

Etymological dictionary of the

Armenian inherited lexicon

Hrach K. Martirosyan

To my Trinity:

my mother, Zhenya Martirosyan (Simonyan)

Ժենյա Մարտիրոսյան (Սիմոնյան)

my wife, Satenik Gharagyozyan

Սաթենիկ Դարագյոզյան

my daughter, Tsovinar Martirosyan

Ծովինար Մարտիրոսյան

Ի՞նչ ես թըռչում, խեղեւ սի՛րս,
Յապար բանի տըրե, սի՛րս,
Ես ո՞նց հասնեմ հապար Կտի
Քեզ Կտի թափով, թե՛րե, սի՛րս:

Հովհաննես Թումանյան

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements.....	vii
Introduction.....	ix
Symbols and abbreviations.....	xi
Part I. Armenian Etymologies: Indo-European Heritage.....	1
Place-names.....	669
Part II. Evaluation and Outlook.....	687
1. Armenian dialects.....	689
2. Aspects of historical grammar.....	705
2.1 Phonology.....	705
2.2 Morphology.....	748
2.3 Word formation.....	757
3. Semantics, culture and etymology.....	769
4. Place-names.....	809
Bibliography.....	817
Sources.....	925
Bibliographical abbreviations.....	931
Indices.....	953

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The present study on Armenian etymology originated as a Leiden University PhD thesis under the guidance of Professor Jos Weitenberg, who was always ready to review and discuss the various details of my work and whose endless patience and unfailing encouragement I cannot adequately repay. I am also very much indebted to my supervisor Professor Alexander Lubotsky, project leader of the Leiden-based Indo-European Etymological Dictionary, for his teaching, constant support and valuable discussions.

I am further indebted to my colleagues from the Department of Comparative Indo-European Linguistics at Leiden University for their valuable inputs on various issues and etymologies: Robert Beekes, Frederik Kortlandt, Michiel de Vaan, Tijmen Pronk, Rick Derksen, Alwin Kloekhorst, Lucien van Beek, Guus Kroonen, Michael Peyrot, Johnny Cheung and Peter Schrijver. My special gratitude goes to Leonid Kulikov, Uwe Bläsing, Slava Chirikba and Armen Petrosyan not only for many discussions and valuable comments, but also for their sincere friendship and constant assistance in many respects.

The last draft of my thesis was read by Jasmine Dum-Tragut, whose suggestions have helped improve the text of this book. My special thanks go to Tijmen Pronk, who has helped me in preparing the manuscript of this book and solving many technical problems. I am deeply indebted to Anush Martirosyan, Hayk Harutyunyan, and, again, to Tijmen Pronk and Leonid Kulikov, for their endless patience in assisting me in computer matters.

I am also very grateful to all those, who have helped me in obtaining the relevant literature and references: Karen Amirxanyan, Arpenik Martirosyan, Tatev Martirosyan, Anush Martirosyan, Marine Torosyan, and, especially, Rafayel Martirosyan, who has introduced me into the wonderful world of books. I am very much indebted to Samvel Martirosyan, without whom I would not have been able to come to the Netherlands. For their help in obtaining literature and for their comments on various issues, I wish to thank Gevorg Jahukyan (†), Manea Erna Shirinian, Gohar Muradyan, Levon Abrahamyan, Verjiné Svazlian, Tork Dalalyan, Ester Khemchyan, Hrachya Tamrazian, Peter Kocharov, Meline Manukyan, Dory Heilijgers, Rémy Viredaz, Václav Blažek, Andrea Scala, Moreno Morani, James Clackson, Martin Kümmel, Brent Vine, Britta Irslinger, Gordon Whittaker, Kevork B. Bardakjian and Theo van Lint.

I would also like to express my deepest gratitude to my beloved school teachers Hratsin Grigoryan (†), Seyran Kalantaryan (†), Tamara Farmanyan, Zarik Tarxanyan and Anahit Avagyan, as well as to my lecturer Gourgen Khachatryan and to my Yerevan supervisor in 1991-1994, Sargis Harutyunyan, for everything.

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 most profound 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 any possible mistakes and misprints.

INTRODUCTION

This work aims at providing a description of the Indo-European lexical stock of Armenian, with systematic inclusion of new data.

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; Ačaṙian 1-2, 1940-51; Solta 1960; Godel 1975; Schmitt 1972-74; 1981; Jahukyan 1972; 1982; 1987; de Lamberterie 1992; 1997; Clackson 1994; Olsen 1999; Kortlandt 2003; Beekes 2003.

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

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

The lexical stock relies heavily upon Ačaṙian's etymological dictionary (HAB). No serious etymological or dialectological investigation can be undertaken without recurring to HAB. Unfortunately, the latter work was written in Armenian and is therefore inaccessible for many students of Indo-European linguistics.

It should be borne in mind that, in the new publication of HAB (vols. 1-4, 1971-1979), numerous misprints and omissions are present, many of which were 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 the scope of Indo-European etymological studies. First of all, this concerns data scattered in Armenian dialectological literature, particularly in Ačaṙian's HAB, as well as in 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. That literature, written mostly in Armenian, remains largely unavailable or inaccessible to 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 present study comprises two basic parts. The first part represents the (alphabetically ordered) lexical corpus with philological and etymological discussion. 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 insufficient (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, Satenik Gharagyozyan, in areas where some of the important Armenian dialects, such as Łarabał, Goris, Ararat/Lori, Van/Diadin, Sasun, etc., are still spoken properly.

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

SYMBOLS AND ABBREVIATIONS

Symbols

C	consonant	>	developed into
H	laryngeal	<<	replaced analogically by
R	resonant	>>	analogically replacing
N	nasal	<...>	omitted part of text
V	vowel	*	reconstructed form
<	developed from	+	and later

Abbreviations of languages

Aeol.	Aeolic Greek	Etrusc.	Etruscan
Afgh.	Afghan	Finn.	Finnish
Akkad.	Akkadian	Fr.	French
Alb.	Albanian	Fris.	Frisian
Arab.	Arabic	FUgr.	Finno-Ugric
Aram.	Aramaic	Gaul.	Gaulish
Arm.	Armenian	Germ.	German
Assyr.	Assyrian	Goth.	Gothic
Att.	Attic Greek	Gr.	Greek
Av.	Avestan	GZ	Georgian-Zan
Balt.	Baltic	Hatt.	Hattic
Bashk.	Bashkir	Hebr.	Hebrew
Boeot.	Boeotian Greek	Hitt.	Hittite
Bret.	Breton	HLuw.	Hieroglyphic Luwian
BSl.	Balto-Slavic	Hom.	Homeric Greek
Buddh.	Buddhist	Hung.	Hungarian
Bulg.	Bulgarian	Hurr.	Hurrian
Byel.	Byelorussian	Ic.	Icelandic
Celt.	Celtic	IE	Indo-European
Chin.	Chinese	Ilr.	Indo-Iranian
ClArm.	Classical Armenian	Illyr.	Illyrian
CLuw.	Cuneiform Luwian	Ion.	Ionian Greek
Cret.	Cretan Greek	Khot.	Khotanese
Dan.	Danish	Khwar.	Khwarezmian
Dor.	Doric Greek	Kurd.	Kurdish
ECauc.	East Caucasian	Lat.	Latin
Egypt.	Egyptian	Latv.	Latvian
Engl.	English	Lezg.	Lezgian
EpArm.	Epic Armenian	Lith.	Lithuanian

Luw.	Luwian	PIE	Proto-Indo-European
Lyc.	Lycian	Plb.	Polabian
Maced.	Macedonian	PNCauc.	Proto-North-Caucasian
MIr.	Middle Irish	Pol.	Polish
ManMPers.	Manichaean Middle Persian	QIE	Quasi-Indo-European
ManParth.	Manichaean Parthian	Russ.	Russian
Megr.	Megrelian	Sax.	Saxon
MHG	Middle High German	Sem.	Semitic
MidArm.	Middle Armenian	SerbCS	Serbian Church Slavonic
MInd.	Middle Indic	Skt.	Sanskrit
ModArm.	Modern Armenian	Slav.	Slav(on)ic
MPers.	Middle Persian	Sln.	Slovene
Myc.	Mycenaean Greek	Sogd.	Sogdian
Norw.	Norwegian	Sumer.	Sumerian
NPers.	New Persian	Swed.	Swedish
O-	Old <...>	Toch.	Tocharian
OCS	Old Church Slavonic	Turk.	Turkish
OHG	Old High German	Turkm.	Turkmen
OPr.	Old Prussian	Ukr.	Ukrainian
Osc.	Oscan	Umbr.	Umbrian
Oss.	Ossetic	Urart.	Urartian
P-	Proto-	Uygh.	Uyghur
Pahl.	Pahlavi	Uzb.	Uzbek
Pal.	Palaic	Ved.	Vedic Sanskrit
Parth.	Parthian	WCauc.	West Caucasian
Phryg.	Phrygian	YAv.	Young Avestan

Other abbreviations

acc.	accusative	E	east(ern)
abl.	ablative	e.g.	exempli gratia, for example
adj.	adjective	et al.	et alii, and others
adv.	adverb	etc.	etcetera
all.	allative	f.	feminine
aor.	aorist	Fs	Festschrift
AV	Atharva-Veda	Gd	Gedenkschrift
c.	commune	g(en).	genitive
ca.	circa	HD	hysterodynamic
caus.	causative	Hes.	Hesychius
cf.	confer, compare	ibid.	ibidem, at the same place
coll.	collective	id.	idem, the same
d(at).	dative	i.e.	id est, that is
dem.	demonstrative	imper.	imperative
dial.	dialectal	impf.	imperfect
dimin.	diminutive	inf.	infinitive
du.	dual	i(nstr.)	instrumental

intrans.	intransitive	pl(ur.)	plural
iter.	iterative	pl. tant.	plural only
^L	line (with the 'minus' sign [-] when counted from the bottom)	prep.	preposition
Lex.	in lexicographic works	pres.	present
lit.	literal(ly)	prob.	probably
loc.	locative	pron.	pronoun
MedPont	Mediterranean-Pontic substratum (a conventional term; see 3.11)	q.v.	quod vide, see there
LW	loanword	ref.	references
m.	masculine	RV	Rig-Veda
n.	neuter	S	south(ern)
nom.	nominative	sg.	singular
N	north(ern)	subj.	subjunctive
obl.	oblique	subst.	substantive
op. cit.	opere citato, in the work quoted	s.v.	sub verbo, under the lemma
p.c.	personal communication	trans.	transitive
PD	proterodynamic	viz.	videlicet, namely
perf.	perfect	voc.	vocative
pers. pron.	personal pronoun	vol(s).	volume(s)
		vs.	versus
		W	west(ern)
		Yt.	Yašt
		YV	Yajur-Veda

Note: Case forms are cited in shorter forms if taken with the number, e.g. GDSg (genitive-dative singular), IPl (instrumental plural), etc.

PART I

**ARMENIAN ETYMOLOGIES:
INDO-EUROPEAN HERITAGE**

A

agan ‘zealous (child, pupil)’.

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

●ETYM Clackson (1994: 223-224₉₈) ascribes a meaning ‘early’ to *agan* and identifies it with *-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, in fact, was first proposed in NHB 1: 101a. However, in its only attestation (see above), *agan*, as stated by Ačařyan (HAB 1: 75a), means ‘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’.

aganim₁, 3sg.aor. *ag-a-w*, imper. *ag-ir* ‘to put on clothes or shoes’ (Bible+), **ag-uc’-anem**, 3sg.aor. *agoyc* ‘to dress someone, make put on clothes; to put into rings’ (Bible+), **ag-oyc**, *i*-stem: IPI *aguc* ‘-i-w-k’ (Exodus 37.10) ‘crowbar, lever, ring for a lever’ (Bible+); with an initial *h-*: **haganim** ‘to put on clothes’ (Paterica+), MidArm. **hag-** in a number of verbal forms and derivatives (MijHayBar 2, 1992: 3-4).

●DIAL Ubiquitous in the dialects, always with *h-*. Next to the basic meaning ‘to put on clothes’, the verb is also used in the meaning ‘to put into rings’, e.g. in T’iflis [HAB 1: 76a].

The initial *h-* is old and probably has an etymological value since: 1) it is attested since Paterica; 2) it is dialectally ubiquitous; 3) in the Van-group and in the Armenian dialects of Iran it is regularly reflected as *x-*. For a discussion, see H. Muradyan 1982: 266, 277, 315-319; 1982a; Greppin 1982-83; 1983: 260-261; Kortlandt 1983: 9-10 = 2003: 39-40; Weitenberg 1986: 90-91; 1996: 105-106.

●ETYM Since Bugge (1889: 13-14), connected with Av. *aovra-* ‘footwear’, Lat. *ind-uō, -ere* ‘to put on, dress oneself in; to assume; to fall or be impaled (upon)’, OCS *ob-uti* ‘to put on footwear’, Lith. *aūtas* ‘foot-cloth, rag’, *aūti* ‘to put on footwear’, Latv. *āuts* ‘cloth, bandage’, see Hübschmann 1897: 411; Ačařean 1908: 121a; Lidén 1933: 41; HAB 1: 75-76; Pokorný 1959: 346; Greppin 1983: 260-261; Mallory/Adams 1997: 109a. See also s.vv. *ar-ag-ast* ‘curtain, canopy, etc.’, *awd* ‘footwear, shoes’, *aw-t’-oc* ‘cover, coat, garment; blanket’.

In order to explain Arm. *hag-* (see above), Kortlandt (1983: 13; 1984: 43 = 2003: 42-43, 55-56) reconstructs **h₂eu-* and points out that the *h-*less form **ag-* must have arisen under the influence of either *o*-grade derivatives (cf. Umbr. *anouihimu* ‘inductor’, for a discussion, see also Ravnæs 1991: 10; Untermann 2000: 112-113) or prefixed formations, e.g. *ar-ag-ast* ‘curtain’; he identifies this etymon with **h₂ues-* ‘to put on clothes’ assuming that the initial laryngeal has been eliminated in Hitt. *ú-e-eš-ta* and Gr. *ἔννυμι* ‘to clothe’ and ‘wears’ to avoid the homonymy with **h₂ues-* ‘to spend the night’.

However, if Hitt. *unu-^{zi}* ‘to adorn, decorate, lay (the table)’ belongs with *aganim*, etc. and derives from PIE **h₃u-néu-ti* and **h₃u-nu-énti* (see Kloekhorst 2008: 918-920; cf. also Eichner 1978: 151₂₈), the Armenian forms *hag-* and *ag-* may be

explained from **h₃eu-* (**hoganim* > *haganim*, see, however, s.v. *hoviw* ‘shepherd’) and **h₃ou-* (**oganim* > *aganim*, loss of the laryngeal before an original **-o-*), see Kloekhorst *ibid.*; for a different analysis, see Lindeman 1982: 29, who does not mention the Armenian *h-*.

For a further philological and etymological discussion and for the nasal present, see Mariès/Meillet apud Minassian 1978-79; Hamp 1975: 101; Szemerényi 1977: 87₃₄₆ (**aw-an-*); Lindeman 1982: 29; Klingenschmitt 1982: 196; Joseph 1984: 48; Greppin 1988-89: 478; Kortlandt 1996: 41; 1996a: 58 = 2003: 115, 119; Beekes 2003: 184. For Armenian *-anim* vs. Hittite *-nu-* (cf. also **ues-nu-* in *z-genum* ‘to dress’, as well as MidArm. *hagnul*) note Arm. *jer-anim* vs. *jer-num* (see s.v. *jer* ‘warmth’). For the Armenian caus. meaning ‘to put into rings’ compare the semantics of the Hittite verb ‘to adorn’.

aganim₂, 3sg.aor. *ag-a-w*, imper. *ag-ir* ‘to spend the night’ (Bible+); **vayr-ag**, *a*-stem: GDSg *vayrag-i* (Book of Chries), IPI *vayrag-a-w-k* ‘(Philo) ‘sleeping in the field’ (Bible+); further see **awt**, *i*-stem ‘sleeping place, spending the night’.

●ETYM Connected with Gr. *ἀλλίς*, *-ιδος* f. ‘tent or place for passing the night in’, *ἰαύω* ‘to sleep, spend the night’, aor. *ἄεσα*, *ἰαυθμός* ‘sleeping place’, see Müller 1890: 8; Hübschmann 1897: 411-412 (sceptical); HAB 1: 76 with references; Pokorny 1959: 72; Mallory/Adams 1997: 171b. For a thorough philological and etymological discussion, see Minassian 1978-79: 25-26.

The underlying PIE verbal root is reconstructed as **h₂ues-*, cf. Hitt. *h₂uiš-* ‘to live’, Skt. *vasati*, *ávasat*, *vásant-* ‘to stay, dwell, spend the night’, etc.; Gr. *ἰαύω* ‘to sleep, spend the night’ is a reduplicated present from **h₂i-h₂eus-*; note also Arm. *go-* ‘to be, exist’ from **h₂uos-* (for a discussion, see Beekes 1969: 57, 127, 129; Greppin 1973: 68; C. Arutjunjan 1983: 256-257; Greppin 1983: 260; Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 531-532). For a further discussion, see Barton 1988; Beekes 1991: 243; Clackson 1994: 104-107, 223₉₂.

An IE **h₂uV-* would yield Arm. **gV-*. One therefore derives *ag-* from a full-grade **h₂eμ-* (Polomé 1980: 28; cf. also Eichner 1978: 151, 151₂₈). This would give Arm. **haw/g-*, however. More probably we can posit PArm. **ag-* < **aw(h)-* < QIE zero grade **h₂u-s-* (for the development, see s.v. *ayg* ‘morning’). This zero grade form may be corroborated by **awt**, *i*-stem ‘sleeping place’ (q.v.).

Kortlandt (1983: 13; 1984: 43 = 2003: 43, 56; cf. also Beekes 2003: 174, 184) posits **Hou-* in *vayr-ag* ‘living in the field’ and **awt** ‘place to spend the night’ < **ou-ti-* (cf. the vocalic development in *ayt* ‘cheek’). This view is improbable as far as **awt** is concerned because: 1) I prefer a different analysis for *ayt* ‘cheek’ (q.v.); 2) **awt**, *i*-stem is most probably a **-ti-*-derivative and is likely derived from a zero-grade root **h₂u-* or, perhaps better, PArm. **aw-* or **ag-* from **h₂us-* (see s.v. **awt**).

agarak, *a*-stem: GDSg *agarak-i*, GDPI *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* : *φωλάσσειν καλάμην ἐν ἀγγῶ*.

In Agat‘angelos § 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].

●DIAL No dialectal evidence is recorded in HAB 1: 77. Here Ačařyan interprets Nor Naxijewan rural *egerek* ‘the summer staying place of bullocks in fields’ as a back loan from Crimean Tatar **egerek* (cf. Turk. *ekrek* in numerous place-names of Asia Minor) < Arm. *agarak*.

Further, note Xotorřur *agrak* ‘country-house, bower, summer place’ [YuřamXotorř 1964: 459].

●ETYM Since long, connected with Gr. *ἀγρός* ‘field’, Lat. *ager* m. ‘field’, Skt. *ājra*-m. ‘field, plain’, etc. Since these forms go back to PIE **h₂eǵ-ro-* which cannot yield Arm. **agar-ak*, Ačařyan (HAB 1: 77a) assumes a loan from a lost IE language of Asia Minor. Others (e.g. Karst 1911: 402; Łap’anc’yan 1939: 17; see also Ĵahukyan 1987: 452; cf. Olsen 1999: 246, 953) link *agarak* with Sumer. *agar* ‘field’. Arm. *agarak* has been interpreted also as follows: “Gr. *ἀγρός* arrangé à l’arménienne” [Mariès/Meillet apud Minassian 1978-79: 29]. For this PIE etymon, 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 *agw-o-y* (cf. *z-agw-o-y* in P’awstos Buzand 3.6), ISg *agw-o-v* (Epiphanius of Cyprus), IPI *age-a-w-k’* or ISg *ag-a-w* (Philo) ‘tail’ (Bible+).

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

In P’awstos Buzand 3.6 (1883=1984: 13^{L-12f}), transl. Garsořian 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 can see, the word is also used in reference to snakes and dogs, despite Ačařyan’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.). For the semantic shift ‘tail’ > ‘penis’, see s.v. *jet* ‘tail’. For a philological analysis, see Minassian 1978-79: 29.

●DIAL Preserved in the dialects with:

initial a-: Agulis, Hačən, Aslanbek, Xarberd, Řotost’o, Akn, Sebastia, Ĵt’, Alařkert, Suč’ava [HAB 1: 78a], Papen, Xotrřur [HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 3b]; Svedia [Andreasyan 1967: 352a];

initial h-: Łarabał *hák^oi*, *hák^oü* [Davt‘yan 1966: 299]; Goris *hák‘i*, *hák‘ü*, *hák^oü* [Margaryan 1975: 311a, 425a], perhaps also *hák‘ün*, cf. AblSg *hák‘ünic‘* (referring to the tail of a hen) [Lisic‘yan 1969: 270]; Šamaxi *hák‘i*, *hák^oi* [Baramyan 1964: 185]; Mełri *hég^oin* [Ałayan 1954: 260a]; Karčewan *hág^oin* [H. Muradyan 1960: 188a]; Kak‘avaberd *hág^oin*, in the village of Gudemnis *hák^oü* [H. Muradyan 1967: 98, 116, 164a]; Areš *hāgi* [Lusenc‘ 1982: 195a]; Šamšadin/ Dilijan *hāk‘i* [Mežunc‘ 1989: 183a].

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

For Partizak, a recent meaning ‘an inseparable friend’ is recorded [HayLez-BrbBař 1, 2001: 3b].

In most of the dialects, the word generally means ‘tail’ (as stressed by Ačarıyan in HAB 1: 78a, in Suč‘ava even pertaining to sheep, fish and birds), while the 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 *ākəsdun* ‘tails’ : *ākək‘* ‘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, as it is found also in Van and Šatax, while in Alaškert we find ‘edge of the spinal column’.

The by-form **āk‘ü*, found in Łarabał, Goris and partially in Kak‘avaberd (see above), has perhaps resulted from a generalization of the oblique stem *agw-*, cf. Łarabał e.g. AblSg *hyak‘van* [S. Harut‘yunyan 1965: 94b^{Nr964g}]), Kak‘avaberd (Gudemnis) GDPl *hāk‘vac‘* [H. 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* (HAB s.v.) can serve as an interesting parallel to the semantic field. Cf. also ClPers. *dum* ‘tail; edge/end’ (‘хвост; конец’) [ĖtimSlovIranJaz 2, 2003: 479]. This Arm. word demonstrates semantic variety already in the Bible, whereas *agi* appears in the literature only in the meaning ‘tail’, the other meanings being confined to the dialects; cf. also V. Ařak‘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 in square brackets.

If the basic meaning of *agi* were indeed ‘edge’ (in the semantic fields of animal and partly, perhaps, human anatomy, as well as dressing; see above, in the dialectological section), I would connect the word to Arm. *haw* ‘beginning’ < perhaps *‘edge’, 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 due to the initial syllable being accented as a result of accent retraction.

As I tried to demonstrate in the dialectological section, a by-form **y-agi* can be reconstructed on the basis of Šatax and Van (but perhaps also on the basis of 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 *yaw* (HAB s.v.).

azazim ‘to become dry, wither’ (Ehišē, see Ter-Minasyan 1989: 404^{L14f}), **azazanam** ‘to become dry’ (Philo), **azazem** ‘to make dry’ (Vkāyk‘ arewelic‘, Sargis Šnorhali, Čařəntir); **azaz-un** ‘dry, withered’ in Genesis 41.23-24 (said of *hask* ‘ear of corn’, Zeyt‘unyan 1985: 342), Philo, etc.

●ETYM Probably from QIE **h₂(H)s-g^h-*, cf. Goth. *azgo* ‘ashes’, etc.; see Meillet 1898: 281-282; 1908-09: 357; HAB 1: 82; Pokorny 1959: 68-69; Ĵahukyan 1982: 66, 102; Lehmann 1986: 54; Mallory/Adams 1997: 170b; Olsen 1999: 489. Sceptical: Greppin 1983: 261. On the PIE etymon, see Lubotsky 1985. Further, see s.v. *ačiwn* ‘ash’.

Arm. *az-az-* is considered a reduplicated present (Meillet 1936: 113) or an intensive (Clackson 1994: 86; cf. Ĵahukyan 1982: 171). For *azaz-un*, see Ĵahukyan 1982: 130-131.

The connection with Gr. ὄσχος, MPers. *azg* ‘branch’, Arm. *azn* ‘tribe’, *ezn* ‘bullock’, etc. (Patrubby 1902-03) is untenable.

azbn, *-bin*, *-bamb* ‘weft, web, warp’.

First attested three times (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 ankc‘es zeōt‘anesin gisaks glxoy imoy and azbin <...>. Ēar 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’, as proposed by Greppin (1983: 262), is rather literal 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‘rč‘el anc‘anel i veray azbaxumb zōrut‘eanc‘s* “they fly over dense forces” (transl. Garsoian 1989: 119-120). As for the renderings ‘weaver’s reed to separate threads’ (emphasis is mine) and ‘stick’, proposed by Bailey respectively for *azbn* and *azboc*, one feels a tendency towards stressing their semantic conformity with Khot. *ysba* < *(*a*)*zbā-* ‘reed’; see the etymological section.

The interpretation of *azbaxumb* should be reconsidered. The first component can in fact be equated with **asp-* ‘to arm’, a quasi-word based on a re-analysis of *aspazēn* and 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. *Ałjk’ < Ałc’k’, Amazar < Amaras, Tozb < Tosp*. So, *azbaxumb* may 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*, although lacking even in Goris, Meṛi and other neighbouring dialects, appears to be found in Leṛnayin Łarabał: *áspə* (Łarabał, Hadrut’, Šałax-Xcaberđ, Meṛtišen) [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 which the threads of the woof pass’. Interestingly enough, this thorough description suits the dialectal (noted as “*řmk.*”) meaning cited in NHB 1: 6b: “the comb-like woof through which the *arēj-k’* pass; = Turk. /p’öčü, p’üčü/”. Compare **aspasatr* (in many dialects) ‘the comb (*santr*) 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 тканья”. 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’, respectively, as the second members) are recorded in Meṛi (*əzbát’il* and *əzbáp’et* [Ałayan 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 Ałayan (1954: 260a) concerning Meṛi *azb*, but this seems to be taken from HAB and should not be used as first-hand information. I am not sure whether there is a solid textual basis for justifying 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’.

Although the textual evidence requires 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 focused 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 the just-mentioned *azbel*.

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

●ETYM Ačařyan (HAB 1: 84b) considers the resemblance with Syriac **azbā* ‘pubic or armpit hair’ as accidental. Indeed, it is semantically remote. Then Ačařyan (AčařHLPatm 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 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. *ađka-* m. ‘coat, outer garment’, Gr. *ἄττοιαι* < **ἄτ-ιοιαι* ‘set the warp in the loom, i.e. begin the web’, *ἄσμου*, more usual *δίασμου*, -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 (*δίασμου* 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*”. In my view, 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) independently suggests the same etymological connection. She mentions only the Greek form and equates *azbn* with *ἄσμου*, assuming “an Arm. sound change **-tm-* (> **-tʰm-*) > **-sm-* (**-zm-*) as in Gk., followed by the particular development of **-m-* > *-b-* as in *skizbn*”. On **-mn* > *-bn*, she too refers to Pedersen. I do not think **at-mn* would yield Arm. *azbn*. For an earlier connection of *azbn* with Gr. *δίασμου* comparing the ending *-bn* with that of *skizbn* see Mariès/Meillet apud Minassian 1978-79: 21.

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)zbā-* ‘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.vv. *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.

However, there seems to be no evidence for an independent **Hos-*, allegedly reflected in CLuw. *hāš-* ‘bone’ (see Hamp 1984; Starke 1990: 120-124; Kloekhorst 2008: 325f), so one should perhaps reconstruct **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; Ačařyan 1947: 227] and Sebastia [HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 367b]. However, we do not know

whether the word was part of the weaving terminology of any Iranian language. Furthermore, *azbn* does not refer to 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-ŋ*. 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 HAB s.vv. *ost* and *ostayn*.

If the Khotanese form is indeed related, we are probably dealing with an innovation by means of the determinative **-b^h-* shared by Armenian and Iranian; cf., apart from *skiz-b-* 'beginning' (see above), also *det-b* vs. *det-in* 'yellow', *surb* 'pure' (see s.vv.). Since PIE **H₂eb^h-* 'to weave' (cf. Skt. *vabh-* 'to bind, fetter', MPers. *waf-* 'to weave', etc.) seems to be an enlargement of the synonymous **He/ou-* (see Gamkrelidze / Ivanov 1984: 581-585; Klimov 1989: 27; Mallory / Adams 1997: 572a), one may compare the **-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*, GDPI *azder-a-c* 'thigh' (Bible+), 'shoulder-(blade), etc.' (Grigor Narekac'i, Nersēs Lambronac'i, etc.).

●ETYM The connection with Skt. *sákthi-* n. 'thigh' (RV+), Gr. *ἰσχίον* n. 'hip-joint, in which the thigh turns', etc., which involves a metathesis **sa- > as-* and a 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 one of an uncertain origin.

Jahukyan (1983: 86-87; 1987: 142, 184) derives *azdr* from PIE **Host-* 'bone' (cf. Gr. *ὄσφῶς*, *-ύος* f. 'loin or loins, lower part of the back', etc.; see s.v. *oskr* 'bone'), reconstructing **ost-d^h-ur > *ozd^hur > azdr*. Olsen (1999: 149) independently suggests the same etymology, but points out that "the formal divergences are not easily overcome". The determinative **-d^h-* is not corroborated 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-d^h-*. Further, compare *asr* 'fleece' and *tarr* 'element' (see s.vv.). Hamp (1984: 200) derives Gr. *ὄσφῶς* from **Host-b^hu(H)-* with *φύω* 'to beget, grow, etc.'.

The PIE origin of the Armenian and Greek words and their appurtenance to the PIE word for 'bone' is improbable. One may rather assume a Mediterranean-Pontic substratum word **H(o)sd^hu-* or the like, though this is uncertain, too.

*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 [Gabikean 1952: 42], Alaškert [Madat'yan 1985: 206a], Svedia, etc. [HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 8a]. In a fairy-tale from Goris, the village of Yayji, recorded in Yerevan in 1969 (HŽHek' 7, 1979: 507^{L11}): *min aznavur arč* 'a giant bear'.

S. Avagyan (1978: 176a) records *aznaur* 'a mythical giant man' in Arčak (close to Van). On the road to Arčak – Van, there is a heap of stones called *Aznavuri kerezman* "grave of Aznavur", a few meters wide and as large 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, Abelyan (1899: 71, 71₁) points out that the word *aznawur* denotes “die Urbewohner Armeniens” and is equivalent to *dew*.

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

In Gomer, *aznahur* is recorded [HayLezBrbBar 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) [Gabiřlean 1912: 233].

●ETYM According to Ačaryan (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 fact that, in most of the dialects, Arm. **azn-awor* is not semantically identical with Georg. *aznauri* ‘nobleman’ and is widespread in Armenian dialects, most of which are 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 improbable.

The Armenian and Georgian words may be independent borrowings from Iranian, but it seems more probable that Arm. **azn-awor* ‘huge man, giant; supernatural being, spirit’ is not related to Georg. *aznauri* ‘nobleman’ or to the other forms [though a contamination is possible; cf. also *Aznanc’-ordi* ‘valiant, brave man’ from *azn*, see SasCř 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 *anjnävur* ‘animate, living, corporeal’, Moks *anjnavur*, *anjnahur* ‘animate; giant, mighty’, Aparan *anjnahur* ‘a mythical being’, Gomer *aznahur* ‘giant’. Of these forms, Ačaryan (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 *anjnävur* ‘animate, living, corporeal’, Moks *anjnavur*, *anjnahur* ‘animate; giant, mighty’, etc., belongs with 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. *jān-vār* ‘living, alive; animal; a fierce beast’, *jān-āvar* ‘alive; an imprudent man’ from *jān* ‘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.). Ačaryan (1902: 216) treats Polis and other forms as borrowings 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. *jān-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; Bahramyan 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‘ srboc‘*, 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 and by lexicographers. The occurrence of ‘Pleiades’ beside *Hayk* ‘Orion’ is very common, cf. Job 9.9, 38.31; Amos 5.8 – *bazmastetk‘* and *Hayk*, next to each other. In the dialect of Van this relationship has created an interesting compound, viz. *Xek‘-bazük‘* (perhaps to be corrected as *päzüik‘*) ‘Orion/Hayk and Pleiades’ (see Ter-Mkrtč‘yan 1970: 182-183) < **Hayk-k‘* + *Bazük-k‘*. About the association ‘Orion-Hayk’ in general, see A. Petrosyan 1991: 102-103; 1991a: 121; 1997: 22-23. On Orion and Pleiades, see 3.1.1-2, 3.1.4.

In *Baḡgirk‘ hayoc‘* (see Amalyan 1975: 8^{Nr128}), *alawun*, var. *alasan*, is rendered by *bazmastt* or *bazum astt* or erroneously *bazmatał* (cf. HAB 1: 9, 92a) ‘Pleiades’.

Obviously here belongs also MidArm. *alawun-k‘* attested in Yovhan Varagac‘i and interpreted as ‘heavenly angels’ in MijHayBař 1, 1987: 18a: *Duk‘ alawunk‘ erknic‘ Hayoc‘ ijēk‘ i dašt ənd is i koc* ‘You, *alawun-k‘* of the heaven of Armenia, come down to mourn with me’.

●ETYM No etymology in HAB 1: 92a. Ĵahukyan (1963a: 86; cf. 1987: 270, with some reservation) connects the word to *atawni* ‘dove’ deriving both from **alau-* ‘white, shiny’ and comparing also **albho-*, read **h₂elb^ho-*. This etymology is uncertain, since the only (cited) evidence for **-au-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, first: *-l-* instead of *-t-* is not explained; second, the origin of *-s-* remains obscure; third, *atawni* ‘dove’ is a derivative 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 apud HAB), 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. *purí-*, etc.). It is remarkable that the Iranian (YAv. API f *paoiriiaēiniias* < **paruijainī-*, NPers. *parvīn*, etc.) and the Greek (*Πλειάδες*) names seem to have been based on the same PIE word. For a discussion and other opinions I refer to Bartholomae 1904: 876; 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; 2002: 55₁₉₂). 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 *alawni* ‘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* ‘ is an *n*-stem like *harawunk* ‘arable land’ (q.v.). The *-s-* is perhaps from a parallel form in the suffix **-ko-* by regular palatalization of **k* after **u*, cf. s.vv. *araws* (NB: next to the above-mentioned *harawunk*), *boys*, 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. *purí-*, 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 **pl_hu-ūer-o-* (see Zimmer 1997: 354-355) seems particularly interesting. If containing the heteroclitic suffix **-ūer/n-*, it matches *alawunk* ‘ and helps to reconstruct a paradigm identical with that of *harawunk* ‘, cf. Gr. *ἄρουρα* f. ‘tilled or arable land; pl. corn-lands, fields’, etc.

At last, one might also take into consideration Karst’s (1948: 79₂) brief note in which he compares *alaw(s)unk* ‘ with Turan. Pers. *alūs, ulus* ‘troupe, foule’. This is uncertain, however.

alewr, aliwr, GDSg *aler* (later also *o*-stem) ‘flour’ (Bible+).

●DIAL Ubiquitous in the dialects [HAB 1: 94b].

●ETYM Belongs with the family of *atam* ‘to grind’ (q.v.), cf. especially Gr. *ἄλευρον* n., mostly in pl. *ἄλευρα*, also *ἄλευρος* f. ‘flour’ [Hübschmann 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 the loss of *w* (see 2.1.33.1). Eichner (ibid. 153-154) derives *aliwr* ‘flour’, *atbiwr* ‘well, spring’, etc. from nominative **-ēw₁*, assuming a subsequent development *-iwr* > *-ewr* analogically after the genitive *-er*, which in turn has

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. *albewr* and 2.1.33.1 for more detail. He concludes that the *-e-* of *albewr* 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 item as '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 could 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, namely **h₂leh₁-uʷ*. 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).

ali-k'₁ (plurale tantum), *ea*-stem: GDPI *ale-a-c'*, AblPI *y-ale-a-c'*, IPI *ale-a-w-k'* (Bible+) 'waves'; **ali**, GDSg *al(w)-o-y* (Paterica) 'wave' (Book of Chries, Ephrem, Seal of Faith, etc.); see also s.v. **ali-k'₂** 'grey hair'.

●DIAL Ararat *alik* 'wave' [HAB 1: 94a]. The old singular *ali* is seen in folklore (see Amatuni 1912: 6b; cf. MijHayBař 1, 1987: 18b for MidArm.). The ClArm. compound *alēkoc-* 'rise in waves, surge, billow' is reflected in Łarabař *alākocnə* (Lisic'yan 1981: 67a, in the context of the sea at the 7th heaven); Ararat *alēkorcum* (Nawasardeanc' 1903: 6a), cf. *alēkorcumn* attested in Awgustinos Bařec'i (HAB 2: 616a).

●ETYM Arm. *ali-k'*, *ea*-stem 'waves' and 'grey hair' derives from PIE **pel-* 'grey' and is connected with Gr. *πολιός*, fem. *πολιάς* 'whitish grey (of hair and of foaming seas)', Myc. *po-ri-wa*, Skt. *palitá-* 'grey, grey of old age, aged', MPers. *pīr* 'old, aged' < **parya-*, Kurd. *pēl* 'wave, billow', Lat. *pallidus* 'pale', *palleō* 'to be/look pale', etc. (Bugge 1889: 9; Meillet 1894: 154; Hübschmann 1897: 412, 520; HAB 1: 93b; Ernout/Meillet 1959: 476b; Pokorny 1959: 804; Mallory/Adams 1997: 641-642).

The problem of the vocalism (**pol-* or **pl-*) of the Armenian word is much debated (see Grammont 1918: 223; Godel 1975: 72; Considine 1978-79: 357, 360; Greppin 1983: 263; 1986: 287; 1989: 165-166, 168; C. Arutjunjan 1983: 259-260; Saradževa 1986: 30-31; Ravnæs 1991: 11-12, 92; Witczak 1999: 176; Olsen 1999: 496-498; Beekes 2003: 156, 171). It has been suggested that the initial **h-* of the

dialectal **halewor* ‘grey-haired, old man’ is a relic of the IE initial **p-* (see HAB 1: 94a; H. Muradyan 1982: 266, 277; 1982a; Greppin 1982-83; Kortlandt 1983: 9-11 = 2003: 39-40; Weitenberg 1986: 90-91). Polomé (1980: 27) assumes a merger of PArm. **hali-* < **plj-* and **ol-* < **pol-*.

One may suggest the following tentative scenario: Arm. *ali-k’*, *-ea* derives from QIE **polieh₂-* (cf. Gr. *πολῖαι* which stands for Arm. *alik’* e.g. in Proverbs 20.29) > PArm. **(p)olīya-* > **aliya-*, with loss of **p-* before **-o-* as in *otn* ‘foot’ from **pod-* (vs. *het* from **ped-*) and the development **-o-* > *-a-* in a pretonic open syllable (2.1.3). The form possibly betrays an earlier paradigm **pól-ih₂-* : **pl-iéh₂-* > **foli-/(f)ali-* : **faliya-* > **al(i)-* : **haliya-*. From this we arrive at an analogical nominative *ali-k’* vs. obl. *alea-* with a residual oblique *h-* reflected in **halewor*.

ali-k’₂, GDPl *ale-a-c’* (Bible+), IPl *ale-a-w-k’* (Yovhannēs Drasxanakertc’i, etc.) ‘grey hair; old age’ (Bible+); **ali** (Yovhannēs Erzknac’i), AccSg *y-alw-o-y* (John Chrysostom) ‘grey hair’; **alewor**, *a-*stem: GDPl *alewor-a-c’* ‘grey-haired; old man’ (Movsēs Xorenac’i, Philo, John Chrysostom, etc.); **ate/ē-bek** in Movsēs Xorenac’i (see below) and Yovhannēs Drasxanakertc’i (NHB 1: 39a).

A few textual illustrations: *p’arġk’ ceroc’ alik’* : *δόξα δὲ πρεσβυτέρων πολῖαι* (Proverbs 20.29); *ew əst kargi patuec’er vasn aleac’d* “and you appropriately honored [us] for these white hairs” (Efišē, Chapter 7, Ter-Minasyan 1989: 342^{L3}; transl. Thomson 1982: 217).

In a *kafa* to the Alexander Romance (H. Simonyan 1989: 76^{L19}): *cer aleawk’ ew šun mtawk’* lit. “old with grey hair, and dog with mind”.

The compound **ate-bek**, with a dark *-t-*, containing *bek-* ‘to break, cut, split’ is attested in e.g. Movsēs Xorenac’i 1.24 (1913=1991: 72^{L17}; transl. Thomson 1978: 114): *xarteāšs ays ew atebek cayriw herac’* “blond with grey-flecked hair”.

●DIAL The word *alik’* ‘grey hair’ has been preserved in phrases and proverbs from T’iflis (*alik’ə eresi vra tal* “to show signs of discontent”) and a number of western dialects, such as Xarberd and Sebastia (e.g. *alik’n anargel* lit. ‘to disgrace one’s grey hair’), often in apposition with *mawruk’* ‘beard’, cf. *alik’-mərūk’ mek ənel* “to scold an old man ignoring his grey hair and beard”, lit. “to make one’s grey hair and beard one”; *ver t’k’nem alik’s ε*, *var t’k’nem mərūk’s ε* “if I spit upwards, it is my grey hair, if downward, it is my beard” [HAB 1: 94a; Hut’Sam 1895: 354b^{L19}, 355^{L9}; Gabikean 1952: 43; Łanalanyan 1960: 74a^{L18}]. Note also *alik’* ‘beard’ in Turkish-speaking Adana [HAB 1: 94a].

The word *alewor* ‘old man’ is widespread in the dialects, practically always with an initial *h-*: Hamšen *halivor*, Muš *halvor*, Akn, Xarberd *halvər* [HAB 1: 94a], Dersim *alevər*, *hal(ε)vər* [Bałramyan 1960: 71], Tigranakert *hālvur* [Haneyan 1978: 181a], Zeyt’un *hālvüy*, Hačən *halivoy*, Svedia *hālivür* [Ačařyan 2003: 295, 558], Van *xalivor* [Ačařyan 1952: 242], Moks *xālvur* [Orbeli 2002: 241], Ararat *alevər*, *halivor* [Markosyan 1989:296a], Łarabał *hālėvur*, *hilivč/ur*, *hilivæer* [Davt’yan 1966: 300], Agulis *hlāvür*, gen. *hāləvāri* [Ačařean 1935: 330], Marała *xālvir* [Ačařean 1926: 381], etc. [HAB 1: 94a].

●ETYM See s.v. *ali-k’₁* ‘wave’.

aloj ‘she-kid’ (Bible+).

●DIAL Van *aloc* [Ačaṙyan 1952: 242], Moks *alüč* (Xrə/eb *alüč*), gen. *alüč*-*u*, pl. *älüč*-*tir* ‘неродившая двухгодовая коза’ [Orbeli 2002: 198], Šatax *aloc* ‘*mayrac*’*u ayč* = a would-be-mother goat’ [M. Muradyan 1962: 191a], Ozim *alüč* ‘two-year-old female kid’ [Hovsep’yan 1966: 234-235]. Svedia *ilecyč* ‘kid’ [Ačaṙyan 2003: 369, 387, 558]. For Musa-leř, Gyozyalyan 2001: 61 records *ulič* ‘she-kid under one year’ vs. *ul* ‘a newborn kid’.

●ETYM No satisfactory etymology (see HAB 1: 95b; Olsen 1999: 196). See s.v. *ul* ‘kid’.

axaz, GDPI *axaz-a-c* ‘ermine, mustela alba’.

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

Nmanin ořaxohk ‘*axazac*’, *ork* ‘*t’otun zink’eans əmbrnil yorsordac*’ *k’an t’ē šalaxil* “The righteous (people) resemble ermines, which prefer to let themselves be caught by hunters rather than to sin”. The source, that is K’ał. 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 ‘Ułegrut’iwn’, in the meaning ‘ermine-fur’; see Akinean 1936: 381^{L44}, 421 (citing the Dictionary of Step’anos Rošk’a, 17-18th cent.).

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

In my view, *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 the dialects, especially in the meaning ‘to lay eggs’; in the Eastern peripheries (T’iflis, Łarabał, Agulis, Ĵula, 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. *ājati*, Av. *azaiti*, Gr. *ἄγω* ‘to lead’, Lat. *ago*, etc. [Hübschmann 1896: 412^{Nr6}; HAB 1: 101-102] : PIE **h₂eǵ-* ‘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 (1983: 14; 1996a: 56 = 2003: 44, 118; see also Beekes 2003: 175, 182) derived *acem* from **h₂ǵ-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 **h₂eǵe/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-ājana-* ‘whip, stick for driving cattle’, Arm. *gawazan* ‘id.’ from Iranian, etc.).

See also s.v.v. *acu* ‘garden-bed’, *aṛac* ‘proverb’, *art* ‘cornfield’.

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

Sirach 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 Middle Armenian: GDPI *acu-o-c*’, AblPI *i yacuoc*’ [MijHayBaṛ 1, 1987: 21b; NHB 1: 21b]. See also below on the dialects of Cilicia and Svedia. The MidArm. 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 may therefore refer to ‘kitchen-garden’. The form *acuk*’ ‘kitchen-garden’ is totally identical 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 [Ačaṙyan 1947: 219], Dersim [Baṛamyān 1960: 71b], Zeyt’un [Ačaṙyan 2003: 295], the plural form has been generalized: **acu-k*’ ‘kitchen-garden’, which is attested in MidArm., in the 13th century (see above). Next to *ajuk*’, Zeyt’un also has pl. *ajvānak*’ [Ačaṙyan 2003: 152].

According to Ačaṙyan (HAB 1: 102b), Kesaria has *ajvik*’ ‘kitchen-garden’, although Ant’osyan (1961: 180) cites only *ajuk*’ ‘kitchen-garden’. The dialectal form *arcu(n)* recorded in NHB (1: 21b) is now confirmed by Nor Juṭa *arcu* [HayLezBrbBaṛ 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: NPI *aju-k*’, GDPI *ajv-ic*’ [Ačaṙyan 2003: 188]. The other classical words displaying such a paradigm are *baṭan-i-k*’ ‘baths’, *harsan-i-k*’ ‘wedding’, *vart-i-k*’ ‘trousers’ and *mawru-k*’ ‘beard’ (ibid.). All these words, except for *mawru-k*’ (GDPI *mawru-ac*’), have classical *-i-k*’ : GDPI *-eac*’. Since the classical diphthong *ea* regularly yields *i* in Zeyt’un (see Ačaṙyan 2003: 85), the classical GDPI *-eac*’ can be seen as directly continued by Zeyt’un GDPI *-ic*’. This would imply that the Zeyt’un word under discussion may presuppose an alternating paradigm *acu-(k)* : **acu-i-k*’. 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*). A theoretically possible paradigm would be NSg. **acú-i* (> class. *acu*), NPI **acu-i-* (> class. NPI **acu-i-k*’, GDPI **acu-eac*’).

One would perhaps prefer a simpler, analogical solution, particularly given that the word for ‘beard’ (ClArm. *mawru-k*’, *mawru-ac*’ : Zeyt’un *muyū-k*’, *muyv-ic*’) is irregular, too.¹ However, this word seems analogical after *acu-k*’ rather than other body-part terms, which in Zeyt’un display different GDPI endings, namely *-uc*’ and *-oc*’ (see Ačaṙyan 2003: 188). The Zeyt’un paradigm of *acu-k*’ can therefore be viewed as old. The reason for the analogical influence may 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.

¹ Postulating 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.

MidArm. GDAbIPI (*y*)*acuoc*‘ (see above) may be seen in Svedia / Musa-Ler, in the refrain of a famous dance-song (YušMusLer 1970: 222): *Ku gir ənnir eēcuc ‘ə, / ərkə nauṛ kir eēr cuc ‘ə* “She was coming out of the kitchen-garden, and there were two pomegranates in her bosom”.

●ETYM A derivative of *acem* ‘to bring; to lead; to move, etc.’ (q.v.) < PIE **h₂eǵ-*: Skt. *ājati*, Gr. *ἄγω* ‘lead’ (Il.), etc. [HAB 1: 101-102]. Arm. *acu* is directly compared with Gr. *ἄγνια*, pl. *ἄγνιαί* f. ‘street, road’ (Il.) and interpreted as a 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 *ἄγνια* and *ἄγω* is nothing more than popular etymology, probably overlying and obscuring an indigenous word”, see also Beekes 1998: 25 and his forthcoming dictionary (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 together.

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

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

In Lamentations 4.8, *acux* renders Greek *ἀσβόλη* ‘soot’. The passage reads as follows: *T‘xac ‘an k‘an zacux tesilk‘ iwreanc*‘ : *Ἐσκότασεν ὑπὲρ ἀσβόλην τὸ εἶδος αὐτῶν*. RevStBible has: “Now their visage is blacker than soot”. In the other attestations and in the dialects, the word mainly refers to ‘coal’.

In Agat‘angelos § 219 (1909=1980: 116^{L1f}), transl. Thomson 1976: 223; see also Norayr Biwzandac‘i 1911: 167): *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 *Arjkat-n* and *Arcut-n*, respectively; for a 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‘ šoṭac ‘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 a 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 or HAB s.v., although 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*. The underlying sorcery may be compared to the one applying *sew acux* “black coal”, which has survived in Akn up to the pre-Genocide period, as described in Čanikean 1895: 166; see also T‘orlak‘yan 1981: 147a on Hamšen.

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

In Baġirk‘ hayoc‘ (Amalyan 1975: 9^{Nr162}), *acux* is rendered by *gorceli* ‘coal’ (on this word see HAB 4: 646b), *mur* ‘soot’, and *anjot*. On the last word, 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 Baġramyan 1964: 185), Ararat *ánjot*, Nor Bayazet *anjox*, Hačən *anjot*. Note also Sasun *anjux* ‘coal, half-burnt wood’ [Petoyan 1954: 103; 1965: 443], and Łazax, etc. (see HayLezBrbBaġ 1, 2001: 63b, with textual illustrations). Apart from *ánjut* and *ánjot*, Łarabał has also *ánjotnə* [Davt’yan 1966: 301].

As reported by Ačāryan (HAB 1: 103a), the form *anjot* is attested in Ēfimērtē (17th cent.). He does not mention the testimony of Baġirk‘ 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 Hačən) dialects, one may take this as an example of affiliation of Baġirk‘ hayoc‘ with the Eastern dialects, especially Łarabał, etc. (H. Martirosyan 2008). Note that in an older lexicographic work (abbreviated as HinBġ), *acux* is glossed by *gorceli* and *mur* (see NHB 1: 21b), just as in Baġirk‘ hayoc‘; only *anjot* is missing. If indeed the original gloss did not include *anjot*, this form may have been added by the compiler/redactor of Baġirk‘ hayoc‘ (probably Eremia from Meġri), 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, namely *ánjot* and *ánjut*.

●ETYM Since Tērvišean and Müller (see HAB 1: 103a ; apud Minassian 1978-79: 22; cf. Hübschmann 1877: 21, without the Armenian form), connected with Skt. *āngāra-* m. ‘coal’ (RV+), Lith. *anglis* m. ‘coal’, OCS *oglb* 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, explicitly stating that the original form was *acut* and ascribing the final *-x* to the probable influence of *cux* ‘smoke’ (see also Ĵahukyan 1987: 183). Kētikēan (1905), too, treats *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 to the fact that the modern literary

language has adopted it. Saradževa (1986: 46) deals with *acux* and dial. **anjoł*, but does not even mention *acut*.

Mēnēvišean (apud Kētikean 1905: 347-348; see also Ačāryan 1967: 127) draws a comparison with Russ. *úgol* and Germ. *Kohle* ‘coal’. Pedersen (apud Kētikean 1905: 348) is more inclined towards Germ. *Kohle* and Ir. *gúal* ‘coal’ than to the Sanskrit and Balto-Slavic forms. In this case, however, the initial *a-* of Arm. *acut/x* remains unexplained, unless one postulates PIE **Hǵ(e/o)ul-* (Witzak 2003: 83-84). One might assume a contamination of the two words for ‘coal’, which would explain the appearance of *-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) puts *acux* in her list of unknown words. Greppin (1983) did not include the word in his etymological dictionary.

The connection with Skt. *áṅgāra-*, Lith. *anglis*, etc. ‘coal’ seems very plausible. The scepticism of scholars is understandable, since the expected Armenian form should have been **ank(V)ł*. In order to solve the phonological problems, Saradževa (1986: 46) assumes a by-form of the PIE root with **-ǵ-* or **-ǵʷ-*. Ĵahukyan (1987: 141, 183) suggests **angoli-* > **angiol-*, with a metathesis of the *-i-*. This view cannot be maintained on the following grounds: (1) **-ǵi-* would have rather yielded *-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 involving the development **HNǵʷu-* > PArm. **anʷkʷu-* > **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. *agnī-* m., etc. ‘fire’ belong to this PIE word, they may be derived from **h₁ngʷni-* (cf. Derksen 2002-03: 10; **h₁* in view of the laryngeal colouring in Latin), whereas the Sanskrit and Balto-Slavic forms would reflect a full grade **h₁ongʷ-(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 **h₁óngʷ-ōl*, gen. **h₁ngʷ-l-ós*.

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, a secondary thematization could be assumed based on the nominative: **h₁(o)ngʷ-ōl-o-*, cf. Skt. *áṅgāra-* (although the Sanskrit form may reflect both **-ol-o-* and **-ōl-o-*; for **-ol-* cf. Gr. *ἄσβολος*, *ἄσβόλη* ‘soot’, see s.vv. *ačiwñ* ‘ash’, *askn* ‘ruby’). This is attractive since it helps explain the loss of *-w-* by the pretonic position: PArm. **a(w)cút-o-* > *acut*, cf. *ačem* ‘to grow’ < PArm. **aug-ǰé-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 Ačāryan (2003: 139) states for Hačən *anjoł*, drawing a comparison with cases such as *masur* ‘sweet-brier’ > Hačən *mansuy*, *mec* ‘big’ > Zeyt’un *minj*, *šak’ar* ‘sugar’ > Zeyt’un *šank’əy*, etc. Also, Šamaxi *hanjuł* is listed with examples of *n*-epenthesis [Bałramyan 1964: 65]. For Łarabał *ánju/ł* (< *acut*), Davt’yan (1966: 77) cites the example of *koriz* ‘stone or

hard seed of fruits' > Լարաթ *kori/enj* in Martakert and north of Step'anakert vs. *korez* and *koreznə* elsewhere. However, this example is ambiguous since it could have resulted from **koriz-n*.

Nevertheless, **anjot* is present in the Eastern (Լարաթ, Ararat, etc.) and extremely South-Western (Sasun and Hačən) dialects and may therefore be archaic. Jahukyan (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 may have resulted from a 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 could be epenthetic, albeit old. Besides, one may also assume an influence of *xanj-ot* 'half-burnt wood' (from *xanj-* 'to scorch, singe', q.v.), attested from the Bible onwards and dialectally present in the extreme NW (Trapizon, Hamšen, etc.), SW (Syria), and SE (Լարաթ, etc.).

If **anjot* is original, *xanj-ot* may be treated as an analogical formation after it. Compare also the discussion s.v. *awji-k* 'collar'.²

akanj, *i*-stem: LocSg *γ-akanj-i* (Ephrem), ISg *akanj-i-w* (Paterica), IPI *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: NPI *akanj-k*', API *akanj-s*, GDPI *akanj-a-c*', IPI *akanj-a-w-k*' (abundant in the Bible) 'ear'.

●DIAL Dialectally ubiquitous, mostly with metathesis of the nasal: **ankaj* [HAB 1: 104b]. On this and on Muš *anganj*, see 2.1.29. With unclear *-o/u-* instead of the second *-a-*: Լարաթ *anguč*, *anjug*, Šamaxi *angəj*, Juła *angoč*, etc. Unchanged: Van-group *akanj* [Orbeli 2002: 199; Ačarıyan 1952: 242; M. Muradyan 1962: 191a], Akn *agənj*, pl. *agəž-vi* [HAB, *ibid.*]. The *-vi* is originally dual (see s.v. *cung-k* 'knee').

●ETYM Arm. *akanj(-k)* is originally the dual of *unkn* 'ear' (q.v.), and the *j* is treated as taken from *ač* 'eye' (also a dual), with voicing after nasal [Meillet 1903: 147; 1936: 84; HAB 1: 104b]; further, see Mariès/Meillet apud Minassian 1978-79: 22.

Pisani (1950: 167) assumes **ousen-g^wη* > *unkn* vs. **ausη-q^w-ī* > *akanj*, with the dual **-ī*. Others directly posit **-n-ih₁*, 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-ih₁* (cf. e.g. Eichner 1978: 147₁₇, 151) would yield Arm. **(h)aganj*. The same holds for **ə₃ws-nt-γə₁* [= **h₃ws-nt-ih₁*], reconstructed by Witczak (1999: 175). Lindeman (1980; 1982: 39) assumes **awsη-a* (cf. Gr. *οὔατα* < **owsη-t-a*) > Arm. **aw(h)an-a* + *-č* 'from *ač* 'eye' with subsequent voicing after nasal. Arriving at **aganj*, he, basing himself upon the idea of voiced aspirates in Armenian, derives *akanj* from **aganj^h* < **ag^hanj^h* through dissimilation of aspirates. For other proposals/references, see Jahukyan 1982: 222₆₀; Rasmussen 1989: 158-159, 170-171₁₆; Viredaz 2001-02: 29-30, 30₂.

None of these solutions seems entirely satisfactory, and the form *akanj-k*' is considered to be unclear by many scholars: Jahukyan 1982: 119; Greppin 1983: 264;

² I wonder if Arm. *unj* 'soot' (q.v.) could be connected with these words, deriving from **h₁ong^w-iV-*.

Kortlandt 1985b: 10 = 2003: 58. Beekes (2003: 189) notes that the $*h_2-$ of $*h_2us-n$ ($> un-kn$ ‘ear’) “perhaps lives on in pl. *ak-anjk*’, whose further origin is unclear”.

I suggest the following solution: $*h_2(e/o)us-$ $>$ PArm. $*ag-$ (cf. s.vv. *ayg* ‘morning’ and *ēg* ‘female’) + suffix $-k\eta$ (as in *akn* ‘eye’) + dual $*-ih_1 = *agkanj > *ak(k)anj > akanj$.

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 $*q$ ‘wanž’ ‘ear’ from Kartv. (unattested) $*qwar-$, cf. Megr. *quž*, etc. He (1975: 352) also assumes that Łarabał *anguč*, etc., with $-u-$, reflects the labial $-w-$ of the Kartvelian form.³ This is unconvincing and was rightly rejected by Ačariyan (HAB 1: 104b). The resemblance of *akanj* with some ECauc forms is probably accidental, too (Jahukyan 1987: 611).

akn (singulative), gen. *akan*, instr. *akam-b* (Bible+), loc. *y-akin* (Yovhan Mandakuni); pl. $<$ dual $ač$ ‘-k’ (q.v.) ‘eye’ (Bible+); **akn**, *an*-stem: GDSg *akan*, NPl *akan-k*‘ (also *akun-k*‘), APl *akan-s*, GDPl *akan-c*‘, IPl *akam-b-k*‘ ‘gem, precious stone, jewel’ (Bible+); **akn**, *an*-stem: GDSg *akan*, AblSg *y-akan-ē*, NPl *akun-k*‘, APl *akun-s*, AblPl *y-akan-s* ‘source, spring’ (Bible+).

For the paradigm of *akn* and $ač$ ‘-k’ and a morphological discussion, see Hübschmann 1894: 115; Meillet 1913: 56; Godel 1975: 33; Schmitt 1981: 104-107; Olsen 1999: 170-171. For a discussion of compounds such as *areg-akn* ‘sun’ and *p‘ayl-akn* ‘lightning’, see Meillet 1927a; Mariès/Meillet apud Minassian 1978-79: 23; Benveniste 1965; Watkins 1974a: 10; Weitenberg apud Beekes 1987: 18-19. For an extensive treatment on the morphology and semantics of *akn* and $ač$ ‘-k’ in Middle Armenian I refer to Weitenberg 1995: 128-132.

The compound *akn-a-včit* ‘crystal-pure, limpid’ is attested twice in T‘ovmay Arcruni [Ananun]: 4.4 and 4.7 (V. M. Vardanyan 1985: 428^{L-1}, 450^{L-13}; transl. Thomson 1985: 340, 353 [here: 4.3 and 4.6]): *əst nmanut‘ean erkuc‘ aknavčit atberc‘ merjakayic‘* : “like two fountains near each other” (in this translation, *aknavčit* is omitted); *atbiwr aknavčit* “a spring of crystal-pure water”.

●DIAL Widespread in the dialects mostly in the meanings ‘source, fountain-head’, ‘gem, precious stone, jewel’, ‘pit of ground-hearth’, ‘wheel’, etc. [HAB 1: 108-109].

The meaning ‘eye’ is rare: Agulis *čkan*, compos. *əknə-* or *əkná-* (in C‘fna: *əšk < ač*‘-k’), Łarabał *əkə*, *əkənə* [HAB 1: 108-109; Ačarean 1935: 21, 331, 336; Davt‘yan 1966: 302]; Karčewan *əkənə* ‘eye; division, share’ [H. Muradyan 1960: 209a]; in Salmast: only in the curse formula *ak-d kurná* “may your eye become blind” [HAB 1: 109a].

Further data can be taken from derivatives: Xarberd $*akn-ik$ ‘fried eggs (unbeaten)’ (see Ačarean 1913: 64a) = *akn* ‘eye’ + diminutive $-ik$ (semantically cf. Russ. *glazún‘ya* ‘fried eggs’ from *glaz* ‘eye’). Note also Zeyt‘un $*akner$ (though here the eggs are beaten). For *atber-akn*, GDSg $-akan$ ‘fountain-head, source’ $>$ Bulanəx *h‘atbərak*, *h‘atbərakan*, etc., see s.v. *atbewr* ‘spring’.

In all the dialects, except for Łarabał, Agulis, etc. (see above), the final $-n$ has dropped, but is preserved in derivatives. In some dialect, e.g. Van, Šatax, Moks, the nasal is seen in oblique cases: GSg *akan*, AblSg *akn-ən* or *akn-ic*‘, NPl *akn-er*, etc. [Ačariyan 1952: 124; M. Muradyan 1962: 102; Orbeli 2002: 199]. For textual

³ Klimov (1998: 246) reconstructs GZ $*qur-$.

illustrations of Moks AblSg *akn-en* ‘‘from the fountain-head’’ cf. two proverbs in Orbeli 2002: 124^{Nr206f}.

In a Gavaš version of the epic ‘‘Sasna crer’’ told by Zardar Ter-Mxit‘aryan (SasCr 1, 1936: 881-882), one finds *ak*, pl. *ak-n-er* as a designation of a sacrificial implement on which the idols are placed, and with which the neck of the victim was cut. The word is identified with *ak* ‘wheel’ [SasCr 2/2, 1951: 965b].

●ETYM Derives from the PIE word for ‘eye’, **h₃(o)k^w-*. For the forms and references, see s.v. *ač‘-k‘* ‘eyes’. The vocalism and the *-k-* instead of *-k‘-* are disputed.

The form *ak-n* has been explained as **ak‘* + singulative *-n* (see Winter 1965: 104; 1986: 20-21; cf. K. Schmidt 1987: 37-38). For a further discussion, see Klingenschmitt 1982: 168; Greppin 1983: 265; 1988-89: 478; also Rasmussen 1989: 170-171₁₆.

Kortlandt (1985b: 9 = 2003: 57-58) derives *akn* and *ač‘-* from PIE AccSg **ok^w-m* and Ndu **ok^w-iH*, pointing out that ‘‘the initial *a-* is the phonetic reflex of *o-* in open syllables <...> and represents both the *o*-grade and the zero-grade vocalism of the root’’, and the expected NSg form was **ok‘*’. Beekes (2003: 187) assumes **h₃k^w-* because *akn* has no *h-* (noting that it is another example of a prothetic vowel), but does not exclude **h₃ok^w-*. He (ibid.) points out that the *a-* of *akn* was taken from the oblique case, cf. gen. *akan*.

On the other hand, the problem of the unaspirated *-k-* has been explained through expressive or hypocoristic gemination seen also in Gr. *ὄκκον* ‘eye’ (Grammont 1918: 239; Mariès/Meillet apud Minassian 1978-79: 22-23). This idea is plausible, but in Armenian the gemination is more likely caused by the suffix *-kn* (cf. Jahukyan 1982: 114, noting also Gr. *ὄκκον* ‘eye’). The same suffix is also seen in *armukn* ‘elbow’, *mukn* ‘mouse’, *unkn* ‘ear’, etc. (see s.vv.).

I conclude that Arm. *akn* is composed as PArm. **ak^h-* (< **h₃k^w-*) + *-kon* (cf. Gr. *ὄκκον* ‘eye’, Arm. *un-kn* ‘ear’, etc.) = **ak^hkon* > **ak(k)n* > *akn*. For the phonological development of such geminates, see s.vv. *akanj* ‘ear’, *ak‘atal* ‘rooster’. An older reflex of **-k^w-* in this etymon may be seen, according to my etymological suggestion, in *y-awn-k‘*, *a-stem*, *i-stem* ‘eyebrows’ (q.v.).

akn ‘source, spring’ (see s.v. *akn* ‘eye’).

●ETYM Witczak (1999: 176) compares Arm. *akn* ‘spring, source’ with Celtic **abon* ‘river’ from IE **ag^won-*. This is gratuitous since *akn* ‘spring’ clearly derives from *akn* ‘eye’ (q.v.).

akut‘ ‘cookstove’, attested in Vardan Barjrberdc‘i (13-14th cent.), Canon Law, and Yaismawurk‘ (AblSg *y-akut‘-ē*). In Baġgirk‘ hayoc‘ (see Amalyan 1975: 141^{Nr112}), *akut‘* renders *xaroyk* ‘campfire’. 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 Ačāryan (HAB 1: 110a) only cites dialect records from Ĵuła, P‘ambak, and Šamaxi. Melri and Areš must be added here [Ałayan 1954: 260b; Lusenc‘ 1982: 195b]. The word also seems to be found in dialects of the Van-group: Šatax *h‘angyüt‘* ‘= *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 be derived from **y-angut*‘. The same holds true for Van, if the actual form has an initial *ä-*; 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; Ačaryan 1952: 101.

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

●ETYM No etymological attempt has been recorded in HAB.

Ĵahukyan (1967: 151) lists *akut*‘ among words showing no consonant shift, linking it with the PIE word for ‘oven’: **Huk^v*: OIc. *ofn*, Gr. *ἰπνός*, etc. Greppin (1983: 265) presents the entry in 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. *aúhns* ‘oven’, Skt. *ukhá* ‘cooking pot’. However, this looks highly improbable, since the formal problems associated therewith are insurmountable. For another IE etymology, see Witczak 2003: 84. Ĵahukyan (1987: 472) draws a comparison with Akkad. *akukūtu* ‘half-burnt wood’, considering the resemblance as doubtful or accidental.

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

at, *i*-stem: GDSg *at-i*, ISg *at-i-w* (Bible+) ‘salt’; **at-i** ‘salty’ (Bible+); late and dial. **an-at-i** ‘not salty’; **y-atem** ‘to salt’ (Bible+); cf. also **at-u** ‘sweet’ (Movsēs Xorenac‘i, Book of Chries, etc.), see HAB 1: 115-116.

●DIAL The forms *at* ‘salt’ and *an-at-i* ‘not salty’ are dialectally ubiquitous [HAB 1: 116b].

●ETYM Since Petermann and Windischmann, derived from the PIE word for ‘salt’, cf. Gr. *ἄλς*, Lat. *sāl*, OCS *solb*, etc. (see Hübschmann 1897: 414; HAB 1: 116). See s.v. *at* ‘salt’ for more details.

atāxin, *o*-stem, *a*-stem; note also NPI *atāxn-ay-k*‘, API *atāxn-ay-s*, GDPI *atāxn-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 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; cf. Mariès/Meillet apud Minassian 1978-79: 24) 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) draws a connection with Lat. *alō* ‘to nurse, nourish’, etc., positing IE **(h₂)/h-k-ih₁no-* with the complex diminutive suffix (cf. Germ. **-ikīno-* in Germ. *Lämmchen*, Engl. *lambkin*, etc.) and interpreting Arm. *-x-* from **-h-k-* by means of “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-ahhe* ‘household’ / ‘хозяйское’ > *allae* ‘Herr, Herrin’ or Urart. **alāhə* > *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. *alahhinu(m)* ‘miller’ (see Ĵahukyan 1987: 472) and Hitt. *alhuesra-* ‘eine Priesterin bzw. Kultfunktionärin’, etc. [van Windekens 1980: 40], and *atx* – with Arab. *ahl* ‘family, tribe, people’ (see Ĵahukyan 1987: 486). I wonder if the word in question has any relationship 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-hhinə* ‘housekeeper’ > Akkad. *allah(h)innu* also ‘a kind of serving girl of the temple personnel’, Aram. *ləhentā* ‘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 Ĵahukyan 1967: 121) going back to Hurrian and/or Urartian (D’jakonov) is the best solution. For the semantic development, cf. OPers. *māniya-* n. ‘household slave(s)’ from **māna-* ‘house’: OAv. *dāmāna-* 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-*“. This word is **garda-* ‘Diener, Hausgesinde, οἰκέτης’ > Bab. *gardu*, Aram. *grd*’, in Elamitic transliteration *kurtaš*, cf. YAv. *gərəda-* m. ‘house of daēvic beings’, Pahl. *gāl* [g’] coll. ‘the gang, the villeins labouring on the estates of the kings, the satraps, the magnates, etc.’, Skt. *grhā-* 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 *kurtaš* see also Funk 1990: 9ff. This brings us to another 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. *ataxin* is not probable.

atalak, *a*-stem: GDSg *atalak-i*, ISg *atalak-a-w* (frequent in the Bible) ‘shouting’; *atalakem* ‘to shout’ (Bible+); dial. **atal-*; interjection *atē* (Bible+).

●DIAL Zeyt’un *ataləg* [Ačaryan 2003: 296]; reshaped: Ararat *atal-ank* ‘cry, lamentation, shout’ [HAB 1: 119a], according to Amatuni (1913: 17b) – ‘curse, scold’. The original verbal root **atal-* has been preserved in Axalc’xa *atalel* ‘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 to connect the Armenian words 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: Ĵahukyan 1987: 111 (cf. 447, 451).

As is pointed out by Olsen (1999: 251₁₁₉), the complete formation of *atatak*, *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, GDPl *jat(a)c* ‘-ac’. This form is represented in NHB 2: 669b as a dialectal form. It is widespread in the dialects (see below).

See also s.v. *atawri*.

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

There are also forms with *-an-* and *-ac-*: T’avriz *atanal*, Agulis *atānil*, C’ħna *atānal*, Suč’ava *axc’el*, Ğodost’o *axc’el*. According to Ačarıyan (HAB 1: 118b), these forms arose in order to distinguish the verb for ‘to grind’ from *atem* ‘to salt’ (cf. Agulis *ätıl* [Ačarean 1935: 332], etc.). Then (ibid.), in Łarabał, the opposite process has taken place: next to *ätıl* ‘to grind’, *atem* ‘to salt’ has been replaced by the compounded verbs *ätav ānil* (ISg of *at* ‘salt’ + ‘to do, make’) and *atə nil* ‘to put into salt(-water)’.

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

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

●ETYM Since 1852 (Ayvazovsk’i; see HAB), connected with Gr. ἀλέω ‘to grind’ (probably an athematic present), MInd. *ātā* ‘flour’, Av. *aša-* (< **arta-*) ‘ground = gemahlen’, NPers. *ārd* ‘flour’, etc. [HAB 1: 118a; Hübschmann 1897: 414; Meillet 1924: 4-6; Pisani 1950a; Mayrhofer EWAia 1: 108; Cheung 2007: 166]; for Hindi *ātā*, etc. see also Scheller 1965, for Pers. *ās*, etc.: Bläsing 2000: 35-36.

Meillet (1924: 5) assumes a present nasal infix (**-ln-* > Arm. *-t-*) 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 reconstructs **h₂lh₁-me* and **h₂lh₁-te* for 1PIPres *atam-k* ‘ and 2PIPres *atay-k* ‘, respectively, and for the former alternative he mentions Iran. **arna-*: Khot. *ārr-*, Pashto *anəl* ‘mahlen’. On the problem of **-ln-* > Arm. *-t-*, 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* > *barnam*) which has ousted an earlier athematic present formation"; see also Clackson 1994: 92, 219₂₈.

With *atam* : Gr. *ἄλέω* 'to grind' also belong *atawri* 'mill; female grinder (of corn)' : Gr. *ἄλετρις* 'woman who grinds corn' and *alewr* 'flour' : Gr. *ἄλευρον* 'id.' (see s.vv.). 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.vv. *atawri* and *alewr*, I basically agree with this view.

atač'em 'to supplicate, beseech; to pray' (Bible+); **atawt'**, *i*-stem 'prayer' (q.v.).

●DIAL Widespread in the dialects [HAB 1: 121-122]. The apparent nasal infix in T'iflis, Havarik', etc. *atanč'*- (Greppin 1983: 268) should be regarded as an epenthesis before the affricate, see 2.1.29, 2.1.30.1.

●ETYM Related with *atawt'-k'*, the latter being a deverbative noun probably in **-ti-* (Meillet 1936: 76-77), as well as with *otok'* 'supplication' (q.v.) and Lat. *loquor* 'to speak, talk, say; to mention' (see Pedersen 1905: 218-219; 1906: 348, 389-390 = 1982: 80-81, 126, 167-168). Further see s.vv. *atat-* 'lamentation, caress, supplication', *aters* 'supplication', *otb* 'lamentation', *otot-* 'lamentation'.

The connection of *atawt'-k'* with *atač'em* is accepted practically by everyone, but the external etymology usually remained unspecified or the proposed explanations were unconvincing, see also Charpentier 1909: 242; HAB 1: 121, 138a; Mariès / Meillet apud Minassian 1978-79: 24 (with an obscure mention of **-py-* > *-c-*); Bediryan 1966: 217-218; Schmitt 1972-74: 23; Godel 1975: 80 (**-kt-*); Greppin 1983: 267-268; Kortlandt 1983: 13 = 2003: 43, etc. Berbérian (1974) reconstructs **at-* 'to pray, supplicate' for *at-ac'em*, *at-awt'*, and *at-ers*, and compares this group also to other words such as *atamoł*, *atand*, *atawat*, *atčat*, etc.

Pokorny (1959: 306) places *atawt'-k'*, *otb*, *otok'*, as well as *atmuk* 'bustle, turmoil, clamour' under the 'Schallwurzel' **el-/*ol-*, cf. Gr. *ὀλολύζω* 'to cry out loudly, call, moan', etc. Jahukyan (1987: 121; 1992: 20) derives *atač'em* and *ata-wt'-k'* from **olat-je-* and **olat-*, respectively, assuming an epenthetic *-w-*, which is untenable.

Winter (1965: 103-105, 114; see also Polomé 1980: 19; Greppin 1986: 279₂) derives *atawt* and *atač'*- from **p̥l̥Oti-* and **p̥l̥O-je-* (read **plh₃-ti-* and **plh₃-je-*) linking it with Lat. *plōrō* 'to wail, weep', *implōrō* 'to invoke, entreat, appeal to; ask for (help, protection, favours, etc.)', which reflects an *-s*-present **pleh₃-s-*.

Klingenschmitt (1970; 1982: 60-61₁, 68, 93) derives Gr. *ἰλάσκομαι* 'to appease, be merciful' from reduplicated present **si-s̥lh₂-skē/o-* and connects it with Arm. *atač'em* < **s̥lh₂-skē/o-*. However, this would yield **atac'*-, thus **-sk̥-je-* is more probable, see s.v. **can-* 'to know, be acquainted' and 2.2.6.1 on *čanač'em* < QIE **ḡnh₃-sk-je-*. For the formation of *atawt'*, *i*-stem, see 2.1.22.12. For the problem

of **-JHC-* > *ata*, see Beekes 1988: 78; 2003: 194; Ravnæs 1991: 91, 99; Kortlandt 1991 = 2003: 96-97. For a thorough discussion, see Clackson 1994: 37, 173-174. The root **selh₂-* may also be reflected in Lat. *sōlārī*, *-ātus* ‘to console’, etc.; for more cognates and references, see Schrijver 1991: 126; Clackson 1994: 174; sceptical: Greppin 1986: 279₃, 289. On the whole, the etymology is quite plausible. It is accepted in Olsen 1999: 80-81 and Beekes 2003: 194. However, the interpretation of Winter is more attractive as far as the semantics is concerned.

atatel ‘to lament bitterly’ (Karapet Sasnec’i, 12th cent.); dial. **atāt** ‘caress; supplication’.

●DIAL Van *atatil* ‘to supplicate’; Zeyt’un, Hačən *atəd* ‘lamentation’; Ganjak *atāt* ‘love, caress’, Łazax, Łarabał *atāt-ov*, *atāt-atāt* ‘bitterly (said of weeping)’, Łazax, Łarabał, Agulis *atāt-ov* ‘bitterly (said of weeping)’, Łarabał *atāt-ov linel* ‘to love very much, caress’; Łarabał *atāt-patāt* ‘supplication’ [Ačařean 1913: 73-74; HAB 1: 122a].

●ETYM No etymology in HAB 1: 122a.

The word has been connected with *atač’em* ‘to supplicate’ (q.v.), see Jahukyan 1967: 303; 1987: 121, 164; Ałayan 1974: 17; hesitantly: Greppin 1983: 268. The *-at-* is not explained properly, however. It may be the iterative suffix seen e.g. in *xac-at-em* vs. *xacanem* ‘to bite, sting’ (q.v.). Note especially some other verbs of the same semantic sphere: *gang-at-* ‘to complain’, if the root is *gang-* ‘to sound’, and especially *patāt-* ‘to entreat, supplicate’. For references on *-at-*, see s.v. *hast-at* ‘firm, steady, solid’.

It seems most probable that *atāt-* is a rhyming formation based on *atač’-* and *patāt-* (q.v.), cf. the compound *atač’-patāt-* in a number of dialects (HAB 4: 14a) and especially Łarabał *atāt-patāt* (see above). Note also *otok’* ‘supplication’ vs. *bolok’* ‘complain’ (q.v.). Typologically compare Łarabał *anec’k’-pteck’* from *anēc* ‘curse’ (Martirosyan/Gharagozyan FW 2003, Goris-Łarabał).

For an uncertain IE etymology, see Witczak 2003: 84-85.

atawt’-k’ (pl. tant.) *i*-stem: GDPI *atawt’-i-c’*, IPI *atawt’-i-w-k’* (abundant evidence in the Bible, see Astuacaturean 1895: 42-44) ‘prayer’ (Bible+).

●DIAL Widespread in the dialects [HAB 1: 138a]. Some dialects have *-c’k’* alongside with the normal variants in *-t’k’*: Van *atoc’k’*, Zeyt’un *ātōc’k’* [HAB 1: 138a; Ačařyan 1952: 243; 2003: 296]. In both dialects the development *t’ > c’* is exceptional and unexplained [Ačařyan 1952: 59; 2003: 100]. With a further development *-c’k’ > -sk’*: Sivri-Hisar *atōsk’* (see PtmSivHisHay 1965: 460a).

●ETYM The word is a deverbative noun based on *atač’em* ‘to supplicate’ which may be derived from QIE **s₁h₂-sk₁-je-* or **plH-sk₁-je-* or **H(o)l(ə)-sk₁-je-*, see there for an etymological discussion.

Arm. dial. (Van, Zeyt’un, Sivrihisar) **atoc’-k’ < atōt’-k’* has not been explained. One may assume a dissimilation *-t’k’ > *-c’k’*, or generalization of API *atōt’-s > *atoc’*. Alternatively, the *-c’-* might be regarded as an archaic reflex of IE **-sk-* form (cf. the related verb *atač’em* ‘to implore, supplicate’ from **-sk₁-je-*). In this respect Georgian *loc^hva* ‘prayer’ calls attention. This word is considered an Armenian loan, although Ačařyan (HAB 1: 138) does not accept it. P. Muradyan (1996: 120-121, referring to Murvalyan) is more positive. The relation of Armenian and Georgian

words becomes more probable in view of Arm. dial. **atoc*-. For the absence of the initial *a-* in Georgian cf. Georg. (*a*)*ludi* ‘beer’ vs. Arm. *awti* ‘a strong fermented drink, intoxicating beverage’ < QIE **h₂(e)lu-t-ijV-*.

atawni, *ea*-stem: GDSg. *atawn-oy* (also *atawnwoy*, e.g. in Genesis 8.9, Zeyt‘unyan 1985: 179), GDPI *z-atawni-s*, GDPI. *atawn-ea-c*‘ (abundant in the Bible, Astuacaturean 1895: 37-38) ‘pigeon, dove’.

The above-mentioned paradigm points to *ea*-stem. GDSg. *atawn-oy* is probably due to haplology from the expected **atawnəwoy*. The same paradigm is also attested in later periods. For instance, in Book of Chries 5.5 (G. Muradyan 1993: 119-123; Russ. transl. 2000: 114-118), one finds the following attestations: GDSg *atawnoy* (119^{L8}, 119^{L14}, 123^{L6}), API *atawnis* (123^{L26}), GDPI *atawnec*‘ (122^{L7}).

For other attestations and derivatives, see NHB 1: 35; Greppin 1978: 127-132.

●DIAL The dialectal evidence can be grouped as follows:

(1) Aġtial (Hung., Pol.) *atvenik*‘ (< dimin. *-ik*), pl. *atvenik*‘-ner [Aġaġyan 1953: 50, 257], Xarberd *atvənik*^v, Sebastia *atvənik*, Partizak *ətvənak*, Alaškert *yeṭvəneg* (according to Madat‘yan 1985: 21, 180, *atunig* from **atōni-*), Moks *ətvənik* (according to Orbeli 2002: 296, *yeṭvənik/k*^v), Šatax *yeṭvənek* [M. Muradyan 1962: 42, 191b], Muš *ətvənik* [HAB 1: 123a], Sasun *atvnik* [Petoyan 1954: 101], Zeyt‘un *atvənə, atvən(n)a*, Haġən *atvəni* (Aġaġyan 2003: 84, 65, 296), Svedia *atvən(n)a, atvərna, atvərnag* (Aġaġyan 2003: 381, 397, 431 [on *r*-epenthesis], 435 [on geminate *-nn-*], 558). Polis *atavni-xuš*, only in religious stories (with Turk. *quš* ‘bird’; see HAB *ibid.*, also Aġaġyan 1941: 44).

(2) Agulis *ətōni* [Aġaġean 1935: 83], Van *yeṭunik* (probably from **etōnik*, see Aġaġyan 1952: 49, 243), Ozim *yeṭuneyk* [Aġaġyan 1952: 243], Salmast *yeṭunik*^v, Łarabał *yeṭōne*^vg^v (see also Davt‘yan 1966: 48, 303), Goris *yeṭunik* (from **yeṭōnek* < *atawni-ak*, see Margaryan 1975: 68, 312a), Ararat, Juła *atunik*, T‘iflis *atunak* [HAB 1: 123a], Mełri *ətōne* [Ałayan 1954: 62, 261a], Karġewan and Kak‘avaberd *tūni* [H. Muradyan 1960: 45, 188b; 1967: 62, 165a].

The initial **e-* of some dialectal forms is perhaps due to assimilation: **atōnek* (< *-eak*). Note e.g. Alaškert *yeṭvəneg* vs. *atunig* (see above), Ararat *atunik* vs. *yeṭunek* [Markosyan 1989: 296b].

The word *atawni* is exceptional in that it has not developed into **atōni*.⁴ It has been assumed that *atawni* was pronounced as **atawəni*, which is corroborated by dial. *atvəni*, etc., whereas the alternant *atawni* itself is reflected in Agulis, Łarabał, Van, etc. **atōni* (Hübschmann p.c. apud HAB 1: 123; Aġaġyan 1935: 83; 2003: 84). Similarly, Karst (1901: 28, § 14 = 2002: 37) posits **atawini* in view of Aġtial *atvenik*‘. Note also the doublets of the river name nowadays called Hagari: *Atawnoy* : *Atuan* (see Ĵihanyan 1991: 230).

H. Muradyan (1982: 176-177), however, argues against this, positing instead a development *atawni* > *atəvni* > *atvəni*. I find it hard to share this view, because the monophthongization of *aw* (documented since the 9th century, see Weitenberg 1996) seems to antedate the syncope of the medial *-a-* (12th cent. onwards; 10-11th century

⁴ A form *atōni*, mentioned in Olsen 1999: 507-508, 770, 776-777, 831, 836, is not attested in literary sources.

examples involve only declined forms, see H. Muradyan 1982: 86-87). The explanation of Hübschmann and Ačařyan is therefore preferable.

The reason for the twofold reflection of *atawni* remains unexplained. I propose to posit a productive *i*-derivation (which is frequent in particular with animal names), based on an older *n*-stem: **ataw-(u)n*, gen. **atawVn* > **atawi/un-i*. The derivation from a single proto-paradigm may also explain the co-existence of the doublets within the same dialects, e.g. Nor Naxijewan *atvenik'* vs. *atunik'* [HAB 1: 123a], Alařkert *yeřvaneğ* vs. *atunig* (see above). The same contrast is seen between very close dialects, e.g. Van *yeřunik* vs. řatax *yeřvaneğ*. Note that **yehunek* (< *etōnek*) cannot yield *yeřvaneğ*, pace M. Muradyan 1962: 42.

Furthermore, a possible archaic relic of the original *i*-less form may be found in SW margin of the Armenian speaking territories. Beside *äřvaneğ*, K'esab also has *ätvun* [Č'olak'ean 1986: 194b]. Theoretically, this form may reflect an older **atawun*, cf. *sořun* 'reptile' > *juřun*, although ClArm. *-un* normally yields K'esab *-ōn* (op. cit. 34).

Some forms point to an ending *-ak* rather than *-eak* or *-ik*. Beside Partizak *etvaneğ* and T'iflis *atunak* (see above), here belongs Ararat Hoktemberyan *yeřunag* [Bařdasaryan-T'ap'alc'yan 1973: 304].⁵ This form too may testify to an original *i*-less form **ataw(u)n*.

The cumulative evidence thus points to **atawun*, which later developed into **ataw(u)n-i*. This may further be corroborated by the etymology (see below).

●ETYM Since Bugge (1893: 1-2), connected with Gr. *ἀλωφούς· λευκός* (Hesychius), next to Gr. *ἀλόφος* m. 'dull-white leprosy' (Hes.), Lat. *albus* 'white, pale, bright, clear', OHG *albiz* 'swan', etc. (H. Suk'iasyan 1986: 137) from PIE **h₂elb^ho-* 'white' (for a discussion of the vocalic problems, see Beekes 1969: 40; Schrijver 1991: 40, 66; Mallory/Adams 1997: 641b; Olsen 1999: 508). řahukyan (1982: 74; cf. Pokorný 1959: 30-31; řahukyan 1967: 95₂₁; řihanyan 1991: 228, 230) posits older **atəb^hni-* or **atəu-ni-*. Ačařyan (HAB 1: 123a) does not accept the etymology and leaves the origin of the word open.

This traditional etymology is difficult both formally and semantically (see Greppin 1978: 131-132; 1983: 268-269). Klingenschmitt (1982, 68₁₁, 165; see also Matzinger 2005: 66) proposes a comparison with Lat. *palumbēs*, *-is* m. or f. 'wood-pigeon, ring-dove', *palumbus* m. 'id.' (cf. also P. de Lagarde 1854: 28^{L768}) and reconstructs **p^hh₂-b^h-n-ih₂-*. Compare also Gr. *πέλεια* f. 'wild pigeon', OPr. *poalis* 'dove'. These forms probably derive from PIE **pel-* 'grey' (see Euler 1985: 95; de Vaan 2008: 442), cf. also *πολιός* 'grey, grey hair', Arm. *ali-k'* 'grey hair; waves' (q.v.).

The same etymology has independently been considered by Witczak (1999: 177), who, however, points out that *-awni* is unexplained and prefers to derive *atawni* from IE **b^halon-iyō-* (cf. Lith. *balañdis* 'dove, pigeon', Ossetic *balon* 'id.'), which is improbable.

⁵ Technically speaking, also the forms with *-ik* presuppose **atawn-* or **atōn-* + *-ik* rather than **atawni* + *-k*, because a suffix *-k* does not synchronically exist. But, of course, *-i* + *-ik* cannot be ruled out.

It has been assumed that the form *palumbus* cannot have been formed after *columbus* ‘pigeon’, because the old form of the latter was *columba* (Schrijver 1991: 375, with ref.). Schrijver (ibid.) adds that Latin *palumb-* “does not have a clear etymology”.

In view of the discussion above (see the dialectal section), one might posit a nasal stem paradigm: nom. **p̥lh₂bʰ-ōn-* (> PArm. **atawun*), gen. **-bʰ-n-os* (> Lat. **palumb-*, for the metathesis cf. PIE **bʰudʰno-* > Lat. *fundus* ‘bottom’, etc., see s.v. *andund-k* ‘abyss’). We are probably dealing with a Mediterranean word; cf. hypothetical **kol(o)mbʰ-(e)h₂-*: Lat. *columba* f. ‘dove, pigeon’ vs. Arm. *salamb*, *a-* stem ‘francolin’ (q.v.), also a Mediterranean word.

atawri, *ea*-stem: GDSg *atawrw-oy*, GDP1 *atawr-eac* ‘mill; female grinder (of corn)’ (Bible+) [NHB 1: 48c; Clackson 1994: 92, 219₃₁]; later: ‘tooth’ (Grigor Narekac’i 63.2). For possible evidence for Arm. **atawr* ‘mill’, see Clackson 1994: 219₃₁.

In Jeremiah 52.11: *i tun aḡreac* ‘: *εις οικίαν 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 (Xač’atryan/Łazinyan 1985: 496^{L46}; Russ. transl. 1988: 203; Engl. transl. 2001: 301): *Or tas patanekac’ atawris ambošnelis* : “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. *ἀλετρις* ‘woman who grinds corn’. (Hübshmann 1897: 414; HAB 1: 118a; Mariès/Meillet apud Minassian 1978-79: 23-24). 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. *ἀλέτριος* appears to be a ghost-word. As *atawri* has an *a*-stem, one may reconstruct **h₂(e)lh₁-tr-ih₂-* (for a 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. *aráṇi-* f. (usually in dual) ‘piece of wood used for kindling fire by attrition’ (RV+) [Mayrhofer EWAia 1: 108]. See also s.vv. *erkan*, *i-* and *a*-stem ‘mill’ and *lar-k*, *i*-stem, *o*-stem and *a*-stem ‘reins, tendons’.

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 *-l̥-* in **-lh₁C/R*, see s.vv. *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). In my view, both reflect a common proto-form, namely **h₂(e)lh₁-tr-i-*, which has developed into Armenian **h₂lh₁-tr-i(H)-eh₂-* (cf. *sami-k*, *sameac*).

atb, *o*-stem: GDSg *atb-o-y*, ISg *atb-o-v* (Bible), LocSg *y-atb-i* (Čarəntir), note also AblSg *y-atb-ē* in Nersēs Lambronac‘i, 12th cent. (which is not compatible with *o*-stem) ‘dung, excrement, filth, manure’ (Bible+), coll. **atb-i-k** ‘place for garbage’ (Ephrem), **atbem** ‘to defecate’ (Matt‘ēos Urhayec‘i), ‘to fertilize the soil’ (Geoponica); see further s.v. **atb-ew-k** ‘filth, garbage, dung-heap’ (Bible+).

●DIAL Widespread in the dialects, in the meanings ‘dung’, ‘excrement’, ‘garbage’, ‘manure’ [HAB 1: 125a].

●ETYM The etymological attempts presented in HAB 1: 124-125 (see also Pokorny 1959: 305, with *att* ‘dirt, filth’, q.v.) are unconvincing.

Schindler (1978) connects *atb*, *o*- and *i*-stems, with Hitt. *šalpa-*, *šalpi-* c. ‘dung’? (on the word see ChicHittDict vol. Š, fasc. 1, 2002: 107) reconstructing **sal-b^ho*-adj. ‘dirty’, with the suffix **-b^ho-* frequently found in color adjectives (cf. Hitt. *alpa* ‘cloud’, Gr. *ἀλλόφος* ‘dull-white leprosy’), and **sal-b^hi-* subst. ‘dirt, excrement’, respectively. He derives the forms from the root **sal-* ‘dirty, grey’: OWelsh pl. *halou* ‘stercora’, OIr. *sal* ‘dirt, filth’, OHG *salō* < **sal-yo-* ‘dirty’, etc. (see Pokorny 1959: 879). This etymon is now reconstructed as **solH-* ‘dirt, dirty’, and the Hittite word is mentioned as a possible derivative of it [Mallory/Adams 1997: 160a]. See also Greppin 1983: 270; 1986: 283; Witczak 1999: 177. Further see s.v. *att* ‘dirt, filth’.

Jahukyan (1979: 23-24; 1987: 146, 190, 592; cf. 1970: 146) earlier suggested the same comparison, but he derives the Hittite and Armenian forms from PIE **selpo-*: Skt. *sarpīś-* n. ‘molten butter, lard’, Germ. *Salbe* ‘ointment’, etc. This etymology is advocated by Olsen 1999: 37. The development **-lp- > Arm. -tb-* (beside the regular voicing after *r* and nasals) is possible, although the evidence is scanty, cf. *hetg* ‘lazy’ if from **selk-*.

Compare also *ju**l**b* ‘roe, spawn’ (q.v.), if composed of **ju-* ‘fish’ (see s.v. *ju-kn* ‘fish’) and *atb* ‘excrement, dung’.

atbewr, **atbiwr**, *r*-stem: GDSg *atber*, AblSg *y-atber-ē*, APl *atber-s*, GDPl *atber-c*‘, IPl *atber-b-k*‘; in pl. obl. mostly *-r-a-*: GDPl *atber-a-c*‘ (Bible; P‘awstos Buzand 4.15, 1883=1984: 102^{L-16}; Movsēs Xorenac‘i 1.16, 1913=1991: 51^{L4}; Hexaemeron 4 [K. Muradyan 1984: 107^{L13}], etc.), IPl *atber-a-w-k*‘ (Grigoris Aršaruni, 7-8th cent.) ‘fountain, spring’ (Bible+). In derivatives, mostly *atber-*, cf. *atber-akn*, GDSg(Pl) *-akan(c)*‘, ISg(Pl) *-akamb(-k)*‘, APl *-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 the dialects. The following dialects display an initial aspiration: Nor Bayazet *haxpur*, Ozim *haxp‘ur*, Moks *häxpür* (HAB 1: 126a; Ačarjān 1952: 243; Greppin 1983: 271, cf. 1982/83: 146). To this, Šatax *häxpür* [M. Muradyan 1962: 191b] should be added.

In view of Šatax, etc. *hä-*, Van *ä-*, 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’, belonging to the *a*-declension class: GSg *axpr-a*, DSg *axpra*, *axprin*, etc. [M. Muradyan 1982: 143, 148]. Thus, without *h-*. In the folklore texts recorded by Orbeli himself, however, we find attestations only with *h-*: *häxpṛē čambäx woskē*

p'əric'in “рассыпали по дороге к роднику золотые” [94^{L3f}, transl. 163]; *t'əlc'in vār häxprə^ē čamp'xin* “бросили его на дороге к роднику” [95^{L11f}, transl. 164 (cf. 1982: 99)]; *nä lač tärek^o trek^o häxpür* “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 a 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 [Orbeli 2002: 120^{Nr41}] reads: *Mart' häxpürəm čür xəmə^ē, atek č'ə^ē k'ar t'älə^ē hinə^ē*: “(When) one drinks water in a spring, it is not nice that he throws a stone into it”. Clearly, *häxpürəm* means ‘in a spring’ here.

ClArm. *atber-akn*, GDSg *atber-akan* has been preserved in Muš-Bulanəx, as repetitively found, for example, 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'atbərak-ic'*. Cf. also Muš/Bulanəx or Sasun/Bołnut *vər h'atbri akan* “on the source of the fountain” [HŽHek' 10, 1967: 65^{L-9,-13}]; Ozim *haxb'arak* [HAB 1: 109a; Ačarıyan 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*. 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; Jahukyan 1959: 172-173; 1982: 31, 92, 221₂₀; Zekiyan 1980: 157; Ałabekyan 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 a 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.

atb-ew-k', *a*-stem: GDP1 *atbew-a-c'* (Bible+), LocPl *y-atbew-s* (Job 2.8) ‘filth, garbage, dung-heap’; later **atbiws-k'**, GDP1 **atbiws-a-c'** seems to be a blend of generalized API forms *atbew-s* and *atbi-s* (beside coll. nom. *atb-i-k'*), see HAB 1: 123-124.

A textual illustration from Job 2.8 (Cox 2006: 58): *ew nstēr yatbews artak'oy k'atak'in* “and he sat in filth (Gr. *κοπρία* ‘dung-heap’) outside the city”.

●ETYM Certainly an old derivative of *alb* ‘excrement, filth’ (q.v.). For the suffix, see Greppin 1975: 92. Olsen (1999: 424) posits a neuter pl-coll. **s₁petə₂*, which is uncertain. One may assume that this *-ew-k'* is in a way related with coll. *-oy-k'*, which formally requires an older **-eu-*.

aɫɛn (GSg *aɫɛtan*) ‘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 the dialects, mostly in the meaning ‘bow’; also in the compound **net-u-aɫɛn* ‘arrow and bow’, cf. Akn *nɛdvatɛt*, Van *netvaneɫ*, Ararat *netvaneɫ*, T‘iflis *nitvaniɫ*, Zeyt‘un *nidb‘atɛt*, *lamb‘atɛt*, etc. [HAB 1: 126b; Ačařyan 2003: 296].

Many dialects (Van, Moks, Ozim, Alaškert, Sebastia, T‘iflis, Axalc‘xa, Agulis [HAB 1: 126b], etc.) have **aneɫ*. Unlike Goris (*hanɛɫ*, *aneɫ*, *anɛɫ*, see Margaryan 1975: 312a), Łarabaɫ [Davt‘yan 1966: 304] has forms both with and without the final *-n*, namely *haneɫnə* and (*h*)*aneɫ*. A trace of the final *-n* can be seen in GSg *anɫan* in Van and Moks, as well as in Van *ananak*, Ozim *anəɫnak*, etc. from **aɫɛtnak* ‘rainbow’ (see below). Note also the initial *h-* in Łarabaɫ and Goris.

Ačařyan (2003: 140) treats the *b-* of Zeyt‘un *nidb‘atɛt* as epenthetic. In my view, we are here dealing with 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 Ačařyan 2003: 299) and Moks *əspāc*, GSg *ās(c)u*, *āstəcu* (see Orbeli 2002: 206).

As to the other Zeyt‘un form, namely *lamb‘atɛt*, Ačařyan (2003: 115, 135) considers it strange, pointing out that *ləm-* is unclear. 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 with 2.1.25. Thus: **nedv-* > **nidb-* > **ninb-* > **nimb-* > **limb-*. The last step involves nasal dissimilation (cf. *nmanim* ‘to resemble’ > Nor-Naxiřewan, Aslanbek, Polis, Sebastia, Xarberd, Tigranakert, Maraɫa, Alaškert, Hamšen, etc. **(ə)lmanil* [HAB 3: 459b]), and/or the alternation *n-/l-*, cf. *napastak* : dial. **(a)lapastrak* ‘hare’, *nuiɫ/nuič* : dial. **luič* ‘a plant’, etc.

This scenario may have been supported/triggered by a contamination with *lput* ‘wool carder’ (in the dialects of Ozim, Muš, Bulanəx, Alaškert, see HAB 2: 306a). A theoretically possible form in Cilicia/Syria would be **lambud*, with nasal epenthesis, cf. *hapalas* ‘bilberry’ (from Arab. *ħabb-al-ās*) > Svedia *həmbālus* (see 2.1.30.1).

The meaning ‘a bow-like instrument used for combing and preparing wool and cotton’ is present in Van, Lori (see Ačařyan 1913: 97a), Muš, Širak, etc. **aneɫ* (see Amatuni 1912: 30b; HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 58a), Řodost‘o *aneɫnag* [HAB 1: 126b], as well as Zeyt‘un *aɫɛt* (see Ačařyan 2003: 296). Orbeli (2002: 202) describes this implement as follows: “орудие в виде лука для трепания шерсти”.

Since the craft of combing and processing of wool was most developed and famous in the area of the Van-group-speaking dialects (especially Ozim and Moks), and carders and felt-makers used to travel throughout Armenia, the Caucasus and even farther (see Orbeli 2002: 19-21, 23), one may wonder if, for example, in Lori and Širak, the semantic shift under discussion was motivated by the spread of the Moks, Van, etc. designation of the instrument, namely *aneɫ* (GSg *anɫan*, see Orbeli 2002: 202). In this respect, a fairy-tale “in the dialect of Łazax”,⁶ recorded in 1894

⁶ Both geographically and dialectally, Łazax is between Lori and Łarabaɫ.

(see HŽHek' 6, 1973: 318-329), is particularly interesting. There lived a wool-carder (*pürt' kyzot*) 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 1.5.

With the suffix *-ak*, **atetn-ak* 'rainbow': Agulis *atiyókən* (Ačařean 1935: 121, 332, assuming **atetnak* > **atetakn*), Alaškert *anetnag*, Ozim *anətnak*, cf. Axalc'xa *atetnavər* (as well as Rodost'o *anetnag*, referring to the above-mentioned implement), see HAB 1: 126b. Interesting is Van *ananak* (not *anank*, as is misprinted in HAB 1: 126b; see HAB-Add 1982: 6; Ačařyan 1952: 243) from **ane(t)nak*. The dialectal form *ananak* is recorded already in NHB 1: 1015b, correctly deriving it from **atetn-ak*. Note also *anana* in a riddle from an unspecified area (see S. Harut'yunyan 1965: 15-16^{Nr134}). See also s.v. *ciacan* 'rainbow'.

The form **anet(n)-(ak)* < *atetn-ak* is due to dissimilation (see Ačařean 1935: 121) or, perhaps better, to both assimilation and dissimilation: *t-t-n* > *n-t-n*; cf. 2.1.25.

●ETYM Usually connected with the group of *otn* 'spine, etc.' (q.v.), see Lidén 1906: 128 (with references); HAB 1: 126b (sceptical, although without comments); Pokorny 1959: 308; Ĵahukyan 1987: 122. The details are not clear, however, so one should join Ačařyan (HAB 1: 126b), Greppin (1983: 271; 1986: 284) and Olsen (1999: 409-410) in considering the etymology uncertain. Ĵahukyan (1987: 122) reconstructs **al-el-* with a question mark. In view of the internal laryngeal (see s.v. *otn*), the anlaut can only be explained if one assumes **HHL-el-*. If my tentative etymology of *utet* with *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, for example, Gr. βίός m. 'bow' and 'bowstring', one may wonder if *atetn* 'bow' derives from *ati(-k)* 'intestine; string of musical instruments'.

aters, *i*-stem, *o*-stem (late evidence) 'supplication' (Bible+), *atersem* 'to supplicate' (Bible+), *aters-an-k'*, pl. tant. *a*-stem: GDPI *aters-an-a-c'* 'supplication' (John Chrysostom, etc.).

●DIAL Muš *atərsal* 'to supplicate', *atərsank'* 'supplication' [HAB 1: 127a].

●ETYM Usually connected with *at-ač'-em* 'to supplicate', q.v. (see Bugge 1889: 36; cf. Olsen 1999: 96). Also Berbėrian 1974 derives *aters* from **at-* 'to pray, supplicate' (cf. Clackson 1994: 174). The second component is identified with an independently unattested PArm. **hers* from PIE **perk-*: Lith. *piršti*, *peršũ* 'to ask for a girl's hand in marriage', Lat. *precor* 'to pray to, beseech, entreat', etc. (see Mariès/Meillet apud Minassian 1978-79: 24); for the etymon, see s.vv. *harsn* 'bride, daughter-in-law', *harc'anem* 'to ask, inquire'. This interpretation is possible but uncertain. Pedersen (1906: 389-390 = 1982: 167-168) assumes **prek-ri-* > *aters*, but such a proto-form would rather yield **erewr*.

atij : Timothy Aelurus (6th cent.), Knik' hawatoy= "Seal of Faith" (7th cent., see Ačařean 1908-09a, 1: 367b); **atič'** (*a*-stem, cf. GDPI *atič-ac'* in Anania Narkac'i, 10th cent.): Eusebius of Caesarea, Anania Narekac'i; **atjik**, *an*-stem (GDSg *atjkan*, ISg *atjkaw* or *atjkamb*, NPI *atjkunk'*, GDPI *atjkanc'*, etc.): Bible+; MidArm. **atjkin** 'virgin, girl'; in Eusebius of Caesaria: *atič'* 'prostitute' (see HAB 1: 129b for semantic parallels).

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

In Muš, Ačařyan (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. The comparison with OIr. *inalit* 'Dienerin' from **eni-(h)altih₂* (the root of Lat. *alō* 'to nurse, nourish', etc.), as suggested by Olsen, is equally unconvincing (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* is unexplained. Hambarjumyan (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 **atj-* < **h₂l-i(e)h₂-*. In this case, the form *atij* would be secondary. The connection with *ataxin* 'female servant' is improbable (see s.v.).

Likewise unconvincing is the derivation from **k^wli-*, cf. Toch. A *k_uli*, B *kliye* 'woman', Modern Irish *caile* 'country woman, girl', etc. (see Viredaz 2001-02: 34-35 for references and discussion); first, the etymology of these words is uncertain (the Tocharian probably derives from the PIE word for 'woman', see Adams 1999: 224-225), and second, I expect Arm. **k'atj* or **k'yl* from QIE **k^wli-*.

Jahukyan (1963a: 87-88; 1987: 145) derives **at-* from **pə-lo-* (cf. *ul* 'kid') and for *-j-* compares *erinj* 'heifer' (q.v.) and *oroj* 'lamb'. This is perhaps the most probable etymology. For the *-j-* see above.

According to Witczak (1999: 177-178), the primitive form **atji* may be related to two other Palaeo-Balkan words denoting 'young girl', namely Maced. *ἀκρεία* and Phryg. (Hesychius) *ἄκριστις*. He reconstructs **akréyā* f. 'young girl' and represents the Armenian development (which he characterizes as "quite regular") as follows: IE **akréyā* > **arKéyā* (metathesis) > **aRGiyā* (lenition) > **atji* (palatalization) > *atij*. Consequently, he derives *atjkn* from **akr(e)i-gon-*.

