arm. *nk'oteal* renders Gr. *κατά-ξηρος* 'very dry, parched'. In 1 Kings 30.13, the Armenian verb renders Gr. *ἐν-οχλέω* 'to be troubled, annoyed; to be unwell, overburdened with work': *nk'otec'ay es ays error d'or : ἡνωχλήθηεν ἐγὼ σήμερον τριταῖος*.

The form *nk'ot-eal* is also attested in Paterica, and *nk'ot-umn* occurs in Yovhannēs Draxanakert'i.

●**ETYM** Meillet (1908-09: 356) connects with *nk't'em*, q.v. Ačāryan (HAB 3: 477b) leaves the origin open.

I suggest a tentative comparison to EBalt. **svel-* 'to burn' (Lith. *svilti* etc., see Derksen 1996: 203, 287), OIc. *svelta* 'sterben, hungern', OEngl. *swelan* 'to burn', OHG *swelzan* 'to burn', Gr. *ἔλη* 'heat of the sun', etc., probably also Arm. *k'atc'* 'hunger' (q.v.). Arm. *n-k'ot-* may derive from **ni-* + **svo-*. [Compare also Arm. *suat-* 'to starve'?).

[For an alternative see s.v. *yogn* 'plenty; to be tired'].

šatit, *o*-stem: ISg *šatit-o-v* (Eznik Koṭbac'i, John Chrysostom); *a*-stem: GDPI *šatit-a-c'* (late, in "Oskip'orik") 'raw flesh, body, corpse'

Attested in Exodus 21.34, Eznik Koṭbac'i, Hexaemeron, etc.

●**ETYM** Müller (WZKM 10: 277, see HAB s.v.) connected with Skt. *śārīra-* n. 'the body, bodily frame, solid parts of the body' (RV+). Hübschmann (1897: 479) derives the Sanskrit from **kālīlo-* and rejects the connection with Arm. *šatit* in view of *š*. Also sceptical: Boisacq 1911-12: 113-114; HAB 3: 490a.

On semantic grounds Mayrhofer (EWAia 2: 617-618) treats the derivation of Skt. *śārīra-* from *śar-* 'zerbrechen, zertrennen, zerschmettern' to be uncertain. He does not mention the Armenian form.

Olsen (1999: 941₁₆) points out that the Müller's suggestion "may be revived if we assume borrowing through an unknown (Iranian?) source". The Iranian would have an initial *s*, however. I hypothetically assume an old (Indo?-)Aryan borrowing at the Mitanni period, perhaps even earlier if the *o*-stem corresponds to the Aryan proto-form: **śālilo-* > Arm. **šālilo-* > *šatit*, obl. *šat(i)to-*. Note that also the synonymous *marmīn*, *o*-stem 'flesh, body' can be regarded as an Aryan loan.

[Bearing in mind that Skt. *śārīra-* is neuter, one may interpret Arm. GDPI *šatḥ-a-c'* (vs. ISg *šatḥ-o-v*) as reflecting an older neuter plural *-*a-* inherited from PIE *-*eh₂-*. The evidence for *šatḥ-a-c'* is scanty, however].

šatim 'to be mistaken, confused'

Nersēs Lambronac'i (12th cent.).

●**DIAL** T'iflis, Ararat, Agulis, Łarabał **šat-* 'to err, to be mistaken, confused; to see badly; to become spoiled (of milk)' [HAB 3: 508a].

●**ETYM** See s.v. *šet* 'slanting, crooked, oblique'.

šant', *i*-stem (ISg *šand-i-w* in a homily ascribed to Ehišē, IPI *šant'-i-w-k'* in "Yaysmawurk'" and Vardan Arewelc'i, GDPI *šant'/d-i-c'* in Philo and Movsēs Kaṭankatuac'i 2.40 [1983: 241^{L1}]; **šant'i**, *a*-stem (GDPI *šant'/deac'* in Philo+) 'lightning, thunderbolt; spark, fiery iron'.

Bible+. Spelled also as *šand(i)*. Borrowed into Georg. *šant^hi* 'fiery iron'. For the verbal **šant'em** 'to strike, thunder, overthrow' (Ehišē; dialects) see below.

For the fiery connotations of *šant'* cf. "Baṛgirk' hayoc'", Nrs. 49-52 (see Amalyan 1975: 247): *šant'·hrac'eal erkat'n ē* "(this) is the fiery iron"; *šant'agoyn·hragoyn* "of fiery colour"; *šant'ahar erknaḥar, kam kaycaknaḥar* "struck by heaven or lightning"; *šant'ik'·kaycak, kam xaroyk* "lightning, or camp-fire". See also Abeghian 1899: 89 ("vom Himmel herabgestiegenes Feuer und Eisen, ferner glühendes Eisen und auch Dreifuss").

Among compounds: *šant'-a-har* in Movsēs Xorenac'i 3.37 (1913=1990: 304^{L19f}): *orpēs zšant'ahar yerkir korcanēr zk'aṇ* "smote the brave warrior to the ground as if he had been struck by a thunderbolt" (transl. by Thomson 1978: 298).

●**DIAL** The dialects have only the verb **šant'em* : Hačən 'to strike (of devils)', Ararat, Agulis 'to bite, cause a burning pain', Šulawer 'to burn' [HAB 3: 494b; Ačāryan 1935: 379; 2003: 99, 331]. According to Amatuni (1912: 510b), Ararat *šant'e/* refers to the biting of snakes and scorpions.

The verb **šant'em* is not attested in NHB or HAB. One finds it, however, in Ehišē, in the meaning 'to thunder or strike' (of a snake) (or 'to be furious' or 'to

thunder/strike furiously'? cf. *bark*, q.v.), pertaining to an impious ruler (*anōrēn išxan*). The passage seems to be formulaic since it strikingly resembles the description of the Evil Eye in spelling formulae. In this respect, the meaning 'to strike (of devils)' (in the dialect of Hačən) is particularly interesting.

I conclude that the basic meaning of *šant* 'was 'stroke' referring to lightning, as well as to devils, snakes and the like (originally, perhaps, to the mythological Thunder Dragon), which has developed to 'lightning-stroke, thunderbolt', 'lightning', 'fiery iron; burn', etc. Or, alternatively, 'burning (by lightning-stroke)'.¹⁴

●**ETYM** Usually derived from PIE **kūpti-* (< **keu-* 'to shine; bright', cf. Skt. *śoṇa-* 'red, purple' etc., see s.v.v. *surb* 'pure, holy', *šuk* 'splendour, glory', etc.) [*Petersson 1915: 3; 1916: 47; Pokorny 1959: 594; Ĵahukyan 1987: 132, 258, 319 (with reservation); 1988, 2: 71]. Olsen (1999: 944) places the word in her list of words of unknown origin. In a footnote (op. cit. 944₂₅), she states: "The derivation from **kūpti-* would seem to be phonetically impossible".

Since Jensen (1898: 117-119, 153-155, 160-163, 180-181, 186, 188), Arm. *šant* 'is discussed in connection with the Luwian theonym *Šanta*, see also Roth 1927: 744; N. Martirosyan 1972: 165, 175; Schultheiß 1961: 221; Ĵahukyan 1987: 319, 424.

Luw. *Šanta* (vocative ^D*Šantaš*, see Starke 1990: 34) is found in personal names from Kültepe and directly attested in the well-known ritual of Zarpiya where he and Innarawantes-deities are invoked (see Hutter 2003: 228 with ref.). In personal names the theonym is joined to typically Luwian elements, and the cult of this "Asianic" god was maintained over a rather extensive area and is met with even in Lydia [Houwink ten Cate 1961: 136-137, 201].

The theonym *Santas* (next to *Kupapa*) is perhaps attested also in a charm from the "London Medical Papyrus", an Egyptian medical text dating to about 1200 BC (see Billigmeier 1981). It also seems to underlie the name *Zaš*, **Zavt-* used by Pherecydes (see West 1971: 50-52; Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984: 903). One cannot give much weight to the initial *Z-* of this name since it is associated with Zeus.

Also Hurr. *Šantaluggan* is cited in this context [Łap'anc'yan 1951b: 592-593; 1961: 120]. Pointing out that Arm. *šant* 'd, being probably of native origin, may be seen in the basis of *Šanta*, Ĵahukyan (1988, 2: 71, 72, 73, 81, 82-83; see also 1987: 424) adds some more Near Eastern theonyms (e.g. Hurr. *Šantaluggan*, the second component of which may be compared with Hitt. *lukke-* 'to shine', Lat. *Lūcetius*, etc.) and toponyms which possibly contain the same Armenian word. Greppin

¹⁴ Is K'esab *šašantil* 'to fall head over heels, turn a somersault' (see Č'olak'ean 1986: 269) related? Perhaps redupl. **ša-šant-*, based on **šant'em* 'to overthrow, strike'.

(1978-79: 9-10) is sceptical, since the logogram 'lightning' has been removed from *Šanta*- and applied to *Tarḫu*-, and "it appears most unlikely that *Šanta* has anything to do with weather". In 1978a, however, Greppin examines the new material introduced by Salvatori and concludes that the god is characterized as 'brilliant', and its name may therefore be related with Arm. *šant*'. Indeed, the lightning is not necessarily the crucial point in the comparison.

As we have seen above, the basic meaning of *šant*' may have been something like 'lightning-stroke; heavenly fire; demon striking (thunderbolt)', etc. Furthermore, Luw. *Šanta* is equated with Marduk, identified by Arameans with Baal of Tarsus and in the Hellenistic period is continued (*Sandon/Sanda*) as "mit dem Bogen bewaffneten" Herakles (see Haas 1994: 370-371, 408, 467, 468, 569-570; Hutter 2003: 229). Santa, as also Yarri, is considered a god of war and pestilence armed with a bow, and he (written MARDUK) causes an epidemic, see Gurney 1977: 16, 30₁ (for this reference I am indebted to Armen Petrosyan). A connection of Yarri with the Babylonian Erra (a god of war and pestilence) and with Apollo as archer has been suggested (see Gurney 1977: 16₃ with lit.). Apollo is a dragon-slayer archer, and he causes pestilence, too [Losev apud MifNarMir 1, 1980: 92-95]. Hence, the relation between an archer god (cf. **Hayk* -- thunder) and devil-striking word may be treated within this framework as well. Note also that Sanda can be compared with the Armenian dragon-slayer thunder-god Vahagn in that they both are equated with Herakles in the Hellenistic period.

In one of his papers on *šant*' and *Santa*, Greppin (1978-79: 10₁₀) mentions Hitt. *šānt*- 'erzürnt' (on which see Starke 1990: 548₂₀₂₉) in a footnote without any further comment. Hutter (2003: 228) points out that "as a war-god Santa can be dangerous to his enemies, and therefore it makes sense to derive his name as a participle from *šā(i)*- 'being angry'". „I wonder if may be brought into connection with Arm. *šant*'/d and or Luw. *Šanta*-. The semantic relationship between 'furious, angry' and 'fiery, hot, ignite', which can also develop to '(heavenly) fire, shining; lightning', is parallel to that of Arm. *bark* (q.v.). Theoretically, Anatol. **šant*- 'to be angry/furious' could yield Arm. **šand*-, and a deverbative noun in **-ti*- might be responsible for the aspirated *-t'*, thus: **šand-ti*- > *šant*', *i*-stem (cf. *maṭt*' etc., see 2.1.22.13). Note that the suffix **-ti*- remained productive also in recent stages of Armenian (see 2.3.1).

Alternatively: bearing in mind the fiery connotation of *šant*', one may revive the older etymology which brought *šant*' together with Gr. *κάρδαρος ἄνθραξ* 'charcoal' (Hesychius), Skt. *cand*- (also *ścand*-) 'to shine, glitter', *candra*- adj. 'shining, light', Lat. *candor*, *-ōris* m. 'dazzling whiteness, brightness; beauty; candour, brilliancy', *candeō* 'to be of brilliant whiteness, shine; to become/be hot',

etc. (Bugge 1893: 57). According to Hübschmann (1897: 479), uncertain. Ačaryan (HAB 3: 494) rejects the etymology, stating that these words correspond to Arm. *xand* 'a strong emotion (with love, mercy, envy or other passions)' < *'burning' (q.v.). In view of pairs like *xet* vs. *šet* etc. (cf. 2.1.18.1 and 2.1.22.3), the connection between *xand* and *šand/t* should not be ruled out. The vacillation *-d/t* may be explained in a way described above: on the basis of the originally verbal **šand-* 'to burn (by lightning-stroke)' a deverbative noun in **-ti-* may have been formed. Thus, **sk^hnd-ti* > *šant*, *i*-stem. For the semantics see also s.v. *bark*.

If the basic meaning of *šant* was 'stroke; lightning-stroke, thunderbolt' rather than 'burning (by lightning-stroke)', the semantic relationship can be compared to that of PIE **per-* 'to hit, strike' > 'thunder', cf. Lith. *pėrti* 'to beat', etc. - Ukr., Czech *perun* 'thunder', Slav. **Perunŭ* 'Thunder-god', Lith. *Perkūnas* 'id.', etc.; see s.v.v. *har(k)-* 'to beat, strike', *orot* 'thunder'.

Conclusion: Arm. *šant*, basically meaning 'lightning-stroke, thunderbolt' or 'burning (by lightning-stroke)' and referring also to devils, snakes and the like (originally, perhaps, to the mythological Thunder Dragon), may be compared with Luwian *Šanta*, the "brilliant" one, a god of war (armed with a bow) which can cause pestilence and in the Hellenistic period is equated with Herakles. It seems more likely that the theonym derives from the appellative. If the existence of Armenian loans in Anatolian languages proves acceptable, the Luwian theonym may be treated as borrowed from Arm. *šant* 'lightning-stroke; heavenly fire'. This would imply that Arm. *šant* was deified by the Armenians in the 2nd and 1st millennia BC. In the period of the Iranian influx, the Armenian god **Šant* has been replaced by Vahagn which subsequently, exactly like Luwian *Šanta*, was identified with Herakles. The appellative *šant* itself may be of PIE origin, though the etymological details are not entirely clear.

šet 'slanting, crooked, oblique', **šetem** 'to crook', **šetim** 'to go astray' (derivatives: *šetič*, *šetut'iwn*, etc.)

mostly late attestations.

● **DIAL** Polis, Axalc'xa *šet* [HAB 3: 508a; Ačaryan 1941: 235]; Moks *šex* 'slanting, skew', *šex-a-k'ē* 'obliquely' (*šexak'ē ert'āl* 'to go obliquely') [Orbeli 2002: 301]. In view of the Moks *k'ē*, it seems that the second component, viz. **k'ē*, represents the hypothetical **gi-* 'to go' (see s.v. *arp*). More probably, however, *šex-a-k'ē* reflects the Modern Armenian *šetaki* 'obliquely' (see Malxaseanc' 3: 510c), and the *k'ē* is erroneous or of other nature.

●**ETYM** Together with *xeť* ‘mutilated, lame; sore (eye); crooked (also morally); abominable’, dial. **xeť-* ‘to become spoilt, undisciplined; to make silly jokes; to scoff, ridicule grimacing’; *šil* ‘squint-eyed’, dial. ‘mad’, Łarabať ‘mistake’, **šil ʔnknel* ‘to be mistaken, confused; to err’; **šat-* (12th cent.; dial.) ‘to err, to be mistaken, confused; to see badly; to become spoiled (of milk)’; *sxal* ‘mistake, failure; crime’, *sxalem*, *sxalim* ‘to err, be mistaken; to stumble; to fail, miss’ (Bible+; widespread in dialects) (see s.v.v.), connected with Lat. *scelus*, Gsg *sceleris* n. ‘misdeed, crime’; Gr. *σκέλος* n. ‘leg (from the hip downwards)’, *σκελλός* ‘crook-legged’, *σκολιός* ‘wicked, crooked’; Skt. *skhálati* ‘to stumble, to stammer, to fail’, MPers. *škarwīdan*, NPers. *šikarfīdan* ‘to stumble, to stagger’; OIc. *skjalgr*, OHG *scelah* ‘squint-eyed’; etc. (Bugge 1893: 57; HAB 2: 356; 3: 490a, 508a, 517a; on **sx-* see Meillet 1903a: 18). The original meaning would be ‘Krümmung, Biegung’ (see Frisk, s.v.). Ačāryan (HAB 2: 490-491) also compares, though with some reservation, with *kať* ‘lame’, **keť* ‘crooked’ (q.v.). The alternation *x* : *k*, however, does not apply normally to native words. The meaning ‘mistake’ of Łarabať of *šil* is remarkable since it combines the form *šil* (‘squint-eyed’) with the semantics of *sxal* (cf. Ĵahukyan 1972: 292; 1987: 278). Elsewhere, Ĵahukyan (1987: 148) separates *šil* ‘squint-eyed’ (grouped with *šet* ‘crooked’ etc.) from Łarabať *šil*, connecting the latter only with Arm. *sxal* and Skt. *skhálati*. This is improbable.

If the etymology is accepted, we must reconstruct a root **skh₁el-*, in view of Skt. *skh-* and Arm. *sx-* (see Schrijver 1991: 433; cf. also Kortlandt 2003: 1, 6, 31), as well as Arm. *š-*. According to Olsen (1999: 195, 813), Arm. *šil* ‘squint-eyed’ is a vṛddhi derivative **skēlo-* or **skēli-*. Given the possible reconstruction with an internal laryngeal, one might alternatively suggest an ablauted form **skeh₁l-*. In this case, the initial *š-* would be analogical after *šet* and others, if the *š-* in these forms is from **skH-*.

According to another etymology, Arm. *sxalim* and Skt. *skhálati* belong to a different root, viz. **sk^wh₂el-*, together with Gr. *σφάλλω* ‘to overthrow, to bring down’; Gr. *σφάλλομαι* ‘to fall, to stumble, to be mistaken’ (see Hübschmann 1897: 490-491^{Nr369}; HAB 4: 224-225; Xačaturova 1979: 365; Klingenschmitt 1982: 144, 169; Viredaz 2005: 91). J. Sometimes an exclusively Armeno-Indoaryan isogloss is suggested, see Pokorny 1959: 929; Ĵahukyan 1987: 148; Olsen 1999: 195³⁶²; Beekes 2003: 169, 202, 211. Beekes (op. cit. 202) notes: “very doubtful Gr. *σφάλλω*, which would require *-k^w-*”. But would the outcome of the PIE **sk^wH-* be distinct from that of **skH-*?

The twofold development of **skH-* as Arm. *š-* and *sx-* is puzzling. Ĵahukyan (1987: 192) assumes that **skh-* yielded Arm. *š-* before front vowels, and *sx-*

elsewhere. Olsen (1999: 195₃₆₂) only speaks of the development **sk-* (unaspirated) > *š-* before a front vowel. Kortlandt (2003: 10) mentions *šet* (with Gr. *σκέλος* etc.) in his list of words that represent the regular palatalization. However, the normal outcome of **ske/i-* is Arm. **c'e/i-* (see 2.1.22.3; also Beekes 2003: 179, 198). I therefore assume the following distribution: **skV-* > Arm. **c'V-* vs. **skHV-* > **sk^hV-* > Arm. **šV-*. Arm. *sxalim* is the only case demonstrating the development **sk^h-* > Arm. *sx-*, and, therefore, may be an old Aryan borrowing (see Ĵahukyan 1987: 192). In page 551, Ĵahukyan (op. cit.) places this case in Iranian context. The Iranian forms, however, have an initial *sk-* (see above), so the best solution is the one suggested by Xačaturova (1979: 365-367, 370, 375), who treats *sxalim* as a loan from the Indo-Aryan language of Near East. It is interesting to note that Vogt (1938: 333) compares Skt. *skhalate* and Arm. *sxalim* Georg.-Zan **sxal-* : *sx^l* (on which see Klimov 1964: 167, comparing with PIE **(s)lei-d^h-* 'slippery, to slide' [Pokorný 1959: 960-961]). Klimov (1993: 32) rejects any dependence from Armenian since the Kartvelian Armenisms are ascribed to a period not earlier than 7-6th cent. BC. This presumption has to be proven, however.

The distribution **kH* > Arm. *x* vs. **skH* > Arm. *š*, reflected in the pair *xet* and *šet*, can be confirmed by *xayt' / xēt' / xit'* vs. *šit'* 'to bite' (see s.v.v.).

The problem of *šet* - *šil* is different from that of *asetn* / **asitn* (GSg *astan*), etc., since neither *šet* nor *xet* appear in vocalism *-i-*. Note also the alternation *t-l*.

Since the semantic field here is 'crooked, twisting, bending' (also referring to body parts), one may derive Arm. *šl(n)-i* 'neck' (q.v.) from **šil-* 'twisting'; see also 3.7.2.

See also *šišat* 'a kind of demon'.

šetb 'knife-blade'.

MArm. (according to Norayr).

● **DIAL** Alaškert, Ararat, Axalc'xa, Cilicia, etc. Eastern dialects have **šetup*': Łarabał **šetup*' [Amatuni 1912: 513a], Goris *šetup*', *šutup*' 'a knife without a handle; knife-blade' [Margaryan 1975: 451b], Meñri *šetap*' 'knife-blade' [Ałayan 1954: 321]. In Cilicia: *xšbig*, with metathesis [Ačaryan 2003: 138, 332]; cf. s.v. *xstor* 'garlic'.

● **ETYM** Borrowed from Syriac *šelpā* 'knife', cf. Hebrew *šōlēf* 'knife, sword', etc. [HAB 3: 508b]. Next to *šelpā*, Syriac also has *šālāfā*, which may explain Arm. *šatap*' 'borer, gimlet', the origin of which is considered unknown. Compare HAB s.v. *šatap*'.

šēr, *šer* 'storax-tree', possibly also 'manna-ash'.

The only classical attestation is found in Genesis 30.37 [Zeyt'unyan 1985: 286]: *Ew ar Yakob gawazan šēr* (vars. *šer*, *šert*, *ššēr*, *er*) *dalar ew ankuzi ew sawswoy ew keteweac' znosa Yakob, ew etew spitak, ew ek'erc zdalarn i gawazanac'n, ew erewēr i gawazansn spitakn, zor k'ercoyr, nkarēn* : "Then Jacob took fresh rods of poplar and almond and plane, and peeled white streaks in them, exposing the white of the rods" (RevStBible).

The relevant part of the Greek text reads: *ῥάβδον στυρακίνην χλωράν καὶ καρυίνην καὶ πλατάνου* "a fresh/green rod of storax-tree, and of nut-tree, and of plane-tree". Arm. *šēr* renders Gr. *στύραξ*, *-ἄκος* 'storax-tree, *Styrax officinalis*; the fragrant gum-resin of the storax-tree'.

In "Yaysmawurk'", the biblical passage is rephrased as follows: *Ainul p'ayt dalar ankuzi, uši ew sōsi*. Ačaryan (HAB 3: 606b) points out that *uši* does not have a correspondent form here and is therefore unknown. This is somewhat surprising because the collation of the set *šēr* : *ankuzi* : *sawsi* with *ankuzi* : *uši* : *sōsi* points to identification *šēr* = *uši*, though the order is not the same. See s.v. *uši*.

●**ETYM** No acceptable etymology is recorded in HAB 3: 510b.

I wonder if somehow related with the first component of *šērxišt* (Amirdovlat' Amasiac'i) or *širixišt* (Mxit'ar Herac'i) 'manna' [Seidel 1908: 210-211; HAB 3: 515b; S. Vardanian 1990: 346, §2206; MiġHayBaġ 215a, 217a]. It has been assumed that Pers. *šīr-xi/ušt* 'manna' is composed of Xurāsānī *kšīru* 'a tree resembling the ash' and *vxīšt* 'gum' [Seidel 1908: 210-211; HAB 3: 515b].

If this is accepted, one can compare Arm. *šēr* 'storax-tree' with *kšīru* '*ash-tree'. The association can easily be explained by two factors: 1) both the storax-tree and the ash-tree have valuable wood of which spears or other implements are made, cf. Gr. *στύραξ*, *-ἄκος* 'storax-tree' which also refers to 'spike at the lower end of a spear-shaft'; on 'ash-tree' > 'spear, handle, shaft' see s.v.v. *hac'i*, *hoyn*, espec. *metex*; note also Arm. *šer-ep* 'ladle' which can derive from *šēr/šer* 'storax-tree'; 2) Gr. *στύραξ* 'storax-tree' produces fragrant gum-resin, and Gr. *μελία* 'manna ash' is etymologically and/or mythologically related with *μέλι* 'honey; sweet gum collected from certain trees, manna' (see s.v. *metex* 'handle of an axe'). See also s.v.v. *metex* and *uši/*hoši*.

*šerep**, o-stem (only ISg *šerep-o-v* in Geoponica, 13th cent.) 'ladle'.

A few late attestations and derivatives. With an unaspirated *-p-* in Geoponica. Can this be supported by the loan into Laz /*šerepi*? In Yaysmawurk': printed *-b-*; cf. on Muš and Alaškert below.

●**DIAL** Widespread in the dialects with an aspirated *-pʰ*; in Muš and Alaškert one finds GSG *šerbʰi* next to NSG *šerepʰ*; see HAB 3: 511a. Baġdasaryan-Tʰapʰalcʰyan 1958 vacat.

●**ETYM** No acceptable etymology is recorded by Ačaryan (HAB 3: 511a). Ĵahukyan (1967: 261) connects to Russ. *čerep* 'scull', *čerpatʰ* 'to scoop, draw, ladle (out)', *čerpak* 'scoop, ladle', etc. from PIE **(s)ker-p-* 'to chop, cut' (see s.v. *kʰer-*, *kʰer-b-*, *kʰer-p-* 'to scratch, chop, carve'). The comparison is interesting, but the phonological details are unclear. Later he (Ĵahukyan 1990: 71, sem. field 5) considered the word to be of unknown origin.

The initial *š-* instead of *cʰ-* or *kʰ-*, as well as the final *-epʰ* might argue in favour of substratum origin: **skʰerepʰ-*; see also s.v.v. *šertʰ*, *še/ēr*. However, the derivation from PIE **(s)ker-p-* seems plausible if one assumes initial metathesis **sk-* > **ks-* and ruki-rule (see 2.1.12). Thus: **kser-epʰ-* > *šerepʰ*. In either case, the *-epʰ* can be compared with another tool-name, viz. *šatapʰ* 'borer, gimlet'. Note the dependence of the vowel rbefore **pʰ* upon the root vowel: *šer-epʰ* vs. *šat-apʰ* (cf. 2.1.23).

The root may be identic with see *še/ēr*; thus: ladle made of storax-wood.

***šitʰ(-)** 'bite; wound'.

The oldest attestation comes from *šitʰ-oł* 'biting' (present participle), in homilies attributed to Yovhannēs Mandakuni (5th cent.) or Yovhannēs Mayragomecʰi (7th cent.). "Varkʰ harancʰ" (Paterica) has *šitʰ-oł*, as well as *šitʰ-eal* 'bitten'. The latter is rendered in "Baġgirkʰ hayocʰ" by *hareal* 'struck; bitten' (see Amalyan 1975: 249^{Nr111}). This (late) medieval dictionary also has the only testimony for the noun *šitʰ*, rendered as *cʰaw aytucʰ-eal*, literally: "pain swollen" (see Amalyan 1975: 249^{Nr113}). {{NOTE - Ačaryan (HAB 3: 516b) cites as *šitʰ-acʰaw aytucʰ-eal*, but the critical edition of Amalyan (1975) helps to clarify the gloss. - ENDNOTE}}. The noun *šitʰ* has been preserved in the dialect of Łarabał (see below). Combining the evidence from "Baġgirkʰ hayocʰ" with that of the dialect of Łarabał one may represent the semantics of *šitʰ* as *'pain of a (swollen) wound'. Aristakēs Lastivertcʰi (11th cent.) has *šitʰ-ocʰ* 'bite (of a bee)'.

●**DIAL** Preserved only in the dialect of Łarabał: *šitʰ* 'the warmth of a wound' [HAB 3: 516b], see above.

●**ETYM** NHB (s.v.) seems to identify with *xaytʰem*. Ačaryan (HAB 3: 516b) mentions only this, leaving the origin of the word open.

In view of the alternation *š-* / *x-* (see s.v.v. *šetʰ*, *xetʰ*, etc.), one may indeed connect with *xaytʰem* 'to bite (of insects and snakes)' and, especially, its ablauted form *xitʰ*, *o*-stem 'pain, colic, twinge' (see s.v.). Note that ***šitʰ(-)** 'bite; wound' practically

combines the meanings of *xayt'em* and *xit'*, and *šit'-oc'* 'bite (of a bee)' goes parallel with *xayt'-oc'* 'bite, sting'.

šil' 'squint-eyed'; *šl-anam* 'to become squint-eyed' (both - Bible+).

● **DIAL** Widespread in dialects, in the meaning 'squint-eyed'. In Łarabať: *šil'* 'mistake; disorder', **šil' ənknel* 'to be mistaken, confused; to err'. In some other dialects - 'mad': Ĵuľa [HAB 3: 517a]; Meťri [Aľayan 1954: 322]. Illustrations from Łarabať/Goris, e.g. in HŽHek' 7, 1979: 464, lines 10, -1 ('disorder, confusion').

Among new dialectal words Ačāryan (HAB 3: 517a) mentions verbal *šluil* 'to become squint-eyed', and adj. *šil-ti*, *šil-t-ik*, *šl-t-ik* 'squint-eyed'. The latter form is found in "Bārgirk' hayoc'" and in the dialects of Ararat and T'iflis [Ačārean 1913: 831b]. In some dialects the -t- is voiced: Łarabať *šildi*, Šulaver *šildik* [Ačārean 1913: 829a], Ararat and Łalt'atš'i *šdik* [Amatuni 1912: 515b]. For the voicing cf. also Łarabať, Agulis *hdi(k)* 'tickle', if from **xtt-i* > **xtl-i* > **xlt-i* (see s.v. **xtit'* 'to tickle').

I wonder if **šil-ti* can be viewed as a deverbative formation in -ti (see 2.3.1).

● **ETYM** See s.v. *šet'* 'slanting, crooked, oblique'.

šišay-k'

In "Bārgirk' hayoc'" (see Amalyan 1975: 249^{Nr114}), *šišayk'* is rendered by *ays-k'* 'demons'.

● **ETYM** Ačāryan (HAB 3: 518a) takes *šišay* as the NSg form and compares it with Syriac *šilāsā* 'weasel, marten', without any conclusion and further remarks. This would make sense if one takes into account the superstitious association of the weasel with the devils (see Ananyan, HayKendAšx 1, 1961: 163-164; see also s.v. **č'asum*). However, the word *šišat'* 'a kind of demon' (q.v.) newly found by L. Hovhannisyan (1987: 131; 1991a: 151-152; 2000a: 218) in the homilies of Eusebius of Emesa and Ephrem Asori sheds new light on *šišay-k'*.

The form *šišayk'* should be interpreted as a metathesized collective form of *šišat'* in -ay-k' (cf. *əngt-ay-k'* 'sea-monster' or 'eel, siren, Nymphe-Snake', see s.v., also 3.5.2.8). Thus: *šiš(a)t-ay-k'* > **šišat-ay-k'* > *šišayk'*.

For the etymology of *šišat'* see s.v.

šišat' 'a kind of demon'.

Not in dictionaries. The word has been found by L. Hovhannisyan (1987: 131; 1991a: 151-152; 2000a: 218) in the homilies of Eusebius of Emesa and Ephrem Asori. The passages read respectively: *Zdews halaceac'*, *zšišats xroveac'* "(he) drove

away the devils, harassed the *šišat-s*"; *Ew aīnun zmarminn surb: uten zhasteays ənd šišats ew ənd surbs zsrbut'iwnn* "And they take the holy body: (they) eat the *hasteay-s* with *šišat-s* and the holiness with saints". For the form *šišay-k* see s.v.

●**ETYM** No acceptable etymology is known to me (see also s.v. *šišayk*).

In my opinion, *šišat* is a reduplicated form of the root **ša-* (< PIE **skHI-*) 'to err, to be mistaken, confused; to see badly', cf. *šet* 'slanting, crooked, oblique', *šetem* 'to crook', *šetim* 'to go astray', *xet* 'mutilated, lame; sore (eye); crooked (also morally); abominable', dial. **xet-* 'to become spoilt, undisciplined; to make silly jokes; to scoff, ridicule grimacing', *sil* 'squint-eyed', dial. 'mistake; mad' (see especially s.v.v. *šet* and *šatim*). The type of reduplication is identic with that found in *cicat* 'laugh', *cicain* 'swallow', etc. (see s.v.v.). The semantic development involved here can be represented as 'crooked, abominable, erroneous, or crazy words/things; crookedness' > 'crooked, abominable person' (typologically cf. *katak* 'play, ridicule, joke', which in P'awstos Buzand 3.19 refers to 'buffoon'; see also s.v. *caṭracu*). For the semantic field cf. *molim* 'to become mad' (Bible+), *mol-or-im* 'to err, to be confused, mistaken; to become mad' (Bible+), in the dialect of Svedia 'to see badly', *moli* 'a kind of sorcerer' (Eznik Koṭbac'i), etc. (see s.v. **mol-*).

šl(n)i, probably **šil*, GDPI *šəl-a-c* 'neck'.

A MArm. word in forms of *šlni*, GDSg *šln-oy*, *šlli*, pl. *šlni-k* (API *šlin-s* and *šlin-k* ^{-s}, GDPI *šlnic*), *šli-k* (GDPI *šlec*), *šlnestan*, etc. [HAB 3: 522b; Łazaryan/Avetisyan, MiġHayBař 2, 1992: 218]; on *šlnestan*, prob. collective, see Weitenberg 1997: 330.

Here must belong also GDPI *šəl-ac*, found in a competition-joke by Nersēs Šnorhali (12th cent., Cilicia): *Břnem šəlac'd ew tam olor* "(May) I take (subj.) your neck and twist it" [Mnac'akanyan 1980: 342^{L10}].

The form *šlli* (also widespread in dialects) comes from *šlni*. The nasalless forms *šli-k*, *šlec* (apparently from **šleac*), and *šəlac* seem to be old rather than simplifications of the geminate *-ll-*. Theoretically, one may restore **šil* or **šul* (*a*-stem, cf. *šəl-a-c*, with subsequent reshaping as of *n*-stem (cf. synonymous *ul-n* 'neck', q.v.), as well as *-i-k* formations based on both **šl-* and **šl-n-*.

●**DIAL** Ubiquitous in dialects: *šlli* (Akn), *šlink*, *šllink*, *šllik*, *šlnis* (Rivola), etc. 'neck' [HAB 3: 522b], Bulanəx *šələk* [S. Movsisyan 1972: 71a]. Interesting is Hamšen *šnlik*, *šnlink* 'face' [Ačāryan 1947: 73, 248]; for the metathesis see par. XX. Ačāryan (HAB 4: 658a) describes the meaning of Bulanəx *šələk* as follows: "the lower part of the occiput, that is already the back" (thus: "the upper part of the

neck" in HAB 3: 522b and in S. Movsisyan 1972: 71a seems be an error or a misprint).

●**ETYM** A connection with Lat. *collum, collus* 'neck' is suggested in NHB 2: 480a and Jahukyan 1967: 262. Ačaryan (HAB 3: 522b) mentions the assumption of NHB not accepting it, and adds no further notes or etymologies. [The connection with Lat. *collus* (probably from **k^wol(h₁)-so-*) would be possible only if one assumes a **skHVI-*].

I propose to restore a PArm. **šil-* 'crooked, twisting (body part)' and relate it with *šil* etc.; see s.v.v. *šet, šil*, and, for the semantics, 3.7.2.

***šuak/g** 'covered courtyard'.

●**DIAL** In DialAdd apud NHB 2: 1065c: *šuag* 'hall (*srah*); covered courtyard (*gawit*); the space between the external and internal doors'. Note that *gawit* 'basically refers to the covered courtyard or the hall attached to a church, palace etc. This is compared with Karin **šuak* 'courtyard' [Ačarean 1913: 839b].

●**ETYM** No etymological attempt is known to me.

The word may belong to **šuak* 'shadow' (q.v.).

***šuk** 'shadow'.

●**DIAL** A dialectal by-form of *šuk* (q.v.), represented in T'iflis, Ararat, Šamaxi, Juła [HAB 3: 541b]. Possibly also in Karin, see s.v. **šuak/g* 'courtyard'. In Goris both *šuk* and **šuak* are present (see Margaryan 1975: 354b, 452b). In some dialects the form **šuk* 'shadow' may have been eliminated since through the regular shift *u > o* it yielded **šok* (e.g. in Łarabał) that would be confused with **šog* 'hot' > dial. **šok*. Note a fairy-tale from Łazax recorded in 1894 where *šok* 'hot' and *švak* 'shadow' are found within the same context [HŽHek' 6, 1973: 312]. (*švak* - also ibid. 250, 355). [It seems that in Łarabał a different choice has been made. Here **šok* 'hot' < *šog* (next to **šok* 'shadow') has been eliminated].

●**ETYM** See s.v. *šuk*.

šuk, *o*-stem (Bible+); LocSg *i šk'-i* (P'awstos Buzand, Ephrem); note LocSg *i šk'-i* in P'awstos Buzand 5.37 vs. ISg *šk'-o-v* in 4.5. 'shadow' (Yovhan Mandakuni, Hexaameron, Philo, etc.) 'veil, sunshade' (Bible+), 'glory, splendour, honour' (Bible+).

For the equivalence of *šuk* and *p'arık* and their "shiny" nature cf. e.g. in P'awstos Buzand 4.5 (1883=1984: 68^{L7,15}; transl. Garsoïan 1989: 116, 117): *mecapaycař p'arök mecaw šk'ov mecareac znosa* : "he honored them with the most brilliant

glory and great splendor" (note the contrast pl. *p'ar-k'* vs. sg. *šuk'*); *loys p'arac' ēakanin*: "light of the glory of the Existing-one".

On the attestation from Xosrov Anjewac'i (10th cent.) see below.

●**DIAL** Widespread. In some dialects - **šuwak'* (q.v.).

Ačāryan (HAB 3: 541b) does not specify the dialectal meaning. To my knowledge, *šuk'* in the dialects mainly (if not only) refers to 'shadow'. (Compare also the expressions in Ačārean 1913: 844b). This is corroborated by the fact that of the three meanings only 'shadow' is linked with the dialectal record in NHB 2: 492c. It is remarkable that, as is noticed by Ačāryan (HAB 4: 280a), ClArm. *stuer* 'shadow, shade' (Bible+; not preserved in dialects) was already extinct by the 10th century and replaced by *šuk'* 'shadow' in the dialects; cf. the attestation from Xosrov Anjewac'i: *Stuer asi, zor šuk' mek' koč'emk', or ankani i marmnoy*: "Stuer means what we call *šuk'*, which falls from a body".

Metri *šak'ar'* 'a shadowy place' [Ačāryan 1954: 322] is probably composed of *šuk'* 'shade' and *ar-* 'to take' (Metri *aril* < *arnum*) rather than *arnem* 'to make', since the latter yielded *aril* (with an untrilled *-r-*) in Metri (see Ačāryan 1954: 263). However, Svedia *šk'eril* (< **šuk'aril*) 'to be shadowy' (see Andreasyan 1967: 264) contains *(-)aril* 'to make' (see op. cit. 23, 25).

●**SEMANTICS** Both meanings, viz. 'shade; veil' and 'glory, splendour', presuppose an older semantics, viz. 'shining, splendour'. This meaning can be illustrated by Grigor Narekac'i (see K'yoškeryan 1981: 166^{L69f}):

Astefaniš lusaworut'eamb pčneal,

Boc'ačāčānč' šk'ov pačučeal.

The whole semantic chain can schematically be presented as follows: 'shine' > 1) 'splendour, glory'; 2) 'shimmer' > 'shadow'.

That the meaning 'shadow' is the youngest is also clear from the dialectal material (see above).

●**ETYM** The word has been compared with OIc. *skugge*, OEngl. *scua*, OHG *scūwo* 'shadow', etc. (from PIE **skeu-* 'to cover' or 'to see') [Dervischjan 1877: 6-7; Bugge 1893: 57; Hübschmann 1897: 480^{Nr324}; Winter 1965: 104]. Ačāryan (HAB 3: 541), however, does not accept the comparison. He (ibid.) also rejects the connection with PIE **k̑(e)u-* 'to shine' (see s.v.v. *surb*, *šoř* etc.), though nowadays they usually accept it, see Pokorny 1959: 594 (< **k̑uō-ko-*); Tumanjan 1978: 320; Ĵahukyan (Džaukjan) 1982: 75, 103; 1987: 132 (though in 57, 207, 232 and 258 - with reservation).

Later on, Ĵahukyan (1995: 186) separates *šuk'* from the IE root and considers it an Iranian loan, cf. Pers. *škōh*, ClPers. *šukōh* 'luxury'. The *-u-* of the ClPers. form, as

Ĵahukyan himself points out, is secondary, thus the Armenian vocalism is problematic. To solve the problem, Ĵahukyan suggests a contamination with PIE **sk^heu-* ‘to cover’ (see s.v. *xuḥ*).

However, several difficulties arise with this etymology. One might suggest that the final *-k* is due to secondary association with the suffix *-k*. This, however, complicates the picture even more, and does not change my argumentation; 2) the meaning ‘luxury’ is clearly secondary in the semantic field of Arm. *šuk* (see above), thus the semantic part of the etymology can be satisfactory only when one can demonstrate that the basic meaning of the Iranian word was ‘to shine’ which was subsequently lost in Iranian but has been preserved in Armenian. Note that the dialectal by-form **šuaḱ* remains unexplained.

One should, I think, turn to the traditional etymology. The usually restored protoform of *šuk* is **k^uō-ko-*. However, the word-structure is strange and, to my knowledge, has no parallels in cognate forms. The PIE form with the **-k*-enlargement **k(e)u-k-* seems the best solution, cf. Skt. *śoc-* ‘to light, to glow, to burn’ (RV+), *śoka-* m. ‘light, flame’ (RV+), YAv. *saokā-* f. ‘appearance, brightness(?)’, Pahl. **sūg* ‘sorrow’ (> Arm. *sug*, *o*-stem; cf. Pers. *sōg/k*); Toch. B *śukye* ‘shining’ (see Mallory/Adams 1997: 514a); etc.

o- interrogative indefinite pronoun.

Agat’angelos+. Also *o-r* ‘which’, *o-v* ‘who’, (Bible+), *y-o* (< **i-o*, a prepositional accusative) ‘where to (interrog.)’ (Bible+), etc., see HAB s.v.v.

y-o has been preserved in the dialect of Svedia (see below).

●**DIAL** The “pure” form has only been preserved in Ĵarabaḥ *hu* ‘who’ and Nor Naxiĵewan (in the villages) *vɔ* (only in *vɔ gina* ‘who knows?’). In Alaškert and Muš, *ov* ‘who’ has been replaced by *or* [HAB 3: 549a].

ClArm. *y-o* ‘where to’ (see above) is continued in Svedia *yɛɔ* ‘where to (interrog.)’ (see HAB 3: 549a, 613b; Ačāryan 2003: 581; in Andreasyan 1967: 376, *yɛu*).

●**ETYM** See s.v. *ur*.

olein, *an*-stem (obl. *-an(c)*), NPl *-iunk* ‘pea, bean; globule’.

Bible+. In Paterica: *olein* (cf. dial.).

●**DIAL** The plant-name has been preserved in several dialects: Muš *ɔlor*, Nor Naxiĵewan *urɛl*, rural *ulei*, Xotorĵur *ɔɛl*, Goris *húleɔina*, Ĵarabaḥ *húleina* (cf. also *ülleɔine* ‘g’ ‘a kind of abscess (*palar*)’). Most of the forms are identic with *olein* attested in Paterica. Ačāryan questions whether Ĵuḥa (rural) *hoɛal* ‘a kind of plant

resembling *olor* = Pers. *holar* belongs here too [HAB 3: 551b]. Other forms, if related, have an initial *x-* or *k-*: Dersim (K'ti) *k'ətur* 'a kind of corn resembling oats' [Bařramyan 1964: 175b], Dersim, Balu *xəlor* 'millet-sized hail; a kind of millet-sized useless grain' [Sargisean 1932: 426; Bařramyan 1964: 140b] (see N. Mkrtč'yan 1983: 31-32).

●**ETYM** Ač'aryan (HAB 3: 551b) rejects all the etymologies (among them also the comparison with Gr. *ὄλυραι* f. pl. 'spelt, etc.').

Olsen (1999: 139, 778, 808) proposes (with reservation) a connection with *olor* 'twisting' and derives them from PIE **k^wlh₁-r-n-*, as an old heteroclitic from **k^welh₁-* 'to twist, turn'. This view is hard to accept since the assumed development **_slh₁C- > Arm. -oloC-* is uncertain, *olor* 'twisting' is probably of a different origin. Besides, the plant-name has been compared with Semitic formes: Akkad. *ħallūru*, *ħi/ullūru*, Aram. *ħurlā*, Arab. *ħullar*, *ħarul*, Hebr. *ħarūl*, also Pers. *heler* [Adonc' 1938: 463 = 1972: 388; N. Mkrtč'yan 1983: 31-32; Ĵahukyan 1987: 459, 470; Greppin 1989a: 79].

If Gr. *ὄλυραι* is also connected, as Adonc' (ibid.) suggests, we are dealing with an old culture word of Mediterranean and Near-Eastern areas. Note also another synonym of Mediterranean origin, viz. *sisein* 'pea' (see s.v.).

In view of related forms in different languages with alternating vocalism as well as with the sequene *r...l*, it is difficult to assess the nature and exact origin of the forms *olein* (Paterica; dialects) and **orel* (Xotorĵur, Nor Naxijewan). An influence of *sisein*, GSG *sis(e)ran* 'pea' (Agat'agetos+; widespread in dialects) should be taken into account, too.

olok' GDSg *olok'-i* (Agat'agetos+), GDPl *olok'-ac'* (Agat'agetos [as a reading variant, see below], Plato), *olok'-oc'* (Philo), APl *z-olog-s* and *z-olok'-un-s* (both in "Yaysmawurk'") 'shin'.

In Agat'agetos 102 (1909=1980: 61^{L16f}; transl. Thomson 1976: 119): *Ew et hraman berel kočets p'aytic', ew ainel əst olok'i* (var. *olok'ac'*) *xotc'ac'* (vars. *xotoc'oc'*, *xotc'oc'*, *xotoc'ac'n*, *xoc'ac'*, etc.) *otic' nora; ew dnel ew pndel užgin aiatkōk'*: "He commanded that blocks of wood be brought and fixed to his shins and feet and tightened with strong cords". Ter-Lewondyan (1983: 69) translates *olok'i xotc'ac'* by ModArm. *srunk'neri oskorneri* "of the bones of the shins". This would imply that *xotuc'* refers to the lower part of the leg in general, whereas *olok'-* to a part of it, perhaps 'shin-bone'.

In "Bařgirk' hayoc'": *ōlox' čur* [Amalyan 1975: 338^{Nr29}].

●**DIAL** Preserved in the dialects of Muš, Axalc'xa, Nor Naxijewan, Juṭa, etc. The semantics of the literary attestations is specified as 'the part of the leg between the knee and heel', while in dialects - 'the part of the leg between the knee and ankle' [HAB 3: 552; Ačairean 1925: 444; 1940: 380]. In the 19th century dictionaries of K'ajuni and Gabamačean the word means 'stalk of a flower', which can be compared with the meaning of the dialect of Bulanəx, viz. 'stalk of wheat' (see HAB 3: 552).

Ararat *əlork'* 'shinbone' and Adana (Turkish speaking) *əlork'* 'shin' (see HAB 3: 552ab) have an epenthetic *-r-*.

Particularly interesting is *cok-olok'* '(anat.) calf' in the dialect of Ozim (see Ačairean 1913: 522b; HAB 3: 552b). Ačaryan (1913: 522b), with some reservation, treats it as a compound with *cak* 'hole; hollow' (**cak-olok'*). This is possible; cf. Nor Bayazet **cak-oskor*, lit. 'hollow bone', described by Ačaryan (1913: 503b) as "a part of flesh/meat [= a body-part? - HM]; voracious person, who is recovering after an illness"; also verbal **cak-oskor-el*. (The latter is also present in my mother's village Erazgavors: *cagəskərel* 'to be/become voracious'). Nor Bayazet *cak-oskor* occurs also in P'ilojeanc' 1888: 39^{L-6}, referring to a body-part of a buffalo. The word **cak-oskor* is also found e.g. in a saying from Nor Naxijewan (P'ork'seyan 1971: 113b): *Jak oskorov Ivana!* "to make an end to the greediness", lit. "to wash with the hollow-bone".

The compound, actually meaning 'hollow bone', must have referred to a bony body-part. Indeed, it has been recorded in Moks in the meaning "pelvic bone": *cak-woskor* 'тазовая кость' [Orbeli 2002: 252].

Ozim *cokolok*, however, refers to 'calf', a fleshy part of the shin. Therefore, I alternatively identify the first component of the compound with *jukn* 'fish'. According to Ačaryan (1952: 277; HAB 3: 160a), the Ozim form of *jukn* is *j'öuk*. N. Hovsep'yan (1966: 232-233), however, is of the opinion that the postulation of voiced aspirated stops in the dialect of Ozim is wrong, and that the Classical Armenian *b/d/g/j/ġ* regularly yielded *p/t/k/c/č*. In this case, the Ozim form of the word for 'fish' would have been **cöuk*. Thus, *cok-olok'* '(anat.) calf' can easily be interpreted as a compound of *cöuk* 'fish' and *olok'* 'shin'. For the semantics see 3.7.3.

●**ETYM** Compared with OCS *lakъtsъ*, Russ. *lókot'*, Czech *loket* 'elbow', etc.; Lith. *alkūnė*, *elkūnė* 'elbow', Latv. *ēlks* 'elbow, bend' *ēlkuons* 'elbow, bend'; Gr. *ὠλένη* 'elbow'; etc. (see Lidén 1906: 95-97; HAB 3: 552; Pokorny 1959: 308; Saradževa 1986: 131-132; Ĵahukyan 1987: 122; 165); see also s.v.v. *oṭn* 'spine, *uln* 'neck', etc. Skt. *ṛkṣāṭā-* f. 'the part of an animal's leg between the fetlock joint and the hoof' is uncertain.

The Balto-Slavic forms derive from **HHol-k-* or **Hh₃el-k-*. Next to this, there is also a Baltic form with acute intonation (Lith. *uolektis*, Latv. *uōlekts* ‘ell’), which requires **HoHl-* or **Heh₃l-*. Note that this alternation of **-o-* and **-ō-* is also seen in *olok* ‘shin’ and *utuk* (in Łarabał, also **(h)utuk*’, with an aspirated *-k*’) ‘palm, distance from the thumb to the little finger’ (q.v.), which both are formed with a guttural suffixal element *-k’/-k* (*k*’), comparable to the **-k-* of the Balto-Slavic and perhaps some other cognate forms. The same is found also in *otm* and *uln* (q.v.), which are considered etymologically related with *ol-ok*’ and *ut-uk*. Theoretically, a PIE *k*-stem might look as follows: nom. **HoHl-ōk* (or **Heh₃l-ōk*), acc. **HoHl-ōk-m*, gen. **HHl-k-ōs* (cf. the HD paradigm of **nep-ōt* ‘grandson’, a *t*-stem [Beekes 1995: 178]). From PArm. nom. **uluk*’ and acc. **ulok-*, as well as from a by-form with the stem **HHol-* or **Hh₃el-*, *utuk/k*’ and *olok*’ have developed. One may alternatively consider the possible dependence of an unstressed vowel on the stressed one (see 2.1.23).

otorm *o*-stem ‘compassion; supplication’ (Bible+); **otormim** (Bible+).

● **DIAL** Widespread in dialects.

● **ETYM** Compared with OHG *arm* ‘poor, miserable’ etc., as from reduplicated **or-orm-* (see Hübschmann 1899: 48-49; HAB 3: 556-557; Pokorny 1959: 306; Solta 1960: 427f). Jahukyan (1987: 121, 164), however, prefers the connection to *etein* ‘trouble’ etc. (from PIE **el-*₅). (One might also consider **el-*₄). Olsen (1999: 961) mentions as a word of unknown origin.

If, nevertheless, the derivation from **or-orm-* is accepted, one notes a remarkable resemblance with the dissimilation which has probably taken place in **(y)otorm* from **ar(a)-orm-i* (q.v.). See also 2.1.24.2 on this kind of dissimilation (*safawart* etc.).

otm GDSg *otin*, in Elias (6th cent.) *otan*, ISg *otamb*, NPl *otunk*’, GDPl *otanc*’ ‘spine, back(bone); spine with spinal marrow; marrow’; dial. also ‘hill-side etc.’

Bible+. Mxit’ar Herac’i (12th cent.) has *ot-o-sar* ‘spinal column’, which is considered dialectal by Ačāryan (HAB 3: 554a).

If the placenames *Ot-akan* and *Otin* (q.v.) belong here, the meaning ‘hill-side etc.’, though attested only in dialects, must be considered very old.

● **DIAL** Muš, Alaškert *ot* (GSg *otan* or *otni*) ‘back; slope of a mountain’ (cf. Muš, Sasun *vər otan* ‘on back’); Xotorjur *vot* ‘slope of a mountain’; Hamšen *(y)εot, yox* (GSg *otan* < *otan*, NPl *otnunk*) ‘long hillock’; etc. [HAB 3: 554b; Ačāryan 1947: 12, 24, 248]; Metri *utnə* ‘the upper part of a hill’ [Ałayan 1954: 45, 282b].

The *an*-stem seen in GDSg *otan* in Elias corresponds to data from Muš, Sasun, and Hamšen. Muš, Bulanəx, Aparan *otm-(k-)il* ‘to lie, lean on one’s arm’. Ačāryan (HAB 3: 554b) compares this **ot-m-* to *ənd-otm-eal* (John Chrysostom), though in the lexicological section he points out that *əndotmeal* should be read as *əndotneal*. One wonders if the forms **otmil* and **əndotmil* reflect a contamination with synonymical *koṭmanim* and *ən-koṭman-im* (with the root *koṭmn* ‘side’).

In sayings from the village of Xult’ik (Bateš), AblSg *yim yoṭnen* ‘from my back’ is used referring to a mula and a donkey (see Tarōnean 1961: 183).

According to Hananyan (1995: 195ab), Svedia (Xtrbek) has *teuṭ* for *uteṭ*, and *təṭṭāg* for *otn*. Formally, *təṭṭāg*, too, seems to derive from *uteṭ*. The form is mentioned s.v. *otn* because *təṭṭāg*, probably, meant ‘marrow’ rather than ‘brain’. This is merely a guess; Hananyan, unfortunately, does not specify the semantics. Something similar is seen in Andreasyan 1967: 378ab (for Svedia/Yotun-ōluk), where Arm. *otn* and *uteṭ* are glossed as *teuṭ* and *təṭṭ*, respectively. Here again, both forms are practically identic and clearly represent *uteṭ*. In page 250, Andreasyan (1967) mentions only one *teuṭ* (*tut*), meaning ‘marrow in bones and skull’, vs. *beyn* ‘mind, brains’ (< Turkish < Arab. *beyn* [Ačārean 1902: 290]). In his description of the dialect of Svedia, Ačāryan (2003: 373, 583) represents (ə)*təṭ*, *tūt* ‘marrow’ s.v. *uteṭ*, in the same opposition with *ben* < Arab. *beyn* ‘brain’.

Akn *otəsar* ‘spinal column’ reflects MArm. *ot-o-sar* ‘spinal column’ (see above). Note also *otəsar* found in Turkish-Armenian dictionary (c. 1720 AD) by Etia Mušetyan Karnec’i (Karin/Xotorjur) [Č’ugaszyan 1986: 41^{Nr33}, 175].

The curious compound Bulanəx *šarət* ‘spinal column’ (see S. Movsisyan 1972: 71a) must represent the opposite order of the components: **šar-ot(n)*.

●**ETYM** Despite the semantic difference, derived from the PIE word for the elbow: Gr. *ὀλένη* f. ‘elbow, underarm’; Lat. *ulna* f. ‘elbow’; OIr. *uilen* ‘angle’ < **ol-ēn-*; OIc. *alin*, OHG *el(i)na* f. ‘ell’ < PGerm. **alin-* < **ol-en-*; Lith. *uolektis*, Latv. *uolekts* ‘ell’, etc., as well as Arm. *uln* (GDSg *ulan*, NPI *ulunk*, GDPI *ulanc*) ‘neck’ (Bible+; dialect of Juṭa), *utuk* ‘palm, distance from the thumb to the little finger’ (Bible+; dialect of Łarabaṭ, with an initial *h-*), and *il(ik)* ‘spindle’ (q.v.), see Liden 1906: 127-131; HAB 3: 554, 592; Pokorny 1959: 308; *Frisk 2: 1146-1147; Schrijver 1991: 78-79, 339, 352.

Olsen (1999: 125-126) points out that the semantic divergence between ‘spine’ (something twisting or turning) and ‘elbow’ (something bending in an angle) is considerable, which seems to me exaggerated. The spine and neck can not only twist and turn, but also bend in an angle. Besides, the shoulder, also a bending body part, is semantically often related with the back (see par. XX). Note also that, in the

dialect of Țuța, the actual meaning of *uln* 'neck' (q.v.) may be 'elbow' (or 'shoulder'). The basic meaning of the PIE word might have been, thus, 'joint, a moving (twisting and/or bending) body part'. This can be corroborated by *śl(n)-i* 'neck', if indeed related with **śl-* 'crooked, twisting/bending'; see also s.v. *šet* and 3.7.2.

Important is also Muș *paṛeki hulunk* 'spinal column' which actually means 'vertebrae of back' and can be considered an important intermediary between *oṭn* and *uln*, see s.v. *uln*.

Because of the above-mentioned semantic divergence, Olsen (1999: 125-126, 806) prefers a connection with Lat. *collus* 'neck' etc. (**k^wol(h₁)-so-* > PArm. **oṭ-*), assuming a contamination "with the almost homonymous word for 'elbow'". This seems unnecessary. Besides, the development **k^wo-* > Arm. *o-* is uncertain.

The ablaut **ol-* vs. **ōl-* seen in IE forms (see especially Schrijver 1991: 78-79) is reflected in Armenian *oṭn* < **Hh₃el-en-* or **HHol-en-* vs. *uln* < **Heh₃l-en-* or **HoHl-en-*. See also *olok* and *utuk*. The connection with *il(ik)* 'spindle' can be accepted only if the internal laryngeal of the PIE root is a **-h₁-* (**Heh₁l-* > Arm. *il*), which is uncertain. It is remarkable that next to *ilik* 'spindle' (q.v.), there is a homonymous dialectal word meaning 'marrow', which, however, can be a Turkish borrowing.

PArm. **ol/ul-* 'spine with neck; marrow' might have also developed into *ut-et* 'brain; marrow' (q.v.). See also *ateṭn* 'bow; rainbow (Bible+)'; 'a bow-like instrument used for combing and preparing wool and cotton (a card)' (Geoponica; dial.).

If these words are related with *olok* 'shin' (q.v.), one might assume the following semantic development: '*hollow bone' > 'shin-bone' and 'marrow'.

Another etymology: Aṭayan 1974: 19.

oč 'not'

Bible+

●**DIAL** Preserved in Zeyt'un, Muș, Hamšen, T'iflis, Ararat, Łarabał, Agulis, etc. Note also Muș *məč* 'only in a proverb (cf. *on-c* 'how' > dial. **monc*). More widespread is *č'-ē* [HAB 3: 562a].

●**ETYM** Since NHB (2: 516a), linked with Gr. *οὐκ, οὐκί, οὐχί* 'not' < **h₂oiu-k^wi(d)*. See also Meillet 1936: 143; Ĵahukyan 1987: 134, 177; Kortlandt 2003 + Beekes 2003 passim (see the index). For the critical discussion see Clackson 1994: 158; 2004-05: 155-156, who treats *o-č* as an inner-Armenian creation: pronoun *o-* (as in *o-k* and *o-mn* 'someone') + simple negative *č* < **kwid*, originally used in conjunction with **ne* which later fell out of use; cf. the fossilised phrase *č'-ik* 'there is nothing'.

Ačāryan (HAB 3: 561b < Meillet) connects the first component *o-* of *oč'* 'not' with Skt. *ati* 'beyond, over' etc.

The inner-Armenian interpretation is most probable. That *č'* functioned as a negative also without the *o-* is seen not only in *č'-ik'* but also in *č'ē* 'not' which is dialectally ubiquitous.

orb, *o*-stem 'orphan'.

Bible+.

●**DIAL** Widespread in dialects. On **orb-cw-ayri* 'widow' < **orphan-and-widow* see s.v. *ayri*.

●**ETYM** From PIE **Horb^h-o-*: Lat. *orbus* 'orphaned, parentless; childless; bereaved; deprived or destitute (of anything)' [cf. *orbō* 'to bereave (of parents, children, etc.), deprive (of)'], Gr. *ὀρφανός* 'orphaned', *ὀρφο-* (in compounds), etc. [Hübschmann 1897: 482; HAB 3: 575]. Finno-Ugric **orpa-* 'orphan' (Finn. *orpo* etc.) is considered a borrowing from an IE (most probably, Aryan) language; see Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 940-941; Rédei 1986: 46; Ĵahukyan 1987: 295 (with ref.). According to Ačāryan (HAB 3: 575b), Georg. *ob-oli* 'orphan' is an Armenian loan. Compare *am*, *am-l-ik* (q.v.). Also Abxaz *a-iba* 'orphan' etc. are considered as borrowed from Arm. *orb* [Ĵahukyan 1987: 602].

Arm. *orb* and the others are usually connected with Skt. *ārbha-* 'small, young', *arbhakā-* adj. 'small, weak, young, being the age of a child' (RV+); OCS *rabъ* m. 'servant, slave', Czech m. *rob* 'slave'; Hitt. *ḫarp-* 'sich absondern', *ḫarpu-* 'gesondert' (on which see Weitenberg 1984: 100-101; Olsen 1999: 18₃₁), etc.; as well as Arm. *arbaneak*, *a*-stem 'servant' (Bible+), q.v. [HAB 1: 299-300; 3: 575; Pokorny 1959: 782; Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 747-748; Ĵahukyan 1987: 141, 164]. Hübschmann (1897: 423) represents Arm. *arbaneak* in a separate entry.

Olsen (1999: 373, 868) derives *arbaneak* 'servant' from the Iranian correspondence of Gr. *ὀρφανός* 'orphaned'. In view of complete structural and semantic parallelism with *pataneak*, *a*-stem (next to *patani* 'youth; servant', Bible+), probably of Iranian origin (though the etymological details are unclear; cf. Olsen 1000: 310₂₄₀, 901), Iranian origin should be viewed as possible. However, the Iranian forms are not attested (apart from the personal names **arbakka-*, **arba-miša-*, etc. [ÈtimSlovIranJaz 1, 2000: 215]), and the meaning of *arbaneak* is not identical with that of Sanskrit. Therefore, *arbaneak* can be treated as a native Armenian word formed as (or analogically after) *pataneak* vs. *patani*.

If all these forms are related, one may assume that the meanings 'servant' (and 'young'?) derive from original 'bereaved, orphaned'. Alternatively: 'small, young' >

‘orphan’ (see, for instance, ÈtimSlovIranJaz 1, 2000: 215) and ‘servant’. In this case, Lat. *orbō* would be denominative.

ordi, *wo-* (rarely *a-*) stem ‘generation, sun/daughter’, espec. ‘son’.

Bible+. On *y-ordwoj* ‘in the son’ (Eznik) see Clackson 1994: 61.

● **DIAL** Widespread in dialects.

● **ETYM** From PIE **por-ti-o-*, cf. Gr. *πόρτις*, *-ιος* f. ‘calf, young heifer (younger than *δαμάλη*), young cow [rarely masculine]; (metaphorically) young maiden’, etc. (see HAB 3: 576; Olsen 1999: 441-442). On the connection with Lat. *partus*, *-ūs* m. ‘bringing forth, birth; foetus, embryo; offspring, progeny’ etc. see Schrijver 1991: 195-197, 211.

See also s.v.v. *ort* ‘calf’, *urju* ‘stepson or stepdaughter’, and *awri-ord* ‘virgin’.

ort, *u-*stem ‘calf; fawn’.

Bible+. In Genesis 18.7 it renders Gr. *μοσχάριον* (see also Clackson 1994: 153). In Canticum 2.9, 2.17, 8.14: *ort’uc’ etanc* = Gr. *νεβρώ ἐλάφων*. That *ort* also refers to the young of *etn(ik)* ‘hind’ is confirmed by later attestations too, see, e.g., Mnac’akanyan 1977: 12, 14, 18. Cf. also *etn-ort* in Evagrius, etc. In the Alexander Romance: *y-etn-ort’-unc* [H. Simonyan 1989: 172⁸].

● **DIAL** Widespread in dialects (mainly with dimin. *-ik* or *-uk*) with initial: 1) *v-* : Moks, Van, Salmast, Łarabał, Marała; 2) *h-* : Aslanbek, Hamšen, T’iflis, Axalc’xa, Ardivin, Karin, Xarberd, Muš, Alaškert, Svedia; 3) *f-* : Suč’ava, Nor Naxijewan, Sebastia, Ararat [HAB 3: 579a].

Agulis *árt’uk* reflects **ort’uk*, cf. *otner* ‘feet’ > *átnar*, *oski* ‘gold’ > *áski* [Ačarean 1935: 63].

Kak’avaberd has *hɔ/urt* in three villages and *vəert* only in Agarak [H. Muradyan 1967: 181b]. Karčewan has *vəert* [H. Muradyan 1960: 202b].

Ardivin *hort* refers to ‘bear-cub’ [HAB 3: 579a].

● **ETYM** Compared with Arm. *ordi*, GDSg *ordwoy* ‘son etc.’ (q.v.) and Gr. *πόρτις*, *-ιος* f. ‘calf, young heifer (younger than *δαμάλη*), young cow [rarely masculine]; (metaphorically) young maiden’, *πόρις*, *-ιος* ‘id.’, *πόρταξ* f. ‘calf’, Skt. *pr̥thu-ka-* m. ‘boy, the young of any animal’, etc., see Hübschmann 1897: 483 (“unsicher”); HAB 3: 578-579; Lidén 1933: 44; Saradževa 1980b: 232; Ĵahukyan 1987: 143, 186. Arm. *ordi* matches Gr. *πόρτις*, *-ιος*. The connection of *ort* is problematic since the aspirated dental in *ort* vs. regularly voiced *-d-* in *ordi* is unclear, and the Skt. word is young; see Mayrhofer 1961: 180-181 (with mention of the connection with *ort* ‘vine’ suggested by Paul de Lagarde).

To explain the aspirated *-tʰ* in *ortʰ*, one has to start with **portH-*, though *Skt. pr̥thu-ka-* is not reliable; see Kortlandt 2003 (< 1976): 1-2; Beekes 2003: 202. I hypothetically restore a PIE HD **-h₂-*stem feminine: NSg **pórt-eh₂-*, GSg **prt-h₂-ós* > PArm. **órd-a-*, obl. **hartʰ-*. The Arm. nominative (as well as *Skt. pr̥thu-ka-*, if indeed related) took over the aspirated **-tʰ-* from the oblique stem exactly like in the PIE word for ‘path, road, ford’: NSg **pónt-eh₁-s*, GSg **pnt-h₁-ós*: Skr. *pánthās*, Arm. *hun* < **pontH-* (q.v.). For more examples of such a paradigmatic leveling in PIE *H*-stems see 2.2.2.6. For Arm. suffixal **-tʰ* resulting from PIE **-t-* + **-h₂-* cf. especially *analutʰ* ‘a kind of deer, hind’, which is semantically close to *ortʰ* ‘calf; fawn’ (see s.v. and 2.3.1).

Arm. fem. **ord-a-* may still be seen in *awri-ord*, *a*-stem ‘virgin’ (Bible+), q.v.

As we have seen, dial. **hortʰ*, with an initial *h-*, is present in numerous dialects ranging from extreme NW (Aslanbek, Hamšen) and N (Tʼiflis etc.) to extreme SW (Svedia) and SE (Kakʼavaberd), as well as to the centre (Alaškert etc.). If the initial *f-* goes back to *h-* (see 2.1.21), the spread of the *h*-form becomes overwhelming. We are left with a small group of SE dialects which belong to the 7th group. (Note that almost all of these dialects, except for Łarabał etc., would have **xortʰ* from **hortʰ* [H. Muradyan 1982: 271]). The initial *h-*, thus, must be taken seriously. I assume that the above-mentioned PArm. paradigm (NSg *ortʰ* < **ord-a-*, obl. **hartʰ-*) was still alive at a period prior to the 5th century. The *h-* of the oblique stem has been eliminated in the classical language and in most of the SE dialects, whereas the other dialects have generalized it.

If this analysis is accepted, we are dealing with a remarkable case of two chronologically different processes of generalization of the oblique stem: 1) PArm. **órd-*, obl. **hartʰ-*; the aspirated **-tʰ-* spreads over the nominative: **ord-* > *ortʰ*; 2) proxi-Classical *ortʰ*, obl. **hartʰ-*; the initial *h-* spreads over the majority of the dialects.

oročam, oroče/im ‘to chew, ruminate’ (Bible+).

●**DIAL** Widespread in dialects mostly as **oročal*. Some peripheral dialects have initial *a-*: Ararat, Tʼiflis *ároč*, Agulis, Łarabał *aruc* [HAB 1: 584-585].

●**ETYM** Patrubány (1908: 26a) connected with *Skt. rādati* ‘to gnaw, bite, dig, scratch’, Lat. *rōdere* ‘to gnaw’, *rādere* ‘to scratch, shave, smooth’, etc. The Armenian form has been explained by **rod-je-*, see HAB 3: 584b (with some reservation); Ĵahukyan 1982: 62; 1987: 145, 188; Kortlandt 1994: 27 = 2003: 104. Olsen (1999: 764) considers the connection to be phonetically impossible “as **-dʒ-* regularly yields

-c-". However, I subscribe to the view of Ĵahukyan and Kortlandt who consider **-dĵi-* > Arm. -č- to be the regular development (see 2.1.22.1).

Lubotsky (1981: 134, 136) reconstructs PIE **reh₂d-* and explains the short vowel of the Sanskrit by loss of the laryngeal before voiced/glottalic stop plus consonant, cf. Vedic athematic imperative *rátsi* (on which see Baum 2006: 53-54, 157). In view of this, Kortlandt (1987: 63 = 2003: 77) considers the appurtenance of the Armenian to be difficult. Schrijver (1991: 309-310) eliminates Lat. *rāđō* and reconstructs **Hreh₃d-* for Lat. *rōdere* and Skt. *ráđati*. Lubotsky and Schrijver do not mention the Armenian.

On the whole, the derivation **Hreh₃d-je-* 'to gnaw' > *oročēn*, *oročām* 'to chew, ruminate' (EArm. dial. **aroč*) is possible, though difficult. The vocalism remains unclear, but this does not seem to be a decisive argument against the etymology. Perhaps the internal -o- of **oroč/aroč* instead of **aruč* is due to lowering influence of **a-* onto **u-*. On the initial *a-* in **aroč* see s.v. *arog(-)* and par. 2.1.17. As far as the semantics is concerned, however, note that the Sanskrit verb basically refers to 'to dig, furrow (a way), scratch' (Lubotsky, p.c.; see also Baum 2006: 53-54, 157).

[Vedic *rátsi* is the athematic imperative of the sigmatic aorist and may therefore be old (Lubotsky, p.c.). I wonder whether Arm. *arac-* 'to pasture; to browse, graze' (q.v.) belongs to this PIE root reflecting QIE sigm. aor. **Hr(e)Hd-s-*].

orot 'thunder' (Zak'aria kat'olikos, 9th cent.; "Paterica"; etc.); **orotam** 'to thunder' (Bible+).

●**DIAL** Preserved in numerous dialects, of both *kə-* and *um-* classes. Polis has *orɔdum*, *orɔrdum* 'noise, fight' [HAB 3: 587b; Ačāryan 1941: 237]. Further, note Svedia *giřdil*, Łarabał and Goris *ərɔtal*, and Agulis *ərətɔl* [HAB 3: 587b; Ačāryan 2003: 583]. According to Ačāryan (HAB 3: 587b), the initial *g-* of the Svedia form is the frozen *k*-particle of the indicative present. I wonder, however, whether it has not resulted from contamination with *gorām* 'to dare, fight' (Bible+), in dialects: 'to shout loudly' and, especially, 'to thunder'. Note especially Zeyt'un (which is very close to Svedia) *g'ərɔdadil* 'to thunder', which Ačāryan (2003: 304; HAB 1: 581a) derives from *gorām*.

For textual passages see in a fairy-tale from Łarabał (HŽHek' 5, 1966: 370^{L1,15}, 372^{L4}): *ergyink' yə ərɔtac* 'the sky thundered'.

On Agulis see below.

●**ETYM** Lidén (1906: 88-91) links with Slav. **Perunŭ* 'Thunder-god', Ukr., Czech *perun* 'thunder', Lith. *Perkūnas* 'Thunder-god', *pėrti* 'to beat', etc. He restores **or-at-* < **por-ad(o)-*, comparing the -at with Goth. *lauhat-jan* 'blitsen', and points

out that the vowel of the suffix is due to assimilatory influence of the root-vocalism (on this see 2.1.23). He also mentions the iterative *-ot* (cf. *xoc'-ot-em* 'wiederholt schlagen') and treats *orot* as "eine postverbale Bildung zu *orotam*".

This etymology is accepted by Meillet, Petersson (see HAB 3: 587b); Pokorny 1959: 819; P. Friedrich 1970: 134; Ĵahukyan (1987: 144, 258, with reservation).

ors, *o*-stem: GDSg *ors-o-y*, ISg *ors-o-v* (Bible, Łazar P'arpec'i, etc.); later also *i*-stem: GDP1 *ors-i-c'* (Aristotle) 'hunt, catch; hunted animal, game' (Bible+), **orsam** 'to hunt' (Bible+).

●**DIAL** Preserved in the dialects of Muš, Hamšen, Agulis, Łarabał, etc. T'iflis has *hurs* and *vurs*, Ararat - *Ĵors* < **Ĵors*. The verb: Svedia *irsil* 'to hunt' [HAB 3: 588b]. Note also Šamšadin, Krasnoselsk *vĴrs* vs. Ĵjewan, DilĴan *ĴĴrs*, *Ĵrs* [Mežunc' 1989: 196a]. For Šamšadin, Xemč'yan (2000: 301b) records *Ĵors* in the glossary, but in her texts *Ĵors* is more frequent.

●**ETYM** The connection with Gr. *πόρκος* 'a kind of fish-trap' (Plato+) proposed by Patrubány is adopted by Solta (1960: 428), Greppin (1974: 70), and Olsen (1999: 13), but Ačāryan (HAB 3: 588a) and Ĵahukyan (1987: 144, 187) accept it with reservation.

Clackson (1994: 164) criticizes the etymology and advocates the suggestion of Ačāryan, who connected *ors* with Lat. *porcus* 'pig', etc. (see HAB 3: 588, with criticism of Meillet). The semantic development would have been '(young pig)' > 'animal for hunting', or 'game' (preserved only in Armenian) > '(young) pig' (see Clackson, *ibid.*).

I propose an alternative etymology which seems semantically more attractive. Arm. *ors* (*o*-stem) may be connected with the Greek and Celtic words for 'roe': Gr. *δορκάς*, *-άδος* f. (Herodotus 7.69), *ζορκάς* (Herodotus 4.192), *δόρξ*, *δόρκος*, *ζόρξ*, *ἰορκος*, etc. 'a kind of deer, roe, antelope, gazelle'; Corn. *yorch* 'roe', MWelsh *iwrch* 'roe-deer (caprea mas)'. The Greek *d*- and *i*-forms may be explained as being due to folk etymology after *δέρκομαι* and as a Celtic (Galatic) loan, respectively (see Schrijver 1995: 61; Beekes 2000: 22, 27). Vennemann (1998: 353-355) treats the Greek and Celtic words as loans from Vasconic languages, cf. Basque *orkatz* 'deer, Pyrenean chamois'. For the semantics of the Greek, viz. 'roedeer' : 'antelope', see Adams 1985: 276-278).

If one assumes a QIE **ĵork-o-* (with a palatalized **-k̑-*), Arm. *ors*, *-o-* would be a probable match. For the loss of the initial PIE **ĵ-* in Armenian see 2.1.6. The basic meaning of the term would have been 'wild animal, animal for hunting'. For the semantic restriction 'wild animal' > '(a kind of) deer' seen in Greek and Celtic

compare Engl. *deer*. Another example for the semantic field: Pahl *naxčīr*, Parth. *nxcyr* 'game, quarry, chase' [MacKenzie 1971: 58] > Arm. *naxčīr* 'slaughter (in hunt of war)' (P'awstos Buzand, Eḥišē, etc.) [HAB 3: 422a] : Pers. *naxčīr* 'hunting, the game; prey, chase, a wild beast; a mountain-goat' [Steingass 1391b]. See also s.v. *erē*.

[**č'asum* probably 'blind mole-rat'.

●**DIAL** I find the word only in the dialect of Svedia: *č'āsseum*. According to Andreasyan (1967: 161-162), it reflects Armenian (otherwise unknown) **č'asum* and denotes a mouse-like animal bigger than the mouse but smaller than the rat, which, unlike the rat, has a short tail, burrows like the mole, gathering the dug-out earth here and there in earth-heaps, and feeds on vegetables and crops. Very often it is used to reprove children caressingly, as well as in a curse. Further, Andreasyan points out that few people saw or can specify **č'asum*, so this animal is considered mostly as mysterious.

I think, this animal fits in well with the description of the kind of mouse called *kuramuk* (see Ananyan, HKendAšx 2, 1962: 74-78) literally 'blind-mouse', which lives underground and burrows like the mole, making earth-heaps on the ground, feeds on plants, and, according to the three pictures (which, however, are ambiguous, since in the first two of them no tail is seen, and in the third one the tail is not drawn completely), probably has a short tail. Cf. *k'ōramuk*, in "Baḡgirk' hayoc'" as synonymous to *z/šiwš* and *xlurd* 'mole' [Amalyan 1975: 103^{Nr153}, 368^{Nr153}]; **koyr-muk* 'mole', lit. 'blind mouse' (Sebastia), cf. Kurd. *məškikor* [Ačārean 1913: 591b]. For the semantic relationship between 'mouse and the like' and 'mole' cf. also *ambewt*, wich in Xotorjur means both 'mole' and 'field-mouse' (see s.v.).

I conclude, that **č'asum* probably means 'blind mole-rat'.

●**ETYM** Stating that this animal is in fact unknown and mysterious to many people, Andreasyan (1967: 161-162) suggests a connection to Arm. *jasm*, a hapax used in Anania Narekac'i (10th cent.), itself of uncertain meaning (probably 'a mythic being, ghost') and of unknown origin (see HAB 4: 123b). Furthermore, it is semantically remote and phonologically incompatible.

The animal under discussion is obviously distinct from the weasel. For the description of the latter I refer to Ananyan, HayKendAšx 1, 1961: 163-171. In some respects, however, such as the size (both are smaller than the rat; pertaining to the weasel see Ananyan, op. cit. 164), there is a certain resemblance. If **č'asum* refers indeed to the 'blind mole-rat', one might add more resembling characteristics such as being fierce and having a (more or less) valuable fur. For the semantic relationship

between 'mouse; rat' and 'weasel' cf. *ak'is* 'weasel', dial. also 'rat', also *mkn-ak'is*, the exact match (perhaps a calque) for *μυγαλῆ* 'field mouse'; see s.v. *ak'is*.

Bearing in mind what has just been said, I propose to relate **č'asum* to **Hkek-* 'weasel' (late IE and/or of substrate origin), from which, I think, Arm. *ak'is* and OInd. *kaśīkā-*, *kaśā-* originated. Pahl. *kākum* 'white weasel' (cf. also Arm. *kngum* and *k'ak'um*) may be derived from the same etymon via a centum intermediary. For more detail see s.v. *ak'is*. The regular Iranian satəm outcome of this **(H)kekVm* would be **časum*, which amazingly coincides with Arm. **č'asum*. Even if no trace of such a satəm form is found in Iranian languages, Arm. (< Iran.) **č'asum* proves the existence of the Iranian form and confirms the reconstruction of **Hkek-* based on the Armeno-Indo-Iranian material, as well as on the indirect centum evidence. (Cf. Arm. *vaz-* vs. *va(r)g-* 'to run').

One wonders why the velar is palatalized in Iranian, whereas in Armenian and Indo-Aryan it is not. The answer might be that in Armenian and Indo-Aryan, the palatalization is blocked by dissimilatory influence of the palatal **-k̑-* at later stages of the independent development of the latter languages, after separation of Indo-Iranian.

č'ir 'dried fruit' (only in a medieval glossary); *č'or* 'dry' (Bible+).

● **DIAL** Both *č'ir* and *č'or* are widespread in dialects [HAB 4: 629, 630b].

● **ETYM** Since NHB (2: 576a, 577b) and Dervischjan (1877: 87), *č'ir* and *č'or* are connected with each other, as well as with Gr. *ξερόν* n. 'terra firma', *ξηρός* 'dry; withered, lean; fasting', Skt. *kṣāra-* 'caustic, biting, corrosive, acrid, pungent, saline', etc. (see Hübschmann 1897: 485; Pedersen 1906: 429 = 1982: 207; Grammont 1918: 215; HAB 4: 629, 630; Kortlandt 1995: 15 = 2003: 108).

Hübschmann (with a question-mark) and Ačaryan (ibid.) posit **ksēro-* and **ksoro-*. The etymology has been doubted because one traditionally expects Arm. *c'* from PIE **ks* or **sk* (see Olsen 1999: 965, 965₆₁). Clackson (1994: 182), too, considers the etymology to be doubtful. In order to solve the problem, Ĵahukyan (1987: 133, also with a question-mark) posits **k(s)īēro-* and **k(s)joro-*, which is not confirmed by any cognate form. Mayrhofer (EWAia 1, 1992: 430) considers the connection of the Sanskrit with the Greek to be "unglaublich".

In my view, there is no solid reason to doubt the connection of the Armenian forms at least with the Greek. In 2.1.12 I try to demonstrate that *č'-* is the expected reflex of the PIE/QIE initial **ks-*.

pal 'rock', only in "Hawak'aban anuanc' kat'utikosac' Ałt'amaray": GDSg *pali(-n)* [HAB 4: 4a]; **pat* 'stone, rock' (confused with *pat* 'ice, cold' in NHB 2: 589b, correctly in HAB 4: 13), only in a compound with *anjaw* 'cave' as the second member: *pat-anjaw* 'stone-cave', attested in Movsēs Xorenac'i 3.45 (1913= 1991: 314^{L11f}; Thomson 1978: 307): *ew aiaji drac' ayrin sep ēr utford miapataf. ew i verust patanjaw k'uawor, or hayi yandunds xorajoroyñ*: "In front of the entrance to the cave there was a massive, vertical cliff, above which an overhanging grotto looked into the depths of the valley"; *pt-pt-a-k'ar* 'immovable stone, rock' in Nersēs Lambronac'i (12th cent.), with reduplication, see HAB 4: 90a; Jahukyan 1987: 114, 251.

● **DIAL** Muš, Bulanəx, Arčeš, Aparan, Nor Bayazet, Van, Old Juła *pal* 'large, immovable (stone, rock)'; *pal-pal k'arer* 'large, immovable stones, rocks'; Bulanəx *pal čakat* 'large, projecting forehead' [Ačarean 1913: 890; HAB 4: 4a]. Also 'rock' (subst.); see below.

Since all the three literary attestations as well as the dialectal evidence display more or less straightforward association with the areas around Lake Van and SW of Armenian speaking territories, one may assume that *pal/t* is a dialectally restricted word since the Classical period.

● **SEMANTICS** Ačaryan (ibid.) mentions only the adjectival meaning of *pal*, whereas Amatuni (1912: 546b) records Muš, Bulanəx, Alaškert, Aparan, Širak, Sip'an, Van *pal* (subst.) 'large stone, rock; cliff'. Glossed as 'rock' also in SasCř 2/2, 1951: 791a; SasCř 2000: 276; Madat'yan 1985: 236b. Textual illustrations for this substantival meaning: Haykuni 1902: 189^{L14}; Bałdasaryan-T'ap'alč'yan 1958: 245₁; SasCř 2000: 156, 240 (several times); Amatuni, ibid.

I conclude that the basic meaning of dial. *pal* is 'rock', which is confirmed by the literary attestations of *pal* and **pat*. That a noun which means 'rock' can function as an attributive in the meaning 'large, immovable (stone, rock)' or the like, is not surprising; cf. *žayi* 'rock': dial. *žer-k'ar*, *leain* 'mountain': dial. *ler-k'ar*, *vēm* 'hard stone': dial. *vēm-k'ar* [HAB s.v.v.; Amatuni 1912: 246a]. Remarkably, our word, *pal*, appears not only as the attributive member of this construction (*pal-k'ar*), but also as the nominal one, cf. Alaškert *žer pal* in SasCř 2000: 156^{L-2}.

● **ETYM** Since Ačaryan (HAB 4: 4a), connected Arm. *pal/t* with Skt. *ba'la-* n. 'power, strength, vigour', Lat. *dē-bilis* 'weak, feeble', Gr. *βέλτερος* 'better', OCS *bolijъ* 'bigger' (cf. Mayrhofer, EWAia 2, 215, with lit.), OIr. *ad-bal* 'mighty', Alpiān (pre-Romance) *pala*, *balu* 'rock', etc.

This etymology, though accepted by Jahukyan (1987: 114), is not attractive. As we have seen, the basic meaning of the Armenian term is 'rock'. The only form

semantically matching the Armenian is pre-Romance *pal(l)a* ‘rock’. More probably, the latter belongs with OIr. *ail* (< **pal-i-*?) ‘cliff’, Mlr. *all* (**p₂iso-*), OIc. *fell* ‘mountain, rock’, OHG *fēlisa* ‘rock, cliff’ (< **palis-*?), and Gr. *πέλλα λιθος* (Hesychius), which is usually derived from PGr. **πελσᾱ* and linked with Skt. *pāṣāṇa* ‘m. ‘stone, rock’, Kati *parši* ‘cliff, mountain’, etc. [Specht 1947: 24, 153, 156; Frisk 2: 499; Pokorny 1959: 807; Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 744₂; Mayrhofer, EWAia 2: 125; Beekes apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 548a; Beekes 2000: 26^{Nr51}, 30].

Beekes (2000: 26^{Nr51}, 30) notes that Gr. *πέλλα* ‘rock’ and *φελλεύς* m. ‘stony land’ point to a non-IE origin and treats them as European substratum words linked with the Germanic, Celtic, and pre-Romance words. He mentions the following irregularities: *p/b^h*, *l/l*, *e/a*. The Armenian forms, which remain unknown to scholars outside of Armenia, might belong here too. Note that a PIE **p-* would not yield Arm. *p-*. I conclude that we are dealing with a Mediterranean and/or European substratum term. If Celtic **pal-i-* and Germanic **pal-is-* are reliable reconstructions, Arm. *pal/t-* could be derived from PArm. **pal-i-* (cf. GDSg *pal-i*) reflecting QIE **pal-i(s)-*.

The vocalism of Arm. **pt-* requires an explanation. Ačaryan (HAB 4: 90a) assumes a difference in ablaut. Similarly, Ĵahukyan (1987: 114) envisages zero grade **-l-* for *pal/t-* and **-ē-* or **-ō-* for **pt-*: **pit-* or **put-*, thus. However, this is improbable. Since *ptptak’ar* in fact is a Middle Armenian form (Nersēs Lambronac’i, 12th cent.), one should rather look for an inner-Armenian explanation.

In Middle Armenian one sometimes finds morphological or compositional polysyllables with syncope of two or even three *-a-s*, cf. e.g. *gangat-awor* ‘complainant’ > *ganktvor*, *datastanel* ‘to judge’ > *dat(ə)stnel*, *vačarakan* ‘merchant’ > *vačrkan*, obl. *vačrkn-* (see Karst 1901: 42 f = 2002: 48f; MiĵHayBaĵ 1, 1987: 139a, 167-168; 2, 1992: 355a), *erasanak* ‘bridle’ > *ersnak* [Č’ugaszyan 1980: 72, several times], *pakasuc’anel* ‘to diminish’ > *pksuc’anel*, *Hayrapet* > *Hrpēt* [H. Muradyan 1972: 75]. Therefore, *ptptak’ar* may simply come from **pať-pať-a-k’ar*. Compare dial. *pal-pal k’arer* ‘large, immovable stones, rocks’ (see above).

paťat ‘entreaty, supplication’ in Ephrem and dial. (see also s.v. *paťat₂*); ***paťatim*** ‘to entreat, supplicate’ (Bible+); ***paťatank’***, GDPI *paťatan-a-c’* ‘entreaty, supplication’, prob. also ‘prayer; solemn assembly, religious service’ (Bible+).

paťatim and *paťatank’* are abundantly attested in the Bible onwards.

The “pure” root *paťat* is found Ephrem: *aťac’ank’ ew paťat*. [For another possible attestation see s.v. *paťat₂*]. In this form it has been preserved in the dialects of Č’aylu and Maraťa; elsewhere - in the dial. compounds *aťac’-paťat* and *aťat-paťat*.

In classical sources such as the Bible and Agat'angelos (773), *paṭat-* is frequently used next to *atōt'k' 'prayer'* (etymologically related with *atač'-*, perhaps also with *atat-*); cf. also *atōt's ew paṭatans matuc'anēin aiaji srbuhwoyn* ("Patmut'iwn srboc' Hrip'simeanc'"; see MovsXorenMaten 1843: 299); *zatōt'əs surb zor paṭatik'* ("Taṭaran"), etc. From these and some other passages (see NHB 2: 589-590) one may conclude that *paṭat-* also referred to 'prayer'. The association between 'supplication' and 'prayer' is trivial.

In Joel 1.14 and 2.15, *paṭat-an-k'* refers to 'solemn assembly, religious service or ceremony'. These two similar passages read as follows: *k'arozec'ēk' paṭatans* : Gr. *κηρύξατε θεραπείαν* [in RevStBible: "call a solemn assembly"]. Here Arm. *paṭat-an-k'* renders Gr. *θεραπεία* 'service, attendance'. This usage seems to be parallel with that of the hitherto unnoticed *paṭat₂* (q.v.), which, if my interpretation is correct, should join *paṭat₁*.

One finds *paṭēt* twice in "Zgōn"/Afrahat: *zpaṭēt atač'anōk'* and *zjērmerand paṭētn xndruacovk'*; note the parallelism of the synonyms *atač'ank'* and *xndruac* (both in IPI). It also appears as scribal variants to *paṭat* in Ephrem. The *-ēt* can be explained by contamination with *atēt* (q.v.).

●**DIAL** Preserved in the dialects of Nor Naxiḡewan, T'iflis, Axalc'xa, Ararat, Šamaxi, Łarabaṭ, Č'aylu, Maraṭa, Salmast, Juṭa, Svedia, Sebastia. For (*atač'-*)*paṭat* see above. The "pure" root *paṭat* is only recorded in Č'aylu and Maraṭa; see Davt'yan 1966: 456. [Compare also Łarabaṭ **anēck'-pēck'* 'curses'].

●**ETYM** No acceptable etymology is recorded in HAB 4: 14a.

Łap'anc'yan (1951b: 593-594; 1961: 115) compares with Hurr. *pal-* 'to ask'. Ĵahukyan (1987: 423, 425) rejects it arguing that the Hurrian word appears to mean 'to know'. Earlier, however, he himself suggested basically the same connection but with a different, complicated scenario: *paṭat* is a deviant form with absence of the consonant shift, going back to IE **(s)pel-* (see s.v. *araspel*), and the latter is connected with Hurr. and Urart. *pal-* 'to know'; see Ĵahukyan 1967: 128, 128₁₂₈; 1967a: 24, 178₁₅. This all is uncertain.

paṭat, prob. 'religious / ceremonial recitation'.

Only in "Patmut'iwn srboc' Hrip'simeanc'" (see MovsXorenMaten 1843=1865: 301): *ew nok'a gnac'in i glux lerinn Paṭatoy, zor asēin sastik yoyž i nma leal divac'n, tun Aramazday ew Astḡkay mecarēin. Ew yačax paštamambk' tōn kardayin, or ē Paṭat*: "And they went to the summit of the mountain of Paṭat which, they said, abounded in devils, [and] they worshiped the sanctuary [lit. house] of Aramazd and

Astlik. And they frequently recited ceremonial recitation (with religious service), which is (called) *Paṭat*".

Ališan (1910: 53; see also Russell 1987: 159) cites the passage with significant differences. Here *Paṭat* is replaced by *Pašat*, which, according to Ališan, seems to be the correct reading. Russell (op. cit. 179₃₀) notes that *tawn* is "probably a scribal error for *tun* 'house'", which seems unnecessary. The same has been suggested by Ališan (ibid.) who wrote *kam tun* "or *tun*" between brackets.

One might conclude from the passage that *paṭat*₂ refers to '(a kind of) ceremonial/solemn recitation' or 'religious service performed by recitation'.

The word is mentioned neither in NHB nor in HAB.

●**ETYM** Probably to be connected with *paṭat*₁ 'entreaty, supplication; prayer' (q.v.), which in Joel 1.14 and 2.15 seems to refer to 'solemn assembly, religious service or ceremony'.

The semantic shift 'prayer' > 'religious service performed by recitation' is typologically comparable to that of *tawn* 'feast' (q.v.). The original meaning of the latter must have been 'sacrificial meal' (cf. OIc. *tafn* 'sacrificial animal', etc.). In the above-mentioned passage from "Patmut'iwn srboc' Hrip'simeanc'", *tawn*, directly equated to *paṭat*₂, is used with the verb *kardam* 'to recite' and, therefore, refers to the religious service performed by recitation.

Note the mountain-name *Paṭat* of the same passage. Russell (1987: 179₃₁) follows Ališan in treating *Pašat* as the correct reading and interprets it as **pašt-šat* 'abounding in worship'. Note that the Armenian characters *š*: *t* are similar.

Eremyan (1963: 36a, 77a), too, accepts the reading *Pašat* identifying the mountain with Assyrian *Pašatu* and modern *Bašet'-daṭ*.

papanjim 'to grow dumb, speechless' (Bible+).

●**DIAL** Widespread in dialects [HAB 4: 26b]. On the nasal epenthesis of Goris *pəmbanjvel* [HAB, ibid.; Margaryan 1975: 358b] see par. XX. Aslanbek *batbənjil* [HAB, ibid.] is perhaps due to contamination with *paṭ* 'cold'.

●**ETYM** Ačaryan (HAB 1: 26a) treats as reduplication of **panj-* 'to bind' linking it with *pind* 'tight', *pndem* 'to tie, fasten' (q.v.), cf. Skt. *bandh-* 'to bind, fasten', *bandhā-* m. 'bond, fetter' (RV+), Pahl. *band-*, *bastan* 'to bind, fetter, fasten', etc. For *j* he mentions cases like *xand-*: *xanj* 'to singe', *xetd-*: *heṭj-* 'to drown', etc. but does not specify the origin of *j*.

Žahukyan (1982: 60-61) posits **b^hṇd^h-j-* or **b^hṇd^h-s-*. I think the former alternative is improbable. A possible trace of PIE **b^hṇd^h-s-* may be seen in Iran. **bad-s-*, cf. Khwarezm. passive *fšȳ-*, *βsȳ-* < **bad-s-ya-*, *pcβsȳ-* < **pati-bad-s-ya-* 'to be/become bound' (see ÈtimSlovIranJaz 2, 2003: 69, 72).

One might also hypothetically posit a trace of reduplicated desiderative with *-s-* found in Indo-Iranian in Celtic (for discussion and references see Kulikov 2005: 441). I wonder if Skt. *bibhantsa-* can corroborate my suggestion, though it is found only by lexicographers. I am indebted to L. Kulikov for checking the Sanskrit form and for indication to his paper.

For the semantics cf. *arm-anam* ‘to be stounded’ (q.v.), if from PArm. **arm-* ‘to bind fast, tie, fit’ seen in *y-arm-ar* ‘fitting’, cf. Gr. *ἄρμύζω* ‘to join, fit together; to bind fast’.

ptuk *o*-stem (later - GSg *ptkan* [HAB 4: 646a]) ‘bud; nipple’; *ptke/im* ‘to bud, germinate’.

(Bible+)

●**DIAL** Widespread in dialects, mostly in the meaning ‘nipple’ or ‘the uddar of a cow’. Van, Goris, Łarabał: ‘bud’. Nor Naxijewan, Polis, Rodost’o, and Turkish-speaking Adana have **ptut* ‘nipple’ or ‘the uddar of a cow’. Note also Urmia, Salmast *ptut* ‘nipple’ [GwrUrmSalm 2, 1898: 97]. According to Ačāryan (HAB 4: 112a; 1941: 69¹⁴⁷), this is due to contamination with *ptut* ‘fruit; pupil (of the eye); fingertip, pinch; etc.’ (q.v.), which is probable. However, the two are formally and semantically close, and one might prefer to derive them from a single root **put-* ‘swelling, bud, drop, nipple’. In this case, **ptut* ‘nipple’ or ‘the uddar of a cow’ can directly belong to *ptut* (q.v.).

●**ETYM** According to Ačāryan (HAB 4: 112a), from PIE **bud-* ‘to swell’, cf. Engl. *bud* etc. See above, and s.v.v. *ptut* and *put*.

ptut *o*-stem

‘fruit (Bible+); pupil (of the eye); grape, etc.’. Nerses Lambronac’i (12th cent., Cilicia) has a form with *-n* (GDSg *pttan*, AblSg *i pttanē*), in the meaning ‘fingertip, pinch’. Given the existence of Hačən (Cilicia) *bādet* < **ptet* ‘id.’, one may restore **ptetn* (see HAB 4: 112b).

●**DIAL** Widespread in dialects, mainly referring to ‘fruit’ and ‘eye-apple, pupil’. Polis *budut* (on which see below) also means ‘bubble’. In Svedia (*bdεϝθ*) the meaning ‘fruit’ has been specialized to ‘olive-fruit’ [Ačāryan 2003: 586].

Ačāryan (HAB; Ačāryan 1947) does not record any form in Hamšen. One may wonder, however, if Hamšen **pitet* ‘fruit of wild trees; wild acorn’ (see Ačāryan 1913: 910b) belongs here. See above for **ptetn*.

For the semantic field particularly interesting are the data from Moks. Ačāryan (1952: 289) records Moks *ptut* not specifying its meaning, probably because he only

knew the basic meaning ‘fruit’, which is represented by the corresponding form in Van (*car-a-put* ‘(tree) fruit’ (ibid.)). But Moks *pətu* (NPI *pətəṇir*) also refers to ‘pupil of the eye’ (*ač’ič’ pətu* ‘глазное яблоко’) and ‘rain drop’, *pətu-əm* ‘a little bit (of liquid)’ (see Orbeli 2002: 204, 314). We see here the semantic identity with *put* ‘drop; dot, spot’ (q.v.) > Moks *put* ‘drop’, *put-əm* ‘a little bit (of liquid)’ (op. cit. 316), for instance: *put-put arun* (= ClArm. *ariwn* blood’) (op. cit. 101^{L-4}). Given the meaning ‘dot, spot’ of *put*, as well as the above-mentioned by-form **ptet(n)* of *put*, one can also introduce another word from Moks, viz. *pəte*, GSg *pətte*, NPI *pəteṇ-nir/-k⁹ir* ‘a spot from splashed boiling food in oil’ (see Orbeli 2002: 314). Note also Šatax *pətte* ‘to bud, germinate’ (see M. Muradyan 1962: 215b).

Moks **pəte* basically means ‘dirty spot of boiling, bubbling oil’. A similar meaning can be seen in verbal **ptt-t-al* (Van, Širak, etc.) referring to the appearance of bubbles of oil on surface of food or water (see Amatuni 1912: 570b). Note also Ganjak **ptt-ot-el* ‘to feel sick/nausea’ [Amatuni 1912: 570b]. Polis *bt’xil* (< *ptil*) has two meanings: ‘to darken (of eye)’, and ‘spread on paper (of ink)’ [Ačaryan 1941: 240]; cf. Sebastia **ptil* [Gabikyan 1952: 478]. This verb presupposes here a nominal root **put* ‘eye-pupil; ink-spot’. Polis also has *budu* (< *put*) ‘nipple’ and ‘fruit’, usually represented as belonging to different lexical items (see HAB 4: 112a; Ačaryan 1941: 69¹⁴⁷, 240). All the three, however, may belong to one word. For **put* ‘nipple’ (also in other dialects) see *ptuk*. Note also Sebastia **put* ‘pupil (of the eye); nipple’ [Gabikyan 1952: 478].

●**ETYM** See above, and s.v.v. *ptuk* and *put*.

Next to *put*, as we saw, there is some evidence for **ptet(n)* - Nerses Lambronac’i (12th cent., Cilicia) **ptetn* and Hačən *bādet* ‘fingertip, pinch’; Moks *pəte* ‘a spot from splashed boiling food in oil’; and, perhaps, Hamšen **pəte* ‘fruit of wild trees; wild acorn’. Old, hypothetical paradigm: NSg *-ōl* > ClArm. *put*, ASg **-el-m* > **ptetn*. See s.v.v. *acu* ‘coal’, *asetn* ‘needle’, and 2.2.2.5. The root is, perhaps, *put* (q.v.), with the basing meaning ‘a small round formation (of water, plant, or other substance)’. For the association ‘fruit’ : ‘drop’ : ‘(oily) splash’ see especially Moks data above. Note especially that, in both cases, the etymological doublets going back to different case forms of the original paradigm have been semantically differentiated: *pətu* ‘fruit; rain drop’ : *pəte* ‘a spot from splashed boiling food in oil’; *ase/it* ‘needle’ : *asu* ‘two small planks that tie the handle of a plough with the pole’.

puc ‘vulva’ (according to Norayr, MArm. word).

●**DIAL** Nor Naxiĵewan, Polis, Ararat, Łarabał **puc* ‘vulva’ [Ačarean 1913: 926b].

●**ETYM** Ačāryan (HAB 4: 105) derives from QIE **bul-sk-*, cf. Skt. *buli-* f. 'buttocks; vulva', Lith. *bulis* (-*iēs*), *bulė*, *bulė* 'Hinterer, Gesäß', as well as Arm. Erzuka *pllik* 'vulva'. For the loss of **-l-* before the affricate see 2.1.22.9.

put *o*-stem 'poppy (= Gr. *ἄνεμώνη*); a sky-blue lily; etc.'

John Chrysostom etc. (see HAB 4: 102-103). In Galen, Gr. *ἄνεμώνη* 'poppy, Anemone coronaria' is rendered by *put* and *ōj-kakawī* (vars. *ōjakayī*, *ōjkakwī*, *ōjktawī*, *ōjkakōp*'), etc. (see Ališan 1895: 653^{Nr3247}; Greppin 1985: 10). Vanakan Vardapet (13th cent.) has *put* in meaning 'a kind of wild herb'. This is to be compared with DialAdd apud NHB (2: 1066b), where *put* refers to a kind of edible plant.

●**DIAL** Muš, Alaškert, Xotorjur, T'iflis, Ararat, Salmast *put*. In Łarabał - *top*, with metathesis.

The meaning 'poppy' of Łarabał *top* (see Ačārean 1913: 1042a) can be confirmed by folk-lore texts. In a fairy-tale (see HŽHek' 7, 1979: 116^{L17}) it is narrated that a boy sees a beautiful, red poppy (*min fāšāngy, karmür top*) and asks his sister, who must be killed by the brother, to pluck the poppy for him. In the glossary of this collection of fairy-tales (p. 736b), *top* is rendered as 'drop' (for a textual illustration see p. 63^{L16}: *min top ärün* "one drop of blood") and 'poppy'. In a Ascension-Day ritual song of the type *jangyulum* (see Grigoryan-Spandaryan 1971: 57^{Nr299}): *K'anc' topə kyärmür č'ika, / Pəec' anis səertə sev a.* - "Nothing is redder than the poppy; but when you open (it, you will see that) the heart is black"; cf. also 157^{Nr950}. The context clearly shows that this is the poppy; see also in the glossary (p. 471b). [Compare Mxit'areanc' 1901: 277: *sewsirt-karmir kakač'* 'black hearted red poppy']. In other *jangyulum*-s one finds a reduplicated form, viz. *top-top*. *Sareran top-top k'atim* "May I pluck (a) poppy from the mountains" (ibid. 179^{Nr1093}; cf. also 190^{Nr1159}). This is identic with Łaradał **tuptup*, recorded in Ačārean 1913: 1042a.

It is not excluded, however, that in Łarabał the word also refers to some other flowers. Ališan (1895: 613^{Nr2975}) states, that *top* is a word used in Eastern Armenia, and it denotes *harsnuk* or *eric'uk*.

Širak has a reduplicated form, viz. *putput* 'a kind of edible poppy' Mxit'areanc' 1901: 277^{L1}, 331; Amatuni 1912: 566b. Note T'iflis *pučpuča* 'a flower (digitalis)' (see Ačārean 1913: 925b), 'poppy' (< Georg.), attested by the 18th century famous poet Sayat'-Nova, who spoke and wrote in the dialect of T'iflis (see K'oč'oyan 1963: 18, 155).

●**ETYM** Ačāryan (HAB 4: 103a) links with *poyn* 'pot' and mentions the folk-belief, according to which if someone plucks this flower, all the pots in his house will break

down; cf. synonymical *amankotruk* etc. But which one was original, the name, or the folk-belief? Ačaryan prefers the former solution. This implies that at a certain stage the flower-name *put* has been folk-etymologically associated with *poytn* (dial. *put-uk* etc.), and this created the folk-belief.

However, one cannot exclude the opposite solution. This would go parallel with another designation of the flower, viz. *cap*'(*cap*'), which is derived from *cap*' 'pot' (see HAB 2: 451a).

For the etymological examination of such botanic terms one should also note that they often are reduplicated, and they may have onomatopoeic origin. As far as the above-mentioned *cap*' is concerned, one notes *cap*' 'clap (of hands)' (Bible+; widespread in dialects). Compare synonymous *kakač*'. One may also assume, that the idea of breaking originated from bursting open of buds, flowers; cf. Skt. *utpala* 'the blossom of the blue lotus (*Nymphaea Caerulea*); any water-lily; any flower', *nīl-otpala* 'blue lotus, *Nymphaea Cyanea*' - probably from *ut-paṭ* 'to tear up or out, pluck, pull out, break out', to root up, eradicate, extirpate' (< **pal/paṭ* 'to burst open').

In this case, Arm. *put*₁ 'poppy; a sky-blue lily' derives from *put*₂ 'a small swelling' and is etymologically identic with *pt-uk* 'bud, gemma' and *ptuṭ* 'fruit; pupil (of the eye); etc.', which are probably connected with Engl *bud* 'bud', Skt. *budbuda-ḥ* 'Wasserblase, Blase', etc. (see Petersson 1916: 252-254; HAB 4: 103b, 111-113; Jahukyan 1987: 115), as well as, perhaps, with Arm. *put*₂ 'drop; dot, spot'. For the association 'fruit' - 'drop' : '(oily) splash' see especially Moks data s.v. *ptuṭ*. The basing meaning of Arm. **put* (from PIE **b(e)u-d-* 'to swell') would have been 'a small round/swollen formation (of water, plant, or other substance)'.

put₂ 'drop; dot, spot'.

In the meaning 'drop': Arak'el Davrižec'i (17th cent.). In "Baḡgirk' hayoc'" (see Amalyan 1975: 249^{Nr112}), *put* and *tup* (with metathesis) are mentioned as synonyms of *šit*' and *kat*'(*il*) 'drop'. The second meaning is represented in reduplicated *tptpik* 'spotted' (cf. dial. *tptp-ur-ik*), attested in Arak'el Siwnec'i (14-15th cent.), see HAB 4: 103a; 3: 457b.

●**DIAL** Nor Naxiĵewan, Polis, Rodost'o, Alaškert, Muš - 'drop'; Xarberd - 'dot'; T'iĵlis, Polis - 'a bit' [HAB 4: 103]. Łarabał has *tɔp* < **tup*, with metathesis, in both meanings. In the glossary of HŽHek' 7 (1979: 736b), *top* is rendered as 'drop'; for a textual illustration see p. 63^{L16}: *min top äriün* "one drop of blood" (= NmušLeřnŁarab 1978: 16 /lines 1 and 3 from the bottom/; glossed in 218b). In HŽHek' 7, 1979 (189, 736b), one finds *təptəporigv* 'spotted'. See also Ačarean 1913: 1043b (s.v. *tptpurik*),

where only Łarabał is mentioned. Further attestations: L. Harut'yunyan 1991: 264^{L20}: *Aškan top č'i kat'um* "No drop is dropped from his eye" (proverb); Xemč'yan 2000: 210b^{Nr156} (Tavuš / Šamšadin) - *tptpurik botaz* "spotted throat" (of a goose).

As we saw above, the word is not attested in Classical Armenian. NHB (2: 1066b) represents it as a dialectal word: *put* 'drop; spot; a kind of edible plant' (the 3rd meaning apparently belongs to *put*₁, q.v.). However, the dialectal spread from extreme North/East to extreme East suggests that the word may be quite old.

The metathesized variant **tup* and its reduplicated form **t(u)p-t(u)p-* are confined to Łarabał. See also s.v. *put*₁. Note that the only attestation comes from Aġak'el Siwnec'i, who is from *Siwnik'* and, therefore, a speaker of what will become the (sub)dialects of Łarabał and Goris. This allows to date the metathesis at a stage anterior to the 15th century. 1913: 1043b (s.v. *tptpurik*), where only Łarabał is mentioned. Further attestations: L. Harut'yunyan 1991: 264^{L20} - *Aškan top č'i kat'um* "No drop is dropped from his eye" (proverb); Xemč'yan 2000: 210b^{Nr156} (Tavuš / Šamšadin) - *tptpurik botaz* "spotted throat" (of a goose).

put₃ *'a small swelling'.

Attested only in Norayr as a MArm. word, s.v. French *bouton* (see HAB 4: 103b).

● **DIAL** Sebastia *bud* 'bread with burnt bubbles'; Łarabał *pūt* 'fried wheat flour that has been kneaded with honey, and dried in the form of fist-sized balls' [HAB 4: 103b]. According to Ačāryan (HAB 4: 103b), both forms come from *put*. The -*ū*- of the Łarabał form, however, points rather to **poyt*. A **put* would give **pōt* in Łarabał.

● **ETYM** The combined evidence from MArm. and dialects, as well as the semantics of the two previous homonymic words, viz. *put*₁ 'poppy, etc.' and *put*₂ 'drop; dot, spot', and that of *pt-uk* 'bud, gemma' and *ptut* 'fruit; pupil (of the eye); etc.', allow to restore the following semantic basis: 'a small round/swollen formation (of water, plant, or other substance). See s.v. *put*₁.

jan, *i*-stem: IPI *jan-i-w* (Bible), GDPI *jan-i-c'* (Hexaemeron, Movsēs Xorenac'i, etc); *o*-stem in Book of Chries, Evagrius of Pontus; *u*-stem in Book of Chries, John Chrysostom, Paterica, etc. 'zeal, effort, labour'; **janam** 'to zeal, labour, make effort' (Bible+).

● **DIAL** The verb has been preserved in Suč'ava *janal*, Juța *jananal*. Note also Suč'ava *glxi janal* 'to do harm, damage', with *glux* 'head'; T'iflis *jan-k'aš* 'diligent, zealous (person)', lit. 'zeal or effort taker/puller' [HAB 4: 122b].

●**ETYM** Connected with Gr. *ζῆλος* m. 'zeal, emulation, jealousy', Dor. *ζᾶλος*, Skt. *yas-* 'to boil, become hot' (RV+), etc. [Meillet 1936: 52; HAB 4: 122]. This etymology is largely accepted, though the Greek and Armenian are now separated from **ies-* 'to boil' and are derived from **ieh₂-* 'to strive', cf. Skt. *yā-* 'to request, implore' (RV+), *yātu-* m. 'sorcery, witchcraft' (RV+), etc. [Pokorny 1959: 501; Ĵahukyan 1982: 40; 1982: 130; Klingenschmitt 1982: 90; Olsen 1999: 90].

The development **iV-* > Arm. *ĵV-* is uncertain, however (see par. XX), unless we assume an Iranian intermediation; cf. Arm. *ĵatuk* 'sorcerer' from the same Iranian root. I therefore tentatively propose to treat Arm. *ĵan* as a loan from the Iranian forms deriving from the same **ieh₂-* (a different etymology is represented in Brandenstein/Mayrhofer 1964: 155), cf. Av. *yāna-*, OP *yāna-* 'request, favour'. The Armenian meaning is remote. However, it may reflect an unattested MIran. form with closer semantics, cf. YAv. *auua-iiā-* f. 'penance', Gr. *ζῆλος* 'zeal', *ζημία* 'loss, damage, penalty', etc. Interesting is the meaning 'to do harm, damage' in the dialect of Suć'ava.

***ĵmar** 'male person'.

●**DIAL** Ĵaradaĵ *ĵmar* (Ačārean 1913: 938a, glossed as *ayr mard* 'male person'). Ĵahukyan (1972: 282) has "Ĵarabaĵ", not indicating the source. However, he obviously took the word from Ačārean 1913, so the *-b-* in *Ĵarabaĵ* must be a misprint.

●**ETYM** Ĵahukyan (1972: 282) compares with Skt. *ĵāmātar-* 'son-in-law, husband of the daughter' (RV+) from PIE **ĝemH-*. For the phonetic side he (op. cit. 282₆) compares with the case of *ĵambem*, implicitly and hesitantly suggesting, thus, an Indo-Aryan borrowing. This is uncertain, however. The loss of intervocalic *-t-* is an old feature, occurring in words of PIE origin (*hayr* 'father' etc.), whereas the initial *ĵ-* (without consonant shift) points to a relatively young period.

Perhaps borrowed from Persian *ĵawān-mard* 'a young man; a generous youth; brave, generous, manly', *ĵū-mard(um)* 'a liberal or generous man' (see Steingass 376b, 379a); cf. also Arm. dialect of Ararat *ĵomard* 'generous' (see Nawasardeanc' 1903: 102a). For loss of the final *-d* cf. *argand* 'womb' > Šamšadin *ärk'än* and Alaškert *argan* (see s.v.).

sal, *i*-stem: GDSg *sal-i* (Bible+), GDPl *sal-i-c'*, IPl *sal-i-w-k'* (Łazar P'arpec'i) 'a large flat block of stone; anvil' (Bible+); **salanam** 'to be as of stone, turn to stone' (Bible+); **sal-(a-y)ark** 'paved with stones' (Bible+); **sal-a-yatak** 'paved with stones'

in Eṭišē, Anania Širakac'i [A. Abrahamyan 1940: 9^{L17}], etc. On **sal-ar-*, in compound *salar-a-kap* 'paved with stones' ("Yaysmawurk'", Minas Vardapet Hamdec'i) see below.

Some illustrations:

in Movsēs Xorenac'i 2.61 (1913=1991: 192^{L9f}; transl. Thomson 1978: 204): *bazumk' i darbnac'*, <...> *eric's kam č'oric's baxen zsaln* "many smiths, <...> strike the anvil three or four times".

The verb *salanam* : in P'awstos Buzand 4.15 (1883=1984: 101^{L-12}; transl. Garsoïan 1989: 143): *Isk t'agaworn salac'eal, oč' inc' lsēr* : "But the king, turning to stone, heard nothing".

In 2 Paralipomenon 7.3 (Xalat'eanc' 1899: 65a): *sal-a-yark* (with *yatak-a-c'* : *yatak* 'bottom, floor'), rendering *λιθό-στρωτος* 'paved with stones'. The second component is *y-ark*, from *ark-* 'to throw, put, stretch, etc.' (see HAB 1: 320-321). Later: *sal-ark-* 'id.', *salark-em* 'to pave with stones' [NHB 2: 684a].

● **DIAL** Widespread in dialects, mostly meaning 'a large flat block of stone'. Other meanings: 'anvil' (Zeyt'un), 'a wine-press basin made of solid stone' (Aynt'ap), 'a flat, hard layer of cheese or yoghurt' (Łarabał), etc. [Ačārean 1913: 950; HAB 4: 155b]. Note also Van, Sip'an, Rštunik', Aparan *sal* 'the back of a knuckle-bone' [Amatuni 1912: 581a]. The verb **salel* 'to pave with stones' is found in Łazax [Ačārean 1913: 950b]. One also finds Maraš **salel* 'to become silent, to cut the voice of himself' in Ačārean 1913: 951a, without comment; not mentioned in HAB. I think this derives from **sal-il* 'to turn to stone, become speechless (by astonishing etc.)'; cf. **k'ar ktril* (see Ačārean 1913: 1101b).

Moks *sal*, GSg *sal-ē*, NPI *sal-ir* 'плиты на крыше'; *sal*, GSg *sal-ē*, NPI *sal-ir* 'ручная наковальня в виде молота' [Orbeli 2002: 320]. A clear illustration for the latter is found in a proverb (see Orbeli, op. cit. 119^{Nr21}). For *sal*, I find two illustrations (64^{Nr34}, 116^{L18}) where, especially in the latter, *sal* refers to a '(flat) stone' in generic sense. Also, e.g. in a Muš fairy-tale recorded in Alek'sandrapol in 1915 [HŽHek' 13, 1985: 212^{L3f}].

Van *salars* 'paved with stones', *salarsel* 'to pave with stones' [Ačārean 1913: 950b; Amatuni 1912: 581]. According to Ačāryan (HAB 4: 155a), the compound *salar-a-kap* 'paved with stones' (with *kap* 'to tie, bind, build'), attested in "Yaysmawurk'" and Minas Vardapet Hamdec'i, is an erroneous form made after *sal-ark* 'id.'. Then he compares Van *salars* without further comments on the *-s* and the loss of *-k-*. He (ibid.) also cites an interesting passage in the dialect of Van from a colophon (1591 AD) by Barset Varagec'i: *salars* (either singular or plural, as he points out).

One may assume that we are dealing with a noun **sal-ar-* ‘flat stone (for paving)’ and Van **sal-ar-s* reflects a frozen API **sal-ar-s*, see 2.2.1.7.

●**ETYM** Since Bugge (1893: 24; see also Meillet 1936: 43), connected with Skt. *śilā-* ‘stone, rock, crag’ (AV+), perhaps also with Oic. *hella* ‘flat stone’ < Germ. **halljōn*, *hallr* ‘stone’ < **halluz*, Goth. *hallus* ‘reef’; see HAB 4: 155b; Pokorny 1959: 542; Ĵahukyan 1987: 131 (the Germanic cognate - with a question-mark); Olsen 1999: 100-101. For the semantic shift ‘stone’ > ‘anvil’ cf. Skt. *ásman-* m. ‘stone’, Av. *asman-* ‘stone, heaven’, Lith. *akmuō*, *-eñs* ‘stone’, etc. vs. Gr. *ἄκμων* ‘anvil; meteoric stone; pestle’.

The Armenian word has been borrowed into Georgian *sali* ‘rock’ and *sala* ‘a flat roundish stone to play with’ [HAB 4: 155-156]. The *-a* of the latter seems to point to PArm. **sal-a-*, which matches the Sanskrit form perfectly: **k̂HI-eh₂-* (see Ĵahukyan 1987: 590). In Łazar P’arpec’i, however, *sal* has *i*-stem, which points to another feminine form: **k̂HI-ih₂-*. If these data prove reliable, we may be dealing with an interchange between **-eh₂-* and **-ih₂-* feminines.

The Germanic form, if related, may derive from **k̂HI-n-*. One wonders whether the Armenian district-name *Saln-a-jor* contains PArm. **sal-n-* ‘stone, rock’ (see s.v.).

sayl, *i*-stem: GDSg *sayl-i*, GDPl *sayl-i-c’* (Bible+); *o*-stem: ISg *sayl-o-v* (“Čarəntir”), IPl *sayl-o-v-k’* (Movsēs Xorenac’i 3.32) ‘wagon’ (Bible+), ‘Ursa Major and Minor, Arcturus’ (Job 9.9, Philo, Anania Širakac’i), ‘north pole’ (Aristotle), ‘north’ (Philo+), ‘axle’ (Gregory of Nyssa).

IPl *sayl-o-v-k’* is attested in Movsēs Xorenac’i 3.32 (1913=1991: 296^{L9}). Despite the fact that the overwhelming majority of manuscripts has *saylovk’* whereas the reading *saylōk’* (cf. also *saylawk’*) is found only in a few manuscripts, one keeps on following NHB citing IPl *-ōk’* = *-awk’* (HAB 4: 169a; Ĵahukyan 1959: 310a).

In Job 9.9, Gr. *Πλειάδες* ‘Pleiades’, *Ἑσπερος* ‘evening-star, Venus’, and *Ἀρκτοῦρος* ‘the star Arcturus, Bearward’ are rendered by Arm. *Bazmastet-k’*, *Gišer-a-var*, and *Sayl*, respectively.

In Anania Širakac’i /7th cent./: *saylk’ astetac’d* (in relation with the north pole), see A. Abrahamyan 1940: 38^{L11f}. Elsewhere (62^{L13}), *Sayl* is said to comprise seven stars, which points to the famous ladle of Ursa Major. *Sayl* is also mentioned in the context of navigation (A. G. Abrahamyan 1944: 331^{L6}). Next to *Sayl*, Anania Širakac’i also mentions *miws Sayl* “the other Sayl” (331^{L1}), probably referring to Ursa Major and Minor. But in the same list one also finds *Arj*, cf. *arj* ‘bear’.

●**ETYM** Compared with Gr. *σάτινῃ* f. ‘chariot’, *σάτιλλα πλειάς τὸ ἄστρον* (Hesychius), the constellation being regarded as a car; considered to be of Phrygian

(Liden 1905; 1933: 454; HAB 4: 169b; Scherer 1953: 145) or, given that σ - vs. Arm. *s*- probably points to a *satəm* feature, Thracian (Schmitt 1966) origin. See also Jahukyan 1987: 311, 346; Olsen 1999: 956.

Arm. *sayl*, *i*-stem, and Hesychian $\sigma\acute{\alpha}\tau\iota\lambda\lambda\alpha$ (perhaps Thracian) can be derived from Mediterranean-Pontic substratum $*\hat{k}ati-lih_2-$. For $*-lih_2-$ see s.v.v. *luc* 'yoke; the constellation Libra', *luc-a[t]li* 'the constellation Orion' and par. XX. For the loss of intervocalic $*-t-$ see 2.1.13.

On the fluctuation between the meanings 'Ursa Major' and 'Pleiades' see 3.1.2.

Adontz (1937: 5-6) connects also Georg. *etli* 'wagon; constellation'. This may be an old independent borrowing from the same unknown source, with the semantic development $*s > *h > \text{zero}$. The latter, regular for Armenian words of PIE inheritance (cf. *at* 'salt' vs. Lat. *sāl*, OCS *solb*, etc.), did not take place in *sayl*. This implies that the original form contained an initial palatal comparable to PIE $*\hat{k}$ (cf. Arm. *siseṛn* 'chick-pea' vs. Lat. *cicer* n. 'id.', also a Mediterranean word), unless one considers the Armenian to be a relatively recent borrowing.

Even if the etymological connection with Georg. *etli* is rejected, the comparison is still interesting with respect to the semantics and the suffix *-li*.

V. Hambarjanyan (1998: 34-38) rejects the connection with $\sigma\acute{\alpha}\tau\iota\lambda\lambda\alpha$ without serious argumentation and treats Arm. *sayl* as a native word derived from PIE $*k^w el-$ 'wheel' (cf. OIc. *hvéll* 'wheel', Gr. $\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\kappa\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ m. 'circle, ring, wheel', Skt. *cakrā-* n., rarely m. 'wheel', etc.), which is unacceptable.

sarem

●ETYM See s.v. *sari-k*.

sari-k, *ea*-stem (there is also IPI *sar-i-w-k*, as a spelling var. of *sar-ea-w-k*) 'chain, fetters, bands'.