This scenario is improbable. IE *-kr-* is not subject to metathesis. Besides, Arm. *t* instead of *r* is not explained. The expected form should be **awrē-* or **awri-*, so one might rather think of Arm. *awri-ord* 'virgin, young girl', q.v.

Conclusion: PArm. **atj-* '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 *atij* is secondary.

ati(-k'), *ea*-stem: GDSg *atw-o-y* in Sirach, Gregory of Nyssa, *ati-o-y* in Grigor Magistros, ISg *ate-a-w* in Severian of Gabala, GDP1 *ate-a-c'* in Grigor Narekac'i 26.3 (Xaç'atryan/Lazinyan 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 the dialects, as a frozen plural: **ati-k'* 'intestine'; in Agulis, Larabał and Goris, with a nasal epenthesis: **atink'*. Ačařyan (HAB 1: 129a) records

no dialectal forms reflecting the “pure” singular (i.e. *k*-less) *ali*, apart from Sebastia plural *ale-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)-ali* “string/tie for the yoke pin (*sami*)”, with an epenthetic *-b-* after *-m-*, as is clearly seen also in Łarabał *səmbétan*.

On Agulis *gʷarátinkʷ* and Łarabał *kiráteʷnkʷ* ‘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 book (p. 296), where Ĵahukyan, with reservation, treats *ali-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₋*).

***atc-** ‘filth’: *atc-a-pitc* ‘filthy, abominable’ (a compound with *pitc* ‘id.’), attested in Movsēs Kałankatuacʻi/Dasxurancʻi 2.32, 7/10th cent. (V. Ařakʻelyan 1983: 212L17), Yovhannēs Ojnecʻi (8th cent.), etc., *atcaptic-utʻiwn* ‘uncleanliness’ (Book of Chries); *atcem* ‘to defile’ (Canon Law), see HAB 1: 132a.

●ETYM See s.v. *at* ‘dirt, filth’. For *-c* vs. *-t* cf. the above-mentioned *pitc* ‘filthy, abominable’ vs. *ptt-or* ‘id.’ [HAB 4: 81-82, 91].

***atc-** ‘salt’ in *atc-eal* ‘salted’ in Eusebius of Caesarea.

●ETYM Belongs with *at* ‘salt’ (q.v.), see Hübschmann 1897: 414; HAB 1: 132a.

atkatk, *a*-stem: GDPI *atkatk-a-c* (Grigor Astuacaban, Grigor Narekacʻi) ‘indigent, poor, miserable’ (Grigor Astuacaban, John Chrysostom, Xosrov Anjewacʻi, etc.); *atkatk-utʻiwn* in Philo, etc.

●ETYM Connected with Lith. *elgetáuti* ‘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 to *atk* ‘at pauper, beggar’ (q.v.); see also Greppin 1983: 271, 274. Uncertain.

The connection with Lat. *algeō* ‘to be cold, feel chilly, endure cold’ (see HAB 1: 132b) is considered not impossible [Mariès/Meillet apud Minassian 1978-79: 24].

***atj-** ‘darkness, fog, twilight’: *atj-utʻiwn-k* ‘darkness’, only in Grigor Narekacʻi 6.4 (beg. of the 11th cent.), in an enumeration, followed by *amprop-k* ‘thunder’ [Xačʻatryan/Łazinyan 1985: 269^{L84}]; translated as ‘затмение’ [Darbinjan-Melikjan/Xanlarjan 1988: 47] and ‘eclipse’ [Khachatoorian 2001: 37]; *atj-atj* ‘fog’ (AblSg *y-atjaj-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 Širakacʻi), ISg *atjamtj-i-w* (Yovhan Mandakuni [2003: 1161a^{L14}], Philo, Ephrem, Sargis Šnorhali), *atjamtj-a-w* (Grigor Astuacaban Nazianzacʻi, Sargis Šnorhali Vardapet); also some derivatives, e.g. *atjamtj-in* ‘dark’ in Yovhan Mandakuni [2003: 1165a^{L3}]; *tartaroskʻn atjamtjinkʻ li xawaraw*. For *-in* cf. *mt* ‘-in from *mut* (n) ‘dark’ (Bible+).

In Joshua 2.5: *and atjamutjs ařawōtin* : *én τῷ σκότει*. In Job 10.22: *yerkir atjamtjin yawitenakan* : *εἰς ἦν σκότους αἰωνίου*. In 2 Peter 2.17: *orocʻ atjamutjkʻ*

xawari(n) yawitean paheal kan : οἷς ὁ ζόφος τοῦ σκοτότος τετήρηται : “for them the nether gloom of darkness has been reserved”. As we can see, in the Biblical passages, *atjamutj* mostly corresponds to Gr. *σκοτός* ‘darkness, gloom (of death, the netherworld, etc.)’, and once (as also in Philo) to *ζόφος* ‘nether darkness; gloom, darkness; the West’.

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

●DIAL Ačarjan (HAB 1: 135b, 335-336) does not record any dialectal forms of **atj-*. In 2.1.33.2, I argue that *atjamutj* has been preserved in Łarabat *žəmaž-en-k‘*. It can also be found in some Western dialects: Muš, Xian, Č‘enkiler **ašmuš* ‘twilight’ [Ačarjan 1913: 115b], Sasun *ašmuš* (glossed by *atjamutj*) and verbal *ašmšil* [Petoyan 1954: 103; 1965: 443]. This word is reminiscent of *atjamutj* ‘darkness, twilight’ and *mšus* ‘fog’ (see s.vv. *mšus* ‘fog’ and **muž* ‘fog’). According to Ačarjan (HAB 1: 330b), Muš, etc. *ašmuš* ‘twilight’ belongs with *aršalurs-k‘* (q.v.).

●ETYM Meillet (1898: 279) treats *atjamutj* as a combination of two types of reduplication, namely *u-* (cf. *spar-spuř* ‘entièrement’, etc.) and *m-* (cf. *arh-a-m-arh*, *xarñ-a-m-arñ*, etc.) reduplications, seen also in **helj-a-m-utj* ‘drowning, suffocation’, on which see s.v. *heljamtj-uk*. The example of *hawrut* and *mawrut* is wrong; these are Iranian loans (see HAB 3: 139-140). Meillet (ibid.) connects the root **atj*, found also in *atj-atj*, with Gr. *ἀχλὺς*, *-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 *atjamutj* in the same way, but reconstructs **a(l)gh-lu-* for Armenian and the cognate forms, connecting the word with Lat. *algeō* ‘to be cold, fill chilly, endure cold’, etc.

Ačarjan (HAB 1: 335-336) rejects the etymology on the following grounds: (1) *arjn* ‘black’ and **at-* ‘dark’ are not taken into account, and their relationship is not clarified; (2) **g^h* > Arm. *j* is uncertain; (3) the connection between Gr. *ἀχλὺς* and OPr. *aglo* “is not firmly accepted”. These arguments are not strong, however. Arm. *arjn* ‘black’ (q.v.) and probably **at-* ‘dark’ are hardly related to **atj-* [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. *ἀχλὺς* to be either conjectural [Toporov, PrJaz [1], A-D, 1975: 58-59] or difficult (Beekes/Adams apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 477a; cf. Beekes 1977: 258). A connection with Norw. *gluma* ‘dunkel werden’, etc. has been assumed (Crepajac 1967: 196, without Armenian).

Pedersen (1906: 367 = 1982: 145), too, treats *atjamutj* as *m*-reduplication, comparable to *arhamarhem* ‘verachte’. These examples are usually compared with *sar-suř* ‘Zittern, Beben’ [this example, in my view, is unclear], *spar-spuř* ‘ganz und gar’, *atx-a-m-alx* ‘Kramwaren, Trödelwaren’, *arh-a-m-arh-em* ‘verachten’, etc. [Karst 1930: 109; Leroy 1986: 71-72]. Next to *atj-a-m-utj*, Pedersen and Karst also cite *atj-a-m-atj*. I was not able to locate this form. If it really exists, one may link it

directly to Łarabał *žamaž-ayn-k' (see above). Otherwise, *žamuž-ayn-k' > *žəməžáyn-, and the by-form *žəməž- is secondary.

Ĵahukyan (1967: 303) regards *attamult* vs. *atjamultj* as a case of alternation *t : j*, giving no other examples and mentioning also *arjn* 'black', although in 171₂₅ and in later works he rightly rejects the connection with *arjn*. Ĵahukyan usually cites *arjn* as meaning 'black' and 'dark'. In fact, *arjn* basically means 'black' and scarcely means 'dark' in the 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". While accepting Meillet's etymology of *atj-, Ĵahukyan treats *multj and *mult as independent roots and connects them with Arm. *moyg 'dark', Russ. *smuglyj*, etc. (1967: 171; 1982: 58; see also H. Sukčiasyan 1986: 204 [see s.v. *muž]), and later (Ĵahukyan 1987: 138), although with reservation, with Arm. *metc* 'soot' (q.v.). Greppin (1983: 272-273) considers Meillet's explanation of *atj-a-m-ulj* as less likely and derives *amultj from PArm. *omulgh-: Gr. *ομίχλη* '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 -j- requires *g^hi-. We have, thus, to assume either a by-form *h₂eg^hl-i-, or a confusion 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. Another possible example of a frozen locative is *anurj-k* 'dream' (q.v.). The meaning 'twilight, darkness' is frequently used in locative/adverbial meaning: "at dawn, at twilight", cf. e.g. *ənd atjamultj's arawōtin* : *ἐν τῷ σκοτει* (Joshua 2.5), as well as dial. *žəməž-ayn-k'-in and *axtamxt-in* 'at twilight' (see s.v. *attamult* 'darkness, twilight'). Thus: loc. *h₂(e)g^hl-i > PArm. *agl-i > *alg-i (regular metathesis) > *atj-i.

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

alt, *o*-stem: GDSg *att-o-y* (Łazar P'arpec'i, John Chrysostom), AblSg *y-att-o-y*, ISg *att-o-v* (Bible+), GDPl *att-o-c*' (Grigor Narekac'i), AblPl *y-att-o-c*' (Hesychius of Jerusalem); *i*-stem: ISg *att-i-w* (Paterica), GDPl *att-i-c*' (Anania Širakac'i) 'dirt, filth, uncleanness (also of soul)' (Bible+), 'skin enclosing the foetus, afterbirth' (Deuteronomy 28.57, Cox 1981: 188-189, rendering Gr. *χόριον*); **alt-et-i** 'dirty, filthy, foul' (Bible+).

ISg *att-o-v* and AblSg *y-att-o-y* are attested in Job 9.31 and 14.4 respectively: *Sastkac'eal attov nerker zis* : *ικανῶς ἐν ῥύπω με ἔβαψας* "you have dyed me thoroughly with filth"; *Isk ard ov ic'e surb yattoy* : *τίς γὰρ καθαρὸς ἔσται ἀπὸ ῥύπου* "Now, who can be free of filth?" [Cox 2006: 97, 118]. Arm. *alt* renders Gr. *ῥύπος* 'filth, uncleanness'.

For the formation of *alt-eli* see Greppin 1975: 81; Ĵahukyan 1987: 250; 1998: 23; Olsen 1999: 409.

●DIAL Widespread in the dialects [HAB 1: 136a].

●ETYM Since Bugge 1889: 35, compared with Arm. *e/altiw*r 'marsh-meadow, swamp', Gr. *ἄρδα* f. 'dirt', *ἄρδαλος* 'dirty'. Ačarjan (1937a; HAB 1: 136a; cf. Hübschmann 1897: 415) accepts the connection of *alt* with the Greek word and

introduces also *atc-* ‘id’ (q.v.) with the alternation *t* vs. *c* seen also in *metc/j* ‘soot’ derived by him from **smerd-* ‘to stink’. He (HAB 2: 24-25) leaves the origin of *e/attiwr* open. This etymology of *alt*, although advocated by C. Arutjunjan (1983: 262-263), is formally difficult (Clackson 1994: 103).

On the other hand, Arm. *alt* and *e/attiwr* are linked with OIc. *ǫldna* ‘to mould’, OHG *oltar* ‘Schmutzkrume’, Lat. *alga* ‘sea-weed; rubbish’, etc., Petersson 1916: 250-252; Pokorny 1959: 305; Solta 1960: 279f; Ĵahukyan 1987: 121, 164; cf. Schrijver 1991: 70. This comparison is possible if one posits a QIE **H₁-d-* for Armenian *alt* shared with Germanic.

Another possibility is to derive *alt* from **sal-* ‘dirty, grey’ (cf. Ĵahukyan 1987: 164): OIr. *sal* ‘dirt, filth’, OHG *salō* < **sal-uo-* ‘dirty’, etc. (for a discussion of cognate forms, see Schrijver 1991: 212-213). Further see s.v. *atb* ‘excrement, dung’. It is possible that this Armenian word for ‘dirt’ and *alt* ‘salt’ flow together, cf. OPr. *saltan* n. ‘grease, fat’, etc. (see Witczak 1999: 179-180; Olsen 1999: 182; cf. Greppin 1983: 273-274, presenting *alt* ‘dirt’ and *alt* ‘salt’ in one entry). Note that both words have variants with affricate *-c* instead of *-t*. For the dental determinative cf. also Arm. *cirt* ‘dung’, dial. *c’r-t-* vs. *c’er* ‘liquid excrement, dung’ (see Amatuni 1912: 645; Ačařean 1913: 1058ab), etc.

For the structure of *e/attiwr* and other etymological suggestions, see Hübschmann 1897: 415; HAB 2: 24-25; Mann 1963: 144; Eichner 1978: 152-153; Greppin 1983: 274; Ĵahukyan 1987: 121, 164, 310, 374; Clackson 1994: 93, 220₃₉; Beekes apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 539b; Olsen 1999: 154-156; Witczak 1999: 179.

alt, *i*-stem: GDP1 *alt-i-c-* (Bible), *u*-stem: GDP1 *alt-u-c-* (inscription 1235 AD) ‘salt’ (Bible+), ‘salt-mine’ (*zatts Kotbay* ‘the salt-mines of Kołb’ in Yovhannēs Drasxanakerc’i, 9-10th cent.); **alt-alt** (Hexaemeron, Book of Chries, etc.), **alt-alt-in** (Bible+) ‘salty, salted’; **alt-alt-uk** ‘salty, salted; saltland’ (Bible+, e.g. API *z-attattuk-s* = Gr. *άλμυρίδα* in Job 39.6, Cox 2006: 250); see also s.v. **atc-* ‘salt’.

In Genesis 14.3 (Zeyt’unyan 1985: 203): *Amenek’ean sok’a gumarec’an i jorm ati, or ē cov altic’*: πάντες οὗτοι συνεφώνησαν ἐπὶ τὴν φάραγγα τὴν ἀλοκὴν (αὕτη ἢ θάλασσα τῶν ἀλῶν).

According to the long recension of the 7th century Armenian Geography, *Ařxarhac’oyc’* [Soukry 1881: 30^{L5}], the province of *Barjr Hayk’* ‘Upper Armenia’ *uni ew řermuks ew atls ew zamenayn parartut’iwns erkri* ‘‘also has hot springs and salt deposits and all the abundance of the earth’’ (transl. Hewsen 1992: 59). Some manuscripts of the short recension, too, have the variant with *-t-*: API *alt-s* or NPI *alt-k’* [MovsXorenMaten 1865: 607^{L16}, 607₂], while others have *at-s* [A.G. Abrahamyan 1944: 349^{L8}]. Also the version of T’ovmas Kiliķec’i (14th cent.) has reading variants *alt-s* and *at-s* [Anasyan 1967: 281^{L15}]. As has been pointed out by Eremyan (1963: 91b), these salt deposits should be located in the district of Mananali, on the left side of the River Mananali, nowadays *T’uzlu-ē’ay* ‘Salty River’), where the pre-revolutionary Russian map ‘‘of 10 verst’’ indicates ‘сол[яный] зав[од]’.

For the Biblical attestations of *alt-alt-uk* see also Olsen 1999: 587^{773f}; for the structure of the word, see Olsen 1999: 587.

●ETYM Since Hübschmann 1897: 414, Arm. *alt* and *at* are derived from the PIE word for ‘salt’ and reflect nom. **sāl-d* and gen. **sal-n-és*, respectively. The form

with *-t* < **-d-* is directly comparable with Goth. *salt* n., OEngl. *salt*, OHG *salz* ‘salt’; zero-grade forms: Norw. *sylt*, OEngl. *sultia*, OHG *sulza* ‘salty water, brine’, Germ. *Sülze*, etc. (see also HAB 1: 136b; Meillet 1936: 38; Mariès/Meillet apud Minassian 1978-79: 23; on PIE, see Lehmann 1986: 294b with ref. ; cf. Beekes 1987c: 50-51). Probably Lat. *sallō*, *salsus* ‘to salt’ belongs here, too (Pokorny 1959: 878; Lehmann 1986: 294b). The Germanic (OHG *salzan*, etc.) and Latin verbs may reflect **seh₂l-d-* or **sh₂el-d-*; for the Latin verb zero grade is possible, too (see Schrijver 1991: 114). For **sald-tos* see Szemerényi 1996: 279.

The PIE word for ‘salt’ has been reconstructed by Kortlandt and others as a HD *l-* stem: nom. **seh₂l-s* > Gr. *ἄλς*, Lat. *sāl*, Lith. *sólymas* ‘brine’, etc.; acc. **sh₂-él-m* > Gr. *ἄλ-α*, Lat. *sal-em*, cf. OCS *solb*; gen. **sh₂l-ós* > Gr. *ἄλός*, Lat. *sal-is*, etc., for a discussion and references, see Schrijver 1991: 98, 130, 111, 113-114; Beekes 1995: 177; Derksen 1996: 23-24, 144; Beekes apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 498.

Meillet (1936: 43, 47) reconstructs Arm. nom. *at* with a regular final *-t* vs. gen. **al-i*, which has been replaced by analogical *at-i*. Note dial. *an-ali* ‘not salty’. For nom. **sal-s* > *at* and a discussion, see Greppin 1986: 283-285, 288; Ravnæs 1991: 92; Olsen 1999: 86-87.

Klingenschmitt (1982: 149) interprets **atc-* as reflecting an original **je/o-* present. However, a QIE **s₁d₂-je-* would rather yield Arm. **atče-* (see 2.1.22.1). One might posit an analogical nominative **atc* < **s₁d₂-s*, compare *anic* ‘nit, louse egg’ from **(s)k̂(o)nid-s*, cf. Gr. *κορίς* < **κοριδ-ς*, gen. *-ίδος* (see s.v.). For a discussion of the problem, see also Greppin 1993; 1994; Kortlandt 1994=2003: 104-106.

It is remarkable that Arm. *t*-less form, viz. *at*, is only found in the singular, whereas *att* (mostly API *att-s* and GDPI *att-i-c*) is limited to the plural. It is therefore tempting to reconstruct PArm. nom.sg. **sal-s* vs. pl. **sal-d-*. The element **-d-* seen in Armenian and Germanic may be interpreted then as a determinative with a collective or similar function; note Arm. pl-coll. *-ti*, and the suffix *-ut* ‘abounding in’. Alternatively: PArm. nom. **sal-d-s* vs. obl. **sal-d-i-* > nom. **atc* beside *at* (the latter from **sal-s* or **salds*, with loss of the cluster in absolute auslaut) vs. obl. **att-i-*. This can explain why the Biblical place-names have been rendered in Armenian by *att* and not by the ‘normal’ word for ‘salt’ *at*. See also above on references to ‘salt mines’ and s.v. place-name *Att-k*. We may conclude that the basic meaning of *att* is something like ‘salt deposits, salt mines, salty place’.

The suffix in *att-att-in* ‘salty, salted’ has been compared with that of Gr. *ἄλινος* ‘consisting of water’ (Olsen 1999: 468).

att-a-muġt ‘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 *attamuġt* ‘morning or evening twilight’, adv. *attamġt-in* ‘at twilight’ [Amatuni 1912: 24a], T‘iflis *axtamuxġt-in*, *axt‘umuxġt-in* ‘at twilight’, Axalc‘xa *attemġt-in* ‘at dawn’ [HAB 1: 336b], Łarabał *attamuġt*, in a textual illustration: *axtamuxġt-in* ‘at dawn’ [HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 21a].

●ETYM See s.vv. **atj-* and *buzatt* ‘n.’

attiwr ‘marsh-meadow, swamp’.

See s.v. *etewr*, *eltiwr* ‘id.’.

atuēs, *u*-stem: GDSg *atues-u*, GDPI *atues-u-c'* (Bible+), *o*-stem: GDSg *atues-o-y* (Grigor Narekac'i, 10-11th cent.) 'fox'.

●DIAL Widespread in the dialects [HAB 1: 135a]. Karčewan *átvest* [M. Muradyan 1960: 188b] has an epithetic *-t* after the sibilant, cf. Axalc'xa and Xotorjūr *ak'ist* from *ak'is* 'weasel' (q.v.); see also 2.1.31.

●ETYM Since long (Rask, NHB, etc., see HAB 1: 135a; see also de Lagarde 1854: 27^{L742}; Meyer 1892: 328₁; Hübschmann 1897: 415), connected with Gr. *άλώπηξ*, *-εκος* f. 'fox' and cognate forms continuing the PIE word for 'fox':

Skt. *lopāśá-* m. 'a kind of jackal', probably 'fox', Proto-Iranian **raupaśa-* 'fox': Sogd. *rwps-* f., Khwar. *rwbs* f., Shughni *rūpc(ak)* f. [Morgenstierne 1974: 68a], Ishkashimi *urvesok*, Yazghulami *rəpc*, *rəbc*, Yidgha *rūso*, Munji *ráwsa*, etc. [Edelman 2003: 123];

Celtic **lop-erno-*: Welsh *llewyn* 'fox', Bret. *louarn* 'fox', etc. [Schrijver 1995: 61-62; 1998; Matasović 2009: 243].

Farther: Av. *urupi-* 'dog', *raopi-* 'fox, jackal', Khot. *rrūvāsa-* 'jackal' [Bailey 1979: 367a]; Lat. *volpēs* f. 'fox' (possibly from **ulp-eh₁-*, see Schrijver 1991: 377 for a discussion), Lith. *lāpė*, Latv. *lapse* 'fox', OPr. *lape* 'fox' [Bammesberger 1970; Adrados 1985; Schrijver 1998; Blažek 1998-99; de Vaan 2000].

See Pokorny 1959: 1179; Fraenkel 1: 340; Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 513-514 = 1995: 432-433; Euler 1985: 91; Toporov, PrJaz [L], 1990: 83-89; Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 482-483; Mallory/Adams 1997: 212-213. For an extensive discussion of the Armenian word, including the paradigmatic alternation nom. *-ēs* vs. obl. *-es-* (cf. Gr. *άλώπηξ* vs. obl. *-εκος*, Meillet 1936: 49) and the *u*-declension for animal designations, see Clackson 1994: 33-35; 95-96, 221₄₉; Olsen 1999: 187-188. For the archaeological background of this PIE term, see Mallory 1982: 204-205; Mallory/Adams 1997: 213a. FUgr. **repā* 'fox' is an Aryan loan [Rédei 1986: 46].

The Greek and Indo-Iranian forms presuppose **h₂lōpe/ēk-* and **h₂le/oupēk-*, respectively, and the Armenian may be derived from both of them (cf. Clackson 1994: 96). This vocalic problem makes some scholars sceptical about the connection between the Armeno-Greek and Indo-Iranian forms (Schrijver 1998: 431; de Vaan 2000: 287-288; 2008: 688). This position seems hypercritical to me. Despite the vocalic problem, one should agree with Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 482 in that Indo-Iran. **Raupāśa-* is "nicht zu trennen" from Arm. *atuēs* and Gr. *άλώπηξ*. The above-mentioned standard dictionaries and Clackson 1994: 96 are positive, too. Beekes (1969: 40) points out that "the relation of *άλώπηξ* to the related words is not clear. Arm. *atuēs* < **alōpek-* cannot be separated from it, but allowance must be made for the possibility of non-IE origin". Euler (1985: 92) considers "ein altes Wanderwort (wie für den Apfel)". For a non-IE origin, see also Greppin 1983: 272; Olsen 1999: 187₃₄₇; de Vaan 2000: 288.

I conclude that Arm. *atuēs*, obl. *-es-* 'fox', Gr. *άλώπηξ*, *-εκος* 'fox', and Indo-Iran. **Raupāśa-* 'fox', prob. also 'jackal' are related; they are probably of non-IE origin; the appurtenance of the other forms is possible but uncertain.

atk'at, *a*-stem: GDSg *atk'at-i*, GDPI *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. *ligóti* ‘to be ill’, OIr. *liach* ‘elend, unglücklich’, OPr. *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. **lyäk-*, see Adams 1999: 568.

I agree with Greppin (1983: 274) in considering the etymology to be weak. Basing himself upon OPr. *licuts* ‘small’, etc., Witczak (1999: 178) derives Arm. *atk‘at* from **əlikudā-*, 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. *ataxin* ‘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 to me. The development *x + h > k* is possible.

ačem ‘to increase, grow’ (Bible+).

●DIAL Widespread in the dialects [HAB 1: 141a].

●ETYM From PIE **h₂eug-* ‘to grow’, with loss of **-u-*: Lat. *augeō*, *augēre* ‘to increase, augment’, Goth. *aukan* ‘to increase, augment’, Lith. *augti* ‘to grow’, etc.; other forms reflect an original *s*-present: Gr. *αὔζω* ‘to increase, strengthen’, *ἀ(F)έζω* < **h₂uegs-* ‘to increase, grow’, Skt. *vaks-*, pres. *ukṣāti*, 2sg.aor. *áukṣīs*, 3sg.perf. *vavákṣa* ‘to grow, become big’, OAv. *uxšiiēitī* ‘grows’, *vaxšt* ‘lets grow’, MPers. *waxšīdan* ‘to grow’, Goth. *wahsjan* ‘to grow’, etc.; for the **s*-less forms cf. Toch. B *auk-* ‘to grow, increase’ vs. *auks-* approx. ‘to sprout, grow up’ (Adams 1999: 130-131). For the etymology of Arm. *ačem*, see NHB 1: 48c; Pedersen 1906: 393-394, 396 = 1982: 171-172, 174; Lidén 1905-06: 503-506; Meillet 1908-09: 357; 1936: 29; HAB 1: 140-141 with lit.; Pisani 1950: 170; Kortlandt 1975: 44; 1980: 99; 1983: 13; 1986: 40 = 2003: 11, 27, 43, 70; Beekes 2003: 178, 204, 208.

This PIE etymon has been (Lidén *ibid.*, HAB *ibid.*, etc.) connected to the word for ‘berry, fruit’: OCS *agoda* ‘fruit’, Russ. *jágodá* ‘berry’, SCr. *jägoda* ‘wild strawberry, berry’, Lith. *úoga* ‘berry’, Latv. *uôga* ‘berry’, Goth. *akran* n. ‘fruit’, etc. The standard dictionaries are inclined to represent two unrelated entries and to connect the Armenian word to the ‘berry’ word (Pokorny 1959: 773; ÈtimSlovSlavJaz 1, 1974: 57-59; Greppin 1983: 275; Mallory/Adams 1997: 63b; cf. Ĵahukyan 1987: 141, 183; for the etymon, see also Derksen 2008: 27). This is very unlikely. Most probably Arm. *ačem* belongs with Lat. *augeō*, etc. and derives from PArm. **awčēmi* < **aug-(i)e-mi* = **h₂(e)ug-(i)e-mi* through loss of **-w-* in pretonic syllable, cf. QIE **h₁ng^w-o/ōl-o-* > PArm. **an^wcūt-o-* > **a(w)cūt-o-* > *acut* ‘coal’ (q.v.). Note also the vacillation *aw* : *a* in e.g. *ačar* vs. *awčar* ‘soap’ (both forms Bible+).

ačiwn, *an*-stem: ISg *ačeam-b* in Basil of Caesarea; also *i*-stem or *o*-stem: *ačen-i* or *ačiwn-o-y* in Paterica, ISg *ačiwn-o-v* in Grigor Narekac'i, etc. 'ash'.

●ETYM Meillet (1908-09: 357) compared the word with Gr. *ἄσβολος* f. (m.) 'soot', *ἄζω* 'to wither', Goth. *azgo*, OHG. *asca* 'ashes', for Armenian positing **azg-y-* (cf. Skt. *āsa-* m. 'ashes, light dust', etc.). Bugge (1892: 445; 1893: 1) connected Arm. *azaz-* 'to become dry' to Gr. *ἄζω*, etc. Accepted by Ačařyan (HAB 1: 82). Sceptical Greppin 1981b: 3-4. Scheftelowitz (1904-1905, 2: 32) relates to Arm. *ostin* 'dry (land)' (see HAB, s.v.), Gr. *ἄζω*, Czech *ozditi* 'darren', etc. Ačařyan (HAB s.vv.) accepts this, too, although Meillet (1908/09: 357) is sceptical. For a discussion of this PIE root, see Lubotsky 1985.

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) presents it as a dialectal word, synonymous 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 MidArm. sources, such as "Bžškarān jioy" (13th cent.), Č'ugaszyān 1980: 154^{L-8}, 158^{L9}; 178 (note), etc.; MijHayBař 1, 1987: 36a.

●DIAL In Polis, Aslanbek, Rōdost'o, Nor Naxijewan, 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 *ačəx-dag* (HAB 1: 142a); cf. **y-ant'Vtak*, s.v. *an(u)t'* 'armpit'. See also below, on Sasun.

As is pointed out by Ačařyan (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 *agr-mēj*), 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 *ačug* denotes 'pelvis' (rendered ModArm. *konk'*) [Danielyan 1967: 185a], and Xarberd: 'thigh' [HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 46a].

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

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

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

●ETYM Ačařyan (HAB 1: 141b) does not record any acceptable etymology. Ĵahukyan (1967: 169; 1982: 58; 1987: 142) connects with Skt. *pājasya-* 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 relates to the process of child growth, A.A. Abrahamyan (1958: 61-62) treats *ačuk* as a participial formation in *-uk* from the verbal stem *ač-* 'to grow'. Ĵahukyan (1982: 216₇₃) considers this less probable. M. Hanneyan (1979: 173) mentions the former etymology (from **pəgio-*) without a reference, then she presents 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 indeed widespread and still vivid in Armenia. If one, nevertheless, accepts the derivation from PIE **pəgio-*, the belief and its influence must then 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 *amlık* '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 the 18th century and which, according to Šaniĵe (pers. com. apud HAB 2: 67b), was borrowed from Arm. *erku* 'two' + *am* 'year', formed with the Georgian suffix *-li-*. Apparently, Arm. *erkeam* 'of two years of age' (Bible+) < *erki-* + *am* is meant here. In view of the existence of Arm. dial. *amlık* and bearing in mind that Arm. 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 *amlık* could be old; see below.

●ETYM Since Hübschmann (1897: 416^{Nr17}), *am* has been connected to Skt. *sámā-* 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, since most of the cognates meaning 'summer' are derivations, and the direction of the semantic shift seems to be 'year' > 'summer', not the other way around. An old paradigm **s(e)m-eh₂-/ *sm₁-h₂-ó-* is reconstructed, see Hamp 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 the generalization of the oblique stem: PIE **sRHV-* > Arm. **aRV-* (compare Beekes 1988: 78).

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

The dialectal *amlık* (q.v.) can surprisingly be equated to the Scandinavian words with the basic meaning 'one-year-old animal', which are of the same origin: OIc. *simull*, Norw. *simla*, etc.; see Pokorny 1959: 905. The derivational basis could be **sm₁H-l-*, whence Arm. dial. syncopated *amlık* < **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-*. Note also Engl. *yearling*, Germ. *Jährling* 'a domesticated animal of one year of age', and Ossetic diminutive suffix *-ul*, *-yl*, particularly in animal-names (see Abaev 1965: 80).

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 cent. (Philo, Yovhannēs Ōjnec‘i, etc.).

●ETYM Frisk (1944: 32 = 1966: 280) connects the word with *am* ‘year’ (q.v.) through contamination with synonymous *žamanak*. This is accepted by Greppin (1983: 276), who mentions *amanak* among other derivatives of *am*. Neither refers to Ačařyan’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, I assume, is the fact that the word is not attested in the oldest period of Armenian literature. L. Hovhannisyan (1990: 94-95; cf. 1991: 26) rejects Ačařyan’s etymology, arguing that Pahl. unattested **amānak* would yield, as Ačařyan 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’.

Ačařyan 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 is related to OIr. *amm* ‘time’ which is mentioned by C. Harut‘yunyan (Arutjunjan 1983: 275) in a different context; cf. HAB s.v. *awr* ‘day’.

amařn, *an*-stem: GDSg *amaran* (Cyril of Jerusalem, Yovhan Mamikonean), *amařan* (according to NHB, but without evidence), API *amaruns* (Philo) ‘summer’ (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 Ačařyan 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.

Łarabał *ámæřnā* [Davt‘yan 1966: 306] and Goris *ameřnā* [Margaryan 312b] are probably due to the influence of *jmeřn* ‘winter’. This form may be seen in the place-name *Ameřn-a-p‘or* in Syunik‘, Sot‘k‘, as attested by Step‘anos Ōrbelean (see 4.9).

●ETYM Since Hübschmann (1897: 416^{Nr19}), *amařn* 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 is more attractive. The idea about 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), is improbable; cf. also Greppin 1983: 277: **sm-r-n-*.

Mentioning the plural forms of *jmeřn* ‘winter’ and *k‘irtn* ‘sweat’ going back to **-on(t)h₂-*, Olsen (1999: 128) writes: “No doubt *amařn* ‘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.

amboť, *i*-stem: GDPl *amboť-i-c*‘ (Philo) ‘whole, integral, intact, pure’ (Philo, Book of Chries, Paterica, etc.).

- DIAL Preserved only in Ozim *amp’uxč*‘ [HAB 1: 152a]. Xosrov Anjewac‘i (10th century), native of the area between the lakes Van and Urmia which roughly coincides with the geographical distribution of the dialectal group of Van-Urmia, to which Ozim belongs too, glosses the word *amboť* by his vernacular form *hamboť* [HAB 1: 152a].

- ETYM Composed of *oť* ‘whole, integral, complete, solid; sound, healthy, unhurt’ (q.v.) and the prefix **amb-* from PIE **h₂mb^hi* ‘around’: Gr. *ἀμφί* ‘on both sides, around’, Lat. *amb-*, OIr. *imb-*, OHG *umbi* ‘around’, etc., see Meillet 1894: 236; 1896: 156; Hübschmann 1897: 416; HAB 1: 151-152; HAB-Add 1982: 4; Pokorny 1959: 34; Ĵahukyan 1982: 50; Mallory/Adams 1997: 32a; for a discussion of the etymon, see also Schrijver 1991: 59-60.

amik ‘one-year-old male kid or lamb’.

Attested in the Bible five times, once in NAccSg *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.vv. *am* and dial. *amlík*.

amis, *o*-stem: GDSg *ams-o-y*, GDPl *ams-o-c*‘; also GDLocSg (*y*)*amsean* ‘month’ (Bible+).

- DIAL Ubiquitous in the dialects [HAB 1: 158b].

- 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.) [Ačarjan 1898b: 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 *astł* ‘star’; cf. Hovdhaugen 1968: 120. Solta (1960: 67₆₄) thinks that the *a-* has been added in order to avoid the homonymy with *mis* ‘meat’. This resembles the explanation of Mann (1963: 19) interpreting *amis* as *am-mis* ‘month of the year’; for a further discussion, see Olsen 1999: 48, 820; Viredaz 2005-7: 1-2. 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.

In my view, Ačarjan’s explanation is sufficient, since there is a common phoneme in *a-mis* and *am*, that is *m*. An influence of this kind in the framework of a

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. *māsa-* (RV+), Dard., etc. *māsa-*, and the *o* declension of *amis* fits the protoform.

Much has been written on the reconstruction of the original paradigm of the PIE word under discussion; see Specht 1947: 9-10, 233; Scherer 1953: 61-71; Beekes 1982; 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 reconstruct the following tentative paradigm:

NSg. **mēh₁n-s-s*

AccSg **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 Ir. **mās-a-* have derived. In Indo-Aryan, there seems to be a semantic opposition between **mās-* ‘moon; month’ and **māsa-* ‘month’; see Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 352; cf. Scherer 1953: 61₁. 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 forms are identical. They have both lost the meaning ‘moon’, replaced by **louksneh₂₋*; cf. Arm. *lusin* and Lat. *lūna*, as well as OCS *luna*.

I conclude, on the basis of PIE **meh₁n-s-s* ‘moon; month’ (cf. Lat. *mēnsis*), that a dialectal (Arm. : Ir.) 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, although the latter derived from the older nominative rather than from the thematic form.

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

●DIAL The word is found in the meaning ‘little (lamb, child)’ in Lori (Ararat) and Łarabał; see HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 49b, as well as in Goris *āmlík* ‘a new-born lamb’ [Margaryan 1975: 375a]. Ačarjan (HAB 1: 156b) cites only Łarabał *āmlig^v* ‘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.

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

●ETYM Ačařyan (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 **sṃH-*), but then he adds that it seems to have been borrowed from Turk. *emlik* ‘sucking lamb’. I think this is unnecessary, since *amlík* can easily be derived from Arm. *am* with the suffixal element **-li(h₂)-* and diminutive *-ik*: **sṃH-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, 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 have been borrowed from Armenian.

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

***am-orj-i-k** ‘testicles’, recorded as a dialectal word in DialAdd apud NHB 2: 1060b (see also 1: 699a s.v. *erku-or-i-k* ‘testicles’: *z-erku-or-e-a-c* in Deuteronomy 25.11, Cox 1981: 174).

●DIAL Ačařyan HAB 3: 582b and Amatuni 1912: 27b record the word without concrete dialectal data, referring only to NHB. Though still known to NHB (first half of the 19th century), the word seems to be extinct by the 20th century. It is present only in literary Modern Armenian: *amorjik* ‘testicles’, *amorj-at-el* ‘to castrate’, *amorj-a-mašk* ‘scrotum’ [Malxaseanc HBB 1: 68c].

●ETYM Composed of the prefix *am-* ‘at, with, together’ and **orj-i-* ‘testicle’, q.v. (HAB 3: 582b).

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”’ ‘cloud’, later also ‘lightning; sponge’. In some derivatives, perhaps ‘sky’ (see s.v. *ampar*) and ‘thunder’; see NHB 1: 24 s.vv. *ampaharim*, *ampaharut‘iwn*, *ampanman*, *ampawor*, *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*, namely *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. *abhrá-* n. ‘thunder-cloud, rain-cloud, blanket of clouds’, Av. *aβra-* n. ‘cloud; rain’, etc., and only thereafter mentions Skt. *nábhas-* 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 **ḡb^hro-* in close relationship with Gaul. *inter ambes* ‘inter rivos’, etc., both Armenian and Celtic being “ohne formantisches r”) and Mallory / Adams 1997: 477.

The correlation with the latter group (i.e. Gr. *νέφος*, etc.) 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, having an *o*-stem, can regularly be derived from PIE *s*-stem **neb^hos* (cf. Jähukyan 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, namely **ḡb^hro-*, which is continued in Arm. *amprop* ‘thunder(bolt)’ (q.v.). Thus, one might accept the explanation of *amp* from **ḡb^hos* (< **ḡb^hos*, through labial assimilation), “a compromise between **ḡb^hró-* and the original *s*-stem” [Olsen 1999: 45]. I, alternatively, propose to assume a generalization of the zero-grade genitive of the PD paradigm: NSg **néb^hos*, GSG **nb^hés-s*. This may be confirmed by another atmospheric term, namely *bark* ‘lightning’, and, perhaps, by *ayt* ‘cheek’ (see s.vv. and 2.2.2.1).

Skt. *ámhas-* ‘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. *ámhas-* 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. *ὄμφή· πνοή* ‘whiff’ (Hesychius), which is semantically remote. The relation between **Hneb^h-* (but Gr. *νέφος* points to the 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 a 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 **nemb^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’, namely Lat. *lens* and Lith. *glinda* from **gnind-*, next to the basic **K/Gnid-* (see s.v. *anic* ‘nit, louse egg’).

Toch. B *eprer* ‘atmosphere, sky, firmament’, *iprer* ‘sky, air’ is said to belong to the words under discussion (albeit considered uncertain in Adams 1999: 65, 90). Regardless of whether this is true or not, it rather seems to be related to Skt. *ámbara-* n. ‘Luftraum’ (not mentioned by Mayrhofer in the context of *abhrá-* 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”).

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 by the influence of *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. *ῥύβρος* and *amprop* (as well as Skt. *ambu-* ‘water’ and *ámbara-* ‘Luftraum’?; see above) point to **b* instead of **b^h*. For the Greek word, this is explained by regular deaspiration after the sonant in an accented syllable; cf. Olsen 1999: 45₈₉ in the context of the Greek word and Arm. *amp* (referring to Schwyzer). 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 a post-nasal position 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 semantically be 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 **nb^hro-*: Oss. *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 may have preserved (or developed secondarily) this meaning; see s.v. *ampar*.

ampar ‘planet’.

Mentioned only in Ališan 1910: 122: *ampar astelk* ‘the seven planets’, from an unspecified author, who in turn is said to have taken it from Elišē, 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 Ačaryan (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 as the prefix *am-* or something else, but not as 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*, Oss. *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 *astelk* ‘*molark*’ ‘planets’ and *astelk* ‘*anmolark*’ ‘stars’ from *mol-ar* ‘erroneous’ (see NHB 1: 204b; 2: 293a; also *anmolar astelk* 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 (albeit 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 Maccabees 1.22, referring to *šot* ‘ray’ of *aregakn* ‘sun’. Thus, *amp* would make sense here with the 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 created after the Greek. E.g., to my mother, Ženya Simonyan (village Erazgavors, in the vicinity of 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 the falling snow) [V. Vardanyan 1985: 192/193]; this is ambiguous, of course. Thomson (1985: 187) has “from the clouds”.

dial. *ampažer* (Ararat) ‘light blue’ [HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 50b]; for the component **žer* cf. *karmr-žer* (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 (Astuacaturean 1895: 60a has *amprap-ac*’, but cf. Cox 2006: 245), Book of Chries, Yovhannēs Draxanakerte’i ‘thunder’.

Renders Gr. *κνδοιμός* ‘din of battle, uproar, hubbub’ in Job 38.25 (Cox 2006: 245). Attested also in Grigor Narekac’i, “Čarəntir”, etc.

●ETYM From PIE **ḡb^hro-*: Skt. *abhrá-* n., rarely m. ‘thunder-cloud, rain-cloud, blanket of clouds’, YAv. *aβra-* n. ‘rain-cloud’, Khot. *ora-* ‘sky’, Lat. *imber*, GSlg. *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 a discussion, especially of the internal *-p-*, see s.v. *amp* ‘cloud’. Since the connection with *amp* is certain and is accepted by everyone including Ačaryan, one should note that, in fact, the etymology was first recognized by NHB and Ĵaxjaxean.

The thematic vowel **-o-* was accented [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 **ḡb^hro-* (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*. One may therefore merely assume a perseveration (see 2.1.28): PIE **ḡb^hro-* > PArm. **amb/pro-* > *ampro-p*.

amul, *o*-stem: GDSg *aml-o-y*, GDPI *aml-o-c*‘ (Bible+) ‘sterile, childless’ (Bible+; 18 attestations in the Bible, Astuacaturean 1895: 58a), ‘barren’ (Agat‘angelos, Yovhannēs Ōjnee‘i, Nersēs Šnorhali, Čarəntir).

●DIAL Karin, Muš *amul*, Sebastia *amur* with *r* due to contamination with *amur* ‘hard’ [HAB 1: 160b] (probably also with *amuri* ‘unmarried’).

●ETYM Composed of the privative prefix *an-* < PIE **h-* and PArm. **fōl-* ‘kid, child’, cf. *ul* ‘kid’ (q.v.), Gr. *πῶλος* m. f. ‘young horse, foal; young girl, youth’, etc. (Meillet 1922c; 1930: 184; 1936: 48; Pokorny 1959: 843; Jahukyan 1967: 236; 1987: 145, 487; Ravnæs 1991: 146-147; Praust 1996: 193-194; Mallory/Adams 1997: 56b; Beekes 2003: 172; cf. Dumézil 1938: 241; Greppin 1983: 280). See further s.vv. *amuri* ‘unmarried’, *suk* ‘childless, sterile’.

The alternative derivation from IE **h-putlo-* with Skt. *a-pútra-* ‘sonless’ (Olsen 1989: 235) is improbable; one rather expects Arm. **amuwt* > **amul* from it. The interpretation of Pisani 1944: 159 as *an-* + **mulo-* (cf. Skr. *mūla-m* ‘root’, thus ‘rootless’) is untenable. I see no reason to abandon the etymology of Meillet, even though it has not been accepted by Ačařyan (HAB 1: 160).⁷

amuri, *ea*-stem: GDSg *amurw-o-y* (Job 24.21), GDPI *amure-a-c*‘ (1 Corinthians 7.8) ‘unmarried, single, widowed; unmarried woman’ (Job 24.21, 1 Corinthians 7.8), ‘wifeless’ (Nersēs Šnorhali, 12th cent.).

In 1 Corinthians 7.8 *amuri* and *ayri* render Gr. *ἄγαμος* ‘unmarried’ and *χήρα* ‘widow’, respectively: *amureac* ‘*n ew ayreac* ‘*n asem* : *λέγω δὲ τοῖς ἀγάμοις καὶ ταῖς χήραις*.

In Job 24.21 we find *amul* and *amuri* rendering Gr. *στεῖρα* ‘infertile (woman)’ and *γύναιον* ‘woman’, respectively: *zi amloyn bari oč* ‘*arar*; *ew amurwoyn oč* ‘*otormec* ‘*aw* “for he did not treat well the barren woman, and had no pity on the young one” : *στεῖραν γὰρ οὐκ εὖ ἐποίησεν καὶ γύναιον οὐκ ἠλέησεν* (Cox 2006: 171).

●DIAL No dialectal record in HAB 1: 162a.

In the late medieval dictionary *Bařgirk* ‘*hayoc*‘ (see Amalyan 1975: 219^{Nr410}) one finds *mōri* rendering *amuri*; in some manuscripts (408₄₁₀): *mōri* ‘*amuri*, *kam ankin mard* “unmarried, or wifeless man”. I think this form betrays a dialectal form in Łarabał and surroundings. The loss of the initial pretonic vowel (see 2.1.33.2) and the sound change *-ú-* > *-ɔ-* are regular in this dialectal area. For some examples of the development *r* > *ř* in Łarabał and Mełri, see Davt‘yan 1966: 68 and Ałayan 1954: 93, respectively.

●ETYM Ačařyan (HAB 1: 162a) rejects all the etymological suggestions and leaves the origin of the word open. In Armeniaca Nr. 61 (HAB 4: 669) he claims that *amuri* refers to ‘wifeless man’ and interprets it as **an-moyri*, composed of the privative prefix *an-* and an otherwise unattested word **moyri* ‘wife, woman, girl’, cf. Gr. *μεῖραζ* ‘girl’, Lat. *marīta* ‘wife’, Lith. *mergà* ‘girl’, *marti* f. ‘bride, young woman’, etc., also Arm. *mari* ‘female bird, hen’ (q.v.).

However, the Biblical attestations seem to point to a basic meaning ‘unmarried or widowed (woman)’; the meaning ‘wifeless’ is attested only in Middle Armenian. The etymology should therefore be viewed as semantically improbable, unless one assumes ‘husbandless’ starting with Skt. *mārya-* m. ‘young man, young warrior’,

⁷ An Arabic origin has been suggested in N. Mkrč‘yan 1980: 61.

Lat. *marītus* ‘married; husband, mate’, etc. Note, however, that the vocalism is uncertain, too.

The derivation from **an-potro-iyō-* (Adontz 1937: 12) or better **ŋ-putr-iyō-* (Dumézil 1938: 241; Godel 1975: 79), with a semantic development ‘qui n’a pas enfanté’ > ‘célibataire’ (Adontz *ibid.*) or ‘mâle sans enfant légal’ > ‘homme sans famille propre, non marié’ (Dumézil *ibid.*) is largely accepted, see Jähukyan 1987: 145, 188 (with hesitation); Ravnæs 1991: 146-147; Beekes 2003: 172. However, this etymology is formally uncertain; Skt. *putrá-* ‘son’ is usually derived from **putlo-* (but note Lat. *puer* ‘boy’, cf. Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 142-143; for a critical analysis of the etymology, see Olsen 1999: 447, cf. 446). Neither the semantics seems to me convincing.

I tentatively suggest to interpret *amuri* as composed of the privative prefix *an-* and PArm. (otherwise unattested) **wir-* ‘man, husband’ (cf. Lith. *výras* ‘man, husband’, OHG *wer* ‘man, husband’, Lat. *vir* ‘man, male; husband’, Skt. *vīrá-* ‘man’, etc.⁸ In view of the absence of the development IE **-n̥-* > Arm. **-ng-* we may assume that the compound has been made at a later stage: **an-wir-íya-* ‘husbandless’ > **am(w)uiríya-* > *amuri*, *-ea-*. This proto-form is structurally and semantically parallel to QIE **ŋ-Hnēr-ieh₂-* ‘husbandless’ > PArm. **an(an)iríya-* > *ayri*, *-ea-* ‘widow’ (q.v.).

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-aygoy* ‘in the morning’, *c-ayg* ‘night’ (< “till dawn”), *z-c-ayg* ‘at night’ (all attested in the Bible).

The word has mainly a *u*-stem. In the Classical period, a form of the *o* declension is used by Agat’angelos: *ənd aygoyn arawōtanaln*. In P’awstos Buzand 4.10 (1883=1984: 86^{L-1}; transl. Garsoïan 1989: 131): *ənd ays 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; HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 52b. In Hamšen *ākvən*, *ākvənā*, *ākvənc’u* ‘in the morning’; *ekuc*, *ek’unc* ‘tomorrow’ [Ačarjan 1947: 220]. According also to HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 33a, Hamšen *akvon* means ‘morning’, but the textual illustration has *akvnc’u* (adv.).

In view of ClArm. *y-ayg-* and MidArm. *y-eg-uc*, Ĵula *h’ekuc* and Agulis *heǰg’üc*, *yeǰg’üc* (HAB 1: 165-166) may be reconstructed as **y-ayg-uc*.

The compound *aygahot* is attested in Ařak’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’ [Ačarjan 1913: 90b; HAB 1: 165ab], Sivri-Hisar *ek’əxk* or *agotk* [PtmSivHisHay 1965: 454, 460a]. Composed of *ayg* ‘morning’ and *hot* ‘earth’ (HAB); cf. also MidArm. and dial. *hot-k* ‘cemetery’ [HAB 3: 112a]. Some Eastern dialects have an epenthetic *-n-*: Łarabał *ik’navəet*, Ararat *ek’nafǰtek* (< **ayg-n-a-hot-ay-k*), etc.

Bařramyan (1960: 110a) interprets Xarberd (K’i) *akəxk*, *agotk* ‘ceremony at the next morning after the funeral’ as composed of *akn* ‘eye’ and *otok* ‘supplication’.

⁸ This etymology partly coincides with that of Eazčean in ‘Patker’ 1890: 198-209 (I cite from HAB 1: 162a).

This view cannot be accepted. The word is certainly identical with **ayg-hot-k'* above.

The initial nasal of *Ĵula 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 being composed of *k'un* 'sleep' and *hot* 'earth'. Further, see 2.1.37.

For the epenthetic nasal also seen in *Ľarabař ik'narot* 'taking the 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: the morning following the wedding, the bride, the groom 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 pārew, aly eg pārew*. As is explicitly interpreted 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 those proposals, one should mention that of Patrubány (StugHetaz, 1905: 158), who suggested a connection with Gr. *αἰών* 'Leben(szeit), Zeit(dauer), lange Zeit', Skt. *āyu-* 'lifetime', etc. The phonological development seems impeccable: PIE NSg **h₂(e)iu-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. Although 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.

Jahukyan (1973: 17) derives *ayg* from IE **ai-* (= **h₂ei-*) 'to burn, shine'. However, *-g* is unexplained. Later Jahukyan himself seems to doubt the etymology, since he excludes the word from the list of the native words (1987: 111-157) and mentions it with a question mark in p. 295, where he hesitantly assumes that Finnish *aika* 'time' may have been borrowed from Arm. *ayg*. Nor is this etymology certain.

Ačaryan compares *ayg* with 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".

In my own view, however, **h₂(e)us(s)i* should yield **(h)aw*. The alternative proposed by Olsen (1999: 108) involves a complicated development: **h₂áusōs* > **aūhu-* > **aūuu-* > (through dissimilation) > **aiūu-* > **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*)*aygoi* ‘in the morning’, which seems to be a secondary locative in **-i*, based on the same thematic form; thus, **aygo-i* > *z-aygoi*, or simply GDPl functioning as an “endungslos” locative without preposition *i/y-* cf. de 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-aygoi* 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 *ar-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 the generalization of the zero grade of the oblique stem; see also s.v. **aġ-*; cf., particularly, the above-mentioned hypothetical **h₂usijō-* > Arm. **aygo-*, a thematization based on the old locative.

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) **awī-o-* > **aygo-* > *ayg*, *o*-stem >> *u*-stem, generalized from **aw-u*.

See also s.v. *anagan*.

aygi, *ea*-stem: GDSg *aygw-o-y*, LocSg *y-aygw-oj*, GDPl *ayge-a-c*’, AblPl *y-ayge-a-c*’, LocPl *y-aygi-s* (rich evidence in the Bible, see Astuacaturean 1895: 62-63); *o*-stem: ISg *aygwov* (only 1 Maccabees 14.12) ‘vineyard; vine’ (Bible+); perhaps also ‘grapes’ (dial.); **ayge-** < **aygi-a-* and **ayg-a-** in a number of compounds (Bible+).

Abundant in the Bible, rendering Gr. *ἄμπελος* f. ‘grape-vine, *Vitis vinifera*’ or *ἀμπελών* m. ‘vineyard’. A textual illustration from 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* ‘barley’. For the meaning ‘grape-vine’, note Hosea 10.1: *Aygi taštawor pttalic* ‘*Israyēl*: *ἄμπελος ἐκκληματοῦσα Ἰσραήλ*.

Many compound place-names (see HayTelBař 1, 1986: 226-229), based on the dialectal variant **e/igi* (see below). For the attestations of the forms *aygi*, *ēgi*, and *igi* in inscriptions, etc., see H. Muradyan 1972: 93-94; Hobosyan 2004.

●DIAL Widespread in the dialects, mainly meaning ‘garden’: Erzinka *ek’i* [Kostandyan 1979: 128a], Agulis *ég’i* (for the paradigm, see Ačařean 1935: 333), pl. *əg’ənāni*, *əg’ənānik*’, Aslanbek, Řodost’o, Xarberd, Tigranakert, C’ina *ek’i*, Akn *eg’i*, Marala, Salmast *ek’i*, Hačən *eg’g’i*, Zeyt’un *eg’ε*, T’iflis *igi*, Juła *ig’i*, Van *ik’i*, Ararat *ik’i* [HAB 1: 166b].

Next to Van *iky* one finds Ozim *hēge* [HAB 1: 166b; Ačařyan 1952: 244], Šatax *hiky* [M. Muradyan 1962: 191b], Moks *hek’ə*’ (see below), as well as Muš *h’eg’i* (HAB, *ibid.*), Aštarak *hik’i*, which has been replaced by *bat* in the village of Őšakan (see Bařdasaryan-T’ap’alc’yan 1971: 218). These forms seem to point to a by-form **y-aygi* (see 2.3.1).

Moks *hek’ə*’, GSg *hek’ü*, NPl *hek’ik’*’ ‘виноградник; сад фруктовый’ [Orbeli 2002: 276]. In a Moks proverb the word seems to refer to ‘grapes’: *Hek’ü sirun t’up’ kəłəzə*’ [Orbeli 2002: 120^{Nr69}]; Orbeli (op. cit. 182^{Nr100}, 1982: 118^{Nr100}) translates it as follows: “Из любви к винограду лижет и куст!”.

●ETYM Connected with Gr. *οἴη* f. ‘service-tree’, Lat. *ūva* ‘grapes’, Russ. *íva* ‘willow’, Czech *jíva* ‘willow’, SCr. *íva* ‘willow’, Lith. *ievà* ‘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. Ačarıyan’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-* or **h₁oh₁i-ueh₂-* or **h₁oih₁-ueh₂-*. On the vocalism, see 2.1.5. Arm. *ayg-i* ‘vineyard, garden’ is thus an *i*-derivative of **ayg-* ‘grapes, vine’. Typologically compare *xatot* ‘grapes’ : **xatot-ut* > Hamšen *havötut* ‘vineyard, garden’ (see Ačarıyan 1947: 233).

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

ayl, *o*-stem: GSG *ayl-o-y*, DLocSG *ayl-um*, AblSG *y-ayl-m-ē*, ISG *ayl-o-v*, GDPI *ayl-o-c*, IPI *ayl-o-v-k* ‘other; alien, foreign; also; but, however; then’ (Bible+).

For abundant evidence for *ayl*, *ayl imm/inč’ok*, and the like, for reciprocal or distributive expressions *ayl ayl*, *ayl ew ayl*, *ayl ayloy*, *ayl aylum*, *ayl and ayl*, *ayl and ayloy* (cf. Gr. *ἄλλος ἄλλον*, Lat. *alius alius*, *alius alium* ‘one another’, Skt. *anyó anyá-*, etc., Mawet 1990: 64; 1992: 157), as well as for numerous derivatives and compounds, see NHB 1: 82-90; Astuacaturean 1895: 64-66; Mawet 1990.

●DIAL Dialectally ubiquitous, used also as enclitic and proclitic [HAB 1: 168-169].

●ETYM Since Schröder, Awetik‘ean, NHB, etc., connected with Gr. *ἄλλος* ‘other’, Lat. *alius*, *-a*, *-ud* ‘another’, OIr. *aile* ‘second, other’, *alaile* ‘other’, Toch. B *alye-k alle-k* ‘other, another’, Skt. *árana-* ‘strange, far’, *áranya-* n. ‘wilderness, desert, jungle’, cf. *anyá-* ‘other, different, alien’, *ārá-* m. n. ‘distance’, etc. (Hübschmann 1897: 417; HAB 1: 168; Pokorny 1959: 25; Frisk 1: 75-77; Ĵahukyan 1982: 132; Mawet 1990; 1992; Mayrhofer EWAia 1, 1992: 80, 107-108, 173; Schrijver 1995: 19, 321-324; Mallory/Adams 1997: 64a, 411; Adams 1999: 28-29). For the adverbial use in the meaning ‘but, however’ cf. Gr. *ἄλλά* (acc. pl. used as adverb) ‘but, however’, Goth. *alja* ‘but’ (HAB 1: 168b; Godel 1975: 81₆₅; Schmitt 1981: 161, 210; Lehmann 1986: 27b; Mawet 1990: 60).

On the problem of *l* : *t* and the spelling variant *ayt*, see NHB 1: 83a; Meillet 1911: 209; 1936: 47; HAB 1: 168b; Ałayan 1961: 75, 81; Ĵahukyan 1982: 25.

For an extensive discussion and references on the problem of **-lj-* > *-yl-* instead of **-lj-*, see HAB 1: 168b; for a further discussion and other examples, see Schmitt 1981: 77; Ĵahukyan 1982: 71-72; Ravnæs 1991: 33-36; Olsen 1999: 795-798; Beekes 2003: 161-162, 211. According to Godel (1975: 81, 87; see also Greppin 1983: 283), this may have been the normal development after *a*. Compare *otj* ‘whole, sound’ (q.v.) from **ol-jo-*, cf. OIr. *uile* ‘whole’. Further see s.v. *da(y)l* ‘colostrum, beestings’, *jayn* ‘voice, sound’. Note, however, *galj* ‘lukewarm’ if from **ul₁-iV-* vs. *gol*, possibly *i*-stem ‘id.’ (q.v.).

The IE cognate forms point to a full-grade **h₂el-io-* (Schrijver 1991: 40; Beekes 2003: 162, 211). This proto-form would yield Arm. **hayl*, however. One may assume a derivation from or contamination from **h₂ol-io-*, cf. Lat. *ollus* ‘ille’, *uls*

‘beyond’, *ultrā* ‘on the other side of, beyond’, OIr. *ol* ‘beyond’, etc. (on which see Schrijver 1991: 51, 68, 317).⁹

For the declension of the Armenian word and especially for dat.-loc. *ayl-um* and abl. *y-ayl-m-ē*, see Meillet 1913: 66; 1936: 90-91; Godel 1975: 35-36; Schmitt 1981: 126-127; Clackson 1994: 63, 212₂₀. For an extensive philological (in particular, semantic) discussion of Arm. *ayl* and the PIE term, see Mawet 1990 and 1992, respectively.

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

GDPI *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.: API *awdi-s* and GDPI *awde-a-c* [Astuacaturean 1895: 1554b]. Further, **ayci-* is seen in *ayce-amm* ‘gazelle, roe’, which renders Gr. *δορκάς* 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 the 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 *ecnə*^ε ‘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. *αἴζ*, *αἰγός* f. ‘goat’, YAv. *īzaēna-* ‘leathern’, etc. [Hübschmann 1881: 176-177; 1897: 417; 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) **aiča*, 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, like the Avestan one, may have derived from zero grade **h₂ig-* > **Hyg-*, with *-y-* analogically after NSg **h₂eig-* (see 2.1.5). 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 *ecnə*^ε ‘of goatskin’ can be compared with YAv. *īzaēna-* ‘leathern’.

ayo ‘yes’ (Bible, Agat‘angelos, Ephrem, Dionysius Thrax, Grigor Narekac‘i, Grigor Magistros, etc.); often accented **ayó** [NHB 1: 93a; Astuacaturean 1895: 66-67]; sometimes **ayoy**, e.g. in Daniel 3.91 (Cowe 1992: 176), Dionysius Thrax (also with

⁹ Note Urart., Hurr. *uli-* ‘other’, Ĵahukyan 1963: 34; 1967a: 41; 1987: 422; 1988: 139.

an initial *h-*), etc. Already in the 12th century, *ayo* was an extinct form, replaced by *ha* [HAB 1: 170b; 3: 3a], q.v.

●ETYM Ačařyan (HAB 1: 170-171) considers *ayo* as an onomatopoeic word and mentions similar forms in different languages. He also points out that the notion ‘yes’ has often a secondary origin or is simply absent from language inventories.

The onomatopoeic origin of *ayo* ‘yes’ is probable. Note that the synonym *ha* is certainly onomatopoeic, cf. Georg. *ho*, Turk. *he*, etc. (HAB 3: 3a). Nevertheless, I putatively propose to derive Arm. *ayo* ‘yes’ from PIE **h₂oiu-* ‘life, age, eternity’, cf. Skt. *āyu-* n. ‘life, lifetime’, Av. *āiiu-* n. ‘life, lifetime, time’ (gen.sg. OAv. *yaoš*, dat.sg. OAv. *yauuōi*, *yauuē*, YAv. *yauue*), OAv. *yauuaē-jī-* adj. ‘living forever’ (cf. Arm. *yawēž*, *i*-stem, Iranian loanword), Gr. *αἰών* m. ‘lifetime, time, duration’, Lat. *aevum* n. (also *aevus* m.) ‘lifetime, eternity’, etc. Intervocalic **-j-* has been preserved, perhaps due to (secondarily) onomatopoeic nature and/or the accent: **h₂oiu-* > PArm. **ayú* > *ayó* (**u* > *o* due to lowering influence of **a*).

For the typology of making words meaning ‘ever; yes’ and ‘never; no(t)’, see Cowgill 1960; see also s.v. *oč* ‘not’. Compare also Arm. Hung. **kenōk* ‘(lit. IPI of *kean-k* ‘life’), Modern Colloquial Armenian *kyank‘um* ‘never’ (< **‘in the life, in lifetime’*).

Admitting the onomatopoeic origin of Arm. *ayo*, N. Mkrtč‘yan (1984: 81-82) mentions Arab. *ajua*, Coptic *haio* ‘yes’.

ay-s ‘this’, etc.

See s.v. **s(a/o)-* ‘this’.

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.*, although the passage is cited in 257a and 258a, s.vv. *bažak* and *bažin*): *ays mrrik bažin bažaki noc‘a* (see Zōhrapean 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 καταγίδος ἡ μερίς τοῦ ποτηρίου αὐτῶν*.

In his commentary on Psalms, Vardan Arewelc‘i (13th cent.) comments upon this passage: *ays*, or *ē hołm* “*ays*, that is *hołm* ‘wind’”. Elsewhere in Psalms, namely 106.25 and 148.8, the same *πνεῦμα καταγίδος* is rendered as *hołm ew mrrik*. In these three passages, thus, *πνεῦμα* corresponds twice to *hołm* and once to *ays*. For the parallelism between *ays* and *hołm*, 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 Kołbac‘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 hołm ē, ew hołmn – ogi* “the *ays* [‘evil spirit’] is *hołm* [‘wind’], and the *hołm* [‘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, albeit 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; Ačaryan, HLPatm 2, 1951: 125; Ĵahukyan 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 the northerly-located *Koṭb*, one may take this evidence as a historical testimony reflecting the dialectal contrast between groups which might be conventionally named as the Muš/Alaškert/Karin-group and the Van/Agulis/ĽarabaĽ-group (see 1.1).

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

See also s.v. *zaysaysem*.

●DIAL Preserved only in Van *setan-ays* (also *setan-ak*) ‘a whirling wind-storm, twister’ [HAB 1: 172a], a compound with *setan* ‘table’ as the first member. In Amatuni (1912: 585b): Van *setanayt* ‘twister’ (= *satani k’ami* ‘wind of Satan’); apparently a misprint for *setanays*. The sailors of Van Lake considered *setanays* to be an evil spirit that came to wreck ships whenever it stormed [Garamanlean 1931: 512b].

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

●ETYM Ačaryan (HAB 1: 172a) rejects all the etymological attempts, including those relating *ays* to Skt. *ásura-* m. ‘god, lord’ and Etrusc. *ais* ‘god’. Ĵahukyan (1983: 87-88; 1987: 450, 462-463; 1988, 1: 64) is inclined to connect the word with Skt. *ásura-* m. ‘god, lord, name of a group of gods’, *ásurá-* ‘godlike; demonlike’ (RV+), Av. *ahu-* m. ‘lord, overlord’, Hitt. *haš-* ‘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*), although this is not corroborated 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 corroborated by the semantics of the Armenian word. On the other hand, Ĵahukyan (1987: 450) also mentions Arab. *ḥanzab* ‘devil’.

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

One prefers positing **h₂(e)nsu-jo-* [Olsen 1999: 958], although the expected Armenian form seems to be **asú(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), Ačaryan (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, although, of course, the historical and chronological background of such a relationship has to be established.

ayt-k', *i*-stem: GDP1 *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 Andreev (1967: 265) derives from *aytoc'* (better: *aytoyc'*) and *aytoc'il*, respectively. Further: K'esab *ütec'* and *ütesg* (from *aytoyc'* and *aytoyc'-k'*), and verbal *ütac'im* (< *aytuc'-*) and *utac'asnim* (< *aytuc'anem*) [Č'olak'ean 1986: 195b]. Ač'aryan 2003 vacat.

●ETYM Since de Lagarde, connected with Gr. *oĩdēō* 'to swell', *oĩdōc* 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]. Lat. *aemidus* 'swollen' probably reflects **h₂eid-sm-* [Schrijver 1991: 38]. Arm. *ayt* may be treated as a regular *s*-stem like Gr. *oĩdōc* 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.

ayr₁, GDSg *arñ*, AblSg *y-arñ-ē*, ISg *aram-b*, NPl *ar-k'*, APl *ar-s*, GDP1 *aran-c'*, Ipl *aram-b-k'* (abundant in the Bible) 'man; husband'.

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

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

The archaic genitive *arñ* has been indirectly preserved in Łarabał gen. *tērnə* < ClArm. *te-arñ*, 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. *άνήρ* (*άνδρός*, *άνδρα*, pl. *άνδρες*; ep. also *άνερα*, *άνερος*, etc.) 'man (*opp.* woman/god/youth); husband'; cf. also Lat. *Nerō*, *neriōsus* 'strong' [Schrijver 1991: 21], Skt. *nār-* 'man, human, hero, warrior' (RV+), etc. Kuiper (1951) posits a Greek old abstract **άνερα*, **άνερα* 'vital energy' on the basis of *-ήνωρα* and *νώνορα* (PIE **h₂ner-*; cf. Skt. *sū-nāra-*, etc.); cf. Frisk 1: 107 ("wenig wahrscheinlich").

Meillet (1896: 151; 1900: 18₁; 1936: 55, 83, 143, 149) correctly rejects the alternative derivation of Arm. *ayr* from PIE **r̥sen-*: Gr. *ἄρσην, -ενος* ‘male’, etc. (Hübschmann 1897: 417-418) and equates Arm. NSg *ayr*, GDSg *ar̥n* and API *ar-s* with *ἀνήρ, ἀνδρός* and PIE acc.pl. **an̥rs* respectively, assuming for *ayr* a development comparable to that of Gr. *ἡμαρ* vs. Arm. *awr* ‘day’ (q.v.). Thus: PIE **h₂nēr* (cf. Gr. *ἀνήρ*) > PArm. **anir* > **aynr* or **aⁿ(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 anticipation/epenthesis, see 2.1.27.1. For the relative chronology of the loss of the nasals in *ayr* and *awr*, see Kortlandt 1985: 20 = 2003: 64. The genitive form *ar̥n* implies a metathesis: **h₂nr-ós* (cf. Gr. *ἀνδρός*) > PArm. **anro-* > **arno-* > *ar̥n*. See further HAB 1: 173-174; AčarLiak 3, 1957: 439; Hamp 1966: 12-13; Greppin 1983: 285-286; Clackson 1994: 35, 195; Olsen 1984: 103; 1985: 5-6; 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-* : *-r̥-* seen in *ayr, aramb* : *ar̥n*, see Ĵahukyan 1967: 312; Clackson 1994: 132.

Hamp (1966: 12-13) proposed the following scenario. Genitive **arnos* (< **anros*, cf. Gr. *ἀνδρός*) 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. For a morphological analysis, see Beekes 1969: 46; see also s.vv. *awr* ‘day’ and *anurj* ‘dream’.

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, albeit unnecessary.

ayr₂, *i*-stem: GDSg *ayr-i*, AblSg *y-ayr-ē*, ISg *ayr-i-w*, LocSg *y-ayr-i*, GDPI *ayr-i-c* ‘cave’ (Bible+).

●DIAL Preserved in the dialects of Ararat, Muš, Alaškert as *er* and in Van, Ozim, Moks, Salmast as *her*; with an initial *h-*; see HAB 1: 175a; AčarĴan 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 (AčarĴan’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 has been demonstrated by Weitenberg 1999-2000: 7-15, AčarĴan’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 AčarĴan’s Law did not operate in this case.

Hačən *k’äyay* is a compound with *k’ar* ‘stone’ as the first member.

●ETYM Often compared with Gr. *ἀντρον* n. ‘Höhle, Grotte’, assuming **antr-iV-* or **antēr* for Armenian; see Pisani 1944: 161-162; Schmitt 1972-74: 23; de Lamberterie 1978: 243-245; Ĵahukyan 1987: 112, 258, 582-583; 1988: 150; 1992: 24

(equating also with Urart. theonym *Airaini*). For more references and a discussion, see Clackson 1994: 98, who considers this etymology uncertain.

The connection with Hitt. *ḫariya-* ‘valley’ (see Greppin 1973: 69) is uncertain, too.

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 regarded as a derivative (etymologically meaning ‘abandoned’) from *ayr* ‘cave, empty’; for the semantic field, see s.v. *xort* ‘adulterine, counterfeit; hard, rough’.

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

●DIAL Ubiquitous in the dialects [HAB 1: 176a].

●ETYM Usually derived from **ayr-* ‘fire’ < **HeHter-*, cf. Av. *ātar-* / *āθr-* ‘fire’ (an old neuter in *-r*), perhaps also Lat. *āter* ‘black, dark’, OIr. *āith* ‘furnace’, Welsh *odyn* (< **āti-*) ‘furnace’, Palaic *hā-* ‘to be hot’, etc., see de Lagarde 1854: 29^{L804}; Hübschmann 1897: 418; HAB 1: 175; Greppin 1983: 286-287; Beekes apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 202b. On the morphology of Av. *ātar-* / *āθr-* ‘fire’, see Beekes 1988: 122-124; Hoffmann/Forsman 1996: 150-152. The Armenian verb is denominative (see further Szemerényi 1977: 25, 28, 32).

Jasanoff (1979: 145; see also Viredaz 2005: 85) proposed a connection with Gr. *αἴθω* ‘to kindle; to burn (with light)’, Skt. *edh-* ‘to set alight, kindle; to shine’, etc. from PIE **h₂eid^h-* (see Mayrhofer EWAia 1, 1992: 267; Cheung 2007: 157). However, the sound development of Arm. *-r-* from PIE **-d^h-* is uncertain; see also s.v. *ur* ‘where (to)’. I would expect **ayd-* from **h₂eid^h-* (see s.vv. *awd* ‘foot-wear’, and *awd* ‘air’). One might rather assume a contamination between Arm. subst. **ayr-* ‘fire’ and Iran. verbal **H(a)id-* (*-δ-* > *-r-*), which has resulted in the Armenian verb *ayr-em* (cf. Klingenschmitt 1982: 98₁₆, assuming an Iranian loanword), but this is uncertain.

ayri, *ea*-stem: GDSg *ayrw-o-y*, GDPl *ayre-a-c* ‘(abundant evidence in the Bible, Astuacaturean 1895: 82-83) ‘widow’ (Bible+), ‘widower’ (hapax, in Ephrem; also in some dialects).

●DIAL The compound **orb-ew-ayri* ‘widow’ < **‘orphan-and-widow’*, although literarily unattested, is ubiquitous in the dialects. Note also Zeyt’un *erigónág* < **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 *orp’əveri* in the village of Čóšara of Hamšen vs. more normal Hamšen *orp’əveri*. This can be explained through dissimilation of labiality: *p’əv* > *k’əv*. Nor Naxiĵewan *orfari*, *ɔfari* (older *erp’evari*) is due to haplology.

As stated by Ačařyan (HAB 1: 176b), **orb-ew-ayri* refers to women. In a fairy-tale recorded in Šuši (Łarabał) in 1926, however, one finds *orp’əveri* referring to a man (see HŽHek’ 5, 1966: 59). One also finds Xnus-Bulanəx *orbewari* ‘widower’ (E. Melik’ean 1964: 206^{L-14}), as well as 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)' [HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 54a].

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

●ETYM Ačarıyan (HAB 1: 176b) does not accept any of the etymological attempts, including the one (Ēmin) that derives *ayr-i* from *ayr* 'man, husband'. This 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: **n-nēr-iyā* 'having no husband, manless' (Dumézil 1940: 69; see also Saradževa 1986: 263-264; Jahukyan 1987: 259, 260, hesitantly; Olsen 1999: 446).

Schmitt (1972-74: 23) argues against this etymology that *ayri* is not only feminine. However, the masculine meaning is clearly marginal and should be viewed as secondary (compare *skesr-ayr* 'husband's father' derived from *skesur* 'husband's mother'). Greppin (1983: 287) argues that the stem for 'man' in Proto-Armenian had prothesis: **anēr*. This is not a decisive argument against the etymology. We can assume a development QIE **n-Hnēr-ieh₂*- '(having) no husband' > PArm. **ananir-ia-* > *ayri*, *ayrea-* 'widow' through haplology and a subsequent sound change as in *ayr* 'man, husband' (q.v.).

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'. The etymology of Dumézil is more plausible, however. See further s.vv. *amuri* 'unmarried' and *suk* 'childless, sterile'.

ayc' 'visit, inspection, investigation', mostly in verbal constructions as *ayc' arnem*, 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 Draxanakerc'i, etc., and derivatives based on *ayc'-el-*. On *-el*, see s.vv. *argel*, *vayel*.

●ETYM Since Pictet, Dervischjan, et al. (see HAB), connected with OHG *eisca* 'question', OCS *iskati* 'to look for, seek', Skt. *ichāti* 'to wish, strive after, seek' (RV+), etc. [Hübschmann 1897: 418; Scheftelowitz 1927: 225]. Ačarıyan (HAB 1: 177a; 3: 32b, pace Hübschmann) correctly identifies *ayc'* 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 *āsce* 'question, search') and *e*-grade (cf. Lat. *aeruscāre* 'to beg, ask for'), respectively. For a 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 the meaning 'late' and, only in Maraš, 'evening' (presumably, as an adjective) [HAB 1: 178a]. Next to forms with an initial

a- (Suč‘ava, Xarberd, Maraš), there are particularly interesting ones the anlaut of which allows to reconstruct a by-form **y-anagan* (see Weitenberg 1986: 92-93, 96): Van *änkyän*, Moks *hänäkyän*, Ozim *hangyän* [Ačarıyan 1952: 244] (for the textual evidence, see Ter-Mkrtč‘yan 1970: 151, 185a), Šatax *h‘änäkyän* [M. Muradyan 1962: 33, 70, 192], Muš *y‘ank‘an* [Bałdasaryan-T‘ap‘alc‘yan 1958: 245a]. See 2.3.1 for more details.

●ETYM Ačarıyan (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 a compound 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‘ ənd aygn; oč‘ kanux*).

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

analut‘, GDSg *anlət‘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 which are allowed to be eaten. 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 *zamr*. 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 *ult-inj* or *ənj-ult* (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: *όφιο-μάχης* : *ōj-a-mart*, *μν-γαλιῆ* : *mkn-ak‘is*, *χαμαι-λέων* : *getn-ārewc*. 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 the Armenian Deuteronomy followed the Greek text less slavishly than the Armenian Leviticus. 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, agr‘aw*, 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 was different from that of Leviticus;

(2) he was native of NW Armenia;

(3) *analut‘* reflects a term different from 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‘*, “man-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 font [A. G. Abrahamyan 1944: 344^{L36}]). In the version of T‘ovmas Kilikec‘i (14th cent.): *nalut‘* [Anasyan 1967: 282^{L-12}].

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 unfounded and unnecessary. This is clearly corroborated by the short recension. I follow the ModArm. translation by Abrahamyan and Petrosyan (1979: 279), which takes 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 *anlət‘oy*, Hewsen (1992: 99₁₁₂) reconstructs a NSg **analet‘* which is a mistake or misprint. The correct form is certainly *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 CIArm. *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‘ajyan (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‘rav gnac‘ tunə* : “(he) flew like a deer and went home”. Here (241b) *ɔnlut‘* is glossed as *etnik, paxra, jeyran*.

As we have seen, *analut‘* is attested in *Ašxarhac‘oyc‘*, among others, in readings *anlət‘-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 'giraffe' or 'a kind of deer'?

analut' is taken by Soukry, Hewsen (see also 1992: 99₁₁₂), and Greppin (1983a: 15) as meaning 'giraffe', which is based on the Biblical attestation and seems to be wrong. 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 (*əncutt*) in the same passage. However, Anania Širakac'i hardly ever saw a giraffe, and he might have been unaware that the giraffe (the denotatum of *əncutt*) is identical 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 a ferocious beast, although already Pliny (ibid.) and Strabo showed this being wrong [Spinage 1968: 41f, 73; Dagg 1982: 2f]. This explains 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 *eļjeru* and *etn*. Next to this, Arm. *erē* is the generic term for 'deer'. In the same list (Deuteronomy 14), next to *analut'*, one finds *eļjeru* rendering Gr. *ἔλαφος*. In Ašxarhac'oyc', we encounter *erē* several times, and *eļjeru* in the context of Barjr Hayk'. One may wonder why the author uses another word for the province of Gugark'. The answer may be twofold: *analut'* denoted a different kind of deer, or *analut'* was dialectally confined to the area of Gugark'.

The best candidate for the denotatum of *analut'* is, in my view, 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 accidental. Unlike most kinds of deer, and amongst them the red deer (maral) which normally hardly have any 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 (emphasis 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 **anuš-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 (see espec. T'ořlak'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 yet received an etymological explanation (see HAB 1: 179a; Olsen 1999: 938).

I propose a connection with PIE **h₁e/ol-Hn-ih₂-* 'deer, hind': OCS *alъnii* 'doe', SCr. *lâne* 'doe', Russ. *lan'* 'fallow deer, doe', Lith. *ėlnis* 'deer', OPr. *alne* 'Tier' (see Toporov, PrJaz, a-d, 1975: 77; Euler 1985: 91), Mĭr. *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), Mĭr. *ailit* reflects PIE **h₁el-(H)n-t-iH-* or **h₁el-en-t-iH-*. The same dental determinative may be reconstructed 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.vv. 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'*, namely Gr. *ἔνελος*: *νεβρός*

‘young of the deer, fawn’ (Hesychius). As I try to demonstrate in 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* > *ɔnli*, etc.; (2) *l...n* > *n...l* (cf. *šlni* > *šnlík*, etc.); (3) *n...n* > *l...n* (cf. *ananux* > *ɔnhluxk*, 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 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’, Mir. *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 dialectally and zoologically restricted to NW of the Armenian speaking territory.

Recently, N. Mkrčjan 2005: 257-258 treated *analut*‘ as a Semitic loan, cf. Akkad. *najālu*, *nālu* ‘roe deer’ (see Landsberger 1950: 33; SemEtymDict 2, 2005: 223-224), with the abstract suffix *-ūtū*. This comparison is quite attractive. The initial *a-* is obscure, although this is not decisive. If this etymology is correct, the connection with the PIE word for ‘deer’ should be abandoned. On the other hand, the alternation Arm. *ełn* : *analut*‘ vs. Gr. *ἔλλός* : *ἔνελος* : Welsh *alanet* remains attractive, too. If we are not dealing with a European-Semitic migratory animal name, one may perhaps assume a blend of PArm. (< IE) **alan-t^h*- or **anal-t^h*- and PArm. (< Sem.) **nalut-*.

anari, *ea*-stem (GSg *anarwoy* in “Čařəntir”, GPI *anareac*‘ in Hexaemeron) ‘enormous’. Attested since the 5th century.

In Eznik Kołbac‘i 1.25 (1994: 84): *jkunk*‘ *anarik*‘ *covakank*‘ “monstrous sea fish (pl.)”.

In P‘awstos Buzand 5.37 (1883=1984: 202^{L16f}; transl. Garsoian 1989: 218): *zaynč*‘*ap*‘ *ayrn 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 vareal* “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]”.

In Movsēs Kałankatuac‘i (1983: 329^{L20}; transl. Dowsett 1961: 217): *višapajukn mi anari nman lerin* “a dragon-fish as large as a mountain”.

Two later attestations quoted in NHB 1: 116b: *orj višapi anarwoy* “Lair of the enormous dragon” (“Čařəntir”); *sparazineal 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 *anari* as *an-* + **ar-* + *-i*, with the root **ar-* that may be identical with Arm. **ar-* seen in *y-arm-ar* ‘fitting’, *arnem* (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 of the same *ard-*.¹⁰

*angi

●DIAL Łarabał **angi* ‘thin, emaciated’, also in a compound with *łtar* ‘id.’ as the first member: *łtar-angi*. From the illustration given by himself (*Inč’ ē hac’ č’es utum, angi es dařel* “Why don’t you eat; you have become an *angi* !”), Ačarėan (1913: 95b) concludes that *angi* must have denoted a kind of unknown animal. Cf. also *angi ktrel* ‘to become (lit.: to cut) thin’ [HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 56a]. For *łtar-angi* compare *łtar-mozi* (pejor., colloquial) ‘thin calf’; Van *parakik t’osun tle mi* “a boy (that is like a) thin /cattle/arjař” 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 details. 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 in the zero grade. The IE word under discussion displays forms with both full (Lith. *angis*, OPr. *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 PArm. paradigm would then be as follows: NSg. **(h)angu(i)* > **ang-(i)*, GSg. **an^wgiyo-* > *awji* (= ClArm. GSg.). Then the genitive has been generalized (with a new nominative *awj*), while **ang-i* has been preserved in Łarabał. Note especially *acut* ‘coal’: Hačən – Łarabał, etc. **ancut* (see s.v.). Uncertain.

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

angł₁, 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 *anket-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).

¹⁰ Yet another etymology is provided by Łap‘anc‘yan 1961: 161-162.

●DIAL Karin *angt*, Łarabat *ang* [HAB 1: 184a], Goris *ang* [Margaryan 1975: 75, 111, 313a]. See further below.

●ETYM No etymology is accepted in HAB 1: 184a. Ĵahukyan (1982: 105; 1987: 412; see also A. Petrosjan 1987: 60-61) derives the word from **ank/g-* (= **h₂enk-*) ‘to bend’, motivating the semantics by the form of the beak. For the **-l-* he compares Toch. A *oñkalām* ‘elephant’, B *oñkolmo/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. *ἀγκύλος* ‘curved, bent’, OIc. *ǫngull* ‘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 *anget-s* three times 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). In my view, Arm. *angt* ‘handle’ can better be derived from **h₂enk-u-l-* and be thus connected with 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 *üngūt* ‘handle’ [HAB 3: 604a; Ačāryan 2003: 559] or *angət* ‘the bowed handle of a pot or basket’ [Andreasyan 1967: 220, 353b].

I conclude that Arm. *angt* (API *anget-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 off 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.¹¹ 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. *γρόψ*, *-γρόπος* ‘gryphon, vulture’ in Deuteronomy 14.12. Note also dial. (Van) *kor-c* ‘*anənek*’ ‘kite’ (see s.vv. *korč* ‘vulture’ and *c’in* ‘kite’). The same semantics is also seen in the above-mentioned Greek match of Arm. *korč*, namely *γρόψ*, which also means ‘anchor’ or the like, and may be related or associated with *γρόπος* ‘hook-nosed, curved, hooked, aquiline’.

angt₂ ‘handle of a pot or basket’.

●ETYM See s.v. *angt₁*.

angti ‘prostitute’.

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

●DIAL No dialectal forms are recorded.

¹¹ A contamination is possible too.

I hypothetically suggest a connection with Moks *āngʷūt* [Orbeli 2002: 202], *āngʷut* ‘a fruit that has fallen from the tree’ [M. Muradyan 1982 /HBrbAtl/: 137]. M. Muradyan (ibid.) treats it as composed of *-ut*, although this suffix usually expresses the idea of having sth. or abounding in sth. (see Jahukyan 1998: 35 for a list). The same root, namely **ank-* in *ank-anim* ‘to fall’, has formed another synonym in the same dialect, namely *ang(a)uk* (see HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 56b), with the suffix *-uk*.

●ETYM No etymological proposal is known to me.

In my view, *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(io/eh₂)-* appears in Armenian as *-tʻi*, *-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 contain the same suffix, but the root **sam-* is otherwise unknown.

and, in the Bible: mostly *o*-stem; 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 the Northern and Eastern dialects, with an initial *h-*: Karin, Tʻiflis, Ararat *hand*, Axalcʻxa *hant*, Łarabař *händ*, etc. [HAB 1: 186b]. Ačaryan (1913: 637a) cites only the meaning ‘cornfield, estate’. One finds considerable evidence pointing also to ‘pastureland’ (for examples, see below). This is corroborated by e.g. DialAdd apud NHB 2: 1064c as well: *hand* ‘a superficial measure of pastureland that can be grazed in one day’.

Some of the compounds and derivatives deserve special attention: Łarabař *händ-ä-vär* ‘estate, 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 corroborate 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. Note also the description of *hand* as ‘групповой участок’ (Čajkend-Getašen) in Džežranov 1898: 69.

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 Łarabař.

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

Textual illustrations for Łarabař *händ-i* ‘in a pastureland’: In HŽHekʻ 5, 1966: 538^{L16f}: *təesnum min händi min čʻoban vexčʻar a ərəcc nəm* : ‘sees (that) a shepherd

grazes sheep in a pastureland”; at 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 mæerne* [NmušLeinLarab 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 handa racelu* “goes to the pastureland to graze”.

The meaning ‘pastureland’ is also seen in L. 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. *ándhas-* 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 *ənjul* ‘calf’); 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 Lārabat *händ-ä-vār* ‘estate, 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 identical 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 to me. 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. *dur̄n*, *dur-* ‘door’, cf. *i dur-s* ‘outdoors, outside’). Note also Av. *adāhuua* loc.pl. ‘house’ which probably derives from the PIE word for ‘doorframe, doorposts’ (cf. YAv. *qidūiā-* 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 *dur̄n* ‘door’ and *art* ‘cornfield’.

However, the word is inflected both as an *o*-stem and an *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-ṭ* ‘grains’ which is usually compared with PIE **h₂end^h-*; see Illič-Svityč 1964: 4; Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 873; Ĵahukyan 1987: 450. Since the semantic relationship ‘cornfield’ : ‘grains’ is plausible (cf. Av. *uruuarā-* ‘flora’, Mlr. *arbor* ‘grain, corn’ vs. Gr. *ἄροισα* ‘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’. Arm. **(h)und* probably reflects **h₂ond^h-os-*, with *h-* from zero-grade oblique stem. Alternatively: from Sem. **hunṭ-*.

According to N. Simonyan (1979: 219-220), the initial *h-* of *hand* ‘cornfield’ comes from a 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 *händ* cannot be explained from **hand*. I suggest to derive it from **y-and* or **y-(h)and*, through Ačaryan’s Law, see 2.3.1. This form may have arisen due to the generalization of the ClArm. locative *y-and-i*, seen in Łarabał *händ-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*, GDPI *dr-and-i-c* ‘(as a reading variant)”; **dr-and-i** (*ea*-stem): GDSg *dr-and-w-oy*, LocSg *aṛ dr-and-w-oj*, NPI *dr-and-i-k*, GDPI *dr-and-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 : ἐπήρθη 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 *dr-and-e-a-c*’, var. *dr-and-i-c*’. If *dr-and-i-c*’ is reliable, it would point to an *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: *drāndi* ‘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 aṛ drandwoy dran tan aṛnn <...:...> ew jērn iwṛ i veray drandwoyn : ἔπεσεν παρὰ τὴν θύραν τοῦ πλῶνος 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 πλῶνος* (with *πύλη* ‘house-door; entrance; one wing of a pair of double gates’) is translated as *aṛ drandwoy dran*, and in the second part of the passage *drāndi* corresponds to *πρό-θυρον*.

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

NHB and HAB only give 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), an *a*-stem, although none of the three attestations cited in NHB provides information on the declension class.

●DIAL Muš/Bulanəx *d’ərāndi* ‘the upper part of the door-frame’ [HAB 1: 186b; Amatuni 1912: 172b], Van *tərāndi* [Ačaryan 1952: 257], Hamšen *derāndi* ‘the

horizontal beam at a balcony' [Ačařyan 1947: 226] (according to T'orlak'yan 1981: 152b, *terenti, terenta*).

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 HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 351b, where the meaning is represented as 'the upper wood of the door-frame'. This meaning of *drəndi* can be corroborated 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 Nřno and Dřno close the door, put the key "above the *drndi* of the door" (*dřan 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* (*jerk' 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 · dřen cłxni* "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 corroborated by a passage from another fairy-tale told by the same person (op. cit. 85^{L4f}): *es ketnim cł, kə k'ašvim dřen drnden, axperd cł gika, zpučućak kə xet'im, meřc'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 above passages, 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 *dřen dərnd-*, as in Judges 19.26-27: *ař drandwoy dřen* (see above). Thus, **dur-* in the compound *dr-and(-i)* has become petrified. A similar passage is found in a fairy-tale told by illiterate Nanuxas Ałekyan (< 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: *dřen dərənt/din*.

We may conclude that in Muš (Bulanəx, Alaškert) the meaning 'the upper horizontal part of the door-frame, lintel' of *drəndi* (as correctly given by Ačařyan 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 HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 350b, a nominative in *drind* is recorded, although in the textual illustration one finds NALoc/AlISg *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; Ačařean 1913: 289a; HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 350b], of which no etymology is known to me. Perhaps from *drandi*, by a semantic shift 'upper-door' > 'upper-surface of hand'; cf. Moks *ceřac' tanis* 'поверхность кисти руки', lit. 'roof of the hand' (see Orbeli 2002: 253). Surmalu *andəvor* 'family', Van *andivor* 'family' > (euphem.) 'wife, spouse' [HAB 1: 186b]. A curse formula from Van (Šērenc' VanSaz 2, 1899: 159^{L12f}, cf. also 161^{L4f}): *Aneck' k'eo tan*

tetac‘, *aneck*‘ *tand andiorac*‘, *jet*‘*in-petin* "Curse to your house and household, curse to the family of your house, to the young and elder".

In Nerk'in Basen, building of the roof started with the beams that were called *andkal*, under which big pillars (i.e. the doorposts? – HM) were put [Hakobyan 1974: 123]. This word seems to be identical with Alaškert *ant'kal*, the Bulanox equivalent of which is *ankaĵ*, lit. '(anatom.) ear' (see S. Movsisyan 1972: 13b, with a thorough description). I have been unable 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. It is tempting to assume that we are dealing with an indispensable evidence for the independent root **and* ‘threshold’. Compare also op. cit. 282^{L-7f}; unclear.¹²

●ETYM Connected with Skt. *ātā-* f.pl. ‘door-frame, door-posts’, YAv. *qīθīiā-* 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 words 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’ [de Vaan 2003: 136]. Note also Arm. dial. **dr-and-ay* (see below). Beekes (apud de 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. *qīθīiā-* would be then a derivative **antiā*.

In view of the 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-* : **-ieh₂-* or a hysterodynamic paradigm NSg **h₂énHt-ih₂*, AccSg **h₂(e)nHt-ieh₂-m*, GSg **h₂nHt-ih₂-ós*. Note that Arm. by-form *drand* is not found in oblique cases (except in a variant reading).

¹² 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)”. In order to avoid this evil, one has to invoke the Holy Trinity and to cross oneself 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’ [Ačārean 1913: 637b; Tēr-Yakobean 1960: 508; HAB 1: 660-661; 3: 39b]. Note also Xarberd **hampert-k'* ‘evil spirits living on thresholds’ (see Ačārean 1913: 634), the structure of which is unclear. Somehow related with the metathesized form of *handip-* ‘to meet, occur’, namely dial. *hanptel* (found e.g. in HŽHek'10, 1967: 103^{L5}; also *hambədel* in Erazgavors, my mother's village)?

Arm. **and-* is usually said to be found only in the compound *dr-and(i)*, the meaning of which is represented as ‘doorposts’ or ‘threshold’. The dialectal material helps to correct this view. 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). Further, 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 found not 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. Aṙak‘elyan (1984: 88) takes *-and* in the word *dr-and* as a suffix, which is untenable.

andi, *o*-stem: GSg *and-w-o-y*, GDPI *and-w-o-c*‘ (Bible+), *andey*, mostly pl. *andey-k*‘ : API *andey-s*, GDPI *and-ē-o-c*‘ (Bible+), GDPI *andey-c*‘ (Afrहत/Zgōn), *andē-i-c*‘ (Aristakēs Lastivertc‘i) ‘cattle; cattle herd’.

In the Bible, we find a few attestations of GDPI *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]. [Thus, *andi* (coll.) ‘herd’?]. As for *andey*, the following forms are attested in the Bible: NPI *andey-k*‘, API *andey-s*, GDPI *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-andey*: *yandey ant‘ac‘aw Abraam ew ar‘ort‘ mi matał ew bari* : *καὶ εἰς τὰς βόας ἔδραμεν Ἀβρααμ καὶ ἔλαβεν μισθάριον 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 GDPI *andēord-a-c*‘.

●ETYM According to NHB (1: 132a), derived from *and* ‘cornfields, etc.’. Ačāryan (HAB 1: 188b) does not accept this explanation, but cites no other etymologies. Jahukyan (1963a: 89; 1987: 112, 157) develops the etymology of NHB; 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.’, Ačāryan (HAB 1: 192b) leaves the origin of the word open. Ałayan (1974: 20-22) connects *anur* ‘ring’, which is implausible.

L. Hovhannisyān (1991a: 147) treats the word 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, it is unconvincing, too. I propose an alternative etymology, although it is not entirely convincing either.

Whether or not related (or contaminated) with *var-* 'to lead, etc.' or *var-* 'to cover', the second component **war* could be identical with that found in *žan-uar* 'palanquin' and *eriw/var* 'fine horse'. As to **andr*, one might assume that it meant 'cart, wagon' and is connected with Skt. *ádhan-* m. 'road' (RV+), OAv. *aduan-*, YAv. *adβan-* m. 'road' from PIE **h₁nd^h-uen-*; Skt. *adhvará-* m. '(Soma-)sacrifice, ceremony' (RV+) < **h₁nd^h-uer-* (probably, an original heteroclitic noun **adhvar-/adhvan-* '(holy) road'); cf. Olc. *qndurr* 'snow-shoe' < PIE **h₁ond^h-ur-o-*, Gr. *ἐνθεῖν* (aor.) 'come' < PIE **h₁nd^h-e/o-*.

Thus, perhaps, **h₁nd^h-ur-* 'road' > PArm. **and(u)r* 'cart, wagon'. For the semantic relationship, cf. PIE **ueǵ^h-* (see Mallory/Adams 1997: 488a). Compare especially Olc. *qndurr* 'snow-shoe' (< PIE **h₁ond^h-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' [Ačārean 1913: 97a; HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 57b] seems to be composed of **andr* + *-a-* + *c'ic* 'pole'. The first component could be the same **andr* 'cart, wagon', unless it is identical with the prefix *andra-* (cf. *t'erac'ic*, with *t'er* 'side', etc., see Ačārean 1913: 358b). Uncertain.

andund-k', *o*-stem: GDPl *andnd-o-c'*, frequent in the Bible; Tumanjan (1978: 161) cites also GSg. *andnd-i*, adding that the word is 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; Ĵahukyan 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^punt*, Alaškert *h'antut* (in HAB 3: 39a – *h'andud*), Šatax *h'ändüt^k'y*, Moks *händüt^k'*, Nor Bayazet *handund*, Agulis *á/ändüt^k'*, Salmast, Urmia (Xoy) *ändüt^k'* [HAB 1: 191a; Ačāryan 1952: 245; M. Muradyan 1962: 94 (the paradigm of Šatax *h'ändüt^k'y*), 192a; M. Asatryan 1962: 191b].

According to Baldasaryan-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', Ačāryan (HAB 3: 39a) also mentions Muš *h'andəndel* '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*, Moks *händüt^k'*, Salmast, Urmia (Xoy) *ändüt^k'* [HAB 1: 191a; Ačāryan 1952: 245; M. Muradyan 1962: 94, 192a; Asatryan 1962: 191b]. Łarabał *əndóxtə* [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 Meřri 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 reconstruct 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 Ačařyan 1952: 245). However, the remaining evidence seems sufficient to corroborate 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'ařo of Hayoc' jor (Van) and first published in 1909, we find *hantiüt'k'* [Sasna çer 1, 1936: 1062]. More evidence is needed. If reliable, this *h-* requires a separate discussion since *ya-* and *ha-* yield Van *ä-* and *xa-*, respectively. A few such examples can be found in Ačařyan 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 Meřri area belonging to group 6 one finds **dund* instead of *andund(k')*: Meřri *dünd* [Ałayan 1954: 295]; Karčewan *dünd* [H. Muradyan 1960: 192a], Kak'avaberd *dund* [H. Muradyan 1967: 169b].

Łarabał (Martakert, Step'anakert) *əndəxtə*, *əndəxtnə* and *əndəxnə* (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. *budhná-* 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), Gr. *πυθμῖν*, *-ένος* 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; Pulju 1997: 390-396; cf. de 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', although 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, that an assimilation has taken place: *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. There were two forms **bund-* 'bottom' and **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 **n-b^hud^hno-* comparable with Skt. *a-budhná-* 'bottomless' (RV 1.24.7; 8.77.5) seems plausible. Note also Pahl. *a-bun* [ʾbwn] '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', although these forms are unclear (see below).

It may seem attractive to directly compare the dial. by-form **(y)an-dud*, without the nasal before the final *-d*, with Gr. *ἄβυσσος* 'bottomless; abyss, underworld' (possibly from **n-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 *an-dóxtə*, its possible protoform **an-duft-* is reminiscent of Alb. *det*, dial. [de:t] m. 'sea' (< **Meerestiefe*) < **d^heub-eto-*; cf. Goth. *diupiþa* '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, although I could not find any convincing parallels. Furthermore, the Łarabał form can be explained in a simpler way; see below.

The form **dund* in the Mełri 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 Mełri 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 Mełri *dend* 'hill' [Ałayan 1954: 295].

Łarabał *andóxtə*, *andóx(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). An alternative explanation 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 **andox(t)nə* and **andox(t)nə* might be explained by a folk-etymological reinterpretation as **and 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 lat'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'.

aner, *o*-stem: GDSg *aner-o-y* (widespread in the Bible; Movsēs Xorenac'i 2.82), GDPl *aner-o-c'* (Philo, for the passage, see NHB 2: 124a and HAB 3: 119b, s.v. *hor*), later *a*-stem: GDSg *aner-i* (Nersēs Šnorhali, 12th cent.), GDPl *aner-a-c'* (Vahram Vardapet, 13th cent.) 'father-in-law, wife's father' (Bible+), 'in-law; brother-in-law, wife's brother' (P'awstos Buzand, Movsēs Xorenac'i, etc.).

This is the principal Armenian word for 'father-in-law, wife's father', widely represented in the Bible (Astuacaturean 1895: 95a).

The meaning 'in-law; brother-in-law, wife's brother' is found in P'awstos Buzand 3.5 (1883=1984: 11^{L14}, transl. Garsoïan 1989: 71): *ew minč' deṛ vasn aynorik zzuēin zna anerk' nora* : "but while his in-laws oppressed him on account of this". Other attestations can be found in Movsēs Xorenac'i 2.82 (1913=1991: 225^{L2}), etc., Vahram Vardapet (13th cent., Cilicia), and Step'anos Ōrbelean (13th cent., Siwnik'), see NHB 1: 139b; HAB 1: 193a; for the attestation in Step'anos Ōrbelean, see also A. A. Abrahamyan 1985: 62-63. Combining the literary testimony from Cilicia and Siwnik' in the 13th century with the dialectal distribution (Hačən, Zeyt'un, Marała, etc.), we can assume that this meaning was present in SW and SE areas from at least the 13th century up to the present time.

MidArm. **aner-jag** 'brother-in-law, wife's brother' [MijHayBaṛ 1, 1987: 52a], with *jag* 'youngling, nestling' as the second member.

●DIAL Widespread in the dialects, mostly in the meaning 'father-in-law, wife's father' [HAB 1: 193a]. In eastern peripheral dialects, Łarabał, Goris, Šamaxi, Kṛzen, etc., one finds *háner*, with an initial *h-* [HAB *ibid.*; Baṛamyān 1961: 174b; 1964: 187; Davt'yan 1966: 310; Margaryan 1975: 313b].

Marała *aner*, Zeyt'un *anir*, and Hačən *aney* refer to 'brother-in-law, wife's brother' (see above for literary testimony), whereas the meaning 'father-in-law, wife's father' is represented by *kakə* and Turk. *keynat'a* in Marała, and by *zək'ənc' bəb* (= *zək'anč'* 'wife's mother' + *pap* 'father') in Zeyt'un [HAB 1: 193a; Ačaṙean 1926: 383; 2003: 308]¹³. A textual illustration is found in a folk-tale told by Nikolayos Petrosyan, an illiterate old man from Manazkert/Hasan-P'aša, in 1912 in Łaznafar [HŽHek' 9, 1968: 211^{L1f}]: *Īnc' anastvac mard en im anertik'* "What kind of 'god-less' people are my in-laws!".

MidArm. **aner-jag** 'brother-in-law, wife's brother' is present in Nor Naxiṙewan, Polis, Arabkir [Ačaṙean 1913: 97b], Širak, Ararat, Muš, etc. [Amatuni 1912: 30-31]. Note Moks *ānercāk^y*, gen. *ānercāk^y-u*, pl. *ānercāk^y-ir* and *-t-ir* 'шурин, сын

¹³ For the typology of such compounds cf. *skesr-ayr* 'husband's father' = *skesur* 'husband's mother' + *ayr* 'man'.

тестя́ vs. *anir*, gen. *änir-uč'*, pl. *änēr-k^o-ir*, gen.pl. *änēr-k^o-ir-u* ‘тесть’ [Orbeli 2002: 202, 203].

●ETYM Dervischjan (1877: 35-36) connects *aner* with Gr. *άνήρ* ‘man, husband’, Skt. *nár-* ‘man, human’, etc. (on this PIE word, see s.v. *ayr* ‘man, husband’). M. Schmidt (1916) derives Arm. *aner*, *o*-stem, from QIE **an-ero-*, a derivative of the PIE word for ‘ancestor’ with the comparative **-ero-* seen in Skt. *ápara-* ‘posterior, later, following’ (cf. typologically Lat. *mater-tera* ‘mother’s sister’, etc.); thus, ‘someone like the grandfather’. Olsen (32-33, 222, 848) posits a form with **-tero-* (cf. Lat. *mater-tera*), which is less probable. Ačaryan (HAB 1: 192-193) rejects these and other etymologies (including the untenable comparison with Gr. *γαμβρός* ‘son-in-law, brother-in-law, sister’s husband’, Skt. *jāmātar-* ‘son-in-law, daughter’s husband’, etc., Bugge 1892: 444-445) and leaves the origin of *aner* open.¹⁴

Winter 1966: (206; see also Schmitt 1972-74: 23; Huld apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 196a) suggests a connection with Gr. *πενθερός* ‘father-in-law, wife’s father; brother-in-law, son-in-law’. In order to explain the formal difficulties, Winter (ibid.) assumes an influence of *hayr* ‘father’. This etymology is untenable.

The etymology of M. Schmidt is the most probable and is accepted in Pokorny 1959: 37; Jähukyan 1987: 111, 259, 260 (hesitantly); Olsen 1999: 32-33.

This etymology implies a connection with Arm. *han(i)* ‘grandmother’, cf. Gr. *άννίς* ‘mother-in-law’, Lat. *anus* ‘old woman’, etc. That this PIE word for ‘ancestress, grandmother’ would develop a meaning ‘wife’s father’ is not impossible, cf. Lith. *anyta* ‘husband’s mother’, OHG *ano* ‘ancestor, grandfather’ vs. *ana* ‘ancestress, grandmother’, etc. (see Szemerényi 1977: 48).

A similar fluctuation is also seen in the PIE word for ‘grandfather’: Arm. *haw* ‘grandfather, ancestor; uncle’ (q.v.), Lat. *avus* ‘grandfather; ancestor, forefather’, *avunculus* ‘maternal uncle; mother’s sister’s husband; great-uncle’, OIr. *ae* ‘grandson’, Lith. *avynas* ‘maternal uncle’, Hitt. *huhḫaš* ‘grandfather’, etc. vs. Lat. *avia* ‘grandmother’, Goth. *awō* ‘grandmother’, etc. (see Szemerényi 1977: 47^{Nr7}, 48^{Nr8}, 61; Lehmann 1986: 53; Huld/Adams apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 238a, 239a). Compare also Bulg. *djādo*, *dedā*, *dēdo* ‘grandfather; old man; father-in-law, wife’s father’, *d’ādō* ‘grandfather; father-in-law, husband’s father’, *dēda* ‘elder sister’, Maced. *dedo* ‘grandfather; old man; father-in-law, wife’s father’, Lith. *dėdė*, *dėdis* ‘uncle’, Gr. *τήθη* ‘grandmother’, *τηθίς* ‘father’s or mother’s sister, aunt’, *τηθία* ‘old woman’, Lith. *tetā*, Russ. *tetja* ‘aunt’, etc. (see s.v. **tat(a)* ‘grandmother; father’).

The eastern dialectal *haner* probably preserves the initial *h-* seen in *han-i* and thus reflecting the PIE laryngeal, cf. Hitt. *hanna-* ‘grandmother’. Note that these dialects do not display a secondary non-etymological *h-* e.g. in cases with metathesis **CRV- > RCV- > e/a-RCV-*, where *C* = voiced or voiced aspirated stop; see s.vv. *atbewr*, *artasu-k'*, *etbayr*, *erkan*, etc.

***anēc-**: *anicanem*, 3sg.aor.act. *anēc*, imper. *anēc* (Bible), 3sg.aor.mid. *anic-a-w* (Grigoris Aršaruni) ‘to curse’ (Bible+); *anēc-k'* pl. tant. *i*-stem: gen.-dat. *anic-i-c'*, abl. *y-anic-i-c'*, instr. *anic-i-w-k'* ‘curse, imprecation’ (Bible+).

●DIAL Ubiquitous in the dialects [HAB 1: 193b].

¹⁴ The resemblance with Pahl. *anēr* ‘non-Aryan, ignoble’ (MacKenzie 1971: 9) must be accidental.

●ETYM From PIE **h₃neid-*: Skt. *ned-*: pres. *nīdati*, aor. *ānindiṣur*, desid. *nīnits-* 'to revile; to blame; to mock', YAv. 1sg.pres.act. *nāismī* 'to curse', Gr. *ὀνειδος* n. 'reprimand, abuse', Lith. *niedėti* 'to despise', Goth. *ga-naitjan* 'to treat shamefully', OHG *neizzan* 'torment', etc. Bugge 1892: 450; 1893: 46; HAB 1: 193; Pokorny 1959: 760; Greppin 1983: 290-291; Lehmann 1986: 146; Ravnæs 1991: 18; Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 54-55; Mallory/Adams 1997: 313a.

The explanation of Arm. *-c-* from **-d̥j-* (Scheffelowitz 1904-05, 2: 30; Polomé 1980: 21; Klingenschmitt 1982: 194-195; Olsen 1999: 88, 478, 763, 811) is untenable; **-d̥j-* would rather yield *-č-* (see 2.1.22.1). One prefers assuming sigmatic aorist: **-d-s-* > *-c-*, cf. YAv. *nāismī* 'to curse' if from **nāid-s-mi* (see Meillet 1918: 211; Pedersen 1924: 222a = 1982: 305a; Pokorny 1959: 760; Ĵahukyan 1982: 74, 189; Kortlandt 1987a: 51; 1994: 28-29; 1996: 41-42 = 2003: 80, 104-105, 115; sceptical Klingenschmitt 1982: 195; Greppin 1983: 290; Olsen 1999: 810₅₅).

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: *and 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. Garsoïan 1989: 93): *mēn mi yant'i harealk'*: "each one taking one [of them] under his arm"; GDPI *ant'-ic* 'in Lewond (see NHB 2: 1044b, in the appendix).

NAccSg *anut'* (also in *y-anut'*) is attested in 2 Maccabees 12.40, Łazar P'arpec'i, Movsēs Xorenac'i 2.85 (1913=1991: 230^{L13}), etc. In oblique cases and derivatives, as well as in 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].

Late *ant'-a-tak* 'armpit' is given 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 Aīnanc') *ənt'etak* refers to 'բոբո' (= '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 *ənt'* 'embrace', Hačən *ənt'* 'bundle', Maraš *ənt'* 'shoulder, back' [Ačāryan 2003: 298].

Hamšen *ənt'*, *ənt* 'embrace, grasp', *ənt'uš*, *əntuš* 'to embrace', *ənt'-t/dag* 'armpit' (with *tak* 'below, under') [Ačāryan 1947: 12, 35, 177, 221].

Apart from Hamšen and Van-group, the compound *ant'-a/i-tak* is also found in Muš (*h'and'etak*) and Alaškert (*h'antetak*) [HAB 1: 208a]; according to Bałdasaryan-T'ap'alc'yan (1958: 245b): Muš *h'ant'etag*. 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 [Ačaryan 1952: 29; M. Muradyan 1962: 34]. In Muš and Alaškert, the word *an(u)t'* is only found 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 also lost in Van-group, but then secondarily restored 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 the word from the PIE term for 'axle' (cf. Skt. *ákṣ-a-* m., Lat. *ax-is*, Lith. *aš-is*, OHG *ahsa* f., etc.), assuming a development **aksn-* > **asn-ut'*. For the semantics, cf. Lat. *axilla* 'armpit', OHG *uohsana*, OEngl. *ōxn* 'armpit', etc. Although 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 Ačaryan (HAB 1: 207b) and Ĵahukyan (1983: 88).

Ĵahukyan (1983: 88) compares Lith. *añtis* 'bosom', *už-añtis* 'bosom; armpit', Latv. *azuōts* 'bosom', considering the *-u-* of NSg *anut'* an analogical restoration. The Baltic word family has no further cognates (Fraenkel 1: 12). In order to explain the aspirated dental *-t'* of the Armenian form, Ĵahukyan reconstructs 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 sonorant and the dental. The former factor would help to reformulate the etymology of Ĵahukyan by assuming a thematic formation based on fem. **h₂(V)nt-eh₂-*. Thus: **h₂(V)nt-h₂-o-* > PArm. **ant^h-o-* vs. **h₂(V)nt-i-* or **h₂(V)nt-eh₂-* > **and-i/a-*; for other examples and a 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', *añká-* m. 'hook, clamp', *āñkas-* n. 'curve' (RV+), Gr. *άγκ-* 'to curve', *άγκάλη* f., mostly pl. 'curved arm, armfull', *άγκύλος* 'curved, bent', *άγκών*, *-ώνος* m. 'elbow', Lat. *ancus* 'with crooked arms', OHG *angul* 'fishhook', SerbCS *qkotb* 'hook' f., ORuss. f. *ukotb* '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. *śúpti-* 'shoulder' (RV), etc. [Mayrhofer EWAia 2: 647].

One wonders whether Lith. *añtis*, etc. point to a "primitive" root **h₂en-* from which **h₂en-k-* has been derived. Cf. also **h₂ens-* > Lat. *ānsa* 'handle, grip', OPr. *ansis* 'hook of a kettle', Lith. *qšà* 'ear of a jug, eye of a needle, button-hole', Latv. *ùosa* '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 together around the idea "des gekrümmten Gelenks"; see 3.7.2.

The irregular labial vocalism of Van, etc. *hünt* ‘remains unexplained (see above). Perhaps an influence of the form *anut*’?

***ant^a(y)r-**: in Baġirk[‘] hayoc[‘], one finds *ant^aayr* ‘spark’ [Amalyan 1975: 21^{Nr455}].

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

Dial. *ant^r-r-oc[‘]* (see s.v. *ant^eet* ‘hot coal, ember’) may belong here, too.

●ETYM Probably related with Gr. *ἄνθραξ* m. ‘charcoal’, as a Mediterranean substratum word. See s.v. *ant^eet* ‘hot coal, ember’ for more detail. We can reconstruct Arm. **ant^h-ar-i*. For the insertion of *-i-* into *ant^aayr* compare *žayn* vs. *žani-k[‘]* (*a*-stem) ‘tusk, fang’; cf. 2.1.27.1.

ant^eet ‘hot coal, ember’, attested in Łazar P[‘]arpec[‘]i /5th cent./ (*y-ant^eet* ‘on ember’), Hexaemeron (loc. *y-ant^eet-i*), Cyril of Alexandria (*ant^eet harkanem*). NHB (1: 151b) also records dial. verbal *ant^eetel* < *ant^eetel*.

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

●ETYM Ačarıyan (HAB 1: 194a) treats the word as a Caucasian borrowing (cf. Georg. *ant-eba* ‘to burn’) and considers the resemblance with Gr. *ἄνθραξ* m. ‘charcoal’ accidental. Vogt (1938: 333) mentions both Greek and Georgian connections. Łap[‘]anc[‘]yan (1961: 163-164) adds Hitt. *ant-* ‘warm’. See also Greppin 1978-79: 435, who points out that the function of the final *-et* is not clarified. Further, see Schultheiss 1961: 225-226.

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

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

We are possibly dealing with an Armeno-Greek(-Hittite?) word of substratum (“Mediterranean”) origin. For the suffixal element *-t*, cf. other semantically similar examples: Lat. *candēla* ‘candle’, Arm. *xand-at-*, *xanj-ot* ‘half-burnt wood’ (Bible+), etc. (see s.vv. *xand*, *xanj-*); Gr. *αἶθ-άλ-η* ‘soot’ from *αἶθω* ‘to kindle; to burn’; Arm. *gaz-at* ‘ash’ vs. **gaz-* ‘to burn’ (q.v.). For the **-r-* element seen in dial. **ant^r-r-*, Gr. *ἄνθ-ρ-αξ*, and perhaps *ant^aayr*, cf. *xanj-r-* (Agat[‘]angelos), *xanj-ar* ‘spark’ (Grigor Magistros, “Geoponica”), see s.vv. *xand*, *xanj-*. Note also Muš *pj-et*, Alaškert *pej-il* ‘spark’ from **pec* ‘spark’ (see HAB 2: 507a) next to Van *pc-ar* ‘spark’ [Ačarıyan 1913: 908] : *payc-ar* ‘shiny, clear, splended’ (Bible+; dial.) [HAB 4: 17-18]; cf. also *acut/x*. Thus, *ant^eet* ‘ember’ and **ant^r-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*.

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 here mentions only *haws pitanis* API 'useful birds' without a specification [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. Hewsen 1992: 59, 153₂₄: *zasid* 'stork'. Ačaryan (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 has been proposed for the word.

I wonder whether one can connect it to PIE **h₂(e)nHti-* 'duck', cf. Skt. *ātī-* 'a water bird', Lat. *anas*, GSg *anatis* (also *anit-*) 'duck', Lith. *ántis* '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. **anudi-*); 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. *νήσσα*, 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, namely **anud* or **anid*.

The semantic fluctuation between 'grazing bird' and 'water bird' can be illustrated by *araws* 'bustard; stork'. If *araws* is indeed related to *arawš*, one should note that the latter is another hapax occurring in the same Ašxarhac'oyc' passage, 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', *gawar Karnoy*, which abounds in water, marshes, reeds and grasses. 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.

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

First attested in Grigor Narekac'i 69.2 (Xaç'atryan/Lazinyan 1985: 522^{L24}): *anick* 'ankerpawork' 'shapeless nits'. Next, three times 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 *ojil* and before *kic* (see s.vv.). For the passages, see also Greppin 1990: 70₆, 70₇. For a semantic discussion, see below.

●DIAL Widespread in the 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 *ha-*: Goris *hanic*, *hanec* [Margaryan 1975: 313b, 424a], Łarabał *hānic*, *hānec* [Davt'yan 1966: 310], Šamšadin and Krasnoselsk *hanic* [Mežunc' 1989: 184a], Mehri *hānec* [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.¹⁵ An old by-form with the prefix *y-* does not seem probable. Firstly, it would be unmotivated. Secondly, it is not yet certain whether Arm. *y-* would yield *h-* in these Eastern dialects or not. Thirdly, there is no corroborating 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*, *oĵlov*, *ancov*. This is unconvincing since *anic* ‘nit, louse egg’ here forms a logical pair with *oĵil* ‘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, corroborate the meaning ‘nit’. Besides, the word clearly refers to ‘nit, louse egg’ in Modern Armenian (see the standard dictionaries) and dialects. Although 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 corroborated 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; Ačařean 1913: 101ab).

●ETYM Since Pictet, *anic* is connected to Gr. *κορίς*, *-ίδος* f., etc. [HAB 1: 195; Pokorny 1959: 608; Greppin 1983: 290-291]. Although 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. *gnida* [Derksen 1996: 258-259; Saradževa 1986: 71-72, 370₅], etc.

¹⁵ 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-*.

Lat. *lens* and Lith. *glinda* point to **gnind-* (see *ÈtimSlovSlavJaz* 6, 1979: 173-174; Derksen 2002-03: 8-9, 9₈; cf. Mallory/Adams 1997: 357b), compare Lat. *nimbus* ‘cloud’ and Iran. **nam(b)-* ‘wet, moist’ next to PIE **neb^h-*, see s.v. *amp* ‘cloud’.

For the initial alternation **k/gh-*, cf. **p/b^h-* in the word for ‘flea’ (see s.v. *lu*) [Meillet 1922g].

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

Pedersen (1906: 343, 387 = 1982: 121, 165) treats *a-* as prothetic 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 **k̑-* rather than **k-*, although Jahukyan (1982: 73, 74; in 1987: 133, with a question mark) reconstructs **knid-s* for Armenian. Earlier (1967: 245, 245₆₉), he assumed 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) reconstructs **H(o)nid-* for the Armenian.

The idea about the dissimilation of Arm. **s-* < **k̑-* before the final affricate *-c* (see Huld 1984: 119 with ref.) or, which practically amounts to 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: **konid-/knid- > *konid-/k̑nid- > *k̑onid-/k̑nid*. Then, **anid-* (< **nid-*) 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 AccSg **anid-n* with *anicanem* ‘I curse’.

A similar alternation **kon-/kn-* (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. It may have been generalized from the oblique stem of the PArm.-PGr. paradigm (see below) rather than **konidā-*, since the nominative of the paradigm was **konid-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. *κονίς* < **κονιδ-ς*). 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 **sḱonid-s* > **c'ónic* >> **sánic*, analogically after the oblique stem, perhaps also due to contamination with *anicanem*,

oblique **s(k)nid-* (loss of **-k-* in the cluster, as in Irish) >> **sonid-* (with analogical **-o-* from the nominative, as in Gr. GSG *κοπίδος*) > **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 s.vv.

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 secondary.¹⁶

aniw, *o*-stem: GDSg *anu-o-y*, GDPI *anu-o-c'* (abundant in the Bible, Astuacaturean 1895: 100a); there is some evidence also for *a*-stem: GDSg *anu-i*, AblSg *anu-ē*, GDPI *anu-a-c'* (NHB 1: 156bc; Ritter 1983: 1954) 'wheel' (Bible+), 'axle of a chariot' (rendering Gr. *ἄζων* in Exodus 14.25, see NHB 1: 156b; Ritter 1983: 1941) 'wheel as a torture instrument' (Bible+, see below), 'sun' (Eznik Kořbac'i, etc., see 3.2 on 'Wheel of the sun'), 'a toy' (John Chrysostom).

For a list of words with both *o*- and *a*-stems, see Ĵahukyan 1959: 321-322.

●DIAL Preserved in Muř. The rest of dialects have replaced *aniw* by *akn* 'eye, etc.' or Turk. *t'ek'er*, etc. [HAB 1: 109a, 196a; Ačarean 1902: 130].

●ETYM Ačaryan (HAB 1: 196a) considers the resemblance of *aniw* with the PIE word for 'navel, nave' accidental and leaves the origin of the Armenian word open. The forms are: Skt. *nābhi-* f. 'nave, hub of wheel; centre; navel (of the body or the world); origin, relationship, family', *nābhya-* n. 'nave, hub of wheel', **nabhā-* 'navel, blood relationship' (in an anthroponym), YAv. *nāfa-* m. 'navel, origin, blood relationship' (for the semantic relationship cf. Arm. *port* 'navel', 'tribe, generation'), OPr. *nabis* 'hub, navel', OHG *naba* 'hub', *nabalo* 'navel', Lat. *umbilicus* m. 'navel; centre, middle' < **h₃nb^h-* (Schrijver 1991: 61-62), Gr. *ὀμφαλός* m. 'navel, umbilical cord', etc., see Pokorny 1959: 314-315; Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 817 = 1995, 1: 716; Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 13-14; Mallory/Adams 1997: 391.

This comparison was revived by Ritter 1983 who posits a *vřddhi*-derivation **h₃nēb^h-o-* (cf. Skt. *nābh-* f. RV 9.74.6), with a semantic shift 'nave' > 'wheel', thus 'zur Nabe gehörig', or 'furnished with a nave'.

This etymology is accepted by a few scholars: Beekes 1987b: 6 (hesitantly: 2003: 186); Meid 1994: 61; Olsen 1999: 23. Olsen (1984: 106; 1985: 9; cf. Greppin 1988-89: 477) posits **h₃nēb^h-i-* directly equating with Skt. *nābhi-* f. 'nave'. However, the Sanskrit form is usually derived from **h₃nob^h-i-* (cf. also Lubotsky 1988: 30), which, as Adams apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 391 points out, would have yielded Arm. **anow* or the like. Nevertheless, this etymology of *aniw* is attractive, and the assumption on **h₃nēb^h-* should be considered at least possible. The alternating *o-*

¹⁶ If we have to reconstruct 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.

and *a*-stems may be derived from PArm. masculine thematic **-o-* and fem. **-eh₂-* proto-forms respectively. The initial **h₃nV-* regularly yields Arm. **anV-* (pace Lindeman 1997: 56₄₆), see s.vv. *anēc-k* ‘curse’, *anun* ‘name’, and 2.1.17.3. For the semantic relation between ‘nave’ and ‘wheel’, see HAB 1: 593-594.

Jahukyan (1971: 49; 1987: 149) assumes a derivation from PIE **sneh₁u-* ‘to turn, bind’, cf. OIc. *snūa* ‘to wind, twist (yarn), twine (thread)’, etc. (on the etymon, see Pokorny 1959: 977; Mallory/Adams 1997: 571b; see also s.v. *neard* ‘sinew, tendon’). However, there are no semantic and structural matches in cognate languages, and the initial *a-* is unexplained. This etymology is therefore rightly dismissed by Ritter 1983: 194₂.

Witczak (1999: 181) compares *aniw* with Skt. *nemí-* f. ‘felloe of a wheel’ positing **āneimi-*. This would yield Arm. **(a)nēm-*, however. One might assume an original HD *i*-stem with nom. in **-ōi* (cf. 2.2.2.4): **Hnéim-ōi*, gen. **Hnim-i-ós* > PArm. **ānéim^w(u)i*, **ānim-í-o-*¹⁷ > **anēw*, gen. **anim-i-* >> *aniw*, gen. *anu-i*. But this is still uncertain.

Culturological excursus: the wheel as a torture instrument

Arm. *aniw* ‘wheel’ refers also to a torture instrument’ (Bible+); cf. Lat. *rota* ‘wheel’, ‘a revolving wheel to which prisoners were bound as a form of torture’ (OxfLatDict); Hitt. *hurkel-* n. ‘a kind of crime’ or ‘abomination’, usually derived from *hurki-* ‘wheel’ < PIE **Huerǵ^h-* ‘to twist, turn, wind’ and referring to a crime to be punished on the wheel or rack; for a discussion, see Hoffner 1964: 336-337; Puhvel 1971; Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984: 494₁, 719-720; Starke 1990: 343-345.

A rack is an old torture instrument, consisting (usually) of a frame having a roller at each end; the victim was fastened to these by the wrists and ankles, and had the joints of his limbs stretched by their rotation (see OxfEnglDict). A similar or the same instrument appears in Armenian, in Agat’angelos: *gel-oc* ‘and *gel-aran*, both deriving from *gel-* ‘to twist; to squeeze’ (q.v.); see HAB 1: 530; 2: 404. As Hoffner (1964: 337) points out, the rack was known only in the Middle Ages but not in Greek, Roman or Near Eastern antiquity.

There also is some textual evidence for the killing at wagons. In P’awstos Buzand 4.58 (1883=1984: 150^{L9f}): *Apa hraman taysr t’agaworn Parsic’ Šapuh*, <...>, *ew zamenayn zkin ew zmanuk hanel and c’ic’ saylic’* : “Then Šapuh king of Persia ordered <...>, and all the women and children impaled on carriage-poles” (transl. Garsoïan 1989: 178). The same formula is also found in P’awstos Buzand 4.24 (120^{L-15}; transl. 157). In Movsēs Xorenac’i 3.35 (1913=1991: 300^{L7ff}): *Zors gereal handerj ganjiwk’n ew tiknawn P’arānjemaw xatac’uc’in i yAsorestan; ew and and sayli c’ic’ haneal satakec’in* “Taking them captive with the treasures and Queen P’arānjem they brought them to Assyria. And there they massacred them by impaling them on wagon poles” (transl.: Thomson 1978: 293).

ankanim, aor. *ank-a-*, imper. *ank-ir*, partic. *ank-eal* (rich evidence in the Bible, see Astuacaturean 1895: 100-104) ‘to fall down; to come down, hang down; to arrive, come to end, cease, stop; to die, fall (especially in a battle); to fall morally, commit a crime, sin, prostitute, etc.’ (Bible+); **ank-ac** ‘fallen, miserable’ (Bible+), ‘cadaver’ (John Chrysostom, etc.); **ankanem** ‘to weave’ (Bible+), **ank-uac** ‘the weaving,

¹⁷ For **-m^w-* > *-w-* see s.v. *awr* ‘day’.

texture' (Bible+); *y-ang* '(at/to) end' (Bible+); *c'-ank/g* 'always, to the end' (Bible+), see also s.vv. *c'ank/g* 'hedge' and *c'ank(an)am* 'to lust'.

For the semantic field cf. e.g. Lat. *cadō* 'to fall (down, from); to be killed, die, perish; to be ruined, decay, abate; to happen; to end, close; to fall through, fail', *cadāver*, *-eris* n. 'dead body, corpse'; see s.vv. **satak* 'corpse', *c'acnum* 'to become low, subside, cease'. See also s.v. *ang-ti* 'prostitute', etymologically perhaps 'the fallen one'.

●DIAL The verb *ankanim* 'to fall down' is ubiquitous in the dialects, mostly with initial *ə-* or *i-* [HAB 1: 199b]. The initial *h'* of Muš and Alaškert *h'anganel* (perhaps also Agulis *həng'ānil*) may point to **y-ang-*. Interesting are Ararat *ang* 'invalid, disabled' [HAB 1: 199b]; Kesaria *ank'ina* 'weaving, texture, cloth' [Ant'osyan 1961: 250].

●ETYM Probably derived from IE **sngʷ-* 'to sink, fall', cf. Goth. *siggan*, OHG *sinke/an*, Germ. *sinken*, Engl. *sink*, etc. (Meillet 1894b: 288; Hübschmann 1897: 419; HAB 1: 199; Pokorny 1959: 906; sceptical Beekes 2003: 204). The appurtenance of forms outside Germanic is uncertain. Further see s.v. *ənkenum* 'to cause to fall, throw down'.

ankiwn, *an-*stem: GDSg *ankean*, AblSg *y-ankiwn-ē* (once), ISg *ankeam-b*, NPl *ankiwn-k'*, GDP1 *ankean-c'*; later also *i-*stem; in Grigoris Aršaruni (7-8th cent.): *angiwn* 'corner' (Bible+).

In 2 Paralipomenon 9.18 *ankiwn* renders Gr. *ἀγκών* '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 wall)', Xian 'cellar', Salmast 'the bottom of a ground-hearth' [HAB 1: 200b].

●ETYM From PIE **h₂eng-*: Lat. *angulus* m. 'corner, angle', Umbr. *anglom* (see Untermann 2000: 101-102), OCS *оґъль* '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 s.v. *ariwn* 'blood'.

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-anjawi*, *a-*stem with compound *k'ar-anjaw* 'cave; fortress; rock' (Bible+). In the Bible: twice in LocSg *y-anjawi* (1 Kings 22.4, 5) and once in LPl *y-anjaws* (1 Maccabees 9.43).

GDSg *anjawi* 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 kolmn 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 must be formulated 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*, *ayr*₂ and *daran* (see HAB s.v.v). The context which unifies these three words can be illustrated by a passage where *paťanjaw* (a hapax composed of *pal/ť* 'immovable rock' [HAB 4: 4a, 13, 90a], q.v., and *anjaw*) appears in an impressive description of 'inaccessible caves' (*yamur ayrs*) of Mananahi; 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. Garsoĭan 1989: 239).

●ETYM Ačařyan (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, although others (cf. Pokorny 1959: 42; Tumanjan 1978; Greppin 1983, etc.) do not mention *anjaw* next to *anjuk*.

I see no serious semantic reasons 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; Bedrāngnis' : 'stony/cliffy place', cf. *vax* 'fear' vs. *vax* 'precipitous/cliffy place'.

The problem of *-aw* is more intriguing. Basing herself on Skt. *amhati-* f. 'Bedrāngnis, Not' and OCS *ozota* 'Enge' and restoring an old "*s/t*-stem", Olsen (1999: 355-356, 784-785) derives *anjaw* < **anjawa-* from **(h)anġ^he/ota-* through vowel assimilation *a-e/o-a* > *a-a-a*. However, the formation of Skt. *amhati-* is "ungewöhnlich" [Mayrhofer EWAia 1, 1992: 38], and the alleged old "*s/t*-stem" seems strange to me. Secondly, I am not sure about the development **-ota-* > Arm. *-awa-*. Furthermore, the explanation of Ĵahukyan (1987: 112) from **anġ^həuo-* (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)nġ^h-u-*. Later, he (1990: 10) considered **-ə-* less probable and assumed a development **-ew-* > *-aw* with the assimilatory influence of the word-initial *a-*.

Olsen, citing only the former version of Ĵahukyan, 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-. However, -w is the regular development in the Classical auslaut; see 2.1.8. The PArm. form could have been **h₂(e)ng^h-H-u-*, probably analogical after the IE antonym **plth₂-u-* ‘wide’; see s.v. *yalt’*. Next to PArm. **h^hat’-u-* from **plth₂-us* there may have existed PArm. **h^hat’-aw-V* from e.g. **plth₂-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 **-HuV-* > *-aw-* after unattested **h^hat’-aw-V*. Compare *y-olov*, *i*-stem ‘abundant’ vs. Skt. *purú-*, f. *pūrvī-* ‘much, abundant’ (RV+). For the development of the PIE interconsonantal laryngeals in 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.

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* : *νοτι δὲ ἡ ψυχὴ ἡμῶν κατάζηρος* (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; Jahukyan 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 ‘monstrous’. It has been preserved in the 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’inč’ 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 Kołbac’i, Philo, etc. In his ‘‘Refutation of the Sects’’, Eznik Kołbac’i (5th cent.) frequently uses the word referring to, for instance, mythical beings (1.25; 1994: 82-86); for a discussion, see Abelyan 1941: 17-21.

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

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

Ačaryan (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 crer’’. In SasCr 2/2, 1951: 821, 965a, it has been explicitly treated as a result

of a wrong interpretation of *anjov hreten* ‘fiery with body’. Note also Gomer *aznahur* ‘giant’ [HayLezBrbBař 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’ [HayLezBrbBař 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. Mkrtč‘yan 1987: 56, 56₁₇; cf. also dial. (Adana) *hrēik* ‘giant’ (see Ačarean 1913: 676a), *hurnik-hreten* (cf. HAB 3: 126, s.v. *hur* ‘fire’). That *huri* not only refers to 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. Mkrtč‘yan 1987: 57]. Note also Širak, etc. *ajbay-huri* (vars. *havja-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 **ajb-* ‘amazement’ + *-a-* + *huri* ‘fairy’. This is implicitly suggested by Abelyan (1941: 91) who renders *ajbahuri* ‘wonderful fairy’ (*hrašali haveržahars*); see also HayLezBrbBař 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; Jahukyan 1987: 112; Olsen 1999: 120; cf. Winter 1965: 102). It has been assumed that Osc. *aftiim* ‘soul’ belongs here, too (Knobloch 1974: 350; on this word see, however, Schrijver 1991: 30; Untermann 2000: 60).

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

anjuk, *o-*stem: GDSg *anjko-y* (a homily ascribed to Elišē; ‘Yačaxapatum’), ISg *anjko-v* (Łazar P‘arpec‘i, John Chrysostom, Grigor Narekac‘i); *a-*stem: ISg *anjka-w* in Movsēs Xorenac‘i 3.68 (see below) and ‘Yačaxapatum’ 6 (although in 10 and 11: GDSg *anjko-y*) adj. ‘narrow; difficult’; subst. ‘narrow passage; mountainous place which is hard to traverse; anxiety, affliction; desire, longing’.

In Movsēs Xorenac‘i 3.68 (1913= 1991: 361^{L10}; transl. Thomson 1978: 352): *Aypiseaw anjkaw heljamłjuk eteal, vtangim* (var. *p‘łkim*) *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. Garsoĭan 1989: 158). The evidence for the declension class comes from the substantive.

●ETYM Since de Lagarde (1854: 15^{L352}) and Hübschmann (1897: 420^{Nr34}), derived from IE **h₂(e)nǵ^h-u-* ‘narrow’: Skt. *amhū-*, MPers. **anzūk*, Goth. *aggwu*, etc.; cf. also PIE *s-*stem: Skt. *amhas-* n. ‘Angst, Bedrängnis’, 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, a few 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 *-k-*; cf. also Pokorny 1959: 42. The compromise proposed by Tumanjan (1978: 156), which presupposes a twofold reflex of **-k-* in Armenian, i.e. *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. To the contrary, *anjuk* mostly is 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’.

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

●DIAL No dialectal forms are recorded in HAB. In 2003: 13, 298, Ačaryan mentions Zeyt‘un forms continuing *anjrdi* (*anj'əyd'a* ‘thirsty’, *anj'əyd'il* and *anj'əyd'nəl* ‘to get thirsty’), stating that the word is absent in other dialects. However, it has been preserved in Goris: *ančardi*, *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* ‘օսոծրոց’ 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 can be more positive here because of strong parallels such as *yur't'i* ‘fertile, watered’ < *y-* (<**h₁en-* ‘in’) + **ur-* + *-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)’, with *apur-* ‘to live’.

antar, *a*-stem: GDSg *antar-i*, LocSg *y-antar-i*, GDPI *antar-a-c* ‘(all attested in the Bible; the alleged IPI *antar-o-v-k* in Job 40.17/22 is in fact *antar-a-w-k*, see Cox 2006: 259); later *i*-stem: GDPI *antar-i-c* (Paterica), IPI *antar-i-w-k* (Nersēs Lambronac‘i) ‘forest’ (Bible+).

●DIAL No dialectal forms are recorded in HAB and HayLezBrbBař. But *antar* is present in a number of E dialects, e.g. Łarabař *ántar* [Davt‘yan 1966: 312]. Besides, it is the principal word for ‘forest’ in Modern Armenian. Note also Melri place-name *Ándar* [Ałayan 1954: 262b].

●ETYM The component **-tar* has frequently been compared to IE **doru-* ‘wood, tree’ (see s.v.v. *targal*, *tarr*, *tořn*, *torg*). Bugge 1890: 85-86 compares the phonological alternation *car* ‘tree’ vs. *an-tar* ‘forest’ (with *an-* from **sm-*; see also

Saradževa 1986: 367³⁵) with *cic* : *tit* ‘teat’ (q.v.). Ačaryan (HAB 4: 671) connects *antar* directly to Gr. *δένδρον*, deriving the latter from **δένρον*. Jahukyan (1987: 118, 245, 258, 259; 1988, 2: 80) reconstructs **sm-daru-* with a question mark. Earlier, he (1967: 182, 303; cf. also NHB 1: 243a) equated the component **tar* with Arm. *car* ‘tree’, placing *antar* in the list of words with alternation *c/t*.

The reconstruction of **sm-dVru-* would be possible if we assume a contamination with *car* ‘tree’. It is tempting to suggest a direct comparison with *tarr/tar* ‘elementum’ (q.v.), although here the alternant *tar* is relatively young. The semantic relationship between ‘wood, material’ and ‘woods’ is well known, cf. Lat. *silva*, Engl. *wood(s)*, Russ. *les(á)*, Fr. *bois*, etc. (see also s.v. *mayri*₁). Arm. *antar* itself is attested in the meaning ‘ύλη’ once (Basil of Caesarea).

One the other hand, one can alternatively suggest an etymological connection with IE **H(o)nd-r-* ‘rock; mountain’: Skt. *ádri-* m. ‘stone, rock; mountain (range)’, Mlr. *ond, onn* < **ondes-* n. ‘stone, rock, mountain’ (for the etymon, see Pokorny 1959: 778; Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984: 666; Mayrhofer EWAia 1, 1992: 65). As is stated by Beekes (apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 547b), the IE root is “poorly attested and uncertain”.

If Arm. *antar* 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 Armenian form, like the Irish one, is perhaps based on neuter **H(o)nd-es-*; thus: **Hnd-(e/o)s-r-eh₂-* > PArm. **antar-a-* > Arm. *antar, -ac*. For the combination neuter **-s-* + **-r-* cf. **kerh₂-s-ro-* > Lat. *cerebrum* ‘brain’ from the *s*-stem found in Skt. *śiras* ‘head’, Gr. *κέρας* ‘horn’ (see Schrijver 1991: 96). The auslaut of the Armenian word might have also been influenced by *car* ‘tree’.

Uncertain.

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

Among numerous Biblical illustrations (Astuacaturean 1895: 117-123), we find a few attestations of the formula **anun dnem** ‘to put a name’. In view of some examples (e.g. 4 Kings 17.34: *orum ed anun Israyēl : oū ēθηκεν τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰσραηλ*), one might assume a Greek calque. This is unnecessary because of other examples, e.g. Genesis 4.17 (Zeyt’unyan 1985: 162): *Ew šinēr k’atak’ ew dnēr anun k’atak’in yanun ordwoy iwroy Enok’ay : καὶ ἦν οἰκοδομῶν πόλιν καὶ ἐπωνόμασεν τὴν πόλιν ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ Ἐνωχ*. Furthermore, the formula is corroborated by dialectal evidence.

●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 Ačaryan 1952: 128, also 103, 245.

In some peripheral NE, E, SE dialects (T’iflis, Ararat, Łarabał, Goris, Ĵula [HAB 1: 209a], Agulis [Ačarean 1935: 127, 335], etc.), one finds *anum* or *anəm*. Note also *anmani* ‘famous’, etc. (HAB, *ibid.*).

anun dnel ‘to put a name’ in Polis, Nor Naxijewan [Ačarean 1913: 107a], and elsewhere (HayLezBrbBar 1, 2001: 69a; Malxaseanc’ HBB 1: 166ab). For a textual illustration, see SasCř 1, 1936: 406^{L789}.

●ETYM Since Klaproth, NHB, etc., linked with the IE forms of the word for ‘name’: Gr. *ὄνομα*, -ατος n., Lat. *nōmen*, -inis n., Skt. *náman-* n. (RV+), MPers., NPers. *nām*, Goth. *namo*, OCS *imę*, 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-m_n-t-os* > **an(u)man(t)*, cf. Gr. *ὄνομα*, -ατος (on the latter view, see Lindeman 1986; Stempel 1993: 150). For different views, references and a discussion, see Schmitt 1967: 91₅₆₂; Greppin 1983: 293-294; Clackson 1994: 33-34, 206₁₂; Kortlandt 1984: 42; 1987: 63; 2001: 12 = 2003: 55, 77, 132; Beekes 1987b: 1-6; 2003: 168, 186, 191; Stüber 1997; Olsen 1999: 132-133. For **-mn* : **-wn* compare *mrjīwn* : *mrjīmn* ‘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 the generalization of **-m-*.

The PIE formula **h₃néh₃-mn d^heh₁-* [Ivanov 1964; 1976a: 41-48; 1981: 140-142, 148-149; 1983a; Mallory/Adams 1997: 438a] is reflected in Arm. *anun dnem* ‘to put a name’.

The ‘name’ functions as an accusative of specification in constructions of the type Skt. *āsīd rājā Nalo nāma* “there was a king Nala (his) name”, etc. (see Hahn 1969; Beekes 1973c). This construction is also found in the original Armenian literature since the oldest period, e.g. in Koriwn (1981: 92^{L2f}, transl. 277): *Ew na arak’ēr zomn Vahrič anum* “He then dispatched a man named Vahrič”. For examples from Elišē, P’awstos Buzand, Łazar P’arpec’i etc., see NHB 1: 221a.

anur, *o*-stem: GDSg *anr-o-y* ‘ring, necklace, collar’ (Bible+); **anr-ak**, AblSg *y-anrak-ē* in Job 31.22 (Cox 2006: 201) ‘collarbone, clavicle’ (rendering Gr. *κλείς* ‘collarbone’ in Job 31.22).

A textual illustration from Job 40.26: *Et’e kopic’es anur* (= Gr. *κρίκος* ‘ring’) *i k’it’s nora* “Will you attach a ring in its snout?” (Cox 2006: 260).

●ETYM Bugge 1893: 3 compares *anur* to Lat. *ānus*, *ī* m. ‘ring, circle; ring, link; anus’¹⁸, OIr. *áinne* ‘ring’. Ačařyan (HAB 1: 209b with ref.) rejects the comparison on the ground of the reconstruction **anKno-* for the Latin word (cf. also Zavaroni 2003: 230f). However, the etymology with the reconstruction of **āno-* (= **h₁eh₂no-*)

¹⁸ For the semantic shift ‘ring’ > ‘anus’ cf. Syriac *ezqəvā*, Gipsy *bokoli* (see HAB 1: 463b s.v. *boket* ‘a kind of round bread’).

is mostly accepted (see Pokorny 1959: 47; Ĵahukyan 1967: 236; 1982: 34; Atabekyan 1979: 65; Greppin 1983: 294; Schrijver 1991: 53; Mallory/Adams 1997: 486b; de Vaan 2008: 45). Also Hitt. *anna-* has been adduced (see Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 817 = 1995, 1: 717 with references).

We may assume QIE **h₁(e)h₂no-* > PArm. **an(o)-* + the suffix *-ur* as in *bl-ur* 'hill', *kt-ur* 'roof', *mr-ur* 'sediment' (vs. *mur* 'soot'), etc. Ĵahukyan (1987: 112, 235, 439; cf. 1998: 35-36) posits **anō-ro-*, but the lengthening of the medial vowel is unexplained. Olsen 1999: 33 starts with **-ur-o-* as secondary thematization of an original **uer/n-* stem (cf. *bl-ur* 'hill' vs. OHG *bilorn* 'tooth-gum') but points out that the stem formation is not corroborated by external evidence.

We may be dealing with a substratum word.

The connection of Arm. *anur* with Gr. *οἰδωσ* 'swelling', etc. (see s.v. *ayt-k'* 'cheek') suggested by AĴayan 1974: 20-22 is untenable.

anurj-k', *i*-stem: GDPI *anrj-i-c'* (Philo, Book of Chries, Gregory of Nyssa, Yovhannēs Drasxanakertc'i, etc.); *o*-stem: GDSg *an(ə)rj-o-y* (Paterica), GDPI *anrj-o-c'* (Grigor Narekac'i) 'dream, day-dream, prophetic vision, vision'.

The oldest attestation is found in Matthew 27.19: *y-anurj-s* 'in a dream'.

The meaning 'prophetic dream' is seen e.g. in the Alexander Romance (H. Simonyan 1989: 76^{L16f}) and in Movsēs Xorenac'i 2.88 (1913=1991: 238^{L5}; transl. Thomson 1978: 243), in the derivative *anrj-akan*. Note also Book of Chries 8.2.2 (G. Muradyan 1993: 189^{L34}; Russ. transl. 2000: 179): *yastuacayin anrjic'n* "в божественных сновидениях".

●ETYM Since NHB (1: 223c), connected with Gr. *ὄναρ* n. 'dream', especially 'fortune-telling dream, vision', *ὄνειρος* m. 'god of dreams, dream', Aeol. *ὄνοιρος* m., Cret. *ἀναίρον· ὄνειρον, ἄναρ· ὄναρ* (Hesychius), Alb. *âdërrë* (Geg.), *ëndërrë* (Tosc.) from **andërrë* < **h₃nr-jo-* (Kortlandt 1986: 38, 44 = 2003: 68, 74). For references and a discussion, see HAB 1: 209-210; Pisani 1934: 180-182; Clackson 1994: 182, 236³³⁹; Balles 1997: 150-152. Arm. *anurj*, *o*-stem, comes from QIE **h₃nōr-jo-*. The alternative *i*-stem probably points to **-ih₂-*.

Beekes (1969: 46) reconstructs the following paradigm: nom. **-ōr*, acc. **-ēr-m*, gen. **-r-ós*. See also s.vv. *ayr* 'man', *awr* 'day'. As to the form in **-jo-*, I assume thematization based on a frozen locative in **-i-* (cf. Hamp 1984a: **Hnen-i* vs. nom. **Hon-r* > **Hneri* > **Hnerjo-*, Helleno-Armenian thematization), cf. s.vv. **atj-* 'darkness', *ayg* 'morning'.

A possible trace of QIE **h₃nor-ih₂-* may be seen in *c'nor-k'*, *i*-stem 'fancy, fantasy, day-dream; bad dream, apparition, boggy'.

ač'-k', pl. tant. *a*-stem: gen.-dat. *ač'-ac'*, instr. *ač'-a-w-k'*, etc. (rich evidence in the Bible, see Astuacaturean 1895: 140-143); *i*-stem: gen.-dat. *ač'-i-c'* (Plato, Paterica, Sargis Šnorhali, Nersēs Lambronac'i, etc.) 'eyes' (Bible+); singulative *akn* 'eye' (q.v.).

●DIAL Almost everywhere NPI *ač'-k'* (also NDU **ač'ui* in Zeyt'un; see Ačarean 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'ina has *əšk*, GSG, *aški* [HAB 1: 223a; Ačarean 1935: 21, 331, 336].

Hamšen **ač'ōk' anel* 'to give (a sign with) a wink' [Ačārean 1913: 117b] derives from 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'* (frequently assimilated to *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'enkiler (Nikomidia) *ač'ič' allal* 'to be struck by the evil eye', K'i **ač'ic'-ehuk* 'stricken by the evil eye', **ač'ic'-ĵur* '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', Xotorĵur **ač'ič'a linel* 'to get sick being struck by the evil eye' (see also YušamXotorĵ 1964: 429b), Karin, Balu **ač'ič'(-)hat* (see s.v. *hat*), Xarberd **ač'ic' anel* 'to pray against the evil eye', Sebastia **ač'ic'-erewut'-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'ič hanel* 'to fulfil one's wish' (see HayLezBrbBař 1: 2001: 45b).

Van *ač'ič'* is still a part of the paradigm [Ačāryan 1952: 128]. Some illustrations can be found e.g. in a folk-tale recorded in 1915 [HŽHek' 14, 999: 13-39]: *meč' pařvu ač'ič'* (18, 19) "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 CIArm. *van-k'*, *-ac'*, which has GDPI *vanic'* in the dialect of Van. For *ot-k'*, *-ic'* 'feet' (q.v.), another form continuing PIE dual, I would also expect a GDPI form with *-ic'* in Van. The actual form is, however, *votac'*, probably analogical after *ceřac' < CIArm. jeřac'*.

●ETYM Together with the singulative *akn* 'eye' (q.v.), derives from the PIE word for 'eye': Skt. *ákṣi-*, GSg *akṣṇás* n., NADu *akṣ-ī* n., YAv. NADu *aši* n., Gr. NADu *ὄσος* n., Lat. *oculus* m. 'eye', OCS NADu *oči* n., Lith. *akis* 'eye', etc., see Hübschmann 1897: 413-414; HAB 1: 107-108, 222-223 with references; Pokorny 1959: 776, 785; Mallory/Adams 1997: 188a. For more references and a discussion, see Godel 1975: 72, 82, 94; Eichner 1978: 147₁₇; Schmitt 1981: 50, 89; Lindeman 1982: 38-39; Mayrhofer 1986: 127₁₁₈; Clackson 1994: 46-47, 111; Witczak 1999: 175.

Armenian dual *ač'-* reflects the PIE dual form **h₃(o)k^w-ih₁* n. 'both eyes'. It is tempting to assume that Arm. **ač'-i-* (post-classical; dialects) directly continues the PIE dual in **-ih₁-*, whereas classical *ač'-a-* reflects the neuter plural in **-(e)h₂-*. Further see s.v. singulative *akn* 'eye'.

aĵ, *o*-stem: GDSg *aĵ-o-y*, AblSg *y-aĵ-o-y*, ISg *aĵ-o-v*; *u*-stem: GDSg *aĵ-u*, GDPI *aĵ-u-c'*; note also LocSg *y-aĵ-u* and *y-aĵ-um*, AblSg *y-aĵ-m-ē* (abundant in the Bible, Astuacaturean 1895: 150-151) 'right'.

Derivatives: *aṛ-ot* ‘skilful, successful’, (*y-*)*aṛ-ot-ak* (Bible+), *y-aṛ-ot* ‘id.’ (Eusebius of Caesarea), (*y-*)*aṛ-ot-em* ‘to have success’ (Bible+), *an-y-aṛ* adv. ‘inappropriate’ (Movsēs Xorenac’i 2.8, 1913=1991: 114^{L17}; transl. Thomson 1978: 141).

See also s.v. *aṛaṣ* ‘front’.

A textual illustration for *aṛ-o-y* and *y-aṛ-m-ē* in one and the same sentence can be found in Movsēs Xorenac’i 1.11 (1913=1991: 36^{L2f}; transl. Thomson 1978: 87): *ew nīzak anari i jerin iwrum aṛoy, ew yahekumn vahan, ew antirk’ yajmē ew i jax-m-ē* ‘A monstrous lance was in his right hand and in the left a shield. Chosen men stood to the right and left’.

●DIAL Widespread in the dialects. In some dialects *aṛ* has been replaced by *saṭ* of Turkish origin [HAB 1: 247a].

●ETYM Connected with Skt. *sādhati* ‘to succeed, reach the goal’, *siddhá-*, *sidhrá-* ‘successful’, *sādhú-* ‘straight, effective’, *sīdhyati* ‘to succeed, be successful’ (for the forms, see also Lubotsky 1988: 46, 113; Kulikov 2001: 482-483), etc. [Lidén 1906: 75-76; HAB 1: 246a; Meillet 1950: 86, also p.c. apud HAB 1: 246b; Jahukyan 1982: 61-62, 132; 1987: 146; Greppin 1983: 296; Kortlandt 1994: 27 = 2003: 104; Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 722-723; Mallory/Adams 1997: 228b; Olsen 1999: 186; Beekes 2003: 199].

Recently this etymology has been criticized by Witczak 1999: 174-175. However, the derivation **sHd^h-jo-* or **seh₂d^h-jo-* ‘successful’ > Arm. *aṛ, o-* stem ‘right’ (cf. Skt. *sādhyá-* m. ‘a class of divinities’) is impeccable both formally and semantically. For the development **-d^hi-* > Arm. *-j-*, see 2.1.22.1. The alternative *u-* stem may be compared with Skt. *sādhú-* (cf. Olsen 1999: 186 with references and a discussion).

Witczak claims that the ModArm. dial. form *háč* ‘seems to have retained the original shape’, which is unfounded. Then he reconstructs PArm. **háč* and derives it from **patyo-*, comparing with Hurr. *pa(n)di/wa(n)di* ‘right’ on the one hand, and with Toch. A *pāci* ‘right’ on the other.

I do not know of a dialectal form that would be derivable from a PArm. **háč*. Even if there are dialectal forms with an initial *h-*, it might be regarded as a relic of the IE **s-* of our **s(e)Hd^h-jo-* (compare the cases of e.g. *arb-* ‘to drink’ and *ali-k* ‘waves’). Alternatively, it might be due to lexicalization of the *y-* prefixed forms. Besides, the final voiced affricate *-j* of the ClArm form regularly becomes unvoiced, whereas an original *-č* cannot yield voiced *-j* in ClArm. I conclude that there are no solid reasons to reject the traditional etymology and especially to derive Arm. *aṛ* from **patyo-*.

Pedersen (1906: 432 = 1982: 210) compares Arm. *aṛ* with Gr. *ἄξιος* ‘worth’, which is untenable as well.

aṛ ‘at, by, to, nearby, in front, before, etc.’ preposition (Bible+, see NHB 1: 281) and prefix, cf. *aṛagast* ‘curtain, etc.’, *aṛac* ‘proverb’, *aṛak* ‘fable’, *aṛapar* ‘craggy place’, *aṛaṣ* ‘front’, *aṛaṣin* ‘first’, *aṛaspel* ‘myth, fable’, *aṛastat* ‘ceiling’, *aṛat* ‘abundant’, *aṛatik* ‘rope’, *aṛark-* ‘subject’, *aṛawawt* ‘morning’, *aṛawušt* ‘urinary bladder’, *aṛeł* ‘carriage-pole’, *aṛēj* ‘threads running along the length of cloth, warp’, **aṛič* ‘village’, *aṛik* ‘ceiling’, *aṛotj* ‘healthy’, **aṛ-orm-i* ‘a log or wooden framework that supports the wall or the ceiling of a house’, etc.

For more examples and a discussion, see HAB 1: 247a; Meillet 1936: 94, 97, 99, 139, 150-151; M. Muradyan 1975: 58-61; T'osunyan 1983 passim; Gyurjinyan 1987; L. Hovsep'yan 1987: 161, 164, 165 et passim; Jahukyan 1987: 243-244, 358; Olsen 1999: 754.

Further see s.vv. *zaṛam* 'senile' and *zaṛanc'em* 'to delire', if containing *z-* and *aṛ-*. Interesting are *z-aṛ-i-vayr* and *z-aṛ-i-koł* 'precipitous'.

●DIAL Łarabał *áris*, *áres* 'at/with me', *árit*, *áret* 'at/with you', *árin*, *áren* 'at/with him/her', Hadrut', Šalax-Xcaberđ *áres*, *áret*, *áren* [Davt'yan 1966: 316], Łazax *áris*, *árit*, *árin* 'id.' [HAB 1: 247b].

The first person form, viz. *áris/áres*, continues ClArm. *aṛ is* (cf. *z-is*, AccSg of *es* 'I'). At a certain stage the final *-s* has been secondarily associated with the first person deictic article *-s*. Based on this re-analysis, the second and third person forms with *-d* and *-n* have analogically been created [HAB 1: 247b].

The prefixed forms see under corresponding entries.

●ETYM Since Meillet (1936: 99), connected with Gr. *πάρα* 'besides, by, next to, alongside, against', *πέρι* 'around, round, quite, by, at, concerning', *πέρυσσι* (Dor. *πέρυσσι*) 'last year', *πόρρω*, Att. *πόρρω* 'forward, beyond, away', *πρό* 'forth, forward, for, before', *πρωί*, Att. *πρωί*, compos. *πρωί-* 'early, in the morning', Skt. *pāra-* 'farther, utmost, highest, surplus', *parás* 'far, further', *pārā* 'away, off', *prá* 'before, forward, forth, in front', *pári* 'around, about, away from', *parut* 'last year', *purás* 'in front, in advance, forward, before', *prātár* 'early, in the morning, the next day', etc. (for the forms and a discussion, see Pokorny 1959: 810-816; Beekes 1973b; Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 86-87, 88-89, 91-92, 146-147, 173-174, 188; Mallory/Adams 1997: 60-61, 173-174, 581b).

It is not entirely clear whether the second *-a-* of the by-form *aṛa-* has an etymological value. A combination *aṛ* + conjunction *-a-* (Ravnæs 1991: 99), which is very productive in compounds, is improbable. In a few words, the *-a-* may be anaptyctic (see s.vv. *aṛaspel* 'myth, fable', *aṛastat* 'ceiling'). Different is the case of *aṛatik* 'rope' (q.v.), which may contain *tik* '*goat's leather', and *aṛapar* 'craggy place' (q.v.), if containing **par* 'foot'.

Different explanations for *aṛ(a)* have been proposed. IE **perə-* (HAB 1: 247a) or **prH-* (Klingenschmitt 1982: 165; Hamp 1986: 293; 1996, see s.v. *aṛaj*; Mallory/Adams 1997: 60b; cf. Clackson 1994: 38-39) would rather yield Arm. **her(a)-* or **(h)ar(a)-*, respectively. That this cannot explain the trilled *-r-* is rightly stressed by Ravnæs 1991: 99. IE **porsō-* (Pokorny 1959: 816 with Gr. *πόρρω*, Att. *πόρρω* 'forward, beyond, away', Lat. *porrō* 'onward, further (off), besides'; see also Jahukyan 1987: 143) would give Arm. **or-* (Ravnæs 1991: 99₁). One might posit **pys-* (cf. Greppin 1983: 296, hesitantly), or **pors-V-* (in derivatives) > PArm. **orV-* > *aṛ-V-* (for this vocalic change, see 2.1.3). A proto-form with **e-grade* in the root (loc. **pers-i*) might explain Arm. *heṛ-i* 'far'. However, the latter is usually derived from **per-(e)ri-*, cf. Goth. *fairra* 'far', OHG *ferro* 'far', etc. (Pokorny 1959: 811; Jahukyan 1982: 42; 1987: 143; Lehmann 1986: 107).

Further see s.vv. *era-* 'first, early, before', *haraw* 'south', *heri* 'far', *heru* 'last year'.

aṛagast *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'eamb krt'ealk', 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 "Yalags ampoc' ew nšnac'" 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 Ačaryan (1913: 130b; HAB 1: 249a) and Amatuni (1912: 55b) describe Ararat *aragast* as a part of a *hnjan* (wine-pressing room) or a house where the grapes are pressed to make wine. According to Bałdasaryan-T'ap'alc'yan (1971: 218), the word *hnjan* in the village of Ošakan is equivalent to *arāk'ast* in Aštarak. See also s.v. *hnjan*.

●ETYM Composed as *ar-* + *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 the generalization of **-u-k-ti-*.

One wonders if *ar-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, -μαί* 'I clothe') seems to be an obstacle for the equation, unless one accepts the explanation given in Kortlandt 2003: 43 (see s.v. *aganim* 'to put on clothes'). Contamination is possible, too. It is interesting that the *i*-stem of *aragast* agrees with what might be expected for *zgest* (cf. Lat. *uestis* 'cloth, garment'; Goth. *wasti* 'garment, dress'), although the evidence for the *i*-stem of *zgest* is late (Paterica+). In the 5th century the word is an *u*-stem. On the other hand, the parallel *a*-stem of *aragast* is reminiscent of formations like Gr. (Hesychius) *γαστία* 'clothing' < **ues-tih₂-* or *ἔσθης* 'clothing' < **ues-th₂-*(?) (cf. also *ἔσθος* 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 merge 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. *araspel*). If this is correct, Gr. *ἔσθης* (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 the 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 it must be posited in order to make a start for part B. One notes that in *hnjan* (if my etymology is accepted; see s.v.), a similar development has taken place, albeit 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'.

arac, *o*-stem and *i*-stem (both attested late) ‘proverb; vision, prophecy, prodigy, etc.’ (Bible+); cf. also **ar-ac-im** ‘to turn around’ (Eznik Kořbac‘i, John Chrysostom).

In (late) medieval dictionaries, *arac* is glossed by the following words: *patgam* ‘command, etc.’, *arhest* ‘craft, skill, art’, *margarēut‘iwn* ‘prophecy’, *ban* ‘thing’, *tesil* ‘vision’, *xōsk* ‘speech, word’, *azdumn* ‘effect’ [Amalyan 1971: 189-192].

●DIAL Agulis, Axalc‘xa *arac*, Alaškert *araj* [HAB 1: 249a]; Meři *arāskav* ‘metaphorically’ < **arac-k‘-ov* ‘with proverb’ [Ařayan 1954: 262b].

●ETYM Since Maksoudiantz 1911-12, Arm. *arac* is treated as composed of the prefix *ar-* ‘at, to, near by, before, etc.’ and the verbal stem *ac-* ‘to bring, lead, drive, move, encircle, beat, pour, etc.’ (q.v.), cf. Lat. *adagiō*, *-ōnis* f. ‘proverb’, *adagium* n. ‘proverb’ (cf. *vetus adagio est* in Varro), *prōdigium* n. ‘omen, portent, monster; marvel, prodigy; monstrous creature’; further note Lat. *aiō* ‘to say, assent, affirm’, Gr. *ἦ* (athematic imperfect) < **h₁e-h₁eǵ-t* ‘he said’, and Arm. *asem* ‘to say, speak, tell’ (q.v.), the *-s-* of which is usually explained from a perfect formation **Hǵ-t* (Walde/Hofmann 1, 1938: 12, 24-25; Ernout-Meillet 1959: 18-19; Pokorny 1959: 290; Ĵahukyan 1967: 184, 308; 1987: 121, 163; Ravnæs 1991: 64; Schrijver 1991: 26-28, 31; Mallory/Adams 1997: 535a; Anttila 2000: 118; cf. Meillet 1892: 164; Brugmann 1904: 506). Arm. *-ac* has been derived from **-h₁oǵ-* (Schrijver 1991: 26; cf. Klingenschmitt 1982: 138).

According to another explanation, the **aǵ-*, represented in Latin and Armenian, derives from PIE **h₂eǵ-* ‘to drive, lead’. Benveniste (1969, 2: 260-263 = 1973: 513-515) assumes that Lat. *aiō* refers primarily to the verbatim quotation of an authoritative utterance, and originally *prōdigium* would have been the ‘prodigy’ of a divine voice which made itself heard along with other signs. For an extensive discussion on these and related issues, see Greppin 1975c: 62-63; 1983: 296-297, 302-303; de Vaan 2008: 31-32, and especially Anttila 2000: 113-121.

If the interpretation of Arm. *tacem* ‘to take care for, look after, nourish; to cultivate’ from PArm. *(*a*)*t-* (cf. Lat. *ad* ‘at, near by, about’ < IE **h₂ed-*) + **ac-* is accepted (see s.v.), then this verb should be regarded as an exact etymological match to Lat. *adagiō*.

Ařayan (HAB 1: 249a) prefers interpreting *arac* as a derivative of *arnum* ‘to gain, obtain, win, plunder, take, grasp, etc.’ in the suffix *-ac*, cf. *arar-ac* ‘created; creature’; for the semantic development, see Gr. *λῆμμα* ‘acceptance, assumption; proverb; inspiration, commission, prophecy’ from *λαμβάνω* ‘to take, grasp’. This interpretation is followed by Klingenschmitt 1982: 137138₂ and Olsen 1999: 238₅₆. However, the connection with Lat. *ad-agiō* is more attractive.

arapar, *a*-stem: ISg *arapar-a-w*, GDPl *arapar-a-c‘* (Movsēs Xorenac‘i, etc.), AblSg *y-arapar-ē* (Alexander Romance) ‘craggy place’ (Bible+).

For Biblical textual illustrations, see Job 39.6 and 40.20 [Cox 2006: 250, 258]. ISg *arapar-a-w* is attested in Movsēs Xorenac‘i 3.9 (1913=1991: 266^{L14f}, transl. Thomson 1978: 262): *ew anti meržeal zŌšakan araparawn* ‘pushed them back from there to the rocks of Ōšakan’; GDPl *arapar-a-c‘* : Movsēs Xorenac‘i 2.22 (1913=1991: 137^{L12}); transl. ‘rocky places’ (Thomson 1978: 159).

●ETYM A word of unknown origin [HAB 1: 251a; Olsen 1999: 962].

I tentatively interpret the word as composed of *ar(a)* ‘at, by, in front’ (q.v.) and the independently unattested root **par* ‘foot’ from Parth. *pāδ* ‘foot’, which is also

found in Arm. *hrapar* ‘rope, tie’, hapax attested in Agat‘angelos § 109 (see s.v. *tik* ‘a vessel made of an animal’s skin’ for the attestation), with the Iranian prefix *fra-* (HAB 3: 132b; Bolognesi 1995; Hamp 1997a: 19-20), and *garšapar* ‘heel, footstep’ (q.v.). This etymology, if accepted, can be important for establishing the status of *aṙa-*, the by-form of *aṙ-*.

For the semantics cf. Arm. *xoč’-ənd-otn* ‘stumbling block, hindrance, impediment’, lit. ‘pointed stone or prickle under feet’, Lat. *impedimentum*, Gr. *ἔμ-ποδ-ών*, *ἔμ-ποδ-ιος* (Frisk 1: 507; 2: 587), Russ. *pre-pjatstvie*, etc. Note especially Arm. *aṙat’ur* ‘under feet’ (Bible+), composed of the same prefix *aṙa-* and an ECauc. word for ‘foot’, cf. Udi *t^hur* ‘foot’, etc. (see HAB 1: 90a).

It is unclear whether *aṙapar* is in a way related with *aparaž* ‘rock, craggy place’ (Bible+; widespread in the dialects, HAB 1: 228b).

aṙaj ‘front part; front, anterior’; **aṙaj-i** ‘in front of, towards; against’; **aṙaj-in** ‘first, prime, prior’ (all Bible+).

●DIAL Dialectally ubiquitous [HAB 1: 251-252].

●ETYM Since Petermann et al., interpreted as *aṙ-* ‘at, to, near by, before, etc.’ + *aj* ‘right’ [HAB 1: 245b, 251b; Greppin 1983: 296]. The complicated explanations starting with **prHu-* or the like (Klingenschmitt 1982: 165, 165-166₁₀; Hamp 1996) are improbable and unnecessary.

aṙaspel, *a*-stem: GDSg *aṙaspel-i*, GDPl *aṙaspel-a-c* ‘(Bible, Movsēs Xorenac’i), ISg *aṙaspel-a-w* (Plato), IPl *aṙaspel-a-w-k* ‘(Movsēs Xorenac’i); **aṙaspel-i-k*’, GDPl *aṙaspeleac* ‘in Agat‘angelos, Movsēs Xorenac’i (reading variant) ‘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 **aṙaspeli*. But such a singular is not attested. Cases where sg. *aṙaspel* (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).

‘mythical story, fiction, tale’: ‘mythical untrue/unbelievable/unsensical story’: ‘fairy-tale = gratuitous talking’: 1 Timothy 1.4: *Yaṙaspelac* ‘*paṙawanc*’ ‘“from fables of old women”. Agathangelos: *aṙaspeleac* ‘*gri*. Eznik Kołbac’i: *Amenek’ean aṙaspels arkanen*.

In Movsēs Xorenac’i 1.6 (1913=1991: 22^{6f}, transl. Thomson 1978: 77): *orum oč’ zok’ ənddimalan karcem i mits unotac’n: bayc’ et’ē zčšmartut’eann ok’ xorhelov k’akel zoč’ yaṙaspels 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”’.

GDSg *aṙaspel-i* and LocSg *yaṙaspel-i* are attested in a remarkable passage from Movsēs Xorenac’i 2.61 (1913=1991: 192^{L8f}, transl. Thomson 1978: 204), for which see s.v. *darbin* ‘smith’.

Other attestations from Movsēs Xorenac’i:

2.7 (1913=1991: 111^{L2f}, transl. Thomson 1978: 138): *T’oḥum zaṙaspelac’n* (var. *zaṙaspeleac’n*) *baṙatans, or i Hadamakertin patmin* ‘“I omit the nonsensical fables that are recounted in Hadamakert”’.

2.8 (115^{L12}; transl. 142), the stories about the power of *Turk' Angeleay* 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 parāweal arāspelōk'* : “Why do we deceive ourselves with ancient tales and old wives' fables?”.

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

In the Alexander Romance (H. Simonyan 1989: 173-174; Wolohojian 1969: 72; Braccini 2004: 42^{V87f}, 150-154), the bard Ismenias approaches Alexander “with devilish words” (*diwabnak baniwk'*), and Alexander becomes annoyed by all these “fairy-tales” (*arāspeleawk'n*) and says angrily: *Arāspels 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' pačučeal arāspels* : “fables elaborated from fictitious accounts”.

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

‘infamous subject for public talkings’: In Gregory Nazianzenus (see NHB 1: 292c): *Zi arāspel zis arasc'ēs i kenc'atums*.

‘fable’: T'ovmay Arcruni (9-10th cent., Vaspurakan) 1.10 (V. Vardanyan 1985: 108): *Aṛ sa inj i čax elanē k'ert'otakan arāspeln or asē : bazum angam atuesk' 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 *arāspel* 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*, cf. *Sksayc' arak, oč' arāspelakan, ayl or ē čšmarit arakeal* (Philo).

‘proverb’: 1 Kings 24.14: *Orpēs asē hin arāspeln, yanawrēn jerac' yelc'ē vnas : avōs légetai ē parabōlē ē arxaiā 'Ez anómōwn ézēleúsetai pliméleia*.

Movsēs Xorenac'i 1.12 (1913=1991: 40^{L4f}; transl. Thomson 1978: 90): *Vasn oroy t'ui ardaranal arāspeln* (dativus cum infinitivo), *or asi i mēj geljkac'* : “*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' arāspelaw varil part ē, et'ē <... >*.

‘enigma, riddle’: In Judges 14.12: *Arkic' jez arāspel* “Let me now put a riddle to you” : *Προβλήω ὑμῖν πρόβλημα*. In Judges 14.18: *oč' gtanēik' zaarāspeln im* “you would not have found out my riddle” : *οὐκ ἂν εὔρητε τὸ πρόβλημά μου*. Adjectival usage in Cyril of Jerusalem; cf. below on dialects.

On the notion of *arāspel* ‘myth’ : ‘fable’ : ‘proverb’ in Movsēs Xorenac'i, see Abelyan 1985: 72; Thomson 1978: 10-11. For the meaning ‘riddle’ of *arāspel, arak*

and *bankn* (q.v.), see S. Harut'yunyan 1960: 7-9; Mnac'akanyan 1980: 6-7; Ōdabašyan 1987: 64₁₀.

Denominative verbs *arāspelem*, *arāspelabanem*, *arāspelagorcem*, *arāspelastetcem* and numerous other derivations, like *arāspelabar*, *arāspelaxaws*, *arāspelakan*, *arāspelakoc*, 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 arāspelabanelov vipasank'n yergeln iwreanc' asen*: < ... >. *Doynpēs ew zharsaneac'n arāspeal 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".

The verb *arāspelem* occurs in Ašxarhac'oyc' (Soukry 1881: 42).

In Baġgirk' hayoc' (see Amalyan 1975: 31^{Nr724}): *arāspel· hrašaban, kam sut patmut' iwn* "miraculous or false story".

●DIAL Preserved in some dialects: Juła 'licentious story' (according to T. Abgarean 1966: 93, 'dishonourable word'); Rodost'o, Tigranakert, Nor Naxijewan, etc. 'immoral, indecent (words)', e.g. *Arāspel baner mi asil* "Do not say indecent things/words"; Karin, Sebastia, T'iflis 'stubborn'. The Turkish-speaking Armenians of Angora use the word in the meaning 'immoral word' and 'fairy-tale' (the rendering *hēk'eac* is a misprint for *hēk'eat* 'fairy-tale', see HAB-Add 1982: 7) [HAB 1: 254a].

Sebastia *arāspel* 'extraordinary (blasphemy); licentious (girl)' [Gabikean 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.vv. *arastat* and *ar-*), and otherwise unattested root **spel-*, which is derived from PIE **spel-*.

This etymology has been proposed by Lidén (1933: 46-49) and is generally accepted (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 **η-pelnō*"). The appurtenance of Toch. B *päl-* 'to praise, commend' is uncertain [Adams 1999: 376-377]. According to Ačaiyan (HAB 1: 253-254), Tumanyan (1978: 204) et al., only the Germanic words are related. Greppin (1981b: 3) notes that the correlation Arm. *arāspel* 'boastful' : Gr. *ἀπειλή* 'fable' should not be rejected, although there is some semantic unbalance. (It seems that Greppin confused here the meanings of the Armenian and the Greek words). The formation of Arm. *arāspel* is parallel to that of OE *bi-spell* 'fable'. Compare also Arm. *arac* (HAB s.v.).

Arm. *ar(-a)-spel* is structurally, semantically, and, as far as the root is concerned, etymologically identical with MHG, OHG *bī-spel* 'belehrende Erzählung, Redensart, Gleichnis, Sprichwort', and OEngl. *bi-spell*, composed of MHG, OHG *bī* 'bei' and Germ. **spella-* n. 'überlieferte Geschichte, Mythos': Goth. *spill* 'myth' (Lehmann 1986: 320), OIc. *spjall* 'Erzählung, Rede, Zauberspruch', MHG, OHG *spel* 'Erzählung', OEngl. *spell* 'Erzählung, Geschichte, Rede, Predigt, Botschaft', Engl.

spell ‘Zauberspruch’ (cf. also *god-spell*, lit. ‘gute Kunde, gute Botschaft, Evangelium’); the actual meaning is ‘nebenbei Erzähltes, das dazu Erzählte’ (Kluge/Seebold 1989: 72a, 272b; HerkWört 1997: 71-72). See also s.v. *arac* ‘proverb; vision, prophecy, prodigy, etc.’.

See also s.v. *pałat-* ‘supplication’.

arastat *a*-stem (GDPI *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): *Kamis tesanel 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 has probably not been preserved. However, she points out to another similar passage of the Greek text (PG vol. 59: 102.8), where the sky is metaphorically associated with the ceiling, too. Thus, we seem to be dealing with a metaphor or comparison rather than lexicalization of the meaning ‘sky’; cf. a similar metaphor with the synonymous *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; MijHayBař 1, 1987: 77a.

●DIAL Preserved in SW dialects: Akn *arəsdax* [HAB 1: 255a], Zeyt‘un *ayəsdəx* [Ačařyan 2003: 299], Aramo *arstut*, NPI *arstətna*, K‘abusie *arəstux* [Łaribyan 1958: 28, 59a, 120b], Malat‘ia *arəstat* [Danielyan 1967: 186b], K‘esab *arəstuot/x/k* [Č‘olak‘ean 1986: 196b], Svedia *arəsdut*, loc./all. *eařəsdaut* < **y-arəstat* [Andreasyan 1967: 33, 354b]. In these descriptions the semantics of the word is not specified. Only Ačařyan (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. *arəstat* is glossed in Gabikean 1952: 80 by Turk. *arəstat*. Note also Turkophone Enkūri *arəstak* ‘ceiling’ [S. Mxit‘arean 1898: 789a].

On Persian, see below.

In the Armenian dialects of Syria, *arəstat* ‘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): *asthunk‘y*, glossed as *katik, šnč‘ap‘ot*, that is ‘uvula, windpipe’ [M. Muradyan 1962: 209a], with no references to the origin or a ClArm. correspondence. Formally, this word is identical with Van pl. *asthunk* ‘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 *arəstat* ‘palate’ with loss of *-ř-* and/or contamination with *asthunk* ‘stars’. In either

case, the word should be discussed within the semantic 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.vv. *ar-* and *araspel*), i.e. **stat*. The latter is connected (Dervischjan 1877: 40₁ and Lidén 1933: 41-42, 45, independently) to OCS *stelja* ‘roof’ and the like (Pokorny’s **stel-₂* ‘ausbreiten, flach hinbreiten’). Everyone accepts this etymology (Pokorny 1959: 1018-1019; Solta 1960: 225ff; Tumanjan 1978: 204-205; Greppin 1983: 297-298; Jahukyan 1987: 151; Olsen 1999: 208, etc.) without mentioning the alternative proposed by Ačaryan (HAB 1: 254), who prefers connecting Arm. **stat* with words presented in Pokorny 1959: 1019-1020 s.v. **stel-₃*.

Both Ačaryan and Pokorny (“wohl”) point out the possibility that these two PIE roots may be related to each other. However, we will continue dealing with a “Wurzel-etymologie” until we recognize the direct association of Arm. **stat* with Gr. *στήλη* ‘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 (**stalnā*, cf. Dor. *στᾶλᾶ*, Lesb. Thess. *στάλλᾶ*, Rix 1992: 67) 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.vv. **arormi*, dial. **ar-*zel** (Ačarean 1913: 132b).

In NHB 1: 293c, *arastat* is glossed by Pers. *arast’ag*, Gr. *ῥοφος*, 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)čar* ‘roof, ceiling’ vs. *a(w)čar* ‘equipment, harness, make-up, ornament, material’.

*arati (dial.) ‘cord’.

●DIAL In the glossary of dialectal words, Ałayan (1954: 297) records Meiri *arāte*, glossing by *aratik* ‘cord’, although the latter is missing in the vocabulary from ClArm. to the Meiri dialect.

●ETYM The word is probably composed of the prefix *ara-* ‘at, to, near by, before, etc.’ and the word *ti* ‘tie’: **ara-ti* > **arāti* > *arāte*, for the development of the final vowel *-i* > *-e* cf. *aceli* ‘razor’ > *cīle*, *anali* ‘saltless’ > *nāle*, *gōti* ‘girdle’ > *gūte*, etc. (see Ałayan 1954: 38-42). The word can structurally be compared (or perhaps even identified with) the synonymous *ara-tik* (q.v.).

*aratik (or **aratak*), *a*-stem: GDPI *aratk-a-c*‘ (Yovhannēs Drasxanakertc‘i), IPI *aratk-a-w-k*‘ (Agat‘angelos § 102, Yovhannēs Drasxanakertc‘i) ‘a cord for binding up a criminal’s feet’.

The passage in Agat‘angelos § 102 (1909=1980: 61^{L16f}; transl. Thomson 1976: 119) see s.v. *olok* ‘shin’.

●DIAL No dialectal forms are recorded in HAB 1: 255-256; 4: 655. For Meiri *arāte*, see s.v. **ara-ti* ‘cord’.

●ETYM According to Ačāryan (HAB 4: 655), the word is composed as *aṛa-* ‘at, to, near by, before, etc.’ + *ti* ‘tie’ + dimin. *-ik*. The same derivative without the diminutive suffix is found in Mehri, see s.v. **aṛa-ti* ‘cord’.

It seems more likely, however, that the second component is *tik* ‘wineskin’. Remarkably, both *tik* and **aṛatik* are *a*-stems, and they both are used in Agat‘angelos to refer to strong cords for binding up someone’s feet or shins (for the passages, see s.vv. *olok* ‘shin’ and *tik* ‘wineskin’).

For the problem of the medial *-a-*, see s.vv. *aṛ-* ‘at, etc.’, *aṛaspel* ‘myth, fable’, *aṛastal* ‘ceiling’, **aṛormi* ‘a log or wooden framework that supports the wall or the ceiling of a house’.

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

●DIAL Widespread in the dialects. Many forms display contraction or allegro-variants, e.g. Nor Naxijewan *aṛadun* (next to *aṛavdun*), Van *aṛatun*, *aṛat-man*, etc., Polis *aṛdu*, etc. Šamaxi *aṛcōt* or *aṛōr* reflects a contraction peculiar to this dialect, cf. *baxtawor* ‘lucky’ > Šamaxi *baxtōr*, etc. [Baṛramyan 1964: 35].

The Aṛtial forms show an irregular absence of the second *-w-*: *aṛvadu(n)* (Suč‘ava, Hungary) and *aṛvadanc* (Romania) [Ačāryan 1953: 50, 259]. Ačāryan glosses these forms as corresponding to ClArm. (Loc. adverb?) *aṛawawtu*. He does not cite any Aṛtial reflex of the “pure” form *aṛawawt*.

●ETYM Ačāryan (HAB 1: 256) does not accept any of numerous etymological proposals, of which only that of Patrubby (StugHetaz1906: 341) is worth of consideration. He analyzes the word as *aṛ-* + **aw-* + *-awt* and compares the root **aw-* with Lat. *aurōra* f. ‘dawn’, Gr. *ἔως*, *αὔωσ* f. ‘dawn’, Skt. *uśās-* f. ‘morning light, morning, dawn’ (RV+), etc. This etymology is advocated by Dumézil (1938b: 49-50; Schmitt 1972-74: 23; Greppin 1983: 298 with 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’.

Aṛayan (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. Aṛayan (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 Ē. Aṛayan), also found in *šat-awōt* (with *šat* ‘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, *aṛ-awōt* itself being the 10th (see Aṛayan 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.

aṛawušt ‘urinary bladder; watery pustule, blister’.

Only one attestation is cited in NHB 1: 298a and HAB 1: 256a: Nemesius of Emesa (or Gregory of Nyssa), “Yafags bnūt‘ean mardoy”, in the meaning ‘urinary bladder’.

I found 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 (245¹²⁴) *aṛawušt jroy* (*jroy* = GSg of *jur*

‘water’) is mentioned as one of the 7 kinds of bodily excrements and probably means ‘watery pustule, blister’.

●ETYM NHB (1: 298a) considers it identical with (*noyn and*) *p’amp’ušt* ‘urinary bladder’. Dervischjan (1877: 80) takes *ara-* as a prefix 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-zel** (dial.).

●DIAL In DialAdd apud NHB (2: 1060c): *arzel* ‘a bed for workers made at the ceiling (*ar jehunn*) or with straw (*celiwk’*) in stables or cattle-sheds”, which 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*’, although in this case the dialectal area is not specified.

Here belongs also Sasun *arzel* ‘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 jehunn* ‘at the ceiling’ (see above). This is probable. ClArm. *jehun* ‘ceiling’, also with a *o*-vocalism, *johunk’* in Severian of Gabala, etc. and in the dialect of Akn, contains **je/ol* ‘log; pole’, cf. Georgian *jeli* ‘log’ and Arm. *jot* ‘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 meaning ‘log, pole, etc.’, see s.v. *ar-a-stat* ‘ceiling’. For *-rj-* > *-rz-* cf. *arjak* ‘free, loose, etc.’ > Łarabał *härzäk*, etc.

arēj (spelled also *arēč’*), *o*-stem: GDSg *arij-o-y* (Leviticus 13.59), *arič’-o-y* (Hexameron, see K. Muradyan 1984: 190L1); *i*-stem: GDPl *arič’-i-c’* (Plato), cf. AblSg *y-arij-ē* (Leviticus 13.56) ‘threads running along the length of cloth, warp’ (Bible+).

In Leviticus 13.48-59 *arēj* ‘threads running along the length of cloth, warp’ occurs several times beside *t’ezan* ‘the weft, the transverse threads which are woven across to make cloth using the warp as a base’. The two terms render Gr. *στήμων* and *κρόκη*, respectively.

●DIAL Present in a number of dialects (in some of them, frozen NPl **arēj-k’*), with different semantic nuances: ‘warp’, ‘twigs that are used to make the basic woven framework of baskets, etc.’, ‘stamen’, ‘shuttle’, ‘spindle’ [HAB 1: 258a], ‘a cylindrical part of the loom made of a reed’ [Gabikean 1952: 81].

In my opinion, here also belongs Moks *härečk^v*, Gen. *härečk^{v-ə^f}*, GPl *häreč’-üč’* ‘окно, window’ (which see Orbeli 2002: 275; a textual illustration in 82^{L-14}, transl. 154: *kəṇə^fk härečkve irišic’*, *k’xə: ur yar č’ə^f* “жена посмотрела в окошко, видит: это не ее дружок”). At the first glance the semantic relation between ‘window’ and ‘warp’, ‘twigs that are used to make the basic woven framework of baskets etc.’

seems impossible. It should be borne in mind, however, that, according to ethnographical records from various regions (see Lisic‘yan 1969: 99; Marutjan 1989: 89a), the roof-windows called *erdik* have been covered by woven frameworks, gratings. That this is the case also in relation with Moks *härečk*⁹, GPI *häreč-üc*⁹, is directly corroborated by *häreč-üc čat* referring to the window-grating, glossed as ‘оконная решетка (рама), заклеиваемая на зиму бумагой’ in Orbeli 2002: 275. It is quite possible that Moks *härečk*⁹ originally referred to the window-grating, that is a woven framework that was used to cover the window.

The initial *h-* of the Moks form is voiced and has nothing to do with ClArm. *h-* which is regularly reflected by *x-* in Moks and other dialects of the Van-group. Together with Muš *h‘arēčk*⁹ and Alaškert *h‘arēčk* it probably reflects an older **y-arēj-k*⁹ (see 2.3.1. on *y-*).

●ETYM The word refers to the threads which gradually go down during the weaving process and is therefore treated as composed of the prefix *ar-* ‘at, to, near by, before, etc.’ and the verbal root *ēj-* ‘to go down’ (HAB 1: 257-258; Olsen 1999: 17).

***arič**, ***arinč** ‘village, settlement’, only in a number of place-names (see Hübschmann 1904: 286, 289-291, 379-380 et passim; HAB 1: 258b).

●ETYM No etymology (Hübschmann 1904: 379; HAB 1: 258-259; Jahukyan 1987: 336-337, 582).

I tentatively propose a composition of the prefix *ar-* ‘at, to, near by, before, etc.’ and *(*h*)*ič-* ‘site, settlement’, a derivative of PIE **sed-* ‘to sit’ (Skt. *sādana-* n. ‘seat, dwelling place’, etc., Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 692); for this etymon, see s.vv. *hecanim* ‘to mount a horse’, *nist* ‘site, seat’.

PArm. *(*h*)*ič-* may reflect a QIE **sēd-ijV-* (cf. Lat. *sēdēs* ‘seat, abode, residence’ in lengthened grade, Schindler 1975b: 267, Schrijver 1991: 376; or stative present **sēd-*, Mallory/Adams 1997: 522) or, perhaps better, **si-sd-je-*, an intensive of the type **dei-dik-je-* ‘to display’: Skt. *dediśyāte* vs. *dēdiś-ṭe* (on which Beekes 1995: 230); cf. also redupl. pres. **si-sd-* s.v. *nist* ‘seat, site’. Thus: *ar-* + **hi(s)č-* = *arič*. Typologically compare the place-name *Ar-nist*.

aṛn ‘wild ram’ attested in Eznik Koḻbac‘i 2.11, 5th cent. (API *z-arin-s*), Commentary on Aristotle by Elias (as synonymous to *šikeria* ‘wild ram’), Commentaries on Dionysius Thrax by Grigor Magistros and Yovhannēs Erzncac‘i (in an enumeration of male animals, beside *xoy* ‘ram’, see Adonc 1915=2008: 239-240, also with mention of *šikeria* ‘wild ram’), see NHB 1: 307c; HAB 1: 261a.

●ETYM Since Meillet (1916d; 1936: 46), connected with Gr. *ἄρσῆν, -ενος*, Att. *ἄρρην*, Ion., Lesb., Cret. *ἔρσην*, Lac. *ἄρσης* adj. ‘male’, Av. *aršan-* m. ‘man, male’, OPers. *aršan-* ‘male, hero, bull’, cf. Skt. *ṛṣabhá-* m. ‘bull’, probably also Gr. *ἀρνεῖός* m. ‘ram’ (see also HAB 1: 261; Jahukyan 1982: 111; 1987: 123; Greppin 1983: 299). Not to be confused (as it sometimes happens, see Hübschmann 1897: 417-418; HAB 1: 173b; Ę. Tumanjan 1978: 271-272, 305-306) with *ayr*, gen. *aṛn* ‘man’, which derive from PIE nom. **h₂nēr* and gen. **h₂nr-ós*, respectively (see s.v.). For Old Persian, see Kent 1953: 171b; Brandenstein/Mayrhofer 1964: 106. Possibly related are also OIc. *orri*, OHG *or(e)huon* ‘capercaille’ (Pokorny 1959: 336, hesitatingly; Mallory/Adams 1997: 363a; not included in Mallory/Adams 2006: 204) and Old Swedish *orne* ‘boar’ (see Euler 1979: 182⁸⁸¹ for references).

In view of the vocalic discrepancy in the Greek forms *ἔρσην* and *ἄρσην*, two different roots may be posited: **h₁rs-en-* (with Arm. *aṛn* and Indo-Iran. **H₁śan-*) and **h₂ursen-* (with Skt. *vṛśan-* ‘manly; male animal, bull, stallion, etc.’, Lat. *verrēs* ‘boar’, Lith. *veršis* ‘bull, ox, ox calf’, etc.), respectively. For a discussion, see Frisk s.v.; Chantraine 1968-80: 116a; Beekes 1969: 91; Benveniste 1969, 1: 21-25 = 1973: 19-22; È. Tumanjan 1978: 65, 271-272, 305-306; Euler 1979: 181-182; Peters 1980: 9; Schrijver 1991: 14; Mayrhofer EWAia 1, 1992: 260-261; 2, 1996: 575-576; Mayrhofer 2005: 15^{Nr8.2}, 33₂₂; Lindeman 1997: 56-57; Vine 2005: 262-267. Note that Arm. *aṛn* cannot be derived from **h₂ursen-* (I rather expect **gar(i)n* from it), unless one assumes that the **-u-* dropped in GDSg and plur. **aṛin-* from PArm. **ə(w)ars-én-V-* due to contraction in a pretonic syllable (cf. 2.1.33.1).

Whether a QIE **h₁rC-* would yield Arm. **erC-* or **arC-* is uncertain. Kortlandt (2001: 12 = 2003: 132) assumes a **h₂-* mentioning Gr. *ἀρνεῖός* ‘ram’. This leaves Gr. *ἔρσην* unexplained. If we must reconstruct **h₁-*, the initial *a-* in Arm. *aṛn* would favour the development **h₁rC-* > Arm. **erC-*. In view of the absence of secure examples, however, this must be regarded as uncertain. One might consider other possibilities, such as assimilation (oblique **h₁rs-ŋ-* > PArm. **aṛan-* in ISg *-b* and GDPI *-c*) or contamination with **h₂ursen-*.

With few exceptions (e.g. Lindeman and Kortlandt), the Armenian *aṛn* and its etymology by Meillet remained unnoticed by most of scholars outside Armenia. The appurtenance of *aṛn* to IE **Hrsen-* is beyond doubt. Georg. *arni* ‘wild sheep’ and Syr. *arnā* ‘mountain goat’ are considered Armenian loanwords [HAB 1: 261b; Greppin 1983: 299; Jahukyan 1987: 467, 555]. If Skt. *vṛśan-* and its cognates are indeed unrelated, we are here dealing with a word belonging to the Armenian-Greek-Aryan group: **h₁rs-en-* ‘male, male animal (bull, stallion, ram)’: Arm. *aṛn* ‘wild ram’, Indo-Iran. **H₁śan-* ‘male, male animal’, Gr. *ἔρσην* vs. *ἄρσην* ‘male’.

aṛnem, 1sg.aor *ar-ar-i*, 3sg.aor. *ar-ar*, imper. *ara* ‘to make; to create’ (Bible+).

●DIAL Widespread in the dialects, in the forms **aynel*, **enel*, **anel*, **arel*, etc. [HAB 1: 262b].

●ETYM From PIE **h₂er-* ‘to fix, put together’: Gr. *ἀραρίσκω*, aor. *ἤραρον* ‘to fit, equip’, Av. *arənauu-*, etc.; see Hübschmann 1897: 420; Meillet p.c. apud HAB; HAB 1: 262 with lit.; Klingenschmitt 1982: 162-163; Clackson 1994: 101-102. See also s.v. *ard* ‘shape, order’. For the paradigm and a further morphological and etymological discussion, see Łaragyulyan 1961: 151-153; Godel 1965: 34-36; È. Tumanjan 1971: 378-381; Hamp 1975: 102; Viredaz 2005-07: 3-4.

aṛnum, 1sg.aor. *aṛ-i*, 3sg.aor. *aṛ*, 3pl.aor. *aṛ-in*, imper. *aṛ* (rich evidence in the Bible, see Astuacaturean 1895: 180-186) ‘to gain, obtain, win, plunder, take, grasp, etc.’ (Bible+); **aṛ**, *i*-stem: ISg *aṛ-i-w*, GDPI *aṛ-i-c* ‘gain, robbery, capture’ (Bible+).

A textual illustration from Genesis 32.22/23 (Zeyt‘unyan 1985: 299): *Εω yaruc eal i nmin gišeri aṛ zerkus kanaysn : ἀναστάς δὲ τὴν νύκτα ἐκείνην ἔλαβεν τὰς δύο γυναικας.*

●DIAL Widespread in the dialects [HAB 1: 248b].

●ETYM Derived from PIE **h₂r-nu-*: Gr. *ἄρνυμαι*, aor. *ἀρόμεν* ‘to win, gain’, probably also Av. *arənauu-* ‘to grant, allot, provide’ (for which see de Vaan 2003: 371); the appurtenance of other forms is uncertain; for the Armenian paradigm and an

etymological discussion, see Hübschmann 1897: 420; HAB 1: 248; Meillet 1936: 105, 112, 114, 121-122, 127; Pokorny 1959: 61; Chantraine 1968-80: 112b; Godel 1975: 52, 125; K. Schmidt 1980a: 3; Schmitt 1981: 50, 53, 68, 137, 147; Ĵahukyan 1982: 70, 127, 184; Klingenschmitt 1982: 247-248; Greppin 1983: 300; Rix 1992: 210; 1999: 88-89, 538, 650; Clackson 1994: 182, 237_{6,4}; Matzinger 2000: 287₂₆; Beekes 2003: 166; cf. 1969: 35.

Arm. aor. *ar-* seems to point to sigmatic aorist (Kortlandt 1996: 41 = 2003: 115).

arogem (Paterica+), **aroganiem** (Agat'angelos /5th cent./, Yovhannēs Drasxanakertc'i /9-10th cent./, etc.), **orogem**, **oroganiem** (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 variant readings.

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

For *aroganiem* Greppin (1983: 301) also cites the meaning 'to pronounce carefully', and among derivatives mentions *aroganut'awn* '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. *ῥέω* 'to flow, stream', Gr. *ῥόος* (Cypr. *ῥόφος*) 'stream', etc. [Bugge (1892: 451-452; HAB 1: 263, 264)]. According to Witczak (1999: 184), *a/oroganiem* "seems to be a denominative formation", which is improbable and unnecessary. For a morphological discussion, see Klingenschmitt 1982: 204. See also s.v. *arū* 'brook, channel, ditch'.

The initial *a-* is prothetic, although this (together with *arū*) is the only unambiguous case of a prothetic vowel before the trilled *r*, *arēwc* 'lion', probably being of onomatopoeic origin. The absence of a prothetic vowel in *rungn* 'nose, nostrils' suggests a loan or a substratum 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 much better attested than *arog-*, so one might think that it is due to the influence of *arū*. On the other hand, a prothetic vowel *a-* with a labial vowel in the root is corroborated 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).

arotj (*o*-stem, *i*-stem, *a*-stem, all late) 'sound, healthy, unhurt' (Bible+).

●DIAL Widespread in the dialects [HAB 1: 263b].

●ETYM Composed of the prefix *ar-* 'at, to, near by, before, etc.' and *otj* 'whole, integral, complete, solid; sound, healthy, unhurt' (q.v.), see HAB 1: 263b; 3: 558.

***ar-orm-i** (dial.) 'a log or wooden structure that supports the wall or the ceiling of a house'.

●DIAL Ačāryan (1913: 136a; HAB 3: 583b) records dial. *aṛ-orm-i* as equivalent to Turk. *k'iriš*, not specifying the dialectal location. For the semantic description, see Malxaseanc' HBB 1: 232c; Marutjan 1989: 72-74. The word is found in a number of dialects with semantic nuances with respect to the exact place of the log in the wooden framework of the house. The forms are:

Zangezur (Goris and surroundings) *həṛəhərmi*, subdial. *raḥərmi*, *raḥərmi* 'a wooden structure at the wall' (Lisic'yan 1969: 100-101 with a thorough description), Meṛi *əṛəhurme* [Ałayan 1954: 297], Muš (Bulanəx) **aṛormi* [S. Movsisyan 1972: 13], Sasun *aṛormi* [Petoyan 1954: 104; 1965: 444] or *arorma* [HayLezBrbBaṛ 1, 2001: 134a] 'an angular log that supports the wooden framework of the ceiling'.

The Goris and Meṛi forms seem to point to **aṛa-orm-i* > **aṛa-h-ormi*, with the glide *-h-* (on which see the discussion on the place-name *K'arahunj* in 4.8). The by-form *aṛa-* of the prefix may be corroborated by *aṛaspel* 'myth, fable' and *aṛastal* 'ceiling' (see s.vv.). In these words, however, the *-a-* can be explained as an anaptyctic vowel before *-sC-*. It is possible that **aṛormi* has been replaced by **aṛ-horm-i* in Meṛi, etc. through restoration of the initial *h-* of the word for 'wall' in Meṛi (*hurm* 'wall'), and the cluster *-rh-* was simplified through insertion of an anaptyxis. Nevertheless, there seem to exist also words with *aṛa-* where the second *-a-* can hardly be of anaptyctic origin, but the etymology of these words (see s.v. *aṛatik* 'cord') is uncertain.

Describing his paternal hut, Xač'atur Abovyan (see G. D. Asatryan 1990: 50) describes how the hail, rain, etc. penetrate *i taneac' i yotormoc' i čelk'ac' lusamtic'* "from the roof, from the **otorm-k'*, and from the holes of the windows". I was not able to find this **otorm-* or **(y)otorm-* in dictionaries. Apparently we are dealing with the oblique stem **aṛorm(w)o-* of our word. For dissimilation *r...r* > *l...r*, see 2.1.24.2.

●ETYM A derivative of *orm* 'wall', q.v. (see Ačārean 1913: 136a; HAB 3: 583b), composed as **aṛ-* 'at, to, near by, before, etc.' + *orm* 'wall' + *-i*. For the prefix *aṛ-* (q.v.) in words that refer to the wooden structure of the home cf. *aṛastal* 'ceiling' (cf. Gr. *στήλη* 'gravestone, post, pillar'), **aṛ-zel* 'a bed for workers made at the ceiling' (cf. *jetun* 'ceiling').

The word *aṛ-orm-i* seems to be quite old since it is found in the dialects that differ from each other both geographically and linguistically, and the suffix *aṛ* was more productive at earlier stages of the development of the Armenian language. Moreover, the root *orm* 'wall' itself has not been preserved in most of these dialects.

aṛu, *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 aṛun 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 *aṛun*, although otherwise unattested 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 *aṛu(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 Naxiĵewan, Aslanbek, Hamšen, Zeyt'un, Muš, Van, Agulis, Łarabał, Ĵuła, etc. In all the dialects the meaning is 'brook', and only in Nor Naxiĵewan 'the path of rain or flood water' [HAB 1: 265a].

Xarberd has *arun*, with an additional *-n* (ibid.). This form is also found in K'esab *arĕn*, see Č'olak'ean 1986: 20, 34, 47 (with many other examples), 197a. Note that some of the examples for the epithetic *-n* in K'esab go parallel with those in Xarberd and others (see HAB s.vv.).

Some dialectal forms point to a prefixed formation, namely **y-arū* : Muš, Alaškert *h'arū*, Van *arū*, Ozim *hāru* [HAB 1: 265a; Ačaryan 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. *srav-* 'to stream, flow', OHG *strom* '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. *sraujà*, Latv. *strauja* 'stream', Russ. *strujá* 'stream', etc.), or **sru-ti-* (cf. Skt. *srutí-*, Gr. *ῥύσις*, etc.), or **sru-to-* (cf. Gr. *ῥυτός* 'flowing'), or **srouros-* n. (cf. Skt. *srótas-* n. 'stream, current' /RV+/, OPers. *rautah-* n., Pahl., NPers. *rōd* 'stream'). Witzak (1999: 184) derives *arū* from **srówos* m., which is formally improbable. For the prothetic vowel, see s.v. *arog(-)* and 2.1.17.4. According to Ačaryan (HAB 1: 265a), Georg. *ru*, *ruvi* 'brook, channel' was borrowed from Armenian before the addition of the prothetic vowel.

The dialectal prefixed **y-arū* (with *y-* from **h₁en-* 'in') can be understood as 'in-flux, in-flow', cf. Lat. *in-flūxio* 'influx, tributary', etc.

As we saw above, Ĵhanyan (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. Av. *rauuan-*, etc.). It is tempting to identify this form with Xarberd *arun* and K'esab *arĕn*. However, one cannot be sure that the final *-n* of **Arū-n* is not the article *-n*. Furthermore, it may, together with the Xarberd and K'esab forms, merely reflect an additional *-n*, on which see 2.2.1.3.

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

asetn GSg *astan* (Bible), ISg *astam-b* (Ephrem), API *astun-s* ("Čarəntir") 'needle' (Bible+). Derivatives based on *astan-*, *asetn-*, *astn-*, etc. Also without *-n* : *ast-a-ktuc* 'a kind of sea bird', literally: '(having a) needle-beak', in Anania Širakac'i, 7th cent. (see A. G. Abrahamyan 1944: 308^{L26}; Abrahamyan / Petrosyan 1979: 362₉); MidArm. *asex*, *aset* [MijHayBař 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 *aysātnə* (next to *aysāt*) [Ačarean 1935: 35, 337], Łarabał *ásetnə* (next to *áset*) [Davt'yan 1966: 317]. Next to *ásut* (see below), Mełri has a trace of *-n* in the derivative *əsətnávur* < *asetnawor* (see Ałayan 1954: 263a). Other compounds, namely *əst-á-ben* and *əst-áman* (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 *ásət* or *ásit* / *ásət*, GSg *ástə^ε* (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 *calet* ‘to fold’ > Agulis *cáylił*, etc. However, the vowel *-ā-* 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)*, which would yield Agulis *áysät(nə)*, as can be seen from e.g. *cicat* ‘laugher’ > Agulis *cáycāt* (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 *ulet* ‘brain’ > *əhut* (next to *ətef*). One must 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, since the other words containing *-et(n)* yielded *-et* (see Ačāryan 1940: 61). A similar case is found in Meñri, Karčewan, and Kak’avaberđ, where we have *ásut* [Ałayan 1954: 263a; H. Muradyan 1960: 190a; 1967: 166b]. Next to *áse/it* ‘needle’ (see above), Moks has *asut*, GSg *ásutə^ε* in different semantics, namely ‘two small planks that tie the handle of a plough with the pole’ (see Orbeli 2002: 206).¹⁹ This word is identical with the word for ‘needle’, as can be 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 HayLezBrbBar 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; Bđoyan 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*”’ and asks: “that is *aset*?””. Ĵahukyan (1972: 281) is more positive and presents 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*, *-ēf* f. ‘edge, point’, *acus* ‘needle’, etc. [HAB 1: 268]. For **-l-*, cf. OCS *osla* ‘whetstone’, Sln. *ósła* ‘whetstone’, OEng. *egle* ‘awn’, Germ. *Achel* ‘tip of an ear’. The explanation, according to which the Armenian form comes from an older **asitan* (> NSg *asetn*, GSg *astan*), which is allegedly corroborated by Slavic **os-i-la-* (see Ĵahukyan 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 Ačāryan (HAB 1: 268) are right in reconstructing **ak-l-* (= **h₂ek-l-*).

Since Arm. *asetn* appears in Agulis and Łarabał with and without *-n* (see above, also Weitenberg 1985: 104), whereas neighbouring dialects such as Ĵuła, Meñri, etc. (as well as Moks) have *asut*, 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 a HD *l*-stem (for the type, see Beekes 1995: 177): NSg **h₂ék-ōl* > > **h₂kōl*, with zero grade in the root analogically after the oblique stem > Nor Ĵuła, Meñri group,

¹⁹ According to Amatuni (1912: 60b), Moks (the village of Knekanc‘) has *asot*: *arōri mač*.

and Moks dial. *asut* (see also s.v. *acut* ‘coal’), AccSg **h₂k-él-m* > *asetn*, GSg **h₂k-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 the nominative **-s* (**katc*’), whereas all the remaining dialects and Classical Armenian have the form derived from the PIE accusative, namely *kat’n* (q.v.). Remarkably, *asetn* and **asut* are both represented in Moks, but with semantic differentiation: *āse/it* ‘needle’ : *asut* ‘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. **asut*) or *asitn* (in HAB 1: 268a, as a variant spelling of *asetn*). For **asitn*, see also above, on Agulis.

asem, 1sg.aor. *asac* ‘-i, 3sg.aor. *asac*’, imper. *asa*, etc. ‘to say, tell, speak’ (Bible+).

One of the principal verbs for speaking. Also refers to the singing of birds, cf. *i žam hawun aseloy* ‘in the time of speaking of the birds or the rooster’ (Łazar P‘arpec‘i), cf. *haw-a-xōs* [Ałayan 1986: 83, 85], dial. *hav-xus-oc*‘ (see Srvanjtyanc‘ 1, 1978: 145), *xoroz-xos* [Lalayan 1, 1983: 249, cf. 243], etc. See also the dialectal section.

●DIAL Ubiquitous in the dialects [HAB 1: 266-267].

The meaning ‘to sing’ is attested in the earlier versions (1890 and 1896) of the poem entitled *Lo‘rec‘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 glosses *asel* as *ergel* ‘to sing’ (ibid. 180).

The derivative *an-as-un* ‘animal’, lit. ‘not-speaking’, is widespread in the dialects. In some of them it refers to ‘bird’ (Suč‘ava), ‘not-speaking, speechless’ (Axalc‘xa, Alaškert, Van, etc.), ‘child’ (Karin)²⁰, ‘uninhabited place, desert’ (Van); see HAB 1: 266-267. Particularly interesting is the meaning ‘uninhabited place, desert’, which presupposes a semantic development based on the contrast ‘human world’ vs. ‘non-human, wild world’.

The dialectal form *asmunk*‘ ‘phrase, word, speech’ (see Ačārean 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 (*e/āsmānk*‘, see Andreasyan 1967: 219, cf. 354b).

The Hamšen 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 (1947:134-135), the *-t-* is an epenthesis of phonetic nature. It is not clear, however, why it only functions in the aorist. Therefore a phonetic explanation does not seem satisfactory. The paradigm is synchronically 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* (Hamšen Class 1); 3) the 3Sg *-av* is not at home in this paradigm.

It should be borne in mind that *asem* is irregular already in Classical Armenian, thus 3sg.aor. is not **asec‘i* but *asac‘i*. This implies that the verb could have been incorporated into Class 3A, the type *xatam* ‘to move, play’: *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*‘,

²⁰ Compare Fr. *enfant* ‘child’ from Lat. *infans* ‘speechless, inarticulate’.

**asc* 'ik', **asc* 'in. For an attestation of e.g. 3pl.aor. *asc* 'in in MidArm, see Yovhannēs T'lkuranc'i, 14-15th cent. [Mnac'akanyan 1941: 180a; Pivazyan 1960: 165^{L19f}].

Assuming a phonological development *-sc-* > *-st-* (desaffrication), we arrive at the actual paradigm, viz. *as-t-i*, etc. The only exception is 3Sg *as-t-av* instead of **asac*'. An explanation for this form could be that the paradigm *asti*, *astir*, **asac*' was odd, thus **asac*' has been replaced by *astav* after the second subtype of Class 3. The imperative forms *asä* and *as-t-ek*', as well as the past participle *as-t-aj* can similarly derive from **as-a*, **as-(a)c'ēk*' and **as-(a)c'-ac*, respectively; cf. MidArm. *asc* 'ac in e.g. Law Code (1265 AD) of Smbat Sparapet [Galstyan 1958: 137a]. Compare *xat-a*, *xat-(a)c'ek*' and *xat-(a)c'aj*'.²¹

For the development *-sc-* > *-st-* (desaffrication) compare *šč* > *št* found in *šičuk* 'whew' > Muš, Alaškert *šdug*. The distribution in Muš is remarkable: *šijug* and *šdug*. Thus, the *-d-* is found only in the syncopated form, where it immediately follows the sibilant *š-*.

●ETYM Usually compared with Gr. *ἦ* (athematic imperfect) < **h₁e-h₁eǵ-t* 'he said', Lat. *aiō* 'I say', etc. Probably from earlier perfect formations, with **-ǵt-* > *-st-* and generalisation of *-s-*; note also Arm. remarkable aorist with internal *-a-*, *asac* 'i. For a discussion of phonological and morphological problems I refer to Meillet 1892: 164; Brugmann 1904: 506; HAB 1: 266; Klingenschmitt 1982: 135, 137-138; de Lamberterie 1980: 223; 1982: 26f and passim; Ĵahukyan 1982: 55, 190; Greppin 1983: 302-303; Schrijver 1991: 26-28; Ravnæs 1991: 17, 64; Clackson 1994: 81; de Vaan 2008: 31-32 (cf. also Hübschmann 1877: 25). See also s.v. *arac* 'proverb', with the expected reflex of **aǵ-* > Arm. *ac-*. For alternative etymological suggestions, see Witczak 2003: 85-86.

The assumption that Arm. *an-as-un* 'animal' < 'qui ne parle pas' is a calque after Greek *ἄ-λογον* 'sans raison' (Benveniste 1964: 37; see also Schmitt 1972-74: 23 for a Georgian parallel with refer.) is highly improbable in view of the fact that *anasun* is widespread in the dialects.

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, Ačaryan (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 *ačiwñ*. 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.

Although not very clear, the etymology is, nevertheless, worthy of consideration. For the semantics, cf. *kayc* 'spark' vs. 'ruby', Gr. *ἄνθραξ* 'charcoal' vs. 'ruby,

²¹ Note the etymological problem of *-s-* in *asem* from PIE **-ǵ-* instead of the expected *-c-*. Thus one might alternatively suggest a development 3sg.aor **Hǵ-t* > PArm. **ast*. This is attractive but very risky.

carbuncle, etc.’. The absence of an initial *h-* is perhaps due to the zero-grade form and the possible influence of *ačiwñ* ‘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 QIE **-g-* which is probably attested in Olc. *aska* ‘ash’, Gr. *ἄσβολος, ἄσβόλη* ‘soot’ (if from **ἄσ(γ)βολ-*); perhaps also in *ačiwñ* < **aščiwñ* ‘ash’. See also s.v. *asči* ‘food’.

The hypothetical preform of *askñ* would then be **h₂Hs-g-m*. For **-g-* cf. the Germanic forms: Goth. *azgo*, OHG. *asca* ‘ashes’. For *-n*, see 2.2.1.3.

astem ‘to look for a bride, ask in marriage’ and **ast-ōt** ‘suitor, fiancé, bridegroom’, both only in Timot‘ēos Kuz (Timothy Aelurus, 5th or 6th cent.) and in *Knik‘hawatoy* (Seal of Faith, 7th cent.); the dictionary entitled *Arjeñ bararan* (1865, Venice) has **hastim** ‘to be engaged, be betrothed (said of a girl)’; see Ačarean 1908-09a, 1: 368aNr7; HAB 1: 277b.

For attestations and a thorough philological discussion, see de Lamberterie 1992a: 92-99.

●ETYM No etymological attempt is recorded in HAB 1: 277b. A connection with *hastem* ‘to affirm, assert, make hard, create’ (q.v.) has been suggested in Ačarean 1908-09a, 1: 368a^{Nr7}. For the semantics cf. Gr. *πενθερός* ‘father-in-law, son-in-law’, etc. from PIE **b^hnd^h-* ‘to bind, fasten’.