5th cent.+. In P'awstos Buzand 4.16: *kapēr patēr erkat'i sareōk* "he chained and bound it with iron bands" (transl. Garsoïan 1989: 147); P'awstos Buzand 5.7: *ew arjakeac' zAršak <...> ew yanroc' paranoc'ēn št'ayic'n sareac'n* "And he freed Aršak from <...>, and from the bonds of the iron yoke upon his neck" (transl. Garsoïan 1989: 199).

●ETYM Usually linked with Gr. $\kappa\alpha\tilde{\iota}\rho\omicron\varsigma$ m. 'the row of threads connecting the warp-threads to the loom', $\kappa\epsilon\iota\rho\acute{\iota}\alpha$ (also $\kappa\alpha\iota\rho\acute{\iota}\alpha$, etc.) f. 'girth of a bedstead; swathing-band, bandage', $\kappa\alpha\iota\rho\omicron\sigma\acute{\epsilon}\omega\nu$ (Homer) 'close-woven', $\kappa\alpha\iota\rho\acute{\omega}$ 'tie the $\kappa\alpha\tilde{\iota}\rho\omicron\iota$ onto the loom'; Skt. $\acute{s}r\ddot{n}khalā-$ 'chain, fetter', $\acute{s}r\ddot{n}khalā-$ 'a chain, fetter' (esp. for confining the feet of an elephant); a man's belt; a measuring chain'; Alb. *thur*

‘fence, knit’, as well as with Arm. *sard*, *i*-stem ‘spider’ (Bible+; dial.), see HAB 4: 187-188; Pokorny 1959: 577-578; Frisk 1: 756; Ĵahukyan 1987: 132, 175. On Skt. *śṛṅkhalā*-, however, see Mayrhofer, EWAia 2, 1996: 374, 652.

Clackson (1994: 139-140) points out that the semantic connection between the Armenian and Greek words is not strong, and the reconstruction of a root **k̑er-* ‘to weave’ rests on very slender evidence. However, Arm. *sar-i-k*’ is connected with the verb *sarem*, which is largely known in literature (though not at the earliest stage) and has been preserved in numerous dialects in meanings ‘to form, make; to equip, prepare; to stretch; to weave; etc.’; note also *sar-k*’, *u*-stem ‘armour, equipment, furniture, etc.’ (see HAB 4: 183-184, 188a). Besides, M. Schwartz (1986: 359-360) adds an Iranian cognate to these IE words, viz. verbal **sar-* ‘to tie, attach, link’. The relation of *sar-k*’ with *aspar* ‘shield’ is doubtful.

I conclude that the restoration of **k̑er-* ‘to tie, bind, attach; to weave’ is probable. Arm. *sar-i-k*’ and Gr. *καῖρος*, *κερία* can be derived from the following paradigm: NSg **k̑er-ih₂-*, GSg **k̑r-ih₂-ós*. In view of its vocalism, Arm. *sarem* may be a denominative verb. It may also have resulted from contamination with the above-mentioned Iran. **sar-* ‘to tie, attach, link’.

Arm. *sard*, *i*-stem ‘spider’ (Bible+; dial.) is usually treated as a **-ti-* derivative: **k̑r-ti-* > *sard*, obl. *sard-i(-)*. This “would imply a semantic transfer from abstract to concrete” [Olsen 1999: 193]. See XX. For the semantic fluctuation between ‘spider’ and ‘spider’s web’ see s.v. *sard*. Olsen (1999: 193) points out that there are other possibilities, such as e.g. **k̑r-dʰh₁o-*. [Perhaps better: **k̑r-dʰch₁-* > PArm. **sar-di-*].

If IPI *sar-i-w-k*’ (next to *sar-ea-w-k*’) is reliable, it would imply the existence of **sar*, *i*-stem next to *sari-k*’, *ea*-stem, and *sar-k*’, *u*-stem [HAB 4: 187b]. In this case, one may suggest the following scenario: NSg **-ui* (< **-ōi*), obl. **-i-*, see s.v. *giwt*. This is, however, uncertain.

sex, *o*-stem: GDSg *sex-o-y* only in Hexaemeron (see K. Muradyan 1984: 134^{L18}), but the attestation is not reliable, see NHB 2: 704c

‘melon’

Attested in Numbers 11.5, Ephrem, Zgōn/Afrahāt (*setx*), Mxit’ar Goš, Galen (*setx* or *sexh*), etc. Derivatives: *sex-eni* and *sex-astan* = Gr. *σικυ-ήλατον* ‘patch of gourds, cucumbers’ (Bible+).

● **DIAL** Airtial/Suč’ava *sex* (with a diphthongal /ie/, see Ačairyan 1953: 285, cf. 25f), Nor Naxijewan, Sebastia (also Gabikean 1952: 491), Axalc’xa, Karin *sex* [HAB 4: 198a].

●**ETYM** Since NHB 2: 704c (see also HAB 4: 197b; Ĵahukyan 1987: 310; Olsen 937₁₀), linked with Gr. *σικύα*, Ion. *-ύη* f. 'bottle-gourd, *Lagenaria vulgaris*; round gourd, *Cucurbita maxima*; gourd used as a calabash', *σέκονα* 'id.' (Hesychius), *σίκυος*, *σικυός* m., *σίκυς* f. 'cucumber', *σίκυος πέπων* 'a kind of gourd or melon, not eaten till quite ripe'; cf. also Lacon. *σεκουάνη* 'a kind of olive' (Hesychius). Further, cf. Slav. **tyky*, cf. Russ. *tykva* 'pumpkin'. Treated as a loanword from Thracian or Phrygian (see HAB 4: 197b, with refer.) or an unspecified source; for discussion see Frisk 2: 704. The vocalic variation of the Greek forms points to Pre-Greek [Furne'e 1972: 251, 357].

The appurtenance of the Slavic is uncertain, and the Armenian form (not mentioned by Frisk and Furne'e) renders it even more difficult.

Probably MedPont **si/ek^hu-*. Irregularities from the Indo-European point of view: 1) vocalic alternation **-e/i-*; 2) **s-* > Arm. *s-*; 3) voiceless aspirated.

sin 'sorb, service-berry' ("Bžškaran"), **sinj** 'sorb, service-berry; haw; etc.' (Geoponica, "Yaysmawurk", Amirdovlat', etc.).

Mostly attested in medical and botanical literature. The tree: *snj-i* or *snj-ni*.

●**DIAL** The form *sinj* has been preserved in numerous dialects, mostly in extreme E and SE (Łazax, Šamaxi, Łarabał, Agulis, Ĵuła, Moks, etc.) and SW (Cilicia, Svedia) [HAB 4: 217a]. In the forms with additional *-n* (or the tree-suffix *-ni*) one finds a development *-nj-* > *-zn-*.

Svedia has *snjäg* (the berry) and *sənjgina* (the tree) (HAB, ibid.), the guttural suffix of which can be identified with *hačar-uk*, *hačar-k-i* 'beech' (see 2.3.1).

●**ETYM** The forms *sin* and *sinj*, though in HAB represented in separate entries, must be connected to each other (see various attempts recorded in HAB 4: 215a, 217a), as well as with Pers. *sinjid* 'jujube', Bundahišn **sinčat* 'jujube' and *synk* (**sinak*) 'sorb' [Bailey 1985: 27-28]. Ačāryan (HAB 4: 217a), though with reservation, compares with Arm. *sinc/j* 'sticky substance' (Philo+). On plant-suffix *-j/z* see 2.3.1.

siseřn (GSg *siseřan* in Fables of Mxit'ar Goš; also *sisřan* in NHB 2: 714b, but with no evidence) 'chick-pea', attested in Agat'angelos, Paterica, Galen; **sisain** in the Fables of Vardan Aygekc'i (13th cent.).

●**DIAL** Widespread in dialects [HAB 4: 218]. The final *-n* is seen in Łarabał, Hadrut' etc. *síseřnə*, *síseř* [Davt'yan 1966: 470], Agulis *sa'ysäřn* [Ačārean 1935: 388], as well as in the paradigm of Van: *siseř*, gen. *sisřan* [Ačāryan 1952: 126].

●**ETYM** Connected with Gr. *κρίός* 'chick-pea', *κίκερροι*, Lat. *cicern*. 'chick-pea', OPr. *keckers* 'chick-pea' [HAB 4: 218a; Pokorny 1959: 598; Toporov, *PrJaz* [3], I-

K, 1980: 302-304; Ĵahukyan 1987: 132], Alb. *thjer(r)*, *thierr* 'lentil, Ervum lens' (Demiraj 1997: 398-399, with ref.). The connection with the Latin word is suggested since NHB (2: 714b).

The reconstruction of the vocalism of this term presents us with difficulties: **-e/i-*. For Armenian, **-ei/oi-* has been assumed [Hübschmann 1883: 13; 1897: 490; HAB 4: 218a; Ĵahukyan 1982: 112]. In view of irregular phonological correspondences, this etymon should be treated as non-Indo-European [Ĵahukyan 1987: 49]. Beekes (2000: 29) mentions the irregular alternations *k/k̂*, *e/i*. One might assume a borrowing from a 'Mediterranean' source [Clackson 1994: 143]. For possibly related North Caucasian forms see Ĵahukyan 1987: 601, 612.

On the reduplication see Greppin 1981b: 6-7; Ĵahukyan 1982: 112-113; Olsen 1999: 410.

siwn, *an*-stem: GDSg *sean*, ISg *seam-b*, AblSg *siwn-ē* (Exodus 26.32), NPl *siwn-k'*, API *siwn-s*, GDPl *sean-c'*, IPl *seam-b-k'* (the paradigm is abundantly represented in the Bible), AblSg *i siwn-ē* also in Paterica; *i*-stem: ISg *siwn-i-w* in Paterica. 'column, pillar'

Attested also in Movsēs Xorenac'i 2.33 (1913=1991: 152^{L10}; transl. Thomson 1978: 171): GDSg *sean*.

●**DIAL** Agulis *sün* [Ačarean 1935: 88, 388], Łarabał, Č'aylu etc. *sün* [Davt'yan 1966: 470], Hadrut' *sün* [A. Połosyan 1965: 34], Hačən *sin* [Ačairyan 2003: 88, 338], Svedia *sayn* [Ačairyan 2003: 399, 587], or *säyn* (see Andreasyan 1967: 383a, though cf. 32), or *soyn* (see Hananyan 1995: 197b), Lori *sin* [M. Asatryan 1968: 60, 192a], Ararat *sun* [Bałdasaryan-T'ap'alc'yan 1973: 38, 343; Markosyan 1989: 315a]. The form *sun* is found in most of the western dialects (*kə*-branch); Xarberd has *son* [HAB 4: 222a]. Dersim: *sun*, *sin*, *sön* [Bałramyan 1960: 99b].

●**ETYM** Connected with Gr. *κίλων*, *-ovog* 'column, pillar' [NHB 2: 716b; Dervischjan 1877: 102]. Three reconstructions have been proposed: **k̂(i)ōn* [Hübschmann 1897: 490; HAB 4: 221b; Pokorny 1959: 598; Ĵahukyan 1982: 43, 108, cf. 222₄₃; Mallory/Adams 1997: 28, 29 (otherwise: 442a)]; **k̂(y)ōn* [Hübschmann 1883: 49; Ĵahukyan 1987: 132; Clackson 1994: 140-143; Mallory/Adams 1997: 442a (see below); Olsen 1999: 135; Lubotsky 2002a: 323b; Beekes 2003: 165, 175; Matzinger 2005: 73]; **k̂sōn* (for the references see HAB 4: 222a; Clackson 1994: 140). In view of Myc. *ki-wo-qe* 'and a pillar' (see Clackson 1994: 140), **k̂(y)ōn* should be regarded as the correct reconstruction.

It has been assumed that the *-w-* was lost before *-u-*: acc. **siwon-n* > **siwun* > *siwn* [Kortlandt 1993: 10₁ = 2003: 103₁, with ref.; Beekes 2003: 165]. Beekes (ibid.)

notes that the *-w-* in *siwn* (= **siun*) does not continue the original **-w-*. For discussion and references see especially Clackson 1994: 140-141.

Clackson (1994: 141-142) reconstructs NSg **k̂iwōm*, NPI **k̂iw̃m̃mes* or NDU **k̂iw̃m̃m(e)h*, assuming that the plural (dual) form might be reflected in Arm. *seam-k'* (pl.) 'doorpost'. Beekes (2000: 21₁) points out that the reconstruction **k̂iw̃m̃mes* for *seam-k'* is unacceptable, and that "it may have generalised *am* < *m̃* before consonant". Then he notes that the absence of the *w* could be analogical after the nominative *siwn* (= **siun*, cf. above).

The attempts to find an Indo-European etymon for **k̂iūōn* were unsuccessful (see Clackson 1994: 141-142, with a thorough critical analysis). Likewise unconvincing is the assumption that **k̂iH-ūon-* "derived ultimately by laryngeal metathesis from **k̂Hi-ūon-* which would derive from **k̂eH(i)-* 'sharpen', i.e., a pointed pole or stake" [Volpe/Adams/Mallory apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 442a].

According to Clackson (1994: 141, 142-143), **k̂iūōn* represents a borrowing into Greek and Armenian from a lost non-Indo-European source. Another possible trace of this word in the Balkan area may be seen in Roumanian *țiu* (see Jahukyan 1987: 298-300, 304, with ref.). The correspondence between Gr. *κ-* and Armenian *s-* suggests that the borrowing took place at a quite early period, before the Armenian 'palatalization' (i.e. assibilation of PIE **k̂-* into Arm. *s-*), see Clackson 1994: 142-143; cf. also Jahukyan 1978: 129; Arutjunjan 1983: 303; Beekes 2000: 21₁.

Recently, however, K. Praust (apud Lubotsky 2001b: 14; 2002a: 323b; accepted in Beekes 2003: 152-153, 165) suggested to derive Gr. *κῑων* and Arm. *siwn* from PIE **(s)kiHu-* 'shin': Russ. *ce'vka* 'bobbin; (esp. hollow) bone; (dial.) shin-bone', OEngl. *scīa* 'shin, leg', Indo-Iranian **Hast-čīHya-*: Skt. *aṣṭhīva* '(nt)-'shin, shank' and Av. *ascuua-* 'shank' (cf. Arm. *čiw* 'shank, leg', probably borrowed from an independently unattested Ir. **čīva-* 'shank', see Martirosyan 2005). On this PIE term see Lubotsky 2002a.

sxal 'mistake, failure; crime', **sxalem**, **sxalim** 'to err, be mistaken; to stumble; to fail, miss'.

Bible+.

● **DIAL** Widespread in dialects. In some dialects (Ararat, T'iflis, Juṭa, Maraṭa): *stal*, with voicing of the *-x-*. Akn and Nor Naxiḡewan have *ztał*, with an initial *zṭ-*; cf. also Muš verbal *zatl̄el* 'to be mistaken' (a misprint for *ztałel*?) [HAB 4: 225a]. On the literary testimony for *zṭ-*, as well as the semantics of the Nor Naxiḡewan form see s.v. *sxalak*.

Ačarean (1926: 96) points out that the development *x* > Maraṭa *f* is exceptional.

Tigranakert *zələxvil* 'to glide, stumble' is represented by A. Haneyan (1978: 207) in the list of purely dialectal words, without a reference to any classical form. It may derive from **zʔal-v-il* with metathesis.

●**ETYM** See s.v. *šēf* 'slanting, crooked, oblique'.

sxalak 'drunken, tipsy' (Isaiah 24.20), ***sxalakim*** 'to become drunken, tipsy, inebriated' (Philo), ***sxatakim*** 'id.' (P'awstos), ***zxatakanam*** (Chrysostom), etc.

In Isaiah 24.20: *ibrew zarbealn ew zsxalak* "like a drunken man" (= Gr. *ὥς ὁ μεθύων καὶ κραιπαλῶν*).

In P'awstos Buzand 4.14 (1883=1984: 97^{L-12f}; transl. Garsoïan 1989: 139): *Isk yoržam arbec 'aw sxatakec 'aw* "and when he had drunk and become inebriated".

●**DIAL** Preserved in the dialect of Nor Naxiĵewan: *zʔalel* 'to become drunken, tipsy' [HAB 4: 225a]. For the initial *z-* cf. *zxatakanam* (Chrysostom), as well as the dialectal forms s.v. *sxal*.

●**ETYM** Belongs with *sxal* (q.v.).

According to Menevischean (1889: 62), "wahrscheinlich dem griech. *μεθυ-σφαλέω* nachgemacht". As demonstrated by Ačaryan (HAB 4: 225a), however, the dialectal (Nor Naxiĵewan *zʔalel* 'to become drunken, tipsy') evidence suggests an inner-Armenian semantic development rather than a literary influence.

sxtor 'garlic'.

Geoponica, Galen.

●**ETYM** See s.v. *xstor* 'garlic'.

sprik 'completely, perfectly'.

Only in Socrates (see HAB 4: 266-267).

●**ETYM** According to Ačaryan (HAB 4: 266-267), belongs with MArm. *sprkik* 'clean, pure' and ClArm. *surb* (q.v.). I think it rather derives from Pahl. *spurrīk* 'entire, complete, perfect' (which see MacKenzie 1971: 76; Nyberg 1974: 179a). Compare also Arm. *spai* and *spuī* [HAB 4: 260-261].

sring (or *srink*), *a*-stem: GDSg *sring/ki*, GDPl *sring-a-c**, IPl *sring-a-w-k** (Bible+); gen. *srnk-i*, with *-k-*, is attested a few times in Daniel 3.5-15 (see Cowe 1992: 165-166), and in Plato. 'pipe, fife'.

Bible+.

●**ETYM** Since HHB and NHB, compared with Gr. *σὺριγγς*, *-ιγγος* f. 'shepherd's pipe, panpipe', which is considered to be of Phrygian or Mediterranean origin (see

thoroughly HAB 4: 283-284; Jahukyan 1987: 310; Greppin 1990b: 351). Gr. *σῦριγξ* and the synonymic *σάλπιγξ*, *-ιγγος* f. 'war-trumpet' and *φόρμιγξ*, *-ιγγος* f. 'lyre', all containing the same ending **-ing*, are considered to be non-IE - Mediterranean or oriental loans (see Meillet, p.c. from 04.12.1931 apud HAB 4: 283b; Frisk 2, s.v.v.). Ačaryan (1937: 3) treats Arm. *sring* and Greek *σῦριγξ* as borrowed from Phrygian, pointing out that the Armenian "ne peut pas être emprunté au grec, mais précisément au phrygien".

Ačaryan (HAB 4: 284a) notes that Arm. *sring* might also be connected with Skt. *śṛṅga*-n. 'horn' (RV+) < **k̑r-n-g^(w)o-*, a derivative of PIE **k̑er(h₂)-* 'horn', but sound correspondences are irregular. On this and other issues see Greppin 1990b and 1990c. Further, see s.v.v. *srun-k* 'shin' and *sruil* 'a music instrument'.

srun-k *i*-stem: GDPI *srōn-i-c*' (note *-ō-*, = *-aw-*) once in Bible and in Paterica; *n*-stem: GDPI *sruan-c*' (twice in Nonnus of Nisibis), *srān-c*' (John Chrysostom, Anania Širakac'i), *o*-stem: GDPI *sm-o-c*' (Anania Širakac'i), etc. 'shin, shank; the leg', in Acts 3.7, perhaps, 'ankle', see Olsen 1999: 79 (= Gr. *σφυδρά*).

Bible+. Spelled also as *srungn*, *srunkn*, *srōn-k*' (in Vardan Aygekc'i; see above on GDPI *srōn-ic*'), etc. The compound *srn-a-pan-k*' 'greaves' (for the structure see Olsen 1999: 322-323) is attested first in 1 Kings (Samuel) 17.6, in the story of David and Goliath: *sinapank' pñjik' i veray barjic' noray* = Gr. *καὶ κνημίδες χαλκαὶ ἐπ' αὐτῶν σκελῶν αὐτοῦ* "And he had greaves of bronze upon his legs" (note *barj* 'thigh, leg' = Gr. *σκέλος*). Note also the denominative verb *srng-em* in different meanings.

●**DIAL** Preserved only in Moks: *srung*' 'the stem ends of wheat remaining attached to the soil after mowing (stubble)' [HAB 4: 286a] (see also Orbeli 2002: 325, *sərunğ*). Ačaryan (HAB 4: 286a) questions whether Karin, Axalc'xa *srnk'-t-il* 'to slip and fall down' belongs here, too.

●**ETYM** Hübschmann (1897: 493-494^{Nr382}; see also Scheftelowitz 1904-05, 1: 285) derives from PIE **krūs-ni-*, connecting with Lat. *crūs* 'shank'. Treated as an Armeno-Italian isogloss [Hanneyan 1979: 183; Ałabekyan 1979: 65, 75, 124]. A contamination with PIE **klouni-* has been assumed, cf. Skt. *śrōṇi*- f. (most in dual) 'buttock, hip, loin', YAv *sraoni*- f. 'buttock, hip', NPers. *surūn* 'buttock'; Lat. *clūnis* 'buttock, club, tail-bone'; Lith. *šlaunīs* 'hip, thigh'; Gr. *κλόνις*, *-ιος* f. 'os sacrum (Steißbein)', *κλόνιον* n. 'loin(s), hip-joint'; etc. [HAB 4: 285-286; Olsen 1999: 79]. One alternatively considers Arm. *srun-k*' an Iranian loan, though in this case the semantics is remote (see Jahukyan 1981: 27-28; 1987: 176, 551; L. Hovhannisyan 1990: 215; Beekes 2003: 175, 196). For the discussion of the anlaut see Kortlandt

1985b: 10-11; 1985a: 61; 1986: 42 = 2003: 58-59, 61-62, 71 (see also s.v. *krunk* 'crane'); Clackson 1994: 44, 233₂₆₂; Olsen 1999: 79.

The hollow shin-bone was used for making flutes and other implements (e.g., bobbins) in and around the house, see 3.9.2. Bearing this in mind, one may wonder if PArm. **sru-n* 'shin, shank' is related with *sru-il* 'a kind of musical instrument' (q.v.) (and *sring* 'pipe', q.v.). In view of synonymical words containing the suffix *-un* (see *c'awł*, *c'awł-un* 'stem, stalk; straw'), one may interpret Arm. *srun-k* as **sru-un*. In this respect cf. especially GDP1 *sruan-c*; wich presupposes nom. **sru-w/mn* (see 2.1.22.11).

sunkn, sungn, sunk, sung 'tree-mushroom' in Geoponica (13th cent.), Galen, Amirdovlat' Amasiac'i (15th cent.), etc.; 'mushroom-like abscess' in Galen, Amirdovlat' Amasiac'i (15th cent.), etc.; GSg *snkan* in "Tōnanamak" and "Yaysmawurk'" (both - in the second meaning) [NHB 2: 732a; MiġHayBaġ 2, 1992: 339a]. Dial. '(tree-)mushroom'.

● **DIAL** Dialectally ubiquitous. Ĵuta *sungn*, Ararat *sungə*, Agulis *sōngən*, Łarabat *sōng'nə*, *sōynə*. In a number of western dialects: *sunk/g* [HAB 4: 252a]. The final *-n* is also absent from the paradigm in Van-group, cf. Moks *sung'*, GSg *səng'-ə*, NPI *səng'-ir* [Orbeli 2002: 326].

Ararat (Vataršapat/Ėjmiacin, Borč'alu/Lori) *sokon* [Amatuni 1912: 595b]; according to Nawasardeanc' (1903: 108b), also *soκo*. Borrowed from Georg. *soḳo* 'mushroom' [HAB 4: 252a].

● **ETYM** Connected with Gr. *σπόγγος, σφόγγος* m. 'sponge; any spongy substance, e.g. tonsils', Lat. *fungus* m. 'fungus, mushroom' [Bugge 1889: 22; Pedersen 1982: 62, 292; HAB 4: 251-252]. For the fluctuation *-nk-* : *-ng-* (cf. Scheftelowitz 1904-05, 1: 283) compare e.g. *ank/g-* 'to fall'.

According to Lide'n (1933: 51-52), the abnormal sound correspondences (on which see Furne'e 1972: 164, 232, 360) point to a Wanderwort, the source of which is unknown. In order to explain the anlaut of the Armenian form, he (Lide'n op. cit. 52; see also Ĵahukyan 1967: 214-215; 1982: 222₅₂) assumes a metathesized **psongos*. See s.v. *xstor* 'garlic' and 2.1.22.5. Also Frisk (2: 770) identifies the Greek, Latin and Armenian forms as "altes Wanderwort". We are probably dealing with a common borrowing from a lost source [Ĵahukyan 1982: 113; Clackson 1994: 183]. Beekes (2003: 197-198) notes: "this is no doubt a non-IE word".

Ačāryan (HAB 4: 252a) treats Georg. *soḳo* 'mushroom' as an Armenian loan, and Arm. dial. *soκon* as a back loan from Georgian. However, the word is present in all Kartvelian languages: **soḳo-* 'mushroom': Georg. (not in OGeorg.), Megrel., Laz

soḱo, Svan *soḱ(w)* ‘id.’; as well as in Nakho-Dagestanian languages: Bezhta, Hunzib *zoḱo*, etc. (see Klimov 1964: 165). Ĵahukyan (1990: 68; cf. 1987: 309-310) points out that the Kartvelian forms are borrowed from IE, or they, together with the IE forms, go back to a common source, probably Mediterranean. In view of the anlaut **(p)s-* and the voiceless velar, one might treat Kartvel. **soḱo-* ‘mushroom’ as an old Armenism. However, the absence of the nasal requires an explanation. Possibly related forms are to be found in Uralic languages: Mordvin *pango* ‘mushroom’, etc. (see Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 932, with lit.; Re’dei 1986: 74-75).

Arm. *spung* ‘sponge’ (Bible+; dialect of Suč’ava) is a Greek loan [NHB 2: 740a; Hübschmann 1897: 381; HAB 4: 266b; Olsen 1999: 927].

I conclude that Arm. *sunk/g(n)*, Gr. *σπόγγος*, *σφόγγος*, Lat. *fungus*, as well as related Caucasian and, perhaps, Uralic forms, point to Medit/Pont. **sp/p^hongo-* / **(p^h)songo-* (and **(p^h)so(n)go-*?) ‘mushroom, fungus; sponge’.

[Medit/Pont. **sp^hong-* ‘mushroom, fungus’ is somehow reminiscent of **swomb/b^h-* (cf. Gr. *σπομφός* ‘spongy, loose, porous’, OHG *swam(b)* ‘mushroom, etc., see Pokorny 1959: 1052; Salmons apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 539a). The latter has been interpreted as a European substratum word [Beekes 2000: 30]. Klimov (1991; 1994: 158-162) compares **swomb/b^h-* with Georgian-Zan *čumb/p-* ‘to saturate with water, get soaked’.]

sut, *o*-stem (Bible, Philo, etc.), *i*-stem (Philo, Mxit’ar Goš; cf. also AblSg *i stē* in Movsēs Xorenac’i) ‘false; falsehood, lie’.

Bible+. Verb **stem** ‘to lie’ (Bible+).

In compounds, not only with *st-*, but also *sut-* (as *sut-ak* ‘lying, liar’, etc.), which presupposes a radical **soyt*.

● **DIAL** Dialectally ubiquitous.

● **ETYM** Connected with Gr. *ψεῦδομαι* ‘to lie’, *ψεῦδος* n. ‘lie’, also *ψύδος*, *ψύθος* [Bugge 1893: 25-26; HAB 4: 253], as well as, perhaps, Slovak. *šúdiť* ‘to deceive’ [Beekes 2000: 31; 2003: 198]. If from PIE **psu-* ‘to blow’, an important Greek-Armenian isogloss [Clackson 1994: 168-169]. According to Beekes (2000: 31; see also 2003: 152, 198), however, both *δ/θ* and *ψ* point to a non-IE form.

Clackson (1994: 168) derives the Armenian adjective from a zero-grade, thematic form **psudo-*, pointing out that one would rather expect an **e* grade form. Then he involves the radical **soyt* (cf. *sutak* etc.) from **pse/oud-*. Olsen (1999: 47-48) suggests a contamination of the *s*-stem noun and the zero-grade **-ro*-adjective known from Gr. *ψυδρός*.

I propose the following scenario. The old verbal stem was **soyt-* = Gr. *ψεύδομαι*, and the zero-grade of the adjective is taken from the nominative. The latter (i.e. Arm. *sut*, *o*-stem) can be directly compared with Gr. *ψεῦδος* n. 'lie', which also has a zero-grade form : *ψύδος*. One can restore a PD neuter *s*-stem paradigm (NSg **psēudos*, GSg **psud-ēs-os*) assuming that Armenian has generalized the oblique stem. See 2.2.2.1 for other possible examples. The original verb **soyt* was replaced by denominative *stem*.

surb, *o*-stem 'pure, clean; holy' (Bible+); ****supr*** (see below for discussion); ***srb-an*** 'anus' in Zgōn (Afrhat), dial. ****srb-an-k'*** 'placenta'.

For a non-religious context see e.g. Hexaemeron [K. Muradyan 1984: 76^{L19}].

In atmospheric context *surb* 'clean, bright' is frequent in "Yatags ampoc' ew nšanac'" by Anania Širakac'i, 7th cent. (A. G. Abrahamyan 1944: 304ff).

MArm. *sprkik*, *spr̥ik*, *sp̥kik*, *sr̥bkik*, etc. (Nersēs Lambronac'i, Ansizk', etc.) [NHB 2: 740ab; HAB 4: 256a; MijHayBař 2, 1992: 344ab]. In "Bžškaran jioy" (13th cent.), e.g.: *sp̥kik* (Č'ugaszyan 1980: 66 [thrice], 71^{L16}, 110 [twice]); *spr̥kik* (52^{L4}); in the glossary: p. 238. Of these forms, *sr̥b-k-ik* can be the original spelling. We are dealing with double diminutive. In this case, **sr̥pkik* yielded *spr̥kik* through metathesis, to simplify the odd cluster *sr̥pk-*.

Remarkably, one finds *supr* in the Latin-Armenian glossary of Autun [Weitenberg 1983: 18]. See below for discussion.

● **DIAL** Dialectally ubiquitous [HAB 4: 256b].

**sr̥b-an-k'* 'placenta' in Łarabał [Ačārean 1913: 986a], Alaškert, Aparan, Sip'an, Širak [Amatuni 1912: 308a], Bulanəx [S. Movsisyan 1972: 71b]. According to DialAdd apud NHB 2: 1067a: dial. *sr̥ban-k'* 'prenatal liquid of a cow'.

In Sivri-Hisar one finds **surb* 'a kind of small frog that lives in humid holes' [Ačārean 1913: 981b]. Obviously, Ačāryan considered the resemblance with *surb* 'pure; holy' to be accidental since he does not mention this dialectal animal-name in HAB 4: 256b, s.v. *surb*. On the contrary, N. Mkrtč'yan (PtmSivHisHay 1965: 455; N. Mkrtč'yan 2006: 152, 584) identifies *surp* 'frog, toad' with *surp* < ClArm. *surb* 'pure; holy' treating the animal-name as a relic of an archaic belief. Note Partizak *mariam-gort* 'a big frog' [Tēr-Yakobean 1960: 512], containing the name of the Virgin Mary. On this issue see 3.5.2.1.

Xut' **sr̥b-or-ēk'* 'saints' [Ačārean 1913: 986b], probably from coll. *sr̥b-or-ay-k'*.

● **ETYM** Connected (since de Lagarde and Müller) with Skt. *śubhrā-* 'shining, glimmering, beautiful', *śobh-/śubha-* 'to be beautiful; to shine', *śubh-* f. 'beauty, splendour, ornament' (all RV+), as well as Skt. *śodh-/śudh-* 'to purify, cleanse; to

be/make clean' (RV+), and derived from PIE **kēu-* 'to shine; bright' : **kū-bʰ-ro-*. Mostly treated as a native Armenian word [Hübschmann 1883: 50; 1897: 492; HAB 4: 256; Pokorny 1959: 594; Ĵahukyan 1987: 132; Stempel 1988; L. Hovhannisyan 1990: 213-214, 215; Mayrhofer, EWAia 2, 1996: 647, 658; Olsen 1999: 31; Beekes 2003: 206]. Also Hitt. *šuppi-* 'purified, sacred' has been connected to these forms (see Ĵahukyan 1967b: 73). This is attractive, though uncertain. On some other uncertain cognates (Lycian, Phrygian) see e.g. Bugge 1897-1901, 1: 40; D'jakonov 1981: 71-72; Ĵahukyan 1987: 291.

On the other hand, Arm. *surb* is regarded as borrowed from a lost Iranian form **subra-*; see Benveniste 1964: 2; Schmitt 1983: 109. In view of the *o*-stem and regular metathesis **-bʰr-* > *-rb-*, Xač'aturova (1973: 192) treats *surb* as an old inheritance rather than an Iranian borrowing or Armeno-Aryan isogloss. More probably, I think, the addition of two elements, viz. **-bʰ-* and **-ro-*, points to a shared innovation. Later, Xač'aturova (1979: 368) is inclined to the loan theory. Ĵahukyan (1987: 551) mentions the metathesis and the semantic difference between the Sanskrit and Armenian words, and considers the native origin of *surb* as more probable. Note the absence of metathesis in Iranian loans such as *atr-*, *čaxr-*, *vagr*, *Tigran*, etc. For further (especially semantic) analysis see Stempel 1988. For the semantics see also Abaev 3, 1979: 189.

A possible trace of OIr. **subra-* is found in Khotanese *suraa-* 'clean, pure' (Emmerick/Skjærvø 1997: 155; see also Lubotsky 2001a: 51₅₁).

Since the root structure *T...Dʰ* is impossible in PIE, Lubotsky (1998a: 78-79; 2001a: 51), assumes a root with *s*-mobile, **(s)kubʰ-ro-* : **(s)kubʰ-* 'clean, beautiful', and connects the root with PIE **(s)keu(h₁)-* 'to observe': Gr. *κοέω* 'to notice', OHG *scouwōn* 'to look at', Goth. *skauns* 'beautiful'. He (ibid., especially 2001a: 51₅₁) treats Arm. *surb* as an Iranian loanword.

The form *supr* in the Latin-Armenian glossary of Autun deserves particular attention. Weitenberg (1983: 18) notes: "showing metathesis?". Such a metathesis would seem strange and unmotivated, however. One must take also MArm. *sprkik*, *sprik*, *spkik*, *srbkik*, etc. into consideration. The glossary is older than the MArm. period (it has been compiled in or before the 9th century, see Weitenberg, op. cit. 13-14), so one might think that MArm. *sprkik* directly reflects an OArm. unmetathesized by-form **subr-*, cf. Skt. *śubhrá-*. Since the development **-bʰro-* > Arm. *-rbo-* is unobjectionable and unvariable, one has to assume a by-form like **kubʰ-ʃ-*, or an unattested Iranian cognate **subr* (compare the case of *vagr* 'tiger'). A simpler solution would be to regard *supr* as a back formation based on *sprkik*, the latter reflecting *srb-k-ik* (simplification of the cluster).

According to Ačāryan (HAB 4: 266-267), hapax *spī-ik* 'completely' (in Socrates) belongs here too. I think it rather derives from Pahl. *spurrīk* 'entire, complete, perfect' (which see MacKenzie 1971: 76; Nyberg 1974: 179a). Compare also Arm. *spai* and *spuī* [HAB 4: 260-261].

I conclude that Arm. *surb*, *o*-stem 'pure, clean; holy' and Skt. *śubhrá-* 'shining, glimmering, beautiful' (probably also Khotanese *suraa-* 'clean, pure'), whether from **ku-b^h-ro-* or **(s)ku-b^h-ro-* (the latter would be possible for Armenian if we assume a by-form **ksu...*, cf. 2.1.22.5), rather represents an Armenian-Indo(-Iranian) isogloss, though the Iranian origin of Arm. *surb* should not be excluded completely (an old borrowing with metathesis?). [Arm. *supr* (Autun), if not analogical after MArm. *spr-k-ik* (metathesized from *srb-k-ik*), may be regarded as an Iranian loan].

vayel 'decent, worthy, proper', *vayel ē* (+ dat.) 'it is proper' (Bible+), **vayel-k** 'enjoyment, delight': *i*-stem: GDPI *vayel-i-c**, IPI *vayel-i-w-k** (Book of Chries, "Yačaxapatum", Grigor Narekac'i, etc.), 'use' (Eznik Koṭbac'i); **vayel-em** 'to enjoy' (Bible+), **vayel-uč*** 'decent; pleasant, delightful' (Bible+); for *-uč** see Olsen 1999: 616, with references and discussion.

●**DIAL** The verb **vayel-el* 'to enjoy; to suit, be proper' is widespread in dialects, mostly in contracted *vel-*. In Maraṭa and Salmast: *level* metathesized from **velēl* [HAB 4: 300a; Ačārean 1926: 76, 424]. On the metathesis see 2.1.26.3.

●**ETYM** Compared with Skt. *vay** 'to pursue, seek, strive after, seek or take eagerly, accept, enjoy' [Dervischjan 1877: 49-50], Av. *vaiia-* 'wish', Gr. *ἔμμαι* 'to strive after; to wish, hurry', etc. [Scheftelowitz 1904-05, 2: 42-43]; cf. also YAv. *vaiieiti* 'pursues', Oss. *wajyn/wajun* 'to hurry', Lith. *výti* 'to drive, pursue, chase', etc. (see Mayrhofer, EWAia, s.v.). This etymology is rejected by Ačāryan (HAB 4: 299-300), who leaves the origin of the word open. A reason for this is that the initial **u-* would yield Arm. *g-*. Ĵahukyan (1967: 265), therefore, lists this word as an example of the irregular reflex **u-* > Arm. *v-*. One may treat *vay-el* as an (old) Iranian loan. For *-el(-)* compare *ayc** 'visit, inspection, investigation' (Bible+) : *ayc'-el-em* in Yovhannēs Drasxanakertc'i etc., and derivatives based on *ayc'-el*; *arg-el* 'obstacle', *argel-um* 'to forbid' (Bible+; cf. dial. **arg*); see s.v. The comparison of these examples is already suggested by Pedersen (1906: 354-355 = 1982: 132-133).

Olsen (1999: 394) interprets *vayel* as containing a suffix *-el-*, of which no other examples are cited. She points out that "the stem *vay-* is probably an old compound of **upo-* + *hay-*, cf. *hayim* 'look, see'". [For an earlier attempt to link with *hayim* see Pedersen 1906: 438 = 1982: 216]. Uncertain.

viz, *i*- or *a*-stem: GDSg *vz-i* in Gregory of Nyssa, AblSg *vz-ē* in Eusebius of Caesarea and Movsēs Xorenac'i 2.79 (see below) 'neck' (Movsēs Xorenac'i, John Chrysostom, Philo, etc.); **ənd-vz-im** 'to rebel' (Bible+), **ənd-vz-em** 'to twist and crash one's neck' in Movsēs Xorenac'i 2.79 (see below) etc.

In Movsēs Xorenac'i 2.79 (1913=1991: 218^{L2f}; transl. Thomson 1978: 226): *zvzē ewet' kaleal yaŋt'ēr* "who used to win by a neck grip". In a couple of lines below one also finds the verb *əndvzem*: *t'ap'eac' handerj əndvzeal ʃaxʃaxmamb* (218^{L5}).

●**DIAL** Widespread in dialects [HAB 4: 338a].

Next to *viz*, some eastern dialects have also forms with an initial *x*-, which, as Ačāryan hesitantly notes, may be identic with *viz*: Agulis *xāyzak* 'back of the head, occiput', also compounds Łarabaŋ **xz-a-kot'* (with *kot'* 'handle, stem'), Łarabaŋ, Agulis, Šamaxi, Łazax **xz-a-tak* (with *tak* 'under, bottom'), Łazax **xz-i-tak*, ʃuŋa **xuz-a-tak*, next to "normal" *vz-a-kot'* and *vz-a-tak* in other dialects [HAB 4: 338a].

Agulis *xāyzak* presupposes **xizak*, cf. *siseŋn* 'pea' > *sāysāŋn*, *spitak* 'white' > *spāyīāk*, *cicaŋ* 'laughter' > *cāyāčāŋ*, etc. (see Ačārean 1935: 61-62). Łarabaŋ etc. **xz*-implies **xiz* or **xuz*. ʃuŋa **xuz-a-tak* points to **xoŋz* [xuyz], **xiwz* or **xuz*, unless the form is due to contamination with *xuz* 'to cut hair'.

●**ETYM** See s.v. *awji-k* 'collar'.

tal 'husband's sister'.

Attested only in Yovhannēs Erzncac'i (13th cent. Gram.). There is no evidence for the declension class. According to (NHB 2: 837c), the word has an *i*-stem (cf. also HAB 4: 356b; Saradževa 1986: 259), and this is sometimes (cf. Tumanjan 1978: 218; Eichner-Kühn 1976: 29, 31) adopted without any remark of caution. Strangely enough, ʃahukyan (1967: 182; 1987: 125, 167) repeatedly treats *tal* as an *o*-stem.

●**DIAL** Widespread in dialects [HAB 4: 357]. In some of them (Muš, Bulanəx, Alaškert, T'avriz, Moks, Van, Salmast), one finds **talw*; in Moks - *taləv* [M. Muradyan 1982: 139; Orbeli 2002: 330]. Metathesized in Maraŋa: *tavl* (not confirmed by Davt'yan 1966: 479).

ʃuŋa has *taln*. Next to *dal*, Hamšēn also has *dalnug* (with the diminutive suffix *-uk*) which appears in a proverb, rhyming with *haysnug* < *harsn-uk* 'little bride or daughter-in-law' (see Gurunyan 1991: 258). This might be taken as evidence confirming ʃuŋa *taln*. However, *dalnug* should be considered analogical after *haysnug* (note the rhyming context of the proverb), unless new evidence is found.

●**ETYM** Since Bugge (1893: 27-28), connected to the PIE word for 'husband's sister': Gr. *γάλως*, Phryg. *γέλαρος· ἀδελφοῦ γυνή, Φρυγιστί* (Hesichius; perhaps to be read as **γέλαφος*), Lat. *glōs*, OCS *zъlъva*, Russ. *zolovka*, etc. The expected form

**cal* was influenced by *ta(y)gr* ‘husband’s brother’ (q.v). Beekes (1976: 13-16; cf. also Schrijver 1991: 131-132) reconstructed a PIE HD *u*-stem: NSg **ǵéǵlh₂-ōu-s*, GSg **ǵéǵlh₂-ū-ós*. As for the laryngeal, others prefer **h₃*, cf. Huld apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 521-522.

Next to this, there is some evidence for an *i*-stem, which seems to confirm Arm. *tal*, *-i* : Gr. γάλις, γαλαός (Hes), Skt. *giri-* f. ‘sister-in-law’, see especially Eichner-Kühn 1976: 28-32; Mayrhofer 1986: 104; EWAia 1, 1992: 487-488, where **ǵlh₂-i-* is reconstructed. In order to explain the unpalatalized *g-*, Eichner-Kühn (op. cit. 30-31) assumes that the PIE etymon had **g-*, and the Slavic *z-* is due to contamination with the word for ‘Schwiegersohn’, cf. Russ. *zjat’*. However, Arm. *tal* would be much more easily explained from **cal* with a dental affricate rather than from **kal*. Besides, one wonders if the Aryan problem may be solved by Weise’s Law, though the Law generally operated in a position before a PIE **r*.

The Armenian word is almost exclusively recorded in dialects. Here we find two groups, representing **tal* and *talw*. According to Ačāryan (1940-1951, 2: 427; 1952: 101), the auslaut *-w* of the latter form arose to distinguish the word from *tal* ‘to give’ and is of unknown origin. Others see it as an archaic relic of **-(ō)u-* [Jahukyan /1972: 272; 1985: 157; 1987: 167, 254; Simonyan 1979: 227; A. Xač’atryan 1985: 116]. Certainly, the *-w* has an etymological value. However, it is not entirely clear why it has been preserved in some dialects and lost in others. (Jahukyan’s and Simonyan’s statement that the dialectal form with *-w* is more archaic than that of the Old Armenian is not technically accurate since the word is a hapax attested in the 13th century). One should look for a distribution.

I see two possibilities:

1) NSg **ǵ(ē)ǵlh₂-ōu-s* > PArm. **taluw* > **talw*; in this case, however, the absence of *-w* in *tal* would be hard to explain. From GSg **ǵéǵlh₂-ū-ós* one expects Arm. **talaw(o)*.

2) NSg **ǵlH-ōi* > **talū(i)* > **talw*, oblique **ǵlH-i-* > **tal(i-)* (see 2.2.2.4). However, the evidence for PIE *i*-stem is scanty and unreliable, and there are no attestations for the declension class of Arm. *tal*. Furthermore, the development **-Vlu(i)* > **-Vlw/v-* is uncertain, though this is reminiscent of Arm. (< Iran., cf. Pers. *sarū*) *saroy* ‘cypress’ (Bible+) vs. Pers. *sarv*, Turk. *selvi* (see HAB 4: 189-190).

In either case **talw* represents the original nominative. This is attractive since, as informed by Ačāryan (1952: 101), *talw* is confined to the nominative in the dialect of Van. The same holds for Moks *taləv* (NPl *talv-ir*), GSg *talüč’* (see Orbeli 2002: 330), and not **talvüč’*. I conclude that Arm. **tal(u)w* reflects the PIE nominative

**ġ(ē)lh₂-ōu-s*, the form *tal* may be explained by loss of *-w* or from the alternative *i*-stem (if Gr. γάλις and Skt. *giri-*, as well as the *i*-stem of Arm. *tal* prove reliable).

They usually assume that Gr. γαλέη 'Wiesel, Marder', Lat. *glīs* 'Hasel-, Bilchmaus' and Skt. *giri(kā)-* 'mouse' (Lex.) are derived from the etymon under discussion, though the details are not clear. For the semantic association see 3.5.2.9. If the basic meaning indeed was 'young girl (as a potential bride)', one may equate the semantic development to that of Turk. *gelin* 'bride', diminutive *gelincik* 'Bräutchen, kleine junge frau; Wiesel'.

tamal, GDSg *tamal-o-y* or ISg *tamal-i-w* in the Alexander Romance, GDSg *tamal-oj* in Proverbs 25.24 'roof, house-top' (also 'ruins'?).

In Proverbs 25.24: *Law e bnakel ar ankean tamaloj ... : κρείττον οἰκεῖν ἐπὶ γωνίας δώματος ἢ μετὰ γυναικος λοιδοροῦ ἐν οἰκίᾳ κοινῇ*. In RevStBible: "It is better to live in a corner of the housetop than in a house shared with a contentious woman".

In the Alexander Romance: *z-tamaloyn kayr* [NHB 2: 842c]: "stood on the roof-tops" [Wolohojian 1969: 73]; "sui tetti stava" [Braccini 2004: 190]. H. Simonyan (1989: 175^{L5}; see also Braccini 2004: 44^{V132}, 190) here has *ztamaliwn kayr*. The Greek text has *τῶν ἐρειπίων ἐστῶς*, on which see Braccini 2004: 190. I wonder if this correspondence with Gr. *ἐρείπια* 'ruins' allows to postulate a similar meaning in Armenian too. This meaning perhaps fits also in another passage from the Alexander Romance (*i tamalss*, var. *i tamaks*), on which see HAB 4: 367a, with Ačāryan's general contextual translation "in unknown marginal regions" (*yancanōt's cayragawānerum*).

Step'anos Ōrbelean (1250/60-1304) thrice mentions a village close to the monastery of Tat'ew, named *Tamalek-k'*. Nowadays, the ruins of the village are called *Tembäläsk* [A. A. Abrahamyan 1986: 470₆₇₇] (perhaps better: *Təmbäläsk*). For API *-ek-s* (in place-names) > *-esk* cf. *Xnjoresk* (see 4.8). I think the stem **tamal-* may be identic with *tamal* 'roof'. The appellative meaning of this place-name might have been 'ruins' or 'building' (see below).

NHB and HAB also cite **tamali** (GSg *tamalwoj*). Ĵahukyan (1987: 462) even has GDPI *-eac'*. However, no attestations are referred to. Olsen (1999: 952) cites *tamalwoj* for the biblical passage, but NHB has *tamaloj* instead.

In Turkish-Armenian dictionary (c. 1720 AD) by Etia Mušet'yan Karnec'i (Karin/Xotorjur), Turk. *gumpēt'* is rendered by Arm. *gmpēt'* and *tamali tun* [Č'ugaszyan 1986: 42^{Nr26}].

●**DIAL** No dialectal form is cited in HAB 4: 367a.

In Goris it is probably found in the place-name *Təmbälāsk*, see above.

●**ETYM** Ačāryan (HAB 4: 367a) rejects the connection with Gr. *δῶμα* n. 'house, living, temple', Arm. *tun* 'house', *tani-k* 'roof', etc. (NHB, Dervišyan) and treats as a Semitic loan, cf. Assyr. *tamlū* (corrected in HAB-Add 1982: 18) 'terrace' < 'filling'. Olsen (1999: 952) places the word in her list of words of unknown origin mentioning only the etymology of Ačāryan.

I agree with Jahukyan (1987: 462) who considers the former etymology (< PIE **dom-* 'house', **dem(ə)-* 'to build') more probable. Jahukyan (ibid.) also mentions the place-name *Tamatta* in Hayasa (see also 1988, 1: 76, referring to HLuw *tam-* 'to build' etc.). Note that in Proverbs 25.24 *tamal* renders Gr. *δῶμα*. The PIE root is **demH-* 'to build' (probably with **-h₁-*, see Beekes 1969: 291): Gr. *δέμω* 'to build', Myc. *demeote* 'those who will build', HLuw. *tam-* 'to build', PGerm. **tim(b)ra-* 'building wood' (cf. Oic. *timbr*, OHG *zimbar*, etc.) from **demh₁-ro-*, etc. Arm. **tamal(i)* may reflect **dmh₁-l(i)-*. For the suffix *-al(i)*, *-li* see 2.3.1. The basic building is, then, 'building, structure', from which the meaning 'roof' may have derived exactly like *tan-i-k* 'roof' from *tun* (GSg *tan*) 'house', q.v. Also the appellative **tamal-* seen in the place-name *Tamal-ek-k*, as well as the (possible) meaning 'ruins' (in the Alexander Romance) seem to be better understood with this basic semantics.

One wonders whether there is a relation with Sarikoli *tom* 'roof', on which see Morgenstierne 1974: 80b, without any indication on the etymology. Note also Turk. *tam* rendered by Arm. words for 'roof' in Turkish-Armenian dictionary (c. 1720 AD) by Etia Mušētyan Karneč'i (Karin/Xotorjur), see Č'ugaszyan (1986: 82^{Nr25}).

tawn, *i*-stem 'feast'.

Bible onwards. See s.v. *paṭat₂*.

●**DIAL** Widespread in dialects.

●**ETYM** Connected with Lat. *daps*, *-pis* f. 'sacrificial meal', Gr. *δάπτω* 'devour', etc., see HAB s.v.; Pokorny 1959: 176-177; Gamkrelidze / Ivanov 1984: 701; Mallory/Adams 1997: 496b. For the semantic field and cultural background see Benveniste 1969: 1: 74-77; 2: 226-229 (= 1973: 61-63, 484-486); Mallory/Adams 1997: 496-497. Watkins (1976; see also Corthals 1979: 229) adds Irish *dúan* 'poem' (< **dapnā-*) to these words. Toch. B *tāpp-* 'to eat' is uncertain [Adams 1999: 286-287].

The Armenian prototype may have been **dh₂p-ni-* or **dh₂p-nih₂-*, for which there is no direct comparative evidence; cf. Lat. *damnum* n. 'financial loss' and Oic. *tafn* 'sacrificial animal', both from **dap-no-*, as well as Gr. *δαπάνη* f. 'cost,

expenditure'. Olsen (1999: 101) alternatively suggests a closer parallelism with Lat. *daps*, "in which case the *i*-stem would have to be a contamination between the acc.sg. in *-n* and an *i*-stem as the usual substitution of an older root noun". I would prefer a direct association with the above-mentioned cognates with the nasal suffixal element, and a subsequent morphological reformation after words like *ban*, *jawn*, etc. The etymological meaning of Arm. *tawn* 'feast' is, then, *'feast with sacrificial meal'.

tiruhi < **tēr-u(r)hi*

tir-uhi 'mistress' (lately attested) [NHB 2: 878c].

●**DIAL** Preserved in the dialects of Aparan *tiruhi* and Urmia (Xoy) *tirōxni* 'priest's wife' (see Amatuni 1912: 237; M. Asatryan 1962: 236a). In folklore texts from Moks collected by Orbeli (2002), one finds *terōxri* 'priest's wife' (though the word did not take place in Orbeli's glossary): *terōxrun xārc'nink* ' "(let's) ask the priest's wife"; *terōxrin k'ünd kāner* "the priest's wife was making dough" (p. 66^{Nr38}); *terōxrun ksə* " (he) tells to the priest's wife" (p. 78^{L-4}).

Šatax *tərxori* 'priest's wife' [M. Muradyan 1962: 216b; 1972: 209].

●**ETYM** The *-n-* of the variant *tirōxni* (Urmia/Xoy) is unclear. [It may reflect a folk-etymological re-interpretation **tēr*, *ōxni* "Lord, bless!", cf. Urmia (Xoy) *ōxnel* 'to bless' (see M. Asatryan 1962: 208b); this is uncertain], whereas Moks *terōxri* 'priest's wife' seems to represent the original form **tēr-urhi*, which is more archaic than the literary form in that it has preserved the *-r-*; on the suffix *-uhi* (< **-urhi*) see 2.3.1.

According to M. Muradyan (1962: 216b; 1972: 209), Šatax *tərxori* 'priest's wife' is composed of *tēr* 'lord' and *huri* '(heavenly) beautiful woman, fairy' which is improbably. I think it must be identified with Moks *terōxri*, and the metathesis *oxr* > *xor* is due to the folk-etymological re-interpretation as **tēr-hōr-i*, from **tēr hōr* 'of the priest'; thus: '(the one that belongs) to the priest'.

**tī* (or **tīn*) prob. 'fat'.

MArm. *xoz-tī*, GDSg *xoztui* or *xoztini* 'fat of swine' is attested in Geoponica and "Bžškaran jioy" (13th cent.) [HAB 2: 382b; Č'ugaszyan 1980: 104^{L-1,-3}, 200; MjHayBař 1, 1987: 346a]. Derived from *xoz* 'swine', but the component **tī* is not specified (ibid.). The latter is hardly identic with the pl./coll. marker *-tī*. It probably is an otherwise unknown word meaning 'fat'.

Another possible trace of the hypothetical **tī* 'fat' may be seen in *katti*. This word is found in Yovhan Mandakuni/Mayragomec'i (5th or 7th cent.), in a list of some dairy and fish products for fast of *Nawakatik*'. Of these words, *katti* and *bacin* are

unknown, and *xer* and *ščuk*, both being dairy products, are very rare in literature and present in a few dialects (see HAB s.v.v.). The word *katti* is listed between *kogi* 'butter' and *bacin* and may denote a kind of dairy product. It may be interpreted as **kat(t')* 'milk' (see s.v. *kat'n* 'milk') + **ti* 'fat', thus: 'fat of milk', that is a kind of butter or sour cream or the like.

Note also dial. *kz-ti* 'a dairy product', on which see HAB 2: 497a.

●**ETYM** No etymology of **ti* (or **tin*, if the nasal in GDSg *xoztini* is old) 'fat' is known to me. One may hypothetically compare it with Gr. *δημός* m. 'fat of animals and men' (cf. Frisk 1: 381) and/or Luw. *tā(j)in-* n. 'oil, fat' (on which see Starke 1990: 239-242).

***tit** 'teat, bosom'.

Only in *merk-a-tit*, in P'awstos Buzand 4.15 /5th cent./ (1883=1984: 102^{L-6}; transl. Garsoïan 1989: 144). The passage reads as follows: *Isk kinn spaneloyñ P'aranjemñ zhanderjsn pataĩcal, zgēss arjakeal, merkatit i mēj ašxaranin kocēr*: "As for P'aranjem, the wife of the slain, rending her garments and loosening her hair, she lamented with bosom bared among the mourners". The text does not cite any reading variant for *merkatit*, but Ačāryan (HAB 4: 404a) notes that in a variant one finds *merkatik*.

In the homilies by Yovhan Mandakuni (5th cent.) or Yovhan Mayragomec'i (7th cent.) one finds *merkatik*. In NHB (2: 255b) the passage is referred to *Mand. c'ank*, but this is not found in the list of abbreviations. In NHB (ibid.) the word is read as *merkatit* and identified with the above-mentioned *merkatit* of P'awstos, and is interpreted as 'with bosom bared'. Ačāryan (HAB 4: 404a, 409a), however, reads the compound as *merk-a-tig* (with *tig* 'arm'), considering *tit* 'bosom' to be a ghost-word. This is possible, though unnecessary. The interpretation suggested in NHB finds some etymological (see below) and culturological support; note the habit of lamentation by women with bosom bared known from the ancient traditions, see e.g. Herodotus 2.85 (*φαίνουσαι τοὺς μαστοὺς*), and Vardiman 1982: 292, 296, and the inset following p. 128 (= Russ. transl. 1990: 288, 292, inset following p. 192).

●**ETYM** For Ačāryan's opinion and philological discussion see above. Bugge (1890: 85-86) compares the correspondence *cic* : (*merka*)*tit* with *car* 'tree' vs. *an-tar* 'forest'.

Together with *titan* 'nurse' (Plato+), as well as *cic* 'bosom' (late attest.; widespread in dialects), *cuc* 'substance to be sucked' (Bible+), dial. 'marrow', *ccem* 'to suck' (Bible+), perhaps also *tat* 'grandmother' (widespread in dialects) [see s.v.v.], derived from PIE **gēid-* 'to suck' and/or **tēta*, cf. Lith. *žįsti*, *zidu* 'to suck',

OEngl. *titt*, Engl. *teat*, Germ. *Zitze*, etc. [Jahukyan 1967: 133₁₄₂, 174, 174₃₀, 182, 302; 1982: 61, 217₈₀; 1987: 153, 196, 593]. For the comparison with the Germanic see already Bugge 1890: 85.

For similar "Lallwörter" in Caucasian languages see HAB 2: 471b; Jahukyan 1987: 593, 608.

If the final *-d* in Hamšen *gɔv-jud* 'green lizard' (cf. *kov-cuc*, lit. 'cow-sucker') is reliable (see s.v. *kov-a-diac* 'a lizard'), one can regard the proto-form **cut* as an intermediary between *cic/cuc* and *tīt* (cf. also the above-mentioned PIE **ǵeid-* 'to suck').

Note also CunLuw. *titan-* n. '(weibliche) Brust, Zitze (bei Tieren)', *titant(i)-* 'säugend', on which see Starke 1990: 229-230. Is there any connection between Arm. *titan* 'nurse' and the Luwian words?

titan, *a*-stem (with no evidence for the declension class) 'nurse' (in Plato and Grigor Magistros); ***titani***, *ea*-stem (AblPl *i titaneac* in Plato) 'wet-nurse'; ***titanem*** 'to nurse, nurture' and ***titanean*** *dayeak* 'nurturing nurse' (Grigor Magistros).

●**ETYM** Ačāryan (HAB 4: 409b) questions: "Made from Gr. *τίτην, τιτηίον* 'nurse'?" Note also *τιθήνη* 'id.'.

For further discussion see s.v. *tīt* 'bosom' (q.v.). If there was also a verbal **tīt-* 'to nurture' (cf. Luw. **tīt(a)ji-* 'säugen', *titan-* n. '(weibliche) Brust, Zitze (bei Tieren)', *titant(i)-* 'säugend', etc. [Starke 1990: 229-230]), one might interpret *tīt-an* as a deverbative noun with the suffix *-an*.

thuk(n) 'a kind of small water worm', perhaps 'leech'.

Attested only in Anania Širakac'i (7th cent.), in NPl *tətkunk* [A. G. Abrahamyan 1944: 308^{L9}]; here a kind of frogs are said to be so small that even *tətkunk* 'swallow them (*kten znosay*). Ačāryan (HAB 4: 414b-415a) points out that the meaning is precised by the dialectal forms. He restores NSg **thuk* apparently also on the basis of the dialectal forms. Formally, the *-n-* of the plural form, perhaps also the (metathesized) *-n-* of Sebastia (see below) suggest rather **thukn*. However, *-unk* can be secondary. As to the meaning, A. G. Abrahamyan and G. B. Petrosyan (1979: 321), in their ModEArm translation of Anania Širakac'i, render the word by Arm. *tzruk* 'leech'.

●**DIAL** Baberd *thuk*, Sebastia *thunk* 'a kind of small, yellowish white water worm'. Note also Sebastia *thuk* 'a kind of freshwater insect' [Gabikyan 1952: 532]. Gabikyan (ibid.) mentions a curse formula: *Thuk gay bernēt* "May a *thuk* come out of your mouth".

Since Anania Širakac'i must have spoken a kind of proto-dialect of Karin or the like, it is interesting to note that Baberd is included in the Karin-speaking area.

●**ETYM** No acceptable etymology is recorded in HAB 4: 414b. Gabikéan (1952: 532) derives from *ṭay* 'child', which is highly improbable. Jahukyan (1967: 135; 1985: 155-156; 1990: 70) links *ṭuk* with Arm. dial. *tlk'el*, *ṭkel* 'in Wasser weich werden' etc. comparing them with Russ. *тля* (*tlja*) 'Motte', from an IE root with initial **t-*. This is not convincing, especially in view of the Armenian *t-* instead of the expected aspirated **t'*.

I wonder if *ṭuk* is somehow related with the synonymic *tzruk* 'leech' (q.v.). I propose a scenario, which, however, must be verified within the chronologal framework. All the dialectal forms representing the consonant shift *t > d*, viz. Xarberd, Sebastia, and Dersim, have undergone a metathesis: *dərzug*, *dərjug*. I assume that the metathesis was a shared innovation in these closely related dialects rather than a recent sound change having taken place in each of these dialects independently. For a certain stage prior to the consonant shift, therefore, one may reconstruct a theoretical form like **trzuk*. If the Iranian dialectal sound law **-rz- > -l-* was still operative then, Arm. **trzuk* may have been borrowed into a Iranian dialect as **fuluk* and borrowed back into Armenian *ṭuk*. Note that both *ṭuk* and the metathesized variant of *tzruk* are geographically confined to more or less the same areas, viz. Sebastia and its eastern surroundings.

***toṛ** 'neck'.

●**DIAL** A dialectal word recorded only in the (sub)dialect of Axta/Hrazdan, as informed by Sofia Ačāryan, the wife of H. Ačāryan (see HAB 4: 658a). Used only in phrases: *toṛə lc'vel ē* "his neck is thickened (lit. filled)"; *toṛə hastac'rel ē* "he has thickened his neck".

Sofia Ačāryan was a native speaker of the Axta/Hrazdan (sub)dialect [G. Step'anyan 1976: 84], and sometimes provided her husband with unique dialectal words (see e.g. AčārlPtm 2, 1951: 388).

●**ETYM** Ačāryan (HAB 4: 658a) connects with Lat. *dorsum*, *īn*. 'back; slope of a hill, ridge', for the semantic shift comparing with *šlni* 'neck' : 'face' (Hamšen), 'upper-back' (Bulanəx), q.v. For more examples see s.v.v. *oṭn* 'spine, back', *uln* 'neck', and 3.7.2.

top'em 'to beat with a beetle' (Eusebius of Caesarea), 'to beet with feet' (Yovhannēs Erznkac'i), **tp'el** ("Yaysmawurk"); **top'an**, *a*-stem (ISg *top'an-a-w*) 'beetle for

beating clothes' (Eusebius of Caesarea+); *top'ič'*, *a*-stem (IPl *top'č'-a-w-k'*) 'id.' (Gēorg vardapet Skewrac'i, 13th cent., Cilicia).

●**DIAL** The verb has been preserved in Sebastia, Alaškert, Axalc'xa, Ararat, Łarabał, Van, Moks, in the form **tp'em* 'to beat'. The noun *top'an* is present in Muš, meaning 'beetle for beating the roof to make it flat' [HAB 4: 431b].

●**ETYM** Compared with Gr. *δέφω*, *δέψω* 'to stamp, knead', SCr. *dépati* 'butt, slay', Pol. *deptać* 'tread' [Petersson 1916: 285; HAB 4: 431b; Ĵahukyan 1987: 118]. According to Clackson (1994: 224₁₁₂), the etymology is not completely certain. For the problem of the aspirated *p'* in the neighbourhood of **s* see Clackson 1994: 100, 222₆₈; cf. also *op'i* 'poplar' (q.v.). One should also take into account the possibility of an onomatopoeic word; see Ĵahukyan 1987: 319, introducing, though with reservation, Luw. *dup(p)i-* 'to beat'. Perhaps related with *tap* 'earth, ground'.

For the formation of *top'-an* see Clackson 1994: 112, 224₁₁₂.

c'awł*, *c'awł-un 'stem, stalk; straw'

The form *c'awł-un* (spelled also as *c'otun*) is more frequent in literature (Bible, Agat'angelos, Hexaemeron, etc.), whereas *c'awł/c'ot* is attested only in Hexaemeron (see K. Muradyan 1984: 134-135) and Ephrem [HAB 4: 466b]. The semantic distribution of the two forms is represented in HAB as follows: *c'awł* 'stem, stalk', *c'awł-un* 'straw'. However, *c'awłun* can also mean 'stalk', cf. in Job 24.24: *ibrew zhask ink'nin ankeal i c'awłnoy* = Gr. *ἡ ὥσπερ στάχυς ἀπὸ καλᾶμης αὐτόματος ἀποπεσών*. The context clearly shows that *c'awłun* refers to the stalk (= *καλᾶμη* 'stalk; stubble') the head of which (*hask* = *στάχυς* 'ear') has fallen down. Besides, dial. **c'ot* (see below) refers both to the stalk and straw. Consequently, the meaning of *c'awł*, *c'awł-un* should be represented as 'stem, stalk; straw' indiscriminately.

●**DIAL** In the dialects of Ararat, Van, Muš, Bulanəx, Alaškert: **c'ot* 'stalk; straw' [HAB 4: 466b]. According to Ačaryan (1952: 49, 296), Van has both forms, with and without *-un*, viz. *c'ot* and *c'otun*. Note also Moks *c'ot* 'millet-straw', GSg *c'otē*, NPl *c'otir* [Orbeli 2002: 339]. On the importance of the Van and Moks forms see below.

●**ETYM** The testimony of the dialect of Van may be important as to the question of the original vocalism since it regularly distinguishes the ClArm. vowels *ō* (= *aw*) and *o*, reflecting them as *ɔ* and *o* [*wo*], respectively (see Ačaryan 1952: 38-39, 48-49). As we saw above, the literary forms of the word for 'stalk; straw' show a fluctuation between *ō* (= *aw*) and *o*. Ačaryan (op. cit. 49; see also 296) explicitly points out, that Van *c'ot* and *c'otun*, despite the fluctuation shown by their literary counterparts,

always have an *ɔ*. This implies that the spelling variant with the *ō* (= *aw*), which is also better attested, is the original one.

Next to the well-attested *o*-stem, *c'awtun* also has an *an*-stem in Netos (GDSg *c'otuan* and ISg *c'ōtuamb*) [NHB 2: 922a]. For this ambiguity cf. *srun-k'* 'shank' (in Moks: 'stubble'). The root of the latter word is **sru-* (cf. Lat. *crūs* 'shank'; see also *sru-il* 'a kind of musical instrument'), so the suffix can be the same *-un*. Unlike *c'awtun* (*o*-stem), *srun-k'* has an *i*-stem, which is perhaps due to contamination with (the Iranian cognate of) PIE **krūs-ni-*, cf. Skt. *śroṇi-* f. (most in dual) 'buttock, hip, loin', YAv *sraoni-* f. 'buttock, hip', NPers. *surūn* 'buttock'; Lat. *clūnis* 'buttock, club, tail-bone'; Lith. *šlaunis* 'hip, thigh'; etc. It may also have been a dual form. For the suffix cf. also *kot'* 'stem, stalk; handle, shaft' - *kot'-un* 'id.'; *joť* 'log, pole' - *jetun/jotun-k'* 'ceiling' (q.v.).

There is no evidence for the declension class of *c'awt*. The absence of *-n* in the paradigm of Moks shows that the form *c'ot* did not have a nasal stem.

I conclude that the original form is *c'awt*, which, though poorly attested in literature, is the basic form represented by the dialects; *cawt-un* is its derivative in the suffix *-un*, found in a number of synonymically close words.

No acceptable etymology is recorded in HAB 4: 466b. Jahukyan (1967: 180) derives the word from PIE **kolH-* 'stubble', cf. *καλάμη* 'stalk; stubble', etc. (see Schrijver 1991: 327). The vocalism, however, does not suite, because the original Armenian form is *c'awt(un)*. One may consider a connection with **keh₂ul-*: Gr. *καυλός* m. 'stem, pole'; Lat. *caulis* m. 'stem (of a plant), stalk, cabbage'; OIr. *cúal* f. 'faggot, bundle of sticks'; Lith. *káulas* m. 'bone', Latv. *kaūls* m. 'bone, stem' (see Schrijver 1991: 268-269). {{NOTE - According to Beekes (1969: 178, 290), the Greek and Lithuanian words may be of substratum origin. - ENDNOTE}} The only problem is the absence of the *s*-mobile, which would explain the initial *c'-* (instead of the expected *k'-*). The same concerns the Jahukyan's etymology, too. In the latter case we are dealing with a PIE **k̂-* rather than a **k-*. This is not relevant here, however, since both **ŝk̂* and **sk̂* result in Arm. *c'*. The PIE *s*-mobile is very unstable, thus one may not rule out its postulation in *c'awt(un)* and in some other cases even if there are no traces of it in cognate languages (see also Jahukyan 1967: 177ff). Thus: PIE **skeh₂ul-* 'stem (of a plant); bone' > Arm. *c'awt* 'stem, stalk; straw'.

c'ncam 'to joy, rejoice'
(Bible+).

●**DIAL** T'iflis *c'ñjal* 'to joy, rejoice', Muš *c'ñjum* 'joy'; Ararat *c'ñjin tal* 'to shine with a beautiful colour', said of the cornfield. In metaphorical or jocular usage: Polis, Karin, Sebastia, Moks, Zeyt'un, Łarabał, Źuła, etc. 'to pay' [HAB 4: 459]. Note also Zeyt'un *c'ñjɔl* 'to joy' [Ačāryan 2003: 341].

There is no evidence for the vocalism of the verbal stem, which may have been either **c'inc-* or **c'unc-*. In this connection Zeyt'un *c'ñjɔl* seems relevant. The infinitive ending *-ɔl* of the Zeyt'un regularly derives from *-al*. Note that the verb *c'ncam* (inf. *c'ncal*) belongs to *a*-conjugation both in ClArm. and in all the dialects. The vocalic development **c'ncɔl* > *c'ñjɔl* is regular too, cf. *targal* 'spoon' > Zeyt'un *d'ɔg'ɔl*, *xndal* 'to joy' > Zeyt'un *xɔndɔl*, *merkanal* > Zeyt'un *mɔyɔɔɔɔl* vs. *merk* 'naked' > *miyg*, etc. (see Ačāryan 2003: 24-25, 146198-201). This implies that Zeyt'un *c'ñjɔl* cannot be taken as evidence for the original vocalism of the verbal stem.

●**ETYM** Scheftelowitz (1904-05, 1: 293) links with Skt. *chand-* 'to appear (good); to please' (RV+), *chāndu-* 'pleasing' (RV), YAv. *saδaiieiti* 'to appear', etc. and derives the Armenian from **skend-jo-*. (Note also, perhaps, Skt. *(s)cand-* 'to shine, glitter', *candra-* 'shining, light', *hāri-scandra-* 'glittering as gold').

Ačāryan (HAB 4: 459a) does not accept this and the other etymologies and leaves the origin of the word open.

The etymology of Scheftelowitz is possible, though the semantic relationship is not straightforward. The protoform **skend-jo-*, however, would yield Arm. **c'(i)nč-*. I propose to derive **c'inc-* from the sigmatic aorist form **skend-s-*, cf. Skt. (RV) 3sg.act. *achān*, 3pl.act. *achāntsur*, subj. *chantsat*, imper. *chantsi* (see Mayrhofer, EWAia 1, 1992: 555-556; Lubotsky 2001a: 32; Baum 2006: 110). Note also Skt. *(s)cand-* 'to shine, glitter', *candra-* 'shining, light', *hāri-scandra-* 'glittering as gold', probably belonging to the same root (cf. Lubotsky 2001a: 49-50). The meaning 'to shine' agrees with that of the Armenian dialect of Ararat. For the regular development **-ds-* > Arm. *-c-* see 2.2.1.2.

uln (GDSg *ulan*, NPl *ulunk*; GDPl *ulanc*) 'neck'.

Bible+. Spelled also as *utn* and *oln*. According to Norayr - MArm. *yulanc' tal* 'to push (Fr. *pousser*)' (see HAB 3: 592b).

●**DIAL** Ačāryan records only Źuła *ulanc' tal* 'to push with one's arm' [HAB 3: 592b], which is identic with the MArm. form of Norayr (see above). In "Bağgirk' hayoc'" (see Amalyan 1975: 191^{Nr453}), *hrel* is interpreted as *meržel*, *kam k'ri tal*, *kam ulans tal*.

Note also Muš *par'eki hulunk'* 'spinal column' glossed in HŽHek' 12, 1984: 641a. Since *par'ek-i* means 'of back', *uln* here seems to refer to 'vertebra'; see below.

●**ETYM** Derived from PIE **Heh₃l-en-* or **HoHl-en-*: Gr. *ὀλένη* f. 'elbow, underarm'; Lat. *ulna* f. 'elbow'; OHG *el(i)na* f. 'ell'; etc., as well as Arm. *oṭn* (GDSg *oṭin*, ISg *oṭamb*, NPl *oṭunk'*, GDPl *oṭanc'*) 'spine, back(bone); spine with spinal cord; marrow' (q.v.). As to the semantic difference, one should pay attention to MArm. *yulanc' tal* 'to push'. Naturally, one cannot push with one's neck. In the dialect of Ĵuta, the exact meaning of this expression is 'to push with one's arm'. Actually, one pushes with one's elbow (or shoulder). Here, thus, one might see the underlying meaning 'elbow', which is identic with the semantics of the PIE word. As to the association between Arm. *oṭn* 'spine, backbone; etc.' and *uln* 'neck', cf. Gr. *σφόινδύλος* m. 'vertebra; (pl.) backbone, spine; neck; joint; etc.'. Note that the neck is, in fact, a part of the spinal column. Finally, Muš *par'eki hulunk'* 'spinal column' actually means 'vertebrae of back' and can be considered an important intermediary between *oṭn* and *uln*.

Liden (1906: 129-130), though with some reservation, connects *uln* 'neck' with the homonymous *uln* (NPl *ulunk'*, GDPl *ulanc'*) 'a piece of pearl or glass, bead; knucklebone; collarbone, clavicle' (Bible+); widespread in dialects, mostly in the meaning 'beads'; in Grigoris Aršaruni (7-8th cent.): IPl *ul-ov-k'* (thus, *ul*, *o*-stem). See also Ĵahukyan 1987: 165.

uln (NPl *ulunk'*, GDPl *ulanc'*) 'a piece of pearl or glass, bead; knucklebone; collarbone, clavicle' (Bible+); widespread in dialects, mostly in the meaning 'beads'; in Grigoris Aršaruni (7-8th cent.): IPl *ul-ov-k'* (thus, *ul*, *o*-stem).

API *uluns* is found in Yovhan Mandakuni/Mayragomec'i (5th/7th cent.), in a list of sorceries (2003: 1262b^{L5f}).

●**ETYM** See s.v. *uln* 'neck'.

utet, *o*-stem (GSg *utḥoy*) 'brain' (Eznik, Buzand, etc.), 'marrow' (Bible+).

Later variants: *utiṭ*, *utiwṭ*, *ytiṭ*, *yteṭ*, *ətuṭ*, *əteṭ*.

●**DIAL** The dialects have two basic forms: *utet* and **utu/oṭ*. The latter variant which contains a labial vowel in the second syllable is also attested in later literature (see above). For Svedia (ə)teṭ, *tūt* 'marrow' see *oṭn*. The initial *u* of the form **utuṭ* is mostly reduced to *ə* or zero. It has been preserved (or secondarily restored as in *ptut* 'fruit' > Marāṭa *putuṭ*, etc.?) in Marāṭa and Č'aylu *ṭṭṭ* (see Ač'aryan 1926: 70, 107, 418; Davt'yan 1966: 449), Urmia (Xoy) *ṭṭṭ* [M. Asatryan 1962: 204a], Kak'avaberd

utóť (in two villages; in the other two - *toť*) [H. Muradyan 1967: 182a]; Nor-Naxijewan *otóť* 'marrow' (see Ačarean 1925: 446; in 64 - as an exception to the rule *u*/unstressed/ > *ə* > zero). There are alternating forms with and without an initial *h*- (Łarabať *otóť*, *hətoť*, *hutóť* [Davt'yan 1966: 449]; Karčewan *otóť*, *hətoť* [H. Muradyan 1960: 202b]), and *y*'- (Muš *y'tet* next to *utet*).

Hamšen has *utet* and *etu* (GSg *uteti*, *etvi*) for 'brain', and (*oskri*) *yet* for 'marrow' [Ačaryan 1947: 27, 54, 250].

The "pure" root **ut* 'brain' is found in Modern Armenian *utn u cucə* 'the true nature, the essence' (see Malxaseanc', HBB 3: 597a), literally: "the brain and marrow" (cf. s.v. *ilik*). Malxasyanc' (ibid.) also introduces the variant *utť*. However, one cannot be sure whether this is a really existing form or a mere theoretical construction to illustrate the intermediary stage in the development *ute/it* > *ut*. At any rate, **ut* is found only in the expression *utn u cucə* and seems to be merely a reduced form from *utet*.

●**ETYM** No acceptable etymology is recorded in HAB 3: 594. Considered to be a word of unknown origin, see Ĵahukyan 1990: 71 (sem. field 4), 72 (noting that this is a basic term which has neither native Armenian nor borrowed synonyms).

In view of GSg *utťoy*, the older NSg can be restored as **utť* [Meillet 1913: 20].

The variants with a labial vowel in the second syllable, viz. **ututť*, and perhaps also *utiwtť* [= /utiwtť?], need an explanation. In view of the absence of reliable examples, Ačaryan (1926: 70) points out that the sound change seen in Marafať *otóť* cannot be specified. H. Muradyan (1960: 30) explains the Karčewan form (*h*)*otóť* from *utet* by regressive assimilation (*utet* > **ututť*) and change of the pretonic *u* to *ə*. One may also think of vocalic metathesis (see 2.1.26.4). In either case, however, one has to explain why the same dialects have both variants side by side: Van *utet* and *utotť*, Ĵuťa *etet* and *etutť* (HAB), Mehtišen *etetť*, *otóť* [Davt'yan 1966: 449]. Besides, the variant **ututť* is widespread in many dialects ranging from Nor-Naxijewan and T'iflis to Syria, Persia and Łarabať, and the spelling variant *utiwtť* seems to have solid philological basis (cf. Olsen 1999: 56-57₁₂₀). Ĵahukyan (1987: 374), with some reservation, sees in *utiwtť* a vowel palatalization. Olsen (ibid.) even treats *utiwtť* as the original form, ascribing etymological value to *-w-*. She suggests a compound of *uti* 'road' (q.v.), here in the meaning 'tube' > 'hollow bone' (cf. in particular OPr. *aulis* 'shin-bone') + **plh₁o-* 'fill', so the original meaning would be 'bone-filler' [Olsen 1999: 56-57].

The restoration of such a compound, however, does not seem probable. Furthermore, this interpretation exaggerates the role of the form *utiwtť* and ignores the other forms, of which *utetť* is indispensable. Therefore, one may tentatively

suggest the following paradigm: NSg **ut-ut*, Obl. **ut-et*. These doublets can theoretically betray an IE *l*-stem with **-ōl* in the nominative and **-el-* elsewhere, cf. *acut* *asetn* 'needle', etc. (see 2.2.2.5). It is interesting, that both *asetn*/**asut* and *utet*/**utut* are represented in certain dialects by semantic differentiation. For *asetn* see s.v. As for *utet*, note Van *utet* 'brain' vs. *utot* 'marrow' [HAB 3: 594b]; Hamšen *etu* 'brain' vs. *yet* 'marrow' [Ačaryan 1947: 27, 54, 250]. The semantic details of the correspondent pair in Ĵuṭa and Mehtišen are not known. In Muš, such a semantic differentiation is represented by the doublets differing in anlaut: *y'tet* 'brain' vs. *utet* 'marrow' [HAB 3: 594b].

If my analysis is accepted, one may tentatively connect the root **ut-* 'marrow; brain' with *otn* (GDSg *otin*, ISg *otamb*, NPl *otunk**, GDPl *otanc**) 'spine, back(bone); spine with spinal cord; marrow' (Bible+; dialects). The latter, despite the semantic difference, is usually derived from PIE **Heh₃l-en-*: Gr. *ὠλένη* f. 'elbow, underarm'; Lat. *ulna* f. 'elbow'; OHG *el(i)na* f. 'ell'; Lith. *úolektis*, Latv. *uōlekts* 'ell', etc., as well as Arm. *uln* (GDSg *ulan*, NPl *ulunk**, GDPl *ulanc**) 'neck' (Bible+; dialect of Ĵuṭa) and *utuk* 'palm, distance from the thumb to the little finger' (Bible+; dialect of Łarabaṭ, with an initial *h-*), see Lidén 1906: 127-130; HAB 3: 554, 592; Pokorny 1959: 308; *Frisk 2: 1146-1147; Schrijver 1991: 78-79, 339, 352; Olsen 1999: 125-126.

Unlike the cases of *asetn* and *acut*, however, there is no ground for a PIE *l*-stem here. If the PIE word did have *l*-stem (**HVH-l-*, see Schrijver 1991: 78-79), it is already reflected in Arm. **ut-*. The ending of the Armenian form can be a suffix. It is worth of mentioning that Gr. *μν-ελός* m. 'marrow' (Homer+), all the etymological attempts of which deal with the root **μν-* (see Frisk 2: 264; Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984: 818 with ref.; Watkins 1995: 531⁷, 535-536), has the same suffix **-elo-*. Note also Gr. *σφόδ-ῶλος* m. 'vertebra; (pl.) backbone, spine; neck; joint; circular whorl which balances and twirls a spindle'. The Armenian by-form **ut-ut*, then, can be due to influence of the proto-paradigm of *asetn* etc. See also *atetn*.

I conclude: next to *ot-n* 'spine; marrow' and *ul-n* 'neck', there was also **ut-* 'spine', which, with the suffix **-elo-*, formed *ut-et*, *o*-stem 'brain; marrow'.

How to explain the later literary forms *ytiṭ* and *yteṭ*, as well as dial. (Muš) *y'tet* (next to *utet*), as well as the initial *h-* Łarabaṭ and some adjacent dialects? Since the initial *u-* is in a pretonic syllable, it can have replaced an older **uy-* (in terms of the ClArm orthography, *oy-*). We arrive, then, at a **uytiṭo-*. In some of the dialectal areas and/or at some stages, the initial **uy-* might yield *ü* and/or *yu-*. There are several cases which seem to prove this phenomenon. In this particular case, however, one may prefer restoring of a by-form with the prefix *y-* < **h₁en-* 'in' (see 2.3.1).

The etymological meaning of *ut-et* (if indeed related with *ot-n* 'spine, etc.') is 'spine'. In **y-utet* 'marrow; brain', then, the marrow (or brain) is seen as substance which is *in the spine* (or *in the skull*).

utuk 'palm, distance from the thumb to the little finger'

Bible. Also *utk-ean* 'handbreadth' (Bible+), see Olsen 1999: 501-502.

● **DIAL** Լարաթ *hətk*, *hətk*ʹ, Mehtišen *hətuk* [HAB 3: 597; Davt'yan 1966: 449]. Davt'yan (ibid.) cites *k'et*, *ket*, as well as *t'iz* under the lemma *utuk*, as if they are semantically identic. According to Malxaseanc' (HBB 3: 600a), the unit of length *utuk* denotes not only the palm, but also the distance between the thumb and the forefinger (index finger), or the distance of four fingers. In "Bārgirk' hayoc'" (see Amalyan 1975: 260^{Nr208}), *utuk* is interpreted by *t'iz* and *tuk*. This implies that in the 17th century *tuk* was a living form [HAB 3: 597b]. "Bārgirk' hayoc'" also has *utkēn*, rendered as *t'zaw*, ISg of *t'iz* (see Amalyan 1975: 260^{Nr202}), which should be linked with *utkean*.

● **ETYM** Ačaryan (HAB 3: 597) connects with Lat. *ulna* 'elbow; ell'; Goth. *aleina* 'ell (distance from elbow to finger tips)', etc. (see s.v.v. *otn* and *uln*). This is accepted by Jahukyan (1987: 122). Olsen (1999: 941), though referring to HAB 3: 597, does not mention this etymology and places *utuk* in the list of words of unknown origin. For the semantics cf. PToch. **ale(n)* 'palm of the hand' (see Hilmarsson 1986: 231-232) { {perhaps also Hitt. *ḫaḫḫal-* 'palm of the hand' (see Schrijver 1991: 78)?} }.

In view of the cognate forms with a **-k-*, viz. Lith. *uolektis*, Latv. *uolekts* 'ell'; Lith. *alkūnė* 'elbow', Latv. *ēlkuonis* 'elbow, bend', etc. (see s.v. *olok*'), one wonders if a PArm. **ut-k-* underlies *utuk*. The unaspirated *-k* could be due to contamination with *-k-ean* (cf. *vayr-(i)k-ean* 'moment'). If this is true, the word-final *-k*' in Լարաթ *hətk*ʹ may become significant, and the internal *-u-* in *utuk* should be treated as secondary, unless *utuk* is from **HoHI-ōk*. Note also the identity of the root vocalism with the vowel preceding the *-k/k*' in *il-ik*, *ol-ok*ʹ, and *ut-uk* (cf. 2.1.23). If the word-initial aspiration of Լարաթ *hətk*ʹ is old, the corresponing EArm. proto-form would be **h₃eHI-* (vs. *utuk* < **HoHI-?*). See also *otn* and *olok*'.

!Compare Oss. **ulVng* 'distance between the thumb and the index finger', which is described by Gatuev (1933: 146) as follows: *улынґ* 'мера длины, равная расстоянию между концами растянутых большого и указательного пальцев' (vs. *удисн* 'мера длины, равная расстоянию между концами растянутых большого пальца и мизинца').

und, *o*-stem: ISg *ənd-o-v* in Yovhan Mandakuni (2003: 1172a^{L16}); IPI *ənd-o-v-k'* (var. *ənd-a-w-k'*) in Ephrem. 'edible seed, grain'.

Bible+. In Daniel 1.12 and 16: API *und-s*, ASg *und* [Cowe 1992: 154], rendering Gr. *σπέρμα* 'seed; seed-time, sowing; germ; race, origin, descent'. With an initial *h-*, **hund**, *o*-stem, *i*-stem, attested in Nonnus of Nisibis (GSg *hnd-o-y*) and Plato. In NHB 2: 124c, *o*-stem; Ačāryan (HAB 3: 601a) also has as *o*-stem, but he cites GDPI *hnd-i-c'* (Nonnus), which points to *i*-stem. In John Chrysostom: *det-a-hund* 'herb-seed'.

Compounds: *ənd-a-but* 'feeding on seeds, herbs' (P'awstos Buzand 6.16), *und-a-ker* 'id.' (Agat'angelos), etc.

●**DIAL** The form *hund* is widespread in dialects: Aslanbek, Axalc'xa, Muš, Cilicia, Ararat, etc. Without the initial *h-*: Xarberd and T'iflis [HAB 3: 601b].

●**ETYM** Ačāryan (HAB 3: 601) rejects all the etymological attempts including those connecting with Skt. *ándhas-* and Gr. *ἄνθος* (Canini, Müller) and leaves the origin of the word open. Ĵahukyan (1990: 72, sem. field 8) considers a word of unknown origin.

The connection with Skt. *ándhas-* etc. cannot be ruled out; see s.v. *and* 'cornfield'.

unkn (singulative; spelled also as *ungn*), *an*-stem: GDSg *unkan* (abundant in the Bible), AblSg *y-unkan-ē* (Bible, Ephrem), ISg *unkam-b* in "Šarakan" (in plural, only GDPI *unkan-c'* in "Tatāran") 'ear'; **unkn dnem** 'to listen (to)' (Bible+), e.g. in Genesis 18.10 [Zeyt'unean 1985: 220]: *Ew Sarra unkn dnēr aī dran xoraniñ : Σαρρα δὲ ἤκουσεν πρὸς τῇ θύρᾳ τῆς σκηνῆς. unkn* 'handle of pitchers, cups, etc.': API *unkun-s* several times in Paterica)

●**DIAL** Preserved in numerous dialects, in the meaning 'handle': Hamšen, T'iflis, Ararat, Alaškert *ung*, Axalc'xa *vong*, Akn *unk'*, Svedia *üng*, etc. [HAB 3: 604a], Ĵuša *ungn*, gen. *əngn-i* [Ačārean 1940: 381a], Łarabał *ōngnə, ōynə* [Davit'yan 1966: 450].

Ačāryan (HAB 3: 604a) points out that the basic meaning of the word, viz. 'ear', has been preserved only in Šatax *unk^gtal* 'to hear, give importance/appreciation to what has been said'. In her ClArm. > Šatax vocabulary, M. Muradyan (1962: 203b) glosses *unk* [read *unkn* ? - HM] by Šatax *ungy* 'attention'. For the semantics cf. Arm. *uš* from the Iranian cognate of this PIE word (see below). Thus, Šatax *unk^gtal* 'to hear, give importance/appreciation to what has been said' can be treated as *unk'/g^y tal* 'to give ear/attention', with *tal* 'to give'.

●**ETYM** Since long (NHB 2: 551a; Bugge 1889: 24; Meillet 1936: 84), derived from the PIE word for 'ear': Gr. *οὐς*, GSg *ὠτός*, NAPI *ὠτα*, also GSg *οὔατος*, pl. *-ατα*; Dor. and Hellenistic NSg *ὠς*, *ᾠτα* (Tarentinian gloss) n. 'ear; handle of pitchers,

cups, etc.’, Av. *uši* (dual) ‘ears’, Pahl. *ōš*, *ōš-īh*, ManichMPers. and NPers. *hōš* ‘consciousness, intelligence’ (see MacKenzie 1971: 61), Arm. *uš* ‘mind, intelligence, consciousness, attention’ (Iranian loanword; for the semantics see above on the Šatax dialect), Lat. *auris* f. ‘ear’, *aus-cultāre* (> Fr. *écouter*) ‘to hear’, OIr. *áu*, GSg *ae* n. ‘ear’ (*s*-stem), Lith. *ausis* f., OCS *uxo* n., gen. *ušese* ‘ear’ (*s*-stem), etc. [HAB 3: 603-604; Pokorny 1959: 785; Mallory/Adams 1997: 173b].

The Armenian form is derived from **(H)us-n-*, with the nasal seen in Gr. GSg *ὀὔατος* < **-n-t-*, Germ. **ausōn*, Goth. gen. *ausins*, Pr. *ausins*, etc., and with the suffix *-kn* as in *akn* ‘eye’, *armukn* ‘elbow’, etc. [Bugge 1889: 24; Hübschmann 1897: 484; HAB, *ibid.*; Lindeman 1980: 60-62; Pisani 1950: 167]. A diminutive **us-on-ko-m* has been assumed (Osthoff, Pokorny; Ĵahukyan 1982: 52, 113-114; 1987: 142). According to Meillet (1896a: 369, 369₁), the **-n-* is comparable with the nasal found in other body-part terms such as Skt. *ākṣi-*, GSg *akṣṇās* ‘eye’, *śīras*, *śīrṣṇās* ‘head’, etc. Compare also Arm. *y-awn-k* ‘eyebrow’, if it reflects PArm. **aw-n-* ‘eye’ from **h₃k^w-n-* (see s.v.). According to Kortlandt (1985b: 10 = 2003: 58), *unkn* consists of *un-* < ASg **us-m*, and *-kn* taken from *akn* ‘eye’, and the plural *akanj-k* remains unexplained.

Greek has *o*-vocalism whereas e.g. Lat. *auris* points to **h₂eus-* [Beekes 1969: 168]. It has been assumed that the Greek has taken **o-* from the word for ‘eye’, and the original anlaut is maintained in Tarentinian *ἀτα* < **ǎφατα* [Schrijver 1991: 47]. Given the abundance of body-part terms with *o*-grade in the root, **h₂ous-* may be restored with more confidence. One wonders if we are dealing with nom. **o* vs. (acc./)gen. **e* as is assumed (e.g. in Beekes 1995: 188-189) for the words for ‘knee’ and ‘foot’. Arm. *unkn* may reflect either *o-* or zero-grade. Beekes (2003: 189) assumes **h₂us-n-*.

Further see s.v. *akanj* ‘ear’.

For the meaning ‘handle of pitchers, cups, etc.’ of *unkn* compare the Greek cognate.

unc^č-k^č, *a*-stem ‘nose; the part between the nose and the mouth; moustache’ (Bible+).

●**DIAL** Preserved in the Łarabał expression **unc^čə č^čē* ‘he does not care’, lit. “it is not (of) his nose/moustache” [HAB 3: 604b].

●**ETYM** Considered to be a word of unknown origin, see HAB 3: 604b (rejecting all the etymological attempts, as well as the connection with the PIE word for ‘nose’: Skt. *nās-*, *nāsā-* f., Lat. *nāris* f., NPl *nārēs*, Lith. *nósīs*, etc.); Ĵahukyan 1990: 72 (noting that this is a basic term which has neither native Armenian nor borrowed synonyms); Olsen 1999: 941.

Given that Arm. *unc̣'-k'* the principle (and the only) term for 'the part between the nose and the mouth; moustache' (for 'nose' there is *k'it'*, also of unknown origin), its native origin is highly plausible. The semantics of the word points to two possible basic meanings: '[that] below the nose' or '[that] above the mouth' (typologically cf. s.v. *y-awn-k'* 'eyebrows'). I tentatively propose a derivation from QIE **upo-(H)neh₂s-* '[that] below the nose', cf. Gr. *ὐπὲρ νη* f. 'moustache' (though there are formal problems), OPruss. *po-nasse* 'upper lip' (see Adams apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 395a).

It is difficult to determine the exact type of derivation for the Armenian. One might assume QIE **upo-(H)neh₂s-ieh₂-*, or dual **-ih₁-eh₂-* 'below the nostrils', developing into PArm. **upun-ja-* (regular loss of **-s-* and haplogy of **-eh₂-*) > **uwunj̄-* > **unj̄-*. Compare *lanj̄-k'*, *a*-stem 'breast', also a dual (see s.v.). The final *-č'* instead of **-j̄-* may be due to influence of *pinč'* 'nostrils' (Damask. etc.; in derivatives: John Chrysostom, Dawit' Anyat', etc.; widespread in dialects, also meaning 'nose', 'muzzle', etc.), and *dunc̣'* 'the projecting part of the head, including the nose, mouth and jaws' (Mařak'ia Abeta or Grigor Akanec'i /13th cent./ etc.; widespread in dialects), unless this comes from **and-unc̣'*, as is interpreted in Margaryan 1971: 219-221. Otherwise: QIE **upo-(H)neh₂s-* > PArm. **upún(a)-* > **un-* + *-č'* analogically after the above-mentioned *dunc̣'* and *pinč'*.

[Alternative: QIE **up-ōs-nieh₂-* 'that above the mouth' (: Shughni *bún* 'beard', if from **upā(ha)nā-*, cf. YAv. *āghan-* 'mouth'; see s.v. *yawn-k'*].

unj̄, *o*-stem: GDSg *ənj̄-o-y* in Gregory of Nyssa 'bottom, depth (of a sea etc.); root; the underground, Underworld'.

P'awstos Buzand, Hexaameron, Philo, etc.

In P'awstos Buzand 4.18 (1883=1984: 109^{L9f}): *zi ēr hārcal zxorann i jor yunj̄ berdin* : "for the tent was pitched in the gorge beneath the fortress" (transl. Garsoïan 1989: 149^{L3f}). [See on this s.v. place-name *K'ar(ah)unj̄*]. In 4.8 (82^{L-6f}, transl. 128): APl *unj̄-s* 'roots' and *ənj̄-ov-in* 'with roots'. In 4.54 (143^{L-11f}): *ənd unj̄* "into the earth".

L. Hovhannisyan (1990a: 153) has found *an-unj̄* 'bottomless' (not in NHB) attested in Agat'angelos. Ačairyan (HAB 3: 604b) records the word referring to "Arjern bararan" (1865) but not mentioning any literary attestation.

●**ETYM** No acceptable etymology is recorded in HAB 3: 604b.

See s.v.v. *unj̄₂* 'treasure', *unj̄₂* 'soot', and 1.12.6.

unj̄₂ prob. 'treasure, treasury, granary, barn'.

In P'awstos Buzand 5.6 (1883=1984: 171^{L17f}): *i gawain Ayrayratu i mec i gewtn enjin ark'uni, orum Ardeansn koč'en*. Garsoian (1989: 196, cf. also 312₂, 444-445) translates as follows: "to the large village named Ardeans, at the royal [fortress] of the district of Ayrarat". Malxasyanc' (1987: 313) renders *enj-in* by ModArm. *kalvac* 'estate'.

●**ETYM** Ačaryan (HAB 3: 605a) identifies with Georg. *unji* 'treasure', of which *unj-eba* (verb) is derived, corresponding to Arm. *ganj-em* in the Bible. Then he (ibid.) notes that he does not know whether there is a connection with *unj₁* 'depth, bottom' (q.v.). I think the connection is very plausible. The semantic development would have been '*bottom, depth, the underground' > 'buried/underground treasure or granary'. Note that *unj* is attested in P'awstos Buzand in various senses: 'bottom, below', 'depth', 'root' (see s.v. *unj₁*), and 'treasury, granary, barn' (see the passage above). For semantic (cf. *ganj*) and etymological discussion see 1.12.6. See also s.v. *unj₃*.

In the passage from P'awstos, thus, *Ardeans* is said to be a village of the royal treasury or, perhaps better, of the royal granary/barn. This may be corroborated by the etymology of the place-name (q.v.).

unj₃ 'soot (in stoves; resulted by smoke); rust'.

Two late attestations only: "History of the nation of the Archers (i.e. the Mongols)" by Małak'ia Abeta or Grigor Akanec'i (13th cent.), and "Oskip'orik".

●**DIAL** Preserved in some (mainly eastern) peripheral dialects, as *unj* or *enj* (without an initial *h*-): Šamšadin/Diliĵan [Mežunc' 1989: 196a]; Areš [Lusenc' 1982: 230a]; Šamaxi [Bałramyan 1964: 220], Kırzen [Bałramyan 1961: 197a], Łarabał [Davit'yan 1966: 459], Goris [Margaryan 1975: 356], Mełri [Ałayan 1954: 283], Karčewan [Muradyan 1960: 202b], Kak'avaberd [Muradyan 1967: 182a]. The basic meaning is 'soot'.

Ačaryan specifies the semantic chain found in Łarabał (probably in Šamaxi and Goris, too) as follows: 'soot; iron-rust; sooty spider-web near stoves' [Ačarean 1913: 867b; HAB 3: 605a]. Concerning the spider-web see below (Hin Ĵuła); cf. also s.v. **mglamandi*. The semantic relationship 'soot' : 'spider-web' parallels Akn *mlul/r* [HAB 3: 352b]. In Areš the meaning is 'iron-rust'. For the meaning 'rust' cf. s.v. **banj*. Important is the meaning in Kırzen: 'rust; sediment' (see below).

Amatuni (1912: 536b) records Van *unj* 'rust of metals'. He refers to the word-collection of *T'oxmaxean* compiled in the prison of Van, and one is not sure whether he had also an independent information for this word.

Šatax *uč* ‘soot’ (see M. Muradyan 1962: 203b) and Moks (the village of Sip) *auč* ‘soot’ (see HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 137-138), both unnoticed by Ačāryan, seem to be very important. According to M. Muradyan 1982: 135, the meaning is ‘wet soot’.

Some other forms appear with an initial *m*-. Hin Juła *munj* ‘spider-web’, Van and Marała *munj-kat* ‘*muč-kat*’ ‘dropping of sooty water from the chimney; sooty water that drops from chimneys’, Ararat *mnj-ot* ‘sooty’ [Ačārean 1913: 796b; Ačāryan 1952: 43, 82, 101, 286; HAB 3: 605a]. Ačāryan (1952: 43) explains this *m*- by a confusion with *munj* ‘dumb’ (q.v.), which is semantically improbable. I think it should rather be explained by the influence of or contamination with *mur* and **murč*₋₁ ‘soot’ (see especially the latter), as well as *mocir*/*močir* ‘ash’. For *munj-kat* ‘*muč-kat*’ cf. the synonymous *mr-kat* in Alaškert (see Ačārean 1913: 802b). The variant *muč-kat* can provide us with additional (indirect) evidence for the nasalless form **uč* (Šatax, Sip).

For an alternative explanation for the initial *m*- see below.

●**ETYM** No etymological attempt is known to me.

The word may be related with *unj*₁ ‘bottom, depth’ (> *unj*₂ ‘treasure’). Its basic meaning would then be ‘sediment/Bodensatz’ (< ‘settling, sinking down’); cf. *mur* ‘soot’ vs. *mrur* ‘sediment’. Remarkably, Kizen *unj* refers to not only ‘rust’ (*žang*), but also ‘sediment’ (*mrur*). The semantics is corroborated by *mat-unč* ‘sediment of grain left on the bottom of a sieve’ (with the first component *mat* ‘sieve’), attested in “Oskip’orik” (probably by Grigor Tat’ewac’i, 14-15th cent.). According to HAB (3: 604b), this compound contains *unj*₁ ‘bottom’. This can serve as a semantic intermediary between *unj*₁ ‘bottom’ and *unj*₃ ‘soot’ (< sediment). Also the following seems relevant for the connection: *unj*₃ ‘soot’ (< sediment) has been preserved only SE dialects (Goris, Łarabał, etc.), and *unj*₁ ‘bottom’ is absent in dialects. However, the latter is found in a number of place-names located in Goris and adjacent areas (see s.v. *K’ar(ah)unj*), and Grigor T’at’ewac’i (see above on *mat-unč*) has lived in Tat’ew, in vicinity of Goris.

The etymology is uncertain. Besides, *unj*₃ ‘soot’, being basically a dialectal word, has a by-form **uč* in Šatax and Sip, as well as, indirectly, in Van and Marała, which seems to be older, because the addition of an epenthetic *-n-* is quite widespread in Armenian dialects (see 2.2.1.3), while a loss of an etymological *-n-* is hardly probable. M. Muradyan (1962: 53, 62) assumes that in Šatax *uč* the nasal has dropped. This is not convincing, because the only other example, that is *knunk* ‘baptism’ > *kənuḱ* ‘y’, has a secondary *-unk*’, and *knuk*’ (attested literarily, too) can be seen as another analogical creation deduced from *knk’em* ‘to stamp; to baptize’;

the root *knik* ‘stamp; baptism’, with an etymological *-i-*, is not preserved in the dialects. On the contrary, the addition of the nasal is quite frequent in Šatax; see Muradyan 1962: 64.

Arm. **uč* ‘soot’ can go back to IE **sōd-ǵV-* ‘soot’: PSlav. **sadjā* (OCS *sažda* ‘ᾠσβολος’, Czech *saze*, Russ. *saža*, etc.), Lith. *súodžiai* pl., OIc, OEngl. *sōt*, Engl. *soot*, OIr. *sūide* f. (< **sōdǵā-*) (see Pokorny 1959: 886; Fasmer 3, 1971: 544); Mallory/Adams 1997: 522b). This is derived from **sed-* ‘to sit’ and basically means ‘sediment/Bodensatz’. Thus, Arm. *unǵi* ‘bottom, depth’ might be cognate, too. Compare e.g. MWelsh *sawdd* ‘Tiefe, Absinken’, also from **sed-* ‘to sit’.

On the other hand, *unǵ* ‘soot; rust’ is reminiscent of Arm. dial. **banǵ* ‘mould; rust’: Xarberd, Manisa, K‘ti *banǵotil* ‘to mould’ [Ačārean 1913: 174b; Gabikean 1952: 107], Xarberd, Beri, Balu *banǵ* ‘mould’ and derivatives [Sargisean 1932: 368; Bařramyan 1960: 114a; HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 163ab]. The meaning ‘rust’ is present in Xarberd and Balu [HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 163b].

Ačāryan (1913: 174b) notes that the root is unknown to him.

Bearing in mind the Iranian anlaut fluctuation *v-/b-/m-*, one may tentatively connect **banǵ* ‘mould; rust’ (from an Iranian unattested form?) with *unǵ* (dial. also **munǵ*) ‘soot; rust’. For the semantics see s.v. *mǵlim*.¹⁵

uši, **ho/uši* probably ‘storax-tree’ and ‘holm-oak’

Attested only in “Yaysmawurk”, probably as equivalent to *šēr* = Gr. *στύραξ* ‘storax-tree, *Styrax officinalis*’, which is a resiniferous tree (q.v.).

●DIAL Ačāryan (HAB 3: 606b) records only Muš *hoši* ‘a shrub with leaves resembling those of the willow’; according to others, as he points out: ‘a kind of oak-tree growing in forests, the leaves of which serve as fodder for sheep in winter’.

One finds the word also in other dialects:

Sasun *hoši*, *hoš-k-i* ‘oak-tree’ [Petoyan 1954: 140; 1965: 140]. According to K‘alant‘ar (1895: 53), the leaves of Sasun *hoši* and *lořp‘i* [also the latter refers to ‘oak’, see Petoyan 1965: 477] serve as fodder for sheep in winter.

Dersim (K‘ti) *hošgi* ‘oak of sun-side’ (*aregdemi katni*) [Bařramyan 1960: 148b].

Sasun and Dersim forms presuppose **hoš-k-i*, with the tree-suffix *-k* on which see 2.3.1.

¹⁵ Alternative: QIE **h₁ong^w-ǵV-* (cf. **h₁ong^w-(o/ō)-* ‘coal’; see s.v. *acut/x* ‘coal; soot’) > *unǵ* ‘soot’.

●**SEMANTICS** The term seems to represent three denotata: 1) a kind of resiniferous (and coniferous?) tree, since it corresponds to Gr. 'storax-tree'; 2) a willow-like shrub or tree; 3) a kind of oak.

A probable basic candidate may be the holm-tree which, with its evergreen foliage, may be related with resiniferous and/or coniferous trees. Compare *t'etawš* that refers to 'holm-oak' on the one hand, and to 'cedar, pine' on the other (q.v.). The Łarabał term continuing *t'etawš*, viz. *t'ətušĩ*, is said to denote a kind of tree the leaves of which serve as fodder for goats. This matches the description of Muš, Sasun *həši* above.

As for the association with a willow-like tree, see the material s.v.v. *aygi* 'vineyard' and *gi* 'juniper'. Compare also Gr. *σμῖλαξ* 'yew, or bindweed, or holm-oak' rendered by Arm. *geřj* 'bindweed, convolvulus; yew-tree' (q.v.).

●**ETYM** No etymology in HAB 3: 606b.

Ĵahukyan (1967: 255; in 1987: 141, with a question-mark) connects with Lith. *úosis* 'ash-tree' etc., and Arm. *hac'i* 'ash-tree', positing **ōsk^hijā-*. The **-sk^h-* (next to **-sk-* in *hac'i* 'ash-tree') is not clear, however. One may assume that the Armenian form reflects a metathesized form found also in Gr. *ὄξυα, -η* 'beech; spear-shaft made from its wood, spear'. For QIE **ks-* > Arm. *-š-* (ruki-rule in internal position) see 2.1.12. Next to Cheremis *oško* 'ash', note Erzamordvin *uks(o)* 'elm, ash' (see Normier 1981: 23-24). Thus: QIE **h₃ek-s-ich₂-* > PArm. **hošiya-* > **hoši*. On the other hand, the by-form *uši*, if old, points to QIE **Hōks-* from **HoHs-* (cf. Lith. *úosis* 'ash-tree' etc.); see s.v.v. *hac'i* and *hoyn*.

For the semantic shift 'ash' > 'storax-tree' and '(holm-)oak' the following is relevant. Both the ash and the storax 1) have valuable wood of which spears or other implements are made; 2) produce manna or gum-resin. Note that in Sasun the manna is found on leaves of oak-trees, and this tree is here called *həši* (which is our word) or *łəp'i*. For more detail see s.v.v. *metex*, *šēr*.

us, *o*-stem 'shoulder' (Bible+); 'flank of a mountain' (Movsēs Xorenac'i, see below); the latter meaning is present in the dialect of Łarabał; note also **us**, **us-ak** 'hill' (Step'anos Őrbelean, Siwnik') [HAB 3: 609b].

In Movsēs Xorenac'i 1.30 (1913=1990: 83^{L7f}; transl. Thomson 1978: 120): *yareweleay usoy meci lerinn minč'ew i sahmans Gott'an* "from the eastern flank of the great mountain as far as the borders of Gott'n".

●**DIAL** Widespread in dialects. With initial *h'-*: Ĵuła *h'us* [Ačārean 1940: 381a]; *y-*: Agulis *yəns* [HAB 3: 609-610]. Two textual illustrations of the Agulis form, transcribed as *eəns*, can be found in Patkanov 1869: 27.

Frozen plural instrumental: Łarabał *ʒs-uk'*: *min xurjīn ʒsuk'ə k'əc'ac* 'a dubble-bag on/around the shoulders' [HŽHek' 5, 1966: 398^{L2}]; *xurjīnə <...> ʒsük'ə k'c'* (ibid. 109^{L14}, 111^{L3}). The same expression is found in singular: *xurjīnə <...> ʒsavə k'c'* [HŽHek' 5, 1966: 647^{L8}].

●ETYM Since long (de Lagarde 1854: 26^{L689}; Dervischjan 1877: 96; Hübschmann 1883: 47; 1897: 484), connected with Gr. *ὤμος* m. 'the shoulder with the upper arm', Lat. *umerus*, *ī* m. 'shoulder', Skt. *ām̐sa-* m. 'shoulder' (RV+), Hitt. *anašša-* 'part of the back', Goth. APl *amsans* 'shoulder' etc. [HAB 3: 609b].

The loss of **n* before **s* in Arm. *us* 'shoulder' and *amis* 'month' (q.v.) was posterior to the development **s > h*, to the assibilation of PIE **k̑* to **š* and to the raising of **o* to *u* before a nasal consonant (Kortlandt 1976: 92; 1980: 101 = 2003: 2, 29; cf. Beekes 2003: 180, 209). It seems impossible to determine whether Arm. *us* continues the full grade as Skt. *ām̐sa-*, or the lengthened grade as Gr. *ὤμος* [Olsen 1999: 21]. The vocalism of the Greek is troublesome (see Beekes 1972: 127; Nassivera 2000: 65₁₆ with ref.).

In view of Toch. A *es*, B *āntse* 'shoulder' probably pointing to **h₂emso-*, as well as the lack of initial aspiration in Arm. *us* and Hittite *anašša-*, one reconsructs PIE **h₂omso-* rather than **h₃emso-* [Lubotsky 1988: 75; Schrijver 1991: 51; Beekes 2003: 168-169]. Adams (1999: 43) assumes **h_{1/4}ōm(e)so-*. On the alternative **h₁eh₃ms-* and discussion of some related issues see Nassivera 2000: 65-67₁₆.

Lat. *umerus*, *ī* m. 'shoulder' may point to QIE **Homes-* [Schrijver 1991: 51; Adams 1999: 43]. In view of the Latin as well as Gr. Hesychian *ἀμέσω ὀμοπλάται* 'shoulder-blades', one posits a PIE *s*-stem **h₂om-s-* : **h₂m-es-*, though the Greek form is considered uncertain (given the preserved *-σ-*, probably of non-Greek origin), and the Latin *-e-* has been treated by others as an anaptyctic vowel; for references and discussion see Beekes 1972: 127; Nassivera 2000: 65₁₆.

I assume that the PIE word for 'shoulder' may reflect HD *s*-stem of the subtype 4, like the word for 'nose': nom. **neh₂-s-s*, acc. **nh₂-és-m*, gen. **nh₂-s-ós* [Beekes 1995: 180]. In view of the abundance of body-part terms in *o*-grade (par. XX), the nominative might have been **h₂om-s-s*. At a later stage of IE, the word may have shifted its declension type into **h₂omso-* under the influence of PIE **Horso-* 'buttocks, on which see s.v. *or* 'id.'. Thus: nom. **h₂óm-s-s*, acc. **h₂m-és-m*, gen. **h₂om-s-ós*. Compare the word for 'mouth', another *s*-stem probably with *o*-grade in the nominative, though this is a neuter and should belong to PD type: nom. **HóH-os*, gen. **HH-és-(o)s*, cf. Skt. *āś-* n., Lat. *ōs*, *ōris* n., Hitt. *a-i-iš(-)*, etc.

In what follows I argue that, apart from Lat. *umerus* and Hesychian *ἀμέσω*, **h₂m-és-* may be corroborated also by Arm. dial. (Agulis) **uns*.

According to Ačāryan (HAB 3: 609b), the nasal in Agulis *yɔns* is an important archaic relic of the **-m-* of the Indo-European form. The development **-Ns* > Arm. *-s* is Pan-Armenian, however, and is reflected in ClArm. and in all the dialects, including Agulis (see 2.1.11). The assumption that Agulis **uns* continues the same proto-form as ClArm. *us* does, viz. PIE **Homso-*, and has preserved the nasal whereas it has been lost everywhere else is thus untenable. I assume that PArm. hypothetical paradigm nom. **u(m)s* : acc. **umes-* (probably from older **ames-*, analogically after nom. **um-* < **h₂om-*) has been preserved up to the earliest stages of the classical period, and the nominative has generalized the nasal of the accusative. This interpretation of the Agulis archaism in terms of (mutual) relationship between the old nominative and accusative parallels that of Agulis **katc* 'vs. ClArm. *kat'n* 'milk' (q.v.).

[In such cases, a word of caution is always in order. One should first try to "exhaust" all the easier and secondary possibilities. For instance, many Armenian body-part terms have *-un-* in their forms (*t'ikunk* 'back, shoulder', *cung* 'knee', *srunk* 'shinbone', *elungn* 'nail', *yawn-k* / **un-k* 'brow', etc.), which could have influenced the Agulis form.

Note also Oss. Iron *on*, Digoron *onæ*, *ionæ* 'shoulder blade' (on the vocalism see Cheung 2002: 211-212). The initial *i-* in Digoron is compared with the article or the prefix **ui-* (see Abaev, 2: 227-228; ÈtimSlovIranJaz 1, 2000: 152), and the final *-æ* perhaps points to an old dual **-ā* [Cheung 2002: 211-212]. One may wonder, thus, if *yɔns* can be explained by contamination with Oss. or Alan **(w)ion-*. Further, cf. dial. **omuz/umuz* 'shoulder' from Turkish.

Nevertheless, my explanation in paradigmatic terms seems to be the most plausible, especially in view of what has been said on Agulis **katc* 'vs. ClArm. *kat'n* 'milk'].

ustr, GSg *uster*, API *uster-s*, GDPI **uster-a-c* 'son'.

Bible+. Often used in opposition to *dustr* 'daughter'. For textual illustrations see NHB (s.v.) and Olsen 1999: 149₂₈₁.

Independently of *dustr*, e.g. in P'awstos Buzand 4.15 /5th cent./ (1883=1984: 104^{L18f}; transl. Garsoïan 1989: 145): *Bayc' cnaw apa P'aranjem t'agaworin ustr mi, ew koč'ec'in zanun nora Pap* "But then P'aranjem bore a boy to the king and he was called Pap".

●**ETYM** Probably from PIE **su(H)k-* 'to suck': OEngl. *sūcan* 'saugen', Latv. *sūkt* 'to suck', *sunkā* 'juice' (see Derksen 1996: 307), Lat. *sūcus* 'juice, sap; vital fluid in trees and plants' (next to *sūgō* 'to suck', presupposing PIE **-g-*), etc. [HAB 611-612]. The semantic development 'sucker' > 'son' is common; cf. Latv. *dēls*

‘son’, Lat. *filius* ‘son’, etc. The **-ter-* in the Armenian is usually considered analogical after *dustr* ‘daughter’. Alternatively: **suH-* (cf. Gr. *υἱός* m. ‘son’, Skt. *sūnu-* ‘son’, etc.); see Pokorny 1959: 914; *Szemerényi 1977: 19; Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984: 423, 765; Olsen 1999: 149. The analogical influence with *dustr* may have been mutual.

ur ‘where, where to’ (interrog.), ‘wherever’.

Bible+. As explicitly pointed out by Ačāryan (HAB 3: 613a), the older distinction (*ur*-static vs. *yo*-allative/directive) has been removed at later stages.

An old **y-ur* may be restored by the dialectal forms.

In Nersēs Lambronaci (12th cent.), as well as in the dialect of Ĵuṭa (*h’ur*, see below), *ur* is used in the meaning ‘why?’ [HAB 3: 613b].

●**DIAL** Widespread in dialects [HAB 3: 613b].

For Suč’ava etc. *urux* see par. XX (cf. also T’iflis *uruk* ‘-min’ ‘at some place’).

The initial *h’-* in Alaškert, Muš, Moks, Ĵuṭa, as well as, perhaps, *h-* in Łarabaṭ, may testify for an old **y-ur* (see par. XX). Zeyt’un *yoy* and Hačən *yuy* (see HAB 3: 613b; Ačāryan 2003: 334) may also continue **y-ur*, though this is uncertain, since these dialects display various reflexes for the initial *y-*, viz. *h-*, *y-*, and zero (see Ačāryan 2003: 113-114). For Ĵuṭa *h’- < y-* see Ačāryan 1940: 125-127.

Hamšen *nir*, *ner*, *neɾ*, *nür*, *nur* (see Ačāryan 1947: 250) and Agulis *nor* (see Ačāryan 1935: 383) represent an initial *n-*. On this see below.

●**ETYM** Compared with Lith. *kur̃* ‘where’ (adv.); Iran. **k^wu-tre*; Skt. *kútra* (adv., in questions - later) ‘where, somewhere (indef.)’ (RV+), OAv. *kuθrā* (adv.) ‘where, where to’, YAv. *kuθra* ‘ob wohl (in questions)’ (see Hübschmann 1897: 481; HAB 3: 613). For discussion of the *-r-* and related problems see Vanseveren 1995; Hamp 1997a: 20-21. Viredaz (2005: 85-86) proposes a derivation from PIE **k^wu-d^he* ‘where’ (interrog.): Skt. *kúha* ‘where’, OCS *kъde* ‘where, when’, etc. However, the development of Arm *-r-* from intervocalic **d^h* is uncertain.

It is better to link the pronominal stem *o-* ‘who, etc.’ and *ur* ‘where’ with PIE forms with an initial **j-* rather than **k^w-* (cf. Skt. *ya-* ‘who, which’ etc.; note Pol. *jak* ‘how’ beside Russ. *kak* ‘how’), see Kortlandt 1983: 11; 1997: 7; 1998 = 2003: 41, 120, 122-124; Weitenberg 1986: 91; Clackson 1994: 52; Beekes 2003: 162-163.

The final *-r* in *ur* > is also found in *i-r* ‘thing’ and *o-r* ‘which’ (see Hübschmann 1897: 481 and especially HAB 3: 613). That these do not have locative function is not a problem since relative and interrogative pronouns often interchange, e.g., the meanings ‘where’ and ‘who’, cf. the cases of **k^wor* and **kwu(r)* (see Mallory/Adams 1997: 456b). Ačāryan (HAB 3: 548a) points out that Arm. *o-* (q.v.) has locative

(allative) function in *y-o* (< **i-o*, a prepositional accusative) 'where to (interrog.)' (Bible+; the dialect of Svedia). Besides, whatever the origin of Arm. *-r*, one sees internal parallel formations on the basis of *o-*, *u-*, and *i-*: *o-r*, *u-r*, *i-r*, *o-mn*, *i-mn*, etc. Furthermore, *ur* also has a non-locative meaning, viz. 'why?' (Nerses Lambronaci, 12th century; Եւթա *h'ur* [HAB 3: 613b]).

Next to a number of dialects showing probable reflexes of **y-ur*, as we saw above, Hamšen *nir*, *ner*, *neɾ*, *nür*, *nur* (see Ačāryan 1947: 250) and Agulis *nɔr* (see Ačārean 1935: 383) represent an initial *n-*. For other cases of addition of an initial *n-* in these dialects see Ačāryan 1947: 73 (*eraz* 'dream' - Hamšen *neraz*) and 1935: 147 (verbs starting with a vowel), without an explanation. Note also Astapat *ner* 'why?' next to Marāṭa, Van etc. *her* from *ēr* (see HAB 2: 119b; Ačāryan 1952: 101, 259). (The Hamšen forms of **(n)ur* 'where to' with many vocalic variants may be due to contamination with *ēr* 'why'). Since the above-mentioned preposition *y-* derives from PIE **h₁en-* 'in', one is tempted to treat this *n-* as an archaic reflex of the nasal in **h₁en-* 'in', thus: **h₁en-(i)ur* > PArm. **inur* > **nur*. It is even possible to derive **y-ur* and **n-ur* from **h₁en-k^wur* > PArm. **igur* (cf. *yisun* 'fifty' from **penk^w*); on this see 2.3.1. Alternatively, one may treat **n-ur* as **end-ur* > **ənnur* > **(ə)nur*.

I conclude, that next to *ur* there was an old by-form **y-ur*.

urd, lately: *i*-stem 'a small canal/brook to water gardens with'.

Attested in Philo, Gregory of Nyssa, and Paterica. In the latter: *ord*. Note also *urd-ic'eal* ('filled') in "Baḡirk' hayoc'" [Amalyan 1975: 262^{Nr242}], which Ačāryan (HAB 3: 410b) places s.v. *yūrt'i* (q.v.).

●**DIAL** Եւթա *urd*, Agulis *ɛrd* [örd], Salmast *yürt* (> Turk. dial. *yürt*), Muš *urd*, Alaškert *urt*; according to Amatuni (1912: 538a), also *urc* (in the village of Mastara), and Van compound **urd-kap* [HAB 3: 616b]. Now we can add Goris *hɔrt* 'water way; pool; brook-mouth' (also 'belly?') [Margaryan 1975: 357b, 429a]; Metri *örd* 'water way' [Ačāryan 1954: 283b].

Note also Urmia, Salmast *urj* 'an island or peninsula in a river' [GwīUrmSalm 2, 1898: 98]. For the semantic derivation 'water(ed)' > 'island' see 3.4.2. The affricate *-j* can be compared with Mastara *urc* above.

●**ETYM** No acceptable etymology is recorded in HAB 3: 616a. The derivation from **ud-ro-* from the PIE word for 'water': Skt. *udrā-* m. 'fish otter', YAv. *udra-* m. 'otter', Gr. *ὕδρως* m. 'watersnake', *ὕδρα* f. 'watersnake', OHG *ottar* 'otter', etc. (see Dervischjan 1877: 89; Łap'anc'yan 1961: 151-152) is not convincing since the expected form is Arm. **urt-*. Iranian borrowing is not plausible either since the semantics is remote, and e.g. *vagr* 'tiger' and the name *Tigran* display no metathesis.

Aṭayan (1974: 64) connects with Lat. *portus* ‘gate’ (cf. *portus*, *-ūs* m. ‘harbour, haven, port; mouth of a river’), Gr. *πόρος* ‘ford, ferry; narrow part of the sea, strait; bridge; passage, opening’, etc., and Arm. *erd*, dial. **yurd* ‘roof-window’, q.v. This is possible, but uncertain.