Lap‘anc‘yan (1961: 105; see also Greppin 1991b: 724b) treats Arm. *astem* as a loan from Hurr. *ašti* ‘woman; wife’. For the typology of the development **ast-* ‘wife’ > the verb *astem* he compares Russ. *žena* ‘wife’ > *ženit’sja* ‘to marry’. Ĵahukyan (1987: 426, 466) accepts the etymology and notes the Semitic origin of the Hurrian word, cf. Akkad. *aššatu(m)* ‘wife’, *aššutum* ‘marriage’ and others, which contain a nasal in the root. On the other hand, the Hurrian word has been connected with Chechen *stē* ‘wife, female’, etc., and the initial *a-* is taken as prothetic (Diakonoff/Starostin 1986: 39; cf. Cheung 2002: 234; Greppin 1991b: 724b).

For an extensive philological and etymological discussion I refer to Greppin 1990-91; Mahé 1990-91; de Lamberterie 1992a (with a thorough treatment in relation with *hastem* ‘to affirm, fasten, etc.’).

Alternatively one may think of PIE **peh₂ǵ/k-* ‘to make fast, fasten’, cf. Gr. *πήγνυμι* to fix; to stick, join; to congeal, coagulate’, etc. (see Lubotsky 1981: 133; 1992: 266; Schrijver 1991: 97; Mallory/Adams 1997: 64b). Especially interesting are the Latin cognates: *paciscō* ‘to arrange or secure by negotiation; to betroth (to)’, *paciscor* ‘to negotiate, arrange; to make a settlement or come to terms; to engage oneself in marriage to’, *pactiō* ‘agreement, compact; marriage settlement’ (OxfLatDict), *pacta* ‘fiancée, bride’ (Dvoreckij 1986: 546c). A QIE **ph₂k-ti(h₂)-* or **ph₂k-teh₂-* ‘betrothal, engagement’, ‘betrothed (girl)’, ‘fiancée, bride’ would yield PArm. **(h)ast-i-* or **(h)ast-a-*. On the institution of the marriage compact among Armenians, see Xařatyan 1989: 15-16. The verb *hastem* ‘to affirm, assert, make hard, create’ (q.v.) may be (folk-)etymologically related with **(h)ast-* ‘to be betrothed; fiancée, bride’.

The connection of Arm. *astem* ‘to look for a bride, ask in marriage’ and *hastim* ‘to be engaged, be betrothed (said of a girl)’ with *hastem* ‘to affirm, assert, make hard, create’ and/or the derivation from QIE **ph₂k-ti(h₂)-* or **ph₂k-teh₂-* (> PArm. **ast-* ‘fiancée, bride’) is possible. If this is accepted, the connection with Hurr. *ašti*

‘woman; wife’ should be abandoned. It is tempting to derive the Hurrian form from PArm. **ast-* ‘bride’ (cf. especially the Latin forms above), but the Semitic forms make this improbable.

astl, *t*-stem: ISg *astel-b*, NPl *astel-k*’, GDPl *astel-c*’ (George of Pisidia), IPl *astel-b-k*’, etc.; *a*-stem: GDPl *astel-a-c*’, IPl *astel-a-w-k*’ ‘star’ (Bible+). *Asttik*, GSg *Asttkan* (in “Patmut’iwn srboč’ Hrip’simeanc’” : *Asttkay*) ‘the planet Venus; the goddess of love’.

●DIAL Ubiquitous in the dialects.

Some dialects display a final *-ə* : Axalc’xa, Ararat, Polis [HAB 1: 279a]; for Polis this is not corroborated in Ačaryan 1941: 74, 90, 204: *asx*. The *-ə* probably betrays an old *-n*, cf. especially Ararat *astlə* : pl. *astlner*. The same holds for GSg *astl-an* in Van [Ačaryan 1952: 124], although this is not corroborated by data from Moks: NSg *astəl*, GSg *astl-ə*’, NPl *astl-ir* (see Orbeli 2002: 206; a textual illustration for NPl: 74^{L6}). Šatax has GSg *astl-i* [M. Muradyan 1962: 94], although NPl is *astəl-ner* (op. cit. 87). A direct reflex of *-n* in the nominative is seen in Goris: *astəlnə* alongside with *astəl* [Margaryan 1975: 315a]. Clear traces of *-n* at least in Goris, Lori and Van allow to postulate **astl-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 *astlan catik* ‘a kind of flower’; Arabkir *astntik*’ ‘étoile filante = falling star’; Van, etc. pl. *astlunk*’ (see Ačarean 1913: 140b). Arabkir *astntik*’ is cited by Ačaryan as *astl-ntik*’. The component *-ntik*’ is unclear, however. I prefer to interpret the word as a petrified plural *astln-ti-k*’ (cf. below on Hamšen).

In some dialects, the dental was lost: Polis *asx* [Ačaryan 1941: 74, 90, 204], Zeyt’un *əsł*, Hačən *əsx* [Ačaryan 2003: 137, 299], Malat’ia *asəx* [Danielyan 1967: 187a], Salmast *ast*’ [HAB 1: 279a], Marała *ask* [Ačarean 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 *astlec*’, although NPl *astel-k*’ has been petrified into NSg *astexk*’ [Ačaryan 1947: 93, 221]; cf. above on Arabkir.

Xarberd and Dersim have a variant with diminutive *-ik* [HAB 1: 279a; Bałramyan 1960: 73b]. Compare the name of the goddess *Asttik*, as well as the female personal name *Asttik*, e.g. Polis *Asxig* [Ačaryan 1941: 74, 90, 204]. For diminutive forms in Svedia, etc., see the following.

For Svedia, next to *usdl*, Ačaryan (2003: 431, cf. 560) records a curious form, *arəsdtag*, which, as he points out, is unclear (“*ori inč’ linelə haytni č’ē*”). For *astl* in this dialect, Andreasyan (1967: 354b) has *usdl*, but also *arəstlig* from *astl-ik*, with the same “epenthetic” *-r-*. Note also K’esab *arəstəlek* [Č’olak’ean (1986: 227)], K’abusie *arəstək*, pl. *aras(ə)lənnir* or *-nnəyr* [Łaribyan 1958: 121a]. In Aramo, Łaribyan (1958: 59a) records sg. *astla* and pl. *arstləir*. The same author has also sg. *ustl*, pl. *astləeyr* (op. cit. 27).

We see that the *-r/r* appears in suffixed formations and in the plural, but not in the “pure” NSg form corresponding to *astl*. 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 *arəstat* ‘ceiling’, taken metaphorically as ‘starry sky’; see 3.7.1. Remarkably, Č’olak’ean (1986: 227) derives K’esab *arəstəlek*

‘star’ from **arastat-ik*, although 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 on the territory of Syria (Svedia, K‘esab, K‘abusie, Aramo), and Arm. *arastat* has been directly recorded only in and around the same area, namely Syria and Cilicia. Thus, the co-existence of forms like e.g. K‘esab *arastat-ek* ‘star’ vs. *arastuot* ‘ceiling’, or of such plurals like e.g. Aramo *arstł-air* ‘stars’ vs. *arstł-na* ‘ceilings’ is hardly due to chance.

On Šatax *asthunk* ‘y ‘uvula, windpipe’, see s.v. *arastat* ‘ceiling; palate’.

Also the final *-a* of Aramo NSg *astla* is interesting (unless it is a misprint). It cannot go back to old **-a-* since **astl-ay* would yield Aramo **astləu* or **asthuə*, cf. *baklay* ‘bean’ > *pagluə*, *tlay* ‘child’ > *dtəu*, *p‘esay* ‘son-in-law’ > *p‘isəu* (see Łaribyan 1958: 59b, 72b, 73a). Instead, it can reflect **astl-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. *ἀστήρ*, *-έρος*, Skt. NPI *tārah* (the absence of the *s-* is unexplained), instr. *stj-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 *t-* stems and the paradigm of Arm. *astł*, see Meillet 1936: 81; Godel 1975: 96; Ĵahukyan 1982: 92, 137; Olsen 1999: 159-161.

The *r-l* fluctuation (cf. Lat. *stēlla* and Arm. *astł*, pl. **astet-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 the addition of **n-* as in Goth. *stairno* and Bret. *sterenn*. This view is accepted by Watkins (1974a: 10-11, 13). One might compare **louk-s-neh₂-* ‘moon’, see s.vv. *lusn* and *lusin*. Ĵahukyan (1982: 104-105; cf. also Olsen 1984: 104; 1985: 6-7) is inclined to an old athematic *l-* stem (**astēl-*, GSg **astel-os*, NPI **astel-es*, cf. Gr. *ἀστήρ*, *ἀστέρος*, *ἀστέρες*, respectively), although he does not exclude the alternative of **astēl-nā-*, noting (221₃₃) the development **-ln-* > Arm. *-t-* seen in **pelnumi* > *hetum* ‘to pour’. Later, he (1987: 152, 195) seems to prefer, although with hesitation, **aster-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; Ĵahukyan 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-* > *-t-*, 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; Ałabekyan 1979: 98. Since the PIE word clearly had an original **-r-*, I prefer the

former alternative, namely **h₂ster-l-*. This solution is also advocated by others: Mayrhofer 1952: 316; Bomhard 1986: 191 (Lat. < **ster-elā*). For a discussion, see also Scherer 1953: 25-27. Note Celt. **stīrlo-* ‘iris of the eye; eye’ (OIr. *sell*, etc.) from QIE **h₂ster-lo-*; cf. PCelt. **ster-* ‘star’ (Schrijver 1995: 421-422, cf. 423^{Nr11}).

For Armenian, we may reconstruct **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, although she assumes a substitution of original **r* with **l* rather than **-rl-*. However, she (op. cit. 159) prefers deriving the Latin word from **h₂ster-leh₂-*. This would separate the Armenian and Latin forms 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. *əngl-ay-k*‘ (q.v.), possibly from IE **H(V)ng^hur-leh₂-*.

Arm. dial. **astet-n* (see above) may represent the 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. *lštar*, etc. [Illič-Svityč 1964: 6-7; Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 685-686, 875, 876, 967; Takács 1997: 373-374]. On the other hand, it was also derived from PIE. **ās-* (= **h₂eHs-*) ‘to burn’, with the suffix of nomina agentis **-ter/l-*; thus: ‘the burning/glowing object’. This view has more adherents; for a 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/l* (see also Tumanjan 1978: 289₁₄₂) would make the restoration of **h₂stel-* stronger.

asr (no evidence for oblique cases in the Biblical attestations, see Astuacaturean 1895: 201b), *r/u*-declension: GDSg *as-u* (Grigor Astuacaban, Anania T’argmanič‘, Xosrovik T’argmanič‘), AblSg *y-asu-ē* (Basil of Caesarea); *o*-stem: AblSg *y-asr-o-y* (Hexaameron, Nersēs Lambronac‘i), ISg *asr-o-v* (Grigor Narekac‘i); *r*-stem: ISg *aser-b* (Nersēs Šnorhali); *u*-stem: GDSg *asr-u* (Basil of Caesarea) ‘wool, fleece’ (Bible+).

The basic **asu-* is also seen in *as-u-i* and *asu-o-y* (Bible+)²², as well as in the derivatives *asu-eay* ‘woollen, of wool’ (Leviticus 13.52, 59) and *asu-et* ‘shaggy, woolly’ (said of a ram in Eznik Kołbac‘i, A. A. Abrahamyan 1994: 126^{L17}).

A number of derivatives with **asr(-a)-** [NHB 1: 334a].

●ETYM Since Bugge 1889: 11, connected to Gr. *πόκος* m. ‘plucked, shorn off sheep’s wool, fleece’ and *πέκος* n. ‘fleece’ vs. *πέκω* ‘to comb, card, shear’, Lith. *pešù* ‘to pluck, pull out’, MPers., NPers. *pašm* ‘wool’, Oss. *fæsm/fans* ‘wool’, *fasyn/fasun* ‘to comb’, cf. Skt. *pākṣman-* n. ‘eyelash’, YAv. *pašna-* n. ‘eyelash’, etc. (for these and more Indo-Iranian forms, see Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 62-63; Cheung 2002: 187); further Skt. *pāšu-*, *pašú-* n., *pašú-* m. ‘cattle’ (cf. Lubotsky 1988: 45 on these

²² These are interpreted as ‘double genitive’ or adjective ‘of wool, woollen’ in NHB 1: 333c. The form **as-u* with gen. *as-u-i* is rather comparable to *met-u*, gen. *metu-i* ‘bee’ vs. *metr*, gen. *met-u*, also *met-u-i* ‘honey’ (q.v.); cf. also È. Tumanjan 1978: 299, 301; Olsen 1999: 106, 435.

alternants), Av. *pasu-* m. ‘cattle’, Oss. *fys/fus* ‘sheep’ (Cheung 2002: 191), Lat. *pecus*, *-oris* n. ‘cattle; herd, flock’, *pecus*, *-udis* f. ‘farm animal, sheep’, *pecūnia* f. ‘property, wealth’, Goth. *faihu* n. ‘property, money’, OHG *fihu* n. ‘cattle’, Lith. *pėkus* ‘cattle, small livestock’, etc. Hübschmann 1897: 421-422; Pedersen 1905: 230; 1906: 370 = 1982: 92, 148; HAB 1: 282-283; Pokorny 1959: 797; Ernout/Meillet 1959: 491; È. Tumanjan 1978: 299-300; Alabekyan 1979: 95-96; on the PIE etymon (without Armenian), see also Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 108-110; Mallory/Adams 1997: 570a.

The problem with this etymology is that the best semantic match to Arm. *asr*, viz. Gr. *πόκος* m., *πέκος* n. ‘fleece’ (cf. Meillet 1936: 142, assuming a special Armeno-Greek correspondence), morphologically disagrees with the Armenian word. The latter belongs to the Armenian **r/u-*declension, which originates from PIE neuter **u-*stems (for a discussion of this class, see Bugge 1889: 11; Pedersen 1905: 230-231 = 1982: 92-93; Meillet 1913: 50-51; 1936: 76, 82; Ĵahukyan 1959: 181, 184-186, 260-261; 1982: 120-121; È. Tumanjan 1971: 228-230; 1978: 293-302; Godel 1975: 33, 95; 1978: 298-302; Schmitt 1981: 98; Hamp 1983: 9-10; 2001: 9-10; Mawet 1993; Clackson 1994: 126-127, 160-161; Olsen 1999: 163-169; Beekes 2003: 156; Matzinger 2005: 59-64), cf. nom. *cunr* vs. *cung-k* ‘knee’ from PIE **ĝonu-* n. ‘knee’ (q.v.); further see s.vv. *artawsr* ‘tear’, *barjr* ‘high’, *catr* ‘laughter’, *metr* ‘honey’, *tarr* ‘substance’.

Thus, Arm. *asr*, gen. *as-u* morphologically corresponds to the *u-*stem neuter forms Skt. *pásu-*, *paśú-*, OHG *fihu*, etc. ‘cattle’. However, the relation of this group with Arm. *asr* ‘fleece’, Gr. *πόκος* m., *πέκος* n. ‘fleece’ and the verb **peḱ-* ‘to comb, card’ is disputed (see Benveniste 1969, 1: 47-61 = 1973: 40-51). It is possible that the Armenian term is a blend of **pe/oḱ-* ‘to comb, shear; fleece’ and **peku-* n. ‘cattle’ (see Solta 1960: 125; È. Tumanjan 1978: 299-300; Ĵahukyan 1982: 120), just like *metr* ‘honey’ (q.v.). Or else, we are dealing with a metonymic development ‘fleece’ > ‘sheep’, and Arm. *asr* < **p(e/o)ḱu-* ‘fleece’ is to be regarded as archaism. For an extensive discussion of these and related issues I refer to Clackson 1994: 159-162.

The Armenian vocalism has been explained from either **-o-* or zero grade (for a discussion, see Considine 1978-79: 357; van Windekens 1980: 41-42; Greppin 1983: 305; Peters 1986: 378₅₃; Ravnæs 1991: 11-13; Olsen 1999: 202; Matzinger 2005: 60₂₅₉; see also the references above and those s.v. *alik* ‘waves’). One may depart from a QIE PD neuter **póku-*, gen. **pəḱ-óu-s* > PArm. **ósu-r*, gen. **(h)as-ú*. The nominative would then analogically become **asu-r* > *asr*. A similar scenario may be suggested also for *barjr* ‘high’, *catr* ‘laughter’, *tarr* ‘substance’ (see s.vv.)²³.

Recently, a connection with Toch. B *yok* n. ‘hair; wool’ and Skt. *yásu-* n. ‘pubic hair’ has been proposed, with a reconstruction like **joku-* or **jeh₂ku-* n. ‘body hair’ (Stalmaszczyk/Witczak 1990: 372; Witczak 1991: 686; 1999: 184; Mallory/Adams 1997: 252a; Adams 1999: 508-509). This etymology is morphologically attractive, and the loss of the initial **j-* is probably correct (see 2.1.6). However, the meaning of the Vedic word ‘pubic hair’ is conjectural. One rather assumes something like

²³ Less probably, the *-a-* may have been taken from an alternative *o-*stem form of *asr*, cf. gen. *asr-o-y*.

‘Same, Samenerguß’ (Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 412). On the whole, this etymology is possible, but far from evident. Besides, there are no compelling reasons to abandon the traditional etymology, although not everything is perfectly clear.

The assumption of a Hittite origin of *asr* (see Lap‘anc‘yan 1961: 166; van Windekens 1980: 42; cf. Schultheiss 1961: 234) is untenable.

atamn, *an*-stem: GDSg *ataman*, NPI *atamun-k‘*, API *atamun-s*, GDPI *ataman-c‘*, IPI *atamam-b-k‘* (rich evidence in the Bible, see Astuacaturean 1895: 201c) ‘tooth’ (Bible+).

●DIAL Present in Ararat, Muš, Van-group, Salmast, etc. In the other dialects the word has been replaced by *akray* or *kerik‘* [HAB 1: 286].

●ETYM Derived from PIE **h₃dont-* ‘tooth’: Gr. *ὀδών*, gen. *ὀδόντος* m., Lat. *dēns*, *dentis* m., Skt. *dán*, acc. *dánt-am* m., Lith. *dant-is*, etc. Hübschmann 1877a: 405; 1897: 422; Scheftelowitz 1904-05, 2: 26; HAB 1: 285-286; Pokorny 1959: 289. For paradigms of this term in cognate languages and a morphological discussion, see Beekes 1995: 179; Szemerényi 1996: 166-167; for the laryngeal, see Beekes 1986a: 72; 1987b: 6-7; Kortlandt 1987: 63; 1989: 50; 2001: 12 = 2003: 77, 94, 132; Schrijver 1991: 23.

The Armenian word has been explained in different ways: **h₁dnt-ṃ* > PArm. **atanan* > **ataman* (“Anschluß an die *m(a)n*-Stämme und gleichzeitig Dental-dissimilation”) > *atamn* (Schindler 1975: 61₃₂), or **odnm* > **odmn* > **otamn* (Beekes 2003: 186), or **h₁dnt-ṃ* > PArm. **atand(a)m* > **atanm* > *atamn*, or **Vdnt-ṃ* > **atan(T)mn* > *atamn* (see Ravnæs 1991: 95, 100). For a further discussion, see Polomé 1980: 27-28; Greppin 1983: 305; 1988-89: 477₁; Olsen 1988-89: 481-482; 1999: 505; Clackson 1994: 34-35, 210-211₉₉; Viredaz 2005-07: 4-6.

The simplest solution seems to be the one suggested already by Hübschmann and Scheftelowitz and accepted by Pokorny (see above; cf. also one of the alternatives mentioned by Ravnæs): **ata(n) + -mn*, cf. *koł-mn* ‘side’ vs. *koł* ‘rib’ (q.v.); see also s.v. *gełmn* ‘wool, fleece’.

atta (dial.) ‘mother, mummy’.

●DIAL Akn *atta* ‘mother, mummy’, cf. Muš, etc. *ade*, Zeyt‘un *áte* (vocative) ‘mum, mother’ [Ačārean 1913: 46b].

●ETYM A nursery word, cf. Skt. *attā* ‘mother, older sister’ [Ĵahukyan 1972: 300; 1985: 153; 1987: 113, 275]. Other comparable forms refer to ‘father, papa, daddy’: Hitt. *attaš*, Gr. voc. *ἄττα*, Lat. *atta*, Goth. *atta*, etc. (see Pokorny 1959: 71; Szemerényi 1977: 7; Schrijver 1991: 46; M. Huld apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 195a).

Though belonging to child language, this etymon may have existed already in PIE. For a discussion of this term with particular attention to gemination in child language see Meillet 1950: 58; Shields 1990; Szemerényi 1996: 110.

This etymon is considered as inherited from a Proto-Nostratic corresponding nursery word, cf. Elam. *atta* ‘father’, Tamil *attai* f. ‘father’s sister, mother-in-law’, Turkish *ata* ‘father, ancestor’, Etruscan *ati* f. ‘mother’, etc. (see Shields 1990: 332₄; Bomhard 2008, 2: 596-598). Note also Hurr. *attai*, Urart. *ate* ‘father’ [Ĵahukyan 1987: 427].

aracem (trans.) ‘to pasture’ (Bible+), **aracim** (intrans.) ‘to browse, graze’ (Bible+); **arawt**, *i*-stem (GDSg *arawt-i* in the Bible, GDPl *arawt-i-c*’ in Yovhannēs Drasxanakertc’i /9-10th cent.) ‘pastureland’.

- DIAL Both *arac-* and *arawt* are widespread in the dialects [HAB 1: 294a, 349-350].
- 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 Arm. *t’urc* ‘cheek’, which is rejected by Ačařyan (HAB 2: 210a), but accepted by Frisk (ibid.), and, with some reservation, Ĵahukyan (1987: 153, 197), who on p. 197 alternatively points 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*). Ałayan’s (op. cit. 25) analysis of *arac-/arawt* as containing the suffix *-awt* is improbable, however. Hambarjumyan (1995: 234-235; 1998: 42-45) identifies *arawt* ‘pastureland’ (< **trəǵ-*) with a non-existent *art* ‘to graze; pastureland’, distinct from *art* ‘field’ (he refers to AčařLiak 3, 1957: 37, but there only *aracel* is mentioned), and **art* and **arc-* appearing in *xaw-art* and *xawarci* in a mysterious passage Movsēs Xorenac’i 1.30 (see H. Martirosyan 1996), which is untenable.

The equation of Arm. *arac-* with Gr. *τρώγω* and *τράγος* would be possible if one assumes **treh₂ǵ-* for Armenian (with a prothetic *a-* as in *artawsr* ‘tear’, q.v.; see also 2.1.17.4), **trh₂ǵ-* for *τράγος*, and **troh₂ǵ-* for *τρώγω*. Beekes (1973: 98) is against reconstructing a 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 it as a compound of an unattested **ar-* < **p₁r-* (cf. *ar-*) and **háuti-* ‘flock of sheeps, etc.’ (see s.v. *hawt*). Olsen (1999: 92-93, 775, 811) derives it from PIE **srHu-d-ie/o-* (cf. Lat. *servō* ‘to serve, preserve; to protect; to keep, observe; to look after’, Av. *hauruua-* ‘aufpassend’, etc. Both etymologies are improbable, since neither the nature of **-d-* nor the alternation *c – wt* is explained. Furthermore, in my view, **-d₁-* would yield Arm. *-č-* rather than *-c-*. See 2.1.22.1 for more details.

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 economical explanation of the alternation *-c- /-wt-* would treat *arawt*, an *i*-stem, as a deverbative noun in **-ti-* based on verbal *arac-*. If, e.g., one accepts the connection with Gr. *τρώγω*, Arm. *arac-* would derive from **treh₂ǵ-*, while *arawt* (*i*-stem) would imply **trh₂ǵ-ti-* (cf. Gr. *τρώξις* f. ‘gnawing, biting’). This mechanism helps explaining 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 Ačařyan (HAB 1: 295a) treats it as a compound 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 (1966: 27; 1993: 9, 22) notes that Ačařıyan’s analysis is reminiscent of a folk-etymology and treats *arahet* as borrowed from unattested Iran. (MMed.) **arahēt(i)*, an old compound of **raθa-/raθai-* ‘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. Hovhannısyān (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’erixanyān’s etymology is not impossible, I see no reason to abandon that of Ačařıyan. A clear typological parallel to the compound *ar-a-het* ‘path of men/people’ is Šamšadin (Łarabał-group) *mārt’ākāecan* ‘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’.

arastoy (*arazdoy*, *erastoy*), API *arastoy-s*, AbIPI *i yarastoy-c*; NHB 1: 338c has GDPI *arastoy-i-c*, but without evidence. Prob. ‘rock, stone’.

Occurs always as a specifier to *vēm* ‘hard stone’. API *arastoy-s* is found in Agat’angelos § 767 (1909=1980: 398^{L10r}; transl. Thomson 1976: 307): *i glxoy leřnēn ařeal vēms arastoyš, antašš, ankop’s, yařt’s, <...>* : “From the summit of the mountain he took solid stones, unworked, unhewn, immense, <...>”. In Book of Chries: AbIPI *i yarastoy-c* ‘*vımac*’. In Philo: *arazdoy vēm*. Ačařıyan (HAB 1: 297a) cites also Eznik Erēc’ (7th cent.) without giving 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 containing the suffix *-oy-k*, on which cf. *erek-oy*, *amōt’-oy-k*, *bar-oy-k*, etc. [Jahukyan 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. *pr̥ṣṭhā-* n. ‘back, mountain-ridge, top’ (RV+), *pr̥ṣṭi-* f. ‘rib’, etc. See s.v. *erastan-k* for further details. That a noun meaning ‘mountain, rock, etc.’ functions as an attributive ‘solid, hard (rock)’ is not uncommon; cf. *leārn* ‘mountain’ : dial. (Ararat) *leř k’ar* ‘hard stone’ [Amatuni 1912: 246a]; *pal/t* ‘rock, stone’ : *pal pal k’arer* [HAB 4: 4a, 13a], etc. The word combination *leř k’ar* is also found in the 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, three times).

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 ζύλα τοῦ πεδίου,
αἱ κέδροι τοῦ Λιβάνου, ἄς ἐφύτευσεν.*

¹⁷ *ἐκεῖ στρουθία ἐννοσσεύουσιν,*

τοῦ ἐρωδιοῦ ἡ οἰκία ἡγεῖται αὐτῶν.

The Armenian translation: < ... >, *boyn aragli apawēn ē noc 'a*.

Identifying *ariovd* with ‘the fir tree’ of the Hebrew text, Ačařyan (HAB 1: 316b) interprets *aratay* as GSg of *arat* ‘stork’ (= *aragli*, GSg of *aragil* ‘stork’), although in 1: 298a he puts a question mark and characterizes the word as uncertain. The declension with GDSg *-ay* and GDPl *-ac*’, apart from some proper names and foreign words, is unknown in Armenian (see AčařLiak 3, 1957: 470-480; Ĵahukyan 1959: 281-282; Weitenberg 1989: 57-58), so that *aratay* is puzzling (hardly a corruption for GPI *aratac*?). According to Ĵahukyan (1965: 251), it points to a foreign origin of the word.

In the Greek text, *τοῦ ἐρωδιοῦ* (GSg) disagrees with *αὐτῶν* (GPI) in number. The Armenian translation faithfully renders the Greek text. Modern translators usually put both in the 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”.

Ačařyan’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. In my view, *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’. In Codex Alexandrinus and in 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 also knew the variant of the Greek word with a iota subscriptum (*-ω-*), which is not attested in the Septuagint though (see Frisk 1, 1960: 572), and erroneously inserted an *-i-* not after, but before *ov=ω*.

Thus, *ariovd* turns out to function here in the meaning ‘stork’, and this makes the interpretation of *arat*, which is a hapax and has a strange genitive form, even more complex.

●ETYM The only etymological attempt known to me is that of Ĵahukyan (1965: 251; 1967: 207, 305; 1987: 113), who derives the word from IE **arad-* (**arōd-*) with some hesitation; cf. Gr. *ἐρωδιός* ‘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. For the connection of the Greek and the Latin words, see Łap’anc’yan 1945: 140 (without Armenian).

Schrijver (1991: 65) considers the Germanic forms semantically remote. Further, he assumes that the Slavic word 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’ [Šeršašidze 1989: 82]. For a 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, **h₂*), 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.

araws ‘virgin soil’, mentioned only in “Arjejn bařaran”, 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’ (see s.v. *aracem* ‘to pasture’), 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’; Mir. *arbor* (< **aruj*), NPl *arbanna*, OIr. gen. *arbe* (< **arjens*) ‘corn’; and Arm. *harawunk* ‘arable land’ (q.v.), an old *r/n*-stem noun based on the PIE verb **h₂erh₃-* ‘to plough’. She derives Arm. *araws* from **arəw-ns-* (although 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, *armenà* ‘oberflächlich gepflügte Erdschicht’ (see Pokorny 1959: 62) is meant. According to Derksen (1996: 154), Lith. *armenà* means ‘aufgepflügte Schicht der Erdoberflächen’ (cf. also *Armenà* ‘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 reflect the suffixal element **-k-*, which, after **-u-*, would regularly yield Arm. *-s-*, see s.vv. *alaw(s)unk* ‘Pleiades’, *boys* ‘plant’, *loys* ‘light’. The pair *araws* – *harawunk* matches that of **alaws* : *alawunk*.

arawr (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 the Van-group: Šatax [M. Muradyan 1962: 193a], Moks, Ozim, and in the villages of Van [HAB 1: 350b; Ačarjan 1952: 249; Greppin 1983: 308]. The evidence for the *h-* (also attested in the literature since Ephrem) is, thus, quite solid.

●ETYM Since Hübschman (1897: 423^{Nr47}; see also HAB 1: 350a), connected with Gr. *ἀροτρον* n., Lat. *arātrum*, Mir. *arathar*, Welsh *aradr*, Olc. *arōr*, Lith. *ārklas*, 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.) points to the zero grade **h₂rh₃trom* (also in Gr. *ἀροτρον*; the zero grade of this type also seen in Lith. *irklas* ‘oar’ from **h₁rh₁-*),

whereas the variant *harawr*, as Lith. *árklas* and Lat. *arātrum*, adopted the *e*-grade of the verb. This is accepted by Beekes (2003 1183, 193).²⁴ Olsen (1999: 35, 765-769, 846) disagrees with this view and reconstructs 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 *h-*, the stability of which would be synchronically supported next to *harawunk'*, q.v.) were the original form, there would be no reason for the loss of its initial *h-*, unless one assumes that *araws* 'virgin soil' (q.v.) was sufficient to cause such a loss. Thus, the assumption of N. Simonyan (1979: 220) about preservation 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 the influence of the unpreserved verb and *harawunk'*, which indeed reflects the PIE laryngeal.

arb-** aorist stem of *əmpem* 'to drink' (q.v.), 3pl. *arb-in*, etc. (Bible+); **arbenam**, 3pl.aor. *arb-ec'-an* 'to get drunk' (Bible+), participle *arbeal* 'drunk' (*arbeal ic'en* = *μειθύουσιν* in the Bible, on this and on the *-e-* of *arbenam*, see Clackson 1994: 230207); **ǰr-*arb-i 'irrigated' (Bible+).

●DIAL Widespread in the dialects, always with an initial *h-*. Most of the forms represent **harbim*, but there are also forms that reflect **harbenam*, such as Muš *harb'enal*, Tigranakert *härp'enal*, Zeyt'un *hayb'incl* [HAB 1: 299b]. The initial *x-* in Salmast and Maraša confirm the original *h-*.

Šatax *čərärpin* 'irrigated soil' continues ClArm. *ǰr-*arb-i** [M. Muradyan 1962: 213b].

●ETYM Derived from PIE **sre/ob^h-*, **srb^h-* 'to sip, drink, gulp', cf. Gr. *ρoφέω* 'to slurp, gulp', Lat. *sorbeō* 'to suck up, soak up, drink up, absorb; to engulf', Lith. *surbiiū* 'to suck', OCS *sr̥bati*, Hitt. *šarāp-* 'to sip', Iran. **hrab* 'to sip, suck in', etc. (HAB 1: 299 referring to Müller; Pokorny 1959: 1001; Ernout/Meillet 1959: 636b; Mallory/Adams 1997: 175b; Cheung 2007: 140).

The Armenian form derives from aorist in zero grade **(e-)srb^h-e/o-*, see Hübschmann 1897: 423; Godel 1965: 27; 1975: 126; Saradževa 1986: 139; Praust 1996: 197-198. For an extensive discussion, see Klingenschmitt 1982: 272-273. It has been suggested that the dialectal **h-* is a relic of the IE initial **s-* (see HAB 1: 299a; H. Muradyan 1982: 318-319; 1982a; Greppin 1982-83; Weitenberg 1986: 90-91).

arbaneak, *a*-stem: ISg *arbanek-a-w* (Severian of Gabala, etc.) 'servant, assistant, successor' (Bible+).

●DIAL Preserved only in Van **arbnik* 'assistant' [HAB 1: 300a] or, more precisely, *ärpnek* 'assistant heir son' [Ačarjan 1952: 248], and in Šatax *hərpəne/ek* 'a child that is capable of assisting' [M. Muradyan 1962: 192b, 213b].

²⁴ 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-*.

●ETYM Compared with Arm. *orb* 'orphan' (q.v.), Skt. *árbha-* 'small, young', OCS *rabъ* m. 'servant, slave', *rabota* 'slavery', ORuss. *robota* 'work, slavery, captivity', Goth. *arbaiþs* f. 'labour', etc. (Hübschmann 1897: 423; HAB 1: 299b; Ałabekyan 1979: 59; Greppin 1983: 308; Saradževa 1986: 289-290; Ĵahukyan 1987: 141; for the Slavic forms, see Derksen 2008: 373).

At first glance Arm. *arbaneak* looks Iranian, cf. e.g. *dayeak* 'nurse, tutor'. Olsen 1999: 373, 868 treats *arbaneak* as a loan from an Iranian unattested correspondence of Gr. *ὀρφανός* 'orphaned'. This is not compulsory, however. The word can easily be analyzed as an *ak*-diminutive of **arb-an-i* 'youth, orphan', cf. e.g. *ordeak* from *ordi* 'son'. As to *-an-i*, we can think of Arm. *kus-an* vs. *koys* 'virgin' and *pat-ani* and *parm-ani*, both 'youth, youngster' on the one hand, and of Gr. *ὀρφ-αν-ός* 'orphaned' on the other. For the structure of *arbaneak* note especially the synonymous *pataneak*.

The connection with *arbun-k'* 'vigour, maturity (of age)' (q.v.) suggested in NHB 1: 341c ("yarbuns haseal spasawor žir") is worth of consideration.

arbun-k' (mostly pl. tant.), GDPI *arbun-c'*, LocPI *γ-arbun-s*, IPI *arb[m]am-b-k'* 'vigour, maturity (of age)' (Movsēs Xorenac'i, Book of Chries, Philo, Gregory of Nyssa, Nilus of Ancyra, Yovhannēs Drasxanakertc'i, etc.); sg. uninflected **arbun** (Philo, Grigor Narekac'i, Čašoc').

For attestations and a philological discussion, see Weitenberg 1989a. GDPI *arbun-c'* instead of an expected **arban-c'* can be compared with the inflexion of the adjective *canr*, *canun-k'*, *canunc'* [Weitenberg 1989a: 109].

●ETYM Ačarıyan (HAB 1: 300-301) rejects all the etymological attempts, including those connecting *arbun-k'* with Arm. *arbaneak* 'servant', *orb* 'orphan' (q.v.), Skt. *árbha-* 'small, young', OCS *rabъ* m. 'servant', etc. (on which see Mayrhofer EWAia 1, 1992: 119-120).

The word *arbun-k'* has been etymologized with Goth. *abrs* 'strong' as **ab^hro-* = **h₂(e)b^hro-* (Ĵahukyan 1982: 74; 1987: 111; cf. Weitenberg 1989a: 109-111). Weitenberg 1989a suggests a connection of *arbun-k'* with *buřn* 'strong, violent' positing **b^hōrH-n-* (sg.) and **b^hrH-on-* (pl.), respectively, belonging with the root **b^herH-*, cf. Skt. *bhar^j* 'to move rapidly to and fro, hurry, quiver', Skt. *bhūrṇi-* 'zealous, wild', *bhurana-* 'active, quick, lively', *φυρμός* 'Verwirrung', etc., for the forms, see Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 250.

The etymology of *buřn* is suggested by Ĵahukyan 1987: 116, 160, 234. The connection with OCS *burja* 'storm', etc. (Saradževa; 1986: 41-42, 361-362₁₂₂; cf. Ĵahukyan 1970: 88₁₆) is unconvincing.

argand, *a*-stem (later also *o-*) 'womb' (Bible+).

●DIAL Akn, Ĵula *arg'and'*, Alaškert *arkant* (according to HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 121b, also *argan*; Madat'yan 1985 vacat), Agulis, T'iflis, Šamaxi *ark'and* (also with an initial *h-*, see also Bařramyan 1964: 59, 189), Axalc'xa *ark'ant'* [HAB 1: 303a]. Further, Łarabał *árgand* (Mehtišen *argánd*) [Davt'yan 1966: 319]. The *d*-less form of Alaškert is also seen in another dialect of Muš-group, namely 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 Łarabał, one would expect **ärk'änd*, through Ačarıyan's Law and subsequent change *-rg-* > *-rk'*-, that was probably anterior 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, which participate in Ačarıyan's Law; cf. also examples in 2.1.39.2. One might therefore consider *argand* as being due to the literary influence. These thoughts may be corroborated by *ärk'än* which is found twice in a tale told in Berd (Šamšadin) 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 *kngvä*] *ärk'änəmn ēl mi tla, 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 Lidén (1906: 21; cf. Pedersen 1982 [< 1907]: 297b) derives it from IE **ark^w*-, cf. Welsh *arffed* 'gremium, Schoss', Gael. *arcuinn* 'udder of a cow'. This etymology is accepted by Ačarıyan (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 Jahukyan (1987: 113, 159, and, for the suffix, 240). Earlier, as well as later, Jahukyan (1982: 71; 1983: 90; 1990: 5) connected **arg-* with Gr. *όρῶα* 'intestine', restoring **(o)rwnt-*.

Pedersen (1949: 1-2) proposed a connection with the Slavic **grōdb* 'breast': Russ. *grud'*, etc., adducing parallels for the semantic relation between 'belly; womb' and 'breast' such as Fr. *sein*, etc. A protoform like **g^{wh}r(V)nd^h*- could indeed yield Arm. *argand* or, perhaps better, **ergand* (see below). This etymology has been fairly popular, 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. *βρένθος* '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 words are semantically remote. In ÈtimSlovSlavJaz 7, 1980: 149, the connection of the Slavic word with Arm. *argand*, Gr. *βρένθος* and others is rejected on semantic grounds.

The "prothetic" vowel *a-* of Arm. *argand* is also unclear. 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 disyllabic, 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 we have *argand* and not **ergand* (see also 2.1.17).

The most recent etymological proposal known to me is that of Witczak (1999: 183), who compares *argand* with Hitt. *šarhuwant-* c./n. 'uterus, placenta' < IE **s^rHu-wnt-h₂*, literally 'full of sausages', cf. Gr. *όρῶα* 'sausage' (or 'intestine'). [As far as Greek is concerned, this etymology in fact coincides with that of Jahukyan, which he seems to have abandoned later (see above)]. However, **s^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 here present some thoughts 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 due to the final weakening as a result of the accent retraction. According to HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 121b, however, a *t*-less variant *argan* is also found 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-*; cf. *salam* vs. GDPI *salamb-a-c'* 'francolin' (q.v.). It is tempting to reconstruct 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, although with reservations, assumes a collective **-eh₂*. For **-nt-h₂*, compare the solution of Witczak (1999: 183) above.

argat 'superfluous branches cut off from vine and used for kindling'.

MidArm. word according to Norayr. MiřHayBař vacat. In Bařgirk' hayoc' it glosses *ur* 'branch': *ur · řit kam argat* [Amalyan 1975: 261^{Nr233}].

In DialAdd apud NHB 2: 1060c: *argat · ur hateal yort'oy; řiwł 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 Perć 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 : Vaxt'ang Ananyan (the village of Połosk'ilisa, Dilijan) (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 Hitt. *ark-* 'to cut off, divide', treating *-at* as a 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 unconvincing.

A. A. Abrahamyan (1958: 63-64) interprets *argat* 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'.

Ałayan (1974: 30-31) derives *argat* from PIE **ureh₂d-* 'branch; root', cf. Gr. *řādīř* 'branch', Lat. *rādīx* 'root', *rāmus* 'branch', MWelsh *gwreid* < **urh₂d-jo-* 'roots', OIc. *rót*, Goth. *waurts* 'root', Alb. *rrēnj/ē, -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 a discussion of OIr. *frén* 'root', Welsh *gwrysg* 'branches', Gr. *řáδaμvoς* 'twig' and others, see especially Schrijver 1991: 182-183; 1995: 173-175.

This etymology is the most probable one, although 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 reservations (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 in the majority of the dialects, cf.

PIE *g^wr(e)h₂-n- > *erkan* ‘hand-mill’ (Bible+; widespread in the dialects) : EArm. (Agulis, Łarabał, Ĵuła, etc.; but Ararat itself has ε-); see Ałayan 1965. See also 2.1.17.4.

Possibly a Mediterranean-European substratum word.

argel, uninflected [Greppin 1983: 309 gives *-i*, *-oy*, probably by mistake] ‘hindrance, obstacle’ (Agat‘angelos, John Chrysostom, etc.), ‘ward, prison’ (Revelation 18.2, rendering Gr. *φουλακή* ‘watching, guarding; ward, prison’); more frequent with verbs such as *ar̄nem* ‘to make’, *linim* ‘to be’, *tam* ‘to give’, etc. (Bible+); **argelum** ‘to forbid, 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 imprison’. The noun *ark‘el* is found in Suč‘ava [HAB 1: 305a]. Western dialects have **argil-*, which is reminiscent of *argilel*, attested in Paterica and considered a dialectal spelling form [NHB 1: 345a].

Amongst the dialects of the Van-group, Ačāryan (1952: 248) only records Ozim *arg‘ilil*. M. Muradyan 1962: vacat (on Šatax). In my view, we do find a relic of the word in Moks *šārāk‘lk^o* ‘задержание мочи’ (= ‘retention of the urine’); e.g. *šārāk‘lk^o* *ə^f* ‘у него задержание мочи’ (see Orbeli 2002: 302), which must be interpreted as **šr-a(r)gil-k‘* = *šer* ‘urine’ + *argel-k‘*, with loss of *-r-* (2.1.33.3) and with a regular reflex of Ačāryan’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/ hindered by snow-storm’. This compound is present in Ararat, Nor Bayazet [Ačārean 1913: 212b; HAB 1: 304b], according to Amatuni (1912: 121b), also in Muš. Amatuni (ibid.) further records Ararat, Muš *bk‘-argel* ‘id.’.

●ETYM Since long, connected with Lat. *arceō* ‘to keep off, prevent; to protect’ (NHB 1: 344a, etc.), Gr. *ἀρκέω* ‘to ward off, keep off; to defend; to suffice’, *ἀρκος* 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 2008 s.v.

Ačāryan (HAB 1: 304b) treats *-el* as a suffix comparable to *-il*. Greppin (1975: 79; 1983: 309) compares Lat. *arcula* ‘small box, casket’. Ĵahukyan (1987: 113) reconstructs **arkelo-*, directly comparing the suffix seen in OHG *rigil* ‘bolt’, etc. However, the appurtenance of the Germanic forms (as well as the Hittite, Baltic, etc. ones) is not universally accepted; see Hübschmann 1897: 423 (mentions only the Greek and Latin cognates); Klingenschmitt, *ibid.*; Mallory/Adams 1997: 270b; Schrijver 1991: 66-67. It is often assumed that Arm. *arg-el* has been created on the model of *awelum* ‘to add, increase’ [Klingenschmitt 1982: 235-238; Viredaz 2005: 94], but we may rather compare *-el* found in *ayc‘-el-* ‘visit’ and *vay-el* ‘proper’, *vayel-em* ‘to enjoy’ (see s.vv.).

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. *rāktas* ‘key’. On Germanic, see Lindeman 2003. For a 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 with Gr. ἄρκος. Arm. dial. *arg may corroborate this assumption. Alternatively, -el- may be 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**, API *ardiwn-s*, GDPI *ardean-c*, 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 *ard*₂ ‘(just) now’ (q.v.). The *u*-declension of *ard* (Ezriq, 5th cent.) is corroborated by *z-ard* ‘ornament’, which is a *u*-stem, too.

●DIAL The forms *ardar* and *zardar-* are widespread in the dialects. In some of them (Łarabał *ärt’är* [Davt’yan 1966: 319], Van *ärtär* [Ačaryan 1952: 248], etc.; Van, Moks, Šatax *zärtär-* [Ačaryan 1952: 259; M. Muradyan 1962: 195b], etc.; cf. Łarabał *zört’är-* [Davt’yan 1966: 350]) we can discern the effect of Ačaryan’s Law in inlaut with subsequent assimilation: *ardar* > **ärtär* > *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 **arīar*. The form is also corroborated by the genuine data of Orbeli (2002: 208) collected in the 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 *ärt’/däk* ‘completely’. Margaryan (1975: 315b) glosses *ardak* as Goris *ärt’äk* not specifying the semantics. In Łarabał there is *tæeten-ärt’äk* ‘completely’ (see HŽHek’ 7, 1979: 736b). The same expression is found in Metri, in a different meaning: *tełən ärdäk* ‘immediately, on the spot’ (see Alayan 1954: 292); see *ard*₂. Their possible synchronic identity (or contamination?) may be seen in Šamšadin/Dilijan *ärt’(n)äk* ‘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’ [Ačaryan 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. ἄρτιος ‘σύνταξις’ (Hes.), ἄρτιω ‘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 Mİr. counterpart of Av. *aradra-* ‘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-dā-), see Considine 1979: 226₁₂ (although 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*‘, GDPI *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, in my view, may belong Meṭri particle of time *ārdāk*, cf. *teṭən ārdāk* ‘immediately, on the spot’ (see Ałayan 1954: 292); Karčewan *ārdāk*‘ ‘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; Ačarjyan 1941: 179; Gabikean 1952: 341]. Thus, it may be identical with *ardak* ‘flat (adj.)’ from *ard₁*, since the latter is etymologically related to *ard₂*. For the semantics, cf. Germ. *eben* ‘flat’ and ‘just now’. The Meṭri expression *teṭən ārdāk* ‘immediately, on the spot’ is also found in Łarabał, in a different meaning: *tæten-ärt’äk* ‘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 Meṭri *hārdā* ‘now’ (see Ałayan 1954: 313, in the glossary of dialectal words). Note also Areš *ärt’ä* ‘early’ [Lusenc‘ 1982: 199a]. If Karčewan *h-* does reflect Class. *y-* (see H. Muradyan 1960: 62-63), we can reconstruct **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*.

In a Łarabał fairy-tale recorded by Ařak‘el Bahat‘ryan in 1860 (HŽHek‘ 6, 1973: 699^{L7}): *šemk‘in ärt’äk nstac* ‘‘seated upright on a 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 *arnem*, *ard₁*) with the original meaning ‘fittingly’. For a discussion, I refer to C. Arutjunjan 1983: 271 and especially to Clackson 1994: 103-104 and, on Lithuanian, 223₈₉.

The absence of the initial *h-* may be due to zero grade possibly seen in *ardi* < **ardiyoh* < **h₂rtijos* : Gr. *ἄρτιος* ‘suitable; ready’ (see also Olsen 1999: 435) and in derivatives. If we are dealing with the suffix *-*ti-* rather than with an *i-*locative 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. *ἀρτιγενής* ‘new-born’, can be a calque from Greek.

***areg-** : ***areg-i**, old genitive of *arew* ‘sun’ (q.v.) reflected in: **Areg k‘atak**‘ ‘the city of the Sun’ attested a few times in the Bible rendering Gr. *Ἡλίου πόλις*, e.g. Genesis 41.45, 50 [Zeyt‘unyan 1985: 345, 346]: *k‘rmi Areg k‘atak‘i* : *ἱερέως Ἡλίου πόλεως*; **areg**, gen. *aregi* ‘the 8th month’ (Bible+); **areg** ‘eastern’ (Agat‘angelos, Grigor

Narekac'i); *areg-akn*, *an*-stem: GDPI *aregakan*, AblSg *y-aregakan-ē*, ISg *aregakamb* (Bible+), NPI *aregakun-k'* (epic song of Vahagn apud Movsēs Xorenac'i 1.31 [1913=1991: 86L4], Eznik Kołbac'i, etc.; later AblSg *y-aregahn-ē* in Grigor Narekac'i 38, 10-11th cent. (Xaç'atryan/Lazinyan 1985: 403L45) 'sun' (Bible+); a number of derivatives based on *areg-*, *areg-n-a-*, *aregahn-a-*.

For the attestations and a philological discussion, see NHB 1: 351-352; Astuacaturean 1895: 214-216; HAB 1: 310-311; Benveniste 1965; Eichner 1972; Clackson 1994: 228₁₈₀; Olsen 1999: 675₂₄. The compound *areg-akn* literally means 'eye of the sun' (rather than 'sun-spring'), cf. *p'ayl-akn* 'lightning', etc. For a philological discussion of the pattern 'eye of the sun', see 3.2 and s.v. *akn* 'eye'.

Note the denominative verb *y-arag-em* 'to expose to the sun' (2 Kings, Cyril of Alexandria, Grigor Astuacaban, etc.) rendering Gr. ἐξ-ηλιάζω 'hang in the sun' in 2 Kings 21.6, 9, 13; for the vocalism, see below.

•DIAL The forms *arew* and *areg-akn* are ubiquitous in the dialects [HAB 1: 313a]. The simplex *areg* has been preserved in Nor Bayazet *areg!* interjection of astonishment [HAB 1: 312b].

There are a few derivatives, e.g. Trapizon, Arabkir, Akn, Dersim, Xotorjur, Kesaria **areg-i* 'sunny place, sunny side or slope' (see Gabriëlean 1912: 242; Ačařean 1913: 146a; Bařramyan 1960: 73b; HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 122a).

•ETYM Arm. *arew/g-* 'sun' derives from IE **h₂reu-i-*: Skt. *ravi-* m. 'sun, sun-god' (Upaniřad+), *ravi-putra-* m. 'son of the Sun' (Kāthaka-Brahmaņa); according to Eichner 1978, here belongs also Hitt. *ħaru(ua)nae-zi* 'to become bright, get light, dawn'. The phonological alternation *-w* vs. *-g-* seen in Arm. *arew* vs. gen. *areg-* is comparable to *kog-i* 'butter' vs. *kov* 'cow' (q.v.). In view of the contrast with *erek* 'evening' < **h₁reg^wos-*, the initial *a-* of *arew/g-* points to **h₂-*. This is corroborated by Hittite *ħ-*.

For an etymological discussion, see Meillet 1894: 164, 164₂; Hübschmann 1897: 424; Grammont 1918: 225; HAB 1: 311-313 with older references; Scherer 1953: 51-52; Benveniste 1965; Schmitt 1967: 259; 1972-74: 23; Godel 1975: 83; Kortlandt 1976: 93; 1987: 62; 1993: 9-11 = 2003: 3, 76, 102-103; Greppin 1983: 311-312; Ĵahukyan 1987: 108; 1992: 18-19; Ravnæs 1991: 17, 76-77; Clackson 1994: 127, 140, 228₁₈₀; Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 440; Olsen 1999: 675-676; Witczak 1999: 182-183; Beekes 2003: 164, 211; Kloekhorst 2006: 85; 2008: 317; Cheung 2007: 192.

In view of the *-i* of Sanskrit *ravi-*, Arm. *arew*, *u*-stem 'sun' and gen. *areg* < **areg-i-* may be interpreted as reflecting an old HD *i*-stem: nom. **h₂reu-ōi-* > PArm. **arew-u(y)*, gen. **h₂r(e)w-i-ós* (rather than **h₂reu-os*, as is frequently assumed) > PArm. **areg-i-* (see the attractive analysis in Olsen 1999: 109-110). Note, on the other hand, that Armenian words ending in *-w* mostly belong to the *u*-declension (Ĵahukyan 1959: 253; for a discussion, see also Ę. Tumanjan 1978: 227-236; Olsen 1999: 109-110). Some scholars (Solta 1960: 407-408; Xaç'aturova 1979: 353, cf. 360₆₂) ascribe a sacral function to the *u*-declension.

The assumption that Arm. *arew* has been borrowed from Aryan in the middle of 2nd millennium BC (Porzig 1954: 162 = 1964: 239-240; Xaç'aturova 1973: 198; 1979: 353-356) is untenable since: 1) at that period the development PIE **e* > Aryan *a* had already taken place, as is seen in Mitanni *panza* 'five'; 2) *arew* belongs

with other poetic words that are culturally and/or semantically associated with each other and are all Armeno-Indo-Aryan (or Armeno-Graeco-Aryan) correspondences, and some of them clearly preclude the loan theory: *arcui* ‘eagle’, *ji* ‘horse’, *c’in* ‘kite’, etc. For the association between ‘bird, eagle’, ‘horse’ and ‘sun’ in the poetic language, cf. e.g. Skt. *pataṅgá-* adj. ‘flying’, m. ‘bird; flying horse; sun’ (RV+, see Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 72-73).

Arm. *arew* probably reflects an IE or Armeno-Aryan poetically or sacrally marked designation of ‘sun’ replacing the PIE unmarked profane word for ‘sun’, **seh₂ul-*. This is reminiscent of the case of Arm. *ji* vs. Skt. *háya-* (see s.vv. *ēš* ‘donkey’, *ji* ‘horse’, and 3.12).

The assumption that Łarabał *rek’nak* is an archaic reflex of the IE proto-form allegedly with an initial **r-* (Ervandyan 2007: 26) is untenable. First, the IE root is now reconstructed as **h₂reu-i-* rather than **reu-i-*. Second, *aregakn* is reflected in Łarabał mostly as *i’rik’nak*, *i’rihynak*, *arék’nak*, *arihynak* [Davt’yan 1966: 319]. Third, the reduction of the initial pretonic syllable of polysyllabic words is regular (see 2.1.33.2). On dial. **are/ag-oj-*, see 2.2.1.5.

The vocalism of *y-arag-em* ‘to expose to the sun’ (Bible+, rendering Gr. *ἐξ-ηλιάζω* in 2 Kings 21.6, 9, 13) is remarkable. We may think of an *o*-grade denominative verb of the IE type of **uosn-eie-* ‘to buy, sell’: Gr. *ὀνέομαι* and Skt. *vasnayáti*, from **uesno-* ‘price’: Skt. *vasná-*, Lat. *vēnum*, Arm. *gin* ‘price’, cf. also **uog^h-eie-* from **uog^ho-* ‘carrying’ (on this pattern, see Beekes 1995: 229-230; Szemerényi 1996: 300; and especially Klingenschmitt 1982: 141-143); thus **Hrou-eie-* ‘to expose to the sun’ > PArm. **arow-eye-mi* > **arowémi* (through contraction **-eye-* > *-e-* as in PIE **treies* > *erek* ‘three’) > *y-aragem* (pretonic **-o-* in open syllable > *-a-*). As to the semantic relation, cf. Akn **arewel* ‘to expose to the sun (said of clothes and fruits to be dried)’ (Gabriëlean 1912: 242), which clearly derives from *arew* ‘sun’.

Culturological excursus

We saw that Arm. *arew/g-* and Skt. *ravi* m. ‘sun, sun-god’ have been inherited from the IE or Armeno-Aryan poetic language. Arm. *Areg* ‘Sun-god’ is indirectly reflected not only in the month-name *Areg* (cf. MPers. *Mihr* ‘Mithra; sun; 7th month’, MacKenzie 1971: 56), but also in Nor Bayazet *areg!* interjection of astonishment, which betrays the deified **arew/g-* ‘god’ or theonym *Arew/g* ‘Sun-god’, compare also Akn **arew!* an oath-exclamation [Gabriëlean 1912: 242], and an oath formula from Łarabał (Łaziyan 1983: 165b^{L-8f}): *en irk’ynakə* ‘(may) that sun (witness for me)’. Further note *aregag* < *aregakn* in a T’iflis version of this type of formulae (Tēr-Atek’sandreaan 1885: 198^{L11}).

Most explicit is the following folk prayer from Łarabał: *Astco c’ncutn tvac arignak*, <...>, *im eress k’o otand takə, du im xoxek’s pahes* : “O! du göttlich strahlende Sonne! <...>. Dein Fuss ruhe auf meinem Antlitz! Bewahre meine Kinder” (Lalayan 2, 1988: 173, first published in 1897, transl. Abeghian 1899: 43 = Abelyan 1975: 42). Compare a poetic association of *arew* ‘sun’ with ‘golden sieve’ in the Ascension Day folk-songs of the type *jangyulum* from Łarabał (Grigoryan-Spandaryan 1971: 165, Nrs. 998 and 999): *Kyärmür arev, væski mat* “Red sun – golden sieve”; *Lüs nan arew væskəmat* “Light and golden-sieve(d) sun”.

For further evidence from folklore supporting the veneration of *Arew* and *Aregak*, see Vardumyan/T'oxat'yan 2004: 90.

arew, *u*-stem: GDPl *arew-u* 'sun; sunlight; life' (Bible+).

- DIAL Ubiquitous in the dialects [HAB 1: 313a].
- ETYM See s.v. **areg* 'sun'.

ariwn, *an*-stem: GDSg *arean*, AblSg *y-aren-ē*, ISg *aream-b*, GDPl *arean-c* 'blood' (Bible+). Note *ariwn xatotoy* 'wine', lit. 'blood of grapes' (Bible), *ariwn ort'oy* 'wine', lit. 'blood of vine' (Ephrem). In compounds: *ariwn-*, *arean-*, and *aren-*.

- DIAL Dialectally ubiquitous [HAB 1: 317b].
- ETYM Connected with Gr. *ἄρα* (also *εἶρα*, *ἦρα*) n. 'blood', Skt. *ásrj-* n., NSg *ásrk* (RV+), GSg *asn-ás* (AV+) 'blood', etc. by Tērvišean and, independently, Bugge (1889: 24), who compares *garun* 'spring' (q.v.) for the loss of the medial **-s-*. The following development has been assumed: **esar-* > **ehar-* > **ear-* > **ar-* [Hübschmann 1899: 44; HAB 1: 317a] or **esar-* > **ehar-* > **ahar-* > **ar-* [Jahukyan 1990a: 11]. See also Kortlandt 1996a: 57 = 2003: 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' is meant here. This is quite possible since the names of seasons often influence each other, cf. *amaṛn* 'summer' and *jmeṛn* 'winter'.

Jahukyan (ibid.) alternatively suggests **əsr-* (if, as he points out, Gr. *ἦρα* is an ancient form), and, for the word for 'spring', **wəsr-*, with the shwa secundum **b*. Hitt. *ēšhar* n., GSg *išhanāš*, points to **h₁esh₂r*. What Jahukyan in fact seems to suggest, is **h₁sh₂r*, although such a form is not found elsewhere. Lat. *asser* cannot be used as evidence for **h₁s-* (see Schrijver 1991: 29). But the Armenian form contains a suffix, and a derivational basis with zero grade is not excluded. 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 forms from the original heteroclitic paradigm, and a contamination with an almost synonymous root **kreuh₂-*, cf. Gr. *κρέατ-ος* < **kreuh₂ht-*.

The best solution seems to be: **h₁esh₂r* > **ehar* > **ar-* + *-iwn*, although the function/origin of the suffix is unclear.

For a thorough discussion on Arm. *ariwn* 'blood', see now Clackson 1999-2000.

arcat', *o*-stem: GDSg *arcat'-o-y*, ISg *arcat'-o-v* (rich evidence in the Bible) 'silver; silver ware; money; wealth'; **arcat'-i** 'silvery'; both forms, as well as a number of derivatives, are abundantly attested in the Bible (Astuacaturean 1895: 220-222) onwards (NHB 1: 360-361).

- DIAL Widespread in the dialects [HAB 1: 318b].
- ETYM Since long (Awgerean apud HAB 1: 318a; Klapproth 1831: 105a; NHB 1: 360c; de Lagarde 1854: 30^{L811f}, etc.), connected with the PIE word for 'silver': Lat. *argentum* n. 'silver', Skt. *rajatá-* 'silver-coloured, shining white, made of silver', n. 'silver' (AV+), YAv. *ərazata-* n., OPers. *ardata-* 'silver', etc., see Hübschmann 1897:

424; HAB 1: 317-318; Pokorny 1959: 64; Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 713 = 1995, 1: 617; Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 425-426; Mallory/Adams 1997: 518b.

The cognate forms point to a PIE **h₂rǵ-nt-o-* (see Schrijver 1991: 67-68 and references above), which would yield Arm. **arcant* > **arcan(d)*. Therefore, Ch. de Lamberterie (1978: 245-246; see also Clackson 1994: 229₁₈₆; Olsen 1999: 868) explains *arcat* ‘silver’ from Iran. > **ardzata-* in the same way as *arcui* ‘eagle’, q.v. (consonant shift as in *partēz* ‘garden’). Viredaz (2005: 89₂₆) derives *arcat* ‘from **arcatta* of a substrate language’.

The aspirated *-t* coincides with the reflex of PIE **t* and points to a rather old period. One might also think of the influence of *erkat* ‘iron’ (Hübschmann 1897: 424; HAB 1: 318b; Schmitt 1981: 75), although the etymology of this word is not entirely clear. To conclude, there are two solutions, which seem to be equally probable: 1) the PIE word for ‘silver’ yielded PArm. **arcant-*, which became *arcat* under the influence of *erkat* ‘iron’; 2) *arcat* is a very old Aryan (3rd-2nd millennium BC) or an old Iranian (first half of the 1st millennium BC) borrowing.

arcui, *ea*-stem: GDSg *arcu-o-y*, NPI *arcui-k*, API *arcui-s*, GDPI *arcue-a-c* (Bible+) ‘eagle’.

For attestations, see NHB s.v. and Greppin 1978: 43-48. Later: *arciw*, a few times in the Alexander Romance, see H. Simonyan 1989: 94^{L-1} (a late *kafā*-poem), 348 (twice), 428^{L1} (the earliest edition); also MidArm. (see Greppin 1978: 46, 48; MijHayBar 1, 1987: 93a).

●DIAL Widespread in the dialects, reflecting **arciw* [HAB 1: 320b].

●ETYM Derived from PIE **h₂rǵipió-*: Skt. *ṛjipyá-* ‘epithet of an eagle, Maruts, racehorse, arrow’, m. ‘eagle’, YAv. *ərəzifiīō.pərəna-* adj. ‘having eagle-feathers’, MPers. *’hwf* ‘eagle’ (= phonetically /*āluf*/), *āluh* ‘eagle’, etc. (Hübschmann 1897: 424-425; Pedersen 1924: 224b = 1982: 307b; HAB 1: 320; Schmitt 1967: 259; 1970; 1971: 178-179; Ivanov 1974: 137; Greppin 1978: 48; Xaç’aturova 1979: 356-358; Mayrhofer EWAia 1, 1992: 250-251; Balles 1997: 148-159; Mallory/Adams 1997: 173a, 191a, 194a, 469b).

Godel (1975: 76) treats *arcui* as a by-form of the original *arciw*. Arguing against this point of view, de Lamberterie (1978: 251₄₁) considers *arciw* to be analogical from gen. *arcuoy* after *t’iv*: gen. *t’woy* ‘number’, etc.

For an extensive discussion, see de Lamberterie 1978: 251-262, regarding Arm. *arcui* as an old Iranian borrowing (see s.v. *arcat* ‘silver’); see also Mawet 1983: 182, 189₁₅ with lit.

Georgian *arçiv-* is borrowed from Armenian [HAB 1: 320b; Diakonoff 1971: 82; Klimov 1993: 35]; according to Diakonoff/Starostin 1986: 45: from Armenian or Urartian.

Arm. *arcui* has also been borrowed into Urartian *Aršibini* (name of a horse), as well as theonym *Aršibedini*, the component **di-* of which is taken as borrowed from Arm. *di-k* ‘god’ (Jahukyan 1963: 133; 1967: 328₆₁; 1976: 109; 1985a: 369; 1986a: 49, 50, 54, etc.; see also A. Petrosyan 2002: 67₂₄₁; Ritter 2006: 414-415). One would like to corroborate this theory “par d’autres bons exemples” (de Lamberterie 1978: 260). Another possible example of such borrowings may be Urart. *šūā* ‘(inland) sea’ (see below).

On the other hand, Arm. *arcui* has been treated as borrowed from Urartian [D’jakonov 1983: 151₁₂] (with a strange reasoning: “since it has also been preserved

in other East Caucasian languages”) or East Caucasian (Diakonoff/Starostin 1986: 45; cf. also Nikolaev 1984: 71). The assumption on the Urartian origin of *arcui* and the scepticism on its IE origin (Diakonoff 1971: 82; 1984: 185b₂₂; 1985: 602; Greppin 1991b: 725b, 725b₅₁; for more references, see Schmitt 1972-74: 24) seem baseless to me.²⁵

Arm. *arcui* is the principal word for ‘eagle’ and largely functions in the cultural context, e.g. in a poetic figure characterizing a swift horse, whereas the Urartian is attested only as a horse-name, and there is no Hurrian match. The association between ‘eagle, kite’ and ‘swift horse’ probably goes back to the Armeno-Graeco-Indo-Aryan poetic language. In the famous epic description of the abduction by King Artašēs of the Alan princess *Sat’inik* (Movsēs Xorenac’i 2.50, 1913=1991: 179^{L3}), the horse of King Artašēs is compared with *arcui srat’ew* ‘sharp-winged eagle’, cf. Skt. *āśu-pátvā* ‘swift-flying’ as epithet of *śyená-* ‘eagle’ (cognate with Arm. *c’in* ‘kite’, see below), Gr. *ὄκυ-πέτης* ‘swift-flying’ (used of horses and hawks), *ὄκυ-πτερος* ‘swift-winged’; cf. also Av. *ərəzifiiō.parəna-* ‘eagle-feathered (arrow)’, Lat. *acci-piter* ‘hawk’, etc. (see Watkins 1995: 170-172, 252-253).

The poetic figures ‘eagle-winged’ and ‘sharp-flying as an eagle’ are attested also in other Armenian sources. Here are a few examples. In the famous Aždahak’s dream, Movsēs Xorenac’i 1.26 (1913=1991: 76^{L11f}), the dragon-riding hero was dashing with eagle’s wings: *arcuoy imm ardarew slac’eal t’ewovk’*. In a *kafa*-poem to the Alexander Romance (H. Simonyan 1989: 94^{L-1}) we find *srənt’ac’ arciv* ‘sharp-riding eagle’. The horse of the Armenian epic “Sasna crer” is flying as an *atavnik* ‘little dove’ (SasCr 1, 1936: 744^{L617}). Note also Aristakēs Lastivertc’i (Yuzbašyan 1963: 64^{L25f}).

It is remarkable that, as has been noted by de Lamberterie (1978: 261₉₂), in RV 4.38.2, etc. (Elizarenkova 1989: 404, 746; Watkins 1995: 170) the horse *Dadrikā-* is compared with *ṛjipyám śyenám*. Vedic *ṛjipyá-* is an epithet of *śyená-* ‘bird of prey, falcon, eagle’, which is cognate with Av. *saēna-* ‘a big bird of prey’, Gr. *ἰκτινος* m. ‘kite’ and Arm. *c’in* ‘kite’ (q.v.). Thus, both **rǵipio-* ‘epithet of a bird of prey’ and **tkiH-(i)no-* or **tkiH-eno-* ‘bird of prey’ belong to the Armeno-Graeco-Indo-Iranian dialect group and can be ascribed to the Armeno-Aryan poetic language (together with *arew* ‘sun’, *ji* ‘horse’, perhaps also *surb* ‘pure, holy’, see s.vv.; further see 3.2), and I see no solid reason to separate Arm. *arcui* from here and treat it as an Urartian or PECauc. borrowing.

I conclude that Arm. *arcui* regularly continues IE dial. **rǵipijo-* (as a native word or, less probably, through a very early intermediation of an Aryan branch), and the Urartian and Georgian words have been borrowed from Armenian.

That Urartian borrowed Armenian words belonging to the cultural lexicon or to the semantic field ‘physical words’ is not something unexpected. Since Msérianz 1904: 129, Arm. *cov* ‘sea’ is compared to Urart. *šúə* ‘(inland) sea’, which is interpreted as *çō(w)ə*. Many scholars consider the Armenian word to be an Urartian loanword (e.g. Łap’anc’yan 1951a: 323, 324; 1961: 137; Ivanov 1983: 37;

²⁵ According to Ĵahukyan (1988, 2: 69, 71, 81), not only the Urartian and Caucasian forms are borrowed from Armenian (see also Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 539 = 1995, 1: 457), but also the anthroponym (m., from Pahuṣa-) *Arziuta*, which is uncertain.

Diakonoff 1985: 600b; Greppin 2008: 2). However, Arm. *cov* probably belongs to the late IE language (or at least to the European substratum), compare Ir. *gó* ‘sea’ (cf. Ir. *bó* vs. Arm. *kov* ‘cow’, Stokes 1901: 191), OIc. *kaf* ‘sea’, etc. (see HAB 2: 468; Schmitt 1972-74: 25; Sausverde 1987; Gippert 1994: 121-122; Olsen 1999: 943). It therefore seems more likely that Urart. *šúā* has been borrowed from Armenian. An example of cultural armenisms in Urartian may be Urart. *burgana* ‘fortress’, possibly borrowed from Arm. *burgn* ‘tower, pyramis’, which seems to be a European substratum word, being itself a back loan from PIE (see s.v. *durgn* ‘potter’s wheel’ for more detail).

arm-anam ‘to be astounded’ (P‘awstos buzand, etc.), **z-arm-anam** ‘id.’ (Bible+), **and-armanam** ‘to be astounded, stricken with amazement; to render senseless, benumb, deaden’ (Bible+).

●ETYM Ačařyan (HAB 1: 327) derives from *armn* ‘root’ (Bible+), cf. ModArm. *p‘ayt/k‘ar ktril* ‘to be petrified’ < ‘to render wood/stone’. Although not impossible, this interpretation is not evident either, 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. *ἀρμός* ‘joint’, pl. ‘fastenings of a door’, *ἀρμύζω* ‘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 the dialects, mostly as **armunk*; a few SW peripheral dialects have preserved the older, nasal-less form **armuk(n)*: Tigranakert *ärmug*, Zeyt‘un *aymæg*, Hačən *aymug* [HAB 1: 330a; Haneyan 1978: 183a; Ačařyan 2003: 300].

●ETYM Since Hübschmann (1897: 425^{Nr59}; see also Osthoff 1898: 60; HAB 1: 329b), connected with Skt. *īrmá-* 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.; OPr. *irmo* ‘arm’, Lith. *irm-ėdė* f. ‘gout’ (literally ‘arm-eating’); SCR. *rāme* ‘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 details). It has been assumed that *armukn* is structurally closer to *y-arm-m-ar* ‘fitting’ belonging to PIE **h₂er-* ‘to fit (together), to put together’ (cf. Arm. *arnem* ‘to make, prepare, create’, q.v.; Gr. *ἀρθρον* ‘joint; limb’, *ἀρθμός* ‘union, friendship’, *ἀρμή* ‘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) reconstructs **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, namely *-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 = h⁴*; this did not colour an adjacent **o*, and therefore the **e* vocalism is to be assumed”.

Some nuances are in need of clarification. A compound like ‘arm-mouse’ (cf. ‘Arm-Maus’ in Klingenschmitt 1982: 68₁₁) does not seem very probable. It becomes easier if one mentions *mukn* ‘muscle’ and *mkan* ‘back’ rather than *mukn* ‘mouse’, although etymologically they are identical, of course. As pointed out by Olsen (1999: 681₃₈), Hübschmann was the 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 with *mukn*. We can even postulate that *armukn* is simply composed of Arm. **arm-o-* ‘arm’ and the suffix *-ukn*. This is exactly what Ačařyan (HAB 1: 329b) suggests. The structure goes parallel with *krukñ* ‘heel’ (Bible+; widespread in the dialects), probably composed of **kur* ‘*angled/curved body part, joint’ and *-ukn* (although the etymological details are unclear, 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-kñ* ‘muscle’, *un-kñ* ‘ear’, etc. [Ĵahukyan 1987: 238]; see also s.vv. *akñ* ‘eye’; *cung*, dial. **cunkñ* ‘knee’.

aršalurš-k‘, aršaluš-k‘, ašalurj-k‘ ‘the last part of the night which is followed by the dawn’, prob. ‘twilight’ (Bible+), **ač‘f/šalurj-k‘** in Movsēs Xorenac‘i 2.42 [1913=1991: 167^{L20}: *and ayganal ač‘alrjac‘n* (variants *aĵalrjoc‘n*, *ašalrjoc‘n*, *ač‘alrjoc‘n*, *aĵalrjuc‘n*, *agalrjac‘*): “at daybreak”, transl. Thomson 1978: 183]; **aršaluš** (Grigor Skewřac‘i, 12-13th cent.), **aršaloys**, **aršalus** (Martiros Ľimec‘i, Mkrtič‘ Našaš, see MiĵHayBař 1, 1987: 96a), **ašaloys**, **aršaloys** (Bařgirk‘ hayoc‘, see Amalyan 1975: 26^{Nr600}, 39^{Nr937}), ModArm. **aršaluys** ‘dawn’ [HAB 1: 330a].

●DIAL Next to Axalc‘xa *aršalus-in* ‘at dawn’, Ačařyan (HAB 1: 330b) also introduces Muš, etc. *ašmuš* ‘twilight’. The latter rather belongs with *atjamuř* ‘twilight’ (q.v.).

●ETYM Ačařyan (HAB 1: 330a) assumes that the Middle Armenian forms are due to contamination with *loys* ‘light’, which is undoubtedly correct, and posits a compound composed of *arš-* ‘beginning’ (?) and *lurj* ‘half-dark’ (q.v.). The first component remains uncertain. Later, he (HAB 4: 655-656) posits *arj(n)* ‘black’ +

lurĵ ‘blue’ (see s.vv.) comparing the compound with dial. **mut*‘(n)-*u-loys* ‘twilight’ = *mut*‘(n) ‘dark’ + *loys* ‘light’. For the atmospheric sense of *arĵn* ‘black; dark’ cf. *arĵn-a-bolor* ‘very dark’. [Alternative: **atĵ*- ‘dark, darkness’ + *lurĵ* ‘light, bright’: **atĵ-a-lurĵ-k*’ > **arĵalurĵk*’ through assimilation *tĵ...rĵ* > *rĵ...rĵ*].

Olsen (1999: 943₁₉) cautiously suggests a compound with *arus-* (in *Aruseak* ‘Venus’, cf. Pahl. *arus* ‘white’) > **arus-* (distant assimilation). This suggestion practically coincides with the etymology of Jahukyan (1981: 21; see also L. Hovhannisyán 1990: 234), who posits an unattested Middle Iranian by-form with *-š* beside YAv. *auruša-* ‘white’, cf. Skt. *aruśá-* ‘reddish, light red, glowing, fire-coloured’, etc. (see Mayrhofer EWAia 1, 1992: 113; Cheung 2002: 233-234). This etymology is slightly preferable to that of Ačařyan.

arĵ, *o*-stem: GDSg *arĵ-o-y* (Bible, Eznik Kořbac‘i), GDPl *arĵ-o-c* ‘ in the Bible (var. *arĵ-u-c* ‘) and Anania Širakac‘i (7th cent., A. G. Abrahamyan 1940: 39L3), AbIPl *y-arĵ-o-c* ‘ (Grigor Narekac‘i 67.5, Xač‘atryan/Łazinyan 1985: 519L89); *u*-stem: GDSg *arĵ-u* (Bible), GDPl *arĵ-u-c* ‘ (Agat‘angelos); *i*-stem: GDPl *arĵ-i-c* ‘ (Grigor Magistros, 11th cent.) ‘bear’.

As an asterism, attested in Anania Širakac‘i (7th cent.), see A. G. Abrahamyan 1940: 39^{L3}; 1944: 331^{L1}.

●DIAL Widespread in the dialects [HAB 1: 334b]. For Van **arĵ-a-plo* ‘ghost’ and **arĵ-a-pap-o* ‘bogy’, see s.v. **bo/u-* ‘spider, ghost’. Tigranakert *arč* ‘ refers to ‘male cat’. Here, this designation for ‘bear’ has been replaced by *ayu* of Turkish origin, found also in Polis and Nor Naxiřewan [HAB 1: 334b]. See further 2.1.36 on *tabu*.

●ETYM Since long (Klaproth 1831: 99a; NHB 1: 374b; Hübschmann 1897: 425), linked with the PIE word for ‘bear’: Gr. *ἄρκτος* f. ‘bear’, Lat. *ursus* ‘bear’, Skt. *řkṣa-* m., YAv. *arša-* m. ‘bear’, Hitt. *řartagga-* ‘bear’ or ‘wolf’, etc. [HAB 1: 334]. The word is now reconstructed as **h₂rtko-* (Schrijver 1991: 56, 68-69, 71-72; Mayrhofer EWAia 1, 1992: 247-248). Despite the troublesome *-ř-*, probably to be explained by *tabu* (see 2.1.36), the appurtenance of Arm. *arĵ* to the PIE word for ‘bear’ cannot be rejected [Meillet 1906: 8]. On a discussion of *-ř-* by Pedersen and Meillet, see 2.1.12 (on *ruki*-rule). For a further discussion and references, see Greppin 1983: 315; Clackson 1994: 233₂₆₉; Olsen 1999: 184.

An influence of *arĵn* ‘black’ has been assumed (Pokorny 1959: 875). Earlier, Scheftelowitz (1904-05, 1: 293, 2: 17) had connected *arĵ* ‘bear’ with *arĵar* ‘cattle’ and *arĵn* ‘black’ (see s.vv.). Winter (1997) analyzes *arĵ* as an original feminine in **-ih₂-* seen in Skt. *řkṣī-* ‘she-bear’, thus assuming **-rtĵi-* > *-rĵ*.

The IE cognate forms of this word for ‘bear’ appear also as the asterism *Ursa Maior* and *Minor* (see Scherer 1953: 131-134, 139, 176-178). For the Armenian equivalent, see above.

arĵar, *o*-stem (paradigm abundantly attested in the Bible, see Astuacaturean 1895: 231bc); *a*-stem: GDPl *arĵar-a-c* ‘ in Eznik Kořbac‘i (5th cent., but the form is considered an emendation, HAB 1: 335a) and Yovhannēs Draxanakertc‘i (9-10th cent.) ‘cattle’.

An illustration of the semantics: Isaiah 7.21: *erinĵ mi yarĵaroc* ‘ : *δάμαλιν βοῶν*. Arm. *arĵar* corresponds to Gr. *βοῶς* and clearly refers to ‘neat, bovid, any bovine

animal' as a generic term, whereas *erinj* renders $\delta\acute{\alpha}\mu\text{-}\alpha\lambda\iota\varsigma$ 'young cow' and, in this context, refers to one young cow taken from/of bovids.

●DIAL Nor Bayazet *arč'ar*, Marala *arč'ar* (with preservation of the medial *-r*), Hamšen, Nor Naxijewan, Šamaxi, Juła *ač'ar*, Muš, Alaškert, Ozim *ačar*, etc., all meaning 'male calf of two years, young bullock that has not yet been yoked' [HAB 1: 335a]. The medial *-ä-* in Moks *ačär*, gen. *-u* 'бык, двухгодовалый, еще не холощенный' [Orbeli 2002: 201], Šatax *ačär* 'a bull of two to three years' [M. Muradyan 1962: 83, 193a], Van *äčär* [Ačaryan 1952: 248], and Mužambar (T'avriz) *ađer* [HAB 1: 335a], is due to Ačaryan's Law (see 2.1.39.2).

●ETYM Ačaryan (HAB 1: 335a) rejects all the etymological suggestions and leaves the origin of the word open. It is still considered of unknown etymology [Jahukyan 1990: 71; Olsen 1999: 938]. However, the derivation from *arj-n* 'black' (Scheftelowitz 1904-05, 1: 293, 2: 17; see s.v. *arjn* 'black' and *arj* 'bear') is possible; for the semantics cf. Skt. *babhru-* 'a reddish-brown cow', Arm. dial. *borek* 'a dark-complexioned cow', OHG *bero* 'bear', etc. (see s.v. **bor* 'brown animal'). For *-ar* cf. *kayt-ar* 'vivid, agile; animal' (Jahukyan 1987: 129, 173), *payc-ar* 'bright' (vs. dial. **payc* 'spark; shine', cf. Ačarean 1913: 908ab), etc. For other examples and a discussion of *-ar*, see Greppin 1975: 50-51.

Some resembling forms are found in East Caucasian languages: Andi *Rajč'* 'calf', etc. (see Starostin 1985: 76^{Nr4} for the forms). According to Jahukyan (1987: 613), they have been borrowed from Armenian.

arjasp (spelled also *arjasp*), *i-* and *a-*stem in HHB, *o-*stem in NHB; the following forms are attested: ISg *arjasp-o-v* in Yovhannēs Erzncac'i (Pluz), 13th cent.; *arjaspn*, AblSg *y-arjaspn-ē* in Mxit'ar Aparanc'i (15th cent.), compounds with *arj(a)spn-a-* (see HAB 335a; MijHayBař 1, 1987: 97a) '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 *arčäsp*, Salmast *ärčasp*, Ozim *arjaps*, Muš *arčaps* [HAB 1: 335b; Ačaryan 1952: 248], Šatax *arčäps* [M. Muradyan 1962: 64, 193a]. According to Orbeli (2002: 208), also Moks has metathesized forms: *arčäp's, arčäfs* "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]. Ačaryan (HAB 1: 335ab) accepts this and compares Lat. *āter* 'black' > *ātramentum* 'writing-ink; blacking', noting that the component **asp* is unknown. See also Jahukyan 1981: 21-22; 1987: 517, 609. Georgian *arjasp'i* and Tušian *arjam* 'vitriol' are considered Armenian loans (see HAB 1: 335b).

Since Arm. *arjasp(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', Khwar. *'spny* 'iron', Av. **hu-safna-* 'steel', a metathesized form from **hu-spana-*, Oss. *æfsæn* 'ploughshare; iron', Pahl. *āsin, āsen* and Pers. *āhan* 'iron' (< **ā-sana*), etc., from Iran. **spana-* < Ar. **suana-* (see

Abaev 1963; 1985: 12-13; Danka/Witczak 1997; Cheung 2002: 156-157). Abaev (ibid.) compares the Iranian word with Gr. *κόρανος* ‘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.vv. *arāspel* ‘myth, tale, fable’ and *arastat* ‘ceiling’) or **ā-span-*. The form *arjaspn* should be considered original, so that we are dealing with loss of the final *-n* in the 7th century.

arjn ‘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: 32L-2; transl. Garsoïan 1989: 87): *yankarcōrēn jiwnn c‘amak‘ arjn linēr araji nora* : “the snow suddenly became black earth before him”. Greppin (1983: 316) sees here a compound *c‘amak‘-arjn* ‘utterly black’. Also found in several compounds (see also MijHayBař 1, 1987: 97a). See also s.v. *arjasp(n)* ‘vitriol’.

The compound *arjn-a-bolor* ‘very dark’ refers to the night in Čarəntir (see NHB 1: 375a) and is the only case in NHB where *arjn* appears in the atmospheric sense.

●DIAL No dialectal forms of *arjn* are recorded in HAB 1: 336b.

I wonder whether Van **arj-a-plo* and **arj-a-pap-o* ‘bogy’ contain *arjn* ‘black’ or *arj* ‘bear’ (see s.v. **bo/u-* ‘spider; ghost’).

●ETYM Scheftelowitz (1904-05, 1: 293, 2: 17) connects *arjn* ‘black’ with *arj* ‘bear’ and *arjar* ‘cattle’ and links them with Gr. *ὄρφνός* ‘dark, murky’, *ὄρφνη* f. ‘darkness, murk, night’, *ὄρφν-αῖος* ‘dark, murky’, *ὄρφν-ινος* ‘dark colour, dark red’. The appurtenance of the Greek word to *ἔρεβος* ‘the dark of the underworld’ (see s.v. *erek* ‘evening’) and Toch. B *erkent-* ‘black’ is uncertain (see Pokorny 1959: 334, 857; Frisk s.vv.; Adams 1999: 95). Theoretically, Arm. *arj-* should reflect QIE **Hrg^{wh}-e-*, **Hrd^h-j-*, or **Hr-j-*, thus a direct connection with *erek*, etc. is hardly possible. Arm. *arj-n* and Gr. *ὄρφ-v-* may reflect **h₃rg^{wh}-(e)n-*. One might think of an Iranian mediation, cf. Khot. *rrāša* ‘dark-coloured’, etc. (Bailey 1979: 362; Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 424), or OAv. *rajiš-* n. ‘darkness’ (Mayrhofer op. cit. 426), but this is less probable. The inner-Armenian relation with *arj* ‘bear’ and *arjar* ‘cattle’ is possible.

Ačarıyan (HAB 1: 335-336; cf. AčarHLPatm 1, 1940: 181) connects Arm. *arjn* ‘black’ with **atj-* and **att-* ‘dark’ and assumes a borrowing from North Caucasian languages: Chechen *ärzi*, Ingush *arji*, Tušian *arji*, ‘arči ‘black’, etc. (cf. Greppin 1983: 315-316). These are considered of Iranian origin (see Jahukyan 1981: 21-22; 1987: 517, 609). The appurtenance of **atj-* and **att-* is improbable (see s.v. **atj-*).

art, *o*-stem ‘cornfield, tilled field’ (Bible+). In Psalms 106.37 (API *art-s*) renders Gr. *ἀγρός* ‘field’. It occurs with the synonymous *agarak* (q.v.) in Isaiah 27.4: *pahel zoč artoy yagarakı* : *φυλάσσειν καλὰμην ἐν ἀγρῶ*. 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 hetefatin ar vayr mi hangč‘el, ur ew hnjołk‘n artorayoc‘n šurj ztefōk‘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 the dialects. All the dialectal material (including also derivatives and compounds; see Ačařean 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 corroborated by endless illustrations from folklore, whereas one can hardly find unambiguous evidence for the meaning ‘uncultivated field’. Here are some examples.

Moks *art/art* is glossed by ‘поле, нива, пашня’ in Orbeli 2002: 205. Textual illustrations: *art vārəc* ‘in “вспахали поле” (58^{L-7}, transl. 133); *taran c’anic* ‘in *artə^f meč*’ “понесли, посеяли на ниве” (59^{L2f}, transl. 134); *art xaser er; məřakun esac*’: ‘*k’anä art ənjə^f*’ – “Поле поспело, он сказал батраку: ‘пойди сожни поле”” (80^{L6f}, transl. 152).

For attestations with a clear reference to ploughing or sowing or mowing/harvesting, see e.g. HŽHek’ 6, 1973 (Łarabal/Tavuř 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* ‘drauřen, im Freien, auřenhalb’ from *laukas* ‘field’. Ačařyan (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 **h₂eǵ-ro-* (cf. also Skt. *ājra-* m. ‘field, plain’, Lat. *ager* m. ‘field’, etc.) would yield **harc-*. The absence of the initial *h-* may be due to the influence of etymologically related *acem* ‘to lead’ and *acu* ‘garden-bed, kitchen-garden’ which probably reflect **h₂ǵ-* (see s.vv.). The QIE (analogical) proto-form of Arm. *art* might then have been **h₂ǵro-*. On the semantics and the problem of derivation of **h₂eǵ-ro-* from **h₂eǵ-* ‘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 **meǵ^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)rHǵ-* ‘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 **h₂ǵro-*): **-rHǵ-* or **Hǵr-* > Arm. **art*. It is difficult to ascertain, however, whether or not the neighbouring **r* and **H* played a role here. 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 the (alleged) Semitic parallels and Sumer. *agar* ‘field’, see Levin 1995: 86-93. Compare Arm. *agarak* ‘landed property, estate’ (q.v.).

Greppin (1991b: 724b) rejects the IE origin of Arm. *art* and treats it as a loan from Urart. *ardi-ne* ‘town’, Hurr. *arde* ‘id.’, cf. Chechen *urd* ‘peasant’s share of land’, Ingush *urd* ‘district’. This is semantically improbable. Nikolaev 1984: 70 considers *art* a NCAuc. loanword.

artawsr (uninflected), NPl **artasu-k**’, *a*-stem (GDPl *artasu-a-c*’) ‘tear’ (Bible+).

●DIAL Ubiquitous in the dialects, all reflecting **artasu-n-k*’ [HAB 1: 345a].

●ETYM Since Hübschmann (1897: 425-426; see also HAB 1: 344-345; Greppin 1983: 316-317), derived from the PIE word for ‘tear’: Gr. *δάκρυ* n., OHG *zahar* (beside *trahan*), etc., and without the initial consonants: Skt. *ásru-* n., YAv. *asrū-* n. pl., Lith. *āšara*, *ašarà* 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 **drāku-h₂*, see Clackson 1994: 47-48, 208₅₂, 229₂₀₂; Olsen 1999: 167-168.

Klingenschmitt (1982: 153-154 ; see also Hamp 1984: 198; Viredaz 2001-02: 29) treats the *-w-* of *artawsr* as an “*u*-Epenthese nach betontem *a* der ursprünglichen Pänultima”, thus: *artawsr* ‘tear’ < **drākūr* vs. *artasu-k*’ (pl.); see also Olsen 1984: 113. A better alternative is suggested by Kortlandt (1985a = 2003: 60-62) who reconstructs the following paradigm: sg. **drākru-* > **artawr* (cf. *mawru-k*’ ‘beard’ next to Skt. *śmāsru-* n. ‘beard’), pl. **drāku-* > *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, eļjeru, ayc ew k’ats, arn 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 only has *erēs* (API) *bazum* ‘many kinds of deer’; see A. G. Abrahamyan 1944: 349. As *arn* means ‘wild male sheep’, it seems that the pair *arn* 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; Hewsens 1992: 153₁₈]. This seems attractive, since there are some other designations of female animals formed with the suffix *-i* < **-ieh₂-*, see s.vv. *-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. Ačařyan (HAB 1: 343) mentions this interpretation without comments and leaves the origin of *arti(k)* open.

In view of the idea that at 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 *ájpioç* ‘wild’ < *ájpoç* ‘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 sheep’ in the epic “Sasna crer”. Note in Psalms 103[104].11 [Rahlfs 1931: 258]: *τὰ θηρία τοῦ άγροῦ* ‘wild animals’, literally ‘beasts of the field’; see Dahood 1970: 38. Cf. also Hitt. *gimraš huitar* ‘animals of the fields’ [Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 469]. Further, see 3.5.2.3.

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. *ájpioç* ‘wild’, which is etymologically related. However, one cannot be sure whether we are dealing with the suffix *-i* derived from **-io-* (cf. *kogi*, *-woy*, *-wov* ‘butter’ : Skt. *gávya-*, *gavyá-* ‘aus Rindern bestehend’, etc.) or **-ieh₂-* (cf. **h₁oiHu-ieh₂* > *aygi*, *-woy*, *-eac* ‘grape-vine; grape-garden’, etc.) unless new evidence is found. The above-mentioned parallel *vayr-i* represents the latter type, 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 (Larabař) lit.: “a dog that wanders in *art*”, refers to an indecent, wandering, undomesticated woman;

arti xoroz (Sebastia) ‘dragon-fly’, lit. “rooster of *art*” (cf. Lat. *agrion virgo* ‘damsel-fly’);

arti muk (dialectal area not indicated) ‘field-mouse’.

Note also in a curse: *tunt-telt art alla* ‘may your house and place become field/wilderness’.

ark‘ay, *i*-stem ‘king’ (Bible+).

More than a 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. *árhoç* m. ‘leader’, *árhoğ* f. ‘beginning, origin’, *árhoyn*, *-ovtoç* m. ‘commander,

archon', *ἀρχω* 'to be the first' (see HAB 1: 346-347; Ačařyan himself rejects the etymology). Ĵahukyan (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. A similar form has been reconstructed by Klingenschmitt (1974: 274₁; see also Matzinger 2000: 288₂₇; Vine 2005: 260) for Gr. *ἀρχω*, deriving it from a root to which *ἀριστος* 'the best, first, noblest' belongs. This is semantically plausible, but the formal objection concerning the Armenian form remains valid.

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 (StuHetaz 1908: 152a) compares Arm. *cařay* '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. *γέρον* 'old man' (see s.v. *cer* 'old').

According to Ačařyan (1913: 155b; not in HAB 1: 347a), Gr. *ἀρχ-* 'to begin' can be connected with Łarabał **arc* 'the beginning of a weaving', **arc'el* 'to begin weaving' from older **arj-*. For the phonological correspondence, cf. Arm. *orj* > Łarabał *værc* '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 period.²⁶

awaz, *o*-stem (later also ISg *-aw*) 'sand; dust' (Bible+).

●DIAL Widespread in the dialects. Łarabał has *hávaz*, with an initial *h-* [HAB 1: 351b; Davt'yan 1966: 322].

●ETYM Connected with Gr. *ἄμμος* 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 AčařHLPatm 2, 1951: 411 (with a question mark); N. Simonyan 1979: 211, 213 (sceptical).

However, the connection of Arm. *awaz* is often considered uncertain (see Greppin 1983: 317-318; 1989: 167; Beekes apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 499b). For the problem of *z*, see also s.v. *eżr* 'edge'. In my view, *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,

²⁶ I wonder if Melri *hārg aril* 'to finish, make an end' (recorded in Ałayan 1954: 312, in the glossary of dialectal words) reflects **y-arg* '(at/in) end'.

Badewanne, Taufbecken' (Bible+), which has probably been borrowed from the same Iranian word through Syriac (*avzānā* 'font = Taufbecken') mediation; 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, Jähukyan 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 Ačārean 1902: 210). Even if not, a contamination seems probable, cf. Ĵuła *havizaran* 'font = Taufbecken' next to *hɔvz* 'garden-basin' (see HAB 1: 352b; Ačāryan 1940: 355a). The initial *h*- in Łarabał *hávaz* 'sand' may also be explained in a more or less similar way. We arrive, then, at a theoretically possible form **ha/ovzan*, which can indirectly be corroborated by Arm. *hnjan* 'wine-press' (q.v.).

awd₁, *o*- and *i*-stem 'footwear' (John Chrysostom, Romance of Alexander, etc.). For the generic semantics 'footwear' 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 kawšak* '“for footwear they use a form of boot”'.

●ETYM Apparently related to Lith. *aũtas* 'foot-cloth, rag', Latv. *àuts* 'cloth, bandage' [HAB 4: 607b-608a; Jähukyan 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. *aũti*, OCS *obuti*, Lat. *induere*. Note also Umbr. *anouihimu* 'an sich nehmen, sich (etwas) anlegen, anziehen' < **an-* + verbal stem **oy-ē-* or **oy-ī-* "mit der Wz. **ə₁e₂-* oder **ə₃e₂-* '(Bekleidung) anziehen'" [Untermann 2000: 112].

Arm. *awd* goes back to QIE **H(V)u-d^h*. Av. *aodra-* 'footwear' hardly bears testimony for the voiced aspirated suffixal element, most probably reflecting **Hou-tleh₂-* (cf. Lat. *subūcula* 'woolen undertunic', Lith. *aũklė* 'shoe-lace, cord, foot-cloth', etc.; see Mallory/Adams 1997: 109a). It has been assumed that Arm. *awd* contains the suffix **-d^h*- 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 **-d^h*- (see s.v. *ayrem* 'to burn'). The same also holds for *awd* 'air' (q.v.).

awd₂, *o*-stem: GDSg *awd-o-y*, ISg *awd-o-v*, GDPl *awd-o-c* 'in the Bible (Astuacatu-rean 1895: 1554), Hexaemeron (K. Muradyan 1984: 43^{L2f}, 195^{L6}), frequent in "Yalags 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, Ĵuła, 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], Łarabał *hɔt'k'* (erroneously printed *čɔt'k'*, see HAB-Add 1982: 19) < **y-ōd-k'* 'the warm breath/expiration of the mouth' [Ačārean 1913: 807a; HAB 4: 609a]. Ĵuła *h'ɔt'* (see Ačārean 1940: 98-99, 161, 390) may continue the prefix *y-* 'in' seen in the reflex of the Łarabał form. This by-form **y-awd* would have basically meant 'inhalation' with a subsequent development to 'breath'.

The compound **bal-ōd* preserved in Bulanəx *b‘alət‘* ‘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. *ἄημι*, etc.) ‘to blow’ (see HAB 4: 608-609). Patrubány (StugHetaz 1908: 214b) points to the dental determinative **-t-* found in Gr. *ἄτμη* f., *ἄτμην*, *-ένοσ* m. ‘breath; scent’. Petersson (1920: 66) reconstructs **aud^ho-* comparing Lith. *áudra*, *audrà* ‘storm (usually accompanied by rain or snow)’ < **aud^h-rā-*, OIc. *veðr* 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 word is considered uncertain (see Cheung 2002: 233). On the Armenian form, Cheung (ibid.) notes: “borrowing?”.

The reconstruction **aud^ho-* (= **h₂eu(h₁)-d^ho-*) is commonly accepted [HAB 4: 608; Jähukyan 1982: 48]. Olsen (1999: 56) points out that a relation of 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*, *audrà* ‘storm’, etc. are related, they may contain **-d^h-* (as the above-mentioned Germanic forms) rather than **-d-*, providing us with more evidence for the reconstruction **h₂eu(h₁)-d^h-*. For the problem of the internal laryngeal, see 2.1.20.

One may reconstruct a neuter *s*-stem **h₂eu^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’.

awt‘, *i*-stem, GDSg *awt‘-i* (Ezekiel 23.17 = *καταλύοντων*), GDPI *awt‘-i-c‘* (Movsēs Xorenac‘i 1.16) ‘sleeping place, lodging place, spending the night; evening, night’ (Bible+), *awt‘ev/wan* < **awt‘i-a-van* or *-awan* ‘lodging place, inn’ (Bible+); **erek-awt‘**, *i*-stem: IPI *erekawt‘-i-w-k‘* ‘passing the night’ (Agat‘angelos, Movsēs Xorenac‘i, etc.); **awt‘-ek** and **awt‘-ekan** ‘stale, food which remained from a previous day’ (Canon Law, see Weitenberg 1996: 99, 1156); deverbative verb **awt‘em** or **awt‘im**, imper. *awt‘ea* ‘to spend the night’ (Yovhannēs Ōjniec‘i, Gregory of Nyssa, etc.); compound verbs **awt‘-aganim**, etc. (Bible+), with *aganim* ‘to spend the night’

GDPI *awt‘-i-c‘* is attested in Movsēs Xorenac‘i 1.16 (1913= 1991: 54^{L9f}; transl. Thomson 1978: 101): *pēs pēs tačars ew seneaks ōt‘ic‘ ew tuns ganjuc‘* ‘various temples and chambers and treasure houses’ (see s.v. *anjaw* for the full passage).

IPI *erek-awt‘-i-w-k‘* is found in Movsēs Xorenac‘i 2.66 (1913= 1991: 202^{L1f}; transl. Thomson 1978: 213): *əndunic‘in hiwrk‘ erekōt‘iwk‘* ‘be received as guests for the night’. Further attestations of this compound: *erekōt‘s arareal* and *ōt‘evans narareal* (in Patmut‘iwn srboč‘ Hrip‘simeanc‘, see MovsXorenMaten 1865: 300^{L13} and 301^{L4f}, respectively); *ew and erekawt‘s arareal* in Yovhan Mamikonean (A. Abrahamyan 1941: 113^{L2}).

For the attestations of a compound with *c'ayg* 'night', *c'ayg-awt'*, see in the addendum apud NHB 2: 1059c²⁷.

In the late medieval dictionary *Barġirk' hayoc'* we find *arōt'* glossed as *minč'ew erekoy* 'till the night' (Amalyan 1975: 32^{Nr759}), which is correctly interpreted by Ĵahukyan 1976a: 41 as composed of *ar'* 'at, by, to, before' and *awt'* 'spending the night, evening, night'.

●DIAL The verb *awt'il* 'to spend the night' is present in Akn *ot'il* [HAB 4: 610b]. An illustration of imperative *ot'ε* (cf. the literary *awt'ea*) can be found in an incantation (Čanikean 1895: 167; S. Harut'yunyan 2006: 153^{Nr205A}): *S. Sargis, mer tunā ot'ε* "S. Sargis, spend the night in our house".

Under the entry *awt'ek(an)* 'stale, food which remained from a previous day' NHB 2: 1024a records dial. *ōt'eki kerakur* 'yesterday's food, stale food'. This form is identical with Mehri *ōt'ek'* 'id.' (Ałayan 1954: 291a, cf. 336; Weitenberg 1996: 99); cf. Łarabał *ōt'ε/i* [HAB 4: 610b; Davt'yan 1966: 501], Hadrut' *ot'ε* [A. Połosyan 1965: 31], Goris *ot'i* [Margaryan 1975: 501a]. Note also Łazax *ot'ānal* 'to become stale, old' [HAB 4: 610b], which is formally identical with *awt'anal* attested in Yovhannēs Draxanakerc'i as a reading variant (see NHB 2: 1023c).

Durean 1933: 114 records an illness caused by the demon (*dew*) called *gišerōt'ik*, lit. 'who dwells/lodges in the night'.

●ETYM A **-ti-* derivative of *ag-* 'to spend the night' (Müller 1890: 8; Bugge 1892: 446; Hübschmann 1897: 411-412 with hesitation; HAB 4: 610; Schmitt 1981: 52, 54_H).

The underlying PIE verb seems to be found exclusively with **-s-*, thus **h₂ues-*. A QIE **h₂(e)us-ti-* would yield Arm. **awsti-*. One may therefore assume an inner-Armenian formation with PArm. **aw(s)-* or **ag-* (< **h₂(e)us-*) and the suffix **-ti-* which remained productive in different stages of Armenian. Further see s.v. *aganim* 'to spend the night'.

awt'-oc', *a*-stem (GDPl *awt'oc'-ac'* in Plato) 'cover, coat, garment; blanket' (Bible+).

●ETYM Related with *ag-anim* 'to put on' and *awd* 'shoes' (q.v.), cf. Lith. *aūtas* 'foot-cloth, rag', *aūti* 'to put on footwear', Latv. *āuts* 'cloth, bandage' [Ačāfean 1908: 121a; Lidén 1933: 41; HAB 4: 609b]. From IE **H(V)u-to-* (see Olsen 1999: 536).

awcanem, 3.sg.act *awc*, imper. *awc*, 3.sg.pass. *awc-a-w*, etc. 'to anoint; to cover by a thin layer of gold, etc.' (Bible+), also with *z-* (Bible+); **awcem**, imper. *awcea* 'to anoint' (Ephrem+), **awc** 'anointment, unguent' (Paterica, etc.; cf. dial. Marala).

●DIAL The verbal forms **ōcel* (widespread) and **ōcanel* (T'iflis, Muš, Svedia, Zeyt'un, Ĵula, Salmast) are considered literary loans. The noun *ōc* 'anointment, unguent' is present in Marala. Note also Van **ōc-uk* 'baptized, anointed; Armenian' [HAB 4: 611b].

Zeyt'un presents structural and semantic contrast: *uznel* 'to smear, grease' < *ōcanel* vs. *ujil* 'to anoint, baptize' < *ōcel* (Ačāryan 2003: 143, 344).

²⁷ The **awt'* is not to be equated with the suffix *-awt'* in *alawt'* 'prayer', *amawt'* 'shame', etc., as in Greppin 1975: 66; 1986: 289.

●ETYM Since Windischmann, etc. (see HAB 4: 611), connected with Skt. *añj-* 'to anoint, smear', pres. VII 3sg.act. *anákti*, 3pl.act. *añjánti*, *añjas-* n. 'anointment', *añjana-* n. 'ointment, fat', Lat. *unguere* 'to anoint', OIr. *imb* 'butter' and Bret. *amann* 'id.' from Celt. **amban* < **h₃ng^w-n* (see Schrijver 1991: 50, 62; 1995: 351), OHG *ancho* 'butter', etc.

The Armenian form is explained by a transfer nasal infix > nasal suffix and a phonological development **ng^w-* (**h₃ng^w-*) > **Hn^wg-* > **auġ-*, see Meillet 1892a: 59; 1936: 37, 44, 106-107; Hübschmann 1897: 426; Pedersen 1906: 358, 409 = 1982: 136, 187; HAB 4: 611; Dumézil 1938a: 100-101; Pokorny 1959: 779; Hamp 1975; Ĵahukyan 1982: 178-180; Klingenschmitt 1982: 164-229 (on *awcanem*: 180-182); Ravnæs 1991: 12, 40-41; Clackson 1994: 84-85. For further references and a discussion, see s.v. *awj* 'snake' and 2.1.27.1.

awj, *i*-stem: GDSg *awj-i*, GDPl *awj-i-c'*, AblSg *y-awj-i-c'* 'snake' (Bible+).

●DIAL Dialectally ubiquitous [HAB 4: 612b]. For Łarabał *ɔxcə*, etc., see Weitenberg 1996: 94ff.

●ETYM Since long (NHB, Windischmann, etc., see HAB 4: 612), connected with Lat. *anguis* m.f. 'snake', Lith. *angis* f. 'snake', etc. One assumes a development PIE **ang^{wh}-i-* (read **h₂eng^{wh}-i-*) > PArm. **an^wgi* > **awġ^hi* (with **g^h* > **ġ^h* before **u/w*) > **awj-i-*, see Hübschmann 1877: 26; 1897: 426; Meillet 1892a: 59; 1936: 154; HAB 4: 611-612; Dumézil 1938a: 100; Pisani 1950: 191; Pokorny 1959: 43; Ĵahukyan 1982: 43, 57; Ravnæs 1991: 40-41; Clackson 1994: 54, 107-108; Olsen 1999: 78²⁸. For this development, see 2.1.27.1. In this particular case, the involving of the tabu (HAB 4: 612a; AčarLiak 6, 1971: 722; Ĵahukyan 1992: 21; see on tabu 2.1.36) is unnecessary because the phonological explanation is satisfactory.

This development has taken place probably only in zero grade (see Beekes 2003: 204-205, 208-209; cf. Kortlandt 1980: 99 = 2003: 27), cf. OHG *unc* 'snake' < PGerm. **ung-* < IE **h₂ng^{wh}-* (see Schrijver 1991: 43-44, 60; for a discussion, see also Lubotsky 1988: 29). The full-grade **h₂eng^h-* would yield **hanj-*.

For a further discussion, see s.v. *iž*, *i*-stem 'viper' which belongs to the nasalless PIE by-form of 'snake' reflected in Skt. *áhi-* m. 'snake, adder', YAv. *aži-* m. 'snake, dragon', Gr. *ὄφις* 'snake', *ἔχις* m.f. 'adder', etc. (see Mayrhofer EWAia 1, 1992: 156). For an extensive treatment of the PIE word for 'snake', see Katz 1998. See also s.v. *əngtay* prob. 'eel'.

The remarkable resemblance of Arm. *awj* with Toch. B *auk* 'snake, serpent' (see Pisani 1941-42: 180-182; 1950: 188, 191-192) has probably been resulted from convergent developments; cf. Adams 1999: 129-130: **h₁óg^{wh}i-* > PToch. **ekw* > **ewk* (metathesis).

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 Andreatyan (1967: 389b), Svedia *anjānāk'* represents ClArm. *awjik'*. Note also K'esab *anjnek*, glossed by *ōjik'* [HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 63b].

²⁸ Perhaps old HD nom. **-ōi* can also be taken into consideration.

●ETYM No etymology is accepted in HAB 4: 612b.

Adontz (1937: 10; see also Pisani 1950: 188-192) connects with Gr. *ἀγχίην*, *-ένος* m. ‘neck, throat; isthmus’ (Il.), Aeol. literary *ἄμωην*, *-ενος* ‘neck’. The relationship between these words has been disputed. The following solutions have been proposed: (1) all the three words are derived 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. *ἄμωην* 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 a discussion, I refer to Morani 1981; 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].

De Lagarde (1854: 26^{L682}) and Scheftelowitz (1927: 249) connected Arm. *viz* (< **vēg^h-*) ‘neck’, gen. *vz-i*, with Gr. *ἀγχίην*. This etymology is largely forgotten, and *viz* is still considered to be a word of unknown origin [HAB 4: 337-338; Jahukyan 1990: 71, sem. field 4]. However, it is worth of consideration. Note also dial. **xiz-* in Agulis *xáyzak* ‘back of the head’, and, in compounds, **xiz* or **xuz* in Łarabał, etc., **xoyz* or **xiwz* in Ĵula **xuz-a-tak*. See s.v. *viz*.

I tentatively suggest to treat Gr. *ἀγχίην* 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 can be represented as NSg **h₂uēg^h-*, obl. **h₂uǵ^h-*. The form **h₂uǵ^h-* (>> **h₂wǵ^h-*, with **-w-* analogical after the nominative) would explain Arm. *awj-i-k’* (perhaps also dial. **xuz*, via an unknown language) whereas nom. **h₂uēg^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 pharyngeal fricative (an unattested Anatolian form?), something like **huēz*, may be responsible for **xiz* and **xoyz*. For the vocalic fluctuation, cf. *višap* : **yušap* ‘dragon’, etc. See also s.vv. *yogn-*, *xonj* ‘tired’.

The relation with Aeol. *ἄμωην*, *-ενος* ‘neck’ remains unclear. It is tempting to derive it from **ang^{wh}-en-* connecting with Arm. dial. (Svedia, K‘esab) **anj-Vn-*. Arm. *j* points to **ǵ^h*, however. One may tentatively reconstruct the following paradigm: nom. **h₂éng^{wh}-*, obl. **h₂ng^{wh}-*; the latter (zero grade) developed into **h₂n^wǵ^{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. *ἄμωην* and Arm. **anjVn-*. Arm. *-j-* is analogical after **awj-*. This is reminiscent of Arm. *acut* ‘coal’ < **aucúto-* from **h₁(o)ng^w-ōl-o-* (cf. Skt. *āngāra-*, etc.) vs. dial. **anjoł* (see s.v. *acut* ‘coal’). If Gr. *ἄμωην* and Arm. **anjVn-* are not related to Gr. *ἀγχίην* and Arm. *awji-k’*, Arm. *j* can be explained by contamination.

awti (GDSg *awtwoy* in NHB 2: 1027b, but without references) ‘a strong fermented drink, intoxicating beverage’ (Bible+); in Modern Armenian = *arat* and Russ. *vódka*.

In Judges 13.4,7,14 and Luke 1.15: *gini ew awti* : *οἶνον καὶ σίκερα*.

Later: **uti** in Knik‘ hawatoy(Seal of Faith), 7th cent.; **awti** in “Girk‘ t‘it‘oc” [HAB 4: 613a]. Compounds in Canon Law: *ambraw-awti* (with *ambraw* ‘date’) and *metr-awti* (with *metr* ‘honey’).

The actual source of the compound **gar-awti** ‘beer’, lit. ‘barley-liquor’ (Malxaseanc‘ HBB 1: 416b; mentioned also by Mann, 1963: 4, 33, without any reference) is unknown to me.

● ЕТҮМ Ача́ryan (1908: 121a) compares *awti* with Balto-Slavic and Germanic words for ‘beer’ (cf. Lith. *alūs* ‘beer’, etc.) but notes that the relationship is uncertain. He is also sceptical in HAB 4: 613b. The same comparison has independently been proposed by Mann (1963: 4, 33; see also Toporov, PrJaz A-D, 1975: 80), who derives *awti* from **oluijo-* or **aluijo-*. These forms would yield Arm. **otgi* or **atgi*, however. Olsen (1999: 443, 799) suggests a better analysis: *(*h*)*alu-* > Arm. **awt-* + derivational suffix **-io-* or **-iah₂-* > *-i*. The sound change **alu-* > Arm. **awt-* may be due to *w*-epenthesis [Beekes 2003: 205] or, perhaps better, metathesis.

Ѓahukyan (1990: 71, sem. field 5) considers *awti* to be a word of unknown origin. In my view, the above etymology is worth of consideration, and *awti* is best derived from **alut-* + *-i*. It must be emphasized that (1) the words that belong here refer not only to ‘beer’, but also to ‘a strong fermented drink’, ‘mead’, etc. (note especially that both Arm. *awti* and Russ. CS *оль* correspond to Gr. *σίκερα* ‘a kind of fermented drink’); (2) they point to **alut-*: Oss. *æluton* ‘a kind of beer’, Georg. (*a*)*ludi* ‘beer’, PSlav. **оль* ‘a kind of fermented drink’, Russ. CS *оль* ‘хмельной напиток из ржи, ячменя и т.п.’, OPr. *alu* ‘mead’, OEngl. *ealu(b)*, Engl. *ale* ‘beer’, Finn. *olut* (prob. from Germ.) ‘beer’ (see Abaev 1949: 338-347; 1964: 96; 1965: 11, 63; Pokorny 1959: 33-34; Otrębski 1966: 51-52; Dumézil 1967a: 30; Toporov, PrJaz A-D, 1975: 79-81; Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 932 = 1995: 825; Хаҷ’aturova 1987; Mallory/Adams 1997: 60; ЁtimSlovSlavJaz 32, 2005: 76, 80-81).²⁹

***awn** ‘property’, only gen. *awn-o-y* found in the compound *awnoy-tēr* ‘lord of property, proprietor, owner’ in Agat’angelos § 376 (emended as *aygwoy tēr* ‘Lord of the vineyard’ in 1909=1980: 188L15 and Thomson 2001: 108) and John Chrysostom; ‘legitimate husband of a woman’ (Yačaxapatum); MidArm. *unetēr* ‘owner’ (Law Code by Smbat Sparapet); unclear is *ger-awneal* corresponding to Gr. *ἐπιπολάζων*.

For a philological analysis, see Norayr Biwzandac’i 1911: 168; HAB 1: 361-362; Lindeman 1978-79: 41₂; Greppin 1983: 321-322.

MidArm. *unetēr* ‘owner’ may contain *un-* ‘to take, have’, MidArm. ‘to possess’ (q.v.).

● DIAL No dialectal record in HAB 1: 362a.

It is unclear whether *hən/yən/ən* ‘individual share of a mower’ (Amatuni 1912: 401-402; Ačarean 1913: 667; M. Asatryan 1962: 224b) belongs here and reflects **hawn*, *(*y*)*awn*.

● ЕТҮМ Ача́ryan (HAB 1: 361-362) connects *awn* with Skt. *āpnas-* n. ‘produce, property, possession’, YAv. *afnāy^vhant-* ‘rich in property’, Gr. *ὄμπνη* ‘food, corn’, *ὄμπν(ε)ιος* ‘pertaining to corn, nutritious, fruitful’, OIc. *efni* ‘material, goods’, *efna* ‘to carry out, work’, Lat. *opēs* f. pl. ‘wealth; resources, assistance’, etc. (see also Ałabekyan 1979: 58; hesitantly Ĵahukyan 1987: 141, 267).

This PIE etymon may be linked with **h₃ep-*: Skt. *āpas-* n. ‘work, action’, Lat. *opus*, *-eris* n. ‘work, effort’, *opulentus* ‘wealthy; abounding with resources; sumptuous’, *opulentia* ‘riches, wealth; sumptuousness’, OHG *uoben* ‘to start to work, practice, worship’, Hitt. *hāppar-* ‘trade, business’, *hāppinant-* ‘rich’, etc., for the forms and a discussion, see Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 746 = 1995, 1: 649-

²⁹ The relation with Semitic **h-l-w* ‘sweet; sweet drink’ (see Illič-Svityč 1964: 5) is uncertain.

650; Melchert 1987: 21; Lubotsky 1990: 131; Mayrhofer EWAia 1, 1992: 84-85, 88; Lindeman 1997: 50; Mallory/Adams 1997: 637b (**h₂-*); Viereck/Goldammer 2003: 407-408; Kloekhorst 2006: 92.

A QIE **opn-* would yield Arm. **own* > **un* (cf. Jähukyan 1972: 259; Lindeman 1978-79: 41). To solve the vocalic problem one may assume PD n. gen. **h₃pn-e/os-s* > Arm. *awno-y* (note that the word is attested only in the genitive). If dial. **hawn* belongs here, it may point to **h₃epnos-* with analogical *-a-* after the oblique stem.

An Iranian intermediation has been considered as a possibility (Jähukyan 1987: 267).

The connection of Arm. *awn* to Gr. *ἄφενος* ‘wealth’ (Lindeman 1978-79; 1990: 20; cf. also references in Greppin 1983: 321-322) is doubtful (Clackson 1994: 181), as is the appurtenance of this Greek word to **h₃ep-* (see the references above). See also s.v. *ap* ‘palm of the hand’.

On the whole, the etymology of Ačařyan can be regarded at least as possible. It should be borne in mind, however, that the philological status of the word is uncertain; a thorough examination is needed.

awr, gen. *awur*, instr. *awur-b*, etc. ‘day; time, age’ (Bible+).

For the meaning ‘age’ note e.g. P^{awstos} Buzand 3.12 (1883=1984: 26^{L1f}; transl. Garsořian 1989: 83): *Zi awurbk’ manuk, tiōk’ aroyg* : “For he was young in years, vigorous”.

●DIAL Dialectally ubiquitous [HAB 4: 617a].

●ETYM Connected with Gr. *ἡμαρ*, Arc. *ἄμαρ*, *-ατος* n. ‘day’, *ἡμέρα*, Dor., etc. *ἀμέρα* ‘id.’; **āmōr* > PArm. **amur* < **a^wmur* > **awur* (see Meillet 1922d: 59; 1936: 55; HAB 4: 616-617; Clackson 1994: 96-97; Olsen 1999: 176-177). Probably to be reconstructed as **Heh₂m-ōr*. For further discussion and references, see s.vv. *ayr* ‘man’, *anurj* ‘dream’.

***awre(a)r**, GDPI *awrer-a-c* ‘disgrace, insult, taunt, curse’.

Attested only in P^{awstos} Buzand 5.3 (1883=1984: 160^{L2f}; transl. Garsořian 1989: 188):

Apa patmec’aw t’agaworin Papay yałags ōrerac’n (var. *ōrinac’n*), *zor ed Hayr mardpetn tiknojñ P’aranjemay, mōr t’agaworin Papay, t’šnamans jałanac’ i berdargel pašarmann; zi ibrew zboz mi, aynpēs t’šnamaneac’ zna i žamanaki, ibrew emut andr gattuk, ew ed anargans tiknojñ, ew ekn el anti ew p’axeaw; etun zays amenayn zroyc’ t’agaworin* : “Then King Pap was told of the curses of the *hayr mardpet* against King Pap’s mother, Queen P’aranjem; of his taunts during the siege of the fortress, when he had berated her like a harlot at the time that he had secretly entered [into the fortress], insulted the queen, come out, and fled. They related all of this to the king”.

Garsořian, thus, translates the word **awre(a)r* as ‘curses’. Malxasyanc’ (1987: 293) renders it as *viravorank* ‘insult’.

●ETYM Ačařyan (HAB 4: 617b) rejects all the etymological attempts, including the comparison with Gr. *ἀπά* ‘prayer, curse’ suggested in NHB 2: 1032b. Jähukyan 1990: 72 (semantic field 21) considers a word of unknown origin.

The interpretation of NHB is worth considering. We can treat the word as composed of an otherwise unattested **aru/w-* ‘curse’ (cf. Gr. Att. *ἀρά*, Ion. *ἀρή* f.

‘prayer, curse’ < PGr. **aryá* < **h₂ru-éh₂*)³⁰ and the plur.-coll. *-ear*, found in e.g. *ban-ear* ‘calumny’ (attested amongst others in the very same source, P‘awstos Buzand, see s.v. *ban* ‘speech, word’).

An **h₂ru-* or **ary-* would yield Arm. **arg-*. One may therefore posit a QIE fem. or coll. **h₂(o)ru-h₂*- (beside **h₂eru-eh₂*- in Greek), or an old **u*-stem **h₂(e/o)r-u-* or Mediterranean substratum **arw-*. Thus **aru/w-* > **aur-* + *-ear* = *awrear*. For the development **aRu-* > **awR-*, see s.vv. *ayr* ‘man’, *awli* ‘a strong fermented drink, intoxicating beverage’, *awr* ‘day’.

The Greek word (cf. also the verb *ἀράομαι* ‘to pray’) has been compared with Hitt. *aruuae^{-zi}* ‘to prostrate oneself, bow, make obeisance’ and Umbr. *arves* ‘precibus’ (for references and a discussion, see Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 802 = 1995, 1: 703; Starke 1990: 447, 447₁₆₁₂; Kloekhorst 2006: 83-84; 2008: 213).

Less probable is the connection of the Greek word with CLuw. *hirun*, *hirut-* n. ‘oath’ (Vine 2005: 260-261 with references and a discussion; Starke 1990: 572-576 on the CLuw. forms). This etymology has been rejected by Lindeman (1997: 82, 82₈₀).

awriord, *a*-stem: GDSg *-i* in EpArm.; GDPI *-ac* ‘in Nersēs Šnorhali (12th cent.); IPI *-aw-k* ‘in Grigor Skewřac‘i (12-13th cent.) [NHB 2: 940c, s.v. *p‘esawēr*] ‘virgin, young girl’ (Bible+). In fact, the oldest attestation is found twice in pre-Christian epic songs (GDSg *ōriord-i*), recorded by the great 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’ (< Urt. *huri* ‘lord’) and **ord-* ‘offspring, son/daughter’ (see s.v. *ordi*). Ačaiyan (HAB 4: 619b) rejects this and other etymologies leaving the origin of the word open. Ĵahukyan (1987: 424, 428; 1988: 142) presents 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 **ātriō-* ‘fire-’ as a parallel of Lat. *ātrienſis* ‘house servant’ from *ātrium*. The compound would correspond, as she points out, to Av. *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 **ahuriyo-* ‘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’.³¹ For the semantic shift, see 3.8.1.

ap‘, *o*-stem: GDSg *ap* ‘-o-y, GDPI *ap* ‘-o-v ‘palm of the hand; handful’ (Bible+).

●DIAL Widespread in the dialects [HAB 1: 364a].

³⁰ On the other hand, one may think of Arm. *awr*, *o*-stem ‘gall’, which is attested three times in John Chrysostom and has no etymological record in HAB 1: 362b. Any relation with Lat. *aurūgō* ‘jaundice’?

³¹ Alternatively, **awri-* may be derived from **h₂ekr(e)i-* ‘young girl’: Maced. *ἀκρεία* and Phryg. (Hesychius) *ἄκριστις*. On these words, see also s.v. *atij*.

The vocalism of Van *äp's et'al* (frozen APl *ap'-s*) 'to go on one's hands and knees' (Ačaryan 1952: 97) is remarkable, since the word *ap'* is normally reflected in the Van-group, viz. Van, Moks, Šatax, Ozim as *ap'*, with no change in vocalism (see HAB 1: 364a; Ačaryan 1952: 25a, 249; M. Muradyan 1962: 193a; Orbeli 2002: 208). The form *äp's* may then be interpreted as **y-ap'-s* 'on hands' through Ačaryan's Law; cf. *y-ap'-s-i-t'er-s* (Bible+), *č'orek'-y-ap'-k'* (Alexander Romance), etc.

Some dialects have forms with *-ur*, Axalc'xa *ap'-ur*, Łarabał, Hadrut', Goris *háp'-ur* [HAB 1: 364a; Davt'yan 1966: 322]. Compare *t'at'-ur* from *t'at'* 'paw' (on which see HAB 2: 138-139; Lusenc' 1982: 147, 206b). One may also think of contamination with ClArm. *buřn* 'palm of the hand, handful' (widespread in the dialects; Łarabał has the verbal form: *p'řn-*); further note ClArm. *agur* 'palm of the hand, handful' (preserved in Xotorjur).

For the initial *h-* of Łarabał, etc. *háp'ur* cf. *hab* in the glossary of Autun (Weitenberg 1983: 19; 1986: 98; H. Muradyan 1985: 221b, 226a). This *h-* probably has an etymological value (see below).

●ETYM Since NHB 1: 397a, connected with Gr. *ἄπτω* 'to touch', *ἀφή* '(sense of) touch, the grip', *ἄψος* n. 'join' (Pedersen 1906: 428 = 1982: 206; Meillet 1929; 1935 = 1978: 62; HAB 1: 363-364 with references; HAB-Add 1982: 4; C. Arutjunjan 1983: 275-276; Ravnæs 1991: 129; sceptical Greppin 1983: 322), which presupposes **s/Hap^h-* or **s/Hap-s-*.

Recently the Armenian and Greek forms have been linked with Skt. *āpsas-* n. 'breast, forehead, front side', Toch. A *āpsā* '(minor) limbs', Hitt. *ḫappešsar-* 'limb, part of the body' (see Stalmaszczyk/Witczak 1990: 39; Witczak 1991: 71; Clackson 1994: 101). This etymology is worth of consideration, although the semantic relationship is not straightforward, and the root shape **h₂eps-* appears to be aberrant. For an extensive critical analysis, see Clackson 1994: 98-101; see also Olsen 1999: 50.

Since NHB 2: 79b, etc. (see HAB 3: 72b; Ĵahukyan 1967: 242), Arm. hapax **hap'ap'em* 'to kidnap' (q.v.) has been derived from *ap'* 'palm of the hand, handful'; note the initial *h-* in Łarabał, etc. (N. Simonyan 1979: 221). The relation with *unim* 'to take, have' (Ĵahukyan 1967: 242; C. Arutjunjan 1983: 276) is uncertain (see also Greppin 1983: 322).

*ap'i, *ap'u, etc. (dial.) 'father'.

●DIAL Ararat (Öšakan, P'arpi) *ap'i* 'father' [Amatuni 1912: 77b], Agulis *ap'i* 'father' [M. Zak'aryan 2008: 60], Mełri *äp'i* 'id.' [Ałayan 1954: 292], Łarabał *ap'i* honouring address to old people; Łazax, Ararat etc. *ap'u* voc. 'father', *ap'un* 'father' [Ačarean 1913: 160ab; HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 139-140], Širak, Muš, Alaškert, Xoy *ap'o* [Amatuni 1912: 77b; Ačarean 1913: 161a]; Łazax *api(n)* voc. 'father' [Ačarean 1913: 127b]; Agulis *apar* 'elder brother' [M. Zak'aryan 2008: 56], Ararat, Nor Bayazet *ap'er* 'father' [Ačarean 1913: 160a].

●ETYM Ĵahukyan (1972: 300; 1987: 56, 112, 275) interprets these forms as nursery words of IE origin, cf. Gr. *ἀφῶς* hypocoristic 'daddy', *ἄφα*, a hypocoristic addressing form between brothers and sisters, and beloved ones, also other hypocoristic forms, *ἀφίον*, *ἀφάριον*, *ἀφίδιον*, *ἀφία*. Note unaspirated *ἄππα* 'father', Toch. B *āppo* 'father', dimin. *appakke* 'dear father' (for the forms see Frisk

1: 126, 127; Chantraine 1968-80: 99a, 100a; Adams 1999: 16, 44; cf. Beekes 1977: 256). Further, note Kurd. *abu* 'father', *āp* 'uncle' etc. (see Ačařean 1913: 44, considering the resemblance accidental). For some East Caucasian comparable forms see Jahukyan 1987: 608.

The onomatopoeic-elementary character of these words makes a direct equation rather difficult. Nevertheless, I see no reason to treat these nursery formations, Arm. *ap'i*, *ap'u*, etc. vs. Gr. *ἀπρία*, *ἀπρίον*, *ἀπρῶς*, etc., as independent creations.

The forms *apar*, *ap'er* and the like probably represent a blend of *ap'i/u* 'father' and *aper* etc. < *elbayr* 'brother', cf. Ačařean 1913: 44, considering the resemblance with Kurd. *abu* 'father', *āp* 'uncle' etc. accidental. On the other hand compare Gr. *ἀπφάριον*.

ak'atāt, *o*-stem: GDPI *ak'atāt-o-c'* (Hamam, Hesychius of Jerusalem) 'rooster' (Bible+); *agatat* 'id.' (Ašxarhac'oyc'); *ak'alal* (Samuēl Anec'i, 12th cent.).

●DIAL Various forms: T'iflis, Hamšen, etc. *ak'lar* (Bařgirk' hayoc', Amalyan 1975: 44^{Nr1069}, glossed by *ak'atāt* and *xoroz*), Axalc'xa, Ararat *ak'lor*, Van *ayhlör*, etc. [HAB 1: 369b]. The form **ak'lor* may be due to contamination with *lor* 'quail'.

●ETYM Patrubány (1906-08 /1908/: 152b) treats the word as composed of **k'ak'* (cf. French *coq* 'cock') and *atāt-* 'shout' (q.v.), thus "shout of a cock", which is untenable. Ačařyan (HAB 1: 368-369) posits broken reduplication from **k'at-k'at* > **k'atāt* and compares the root with Gr. *καλέω* 'to call, summon; to invite; to invoke; to name', Skt. *uṣā-kal-a-* 'rooster', OIr. *cailech* 'rooster', cf. Gr. *ἠϊκανός* *ὁ ἀλεκτρωνόν* 'rooster' (Hesychius), lit. 'early-singer' (see also Solta 1960: 29-31; Olsen 1999: 204). On these IE designations of 'rooster' mostly containing the root **klh₁-*, see Schrijver 1991: 95, 185, 206, 222, 427; 1995: 141, 281, 323; and especially Schlerath 1994.

The initial *a-* is reminiscent of the obscure *a-* of substratum origin in some bird-names (see Schrijver 1997: 310-313; 2001: 419). On the other hand, one may assume a compound with PArm. **ag-* or *ayg* 'morning' from **h₂(e)us-* (see s.v. *ayg* 'morning'), cf. the Sanskrit and Greek forms above with *uṣā-* and *ἠϊ*, both cognate with Arm. *ayg-*. The Armenian compound **a(y)g-k'at-* would develop to **ak'k'at-* > **ak'at-*, cf. **h₃(e)k^w-* + *-kn* > PArm. **ak'-kn* > **akkn* > *akn* 'eye'. See also s.v. *k'akor* 'dung'.

ak'is, *i*-stem 'weasel' (Bible+), dial. also 'rat'. In Leviticus 11.29, where it is listed among unclean animals, the word renders Gr. *γαλιῆ* 'weasel'; cf. also *mkn-ak'is* in Leviticus 11.30, the exact match (perhaps a calque) for *μυγαλιῆ* 'field mouse' in the corresponding Greek passage (see Wevers 1986: 131; 1997: 154). The counterpart of the latter in the Hebrew and Aramaic Bibles is interpreted, it seems, as 'gecko' and 'hedgehog', respectively. 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 křoc'*, *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 *ōj*, *kam mukn*, *kam ak'is* (Nonnus of Nisibis).

In Bařgirk' hayoc' (see Amalyan 1975: 44^{Nr1068}), *ak'is* is glossed as follows: *titeřn*, *kam mknak'is*, *kam getnariwc*, *kam xhurd*. 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 *āk'yis*, Moks *ak^o'is* 'weasel' [Ačařyan 1952: 25, 249]; with a final *-t*: *ak'ist* 'weasel' (Xotorjūr), 'rat' (Axalc'xa) [HAB 1: 370a; YuřamXotorj 1964: 432a; HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 140b] (for the epithetic *-t*, see 2.1.31).

In Turkish-Armenian dictionary (c. 1720 AD) by Etia Muřetyan Karnec'i (Karin/Xotorjūr) 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 Xotorjūr (see above). Note that Etia Muřetyan was born in Karin, and that Axalc'xa is closely related to the Karin dialect. However, Etia's father was from Xotorjūr, and in this dialect the word denotes 'weasel' rather than 'rat', as in Axalc'xa. Therefore, one may directly identify this recording with the Xotorjūr form. For Turkish *qāqum* and the Iranian forms, see below.

For the semantic relationship 'mouse; rat' : 'weasel' (the latter is the smallest of all the mustelids; it is smaller than the rat, Ananyan, HayKendAřx 1, 1961: 164-166, 168); see below; also s.v. **č'asum*.

●ETYM Ačařyan (HAB 1: 370a) does not accept any of the etymologies he mentions. 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 Urartian 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. *kařikā-* f., which is attested in RV 1.126.6 in the possible meaning 'Ichneumonweibchen' [Geldner 1951, 1: 175; Elizarenkova 1989: 158, 622] or 'weasel' (see Monier-Williams 1899/1999: 265a; Mayrhofer EWAia 1, 1992: 330), and is considered a derivation from **kař-* f. [Wackernagel/Debrunner 1954: 428f]. Here belongs also *kāřa-* 'weasel'.

The connection of the Sanskrit words to Lith. *šėřkas* '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 positive Mallory/Adams 1997: 439b.

The existence of and the relation to Toch. **kiř*, the alleged source of Turk. **kīř*/**kīl* 'Zobel' is quite doubtful [Šerwařidze 1989: 85].

If Arm. *ak'is* is related, one might reconstruct a QIE **Hkeķ-ih₂-* (or **Hkeķ-i-*). 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 **-k̄-*: **k - k̄ > k' - s* (instead of *č' - s*); see 2.1.14.

The feminine suffix is reflected in the *i*-stem; cf. s.vv. *ayc* 'goat', *gort* 'frog'.

The only phonological problem is the medial *-i-* instead of *-e-*. This can be explained by reconstructing NSg **Hkeķ-s* alongside of the oblique **Hkeķ-*. The former has been generalized in Armenian, while Indo-Aryan has chosen the latter. For the mechanism, see Clackson 1994: 95-96 (further, see s.v. *ahuēs* 'fox').

A similar problem of Arm. *iž* 'viper' (q.v.) can be solved in the same way. Note that both *ak'is* and *iž* are *i*-stems, so the rise of **e* to *i* may also be due to generalization of genitive **-jo-*, 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 further s.v. *iž* 'viper'.

Whether the **-k̂-* of the word was a suffixal element or was reanalyzed as such at a certain stage is hard to assess. This probable correspondence might also be regarded as a substratum word. Note particularly other animal-names confined to Armenian and a few IE and/or non-IE languages which contain **-k̂-* or **-ḡ^h-*, especially those which are to some extent comparable to mustelids, or are chthonic; see HAB s.vv. *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/ḡ^h-*, from which Arm. *ak'is* and Indo-Ar. **kaś-* regularly derive, whereas *axaz* may reflect a lost form of some IE or non-IE language of the Balkans or Asia Minor or Eastern 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. *xoz* : *xoč-* : *koč-* 'pig', and next to Arm. *kngum*, *k'ak'um*, and Pahl. *kākom*, etc., there is Turk. *qāqum* recorded by Elia Karnec'i as *xaxum* (see below). Thus, in an Iranian language, next to Indo-Ar. **kaś-*, 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 corroborate my etymology.

If the word derives from **H(e)k^h-*, one may wonder whether this is somehow related with Tsez. **ʔāq^mV* 'mouse' (see Nikolayev/Starostin 1994: 523), Skt. *ākhū-* 'mole (RV +); mouse (Lex.)', Hebr. 'aqbār 'mouse' (cf. Arm. *ak'bak*, in Baḡgirk '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'kw̄m*] '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* [Hübschmann 1897: 278^{Nr166}; HAB 2: 607; 4: 568b]. For Turk. *qāqum* recorded by Elia Karnec'i as *xaxum*, see above. The initial *kn-* in *kngum* is puzzling; perhaps, contamination with Iran. **gauna-ka-* 'haarig, farbig' > Gr. *γ/καυνάκης* "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 corroborated by its regular satəm reflex in Iranian **ča/āsum*, hypothetically reconstructed by me on the basis of Arm. **č‘asum* (prob.) ‘mole-rat’, q.v.

The nature of *-um* is not very clear. It is reminiscent of the Armenian *-mn* in several animal-names, see s.vv. *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 an Armenian *u*-stem which is very productive in animal-names (cf. *atuēs*, *-es-u* ‘fox’, etc.).

B

babič‘ ‘sorcerer’, only in medieval glossaries (see Amalyan 1971: 266). Not in NHB and HAB.

●ETYM No etymological attempt is known to me. I propose to treat the word as composed of **bab-*, a reduplication of the verb *ba-m* ‘to speak, tell’, and the agent suffix *-ič‘*, cf. *t‘ov-ič‘* ‘sorcerer’ from *t‘ovem* ‘to practise sorcery’, etc. For the possible ancient meaning ‘to practise sorcery, prophesy, whisper incantations’ of PArm. **ba-* cf. the Slavic cognates: SCr. *bājati* ‘to practise sorcery, exorcize’, Bulg. *bája* ‘to whisper incantations’, CS *basně* ‘tale’, Russ. *básnja* ‘fable’, SCr. *bāsma* ‘incantation’, Bulg. *básnja* ‘fantasy, fable’, etc. (see s.vv. *bam* ‘to speak, say’, *bankn* ‘myth, fairy-tale, riddle’).

bal, *i*-stem, *o*-stem (both attested late) ‘mist, fog’, dial. also ‘white fleck’.

The oldest appearance in the compound *bal-a-jig* ‘fog-bringing’ (Hexaemeron, see K. Muradyan 1984: 195^{L21}). Independently attested in the Alexander Romance, Sebēos (7th cent.), Yovhannēs Erzknac‘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^{L6}. On the next page (440^{L8}), the very same context is represented by synonymous *vasn šamandatin*.

According to NHB and HAB, *bal* is an *i*-stem: GDPI *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 Anania Širakac‘i /7th cent./, see A. G. Abrahamyan 1944: 319^{L4}, as well as in the title of one of the following chapters: *Yatags baloy* ‘‘About the *bal*’’ (op. cit. 319^{L32}).

In Gregory of Nyssa (translated by Step‘annos Siwnec‘i in the 8th cent.): *bal-a-jew*, var. *bat-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 *Balēš*. According to a traditional story, the place-name has been named **pat-ēš*, literally “frozen donkey” (and later > *Balēš*), after a donkey which was stuck and frozen in the snow (see Łanalanyan 1969: 160^{Nr411}). For the alternation -*l/l*- cf. *bat-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 the snow can be significant. It is tempting to speculate that the story originally implied a folk-etymological play with **bal/hēš* ‘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 *Astlik*.

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; Ačařyan 1952: 249], Sebastia *bal* (and *bar*) ‘white dirt on one’s tongue when one’s stomach is disordered’ [Gabikean 1952: 101]. Ačařyan (1952: 19) mentions Van *pal* as one of the few exceptions to Ačařyan’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 the Western (mostly to Muš and Van) areas, and the atmospheric context has not been preserved in the dialects independently. In this respect, particularly interesting is the newly-found testimony from K^yärk^yänj (Šamaxi), in the extreme east of the Armenian-speaking territory, where we have *pal*, as well as *pāl* (with Ačařyan’s Law), see Bařramyan 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 Bařramyan (op. cit. 283) as *t‘utb* ‘rain-cloud’ and *amp* ‘cloud’.

●ETYM Since Patrubány (HandAms 1903: 150) and Scheffelowitz (1904-05, 2: 37), connected with Gr. *φαλός*: *λευκός* ‘white’ (Hesychius), *φαλιός* ‘having a patch of white’, Lith. *bālas* ‘white’, Latv. *bāls*, *bāls* ‘pale’, Lith. *báltas* ‘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 Ačařyan (HAB 1: 383) and Ĵahukyan (1987: 115, from **bhəli-*). 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 sometimes mentioned 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 Socrates.

Movsēs Xorenac‘i 2.61 (1913=1991: 192^{L9f}; transl. Thomson 1978: 204): *bazumk‘ i darbnac‘*, <...> *baxen zsaln* ‘many smiths, <...> strike the anvil’.

Ačařyan (HAB 1: 389b) argues that the late spelling *batx-* reflects an emphatic */baxx-/*, where *-t-* corresponds to */x/* rather than to **l*. Compare dial. (Łarabał) *uxay*, interjection of joy (Ačařean 1913: 866b), which is found in the form *Uxay* numerous times in e.g. HŽHek‘ 6, 1973: 633-636.

●ETYM Ačařyan (HAB 1: 389b) does not accept any of the etymological suggestions and leaves the origin open. Schultheiß (1961: 221) compares Hitt. *uallḫ-* ‘schlagen’. Ĵahukyan (1987: 317) rightly rejects the comparison since the initial *u-* 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 Megr. *bax(-)* ‘to beat’, although Ačařyan (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.

bałbaĵ-an-k‘ (API *bałbaĵ-an-s* in Severian of Gabala), **bałbanĵ-umn** (GDPI *bałbanĵ-man-c‘* in Anania Narekac‘i) ‘senile fables, sorcerous or delirious talk, nonsense (of fables), silly prattle, maundering’; **bałbaĵem** (Grigor Magistros), **bałbanĵem** (Matt‘ēos Urhayec‘i) ‘to talk nonsense, chatter, jabber, etc.’

●ETYM Onomatopoeic word [HAB 1: 397b]. Further see s.vv. *barba(n)ĵ* ‘senile fables, sorcerous or delirious talk, silly prattle, maundering’ and **bl-bl-am* ‘to chatter, jabber, babble, prattle, talk nonsense’.

bam ‘to speak, say’ (Bible+). The verb rarely occurs independently. One mostly finds the present singular forms *bam bas bay* in conjunction with the verb *asem* ‘to say’. For instance, in Deuteronomy 32.26 (Cox 1981: 207): *asac‘i bam c‘ruec‘ic‘ znosa* : *εἶπα Διασπερῶ αὐτούς*. For other examples, see Meillet 1913: 116. A relic of this usage is seen in the conjunction *bay*, *ba-* ‘that’ (see NHB 1: 430-431 and HAB 1: 383-384 for more material and a discussion), which has been preserved in the dialects, see e.g. V. Ařak‘elyan 1979: 41; cf. also *ba*, *bas* ‘of course, then, thus’ (Ačařean 1913: 162a; HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 142, 165b). Note especially the expression *ba č‘es asi?* lit. ‘wouldn’t you say?’, which is reminiscent of the above-mentioned classical usage of *ba-* in conjunction with *asem*.

For the rich evidence of this verb and its derivatives (*bambas-*, *bay*, *ban*, *bankn*, *bař*, *barbař*, see s.vv.), see NHB 1: 430-437, 439, 442; Astuacaturean 1895: 260-265, 269, 272-273; HAB 1: 383-386.

●DIAL See s.vv. *bambas-*, *ban*, *bankn*, *bař*.

For *ba(s)*, see above. Beside *bas* ‘of course, then, thus’ there is also dial. *bas* ‘conversation; secret, reason; argument’ (HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 165-166); compare however Kurd. *bahs*, *bás* (f.), *bās* ‘рассказ, разговор; спор’ considered an Arabic loanword (se Cabolov 1, 2001: 110).

●ETYM Since Windischmann et al., linked with PIE **b^heh₂-*: Gr. *φημί* ‘to say, explain, argue’, *προ-φήτης* ‘announcer, seer, prophet’, Lat. *fārī* ‘to say’, *fāma* ‘rumour, fame’, RussCS *bajati* ‘to tell fables’, etc., see Hübschmann 1897: 427-428; HAB 1: 386; Meillet 1936: 154; Pokorny 1959: 105; Frisk 2: 1009-1010, 1058-1059; Walde/Hofmann 1: 458; Ĵahukyan 1987: 115; Mallory/Adams 1997: 535a.

See also s.vv. *babič’*, *bambasem*, *bay₁*, *ban*, *bankn*, *bař*, *barbařem*.

bambasem ‘to malign, backbite, gossip’ (Bible+), **bambas** ‘backbite, gossip’ (John Chrysostom, Nersēs Šnorhali, etc.), **bambas-ank’** ‘backbite, gossip’ (Bible, Movsēs Xorenac’i, Gregory of Nyssa, Grigor Narekac’i, etc.). For attestations and derivatives, see NHB 1: 430; Astuacaturean 1895: 260.

●DIAL Dialectally ubiquitous: Zeyt’un *b’ambasil*, Hačən *b’ambasel* [Ačərean 2003: 301], Van *pambasel*, Ozim *b’ämbasil* [Ačərean 1952: 250], Moks *pämbäsil*, 3sg.aor. *pämbäs-ic’* ‘злословить’ [Orbeli 2002: 309], Łarabał *pəmbásel* [Davt’yan 1966: 324], etc. [HAB 1: 401b]. For compounds, see HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 156a.

●ETYM Composed of 1sg.pres. *bam* and 2sg.pres. *bas* of the verb *bam* ‘to speak, say’ (q.v.), cf. *bay-ban-ear* ‘argument’ (see s.vv. *bam*, *bay₁*, *ban*), dial. *ase-kəse* (3sg.pres. of *asem* ‘to say’), *əsi-əsav* (1sg.aor. + 3sg.aor. of *asem* ‘to say’), etc. [HAB 1: 385, 401b].

bay₁, *i*-stem: GDSg *bay-i-c’* (Dawit’ Anyałt’, Nersēs Lambronac’i, etc.), IPl *bay-i-w-k’* (Sargis Šnorhali, Grigor Tlay) ‘speech, word, verb’ (further attested in Movsēs Xorenac’i, Philo, Cyril of Alexandria, Dionysius Thrax, etc. For *bay-ban-ear* ‘argument’ (John Chrysostom) and the conjunction *bay*, see s.vv. *bam* ‘to speak, say’, *bambasem* ‘to malign, backbite, gossip’, *ban* ‘speech, word’).

For the paradigm of *bay*, see Matzinger 2005: 57.

●DIAL See s.v. *bam* ‘to speak, say’.

●ETYM From PIE **b^hh₂-ti-*, a derivative of PIE **b^heh₂-* ‘to speak’, cf. Gr. *φάσις*, *φάτις* f. ‘declaration, enunciation, rumour’ vs. *φημί* ‘to say’ [Hübschmann 1897: 428; HAB 1: 386a; Meillet 1936: 154; Ĵahukyan 1982: 46, 125]. See s.v. *bam* ‘to speak, say’.

bay₂, according to NHB 1: 431a, *i*-stem; but there is only LSg. *i bayi* (12th cent.) ‘den, lair (especially of bear)’.

In “Ołb 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 Kołbac’i, 5th cent.).

●DIAL According to NHB 1: 431ab and Jaxjaxeian – dial. *bay* and *bah*. Ačəryan (HAB 1: 402b) does not report any dialectal material. Now we can introduce Xotorĵur *bayil* ‘to hibernate (of bear)’, *bayoc’* ‘hibernation place of bear’ (see YušamXotorĵ 1964: 433a; HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 156, 157). Note that the latter form is completely identical with *bayoc’* of Eznik Kołbac’i (of Kołb). Further: Sasun *päh* ‘den, lair, cave of a bear’ [Petoyan 1954: 152; 1965: 516].

Since both “pure” root forms *bay* and *bah* (considered dialectal!) are attested in authors from Cilicia, and *bayoc’* (Eznik of Kołb) has been preserved in Xotorĵur, 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 Ačařyan (HAB 1: 402b).

V. Arak'elyan (1979: 37; 1981: 77) assumes that *bay-oc'* is identical with dial. (Ararat) *bay!* 'hushaby' and means 'sleep' rather than 'den, lair'. This is improbable. Moreover, *bay-oc'* 'den, lair' is directly corroborated by the dialect of Xotorjur (see above).

Ałayan (1974: 35-36) connects the word with OIr. *both* 'hut', Welsh *bod* 'dwelling'; Lith. *būtas* 'house', etc. from **b^h(e)uH-* 'to be'; see s.vv. *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. *bót/ë, -a* f. 'Lehmsorte (zum Polieren); Boden; Erde; Welt' (< **b^huē/ā-tā-*). On the latter, see Demiraj 1997: 107.

Not all the formal details are clear. For the semantic field, cf. the etymologically cognate Arm. *boyn* 'nest; den, lair; hut', Skt. *bhūvana-* n. 'Wesen; Welt' (RV+), etc.

ban, *i*-stem: GDSg *ban-i*, ISg *ban-i-w*, GDPI *ban-i-c'*, IPI *ban-i-w-k'* (rich evidence in the Bible, Astuacaturean 1895: 260-265) 'speech, word; Logos; thing; precept, commandment, etc.' (Bible+).

Plural **ban-ear**, *o*-stem (characterized in NHB and HAB as dialectal) 'calumny' in P'awstos Buzand (see below), Łazar P'arpec'i (acc. *z-baner-d*) and Vardan Arewelc'i (*banear*); 'quarrel' (Ephrem), *baner-ot'* 'pugnacious, quarrelsome' (Ephrem), *bay-banear* 'quarrel, argument' (John Chrysostom) [NHB 1: 432a, 436c-437a; HAB 1: 385]. In P'awstos Buzand 3.5 (1883=1984: 11^{L15}; transl. Garsoian 1989: 71, see also note 248₁₂): *azateal linēr Yusik i baneroyn* : "Yusik was delivered from calumny".

Note also the verb *banim* 'to work' (Ignatius, HAB 1: 403b), and *banim* in Timot'ēos Kuz (Timothy Aelurus, 5th or 6th cent.), see Ačařean 1908-09a, 1: 368b^{Nr11}.

●DIAL Widespread in the dialects: *ban* 'work, business; thing; subject', *banel* 'to work', in some dialects also 'to weave, embroider', with derivatives and a considerable number of phrases Amatuni 1912: 85-89; Ačařean 1913: 169-175; HAB 1: 403; HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 157-161, 162a, 163-164.

In Nor Naxijewan, Polis (Ačařean 1913: 169b), as well as in contemporary dialects and in the modern colloquial language, *ban* is used as a euphemism for 'penis' (and 'vulva').

●ETYM Belongs with *bam* 'to speak, say' (q.v.), from PIE **b^heh₂-*: Gr. *φημι* 'to say', etc. Derived from **b^heh₂-ni-*, cf. OJc. *bōn* 'request, prayer', OE *bēn* 'request, prayer', see Hübschmann 1897: 428; Jahukyan 1982: 46, 125; Klingenschmitt 1982: 84, 90; Saradževa 1985: 79-80; Olsen 1999: 79. Compare also **b^heh₂-sni-*, cf. OCS *basnъ* 'tale', Russ. *básnja* 'fable', etc.

bankn 'myth, fairy-tale' in John Chrysostom (spelled also *bangn*), Barseł Čon; API *bankun-s* (Parapm. apud NHB 1: 437a s.v. *ban-ik* 'little word', but according to HAB 1: 408a belongs here); **bankn-ark-em** 'to tell fables, myths' (Eusebius of Caesarea); **bunkn** 'idle talk' (Mxit'ar Aparanc'i, see HAB 1: 408a).

In Turkish-Armenian dictionary (c. 1720 AD) by Etia Mušetyan Karnec'i (Karin/Xotorjur) one finds *bunk* which, together with *srñjut'ün*, renders Turk. *hegiat* 'fairy-tale' (Č'ugaszyan 1986: 54^{Nr42}, 105, 162).

●DIAL Van *päyns, päns* 'myth, tale' < **bank/gn-s* (Ačarean 1952: 64, 99, 250; cf. Srvanjtyanc' 1, 1978: 167), Lori *bungl, bunkl*, 'riddle' [Amatuni 1912: 117a; HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 222a; HAB 1: 408a], Łarabał, Hadrut', Šařax-Xcaberd *pāngəl* 'riddle' [Davt'yan 1966: 324]³², Ĵula *b'ungn* 'fairy-tale', Xian *banklik* 'story, tale, narrative; fable' [HAB 1: 408a; Gabikean 1952: 106], Xarberd 'id.' [HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 162b].

The development *ba/unkn* > *bunkl* is reminiscent of *damon* 'plum' > Lori *dambul* 'id.', etc. (HAB 1: 618b), *etungn* 'nail' > Goris *tengəl* (see s.v.). The labial vocalism is probably secondary, cf. *gayl* 'wolf' vs. *goyl*, Łarabał *k'ül*, etc. For a semantic and philological discussion, see S. Harut'yunyan 1960: 7-9.

●ETYM Since long (NHB 1: 437a; Dervischjan 1877: 11), linked with *bam* 'to speak, say', *ban* 'word, speech' (q.v.). Ačaryan (HAB 1: 408a) leaves the origin of the word open. Ĵahukyan (1987: 115; cf. H. Suk'iasyan 1986: 145) reconstructs **b^hən-ŭ-* and marks only the Germanic cognates. Beside OHG *bannan* 'befehlen', Germ. *bannen* 'durch Zauberkraft vertreiben oder festhalten', etc. note also Skt. *bhānati* 'to speak, sound', Khot. *ban-* 'to cry out, complain', etc. (see Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 244; HerkWört 1997: 62b); see also s.v. *ban* 'word, etc.'

The Armenian word may contain the suffix *-kn*, see s.vv. *akn* vs. *ač* 'eye', *atjikn* vs. *atij* 'girl, virgin', *armukn* 'elbow', *jukn* 'fish', *mukn* 'mouse', etc.

For the semantics, cf. RussCS *bajati* 'to tell fables', Ukr. *bájati* 'to tell, narrate; to practise sorcery', SCr. *bäjati* 'to practise sorcery, exorcize', Sln. *bájati* 'to talk idly; to prophesy; to practise sorcery', Bulg. *bája* 'to whisper incantations'; CS *basně* 'tale', Russ. *básnja* 'fable', SCr. *bāsma* 'incantation', Bulg. *básnja* 'fantasy, fable', etc. (ĖtimSlovSlavJaz 1, 1974: 138-140, 161-162; Derksen 2008: 34; see also Saradževa 1985: 79-80; 1986: 192-193). See also s.v. *bab-ič* 'sorcerer'.

According to Russell (1985-86: 5 = 2004: 59), Arm. *bankn* (referred only to Bedrossian's *New Dictionary*) is probably only a transliteration of NPers. *bāng* 'voice, cry' (cf. Arm. *vank* 'syllable', an earlier Iranian loanword, Pahl. *vāng*). This view (cf. also Hiwnk'earpēyēntean, rejected in HAB 1: 408a) is untenable because: 1) the Armenian word is an old and vivid word and cannot be regarded as a mere transliteration; 2) its semantics ('myth, fable; fairy tale; riddle') is remote from that of the Persian word (voice, cry, syllable); 3) the etymological connection with native words *ban*, etc. seems quite secure.

bajał-im 'to tell fables, talk nonsense, talk idly, chatter, jabber, etc.' (Movsēs Xorenac'i, Hexaameron, Hesychius of Jerusalem, Nersēs Lambronac'i, Vanakan Vardapet, etc.), **bajał-an-k'** (API *bajał-an-s* in 4Kings 9.11 rendering Gr. *ἀδολεσχία*, Eznik Kořbac'i, Movsēs Xorenac'i, John Chrysostom, etc.), *a*-stem: GDPI *bajał-an-a-c'* (Yovhannēs Őjnec'i), **bajał-umn**, ISg *bajał-mam-b* (Hesychius of Jerusalem), NPI *bajał-mun-k'* (Vardan Arewelc'i), API *bajał-mun-s* (John Chrysostom), GDPI

³² In Lori, Zangezur, Łaradał, this word for 'riddle' occurs also in riddles themselves (S. Harut'yunyan 1965: 194b^{Nr1996AB}).

baĵat-man-c (Hesychius of Jerusalem, etc.) ‘sorcerous or delirious talk, nonsensical fables, garrulity, silly prattle, maundering, bagatelle’.

A textual illustration from Movsēs Xorenac‘i 2.7 (1913=1991: 111^{L2f}; transl. Thomson 1978: 138): *T‘otum zařaspelac‘n aĵatans* ‘I omit the nonsensical fables’.

●ETYM Onomatopoeic word according to HAB 1: 412-413 (with a number of examples for *-at-*). Further see s.vv. *baĵarel-* and especially *barba(n)ĵ* ‘id.’.

baĵarel, only in a late medieval glossary, glossed by *ařaspelel* ‘to tell myths, fables’ [Amalyan 1971: 266].

●ETYM Amalyan (1971: 266) hesitantly links the form with *baĵat-* (q.v.). Further see s.v. *barba(n)ĵ*.

bař, *i*-stem: GDSg *bař-i* (Yovhannēs Drasxanakertc‘i), IPI *bař-i-w-k* (Dionysius the Areopagite, Yačaxapatum) ‘word’ (Philo, Dawit‘ Anyařt‘, Dionysius Thrax), ‘language, speech’ (Yovhannēs Drasxanakertc‘i, Yačaxapatum), ‘melody, tune’ (Paterica), etc.

●DIAL T‘iflis (Sayeat‘-Nova) *bař*, Ĵula *b‘ař*, Moks *pär* [HAB 1: 413a], Zeyt‘un *b‘ar* [Ačarean 2003: 301], Šatax *pär* [M. Muradyan 1962: 193b], Ararat, Muř, Łarabař, etc. **bař* ‘word, speech, talk; the way of singing’ [Amatuni 1912: 90b; HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 165a].

According to Ačaryan (1952: 53, 250), Van *p‘ař* is a loan from the literary language of Polis, hence the initial aspirated *p*‘-.

●ETYM Related with *bam* ‘to speak, say’ (q.v.); perhaps from **b^heh₂-s-ri-* [Ĵahukyan 1982: 126]. One may wonder whether there is a connection between this **b^heh₂-s-* and Skt. *bhiřaj-* m. ‘healer, physician’, etc. (on which see Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 264-265). Semantically compare Slav. **badlbi* : OCS *balii*; *bali* ‘physician’, ORu. *balii*; *balija* ‘physician, enchanter’, SCr. *bājalo* m. ‘sorcerer’, Russ. dial. *bājala* ‘talker, chatterer, story-teller’, Lat. *fābula* ‘story, tale, fable, play talk’, etc., from the same PIE root **b^heh₂-* (ĒtimSlovSlavJaz 1, 1974: 150; Derksen 2008 s.v.).

See also s.v.v. *babič* ‘sorcerer’, *bankn* ‘myth, fairy-tale, riddle’, *barbař* ‘human voice, speech, word’.

bařnam, 3sg.aor. *e-barj*, 3pl.aor. *barj-in* ‘to lift, lift up, extol, raise, bear away’ (Bible+).

●DIAL The verb *bařnal* (somewhere also **barj-*) is widespread in the dialects. In some of them it has been contaminated with *bern* ‘load’ [HAB 1: 415a].

●ETYM See s.v. *barjr* ‘high’.

barbaĵ (Hexaameron), *barbaĵ-an-k*‘, API *-an-s* (Eznik Kořbac‘i, John Chrysostom, Philo, Yovhannēs Drasxanakertc‘i), *barbaĵ-umn*, API *barbaĵ-mun-s* in Movsēs Xorenac‘i 2.70 (1913= 1991: 206L12) and Gregory of Nyssa; *barbanĵ* (Hexaameron, Yovhan Mandakuni, John Chrysostom), *barbanĵ-an-k*‘ (Grigor Vkasasēr), API *barbanĵ-an-s* (John Chrysostom), *a*-stem: *barbanĵ-an-ac*‘ (Book of Chries, Hesychius of Jerusalem), *barbanĵ-umn* (Yařmawurk‘), NPI *barbanĵ-mun-k*‘ (Łazar P‘arpec‘i, Grigor Narekac‘i, etc.), API *barbanĵ-mun-s* (Philo), GDPI *barbanĵ-man-c*‘ (Łazar P‘arpec‘i, Yačaxapatum) ‘senile fables, mythic stories, whisper of sorcerers, sorcerous or delirious talk, nonsense (of fables), silly prattle, maundering’; the verb: *barbaĵem* (John Chrysostom, Philo, Hesychius of Jerusalem, etc.), *barbanĵem*

(Eznik Kořbac‘i, John Chrysostom) ‘to tell fables, talk nonsense, chatter, jabber, etc.’.

Figura etymologica in Yovhan Mandakuni/Mayragomec‘i (5th/7th cent.), in a list of sorceries (2003: 1262b^{1.5f}): *zsatanayakan barbanjs barbanjel* (alongside with *yurut’s yur’t/el*). Here the word refers, thus, to ‘sorcerous or delirious words’.

●ETYM Treated as an onomatopoeia by Ačaryan [HAB 1: 419-420]. In my opinion, the onomatopoeic nature does not exclude a connection with Arm. **ba-* ‘to speak, say; to tell fables’ (see s.vv. *babič’*, *bam*, *ban*, *bankn*, *bar*, *barbar*) as has been suggested by Dervischjan (1877: 11), or with Gr. *βάρβαρος* ‘foreign(er), non-Greek; uncivilised, raw’, Skt. *barbara-* ‘stammer’, etc. (Petersson 1920: 74-75).

For forms with **-l-* instead of **-r-* cf. Skt. *balbalā* (with *kar-*), Czech *blblati* ‘stammeln’, Lat. *balbūtīō* ‘to stammer, stutter; to speak obscurely, babble’, Engl. *babble*, etc. (see Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 217-218), see s.vv. *batba(n)j-* ‘sorcerous or delirious talk, nonsense (of fables), silly prattle, maundering’, **bl-bl-am* ‘to chatter, jabber, babble, prattle, talk nonsense, sing (said of nightingales), etc.’.

One might suggest a further tentative derivation of **batj-* (a hypothetical root of *batba(n)j-*) from IE **b^heh₂-d^hl-*: Lat. *fābula* ‘story, tale, fable, play talk’; Slav. **badli-* m. *ī* ‘enchanter, healer, physician’: OCS *balii* ‘physician’, ORuss. *balii*; *balija* ‘physician, enchanter’, cf. also SCr. *bājalo* ‘sorcerer’, Russ. dial. *bājala* ‘talker, chatterer, story-teller’, etc. (on which see ÈtimSlovSlavJaz 1, 1974: 137-138, 150; Derksen 2008: 32-33, 34 s.v.). A QIE fem. **b^heh₂-d^hl-ieh₂-* would yield PArm. **batdja-* (through regular metathesis) > **batj-* (**-d^hi-* > Arm. *-j-*, see 2.1.22.1). Reduplicated **bat-batj-* might yield **batbaj-* through possible loss of *-t-* before an affricate (see 2.1.22.9).

The simplex **ba(t)j-* ‘mythic story, fable, sorcerous or delirious talk, garrulous talk’ may also be seen in *baj-at-im* ‘to tell fables, talk nonsense, talk idly, chatter, jabber’ and *baj-ar-el* ‘to tell myths, fables’ (see s.vv.).

barbar, *o*-stem: GDSg *barbar-o-y*, ISg *barbar-o-v* (rich evidence in the Bible, Astuacaturean 1895: 272-273) ‘human voice, speech, word’ (Bible+), *barbarem*, *barbarim* ‘to speak, shout’ (Bible, Eřiřē, Ephrem etc.).

●DIAL No dialectal forms are recorded in HAB 1: 420a. According to Ačaryan (1952: 53), Van *p’ar-p’ar* is a loan from the literary language of Polis, hence the initial aspirated *p’-*.

●ETYM A reduplicated form of *bar* ‘word, speech’ [HAB 1: 385b; Schmitt 1981: 87], see s.v.v. *bam* ‘to speak, say’ and *bar* ‘word, speech’.

bard, GDPl *bard-i-c’* ‘heap of corn or grass’ (Bible+), secondary denominative verb *bardem* ‘to pile’ (Paterica, etc.).

●DIAL Axalc‘xa, Ararat, Muř, Bulanəx, řirak, Aparan, etc. *bard* ‘heap of corn or grass consisting of 30, 36, or 30-40 bunches’, Muř, Aparan, Sip‘an, Van *bardoc* ‘heap of corn or grass’ [Amatuni 1912: 91; Ačarean 1913: 177a; HAB 1: 421-422]; řatax *pärt’*, *pärt’oc* ‘heap of 20 bunches’ [M. Muradyan 1962: 193b, 215a], Van *pärt’*, Moks *pärt’*, Ozim *b’ärt’uc* [Ačarean 1952: 250]; on Van, see below. Č‘arsančag **bard* ‘30 eggs’ [Ačarean 1913: 177a].

●ETYM Derived from PIE **b^hṛ-ti-*: Skt. *prá-bhṛti-* f. ‘offering’ (RV+), *bhṛti-* f. ‘support, maintenance’, Lat. *fors, fortis* f. ‘fortune, chance, accident’, Germ. *ge-burt*, etc.; from the verb seen in Arm. *berem* ‘to bring, bear’, Skt. *bhárati* ‘to carry, maintain, foster, bring’, Gr. *φέρω* ‘to carry, bear’, Lat. *ferō* ‘to carry, bear’, Goth. *bairan* ‘to carry’, etc. (Meillet 1936: 155; Schmitt 1981: 53, 58, 59; Jahukyan 1982: 125, 173; Olsen 1999: 81). For further references see HAB 1: 421b; see further s.v. *berem* ‘to bring, bear’.

For the semantic relationship ‘to bear a child’ : ‘to bear fruit’, note that Arm. dial. Van *pārt* ‘refers to a heap that consists of 30 bunches, and a mother which bore 15 children is called *kes pārt* ‘half heap’ [Ačārean 1952: 250].

bark ‘bitter’ (Agat‘angelos), ‘angry’ (John Chrysostom+), ‘loud (about talking, especially laughing’, John Chrysostom+; on MidArm. attestations, see MiĵHayBař 1, 1987: 117b), ‘lightning’ (Bible+), ‘fiery, very hot’ (Geoponica+); **barkanam** ‘to be angry’ (Bible+), etc.

●DIAL Widespread in the dialects (mostly of the *kə*-class), especially in the meaning ‘strong, hot, ignite (fire, sun)’ [Amatuni 1912: 92; HAB 1: 425; HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 171a]. A textual illustration can be found in a lullaby from Akn: *bark arewik* (the latter word means ‘little sun’) [Palean 1898: 602a^{L-12} = Ř. Grigoryan 1970: 54^{Nr23}]. Note also Xarberd *barkank* ‘passion, strong desire’ [Ačārean 1913: 178b], Sebastia *bark* ‘very hot, strong, bitter (vinegar, pepper, 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, although the second *-a-* is not clear (see below on *barak* ‘lightning’).

●ETYM The connection with Skt. *bhrāj-* ‘to shine, to beam, to sparkle’ and Gr. *φλέγω* ‘entzünden, verbrennen, erleuchten; brennen, flammen, leuchten, glänzen’ and many other etymological attempts are rejected by Ačāryan (HAB 1: 424-425). Lidén (1906: 57-60) compares Gr. (Cretan) *φάγρος* ‘whetstone’. Clackson (1994: 182) and Salmons/Niepokuj (apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 510a) are sceptical about this etymology, although 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)rg^w-* ‘unfriendly’, cf. OIc. *berkja* ‘poltern, toben’ (< Germ. **barkjan* ‘prahlen, poltern’), Latv. *barġs* ‘streng, hart, unfreudlich, unbarmherzig’, etc., for the semantic development comparing Engl. *rough* ‘rauh, unsaft, streng, scharf, herb’. This etymology is accepted by Pokorny (1959: 163); Mallory/Adams (1997: 22b), as well as, albeit with some reservations, 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 an 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 Sasneč’i (12th cent.): *barak yarp’woyn*, 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 include 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. *oĩdos*, 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?

barjr, *r/u*-declension: GDSg *barj-u*, NPI *barjun-k*’, API *barjun-s*, GDPI *barjan-c*’, etc. ‘high’ (Bible+); **-berj* ‘high’ in compounds (q.v.); *bařnam* < **barjnam*, aorist **barj-*: 3sg *e-barj*, 3pl *barj-in* ‘to lift, lift up, extol, raise, bear away’ (Bible+).

For attestations and a philological discussion, see de Lamberterie 1986a.

•DIAL The forms *barjr* and *bařnam* are widespread in the dialects [HAB 1: 415a, 427b].

•ETYM Since Gosche 1847: 72^{Nr201}, etc. (see HAB 1: 414-415, 427a), connected with cognate forms representing the PIE word for ‘high’, **b^herǵ^h-*, **b^hrg^h-u-*, **b^hrg^h-(e/o)nt-*: Hitt. *parku-* ‘high’, Skt. *bṛhānt-* (f. *bṛhatī-*) ‘large, wide, abundant, lofty, high, strong, dense, loud’, YAv. *bərəzant-* (f. *bərəzaitī-*) ‘rising high, high, loud’, Oss. *bərzond* ‘high’, MPers. *buland* ‘high, big’, Germ. *Burgund*, etc., see Hübschmann 1897: 428; Pokorny 1959: 140-141; Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 232; Mallory/Adams 1997: 269ab; Cheung 2002: 173.

PArm. **barj-u* is comparable with Hitt. *parku-*, and the nasal stem is in a way comparable with the Indo-Iranian, etc. For the heteroclitic *r/u*-declension, see s.v. *asr* ‘fleece’. For a discussion of this and related issues, as well as for *-berj*, see Meillet 1930a; 1936: 62; Gödel 1975: 33, 95; È. Tumanjan 1978: 300; Schmitt 1981: 53, 98, 159, 187-188, 200; Jähukyan 1982: 120-121; Klingenschmitt 1982: 108-109; de Lamberterie 1986a; Saradževa 1986: 29-30; Stempel 1993: 147 (< 1987); Olsen 1989: 224, 232; Hamp 1990-91; Mawet 1993: 301; Matzinger 2005: 50, 60, 62-63. For **-berj* cf. Skt. *-bārhas-* ‘firmness, strength’ in Vedic compounds *ādri-barhas* ‘felsenfest’, *dvi-bārhas* ‘doppelte Stärke habend’ (cf. Hamp 1990-91: 9; Matzinger 2005: 50; for the forms, see Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 212).

For the present *bar̄nam* < **barj-nam* vs. aor. *barj-*, see Hübschmann 1897: 428 and apud HAB 1: 414b; Meillet 1936: 54, 111, 118, 130; Schmitt 1981: 45-46, 137, 147, 200; Klingenschmitt 1982: 107-110; Ĵahukyan 1982: 170, 183-184, 188, 195; Clackson 1994: 219₂₈.

Further, see s.vv. *burgn* ‘tower’ and *durgn* ‘potter’s wheel’.

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. **jot(-a)-har-*.

●ETYM Lidén (1905-06: 490-491) compares Slav. **bersto-* ‘elm’ (cf. Russ. *bérest*, etc.) and derives *barti* from **b^hrstijā-*, assuming a development *-rst-* > *-rt-*. He does not cite any parallel for this development, however. Ačarıyan (HAB 1: 430) rejects the connection. In my view, 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 derivative of PIE **b^h(e)rHg-* ‘birch’: Skt. *bhūrjā-* 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. *bérzas*, Russ. *berëza*, SCr. *brëza* ‘birch’, OHG *birka* ‘birch’, MoHG *Birke* ‘birch’, etc. According to the material presented 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 *barti* from **b^hrg-ijo-*, listing the word among other examples with an aberrant *-t-* (instead of *-c-*) from PIE **-g-*, 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 the Mediterranean and Near East areas: Gr. *βράθν* n. ‘savin, Juniperus sabina; Juniperus foetidissima’ (also *βόρατον* n., *βορατίνη*); Lat. *bratus* (Pliny) ‘an Anatolian cypress’; Aram. *b^rrāt*, Hebr. *b^rrōš*, Assyrt. *burāšu* ‘cypress’ < Proto-Semitic **brāθu* (see Huld 1981: 303). See also 1.12.1 on *brinč* ‘snowball-tree’.

The semantic shift in Lat. *fraxinus* ‘ash’ (for an 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 the 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).

For the semantic fluctuation between ‘birch; elm; linden’ and ‘poplar; aspen’ cf. *t‘eti* ‘elm’ (q.v.), Gr. *πελέε-α*, Ion. *-η* ‘elm, Ulmus glabra’, Lat. *tilia* ‘linden’ > Gr. (Hesychius) *τιλία· α ἵγειροι* ‘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 borne in mind, first of all, that the semantic fluctuation between ‘poplar, aspen’ and ‘plane’ is frequent, see H. Martirosyan 2008. 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 a possible association with **b^hreHǵ-* ‘to shine’ (cf. Skt. *bhrāj-* ‘to shine, beam, sparkle’, etc.), I refer to Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 270, 280 (with literature). The connection is based on the bright whiteness of the birchbark. A similar semantic development may also be seen in my tentative etymologies of *čandari* ‘plane-tree; poplar’ and *saws(i)*. 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 *Arewardik*‘ (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).

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*). 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 1948: 69-70; Bartikjan 1967; Russell 1987: 530.

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 the 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 the top of the birch tree” (see Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984: 620). 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 the Armenian tradition, too, we find relics of a similar association of the poplar with the ideas of virginity, purity, motherhood, etc. In Nerk‘in Basen the poplar was venerated by girls and women, and was believed to bestow love and children (G. Hakobyan 1974: 265). 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 was seen on top of the tree. Note also the motif of the bride on the poplar or plane in fairy-tales. In a fairy-tale from Lori (Noyemberyan) [HŽHek‘ 8, 1977: 651-669], the bride of a prince, who 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 sight and is cured by the Holy Mary, who visits the bride first in a dream, then in a tree-garden, near a spring under the poplar trees (*bardi cařer*). 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^hrHǵ-* ‘birch’, should be viewed in a larger culturological framework. Further, see H. Martirosyan 2008.

bawił, *a*-stem according to NHB 1: 478, but without references (spelled also as *bawil*, *bawel*) ‘labyrinth’ (Eusebius of Caesarea, Grigor Narekac‘i), ‘a dark, covered place’ (John Chrysostom+); **bawł-ak** ‘a dark, covered place’ (John Chrysostom), **bawłak-a-jew** ‘*bawłak*-shaped’ (Eusebius of Caesarea).

In Grigor Narekac‘i 40.2 (Xaç‘atryan/Lazinyan 1985: 409^{L17}; Russ. transl. 1988: 143; Engl. transl. 2001: 199): *Oč‘ bawilłk‘ xoršic‘, oč‘ štemarank‘ yarkac‘* : Ни ходы сокрытые, ни клетки жилищ : “Nor secret passages, nor living quarters”. In Bařgirk‘ hayoc‘ (Amalyan 1975: 53^{Nr236f}): *bawel‘ šinuac patuacoyk‘; bawil‘ k‘iw teli*. This seems to reflect an attestation from the Commentary on Narek (cf. NHB 1: 478c).

●ETYM Ačařyan (HAB 1: 433b) rejects all the etymological attempts, including the connection with *Babylon* proposed by Hyunk‘earpēyēntean, and leaves the origin of the word open.

Jahukyan (1991: 36-37) derives the forms *bawel* and *bawił* from QIE **b^həu-elā* and **b^həu-lā* respectively, from PIE **b^h(e)uH-* ‘to be’, linking the Armenian word with Gr. *φωλεός, φωλεά* ‘den, lair’ etc. (see s.v.v. *bay* ‘den, lair’, *boyn* ‘nest; den, lair’). However, the semantics is not evident, and the phonological details are not explained. One might posit QIE **b^hou(H)-l-eh₂-* > PArm. **baw(a)ł(a)*, whence a secondary nominative *bawił* in a way more or less comparable with the explanation of *lusin* ‘moon’ and *katin* ‘acorn’ (q.v.). However, Gr. *φωλεός* ‘den, lair’ and Oic. *ból* ‘id.’ have been derived from **b^hō-lo-* (cf. Alb. *botë* ‘earth, world’ < **bātā*, see Rix 2003: 365), which makes the explanation of Arm. *bawił* more difficult.

Recently, the old connection of *bawił* with *Babylon* has been revived (Arcrun Sahakyan apud L. Abrahamyan 2004: 17, 17₉; L. Abrahamian 2006: 217; A. Petrosyan 2007: 18-21). Note also *babēł* glossed as *šp‘ot‘umn, xarnakumn* ‘confusion’ in *Onomastica sacra* (Wutz 1914: 966^{Nr97}). For the notion of *Babylon* ‘labyrinth’, see L. Abrahamyan 2004: 17₉ (with lit.); de Freitas 1987: 413b; and especially A. Petrosyan 2007: 18-19₅₀ with extensive literature. This etymology is more attractive, though the time (in relation with the chronology of the sound change intervocalic **-b- > -w-*) and ways of borrowing need clarification.

bekanem, 3sg.aor. *e-bek*, imper. *bek* ‘to break’ (Bible+); iterative **bek-t-em** (Bible+); **bek** ‘broken, mutilated’ (Bible+).

●DIAL According to Ačařyan (HAB 1: 437a) here belongs Łarabał *pek* ‘pit; ruined place’. Margaryan (1971: 218-219; cf. 1975: 317a, 458a) adds also Goris *pāk* ‘ruin, a destroyed and ruinous place; outdoor latrine’, and, rejecting Ačařyan’s interpretation, derives both forms from *bak* ‘courtyard, sheepfold’, which is

semantically improbable. We may be dealing with two homonymous (and contaminated) words.

On Tʿiflis **bokel* ‘to fist, punch; to push’ (Ačařean 1913: 200), see below.

●ETYM From PIE **b^heg-* ‘to break’, nasal present **b^h-n-eg-*: Skt. *bhañj-*, *bhanákti* ‘to break, shatter’, ManMidPers. *bxt-gyʰ* ‘opposition, division, conflict’, ManSogd. *βxt-wnyy* ‘internal conflict, schism’, OIr. *bongid*, *-boing* ‘breaks’, etc. For the etymology and for the morphology of Armenian nasal-suffixed presents vs. PIE nasal-infixes, see Hübschmann 1897: 429; HAB 1: 436-437 with references; Kuiper 1937: 117, 123, 150; Pokorny 1959: 114; Hamp 1975: 104, 106; Schmitt 1981: 135, 141; Klingenschmitt 1982: 184-185; Clackson 1994: 85; Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 242-243; Mallory/Adams 1997: 81a; Cheung 2007: 3-4. For the morphology, see also s.v. *awcanem* ‘to anoint’.

According to Ĵahukyan (1985: 155; 1987: 115, 255), Tʿiflis **bokel* ‘to fist, punch; to push’ belongs here too, reflecting *o*-grade; cf. OIr. *bongid* ‘breaks’, Dutch *bonken* ‘schlagen, prügeln’, etc. However, the appurtenance of the Irish word is uncertain (see Schrijver 1995: 306; Matasović 2009 s.v. **bu-n-g-o-* ‘to break’), and Dutch *bonken* is considered onomatopoeic (de Vries/Tollenaere 1993: 90b).

bet-un, *o*-stem: GDSg *betn-o-y* ‘product, harvest, semen, fruit’ (Book of Chries, Philo, Yovhannēs Draxanakercʿi, Vardan Arewelcʿi), glossed by *sermn* ‘semen, seed’ and *ptut* ‘fruit’ in *Bargirkʿ hayocʿ* (Amalyan 1975: 55Nr274), adj. ‘fertile’ only in ModArm., *an-betun* ‘fruitless’ (since Łazar Pʿarpecʿi, 5th cent.), *bazm-a-betun* ‘fecund, fertile’ (Book of Chries, etc.); *betn* glossed by *berk* ‘harvest’ in *Bargirkʿ hayocʿ* (Amalyan 1975: 55Nr272), *betn-awor* ‘fecund, fertile, fruitful’ (Book of Chries, Philo), *betnaworem* ‘to fecundate, impregnate’ (John Climachus, Nersēs Lambronacʿi); *bet-mn*, GDSg *betman* ‘semen, sperm’ (Timotʿēos Kuz = Timothy Aelurus), *betmn-a-ber* ‘fecund, fertile, abundant’ (Tʿēodoros Kʿrtʿenawor), *betmn-awor* ‘fecund, fertile, abundant’ (Philo), *betmnaworem* ‘to fecundate, impregnate’ (Grigor Narekacʿi); later *bazm-a-bet* ‘fecund, fertile’ (Ganjcʿ, Karapet Vardapet).

According to Ačařyan HAB 1: 439a, the root *bet* in *bazm-a-bet* (with *bazum* ‘many, abundant’) is made up on the basis of a wrong interpretation of *bet-un* in synonymously *bazm-a-betun* as an adjective. However, there is nothing against postulation of a noun *bet* ‘product, harvest, semen, fruit’ in *bazm-a-bet* exactly as the noun *bet-un* in *bazm-a-betun*.

●ETYM Ačařyan (HAB 1: 439a) accepts none of the etymologies and leaves the origin of the word open. Adontz (1937: 9) derives the word from PIE **b^hel-* ‘to blow, grow, swell’, cf. Gr. *φαλλός* m. ‘penis’, *φαλλαρίζω* ‘to have an obscene conduct’ (Chantraine 1968-80: 1175), OIc. *boli* ‘bull’, etc.³³ Further see s.v. *bolor* ‘whole, entire; round, spherical; circle; bud, etc.’.

The independently unattested root **bet* may be regarded as a noun (see above) meaning ‘product, harvest, semen, fruit’ and derived from QIE **b^hel-no-*; note Gr. *φαλλός*, which points to zero grade, however. For synonymous *bet(-n)* vs. *bet-mn* cf. *koł* vs. *koł-mn* ‘side’, *jer* vs. *jermn* ‘warm(th)’, etc. If one prefers to posit an underlying PArm. verbal **bet-* ‘to impregnate, fertilize’, a nasal present **b^hel-ne-*

³³ A connection with Gr. *φαλλός* has been suggested already by Hiwnkʿearpēyēntean and rejected in HAB 1: 439a.

may be posited. For *beł-mn* ‘semen, sperm’ compare especially *ser-mn* ‘semen, seed’ vs. *ser* ‘tribe, birth, generation’ and verbal *sere/im* ‘to grow, multiply, etc.’.

berd, *a*-stem: GDSg *berd-i*, ISg *berd-a-w*; *i*-stem: ISg *berd-i-w*, GDPI *berd-i-c*, IPL *berd-i-w-k* ‘fortress’ (Bible+).

●DIAL Present in a number of dialects [HAB 1: 443a].

●ETYM The Indo-European origin and the connection with **berj-* and *barjr* ‘high’ (for references and a discussion, see HAB 1: 442-443; Schmitt 1972-74: 9, 24) are untenable. Most probably *berd* is a Semitic loan, cf. Aram. *birtā*, Akk. *birtum* (see HAB 1: 442b; Ĵahukyan 1987: 476). Further, see Ravnæs 1991: 97-98.

The connection with Syriac *merdā* ‘castle’ is rejected by Hübschmann (1897: 301) because of the anlaut. Eilers (1953: 73₁; 1971: 62₁₁₄) discusses this in the context of *b-/v-* alternation. On the other hand, he (1971: 62₁₁₄; 1974: 49₆₉) involves Iran. *bard* ‘stone’.

berem, 3sg aor. *e-ber* ‘to bring, bear, give fruit’ (Bible+).

For an extensive treatment of the paradigm of *berem* in the historico-comparative context, see Meillet 1936: 155-157; Ĵaragyulyan 1961: 80, 87-108, 146-148 et passim. Further see Ravnæs 1991: 51, 74-76.

●DIAL Dialectally ubiquitous [HAB 1: 441b].

●ETYM Since Acoluthus (1680 apud HAB 1: 441a), etc., linked with the PIE term for ‘to bring, bear’, **b^her-*: Lat. *ferō* ‘to carry, bear’, Gr. *φέρω* ‘to carry, bear’, Skt. *bhāratī* ‘to carry, maintain, foster, bring’, Goth. *bairan* ‘to carry’, etc. [HAB 1: 440-441; Hübschmann 1897: 429; Pokorny 1959: 128, 129; Schmitt 1981: 48; Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 246-249; Mallory/Adams 1997: 56].

For 3sg.aor. *e-ber* < **é-b^her-et*, also present in a number of dialects such as Moks, etc., cf. Skt. *á-bhar-at*, Gr. *ἔ-φερ-ε*.

-berj ‘high’ in compounds *barjr-a-berj* ‘very high’ (Bible+), *erkn-a-berj* ‘himmelhoch’ (Eznik Kołbac’i, Agat’angelos, etc.), *leĴn-a-berj* ‘berghoch’ (Eznik Kołbac’i), etc.

In the late medieval dictionary *BarĴgirk* ‘*hayoc*’ [Amalyan 1975: 55^{Nr271}] we find *berj* glossed as *barjr* ‘high’ and *šēn* ‘building, village’.

●ETYM See s.v. *barjr* ‘high’.

bzzel (John Chrysostom), *bzzal* (Grigor Magistros) ‘to buzz’, said of flies, bees, beetles and other insects. Deverbative nouns *bzz-ank* and *bzz-umn* (Nersēs Šnorhali).

●DIAL The verb *bzzal* is widespread in the dialects [HAB 1: 445a; HayLezBrbBaĴ 1, 2001: 189b].

●ETYM According to AčāĴyan (HAB 1: 444b), this is an onomatopoeic verb which is etymologically unrelated with other similar forms found in IE (Engl. *buzz*, etc.) and non-IE (for Caucasian parallels, see Ĵahukyan 1987: 588, 602) languages. However, the onomatopoeic nature of the word cannot categorically exclude the etymological connection. Further see s.v. *bzē/iz* ‘beetle’.

bzēz, *o*-stem: GDSg *bzez-oy* in Geoponica; *i*-stem: GDSg *bzez-i* Oskip’orik (both attestations are late) ‘beetle, dung-beetle’ (APl *bzēz-s* in Hexaameron, see K.

Muradyan 1984: 259L4); *bzič*, *o*-stem: GDP1 *bzz-o-c*‘ in Grigor Magistros (11th cent.) ‘id.’ (attested also in Canon Law).

The Armenian word renders Gr *κάνθαρος* ‘a kind of (dung-)beetle, *Scarabaeus pilularius*’ in Hexaameron [K. Muradyan 1984: 259^{L4}, 372b].

●DIAL Muš *bzez*, Xarberd *b‘zez* [HAB 1: 445a], Sebastia *bzez* [Gabikean 1952: 116], etc.

●ETYM Certainly related with *bzz-* ‘to buzz’ (q.v.). Mentioned in Greppin 1990: 70 without an etymological note. Regardless of the obvious onomatopoeic nature of this insect-name (cf. also Engl. *buzz*, etc.), one might nevertheless suggest a further tentative analysis.

If Lat. *fūcus*, *-ī* m. ‘drone’, Slav. **bučati* ‘to buzz, hum’, OCS **bučela* ‘bee’, etc. go back to IE **b^h(o)uk^w*- ‘a kind of buzzing insect’ (see Gamkrelidze Ivanov 1984, 2: 602₂ = 1995, 1: 516₈₁), one may assume that the same etymon yielded **bus* through regular palatalization of the velar after **-u-*. The sibilant would easily become voiced through contamination with the onomatopoeic *bzz-* ‘to buzz’. We arrive at a PArm. hypothetical **buz*, which strikingly coincides with Partizak, Manišak (< Hamšen) *buz* ‘an insect which badly bites cows’, glossed by *p‘ek‘elek* (see Tēr-Yakobean 1960: 472); perhaps ‘drone’ or ‘hornet’. The ending *-ēz* is also found in some insect- and lizard-names, such as *xlēz* and *močēz/s* ‘lizard’ (HAB s.vv.), dial. *dzez* ‘beetle’ (HAB 1: 445a), **dt-ēz* ‘bee, bumble-bee’ (q.v.).

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. *blù*, etc. Abelyan and Ačařyan (see HAB 1: 450) reject the meaning ‘light-blue’. After an extensive discussion, however, Ałayan (1974: 44-47) advocates the basic meaning ‘light-blue’, which has developed into the fish-name (cf. the fish-name *kapoyt* which follows *bil* in the list). Then he connects *bil* with OCS *bělъ*, Russ. *bélyj* ‘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 Jahukyan (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 to Engl. *blue*, etc.; cf. the idea of NHB above.

Compare also **bt-ēt* (see HAB 1: 456a).

***bl-bl-am** ‘to chatter, jabber, babble, prattle, talk nonsense, sing (said of nightingales), etc.’.

●DIAL Ararat, Łoři, Łazax, Łarabał, Muš *blbl-al*, *blbl-ac‘nel*, see Amatuni 1912: 104b; Ačařean 1913: 192-193 (with derivatives).

●ETYM Onomatopoeic verb, cf. Engl. *babble*, etc. See also s.vv. *bałba(n)j-*, *barba(n)j* ‘sorcerous or delirious talk, nonsense (of fables), silly prattle, maundering’.

blit‘, *a*-stem in NHB, but without ref. ‘a roundish soft bread’ (Bible+); **blt‘-ak** ‘lobe of the ear’ (Bible); ‘lobe of the liver’ (Gregory of Nyssa). In Dawt‘ak (7th cent.) apud Movsēs Kałankatuac‘i 2.35 (1983: 228^{L23}): *blt‘aks oč‘xarac* ‘“soft meat of sheep”

(*oĉ'xarneri p'ap'uk mis*) [V. Aġak'elyan 1969: 178]] or “choice morsels of sheep” [Dowsett 1961: 147].

●DIAL Preserved in the dialects of Xarberd, Xotorġur, T'iflis, Axalc'xa (*b'lint'*), Łarabał, Van, Moks, etc., basically meaning ‘a kind of cake’ [HAB 1: 454]. The meaning in Moks (*pəlit'*, GSG *pəlt'əf'*) is thoroughly described in Orbeli 2002: 312. Remarkably, Ararat, Moks, etc. also have the meaning ‘a small swelling’ [Amatuni 1912: 105a].

●ETYM No acceptable etymology is recorded in HAB 1: 454a. Ĵahukyan (1971: 49-50; 1987: 117, 161) derives from PIE **b^hl-ei-* ‘to swell’ (cf. Gr. *φλιδάω*, etc.). This proto-form would yield Arm. **e-tbi-*, however. Olsen (1999: 244, 948) places *blit'* 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 *boyt'* ‘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-t-*, from the root **b^heuH-* ‘to grow’. The full grade is reflected in *boyl* (q.v.). Note that both *bl-it'* and *boyt'* (if from **bu-it'*) contain the suffix *-it'* (see 2.3.1). Since *boyl* is 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-i-t^hV-* > *blit'*.

blur, *o*-stem: GDSg *blr-o-y* (frequent in the Bible; also e.g. in Movsēs Xorenac'i 2.39, 2.86, 1913=1991: 165, lines 3 and 11, 233^{L9}), LocSg *i blr-i*, IPI *blr-o-v-k'*, GDPI *blr-o-c'* (abundant evidence in the Bible, Astuacaturean 1895: 296); *a*-stem: IPI *blr-a-w-k'*, var. *blērōk'* (Zeno, see Xaĉ'ikyan 1949: 81b^{L11}); *r*-stem: GDSg *bler* (Zenob, Yovhan Mamikonean: HAB 1: 455b), ISg *bler-b* (Oskip'orik) ‘hill’ (Bible+).

●DIAL Muš, Alaškert, Ararat *b'łur*, Zeyt'un *b'ülür* [HAB 1: 456a] or *b'ülüy* [Aĉarġyan 2003: 302].

●ETYM Since Thomaschek (see HAB) and Petersson (1916: 260-262), linked with Oic. *bali* ‘Erhöhung entlang dem Uferande; kleine Erhöhung auf ebenem Boden’, Welsh *bâl* f. ‘Erhöhung, Berggipfel’. Accepted in HAB 1: 455-456; Ĵahukyan 1987: 115, 235 (on the suffix), 582-583. See Pokorny 1959: 120-122, the root **b^hel-* ‘to grow, swell’, with Arm. *bet-un* ‘fertile’. Arm. *bl-ur* is considered to reflect **b^hōl-*. For the formation, see s.v. *anur* ‘ring’ and Olsen 1999: 33.

Uncertain.

***bt-** ‘to shout’ (dial.): Van **btal* ‘to cry loudly (said of children)’ [Aĉarġyan 1913: 195a], Łarabał, Ararat, etc. **bt-bt-al*, **bt-t-al*, **bt-aw-el* ‘to shout (said of animals and people)’ [Amatuni 1912: 106-107; Aĉarġyan 1913: 195ab].

●ETYM No etymology is known to me.

See s.v. *bot-ok'* ‘loud complaint, cry’. The form **bt-aw-* is reminiscent of Łarabał, Ararat onomatopoeic *kř-av-el* ‘to croak’ (said of crows) vs. dialectally widespread *kř-kř-al* ‘id. (said of birds, particularly crows, as well as of frogs, snakes, buffalos, etc.)’; see HAB s.vv. *agrāw* ‘crow’, *ka(r)kaĉ'*, and *křunk* (q.v.).

bolor, *o*-stem: ISg *bolor-o-v* (8 times in the Bible, Astuacaturean 1895: 301c), *i*-stem: ISg *bolor-i-w* (Plato), GDPI *bolor-i-c'* (Book of Chries, Grigor Narekac'i) ‘whole, entire; round, spherical; circle’ (Bible+), ‘calyx of a flower, husk, rosebud, an

ornament' in IPl *bolor-i-w-k'* (Wisdom 2.8, rendering Gr. κάλυξ, and Book of Chries), *bolor-ak* 'round, circular' (Bible+), *bolorem* 'to twist round, coil, plait, gather' (Bible+); *bolor-ek'-ean/-in*, *-ec'-un(-c')*, *-ek'-um-b-k'* 'the whole of' (Eznik Kořbac'i, Eřiře, Philo, Book of Chries, etc.); *bolor-ři* 'round, circular, revolving, versatile' (Bible+).

●DIAL The form *bolor(-k')* is widespread in the dialects, in meanings 'around', 'round, circular', 'whole', etc. [HAB 1: 462a]. Hamřen *pōlydik'* 'environs, neighbourhood, surroundings' is from **bolor-ti-k'* [HAB 1: 462a; Ačaryan 1947: 223], cf. Akn *bōlartik'* or *bōlarti* 'id.' [Gabriēlean 1912: 248]. See also s.v. **boyl* 'ball of dough'.

●ETYM Since long (see HAB 1: 461-462 with references; Ĵahukyan 1987: 115), derived from PIE **b^hel-* 'to blow, grow, swell', cf. Gr. φαλλός m. 'penis', OIc. *boli* 'bull', OSax. *bula* 'id.', *bulluc* 'young bull', Engl. *bull* 'id.', Lat. *follis* 'leather bag filled with air, ball' (on which see Schrijver 1991: 177, rejecting the comparison with Lat. *flāre* 'to blow', OHG *blāen* 'id.' < **b^hleh₁-ie/o-*, OHG *blāsan* 'id.' < **b^hleh₁-s-*, etc.), OIr. *ball* 'body part', OHG *bolla* f. 'Wasserblase, Fruchtbalg oder Knoten des Flachses', *bilorn* 'gum (in mouth)', Sax. *bealluc* m. 'testicle' < **b^hol-n-*, OIc. *bōllr* 'ball, testicle', Old Swedish *bu/olde* 'swelling, abscess, tumour', *bu/olin* 'aufgeschwollen', etc.

Standard dictionaries (Pokorny 1959: 120-122; Mallory/Adams 1997: 71b) mention under this root only Arm. *behun* 'product, harvest, semen, fruit' (q.v.), etymologized by Adontz (1937: 9). Further see s.vv. *blur* 'hill', *boř* 'swelling, tumour, wound', **boyl* 'ball of dough'.

For the structure of *bol-or(-)* and Hamřen **bolor-t-i-k'* 'surroundings' compare *ol-or(-)* nd *olor-t* 'winding, etc.'; for *bol-or-ři* cf. *gol-or-ři* 'vapour, steam' vs. *gol* 'warm' (q.v.), *layn-ři* vs. *layn* 'broad', see HAB 1: 461; 3: 551-552; Greppin 1975: 116, 130; Ĵahukyan 1998: 29; Olsen 1999: 509-510, 524-526. The pattern *bol-or* : *blur* 'hill' is reminiscent of *kotor* : *ktur* 'cut' [Olsen 1999: 525₆₆₁].

According to Ačaryan (HAB 1: 461b), here belongs also MidArm. and dial. Axalk'alak', řirak, Ararat, Muř, Van *pl-or* 'testicle' (Amatuni 1912: 27b; Ačarean 1913: 913b), cf. OIc. *bōllr* 'ball, testicle', etc. The Armenian form points to **b-*, thus one may think of Skt. *buli-* f. 'buttocks; vulva', Lith. *bulis* (-iēs), *būlė*, *bulė* 'Hinterer, Gesäß'; cf. also MidArm. *plpl-k-el* 'to blossom, bud', Erzinka *pllik* 'vulva', Łarabał, Ararat *pupul* 'penis', etc. The fluctuation *b-/p-* (PIE **b^h-/b-*) may be due to soundsymbolic nature of words, note further *přpřak* 'bubble' vs. *bořboř* 'blossom, sprout'.

*boxi, **buk'i* 'hornbeam' (dial.).

●DIAL Lori, Łazax *boxi*, Łarabał *pexi*, rural *pūk'i* 'hornbeam' (Amatuni 1912: 112a; Ačarean 1913: 200a; Aliřan 1895: 96), Burdur *bexi* 'id.' [N. Mkrtč'yan 1971: 198]. Łarabał *pōxi/ε* and *pėxi* (Davt'yan 1966: 328) regularly reflect **boxi* by Ačaryan's Law (see 2.1.39.1), whereas *pūk'i* presupposes **buk'i*.

●ETYM Connected with Gr. φηγός f. 'oak', Lat. *fāgus* f. 'beech', OIc. *bók* 'beech', OHG *buohha* 'beech', Goth. *boka* 'letter', etc. (Ĵahukyan 1972: 317, referring to Ačaryan). The appurtenance of Slav. **buzь* 'elder' and Kurd. *büz* 'elm' is uncertain. For a discussion of the IE forms, the vocalic problem and the 'beech'-argument, see Osthoff 1905: 249-258; Thieme 1953: 546; Eilers/Mayrhofer 1962; Lane 1967; P.

Friedrich 1970: 106-115; Krahe 1970: 55-56; ÈtimSlovSlavJaz 1, 1974: 172; Henning 1977; Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 621-623 = 1995: 533-535; P. Friedrich & Mallory apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 58-60; Blažek 2002; de Vaan 2008: 199.

Ĵahukyan (1972: 317₆₇) points out that the appurtenance of the Armenian form to this term is doubtful because of the vocalism. Note, however, that some cognate forms show possible traces of *-u* after the root vowel. As for the *-x-* and *-k-* instead of the expected *-k-*, I propose to posit forms with tree-suffixes *-x-i* (see s.vv. *kałamaxi*, *metex*, and 2.3.1) and *-k'-i* (cf. Lori *kałnā-k'-i* vs. ClArm. *kałn-i* 'oak').

This Armenian word is confined to the N, NE and E peripheries. This is in agreement with the geographical spread of the beech-tree (see literature above, particularly the map in Mallory/Adams 1997: 59). For the semantic relationship 'beech' : 'hornbeam', see P. Friedrich 1970: 99-101; Mallory/Adams 1997: 273.

I conclude that Arm. **boxi* and **buk'i* may be traced back to **bo(k)-x-i* and **buk-k'-i*, respectively. The reconstruction of the QIE form (**b^heHug-*, **b^hoh₂g-*?) remains unclear.

***boxoxič**, Baġirk '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 *xəxəj*. See 1.12.4 for more details.

bok adj. and adv. 'barefoot' (Bible+), *bokanam* 'to become barefoot', *bokac'eal* (Bible); *bok-otn* 'id.' (Grigoris Aršaruni, Yovhannēs Draxanakerc'i, etc.), a compound with *otn* 'foot'; MidArm. *bok-ik* 'barefoot' (MijHayBař 1, 1987: 128a).

●DIAL The pure forms *bok* and *bok-ik* are not recorded. The MidArm. diminutive form **bok-ik* yielded **bobik* in practically all the dialectal areas (in a few of them: **bob-l-ik*), and *tépeg^v* in Łarabał (HAB 1: 463a). The form **bobik* is explained through a simultaneous process of assimilation and disimillation, and Łarabał **topik* reflects a further development, perhaps prompted from the compound **otn-a-bobik* (see 2.1.25).

The MidArm. and dialectal diminutive forms *bok-ik* and **bob-ik* are recorded already in NHB 1: 503c.

●ETYM Derived from PIE **b^hoso-*, cf. Lith. *bāsas*, OCS *bosz* 'barefooted', OHG *bar* 'naked, bare', etc. (Hübschmann 1897: 430; HAB 1: 462-463; Pokorny 1959: 163; Mallory/Adams 1997: 45b). For a discussion of the *-k-*, see s.v. *merk* 'naked'.

boł '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 xač'" (see Harut'yunyan/Xač'atryan 2000, passim). In a Moks version: *pōłe xač'* [Yovsēp'eanc' 1892: 12]. In Orbeli 2002: 315, Moks *pōł* is glossed in square

brackets as ‘րթած’ = ‘hornbeam’. This seems to be due to confusion with *boxi ‘hornbeam’ (q.v.).

●ETYM See s.v. *boṭk*.

boṭboj, *o*-stem: GDPI *boṭboj-o-c*‘ (Agat‘angelos, Book of Chries), IPI *boṭboj-o-v-k*‘ (Agat‘angelos, 5th cent.); *i*-stem: GDPI *boṭboj-i-c*‘ (Yovhannēs Drasxanakertc‘i), IPI *boṭboj-i-w-k*‘ (Gregory of Nyssa, and a homily attributed to Movsēs Xorenac‘i); *a*-stem: GDPI *boṭboj-a-c*‘ (Gregory of Nyssa), IPI *boṭboj-a-w-k*‘ (Hexaemeron: K. Muradyan 1984: 129^{L8}, and Gregory of Nyssa) ‘sprout, offshoot, blossom, bud’ (Bible+); denominative verbs **boṭbojem** ‘to germinate, bud, sprout’ (Bible+), **boṭbojanam** ‘id.’ (Philo, Gregory of Nyssa).

In Job 15.30 (Cox 2006: 127) and Song of Songs 2.13 Arm. *boṭboj* renders Gr. *βλαστός* and *ὄλωνθος*, respectively.

●DIAL No dialectal record in HAB 464-465.

V. Aṛak‘elyan (1984a: 142) derives dial. (the village of Kotayk‘/Elkavan) *bhəxpuč* ‘bubble-like formation on the bread called *lavaš*; bubbled bread’ from *boṭboj*, and *pəṭčək* ‘bubble’ from *ptpjak*, and states that *boṭboj* and *ptpjak* are confused in HAB. Indeed, Ačāryan lists this and related forms below under the entry *ptpjak* ‘bubble’, HAB 4: 91a. The thing is that it is not always easy to distinguish between these forms because such consonant clusters must have been subject to assimilatory and dissimilatory processes. Further on the fluctuation *b-/p-* see in the etymological section.

The noun **bxbuč* is also found in Nor Bayazet (Ačārean 1913: 194a); note also the verb *bxbč-* ‘to bud, germinate’ (of flowers), for a textual illustration see P‘iloyeanc‘ 1888: 25^{L-8}. Further cf. some forms recorded in Ačārean 1913: 194a. Probably here belongs also Łarabat *pxpxótil* ‘to germinate, bud’ (cf. HAB 1: 481b).

●ETYM Ačāryan (Adjarian 1918: 162; HAB 1: 464-465; see also Ĵahukyan 1987: 115; cf. Olsen 1999: 936₃) treats *boṭboj* as a reduplication of the type of *dotdoj* ‘quivering’, from the root seen in *boṭ* ‘a plant’, *boṭk* ‘radish’ (q.v.), as well as with Lat. *folium* n. ‘leaf; petal (esp. of a rose)’ and Gr. *φύλλον* n. ‘leaf’.

The etymology is quite acceptable. In my opinion, Arm. *boṭboj* is to be treated as a reduplication of **boṭj-* from QIE **b^hol-jo-*, cf. Lat. *folium* and Gr. *φύλλον*, probably from the *o*-grade form, too (see Beekes 1990a: 378; Mallory/Adams 1997: 348a; for discussion on this etymon see also Schrijver 1991: 131, 177); note Lat. *flōs, flōris* m. ‘blossom, flower; youthful prime’, etc. Further see s.v.v. *boṭk* ‘radish’, *boṭj* ‘swelling, tumour’. Thus: **boṭ-boṭj* > *boṭboj*.

There seems to be some kind of relationship between *boṭboj* ‘blossom, sprout’ and *ptpjak* ‘bubble’. Interesting are *p(l)pluk* ‘bud, gemma’, Trapizon *bumbulak* < **pumpul-ak* ‘bud’, etc., astonishingly reminiscent of Lith. *bumbulas* ‘bud’, etc. The fluctuation *b-/p-* (IE **b^h-/b-*) may be, apart from reasons mentioned in the dialectal section, due to soundsymbolic origin; cf. Engl. *bubble*, etc.

boṭk ‘radish’. In the later literature: Galen (= Gr. *ράφανίς* [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 **boṭk-uk**, with a diminutive suffix *-uk*, attested in Hexaemeron (K. Muradyan 1984: 304^{L5}): *boṭkukk* ‘*eṭjerac*‘ *ort*‘*uc*‘ *kam*

garanc ‘“little horns of calves or lambs”’. Here *bołkukk* ‘has no correspondent form in the Greek text; *bołkukk* *eljerac*’ renders Gr. τὰ κέρατα [NHB 1: 504a; K. Muradyan 1984: 372b]. Arm. *bołk-uk* should be interpreted as ‘newly grown horn’ (as is suggested by Ačaryan [HAB 1: 465a]) rather than ‘radish-like small horn’ (as in NHB 1: 504a). This might imply an etymological meaning ‘*growing’.

●DIAL *bołk* ‘radish’ is ubiquitous in the dialects. In Muš and Alaškert, one finds *b’ot*, without the final *-k* [HAB 1: 465a; Madat’yan 1985: 185a]. Łarabał *pəxxk/pəxk* and *pəxk* (see HAB and Davt’yan 1966: 328), Moks *pətk* (see HAB; Ačaryan 1952: 251; Orbeli 2002: 315), etc. point to Ačaryan’s Law and subsequent consonant shift (see 2.1.39.1).

●ETYM Ačaryan (HAB 1: 464-465) derives *bołk* from **boł* ‘plant, sprout’ (see s.vv. *boł* and *bołboj*), 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. *bołk* can be originally identical 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 asks: “is it possible to suggest a Semitic loan from Armenian?”.

Further, see s.v. *boł*.

bołok’, *o*-stem: GDSg *bołok’-o-y*, ISg *bołok’-o-v* in Łazar P’arpec’i; *a*-stem: GDPI *bołok’-a-c* in “Ganjaran” ‘loud complaint, cry’ (Bible+); **bołok’em** ‘to cry, complain loudly’ (Bible+), ‘declamation of a herald’ (Athanasius of Alexandria); dial. (Hamšen) ***bołok’-** ‘to shout loudly’ (with *-l*).

●DIAL Ararat *bołok’el* ‘to complain’, Ozim *b’ołok’-ič* ‘complainer’, etc. [HAB 1: 466a].

In his ClArm. > Hamšen glossary, Ačaryan (1947: 223) does not record *bołok’em*. In the glossary of purely dialectal words in Hamšen, he (op. cit. 259) records Hamšen *pəłokuš* ‘to shout loudly (said of both people and animals)’ deriving it from **bołok’el* (with *-l*), with no further comment. The appurtenance to *bołok’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 *bołok’*, *batba(n)j*, and dial. **bl-bl-al* ‘to babble’ under the entry **b^hel-₆* of Pokorny 1959. One might also think of Arm. dial. (Van, Łarabał, Ararat, etc.) **bl-*, **bl-bl-*, **blaw-* ‘to shout’, q.v.

bołj ‘swelling, tumour, wound’, **bołj-un** ‘having a swelling’; **bołjn** ‘ball’ (all MidArm, see HAB 1: 466a; M. Muradyan 1972: 188; MiĴHayBař 1, 1987: 128).

●DIAL Tigranakert *bołj-oc* ‘swelling, tumour, wound’ [HAB 1: 466a].

●ETYM No etymology in HAB 1: 466a. Ĵahukyan (1965: 252; 1987: 115; see also H. Suk'iasyan 1986: 147-148) derives the word from IE **b^hel-* 'to blow, swell', whence also *bol-or* 'whole; round, spherical' (q.v.). For *boĵ* he reconstructs **b^hold^hio-* or the like, cf. Old Swedish *bu/olde* 'swelling, tumour', etc. Further see s.v. **boyl* 'ball of dough'.

***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) presents Łarabał, Hadrut', Šařax, Marařa *böv* as equivalent to ClArm. *karič* 'scorpion'; cf. Areš *böv*, *bövä* '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', **arĵ-a-plo* 'ghost' (according to Durean 1933: 110, *arĵablō* 'a *čiwat* = monster'), Surmalu **boloy* 'insect'. Next to **arĵ-a-plo*, Van also has **arĵ-a-pap-o* 'bogy' [Ačarean 1913: 154a]. Ačaryan does not specify **arĵ-* and **pap-*. The latter is, apparently, identical with *pap* 'grandfather', cf. **pap-uk* 'old man' > Van, Alaškert 'an insect' (see Ačarean 1913: 896b). The component **arĵ-* can be equalled with *arĵn* 'black' or *arĵ* 'bear'. The latter alternative seems more probable; cf. Russian *Veles*, the adversary of the thunder-god, which is associated with the bear and *lešij*, the forest spirit (Uspenskij 1978: 114-125).

***bol/tol-**: Van **bololan*, T'iflis **botolay* 'bogy, ghost';

***bo-bo** : Ararat, Iğdir, Bařeš, Nor Bayazet *bobo* 'bogy, ghost';

***bo-bol/t** : Alek'sandrapol, Širak *bobol*, T'avriz, Ĵuřa *bobox* 'ghost', Ganĵak **bobol* 'insect' [Ačarean 1913: 197b, 200-201; HAB 2: 229b, 369a; 4: 95a] (according to HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 192b, 204a: Łarabał, Ganĵak *biboł*, *boboł*, *bobox* 'silkworm'); cf. also Tigranakert *babula* 'bogy' (see Haneyan 1978: 202).

***b/p(o)loč**, ***b/p(o)toč** : Ararat, Astapat **bloĵ*, Širak *błbč*, Lori, Muš **botoč* [Amatuni 1912: 105b], Akn **ploč*, Bařeš, Van **poloč*, Łarabał **płoč* 'insect, beetle', Nor Naxiĵewan **pořoč* 'bogy' [Ačarean 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 Ačaryan (HAB 4: 95a; cf. also 2: 229a and Ačarean 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 Łarabał, Areš, etc., which Ačaryan mentions only as a semantic parallel, seems to be related, too. Note also the reduplicated **bo-bo*, which is not necessarily a reduced form of **bo-bol/t*. Secondly, the spread of this word in the neighbouring languages, as we shall see, is much wider. Thirdly, these words may all be onomatopoeic.

Klimov (1998: 145) represents Kartvel. **oboba-* 'spider': Georg. *oboba-* 'spider', Megrel. *bo(r)bolia-* < **bo(r)bo-*, with dimin. *-ia*, Laz *bobon-va-* < **bobo-*, Svan **opopa*, *wopopä*, etc.

Amirdovlat' Amasiac'i (15th cent.) mentions Turk. /pō/ as an equivalent of 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* : Bulg. *būba* 'a worm; bug; bogy', dial. 'cocoon of the silkworm', Maced. *buba* 'insect', etc. (see ÈtimSlovSlavJaz 2, 1975: 229-230), Lith. *baĩbalas* 'May-bug', Latv. *bambals, 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 Jähkec'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 the 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 Juła have *b'it'*; note also T'iflis *bit'* next to *but'*, as well as Xotorjür *bit'* [YušamXotorj 1964: 434b]. The form *boyt'n* can be traced in Łarabał *püt'nə* and in Akn *b'ət'n-üg* (see HAB 1: 466b). Commenting upon Juła *b'it'*, Ačaryan (1940: 87; see also 356b) states that there is no other example with *-oyt'*. Note, however, *čkoyt'* 'little finger' > Juła *ck-ik*, rural *čfkit'* [HAB 3: 205a; Ačarean 1940: 375a].

Bearing in mind the classical meaning 'a soft lump of flesh, lobe', one may add more dialectal evidence: Muš *but'-ik gđal* 'young of a frog' (with *gđal* 'spoon'); Ararat, Łarabał *but'* 'hump', Ararat, Łazax *but'-ik* 'hump-backed' (see Ačarean 1913: 204a).

In Łarabał, *püt'nə* seems to refer also to '(round) hill or rock', as attested in a folk-tale (L. Harut'yunyan 1991: 52^{L16f}): *K'yənum ən, tem ətnum min saru, k'sanum min cör, min pülür püt'nav pat tam, min k'rəcəlk'av ni mnnum tap'en takə* "They go, encounter a mountain, come down into a ravine, go around a round hill/rock, enter under the ground through a stone-chink". Note also Łarabał **xul-u-boyt'n* 'rugged' with *xül* 'rugged' < *xoyl* 'swelling, spot', q.v. (see Ačarean 1913: 488b; HAB 2: 392a) and cited as *xləput'nə* 'rugged' in L. Harut'yunyan 1991: 362. The component **boyt'n* may be identified with *püt'nə* 'hill or rock' < *boyt'n* 'thumb'. For the semantics compare *matn* 'hill' vs. *matn* 'finger' (q.v.).

●SEMANTICS The semantic range ['lobe (of the ear or the liver)'; 'thumb'; 'hump'; 'young of a frog'] suggests a basic meaning '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) connects *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. OIc. *pumall*, OHG *dūmo*, etc. 'thumb' from PIE **teuH-* or **teHu-* 'to swell; crowd, folk; fat; strong'. Ačaryan (HAB 1: 466b) is sceptical and leaves the origin of the word open. Jähukyan (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', although these forms presuppose **b-*. See also s.vv. *boyt'*₂ 'felloe' and *boyl* 'group'.