I alternatively propose a connection with Alb. *húrdhë* f. ‘pond, pool; swamp’ (on which see Demiraj 1997: 205) < PAlb. **urðā-* < IE **uh₁r-d^(h)eh₂-*, from **uch₁r-* ‘water’: Skt. *vāṛ-*, *vāri-* n. ‘water’, YAv. *vāra-* m. ‘rain’, Parth. *w’r* ‘drip of rain’, MPers. *wārān*, Pers. *bārān* ‘rain’ (cf. also, perhaps, Arm. etymologically obscure *varar* ‘abundant (water, river)’, and *vard-a-var* ‘folk festivity of water-pouring’), Luv. *ya-a-ar* ‘water’, OIc. *vari* m. ‘liquid, water’, OPruss. *wurs* ‘pond, pool’, etc.

Perhaps composed as PIE **uh₁r-* ‘water’ + **d^(h)eh₁-* ‘to put, make’ (cf. Skt. *dha-* ‘to put, place, make, produce’, etc.; see s.v. *dnem* ‘to put; to make, build’): **uh₁r-d^(h)eh₂-*. We may be dealing with an Armeno-Albanian innovation. [Alternatively: an old Balkan substratum/cultural word?].

Mastara *urc* ‘canal’ and Urmia, Salmast *urj* ‘an island or peninsula in a river’ (< ‘watered’), with a final affricate, may be hypothetically derived from (analogical) nominative **urd-s* (see 2.2.1.2).

Any relation with *yurt* ‘i’ ‘watered, irrigated’? (q.v.).

urju, *a*-stem ‘stepson or stepdaughter’.

Attested in Severian of Gabala (GDPI *urju-ac*), Eusebius of Caesarea.

● **ETYM** Bugge (1892: 451; 1893: 23) derives from **ordi-u*, composed of *ordi* ‘generation, son/daughter, espec. son’ and the suffix *-u* as in *mawr-u* ‘stepmother’. Ačaryan (HAB 3: 618-619; 4: 641-642) rejects the connection and derives the word from PIE **putro-* (cf. Skt. *putra-* m., Av. *puθra-* m. ‘son, child, young of an animal’, etc.), treating the *-j-* as a genitive as in *get-j* (see s.v. *giwt* ‘village’), cf. *get-j-uk* ‘peasant’. One misses here the origin of *-j-*.

This etymology would become easier if one assumes an *i*-stem or **-io-* suffix (cf. **putrjo-* mentioned in Jahukyan 1987: 186 sceptically), or an original feminine: **putr-i(e)h₂-* > PArm. **u(w)r-j-*. The final *-u* is readily explained as analogical after *mawr-u* ‘stepmother’.

Jahukyan (1987: 143, 186) accepts Bugge’s etymology with reservation and considers the other one as less probable. Then he (op. cit. 259-260) points out that the PIE origin of *urju* is doubtful. The word has been explained as a *vṛddhi*-derivative from *ordi* [Pedersen 1906: 360 = 1982: 138; *Darms 1978: 341; Olsen 1989a: 21; 1999: 21₃₄, 22₃₇]. Note that Olsen (1989a: 21) derives **ōrtyo-* > *urju* from the root of Gr. *ὄρϋμι* ‘rise’, but in 1999: 441-442 accepts the derivation

of *ordi* from **portio-*. The connection with *ordi* is accepted also by Clackson (1994: 147), although, as he points out, "an exact morphological analysis is extremely difficult".

p'aycatn, *an*-stem: GDSg *p'aycatan* (Plato), *p'ayctan(n)* (Geoponica), ISg *p'aycatam-b* (Socrates); spelled also as *p'ayjatn* (Socrates); ***p'aycetn*** (Grigor Tat'ewac'i, Amirdovlat' Amasiac'i)
'spleen'

John Chrysostom, Philo, Plato, Grigor Magistros, etc. [NHB 2: 930b; HAB 4: 477; MiġHayBaġ 2, 1992: 411a].

● **DIAL** Agulis *p'āycātñ*, *p'āycāt*, Šamaxi *p'ayc'ax*, Łarabał *p'ācētnə*, *p'ācētnə*, Moks *p'acēt* (according to Orbeli 2002: 341, *p'acex*, pl. *p'acexk'ir*), Muš, Alaškert *p'ajeł*, Ararat *p'ec'et*, *p'ijex*, Juła *p'iceł*, Łazax *p'ic'ax*, T'iflis *p'icił*, *p'ic'ax*, Xotorĵur *sipex*, etc. 'spleen' [HAB 4: 478a].

Šamaxi has *p'a(y)c'ax*, *p'acētnə*, in the village of K'ark'anĵ: *p'oc'ex*, with an exceptional sound change *ay > ɔ* [Baġramyan 1964: 33, 229].

According to Hačean (YušamXotorĵ 1964: 508a), Xotorĵur *sipex* refers to 'kidneys'. On the formal problems of the Xotorĵur see below.

● **ETYM** Since long (Lagarde [Boetticher] 1850: 363^{Nr270}; 1854: 26^{L702f}; Dervischjan 1877: 4), compared with the PIE word for 'spleen': Skt. *plihān-* m., YAv. *spərazan-* m., MPers. *spurz*, *spul* < SWIr. **spṛdan-*, NPers. *sipurz*, Gr. *σπλήν* m. (cf. also *σπλάγχνον* n., pl. *σπλάγχνα* 'inward parts, esp. the heart, lungs, liver, kidneys; sacrificial feast', metaph. 'the seat of the feelings, affections'), Lat. *liēn* (< **lihēn* ? see Schrijver 1991: 122), OIr. *selg*, SerbCS *slězena*, Latv. *liēsa*, etc. [Walde 1909; HAB 4: 477-478; Pokorny 1959: 987; Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 815; Mallory/Adams 1997: 538b; Beekes 2003: 197]. Sceptical: Hübschmann 1876: 777 (1897 vacat).

Despite formal problems which are usually explained through tabuistic sound-replacements (see Meillet apud Vendryes 1914: 310 and references above), all these forms obviously point to a PIE term. Frisk (2: 770) rightly notes: "Mehrere der idg. Benennungen der Milz zeigen trotz großer lautlicher Variation eine unverkennbare Ähnlichkeit, die nicht zufällig sein kann". One usually reconstructs **spelg^h-*, **splg^hen-*, etc.

According to Lagarde (1854: 26^{L702f}), Arm. *p'aycatn* derives from older **p'taicān*. Ačāryan (HAB 4: 477b) posits Arm. *p'aycatn* and **p'acaytn* coming from older **p'aytcan*. Ĵahukyan (1987: 150) prefers **p'atcayn* and reconstructs **p^həlg^hñiā-* with a question-mark.

If the Sanskrit and Latin forms allow reconstructing a by-form with internal **-j-* (which is uncertain), it may also account for the internal *-y-* of the Armenian, though details remain to be unclear.

According to Ĵahukyan (1967: 154²²⁵), the internal *-c'-* in some dialects, going back to **-j-* < **-g^h-*, points to secondariness of *-c-* in ClArm. *p'ayc'atn*. One may rather assume an assimilation *p'...c* > *p'...c'*; cf. *p'etur* 'feather' > Marāṭa *p'ut'ur*; Łarabaṭ *t'ep'ur*, etc.

Ačāryan (ibid.) derives the dialectal forms from *p'aycat[n]* and **p'acayt[n]* > **p'acēt*, with the exception of Xotorĵur *sipex*. According to him, the latter goes back to OArm. **sipeṭn* or **sipayṭn*, an archaic form which is different from the classical one and goes back to a QIE form with **sp-* rather than **sp^h-* (the latter being responsible for the initial aspirated *p'-* of the classical form *p'aycatn*), and with loss of **-g^h-* as in Gr. *σπλήν*. Ĵahukyan (1982: 111) seems to accept this, by positing dial. **spayṭn*.

The analysis of Ačāryan is not convincing. There is no evidence for variation **sp-* : **sp^h-*. Alongside of PIE **pV-* > Arm. *(h)V-*, we can speak of **sp-* > Arm. *sp-* and **(s)p-* > Arm. *p'-* (for the material and discussion see Ĵahukyan 1982: 47-48, 66-67; Beekes 2003: 197). Besides, the Xotorĵur form, in my view, may be explained in a more plausible and attractive way.

Cappadocian Greek (Pharasa) *πείσάχι* 'spleen' is considered to be an Armenian loan; see Karolidēs (Καρολίδης) 1885: 96; Lagarde 1886: 60b; Bugge 1893: 11; Dawkins 1916: 196, 632-633; HAB 4: 478a. This form may have been borrowed into Xotorĵur *sipex* through metathesis /labial...dental/ > /dental...labial/, cf. *put* 'poppy', 'drop' > Łarabaṭ *tɔp* 'id.', *p'etur* 'feather' > dial. (Zeyt'un, Xarberd, Hamšen, Karin, Alaškert, Łarabaṭ, Agulis, Ĵuṭa, etc.) **tep'ur*, perhaps also Arm. **t'epēk* 'ape; jackal' if borrowed from Gr. *πίθηκος* 'ape' (see 2.1.26.2). Xotorĵur *sipex* 'spleen', thus, may be regarded as a back loan: Arm. *p'aycatn* 'spleen' > Cappadocian Greek *πείσάχι* 'id.' > Xotorĵur *sipex* 'id.' (on back loans see 1.10).

Arm. dial. Akn, Č'arsančag, Tivrik **kayc-ar* 'tongs, fire-tongs' [Ačārean 1913: 544b] has been borrowed into Cappadocian (Pharasa) *καϊζάρ* 'tongs' (see HAB 2: 507b for refer. and discussion); according to Dawkins (1916: 605b): *καϊτσάρι*. Arm. *-ayc-* is reflected here as *-aiž-* or *-aitσ-*, in contrast with *-eiσ-* in the word for 'spleen'. The reason for this may be that Cappadocian *πείσάχι* 'spleen' has been taken over from Arm. dial. **p'eyc'ex*/**p'ic'ex* (with aspirated *-c'-*; see above). One might posit the following distribution: Arm. non-aspirated *-c-* (> voiced *-j-* in the relevant dialectal areas) : Cappadocian affricate *-ž-* or *-τσ-*; Arm. aspirated *-c'-* : Cappadocian sibilant *-σ-*.

Laz *p^hanc'ala* 'spleen' (next to Georg. *p^hac'ali/a* 'id.'), which is considered to be an Armenian loan (see HAB 4: 478a), seems to point to QIE **(s)p(l)ng-*, cf. Gr. *σπλάγγνον*.

See also s.v. *p'tj-uk* 'bitterness of heart'.

p'ast, *i*-stem (GDPI *p'ast-i-c'* in Yovhannēs Drasxanakertc'i) 'proof, argument, reason, true cause'.

Yovhannēs Drasxanakertc'i (9-10th cent.) etc. Earlier and more frequently found in compounds: Philo, John Chrysostom, Movsēs Kaṭankatuac'i, etc.

●**ETYM** No etymology is accepted in HAB 4: 484a. The connection with Gr. *φά-σις* f. 'utterance, expression; statement; mere assertion, without proof', Lat. *fās* 'divine law; right; obligation', *fāsti* 'list of festivals; calendar' etc. from PIE **b^heh₂-* 'to speak' (Jahukyan 1967: 122-123) is problematic both formally and semantically. From the semantic point of view, the other Greek *φά-σις*, meaning 'denunciation, information laid; appearance', would match better. Bailey (1986: 7) compares with Oss. *fāst*, *fāst(ā)* 'question, counsel', from Iran. *fras-* 'to question' (cf. YAv. *frašna-* m. 'question', Khot. *brašta-* 'questioned' etc.). Neither this is convincing.

Patrubāny (1908: 152a) derives Arm. *p'ast* (*i*-stem) from QIE **(s)pək-ti-*, a **ti*-derivation from **(s)pek-* 'to observe, see', linking with *spasem* 'to wait, serve' and *asem* 'to say'. This etymology, though rejected by Ačāryan (HAB, *ibid.*), is worth of consideration.

The PIE root is represented by Skt. *(s)paś-* 'to see (*paś-*); to observe, to watch, to spy (*spas-*)', *spaṣṭā-* '(clearly) perceived, clear, visible', Gr. *σκέπτεται* 'to look around, to look at', Lat. *speciō* 'to see', etc. (See also s.v. **hes-*). Armenian *spasem* is an Iranian loan, but *asem* is hardly related. The *i*-stem of Arm. *p'ast* is thus old. See 2.3.1 on **ti-*. The etymological meaning of *p'ast* would be 'what is seen, evident'; cf. *c'oyc'* (*i*-stem) 'show, indication, example' (Bible+) : 'proof' (Philo, Athanasius of Alexandria, etc.), also *apa-c'oyc'* : *ἀπό-δειξις* 'showing forth, making known, exhibiting' (on the latter correspondence see Weitenberg 1997a: 449).

A possible parallel, both for the semantic development and the suffix **-t(i)-*, may be *yayt*, *i*-stem 'known, clear, evident', if composed of *y-* and *hay-* 'to see, watch' (see s.v.).

p'esay, *i*-stem 'bridegroom; son-in-law'.

Bible+.

●**DIAL** Dialectally ubiquitous.

●**ETYM** No acceptable etymology is recorded in HAB 4: 497b. Patrúány (*1908-: 277b) treats as composed of **(s)b^hend^h-s* (cf. Gr. *πενθερός* etc.) and the ending *-ay*, seen also in *caray*, *i*-stem ‘servant; captive’. Ĵahukyan (1967: 123) repeats this etymology, but gives it up later (1987: 260), stating that the origin of the word is unknown.

Winter (1966: 203-205) links the word with Lat. *procus*, *ī* m. ‘suitor, wooer’, deriving it from a base **perk-* rather than **prek-* (cf. Lith. *persu* ‘to ask for a girl’s hand in marriage’), and cites *ark’ay* ‘king, ruler’ as containing the same suffix; see also Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 1: 237. However, the loss of *r* (see 2.1.33.3), the suffix, and the initial *p’-* are not clear. The ending *-ay* is probably somehow related with that of *yawr-ay* ‘stepfather’ (q.v.). Olsen (1999: 946) considers *p’esay* as a word of unknown origin.

Any relation with Pahl., NPers. *pus*, *pusar*, Manich. MPers. *pwsr* ‘son’? (see the word in MacKenzie 1971: 69).

On *p’esawēr* see Olsen 1999: 913.

p’ĵ-uk (spelled also as *p’ĵuk*, *p’ĵuk*) ‘bitterness of heart’ (John Chrysostom, Vardan Arewelc’i, etc.); ***p’ĵ-k-am*** (*p’ĵ-k-ac’-eal* and *p’ĵ-k-al-ov* in Łazar P’arpec’i, 5th cent.), ***p’ĵ-k-im*** (Movsēs Xorenac’i, John Chrysostom, Ephrem), ‘to distress oneself, grieve, begin to sob’; ***p’ĵ-k-umn*** (Łazar P’arpec’i, etc.).

For the attestation in Movsēs Xorenac’i 3.68 (1913=1991: 361^{L10}) see s.v.v. *anjuk* and *heĵjamĵuk*.

●**DIAL** Muš *p’xckal* ‘to prepare oneself for sobbing’, Šamaxi *p’xckil*, T’iflis *p’xc’kil* ‘to distress oneself’ [HAB 4: 506b].

●**ETYM** No acceptable etymology is recorded in HAB 4: 506b.

Ĵahukyan (1967: 104) proposed a connection with Gr. *πλῆσσω* ‘to beat’, *πληγή*, Dor. *πλᾶγά* f. ‘blow, stroke; (metaph.) blow, stroke of calamity, esp. in war’, Lat. *plangō* ‘to strike, beat; to beat the breast in mourning, mourn for’, Russ. *plákat’* ‘to cry’, etc. This comparison is formally problematic; **pIVk/g-* and **p_lk/g-* would yield Arm. **IVk’/k-* or **hatK*, respectively. The semantic development is perhaps possible but not attractive since the Armenian word basically refers to the state of bitterness or willing to cry rather than to the process of crying. No wonder that Ĵahukyan did not include this etymology into his monumental 1987.

I propose a derivation from PIE **sp(e)lg^h-*, the word for ‘spleen’, see s.v. *p’aycatn* ‘spleen’. A lengthened QIE **(s)pēlg^h-* would yield Arm. **p^hiĵ-*, of which regularly - *p’ĵ-uk* and *p’ĵ-k-a/im*. For the semantics note that the spleen is regarded as the seat

of melancholy or morose feelings (OxfEnglDict). Compare also Gr. *σπλάγχχνον* n., pl. *σπλάγχχνα* 'inward parts, esp. the heart, lungs, liver, kidneys; sacrificial feast', metaph. 'the seat of the feelings, affections' (next to *σπλήν* m. 'spleen'), from the same PIE term for 'spleen'.

p'os, *o*-stem (Bible, Movsēs Xorenac'i, Yovhannēs Draxanakertc'i), *i*-stem (Agat'angelos, Grigor Narekac'i) 'furrow, trench; hollow; channel'.

Bible+. The word (GDPl *p'os-i-c*) is found in the place-name *Drunk' P'osic'* (> Gr. *φοσέων πύλας* [HAB 4: 518a]) which is attested in Agat'angelos 36 [1909=1980: 24], in a passage that also contains the verb *p'osem*. This toponym is located in a place which, as testified in the same passage, was called *Soyz*, identic with *soyz* 'depth; hollow, den, lair' (Anania Širakac'i, Philo [NHB 2: 727c]), q.v.

In Movsēs Xorenac'i 3.32 (1913=1991: 296^{L10f}; transl. Thomson 1978: 289): *ar ezerb p'osoyn* "by the edge of the ditch".

●**DIAL** Dialectally ubiquitous.

●**ETYM** Since long, considered borrowed from Gr. *φóσσα* (< Lat. *fossa* 'ditch, trench', from *fodiō* 'to dig (up); to stab') [Hübschmann 1897: 387; HAB 4: 517b; Olsen 1999: 928]. The Armenian *o*-stem is also seen in Georgian *p'oso*, which is considered an Armenian loan [HAB 4: 517b; Ĵahukyan 1987: 590].

However, the word is very widespread in dialects which is unusual for a Greek loan. Given this circumstance, as well the *o*- and *i*-stems of *p'os* (note also Georgian *p'oso*), and the resemblance with *p'or* 'hole; belly' (q.v.), Ĵahukyan (1967: 123, 123-124₁₂₅) derives *p'os* from PIE **b^hed^h-* (cf. Lat. *fodiō* 'to dig'), which is impossible. Later, he (1987: 620) represents the Greek etymology (from *φóσσα*, that is) with a question-mark.

One may alternatively consider a comparison with OEngl. *furh* 'Furche, Graben', Lith. *pra-paršas* 'ditch', Lat. *porca* 'ridge between furrows', Skt. *pārsāna-* 'precipice, chasm' (RV), etc. There are two problems here: the initial **p-* would not develop into Arm. *p'*, and the loss of **-r-* is not clear. PIE **pork-* would yield Arm. **ors*. Both problems are also seen in the etymology of *p'esay* 'bridegroom; son-in-law' (see s.v. and 2.1.33.3).

Any relation with Pahl. *pusyān* 'womb'?

p'ul 'fall, ruins' (not in 5th cent.); **p'lanim** 'to fall' (Bible+); later also **bl-** 'to fall, ruin'.

●**DIAL** Widespread in dialects: *p'ul gal*, **p'/blil*, *p'/bl-č'-il*, etc. For the thorough representation of the dialectal forms and the analysis of the initial *p'-/b-* alternation

(as an inner-Armenian development rather than a result of the Siebs' Law) see Weitenberg 1992.

According to Ačaryan (HAB 1: 468a, s.v. *boył*), Ararat *bulk* 'avalanche' belongs here, too. Earlier (1913: 204b), he linked the form to *boył* (q.v.).

●ETYM Usually connected with Germ. **falla-* 'to fall', Lith. *pulti* 'fallen, über jmd. herfallen, ihn angreifen', etc. [Bugge 1893: 28-29; Hübschmann 1897: 501; HAB 4: 522; Pokorny 1959: 851; Mallory/Adams 1997: 191b], probably reflecting PIE **ph₃l(H)-* (see Klingenschmitt 1982: 164-165, 171-172; Kortlandt 1976: 92 = 2003: 2; Weitenberg 1992: 308, 313; Beekes 2003: 202).

According to Klingenschmitt (op. cit. 172), the original present PArm. **palŋ-* < PIE **ph₃lnH-* has been replaced by **p^hulani-* < PArm. **pōlŋ-* analogically after aor. **p^hul(a)-* < PArm. **pōla-*. However, neither PArm. **pa-* nor **pō-* would yield **p^hV-*. In order to explain the aspirated stop *p^h-* in the Armenian form, one needs an unambiguous sequence **pHV-*. The reconstruction of **p^hōl-* (see Pokorny 1959: 851; Jahukyan 1982: 48, 181; 1987: 145) does not help much because, apart from the fact that the existence of the PIE series of aspirated voiceless stops is not commonly accepted, the Armenian form is the only form suggesting such a stop. An alternative **pHōl-* is cited in Mallory/Adams (1997: 191b), with a question-mark. This too is unclear. Therefore, I tentatively propose an alternative explanation.

The nominal *p^hul* is not attested in the 5th century. Nevertheless, it is not necessarily young. In 2.2.2.5 I tried to demonstrate that some Armenian words seem to continue the PIE HD *l*-stem paradigm. Based on this pattern, one may restore the following paradigm at a certain age of Proto-Armenian:

NSg **peh₃-ōl*,
ASg **ph₃-ēl-m*,
GSg **ph₃-l-ós*.

Then, PArm. **pōl* became **p^hōl* > *p^hul* analogically after the accusative **p^hol-n* (for **pH* > Arm. *p^h* see 2.1.18.2). For the interrelationship between the nominative and accusative forms see 2.2.1.3. The initial *p^h-* of the verbal **p^hōla-* is due to influence of the nominal **p^hōl*. However, the IE root is verbal, and it is very risky to restore an old nominative based solely on Armenian. The explanation, thus, can be true only if the existence of the paradigm in Prot-Armenian will be proven.

k'atirt', *a*-stem 'stomach of animals'.

Bible+. Spelled also as *k'atert'* (Gregory of Nyssa) and *k'atird*. For the latter NHB has attestations from the Bible (once, in gen. *k'atrd-i*), Hexaameron and Geoponica. The critical text of Hexaameron, however, has *k'atirt'* (in GDPI

k'atrt'-ac'); no manuscript has *-rd-*, which appears only in Venice edition [K. Muradyan 1984: 308^{L5}].

●**DIAL** Preserved in Cilicia: Zeyt'un *k'atəyd'*, *k'atərd'*, Hačən *k'atəyt'* [HAB 4: 544a]. The *-u-* in Zeyt'un *k'utəyd'* cited in Ačāryan 2003: 343 must be a misprint since the word is not mentioned in Ačāryan's (op. cit. 26-27) exhaustive list of the exceptions to the rule ClArm. *a* > Zeyt'un *a* in the first syllable of disyllabic words. Indeed, in p. 100 one finds *k'atəyd'*.

●**ETYM** Dervischjan (1877: 78) compares with Gr. *χολάδες* 'bowels' and Lat. *hira*, *hilla* 'id.', treating *-irt'/d* as from **-tro-* by metathesis. PIE **-tro-*, however, would yield Arm. *-wr-* (see 2.1.26.2). Ačāryan (HAB 4: 544a) rejects the connection and leaves the origin of the word open. Ĵahukyan (1967: 124) mentions the etymology (adding also Russ. *želúdok* 'stomach') as an example of irregular aspiration of the dental. Lidén (1934b: 23-25) compares with Gr. *καλίδια*: *ἔντερα*. *Κύπριοι* (Hesychius) and Lit. *skilvis* 'Bauch, Magen', with *-rd* after *leard* 'liver' (not mentioned in HAB); see also Frisk, s.v. Olsen (1999: 942) places *k'atirt'* in her list of words of unknown origin.

Pokorny (1959: 435) presents Gr. *χολάδες*, *χόλικες* f. (m.) pl. 'bowels' and Slav. **želqdzьkь* 'stomach' (cf. Russ. *želu'dok*, Pol. *żołądek*, etc.) under the root **g^hel-(o)nd-*. Beekes (2000: 31) connects these Greek forms with Gr. *κόλον* n. 'large intestine', *καλίδια* 'intestines', *γάλλια* 'intestines', and Arm. *k'atirt'*, noting that "Gr. *-αδ-* < **-pd-* should be given up". In view of phonetic irregularities (**g^h/k/g*, *c/o/a*, *l/lh*), he assumes non-IE, substratum origin. This, in fact, combines the etymologies of Dervischjan and Lidén.

The ending of Arm. *k'atirt'* needs a closer examination. Gr. *καλίδια* seems to be the best match. The Armenian aspirated *-t'* goes back to **t^h* rather than **d* or **t* (in latter cases we would have had **k'atirt* and **k'atirtw*, respectively). The scholars usually operate with *k'atird* (Lidén, Frisk, Beekes) and assume an influence of *leard* 'liver'. This is improbable since the spelling *k'atird* is secondary. I propose to start from a substratum proto-form **kalit^h* -> Arm. **k^hatit^h*-. The ending **-rā-* has been taken from *ənder-k'* (*a*-stem) 'intestines' (cf. Gr. *ἔντερα* etc.), q.v. Then, **k'atit^h-ra-* was metathesized into *k'atirt'*, *a*-stem.

If this is a substratum word, one may look for correspondences in neighbouring non-IE languages. Such a correspondent may be seen in Assyrian *kalitu* 'kidney', regarded as a seat of the feelings (see Meek 1913: 16, 55; see also Delitzsch's note in 133).

k'arb, *i*-stem: GDSg *k'arb-i*, GDPl *k'arb-i-c'* (Bible+) 'basilisk, asp'.

In Psalms found twice with the synonymous *iž*: GDSg *iži ew k'arbi* (57.5); GDPI *ižic' ew k'arbi* (90.13). In the former attestation the pair *iž*: *k'arb* renders Gr. ὄφις 'serpent': ἄσπίς 'the Egyptian cobra, 'Coluber haie', whereas in the latter: ἄσπίς 'Egyptian cobra' and βασιλισκός 'a kind of serpent, basilisk, perhaps Egyptian cobra'.

In Hexaemeron, the same pair (GDPI *ižic' ew k'arbi*) renders Gr. ἔχις 'viper' and ἄσπίς 'Egyptian cobra, 'Coluber haie'; see K. Muradyan 1984: 313^{L14}, 373b, 378a).

In P'awstos Buzand 4.15 one finds *k'arb oĵ*, with *awj* 'snake' (1883=1984: 101^{L-3}): *ibrew oĵi k'arbi*. Garsoïan (1989: 143) translates "a deaf asp", though the Armenian text has no word for 'deaf'. [This (confusion?) is somehow reminiscent of Pers. *kar* 'deaf; a snake not yielding to incantation', see Steingass 1019b]. Note also *oĵk' ižk' ew k'arbk'* in 5.27 (187^{L23}). Garsoïan (1989: 207) translates "adders, asps and basilisks", as if three different kinds of snakes are ment. More probably, *awj* is and functions here as a generic term for 'snake', whereas *iž* and *k'arb* are specifiers; thus: **iž-awj*, **k'arb-awj*. Note also in Nersēs Šnorhali (12th cent., Cilicia): *ižic'n ew əzk'arbi'n oĵic'* (see K'yoškeryan 1987: 251^{L50}); in Step'anos Kelec'i, prob. 16th cent. [H. Sahakyan, UšMĵnHayBnst 1, 1986: 374^{L31}]: *t'iwnawor k'anc' k'arbi oĵi* "(more) poisonous than *k'arb-oĵ*". Compare *iž mi k'arb* in Hexaemeron, with *iž* 'viper' [K. Muradyan 1984: 314^{L1}], which should be understood as something like an *iž* of the kind of *k'arb*. Typologically compare dial. **šah-mar oĵ* 'basilisk-snake' (with *šah* 'king'): Łarabał *šahmar əxcə* (HŽHek' 5, 1966: 23 /twice/); Van *šaxmar oc'* (in a proverb from Arčak it is poisonous, see S. Avagyan 1978: 157b); etc.

That **k'arb-awj* has been lexicalized is also clearly seen from the dialect of Svedia (see below).

In Dawt'ak (7th cent.) apud Movsēs Kałankatuac'i 2.35 (1983: 228^{L14}; transl. Dowsett 1961: 147): *t'oynk' k'arbi* "venom of aspics".

In "Baġgirk' hayoc'" (Amalyan 1975: 128^{Nr50}), *iž*, as female, is contrasted with *k'arb*, a male.

●**DIAL** Preserved in Svedia, in a compound with *oĵ* 'snake': *k'arboĵuc'* [HAB 4: 561a] or *k'arpoĵuc'* (< **k'arbi oĵ*) or *k'arp'a*, *k'arp'oĵuc'* 'a kind of very poisonous snake of gray colour with white spots, of the size to 1,5 m, = Turkish /*boz yılan*' [Andreasyan 1967: 163, 388b] (with a small head and narrow neck - Ačāryan). For the compound **k'arb-oĵ* cf. the above-mentioned attestations in P'awstos Buzand etc.

●**ETYM** Derived from IE **(s)ker-* 'to cut', see s.v.v. *k'er-(t')*-, *k'er-b/p'-* 'to scratch, chop, carve'; the closest cognate is Gr. σκορπίος m. 'scorpion; a sea-fish', σκορπίς,

-ίδος f. 'a sea-fish' [HAB 4: 561a; Ĵahukyan 1987: 148, 192]. The comparison with the Greek is first proposed by Dervischjan (1877: 17).

Frisk (2: 739) assumes an "Entlehnung aus einer Mittelmeersprache". Olsen (1999: 101) notes that there is no sufficient basis for determining the original derivational type, and, following Frisk, assumes common borrowing from an unknown source. Note another possibly Mediterranean word, viz. Gr. *καρίς*, -ίδος 'Crustacea' : Arm. *karič* 'scorpion', dial. 'crayfish' (q.v.), which is typologically comparable with *σκοπί(ο)ς* : *k'arb* in several respects: 1) *ίς*, -ίδος (for -ič in Arm. *karič* cf. also perhaps **k'arb-ič-*, see s.v. **k'arpičon*); 2) the same semantic field; 3) restriction to Greek and Armenian.

The comparison of Arm. *k'arb* with Pers. *karva* (NHB, Hiwnk'earpēyēntean), though rejected by Ačaryan (HAB 4: 561a), is worthy of consideration. In Steingass (1025-1026) one finds Pers. *karava* 'an animal whose bite is said to be worse than that of a serpent'. Probably 'scorpion' is meant. Compare Arab. *'aqrab* 'scorpion', Gr. *κάραβος* m. 'horned or cerambycid beetle; a prickly crustacean, crayfish', *καράβις*, -ίδος f. 'id.', diminutive *καράβιον* = *ἐφόλκιον* n. 'small boat towed after a ship' (Hesychius), *κηραφίς*, -ίδος f. 'a kind of locust', etc. For the semantic relation 'scorpion' : 'crayfish' see s.v. *karič* 'scorpion'. Further see s.v. **k'arpičon*.

It is not clear whether or not all of these words are related with Gr. *σκοπίος* 'scorpion; a sea-fish' and Arm. *k'arb* 'basilisk, asp'. The appurtenance of at least the following three forms seems plausible: Pers. *karava* (prob.) 'scorpion', Arab. *'aqrab* 'scorpion', and Gr. *κάραβος* m. 'a prickly crustacean, crayfish'. One can posit MedPont **(s)kVr(V)p/b-* 'a biting insect or reptile'.

Though of substratum rather than of ultimately IE origin, Gr. *σκοπίς*, *σκοπίος* and Arm. *k'arb*, *i*-stem, might reflect a common source form, which had the following paradigm at an early stage, when the IE pattern of HD declension was still operating: NSg **skórp-i-*, GSg **(s)kṛp-i-ós*. The Greek and Armenian forms can be explained as generalizations of the nominative and the oblique cases, respectively. See 2.2.2.4; cf. especially s.v. **angi*, if related with *awj* 'snake'. Note that *awj* and *iž* have also *i*-stem inherited from PIE. The absence of the *s*-mobile in Armenian is perhaps due to simplification of the consonant cluster **skrp-*. Alternatively, one may think of substratum **-a/o-* vacillation seen in some other animal designations of Mediterranean origin; see s.v.v. *lor* 'quail' and *karič/kor* 'scorpion'.

****k'arp/bičon*** prob. 'scorpion' or 'horned beetle'.

●**DIAL** Trapizon **k'arpičon* 'an uncertain kind of horny insect' [Ačārean 1913: 1106a]. One finds the word in a riddle recorded in Trapizon [Haykuni 1906: 351^{L-1f}; = S. Harut'yunyan 1965: 79b^{Nr799}]:

Kov mə unim ɔni-ɔni,

Kotošvənin cərcəroni.

The answer is *k'arpičon*, described as a *eḟjiwrawor bzēz* "horny beetle".

It seems that the informant spoke the dialect of Hamšen rather than Trapizon. First of all, the *-p-* of *k'arpičon* is strange since the dialect of Trapizon lacks the voiceless series (though it does have a *k* in Turkish loans [AčārHLPatm 2, 1951: 344]). Though the recorder seems to follow the literary orthography keeping the voiceless stops unchanged, this is perhaps irrelevant for *k'arpičon* because the word is quite unique and is not present in the literary language. The plural form *kotoš-və-ni*, too, is present in Hamšen: *godešvəni* [Ačāryan 1947: 84]. The tree-name *cərcəroni* is identified with *coreni*, a thorny shrub [S. Harut'yunyan 1965: 79₃]. This is quite possible since *cor* 'barberry', though not recorded in Hamšen, is present in the other side of the river Čorox, viz. in Baberd, also in a reduplicated form *jorjor* [HAB 2: 469a].

ɔni-ɔni must continue *hani-hani* 'guess-guess!' from *hanem* 'to take out/off' (a frequent pattern of Armenian riddles; cf. also *haneluk* 'riddle' from the same root). For the loss of the initial *h-* in Hamšen cf. *hačari* 'beech' > *ažri*, *hapa* > *aba* [Ačāryan 1947: 51]. The sound change *an* > *ɔn* is restricted to few dialects, among them Hamšen (see Bařramyan 1965: 80-81); Trapizon is not mentioned in this context; cf. also AčārHLPatm 2, 1951: 343-345. A quick look at the texts in the Trapizon dialect [Ačārean 1911: 180-183] is sufficient to see that the sound change is not found here. It seems to have operated in the villages of Trapizon; cf. Bařramyan 1965: 90. Ačāryan (1911: 178; 1947: 5) informs, however, that the villages of Trapizon belong to the Hamšen dialect.

The form *k'arpičon* can continue **k'arbičon* (or **k'arbičawn*). An old *-p-* would yield *-b-*, but a *-rb-* could indeed become *-rp-* in Hamšen; cf. Ačāryan 1947: 41-42. The *-č-* perhaps remained voiceless due to the assimilatory influence of the *-p-*.

●**ETYM** The word is rendered as 'an uncertain kind of horny insect' [Ačārean 1913: 1106a; Harut'yunyan 1965: 79₂]. It can refer to horned beetle or to a kind of scorpion with thorny "horns". **k'arb-ič-on* can be derived from *k'arb*, *i*-stem 'basilisk, asp' (Bible+; dial. of Svedia) with the suffix *-ičon*, cf. *bad* 'duck' : *badičon* [Greppin 1978: 30-31]. The most remarkable thing is that the closest cognate of *k'arb*, viz. Gr. *σκορπίος* m., means 'scorpion'. Further, note Gr. *κάραβος* m. 'horned or cerambycid beetle; a prickly crustacean, crayfish', Arab. 'aqrab 'scorpion'. For *-ič*

cf. Arm. *karič* 'scorpion', dial. 'crayfish' vs. Gr. *καρίτζις*, *-ίδος* 'Crustacea' (see s.v.)¹⁶.

***k'ol**

In two manuscripts of "Baġgirk' hayoc'", *k'ol/k'ōl* renders *mayri* 'forest' (Amalyan 1975: 404^{Nr104}; see also MiġHayBaġ 2, 1992: 454a).

●**DIAL** **k'ol* 'wild shrub' (Ararat, Łazax, Łarabał); 'forest' (Lōri, Łazax, Łarabał, Šulaver); 'the root of a rose-shrub' (Van); 'nap; remnants of wool' (Łarabał; also *k'ol-k'*) [Ačārean 1913: 1120ab-1121a].

In Turkish-Armenian dictionary (c. 1720 AD) by Etia Mušet'yan Karneč'i (Karin/Xotorĵur) one finds *mušk'ōl* with *mayri* and *mēri* 'forest' rendering Turk. *mēša* [Č'ugaszyan 1986: 63^{Nr105}, 138, 140]. Č'ugaszyan (op. cit. 140) points out that *mušk'ōl* is of unknown origin. One may identify its component **k'ōl* with dial. **k'ol* 'forest'. [But what is **muš-*?].

●**ETYM** No etymological explanation is known to me.

May be derived from IE **kos(e/o)lo-* 'hazel (Corylus)': OIr. *coll*, Lat. *corulus*, OIc. *hasl*, OHG *hasal*, etc.; probably also Lith. *kasulas* 'hunter's spear, stick, bush' (see Pokorny 1959: 616; P. Friedrich 1970: 73-77; P. Friedrich apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 260; Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984: 636). The OArm. meanings would have been 'hazel-shrub' and 'hazel-thicket'. For the semantic relationship 'forest, thicket' and 'hazel-shrub, -thicket' compare Slav. **lěska*, **lěšnje*, **lěščina* 'hazel, hazel-shrub', all from, probably, OCS *lěsz* (cf. Russ. *les*) 'forest, wood(s)' (see ÈtimSlovSlavJaz 14, 1987: 239-241, 249-252, 259, 263-264; Černyx 1: 476-477). Note especially SCr. *lēs* 'forest; tree (as material); 'hazel'; Russ. dial. *lěša* 'hazel'; etc. [ÈtimSlovSlavJaz 14, 1987: 241, 249]. For a further typological parallel cf. Turk. */meše/* 'oak; forest'.

Arm. dial. **k'oli*, an isolated and unspecified colour name (see Ačārean 1913: 1120b), may be seen as a derivative with the productive *i*-suffix based on PArm. **k'ol* 'hazel'; compare OEngl. *hæsel*, Engl. *hazel* 'a light brown to a strong

¹⁶ A considerable number of animal designations in the Hamšēn dialect belong to the 6th declension with gen. *-ən* and abl. *-ā* (see Ačāryan 1947: 95-96). One may therefore wonder whether *k'arpičən* is not in fact a genitive form. The nominative **k'arb-ič* would contain the same suffix as the above-mentioned *karič* 'scorpion', yet another Mediterranean word. This is, of course, no more than a guess. One needs more evidence to establish the philological background of this Trapizon/Hamšēn word.

yellowish brown'. This is attractive but uncertain since the exact meaning of the Armenian word is unknown.

k'os, *o*-stem: ISg *k'os-o-v* in Deuteronomy 28.27; IPl *k'os-o-v-k'* in "Čarəntir" ; uncertain: Hexaemeron 5 (K. Muradyan 1984: 150^{L11}; note: 341₇₁). 'a kind of leprosy, scab, itch'.

Bible+. In Deuteronomy 28.27 (Cox 1981: 184): *harc'ē zk'ez t[ē]r ketov egiptac'ocn ew t'anč'iwk' ew zayrac'eal k'osov, ew mnov, zi mī karasc'es bžškel* : *πατάξαι σε κύριος ἐν ἔλκει Αἰγυπτίου ἐν ταῖς ἔδραις καὶ ψώρα ἀγρία καὶ κνήφη ὥστε μὴ δύνασθαι σε ἰαθῆναι* [RevStBible has: "The Lord will smite you with the boils of Egypt, and with the ulcers and the scurvy and the itch, of which you cannot be healed"]. Here *ψώρα ἀγρία* "with malignant itch/scurvy" is rendered by *zayrac'eal k'osov*. [Gr. *ψώρα* 'itch, scurvy; a disease of trees, scab; moth'].

Refers also to a disease of trees (Euagrius) and to "stone-moss" (*k'ar-a-k'os* in Agat'angelos+).

●**DIAL** Widespread in dialects [HAB 4: 588a]. On **k'awt'ai-k'osi* see 3.5.2.2.

●**ETYM** The etymology of *k'os* is uncertain; derived from **kosso-* (cf. Lith. *kasyti* 'to scratch constantly' etc.) or compared with Arm. *k'or* 'scratch, itch' (see HAB 4: 588a; Jahukyan 1967: 124₁₀₅; Olsen 1999: 44).

PLACE-NAMES

Arciw

a village in the province of Siwnik', close to the monastery of Tat'ew; next there is also *Arciw-a-katar*, lit. 'eagle-summit' (both in Step'anos Ōrbelean, died in 1304); also other derivatives [Hübschmann 1904: 404-405].

●**ETYM** = *arcui*, *arciw* 'eagle' from **h₂rgipió-*: Skt. *ṛjipyá-* etc.; cf. Av. *ərəzifīa-* 'Bergname: 'Adler', see Hintze 1994: 416; for Iranian and other parallels see Eilers 1987: 26 (note especially Indian mountain-name *Gṛdhra-kūta* m. 'Geierspitze', structurally comparable with Arm. *Arciw-a-katar*).

Ardean-k' (APl *Ardean-s*) a large village in the province of Ayrarat, attested only in P'awstos Buzand 5.6 (1883=1984: 171^{L176}). The passage reads: *i gawaṛn Ayrayratu i mec i gewṛn ənjīn ark'uni, orum Ardeansn koč'en* : "to the large village named Ardeans, at the royal treasury/barns of the district of Ayrarat". The name appears in APl *Ardean-s* and implies NPl *Ardean-k'* [Garsoïan 1989: 444-445].

●ETYM No etymology is known to me.

In the passage from P'awstos, *Ardeans* is said to be a village of the royal treasury or, perhaps better, of the royal granary/barn (see s.v. *unj*₂ 'treasure, granary'). Bearing this in mind, one may derive *Ardean-s* from Arm. **ard(i)*, *ea*-stem 'work': *ardea-w-k* 'indeed' (instrumental); *ardiwn-k*, APl *ardiwn-s*, GDP1 *ardeanc* 'deed, work; (earth) products' (Bible+), dial. **ard(i)umn* 'earth goods, harvest' (see s.v. *ard*₁). Note that the latter has been preserved in the dialect of Ararat, which is roughly spoken on the eastern part of the province of Ayrarat. *Ardean-k* is composed of **ardi* 'work, goods' and the suffix *-an-k*, cf. *apr-an-k* 'products, properties' from verbal **apur-* 'to live, survive'.

The exact location of *Ardean-s* is unknown. It is tempting to locate it in Širak, a district in Ayrarat, the famous barns of which are mentioned in the old saying recorded in Movsēs Xorenac'i 1.12 (1913=1991: 40^L; transl. Thomson 1978: 90): *t'ē k'o Šarayi orkorn ē, asen, mer Širakay ambark'n ē'en* : "If you have the throat of Sharay, they say, we do not have the barns of Shirak"; for the full passage and the context see s.v. *araspel*. The high quality and abundance of bread in Širak was famed even in the 20th century, cf. e.g. the story "Gelə" ("The wolf") written in 1913 by H. T'umanyan (5, 1994: 118^{L12f}). [Comparable fame - for Basen, another district of Ayrarat; see Hakobyan 1974: 6, 14].

That a place abounding in corns, fruits etc. and/or having famous barns can be named 'barns, granary' and the like is not unusual, cf. *Mayeak* in Moks < *mayeak* 'barn' (see HAB 3: 245a). In this respect the following seems interesting.

The territory of the province of Moks roughly coincides with Uart. country of *Aiduni/Ajadu*, south of Van Lake, the name of which has survived in the district-name *Aytu-an-k*. In *Aiduni/Ajadu* there is a place-name *Ardiunak* which, according to Ĵahukyan (1988: 157, 159-160), derives from Arm. *ardiun-k* 'earth products'. If this is true, one wonders whether Uart. *Ardiunak* is identic with Arm. *Mayeak*, both names reflecting synonymous appellatives meaning 'earth products, barns'. In this case we are dealing with continuation of the toponymical pattern: **Ardiwn-* has been replaced by *Mayeak*. For such a replacement see 9.3. At any case, *Mayeak* and, possibly, *Ardiunak* can serve at least as typological parallels for the origin of the place-name *Ardean-k* < **earth goods, barns*.

Getar(u)

Ge/ētaru, a river (= *Agri-ē'ay*) and a district in Atuank', attested in Ptolemy 5.11.2 (*Γαιτόρα*) and "Ašxarhac'oyc'" [Eremyan 1963: 47b, 105a^{L15f}; HayTetBaṛ 1, 1986: 845c]. Read differently in "Ašxarhac'oyc'": *Dēgaru* [Soukry 1881: 29^{L8}; in the

French transl. *Degarou* (p. 39)]; A. G. Abrahamyan 1944: 348^{L26}. See also Hewsens 1992: 143-144, 145^{75f}. Eremyan (1963: 47b) also cites a spelling *Dedairu*, not specifying the manuscript. MovsXorenMaten 1865: 606 vacat.

Getař, *Getař-C*ay*, a river in contemporary Armenia traversing the capital Yerevan, a left tributary of the river Hrazdan [HayTetBar 1, 1986: 845b-c; G. D. Asatryan 1990: 6-7, 17].

Getař-su (*Gadar-su*), a river in the Urmia basin, probably identic with *Arasx* [HayTetBar 1, 1986: 845c; Hewsens 1992: 178¹³⁷]; see s.v. *Erax*.

Getař, a village in vicinity of Kars [HayTetBar 1, 1986: 845c].

●**ETYM** Hewsens (1992: 178¹³⁷) interprets the river-name *Getař-su* (*Gadar-su*) as *get* 'river' + *Ar[asx]* (?). In my view, this and the others contain the appellative *getař* 'river-bed; river-shore; outbranching river' (in Łazar P'arpec'i: *getařu*), q.v.

Gēn

**Gēn* (*Ginay get* "the river of **Gēn*"), close to Artašat (Movsēs Xorenac'i). Perhaps identic with *Gēn* mentioned by Anania Širakac'i (7th cent.) [A. G. Abrahamyan 1944: 228^{L33f}] in an arithmetical exercise, as the hunting place of the Kamsarakan family; see par. XX.

Note also *Gin-akan get*, a village (but with *get* 'river') in the district of Ewaylax (in the province of Siwnik') mentioned by Step'anos Ōrbelean (1250/60-1304), as well as *Ginoy blur*, a hill in front of *Duin* (see Hübschmann 1904: 419).

●**ETYM** If originally a hydronym, *Gēn* may be derived from PIE **ueis-* 'to flow' (cf. Lat. *vīrus* n. 'slimy liquid; venom; poisonous fluid', OIc. *veisa* 'Schlamm, Sumpf', OEngl. *wāse* 'Schlamm, Sumpfland' < Germ. **waisō*, Av. *vīš* n. 'poison, venom, poisonous juice', etc.) which is found in numerous river-names such as Celtic **Vis-*, Lat. *Vistula*, Russ. *Vechra*, etc. (see Pokorny 1959: 1134) [Jihanyan 1991: 240]; see also s.v. *gēs* 'corpse; bad'.

As pointed out by Jihanyan (ibid.), **Gēn* (*a*-stem) structurally corresponds to Lat. *vēna* 'blood-vessel, vein; artery; (underground) stream' < PIE **ueis-nā-*. For the semantic field 'to stream' : 'river-name/' : 'blood-vessel, vein' cf. Iran. **rasā-* f. 'name of a mythical stream' (RV), Skt. *rasa-* m. 'juice (of plants), liquid', PIran. **raha-ka-* 'blood-vessel, vein', OCS *rosa* 'dew', etc. (see s.v. *Erax*).

Gis

a village in the extremely eastern province of Uti-k' attested only in Movsēs Kaťankatuac'i/Dasxuranc'i /7-10 cent./, several times [Hübschmann 1904: 419]. According to this source, the first church of this region has been founded here.

According to Yampol'skii (apud Dowsett 1961: 5-6₅), *Gis* must be identified with *Kiš* (north of present-day Nukha), where he himself investigated an ancient ("round") church. V. Arak'elyan (1969: 277₇₀, without any references) states, however, that this *Gis* should not be confused neither with *K'is* close to Nukha, nor with *Gis* in Łarabał (in the district of Martuni). See also Ulubabyan 1971: 176-177.

In Movsēs Kałankatuac'i/Dasxuranc'i 1.27 (V. Arak'elyan 1983: 95^{L12f}; ModArm. transl. 1969: 70): *Anc'anelov ənd Hayastan, čanaparhordē hasanel i sahmans arewelic', i gawaın Utiakan. Ew mteal bnakēin i čaxčaxut tetis ew i lōraboyš mōrsn, ar teleawn, orum Gisn koč'en*: "he passed through Armenia into the eastern regions to the province of Uti; and he [in the text: pl. - HM] dwelt among marshy places and moss-covered swamps in the place called Gis" (transl. Dowsett 1961: 54).

The attested forms are: accusative *Gis* (95^{L15}, 97^{L7}), allative/directive and locative *i Gis* (10^{L18}, 201^{L19}, 213^{L1}, 214^{L19}, 344^{L8}), genitive *Gis-o-y* (275^{L1}).

●**ETYM** No etymological attempt is known to me. Hübschmann (1904: 419) points out that *Gis* does not belong with *gi* 'juniper'. One should agree with this since GDSg *Gis-oy* points to a root **gis-*, with etymological *s*, rather than to a frozen API **gi-s*.

I propose a derivation from PIE **u(e/o)ik̑-*: Skt. *vís-* f. 'settlement, dwelling-place, community, tribe', OPers. *viθ-* 'house, royal house, royal clan, court', Pahl. *vīs* 'manor-house with adjacent village; village' (see Kent 1953: 208a; Brandenstein/Mayrhofer 1964: 154; Nyberg 1974: 214a), Gr. *oἶκος* 'house, dwelling-place; one's household goods, substance; a reigning house', Lat. *vīcus* 'village; district of Rome; street' (from **uoiḱ-*), *vīlla* 'rural dwelling with associated farm buildings', OCS *вѣсь* f. 'village, terrain', etc. (See also s.v. *giwł* 'village').

PIE **uik̑-* 'manor, estate, manor-house', 'royal house', 'settlement, village' > PArm. **gis-* is phonologically impeccable. For the semantics compare *Agarak*, a very frequent place-name from *agarak* 'estate, a landed property, house with all possessions, village', see Hübschmann 1904: 393-394; HayTetBar 1, 1986: 17-20 (45 place-names); *Giwł-ik*, diminutive from *giwł* 'village' (Hübschmann 1904: 419), etc.

Dalari-k'

: a village probably in the district of Turuberan (API *Dalari-s*, allative *i Dalari-s*, GDPI *dalarea-c'* in P'awstos Buzand 3.20; see below); **Dalarink'**: a village in Čahuk, in the province of Siwnik', attested in Step'anos Ōrbelean (1250/60-1304) [A. A. Abrahamyan 1986: 404a; Ališan 1893: 480a].

According to Hübschmann (1904: 420), the first place-name was situated in Apahuni-k' (in the province of Turuberan). However, the passage from P'awstos Buzand 3.20 (1883=1984: 45-46; transl. Garsoïan 1989: 97) reads as follows: <...>, *xatāc'uc'in yerkrēn Apahuneac'*. *Ibrev ekin hasin i gewt' mi, orum anun Dalaris koč'ēin; yoržam ekn emut zōravarn Parsic' i nerk's i gewtn Dalaris, acēr kapeal zark'ayn Tiran ənd iwr* : "<...>, and carried of from the land of Apahunik' <...>. When they reached a certain village called Dalarik', the Persian commander entered into the village of Dalarik' and took the chained King Tiran with him". The village, thus, may be located in vicinity of Apahunik' rather than in it.

Then we read: *Ew asē Varaz: Atē, tesēk' acut, orov erkat' šotac'usc'uk', zi zač's xaresc'uk' zark'ayis Hayoc'*. *Ew andēn berin acut, orov xarēin zač'sn Tiranay* : "And Varaz said: 'Now then! Bring [glowing] coals with which to heat iron to the glowing point so as to burn out the eyes of the king of Armenia'. And they immediately brought coals with which they burned out the eyes of King Tiran". The text proceeds as follows: "Then Tiran himself began to speak and said: 'in exchange for the darkening of the light of my two eyes in this place, let its name be changed for eternity from *Dalarik'* ['Green'] to *Acut* ['Coals'], and let this remain as a sign in remembrance of me". In this last sentence, the toponym is put in GDPI *dalareac'* : *p'oxanak Dalareac's anuan* "instead of this name of *Dalarik'*".

●**ETYM** Derived from *dalar* 'young, fresh; grass, herbs', *dalari* 'grass, herbs' [Hübschmann 1904: 420].

The two names of a place in the passage from P'awstos (see above) are treated as symbolic and fictitious [Garsoïan 1989: 264₁₈, 458]. The symbolic contrast in the text is obvious, but this does not necessarily imply that the author made up these toponyms. Note that Step'anos Tarōnec'i/Asofik (10-11th cent.) has *Arjkat-n* instead of *Acut*, though he refers to P'awstos, and Vardan Arewelc'i (13th cent.) - *Arcut-n* [Hübschmann 1904: 395]. As for *Dalarik'*, the appellative *dalar(i)* 'herbs' is a quite plausible base to build a toponym upon, and is indeed found in another toponym, viz. *Dalarink'* (in Siwnik'). Furthermore, one may assume that *Dalarik'* was situated in the district of *Dalaī*, bordering with Apahunik' in the north-west, and its name was identic with that of the district. I conclude that P'awstos adjusted (one of) the names of the village into his symbolic interpretation rather than made it/them up. On the -r- in *Arcut* see 2.1.30.2.

Duin a city in the province of Ayrarat.

Attested since Łazar P'arpec'i (5th cent.): Loc. *i Duni* in 3.77 [1904: 141^{L14}], 3.82 [149^{L28}], and abl. *i Dunay* - 3.71 [1904: 128^{L29}]. Sebēos (7th cent.) has *Dəvīn*,

Dəvnay, *i Dəvnay* (3.1, see 1851: 48; CHECK! *Abgaryan 1979). T'ovmay Arcruni (9-10th cent.): *Dvnay* (3.9), *Duni* (3.22); Ananun: *Dunay* (10); Yovhannēs Drasxanakertc'i (9-10th cent.): *Dvnay* [1912=1980: 333^{L6}]; etc.; Ašxarhac'oyc'" : *Dunay k'atak'* [A. G. Abrahamyan 1944: 350^{L40}].

The oblique stem *Dun-* should probably be read as *Dəvn-* or *Dwən-*. However, the attestations in folklore (*Duna k'atak'*, see below), if reliable, can imply that the pronunciation *dun-* was possible too.

There is no record of any settlement at Duin in P'awstos Buzandac'i (3.8), which refers to the site as *Blur* 'hill' (1883=1984: 16): *minč'ew i daštn Mecamōri i blurn or anuaneal koč'i Duin: or kay i hiwsisoy kotmanē k'atak'in meci Artasatu* "to the hill in the plain of the Mecamōr called Duin, which is on the northern side of the great city of Artasat" (transl. Garsoïan 1989: 75). According to Movsēs Xorenac'i 3.8 (1913=1991: 265^{L12f}), King Xosrov P'ok'r (Kotak) transferred the Armenian capital from Artasat to Duin (probably in the second half of the fifth century) because of its healthier climate: *veroy antařin yost mi, aparans hovanawors šineal, or əst parsakan lezuin Duin koč'i, or t'argmani blur* "to a spot above the forest and built a shady palace. The place is called Duin in Persian; in translation it means 'hill'" (transl. by Thomson 1978: 261). [NOTE - Here Thomson has translated *ost* as 'spot'. According to HAB (3: 568b), its actual meaning is 'hill', as Thomson himself translates the word elsewhere in Movsēs Xorenac'i (1.11, 1.12), see s.v. *ost* 'hill']. On *Blur* lit. 'hill' see T'ovmay Arcruni (9-10th cent.) 2.1, 3.22, and the footnotes by V. M. Vardanyan (1985: 127) and Thomson (1985: 145₁).

See also Hübschmann 1904: 422; Thomson 1978: 261₇; Garsoïan 1989: 460-461.

●**DIAL** In a fairy-tale told in Aštarak in 1912 by Geworg Geworgyan, an illiterate old man, one finds several times (see HŽHek' 1, 1959: 392-393, 398) *Duna k'atak'*, considered a city of royal residence (*t'agavoranist*). On the vocalism in *Dun-* see above. One wonders whether the narrator indeed pronounced as /*duna*/, or it is a result of learned tampering.

●**ETYM** According to Movsēs Xorenac'i (see above), *Duin* is from Persian and means 'hill'. Hübschmann (1904: 422) considers *Duin* as of unknown etymology. He states that the etymology of Movsēs Xorenac'i is "ein Irrtum, der durch die Quelle des Moses, FB. 18-21 [that is P'awstos - HM], veranlaßt ist". This is not necessarily true.

Minorsky (1930: 117-120) identifies the underlying Persian word with *-duvīn* which is "pleinement attesté dans la toponymie de la région clairement délimitée au sud-est de la mer Caspienne".

The testimony of Movsēs is put under new light by the comparison with Ir. *dūn* 'hill', OEngl. *dūn* 'mountain', etc., from PIE **d^heu-* (see Jahukyan 1963a: 96-97;

1987: 584, developing the idea of Norayr Biwzandac'i). Despite the absence of direct evidence from Indo-Iranian languages, thus, Movsēs may be right.

An Iranian **dūn* would yield Arm. **doyn* or **dun*. The form *Duin* may be explained by the process involved in Clackson's interpretation of *lusin* 'moon' (q.v.); cf. also the hill-name *Lsin* and village-name *Otin* (q.v.).

T'əmnis

a village in Korčayk', close to the mountain of *Sararad* = *Judī-Dagh* upon which Noah's Ark is said to have come to rest. Attested in "Patmut'iwn srboc' Hrip'simeanc'" [MovsXorenMaten 1843: 300 = 1865: 301; Ališan 1910: 63-64]. In the long recension of "Ašxarhac'oyc'": *T'man* [Soukry 1881: 32; Eremyan 1963: 108a; Hewsens 1992: 63]. Nowadays called *Bētmanīn* or *Heštāne*. See Hübschmann 1904: 333-334 (= 1907: 202-203); Eremyan 1963: 53b; Hewsens 1992: 170₂, 174-175₁₁₆.

●**ETYM** In "Patmut'iwn srboc' Hrip'simeanc'" (see above), the origin of the place-name is traditionally related with the Flood story told among Syrians (*asi yAsorwoc'*) and is interpreted as *ut' ogik' elin i tapanēn* "acht Seelen stiegen aus der Arche" (cf. Arab. *θamānūna* 'eighty'); compare the modern names of the village: *Karye i Thmānin*, i.e. "Dorf der Acht", Kurd. *Heštāne*, i.e. "achtzig" [Hübschmann 1904: 333-334].

However, this traditional interpretation may be folk-etymological. There are variants of the story of Noah's Ark in relation with other mountains of the Armenian Highland, and these traditional stories too are involved in folk-etymological interpretations; cf. *Naxč-awan*, re-interpreted as *Nax-iĵewan* "erste Station" [Hübschmann 1904: 455; 1901: 73-79 = 1990: 99-105] (for the corresponding story see Łanalanyan 1969: 157^{Nr402}); *Ainos* as if from **ar (z)Noy*s "take this Noah!" (Łanalanyan 1969: 24^{Nr51}), etc.

The native Armenian origin of the toponym is not impossible. That the mountains of Ararat in the Bible version of the Flood story refer to Armenia is clear e.g. from the Chronicle by Eusebius of Caesarea (3-4th cent.) [1818, 1: 36-37]: *Ew i navēn ur* [or *or*] *č'ogaw dadareac' i Hays, ew c'ayžm sakaw inč' masn i Korduac'woc' lerinn i Hayoc' ašxarhin mnal nšxar asen* : "and from the ship where/which rested in Armenia, and they say that a small part of it till now remains (as a relic) in the mountain of *Kordu-k'* in the world of Armenia".

Ĵahukyan (1987: 416) derives *T'əmnis* from PIE **tem(ə)-* 'dark', cf. Mlr. *temen*, Russ. *temnyj*, etc. Mountain-names are frequently named 'dark' or 'black'; see 9.6. I think, this etymology becomes more probable under the light of Arm. ("Baġgirk'

hayoc'") *t'umni* 'darkness', *t'umnanal* 'to become dark' (see Amalyan 1975: 123^{Nr223f}), q.v.

The IE root is also found in the suffixal element **-r-*, cf. **temH-s-reh₂-* 'darkness' (: *Skt. tāmistrā* f. 'dark night', etc.) > Lat. **temafrā* > *tenebrae* f.pl. 'darkness'. Especially important is Illyr. *Τόμαρος*, which is a mountain-name, too (see Mallory/Adams 1997: 147a). One may also wonder if *Aḷ-t'amar* (a rocky island and fortress in Van Lake) is composed of **Aḷ(i)* 'Van Lake' (q.v.) and **t'amar* 'mountain', identic with Illyr. *Τόμαρος*.

In these areas there was a district named *Tmorik* (see Hübschmann 1904: 336-337). According to Hewsén (1992: 170-175), this name is related with *T'man/T'əmnis*. If this is true, for the element *-r-* cf. the above-mentioned Illyr. mountain-name *Τόμαρος*.

Kotb

a village in Ayrarat, in the district of Čakat'k', now *Tuzluca* [Hewsén 1992: 211^{Nr5}]; also **Kotb-* in *Kotb-a-k'ar* and *Kotb-o-p'or* (in Gugark'), compounds with *k'ar* 'stone' and *p'or* 'belly, womb; ravine' (both very frequent in compound place-names). Attested in the 5th century onwards [Hübschmann 1904: 441].

●**ETYM** Comparing with the first part of Urart. *Qulbi-tarrini*, Ĵahukyan (1986a: 51, 51₂₆) proposed a connection with Gr. *γλάφυ* n. 'hollow, cavern', *γλαφυρός* 'hollow(ed)'. Ĵihanyan (1991: 248), in fact, independently suggests the same etymology referring to PIE **geleb^h-* 'schaben, schabend aushöhlen, hobeln' ('geglättete Stange, Balken'), see Pokorny 1959: 367. However, this etymology is uncertain, and the vocalic relationship between the Greek and Armenian is not clear.

I suggest a comparison with Gr. *δελφύς*, *-ύος* f. 'womb', *δολφός* ἡ μήτρα (Hesychius) which comes from PIE **g^welb^hu-* 'womb', cf. *Skt. gārbha-*, Av. *garəβa-* m. 'womb', also with *o*-grade. The toponymical value of the word is corroborated by Gr. *Δελφοί* (pl.) name of the inhabitants of Delphi and of the town itself. It has been assumed that the place was originally **Δελφύς* after the form of the land (see Frisk s.v.; Beekes, Database, s.v.).

The derivation **g^wolb^h-* > Arm. *Kotb* is formally impeccable. The meanings 'womb', 'belly' and the like form place-names very frequently. Therefore, we are dealing with a strong candidate for an old native Armenian place-name shared by Greek.

Met a left tributary of Euphrates/Aracani, the main river of the district of Tarawn (in the province of Turuberan); the more recent and common Armenian name is *Metr-a-get*,

lit. 'honey-river'; = Turkish *Kara-su*, lit. 'black water' [Hübschmann 1904: 323; Jihanyan 1991: 252-253]. Usually identified with *Τηλεβόας* mentioned in *Xenophon, Anabasis* 4.4.3 [2001: 326/327]; see *Markwart, *Philologus* 10/1: 236; Eremyan 1963: 70b; Krkyašaryan 1970: 260₁₇; Hewsens 1992: 165₆₅.

In the long recension of "Ašxarhac'oyc'" we read on the district of Tarawn: *yorum gay getn Met ew ankani yEp'rat*: "par où passe le fleuve de Megh (*Met*) qui tombe dans l'Euphrate" [Soukry 1881: 31^{L5}, French transl. 41; Engl. transl. Hewsens 1992: 63^{L2}.

●**ETYM** Probably derives from PIE **mel-* 'dark, black, blue': Gr. *μέλας* 'dark, black', Skt. *māla-* 'dirt, impurity, filth' (RV+), Lith. *mėlas* 'blue', etc.; cf. numerous river-names in the Balkans and Asia Minor, such as *Μελας*, *Μελης*, *Mella*, etc. (see Jihanyan 1991: 252-253; Petrosyan 2003: 207, 213, 215). On the Thracian, Pamphylian, and Kappadocian river-name *Μελας* usually identified with Gr. *μέλας* 'black', as well as for numerous parallels and semantic discussion see Pârvulescu 1989. Remarkably, the etymological semantics of Arm. *met* is confirmed by the modern Turkish name: *Kara-su*, lit. 'black water' (see Jihanyan, *ibid.*). Thus, the more common Armenian name, viz. *Met-a-get*, lit. 'honey-river', must have been resulted from folk-etymology.

How old is the association with 'honey'? On the village of **Met-a-gom* see Hübschmann 1904: 323. The rivername *Met* seems identic with the place-name *Metri* by Zenob Glak and Yovhan Mamikonean [Hübschmann 1904: 323; Jihanyan 1991: 253]. One wonders if there may be any relation with Hitt. *melit*.

Otakān the main fortress of the Mamikonean family in the district of Tarōn, on the bank of the Ep'rat/Aracani (mod. Murad-su) east of Aštišat. [Hübschmann 1904: 326, 459-460; Eremyan 1963: 74b; Garsoïan 1989: 485]. Nowadays: village of *Axkan* (Eremyan, *ibid.*). Usually identified with *Ὀλανή* (pro *Ὀλα[κα]νή*) in Strabo (Geogr. 11.14.6); cf. also *Volandum* (Tacitus, Ann. 13.39). But Strabo's *Ὀλανή* is located near Artasat (see Ačaryan 1940a: 59, 117). Thus, only the name can be identic.

The ruins of the fortress are still seen on precipitous rocks on the bank of Aracani [Tomaschek 1896: 11; Hübschmann 1904: 460]. Cuinet (2, 1891: 586-587) describes the place as follows: "A l'extrémité occidentale de cette plaine (i.e. the plain of Muš - HM), se trouvent deux grands rochers hauts de 60 mètres, au milieu desquels l'Euphrate oriental passe avec fracas dans sa course rapide vers le sandjak voisin. Au sommet de l'un de ces rochers, situé sur la rive droite, et entouré d'eau de trois côtés,

il existe une plate-forme de 140 pas sur 120 où subsistent encore quelques restes du château-fort 'Oghgan'".

See also Petoyan 1965: 365-366; the map apud Petoyan 1954; Hewsen 2001: 55 (map 48 A5).

Attested in P'awstos Buzand 5.3 (1883=1984: 160); Movsēs Xorenac'i 2.84 (1913=1991: 228^{L5}); Etišē (1989: 138^{L1}); etc. In Yovhan Mamikonean: *Otkan* (with syncope).

●**ETYM** Composed of an unclear **ot* and the suffix *-akan* [Hübschmann 1904: 460]. By characterizing the fortress as 'rundlich' Tomaschek (1896: 11) probably suggests a composition with Arm. *ōt* 'ring' which would be impossible in view of the vocalic difference [Hübschmann 1904: 460].

Ĵahukyan (1987: 416) points out that the suffix *-akan* (of Parthian origin) occurs very seldom with native Armenian stems, and among examples mentions *Ot-akan*. He, thus, assumes a native Armenian appellative **ot* not specifying it.

The stem **ot-* may be derived from Arm. *ot(n)* 'spine, back' which in dialects (including Muš, located on the same territory of Tarōn) refers to 'slope of a mountain', 'long hillock', 'the upper part of a hill' (see s.v.).

Alternatives:

1) from PIE **p(o)lh₁-*: Gr. *πόλις* f. 'fortress, stronghold', Skt. *pūr* 'rampart, wall made of mud and stones, fortification, palisade' (RV+), *purī* 'stronghold, fortress, town', Lith. *pilis* 'castle, stronghold', etc. Note also ^{URU}*Pulija(ni/a)*, a placename in the western part of the country of Habḥi (south of Van Lake) attested in Assyrian sources from 9-8th centuries (see N. Arutjunjan 1985: 160), which may be related with this IE forms whether or not identic with Arm. *Ot-*. An underlying **poli(V)n* can be compared with Arm. *Otin* (q.v.); note that the loss of **p-* before the vowel *-o-* is regular in Armenian.

2) cf. Gr. *Ὀλύμπος* - name of mountains in Greece and Asia Minaor.

Saln-a-jor, vars. *Saln-oy jor*, *San-o-jor*: a district in the province of Aṭjnik', according to "Ašxarhac'oyc'" [MovsXorenMaten 1865: 607^{L-8}; A. G. Abrahamyan 1944: 349^{L17}]; in the long recension: **Sal-a-jor** [Soukry 1881: 31^{L1}]. The second member is *jor* 'ravine'. The long recension also mentions **Salnay lerink'**, mountains of which the river *K'atirt'* (= Batman-su) issues [Soukry 1881: 37]. Note also **Saln-apat** (= *Jor-a-vank*), a monastery in the district of Tosp, east of Van-Lake (for ref. see Hübschmann 1904: 447).

See Hübschmann 1904: 314, 317, 465; Eremyan 1963: 79b; Hewsen 1992: 162₅₇).

●**ETYM** Usually interpreted as containing an unknown **Salin* or **Salun* [Hübschmann 1904: 465; Hewsen 1992: 162₅₇].

One wonders whether we are dealing with PArm. **sal-n-* 'stone, rock', on which see s.v. *sal*. Note that this area is heavily mountainous, and the name of a neighbouring district, viz. *Xoyt'/Xut'* (south of the province of Turuberan), also contains an appellative meaning 'rock, reef; hill' (see s.v. *xut'/xoyt'*).

Sim

a famous mountain in Sasun. Commenting upon Movsēs Xorenac'i 2.8 (see below), Hewsen (1988-89: 297) points out that *Sim(-sar)* "is precisely the name given by the Armenians to the Taurus range where it bordered the plain of Muš on the south separating it from Sanasunk', the later Sasun". Nowadays it is called *Kurtik-dať* [Eremyan 1963: 80b], *Kurtək/Kurtək'* (see Petoyan 1965: 363, also a photo between pp. 26 and 27).

In Movsēs Xorenac'i 1.6 (1913=1991: 26; transl Thomson 1978: 80-81), after Xisut'ra's (= Noah) landing in Armenia, his son Sem went to spy out the land to the northwest, reached a long mountain, lingered by the river for two months (*erklusneay awurs*), and called the mountain after his name *Sim*.

The mountain plays a significant role also in the traditional story of inhabitation of this area. This time it relates with Sanasar, one of the two sons of Senek'erim who killed his father Senek'erim and fled to Armenia. In Movsēs Xorenac'i 1.23 (1913=1991: 70), Sanasar dwelt *yarewmtic' harawoy ašxarhis meroy* "in the southwest of our land"; *i smanē ačumn ew bazmaserut'iwn leal, lc'in zSimn asac'eal leain* "his descendants multiplied and propagated and filled the mountain called Sim" (transl. Thomson 1978: 112).

Other attestations: Movsēs Xorenac'i 2.74 and 2.84 (1913=1991: 212^{L6f}, 228^{L6}): *Simn koč'ec'eal lerinn* "the mountain called Sim". In 2.8 (116^{L15f}; transl. 143), relating on Šarašan from the house of Sanasar (spelled as *Sarasar* - GSg *Sarasaray*): *zleainn Tawros, or ew Sim* "the Taurus Mountain, that is Sim".

For the historico-traditional role of Sim, as well as for other attestations of the mountain-name see Tomaschek 1896: 4-5; Hübschmann 1904: 310-311, 315-316.

●**ETYM** According to Łap'anc'yan (1945: 20-21₁), the mountain-name *Sim* originates from Sem. *Sin* 'Moon-god'. This is accepted by Petoyan (1965: 381-383, with traditional stories around the mountain). However, this etymology is not plausible. Improbable is also the comparison with Arm. *s/šeam* 'Pfosten, Schwelle' (see Tomaschek 1896: 5; Xač'konc' 1899: 82b).

I propose a derivation from PIE **k^heh₁mo-*, cf. Skt. *śyāmā-* 'black, dark-coloured' (AV+), Avest. *Siiāmaka-* m. name of a mountain (see Hintze 1994: 83-84, 457; cf. also Arm. *Simak*), Lith. *šėmas* 'blue-grey', etc. Note also Skt. river-name *Śyāmā*, literally meaning 'black' (see Pârvulescu 1989: 290). Mountain-names are frequently named 'dark' or 'black'; see 9.6. Moreover, this etymology may be directly corroborated by the other name of the mountain Sim, viz. *Sev-sar*, lit. "Black-mountain" (see Sasna cîr 2/2, 1951: 870; Abet'yan 1985: 22; A. Petrosyan 2002: 143-144 = 2002a: 155). Even if Sim/Kurtik and Sew-sar are not identic, they are at least closely located and probably form neighbouring summits of the mountain-range Eastern Tavros (see e.g. the map apud Petoyan 1954).

Tap'e(a)r, GDSg *Tap'er-a-y*

Arm. *tap'-er* 'plains, plain places' : 'i siti piani' [Hübschmann 1904: 388], attested in Geoponica (13th cent.) with *koł-er* and *matner* (see s.v. *matn₂* 'hill-side; slope'); appears as place-names (*Tap'-ear*) in the districts of Bałk' and Arewik', both in the south of Siwnik', and both attested in Step'anos Orbelean (1250/60-1304/5) [Hübschmann 1904: 473].

In P'awstos Buzand 3.12 and 4.55 (1883=1984: 26^{L-9f}, 146^{L10}; transl. Garsoïan 1989: 82, 175): *i daštn yayn koys getoyn Tap'ern kamrji*, <...>, *anc'eal ənd kamurjn Tap'eray*, *mteal i k'atak'n mec yArtašat* : "in the plain on the other side of the river at the bridge of Tap'er. <...>, they crossed the bridge of Tap'er, entered the great city of Artašat"; *ew anc'uc'in əst Tap'ern kamurj*, <...>, *asen zōragluxk'n Parsic' c'Zuit'erēc' k'atak'in Artašatu*.

This bridge is called *Tap'er-akan* in Agat'angetos 33 (1909=1980: 23^{L6}; transl. Thomson 1976: 49): *i Tap'erakan kamrjac'n getavēž aīnēin znosa* : "from the bridge of Tap'er they cast them into the river". Here, the bridge is mentioned next to the bridge of Artašat (see the previous passage cited s.v. place-name *Mawr*) and must be identic or close to it. Note that in the beginning of the same paragraph 33 (p. 22^{L16}) more than one bridges are mentioned at the gate of the city of Artašat (*i xe/s kamrjac'n aī druns Artašat k'atak'i*), though Thomson (1976: 49) took it as a singular.

Tuaracatap'

A district in the province of Turuberan. Attested in "Ašxarhac'oyc'" (7th cent.) [Soukry 1881: 31; Eremyan 1963: 107a]; in the short recension: *Tuaracatap'* [MovsXorenMaten 1865: 607], corrupted variants: *Muracatap'*, *Markatap'* [A. G. Abrahamyan 1944: 349^{L21}]. On the attestation in Aristakēs Lastivertc'i see below.

●**ETYM** Clearly composed as *tuarac* + *-a-* + *tap* ‘plain, land’. The word *tuarac* (see s.v. *tuar* ‘cattle’) means ‘pasturing’ (Eusebius of Caesarea: *i tuaraci*) and ‘pasturer, herdsman’ (in a homily of / ascribed to Etišē), cf. also *tuarac-akan* ‘herdsman’ (Bible+) [NHB 2: 890bc]. The place-name has been explained in NHB (2: 890c) as “a plain place of pasturing” (*tefi arōti tap’arak*). Hübschmann (1904: 476), however, departs from the meaning ‘herdsman’ (‘Hirt’) and interprets the place-name as ‘Hirtenebene’ (for the component *tap* see *ibid.* 388). The same view is reflected in Kapancjan 1940, V. Xačatrjan 1980: 111. Note that only the meaning ‘herdsman’ is present in dialects (see Ačarean 1913: 1019b). For ‘pasturer’ > ‘pasturing’ see also s.v. *hawran*.

Ačaryan (HAB 4: 424a) points out that *tuarac-a-tap* ‘place for cattle pasturing’ also (underlining mine - HM) appears as a place-name. In fact, there seems to exist no attestation for this compounded appellative. NHB (2: 860c, 890c) cites one illustration found in Aristakēs Lastivertc’i 16 (11th cent.): *i tuaracoy tap*, and refers to the place-name *Tuarac-a-tap*. It seems that both NHB and HAB take *tuaracoy tap* of Lastivertc’i as an appellative. However, a closer look at the passage shows that we are dealing with the same place-name *Tuarac-a-tap*, as is correctly understood by Yuzbašyan. The passage reads as follows: <...>, *xatay ijanē i Tuaracoy Tap*, *ew anti ijanē yəndarjak daštn Basenoy ar anar amroc’awn or koč’i Awnik* : “<...> направился к Туарац’ой Тап’у. Оттуда он спустился к широкой долине Басеана и [подошел] к неприступной крепости по названию Авник” [Yuzbašyan 1963: 89^{L20f}, 158b; 1968: 101, 166₁₈].

The place-name is obviously reflected in Urart. *Tuarašini ħubi*, see Kapancjan, *ibid.*; Eremyan 1963: 86; Arutjunjan 1965: 195-197; V. Xačatrjan 1980: 111; *Arutjunjan 1985?; Ĵahukyan 1985a: 369; 1987: 430, 443; 1988: 155. Instead of *tap*, here we find Urart. *ħubi*, somehow related with Arm. *hovit* ‘valley’, which is very productive in place-names (see Ĵahukyan 1985a: 370; 1987: 434, 442-443).

That a district-name is based on the idea of pasturing is very natural, cf. e.g. *Kog-ovit* (q.v.). Moreover, as we can see from an Urartian inscription, *Tuarašini ħubi* must have had a considerable quantity of cattle and flock [Arutjunjan 1965: 196-197].

PART II

EVALUATION AND OUTLOOK

A. ARMENIAN DIALECTS

1.1 Preliminaries: treatment of archaic features in dialects

The foundation of Armenian dialectology has been laid by Hrač'ya Ačāryan, the most outstanding figure in armenological disciplines, whose incredible diligence and productivity have been a constant source of my inspiration. His "Armenian dialectology" (1911), "Armenian dialectological dictionary" (1913) and eleven dialect descriptions form the basic storage of dialectological data, which are systematically included, supplemented and evaluated in his fundamental AčārHLPatm and AčārLiak, and especially in the crown of his studies, the etymological dictionary of Armenian (HAB).

Unfortunately, most of the studies of Ačāryan (as well as of Ĵahukyan and others) are written in Armenian and are therefore inaccessible for many students of Indo-European linguistics.

Apart from Ačāryan's and Ĵahukyan's works, the following general dialectological studies and handbooks should be mentioned: Patkanov 1869; Yovnanec 1897; Msereanc' 1899; Ľaribyan 1953; A. Grigoryan 1957; Greppin/Khachaturian 1986. Extensive phonological treatments are given in H. Muradyan 1982; Vaux 1998. A lucid overview on aspects of Armenian dialectology can be found in Weitenberg 2002.

Armenian dialects preserve many archaic features. Meillet (1936: 11) mentions two such examples: dial. **lizu* vs. Classical *lezu* 'tongue' and the preservation of the preposition *z-*.

Kortlandt (1980: 105 = 2003: 32) thinks that the reflex of PIE **rs, t'aršamim* : *t'arāmim* 'to wither', q.v. (see Winter 1966: 205), offers the only trace of early dialectal diversity. Clackson (2004-05: 154) points out that this assertion needs correction, and adds some other examples, namely the semantic doublets of *ays*

‘wind; (evil) spirit’ (q.v.), and *p’axnum* : *p’axč’im* both meaning ‘to flee’ in the Bible translation.

Beekes (2003: 142) basically agrees with Kortlandt. Then (142-143) he mentions the case of *-n* (see 2.2.1.3), stating that e.g. dial. *astetnə* (vs. ClArm. *astf* ‘star’, q.v.) "cannot have been taken from the Classical dialect; it must have been selected at an earlier stage". As another such case Beekes (ibid.) mentions the word for ‘milk’; see s.v. *kat’n* ‘milk’. His conclusion is that "the Classical language is one dialect (group), perhaps of a small number of speakers, that there were several dialects (though perhaps differing only on a limited scale), and that the modern dialects may preserve important data for the reconstruction of the oldest history of the language".

Viredaz (2003: 76) points out that pre-Classical dialect variants within Armenian are very few and very late. As an example he mentions *lizu* > *lezu* ‘tongue’. For a discussion of an important testimony from the 5th century see s.v. *ays* ‘spirit; wind’.

The problems of the origin of the Armenian dialects and their existence in the classical period, as well as numerous archaic dialectal words and features are studied in AčarHLPatm 2, 1951: 114-141, 324-439; Winter 1966; Jahukyan 1972; 1985; N. Simonyan 1979.

In these studies, dialectal archaisms are mostly represented as preservation of what has been lost in the classical language and/or in other dialects. Methodologically speaking, such an approach is not completely justifiable. My study intends to establish the philological background of the lexical data with systematic evaluation of deviant dialectal forms and features throughout the following chapters and the lexical corpus. In order to give an idea how I treat and evaluate dialectal archaisms and to demonstrate the importance of the dialectal data with respect to the etymological studies, I refer to my treatment of e.g. dial. **anum* vs. ClArm *anun* ‘name’ from PIE **h₃neh₃-mn* ‘name’, and Agulis *yɔns* vs. ClArm. *us* ‘shoulder’ from PIE **Homsos* ‘shoulder’.

The importance of the Armenian dialectal archaisms is not limited to Armenology proper. The Armenian peripheral dialects may provide us with information that can be indispensable even for establishing the status of the Indo-European cognate forms. I shall mention two examples when certain Greek, Latin and Armenian cultural terms of so-called Mediterranean substratum obtain invaluable additional material from Armenian dialects which confirms the connection and clarifies the status and spread of the terms.

Arm. *kat'n* 'milk' has been considered to be cognate to Greek **gala(kt)* [γάλα, γάλακτος] n. 'milk', Lat. **(g)lk-t-* [*lac, lactis*] n. 'milk', although the absence of *-l-* in Armenian makes the connection not evident. But the dialects of Agulis and Meṭri represent a form that have preserved the liquid: **katc'* < nom. **głkt-s* [Weitenberg 1985: 104-105]. This form shows that various reconstructions with initial **ġ-* or **d-* or **m-* should be given up.

In a series of articles (1986, 1992, 1993, 1996, 1997, 1999-2000, 2001), Weitenberg extensively treats several phonological features of Armenian dialects as reflecting old, partly even prehistoric isoglosses. These studies open new perspectives for the history of Armenian dialects, as well as for Armenian etymology. This can be exemplified by his rule on the reconstruction of an additional *y-* and related chronological issues such as Ačāryan's Law and consonant shift (see 2.3.1).

As is shown by Weitenberg's treatment of Ačāryan's Law, one can posit an old contrast between A) western dialects (Muš, Alaškert, Karin/Erzrum, etc.) and B) eastern-southeastern ones (Agulis, Łarabał, Van, etc., groups 6 and 7). For a discussion of a possible historical testimony from the 5th century for this dialectal contrast see s.v. *ays* 'wind; spirit'.

In a number of cases we can speak of a more narrow dialectal feature; e.g. in cases like *erkan* 'mill' (q.v.) the prothetic vowel before a word-initial *r-* is *a-* only in Agulis, Łarabał and other adjacent dialects whereas the Van subgroup joins to the remaining areas and the classical language.

1.2 5th century dialectal words

The collation of the dialectal distribution of a word with the geography of literary attestations often brings to remarkable conclusions. To give an example, *getař* 'river-bed; river-shore; outbranching river' is present in eastern dialects: Ararat (Erevan, Ošakan), Meṭri, Juła. The only exception is Muš. However, the only source for this is Amatuni, and I have an impression that the evidence he represents as from Muš actually comes from the Muš-speakers of the Ararat area (Aštarak, Yerevan, etc.), where many immigrants from Muš live since the 19th century. Another such example may be *argat* (q.v.).

The same distribution is found also with literary attestations. Łazar P'arpec'i (5th cent.) was native of the village of P'arpi (very close to the above-mentioned Ošakan); Step'anos Orbelean (13th cent.) was from Siwnik'; "Bařgirk' hayoc'" shows close affinities to the eastern dialects (I hope to discuss this elsewhere). This holds also for the place-name *Getař(u)*: 1) a river (= *Agri-č'ay*) and a district

in Aṭuank'; 2) a left tributary of the river Hrazdan. Thus, we are perhaps dealing with a word dialectally restricted to Eastern Armenia since the 5th century.

1.3 Dialectal words: new or old?

Throughout his dictionary (HAB), Ačāryan records numerous dialectal formations labelling them as *nor bafer* "new words". Sometimes, however, one doubts whether this definition is justifiable. Let us take a look at some examples. According to Ačāryan (HAB 2: 621a), dial. **arikot* and **arkot* are new words. The forms are: Muš, Van **arkot* 'stony place; precipice' [Amatuni 1912: 57b; Ačārean 1913: 133a]; Xotorjur **arikot* 'sloping, precipitous' [YušamXotorj 1964: 430a; HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 99b]; Hamšen *arangel* [Ačārean 1913: 135; 1947: 221]. Next to *z-ar-i-kot(-eal)* 'precipitous' ("Book of Chries" etc.), one also finds *ar-i-kot-eal* 'precipitous, sloped' in Movsēs Xorenac'i 1.16 (1913= 1991: 51^{L13}; transl. Thomson 1978: 99). The dialectal forms are not recent, thus.

***gišer(n)uk**: Among several dialectal derivatives from *gišer* 'night' which denote 'bat', Ačāryan (Ačārean 1913: 230b) also mentions Maškert (Arabkir/Xarberd) *gišeruk* and Łazax *gišernuk*.

Compare Lat. *vesper-ugō* 'bat'. Since Arm. *gišer* and Lat. *vesper*, as well as, probably, Arm. *-uk* and Lat. *-ugō* are etymologically related with each other (for the suffix see Olsen 1999: 584-592), and since Maškert and Łazax are located in the opposite peripheries of the Armenian-speaking territory, Arm. **gišer(n)uk* is a potentially old formation, though the independent creation of these forms cannot be excluded.

Darman-a-got 'Milky Way', lit. 'straw-stealer', is considered to be a new word [HAB 1: 640a]. The word is found only in eastern dialects, Ararat, Lori and Łarabař, and may indeed be a recent replacement of the older **Yard(a)got*. However, this is hard to verify since in Łarabař, next to 'Milky Way', *Darmanagot* denotes a small 'straw-stealing' cloud, and this may reflect older folk-beliefs since a similar association between 'Milky Way = Straw-Stealer' with 'straw-stealing wind' is recorded in Xotorjur, which is very far from Łarabař both geographically and dialectally. For more detail see 3.1.3.

***erat'at'**: Ačāryan (HAB 2: 55a) represents Łarabař, Lori *hərat'at'* < **er-a-t'at'*, composed of *eri* 'shoulder' (q.v.) and *t'at'* 'arm, paw', as a new word. Probably, Xotorjur **erelt'at'* 'shoulder-blade' [YušamXotorj 1964: 447b] belongs here too, though the nature of the internal *-l-* is obscure. Since these dialects are not contiguous, **er-a-t'at'* may be old.

Šulaver (in the territory of Georgia) **net-ōj* 'a kind of snake' [Ačārean 1913: 811b], obviously *net* 'arrow' + *ōj* 'snake'. Ačāryan (HAB 3: 442b) represents as a new dialectal word derived from *net* 'arrow'. One finds Dersim (K'ti) *nēdig* 'a poisonous snake', represented by Baṛamyan (1960: 155a) only in the glossary of dialectal words. It certainly represent a diminutive form of *net* 'arrow'. Since these dialectal areas are very far from each other, a question arises: are we dealing with an archaism or independent innovations?

Ačāryan (HAB 4: 413a) places *taṭṭjik* 'a young girl/woman' in his list of new dialectal words. The compound is present in the dialects Davrež/Tabrez [Ačārean 1913: 1032b], and Metri (*təṭaxč'ek'*, see Aṭayan 1954: 332). Certainly composed of *tay* 'child' and *aṭjik* 'girl'. Given the literary attestation of *tay aṭjik* 'a small girl', as well as the fact that in southeastern and eastern dialects *tay* means 'boy' rather than '(generic) child' (see HAB 4: 412b), one can assume that *taṭṭjik* is relatively old.

k'atoc 'mowing time' (in Karin, see Ačārean 1913: 1092b), a derivative of ClArm. *k'atem* 'to pluck, weed, mow, harvest', is considered to be a new dialectal word [HAB 4: 541b]. However, this dialectal word is not confined to Karin. More importantly, the word is identical with the old Armenian month-name *k'at-oc*, which has often been wrongly interpreted as 'month of goats'.

Conclusion: The definition "new words" should be clarified. The mere fact that a word is not attested in literature does not necessarily imply that it is new. A dialectal word can be labelled as new only after a thorough analysis, which should reckon, next to linguistic details, also with factors like the dialectal spread, underlying folk-beliefs, etc.

1.4 Textual replacement by dialectal synonyms

A number of classical words attested in the earliest edition of the Alexander Romance, published first by H. Simonyan (1989), in the final edition have been replaced by dialectal equivalents:

moṭ-ēz 'lizard' (Bible+); widespread in dialects, also in the form **motoz*-. In the earliest edition of the Alexander Romance (see H. Simonyan 1989: 431^{L5}): *moṭēzk' meck' orpēs višapk'* "lizards as big as dragons"; the final edition has here: *moṭozk' k'an zvišaps mec ēin* (306^{L4f}). The classical form *moṭēz*, thus, has been replaced by dialectal **motoz*-, present in Van, Moks, Salmast, etc.

The word *maškat'ew* '(having) a wing of skin', an epithet of the bat (*č'ḥjikan*) in "Hexaameron", in the independent meaning 'bat' appears first in the earliest edition of the Alexander Romance (see H. Simonyan 1989: 423^{L-3}). In the final

edition we find *čəfjikan* instead (op. cit. 290^{L-3}). Since *maškat'ew* 'bat' is poorly and lately attested and is represented only in some peripheric dialects, viz. Hamšen and Xotorjur (see s.v.), whereas *č'itj*, *č'fjikan* (Bible+; dialects of Sebastia, Axalc'xa, Alaškert [HAB 3: 628-629]) seems to be the principal word for 'bat', one may assume that the original translator belonged to a peripheric dialect variation where *maškat'ew* was the term for 'bat'. The later editor(s) considered *maškat'ew* odd or little known and has/have replaced it by the "more normal" *č'fjikan*.

But sometimes things are not clear. For instance, instead of *sex* 'melon' (Bible+), preserved in several dialects, the final edition has *metrapop* (see H. Simonyan 1989: 306^{L-3}, 431^{L-5}), which is attested in the Bible onwards but is absent in dialects. Moreover, it denotes a particular kind of melon (synonymical to MArm. *šamam*) rather than merely 'melon'.

In some cases, specific terms are interpolated. For instance: *aniw sayli, or ē kundn* "a wagon-wheel which is *kundn*" (see H. Simonyan 1989: 432^{L-16}, in the earliest edition). The word *kunt(n)* or *kund(n)* 'wheel' is attested in "Book of Chries" onwards and represented by Ačāryan (HAB 1: 593-594) as belonging to the more widespread *gund* 'ball', though some philological details are unclear. In dialects it refers to the wheel of wagons, mills, spinning-wheels, etc. For the translator of our text, as we saw, *kundn* has the specific meaning 'wagon-wheel'. It is interesting to note that in the dialect of Alaškert one finds *kund* (pl. *kəndner*), in the very same specific meaning 'wagon-wheel' and with an initial *k-* which presupposes a classical *k-* rather than a *g-* (see HAB 1: 594a).

In different editions of the Alexander Romance we find *xec'geti(n)* or *xē/āč'ap'ar/r* as the words for 'crayfish', see H. Simonyan 1989: 261 (thrice *xec'getin*, and once *xec'ip'ar*), 290 (pl/coll. *xec'getneay*), 413 (*xec'geti, or ē xič'ip'ar*), 423 (*xēč'ip'ar*), 478 (thrice *xāč'ap'ar*). In a 16th century *kafā*, Zak'aria Gnunec'i (of Gnuni) introduces *saratfanay* as synonymous to *xec'ip'ar* (see H. Simonyan 1989: 261). The form astonishingly resembles the word for 'crayfish' in the dialect of Moks, viz. *sālātrāna* (Orbeli 2002: 320, rendered by Russ. *krab* 'crab'), cf. also Van *salatrana* 'Satan'¹. Zak'aria of Gnuni introduced *saratfanay* probably because it was a normal word for his vernacular dialect. The original domain of the Gnuni seems to have been found around the areas (*Afiovit* etc.) immediately north and east of Lake Van (see Adontz 1970: 240; Toumanoff 1963:

¹ Ačāryan (1952: 72, 104, 290; HAB 4: 164a) placed these forms s.v. *safamandr* 'salamander'.

205; Garsoïan 1989: 374-375; Hewsén 1992: 343; S. Petrosyan 1999: 176). One may therefore assume that we are dealing with a dialectal word confined to the Van-Moks area already in the 16th century.

1.5 Interdialectal loans

Arm. **brinč* etc. 'snowball-tree': Agulis *b/prišnə*, with allophonic *b*- and *p*- (the shift *b* > *p* being irregular for this dialect), is considered to be a loan from Łarabat *prišnə* [Ačaryan 1935: 93]. The latter probably reflects **brōš*- or **brōš*-, cf. Łazax *p'riš*, Łaradat *brōšni* (see 1.12.1).

In Hamšen region, the initial *g*- yields *g'*- in Mala, *k*- in Čanik, and *g*- in Trapizon. In view of this, Ačaryan (1947: 42) treats Hamšen ClArm. *gerandi* 'scythe' > Hamšen *gerəndi* (also *k'erəndi*), *gattikur* 'a plant' > *gaṭgur*, etc. as borrowed from other dialects, such as Trapizon.

Šamšadin/Dilijān *xemk* 'the wooden frame of a sieve' (see Mežunc' 1989: 205b), for which cf. Van, Moks *xim*, *xemk*; Juṭa *xemk*; etc. (see HAB 3: 93-94). The initial *x*- is irregular for Šamšadin, Łaza and adjacent areas. One therefore might assume that the initial *x*- in Šamšadin/Dilijān *xemk* is due to the influence of famous wool-carders and felt-makers from Moks, Ozim, and other Van-group-speaking areas, who used to travel throughout Armenia, Caucasus, and even farther. Note especially a fairy-tale from Łazax the hero of which is from Van (HŽHek' 6, 1973: 318-329).

In the same fairy-tale (326^{L3}) one finds *anet* 'wool-card'. In the dialects of Van, Moks, Lori, Muš, Širak, etc., **anet* 'bow' (from ClArm. *atətn* 'bow; rainbow', q.v.) is described as 'a bow-like instrument used for combing and preparing wool and cotton (a card)'. One may wonder if, e.g. in Lori, Łazax, and Širak, this semantic shift too was motivated by the influence of the wool-carders and felt-makers from Van-group-speaking areas.

lurj 'light, shiny; awake; cheerful; (light) blue' has been preserved in few dialects: Muš *lurč* 'a kind of blue canvas that is made in Haleb (= Turk. *zalı*)'; T'iflis *lrč'anal* 'to turn blue' (referring to a beaten and bitten body); Akn. *lrjuc* 'in one's waking hours' [HAB 2: 304]; as well as in Syria: Svedia *lurč* 'blue' [Ačaryan 2003: 570], or *laurč/č* 'violet (colour)' [Andreasyan 1967: 149, 363b]; K'esab *lorj* 'light blue' (also in derivatives) [Č'olak'ean 1986: 204a, 244]; Aramo *laurč* 'blue' [Łaribyan (1958: 54, 65a)]. As we can see, the "pure" adjectival colour designation *lurj* 'blue' has been preserved only in the dialects of Syria, whereas in Muš we find only a technical meaning: 'a kind of blue canvas that is made in Haleb'. Since Haleb (Aleppo) is situated in NW Syria, very close to Svedia and

K'esab, one may assume that the dialect of Muš has borrowed the word from the dialects of Syria, together with the product.

On interdialectal contacts in the valley of Ararat see Bagdasarjan-Tapalcjan 1976.

1.6 "Ašxarhac'oyc'" (Armenian Geography): agreement between historical and dialectal distributions

The 7th century Armenian Geography ("Ašxarhac'oyc'") by Anania Širakac'i mentions the following products of the province of Gugark': *analut* 'hind, deer' (probably 'fallow deer'), *hačar cař* or *hačar-a-cař* 'beech-tree', *serkewil* or *s(o)rovil* 'quince', *tawsax* or *tōsax* 'box-tree' [Soukry 1881: 34^{L-1f}; French transl. 46; MovsXorenMaten 1865: 610; A. G. Abrahamyan 1944: 350^{L31}; Eremyan 1963: 110; Greppin 1983a: 15; Hewsens 1992: 65, 65A].

The tree-name *hačar*- 'beech' (Agat'angelos+; see HAB s.v.; Greppin 1983a) has been preserved only in Hamšen, Lori, Łazax, Łarabať [HAB 3: 16a]. The tree *Fagus orientalis* is native to Balkan Peninsula, Crimea, Caucasus, N. Iran [P. Friedrich 1970: 112-115; Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984: 623 = 1995: 535, with lit.; FITurk 7, 1982: 658; Mallory 1989: 115-116, 160, 216; Friedrich and Mallory apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 58-60]. It is common in N. Turkey and is scattered in W. and S. Anatolia [FITurk 7, 1982: 657-658, 887: map 77]. It is one of the most typical trees of the Hamšen area (see espec. T'orlak'yan 1982: 25f, 31, etc.). Thus, *Fagus orientalis* is present only in the extreme NW, N and NE of the Armenian speaking territory and is absent from the rest of the Armenian highland. This is clearly seen especially in the maps: P. Friedrich 1970: 113^{M16}; FITurk 7, 1982: 887^{M77}; Mallory/Adams 1997: 59. The distribution thus perfectly corresponds to the dialectal spread (Hamšen, Lori, Łazax, Łarabať) and the testimony of "Ašxarhac'oyc'" (Gugark').

The term *tawsax* 'box-tree' (Bible+), another product of Gugark', refers to *Buxus sempervirens* which, except for Europe and NW Africa, is present in Transcaucasia, N. Iran, and in Turkey it is confined mainly to the Pontic coastal areas and in Cilicia [FITurk 7, 1982: 631, 886^{M74}]. On Hamšen see T'orlak'yan 1982: 25, 28, 31. From FITurk 7, 1982: 631 we learn that in Rize "the species forms a moss forest above Hemçin". Remarkably, the word *tawsax* has been preserved only in the dialect of Hamšen: *dəsxı*, *dəsxəni*, GSG *dəsxu*, *dəsxec* 'ə (see Ačairyan 1947: 12, 92-93, 255).

Most remarkable is *analut*', on which see s.v.

Arm. *gaz(a)pēn* 'manna' is scarcely attested in literature and has been preserved in the dialects of Muš, Alaškert, Ozim, Karin (Erzrum), Axalc'xa [HAB 1: 499b]. Since the district of Karin neighbours with Turuberan, and Axalc'xa belongs to the dialect group of Karin (Erzrum), one can speak of the original dialectal restriction of this word.

The oldest attestations are found in "Ašxarhac'oyc'" by Anania Širakac'i (from Širak) and in "History of Tarōn" by Zenob. In the former, *gazpe/ēn* is mentioned as a product of Turuberan (the province where the district of Tarōn is located), alongside with *metr* 'honey' [MovsXorenMaten 1865: 608^{L2}; A. G. Abrahamyan 1944: 349^{L24}]. In the long recension (Soukry 1881: 31^{L4}), *gazpe/ēn* is missing. Instead one reads: *metr anoyš k'an zamenayn erkri* : "the sweetest honey in the world" [Hewsen 1992: 63]. Also Sasun, a district south to Taron, abounds in manna, see K'alant'ar 1895: 30-31; Petoyan 1965: 101-104. According to Amirdovlat' Amasiac'i (see S. Vardanyan 1990: 93, §392), manna is abundant in Amid, that is, further south-east to Sasun.

On manna, "History of Tarōn" (A. Abrahamyan 1941: 143-144) informs: *zor gazpēn* (var. *gazpan*) *koč'emk'* : "which we call *gazpēn*" (in transl by V. Vardanyan 1989: 59: *gazpa*). Under "we" the population of Tarōn should be understood. These attestations point to a geographical restriction which basically agrees with the dialectal spread of the word.

Another example is *arawš* 'a kind of bird identic with or resembling bustard', only in the long recension of "Ašxarhac'oyc'"; probably identic with Xotorjur **caroš* 'a kind of bird with very tasty flesh, which sings in whistling voice, big partridge'. See s.v. for more detail.

1.7 Further issues on "Ašxarhac'oyc'"

In both the long and the short recensions of "Ašxarhac'oyc'" one finds *zarik* as a product of the province of Korčēk' = Korčayk' [Soukry 1881: 32^{L13}; MovsXorenMaten 1865: 608^{L14}; A. G. Abrahamyan 1944: 349^{L34}].

The word *zarik* refers to 'arsenic' and has been borrowed from Mİran. **zarnik* (> Arm. **zarrik* > *zarik*), cf. Pers. *zarnī(x)*, Arab. *zarnīx/q* etc. 'arsenic' [Hübschmann 1897: 149; HAB 2: 81]. However, Eremyan (1963: 93-94) mentions other semantic nuances and points out that the establishing of the specific meaning of *zarik* within the context of "Ašxarhac'oyc'" needs additional evidence. See also Hewsen 1992: 176₁₂₇ (brief note). On the map of "Ašxarhac'oyc'" apud Eremyan 1963, *zarik* is conjecturally indicated in the district of Čahuk which can be shown to be correct by a curious accident.

A more recent borrowing from Pers. or Arab. *zarnīx* is MArm. *zārne/x*, *zīnex* (MijHayBař 1, 1987: 209a221a; also Hübschmann 1897: 149; ModArm. *zīnex*). Present in the dialects of Moks, Van, Akn, T'iflis, etc. [HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 422b].

That *zarīk* and *zārnix* refer to 'arsenic' is clearly shown by Amirdovlat' Amasiac'i (15th cent.) who treats these forms as equivalent to Pers. *zīnex* and Arm. *mkn-deł*, literally 'mouse-poison' and describes the varieties and the medical value of the arsenic (see S. Vardanjanc 1990: 119 §525, comments 606₅₂₅). He also notes that the arsenic is used for depriving the armpit of hair (ibid.). Compare Moks *zārnex* described as follows: "yellow earth used for removing one's body-hair" [HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 422b; Orbeli 2002: 222].

One can even specify the precise location of the mines of *zarīk* mentioned in "Ašxarhac'oyc'". According to Srvanjtyanc' (1, 1978 [< 1884]: 402), there are mines of *zārnex* in the vilayet of Van, districts of Norduz and Ĵulamerg, and one finds select coal in the vicinity of the village of Šamanis. Since Norduz and Ĵulamerg are situated in the territory of the province of Korčayk', more precisely - in the district of Čahuk (see e.g. the map in Cuinet 2, 1891: 522/523), one can identify the evidence from "Ašxarhac'oyc'" (7th century) with the testimony of Garegin Srvanjtyanc' (1884 AD) positing mines of arsenic in the district of Čahuk.

According to Strabo (16.1.24), Korduk' (in Korčayk') produced *γαγγήτις λίθος* 'lignite', i.e. 'a variety of brown coal', which chases serpents (see Ačarıyan 1940a: 90, ModArm. transl. 91). This is obviously identical with the testimony by G. Srvanjtyanc' on coal in this area.

1.8 Anania Širakac'i

On this author see 1.6 and 1.7.

Parallel to *Karič*, the standard term for the constellation Scorpio, Anania Širakac'i sometimes (see A. G. Abrahamyan 1944: 329^{L10}, 330^{L12}) uses the vernacular form *Kor* (see s.v.v.). The word *karič* is widely attested in the 5th century onwards in both meanings 'scorpion' and 'the constellation Scorpio', and is widespread in dialects ranging from Sebastia, Muš, Karin to Agulis, Salmast, Łarabał, from Axalc'xa and T'iflis to Moks and Ozim. In contrast with this, *kor* is attested only in Širakac'i (7th cent., Širak) and some later, MArm. sources: in a riddle by Nersēs Šnorhali (12th cent., Cilicia), Fables by Vardan Aygekc'i (12-13th cent., Tluk', Cilicia), Geoponica (13th cent.), Amirdovlat' Amasiac'i (15th cent., Amasia), has been preserved in some W and SW dialects: Cilicia,

Xarberd, Akn, Arabkir [*kə*-class], as well as in extremely SE: Marāṭa and Salmast (if Sal., absent from the list of abbreviations, is for Salmast) [*l*-class]. One may assume that *kor* was a dialectally restricted form present also in the vernacular of Anania Širakac'i.

The unexplained asterism ***Arkawt*** is attested only in Anania Širakac'i (A. G. Abrahamyan 1944: 331^{L3}). It probably derives from *ark-an-em* 'to throw (a missile etc.)' and may be regarded thus as a vernacular term for Orion, Orion's belt, or Sagittarius, though Širakac'i usually uses the standard terms *Kšīr* and *Aleṭnawor* (see 3.1.4). In this case, however, dialectal evidence is missing.

1.9 Nersēs Šnorhali (12th cent., Cilicia)

The riddle Nr 112 by Nersēs Šnorhali [Mnac'akanyan 1980: 261] reads:

*I hiwsisoy gay jiawor,
Hanc' sur ert'ay zinč' t'ewawor,
Zp'ičik's aīnē kotor-kotor,
Xayt'ē zmarđoyñ ač'k'n zed kor.*

"There comes from the north [an] equestrian,
Rides as a sword, as having wings,
Brakes pine-trees in pieces,
Bites the eye of the man as a scorpion".

The answer is ***parxar*** 'a northern cold wind', which otherwise is attested only in Geoponica (13th cent.), *pa(r)xrc'i*, and derives from *Parxar*, the mountain-range called also *Pontic*, in areas close to Xotorjur [HAB 4: 62b]. Preserved in Xotorjur, Baberd *barxar*, Zeyt'un *baxər/yc'a* 'a northern cold wind' [HAB 4: 63a].

p'iči 'pine-tree' (John Chrysostom, Fables of Mxit'ar Goš, Geoponica, etc.); present in Xotorjur [YušamXotorj 1964: 518b], Hačəṇ, Svedia [HAB 4: 503-504].

kor 'scorpion' is further attested only in Anania Širakac'i (7th cent., Širak) and some later, MArm. sources: in Fables by Vardan Aygekc'i (12-13th cent., Tluk', Cilicia), Geoponica (13th cent.), Amirdovlat' Amasiac'i (15th cent., Amasia); preserved in some W and SW dialects (Cilicia, Xarberd, Akn, Arabkir), as well as in extremely SE (Marāṭa, Salmast).

Thus, three words in the same riddle by Nersēs Šnorhali (Cilicia), viz. *kor*, *parxar*, *p'iči*, seem to be restricted mostly to NE, E and SE dialects of *kə*-class, particularly in Cilicia and Pontic and adjacent areas.

1.10 Back loans

MPers. **bāzūk* ‘arm’ (cf. Pers. *bāzū*) > Arm. *bazuk* ‘1. arm; 2. beet’ > Pers. *pāzū* ‘beet’ (see HAB 1: 377; G. Asatryan 1990: 143).

Arm. *gerandi* ‘scythe’ (q.v.): Łarabat *k^yarāndi* (vs. regular *kerāndu*) and Kirzen *k^yarāntⁱ* can be explained as back loans from Azerbaijani. Similarly, Hamšen *k^yerendi* may have been borrowed from Laz *k^herendi*, which in turn is considered to be an Armenian loan.

As is demonstrated by Ačāryan (HAB 3: 204a), Van, Muš, Alaškert, Bulanəx **čiwł* ‘flock of sheep’ derives from *čiwł* ‘branch’ and *čel* ‘to divide’, and Kurd. *čel* ‘(sheep-)flock’ is borrowed from Armenian (see 3.9.1). Sasun **čol* ‘flock of sheep’ recorded by Ačāryan (1913: 739b) without any etymology or internal connections, may have been borrowed from Kurdish. Thus: Arm. *čiwł* ‘branch, division; flock’ > Kurd. *čel* ‘(sheep-)flock’ > Arm. dial. (Sasun) **čol* ‘flock of sheep’.

Next to *partēz* ‘garden; kitchen-garden’ (Bible+; dialects), there is *pahēz* ‘kitchen-garden’ (Paterica+; SE dialects) for which I tentatively propose the following scenario: Iran. **pardēz* > Arm. *partēz* (at an early stage) > NWIran. **pa(r)hēz* (with the regular development **rt* > NWIran. *rθ* > *(r)h*) > Arm. *pahēz*. We might be dealing here, thus, with a “double back loan” (or a re-re-borrowing?).

For another similar case see s.v. *thuk(n)* ‘a kind of small water worm’, perhaps ‘leech’.

Arm. *p^yaycañ* ‘spleen’ > Cappadocian Greek *πεισάχι* ‘id.’ > Xotorjur *sipex* ‘id.’ (see s.v.).

1.11 Re-borrowings in dialects

Iranian lexemes that have already been borrowed in Classical Armenian may be re-borrowed in different forms independently in individual dialects. Two well-known examples: dial. *bazar* ‘market’ vs. ClArm. *vačar* ‘trade, market’, cf. Pahl. *vāčār* vs. Pers. *bāzār* [HAB 4: 298-299; Ĵahukyan 1987: 491; HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 145a]; Arm. dial. *bet^{ar}* ‘worse, ugly’ vs. ClArm. *vatt^{ar}* ‘bad, worse, evil’ (Bible+; Tⁱiflis dial.), cf. Pahl. *vattar* ‘worse, bad, evil’, NPers. *bat(t)ar* ‘id.’ [HAB 4: 312a].

Arm. *erang* ‘colour, dye’ (Bible+) is a MIran. loan, cf. MPers. *rang* ‘colour, dye’. The form has not been preserved in Armenian dialects [HAB 2: 39a]. Instead, one finds dial. **rang* as a recent borrowing from Pers. *rang*, cf. e.g. Ararat *řang* [Nawasardeanc^y 1903: 103b] or *(h)erang* [Markosyan 1989: 370b] and Goris *erang* [Margaryan 1975: 513a].

Alongside of *rang*, Persian also has *ranj* ‘colour’ (see Steingass 587b) which seems to be reflected in some Arm. dialectal compounds. Whether Ozim *narenj* ‘dye thread’ belongs with *narinj* ‘orange’ is uncertain (see HAB 3: 431b). More probably, I think, it is composed as **nar-* ‘to dye’ + **ranj* ‘colour’ (see 2.3.1 under the suffix *-awt*, on *narawt* ‘coloured thread or plait/braid’). Further, Ararat *mkna’inj* ‘mouse-coloured (e.g. horse, cat)’ [Amatuni 1912: 483a] can be interpreted as *mukn* ‘mouse’ + conjunction *-a-* + **rinj* ‘colour’.

More interesting are cases where the old and recent borrowings display not only formal but also semantic contrast, see 2.1.38 on ***darman*** ‘medicine, remedy’ etc.

1.12 Internal etymology

The examination of dialectal materials plays an indispensable role in etymological research in many respects. Apart from well-known cases where some peripheral dialects preserve a phoneme, morpheme or other features which are otherwise lost in ClArm. and in the majority of dialects (see e.g. s.v.v. *kat’n*, *katin*, *c’ax/k’*, *us*, etc.), one has to reckon with dialectal material first of all in dealing with the internal etymology. The latter is the starting point of any etymological research since there can be no external comparison before reaching a clear picture of the internal evidence. Very frequently, literary attestations are too scarce, and the dialects provide us with valuable information to bridge the gaps in literary testimony. Here are some examples.

1.12.1 A considerable number of plant-names point to the Mediterranean substratum, and some of them also have possibly related forms in Semitic languages. In some cases it is very difficult to determine whether the Armenian term originates from the Mediterranean substratum or is a Semitic loan. The analysis becomes even more complex when the Armenian term displays by-forms with phonological and/or word-formative irregularities, which renders the reconciliation between internal and external data practically impossible. Let us take a look, for example, at the word for ‘snowball-tree etc.’.

brinc’ (the fruit), *brinc’-(en)i* (the tree); dial. ****bro/ōš-***, ****btinc’/j-***, etc. ‘*Celtis australis* or *occidentalis*’ (see Ališan 1895: 101^{Nr387}; HAB 1: 490b) or ‘snowball-tree, guelder rose (*Viburnum opulus*)’. According to Malxaseanc’ (1: 397b), *brinc’-i* means ‘*Viburnum opulus*’, whereas the alternating dialectal forms *pršni* and *p’ršni* are taken as synonymous to *ltn-eni* and denote ‘*Celtis australis*’ or, according to Sepetčean, ‘*Celtis caucasica*’ (Malxaseanc’ 2: 221c; 4: 129a, 528b).

Abeghyan (Abeghian 1899: 61) distinguishes *bīnč'-i* 'Viburnum opulus' and *bīi* 'Celtis australis' (the latter form is otherwise unknown to me).

Attested in Galen (*bīnč'*, *bīnč'*, etc., see Ališan 1895: 101^{Nr387}; Greppin 1985: 139) and Juansēr [HAB 1: 490b]. NHB (2: 1061b) has only as a dialectal word.

Preserved in the dialects of Akn, Arabkir, Xarberd, etc. **bīnč'*, **bīnč'-i*. Muš, Baṭeš, Bulanəx have **b'īnč'* [HAB 1: 490b]. Šatax *pətišk* 'a wild plant' which is found in the glossary of purely dialectal words of the dialect description [M. Muradyan 1962: 215b] apparently belongs here, too. That Šatax *pətišk* reflects **btinč'-k* is confirmed by Moks *pətinč'k*, gen. *pəṭənč'kə*, pl. *pəṭənč'kətir* 'кустарный] плод, мелкий, круглый, желтый и с косточкой, мяса мало, терпкий, поспекает осенью' (see Orbeli 2002: 313).

Ališan (1895: 631^{Nr3069}, 635^{Nr3103}) records Sasun, Muš *p'īnj'k*, *p'īnj'k'-i* vs. northern *p'īšni* describing as 'a shrub with hard wood and sweet fruit of the size of a small acorn' and identifying, though hesitantly, with *bīnč'*. Note Sasun *pīnč'*, *pīnč'*, *pīnj'k* [Petoyan 1954: 153; 1965: 517-518].

Agulis *bīāšnə*, *pīāšnə* Łarabaṭ *pīēšnə* (the berry), *pīšnēne* (the tree), Łazax *p'īroš*, Łaradaṭ *bīošni* [HAB 1: 490b].

Ačāryan (HAB 1: 490b) notes the resemblance with Assyr. *burāšu*, Hebr. *b'roš*, Aram. *brūtā*. He, however, leaves the etymology open since the Semitic words mean 'cypress'. N. Mkrtč'yan (1983: 26) advocates the connection stating that the corrected meaning of Akkad. *burāšu* is 'Juniperus giganteus', which is identic with the meaning of Arm. **bīoš-ni*, **bīāš-nə*.² He also notes that the Armenian form *bīnč'* may have a different origin, which seems improbable.

The semantic difference is not a decisive argument against the connection. The snowball-tree and the juniper or the like are notoriously marked in Armenian tradition. Arm. *bīnč'ī* is a strong 'Abwehrmittel' against the Evil Eye [Abeghian 1899: 61]. Note also the curse formula from Axalc'xa: *bīnč'ī terew ute* "may he eat leaf of snowball-tree" (see Ačārean 1913: 207b). In a number of traditional stories, the juniper protects Jesus Christ, or is related with certain saints (Łanalanyan 1969: 115-116).

The tree-names under question come from Mediterranean and Near East areas: Gr. *βράθυ* n. 'savin, Juniperus sabina; Juniperus foetidissima' (also *βόρατον* n., *βορατίνη*), Lat. *bratus* (Pliny) 'an Anatolian cypress'; Aram. *b'rat*, Hebr. *b'roš*, Assyr. *burāšu* 'cypress' < Proto-Semitic **brāθu* (see Huld 1981: 303).

² I wonder where did he take his information on this meaning of the Armenian word.

Georgian *brinjʰaos-xe* ‘*Celtis australis* or *caucasica*’ is considered an Armenian loan [HAB 1: 491a].

Some of the Armenian dialectal forms, viz. Łazax and Łaradał, point to **brōš* or **brōš̌*, which is derivable from Semitic, cf. Assy. *burāšu* and Hebr. *bērōš̌*. In view of the forms in closely related Łazax and Łaradał, Łarabał *prēšnə* too seems to reflect **brōš̌*. Given the allophones with initial *b-* and *p-*, Agulis *b/prāšnə* is considered to be a loan from Łarabał [Ačaryan 1935: 93]. Since the accented penultimate *-ó-* yields *-a-* in Agulis (see Ačaryan 1935: 66-67), one may restore **brōš̌-* for Agulis.

Some comments on Łarabał vocalism are in order. In view of the examples like *boxi* ‘hornbeam’ > *péxi*, the derivation **brōš̌-* > Łarabał *prēšnə* seems regular. A closer look shows, however, that Łarabał *-ε-* reflects an older *-o-* only when it follows an initial *b-* or *v-* (see 2.1.39.1). There are two possibilities: 1) the rule also operated with **brō-*; 2) Łarabał *prēšnə* reflects a form different than the one seen in Łazax, Łaradał and Agulis, and requires another solution. Since accented *i* yields Łarabał *ε* (see Ačarean 1899: 68; Davt’yan 1966: 35), one may derive Łarabał *prēšnə* from **brinč̣-n-*. For *-nč̣-* > Łarabał *-š-* (cf. *matnašunč̣* > Łarabał *mənnāšōš* ‘a suppurative swelling on one’s finger-tip’) see 2.1.11. The same solution is given by Ałayan (1954: 39, 84) for Metri *bərešnə*.

How to reconcile **brōš̌-* with the other forms, viz. **brinč̣-* and **btinč̣/ǰ̣*? The latter forms may be due to epenthetic *-n-* (see 2.1.30.1) or metathesis of the nasal element of the tree-suffix: **-Vš-n-* > **-Vnš-> *-Vnč̣-*. The vowel *-i-* can be secondary, analogical; thus: **bi(ō/u)š-ni* > **brinč̣-i* (the tree) >> **brinč̣-* (the berry). The shift *-nš-* > *-nč̣-* is uncertain, however. Note that next to forms with sibilant *-š-* there are ones with dental stops, cf. Gr. *βόρατον*, Aram. *brūtā*, etc., so the Armenian may reflect a substratum form with an affricate. One can also offer other alternatives for *-inč̣/ǰ̣*: 1) **-in-ieh₂-* > Arm. *-inǰ̣*, cf. Gr. *βόρατ-ί νη* vs. *βόρατον*; 2) compare other Armenian plant-names (Persian/Arabic loans) such as *t’urin̄ǰ̣*, *narin̄ǰ̣* ‘orange’ (see HAB s.v.v.).

Arm. **bi-o/ōš* vs. *biri* (Abetyan) and **bi/tinč̣-* can have been synchronically interpreted as containing a “plant-suffix” *-o/ōš* seen e.g. in *t’et-awš* vs. *t’et-i* ‘elm’ (q.v.); see also 2.3.1.³

³ Any relation with Burushaski *biranč̣̌* ‘mulberry’? It is remarkable that some of the Caucasian comparable forms of the term for ‘blackberry etc.’ refer to ‘guelder rose’, which is identic with the meaning of Arm. *brinč̣*. See s.v. *mor* ‘blackberry’.

1.12.2 **brut**, *i*-stem: GDSg *brt-i*, GDPl *brt-i-c'* (Bible); *a*-stem: GDPl *brt-a-c'* (Yovhannēs Erznkac'i Corcorec'i, 13-14th cent.) 'potter'; widespread in dialects [HAB 1: 493b]; e.g. Moks *pərut* 'гончар' [Orbeli 2002: 315].

Ĵahukyan (1987: 313) takes *brut* as possibly borrowed from Hitt. *purut* 'clay'. We are probably dealing with an older (derivative?) **purut-i* (cf. Ĵahukyan, op. cit. 316). The semantics seems to be corroborated by dial. **brt-in* 'a kind of red clay' (< *brut*, according to HAB ibid.), mentioned by Ĵahukyan. A philological discussion is in order. The following is not to argue against the Hittite etymology of *brut* but only to demonstrate that the philological background and the internal data deserve a more careful look.

The meaning 'clay' of dial. **brt-in* can hardly directly reflect the Hittite semantics since *-in* points rather to a derivative. Besides, Ačāryan (1913: 212b) does not specify the form and location of the dialectal word. Such a form is found e.g. in Šatax: *pərt-en* 'treated clay to make pottery with' (see M. Muradyan 1962: 77, 215b). One might rather derive this word from the verb represented e.g. by Moks *pərtil* 'мять, смазывать, мешать' = 'to batter, plunge, anoint, mix' (see Orbeli 2002: 314). Note especially Moks *pərtun xot* 'горшечная глина = potter's clay', lit. 'earth' (see Orbeli ibid.).

Thus, dial. **brt-in* cannot be used as evidence for a possible basic meaning 'clay' of *brut*. For this purpose one might mention a better example, viz. the derivative *brt-eay* 'made of clay' (attested in Zenob).

1.12.3 Next to *ktrem* 'to cut', *ktur-k'*, etc., one finds **ktir* as the second member of the poorly attested compound *hat-u-ktir* (also *hat-u-kčir*) (see HAB 2: 642a). No dialectal forms specifically belonging to **ktir* are recorded by Ačāryan (HAB 2: 642-643), though the dialectal descendants of the forms *k(o)tor* and *ktrem* are abundant. One would like to find more internal evidence for **ktir*, too, since it would be helpful in establishing the status of the poorly attested and ambiguous *hat-u-kt/čir*.

Among the forms mentioned by Ačāryan s.v. *kotor* (HAB 2: 643a), Maraṭa *kutir* seems interesting; see also Davt'yan 1966: 400.

In the dialects of Van, Sasun and Šatax, there is a similar form, viz. *kətir*, meaning 'flock of sheep' (see Ačāryan 1913: 619a; M. Muradyan 1962: 212b). According to A. Xač'atryan (1993: 107), the word is connected with *ktr-em* 'to cut'. This is corroborated by semantic parallels presented in 3.9.1. I suggest to add here also *ktir-k'* 'dowry' (John Chrysostom); for the semantic development cf. *bažin-k'* 'dowry' from *bažin* 'share, cut' (see 3.8.2).

1.12.4 *xučič* ‘scarecrow’ is attested in Evagrius of Pontus. In “Baġgirk’ hayoc’” (Amalyan 1975: 113^{Nr95}, cf. 145^{Nr224}), *xočič* is glossed alongside of *xrtuilak* ‘scarecrow’ and **bo-xoxič* (q.v.). The root seems to be *xuč* ‘scarecrow, bogy’ found (pl. *xuč-k*) in John Chrysostom. Ačāryan (2: 418a) rejects the relation of these words with *xučap* ‘panic fear’ (Philo etc.): *xučap-k* ‘bogy, ghost’ (Bible) on the strength of the dialectal forms: Sebastia *xoxj* ‘bogy’, Erzinka ets. **xox* ‘etc.’. He (Ačārean 1913: 481a) compares the latter with Pers. *kux*.

A more careful internal examination shows that Ačāryan’s analysis must be revised. First of all, *xuč-k*, being attested John Chrysostom, shows that the root may be **xuč* rather than **xox*. Sebastia *xoxj* can easily be regarded as reduplication. Secondly, a root **xox* cannot explain *xo/učič*, which rather comprises **xuč-* and the suffix *-ič*. Finally, the root **xuč-* is corroborated by dialectal forms. The same dialect of Erzinka also has *xuj-ur-ik* ‘scarecrow used in drought-ritual by children’ (see Kostandyan 1979: 152b, in the glossary of dialectal words). Further: Vatařšapat/Ejmiacin *xunč-ak* ‘scarecrow’ (Amatuni 1912: 292a), Nor Bayazet *xuč-kurur-ik* ‘doll of the drought-ritual’ (Ačārean 1913: 489-490).

The element *-ap* is not entirely clear. Nevertheless, compare *tagnap* which is synonymous to *xučap* (see Łap’anc’yan 1961: 164).

Thus: ****xuč-***: *xo/uč-ič*, with the suffix *-ič*, and redupl. **xu-xuč*. The latter has re-analysed as derived from **xo/ux*. Note also secondary forms based on this **xo/ux* and containing elements *-l-* and/or the same suffix *-ič*, cf. **xox-ič* (see s.v. **bo-xoxič* ‘scarecrow’). Sebastia **xuxuč* is either due to vocalic assimilation, or it reflects another type of reduplication. Note also *xax-al-ič* (see Lisic’yan 1969: 270₄₂), Partizak **xuxu-l-ič*, etc. Typologically compare **bo-* : **bo-bol* : **bolo-č* ‘insect, bogy, etc.’ (q.v.).

1.12.5 *čkoyt’*, *a-stem*, ***čkoyt’n***, *an-stem* (John Chrysostom etc.); ***ckoyt’***, *o-stem* (Bible+); ***čkik*** (Arak’el Dawrižec’i, 17th cent.) ‘the little finger’.

Widespread in dialects. All the *kə*-class dialects, including those located in extreme peripheries such as Transylvania, T’iflis, Cilicia, as well as Van and Salmast, have the form *čkoyt’*. In contrast with this, the forms of the dialects of the extreme south-east and east are characterized by the initial hissing affricate *c-* and the absence of *-oyt’*. Thus: Łarabał *ckéynə*, *kcéynə*, Juła *ck-ik* (next to rural *čfkít*, for which I posit *čkoyt’* = /čkuit’/ > **čkwit’* > **čkwit’*, through metathesis), Šamaxi *ckla mat*, Agulis *clayg’ büt’*, Ganjak *ccink’*, etc.; cf. also Aza,

Maratā **čltik* [HAB 3: 205a]. In K'esab, one finds an intermediary form, viz. *čəkek* (see Č'olak'ean 1986: 206a).

Aṛak'el Davrižec'i lived very close to Nor Ĵuṭa and witnessed the well-known migration of Ĵuṭa. The form *ckik*, used only by him, can be seen, in fact, as a direct recording of the dialectal form of Ĵuṭa in the 17th century.

Ačāryan (HAB 3: 204-205) reconstructs a proto-form **c(u)lkoyt'* and treats it as borrowed from Kartvelian languages; cf. Laz *cúlu k^hí^hi* (lit.) 'little finger'. The internal examination would point, however, to a **čk-/ck-* which took the suffix *-oyt'* (see s.v.v. *boyt'*, *bl-it'*; and 2.3.1) in the literary language and in *kə*-dialects, but not in SE and E dialects. Ačāryan's etymology can be true only if one assumes that *ckoyt'* has been reduced to **ck-* in those dialects and subsequently took other suffixes such as *-ik* etc.

1.12.6 When examining the origin of **homonymous words**, one must naturally start with scrutinizing the possible internal relations between them. An illustrious example is *unĵ* with its three homonymous forms:

unĵ₁, *o*-stem: GDSg *ənj-o-y* in Gregory of Nyssa 'bottom, depth (of a sea etc.); root; the underground, Underworld' (P'awstos Buzand, Hexaameron, Philo, etc.);

unĵ₂ prob. 'treasure, treasury, granary, barn' (P'awstos Buzand 5.6); cf. Georg. *unĵi* 'treasure';

unĵ₃ 'soot (in stoves; resulted by smoke); rust', attested in "History of the nation of the Archers (i.e. the Mongols)" and "Oskip'orik", preserved in mainly eastern peripheral dialects; cf. also Moks *uč*. See s.v.v.

The first two are most likely connected, implying a semantic development '*bottom, depth, the underground' > 'buried/underground treasure or granary'. In order to establish the semantics, we must take another set of words into consideration:

ganĵ, *u*-stem, *i*-stem 'store, treasure' (Bible+; several dialects), probably an Iranian loan: Pahl. *ganĵ* 'treasure, treasury' [MacKenzie 1971: 35], Pers. *ganĵ* 'store, hoard, hidden treasure; granary, store-house, mart; case' [Steingass 1098a], MIran. *ganĵ* 'treasury'; also Iranian loans: Skt. *ganĵa-* 'treasury, jewel room; a mine; a cowhouse or station of cowherds; a mart, place where grain etc. is stored for sale; tavern' [Monier-Williams 1899/1999: 342c], Gr. *γάζα* f. '(royal) treasury', Aram. *gnz*', etc., see Hübschmann 1897: 126; HAB 1: 516-517; Nyberg 1974: 81a; Olsen 1999: 872. In view of the final *-j* instead of *-ĵ*, Arm. *ganĵ* (cf. also Georgian *ganĵi* 'buried treasure') is considered to be a Median loan (see

Ĵahukyan 1987: 505-506, 554, 558, with ref.). For an alternative solution see below.

Some of the forms above refer to ‘hidden or buried treasure’. This enables us to introduce other words. Arm. *ganjak* ‘bowels, entrails, interior’ (Eusebius of Caesarea, Alexander Romance, Anania Širakac’i [GDSg *ganjak-i*, A. G. Abrahamyan 1944: 329^{L14f}, see s.v. *c’ayl-k’* for the passage], etc.), ‘wallet, case’ (Yovhannēs Vanakan Vardapet Tawušec’i, 12-13th cent.). Ačāryan (HAB 1: 517b) takes the meaning ‘wallet, case’ as original and derives the word from Pers. *ganja/e* ‘wallet’, assuming that the latter has lost the secondary meaning ‘entrails, interior’. See also Ĵahukyan 1987: 520, with a questionmark. This interpretation is not convincing. I think *ganjak* belongs with our *ganj* ‘store, treasure’, and the basic meaning is ‘buried/hidden treasure’.

Further, note the place-name *Ganjak*, as well as compound place-names *Ganj-a-sar* and *Ganj-a-p’arax*, with *sar* ‘summit of a mountain’, dial. ‘mountain’, and *p’arax* ‘sheep-fold’, respectively. The first component **ganj-* is considered to be unknown by Hübschmann (1904: 417). I propose to interpret it as meaning ‘ravine, valley, district’ (see s.v. place-name *Kotb* for the semantic field) and connect to Arm. **ganj-* ‘bowels, interior; buried treasure’.

Summarizing the evidence, we can posit **ganj-* ‘*bottom, depth, the underground; *the interior of earth or belly’ > 1) ‘buried/underground treasure’; 2) ‘bowels, entrails’; 3) ‘ravine’ or the like.

Given the formal similarity and semantic identity, one can etymologically identify Arm. *ganj* (with related Iranian and other forms) with Arm. *unj*. The proto-form must be reconstructed with an initial **w-*, which yields Arm. *g-* when followed by a vowel, and Iran. *g-* when followed by a short *a*. Arm. **gan-* : **un-* points to ablaut **wan-* : zero-grade **un-*. In view of the parallel *i-* and *u-* stems of Arm. *ganj*, as well as the fact that the ablaut alternants differ also with respect to the following affricate (*ganj* vs. *unj*), one can tentatively reconstruct the following old paradigm: nom. **wanj-ōi-* > Arm. **ganj-u(i)*, with hissing affricate; gen. **unj-jo-* > *unj*, with hushing affricate. If this is true, the paradigm is identical with the one inherited from PIE HD *i*-stems, seen in *giwt* ‘village’ (q.v.), *arew* ‘sun’, etc. (see also 2.2.2.4). For the sound development **ji* > *j* see 2.1.22.2.

The ultimate origin of the Armenian and other forms is unclear. Given the formal variety and the large semantic field of the Armenian forms one may not

rule out the possibility that the source of the forms in other languages (at least of some of them) was Armenian⁴.

If *unj*³ 'soot; rust' (cf. also dial. **banj* 'id.') is related to the others, one may assume a semantic development 'bottom, depth' > 'sediment/Bodensatz' > 'soot; rust'. In this case, Moks *uč* should be interpreted as having lost the nasal, though more naturally *unj* could be regarded as an epenthetic form of an original **uč*. For more detail see s.v. *unj*³.

B. ASPECTS OF HISTORICAL GRAMMAR

In the following I give a comprehensive overview of various features that result from the individual treatments in Part 1.

2.1 Phonology

2.1.1 PIE **e* > Arm. *a*

Hübschmann (1899: 46) points out that in Arm. *vat'sun* 'sixty' vs. *vec* 'six', *vasn* 'for, because' vs. Gr. *ἐκῆτι*, and *tasn* 'ten' vs. Gr. *δέκα*, IE **e* yielded *a* "unter unbekannten Umständen". But the Iranian origin of *vasn* cannot be doubted (see HAB 4: 309-310). One has assumed lowering **e* > *a* before *-u-* in the following syllable (for references and discussion see Clackson 1994: 126-127, 159, 206₂₁). Kortlandt (1994a: 255-256; 1996: 57 = 2003: 100-101, 118; see also Beekes 2003: 156) rejects the rule in view of *heru* 'last year' < **peruti*, and explains the numerals *vat'sun* and *tasn* by assuming analogical zero grade taken from the ordinals. For more material and discussion see Greppin 1980a. Note also *awri-ord* 'virgin, young girl' if related with Uart. *curi* 'lord' (see s.v.). Further, see Gayseryan 1990: 85.

On substratum fluctuation **-e/a-* see s.v.v. *kamurj* 'bridge', *pal* 'rock'.

2.1.2 PIE **e* > Arm. *ē* or *i* before sibilants *š*, *ž*

⁴ The connection of Arm. *ganjak* with Skt. *vakṣaṇā* 'Bauch, Höhlung, Eingeweide' proposed by Petersson (1916: 247-248) is uncertain (cf. Mayrhofer, EWAia 2: 487), but perhaps not impossible. One may hypothetically derive Skt. *vakṣaṇā* from substr. **u(a)ng^h-s-* and connect to PArm. **uanj-(ō)i*, obl. **unj-*, which developed into Arm. *ganj*, *u*-stem and *i*-stem 'store, treasury, buried treasure; belly, entrails, interior', and *unj* 'bottom, depth; buried treasure, store, barn', respectively. Since the *-ak* of Arm. *ganjak* points to Iranian loan, this word can be seen as a back loan into Armenian.

Arm. *gišer* ‘night’ vs. Lat. *vesper*, OCS *večerъ*, etc.; Arm. *iž*, *i*-stem ‘viper’ vs. Gr. *ἔχις*, Skt. *āhi-*, YAv. *aži-*, etc.; *ēs* ‘ass’ vs. Lat. *equus* ‘horse’ etc. In these examples, the *i* for *e* is explained by the following palatals *š* and *ž* (see Pedersen 1905: 205 = 1982: 67; Bonfante 1937: 27). This development may be related with **med^h-io-* > Arm. *mēj*, cf. Lat. *medius* ‘mid, middle’ (see s.v. *iž* ‘viper’ for more detail).

2.1.3 PIE **o* > Arm. *a*

This development may be formulated as follows: the unstressed **o* in initial **Ho-*, **so-*, **po-* becomes *a* in open syllables unless it was followed by a syllable containing another **o* or, as Kortlandt (1983: 10) adds, by the reflex of **w*. For discussion and references I refer to Bonfante 1975; Kortlandt 1980: 105; 1983: 10; 1985b: 9 (= 2003: 32, 40, 58); Jahukyan 1983a; 1990a: 3-6; Morani 1994.

A fluctuation between *o* and *a* seems to be found in words of substratum (Mediterranean) origin, e.g. in some animal designations:

Arm. *lor* ‘quail’ vs. Gr. *λάρος* m. ‘sea-mew, gull’, *λαρίς*, *-ίδος* f. ‘id.’;

Arm. *kor* and **kor-č* ‘scorpion’, ‘animal with a crooked body-part’ vs. *karič* ‘scorpion’ < **karid-ja*, cf. Gr. *καρίς*, *-ί/ιδος* ‘Crustacea’ vs. *κουρίς*, *κωρίς* ‘id.’. Note the element **-id-* seen in both sets of words (*λαρίς*, *-ίδος* and *καρίς*, *-ί/ιδος*).

Compare also Gr. *πάρδαλις* vs. *πόρδαλις* f. ‘leopard’.

2.1.4 PIE **pe-* : **po-* > Arm. *he-* : *o-*

A clear example of this distribution is *het* : *ot* ‘foot’ from **ped-* and **pod-*, respectively. Ačaryan (AčarLiak 6, 1971: 519-520) argues against this rule, mentioning *holani* ‘uncovered’ and *hoł* ‘earth, soil’ as counter-examples. On these words see s.v.v.

2.1.5 PIE **Hoi-* or **Hy-* > Arm. *ay-*

Discussing the vocalic problem of Arm. *aytnum* ‘to swell’ vs. Gr. *οἰδέω* ‘to swell’ etc., Meillet (1894: 153) points to **ai-* seen in Lat. *aemidus* ‘swollen’. The latter probably reflects **h₂eid-sm-* [Schrijver 1991: 38]. However, a full-grade **h₂e-* would yield Arm. *ha-* (2.1.16). According to Kortlandt (2003: 32, 40, 42-43; see also Beekes 2003: 158, 182), PIE **Hoi-* developed into Arm. *ay-*; cf. *aygi*, *ayt*, *ayc*. I accept his view on the loss of the initial laryngeal before **-o-*. As to the development **Hoi-* > *ay-*, I alternatively propose the following scenario.

Originally, Arm. *ayt* 'cheek' may have been an *s*-stem neuter (cf. Gr. *οἶδος* etc.; see s.v.) of PD declension: NSg **h₂oid-os*, GSG. **h₂id-ēs-s* > PArm. **oīt-*, **ait-* (with analogical *-j-* after the nominative). Subsequently, the oblique stem was generalized. This analysis may be corroborated by *amp* 'cloud', *bark* 'lightning', etc.; see s.v.v. and 2.2.2.1.

See also s.v.v. *aygi* 'vineyard', *ayc* 'goat', and *ayc* 'visit, inspection'.

2.1.6 PIE **j-* > Arm. zero

Since a sound change **k^w* > Arm. zero is untenable (if not impossible), and the development **j-* > Arm. *j-* (see Minshall 1955, with references and discussion) is not convincing either, one should posit PIE **j-* > Arm. zero; Arm. *ur* 'where, where to' (interrog.), 'wherever', *o-*, interrogative indefinite pronoun; also *o-r* 'which', *o-v* 'who' (see s.v.v.) should be derived from PIE **j-* rather than **k^w*-forms: PIE **jo-*, cf. Skt. *yā-* 'who, which' etc.; note Pol. *jak* 'how' beside Russ. *kak* 'how' (Kortlandt 1983: 11; 1997: 7; 1998 = 2003: 41, 120, 122-124; Weitenberg 1986: 91; Beekes 2003: 162; cf. also Clackson 1994: 52; Olsen 1999: 50).

This view may be corroborated by two etymologies of mine: *ēg*, *i-* or *a*-stem 'female' < PArm. **eig-i-* < **(y)eyw-i-* < QIE **ieus-i(e)h₂-* or **ieus-it-*; *ors*, *o*-stem 'hunt; animal for hunting' < QIE (substratum) **iork-o-* 'deer, roe'; see s.v.v.

2.1.7 PIE **j-* > Arm. *l-*

leard 'liver' vs. Skt. *yākr̥t* etc.;

luc 'yoke' vs. Skt. *yuga-*, Lat. *iugum*, etc.

Different explanations have been offered for these words (see s.v.v.). Hamp (1982: 191) assumes *l* < [λ] < **[j]* < **[i]*, "an unspectacular phonetic sequence known from current attestation in dialects of a number of languages".

The alternation **j-* : **l-* is reminiscent of the possible correlation seen in designations of 'elephant' (see Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 524-525; Mallory/Adams 1997: 176-177).

In some Armenian dialectal words we see an initial *l-* instead of *y-*, cf. *ystak* 'pure' > Muš *listag*, *hiwsem* 'to weave' (q.v.) > Łarabał *lūsil*, *yesan* 'whetstone' > Alaškert, Muš, Sasun *lesan*. In some cases contamination is possible. For Łarabał *lūsil*, Ačaryan (HAB 3: 101b) assumes contamination with PIE **plek-* 'to weave'. Muš *listag* may be due to influence of *loys* 'light'. On the whole, however, a phonetic explanation seems more reasonable. It is remarkable that in all cases the first following consonant is the sibilant *-s-*. Thus, we may be dealing with a sound

change of the type *y...s* > *l...s* which is younger and is hardly related with the cases seen in *leard* and *luc*.

With this hypothetical sound development in mind, one can consider the following possible example: dial. **liz* 'female buffalo', in Van [Ačarean 1913: 423a] and Moks [HayLezBrbBar 1, 2001: 225b]. NPI *liz-n-ir* is attested in a Moks version of the famous folk-song "Camt'el" (see Šahpazean 1913: 26^{L-6} and footnote 3). The plural ending *-ner* (Van and Šatax) : *-nir* (Moks) presupposes an older NSg form with *-n* (see Ačaryan 1952: 108; M. Muradyan 1962: 85; M. Muradyan 1982: 139); cf. Van/Šatax *yezner*, Moks *iznir*, the plural of *yez* (Moks *iz*) < ClArm. *ezn* 'bullock'. This implies that the older nominative form of the word under discussion would have been **lezn*. One wonders, then, if **lez-n* 'bullock' is identical with the synonymous by-form **ye/iz* < ClArm. *ezn* 'bullock'. Typologically compare the above-mentioned *ystak* which is represented in Muš by two forms next to each other: *h'istag* and *listag* (see Bačdasaryan-T'ap'alc'yan 1958: 266a). Note that here, too, the following consonant is a sibilant, though in this case it is a voiced one.

2.1.8 PIE **u*

The treatment of PIE **u* has been subject of extensive discussion in the last two decades: Ačabekyan 1981; 1981a; Godel 1982a; Olsen 1986; Kortlandt 1993 = 2003: 102-105; Manaster Ramer/Michalove 2001.

According to Pedersen (1905: 196 = 1982: 58), the intervocalic **-w-* "erscheint als arm. *v* wo es auslautend geworden ist, sonst aber als *g*". Note that *govem* is irrelevant since it is an Iranian loan (see s.v.). For different aspects concerning this phoneme see s.v.v. *anjaw* 'cave', *cung* 'knee', *kov* 'cow', *haraw* 'south', *harawunk* 'arable land', *hoviw* 'shepherd', etc.

2.1.9 Nasals

In two cases we find Arm. *m* from PIE **n-*: Arm. *merk* 'naked' : Skt. *nagnā-* 'naked', Lith. *nuogas* 'naked', etc.; Arm. *magil* 'claw' : Gr. *ὄνυξ*, *-ὄνυξ* m. 'talon, claw, nail', OHG *nagal* 'nail', etc. (see 2.1.17.3). Since in both cases the PIE root contains a labiovelar, it is tempting to assume its assimilatory influence on the initial nasal: PIE **neg^w-no-* > **n^weg^wno-* > **mekn-* > *merk* (influence of *lerk* 'hairless; smooth'?). Note especially YAv. *mayna-* 'naked'. The etymological details concerning these words are uncertain, however.

Moks **mžtawil* next to **nžwatil* is probably due to contamination of **muž* ‘fog’ and *nuatim* ‘to become dim; to faint, swoon, grow weak’ (Bible+; in dialects also **ntawil*); see s.v. **muž* ‘fog’.

2.1.10 PIE **s* > Arm. *h*

This sound change (see Greppin 1975a; Jahukyan 1982: 39-40; Beekes 2003: 169) has taken place in Armenian, Greek, Iranian, Phrygian, Lycian (and also in Brythonic Celtic) [Szemerényi 1985; Clackson 1994: 53-54].

For the loss of internal **s*- see Viredaz 2000, as well as the discussion s.v. *ariwn* ‘blood’.

2.1.11 PIE **-Ns-* > Arm. *-s* (N = any nasal)

amis ‘month’ vs. Lat. *mēnsis*, Gr. *μήν*, Skt. *mās-*, etc.;

is ‘me’ (acc.) next to gen. *im*, dat. *inj*: **h₁me-*;

mis ‘meat’ vs. OCS *měso* ‘flesh, meat’, Goth. *mimz* ‘meat’, etc.;

us ‘shoulder’ vs. Gr. *ὤμος*, Lat. *umerus*, Skt. *amśa-*, etc.

All the forms of Armenian (ClArm., MArm. and all the dialects) regularly participate in this pre-Classical development (for the relative chronology see Kortlandt 1980: 101 = 2003: 29). Therefore, the Agulis form *ɣɔns* seems to be particularly important (see s.v. *us* ‘shoulder’).

For a later period one finds evidence for *-nč’* > *-š*.

Davt’yan (1966: 62, cf. 425) posits a sound change *rt’* > Łarabať *š* introducing only one example: *matnašurt’n* ‘a suppurative swelling on one’s finger-tip’ > *mənnášš*. This sound development is improbable. Next to *matnašurt’n* (lit. ‘finger-lip/edge’; attested in "Bžškarán" apud NHB 2: 215a, preserved in Van *matišurt*) there is a dialectal (Muš, Karin, T’iflis, etc.) equivalent **matnašunc’*, lit. ‘finger-breath’ (see Amatuni 1912: 465a). Ačaryan (1913: 759a) correctly derives Łarabať *mənnášš* from this compound.

Astuacašunc’ ‘Bible’ > Aslanbek *asvajašüş* [HAB 3: 535b].

The sound change is more transparent when *-nč’* is followed by another consonant; cf. examples from e.g. Metri [Ałayan 1954: 84], among them *bərešnə* from **brinč’-n-* ‘snowball-tree’, cf. also Łarabať *préšnə* (unless one prefers to link it with Łazax, Łaradať, Agulis **broš-*, see 1.5 and especially 1.12.1).

2.1.12 Ruki-rule

On *veštasán* ‘sixteen’ vs. *vec’* ‘six’, and *arj’* ‘bear’, Meillet (1898: 280-281₁) writes: "L’ancienne prononciation chuintante de arm. *ç* issu de i.-e. *ks* (*kš*) des

dialectes orientaux), établie par *veštasán*, est attestée aussi par *arj* 'ours', cf. skr. *ṛkṣas*, gr. *ἄρκτος*; la prononciation chuintante n'a été éliminée que postérieurement au passage de la sourde à la sonore après *r*^h. Pedersen (1905: 208; 1906: 432 = 1982: 70, 210) rejects this explanation and derives *arj* from **ṛkṣjo-*, introducing also *aj* 'right' vs. Gr. *ἄξιος* 'worth'. Similarly, he (1906: 413 = 1982: 191) explains Arm. *-rš-* in *t'arš-* and *garš* (q.v.) as having resulted from **-rṣj-*, cf. Skt. *ṛṣyati* and *hrṣyati*, respectively. Meillet (1950: 85-86; cf. also 1900c: 316; 1936: 39-40) accepts **-rṣj-* > *-rš-* but is sceptical as to **-kṣjo-* > *-j-* since there is no trace of **-j-* in the cognates of the word for 'bear', and *aj* has a better etymology (see s.v.). Note that the PIE word for 'bear' contained **-tḱ-* rather than **-ks-*. Tabu (see 2.1.36) and/or contamination (cf. *arjn* 'black') may have played a role in Arm. *arj* as well.

The explanation of *-rš-* in *t'arš-* and *garš-* from **-rṣj-* seems unconvincing and unnecessary. In what follows I shall try to explain these and other cases by the well-known ruki-rule.

Let us sum up the evidence. The first case, viz. *veštasán*, is practically the only example of the ruki-rule in Armenian commonly cited in Indo-European literature. Also the following two words, viz. *t'aršam* and *garšim*, played some role in relevant discussions. Other examples may be added to these:

vec 'six' < **sueks* vs. *veštasán* 'sixteen' < **sueks-dekm*;

**t'arām* (adj.) : **t'aršam-ém(i)* (verb) 'to wither'; for the philological discussion see s.v.;

jař vs. *garšim* (see above and s.v.); note that the IE source for *garš-* is verbal, thus the Armenian noun *garš* must be analogical after the verb *garšim* 'to abominate, be disgusted';

gišer 'night' vs. Gr. *ἔσπερος*, Lat. *vesper*, Lith. *vākara*s, OCS *večerъ*, etc. on the one hand, and Welsh *ucher* < **woiksero-*, Bulg. dial. (Vinga) *uščer*, on the other; perhaps contaminated with the other synonymous word: YAv. **xšapar-*, Skt. *kṣāp-*, Hitt. *ispant-* 'night', etc.), thus: **ueksepero-* > PArm. **we(k)še(w)éro-* > **geišero-* > *gišer*.

moš(-) 'blackberry', *moš-i* 'bramble, blackberry-bush' vs. *mor*, *mor-eni* 'id.', Gr. *μόρον* n. 'black mulberry; blackberry', *μορέα*, -έη f. 'mulberry-tree, *Morus nigra*', Lat. *mōrum*, *ī*, n. 'fruit of the black mulberry', *mōrus*, *ī*, f. 'black mulberry-tree', cf. Gr. *μόρον* 'black mulberry; blackberry', *μορέα*, -έη 'mulberry-tree, *Morus nigra*', Lat. *mōrum* 'fruit of the black mulberry', *mōrus* 'black mulberry-tree', etc.; the form *mo(r)š* is mostly found in derivatives (*moš-a-vayri* in Jeremiah

17.6, *moš-i*, etc.) and probably points to the tree/plant-name **morš-í-* derived from PArm. **mor-s-íeh₂-* (see also s.v.v.).

č'ir 'dried fruit' (only in a medieval glossary), *č'or* 'dry' (Bible+) vs. Gr. ξηρός 'dry; withered, lean; fasting' (see s.v.);

uši, **ho/uši* probably 'storax-tree' and 'holm-oak', if from QIE **h₃ek-s-ieh₂-* (cf. Gr. ὄξυς, -η 'beech; spear', Erzamordvin *uks(o)* 'elm, ash', etc.) or **HoHks-* from **HoHs-* (cf. Lith. *uosis* 'ash-tree' etc.) > PArm. **ho(k)šiya-* > **hoši*, and **u(k)šiya-* > *uši* (see s.v.).

The rule did not operate in Arm. **-rs-* coming from PIE **-rk-*, cf. *hars-n* 'bride' from **prk-*; see also see s.v.v. *ors* 'hunt-animal', *p'esay* 'bridegroom', etc.

Conclusion: on the strength of the presented evidence, I preliminarily reformulate the ruki-rule in Armenian as follows: PIE **-s-* following **k* or **r* yields Arm. *-š-* in post-apocopic internal pretonic or initial (or, simply, in the non-final) positions. In other words, in these positions **-rs-* and **(-)ks-* yield Arm. *-(r)š-* and *-(k)š-* [in the initial position: *č'-*] respectively, in contrast with *-r-* and *-c'-* in the remaining positions.

Comparable data from dialects

harsanik 'wedding' > Nor Naxijewan and Sivrihisar *hašnik*. N. Mkrtč'yan (1995: 210) takes this as one of the isoglosses shared by the dialects of Nor Naxijewan and Sivri-Hisar, both supposed to have migrated from Ani. One must also add Hačən *hašnik* (also *haš[n]uk* 'little bride') [Gasparyan 1966: 50], Sebastia *hašnik* and other derivatives such as *hašn-uk* etc. [Gabikyan 1952: 329], Č'aharmahal *hašnik* [Eremean 1923: 79a], Juła rural *hašnik* [HAB 3: 62b]. Remarkably, *hars(n)* 'bride' does not display the development *rs* > *(r)š* in the forms recorded in HAB 3: 62b. Č'aharmahal has *hays* and *haš* [Eremean 1923: 79a], and the latter is obviously analogical after *hašnik* 'wedding'. Thus, the distribution seems to be as in the ruli-rule for ClArm., which seems to have operated only in initial or internal position.

Thus: NW - Nor Naxijewan and Sivri-Hisar (both probably from Ani) : SW - Hačən, Sebastia : SE - Č'aharmahal, villages of Juła (migrated from Ayrarat regions). Shared innovation or archaism? If the latter is the case, one might assume that the operation of the ruki-rule continued in a certain area. Compare also the distribution of the development *VrV-* > *žšV* in Nor Naxijewan, Sivri-Hisar, and Hačən (see s.v. *erek* 'three').

Note also *hangoyc* 'knot' : **hangu(r)st* > Sebastia *hankušt* (see Gabikyan 1952: 329).

2.1.13 Loss of intervocalic *-t-

Alongside of the well-known examples like *hayr* ‘father’ < PIE **ph₂tēr*, *mayr* ‘mother’ < **meh₂tēr* etc., this development is also seen, as is pointed out by Ĵahukyan (1987: 346) in a non-IE word *sayl*, *i*-stem ‘wagon; Ursa Major and Minor, Arcturus’ vs. Hesychian *σάτιλλα·πλειάς τὸ ἄστρον* (see s.v.).

2.1.14 The absence of palatalization

PIE labiovelars have been palatalized in Armenian before front vowels. The exceptions may be explained by the restoration of the velar or other circumstances, such as the preceding nasal (as in *hing* ‘five’ < PIE **penk^we*), etc. [Kortlandt 1975 = 2003: 10-12; Beekes 2003: 176-179].

An interesting case is *geĴj-k* ‘glands’ from PIE **g^{(w)h}elg^h*; cf. Russ. *železá* etc. Beekes (2003: 177) writes: "The velar is not palatalized; was it taken from the zero grade?". More probably, we are dealing with a restoration of the velar occlusive caused by dissimilation; in other words, the palatalization of the velar occlusive was blocked by the presence of a palatal **g^h* in the root (see Meillet 1905-06: 243-245; HAB 1: 535; Ačāryan 1952: 79; Ĵahukyan 1967: 196; 1982: 216₇₅; Kortlandt 1975: 43-44 = 2003: 10-11)⁵.

If related with Skt. *kaśīkā* ‘Ichneumonweibchen’ or ‘weasel’ and *kāśa* ‘weasel’, *ak’is* ‘weasel’ (q.v.) derives from **Hkek^h-ih₂* and shows a similar depalatalization: **k - k^h > k’ - s* instead of *č’ - s* (see s.v. **č’asum*).

The rule seems also to function with the affricates originated from palatalization of dentals, cf. Arm. *geĴj*, *o*-stem ‘moist’ (Bible+; several dialects) from QIE **g^wheid^h-io-*, cf. Russ. *židkij* etc. ‘liquid, watery’ (unless one assumes *o*-grade form for Armenian). In the light of this example, I propose to derive Arm. dial. **keč’-i* ‘birch’ (q.v.) from QIE **g^wet-iV-*, cf. Lat. *betula* ‘birch’, Welsh *bedwen* ‘id.’, etc. (from PIE **g^wetu-* ‘resin’, cf. Skt. *jatu*-n. ‘lac, gum’ etc.).

Other possible examples: see s.v.v. *k’is-*, *kič* ‘sting’, see s.v. **kic-* ‘to bite’ (the etymology is uncertain).

The absence of palatalization may be due to the onomatopoetic nature of certain words. A probable example is **get-*, *geĴ-geĴ-* ‘to sing’ (P’awstos Buzand, Hexaameron, etc.) from PIE **g^hel-*, cf. OIc. *gala* ‘to call, sing’, OHG *galan* ‘to

⁵ Ačāryan (1906-08; AčāriLiak 6, 1971: 542; 1952: 79-80) introduced some dialectal parallels to this dissimilatory development: *Ĵ(r)atac* ‘-k’ ‘water-mill’ > Aslanbek *k’atašk*; *č’orek šabt’i* ‘Wednesday’ > Van *k^oörök^o əšpät’* and *č’örök^o əšpät’*. He assumes that the palatals *Ĵ* and *č’* have turned into their velar correspondent *k’* through dissimilatory influence of *š*. However, an assimilatory influence of *-k’-* seems more likely and simpler (an alternative mentioned but rejected by Ačāryan himself).

sing', etc. Compare Arm. dial. onomatopoetic **gl-gl-*, referring to water or laughing (see Amatuni 1912: 135a; Ačārean 1913: 232b).

mak'i 'ewe' is perhaps of onomatopoetic origin (see Olsen 1999: 808). Borrowing: Arm. *gerdastan*, *a*-stem 'body of servants and captives; possessions; estate, landed property' (Bible+) : PIE **g^herd^h-*, cf. Skt. *grha-* m. 'house, residence' (RV+), YAv. *garəda-* m. 'house of daēvic beings', Goth. *gards* m. 'house, housekeeping', etc. The absence of palatalization of the initial guttural is unexplained, so one should rather treat the Armenian form as an Iranian loanword.

See also s.v. *kiw* 'tree pitch'.

2.1.15 **-P: -w** (P = any labial stop)

For a thorough discussion of this alternation in verbs like *t'awt'aw/p'-* 'to shake, jolt, move violently; to blink with eyes' and **sawsaw/p'-* 'to tremble with fear; to rustle' I refer to Weitenberg 1992.

Weitenberg (ibid.) also discusses two loans displaying the same phonological interchange: *terew* 'leaf' and *ketew* 'bark'. In the following I represent additional evidence concerning these and some other examples.

Arm. *terew* 'leaf' (Bible+; dialectally widespread); borrowed from Semitic (there are forms with both *f* and *p*) [Hübschmann 1897: 287, 317; HAB 4: 398b]. Ačāryan (HAB 398b) does not record any form with a final labial stop instead of *-w*. This is repeated by Weitenberg (1992: 304-305) who treats the plant-name *terep'-uk* as a derivation of *terew* 'leaf' and compares it with the case of *ketew* : *ketep'/b-* : dial. **klep* 'bark, rind'.

The existence of dial. **terep'/b* can be confirmed. Though Ačāryan (1947: 255; HAB 398b) does not record any form from Hamšen, such a form is extant, as has been recorded in HayLezBrbBar 1, 2001: 328b, with a final stop: *dereb* 'leaf'. Note also Xotorjur (the closest dialect of Hamšen) *terep* [YušamXotorj 1964: 513a]. Ačāryan (1913: 535b) himself mentions the Hamšen plant-name **kat'n-terep'-i* which corresponds to Trapizon **kat'n-terew-i*, obviously composed of *kat'n* 'milk' and *terew* 'leaf'. Note also **kat'n-tereb-i* in Béguinot/Diratzouyan 1912: 66 (Nr 304) referring to 'Acer platanoides' (cf. s.v. *t'k'i* 'maple') represented in the Trapizon/Mala region.

For other examples of alternation *P: w* see HAB, s.v.v. *xečep*, *ketew*, *kotov*, *ktew*, *šarap'* : *šarawiš*, etc.

See also s.v. *maškat'ew* 'bat'.

2.1.16 PIE ***HV-** (H = any laryngeal, V = any vowel)

Meillet (1936: 38) did not operate with PIE laryngeals and therefore treated the initial Armenian *h-* vs. the vocalic anlaut in PIE as secondary. Similarly sceptic is Benveniste (1969, 1: 224) who treats the initial *h-* of Arm. *han* 'grandmother' and *haw* 'grandfather', though corresponding to Hitt. *h-*, as "une aspiration secondaire due à un phénomène récent".

As has been noticed first by Austin (1942: 22-23), the initial *h-* of Arm. *han* 'grandmother', *haw* 'grandfather', *hoviw* 'shepherd' etc. alongside of the Hittite equivalents should be treated as a direct reflex of PIE laryngeals. This view has been advocated and developed by a number of scholars: Jahukyan 1967b: 66; 1994: 14; Greppin 1973; 1981: 120-121; Polomé 1980; Kortlandt 1983: 12-15; 1984; Beekes 1988: 76; 2003: 179-183; etc. According to Kortlandt (ibid.), **h₂e-* and **h₃e-* yielded Arm. *ha-* and *ho-*, respectively, whereas any laryngeal followed by **-o-* has been dropped. I studied the problems of Armenian laryngeals and the initial aspiration in the classical language as well as in eastern peripheral dialects such as Łarabał and Goris in my unpublished master thesis, H. Martirosyan 1991.

Nowadays, a number of Indo-Europeanists still treat the Armenian evidence with reservation (see Lindeman 1982: 17-18; 1987: 34; Mayrhofer 1986: 132₁₄₂, 141; Szemerényi 1996: 126) or do not mention it at all, considering the Hittite *h-* to be the only consonantal reflex of the PIE laryngeals, e.g. Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 1: 203, 206; Schmitt (Šmitt) 1988: 23; etc.

For an overview and discussion of the problem see Winter 1965; Greppin 1975b; 1988; Polomé 1980. See further s.v.v. *hayc'em* 'to ask, supplicate, demand', *han* 'grandmother', *hask* 'ear of corn', *hat* 'grain', *harawunk* 'sowing, sowing-field, arable land', *haw* 'grandfather', **haw-* 'river' (see s.v. *getar-*), *hoyn* 'cornel', *hoviw* 'shepherd', *hot* 'smell, odour'. In some cases traces of *h-* can be found in later literature and dialects, see e.g. *and* 'cornfield', *arawr* 'plough', etc.

The absence of an expected initial *h-* in some cases may be due to time constructions with *z-* and *y-*, and generalization of the zero grade of the oblique stem; see e.g. s.v.v. **atj-* 'darkness, twilight', *ayg* 'morning', *ayc* 'visit, inspection', etc.

The assumption on Arm. *x-* and *k-* as other reflexes of the PIE laryngeals is untenable. An example is Arm. *ozni* 'hedgehog', which has dialectal by-forms with initial *k-* and *x-*: *kozni*, *xozni*. It has been suggested that the anlaut of these forms represent an Indo-European laryngeal, which is lost everywhere. This is highly improbable since: 1) the regular outcome of **h₂-* and **h₃-* is Armenian *h-*; 2) Gr. *ἐχῖνος* shows that here we are dealing with **h₁-* which is regularly lost even in Armenian and Anatolian; 3) the solution can be much simpler: I think the

initial *k-* and *x-* are due to contamination with other "culturally" related animal names, viz. *kuz* 'marten' and *xoz* 'pig', cf. English *hedgehog* : *hog*.

2.1.17 Prothetic vowel

2.1.17.1 Preliminaries

The so-called "prothetic vowel", viz. Gr. $\acute{\alpha}$ - (and $\acute{o}$ -) : Arm. *a-*, and Gr. $\acute{\epsilon}$ - : Arm. *e-* vs. zero in other languages, is now interpreted as a vocalized reflex of PIE initial laryngeal followed by a consonant. It has been generally assumed that Armenian, as Greek, represents a triple reflex⁶.

For the material and discussion I refer to Meillet 1927; Bonfante 1937: 19; Hovdhaugen 1968; Muller 1984; Olsen 1984; 1985; 1988-89; Picard 1989; as well as the literature cited in 2.1.16. See also under relevant entries. Here I would like to draw attention to some considerations.

2.1.17.2 PIE **h₁le/a-* > Arm. *IV-* (V = any vowel)

lanj, *a-stem* 'breast' (< 'lungs') < QIE **h₁lng^{wh}-i(h₁)-eh₂-*, cf. Gr. $\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\alpha\chi\acute{\upsilon}\varsigma$ 'small, short, mean, little', $\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\alpha\phi\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$ 'light (in weight)', OIc. *lunga* 'lung', etc.; *lerk* 'hairless', dial. 'smooth' : *o-tork* 'smooth, polished' vs. cf. Mlr. *lerg* f. 'sloping expanse, plain, surface' < **lergā*, *less-lergg* 'pasture', Nlr. *learg* 'a plain; field', etc. (q.v.).

If the etymology of *lanj* is correct, we may be dealing with PIE **h₁IV-* > Arm. *IV-*, in other words, loss of initial **h₁-* before **-l-* + a vowel. The connection of *lerk/o-tork* with Celtic, though often met with scepticism, cannot be excluded. There is no direct evidence for an initial laryngeal here. A PIE initial **l-*, however, yields Arm. *l-*, as is clear from *loys* 'light', *lusin* 'moon', etc. This implies that *lerk* : *o-tork* points to **Hle/org^(w)-*. It is theoretically possible that **h₁le-*, with a front vowel in the root, yields Arm. **(ə)IV-*, whereas in the form with *o*-grade the shwa is not lost and is assimilated to the root vowel. Compare Arm. *orcam* 'to vomit' < **orucam* vs. Gr. $\acute{\epsilon}\rho\epsilon\upsilon\gamma\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$, from **h₁reug-*. For this assimilation see below.

2.1.17.3 PIE **h₃NV-* > PArm. **oNV-* > **(u)m-V-*

As is well known, PIE initial **h₃nV-* yields Arm. **anV-* (through **o* > *a* in open syllable?), cf. *anēc-k* 'curse' vs. Gr. $\acute{o}\nu\epsilon\iota\delta\omicron\varsigma$ n. 'reprimand, abuse', Lith. *nícdėti* 'to despise', etc.

⁶ Sceptical: Lindeman 1990.

On the other hand, there are two words which, in my view, may point to a development PIE $*h_3NV-$ > PArm. $*oNV-$ > $*(u)m-\acute{V}$, if the nasal is $*m$, whether original or secondary:

Arm. *mēg*, *o-* or *a-*stem ‘mist, fog’ < $*h_3meig^h-o-$ or $*h_3meig^h-eh_2-$, cf. dial. **mglim* ‘to cloud’ vs. Gr. *ὁμίχλη* ‘fog’, OCS *mēgla* ‘mist, haze’, Lith. *migla* ‘fog’, Dutch dial. *miggelen* ‘staubregnen’. I do not subscribe to the theory that the Armenian word is an Iranian loan (see s.v. for discussion).

Arm. *magil* ‘claw’ vs. Gr. *ὄνυξ*, *-vχος* m. ‘talon, claw, nail’, OHG *nagal* ‘nail’, etc. Perhaps: QIE $*h_3nog^{wh}-\acute{o}l-eh_2-$ (coll. form, based perhaps on old HD nom. $*-\acute{o}l$, cf. s.v.v. *acut* ‘coal’, *asetn* ‘needle’) > PArm. $*onog^{w}ula-$ > $*on^w ag^{w}ul(a)-$ > **umagúl*, obl. **mag(u)l-á-*, with regular developments $*oN-$ > *uN-* and with *-o-* > *-a-* (on the latter see 2.1.3). The shift $*n > m$ may be due to assimilatory influence of the labiovelar of the following syllable, cf. Toch **mekwā* : A *maku*, B *mekwa* ‘nails’ (see Adams 1999: 467). A similar assimilation can also be seen in *merk* ‘naked’ vs. **neg^{w}no-*, perhaps also in *mut^{w}n* ‘dark; darkness’, if from PIE $*nok^{w}t-$ ‘night’.

The other Armenian reflex of the same PIE word, viz. *etungn* ‘nail’, may be explained as follows: $*h_3nog^{hw}-$ > $*onu(n)g^{w}-$ > $*(u)tung-$ (nasal dissimilation and loss of the pretonic vowel) > *e-tungn*, with a regular *e-* prothesis before the initial *t-*.

This material seems to lead to the following tentative conclusion: 1) $*h_1IV-$ (where *-V-* is a non-labial vowel) > PArm. $*-eIV-$ > $*i\acute{V}-$ > *IV-*; 2) $*h_3m/n^wV-$ > PArm. $*omV-$ > $*um\acute{V}-$ > *mV-*. This evidence, together with the contrast between e.g. Arm. *erek(-oy)* ‘evening’ : Gr. *ἔρεβος*, Goth. *riqis*, etc. (PIE $*h_1reg^{w}-e/os-$) and Arm. *arew* ‘sun’ : Skt. *ravi-* ‘sun, sun-god’, cf. Hitt. *haruayanai-* ‘to become bright, to dawn’ (PIE $*h_2reu-i-$), may be treated in terms of the triple representation of the laryngeals in Armenian.

2.1.17.4 Prothetic vowel *a-* with a labial vowel in the root

The vocalic reflex of the PIE initial laryngeal appears in Armenian as *e-* or *a-*. Note the contrast *erek* ‘evening’ : *arew* ‘sun’ above. In both cases, the root vowel is $*-e-$, and the reflexes of the laryngeals $*h_1-$ and $*h_2-$ are distinct. In contrast, the real prothetic vowel (that is, an initial vowel of no etymological value) is mostly *e-* if the root contains *-a-*, cf. e.g. *erkan* ‘hand-mill’ (Bible+; widespread in dialects) from PIE $*g^w r(e)h_2-n-$: Lith. *gìrna* ‘millstone’, OCS *žrěny*, cf. Skt. *grāvan-* ‘pressing-stone’, etc.; *etbayr* ‘brother’ < PIE $*b^h reh_2 tēr$ ‘id.’. This is corroborated by numerous Iranian loans, cf. Arm. *erang* ‘colour, dye’ (Bible+) vs.

MPers. *rang* ‘colour, dye’; further, *erak*, *eram*, *eran-k*‘, *erasan*, all from Iranian forms with initial *r*- (see HAB s.v.v.).

On the other hand, the prothetic vowel is *a*- if the word contains a labial vowel or diphthong:

āru ‘brook, etc.’ from PIE **sru-* (cf. Greppin 1980a: 97, who assumes **e-iu-* > *a-iu*, with “erratic **e* > *a*”) and *ārog-* ‘to water, wet, sprinkle, irrigate’ from PIE **srou-* ‘to strem, flow’; see s.v. Better attested is the variant *ōrog(an)em*, which, as well as *oroč-* ‘to chew, ruminate’ (cf. Skt. *rádati* ‘to gnaw, bite, scratch’, Lat. *rōdere* ‘to gnaw’) and *orcam* ‘to vomit’ (vs. Gr. *ἐρεῦγομαι*) can be explained by assimilation. Further: *artasu-k* ‘tears’ from **draku-* (q.v.). Note also *arawt* ‘pasturing’ (q.v.).

Here again, the same phenomenon can be observed in Iranian loans: *aroyr*, *i-* stem ‘brass’ (Bible, Ephrem) from Iran. **rōδ*, cf. MPers., NPers. *rōy* ‘copper, brass’, Skt. *lohā-* m. ‘reddish metal’, etc.; cf. also Georg. *rvali* ‘copper, brass’, which, according to Ačāryan (HAB 1: 331b), is borrowed from Armenian⁷.

Further: *araws₂*, *araws* ‘bustard’, if from Iran. **rūs* ‘wild sheep’ (see s.v. *araws₂*)⁸.

2.1.18 PIE **p/t/k* + **H*

2.1.18.1 **kH* > Arm. *x* vs. **k* > Arm. *k*‘

Arm. *xaxank*‘ ‘loud laughter’ (Ephrem+) next to Skt. *kākhati* ‘to laugh’, Gr. *καχάζω*, OCS *xoxotati* ‘to laugh loudly’, and *c’ax* ‘branch’ (Geoponica etc.; widespread in dialects) next to Skt. *śākhā-* f. (RV+) ‘branch, twig’, are considered to represent PIE **k^h* [Meillet 1894b: 294; 1936: 35; 1950: 78-83].

This view can hardly be maintained since the reconstruction of PIE aspirated unvoiced series is generally abandoned (see, however, Elbourne 2000). Also, the first example clearly has expressive character (see Beekes 1995: 132, 139, 224). Greppin (1981b: 5) notes that the word is more likely to be onomatopoeic rather than from PIE **kh-* or **kH-*.

Another onomatopoeic formation with *-x-* is *baxem* ‘to beat (said of breast, wave, etc.); to knock (at a door); to strike’, also reduplicated *babax-* (both Bible+); compare Laz and Mingr. *bax(-)* ‘to beat’, as well as Russ. *bac*, *babax(-)*, Engl. *bang*, etc., all of onomatopoeic origin (see s.v.).

⁷ Greppin (1980a: 98) points out that the expected form is **e-r-*.

⁸ The rule seems in a way comparable with the dependence of the reflex of ClArm. *ere-* in the Juṭa dialect upon the vowel of the third syllable, as is formulated by Ačāryan (1940: 56-57): *ereCa-* > (*h*’) *areCa-* vs. *ereCo/u-* > (*h*’) *araCo/u-*.

As to *c'ax*, which in some dialects (Łarabał, Agulis, Lori, etc.) also has a form with *-k'* instead of *-x*, we are rather dealing with the development **-kH-* > Arm. *-x-*. The alternants *c'ak'* and *c'ax* probably reflect nom. **-k-eh₂-* and gen. **-k-h₂-ós*, respectively (see s.v.).

On **skH-* > Arm. *š* see 2.1.22.3.

2.1.18.2 **tH* and **pH*

The same may be seen with **tH* and **pH*, though the material is not conclusive; see s.v.v. *analut'* 'deer', *t'arp'/b* 'fishing-basket', *yalt'* 'broad', *ort'* 'calf', *p'ul'* 'fall, ruins', as well as 2.2.2.6, and 2.3.1 (on the suffix *-t'*).

2.1.19 **-uH(s)m* > Arm. *-ukn*

Kortlandt (1985b: 9 = 2003: 57; see also Beekes 2003: 196) derives Arm. *jukn* 'fish' and *mukn* 'mouse' from PIE ASg **dgʰuH-m* and **muHs-m* respectively (with loss of **-s-* in *mukn*), assuming that "the laryngeal was oralized before the syllabic nasal" and is reflected as glottalic *-k-*. Another possible case is, according to Kortlandt (1985b: 10-11; 1986: 42 = 2003: 58-59, 71), *krunk* 'crane' if representing a metathesized form of ASg **gruHnm* (cf. OHG *krani/uh* 'id.').

Given that the material is scarce, and that the suffix *-kn* was widespread in OArm. (see 2.3.1), one may interpret *jukn* and *mukn* merely as **ju-* + *-kn* and **mu(h)-* + *-kn*. For *krunk* see s.v.

Kortlandt (2003: 59) points out that "the laryngeal was not oralized in **-iHm*, as is clear from the original accusative *min* of *mi* 'one'".

2.1.20 PIE **-CHC-*

The development of the PIE internal laryngeals in Armenian is much debated, see Clackson 1994: 36-41, etc.

Listing words some of which show *-a-* as a reflex of a laryngeal as an *-a-* (cf. *arawr* 'plough' etc.) whereas the others (*dustr* 'daughter', *armukn* 'elbow', etc.) show zero reflex, Greppin (1988: 75- 76) concludes: "I see no systematic explanation for this contradiction". Commenting upon this conclusion, Lindeman (1989: 283) writes: "So we are left wondering whether *arawr* 'must' reflect IE. **A(e)rO-trom* [= **h₂(e)rh₃-trom* (HM)], or whether it might not rather be compared to Lat. *arātrum*" (with a reference to Meillet 1936: 32). But Lat. *arātrum* is based on the verb *arāre* (see Schrijver 1991: 108). According to Lindeman (1982: 40-41), Lat. *arāre* and the PArm. unattested **arā-* may reflect an iterative in **-ā-* with zero grade in the root syllable: **h₂rH-eh₂-ye-*.

According to Beekes (1988: 77; 2003: 192-193; see also Kortlandt 2003: 120), the laryngeal was vocalized in the first syllable and before a cluster. He explains the counter-example of *harawunk* ‘arable land’ (q.v.) as a result of analogy. There seem to exist more examples, however: *haraw* ‘south’ from **prHuo-*; *yolov* ‘many’ and *alawunk* ‘Pleiades’ from **p(o)lh₁u-*; etc. (see s.v.v.). For the assimilation involved in *haraw*, *yolov* and others see 2.1.23. The rule of Beekes, then, can be reformulated as follows: the internal laryngeal was vocalized before a cluster and before a resonant, and was lost before a single stop.

See also s.v.v. **and-* ‘door-frame’, *anjaw* ‘cave’, *armukn* ‘elbow’, *barti* ‘poplar’, *kardam* ‘to call, recite’.

Olsen (1999: 778, 808) assumes **-lh₁C-* > Arm. *-oloC-* when a labial **p* or labiovelar **k^w* precedes the sonant. Her examples, however, are not convincing. The derivations of *holov* ‘rolling’ from **k^wlh₁-ti-* (cf. Skt. *cūrti-* ‘moving’) and *yolov* from the zero-grade **plh₁b^hi* (cf. Skt. *pūrbhis* ‘in Fülle’) are doubtful because the internal laryngeal seems to regularly drop in the position before a stop (see above), and the developments **k^w-* > Arm. *h-* and **-h₁ti-* > Arm. *-Vw-* are uncertain.

More probably, *yolov* reflects **polh₁u-s* (cf. Gr. *πολύς* ‘much’). The IE etymology of *oloṛn* ‘pea, bean; globule’ (old heteroclitic **k^wlh₁-r-n-* from **k^welh₁-* ‘to twist, turn’; see also op. cit. 139) combining with *olor* ‘twisting’ should be rejected since the plant-name certainly is a Semitic loan or Medit.-NEast. cultural word, and *olor* is probably of a different origin; see s.v.v. Uncertain is also the interpretation of *holonem* ‘to collect, gather, assemble’ as a denominative from **plh₁no-* ‘full’ since *holon-* is a later and poorly attested derivation from ClArm. *hoyl* ‘group’ (q.v.).

2.1.21 PArm. **(h)o-* > dial. *fō-*

In a few ClArm. words with initial *o-* or *ho-* one finds dialectal forms with **fō-*: (*h*)*ogi* ‘soul; spirit’, *hoṭ* ‘earth, ground’, *hoṭ* ‘smell’, *hor* ‘pit’, *ort* ‘calf’, *ors* ‘hunt’ (see H. Muradyan 1982: 267-276). One may add *hoyn* ‘cornel’.

Ačāryan (2003: 106-107) notes that this development occurs in monosyllables and is conditioned by the vowel *o*. He (AčārlHPatm 2, 1951: 411) correctly derives the form **fort* ‘calf’ (see s.v. ClArm. *ort* ‘calf’) from **hort*.

H. Muradyan (ibid., espec. 274-275) assumes the opposite direction (*o-* > *vo-* > *fō-*), explicitly referring to the devoicing process. It is not clear, however, why this process took place in a few words only and did not affect *otn* ‘foot’, *orj* ‘male’ and many others. Also the reason of this devoicing and its distribution are unclear.

If one tries to relate this initial devoicing to the consonant shift $b/d/g > p/t/k$, then it would be unclear why the development $o- > vo- > f\ddot{o}-$ occurred in a dialect such as Ararat which does not show consonant shift, and why this would not happen to Van, Łarabał and others, which did participate in the consonant shift. It is remarkable that *ort* ‘calf’ yielded Kak’avaberd *hɔ/urt* in three villages and *vært* only in Agarak, whereas Agarak systematically displays the consonant shift, i.e. devoicing (see H. Muradyan 1967: 65-67).

Of the cited examples, two go back to PIE **h₃e-* (*hot* ‘smell’, *hoyn* ‘cornel’), one probably to **j_o-* (*ors* ‘hunt, game’), one to **po-* (*ort* ‘calf’ vs. *ordi* ‘sun etc.’), and the rest are etymologically uncertain. In view of reliable cases which do not display *f\ddot{o}-* forms in dialects such as *ot(n)* ‘foot’ < PIE **pod-*, etc., and, in particular, *ordi* < PIE **porti-o-* (etymologically related with *ort* ‘calf’), I assume that the development $o- > vo- > f\ddot{o}-$ has taken place only in words with old *ho-* (from **h₃e-*, perhaps also **j_o-*?) and did not affect those with *o-* from PIE **po-*, **Ho-*, **so-*).

An exception is *ort* ‘calf’ (dial. **hort* and **fort*). Since the etymologically related *ordi* (< PIE **porti-o-*) does not have an aspirated *-t*, nor has it dialectal forms with *ho-* or *f\ddot{o}-*, I suggest to examine the problem of **h/fort* within the context of the aspirated *-t*, see s.v. *ort*. See also s.v. *hot* ‘earth’.

Among other cases, note *hog* ‘pain, grief; care’ (Bible) > **fog*, *ogi* and *hog-i* ‘spirit, soul’ (both Bible+) > **fogi* [H. Muradyan 1982: 268f] vs. the etymologically related *hov* ‘cold’, with no *f\ddot{o}-* forms. Whatever the ultimate origin of these words (cf. also *hewam* ‘to breathe heavily’), the absence of *f\ddot{o}-* forms in the case of *hov* is easily explained by labial dissimilation (see Ačaryan 2003: 106-107). These words have been derived from **peu-*, cf. Lith. *pūsti* ‘to blow’, etc. (see HAB 3: 89-90). The form *ogi* would not display *f\ddot{o}-* forms for two reasons: 1) it is disyllabic; 2) its anlaut would be **po-*; cf. the cases *otn* ‘foot’ and *ordi* ‘son’ never displaying *f\ddot{o}-* forms. One can assume that *hog* and *hogi* obtained the *h-* from the verb *hewam*, and this secondary *ho-* yields *f\ddot{o}-* in relevant dialects. Note that the etymology is not yet well established, and *hog* is semantically remote.

I conclude that the original distribution is as follows: PIE **po-* > Arm. *o-* (not *ho-*) vs. PArm. **ho-* (from e.g. PIE **h₃e-*) > *f\ddot{o}-*. Cases with **po-* > *f\ddot{o}-* like (*h*)*ort* ‘calf’ are exceptional/uncertain and may be explained by analogical processes, see e.g. s.v. *ort* ‘calf’.

For the phonetic discussion of the development *ho-* > *fō-*, I would like to mention a unique case of the same development *h* > *f* in auslaut⁹: Arm. *srah* ‘hall’ (Bible+) > Zeyt’un *soyɔf*, *sɔɔf*, vs. *srah* in Łarabał, Ararat, etc., and *srax* in Muš, Moks, Salmast, etc. [HAB 4: 281-282], of which Ačaryan (2003: 108, 338) offers no explanation. Since the only dialect showing the development is Zeyt’un, where the vowel *-a-*, unlike in the other dialects, regularly yielded *-ɔ-*, one can restore the following development: *srah* > Zeyt’un **sroh* > *soy/rɔf*. Here again, the sound change *h* > *f* may be conditioned by the neighbouring labial vowel *ɔ*, which, in this case, precedes the *-h*. Note, however, many counter-examples in Ačaryan 2003: 108.

2.1.22 Clusters

2.1.22.1 PIE **-ṭj-* (T = any dental stop)

According to Pedersen (1906: 396-397 = 1982: 174-175): **-ṭj-* > *-č’-*, **-dṭj-* > *-č’-*, **-dṭj-* > *-j’-*. This is shown e.g. by the following examples:

gēj’ ‘moist’ < **g^{wh}e/oīd^h-jo-* vs. cf. Russ. *židkij*, SCr. *židak*, etc. ‘liquid, watery’;

koč’em ‘to call, invite’ < **g^wot-je-* vs. Goth. *qīpan* etc.;

mēj’ ‘middle’ < **med^h-jo-* vs. Lat. *medius* etc.;

See s.v.v., as well as s.v. *oročam* ‘to chew, ruminare’. For more examples and discussion see Jahukyan 1982: 60-62; Greppin 1993; Kortlandt 1994 = 2003: 104-106.

This sound development may also apply with PArm. affricates. See the following entry.

2.1.22.2 PArm. **-c̣j-* > *-č’-*, **-j̣j-* > *-j’-*

Possible examples:

koškočem < **koč-koč-em* ‘to beat, break’ < **koc-koc-je-mi*, from *koc-* ‘to beat; to lament by beating one’s breast’, possibly a reduplicated present in *o*-grade with the present suffix **-je-* (see 2.2.6.1);

nom. **wanj-ōi-* > Arm. **ganj-u(i)* < *ganj*, *u*-stem and *i*-stem ‘store, treasury, buried treasure; belly, entrails, interior’; gen. **unj-jo-* > *unj’* ‘bottom, depth; buried treasure, store, barn’ (see 1.12.6)¹⁰.

⁹ Typologically compare Alb. final *-h* > *-f* in many dialects (M. de Vaan, p.c.).

¹⁰ In view of Skt. *asva-* ‘horse’ > *asvatara-* ‘mule’, ‘a horse, the one of the two’, one could derive Arm. *jori* ‘mule’ from *ji*, *o*-stem ‘horse’: PArm. *ji-yo-* ‘horse’ + suffix *-or-*, or

2.1.22.3 PIE **sk-* > Arm. *c-*, PIE **skH-* > Arm. *š-*

Next to PIE **kH* > Arm. *x* (2.1.18.1) and the well-known development PIE **sk* > Arm. > *c* (see Meillet 1987: 32; Beekes 2003: 198), one may also consider a sound change PIE **skH-* > Arm. *š-*. For discussion see s.v.v. *xayt* ‘sting, bite’, *šant* ‘lightning, thunderbolt, spark’, *šet* ‘slanting, crooked, oblique’, *sxał* ‘mistake, failure; crime’, etc.

2.1.22.4 PArm. **-cC-* > *-sC-*

Arm. *kaskac* ‘doubt, fear’ (Bible+; several dialects; in Łarabał and Ararat: *kackac*) derives from **kac-kac*, a reduplication of **kac-*, probably found in *karcem* ‘to assume, doubt’ [HAB 2: 533-534]. The phonetic change *-ck-* > *-sk-* is trivial and can help to reinterpret and understand some formations and etymologies.

Ararat, Lori, Č‘enkiler, Van *pspt-al* ‘to shine’, Ararat, Łarabał *pspt-in tal* ‘to shine’ (see Ačārean 1913: 929-930, without etymology). The root seems to be **pot* ‘fiery coal’ (Łarabał; see Ačārean 1913: 919b), cf., perhaps, *pat-* ‘shine’ [HAB 4: 13a, 14-15], *p‘atp‘atim*, *p‘ot(p‘ot)em* ‘to shine’ [HAB 4: 476], and, perhaps, dial. **pl-pl-al* ‘to shine’ (see Ačārean 1913: 914a). The first part of the compound, viz. **ps-*, may be identical with Ararat, Łarabał, T‘iflis etc. **pec* ‘spark’, cf. Van *pc-ar* ‘spark’ [Ačārean 1913: 908]; cf. also *payc-ar* ‘shiny, clear, splended’ (Bible+; dial.) [HAB 4: 17-18]. We arrive at **p(e/a)c-pot-*.

Compounds of this semantic sphere containing (almost) synonymic roots are common; cf. **kayc-u-pot-un* (Łarabał *kəcəpɔtun* [Ačārean 1913: 545a], Goris *kəcəpuɔtun* [Margaryan 1975: 414a]) ‘fiery’, comprising *kayc* ‘spark’ and the very same **pot* ‘fiery coal’; Ganjak *pecin-krakin anel* (*pec* ‘spark’ and *krak* ‘fire’) [Ačārean 1913: 908a]; etc. If this etymology is correct, Xian, Č‘arsančag *psal* ‘to shine’ (especially of eyes; cf. also *ps(ps)-ik* ‘eye’) [Ačārean 1913: 929b] should be treated as a back-formation based on **ps-pVł-* < **pc-pVł-*. Van *ps-pet* ‘eye-light’ (see Ačārean 1913: 929b) can be seen, then, as an intermediary between the semantics of *psal* ‘to shine’ (of eyes) and the formation of *ps-pt-al* ‘to shine’.

perhaps even **-tor-*, as in the above-mentioned Sanskrit form (note that **-oto-* > *-o-* is regular in Armenian, cf. *č‘ork* ‘four’ etc.) + the suffix *-i* which is frequent in animal-names such as *ayci* ‘goat’, *mari* ‘female bird’, *mak* ‘i’ewe’, etc. Thus: **j(i)yor-i* > *jori*.

Arabkir, Polis, Karin etc. *kas-karmir* 'entirely red' (see Ačarean 1913: 553b; HayLezBrbBař 3, 2004: 49a) is treated by Vaux (1998: 242-244) as a fixed coda reduplication. I tentatively propose to treat *kas-karmir* as a compound of the type discussed above: *ka(y)c* 'spark' + *karmir* 'red' = **kac-karmir* > **kas-karmir*.

Other examples (e.g. Nor Naxiřewan *mos-mōř* 'strictly blue', see Tigranean 1892: 115; Amatuni 1912: 489a) may be analogical or due to Turkish influence, see the report of Andrea Scala presented at the Workshop "Cultural, linguistic and ethnological interrelations in and around Armenia" in Michaelbeuern, July 4th to 7th, 2007.

2.1.22.5 PIE (and/or substratum) **sCV-* > Arm. *sV-*

For examples and discussion I refer to Lidén 1933: 50-52, řahukyan 1967: 214-215, and HAB s.v.v. *san*, *sandutř*, *sareak*, *sunkn*. See also my treatment s.v. *sunkn* 'mushroom' (cf. Gr. *σπόγγος* 'sponge, tonsil').

It is difficult to determine whether we are dealing with metathesis **sp-* > **ps-* > **s-* (cf. Lidén *ibid.*) or merely **spV-* > **s(p)V-*.

A similar alternation is found in Iranian, though in this case the starting point is PIE **k_u-*: SWIran. *s-* vs. Iran. *sp-* (see Brandenstein/Mayrhofer 1964: 12-13, 39; OsnIranJaz-Sr 1981: 29₈, 174; Schmitt 1983: 80-81; Abaev 1985: 12; řahukyan 1987: 562). Reflected in Iranian loans into Armenian, e.g. *sandaramet-k* 'underworld', also as a theonym: *Spandaramet* (Bible+); borrowed from Iranian, cf. Pahl. *Spandarmad* 'earth goddess' [HAB 4: 172-173; Russell 1987: 324-329].

Next to *spah* and *spay* 'army' (borrowed from Iranian, cf. Pahl. *spāh*, NPers. *sipāh* 'army', etc.), attested since the Bible, there is *sah* 'army' (John Chrysostom), also in compound *sah-a-pet* 'army leader' (Canon Law). řahukyan (1987: 543, 543₆₅, 551, 562) mentions this correspondence as a case of Iranian dialectal alternation *s-/sp-* alongside of *sandaramet* (see the previous item). His third example, i.e. *aspar* 'shield' vs. *sar-k*, *u*-stem 'armour, equipment, furniture, etc.' (see also Schmitt 1983: 76, 80-81) is doubtful since *sar-k* does not mean 'shield' and probably has a different origin; see s.v. *sari-k*.

The above-mentioned assumption of Lidén on **sp* > *ps* (cf. Arm. *sunkn* 'mushroom' vs. Gr. *σπόγγος* 'sponge, tonsil') is reminiscent of a similar sound change seen in Ossetic; cf. PIran. **spāda-* > Oss. *æfsad* 'army'; **spāta-* > Oss. *æfsadun* 'to saturate'; **spana-* > Oss. *æfsæn* 'ploughshare' (see s.v. *arřaspn* 'vitriol'); **aspā-* > Oss. *jæfs/æfsæ* 'mare'; **kařiapa-* > Oss. *xæfs/xæfsæ* 'frog'

(initial *x-* is unexpected); see Cheung 2002: 156-157, 196, 246; Cabolov 1, 2001: 573.

Further typological parallels can be found in Armenian dialects:

dial. (Muš etc.) *sak'an* 'beaker, glass', cf. Turkish forms and Russ. *stakan* 'beaker, glass' (see Fasmer s.v.). I find the Armenian forms e.g. in a fairy-tale from Alaškert (Haykuni 1902: 158, lines 2-5; reprinted: HŽHek' 9, 1968: 77); in other fairy-tales from the Alaškert and Xnus regions: *stak'an* (HŽHek' 9, 1968: 159¹⁴), *istəkan* (305^{L15,20}, 306^{L-14}); in the glossary (635a): *sak'an* and *stakan*, rendered by ModArm. *bažak*. Also found in a fairy-tale told by Abraham Hakobyan (a 45-year-old illiterate farmer, former inhabitant of the village of Vardenis in the Muš-region) and recorded by Senek'erim Šalčyan in Alek'sandrapol/Leninakan in 1915 (HŽHek' 13, 1985: 221, lines -11, -16), also glossed by ModArm. *bažak* (521b).

The anthroponym *Step'an(n)os*, from Gr. *Στέφανος* [Hübschmann 1897: 336], appears also as *Tep'an(os)* since 1601 AD, dialectally also as *Sep'an* [AčaṙAnjn 4, 1948: 600]. The form *Sep'an* is found thrice in a fairy-tale recorded by Orbeli (2002: 65^{Nr35}) in 1911-12 in Moks. In the Russian translation made by Orbeli himself (op. cit. 139) it is rendered as *Степан*. Further: in Nor Bayazet: *Sub-Sep'anos* < *Surb* 'holy' *Step'annos* [P'iloyeanc' 1888: 25-26]; in a fairy-tale recorded in T'iflis (< Muš, village of Saləkan) in 1916 (HŽHek' 13, 1985: 14-15); in the autobiography of V. Ananyan (1980: 368-369), on refugees of the Genocide from the Van/Arčak region.

2.1.22.6 PIE **dw-* > Arm. *-rk-* or *-k-*

The sound change **dw-* > Arm. *-rk-* has received a large amount of discussion and should be taken as uncertain, though it "cannot be dismissed" (see Clackson 1994: 113, with references). It has been assumed that the regular reflex is *k*. The initial *er-* of *erku* 'two' (< *duo-h₁* or **duōu*) is interpreted as taken from *erek* 'three', and the original **ku-* is seen in *keṭ-a-karc* 'doubtful', *kuṭ* (allegedly) 'fold, double', *kic* 'conjoined', *kēs* 'half', *koys* 'side', and *krkin* 'twice, again', which is not convincing; most of these etymologies are doubtful or simply wrong (see s.v.v.; see also Meillet 1908-09: 353-354). Arm. *erkar* 'long' (< **dueh₂-ro-*, cf. Gr. *δηρός*, Dor. *δαρός* 'lasting long', etc.) is another possible case representing the sound law under discussion.

Nevertheless, the development **dw-* > *-rk-* is phonetically improbable. For the discussion see also Pedersen 1906: 176-177, 178; AčaṙLiak 6, 1971: 402-403; Pisani 1934: 185; Schmitt 1972/74: 10-11; Ĵahukyan 1982: 75; Ivanov 1983:

27-29 (**dw-* > **rkw-* > *erk-*); Szemerényi 1985: 788-795; Vennemann 1986: 33-34, 41-42; Kortlandt 2003: 2-3, 7, 28, and especially 88-95 (= 1989); Lamberterie 1992: 257; Bolognesi 1994: 34-35; Harkness 1996; Olsen 1999: 270-271; Beekes 2003: 199-200, 209; Viredaz 2003.

See also s.v.v. *erkn* 'labour pains', *erknč'im* 'to be frightened', and *erkiwt* 'fear'.

One wonders if the development can be elucidated by some indirect evidence from neighbouring languages or by dialectal archaisms. Klingenschmitt (1982: 225, 238-239) proposed the following development: **d̥uō* 'two' > **t̥uō* > **t̥g̊uō* > **tk̊u* > *erku*. This is met with with scepticism (cf. e.g. Szemerényi 1985: 791-794). If, nevertheless, one accepts this development, it would be tempting to treat Kartv. **t̥qub-* 'twins' (on which see Klimov 1998: 194) as reflecting the theoretical PArm. **tk̊u-* 'two'. This is attractive but uncertain. Similarly, nothing can be based on Juŕa *y'etkar* or *yetkar* 'far away' from *erkar* (q.v.).

In non-initial position: PIE **meldu-i(h₂)-* (cf. Skt. *m̐dvī-* f. 'delicate, weak, soft, mild', Lat. *mollis* 'weak, soft' from **moldu-i-*) > Arm. *metk* 'soft' (q.v.). Also *oskr* 'bone', if from **ost-wer-*.

2.1.22.7 PIE **-k̑r-* > Arm. *-wr-*

mawru-k̑ 'beard' (Bible+; widespread in dialects, also **miruk̑*, **muruk̑*) < PIE **smok̑ru-*, cf. Lith. *smãkras*, *smakrã* 'chin' vs. Skt. *śmāsru-* n. 'beard', etc.

See also s.v. *artawsr* 'tear'.

A possible example may be Arm. *giwt* 'village', if from QIE **ue/oik̑(s)-l-ih₂-* (see s.v.).

See also s.v. *erinj̑* 'heifer, young cow' (if from **k̑r-*).

There are no cases with **g̑* and **g̑̃*. A special development is found in *art* 'cornfield' from **h₂(e)g̑ro-*, which is hard to explain (see s.v.). Kortlandt (1980: 101 = 2003: 28) notes that the palatal articulation of **-g̑̃-* before **-r-* was preserved in *merj* 'near' (cf. Gr. *μέχρι* 'near'), but later assumes **me-g̑̃sr-i* (see s.v. *merj* 'near').

2.1.22.8 PIE **-h₁n-* > Arm. *-t-*

For examples and references see Lidén 1933: 42; Meillet 1936: 48; Bonfante 1937: 19. See also s.v.v. *atam* 'to grind', *arastat̑* 'ceiling', *astt̑* 'star', etc.

Note also *Atiwn*, a district of the province of *Barjr Hayk̑* 'Upper/Higher Armenia', if from **Alnib/wn*, cf. *Analibna* (Ptolemy) etc.

2.1.22.9 PIE **-h₂c* > Arm. *-c*

According to Ačaryan (HAB 4: 105), MArm. and dial. (Nor Naxiĵewan, Polis, Ararat, ĽarabaĽ **puc* ‘vulva’, see Ačarean 1913: 926b) derives from QIE **bul-sk-*, cf. Skt. *buli-* f. ‘buttocks; vulva’, Lith. *bulis* (-iẽs), *bulė*, *bulė* ‘Hinterer, Gesäß’, as well as Arm. Erzuka *pllik* ‘vulva’. If true, the sound change can be linked to the following possible cases.

PIE **pelk-sk-* or **pelk-s* (cf. OHG *fēlga*, OEngl. *fēlg(e)* ‘felloe’) > **hetc* > *hec* (*i*-stem) ‘felloe’ (q.v.). See especially s.v. *kat* ‘milk’ on the loss of **-l-*, which has been preserved in Agulis and Mehri **kac*.

Compare also *aĵamutj* ‘darkness, twilight’ > ĽarabaĽ *žəmaženk* (see s.v. **aĵ-*).

2.1.22.10 PIE **-mp-* > Arm. *-m-*

See Meillet 1922c, on *amul* ‘childless’. Other examples are adduced in Adontz 1937: 12; Dumezil 1938; 1997: 3-4. However, not all of these etymologies are convincing. For instance: *amay*, *ea*-stem (adj.) uninhabited, desert; (subst.) desert, an uninhabited or uncultivated tract of country; a wilderness’ (Movsēs Xorenac’i 3.20, etc.; dialects), ‘abandoned, orphaned, bereaved’ (P’awstos Buzand 5.44 etc.); no acceptable etymology in HAB 1: 144b. The word has been interpreted as **an-pat-iyo-* (cf. Gr. *πατέουαι* ‘manger’ etc.) ‘lieu sans fourrage’ [Adontz 1937: 12; Dumezil 1938: 241; 1997: 3]. This is semantically improbable. I tentatively propose to treat *amay* as an Iranian loan with privative *a-* and **may-* ‘dwelling’, cf. YAv. *maiia-* n. ‘satisfaction, pleasure’, Sogd. *my’kcyk* ‘fortunate/happy’, Skt. *māyas-* n. ‘refreshment, enjoyment’ from **mej(H)-es-* (see Mayrhofer, EWAia 2: 315-316). For the semantic field ‘happiness, enjoyment, satisfaction’: ‘dwelling, city’ see HAB 3: 498-499, on *šat*. On the structure of Arm. *amay-i* cf. *anp’ay*, *i*-stem (GDPl *anp’ay-i-c*): *anp’ay-i* ‘uninhabited, desert, inaccessible, untrodden’, said of ravines (Anania Širakac’i, 7th cent.), and river-banks (Paterica), apparently composed of priv. *an-* and *p’ay* ‘foot’ < Iranian (cf. Pers. *pay* ‘foot; footstep, track’, *pāyīdan* ‘to stand firm; to be constant, fixed, established; to trample upon’, etc.).

Deriving *amol* ‘couple’ (Agat’angelos etc.; dialects of Karin, Muš, Van, Moks, Salmast, etc.) from **s^hm-pol-*, Dumezil (1938: 241) points out the accordance of this etymology with dialectal forms with *b* after *m*, **ambol*. In fact, the *b* must be secondary, see 2.1.30.1.

2.1.22.11 PIE **-mn* > Arm. *-wn*

Clear examples are *mj̄iwn* : pl. *mj̄munk* ‘ant’ (q.v.), *paštawn*, gen. *pašt-aman* ‘service’, etc. The sound change seems to have operated in the final position, whereas in the oblique stem the *-m-* remains intact, as is clear from *paštawn* vs. gen. *pašt-aman*. This is corroborated by the word for ‘name’.

anun, gen. *anuan* etc. ‘name’ (Bible+; dialectally ubiquitous). PIE nom. **h₃neh₃-mn* yielded Arm. **anuwn* > *anun*, whereas EArm. dial. **anum* could be explained by generalization of obl. **anman* < **h₃n(e)h₃-men-*. For more detail see s.v. *anun* ‘name’ and 2.2.2.3.

2.1.22.12 PIE **-Ct* > Arm. *-wT*

A number of examples display an addition of *-w-* before a dental stop. This type of alternation is represented by 3 subtypes:

1) *-t* : *-wt*

git- in *gtanem* (aor. *gt-i*, *e-git*) ‘to find’ (Bible+; widespread in dialects) : *giwt* (*i*-stem) ‘finding, invention’ (Bible+); see s.v. **git-*.

hat, *o-sem* (later also *i-*) ‘grain, seed; piece, fragment, section’ (Bible+), *hatanem* ‘to cut, split’ (Bible+), *y-atem*, *y-atanem* ‘to cut off branches from trees and especially from vine’ (Bible+) : *y-awt* ‘cut-off branch’ (Ezechiel 15.4), on which the denominative verb *y-awtem* (Paterica+) is based; *hawt*, *i*-stem ‘flock of sheep’ (Bible+; dial.); see s.v.v. *hat*, *hawt*.

mat- (q.v.) in *matč’im*, *matnum* ‘to approach, come close’ (Bible+) : *mawt* ‘near, close’, also *i mawtoy* and *mawtim* ‘to approach’ (Bible+; widespread in dialects). Linked with OIc. *mōt* n. ‘Zusammentreffen, Begegnung’, OEngl. *mōt* ‘Gesellschaft, Versammlung, Zusammenkunft, feindliche Begegnung’, etc. [HAB 3: 265-266, 373]. Klingenschmitt (1982: 70-71) explains Arm. *mawt* from **ma^utu* < **mædu-*.

2) *-c* : *-wt*

arac- ‘to browse, graze’ (Bible+) : *arawt*, *i*-stem ‘pastureland’ (Bible+); see s.v. *aracem*.

**boyc-* in *bucanem* ‘to feed’ (Bible+) : *but* ‘food’ (Bible+; dial.), on which the denominative *btem* ‘to feed’ (Ephrem+) is based; see s.v. **boyc-*.

**moyc-* in *mucanem* ‘to introduce, give entrance’ (Bible+) : *mut* (*i*-stem) ‘entrance; income; sunset, West’ (Bible+), *mtanem* ‘to enter’ (Bible+; widespread in dialects).

3) *-č’* : *-wt’*

čanač’em ‘to know’ : *canawt’*, *i*-stem ‘(adj. and subst.) known’, etc.

The phonological problems involved in explanation of these words have mostly been discussed in the context of the *w*-epenthesis (on which see s.v.v. *acut* 'coal', *awji-k* 'collar'). Some of the proposals are mentioned in the following. For the general discussion see also Winter 1966: 204; A. Xaç'atryan 1993.

Klingenschmitt (1982: 153-154) treats the *-w-* in *artawsr*, *arawt*, *hawt* etc. as an "*u*-epenthese nach betontem *a* der ursprünglichen Pānultima", e.g. *artawsr* 'tear' < **dra^hkur*: *artasu-k* (pl.) < **dra^hkú-ə₂*, assuming that *arawt* is composed of the PIE prefix **p_hṛ(i)* and Arm. **hawti* (cf. *hawt*, *i*-stem 'flock of sheeps etc.'), the latter belonging to PIE **peh₂-* 'to pasture' (on this see s.v. *hawran* 'flock of sheep or goats'). Then, he (ibid.) restores an old **i*-stem with **-ōi* in the nominative (as in *gewt*, q.v.): NSg **pah₂dō(i)* > **fātū* > **ha^htu* > **ha^htu*, ISg **pə₂d-i-b^hi-* > **hat-i-w(i)*, etc. For the epenthetic *-w-* compare also well-known issues on *awr* 'day', *awj* 'snake' etc. On *giwt* and others see Klingenschmitt 1982: 178-182.

This account, however, is not convincing. The proposed etymology of *arawt* is improbable (note, in particular, that the *-c-* of *aracem* remains uncertain, and **ar-* is attested only with a trilled *-i-*: *ar-*), for *artawsr* another explanation is preferable (see s.v.), *hawt* has a better etymology (see s.v.), etc. More important, all the three subtypes of alternations seem to be of the same nature, whereas Klingenschmitt's explanation can only be applied to the second subtype.

A unitary solution for all the subtypes would be preferable. In practically all these cases (except for *mawt*) we are dealing with deverbatives containing a final *-t* and belonging to the *i*-declension. The PIE deverbative suffix **-ti-* is then a good candidate.

Winter (1962: 261) derives *giwt* from **uid-ti-* assuming a development of **-dt-* to *-wt-*. This view is advocated by Clackson (1994: 155). Compare Arm. *an-giwt* adj. 'not found' (Koriwn, P'awstos, Łazar P'arpec'i, Ehišē) with Skt. *ā-vitti-* f. 'not-finding' (AV); see s.v. *git-*.

The third subtype may be explained as follows: **ġnh₃-sk-ic-* > **canač'em* > *čanač'em*: **ġnh₃-sk-ti-* > *canawt* (see Clackson 1994: 40), and the first subtype involves a development of **-ġ-t-* to *-wt-*, see s.v.v. *arawt*, *but*, *mut*. The development of **-dt-* to *-wt-* seems to contradict that seen in *p'o^hyt* 'zeal' which is derived by Klingenschmitt (1982: 167) from **(s)peud-to-* (see s.v.). However, here the **-dt-* follows a diphthong, and we may be dealing with a simplification: **-eud-t-* > *-oy(t)t*. For a similar explanation see Clackson 1994: 155. The postulation of the suffix **-ti-* (or **-to-*) and the subsequent simplification of the clusters can clarify, in my opinion, many other notorious problems, such as

ert'am, *mat't'em*, etc., which may be denominative verbs based on *i*-stem nouns, see s.v.v. and the following section (2.1.22.13); on the suffix **-ti-* see 2.3.1.

According to this mechanism, the alternation *-c-* : *-wt-*, *arawt*, *i*-stem, must be taken as a deverbative noun in **-ti-* based on verbal *arac-*. If the latter derives from **treHg-*, *arawt* (*i*-stem) would point to **trHg-ti-* (cf. Gr. *τρωξ-ις*). Similarly, *but* 'food' (vs. *boyc-* 'to feed' < **b^heug-*) is best explained by **buwt* from **b^hug-ti-*, cf. Skt. *bhukti-* f. 'Genießen' (Br.+)¹¹.

2.1.22.13 PIE **-RC-t-* > Arm. *-R(C)t'*

As we have seen in the previous section, in *p'oyt'* 'zeal' < **(s)peud-to-* one can postulate simplification: **-eud-t-* > *-oy(t)t'*. The final dental is aspirated here. This can be corroborated by other examples.

xayt' 'sting, bite' (Bible), *xayt'em* 'to bite (of insects and snakes)' (Bible+); *xayt'em* may be a denominative verb based on *xayt'* < **kh₂eid-ti/o-*, cf. Lat. *caedō*, etc. The forms *xit'* and *šit'* represent the zero grade of the same word and go back to PIE **kh₂i(d)-t-* and **skh₂i(d)-t-*, respectively. This seems to contradict *giwt*, etc. However, in *xit'* and *šit'* we might be dealing with analogical influence of the other ablaut forms, especially *xayt'*. The form *xawt'* 'ill, sick (of body, eye, or ear)' (Bible+), dial. **xōt'-ik* 'a kind of wound', is unclear, since a hypothetical **kh₂(e)d-t-* would yield **xawt* according to the previous section. For the discussion see s.v.v. and especially *xayt'*.

For discussion of other cases see s.v.v. *an(u)t'* 'armpit', *ert'am* 'to go', *kat'n* 'milk', *mat't'em* 'to pray', *šant'* 'lightning', *p'oyt'* 'zeal'.

2.1.23 Assimilation: **-ə... V₁'-> -V₁... V₁'* (**ə* also from PIE **-H-*; V = any vowel)

In 2.1.20 I assumed that the internal laryngeal was vocalized before a resonant, cf. **h₂(e)rH-u-* > *harawunk'* 'arable land'; **prHuo-* > *haraw* 'south'; etc. Various attempts to explain the vocalism of *yolov* 'many' are not convincing (see s.v.). The best solution is, to my mind, the direct derivation from **polh₁u-s* (cf. Gr. *πολύς* 'much'). The vowel of the final syllable underwent an assimilatory

¹¹ It may be argued against this explanation that **-ugt-* would yield Arm. *-ust-*, as shown by PIE **d^hugh₂-tēr* > Arm. *dustr* 'daughter' (q.v.). This is not conclusive, however, since *dustr* is the only example. Unlike *dustr*, where we are dealing with the sequence **-g(H)t-* as directly inherited from PIE, *but* has been analyzable in Old Armenian for a long period, so **buc-ti-* would not necessarily develop to an assimilated **bust*. Besides, if the derivation of *ustr* 'son' (q.v.) from **su(H)k-ter-* is accepted, *dustr* could be explained by the analogical influence of *ustr*.

influence by that of the first syllable. It is remarkable that *alawunk* ‘Pleiades’ (q.v.), which apparently derives from the same PIE word (cf. YAv. **parijainī-*, NPers. *parvīn*, Greek *Πλειάδες*), underwent the same assimilation, starting with the *-a-* from the zero-grade form (cf. Ilr. **prHu-* ‘abundant’).

For *ariwn* ‘blood’ and *garun* ‘spring’ Szemerényi (1960: 21) assumes assimilation and contraction: **ehar* > **ahar* > **ar-*, **gehar* > **gahar* > **gar-*. Similarly, he (ibid.) explains *č’or-k* ‘four’ and *k’or-k* NPl of *k’oyr* ‘sister’ from **č’ewor-k* < **k^wetores* and **k^hehor-k* < **swesores*, respectively.

2.1.24 Dissimilation

2.1.24.1 Grassmann’s Law is ‘breath dissimilation’ or a dissimilatory loss of the aspiration of the initial stop, which took place in Indo-Iranian and Greek independently [Collinge 1985: 47-61; Beekes 1995: 99, 128; Szemerényi 1996: 19, 56]. The rule seems to have partly operated in Armenian, cf. *pind* ‘tight, fastened’, *pndem* ‘to tie, fasten’ from PIE **b^hend^h-*, cf. Skt. *bandh-* ‘to bind, fasten’ etc. (see Jahukyan 1969: 66; 1978: 176₁₃). See also s.v. *papanjim* ‘to grow dumb, speechless’. Counter-examples: *barjr* ‘high’, *gefj-k* ‘glands’, *dēz* ‘pile’, etc.

2.1.24.2 *r...r* > *l...r*

Apart from the well-known cases of Indo-European origin, viz. *atbawr* ‘spring, well’ and *etbayr* ‘brother’ (q.v.), this dissimilation is also seen in *otorm* ‘compassion; supplication’ (Bible+; widespread in dialects), if this word derives from reduplicated **or-orm-* (see HAB 3: 556-557). See, however, s.v. *otorm* ‘compassion; supplication’. Note also an Iranian loan: *satawart* ‘helmet; mitre’ (Bible+; dial.) < MPers. **sāravart(i)-*, literally ‘Kopf-bedeckung’ [Hübschmann 1897: 235-236; HAB 4: 165, 652b]. See AčarLiak 6, 1971: 699-700.

Examples in dialects:

orar, *urar* ‘stole, tippet’ attested in Eusebius of Caesarea etc. < Gr. *ὠράριον* [Hübschmann 1897: 369; HAB 3: 615a]; widespread in dialects: T’iflis, Axalc’xa, Łarabał, Polis, Sebastia., Muš etc. *urar*, Tigranakert *urär*, Marała *üurar*, Zeyt’un *uyoy*, *uror* [HAB 3: 615]. Only in Juła: *ular*, through dissimilation [Ačarean 1940: 154, 381a]. Compare Georgian *olari* ‘id.’, treated as an Armenian loan in HAB 3: 615b;

parart ‘fat’: Dersim *barard* and (Čarsančag) *balard* [Bařramyan 1960: 98a]. The word *balard* ‘fresh’ (Erznka, Xnjorek) recorded in the glossary of purely dialectal words (op. cit. 112b) seems to belong here, too;

Dissimilation in the opposite direction, viz. $r...r > r...l$, is less frequent; see 3.5.2.2 on Svedia *j'irəbätig* 'hyena' etc.

2.1.25 Assimilation and dissimilation

Very often, especially in dialects, an assimilatory or a dissimilatory process seems irregular and arbitrary. A careful examination reveals that we may be dealing with a complex simultaneous process of assimilation and/or dissimilation in which three or more (rather than two) participants are involved. A possible example is *bok-ik* 'barefoot' > dial. **bobik*. A metathesis of the type $P...K > P...P$ is exceptional for Armenian and does not occur in words like *bak*, *buk*, *po/uk*, *p'ak*, etc. (see HAB s.v.v.). One might therefore explain *bokik* > **bobik* through a twofold process: assimilation ($b...k > b...b$) and dissimilation ($k...k > b...k$). Thus: $b...k...k... > b...b...k$ [labial-velar-velar > labial-labial-velar, or ABB > AAB]. Cf. Aġayan 1987: 269-270. Examples for vocalic assimilation + dissimilation: *eraxay* 'child' > dial. **erexa*, Mİran. **Mihrakān* > Arm. *mehekan* 'the 7th month of the ancient Armenian calendar'.

An interesting example is discussed s.v. *atēn* 'bow; rainbow'.

Further examples:

zok'anč 'wife's mother' > Łarabał *zānk'uč*, *zāmk'uč*, *zēnk'uč*, *zēmkn'uč* [Davt'yan 1966: 351]: *zok'anč* > **zak'onč* > *zā/enk'uč* > *zā/emk'uč*; as well as *nzov* 'to curse' > Łarabał *mzov*,

žptal 'to smile' : Šatax *žəmtal* [M. Muradyan 1962: 196b]; M. Muradyan (1962: 55) posits a twofold development: *žp* > *žm*, assimilative loss of the plosive feature, and *pt* > *mt*, plosive dissimilation.

xatof 'grape' > **xavof* (in numerous dialects, see HAB 2: 322a). The choice of the -v- may have been triggered by the following labial vowel -o-: A-AoA > A-BoA (/vel. + V + vel. + V^{lab} + vel./ > (/vel. + V + lab. + V^{lab} + vel./, in other words, of the three velar fricatives, the middle one, which precedes the labial vowel -o-, is dissimilated into labial -v-). Compare dial. **pavart* from *parart* 'fat': *balard* (see above). Note also **havof* < the same *xatof* 'grape'. This is, thus, a combination of two dissimilatory developments: 1) $x-t-t > h-t-t$, 2) $x-t-t > x-v-t$.

tzruk 'leech' (q.v.) is reflected in Ĵuta as *pzdruk* 'a leech-like water worm' [HAB 4: 400a]. In order to explain this form, Aġaryan (1940: 145, 160-161, 163) proposes a complicated scenario involving three steps: 1) metathesis (*tz-* > **zt-*); 2) addition of a "prothetic" *p-*; 3) *-zt-* > *-zd-*. Thus: *tzruk* > **ztruk* > **p-ztruk* > *pzdruk*. The first two steps are not convincing, however. An alternative

explanation is: 1) *tzruk* > **tzdruk*, with epenthetic *-d-*, cf. *t'mril* > *Ĵuġa d'mbrel, manr* > *Ĵuġa mandr*, etc. (see Ačārean 1940: 159-160); examples of a position before sibilants can be found in other dialects; 2) **tzdruk* > *pzdruk*, with dissimilatory simplification of the initial cluster comprising four dental phonemes.

Amatuni (1912: 442a) records Muš, Alaškert *čšnarot* 'truly' (unknown to Ačāryan), used in oaths. No etymological attempt is known to me. It seems to be identical with *čšmarit*, *i*-stem (later also *a*-stem) 'true, precise, genuine' which is attested in the Bible onwards and has been preserved in several dialects. In Polis, only in the oath formula **čšmarit Astuac* "true God" [HAB 3: 209]. The vowel *-o-* is unclear. As for *-n-* instead of *-m-*, one can assume "circular assimilation": *čš-m-r-t* (all the consonants but *-m-* being dental) > **čš-n-r-t*: dental-labial-dental > dental-dental-dental (ABA > AAA).

Another example of ABA > AAA [*vc-c* > *pc-c*] may be seen in *kovcuc* 'a kind of lizard' (lit. 'cow-sucker') > Xotorĵur: *kopcuc* 'green lizard' [YušamXotorĵ 1964: 472a]; see s.v. *kov-a-diac*, cf. also *dagať-k* 'coffin' > Malat'ia, Sebastia **gagaťk*.

2.1.26 Metathesis

2.1.26.1 Criteria

In order to assess the nature and direction of metathesis one has to start with the oldest form, taking into account two basic criteria: 1) philological (chronology and reliability of the attestations); 2) etymological.

Things are often unclear, especially with cultural and/or substrate words. For instance, alongside with ClArm. *oloġn* 'pea, bean; globule' (Bible+; dialects), there are other variants: *oleġn* (Paterica; several dialects), and **orel* (dialects of Xotorĵur, Nor Naxiĵewan). Both philological (*oloġn* is the basic form and is attested in the Bible onwards) and etymological (cf. Akkad. *ħallūru*, *ħi/ullūru*, etc.; probably also Gr. *ὄλυραι*) suggest that *oloġn* must serve as a starting point. The fact that the same metathesis is present also in Semitic forms (cf. Aram. *ħurlā*, Arab. *ħarul*, Hebr. *ħarūl*) makes it difficult to determine whether the dialectal form **orel* is due to intermediation of a particular Semitic language or represents an independent development of a similar nature. The latter alternative is more probable, since **orel* is present only in two Armenian dialects located far from the Semitic languages.

Also internal factors must be dealt with. The vocalism of **olein* (and **orel*) seems to have resulted analogically after *sisein*, GSG *sis(e)rian* ‘pea’ (Agat’angelos+; widespread in dialects).

In order to explain some unclear dialectal forms one can postulate a metathesis which is corroborated by other dialectal forms. For instance, *ĵulhak* ‘weaver’ (also *ĵulahak* in Grigor Tat’ewac’i, see HAB-Add. 1982: 16), dial. also ‘spider; spider-web’, is borrowed from Pers. *ĵulāhak* ‘weaver’; cf. *ĵulāh(a)*, *ĵulāh(a)* ‘spider; weaver’. Some forms have an “epenthetic” *-w-* or *-f-*: Č’mš kacag *č’uvulag*, Karin *ĵuflak* next to *ĵulfa(k)*, Axalc’xa *ĵ’uflak* [HAB 4: 133a], Berri (Dersim) *ĵivālāg* ‘spider-web’ [Bačramyan 1960: 164a], Tigranakert *č’üvlāg*, *č’ulāg* [A. Haneyan 1978: 196a], Malat’ia *ĵuvalag* ‘weaver; spider’ [Danielyan 1967: 225], etc. One notes that none of these forms displays a reflex of the *-h-*. Therefore, the forms of the type **ĵuw(V)lak* should be interpreted as coming from **ĵuhalak*, which in turn represents a metathesized form of *ĵulahak*. The postulation of such a metathesized form, viz. **ĵuhalak*, is directly confirmed by Zeyt’un *č’halog*, *ĵ’halog* ‘weaver; spider’ [HAB 4: 133a; Ačāryan 2003: 337], Ararat *ĵuhlak* [Nawasardeanc’ 1903: 102a] or *ĵuhlag*, T’iflis *ĵúhlak*, Ĵuta *ĵuxlak* (the *-x-* is from *-h-*) [HAB 4: 133a]. Note that Zeyt’un is both geographically and dialectally very close to Malat’ia and Svedia, and is located between them. Its **ĵuhalak* matches Malat’ia *ĵuvalag*. The Svedia and Hačən forms have the unmetathesized sequence *-lh-* (see Ačāryan 2003: 337, 586). As to the development *-uha-* > *-uwa-*, see 2.1.32, on *zohal*.

Next to Moks *terōxri* ‘priest’s wife’ one finds *tərxori* ‘id.’ in the dialect of Šatax, which is both dialectally and geographically closest to Moks. M. Muradyan (1962: 216b; 1972: 209) interprets Šatax *tərxori* ‘priest’s wife’ as composed of *tēr* ‘lord’ and *huri* ‘(heavenly) beautiful woman, fairy’ not mentioning the Moks form. This etymology is not convincing. It is better to treat Moks *terōxri* as the original form deriving from **tēr-urhi*, and the metathesis of the Šatax form is due to the folk-etymological re-interpretation as **tēr-hōr-i* ‘(the one that belongs) to the priest’; see s.v. *tiruhi*.

In what follows I present several sets of (mainly dialectal) examples.

2.1.26.2. Stops

PIE **-Dr-* and **-Dʰr-* are subject to metathesis in Classical Armenian (see s.v.v. *atbewr* ‘spring, well’, *artawsr* ‘tear’, *etbayr* ‘brother’, *surb* ‘pure, holy’, etc.), but **-tr-* is not. It yields Arm. *-wr-*.

One might expect metathesis also in a form with an aspirated **-T^h-*, in words of substratum origin, for instance. A possible example would be *k'atirt'*, *a*-stem 'stomach of animals', if from **k'atit^h-ra-* (q.v.).

Examples from dialects:

Labial : dental

put 'poppy' > Łarabał *tɔp* 'id.', *put* 'drop' > Łarabał *tɔp* 'id.' (q.v.), *p'etur* 'feather' > dial. (Zeyt'un, Xarberd, Hamšen, Karin, Alaškert, Łarabał, Agulis, Ĵuła, etc.) **tep'ur* 'id.'.

Arm. *p'aycatn* 'spleen' > Cappadocian Greek *πείσάχι* 'id.' > Xotorĵur *sipex* 'id.', see s.v. *p'aycatn*.

This material can be used in making new etymologies. For instance, *t'epek* 'ape; jackal', of which no etymology is known to me, may be regarded as a loan from Gr. *πίθηκος* 'ape' through metathesis /labial...dental/ > /dental...labial/ discussed above (see 3.5.2.2 on the etymology).

Dental : velar

dagał 'coffin' > dial. **gadał, targal* 'spoon' > **gdal, jgem* 'to throw' > dial. **gjem* (see HAB s.v.v.).

Next to *katin* 'acorn' (q.v.), the dialect of Łarabał has *tkóten* and metathesized *któten* 'hazel-nut'.

čakat 'forehead' (Bible+; widespread in dialects) > Rodost'o *ĵadag*, gen. *ĵadgi* [HAB 3: 176a].

Next to ClArm. *čkoyt'* and *ckoyt'* 'the little finger', Łarabał has *ckéynə*, *kcéynə*, etc. (cf. also Ĵuła *ck-ik*, Šamaxi *ckla mat*, etc.). The form *kcéynə*, found also in Goris (see Margaryan 1975: 346a), represents a metathesis *ck-* > *kc-*.

2.1.26.3 Nasals, resonants, spirants

r...N > N...r

Arm. *erani* 'blissful' > Łarabał (*h*)*ənérak, nérak*.

For the dialect of Hamšen, Ačarıyan (1947: 73; see also 235) mentions only one case for *r...n > n...r*: *cirani gōti* 'purple girdle' > *jinari kōdi* 'rainbow'. The other dialects have no metathesis here: Polis *jirani-gōdi* [Ačarıyan 1941: 220], Erzinka *cirani gōdi* [Kostandyan 1979: 157b], Svedia *ciränə kudək'* [Andreasyan 1967: 366b], K'esab *ciränə kütä* [Č'olak'ean 1986: 206a], Xotorĵur **cirani-gōti* [YušamXotorĵ 1964: 466a], etc.

A possible typological parallel: The name *Amirani*, the theomachist hero of the type of Prometheus in the Georgian Epic, is considered to be somehow related with *Mihr* (see A. Petrosjan 2002a: 182-183, with ref.). I tentatively derive *Amirani* from Persian *Ahriman* 'Ahriman, the principle of Evil, opposed to Ormuzd, the principle of Good; the devil; a demon'. Iranian **hr* is reflected in Georgian as *r* (see e.g. HAB, s.v.v. *agah*, *ah*, *bah*, *zoh*). *Ahriman* could develop to **A(h)riman* > **Amiran-* through dissimilation *r...N* > *N...r*. Also an association with *Mihr* may have played a role here.

For an older stage compare PIE gen. **h₂nr-ós* > Arm. *ain*, gen. of *ayr* 'man' (q.v.). Here, however, we are dealing with contact rather than distant metathesis.

The opposite: *n...r* > *r...n*

anar > Svedia *äränud* [Andreasyan 1967: 353b]; *t'onir* 'ground-hearth' > Łarabał *t'órūn*, etc.

l...n > *n...l*

This metathesis is found e.g. in MFr. *alumette* > Fr. *omelette* 'omelet'.

For the dialect of Hamšen, Ačāryan (1947: 73) mentions only one case: *šni-* 'neck' (q.v.) > *šnlik* 'face'. Here may belong also *xnlink* from *xlink* 'snivel', mentioned by Ačāryan (ibid.; see also p. 233) as a case of nasal epenthesis. What he suggests is, in fact, anticipation (see 2.1.27.2). It seems probable, however, that anticipation was preceded by metathesis. The forms *šnlik* and **xnlik* have developed into *šnlink* and *xnlink*, with an epenthetic *-n-*, exactly as in *banali* 'key' > Hamšen *pōnlink/k* alongside with *pōnlik/k*. The form *xnl-* is corroborated by other NW dialects such as Rodost'o, Ewdokia and Karin. Here, Ačāryan (HAB 2: 373b) explicitly assumes a metathesis **xln-* > **xnl-*.

Another case for such a metathesis is found in dial. **gdalnoc* (< **gdal-anoc*) 'a pot for spoons', present in Hamšen, Karin, Širak, Xarberd, Sebastia, etc. (see Amatuni 1912: 127a; Ačārean 1913: 222b; Gabikian 1952: 135; HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 232a). As is shown by Blāsing (1992: 42), the Armenian word has been borrowed into Turkish dial. (in Hamšen area) *gedanluç*, *gedanloç* 'kleines, an der Wand befestigtes Holzkästchen mit runder Öffnung an der Vorderseite zur Aufbewahrung der Löffel', as well as *kadanloç* 'Löffelkästchen' (also in Sivas).

According to Blāsing (ibid.), the metathesis *ln* > *nl* "erst bei oder nach der Entlehnung ins Türkeiitürkische eingetreten ist". In view of the above-mentioned examples from Armenian Hamšen and adjacent areas I assume that the metathesis may have taken place in Armenian Hamšen, though the metathesized form **gdanloc* is not recorded here. It should be borne in mind that Ačāryan's **gdalnoc* is a standard reconstruction rather than a phonetic record of the word,

which would have an initial *k*- in Hamšen (cf. *gdal* > Hamšen *kdal* ‘spoon’ [Ačāryan 1947: 62, 255]). In either case, we are dealing with a clear case of *ln* > *nl* metathesis in this region¹².

On *analut* ‘deer’ see below.

Bearing in mind also the case of *cirani* > Hamšen *jinari* (see above), one may postulate a more or less regular metathesis *R...n* > *n...R*, where the *R* is either *r* or *l*. While other dialects metathesize in both directions, Hamšen seems to display only the mentioned one, since *anali* and *banali* remain unchanged here: *ɔnli* and *pɔnlik/kʻ*, *pɔnlink/kʻ* (see Ačāryan 1947: 56, 220, 222). A dissimilation from *n...n* results in *n...l* in *ananux* ‘mint’ > Hamšen *ɔnluxkʻ*, cf. also *annman* ‘not resembling’ > *ɔnləmɔn* (see Ačāryan 1947: 56, 220, 221).

The contact group *ln* (resulting from *-lin-* or *-lun-*) mostly develops into Hamšen *-ll-*, cf. *lnum* ‘to fill’ > *lluš*, *linim* ‘to be, become’ > *əlluš*, **(h)ulunem* ‘to button up’ > *hilluš*, etc. [Ačāryan 1947: 56]. One may assume that the metathesis *l...n* > *n...l* is relatively old and predates the syncope of *-a-*. Thus, 1) **gdalanocʻ* > *gdanalocʻ* (metathesis); 2) **gdanalocʻ* > **gdanlocʻ* (syncope). Otherwise we would have **gdallocʻ*.

It seems that the metathesis is not old enough to affect *-l(i)n-* and *-l(u)n-*, unless we admit that a metathesis is an irregular process, or in individual cases it has been blocked by other circumstances. The latter alternative is more plausible. The absence of metathesis in, for instance, *lnum* ‘to fill’ (< **linum*) > *lluš*, is easy to explain. The nasal belongs to the present and is naturally absent from aorist (*lcʻ-i*, *lcʻ-ir*, *ε-licʻ* etc.) and imperative (*licʻ*, *lcʻ-εkʻ*), see Ačāryan 1947: 133, 232, thus a metathesized **nəlum* would not be tolerated in the paradigm where the other forms have an initial *l-*. The same holds for *elanem* ‘to rise’ > *əlluš*: *εla*, *yeł*, etc. (op. cit. 128, 227).

To sum up: in the Hamšen dialect (partly also, perhaps, in Karin etc.), the phonotactics of the sonants *n* and *l* seems to be governed by three rules: 1) *n...l* > *n...l* (unchanged), cf. *anali* > *ɔnli*, etc.; 2) *l...n* > *n...l* (cf. *šlni* > *šnlíkʻ*, etc.); 3) *n...n* > *l...n* (cf. *ananux* > *ɔnluxkʻ*, etc.). In all the three cases the outcome is *n...l*. The *n...l* is thus the most preferred sequence of these sonants.

¹² An interesting though highly hypothetical case may be *Afiwn* (“Ašxarhacʻoycʻ”) vs. *Anilib(n/la)* (Ptolemy etc.), name of a district in the province of *Barjr Haykʻ* ‘Upper/Higher Armenia’, perhaps pointing to **Alnib/wn*. Note that this province was situated in NW of historical Armenia, thus not far from the Hamšen region. If the interpretation is accepted, this example may be important for the chronology.

In the light of what has been said, the derivation of *analut* ‘deer, hind’ (q.v.) from QIE **h₁(o)l-Hn-th₂o-* (with the same metathesis *L...n > n...l* seen also in the related Hesychian *ἔνελος· νεβρός* ‘young of the deer, fawn’) becomes more significant. If my etymology of *analut* is accepted, one can postulate a dialectally restricted word in the Classical period.

Conclusion: The metathesis *L...n > n...l* may be regarded as an areal feature restricted to the NW of historical Armenia (Hamšen, Karin, Barjr Hayk’) or perhaps, in a broader sense, to Mediterranean/Pontic regions (cf. Hesychian *ἔνελος* ‘fawn’ above). Arm. *analut* ‘deer’ < QIE **h₁(o)l-Hn-th₂o-* demonstrates that this metathesis is rather old.

L...r > r...l

oloín ‘pea, been; globule’ (Bible+; several dialects) : **orel* (dialects of Xotorjur, Nor Naxijewan). The same metathesis is present also in Semitic forms (see s.v. *oloín*). Probably we are dealing with independent developments of a similar nature.

h...v > v...h

hawak-em ‘to gather’ > Łarabať *həvák-el* and *vəhák-el* [Davt’yan 1966: 411]. A textual illustration can be found in a fairy-tale from Łarabať recorded by Grigor Bahat’ryan in 1860 (HŽHek’ 6, 1973: 67^{L20}): *vəhák-al ən* ‘they have gathered’.

lv > vl

luanam ‘to wash’ (Bible+; widespread in dialects) > Polis, Aslanbek, Karin, Muš, Xarberd, Zeyt’un, Van, Salmast, etc. **vlal* (see HAB 2: 300b).

v...l > L...v (the opposite of the previous one, though here we are dealing with distant metathesis)

vayel-em ‘to enjoy; to suit’ > **vel-el* (contraction as in *hayeli* ‘mirror’ > **hili*, etc.) > Maraťa and Salmast *level* [HAB 4: 300a; Ačarean 1926: 76, 424].

m...n > n...m

mananay ‘manna’ > Šamaxi *nəmana* [Baťramyan 1964: 67, 213].

2.1.26.4 Vocalic metathesis

zok’anč ‘wife’s mother’ > Łarabať *zánk’uč*, *zámk’uč*, *zénk’uč*, *zémk’uč* [Davt’yan 1966: 351]: *zok’anč* > **zak’onč* > **zánk’uč*.

lezu ‘tongue’ > Łarabať *lúzi* [Davt’yan 1966: 366].

Martiros > Gor. *Mərtüris* (see Lisic'yan 1969: 273).

See also s.v. *uteł*, *o*-stem 'brain'.

2.1.26.5 Metathesis involving a cluster

Arm. dial. **pəngəl* 'panther' seems to be related with Pers. *palang* 'leopard, panther', cf. Skt. *pr̥dāku-*, Sogd. *pwrōnk-*, Gr. *παρδαλις* 'leopard', etc. (see Lubotsky 2004: 4). Metathesis of a cluster (*l...ng* > *ng...l*) or contamination with another oriental word **panTVr/l-*, cf. Gr. *πάνθηρ*, *-ηρος* m. 'panther', Skt. (Lex.) *puṇḍarīka-* m. 'tiger'.

This is reminiscent of the following example:

Next to Akn, Polis *kīt'n-il* 'to lean, recline, incline the body against an object for support' (see s.v. *kīt'unk* 'back'), Ararat attests *knt'īnil*, with metathesis, as is pointed out by Ačāryan (HAB 2: 669b). One of the possible scenarios is: 1) **-t'n-* > *-nt'n-* (anticipated or epenthetic *-n-*); 2) **kīnt'n-* > **knt'īn-* [influenced by dial. **šnt'(i)el*, **šnt'ī-k/n/t-el* 'to sit, lie'? For the forms see Ačārean 1913: 834a].

In both cases, thus: $C_1RNC_2 > C_1NC_2R$, in other words, metathesis of R and the cluster NC_2 .

2.1.26.6 Miscellaneous

šišat 'demon' (q.v.) : NPI *šiš-ay-k*

Šahmar > *Šamxar*, found in a fairy-tale (1918/1965, Nor Bayazet - Yerevan), see HŽHek' 9, 1968: 552-554.

čm-l-em 'to squeeze, press' (Bible+; several dialects) > Muš *člmił*, next to it we find dial. (widespread) **čm-ī-em* > Aslanbek, Sebastia, Akn **jərmel*. Other metathesized forms of this verb are *člm-k-ot-* vs. *čm-l-k(o)t-*. The evaluation of forms like *čmkt'el*, *čmtk'el*, *čm-t'-el* vs. *kčmt/t'el*, *kmčt'el* etc. 'to pinch' depends on whether the forms with *čm-* derive from *čm-* 'to press' or are metathesized from **kčm-*. See s.v. *čm-*.

2.1.27 Anticipation

2.1.27.1 Anticipation of *-i-* (or a palatal element) or metathesis

Classical Armenian words of Indo-European origin: *ayl* 'other', *ayr* 'man', *jayn* 'voice', *p'ayl* 'shine'; for later periods: *žayn* vs. *žanik* 'tusk' (see HAB s.v.v.). Note also PIE **medʰ-io-* > PArm. **mej-* > *mēj* 'middle'. Further, see s.v.v. *ayg* 'morning' and *ēg* 'female'.

Ačāryan (1935: 35) cites three examples of the irregular sound change ClArm. *a* > Agulis *ay*: *asetn* 'needle' > *áysāt(nə)*, *calel* 'to fold' > *cáylił*, *halel* 'to

melt' > *háyilil*. One may explain these forms through anticipation of the front vowel *e/i* in the following syllable. On *áysät(nə)* see also s.v. *asetn*.

ClArm. *kamuř* 'bridge' (q.v.) > Kak'avaberd *kármij* in the village of Varhavar (vs. *kármunř* in other villages, as well as in other Armenian dialects). Perhaps the following development has taken place here: **karmuř* > **karmuiř* > *kármij*. Cf. above on *mēř* 'middle'.

2.1.27.2 Anticipation of nasal

gtanem 'to find' > Van etc. *kəndənil*.

xlink 'snivel' > Hamšen *xnlink*, see above on metathesis, 2.1.26.3.

**ayg-hot-k* 'ceremony at the next morning after the funeral', eastern **ayg-n-a-hot* > Jüta *nagnaxot* and Šamaxi *ink'nahot*. See s.v. *ayg* 'morning'.

See also next.

2.1.28 Perseveration

Ačāryan (AčārLiak 6, 1971: 716-717) presents a number of cases with perseveration: *kanac* 'green' > **kananč* in most of the dialects [HAB 2: 511a] and *čanač'em* 'to know' (q.v.) > dial. **čananč'el*. The examples are ambiguous, however, since an additional *-n-* is often seen before hushing affricates, especially *-č-*; see 2.1.29.

Some of the other examples can also be explained by epenthetic *-n-*, as *mek* 'we' > **menč*, *mawruk* 'beard' > **mirunk*, etc.

Similarly, Łarabał *hriřtrak* from *hreřtak* 'angel' may be a mere case of *r*-epenthesis, cf. *lōřtak* (plant) > Šatax *lořtrak*, *napastak* 'hare' > Šatax *ləpəstrak*, etc. (see M. Muradyan 1962: 64).

2.1.29 Perseveration or anticipation of nasal

In H. Petrosyan 1987: 478 we find the following examples of anticipation:

akanř 'ear' > Muš *anganř* (see HAB 1: 104b);

atač'ank 'supplication' > Kırzen *tanč'ank* [Bařramyan 1961: 173b];

zok'anč 'wife's mother' > dial. (mostly western) **zənk'anč* [HAB 2: 110b];

irikun 'evening' > Polis *iringun*, Sebastia *h'iringun* [HAB 2: 46a].

Of these examples, however, perhaps only *iringun* is a straightforward case of anticipation. An additional *-n-* is often seen before hushing affricates, especially *-č-*, whether or not the word originally contained a nasal *-n-*; cf. e.g. in the dialect of Kırzen: *atač'el* 'to beg, supplicate' > *atanč'el*, *amač'el* 'to be shy' > *həmanč'el*,

barač'el 'to bellow' > *bəranč'el*, *kanač'* 'green' > *kananč'*, *čanač'el* 'to know' > *čənanč'el*. In Kırzen *tanč'ank'* we can thus posit an epenthetic *-n-*.

As for *akanj* and *zok'anč'*, there are also forms displaying a metathetic *-n-*, e.g. Kırzen *angj* and *zänk'äč'* (see Bařramyan 1961: 81, explicitly positing metathesis). The form **zo/ank'ač'* is widespread and is represented in northern and eastern dialects, as well as in Alařkert and Ararat [HAB 2: 110b]. One may assume that also western **zonk'anč'* reflects the metathetic form **zonk'ač'* with a subsequent addition of the above-mentioned *n*-epenthesis before *-č'* (and/or with a secondary restoration of the original *-nč'*). More demonstrative is the word for 'ear', the dialectal forms of which (HAB 1: 104b) display the following distribution: 1) unchanged **akanj* in Van-group and Akn; 2) *anganj* only in Muř; 3) **ankař* in the rest (Suč'ava, Nor Naxiřewan, Polis, T'iflis, Hamřen, Sebastia, Alařkert, Łarabař, Agulis, Marařa, etc.).

2.1.30 Epenthesis

2.1.30.1 Epenthetic nasal

Before a dental stop or affricate

blit' 'a kind of bread or cake' (q.v.) > Axalc'xa *b'lint'*.

ddum 'pumpkin' > Hamřen, Agulis, řuřa **dəndum*, whereas the majority of the dialects has no epenthetic *-n-*. Since Hamřen is located in extreme NW, while Agulis and řuřa are in SE, we are hardly dealing with a shared innovation. One may assume an archaism or an independent development. Perhaps a (quasi-)reduplication **dumdum*.

xuc' 'small chamber' (5th cent.+; several dialects) > dial. (Moks, Ozim, Sipan, Hamřen) *xunc'* [HAB 2: 422-423].

**ccruk* 'leech' (cf. Aparan, Bulanəx *ccruk* from *tzruk*, due to contamination with *ccel'* 'to suck') > Nor Bayazet *jnjruk* (with an epenthetic *-n-*).

kamurj 'bridge' > **karmunj* (late attestations), which is the only form found in dialects.

karkut 'hail' (q.v.): Aslanbek *gargünd*. Ačaryan (HAB 2: 556b) assumes a folk-etymological association with *gund* 'ball'.

kēř 'point, dot' : E and N dial. *kent* 'odd'.

hnjan 'wine-press', if from **ha/ouzan*, see s.v.

mec 'big' > **menc*, *mēř* 'middle' > **manj*, etc.

The epenthetic nasal is also seen in recent borrowings, e.g. Turk. *suč* > Ařtiaľ (Pol.) *sunj* 'sin' (see Ačaryan 1953: 188, 197).

Before a labial stop

žpit 'smile', *žptim* 'to smile' (Bible+) : *žmtim* (Philo etc.), *žmb(ə)tim* ("Knik' hawatoy" = "Seal of faith", 7th cent.). Dial.: Ararat *žəpətel* : Moks, Salmast, T'iflis, Alaškert **žmtal*, Kürin *žmnil* [HAB 2: 234b]. No acceptable etymology in HAB 2: 234b. The comparison with OIc. *gaman* 'Freude, Spaß, Wollust', MHG *gampen*, *gumpen* 'to spring' etc. (< PIE **g^{wh}em-b-*; see Jahukyan 1967: 200) implies that the nasal in the Armenian form is original. However, the etymology is highly uncertain, and *žpit* is the oldest and principal form. In my view, *žp(i)t-* has developed to **žmbt-* (cf. "Knik' hawatoy") with nasal epenthesis, then **žmbt-* was simplified to **žmt-*.

**xabarik-a-tu*, lit. 'who gives information or news' > Hadrut' *xəmbərkatu* 'spider' (see Połosyan 1965: 286^{L-7}, without etymology); cf. *xəbər-bezan* 'spider' (Martirosyan/Łaragyozyan, FW 2003, Łarabať).

xipilik 'demon, nightmare' > dial. *xmblik* 'house spirit or goblin, brownie' (T'oxBať apud Amatuni 1912: 696a).

hapalas 'bilberry, Vaccinium Myrtillus L.' (Geoponica) from Arab. *habb-al-ās* : Svedia *həmbälus* [HAB 3: 44-45; Ačaryan 2003: 575; Andreasyan 1967: 176, 370b].

hpart 'proud' > Šamšadin **hmbart*, in compound *tärtäk-hmbart* 'empty-proud'; see textual illustrations in Xemč'yan 2000: 172a^{L17}, 221a^{L22}.

šahpalut 'chestnut' (an Iranian loan, cf. Pahl. *šāh-balūt* 'id.', lit. 'royal acorn') > Łarabať *šmbalut* 'chestnut' [Hübschmann 1897: 272; HAB 3: 486a].

Before a velar

Jagejor > *Zangezur* (for an etymological discussion see Margaryan 1988: 125-126).

For examples in Zeyt'un see Ačaryan 2003: 139. Here Ačaryan argues that *šak'ar* 'sugar' > Zeyt'un *šank'oy* (**šan-k'ar*) is due to re-interpretation as *šan k'ar* 'dog's stone'.

An older example may be seen in Arm. *kngum* vs. *k'ak'um* and Pahl. *kākum* 'white weasel', see s.v. *ak'is* and **č'asum*.

Compositional epenthesis

**ayg-hot-k'* 'ceremony at the next morning after the funeral' > Łarabať *ik'návəet*, Ararat *ek'naf'etek*, Juľa *nagnaxot*, Šamaxi *ink'nahot*, etc.; also Łarabať *ik'narot* (with *arawt* 'pasturing'); see s.v. *ayg* 'morning'.

**āi-i-koł* ‘precipitous, sloped’ (cf. *āi-i-koł-eal* in Movsēs Xorenac’i 1.16 vs. *z-āi-i-koł(-eal)* ‘precipitous’ in “Book of Chries” etc.) > Hamšen *āṛengeł* (cf. Xotorjur **ārikoł*, Muš, Van **ārkoł*); see 1.3.

maškat’ew ‘(having) a wing of skin’ (an epithet of the bat in Hexaameron 8), ‘bat’ (Alexander Romance etc.) > Hamšen *maškənt’ew* (see s.v.).

Ambiguous cases

It is sometimes unclear whether we are dealing with epenthesis or metathesis, or analogical influence.

gruz ‘curly’ (MArm. and dialects of Cilicia, Van, Agulis, etc. Ačāryan (HAB 1: 601) assumes that Van, Salmast, Nor Bayazet *kiunj* is the original form and for the sound change *nj* > *z* compares *koriz* ‘stone or hard seed of fruits’ which appears in Łarabał (*kōrenj*) and Van-group (**kotiñj*) with *-nj* (see also HAB 2: 648b; Davt’yan 1966: 77). However, the nasalless form *koriz* is attested in literature (Hexaameron, Paterica, Grigor Magistros, etc.) and is present in most of the dialects, such as Hamšen, T’iflis, Ararat, Šamaxi, etc.; cf. also Juła *ktez* and Agulis *ktaz*. It is more probable, then, that *koriz* is the original form, and Łarabał/Van **kor/tiñj* has a non-etymological epenthetic *-n-* or should be explained as follows: **kotiz* > **kotiz-n* (additional *-n*, on which see 2.2.1.3) > **kotiñj*. Similarly, *gruz* ‘curly’ > **gruz/ž-n* (cf. Łarabał *kəřəž-n-ut*) > Van etc.

For both words no acceptable etymologies are recorded in HAB. Is *gruz* ‘curly’ related with Pers. *gurs* ‘curled hair; a ringlet’ (which see Steingass 1082a)?

Sometimes we have an alternation *VnC* : *VC* where the nasal seems to be epenthetic, e.g. Sebastia *thunk* vs. Baberd *thuk* ‘a kind of water worm’. However, the only attested form NPl *tətkunk* may suggest an original **thukn*, and Sebastia *thunk* is probably due to metathesis, cf. *armukn* ‘elbow’ (q.v.) > most of dialects **armunk*.

2.1.30.2 Epenthetic *-r-*

ac-el-i ‘razor’ (Bible+; several dialects) : Muš, Alaškert, Nor Bayazet, Ozim, Ararat, Marała **arceli* [HAB 1: 102b].

acu ‘garden-bed’ < PIE **h₂(e)g-us-ih₂-* (cf. Gr. *ἄγυια*, pl. *ἄγυιαί* f. ‘street, road’ (q.v.) > Nor Juła *arču* (see HayLezBrbBar 1, 2001: 100a; cf. NHB 1: 21b); see s.v. *acu*. Given the etymology of the word, the *-r-* should be seen as epenthetic.

bažanem ‘to divide’ (Bible+; ubiquitous in dialects; borrowed from Iran. **baž-*) is spelled as *baržan-* in a number of sources as Xosrovik (8th cent.) etc. The

-r-, as is explicitly pointed out by Ačāryan (HAB 1: 381b), has no etymological value.

hosem ‘to make flow, pour down, winnow’ (Bible+; dial.). From this verb a derivative in *-eli* is made in dialects for ‘winnowing-fan’, viz. **hoseli*. A number of dialects (Muš, Bulanəx, Ararat, Łazax) have **hoseli*. For the description of the implement see HayLezBrbBař 3: 2004: 308a. According to Ačāryan (HAB 3: 315), the latter is the original form, and the *-r-* has dropped everywhere else. It is not clear, however, why would the *-r-* drop in the underlying verb without a single trace in the whole classical and MArm. literature, but be preserved in some of the dialectal forms of a derivative. An epenthesis seems more probable.