The suffixal element **-t-* is also found in Gr. *φυτόν* n. ‘plant’, Skt. *bhū-ti-*, *bhū-ti-* f. ‘Wohlsein, guter Zustand, Gedeihen’, *prá-bhūta-* ‘abundant, much, considerable, great’, etc. On the other hand, one may also consider the synchronic suffix *-t-* in body-part terms like **kuř-t-n* ‘back’ next to *kuřn* ‘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).

boyt₂ ‘felloe’. Attested only in Step‘anos Siwnec‘i (8th cent.), as a synonym of *hec* ‘felloe’ (q.v.).

●ETYM No etymology is recorded in HAB 1: 467a. According to Ĵahukyan (1965: 252), the word may have resulted from a semantic development of *boyt*₁, although he does not specify the motivation. For a suggestion, see 3.9.4.

boyl, *i*-stem: GDP1 *bul-i-c* in Łazar P‘arpec‘i, 5th cent.; MidArm. *a*-stem ‘group (of people, deers, stags, etc.)’; MidArm. **boyl-k** ‘Pleiades’.

5th century onwards. In Łazar P‘arpec‘i, 5th cent. (1904=1985: 10^{L31f}, transl. Thomson 1991: 43): *ew aylk‘ zhet bulic‘ eĵeruac‘n ew etanc‘ ĵiarĵak eteal* ‘others gallop after herds of stags and hinds’. A MidArm. *a*-stem is seen in *bulk‘ i bul-a-c*, see MijHayBař 1, 1987: 130a.

●DIAL Akn *b‘ol* ‘group’; Alařkert, Ararat, Tigranakert, Xarberd, řirak, etc. **boylk* ‘Pleiades’ (see also Nřdehean 1902: 269; Amatuni 1912: 80b), Zeyt‘un *b‘li* ‘a star’ [HAB 1: 468a]; řirak *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’ [YuřamXotorĵ 1964: 435a]; Hamřen *pulk*, *pulk* (from *boyl-k*), GSg *palkən* ‘shrub’ [Ačarıyan 1947: 73, 223], Muř, Alařkert, 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], Sasun > T‘alin *purk* (Martirosyan/Gharagyozyan FW 2003, September 6); 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 Ačarıyan (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.).

See also s.vv. *boĵ* ‘swelling, wound’, **boyl* ‘ball of dough’.

●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. *būrỹs* ‘multitude, crowd’, Latv. *būris* ‘heap, mass’. Ĵahukyan (1987: 114) follows Meillet, although Ačarıyan (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 *bylĭje* ‘herbs, plants, grass’, Czech. *býli* ‘weed’, SCr. *bĭlje* ‘plants, grass’ (Slav. < **b^hHu-l-io-*) and Gr. *φῶλον* n. ‘race, tribe, class’, *φῶλή* f. ‘tribe, group of tribes, community’, as the *l*-suffixation of PIE **b^heuH-* or **b^hHu-*, cf. Gr. *φύομαι* ‘I grow, I become’, *φῶτόν* n. ‘growth, plant’ < **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. *bahulá-* ‘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 Ačařyan (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.vv. *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.

See also s.vv. *botj* ‘swelling, wound’, **boyl* ‘ball of dough’.

***boyl** (dial.) ‘ball of dough’.

- DIAL Łarabał, Hadrut’, Śařax-Xcaberđ *pūl* ‘ball of dough’ [Davt’yan 1966: 329].
- ETYM Ačařyan (HAB 1: 461b, 462a) presents this dialectal word as *bul* ‘ball’ and derives it from **b^hol-* ‘to swell’, together with *bol-or* ‘whole; round, spherical’. To these have been connected also MidArm. *botj* ‘swelling, tumour, wound’ and *botjn* ‘ball’, q.v. (see M. Muradyan 1972: 188; Ĵahukyan 1987: 115). However, Łarabał, etc. *pūl* rather requires **bul* or **boyl*. It is therefore preferable to follow Davt’yan (1966: 329) in deriving *pūl* from *boyl* ‘group’, dial. ‘avalanche’, ‘shrub’, ‘Pleiades’ (q.v.), unless one assumes **b^hol-ĭV-* > **boyl* as in *ayl* ‘other’ vs. Lat. *alius*. The form *botj* points to **b^hol-ĭV-* or, less probably, or **b^holġ^hĭV-*, which see Mallory/Adams 1997: 45a, 561a. It is unclear whether Arm. *botboj* ‘blossom, sprout’ is related with these words.

For the semantic relationship cf. *gund* ‘ball (also of dough and the like)’ vs. *gund* ‘group’ (see HAB 1: 593-595), perhaps also *xoyl* ‘swelling, tumour, gland’ vs. *xoyl* ‘army’ (q.v.).

Arm. *boyl*, *i*-stem ‘group’ probably derives from QIE **b^heuH-l-i-* (see s.v.). If indeed belonging here, *botj(n)*, *btj-* may reflect a thematic **b^heuH-l-ĭo-* or fem. **b^heuH-l-ĭeh₂-* > **boytj-*.

***boyc-**: *bucanem* ‘to feed’ (Bible+); **-boyc** (as the second member of a number of compounds, e.g. *and-a-but*, which see s.v. *und*); **but** ‘food’ (Bible+), on which the denominative *btem* ‘to feed’ (Ephrem+) is based.

●DIAL Ačaryan (1953: 193) mentions Ařtial *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; to make use of’ (RV+), *bhóga-* m. ‘Genuß, Freude, Nutzen’ (RV+), *bhukti-* f. ‘Genießen’ (Br.+), OAv. *būj-* f. ‘penalty’, Khot. *būjsana-* ‘feasting’, *hambujs-* ‘to enjoy’, Lat. *fungor* ‘to enjoy; to suffer’. Mayrhofer (EWAia 2, 1996: 275-276) does not mention the Armenian form, although 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. *bhaksá-* m. ‘Essen, Trank, Speise, Genuß’ (RV+). For Iranian forms, see also Cheung 2007: 19 (with Armenian). For a further analysis, see Benveniste 1966.

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 Ařtial **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 the dialects [HAB 1: 469a].

●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. *bhívana-* n. ‘Wesen; Welt’ (RV+), etc.; see s.vv. *bay* ‘lair’, *boys* ‘plant’, *boyt* ‘thumb; a soft lump of flesh, lobe’, etc.

boys, *o*-stem: ISg *bus-o-v*, GDPI *bus-o-c* ‘(Hexaameron) ‘plant’ Bible+; **busanim** ‘to grow, germinate, originate, be produced’ (Bible+).

●DIAL Widespread in the dialects, especially as a verb, with or without the nasal suffix: **bus-n-* (Polis, T‘iflis, Hamšen, Cilicia, Łarabał, Van, etc.) : **bus-* (Ararat, Muš, Alaškert, Ozim). Next to verbal *b‘usnil*, Xarberd has a participle *buss-aj* ‘grown’, with a geminate *-ss-* [HAB 1: 470b].

●ETYM Since NHB (1: 505b), connected with Gr. *φύομαι* ‘to grow, become’, *φύτόν* n. ‘plant, growth’, *φύσις* f. ‘growth, descent, nature, being’, 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.vv. *boyl*, *boyn*).

bosor ‘blood-red, crimson’ (Cyril of Jerusalem, Grigor Narekac‘i, Nersēs Šnorhali, etc.).

●ETYM The word *bosor* has been connected with *boc* ‘flame’ and Lat. *focus* ‘fireplace, hearth, fireside’ (Petersson 1916: 285; Pokorny 1959: 162, etc.), see s.v. *boc* ‘flame’ for more detail. Ačaryan (HAB 1: 473; AčarHLPatm 1, 1940: 181), however, separates *bosor* from *boc* and identifies it with the Biblical place-name *Bosor*, *Bosoray*, transliterated from Greek *Βοσόρ*, cf. Genesis 36.33 (Zeyt‘unyan

1985: 318): *Yobab ordi Zarehi i Bosoray* : Ἰωβαβ υἱὸς Ζαρά ἐκ Βοσσοραῶς. For other Biblical attestations, see Astuacaturean 1895: 302. Note especially Isaiah 63.1: *karmrut 'iwn jorjoc ' iwroc ' i Bosoray* : ἐρύθημα ἱματίων ἐκ Βοσσορ.

For the association with the notion 'dark, red' and for the testimony from medieval literature and glossaries, as well as for the derivatives of *bosor* and *Bosor*, see NHB 1: 505-506; HAB 1: 473; Wutz 1914: 870^{Nr167}; Amalyan 1971: 108, 112. For *bosor-ac'i* see Olsen 1999: 344₃₂₀. For a further discussion on *bosor*, see Greppin 1980b; Weitenberg 1989: 60₁; L. Hovhannisyán 2001: 183-184.

***bor** *'brown animal'; 'brown or motley/spotted' (> 'leprosy').

This word is not attested independently. I tentatively reconstruct 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 Ačařyan (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 exactly means; perhaps 'a dark-complexioned cow with white spots'.

Loři *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 a dark 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. *kaβra-* m. 'beaver', Skt. *babhrū-* 'reddish brown, brown; a kind of ichneumon; a reddish-brown cow' < PIE **b^heb^hru-*: OHG *bibar* 'beaver' < PGerm. **bebru-*; OHG *brūn* 'brown' (< PIE **b^hruH-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'; late attested. Much older and widespread is *bor-ot* 'leprosy' (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/* 'leprosy'³⁴ [HAB 1: 474b; Ĵahukyan 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. *mrĵiwn* 'ant'), one may assume that Arm. *uruk* 'leprosy', which, to my knowledge, has not received an etymological explanation, is borrowed from Iran. **vorūk-* through an intermediary **wuruk*.

³⁴ Is the Sogdian form reliable? In Gharib 1995, I could only find *βr'wk'* [brūk] 'eyebrow' (p. 107a) and *βwr* [βōr] 'blond' (p. 115a).

It seems that the forms are related to **bor* ‘brown or motley/spotted’ (q.v.). For the semantics, cf. Arm. *pisak* ‘spotted; leprous’, dial. of Van and Լարաթ *p’is* ‘dirty’: Pers. *pīs* ‘leprous; dirty’ (see HAB 4: 84b; Ačārean 1902: 352); cf. also Gr. *ἀλλόφος* 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 details, see s.vv. **bor* ‘brown animal’, *boreni* ‘hyena’.

borb ‘bright, aflame, burning, abundant’ in a few late compounds (HAB 1: 475b); independently only in Anania Širakac’i (A. G. Abrahamyan 1940: 40^{L23}): *borb šot lusoyñ* ‘bright shine/ray/reflection of the light’ (cf. ModArm. translations in HAB 1: 475b; Abrahamyan/Petrosyan 1979: 98); **borb-ok** ‘aflame’ (Movsēs Xorenac’i 1.1, 1913=1991: 6^{L4} and the Letter to Sahak, NHB 1: 507c), ‘kindling, flame’ (Aristakēs Lastivertc’i, see Yuzbašyan 1963: 78^{L14}, 80^{L19}); **borbok'em** ‘to set on fire, kindle, inflame; to fan the flame’ (abundant in the Bible and following literature).

●DIAL The verb *borbok'el* is present in a number of dialects. Some dialects have a form with nasal epenthesis, e.g. Van *borbonk'*, Nor Bayazet *b'orb'ank'el*. The noun *borb* has been preserved in Ararat *b'orp'* [HAB 1: 476b], cf. Areš *-b'orb* [Lusenc' 1982: 201b]. For Լարաթ *p'erp'el* ‘to fan the fire, provoke’, see below.

●ETYM Since long, connected with Lat. *fervere*, *-ēre* ‘to steam, burn, glow, be heated, ferment’, etc. from **b^her-u-* (for a discussion of these forms, see Schrijver 1991: 252-256). This is followed by Ačāryan (HAB 1: 476a). Pisani (1944: 162-163) independently assumes the connection with *fervere* and interprets the Armenian form through ‘broken reduplication’ as in Gr. *πορφύρω* ‘to surge, boil, be stirred’. Dumézil (1938b: 52) assumes an enlargement of the same root, **b^ho-b^hr-o-*.

It seems best to interpret *bor-b* as a broken reduplication, cf. PIE **ḡb^hro-* > *ampro-p* ‘thunder’, **pter-* > *t'er-t'* vs. *t'er* ‘leaf’ (see s.v.v.); for *-ok*, compare e.g. *atok* ‘full, fat’, *barwok* ‘good, well’, etc; note also the verbs *ketek'em* ‘to tear, rend’, *otok'em* ‘to supplicate’ (see s.v.v.). Alternatively, QIE **b^hor-b^hor-* > **borbo(r)-k-*.

Ačāryan (HAB 1: 476a; AčāřLiak 3, 1957: 56) points out that *borb* represents an **o*-grade root whereas the **e*-grade is seen in Լարաթ *p'erp'el*. This view is widely accepted (Jahukyan 1972: 278; N. Simonyan 1979: 247; Ervandyan 2007: 29). As has been shown by A. Xač'atryan 1984: 321-322, however, this form is to be explained from *borb-* through Ačāryan's Law (see 2.1.39.1).

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.; **borē** (Grigor Magistros, etc.) ‘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 Garsořan (1989: 138^{L4f}).

Further, Ačāryan (HAB 1: 477a) cites **boray** (Physiologus). According to Weitenberg (p.c.), however, the actual form is AccSg *z-boray-n*, with a hypercorrect *ay* after *boren*/**borēn* < *borean*. The same **borēn* was synchronically analyzed as *borē-n*, with the article. Thus, there is no reason to posit a variant *boray*, and the form *borē* is secondary.

●DIAL Ararat *bor-ani* ‘coat of a fur of hyena’ [Ačārean 1913: 203a; HAB 1: 477b; HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 211b].

●ETYM Ačařyan (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 Ačařyan 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 an Iranian origin of *boreni*, cf. YAv. *baβra-* m. ‘beaver’. As is pointed out by Ĵahukyan, the Iranian word is semantically remote. However, this is not a serious problem, since the other meanings may have been lost in Iranian. It must be borne in mind 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; Ačařyan 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 relationship between *boreni* ‘hyena’ and *bor* ‘leprosy’, cf. Sarikoli *pis*, Wakhi *pəs* ‘leopard’, which is compared with Skt. *piśa-* ‘deer’, *piśānga-* ‘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; leprous’). For an interchange between designations of the hyena and the leopard or panther and the like, see s.v. *lusan* ‘lynx; marten; hyena’. But in the case of **bor-* ‘brown animal; brown or motley/spotted’ (q.v.) (cf. also *bor* ‘leprosy?’) > *boreni* ‘hyena’, the semantic development probably went through the notion 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.vv. *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). In view of cases like *aštē*, *aštēay* < 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., the variant *borē* may presuppose an earlier **bor-i*. Weitenberg offers a different explanation for *borē* (see above). Nevertheless, **bor-i* may be corroborated by the following.

To my knowledge, NAccSg *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*), although its GDPl is *iš-an-c*‘ (Łazar P’arpec‘i) rather than **iš-an-ic*‘.³⁵ Thus, NAccSg *borean* can be either a back-formation after *borenic*‘, or a misinterpretation of *boreni*.

I tentatively conclude that the original name for the hyena may have been **bor-i*, and *bor-eni* originally meant ‘hyena fur’ (cf. Ararat dial. *bor-ani* ‘coat made of

³⁵ Or else, cf. *lus-an* ‘lynx’ (q.v.). For *-eni* cf. also *k’awt’ar* and *k’ōt’ar-inē* in “Bařgirk‘ hayoc’”, both meaning ‘hyena’, Amalyan 1975: 58^{Nr367}, 337^{Nr212}.

hyena fur'); or else, we might posit a petrified adjective like Av. *baβraini-* 'of beaver', cf. Ĵahukyan 1987: 160; Olsen 1999: 414.

Of some interest may also be Oss. *bi/eræġ* 'wolf'. It has a certain resemblance "with Turkic 'wolf', cf. Chagatay, Turkm. *bōri*, etc., but final *-æġ* does not have a reflex in any Turkic language" [Cheung 2002: 173]. Abaev suggested a borrowing from Khotanese *birgga* < Plr. *yrka-*. However, the Khotanese *-gg-* = [g] does not agree well with Oss. fricative *-ġ-* (ibid.).

Conclusion: Iranian **bōr-* 'brown, multicoloured, etc.' (< PIE **b^heb^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/* 'leprous'), 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 'hyena fur'.

boc', *o*-stem: GDSg *boc'-o-y*, AblSg *i boc'-o-y*, ISg *boc'-o-v* 'flame', widely attested in the Bible (Astuacaturean 1895: 304a), rendering Gr. *φλόξ* 'flame, burning fire'.

AblSg *i boc'-o-y* occurs also in the famous epic song *Birth of Vahagn* in Movsēs Xorenac'i 1.31 (1913=1991: 86^{L2}). Gen. *boc'-w-o-y* in John Chrysostom, if reliable, points to a nom. **boc'-i*. A metaphorical usage is found in John Climachus: 'energy, fire of love, spiritual light'. Further attestations: Eznik Kołbac'i, Nilus of Ancyra; numerous derivatives [NHB 1: 508-510; HAB 1: 478a].

●DIAL Widespread in the dialects [HAB 1: 478b; HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 212]. A few derivatives: Xarberd, Muř **boc'el* 'to kindle', řirak *boc'-kltal* 'to blaze up, suddenly inflame' [Ačārean 1913: 203b], Ararat *boc'-a-xorov* 'half-cooked, roasted on flame' [Amatuni 1912: 115b], Areř-Havarik' *bōc'i* 'dry twigs, firewood' [Lusenc' 1982: 201b] or *boc'i* (in a folk-tale, see Tēr-Połosean 1921-22: 172a^{L14} = HŽHek' 6, 1973: 581^{L5}), Łarabał, **boc'-i* 'id.', etc. [HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 212]. Possibly, Meřri *būnc* 'the thin smoke of a sunk oven' also belongs here [Ałayan 1954: 265b].

●ETYM Patrubány (1902-03a: 163) links Arm. *boc'* with Lat. *focus*, *-ī* m. 'fireplace, hearth; hearth, fireside (as the symbol of home-life); home; family, household; brazier; sacrificial hearth or altar' and posits **b^hok-sk-o-*. Petersson (1916: 285) accepts the comparison and includes also Arm. *bosor* 'blood-red, crimson', deriving *boso-r* from **b^hokō-* and *boc'* from **b^hok-so-*; see also Pokorny 1959: 162; Ałabekyan 1979: 65; Olsen 1999: 51, 51₁₀₅. The connection between Arm. *boc'* and Lat. *focus* is accepted also in Schmitt 1981: 217; Ivanov 1983: 38 (assuming a substratum word related with Yeniseian *bok* 'fire' through North Caucasian mediation). Ĵahukyan (1987: 117, 218 [15.66], 236, 269; cf. 1982: 131, 224₇₃) accepts the reconstruction **b^hok-so-* for *boc'* and is hesitant on the appurtenance of *bosor*. Olsen (loc. cit.) alternatively assumes **b^hok-jo-*, which is improbable.

Ačāryan (HAB 1: 478; see also Ę. Tumanjan 1978: 156; H. Suk'iasyan 1986: 149) prefers a connection of Arm. *boc'* to Gr. *φάος*, *φῶς* 'light', etc., which is untenable. The word *bosor* seems to be unrelated (see s.v.).

M. de Vaan (2008: 228-229) considers the connection of Lat. *focus* with Lat. *fax* 'torch' and Lith. *žvākė* 'candle' as formally impossible, and the interpretation of

focus as a back-formation to *foculus* ‘small stove’ < **fweklo-* < **d^hg^{wh}-e-tlo-* as chronologically difficult. He leaves the origin of the Latin *focus* open. Schrijver (1991: 277-278, 448) treats *foculum* ‘fire-pan’ as a deverbative of *fovĕre* ‘to warm’ < **d^hog^{wh}-ei-ō-*, cf. Skt. *dāháyati* ‘to cause to burn’, Lith. *dėgti* ‘to burn’.

In my opinion, the best solution for Lat. *focus* is linking it with Arm. *boc* ‘flame’. They may be regarded as substratum words as e.g. Lat. *faber* ‘craftsman, smith’ and Arm. *darbin* ‘smith’ (q.v.).

Nikolaev 1984: 70 considers *boc* ‘a loan from NCAuc. **bōncc* ‘flame’. However, there are no compelling reasons to abandon the IE etymology. The North Caucasian forms, if related, may be treated as borrowed from Armenian. For the epenthetic *-n-*, compare Arm. dial. *būnc* ‘.

brdoř ‘lammergeyer / Gypaetus barbatus’ (Greppin).

Attested only in Vanakan Vardapet Tawušec‘i (13th cent.): *Ayl haw kay, brdoř asen, or zayn jagn* (*ənkec‘eal yarcuoy*) *arnu ew snuc‘anē* [NHB 1: 518b]: “They say there is another bird, the *brdoř*, which takes in and nourishes the young (which the Eagle casts out).” [Greppin 1978: 40]. Or rather – “There is another bird, which is called *brdoř*, <...>“.

●ETYM Greppin (1977: 206-207; 1978: 40-42, 47; 1978b: 153; 1979: 215-216) introduces parallels and specifies *brdoř* 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 *-oř* is unknown, and *brdoř* should be derived “from the unknown Armenian substratum”. (Against this etymology: Hovsep‘yan/Simonyan 1981: 220b). Elsewhere, Greppin (1977: 205-206; 1983: 663₃) suggests a comparison with Rum. *barzǎ* ‘stork’.

These suggestions seem unnecessary, since *brdoř* is transparently composed of *burd* ‘wool’ and *oř* ‘buttocks’, meaning in fact ‘with wooly buttocks’; see HAB 1: 489a, 3: 564a.

buzat‘n, only in Bařgirk‘ hayoc‘, glossed by *ařjamuř* ‘darkness’ (see Amalyan 1975: 58^{Nr373}). Ačarıyan (HAB 1: 479a) identifies it with *bazoxť* ‘darkness’ (P‘eřtamalčean’s dictionary) and another gloss from Bařgirk‘ hayoc‘, namely *bazuit* · *ařjamuř*. For the latter, the reading *bazuxt* ‘ is preferred in the critical edition (Amalyan 1975: 46^{Nr35}).

●ETYM Ačarıyan (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 Bařgirk‘ hayoc‘ also has *bazekac*‘, *bezek*, and *buzi* (var. *bozi*), all glossed by *aregahn* ‘sun’ (see Amalyan 1975 s.vv. ; Ĵahukyan 1976a: 4). According to Ačarıyan (HAB 1: 435b, 460a), these forms are linked with *bezak* ‘lightning, sun’ (Evagrius of Pontus, Grigor Magistros) and Hebrew *bāzāq* ‘lightning’. Ĵap‘anc‘yan (1975: 368-369; see also Ĵahukyan 1973: 18; 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 **ařt*‘- ‘darkness’ (on which see s.v. *ařt-a-muř*). In this case,

we are dealing with a compound of the type *mut'-u-lus* (dial.) 'twilight', lit. 'dark-and-light'.

buc, *a*-stem: GDPI *bc-a-c'* (Genesis 31.7, 31.41, Zeyt'unyan 1985: 288, 293), *o*-stem: GDPI *bc-o-c'* (Ephrem) 'lamb'.

In the Bible (Genesis 31.7, 41 and Ezekiel 46.13) *buc* renders Gr. *ἀμνός* m.f. 'lamb'. In Grigor Magistros, commentary on Dionysius Thrax, *buc* is listed with animal-names of neutral semantics (see Adonc 1915=2008: 241^{L4}, cf. *bzak* 'he-goat' in 240^{L15}, an Iranian loanword, see HAB 1: 444b). For the meaning 'lamb' note also Georg. *buc'i* 'lamb', considered an Armenian loanword (see below).

●ETYM Since de Lagarde (1854: 27^{L733}), connected with Av. *būza-* 'he-goat' (de Vaan 2003: 288), MPers., NPers. *buz* 'goat' (MacKenzie 1971: 20; cf. Arm. *bzak* above), OIc. *bukkr* 'buck', OEngl. *bucca*, Engl. *buck* < Germ. **bukka-* probably from **b^huǵ-no-*, OIr. *boc*, Mlr. *bocc*, MWelsh *bwch*, etc. 'buck' (Schrijver 1995: 26) < Celt. **bukko-* 'goat' < **bug-ko-* (possibly from Germanic, Matasović 2009: 83), cf. Skt. Lex. *bukka-* 'goat', etc.; see Hübschmann 1897: 430; HAB 1: 482a; Pokorny 1959: 174 (misprinted *buz*); Ĵahukyan 1982: 56, 129; Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1998, 2: 586 = 1995, 1: 501; Mallory/Adams 1997: 229.

In view of parallel *o*- and *a*-stems of Arm. *buc* (cf. Ĵahukyan 1959: 321a; 1982: 129; È. Tumanjan 1978: 162), one may posit PArm. **buc-o-* vs. **buc-a-* originally from IE masc. **b^huǵ-o-* and fem. **b^huǵ-eh₂-*, respectively.

This IE word is probably related with some North Caucasian forms, such as Lak *buxca* prob. from **buc-xa* 'young he-goat', Nakh **b'ok* 'male goat'; cf. also Burushaski *buc* (Witzel 2003: 21-22). One may wonder whether the Caucasian forms are old borrowings from Armenian (cf. HAB 1: 482a). Note also Georg. *buc'i* 'lamb', an obvious Armenian loanword [HAB 1: 482a; Ĵahukyan 1987: 555].

bušt, *o*-stem (GDSg *bšt-oy* in Yakob Ĵahkec'i), cf. also GDSg *p'atlap'št-i* in Abusayid (see below) 'urinary bladder; blotch, pustule, abscess; bubble':

'urinary bladder' (Plato); 'blotch, pustule' (Kirakos Ganjakec'i, 13th cent., Ganjak [Melik'-Ohanjanyan 1961: 40^{L8}] = Russ. 'прыщ' [Xanlarjan 1976: 59], etc.); 'bubble' (Yakob Ĵahkec'i); *bštīm* 'to swell' in Aṙak'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'anp'ušt* 'urinary bladder' (Ezrik Kołbac'i, Anania Širakac'i, etc.), next to which there is a late attested synonym in numerous variant spellings: *batlab/p'ušt*, *p'al'abušt*, *p'al'ap'ušt* 'urinary bladder'. Of this term, three attestations are cited in NHB 1: 426c and HAB 1: 485a: Nersēs Palianc', 14th cent. (*balabušt*), 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'atlap'ušt*, GDSg *p'atlap'šti*), 205 (*p'alap'ušt*, GDSg *p'alap'ušti*), in the glossary: 230; see also S. Vardanyan 1971: 209. In Grigoris, one finds *p'ataybušt* (see MiĵHayBaṙ 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' [MiĵHayBaṙ 2, 1992: 5a]. The word is also attested in "Bžškaran əntreal 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 *aġawušt* ‘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 Muš *p’alamp’ušt* ‘urinary bladder’ [HAB 1: 485b]. On Hamšen *pšt-ig* ‘abscess’, see Ačaryan 1947: 14.

Neither *p’amp’ušt*, nor *p’alap’ušt* (etc.) are recorded in the dialects. However, Muš *p’alamp’ušt* remarkably combines the features of these synonymous compounds, namely the nasal of the former and the *-la-* of the latter. One also finds Balu *balabušt* [Sargisean 1932: 366].

Among new derivatives, Ačaryan (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 Gabikean 1952: 43; HayLezBrbBaġ 1, 2001: 11b). Note also Sebastia *halabušt* ‘urinary bladder’ (see Gabikean 1952: 324), which is identical with the above-mentioned literary *halabušt* ‘urinary bladder’ not only formally and semantically, but also geographically, since *halabušt* is attested in the 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. *buġburas*, *buġbulas* ‘Knospe, knotenartige Verdickung, Kugel’, *bumbulys* ‘Steckrube, Wasserblase, Kalbsauge’, *bumbulis* ‘Pupille, buġbulas ‘water bubble’, Latv. *buġburs* ‘eine harte Hervorragung der Höcker, Auswuchs, Ball’, Pol. *bąbel* ‘Wasserblase’, Gr. *βουβυλίδας· πομφόλυγας* (Hesychius) ‘water bubbles’, Lat. *bullā* ‘water bubble’, etc., and, on the other hand, Lith. *paġpti* ‘to swell’, CS *pupġ* ‘navel’, SCr. *pūp* ‘bud’; 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 its expressive and onomatopoeic nature, and perhaps also of the reduplication. Arm. *p’amp’ušt* is interpreted as **p’amp’ + bušt* (HAB; Saradževa 1986: 134).

According to Ačaryan (HAB 1: 485b), Georg. *bušti* ‘urinary bladder; bubble’ and Laz *busti* ‘urinary bladder’ are borrowed from Armenian.

Arm. *aġawušt* ‘urinary bladder; watery pustule, blister’ (q.v.), in my view, belongs with *bušt*, with intervocalic *-b-* yielding Arm. *-w-*. The first component is perhaps identical with the prefix *aġ-*. One might alternatively assume: (1) an old variant with **-r-* as in Lith. *buġbulas* ‘water bubble’; (2) an Iranian or Caucasian form **arabušt* as a rhotacized variant of Arm. **(h)alabušt*, with **-ara-* > Arm. *-aġa-* as in Iranian loans such as *paġaw* ‘old woman’ (cf. Pers. *pārāv*), etc. In this case, we might be dealing with a back-loan. But this is all uncertain.

Compare also *ptġjak* ‘bubble’.

buġn (*i*-stem, cf. adv. *bġn-i-w* ‘violently’ in Eusebius of Caesarea) ‘strong, violent’, ‘violently’, ‘violence, strength; tyrant’ (Bible+).

●ETYM Ačaryan (HAB 1: 486; see also Olsen 1999: 123-124) equates this word with *buġn*, *-in/-an-*stem ‘hand, fist’ (Bible+, widespread in the dialects) and does not accept any of the etymologies. More probably, *buġn* ‘strong, violent’ is related with

Skt. *bhūrṇi-* ‘zealous, wild’, etc. (Ĵahukyan 1987: 116, 160; Weitenberg 1989a); see s.v. *arbun-k* ‘vigour, maturity (of age)’. The comparison seems to be valid, although the vocalism is not quite clear.

burgn, GDSg *brgan* (Grigor Narekac‘i, “Čařəntir”), API *brguns* (Bible) ‘tower; pyramis’ (Bible+).

●ETYM For the etymology and a discussion, see s.v. *durgn* ‘potter’s wheel’.

G

*galoroč

●DIAL Sebastia *galoruč* ‘small shell that is used to adorn the horse or mule harness’ [Gabikean 1952: 131].

●ETYM No etymological attempt is known to me.

Probably composed of **gal-* or *galar-* ‘winding, twisting’ + *oroč* ‘shell-bead’: **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*.

galjn ‘a kind of convolvulus’ (Agat‘angelos, Yovhan Mandakuni, etc.).

●ETYM See s.v. *geļj* ‘id.’.

galj (*i*-stem according to NHB 1: 524b but without evidence) ‘warmish, lukewarm’ (Revelation 3.16, Elias on Aristotle), *galjanam* ‘to become lukewarm’ in Nersēs Šnorhali (12th cent.), Vanakan (13th cent.), caus. *galjac‘uc‘anem* (Philo).

The meaning is very clearly seen in Revelation 3.16: *galj es, ew oč‘ jerm, ew oč‘ c‘urt* ‘you are lukewarm, and neither warm nor cold’. Arm. *galj* stands for Gr. *χλιαρός* ‘lukewarm’.

●ETYM See s.v. *gol* ‘lukewarm’.

gattakur, LocSg *i gattakr-i* in Čařəntir ‘shell-fish’ (Alexander Romance, Gregory of Nyssa, Eusebius of Caesarea, Philo; *gattakray*, AblSg *i gattakray-ē* in Sargis Šnorhali Vardapet (12th cent.), GDP1 *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 mēj 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): API *gattakurs*.

●ETYM According to Ačarıyan (HAB 1: 506-507), contains *galt* ‘hidden, secret’. He does not specify the second component. In my view, **kur*, **kray* ‘shell’ is identical with **kray* found in *kray-a-kir* ‘a kind of mollusc’ (Grigor Magistros), etc., and *kray* ‘tortoise’. As to the first component, cf. dial. **gl-t-or-em* ‘to roll’, also Sebastia *galoruč* ‘small shell that is used to adorn the horse or mule harness’ [Gabikean 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.

gam, supplet. aor. *ek-* (q.v.) ‘to come’ (Bible+).

●DIAL Ubiquitous in the dialects [HAB 1: 501a].

●ETYM Usually interpreted as an athematic verb **ueh₂(-d^h)-mi*, cf. Hitt. *u^uami* ‘to come’, Lat. *vādere* ‘to go, walk, rush’, *vādāre* ‘to wade through, ford’, *vadum* ‘ford’, Welsh *go-di-wawd* ‘overtook’ < **ueh₂d^h-*, Oic. *vaða*, OHG *watan* ‘to advance, wade’ < **uh₂d^h-* (for the forms and a discussion of the laryngeal, see Schrijver 1991: 170), see Meillet 1936: 134-135; Pokorny 1959: 1109; Godel 1965: 23; Jahukyan 1982: 74; cf. Clackson 1994: 80-81. The appurtenance of the Hittite word is uncertain (cf. Kloekhorst 2008: 992).

The comparison with Gr. *κίχάω* ‘to reach, arrive, meet’ (Hübschmann 1897: 441; Klingenschmitt 1982: 86) is untenable since this root has an initial palatovelar **g^h-*, cf. YAv. *za-zā-mi* ‘to leave’, Skt. *já-hā-ti* ‘to leave, abandon’, etc. (see Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 813-814).

gayl (spelled *gayl* in the famous palimpsest of Agat’angelos, see Galēmk’earean 1911: 128bL2f), *o*-stem: GDPI *gayl-o-c*’ (Bible), *u*-stem: GDSg *gayl-u* (Movsēs Xorenac’i 2.70, 1913 = 1991: 207L3), AblSg *i gayl-u-ē* (Vark’ Grigori Astuacabani) ‘wolf’ (Bible+), ‘muzzle, cover for nose and mouth, bit’ (Bible; Agat’angelos § 69, 1909=1980: 39L3).

For the semantics cf. Lat. *lupus* ‘wolf’, ‘a bit with jagged teeth’, *lupātus* ‘a jagged-toothed bit for less tractable horses’, etc. [HAB 1: 511-512].

●DIAL Dialectally ubiquitous [HAB 1: 512b].

Most of the eastern peripheral dialects display forms with irregular vocalism. Šamaxi and Madrasa *k’ul* (vs. regular *k’el* in the village of K^yärk^yänj) represents an exceptional sound change *ay > u* [Bařramyan 1964: 33, 192]; cf. also K^yärk^yänj *p’oc’ex* from *p’aycatn* ‘spleen’ (q.v.). Almost everywhere in Łarabał one finds this form with irregular vocalism, *k’ül*, *kül*, next to regular *k’el* and *k’il* in a few locations only [Davt’yan 1966: 45, 332]. Further: Meřri, Kak’avaberđ, Karčewan *gül* [Ałayan 1954: 60, 265a; H. Muradyan 1960: 45, 191a; 1967: 61, 168a].

This EArm. dialectal form is testified in the form *goyl* (beside *gořn* vs. *garñ* ‘lamb’, q.v.) by the 13th century author Vardan Arewelc’i, who was native of Ganjak or surroundings (see Jahukyan 1954: 247). Note also *gul* in the famous material of Schröder (see Patkanov 1868: 54; Sargseanc’ 1883, 1: 23).

Ałayan (1954: 85) explains this aberrant form through tabu and compares it with Meřri *ořj* (beside the regular form *ařj* ‘bear’), which was used by hunters, or by people when supposing a danger; for a further discussion, see 2.1.36.

MidArm. *gayl-agřaw* ‘a kind of black raven, *Corvus corone*’ [MiřHayBař 1, 1987: 138a] is continued in Łarabał *k’ülükřáv*, *k’uláklav*, *kəřáklav* [Davt’yan 1966: 332].

MidArm. *mard-a-gayl* ‘hyena’, lit. ‘man-wolf’ (cf. *were-wolf*), attested in Fables by Mxit’ar Goř [MiřHayBař 2, 1992: 116-117], is present in Axalk’alak’, Ararat, Łarabał, Van [Ačarean 1913: 761-762], Bulanəx, Alaškert, etc. [Amatuni 1912: 467a]. The hyena was considered a werewolf and was also called *k’awt’ar-k’osi* ‘hyena; old witch’ (see Ananyan HayKendAřx 1, 1961: 421-433). For the werewolf and other related issues, in particular on *gayl-řori*, *gayl-řorek* ‘hyena’ in Amirdovlat’ Amasiac’i and dial. (Büt’ania/Nikomedia) **gayl-řori* ‘a kind of predator’ composed as *gayl* ‘wolf’ + *řori* ‘mule’, see 3.5.2.

Muš pl. *g'il-an, g'il-an-k'* [HAB 1: 512b].

●ETYM Since Müller et al., derived from the PIE word for 'wolf', **u₁lk^wo-*: Gr. *λύκος*, Skt. *vṛka-*, YAv. *vəhrka-*, MPers., NPers. *gurg*, Lith. *vilkas*, OCS *vlъkъ*, Goth. *wulfs*, Toch. B *walkwe*, etc. [HAB 1: 512; Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 1: 270]; for the IE forms (not mentioning the Armenian) see Pokorny 1959: 1178-1179; Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 570-571; Adams 1999: 582. However, the development **-lk^w-* > **-ly-* (or **-lχ^w-*) > **-lj-*, with lenition of the intervocalic velar stop (Pedersen 1906: 364, 406 = 1982: 142, 184; Grammont 1918: 237-239; Pisani 1934: 182; Winter 1962: 261; Kortlandt 1976: 95; 1980: 103-105; 1985b: 9-10; 1985: 20 = 2003: 5, 30-32, 58, 64; Lehmann 1986: 412) is doubtful in view of the absence of reliable parallels (see also Ravnæs 1991: 103, 143₁). I rather expect **gatb* or the like. The derivation of *gayl* from **u₁lp-* (Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 492 = 1995, 1: 413) does not solve the problem. Neither **u₁lk^wi-* (HAB 1: 512 with ref.; cf. the feminine form, Lindeman 1982a: 159-160) is plausible; it would probably give **gatč'* or **galj*.

In order to explain *-yl* satisfactorily we have to start with **u₁lio-* or **uai-lo-*. It is therefore preferable to link Arm. *gayl* with Mir. *fāel* 'wolf' (Hübschmann 1897: 431 referring to Fick Wb. II, 259; Mann 1963: 132; Mallory/Adams 1997: 647a; hesitantly: Jahukyan 1982: 35, 41). Arm. *gayl* and Celtic **uay-lo-* are usually interpreted as 'the howler' and derived from PIE **uai-*, cf. Mir. *fae* 'alas', MWelsh *gwaē* 'woe', Arm. *vay* 'woe, etc.' (see Pokorny 1959: 1111; Frisk 2: 143-144; Jahukyan 1982: 41; Olsen 1999: 34, 848; Matasović 2009 s.v. **waylo-*). Note also OIr. *foilan, failen* 'gull', MWelsh *gwylan* 'gull', etc. probably from **uail-an-* 'wailer' (Schrijver 1995: 115-116).

It is remarkable that both the Armenian and Celtic terms formed anthroponyms, cf. Arm. *Gayl, Gayl-uk*, etc. (AčařAnjn 1, 1942: 445-446) and Gaul. *Vailo, Vailico*, OIr. *Failan*, etc. (Pokorny 1959: 1111).

Arm. *gayl* cannot have been borrowed from Georg. (*m*)*gel-* 'wolf', etc. because of the vocalism. Besides, the IE origin of *gayl* is obvious. For a discussion, see Hübschmann 1897: 431; HAB 1: 512-513; Meščaninov 1925: 406; Klimov 1964: 130; Kortlandt 1976: 95 = 2003: 5; Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 496 = 1995, 1: 416; Ravnæs 1991: 103₁. Note that Arm. **gel*, represented in a considerable number of dialects (HAB 1: 512b), clearly derives from *gayl* through regular development *ay* > *e*. Thus, the Kartvelian forms, if related with the Armenian word, should be regarded as armenisms.

Adontz (1937: 8) separates Arm. *gayl* 'muzzle, cover for nose and mouth, bit' from *gayl* 'wolf' and connects the latter with Skr. *valga* 'bride', Latv. *valgs* 'cord', Lat. *valgus* 'bow-legged' (cf. Schrijver 1991: 464; Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 517, 526), which is untenable.

One may conclude that PIE **u₁lk^wo-* 'wolf' has been replaced by (or contaminated with) **uai-lo-* possibly 'howler' in Armenian and Celtic for reasons of tabu (cf. HAB 1: 512a; Solta 1960: 32f; Jahukyan 1987: 155, 198; 1992: 21; Olsen 1999: 34). For tabu, see also in the dialectal section, on dial. *goyl*.

On the wolf in the IE cultural context, see Ivanov 1975; 1977; 1977b; Mallory 1982: 202-204; Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 493-497 = 1995, 1: 413-417; Mallory / Adams 1997: 647-648. On the wolf in Armenian tradition, see A. S. Petrosyan 1989.

For the werewolf, see in the dialectal section. For the wolf as ‘outlaw’ and the phrase ‘to become a wolf’ with possible IE parallels, see 3.5.2. Note also the Armenian river-name *Gayl*.

gan, *i*-stem: GDSg *gan-i*, ISg *gan-i-w*, IPl *gan-i-w-k* ‘beating, blow’ (Bible+), MidArm. ‘wound’; **ganem** ‘to beat, strike, whip’ (Bible+).

●DIAL Only *gan* ‘wound’ in a few dialects [HAB 1: 515a].

●ETYM From PIE **g^{wh}hen-* ‘to strike’: Hitt. *kuenzi*, *kunanzi* ‘to kill, slay, ruin’, Skt. *hānti* ‘to strike, slay, kill’, Gr. *θείνω* ‘to kill’, *φόνος* m. ‘murder’, *-φόντης* ‘murdering’, etc.; see Hübschmann 1877: 24; 1897: 431-432; Patrubány 1904: 427-428; HAB 1: 514, 127b; Pokorny 1959: 492; Ĵahukyan 1982: 125; 1987: 130; García-Ramón 1998: 142₁₂. Further see s.vv. *ĵin* ‘staff, beating stick’, **ĵinj-* ‘to annihilate, destroy, wipe clean’.

Arm. *gan*, *i*-stem, has been derived from **g^{wh}η-(n)i-* or **g^{wh}η-ti-*. Since **g^{wh}η-ti-* (see Winter 1966: 206; Viredaz 2005: 97) would rather yield **gand-* (*k’san* ‘twenty’ is not a decisive counter-example since it may be due to the influence of *-sun* in *eresun* ‘thirty’, etc.), the former solution seems more probable. The verb *ganem* is likely deverbative.

Some scholars treat Arm. *gan* as an Iranian loanword (see Benveniste 1957-58: 60-62; Schmitt 1981: 76; Olsen 1999: 872; cf. 1989: 221, 222). Against this, see L. Hovhannisyán 1990: 213; Viredaz 2005: 97₆₅. The Iranian origin is improbable and unnecessary.

garñ, *in/an*-stem: GDSg *garñ*, ISg *garñam-b*, NPl *garñ-k*, APl *garñ-s*, GDPl *garñac* ‘(rich evidence in the Bible, see Astuacaturean 1895: 321-322) ‘lamb’ (Bible+).

●DIAL The principal Classical Armenian words for ‘lamb’ and ‘kid’, viz. *garñ* and *ul*, both of IE origin and practically ubiquitous in Armenian dialects, in the dialect of Hamšen have been replaced by *ĵuzik* and *ոլայ*, borrowed from Turk. *quza* and *oĵlaq* respectively (Ačařyan 1947: 188). Some eastern dialects have an unexplained *o*-vocalism: Agulis-C’ina *kórñə*, Mełri *górñə*, etc. [HAB 1: 519b; Ałayan 1954: 265b]. The EArm. and Zeyt’un **gořñ* is recorded as *gořñ* by Vardan Arewelc’i, 13th cent., Ganjak (Ĵahukyan 1954: 247); see also s.v. *gayl* ‘wolf’.

●ETYM Since long (NHB 1: 1023b; de Lagarde 1854: 27^{L732}), connected to cognate forms going back to the PIE word for ‘lamb’, **uřh₁ēn*, gen. **uřh₁no-*: Skt. *úran-*, nom. *úrā*, acc. *úrañam* m. ‘lamb’, NPers. *barra* ‘lamb’ < PIr. **varñ-aka-*, Gr. *ἀρήν* m., *φαρην* ‘lamb’, *πολύ-ρρην-ες* ‘possessing many lambs’ < IE **-urh₁-n-*, etc., see Hübschmann 1897: 432; Meillet 1903: 141; HAB 1: 519; Pokorny 1959: 1170; Hoffmann 1982: 83-86; Meier-Brügger 1990a; Mayrhofer EWAia 1, 1992: 225-226; Mallory/Adams 1997: 511a

Meillet 1936: 43 derives the Armenian form from **w^oren-* and considers the trilled *-ř-* analogical after the nominative *garñ* where it is due to the following nasal. In other examples, as he points out, no analogical influence has taken place, cf. *ar-ar-* vs. *arñem* ‘to make’, *dur-k* vs. *durñ* ‘door’ (see s.vv.); for a further discussion, see s.vv. *arñ* ‘wild ram’ and *jeř-* ‘hand’ (both with original trilled **-rr-* reflecting PIE **-rs-* and **-sr-*, respectively). The derivation of gen. *garñ* and instr. *garñam-b* from **uřar-en-os* and **uřar-η-b^hi*, respectively (see Stempel 1993 < 1987: 149) are not thus satisfactory. It seems better to posit PArm. **uřr(e)n* < **uřH(e)n-* (**-rH(n)-* > Arm. -

ř-?) in a way comparable to the Proto-Greek form (cf. also Meier-Brügger 1990a) and Iran. *varna- > *varra-; for a discussion, see Hübschmann 1897: 432; Schmitt 1981: 53; Clackson 1994: 38, 207₃₁, 208₆₀, 237_{6,4}; Olsen 1999: 120-121; Beekes 2003: 154, 193.

gari, *ea*-stem: GDSg *garw-o-y* (or *garoy*, see below), ISg *gare-a-w*, GDPI *gare-a-c'* (abundant in the Bible); *o*-stem: ISg *garw-o-v* (once in the Bible), GDPI *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'orenoy ew garoy aygeac' ew nřneneac'*: γῆ πυροῦ καὶ κριθῆς, ἄμπελοι, συκαῖ, ῥόαι.

●DIAL Widespread in the dialects [HAB 1: 522b].

Next to the regular Łarabał *k'ári*, one finds *k'ǎre/i*, with an irregular labial vowel, in the village of T'atlot [HAB 1: 522b], as well as, according to Davt'yan (1966: 24, 28, 332), in most of the villages of Hadrut'. Not mentioned in Połosyan 1965: 16, in the list of Hadrut' words displaying an irregular development *á* > *ǎ*. The same inexplicable labial vowel is found in Juła *g'ori* [Ačarean 1940: 52, 357b].

●ETYM Connected with Gr. *κριθ-ή* f. 'barley-corns', usually pl. 'barley', from an original root noun **krīθ* > Ep. *κρί* 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 2008 s.v. for references and a 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. *k'eri* '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; Furnée 1989: 116-117; Braun 1998: 33, 53, 85, 98. For possibly related North-Caucasian forms, see Chirikba 1985: 101-102^{Nř74}. Further on the Basque and other forms, see Witzel 2003: 22, 31.

The Armenian and Greek forms presuppose something like **g^hriV-/g^hrīd^h*- whereas the rest of cognates are usually derived from **g^hersd^h*- or **g^herd^h*- (see the above references, also Ĵahukyan 1982: 133; 1987: 128, 310; Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 656). Arm. *gari* is explained from the Lindeman variant **g^hřiom* [Olsen 1999: 439], through depalatalization **g^hř-* > **g^hr-* [Gamkrelidze/Ivanov, *ibid.*]. In view of formal difficulties, one may assume a Mediterranean substratum word.³⁶

garš, *i*-stem: GDPI *garš-i-c'* in John Chrysostom 'abominable' (Bible+), pl. 'abominable thing or person' (Philo, John Chrysostom); **garšim** 'to abominate, loathe, 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, mentioning further the Sanskrit by-form *ghṛṣu-* 'excited', and adds Lat. *horreō* 'to bristle; to have a rough appearance; to shiver, tremble; to

³⁶ According to Ĵahukyan (1987: 310, with references): a 'Wanderwort' of Aegean origin.

shudder at'. In 1896: 151, he mentions Lith. *garssus* with a question mark. Pedersen (1906: 413 = 1982: 191) explains Arm. *-rš-* from **-rsj-* (: Skt. *hṛsyati*), comparing *t'arš-* : Skt. *tṛṣyati* (see s.v.). This is accepted by Meillet (1950: 85). See, however, 2.1.12.

In view of formal (Arm. *g* instead of *j*) and semantic problems, Hübschmann (1897: 432) considered the connection with the Sanskrit and Latin words as uncertain. Ačaryan (HAB 1: 523b) agrees with this and links these forms with Arm. *jar* 'curved, ugly'. According to Pokorny (1959: 445), these forms belong with Arm. *jar* 'hair', whereas Arm *jar*, although with reservations, is linked with Skt. *hira-h* m. 'Band', *hirā* 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 a discussion, see also Ĵahukyan 1987: 171.

The formal argument against the connection of *garšim* with the Sanskrit and Latin forms is not crucial. In Indo-Iranian one finds **^harš-* and **^harš-*, probably due to conflation of two roots; cf. Skt. *harṣ-* vs. *ghṛṣ-*; Av. *zarəšiiamna-* 'excited', Pashto *ziž* 'rough, stiff' and Khot. *ysīra-* 'rough' vs. Parth. *gš-* 'to be happy' and Sogd. *wyš* 'to be glad' [Mayrhofer EWAia 2: 807-808]. It has been assumed that the variant **^harš-* with an initial velar stop arose after depalatalisation of the palatovelar in the zero-grade **^hrs-* (Weise's Law), and Arm. *garšim* is an Iranian loanword (see Cheung 2007: 471).

The Sanskrit verb (*hārṣate*, *hṛsyati*) 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', *harṣana-* '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. *jar* and *garšim* are native words originating from conflated **^hrs-* and **^hrs-*, respectively.

As we have seen, Iranian displays a semantic distribution: **z-*variant: 'rough, stiff' vs. **g-*variant: 'to be glad, happy'. If a reverse distribution, namely MIran. **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 the 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. *pāδ* '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 MIran. 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".

garun, GDSg *garn-an* (more often: *garnayn-o-y*) ‘spring, springtime’ (Bible+); ***garn-ayin**, GDSg *garnayn-o-y* ‘vernal’ (Bible+), **garn-ani**, GDSg *garnanw-o-y* (Agat‘angelos), *garnan-o-y* (Eusebius of Caesarea, etc.), ***garnan-ayin**, GDSg *garnanayn-o-y* (Łazar P‘arpec‘i) ‘vernal’, etc.

●DIAL Ubiquitous in the dialects; some of them have a frozen plural ***garun-k‘** [HAB 1: 525a].

●ETYM Derived from the PIE word for ‘spring’, heteroclitlic neuter ***ues-r**, ***ves-n-**: Gr. *ἔαρ* n., Lat. *vēr*, *vēris* n. (with unexplained lengthened grade, see Schrijver 1991: 128), MPers. *wahār*, Pers. *bahār*, Olc. *vár* ‘spring’, Lith. *vāsara* ‘summer’, OCS *vesna* ‘spring’, etc.; ***ues-r** > ***gehar** > ***gar-**, see Hübschmann 1897: 432-433; Pedersen 1906: 416 = 1982: 194; Grammont 1918: 247; HAB 1: 524 with references; Pokorny 1959: 1174; Szemerényi 1959-60a: 109, 109₂; Ałabekyan 1979: 87-88; Ravnæs 1991: 102; Viredaz 2000: 292, 301-302; see also s.v. *ar-iwn* ‘blood’.

It has been assumed that Arm. *gar-un* derives from ***gar-** and the suffix ***-ont-**, as in Skt. *vasantá-* m. ‘spring’ (RV+); see Stempel 1993 < 1987: 151-152; Olsen 1989: 224-225; 1999: 41-42 with lit. If one expects ***garund-**, the loss of **-d-** may be explained by ***garun-k‘**. Perhaps a better alternative is ***-ōn** or ***-ōn(t)** as in Gr. *χειμῶν*, *-ῶνος* m. ‘winter’. We can also posit an old by-form ***garun-n** (cf. Viredaz 2000: 302) < acc. ***wesar-on-m**, which would explain the oblique and compositional *garn-an(-)*.

***gez** ‘road, way’.

●ETYM Unattested. Jahukyan (1991: 37-38) reconstructs a PArm. ***gez-a-** < QIE ***ueg^h-eh₂-** from PIE ***ueg^h-** ‘to move, drive’, cf. Skt. *váhati* ‘to carry, drive’, YAv. *vaz-* ‘to move, carry, drive (a chariot)’, OHG *wagan* ‘cart’, *weg* ‘way’, Alb. *údhë* f. ‘road, way’ (on which see Demiraj 1997: 400-401), etc.; on the PIE etymon, see Pokorny 1959: 1118-1120; Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 535-537; Mallory/Adams 1997: 91a, 488a; Cheung 2007: 429-432. The PArm. word is indirectly confirmed, he assumes, by Georg. *gza-* ‘way, path’, Megr. *za-*, Laz *(n)gza-* ‘id.’ (Georgian-Zan ***gza-** ‘way, path’, Klimov 1998: 30), presumably borrowed from Armenian. Uncertain.

gelum ‘to twist; to squeeze’ (Bible+). In Agat‘angelos § 69 (1909=1980: 39^{L5}): *gel-oc‘* and *gel-aran*, GDPl *gellarana-ac‘*, ‘rack’; see HAB 1: 530; 2: 404.

In T‘ovmay Arcruni /Ananun/ 4.7 (V. M. Vardanyan 1985: 450^{L-16f}): *zi ayr arcat‘asēr orov gelul zparanoc‘n lawagoyn hamari, k‘an et‘ē dang mi tužel yarcat‘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 the published editions, the word *orov* (thus 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 *gellaran* is found in *gelərnak* (see DialAdd

apud NHB 2: 1061b) = *gelaran-ak* (Norayr, = Fr. ‘bille’), and Moks *k’älärän* [HAB 1: 531a].

●ETYM Arm. *gelum*, and *g(i)l* ‘to roll’ (q.v.) are compared with Gr. *ἐλύω* ‘to roll round’, *εἰλύω* ‘to enfold, enwrap’, ‘to press, squeeze’, *εἴλω* ‘to press; to contract his body, draw himself together’ (said of a man or an animal, e.g. an 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*, like the Armenian and Greek verbs, reflects *e*-grade **uelHu-* [Schrijver 1991: 470]. Note also Gr. *εἰλέω* ‘to wind, turn round; to roll up tight; to bind fast’, *εἰλέος* m. ‘intestinal obstruction; lurking place, den, hole’, *ἔλιξ*, *-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 *getj* ‘bindweed, convolvulus; yew-tree’ (q.v.) and Gr. *ἔλιξ*, *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 and considers the etymology 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 the other cognates (see HAB, Pokorny); (2) I fail to see a trace of the **-i-* in Arm. *getj*. Arutjunjan (1983: 342₂₃₈) asserts that *gayl*, *gayl-uk* ‘bindweed’ corroborates the development **li* > Arm. *l* in *getj*. However, a trace of **i* in *gayl* would not necessarily imply its presence also in *getj*, since they can be different formations. Besides, and more importantly, *gayl* found in *gayluk* and other plant names is obviously identical with *gayl* ‘wolf’ [Ališan 1895: 106-108, Nrs. 409-418; HAB 1: 512a]; (3) the suffixal elements are different; on Arm. *-j-*, see below; (4) various plant names are derived from the verb in other languages, too (see HAB).

Clackson’s scepticism is thus justified, as far as the idea of an 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-g^h-* may be corroborated by the Germanic word for ‘willow’; see s.v. *getj* ‘bindweed, convolvulus; yew-tree’.

For *gelumn* = Lat. *volūmen* = Gr. *εἰλῶμα*, see Olsen 1999: 595-596.

get, *o*-stem ‘beauty’ (Bible+); ‘(beautiful) appearance, look’ in Yovhannēs Drasxanakertc’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 *xožor-a-get*, translated by Thomson (1978: 141) as ‘deformed’. Then, the historian states that *Turk* ‘was called *Angeteay* because of his great ugliness (*vasn aravel žahadimut’eann*), and the name of his family (*Anget tun* ‘the house of *Angf*’) derives from it. Movsēs assumes, thus, an appellative *an-get* ‘not beautiful’, which is indeed attested in Nersēs Lambronac’i (see NHB 1: 125a). Further on this, see below.

In Yovhan Mandakuni/Mayragomec'i (5th/7th cent.) [2003: 1164b^{L15f}]: *zvayelč'ut'iw n getoyn*.

Movsēs Xorenac'i has yet another compound (also a hapax): *bare-get* 'good-looking' (1.12: 41^{L5}).

In Sebēos/Ananun 1 (Abgaryan 1979: 51^{L4f}): *yoyž t'ip'eal ēr i véray anjin ew getoy nora getec'kut'eann* : (literal transl.) "[The queen Šamiram] very much lusted for his [of Aray Gelec'ik] person/body and for the look of his handsomeness".

●ETYM Ačaryan (HAB 1: 532-533) derives from PIE **uel-* 'to see', cf. Lat. *vultus*, *vultus*, *-ūs* m. 'countenance, facial expression; face; looks, features', Bret. *gulet* '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'; cf. Gr. *ἄιδης*, etc.

***get-** 'to sing': *get-awn* 'song' (John Chrysostom); *getgetem* 'to sing beautifully, quiver, vibrate' in Hexaameron (said of *čpu'n*, 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}), for 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: GDPI *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 spaneloy n i mēj kocoyn barbarēin getgeteal xandatatut'eamb* : "They sang with moaning voices in the midst of their laments, quavering with compassion over the victim".

●ETYM Ačaryan (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 barrajig* 'Smilax excelsa L.' (34^{Nr35}).

●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. *gatjn* 'id.>'; see s.v., and HAB 1: 505-506, 534b. On the semantics, see V. Ařak'elyan 1984a: 146-147. For the discussion, in particular on *-j-*, see s.v. *gelum* 'to twist'. QIE **uel-g^h-* 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. *gėležuonys* 'submaxillary gland' (Bugge 1892: 448-449; 1893: 5-6; Hübschmann 1897: 433; 1899: 45; HAB 1: 535ab; Pisani 1950: 175; 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.vv. Against the connection with *getj-k'* 'glands': Arutjunjan (1983: 342₂₃₉).

getmn, *an*-stem: GDSg *getman*, GDPI *getman-c* 'wool, fleece' (Bible+).

●ETYM Derived from PIE **h₂ulh₁-no/eh₂-* 'wool': Hitt. *hulana-*, Skt. *ūrñā-* f., YAv. *varənā-* f. 'wool', Gr. *λῆνος* n. 'wool, wool fibre', Lat. *lāna* f. 'wool', Goth. **wulla*, OHG *wolla* 'wool', Lith. *vilna* f., SCR. *vūna* f. 'wool', etc., see Hübschmann 1883: 24; 1897: 434; HAB 1: 536a; Pokorny 1959: 1139; Peters 1980: 41; 1987; 1988: 375; Lehmann 1986: 412; Lindeman 1990a; Mayrhofer EWAia 1, 1992: 243 (without Armenian); Mallory/Adams 1997: 648b.

PIE **HulHn-* was usually syllabified as **(H)ulHn-*, cf. Lat. *lāna*, Lith. *vilna*, etc. The Celtic forms may have preserved the archaic syllabification **HulHn-* > Celt. **ulan-*: OIr. *olann* f., MWelsh *gwlan* m., Bret. *gloan* m. (**ulan-* > **ūlan-* > **ulan-*) 'wool', etc. (Schrijver 1995: 177).

Armenian has full grade, as Lat. *vellus* n. 'fleece' does (see HAB 1: 536a; Ę. Tumanjan 1978: 255-256; Ařabekyan 1979: 84; Lehmann 1986: 412; Beekes 1988: 94; 2003: 187, 193; Schrijver 1991: 179-181; Lindeman 1997: 96₉₉). For the full grade Ĵahukyan (1987: 198-199) also compares OEngl. *wil-mod* 'spinning wheel'.

It is tempting to reconstruct a QIE **Huel(H)-mn-* (cf. Olsen 1999: 504) for Armenian and Latin (cf. also Grammont 1918: 242); perhaps NSg **h₂uelh₁-men-*, obl. **h₂ulh₁-mn-os-* >> PLat. **vel(m)no-*, cf. Gr. *πυθμῖν* 'bottom' vs. Skt. *budhnā-* and Lat. *fundus* (see s.v. *andund-k'* 'abyss'). Schrijver 1991: 181 assumes **ueld-mn̥*. For **-men-* in a synonymous word cf. MPers., NPers. *pařm* 'wool', Oss. *fæsm* 'wool' vs. Skt. *pākřman-* n. 'eyelash', YAv. *pařna-* n. 'eyelash', etc. (for the etymon, see s.v. *asr* 'fleece'). Note also **Hd̥n̥(t)-mn* > PArm. **ata(nt)mn* > *atamn* 'tooth' (q.v.).

***ge-n/c'** 'to put on clothes', ***gest** 'dress, garment, clothes' (dial.).

See s.v. *z-genum* 'to put on clothes', *z-gest* 'dress, garment, clothes'.

get, *o*-stem ‘river’ (Bible+); pl.-coll. *get-oray* ‘rivers’ (Socrates apud HAB 1: 537a), *get-oray-k*‘ (Alexander Romance, see H. Simonyan 1989: 475^{L5}).

●ETYM From PIE **ued-os-* n. ‘water’: Gr. *ῥόδος* n. ‘water’, cf. Skt. *útsa-* 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)-* ‘wet’ [Starke 1990: 567-568], etc. (see below).

The PIE root is mainly represented in heteroclitic **uod-r*, GSg **ued-n-s*: Hitt. *uātar/ueten-* n. [Starke 1990: 565-568], Gr. *ῥόδωρ -ατος*, etc. In this respect, Arm. *getoray* seems important to me since, if from **ued-or-eh₂-*, it can shed some light upon the origin of the Arm. coll. *-oray(-k)*‘.

getar(u), GDSg *getar-i*, *getaru-i* ‘river-bed; river-shore; outbranching river’.

Not in NHB. Ačařyan (HAB 1: 537) only cites Step‘anos Orbelean 42 (1250/60-1303/5): *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 Őšakan. This is accepted by Ačařyan (HAB 1: 537). Elsewhere, Ačařyan records other semantic nuances in Ararat (and Ĵula); see below. ‘‘Arjerŋ bařaran’’ interprets as *get-ezr* ‘river-shore’. This agrees with the testimony from the dialects of Ararat and Meřri (see below). A. A. Abrahamyan (1986: 211) translates as *jor-a-hovit* ‘ravine-valley’.

In Bařgirk‘ *hayoc*‘ (Amalyan 1975: 183^{Nr222}), *getar* glosses an otherwise unattested word *hawari* (vars. *hawar*, *hawari*, *hawareli*; see 396₂₂₂). Here, Ačařyan (HAB 3: 69a) points out that in the dialects of Ararat and Ĵula *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: 150^{L9}; transl. Thomson 1991: 209): *karcēr i teřisn 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 the word with ModArm. *get-a-vtak* ‘tributary of a river’.

There are several place-names (one of them being attested in Ptolemy as *Γαιτάρα*) which obviously contain this word; see s.v. *Getar(u)*.

●DIAL Ararat *getar* ‘river-shore’ [Ačařean 1913: 224a]; Meřri *getarŋə* ‘river-shore’ (see Ałayan 1954: 293, in a glossary of purely dialectal words); Muš, Őšakan *getar* ‘the former river-bed which is ploughed’; Ararat and Ĵula *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 *arnum* ‘to take’, as is suggested in NHB (*arŋul getoy zač‘s*).

●ETYM There can be no doubt that *getar* derives from *get* ‘river’ (q.v.). Ačařyan (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 identical with Arm. *ařu* ‘brook, tributary; channel; ditch, trench, furrow, passage’ (q.v.). The fact that in the oldest attestation we find *getařu*, 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. Av. *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 identical second component) would be comparable to that of PArm. **wed(V)-sru-*.

The word *haw-ar-i* which is represented in Bařgirk‘ hayoc‘ as synonymous to *getar* (see above) seems to follow the same pattern, with the same **ar*. I suggest to derive the first component **haw* from PIE **h₂ep-* ‘river, water’: Luw. *hāpa/i-* ‘river’, Skt. *āp-* ‘water’ (cf. *dvīpá-* ‘island, island in a river, sandbank’ (RV+) < **dui-h₂p-ó-*, lit. ‘having water on two sides’), Toch. AB *āp* f. ‘water, river, stream’, etc.

Note also *kawarñ* ‘brook, canal’ (Cyril of Alexandria; several dialects [HAB 2: 561b]), if composed of *kaw* (= the word for ‘clay’?) and **ar-*.

getin, *o*-stem: GDSg *getn-o-y*, AblSg *i getn-o-y*, AllSg *i getin*, LocSg *i getn-i* (rich evidence in the Bible, see Astuacaturean 1895: 328c), *a*-stem: ISg *getn-a-w* (Hexaameron, see K. Muradyan 1984: 276¹⁹), IPI *getn-a-w-k*‘ (Agat‘angelos); API *getin-s* (Grigor Narekac‘i) ‘earth, ground’ (Bible+).

●DIAL Ubiquitous in the dialects [HAB 1: 538b].

●ETYM Scheftelowitz 1904-05, 2: 44 suggests a connection with Gr. *οἶδας* ‘ground’. Ačařyan (HAB 1: 538) rejects this and other etymological suggestions and leaves the origin of the word open.

A very attractive etymology is proposed in Götze/Pedersen 1934: 79-80, who connect Arm. *getin* to Hitt. *utnē* < **-nēi*, obl. *utni-* n. ‘land’, deriv. *utnijant-* c. ‘people, population’.³⁷ The connection of this Hittite word to CLuw. **uatna-* ‘land’ in *Kizzuuatna-*, Lyc. *wedre/i-* ‘city, country?’ is uncertain. For the forms, attestations and morphological discussion see Neu 1974: 109-114; Starke 1990: 468₁₇₀₅; Melchert 1994: 161; Kloekhorst 2006: 90; 2008: 933-934. Jahukyan 1987: 155, 198 accepts the etymology, but later on (1990: 71, sem. field 1) he considers *getin* a word of unknown origin.

³⁷ Commenting upon this etymology, Kammenhuber (1961: 56-57) writes: “Ein besonders enger Kontakt zwischen den Armeniern und Heth.-Luviern nach dem Verlassen der idg. Heimat ist nach den (bisher angeführten) Übereinstimmungen sehr unwahrscheinlich”.

Since the Hittite word is neuter, we may tentatively reconstruct a PD neuter *n*-stem (for this declension see Beekes 1995: 186): nom. **uéd-n*, obl. **ud-én-*. This paradigm would develop into PArm. **wéd-an*, obl. **udén* >> **wéd(a)n*, **wedén*, whence **wedén-o-* with secondary thematization: **ued-én-os* : **ued-en-ósyo-* > Arm. **getín(o)* : **get(i)nó(yo)* > ClArm. *getin* : *getnoy*. For a discussion on *-in* see s.vv. *lusin* ‘moon’, *katín* ‘acorn’; further cf. Olsen 1999: 464-465. If Gr. *οὐδας* ‘ground’ is related, we might reconstruct **h₃u(e)d-*, but this is uncertain (see Kloekhorst *ibid.*).

The Armenian (see Patrubány StugHetaz 1908: 152a) and Anatolian forms may be derived from the PIE neuter word for ‘water’, cf. OCS *voda* ‘water’, etc. (see s.v. *get* ‘river’), thus ‘water-land, land neighbouring with water’ (see Pisani 1957: 552; Melchert 1994: 161). In this case the appurtenance of the Greek form becomes even more problematic.

The singular forms of Arm. *getin*, *o*-stem are abundantly attested in the Bible, but in the Concordance we find no testimony for plural forms. The only attestations for the *a*-stem are found with instrumental: sg. *getn-a-w* (Hexaameron) and pl. *getn-a-w-k* (Agat‘angelos). It is tempting to explain this *a*-stem from IE neuter plural **-h₂*.

Apart from this attestation of IPI, we find no plural forms in NHB, leaving aside API *getin-s* in Grigor Narekac‘i (10-11th cent.). Note the absence of dialectal forms in a frozen plural even when used in apposition with pl. tant. *erkin-k* ‘sky’. In folk texts from Nor Naxijewan, for example, we often find *kedin* contrasted with *ergink* ‘sky’ (P‘ork‘šeyan 1971: 92a^{Nrs7-8}, 106b^{L13}), also in a compound form *ergink*‘*kedin* ‘sky-earth’, with the verb in singular (op.cit. 32a^{Nr3}).

ger ‘above, higher, over, more than’ (Book of Chries, Porphyry, Yovhannēs Ōjneg‘i, Xosrovik T‘argmanič‘, Anania Narekac‘i, etc.); the oldest attestation is **ger i veroy** in Eznik Koľbac‘i (5th cent.), John Chrysostom [HAB 1: 539a].

Widely used as a prefix in the hellenophile style (NHB 1: 542-549; HAB 1: 539; A. Muradyan 1971: 141-142; Ĵahukyan 1993a: 10).

●ETYM Probably derived from IE **h₂uer-*, cf. Gr. *ἀείρω* ‘to raise (up)’; for references to Meillet (*BSL* 26, p. 9) et al. and for a discussion, see HAB 1: 539-540; Chantraine 1968-80: 22-23 (hesitantly Hübschmann 1897: 495). Further see Kortlandt 1976: 94-95 = 2003: 4; Ĵahukyan 1987: 156, 199. The relation with PIE **u₂ers-* (cf. Skt. *várṣman-* n. ‘height, peak, top’, Lith. *viršùs* ‘top, peak’, OCS *vrъxъ* ‘upper end, top, point’, etc., see Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 523; Mallory/Adams 1997: 416a).

If this Greek verb is etymologically identical with homonymous *ἀείρω* ‘to bind together’ (see Beekes 1969: 57; Chantraine 1968-80: 23-24), then Arm. *ger* is related with *geri* ‘captive’ (q.v.).

The connection with Arm. *ver* ‘above’ is untenable since a PIE **(h)u-* cannot yield Arm. *v-*; this word regularly derives from **upéri* (see also Ravnæs 1991: 69-70). See s.v. *ver* for more detail.

geran, *a*-stem (later: ISg *geran-i-w*) ‘beam, log’ (Bible), ‘a kind of meteorological phenomenon’ (Philo+). For the latter meaning, Ačaryan (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 hrelēn* “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 the dialects [HAB 1: 540b].

●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. (< **uernā-*) ‘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; Jahukyan 1987: 156; Olsen 1999: 297. In order to explain Arm. *-a-*, unclear forms are reconstructed: **uer-ḡnā-*, **uerbnā-*. Probably reshaped under the influence of the suffix *-an* (on which see Jahukyan 1998: 11-12; Olsen 1999: 287-301).

gerandi, *a*-stem (ISg *gerandeaw* in Łazar P‘arpec‘i, 5th cent.) ‘scythe; sickle’ (Bible+). Yovhannēs Draxanakerc‘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 the dialects: Hamšen, Axalc‘xa, Muš, Van, Salmast, Łarabał, etc. [HAB 1: 540b].

According to Bałramyan (1961: 177b), Kŕzen *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^herēndi*, 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 Ačarıyan (HAB 1: 540b), *kerāndú*. Compare Ijewan/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 *mangał* ‘sickle’. This specification is seen already in the 5th century, cf. Łazar P‘arpec‘i 88 (1904=1985: 159^{L8f}): *mangaław 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’. Ačarıyan (HAB 1: 540b) does not accept these and other etymologies and leaves the origin of *gerandi* open. Jahukyan (1987: 156) does not mention *gerandi* next to *geran*, and takes *gerandi* to be of unknown origin (1990: 72, sem. field 8).

Olsen (1999: 439) compares with Gr. *χεράς, χεράδος* n. ‘Geröll, Kies, Geschiebe’ (in Liddell/Scott/Jones ‘silt, gravel, and rubbish, brought down by torrents’) and reconstructs **g^herġt-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 to 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 *dēs* ‘sickle’ (< Iran **dāθrī-*), etc.; see Mayrhofer EWAia 1: 716; ÈtimSlovIranJaz 2, 2003: 438-441. PIE **deh₁-V-* would yield Arm. **ti-V-* > **ti*. 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 synonymous word in Arm. dialects, namely *mārāndi* ‘the biggest kind of sickle’ (Ijewan 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 Drasxanakerc‘i); **gerdast-akan**, **gerdastan-ik** ‘servant, female servant’ (John Chrysostom). Ačařyan (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. *θεραπεΐα* (in coll. sense) ‘body of attendants, retinue’: *i veray gerdastani iwroy* : *ἐπὶ τῆς θεραπεΐας* (Nestle/Aland 203).

●DIAL Alaškert, Axalc‘xa *g‘erd‘astan*, etc.; according to Ačařyan (HAB 1: 542a), from the literary language.

●ETYM Ačařyan (HAB 1: 541) derives from PIE **g^herd^h-*: Skt. *grhá-* m. ‘house, residence’ (RV+), YAv. *garəda-* 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 mediation [Brandenstein/Mayrhofer 1964: 120; Nyberg 1974: 80; Perixanjan 1983: 309-310₁₉, cf. 58; Jahukyan 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. *ataxin* ‘female servant’.

geri, *ea*-stem: GDSg *gerw-o-y*, GDPI *gere-a-c* (Bible+) ‘captive’, **gerem** ‘to capture, take prisoner’ (both are richly attested in the Bible, see Astuacaturean 1895: 330); late diminutive **gerēk** ‘miserable, poor’ (Yaysmawurk‘, see HAB 1: 543b).

Some textual illustrations: in P'awstos Buzand 5.44 (1883=1984: 218^{L8f}, transl. Garsoïan 1989: 229): *zi otormēr alk'atac', tnankac', gereac', amayeac', oțarac', pandxtac'* : "For he comforted the poor, the homeless, the captive, the abandoned, the stranger, the wanderer"; in Genesis 34.29 (Zeyt'unyan 1985: 308): *zkanays noc'a gerez'in : tās gynaiķas autōn hēmalōteusan.*

The verb **gerem** and the compound **gerevar**, *a*-stem 'captor' (= *geri* 'captive' + *-a-* + *var-* 'to lead') co-occur in Job 1.15: *Ew ekin gerevark' ew gerez'in znosa : kai ēlthōntes oi aīχmalōtebōntes hēmalōteusan autās* : "And captors came and carried them off" (Cox 2006: 52).

●DIAL Van, Moks, Salmast, etc. [HAB 1: 544b]. According to Ačāryan (1913: 226a; HAB *ibid.*), Manisa, Č'enkiler, Č'arsančag, Tarente ***gerek-nal** 'to beg, supplicate' derives from *geri*. If this is true, the verb may be derived from the diminutive *gerēk* 'miserable, poor' (see above), basically meaning 'to supplicate miserably, like a miserable person'.

●ETYM Lidén (1906: 106-108) links Arm. *geri* with Gr. *εὐρίσκω* 'to find', OIr. *-fúar* 'I found' < IE **ue-ur-*, pass. *-frīth* 'inventum est' < IE **urē-to-*, etc., assuming that the original meaning of the Armenian word is 'nehmen, ergreifen'. Though largely accepted (Pokorny 1959: 1160; Frisk, s.v.; Ĵahukyan 1987: 156; M. Niepokuj *apud* Mallory/Adams 1997: 202a), this etymology is problematic both formally and semantically. See also Olsen 1999: 439.

A preferable but largely forgotten etymology has been proposed by Ačāryan (HAB 1: 544), who connects Arm. *geri* to Gr. *ἀείρω* 'to bind together', *συν-ωρίς*, *-ίδος* f. 'two-horse team', Lith. *virvė* 'string', OCS *obora* (< **ob-vora*) 'string', etc. The same has independently been suggested by Olsen (1999: 439, 763). For a further discussion, see Barton 1989: 154₆₀. For the semantic relationship compare MPers. *band-ak* 'servant, slave' from *band-*, *bastan* 'to bind, fetter, fasten', cf. Skt. *bandh-* 'to bind, fasten', *bandhá-* m. 'bond, fetter' (RV+), etc. (see *ĒtimSlovIranJaz* 2, 2003: 68-80), as well as Arm. *bant* 'prison' (Iranian loanword), on which see HAB 1: 409-410. See also s.v.v. *pind* 'firm, dense, fastened', *papanjim* 'to grow dumb, speechless'. Note also Georg. *geri* 'stepson' and an identical form in the Armenian dialect of T'iflis (HAB 1: 544b). For WCauc. forms possibly borrowed from Armenian, see Ĵahukyan 1987: 602.

Further, see s.v. *ger* 'above, higher, over, more than'.

gēj, *o*-stem: GDSg *giĵ-o-y*, GDPl *giĵ-o-c* (Philo, Aristotle, Gregory of Nyssa), LocSg *i giĵ-i* (Bible+) adj. 'moist; lascivious', subst. 'moisture' (LocSg *i giĵ-i*). In the verb *giĵanam* and in the compound *giĵ-akn(-eay)*, refers to eye-pus.

In Movsēs Xorenac'i 2.6 (1913=1991: 108^{L5}, transl. Thomson 1978: 135): *i giĵin ew i maraxlut telis 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 *geĵril* 'to mould' [Ačārean 1913: 227b; HAB 1: 551a].

●ETYM From QIE **g^{wh}e/oid^h-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.³⁸ Note also Russ. *žíža* < **židjā*, as well as several dialectal forms with the root *žid-* referring, as the Armenian cognate, to dirt; 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) dirt; moral dirt’.

For the Armenian word, usually an *e*-grade is reconstructed, see Jahukyan 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 *geťj-k* ‘glands’, *ak’is* ‘weasel’, *keč’i* ‘birch’ (see 2.1.14), which seems plausible.

Armenian **žiž-* in *žžak* (T’ovmay Arcruni 1.3 – 9-10th cent.), *žižmak*, *ž(i)žmunk*’, **žžuank*’ ‘insects, worms; hallucination, mirage; nightmare’ and *žiži* ‘dragon-fly’ is considered to have onomatopoeic origin by Ačařyan (HAB 2: 229-230). I tentatively propose an alternative etymology. If *gēj* indeed reflects an *o*-grade, one may assume that **žiž-* is related and goes back to **g^{wh}(e)id^h-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 (**čipr*, *čpur* ‘eye-pus’: *čpuřn* ‘dragon-fly’, etc.).

***gēt-** ‘to know’: *gitem*, aor. 1sg. *git-a-c* ‘-i, 3.sg *git-a-c* ‘to know, be acquainted with; to be able; to copulate’ (Bible+), ‘to consider’ (Agat’angelos, etc.); **-(a-)gēt** as the second member of a number of compounds (Bible+); *gēt*, *a*-stem: GDPl *git-a-c*’ (Bible+); *i*-stem: GDPl *git-i-c*’ (Eusebius of Caesarea) ‘wizard, magician, sorcerer’ (Bible+).

●DIAL The verb is ubiquitous in the dialects [HAB 1: 552b].

In a folk-tale from Łarabał recorded by M. Mxit’aryan in 1961 (HŽHek’ 6, 1973: 103^{L8}) one finds a numeration of various specialists, sorcerers and hakeems/medics, which tried to cure the mute princess: *hāk’yim*, *gyidac’ot*, *derviř*, *p’alč’i mart’ik’y*. Of these, *gyidac’ot* reflects **git-ac* ‘-ot and can be compared with ClArm. *gēt* ‘wizard, magician, sorcerer’.

●ETYM From PIE **ueid-* ‘to know, be acquainted with’: Skt. *ved-* ‘to know, be acquainted with’, Goth. *wait* ‘he knows’, etc. Hübschmann 1897: 435; HAB 1: 552; Pokorny 1959: 1125. The Armenian verb is derived from PIE perfect **uoid-h₂e*, cf. Skt. perfect *véda*, Gr. *oída*, Goth. *wait*. For a discussion, see Meillet 1936: 112; K. Schmidt 1980: 43; 1985: 86; Schmitt 1981: 52, 134, and especially Peters 1997.

On the relation between the two PIE roots **uid-* ‘to know’ and ‘to find’ as well as on the phrase ‘to find favour’, see de Lamberterie 1978-79 (on the phrase, see also Clackson 1994: 180-181); Saradževa 1986: 163-164.

gi, *o*-stem: GDSg *gi-o-y* ‘juniper’ (Bible+); with *h*-glide **gi-h-i** ‘id.’ (lex.).

●DIAL Zeyt’un *g’ē* ‘juniper’, Binkean *g’i* ‘cypress’ [Ačařyan 2003: 107-108; HAB 1: 554b]; Xotorĵur *g’ihi* ‘juniper’ [HAB 1: 556b; Ačařyan 2003: 108; YuřamXotorĵ 1964: 437b]; **gi-h-eni* > Łarabał *kéne*, Loři *keni*, etc. [HAB 1: 554b]. For the latter form cf. *gin* glossed as *geni car* in the glossary *Barĵirk’ hayoc*’ (Amalyan 1975: 66^{Nr183}). Amalyan (op. cit. 357¹⁸³) identifies this tree with *gi*, *gieni*.

³⁸ A completely different etymology is offered by Woodhouse (1994).

Ananyan (1984: 241, 320, 430, 481-482, 486) describes Ararat *keni* as an evergreen conifer with very oily pitch and easily kindling ‘needle-leaves’. He mentions *gihi* and *keni* side by side in the same context, as similar but different trees (op. cit. 49, cf. 355). Zangezur *keni* is said to have thorny branches [Lisic‘yan 1969: 100]. According to Malxaseanc‘ HBB 1: 435b, *gi*, *gihi* refers to ‘yew, taxus’. For a further discussion, see Ališan 1895: 122-123.

●ETYM Derived from PIE **uei(H)-t-*: Ilr. **uaj-t-*: Gr. *φῦέα* ‘willow’, Skt. *vetasá-* m. ‘Calamus Rotang or another kind of similar reed’, *vaitasá-* m. ‘Rohrstock’ (= ‘penis’), *vetra-* m. ‘a big kind of Calamus’, YAv. *vaētay-* f. ‘Weide, Weidengerte’ (Bartholomae 1904: 1314), Pashto *vala* < **uajtiijā-*, Pahl. *wēd* [wyt], NPers. *bēd* ‘willow’ (see MacKenzie 1971: 89), Kurd. *bī*, *bīd* ‘тополь = poplar’ (Kurmanji), ‘willow’ (Cabolov 1, 2001: 197-198), Lat. *uītis* ‘vine, vine-branch; centurion’s staff’, OHG *wīda* ‘willow’, Germ. *Weide*, etc., see Lidén 1905-06: 494-498; HAB 1: 554; 4: 627; on the etymon, see also Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 628, 649-650; Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 578-579; Mallory/Adams 1997: 571a, 643a.

The Armenian word is often mentioned under the derivative **uei-s-* (Pokorny 1959: 1133; Mallory/Adams 1997: 644a). In fact it belongs with **uei(H)-t-* (thus also P. Friedrich 1970: 55; Campbell 1990: 174).

Klimov (1989: 23-24; 1994: 76-78; 1998: 226-227) relates this IE tree-name with Kartv. **ywi-* ‘juniper’ considering the cluster **yṵw-* as a reflex of PIE **H₂u-*. More probably, the Kartvelian word is an Armenian loanword, as is stated by Ačaryan in HAB 1: 554b; 4: 627 for Georgian *γvi-a*, etc. The semantics corroborates this assumption. Klimov 1994: 77 rejects the direct comparison on phonological grounds. However, Kartv. **yṵw-* can be regarded as the reflex of PArm. **g^wi-* < IE **ui(H)-*. Exactly the same is seen in another early armenism in Kartvelian: **yṵwino-* ‘wine’ < Arm. **g^winio-*: *gini*, gen. *ginwoy* ‘wine’, cf. Gr. (*φ*)*οῖνος*, Lat. *vīnum*, Hitt. *uīian-*, etc. Besides, Klimov’s idea on Kartv. **yṵw-* vs. PIE **H₂u-* is unconvincing because neither of these PIE lexemes has in fact an initial laryngeal.

gil, *o*-stem or *a*-stem: IPI *gl-o-v-k*‘, var. *gl-a-w-k*‘, in Yovhan Mamikonean (A. Abrahamyan 1941: 199^{L5}: *k‘arambk‘ ew glovk‘/glawk‘ yanxnay kotorec‘in*); API *gil-s* in 1 Maccabees 2.36 ‘stone for throwing’; **gil** ‘rolling’ (Grigor Narekac‘i., etc.); **glem** ‘to roll’ (Bible+), frequently referring to rolling of rocks [*vēm*] or stones [*k‘ar*], see NHB 1: 559b (*vēms glel* also in Anania Širakac‘i, see A. G. Abrahamyan 1944: 321^{L3}); **gl-or-em** ‘to roll; to stumble, fall down’ (Bible, Agat‘angelos, etc.); **gayt‘-a-gl-im** ‘to roll, stumble, 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. *šeljaxtirk*‘, as well as in the recent editon (2003: 1264a^{L-16}).

In Bařgirk‘ 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 the 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-*gl-im* 'to roll, fall down; to err' (Bible+).

Ačāryan (HAB 1: 556a), with reservations, also mentions Van **gil* 'a kind of soft stone'. (Ačāryan 1952: 253 vacat). Note also Kīzen *g'il* 'a stone to wash with' [Bařamyān 1961: 177b], Areš *gil* 'id.' [Lusenc' 1982: 202a], both represented as from ClArm. *gil*. Ačāryan (HAB 1: 556a) alternatively compares 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 Maccabees 2.36 -s) 'stone for throwing' from the root for 'to roll' and takes as an isolated word of unknown origin. I see no 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.

gin, *o*-stem: GDSg *gn-o-y*, GDPl *gn-o-c*' (Bible+); later also *i*-stem: IPl *gn-i-w-k*' (Nersēs Lambronac'i, 12th cent.) 'price, purchase price; buy; hiring price' (Bible+).

●DIAL Ubiquitous in the dialects [HAB 1: 557a].

●ETYM Since long (Tērvišean apud HAB; Bugge 1889: 24; Hübschmann 1883: 24-25; 1897: 434), derived from PIE **ues-no-*: Skt. *vasná-* n. 'purchase price', Lat. *vēnum* n. in the formula *vēnum dare* 'to put up for sale', cf. Gr. *ῶνος* 'purchase price' and the verbal form in Hittite, *uāš-* 'to buy', see HAB 1: 556-557; Pokorny 1959: 1173; Mayrhofer KEWA 3, 1976: 177; EWAia 2, 1996: 535; Mallory/Adams 1997: 185a; Olsen 1999: 29.

The Armenian form is usually derived from **uēsno-*, but this seems unnecessary; *gin* can be regarded as the regular outcome of **uesno-* (see Ringe 1984: 51; Morani 1991: 178-179; Beekes 2003: 170; cf. Ravnæs 1991: 7; Clackson 1994: 111).

gind, *a*-stem: GDPl *gnd-a-c*' (Bible+); later: *o*-stem: IPl *gnd-o-v-k*' in John Chrysostom (see Hac'uni 1923: 132-133), *i*-stem: GDPl *gnd-i-c*' (Čarəntir 'earring' (Bible+); ***gnd-ak*** 'vine' in Genesis 49.11 (*z-gndak-ē*, Zeyt'unyan 1985: 385), Hexaemeron (K. Muradyan 1984: 145^{L11}, 147^{L5}), Philo, etc.

17 attestations in the Bible (Astuacaturean 1895: 333c). Textual illustrations from Movsēs Xorenac'i: 2.47 (1913=1991: 174^{L5f}; transl. Thomson 1978: 187-188): *gind yerkosin akanjśn*, <...;...>, *bayc' miayn yerkuc' gndac'n* : "rings for both ears, <...;...>, except for the two [ear]rings". For the context, see Xalat'janc 1896, 1: 256ff; Hac'uni 1923: 84; Thomson 1978: 188₃. For attestations in Agat'angelos, Efišē, John Chrysostom, etc., see Hac'uni 1923: 96, 110, 116, 132-133, 220, 298.

●DIAL The form *gind* is present in Muš, Alaškert, Ararat, Van-group, Salmast, etc. [HAB 1: 558a]. A textual illustration in a folk-song from Muš (R. Grigoryan 1970: 169^{Nr284}): *gnder akanjīn* '(wearing) rings on his ear(s)'.
 ●ETYM From QIE **uend^h-eh₂-*: OEngl. *windan* 'to wind', Germ. *winden* 'to wind', OHG *winda*, Germ. *Winde* 'bindweed, convolvulus' (< 'die Sichwindende, HerkWört

1997: 815b; cf. Arm. *gnd-ak* ‘vine’), Skt. *vandhūr-* m. ‘seat of carriage, framework of carriage’, *vandhūra-* n. ‘framework of carriage’ < **vandh-* ‘to plait, wind’ (cf. Iran. **vand-* > Arm. *vand-ak* ‘plaited net, basket, cage’, HAB 4: 304-305), etc., see Lidén 1906: 5-8; HAB 1: 557; Pokorny 1959: 1148; Schmitt 1981: 61; Ravnæs 1991: 69, 71; Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 503 (without Armenian); Mallory/Adams 1997: 607a; Olsen 1999: 70; Viredaz 2005: 97, 97₆₄. Hamp 2001: 9 adduces also Alb. *veth*, pl. *vath* ‘earring’ (sceptical Kortlandt 1986: 41 = 2003: 70).

gini, *wo*-stem: GDSg *ginw-o-y*, AblSg *i ginw-o-y*, ISg *ginw-o-v*, LocSg *i ginw-o-ǰ*; *ea*-stem: ISg *gine-a-w*, GDP1 *gine-a-c*’, IPI *gine-a-w-k*’ (rich evidence in the Bible, see Astuacaturean 1895: 334-335) ‘wine’ (Bible+); a number of compounds with **gin-** and **gine-** < **gini-a-*

●DIAL Ubiquitous in the dialects [HAB 1: 559a].

●ETYM Since long (NHB 1: 553c; Hübschmann 1883: 25; 1897: 434-435), connected with Gr. (f)*oĩvos* m. ‘wine’ and Lat. *vīnum* *ī*, n. ‘wine’; note also Alb. *véř/věňě* ‘wine’, Hitt. *uījan-* c. ‘wine’, CLuw. *uīnija-* ‘of wine’, HLuw. *wījan(i)-* ‘vine’, etc. See HAB 1: 558-559; Pokorny 1959: 1121; Beekes 1987a; Mallory/Adams 1997: 644; Demiraj 1997: 414; Olsen 1999: 439-440³⁹.

The word for ‘wine’ has been treated as non-IE (see HAB 1: 558-559 with literature and a discussion; Krahe 1970: 86-87; Greppin 2008a). According to Meillet (1908-09b: 163; 1936: 143; see also Meillet/Vendryes 1924: 16-17), we are dealing with a Mediterranean word. Ačaryan (1937: 3; AčarHLPatm 1, 1940: 103) treats Arm. *gini* and Gr. *oĩvos* as borrowed from Phrygian, or from the Mediterranean or Aegean civilization. Ĵahukyan (1987: 49, 155, 307, 309, 450) mentions Indo-European, Mediterranean, and Semitic theories. Further see Otkupščikov 1985: 102.

The PIE origin of ‘wine’ is more probable (see Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 647-648 = 1995: 557-558; Otkupščikov 1985; Beekes 1987a). For a discussion, see also Bonfante 1974; Schmitt 1981: 52, 68-71; Mallory/Adams 1997: 644-646; Matzinger 2005: 20, 66. One now reconstructs an *n*-stem < **u(e)ih₁-on-*, see Beekes 1987a; Kloekhorst 2008: 1012; cf. Gippert 1994: 119₁₆.

Kartv. **γwino-* ‘wine’: Georg. *γvino-*, Megr. *γvin-*, Laz *γ(v)in-*, Svan *γwin-e/āl* is treated as a loan from PArm. **γ^weinjo-* < **ue/oi(H)njō-* through the development Arm. *g-* < **γ^w-* < PIE **u-*, see NHB 1: 553c (explicitly deriving the Georgian form from Armenian); Bugge 1893: 83 with ref.; Hübschmann 1897: 397, 434-435; Pedersen 1906: 458 = 1982: 236; HAB 3: 558-559; Illič-Svityč 1964: 5₁₂, 8; Ĵahukyan 1967: 53; Kortlandt 1976: 95; 1989: 44 = 2003: 4, 89; for a critical analysis, see Ravnæs 1991: 85₁.

Klimov (1964: 203-204; 1989: 23, 25; 1994: 78-82, cf. 106-108; 1998: 227) repeatedly rejects the Armenian origin of the Kartvelian word and treats the latter as a very early Indo-European loanword. However, his assumption on the development PIE **H_u-* > Kartv. **γw-* is uncertain especially as far as this particular word is concerned because this PIE word has no initial laryngeal, whereas the development

³⁹ According to Olsen 1999: 439-440, the vacillation between *wo-* and *ea-* stem of Arm. *gini* probably points to an old neuter.

PIE **u-* > PArm. **y^w-* > Kartv. **y^w-* is practically impeccable. Note also PIE **ui(H)-* > Arm. **y^wi-* ‘juniper’ > Kartv. **y^wi-* ‘juniper’ (see s.v. *gi* ‘juniper’).

For further references and a discussion on Armenian and Kartvelian forms and related issues, see Dumézil 1967a: 29-30₂; Greppin 1997a: 384; Takács 1997: 374; Witzel 2003: 22₈₈; Viredaz 2003: 68₄₃, and especially Gippert 1994: 117-121 and Greppin 1998; 2008a.

gišer, *o*-stem: GDSg *gišer-o-y* and LocSg *gišer-i* or *i gišer-i* (abundant in the Bible, see Astuacaturean 1895: 336); *a*-stem in adverbial forms: ISg *gišer-a-w* (Elišē, 5th cent.; Aristakēs Lastivertc‘i, 11th cent.), GDPl *gišer-a-c*‘ (Isaiah 26.9, Gr. *ἐκ νυκτὸς*) ‘night’ (Bible+); **gišer-ayn** adv. ‘at night’ (Bible+); **Gišer-a-var** (later also *Gišer-a-var*, folk-etymologically associated with *var-* ‘to light up, kindle’) ‘planet Venus, Evening Star’ (Job, Cyril of Jerusalem, etc.; renders Gr. *ἕσπερος* ‘Evening-Star, Venus’ in Job 9.9 and 38.32, see Cox 2006: 93, 247; see also 3.1.5).

On genitive *gišer-oy* vs. locative and adverbial *gišer-i*, see Clackson 1994: 63; Olsen 1999: 179, 179₃₃₁. For the parallelism between *o*- and *a*-stems, see below.

● **DIAL** Ubiquitous in the dialects [HAB 1: 560b]. Interesting are Mełri *k‘šan-raku* ‘morning-evening’, *k‘šan-k‘šerav* ‘early morning’, *k‘šanə*, *k‘šanac* ‘in the morning’ [Ałayan 1954: 335-336], practically the same in Karčewan [H. Muradyan 1960: 234a], Kak‘avaberd *k‘išānac* ‘in the morning’ [H. Muradyan 1967: 208b].

● **ETYM** Connected with Gr. *ἕσπερος* 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. *vākaras* m. ‘evening’, OCS *večerъ*, etc.; see Klaproth 1831: 99a (*kšer*); Hübschmann 1897: 435; HAB 1: 559-560; Mladenov 1937: 99; Mallory/Adams 1997: 184a. For a sceptical discussion, see Brugmann 1902-03: 157-163.

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*. Pisani (1950: 170-171) assumes **sk* > *š* before front vowels. Schrijver (1995: 159-160; see also Beekes 1996: 232₁₀) posits **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); see also Pokorny 1959: 1173 with ref. For **ue(i)kuero-*, see Katz 2000: 72₁₀ with references. Blažek 2004: 66 posits **uēk^wero-* and compares with the case of *iž* ‘viper’ (q.v.). Jahukyan 1984a: 160 posits **ueisk^hero-*, with **-sk^h-* > Arm. *-š-*, but this is unfounded.

One also assumes **-ksp-* > **-kš(p)-* comparing with *veštasan* ‘sixteen’ (Normier 1981: 23-24₁₇; Beekes 2003: 201; 2004). 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. *kšāp-* f., Hitt.

ispant- ‘night’, etc.; cf. also Puhvel 2003: 348), thus: **ueksepero-* > Parm. **we(k)še(w)ero-* > **geišero-* > *gišer*.

The assumption of a compound (see Hamp 1966: 13-15; Olsen 1999: 179₃₃₂ with ref.) comprising **ueik/g-* ‘Wechsel, unit of time’ and **ksperos* ‘night’ is improbable. Against the *-i-, see above. For a further discussion of this IE term in the context of an ancient European substratum, see Beekes 1996: 232-233₁₀.

The parallelism of *o-* and *a-*stems of *gišer* is comparable with that of Gr. ἔσπερος : ἑσπέρα and Lat. *vesper* : *vespera* [Olsen 1999: 179].

***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.; a hapax).

The *i*-stem of *giwt* is based on: GDSg *giwt-i* (Agat‘angelos, Łazar P‘arpec‘i), GDPl *giwt-i-c*‘ (Agat‘angelos), IPl *giwt-i-w-k*‘ (Agat‘angelos, Philo).

●DIAL The verb *gtanem* is widespread in the dialects.

In the Van-group, we find **gntn-*.

According to Ačaryan (HAB 1: 564b), here also belonged Akn *git* ‘the time of abundant food, when everything is found in abundance’. Gabriëlean (1912: 251) records *git* in the same dialect, as the root of *gtanem*, “more original than the form *giwt*”. It appears in *git ē* “is found”.

●ETYM From PIE **u(e)id-*: Skt. aor. *ávidat* (= *e-git* ‘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 the “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 *git-*, 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 the most preferable. See 2.1.22.12 for more details. In this case, Arm. *an-giwt* adj. ‘not found’ (Koriwn, P‘awstos, Łazar P‘arpec‘i, Elišē) would match Skt. *á-vitti-* 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*.

giwt, *j/i*-stem [see below] ‘village’. Widely represented at all the stages of Armenian.

Much has been written about the anomalous paradigm and the variety of the spellings (*giwt*, *gewt*, *geawt*, *geōt*, *gut*, *get*) of the word; cf. A. A. Abrahamyan 1976: 57; Schmitt 1981: 95, 108; Jahukyan 1982: 96, 118, 119; L. Hovhannisyanyan 1991: 16-17, etc. In general, I accept the paradigm reconstructed by V. Ařakelyan (1984: 25-26), based on solid textual evidence (cf. also Meillet 1913: 58; Olsen 1999: 172): NSg *ge(a)wt*, GSg *getj*, GDPl *giwtic*‘, although I disagree with his diachronic interpretation of *-e-* in *getj* and *-iw-* in *giwtic*‘ directly from the *-eaw-* of the nominative form, as well as with **gewet-j* > *getj*, suggested by Ačaryan (HAB 4: 628a) and Jahukyan (1982: 119), and *gewt* > *get*, assumed by S. Avagyan and H. Muradyan (see below).

The *-a-* of *geawt* may be secondary, see s.v. *e(a)wt'n* ‘seven’, so that the idea of H. Muradyan (1982: 149) about the sound shift *-eaw- > -ew-* in pretonic position is irrelevant here. One should perhaps assume that *geawt/geōt* is merely a variant spelling of what was pronounced as /gūt/. A question arises, however, why all the dialectal forms derive from *geł*, whereas in the case of the word for ‘seven’, *eawt'n* seems to be the only form present in dialects. The reason for this may be, as we shall see, that the *-w-* in *geawt* did not originally belong to the etymon.

I agree with V. Ařak'elyan that *giwt* is analogical after GDPI *giwtic'*. According to Astuacaturean (1895: 332), the latter is attested in the Bible four times rather than three times, as Ařak'elyan says, although 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 GDPI. The pair *geawt* : *giwtic'* leads to an opposition *-éw-/-iw-(')*, on which see Meillet 1913: 17-18; Weitenberg 1993a: 67. Compare e.g. *ařewc* vs. oblique *ařiw-* ‘lion’. See also s.v. *ewt* ‘oil’. If GDPI *getic'* is reliable (see below), it could have been older than *giwtic'* : *getic'* > **gewtic'* (analogically after NSg *ge(a)wt* > *giwtic'*).

It has been customary to treat *geł* as a dialectal form. However, in NHB 1: 534c one finds a special entry *geł*, with six attestations (*gełs*, *getic'*, *gełiwk'*, etc.), two of them already in the Classical period (Elišē and Eusebius of Caesarea). Besides, according to Astuacaturean (1895: 332a), *geł* is found twice in the Bible, namely in Nehemiah 6.2 (*i geł*) and Mark 11.2 (*i geł-d*). V. Ařak'elyan (1984: 26) notes this, not specifying the locations, and states that this *geł* is dialectal. The latter attestation seems to have a variant reading *i geawt-d*, see NHB 1: 559a, where, moreover, Luke 13.22 is cited, too, with variants *and gełs/gełwts/geawts*.

More examples can be added. Movsēs Xorenac'i 2.57 (1913=1991: 187) has IPI *gełiwk'*, next to GDPI *giwtic'* (2.56: 186) and nom/loc. *geōt* = *geawt* (*i geōtn T'ordan* ‘in the village of T'ordan’, in 3.11: 269^{L15}). IPI *geł-i-w-k'* is also attested in Elišē (1989: 138^{L4}). In the oldest manuscript (Nr 10151 of Matenadaran; 13th cent.) of the Alexander Romance, which is the initial edition, one finds NPI *geawt-k'* and IPI *geł-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 of the opposition between *ge(a)wt* and *giwtic'* (H. Simonyan 1989: 126, 128). GDPI *geł-i-c'* is also attested in Book of Chries 8.6.2 (G. Muradyan 1993: 198^{L7}).

Note also some derivatives:

gełak'atak' : *κωμόπολις* (Mark 1.38); *k'atak'aget-j* (GSg), composed of the same components as the previous compound, but with a reverse order: *ew anun k'atak'agetjn koč'ec'aw T'əmnis* ‘and the name of the κωμόπολις was called T'əmnis’ (in ‘Patmut'iwn srboč' Hřip'simeanc''; see MovsXorenMaten 1843: 300); *gełastaneayk'* (Movsēs Kařankatuac'i); *gełōrēk'* (Mxit'ar Goš, Law Code, 12th cent.; cf. dial. (Goris) *k'ūt-ar-ank'*, etc.; see below). A number of derivatives with *geł-* is found in MidArm.; see MiřHayBař 1, 1987: 141-143; *geł-a-bnak* ‘villager’, lit. ‘dwelling in a village’ (Paterica 19).

I shall try to bring these data into a coherent set below.

●DIAL Dialectally ubiquitous. Remarkably, almost all the forms (including also, I think, Tp'lis *git* and Tigranakert *k'it*) derive from *get*, showing no traces of the *-w-*. Svedia *g'it* (or *kit*), too, represents *get*, since *giwt* would not develop into **git*; cf. *čiwł* 'branch' > *jeut*, *šiwł* > *šečł* (note also *ewł* 'oil' > *it*, q.v.) [Ačaryan 2003: 399; Andreyan 1967: 26, 32, 357a]. The form **güt* is found only in some extreme Eastern dialects: Goris *k'üt*, *k'ütarank'* (see Margaryan 1975: 320a), Areš *gyutarank'* [Lusenc' 1982: 202a], Šamaxi *k'üt* [Bařramyan 1964: 192]. According to S. A. Avagyan (1973: 201), *gut* is also present in Ijewan-Šamšadin, although for this subdialect, Mežunc' (1989: 186a) only has *k'et*. In Łarabał, Hadrut', and Šařax, *giwt* has been replaced by *šen*, whereas Č'aylu, Marała and Mehtišen have *k'et* [Davt'yan 1966: 335]. Goris *k'ütarank'* 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 *gewł* 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 unsatisfactory since the complete loss of the labial element of the diphthong is irregular; cf. H. Muradyan 1982: 187f; Haneyan 1985; see also HAB s.vv. *e/iwł* (q.v.), *čiwł*, *hiwł* and *xut*.

In Zeyt'un, the classical AblSg *i getjē* has been preserved as *g'etj'en* [Ačaryan 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. *viś-* f. 'settlement, dwelling-place, community, tribe', OCS *vъsъ* f. 'village, terrain', Lat. *vīcus* 'village; district of Rome; street' (from **uoiĕ-*; see Schrijver 1991: 471), and, especially, *vīlla* 'rural dwelling with associated farm buildings'. It is uncertain whether Lat. *vīlla* reflects **ueiĕ-s-leh₂-* (cf. Goth. *weihs*, *s*-stem neuter 'village') or **ueiĕ-sleh₂-* [Casaretto 2000: 222-223]. See also s.v. the place-name *Gis*.

Ačaryan (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.

Jahukyan (1982: 222₅₉; cf. also 1985: 158; 1987: 272, 413) considers the derivation of *gewł* from **uoiĕ-s-lā-* doubtful because of the *-w-*, although the latter, he adds, might be epenthetic like in some other cases.⁴⁰ However, the development **-k(s)l-* > *-wł* is not irregular; see s.vv. *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/oik(s)-l-ih₂-*.

Pedersen (1906: 456-458 = 1982: 234-236; cf. Peters 1980: 39, 41) suggests a connection with Gr. *ἀβλή* f. 'open court before the house, courtyard; steading for cattle; hall, court (also of a temple); any dwelling, abode, chamber', *ἀβλις*, *-ιδος* f. 'tent or place for passing the night in'; see s.v. *aganim₂* (q.v.). With respect to the connection with *ἀβλις*, Schindler (p.c. apud Peters 1980: 39) prefers restoring PArm. **uesetlī*, **uesetlīās*.

⁴⁰ In Jahukyan 1990: 72 (sem. field 19): of unknown origin.

Arm. *gewt* has also been treated as an East-Caucasian borrowing, cf. Tabasaran *з/кьул* ‘village’, Agul *збул* ‘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 with Oss. *qæw/ġæw* ‘village, settlement’, Skt. *ghóṣa-* ‘village’, etc. (see Cheung 2002: 214) is uncertain.

The problem with all these etymologies is that no satisfactory and economical explanation is offered for the isolated paradigm and for the phonological problems of *gewt*.