A hitherto unnoticed feature of this phenomenon is that in all these cases the epenthetic *-r-* appears only in derivative forms. In other words, there are no forms like verbal **arc-* and **hors-* vs. *acem* and *hosem*, and the *-r-* is present only in derivatives **arc-u*, **arc-eli*, **hors-eli*.

Similarly, in the Armenian dialects of Syria, ClArm. *ast* ‘star’ (q.v.) is reflected as *ust/dt*, but its diminutive suffixed as well as plural forms have an inserted *-r-* or *-i-*: Svedia *arəsdtag*, *arəstig*, K’abusie *arastək*, pl. *aras(ə)tənnir* or *-nnoyr*, Aramo *arstəir*. In this case the epenthesis may have been prompted by contamination with *arastat* ‘ceiling’, taken metaphorically as ‘starry sky’; see 3.7.1.

Another peculiarity is that the epenthesis often occurs before sibilants and affricates.

Further examples:

xuc ‘small chamber’ (5th cent.+; several dialects) > Akn *xurc* [HAB 2: 422-423].

karž, dial. *kaž-* : MPers. *kač*, NPers. *kaž* ‘raw or floss silk’ > Arab. *qaz* > NPers. *qaz*, see Maciuszak 1996: 30.

koč ‘stem, beam; ankle’ > Xotorjur *koyj* (< **korč*) ‘balkony’ [Ačārean 1913: 590a; HAB 2: 626a; YušamXotorj 1964: 472b; Kostandyan 1985: 63].

kovcuc ‘a kind of lizard’, composed of *kov* ‘cow’ and *cuc* ‘sucking’; in some dialects: *kovrcuc*, see s.v. *kov-a-diac*.

stec/stēc ‘weaver’s vertical stick’: Moks *əsterc* (or *stērc*). According N. Simonyan (1979: 245-246), Moks **sterc* has preserved the original form, with *-r-*.

Other: Xotorjur, Sebastia **katart* vs. Hamšen, Trapizon *kalat* ‘a big basket’ from Gr. *καλάθος*, see Ačārean 1913: 541b.

Also in modern times: Russ. *bloknót* ‘note-book’ > Colloquial Arm. *bloknort*.

According to M. Muradyan (1962: 64), in Šatax we find epenthesis also in *hangoyc* ‘knot’ > *xangyörc*, and *pahēz* ‘kitchen-garden’ > *paxrez*. These cases are ambiguous, however. The former may be due to contamination with *gorc* ‘work, weaving’, and the latter probably reflects the original Iranian form: **pahēz*. Compare **bahel* ‘to spade’ > Kak’avaberd *bihrīl*, *pihrīl*. As correctly stated by H. Muradyan (1967: 101), here the *-r-* is etymological: **bahər*.

2.1.30.3 Miscellaneous

sr > *str*

See 2.1.25, on *tzruk* ‘leech’. Compare Latv. *strauja* ‘stream’, Russ. *strujá* ‘stream’, Oic. *straumr* ‘stream’ next to Lith. *sraujà*, Skt. *srav-* ‘to stream, flow’, etc. from PIE **srou-* ‘to flow, stream’ (see s.v.v. *arū*, *arog*).

-snC- > *-stnC-*

Nor Naxi]ewan *lustnga* ‘moony night’ (< *lusn(a)kay*) vs. *lusin* ‘moon’ [HAB 2: 296a].

2.1.31 Epithetic *-t* after sibilants

atūēs ‘fox’ (q.v.) > Karčewan *átvest* [Muradyan 1960: 188b].

ak’is (*i*-stem) ‘weasel’ (q.v.) > Xotor]ur *ak’ist* ‘weasel’, Axalc’xa *ak’ist* ‘rat’. Curiously enough, the same kind of additional *-t* is found in Oss. *myst* ‘mouse’ < **mūs-* (cf. Cheung 2002: 206); cf. *mystūlæg* ‘weasel’ and Lat. *mūstēla* ‘weasel’. Compare *airnēt* ‘rat’ (HAB s.v.).

šrēs ‘a kind of mountainous edible herb that produces sticky paste’ (late and poorly attested; widespread in dialects, including those in extreme north, east and south-west) < Pers. **širēš*, cf. *sirīš* ‘id.’, *sirīšim* ‘glue; bird-lime’ [HAB 3: 544-545], Skt. *śreṣ-* ‘to adhere, to stick, to be attached’, etc. Some of the dialects have a final *-t*: Ararat, Alaškert, Van, Urmia, Salmast, Maraṭa, Juṭa [HAB 3: 545a; GwUrmSalm 2, 1898: 98].

It seems that we are dealing with another case of the epithetic *-t* following a sibilant. Note, however, Pers. *sirišt* ‘mingle, mixture’ or ‘nature’ (see HAB 3: 545a), Khot. *ṣṣiṣṭa-* adj. ‘attaching, hold’, as well as the infinitive: Pers. *sirištan* ‘to mingle’ = Pahl. *srištan* ‘to mix, knead’ < **srēs-* (see MacKenzie 1971: 76). Since most of these dialects are located in areas neighbouring with Iran (SE Armenia) and in Iran itself, one may alternatively relate the Armenian *-t* with those Iranian *t*-containing forms, though the epithetic *-t* should not be ruled out completely.

poz ‘horn’: Juṭa *poz*d, Agulis *puzt* [HAB 4: 93b].

hangoyc ‘knot’ > dial. **hangust* [HAB 3: 37b].

patroys ‘inoculation, grafting’ > Hamšen *badrust*, Muš *padrust*, Svedia *badrest*, Juša *patrust* [HAB 4: 54a].

For more examples in Hamšen see Ačaryan 1947: 74. For discussion of one of them see s.v. *asem* ‘to say’. In Hamšen *Istus K’ristos* < from *Yisus K’ristos* (see Ačaryan 1947: 74), *Istus* is clearly influenced by *K’ristos*.

Found even in a modern borrowing from Russian: *fókus* > Axalk’alak’ *fók’ust* (in a manuscript written by the father of Mane-Erna Širinyan).

2.1.32 Hiatus, glide

-w- before a labial vowel

ark’ayut’iwn ‘kingdom’ > Łarabał *ark’əvot’un* [HAB 1: 347a], Moks *ärk’äwut’in*, *ark’awot’in* [Orbeli 2, 2002: 99^{L21}, 124^{Nr203}], etc.

V^whV > *V^wwV* *ĵul(a)hak* ‘weaver’, dial. also ‘spider; spider-web’ (from Pers. *ĵulāhak* ‘weaver’) > **ĵuhalak* (metathesis; cf. Zeyt’un *čhalog*, *ĵ’halog*, T’iflis, Ararat **ĵuhlak*, Juša *ĵuxlak*) > **ĵuwalak* (cf. Malat’ia *ĵuvalag*, Tigranakert *č’üvläg*, etc.

zohal, *zōhal* ‘the planet Saturn’ > *Zval Astt*, the princess of India (*Hndkastan*) in a fairy-tale from Bašēš (see HŽHek’ 9, 1968: 361-375). However, *Zval* is the modernized orthographic variant of *Zual Astt* ‘the Star Zual’ in the original text (Haykuni 1901: 321-333). One should then reckon with the alternative possibility which would imply a mere loss of the -h- (*Zuhal* > *Zual*) rather than *Zuhal* > *Zuwal*.

-h-

Dial. *vrayek* ‘rain’ > Hamšen *vraheg*, where, as Ačaryan (1947: 36) points out, the -h- is due to the hiatus (*horanj*). There is also a contracted form, viz. *vreg* (ibid.).

For -h- cf. *gi*: *gi-h-i* ‘juniper’ (see HAB, s.v.); see also s.v. **e-al* ‘to go’ , and 4.8, on the place-name *K’arahunj*.

2.1.33 Loss

2.1.33.1 Loss of w before r or loss of intervocalic w

Szemerényi (1960: 20-21) assumes that the sequences *ewa*, *owa*, *awa* suffered loss of intervocalic -w- and subsequent contraction: *nor* ‘new’ < **newəros* (cf. Gr. *νεαρός* ‘young’), *sor* ‘hole’ < PIE **kowor-* (cf. Lat. *caverna* ‘cavern, grotto, cave, hole’), *erkan* ‘millstone’ < **erkawan-*, and the genitives of the type *ather* ‘well’ and *aler* ‘flour’ from **athewar(os)*, **alewar(os)*, with the instrumental -*erb* from

**-ewarbi*. Ałabekyan (1981: 104) points out that the loss of *-w-* occurs especially when followed by the suffix **-ro-* or determinative **-r-*.

Kortlandt (2003: 29-30 = 1980: 102) represents these examples in his chronology under PA 12c ("Loss of labialization before **o*, **u*, and nonsyllabic **r*"), stressing the opposition GSg *atber* and *aler* : NSg *atbewr*, *alewr*. He further (2003: 103) points out that "there is no reason to assume an intervocalic **-w-* in *nor* and *sor*, which evidently adopted the suffix **-ro-* at an early stage". Similarly, Beekes (2003: 165) derives *nor* from **neu-ro-* (> **nou-ro-* > *nor*), with **-ro-* replacing **-o-*, and GSg *atber* from **brewr-os*, the reshaped gen. of *atbiwr*. For the latter see also Eichner 1978: 153-154.

It has been assumed, however, that *atber* has developed from **atbewater* by regular loss of intervocalic **-w-*. For references and more detail see s.v.v. *atbewr* and *alewr*. As for *sor* 'hole, den, cave' (cf. Gr. *κύρην* 'hole', Lat. *caverna* 'cave, hole', etc.), I prefer to derive it directly from **kōwHro-* (> PArm. **sowəro-*) and treat as a case of loss of intervocalic *-w-*.

Kortlandt (2003: 103) leaves out *erkan* from the list since there is no evidence for *-w-* in the Armenian form, cf. Lith. *girma* etc. He adds *nerd-i*, GSg of *neard* 'sinew' (< **sneh₁ur-t-*). I think this is ambiguous since any *-ea-* automatically yields *-e-* in pretonic position. As for the loss of *-w-* in NSg *neard*, Kortlandt (op. cit. 103₁) characterizes it as "delabialization before non-final *-r-* <...> as in *leard* 'liver'". This seems to imply that the rule is not confined to the sequence *-wrV-*, since here we have **ne(H)w₁rt-* > **ne(w)ərt-* > *neard*. At a certain stage this is, in fact, an intervocalic position. However, Beekes (2003: 165) assumes that the loss of the *w* in NSg *neard* is analogical after the (old) oblique cases: **snēwr-*, which lost its *w* just like *atber*.

The secondary *w* (that is, *-w-* not from PIE **-u-*) is not lost before *r*, cf. PIE GSg **ph₂trós* > Arm. GSg *hawr* 'of father'; **smōkru-eh₂-* > *mawruk* 'beard'.

2.1.33.2 Loss of the initial vowel or syllable

Loss of pretonic *i-* or *u-* is well-known, cf. *ner* 'husband's brother's wife; husband's other wife' vs. Gr. *εἰ νόταρες*, Skt. *yātar-*, Lat. pl. *ianitrīcēs*, etc. (see s.v.). See also HAB, s.v.v. *hrey* and *ver*.

The pretonic vowel or syllable of trisyllabic words is lost in Łarabał and adjacent dialects which have penultimate accent. This mainly concerns derivatives.

a(r)celi ‘razor’ (Bible+; widespread in dialects) > Łarabał, Goris, Šamaxi *cíli* (> Udi *cíli*), Agulis *céli* [HAB 1: 102b; Margaryan 1971: 211]; *akanat* ‘trap’ > Łarabał *kanat* ‘net for catching birds’ [HAB 1: 109ab].

**ayg-hot-k* ‘ceremony at the next morning after the funeral’ and *hot* ‘earth’, eastern **ayg-n-a-hot* > Šamaxi *ink’nahot* and *k’nahot*. The latter variant may be due to reinterpretation as composed of *k’un* ‘sleep’ and *hot* ‘earth’. See s.v. *ayg* ‘morning’.

asaranoc ‘oil-mill’ > Łarabał *sranoc* [S. A. Avagyan 1978: 28-32].

Łarabał *č’ürügü* ‘until evening’ < **č’-erekoy* [Ačarean 1913: 879b], probably from **(min)č’-erekoy*.

hac’ahan ‘an implement for taking out the baked bread’ (Zak’aria K’anak’erc’i, 17th cent.) > Šamaxi *cahan* vs. Łarabał and Goris *cəhan* [HAB 3: 65a; Margaryan 1975: 112, 406b].

On the basis of this evidence, I propose the following etymologies.

Ačaryan (1913: 390a; HAB 2: 223b) interprets Łarabał **žamažamk* ‘twilight’ as **žam-a-žam*, lit. ‘time of the church service’. Next to **žamažamk*, however, there are many forms with final *-nk*: Łarabał, Ganjak **žmažank* [Amatuni 1912: 229a; HayLezBrbBař 2, 2002: 154a], adv. *žamažank-in* and *žžmank-in*, the latter being rendered as *aťjamuťjin* [Lalayan 2, 1988: 443], Meřri *žəmažunk* [Ałayan 1954: 299], Hadrut *ižimäženk* [Połosyan 1965: 15], etc. The *-nk* forms are more frequent in folklore texts. One may derive this word from ClArm. *aťjamuťj* ‘darkness’, positing a formation with *-ayn-k* found with other terms for time (cf. *hram-čēn-k*, *vařord-ayn*, see HAB s.v.v.): **(ať)jamuťj-ayn-k* > **žamužaynk* > *žəməžānk*. The more widespread by-form *žəmaž* **žəmaženk* may be analogical after the most productive pattern of compounds with conjunction *-a-*, and **žam-a-žam-k* is due to folk etymology. If the form *aťj-a-m-aťj* (see Karst 1930: 109), with internal *-a-*, really exists, it may strengthen the postulation of Łarabał **žamaž-ayn-k*.

Goris *čəřavand* ‘thick beams of the ceiling’ [Margaryan 1975: 434a], Łarabał **čřawand* ‘id.’ [Ačarean 1913: 734b]. I suggest a composition of *a(w)čřař* ‘ceiling’ (cf. Łarabał, Lori, Moks etc. **o/čřoř-k*, see HAB 1: 140a) and **vand-* ‘a framework of wooden bars, a wooden trellis-work’, cf. *vand-ak* ‘a wicker basket, net; a wooden trellis-work’. Thus: **(aw)čřař-a-vand* ‘wooden framework of the ceiling’.

2.1.33.3 Loss of *r*

Compare *p'esay* 'bridegroom; son-in-law' (Bible+; dial.) < **perk-* and *tesanem* 'to see' < **derk-* vs. *harsn* 'bride' (see Winter 1966: 205). One may a priori assume an accent-dependent distribution: **p^hersáy-i* > *p'esay*, **tersaném(i)* > *tesanem*: **hárs-n* > *harsn*. The *-r-* is lost, thus, in unaccented syllables, before a sibilant. However, the material is scanty, and the etymology of *p'esay* is not very certain. Both problems (the initial *p'-* and the loss of **-r-*) occur also with the hypothetical derivation of *p'os* 'furrow, trench; hollow; channel' from PIE **pork-* (see s.v.).

No loss in *ors*, *o-*stem 'hunt; animal for hunting' (Bible+; dial.), perhaps from PIE **iork-o-* 'deer, roe' (cf. Gr. *δόρκος*, *ζόρξ*, *ῥορκος*, etc.; Corn. *yorch*, 'roe', Welsh *iwrch*); see s.v.

Further: *-parišť* vs. *paštem* 'to adore', from Iranian **pari-štā-* (see Meillet 1922k: 217; HAB 4: 23-24).

On Moks *šəřāk'lk* 'retention of the urine' < **šř-a(r)gil-k* see 2.1.39.2 (Ačāryan's Law).

2.1.34 Haplology

An old example is *tuarac* 'herdsman' = *tuar* 'cattle' + *arac* 'pasturing'; see s.v. place-name *Tuarac-a-tap*. The Urartian match, with *ṭuarašini hubi*, provides us with a unique clue for the absolute chronology of this haplological sound change. In a fairy-tale from Berd (Šamšadin) one finds *vəexčarac* 'shepherd' [Xemč'yan 2000: 35a^{L-13}], with the same kind of haplology: *oč'xar* 'sheep' + *arac*.

A dialectal example is *xatof* 'grapes' > Hamšen *havöt* and *xatōt* vs. *xatōt-eni* > Hamšen *xatēni*, with haplological loss of *-(o)t-* [Ačāryan 1947: 53-54]. This example helps to clarify the conditions of haplology. It shows that one of the two identical or similar phoneme groups undergoes haplological loss if these groups are not in the final position.

Haplology may also occur when the two groups of phonemes are partially identical; cf. **orb-ew-ayri* 'widow' > Nor Naxiĵewan *ɔrfari*, *ɔfari* (older *ɛrp'evari*); see s.v. *ayri* 'widow'. Thus, *-p'(e)va-* > *-fa-*, or, as far as *ɔfari* is concerned, *-rp'e-war-* > *-far-*. However, this is ambiguous; other explanations are also possible, e.g. allegro (see the next paragraph), or simplification of the cluster *-rp'(e)va-* > *-r(p')fa-*; the absence of the first *r* in *ɔfari* might be due to dissimilatory loss.

2.1.35 Allegro

Allegro forms occur frequently in compounded kinship terms. Typical examples are the terms with *hayr* ‘father’: *hōr-etbayr* ‘paternal uncle’: Suč’ava *hōb’ar*, Hamšen *hōrb’er*, Łarabał *hōrp’er* [HAB 3: 32b], Karčewan *herbār* [H. Muradyan 1960: 82-83, 199b], etc.; *hōr-a-k’oyr* ‘paternal aunt’ > Łarabał, Hadrut’ *hāk’u*, *hāk’ur* [HAB 3: 32b; Davt’yan 1966: 415], etc.

For *hōr-a-k’oyr* ‘paternal aunt’ and *mōr-a-k’oyr* ‘maternal aunt’ > Kak’avaberd *hāk’ur* and *māk’ur*, H. Muradyan (1967: 101) suggests the following scenario: the component *hōr* has been dropped first, and then the initial *h-* is added to the remaining part **ak’ur*, which is found in other dialects as *ak’ir*. This is unnecessarily complicated. Moreover, **ak’ir* (Łarabał *á-k’er*) is best explained as a vocative form of *k’oyr* ‘sister’ (see HAB 4: 587a). Thus, *hōr-a-k’oyr* > *hāk’ur* is merely an allegro or, perhaps better, a haplogized form: **horak’ur* > *hāk’ur*.

Other examples:

**orb-ew-ayri* ‘widow’ > Nor Naxijewan *ɔrfari*, *ɔfari* (older *erp’evari*); see 2.1.34 (on haplogy).

Łarabał *singydem* < **es inč’ gitem?* literally: “what do I know?” [HŽHek’ 6, 1973: 454^{L-6}]; Č’aylu, Marała *išnam?* ‘id.’ < *inč’ imanam* or *inč’ gitenam* (see Davt’yan 1966: 362).

Urmia, Salmast *šma?* (next to *inč’hma?*) ‘why?’, literally ‘for what?’ [GwřUrmSalm 1, 1897: 544].

Meři **k’šan-* ‘early morning’, probably from **gišer-hana-*, unless very old (see s.v. *gišer* ‘night’).

2.1.36 Tabu, euphemism

Arm. *arj* cannot be derived from PIE **h₂rtkō-* ‘bear’ (cf. Gr. *ἄρκτος*, Skt. *ṛkṣa-*, Hitt. *hartagga-*, etc.) through regular sound developments; see s.v. *arj* ‘bear’. The irregularity may be explained by tabu [HAB 1: 334b; AčarLiak 6, 1971: 722]. Perhaps a contamination with *arjñ* ‘black’ also played a role. The variety variety of designations for ‘bear’ in different languages is usually explained by tabu [Meillet 1906: 7-12]. In Slavic, the PIE name for ‘bear’ has completely disappeared on account of tabu whereas that of ‘wolf’ has preserved [Bernštejn 1984: 13]. The basic term for ‘bear’ in Armenian has often been replaced by designations like *leřan catkakox* ‘flower-trampler of the mountain’, *tanj-a-ker* ‘pear-eater’ (cf. Russ. *medved’* ‘honey-eater’), *k’eri* ‘uncle’, etc. [HAB 1: 334b]. According to Gabikéan (1952: 224; see also HayLezBrbBař 2, 2002: 221a), Sebastia *leřan catkakox* refers to ‘wolf’.

Tabu has often been incorrectly invoked. Thus, Ačāryan (AčārLiak 6, 1971: 722) explains the phonological irregularity of *kamurj* 'bridge' vs. Gr. *γέφυρα* (Boeot. *βέφυρα*, Cret. *δέφυρα*, Lac. /Hesychius/ *δίφυρα*) by tabu. It is understandable, however, why would a word meaning 'bridge' undergo tabu. Also, the word can be of substratum origin (see s.v.). Therefore one should try to corroborate the assumption of tabu in every case with cultural data. Such an explicit information can be found e.g. for 'bear' in Dersim where women were afraid to pronounce the name of the bear and used other designations instead (see Halajyan 1973: 287b₁).

Also the snake often became subject of tabu. Ałayan (1987: 397) records a folk-belief in the villages of Metri according to which the snake will appear if its name is mentioned, so people used words meaning 'rope' (*t'ok*, *č'at'u*, *paran*) instead. In view of this, the explanation of the peculiar form of the word *awj* 'snake' through tabu (see AčārLiak 6, 1971: 722) seems plausible. However, even here one has to be cautious since there is a phonological explanation available (see s.v. *awj* 'snake').

See also s.v.v. *mor(m)* 'tarantula', *mriwn* 'ant'.

Some words have been replaced by semantically related forms. For instance, *əntanik* 'family' substitutes the word for 'wife' (see AčārLiak 2005: 11). Similarly: Van *andivor* 'family' > 'wife, spouse' [HAB 1: 186b].

I wonder if Skt. *jāyā́-* f. 'woman, wife' (RV+) can be explained in the same way. If this word indeed belongs to *janí* 'to be born, produce', its basic meaning might have been something like 'race, tribe, family' (cf. *jā́ta-* 'born; birth, origin, race', *jā́-* mf 'child, family, descentance', etc.). In this case we might be dealing with 'tribe, family' > 'wife' comparable to the development of Arm. *əntanik*.

As is convincingly demonstrated by Ačāryan (HAB 4: 632), the village-name *Kot* 'has been replaced by *Adiyaman*, lit. Turk. "Odd-named", since the Turkish pronunciation of *Kot* is *göt*, and this is homonymous with Turk. *göt* 'buttocks'.

This is corroborated by the following. Arm. *kot* 'handle' is pronounced as *göt* in the dialect of Hamšen. Since the speakers of Hamšen all understand Turkish, they deliberately avoid using the word and replace it by *böč* < *poč* 'tail'. This is the explicit interpretation given by the inhabitants of Gagri as an answer to Ačāryan's inquiry (ibid.).

2.1.37 Folk-etymology

Arm. *šatgam* 'turnip' is attested in the 12th century onwards, and is widespread in dialects. The by-form *šotgam* is found in "Geoponica" (13th cent.),

and in the dialects of Akn, Xarberd, Tigranakert (**šotgam*), Zeyt'un (*šuxg'ə/om*), Sebastia (*žoxbank'*) [HAB 3: 489-490]. One may wonder if the by-form *šotgam* is due to folk-etymological association with *šot* 'ray, shine'; cf. the following riddle from Bates, the village of Xult'ik (see Tarōnean 1961: 113, 164):

Gluxn i xoť,

Murusn i šot

"The head - in soil, the beard - in ray, shine".

2.1.38 Semantic differentiation of phonological alternants

ClArm. *hogi*, *ogi* 'soul, spirit, person' (both Bible+) is probably of native origin and may be related with *hewam* 'to breathe heavily' and *hov* 'cool'; see 2.1.21. The alternants have become semantically differentiated in Modern Armenian: *hogi* 'soul' vs. *ogi* 'spirit, spiritual power, zeal' [HAB 3: 107b].

A variant of this process is seen in dialects. It should be first of all noted that the by-form *ogi* is almost absent in dialects whereas *hogi* is ubiquitous. In Agulis, we find two forms: *heḡ^(v)i* 'person', with the regular vocalic reflex, and *hók'i* 'soul', a literary loan, with no vocalic shift [Ačārean 1935: 67, 69, 370; HAB 3: 108b]. More illustrative is Juła with its triple representation: 1) *xog'i* 'person', which is the oldest by-form in view of the regular reflex *h > x*; 2) *vog'i* 'soul', a literary loan from the by-form *ogi*; 3) *hog'i* 'soul', a literary loan from the by-form *hogi* [Ačārean 1940: 72, 114, 373b; HAB 3: 108]. In both dialects the older, genuine dialectal forms have the meaning 'person', whereas the recent forms which have been borrowed from the literary language refer to 'soul'.

Other cases showing a similar formal contrast accompanied by semantic differentiation:

dew, *a*-stem: GDSg *div-i*, GDPl *div-a-c'* (Bible+) 'spirit, demon' (Bible+), 'angel' (Etišē, John Chrysostom), 'soul' (Plato). Iranian loanword, cf. MPers., NPers. *dēw* 'demon', YAv. *daēuua-* m. 'demon, monster, idol', etc. [Hübschmann 1897: 140; HAB 1: 657-658; ÈtimSlovIranJaz 2, 2003: 306-310].

Widespread in dialects, mostly meaning 'a monster-like mythical creature'. Some dialects which normally display a consonant shift *b/d/g/ > p/t/k*, have by-forms with *d-* and *t-*, with semantic differentiation: Moks *tēv* 'devil, Satan' : *dev* 'monster' [HAB 1: 658b; Ačāryan 1952: 256, cf. 57]; Marała *tēv* 'devil, Satan' : *dev* 'mythical dragon' [Ačārean 1926: 89, 391; HAB 1: 658b].

Of these by-forms, *tēv* is undoubtedly the older one since it reflects the shift *d > t* regular for these dialects. The meaning of the older form *tēv* is religious and

suits the classical literary context. For an illustration compare a proverb from Moks (Orbeli 2002: 119^{Nr4(3)}): *Inč' tev* (var. *sātāna*) *xac'ic' kəp'axē* : "(He) flees from the cross like a devil/Satan". In most of the dialects the meaning 'devil, Satan' has been replaced by 'monster, dragon, giant', a meaning that has become dominant obviously due to the extensive use of the word in folklore, especially in fairy-tales. Of other neighbouring languages, cf. e.g. the textual illustration for Kurd. *dēw* cited in Cabolov 1, 2001: 304-305, in the motif of Cyclops. Consequently, the recent re-borrowing (perhaps partly due to Turkish influence, see Ačārean 1926: 89) *dēv* in given dialects comes to mean 'monster, dragon', whereas the older meaning 'devil, Satan' remained attached to the genuine dialectal form *tēv*.

Also Łarabat has doublets *tēv/dēv*, though in this case no semantic differentiation is indicated [HAB 1: 658b; Davt'yan 1966: 341].

darman, *o*-stem, *i*-stem 'cure, remedy, medicine; refreshment; provender, provision, victuals; care; subsistence, nourishment, maintenance' (Bible+), an Iranian loan, cf. Pahl. *darmān* 'medicine, remedy' [MacKenzie 1971: 24; Nyberg 1974: 58b], probably related with Skt. *dhārman-* n. 'support, firm hold, fixed order, law' (RV+) from PIIr. **dʰar-* 'to hold, keep, preserve, support' [Hübschmann 1897: 138; HAB 1: 640a; Mayrhofer, EWAia 1, 1992: 778-779, 780; ÈtimSlovIranJaz 2, 2003: 338].

Two basic meanings are represented in dialects: 'straw' and 'medicine, remedy'. Some dialects participating in the consonant devoicing shift display two forms: 1) with initial *t*- and the meaning 'straw'; 2) with initial *d*- and the meaning 'medicine, remedy'. For instance: Hamšen *tarmən* 'straw' vs. *dermən* 'remedy' [Ačāryan 1947: 22, 43, 226]; Moks *tārman* 'straw' vs. *dārman* 'remedy' [Ačārean 1952: 255, cf. 57]; Urmia/Xoy *tārmān* 'straw' vs. *dārman* 'remedy' [M. Asatryan 1962: 194b], etc. The former is the genuine dialectal reflex of ClArm. (< MIran.) *darman* whereas the latter is a recent (re-)borrowing from Persian or (as in Ačāryan 1947: 226) Turkish.

This can be corroborated by semantic analysis. All the Iranian forms (Pahl., NPers., Kurd. etc.) have only the meaning 'medicine, remedy' (see the references above, especially ÈtimSlovIranJaz 2, 2003: 338; also Steingass 514a; Cabolov 1, 2001: 277-278). The classical meanings 'care', 'provision, victuals' 'subsistence, nourishment, maintenance' etc., as well as the dialectal meaning 'straw' (from 'fodder' < 'nourishment, victuals') should be treated as reflecting an Iranian older, unattested meaning (cf. Skt. *dhārman* 'support etc.') rather than a semantic development from 'medicine, remedy'.

More evidence can be obtained from folklore texts, e.g. in Łaziyan 1983 on Łarabał: *darman* : *xelk'u darman*, with synonymous *xelk'u čar* 'remedy for intelligence' (134-135); *dardis darmen* 'remedy for my grief' (157a, lines 11, 17); *terman* : in a narrative where a boy *terman č'i tam* "does not give straw/fodder" to the buffalo (82b^{L-11}); in a proverb (164a^{L17}): *K'yohna terman a k'amun tam* : "(He) winnows old straw".

On **darman-a-got* 'Milky Way', 'cloud' see 3.1.3 and 1.3.

Also morphological alternants seem to display semantic differentiation. For possible cases see s.v.v. *asečn* 'needle', *ptut* 'fruit', *utet* 'brain'.

2.1.39 Ačaryan's Law

2.1.39.1 Ačaryan's Law with -o- Łarabał

Ačaryan's Law describes the fronting of back vowels after voiced obstruents (see Ačaryan 1952: 18-23, 40; H. Muradyan 1982: 92-93; H. Muradyan apud Greppin/Khachaturian 1986: 27-33; Weitenberg 1986: 95-96; 1996: 103-114; 1999 [2000]; Vaux 1998: 10-11. Here we will only be concerned with the vowel *o* in Łarabał.

The regular reflex of *-o-* following an initial voiced stop is *-ö-* in Łarabał. Next to this, one also finds *-o- > Łarabał -ε-* (the examples are taken from the glossary in Davt'yan 1966: 299: 503):

boxi 'hornbeam' > *póxi/ε, péxi*,
bokik 'barefoot' > *pəépig', pəpəg'*,
botk 'radish' > *pəxxk/pöxxk* and *pəxxk*,
bor 'bumble-bee, drone' > Hadrut' and Šatax *pεi*, next to Łarabał *pórnə, púrənə* [Davt'yan 1966: 329, 363];

also word-internally: *borbos-* 'to mould' > *pərp'εšne/il* : **borbos-* > **börbös-* (Ačaryan's Law) > **börp'ös-* (*-rb-* > *-rp-*) > **p'örp'ös-* (assimilation).

There are no examples with *go-* and *do-*, apart from *gortn-uk* 'little frog' > *k'ór(t)nuk, k'ér/rt'nuk, kért'nuk*. Neither are there examples with initial unvoiced stops, including the labial ones: *t'o-*, *to-*, *p'o-*, *po-*, *k'o-*, *ko-*. One may therefore preliminarily formulate the following rule: as a result of Ačaryan's Law (and the subsequent consonant shift), ClArm. *bo-* yields Łarabał *pε-* (next to *pö-*). This can be due to labial dissimilation.

A similar case is found with initial *o-* which regularly yields Łarabał *vəε'-* or *vε'-* (also word-internally, cf. *sovorem* 'to learn' > *səvəε'εl*). This probably shows that the rule operates not only with voiced labial stop *b-* but also with voiced labial (labiodental) fricative *v-*.

Note that *mo-* does not usually yield Łarabať *mō-*, but one does find one instance with *mo-* > *mə-*: *mocak* ‘mosquito’ > *məcək*.

As to *gortn-uk* ‘little frog’ > *kʷértʷnuk/kértʷnuk*, we may be dealing with dissimilative loss of the first of two labial vowels.

For Łarabať *prēsna*, probably from **broš-* (cf. Łazax *pʷrōš*, Łaradať *brošm*) or *brinčʷ* ‘snowball-tree’, see 1.12.1.

2.1.39.2 Ačāryan’s Law in inlaut

Ačāryan’s Law also operated in inlaut, cf. *arjasp* ‘vitriol’ : Šatax *arčāps*, Moks *arčāsp* or *arčāpʷs/arčāfš* vs. Alaškert *arčāsp*, Muš *arčāps*, etc. (see s.v.). For more examples and some remarks concerning the relative chronology see s.v.v. *argand* ‘womb’, *ard* ‘shape’.

This can be used successfully in etymological research.

Moks *šərākʷlkʷ* ‘задержание мочи’ (= ‘retention of the urine’); e.g. *šərākʷlkʷ* Եր ‘у него задержание мочи’ [Orbeli 2002: 302]. The first component of this word is surely *šer* ‘urine’ (Geoponica) which is widespread in dialects [HAB 3: 510a].

There are MArm. and dial. derivatives referring to the retention of the urine: *š(e)r-kap* and *šr-at* [HAB, *ibid.*; Amatuni 1912: 147a; Ačārean 1913: 246b; Ter-Mkrtčʷyan 1970: 150₁₁; MiġHayBař 2, 1992: 214a], with *kap-* ‘to tie, bind’ and **(h)at-* ‘to cut’ respectively. It is conceivable that our *šərākʷlkʷ* too contains a second member meaning ‘to bind’, ‘to cut’, ‘to hold, obstacle’, or the like. Another clue to the interpretation of the word can be provided by the palatal *kʷ*, presupposing an older **-ge-* or **-gi-* (Ačāryan’s Law). This brings us to ClArm. *argel-* ‘to forbid, obstacle, hinder, etc.’, cf. Ozim *argʷilil* etc. (see s.v.). Thus, Moks *šərākʷlkʷ* ‘retention of the urine’ goes back to **šr-a(r)gil-kʷ*, with loss of *-r-* (on which see 2.1.33.3).

2.2 MORPHOLOGY

2.2.1 Case system

2.2.1.1 Vocative

Ĵahukyan (1959: 131) points out that there are no data concerning any accentual difference between the vocative and nominative forms in Old Armenian. According to Ačāryan (AčāřLiak 6, 1971: 283, 336v), however, in both Classical and Modern Armenian, the vocative is sometimes accented on the first syllable, cf. *haʷyrik* ‘father’, *maʷyrik* ‘mother’, *Kaʷrapet*, *Łaʷzar(ē)*, *Peʷtr-ē/Peʷtros*, etc. [AčāřLiak 6, 1971: 283, 336]. Traces of initial accentuation of vocative forms

have been preserved in Armenian manuscripts [Torbiörnsson 1945; Weitenberg 2001: 65₁].

Armenian dialects provide rich evidence for such vocative forms. Some examples from e.g. P'ilojeanc' 1888 (Nor Bayazet): *harse* (21^{L1}, 22^{L-6}, 23^{L9}); *Ho'romsim* (25^{L4}, 26^{L7}); *Mayran* (31^{L5}); *Margarit* (34^{L-4}). Vocative words that are, in fact, lexicalized expressions or formulae: *tnakolner* "you whose house may be destroyed!" (23^{L11}). Such a word takes the accent on the first syllable even when it is adjacent to a "normal" vocative word, the latter being unaccented: *turban harse* "you, dear sister-in-law (*I may be sacrificed to you)" (21^{L1}); frozen: *harse-n* (21^{L8}). Note also *ordi* 'son!' in a fairy-tale from the village of Igahat (Lori, district of Alaverdi) told by D. Połosyan-Šahverdyan and recorded by E. Lalayan in 1915 (HŽHek' 8, 1977: 69^{L15}).

Also accented is the vocative particle preceding the noun: Lori *ay mer-a*, frequently e.g. in a fairy-tale from the village of Šnot (recorded by Hm. Mažinyan; see Nawasardeanc' 5, 1889 = HŽHek' 8, 1977: 16-18); *ay k'ir-a* (ibid. 19^{L19}); Łarabał *a-k'er* vs. *k'oyr* 'sister' [HAB 4: 587a]. A fairy-tale from Łarabał (Nawasardeanc' 6, 1890: 32-33 = HŽHek' 6, 1973: 175-176) is totally built upon questions with the vocative particle *ay*.

The vocative with initial accentuation may be regarded as Indo-European inheritance. In Vedic Sanskrit, the vocative, when accented, in the beginning of a sentence is accented on the first syllable, e.g. *pitar* vs. NSg *pitā* (see Whitney 1960: 108-109; Macdonell 1993: 457; Szemere'nyi 1996: 189; Burrow 2001: 235). The same is found in Greek: *ἀδελφε* vs. NSg *ἀδελφός* 'brother'; *δέσποτα* vs. *δεσπότης* 'master (of the house), lord'; *πάτερ* vs. *πατήρ* 'father'; etc. (Rix 1992: 131-132, 38, 152; see also Meillet/Vendryes 1924: 498). One might also look for evidence in modern Iranian languages. Indeed, in Kurdish Awroman, according to MacKenzie (1966: 21): when no vocative particle is present the stress is brought forward to the first syllable of a noun.

2.2.1.2 Nominative *-s

See *anic* 'nit, louse egg', **katc* 'milk' vs. *kat'n*, *hec* 'felloe', if from **pelk-s* (see s.v.).

Another possible example is dial. (Urmia, Salmast) *urj* 'an island or peninsula in a river', if it belongs to *urd* 'a small canal' (< PIE **uh₁rd^h*-, see s.v.) and derives from PArm. NSg **urd-s*.

I wonder if this **-s* is responsible for cases like nom. *atuēs* 'fox' vs. oblique *atues-*. Compare also *Bēl* vs. GDSg *Belay*: in Movsēs Xorenac'i 1.10 and 1.11

(1913=1991: 32-37; additional readings: 416-418), the nominative is always *Bēl*, whereas the gen./dat. form is spelled as both *Belay* and *Bēlay*.

2.2.1.3 Nominative-accusative: syncretism

On this issue, as well as for the additional *-n* from PIE acc. **-m* see Meillet 1903b: 234-238; Meillet 1922b; Weitenberg 1985; Kortlandt 1985.

For a remarkable case see *kat'n* 'milk' vs. Agulis and Meṭri **katc'*. Also s.v. *us* 'shoulder'.

Arm. *arjasp* (attested since the 7th cent.) and *arjaspn* 'vitriol'; the second component is borrowed from **span-* or **ā-span-*. Therefore, the form *arjaspn* should be considered the original, so we are dealing with loss of the final *-n* in the 7th century.

2.2.1.4 Genitive

PIE GSg **-osyo-*: Skt. *-asya*, Gr. *-οιο*, *-ου*, Arm. *-oy*, see Meillet 1900a: 17; *-oĵ-* Meillet 1900a: 18-19.

2.2.1.5 Locative

Locative in *-i*

A distinct locative in *-i* is found in a number of *o*-stem nouns, cf. *gišer*, *o*-stem 'night' : loc. *gišer-i* (see Meillet 1913: 49; A. Abrahamyan 1976: 23-24, 38-39; Clackson 1994: 63).

This and the following issue will be exemplified by the dialect of Łarabał.

Locative in *-i* in Łarabał

händ-i 'in pasture-land': *Vart'in* <...> *ešəm a, tæsnun min händi min č'oban vexčar a ərəcc'nəm*. "Vart'i <...> looks, sees (that), on a pasture-land, a shepherd pastures sheep" [HŽHek' 5, 1966: 538^{L17}]. In a riddle (see Barxutareanc' 1898: 51): *Mi kov unem - handi a* : "I have a cow, (which) is on the pasture-land". On other attestations see s.v. *and* 'cornfield; pastureland'. ClArm. *and* 'cornfield' generally has an *o*-stem. In the Bible it is found 21 times in LocSg. *y-and-i*. The initial *h-* (hardly from the PIE laryngeal) may be due to generalisation of the locative form: *yandi* > *händi* (through Ačaryan's Law).

əra/āz-i 'in a dream' [HŽHek' 5, 1966: 540^{L-2}; HŽHek' 6, 1973: 140^{L-9}, 183^{L-5}]. In a fairy-tale recorded by M. Grigoryan in Mardakert in 1950 [HŽHek' 5, 1966: 401-409], *əra/āz-i* 'in a dream' is found frequently (402^{L6}, 403^{L13,18}, 404^{L-14}, 405^{L-18}, 408^{L-8}). Next to it, one also finds the more recent, normal form *ərazum*

(402^{L8}, 405^{L-8}, 407^{L-1,-4}, 408^{L10}). Note that *eraz* has a *u*-stem in Լարաթ, at least in the same fairy-tale (cf. GDSg. *ərazu* : 402^{L14}, 406^{L-6}), and an *o*-stem in ClArm. Therefore, the option that Լարաթ LocSg. **(y)eraz-i* is identical with ClArm. LocSg. *y-eraz-i* 'in a dream' (frequent in the Bible) should be taken seriously.

Լարաթ has a locative adverb meaning 'yesterday' from ClArm. *erēk*, *-i* 'yesterday' : *erek(oy)* 'evening' (< PIE **h₁reg^wos*), in the following variants: *ərek/g-i* and *yərk/g^l-ε* (see Davt'yan 1966: 200): *əregy-i* 'yesterday' [HŽHek' 5, 1966: 242^{L9}, 568^{L-5} (*iregyi*); HŽHek' 6, 1973: 407^{L3}, 539^{L-13} (*eregyi*), 584^{L14} (*əregi*)]; *yrke* [HŽHek' 5, 1966: 591^{L15}]; *əregi* 'yesterday', in a fairy-tale from Kirovabad/Ganjak (HŽHek' 6, 1973: 584^{L14}).

These three examples show that the classical locative in *-i* has been preserved in Լարաթ. Later it produced more recent, analogical adverbs, such as *sōri* 'today', *urkyūni* 'in the evening', etc. An illustration for *šūt-i* 'quickly' is found in [HŽHek' 5, 1966: 573].

Locative in *-oĵ*

The locative in *-oĵ* (usually compared with Gr. loc. *-oθi*) is extensively discussed in Clackson 1994: 60-68.

This morpheme also has temporal aspect. Here are some examples:

in Movsēs Xorenac'i 2.61 (1913=1991: 192^{L10}; transl. Thomson 1978: 204): *yawur miašabat'woĵ* "on the first day of the week";

several occurrences with weekday-names (*č'orek'šabat'woĵ*, *hingšab(a)t'woĵ*) are found in Anania Širakac'i, 7th cent. [A. G. Abrahamyan 1944: 310-311]; *y-amenayn taroĵ* [A. G. Abrahamyan 1940: 53^{L2}];

i tarwoĵ 'in a year/в году' in Movsēs Kałankatuac'i/Dasxuranc'i 1.26 (V. Aṙak'elyan 1983: 90^{L9,11}); Aristakēs Lastivertc'i (11th cent.), chapter 22 (see Yuzbašyan 1963: 122^{L14}; Russ. transl. 1968: 119); *nawasard-oĵ* "in the month of New Year" in "Vipasanut'iwn" by Nersēs Šnorhali (12th cent.), see M. Mkrtč'yan 1981: 57^{L344}.

In a colophon by Dawit' K'obayrec'i from 1178 AD [HayJerHiš V-XII, 1988: 223^{L22f}]: *yaprihiōs amswōĵ* 'in April'.

***ōragoči** 'a dream indulged in while awake, day-dream': Լարաթ, Լազա *ərakōči*, Տուլա *ərakōči*, T'iflis *aragūči*. Ačāryan (1913: 1137b) records a semantic illustration: *erazi t'ε ragoči?*: "in a dream or while awake?".

Լարաթ *ərašyōči* is glossed by *irakanum* 'in reality' in HŽHek' 5, 1966: 726b and in Grigoryan-Spandaryan 1971: 459a; 'by day' in HŽHek' 7, 1979: 725b and (*ərašyōči*) in L. Harut'yunyan 1991: 359. It frequently occurs in contrast with

araz ‘dream’ (cf. also the Ačāryan’s illustration above): *Es araz a, t’ä əṛəkyoči*: “Is this a dream or reality?” [HŽHek’ 5, 1966: 185]; *mhengy düz a ənnākan, henc’ a iski āräz č’ini, lhä ases əṛəkyoči ya, lhä ases k’əštan əm kyam!* [ibid. 406]. The same (or a similar) passage is quoted in HayLezBrbBaṛ 2, 2002: 54a. The other of the two citations found in this dictionary (both - from unspecified sources) runs as follows: *Arazəms pač’ec’ir, əṛəkyoč’i xač’ec’ir*: “You kissed me in my dream, but crucified me while awake/in reality”. For the final adverbial *-i* cf. **eraz-i* in some of these passages (see above for more detail and illustrations), cf. also ClArm. *(y)-art’-mn-i, i zart’-mn-i* ‘while awake’.

In HayLezBrbBaṛ 2, 2002: 54a, one also finds a by-form *əllkoči*. Hadrut’ *əṛək’əči* is rendered as *arač’ok’* [A. Połosyan 1965: 88], apparently re-interpreted as *ar’ ač’ōk’* “in front of the eyes”.

Goris *əṛəkəči, urüköči* (subst.) ‘having a vision in one’s waking hours’ [Margaryan 1975: 386b, 488b]. Interpreting the word as *ōṛə kesōrin*, Margaryan (op. cit. 386b) seems to suggest that the word contains Arm. *ōr* = *awr* ‘day’. Ačāryan (1913: 1137b) presents the entry as **ōragoči* (though not mentioned in HAB 4: 617a, s.v. *ōr* = *awr* ‘day’). No explicit etymology is known to me.

One may assume that this locative adverb contains a combination of *-oĵ* and *-i*. Typologically cf. adverbs which reflect an instrumental ending + *-i*, such as *iwr-ov-i, mt-ov-i, y-ir-aw-i, ir-aw-ac’-i*, etc. (see NHB, Malxaseanc’, etc. s.v.v.), as well as *ənj-ov-in* ‘with roots’ and *glx-ov-in* ‘with heads’ in P’awstos Buzand 4.8 (1883=1984: 82^{L-6}; transl. Garsoïan 1989: 128).

As for the root, one may think of *areg* ‘sun’. Note especially the vocalism and the voiced *-g-* of T’iflis *aragúči*. If the internal *-a-* of the T’iflis form is old, one is tempted to compare **arag-* with *y-arag-em* ‘to expose to the sun’ (2 Kings, Cyril of Alexandria, Grigor Astuacaban, etc.) rendering Gr. *ἐξ-ηλιόζω* ‘hang in the sun’ in 2 Kings 21.6, 9, 13. In Łarabał, pretonic vowels regularly yield *ə*, and *-go-* gives *-kō-* through Ačāryan’s Law and subsequent devoicing, thus **are/ag-oĵ-i* > Łarabał *əṛək’ōči* is entirely regular. The initial *o-* seen only in Šulaver may be due to influence of *ōr* ‘day’.

Though unattested, **areg-oĵ* is quite possible in view of the parallel formation *y-arew-oĵ* ‘in sunny places’ in Sargis Šnorhali Vardapet (12th cent.): *šġi yanjrewi ew yarewoĵ* (see HAB 1: 311a). Some other parallels: Łarabał **arew-a-loys-ov* ‘by day’, lit. ‘by sun-light’ [Ačārean 1913: 148a]. In a jocular folk-song from Burdur (migrated from Łarabał in the 18th century) on a stolen *t’əmban* ‘shorts’ [N. Mkrtč’yan 1971: 222], the *t’əmban* is said to have been sewed *irik’nək-ov* ‘by

day' (lit. 'by sun') and lost *lisniyek-ov* 'at night', lit. 'by moon'. In Fables by Vardan Aygekc'i we find *y-arewu* 'by day'¹³.

2.2.1.6 Instrumental -aw: -ok' in Łarabał

Ačaryan (1899: 97, 147) derives the Łarabał ISg ending -av from ModArm. -ov rather than ClArm. -aw. This is confirmed by the phonological reflex of ov in e.g. *xorovem* 'to roast' > *xrráveł*, *kov* 'cow' > *kav*, etc.

The plural has -ok'/-uk'. For instance: ClArm. *us* 'shoulder' : Łarabał IPl *os-uk'*: *min xurjin osuk'ə k'əc'ac* [HŽHek' 5, 1966: 398^{L2}]; *xurjinə* <...> *osük'ə k'c'* (ibid. 109^{L14}, 111^{L3}). The same expression is found in the singular: *xurjinə* <...> *osavə k'c'* [HŽHek' 5, 1966: 647^{L8}]. It seems that Łarabał **usok'* reflects **us-av-k'* = ISg **us-av* + pl. marker -k'. The development -av-k' > -ok' (seemingly identic with ClArm. -aw-k' > -ōk') is unexpected for such a recent stage, however. One expects **usavk'*. More likely, **us-ok'* is analogical after the type of ClArm. *jei-k'*, IPl *jei-a-w-k'*, *jei-ō-k'* 'hand' : Łarabał IPl *cəiəok'* (see e.g. HŽHek' 6, 1973: 466^{L12}).

Unlike the numerous petrified adjectives of the type *xelok'* 'clever, intelligent', *aiok'-p'aiok'* 'with honour, glory', etc., the above-mentioned examples demonstrate the function of the case marker. Note also: *pəetk a* <...> *srtok' əli* 'must be brave' [HŽHek' 6, 1973: 452^{L19}]; *tü* <...> *užok' es* 'you are strong' [HŽHek' 6, 1973: 401^{L4}, 402^{L5}]. Of these adjectives, *xelōk'* and *p'aiōk'* reflect the ClArm. IPl forms in -aw-k' = -ōk' of *xel-k'* and *p'ai-k'*, both *a*-stems. The others are analogical.

2.2.1.7 Accusative pl. -s

The Classical Armenian accusative plural ending -s has been lexicalized in many dialects. For instance, *kriw-s*, APl of *kriw* 'fight', appears in Ararat, Łarabał, Łazax etc. *kriws tal* 'to struggle', literally 'to give fights' (see Ačarean 1913: 613a). Textual illustrations are found e.g. in a fairy-tale from Sisian, in Zangezour (HŽHek' 6, 1973: 236^{L-11}), and, in Ł. Ałayan 1979: 615^{L12}.

For examples of frozen APl ending -s in toponyms see 4.8.

2.2.2 Paradigmatic solution for a phonological or morphological irregularity

¹³ Less probable alternative: **irak-oj-i*, cf. *ir-ak-ut'iwn* 'reality, deed' (e.g. in Movsēs Xorenac'i 1.19 (1913=1991: 57^{L5}); cf. also *irakan* '(real) event' in 2.2 (1913=1991: 104^{L3}).

2.2.2.1 *s-stem neuters

Some words (possibly) belonging to PIE PD *s*-stem neuters show vocalic peculiarities which may be explained by generalization of the zero-grade genitive.

amp, *o*-stem 'cloud; lightning' : Skt. *nābhas-* n. 'cloud, mass of clouds', Gr. *νέφος* n. 'cloud', OCS *nebo* 'sky', etc. The Armenian old nominative **neb-* (< **nébʰos*) was replaced by *amp* after the genitive **amp-* from **nbʰés-s*. The possible influence of *amprop* 'thunder' (< **mbʰró-* : Skt. *abhra-* n. 'thunder-cloud', etc.) must too be taken into account. See s.v.v. *amp* and *amprop*.

ayt 'cheek' : Gr. *οἶδος* etc. (see s.v.). The Armenian old nominative **oit-* (> **ēit*) from **h₂oid-os* was replaced by the oblique stem **ait-* (from NSg Gsg. **h₂id-és-os*); see also 2.1.5.

bark 'lightning' (q.v.), if related with Skt. *bhargas-* n. 'radiance, splendour, light' (RV+), would have had an old nominative **berk* from **bʰérgʷ-os*. It became *bark* analogically after the oblique **bʰrgʷ-és-* > **bark-*.

sut, *o*-stem 'false; falsehood, lie' (Bible+; dial.) : Gr. *ψεῦδος* n. 'lie', also *ψύδος*, NSg **psēudos*, Gsg **psud-és-os*; see s.v.

For a discussion of *n*-stem neuters which are mostly continued as Arm. *o*-stems see Meillet 1936: 74; Olsen 1999: 44-48; see also s.v.v. *get* 'river', *hot* 'smell, odour'.

2.2.2.2 Other type *s-stem

See the discussion s.v. *us* 'shoulder'.

2.2.2.3 *n-stem

anun, gen. *anuan* etc. 'name' (Bible+; dialectally ubiquitous) : EArm. dial. **anum*. From PIE PD *n*-stem neuter nom. **Hneh₃-mn*, obl. **Hn(e)h₃-men-*: Skt. *nāman-*, Lat. *nōmen*, etc. The PArm. paradigm, nom. **anuwn* : obl. **an(V)man-*, was levelled into 1) **anuwn* : **anwan* > ClArm. *anun* : *anuan*, with generalization of **-w-*; 2) **anumn* : **anman* > *anum*, with generalization of **-m-*. See s.v. *anun* 'name'.

2.2.2.4 PIE HD *i*-stem

Arm. *tal* (*i*-stem, but without evidence) 'husband's sister' (13th cent. hapax); in dialects: *tal* (widespread) : Muš, Van, Moks etc. **talv*. At least in Van and perhaps Moks, the final *-v* is confined to the nominative. If the word is directly derivable from a PIE *i*-stem (cf. Gr. *γάλις* and Skt. *giri-*) rather than *u*-stem (cf.

Gr. *γάλας*, OCS *zъlъva*, etc.), the following paradigm may be reconstructed: NSg **ǵl̥H-ōi* > **tal̥əu* > **talw*, oblique **ǵl̥H-i-* > **tal(i-)*. See s.v. *tal*.

For discussion and other examples see s.v.v. *arew* ‘sun’ and especially *giwt* ‘village’. Further: s.v. *k’arb* ‘a snake’.

2.2.2.5 **l*-stems

See s.v.v. *asetn* ‘needle’, *joť* ‘log, bar’, *ptuť* ‘fruit’, *p’ul* ‘fall, ruins’, and especially *acut* ‘coal’.

2.2.2.6 Laryngeal stems

The hysterodynamic (HD) paradigm of PIE words in laryngeal stems is reconstructed as follows: NSg **Có(R)C-eH-s*, GSg **C(R)C-H-ós* (see Beekes 1995: 181-183). A well-known example is the PIE word for ‘path, road, ford’: NSg **pónt-eh₁-s*, GSg **pnt-h₁-ós*, cf. Av. *pañtā* vs. ISg *paθa*. The nominative analogically became **pontiH-* in Skr. *pāñthās* and, probably, Arm. *hun* (q.v.). For the *o*-grade nominative within this paradigm cf. also PIE **Hros-eh₂-*: Lith. *rasà* ‘dew’, OCS *rosa* ‘dew’, Skt. *rasā-* f. ‘name of a mythical stream at the end of the world, a tributary of the Indus’ (RV) (cf. also *rása-* m. ‘juice (of plants), liquid, essence’), YAv. *raḡhā-* f. ‘name of a mythical stream’.

Next to Arm. *ordi* (*wo*-stem) ‘generation, son/daughter’ (< PIE **por-ti-o-*, cf. Gr. *πόρτις*, *-ιος* f. ‘calf, young heifer; young maiden’, Lat. *partus*, *-ūs* m. ‘bringing forth, birth; foetus, embryo; offspring, progeny’, etc.), there also exists Arm. *ort*¹ (dial. also **hort*) ‘calf; fawn’, the aspirated *-t’* of which needs an explanation. One may restore a PArm. HD **-h₂-*stem paradigm (whether original or analogical) in the same way as we have seen above: NSg **pórt-eh₂-*, GSg **prt-h₂-ós* > PArm. **órd-a-* (cf. *awri-ord*, *a*-stem ‘virgin’), obl. **hart^h-*. Subsequently, NSg **ord-* became *ort’* analogically after the oblique **hart’*. The analogical influence of the oblique form seems to function also at a much later period and causes an initial aspiration in the majority of the dialects (**hort*). See s.v.v. *ordi* and *ort’*.

Arm. *c’ax* ‘branch’ (Geoponica etc.; widespread in dialects) vs. Skt. *śākhā-* f. (RV+) ‘branch, twig’ etc. In some Armenian dialects (Łarabať, Agulis, Lori, etc.) we also find a form with *-k’* instead of *-x*. Here we are dealing with the development **-kH-* > Arm. *x*, Skt. *kh*, Slavic *x*. The alternants *c’ak’* and *c’ax* probably reflect nom. **-k-eh₂-* and gen. **-k-h₂-ós*, respectively.

For a similar analysis see also s.v.v. *t’arp’/b* ‘a wicker fishing basket’ and **law/p’-* ‘flat (hand, stone, etc.)’. Note that the alternation *w/p’* (after a vowel) and

b/p (after **-r-*) point to the nom. **-p-eh₂-* and **-ph₂-ó-* respectively, much the same way as *d/t* and *k/x* in cases above.

2.2.3 Generalization (or relics) of PIE fem. adjectives in **-ih₂-* in Armenian

PIE **meldu-i(h₂)-* (cf. Skt. *mṛdvī-* f. 'delicate, weak, soft, mild', Lat. *mollis* 'weak, soft' from **moldu-i-*) > Arm. *mełk*, *i*-stem according to NHB 'soft' (q.v.).

yatt 'wide, broad spacious (land, space, territory); mighty' (5th cent.) : *yatt-k-u* 'victorious, mighty' (Philo+), spelled also *yatt-u* (e.g., in Grigor Maškuori, 12th cent.). While *y-att* (q.v.) can be derived from PIE **plth₂-ú-* (cf. Skt. *pṛthú-* etc.), *y-att-u* must have had one syllable more and can theoretically go back to PIE fem. **plth₂-u-ih₂-* (Skt. *pṛthvī-*, Av. *pəṛəθβī-*). However, the *-u* in *yatt-u* can be accounted for by the synchronic pattern of adjectives in *-u*, cf. *has-u*, *ls-u*, etc. (see Jahukyan 1987: 241).

For other possible examples see s.v.v. *yolov* 'many' and *yojr* 'fat'.

2.2.4 Numerals

2.2.4.1 Stability and replacements

For the PIE sources of Armenian numerals see Kortlandt 1994a (= 2003: 98-101, with a small addition).

In general, the native numerals are stable in dialects. In some of them, however, the '70' etc., as well as the ordinals are replaced by Turkish equivalents.

In the dialect of Aslanbek, the numerals '70', '80', '90', as well as the ordinals (e.g. *pešinči* '5th'), are replaced by Turkish forms. The distributives are formed normally: *č'ōrsagā* < *č'ors-akan* 'four by four', *ergergü* < *erk-erku* 'two by two', etc. [Ačarean 1898: 83-84, 85b^{L-5} and note 1; Vaux 2001: 43, 51, 62₄₃].

In the dialect of Aramo, the numerals '70', '80', '90', as well as the ordinals, are Arabic [Łaribyan 1958: 10, 34]. This seems to be the case also in K'abusie, since the numerals for '70', '80', and '90' are absent from the list (see op. cit. 99). A similar situation is seen in Van (see Ačaryan 1952: 26).

Mužambar (T'avriz), T'iflis, Łarabał (in some villages) **erek'-k'san* 'sixty' < *erek* 'three' + *k'san* 'twenty'; cf. *erek k'san mi tasə* 'seventy' < "three twenty (and) one ten"; taken from the Caucasian system [Ačarean 1913: 307a].

2.2.4.2 Collective numerals

ClArm. *erkok'in*, *erkok'ean* 'both' (Bible+) has been preserved in Łarabał *ərkək'an*, *əurkək'an*, Mełri *ərkək'en* (see s.v. *erku* 'two'). ClArm. *erek'in*, *erek'ean* 'all the three' (Bible+) has been preserved in Łarabał *ərek'an*, *irek'an*

and Karčewan *irik'ēn*, but in other parts of Metri region one finds forms with *-k'k'-* or *-k'k'-*: Metri *irik'k'ēn*, Kak'avaberd *irēk'kan* (see s.v. *erek'* 'three'). The other forms are: *č'orek'in* or *č'orek'ean* 'all the four' > Łarabał *č'urk'ek'an* vs. *č'ursek'an* and *č'urek'an*, *hngek'in* or *hngek'ean* 'all the five' > *həngək'an* (emphatic *hngək'k'an*), *vec'ek'in* or *vec'ek'ean* 'all the six' > *vəc'ek'an*, etc. [Davt'yan 1966: 126]; Metri *č'ərk'ek'ēn*, *hing'ek'ēn* or *həngək'ēn*, *vəc'c'ek'ēn*, etc. [Ałayan 1954: 179-180]; Kak'avaberd *č'ərék'kan*, *hingék'kan*, *vi/ec'ek'kan*, etc. [H. Muradyan 1967: 127-128]. See also AčarLiak 1, 1952: 325-326.

One might treat the gemination in Metri *irik'k'ēn* and Kak'avaberd *irēk'kan* (for *erek'ean*) as emphatic. More probably, however, they go back to analogical **erek'-k'ean* (that is, *erek'* > *irēk'* 'three' + *-k'ean*) after *ərkək'ēn* which is analysed as *ərkək'-* (cf. *erku* 'two') + *-k'ean*. The analogical process is clearly seen in forms like Łarabał *č'urk'ek'an* (next to *č'urek'an* directly from ClArm. *č'orek'ean*) and Metri *č'ərk'ek'ēn* and Kak'avaberd *č'ək'ek'kan*.

The analogy has functioned in Karčewan differently. Here we find *yərkēn*, *irik'ēn*, *č'ək'ēn*, *hingēn*, etc. [H. Muradyan 1960: 110]. These forms can hardly reflect different formations since: 1) there is no alternative way to satisfactorily explain Karčewan *yərkēn*; 2) Karčewan is dialectally and geographically very close, actually almost identical with Kak'avaberd and Metri, so that one hardly expects a significant variance in relation with such archaic grammatical features; 3) Karčewan *irik'ēn* exactly corresponds to ClArm. *erek'ean* (or *-in*); 4) the paradigm of *yərkēn*, viz. gen. *yərkunc'ū* etc. (see H. Muradyan 1960: 110) clearly continues that of Classical Armenian: *erkok'in*, *erkoc'un*, etc.

One therefore must start with Karčewan *irik'ēn* < ClArm. *erek'ean*. Apparently, this form has been analysed as *erek'* 'three' (> Karčewan *irik'ē* 'id.') + *-ean* or *-in*. Then, *erkok'ean* has been replaced by analogical *yərkēn*, as if composed of *erku* 'two' (> Karčewan *yərku* 'two') and *-ean* or *-in*. The same holds for the other numerals.

In Łarabał, the Classical Armenian paradigm *erkok'in*, gen. *erkoc'un* etc., has been replaced by *ərkuk'an-əc'* etc. (see Davt'yan 1966: 127), with *-c'-* > *-k'-* analogically after the nominative, whereas in Metri-region the *-c'-* has been preserved (see AčarLiak 1, 1952: 325-326). Note further Karčewan gen. *yərkunc'ū*, etc. [H. Muradyan 1960: 110]. For Metri, Ałayan (1954: 180) records by-forms with *-k'-* and *-c'-*: *ərkəc'un* and *ərkək'ēn-u*. Kak'avaberd has analogical *irēk'-c'-un* etc. [H. Muradyan 1967: 128].

Sometimes *erkok'ean* is replaced by *ǰuxek'yan* [AčarLiak 1, 1952: 326], obviously with *ǰuxt* 'pair' of Iranian origin, cf. Pahl. *ǰuxt*, Pers. *ǰuft* 'pair, couple'.

2.2.5 Pronouns

For a number of issues see s.v. *ur* 'where, where to' (interrog.), 'wherever'.

2.2.6 Verbs

2.2.6.1 *-je-presents

For these formations see Meillet 1936: 107-108; 1950: 109-110; Ĵahukyan 1982: 171. See further s.v.v. *goč'em* 'to call', *koč'em* 'to call', as well as *y-orǰ-orǰ-em* 'to call'; all are synonymous verbs with *o*-grade and *-je-present.

koškoč'em < **koč-koč-em* 'to beat, break' (q.v.) < **koc-koc-je-mi*, from *koc* 'to beat; to lament by beating one's breast', a reduplicated present in *o*-grade with the present suffix *-je-. For *-cj- > -č- see 2.1.22.2.

čanač'em (see s.v. **can-* 'to know, be acquainted') derives from QIE **ǵnh₃-sk-je-*, with zero grade in the root, cf. Gr. *βαίvw* 'to go' and Lat. *venio* 'to come; to go' from **ǵ^wh₃-je-* (see Beekes 1995: 228).

Another possible, though highly hypothetical example is Arm. conjectural **huyem* 'to fear' < **pu-je-mi* (see s.v. *hoy* 'fright, fear').

2.2.6.2 Nasal presents

For an important case, cf. *har-k-anem*: aor. *har-i* 'to call'.

In the dialect of Agulis, the verbs of the 2nd class, that is those with a suffix -*anim* (-*anim*) in present, form their aorist and imperative without the nasal element: -*aham* (-*aham*) and -*ahi* (-*ahi*), respectively (see Ačaryan 1935: 245-249). The -*h*- is perhaps a glide.

2.3 WORD FORMATION

2.3.1 Affixes

Extensive comparative treatments of the Armenian affixes can be found in Greppin 1975; Ĵahukyan 1987; 1998; Olsen 1999. In this section I present a selection of affixes that are relevant for analysis of lexical entries in Part 1.

-(a)li-

am-li-k 'one-year-old child or lamb'); *tam-ali* 'roof' (see s.v.v.).

**luc-ali* [if *lucatl* is a corruption] ‘the constellation Orion=Hayk’ = *luc* ‘yoke; the constellation Libra’ + *-ali-*, perhaps from fem. **-lih₂-*, cf. Lat. *iugula* f. ‘a part of the constellation Orion’; see s.v.v. *luc* ‘yoke’ and *luca[t]li* ‘Orion’. For *sayl*, another asterism with **-lih₂-*, see below.

sayl, *i*-stem (Bible+), *o*-stem (Movses Xorenac’i, “Čarəntir”) ‘wagon’ (Bible+), ‘Ursa Major and Minor, Arcturus’ (Job 9.9, Philo, Anania Širakac’i), ‘north pole’ (Aristotle), etc. : Hesychian *σάτιλλα πλειάς τὸ ἄστρον* (perhaps of Thracian origin), next to Gr. *σατίνη* f. ‘chariot’. Probably from Mediterranean/Pontic substratum **kati-lih₂-*.

-(a)mn : -iwn : -imn

For the suffix *-amn*, Greppin (1975: 37) only mentions *atamn* ‘tooth’; cf. *-mn* (op. cit. 110-111). Ałayan (1980: 142) analyzes *ayceamn* ‘gazelle, roe’ as **ayci-* + *-amn* and compares it with *eteamn* = **eti-amn* ‘hoar-frost’ (q.v.), *pašt-awn*, *-aman* ‘service’, etc. He further (op. cit. 139-140, 142, 146₁) also mentions the animal-names *t’ož-iwn* ‘(bear-)cub’, *kor-iwn* ‘cub’, *mij’iwn/-imn* ‘ant’. Other nimal-names: *ayceamn* ‘roe-buck’ (see Clackson (1994: 89; Ĵahukyan 1998: 9, noting that the origin of the suffix is not clear.); see also s.v. *lusan* : dial. **lus(e)amn*).

Compare the type *-un*, gen. *-uan*, presupposing older nom. **-uwn* or **-umn*. Thus, *anun*, GDSg *anuan* ‘name’, *jetun*, GDSg *jetuan* ‘ceiling’, *srun-k*, GDPl *sruan-c* (vs. *sru/ōn-i-c* etc.) ‘shin, shank’, etc. (see s.v.v.) are derived from **anuwn*, **jetuwn*, **sruwn*, etc., respectively (see Ałayan, *ibid.*; Zekiyan 1980: 156-157). Here again we are thus dealing with *-mn/-wn*. See s.v. *anun*. As regards *jetun*, note ISg *jetmamb* (Anania Sanahnec’i, 11th cent.).

ardiwn-k ‘deed, work; earth products’ (Bible+) > Ararat *ardum* ‘earth goods, harvest’ < **ard(i)umn* (see s.v.).

-awš

Arm. *t’et-awš* ‘holm-oak; pine’ (Bible+; dial.) vs. *t’et-i* ‘elm’ (late attest.; several dialects), cf. Gr. *πτελέ-α*, Ion. *-η* ‘elm’, Lat. *tilia* ‘linden’; note also Georg. *t^helamuš* ‘elm’ (see s.v.v.).

Greppin (1975: 64-65) posits *-awš/-oš* as a botanical suffix seen in *t’et-awš* and *zarawš* ‘germander’ (Galen, Bžškaran), the latter being of unknown origin [HAB 2: 85a]. He considers (1974: 69) *-awš* to be of substratum origin and adds other plant-names which, however, seem to be irrelevant (cf. e.g. *marzangoš* < Pers. *marzan* ‘mouse’ + *gōš* ‘ear’; see HAB 3: 282b).

Ĵahukyan (1987: 380) mentions *t'eṭ-awš* as the only example of the suffix *-awš*, and presents a separate entry for the suffix *-oš* found in the adjective *dandal-oš* (cf. *dandat* 'slow'), as well as in *tk-ṛ-oš* 'big-bellied' (deverbative adjective) and *brd-oš* 'medley' (deverbative noun). All of these three words are dialectal, however, and may also represent *-awš* (= *-ōš*).

Further possible examples:

koki-oš vs. *kokoṛ* 'water-lily; currant' (late; dial. of Łarak'ilisa) [HAB 2: 618b];

kokan 'blackthorn', only in *kokan-eni*, attested in "Bžškarani"; present in some dialects [HAB 2: 617b]; probably here belongs Ararat, Lori *ṭṭn-oš* 'a kind of black round plum, *hapalasi* ['bilberry, *Vaccinium Myrtillus* L.'], found in the northern parts of Armenia' (see HayLezBrbBaṛ 3, 2004: 355a);

brinč 'snowball, *Viburnum opulus*' (poorly attested; dial.) : Łazax and Łaradaṭ **brōš* or **brōš*.¹⁴

p'otoš 'muraena, moray eel' (Step'anos Lehač'i), if from *p'ot* 'pipe' (see s.v. *əngṭayk*).

See also s.v. *arawš* 'a kind of bird identical with or resembling bustard'.

An interesting example seems to be the Iranian word for 'violet': Pahl. *wanašag*, Pers. *bunašā* 'violet' [MacKenzie 1971: 86], Zoroastrian *vanašā*, Arabic-Persian *banafšaj*, *manafšaj* [Bailey 1985: 29], Kurd. *banafš* [Cabolov 1, 2001: 115]; Iranian borrowings: Turk. *menekše* > Arm. dial. *menek'se* [Ačārean 1902: 233], Turk. *menefše* (cf. Arm. *manōšay* in Amirdovlat' etc.), Syriac *mənīškā*, etc.; Arm. *manušak* < **manawšak* < MPers. **manafšak* (Agat'angelos+; dial. widespread) vs. *manišak* (Nersēs Lambronac'i+; dialects of Muš, Alaškert, Ararat, Agulis, Łarabaṭ, etc.), probably from Syriac [Hübschmann 1897: 191, 311; HAB 3: 256, 258a; Ĵahukyan 1987: 533].

Bailey (1985: 29) derived the Iranian form from *vana-* 'blue', comparing also Arm. *van-* 'crystal'. I propose a comparison with Gr. *ῥov* [< **ῥiov*], DPI *ῥασι* [ῥα] n. 'violet', *ῥία* (= *ῥία*) *ῥαθῆ* (Hesichius) and Lat. *viola*, which are considered to be Mediterranean loans (see Frisk, s.v.). A proto-form like **wion-* might yield Iran. **v(y)an-*, with loss of *-y-* as e.g. in the word for 'tiger': Pahl. *babr*, MĪr. **vagr* (cf. Arm. *vagr*, Georg. *vigr*) vs. Skt. *vyāghra-* 'tiger'. We might be dealing with a Mediterranean-Iranian/Near-Eastern flower-name, as in the case

¹⁴ Ačāryan (HAB 1: 490b) notes the resemblance with Assy. *burāšu*, Hebr. *b'rōš*, Aram. *brūtā* (on these forms see s.v. *barti* 'poplar'). He, however, leaves the etymology open since the Semitic words mean 'cypress'; see 1.12.1.

of Gr. *ῥόδον* < **ῥόδον*, Aeol. *ῥόδον* n. 'rose' : OIran. **urda-* 'rose' (cf. Arm. *vard*, NPers. *gul* 'id.', etc.); see Meillet 1908-09b: 162 (cf. HAB 4: 317-318). At any rate, Ir. **-afš* can be regarded as a suffix of substratum origin comparable with Arm. *-awš* in *t'et-awš* etc.

I conclude that *-awš* is a suffix mainly found in plant and animal names of substratum origin. Probably Mediterranean; cf. espec. *t'et-awš* : *t'et-i* vs. Gr. *πελέε-α* 'elm' and Lat. *tilia* 'linden'.

-awt

Next to *kar-awt*, Jahukyan (1990: 74) mentions *ar-aw-awt* 'morning' and *et-awt* 'straw', and points out that the attempts of interpreting *-awt* on IE basis are not convincing, though the IE origin of the roots is possible.

karčarawt, *i*-stem 'brief(ly)' (Bible +); the *i*-stem is seen in *karčarōt-i-w* 'in brief, briefly' [Łazar P'arpec'i, Movsēs Xorenac'i 1.15 (1913=1991: 50^{L15}), etc.] and *karčarōt-i-w-k'* [Movsēs Xorenac'i 2.49 (1913=1991: 176^{L15}), John Chrysostom, etc.]. Transparently contains *karč* 'short, brief' (HAB), perhaps also the verbal root *ar-* 'to take', as suggested in NHB 1: 1074a (*karč areal ew yōdeah*).

The same *-arawt* occurs in another synonym: *hamarawt* 'brief' (Bible+), also *i*-stem; cf. *hamarōt-i-w-k'* in Eusebius of Caesarea, etc.

According to Ačaryan (HAB 3: 21a), *hamarōt* contains the Iranian prefix *ham-*. He also states that *karčarōt* and *hamarōt* have the same root **arōt* or **rōt*, which is of unknown origin. Olsen (1999: 887, 889) suggests a derivation from the participle of IIr. **-rabh-*, cf. Skt. *rabh-* 'to grasp'.

In my view, we are dealing with the suffix *-awt*, which may be identified with that of *araw-awt* 'morning', as well as in some hour-names (see s.v. *arawawt*), and originates in *hawt* (*i*-stem), *y-awt* '*division, cut'; see s.v. *hat-* (*z-at-*, *y-at-*) 'to cut; to divide; to cut off'. The basic function of the suffix may be to express the derivational meaning 'division, cut', such as 'a time-division, unit of time'.

narawt, *u*-stem: GDPI *narōt-u-c'* in Ezekiel 27.16, 24; *a*-stem: GDPI *narōt-aw-k'* twice in P'awstos Buzand 6.2 (1883=1984: 223); *o*-stem: GDPI *narawt-o-c'* in Hexaameron 4 (K. Muradyan 1984: 120^{L3}) 'coloured thread or plait/braid' (Bible+). In Nersēs Šnorhali (12th cent., Cilicia), the word refers to a thread that was bound on the horns of an animal (NHB 2: 405c). The word is widespread in dialects, in the meaning 'motley thread bound on the neck of a bride and a bridegroom' [HAB 3: 433a]. According to Amatuni (1912: 501a), the thread consists of three colours, green, red and white, and is also bound on the neck of a child when being baptized.

Ačaryan (HAB 3: 431b) mentions Ozim *narenj* ‘dyed thread’ s.v. *narinj* ‘orange’ and questions whether it belongs there (i.e. to *narinj* ‘orange’; cf. Moks *narenjə* ‘оранжевый (цвет)’, Orbeli 2002: 297). In fact, it seems to belong to the first component of *nar-awt*, see below.

No acceptable etymology is recorded in HAB 3: 432-433.

Nowadays the word is treated as an Iranian loan, cf. Khot. *nar-* ‘to dye’; perhaps also Arm. *ner-k* (?) [Jahukyan 1987: 536; Olsen 1999: 896].

But *-awt* remains unclear. It may be identical with our suffix *-awt*. However, one might alternatively posit Iran. **nar-* ‘to paint, dye’ + Iran. **raxt-* ‘coloured plait/braid’ (cf. Khwar. *rxtk* ‘red’, Skt. *raktā-* ‘dyed, red’). For **-rawt* < **raft* instead of **raxt* compare Pers. *juft* ‘pair, couple’ vs. Pahl *juxt* (see MacKenzie 1971: 47, with an exclamation-mark). This etymology partly coincides with that of Dervišyan, who interprets the word as **n-arak-t*, comparing the second component with Skt. *raktā-* (see HAB 3: 432b).

Another such compound can be seen in Ozim *narenj* ‘dyed thread’ (see above), which, I think, is composed of **nar-* ‘to dye’ + **ranj* ‘colour’, cf. Pers. *ranj* (alongside with *rang*) ‘colour’ (see Steingass 587b), MPers. *rang* ‘colour, dye’ > Arm. *erang*. For Arm. dial. **re/anj* ‘colour’ see 1.11.

-t’ (and/or -it’) < PIE **-t-* + **-H-*. See s.v. *yalt’* ‘broad’; other examples: see 2.1.18. In body-part terms: see s.v.v. *bl-it’* ‘a roundish soft bread’; *boyt’*, *boyt’n* ‘thumb’, **boyt’* ‘a soft lump of flesh, lobe’; *kī-t’-un-k’* ‘back’ vs. *kuīn* ‘back’. Compare Skt. *pr̥sthā-* n. ‘back, mountain-ridge, top’ (RV+) from PIE **prsth₂-*, cf. YAv. *paršta-* m. ‘back, spine, support in the back’, *paršti* ‘back’, Lith. *pīrštas* ‘finger’, OCS *pr̥stь* ‘finger’, etc., vs. Skt. *pr̥ṣṭī-* f. ‘rib’ (RV+).

For the morphology compare Skt. *rātha-* m. ‘light two-wheeled war-chariot’ (RV+) from **Hrot-h₂-o-*, derivative of PIE **Hrot-eh₂-* ‘wheel’, cf. Lat. *rota* f. ‘wheel, disc’, OIr. *roth* ‘wheel’, OHG *rad* ‘wheel’, Lith. *rātas* ‘wheel’, etc.

-(V)x

***bo/ux-i** ‘hornbeam’ (dial. Ararat, Łarabał, see Ačarean 1913: 200a), if related to the PIE word for ‘beech-tree’, cf. OHG *buohha*, etc., see Jahukyan 1972: 317, with reservation because of the vocalism and the *-k-* in Łarabał rural *pūk’i*. The formal problems would be partly solved if we assume **bo/uk-* + tree-suffix *-x-* + *-i*, thus **bo/u(k)xi*.

Saradževa (1981a: 229) compares the *-ax* of *katam-ax* ‘aspen’ (alongside Hesychian *καλαμίν-δαρ*, etc.) with the ending of numerous Greek tree-names

probably of Mediterranean origin, such as $\sigma\mu\tilde{\iota}\lambda\alpha\zeta$ 'Taxus' etc. Here are some other possible Armenian examples.

met-ex, *o*-stem, *i*-stem 'the handle of an axe' (Deuteronomy 19.5, Ephrem, "Naxadrut'iwnk'" Ecclesiastes), if related with Gr. $\mu\epsilon\lambda\acute{\iota}\alpha$ 'manna ash, Fraxinus ornus; ashen spear' (see s.v.).

tawsax 'box-tree, Buxus sempervirens' (Bible+), according to "Ašxarhac'oyc'", a product of the northern Armenian province of Gugark'; preserved in the dialect of Hamšen: *dəsxī*, *dəsxəni* (see 1.6)¹⁵.

From these examples one has an impression that the vowel before *x* agrees with the vocalism of the root: *met-ex* vs. *kaṭam-ax* and *taws-ax*. **bo/u(k)xi* may be explained through **buk-(u)x-í* > **bu(k)xí*. Note that the tree-suffix *-i* is accented even in dialects with penultimate accent, such as Łarabaṭ.

See also s.v. **t'k'i** 'maple'.

Since *kaṭam-ax* and *taws-ax* are reliably attested also in these pure forms, without the tree-suffix *-i*, one can consider *-ax* to be a tree-suffix on its own, of non-IE, perhaps Mediterranean origin. Later the forms analogically received the native and productive tree-suffix *-i*: *kaṭamax-i*, *tawsax-i*.

-k - diminutive > plant-suffix

From amongst the examples for the determinative *-k* in H. Suk'iasyan 1986: 90, the following are reliable: *boṭ-k* 'radish' (q.v.) and *jaṭk* 'branch' (HAB s.v.).

Alongside of *hačar caṛ* or *hačar-a-caṛ* 'beech-tree', one finds *hačar-uk* as the designation of the fruit in Agat'angelos §644 (1909=1984: 330^{L8}). Łarabaṭ, Lori **hačar-k-i* (see HAB 3: 16a), then, should be regarded as composed of *hačar-uk* and the tree-suffix *-i*. A similar suffix can also be seen in *kas(t)-k-eni* 'chestnut-tree' (q.v.).

Compare *sinj* 'sorb, service-berry; haw; etc.' (q.v.) > Svedia *snj-äg* (the berry) and *sənj-g-ina* (the tree).

**hac'eak* and **xnjoreak* are seen in place-names (see 4.8).

The diminutive suffix *-ik* is seen in a number of dialectal forms of Arm. *mor* 'blackberry': Sasun *mor-ig*, Moks *murun-ik* 'blackberry', Muš, Alaškert **moren-uk*, Atap'azar *məml-ig*, Nikomidia **morem-uk*, **mor-mor-ik*, Muš **moremuk*, Akn **morm-ik*, etc. Comparable forms are also found in other languages, cf. Sasun *mor-ig* 'blackberry': Chechen *mürg* 'guelder rose, snowball-tree' < PNakh. dimin. **mor-iḱ*: Gr. $\mu\nu\rho\text{-}\acute{\iota}\kappa\text{-}\eta$ 'tamarisk'.

¹⁵ Somehow related with Hurr. *taškar-* 'box-tree': **tak^hsar-* + *-(a)x?*.

-kn

For examples see Jahukyan 1987: 238. For discussion see s.v.v. *armukn* ‘elbow’ and *unkn* ‘ear’.

Kortlandt (1985b: 9-10 = 2003: 57-58) offers different explanation for *akn* ‘eye’, *jukn* ‘fish’ *mu-kn* ‘mouse’ (q.v.), see 2.1.19.

-j/z in animal plant names

Apart from well-known plant-names such as *det-j* ‘peach’ from *det-in* ‘yellow’, this suffixal element can also be seen in animal denotations.

Some animal-names (especially those of mustelids, lizards etc.) confined to a few IE and/or non-IE languages probably contain a suffixal **-k̂-* or **-ĝ-*, cf. *atuēs* ‘fox’; *ak’is* ‘weasel’ : *axaz* ‘marten’; *lusan-* ‘lynx’; *inj* ‘panther’ (see s.v.v.); *kuz* ‘cat; marten’ (< Iran. - Sem.); etc. Cf. also Latv. *luōss* ‘weasel’, Russ. *laska* ‘weasel’, NPers. *rāsū* ‘weasel’, if from **loH-k̂-* ‘weasel’ (see Mallory/Adams 1997: 638b).

This suffixal element is reminiscent of the Indo-Iranian animal suffix **-ācā-* (see de Vaan 2000) and probably related **-āḡā-* found in IIr. **yaráḡā-* ‘wild boar’ (> Finno-Volgian **oraśe* ‘(castrated) boar’; cf. Arm. *varaz*, Iranian loan) which are given a substratum origin (see Mallory 1982: 211; Rédei 1986: 54; Lubotsky 2001: 303, 304, 307, 309, and espec. 312). The latter contains a **-ḡā-* comparable Arm.-IAr. **sing^ho-* : Skt. *simha-* ‘lion’, *inj* ‘panther’. Note also **h₁el-k̂-* : Gr. *ἄλκη* ‘elk’, Skt. *śśa-* m. ‘male antelope’ (AV), etc.

Other possible examples:

xl-ēz ‘lizard’ (MArm.), dial. also ‘snail’; cf. *xtunjn* ‘snail’, Airtial *xoxanč* ‘crayfish’ (see Ačāryan 1953: 269), Svedia: *xranč*, *xranj* ‘chameleon’, etc. related to Syriac *xlizonā* ‘snail’ etc. (see 3.5.2.5). Separating the element *-ēz*, I propose a connection with Kartvel. **mxul-* ‘lizard’, see below.

moḡ-ēz ‘lizard’ (Bible+; widespread in dialects): in Leviticus 11.30, *kovadiac* ‘and *mo/utēz* render Gr. *καλαβώτης* ‘spotted lizard, gecko’ and *σαύρα* f. ‘lizard’ (see Wevers 1997: 154), respectively. In a number of dialects, as well as in the final edition of the Alexander Romance (see H. Simonyan 1989: 306^{L4f}), in the form *moḡoz* (see 1.4).

Ačāryan (HAB 3: 342) compares the word with Pers. *mālūs* or *mālōs* ‘green lizard’. I wonder if there is a relation with ORuss. *smolžb* ‘snail’, Beloruss. *смоўж* ‘snail’, Polab. *mouz* ‘snail’, Chech *mlž* ‘shellfish’, Pol. *matż* ‘id.’ (see Fasmer 3: 690). On the semantic correlation ‘lizard’ : ‘snail’ see above on *xlēz* ‘lizard’ and

‘snail’; cf. also Arm. *xinjajl* ‘snail’ vs. dial. (Svedia) *xranj* ‘chameleon’, etc. (see 3.5.2.5).

Given the remarkable formal and semantic resemblance, I propose to combine Arm. **xul-* ‘lizard; snail’ with **mo/ut-* ‘lizard’ deriving them from **(m)xul-* and **m(x)o/ut-*, respectively. This may be corroborated by with Kartvel. **mxul-* ‘lizard’: Georg. *mxuliv-* ‘lizard’, Laz *mtxola(r)-*, *xolura-*, Megr. *xolar-*, etc. (see Klimov 1964: 144; 1998: 134).

Remarkably, Aparan and Surmalu *motoz-r-ik* ‘lizard’, and especially Trapizon and Hamšen **mot-or-ik* ‘a small poisonless snake’ (see HAB 3: 342b; Ačaryan 1947: 263), with a suffixal *-r-*, is reminiscent of the Kartvelian forms like Laz **m(t)xolar-*. Note also MArm. hapax *martis* ‘a kind of reptile’ [Amatuni 1912: 469b], of which no etymology has been proposed [HAB 3: 286a]. One might hypothetically connect it with our words for ‘lizard’ and ‘a small poisonless snake’ assuming the following development: **mo/al-ur-is* > **matris* > *martis* (metathesis).

It is also interesting that Arm. *xlēz* has forms with initial *m-*: *məglez*, *mgəldrez*, *mixlez*. One might assume contamination with synonymous *motēz* and/or contamination with *mukn* ‘mouse’. This is possible, but I would not exclude the possibility that this *m-* is somehow related with the Kartvelian *m-*. At any rate, the correlation of *xlēz* and *mtēz* and Kartvel. **mxul-*, whether original or contaminative, seems very plausible.

Compare further Van, Šatax **deť-ez* ‘bumble-bee’, if from *deť-* ‘yellow’.

y-

It has often been stated that PIE initial **p-* and **s-* sometimes irregularly yield *y-* instead of *h-* (see Winter 1966: 203ff; H. Muradyan 1982: 277-278; Greppin 1983b; Ĵahukyan 1987: 244, 372-373). The usually listed examples are: **penk^we* > *hing* ‘five’ : **penk^wēkomth₂* > *yisun* ‘fifty’; **ph₂t-ēr* > *hayr* ‘father’ : *yawray* ‘stepfather’; etc. Greppin (1983b) discusses this conflicting evidence within the context of a reverse development, viz. ClArm. *yV-* > ModArm. and dial. *hV-*, and explains the forms with *y-* as hypercorrections. He also (ibid.) adduces *yat^tem* ‘to overcome, subdue’ (q.v.).

Admitting the alternative development **p-* and **s-* > *y-* (alongside of the regular *h-*), Ĵahukyan (1987: 244) points out that the words with *h-* sometimes also have variants with *y-* (cf. *hatanem* : *yatanem* ‘to cut’), and, therefore, it is often difficult to assess whether the *y-* is of prefixal origin or not. In cases with initial *zero* and **s-*, he continues, the prepositional (= prefixal) origin of the *y-* is

not very probable. Nevertheless, it seems obvious that *y-atem*, *y-atanem* ‘to cut off branches from trees and especially from vine’ (Bible+) is a prefixed formation from *hatanem* ‘to cut, split’ (Bible+), q.v. Its basic meaning is ‘to incise’, so Lat. *in-cīdō* ‘to cut into; to make an end to; to engrave’ (from *caedō* ‘to fell, hew; to cut; to slaughter’) can serve as a clear typological illustration for such a formation. The initial *h-* drops in these cases: **y-(h)at-* > *yat-*. Thus, the ultimate origin of the anlaut is irrelevant.

Alongside ClArm. *hiwsem* ‘to weave, plait’ (q.v.), there is a later and poorly attested variant in *y-*: *yus-*, *yōs-* (Ephrem; "Geoponica"). Also this is taken by Winter (1966: 202-204) as a conflicting example of *y-* vs. *h-*. Nevertheless, he (op. cit. 209) admits the possibility of considering *y-* here as the prefix *y-*, adding that "such an analysis seems precluded for *yisun* ‘fifty’". This is quite possible. The structure of **y-iws-* would then be parallel to that of Gr. *ἐμ-πλέκω*, Dutch *in-vlechten*.

The postulation of the productive prefix *y-* can also solve the puzzle of *yawray* ‘stepfather’, probably from **y-(h)awr-ay* lit. ‘(who is) in fatherhood, paternity’ (see s.v.).

Arm. *yisun* ‘fifty’ (from PIE **penkʷēkomth₂* ‘fifty’: Gr. *πεντή-κοντα*, Lat. *quīnquāgintā*, Skt. *pañcā-śāt* f., etc.) is usually explained as **hingisun* > **hingsun* > **hi(n)sun*, with common loss of nasal before *-s-* [Meillet 1936: 40; Clackson 1994: 171]. Winter (1966: 206) points out that "such an assumption implies that this particular sound change remained active until a fairly late time, as the syncope of *i* and *u* is a rather recent phenomenon, and only after **i* from **ē* was syncopated did **yin-* and *-sun* come in direct contact". For a survey of theories mostly relying upon the loss of **-n-* before **-s-* see Clackson 1994: 234₂₉₂. None of them, however, explains the *y-* satisfactorily. Kortlandt (2003: 40, 44, 100, 123-124) assumes that pretonic **hin-* yielded *yi-*. I prefer starting with **hingisun*: **hiṅisun* > **(h)i(ṅ)isun* > **(h)i-isun* > **i-y-isun* (where the *y-* is perhaps a glide) > *yisun*. This explanation basically coincides with that of Beekes (2003: 163). See also below.

As is noted by Lidén (1906: 76), numerous words meaning semantics ‘many, abundant, plenty, fat, etc.’ contain the prefix/preposition *y-*. Lidén mentions *y-ač-ax*, *y-olov*, *y-oyž*, and *y-ogn* (see s.v.v.). More examples can be found s.v. *y-uir-t’i*.

In dialects

Bearing in mind that the Classical *y-* yields voiced *h-* (*h*) in Šatax whereas it disappears in Van (see Ačāryan 1952: 76; M. Muradyan 1962: 24, 53), one should

trace the anlaut of e.g. Šatax *hāk̄yi* ‘tail’ (vs. ClArm. *agi*, q.v.) back to *y-* rather than *h-* since the latter would have given *x-*. On this and related problems see also AčarHLPtm 2, 1951: 427-428; H. Muradyan 1982: 225ff, 276ff; H. Muradyan 1982a; Haneyan 1985: 36ff.

Weitenberg (1986: 92-97; 1993; 1996: 105-106) formulated a rule according to which one may restore an old parallel form with an additional *y-* if the initial *a-* of a Classical word corresponds to Šatax *h’ā-*, Van *ā-* and Muš *h’a-*. He (1986: 96) lists 20 such forms. Then he adds: "It seems to me that the words reconstructed in the list above can be added to the stock of 5th century Armenian and should be accounted for in etymological studies" (1986: 96).

The forms with *y-* can be explained from prefixation with *y* < PIE **h₁en* ‘in’; cf. Weitenberg 1986: 94. Regarding e.g. **y-andund-k’*, this is easy to understand since *andund* ‘abyss’, *yatak* ‘bottom’ etc. are frequently used in allative contexts, particularly in idioms, curses and spells of the structure "may you/the Evil eye go to Black abyss/hell; he went to/disappeared in abyss/hell"; cf. *i yan(y)atak covn* ‘to the bottomless sea’ [Ōdabašyan 1976: 121; Harut’yunyan 2000: 12]; in the dialect of Muš (Bulanəx): <...> *i cov*, /*Covn h’anatak* [Movsisyan 1972: 130a]; etc. For the relationship *i y-*: Muš *h’-* see Weitenberg 1997. Note also the context with the ablative: *hanem i yandndoc’ (jur, atbiwr, šogilk’)* ‘to take (water, well, steam) from the Abyss’ (see Mnac’akanyan 1956: 383^{L29}, 391^{LL28,44}). The preverb *i/y-* (cf. Weitenberg 1986: 93-94) may also have played a role here; cf. **y-andndim* ‘to get lost underground, to get rid of smth., smb.’.

In my view, The structure of **y-an-und-k’* is parallel to Armenian *yatak* ‘bottom (of sea, underworld, hell)’, dial. also ‘hell; abyss’: *y-* + Iran. privative *a-* + *tak* (**a-tāk* ‘bottomless’), exactly like **y-an-und-k’*; cf. the synonymous Pahl. *a-bun* ‘bottomless’. For the etymological textual parallelism between the two Armenian synonyms see s.v.v.

Further examples see s.v.v. *an(u)t’ armpit*, *aru* ‘brook’.

-t’i, -ti, -di*: PIE **-ti-

This suffix is found in words of PIE origin (e.g. *bay* ‘word’ from PIE **b^hh₂-ti*). It remained productive at later stages too. Compare *an-jr-di* ‘arid, not-watered’ (with privative *an-* and *jur* ‘water’), *y-ur-t’i* ‘watered, irrigated, fertile’, *nawt’i* ‘hungry’ < **n-* + **aw-* + *-t’i*, perhaps also *nay* ‘moist’; see s.v.v. Further, see 2.1.22.13-14.

Arm. *sard*, *i-* stem ‘spider’ (Bible+; dial.) is usually treated as a **-ti-* derivative: **kr-ti-* > *sard*, obl. *sard-i(-)*. See s.v.

In *spand*, *i*-stem 'slaughter' (cf. *span-anem* 'to kill'; see s.v.), Viredaz (2005: 91-92, 97₆₆) sees an Armenian creation with the suffix **-di-* < PIE **-tis*, which, being "phonetically regular after **r* and **l*, seems to have been analogically extended after *n*". He points out that *-nd* is not regular here, in view of *hun* 'ford' < **pontis*. However, *hun* may be from **pontH-*.

Svedia **anapurt* 'uninhabited' [HayLezBrbBar 1, 2001: 55a], *anaburd diť* 'uninhabited place' [Andreasyan 1967: 201]. Andreasyan (1967: 353b) derives it from *anapat* 'desert', which is unsatisfactory. From *anapat* one expects Svedia **anabud*. The word may be composed (or folk-etymologically reinterpreted as such) of the privative prefix *an-*, the root *apur-* 'to live' and a suffixal element *-d*. The latter may derive from IE **-ti-*, with regular voicing of **-t-* after **-r-*. See also s.v. *anjrdi* (preserved in Zeyt'un and Goris).

There are a few dialectal formations in *-ti*, with a voiceless unaspirated *-t-*:

dial. (Xian) *an-lí-ti* 'garrulous, chattering, talkative'; Ačaryan (1913: 100a) writes: "it seems composed of the privative *an-* and the verb *lrel* 'to be silent'". He does not specify *-ti*, which is clearly a deverbative suffix here. Thus, *an-lí-ti* basically means 'who does not get silent'.

Urmia, Salmast *anlrti* 'insatiable (for eating and drinking)' [GwrUrmSalm 1, 1897: 545] is probably composed of privative *an-*, *l(i)r-* 'full' and the suffix *-ti*.

These examples should be linked with ClArm. *lk-ti* 'licentious' vs. verbal *lk-n-im* (on which see HAB 2: 289-290, in separate entries).

-uhi, -urhi

A productive feminine suffix in later Armenian, the oldest example of which is *t'ag-uhi* 'queen' (see Meillet 1913: 32; Godel 1975: 63-64; Ĵahukyan 1987: 356; L. Hovhannisyanyan 1990: 156; Olsen 1999: 592). For the philology of the suffix I refer to Vardanean 1911. For the declension see Weitenberg 1989: 59, 65-70. For the variant *t'agurhi* (Labubna) see Vardanean 1911: 311 (with the attestation).

The variant *-urhi* is also found in the female anthroponym *Smbat-urhi*. Movsēs Xorenac'i 2.37 (1913=1990: 162^{L19}) mentions the two daughters of Smbat, *Smbat-anoyš* and *Smbat-urhi* (vars. *Smbatuhri*, *S(m)batuhi*), who are otherwise unattested [Thomson 1978: 180₁₀]. Another female anthroponym is found in 3.48 (319^{L15f}): *Tačaturhi* (vars. *Tačatuhri*, *Tačatuhi*).

Next to *isk-uhi* 'true queen', based on *isk* 'essence; essential, original', one finds *iskurhi* (not cited in NHB 1: 869b) in the final edition of the Alexander

Romance: *ar At'enay iskurhwoyn* (see H. Simonyan 1989: 353^{L4}). Here also: *astuac-urhi* 'goddess' (op. cit. 178-179, several times).

See s.v. *tir-uhi*, of which Moks *teröxri* 'priest's wife' (< **tēr-urhi*) is particularly important, see below.

For the etymological attempts see references in Vardanean 1911: 309₁. Benveniste (1945: 74) deduces it from *t'ag-uhi* 'queen' (the female counterpart of *t'ag-awor* 'king', literally 'crown-bearer') which is borrowed from NWIran. **tāga-br̥θryā-* 'Kronen-trägerin' (cf. YAv. *barəθrī-* f. 'female carrier, mother'; Skt. *bhartar-* m. 'husband, nourisher' (RV+); *bhartrī-* f. 'female nourisher, mother' (AV+)), assuming the following development (found also in *patuhas* 'punition'): **-wr̥hi* > *-wr̥hi* > *-urhi*, *-uhi*; see also Godel 1975: 63; Schmitt 1982: 102; 1983: 102; Olsen 1999: 592; and, with references to other, less convincing explanations, Ĵahukyan 1993: 267; 1998: 33.

Vardanyan (Vardanean 1911: 314) notes that in the female anthroponym *Hamazasp-uhi*, *-uhi* is synchronically different and is borrowed from Pahl. *ūrhi*, *ūhi* 'daughter', but the ultimate origin of the suffix *-uhi*, too, is combined with the Pahlavi word (see s.v. *ustr* 'son').

Moks *teröxri* 'priest's wife' (< **tēr-urhi*) is particularly important since it seems to be, apart from the attestation of *t'agurhi* in Labubna, the only evidence for the original form of the suffix, viz. *-urhi*.

The suffix *-u(r)hi*, thus, originates from *t'ag-uhi* 'queen' and has been generalized to a feminine suffix in generic sense. For the typology see s.v. *awri-ord* 'girl'.

2.3.2 Reduplication

On reduplication patterns of Proto-Armenian I refer to the survey in Ĵahukyan 1987: 250-252. On reduplicated presents see 2.2.6.1, and s.v.v. *koškočem* 'to beat, break', *yotdotdem* 'to shake, move, cause to totter, waver', *y-orj-orj-em* 'to call'.

In Classical Armenian, **intensive reduplication** occurs not only word-compositionally, but also merely as a repetition, or in distributive function, or to express the idea of 'every'. E.g. in P'awstos Buzand 4.55 (1883=1984: 147^{L9f}; transl. Garsoïan (1989: 176): *xatac'(uc')eal ew zayl gerut'iwns gawarac' gawarac', kotmanc' kotmanc', p'ori p'ori, zašxarhi ašxarhi, acin žotovec'in i k'atak'n Naxčawan, zi and ēr zōražotoŋ iwreanc' zōrac'n* : "[the Persians] also took away captives from every district, region, valley, and realm, and collected them in the city of Naxčawan, for that was the gathering place for their army".

Malxasyanc' (1987: 267) translates not "from every" but "from various (*zanazan*)".

šrj- 'to turn' : *šrj-šrj-*, attested in Agat'angelos 112 (1909=1980: 66^{L7f}; transl. Thomson 1976: 125): *ew k'aršec'in ew t'atec'in zna i tataskin; ew šrjšrjēin zna andēn* : "they dragged and buried and rolled him in the 'thistles'". For the whole passage see s.v. *tatask* 'thistle'.

For a list of such examples see Leroy 1986: 64-65, and, with the conjunction *-a-*, 70-71.

With the copula *ew*

In Agat'angelos 33 (1909=1980: 22^{L16f}; transl. Thomson 1976: 49): *Zi getn Erasx yaruc'eal gayr li dariw ew dariw* : "For the river Araxes had risen and was flowing full to both banks". The same expression occurs in Joshua 3.15: *c'eal gayr dariw ew dariw*. Here the Greek text reads as follows: *ὁ δὲ Ἰορδάνης ἐπλήρου καθ' ὅλην τὴν κρηπίδα αὐτοῦ ὥσπερ ἡμέραι θερισμοῦ πυρῶν*. As is clear from the collation of the passage, the Armenian phrase is not a Greek calque. Ačaryan (HAB 1: 631b) does not mention this passage, but compares Agat'angelos' phrase with a similar one from 1 Paralipomenon 12.15 with *ap'n* 'shore, bank' instead of *dar* : *gayr [getn Yordanan] li ap'amb ew ap'amb ar hasarak cayriw iwrov*.

Reduplication *a/o* etc.

For this type, Leroy (1986: 67, 67₂₀) presents only one example: *hay-hoy-em* 'to scold, utter abuse or slander' (Bible+; dial. Ararat, Sebastia etc.), cf. Pers. *hāy ū hōy* 'tumulte, plainte', etc.; onomatopoeic [HAB 3: 30b]. In the dialect of Łarabat it has been replaced by *hɔvhɔvel* (HAB), reduplication of **hov* or **huv*, unless one assumes a remodelling with the copula *u* 'and': **hayuhoy* > **ha(y)whoy* > (assimil.) **hov-hov*; cf. also Pers. *hāy ū hōy*. See also Jahukyan 1987: 250-252, 364.

Greppin (1981b) argues that the IE reduplicated verb class was not continued in Armenian, and that reduplication was (re)introduced into Armenian through the influence of Hittite-Luwian and perhaps also Hurro-Urartian. See the references in Greppin 1981b: 8. I cannot share this opinion since: 1) the material introduced by Greppin is far from exhaustive; 2) some examples of native origin are removed to hastily; cf. *hototim* 'to smell' vs. Gr. *ὀδωδῆ* f. 'smell' and perf. *ὀδωδα*; though in some cases we have no reduplicated nominal formations in cognate languages, one still has to reckon with the fact that they are of IE origin; see e.g. HAB s.v. *hetet* 'flood'; 3) words like *xaxank*, *mimram*, *tatrak* etc. (also those not included

in Greppin's list, such as *atatak* etc.; see above) which all have reduplicated parallels in cognate languages cannot be removed only because of onomatopoeic nature; 4) Greppin himself accepts the cases of *kokord* 'throat' and *sisein* 'chickpea'; 5) there are only a couple of examples where we may be dealing with Hittite loans, and all these represent only full-reduplication (cf. *xotxotem* 'to slaughter', *jaxjaxem* 'to crush, destroy', etc.; on *getget-* see s.v.), whereas the examples above, as well as the examples of the types **Ci-CaR* (see s.v. *cicat* 'laighter', cf. also s.v. *šišat* 'demon') and **Ca-CuC* (see above, also s.v. *karkut* 'hail') are of IE origin.

C. SEMANTICS, CULTURE AND ETYMOLOGY

This section comprises sketches on several semantic fields, which can illustrate the relevance of anthropological and mythological evidence for philological and etymological studies. At the end of this section I present an overview on the Mediterranean-Pontic substratum lexicon, which mainly comprises animal and plant designations, as well as cultural words.

An interesting case demonstrating an agreement between philological analysis, dialectal spread and zoological data is represented by *analut* 'a kind of deer' (see s.v. and 1.6).

3.1 Astral/Celestial world

3.1.1 Starry sky

There is a certain association of 'Pleiades' and 'starry sky' with the idea of 'sieve' (possibly also: 'sieve of a thousand holes/eyes', see Puhvel 1991. This is reminiscent of Axalk'alak' **astucoy maṭə* 'sky', literally: "the sieve of God"; used in an expression that means "who can escape from under the God's sieve (i.e. from the Last Judgement)?" [Ačarean 1913: 141b].

This equation is also found in a widespread type of Armenian riddles where the starry skay is represented as a sieve (see S. Harut'yunyan 1965: 8-11). Compare 'thousand eyes' in variants from Lori (10a^{Nr70}) and Axalc'xa (11b^{Nr79}), in the latter referring to the Milky Way. [Note that Axalc'xa is geographically and dialectally very close to Axalk'alak']. A Partizak riddle on *asttner* 'stars' reads [Tēr-Yakobean 1960: 389^{L1}]: *Mer tan vray maṭ mə hawkit* : "A sieve of eggs above our house". In a riddle from Moks (Karčkana Nanəkanc') told by Armaṭan Martirosyan [Haykuni 1906: 350^{L10}], *astter* 'stars' is represented as a sieve of *č'ort'an* (a milk product).

The folk astronomy in all the countries of the Northern hemisphere distinguishes first of all (the ladle of) Ursa Major, Orion or its belt, and Ursa

Minor [Karpenko 1981: 45]. Of the Armenian designations of these astral terms, the following are of considerable importance:

Sayl (rendering Gr. *Ἀρκτοῦρος* ‘the star Arcturus, Bearward’ in Job 9.9) vs. Gr. *σατίνη* f. ‘chariot’, *σατίλλα· πλειᾶς τὸ ἄστρον* (Hesychius), the constellation being regarded as a car [considered to be of Phrygian (Lidén 1905; 1933: 45₄; HAB 4: 169b; Scherer 1953: 145) or Thracian (Schmitt 1966) origin]. For various designations for Ursa Major based on ‘wagon, chariot’ in IE and non-IE languages see Scherer 1953: 139-141; Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 686, 686₂ (with ref.).

Hayk ‘Orion’ (see Ališan 1910: 130ff), dial. *Xek*’ (on which see below, on Pleiades); cf. also Van *xek’er* ‘starry sky’ [HayLezBrbBar 2, 2002: 317b]. See s.v. *alaw(s)unk*’.

3.1.2 Pleiades

The dialectal designation for the constellation of Orion *xek*’, *xek’er*, as well as the combined *Xek’-bazük*’ ‘Orion/Hayk and Pleiades’ are mentioned s.v. *alaw(s)unk*’ ‘Pleiades’ within the context of the close association of these two astronims. On *xek*’, *xek’er* see HAB 3: 373; Łanalanyan 1969: 10^{Nr8}. In fact, in the traditional story cited by Łanalanyan, *xek’er* (a formation with double plural markers, namely *-k*’ and *-er*) ‘Orion’ seems to denote ‘Pleiades’, the well-known asterism in the constellation of Taurus. According to the story, the three sons and the three daughters (the total number of them being, thus, six) of Hayk (=Orion) transformed into those stars. This can be compared to the famous Greek version, in which the seven sisters pursued by Orion, metamorphosed as doves-Pleiades.

As is well known, one of the seven stars of Pleiades is barely visible, so in many cultures their canonic number is six, unlike Greek tradition which has seven Pleiades; see Puhvel 1991: 1244. Note the fluctuation in the Indian tradition, in which the six stars of the Pleiades are said be the unfaithful wives of the seven sages (the stars of the Ursa Major); only the seventh was faithful (see Parpola 1985: 121). A typological parallel can be found, for example, in Tuareg tradition, where "die Plejaden sind die sieben Töchter der Nacht, von denen die siebente ein einäugiger Knabe ist" [Höltker 1928: 292].

Arm. *bazum* ‘many’ seems to be a loan from an unattested Mİran. form cognate with OAv. *bəzuuaitē* ‘dense’, Khot. *balysga-* ‘wide, large’ < **bazulaka*’-, Skt. *bahu*’- ‘many, much, frequent, abounding in’ (see Hübschmann 1897: 426-427; HAB 1: 378; Bailey 1979: 270; Ĵahukyan 1987: 518; Mayrhofer, EWAia 2, 1996: 221; Olsen 1999: 870). It is found in a few formations meaning ‘Pleiades’ in

Classical and Middle Armenian, as well as in dialects [NHB 1: 415c; HAB 1: 379a; MiġHayBaġ 1, 1987: 108b; Amatuni 1912: 80b]. Cf. also Moks *pāzūnk*ʹy [Ačāryan 1952: 249], Šatax *pāzunk*ʹ [M. Muradyan 1962: 193a], Svedia *pāzānk*ʹ (*u* > *ä* is here regular before *NK*; the meaning here is 'Ursa Minor') [Andreasyan 1967: 355b, cf. 22] (all of them assimilated from *bazum-k*ʹ or based on the "pure" **bazu-*?). But the above-mentioned **bazuk*ʹ is not based on *bazum* 'many' with loss of the *m*, as is suggested in Ačāryan 1952: 99, cf. 105, 249. One should rather treat it as a parallel form next to *bazum* with a different Iranian suffix, that is **-ka-*: **bazuk* + *-k*ʹ (pl. marker).

Thus, **bazuk* 'Pleiades' (< 'many') is an old dialectal word preserved in Van *pāzūk* (next to *pāzūmk*ʹ < *bazum-k*ʹ) [Ačāryan 1952: 43, 99, 105, 249], Meṛi *bēzūk* [Aṭayan 1954: 25, 264], Łarabaṭ *pāzūk*, *pēzūk* [Davtʹyan 1966: 323], Šamšadin/ Dilġan *pāzūk* [Mežuncʹ 1989: 185a], Borčʹalu (Lōri) *bazuk* [Amatuni 1912: 80b], as well as in Hamšen **bazuk* (see Y. Muradean 1901: 80).

To my knowledge, no Iranian forms (neither with *m* nor with *k* suffixal elements) meaning 'Pleiades' have been mentioned in connection with the Armenian forms. The forth asterism of the Sogdian Lunar Zodiac may be *Strβʹzk*, interpreted by Bogoljubov (1987: 9-10) as reflecting **Star-Bāzuka-*, the second component of which, viz. *bāzu-* 'hand', corresponds to the Indian equivalent asterism: *Bāhu-* (cf. Monier-Williams 1899: 730b: 'the constellation Ārdra', by lexicographers). If this is true, Arm. **bazuk* 'Pleiades' (< 'many') is etymologically different. I cannot say whether confusion has taken place here. At any rate, however, there seems to be a correlation; cf. Skt. *bahulā-* 'thick; many', f. pl. 'Pleiades', and *bāhula-* 'manifold; the month Kārttika, when the moon is near the Pleiades' (see Monier-Williams 1899: 726b and 730c, respectively). For the semantic development cf. also Arm. *boyl* 'group' (q.v.) : *boyl-k*ʹ 'Pleiades' (see below). [The resemblance of *boyl(k)*ʹ with Skt. *bahulā-* and *bāhula-* seems to be accidental]. Numerous other parallels can be found in various languages (see Scherer 1953: 141f; Părvulescu 1988: 103f; Puhvel 1991; etc.).

Next to *boyl-k*ʹ 'Pleiades' (from *boyl*, *i*-stem 'group' < **b^heuH-l-i-*, cf. Skt. *bhūri-* 'much, abundant, numerous', OAv. *būiri-* 'abundant'), Malatʹia has *pʹrk*ʹ < **boyr-k*ʹ, probably borrowed from Mİran. **būr-* (cf. OAv. *būiri-* 'abundant'), unless directly comparable with Lith. *būrỹs* 'multitude, crowd', Latv. *būris* 'heap, mass'. In either case, we are dealing with the same semantic development: 'multitude, mass' > 'Pleiades'.

Since the semantic development 'multitude' > 'Pleiades' is one of the most representative patterns for naming this star cluster, one may explain *alaw(s)unk*ʹ

‘Pleiades’ as containing the zero-grade form of *y-olov* ‘many’ (< **polh₁us*, cf. Gr. *πολύς* ‘many’), viz. **plh₁u-* (cf. Skt. *puru-*, etc.). See s.v.

Some Armenian forms of e.g. *boyl* ‘group’ (q.v.) refer to ‘Ursa Major’ rather than ‘Pleiades’. This interchange, seen also in Hesychian *σάτιλλα* ‘Pleiades’ vs. Arm. *sayl* ‘Ursa Major etc.’ (q.v.), can be conditioned by the fact that both comprise seven stars (cf. Schmitt 1966: 148₂). There is also some fluctuation or confusion between ‘Orion’, ‘Ursa Major’ and ‘Libra’; see 3.1.4.

3.1.3 Milky Way

Yard(a)goť: In “Yatags ampoc’ ew nšanac’” by Anania Širakac’i, 7th cent. (A. G. Abrahamyan 1944: 307^{L11f}): *Astetk’ en oroc’ xairnakeal čanaparhk’ linin gnac’ic’*, or *anuanec koč’[n] yardgoť*: “There are piles of stars that stretch as a road and is called *yardgoť*” (cf. EArm transl. Abrahamyan/Petrosyan 1979: 319^{L-3f}). The published text is based on the oldest Armenian manuscript of paper (Matenadaran Nr 2679) which is copied by the scribe Łukas in 971 AD (op. cit. 142). If the reading is reliable, the syncope of *-a-* antedates the 10th century. See also below, on the dialect of Xotorĵur.

In “Yatags kendanatesakac’” by the same author (see A. G. Abrahamyan 1944: 326^{L14f}), in API: *yardagoťs - zhet astuacoc’n*: “the trace of gods”.

Discussing the various interpretations of the *Kat’in cir* ‘Milky Way’, lit. ‘circle of milk’, Anania Širakac’i (A. Abrahamyan 1940: 37, lines 15-19; see also Łanalanyan 1969: 7^{Nr4a}) mentions also Arm. *Yardgoti het* ‘the trace of the Straw-stealer’, explicitly interpreting it by the myth on the god Vahagn, the ancestor of Armenians (*naxni Hayoc*), who steals straw from Baršam, the ancestor of Syrians (cf. also ModArm. transl. Abrahamyan/Petrosyan 1979: 95-96).

For other attestations of *Yardagoť* see Ališan 1910: 126-130. Xotorĵur **erdgoť* is explained as “*cir xawarman* which is better visible in august” [YušamXotorĵ 1964: 444b]. By *cir xawarman*, apparently, the ecliptic is meant, cf. Modern Armenian *xawar-a-cir* (see Malxaseanc’ 2, 1944: 251c). In reality, we seem to be dealing with a visible celestial body or phenomenon rather than an abstract line or circle, since Hačean (ibid.) adds: “It is believed that these are [NB: plural - H. M.] the ones that make wind”. He also cites an expression: *erdgotnin elan, erdn cackink’* “the *erdgoťs* arose/appeared, let us cover the straw” [otherwise they will steal the straw]. [YušamXotorĵ 1964: 444b]. Then (op. cit. 447b), Hačean introduces another entry: *erdgoť* ‘Milky Way’. I conclude that these two entries must be combined in the following way: *erdgoť* (pl. *erdgotni*) denotes

the Milky Way and is associated with the straw-stealing wind. See also below on Լարաթ **darman-a-got*.

The above-mentioned association with ecliptic is not surprising. Note that e.g. some Maya people (Chortí) seem to visualize the Milky Way as a path or axis intersecting with the ecliptic, the path of the Sun [Milbrath 1999: 40b].

Since Anania Տիրակա՛ւ (7th cent.) was native of Տիրակ which is close to Xotorjūr both dialectally and geographically, one may regard **Yard(-a)-got* as a potential case of areal restriction recorded in the 7th century. Both Anania Տիրակա՛ւ and the dialect of Xotorjūr have the name in plural, as well as the syncopated form *yardgot* (manuscript from 971 AD). The area may have been somewhat larger since one also finds the word in other *kə*-dialects such as Tigranakert *hārt k'ut* (see Haneyan 1978: 51).

In eastern dialects, namely Ararat, Lori [Amatuni 1912: 162a; Ačarean 1913: 270a] and Լարաթ [Lisic'yan 1981: 66b], **Yard(-a)-got* has been replaced by ***Darman-a-got*** 'Milky Way', with *darman* 'straw'. The actual designation of the Milky Way in Լարաթ is *Termanukōti čənapar* "the road/way of the Straw-Stealer" or *Termani həti* "the road/way of straw" [Lisic'yan 1981: 66b].

Լարաթ *Termankyöt* : **Darmangoť* occurs e.g. in an Ascension folk-song ("jāngyulum") from Լարաթ (probably Տւժի) [Grigoryan-Spandaryan 1971: 219, Nr 1348]:

*Kyetə k'əšəm a Termankyötin,
Ast'xerin šoxkn a catkin c'otin,
Lüsnəngyän el aşk a tiräl
Lüs čəkatis vəeske p'otin.*

"The river drives the *Darmangoť*,
The reflection of stars is on the dew of flowes,
And the Moon has put his eye
On the golden coin of my forehead".

Obviously, *Darmangoť* refers here to Milky Way; the river drives down the reflection of the Milky Way.

In Varanda (a region of Լարաթ), *Darmanagot* also denotes a small cloud considered to be a sign for a wind which will steal straw from thrashing-floors (see Lalayan, *ibid.*). For the association between 'Milky Way = Straw-Stealer' with 'straw-stealing wind' see above on Xotorjūr.

On corresponding beliefs particularly in connection with the testimony from Eznik Koťbac'ı (5th cent.) see Garamanlean 1931: 515a; Abet'yan 1941: 18, 23-25, 30-31; B. Arak'elyan 1951: 80.

Arm. *Kat'in cir* or *Cir kat'in Kat'in cir*, lit. 'circle of milk', is apparently a calque from Gr. κύκλος γαλαξίας 'Milky Way'. On this calque, as well as many other designations of the Milky Way in other languages, some of which contain the element 'straw', see Ališan 1910: 128-130; Eilers 1974: 15-17; Karpenko 1981: 14-26.

However, the motif of 'milk' in this connection is not only resulted from learned tampering. A traditional story recorded in Łarabať relates the Milky Way with milk from the breast of a female werewolf [Lalayan 2, 1988: 175; Łanalanyan 1969: 8^{Nr4/6}; Lisic'yan 1981: 66b].

The Armenian designations of the Milky Way and the traditional stories explaining those designations and the origin of the Milky Way (see Abeghian 1899: 49-50; Y. Muradean 1901: 80; Ališan 1910: 129-130; Lalayan 2, 1988: 175; Amatuni 1912: 162a; Karst 1948: 67-68, 76-79; Petoyan 1965: 341; Łanalanyan 1969: 7-9; S. Movsisyan 1972: 27b; Lisic'yan 1981: 66b; Martirosyan/Łaragyozyan, FW 2003) are mostly connected with the idea of stealing, cf., apart from the above mentioned *Yard(a)got* and *Darmanagot* 'straw-stealer', also *Sanamor k'aš*, *Derman hhi*, etc.

On the other hand, the mouse is often named as 'the stealer'. The interpretation of the PIE word for the mouse (**muHs-* = **mūs-*) as a root noun from **meus-* 'to steal' (see Mayrhofer, EWAia 2, 1996: 383-384) is perhaps doubtful because of the vowel. Still, there are other examples confirming the association of the mouse with stealing, see Emeneau 1993: 199 [perhaps also Hittite *kapirt* 'mouse', if from PIE **b^her-* 'to carry, bear', secondarily: 'to steal' (cf. Lat. *fūr* 'thief'), cf. also the denominative verb Lyd. *kabrdokid* 'steal' Mallory/Adams 1997: 387a; but this is uncertain].

One may therefore assume that "Vahagn the Straw-Stealer" was a chthonic deity somehow associated with the mouse, like Apollo Σμινθεύς (from *σμίνθος* 'mouse'), and the Milky Way has originally been considered "the way of Vahagn the Mouse / the straw-stealer". This reconstruction is confirmed by the striking parallel of Russ. *мышина тропка* (*myšína trópka*) 'Milky Way', literally: "the Way of the Mouse", dial. *Myšínny Trópki* (see SlovRusNarGov 19, 1983). The only problem of my hypothesis seems to be the absence of evidence which would prove the direct association of the mouse with the Milky Way in Armenian, like we have for East Slavic. However, even this can be demonstrated by a relic seen in a riddle from Daralagyaz - Keč'ut, recorded by S. Harut'unyan (1965: 8b^{Nr61}): *orə gnac' / mukə mnac'* "The day passed, the mouse stayed". The answer of the riddle is: *ASTŁER* 'stars'. S. Harut'unyan (op. cit. 220b^{Nr61}) points out that "by

the metaphor of the mouse, the smallness of stars is stressed". One might consider this explanation to be unsatisfactory. In the light of what has been said in this paragraph, I assume that this riddle betrays the otherwise lost denotation (or idea) of the Milky Way as "the Way of the Mouse (= Vahagn) / the straw-stealer".

3.1.4 Orion, Libra, and other asterisms

3.1.4.1 Designations for Orion and Libra

As we have seen in 3.1.2, the constellation Orion is called *Hayk*, dial. *Xek*'. Other designations display a fluctuation with 'Libra':

luc 'yoke; burden; the beam of a balance of which the scales are suspended' (Bible+), 'the constellation Libra' (Zak'aria Kat'otikos, 9th cent.), 'pair' (Geoponica); Muš/Bulanəx *luc-k*' is a constellation consisting of eight stars each of them representing a certain personage of the ploughing process: yoked oxen, ploughmen, dinner-bringer, and wolf which attacked the latter [HAB 2: 301b]. S. Movsisyan (1972: 55b) offers almost the same picture, but here the constellation consists of seven stars and is identified as Ursa Major. See also s.v. *luca[t]li* 'Orion'; cf. Lat. *iugula* below. Note that Lat. *iugula* 'the girdle of Orion', as well as Gr. ζυγόν n. (also ζυγός m.) 'yoke of a plough of a carriage; beam of the balance; the constellation Libra' are cognate to Arm. *luc*. Typologically compare OHG *pfluoc* 'Orion' < 'plough', etc. (see Scherer 1953: 188, 224).

Thus: *luc* refers to 'Libra', 'Orion', 'Ursa Major'. Note that Orion is often associated with Pleiades, and the latter is sometimes confused with Ursa Major (see s.v. *alaw(s)unk*' and 3.1.2).

kšir 'weigh, balance, scales' (Bible+) : 'the zodiacal constellation Libra' in Hexaemeron, Anania Širakac'i (see A. G. Abrahamyan 1944: 323, 327, 329-330, 332); dial. Zeyt'un **kširk*' 'the constellation Hayk/Orion', Maraṭa **k'ar-kširk*' 'id.' [Ačarean 1913: 582b, 1104a]. According to S. Movsisyan (1972: 55b), Bulanəx *Kširk*' refers to a part of Orion with three stars forming one line and "called *Šamp'ur Haykay* in astrology". This is in perfect agreement with the testimony of Anania Širakac'i ("Yaṭags kendantatesakac'" : "On zodiacal constellations") which says that the constellation *Kšir* consists of three stars (see A. G. Abrahamyan 1944: 332^{L8}) and is thus, in fact, identic with the girdle of Orion. In another chapter (323^{L12f}), Arm. *Kšir* is represented as equivalent to Gr. *ziwgaws/ziwgos* (cf. ζυγός 'yoke; beam of the balance; the constellation Libra') and Pers. *t[a]razuk*, on which see next. On **šamp'ur-kširk*' see below.

t[a]razuk Pers. 'Libra' (see above), cf. Pahl. *tarāzūg*, NPers. *tarāzū* 'balance, scales; astr. Libra' [MacKenzie 1971: 82]; see HAB 4: 383a. As has been shown

by L. Hovhannisyan 1990: 230, this is a mere record of the Persian term rather than a borrowing. A recent borrowing from New Persian is found in the dialect of Akn: *t'erazu* (glossed by *kšir*) 'a constellation comprising three stars on one line' (see Čanikean 1895: 331). The same dialect also has the appellative *t'erazu* 'balance' found in a folk-song (see op. cit. 439^{L-7}, footnote 4).

šamp'ur 'rod of wood or metal' (Bible+), in the book *Ēfimērtē* and in the dialect of Zeyt'un: 'the constellation Hayk/Orion'; cf. Ararat **šamp'ur-kširk* 'id.' [Ačarean 1913: 820b; HAB 3: 492b]. For the association between *Hayk* [= Orion], *Kšir*, and *Šamp'ur* see also "Bağırq hayoc": Amalyan 1975: 178^{Nr108}, 270^{Nr144}; Ališan 1910: 133-137.

Sasun *Šahink* 'Libra' [Petoyan 1965: 340]; on the appellative *šāhink* 'balance, scales' see Petoyan 1954: 148; 1965: 509.

Conclusion: different designations following a common semantic pattern: 'yoke' or 'balance, scales'. The central idea is here 'pair, yoke' or 'rod, beam of the balance' referring to the girdle of Orion, a short line of three bright stars across the middle of the constellation Orion.

The oldest Armenian designation of this pattern is *luc*, of native origin, cf. *ζυγόν* n. (also *ζυγός* m.) 'yoke; beam of the balance; the constellation Libra', Lat. *iugula* f. 'a part of the constellation Orion, the girdle of Orion', with a suffix somehow comparable with that of Arm. *luc-a[t]li* (see s.v.). The other Armenian designations reflecting the same basic idea, viz. 'yoke', 'balance, scales' or, in the case of *šamp'ur*, 'the beam of a balance' (cf. the corresponding meaning of *luc*), are loans.

3.1.4.2 Further remarks on Hayk/Orion and related issues

According to Movsēs Xorenac'i 1.11 (1913=1991: 36-37; transl. Thomson 1978: 87-88), the skillful archer (*atēnawor*) Hayk, the ancestor of the Armenians, kills Bēl (identified with Nebrovt' in 1.5, p. 20^{L5}) with an arrow, "embalmed the corpse of Bēl with drugs, he [Mar Abas Catina - Thomson, note 5] says, and ordered it to be taken to Hark' and to be buried in a high place in the view of his wives and sons".

Hark' was a district of Turuberan, northwest of Lake Van. The summit on which Bēl has been buried may be identified with one of the mountains to the south of the district of which the river *Metraget* issues. Another source of this river appears in a folk-version of this narrative, according to which Hayk took the corpse of Bēl to the summit of the mountain *Nemrut*' (note the equation Bēl=Nebrovt' above) and burnt it down; the fire turned into water and deepened

downwards into the mountain (see Łanalanyan 1969: 73^{Nr194g}), probably forming the underground sources of the river Metraget which is told to originate from a lake on the summit of the mountain *Nemrut* (op. cit. 89^{Nr233b}). [Satenik Gharagyozyan prepares a paper on this].

As we have seen, the ancestor of the Armenians, Hayk, the skillful archer (*atetnawor*), is identified with the constellation of Orion, which was in a way associated with Pleiades. Particularly marked was the girdle of Orion, consisting of three bright stars across the middle of Orion. Orion's dog is identified with Sirius, the dog-star (see Scherer 1953: 109-116), Arm. *Šn-astt* (lit. 'dog-star'), attested in Anania Širakac'i as the first asterism in the list of eighteen stars or constellations which indicate *zanjrewac' saskut' iwn* "abundance of rains" (A. G. Abrahamyan 1944: 331^{L1f}). On Orion's Belt and Dog-Star see also Ališan 1910: 132-133, 137-138. On Hayk/Orion : Pleiades : Dog-Star and related issues see references s.v. *alaw(s)unk* 'Pleiades' to a number of works by A. Petrosyan, and especially A. Petrosyan 2003: 192-193, 205.

We have also seen that the girdle of Orion (the Three-Star) was often named 'beam of the balance'. In view of this, one may assume that the Persian theonym and asterism *Tīr*, which, next to the meanings 'the angel who is guardian of the cattle', 'name of the fourth month and the 13th day of every month', 'the planet Mercury', 'arrow' etc., denotes also 'a scale-beam' (see Steingass 341a), may have referred to the divine archer of the type Orion/Hayk and/or to 'Orion's belt' as well; cf. also *tīr-andāz* 'archer'. Note the Indo-Iranian term for the Orion's girdle seen in the designation of Sirius **tištriya-* < **tri-str-iyo-* 'belonging to the Three Stars': YAv. *tištriiaēniō*, *-aēnias-catištriia-* 'Sirius-Stars' [Hoffmann/Forssman 1996: 127], *Tištriia-* m. name of Sirius, worshipped as a god, Pahl. *Tištār* 'Sirius', considered as confused with *Tīr* 'the planet Mercury', cf. also Pers. *tīr* 'arrow' [MacKenzie 1971: 83; Nyberg 1974: 193b], Skt. *tiṣya-* (*tiṣya-*) m. name of a fixed star or asterism (RV+), etc. (Lelekov apud MifNarMir 2: 515; Mayrhofer, EWAia 1: 649; cf. Bogoljubov 1987: 9; for another etymology of **Tištriya-* involving *tig-ri-* 'arrow' etc., see Scherer 1953: 113 with ref.). I putatively conclude that Pers. *tīr-andāz* 'archer' too referred to 'Orion' or 'Orion's belt, Three-Star'. This may be corroborated by the following considerations.

The typical Armenian fasting period called *Arājawor-a-c'* (*araj-awor* 'going in front, forerunner') belongs to the movable feast-cycle of the end of the year roughly corresponding to January-February [K'ristHayast 2002: 75]. St. Sargis (mostly considered to be the Christian descendant of the resurrecting god Aray Geṭec'ik) and his dog which was always going in advance of the saint and was

therefore called **araj-awor* 'forerunner', played an essential role in the traditional background of this fasting, the latter having been determined to honour the dog **arajawor* which was killed by wolves [HAB 1: 252-253; Čanikean 1895: 471; Matikean 1930: 153-170; Ľap'anc'yan 1945: 61-68; A. Petrosyan 2001: 158].

Diachronically, the fasting *Arāj-awor-a-c'* of the movable calendar seems to be somehow related with the fixed feast *teain-and-araj* (lit. "going forwards to the Lord, meeting the Lord"), on February 13/14, corresponding to Candlemas (Germ. Lichtmesse), the feast of the presentation of Christ in the Temple or purification of the Virgin Mary celebrated with a great display of candles, on the 2nd of February.

The Armenian popular designation variants of the feast are *Terəndez* [Amatuni 1912: 625a; Davt'yan 1966 (Č'aylu)] or **Terntas* [Ačārean 1913: 1025-1026] (found in numerous dialects); Ararat, Muš *drndez* [Amatuni 1912: 172]; Ľarabaġ *Dərdəra(n)č'* [Davit'yan 1966: 482] or *Dəndəronj* [Lisic'yan 1981: 70b], Goris *Dərdaranč'* [Lisic'yan 1969: 262-263], etc. [Bdoyan 1972: 445a₆₈]. NHB (2: 862b) represents *Tērəntas* as a dialectal equivalent to *Teain-and-araj* and *Tēr-and-ays*, the latter being a re-interpretation as "Lord with/at this" (see also HAB 4: 402b). Note Hačən *Deyendez* 'New Year' vs. Zeyt'un *deyindās* 'Candlemas' [HAB 4: 402b; Ačāryan 2003: 95, 340].

In the same dialect of Hačən, the term for 'Candlemas' is substituted by *šved*, which goes back to *šuot* 'February, the month of freedom of devils; the demon of February' [HAB 3: 537-538].

Kesaria **kučuk* 'a spirit personifying February', in the village of Karmir - 'the feast of *Teainəndaraj* (February 13/14)' [Ačārean 1913: 604a; Hoy 1898]. Ačāryan (ibidem) separately mentions Partizak **kučuk* 'short, with broken handle' (said of a spoon). Ant'osyan (1961: 262) represents these two together: *güjüg* 'a spoon without a handle; February; the little finger'.

The feast *Teainəndaraj/Tērəntas* 'Candlemas' is especially characterized, apart from the display of candles, by setting a big campfire. The young people (including the barren women, as e.g. in Goris) jumped over it, the young couples walked round the fire, and the girls and women singed the hems of the skirts, etc. [Abeghian 1899: 72-73; Lisic'yan 1969: 262-263; 1981: 70b; Bdoyan 1972: 444-447; K'ristHayast 2002: 1018-1020]. Contextually speaking, this festivity is a part of the final, 'chaotic' period of the year associated with wolves and demons (cf. *šuot* 'demon' : 'February' etc.) and immediately followed by the resurrection of the sun and nature and the establishing of the 'cosmic order'.

In both Indian and Iranian systems of the lunar zodiac, the count starts with the asterism Pleiades. In those lists, the first lunar station is the one situated in the vicinity of the point of vernal equinox. It follows from this that both systems have been established in somewhere between the 3rd and 2nd millennia when the point of vernal equinox was located nearby Pleiades [Bogoljubov 1987: 6-8]. Note that the latter is named **parvya-* 'first' (ibid.). [If this term originally derives from PIE **pe/olh₁u-* 'many' (see s.v. *alaw(s)unk'* 'Pleiades'), the association with **parvya-* 'first' must be treated as secondary]. At the end of each year, that is before the vernal equinox, Tištriia- conquered the demon of drought and released the waters [Bogoljubov 1987: 8-9].

In what follows I present an evaluation and outlook of the issue.

1) The feast *Teaṛnəndaṛaj* 'Candlemas' (February 13/14), lit. "going forwards to the Lord, meeting the Lord" can be regarded within the large context of the movable feast-cycle of the end of the year roughly corresponding to January-February, in relation with the (diachronically identic?) typical Armenian fasting period called *Aṛajawor-a-c'* (*aṛaj*-awor 'going in front, forerunner').

2) The central figures of this cycle are St. Sargis, the Christian descendant of the resurrecting god Aray Geṭec'ik, and his dog which was always going in advance of the saint and was therefore called **aṛaj*-awor 'forerunner'. The fasting has been established for commemoration of the dog which has been killed by wolves. The dog is a prominent personage in this cycle, in association with *aralēz-k'* and the like (cf. the well-known motifs of Aray Geṭec'ik, Artawazd, Zangi-Zrangi, etc.). Compare also *St. Karapet*, lit. 'forerunner', i.e. Yovhannēs Mkrtič' = John the Baptist, the forerunner of Jesus Christ. It is remarkable that the festival of *nawasard* 'New Year' has been established for the commemoration of John the Baptist/St. Karapet (Agat'angelos 836 and P'awstos Buzand 4.15), and St. Karapet, according to a traditional story (see Łanalanyan 1969: 254-255), was associated with the dog.

3) The month February with *Teaṛnəndaṛaj* 'Candlemas' etc. formed the final, 'chaotic' period of the year associated with wolves and demons and immediately followed by the resurrection/release of the sun and/or waters, i.e. the rebirth of the nature, and the establishing of the 'cosmic order'. In the Armenian dialect of Hačən, remarkably, *Deyəndəz* < **Terənt/das/z* 'Candlemas' has shifted its meaning into 'New Year' (hardly due to influence by *dayi* < *tari* 'year'), and the meaning 'Candlemas' is represented by *šved*, which goes back to *šuot* 'February, the month of freedom of devils; the demon of February'.

For the contrast with wolves see the previous point 2. In Muš/Bulanəx, one of the stars of the Armenian asterism *luc* (lit. 'yoke; beam of the balance'), usually referring to Orion or Libra (or Ursa Major, which has often been confused with Pleiades), represents the wolf attacking the person who brought dinner for ploughmen.

4) In a deeper perspective, **Teainəndaraj* 'Candlemas' can be interpreted as '(the feast of) the Archer Hayk/Orion = Ilran. **Tištriia-*' in association with Pleiades, marking the vernal equinox and, subsequently, the New Year, and Sirius, Orion's dog. Iranian Tištriia- conquered the demon of drought and released the waters. Similarly, the skillful archer Hayk, the ancestor and eponym of the Armenians, kills Bēl/Nebrovť and (indirectly) gives rise to the underground sources of the river Meṭraget, lit. 'honey-river' (see S. Harut'yunyan 2000: 226, 230, espec. 232; A. Petrosyan 2003: 203-204). The names of both Tištriia- and Hayk are related with the asterism 'Orion's belt' : 'Three-Star'. Note also Arm. *Šn-astt* 'Sirius', lit. 'dog-star', the first in Širakac'i's list of the asterisms which indicate "abundance of rains". See also below, on *Arkawt* (addendum).

5) To my knowledge, no satisfactory etymology has been proposed for Arm. dial. **Terənt/das/z* 'Candlemas'. It can hardly be explained as a corrupted or re-interpreted form of *Teainəndaraj*. I tentatively propose to treat **Terənt/das/z* as reflecting (or influenced by) Pers. *tīr-andāz* 'archer' and testifying by this the unattested theonymical/astral aspect of the latter, comparable to the divine/astral archer Hayk/Orion/Tištriia- (see the previous point 4). Next to *tīr-andāz* 'archer', note the Persian theonym and asterism *Tīr*, which also denotes 'a scale-beam' (cf. the association 'beam of the balance' : 'Orion's belt').

3.1.5 Planets

Most of the planet-names are loans. Of names comprising native Armenian components important are especially those of Venus: *Gišer-a-var*, Sasun *Lus-astt* [Petoyan 1965: 340, 478], Bulanəx *Lusu-asyt* [S. Movsisyan 1972: 55b], etc.

**Bari lusoy astt*: Arčak *Pari lusu astt* 'the planet Venus', literally: 'star of the Good light' (see S. Avagyan 1978: 24b^{L-10}).; cf. dial. *barili/us* 'dawn', literally 'good light' (see Amatuni 1912: 92a); cf. in a folk-song (see Abet'yan 1940: 127^{L-12}): *Bari lusun durs elay* "I went out at dawn". Typologically cf. Iran. **vahu-uša(h)-farnah-* "whose good/benefit is from the farn of Morning Star" (see Bogoljubov 1989: 88).

Aprayoyz 'the planet Saturn'.

Found only in K'aḷuni [HAB 1: 243; L. Hovhannisyan 1990: 220].

Composed as **apr* < Pahl. *abr* 'cloud', Prs. *abr* 'cloud' (see MacKenzie 1971: 4) from PIE **ḡbʰro-* (see s.v.v. *amp*, *ampar*, *amprop*) + *-a-* + *yoyz* 'to move, stir', lit.: 'cloud-mover, rain-bringer' [HAB 1: 243; L. Hovhannisyan 1990: 220]. This is corroborated by Arak'el Siwnec'i (14-15th cent.) who describes Saturn (*Zawhal asth*, on which see s.v. *Astfik*) as *ampayholov* (see A. G. Abrahamyan 1979: 47^{L-15}), composed of *amp* 'cloud' and *holov-* 'to roll, move rolling, turn'.

In the dictionary of Zak'aria (15th century) a similar compound is used to render *amprop* 'thunder', namely: *ampayoyz* < *amp* 'cloud' + *-a-* + *yoyz* (see Amalyan 1966: 97). Compare *yuzumn* (or pl. *yuzmun-k's*) *ampoc* 'frequent in "Yatags ampoc' ew nšanac'" by Anania Širakac'i, 7th cent. (A. G. Abrahamyan 1944: 305-309). Note also *hoṭm-a-yoyz-k* 'with *hoṭm* 'wind' as the first member (Hexaemeron); *anjrew-a-yoyz*, with *anjrew* 'rain' as the first member, in Hexaemeron (see K. Muradyan 1984: 195^{L20}) and Movsēs Xorenac'i 3.68 (1913=1991: 365^{L1}; transl. Thomson 1978: 354): *amaṛn anjrewayoyz* "summer very rainy".

I could not find parallels for this kind of designation of Saturn in Eilers 1976: 88-97, 99-100. Its semantics is rather suitable to Jupiter; cf. the epithet of Zeus *νεφεληγερέτα* 'cloud-gatherer'. Note, however, appellatives like 'Unglück' and 'dunkelfarbig, düster' (Eilers ibid.). Further: Skt. *anila-prakṛti-* 'Saturn' < "having an airy or windy nature".

3.2 Purple Sea

Criticizing heathen notions about the world structure, Anania Širakac'i (7th cent.) writes (A. Abrahamyan 1940: 15^{L16}): *Zcovē asen xelagareal p'ilisop'ayk'n het'anosac* 't'ē *pat aīeal zerkraw, ew i mījī covu ē erkir orpēs ktzi mi*: "The mad heathen philosophers say about the sea that it encircles the earth, and the earth is in the middle of the sea like an island" (cf. also ModArm. transl. Abrahamyan/Petrosyan 1979: 75). It has been assumed that Anania Širakac'i may have taken this information from Cosmas Indicopleustes [Abrahamyan/Petrosyan 1979: 341₁₂].

cirani cov 'Purple Sea', in the famous epic fragment on the birth of Vahagn; see Abelean 1, 1955: 34; Saradževa 1976: 192.

In a medieval riddle [Mnac'akanyan 1980: 313^{Nr230}] written by Nersēs Šnorhali (12th cent., Cilicia), the mirror (*hayeli*) is represented as *ciran cov-ik* 'little purple-sea'.

In a folk morning-prayer from Getark'unik' (R. Grigoryan 1983: 235a): *Erkink' cov a cirani* "The heaven is a purple sea".

In a folk-song consisting of a series of questions and answers of the pattern: "Whom may my little child resemble? - May (or may not) he resemble ..." (R. Grigoryan 1970: 175^{Nr305}), among negative answers, *Ciran cov* 'Purple Sea', as well as *arew* 'sun' and *lusin* 'moon' are mentioned.

In ritual songs of *Cař-zardar* 'Palm Sunday': "My friend fell into the sea, and the sea (*cov*) became purple (*cirani*)" [R. Grigoryan 1970: 317-319, 321].

Compare dial. *arun cov* 'Blood-Sea': in a number of variants for the riddle on thunder or hail the heavenly sea is represented as 'blood-sea': Širak *aryunacov*, Basen *arni cov*, Borč'alu (Loři) *aren cov*, *arin cov* (see Abeghian 1899: 77; S. Harut'yunyan 1965: 11-12, 223-224); in geographically unlocalized variants of the riddle: *arən-cov*, *arun cov* [S. Harut'yunyan 1965: 61a^{Nr633a}/251a, 204a^{Nr2087}/321b].

In a folk-song from Moks (Yovsēp'eanc' 1892: 22^{L11f}):

Cař əm ker meč' arənkın covirun,

Xawk' əm ker meanč' en covun.

"There was a tree in blood-seas, there was a bird in that sea".

In a folk-song (R. Grigoryan 1970: 352^{Nr752}), *Lusunka k'eri* "Uncle Lusunka" says he is coming *Abrahamu covu veren* "from over the sea of Abraham".

3.3 Time

3.3.1 Temporal, spatial and processual aspects

PIE **dieu-* has two basic meanings: 'day' and 'heaven'. These, in fact, reflect the temoral and spatial aspects of the basic meaning 'daylight'. Note also Lat. *Saeculum* (Weitenberg, p.c.).

Here are some more examples for the interchange between temporal, spatial and processual aspects:

and, *andēn* 'then, in that time; there, in that place' (both in the 5th cent.);

atean 'meeting, gathering; judgement, interrogation' : 'court-room' : 'time, while' [HAB 1: 286-287];

žam 'time; hour' : 'church ceremony' : 'church' [HAB 2: 221-224];

vayr 'place' : 'field, commons' : 'a while', *vayrkean* 'minute' [HAB 4: 300b];

dial. *teṭə* 'while' (< *teṭ* 'place'); cf. in a fairy-tale from Loři: *manelis teṭə* 'while spinning'; *xač'ə gnalis teṭə* 'while going to the Cross' (see HŽHek' 8, 1977: 73^{L2} and 75^{L18}, respectively); in Šamšadin (Tavuš): *ərek'nakə mer mtnilis teṭə* "when the sun was setting" [Xemč'yan 2000: 28a^{L9}].

Next to these examples, Ačāryan (HAB 1: 286-287) also mentions Pers. *gāh*. One may add more:

Parth. *tcr* [**tažar*] ‘palace, dwelling’; as an astronomical term, ‘double hour, period of two hours’ [Boyce 1977: 86];

Lat. *saeculum*, *-ulī* n. ‘the body of individuals born at a particular time, generation; (pl.) the succession of generations; a breed, race; the present time, the contemporary generation, the age; human life time, generation; century; human life, the world’ (“Oxford Latin Dictionary”);

Celt. *bitu-* ‘world’ < *‘life’ (see Meid 1985); this is reminiscent of Arm. **ašxarh mtneł* ‘to marry’, lit. ‘to enter into world/life’.

Arm. *ropē* ‘second, moment, eye-wink’ (= ‘element/unit of time’ - temporal aspect) : *ropē-k* ‘world’ (= ‘elements of space’ - spatial aspect)’.

3.3.2 Seasons

Among the PIE seasonal terms, ‘winter’ and ‘spring’ are stable, while ‘summer’ and ‘autumn’ are liable to innovations. One assumes that the PIE system of seasons comprised three seasons, one of them representing ‘summer and autumn’; for references and discussion see Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 852-853, 853-854₁ = 1995: 750-751₂₀.

The new terms for ‘summer’ often derive from words for ‘year’, cf. Arm. *amain* ‘summer’ : OHG *sumar* ‘summer’ vs. *am* ‘year’ : Skt. *sāmā-* ‘year, season’ etc. (see s.v.v.), as well as Russ. *leto* ‘summer’ : *let* ‘year’.

The PIE word for ‘autumn’ has frequently been replaced by derivatives like ‘after summer’, ‘before winter, harvest’, etc. [Baldi/Mallory apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 504b]. The autumn (and/or the end of the summer) is also associated with ‘harvest-time’ [E. Hofmann 1932: 132]. The year in Indo-Iranian calendar was divided into six seasons (on Iranian *gāhānbārs*, six well-defined solar dates rather than seasons, see Hartner 1985: 749-756), of Indic names of which only two reflect PIE seasonal terms: *vasantā-* ‘spring’ and *hemantā-* ‘winter’ (see Èrlx 1989: 246).

The Armenian seasonal terms are usually stable. Some exceptional replacements have taken place in a few dialects. In Nor Naxijewan, *ašun* ‘autumn’ has been replaced by **kiz/kuyz* : *giz*, rural *guyz* (see P’ork’šeyan 1971: 220b): *kuyzə kuka* “the autumn comes” (52b^{L8}). Note that in the same song the winter is represented by the native, basic Armenian term, viz. *jmeṛn* (52a^{L10}): *Cmeṛə anc’av, puk’ə halec’av* “The winter passed, the snow melted”. Other illustrations: *ušgeg kizin* ‘in the late autumn’ (57b^{L4}); *kuyzə egav* “the autumn came” (79a^{L3}).

In a remarkable passage (80b^{L14f}), all the seasons are mentioned: *kizin, cmeṛə ew paherin cin xist ateg er, ama erb amaṛə egav, cin p’erātəc’av* “In autumn, winter

and in fasts, the horse was very good, but when the summer came, the horse <...>. As we can see, the winter and summer are represented by the native terms *cmē* and *amaṛ*, whereas *kiz* appears instead of *ašun* 'autumn', and *pah-er* 'fasts' functions for the spring (or is somehow related with Pers. *bahār* 'spring?'), of which the native term is *garun*. The words *jmeṛ* and *amaṛ* are also mentioned in 80b^{L9f}. For the origin of **kiz/kuyz* note Pers. *gūz* 'autumn' (see Steingass 1102b). Next to *amōr* from ClArm. *amaṛn* 'summer' (q.v.), of native/IE origin (see HAB 1: 146; Ačāryan 2003: 296), the dialect of Zeyt'un has also *t'amuz* (gen. *t'amzon*) 'summer', borrowed from Arab. *tammūz* 'July' (Ačāryan 2003: 186).

3.4 Geographical terms

3.4.1 'mountain' : 'forest'

Semantic shift 'mountain' > 'forest', perhaps through intermediary 'wooded mountain = Bergwald'; cf. the IE and non-IE parallels mentioned in Tolstoj 1969: 22ff, 69, 71-73, 80-88; Martynov 1971: 14 (in *Ètimologija* 1968); Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984: 666; Toporov, PrJaz (2), 1979: 164-165; as well as OHG *hart* etc. 'Bergwald' from 'Stein(haufen)'. Further examples: PIE **gw(o)rH-eh₂-* 'mountain': Skt. *gīrī-* m. 'mountain, hill', OCS *gora*, Czech *hora* 'mountain', Pol. *góra* 'mountain' : Lith. *giria* 'wood', Slk. *hora* '(wooded) mountain', Sln. *gora* 'mountain, (dial.) wood', etc. For the meaning 'wooded mountain' see also Nagy 1974: 116, on **perkʷunio-*.

In Armenian, this semantic shift is represented by *sar* 'mountain' > Hamšen *sar* 'forest' [Ačāryan 1947: 253]. See also *antaṛ* 'forest'. The opposite development: Arm. **c'axut* > Hamšen dial. *c'axud* 'forest' [Ačāryan 1947: 256], which in Muslim Hamšen also means 'mountain' [Bert Vaux, 21.10.03, Hamšen Conference, Leiden]; *cmak* 'dark place': dial. 'forest'; according to Gabikean (1952: 475), Muš *cmak* means 'brushy mountain'.

3.4.2 'to stream, flow' > 'water(ed), irrigated land' > 'island, river-shore'

OHG. *auwa*, *ouwa* 'meadow; island', Germ. *aue*, *au* 'Niederung, Flusslandschaft, Wiese; Insel', and others derive from Germanic **ahw(j)ō* 'water' (cf. OHG. *aha*, OEngl. *éa* 'water; river', etc.); cf. also OEngl. *éaland*, *éalond* 'island' = *éa* 'water; river' + *land*. The involved semantic development is: 'of or pertaining to water, watery, watered' > 'watered place, meadow, island'. Further examples can be seen in Russ. *ostrov* 'island' < PIE **srou-*, cf. Russ. *strujá* 'stream', Lith. *sraujá*, Latv. *strauja* 'stream', Skt. *srav-* 'to stream, flow', etc. (see s.v.v. *arū*, *arog*); Skt. *dvīpa-* 'island, island in a river, sandbank' (RV+) <

**dui-h₂p-ó-*, lit. 'having water on two sides', cf. Skt. *áp-* 'water', Toch. AB *āp* f. 'water, river, stream', etc.

The semantic development can also be seen in Armenian; see s.v. *getar(u)*. Another possible example is dial. (Urmia, Salmast) *urj* 'an island or peninsula in a river', if belonging to *urd* 'a small canal' (q.v.).

3.5 Animals

3.5.1 young animals : young branches : child, generation (human, fauna and flora)

See s.v. *erinj* 'calf' : 'vine', cf. *ort* 'id.'.

morč, *morč* 'young branch, stick' > Xarberd *morč(ik)*, Dersim *mərj* 'thicket? <mac'ar>; young branch' [HAB 3: 349b; Bařramyan 1960: 93a] : Sebastia *manuk-morčuk* 'young (children, orphans)' [Gabikyan 1952: 410] : Akn *morč-ik* 'offspring, son or daughter' [HAB 3: 349b].

beet

The plant beet plays an important role in the semantic field 'stem/stalk/root of a plant; tribe, generation', cf. *tak* 'root of a plant; tribe, family, kin' (cf. also Kurd. *tak* 'stem, stalk', considered an Armenian borrowing) refers to 'beet' in several dialects' (see HAB 4: 360). For the semantic association 'beet' : 'young branches, shoots' note Arm. *bazuk* 'arm' has generally shifted the semantics to 'beet', but in other dialects it refers to 'thin and green branches of vine' (Arabkir), 'the stalk, stem of a plant' (Akn), etc. [HAB 1: 377]; *čakəndti bazuk* in "Bžškan jioy" (13th cent.), see Č'ugaszyan 1980: 110^{L21}.

Hebrew *t(')ō* 'wild ox or a kind of antelope' corresponding to Gr. *ὄρυξ* and Arm. *yamoyr*, in Isaiah 51.20 stands for Gr. *σεντλίον* 'beet' and Arm. *čakndet* 'beet'. In this respect, a Partizak riddle [Tēr-Yakobyan 1960: 390^{L1f}] seems particularly interesting. Here, *č'ük'üntür* 'beet' is equated with *karmir kov* 'red cow'. The same is seen in a riddle from Trapizon or Hamšen (collection of Nerses Fntk'yan; see T'orlak'yan 1986: 205^{L-17}): *Karmir kovə ktrec'ank', kat'il mə arun durs č'ekav*: "We cut (slaughtered) the red cow, not a drop of blood came out". It should be borne in mind, however, that the bovid animals are frequently found in riddles representing different subjects; cf. *karmir kov* 'red cow' referring the fire (T'orlak'yan, *ibid.*, the next riddle). Compare also *karmir eiz* 'red bullock' equated with *keřas* 'cherry etc.' in Trapizon [Haykuni 1906: 351^{L-5f}]; *sew kov* 'black cow' = *bořk* 'radish' in Moks (Karčkana Nanəkanc') [Haykuni 1906: 350^{L16}]. In view of what has been said above on Gr. *σεντλίον* 'beet' etc., nevertheless, the equation 'beet' : 'cow' in riddles may be significant.

Bearing in mind this material, one may approach Muš *čav*, Bulanəx, Širak, Aparan *čavik* ‘leaf of beet’ (Amatuni 1912: 80a; see also HayLezBrbBař 3, 2004: 374a) in a broader context of internal comparison. Karčewan and Kak’avaberd *čev* ‘young animal’ are listed in glossaries of dialectal words without any inner-Armenian correspondence (see H. Muradyan 1960: 221b and 1967: 198b, respectively).

Formally, it can represent Arm. *čiw* ‘shin, shank’ which also refers to the leg in humans and in other vertebrates, as well as to the arm and wing (cf. T’iflis, Ararat, Łazax, Łarabař *haw-či/aw* ‘poultry’ [Ačarean 1913: 652a]), but a connection with **čaw* ‘leaf of beet’ seems semantically more attractive, especially in view of Metri *gəř-a-čev* ‘the child of a thief’ (see Ałayan 1954: 294) = *goř* ‘thief’ + *-a-* + *čev*, where *čev* apparently means something like ‘child, generation’ and should be linked with Karčewan and Kak’avaberd *čev* ‘young animal’. The vowel development *a* > *ε* after unvoiced consonants in monosyllables is not very common in Kak’avaberd, but we do have some examples here, cf. *čanc* ‘fly’ > *čenj* or *čänj*, *čas* ‘dinner’ > *čes*, *č’ap* ‘measure’ > *č’ep* (Varhavar), etc. (see H. Muradyan 1967: 21). In Karčewan there are more examples (see H. Muradyan 1967: 19).

As to the literary language, it is tempting to consider *čawak* ‘child’ (also in *čavaket* ‘daughter’), attested only by grammarians. Lagarde (see HAB 2: 85a) and Ĵahukyan (1967: 210, 308) link *čawak* with *zawak* *a*-stem ‘child, offspring, tribe, generation’ (Bible+; widespread in dialects). Ĵahukyan (1967: 210) proposed to connect *čavak* with Avest *taoxman* etc. (see HAB 4, s.v. *tohm* ‘tribe’), which is formally improbable. As to *zawak*, an Iranian origin is considered possible (see Ĵahukyan 1987: 437, 555, 571), cf. Sogd. *’zwn* (op. cit. 525, with a question-mark). The latter (*’z’wn*) means ‘being, creature; existence; child’ [MacKenzie 1970: 43]. This etymology does not seem to be secure. There have been other attempts, e.g. Av. *zəθwa* > **zahwak* > *zawak* (Marr, see HAB 2: 85). Olsen (1999: 151₂₈₅, 244-245, 769₁₄, 784, 858) derives from Ir. **zanθa-(ka-)* < **gēnh₁to-*, cf. Av. *zəθa* ‘birth etc.’, MPers. *z’hk* ‘child, offspring’ vs. *z’tk* ‘child’, with the development *θ* < *w* in intervocalic position. She admits (245₇₆), however, that there is no reliable example of the development, and mentions *hambaw* ‘fame’ with a question-mark. I therefore prefer positing Iran. **za(n)θwa-ka-*, cf. OAv. *hu-zəntu-* ‘of good lineage, noble’, *haozəθβa-* n. ‘good relationship’, Skt. *ĵātu* ‘from birth, by nature’, *ĵantú-* m. ‘creature, being, tribe, race’, from **g(e)nh₁-tu-* (cf. Marr’s etymology), or Iran. **zā-va-ka-* < *gñh₁-uo-*.

For the alternation *č* - *z* Jahukyan (1967: 308) only mentions *čawak* : *zawak*, but there are more of such examples, e.g. *xoz* vs. *xoč* ‘pig’.

The internal comparison helps thus to restore Arm. **čaw(-)* ‘child, generation; young animal; leaf of beet’. All the three aspects (viz. human, fauna and flora) are present.

3.5.2 ‘chthonic beasts or insects’ : ‘pagan, abominable, demon’ : ‘grandmother, lady’

[This chapter is based upon a study for which I received funding support from the Knights of Vartan FAS, to whom I express my deep gratitude. Parts of it was presented in a joint report shared with Satenik Gharagyozyan at the 10th General Conference of the AIEA, Vitoria-Gasteiz, 7-10 September 2005 (see Martirosyan/Laragyozyan 2005), and at the Workshop *Cultural, linguistic and ethnological interrelations in and around Armenia* in Michaelbeuern, July 4-7, 2007].

3.5.2.1 ‘woman, lady, (grand)mother’ : ‘insect, snail, frog etc.’ : ‘demon, spirit’

**mam-uk* ‘little grandmother’ > ‘spider’: Muš *mamuk* ‘spider’ [Amatuni 1912: 149-150], Svedia *māmeüġ* ‘spider’ < **mam-uk* [Andreasyan 1967: 374a], Polis, Nor Naxiġewan *mamuk* ‘id.’, see Ačarean 1913: 748a and HAB 4: 186b, with parallels from other languages: Kurd. *pirik* ‘grandmother; spider’, Georg. *deda-zardeli* ‘*mother-spider’, etc. Further: *satanay* ‘Satan’ > dial. ‘spider’ (see HAB 4: 164a, 180a; cf. also 1: 658a); Metri, Karčewan, Kak‘avaberd *tat* ‘scorpion’, literally, ‘grandmother’ (see s.v. *tat* ‘grandmother’).

mor, morm ‘tarantula’ (MArm. and dial.): Gr. *Μορμώ, -όος -οῦς, Μορμών, -όος* f. ‘she-monster, bogey’ (also used by nurses to frighten children), generally ‘bugbear’, Lat. *formidō, inis* f. ‘fear, terror; a thing which frightens, bogey’; note also Gr. *μύρμηξ* ‘ant; fabulous animal in India’, Lat. *formica* ‘ant’, and especially Arm. dial. (Lori) *mormən* (see s.v. *mor, morm* ‘tarantula’).

Similar formations can also be found for the **snail**, cf. Łarabał *ana-xat’un* [Ačarean 1913: 93b], *ala-xat’un* (see HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 12a; also Martirosyan/Laragyozyan FW 2003, Goris). In both forms the second component is *xat’un* ‘Lady’. According to Ačaryan (ibid.), *ana-* is either the female personal name *Anna*, or Turk. *anne* ‘mother’. The latter seems more probable especially because, next to Goris *anaxat’um/n*, Margaryan (1975: 375a) also cites *mama-xat’um*. As to the variant *ala-*, we must be dealing with *al* ‘female demon’.

Note especially that, by Hazāra in Afghanistan, the female demon *āl* is called *al-xātū* < **āl-xātūn* 'Herrin Āl', see Monchi-Zadeh 1990: 6^{Nr9}.

Mehri, Karčewan, Kak'avaberd *tat* 'scorpion', literally, 'grandmother'; see s.v. *tat*.

In a poem by Arak'el Siwnec'i /14-15th cent./ [Potureau 1914: 52, stanza 30] the Virgin Mary is equated to 'spider':

*Sard es lusefēn yankean,
Aranc' niwt' hines zostayn;
Ansermn yəṭac'ar əzBan.*

"You are a shiny spider in the corner,
You weave a web without material;
You begot (became impregnated by) the Logos without sperm".

Designations for '**lady-bug**' (see for more detail s.v. *zatic* 'sacrifice; Passover; Resurrection feast, Easter; feast'; dial. also 'ladybug'):

'(bug of the) Virgin Mary': Germ. *Marienkäfer*, Engl. *ladybug*, Arm. diall. Arčak/Van *mayram xat'un* 'the Lady Mariam', etc.;

'cow of God': Arm. dial. Łarabał **astucoy kov/eznak*, Russ. *bož'ja korovka*, Lith. *diėvo karvytė*, Roman. *vaca domnului*, etc.

Frog

In a traditional story (on a place called *T'ornatap*', close to Goris) told by Šalunc' Mak'an and recorded by Sero Xanzadyan in 1947 (Łanalanyan 1969: 98^{Nr263}), a young woman is metamorphosed to a *kyořt'unk* 'frog'. A similar story from Alaškert narrates about a pregnant woman turning into a frog too (op. cit. 130^{Nr355}). There is a considerable body of ethnographic data showing that frogs were associated with ideas of fertility and rain, and were considered to be female devils or mermaids; frog-shaped talismans (or those made of frogs) were largely used by (particularly, pregnant) women [Bdoyan 1972: 476-478, 495-497; A. Israyelyan 1979: 86]. On an oracular practice related with a big frog living in a well in the village of Šxnoc' (Karin/Erzrum region) see Łanalanyan 1969: 104^{Nr283}. Compare the oracular practice with Finno-Ugric "Golden Woman" and a silver frog (see Sokolova 1990: 156).

The motif of a girl transforming into a frog is widespread also in fairy-tales; see e.g. HŽHek' 3: 243, 326, 489; 4: 394; 5: 189, 593; 6: 69; 9: 195 [= Haykuni 1902: 172], 343-346; 10: 73; 11: 200; 13: 284 (for these references I am indebted to S. Łaragyozyan). In two of these, namely those from HŽHek' 9, *Kirkīan*

Sanamer and *Xorxor xanum* seem to implicitly represent an aquatic female deity personified as a frog and associated with weaving.

In a fairy-tale edited/retold by Nazinyan (1986: 79) one finds a contrast *gort* 'frog' (female) : *agriav* 'raven' (male).

According to N. Mkrtč'yan (PtmSivHisHay 1965: 455; N. Mkrtč'yan 2006: 152, 584), the word *surp* 'frog, toad' in the Armenian dialect of Sivri-Hisar derives from homonymous *surp* 'holy' < ClArm. *surb* 'pure; holy' (q.v.). Since, as we have seen, the frog plays a significant role in rituals and folk-beliefs, the interpretation of N. Mkrtč'yan should be taken seriously. Note also Partizak *mariam-gort* 'a big frog' [Tēr-Yakobean 1960: 512], obviously composed of *Mariam* 'St. Mary' and *gort* 'frog'.

We have seen that the frog is associated mainly with the female principle. It is interesting to note in this respect that Arm. *gort*, *i*-stem 'frog' (q.v.) may be derived from QIE feminine **vord-iH-*, cf. Latv. *varde*.

Further examples:

'butterfly': Arm. *xipilik* (mostly dial.) 'nightmare, spirit; an illness; beautiful girl; doll; trefoil; etc.' [HAB 2: 369]; Russ. *babočka* 'butterfly' from *baba* 'woman, wife', etc.

'damsel-fly, dragonfly, mosquito': Engl. *damsel-fly* "the slender dragon-fly *Agriion Virgo*, and kindred species, called in French *demoiselle*" from *damsel* 'a young unmarried woman' (OxfEnglDict).

3.5.2.2 'hyena, wolf, jackal' : 'mule, ass' : 'ape' : 'heathen, abominable, outlaw'

The association between the ideas 'heathen' and 'impure, abominable' is trivial; cf. e.g. Koriwn 15: <...> *ew hogewor siroyn erandmamb zaft ew zžang šarawahot diwac'n ew zsnotiagorc paštamann i bac' k'erēr*, <...>. - "<...>," and with spiritual love and energy he removed [from them] the purulent uncleanness of the worship of spirits and false idols, <...>" (see Pivazyán 1981: 110^{L24f}, English transl. by Bedros Norehad - 285).

This is also reflected in the language. Adjectives like 'very dirty', 'abominable', 'lascivious', etc., can be related with similar ideas within religious context and referring to heresy, sect, demons, chthonic animals, etc. Very often the bat, the lizard, and insects like the butterfly, the dragon-fly, worms, etc., appear in this context. Also the physical illness can relate with moral or religious illness, as it were.

Arm. *gēj*, *o*-stem adj. 'moist; lascivious', dial. (Łazax) 'very dirty', subst. 'moisture' (refers also to eye-pus) is derived from PIE **g^{wh}oid^h-io-*, cf. Russ.

židkij, SCr. *židak*, etc. 'liquid, watery' (note also dial. *žid-* referring to dirtiness), perhaps also Gr. *δεῖσα* f. 'slime, filth'. The basic meaning is 'liquid; liquid dirtiness; moral dirtiness', see s.v. *gēj*. Compare also Russ. dial. *židi* pl. 'forest demons; heretics', if related, as well as Armenian **žiz-* in *žžak* (T'ovmay Arcruni 1.3 - 9-10th cent.), *žžmak*, *ž(i)žmunk*, **žžuank* 'insects, worms; hallucination, mirage; nightmare' and *žži* 'dragon-fly'. Note also Arm. dial. Muš **pařavi ččer* or *čter*, Xarberd **pařvu čičar* 'a kind of river-mollusc' (see Ačaryan 1913: 896-897).

**čipri/čpur* 'eye-pus' : *čpurin* 'dragon-fly'; note that the previous term, that is *gēj*, also refers to eye-pus.

mctneay, *mctni* 'a Christian sect' : 'abominable'. Ačaryan (HAB 3: 330a) does not record dialectal forms. However, Dersim *məjətnəd* 'abominable' (see Bařramyan 1960: 153b), apparently, belongs here.

borborianos, *borborit(on)*, etc. 'a Christian sect' : 'lascivious' from Gr. *Βορβοριανοί*, *Βορβορίται*, cf. *βόρβορος* 'mire, filth', etc. [HAB 1: 477a].

bor-ot 'leprous' > Georg. *borot'i* 'evil, bad, unjust, dangerous', Tuš *bort'ob* 'dirtiness'. In the Armenian dialect of Malat'ia *borot* means 'heretic' (see HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 212a). Ačaryan (HAB 1: 475a) cites several examples which corroborate the semantic relationship 'leprous' : 'bad; unpure, dirty': Pers. *pīs* 'leprous; dirty' (cf. Arm. *pisak* 'leprous' and dial. of Van and Łarabař *p'is* 'dirty' [HAB 4: 84b; Ačarean 1902: 352]); Arm. dial. (Van) *kř-ot* 'leprous; bad, useless'. The latter is identic with Ararat, Muš, Nor Bayazet *gr-ot* 'id.' (see Amatuni 1912: 154b; Ačarean 1913: 257b; HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 286b). No etymology of the word is known to me. One may assume that *gr-ot* is derived from **gřr*, an unattested ablaut form of *gayr* 'dirt', cf. *z-gayr*- 'vomit, etc.'.

In view of these examples, the beasts like hyena and wolf become particularly significant. Apart from the above-mentioned *bor* 'leprosy', probably related with *boreni* 'hyena' (q.v.), note also *k'os-ot* 'scabbed' (from *k'os* 'a kind of leprosy, scab'), in dialects also 'dirty, useless' [Ačarean 1913: 1121b; HAB 4: 588a] : *k'awt'ar-k'osi* 'hyena; old witch', which is composed of *k'awt'ar* 'hyena; old witch' and *k'os* 'scab'.

Arm. dial. *k'awt'ar-k'os(i)* 'hyena; old witch' has been preserved in T'iflis, Łarabař [Ačarean 1913: 1107a; HAB 4: 567a], Łazax [Ananyan, HayKendAšx 1, 1961: 421]. Ačaryan (HAB 4: 567a) correctly represents the word with the meaning 'hyena; old witch', though earlier (1913: 1107a) he described the animal as 'a kind of rabid wolf'. Ananyan (ibid. 421, 425, 427, 429, 432) corroborates the

meaning 'hyena' and states several times that this is the animal called *mard-a-gel* 'werewolf'.

The first component of the compound is *k'awt'ar/r* or 'hyena; old witch'. This word is poorly attested but is widespread in dialects [HAB 4: 567a]. In "Bargirk' hayoc'" (Amalyan 1975: 58^{Nr367}, 337^{Nr212}), *k'awt'ar* and *k'ot'arinē* are represented as synonymous to *boreni* 'hyena', and are said to eat the flesh of corpses. The word is borrowed from Pers. *kaftār* 'hyena'. For other forms in various languages see HAB 4: 567a; Bläsing 2000: 39. Bläsing (ibid.) records Turk. dial. *kafdar*, *kaftarküç* (Kars), *kaftaküski* (Ardvin) 'hyena', Azerbaijani *kaftar* 'hyena; (pejorative) 'alter, häß-licher Kerl, alter Knacker', *kaftarkuş* 'id.', *kaftarkus* 'alter Stinker', mentioning also Arm. *k'awt'ar/r* and *k'awt'ar-k'os(i)*. He points out that the element *-kUs/s̃* is unclear. I suggest to treat Arm. *k'awt'ar-k'os(i)* as containing *k'os* 'a kind of leprosy, scab' (Bible+; widespread in dialects). The etymology of *k'os* is uncertain; derived from **kosso-* (cf. Lith. *kasýti* 'to scratch constantly' etc.) or compared with Arm. *k'or* 'itch' (see s.v.). The Turkish dialectal (Kars, Ardvin) and Azerbaijani forms should be seen, then, as Armenian loans. Note that their geographical distribution is roughly compatible to that of the Armenian (T'iflis, Łarabaŋ).

Marzvan **gayl-parav* 'a female evil spirit that like the *ali-paraw* strangles newborn children' [Ačarean 1913: 219a]. The second component is *paraw* 'old woman'.

ǰoreak 'a kind of small locust', Bible+; e.g. Leviticus 11.22, rendering Gr. *βροῦχος* (see Wevers 1997: 150). In Geoponica /72/ (13th cent.) - rendering Greek 'hyena'. According to NHB 2: 676a and Astuacaturean 1895: 1300b, **ǰoreak** is attested also in 2 Paralipomenon 6.28. In the text of Xalat'eanc' (1899: 63b), one finds *marax* 'locust' instead.

As is suggested in NHB 2: 676a, **ǰoreak** is composed of *ǰori* 'mule' and dimin. *-ak*, though Ačaryan (HAB 4: 132a) seems sceptical about this.

Ačaryan (HAB 4: 132a) mentions no dialectal forms, and considers the meaning 'hyena' attested in Geoponica to be uncertain. However, in Amirdovlat' Amasiac'i (see S. Vardanian 1990: 94-95, §397, comment 596₃₉₇; MiġHayBair 1, 1987: 138a; cf. NHB 1: 508b), one finds *gayl-ǰori* (gen. *gayl-ǰoru*), *gayl-ǰorek* 'hyena', with *gayl* 'wolf' as the first member. Since in such compounds *gayl* usually functions as attributive to the animal represented in the second member (cf. *gayl-agraw* 'a kind of raven', with *agraw* 'raven'), *ǰori/ǰorek* as the second member of *gayl-ǰorek* means 'hyena' whereas the actual meaning of the compound could be 'a kind of hyena'. The evidence for the compound is

corroborated by dial. (Büt'ania/Nikomedia) **gayl-ǰori* 'a kind of predator' < *gayl* 'wolf' + *ǰori* (see Ačarean 1913: 219a), where unsuffixed *ǰori* is used instead of *ǰoreak*.

The existence of *ǰoreak* 'hyena' is also confirmed by more straightforward and unambiguous evidence, both literary and dialectal. In a medieval riddle by Nersēs Šnorhali (12th cent., Cilicia) [Mnac'akanyan 1980: 298^{Nr 189}], the animal called *ǰoreak* is represented as follows:

*Azniw uni ink'n žanik',
Išxanayk' mi ir handipik';
Gerezmanac' uni balnik',
Uti zmeṛealn u zoskrtik'.*

Translation: "He has tusks of good kind; do not you dare to encounter him! He has the key to graves, and he eats the dead and bones".

In the glossary of the book, Mnac'akanyan (1980: 503b) has *ǰoreak* 'locust' referring to the very same riddle Nr 189. This does not make any sense. Given the evidence represented above, one can safely postulate that here too we are dealing with the meaning 'hyena' of *ǰoreak*, and this perfectly fits in the context.

In his list of animal-names in Svedia, Andreasyan (1967: 162) mentions *čiræg* 'hyena; - Arab. /*dabaa*'. Taking the word as "formally identic with *ǰori* 'mule' (> Svedia *čira*, op. cit. 381b; in Ačaryan 2003: 586 - *ǰ'ira*), he does not give any further comment. I think it simply reflects *ǰoreak*, confirming the meaning 'hyena'. Note that Nersēs Šnorhali is from Cilicia, and the dialects of Cilicia and Svedia are appropriate locus for MArm. items (cf. Ačaryan 2003: 12-13, 350). It is remarkable that the very same dialect of Svedia has **ǰorepatik* 'hyena' which probably contains *ǰori* 'mule' (see below) and parallels with *yušk-a-parik/všk-a-pari-k* 'a mythical being' = 'ass' (cf. Pers. *vušk* 'ass') + *parik* 'fairy'. Further, note Svedia *bərrə-j'irig* 'hyena' = Arab. *barriṭ* 'wild' + *ǰoreak* [HAB 4: 61b]. For the association of the hyena and the wolf with the witch or female demon see below.

The association 'mule' : 'wolf, hyena' should not surprise anyone. Firstly, both are "out of the Law". For the wolf see below. As to the mule, the fact that this animal is unique in not having been created by the Creator (cf. the medieval riddles by the very same Nersēs Šnorhali, in Mnac'akanyan 1980: 293^{Nr177}, 335^{Nr49}) seems sufficient. Secondly, both meanings can derive from 'brown/grey animal', cf. Gr. *κίλλος* 'grey' : *κίλλος* m. 'ass' and Cyprian 'cicada' (glossed as

τέτιξ πρῶινός in Hesychius); Fr. *gris* 'grey' : *grison* 'donkey'; Arm. **bor-* 'brown (animal)' : *boreni* 'hyena', probably also *vorak* 'locust' (unattested).

I conclude that we have strong evidence for MArm. and dial. *ǰoreak* 'hyena'.

According to Ačāryan (2003: 350, 426, 585; HAB 4: 61b), Svedia *j'irəbätig* 'hyena' is composed of *j'ira* (< ClArm. *ǰori* 'mule') and ClArm. *parik* 'a mythical being, spirit', cf. *yušk-a-parik* / *všk-a-pari-k* 'a mythical being' = 'ass' (cf. Pers. *vušk* 'ass') + *parik*. Thus, **ǰori-(a-)parik* 'mule-demon' (> 'hyena') perfectly parallels the pattern of *yušk-a-parik* 'ass-demon'. (See also **ēš-xīan*). There is ample evidence corroborating the "hyenic" aspect of *ǰori* 'mule', see *ǰoreak*.

Elsewhere (Ačāryan 2003: 527), the first component is considered to be *ǰur* ('water'). Compare in this respect **ǰr-parik* which is recorded by Ačāryan (1913: 945b) without any reference to the dialectal area. Interestingly, the meaning of this form is not 'hyena' but 'an old woman which cures with sorcery and spelling'. This can be identified with Akn *ǰrporik* 'old woman', perhaps 'witch', according to S. Erēc' (1898: 380a), reflects **ǰr-parik* with the sound change *a > ɔ*. In all his examples, however, as well as in those of Gabričlean 1912: 23, the sound change is seen in the position before the nasal *-n-*, and one is not sure whether it applies in other conditions too.

If **ǰr-parik* 'old woman, witch, sorceress' indeed comprises *ǰur* 'water' and *parik*, its original meaning would have been 'female water spirit, nymph'. Svedia *j'irəbätig* hardly contains *ǰur* 'water' because it means 'hyena' (unless one assumes a semantic development 'female water spirit' > 'old witch, sorceress' > 'hyena').

Ačāryan (2003: 426) mentions the change *-r- > -t-* not specifying it any further. The sound change may be dissimilative. Usually the first *-r-* is dissimilated (see 2.9.2.2). However, the opposite is possible too, cf. *varagoyr* 'curtain', which has a final *-l* in Zeyt'un, T'iflis, and Moks (see HAB 4: 314b; Ačāryan 1952: 293; 2003: 129, 339). But this is not necessarily the case in view of Hačən *t'ubul* < *p'etur* 'feather' (see Ačāryan 2003: 129) which implies that in *varagoyr* and *p'etur* we may be dealing with a special development, viz. final *-r* yielding *-l* after *-oy/-u-*. If this is the case, **ǰori-patik* remains unparalleled. One may therefore take into account also other factors such as contamination; note, for instance, Sebastia *čr-patu* 'frog; (pejorative) a new-born child of a woman' (see Gabikean 1952: 379).

The association 'ape' : 'jackal' can be illustrated by the word *t'epek*.

Ačāryan (HAB 2: 173a) cites an attestation of this words in homilies by John Chrysostom and posits the meaning 'ape', as is shown by the Greek original. Then

Ačaryan (ibid., citing also "Arjeṛn baṛaran") connects the word with MArm. *t'obēk* 'a predator' attested in Fables by Mxit'ar Goš. According to MiġHayBaṛ 1, 1987: 261b, *t'obēk* here refers to 'baboon'. This is uncertain since, as will be shown, the word basically means 'jackal' in MArm. and in dialects.

In a medieval riddle by Nersēs Šnorhali (12th cent., Cilicia) [Mnac'akanyan 1980: 297^{Nr187}] one finds *t'aspek*, var. *t'ēpēk*, described as a beast with light brown hair, and invisible as the Satan; they gather and lament in the night. Mnac'akanyan (ibid. 498b) identifies with *t'epēk* 'a kind of ape' with a question-mark. This animal is also found in another riddle of the same collection [Mnac'akanyan 1980: 378^{Nr9}], written by "Ananun (Anonymous) 9" (13-14th cent.): *t'ep'ēk*, described as a nocturnal thief that barks as a dog. Mnac'akanyan (ibid. 499a) glosses *t'epēk* as 'a kind of ape'. Both riddles, however, suggest that the jackal rather than the ape is meant.

No dialectal forms are recorded in HAB 2: 173a.

The word is found in Svedia and adjacent dialects. Č'olak'ean (1986: 203a) derives K'esab *t'ipik* from *t'obēk/t'epēk*. Unfortunately, he does not specify the meaning. According to Andreasyan (1967: 160, 225), Svedia *t'ip/bæg* continues *t'epa/uk* or *t'opek* and refers to 'jackal'. In the glossary of her folklore collection from Musa-Leṛ, V. Svazlyan (1984: 197b) glosses *t'ibig* 'jackal'. Textual illustrations for this word can be found in a fairy-tale from this collection (117a): indefin. *t'ibi mə* and defin. *t'ibeyə* (twice).

No etymology of *t'epēk* is accepted in HAB 2: 173a.

I propose a connection with Gr. *πίθηκος*, Dor. *-ᾱκος* m., *πίθων* m. 'ape'. The Greek has been derived from **πιθος* 'häßlich', cf. Lat. *foedus* 'foul, filthy; ugly; vile; abominable' (Pokorny 1959: 162 s.v. **bhōi-* : *bhēi-* : *bhī-* 'sich fürchten'), but this etymology is uncertain (see Frisk s.v.; Schrijver 1991: 521). Arm. **t'epēk* 'ape; jackal' may be regarded as a loan from Gr. *πίθηκος* 'ape' through metathesis /labial...dental/ > /dental...labial/, cf. *p'etur* 'feather' > dial. **tep'ur* 'id.', *p'aycatn* 'spleen' > Cappadocian Greek *πεῖσάχι* 'id.' > Xotorĵur *sipex* 'id.', etc. (see 2.1.26.2).

The association 'ape' : 'jackal' is conceivable. The baboon can serve as an intermediation between the dog and the ape since he has a doglike muzzle and is therefore called *κυνοκέφαλος* 'dog-headed' in Greek. Note also a medieval riddle by Nersēs Šnorhali (12th cent., Cilicia) [Mnac'akanyan 1980: 293^{Nr178}] where the ape (*apuznay*) is described as *šən-k'it'* 'having a nose of a dog' (ibid. 502b). Besides, both the ape and the jackal are considered to be heathen, abominable, demonic. The relatedness of the jackal with the wolf, hyena, etc. needs no

comment. As to the ape, note 'evel spirit' > 'ape', cf. LitMong *albin* 'evel spirit' > Teleut *almīn* 'evel spirit; ape' [Tatarincev 1993, 2: 88]. The same development is seen in the case of PTurk. **bāčīn* 'ape', cf. Tumen Tatar *bicin* 'evel spirit' (ibid.). The latter may represent the opposite direction of the semantic development if one accepts the connection with Gr. *πίθων, -ωνος* m. 'small ape' and Afro-Asiatic forms (see Šervašidze 1989: 78, 78₃₁, with lit.). Note also Gr. *σάτυρος* m. 'Satyr; (from their supposed likeness) a kind of tailed ape'.

3.5.2.3 To become a wolf

The idiomatic expression "to become a wolf" in §37 of the Hittite Laws (see J. Friedrich 1959: 27; Hoffner 1964: 38, 189-190), reflecting the concept "to be deprived from one's rights", has been discussed by Weitenberg (1991) in connection with Germanic and other data. (On Germ. 'wolf' : 'outlaw' see also Gerstein 1974). Weitenberg (op. cit. 194) points out that there is no material basis for direct comparison of Hittite "you have become a wolf" with *wargus sit* in the Lex Salica since the meaning 'wolf' of North Germanic *vargr* is recent. Then he introduces an interesting parallel from the Armenian Canonical law, *gayl etew* "he became a wolf", which reflects a background that is comparable to the situation in §37 of the Hittite Laws.

It is not clear, however, whether the document is an originally Armenian text or a translation. Therefore, Weitenberg (op. cit. 195) comes to the following cautious conclusion: "it cannot be shown that at the Proto-Indo-European level such an expression was used in the sense in which it was used in Hittite: that it had a well defined meaning in legal language".

The Armenian evidence becomes more reliable since we find a similar expression in Chapter 40 of the History of Lewond, in the 8th century [Šahnazareanc' 1857: 196^{L-1f}]: *ew xortakēr zk'atc'r luc hawatoyñ or i K'ristos, ew orošiwñ i hōtēñ Teain ew zgenoyñ zkerparan gayloy, ew partawor aīnēr zink'n tiezerakan atenin* : "He destroyed the easy yoke of his faith in Christ, separated himself from the flock of the Lord, and assumed the image of a wolf, thus making himself subject to the eternal judgement" (transl. Arzoumanian 1982: 145). The expression *zgenoyñ zkerparan gayloy* literally means "he put on the image of a wolf" (cf. the ModArm. translation in Ter-Lewondyan 1982: 129).

Note also a medieval riddle [Mnac'akanyan 1980: 289^{Nr169}] written by Nersēs Šnorhali (12th cent., Cilicia), where the wolf is described as a thief who did not worship Christ: *č'ēr K'ristosi erkrpagot*.

One may assume that the phrase "to become a wolf" or "to assume the image of a wolf" at least in Hittite and Armenian legal traditions reflects an Indo-European legal expression. It seems to actually mean "to become an outlaw, offcast, a person declared to be outside the society".

3.5.2.4 'hind, deer' : 'dragon, snake' : 'wolf' : 'devil'

'hind' : 'dragon, snake'

In a medieval riddle [Mnac'akanyan 1980: 287^{Nr164}] written by Nersēs Šnorhali (12th cent., Cilicia), the hind (*etn*) is described as follows:

E annman atuor tikiñ,

Ink'n cnani zmayrn ojin

"She is a matchless lovely Lady; (she) herself gives birth to the mother of the snake".

Amirdovlat' Amasiac'i (15th cent.) thoroughly describes the snake-eating habit of the deer/stag (see Vardanian 1990: 40).

According to folk-beliefs recorded in Ĵavaxk' (Axalk'alak'), the dragon (*ušap*) = tornado originates from a new-born deer that has been taken to the sky by dragons [Lalayan 1897: 239 = 1, 1983: 241; see also Garamanlean 1931: 512a].

In two variants of the riddle on the thunder (see 3.2, on *cirani cov*) [S. Harut'yunyan 1965: 61a^{Nr633a}/251a, 204a^{Nr2087}/321b], the thunder has been replaced by the stag (*etjēru*) and the dragon (*višap*).

In a fairy tale from Łarabał [HŽHek' 5, 1966: 492-494], a deer (*ĵeyran*) appears in the role of the resurrecting personage (which in fairy-tales is commonly represented by a demon), and transforms to a snake.

On the association 'deer' : 'dragon/snake' see also Deweĵyan 1982: 148-149.

'hind, deer' : 'wolf' : 'devil'

As we have seen, the dragon and snake are associated with the deer. In view of the association of 'Satan' with 'wolf' and 'hyena' (see above, as well as 4.3), one also expects a parallelism between the wolf and the deer. Indeed, designations of the sun-shower in Armenian [Amatuni 1912: 69b; HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 235a] and other languages often refer to the wolf [Abeghian 1899: 108; A. Petrosyan 1987: 58₁₁], and in Ĵavaxk' one finds the hind instead [Lalayan 1897: 247^{L2} = 1, 1983: 247]: *Arewov anjrew galis, asum en, etniknerə kə cnin* "when it rains by the sun, they say, the hinds give birth". See also A. Petrosyan 1987: 58₁₂. In Nerk'in Basen, both the wolf and the hind function in this context (see G. Hakobyan 1974: 277).

As we have seen above, in the same area, i.e. in Ĵavaxk', the dragon is believed to originate from a new-born deer. The two motifs are combined in a variant attested by G. Ter-Mkrtč'yan, native of the same area (the village of Cuřrut' close to Axalc'xa), see P. Hakobyan 1979: 6. It says that the dragons are born from hinds in mountains in the time of *banĵarbusuk*. The latter refers to a kind of soft snow or hail in the early spring [Amatuni 1912: 89b; Ačarean 1913: 174b]. Remarkably, it is synonymic to *siklik* or *sĕklik*, which seems to etymologically refer to one of the daughters of the Satan (see below). Thus, the sun-shower and *banĵarbusuk* are related with the wolf, the deer, or the devil.

Also in designations for 'plant-seeds floating in the air' one finds the parallelism 'deer' : 'devil, Satan'; cf. Dilĵan/Pořosk'ilisa *baxri p'rp'ur* lit. 'foam of deer' (see Ananyan 1980: 370) vs. Atap'azar *satanayi črag* and Polis *satanayi ařapa* (see Ačarean 1913: 956ab), lit. 'Satan's lamp' and 'Satan's wagon', respectively.

Further etymological implications

We have seen that there is enough material explicitly or implicitly reflecting an association between the deer, the snake or dragon, the wolf, and the devil. This evidence can play a significant role in etymological studies. In the following I propose some ideas.

Dragons are born from hinds in the time of *banĵarbusuk*, that is 'a kind of soft snow or hail in the early spring' (see above). In DialAdd apud NHB 2: 1066c one finds a dialectal word *siklik* or *sĕklik*, which, according to Amatuni (1912: 589a), has been preserved in Trapizon. The word is synonymic to *banĵarbusuk*. No etymological explanation of *si/ĕklik* is known to me. I think this word may be identified with one of the two daughters of the Satan: *Sĕlik* and *Bĕlik*, in Ewdokia [Gazančean 1899: 22, 54] and in Sebastia [Gabikean 1952: 499]; cf. the light-minded (*giř*) spouses *Sklik* and *Baklik* in a fairy-tale [HŽHek' 3, 1962: 388-390].

Dial. (Muř, Van) *xazal-oj* 'a kind of snake', with *oĵ* (= *awj*) 'snake' as the second component (see Ačarean 1913: 445a), or simply *xazal* [HayLezBrbBař 2, 2002: 260b], can be identic with dial. (Muř, Van, Sasun, Moks) *xăzal/xazal* 'hind, deer' (on which see Petoyan 1954: 127; 1965: 479; HayLezBrbBař 2, 2002: 260b).

The mountain-name *Gaylaxaz-ut* is explicitly understood as 'abounding in *gaylaxaz*'. The latter (lit. = 'wolf's stone') refers to 'flint' and resembles or is confused with dial. *satani etung* 'obsidian', lit. 'Satan's nail. Earlier the mountain

was called *Paxray*, possibly identic with *paxray* 'cattle; hind, deer, stag'. Aristakēs Lastivertc'i testifies a traditional story on this mountain and a Holy Cross destroyed by "servants of the Satan". It is possible, thus, that both names of this mountain somehow reflect the mythological background of it. See 4.3 for more detail.

There is abundant cultural evidence demonstrating a close association between the stag and the cross or divinities, see Mnac'akanyan 1977 (especially 17-21); Deweġyan 1982; cf. also the famous song by Grigor Narekac'i entitled "Taġ yarut'ean", the horns of the oxen are described as *xac'-a-nman* 'cross-like' [K'yoškeryan 1981: 62^{L26}; Mnac'akanyan 1977: 20-21]. In what follows I shall discuss the word *xac'eneak* within the same cultural framework.

xac'eneak 'a kind of male animal' [HAB 2: 335a]. In NHB 1: 924c: "perhaps *xoĉ'k'orak* 'a young swine, pig'" (highly improbable). Attested only by grammarians. Grigor Magistros (11th cent.) mentions it in a list of male animals, between *etġeru* 'stag' and *xoy* 'ram' [Adonc 1915: 240]. No etymology is known to me.

Formally, *xac'eneak* can be interpreted as *xac'* 'cross' + *-eni-* + dimin. *-ak*. For the suffix *-eni* = *-ean* + *-i* cf. *ark'ay* 'king' : *ark'ayean*, *ark'ayeni* 'royal', etc. (see Ĵahukyan 1998: 23). Bearing in mind that the basic meaning of *xac'* and *xēĉ'* 'cross' (q.v.) was 'stick, staff; forked branch, pole', one may identify *xac'eneak* with the stag. The fact that *etġeru* is also mentioned in the list should not be a problem because we are dealing with a list of male animal designations and not the animals (i.e. the denotata) per se, so *etġeru* and *xac'eneak*, mentioned next to each other, might be synonymous. Besides, *xac'eneak* could have been the male of a different kind of deer (e.g. fallow-deer; see s.v. *analut*). Such a metaphoric designation perfectly parallels Oss. *sag* 'deer' (< **šāka*- lit. 'forked, having branches') and Russ. *soxátyj* 'elk' which derive from Oss. *sagoj/sagojnæ* 'hay-fork' (cf. Sogd. (Man.) *š'yh* 'branch') and Russ. *soxa* '(wooden) plough' (cf. Pol. *socha* 'two-pronged fork', Bulg. *soxa* 'stick with a fork', Sln. *soha* 'pole with a cross-beam' etc.), see Abaev 1: 49, 179*; Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984: 519; Cheung 2002: 222 (see also s.v. *c'ax*). Thus, the derivation of *xac'eneak* '(prob.) stag' from *xac'* 'cross' may be based on both metaphoric and cultural motivations. What would be, then, the semantic motivation?

3.5.2.5 'spider' : 'ass'

We have seen the associations 'lady, grandmother' : 'spider or other insects' : 'demon' on the one hand, and 'hyena' : 'ass, mule' : 'fairy, spirit' on the other.

Combining these semantic fields into a broader context, one can understand the following data.

***ēš-xranj/č** ‘a poisonous spider or the like’: Xotorjur *ēšxranj* ‘a wild, poisonous spider’ (see YušamXotorj 1964: 447b; in HayLezBrbBař 2, 2002: 26a - *ēšxianč*) may be connected with Łarabał **išaxařanč* ‘a kind of black, poisonous insect’ and Ararat *išuxařanč* ‘a kind of insect living under ground’ = Trapizon *getni lakot*, lit. ‘earth-puppy’, Fr. *courtilière*, Russ. *medvédka* [Ačārean 1913: 225a, 399b], also Muš, Van *iša/əxařanč* and Nor Juła *išixaiřič* ‘a kind of black insect’ (see Amatuni 1912: 233a; HayLezBrbBař 2, 2002: 177b). According to Davt’yan (1966: 363), Łarabał and Hadrut’ *išə/ixářanč* refers to ‘bumble-bee, dog-bee’ and is synonymical to *púřnə* < *boř*. The latter is described by Ačāryan (HAB 1: 473a) as follows: ‘a kind of big, black fly which stings horses and cattle’.

The word seems to comprise *ēš* ‘ass’ and **xr/řanj* ‘a chthonic beast, lizard or snail’. I find the latter word in the dialect of Svedia: *xranč*, *xranj* ‘chameleon’ [Andreasyan 1967: 160, 237]. The OArm. form of *xranj* would be **xranj*, and/or, given the parallel of *narinj* > *laranj* (see Andreasyan 1967: 361b, 376b), **xrinj*. Andreasyan (1967: 237) ascribes onomatopoeic origin to the word, trying to connect it to *xřnč’em* ‘to grunt (in Łazax, said of an ass)’. This is not convincing, but a folk-etymological association is obvious, see below. I propose a connection to *xtunjn* ‘snail’ and *xlēz* ‘lizard’, dial. also ‘snail’; cf. Syriac *xlizonā*, which is borrowed in the dialect of Zeyt’un in both meanings, ‘snail’ and ‘lizard’ (see HAB 2: 315a, s.v. *xalizon*). For the -r- of **xrVnj* cf. Arm. *xřnjayl*, *xřnč’ot* = Gr. *κοχλίαν* in Galen [NHB 1: 986a; Greppin 1985: 62-63] and Georg. *q’urinc’ila* ‘a kind of snail’ [HAB 2: 376b]. Is Kartvel. **mxul-* ‘lizard’ [Klimov 1964: 144; 1998: 134] somehow related, too? for more detail see 2.3.1, on -(ē)z.

Ačāryan (1953: 269) finds Artial *xoxanč* ‘crayfish’.

Further, note Urmia, Salmast *xəřjala* is rendered as *xec’ap’ar* ‘crayfish’ in GwřUrmSalm 2, 1898: 97.

Dial. **salatrana* ‘crayfish’ (Moks) : ‘Satan’ (Van), see HAB 4: 164a.

Note some designations of the spider and other insects which literally mean ‘divine ass etc.’: Pers. (Xurāsānī) *šotor e xodā* ‘spider’, literally ‘Gotteskamel’; Lurī *xar e xodā* ‘spider’, literally ‘Gottesesel’, next to Pers. *xar i xudā*, which, like Gabrī of Kirmān *gō-xodā* ‘Gottesochse’, denotes ‘Kellerassel’ (see Monchi-Zadeh 1990: 10-11^{Nr23}). Other designations of the spider in Xurāsānī (see Monchi-Zadeh 1990: 10-11^{Nr23}): *asb e doldol* ‘Doldol’s horse’, *hašū-dôdô* ‘spider’ < ‘camel-Dodo’.

3.5.2.6 *čř*

Slav. **aščerъ* : OCS m. *ašterъ* 'lizard', Russ. *jaščer* 'inflammation of the tongue of cattle, horses', *jaščur* 'a kind of mouse or dormouse', *jaščerica* 'lizard', Czech dial. *jaščur* 'salamander', Upper Sorbian *ješčer* 'otter; grass-snake', etc.; cf. Lith. *skėrys* m. 'locust', Latv. *skīrgailis* m. 'lizard', etc., perhaps also Gr. *σκίουρος* m. 'squirrel'; note also Slav. **gu-ščerъ* 'lizard' [ĖtimSlovSlavJaz 1, 1974: 87-89; 7, 1980: 179].

Slav. **ščur* designates chthonic beings such as sandmartin, rat, mole, grass-snake, salamander, earthworm, grasshopper, cricket, scorpion; the prefixed form **pra-ščur* means 'dead ancestor'; note also *ščurit* 'to squint'; derived from IE **skeur-* 'to cover, hide', cf. Lat. *obscurus* 'dark, shady, obscure; gloomy'; Slav. **gu-ščerъ* 'lizard' perhaps contains **gu-* 'horned cattle', cf. the traditional belief that the lizards are cowmilkers [Jakobson 1959: 277].

Since Russ. *jaščur* refers to 'a kind of mouse or dormouse', the dormouse being a small rodent of a family intermediate between the squirrels and the mice, the comparison with Gr. *σκίουρος* m. 'squirrel' does not seem impossible. The interpretation as 'shadow-tail' has a flavour of folk-etymology. One may tentatively posit **sker-* : **ski/eur-* or **skiw(o)r-*, a designation for chthonic beings of substratum origin; compare Arm. Moks **swor-ik* 'squirrel'.

3.5.2.7 Lizard : cow-milker/sucker

There is a similar belief among Armenians about dragons that suck the milk of cows [Ališan 1910: 210; Garamanlean 1931: 510, 515-516]. See also HAB 1: 457b s.v. *bnas* 'a kind of cattle/sheep sucking snake'.

According to Romanian folk-beliefs (see Svešnikova 1979: 216, 218), werewolves take away milk from the cow striking her on the leg. Corresponding beliefs are recorded concerning witches (*Butterhexen* or *Hasenfrauen*) among Germanic and Celtic peoples [Riegler-Klagenfurt 1910: 187]. On witches that fly in the shape of butterflies steal butter or cream (cf. Germ. *Scmetterling*, *Molkendieb*, *Buttervogel*, Engl. *butterfly*, etc.) see Makovskij 1986: 50-51.

According to Jakobson (1959: 277), Slav. **gu-ščerъ* 'lizard' is probably composed of **gu-* 'horned cattle' and **(a)ščerъ* 'lizard or other chthonic beings' and should be treated in relation with the traditional belief that the lizards are cowmilkers. Note also Ukr. *molokosís* 'lizard', lit. 'milk-sucker' (see Fasmer 3: 690).

West Circassian *hadepčeməʔʷ* (Temirgoy dial.), *hadečeməʔʷ* (Ghapsugh dial.) 'tortoise' may contain *čemə* 'cow', though the first component (cf. *hade*

‘corpse’?) is unclear (R. Smeets, p.c.). For the association between ‘tortoise/turtle’ and ‘frog’ cf. Iran. **kasjapa-* (cf. YAv. *kasiapa-* m. ‘turtle’, Pers. *kašaf/w* ‘turtle’, etc.) > Oss. *xæfs/xæfsæ* ‘frog’ (see Cheung 2002: 246); Germ. *Schild-kröte* ‘tortoise’, lit. ‘shield-toad’. Compare also Arm. dial. (Artial, Hungary) *taštov gort* ‘tortoise’ < ‘a frog with a basin’, see Ačaryan 1953: 195, 197 (considered a Turkish calque).

Note especially Skt. *godhā-* f. ‘Iguana, a species of big lizard’ (RV) < ‘*cow milker/sucker’ etymologically and semantically comparable with Arm. *kovadiac* ‘a kind of lizard, toad’ (Bible+). The underlying semantic pattern remained to be vivid since *kov-a-diac* has later been replaced by synonymous *kov-(a)-cuc* or *kov-r-cuc* (see s.v. *kovadiac*). Commenting upon the etymology of Sebastia *kov-r-cuc*, Gabikyan (1952: 311) informs us that, as people say, the lizard likes very much sucking cow’s udder, which becomes then swollen and bleeds.

For the belief that lizards, toads and snakes are ‘cow-suckers’ see Lüders 1942: 44ff = 1973: 511ff. On some examples of the pattern ‘goat biter/sucker’ > ‘a kind of lizard’ in other languages see Monchi-Zadeh 1990: 45-46.

For the structural typology of *-ac* in *kov-a-di-ac* and folk-believes around this lizard, probably to be identified with the toad, the following seems interesting.

In the dialect of Van, Ačaryan (1913: 760b) records **mac’oc*, **kanač’-m’ac’oc*, rural **matot*, **kanač’-matot* ‘a kind of green large lizard which is believed to give his poison to snakes’. The first component of the compounded variants is *kanač* ‘green’.

No etymological attempt is known to me.

This lizard is obviously identic with Svedia *ucə-xmc’näg* (< **ōji-xmc’nuk*, lit. ‘who gives the serpent to drink’) ‘a kind of green lizard which gives poison to the serpent to drink’ (see Andriasyan 1967: 161, 264). Note also K’esab *ujə xumc’ənuɹ* ‘a kind of black, snake-like, harmless lizard (two spans long) that lives in moist earth and is believed to provide snakes with poison and makes them drink it’ [Č’olak’ean 1986: 271].

Bearing in mind this synonymous compound, one may tentatively derive Van **mac’-oc* from **xm-ac’-ōj* ‘who gives the serpent to drink’.

A similar folk-belief is recorded by Sargisyan (1932: 457) on Balu **kovrcuc* ‘a large poisonous lizard that jumps onto a human face, and from which the snake takes his poison’, and by Petoyan (1954: 113; 1965: 457) on Sasun *govjuj* ‘a green lizard which is supposed to give poison to the snake’. It seems that we are dealing with the toad (see s.v. *kovadiac* ‘a lizard, toad’).

The element *-ac* in **xm-ac-ōj* is probably identic with that found in a synonymous *kov-a-di-ac* 'a lizard, toad', lit. 'who drinks the milk of a cow' (q.v.). The structure is completely identic: *xmem* 'to drink' : **xm-ac* vs. *diem* 'to drink milk' : **di-ac* 'who drinks milk' (cf. also *stn-diac* 'baby'). One may argue that in the compound under discussion the meaning is causative. I am not sure whether this is strong enough to reject the comparison. Besides, in the underlying folk-beliefs an inversion of the subject and the object may have taken place. In Hačən, that is very close to Svedia, the very same lizard is called 'who eats poison of the snake' (see HAB 3: 342b).

Still there are two formal problems:

1) Ačāryan presents the (quasi-)reconstruction of the Van compound. The precise form is, thus, unknown. If the actual form indeed contains *-o-* rather than *-ō-* (= *-aw-*), then we have a problem;

2) Where does the variant **matot* come from? Perhaps through intermediation of a dissimilated variant **matoc* and/or some kind of folk-etymology?

3.5.2.8 Eels

atanak

Papen *atanak* 'a kind of longish worm that lives in mud' [HayLezBrbBaī 1, 2001: 36a]. In the word-collection of Arsēn vardapet T'ōxmaxean made in the prison of Van (see Amatuni 1912: 684a), *atanak* is explained as follows: *ergot ordn čahičneri, atik'ajew serm gorteri* "the singing worm of swamps; the intestine-like semen of frogs". It must be identic with Van *atanak* 'a kind of animal which, like a turtle, consists of a large lump of flesh, lives in brooks and sweetly sings in the night' [Ačārean 1913: 73a]. According to Ačāryan (ibid.), the same animal is called *kr̥r* in Muš.

I think this is the eel. The description of both Papen and Van forms fits here. The eels are nocturnal feeders in day time living mostly in mud. They also sing or at least are believed to sing. The association with female sea-monsters or sirens is plausible, see s.v. *əngtayk*. The eels are very little known in Armenia, but they still are present in Cilicia, and in the Caspian.

3.5.2.9 'weasel, mouse, etc.' : 'bride, young woman, etc.'

A synchronically clear example is Turk. *gelin* 'bride', diminutive *gelincik* 'Bräutchen, kleine junge frau; Wiesel'. Gr. γαλέη 'Wiesel, Marder', Lat. *glīs* 'Hasel-, Bilchmaus' and Skt. *giri(kā)*- 'mouse' (Lex.), sometimes connected to the PIE word for 'husband's sister' (cf. Gr. γάλις, Skt. *giri-* f. 'Schwägerin', etc., see

s.v. *tal* 'husband's sister'), though the details (e.g. the laryngeal) are not clear; see Mallory/Adams 1997: 387, 521-522. For the (erotic) associaton between a young girl or woman and weasel compare RV 1, 126.6 where a young woman "trembles like *kaśīkā-* ('Ichneumonweibchen or weasel')". Here the context is clearly erotic. If Arm. *ak 'is* (*i*-stem) 'weasel' (q.v.) is related with Skt. *kaśīkā-*, one may treat its *i*-stem from PIE feminine **-ih₂-*. This would be another piece of evidence in favor of "feminine nature" of the weasel. For the association 'weasel; marten' : 'love; wedding' see also Toporov, PrJaz (I-K) 1980: 279-283.

Hamšen (Čanik) *xadug mork'urik* 'a kind of mouse' [T'orlak'yan 1986: 116^{Nr135}, 233b], literally: 'spotted, motley or beautiful mother's sister'. Probably refers to the weasel, cf. *cimuk* 'weasel', described by people as *balak' = xatutik* (see Martirosyan/Łaragyozyan FW 2003, September, Hrazdan), or *č'al, č'altik* 'motley' (see Ananyan, HayKendAšx 1, 1961: 164, 168; cf. especially the kind called *xayt-ak'is* "motley/spotted weasel", see op. cit. 157). Compare also Abkhaz *apšja* 'weasel' < 'beautiful' (Chirikba, p.c.; Starostin has a different etymology).

Other examples: Sebastia *hašn-uk* 'weasel' from *harsn-uk* 'little bride' [Gabikyan 1952: 329]; cf. also *nert'akn* (q.v.).

In the fable "The weasel and the mouse" of Olympian (see AİÖtomp 1854: 171-172; transl. by Orbeli 1956: 125), the goddess of love Astik transformed the weasel, who had fallen in love with a boy, to a beautiful woman.

In a humorous fairy-tale (1926, Leninakan < Bulanəx), a mouse (*harsnuk-muk* "little bride or daughter-in-law : mouse") marries a rooster (*čet*) [HŽHek' 10, 1967: 376^{Nr140}].

3.6 Plants

'cut, split' : 'grain, corn'

Arm. *hat*, *o*-stem 'grain' is related with *hatanem* 'to cut' (q.v.) [Is Arm. *hačar* 'spelt' (Bible; Łarabał etc.) related too?]. It seems likely that *hat* derives from **h₂edos-* n. 'sort of cereal, grain' (cf. Lat. *ador* etc.). If we are dealing with a deverbative noun, Arm. *hat-* 'to cut' would be the only independant evidence for the underlying verb. According to Morani (1991: 176-177), the Armenian displays the development 'grain, seed' > 'cut, section, piece, fragment'.

The semantic relationship is reminiscent of *kut*, *o*-stem 'seed' (Hexaameron+) and, if related, *kt-ur* and *kot-or* 'cut, piece' (both Bible+); for the suffix cf. *hat-or* 'cut, fragment'.

Some (possible) examples: Lat. *terō* 'to grind; rub' : *trīticum* n. 'wheat'; Lat. *secale* 'rye' : *secāre* 'to cut' (though rejected in Szemerényi 1959/60: 247); Engl. *spelt* 'a species of grain (*Triticum spelta*)' : 'to husk or pound (grain)'.

3.7 Body parts

3.7.1 'ceiling' : 'palate' : 'sky, heaven'

arastat 'ceiling' (Bible+) > MArm. (mainly in medical literature) and dial. 'palate'; see s.v.

In Partizak, Sebastia, Xotorjur etc., Arm. *arik* 'ceiling' (q.v.) also means 'ceiling of the mouth', that is to say, 'palate'.

ClArm. *jetun* 'ceiling' (q.v.) is metaphorically associated with the sky (Eznik Koṭbac'i etc.).

Dial. *tamat* 'palate' vs. ClArm. *tamal(i)* 'roof' seems interesting too, but the relation is uncertain; see s.v. *tamal*.

Typologically cf. Moks *ač'ič' tanis* 'upper eyelid', lit. 'roof of the eye' and *ceṛac' tanis* 'поверхность кисти руки', lit. 'roof of hand' (see Orbeli 2002: 204, 253); see also s.v. **and-*: *dr-and*.

For the semantic shift 'ceiling' > 'palate' Ačaryan mentions dial. *t'avan* from Turk. *tavan* 'ceiling; palate' (HAB 1: 254a, 255a; see also 1902: 121, 329).

As for the semantic shifts 'ceiling' > 'palate' and 'ceiling' > 'sky', one finds examples displaying the opposite developments:

'sky' > 'palate', cf. Lat. *palātum* 'roof of the mouth, palate' (> Engl. *palate*), perhaps related to Etruscan *falandum* 'sky' (OxfEnglDict) or **falatu?* (gl. *falado*); on the latter form see Beekes/*van *der Meer 1991: 106a.

'sky' > 'ceiling', cf. Lat. *caelum* 'heaven, sky' > MLat. 'canopy; vault; roof', It. *cielo*, F. *ciel* 'sky; canopy; ceiling', Engl. *ceiling*, etc.

Note also in the Ossetic epic the mountainous house of *Mar'am* is described as having a roof of midnight-stars: "звезды полночные - крыша" [Gatuev 1932: 27].

All the three components, as in the case of *arastat*, are found in Slav. **nebo* 'sky, heaven' (from PIE **neb^h*- 'sky; cloud', see s.v. *amp*): SCr. *nebo* 'sky, heaven', dial. 'ceiling; palate', Sln. *nebō* 'id.', Russ. *něbo* 'palate', etc. (see ÈtimSlovSlavJaz 24, 1997: 101-102). On the semantic field see also Pisani 1950b. For 'heavenly' > 'star or planet' see s.v. *ampar*.

Šatax *asttunk* 'y' 'uvula, windpipe' is formally identic with Van etc. *asttunk* 'stars', thus we may be dealing with a shift 'sky (= stars)' > 'palate', unless it is derived from *arastat* 'palate' with loss of *-i-* and/or contamination with *asttunk* 'stars'.

‘stars’; see s.v. *arastat* ‘ceiling; palate’. For the relationship ‘star’ : ‘sky’ cf. E.g. Kassit. *da-ka-aš* ‘star’ : *da-gi-gi* ‘sky’, ‘*Star’, Tigrē Ethiopian *‘astar* ‘sky’, etc. (see Eilers 1976: 57, 57₁₃₄). For ‘palate’ > ‘uvula etc.’ cf. Engl. *palate*, *palace* ‘the roof of the mouth’ that also refers to a relaxed or enlarged soft palate or uvula.

3.7.2 ‘crooked, twisting, bending’ > ‘a twisting/bending body-part’

The meanings ‘armpit’, ‘armfull’, ‘shoulder’, ‘elbow’, ‘neck’, and ‘knee’ can be grouped around the idea “des gekrümmten Gelenks”; cf. Skt. *āncati* ‘to bend’, *ānikas-* n. ‘curve’, Gr. *ἀγκ-* ‘to curve’, *ἀγκάλη* f., mostly pl. ‘curved arm, armfull’, *ἀγκών* ‘elbow’, Lat. *ancus* ‘with crooked arms’, etc.; Arm. *an(u)t* ‘armpit’, dial. also ‘embrace, grasp’, ‘bundle’, ‘shoulder, back’ (q.v.). See also K. H. Schmidt 1962: 117, with a possible example from Kartvelian languages. Further examples:

ClArm. *bazuk* ‘arm’ > Udi *bazuk* ‘armpit’ [HAB 1: 376-377].

This semantic field also includes a shift ‘shoulder’ > ‘back, spine’ or ‘breast’. The connection of *otn* ‘spine, back’, *uln* ‘neck’ (dial. also, perhaps, ‘elbow’ or ‘shoulder’) and *utuk* ‘palm, distance from the thumb to the little finger’ with Gr. *ὠλένη* ‘elbow, underarm’, Lat. *ulna* ‘elbow’, *uilen* ‘angle’, etc., points to a basic meaning ‘joint, a moving (twisting and/or bending) body part’ (see s.v.v., especially *otn*).

A similar semantics is represented by *šet* ‘slanting, crooked, oblique’, *šil* ‘squint-eyed’, etc. : Gr. *σκελος* n. ‘leg (from the hip downwards)’, *σκελλός* ‘crook-legged’, *σκολιός* ‘wicked, crooked’, Lat. *scelus*, GSg *sceleris* n. ‘misdeed, crime’, etc. (see especially s.v. *šet*). Here may belong, I think, also Arm. *šl(n)-i* ‘neck’ (q.v.). This would match the meaning ‘neck’ of the above-mentioned *uln* and remove the alleged semantic obstacle (see s.v. *otn*).

A case of ‘shoulder’ : ‘spine, back’ : ‘chest, breast’ is found in NPers., MPers. *dōš* ‘shoulder’, cf. YAv. *daoš-* ‘upper arm’, Skt. *dōṣ-* n. ‘arm, fore-arm’ (RV+), OIr. *doē* ‘arm’, etc. The Persian word has been borrowed into Arm. dial. *doš* ‘chest, breast; slope (of a mountain)’ (see HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 345-346), perhaps through Turkish intermediation [Ačārean 1902: 336; Margaryan 1975: 511b (on Goris *dōš* ‘breast; slope’)].

3.7.3 ‘calf of leg’ : ‘fish’

Ararat, Lori, Širak, Bulanəx, Alaškert *juk*, *jkn-er* (pl.) ‘(anat.) calf’ [Amatuni 1912: 372a], which is the basic Armenian word for the fish, viz. *jukn*. Łarabał **jukn-a-mis* ‘(anat.) calf’ (see Ačārean 1913: 690b) literally means ‘flesh of fish’.

We find it, for example, in a fairy-tale: *vəennis cūknamesə* "the **juknamis* of my leg" [HŽHek' 5, 1966: 523]. Note also Bulanəx *juk*, glossed as *msi mkanunk* "muscles of flesh" [S. Movsisyan 1972: 71a]

This curious semantic relationship can be compared with that of Russ. *ikra* 'roe, spawn, caviar', '(anat.) calf' (see s.v. *leard* 'liver').

In the dialect of Ozim, the calf (of leg) is called *cok-olok*. Ačāryan (1913: 522b), with some reservation, treats it as a compound with *cak* 'hole; hollow' (**cak-olok*), which is improbable. On the strength of the above-mentioned material, one can interpret *cok-olok* as composed of *cōuk* 'fish' and *olok* 'shin'. For the analysis see s.v. *olok* 'shin'.

3.8 Human world: social aspects etc.

3.8.1 'princess, queen' > 'girl' and vice versa

Arm. *awri-ord*, *a*-stem 'virgin, young girl' (Bible+) is probably composed of **awri-* 'lord' or 'lordly' (cf. Uart. *huri* 'lord' or Iran. **ahur-i-* 'lordly') and **ord-* 'offspring, son/daughter'; see s.v. If this is accepted, we are dealing with the semantic shift from the elevated level to the generic one: 'princess' > 'girl'. A similar generalization is found in the feminine suffix *-u(r)hi*, originated from *t'ag-uhi* 'queen' (see 2.3.1). In what follows a case with the opposite development is discussed.

Arm. *dšxoy* 'queen' (Bible+) is an Iranian loan, though the *-oy* is not entirely clear (L. Hovhannisyan 1990: 239, with references), cf. MPers. *dwxsš* [duxš] 'maiden, virgin; one of the women' [Boyce 1977: 37], *duxš* 'princess', OPers. **duxçr-* f. 'daughter' (see Brandenstein/Mayrhofer 1964: 117; ÈtimSlovIranJaz 2, 2003: 477-478). These words imply a semantic shift 'daughter, maiden, woman' > 'princess, queen'.

3.8.2 'share' > 'dowry'

Arm. *bažin-k* 'dowry', widespread in dialects [Amatuni 1912: 81; Ačārean 1913: 164a; HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 147a147a] and attested in Grigor Tat'ewac'i, clearly derives from *bažin* 'share' (see HAB 1: 382a).

This semantic development helps to etymologize Arm. *ktir-k* 'dowry', which is attested only in John Chrysostom: *Č'ic'ē jeřnhas* [harsn] *t'axanjs ew ktirs i mēř berel?* [NHB 1: 1131a]. No acceptable etymology is known to me. Ačāryan (HAB 2: 677a) only mentions the improbable connection with *əntir* 'selected, excellent' proposed by Hiwnk'earpēyēntean.

The word can be linked with **ktir* ‘cut’, dial. ‘sheep-flock’ (see 1.12.3) going back to *kotor*, *ktur-k* ‘cut, share’, demonstrating, thus, the same semantic development as is seen in *bažin-k*.

3.9 Craft and occupations

3.9.1 ‘to cut, divide’ > ‘a division of flock’ > ‘flock of sheep’

As convincingly demonstrated by Ačaryan (HAB 3: 204a), Van, Muš, Alaškert, Bulanəx **čiwł* ‘flock of sheep’ derives from *čiwł* ‘branch’ and *čēł* ‘to divide’. In the folk-story “Karos Xaç’”: *čyut mə oč’xar* (Srvanjtyanc’ 1, 1978: 608; Karos Xaç’ 2000: 63a). According to Ačaryan (ibid.), Kurd. *čēł* ‘(sheep-)flock’ and perhaps Arab. *ǧul* ‘flock of sheep; group’ are borrowed from Armenian. Sasun **čōl* ‘flock of sheep’ (see Ačarean 1913: 739b) may be reborrowed from Kurdish; see 1.10 on back loans.

[Also interesting is Mush *čta* ‘a part of a sheep-flock’ (see HŽHek’ 13, 1985: 519a), if belonging to words under discussion.

In the same dialectal area there is another word for ‘flock’, namely **ktir* ‘flock of sheep’ (Van), ‘a flock of 22-30 sheep or goats’ (Sasun) [Ačarean 1913: 619a], as well as Šatax *kətir* ‘flock of sheep’ (see M. Muradyan 1962: 212b). Attested in a number of editions of the folk-story “Karos Xaç’” (2000: 60a, 67b; 68b, 69a; also S. Avagyan 1978: 135b^{L12}), in the very same passage where *čiwł* occurred (see above): *k(y)arsun ktir oč’xar* ‘forty flocks of sheep’. A. Xaç’atryan (1993: 107) relates the word with *ktr-em* ‘to cut’ (see 1.12.3 on **ktir*).

Citing these two semantic parallels, A. Xaç’atryan (ibid.) convincingly connects Arm. *hawt*, *i*-stem ‘flock of sheep’ (q.v.) with *y-awt* ‘cut-off branch’ and *hatanem* ‘to cut’. The basic semantics of *hawt* and *y-awt* is, thus, ‘a division, cut’. See s.v. *hat*. [HAB 3: 204a].

3.9.2 Shin-bone > implement

The hollow shin-bone was used for making flutes and other implements (e.g., bobbins) in and around the house, cf. OEngl. *scīa* ‘shin, leg’; Russ. *čevka* ‘bobbin; (esp. hollow) bone; (dial.) shin-bone’, OCS *čěvbnica* ‘flute’, SCr. *ci`jev* ‘tube, spool, shin-bone’, *cjevnica* ‘shin-bone, flute’; Lith. *šėivà* ‘spool, forearm, shin(-bone)’; Indo-Iranian **Hast-čīHya-* ‘shin, shank’; etc. (from PIE **(s)kiHu-* ‘shin’). For these and some other examples see Lubotsky 2002: 322b. In this context it is interesting that alongside of *čūr* ‘shank’, the dialect of Sebastia has also *čūra*, *čēōre* ‘a kind of (small) flute’ [Gabikéan 1952: 378], see Martirosyan 2005: 83. See also s.v. *srunk* ‘shin-bone’.

Metri *č'ak'* 'shin-bone of cattle; instrument for carding wool' [Ałayan 1954: 323]; Moks *č'āk'* 'a stick used for beating and carding wool' [Orbeli 2002: 306]. The meaning 'shank' is often related with meanings like post, pole; shaft; stalk', etc., cf. Engl. *shank* 'shank; a shaft of a column'; Latv. *stulps* 'shank; post, pole'; OEngl. *scīa* 'shin, leg' next to MHG *schīe* 'post', etc. [Lubotsky 2002: 323b] (see also *siwn* 'pillar'). Further: Oss. *zæng* / *zængæ* 'shin; stalk', cf. Skt. *jāṅghā-* f. 'ankle' (RV+); YAv. *zānga-* m. 'ankle', MPers. *zang* 'ankle, shank' (see Cheung 2002: 254).

3.9.3 'weaving, plaiting' : 'multiplicity, abundance'

In P'awstos Buzand 3.14, Arm. *hiwsem* 'to weave, plait' refers to the thickness or piling of snow. This makes the derivation of **hiwsi(n)* 'avalanche' (q.v.) from *hiwsem* 'to weave, plait' more probable.

The Pleiades are usually named as 'many, multiple, abundant' (see 3.1.2). Next to this widespread pattern, there seem to exist also cases which possibly imply a basic meaning like 'Geflecht', cf. Skt. *kṛttikā-* f. pl. 'Pleiades' (AV+) from **kṛt-ti-* 'Geflecht', *kart-* (*kṛṇātti*, AV+) 'to spin, twist threads'; Lat. *Vergiliae* 'Pleiades' from conjectural **vergus* 'Geflecht' or the like [Scherer 1953: 141-142; Mayrhofer, EWAia 1, 1992: 391].

These examples, if acceptable, imply a development 'plait' > 'multiplicity, abundance'. One wonders whether the opposite is possible too. Arm. *boyt* 'lobe (of the ear or the liver); thumb; hump' etymologically meant 'abundance, growth, swelling' (see s.v.). Given the fact that the 'felloe' is usually expressed as 'curved, plaited' (see 3.9.4), one might attempt a derivation of *boyt*₂ 'felloe' (8th cent.) from *boyt*₁, through the semantic development 'multiplicity, abundance' > 'woven together'. Uncertain.

3.9.4 'plaited, twisted' > 'felloe'

Gr. *ἵτρυς* 'felloe' and Lat. *vitus* 'fellow' are **tu-* derivatives from the PIE verb for 'to twist, wind, plait': Lat. *viēre* 'wind, bend', OCS *viti* 'twist, wind', Russ. *vit* 'something that has been plaited', etc.

The same semantic shift can be seen in **pel-k̂-* 'to turn, wind' (a form of **plek̂-* 'to plait') > OHG *felga*, OEngl. *felg(e)* 'felloe', probably also Arm. *hec* 'felloe' (if from **hetĉ*), q.v. See also s.v. *boyt*₂ 'felloe'.

3.10 Miscellaneous

In the territory of Լարաթ, e.g., one finds five synonyms for ‘hungry’: *anōt’i*, *k’atc’ac*, *sovac*, *tūznə* and *naštāv* [Davt’yan 1966: 313]. The first three of them are of IE origin, *sov* is probably an Iranian loan, and the other two are dialectal.

Davt’yan (1966: 52, 343) derives Լարաթ, Hadrut’ etc. *tūznə* ‘hungry’ from ClArm. *doyzn*, without any comment. ClArm. *doyzn* means ‘few, a few, small, miserable; insignificant (person)’ (Bible+) and has no acceptable etymology [HAB 1: 678b]. Ačaryan (HAB *ibid.*) does not record any dialectal forms. The derivation of Լարաթ etc. *tūznə* from *doyzn* is formally impeccable. As to the semantics, cf. Pers. *nahār* ‘diminution; fasting’, *ni/ahār* ‘detriment, loss; a wasting of the body’, *ni/ahārīdan* ‘to waste, decay, fall away’ [Steingass 1437b], Arm. *nihar* ‘thin, lean; skinny’ (Gregory of Nyssa, Anania Širakac’i, etc.; a few dialects), see HAB 3: 452a.

Č’aylu (in the territory of Լարաթ; linguistically close to Urmia/Xoy, in Persia) *naštāv* ‘hungry’ must be from Pers. *nāštā* ‘hungry’ [mentioned in HAB 3: 477b for a different occasion. But what about the final -v? Compare the cases such as *armaw* ‘date (fruit)’?].

3.11 Mediterranean-Pontic substratum

The lexicon of Armenian is characterized by: 1) the native, i.e. Indo-European heritage; 2) a considerable number of loanwords; 3) a large number of words of unknown origin.

In etymological examination, one must reckon, alongside of philological analysis, also with the relevant historical background. If we are dealing with a loanword from a known neighbouring language within the framework of well-established historico-cultural circumstances, like in cases of Middle Persian, Aramaic, Arabic, Georgian etc., the matters are straightforward. Things are complicated, however, when we are dealing with the native layer. The reason for this is simple: the location of the Proto-Armenian homeland and its derivation from the ‘Urheimat’ of the Indo-Europeans have not yet been established. It should be pointed out that most of the scholars look for the ‘Urheimat’ of the Indo-Europeans to the north (in Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, to the south) of the Caucasus and the Black Sea.

Even more problematic are the borrowings from an unknown source. In recent years, the methodology of dealing with such borrowings has been developed and applied by Kuiper (1995), Beekes (1998a; 2000; 2003a), Schrijver (1997), and Lubotsky (2001). It has been pointed out that an etymon is likely to be

a loanword if it is characterized by some of the following features: 1) limited geographical distribution; 2) phonological or morphophonological irregularity; 3) unusual phonology; 4) unusual word formation; 5) specific semantics (see Schrijver 1997: 293-297; Beekes 2000: 22-23; Lubotsky 2001: 301-302).

Throughout this dissertation, I apply this methodology to the so-called Mediterranean substratum words in Armenian, which mostly are plant names, animal names, cultural words. In these cases an etymon is attested in Armenian, Greek, Latin and/or another Indo-European language of SE Europe (like Albanian, Phrygian etc.) or Anatolia, but the phonological or word-formative correspondences are irregular with respect to the Indo-European system, nor do they allow to assume a loanword from one language to another.

The Armenian words that are frequently considered to be of Mediterranean origin are: *gini* 'wine', *ewt/iwt* 'oil', *t'uz* 'fig', *spung* 'sponge', *sunk/g(n)* 'mushroom' [Meillet 1908-09b; 1936: 143; Meillet/Vendryes 1924: 16-17; AčaṙHLPatm 1, 1940: 100-104; Ĵahukyan 1987: 307-308]. Ačaṙyan (1937: 3) treats Arm. *gini* 'wine', *ewt/iwt* 'oil', *sring* 'pipe, fife', and their Greek matches as loans from Phrygian or from the Aegean civilization. Ĵahukyan (1987: 306-311) provides us with references and discussion, introducing more words.

Throughout this book I discuss most of these, as well as some other words (a few of which have been etymologized by me) that have not been discussed in this context before. At the end of this paragraph I give a list of these Mediterranean words, ordered by semantic fields. The list is by no means exhaustive. I excluded *gini* 'wine' (cf. Gr. *(Ϝ)οῖνος*, Lat. *vīnum*, Hitt. *uḫḫan-*, etc.) from the list since the Indo-European origin of the term for 'wine' is more probable (see Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 647f = 1995: 557f; Otkupščikov 1985; Beekes 1987a; Kloekhorst 2007, 2: 1170; for discussion see also Ĵahukyan 1987: 49, 155, 307, 309, 450; Mallory/Adams 1997: 644-646). I also excluded *spung* 'sponge' which is likely to be a Greek loan (see s.v. *sunk/gn* 'mushroom').

Bearing in mind that Greek and Latin on the one hand and Armenian on the other are historically located on the opposite sides of the Black Sea, as well as that in some cases Mediterranean words have related forms in the Caucasus and Near East, I prefer not to confine myself strictly to the notion of so-called Balkan Indo-European. I conventionally use a term Mediterranean-Pontic Substratum (shortly: MedPont). In some cases (e.g. *ors* 'hunt, game', *pal* 'rock'), an etymon is also present in other European branches, such as Celtic and Germanic, thus we are faced with the European Substratum in terms of Beekes (2000). Whether the

Mediterranean-Pontic and European substrata are identical or related is difficult to assert.

There are words belonging to the same semantic categories (plant names, animal names, cultural words) that may be treated as innovations shared by Armenian and Greek etc. For instance, the morphological agreement between Arm. *katin*, *o*-stem 'acorn' and Gr. *βάλανος* f. 'acorn' (vs. Lat. *glāns*, *glandis* f. 'acorn, beach-nut', Russ. *žělud'*, SCr. *žělūd* 'acorn', Lith. *gilė*, dial. *gylė* 'acorn', Latv. *zīle* 'acorn', etc.) may reflect a common innovation made jointly by Greek and Armenian [Clackson 1994: 135-136, 200/237₂]. I have not put such words in the list since they are of Indo-European origin and do not represent any phonological or morphological deviation. Nevertheless, these innovations are relevant to our topic in that they may be ascribed to the same MedPont area and period. In other words, after the Indo-European dispersal, Proto-Armenian, Proto-Greek and some contiguous language-branches (e.g. Thracian, cf. Kortlandt 2003: VIII, 83-87) may have remained in contact somewhere in the Mediterranean (Balkan) and/or Pontic areas prob. in the 3rd and 2nd millennia B.C. I hope to discuss this issue on another occasion.

The consonantal correspondences are of two kinds:

1) archaic, matching the correspondences of the native Indo-European heritage: *kat'n* 'milk', *kamurj* 'bridge' (**g/gʷ*: Arm. *k*); *ors* 'hunt, game', *siseṛn* 'chick-pea', *siwn* 'column, pillar' (**k̂*: Arm. *s*); *erbuc* 'breast of animals' (**ġ*: Arm. *c*);

2) relatively recent: *kaṭamax(i)* 'white poplar, aspen', *kask* 'chestnut', *karič* 'scorpion', *kor* 'scorpion' (**k*: Arm. *k*), *pal* 'rock' (**p*: Arm. *p*); *sring* 'pipe, fife', *sayl* 'wagon' (**s*: Arm. *s*, unless borrowed from lost *satəm*-forms).

This implies that we have to deal with at least two chronological layers (cf. Jahukyan 1978: 129 on the examples of *karič* and *siwn*), and that the Proto-Armenians must have remained in or close to the Mediterranean-Pontic areas for a long period of time.

Semantic fields:

flora: *gari* 'barley'; *ewt* 'oil' (if from 'olive'); *t'etawš* 'holm-oak; cedar, pine', *t'eti* 'elm'; *t'uz* 'fig'; *xstor* 'garlic'; *kaṭamax(i)* 'white poplar, aspen', probably also 'pine'; *kask* 'chestnut'; *metex* 'the handle of an axe' (if from 'ash-tree'); *moš* 'tamarisk; blackberry, bramble', *mor* 'blackberry (the fruit of bramble)'; *siseṛn* 'chick-pea'; *sunk/g(n)* 'mushroom'; *uši/*(h)oši* probably 'storax-tree' and 'holm-oak'.

fauna: *erbuc* 'breast of animals'; *lor* 'quail' (prob. from 'sea-gull'); *karič* 'scorpion'; *kor* 'scorpion'; *mor(m)* 'tarantula'; *ors* 'hunt, hunted animal, game' (if from 'a kind of deer, roe'); *k'atirt* 'stomach of animals'; *k'arb* 'basilisk, asp'.

physical world: *pal* 'rock'.

products: *ewt* 'oil' (cf. above, on "flora"); *kat'n* 'milk'.

implements, buildings: *t'arp* 'a large wicker fishing-basket, creel'; *kamurj* 'bridge'; *sayl* 'wagon'; *sring* 'pipe, fife'.

D. PLACE-NAMES

4.1 Preliminaries

Unlike the Armenian anthroponyms which are extensively represented in AčarAnjn (= Ačaryan 1942-1962, 5 vols.), Armenian place-names have not been studied in such a thorough way. The voluminous HayTetBař is very helpful in presenting an extremely large body of data. With respect to philological and etymological examination, however, this dictionary has little value (cf. also Ĵihanyan 1991: 204). The only systematic treatment is found in Hübšchmann 1904 (Arm. transl. = Hiwbšman 1907), which is, however, far from exhaustive. Unfortunately, this valuable monograph is frequently neglected in etymological studies.

The hydronyms are covered in Ĵihanyan 1991.

For the study of historical geography of Armenia particularly important are the works by Ĺ. Ališan, T'. Hakobyan, S. Eremyan, R. Hewsen, and others. Urartian place-names are systematically treated in N. Arutjunjan 1985.

Numerous Armenian place-names are etymologically treated by G. Ĺap'anc'yan, G. Ĵahukyan, V. Xač'atryan, A. Petrosyan, S. Petrosyan and others as of native (that is to say, of Indo-European) origin. Many of these etymologies, however, cannot bear criticism. For an overview on place-names which contain native Armenian elements see Ĵahukyan 1987: 412-417.

Justly criticizing the etymological methods of V. Xač'atryan (1980), D'jakonov (1983: 164) claims that none of the toponyms and ethnonyms attested between the third and first millennia in the Armenian Highland has been demonstrated to be Armenian. As regards the first half of the first millennium, note e.g. ^{URU}*Barzuriani*, a stronghold in Uaias, south to Lake Van (!), attested in the 8th cent. BC (see N. Arutjunjan 1985: 54), which is derived from Arm. *barjr* 'high' by Ĵahukyan (1988: 160).

An Indo-European etymology of an Armenian place-name can be considered most reliable if it meets the following two requirements: 1) it presupposes an appellative that is compatible with the type of place-name; 2) there is/are cognate place-name(s) in (an) IE language(s).

The systematic examination and evaluation of all the place-names for which IE etymologies have been proposed is beyond the scope of my work. In a supplement to the vocabulary I shall represent only a few etymologies (some of them being of my known) that conform to the above-mentioned criteria.

In the following chapters some aspects of toponymical etymology will be discussed.

4.2 Textual evidence for identifying the appellatives

According to Movsēs Xorenac'i, *Duin* reflects an otherwise unknown Iranian word for 'hill'; see s.v.

Čahuk, a place-name close to Naxčawan, attested in Sebēos 16 (1979: 87^{L28}). No acceptable etymology is known to me. Hübschmann (1904: 447) mentions with another homonymous place-name (in Siwnik') on which he comments: "sicher nicht zu *čahuk* 'Herde' (von Füchsen)". Jihanyan (1991: 250) restores an unattested river-name **Čahuk* identic with modern *Ĵatri-č'ay* and derives it, though with reservation, with the same *čahuk* 'group'.

However, an etymology of a place-name that shows no semantic motivation has no value. The above-mentioned passage from Sebēos provides us with an important clue: *i šambin or koč'i Čahuk* "das Röhricht (*šamb*), das genannt wird *Čahuk*" [Hübschmann 1904: 447]. In view of this information, one can safely derive *Čah-uk* from Arm. **čah/x-* 'marsh, meadow' (cf. *čah-ič*, *čax-in*, etc. [HAB 3: 177]).

It has been assumed that this place-name is identical with *Šamb* mentioned in another chapter by Sebēs (1979: 146^{L20}), on which see Hübschmann 1904: 458. For literature and discussion I refer to Abgaryan 1979: 316-317₅₂₂. If this turns out to be true, then we are dealing with alternating names for one and the same place that are based on synonymic appellatives (see 4.3).

Note also Agulis *Šumb* 'name of a spring' < *šamb* (see Ačārean 1935: 24, 379). Agulis too is located in the vicinity of Naxčawan.

4.3 Synonymic or contrasting place-name variants

Some geographical places are known by different names given by the same or different populations in the same or different periods of time. In certain cases, the

name variants turn out to contain the same semantic nucleus. Sometimes, alongside of these (often synchronically opaque) variants, there is yet another name that has synchronically transparent semantics not confirmed by other data and should therefore be explained by folk-etymology. For instance, the river-name *Met* (q.v.) probably derives from PIE **mel-* 'dark, black, blue': Gr. μέλας 'dark, black', Skt. *māla-* 'dirt, impurity, filth' (RV+), Lith. *mėlas* 'blue', etc.; cf. numerous river-names in the Balkans and Asia Minor, such as *Μελας*, *Μελης*, *Mella*, etc. Remarkably, the etymological semantics of Arm. **met* is confirmed by the modern Turkish name: *Kara-su*, lit. 'black water'. Thus, the more common Armenian name, viz. *Met-a-geť*, lit. 'honey-river', must have been resulted from folk-etymology.

The mountain *Gaylaxaz-ut* (earlier named *Paxray*, see below) is identical with *Baghi/yr dagh* and is probably located in the district of Mananañi, in the province of Barjr Hayk', close to or on the border between the provinces of Barjr Hayk' and Cop'k' [Hübschmann 1904: 287, 416; Eremyan 1963: 76b].

In Chapter 23 of the "History" of the 11th century author Aristakēs Lastivertē'i (see Yuzbašyan 1963: 128^{L17}) we read: *I hatuac(s) lerinn Paxray or ayžm koč'i Gaylaxazut*, <...> "In a part of the mountain *Paxray* which now is called *Gaylaxazut*, <...>". Yuzbašyan (1968: 124) translates the beginning of the passage slightly differently: "близ горы Пахрай". The Divine sign (*Astuacayin nšan*) was established here in the village of *Bazm-atbiwr* (lit. "abounding in springs"), and the village have been renamed *Xač'* ('cross'). Then the historian tells that the "servants of the Satan" (*kamarar mšakk'n satanayi*) destroyed the Cross and returned "to their snake-dwelling lairs" (*yōjabnak orj's iwreanc* "в свои <...>, змеинные логова").

Hübschmann (1904: 287, 416) correctly interpreted *Gaylaxazut* as composed of *gaylaxaz* 'flint, Feuerstein' and the suffix *-ut* (thus: "feuersteinreich"), and treats *Paxray* as a genitive of unattested **Paxir*. The latter statement is not necessarily true. *Paxray* may in fact be identic with *paxrē*, *paxray* 'cattle', which denotes the hind/deer in the dialects of Ararat, T'iflis, Łazax (*paxra*), and the stag in Łarabať (*baxra*); see HAB 4: 7; Ačairean 1913: 891a. A possible trace of this meaning may be found in western dialects, if *xrkagu(v)* reflects **(pa)xrik-a-kov* (as I shall argue elsewhere). Place-names based on appellatives that denote the hind or the stag are not uncommon (see 4.5).

The denotata of *gaylaxaz* 'flint' (lit. 'wolf's stone') and dial. *satani etung* 'obsidian' (lit. 'Satan's nail') resemble each other and are often confused. In DialAdd apud NHB 2: 1066c, *satani etung* is described as a black stone that

resembles *gaylaxaz*. According to Amatuni (1912: 584b) and Ačaryan (1913: 956a), *satani ctung* is identic with *gaylaxaz*. For the parallelism between ‘Satan’ and ‘wolf’ and ‘hyena’ see 3.5.2.4. On the other hand, the wolf and the dragon or snake are surely associated with the deer (3.5.2.4). Bearing in mind that the mountain of *Paxray* = *Gaylaxazut* is said to be dwelled by "servants of the Satan" (in "snake-dwelling lairs"), one may assume that the "devilish fame/nature" of the mountain is conditioned by the abundance of *gaylaxaz*-stones as is seen in the name of the mountain (*Gaylaxaz-ut*) and is also reflected in its earlier name *Paxray*, if this indeed is identic with *paxray* ‘hind, deer’. Note also the association of the stag with ‘cross’ (see 3.5.2.4 on *xac’eneak* etc.).

Some further examples.

If *Šamb* is indeed the name variant of *Čahuk* (see 4.2), we might be dealing with a case of alternating names for one and the same place that are based on synonymic appellatives.

Siah-kuh lerink’ = modern *Łara-dat* (see Eremyan 1963: 80b), both meaning ‘black mountains’; see 4.6.

Sim : *Sev-sar*, see s.v. place-name *Sim*.

Urat. *Ardiunak* (in *Aiduni/Ajadu*, south of Lake Van, roughly coinciding with the territory of the province of Moks), possibly deriving from Arm. *ardiun-k’* ‘earth products’ : Arm. *Mayeak* in Moks < *mayeak* ‘barn’. Urart. *Ardiunak* may be geographically identical with Arm. *Mayeak*, both names reflecting synonymous appellatives meaning ‘earth products, barns’; see s.v. place-name *Ardean-k’*.

4.4 ‘Cattle / pasturing’ > ‘pastureland’ > place-name

This pattern of making place-names is common; cf. those with *tap’* ‘earth, plain, field’, e.g. *Ernj-a-tap’*, a village close to Aparan, on NE slopes of the mountain called *Arayi ler* [HayTetBar 2, 1988: 247c] with *erinj’* ‘heifer’ as the first member, *Tuarac-a-tap’* (q.v.), etc. Note also Ararat *naxratap’* ‘pastureland’ (see Markosyan 1989: 348a) = *naxir* ‘herd’ + *-a-* + *tap’*.

Step’anos Ōrbelean (13-14th cent.) mentions a place in Siwnik’ named *Maxat-a-tap’-k’*, the first component of which is identified with *maxat* ‘Mantelsack, Felleisen, Tasche’ by Hübschmann (1904: 448). However, the semantics is not very probable for a place-name. One should rather think of *makat* ‘sheep-fold’, dial. *matal*, with the alternation *-t* : *-l* (cf. also Kurd. *mevel*, HAB 3: 231). This is an old Semitic loan and seems to be found in Urart. ^{URU}*Maqaltuni* (on the place-name see N. Arutjunjan 1985: 132-133) < *makat* + *tun* ‘house’ [Jahukyan 1987: 445].

One might also find similar examples with *hovit* ‘valley’ which is very frequent in place-names (see Hübschmann 1904: 384-385; HAB 3: 116-117), with a first component that itself is a place-name (cf. *Arčišak-ovit* etc.) or an appellative (cf. *Arj-ovit* with *arj* ‘bear’).

In view of these data, the district-name *Kog-ovit* (q.v.), may be interpreted as ‘the valley of cow’, with *kov*, GSg *kog-* ‘cow’ (q.v.).

4.5 Wild animals > place-names

A number of place-names are based on appellatives that denote wild animals, see Ĵahukyan 1987: 417. On *Arj-ovit* see 4.4. The hind or the stag frequently appear in this function: *Etanc’ berd* or *Etnut*, probably *Eĵeruenik’* (see Hübschmann 1904: 423-424), etc. The mountain-name *Paxray*, later *Gaylaxazut*, as informed by Aristakēs Lastivertc’i (see Yuzbašyan 1963: 128^{L17}), probably located in Mananahi (in the province of Barjr Hayk’), seems to be identic with *paxrē*, *paxray* ‘cattle’, dial. ‘hind/deer; stag’; see 4.3. See also s.v. *Arciw*.

Interesting is *Yetin axpür* < **Etin atbiwr* ‘spring of hind’ in ĽarabaĽ (close to the village of Kusapat; see Lisic’yan 1981: 56b, 59), which is not attested in literature but reflects the classical genitive *etin*.

4.6 Mountains named as ‘dark’ or ‘black’

Mt’in leaĽn ‘the Dark mountain’ (= *Kangar-k*), in the province of Gugark’; attested in Movsēs Xorenac’i 2.8 (1913=1991: 113^{L16}) and AsoĽik (11th cent.); see Hübschmann 1904: 354, 453.

**Mt’in leaĽn* or *Mut’n ašxarh* = *Masis*, see *Ališan (Ayrarat) 1890: 469; Xač’konc’ 1898: 486-487; Hübschmann 1904: 453.

Seaw leaĽn ‘the Black mountain’ (Cilicia), attested in Matt’ēos Urhayec’i (12th cent.) etc. [Hübschmann 1904: 466].

Siah-kuĽ lerink’ = *Ľara-daĽ* (see Eremyan 1963: 80b), both meaning ‘black mountains’.

In view of these data, one may propose similar semantic interpretations for e.g. *T’əmnis* and *Sim* (see s.v.v.).

4.7 Place-name > wind-name

Step’anos Őrbelean (13-14th cent.) writes that the district *Sot’-k’* (on the shore of Sevan Lake) has taken its name from the strong winds. Hübschmann (1904: 467) points out the absence of such an appellative in Armenian. Ačāryan (HAB 4: 238b) records dial. (Nor Bayazet) *sot’* ‘an eastern, bitter wind on Sevan’.

According to A. A. Abrahamyan (1986: 410₁₆), the latter may be a derivative meaning not the other way around. This suggestion is quite probable and may be confirmed typologically by the example of **Parxar** (mountain-name) > *parxar*, *pa(r)xr-c'i* 'a northern cold wind' (HAB 4: 62-63); see 1.9.

4.8 Dialectal place-names as evidence for otherwise unattested dialectal words, forms or meanings

Only a few papers (cf. especially those by Margaryan) dealing with the etymology of dialectal place-names are known to me.

There are numerous dialectal place-names and micro place-names (micro-toponyms) that are absent (or poorly attested) in literature but conceal old features. On the other hand, some place-names, though attested in literature, seem to reflect certain local dialectal words or forms (sometimes - otherwise lost) and can thus provide us with relevant data for the absolute chronology of those dialectal features. In this and the following chapters I present some examples from the northeastern (Hamšen/Xotorĵur) and especially from the eastern (Ľarabat/Arc'ax and surroundings) peripheries of the Armenian-speaking territory.

Words can be lost (or ignored by the dialect describers) in certain dialects but preserved in adjacent dialects. One might hope that at least in some cases a place-name bears witness to the once existed dialectal form. For instance, Arm. **hiwsi(n)* 'avalanche' has been preserved in Xotorĵur *husi* but is lost in Hamšen. However, the place-name **Hus-er** in Hamšen seems to testify the existence of Hamšen **husi* (see s.v. **hiwsi* 'avalanche').

Ľarabat **Kohak** is a sacred grove of holy *čapki* 'cornus sanguinea' on the top of a hill, in the village of Gyuney-Čartar [Lalayan 2, 1988: 162; Martirosyan/Ľaragyozyan, FW 2003]. It may be identic with Arm. *kohak* 'wave; hill', which has not been preserved in dialects. The latter meaning is attested, among others, by Movsēs KaĽankatuac'i and Step'anos Őrbelean, both from the eastern part of Armenia. One is tempted to assume, therefore, that the place-name under question continues the EArm. dial. word though later it has been lost.

On Ľarabat **EĽin atbiwr* see 4.5.

No dialectal forms of ClArm. *tamal(i)* 'roof, house-top; prob. also ruins' are attested in HAB 4: 367a. Its existence in the Goris region can be testified by **Tamalek-k'**, a village close to the monastery of Tat'ew. Nowadays, the ruins of the village are called *Təmbäläsk*, from frozen APl **tamali-ak-s* (see s.v. *tamal* 'roof etc.').

A similar case (with the same structural-morphological background) is represented by **Xnjoresk**, a village in the former district of Goris. Variants: *Xnjorēk's*, *Xncorēsk'* (18th cent.). The oldest variant is *Xnjoreak* (= *xnjor-i* 'apple-tree' + diminutive suffix *-ak*), found in almost all the manuscripts of Step'anos Ōrbelean (1250/60-1304); see Margaryan 1992: 135-138. In a colophon from 1654, as well as in Abraham kat'otikos Kretac'i (1735) one finds *Xnjorek* [Lisic'yan 1969: 97; Margaryan 1992: 135-136].