Meillet (1894: 157-158) explains Arm. *geġ* 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 *l*”, 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) 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*, *geġ*, *giwtic* is ingeniously interpreted by Klingenshmitt (1982: 154) and, independently, by Rasmussen (1985 [1987]: 31-34 = 1999: 105-109) as reflecting a PIE HD *i*-stem with an old NSg in **-ōi*, gen. **-i-ós*. Thus, Arm. gen. *geġ* easily derives directly from **gelyo-*, rather than from **gewlyos*, as Meillet had to assume. See also Clackson 1994: 64, 68, 127, 213₃₇; Kortlandt 1996a: 57 = 2003: 118; Olsen 1999: 172, 828 (see s.v. *catr* ‘laughter’). For other possible examples of the type, see 2.2.2.4 and s.v. *tal*. For a 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*), *ἀλήη*, Dor. *ἀλία* ‘assembly of people’, (f) *ἀλις* adv. ‘in crowds, in plenty’ (< **ul̥-i-s*, vocalized according to Lindeman’s Law, or, as Hamp assumed, due to a laryngeal), *ἰλη*, Dor. *ἰλᾶ* ‘band, troop of men’, Russ. *válo* ‘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) > *geġ*. Developing this etymology, Hamp (1994) reconstructs a **-Héi-* suffix.

The etymology is plausible, although, 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 correct, one may perhaps revive the connection of *gewt* to Urartian *ueli* ‘crowd, detachment of an army’ (see Meščaninov 1978: 322 and N. Arutjunjan 2001: 470b for this word), 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. *g-*⁴¹ (cf. *Uelikuni : Getak’uni*), that is, before the 8th century BC.

Regardless of the ultimate origin of PArm. **wel-i-*, the following original paradigm can be established:

NSg **wél-ōi* > **getu* or **get^w* > allophonic variants A. *get* and B. *gewt*
(through anticipation)

GSg **wel-i-óh* > *getj*

GDPI **wel-i-sko-* > *getic*‘

IPI **wel-i-b^hi-* > *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 mainly confined to the learned tradition. This scenario can account for the diversity of the forms, as well as for 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’ might have been borrowed into Urartian *ueli* ‘crowd, detachment of an army’.

glux, *o*-stem: GDSg *glx-o-y*, ISg *glx-o-v*, GDPI *glx-o-c*‘ (rich evidence in the Bible, see Astuacaturean 1895: 344-347) ‘head; end, summit; chief’ (Bible+).

For an extensive philological analysis, see Bolognesi 1986: 11-15.

●DIAL Ubiquitous in the dialects [HAB 1: 565-566].

●ETYM Fick 1877: 173 derives *glux* from **galu-ka-* linking it with the Balto-Slavic word for ‘head’: OCS *glava* ‘head, chapter’, Russ. *golová*, Lith. *galvà*, etc.; for other references, see HAB 1: 565b; Ačařyan himself does not accept the comparison and leaves the origin of the word open.

Pedersen 1924: 224b = 1982: 307b assumes a suffixal *-x*. Meillet (1935 = 1978: 62; 1936: 36; 1936c; see also Pisani 1950: 188) posits **g^hōlu-k^ho-* > **g(u)luxo-* treating the *-x-* as a suffixal element found also in *ataxin* ‘female servant’ (see, however, s.v.). Saradževa (1986: 124-125) posits **g^hōlu-k^(h)-* for Armenian. Beekes 2003: 202 considers the comparison as quite uncertain. For a further discussion, see Olsen 1999: 43-44. Even more uncertain is the appurtenance of Gr. *χέλυς*, *-υος* f. ‘tortoise; lyre’. This word is considered of non-IE origin, see Furnée 1972: 247 (“pontisch-balkanisches Sprachgut?”); Beekes 1977: 257, 260.

To conclude: the connection of Arm. *glux* with BSlav. ‘head’ is possible, but details are uncertain. The underlying QIE form may be reconstructed as **g^holHu-(e)h₂-* and, for Armenian, something like **g^holHu-k-h₂-o-* (with inclusion of a suffixal element **-k-* and thematization) or simply **g^holHu-* + substratum suffix **-xo-* (cf. e.g. the tree-names *katamax*, *metex*, *tawsax*) > **gouluxo-* (with anticipation of the labial vowel, see s.vv. *acut* ‘coal’, *awr* ‘day’, etc.) > **g(u)lúxo-* > *glux*, obl. *glx-o-*. Perhaps a European substratum word.

⁴¹ **u(o)ik-s-l-i(h₂)-* > *gi/ewt* : oblique **gewet-* > *get-* remains, perhaps, an alternative.

go- ‘to be, exist’ (defective; no aorist): 3sg.pres. *goy* (Bible+), 1pl.pres. *gom-k’* ‘John Chrysostom), etc.; 3sg.impf. *goyr* (Agat‘angelos, Eznik Kořbac‘i, Eliřē, Movsēs Xorenac‘i, etc.), *gol* infinitive ‘to be, exist’ (Philo, Cyril of Alexandria, etc.); *goy*, *i*-stem ‘essence; God; property’ (Bible+).

For the paradigm, see Meillet 1913: 92-93; Ľaragyulyan 1961: 171; Godel 1975: 41; A. A. Abrahamyan 1976: 209; Schmitt 1981: 139-144, 153.

●ETYM Derived from PIE **h₂ues-*: Hitt. *ħuiřzi* ‘to live’, Skt. *vasati*, *avasat*, *vasant-* ‘to stay, dwell, spend the night’, Goth. *wisan* ‘to be’, etc.; the *o*-vocalism points to perfect **uose*, cf. Goth. *was* ‘I was’; see Meillet 1894: 155; 1936: 112, 117, 132; Hübschmann 1897: 435-436; HAB 1: 576-577; Pokorny 1959: 1170; Ařabekyan 1979: 94; Godel 1975: 112; Polomé 1980: 28; Schmitt 1981: 134-135, 153; Klingenschmitt 1982: 260-261; Ĵahukyan 1982: 169, 173; K. Schmidt 1985: 86; Clackson 1994: 223₉₆; Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 531-532; Mallory/Adams 1997: 171b; Olsen 1999: 89.

Kortlandt (1998a = 2003: 125; cf. also Beekes 2003: 187) argues against this etymology pointing out that “it remains unclear why the perfect should have replaced the original present tense in this verb” and derives Arm. *go-* from **up(o)-e-ose* ‘suberat’. However, **upV-* would have yielded **vV-*, as we can see in *ver* from **uperi* ‘above’ (q.v.).

gog- (defective verb), imper. *gog*, *gog-ēk’*, *gog-ř-*, subj. *gog-c’-* (Bible+), instr. case of infinitive *gogel-o-v* (Cyril of Alexandria) ‘to say’ (Bible+).

●ETYM From PIE **h₂uog^{wh}-eie-* with Lat. *voveō* ‘to vow solemnly, pledge’, *vōtīvus* ‘offered in fulfilment of a vow’, cf. Umbr. *VUFRU* ‘votivum’, Skt. *vāghāt-* m. ‘singer, priest’, *óhate* 3pl. ‘to praise, announce’, *óhas-* n. ‘praise’, Gr. *εῴχομαι* ‘to proclaim, promise solemnly, pray’, etc.; the laryngeal depends on the connection with Gr. *εῴχομαι*, which is disputed. For the etymology and a discussion of the laryngeal, see Meillet apud HAB 1: 570a; Pokorny 1959: 348; Kortlandt 1976: 96₅; 1983: 13; 1987: 62 = 2003: 5₅, 43, 76; Ĵahukyan 1982: 48-49, 59; Schrijver 1991: 76, 279, 450; Ravnæs 1991: 69; Mallory/Adams 1997: 449b; Viredaz 2001-02a: 5-6; Beekes 2003: 187; Cheung 2007: 169-170; de Vaan 2008: 691.

For a further discussion on this PIE etymon, see Schmitt 1967: 261-262; Euler 1979: 215-216; Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 803 = 1995, 1: 704; Mayrhofer EWAia 1, 1992: 283; 2, 1996: 539. For the paradigm and a morphological discussion of the Armenian verb, see Meillet 1936: 135; Ľaragyulyan 1961: 171-172; Klingenschmitt 1982: 275.

godi, *ea*-stem: GDSg *god(w)oy* in Paterica, GDPI *gode-a-c’* in Canon Law, Kirakos Ganjakec‘i (Melik‘-Őhanĵanyan 1961: 324^{L13}) ‘leprous person’ (attested also in Athanasius, Vardan Arewelc‘i, Yaysmawurk‘).

●DIAL Muř *g‘od‘i* ‘leprous; bedridden, weak, flaccid; ugly’, Ararat *g‘ot‘i* ‘lazy’, Van *ky(ē)oti*, *kōti* ‘disabled, invalid; useless, good-for-nothing’ [HAB 1: 570-571; Ačarıyan 1952: 55, 254], řatax *gyot* ‘paralytic’ (with no consonant shift, Muradyan 1962: 45, 209b), Xotorĵur *godi* ‘illy; stupid’ [YuřamXotorĵ 1964: 438b], Akn **godi* ‘lazy’ [Gabriēlean 1912: 252], Arabkir id. (Ačarean 1913: 247a), Atap‘azar **got‘enal* ‘to boast’ [Ačarean 1913: 247a], etc. [HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 275-276].

Sometimes used pejoratively, with an expressive geminate, e.g. Sebastia *goddi* [Gabikean 1952: 148]

In a folk-tale from Muš-Bulanəx (HŽHek' 10, 1967: 136-143), *got'i* is used several times in the meaning 'lazy, idle' (see also the glossary, op. cit. 605a). The word may also be associated with the meaning 'light-minded, crazy', cf. very clear attestations of *xelar-got'i* (op. cit. 141, lines -6 and -15) and *xɾpuk-got'ec'uk* (34^{L13}), which contain *xelar* 'mad, crazy' and *xɾpuk* 'mad, senile' respectively.

In Turkish-Armenian dictionary (ca. 1720 AD) by Etia Mušetyan Karnec'i (Karin/Xotorjur), Turk. *jutam* is glossed by *gōt'i*, *čutam*, etc. [Č'ugaszyan 1986: 76]. Č'ugaszyan (op. cit. 134) identifies *jutam* with Arab., Pers., Turk. *djudham* 'leprosy, leprous'.

●ETYM No etymology is accepted in HAB 1: 570b.

If this word is not a borrowing (cf. Arab., Pers., Turk. *judam* 'leprosy, leprous', cf. NHB 1: 566b; see also above), one may assume a connection with **godi* 'the female personage of the rain-invoking ritual and the doll personifying her', 'Regenmädchen', and **got'/di* in *caɾ-a-got'i* 'tree-worshipping' (Movsēs Kałankatuac'i 2.40, see V. Aṛak'elyan 1983: 240^{L19f}; transl. Dowsett 1961: 155, 155₅). See s.vv. for a tentative etymology.

***godi** 'the female personage of the rain-invoking ritual and the doll personifying her', 'Regenmädchen'.

●DIAL Present in rain-invoking songs from Łarabał (*godi*, Łaziyan 1983: 156a^{Nr1}; see also T'. Hayrapetyan 2004: 220-221) and Kapan (*gōdi*, K'ajberuni 1902: 116).

●ETYM No etymological attempt is known to me.

For a suggestion, see s.vv. *godi* 'leprous person' and **got'/di* 'worship, sorcery'.

***got'i**, ***godi**, only in a compound *caɾ-a-got'i* (vars. *caɾaygot'i*, *caɾoy got'i*, *caɾagodi*, *caɾakodi*, etc.) 'tree-worshipping', attested twice in Movsēs Kałankatuac'i 2.40 and 2.41: *K'anzi satanayakur caɾagot'i molorut'eambn alčateal azgn ayn*, <...> : "For that tribe, demented in their satanically deluded tree-worshipping errors <...>" (V. Aṛak'elyan 1983: 240^{L19f}; transl. Dowsett 1961: 155, 155₅); *Ew baɾnam zkarcis srtic' jeroč' ew zcaɾagot'i molorut'iwnd, or oč' inc' isk en* "I shall dispel the doubts of your hearts and your tree-worshipping error concerning things which are nothing in themselves" (V. Aṛak'elyan 1983: 254^{L17f}; transl. Dowsett 1961: 163, 163₁). NHB vacat; found by Ačarıyan [HAB 1: 571b].

●ETYM No etymology in HAB 1: 571b.

I tentatively assume a connection with *godi* 'leprous', which displays a range of meanings in the dialects: 'bedridden, weak, flaccid', 'lazy, idle', 'light-minded, crazy', 'ugly', 'boasting' (unless this is a loan, see s.v.); and dial. **godi* 'the female personage of the rain-invoking ritual and the doll personifying her', 'Regenmädchen' (q.v.)⁴². Bearing in mind the semantic field 'witch, sorceress, demon, fairy', 'hyena', 'leprous', 'heretic', 'bad, useless', etc. (see 3.5.2.2), one may posit a hypothetical PArm. **god-i*- 'worship, pagan cult' (cf. the attestation in Movsēs Kałankatuac'i) > 'pagan goddesses, witch, sorceress, mythical being, fairy'

⁴² A problem is that Łarabał, etc. *godi* 'rain-bride' shows no consonant shift. A recent loan?

(hence ‘rain-bride, female demon’), which might develop into ‘leprous’, ‘lazy, idle’, ‘light-minded, crazy’, etc.

PARm. **god-i-* ‘worship, pagan cult’ may be derived from PIE **g^{wh}e/od^h-*: Gr. *θέσσασθαι* ‘to ask, pray’, denominative *ποθέω* ‘to desire, long for, miss’, OIr. *guidid* ‘to ask, pray’, OCS *žędati* ‘to wish, long for, desire’, 1sg. *žęždę*, YAv. *jad-* ‘to ask, demand’, OPers. *jad-* ‘to pray, ask’, etc. (see Kent 1953: 184b; Pokorny 1959: 488; Brandenstein/Mayrhofer 1964: 127; Chantraine 1968-80: 432-433; Rix 1992: 97; Mallory/Adams 1997: 449-450; Cheung 2007: 220-221). For the Armenian form one may posit a QIE nominal **g^{wh}od^h-ieh₂-*, cf. Gr. *ἐπι-ποθ-ία* ‘longing’ and OIr. *guide* f. ‘prayer’, as well as Gr. *πόθος* m. ‘desire, longing, love’, *ποθή* f. ‘id.’, etc.

On the other hand, compare OHG *guot* ‘good’, OCS *godъ* ‘time, suitable time, holiday, year’, Czech *hod* ‘religious holiday’, *hody* ‘feast’, Pol. *gody* ‘feast’, Lith. *guõdas* ‘honour, worship, hospitality’, etc. (see Derksen 1996: 67).

Uncertain.

gol, prob. *i*-stem or *a*-stem (GDSg *gol-i* in NHB 1: 566b, but without references) ‘warmth, lukewarmness’ (John Chrysostom), *jern-a-gol* ‘warmth, heat’ (Agat‘angelos, 5th cent.); **gol* ‘lukewarm; steam’ (see dial.), *gol-a-xaın* ‘warmish’ (Ephrem, etc.), *golanam* ‘to grow warm’ (John Chrysostom); *golo(r)ši*, *ea*-stem: GDSg *golo(r)š-o-y* (from the expected **golo(r)šwoy*, unless one posits **golorš*, *o*-stem) in Gregory of Nyssa, AblSg *i goloršoy* in Eznik Kołbac‘i /5th cent./, GDPI *golo(r)še-a-c*‘ in Philo, AblPl *i gološeac*‘ in Paterica; (*w*)*o*-stem: GDSg *golo(r)š-o-y* (see above), IPI *gološ-o-v-k*‘ in Gregory of Nyssa ‘vapour, steam’ (Bible+).

●DIAL The form **gol** is widespread in the dialects, in the meanings ‘steam on windows and glasses’ (Suč‘ava, Axalc‘xa, Ararat, Muš, Xarberd, etc.), ‘lukewarm’ (T‘iflis, Ararat), ‘vernal equinox’ (Muš), ‘burning, flaming’ (Hamšen [köl, Ačařyan 1947: 225], Rödost‘o, Tigranakert, Sebastia), etc. (see Ačařean 1913: 247; HAB 1: 572a; for some illustrations, see Amatuni 1912: 147a);

***gol-k**‘: Aslanbek ‘warmth (of sun or fire)’ [Ačařean 1913: 247b], Hamšen *kölk*‘, *kölk* ‘heat of flame’ (Ačařyan 1947: 225; JaynHamš 2, 1979: 220a).

Trapizon and Hamšen ***gol(a)nal** ‘to grow warm’ vs. ***golel** ‘to burn’, ***golil** ‘to be burnt, kindle’ [Ačařean 1913: 247a]. A textual illustration from Hamšen folklore (JaynHamš 2, 1979: 11^{L-9}): *Arevə t‘öx zis kolä* ‘‘May the sun burn me down’’. Further illustrations: op. cit. 14^{L-2}, 16^{L-4}, 30^{L-7} (infinitive *koluš*), 49^{L-2} (*kol-ot* ‘burning’); T‘ořlak‘yan 1986: 31^{L-12} (*siyt koloł krak* ‘‘heart-burning fire’’, glossed in 228b, inf. *koluš*); JaynHamš 3, 1989: 218^{L4}.

Compounds with *amp* ‘cloud’ and *arew* ‘sun’: Polis, Č‘arsančag, Arabkir **amp-gol* ‘cloudy and warm summer day’ (= Van **amp-šoł*, with *šoł* ‘ray, shine; warm(th)’); Nor Naxiřewan **arew-gol* ‘lukewarm (said of e.g. water)’; Č‘enkiler (Nikomidia) **arew-etk-ik* ‘lukewarm (said of e.g. water)’ [Ačařean 1913: 88a, 147-148]. Reduplication: Muš **gol-gl-uk* ‘warmish (e.g., rays)’ [Ačařean 1913: 247a].

●ETYM Since Bugge and Scheftelowitz (see HAB 1: 571-572), connected with OIc. *vella* ‘to bubble, boil’, *ylr* ‘warmth’, OHG *walm* ‘zeal, heat’, *wali* ‘lukewarmness’, Goth. *wulan* ‘to be aglow with, seethe’, Lith. *vildėti* ‘to make lukewarm’, etc. (Pokorny 1959: 1140, cf. 1142; Lehmann 1986: 411b; Joe Salmons apud Mallory / Adams 1997: 264a). The Lithuanian form is not found in Fraenkel or elsewhere. Pokorny probably meant *vildyti* (also *vildyti*, *vilđo*, *vilđe*) ‘to chill, let something

cool' (Rick Derksen, p.c.). There is no agreement on the appurtenance of some cognate forms.

Ačaryan (HAB 1: 506a, 571-572) also adds Arm. *galj* 'warmish, lukewarm' (q.v.), not specifying "the determinative (ačakan)" *-j*. According to Jahukyan (1987: 199), the latter comes from **-k-* (cf. **uelk/g-* 'wet, damp', Pokorny 1959: 1145-1146) or **-t-*. However, none of these determinatives would yield Arm. *-j*, and the semantic relation is not evident.

If Arm. *gol* was indeed an *i*-stem (or an *a*-stem, see above), one may posit a collective/feminine **uol-ih₂-* (or **uol-eh₂-*, or **uol-i-*), compare OHG *walī* 'lukewarmness' (cf. Ałabekyan 1998: 73; Olsen 1999: 642; Viredaz 2001-02: 30). This is attractive since it may explain *gol* and *galj* within a single paradigm, treating *galj* as a frozen genitive. If we posit a PIE PD *ih₂-*stem (cf. Beekes 1995: 185), nom. **vól-ih₂*, gen. **ul̥-iéh₂-s* (alternatively, HD *i*-stem, cf. Beekes 1995: 180-181: **uól-(ō)j* : **ul̥-iós*), the paradigm would yield PArm. **gól-(u)i*, gen. **galyV̄-* > *gol* : **galj-*. For this kind of paradigmatic solution, see 2.2.2.4. As to the *o*-grade, note three other Armenian words that refer to the ideas of 'warmth' and 'shine', but have no reliable etymology: *šog*, *šoł*, *c'ol*.

NHB (1: 566b, 2: 487c) identifies *golo(r)ši* with *šogoli* 'steam' (Philo, etc.). In fact, the latter is a derivative of *šog*, *o*-stem 'heat; steam', cf. also Muš dial. *šog* '-il-k' 'steam' [HAB 3: 528b]. As to *-orši*, Ačaryan (HAB 1: 571b) compares it with *bolor-ši* 'round' from *bolor* 'whole, entire; circle', *layn-ši* from *layn* 'broad'. The evidence for this 'suffix' is meagre, however, and it points to *-ši* rather than *-orši* (see also Olsen 1999: 509-510). I tentatively suggest to treat *golorši* as a compound with **Hue/ors-*: Hitt. *uarša-* 'fog, mist', Gr. *έέρση, άέρση, έρση* f. 'dew', etc. (for the root, see s.v. *yurt* 'i' 'watered, irrigated, fertile'). Thus: QIE **uol-HuVrs-ieh₂-* 'warm vapour' > PArm. **wol-ə(w)oršiya-* > *golorši*, *-ea-c'* 'vapour, steam', with the ruki-rule (see 2.1.12).

gom, *a*-stem: AblPl *i gom-a-c'* in 1 Paralipomenon 17.7; *o*-stem: AblPl *i gom-o-c'* in John Chrysostom⁴³ 'fold/stall for sheep or cattle' (Bible+; dialect of Hamšen); 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 makatatele xašanc' : έκ τής μάνδρας έξόπισθεν τών 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 Vałaršak arranges as hunting places. I therefore wonder whether the semantics of the word was confined to the human activities.⁴⁴

⁴³ Note also *Gomoc' vank'* (Petoyan 1965: 33-34).

⁴⁴ Note also, perhaps, *goms i lerins* : *μάνδρας έν τοις όρεσιν*, 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

As a component in place-names, see Hübschmann 1904: 382 (also s.vv.); Jahukyan 1987: 414-417.

●DIAL Widespread in the 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 found in Germanic (gemination presumably from **-mn-*): Dan. *gamme* 'sheepfold', Swed. dial. *gamme* 'crib, manger', OIc. *gammi* m. 'Lappenhütte, Erdhütte', Swiss *gämmeli* 'Viehhütte', etc. [Lidén 1906: 14-16; HAB 1: 574-575; Pokorny 1959: 452; Jahukyan 1987: 128].

The etymology has been doubted, since the expected reflex is **gun* (Jahukyan 1987: 171, cf. 254) or **gum* (Olsen 1999: 198). Olsen (ibid.) reconstructs **g^hos-mo-/eh₂-*, connecting Skt. *ghas-* 'to eat', etc., and 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-*?), 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*. We may assume a European substratum word **g^hom(m)-*.

On possible Armenisms in Caucasian and other languages, see HAB 1: 575a; Jahukyan 1987: 602, 602₁₀.⁴⁵

goč'em, 3sg.aor. *goč'eac* 'cry, shout', imper. *goč'ea* 'to shout, cry out, call out; to bellow, roar; to murmur, purl' (Bible+), **goč'iwn**, GDSg *goč'man*, ISg *goč'mam-b* 'cry, sound, roaring' (Bible+), **goč'** 'shout' (Simēon Aparanc'i, 18th cent.).

●DIAL Axalc'xa, Xarberd *g'č'al* 'to murmur, purl'. In other dialects: compound *gorum-goč'um* 'shouting' [HAB 1: 580b].

●ETYM From QIE **uok^w-je-*: Lat. *vocō, -āre* 'to call, call upon, summon', *vōx, vōcis* f. 'voice, sound, word, speech', Skt. *vivakti*, aor. *āvocat* 'to speak, say, call', *vāc-* f. 'voice, sound, word, speech', Gr. *ōn-* f. 'voice, sound, word', *ōssa* f. '(prognostic) voice, rumour', etc., see Meillet 1911-12c: 285; 1950: 110; HAB 1: 580a with more references to Meillet and others; Pokorny 1959: 1135-1136; Godel 1965: 24; 1975: 82; Schmitt 1981: 64, 172; Jahukyan 1982: 59, 171; Kortlandt 1987a: 51 = 2003: 81; Clackson 1994: 211₉; Mallory/Adams 1997: 535a; Olsen 1999: 488, 811; Beekes 2003: 201; for the etymon, see also Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 489-491, 539-540.

Ačařyan (HAB 1: 580a) does not accept the etymology and treats the Armenian word as an onomatopoeia. The derivation of *goč'em* from **uok^w-je-* is impeccable, however. For the *o*-grade and **je*-present compare the synonymous verbs *koč'em* 'to call, invoke' < **g^wot-je-*, *yorjorjem* 'to call', see s.vv. and 2.2.6.1. On *goč'-iwn* < **-imn* vs. gen. *goč'-man*, see Meillet 1936: 48; Olsen 1999: 485-488.

may have simply used mountainous sheep-folds for their dwelling. According to Hübschmann (1904: 382), in Movsēs Xorenac'i *gom* refers to 'Gehege'.

⁴⁵ Lap'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 the dialects. The noun: Adana (Turkish-speaking Arm.) *łv* ‘praise’ [HAB 1: 583a].

●ETYM Meillet (1894b: 280) connected Lat. *faveō*, *favēre* ‘to favour, befriend’ and OCS *gověti* ‘to revere, live a god-fearing life’; cf. also Russ. *govět* ‘to fast’, Czech *hověti* ‘to satisfy, show indulgence’, etc. (see *ĚtimSlovSlavJaz* 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 verb. 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’.

All these suggestions must be abandoned since, as is convincingly shown by Ačāryan (HAB 1: 582b), Arm. *govem* is an Iranian loan; cf. Pahl. *gufian*, *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; Cheung 2007: 113-114. For the semantics of the Armenian word, cf. Sogd. *γwβ* ‘to praise’, Khwar. *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 outside 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 (although 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: 803-804₃. For a discussion of Arm. *gusan* and Parth. *gōsān* ‘minstrel’, see HAB 1: 597-598; 4: 629-630; Boyce 1957.

gorc, *o*-stem ‘work, labour’ (Bible+), **gorcem** ‘to work, labour; to make; to produce; to influence; to cultivate; to weave’ (Bible+); **gorci**, *ea*-stem: ISg *gorce-a-w*, IPl *gorce-a-w-k* ‘(Bible+); *wo*-stem: IPl *gorcw-o-v-k* ‘(Philo, Čarəntir) ‘tool, instrument; means’ (Bible+).

●DIAL The noun is widespread in the dialects, mainly in the meaning ‘work, labour’ [HAB 1: 584a]. The verb is seen in Hamšen *կոյյւժ*, caus. *կոյյե՛ն անս* ‘to weave’, Agulis *g^vārcil* ‘to weave’ [Ačārean 1935: 66, 345; 1947: 225; HAB 1: 584a]. Agulis has *g^vurc* ‘weaving, embroidery’ vs. *gōrc* ‘work, opus, composition’, the latter being a literary loan (see Ačārean 1935: 64-65, 345), cf. 2.1.38.

●ETYM From PIE **ue/orǵom*, cf. Gr. *ἔργον* n. ‘work, labour, work of art’, OHG *werc* ‘work’, Av. *vərəz-* ‘to do, work’, etc. (perhaps also Lith. *var̃gas* ‘hardship, misery’, etc.; see Derksen 1996: 73-74); see de Lagarde 1854: 16^{L375}; Hübschmann 1897: 436; HAB 1: 584a; Pokorny 1959: 1168; Mallory/Adams 1997: 649a.

Meillet (1922i; cf. 1936: 105) treats the vocalism of *gorc* as taken from the verb *gorcem*, which "apparaît ainsi comme un ancien itératif, non comme un dénominatif"; cf. Goth. *waurk* and *waurkjan* vs. OEngl. *werk*, OHG *werc*, Gr. *φέρων*, etc.; further, cf. Schmitt 1981: 135; Klingenschmitt 1982: 142; Olsen 1999: 440; Viereck/Goldammer 2003: 405-406. See also 2.2.6.4.

On *gorci*, *ea*-stem 'tool, instrument', see Olsen 1999: 440.

Arm. *vard-*, *varž* 'tuition, instruction' and *varj* 'reward, wages, hire' are Iranian loans; see Hübschmann 1897: 245; HAB 4: 318-321, 322; Jahukyan 1987: 545-546; Olsen 1999: 909. For the Iranian etymon, **uarz-* 'to do, work, till the land', see Cheung 2007: 425-427.

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}); MidArm. **gortn**, GSg *gortan*, NPI *gortun-k*' (Mxit'ar Goš, etc.) 'frog'; in MidArm.: **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 mamur**' 'green moss on the surface of morass' (lit. 'frog's moss'), **gortn-uk** 'wart' [MijHayBař 1, 1987: 154-155].

Frequent in the Bible [Astuacaturean 1895: 363b], rendering Gr. *βάτραχος*. In Exodus 8, one finds both an *i*-stem (ISg *gort-i-w* : 8.2) and an *o*-stem (GDSg *gort-o-y* : 8.12). GDPI *gort-o-c*' is found in Wisdom 19.10, as well as in the later literature: Yovhannēs Ōjnc'ī (8th cent.) and Nersēs Lambronac'ī (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 the dialects; in the Eastern dialects (Łarabał, Goris, Agulis, etc.), as well as in the extreme SW (Zeyt'un) : **gortn-uk* [HAB 1: 585b]. For this **gortn-*, cf. the MidArm. evidence above, as well as several compounds in various dialects [Ačārean 1913: 252-253; HAB 3: 244b] and the 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'örtə* [Orbeli 2002: 272].

Note the formal identity between MidArm. *gortn-uk* 'wart' and dial. **gortn-uk* 'frog'. This can be observed even synchronically: Łarabał *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) *kərcnc'úc* 'a wart on the hand', which he derives from **gortn-c'oyc*', apparently assuming *c'oyc*' 'show' as the second member (assimilation *t > c* or influence of *kocic*?). If this is the case, one can compare the folk-practice of curing the warts by spells 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'hi) *kərtənjij* 'wart' [Bařramyan 1960: 146a], which seems to derive from **gortn-cic* 'frog-nipple'. For the semantics, cf. Germ. *Warze* 'wart' : 'nipple'.

Dersim (K'hi) *kərdənpurt*' and *kərdənp'ərp'ur* 'water-plant' [Bařramyan 1960: 145b] are from *gortn-burd*, lit. 'frog's wool' and **gortn-p'rp'ur*, lit. 'frog's foam'.

●ETYM Since de Lagarde (1854: 29^{Nr780}) connected with Lith. *varlė*, *vařlė* 'frog', Latv. *vařde* '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. *ῥόπος* m. 'watersnake', *ῥόπα* 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 the IE feminine in **-iē* or **-iā-*, and that Arm. **gort-i-* corresponds to Latv. *vaĩde* even with respect to the stem [Meillet 1896: 150; 1936: 76; Ĵahukyan 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-vĩrde* 'abscess', Russ. *vėred* '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 this association in the 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?)". Ĵahukyan (1987: 157) mentions only the *o*-stem and reconstructs **uordo-*.

According to Kipšidze, Megrel. *gordi* 'frog', Tuš. **y/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* unconvincing, argues against Ačarıyan's (in fact, Ačarıyan 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.

grē or **greay** 'crane', only attested in Grigor Magistros (11th cent.), GDPI *grē-i-c'* [NHB 1: 587a; HAB 1: 605b; Greppin 1978: 103].

●ETYM Since NHB 1: 587a, linked with Gr. *γέρανος*, Lat. *grūs*, and Arm. *křunk* 'crane' (q.v.). In view of the absence of the consonant shift in Arm. **gre(a)y*, Greppin (1978: 103; Greppin apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 140b) assumes an intermediation of MPers. unattested **grī* or another neighbouring language. Uncertain.

gun 'effort', in the idioms *gun gorcem*, *gun dnem* 'to make an effort' (Bible, Agat'angelos, etc.).

●ETYM Derived from IE **uen-* ‘to win, usurp’: Skt. *vanóti* ‘to win, usurp’ (RV+), MPers. *wānīdan* ‘to conquer, usurp, destroy’ (> Arm. *vanem* ‘to drive away’), etc., see Petersson 1916: 255; HAB 1: 592-593, 4: 302; Jahukyan 1987: 156; Olsen 1999: 211.

Though sometimes unified, the etymons for ‘to strive’ (cf. Skt. *vánate* ‘to love, desire’, etc.) and ‘to win, usurp’ should be kept apart (see Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 499 and 501). A derivation QIE **uon(H)os* ‘striving’ (see Olsen *ibid.*) > Arm. *gun* ‘effort’ is quite possible.

The connection with *vandem* ‘to drive away, destroy’ (q.v.) is uncertain.

D

***d(a/o)-**, etc.

See s.v. **s(a/o)-* ‘this’.

dada, dado (dial.) ‘sister, elder sister; uncle’s wife; nurse, midwife, tutor; grandmother’, ‘father’.

●DIAL Nor Naxijewan, T’iflis, Karin, Tigranakert, Van, etc. **dada*, Van, Muš, etc. voc. *dád-ε*, Moks, Salmast, etc. **dado* ‘sister’, espec. ‘elder sister’; Muš, Van, Sasun ‘grandmother’, Van-Papen, etc. ‘father’, ‘uncle’s wife’, ‘nurse, female tutor’, Muš ‘midwife’, T’iflis ‘wise’; Xizan voc. *dado* ‘father’ [Ačārean 1913: 262a; HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 297a]; Sasun *dade* ‘mother; grandmother’ [Petoyan 1954: 114; 1965: 459]; Xoy-Urmia *dāde* ‘sister, elder sister’ [M. Asatryan 1962: 214a].

●ETYM Nursery word probably of IE origin (see Jahukyan 1972: 300); for IE and non-IE comparable forms and a discussion, see s.v. **tat(a)* ‘grandmother; midwife; father, etc.’.

dal (no evidence for the declension class) ‘colostrum, beestings’ in Ephrem, Vardan Arewelc’i [NHB 1: 590c], Amirdovlat’ Amasiac’i (see S. Vardanjan 1990, p. 46 § 90, p. 98 § 426, p. 163 § 799); spelled also as *dayl* (NHB and HAB, without specified references).

●DIAL Present in a considerable number of (mostly of *kə*-class, but also Ararat and Ĵuła) dialects [Amatuni 1912: 158a; HAB 1: 612a; HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 298], among others: Nor Naxijewan, T’iflis *dal*, Ararat, Muš, Sebastia, etc. *d’al* [HAB 1: 612a], Ozim *d’äl*, Van *täl* [Ačāryan 1952: 255], Moks *täl*, gen. *-ə̄*, pl. *-ir* [Orbeli 2002: 330], Šatax *täl* [M. Muradyan 1962: 194b], Hamšen *tal* [Ačārean 1947: 225; Bläsing 1992: 73], Ĵuła *dal* (with an initial *d-*, not *d’-*, Ačārean 1940: 95, 358b), etc. Moks *dahl* (!) is recorded in HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 298a.

Ačāryan (HAB 1: 611b; cf. Jahukyan 1987, etc. below) points out that *dayl* is the original form, and that the by-form *dal* originated from *dayl*. However, the evidence for *dayl* is uncertain (see above). Furthermore, the by-form **dayl* is not specifically supported by dialectal material. Although the change *ay > a* is regular for Middle Armenian (Karst 1901: 23-24) and many dialects, a considerable number of dialects display another development, viz. *ay > ε* (see H. Muradyan 1972: 90-94; 1982: 155-162). Note that Van, Moks, etc. *täl* regularly reflects *dal* through Ačāryan’s Law and the subsequent consonant shift. Bearing in mind that there is no dialectal **del*, we

arrive at the following conclusion: both literary and dialectal attestations point to a basic *dal*. The existence of a by-form *dayl* is uncertain.

In Hamšen, the yellowish milk produced by a cow for the first two or three days after a calf is born is called *talnkat*, a compound with *kat* ‘milk’, whereas *tal* refers to a hard product made of cooked *talnkat* (see T‘ořlak‘yan 1981: 145b with a thorough description of preparing this food; for the compound, see also HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 299b). In a number of dialects one finds a semantic contrast: *xiř* ‘colostrum’ vs. *dal* ‘a food made of cooked colostrum’ (Amatuni 1912: 158a, 278b; Ačarean 1913: 469a; Martirosyan/Gharagyozyan 2003 FW passim; see also Nawasardeanc‘ 1903: 25; HAB 1: 612a; Gabikean 1952: 159; HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 298; 2, 2002: 325a).

Derivatives: Moks, etc. **dal-eni* ‘ferment for cheese’ (Amatuni 1912: 158a; see also Malxaseanc‘ HBB 1: 482c); Karin, Ĵavaxk‘ *dal-ot* ‘thick and fat (milk)’ [Malxaseanc‘ HBB 1: 483a; HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 299b]; Ararat, Karin, etc. *di/alama*, Polis, Partizak *deleme* ‘ferment for cheese’ [HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 299a], Moks *dālāma* ‘молоко, затвердевающее в процессе варки сыра, перед тем как он сварится’ [Orbeli 2002: 217], probably a back loan from Turkish dialects (cf. Bläsing 1992: 73 on Sivas *tel-me*).

●ETYM Since long (de Lagarde 1850: 352-353; 1854: 14^{L306f}; Hübschmann 1883: 26; 1897: 437; HAB 1: 611-612, 668), connected with Skt. *dhāyati* (RV+) ‘to suck, drink mother’s milk’, etc. and Arm. *diem* ‘to suck, drink mother’s milk’, *dayeak* ‘nurse, tutor’. See Pokorny 1959: 241-242; Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 570 = 1995: 487; Mallory/Adams 1997: 382a, 556a. Arm. *dayeak* (q.v.) is an Iranian loanword.

The PIE verbal root is reconstructed as **d^heh₁-*. The cognate *l*-formations are: Umbr. *FELIUF* ‘lactentes’, Latin *filius* ‘son’ from **d^h(e)h₁-i-l-io-* [Schrijver 1991: 242; de Vaan 2008: 219-220]; Mlr. *del* ‘nipple’, OIr. *deil* ‘female pig of two years old’, *delech* ‘having udders, milch cow’ from **d^heh₁-l-*; Gr. *θηλή* ‘mother’s breast’ from **d^heh₁-l-éh₂-*; Lith. *dėlė*, dial. *dielė* ‘leech’, *pirm(a)dėlyš* ‘first-born (of animals and fruits)’, *pirm(a)dėlė* ‘cow which bears a calf for the first time’, Latv. *dēle* ‘leech’ beside *dēt* ‘to suck’ and *dīlīt* ‘to suck’ (see Fraenkel s.v.; Derksen 1996: 60), *dēls* ‘son’ from **d^heh₁-li-* vs. *dīle* ‘sucking calf’ from **d^hh₁-i-l-eh₁-*; OHG *tili* f. < **deljō*, *tila* f., OEngl. *delu*, etc. ‘teat’, probably from **d^heh₁-l-éh₂-* [Schrijver 1991: 139, 242, 344-345, 352]; Kurd. *dēl*, *dālik* f. ‘female; female dog’ (> Arm. dial. *del* ‘female dog’, Ačarean 1913: 271b), etc., probably from an old **lu*-formation (see Hübschmann 1883: 26; Cabolov 2001: 301-302; ÈtimSlovIranJaz 2, 2003: 447)⁴⁶; Skt. *dhāru-* adj. ‘sucking’, possibly from **d^heh₁-lú-*; Gr. *θηλυς* ‘feminine’, etc. (Mayrhofer EWAia 1, 1992: 789 with literature); Alb. *dele* f. ‘sheep, ewe’ from **d^heh₁-l-éh₂-* > PALb. **dejlīā* [Demiraj 1997: 127-128].

As we can see, there are *l*-formations based on both **d^heh₁-* and **d^heh₁-i-*. The latter probably represents an *i*-present (see Mayrhofer EWAia 1, 1992: 776 with a discussion and literature).

⁴⁶ The etymology of Oss. *dalys/dalis* ‘one-year-old lamb’ is obscure (see Cheung 2002: 177). One wonders whether it can be in a way related to this etymon. For the semantics cf. Olc. *dilkr* ‘lamb’, OIr. *dīnu* ‘lamb’, etc.

Orel (1994: 357) compares the Albanian form (PALb **daila* ‘sheep’ < ‘suckling’) in particular with Arm. *dayl* ‘beestings’ from **d^hh₁ilo-*. On the other hand, the Armenian form has been derived from **d^hh₁-l-i-* (Schrijver 1991: 344). Arm. *da(y)l* is formally and semantically comparable with Albanian (see Pedersen 1905: 201 = 1982: 63; HAB 1: 668b; Kortlandt 1986: 41 = 2003: 70-71; Jahukyan 1987: 303): Tosk *dhállë*, Gheg *dhállt(-i)* ‘skim milk; churning’ (for references, see Toporov PrJaz a-d, 1975: 285), cf. Alb. *djathë* ‘cheese’, originally ‘aus saurer Milch gemachter Quark’, Skt. *dádhi* n. ‘sour milk, whey’, OPr. *dadan* ‘milk’ (Toporov op. cit. 284-286; EWAia 1, 1992: 692; Demiraj 1997: 135-136).

The form *dal* points to a QIE **d^hh₁-l-i(e)h₂-* or, possibly, **d^hh₁-l-i(e)h₂-*; for the problem of the palatal *-l*, see Ravnæs 1991: 90-92. The by-form *dayl*, if reliable, may be derived from **d^hh₁-l-je₂-* > **daly* through metathesis or *y*-epenthesis (compare *ayl*, *o*-stem from **al-jo-*: Lat. *alius*, etc.; for a discussion, see Godel 1975: 87; Ravnæs 1991: 33-35; Olsen 1999: 796, 796₄₄). The formation is comparable to that of Lat. *fīlia* ‘daughter’ and Alb. *dele* f. ‘sheep, ewe’; for the semantics note also Alb. *dhállë* ‘skim milk; churning’. As far as *dayl* is concerned, the possibility of **d^hh₁-i-l-* (cf. **d^həi-li-* in Jahukyan 1987: 119) should not be ruled out completely. The presence of the doublet formations **d^h(e)h₁-l-* and **d^hh₁-i-l-* in one and the same language is not impossible, cf. Latv. *dēls* ‘son’ vs. *dīle* ‘sucking calf’ (Schrijver 1991: 242). However, it is not certain whether **d^hh₁-i-l-* would be realized as PArm. **dajl-* or **d(H)il-*.

The semantics has developed in three basic directions: 1) ‘to suck(le)’ > ‘one who/which sucks, suckling, infant, calf, etc.’; 2) ‘to give milk’ or ‘to milk’ > ‘one who/which gives milk or is milked, dairy cow, nipple, etc.’; 3) ‘to feed with milk, nurse’ > ‘one who nurses, wet-nurse’. For an extensive semantic discussion, see Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 570-571₁ = 1995: 487₄₂.

dalar, *o*-stem (Bible+) ‘green, fresh’; **dalar-i**, *dalarw-o-y*, *-o-ǰ* ‘greenery, grass, herb’ (Bible+).

Some textual illustrations:

dalar-o-y in Job 39.8, Cox 2006: 250.

dalari, LocSg *dalarwoǰ*, in Movsēs Xorenac’i 3.68 (1913=1991: 359^{L1}; transl. Thomson 1978: 350): *i vayri dalarwoǰ* ‘in a verdant place’.

In Grigor Narekac’i 63.2 (Xaç’atryan/Łazinyan 1985: 496^{L43}; Russ. transl. 1988: 203; Engl. transl. 2001: 301): *Or busuc’anes yerkrē dalari*: ‘‘Ты, что растишь зеленую поросль из <...> земли’’: ‘‘You, who grows the green sprouts from the <...> earth’’.

GDPI *dalare-a-c* ‘ in Book of Chries 8.7.3 (G. Muradyan 1993: 200^{L11}).

See also s.vv. *acut* ‘coal’ and place-name *Dalari-k*’.

●DIAL *dalar* is widespread in the dialects [HAB 1: 613a].

●ETYM Connected with Gr. *θάλλω* ‘to bloom, flourish, grow’, *θάλος* n. ‘sprout’, *θαλλός* m. ‘green twig, esp. of the olive, sprout’, Welsh *dalen* ‘leaf’, Alb. *dal* ‘to sprout’, etc. Arm. *dalar* is to be compared with Gr. *θαλερός* ‘blooming, fresh’, probably from QIE **d^hlh₁ro-* (see Mayrhofer 1986: 127₁₁₈ and references below). Probably related to Arm. *dalukn* ‘jaundice’, *det* ‘herb’, *det-in* ‘yellow’. For thorough philological and etymological discussions, see HAB 1: 612-613, 647-650; Clackson 1994: 118-120. For *dalukn*, see Mawet 1993: 304-305 and, especially, Olsen 1994.

For **-lh₁-* > Arm. *-l-* (not *-l̄-*), see s.vv. *alawunk* ‘Pleiades’, *yolov* ‘many’, etc.

If the PIE origin is not accepted, one might think of Mediterranean substratum (see 3.11).

To explain Arm. *deł*, one may perhaps assume an old *n*-stem: nom. **d^hél(H)-n-*, gen. **d^hl-nós*. Arm. *deł* ‘herb’ and *θαλλός* m. ‘green twig, sprout’ have generalized the nominative and oblique stems, respectively. See 2.2.2.3.

dalukn ‘jaundice’ (Bible+).

See s.v. *dalar* ‘green, fresh’.

daku, *a*-stem: GDPl *daku-a-c*‘ in T‘ovmay Arcruni 1.1, 9-10th cent. (1985: 28^{L-1}; transl. Thomson 1985: 78) ‘adze, axe’ (John Chrysostom, Socrates, Čařantir).

NHB 1: 592a cites *dakur*, with no attestation, cf. *dagur* ‘plane’ in Koylaw’s dictionary [HAB 1: 613b]. See below on a dialectal correspondence.

●DIAL Akn *dakur* [HAB 1: 614a], Sebastia *dakur*, also *dakurag* [Gabikean 1952: 159], from **dakur-urag* (with *urag* ‘adze’) through haplology. Note also *t‘aguřak* (HAB *ibid.*; uncertain).

●ETYM Since Lidén (1906: 55), derived from **d^hāg-u-*, cf. Gr. *θήγω*, Dor. *θᾶγω* ‘to sharpen, whet’, *θηγάνη* ‘whetstone’. For other (alleged) correspondences, a discussion and references, see HAB 1: 613-614; Arutjunjan 1983: 278-279; Ĵahukyan 1987: 119, 162, 302; and especially Clackson 1994: 116-118.

The connection with the Greek word is possible but uncertain; the appurtenance of *daku* to the ‘Wanderwort’ Late Latin *daga*, Engl. *dagger*, etc. is semantically more satisfying [Clackson 1994: 116-118]. The by-form *dakur* may be due to analogy of (or contamination with) *sakur* ‘battle-axe’ and *čkur* ‘axe’. Note also Ararat *akur* ‘pick, hoe’ (see HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 33b).

damban, prob. *i*-stem or *a*-stem: AblSg *i damban-ē*, which precludes the *o*-declension (Grigor Narekac‘i, 10-11th cent.), LocSg *i damban-i* in T‘ēodoros K‘řt‘enawor, 7th cent. (NHB 2: 1050a), Grigor Narekac‘i ‘tomb, grave’; a few derivatives: **damban-akan** ‘mourning song’ in Dionysius Thrax (6-7th cent.): *ew zdambanakann užgnaki* : *τὰ δὲ ἐλεγεῖα λιγυρῶς* (AdonDion 2008: 2^{L21f}), see also A. Muradyan 1971: 159-160; **dambaran** ‘tomb, grave’ in Yovhannēs Drasxanakertc‘i (9-10th cent.), etc.

●ETYM Since Lidén (1906: 41-43; sceptical Meillet 1910-11: 218-219), connected with Gr. *ταφή* f. ‘interment’, *τάφος* m. ‘funeral rites; grave, tomb’, *τάφρος* f. ‘ditch, trench’, *θάπτω* ‘to bury’ (from **d^hmb^h-iō*, see Rix 1992: 90), Old Pruss. *dambo* ‘ground’, etc. One reconstructs **d^hmb^h-* (HAB 1: 618a; Pokorny 1959: 248; Mann 1963: 61; Rix 1992: 90). For other (alleged) cognates and references, see Clackson 1994: 120-121; Rix 2003: 372, 380₆₀.

This Armeno-Greek correspondence has been regarded as a technical funeral term, and the appurtenance of other cognate forms are considered uncertain (see Toporov, PrJaz 1 [a-d], 1975: 294-295 with literature), although Clackson (1994: 121) is positive on especially Old Pruss. *dambo* ‘ground’.

The suffix *-aran* is certainly Iranian, whereas *-an* can be of both native and Iranian origin (for the material, see Clackson 1994: 110-112, 121)⁴⁷.

⁴⁷ For a suffix *-an* in place designations, cf. *kac-an* ‘path’, *kap-an* ‘pass, gorge’, *p‘ot-an* ‘street’, etc. Note also Uartian *iarani* ‘shrine, sanctuary’ (on this word, see Meščaninov 1978:

V. Chirikba (p.c.) suggests a connection of the Armenian word with Abkhaz *a-damra* ‘tomb, grave, dolmen’. A loss of *-an* is not easy to explain, therefore he assumes an old borrowing from Arm. **damb(a)r-*. One may assume that PArm. **d^hamb^h-ro/-reh₂-* ‘tomb’ (cf. Gr. *τάφρος* f. ‘ditch, trench’) has been borrowed into Abkhaz *a-damra* at an early stage. Later, **damb(a)r-* was replaced by *dambaran* under the strong influence of *-aran*, a suffix which makes depository and similar terms.

I conclude that Arm. *damban* and **dambar* ‘tomb, grave’ and the related Greek (perhaps also some other European) forms represent a cultural word belonging to the Mediterranean-Pontic substratum (see 3.11). Abkhaz *a-damra* ‘tomb, grave, dolmen’ is a very old armenism and probably corroborates the MedPont origin (cf. other technical terms such as *kamurj* ‘bridge’, q.v.).

Further, note Arm. *t’umb* ‘mound; fence, wall around a house’, Gr. *τύμβος* m. ‘mound, burial mound, grave’, etc. (see HAB 2: 206). If these words belong with *damb-an*, Gr. *ταφή*, etc., we may assume another Mediterranean cultural term with aberrant *u*-vocalism, cf. *burgn* ‘tower’, *durn* ‘potter’s wheel’ (see s.v.v.). Note that Arm. *t’umb*, if interpreted correctly, must belong to a younger period in view of *t’-* instead of *d-*.

dayeak, *a*-stem: GDSg *dayek-i* (P⁺awstos Buzand), GDPl *dayek-a-c’* in the Bible and Ełišē [Ter-Minasyan 1989: 404^{L8}] ‘nurse; wet-nurse; tutor’ (abundant in the Bible, etc., Astuacaturean 1895: 375; NHB 1: 593); dial. ‘midwife’.

Abundantly attested in the Bible, etc., also in compounds: *dayek-(a-)*, see Astuacaturean 1895: 375; NHB 1: 593. Apart from the Bible, the meaning ‘tutor’ occurs in e.g. Movsēs Xorenac’i 2.43 (1913=1991: 168^{L9}; transl. Thomson 1978: 184). MidArm. *dayek* ‘nurse, wet-nurse’ [MijHayBař 1, 1987: 164b].

●DIAL The MidArm. form *dayek* is present in a number of *kə*-dialects, in the meaning ‘midwife’. In Polis, Axalc’xa, Karin, Sebastia and Akn, one finds **dahek*, with the glide *-h-* [Ačarean 1913: 265a; HAB 1: 619a].

●ETYM Since long, linked with Arm. *diem* ‘to suck, drink mother’s milk’, Pers. *dāyah* ‘wet-nurse’ (Gēorg Dpir, NHB 1: 593a), Skt. *dhāyati* ‘to suck, drink mother’s milk’, Arm. *da(y)l* ‘beestings’, etc. (de Lagarde 1850: 352-353; 1854: 14^{L306f}; Hübschmann 1883: 26; 1897: 437). Arm. *dayeak* is put in this context as a native word, see Hübschmann *ibid.*; Pedersen 1905: 204; 1906: 405 = 1982: 66, 183 (**day-i-*, or **-ti-* formation); Pokorny 1959: 241-242 (**d^hə-ti-* > Arm. **day-*); Schrijver 1991: 344 (**d^hh_{ij}-*).

In fact, Arm. *dayeak* should be regarded as an Iranian loanword, cf. Pahl. *dāyag* ‘(wet-)nurse’, etc. (HAB 1: 618-619, 668a; Malxaseanc’ HBB 1: 485a; Schmitt 1972-74: 24; Perixanjan 1983: 125, 327₁₉₂; Ĵahukyan 1987: 162, 522, 551; L. Hovhannisyān 1990: 216-217; cf. Ravnæs 1991: 143). On the Iranian etymon, see ĒtimSlovIranJaz 2, 2003: 445-448; Cheung 2007: 47.

137; N. Arutjunjan 2001: 450-451), which might be regarded as a loanword from PArm. conjectural **iar-an* ‘shrine’ < PIE **ish₁ro-* ‘holy’, cf. Gr. *ιερός* ‘holy, divine’, *ιερόν* n. ‘consecrated area, temple’, Skt. *iṣirá-* ‘strong, active’, etc. This is, of course, highly hypothetical.

dayl ‘colostrum, beestings’ (NHB and HAB, without specified references).

For dialectal forms and an etymological discussion, see s.v. *dal* ‘colostrum, beestings’.

daylayl-ik-k’ ‘twitter, trembling song’ (Grigor Astuacaban Nazianzac’i, John Chrysostom, Plato, Grammarians). Spelled also as *dala(y)lik-k’* and *dēlēlik-k’*. On ModArm. *daylayl(ik)* ‘twitter’ and *daylaylel* ‘to twitter’, see Malxaseanc’ HBB 1: 485b.

●ETYM Ačaryan (HAB 1: 619b) treats the word as reduplication of a root **dayl*, which he, with some reservation, considers onomatopoeic.

The root **da(y)l* is homonymous to *da(y)l* ‘colostrum’ (q.v.). On the strength of typological parallels for the poetic association ‘cow, milk’ : ‘song, stanza’ or ‘stream of milk’ : ‘stream of speech’ (see Ivanov 1979a: 13-14; Ivanov apud MifNarMir 2, 1982: 5-6; Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 567-568, 569₄, 571; Lubotsky 2002b: 35), one is tempted to assume that the resemblance of these two words is not a mere chance. Note also Vedic *dhénā-* f. ‘stream of milk, nourishing stream’ : ‘stream of speech’ (Mayrhofer EWAia 1, 1992: 797; cf. Humbach 1982: 107-111), which is etymologically related with Arm. *da(y)l* ‘colostrum’. The idea is highly uncertain, however, and the onomatopoeic origin of **dayl* ‘twittering song’ is more probable.

dar̄nam, 3sg.aor. *darj-a-w* ‘to go/come back, return; to turn, become’ (Bible+); *darj*, *i*-stem: GDSg *darj-i*, LocSg *i darj-i* (Bible), AblSg *i darj-ē* (Philo), IPl *darj-i-w-k’* (Grigoris Aršaruni, 7-8th cent.) ‘return, departure; turning’ (Bible+).

●DIAL The verb *dar̄nam* is ubiquitous in the dialects. The stem *darj-* is seen in *Julā d’ar̄c’nel*, Polis *dar̄c’unel*, etc. [HAB 1: 639b].

●ETYM Arm. **dar(j)-nam* has been connected to Alb. *dredh*, aor. *dródha* ‘to turn, wind’ on the one hand, and to Gr. *τρέχω* ‘to run’, *τροχός* m. ‘wheel; potter’s wheel’, OIr. *droch* ‘wheel’, and Arm. *durn* ‘potter’s wheel’ on the other, for other (alleged) forms, references and a discussion, see Lidén 1906: 101-104; HAB 1: 639; Pokorny 1959: 258 and 273; Chantraine 1968-80: 1135-1136; Demiraj 1997: 143-144; Mallory/Adams 1997: 491b, 640b; 2006: 249-250, 399-400; Olsen 1999: 193, 954-955.

These forms are often represented under two different lexemes. In view of the obvious parallelism between *dar̄nam* < **dar(j)nam* ‘to turn’ vs. *durn* ‘potter’s wheel’ on the one hand, and *bar̄nam* < **barj-nam* ‘to lift’ vs. *burn* ‘tower’ on the other, one rather assumes that *dar̄nam* and *durn* are outcomes of one and the same root **dr(e)ḡ^h*, although details are disputable. It is remarkable that both *burn* and *durn* are cultural terms derived from verbal stems and displaying the same kind of phonological irregularities, viz. **-ur-* and **-ḡ^h-* vs. **-r(V)-* and **-ḡ^h-*, respectively. Besides, these cultural terms have related forms in non-Indo-European languages of Near East and Caucasus. For a further discussion and references, see s.v. *durn* ‘potter’s wheel’.

darbin, *a*-stem: GDSg *darbn-i* (Job 32.19 [Cox 2006: 210]), GDPl *darbn-a-c’* (Job 41.16 [Cox 2006: 264], Movsēs Xorenac’i 2.61, Response to Sahak’s letter, Grigor Narekac’i) ‘blacksmith’ (Bible+); *darbnem* ‘to forge’ (John Chrysostom, Gregory of Nyssa, Paterica); coll. *darbn-ay-k’* (“Čarəntir”).

According to Ačařyan (HAB 1: 636a), the basic and oldest meaning is ‘artisan, craftsman’, which is seen in *darbin pñjoy ew erkat’oy* (Genesis 4.22, see now in Zeyt’unyan 1985: 163). However, the Greek text here has *χαλκεὺς χαλκοῦ καὶ σιδήρου*, and Arm. *darbin* simply renders Gr. *χαλκ-εὺς* m. ‘metal worker, coppersmith, blacksmith’.

The word *darbin* is mentioned in an interesting passage describing the cult ceremonies related with *Artawazd*, imprisoned in mountain Masis (Ararat): Movsēs Xorenac’i 2.61 (1913=1991: 192^{L3f}; transl. Thomson 1978: 204): *Vasn oroy ew ar meroy isk žamanakaw bazumk’ i darbnac’, zhet ert’alov ařaspelin, yawur miařabat’woř eric’s kam č’oric’s baxen zsaln, zi zōrasc’in, asen, řt’ayk’n Artawazday. Bayc’ ē čřmartut’eamb ayspēs, 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 yařaspelin asen ayspēs* “This the same singers express in the fable as follows”.

In *Patasxani t’ht’oyn Sahakay* (Response to the letter of Sahak) ascribed to Movsēs Xorenac’i (MovsXorenMaten 1843: 294-295; see also Aliřan 1910: 42-43; Russell 1987: 250, 404), mention is made of a shrine of the goddess Anahit in a place in the district of Anjewac’ik’ called *Darbnac’ k’ar* ‘stone of blacksmiths’. Here the blacksmiths (attested forms: API *darbin-s*, GDPI *darbn-a-c*) are explicitly described in the context of a heathen cult and are called *gorcōneayk’ č’arin* ‘ministers of evil’. The shrine of Anahit was replaced by a small church *Surb Astuacacin*, and the place was renamed *Hogeac’ vank’* (ibid.), note traditional stories (Łanalanyan 1969: 246-247) where we also encounter the *Kař dew* ‘lame demon’ (cf. Russell 1987: 205), the demon called *Kudrut’*, and a bear. On *Hogeac’/Hogwoc’ vank’*, see Hübschmann 1904: 342-343.

●DIAL Widespread in the dialects: Sebastia, Karin, Muř, Ĵuřa *d’arb’in*, Ararat *d’arp’in*, Łarabař *tārpın*, Alařkert *d’ārpın*, T’iflis *dārp’un* (!), etc. [HAB 1: 636b]. Van, Moks, Salmast *tārpın*, Ozim *d’ārpeyn* [HAB ibid.; Ačařyan 1952: 255] and řatax *tārpın* [M. Muradyan 1962: 195a] display a regular reflex of *da-* through Ačařyan’s Law.

●ETYM Since Meillet (1894: 165), connected with Lat. *faber, fabrī* m. ‘craftsman, workman, artisan; metal worker, smith’ and derived from PIE **d^hab^h-* ‘to put together, fit’: Goth. *ga-daban* ‘to be suitable’, OEngl. *ge-dæfte* ‘mild, gentle’ < ‘*fitting, becoming’, OCS *dobrŭ* ‘ἀγαθός, καλός’, etc. (Hübschmann 1897: 438; HAB 1: 636; Pokorny 1959: 233-234; Lehmann 1986: 134-135). Ĵahukyan (1982: 74; 1987: 119) accepts the connection with Lat. *faber* and OCS *dobrŭ* and follows Pokorny in reconstructing **d^hab^hřino-* for Armenian.

The relatedness of Arm. *darbin* and Lat. *faber* with the other forms is uncertain (see Schrijver 1991: 102; Kuiper 1995: 66; de Vaan 2008: 197). According to Mallory/Adams (1997: 139a), although IE **d^hab^hřos* ‘craftsman’ is attested in only two stocks, “the geographical distribution of those attestations strongly suggests PIE status”. More probably, however, this is a non-IE word (Beekes 1996: 230; cf. also Kuiper 1995: 66) and belongs with the Mediterranean-Pontic substratum (see 3.11).

The reconstruction of **-ino-* (see above) is improbable. One might rather assume coll./fem. **-neh₂-* (see Olsen 1999: 471) or **-sneh₂-*, cf. Gr. τέχνη f. ‘craftmanship, handiwork, art’ vs. Skt. *tákṣati* ‘to form by cutting; to fashion, form’, etc. (see s.v. **t’eši* ‘spindle’). For a possible original *n*-stem, cf. *hiws-n* ‘carpenter’ vs. *hiwsem* ‘to weave’ (q.v.). PArm. **dabr-(s)na-* ‘forging’ would develop into *darbin*, *a*-stem ‘forger’ as in *lusin* ‘moon’ from **louk-sneh₂-*, *kaṭin* ‘acorn’ from **g^hlh₂eno-* (q.v.). For the suffix *-in*, see Ĵahukyan 1987: 234; Olsen 1999: 463-473. Note especially *atx* : *ataxin* ‘female servant’ (q.v.). For the development ‘craft’ > ‘craftsman’ cf. OIr. *cerd* ‘craft; poetry’ > ‘craftsman, artisan, gold- and silversmith; poet’ (see s.v. *k’erday* ‘scribe’).

Alternatively, Arm. *darbin* has been linked with Skt. *dṛbhāti* ‘to tie together’, Lith. *dárbas* ‘work’, *dárbti* ‘to work’, etc. (Mann 1963: 58, 94; Blažek 2008: 77, 79). Note especially Lith. dial. *darbinỹkas* ‘worker’ (on this and related forms and on the suffix *-i/enỹkas*, see Derksen 1996: 48, 99, 185-186; cf. Fraenkel s.v.), which has been linked with *darbin*, Lat. *faber* and others already in HAB 1: 636a; see also Ałabekyan 1979: 56. However, this is less probable.

Gordon Whittaker (2004: 389₁₃; 2005: 414, 414₆)⁴⁸ compares Arm. *darbin* and Lat. *faber* with Sumerian *tabira* ‘joiner’ and Hurrian *tabiri* ‘Metallgießer’, probably also ‘smith’. Ilya Yakubovich (apud Blažek 2008: 79₂) independently suggests the same comparison, but proposes to derive Arm. *darbin* from the Hurrian word, borrowed into Sumerian *tabira*, *tibira* ‘metal worker’. However, I see no serious reasons to abandon the connection of Arm. *darbin* with Lat. *faber*. According to Whittaker (ibid.), the Sumerian word (*tabira* ‘artisan, joiner’, not ‘metal worker’) is not related with the Hurrian, but is rather a loan from PIE **dhabh-ro-*.

Leaving the Sumerian word out of consideration, I assume that Hurrian *tabiri* could be borrowed in the 2nd (or 3rd) millennium from the Proto-Armenians which may have been settled at that time in the NW parts of the historical Armenia, in and around Hajaša, ‘*the land of metal/iron’ (see s.v. *Hay-k* ‘Armenia’).

The proto-form that underlies Arm. *darbin* with Lat. *faber* may be reconstructed as a QIE HD *r*-stem: nom. **d^hab^h-ér*, acc. **d^hab^h-ér-m*, gen. **d^hab^h-r-ós* (type ‘father’, see Beekes 1995: 177).⁴⁹

The passages from Movsēs Xorenac’i, etc. (see above) seem to reveal the meaning ‘heathen priest; poet’ or the like, which possibly originates from the Indo-European tradition, cf. OIr. *cerd* ‘craftsman, artisan, gold- and silversmith; poet’ (see s.v. *k’erday* ‘scribe’), *fabbro del parlar* in Dante; OIc. *ljodasmiðr* ‘poet’ and *galdrasmiðr* ‘Verfasser von Zaubersliedern’ vs. *smiðr* ‘artisan, smith’, etc.⁵⁰ For these and other data on the relation between ‘smith’, ‘forger, sorcerer’ and ‘poet, forger of words and songs’, see Durante 1968: 270-271 (< 1960: 236-237); Ivanov/Toporov 1974: 148-149, 158-163, 172-173; Ivanov apud MifNarMir 2: 21; Mallory/Adams 1997: 139ab. For an extensive study of IE ‘smith’, see Blažek 2008 and forthc.

⁴⁸ I am indebted to Prof. Gordon Whittaker for these references and for detailed discussions.

⁴⁹ If Hurrian *tabiri* is indeed an Armenian loan, it may reflect the PArm. old nominative.

⁵⁰ The Armenian and Germanic poetic traditions often display similarities, see, e.g., s.vv. *ařaspel* ‘myth’, *tal* ‘song’.

The Lame Demon, which functions in the context of *Darbnac' K'ar* 'stone of blacksmiths', may reflect the IE divine smith, which was lame, too (on the latter, see Ivanov apud MifNarMir 2: 22b; Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 715₁).

darj, *i*-stem 'return, turn' (Bible+), and aor. stem of *darṅnam* 'to go/come back, return; to turn, become' (q.v.).

●ETYM See s.v. *darṅnam* 'to return, turn'.

deṭ, *o*-stem: ISg *deṭ-o-v* (Bible), GDPI *deṭ-o-c* (Łazar P'arpec'i, Movsēs Xorenac'i); *a*-stem: IPI *deṭ-a-w-k* (see below) 'herb; medicine; poison, etc.' (Bible+); **deṭem** 'to cure, poison' (e.g. P'awstos Buzand, see below), **deṭ-in** (gen. *deṭn-i*) 'yellow' (Plato, John Chrysostom, etc.); **deṭ-j** 'peach' (Paterica, Geoponica, etc.), *karmr-a-deṭj* 'red peach' (Agat'angelos).

In Łazar P'arpec'i, 5th cent. (1904=1985: 9^{L33f}; transl. Thomson 1991: 42): *And gtanin ew azgi azgi armatk' busoc' i pēts ōgtakarut'ean deṭoc', aṣt čartaragēt čanač'ohut'ean stugahmut bžškac'n yōrinuacoc'n* : "There are found every sort of root and plant useful for the needs of medicine; they are prepared according to the knowledgeable skill of the most expert physicians".

In P'awstos Buzand 4.15 /5th cent./ (1883=1984: 104; transl. Garsoĭan 1989: 145) one finds IPI *deṭ-o-v-k* and *deṭ-a-w-k* "by poison" in the same passage; see the lines -10 (figura etymologica: *deṭel zna mahuan deṭōk'n* "to infect her with a deadly poison") and -15.

In Movsēs Xorenac'i 1.11 (1913=1991: 37^{L7f}; transl. Thomson 1978: 88): *Bayc' zdiakn Belay pačučeal deṭovk' (var. deṭōk', see readings at pp. 37 and 418a), aṣē, hramayē Hayk tanel i Hark', ew t'atēl i barjrawandak teṭwoj, i tesil kananc' ew ordwoc' iwroc'* "But Hayk 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".

GDPI *deṭ-o-c* is found in Movsēs Xorenac'i 2.31 (1913=1991: 149^{L9f}; transl. Thomson 1978: 169): *vasn bžskut'eand, or lini i jeṣ k'o aṛanc' deṭoc' ew armatoc'* "and about the healing that was accomplished through you without medicines or drugs".

See also Yovhan Mandakuni/Mayragomec'i (5th/7th cent.), 2003: 1164b, lines -14, -16.

●DIAL All the forms are widespread in the dialects [HAB 1: 649b, 651].

According to Jahukyan (1972: 280; 1987: 119, 255, 277; see also H. Suk'iasyan 1986: 155), here also belongs Van **deṭ-d* 'the root of a plant used in hair-washing' (on which see Ačaṙean 1913: 272a).

Further, see s.v. *deṭ-b* 'yellow'.

●ETYM See s.v. *dalar* 'green, fresh'.

deṭb 'yellow' in Anania Širakac'i (7th cent.), NHB 1: 609a. In the edition of A. G. Abrahamyan (1940: 40^{L7}), one finds *deṭin* 'yellow' instead.

The variant *deṭb* is not necessarily a corruption. A similar variation is also seen in the case of the preceding word of the same passage: *lurt'* (NHB) vs. *lurj* (Abrahamyan's edition); both alternants are reliably attested elsewhere, see s.v. *lurj* 'shiny; blue'. Besides, as Ačaṙyan (HAB 1: 650a) stresses, the existence of *deṭb* is

corroborated by *detb-a-goyn* (attested by the same author, Anania Širakac'i) and dial. **detb-el* (see below).

The compound *detb-a-goyn*, lit. 'yellow-coloured', occurs in the Long Recension of Ašxarhac'oyc' by Anania Širakac'i, 7th cent., see HAB 1: 650a. Ačaryan refers to Soukry 1881: 45^{L1} (transl. of the passage Hewsen 1992: 75), but here *getbagoyin* is printed.

●DIAL Muš *d'exb'el* 'to grow yellow by dirt (said of clothes)' [HAB 1: 650b].

According to Ĵahukyan (1972: 280; 1987: 119, 255, 277, 305; see also H. Suk'iasyan 1986: 155), here also belongs Akn **dl-b-ik* 'a branch with fruits' (on which see Ačarean 1913: 279b).

G. Gyožalyan (2001: 17) records Svedia (Musa-leř) *txp'ina* 'a plant with grape-sized yellow sticky fruits'. I wonder if this word derives from our *detb* 'yellow'. It may reflect **detb-eni*.

●ETYM According to Ačaryan (1898b: 371b; HAB 1: 648b, 650; Ĵahukyan, *ibid.*), *detb* is composed of **det* (see HAB s.v. *det* 'herb' and *det-in* 'yellow') and the determinative *-b*.

The *-l-* of *dl-b-ik* perhaps points out to an independent formation **dal-* 'fresh branch, herb' (cf. *dal-ar* 'fresh plant') + the same determinative *-b-*.

***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 *ttez* '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 *detez-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.vv. *delin*, *detj*). For the semantics cf. Šatax *zər-ket* 'bumble-bee' and dial. *zr-kēc* 'yellow bumble-bee', if containing *zər* 'yellow' (see s.v. *kēt₂*). 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).

dzi 'horse', only commentaries on Dionysius Thrax: Step'annos Siwnec'i, as synonymous to *ji* 'horse', and in Grigor Magistros, listed with semantically neutral horse-designations (see Adonc 1915=2008: 209^{L16}, 241^{L8}).

●ETYM Probably to be identified with *ji* 'horse' (q.v.), see NHB 1: 611c; Ĵahukyan 1967: 184; sceptical HAB 658c.

***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 Russ. *temu* (written in Armenian characters) 'children'. Obviously, this form is a misprint for Russ. *deti* = *demu*, caused by the formal similarity of the handwritten Russian characters *m* and *u* 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. **děte* (: Russ. *ditjá* 'child', Czech *dítě*, Bulg. *deté* 'id.', etc.) goes back to **d^heh₁-t-*, from PIE **d^heh₁-* '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 Naxijewan) 'child' < Turk. *bebek* (on which see Ačarean 1902: 291). Alternatively, an onomatopoeic formation.

diem, caus. *di-ec* '-uc *anem* 'to suck, drink mother's milk' (Bible+).

●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 **dhāye-*. I assume that PA **ǵ* 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* 'horse' to Skt. *hāya-* 'id.' by positing a prototype **ǵhāyo-*".

However, Skt. *dhāyati* may be derived from **d^heih₁-e-* (see Mayrhofer EWAia 1, 1992: 776; or, rather, **d^hh₁-eie-*), 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). Jahukyan (1987: 119) reconstructs **dhēie-* = **d^heh₁-ie-*.

See also s.v. **dal*.

di-k', GDPl *di-c*', IPl *di-a-w-k'* 'god' (Bible+).

●ETYM Since Müller (1890: 2), compared with Gr. *θεός* 'god' [HAB 1: 672-673]. Arm. *di-k'* (< pl. **d^hēsēs*) derives from the full-grade **d^heh₁s-*: Lat. *fēriae* < 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. *dhīs-ṇiya-* 'Götter geneigt machend' represent the zero-grade **d^hās-* = **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; Untermann 2000: 281-283, West 2007: 121]. 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 **d^hēh₁s-s*, GSg **d^hh₁s-ós*. Both **d^hēh₁s-s* and **d^heh₁s-s* would result in Arm. *di-k'*.

The derivation of the Greek and the Armenian words from **d^h(e)ues-* 'to dissipate, blow' (cf. Lith. *dvasià* 'breath, spirit, soul', etc.; see Pokorny 1959: 269; Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984: 466; see also references in Frisk, s.v.) must be abandoned, in particular, because of Myc. *te-o* [Schwartz 1992: 392]. As far as Armenian is concerned, Lindeman (1982: 45) is positive about this etymology and explains Arm. *di-k'* as reflecting the lengthened grade **d^hwēs-*. He admits, however,

that the Greek word can hardly belong here. This would imply separating 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 *Ζηλυ-δηζή* f. belong to the Greek and Armenian words. He (1974: 12) is inclined to the derivation of Gr. *θεός* from **d^hweso-s* and treats Arm. *di-k'* and Thracian *δεσα-* as a contamination of **d^hweso-* and **diw-* (on which see HAB s.v. *tiw* 'day'). In general, this is implausible (see above on Myc. *te-o*) and unnecessary since the paradigm **d^heh₁s-s*, GSg **d^hh₁s-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 **d^heh₁s-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.vv. *ciacan* 'rainbow', *katin* 'acorn', *tiw* 'day').

It has been assumed that Arm. *di-k'* 'god' is reflected in the Urartian theonym *Aršibe-di-ni* (see s.v. *arcui* 'eagle').

dnem, 1sg.aor. *e-di*, 3sg.aor. *e-d*, imper. *di-r* 'to put, lay; to make, build; to suppose, assume' (Bible+), 'to close the door' (P'awstos Buzand, etc.); **di-r**, *i*-stem 'position, site; order' (Bible+), 'cemetery' (Łazar P'arpec'i, Movsēs Xorenac'i, Canon Law, Plato, etc.).

●DIAL The verb *dnem* 'to put' is ubiquitous in the dialects [HAB 1: 676].

In Agulis, *dnem* has been replaced by *dril* (C'ina *t'əril*), which also means 'to suppose, assume', e.g. *drik^o t'ä* 'let us suppose/assume that', cf. ClArm. *dic'uk' t'ē* [HAB 1: 676ab; Ačārean 1935: 347]. As has been pointed out by Ačāryan (1935: 125), in Agulis the verb has been reshaped after the root *dir*.

The aorist paradigm in K'esab is as follows: sg. *dərä*, *dəri*, *idej*; pl. *dərunk'*, *dərek'*, *dəren* (Č'olak'ean 1986: 154, for *-j* from *-c'* in the 3sg form, see 44). Whereas the root **di-* has been replaced by **dir* throughout the paradigm, the 3sg form seems to reflect **e-dic'*. This form is reminiscent of 3sg.aor *e-li-c'* vs. pres. **li-nu- > lnum* 'to fill'.

T'iflis *ju dnel* means 'to lay eggs', cf. Germ. *legen* [Ačārean 1913: 281b], see below on the Latvian parallel from the same PIE verb. Ĵula *d'irk'* 'coffin' is comparable to ClArm. *dir-k'* 'cemetery' [HAB 676b].

●ETYM Derived from PIE **d^heh₁-* 'to put, lay; to make, produce': Skt. *dhā-* 'to put, place, make, produce', Gr. *τίθημι* 'to put down, ground, create', Lat. *con-dere* 'to build, found; to compose, make', *fē-cī* 'I have made', OHG *tuon* 'to do', Lith. *dėti* 'to lay, put', Latv. *dēt* 'to lay eggs' (cf. Arm. dial. T'iflis), etc. See Hübschmann 1897: 439; HAB 1: 675-676; Pokorny 1959: 236; Mayrhofer EWAia 1, 1992: 783-786; Viereck/Goldammer 2003: 408.

Arm. *dnem* is composed as **di-* + pres. suffix **ne-* seen in e.g. *ar-ne-m* vs. aor. *ar-ar-* 'to make' (q.v.), see also s.v. *əmpem* 'to drink'; the aorist forms 1sg. *e-di* and 3sg *e-d* are derived from **é-d^heh₁-m* (cf. Skt. *ádham*) or sigm. **e-d^heh₁-s-om* (cf. OCS *děchъ*) and **é-d^heh₁-t* (cf. Skt. *ádhat*), respectively; *di-r* is comparable with

e.g. *li-r* (see s.v. *li* ‘full’). For the paradigm and a discussion, see Meillet 1910-11a: 243; 1913: 105; 1936: 19, 122-123, 132; Łaragyulyan 1961: 153-155; È. Tumanjan 1971: 381-383; Ant‘osyan 1975: 213-214, 219; Godel 1975: 53, 114, 117, 126-127; Schmitt 1981: 153-154; Klingenschmitt 1982: 132, 163; K. Schmidt 1985: 86.

don ‘a kind of bread’, attested only in Yaysmawurk‘. In Baġgirk‘ hayoc‘, *don* renders *pak‘simat* [Amalyan 1975: 273^{Ni227}]. 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 IPI of *hac‘* ‘bread’. Ačarġyan (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, although 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 *don* type”. 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 an *i*-stem).

●DIAL Łazax *dɔn* [Amatuni 1912: 173b], Širak *dɔnik* ‘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 *dɔtik* ‘a kind of longish bread with a hole in the middle’ (mentioned as *tɔtik* by G. Srvanġtyanc‘ in his “Groc‘u broc’”, see 1, 1978: 40). As far as semantics is concerned, this form is reminiscent of Muš, Bulanəx *donik*. However, *dotik* derives from Van *dot* ‘frame around a wheel’ [Ačarean 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 also found in Gabikean 1952: 170: *dompik nkanak, pztik sōmin*. Besides, Gabikean (ibid.) separately gives Sebastia *don* ‘thick liquid food for shepherd’s dogs, made of barley flour’. It is uncertain whether these words are related with each other and with *don* ‘a kind of bread’.

●ETYM Ačarġyan (HAB 1: 679-680) connects Skt. *dhānā-* f. pl. ‘roasted grains’ (RV+), Khotanese *dānā-* ‘corn’, MPers. *dān, dānag* ‘seed, corn’, NPers. *dāna* ‘seed, corn’ (> Arm. dial. *dan* ‘grain’), Lith. *dūona* ‘bread, corn, grain’, Latv. *duōna* ‘slice of bread’, etc. (from PIE **d^hoH-neh₂-*). Note also Toch. B *tāno* f. ‘seed, grain’ [Adams 1999: 286].

Ĵahukyan (1987: 162-163) presents three objections to this etymology: (1) PIE **d^hoH-neh₂-* 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 **g^hom(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-*, also found in Toch. B *tāno* 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; Jähukyan 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 semantically unlikely [Mallory/Adams 1997: 237a; Adams 1999: 286].

Jähukyan (1987: 426) points out that Arm. *don* resembles Hurr. *tuni* ‘a kind of bread’, but is sceptical about 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 Jähukyan’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].

Jähukyan’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 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^hoH-neh₂-* ‘grain; bread’ (although 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 **d^hoH-neh₂-*, 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 **d^hōnā-* (note that the Hittite word cannot be derived from PIE **d^hoH-neh₂-* in view of its vocalism). At

this stage of research, it is hard to choose between these possibilities. The second one does not seem probable to me.

du 2sg.pers.pron. ‘thou’ (Bible+), *dun* (Timothy Aelurus); pl. *du-k’* (Bible+). For oblique forms, see s.vv. *k’o*, *k’ez*, *jez* and *jer*. For references to the paradigm and a discussion, see 2.2.5.

●DIAL Ubiquitous in the dialects. Many of them display forms reflecting *dun*, Suč’ava, Nor Naxijewan, T’iflis, Muš, Polis, Hamšen, Akn, Xarberd, Sebastia, Tigranakert, Zeyt’un, Marała, etc. [HAB 1: 681b; AčarLiak 2, 1954: 58-59].

●ETYM From PIE 2.sg.pers.pron. **tuH* ‘thou’: Skt. *t_(u)vám*, Gr. *σú*, Dor. *τú*, Hom. also *τύνη*, Lac. *τύννη*, acc. *σέ*, gen. *σέο*, *σείο*, Lat. *tū*, Goth. *þu*, Lith. *tù*, OCS *ty*, etc., see Hübschmann 1883: 28, 40; 1897: 440; HAB 1: 681 with references. The *d-* in *du* ‘you’, anaphoric *da* (mostly enclitic) and demonstrative *ay-d* (= accented **ái-* + **to-*) instead of *t’-* has been explained by the unaccented position; cf. the Germanic and Celtic parallels (Meillet 1908-09a: 91-93; 1936: 33-34, 92; cf. 1962: 295 = 1978: 295; AčarLiak 2, 1954: 44; Ĵahukyan 1982: 147; 1987: 197; cf. Hübschmann 1897: 440).

It has been assumed that *du-k’* substituted **ju-k’* (from PIE **iuH-*: Skt. *yūyám*, Lith. *jūs*, Goth. *jūs*, etc.), and *jez* represents **jeji* < **jeji* < **jeǵ^hi-* through assimilation, see Meillet 1920: 251; AčarLiak 2, 1954: 56-57; Ĵahukyan 1967: 264; 1982: 147; 1987: 173; Schmitt 1981: 117; Ravnæs 1991: 65, 65₁; cf. Godel 1975: 110; for *du-k’*, see also O. Haas 1940: 98; Stempel 1994: 15. For a discussion see also Pisani 1950: 180-181; Pokorný 1959: 513; Winter 1965: 113-114; Stempel 1994: 15-16; Ałabekyan 1998: 72. However, the development **i-* > Arm. *ǰ-* is disputed (see 2.1.6), thus one may alternatively posit **yeji* > **jeji* > *jez*.

On AblPl *jēn-ǰ*, see s.v. *mek’* ‘we’.

One may wonder whether the by-form *du-n* (attested in Timothy Aelurus and present in a considerable number of dialects) can be compared to Gr. *τύνη*, etc.

duřn, GDSg *dran*, AblSg *i dran-ē*, ISg *dram-b*; Npl *drun-k’*, Apl *drun-s*, LocPl *i drun-s*, GDPl *dran-c’*, AblPl *i dran-c’*, IPl *dram-b-k’*; plur. **dur-k’**, acc. *dur-s*, gen.-dat. *dr-a-c’*, abl. *i dr-a-c’*, instr. *dr-a-w-k’* (rich evidence in the Bible, see Astuacaturean 1895: 407-410) ‘door; palace’ (Bible+), ‘pass’ (Elišē, Movsēs Xorenac’i, etc.), ‘retinue’ (P’awstos Buzand 4.15 [1883=1984: 99^{L-1}], Elišē, etc.); **i dur-s** ‘outside’ (Bible+); **dr-and(-i)** ‘space before a door, porch; threshold’ (see s.v. **and-* ‘door-frame; threshold, vestibule’); **drac’-i** (based on GDPl *dr-a-c’*), *ea*-stem: GDSg *drac’w-o-y*, GDPl *drac’e-a-c’* ‘neighbour’ (Bible+); **dran-ik**, GDPl *drank-a-c’* ‘palace guardian’ in Movsēs Xorenac’i 3.37, 1913=1991: 303^{L1} (cf. Bediryan 1962: 141-142); **droyl** ‘yard-keeper’ (Basil of Caesarea); a number of compounds with *drn(-a)-* or *dr-* as the first member, or *-duřn* as the second member.

●DIAL The form *duřn*, mostly with loss of the final nasal (except for Łarabał, Goris, Šamaxi), is ubiquitous in the dialects; *dur-s* is widespread [HAB 1: 685-686]. A frozen pl. *durk’* ‘door’ has been preserved in Agulis [Ačarean 1935: 347; M. Zak’aryan 2008: 89], Melri [Ałayan 1954: 267b], Karčewan [H. Muradyan 1960: 192a], Kak’avaberd [H. Muradyan 1967: 107, 112, 169b, 211^{L11}]; also as the first member of compounds, *dərkk’-á-* (e.g. in Karčewan, see H. Muradyan 1960: 212b).

Some plural forms represent a dual *dṛ-vi* (also MidArm., see MiĵHayBař 1, 1987: 181b), referring to the two leaves of a door, e.g. Hamšen *tṛvi* (Artašes Ēk‘suzean p.c. apud Ačařyan 1947: 86), Svedia *tṛva* [Hananyan 1995: 72], Akn *dṛvi* (attested e.g. in a lullaby, see Čanikean 1895: 408^{L6}; Ā. Grigoryan 1970: 53^{Nr17}), etc. Interesting is the paradigm of Svedia: NSg *tauṛ*, AccSg *z-tauṛ*, GDSg *trun*, NPI *tṛva* (Andreasyan 1967: 56); according to Ačařyan 2003: 464: NSg *d‘ṛ*, GDSg *d‘ṛṇ*, ISg *d‘ṛn-um*.

Muš *dṛverk* ‘the threshold with the yard and surroundings’ [Ačařean 1913: 288b] comprises not only the original dual **-u-*, but also coll.-pl. *-er* and *-k*.

●ETYM Since long (Acoluthus 1680, Awetik‘ean 1815, etc., see HAB 1: 685b), connected with cognate forms of the PIE word for ‘door’, **d^hu(o)r-*: Skt. *dvār-* f., NADu *dvārā*, *dvārau*, API *dūras* ‘door, gate, the two leaves of a door’, *dvāra-* n. ‘id.’, *dvārī-* f. (with aberrant *d-*), YAv. *duuar-* ‘gate’, MPers. NPers. *dar*, Parth. *bar* ‘door’ (Mayrhofer EWAia 1, 1992: 764-765), Gr. *θύρα*, Ion. *θύρη* f. ‘door, door-leaf’, mostly in. pl. ‘double or folding doors’, NPI *θύραι* f. ‘door’, Lat. *foris* f. ‘door, gate’, pl. *forēs* ‘the two leaves of a door, entrance’, *forās* adv. ‘out of doors, abroad, forth, out’, *forum*, *ī* n. ‘forum, open square, market, court of justice’, *forus*, *ī* m. ‘gangway in a ship, row of benches erected for spectators at games’ < **d^huor-* (Schrijver 1991: 471-472), OIr. *dorus* ‘gateway, doorway’, Welsh *dor* ‘door’ < **d^hu(o)r-eh₂-*, Goth. *daur* ‘gate’, OEngl. *door* ‘door, gate, pas’ < **d^hur-om*, Lith. NPI f. *dūrys*, dial. *dūres*, Latv. NPI f. *dūrvī*, OCS *дврь*, NPI *дврь* ‘door’, *дворь* ‘courtyard’, Alb. *dërë* f. ‘door’ (Demiraj 1997: 129-130), Toch. B *twere* ‘door’ < **d^huor-o-* (Adams 1999: 323-324), Hitt. *andurza* ‘inside, indoors’ prob. from **h₁(e)n-d^hur-s* ‘indoors’ (Kloekhorst 2008: 188); see Hübschmann 1877: 24; 1883: 28; 1897: 440; HAB 1: 684-685; Pokorny 1959: 278-279; Frisk 1: 695-696; Mallory/Adams 1997: 168-169.

The forms *dur-k*, *dr-a-w-k* show that the nasal of *duṛn* is an original singulative, and the form cannot go back to an old *n*-stem; *duṛn* reflects PIE acc. **d^hūr-ṇ* (Schmitt 1981: 199; Kortlandt 1985b: 9; 1985: 19, 23 = 2003: 57, 63, 67; Beekes 2003: 166) or **d^huor-ṇ* (Viredaz 2001-02: 25), the *-n* was spread throughout the paradigm (see HAB 1: 684-685 with a discussion and literature; Meillet 1936: 84, 93; AčařLiak 3, 1957: 414; Ravnæs 1991: 101; Ē. Mkrtč‘yan 1992: 71-72).

As is suggested by Hübschmann (1894: 115; see also O. Haas 1940: 98), Arm. *dur-k*, as Skt. *dvārau*, may go back to the old dual. For different views, see Saradževa 1986: 225; Olsen 1999: 129-130. It is tempting to compare MidArm. and dial. dual **dṛ-u-i* with Skt. *dvārau*. PArm. **dur-a-* appears only in plural and points to fem.pl. **d^hur-eh₂-*, cf. Gr. fem. *θύρᾱ*, *θύρη*, pl. *θύραι*, etc. (see Frisk *ibid.*; Beekes 2003: 174).

The hapax *droyl* ‘yard-keeper’ has been interpreted as a derivative of *dur-* ‘door, yard’ with **-tel-*, **d^huro-tel-* (Ałayan 1974: 62; Jahukyan 1987: 120, 163, 240; 1994: 15-16; 1998: 29-30).

dustr, GDSg *dster*, NPI *dster-k*, GDPI *dster-c* or *dster-a-c*, IPI *dster-aw-k* ‘daughter’ (Bible+).

●DIAL In almost every dialect replaced by *atĵ-ik* ‘girl’. Preserved only in Suč‘ava: *d‘ustrə*, GSG *d‘əsder*, or *d‘rusd*, GSG *d‘arəsder* ‘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 **d^hugh₂-tēr* > PArm. **dust(i)r*, NPI

**d^hugh₂-ter-es* > *dster-k* [Hübschmann 1897: 440; HAB 1: 686]. For the declension, see also s.v. *k'oyr* 'sister'. For the laryngeal loss, 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.

durgn, GDSg *drgan* (Bible), MidArm. AblSg *i drgan-ē* 'potter's wheel'.

In the late medieval dictionary *Baḡirk' hayoc* 'one finds *drgan* glossed as *brti č'arx* "potter's wheel" (Amalyan 1975: 82^{Nr274}; MijHayBaḡ 1, 1987: 184a), formally identical with the genitive of *durgn* (cf. Amalyan 1975: 362₂₇₄).

●DIAL According to Ačaḡyan (HAB 1: 687b), Ganjak *turg* perhaps belongs here, although its exact meaning is not known. It occurs in Mamikonean 1895: 80, where it is told that the channel (*aru*) turned the water-mill, then *šur ēr talis ankanə u turgə banec* 'not *p'rranə u čaxarakə* "turned the *ankan* and *p'rran* which makes the *turg* work, and the *čaxarak* ('spinning-wheel')". The word *ankan* is here identified with the 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' (q.v.) with the 'instrument-suffix' *-an*, cf. *top'-an* 'beetle for beating clothes' from *top'em* 'to beat' (q.v.), as well *p'rr-an* which appears in the same sentence we are discussing. The latter in Łarabał means 'scraper' (= *šrnč'an, fərltax*, see Ačaḡean 1913: 1086b). Also *turg* probably denotes a kind of turning implement.

To this Ačaḡyan does not add any other dialectal evidence.

Now the word is found in extreme NW and SW. Xotorĵur has *durg* 'the main tool of a potter' (see YušamXotorĵ 1964: 442a, with the names of its parts). Č'olak'ean (1986: 200a) glosses ClArm. *durgn* by K'esab *dörg*, not specifying the meaning.

The word is probably found also in Ararat, *dərg*, see Ananyan 1984: 353^{L2}.

●ETYM Related with Gr. *τροχός* m. 'wheel; potter's wheel' and OIr. *droch* 'wheel', cf. also Gr. *τρέχω* 'to run', Arm. *darj-*, *darnam* 'to turn', etc. [NHB 1: 156b (s.v. *aniw*); Hübschmann 1897: 440; HAB 1: 687; van Windekens 1986: 222]. Arm. *durgn* is formally problematic. In order to explain it, a form with lengthened grade has been assumed, with a subsequent metathesis: **d^hrōg^h-* > **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) reconstructs nom. **d^hrōg^h-s* > **Vrdu*, acc. **d^hrog^h-m* > **Vrdogn* > **Vrdugn* (analogically after the vocalism of the nominative), gen. **d^hrg^h-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 **d^hōrg^h-*, see Clackson 1994: 209₆₃; cf. also Ĵahukyan (1987: 120, 253-254), who hesitantly tries **d^hōrg^h-* and **d^hrg^h-*. For the vocalic problem and the "Gutturalwechsel" in the context of the obvious parallel of *burgn* 'tower' : **berj* 'high', *barnam* 'to lift', see Eichner 1978: 147₁₉; de 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 **kēr-d* 'heart', GSg **kr-ed-s* (see Beekes 1995: 190). Thus: NSg **d^hōr-g^h*, GSg **d^hr-*

og^h-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. Dargin *durug* ‘spindle’, PLezg. **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 **d^hōrg^h/*d^hrog^h-* ‘wheel’⁵¹. Nikolaev (1985: 72) considers Gr. *ἄτρακτος* m. (f.) ‘spindle’ and Skt. *tarku-* ‘spindle’ as borrowed from the same Caucasian word.

Arm. *burgn* (GSg *brgan*) ‘tower; pyramis’ (Bible+) is compared with Gr. *πύργος* m. (also *φύρκος*) ‘tower’ (NHB and Petermann; see HAB 1: 488b). Adonc’ (1938: 465 = 1972: 389-390) compares Arm. *burgn* with Urart. *burgana* ‘fortress’ and assumes a word of “asianic” origin that has been penetrated into the Mediterranean area. On the other hand, Arm. *burgn* 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 *burgn* to Urart. *burgana* ‘fortress’; see also D’jakonov 1983: 165. Diakonoff (1971: 84₈₉) also mentions Udi *buruh*, *bury* ‘Berg’. Further, compared with Caucasian languages: Inkhoqvari *bey* ‘stable’, Akhwakh *boryo* ‘shed’, Karata *beywa* ‘shed’, Abkhaz *a-bā* < **baya* ‘fortress’, Kab. *baq* ‘shed’ [Diakonoff/Starostin 1986: 18]. I wonder, however, whether these words are not in a way related with Arm. *bak* ‘yard; shed’, Georg. *bak’i* ‘hedged stable; yard’, Laz *baki*, Svan *bog* ‘stable’ (see HAB 1: 390-391), and/or with Georgian-Zan **baga-* ‘sheep-pen, goat-pen, crib’ (on which see Klimov 1998: 6, with no relatives outside Kartvelian).

In an additional note, Diakonoff and Starostin (1986: 99^{ADD3}) point out that Urart. *burg-ana* means rather ‘pillar, column’, and the comparison with the above-mentioned Caucasian forms cannot be upheld.

However, the opposite direction of the borrowing is possible too. As we have seen, *burgn* is related with **bar(j)-nam* exactly as *durgn* with **dar(j)-nam*. The strange vocalism of *burgn* is comparable with the irregular *-u-* in Gr. *πύργος* and *φύρκος* ‘tower’ (see also Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 744-745 = 1995, 1: 648). These circumstances suggest that we may be dealing with a ‘Wanderwort’ ultimately of IE origin; the Armenian, Greek, and Near Eastern forms may reflect an IE centum form (perhaps back loans from indigenous Mediterranean and/or European languages). The Armenian origin of Urart. *burgana* cannot be excluded (cf. also Diakonoff 1985: 602-603).

⁵¹ The Caucasian reconstruction looks suspicious. If Dargin *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 close to East Caucasian languages of Dagestan.

E

ezn, GDSg *ezin*, NPl *ezin-k'*, APl *ezin-s*, GDPl *ezan-c'*, IPl *ezam-b-k'* ‘bullock, ox’ (Bible+).

●DIAL Widespread in the dialects. Traces of the final *-n* are seen in Łarabał, etc. *y'éznə*, Agulis *iznə*, Hamšen *yiz*, gen. *ezənə*, T'iflis *yízə*, etc. [HAB 2: 6a].

Łarabał **astucoy ezn* ‘Lady-bug’. Names of the Lady-bug usually display a feminine connotation (see 3.5.2.1). 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’ (Artašes Ēk ‘suzean, apud Ačařyan 1947: 86).

●ETYM Since long (de 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 cognate, although it is mentioned in KEWA 1: 68.

Hübschmann (1899: 47) points out that the Sanskrit word is uncertain, and Av. *azī-* 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 a female bovine. For possible dialectal relics of the older feminine semantics of *ezn*, see above.

The vocalism of the Armenian word does not match that of Celtic; cf. Greppin 1980: 133; Hamp 1986a: 64₁. Olsen (1999: 121) assumes a lengthened grade of the root **h₂ēg^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. **h₂h₁ég^h-* (> Ilr. and Arm.), obl. **h₂h₁g^h-* (> Celt.).

Arm. *ezn* (cf. gen. *ezin*) may be seen as a frozen accusative **(H)h₁ég^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, 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 see” (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 heletatin* “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: Marala, Salmas *yerz*, Ararat *yerzə* [HAB 2: 6b]. Both watery and non-watery aspects are seen in the derivatives (see Ačařean 1913: 292a; HAB 2: 6-7).

In a folk-prayer from Muš/Bulanax (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. *ežià* ‘boundary(-strip)’, etc. [Meillet 1898: 282; Hübschmann 1899: 47; HAB 2: 6b; Beekes 2003: 181]. The BSL forms derive from **h₁eǵ^h-* ‘balk, border’: Lith. *ežė* ‘border, frontier’, Latv. *eža* ‘boundary(-strip)’, Russ. *ěž*, ORuss. *ěžь* ‘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 **h₁eǵ^h-er-* (not mentioning Arm. *ezr*) and Lith. *ežià*, etc. uncertain. There seems to be no solid ground for this opinion. Meanings such as ‘mill-pond’, ‘drain, canal’ and ‘brook’ form a semantic link between **jěž-/jež-* ‘dam, weir’ and **jezero* ‘lake’. Besides, the Armenian word is an intermediary form, since it is semantically identical with Lith. *ežià*, but formally closer to Lith. *ėžeras* ‘lake’, OCS *jezero* n. ‘lake’, etc. [Pokorny 1959: 291-292; Toporov, PrJaz [1], 1975: 131-133; ĖtimSlovSlavJaz 6, 1979: 33-34, 59-60; Saradževa 1986: 26-27; Ĵahukyan 1987: 163; Olsen 1999: 146-147; Derksen 2002: 10-11; Blažek 2003: 246-247].

The connection with the Greek mythological river *Ἄχέρων* 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. [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 of 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. PArm. pl. **ezer-a-* (cf. IPl. *ezer-a-w-k’*) possibly points to neuter pl. in **-h₂*.

elanem, 3sg.aor. *el*, 3pl.aor. *el-in*, imper. *el*, pl. *elēk’* (rich evidence in the Bible, see Astuacaturean 1895: 423-431) ‘to come/go out; to rise, ascend, mount; to go forward or before, advance; to emanate, proceed, originate’ (Bible+); caus. **eluzanem*, unattested in the classical language, but note the compound *mard-eloyz* ‘man-

kidnapper' in 1 Timothy 1.10 (GDPI *mardeluz-a-c'*) and Grigor Narekac'i, *y-el/huz-ak*, *a*-stem: GDPI *-a-c'* 'robber' (Movsēs Xorenac'i, etc.); the meaning 'to extract, produce, make come up (of plants)' (cf. Dionysius Thrax) is seen in *eluz-umn* 'shoot, sprout' (NPI *eluzmunk'* in Book of Chries); *and-eluzanem* 'to discover, make come out' (T'ovmay Arcruni), 'to fasten or join together, bind together' (Bible+); caus. *eluc'anem* 'to make ascend' (Plato); *el*, *i*-stem: GDPI *el-i-c'* 'egress, departure; ascent, advancement, course; issue; end' (Bible+); *elust*, gen.-dat. *elst-ean* 'egress, the going out, ascent, growing of plants' (Philo, Gregory of Nyssa, etc.).

●DIAL The verb is ubiquitous in the dialects [HAB 2: 9b].

●ETYM Compared to Gr. *ἐλεύσομαι* 'to come, go', *ἐπ-ηλὺς* 'immigrated, foreigner', etc. (HAB 2: 8-9 with lit.; Pokorny 1959: 306). However, the derivation of Arm. *eluz-* from **h₁leu-g^h*- or **h₁leud^h*- or sigm. aor. **h₁leud^h-s-* is uncertain, and, on the whole, the etymology is doubtful (Ravnæs 1991: 19; Clackson 1994: 206₁₈; Olsen 1999: 89₁₈₀; cf. also Hübschmann 1897: 441). For an etymological and morphological discussion and for the problem of the laryngeal (cf. 2.1.17.1), see Pedersen 1906: 424-425 = 1982: 202-203; Beekes 1969: 289; Jasanoff 1979: 144; Weitenberg 1980: 211; Normier 1980: 19; Greppin 1981: 134-136; 1986: 287; Klingenschmitt 1982: 263; Kortlandt 1987: 62; 1987a: 51; 1994: 29; 1996: 41; 1999: 47-48; 2001: 12 = 2003: 76, 80, 105, 115, 129, 132; Ravnæs 1991: 19; Olsen 1999: 763-764; Viredaz 2001-02a: 5, 5₂₃; Beekes 2003: 185.

The comparison with Lat. *amb-ulō* 'to go about, take a walk', etc. (see HAB 2: 9a) is untenable; cf. Schrijver 1991: 40, 400.

ek-, suppl. aor. of *gam* 'to come': 1sg. *eki*, 2sg. *ekir*, 3sg. *ekn*, 3pl. *ekin*, etc., imper. *ek*, *ekay-k'* (Bible+); *ek*, *a*-stem: GDSg *ek-i*, GDPI *ek-a-c'* (Bible), IPI *ek-a-w-k'* (Movsēs Xorenac'i 1.10) 'stranger, proselyte' (Bible+); *i*-stem: GDPI *ek-i-c'* (Łazar P'arpec'i) 'advent, the coming' (P'awstos Buzand, Łazar P'arpec'i, Philo, Anania Širakac'i, etc.); *ek-k'* 'event' (Philo+), 'income' (Paterica).

The verb is widely represented in the Bible (Astuacaturean 1895: 309-316). Two textual illustrations of the noun *ek*, *a*-stem 'stranger, proselyte' from Movsēs Xorenac'i: 1.10 (1913=1991: 33^{L7f}; transl. Thomson 1978: 85): *ew aylovk' andocnōk' ew ekōk'* "and [with] other domestic servants and the outsiders". 1.3 (12^{L2f}; Thomson 1978: 70): *ōv ok' i c'elic's orošeloc' antani ew merazneay, ew ōyk' omank' ekk' antanec'ealk' ew meraznac'ealk'* : "which of the various tribes are indigenous and native and which are of foreign origin but naturalized".

●DIAL Ubiquitous in the dialects [HAB 2: 12a]. Some dialects have preserved the archaic paradigm, e.g. Łarabał aor. *yéke, yéker, yékə* < *eki, ekir, ekn*, imper. *yek* < *ek*, etc.

●ETYM From PIE **g^wem-*: Skt. *gam-*, pres. *gácchati*, aor. *ágamam, ágan* 'to move, go, come', OAv. 3.sg.aor. *jān* 'to go, come', *gata-* 'gone, come', pres. *jasaiti* (*ja-s-a* instead of **ga-s-a-* < PIE **g^wem-ske/o-* with secondary *j-* from the aorist) 'to go', Gr. *βαίνω* 'to go', Lat. *veniō* 'to come' < PLat. **vemīō*, Goth. *qiman* 'to come', etc., see Hübschmann 1897: 441; HAB 2: 11-12; Pokorny 1959: 464; for the Greek and Indo-Iranian forms, see Frisk 1: 208-210, 279; Mayrhofer EWAia 1, 1992: 465-466; Cheung 2007: 93-94, 98-101.

Arm. 3.sg. aor. *ekn* reflects the original root aorist PIE **h₁é-g^wem-t*, cf. Skt. *ágan*, with *g-* analogically after the present. Other cognate forms are based on **g^weh₂-* (on

which see below), cf. aor. Ved. *á-gāt*, Gr. *ἔβη*. The Armenian aorist augment *e-* had spread throughout the paradigm and became a part of the root⁵². For the suppletive paradigm *gam* vs. aor. *ek-i* and an etymological discussion, see Pedersen 1905: 212-213, 212₁ = 1982: 74-75, 74₁; Meillet 1913: 105; 1936: 57, 125, 134-135; Ľaragyulyan 1961: 162-163; Ę. Tumanjan 1971: 395-396; Godel 1975: 53, 114; Schmitt 1981: 155-156; Ĵahukyan 1982: 188-189; Kortlandt 1981: 31; 1987a: 49-51; 1995; 1996: 40; 1999: 48 = 2003: 36, 79-81, 107-109, 114, 129; Klingenschmitt 1982: 86, 95, 263; Lindeman 1986; Barton 1989: 146₃₈, 149₄₅; Clackson 1994: 56; Beekes 2003: 181. On of the noun *ek*, *a*-stem ‘stranger, proselyte’, see Olsen 1999: 62.

It has been assumed that Arm. *ka-* ‘to stay, stop, rest, stand, dwell’ belongs here too and reflects **g^weh₂-* (cf. above), with an original meaning ‘to step, put the foot, arrive, establish oneself’, cf. Skt. *gā-*: pres. *jāgāti*, aor. *āgāt*, perf.opt. *jagāyāt* ‘to put down the foot (while going), step, stride’, Gr. *βίβαζ* ‘going on, continuing’, *ἔβην* ‘to get ready to go’, *βῆμα* n. ‘step, rostrum’, *βωμός* m. ‘raised platform, stand, base (of a statue), altar’ (for the semantic development, see Beekes 1969: 290), Lith. dial. *góti* ‘to go’, *at-góti* ‘to arrive’, etc., see Scheftelowitz 1904-05, 2: 15; Pedersen 1906: 481 = 1982: 259; Pokorny 1959: 463; Godel 1965: 23, 35, 37; 1975: 124; Ālabekyan 1979: 101; Klingenschmitt 1982: 85, 87-89; Ĵahukyan 1982: 175-176; 1990: 65 with hesitation; Olsen 1999: 295; for the forms, see also Mayrhofer EWAia 1, 1992: 482.