As has been demonstrated by Margaryan (1992: 134-138), *Xnjoresk* is composed of *Xnjoreak* (= *xnjori* 'apple-tree' + diminutive suffix *-ak*) and *-s* : **Xnjore(a)k-s* > *Xnjoresk* (through metathesis). Compare *xnjr-k-ec'i* 'inhabitant of Xnjoresk' - *xnjörkec'i* [Łanalanyan 1960: 97b; Grigoryan-Spandaryan 1971: 42^{Nr203}] or *xünjürkec'i* [Margaryan 1992: 136-137]. The *-s*, not specified by Margaryan, is certainly the ClArm. API ending. Compare also *Tamalek-k'* : *Təmbäläsk* above. The same metathesis is found in *p'uk's* 'bellows' > *Metri p'ɔsk* [Ałayan 1954: 289b] etc.

That the API *-s* does not appear in *xnjr-k-ec'i* 'inhabitant of Xnjoresk' is normal; cf. *muk-äc'ə* 'inhabitant of Mok-k'/Mok-s' (see M. Muradyan 1982:139). For the typology of the structure /tree-name + diminutive suffix + plural marker/ cf. **Hac'ek-k'* < *hac'i* 'ash-tree' + *-ak* + pl. marker *-k'*.

K'ar(ah)unĵ, *K'arunĵ*, the name of a village in the district of Ewaylax (in the province of Siwnik') mentioned by Step'anos Ōrbelean (1250/60-1304). This seems to be the *k'atak'agiwtñ K'arunĵoy*, in Yovhannēs Draxanakertc'i (9-10th cent.) [1912=1980: 333^{L4}], identified with the present-day village of *K'arahunĵ* not far from Goris (see T'osunyan 1996: 379^{L25}). The variant with the conjunctive *-a-*, viz. *K'ar-a-hunĵ*, is attested in Abraham kat'otikos Kretac'i (1735); see Margaryan 1988: 129.

There are also other place-names in Zangezour and Łarabał named *K'ar-a-hunĵ*. In Lori one finds *K'arinĵ*, the name of a village close to Dset, on the foot of the mountain Č'at'in-dał.

Composed of *k'ar* 'stone' and *unĵ*₁ 'bottom, depth' (q.v.) (see Hübschmann 1904: 387 and, independently, Margaryan 1988: 129). The passage from P'awstos Buzand 4.18 (1883=1984: 109^{L9f}) which Hübschmann cites as a contextual illustration for *unĵ* reads as follows: *zi ēr hareal zxorann i jor yunĵ berdin* : "for the tent was pitched in the gorge beneath the fortress" (transl. Garsoïan 1989: 149^{L3f}). The component *unĵ* seems to be also found in other compounded place-names, though not all the components are entirely clear: *Arp'-unĵ-n*, *Unĵ-i-jor* (see

Hübschmann 1904: 387 and 462, respectively), *unĵ-or-k* (also in Step'anos Ōrbelean).

Compare also the fortress *Brd-a-honĵ Łala*, see Barxudaryan 1995 (< 1885): 87 (the author cites also *Berdaunc* between brackets). This is perhaps to be understood as **berd-a-(h)unĵ*. Compare with *yunĵ berdin* "beneath the fortress" in the above-mentioned passage from Buzand 4.18. The same pattern is seen in *Berdatak*, in Siwnik' (see Hübschmann 1904: 388, 414).

According to Margaryan (1988: 129), the second component *unĵ* acquired a prothetic *h-* (as in *ənker* 'friend' > *hinger*, etc.), and this triggered an intrusion of the conjunctive vowel *-a-*. This process does not seem probable. Besides, the actual dialectal reflexes of *unĵ* in Goris etc. are *unĵ* or *ənĵ*, without an initial *h-* (for the connection of *unĵ*₁ 'bottom' with *unĵ*₃ 'soot < sediment' see s.v. *unĵ*₃). More likely, the *-h-* can be interpreted as a glide as in *gi-h-i* 'juniper'. Compare variant forms of the ordinal numerals in the suffix *-inĵi*: *erku-h-inĵi* 'second', *č'ors[ə]-h-inĵi* 'fourth', *əxtə-h-inĵi* 'seventh', etc. Note the symmetry of the semantic field (and perhaps even the etymological identity) of *ganĵ(ak)* and *unĵ* (see s.v. *unĵ* and 1.12.6)¹⁶.

4.9 Place-names attested in literature and containig dialectal words or features

Amėrnep'or, a spot in Siwnik', in the district of Sot'k' (on eastern and southeastern sides of Sewan-Lake, neighbouring with Arc'ax/Łarabał), attested by Step'anos Ōrbelean (1250/60-1304). Hübschmann (1904: 398, cf. 389) posits a compound of unknown **ameın* and *p'or* 'valley, ravine, district'. In my view, **ameın* can be identified with Łarabał *áməėinə* and Goris *ameınə* < ClArm. *amain* 'summer' (q.v.).

Dizap'ayt, a mountain in the south of Łarabał, 2496 m; also called *Ziarat* [Lisic'yan 1981: 55ab; V. Arak'elyan 1969: 281₁₃₇].

Attested in Movsēs Kałankatuac'i/Dasxuranc'i 2.5 (V. Arak'elyan 1983: 119^{L12f} [also in the title of the chapter]; transl. Dowsett 1961: 70): *Yařaĵ k'an ztesč'aworeln teain Abasay Atuanic' ašxarhis i t'snameac' hrdehec'an*

¹⁶ According to a theory which is popular in Armenia, *K'ar-a-hunĵ*, a megalithic monument in Sisian, reflects the same pattern as in *Stone-henge*, name of a celebrated stone circle on Salisbury Plain: 'stone' + **hunĵ/henge*. This view can hardly be taken seriously.

vkayarank'n: i Dizap'ayt lerinn i Kataroy vans, <...>. Amenek'ean sok'a i leainn Dizap'ayt ačapareal xotabut kenōk', <...>: "Before Tēr Abas was elected spiritual overseer of this land of Albania, the chapels on Dizap'ayt Hill in Kataroy Vank' were burned down by our enemies. <...>. They fled in haste to the hill of Dizap'ayt and lived on grass, <...>".

According to V. Arak'elyan (1969: 281₁₃₇), this mountain is nowadays called *Ziarat'*, and the monastery called *Kataro vank'* is still venerated. This monastery is not mentioned in M. Barxutareanc' 1995 < 1895: 56. Here one finds the fortress of *Dizap'ayt*, a new martyrion in the place of the old monastery of Dizap'ayt, as well as a ruined martyrion named *Oxtə-dīnē-xut'* "rock with seven doors", situated on a rock/*k'erc* (ibid.).

According to a traditional story, *Dizap'ayt* is composed of *dēz* 'heap' and *p'ayt* 'wood': *Het'anosk' žotoveal i glux lerins zbazums i k'ristonēic', ew dizeal zp'ayt bazum, hroy čarak etun zamenesean, usti anuanec'aw Dizap'ayt* [Ĵalaleanc', 1, 1842: 211 apud Łanalanyan 1969: 16^{Nr28}; Lisic'yan 1981: 55b]. Hübschmann (1904: 421-422, with other references) notes: "Aber 'Holzhaufen' wäre doch arm. **p'aytadēz*, während *dizap'ayt* 'Haufenholz' bedeuten würde. Volksetymologische Umgestaltung eines fremden Wortes?".

As a matter of fact, **dizap'ayt* is a real word in the local vernacular, i.e. the dialect of Łarabał, meaning 'a long pole used as a support for a heap' (see Ačārean 1913: 277a; L. Harut'yunyan 1991: 154, 377). The actual Łarabał form is *tzap'ad* according to L. Harut'yunyan (ibid.). He (377) also records a metaphorical meaning of the word: 'a tall and thin person'.

The basic semantics of **diz-a-p'ayt* is, thus, 'Haufenholz', just as Hübschmann correctly expects it to be. This Łarabał mountain-name may derive, thus, from **diz-a-p'ayt* 'a high pole, heap-support', which has been preserved in the dialect of the very same area, that is Łarabał.

If this analysis is accepted, we are dealing with an old record of a dialectal word. This implies, further, that Łarabał **dizap'ayt* is not a "new word", as is represented by Ačāryan (HAB 1: 659b).

Ĵahayreank', a village of the district of Ewaylax (in the province of Siwnik') attested by Step'anos Ōrbelean (1250/60-1304). No etymological explanation is known to me. One may reconstruct **joł-a-har-i*, identifying it with Metri *jəthāre* 'a kind of poplar-tree', Karčewan *jəthāri* 'a tall tree of which logs/beams (*joł*) are made', composed of *joł* 'log, pole' (> Metri *jute*) and *har-* 'to beat, strike, cut'; see s.v. **joł(-a)-har-i*.

See also s.v. place-name **Getair(u)**.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abaev, V. I.
 1949 Osetinskij jazyk i fol'klor. Vol. 1. Moscow, Leningrad: Academy Press.
 1958-95 (1-5), Istoriko-ëtimologičeskij slovar' osetinskogo jazyka. 1: 1958; 2: 1973; 3: 1979; 4: 1989; [5] Ukazatel': 1995. (Moscow), Leningrad: Academy Press/"Nauka".
 1970 Tipologija armjanskogo i osetinskogo jazyka i kavkazskij substrat. In *SprGes* 1970: 16-28.
 1978 Armeno-Ossetica. In *VoprJaz* 1978, Nr 6: 45-51.
 1985 Avestica. In *Fs Knobloch* 1985: 7-19.
- Abgaryan, G. V.
 1979 (ed.), Patmut'iwn *Sebeōsi* (critical text with introduction and commentary). Yerevan: Academy Press.
- Abēfyan, Manuk
 1899 (Abeghian), Der armenische Volksglaube. Leipzig: Druck von W. Drugulin. [ModEArm. transl. by Sargis Harut'yunyan: in *M. Abefyan*, Erker, vol. 8, Yerevan: Academy Press, 1975: 11-102].
 1940 Gusanakan žofovrđakan tafer, hayrenner yev antuniner (uraxut'yan, siru, harsank'i, ororoc'i, lac'i). Yerevan: Academy Press.
 1941 "Višapner" koč'vac kot'oñern ibrev Astlik-Derketo dic'uhu arjanner. Yerevan: Academy Press.
 1955-59 (1-2) (Abetean), Hayoc' hin grakanut'ean patmut'iwn (2nd publ.). Vol. 1, 1955; vol. 2, 1959. Beyrut': "Sewan".
 1985 Erker. Vol. 8. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- Abrahamyan, A. A.
 1958 Barak'nnakan ditoñut'yunner. In *Tetekagir* [Izvestija Ak. N. ArmSSR, Obščestvennye nauki], 1958, Nr. 4: 61-64. [Not seen; I cite from Greppin 1981a: 496 and 1983: 309 (see s.v. *argat*) and from Ĵahukyan 1982: 216₇₃ (see s.v. *ačuk*)].

- 1970 Ezniki erki bnagrayin mi k'ani meknabanut'yunner. In *PatmBanashHand* 1970, Nr 2: 93-106.
- 1986 *Step'anos Orbelyan*, Syunik'i patmut'yun. Yerevan: "Sovetakan grof".
- 1994 See *Sources*: Eznik Kořbac'i.
- Abrahamyan, Ařot Arseni [identical with the preceding author?]
- 1976 Grabari jeřnark. Yerevan: "Luys".
- Abrahamyan, A. [identical with the following or preceding author?]
- 1952-53 Davit' Alavka ordu kanonnerə. In: 1) *Eřmian* 1952, Sept-Oct: 48-57; 2) *Eřmian* 1953, Jan: 56-62; 3) Febr: 53-60; 4) March: 51-63.
- Abrahamyan, A. G.
- 1940 (ed.) *Anania řirakac'i*, Tiezeragitut'iwn ew tomar (redacted by H. Ačaryan). Yerevan: Armenian State Press (HayPetHrat).
- 1941 [Ařot: the same author as 1940 and 1944 or identic with the previous author?] (ed.), *Yovhan Mamikonean*, Patmut'iwn Tarōnoy (critical text and introduction). Yerevan: Matenadaran/Gitamankavarřakan hratarakč'. tparan.
- 1944 Anania řirakac'u matenagrut'yunə: usumnasirut'yun. Yerevan: Matenadaran Press.
- 1979 Tomaratiezeragitakan erek' bnagrər. In *BngTxnPtmHay* 7: 38-66.
- Abrahamyan, A. G. and Petrosyan, G. B.
- 1979 *Anania řirakac'i*, Matenagrut'yun: introduction, translation and commentary. Yerevan: "Sovetakan grof".
- 1987 Hovhannes Erznkac'u "Yařags erkayin řarřmann" ařxatut'yan norahayt jeřagirə. In *BngTxnPtmHay* 8: 52-80.
- Ačaryan, Hrač'ya Hakobi
- 1898 (Ačarean), K'nnut'iwn Aslanbēgi barbařin. In *Bazmavēp* 56, 1: 31-35; 2: 83-88.
- 1898a (Ačarean), K'nnut'iwn Aslanbēgi barbařin (reprinted from 1898). Venice: S. Lazar. (Usumnasirut'iwnner haykakan gawarabanut'ean, 1).
- 1898b Haykakank'. In *Bazmavēp* [>] 56, 370-372.
- 1899 (Ačarean), K'nnut'iwn řarabaři barbařin. Reprinted from "Ararat" 1899. Vařarřapat: Tparan Mayr At'ořoy S. Eřmianci. (Usumnasirut'iwnner haykakan barbařaxōsut'ean, 3).

- 1902 (Ačārean), T'urk'erēnē p'oxāreal bārer hayerēni mē] (= Ēminean azgagrakan žoťovacu, vol. 3). Moscow, Vataršapat.
- 1906-08 (Adjarian), Gutturales issues de semi-occlusives par dissimilation. In *MSL* 14: 288.
- 1908 (Ačārean), Hayerēn nor bārer Noragiwt Mnac'ordac' Groc' mē]. Vienna: Mxit'arean Tparan. (Azgayin Matenadaran, 56).
- 1908-09 (Adjarian), Étymologies arméniennes: 1-9. In *MSL* 15: 242-245.
- 1911 (Ačārean), Hay barbaragitut'iwn: uruagic ew dasaworut'iwn hay barbarneri (barbaragitakan k'artēsov). Moskua, Nor-Naxiĵewan. (Ēminean azgagrakan žoťovacu, vol. 8). [Armenian dialectology: a sketch and classification of Armenian dialects (with a dialect map)].
- 1913 (Ačārean), Hayerēn gawarakan bāran. T'iflis (Ēminean azgagrakan žoťovacu, vol. 9).
- 1918 (Adjarian), Étymologies arméniennes: 10-20. In *MSL* 20: 160-163.
- 1925 (Ačārean), K'nnut'iwn Nor-Naxiĵewani (Xrimi) barbari. Yerevan.
- 1926 (Ačārean), K'nnut'iwn Maraťayi barbari. Yerevan.
- 1935 (Ačārean), K'nnut'iwn Agulisi barbari. Yerevan: PetHrat (State Press).
- 1937 (Adjarian), De l'affinité du grec et de l'arménien. In *Mélanges Émile Boisacq* 1: 3-4.
- 1937a (Adjarian), Etymologie du mot arm. *metc*. In *Fs Pedersen 1937*: 125-126.
- 1940 (Ačārean), K'nnut'iwn Nor-Ĵuťayi barbari. Yerevan.
- 1940a Strabon (select. and transl.). Yerevan: University Press. (Otar aťbyurner hayeri masin, Nr 1; Hunakan aťbyurner, Nr 1).
- 1940-51 (AčārHLPatm 1-2): Hayoc' lezvi patmut'yun, vol. 1, Yerevan: University Press, 1940; vol. 2, Yerevan: HayPetHrat (=State Press), 1951.
- 1941 K'nnut'iwn Polsahay barbari. In *Gitakan ašxatut'yunner* of Yerevan State University, vol. 19: 19-250.
- 1942-1962 Hayoc' anĵnanunneri bāran [AčārAnĵn 1-5]. 1, 1942; 2, 1944; 3, 1946; 4, 1948; 5, 1962. Yerevan: University Press. [The volumes 1-4 = *Gitakan ašxatut'yunner* 21, 24, 25, 26, respectively].

- 1947 K'nnut'yun Hamšeni barbari. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- 1952 K'nnut'yun Vani barbari. Yerevan: University Press.
- 1953 K'nnut'yun Artiali barbari. Yerevan: Academy Press. (Hayeren barbarner, 1).
- 1955-2005 (AčarLiak): Liakatar k'erakanut'yun hayoc' lezvi: hamematut'yamb 562 lezuni. Yerevan: Academy Press. Introductory vol., 1955; vol. 1, 1952; vol. 2, 1954; vol. 3, 1957, vol. 4a, 1959, vol. 4b, 1961; vol. 5, 1965; vol. 6, 1971. The last [7th] volume does not have a number; it comprises the unfinished manuscripts of the author on Semantics, Lexicology, and Syntax (ed. by S. Galstyan and X. Badikyan): Yerevan: University Press, 2005. I cite it as AčarLiak 2005.
- 1967 Kyank'is hušeric'. Yerevan: "Mitk'", Yerevan State University.
- 1971-79 (HAB), Hayerēn armatakan baṛaran, in 4 vols (second edition). Yerevan: University Press. [The original edition: 1926-1935, in 8 volumes].
- 2003 K'nnut'yun Kilikiayi barbari. Yerevan: University Press.
- Adams, Douglas Q.
- 1985 Designations of the *Cervidae* in Proto-Indo-European. In *JourIndEurStud* 13, 3-4: 269-281.
- 1999 A dictionary of Tocharian B. Amsterdam/Atlanta: Rodopi (LeidStudIndEur; 10).
- Adjarian see Ačariyan
- Adonc', N.
- 1911 Tork' astuac hin Hayoc'. In *Yušarjan*. Vienna: 389-394.
- 1915 Dionisij Ōrakijskij i armjanskije tolkovateli (texts and study). Petrograd: Tipografija Imperatorskoj Akademii Nauk. (Bibliotheca Armeno-Georgica, 4).
- 1927 *Tarkou* chez les anciens arméniens. In *RevEtArm* 7: 185-194.
- 1937 Quelques étymologies arméniennes. In *Mélanges Émile Boisacq* 1: 5-12.
- 1938 (Adontz, Nicolas), Emprunts de haute époque en arménien. In *REIE* 1: 457-467 (Arm. transl. see 1972: 382-392).
- 1970 (Adontz), Armenia in the period of Justinian: the political conditions based on the *naxarar* system (< 1908; translated with partial revisions, a bibliographical note and appendices by Nina G. Garsoïan). Lisbon: Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation.

- 1972 Hayastani patmut'yun. Yerevan: "Hayastan".
- Adontz, N. see Adonc', N.
- Aghayan, E. see Ałayan.
- Akaba, L. X.
- 1955 Abxazy Očamčirskogo rajona. In *Kavkazskij etnografičeskij sbornik* 1: 48-112.
- Akinean, H. N.
- 1936 Simēon dpri Lehač'woy Utegrut'iwn : Nkaragir uteworut'ean i Lvovē i K. Polis, i Hrom, i Muš ew yErusełēm yamsn 1608-1619. Vienna: Mxit'arean Tparan. (Azgayin Matenadaran, 141).
- Atabekyan, Melada A.
- 1979 Hay-italyan barayin zugabanut'yunner. In *Hayoc' lezvi hamematakan k'erakanut'yan harc'er*. Yerevan: Academy Press : 23-127.
- 1980 Stugabanakan ditotut'yunner. In *PatmBanashHand* 1980, Nr 3: 159-168.
- 1981 Hndevropakan *u bałajaynə hayerenum. In *PatmBanashHand* 1981, Nr 4: 95-108.
- 1981a Hndevropakan jaynavor ew jaynord *u-n hayerenum. In *LrHasGit* 1981, Nr 8: 56-63.
- 1998 Hayereni hamematakan hnč'yunabanut'yan harc'er. In *Hayoc' lezvi hamematakan k'erakanut'yan harc'er* 2. Yerevan: "Anania Širakac'i": 49-144.
- Ałayan, E. B.
- 1954 Metru barbar. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- 1965 (Agajan), Ob odnom fonetičeskom zakone drevnearmjanskix dialektov. In *LingPosn* 10: 7-14.
- 1973 Barak'nnut'yun ew stugabanut'yun. In *PatmBanashHand*, Nr 2: 16-26.
- 1974 Barak'nnakan ew stugabanakan hetazotut'yunner. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- 1976 Ardi hayereni bac'atrakan bararan. Vol. 1 (letters A- J); vol. 2 (letters L-F). Yerevan: "Hayastan".
- 1980 (Aghayan), Declination [read *déclinaison* ? - HM] en *-iwn/-ean, -un/-uan* de l'arménien classique. In *ProcFICAL* 1980: 139-146.
- 1984 Əndhanur ew haykakan baragitut'yun. Yerevan: University Press.

- 1985 On the chronology of Indo-European $\bar{o}$ and $\check{o}$ ($\check{o}m$, $\check{o}n$) > Armenian u sound shift, in *AAL* 6: 21-25.
- 1986 *Aknarkner hayoc' tomarneri patmut'yan*. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- 1987 *Lezvabanut'yan himunk'ner*. Yerevan: University Press.
- Aṭayan, Łazaros
- 1979 *Erker* (ed. by B. H. Ananikyan). Yerevan: "Sovetakan groṭ" (Hay dasakanneri gradaran).
- Ališan, Lewond
- 1895 *Haybusak kam haykakan busabarut'iwn*. Venice: S. Lazar.
- 1910 *Hin hawatk' kam het'anosakan krōnk' Hayoc'*. Venice: S. Lazar.
- 1920 *Yušikk' hayreneac' hayoc'*. Venice: S. Lazar.
- Allahvērtean, Y.
- 1884 *Ulnia kam Zeyt'un*. K-Polis: Paṭatlean/Aramean.
- Allen, Leslie C.
- 1983 *Psalms 101-150* (transl. from the Hebrew with comm., explanations and notes). Waco, Texas: Word Books. (World Biblical Commentary 21).
- Allen, W. S.
- 1950 Notes on the phonetics of an Eastern Armenian speaker. In *TrPhilSoc* 1950 [1951]: 180-206.
- Amalyan, H. M.
- 1966 *Miṣnadaryan Hayastani baṛaranagrakan hušarjanner* (V-XV dd.). Yerevan: Academy Press.
- 1971 *Miṣnadaryan Hayastani baṛaranagrakan hušarjanner* (XVI-XVII dd.). Yerevan: Academy Press.
- 1975 *Baṛgirk' hayoc'*. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- Amatuni, Sahak Vardapet
- 1912 *Hayoc' baṛ u ban. Vaṭaršapat*.
- Ananyan, V. S.
- 1961-75 see *HayKendAšx* 1-5.
- 1978 *Hin vrani p'ok'rik bnakič'ə*. Erevan: "Sovetakan groṭ".
- 1980 *Ur en tanum kacannerə?* Erevan: "Sovetakan groṭ".
- 1984 (1-4), *Erker*. In 4 volumes. Yerevan: "Sovetakan groṭ". [Whenever the volume number is not indicated, the volume 4 ("Hovazajori gerinerə") is meant].
- Andreasyan, Tigran

- 1967 Svediayi barbaṛə (K'ist'inəgi lezun). Yerevan: Academy Press.
- Ant'osyan, S. M.
- 1961 Kesariayi barbaṛə. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- 1972 Bayə ew nra xonarhman hamakargə. Č't'ek'voṭ xosk'i maser. In *Aknarkner mijin grakan hayereni patmut'yan*. Yerevan: University Press: 297-490.
- Anttila, Raimo
- 1986 Deepened joys of etymology, Grade a (and ä). In *Journal de la Société finno-ougrienne* 80: 15-27.
- Arak'elyan, B. N.
- 1951 Ditoṭut'yunner Višapak'aṭ Vahagni masin. In *Tetekagir HSSR GA: has. git.* 1051, Nr 2: 75-81.
- 1988 Urartun ew hay žoṭovrdi kazmavorumə. In *UrHay 1988*: 5-46.
- Arak'elyan, Varag
- 1969 *Movses Kaṭankatvac'i*, Patmut'yun Aṭvanic' ašxarhi (ModEArm. translation and commentary). Yerevan: "Hayastan".
- 1975 Grigor Narekac'u lezun ew očə. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- 1979 Barak'nnakan ditoṭut'yunner. In *PatmBanashand* 1979, Nr 4: 35-45.
- 1981 Aknarkner hayoc' grakan lezvi patmut'yan (V dar). Yerevan: Academy Press.
- 1983 (ed.), *Movsēs Kaṭankatuac'i*, Patmut'iwn Aṭuanic' ašxarhi (critical text and introduction). Yerevan: Academy Press.
- 1984 Hingerord dari hay t'argmanakan grakanut'yan lezun ew očə. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- 1984a Barak'nnakan ditoṭut'yunner. In *PatmBanashand* 1984, Nr 3: 142-151.
- Arbeitman, Yoël
- 1980 The recovery of an IE collocation. In *ProcFICAL 1980*: 225-231.
- Arbeitman, Yoël & Ayala, Gilbert-James
- 1981 Rhotacism in Hieroglyphic Luwian. In *Gd Kerns 1981*, part 1: 25-28.
- Ardzinba, V. G.
- 1983 Posleslovie: O nekotoryx novyx rezul'tatax v issledovanii istorii, jazykov i kul'tury drevnej Anatolii. In *Makkuin, Dž. G., Xetty i ix sovremenniki v Maloj Azii* (Russ. translation by F. L.

- Mendel'son). Moscow: GRVLI "Nauka"; pp. 152-180.
- Arevšatyan, S.
 1956 (Arevšatjan), Traktat Zenona Stoika "O prirode" i ego drevnearmjanskij perevod. In *BanbMaten* 3: 315-342.
- Arutjunjan, Covinar R.
 1983 Armjano-grečeskie leksičeskie izoglossy. In *OčSrLekArm* 1983 : 221-354.
- Arutjunjan, N. V.
 1965 Nekotorye voprosy toponimiki Urartu. In *PatmBanasHand* (= IFŽ) 1965, Nr 1: 187-200.
 1978 K interpretacii urartskoj nadpisi iz Xagi. In *DrevVost* 3: 153-167.
 1985 Toponimika Urartu. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- Arzoumanian, Zaven
 1982 History of *Lewond*, The Eminent Vardapet of the Armenians. Translation, introduction and commentary. Philadelphia.
- Asatryan, G. D.
 1990 Patmakan K'anak'erə ew k'anak'erc'inerə (XII-XX darer). Yerevan: "Hayastan".
- Asatryan, G. S.
 1990 Ardyok' kan haykakan p'oxarut'yunner nor parskerenum? in *PatmBanasHand* 1990, Nr 3: 139-144.
 1992 Kontakty armjanskogo s novoiranskimi jazykami (PhD dissertation: avtoreferat). Yerevan.
- Asatryan, M. E.
 1962 Urmiai (Xoyi) barbarə. Yerevan: University Press.
 1968 Loṛu xosvack'ə. Yerevan: "Mitk'" / University Press.
- Astuacaturean, T'.
 1895 Hamabarbar Hin ew Nor Ktakaranac'. Jerusalem: St Jacob.
- Austin, William M.
 1941 The prothetic vowel in Greek. In *Language* 17: 83-92.
 1942 Is Armenian an Anatolian language? In *Language* 18: 22-25.
- Avagyan, Suren Artemi
 1973 Vimakan arjanagrut'yunneri hnč'yunabanut'yun (X-XIV dd.). Yerevan: Academy Press.
 1978 Vimakan arjanagrut'yunneri barak'nnut'yun. Yerevan: University Press.

- 1986 Vimagrakan prptumner. Yerevan: University Press.
- Avagyan, Serine Movsesi
1978 Arčak. *Hay azgagrut'yun ew banahyusut'yun* 8. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- Avetisyan, E. S.
1989 Kirakos Episkoposi "Vasn t'řč'noc'" banastetcut'yunə. In *BanbErewHamals* 1989, Nr 3: 122-126.
- Bailey, Harold W.
1956 Armeno-Indoiranica. In *TrPhilSoc* 1956: 88-126.
1968 Saka of Khotan and Wakhān. In *Fs Kuiper 1968 (Pratidānam)*: 157-159.
1979 Dictionary of Khotan Saka. Cambridge, London, New York, Melbourne: Cambridge University press.
1985 Armenian *sin* and *zgeř* (*zkeř*). In *AnnArmLing* 6: 27-30.
1986 An Iranian miscellany in Armenian. In *Gd Berberian 1986*: 1-8.
1987 Armenia and Iran IV. Iranian influences in Armenian. 2. Iranian loanwords in Armenian. In *EncIran* 2, 1987: 459-465.
1989 Two Armeno-Iranian etymologies. In *AnnArmLing* 10: 1-4.
- Bakunc', Aksel
1976 Erker. In 4 volumes. Vol. 1. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- Baġdasaryan-T'ap'alc'yan, S. H.
1958 Mšo barbařə. Yerevan: Academy Press.
1971 Barimasti p'op'oxut'yan mi k'ani erewuyt'ner Araratyan barbařum. In *PatmBanasHand* 1971, Nr 4: 217-234.
1973 Araratyan barbaři xosvack'nerə Hoktemberyani řřjanum. Yerevan: Academy Press.
1976 (Bagdasarjan-Tapalcjan), Meřdialektnye kontakty v Araratskoj doline. In *LingGeogrDiallJaz*: 100-108.
- Bařramyan, R. H.
1960 Dersimi barbařayin k'artezə. Yerevan: Academy Press.
1961 Křzeni barbařə. Yerevan: Academy Press.
1964 řamaxii barbařə. Yerevan: Academy Press.
1965 'A' jaynavori p'op'oxut'yunə barbařnerum. In *PatmBanasHand* 1965, Nr 4: 79-95.
1974 Hayeren bařer "K'it'abi dada Gorgudum". In *PatmBanasHand* 1974, Nr 1: 162-174.
- Bartholomae, Christian

- 1899 Arica XI. In *IndogForsch* 10: 1-20.
- 1904 Altiranisches Wörterbuch. Strassburg: Verlag von Karl J. Trübner.
- Bartikjan, R. M.
- 1967 Eretiki Arevordi ("Syny solnca") v Armenii i Mesopotamii i poslanie armjanskogo katolikosa Nersesa Blagodatnogo, in *ĖllBIVVizIr*: 102-112.
- Barton, Charles R.
- 1963 The etymology of Armenian *ert'am*. In *Language* 39/4: 620.
- Barxudareanc', Makar Vard./Epis.
- 1883 (Makar Vard.), Pələ-Puṭi. T'iflis: Mov. Vardaneani ew Ənk. tparanum.
- 1995 (1895) (Makar Epis. Barxutareanc'/Barxudaryan), Arc'ax. Step'anakert: "Munk'", 1995; Yerevan: "Amaras", 1996. Reprinted from 1895, Bagu: "Arōr".
- Barxutareanc', Usta-Gēorg
- 1883 Arazə tarin ktari. Šuši: Tparan M. Mahtesi-Yakobeanc'.
- 1896 Č'obann u nšanacə (1883 t'uin). T'iflis: Tparan M. Šarajēi.
- 1898 Baroyakan aracner. Tp'xis: Tparan M. Šarajēi ew Ənk.
- Basmaĵean, K. Y.
- 1926 (ed.) *Amirtovlat'i Amasiac'woy Angitac' anpet kam bararan bžškakan niwt'oc'*. Vienna: Mxit'arean tparan.
- Baum, Daniel
- 2006 The imperative in the Rigveda. PhD diss. Leiden University. Utrecht: Landelijke Onderzoekschool Taalwetenschap.
- Bdoyan, V. H.
- 1964 Šarac'an sistemə Vana lči avazanum. In *PatmBanasHand* 1964, Nr 1: 249-257.
- 1972 Erkragorcakan mšakuyt'ə Hayastanum. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- 1986 Haykakan ałamanner. Yerevan: "Sovetakan groṭ".
- Beekes, Robert S. P.
- 1969 The development of the the Proto-Indo-European laryngeals in Greek. The Hague, Paris: Mouton.
- 1972 *H₂O*. In *Sprache* 18: 117-131.
- 1973 The Proterodynamic 'Perfect'. In *ZVS* 87: 86-98.
- 1973a The Greek *i-* and *u-*stems and πόλις, -ηος. In *Glotta* 51:

- 228-245.
- 1985 The origins of the Indo-European nominal inflection. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft, 46).
- 1987 Gr. (ἄ)στεροπή, ἄστροπή. In *MünStudSpr* 48: 15-20.
- 1987a On Indo-European 'wine'. In *MünStudSpr* 48: 21-26.
- 1988 Laryngeal developments: a survey. In *LaryngTheor* 1988 : 59-105.
- 1988a PIE. *RHC*- in Greek and other languages. In *IndogForsch* 93: 22-45.
- 1989 Old Persian *p-ḡ-i-m*. In *MünStudSpr* 50: 7-13.
- 1995 Comparative Indo-European linguistics: an introduction. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- 1998 *Hades* and *Elysion*. In *Fs Watkins 1998*: 17-28.
- 1998a The origin of Lat. *aqua*, and of **teutā* 'people'. In *JourIndEurStud* 26, 3-4: 459-466.
- 2000 European substratum words in Greek. In *Ofitsch/Zinko 2000* : 21-31.
- 2002 [2004] Hom. *γέφυρα*, and Arm. *kamurj* 'bridge'. In *Glotta* 78, 1-4, 2002 [2004]: 12-21.
- 2003 Historical phonology of Classical Armenian, apud *Kortlandt 2003*: 133-211.
- 2003a Indo-European or substrate? *φάτνη* and *κῆρυξ*. In *LangPrehEur* 2003: 109-115.
- Beekes, R. S. P., and van der Meer, L. B.
- 1991 De Etrusken spreken. Muiderberg: Dick Coutinho.
- Be'guinot, Augusto & Diratzouyan, P. Nersès
- 1912 Contributo alla flora dell'Armenia. Venezia: Tipografia Armena di S. Lazzaro.
- Belck, Waldemar
- 1901, 1-2 Beiträge zur alten Geographie und Geschichte Vorderasiens. 2 vols. Leipzig: Verlag von Eduard Pfeiffer.
- Belenickij, A. M.
- 1964 K istorii kul'turnyx svjazej Srednej Azii k Indii v rannee srednevekov'e. In *IndDrev* 1964: 188-198.
- Benninghaus, Rüdiger
- 1989 Zur Herkunft und Identität der Hemçinli. In *EthnGrTurk* :

497-502.

Benveniste, Émile.

- 1927 Sur quelques emprunts iraniens en arménien. In *HandAms* 41: 761-764.
- 1929 Le nom d'un animal indien chez Élien. In *Fs Schrijnen 1929* : 371-376.
- 1930 Sur *-r-* de arménien *merk* 'nu'. In *RevEtArm* 10/2: 187.
- 1932 Une racine indo-européenne. In *BSL* 33: 133-135.
- 1945 Etudes iraniennes. In *TrPhilSoc* 1945 [1946]: 39-78.
- 1957-58 Mots d'emprunt iraniens en arménien. In *BSL* 53 (1957-1958), fasc. 1: 55-71.
- 1964 Éléments parthes en arménien. In *RevEtArm* n.s. 1: 1-39.
- 1965 Arménien *aregagn* 'soleil' et la formation nominale en *-agn*. In *RevEtArm* n.s. 2: 5-19.
- 1969, 1-2 Le vocabulaire des institutions indo-européennes. 1. économie, parenté, société; 2. pouvoir, droit, religion. Paris: Les Editions de Minuit.

Bernštejn, S. B.

- 1984 Nekotorye voprosy metodiki izučenija problem `etnogeneza slavjan. In *ĖtnNarBalk 1984*: 11-17.

Bezzenger, Adalbert

- 1877 [Miscellanea 2-10]. In *BKIGS* 1: 163-170.

Bijagov, L.N.

- 1974 K voprosu ob interpretacii "Xaldi i Arubani-Bagbartu". In *LrHasGit (VON)* 1974, Nr 11: 98-101.

Billigmeier, Jon-Christian

- 1981 *Santas* and *Kupapa* on Crete. In *Gd Kerns 1981*, 2: 751-760.

Blanchard, Monica J. & Young, Robin Darling

- 1998 A Treatise on God written in Armenian by Eznik of Kotb (floruit c. 430-c. 450). An English translation, with introduction and notes. Leuven: Peeters.

Blaßing, Uwe

- 1992 Armenisches Lehnwort im Türkisch-türkischen am Beispiel von Hemçin. Amsterdam/Atlanta: Rodopi.
- 1995 Armenisch - Türkisch: etymologische Betrachtungen ausgehend von Materialien aus dem Hemçingebiet nebst einigen Anmerkungen zum Armenischen, insbesondere dem

- Hemçindialekt. Amsterdam/Atlanta: Rodopi.
- 1995a Bemerkungen zu arm. *kotinj* 'Schnecke'. In *NewApprMedArm* : 111-119.
- 2000 Irano-Turcica: weitere iranische Elemente im Türkeiitürkischen. In *FolOrient* 36 (Studia in honorem Stanislaw Stachowski dicata): 33-61.
- Blažek, Václav
- 2001 On the Baltic theonyms: Baltic-Italic correspondences in divine-names. In *JourIndEurStud* 29, 3-4: 351-365.
- Bloomfield, Maurice
- 1908 The etymology of *πρέσβυς*. In *AmJPhil* 29, 1: 78-81.
- Boehme, R. L. & Flint, V. E.
- 1994 Dictionary of animal names in five languages: birds. Moscow: Russo; Russkij jazyk.
- Boetticher see Lagarde, Paul de
- Bogoljubov, M. N.
- 1987 O drevneindijskom nazvanii Plejad. In *LitKDSInd* 1987: 6-10.
- 1989 Iranske nazvanija utrennej zvezdy. In *VoprJaz* 1989, Nr 4: 88-91.
- Boisacq, Émile
- 1911-12 Grec *κέλωρ* 'fils' et homonymes. In *MSL* 17: 113-116.
- Bolognesi, Giancarlo
- 1960 Le fonti dialettali degli prestiti iranici in armeno. Milano: Società Editrice Vita e Pensiero. (Pubblicazioni dell'Università cattolica del Sacro cuore. Serie 3: Scienze filologiche e letteratura, 1).
- 1994 La contribution de Holger Pedersen aux études de linguistique arménienne. In *Pedersen Kolloquium 1994*: 29-39.
- 1995 Some notes on Arm. *hrapar* and its etymology. In *AnnArmLing* 16: 1-11.
- Bomhard, Allan R.
- 1986 An etymological note: PIE **H₂s-tér-* 'star'. In *JourIndEurStud* 14, 1-2: 191-192.
- Bonfante, Giuliano
- 1937 Les isoglosses gréco-arméniennes. I. Faits phonétiques. In *Fs Pedersen 1937*: 15-33.
- 1975 Un capitolo di fonologia dell'indoeuropeo: il problema dell'ō

- breve. In *Fs Benveniste 1975*: 47-54.
- Bournoutian, George A.
 1994 A history of Qarabagh: an annotated translation of Mirza Jamal Javanshir Qarabaghi's *Tarikh-e Qarabagh*. Costa Mesa, California: Mazda Publishers.
- Boyce, Mary
 1977 A word-list of Manichaean Middle Persian and Parthian (with a reverse index by Ronald Zwanziger). Leiden: E.J. Brill; Téheran-Liège: Biliothèque Pahlavi. (Acta Iranica 9a, Série 3 - "Textes et mémoires", vol. 2-supplément).
- Braccini, Tommaso
 2004 Carmen choliambicum quod apud Ps.-Callisthenis *Historiam Alexandri* reperitur. München, Leipzig: K.G. Saur Verlag GmbH (Beiträge zur Altertumskunde, 210).
- Brandenstein, Wilhelm and Mayrhofer, Manfred
 1964 Handbuch des Altpersischen. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
 Bratcher, Robert G. & Reyburn, William D.
 1991 A translator's handbook on the book of Psalms. New York: United Bible Societies.
- Braun, Jan
 1998 Euscaro-caucasica: historical and comparative studies on Kartvelian and Basque. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Akademickie (Academic Publications) DIALOG. (Philologia orientalis, 4).
- Brosset, M.
 1870 Deux historiens arméniens: Kiracos de Gantzac, XIII^e s., Histoire d'Arménie; Oukhtanès d'Ourha, X^e s., Histoire en trois parties. St.-Petersbourg.
- Bugge, Sophus
 1889 Beiträge zur etymologischen Erläuterung der armenischen Sprache. Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel.
 1890 Etruskisch und Armenisch: sprachvergleichende Forschungen. Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel.
 1892 Beiträge zur etymologischen Erläuterung der armenischen Sprache. In *IndogForsch* 1: 437-459.
 1893 Beiträge zur etymologischen Erläuterung der armenischen Sprache. In *ZVS* 32: 1-87.
 1897-1901 (1-2), Lykische Studien. 1, 1897; 2, 1901. Christiania: In

- Kommission bei Jacob Dybwad; A. W. Brøgers Buchdruckerei.
(Videnskabselskabets Skrifter. II. Historisk-filosofisk Klasse.
1897, Nr 7; 1901, Nr 4).
- 1899 Einige Zahlwörter im Lykischen. In *IndogForsch* 10: 59-61.
- Burrow, Thomas
2001 The Sanskrit language. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers
Private Limited; London: Faber and Faber (< 1973 < 1955).
- Cabолоv, R. L.
2001 Ètimologičeskij slovar' kurdsogo jazyka, vol. 1. Moskva: Russian
Academy Press "Vostočnaja literatura".
- Campbell, Lyle
1990 Indo-European and Uralic tree names. In *Diachronica* 7/2:
149-180.
- Čanikean, Y. K.
1895 Hnut'iwñk' Akñay. T'iflis: Tparan M. D. Rõtineanc'i. (T'iflisi
hayoc' hratarakč'akan ənkerut'iwñ, 89).
- Cardona, George
1987 On Sanskrit *bhunákti* 'aids, serves, protects'. In *Fs Hoenigswald*
1987: 65-72.
- Casaretto, Antje
2000 Korpusssprachen und Produktivität: Einige Überlegungen zu den
gotischen *s*-Stämmen. In *HistSpr* 113: 210-238.
- Chapman, Donald and Chapman, Norma
1975 Fallow deer: their history, distribution and biology. Lavenham,
Suffolk: Terence Dalton Limited.
- Cheung, Johnny
2002 Studies in the historical development of the Ossetic vocalism.
Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag.
- Chirikba, Viacheslav A.
1985 (Čirikba), Baskskij i severokavkazskie jazyki. In *DrevAnat* 1985
: 95-105.
1996 Common West Caucasian: the reconstruction of its phonological
system and parts of its lexicon and morphology. Leiden:
Research School CNWS (CNWS publications, 48).
- Clackson, James
1994 The linguistic relationship between Armenian and Greek.
Oxford, Cambridge: Blackwell (Publications of the Philological

- Society, 30).
- 2004-05 Review of Kortlandt 2003 (with an appendix = Beekes 2003). In *AnnArmLing* 24-25: 153-158.
- Členova, N. L.
- 1989 Volga i Južnyj Ural v predstavlenijax drevnix irancev i finno-ugrov vo II - načale I tys. do n. è. In *SovArx* 1989, Nr 2: 225-240.
- 1990 Zaključitel'noe slovo po diskussii. In *SovArx* 1990, Nr 3: 161-165.
- Č'olak'ean, Yakob
- 1986 K'esapi barbarə. Haleb.
- Colditz, Iris
- 1987 Bruchstücke manichäisch-parthischer Parabelsammlungen. In *AltForsch* 14/2: 274-313.
- Collinge, N. E.
- 1985 The laws of Indo-European. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Considine, Patrick
- 1979 A semantic approach to the identification of Iranian loanwords in Armenian. In *Fs Szemerényi* 1979, 1: 213-228.
- 1984 Two Armenian runners. In *AnnArmLing* 5: 51-58.
- Čop, B.
- 1955 Etyma. In *Linguistica* 1: 28-33 [Not seen. I cite from Greppin 1983. See s.v. *azbn* 'weft, warp'].
- Corthals, Johan
- 1979 Altirisch *dúas*. In *Fs Szemerényi* 1979, 1: 229-234.
- Cowe, S. Peter
- 1992 The Armenian version of Daniel. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press (University of Pennsylvania Armenian texts and studies, 9).
- Cowgill, Warren
- 1986 Einleitung. In *Indogermanische Grammatik* 1/1 (Ins Deutsche übersetzt und bibliographisch bearbeitet von A. Bammesberger und M. Peters). Heidelberg: Carl Winter, Universitätsverlag.
- Cox, Claude E.
- 1981 The Armenian translation of Deuteronomy. University of Pennsylvania: Scholars Press (Armenian texts and studies, 2).

- 2006 Armenian Job: reconstructed Greek text, critical edition of the Armenian with English translation. Leuven - Paris - Dudley, MA: Peeters. (Hebrew University Armenian studies, 8).
- Crepajac, Ljiljana
1967 Die idg. Wortsippe **gh/ghel-* 'hell, glänzend' im Griechischen und Slavischen. In *ZVS* 81, 3/4: 181-196.
- Č'ugaszyan, B. L.
1980 see *Sources*: Bžškan jioy ew arihasarak grastnoy (13th cent.).
1986 (ed., with introduction and commentary), *Etia Mušet'yan Karnec'i*, T'urk'eren-hayeren ba'aran. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- Cuinet, Vital
1890-1900 La Turquie d'Asie: géographie administrative, statistique descriptive et raisonnée de chaque province de l'Asie-mineure. Paris: Leroux. Vol. 2, 1891.
- Čulartean, H. Simon V.
1880 A'rack' azgayink'. Venice: S. Lazar.
- Cuny, A.
1937 Questions d'apophonie vocalique. In *Mélanges Émile Boisacq* 1, 1937: 227-231.
- Dahood, Mitchell, S. J.
1970 The Anchor Bible: Psalms III (101-150). Intr., transl. and notes with an appendix. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company.
- Dalalyan, Tork'
2000 Hay-ōsakan lezvamšakut'ayin a'rnč'ut'yunner (candidate avtoreferat). Yerevan.
2004 "Sasna creri" ew ōsakan "Nart'yan dic'avepi" hamematakan k'nnut'yan urvagcer. In *SasC'iGit* 2004: 82-87.
- Danielyan, T'ewan
1967 Malat'ia'i barba'ə. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- Dankoff, Robert
1995 Armenian Loanwords in Turkish. Wiesbaden. Harrassowitz Verlag ("Turcologica", ed. by Lars Yohanson; vol. 21).
- Darbinjan-Melikjan, M. O. and Xanlarjan, L. A.
1988 *Grigor Narekaci*, Kniga skorbnix pesnopenij (Russ. transl. and commentary. With an introduction by S. S. Averincev). Moscow: GRVLI "Nauka".

- Darms, Georges
 1978 Schwäher und Schwager, Hahn und Huhn: die Vṛddhi-Ableitung im Germanischen. München: Kitzinger. (MünStudSpr Beiheft 9).
- Dashian, P.
 1890 Das Hochland Ulnia oder Zeitun. In Mittheilungen der kais. königl. geographischen Gesellschaft in Wien 33 (N.F. 23): 424-458.
- Davt'yan, K. S.
 1966 Lernayin Łarabaŋi barbarayin k'artezə. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- Dawkins, R. M.
 1910 Modern Greek in Asia Minor. In *JourHellStud* 30: 109-132, 267-291.
 1916 Modern Greek in Asia Minor: a study of the dialects of Sílli, Cappadocia and Phárasa with grammar, texts, translations and glossary; with a chapter on the subject-matter of the folk-tales by *W.R. Halliday*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Degen, Rainer
 1979 See Ullmann 1979.
- Delamarre, Xavier
 2001 Dictionnaire de la langue gauloise: une approche linguistique du vieux-celtique continental. Paris: Errance.
- Demiraj, Bardhyl
 1997 Albanische Etymologien: Untersuchungen zum albanischen Erbwortschatz. Amsterdam, Atlanta: Rodopi (LeidStudIndEur, 7).
 2001 Das Meyersche Gesetz über den Schwund der intervokalischen Media im Albanischen (Revision). In *MünStudSpr* 61: 57-92.
- Derksen, Rick
 1996 Metatony in Baltic. Amsterdam, Atlanta: Rodopi (LeidStudIndEur, 6).
- Dervischjan, P. Seraphin
 1877 Armeniaca I: Das Altarmenische. Wien: Mechitharisten Buchdruckerei.
 1885 (Tērvīšean, H. Serovbē), Hndewropakan naxalezu. K. Polis: Nšan K. Pērpērean.

- Diakonoff, I. M. see D'jakonov.
- Dowsett, C. J. F.
- 1961 The History of the Caucasian Albanians by Movsēs Dasxuranc'i (English translation and commentary). London, New York, Toronto: Oxford University Press. (London Oriental Series, 8).
 - 1965 Armenian *niwt'*, *niwt'em*, *hiwt'*, *hiwt'em*. In *RevEtArm* n.s. 2: 117-128.
 - 1986 Little Satana's wedding breakfast. In *Gd Berberian 1986* : 243-263.
- Drazin, Israel
- 1982 Targum Onkelos to Deuteronomy (English translation, analysis and commentary). Ktav Publishing House.
- Driem, George van, & Suhnū Rām Sharmā
- 1996 In search of Kentum Indo-Europeans in the Himalayas. In *IndogForsch* 101: 107-146.
- D'jakonov, I. M.
- 1968 Predystorija armjanskogo naroda: istorija Armjanskogo nagor'ja s 1500 po 500 g. do n. è. - xurrity, luvijcy, protoarmjane. Yerevan: Academy Press. [English transl. with revisions by the author: see 1984].
 - 1971 (Diakonoff), Hurrisch und Urartäisch. Transl. from Russian by Karl Sdrembek (MünStudSpr, Beiheft 12, N.F.). München: R. Kitzinger.
 - 1980 In *DrJazMalAz* 1980: Xurritskij jazyk i drugie substratnye jazyki Maloj Azii (99-106); Frigijskij jazyk (357-377); Primečanija to *Xaaz. Pamjatniki frigijskogo jazyka* (408-418).
 - 1981 K drevnevostočnomu substratu v armjanskom jazyke. In *PatmBanasHand* (= IFŽ) 1981, Nr 1: 56-78.
 - 1983 K praistorii armjanskogo jazyka: o faktax, svidetel'stvax i logike. In *PatmBanasHand* (= IFŽ) 1983, Nr 4: 149-178.
 - 1984 (Diakonoff), The pre-history of the Armenian people (transl. from D'jakonov 1968 by Lori Jennings; with revisions by the author). Delmar, New York: Caravan Books (Anatolian and Caucasian studies).
- Diakonoff, I. M. and Starostin, S. A.
- 1986 Hurro-Urartian as an Eastern Caucasian language (MünStudSpr, Beiheft 12, N.F.). München: R. Kitzinger.

- Dumézil, G.
 1938 Traitement de *m + p* en arménien. In *BSL* 39: 241-242.
 1997 Vartan Matioossian (ed.), A Long-lost contribution to Armenian linguistics by *Georges Dumézil* "Quelques adjectifs négatifs de l'arménien" [< 1947]. In *AnnArmLing* 18: 1-5.
- Dumont, Darl J.
 1992 The ash tree in Indo-European culture. In *MankQuart* 32/4: 323-336.
- Dunaevskaja, I. M.
 1961 Principy struktury xattskogo (protoxettskogo) glagola. In *Peredneaziatskij sbornik*, 1: 57-159.
- Durean, Eṭišē Patriark'
 1933 Hayoc' hin krōnə kam haykakan dic'abanut'iwn. Jerusalem: Tparan Srboc' Yakobeanc'. (Durean Matenadaran, 3).
- Duridanov, Ivan
 1974 Zur etymologie des Wortes (*h*)urda. In *LingBalk* 17, 1: 51-62.
- Eichner, Heiner
 1978 Die urindogermanische Wurzel **H₂reu* 'hell machen'. In *Sprache* 24: 144-162.
- Eilers, Wilhelm
 1953 Der alte Name des persischen Neujahrsfestes. In Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur in Mainz: geistes- und sozialwissenschaftliche Klasse, 1953/2: 35-86. Wiesbaden.
 1974 Die vergleichend-semasiologische Methode in der Orientalistik. In *Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur in Mainz: geistes- und sozialwissenschaftliche Klasse*, 1973/10. Wiesbaden.
 1974a Herd und Feuerstätte in Iran. In *AntiqIndog* 1974: 307-338.
 1976 Sinn und Herkunft Planetennamen. In *Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften: Philosophisch-historische Klasse. Sitzungsberichte* 1975/5. München.
 1979 Die *Al*, ein persisches Kindbettgespenst. In *Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften: Philosophisch-historische Klasse. Sitzungsberichte* 1979/7. München.
 1982 Geographische Namengebung in und um Iran. In *Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften: Philosophisch-historische*

- Klasse. Sitzungsberichte* 1982/5. München.
- 1987 Iranische Ortsnamenstudien. In *Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften: Philosophisch-historische Klasse. Sitzungsberichte*, 465. Wien.
- Elbourne, Paul
- 2000 Plain voiceless stop plus laryngeal in Indo-European. In *HistSpr* 113: 2-28.
- Elizarenkova, T. Ja.
- 1989 (ed.) *Rigveda*: mandaly I-IV. Moscow: "Nauka".
- Emeneau, Murray B.
- 1993 Rats, mice, and other small rodents in the Indian linguistic area. In *Fs Szemerényi* 1993, 3: 197-201.
- Emmerick, R. E. & Skjærvø, P. O.
- 1997 Studies in the vocabulary of Khotanese III. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. (Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, philosophisch-historische Klasse; Sitzungsberichte 651; Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Iranistik hrsg. von H. Eichner und R. Schmitt, Nr. 27).
- Ereman, Aram
- 1923 Č'aharmahali hay žotovrdakan banahiwsut'iwne. Vienna: Mxit'arean tparan.
- 1953 (Ereman), Step'anos Erec'i mecaržek' jeragir matyanə . In *Ejmiacin*, 1953, 7-8: 26-32.
- Ereman, S. T.
- 1963 Hayastanə əst "Ašxarhac'oyc'" -i: p'orj VII dari haykakan k'artezi verakazmut'yan žamanakakic' k'artezagrakan himk'i vra. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- 1972-1973 "Ašxarhac'oyc'i" skzbnakan bnagri verakangnman p'orj. A) in *PatmBanasHand* 1972, Nr 4: 209-230; B) in *PatmBanasHand* 1973, Nr 1: 238-252; C) in *PatmBanasHand* 1973, Nr 2: 261-274.
- Erēc', S.
- 1898 Hmac'[!]akner: Nuēr ar H. Ł. A. In *Biwrakn* 1898, June 11: 380.
- Eren, Hasan
- 1999 Türk dilinin etimolojik sözlüğü. Ankara.
- Èrlx, V. R.

- 1989 Korčaga iz Majkopskogo muzeja. In *SovArx* 1989, Nr 2: 244-247.
- Eska, Joseph F.
1992 Further to $\alpha\nu\delta\omicron\omicron\nu\nu\alpha\beta\omicron$. In *Journal of Celtic Linguistics* 1: 119-125.
- Euler, Wolfram
1979 Indoiranisch-griechische Gemeinsamkeiten der Nominalbildung und deren indogermanische Grundlagen. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft).
- Evans, David
1974 Dodona, Dodola, and Daedala. In *MythIEAnt*: 99-130.
- Falk, Harry
1994 Copper Hoard weapons and the Vedic *vajra*. In *SouthAsArch* 1993, 1: 193-206.
- Fasmer, Maks
1964-73 (1-4), *Ètimologičeskij slovar' russkogo jazyka* (translated from German and supplemented by O. N. Trubačev). Vol. 1, 1964 - vol. 4, 1973. Moscow: Progress.
- Feydit, F.
1979 (Feydi), Hnč'yunabanakan ditotut'yunner. In *PatmBanasHand* 1979, Nr 3: 57-61.
1980 Sopra certe tendenze della fonetica armena e la loro incidenza sulla morfologia della lingua classica e l'etimologia. In *Transcaucasica* 2, Venezia: 43-47.
- Fick, A.
1877 [Miscellanea 11-18]. In *BKIGS* 1: 170-174.
1905 Hesychglossen 2, in *BKIGS* 29, 1905: 196-201.
1905a rec. on Matthaeus Much, Die Heimat der Indogermanen, Berlin 1902, in *BKIGS* 29, 1905: 225-247.
- Finck, Franz Nikolaus
1903 Armen. *moli*. In *ZArmPhil* 1: 170.
1903-04 (1-2) Kleinere mittelarmenische Texte. 1. in *ZArmPhil* 1, 1903: 97-120, 177-219, 301-352; 2. in *ZArmPhil* 2, 1904: 81-111.
- Forssman, Bernhard
1994 Zu hethitisch šipand- und išpand-. In *Pedersen Kolloquium* 1994 : 93-106.

- Fraenkel, Ernst
 1937 Zur baltischen Wortforschung und syntax. In *Fs Pedersen 1937*: 443-455.
 1955-1965 (1-2), Litauisches etymologisches Wörterbuch. Heidelberg: Carl Winter. Universitätsverlag; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Frejman, A. A.
 1958 Tadžikskoe *pūst* 'koža, kožura, kora, oboločka, skorlupa, šeluxa, škura'. In *SovVost* 1958, Nr 6: 77-81.
- Friedrich, J.
 1959 Die hethitischen Gesetze. Leiden: Brill.
- Friedrich, Paul
 1970 Proto-Indo-European trees: the arboreal system of a prehistoric people. Chicago, London: Chicago University Press.
- Frisk, Hjalmar
 1944 Etyma Armeniaca. In *GötHögArs* 50, 1944, 1: 1-36 (= 1966: 253-280).
 1960-1972 (1-3), Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch. Vol. 1, 1960; vol. 2, 1970; vol. 3 (Nachträge, Wortregister, Corrigenda, Nachwort), 1972. Heidelberg: Carl Winter,
 1966 Kleine Schriften zur Indogermanistik und zur griechischen Wortkunde. Göteborg: Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis.
- Fulk, Robert D.
 1988 PIE *ə in Germanic unstressed syllables. In *LaryngTheor* 1988: 153-177.
- Funk, Bernd
 1990 Rannie svjazi grekov s deržavoj Axemenidov v svete drevnepersidskix i antičnyx istočnikov. In *VestDrIst* 1990, Nr 2: 3-23.
- Furne'e, Edzard Johan
 1972 Die wichtigsten konsonantischen Erscheinungen des Vorgriechischen: mit einem Appendix über den Vokalismus. The Hague, Paris: Mouton.
 1989 Die Urbaskisch und Urkartvelisch: Indizien für eine Verwandtschaft. Leiden: The Hakuchi Press.
- Gabikēan, Karapet
 1952 Baġgirk' Sebastahay gawaṛalezui. Erusaṭēm: St Jacob.

- Gabriëlean, M. S.
 1912 Aknay gawarabarbarə. Vienna: Mxit'arean tparan.
- Galēm̄k'earean, Grigoris
 1911 Agat'angelosi krknagir bnagirə [palimpsest]. In *Yušarjan* : 67-160.
- Galšoyan, M. H.
 1981 Marut'a sari amperə: patmvack'ner. Erevan: "Sovetakan grof".
- Galstyan, A. G.
 1958 See Smbat Sparapet.
- Galustean, Gr. H. (Kilikec'i)
 1934 Maraš kam Germanik ew heros Zēyt'un. New York: "Koč'nak" (Maraši hayrenakc'akan miut'iwn).
- Gamkrelidze, Th. V. & Ivanov, V. V.
 1984 Indoeuropejskij jazyk i indoeuropejcy: rekonstrukciya i istoriko-tipologičeskij analiz prayazyka i protokul'tury. With a preface by R. Jakobson, 2 vols, Tbilisi: University Press. [English translation - see 1995].
 1995 Indo-European and the Indo-Europeans: a reconstruction and historical analysis of a proto-language and a proto-culture. Part 1. The text. Transl. by J. Nichols, ed. by W. Winter. Berlin, New York : Mouton de Gruyter (Trends in linguistics. Studies and monographs, 80). [English translation of the Russian original 1984].
- Garamanlean, H. A.
 1931 Žoťovrdakan hawatk'ə Ezniki k'ov. In *HandAms* 45, 1931, 3-5: 232-246; 7: 423-432; 8-9: 489-517; 10-11: 637-657 [the last part entitled: Hreštaknēr u satananērə hay žoťovrdakan hawatk'in mēj].
- Garsoġian, Nina G.
 1989 The Epic Histories attributed to P'awstos Buzand (*Buzandaran Patmut'iwnk'*): translation and commentary. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Gasparyan, H.
 1966 Haġəni barbarə. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- Gatuev, Dzaxo
 1932 Amran: osetinskij `ēpos. Russ. transl. and commentary. (Introduction and redaction by N. Marr). Moscow, Leningrad:

- Academia.
- Gauthiot, Robert
1916 Iranica. In *MSL* 19: 125-132.
- Gayseryan, V. A.
1990 Sepagir afbyurneri ^{KUR}*Etiu* erkri toponimikayi harc'er. In *LrHasGit* 1990, Nr 3: 76-87.
- Gazančean, Yovhannēs
1899 Ewdokioy hayoc' gawarabarbaṛə. Vienna: Mxit'arean tparan.
- Geldner, K. F.
1951 *Der Rig-Veda* aus dem Sanskrit ins Deutsche übersetzt und mit einem laufenden Kommentar versehen von K. F. Geldner. Volumes 1-3. Cambridge, Massachusetts. (Harvard Oriental Series, 33-35).
- Georgiev, Vladimir I.
1974 Prinzipien der Deutung der thrakischen zweistämmigen Personennamen. In *LingBalk* 17, 3: 5-21.
1975 Die thrakischen Götternamen: ein Beitrag zur Religion der alten Thraker. In *LingBalk* 18, 1: 5-56.
- Gerstein, Mary R.
1974 Germanic *Warg*: The Outlaw as Werwolf. In *MythIEAnt* 1974: 131-156.
- Geworgyan, G.G.
1980 Łzlar. *Hay azgagrut'yun ew banahyusut'yun* 10. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- Geworgyan, T'amar
1999 Lori (Taširk' - Joraget). *Hay azgagrut'yun ew banahyusut'yun* 20. Yerevan: Academy Press "Gitut'yun".
- Gharib, B.
1995 Sogdian dictionary: Sogdian-Persian-English. Tehran: Farhangan Publications.
- Gippert, Jost
1993, 1-2 Iranica Armeno-Iberica: Studien zu den iranischen Lehnwörtern im Armenischen und Georgischen. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Part 1; Part 2: Materialien. (Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-historische Klasse. Sitzungsberichte, 606. Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Iranistik, 26).

- 1994 Die Glottaltheorie und die Frage urindogermanisch-kaukasischer Strachkontakte. In *Pedersen Kolloquium 1994*: 107-123.
- Godel, Robert
- 1975 An introduction to the study of Classical Armenian. Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag.
- 1982 Linguistique arménienne: Études diachroniques. Paris: Librairie H. Samuel / Venise - St. Lazare: Imprimerie des PP. Mekhitaristes.
- 1982a Une "loi phonétique" bien difficile à énoncer: *w > arm. w (v)/g/zéro. In *RevEtArm* n.s. 16: 9-16 [reprinted in *Cahiers Ferdinand de Saussure* 38, 1984: 281-288].
- 1984 Une concordance lexicale gréco-arménienne. In *Cahiers Ferdinand de Saussure* 38, 1984: 289-293.
- Gordlevskij, V. A.
- 1927 Džardžary v Konii [Les Djardjares de Konia]. In *DoklANSSSR* 1927: 108-113.
- Gosche, Richardus
- 1847 De Ariana linguae gentisque Armeniacae indole prolegomena. Berlin (Berolini).
- Grammont, Maurice
- 1918 Notes de phonétique générale. 6. Arménien classique (pp. 213-253); 7. Arménien médiéval et arménien moderne (pp. 253-259). In *MSL* 20: 213-259.
- Grantovskij, È. A. & Raevskij, D. S.
- 1984 Ob iranojazyčnom i "indoarijskom" naselenii Severnogo Pričernomor'ja v antičnuju èpoxu. In *ÈtnNarBalk* 1984: 47-66.
- Grassmann, Hermann
- 1873/1964 Wörterbuch zum Rig-Veda. Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus [4th, unchanged edition: Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1964].
- Greppin, John A. C.
- 1973 Armenian *h*-, Hittite *h*-, and the Indo-European laryngeal. In *HandAms* 87 (January-March): 61-80.
- 1974 Comments on some Armenian suffixes of substratum origin. In *LingBalk* 17, 3: 65-71.
- 1975 Classical Armenian nominal suffixes: a historical study. Wien: Mechitharisten-Buchdruckerei.
- 1975a Does IE *sV- give Arm. *hV*-? In *ZVS* 89: 46-52.

- 1975b Sovremennoe sostojanie izučenijskix armjanskix laringalov. In *PatmBanashHand* 1975, Nr 1: 54-70.
- 1978 Classical and Middle Armenian bird names: a linguistic, taxonomic, and mythological study. Delmar, New York: Caravan Books.
- 1978a A further comment on the God *Šanta-/Σανδων*. In *La Parola del Passato* (Napoli) 33: 411-413.
- 1978b Ornithologia Armeniaca. In *LezOčHarc* 5: 151-156.
- 1978-79 Armeno-Luwica. In *RevEtArm* n.s. 13: 7-13.
- 1979 *Lumri, sakr ew dahuč* bāneri stugabanut'yunə. In *PatmBanashHand* 1979, Nr 1: 213-216.
- 1980 The origin of Arm. *z* from IE **gh* and **dh*. In *ProcFICAL* : 131-137.
- 1980a A note on the alternation of *E* and *A* in Classical Armenian. In *AnnArmLing* 1: 97-103.
- 1981 Some comments on Arm. *eluzanem* 'extract', *ett* 'place' and *etfewr* 'horn'. In *ZVS* 95: 134-140.
- 1981a (Various reviews). In *RevEtArm* n.s. 15.
- 1981b Reduplicated patterns in Classical Armenian. In *AnnArmLing* 2: 1-11.
- 1981b Concerning the reply of Kerns and Schwartz to Austin. In *Gd Kerns* 1981, 1: 119-126.
- 1982 Arm. *t'* - Gk. *πτ*. In *JourIndEurStud* 10: 347-354.
- 1982a Two points on Hurrian-Armenian lexical relationships. In *Fs Diakonoff* 1982: 117-119.
- 1982-83 Some comments on the chronology of secondary aspiration in Classical Armenian. In *ZVS* 96: 146-151.
- 1983 An etymological dictionary of the Indo-European components of Armenian, in *Bazmavēp* 141, 1-4: 235-323.
- 1983a The Armenian botanical terms *hačar*, *hačari* and *hačaruk*. In *RevEtArm* N.S. 17: 13-17.
- 1983b Hypercorrection in Armenian. In *AnnArmLing* 4: 67-71.
- 1983c Gk. *ἀλέτριος* and the modern Armenian Grammarians. In *RevEtArm* n.s. 17: 19-20.
- 1984 Arm. *šun* 'dog' and the passage of IE **k^w* to Arm. *š*. In *AnnArmLing* 5: 91-97.
- 1985 Bārk' Gatianosi: the Greek-Armenian dictionary to Galen.

- Delmar, New York: Caravan Books.
- 1985a Review of *Huld 1984*. In *RevEtArm* n.s. 19: 462-463.
- 1986 The development of Armenian *l* and *ł*. In *Gd Berberian 1986* : 279-292.
- 1987 Armenian *art* 'field' and Arm. *acem* 'drive'. In *JourIndEurStud* 15, 3-4: 393-396.
- 1988 Laryngeal residue in Armenian: genetic and loan evidence. In *LaryngTheor 1988* : 179-193.
- 1989 Armenian and the theory of etymology. In *JourIndEurStud* 17: 165-170.
- 1989a 'Akkadian' loan words in Armenian. In *AnnArmLing* 10: 73-83.
- 1990 Armenian insect names. In *AnnArmLing* 11: 67-73.
- 1990a Some comments on *nepuk* 'millipede, sowbug'. In *AnnArmLing* 11: 75-78.
- 1990b The etymology of Gr. *σῦριγξ* 'pipe'. In *HistSpr* 103: 35-37.
- 1990c A note on Armenian *zuina*. In *FolOrient* 27: 185-188.
- 1991a The survival of ancient Anatolian and Mesopotamian vocabulary until the present. In *JourNearEastStud* 50, 3: 203-207.
- 1991b Some effects of the Hurro-Urartian people and their languages upon the earliest Armenians (with additional notes by I. M. Diakonoff dated October 4, 1989). In *JAmOrSoc* 111.4: 720-730.
- 1991c The Mediterranean term for cabbage. In *AnnArmLing* 12: 77-88.
- 1993 The development of **Ty* in Classical Armenian. In *ProcSISAL* 2: 15-24.
- 1994 A rejoinder to Frederik Kortlandt on the palatalization of dentals in Armenian. In *AnnArmLing* 15: 33-35.
- 1994a Armenian *axerak* and *ahiparanoc* '. In *AnnArmLing* 15: 79-84.
- 1996 Armenian *atatanč* 'duck?'. In *AnnArmLing* 17: 73-77.
- Greppin, John A. C. & Khachaturian, Amalya A.
- 1986 A handbook of Armenian dialectology. Delmar, New York: Caravan Books. (Append.: see Jahukyan 1986 and H. Muradyan 1986).
- Grigoryan, A. V.
- 1957 Hay barbaragitut'yan dasənt'ac'. Yerevan: University Press.
- Grigoryan-Spandaryan, M. M.

- 1971 Leinayin Łarabati banahyusut'yunə. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- Grigoryan, R. H.
- 1970 Hay žoťovrdakan ōroroc'ayin ew mankakan erger. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- 1983 Geťark'unik'. *Hay azgagrut'yun ew banahyusut'yun* 14. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- Grigoryan, S. A.
- 1988 Hayereni armatakan gunanunnerə, nranc' imastayin tarberakumn u stugabanut'yunə. In *BanbErevHamals* 1988, Nr 2: 188-192.
- Grossfeld, Bernard
- 1988 The Targum Onqelos to Deuteronomy (English translation, apparatus, notes). Edinburgh: T& T Clark Ltd. (The Aramaic Bible, 9).
- Gurney, O. R.
- 1977 Some aspects of Hittite religion. Oxford University Press (The Schweich lectures of the British Academy 1976).
- Gurunyan, Hakob
- 1991 Hamšenahay banahyusut'yun. Yerevan: "Luys".
- Gyulnazaryan, Xažak
- 1984 Hetk'er getni vra ew getni tak. Yerevan: "Sovetakan groť".
- Haas, Otto
- 1961 Phrygische Inschriften: Berichtigte Lesungen - verbesserte Deutungen. In *Sprache* 7: 77-92.
- Haas, Volkert
- 1994 Geschichte der hethitischen Religion. Leiden, New York, Köln: Brill.
- Haas, Volkert & Wilhelm, Gernot
- 1974 Hurritische und luwische Riten aus Kizzuwatna. Kevelaer: Verlag Butzon & Bercker; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag. (Alter Orient und Altes Testament: Veröffentlichungen zur Kultur und Geschichte des Alten Orients 3; Hurritologische Studien 1).
- Hakobyan, G. A.
- 1974 Nerk'in Baseni azgagrut'yunə ew banahyusut'yunə. Yerevan: "Hayastan".
- Hakobyan, Vazgen Artašesi
- 1951-56 (1-2) Manr žamanakagrut'yunner XIII-XVIII dd. (compiled by

- V. A. Hakobyan). Vol. 1, 1951; vol. 2, 1956. Yerevan: Academy Press. (Materialy po istorii armjanskogo naroda, 3, 7).
- Halajyan, Geworg
- 1973 Dersimi hayeri azgagrut'yunə. *Hay azgagrut'yun ew banahyusut'yun* 5. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- Hambarjumyan, V. G.
- 1995 Movses Xorenac'u Patmut'yan "Tenč'ay Sat'enik tikin" hatvacə. In *PatmBanasHand* 1995, Nr 2: 227-236.
- 1998 Aknarkner hayoc' lezvi hamematakan baragitut'yan. Yerevan: Academy Press "Gitut'yun".
- Hamp, Eric P.
- 1966 Three Armenian etymologies. In *RevEtArm* n.s. 3: 11-15.
- 1970 Sanskrit *duhitā*, Armenian *dust*, and IE internal schwa. In *JAOS* 90.2: 228-231.
- 1973 *Mōrum*. In *AmerJourPhil* 94/2: 167-169.
- 1975 On the nasal presents of Armenian. In *ZVS* 89: 100-109.
- 1982 'Arm, shoulder'; Gothic *inu*, Greek *ἄνευ*, OHG *ānu* 'ohne'; On Greek ζ - *y-. In *JourIndEurStud* 10: 187-191.
- 1982a *-og in British Celtic and notes on *bro*. In *ÉtCelt* 19: 143-149.
- 1983 Philologica varia. In *RevEtArm* NS 17: 5-12.
- 1983a On the Helleno-Armenian shared lexicon. In *AnnArmLing* 4: 63-64.
- 1983b *Erastank'*. In *AnnArmLing* 4: 64-65.
- 1983c (Hemp'), Mi k'ani kisašp'akanneri masin hayereni patmut'yan meĵ. In *PatmBanasHand* 1983, Nr 1: 38-42.
- 1986 Armenian *yisun*. In *Gd Berberian* 1986: 293-294.
- 1986a *ezn* 'ox'. In *AnnArmLing* 7: 63-64.
- 1986-87 Armenian *bok* 'barefoot'. In *RevEtArm* n.s. 20: 35-36.
- 1990 Three Armenian sound laws. In *AnnArmLing* 11: 21-23.
- 1991 *Erastank'*. In *AnnArmLing* 12: 5.
- 1994 Arm. *gewt'* 'village'. In *AnnArmLing* 15: 24-26.
- 1997 The Celtic road to the *γέφυρα*. In *Gd Campanile* 1997, 1: 463-466.
- 1997a Two notes. In *AnnArmLing* 18: 19-21.
- 1998 Two regular milk products. In *Fs Watkins* 1998: 241-242.
- Hananyan, Gaht'uhi Karapeti
- 1995 Svediaiyi barbaṛə (Xtrbeki xosvack'). Yerevan: University Press.

- Haneyan, A. N.
- 1978 Tigranakerti barbaṛə. Yerevan: Academy Press.
 - 1985 Grabari baraskzbi y jaynordi artac'olumə ardi hayereni barbarnerum. In *Hayereni barbaṛagitakan atlas: usumnasirut'yunner ew nyut'er* 2. Yerevan: Academy Press : 22-45.
 - 1985a Grabari oy ew iw erkbarbarneri patmakan hnč'yunap'oxut'yan šurjə. In *HayLezPatmHarc* 2: 37-58.
- Haneyan, M. K.
- 1979 Marmni maseri hndewropakan anvanumneri taracqayin nkaragirə hayerenum. In *Hayoc' lezvi hamematakan k'erakanut'yan harc'er*. Yerevan: Academy Press: 128-187.
 - 1998 Hayereni hndewropakan barapašari t'ematik-imastayin mi k'ani xmbəri tarack'ayin bnut'agirə (ntesakan gorcuneut'yun artahaytoṭ baṛer). In *Hayoc' lezvi hamematakan k'erakanut'yan harc'er* 2. Yerevan: "Anania Širakac'i": 145-227.
- Harðarson, Jon Axel
- 1995 Griechisch *τηλε*. In *HistSpr* 108: 205-206.
- Harkness, John
- 1996 Another approach to "The Great Armenian Puzzle". In *AnnArmLing* 17: 11-19.
- Hartmann, R.
- 1965 al-Furāt. In *EncIsl* 2: 945-947 [+ E. de Vaumas, 947-948].
- Hartner, W.
- 1985 Old Iranian Calendars. In *The Cambridge history of Iran*. II, *The Median and Achaemenian periods* (ed. Ilya Gershevitch), Cambridge: 714-792.
- Harut'yunyan, Lewon
- 1991 Nšxarner Arc'axi banahyusut'yan. Yerevan: University Press.
- Harut'yunyan, N. V.
- See N. Arutjunjan.
- Harut'yunyan, Sargis
- 1960 Hay žoṭovrdakan hanelukner: usumnasirut'yun. Yerevan: Academy Press.
 - 1965 Hay žoṭovrdakan hanelukner. Yerevan: Academy Press.
 - 2000 Hay aṛaspelabanut'yun. Beyrut' ("Hamazgayin").
- Harut'yunyan, Sargis & Xac'atryan, Ženya

- 2000 (eds.), *Karos xač': usumnasirut'yunner ew bnagrer*: Yerevan: Academy Press "Gitut'yun".
- Harut'yunyan, Covinar (Tsovinar)
1983 See C. Arutjunjan 1983.
- Haykuni, S.
1902 *Žoťovrdakan hēk'eat'*. *ĖmAzgŽoť* 4. Moscow, Vaťaršapat.
1906 *Žoťovrdakan erg, ařac, asac, haneluk, erdum, ōrhnank', anēck', ew aynl*. *ĖmAzgŽoť* 6. Moscow, Vaťaršapat.
- Henning, W. B.
1935-37 Soghdische Miszellen. In *BSOS* 8.2/3: 583-588.
1939 Sogdian loan-words in New Persian. In *BSOS* 10.1 [1939-1942]: 93-106.
1945 Two Central Asian words. In *TrPhilSoc* 1945 [1946]: 150-162.
- Heubeck, Alfred
1949-50 *Smyrna, Myrina und Verwandtes*. In *BeitrNamenf* 1: 270-282.
- Hewsen, Robert H.
1983 The Kingdom of Arc'ax. In *MedArmCult* 1983: 42-68.
1988-89 Introduction to Armenian historical geography IV. In *RevĖtArm* 21: 271-319.
1992 The Geography of Ananias of Širak (*Ašxarhac'oyc'*): the long and the short recensions. Introduction, translation and commentary. Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag. (Beihefte zum Tübinger Atlas des Vorderen Orients. Reihe B /Geisteswissenschaften/, 77).
2001 *Armenia: a historical atlas* (cartographer-in-chief: Christopher C. Salvatico). Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Hilmarsson, J. G.
1986 *Studies in Tocharian phonology, morphology and etymology: with special emphasis on the o-cocalism*. Reykjavik.
- Hintze, Almut
1994 *Der Zamyād-Yašt: Edition, Übersetzung, Kommentar*. Wiesbaden: Reichert. (Beiträge zur Iranistik, 15). [Zugl.: Erlangen, Nürnberg, Univ., Diss., 1990].
- Hirt, Herman
1899 Akzentstudien 11-14. In *IndogForsch* 10: 20-59.
- Hofmann, Erich

- 1932 Kultur und Sprachgeist in den Monatsnamen. In *ZVS* 59: 132-142.
- Hoffmann, Karl, & Forssman, Bernhard
- 1996 Avestische Laut- und Flexionslehre. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft, 84).
- Hoffner, Jr. H. A.
- 1964 The laws of the Hittites. Brandeis University, PhD, 1963.
- 1966 An English-Hittite Glossary. In *RevHitAs* 25, fasc. 80: 5-99.
- 1974 Alimenta Hethaeorum: food production in Hittite Asia Minor. New Haven, Connecticut. (American Oriental series, 55).
- Höltker, P. Georg
- 1928 Zeit und Zahl in Nordwestafrika. In *Fs Schmidt 1928*: 282-302.
- Hooker, J. T.
- 1979 γέφυρα: a Semitic loan-word? in *Fs Szemerényi 1979*, 1: 387-398.
- Houwink ten Kate, Ph. H. J.
- 1961 The Luwian population groups of Lycia and Cilicia Aspera during the Hellenistic period. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Hovdhaugen, Even
- 1968 Prothetic vowels in Armenian and Greek and the laryngeal theory. In *NrsTidSpr* 22: 115-132.
- Hovhannisyan, H. V.
- 1978 T'atronə mĭjnadaryan Hayastanum: patmut'yan ew tesut'yan harc'er. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- 1990 Hay hin draman ew nra paymanajewerə. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- Hovhannisyan, L. Š.
- 1977 Grabari ew Łarabaŭi barbaŕi aŕnč'ut'yan harc'i šurjə. In *PatmBanashHand* 1977, Nr 1: 141-152.
- 1979 Barayin hnabanut'yunner Łarabaŭi barbaŕum. In *LrHasGit* 1979, Nr 9: 52-60.
- 1987 Norahayt baŕer hay matenagrut'yan meĭ: 1. Evsebios Emesac'u čäŕerum; 2. Ep'rem Asoru ke'urdnerum. In *PatmBanashHand* 1987, Nr 4: 130-138.
- 1988 Hayereni iranakan p'oxarut'yunneri gorčarakan mi k'ani aranjnahatkut'yunner. In *PatmBanashHand* 1988, Nr 3: 126-134.

- 1988a Hay-iranakan zugadipunner. In *BanbErewHamals* 1988, Nr 3: 168-173.
- 1990 Hayereni iranakan p'oxarut'yunnerə. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- 1990a Nor Haykazean bararanum č'vkayvac barer V dari ink'nuruyn grakanut'yunic'. In *PatmBanasHand* 1990, Nr 2: 149*-158.
- 1990b Ğarabati barbarum iranakan mi k'ani p'oxarut'yunneri masin. In *LrHasGit* 1990, Nr 11: 65-70.
- 1991 Barayin tarberakner V dari grabarum. In *HayLezPatmHarc* 3: 5-60.
- 1991a V daric' vkayvac mi k'ani bareri k'nnut'yun. In *PatmBanasHand* 1991, Nr 2: 147-152.
- 2000 Ğarabati barbari barapašari hnaguyn šerterə. In *LrHasGit* 2000, Nr 1: 117-122.
- 2000a Barak'nnakan nkatarumner "Bargirk' hayoc'um" teğ gtac mi k'ani bareri veraberyal. In *PatmBanasHand* 2000, Nr 2: 213-221.
- Hovhannisyan, N. G.
- 1991 Našaš Hovnat'ani tateri lezun orpes vağ ašxarhabari artahaytut'yun. In *HayLezPatmHarc* 3: 61-192.
- Hovsep'yan, N. E.
- 1966 Ozmi barbari mi k'ani aranjnahatkut'yunneri masin. In *PatmBanasHand* 1966, Nr 2: 226-238.
- Hoy
- 1898 Tearəndarəğə Karmiru meğ. In *Biwrakn* 1898, June 11: 380-381.
- Hübschmann, H.
- 1876 Review of *Dervischjan 1877*. In *ZeitDeutMorgGesel* 30: 774-779.
- 1875/77 Ueber die stellung des armenischen im kreise der indogermanischen sprachen. In *ZVS* 23, [1875] 1877: 5-49. [ModEArm. transl. by Liana Hovsep'yan see 1985; 1990: 46-88].
- 1883 Armenische Studien. 1/1. Grundzüge der armenischen Etymologie. Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel.
- 1897 Armenische Grammatik. 1. Theil: Armenische Etymologie. Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel.
- 1899 (On Hübschmann 1897). In *Anzeiger zu IndogForsch* 10: 41-50.
- 1899a Review of Horn 1898. In *Anzeiger zu IndogForsch* 10: 18-41.

- 1904 Die altarmenischen Ortsnamen. In *IndogForsch* 16: 197-490 (+ Karte). Published also separately: Strassburg: Karl Trübner, 1904. ModWArm. translation: Hiwbšman 1907.
- 1894 Arisches und Armenisches. In *IndogForsch* 4: 112-120.
- 1907 (Hiwbšman), Hin Hayoc' tetwoy anunnerə (ModWArm. translation from Hübschmann 1904 by H. B. Pilēzikčean). Vienna: Mxit'arean Tparan.
- 1985 (Hyubšman), Hayereni dirk'ə hndevropakan lezuni šrjanum(/šark'um) (ModEArm. transl. of 1875/77 by Liana Hovsep'yan). In *PatmBanasHand* 1985, Nr 4: 27-54.
- 1990 (Hyubšman), Hayagitakan usumnasirut'yunner. Yerevan: University Press.
- Huld, M. E.
- 1981 Albanian corrigenda to Friedrich's *Proto-Indo-European trees*, in *ZVS* 95: 302-308.
- 1984 Basic Albanian etymologies. Columbus, Ohio: Slavica.
- Hutter, Manfred
- 2003 Aspects of Luwian religion. In *Melchert* (ed.) 2003, Chapter 6: 211-280.
- Illič-Svityč, V. M.
- 1964 Drevnejšie indoevropsko-semitskie jazykovye kontakty. In *PrIndEvrJaz*: 3-12.
- 1971 Opyt sravnenija nostratičeskix jazykov (semitoxamitskij, kartvel'skij, indoevropskij, ural'skij, dravidijskij, altajskij). Vvedenie: sravnitel'nyj slovar' (b-Ḳ) (with redaction and introduction by V. A. Dybo). Moscow: "Nauka".
- 1976 Opyt sravnenija nostratičeskix jazykov (semitoxamitskij, kartvel'skij, indoevropskij, ural'skij, dravidijskij, altajskij). Sravnitel'nyj slovar' (l-3'). Ukazateli (with redaction by V. A. Dybo). Moscow: "Nauka".
- 1984 Opyt sravnenija nostratičeskix jazykov (semitoxamitskij, kartvel'skij, indoevropskij, ural'skij, dravidijskij, altajskij). Sravnitel'nyj slovar' (p-q). Po kartotekam avtora (with redaction by V. A. Dybo). Moscow: "Nauka".
- Israyelyan, Astik
- 1979 "Bužič'" ulunk'-pahpanakner. In *LrHasGit* 1979, Nr 3: 80-88.
- Išxanyan, R. A.

- 1987 Mi k'ani hnaguyn tetanunneri ew anjnanunneri stugabanut'yan p'orj. In *ThesSISAL 1987*: 71-72. [Not published in *ProcSISAL (1987) 1993*].
- Ivanov, V. V.
- 1974 Opyt istolkovaniija drevneindijskix ritual'nyx i mifologičeskix terminov, obrazovannyx ot *aśva-* 'kon''. In *Gd Vorob'jev-Desjatovskij 1974*: 75-138.
- 1976 Problemy istorii metallov na Drevnem Vostoke v svete dannyx lingvistiki. In *PatmBanashHand (=IFŽ) 1976*, Nr 4: 69-86.
- 1983 Vydelenie raznyx xronologičeskix sloev v drevnearmjanskom i problema pervonačal'noj struktury teksta gimna Va(x)agnu. In *PatmBanashHand (=IFŽ) 1983*, Nr 4: 22-43.
- 1985 Ob otnošenii xattskogo jazyka k severozapadnokavkazskim. In *DrevAnat 1985*: 26-59.
- Ivanov, V. V. & Toporov, V. N.
- 1974 Issledovanija v oblasti slavjanskix drevnostej: leksičeskie i frazeologičeskie voprosy rekonstrukcii tekstov. Moscow: "Nauka".
- Jasanoff, Jay H.
- 1979 Notes on the Armenian personal endings. In *ZVS 93*: 133-149.
- Ĵahukyan, G. B.
- 1959 Hin hayereni holovman sistemə ew nra cagumə. Yerevan: University Press.
- 1963 (Džaukjan), Urartskij i indoevropskie jazyki. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- 1963a Stugabanut'yunner. In *PatmBanashHand 1963*, Nr 4: 85-98.
- 1964 Xajasskij yazyk i ego otnošenje k indoevropskim jazykam. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- 1965 Stugabanut'yunner. In *PatmBanashHand 1965*, Nr 1: 251-261.
- 1967 (Džaukjan), Očerki po istorii dopis'mennogo perioda armjanskogo jazyka. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- 1967a (Džaukjan), Vzaimootnošenje indoevropskix, xurritsko-urartskix i kavkazskix jazykov. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- 1967b Hayereni ew xet'a-luvakan lezuni barayin kazmi cagumnayin zugadipumnerə. In *PatmBanashHand 1967*, Nr 4: 57-74.
- 1969 (Djahukian), Armenische Miscellen. In *Fs Pagliaro 1969*, 2: 65-

- 71.
- 1972 Hay barbaragitut'yan neracut'yun: vičakagrakan barbaragitut'yun. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- 1974 Žamanakacic' hayereni tesut'yan himunk'nerə. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- 1975 Die Bedeutung der ersten (indogermanischen) und der zweiten (inner-armenischen) Palatalisierung für die Konstituierung des armenischen Konsonanten-Systems, in *ZVS* 89: 31-42.
- 1978 Obščee i armjanskoe jazykoznanie. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- 1979 Stugabanut'yunner. In *LrHasGit* 1979, Nr 3: 23-34.
- 1981 Hay-iranakan zugadipumner. In *BanbErewHamals* 1981, Nr 2: 21-29.
- 1981a Movses Xorenac'u "Hayoc' patmut'yan" arajin grk'i lezvakan aŭbyurnerə. In *PatmBanasHand* 1981, Nr 3: 48-63.
- 1982 (Džaukjan), Sravnitel'naja grammatika armjanskogo jazyka. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- 1983 Stugabanut'yunner. In *BanbErewHamals* 1983, Nr 2: 86-94.
- 1983a (Džaukjan), O perexode *o > a v armjanskom jazyke. In *HayLezGrak* 1-2: 40-53.
- 1984 Bnik hayeren armatnerov kazmvac anjnanunnerə. In *PatmBanasHand* 1984, Nr 4: 32-44.
- 1985 (Djahukian), Die archaischen Schichten armenischer Dialektwörter. In *Fs Winter 1985*: 151-160.
- 1985a (Džaukjan), Urartskie zaimstvovanija v armjanskom jazyke. In *Kul'tNasIVost* 1985: 364-372.
- 1986 (Djahukian), Introduction. In *Greppin/Khachaturian 1986*: 9-26.
- 1986a Haykakan šertə urartakan dic'aranum. In *PatmBanasHand* 1986, Nr 1: 43-58.
- 1986-1987 L'étymologie des mots *haraw* "sud", *hiwsis(i)* "nord" et le système d'orientation des anciens Arméniens, in *RevEtArm* NS 20: 29-33.
- 1987 Hayoc' lezvi patmut'yun: naxagrayin žamanakašrjan. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- 1988 Urarterenə ew hayerenə. In *UrHay 1988*: 127-168.
- 1988, 1-2 O sootnošenii xajasskogo i armjanskogo jazykov, in 1) *PatmBanasHand* (= *IFŽ*) 1988, Nr 1: 60-79; 2) *PatmBanasHand* 1988, Nr 2: 68-88.

- 1990 Hayereni anhayt cagman bararmatnerə. In *PatmBanasHand* 1990, Nr 2: 62-77.
- 1990a (Djahukian), Combinatory vowel changes in Armenian. In *AnnArmLing* 11: 1-16.
- 1991 Stugabanut'yunner. In *PatmBanasHand* 1991, Nr 2: 36-44.
- 1991a Arc'axahay (Ēarabā) barbari kazmavorman masin. In *LrHasGit* 1991, Nr 5: 52-58.
- 1992 Lezvakan nor tvyalner hayoc' naxak'ristoneakan kroni ew havatalik'neri masin, in *PatmBanasHand* 1992, Nr 1: 14-27.
- 1993 (Jahukian), The Armenian suffixes of Iranian origin. In *Fs Szemerényi 1993*: 257-269.
- 1994 (Djahukian), Indoeuropäische phonetisch-grammatische Dialekt-Isoglossen, die vom Hethitisch-Luvischen und Armenischen geteilt werden. In *IndogCaucas 1994*: 12-24.
- 1995 Hay-iranakan lezvakan zugadipumner. In *PatmBanasHand* 1995, Nr 2: 183-186.
- 1998 Hin hayereni verjacanc'neri cagumə. In *Hayoc' lezvi hamematakan k'erakanut'yan harc'er* 2. Yerevan: "Anania Širakac'i": 5-48.
- Jakobson, Roman
- 1959 Marginalia to Vasmer's Russian etymological dictionary (P-Я). In *IntJourSlavLingPoet* 1/2: 266-278.
- Jasanoff, Jay H.
- 1997 Gathic Avestan *cikōitərəš*. In *Fs Beekes 1997*: 119-130.
- Jensen, P.
- 1898 Hittiter und Armenier. Strassburg: Verlag von Karl J. Trübner.
- Jeremías, É. M. & Maróth, M.
- 1977 Drei mittelliranische wörter für 'Sonne'. In *Fs Harmatta 1977* (= *ActAntHung* 25): 221-226.
- Ĵihanyan, V. G.
- 1991 Haykakan leinašxarhi ĵranunnerə. In *HayLezPatmHarc'* 3: 193-276.
- Johnson, Buffie
- 1988 Lady of the beasts: ancient images of the Goddess and her sacred animals. HarperSanFrancisco (a division of HarperCollins Publishers).
- Joseph, Brian D.

- 1984 Lindeman versus Kortlandt: summary and evaluation. In *AnnArmLing* 5: 45-50.
- Kagarov, E. G.
1928 Mifologičeskij obraz dereva, rastuščego kornjami vverx, in *DoklANSSSR* 1928: 331-335.
- K'alant'ar, A.
1895 Sasun. [T'iflis].
- Kammenhuber, Annelies
1961 Zur Stellung des Hethitisch-Luvischen innerhalb der indogermanischen Gemeinsprache. In *ZVS* 77: 31-75.
- Kapancjan, Grigor
See Łap'anc'yan.
- Karagyozyan, H. H.
1975 Sepagir aṭbyurneri *Alia* k'atak'ə. In *LrHasGit* 1975, Nr 4: 89-99.
- Karapetyan, Donara M.
1986 Hovasap' Sebastac'u "Bžškaran əntreal tarrakan maxc'i" bnagitakan erkə. In *Banber Matenadarani* 15: 288-316.
1993 See *Sources*: Asar Sebastac'i.
- Karapetyan, Eḡiazar Karapeti
1962 Sasun: azgagrakan nyut'er. Yerevan: Haypethrat.
- Karpenko, Ju. A.
1981 Nazvanija zvezdnogo neba. Moscow: "Nauka". (Series "Literaturovedenie i jazykoznanie").
- Karolidēs (Καρολιδης), Paulos
1885 Γλῶσσάριον συγκριτικὸν ἐλλήνοκαππαδοκικῶν λέξεων ἡτο ἰ ἡ ἐν Καππαδοκίᾳ λαλουμένη Ἑλληνικῇ διαλεκτὸς καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ σωζόμενα ἰχνη τῆς ἀρχαίας. Καππαδοκικῆς γλῶσσης - ὑπο Π. Καρολίδου. Σμυρνή: ἐκ τοῦ τυπογραφείου "Ὁ Τυπὸς".
- Karst, Josef (Joseph)
1901 Historische Grammatik des Kilikisch-Armenischen. Strassburg: Verlag von Karl J. Trübner (= 1970: Photomechanischer Nachdruck. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co.). For a ModArm. translation see Karst 2002.
1911 Zur ethnischen Stellung der Armenier. In *Yušarjan* 1911 : 399-431.

- 1930 Armeno-Pelasgica: Geschichte der armenischen Philologie in kritischer beleuchtung nach ihren ethnologischen Zusammenhängen dargestellt. Heidelberg: Carl Winters Universitätsbuchhandlung.
- 1948 Mythologie arméno-caucasienne et hétito-asianique. Strasbourg, Zurich: Editions P. H. Heitz.
- 2002 Kilikyan hayereni patmakan k'erakanut'yun (ModArm. translation from Karst 1901 by Dmitri Alivnyak). Yerevan: University Press.
- Katz, Joshua T.
1998 How to be a dragon in Indo-European: Hittite *illuyankaš* and its linguistic and cultural congeners in Latin, Greek, and Germanic. In *Fs Watkins 1998*: 317-314.
- Kavkazskij ètnografičeskij sbornik 1
1955 Moscow: Academy Press.
- Kelly, Fergus
1976 The Old Irish tree-list. In *Celtica* 11: 107-124.
- Kent, Roland G.
1953 Old Persian: grammar, texts, lexicon. New Haven, Connecticut: American Oriental Society (American Oriental Series, 33).
- Kern, J. H.
1894 *Mist* und die Wurzel *migh*. In *IndogForsch* 4: 106-112.
- Kētikean
1905 *Acux t'ē acut*. In *HandAms* 19, 1905, Nr 11: 346-348. [The name of the author is not printed. According to Ačāryan (HAB 1: 103a), it is Kētikean].
- Khachatoorian, Khachatoor
2001 *Grigor Narekatsi*, The Book of Sadness. Yerevan: "Nairi".
- Kim, Ronald
2000 'To drink' in Anatolian, Tocharian, and Proto-Indo-European. In *HistSpr* 113: 151-170.
- Kimball, Sarah E.
1999 Hittite historical phonology. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft, 95).
- Klaproth, Julius
1831 Asia polyglotta (2nd ed.). Paris: Verlag von Heideloff & Campe.

- Klimov, G. A.
- 1964 Ètimologičeskij slovar' kartvel'skix jazykov. Moscow: "Nauka".
 - 1971 Kavkazskie ètimologii (1-8). In *Ètimologija* 1968: 223-230.
 - 1989 Refleks indoevropskogo laringal'nogo v kartvel'skix jazykax? In *VoprJaz* 1989, Nr 6: 23-28.
 - 1991 The Kartvelian analogue of Proto-Indo-European **suomb(h)o-* 'spongy, porous'. In *Fs Polomé 1, 1991*: 111-116.
 - 1993 Ešče odno svidetel'stvo prebyvanija arijcev v Perednej Azii. In *VoprJaz* 1993, Nr 4: 29-37.
 - 1994 Drevnejšie indoevropizmy kartvel'skix jazykov. Moscow: Rossijskaja Akademija Nauk, Institut Jazykoznanija; "Nasledie".
 - 1998 Etymological dictionary of the Kartvelian languages. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Klingenschmitt, Gert
- 1982 Das altarmenische Verbum. Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag.
- Kloekhorst, Alwin
- 2007 The Hittite inherited lexicon (2 volumes). PhD diss. Leiden University.
- Kluge, Friedrich
- 1989 (Kluge/Seebold), Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache. 22.Auflage, unter Mithilfe von Max Bürgisser und Bernd Gregor völlig neu bearbeitet von Elmar Seebold. Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Knobloch, Johann
- 1974 Osk. **ai̯z* 'Vermögen' und die Beteiligung mit irdischen Gütern. In *AntIndogerm*: 349-351.
- K'oč'o'yan, A. K.
- 1963 Sayat'-Novayi hayeren xaferi ba'aran. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- Kortlandt, Frederik H. H. (all the papers, except for 1980b, are reprinted in 2003 with some additional comments)
- 1975 A note on the Armenian palatalization. In *ZVS* 89: 43-45.
 - 1976 Notes on Armenian historical phonology I. In *StudCauc* 3: 91-100.
 - 1978 Notes on Armenian historical phonology II: The second consonant shift. In *StudCauc* 4: 9-16.
 - 1980 On the relative chronology of Armenian sound changes. In

- ProcFICAL 1980*: 97-106.
- 1980a Albanian and Armenian. In *ZVS* 94: 243-251. [I refer to the revised version: 1986].
- 1980b *H₂o* and *oH₂*. In *Lingua posnaniensis* 23: 127-128.
- 1983 Notes on Armenian historical phonology III: *h-*. In *StudCauc* 5: 9-16.
- 1984 PIE. **H-* in Armenian. In *AnnArmLing* 5: 41-43.
- 1985 The syncretism of nominative and accusative singular in Armenian. In *RevEtArm* n.s. 19: 19-24.
- 1985a Arm. *artawsr* 'tear'. In *AnnArmLing* 6: 59-61.
- 1985b Notes on Armenian historical phonology IV. In *StudCauc* 6: 9-11.
- 1986 Armenian and Albanian. In *PlacArmLIE*: 38-47.
- 1987 Notes on Armenian historical phonology V. In *StudCauc* 7: 61-65.
- 1987a Sigmatic or root aorist? In *AnnArmLing* 8: 49-52.
- 1989 The making of a puzzle. In *AnnArmLing* 10: 43-52.
- 1991 Arm. *canawt* 'known'. In *AnnArmLing* 12: 1-4.
- 1993 Intervocalic **w-* in Armenian. In *AnnArmLing* 14: 9-13.
- 1994 Palatalization of dentals in Armenian. In *AnnArmLing* 15: 27-31.
- 1994a Proto-Armenian numerals. In *Pedersen Kolloquium 1994*: 253-257.
- 1995 The sigmatic forms of the Armenian verb. In *AnnArmLing* 16: 13-17.
- 1996 Arm. *cafr* 'laughter'. In *AnnArmLing* 17: 55-59.
- 1997 Arm. *nēr* 'sister-in-law'. In *AnnArmLing* 18: 7-9.
- 1998 The development of **y-* in Armenian. In *AnnArmLing* 19: 15-18.
- 2001 Armenian *ariwn* 'blood'. In *AnnArmLing* 21: 11-12.
- 2003 Armeniaca: comparative notes; with an appendix on the historical phonology of Classical Armenian by Robert S. P. Beekes [see Beekes 2003]. Ann Arbor: Caravan Books.
- Kostandyan, D. M.
1979 Erznkayi barbarə. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- Kostanyan, S.-A. S.
1983 "Hazarapet" termini masin. In *PatmBanashHand* 1983, Nr 2-3:

178-189.

Krkyasaryan, Simon

1970 *K'senofon. Anabasis* (ModArm. transl. and commentary). Yerevan: Academy Press.

1986 *Herodotos. Patmut'yun inə grk'ic'* (ModArm. transl. and commentary). Yerevan: Academy Press.

Kuiper, F. B. J.

1942 Notes on Vedic noun-inflexion. In *MedKonNedAkadWetLet* 5.4: 161-256 (1-96).

1951 *Νόροπι χαλκῶ*. In *MedKonNedAkadWetLet* 14.5: 201-227.

1995 Gothic *bagms* and Old Icelandic *ylgr*. In *NOWELE* 25, March: 63-88.

Kulagina, A.V.

1999 Russkaja ěrotičeskaja častuška, in M. Levitt, A. Toporkov (eds.), *Eros and Pornography in Russian Culture*. Moscow: "Ladomir": 94-162.

Kulikov, Leonid

2001 The Vedic *-ya*-presents. PhD diss. Leiden University.

2005 Reduplication in the Vedic verb: Indo-European inheritance, analogy and iconicity. In *StudRedup 2005*: 431-454.

K'yoškeryan, Armine

1981 (ed.) *Grigor Narekac'i*, Taťer ew ganjer. Yerevan: Academy Press.

1987 (ed.) *Nerses Šnorhali*, Taťer ew ganjer. Yerevan: Academy Press.

Lagarde, Paul de

1850 (Boetticher), Vergleichung der armenischen Consonanten mit denen des Sanskrit. In *ZeitDeutMorgGesel* 4: 347-369.

1854 Zur Urgeschichte der Armenier: ein philologischer Versuch. Berlin: Besser'sche Buchhandlung. - W. Hertz (aus der K. K. Hof- und Staatsdruckerei zu Wien).

1866 Gesammelte Abhandlungen. Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus.

1868 Beitræge zur baktrischen Lexikographie. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner.

1886 NeuGriechisches aus KleinAsien. In *AbhKönGesWisGöt* 33.1: 3-68.

Lalayan (Lalayeanc', Lalayan), E.

- 1892 (Lalayeanc'), Ĵawaxk'i burmunk'. T'iflis: Tparan "Arōr" T. Nazarean. (Žoťovrdagrakan niwt'er, 2).
- 1897 Ĵawaxk' (re-printed from "Azgagrakan handēs"). T'iflis: Tparan M. D. Rotineanc'i.
- 1983-88 (1-2), Erker. Vol. 1, 1983; vol. 2, 1988. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- Lamberterie, Charles de
- 1978 Armeniaca I-VIII: études lexicales. In *BSL* 73: 243-285.
- 1980 Échange de gutturales en arménien. In *ProcFICAL (1979)* : 221-223.
- 1986 Deux isoglosses entre l'arménien et l'indo-iranien. In *PlacArmLIE 1986*: 48-61.
- 1990 (1-2), Les adjectifs grecs en -υς: sémantique et comparaison (2 vols.). Louvain-la-Neuve: Peeters. (Bibliothèque des cahiers de l'Institut de Linguistique de Louvain, 54-55).
- 1992 Introduction à l'arménien classique. In *LALIES* 10 (Aussois, 1988-1989): 234-289.
- 1997 L'arménien. In *LangIndEur 1997*: 139-165.
- Łanalanyan, Aram
- 1960 Aracani. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- 1969 Avandapatum. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- Landsberger, B.
- 1950 B. Landsberger's lexicographical contributions. In *JCunSt* 4: 1-62.
- Lane, George S.
- 1970 Tocharian: Indo-European and non-Indo-European relationships. In *IndEur&IndEur 1970*: 73-88.
- Langlois, Victor
- 1867 Collection des historiens anciens et modernes de l'Arménie. Vol. 1. Paris: Libraire de Firmin Didot Frères.
- Łap'anc'yan, Grigor A. Kapancjan, Grigor
- 1927 "Hnēabanakan" mi k'ani mnac'ordner hayerenum. Stugabanut'yunner - *ariwc, morm, xlēz*. In *Tetekagir HXSH gitut'yan yev arvesti instituti* 1927, Nr 2: 77-104 + 105-113.
- 1945 Ara Getec'ki paštamunk'ə. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- 1951a (Kapancjan): K ustanovleniju xurritskogo termina *šarr-//zarr-* v značenii 'sluga, rab' po dannym armjanskogo i gruzinskogo

- jazykov. In *ArchOr* 19: 321-328.
- 1951b (Kapancjan): Xurritskie slova armjanskogo jazyka. In *ArchOr* 19: 579-605.
- 1961 Hayoc' lezvi patmut'yun: hin šrjan. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- 1975 (Kapancjan): Istoriko-lingvističeskie raboty. Vol. 2, 1975. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- Łaribyan, Ararat Sahaki
- 1953 Hay barbaragitut'yun: hnč'yunabanut'yun ew jewabanut'yun. Yerevan: Armenian State External [*heřaka*] Pedagogical Institute Press.
- 1958 Hayereni norahayt barbarneri mi nor xumb. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- 1966 Review of Davt'yan 1966. In *PatmBanasHand* 1966, Nr 4: 273-276.
- Laufer, Berthold
- 1919 Sino-Iranica: Chinese contributions to the history of civilization in ancient Iran. Chicago. (Field Museum of Natural History publications 201; Anthropological series, vol. 15, Nr 3).
- Lavrov, L. I.
- 1955 Abaziny (istoriko-ětnografičeskij očerk). In *Kavkazskij ětnografičeskij sbornik* 1: 5-47.
- Łazaryan, R. S.
- 2001 Mišin grakan hayereni barapašarə. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- Łazaryan, R. S., Avetisyan, H.M.
- 1987-92 See MišHayBar.
- Łaziyan, Alvard S.
- 1983 Arc'ax. *Hay azgagrut'yun ew banahyusut'yun* 15. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- Lehmann, Winfred P.
- 1952 Proto-Indo-European phonology. Austin: University of Texas Press and Linguistics Society of America.
- 1986 A Gothic etymological dictionary (based on the 3rd ed. of Feist's dictionary). Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Lejeune, Michel
- 1982 Notes d'étymologie gauloise. In *Études Celtiques* 19: 107-119.
- Leroy, Maurice
- 1986 Le redoublement comme procédé de formation nominale en

- arménien classique. In Maurice Leroy and Francine Mawet (eds.), *La place de l'arménien dans les langues indo-européennes*. Louvain: Peeters: 62-75.
- Levin, Saul
 1995 Semitic and Indo-European: the principal etymologies: with observations on Afro-Asiatic. Amsterdam, Philadelphia. John Benjamins Publishing Company. (Amsterdam studies in the theory and history of linguistic science. Series IV. Current issues in linguistic theory, 129).
- Liddell, Henry George, and Scott, Robert
 1940/1953 A Greek-English Lexicon. A new edition revised and augmented throughout by Sir Henry Stuart Jones, with the assistance of Roderick McKenzie and with the co-operation of many scholars. Oxford: Clarendon Press. [I systematically used this dictionary though not mentioning it].
- Lidén, Evald
 1905 [apud HandAms 191b, on *sayl*].
 1905-06 Baumnamen und Verwandtes. In *IndogForsh* 18: 485-509.
 1906 Armenische Studien. Göteborg: Wald. Zachrissons.
 1933 Armeniaca. In *GötHögÅrs* 39, 1933: 2 (= Donum natalicium Oscari von Sydow oblatum): 39-56.
 1934a Zur indogermanischen Terminologie der Milchwirtschaft. In *ZVS* 61: 1-13.
 1934b Zur alten tieranatomischen Terminologie. In *ZVS* 61: 14-28.
 1937 Wortgeschichtliches. In *Fs Pedersen 1937*: 88-94.
- Lindeman, Fredrik Otto
 1980 Indo-European and Classical Armenian: a phonological note. In *ProcFICAL 1980*: 59-66.
 1982 The triple representation of Schwa in Greek and some related problems of Indo-European phonology. Oslo, Bergen, Tromsø: Universitetsforlaget.
 1987 Introduction to the 'Laryngeal Theory'. Oslo: Norwegian University Press (Universitetsforlaget AS).
 1989 Review of Laryng 1988. In *HistSpr* 102: 268-297.
 1990 Is there any conclusive evidence for a triple representation of schwa in Armenian? In *AnnArmLing* 11: 25-30.
 1990a A note on the phonology of the word for 'sheep' in

- Indo-European. In *HistSpr* 103: 20-21.
- 2003 On a possible vestige in Germanic of a particular Indo-European type of construction with the verbal theme **H₂er-k-* 'to hold'. In *HistSpr* 116: 96-99.
- Lisic'yan, Step'an D.
- 1935 (Lisician), Koşun-daş: megalitičeskoe gorodišče v Sisiane (Zangezure). In *Gd Marr 1935*: 709-721.
- 1955 (Lisician) Očerki ètnografii dorevoljucionnoj Armenii. In *Kavkazskij ètnografičeskij sbornik* 1: 182-264.
- 1969 Zangezuri hayerə. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- 1981 Lërnayin Ğarabati hayerə: azgagrakan aknark. *Hay azgagrut'yun ew banahyusut'yun* 12: 7-84. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- Loewenthal, John
- 1928 Lat. *vesper*. In *ZVS* 55: 4-5.
- Ĺreĵyan, Lusine
- 2004 Erkvoryakneri araspelnerə "Sasna c'rer" ēposum. In *SasC'Git 2004*: 117-120.
- Lubotsky, A. M.
- 1981 Gr. *pégnumi*: Skt. *pajrá-* and loss of laryngeals before mediae in Indo-Iranian. In *MünStudSpr* 40: 133-138.
- 1988 The system of nominal accentuation in Sanskrit and Proto-Indo-European. Leiden, New York, København, Köln: E. J. Brill. (Memoirs of the Kern Institute, 4).
- 1990 La loi de Brugmann et **H₃ø-*. In *RecLar 1990*: 129-136.
- 1992 The Indo-Iranian laryngeal accent shift and its relative chronology. In *RekRelChr 1992*: 261-269.
- 1997 Review of: Marianne Volkart, *Zu Brugmanns Gesetz im Altindischen*. (Universität Bern. Institut für Sprachwissenschaft. Arbeitspapier 33.) Bern 1994, 68 p. In *Kratylos* 42: 55-59.
- 1998 Avestan *x^varənah-*: the etymology and concept. In *SprKultIndog 1998*: 479-488.
- 1998a Vedic roots of the type **TeRD^h-*. In *StudIndogLodz* 2: 75-81.
- 1999 Avestan compounds and the RUKI-rule. In *Gd Schindler 1999*: 299-322.
- 2000 Indo-Aryan 'six'. In *Ofitsch/Zinko 2000*: 255-261.
- 2000a The Vedic root *vṛ-* 'to cover' and its present. In *IndIranIndog 2000*: 315-325.

- 2001 The Indo-Iranian substratum. In *EarContUralIndEur 2001* : 301-317.
- 2001a Reflexes of Proto-Indo-European *sk in Indo-Iranian. In *IncLing* 24: 25-57.
- 2001b Het vuur na aan de Indo-Europese schenen leggen: over de reconstructie van betekenis. Inaugural lecture Leiden University.
- 2002 Scythian elements in Old Iranian. In *IndoIranLangPeop 2002* : 189-202.
- 2002a The Indo-Iranian word for 'shank, shin'. In *JAmOrSoc* 122.2: 318-324.
- 2004 Vedic *pr'dākusānu-*. In *IndIranJour* 47: 1-6.
- Lüders, Heinrich
- 1942 Von indischen Tieren. In *ZeitDeutMorgGesel* 96: 23-81 [= Lüders 1973: 490-548].
- 1973 Kleine Schriften (ed. by Oscar von Hinüber). Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag GmbH.
- Lusenc', Ašot Łukasi
- 1982 Areši barbarə. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- Macdonell, Arthur Anthony
- 1993 A Vedic grammar for students. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers Private Limited (< London: Oxford University Press, 1916). Reprint: 2004.
- Maciuszak, Kinga
- 1996 Notes on etymology of the New Persian colour names. In *Studia etymologica Cracoviensia* 1: 25-37.
- MacKenzie, D. N.
- 1966 The dialect of Awroman (Hawrāmān-i Luhōn): grammatical sketch, texts and vocabulary. København: Kommissionær - Ejnar Munksgaard. (Historisk-filosofiske skrifter, 4.3).
- 1970 (ed.), The 'Sūtra of the causes and effects of actions' in Sogdian. London, New York, Toronto: Oxford University Press.
- 1971 A concise Pahlavi dictionary. London, New York, Toronto: Oxford University Press.
- Madat'yan, K'. M.
- 1985 Alaškerti xosvack'ə (Aparan-Aragaci tarack'). Yerevan: Academy Press.
- Madoyan, A.

- 1989 (ed.), *Aṛak'el Siwnec'i*, Adamgirk'. Yerevan: University Press.
- Mahé, J.-P.
 1982 Le crime d'Artawazd et les *k'ajk'* ou le mythe du temps profané. In *RevEtArm* n.s. 16: 175-206.
 1986-87 Remarques supplémentaires sur Artawazd et les *k'ajk'*. In *RevEtArm* n.s. 20: 557-558.
 1986-87a Arménien *haw* 'grand-père' et 'oncle'? In *RevEtArm* n.s. 20: 55-56.
- Makaev, È. A.
 1974 Armjano-kel'tskie izoglossy. In *Kel'ty i kel'tskie jazyki*: 51-62.
- Makovskij, M. M.
 1986 Anglijskaja ètimologija. Moscow: "Vyssšaja škola".
- Mallory, J. P.
 1982 Indo-European and Kurgan fauna I: wild mammals. In *JourIndEurStud* 10: 193-222.
 1989 In search of the Indo-Europeans: language, archaeology and myth. London: Thames and Hudson.
- Mallory, J. P. and Adams, D. Q. (eds.)
 1997 Encyclopedia of Indo-European culture. London, Chicago: Fitzroy Dearborn Publishers.
- Malxasyanc', Step'an
 1944-45 (1-4), Hayerēn bac'atrankan baṛaran. Yerevan. (Re-printed in 1955-56 and 1983, Pēyruṭ': "Sewan").
 1987 *P'avstos Buzand*, Hayoc' patmut'yun. ClArm. text with ModArm. translation and commentary (collations: pp. 416-417). Yerevan: University Press. See also *Sources*: P'avstos Buzand.
- Mamikonean, N.
 1895 Hazaric' mekə (vēpik). T'iflis: Tparan Yovhannēs Martiroseanc'i. ("T'iflisi Hayoc' hratarakč'akan ənkerut'iwn", Nr 96).
- Manaster Ramer, Alexis & Michalove, Peter A.
 2001 Etymology vs. phonology: the treatment of */w/ after sonorants in Armenian. In *MünStudSpr* 61: 149-161.
- Mann, Stuart E.
 1963 Armenian and Indo-European: Historical phonology. London: Luzac & Co. Ltd.
- Margaryan, Alek'sandr S.

- 1971 Barbarayin baĕri meknuťyunner: 1-7. In *PatmBanasHand* 1971, Nr 3: 210-222.
- 1973 Barbarayin baĕri meknuťyunner: 8-13. In *PatmBanasHand* 1973, Nr 4: 127-136.
- 1975 Gorisi barbarə. Yerevan: University Press.
- 1975a Barbarayin baĕri meknuťyunner: 14-19. In *PatmBanasHand* 1975, Nr 2: 183-191.
- 1977 Barbarayin baĕri meknuťyunner: 20-24. In *PatmBanasHand* 1977, Nr 3: 157-164.
- 1980 Barbarayin baĕri meknuťyunner: 25-28. In *PatmBanasHand* 1980, Nr 2: 98-104.
- 1988 Mi k'ani tetanunneri cagman masin. In *PatmBanasHand* 1988, Nr 4: 123-130.
- 1992 Tetanvanakan meknuťyunner. In *PatmBanasHand* 1992, Nr 1: 133-139.
- Markosyan, Razmik Ararati
- 1989 Araratyan barbar. Yerevan: "Luys".
- Marr, N. Ja.
- 1927 Egipetskij, ŕumerskij, kitajskij i ix paleontologičeskie vstreči, in *DoklANSSSR*: 82-84.
- Martirosyan, H. A. (= Martirosjan A. A.)
- 1964 (Martirosjan A. A.), Armenija v ĕpoxu bronzy i rannego ŕeleza. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- Martirosyan, Hrach Kayosiki
- 1990-91 The ancient Armenian day-names (unpublished).
- 1991 The reflexes of the Proto-Indo-European laryngeals in Armenian (unpublished).
- 1993 Armeno-Indoarica (unpublished).
- 1996 *Artaxur xawart*-i meknuťyan nor p'orj [New attempt of interpretation of *artaxur xawart*]. In *PatmBanasHand* 1996, Nr 1-2: 311-316.
- 2003 On the Armenian spring feast of the cow sacrifice: a comparative historical study. In *International Congress on Armenian studies: Armenology today and prospects or its development* (September 15-20, 2003, Yerevan). Abstracts of papers. Yerevan University Press, 2003. Page 106.
- 2003a Thoughts on the lexicon of Narekac'i. In *Colloque international*

- Grégoire de Narek* (12-23 décembre 2003; Paris, dans les salons de l'INALCO). Theses, p. 14.
- 2005 On Armenian *čiw* 'shank'. In *IranCauc* 9.1: 81-84.
- forthc. On Armenian *andund-k* 'abyss'. In *Fs Weitenberg*.
- Martirosyan, Hrach & Łaragyozyan, Sat'enik
- 2003 (FW), Armenia and Łarabał (video materials).
- 2005 (unpublished), On Armenian words of mythological and folklore origin. Presented at the 10th General Conference of the AIEA. Universidad del País Vasco, Vitoria-Gasteiz, 7-10 September 2005.
- Martirosyan, Nšan
- 1972 Npast mə het' ew hay barak'nnut'yan, in *PatmBanasHand* 1972, Nr. 2: 163-186.
- Mat'ewosyan, A. S.
- See HayJerHiš.
- Matikean, H. Ałek'sandr V.
- 1930 Aray Gełec'ik: hamematakan-k'nnakan usumnasirut'iwn. Vienna: Mxit'arean tparan. (Azgayin Matenadaran, 126).
- Matzinger, Joachim
- 1997 A note on Armenian *doustr*. In *AnnArmLing* 18: 11-18.
- 2000 Armenisch *ark'ay* 'König': Ein etymologischer Versuch. In *HistSpr* 113: 283-289.
- 2005 Untersuchungen zum altarmenischen Nomen: die Flexion des Substantivs. Dettelbach: Verlag J. H. Röhl. (Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft; Beiheft 22, Neue Folge).
- 2006 Altarmenisch *ewł/iwł'Öl*'. In *Fs Pisowicz 2006*: 71-72.
- Mayrhofer, Manfred
- 1952 Stern. In *BeiGesDeuSprLit* 74: 316-318.
- 1961 Indogermanische Randglosse zu "Kluge-Mitzka". In *Sprache* 7: 177-189.
- 1979 Ausgewählte kleine Schriften (hrsg. von Sigrid Deger-Jalkotzy, Rüdiger Schmitt). Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag.
- 1986 Lautlehre: segmentale Phonologie des Indogermanischen. In *Indogermanische Grammatik* 1/2. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, Universitätsverlag.
- 1987 Die Vertretung der indogermanischen Laryngale im Lateinischen. In *ZVS (= KZ)* 100: 86-108.

- 1992-2001 See EWAia.
- McNamara, Martin M. S. C.
- 1997 Targum Neofiti 1: Deuteronomy (English translation, apparatus, notes). Edinburgh: T & T Clark Ltd. (The Aramaic Bible, 5A).
- Meek, Th. J.
- 1913 Cuneiform bilingual hymns, prayers and penitential psalms. In *BeiAssSemSpr* 10/1: 1-127 (with notes of Fr. Delitzsch in 129-146).
- Meier-Brügger, Michael
- 1990 Zu griechisch *ἄγρωστις*. In *HistSpr* 103: 33-34.
- 1993 Zu griechisch *νήσος*. In *HistSpr* 106: 302.
- Meillet, A.
- 1894 Notes arméniennes. In *MSL* 8: 153-165.
- 1894a Varia. In *MSL* 8: 235-245.
- 1894b De quelques difficultés de la théorie des gutturales indo-européennes. In *MSL* 8: 277-304.
- 1896 Varia. In *MSL* 9: 136-159.
- 1896a Indo-iranica. In *MSL* 9: 365-380.
- 1898 Étymologies arméniennes. In *MSL* 10: 274-282.
- 1900 Étymologies arméniennes. In *MSL* 11: 390-401.
- 1900a Notes sur quelques faits de morphologie. In *MSL* 11: 6-21.
- 1900b Letto-slavica. In *MSL* 11: 173-186.
- 1900c Sur les suffixes verbaux secondaires en indo-européen. In *MSL* 11: 297-323.
- 1902 Review of Ačarean 1899 (1901). In *JourAsiat* 9^e série, tome 19: 561-571.
- 1903 De quelques archaïsmes remarquables de la déclinaison arménienne. In *ZArmPhil* 1: 139-148.
- 1903a De la différenciation des phonèmes. In *MSL* 12: 14-34.
- 1903b Varia. In *MSL* 12: 213-238.
- 1903c Étymologies arméniennes. In *MSL* 12: 429-431.
- 1905-06 Varia. In *MSL* 13: 237-253.
- 1906 Quelques hypothèses sur des interdictions de vocabulaire dans les langues indo-européennes. Chartres: Durand.
- 1908-09 Armeniaca. In *MSL* 15: 353-357.
- 1908-09a Notes sur quelques faits gotiques. In *MSL* 15: 73-103.
- 1908-09b De quelques emprunts probables en grec et en latin. In *MSL* 15:

- 161-164.
- 1908-09c À propos de quelques etymologies. In *MSL* 15: 336-340.
- 1911 Remarques sur les / de l'arménien classique. In *Yušarjan 1911* : 209-211.
- 1911-12 Sur les mots iraniens empruntés par l'arménien. In *MSL* 17: 242-250.
- 1911-12a Les formes verbales de l'indo-européen **me/g₁*- 'traire'. In *MSL* 17: 60-64.
- 1911-12b Notes iraniennes. In *MSL* 17: 107-112.
- 1911-12c Les noms de nombre en tokharien B. In *MSL* 17: 281-294.
- 1913 Altarmenisches Elementarbuch. Heidelberg: Carl Winters Universitätsbuchhandlung.
- 1916a Persica. In *MSL* 19: 49-59.
- 1916b Latin *vel*. In *MSL* 19: 63-64.
- 1916c Slave *mazati*, arménien *macanim*. In *MSL* 19: 122-123.
- 1916d Arménien *ain*. In *MSL* 19: 124.
- 1916e Sur l'histoire des consonnes en grec. In *MSL* 19: 163-173.
- 1916f De quelques présents radicaux athématiques. In *MSL* 19: 174-177.
- 1916g Latin *pluit* et arménien *hehum*. In *MSL* 19: 178-180.
- 1916h De quelques présents athématiques à vocalisme radical *o*. In *MSL* 19: 181-190.
- 1918 A propos du présent avestique *nāismī*. In *MSL* 20: 210-212.
- 1922a Des causatifs arméniens en *-uc'anem*. In *MSL* 22: 47-48.
- 1922b Du nominatif et de l'accusatif. In *MSL* 22: 49-55.
- 1922c Arménien *amul*. In *MSL* 22: 55.
- 1922d De quelques contradictions phonétiques. In *MSL* 22: 56-60.
- 1922e Sur le sort de *w* géminé en arménien. In *MSL* 22: 61-63.
- 1922f *Xšm* dans le pronom 'vous' en iranien. In *MSL* 22: 140-141.
- 1922g À propos du nom indo-européen de la 'puce'. In *MSL* 22: 142-143.
- 1922h Le nom de nombre 'un'. In *MSL* 22: 144.
- 1922i Les noms du type *φέρων*. In *MSL* 22: 203.
- 1922j Traitement de *s* suivie de consonne. In *MSL* 22: 211-214.
- 1922k Lat. *crēdō* et *fidēs*. In *MSL* 22: 215-218.
- 1922l Notes iraniennes. In *MSL* 22: 219-227.
- 1922m La forme du génitif pluriel en ombrien. In *MSL* 22: 258-259.

- 1924 Remarques étymologiques. In *RevEtArm* 4, fasc. 1: 1-6.
- 1927 De la prothèse vocalique en grec et en arménien. In *BSL* 27: 129-135.
- 1927a Sur *arew*, *aregagn* et *p'aylakn*. In *HandAms* 41: 757-762.
- 1930 Observations sur l'étymologie de l'arménien. In *RevEtArm* 10/2: 183-186 (= 1978: 223-226).
- 1936 Esquisse d'une grammaire comparée de l'arménien classique. Wien: Mechitharisten. (ModArm. translation: Meyē 1988).
- 1936a Arménien *hangčim* 'je me repose'. In *BSL* 37 (Nr 110): 11.
- 1936b Arménien *gir*, *grel*. In *BSL* 37 (Nr 110): 12.
- 1936c Arménien *ataxin*, *atij* (*atjik*). In *BSL* 37 (Nr 110): 73-74.
- 1936d Arménien *šurj* 'autour'. In *BSL* 37 (Nr 110): 75.
- 1950 Les dialectes indo-européens (nouveau tirage avec une introduction nouvelle et des additions). Paris: Librairie ancienne Édouard Champion; Librairie de la Société de Linguistique de Paris.
- 1978 (Meye, Antuan), M. Minasyan (ed.), Hayagitakan usumnasirut'yunner. Yerevan: University Press.
- 1988 (Meyē), Dasakan hayerēni hamematakan k'erakanut'ean uruagic (ModArm. translation of Meillet 1936 by Martiros Minasean). Geneva.
- Meillet, A. & Vendryes, J.
- 1924 Traité de grammaire comparée des langues classiques. Paris: Librairie Ancienne Édouard Champion.
- Melchert, H. Craig
- 1979 Three Hittite etymologies. In *ZVS* 93: 262-271.
- 2003 (ed.) The Luwians. Leiden, Boston: Brill (Handbuch der Orientalistik, 1/68).
- Melik'ean, Eṭišē Y.
- 1964 Hark'-Xnus. Ant'ilias, Lebanon: Tparan Kat'otikosut'ean Hayoc' Meci Tann Kilikiyoy.
- Mēlik'-Dawit'pēk, S.
- 1896 Jaynakan usumnasirut'iwn Maraši barbarin. In *HandAms* 1896: 43-45, 113-114, 229-232, 354-357.
- Melik'-Ōhanjanyan, K. A.
- 1961 See *Sources*: Kirakos Ganjakec'i.
- Melik'-Šahnazareanc', Kostandin K. (Tmblac'i Xac'an)

- 1907-08 (1-2), *Zuřna-tmbła*. Vol. 1, 1907; vol. 2, 1908. Vatarřapat: Elēk'trařarř Tparan M. At'ořoy S. Eřmianci.
- Menevischean, P. G.
1889 Faustus von Byzanz und Dr. Lauer's deutsche Übersetzung. In *WienZeitKundMorg* 3: 51-68.
- Meřćaninov, I. I.
1978 Annotirovannyj slovar' uratskogo (Biajnskogo) jazyka. Leningrad: "Nauka", Leningradskoe otdelenie.
- Meye/ē see Meillet, A.
- Meřunc', B. X.
1989 řamřadin-Diliřani xosvack'ə. Yerevan: University Press.
- Mik'ayelyan, G. H.
1980 Nor Bayazet. *Hay azgagrut'yun ew banahyusut'yun* 11. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- Milbrath, Susan
1999 Star gods of the Maya: astronomy in art, folklore, and calendars. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Minasyan, řořer Marlesti
1999 řarabaři barbaři darjvacnerə (atenaxosut'yan řetmagir). Yerevan.
- Minorsky, M. V.
1930 Le nom de Dvin. - Kařāl/řazah. In *RevEtArm* 10/1: 117-123.
- Minshall, Robert
1955 'Initial' Indo-European */y/ in Armenian. In *Language* 31/4: 499-503.
- Mkrtć'yan, H. M.
1952 Karno barbařə. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- Mkrtć'yan, Manik
1973 (ed.) *Nersēs řnorhali*, Ořb Edesioy. Yerevan: Academy Press.
1981 (ed.) *Nersēs řnorhali*, Vipasanut'iwn. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- Mkrtć'yan, Nerses Alek'sani
1971 Burduri barbařə. Yerevan: Academy Press.
1983 (Mkrtćjan), Substratnye nazvanija rastenij v armjanskom jazyke. In *Drevnij Vostok* (Yerevan: Academy Press) 4: 24-37. [English summary: 286-287].
1988 (Mkrtćjan), Utočnenie akkadsnix nazvanij rastenij po dannym armjanskogo jazyka. In *Drevnij Vostok* (Yerevan: Academy

- Press) 5: 187-202.
- 1995 Sivri-Hisari gałt'ōjaxi ew barbari masin. In *PatmBanasHand* 1995, Nr 2: 205-214.
- 2006 Anatoliayi norahayt hay barbarnerə ew banahyusut'yunə. Yerevan: "Örenk' ew irakanut'yun". (Hetinakayin hratarakut'yun).
- Mladenov, Stefan
- 1937 Zur armenischen und slavischen Etymologie. In *Fs Pedersen 1937*: 95-102.
- Mnac'akanyan, Asatur Š.
- 1941 (ed.), *H. T'lkuranc'i*, Tał garnann. In *MatGNŽoł* 1: 178-181.
- 1956 Haykakan mĭjnadaryan žofovrdakan erger. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- 1977 Dic'abanakan eĭjerun mĭjnadaryan hay arvestum. In *Banber Matenadarani* 12: 7-49.
- 1980 Hay mĭjnadaryan hanelukner (5-18 dd.). Yerevan: Academy Press.
- 1980a "Govank' t'ř'noc'" tałšark'ə, nra hetinakə ew žamanakə. In *Banber Matenadarani* 13: 233-258.
- 1995 Hayrenner: texts, introduction, commentary. Yerevan: "Nairi"; Matenadaran.
- Monchi-Zadeh, Davoud
- 1990 Wörter aus Xurāsān und ihre Herkunft. (Acta Iranica 29). Leiden: <Diffusion E. J. Brill>.
- Monier-Williams, Monier
- 1899/1999 A Sanskrit-English dictionary. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers.
- Morani, Moreno
- 1991 Three Armenian etymologies. In *JSocArmStud* 5 (1990-1991): 173-183.
- 1994 Sui casi di IE *o > Arm. a. In *Fs Belardi 1994*, 1: 385-398.
- Morgenstierne, Georg
- 1974 Etymological Vocabulary of the Shughni Group. Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag.
- Movsisyan, Sahak (Bense)
- 1972 Hark' (Mšo Bulanəx). *Hay azgagrut'yun ew banahyusut'yun* 3. Yerevan: Academy Press.

- Msereanc', Lewon
 1899 Hayerēn barbaraxōsut'iwn. (Arm. transl. from Russian by Gabriēl Mēnēvišean). Vienna: Mxit'arean Tparan. (Azgayin Matenadaran, 30).
- Muller, Gerard
 1984 The developmend of vocalized laryngeals in Old Armenian. In *APILKU* 4: 95-98.
 1984a Notes on four Old Armenian etymologies. In *APILKU* 4: 99-101.
- Müller, F.
 1877 Schwan und Taube [Miscellanea 1]. In *BKIGS* 1: 163.
- Mutdusyan, Zohrab
 1985 Haykakan naxamayr astvacut'yan ew Xaldii harc'i šurjə. In *LrHasGit* 1985, Nr 7: 61-71.
- Muradyan, A. N.
 1971 Hunaban dproc'ə ew nra derə hayereni k'erakanakan terminabanut'yan stełcman gorcum. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- Muradyan, Gohar
 1993 Girk' Pitoyic'. Critical text with introduction and commentary. Yerevan: Academy Press.
 2000 Kniga Xrij. Russ. Translation with introduction and commentary. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- Muradyan, H. D.
 1960 Karčewani barbarə. Yerevan: Academy Press.
 1967 Kak'avaberdi barbarə. Yerevan: Academy Press.
 1972 Neracut'yun; Hnč'yunabanut'yun. In *Aknarkner mijin grakan hayereni patmut'yan*. Yerevan: University Press: 7-165.
 1982 Hayoc' lezvi patmakan k'erakanut'yun, vol. 1. Hnč'yunabanut'yun. Yerevan: Academy Press.
 1982a Havelakan h//h'-n hayereni barbarnerum. In *BanbErewHamals* 1982, Nr 2: 202-206.
 1986 How to interpret Adjarian's Law. In *Greppin/Khachaturian 1986* : 27-33. [This paper originally appeared, in a slightly different form, in *BanbErewHamals* 1973, Nr 2: 161-170].
- Muradyan, Kim
 1984 See Hexaemeron.
- Muradyan, M. H.

- 1962 Šataxi barbaṛə. Yerevan: University Press.
- 1972 Baragitut'yun. In *Aknarkner miġin grakan hayereni patmut'yan*. Yerevan: University Press: 167-296.
- 1982 Urvagic Moksi barbaṛi. In *Hayereni barbaṛagitakan atlas: usumnasirut'yunner ew nyut'er* 1. Yerevan: Academy Press : 108-183.
- Muradyan, P.
1996 Kovkasyan mšakut'ayin ašxarhə ew Hayastanə: Armeno-Georgica. In *PatmBanasHand* 1996, Nr 1-2: 117-136.
- Muradean, Y.
1901 Hamšēnc'i hayer. T'iflis: K. Martiroseanc'i tparan (reprinted from "*Azgagrakan handēs*").
- Murvalyan, A. A.
1955 Hayoc' lezvi barayin kazmə (usumnasirut'yun). Yerevan: Academy Press.
- Muşet'yan, Armen H.
1997 (Musheghian), Armenian etymologies. In *AnnArmLing* 18: 51-57.
- Mxit'areanc', A.
1901 P'srank' Širaki ambarneric'. (= Ēminean azgagrakan žotovacū, vol. 1). Moscow, Alek'sandrapol.
- Nagy, Gregory
1974 Perkūnas and Perunъ. In *AntiIndogerm* 1974: 113-131.
- Nassivera, Michele
2000 The development of the PIE words for 'sky', 'cow' and 'ship' and the relative chronology of Osthoff's law. In *HistSpr* 113: 57-70.
- Nawasardeanc', Tigran
1882- (HŽHĕk' 1-), Hay-žotovrdakan hĕk'iat'ner.
1903 Baṛgirk' Araratean barbaṛi. T'iflis: Tparan Movsēs Vardaneanc'i. (See also HŽHĕk' 5, 1889: 81-141).
- Nazinyan, Artasēs
1986 Hay žotovrdakan hek'iat'ner. Yerevan: "Sovetakan Groŭ".
- Nestle/Aland
1984=1993 See *Sources*: Bible.
- Nejxardt, A. A.
1982 Skifskij rasskaz Gerodota v otečestvennoj istoriografii.

- Leningrad: "Nauka", Leningradskoe otdelenie.
- Neu, Erich
 1970 Ein althethitisches Gewitterritual. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz. (StBoT 12).
 1974 Der Anitta-Text. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz. (StBoT 18).
- Niedermann, Max
 1899 Studien zur Geschichte der lateinischen Wortbildung. In *IndogForsch* 10: 221-258.
- Nikolaev, S. L.
 1985 Severokavkazskie zaimstvovanija v xettskom i drevnegrečeskom. In *DrevAnat* 1985: 60-73.
- Nikolajev, S. L. & Starostin, S. A.
 1994 A North Caucasian etymological dictionary. Moscow: Asterisk Publishers.
- Nocentini, Alberto
 1994 Le radici ie. **mor-/morm-* 'incubo' e **bū-/bub-* 'spauracchio' e il sistema fonologico indeuropeo. In *Fs Belardi* 1994, 1: 399-415.
- Norayr N. Biwzandac'i
 1923 K'nnadatut'iwn Haybusaki. In *HandAms* <...>, 496-506, <...>.
- Normier, Rudolf
 1980 Beiträge zur armenischen Etymologie I. In *AnnArmLing* 1: 19-22.
 1981 Zu Esche und Espe. In *Sprache* 27: 22-29.
- Nyberg, H. S.
 1974 A manual of Pahlavi. Part 2. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Odabašjan, A. A.
 1976 (Odabašjan), Narodnye verovanija armjan (po materialam rukopisnyx talismanov 15-19 vv.). In *Kavkazskij etnografičeskij sbornik* 6. Mosow: "Nauka", 107-130.
 1987 Tiezerakan caṛə hin hayoc' dic'abanakan hamakargum. In *LrHasGit* 1987, Nr 10: 61-71.
- Oettinger, Norbert
 1979 Die Stammbildung des hethitischen Verbuns. Nürnberg: Carl. (Erlanger Beiträge zur Sprach- und Kunstwissenschaft, 64).
 2003 Review of *Kimball* 1999. In *IndogForsch* 108: 339-341.
- Ofitsch, Michaela, & Zinko, Christian

- 2000 (eds.), 125 Jahre Indogermanistik in Graz: Arbeiten aus der Abteilung "Vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft" Graz. Leykam.
- Olsen, B. A.
- 1984 On the development of Indo-European prothetic vowels in Classical Armenian. In *APILKU* 4: 103-118.
- 1985 On the development of Indo-European prothetic vowels in Classical Armenian. In *RevEtArm* n.s. 19: 5-17.
- 1986 The Armenian continuations of Indo-European intervocalic **w*. In *AnnArmLing* 7: 51-56.
- 1988-89 A surrejoinder to J.A.C. Greppin's remarks on prothetic vowels in Armenian. In *RevEtArm* n.s. 21: 481-483.
- 1989 A trace of Indo-European accent in Armenian. In *HistSpr* 102: 220-240.
- 1994 Armenian *dalowkn* 'jaundice' and the IE suffixes **-g^won-*, **-gon-* and **-don-*. In *Pedersen Kolloquium 1994*: 331-347.
- 1999 The noun in Biblical Armenian: origin and word-formation: with special emphasis on the Indo-European heritage. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter (Trends in linguistics. Studies and monographs 119).
- Oranskij, I. M.
- 1975 Indo-iranica 4: tadžik (régional) *buruĭ* 'bouleau'. In *Fs Benveniste* 1975: 435-440.
- 1977 Est' li ètimologičeskaja svjaz' meždū russk. *bereza* i tadž. *burs* 'arča'? in *Ètimologija* 1975. Moscow: "Nauka": 138-140.
- Orbeli, I. A.
- 1956 Basni srednevekovoj Armenii. Moscow, Leningrad: Academy Press.
- 1982 Fol'klor i byt Moksa. Moscow: GRVLI "Nauka".
- 2002 Izbrannye trudy v dvux tomax, vol. 2. Yerevan: Academy Press "Gitutjun".
- Orel, Vladimir
- 1994 Albanian and Indo-European. In *Pedersen Kolloquium 1994*: 349-364.
- Osthoff, Hermann
- 1898 Griechische und lateinische Wortdeutungen (dritte Reihe). In *IndogForsch* 8, 1-2: 1-68.
- Otkupščikov, Ju. V.

- 1985 Ob indoeuropejskom proisxoždenii lat. *vīnum*, dr.-greč. (Ϝ)οἶνος 'vino'. In *VoprJaz* 1985, Nr 4: 95-103.
- Otten, H.
1950 Die Gottheit Lelvani der Boğazköy-Texte. In *JCunSt* 4: 119-140.
1988 Die Bronzetafel aus Boğazköy: ein Staatsvertrag Tuthalijas IV. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz. (StBoT, Beiheft 1).
- Palean, T. V.
1898 Mankakan ṛṛṛ Aknay barbarov. In *Biwrakn* 1898: 601-602.
1898a Antuni (Aknay gawarabarbarov). In *Biwrakn* 1898: 393-394.
- Parpola, Asko
1985 The sky-garment. Helsinki (Studia Orientalia edited by the Finnish Oriental Society, 57).
- Parvulescu, Adrian
1986 Arm. *amusin* 'spouse'. In *AnnArmLing* 7: 45-49.
1989 'Black water' in the Thracian hydronymy. In *ThracMyc* 1989: 290-295.
- Patkanov, K.
1864 Izsledovanie o sostave armjanskago jazyka. Sankt-Peterburg: Tipografija Imperatorskoj Akademii Nauk.
1869 Izsledovanie o dialektax armjanskago jazyka: filologičeskij opyt. Sankt-Peterburg: Tipografija Imperatorskoj Akademii Nauk.
- Patrubá'ny, Lukas v.
1897 Beiträge zur armenischen Ethnologie. In *EthnMittUng* 5, 1896: 139-153.
1897a Armenische Etymologien. In *EthnMittUng* 5, 1896: 234.
1906-1908 (Badrupanean, Łukas), Stugabanakan hetazōtut'iwnk'. In *HandAms* <...>; 21, 1907: 16-17, 89-90, 303-306; 22, 1908: 23-27, 85-86, 151-155, 186-189, 212-215, 245-247, 274-276.
1908 (Badrupanean, Łukas), Lezuabanakank'. In *HandAms* 1908: 276-279, 312-315, 341-344.
- Pedersen, Holger
1905 Zur armenischen Sprachgeschichte. In *ZVS* 38: 194-240 (=1982: 56-102).
1906 Armenisch und die Nachbarsprachen. In *ZVS* 39: 334-485 (= 1982: 112-263). ModWArm. translation: Pedersøn 1907.
1907 (Pedersøn), Hayerēn ew drac'i lezunerə (ModWArm. translation

- of Pedersen 1906 by H. T'ovmas Ketikean). Vienna: Mxit'arean Tparan.
- 1982 Kleine Schriften zum Armenischen (hrsg. von Rüdiger Schmitt). Hildesheim, New York: Georg Olms Verlag.
- Penney, J. H. W.
- 1988 Laryngeals and the Indo-European root. In *LaryngTheor 1988*: 361-372.
- Perixanjan, A. G. (P'erixanyan)
- 1982 Ètimologičeskie zametki I. In *PatmBanasHand* (= IFŽ) 1982, Nr 1: 55-62.
- 1985 (Pe'rikhanian), Arm. *dašxuran* et arm. *vsestak*. In *AnnArmLing* 6: 75-80.
- 1993 Materialy k ètimologičeskomu slovarju drevnearmjanskogo jazyka. Part 1. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- Peters, Martin
- 1980 Untersuchungen zur Vertretung der indogermanischen Laryngale im Griechischen. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. (Sitzungsberichte Philosophisch-historische Klasse, 377. Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Linguistik und Kommunikationsforschung, 8).
- 1988 Zur Frage strukturell uneinheitlicher Laryngalreflexe in idg. Einzelsprachen, in *Laryng* 1988: 373-381.
- Petersson, Herbert
- 1916 Beiträge zur armenischen Wortkunde. In *ZVS* 47: 240-291.
- 1920 Arische und armenische Studien. In *Lunds Universitets Årsskrift*. N.F. Avd. 1, Bd. 16. Nr. 3. Lunds, Leipzig.
- Petoyan, Vardan A.
- 1954 Sasuni barbarə. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- 1965 Sasna azgagrut'yunə. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- Petrosyan, Armen
- 1987 (Petrosjan), Otráženie indoevropskogo kornja **uel-* v armjanskoj mifologii. In *VON* (= *LrHasGit*) 1987, Nr 1: 56-70.
- 1990 (Petrosjan), Armjanskije ètnonimy v svete mifologičeskix dannyx. In *MežIssArm* 1990: 234-245.
- 1991 (Petrosjan), Armjanskije ètnonimy, drevnearmjanskaja model' mira i vopros lokalizacii drevnejšix armjanskix plemen. In *BanbErevHamals* (= VEU) 1991, Nr 2: 102-115.

- 1991 Samonazvanie armjan i vopros lokalizacii nositelej protoarmjanskogo jazyka. In *LrHasGit* (=VON) 1991, Nr 5: 120-129.
- 1997 Arami araspelə hndevropakan araspelabanut'yan hamatek'stum ew hayoc' azgacagman xndirə. Yerevan: Van Aryan.
- 1997a Haykakan ėposi hnaguyn akunk'nerə: hndevropakan araspelner ew patmakan naxatiper. Yerevan: Van Aryan.
- 2001 Ara Gefec'ik ew surb Sargis: hndevropakan astvacn u nra k'ristoneakan hetnordə. In *HaySrb 2001* : 157-169.
- 2002 The Indo-European and ancient Near Eastern sources of the Armenian Epic. JIES Monograph Nr 42. Washington D. C.: Institute for the Study of Man.
- 2002a (Petrosjan), Armjanskij ėpos i mifologija: istoki, mif i istorija. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- 2003 Hayoc' azgacagman harc'er avandakan tvyalneri k'nnut'yan luysi tak. In *PatmBanasHand* 2003, Nr 2: 189-224.
- 2006 Hayoc' azgacagman harc'er. Yerevan: "Noravank".
- 2006a Aramazd: kerpar, paštamunk', naxatiper. Yerevan: Van Aryan.
- Petrosyan, H. Z.
1987 Hayerenagitakan baġaran. Yerevan: "Hayastan".
- Petrosyan, L. N.
1968 Hay žoġovrdakan p'oxadramijoc'nern əst matenagrut'yan. In *LrHasGit* 1968, Nr 9: 36-48.
- Petrosyan, S. G.
1976 Merjsewanyan c'ėteri miut'yunə Haykakan leġnašxarhi hyusis-arewelk'um (m. t'. a. 6-5 dd.), in *PatmBanasHand* 1976, Nr 1: 187-198.
- 1977 T'raka-kimerakan c'ėteri miut'yunnerə Haykakan leġnašxarhum (m. t'. a. 6-5 dd.). In *PatmBanasHand* 1977, Nr 2: 207-220.
- 1979 Hin Marastani tarack'i errord ėt'nikakan tarri masin. In *PatmBanasHand* 1979, Nr 4: 46-58).
- 1999 Gnuni naxararakan tohmi ew ginu paštamunk'i šurġ. In *PatmBanasHand* 1999, Nr 2-3: 175-189.
- Petruševskij, I.
1930 O doxristianskix verovanijax krest'jan Nagornogo Karabaxa. Izvestija Azerbajdžanskogo Gosudarstvennogo Naučno-Issledovatel'skogo Instituta: Istoriko-etnografičeskoe i

- arxeologičeskoe otdelenie. 1.5. Baku: Izdatel'stvo AzGNII.
- Picard, Marc
1989 A reanalysis of Armenian prothesis and metathesis. In *FoLLingHist* 10/1-2: 61-69.
- P'ilojeanc', S.
1888 Korac margarit: Nor-Bayazēdi keank'ic'. T'iflis: Tparan M. D. Rotineanc'i.
- Piotrovskij, B. B.
1940 Uratskaja bronzovaja statuëtka Gos. Muzeja Armenii. In *Sovetskaja arxeologija* 1940, Nr 6: 89-91.
- Pisani, Vittore
1934 Armeniaca. In *ZVS* 61: 180-189.
1941-42 Glottica parerga: 1. Appunti di tocarico; 2. Alcuni casi di analogia fonetica; 3. *Sulpur/sulfur* e le aspirate indeuropee. In *RendLombLett* 75: 157-171; 172-190; 257-280.
1950 Palatalizzazioni ed esiti di *s*+ gutturale; esiti delle semivocali. In *RicLing* 1/2: 165-193.
1950a Gr. *ἄπρος*. In *RicLing* 1/1: 141.
1950b Russo *potolok*. In *RicLing* 1/2: 271-272.
- Pisowicz, Andrzej
1986 Quelques remarques sur le développement des sonores en arménien ancien. In *Gd Berberian* 1986: 659-661.
1989 Die armenischen Entlehnungen in türkischen Dialekten. In *FoLor* 26: 123-129.
- Pitra, J. B.
1855 Spicilegium Solesmense complectens Sanctorum Patrum scriptorumque ecclesiasticorum anecdota hactenus opera. Vol. 3. Paris. (Arm. text of "Physiologus": 374-390).
- Pivazyan, E.
1960 *Hovhannes T'lkuranc'i*, Tafer: texts, introduction, commentary. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- Pokorny, Julius
1959 Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch, vol. 1. Bern, Stuttgart: Francke [> 1994].
- Polomé, Edgar C.
1980 Armenian and the Proto-Indo-European laryngeals. In *ProcFICAL* : 17-33.

- 1997 Thoughts about the Celtic religious vocabulary. In *Gd Campanile* 1997, 2: 809-814.
- Połosyan, A. M.
1965 Hadrut'i barbařə. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- Połosyan, H. M.
1969 Zeyt'uni patmut'yunə (1409-1921 t't'). Yerevan: "Hayastan".
- Pomorska, Marzanna
1996 Some names for 'button' in Turkic languages. In *Studia etymologica Cracoviensia* 1: 63-76.
- P'ork'seyan, X. A.
1971 Nor Naxiřewani hay řəřovrdakan banahyusut'yunə. *Hay azgagrut'yun ew banahyusut'yun* 2. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- Poturean, H. Mkrtiř'
1914 *Arak'el Siwnec'i ew ir k'ert'uacnerə*. Venice: S. Lazar.
- Puhvel, Jaan
1969 "Meadow of the Otherworld" in Indo-European tradition. In *ZVS* 83: 64-69.
1971 Hittite *řurkiř* and *řurkel*. In *Sprache* 17: 42-45.
1985 Sober thoughts on Latin *ēbrius*. In *Fs Winter* 1985: 693-696.
1991 Names and numbers of the Pleiad. In *Fs Leslau* 1991, 2: 1243-1247.
- Radde, Gustav
1890 Karabagh: Bericht über die im Sommer 1890 im russischen Karabagh von Dr. Gustav Radde und Dr. Jean Valentin ausgeführte Reise (mit Karte). Gotha: Justus Perthes. (Ergänzungsheft No. 100 zu "Petermanns Mitteilungen").
- Raevskij, D. S.
1990 K stat'e N. L. Členovoj "Volga i Juřnyj Ural v predstavlenijax drevnix irancev i finno-ugrov vo II - nařale I tys. do n. ř". In *SovArx* 1990, Nr 3: 151-154.
- Rahlfs, Alfred
1931 (ed.), *Psalmi cum Odis*. Göttingen : Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. (Septuaginta, vol. 10).
1979 See *Sources* : Bible.
- Ramat, Anna Giacalone
1974 Alcuni aspetti della terminologia agricola del gotico. In *AntiqIndog* 1974 : 69-83.

- Rapoport, Ju. A.
 1971 Iz istorii religii drevnego Xorezma (ossuarii). Moscow: "Nauka".
- Rasmussen, Jens Elmegård
 1985 Miscellaneous morphological problems in Indo-European languages (I-II). In *LingPosn* 28, 1985 [1987]: 27-62.
 1999 Selected papers on Indo-European linguistics: with a selection on comparative Eskimo linguistics. Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press, University of Copenhagen. (Copenhagen studies in Indo-European, 1).
- Re'dei, Ka'roly
 1986 Zu den indogermanisch-uralischen Sprachkontakten. Wien: Verlag der Akademie. (Sitzungsberichte Philosophisch-historische Klasse, Bd. 468. Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Linguistik und Kommunikationsforschung; H. 16).
- Riegler-Klagenfurt, Richard
 1910 Zwei mythische Tiernamen. In *WörtSach* 2: 186-190.
- Rix, Helmut
 1969/1972 Review of Beekes 1969. In *Kratylos* 14: 176-187.
 1992 Historische Grammatik de Griechischen: Laut- und Formenlehre. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Rosenberg, A. J.
 1991 Psalms 3: a new English translation (transl. of text, Rashi and commentary). New York: Judaica Press.
- Roth, Karl
 1927 Die Bedeutung des Armenischen. In *HandAms* 41: 741-750.
- Russell, James R.
 1980 The word *k'ustik* in Armenian. In *ProcFICAL* : 107-114 (= 2004: 1-8).
 1987 Zoroastrianism in Armenia. Cambridge: Harvard University Department of Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations and National Association for Armenian Studies and Research. (Harvard Iranian Series, 5).
 1987a Yovhannēs T'lkuranc'i and the Mediaeval Armenian lyric tradition (Oxford University thesis). Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press. (University of Pennsylvania Armenian texts and studies,

- 7).
- 1998/2000 A scholium on Coleridge and an Armenian demon. In *JourSocArmStud* 10, 1998, 1999 [2000]: 63-71
- 2004 Armenian and Iranian studies. Cambridge, Massachusetts, London, England: Harvard University Press (Harvard Armenian texts and studies, 9).
- Sahakyan, Hasmik
- 1986-87 See UšMjnHayBnst 1-2.
- Šahpazean, Y.
- 1913 Bun haykakan steġcagorcut'yun. Łalat'ia: Tparan "Šant'".
- Sani, Saverio
- 1994 La serie lessicale di sskr. *nabh*. In *Fs Belardi 1994*, 1 : 83-97.
- Saradževa, L. A.
- 1976 Sravnitel'no-tipologiġeskoe issledovanie cvetovyx oboznaġenij v drevnearmjanskom i staroslavjanskom jazykax. In *PatmBanashHand* (=IFŽ) 1976, Nr 4: 186-198.
- 1980 Armjano-slavjanskije leksiko-grammatičeskie paralleli. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- 1980a K voprosu o dialektnom var'irovanii indoevropskoj zemledel'ġeskoj terminologii (na materiale armjanskogo i slavjanskix jazykov). In *LrHasGit* (=VON) 1980, Nr 1: 52-63.
- 1980b Životnovodġeskaja terminologija indoevropskogo proisxoždenija v armjanskom i slavjanskix jazykax. In *PatmBanashHand* (=IFŽ) 1980, Nr 1: 230-242.
- 1980c Ètimologiġeskie zametki. In *BanbErewHamals* (=VEU) 1980, Nr 1: 207-209.
- 1981 Sravnitel'no-tipologiġeskoe issledovanie indoevropskoj botaniġeskoj terminologii v drevnearmjanskom i slavjanskix jazykax. In *Ètimologija 1979*. Moscow: "Nauka": 156-167.
- 1981a Ètimologija armjanskogo nazvanija osiny - *kałamax*. In *PatmBanashHand* (=IFŽ) 1981, Nr 4: 227-229.
- 1986 Armjano-slavjanskije leksiko-semantiġeskie paralleli: sravnitel'no-istoričeskoe issledovanie genetiġeski obšġej leksiki. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- 1991 Odnostoronnie armjano-baltijskie izoglossy. In *PatmBanashHand* (=IFŽ) 1991, Nr 2: 170-175.
- Sargisean, Yartut'iwn K'hn. (Alewor)

- 1932 Balu: ir sovoroyt'nerə, krt'akan u imac'akan vičakə ew barbarə. Cairo: "Sahak-Mesrop".
- Sargsyan, Armen Yu.
2002 Arc'axahay barbari usumnasirut'yan patmut'yun. In *Arcaxskij Gosudarstvennyj Universitet: učenye zapiski: lingvistika (priloženie)*, Stepanakert. Vol. 1: 3-6.
- Sargseanc', Sargis
1883 Agulec'oc' barbarə (zōkeri lezun): lezuabanakan hetazōtut'iwn. Vols. 1-2. Moscow: Skoropečatnja O. Gerbeka.
- Sargsyan, G. X.
1956 Aṭbyurneri ōgtagorcman etanakə Movses Xorenac'u mot, in *Banber Matenadarani* 3: 31-42.
1967 (Sarkisjan), O dvux znachenijax termina *dastakert* v rannix armjanskix istočnikax. in *ĖllBIVVizIr*: 97-101.
1988 Urartakan terut'yunə ew hayerə (hay žoṭovrdi kazmavorman xndri šurjə). In *UrHay* 1988: 47-126.
1988a Mi havelum. In *UrHay* 1988: 169.
- Sargsyan, Vahan
1988 Baskern Ararat leṛan storotum. In *Garun* 1988, Nr 3: 66-74.
- Šaumjan, R. M.
1935 Armeniaca-Lesgica (Armjano-lezginskie leksiko-morfologičeskie paralleli). In *Gd Marr* 1935: 419-426.
- Sausverde, E.
1987 Hayeren cov bari stugabanut'yunə. In *ThesSISAL* 1987: 159 [Not published in *ProcSISAL (1987) 1993*].
- Schanidse, A.
1970 Etymologisches zu *Bati* ('Gans') und *Kvati* ('Ente') in den Kartwelsprachen. In *SprGes* 1970: 199-201.
- Scheftelowitz, J.
1904 Die Begriffe für "Schädel" im Indogermanischen, in *BKIGS* 28, 1904: 143-158.
1904-05 Zur altarmenischen Lautgeschichte, 1) in *BKIGS* 28, 1904: 282-313; 2) in 29, 1905: 13-71.
1927 Idg. *zgh* in den Einzelsprachen. In *ZVS* 54: 224-253.
1929 Die verbalen und nominalen *sk̂*- und *sk*-Stämme im Baltisch-Slavischen und Albanischen. In *ZVS* 56: 161-210.
- Scheller, Meinrad

- 1965 Hindi *āṭā*. In *ZVS* 79, 3/4: 224-238.
- Scherer, Anton
- 1953 Gestirnnamen bei den indogermanischen Völkern. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, Universitätsverlag.
- 1974 Sociologisches über Sternnamen. In *AntiqIndog* 1974: 185-192.
- Schindler, Jochem
- 1966 Hethitisch *lišši* 'Leber'. In *Sprache* 12: 77-78.
- 1966a Idg. **dy-* im Tocharischen. In *IndogForsch* 71: 236-238.
- 1973 Bemerkungen zur Herkunft der idg. Diphthongstämme und zu den Eigentümlichkeiten ihrer Kasusformen. In *Sprache* 19: 148-157.
- 1975 Armenisch *erkn*, griechisch *ὀδύνη*, irisch *idu*. In *ZVS* 89: 53-65.
- 1975a L'apophonie des thèmes indo-européens en *-r/n*. In *BSL* 70, 1: 1-10.
- 1994 Alte und neue Fragen zum indogermanischen Nomen (Erweitertes Handout). In *Pedersen Kolloquium* 1994: 397-400.
- Schlerath, Bernfried
- 1994 Der Morgensänger. In *IndogCaucas* 1994: 164-167.
- Schmid, Joh. Michael
- 1900 Des Wardapet Eznik von Kolb *Wider die Sekten*: aus dem Armenischen übersetzt und mit Einleitung, Inhalts-Übersichten und Anmerkungen versehen. Wien: Druck und Verlag der Mechitharisten-Congregation.
- Schmidt, Karl Horst
- 1962 Studien zur Rekonstruktion des Lautstandes der südkaukasischen Grundsprache (hrsg. von der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft, XXXIV, 3). Wiesbaden: Kommissionsverlag Franz Steiner GMBH.
- Schmitt, Rüdiger
- 1964 Desaffrizierung im Armenischen? In *MünStudSpr* 16: 89-93.
- 1966 Die Hesychglosse *σάτιλλα*. Eine Nachprüfung. In *Glotta* 44: 148-151.
- 1967 Dichtung und Dichtersprache in indogermanischer Zeit. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- 1972-74 Die Erforschung des Klassisch-Armenischen seit Meillet (1936).

- In *Kratylos* 17: 1-68.
- 1975 Von Bopp bis Hübschmann: Das Armenische als indogermanische Sprache. In *ZVS* 89, 1: 3-30.
- 1980 "Armenische" Namen in altpersischen Quellen. In *AnnArmLing* 1: 7-17.
- 1981 Grammatik des Klassisch-Armenischen mit sprachvergleichenden Erläuterungen. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft, 32).
- 1983 Iranisches Lehngut im Armenischen. In *RevEtArm* n.s. 17: 73-112.
- 1987 Armenia and Iran I. Armenia, Achaemenid province. IV. Iranian influences in Armenian. 1. General. In *EncIran* 2, 1987: 417-418; 445-459.
- 1988 (Šmitt), Pragmatika i sistematika v laringal'noj teorii. In *VoprJaz* 1988, Nr 1: 23-31.
- Schrader, O.
1917-29 (1-2), Reallexikon der indogermanischen Altertumskunde: Grundzüge einer Kultur- und Völkergeschichte Alteuropas. Zweite, vermehrte und umgearbeitete Auflage (hrsg. von A. Nehring). Berlin, Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter,
- Schrijver, Peter C. H.
1991 The reflexes of the Proto-Indo-European laryngeals in Latin. Amsterdam, Atlanta: Rodopi (LeidStudIndEur, 2).
1995 Studies in British Celtic historical phonology. Amsterdam, Atlanta: Rodopi (LeidStudIndEur, 5).
1997 Animal, vegetable and mineral: some Western European substratum words. In *Fs Beekes 1997*: 293-316.
- Schultheiß, Tassilo
1961 Hethitisch und Armenisch. In *ZVS* 77: 219-234.
- Schwartz, Martin
1986 Coded sound patterns, acrostics, and anagrams in Zoroaster's oral poetry. In *Fs Humbach 1986*: 327-392.
1992 Relative Chronology in and across formal and semantic hierarchies: the history of **dhwer(E)-* 'go apart' in Indo-European. In *RekRelChr* 1992: 391-410.
- Seebold, E.

- 1988 Wissenschaftsgeschichte und Theorieformulierung. Oder: Wie nötig ist die Laryngalhypothese? In *LaryngTheor* 1988 : 497-525.
- Seidel, E.
1908 *Mechithar's, des Meisterarztes aus Her*, 'Trost bei Fiebern': nach dem Venediger Druck vom Jahre 1832 zum ersten Male aus dem Mittelarmenischen übersetzt und erläutert. Leipzig.
- Šermazanean-Vardaneanc', Galust
1861 Im nšanacə Arazn a. In *Krunk Hayoc' ašxarhin* 2, Nr. 4 (April): 266-282. [A play in the subdialect of Astapat (Ararat)].
1861a Azgayin harsanik'. In *Krunk Hayoc' ašxarhin* 2, Nr. 6 (June): 426-440. [A play in the subdialect of T'avriz/T'arviz (Ararat)].
- Šervašidze, I. N.
1989 Fragment obščetjurkskoj leksiki: zaimstvovannyj fond. In *VoprJaz* 1989, Nr. 2: 54-92.
- Šērenc', Gēorg G.
1885-1899 [VanSaz 1-2], Vanay saz. Vol. 1. Hawak'acoyk' Vaspurakani žoťovrdakan ergeri, hēk'eat'neri, aracneri ew hanelukneri (teťakan barbařov). T'iflis: Tparan Yovhannēs Martiroseanc'i, 1885. Vol. 2. Hawak'acoyk' Vaspurakani žoťovrdakan ergeri, hēk'eat'neri, aracneri, hanelukneri, ōrhnut'iwnneri ew anēck'neri (teťakan barbařov). T'iflis: Tparan K. Martiroseanc'i, 1899.
- Simonyan, Hasmik
1989 (ed.), Patmut'iwn Aťek'sandri Makedonac'woy: haykakan xmbagrut'yunner. Yerevan: Academy Press. See Alexander Romance.
- Simonyan, N. M.
1979 Hay barbařneri hndewropakan hnabanut'yunnerə. In *Hayoc' lezvi hamematakan k'erakanut'yan harc'er*. Yerevan: Academy Press : 188-248.
1991 Hayereni bayakazmut'yan mi k'ani harc'er. In *HayLezPatmHarc'3*: 277-312.
- Širokov, Oleg
1980 Mesto armjanskogo jazyka sredi indoevropskix i problema armjanskoj prarodiny: avtoxtonnost' armjan po dannym sravnitel'no-istoričeskogo jazykovedenija. In *LrHasGit* 1980, Nr

- 5: 80-93.
- Sokolova, Z. P.
 1990 Ardvi Sura Anaxita irancev i "Zlata Baba" finno-ugrov. In *SovArx* 1990, Nr 3: 154-161.
- Solta, G.R.
 1960 Die Stellung des Armenischen im Kreise der indogermanischen Sprachen: eine Untersuchung der indogermanischen Bestandteile des armenischen Wortschatzes. Wien: Mechitharisten. (Studien zur armenischen Geschichte 9).
 1966 Lat. *viridis* und deutsch *grün* (ein Beitrag zur Wortbildungslehre). In *Sprach* 12: 26-47.
- Soukry, P. Arsene
 1881 Géographie de Moïse de Corène d'après Ptolémée. Texte Arménien, traduit en Français. Venise: Imprimerie Arménienne.
- Specht, Fr.
 1944 Ai. *godhā*. In *ZVS* 68: 217.
 1947 Der Ursprung der indogermanischen Deklination. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Spinage, C. A.
 1968 The book of the giraffe. London: Collins.
- Springer, Otto
 1987 Greek *φάλιος*, Latin **balan*, Old High German *bal* (?) 'marked by a blaze': a horse fanciers' multilingual symposium. In *Fs Hoenigswald 1987*: 375-383.
- Srvanjtyanc', Garegin
 1978-1982 (1-2) Erker. In 2 vols. Vol. 1, 1978; vol. 2, 1982. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- Starke, Frank
 1990 Untersuchung zur Stammbildung des keilschrift-luwischen Nomens. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz. (= StBoT 31).
- Starostin, S. A.
 1985 Kul'turnaja leksika v obščeseverokavkazskom slovarnom fonde. In *DrevAnat 1985*: 74-94.
 1998 Hurro-Caucasica. In *Fs Toporov 1998*: 90-99.
- Stefano, Giuseppe di
 1996 The Mesopotamian fallow deer (*Dama*, Artiodactyla) in the Middle East Pleistocene. In *NJbGeolPal* 199/3: 295-322.

- Stefano, Giuseppe di and Petronio, Carmelo
 1997 Origin and evolution of the European fallow deer (*Dama*, Pleistocene). In *NJbGeolPa* 203/1: 57-75.
- Steingass, F.
 1977/2000 A comprehensive Persian-English dictionary: including the Arabic words and phrases to be met with in Persian literature: being *Johnson and Richardson's* Persian, Arabic and English dictionary. Revised, enlarged and entirely reconstructed by F. Steingass. [1892/1977: London: Routledge & Kegan Paul]. New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers, 2000.
- Stempel, Reinhard
 1988 Armenisch *surb* 'heilig, rein': Erbwort oder Lehnwort? In *Fs Müller 1988*: 239-244.
 2000 Armenisch und Indoiranisch. In *IndIranIndog 2000*: 515-522.
- Step'anyan, Garnik
 1976 Ačaryani het: hušer. Yerevan: "Hayastan".
- Step'anyan, Lusik
 2003 See *Sources*: Yovhan Mandakuni.
- Steuerwald, Karl
 1972 Türkisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Stone, Michael E.
 1979 The Armenian version of IV Ezra. University of Pennsylvania: Scholars Press (University of Pennsylvania Armenian texts and studies, 1).
- Suk'iasyan, A. M.
 1967 Hayoc' lezvi homanišneri bařaran. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- Suk'iasyan, A. M. and Galstyan, S. A.
 1975 See *Abbrev.*: HayLezDarjBař.
- Suk'iasyan, Henrieta V.
 1979 Ačakanə hndewropakan bari kazmum (hayereni nyut'i himan vra). In *Hayoc' lezvi hamematakan k'erakanut'yan harc'er*. Yerevan: Academy Press: 249-324.
 1986 Ačakanə hayerenum. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- Svazlyan, Veržine Garniki
 1984 Musa leř. *Hay azgagrut'yun ew banahyusut'yun* 16. Yerevan: Academy Press.

- Svešnikova, T. N.
- 1979 Volki-oborotni u rumyn. In *BalcLingIssl* 1979: 208-221.
 - 1987 Ob odnom fragmente narodnogo kalendarja: "volč'i dni" u rumyn. In *IsslStrTeks* 1987: 266-277.
- Szemerényi, O.
- 1954 Latin *promulgare*. In *Emerita* 22: 159-174.
 - 1959/60 Etyma Latina I (1-6). In *Glotta* 38, 3/4: 216-251.
 - 1960 Studies in the Indo-European system of numerals. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, Universitätsverlag.
 - 1964 Syncope in Greek and Indo-European and the nature of Indo-European accent. Naples (Napoli): Istituto universitario orientale di Napoli. (Quaderni della sezione linguistica degli annali a cura di Walter Belardi; 3).
 - 1985 Armenian between Iran and Greece. In *Fs Winter 1985*: 783-799.
 - 1996 Introduction to Indo-European linguistics (translated from the 4th edition, 1990, with additional notes and references). Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Takács, Gábor
- 1996 Egyptian lexics in an Afrasian perspective: new etymologies, in *Studia etymologica Cracoviensia* 1: 125-171.
- Taşcan, H. Y.
- 1921 Hay bnakč'ut'iwnə Sew covēn minč'ew Karin. Vienna: Mxit'arean Tparan. (Azgayin Matenadaran, 90).
- Tatarincev, B. I.
- 1993 Zaimstvovaniya ili iskonnoye leksika? (K probleme drevnix slov inozazyčnogo proisxoždeniya v tjurkskix jazykax). In *VoprJaz* 1993: 1) Nr. 1: 114-128; 2) Nr. 2: 83-95.
- T'emurčyan, V. S.
- 1970 Gamirk'i hayerə. *Hay azgagrut'yun ew banahyusut'yun* 1. Yerevan: Academy Press (pp. 7-140).
- Ter-Lewondyan, Aram
- 1982 *Lewond*, Patmut'yun. Translation, introduction and commentary. Yerevan: "Sovetakan groŋ".
 - 1983 See *Sources*: Agat'angelos.
- Ter-Minasyan, E.
- 1989 (ed.): *Etišē*, Vardani ew Hayoc' paterazmi masin (ModArm.

- translation and commentary; includes also the classical text).
Yerevan: University Press.
- Ter-Mkrtč'yan, E.
1970 Vanec'oc' harsanik'ə. *Hay azgagrut'yun ew banahyusut'yun* 1. Yerevan: Academy Press (pp. 143-198).
- Ter-Połosyan, Avetik'
1939 Hayastani kladoc'ernerə 3: Step'anavani šrjani kladoc'ernerə. In *ErHamGitAšx* 9: 5-46.
- Tērvišean, H. Serovbē
see Dervischjan, P. Seraphin.
- Tēr-Yakobean, Yakob
1960 Partizakə xatutik. Yaweluacabar - Manušak ew ir hēk'eat'nerə. Paris.
- Teubner, Johann Karl
1974 Einige chwaresmische Tiernamen. In *AntiqIndog* 1974 : 301-305.
- Thieme, Paul
1952 Studien zur indogermanischen Wortkunde und Religionsgeschichte. In *Berichte über die Verhandlungen der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig: Philologisch-historische Klasse*, 98/5. Berlin.
1968 Die Wurzel vat. In *IndogermDicht* 1968 : 187-203.
- Tigranean, Gēorg
1892 Aṛack', asac'uack' ew zroyc'k' hayoc' Nor-Naxiǰewani. Rostov (Dōni veray): Tparan Yovhannu Tēr-Abrahamean.
- Thomson, R. W.
1976 *Agathangelos* : History of the Armenians (Armenian text and English translation on facing pages; "The Teaching of St. Gregory" is omitted; with introduction and commentary). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
1978 *Moses Khorenats'i* : History of Armenians: translation and commentary. Cambridge, Massachusetts, London, England: Harvard University Press (Harvard Armenian texts and studies, 4).
1982 *Etišē* : History of Vardan and the Armenian War: translation and commentary. Cambridge, Massachusetts, London, England: Harvard University Press (Harvard Armenian texts and studies,

- 5).
- 1985 *Thomas Artsruni* : History of the House of the Artsrunik': translation and commentary. Detroit, Michigan: Wayne State University Press (Byzantine texts in translation).
- 1991 The History of *Łazar P'arpec'i*. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press. (Columbia University Program in Armenian Studies. Suren D. Fesjian Academic Publications, 4).
- 1995 A bibliography of Classical Armenian literature to 1500 AD. Turnhout: Brepols.
- Thomson, R. W. & Howard-Johnston, James
- 1999 The Armenian History attributed to Sebeos. Translated, with notes, by R. W. Thomson; historical commentary by James Howard-Johnston; assistance from Tim Greenwood. Part 1. Translation and notes. Part 2. Historical commentary. Liverpool University Press. [For translated passages I simply cite *Thomson 1999* with no indication to the volume number, which is, naturally, 1].
- Thurneysen, R.
- 1937 Zwei irische Etymologien. In *Fs Pedersen 1937*: 301-302.
- Tigō
- 1889 Łali adat'neran patkerner. Čpatət k'ōlat ktri. T'iflis: Yovhannēs Martiroseanc'i Tparan.
- Tiracjan, G. A.
- 1983 K antičnym istokam armjanskoj rannesrednevekovoju kul'tury (po arxeologičeskim dannym). In *PatmBanashHand* (=IFZ) 1983, Nr 2-3: 55-64.
- Tolstoj, N. I.
- 1969 Slavjanskaja geografičeskaja terminologija: semasiologičeskie etjudy. Moscow: "Nauka".
- Tomaschek, Wilhelm
- 1896 Sasun und das Quellengebiet des Tigris: historisch-topographische Untersuchung. In *Kaiserliche Akademie der Wissenschaften: Philosophisch-historische Classe. Sitzungsberichte*, 133/4. Wien.
- Toporov, V. N.
- 1975- See *PrJaz*.
- 1979 Lady-bird (*Coccinella septempunctata* L.) in the Baltic and

- Slavic traditions in connection with the reconstruction of some motives of the principal myth. In *Fs Biezais 1979*: 268-273.
- 1981 Ešče raz o baltijskix i slavjanskix nazvanijax bož'ej korovki (*Coccinella septempunctata*) v perspektive osnovnogo mifa. In *BaltSlavIssl 1980*, 1981: 274-300.
- 1995 Mif. Ritual. Simvol. Obraz: issledovanija v oblasti mifopoetičeskogo (izbrannoe). Moscow: Progress-Kul'tura.
- Torbiörnsson, Tore
- 1945 Armenisk akcentuering. In *Årsbok. Kungl. Humanistiska Vetenskaps-Samfundet i Uppsala* (pp. 85-96). Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksells boktryckeri; Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz.
- T'ořlak'yan, Barunak G.
- 1982 Hamšenahayeri azgagrut'yunə. *Hay azgagrut'yun ew banahyusut'yun* 13. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- 1986 Nšxarner Hamšeni ew Trapizoni banahyusut'yan. Yerevan: University Press.
- T'osunyan, G. B.
- 1996 See *Sources*: Yovhannēs Drasxanakerte'i.
- Toumanoff, Cyril
- 1963 Studies in Christian Caucasian history. Georgetown University Press.
- T'umanyan, E. G.
- 1971 (Tumanjan), Drevnearmjanskij jazyk. Moscow: "Nauka".
- 1978 (Tumanjan), Struktura indoevropejskix iměn v armjanskom jazyke: opyt rekonstrukcii. Moscow: "Nauka".
- T'umanyan, Hovhannes
- 1988- (1-), Erkeri liakatar žořovacu (in 10 volumes). Yerevan: Academy Press.
- Twain, Mark
- 1993 The adventures of Tom Sawyer (ed. with an introduction by Lee Clark Mitchell). Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Uhlenbeck, C. C.
- 1942 De oudere lagen van den Baskischen woordenschat. In Mededeelingen der Nederlandsche Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afdeeling Letterkunde 5/7: 327-376.
- Ullmann, Manfred
- 1979 Wa-řairu l-řadīti mā kāna lařnan (mit einem Anhang von

- Rainer Degen). In *Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften: philosophisch-historische Klasse. Sitzungsberichte* 1979/9. München (Beiträge zur Lexikographie des Klassischen Arabisch, 1).
- Ulubabyan, Bagrat
- 1971 Patma-ašxarhagrakan čšgrtumner. In *BanbErevHamals* 1971, Nr 1: 176-186.
- 1982 See *Sources*: Łazar P'arpec'i.
- Vaan, Michiel de
- 2000 The Indo-Iranian animal suffix *-ā́cá-. In *IndIrJour* 43: 279-293.
- 2003 The Avestan vowels. Amsterdam, New York: Rodopi. (LeidStudIndEur, 12).
- Vanc'ean, Gr.
- 1899-1901 Naxahayerēni hetk'er zōkerēnum. 1) in *HandAms* 13, 1899, Nr 5: 147-149; 2) in *HandAms* 15, 1901, Nr 5-6: 180-181.
- Vanseveren, Sylvie
- 1995 A propos de arm. *ur* étymologique pronominale. In *AnnArmLing* 16: 37-44.
- Vardanean, H. Aristakēs
- 1910 Hayerēn nor bārer S. Irenēosi "C'oyc'k'" ew "Ənddēm herjuacoc'" groc' mēj. In *HandAms* 24: 281-284, 301-306.
- 1911 "Uhi" masnikə dasakan hayerēni mēj. In *Yušarjan*: 309-314.
- Vardanyan, R. H.
- 1989 Hayastani č'ap'ern u kšīrnerə (V-XV darer). Yerevan: Academy Press.
- Vardanyan, R. O. (= H.), Asatrjan, D. G.
- 1980 Nekotorye zamečanija po metrologii Urartu. In *PatmBanasHand* (= *IFŽ*) 1980, Nr 2: 166-178.
- Vardanyan, Stella A.
- 1974 See *Sources*: Abusayid.
- 1971 Hay bžškakan terminabanut'yunə XII darum. In *Banber Matenadarani* 10: 185-212.
- 1990 (Vardanyan), *Amirdovlat Amasiaci*, Nenužnoe dlja neučej. Moscow: "Nauka".
- Vardanyan, Vardan H.
- 1989 (ed.) *Hovhan Mamikonyan*, Taroni patmut'yun (introduction,

- ModEArm. translation, commentary). Yerevan: "Xorhrdayin groġ".
- Vardanyan, V. M.
- 1973 "Patmut'iwn tann Arcruneac'" erkum hišatakvac mi k'ani tetanunneri masin. In *PatmBanasHand* 1973, Nr 1: 111-122.
- 1985 *T'ovma Arcruni ew Ananun* : Patmut'yun Arcruneac' tan. Yerevan: University Press (Usanoġi gradaran).
- Vardiman, E. E.
- 1982 Die Frau in der Antike: Sittengeschichte der Frau im Altertum. Düsseldorf und Wien: Econ Verlag GmbH. (Russ. transl. see Vardiman 1990).
- 1990 Ženščina v drevnem mire (transl. in Russian from *Vardiman 1982* by M. S. Xaritonov, with afterword and commentary by A. A. Vigasin). Moscow: GRVLI "Nauka".
- Vardumyan, G. D.
- 1991 Doxristianskie kul'ty armjan. *Hay azgagrut'yun ew banahyusut'yun* 18: 59-146. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- Vartanov, Ju. P.
- 1983 Proisxoždenie semitskix nazvanij metallov. In *DrevVost* 4: 83-98.
- Vasil'ev, V. I.
- 1990 O stat'e N. L. Členovoj "Volga i Južnyj Ural v predstavlenijax drevnix irancev i finno-ugrov vo II - načale I tys. do n. e". In *SovArx* 1990, Nr 3: 150-151.
- Vasil'kov, Ja. V.
- 1998 Indoevropskaja poëtičeskaja formula v mordovskom obrjadovom tekste. In *Fs Toporov 1998*: 352-369.
- Vaumas, E. de
- 1965 al-Furāt. In *EncIsI* 2: 947-948 [see also Hartmann 1965].
- Vaux, Bert
- 1998 The phonology of Armenian. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- 2001 The Armenian dialect of Aslanbeg. In *AnnArmLing* 21: 31-64.
- Vendryes, J.
- 1914 La famille du latin *mundus* 'monde'. In *MSL* 18: 305-310.
- Vennemann, Theo
- 1986 Syllable-based sound changes in early Armenian. In *AnnArmLing* 7: 27-43.

- 1998 Etymology and phonotactics: Latin *grandis* vs. Basque *handi* 'big' and similar problems. In *JourIndEurStud* 26, 3-4: 345-390.
- Viredaz, Rémy
- 2000 *k'erb, jerb, χερσί*. In *HistSpr* 113: 290-307.
- 2003 The Great Armenian Puzzle is not thorny. In *AnnArmLing* 22-23: 59-81.
- 2005 Notes on Armenian historical phonology. In *AnnArmLing* 24-25: 85-103.
- Vogt, Hans
- 1938 Arménien et Caucasicque du Sud. In *NrsTidSpr* 9: 321-338.
- 1958 Les occlusives de l'arménien. In *NrsTidSpr* 18: 143-161.
- Vries, J. de & Tollenaere, F. de
- 1993 Etymologisch woordenboek (with assistance of A. J. Persijn). The Hague: "Het Spectrum". (< 1991 < 1958),
- Wackernagel, Jacpb, & Debrunner, Albert
- 1954 *J. Wackernagel, Altindische Grammatik. Band II, 2. Die Nominalsuffixe von A. Debrunner*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Walde, A.
- 1909 Zu den indogerm. Wörtern für 'Milz'. In *IndogForsch* 25: 160-166.
- Walde, A., Hofmann, J. B.
- 1938-54 (1-2), Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch. Heidelberg.
- Watkins, Calvert
- 1974 'god'. In *AntiqIndog* 1974: 101-110.
- 1974a I.-E. 'star'. In *Sprache* 20: 10-14.
- 1976 The etymology of Irish *dúan*. In *Celtica* 11: 270-277.
- 1995 How to kill a dragon: aspects of Indo-European poetics. New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wegner, Ilse
- 1981 Gestalt und Kult der Ištar-Šawuška in Kleinasien. Kevelaer: Verlag Butzon & Bercker; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag. (Alter Orient und Altes Testament: Veröffentlichungen zur Kultur und Geschichte des Alten Orients und des Alten Testaments 36; Hurritologische Studien 3).
- Weinberg, Gladys Davidson, and Weinberg, Saul S.
- 1956 Arachne of Lydia at Corinth. In *Fs Goldman* 1956: 262-267.

Weiss, Michael

- 1994 On the non-verbal origin of the Greek verb *νήφειν* 'to be sober'. In *HistSpr* 107: 91-98.

Weitenberg, Jos J. S.

- 1981 Armenian *əntocin*. In *AnnArmLing* 2: 85-89.
- 1983 Armenian dialects and the Latin-Armenian glossary of Autun. In *MedArmCult* 1983: 13-28.
- 1984 Die hethitischen *u*-stämme. Amsterdam: "Rodopi".
- 1985 Additional *-n* in Armenian. In *AnnArmLing* 6: 101-106.
- 1986 Additional *h-*, initial *y-* and Indo-European **y-* in Armenian. In *PlacArmLIE*: 90-101.
- 1989 The inflection of proper names in Armenian. In *AnnArmLing* 10: 57-72.
- 1989a Armenian *arbun(k')* 'vigour, maturity'. In *Hanġamana* (ed. by Subhadra Kumar Sen. Calcutta University): 109-112.
- 1991 The meaning of the expression "to become a wolf" in Hittite. In *Fs Polomé 1991-1992*, 1: 189-198.
- 1992 An early dialectal phonetic split in Classical Armenian: the cases of *t'awt'ap'em* and *p'lanim*, in John A. C. Greppin (ed.), *Proceedings of the Fourth International Conference on Armenian Linguistics*, Cleveland State University, Cleveland, Ohio September 14-18, 1991. Delmar, New York: Caravan Books, 295-318.
- 1993 Initial *y-* in Classical Armenian and the early development of Armenian dialects. In L. Hovsepian, N. Parnassian, S. Simonian (eds.), *Proceedings of the Second International Symposium on Armenian Linguistics*, 21-23 September 1987. Yerevan: Armenian Academy Press, 208-217.
- 1993a On the interpretation of Postclassical Armenian linguistic data. In Henning Lehmann & J. J. S. Weitenberg (eds.), *Armenian texts: tasks and tools*. Aarhus University Press, Denmark [printed by the Alden Press, Oxford] (Acta Jutlandica LXIX.1; Humanities Series 68): 65-74.
- 1995 The role of morphological variation in medieval Armenian poetry. In *NewApprMedArm* 121-134.
- 1996 On the early development of the Armenian dialects. In Dora Sakayan (ed.), *Proceedings of the Fifth International Conference*

- on *Armenian Linguistics*, McGill University of Montreal, Quebec, Canada May 1-5, 1995. Delmar, New York: Caravan Books, 93-118.
- 1997 Armenian plurals in *-stan*. In *ActOrHung* 50, 1-3: 329-336.
- 1997a Linguistic continuity in Armenian hellenizing texts. In *Muséon* 110/3-4: 447-458.
- 1997b The prepositional group *i y-* and the orthography of Gospel manuscript M (Matenadaran 6200). In *AnnArmLing* 18: 39-50.
- 1997c Armenian *mawruk* ‘beard’. In *Fs Beekes 1997*: 339-347.
- 1999-2000 On the early development of Armenian dialects. 2. The monophthongization of *ay*. In *AnnArmLing* 20: 1-26.
- 2001 Thoughts on early Armenian accentuation. In *AnnArmLing* 21: 65-73.
- 2002 Aspects of Armenian dialectology. In *PresDayDial 2002* : 141-157.
- 2003 Classical Armenian *hagag* ‘breath’ and *ogem* ‘to speak’. In *Fs Winter 2003*: 419-428.
- 2006 Aspects of Classical Armenian orthography: Armenian *e*, *ē* and the Greek names in the Gospels. In *Fs Pisowicz 2006* : XX.
- West, M. L.
- 1971 Early Greek philosophy and the Orient. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Wevers, J. W.
- 1995 Notes on the Greek text of Deuteronomy (Septuagint and cognate studies series, 39). Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press.
- 1997 Notes on the Greek text of Leviticus (Septuagint and cognate studies series, 44). Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press.
- Whitehead, G. Kenneth
- 1972 Deer of the world. London: Constable.
- Whitney, William Dwight
- 1960 Sanskrit grammar: including both the classical language, and the older dialects, of Veda and Brahmana. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press; London: Oxford University Press (< Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel, 1879, 1889, 1896).
- Windekens, A. J. van
- 1980 Quelques confrontations lexicales arméno-hittites. In

- AnnArmLing* 1: 39-43.
- 1986 Dictionnaire étymologique complémentaire de la langue grecque: nouvelles contributions à l'interprétation historique et comparée du vocabulaire. Leuven: Peeters.
- Winter, Werner
- 1962 Problems of Armenian phonology 3. In *Language* 38: 254-262.
- 1965 Armenian evidence. In *EvidLaryng*: 100-115.
- 1966 Traces of early dialectal diversity in Old Armenian. In *AncIEDial* 1966: 201-211.
- 1980 Eine verschüttete armenisch-baltoslavische Isoglosse? In *Lingua posnaniensis* 23: 209-214.
- 1980a Tocharisch B *yok*, A *yok* 'Körperhaar, Farbe' und Verwandtes. In *Fs Seiler* 1980: 469-472.
- 1983 Nochmals arm. *hiwsn* 'Zimmermann'. In *Sprache* 29: 177-181.
- 1986 Hayereni anvanakan t'ek'man mi k'ani harc'er. In *PatmBanashHand* 1986, Nr 2: 17-24.
- Witzak, K. T.
- 1999 Studies in Armenian etymology (1-30). In *StudEtymCrac* 4: 173-190.
- 2003 Studies in Armenian etymology (31-35). In *AnnArmLing* 22-23: 83-87.
- Wolohojian, Albert Mugrdich
- 1969 The Romance of Alexander the Great by Pseudo-Callisthenes (translated from the Armenian version with an introduction). New York and London: Columbia University Press. See *Sources*: Alexander Romance.
- Woodhouse, Robert
- 1994 Greek *αἶα*, *δευω* and *δεισα*, in *HistSpr* 107: 99-100.
- Wünsch, Josef
- 1890 Die Landschaften Schirwan, Chisan und Tatik. In *Mittheilungen der kais. königl. geographischen Gesellschaft in Wien* 33 (N.F. 23): 1-19 (+ Taf. 1).
- Xač'atryan, A. E.
- 1982 Ač'aryanə ew hay barbaragitut'yunə. In *Hayereni barbaragitakan atlas: usumnasirut'yunner ew nyut'er* 1. Yerevan: Academy Press: 28-107.
- 1985 Hnč'yunabanut'yan usumnasirut'yan skzbunk'nerə hay

- barbaragitakan ašxatut'yunnerum. In *HayBrbAtl* 2: 91-135.
- 1993 Hayereni patmakan hnč'yunap'oxut'yan mi k'ani harc'er. In *ProcSISAL* 1993, 1: 102-118.
- Xaç'atryan, Gurgen Kiproni
- 2004 Haykakan Hamabarbar (Concordance), Nr 17. *Sebeos*. (Based on the critical text of Abgaryan 1979). Yerevan: "Zangak".
- Xaç'atryan, Gurgen K. & Efiazaryan Vano A.
- 2005 (ed.), *Sebeos*, Patmut'yun (the Modern EArm. translation with the Classical Armenian text of Abgaryan 1979 on facing pages, with introduction and commentary). Yerevan: "Zangak".
- Xaç'atryan, M. M.
- 1979 Haykakan leřnašxarhn u P'ok'r Kovkasə əst Ptłomeosi. In *BngTxnPtmHay* 7: 158-181.
- 1980 Haykakan leřnašxarhn əst Ptłomeosi k'artezagrakan tvalneri. In *PatmBanasHand* 1980, Nr 2: 199-211.
- Xaç'atryan, P. M.; Łazinyan, A. A. (eds.).
- 1985 Grigor Narekac'i, Matean utbergut'ean. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- Xaç'atryan, Raisa
- 1999 T'alın. *Hay azgagrut'yun ew banahyusut'yun* 20. Yerevan: Academy Press "Gitut'yun".
- Xaç'atryan, Valerij N.
- 1971 Vostočnye provincii Xettskoj imperii: voprosy toponimiki. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- 1980 Strana Xajk' v sostave Urartu. In *LrHasGit* (= *VON*) 1980, Nr 6: 101-112.
- Xaç'aturova, E. G.
- 1973 Ob armjano-indijskix leksičeskix izoglossax. In *PatmBanasHand* (= *IFŽ*) 1973, Nr 2: 191-199.
- 1979 Drevnejšie armjano-indo-iranskije jazykovye kontakty. In *Hayoc' lezvi hamematakan k'erakanut'yan harc'er*. Yerevan: Academy Press : 325-375.
- 1987 Hay-k'art'velakan stugabanut'yunner. In *ThesSISAL* 1987: 81. (Not in *ProcSISAL* 1993).
- Xaç'aturyan, Xaç'atur
- 2001 See Khachatoorian 2001.
- Xaç'ikyan, L. S.

- 1941 "Yafags taremtin i Vanakan Vardapetē asac'eal" (introduction, critical text and commentary). In *MatGNŽot* 1: 151-169.
- 1949 Zenoni "Yafags bnut'ean" erki haykakan t'argmanut'yunə. In *MatGNŽot* 2, 1949 [1950]: 65-98.
- 1963 Naxamesropyen gri harc'ə ew hmayagerə. In *PatmBanasHand* 1963, Nr 4: 145-158.
- Xač'konc', D.
 1898 "Mut'-aşxarhk'i" verlucumə. In *Biwrakn* 1898, 26: 484-487.
 1899 'Ön', 'C'rōnk' u 'Žankari'. In *Biwrakn* 1899, 6: 81-83.
- Xalat'eanc', Grigor
 1899 *Girk' mnac'ordac'* əst hnagoyn hay t'argmanut'ean. Moscow: Tparan Varvārē Gac'uk.
- Xanlarjan, L. A.
 1976 See *Sources*: Kirakos Ganjakec'i.
- Xemč'yan, Est'er H.
 2000 Tavuš. *Hay azgagrut'yun ew banahyusut'yun* 21. Yerevan: Academy Press "Gitut'yun".
- X. K'.
 1899 Yisusin nuēr. In *Biwrakn* 1899: 17-18.
- Yovnanean, Lewond
 1897 Hetazōtut'iwnk' naxneac' ramkōrēni vray: usumnasirut'iwnk' ew k'at'uack'ner (2 volumes). Venice: S. Lazar. (Azgayin Matenadaran, 23-24).
- Yovsēp'eanc', Garegin Sarkawag
 1892 P'srank'ner žoťovrdakan banahyusut'iwnic'. T'iflis: M. Šarajē.
- Yuzbašyan, Karen N.
 1963 (ed.), Patmut'iwn *Aristakisi Lastivertc'woy*. Yerevan: Academy Press.
 1968 (Juzbašjan), Povestvovanie Vardapeta Aristakēsa Lastivertci. Russian transl. with introduction and commentary. Moscow, Leningrad: GRVLI "Nauka". (Pamjatniki pis'mennosti Vostoka, 15).
- Zatikyan, Hovhannes
 1992 Karin. Yerevan: "Hayastan".
- Zekian, Boghos Levon
 1980 Suggestions for a systematic approach to the nominal declension system of Classical Armenian. In *ProcFICAL* 1980: 147-162.

- Zeyt'unyan, A. S.
 1985 (ed.), *Girk' cndoc'*: critical text. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- Ziegler, Joseph
 1939 (ed.), *Septuaginta*. Vol. 14: Isaias. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Zimmer, Stefan
 1997 Gallisch *DIVERTOMV*, kymrisch *llawer*, tocharisch *A want-wraske*. In *Fs Beekes 1997*: 353-358.
- Zoller, C. P.
 1989 Bericht über grammatische Archaismen im Bangani. In *MünStudSpr* 50: 159-218.
- Zupitza, E.
 1904 Miscellen. In *KZ* 37: 387-406.
- Zōhrapean, Yovhannēs
 1805 *Astuacašunč' matean Hin ew Nor Ktakaranac'* (4 vols.). Venice: S. Lazar.

Sources

[Throughout my book the citations are given by pages and lines. The sign minus indicates that the line is counted from the bottom of the page].

Abusayid - A 12th century Syrian scholar who lived in Cilician Armenia and wrote on medicine. "Yatags kazmut'ean mardoyn"; ed. by S. A. Vardanyan (Arm. text and Russ. translation). Yerevan: Academy Press, 1974.

Agat'angelos - Patmut'iwn Hayoc' (5th century).

Critical edition: G. Tēr-Mkrtč'ean, St. Kanayecanc'. Tp'tis (Tiflis): Aragatip Mnac'akan Martiroseanc'i, 1909. A facsimile reproduction with an introduction by R. W. Thomson. Delmar, New York: Caravan Books, 1980.

The same text with ModArm. translation (on facing pages) and commentary by A. Ter-Lewondyan. Yerevan: University Press, 1983.

English translation with the Armenian text (on facing pages): Thomson 1976.

For the palimpsest see Galēmkk'ecarean 1911.

Alexander Romance - by Pseudo-Callisthenes.

Critical edition with introd. and commentary; see H. Simonyan 1989;

English translation: Wolohojian 1969. See also Braccini 2004.

Amirdovlat' Amasiac'i (15th cent.; Amasia). Armenian text: Basmajean 1926.

Russ.: see S. Vardanyan 1990.

Anania Širakac'i (c. 600-c. 670; Širak, in the province of Ayrarat).

Collection and study; see A. G. Abrahamyan 1944. "Tiezeragitut'iwn ew tomar": see A. G. Abrahamyan 1940. Collection in ModArm.: A. G. Abrahamyan and G. B. Petrosyan 1979.

Armenian Geography (*Ašxarhac'oyc'*): MovsXorenMaten 1865: 585-616; A. G. Abrahamyan 1944: 336-354. With a French translation: Soukry 1881. With an introduction, ModArm. translation and annotated indices: Eremyan 1963. An unfinished attempt of a reconstructed text with thorough footnotes; see Eremyan 1972-1973. English translation with introduction and commentary: Hewsen 1992. ModArm. Translation: A. G. Abrahamyan and G. B. Petrosyan 1979: 258-312.

Aristakēs Lastiver(t)c'i - 11th cent.; born in Lastiver (district of Karin, in the province Barjr Hayk'): *Patmut'iwn* (History); critical edition: Yuzbašyan 1963. Russian translation: Yuzbašyan (Juzbašjan) 1968.

Aṛak'el Siwnec'i (14-15th cent.): "Adamgirk'", critical text: Madoyan 1989; poems: Poturean 1914.

- AiOłomp 1854 - Arakk' Ołompianu (apud Mxit'ar Goš 1854).
- Asar Sebastac'i (16-17th cent., native of Sebastia), "Girk' bžškakan arhesti" (16-17th cent.), ed. by D. M. Karapetyan. Yerevan: Academy Press, 1993.
- Bible: the complete ClArm. Text: Zōhrapean 1805; separate editions: Xalat'eanc' 1899; Cowe 1992; Cox 1981; Cox 2006; Zeyt'unyan 1985; Stone 1979. Septuaginta (ed. by Alfred Rahlfs). Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1935, 1979. Deuteronomy and Leviticus: Wevers 1995; 1997. New Testament: Nestle/Aland. Novum Testamentum Graece et Latine. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1984, 1993. See also BiblSacrPolygl 1, 1657.
- Book of Chries (Book of Chreia)
- Book of Chries (Book of Chreia), *Girk' Pitoyic'*. A half-translated handbook of rhetoric (sec. half of 5th cent. or 6th cent.), written after the pattern of the Greek schoolbook composed by Aphthonius of Antioch. Critical text with introduction and commentary: G. Muradyan 1993; Russ. translation with introduction and commentary: G. Muradyan 2000.
- Bžškaran jioy ew arhasarak grastnoy (13th cent.). Ed. by B. L. Č'ugaszyan. Yerevan: Academy Press, 1980.
- Colophons*: see HayJerHiš.
- Dawit' Alawkay Ordi (11-12th cent., Ganjak/Kirovabad): A. Abrahamyan 1952-53.
- Dawt'ak (7th cent.): see Movsēs Kaťankatuac'i (Dasxuranc'i).
- DivHayVim 5, 1982: Divan hay vimagrut'yan. Vol. 5: Arc'ax. Compiled by S. G. Barxudaryan; redacted by B. N. Arak'elyan. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- Eťia Mušet'yan Karnec'I, a merchant and philologist who knew many languages (Armenian, Classical Armenian, Turkish, Latin, French; partly - Persian, Polish, Russian (see Č'ugaszyan 1986: 17, 19, 31₂); born in 1689 in Karin; his father was from Xotorjur. Turkish-Armenian dictionary, around 2000 words (c. 1720 AD); see Č'ugaszyan 1986.
- Eťiše (5th century), Vasn Vardanay ew Hayoc' paterazmin: "History of Vardan and the Armenian War". Ed. by E. Ter-Minasyan (ClArm. text with ModArm. translation and commentary). Yerevan: University Press, 1989. English translation: Thomson 1982.
- Eusebius of Caesarea (3-4th cent.), Chronicle: J. Aucher, *Ewsebi Pamp'ileay Kesarac'woy Žamanakakank' erkmasneay*. 2 vols. Venice: S. Lazar, 1818.
- Eznik Koťbac'i (5th cent.; the village of Koťb in Čakatk', Ayrarat): Eťc aťandoc' "Refutation of the Sects" / "De Deo".

- Critical edition: M. Minasean, in *HandAms* 1987-1992.
 ClArm. text with ModArm. translation and commentary by A. A. Abrahamyan. Yerevan: University Press, 1994.
 English translation: Blanchard/Young 1998.
 German translation: Schmid 1900.
- Folk-tales* : Hay žoťovrdakan hek'iat'ner (HŽHek'), redacted by H. Örbeli et al. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- 1959 Vol. 1 (Ararat), ed. by A. M. Nazinyan.
 1959 Vol. 2 (Ararat), ed. by A. M. Nazinyan.
 1962 Vol. 3 (Ararat), ed. by A. M. Nazinyan.
 1963 Vol. 4 (Širak - Alek'sandrapol, Basen, Ĵavaxk'), ed. by M. S. Mkrtč'yan.
 1966 Vol. 5 (Łarabať), ed. by A. M. Nazinyan and M. M. Grigoryan (Spandaryan).
 1967 Vol. 10 (Muš-Bulanəx), ed. by S. Tarone'i.
 1968 Vol. 9 (Alaškert etc.), ed. by M. S. Mkrtč'yan.
 1973 Vol. 6 (Arc'ax/Łarabať-Utik'), ed. by A. M. Nazinyan and V. G. Svazlyan.
 1977 Vol. 8 (Gugark'), ed. by A. M. Nazinyan and R. H. Grigoryan.
 1979 Vol. 7 (Łarabať-Zangezur), ed. by A. M. Nazinyan and M. N. Ārak'elyan.
 1980 Vol. 11 (Muš-Bulanəx), ed. by M. S. Mkrtč'yan.
 1984 Vol. 12 (Mšo dašt/Taron/Turuberan), ed. by V. G. Svazlyan.
 1985 Vol. 13 (Muš/Taron/Turuberan), ed. by A. S. Łaziyan.
 1999 Vol. 14 (Van/Vaspurakan), ed. by A. Łaziyan.
- HŽHek' 1980: Haykakan žoťovrdakan hek'iat'ner (ed. by N. A. Hakobyan, A. S. Sahakyan). Yerevan: University Press.
- Grigor Narekac'i (circa 947 - after 1003; south of Lake Van). Matean Oťbergut'ean (1001-1003 AD).
 Critical edition: P. M. Xač'atryan, A. A. Łazinyan. Yerevan: Academy Press, 1985.
 Other editions: Garegin episkopos Trapizoni. Narek, Buenos Ayres, 1948. A facsimile reproduction with an introduction by James R. Russell. Delmar, New York: Caravan Books, 1981.
 Russ. Translation: Darbinjan-Melikjan and Xanlarjan 1988.
 English translation: Khachatoorian 2001.
 Songs: K'yoškeryan 1981.

- Hayrens* : see Mnac'akanyan 1995.
- Herodotos: ModArm. transl. and commentary: Krkyašaryan 1986.
- HayJerHiš V-XII: Hayeren jeragreri hišatakaraner: V-XII dd. Ed. by A. S. Mat'ewosyan. Yerevan: Academy Press, 1988.
- Hexameron: Barset Kesarac'i, Yałags vec'awreay ararč'ut'ean (ed. by Kim Muradyan). Yerevan: Academy Press, 1984.
- Kirakos Ganjakec'i (13th cent.; "world"/district of Ganjak):
 Patmut'yun Hayoc' - Critical text by K. A. Melik'-Ohanjanyan. Yerevan: Academy Press, 1961.
 French translation: Brosset 1870.
 Russ. transl. by L. A. Xanlarjan: *Kirakos Gandzakeci*, Istorija Armenii. Moscow: GRVLI "Nauka", 1976 .
 ModEArm. transl. by Varag Arak'elyan: Hayoc' patmut'yun. Yerevan: "Sovetakan grot", 1982.
- Koriwn: Vark' Maštoc'I, "The life of Maštoc'" (5th cent.). Ed. by M. Abelyan / E. Pivazyan (comprises the critical edition and ModArm., Russ. and Engl. translations, as well as a study by M. Abelyan in Arm., Russ. and Engl.). Yerevan: University Press, 1981.
- Łazar P'arpec'i (5th cent.; P'arpi, a village close to Aštarak): Hayoc' patmut'iwn. T'uht' ar Vahan Mamikonean. Ed. by G. Tēr-Mkrtč'ean, St. Malxasean. Tp'his (Tiflis): Aragatip Mnac'akan Martiroseanc'i, 1904.
 A photographic reproduction with a new introduction and critical bibliography by Dickran Kouymjian: Delmar, New York: Caravan Books, 1985.
 Transl. into ModEArm with commentary by Bagrat Ulubabyan. Yerevan: University Press, 1982.
- Łewond Vardapet (8th cent.); text: Šahnazareanc' 1857.
 English translation with introduction and commentary: Arzoumanian 1982.
 Modern EArm. translation with introduction and commentary: Ter-Łewondyan 1982.
- Movsēs Kałankatuac'i/Dasxuranc'i (7-10 cent.); critical text: V. Arak'elyan 1983;
 English translation: Dowsett 1961; ModEArm. translation: V. Arak'elyan 1969.
 The chapter 2.35 comprises "The elegy on the death of the great prince Juanšēr" by *Dawt'ak* (7th cent.), an acrostic poem (see V. Arak'elyan 1983: 224-230; 1969: 176-179; Dowsett 1961: 145-148).
- Movsēs Xorenac'i (5th cent.; the dating is a matter of fierce debate). The most

famous of all Armenian historians, the "father of [Armenian] history". His "History of Armenians" (*Patmut'wn Hayoc'*) gives an account of the history of the Armenian nation from the origin to the death of Mesrop Maštoc' in 440 AD.

Critical edition: M. Abetean, S. Yarut'wnean, *Movsisi Xorenac'woy Patmut'wn Hayoc'*. Tp'his (Tiflis): Aragatip Mnac'akan Martiroseanc'i, 1913. A facsimile edition with additional collations by A. B. Sargsyan. Yerevan: Academy Press, 1991.

English translation and commentary: see Thomson 1978.

ModArm. translation (with introduction and commentary) by St. Malxasyan. Yerevan: "Hayastan" (ed. by Gagik Sargsyan), 1990.

Collected works: MovsXorenMaten (see *Bibliographical abbreviations*), Venice, 1843, 1865; comprises also works the attribution of which to Movsēs is debated or wrong; for "Armenian Geography" (*Ašxarhac'oyc'*) see *Anania Širakac'i*.

Mxit'ar Goš (12-13th cent.); Arakk' Mxit'aray Goši. Venice: St. Lazar (with fables of Olympian [pp. 165-189], see ArOłomp 1854).

Mxit'ar Herac'i (12th cent.); see Seidel 1908.

Nersēs Šnorhali (1101/02-1173, Cilicia):

Ołb Edesioy; see M. Mkrtč'yan 1973.

Vipasanut'wn; see M. Mkrtč'yan 1981.

Songs; see K'yoškeryan 1987.

Patmut'wn srboc' Hrip'simeanc' : "History of Rhipsimē and her companions"; attributed to Movsēs Xorenac'i (q.v.); the text is published in *MovsXorenMaten* 1843, 1865.

P'awstos Buzand, *Hayoc' Patmut'wn* or *Buzandaran Patmut'wnk'* (5th cent.).

ClArm. text: K'. Patkanean. St. Petersburg, 1883. A facsimile reproduction with an introduction by Nina G. Garsoian. Delmar, New York: Caravan Books, 1984.

The text (< 1892, Venice) with ModArm. translation and commentary by St. Malxasyan (collations: pp. 416-417): Malxasyanc' 1987.

English translation and commentary: Garsoian 1989.

Philo (6th century).

"Physiologus"; see Pitra 1855.

Sasna črer : SasČr (Armenian epic) 1, 1936; 2/1, 1944; 2/2, 1951: M. Abet'yan

- (ed.) with the assistance of K. Melik'-Öhanjanyan. Yerevan: State Press. 3, 1979 and 4, 1999: ed. by Sargis Harut'yunyan and Arusyak Sahakyan. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- SasC'r 2000, ed. by Roza Grigoryan and Eranuhi Melik'-Muradyan. Yerevan: Academy Press "Gitut'yun".
- The most recent and valuable study on Armenian epic is A. Petrosyan 2002 (an expanded English version of the Armenian original 1997a). Russian version: see 2002a.
- Russ. transl. of selected versions of the epic: see next.
- SasUdal, Armjanskij narodnyj `epos *Sasunskie udal'cy*: izbrannye varianty. Russ. transl. and glossary-commentary by K. Melik'-Öhanjanyan. Yerevan: Van Aryan, 2004.
- Sebēos (7th cent.): critical text: Abgaryan 1979. The Modern EArm. translation with the Classical Armenian text of Abgaryan 1979 on facing pages, with introduction and commentary: G. Xaç'atryan/Ehiazaryan 2005. Concordance: G. Xaç'atryan 2004. English translations with notes: Thomson 1999 (with historical commentary by James Howard-Johnston).
- Simēon Lehaç'i (17th cent.): *Utegrut'iwn*, see Akinean 1936.
- Smbat Sparapet (13th cent., Cilicia), *Datastanagirk'*. Ed. (with a Russian translation) by A. G. Galstyan. Yerevan: Haypethrat, 1958.
- T'ovma Arcruni and Ananun (10/13th cent.): the Classical Armenian text with Modern Armenian translation (on facing pages) and commentary: V. M. Vardanyan 1985. English translation and commentary: Thomson 1985.
- Vanakan Vardapet Tawušeç'i /Yovhannēs Vanakan/: 1180/1181-(after) 1251. The critical text with introduction and commentary: Xaç'ikyan 1941.
- Xenophon. *Anabasis* 2001 (with an English translation by Carleton L. Brownson; revised by John Dillery). Cambridge, London: Harvard University Press.
- ModArm. transl. and commentary: Krkyašaryan 1970.
- Yovasap' Sebastac'i (16th cent., Sebastia), "Bžškaran əntreal tarrakan maxc'i"; see D. M. Karapetyan 1986.
- Yovhan Mamikonean (7th cent.; Tarōn), "Patmut'iwn Tarōnoy"; this History is closely connected with that of Zenob Glak.
- Critical text: Aš. Abrahamyan 1941.
- ModEArm. translation (with introduction and commentary): V. H. Vardanyan 1989.
- English translation: Avdoyan 1993 [not seen].
- French translation by Jean-Raphael Emine: Langlois 1867: 357-382. [Zenob

Glak: by Langlois, ibid. 333-355].

Yovhan Mandakuni (5th cent.) or Yovhan Mayragomec'i (7th cent.). Recently published by Lusik Step'anyan (with a short foreword and bibliography): *Yovhan Mandakuni, Ćark'; Kanonk'.* In *Matenagirk' Hayoc'.* Vol. 1. E dar (5th century). Ant'illas, Lebanon, 2003 (pp. 1153-1288).

Yovhannēs Drasxanakertc'i (9-10th cent.)

1912=1980: Yovhannu kat'olikos Drasxanakertec'woy Patmut'iwn Hayoc'. T'iflis, 1912. A facsimile reproduction with an introduction by Krikor Maksoudian: Delmar, New York: Caravan Books, 1980.

Transl. into ModEArm. and commentary by G. B. T'osunyan. Yerevan: University Press, 1996.

Yovhannēs T'lkuranc'i (14-15th centuries; T'lkuran was situated in Mesopotamia, between Amid and Hromkla, see Pivazyan 1960: 29f); Mnac'akanyan 1941; Pivazyan 1960; Russell 1987a.

Zeno: Tract "On Nature". Transl. into Armenian prob. in 6-7th cent. (the oldest manuscript is from 1280: Matenadaran Nr 5254). See Xač'ikjan 1949; Russ. transl.: Arewšatyan 1956.

Bibliographical abbreviations

AbhKönGesWisGöt	Abhandlungen der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen: historisch-philologische Classe. Göttingen: in der Dieterichsen Buchhandlung.
ActOrHung	Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae. Budapest.
ActAntHung	Acta Antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae. Budapest.
AčarAnjn 1-5	see Ačaryan 1942-62.
AčarHLPatm 1-2	see Ačaryan 1940-51.
AčarLiak	see Ačaryan 1955-2005.
AltorForsch	Altorientalische Forschungen.
AmJPhil	American journal of philology.
AncIEDial 1966	<i>H. Birnbaum, J. Puhvel</i> (eds.), Ancient Indo-European dialects: proceedings of the Conference on Indo-European linguistics held at the University of California, Los Angeles, 1963. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of

	California Press.
AnnArmLing	Annual of Armenian linguistics.
AntiqIndog 1974	<i>M. Mayrhofer, W. Meid, B. Schlerath, R. Schmitt</i> (eds.), <i>Antiquitates indogermanicae: Studien zur indogermanischen Altertumskunde und zur Sprach- und Kulturgeschichte der indogermanischen Völker. Gedenkschrift für Hermann Güntert</i> . Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck. (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft, 12).
Anzeiger zu IndogForsch:	Anzeiger für indogermanische Sprach- und Altertumskunde. Beiblatt zu den <i>Indogermanischen Forschungen</i> .
APILKU	Arbejds papirer: Institut for Lingvistik. Københavns Universitet.
ArchOr	Archiv Orientalní. Prague.
BalcLingIssl 1979	Balkanica: Lingvističeskie issledovanija. Moscow: "Nauka", 1979.
BaltSlavIssl	Balto-slavjanskije issledovanija. Moscow: "Nauka",
BanbErewHamals	Banber Erewani hamalsarani: hasarakakan gitut'yunner = Vestnik Erevanskogo universiteta: obščestvennye nauki (VEU). Yerevan: University Press.
BanbMaten	Banber Matenadarani. Yerevan: Academy Press. For the first two volumes see MatGNŽoť.
BeiAssSemSpr	Beiträge zur Assyriologie und semitischen Sprachwissenschaft. Leipzig.
BeiGesDeuSprLit	Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur. Halle (Saale).
BeitrNamenf	Beiträge zur Namenforschung.
BiblSacrPolygl 1, 1657	<i>B. Walton</i> (ed.), <i>Biblia Sacra polyglotta</i> . Vol. 1. London: Thomas Roycroft. M DC LVII (=1657).
BKIGS	Beiträge zur Kunde der indogermanischen Sprachen (ed. Ad. Bezzenger). Göttingen.
BngTxnPtmHay	Bnagitut'yan ew texnikayi patmut'yunə Hayastanum (gitakan ašxatut'yunneri žoťovacu). Yerevan: Academy Press.
BSL	Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris.
BSOS	Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies. University of

- London. (Currently published by School of Oriental and African Studies).
- DerSöz 1963-82 (1-12), Türkiye’de Halk Ağzından, Derleme sözlüğü. Vol. 1, 1963 - vol. 12, 1982. Ankara.
- DialAdd apud NHB Addendum of dialectal words in NHB 2: 1060-1067.
- DoklANSSSR Doklady Akademii Nauk SSSR (Comptes Rendus de l’Académie des Sciences de l’URSS). Moscow/Leningrad: Academy Press.
- DrevAnat 1985 Drevnjaja Anatolija. Moscow: GRVLI "Nauka".
- DrJazMalAz *I. M. D’jakonov and V. V. Ivanov* (eds.), Drevnie jazyki Maloj Azii: sbornik statej. Moscow: "Progress".
- DrevVost Drevnij Vostok. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- EarContUralIndEur *Christian Carpelan, Asko Parpola and Petteri Koskikallio* (eds.), Early contacts between Uralic and Indo-European: linguistic and archaeological considerations. Papers presented at an international symposium held at the Tvärminne Research Station of the University of Helsinki (8-10 January, 1999). Helsinki: Suomalais-ugrilainen seura. (Mémoires de la Société Finno-ougrienne, 242).
- ÈllBIVVizIr 1967 Èllinističeskij Bližnij Vostok, Vizantija i Iran: istorija i filologija. Moscow: "Nauka".
- ÈmAzgŽoť Èminean azgagrakan žoťovacu.
- EncIran 1-, 1982- *Ehsan Yarshater* (ed.), Encyclopaedia Iranica. Vol. 1, London, Boston and Henley: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1982; vol. 2, London and New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1987; <...>; vol. 12, New York, New York: Encyclopaedia Iranica Foundation, 2004; vol. 13, fascicle 4, New York: Encyclopaedia Iranica Foundation, 2006. (Columbia University, Center for Iranian studies).
- EncIsl 1-12, 1960-2004. The encyclopaedia of Islam (prepared by a number of leading orientalists). Leiden: Brill, etc.
- ErHamGitAšx Yerevani petakan hamalsaran: gitakan ašxatut’yunner. Yerevan: University Press.
- ÉtCelt Études celtiques. Paris.
- EthnGrTurk 1989 Ethnic groups in the Republic of Turkey. Comp. and ed. by Peter Alford with the assistance of Rüdiger Benninghaus. Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag.

	(Beihefte zum Tübinger Atlas des Vorderen Orients. Reihe B /Geisteswissenschaften/, 60).
EthnMittUng	Ethnologische Mitteilungen aus Ungarn. Budapest.
ÈtimSlovIranJaz	<i>V. S. Rastorgueva, D. I. Èdel'man</i> , Ètimologičeskij slovar' iranskix jazykov. Vol. 1, 2000; 2, 2003; 3, 2007 -. Moscow: "Vostočnaja Literatura" Publishers.
ÈtimSlovSlavJaz	<i>O. N. Trubačev</i> (ed.), Ètimologičeskij slovar' slavjanskix jazykov. Vol. 1, 1974 ī vol. 32, 2005 (in progress). Moscow: "Nauka".
ÈtnNarBalk 1984	<i>L. A. Gindin</i> (red.), Ètnogenez narodov Balkan i Severnogo Pričernomor'ja: lingvistika, istorija, arxeologija. Moscow: "Nauka".
EvidLaryng	<i>Winter, Werner</i> (ed.), Evidence for laryngeals. The Hague, London, Paris: Mouton.
EWAia	<i>M. Mayrhofer</i> , Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen, 3 vols., 1992-2001. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag C. Winter.
FITurk	<i>P. H. Davis e.a.</i> (ed.), Flora of Turkey and the East Aegean Islands. Vol. 1 (1965) -. Edinburgh: University Press.
FolLingHist	Folia linguistica historica. Societas Linguistica Europaea.
FolOrient	Folia Orientalia. Krako'w.
Fs Beekes 1997	<i>A. Lubotsky</i> (ed.), Sound law and analogy: papers in honor of Robert S. P. Beekes on the occasion of his 60th birthday. Amsterdam-Atlanta, GA: Rodopi B.V.
Fs Belardi 1994	<i>P. Cipriano, P. Di Giovine, M. Mancini</i> (eds.), Miscellanea di studi linguistici in onore di Walter Belardi. 1-2. Roma: Il Calamo.
Fs Benveniste 1975	Mélanges linguistiques offerts à Émile Benveniste. Louvain: Dépositaire Éditions Peeters. (Collection Linguistique publiée par la Société de Linguistique de Paris, LXX).
Fs Biezais 1979	Humanitas religiosa: Festschrift für Haralds Biezais zu seinem 70. Geburtstag. Uppsala: Almqvist and Wiksell.
Fs Diakonoff 1982	Societies and languages of the ancient Near East: studies in honour of I. M. Diakonoff. Warminster, Wilts, England: Aris & Phillips Ltd.

- Fs Goldman 1956 *Weinberg, Saul S.* (ed.), *The Aegean and the Near East: studies presented to Hetty Goldman on the occasion of her seventy-fifth birthday*. Locust Valley, New York: J. J. Augustin Publisher.
- Fs Harmatta 1977 *Studies in honour of J. Harmatta*. = *ActAntHung* 25, 1977. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Fs Hoenigswald 1987 *George Cardona and Norman H. Zide* (eds.), *Festschrift for Henry Hoenigswald: on the occasion of his 70. birthday*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.
- Fs Humbach 1986 *B. Forssman, K. Hoffmann, J. Narten* (eds.), *Studia grammatica iranica: Festschrift für Helmut Humbach*. ("Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft", Beiheft 13, N.F.). München: R. Kitzinger.
- Fs Knobloch 1985 *Hermann M. Ölberg and Gernot Schmidt* (eds.) [unter Mitarbeit von Heinz Bothien], *Sprachwissenschaftliche Forschungen: Festschrift für Johann Knobloch zum 65. Geburtstag*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Kulturwissenschaft, 23).
- Fs Kuiper 1968 *Pratidānam: Indian, Iranian and Indo-European studies presented to Franciscus Bernardus Jacobus Kuiper on his 60th birthday*. The Hague, Paris: Mouton.
- Fs Lehmann 1977 *Paul J. Hopper et al.* (eds.), *Studies in descriptive and historical linguistics: Festschrift for Winfred P. Lehmann*. (Amsterdam studies in the theory and history of linguistic science. Series IV Current issues in linguistic theory, 4). Amsterdam: John Benjamins B. V.
- Fs Leslau 1991 *Alan S. Kaye* (ed.), *Semitic studies: in honor of Wolf Leslau on the occasion of his 85th birthday* (2 vols.). Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Fs Müller 1988 *Piotr O. Scholz & Reinhard Stempel* (eds.), *Nubia et oriens christianus: Festschrift für C. Detlef G. Müller zum 60. Geburtstag*. Köln: Verlag Jürgen Dinter. (Bibliotheca Nubica, 1).
- Fs Pagliaro 1969, 1-3 *Studia classica et orientalia Antonino Pagliaro Oblate*. Roma.
- Fs Pedersen 1937 *L. Hjelmslev, C. Höeg, Ch. Møller, Ad. Stender-Petersen*

- (eds.), *Mélanges linguistiques offerts à M. Holger Pedersen à l'occasion de son soixante-dixième anniversaire*, 7 avril 1937. Aarhus: Universitetsforlaget; København: Levin & Munksgaard. (Acta Jutlandica: Aarsskrift for Aarhus Universitet, IX1).
- Fs Pisowicz 2006 *Anna Krasnowolska, Kinga Maciuszak, Barbara Mękarska* (eds.), *In the Orient where the gracious light ...: Satura orientalis in honorem Andrzej Pisowicz*. Kraków.
- Fs Polomé 1991-92, (1-2), *Perspectives on Indo-European language, culture and religion: studies in honor of Edgar C. Polomé*. Vol. 1, 1991; vol. 2, 1992. Virginia: McLean; Institute for the Study of Man (Journal of Indo-European studies; Monographs 7, 9).
- Fs Schmidt 1928 *W. Koppers* (ed.), *Festschrift: publication d'hommage offerte au P. W. Schmidt*. Wien: Mechitharisten.
- Fs Schrijnen 1929 *Donum natalicium Schrijnen: Verzameling van opstellen door oud-leerlingen en bevriende vakgenooten opgedragen aan mgr. prof. dr. Jos. Schrijnen bij gelegenheid van zijn zestigsten verjaardag 3 Mei 1929*. Nijmegen, Utrecht: N. V. Dekker & Van De Vegt.
- Fs Seiler *Gunter Brettschneider & Christian Lehmann* (eds.), *Wege zur Universalienforschung : sprachwissenschaftl. Beitr. zum 60. Geburtstag von Hansjakob Seiler*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag. (Tübinger Beiträge zur Linguistik, 145).
- Fs Szemerényi 1979 *Bela Brogyanyi* (ed.), *Studies in diachronic, synchronic, and typological linguistics: festschrift for Oswald Szemerényi on the occasion of his 65th birthday* ("Current issues in linguistic theory", vol. 11, in two parts). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Fs Szemerényi 1993 *Bela Brogyanyi and Reiner Lipp* (eds.), *Comparative-historical linguistics: Indo-European and Finno-Ugric* (Current issues in linguistic theory, 79). Papers in honor of Oswald Szemerényi. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Fs Toporov 1998 *A. A. Gippius, L. G. Nevskaja, T. M. Nikolaeva, T. V. Cív'jan* (eds.), *Πολυτροπον*. To 70th birthday of Vladimir

- Toporov. Moscow: "Indrik".
- Fs Watkins 1998 *Jay Jasanoff, H. Craig Melchert and Lisi Oliver* (eds.), *Mír* curad: studies in honor of Calvert Watkins. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft, 92).
- Fs Winter 1985 *U. Pieper and G. Stickel* (eds.), *Studia linguistica, diachronica et synchronica* Werner Winter sexagenario anno MCMLXXXIII. Berlin, New York, Amsterdam: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Fs Winter 2003 *Brigitte L. M. Bauer, Georges-Jean Pinault* (eds.), *Language in time and space: a Festschrift for Werner Winter on the occasion of his 80th birthday*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Gd Berberian 1986 *Dickran Kouymjian* (ed.), *Armenian studies in memoriam Haïg Berberian (1887-1978)*. Lisbon: Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation (Armenian Library of the Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation).
- Gd Campanile 1997 *Scribthair a ainm n-ogaim: scritti in memoria di Enrico Campanile*. Pacini Editore S.p.A.
- Gd Güntert 1974 see *AntiqIndog* 1974.
- Gd Kerns 1981, 1-2 *Yoël L. Arbeitman & Allan R. Bomhard* (eds.), *Bono homini donum: essays in hitorical linguistics, in memory of J. Alexander Kerns*. (Amsterdam studies in the theory and history of linguistic science. Series IV Current issues in linguistic theory, 16). Amsterdam: John Benjamins B. V.
- Gd Marr 1935 *I. I. Meščaninov* (ed.), *Akademija Nauk SSSR XLV: Akademiku N. Ja. Marru*. Moscow, Leningrad: Academy Press. 1935.
- Gd Schindler 1999 *Compositiones indogermanicae in memoriam Jochem Schindler* (hrsg. von H. Eichner und H.C. Luschützky unter redaktioneller Mitwirkung von V. Sadovski). Praha (: enigma corporation), 1999.
- Gd Vorob'jev-Desjatovskij 1974: *Problemy istorii jazykov i kul'tury narodov Indii: sbornik statej pamjati V. S. Vorob'jev-Desjatovskij*.

	Moscow: GRVLI "Nauka".
GötHögÅrs	Göteborgs Högskolas Årsskrift. Göteborg: Wettergren & Kerber (Elander).
GwUrmSalm 1897-98	(1-2), Banasēr, Gawarakan barer Urmioy ew Salmasti hayoc'. In <i>Bazmavēp</i> : 1) 1897: 544-547; 2) 1898: 96-98.
HAB	see Ačāryan 1971-79, 1-4.
HAB-Add 1982	Hr. Ačāryan, Hayerēn armatakan bararan: havellik' ew uḥelik'. Yerevan: University Press.
HayBrbAtl	Hayereni barbaragitakan atlas: usumnasirut'yunner ew nyut'er. Yerevan: Academy Press, vol. 1, 1982; vol. 2, 1985.
HayKendAšx	<i>V. S. Ananyan</i> , Hayastani kendanakan ašxarhə: hnaguyn žamanakneric' minč'ew mer ōrerə. Vol. 1, 1961; vol. 2, 1962; vol. 3, 1965; vol. 4, 19XX; vol. 5, 1975. Yerevan: "Hayastan" (vols. 1 and 2: HayPetHrat, State Press of Armenia).
HayLezBrbBaī 1-	(2001-), <i>A. Sargsyan et al.</i> (eds.), Hayoc' lezvi barbayin bararan. Vol.1, 2001; vol. 2, 2002; vol. 3, 2004 [letters k-č]. Yerevan: Academy Press "Gitut'yun".
HayLezDarjBaī 1975	<i>A. M. Suk'iasyan, S. A. Galstyan</i> , Hayoc' lezvi darjvacabanakan bararan. Yerevan: University Press.
HayLezGrak	Hayoc' lezu ew grakanut'yun: gitakan ašxatut'yunneri mījḥakan žoḥovacu. Yerevan: University Press.
HayLezPatmHarc'	Hayoc' lezvi patmut'yan harc'er. Yerevan: Academy Press.
HaySrb 2001	<i>Sargis Harut'yunyan, Aram K'alant'aryan</i> (eds.), Hayoc' srberə ew srbavayrerə: akunk'nerə, tiperə, paštamunk'ə. Yerevan: "Hayastan" (Nat. Acad. of Sciences of the Republic of Armenia: Institute of Archaeology and Ethnography).
HayTetBaī 1-5	(1986-2001), <i>T'. X. Hakobyan, St. T. Melik'-Baxšyan, H. X. Barseṭyan</i> . Hayastani ew harakic' šrjanneri tetanunneri bararan. Vol. 1, 1986; vol. 2, 1988; vol. 3, 1991; vol. 4, 1998; vol. 5, 2001. Yerevan: University Press.
HistSpr	Historische Sprachforschung. Göttingen. See also <i>KZ</i> and <i>ZVS</i> .
HŽHek'	see <i>Sources</i> : Folk-tales.

IncLing	Incontri linguistici. Pisa, Roma.
IndDrev 1964	<i>V. V. Struve, G. M. Bongard-Levin</i> (eds.), <i>Indija v drevnosti</i> (collection of papers). Moscow: GRVLI "Nauka".
IndEur&IndEur 1970	<i>George Cardona, Henry M. Hoenigswald, and Alfred Senn</i> (eds.), <i>Indo-European and Indo-Europeans</i> . Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. (The Haney Foundation series, University of Pennsylvania, 9).
IndIranIndog 2000	<i>Bernhard Forssman & Robert Plath</i> (eds.), <i>Indoarisch, Iranisch und die Indogermanistik: Arbeitstagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 2. bis 5. Oktober 1997 in Erlangen</i> . Wiesbaden: Reichert Verlag.
IndIranJour	Indo-Iranian journal.
IndoIranLangPeop	<i>Nicholas Sims-Williams</i> (ed.), <i>Indo-Iranian languages and peoples</i> . New York: Oxford University Press, 2002. (Proceedings of the British Academy, 116).
IndogCaucas 1994	<i>Indogermanica et Caucasica: Festschrift für Karl Horst Schmidt zum 65. Geburtstag</i> . Hrsg. von Roland Bielmeier und Reinhard Stempel; unter Mitarb. von René Lanszweert. Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter. (Untersuchungen zur indogermanischen Sprach- und Kulturwissenschaft, 6).
IndogDicht 1968	<i>R. Schmitt</i> (ed.), <i>Indogermanische Dichtersprache</i> , Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
IndogForsch	<i>Indogermanische Forschungen</i> . Strassburg: Karl J. Trübner.
IntJourSlavLingPoet	<i>International journal of Slavic linguistics and poetics</i> . 's-Gravenhage: Mouton & Co.
IsslStrTeks 1987	<i>Issledovanija po strukture teksta</i> . Moscow: "Nauka".
JAmOrSoc	<i>Journal of the American Oriental Society</i> .
JaynHamš	<i>Jayn hamšenakan</i> . Vol. [1]. Sero Xanzadyan (ed.). Yerevan: "Hayastan", 1971; vol. 2. A. Zeyt'unyan (ed.). Yerevan: "Sovetakan groŭ", 1979; vol. 3. Sergey Vardanyan (ed.). Yerevan: "Xorhrdayin groŭ", 1989.
JCunSt	<i>Journal of Cuneiform Studies</i> .
JourAsiat	<i>Journal asiatique</i> .
JourHellStud	<i>Journal of Hellenic studies</i> .

JourIndEurStud	Journal of Indo-European studies.
JourSocArmStud	Journal of the Society for Armenian Studies.
IranCauc	Iran and the Caucasus: research papers from the Caucasian Centre for Iranian studies, Yerevan. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
Kel'ty i kel'tskie jazyki	Jarceva, Serebrennikov, Makaev, Korolev (eds.). Moscow: "Nauka", 1974.
Kluge/Seebold	see Kluge 1989.
Kul'tNaslVost	Kul'turnoe nasledie Vostoka: problemy, poiski, suždenija. Leningrad: "Nauka", 1985.
K'ristHayast 2002	K'ristonya Hayastan: hanragitaran (encyclopedia). Redactor-in-chief and director: H. M. Ayvazyan. Yerevan: Haykakan hanragitarani glxavor xmbagrut'yun.
KZ	Kuhns Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung. See also <i>HistSpr</i> and <i>ZVS</i> .
LALIES	Actes des sessions de linguistique et de littérature 10 (Aussois, 1988-1989). Paris: Presses de la Sorbonne Nouvelle. 1992.
LangIndEur 1997	Langues indo-européennes (sous la direction de Françoise Bader). Paris: CNRS Éditions.
LangPrehEur 2003	Languages in prehistoric Europe. Ed. by Alfred Bammesberger, Theo Vennemann; in collaboration with Markus Bieswanger, Joachim Grzega. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter.
Language	Language: Journal of the Linguistic Society of America.
LaryngTheor 1988	<i>Alfred Bammesberger</i> (ed.), Die Laryngaltheorie und die Rekonstruktion des indogermanischen Laut- und Formensystems. Heidelberg: Carl Winter: Universitätsverlag.
LingBalk	Linguistique Balkanique (Balkansko ezikoznanie). Sofia: Academy Press.
LingGeogrDialIstJaz	Lingvističeskaja geografija, dialektologija i istorija jazyka. Yerevan: Academy Press, 1976.
LingPosn	Lingua Posnaniensis.
LeidStudIndEur	Leiden studies in Indo-European. Series edited by R. S. P. Beekes, A. Lubotsky, J. J. S. Weitenberg. Amsterdam/Atlanta: Rodopi.

LezOčHarc'	Lezvi ew oči harc'er. Yerevan: Academy Press.
LitKDSInd 1979; 1987	Literatura i kul'tura drevnej i srednevekovoj Indii (sbornik statej). Mosow: GRVLI "Nauka".
LrHasGit	Lraber hasarakakan gitut'yunneri = Vestnik obščestvennyx nauk (VON). Yerevan.
MankGAŽoť	Erewani X. Abovyani anvan Haykakan petakan mankaržakan instituti gitakan ašxatut'yunneri žoťovacu. Yerevan: Academy Press.
MankQuart	Mankind quarterly.
MatGNŽoť	Matenadaran: gitakan nyut'eri žoťovacu; vol. 1, 1941; vol. 2, 1949 [1950]. Since vol. 3 Banber Matenadarani.
MedArmCult 1983	<i>Thomas J. Samuelian and Michael E. Stone</i> (eds.), <i>Medieval Armenian culture</i> . Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1984 (University of Pennsylvania Armenian texts and studies, 6).
MedKonNedAkadWetLet:	Mededelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, afd. Letterkunde. Amsterdam: Noord-Hollandsche Uitgevers Maatschappij.
Mélanges Émile Boisacq 1-2, 1937-1938:	<i>Annuaire de l'Institut de Philologie et d'Histoire Orientales et Slaves</i> . 5, 1937; 6, 1938. Bruxelles.
MežIssArm 1990	<i>S. A. Esajan & G. E. Aresjan</i> (eds.), <i>Meždisciplinarnye issledovanija kul'turogeneza i etnogeneza Armjanskogo nagor'ja i sopredel'nyx oblastej</i> . Yerevan: University Press.
MifNarMir 1-2	Mify narodov mira: ènciklopedija. Redactor-in-chief: S. A. Tokarev. Vol. 1, 1980; vol. 2, 1982. Moscow: "Sovetskaja ènciklopedija".
MiġHayBař 1987-92	(1-2), <i>Łazaryan, R. S., Avetisyan, H.M.</i> , Miġin hayereni bařaran, vol. 1, 1987; vol. 2, 1992. Yerevan: University Press.
MovsXorenMaten	Srboy hōrn meroy <i>Movsēsi Xorenac'woy</i> Matenagrut'iwnk'. Venice: S. Lazar, 1843; 1865. (See <i>Sources</i> : Movsēs Xorenac'i).
MSL	Mémoires de la Société de Linguistique de Paris.
MünStudSpr	Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft.
MythIEAnt 1974	Myth in Indo-European Antiquity, ed. by Gerald James

- Larson, coedited by C. Scott Littleton and Jaan Puhvel. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press.
- NewApprMedArm *J. J. S. Weitenberg* (ed.), New approaches to medieval Armenian language and literature. Amsterdam/Atlanta: Rodopi, 1995.
- NHB *G. Awetik'ean, X. Siwrmēlean, M. Awgerean*, Nor baġirk' haykazea lezui, 2 vols, Venice: St Lazar (1836-1837); reprinted Yerevan: University Press (1979-1981).
- NJbGeolPal Neues Jahrbuch für Geologie und Paläontologie. Stuttgart.
- NmušLeinĻarab 1978 Nmušner Lernayin Ļarabaġi Źoġovrdakan banahyusut'yunic' (compiled by Mik'ayel Arak'elyan and Robert Ļahramanyan). Yerevan: "Hayastan".
- NovVulgBiblSacr Nova Vulgata Bibliorum Sacrorum editio. Libreria Editrice Vaticana: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis. 1979.
- NOWELE North-Western European language evolution. Odense: Odense University Press.
- NrsTidSpr Norsk Tidsskrift for Sprogvidenskap. Oslo.
- OčSrLekArm 1983 *G. B. Džaukjan, L. A. Saradževa, C. R. Arutjunjan*. Očerki po sravnitel'noj leksikologii armjanskogo jazyka. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- Ofitsch/Zinko 2000 *Michaela Ofitsch and Christian Zinko* (eds.), 125 Jahre Indogermanistik in Graz. Leykam.
- OsnIranJaz-Dr 1979 Osnovy iranskogo jazykoznaniya: drevneiranskije jazyki. Ed. by V. A. Abaev, M. N. Bogoljubov, V. S. Pastorgueva (otv. red.). Moscow: "Nauka".
- OsnIranJaz-Sr 1981 Osnovy iranskogo jazykoznaniya: sredneiranskije jazyki. Ed. by V. A. Abaev, M. N. Bogoljubov, V. S. Pastorgueva (otv. red.). Moscow: "Nauka".
- OsnIranJaz-Nov 1-2 Osnovy iranskogo jazykoznaniya: novoiranskije jazyki. Ed. by V. A. Abaev, M. N. Bogoljubov, V. S. Pastorgueva (otv. red.). Moscow: "Nauka", 1982, 1987.
- PatmBanasHand Patma-banasirakan handes = Istoriko-filologičeskij žurnal (IFŽ). Yerevan: Academy Press.
- Pedersen Kolloquium In honorem Holger Pedersen: Kolloquium der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 25. bis 28. März

	1993 in Kopenhagen (hrsg. von J. E. Rasmussen, unter Mitwirkung von Benedicte Nielsen). Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag. 1994.
PlacArmLIE 1986	<i>Maurice Leroy and Francine Mawet</i> (eds.), <i>La place de l'arménien dans les langues indo-européennes</i> . Louvain: Peeters.
PtmSivHisHay 1965	<i>Grigor Tēr Yovhannēsean</i> (ed.), <i>Patmagirk' Sivri-Hisari hayoc': tēḡagrakan, patmakan ew azgagrakan</i> (initiated by Mihran Nersēsean). Pēyrut': Tparan Mšak.
PresDayDial 2002	<i>Jan Berns, Jaap van Marle</i> (eds.), <i>Present-day dialectology: problems and findings</i> . Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter. (Trends in linguistics: Studies and monographs, 137).
PrIndEvrJaz 1964	<i>V. N. Toporov</i> (ed.), <i>Problemy indoevropskogo jazykoznanija: etjudy po sravnitel'no-istoričeskoj grammatike indoevropskix jazykov</i> . Moscow: "Nauka".
PrJaz	<i>V. N. Toporov</i> , <i>Prusskij jazyk: slovar': A-D</i> (1975); <i>E-H</i> (1979); <i>I-K</i> (1980); <i>K-L</i> (1984); <i>L</i> (1990); to be continued. Moscow: "Nauka".
ProcFICAL 1980	<i>Proceedings of the First international symposium on Armenian linguistics</i> (11-14 July 1979); ed. By John Greppin. Delmar, New York: Caravan Books.
ProcSISAL 1993, 1-2	<i>Proceedings of the Second international symposium on Armenian linguistics</i> (21-23 Sept. 1987); vols. 1-2. Yerevan: Academy Press. See also <i>ThesSISAL 1987</i> .
RecLar 1990	<i>La reconstruction des laryngales</i> (= <i>Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Liège</i> , fascicule CCLIII). Liège-Paris.
RekRelChr 1992	<i>R. Beekes, A. Lubotsky, J. Weitenberg</i> (eds.), <i>Rekonstruktion und relative Chronologie: Akten der Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft; 8</i> (Leiden, 1987). Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft.
REIE	<i>Revue des études indoeuropéennes</i> .
RendLombLett	<i>Rendiconti: Reale Istituto Lombardo di Scienze e Lettere</i> , Milano; classe di lettere.
RevHitAs	<i>Revue hittite et asianique</i> . Paris.

RicLing	Ricerche linguistiche. Roma. 1950-.
SasCr; SasUdal	see <i>Sources</i> : Sasna crer.
SasCrGit 2004	Azat Etiazaryan, Sargis Harut'yunyan, Armen Petrosyan [editor-in-charge], Varag Nersisyan (eds.), Haykakan "Sasna crer" ēposə ew hamašxarhayin žarangut'yunə: mĭjazgayin gitažotovi zekuc'umnerə, 4-6 November, 2003, Caṯkajor (The Armenian epic "Daredevils" of Sassoun and the world epic heritage: international conference's reports). Yerevan: Academy Press.
SlovRusNarGov 1-	<i>F. P. Filin</i> (ed.), Slovar' russkix narodnyx govorov. Leningrad: Nauka, 1963-.
SouthAsArch 1994	(1-2), South Asian archaeology 1993: Proceedings of the Twelfth International conference of the European Association of South Asian Archaeologists held in Helsinki University 5-9 July 1993 (ed. by Asko Parpola & Petteri Koskikallio). Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1994.
SovArx	Sovetskaja arxeologija.
SovVost	Sovetskoe vostokovedenie.
SovĖtn	Sovetskaja ėtnografija.
SprGes 1970	<i>Harry Spitzbardt</i> (ed.), Sprache und Gesellschaft. Friedrich-Schiller-Universität Jena.
SprKultIndog 1998	<i>Wolfgang Meid</i> (ed.), Sprache und Kultur der Indogermanen: Akten der X. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft (Innsbruck, 22-28 September 1996). Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft. (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft, 93).
StBoT	Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten.
StudCauc	Studia Caucasica.
StudEtymCrac	Studia etymologica Cracoviensia. Kraków.
StudIndogLodz	Studia indogermanica Lodziensia. Łódź.
StudRedup	<i>Bernhard Hurch</i> (ed.), Studies on reduplication. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. (Empirical approaches to language typology, 28).
ThesSISAL 1987	The Second international symposium on Armenian linguistics (21-23 Sept. 1987). Theses of reports. Yerevan:

	Academy Press. See also <i>ProcSISAL (1987) 1993, 1-2.</i>
ThracMyc 1989	<i>Jan G. P. Best and Nanny M. W. de Vries</i> (eds.), Thracians and Mycenaeans: proceedings of the Fourth International Congress of Thracology, Rotterdam, 24-26 September 1984. Leiden etc.: E. J. Brill, 1989.
TrPhilSoc	Transactions of the Philological Society. London.
TurkArmDict	see Čugaszyan 1986 and <i>Sources</i> : Etia Mušetyan Karnec'i.
T'ōxBaṛ	<i>Arsēn vardapet T'ōxmaxean</i> , Baṛakoyt Haykakan lezui (unpublished manuscript); a collection of (dialectal) words compiled in the prison of Van (cited in Amatuni 1912).
UšMjñHayBnst 1-2	<i>Hasmik Sahakyan</i> (ed.), Uš mījnadari hay banasteġcut'yunə. Yerevan: Academy Press. Vol. 1, 1986; vol. 2, 1987.
UrHay 1988	<i>B. N. Aṛak'elyan, G. B. Ĵahukyan, G. X. Sargsyan</i> , Urartu-Hayastan. Yerevan: Academy Press.
VanSaz 1-2	see Šġrenc' 1885-1899.
VestDrIst	Vestnik drevnej istorii. Moscow.
VoprJaz	Voprosy jazykoznanija. Moscow.
WörtSach	Wörter und Sachen.
WienZeitKundMorg	Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes.
YušamXotorġ 1964	<i>H. Yarut'iwn v. Hulunean and H. Matt'ēos v. Hačġean</i> , Yušamatean Xotorġjuri. Vienna: Mechitharisten.
Yušarjan 1911	<i>Nersēs Akinean</i> (ed.), Festschrift aus Anlass des 100 jährigen Bestandes der Mechitaristen-Kongregation in Wien (1811-1911), und des 25. Jahrganges der philosophischen Monatsschrift Handes amsorya (1887-1911). Vienna: Mxit'arean Tparan.
ZArmPhil	Zeitschrift für armenische Philologie. Vol. 1, 1903; vol. 2, 1904. Marburg (Hessen): N. G. Elwert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung.
ZeitDeutMorgGesel	Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft.
ZVS	Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung. See also <i>HistSpr</i> and <i>KZ</i> .

ARMEENSE ETYMOLOGISCHE STUDIES vanuit een dialectaal en cultureel perspectief. De Indo-Europese basis van het lexicon.

SAMENVATTING

Deze dissertatie biedt een volledig bijgewerkte en gemoderniserde etymologische beschrijving van 530 Armeense lexemen, waarvan Indo-Europese oorsprong zeker of waarschijnlijk is.

Armeens is vanuit Indo-Europees standpunt al meer dan 100 jaar bestudeerd. Er bestaan veel waardevolle handboeken, detailstudies en overzichten van de vergelijkende studie van het Armeens. De meeste daarvan concentreren zich op het Klassiek Armeens (ca. 500 na Chr.) en gebruiken slechts zelden moderne dialectale en etnografische gegevens. Niet-literaire gegevens vanuit de Armeense dialecten zijn voor het grootste deel buiten het blikveld van het Indo-Europese etymologische onderzoek gebleven. Een uitzondering vormen de fundamentele studies van Ačaryan (HAB) en Jahukyan (1972 en 1987).

Dit boek integreert de lexicale, fonetische en morfologische gegevens van de Armeense dialecten en van etnografische beschrijvingen op een systematische wijze in de etymologische benadering van het Indo-Europese lexicon binnen het Armeens. Deze benadering is nieuw. In deze dissertatie wordt gebruik gemaakt van het materiaal dat is verzameld in Ačaryan's etymologische woordenboek en in de bestaande beschrijvingen van de individuele dialecten. Ook wordt een grote hoeveelheid materiaal verwerkt dat is geëxcerpeerd uit folkloreteksten en antropologische beschrijvingen, die meestal onbekend of onbereikbaar zijn voor geleerden buiten Armenië.

Dit werk bestaat uit twee hoofddeelten: een etymologische bestudering van Armeense woorden die van zekere of waarschijnlijke Indo-Europese oorsprong zijn, en een eerste poging om te komen tot een zekere systematisering van taalkundige en culturele elementen die men kan afleiden uit de etymologische behandeling.

In het eerste deel worden de geselecteerde lexemen op een systematische manier gepresenteerd en bestudeerd. In een filologische sectie worden de semantiek en de literaire referenties van een woord met zijn afleidingen behandeld met inbegrip van de morfologische kenmerken. Voor ieder lemma volgt dan een overzicht van de dialectale distributie en een discussie van de linguistische, dialectgeografische en etnografische aspecten die van belang zijn voor een etymologische beoordeling van het literaire materiaal. Daarop volgt een volledige etymologische discussie met insluiting van andere relevante Indo-Europese talen.

Het tweede deel biedt een evaluatie van enkele resultaten van de etymologische studie in deel 1. Het vormt tevens een vooruitblik op diepgaander soortgelijk onderzoek. Er worden gevolgtrekkingen gemaakt voor de etymologische studie van het Armeens in algemene zin. Tenslotte worden systematisch de resultaten van de etnografische gegevens uitgewerkt.

CURRICULUM VITAE

Ik ben geboren op 10 november 1964 in Kirovakan/Vanajor (Armenië). Van 1972 tot 1982 bezocht ik de Middelbare school Nr. 3 in Kirovakan. In 1986 begon ik met de studie Armeense Taal en Literatuur aan het Pedagogisch Instituut van Kirovakan, die ik in 1991 afsloot (onderwerp van het diploma proefschrift: “The reflexes of the Proto-Indo-European laryngeals in Armenian”). Van 1991 tot 1994 werkte ik als onderzoeker aan het Instituut van Archeologie en Volkenkunde in Yerevan, onder de leiding van prof.dr. Sargis Harutyunyan. In 2001 trad ik als assistent-in-opleiding in dienst bij de onderzoekschool CNWS van de Universiteit Leiden (vanaf september 2005 overgenomen door het Leiden University Centre of Linguistics).