Ačaryan (HAB 2: 504-505) does not accept this etymology of *ka-m* and leaves the origin of the word open⁵³. Schmitt 1981: 202 takes *kam* as an etymologically unclear word. Nevertheless, the etymology is quite attractive. The present *kam* and aorist *ka-c-* reflect QIE **g^weh₂-mi* (athematic present) and **g^weh₂-ske-*⁵⁴ respectively, and the deverbative noun *kay*, *i*-stem ‘standing place, station, site’ clearly derives from **g^wh₂-ti-* (cf. Olsen 1989: 222; 1999: 783); cf. Gr. *βάσις* ‘step, base’, Skt. *gāti-*, Goth. *qumþs* from **g^wṛ-ṛ-ti-* (see e.g. Rix 1992: 89, 146).

For a discussion of the PIE verbs **g^wem-* and **g^weh₂-* and the meaning ‘to step, put the foot, arrive, establish oneself’, see Lubotsky 2001b.

*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’i, Moks *ial* ‘to go’ [Ačarean 1898: 32a, 35a; 1913: 396a; HAB 2: 54a]. For numerous textual illustrations from Aslanbek, see Ačarean 1898: 85ab, 87a. Partizak *iyank* ‘may we go’, *k-iyas* ‘you are going’ [Tēr-Yakobean 1960: 265^{L-13f}, 415^{L-2}].

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 *yäs* (97^{L-9}, 98^{L-4}), 3sg *yä* (55^{L17}, 58^{L4}, 63^{L17}, 64^{L-4}, 80^{L7}), 1pl *yānk* (58^{L-4}, 62^{L18}, 66^{L3}, 68^{L12}, 70^{L13}, 86^{L-14}), 3pl *yän* (86^{L14}, 95^{L14}); subjunctive past: 1sg *yām* (74^{L9}), 3sg *yēr* [from **yayr*] (66^{L10,11}, 93^{L-3}),

⁵² One wonders whether Arm. dial. **eku(-)* is archaic and reflects **g^wom-* or zero-grade **g^wm-* with a labial effect of **g^w-* (cf. Ālabekyan 1979: 101-102).

⁵³ In HAB 2: 12a, s.v. *ek-* ‘to come’, Ačaryan notes Arm. imper. plur. *e-kay-k* as reflecting **g^weh₂-*.

⁵⁴ Formally, aor. *ka-c-* can also go back to **g^wṛ-sk-* with loss of the nasal before **-sk-* > *-c-*.

3pl *yen* [**yayin*] (62^{L19}); with particles: 1sg *tə-yäm* (58^{L11}, 60^{L4}, 68^{L10}, 81^{L-15}, 97^{L10-11}, 120^{Nr64}), 2sg *tə-yäs* (68^{L8}, 75^{L1}, 96^{L3}), *kə-yäs* (74^{L-15}), 3sg *kə-yä* (86^{L5}), *t'əx-yä* (58^{L4}), 3pl *tə-yän* (86^{L8}); pres.: 3sg *kə-yä* (86^{L4}), 1pl *kə-yänk*^o (57^{L-11}), 3pl *kə-yän* (57^{L12}, 67^{L8}); neg. 1sg *č'ə-yäm* (77^{L-7}).

With particles (especially with *t'əx* 'let' and neg. *č'ə*) one often finds forms with a vowel *-i-*: *t'əx-iyä* (56^{L1}), 3sg *k-iyä* (91^{L-9}, 93^{L11-4}, 127^{Nr45,47}), 3pl *k-iyän* (95^{L16}), 1sg *č'am iyä*, 2sg *č'as iyä* (81, lines -6 and -8, cf. 1sg *č'am ért'a*, in line -13), 3sg *č'-iyä* (127^{Nr36,47}). These forms cannot be used as evidence for the form **ial* since this *-i-* hardly belongs to the verbal stem. Thus, the verb in Moks is **ya-* rather than **i(y)a-*.

In Moks, the synonymous verb *ert'am* is often used in the same texts next to **ya-*, sometimes even in the same or neighbouring sentences, e.g. 56^{L1} (3sg *t'əx-ert'a* 'let him go' vs. *t'əx-iyä* 'id.' in the same sentence); 57^{L-10f} (1pl *k-ert'änk*^o vs. *kə-yänk*^o in the same sentence); 67^{Nr40} (3pl *k-ert'an* in line 4 vs. *kə-yän* in line 8); 81^{L-6,-13} (1sg *č'am iyä* vs. *č'am ért'a*), etc.

Neither *ert'*-, nor **ya-* are 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-ert'an* and 1pl.subj. *yänk*^o vs. 3pl.aor. *k'äc'in*.

Ačaryan (1898: 35a) points out that Aslanbek *ial* is pronounced as *ihal* or *iyal* which resulted from the combination of two vowels. He suggests, thus, a hiatus-glide, on which see 2.1.32.

T'iflis *ehal* 'to go' is attested in the work of 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 **eham*, cf. *erkat* 'iron' > T'iflis *érkat*, *eraz* 'dream' > *éraz* (see Ačaryan 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 Ačaryan (HAB 2: 54a) places the word s.v. *ert'am* 'to go'. Earlier, he did the same 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-eham* 'I shall go' as belonging to *ert'am*.

On the other hand, Ačaryan (HAB 2: 54a; see also 1913: 396a) mentions the etymology suggested by Tērvišean 1887: 91₁, linking **ial* with Skt. *éti* 'to go', etc., but does not specify his opinion. Elsewhere (HAB 4: 12b), he, albeit 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* may be a back-loan, see 1.10).

The etymology of Tērvišyan deserves more attention. This dialectal word may be derived from PIE **h₁ei-* 'to go': Skt. *éti* 'to go', Gk. *εἶμι* 'to go', Lith. *eiti* 'to go', etc. See s.v. *ēj*, *iĵanem* 'to go down'. Note also PIE **h₁i-eh₂-* (derived from **h₁ei-*): Skt. *yā-* 'to drive (fast), speed', 3sg.act. *yāti* (RV+), 3sg.med. *īyate*, Lith. *joti* '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. *yáti*), although, admittedly, one needs further philological evidence for the establishing and precise reconstruction of the Armenian by-forms.

etbayr, GSg *etbawr*, NPI *etbar-k'*, GDPI *etbar-c'*, etc. 'brother' (Bible+).

●DIAL Ubiquitous in the 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 Dersim *axp/bar*, *a(t)bar*, Mirak' *albār* [Bałramyan 1960: 78a], Malat'ia *axp'ar* [Danielyan 1967: 190a], Svedia *axb'ar* [Ačarıyan 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*, *albēr*) is attested since the 12th century in MidArm. 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'äy* (cf. also Maraš *exper* [Galustean 1934: 377]), vs. Hačən *axb'ay*, GSg *axb'ey* [HAB 2: 16b; Ačarıyan 2003: 39, 80, 307]. This *ε-* 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. *bhrātar-*, 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*.

eteamn, *an*-stem (GSg *eteman*, ISg *etemamb*) 'hoarfrost' (Bible+). In "Yačaxapatum" and Vardan Arewelc'i (13th cent.), dial. *etemn*. A meteorological description of *eteamn* (vars. *etemn*, *eteam*) is found in Anania Širakac'i, 7th cent. (A. G. Abrahamyan 1940: 32^{L15}).

●DIAL Hamšen *etim* 'icicle', Łazax *etm-a-kal-el* 'to be covered by hoarfrost' [HAB 2: 17a; Ačarean 1947: 227]; Xotorjur *etim* 'hoar-frost' [YušamXotorj 1964: 459]. Also Dersim *yetyam* [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 *ayceamn* 'gazelle, roe' < **ayci-* + *-amn* (see s.v. *ayc(i)* 'goat' and 2.3.1). Olsen (1999: 376, 943) mentions it as a word of unknown origin, containing the suffix *-eamn*.

I propose to compare Arm. **eti-* with BSl. **h₁iH-ni-* 'hoar-frost, rime' (cf. Beekes apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 287a): Russ. *inej*, Czech *jíni*, SCr. *inje*, Bulg. *inej*, Lith. *ynis* (dial.), etc. The full grade of the word, namely **h₁eiH-ni-*, may have yielded PArm. **eiāni-* > **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-āmVn* > **(i)hiamn* (with dissimilation *n ... n > t ... n*, and loss of word-initial pretonic *i-*, see 2.1.33.2) > *e-łeamn*, with a regular prothetic *e-* before *t*. For the suffix cf. *saramanik* 'ice'. Thus: **eni-am(a)n > eteamn* with nasal dissimilation.

etn, NPl *etin-k'*, GDPl *etan-c'* 'deer-cow, hind' (Bible+); **etn-ort'**, *u*-stem: GDPl *etnort'-u-c'* (Mxit'ar Gōš, 12-13th cent.) 'young of the deer, fawn' (Evagrius of Pontus, Grigor Narekac'i, etc.).

The word renders Gr. *ἔλαφος* m. f. 'deer; deer-cow, doe' in the Bible (for a textual illustration, see Job 39.1, Cox 2006: 249) and Hexaemeron (K. Muradyan 1984: 295^{L10}, glossed in 373a).

●DIAL Goris *yeṭnə* 'deer-cow, hind', *buṭa-yeṭnə* 'stag' (with *buṭa* 'ox' from Turkish, cf. Ačařean 1902: 297) [HAB 2: 22a; Lisic'yan 1969: 141]; with the diminutive suffix *-ik*, Axalc'xa, Karin *etnik*, Ğodost'o, Akn *etnig*, Sebastia *yeṭnig* 'deer-cow, hind' [HAB 2: 22a], Goris *yeṭn-ik* 'deer, hind' [Lisic'yan 1969: 141], Van *yeṭnik* and Ozim *yeṭneyk* adj. 'young' [Ačařyan 1952: 257].

The place-name *Yeṭin axpür* < **Etin atbiwr*, lit. 'spring of hind' (Ľarabał, close to the village of Kusapat, see Lisic'yan 1981: 56b, 59) may be regarded as a relic of the classical genitive *etin*.

Interesting is also Č'arsančag **etnar* [HAB 2: 22a] = *yeṭnar* 'deer-cow, hind' [Bařramyan 1960: 78b]. In a colophon from the same region, Akn (1676 AD), we find a female anthroponym *Etinar* (Čanikean 1895: 91; cf. also *Etinar* in a folk-song, Ğ. Grigoryan 1970: 81^{Nr70}), which must be identified with the local dialectal *yeṭnar* 'deer-cow, hind' [AčařAnjn 2, 1944: 118; Ğahukyan 1984: 39]. The initial *h-* of the by-form *Hetnar* [AčařAnjn 3, 1946: 81] seems to be due to influence of *Heṭinē*. Note also *Heṭnar*, a widespread cow-name in Hamšen (see T'orlak'yan 1981: 144a).

The second part of *yeṭnar* 'deer-cow, hind' is unexplained. I wonder if the word is composed of *etn* and **nar*, the latter probably from Persian, cf. *gavazn-e-nar* with *gavazn* 'fallow deer, doe, elk, stag' (on which see Eilers DeutPersWört 1, 1967: 462).

●ETYM From PIE **h₁el-(h₁)en-*: Gr. *ἔλλός* 'deer-calf' < **h₁el-no-*, *ἔλαφος* m. f. 'deer; deer-cow, doe' < **h₁el-ŋ-b^ho-*; cf. also **h₁e/ol-Hn-ih₂-* 'deer, hind': OCS *jelenb* 'deer', *al'nnii* 'doe', SCr. *lâne* 'doe', Russ. *lan* 'fallow deer, doe', *olén* 'deer, stag-beetle', dial. *elén* 'deer, stag-beetle' (for the comparison with Russian, see already NHB 1: 656a), Lith. *ėlnis* 'deer' (see de Lagarde 1854: 28^{L749}), Mir. *ailit* f. 'doe, hind' < **h₁el-(H)n-t-iH-* or **h₁el-en-t-iH-*, Gr. Hesychius *ἔνελος*: *νεβρός* 'young of the deer, fawn' probably from **el-en-os* through metathesis (for the forms and a discussion, see ĘtimSlovSlavJaz 6, 1979: 19-21; Adams 1985: 273-276; Schrijver 1995: 78-79; Derksen 2002: 6); see Hübschmann 1897: 442; HAB 2: 21-22; Pokorný 1959: 303; Ravnæs 1991: 90; Mallory/Adams 1997: 154b; Olsen 1999: 142-143).

The Armenian expected form **elin-* < **h₁el-(h₁)en-* became *etin*, with a dark *-t-*, analogically after the nominative *etn* (see Meillet 1936: 47, 80), perhaps also a theoretical by-form **et-* from **h₁el-no-* (cf. Gr. *ἔλλός*) through the development **ln-* > Arm. *-t-*. Further see s.v. *analut* 'a kind of deer, hind'.

The PIE term probably referred to 'red deer, Rothirsch, Cervus elaphus' [Mallory 1982: 211-212, 216-217; Mallory/Adams 1997: 154-155].

ettiwr-k', **ettewr-k'** (mostly in pl., acc.-loc. (*y-*)*ettiwr-s*), *a*-stem: GDPl *ettiwr-a-c'* (John Chrysostom), AblPl *y-etter-a-c'* (Sargis Šnorhali, 12th cent.) 'marsh-meadow, swamp, moist or irrigated place', attested also in Isaiah 35.7 (with reading variants *attiwr*, *atter-*), Gregory of Nyssa, John Chrysostom [NHB 2: 657c; HAB 2: 24b].

Singular *etiwr* is glossed in the medieval dictionary *Baḡirk' hayoc'* as 'moist place, watered soil, small spring' [Amalyan 1975: 88^{Nr126}].

The oldest attestation is found in Isaiah 35.7: *Elic'i anjurn yettewrs* (vars. *yaltiwr*s, *yalters*): *καὶ ἡ ἄνυδρος ἔσται εἰς ἔλη*.

●ETYM Ačařyan (HAB 2: 24-25) rejects all the etymological suggestions and leaves the origin of the word open. For a discussion and references, see s.v. *at* 'dirt, filth'.

The ending *-ewr* probably points to an old neuter, cf. *alewr* 'flour' vs. Gr. *ἄλευρον* n., mostly in pl. *ἄλευρα* 'flour' (q.v.); *atbewr* 'fountain, spring' vs. Gr. *φρέαρ, -ατος* n. 'an artificial well; spring; tank, cistern' (q.v.). I tentatively assume an underlying **e/at-o-* derived from PIE neuter *s*-stem **sél-e/os-*: Gr. *ἔλος* n. 'marsh-meadow, swamp', Skt. *sáras-* n. 'lake, pool', cf. *sarasī-* f. 'Teich, Pfuhl, Sumpf', etc. (see Euler 1979: 213; Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 708; Beekes apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 370b). A theoretical **e/alewr* 'marsh-meadow' may have been replaced by *e/attewr* based on a form with a dental determinative, **at-t-* formed as (or etymologically identical with) *at* 'dirt, filth' (q.v.).

Ačařyan (HAB 2: 25a) claims that the doublets *e-* and *a-* point to a prothetic vowel. If the reading variant *attiwr* proves reliable, and if my interpretation above is accepted, one may explain the alternation *e* : *a* in PArm. **el-t* : **al-t-* through the underlying case forms of the PIE PD neuter paradigm: nom. **sél-os*, gen. **síl-és-(o)s* > **sel-* vs. **sl-* >> PArm. **el-t-*, **al-t-*.

The *a*-stem in plural of *e/attewr* 'marsh-meadow' and *atbewr* 'spring' (GDPI *-a-c'*) may go back to the neuter plural **-h₂*, cf. Gr. *ἄλευρα* 'flour', etc.

etungn, *an*-stem: ISg *etngam-b* (Paterica, spelled as *ətəngamb*), NPl *etngun-k'*, APl *etngun-s* (Bible), IPl *etngam-b-k'* in Movsēs Xorenac'i 2.8 (1913=1991: 115^{L5f}) 'nail' (Bible+).

●DIAL Ubiquitous in the dialects [HAB 2: 23b].

Some dialects display forms with vocalic aberration, which seems to be due to metathesis *e...u* > *u...e*, cf. Łarabał *téngnə, téynə* [Davt'yan 1966: 344], Goris *təngəl* (on which see s.v. *bankn* 'myth, fairy-tale'), Dersim *ətینگ* vs. *ətung, tung* [Bařramyan 1960: 78b], etc. This vocalism is attested already in Middle Armenian, cf. e.g. IPl reading variants *ətəngam-b-k'*, *təngambk'*, *təng/kamk'*, etc. in Nersēs Šnorhali, 12th cent., Cilicia (see K'yoškeryan 1987: 250^{L27}). For a further discussion, see s.v. *cung-k'* 'knee'.

The by-form **a-tung* (see AčařHLPatm 2, 1951: 415; Ałayan 1965: 8; Peters 1986: 378₅₃) is not supported by unambiguous evidence. Further, note Hačən *ətung*, Zeyt'un *ətung* [Ačařyan 2003: 39, 307], Malat'ia *utung* [Danielyan 1967: 190a], etc. [HAB 2: 23b].

●ETYM Derived from PIE **h₃nog^{wh}* - or **h₃nog^h-u-* 'nail': Gr. *ὄνυξ, -υχος* m. 'talon, claw (of the eagle, falcon, beasts of prey); nail; veined gem, onyx, dardonyx', Lat. *unguis* m. 'nail (of a human finger or toe); claw, talon, hoof', *ungula* f. 'hoof', OHG *nagal* 'nail', Toch. A *maku*, B. *mekwa* 'nails' < PToch. **mekwā* < **nekwā* through assimilation (see Krause/Thomas 1, 1960: 66; Szemerényi 1960: 46₁₁; Adams 2999: 467; cf. Blažek 2001a; compare Arm. *magil* 'claw', on which see below), etc.; see HAB 2: 23a with lit.; Pokorny 1959: 780; Ernout/Meillet 1959: 747; Lehmann 1986: 145-146.

The appurtenance of *etungn* to this PIE etymon is accepted practically by everyone, though details are unclear. One often assumes **nog^h-lo-* > **long^ho-* through metathesis > **e-lung-*, with prothetic *e-* automatically before the initial *l-* (HAB 2: 23a; Ałayan 1961: 79, 80; 2003: 96, 100; Jahukyan 1967: 236₄₈; 1982: 114-115). Bugge 1889: 34-35 assumes **ungl-* > **(e)lung*.

Szemerényi 1964: 240 offers the following scenario: **nog^h-* > **e-nog^h-* (with no explanation for the prothetic vowel **e-*) > **e-nog^hn* (with **-n* so frequent in names of parts of the body) > **enongn* (anticipation) > **enungn* > *etungn* (dissimilation). Beekes (1987b: 7) writes: "perhaps from **enong-* < **onong-*, which could be a contamination of **onog-* and **ong-* from **h₃nog^{wh}-*, **h₃ng^{wh}-*". For a further discussion on phonological problems concerning the Armenian and cognate forms, see Solta 1960: 147-148; Rix 1970: 96, 108₇₉; Beekes 1971 (on *μώνυχες ἴπποι*); 1972: 129 (against the dissimilation in **-nungn-* > **-lungn*, noting that there was no such dissimilation in *anun* 'name'); Schrijver 1991: 62-63; Blažek 2001a: 193.

The apparent disagreement between Arm. *e-* and Gr. *o-* puzzles scholars (see e.g. Hovdhaugen 1968: 121; Beekes 1969: 47; 1971: 141; Olsen 1984: 110; 1985: 13; 1999: 138; Ravnæs 1991: 18), and they often (e.g. Rix 1970: 108₇₉; Olsen *ibid.*; Clackson 1994: 34) return to the idea on **et-* < *etjewr* 'horn' first proposed by Osthoff. Greppin (1988-89: 478) points out that the etymology is obscure.

I find Osthoff's solution unattractive. The vocalic discrepancy may become irrelevant if we treat Arm. *e-* as a secondary prothesis before a PArm. initial **l-* (cf. above). We can start from PArm. **unug-n* with a final nasal frequent in body-part terms (probably from acc. **-ŋ*). This form developed into **unungn* through nasal anticipation (cf. e.g. *krunkn* vs. *krukn* 'heel') > **(u)núngn* (loss of pretonic **u-*) > **lungn* (dissimilation, see above) > *e-lungn*. Compare the scenario proposed by Meillet (1936: 47-54-55; cf. above on Szemerényi's view; also Frisk 2: 398-399).

Arm. *magil*, *a*-stem 'claw', too, has been derived from this etymon, see Hübschmann 1877: 35-36; Bugge 1889: 34-35; 1903 (cf. Bugge 1893: 85 and HAB 3: 219b on Caucasian origin of the Armenian word). For a discussion and more references, see Hübschmann 1883: 41; 1897: 471; HAB 3: 219-220. For *-il* and a general discussion, see Olsen 1999: 452-453. Olsen (1984: 110; 1985: 13) explains the initial *m-* (instead of *n-*) by strong influence of *matn* 'finger'. Alternatively, we can assume assimilation (see above on Tocharian). For a further discussion on this and the problem of the laryngeal, see 2.1.17.3.

em, pres. sg. *em es ē*, pl. *emk' ēk' en* 'to be' (Bible+).

●DIAL Ubiquitous in the dialects [HAB 2: 26a].

●ETYM From the PIE athematic present **h₁es-mi*, **h₁es-si*, **h₁es-ti*, 3pl. pres. **h₁s-énti*, etc., cf. Sg. *ásmi ási ásti*, 3pl. *sánti*, OAv. *ahmī, hən̄tī*, Gr. *εἶμί, εἶ* (Dor. *έσσί*), *έστί*, Hitt. *ešmi ešši ešzi*, Lat. *sum est sunt*, OCS *jesmь*, OLith. *esmi*, etc.; for the Armenian paradigm and an etymological discussion, see Hübschmann 1897: 442; HAB 2: 25-26; Meillet 1936: 163 (index); Godel 1965: 23; 1975: 40-41, 72, 112, 116-117, 124; Schmitt 1981: 65, 139; Olsen 1999: 10, 44.

erand, AblSg *y-erand-ē* (which precludes an *o*-stem), GLocSg (*y/z*)*erand-i*, etc. (Bible+) 'the day before yesterday'.

Astuacaturean 1895: 445b cites 20 attestations in the Bible, all of them but one reflecting *y-* or *z-*forms. This holds true also for the rest of the evidence, except for an attestation in John Chrysostom [NHB 1: 662ab]. Note also *y-erand* adv. ‘the day before yesterday’ in Paterica, and *y-erandean* adj. ‘of the day before yesterday’ in Paterica, Grigor Magistros and Čařəntir [NHB 1: 662b; 2: 355b], *y-erand-ust* ‘since the day before yesterday’ in Ephrem [HAB 2: 31b]. This may lead to two assumptions:

1) we cannot be sure whether the original anlaut of the word was **e-* or **he-* since the initial *h-* would drop in *y-* and *z-*forms: **y-he-* > *y-e-*, **z-he-* > *z-e-*;

2) the dialectal form *heřand* in Moks, with an initial voiced *h-* (note that ClArm. *h-* would normally yield Moks *x-*), may reflect an older **y-erand*, although this cannot be proven in view of the absence of evidence in other dialects such as those of the Muř group (see 2.3.1 on *y-*).

●DIAL Van *yeřand*, Moks *heřand* [Ačařyan 1952: 257], cf. also *herek č’ε heřand* ‘позавчера’ [Orbeli 2002: 277]; Marařa *yařand* (with a sound change *eř-* > *yař* seen also in *eřam* > Marařa *yařřal* ‘to boil’), gen. *yařatva* ‘the day before yesterday’ [Ačařean 1926: 39, 90-91, 392], Salmast *yeřand* [HAB 2: 32a].

●ETYM Since NHB 1: 662a, derived from *eř-* < *err-* (Movsēs Xorenac’i, Philo, etc., see s.v. *erek* ‘three’), cf. Gr. *τρίτη ἡμέρα*, Lat. *nudius tertius* ‘it is the third day since, three days ago, i.e. the day before yesterday’. Ačařyan (HAB 2: 32a) hesitates to accept this because the form *eř-* does not occur in the so-called Golden Age; he leaves the origin of the word open. Greppin (1975: 40) points out that, at the nominal level, the Armenian suffix *-and* can be related to MPers. *-and*. But this can hardly be the case, he proceeds, with the adverbial *-and* found in *eř-and* ‘two days ago’. Olsen (1999: 304) accepts the connection with the numeral ‘three’ but considers its construction problematic.

The connection with ‘three’ is possible but not entirely satisfactory. I therefore tentatively propose an alternative etymology. Arm. *erand* ‘the day before yesterday’ may be in a way related with PIE **per-* ‘through, forward’, which displays various derivatives, such as Gr. *πρό* ‘forth, forward, for, before’, *πέρσω*, Att. *πόρρω* ‘forward, beyond, away’, Lat. *porrō* ‘onward, further (off), besides’, Arm. *ař* ‘at, by, before’, *heř-i* adv. ‘far (of time and space)’, *heru* ‘last year’, *heruin-* ‘two years ago’ (see s.vv.). The trilled *-ř-* as in *ař* and *heř-* points to IE **-rs-*. For the suffix we can compare time-terms such as Gr. *χειμών* vs. Skt. *hēman-* and *hemantá-* ‘winter’, Hitt. *iřpant-* ‘night’, etc. See also s.vv. *ařun* ‘autumn’, *garun* ‘springtime’, *erek(o)y*, *erik-un* ‘evening’.

If we assume a QIE **pers-on(t)*, PArm. **heř-and-i* (cf. loc. *(y/z-)eř-and-i*) may reflect QIE **pers-ηt-i-*. On the initial **h-*, see above.

es, acc. *z-is*, gen. *im*, dat. *inj*, abl. *y-inēn*, instr. *inew* 1sg.pers.pron. ‘I’ (Bible+).

For references to the paradigm and a discussion, see 2.2.5.

●DIAL Ubiquitous in the dialects [HAB 2: 33a].

●ETYM Derived from PIE 1sg.pers.pron. **h₁eǵ^h-H-om* : **h₁eǵ-oH*, cf. Skt. *ahám*, OAv. *azām*, YAv. *azəm*, Gr. *ἐγώ*, Lat. *egō*, Goth. *ik*, OCS *azъ*, etc. (see Hübschmann 1877: 24; 1897: 442; HAB 2: 32b with references; Pokorny 1959: 291; Mallory/Adams 1997: 454; for the forms, see also Mayrhofer EWAia 1, 1992: 155).

Scholars usually assume that PArm. **ec* or **ez* has become *es* in the position before words with initial stops (Meillet 1892: 164; 1936: 57, 92; AčařLiak 2, 1954: 44; Ĵahukyan 1967: 184₆₉; Godel 1975: 110; Schmitt 1981: 75, 116). Others posit a by-form **ek-*, cf. OPr. *e/as*, Lith. *eš* (Ĵahukyan 1967: 184₆₉ with refer.; Toporov PrJaz [a-d] 1975: 113-116; Saradževa 1986: 286-287). Further, an influence of the 1sg. *s*-deixis has been assumed, cf. 2sg. *d*-deixis vs. *du* ‘you’ instead of **t*‘*u* (Godel 1975: 110; H. Petrosyan 1976: 57; 1987: 408). At last, Arm. *es* has been considered to be in a way related with Urart. *ieše* ‘I’ (see HAB 2: 32-33 for references; Ĵap‘anc‘yan 1961: 324; Ĵahukyan 1963: 8, 69; 1967: 184₆₉; cf. AčařHLPatm 1, 1940: 172; Ĵahukyan 1987: 429).

Gen. *im* and possessive *im*, -*oy* reflect **h₁me-* and **h₁mos*, respectively, cf. Gr. *ἐμέ*, gen. *ἐμέο*, poss. *ἐμός*, etc., with **h₁-* > **e-* in Armenian and Greek, note also Alb. *im* and Hitt. obl. *amm-*, see (Kortlandt 1986: 39, 45; 1987: 62; 2001: 12 = 2003: 69, 74, 76, 132; Beekes 1987b: 7-12; 1995: 207; 2003: 168; Schrijver 1991: 17; Kloekhorst 2006: 77-78; for a critical discussion, see Lindeman 1990: 28-30; 1997: 131; Clackson 1994: 34).

Dat. *inj* derives from **h₁m(e)-ĝ^(h)i*, cf. Hitt. *ammuk*, Venetic *meĝo*, Lat. *mihī*, Goth. *mi-k*, OHG *mi-h*, etc., further cf. Gr. *ἐμε-γέ*; the same particle is also found in **tue-ĝ^hi* > *k‘ez* ‘dir’, cf. Hitt. *tuk*, Goth. *puk*, OHG *dih* (see Pedersen 1905: 226 = 1982: 88; Meillet 1936: 28; AčařLiak 2, 1954: 45, 56; Pokorny 1959: 702; Ernout/Meillet 1959: 391b; Schindler 1966b: 73₂₂; Schmitt 1981: 115-117; Hamp 1981: 13-14; Ĵahukyan 1982: 141-142, 147; Viredaz 2005: 95; Kloekhorst 2008, chapter 2.1). It has been assumed that these forms are all modified on the analogy of nom. **eĝō* (Szemerényi 1996: 213-214).

Acc.-loc. *is* derives from **in-s* < **im-s*, in -*s* with nom. *es* due to influence of the deictic particle -*s* (Godel 1975: 110, see above) or through a development **ins* < **inc* < **h₁m(e)-ĝi*. The **in-* here was extended to abl. *y-in-ēn* and instr. *in-ew*. For a discussion of these issues, see Meillet 1936: 92; AčařLiak 2, 1954: 45, 56; Pokorny 1959: 418, 702; Ĵahukyan 1967: 184₇₀; 1982: 147; Godel 1975: 110; Schmitt 1981: 115-116; Klingenschmitt 1982: 212; Ravnæs 1991: 19; Beekes 2003: 168; Viredaz 2005: 95. On the other hand, abl. *y-inēn* is considered to represent earlier **imēn*, cf. Goth. gen. *meina* of *ik* ‘I’ (see Pedersen 1905: 226 = 1982: 88; AčařLiak 2, 1954: 56; Kortlandt 1984a: 104 = 2003: 50).

etġ, gen. *etel* ‘site, place’ (Bible+); **zetetem**, caus. *zetelec‘uc‘anem* ‘to put in a particular place, establish a dwelling for someone, collocate’ (Bible+), **z-etel-im** ‘to rest, repose, be established in a rest-place’ (Bible+), **zetet** ‘established, constant’ (John Chrysostom, Book of Chries); later with assimilation *zt-* > *st-*: **stetem** ‘to take a rest’ (Paterica), **stetanam** ‘id.’ (Gregory of Nyssa).

●ETYM See s.v. *tel(-i)* ‘site, place’.

era- ‘first, early, before’, in *era-xayri-k‘* (var. *ere-*) ‘first fruit or harvest, early ripened fruit’ (Bible+).

●ETYM Linked with *ař-* ‘at, by, to, nearby, before, etc.’ (q.v.) by Ačařyan (Adjarian 1918: 163; HAB 2: 35-36). Ĵahukyan (1987: 143, 186) departs from **prō-* ‘early’ (cf. Gr. *πρωτ*, Att. *πρώ*, compos. *πρωτ-* ‘early, in the morning’, Skt. *prātār* ‘early, in

the morning, the next day', etc.) and posits **prə-* (= **prH-*) for Armenian. Note also Lat. *prae* 'before, in front of', from the locative **preh₂-i* (see Beekes 1973b).

The second component of *era-xayri-k'*, viz. *xayri* 'fruit, harvest', is hardly of IE origin. An Arabic etymology has been proposed (N. Mkrtč'yan 1984: 74-75; Jahukyan 1987: 486 hesitantly).

erastan-k', *a*-stem: GDPl *erastan-a-c'* 'buttocks'. Several attestations in the Bible, rendering Gr. *ἔδρα* : *ἔδρα* 'seat; rump'. Singular usage: in Philo.

●ETYM Compared with Gr. *πρωκτός* m. 'anus', Skt. *pr̥ṣṭhā-* n. 'back, mountain-ridge, top' (RV+), *pr̥ṣṭi-* f. 'rib' (RV+), cf. YAv. *paršta-* m. 'back, spine, support in the back', *paršti* '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 vocalism of the Iir. forms is incompatible with that of Gr. *πρωκτός*. 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 contamination is possible.

Different proto-forms have been suggested: **prōkto-* : **prākto-* [Pokorny 1959: 846; Frisk 2: 608; Jahukyan 1987: 145]; nom. **proHkt-* vs. obl. **prākt-*, type **pōnt-eH-*; Arm. *-n* from acc. **-m* (see Hamp 1983b; 1991); **prōkt-s* : **pr̥kt-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 the 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 *sr̥b-an* 'anus'. The latter is attested in Zgōn (Afrahat) and is found in a number of dialects, as a frozen plural: **sr̥ban-k'* 'placenta; prenatal liquid of a cow' (see s.v. *sur̥b* '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, in my view, 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. *στηθύσιον* (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^hruǵo-* or **b^hrugo-* with Gr. *φάρυγξ*, gen. *-υγος*, *-υγγος* 'throat; dewlap of a bull', and Lat. *frūmen* 'throat' < **frūǵ-smen*. He is sceptical about Goth. *brusts* 'breast', Russ. *brjuxo* 'belly', etc. The etymology is

accepted in Ĵahukyan 1987: 116, 262; Olsen 1999: 49. The metathesis $*b^hr-$ > Arm. *erb-* is regular, see 2.1.26.1.

Olsen (ibid.) derives *erbuc* from nom. $*b^hrug/\acute{g}-s$ assuming that $*\acute{g}$ and $*\acute{g}s$ would merge in Arm. *c*. If the *-c* in *erēc* ‘elder’ (q.v.) reflects $*sg^w-$ (cf. Gr. *πρέσβυς*), the *-c* of *erbuc* must rather be explained from the non-nominative forms. In view of the absence of other examples, however, this is uncertain.

The Greek form is considered to be of non-IE origin (see Beekes 1969: 197, with ref.). We may be dealing with a Mediterranean (or, if the Germanic and Slavic words are related, European, see 3.11) substratum word.

Hardly any relation with *eri* ‘shoulder of animals’ (q.v.).

erg, *o*-stem: GDSg *erg-o-y*, GDPl *erg-o-c*, IPl *erg-o-v-k* ‘song; poem’ (Bible+), ‘playing (music)’ (Bible), ‘scoff, derision, scoffing song’ (Habakkuk 2.6, John Chrysostom, etc.); **ergem** ‘to sing; to play a musical instrument’ (Bible+), ‘to praise’ (Philo).

The late medieval dictionary *Bargirk* ‘*hayoc*’ glosses *erg* and *ergem* as *par* ‘dance’ and *parel* ‘to dance’, respectively (Amalyan 1975: 92^{Ni233f}). For the semantic syncretism, cf. *xat* ‘mockery, scoff, play’, ‘song’, ‘dance’.

●DIAL Ačařyan HAB 2: 43a considers the dialectal forms as literary loans.

●ETYM Since long (de Lagarde 1854: 15^{L332}, see further HAB 2: 42-43; Hübschmann 1897: 443), connected with Skt. *arká-* m. ‘ray, light, shine; song, magic song’, cf. also *řc-* f. ‘song of praise, poem, stanza, verse’, *řcati* ‘to shine; to sing, to praise’. To this PIE etymon belong also OIr. *erc* ‘sky’⁵⁵, Toch. A *yärk*, B *yarke* ‘worship, reverence’, Hitt. *ārku-zi*, *arku-* ‘to chant, intone’ (see Duchesne-Guillemain 1940: 172; Mayrhofer EWAia 1, 1992: 114-115, 249-250; Adams 1999: 484; Kloekhorst 2008: 205).

Arm. *erg*, *o*-stem and Skt. *arká-* derive from thematic $*h_1erk^w-o-$. The Armenian word is regarded as an inheritance from the IE poetic language (see Schmitt 1967: 259-260; Saradževa 1986: 195-196; Ĵahukyan 1987: 108). The assumption that Arm. *erg* is a loan (see Xaçaturova 1973: 194-195; 1979: 359; Bailey 1979: 25a) is improbable and unnecessary (see also L. Hovhannisyan 1990: 214, 215).

erek ‘evening’ (Job 7.4, rendering Gr. *ἑσπέρα* in contrast with *tiw* vs. *ἡμέρα*, see Cox 2006: 83), ‘west’ (Philo), ‘Evening Star’ (George of Pisidia); **ereak** ‘evening’ (Paterica+); prepositional constructions such as **ar** **ereks** ‘at/towards evening’ in Genesis 49.27 (Zeyt’unyan 1985: 388) rendering Gr. *εἰς τὸ ἑσπέρας* in contrast with *z-ayg-un* vs. *τὸ πρωινὸν*, and in Deuteronomy 16.6 (Cox 1981: 143) rendering *ἑσπέρας*, and **and** **erek-s** ‘at/towards evening’ rendering *πρὸς ἑσπέραν* in Exodus 12.6 (further see de Lamberterie 1990, 2: 162); **c**-**erek** ‘day’ < ‘until evening’ (Bible+); **erek-awt**, *i*-stem: IPl *erekawt-i-w-k* ‘passing the night’ (Agat’angelos, Movsēs Xorenac’i, etc.); **ere/ikanam** ‘to spend the night; to stay by the evening’ (Bible+); **erek-oy**, GDSg *erekoy-i*, LocSg *y-erekoy-i* ‘evening’ (Bible+), **ere/ik-un** ‘evening; in the evening; of the evening’ (Leviticus, Elišē, John Chrysostom, Philo, etc.); **ereko-**

⁵⁵ According to Makaev (1974: 56-57), OIr. *erc* ‘sky’ may belong to the PIE name of the Thunder God ($*perk^w-$) and be interpreted as an elliptic phrase ‘abode of the Thunder God’.

r-i, GDSg *erekorw-o-y*, GDPI *erekore-a-c* ‘evening’ and a few derivatives based on **ereko-r-* (Bible+); see also s.v. *erēk* ‘yesterday’.

For some Biblical attestations and derivatives of *ereko(oy)*, see Olsen 203, 436, 469, 511-512, 532.

●DIAL The form *erikun* > **irikun* is ubiquitous in the dialects. A few of them display nasalless forms: Akn and Rodost’i *irigu* beside *irigun*, Nor Juła *y’araku*, Łaradał *araku*, etc. [HAB 2: 46a]. Interesting is especially Nor Juła *y’araku* (Ačarean 1940: 56-57, 137-138, 360b; for a textual illustration from a folk-song, see Eremean 1930: 56^{L6}) with prothetic *y’-* and *a-vocalism*. This *y’*, together with Muš, Alaškert and Moks *h’-* and Havarik’, Ozim *h-* probably points to a prefixed by-form, frozen locative **y-ereku(n)*.

●ETYM Since long (de Lagarde 1854: 16^{L370f}, Dervischjan 1877: 68; Hübschmann 1883: 30; 1897: 443; Pedersen 1924: 222a, 223b = 1982: 305a, 306b), connected with Skt. *rájas-* n. ‘dust, mist, vapour, gloom, dirt’, *rajasá-* ‘unclean, dark’ (AV), OAv. *rajiš-* n. ‘darkness’, Gr. *ἔρεβος* n. ‘the dark of the underworld’, Goth. *riqis* n. ‘darkness, twilight’; here belongs also Arm. *erēk* ‘yesterday’, q.v. (first suggested in NHB 1: 682c). See HAB 2: 45-46, 52a; Mladenov 1937: 99-100; Pokorny 1959: 857; Frisk 1: 550; Schmitt 1981: 64, 68; Lehmann 1986: 286; de Lamberterie 1990, 2: 162; Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 426; Huld apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 147a; Olsen 1999: 203; Matzinger 2005: 42. On Goth. *riqis/z* n. and OIc. *røkkr* n. ‘darkness’ < PGerm. **rek^wiz-*, see Lehmann 1986: 286; Casaretto 2000: 230-231.

Meillet (1927: 129, 131) states that, in view of the Sanskrit and Gothic cognates, the initial **e-* of the Armenian and Greek forms must be regarded as prothetic; see also Bonfante 1937: 19. More probably, however, Gr. *ε-* and Arm. *e-* point to PIE initial **h₁-*, although the evidence for this development is meagre (see Beekes 1969: 36, 87-88; 1987b: 6-7; 2003: 177, 185; Hovdhaugen 1968: 122; Kortlandt 1980: 103; 1987: 62-63; 2001: 12 = 2003: 30, 76-77, 132; Mayrhofer 1986: 126₁₁₅; cf. also Winter 1965: 101; Polomé 1980: 18). Note especially the contrast **h₁re-* : **h₂re-* > Arm. *ere-* : *are-* in *erek* ‘evening’ vs. *arew* ‘sun’ (q.v.). Sceptical: Schmitt 1981: 68, 77_{AE}; Klingenschmitt 1982: 105₂₇; Olsen 1984: 112; 1985: 12; Lindeman 1990: 28-30; 1997: 131; Clackson 1994: 33, 183. For a further discussion and references, see s.vv. *areg-* ‘sun’, *elanem* ‘to come/go out, rise, ascend’, *es* ‘I’, *inn* ‘nine’, and 2.1.17.

The PIE reconstruction would then be **h₁reg^w-e/os-*, *s*-stem neuter. Toch. A *orkām* ‘darkness; dark’ and B *ork(a)mo* ‘id.’ reflecting a PToch. **orkmo* from QIE **h₁(o)rg^w-mon-* may belong to this etymon, too [Adams 1999: 123]. For a discussion of the Iranian facts, see Bailey 1961: 77-78 (on this, see s.v. *arjñ* ‘black’).

Arm. *erekoy*, *i*-stem ‘evening’ is interpreted as an original genitive of time (de Lamberterie 1990, 1: 162, 162₂₁; Clackson 1994: 223-224₉₈; Olsen 1999: 511-512; Matzinger 2005: 23₁₁₁, 42)⁵⁶. The form *ere/ikun* may have been composed as (or influenced by) *ayg-u-n* from *ayg*, *u*-stem ‘dawn’ (q.v.). We also may think of PArm. **erekoh* + **-n-*, cf. Gr. Aeol. *ἔρεβενός* ‘dark’ < **h₁reg^wes-no-*, *ἔρεμνός* ‘id.’ < **h₁reg^w-no-* (for these forms, see Frisk 1: 550). For further Armenian and Greek parallels for time-derivatives with the nasal element, see s.v. *heru* ‘last year’. On the

⁵⁶ Olsen *ibid.* alternatively considers the possibility of a substantivization of a secondary **-jo-* derivative: **-os-jo/eh₂*.

other hand, one might think of *-e/ont- seen in time-terms such as Hitt. *ispant-* ‘night’. It is tempting to interpret PArm. **ereko-r-ia-* (cf. *erekor-i-*, *-ea-c-* ‘evening’) as composed of PArm. neuter **ereko(h)* and QIE fem. *-*r-ieh*₂-; structurally compare another time-word, Gr. *ὀπώρα* f., Lac. *ὀπάρα* ‘end of the summer, beginning of autumn; harvest, fruit’ < **op-osar-eh*₂-, a fem. to **h₁os-*r** ‘after the summer’. Further note Gr. *χειμῶν* ‘winter’ vs. Arm. *jm-er-n* ‘winter’; Gr. *ἔαρ* n., OCS *vesna* ‘spring’, Skt. *vasantá-* m., etc. vs. Arm. *gar-un* ‘spring’ (q.v.). Note also Arm. coll. *-or-ay-k-*. If all these tentative suggestions are accepted, one might posit PArm. **ə₁reko-r-ia-* vs. **ə₁rekōn* reflecting *-*r-ieh*₂- vs. *-*e/on(t)* more or less like Gr. *ἑσπέ-ρ-α* f. ‘evening’ vs. YAv. **xšap-ar-*, **xšaf-n-*, Skt. *kṣáp-* f. and Hitt. *isp-ant-* ‘night’ (on this etymon, see s.v. *gišer* ‘night’).

The vocalism of *erik-un* ‘evening, in the evening’ and *erēk* ‘yesterday’ < ‘at evening’ vs. regular *erek(o-* < **h₁reg^wos* is synchronically inexplicable. I assume an anticipation of the locative marker *-i*, or simply a frozen locative **erek-i* > **ereik* : **erik-* (gen. *ere/ik-i* and Łarabał, etc. loc. **er(e)k-i*, see s.v. *erēk* ‘yesterday’) just like in Arm. *ayg*, *u*-stem ‘morning’ (q.v.): LocSg **h₂us-s-i* > PArm. **aw(h)i* > (thematization) **awj-o-* > **aygo-* > *ayg*, *o*-stem >> *u*-stem, generalized from old nom. **aw-u*. For other time-words reflecting frozen *i*-locatives, see s.vv. **atj-* ‘twilight, darkness’ and *anurj* ‘dream’. On the *i*-locative reflected also in the dialect of Łarabał, see 2.2.1.5.

erekʻ, 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*) ‘three times’ (Bible+). In Movsēs Xorenac’i 2.61 (1913=1991: 192^{L10}; transl. Thomson 1978: 204): *eric’s kam č’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, three times’ (Bible+), see below, also s.v. *krkin*.

In later compounds: *er-* < *err-* (Movsēs Xorenac’i, Philo, etc.), e.g. *er-a-yark* in Movsēs Xorenac’i 1.16 (1913=1991: 53^{L5f}; transl. Thomson 1978: 100): *aparans* <...> *krknayarks ew erayarks* “palaces <...> of two and three stories”. The form *er-* is derived from *err-*, as in *tarr* ‘element’ > *tar* [HAB 2: 50b]. I wonder whether it can be analogical after *k’ar-* (q.v.).

●DIAL Ubiquitous in the dialects. Note Antiokʻ *ərkʻ* and Hačən *žekʻ* (cf. Nor Naxijewan *žekʻ*) vs. Zeyt’un *iyikʻ* [Ačařyan 2003: 307]. The Hačən form is exceptional since there are no other examples of the development *VrV* > *žV* (cf. *erēk* ‘yesterday’ > Hačən *iyeg*, etc.) [Ačařyan 2003: 130], whereas it is regular in Nor Naxijewan (see Ačařyan 1925: 53, 154-155).

Sivri-Hisar *šek/šekʻ* ‘three’ (see PtmSivHisHay 1965: 469a; N. Mkrtč’yan 1995: 207, 210). N. Mkrtč’yan (1995: 210) takes this word as one of the isoglosses shared by the dialects of Nor Naxijewan and Sivri-Hisar.

On Moks *irik^oin* ‘for the third time’ (apparently a relic from ClArm. *erek-kin* ‘three times’) and *irik^oir* ‘id.’, see s.v. *krkin*.

ClArm. *erek’in*, *erek’ean* ‘all the three’ (Bible+) has been preserved in Łarabał *ərék’an*, *irék’an* [Davt’yan 1966: 347], Metri *irik’k’én* [Ałayan 1954: 179-180, 268a], Karčewan *irik’én* [H. Muradyan 1960: 110, 192b], Kak’avaberd *irék’kan* [H.

Muradyan 1967: 127-128, 170a]. See also AčařLiak 1, 1952: 325-326]. On these forms, see 2.2.4.2.

●ETYM From PIE **treies* m. ‘three’: Skt. *tráyas*, Gr. *τρεις*, Lat. *trēs*, Lith. *trỹs* ‘three’, etc.; cf. also Arm. Abl *eris* < **trins* : Goth. *þrins*, instr. **eri-w-* < **tri-b^hi-* : Skt. DAbIPI *tribhyás* [HAB 2: 50-51]. PIE **trins* > Arm. *e-ris* shows that the rise 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 **(k^w)turo-* ‘fourth’, i.e. a contaminated **triro-* [Szemerényi 1960: 95; Kortlandt 2003: 101]. On *erkir* ‘second’, *erir* ‘third’, etc., see also Meillet 1911-12c: 294 (comparing Tocharian *r*); Jahukyan 1982: 223₆₆, and s.v. *krkin*.

erēk, *i*-stem: GSg *erek-i* in Joshua 3.4 (rendering Gr. *ἀπ' ἐχθέρς*), Psalms 89.4 (*awr ereki* : *ἡ ἡμέρα ἡ ἐχθέρς*), in homilies by Eusebius of Nemesa (found by L. Hovhannisyán 1987: 132), *erik-i* (Cyril of Alexandria), cf. also *zy-erek-i* (Cyril of Jerusalem, Zgōn-Afrahāt, Severian of Gabala), AblSg *y-erek-ē*, *y-erik-ē* (a few times in the Bible, e.g. Exodus 4.10, *y-ere/ik-ē* : *πρὸ τῆς ἐχθέρς*) ‘yesterday’ (Bible+).

●DIAL Ubiquitous in the dialects [HAB 2: 52]. Some E and SE peripheral dialects have forms reflecting *er(e)k-i*, Havarik ‘*hereki*, Ĵuła *arké* [HAB 2: 52b], Agulis *yarké*, C‘hna *arké* [Ačařean 1935: 45, 349], Łarabał *arék/g-i* and *yark/g^v-é* [Davt‘yan 1966: 200, 347].

●ETYM Derived from *erek(oy)* ‘evening’ (q.v.). Ačařyan (HAB 2: 52a) adduces a number of semantic parallels for the development ‘evening’ > ‘yesterday’ from IE and non-IE languages and mentions also Arm. dial. T‘iflis *irigun* ‘yesterday evening’. Compare also *ayg* ‘morning’ > **ayg-un/c* ‘tomorrow’ (q.v.).

L. Hovhannisyán 1987: 132 treats *eriki* as an old dialectal form and compares it with Łarabał *yarke*, etc. In my opinion Łarabał *arék/g-i* and *yark/g^v-é* (Davt‘yan 1966: 200, 347) point to **erék-i* and **er(e/i)ki*, respectively, and the form *erek-i* (beside *o*-stem *erēk*) should be regarded as a frozen locative (see s.v. *erek* ‘evening’ and 2.2.1.5; cf. also the cases of **atj-* ‘twilight, darkness’, *ayg* ‘morning’, *anurj* ‘dream’).

erēc, GDSg *eric-u*, AblSg *eric-u-ē*, NPI *eric-un-k*, GDPI *eric-an-c* [Astuacatu-rean 1895: 460ab]; *a*-stem: ISg *eric-a-w* as a variant reading in Movsēs Xorenac‘i 3.63 (1913=1991: 347^{L22}); *o*-stem: GDPI *eric-o-y* in Ełiřē 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; Jahukyan 1982: 95, 122; Olsen 1999: 105, 124, 163, 166, 170, 186. ‘(adj.) elder; presbyter’ (Bible+).

●DIAL Preserved in several *kə*-dialects [HAB 2: 53a]. Note Moks *erēc*, gen. *iric-u* ‘священник, поп’ [Orbeli 2002: 224]; Hamřen *erēc*, *eric*, gen. *iric-u* [Ačařyan 1947: 91, 227].

In the Eastern areas, the word is only found in the compound **eric-a-kin* ‘wife of the priest’: Agulis *arc‘ákin* [HAB 2: 53a; Ačařean 1935: 349]. A possible trace of the unstressed **arc-* is also found in the toponym *Arcvanik* < *Eric-van-ik* (Kapan region), see s.v. the place-name *Arciw*.

●ETYM Connected with Gr. *πρέσβυς* m. ‘old man; the elder; ambassador; president’, perhaps also Lat. *prīscus* ‘ancient’, see Bugge 1889: 12; Meillet 1894b: 296; Hübschmann 1897: 444; HAB 2: 52-53; Ĵahukyan 1982: 72, 122; 1987: 143, 186 (the Greek cognate is considered doubtful); Olsen 1999: 166, 170. (On Greek, see also Bloomfield 1908). For a philological and etymological discussion, I especially refer 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 (GDPI *ert’ic’*), Movsēs Xorenac’i, and Grigoris Aršaruni [NHB 1: 683a].

●DIAL Widespread in the dialects [HAB 2: 54a]. 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-t^h-sk-* or **ser-* + **-t^h-*, **-d^h-*, **-g^h-*, or **-k^h-* (see Meillet 1898: 276-277, 278; 1936: 135; Hübschmann 1899: 47; HAB 2: 53-54). For **h₁r-sk-* cf. Skt. *ŗcchāti* ‘to reach, come towards, meet with’, Hitt. *ar-ŗk-* iter. ‘wiederholt gelangen, Einfälle machen’, etc. Since the sequence **-rt-* yields Arm. *-rd-*, a **-t^h-* suffix is usually reconstructed for Arm. *ert’am*. 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 **-t^h-*. 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* three times 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); *ar’ eri* (also *y-eri*) ‘near, at the side’ (Ařxarhac’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. *βραχίον* ‘(upper) arm; shoulder of beasts’, *σπαγόνια* ‘the parts under or near the jaw’, *ἔνστρον* ‘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* = *σηθόνιον* (dimin.) ‘breast’.

●DIAL Ararat *eri*, Łarabał, Marała *héri*, Salmast *neri* (sic! *n-* is reliable? – HM); Łarabał *hərat‘at‘* < **er-a-t‘at‘*, with *t‘at‘* ‘arm, paw’ as the second member [HAB 2: 55a]. For Łarabał *hrət‘at‘umə* ‘in/on the back, shoulder-blade’, see Łaziyan 1983: 146b^{L-18}, glossed as *hərat‘at‘* ‘shoulder-blade, back’, *hərt‘at‘-en* (186b). In another illustration from this book (85a^{L17}), 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^{L8}, where the hero is seated on the *hrət‘at‘en* of a dragon.

In a story written in 1884, Ł. Ałayan (1979: 623^{L-6f}) describes a buffalo named Dursun as having horns stretching along the neck and reaching the *ərat‘at‘-s*.

Probably, Xotorĵur **erelt‘at‘* ‘shoulder-blade’ [YušamXotorĵ 1964: 447b] belongs here too, although the nature of the internal *-l-* is obscure.

●ETYM Ačāryan (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 *řit* ‘id.’, ORuss. *ritb* ‘hoof’, etc., reconstructing **rēito-*, **rēitā-*. This etymology is largely accepted: Pokorny 1959: 863; Solta 1960: 418; Ĵahukyan 1987: 145, 189; Olsen 1999: 444.

If the initial *h-* in Łarabał, etc. indeed has an etymological value, one should give preference to Ačāryan’s etymology.

erinĵ, *o*-stem: GDPI *ernĵ-o-c‘* (5x in the Bible), IPI *ernĵ-o-v-k‘* (in Genesis 41.3, see Zeyt‘unyan 1985: 339); *u*-stem: GDSg *ernĵ-u* (4x in the Bible), GDPI *ernĵ-u-c‘* (once in the Bible, also in the Commentary upon Judges ascribed to Ehišē); *a*-stem: ISg *ernĵ-a-w* (Philo) ‘heifer, young cow; cow; bride’ (see also s.v. *ernĵnak*) (Bible+). In Isaiah 7.21: *erinĵ mi yarĵaroc‘* ‘‘one young cow from/of bovids’’ : *δάμαλιν βοῶν*. See also s.v. *arĵar*.

●DIAL Widespread in the 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; diphthongized *ye-*: Ozim, Šamaxi, Ĵula; *he-*: Łarabał, Goris, Mužambar (a village of T‘avriz/Tebriz) [HAB 2: 56b]; *he-* is also found in Kĵizen [Bałramyan 1961: 180b], Mełri [Ałayan 1954: 268a], Karčewan [H. Muradyan 1960: 192b], Kak‘avaberd [H. Muradyan 1967: 170a], although Agulis, closely associated with the Mełri group, has *árinĵ* [HAB 2: 56b; Ačārean 1935: 44, 349].

In all the dialects, *erinĵ* refers to ‘a two-year old female calf’ [HAB 2: 56b], Ararat *erinĵ* 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 **qrend^hio-*, connecting OHG *hrind* ‘bovine animal’, Germ. *Rind* ‘id.’, etc. See also Adontz 1937: 7-8. Ačāryan (HAB 2: 56b) rejects this etymology (as well as all the others), because the Germanic form derives from the PIE word for ‘horn’, with initial **k-*. This is not a decisive argument since the initial palatovelar in **krV-* 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 **krV-* are merely simplified to **rV-*. Jähukyan (1987: 132) posits **krentjo-*.

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', OPr. *eristian* (see Euler 1985: 87), OIr. *heirp* f. 'deer', *erb* 'cow' < **er-b^h-*, 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; Euler 1985: 87; Schrijver 1991: 65; Mallory/Adams 1997: 511a; Olsen 1999: 185. Lat. *ariēs*, *-etis* m. 'ram', with unexplained *a-*, and Umbr. AccSg *ERIETU* 'arietem' may reflect **h₁riet-* [Schrijver 1991: 65-66].

In view of the acute intonation, the Baltic forms may be separated from these words and go back to **ieh₁-ro-*, cf. ORuss. *jara* 'spring', OHG *jār* 'year', Av. *yār-* n. 'year', Gr. *ὥρᾱ* 'time, season', etc. (Derksen, p.c.; 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. *lāne* '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.vv. *morm* 'tarantula', *mrjīwn* 'ant', and 3.5.2.1; on *xtunj-n* 'snail', see also 2.3.1, under the suffix *-j/z*).

Megrelian *orijī*, *orinjī* 'neat', *orjī* 'cow' are considered Armenian loans (see HAB 2: 56b with ref.). If this is correct, and if the labial initial does not have an inner-Megrelian explanation, one is tempted to compare it with the OArm. hypothetical **u/wrinj-* (see above).

The initial *h-* in the 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 old' mostly in Van and the adjacent dialects (see Ačārean 1913: 657b).

Alternative 1): Ararat *erinj* 'a three-year-old sprout of grapes which is replanted separately' is reminiscent of Gr. *θρινία· ἄμπελος ἐν Κρήτη* 'vineyard' (Hesychius), perhaps from **trisinijeh₂-*, cf. Alb. *trishe* < **trisjeh₂-* 'offshoot, seedling, sapling' and SCr. *trs* < **triso-* 'grapevine, reed' (see Mallory/Adams 1997: 644b). This may be a word of substratum (Mediterranean/Pontic) origin. The Armenian word may be identical with the protoform of the Greek: **trisinijeh₂-* > 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-injeh₂-*, cf. Skt. *paryāriṇī-* f. 'cow which has its first calf after a year'.

erkan, *i-stem*, *a-stem* : GDSg *erkan-i* (Bible), GDPl *erkan-i-c* ' (Yovhannēs Erzncac' i, 13-14th cent.), ISg *erkan-a-w* (Vardan Arewēlc' 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 *árkan* [HAB 2: 61b; Ačařean 1935: 349]. The *a-* is only found in E and SE margins, Agulis, Łarabał, Ĵuła, etc.

●ETYM Since Bugge (1889: 15), connected with Skt. *grávan-* m. 'pressing-stone, stone used to press Soma' (RV+), Toch. B *kärweñe* 'stone', Oic. *kvern* 'hand-mill', Lith. *gìrna*, *gìrnos* 'millstone', OCS *žrěny*, Russ. *žěrnov* m., *žěrna* 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 rejected this view (apud HAB 2: 61a) and derived *erkan* from **g^wrāwanā* with the development **-awa-* > *-a-* [Meillet 1908-09: 354-355]. The protoform **erkawan* is unnecessary, since, in view of Lith. *gìrna*, etc., Arm. *erkan* can go back to PIE **g^wr(e)h₂-n-*. On the prothetic vowel, see 2.1.17.4.

Arm. *erkan* is an *i*-stem and/or an *a*-stem. I wonder if it can be derived from PIE dual **-ih₁-*. See also s.v. *atawr(i)*.

erkayn, *i*-stem (GDPI *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* : *σχοινίω μακρῶ* (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 imn daštajew ew erkaynajig* "a wide meadow like a plain".

●DIAL Ubiquitous in the dialects. Šatax *herken* [M. Muradyan 1962: 195b], Moks, Ozim *herken*, and Muš, Alaškert *h'ergen* (HAB 2: 61a; Ačařyan 1952: 258; Orbeli 2002: 277, textual illustrations from the 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 references; Ačařyan (HAB 2: 61b) cites two late attestations (both in Elias, comm. 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 leařn 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, Rōdost'o *ergar* 'long', Haštarxan *erkar* 'far away', Ĵuła *y'etkar* or *yetkar* 'far away' [HAB 2: 61b; Ačařean 1940: 361a]. Ačařyan does not account for the abnormal *-t-* in the Ĵuła 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. *δηρός*, Dor. *δᾶρός* 'lasting long', Lat. *dūrō* 'to make/become hard; to endure, last out, survive', Skt. *dūrā-* 'far' (RV+), etc., through the sound change **dw-* > Arm. *-rk-* (< **dueh₂-ro-*); also related with *erkayn* 'long' (see HAB 2: 60-61; Jahukyan 1982: 75), cf. Gr. *δῆν* 'long, far' < **δḡān-* [de 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 a 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 HAB s.v. *tew* 'duration').

Szemerényi (1985: 794-795) derives Arm. *erkar* from **eri-dwāros* (cf. Gr. *ἐπι-* 'very', etc.). The other etymology which connects *erkar* with Lith. *eŗdvas* 'wide, spacious' (Meillet 1896: 150) is favoured by Kortlandt 2003: 95 (an addendum to his 1989 paper). 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'. Sceptical: Clackson 1994: 113. Cf. also Kortlandt 2003: 93, 95. The irregular *-t* in *Julā 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* must rather be 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 variant spellings with *-iw/ew* alternation, or without *-w-*. For instance: ISg *erkitiw* (vars. *erkiwtiw*, *erkewtiw*) in Deuteronomy 28.22 (Cox 1981: 184): *harc 'ē zk'ez t[ē]r <...> ew xt'iwk' ew erkitiw* (vars. *erkiwtiw*, *erkewtiw*) *ew xoršakaw : patáçai se kýrios <...> kai ēpēthimō kai φόνω kai άνεμοφθορία*. 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*, *Julā yergut*, Ararat *yergut*, T'iflis *yirgut*, Muš *y'ergut*, Ozim *yerkot* [HAB 2: 65b; Ačařyan 1940: 361a; 1952: 258]. (Some of) the dialect forms may be literary loans, as is suggested for e.g. *Julā yergut* (see Ačařean 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 de 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* 'ὀδίνω'; *erknč'im* 'to fear' (aor. *erkeay*, imper. *erkir*); *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 ytwoy* : ὡςπερ ἡ ὠδὴν τῆ ἐν γαστρὶ ἐχούσῃ (1Thessalonians 5.3); *šurj eten zinew erkunk' mahu* : περιέσχον με ὠδῖνες 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 etegnik* : "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', *δείδω* 'to fear', Lat. *dīrus* 'fearful', Skt. *dvēṣti* 'to hate', Av. *duuaēθā* '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 **perg^h-*, cf. OHG *furhten* 'to fear, be frightened'. This etymology 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 Schindler (1975; see also Arbeitman / Ayala 1981: 25; Klingenschmitt 1982: 238-239; de 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 the 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. For a semantic analysis, see Benveniste 1954: 254-255. 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' (Ezriq Kołbac'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. *διστάζω* '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 Kołbac‘i, Movsēs Xorenac‘i, etc.), so that 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.vv.). The meaning ‘fearful doubt’ unifies the meanings of the two sets of words, namely ‘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 the 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 (*aławatumn*) of the numeral *erku*”.

In definite usage: Łarabał **erku-n-*; e.g. in HŽHek‘ 5, 1966: 425^{11f}: *ink‘ ar 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 *arkók‘an*, *erurkók‘an*, Mełri *arkók‘en* [AčařLiak 1, 1952: 325-326; Davt‘yan 1966: 348; Ałayan 1954: 179-180, 268a]. Karčewan has *yərken* [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 been extensively discussed; 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 *kut‘* ‘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. For a discussion, see 2.1.22.6; see also s.vv. *erkar*, *erkn*, *kēs*, *koys₂*, *krkin*, *krtser*, *kut‘*, *kic‘*.

On *erkic‘*s ‘twice, again’ and *erkir* ‘second’, see s.vv. *kic‘* and *krkin* respectively.

***ernĵak** ‘spider’.

●DIAL Axalc‘xa **ernĵak* ‘spider’ [Amatuni 1912: 149b], Karin *ernĵak* ‘id.’ [HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 392a]; cf. also Erzinka *erunĵek* ‘spider-web’ [Kostandyan 1979: 152b].

●ETYM Ačařyan (HAB 2: 68b) cites s.v. *erinĵ* ‘heifer, young cow’ (q.v.), not specifying the semantic motivation.

If indeed from *erinĵ*, **ernĵ-ak* ‘spider’ may refer to the Mother Goddess *Anahit-Astĵik*, 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. **erVnĵ-* ‘spider’ from a Mediterranean substratum, cf. Gr. *ἀράχνη* f. ‘spider; spider’s web’, Lat. *arāneus* m. ‘spider’, *arānea* f. ‘spider; cobweb, spider’s web’, perhaps also OEngl. *rengē*, *rynge* ‘spider; spider’s web’ < **rāknia* (on these forms, see Beekes 1969: 34). One reconstructs substr. **(a)rVkh^hn-(i)eh₂-* or **(a)rVk(s)n-(i)eh₂-*. Arm. **e-rVnĵ* may reflect **raKn-ĵeh₂-* > **ra(K)nĵ-* > **e-ranĵ*, with regular prothetic *e-* before initial *r-*. Attractive, but risky.

Other alternatives: Compare Pahl. *ēraxtan*, *ēranĵ-* ‘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. Further, compare Xotorĵur **xranĵ* ‘spider, etc.’, see 3.5.2.5.

ernĵ(n)ak (spelled also as *ernĵay*, *ernĵan*, *ernĵnak*, *erinĵan*, *erinĵak*, *eriĵnak*) ‘a thorny edible plant’. MidArm. medical literature (see HAB 2: 68; MiĵHayBař 1, 1987: 203-204).

●DIAL Relatively widespread in the dialects, mostly reflecting the forms **ernĵn-ak* and **ernĵn-uk* (Ararat also *erənĵanuk*), see HAB 2: 68b; also Moks *erənĵinak* ‘съедобное колючее растение’ [Orbeli 2002: 225]. For the semantic description, see Amatuni 1912: 184 (also 177a, s.v. *eřšnak?*); HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 392a. On Axalc‘xa *ernĵak* ‘spider’, see s.v. **ernĵak*.

●ETYM Ačařyan (HAB 2: 68b) derives from *erinĵ* ‘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 to Arm. *erinĵ* (q.v.).

ewt‘n (secondary *eawt‘n*), *an*-stem: GDPl *e(a)wt‘an-c-* ‘seven’ (Bible+); *e(a)wt‘an-asun*, *i*-stem: GDPl *-asn-i-c-* ‘seventy’ (Bible+); *e(a)wt‘n-erord*, *a*-stem: GDSg *-i*, GDPl *-a-c-* ‘seventh’ (Bible+).

●DIAL The form *eawt‘n* = *eōt‘n* is ubiquitous in the dialects, and *eōt‘anasun* is widespread [HAB 2: 74]. A considerable number of dialects have a final *-xt*, on which see AčařHLPatm 2, 1951: 403; Weitenberg 1996: 96-99; Ervandyan 2007: 33.

●ETYM Derived from PIE **septm̥* ‘seven’: Skt. *saptá*, YAv. *hapta-*, MPers. *haft*, Gr. *ἑπτά*, Lat. *septem*, Goth. *sibun*, etc., Klaproth 1831: 107b; NHB 1: 706b; Hübschmann 1897: 445; HAB 2: 74; Pokorny 1959: 909; Ravnæs 1991: 100; Mallory/Adams 1997: 402.

The origin of Arm. *-a-* is not entirely clear. For phonological problems, in particular for a discussion of *ew* : *eaw*, see HAB *ibid.*; Meillet 1936: 32, 45-46; Greppin 1975a: 50-51; Ałayan 2003: 101, 259-262. Winter 1966: 202 assumes a blend of *ewt'n* and **awt'n*, not specifying **awt'n* (sceptical Greppin 1975a: 51). The latter is now interpreted as PArm. ordinal **(s)awt'n-* from **sptmó-* ‘7th’ (Kortlandt 1994a: 254 = 2003: 99; Beekes 1995: 214, 216).

Note that the form *ewt'n* has not been preserved in any form of Armenian, and the non-classical *eawt'n* can be considered as the outcome of a regular phonetic development seen also in *geawt* ‘village’, *čeawt* ‘branch’ (see Weitenberg 1996: 96-99). That the ordinal has played a role should also be taken into consideration. For further references on phonological problems of this word, in particular the initial **s-*, see s.v. *hin* ‘old’.

ewt, *o*-stem: GDSg *iwł-oy* ‘oil’ (Bible+); dial. almost exclusively **et*.

Some Biblical attestations taken from critical or diplomatic editions (I first cite the form found in the basic text of these editions and then the variant readings):

Genesis: AccSg *iwł* in 28.18 (var. *ewł*, 3x *et*) and 35.14 (2x *et*), see Zeyt‘unyan 1985: 274, 311.

Deuteronomy: AccSg *et* in 28.51 and 32.14 (vars. *ewł*, *iwł*), *z-ewł* in 7.13 and 11.14 (vars. *z-iwł*, *z-ewł*), GSg *et-u* in 8.8 (var. *iwłoy*, once *etwu*), *z-etoy* in 14.22 (vars. *zewłoy*, *zewłwoy*, *ziwłoy*, *ziwłto*) and 18.4 (vars. *zewłwoy*, *zewłoy*, *ziwłoy*), ISg *itov* in 28.40 (vars. *ewłov*, *iwłov*), see Cox 1981: 187, 205, 109, 124, 112, 137, 149, 186, respectively.

Daniel: ISg *ewłov* in 10.3 [Cowe 1992: 209].

It appears that Deuteronomy is more inclined to NAccSg *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 it is not certain that 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, although the variant reading allative *y-iwł/y-ewł* appears to be original 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’ in the same passage. Gen. *et-u* is also found in Nersēs Šnorhali (12th cent.).

The classical paradigm is usually reconstructed as follows: nom. *éwł*, gen. *iwłóy* [Meillet 1913: 18, 180a; 1936: 63; Matzinger 2006: 72]. See also s.v. *giwł* ‘village’.

●DIAL Dialectally ubiquitous. All the forms represent **et*, apart from Juła *ut* [HAB 2: 252].

●ETYM Since NHB, Petermann, Windischmann and others, connected with Gr. *ἐλαία*, Att. *ἐλάα*, Ion. *ἐλαίη* f. ‘olive-tree; olive’, *ἐλαίος* m. ‘wild olive’, *ἐλαίον* 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 word cannot have been borrowed from 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]. Ačařyan (1937: 3) treats the Armenian and the Greek words as borrowed from Phrygian or from the Aegean civilization. Mentioning the Mediterranean theory, Ĵahukyan (1987: 307, 307₉, 466, with ref.) also notes Akkad. *ulū(m)* ‘fine oil, butter’.

As is shown by Lat. *olīva*, the Greek word must be reconstructed as **ἐλαιϝ-* [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. *ἐλαιον* 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 *sepal* ‘Salbe, Fett’. On this root, see also s.v. *hiwt* ‘moisture’. However, one might expect metathesis **bl-* > Arm. *-lp-*, although all the known examples 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 2008 identifies *ewł* with Gr. *ἐλπος*, Alb. *gjälpe* ‘butter’, Skt. *sarpīṣ-* n. ‘molten butter, lard’, Germ. *Salbe* ‘ointment’, Toch. A *šälip*, B *šalype*, “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 a non-initial position.

On the whole, the Mediterranean origin (with Gr. *ἐλαιον* ‘oil’) of Arm. *ewł* seems more plausible, although the details remain unclear.

Z

zaysaysem ‘to fear’, attested only in Timot‘ēos Kuz (Timothy Aelurus), see Ačařean 1908-09a, 1: 370a^{Nr18}. According to Ačařyan (HAB 2: 78a), identical with *zaysel*, which is found in Bařgirk‘ 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.

In my view, *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 corroborated by *z-ays-ot*, which is glossed in Bařgirk‘ 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.), although 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‘-ot*.

zāram, *a*-stem: GDPl *zāram-a-c* ‘senile’ (Book of Chries, Paterica, “Čarəntir”). Derivatives: in Ephrem, Yovhannēs Öjnec‘i, Alexander Romance, etc.

●ETYM Interpreted as prefix *z-* + prefix *ar-* + *am* ‘year, age’ (q.v.); similarly: *zařanc’em* ‘to be delirious (of drunkenness or especially of senility)’ = *z-* + *ar-* + *anc’-* ‘to pass’ [HAB 1: 143a, 213a; 2: 80b; M. Muradyan 1975: 63, 64; Ĵahukyan 1987: 243].

It is possible that *zařam* contains *am* ‘year; age’. Similarly, *zařanc’-* may contain *anc’-* ‘to pass, surpass, be destroyed, etc.’ (Bible+; dialectally ubiquitous); typologically cf. *anc’eal zawurbk’* ‘become old, aged’, rendering Gr. *προβεβηκότεες ἡμερῶν* in Genesis 18.11, *προβεβηκῶν ἐν ἡμέραις* in Luke 1.18 and 2.36. Besides, next to *zařanc’* there are also other formations such as *z-anc’-* and *ar-anc’-* (see HAB 1: 213a).

Nevertheless, the first part **zar* (especially in *zařam*) 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. *zařam* as borrowed from the Iranian word for ‘old, senile, decrepit’, cf. Pahl. *zarmān* ‘old man; old age, decrepitude’, Oss. *zæronđ* ‘old’, etc. Probably, the Armenian forms comprise that Iranian word, but have been reinterpreted as containing the prefixes *z-* and *ar-*.

zařanc’em ‘to be delirious (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. Garsoĳan 1989: 216): *k’aj arbeal ic’ē ew mtōk’ zařanc’eal yarbec’ut’enē* <...>. *Ew etew ibrew anc’in zařanc’in i ginwoyn, ašt č’ap’ anc’anelov*, <...> : ‘has drunk a great deal and that his mind is overcome with drink, <...>. And it so happened that they were overcome with wine, having gone beyond measure, <...>’.

●ETYM See s.v. *zařam*.

zatic, *a*-stem: GDSg *zatic-i*, abundant in the Bible [Astuacaturean 1895: 508-509]; only in Cyril of Jerusalem: GDPI *zatic-a-c’* ‘sacrifice; Passover; Resurrection feast, Easter; feast’; dial. also ‘ladybug’ (Bible+). According to Ačĳaryan (HAB 2: 82b), the original meaning is ‘sacrifice’, attested in John Chrysostom. L. Hovhannisyan (1990: 240) accepts this, although his textual illustrations are not convincing.

●DIAL Widespread in the 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 Ačĳarean 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 karvýtė*; Roman. *vaca domnului*, etc.; (2) ‘(bug of the) Virgin Mary’: Lith. *diėvo marýtė*; Germ. *Marienkäfer*, Engl. *ladybug*, etc. (see Toporov 1979; 1981a; and Toporov apud MifNarMir 1: 181-182).

Both patterns are represented in Armenian dialects: (1) Łarabał **astucoy kov/eznak* [Ačĳarean 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 might think 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 no one 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, however. Besides, note the variant with *ezn* 'bullock'. Finally, there is also Լարաթ *kavkav* [Martirosyan/Gharagozyan, 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 *mataš*; 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, although 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 Jahukyan (1991: 38-39), who compares the semantic field of *tawn* 'feast' < *'sacrificial animal/meal' (q.v.).

According to Hovhannisyan (1990: 240), *zatic* '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'. In HAB, a different etymology for *zenum* is given: YAv. *ziiānā-* f. 'Schaden', Pahl. *zyān* 'loss, harm, damage' (on these, see MacKenzie 1971: 100; Mayrhofer EWAia 1, 1992: 602-603).

z-genum, 3sg.aor. *zge-c'-a-w*, imper. *zgec'-ir* 'to put on clothes' (Bible+); **z-gest**, *u*-stem: GDSg *zgest-u*, AblSg *i zgest-ē*, IPl *zgest-u-k'* (Bible), GDPl *zgest-u-c'* (Lazar P'arpec'i); *i*-stem: ISg *zgest-i-w* (Grigor Narekac'i), GDPl *zgest-i-c'*, IPl *zgest-i-w-k'* (Paterica+); *o*-stem: ISg *zgest-o-v* (Pataragamatoyc'k', Grigor Narekac'i) 'dress, garment, clothes' (Bible+); dial. ***ge-n/c'-** 'to put on clothes', ***gest** 'dress, garment, clothes'

●DIAL Šamaxi *skest*, Suč'ava *sg'esd* 'church garment', Դժա *əsg'ic'* 'id.'; Agulis *əsk'ānil*, Լարաթ, Լազաք *kenal* 'to put on clothes', imper. *kéc'*, Šamaxi *kec'(v)il* 'id.'; Alaškert, Muš, Xlat', Nor Bayazet *g'est* [HAB 2: 88b].

●ETYM From PIE **ues-* 'to be dressed': Skt. *vāste* 'to be clothed, wear', Hitt. *ueš-* 'to be dressed', etc., see Hübschmann 1897: 446; HAB 2: 88 with references; Grammont 1918: 243; Pokorny 1959: 1172; Ałabekyan 1979: 93; Ravnæs 1991: 7-8; Mallory/Adams 1997: 109; Matzinger 2005: 59. For a thorough analysis, see especially Clackson 1994: 178-180.

The verb (*z*-)*ge-nu-* derives from IE **ues-nu-*, cf. Gr. *ἔννυμι* 'to clothe' (Meillet 1936: 112, 115-116; K. Schmidt 1980a: 3); the noun (*z*-)*gest, u-* and *i*-stem points to **ues-tu-* and **ues-ti(h₂)-* f., cf. Lat. *vestis, is* f. 'garments, clothing; clothes; cloth', Goth. *wasti* 'garment, dress', Gr. Hesychius *γῆστία* 'clothing', etc. Further see s.vv. *aganim* 'to put on clothes', *aragast* 'curtain', *zgest* 'dress'.

zgest ‘dress, garment, clothes’

See s.vv. *zgenum* ‘to put on clothes’ and *ař-ag-ast* ‘curtain’.

zign ‘a kind of marine predator’.

Only in Hexaameron; see K. Muradyan 1984: 245, 257₇₀, 373b.

- ETYM Jahukyan (1967: 183, 308) derives it from IE **g^hiū-* (as opposed to **g^hiū-*; cf. s.v. *jukn* ‘fish’) in the context of a deviant development of the PIE palatal **g^h* 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.

zist, *a*-stem: GDSg *zəst-i*, AblSg *i zəst-ē*, IPl *zst-a-w-k’* (Bible+), *o*-stem: IPl *zst-o-v-k’* (Philo) ‘the fleshy parts between the loins and knee’ in Genesis 32.25/26-32/33 (Zeyt’unyan 1985: 299-301) and Leviticus 3.10; ‘seat in a boat’ (Grigor Narekac’i).

- ETYM Meillet p.c. apud HAB 2: 96b interprets *zist* as *z-* + **hisdo-* < IE **si-sd-o-*, redupl. of **sed-* ‘to sit’ seen in *nist* ‘seat, site’ (q.v.). The connection with *nist* has been suggested already in NHB 1: 736c. Further see Olsen 1999: 72. Compare also **pi-sd-o-*: OPr. *peisda* ‘ass’, Russ. *pizdá* ‘vulva’, etc. (Mallory/Adams 1997: 507b).

zut, *o*-stem: ISg *zt-o-v* (3 Kings 6.21) ‘clean, pure, unmixed’ said of gold, thoughts, etc. (Bible, Agat’angelos, John Chrysostom, Nersēs Lambronac’i, etc.), **ztem** ‘to cleanse, purify; to test by fire, purify by melting (said of metals, etc.)’ in Job 22.25 (see below), Lamentations 4.7, Agat’angelos, Eznik Kolbac’i, John Chrysostom, etc.).

In Job 22.25: *Ew etic’i Amenakaln awgnakan k’ez i t’snameac’*, *ew ystak hatusc’ē k’ez ibrew zarcat’ zteal*: *ἔσται δε σοι ὁ παντοκράτωρ βοηθὸς ἀπὸ ἐχθρῶν, καθαρὸν δὲ ἀποδώσει σε ὥσπερ ἀργύριον πεπυρωμένον* ‘And the Almighty will be a help to you from enemies, and he will render you pure as silver tried by fire’ [Cox 2006: 163].

- DIAL Axalc’xa, Ararat, Muš *zut*, Sebastia, Tigranakert *zud* [HAB 2: 109a], Alaškert *zud* and *zudər* [HAB ibid.; Madat’yan 1985: 188b], Karin, etc. *zudr* [HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 425b]⁵⁷. The verb in Tigranakert has a geminate *-dd-*, *zddel* [HAB 2: 109a], but Haneyan (1978: 185b) records only *zədil*.

The basic meaning of dial. and ModArm. *zut(r)* is ‘pure, unmixed’ said of e.g. silver, gold, spirit, etc. (Malxaseanc’ HBB 2: 37b; HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 425b), and the verb *ztel* means ‘to purify, cleanse; to purify by melting or straining, filtering’ (Malxaseanc’ HBB 2: 39a). The final *-r* of **zut-r* is unclear. If the meaning ‘pure, unmixed’ was used also pertaining to ‘honey’, the form **zutr* can be analogical after *metr* ‘honey’.

A different meaning is found in Hungarian, *zutr* ‘always, continuously’ [HAB 2: 109a].

- ETYM No etymology in HAB 2: 109a; Olsen 1999: 962.

Jahukyan (1967: 184, 307-308) derived *zut* from QIE **g^hu-d-o-*, cf. Lat. *fundō*, *fūdī* ‘to pour out, shed; to cast (metals)’, *in-fundō* ‘to pour in’, etc.; for the etymon cf. Gr. *χέω* ‘to pour, spill’, *χυτός* ‘spilled’, etc., see s.v. *jew* ‘shape’. For the initial *z-*

⁵⁷ In HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 425b one also finds *zudi* ‘pitch’; this is reminiscent of *jiwt’* ‘pitch’ (on which see HAB 3: 154).

instead of *j-* Ĵahukyan (ibid.) lists some comparable examples, such as the dialectal doublets *joł* and *zol* ‘stripe of leather’ (on which see Ačařean 1913: 323; HAB 3: 157b). The example of *zign* ‘a kind of marine predator’ should be abandoned (see s.v.).

Though not maintained in Ĵahukyan 1987, this etymology is worth of consideration. Details remain unclear, however. One may also think of contamination with a Miran. form belonging to the same PIE etymon, cf. Av. *ā-zuiti-* f. ‘clarified butter, sacrificial fat’ vs. Skt. *ā-huti-* f. ‘offering’ (RV+), *haviṣ-* n. ‘libation, sacrificial liquid, sacrificial substance’ (RV+), *hav-*, pres. *juhóti* ‘to sacrifice, offer, pour (an oblation, ghee, etc.)’.

Ē

ēg, *i*-stem: GDSg *ig-i*, several times in the Bible; GDPI *ig-i-c* ‘in Ephrem, Plato; *a*-stem: GDPI *ig-a-c* ‘in “Šarakan” (note that GDSg *ig-i* presupposes an *i*- or *a*-stem, and GDPI *ig-i-c*, pointing to an *i*-stem, is better attested) ‘female’ (Bible+).

●DIAL Widespread in the dialects. Note also Tʼiflis **eg hac* ‘a kind of ritual bread for New Year’ [HayLezBrbBar 2, 2002: 7b], Van *ekʼy*, gen. *ekʼyu* or *ikʼyu* ‘female buffalo’ [HAB 2: 116a; Ačařyan 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. *yóṣā-* f. ‘girl, young woman’ (RV+), *yóṣit-* f. ‘id.’ (RV), MInd. *yosiā-* f. ‘woman’; of unclear origin (connection with *yúvan-* ‘young’ is 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.

ēš, *o*-stem (abundant evidence in the Bible), *u*-stem (scarce evidence) ‘donkey’.

●DIAL Ubiquitous in the dialects [HAB 2: 118a].

●ETYM Connected with Skt. *ásva-* m. ‘horse, steed’, *ásvā-* f. ‘mare’, *ásv(i)ya-* ‘pertaining to a horse, consisting of horses; possession of horses’, YAv. *aspa-* m. ‘horse’, Lat. *equus* m. ‘horse’, etc., from PIE **h₁ek₂wo-* ‘horse’, see Pedersen 1905: 197-198, 205; 1906: 404, 447-449 = 1982: 59-60, 67, 182, 225-227; Ačařean 1908-09: 243; HAB 2: 117-118; Mann 1963: 9, 102; Toporov, PrJaz [A-D], 1975: 137; Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 544₁ = 1995: 463₁; Mallory/Adams 1997: 274a; Blažek 1998; Viredaz 2005-07: 7-9. Not included in the thorough list of cognates by Meid 1994: 54.

Watkins (1970: 7; see also de Lamberterie 1978: 262-266; 2006: 213-223; cf. Godel 1975: 85) envisages the semantic shift ‘horse’ > ‘donkey’ in the context of the semantic hierarchy between two words for ‘horse’, Arm. *ēš* : Skt. *ásva-* (semantically unmarked; “language of men”) vs. Arm. *ji* : Skt. *háya-* (semantically marked; “language of gods”). See 3.12 for references on “language of men” vs. “language of gods”.

Hurr. *ešši*, *iššija-* ‘horse’ has been compared with the PIE word for ‘horse’ (Ĵahukyan 1963: 132; Diakonoff/Starostin 1986: 34; Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2:

560, 915 = 1995: 478 with references, 809; Blažek 1998: 21-22, 24; A. Petrosyan 2002: 23). Ĵahukyan (1963: 132, 132₂₄₄) links the Hurrian word with the derivatives Skt. *ásv(i)ya-* ‘pertaining to a horse’, Gr. *ἵππιος* ‘belonging to a horse’.

For the archaeological background, see Mallory 1982: 209-211. For Caucasian and Eurasian parallels, see Blažek 1998: 26-27; Witzel 2003: 17-18, 20.

Dial. NPI **iš-uan(-k’)* seems to be a blend of gen. *išu-* and pl. *iš-an(k’)*. Alternatively, the part **iš-v-* may presuppose a form with *-vi*, originally dual (cf. *šn-vi* : *šun* ‘dog’ etc., see Karst 1901: 190-192, §§ 245-246). Thus: **iš-v(i) + -an(k’)*. Compare the compounded plural marker *-və-ner* in the dialect of Van (see Ačařyan 1952: 109).

***ēĵ-** ‘to come/go down, descend; to stay overnight; to calm down’: *ĵanem*, 1sg.aor. *ĵ-i*, 3sg.aor. *ēĵ*, imper. *ēĵ* (rich evidence in the Bible, see Astuacaturean 1895: 619-621); *ĵ-awor* ‘guest’ (Bible); *ēĵ*, *i*-stem: GDSg *ĵ-i*, GDPI *ĵ-i-c’*, IPI *ĵ-i-w-k’* ‘the coming/going down, descent’ (Koriwn, Ephrem, etc.), ‘page (of a book), column’ (Jeremiah 36.23); see also s.v. *ar-ēĵ* ‘threads running along the length of cloth, warp’.

●DIAL The verb is ubiquitous in the dialects. Kusget (Motkan) *išvil* refers ‘to go’, since the area is mountainous, and going is equivalent to going down [HAB 2: 119b; 4: 655b].

●ETYM Probably from PIE **h₁e/oi-g^h-*: Gr. *οἶχομαι* ‘to go (away), leave, disappear’, *οἰχνέω* ‘to go, come, walk, approach’, Lith. *eigà* ‘course’, OIr. *óegi* ‘guest’ < **oig^h-ēt-*, perhaps also OCS *iti*, 1sg. *idǫ* ‘to go’, etc. (see s.v. **e(h/y)am* or **i(h/y)am* ‘to go’). The Armenian nasal present is probably an innovation based on an older present in **-e-* or **-je-*, cf. Gr. *οἰχνέω* vs. *οἶχομαι*. For the etymology and a discussion, see Scheftelowitz 1904-05, 1: 311; Pedersen 1906: 425 = 1982: 203; HAB 2: 119a, 4: 655b; Pokorny 1959: 296; Frisk s.v.; Klingenschmitt 1982: 207-208; Ĵahukyan 1982: 59; 1987: 121, 436; Beekes 2009 s.v..

Armenian demonstrates a semantic shift ‘to go’ > ‘to go down’, cf. the above-mentioned dialectal (Kusget) meaning. If the latter does not reflect the original meaning, this dialect represents the result of a twofold semantic shift: PIE ‘to go’ > Arm. ‘to go down’ > ‘to go’.

Ə

əmpem (spelled also as *ənp/bem* several times in Ephrem), suppletive aor. *arb-i* ‘to drink’ (Bible+; for the paradigm, see Łaragyulyan 1961: 165-166), **ump* in the compound *t’er-ump/b* with *t’eri* ‘incomplete’ (Canon Law); *ump* subst. ‘drink, drinking’ (Dionysius Thrax, 6-7th cent., see Adonc‘ 1915=2008: 12).

●DIAL Xarberd, Nor Naxijewan *umb* ‘sip, drink’ [HAB 3: 600a], Arabkir **ump* ‘drop’, **əmp-ik* > *əmbig* ‘a small drop’ [Dawit‘-Bēk 1919: 68; HAB 3: 600a], Svedia (nursery words) *əmb-äg*, *əmbu* ‘drink’ [HAB 3: 600a; Andreasyan 1967: 220, 360a].

●ETYM Meillet 1892: 164 derives *əmpem* from IE **pimbō* ‘to drink’ with Skt. *pibati*, Lat. *bibō*, OIr. *ibid* (reduplicated thematic present of the word for ‘to drink’, cf. Gr. *πίνω* ‘to drink’, etc.) considering the nasal to be secondary as in Lat. *rumpō* ‘to

burst, break down' vs. Goth. *raupjan* 'to pluck'. In 1896: 155, he posits **ənd-hipem* with a question-mark. Similarly, Ĵahukyan (1987: 144, 187; see also N. Simonyan 1991: 291) assumes **pibeti* > **hipeti* and a subsequent addition of *ənd*, thus: **ənd-hipe-* > *əmpē-*. For a criticism of this view, see Klingenschmitt 1982: 156; Ravnæs 1991: 161₁. On the other hand, **en-pib-e/o-* has been posited, cf. Lat. *im-bibō* 'to imbibe', etc. (Praust 1996: 193-199; Viredaz 2003: 76, 76₈₅). Later, Meillet 1936: 134 regards *əmpem* as an obscure present, which is difficult to separate from Skt. *pibati*, Lat. *bibō*, etc.

Charpentier 1909: 249-251 starts with the noun *ump* deriving it from **pō-p-mo-* (based on a reduplicated form of the same verbal stem, cf. Gr. *πῶμα* < **pō-mḡ* 'drink' vs. *πίνω* 'to drink') > **pōmpo-* (metathesis) and treating *əmpem* as a denominative verb. Hamp 1967: 15-16 (cf. Schmitt 1981: 58; Praust 1996: 188-189) suggests a nasal-infix present **pōmb-* from an earlier **pōb-*, the latter being a cross of the perfect vocalism *πω-* with an original **pib-*: Skt. *pibati*, etc. Later he (1975: 107-109) treats *əmpem* as an ancient IE reduplication with a nasal formation in Armenian.

The appurtenance of *əmpem* to the PIE word for 'to drink' is also accepted in Pokorny 1959: 840; Ernout/Meillet 1959: 70; Schmitt 1981: 157; Mallory/Adams 1997: 175b. For further references and other etymological suggestions, see HAB 3: 599-600; Schmitt 1972-74: 25; Ĵahukyan 1982: 228₂₅; Clackson 1994: 181. Ačaryan (HAB *ibid.*) does not accept any etymology and leaves the origin of the word open. For an extensive etymological treatment, see Praust 1996.

The derivation of *əmpem* from **pimb-* reflecting the reduplicated present **pi-ph₃-* with analogical nasal infix is largely accepted (see Hamp 1975: 107-109; Klingenschmitt 1982: 79, 85, and especially 156; Kortlandt 1987a: 50 = 2003: 80; Beekes 1988: 61; 2003: 163, 172; Ravnæs 1991: 161₁; Clackson 1994: 216-217₁₀₆; Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 113). One may assume (basically following Hamp 1975: 108) that, at a certain age, the morphology of the reduplicated present **hipem* became opaque; in order to emphasize the suppletive contrast with aor. *arb-i*, a present marker, viz. the nasal suffix *-ne-* has been added (cf. pres. *ar-nem* vs. aor. *ar-ar-i* 'to make'; pres. *dnem* < **di-ne-mi* vs. aor. *ed-i* 'to put'; see also s.v. *lsem* 'to hear'). Thus: **(h)ip-nemi* > **inpēm(i)* with metathesis as in **_n-bud^hno-* > *an-dund-k* 'abyss' (q.v.). The loss of **h-* is difficult, however; it may be due to the pretonic position. Alternatively, one may think of *ənd* or **h₁en-* (see above).

The vocalism of PArm. **(h)imp-* is in conflict with *ump* (late literary attestations and a few dialects), as has been pointed out by Hübschmann 1897: 447; 1899: 45. However, *ump* may be analogical (see Meillet 1892: 164; Vogt 1938: 337; Klingenschmitt 1982: 156; Ravnæs 1991: 161₁; N. Simonyan 1991: 291; Clackson 1994: 235₃₁₄; Praust 1996: 188-189; cf. e.g. *nunĵ* vs. *ninĵ* and *nnĵem* 'to sleep', *ĵunĵ* vs. *ĵinĵ* and *ĵnjem* 'to clean').

For a discussion of the problem of **-b-* (> Arm. *-p-*) in the thematic present **pibeti* < **pi-ph₃-e-ti*, see Beekes 1981-82: 113; 1988: 61; 1989: 25; Mayrhofer 1986: 100, 143, 143₁₈₅, 174-175; Schrijver 1991: 412, cf. 147; Lindeman 1997: 120, 174, 184.

For the reduplicated present of this type, see also s.v. *ylp* 'anam' 'to be filled to repletion, be overfilled, be satiate' (q.v.), if from QIE **h₁en-pi-pl(e)h₁-* or **h₁en-pi-*

pl(h₁)-ne- (cf. the nasal epenthesis or infix in Gr. *πί-μ-πλη-μι* and *έμ-πίμπλημι* 'to fill', which is reminiscent of that in *əmpem* 'to drink').

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. *Ερινύες*, the name of female avenging chthonic deities.

●ETYM The etymological proposals are unconvincing. NHB 1: 764b and others (see HAB 2: 122a) suggest a connection with *ənkłmem*, *ənkłnum* 'to sink into the water'. Ačarjan (HAB *ibid.*) leaves the origin of the word open. The root is considered identical with *gil/git-* 'to roll, stumble' (q.v.) by M. Muradyan (1975: 57). A. Petrosyan (1987: 59, 61, 70) sees in *əngtay* the conjectural theonym **Geł-* (cf. *Angeł-*), which is interpreted by Petrosyan himself as a reflex of the IE theonym **uel-* (on which see especially Ivanov/Toporov 1974). According to Łap'ancyan (1975: 365), *əngtay* derives from Akkad. *Nik(k)al*. For a further discussion, see Russell 1987: 455.

I propose to revive the comparison with Lat. *anguilla* 'eel' (possibly from **angulla*, influenced by *anguis* 'snake'), suggested by Durean (1933: 118) in passing, with a question mark. Compare Gr *έγγελυς, έμβηρις*, Lith. *ungurys* m. 'eel', Russ. *úgor* m., etc. For a 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. *anķara* 'grass-snake' (Orbeliani) which has been compared with this IE word (Klimov 1994: 169-170, with ref.). For the semantic association between 'grass-snake' and 'water-snake' cf. *lortu*. If the initial vowel was **a- = *h₂(e)-*, the Arm. *ə-* 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: **ingula-* or **ungula-* would both yield **əng(ə)łta-*. Preciser, perhaps, NSg **h₂óng^h-ur/l-* > PArm. **ung(u)ł*, pl./coll. **ung(u)ł-áy-k' > əngł-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 **astel-a-*. Otherwise, substratum vacillation **-r/l-?*

Arm. *əngtayk'* can be explained either as a collective formation in *-ay-k'* on the basis of **a/ungul-*, 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. *Ερινύες*, the name of female chthonic deities, so it might denote female sea-monsters. Next, in the Armenian folk tradition recorded in Łarabał [Łalayan 2, 1988: 170], the eel is a metamorphosed pipe of *Gabriel hreštak*, which swims around singing, and the fishers listen to this sound when hunting it.⁵⁸ 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 swim the rivers upstream, the males mostly remaining in the brakish water of the estuary.

For the singing peculiarity ascribed to the eel, see 3.5.2.8 (on *atanak*, etc.).

⁵⁸ 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 *-awš*.

One might wonder whether the Armenian word can have been borrowed from Latin. This seems less likely, albeit 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-kʻ*, which, too, are female chthonic deities with “snaky-hair”, also connected with the idea of Motherhood, although they, on the contrary, are hostile to mothers and new-born children.

ander-kʻ (spelled also as *anter-kʻ*), pl. tant. *a*-stem: GDPI *ant/der-a-cʻ*, IPI *-a-w-kʻ* ‘entrails, intestines, bowels’ (Agatʻangelos, John Chrysostom, Philo, Gregory of Nyssa, Grigor Narekacʻi, etc.).

●ETYM Derived from PIE **h₁enter-h₂*, cf. Gr. *ἔντερα* n.pl. ‘intestines, bowels’ (= Arm. **inder-a-* ‘id.’), Russ. *játro* n., pl. *játra* ‘entrails, eggs, testicles’, *jadró* ‘kernel, testicle’ from Slav. **jęt/dro* (see *ĖtimSlovSlavJaz* 6, 1979: 65-66, 72), Skt. *ántara-* ‘interior’, *āntrá-* n. ‘intestine’, etc., see NHB 1: 771a; Hübschmann 1897: 447-448; HAB 2: 125; Pokorny 1959: 313; Jahukyan 1982: 36; Clackson 1994: 183; Mallory/Adams 1997: 179b; Olsen 1999: 809; Beekes 2003: 146, 173, 204.

ankenum ‘to cause to fall, throw down’ (Bible+); cf. also *z-ankenum* in Job 40.8 (Cox 2006: 256): *mi zankenur zdatastan im* “do not shrug off my judgement”.

●ETYM Ačaryan (HAB 2: 128b) connects the verb with *ankanim* ‘to fall down’ < **sng^w*- (q.v.) and derives it from PArm. **ink-* < full-grade QIE **seng^w*-. Godel (1965: 26, 37; 1975: 74, 125, 126; 1982: 10) derives *ankenum* from caus. **song^w-eye-* (with trans.-caus. present **-nu-* as in *lnum* ‘to fill’, etc.), vs. *ank-anim* ‘to fall down’, with mediopassive inflection *ank-ay* (q.v.), derived from aor. **sng^w*-, the genuine present **seng^w-e/o-* being preserved in the Germanic languages, cf. Goth. *sigqan*. Also Barton (1989: 145, 145₃₄, 149) assumes a root aorist middle in zero grade **sng^w*-. For the aor. *anke-cʻ-* from **song^we(je)-ske/o-*, see Godel 1975: 128. Further see Hamp 1975: 101, 1064; Kortlandt 1980: 99; 1987a: 811; 1996: 41 = 2003: 27, 811, 115.

Frisk (1944: 20-25 = 1966: 268-273) and Klingenschmitt (1982: 249) analyze *ankenum* as composed of *and* and **ke-*, deriving the latter from PIE **ges-*, cf. Oic. *kasta* ‘werfen’ and Lat. *gerere*, *gessī* ‘to carry on’. This is not convincing. Because of *ankanim* ‘to fall’, Viredaz (2003: 7686) rightly prefers the former explanation of *ankenum*.

ant/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 *arcʻatʻ-a-gin* ‘(slave) bought with money’ in Genesis [Weitenberg 1981], and to *ek* ‘outsider’ (< ‘comer’) in Movsēs Xorenacʻi 1.10 (1913=1991: 33^{Lf}, transl. Thomson 1978: 85): *ew aylovkʻ andocnōkʻ ew ekōkʻ* “and [with] other domestic servants and the outsiders”.

●ETYM Composed of **and-* (cf. Gr. *ἔνδον* ‘within’) and **cin-* ‘to give birth; to be born’ (q.v.); for a thorough philological and etymological analysis I refer to Weitenberg 1981.

T'

t'arām 'withered' in Łazar P'arpec'i (5th cent.) and Sargis Šnorhali (12th cent.), **an-t'arām** 'unwithered, evergreen' from the Bible (three times) onwards, **t'arāmim** 'to wither', late attestations, apart from the 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'angelos), **t'aršamim** 'to wither' (Bible 3x, Łazar P'arpec'i, Movsēs Xorenac'i, Paterica, Nilus, etc.); **t'ořmil** 'id.' (Geoponica, 13th cent.), **t'ořrjš(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'arām-** (Hačən, Tigranakert, Xarberd, Agulis, Šamaxi), ***t'ořom-** more widespread: Polis, Axalc'xa, Hamšen, Sebastia, Karin, Muš, Van, Moks, Ararat, Marała, etc. 'to wither' [HAB 2: 156b]; **an-t'arām** 'a flower' in Zeyt'un, Ararat [Ačarean 1913: 98a], Muš [Amatuni 1912: 31], etc. The by-form **t'aršam-* is not recorded, but its presence may be proven by e.g. Svedia *t'išmil*, although Ačarıyan (2003: 396, 416, 568) derives this form from *t'ořnil*.

In a prayer from Ĵavaxk', one finds an adjectival **an-t'ar'akan** (see Lalayeanc' 1892: 10^{L8} = 1, 1983: 340). Formally, it represents the pure root ***t'ar'**, although one cannot be sure that it is not a recent analogical formation. Note that prayers often preserve archaisms.

●ETYM Since long connected with Skt. *tarš-*: *třsyant-* '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. *třsyati*), comparing *garš-* : Skt. *hřsyati* (see s.v.), which is accepted by Meillet (1950: 85). See, however, 2.1.12.

The twofold reflex of PIE **rs* in *t'aršamim* : *t'arāmim* 'to wither' is considered to be one of the oldest traces of early dialectal diversity. In order to evaluate this reflex, one should try to establish the philological background of the distribution.

The adjectives *t'arām* and *ant'arām*, 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'arām-* is found only in the participle and causative, each of them once in the Bible. That the verb *t'aršamim* is old and archaic may be indirectly corroborated by its disappearance from the modern dialects and its replacement by *t'arām-*. We may hypothetically reconstruct the following original distribution: PArm. **t'arām* (adj.) : **t'aršam-émi* (verb). This seems to fit into my reformulation of the ruki-rule in Armenian, see 2.1.12.

On the other hand, one may also assume the influence of Iran. **tarš-* 'to be thirsty' (cf. Av. *taršna-* m. 'thirst', etc., for the forms see Cheung 2007: 383-384), although this is probably unnecessary. Note also Arm. dial. K'esab *tāštia* 'arid, not watered' (see Č'olak'ean 1986: 317a), possibly reflecting an Iranian *-ti-* formation.

t'arp' 'a large wicker fishing-basket, creel', in Anania Širakac'i (A. G. Abrahamyan 1944: 228^{L23}), allative/directive *i t'arp'* : *Ew or yuřkanēn zercaw, i t'arp' ənkaw* :

“and which (of the fish – HM) got rid of the fishing-net, fell into the fishing-basket”; *t'arb* ‘a framework of wooden bars, a wooden trellis-work’, in Movsēs Kałankatuac'i/Dasxuranc'i 2.51 (V. Ařak'elyan 1983: 283^{L17f}, with no variant readings): AccSg *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. Ařak'elyan 1969: 220.

●DIAL Muš, Alaškert, Ararat (see also Nawasardeanc' 1903: 39-40), Marała, Xoy *t'arp'* ‘a large wicker fishing-basket, creel’ (for a thorough description, see Amatuni 1912: 206b; Ačārean 1913: 352a), Zeyt'un *t'zyp'* ‘a hunting basket or net (for fish, fox, etc.)’ [HAB 2: 162b; Ačāryan 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'* (although the evidence is not entirely straightforward, see Ačāryan 2003: 91). This dialect, thus, probably points to *t'arp'*.

As we have seen, the word is attested only twice in the literature, and one of the attestations comes from Anania Širakac'i, native of Širak. The dialectal dictionaries do not record the word in the 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 Ačāryan (HAB 2: 162b) connects Gr. *τάρπη* ‘large wicker basket’, also *ταρπός*, *τερπός* m., *ταρπώνη* f. ‘id.’. The Greek and Armenian words are usually derived from PIE **tu(e)r-p-* : **tuerH-* ‘to grab, enclose’, cf. Lith. *tvėrti* ‘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. **tōrp-eh₂-* (or **terp-eh₂-*, if the vocalism of *τερπός* is old), gen. **tṛp-h₂-ós*. This would yield PArm. **t^hṼrb-a-*, gen. **t^harp^hó-* ‘large wicker basket’. Then the oblique stem **t^harp^h-* would be generalized. One might also posit a thematic **trpH-ó-*, as in Gr. *ταρπός*; but Arm. abl. *t'arb-ē* precludes the *o*-declension. For this kind of paradigmatic solutions, 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 to the corresponding morphological system inherited from Indo-European.

t'ezan, *o*-stem: AblSg *i t'ezan-o-y* (Leviticus 13.56); later *a*-stem: GDSg *t'ezan-i* (Cyril of Alexandria, Čarəntir), GDPl *t'ezan-a-c'* (Čarəntir) 'the weft, the transverse threads which are woven across to make cloth using the warp as a base' (Bible+), 'long sleeve' (Čarəntir); **t'ezan-i-k'**, *ea*-stem: GDPl *t'ezan-e-a-c'* (Paterica, Grigor Narekac'i), IPl *t'ezan-e-a-w-k'* (Nersēs Lambronac'i) 'long sleeve' (also John Chrysostom, etc.).

The word *t'ezan* 'weft, threads which are woven across' (rendering Gr. κρόκη) occurs several times in Leviticus 13.48-57, in contrast with *arēj* 'threads running along the length of cloth, warp' (Gr. στήμων).

●DIAL The syncopated form *t'eznik* 'long sleeve' is found in a number of western dialects: Nor Naxijewan, Trapizon, Muš, Zeyt'un, etc. [HAB 2: 168a]. Note also Moks *t'eznink*⁹ 'широкий, длинный, открытый (распоротый) обшлаг рукава' [Orbeli 2002: 230].

●ETYM The derivations from IE *tek- (Lat. *texō* 'to weave', NHB 1: 803c) and *(s)teg^h- 'stitch' (see Saradževa 1986: 230, 235-236, 402₁₄₂ with ref.; cf. also *stec* 'weaver's vertical stick') are rejected because of the -z- which requires a palatovelar *-g^h-, and the word is considered to be of unknown origin [HAB 2: 168a; Olsen 1999: 300, 947].

t'elawš '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 *kalamax*. In "Bžškaran" (apud NHB 2: 995a; cf. S. Vardanján 1990: 86, § 356), where *k'araxunk* is described as *t'elōš caroyñ xiž patuakan* "valuable pitch of the tree *t'elōš*". 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 any of the other provinces, and that the word *t'elawš* 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 (see H. Martirosyan 2008), *t'elōš* is used to gloss *t'eli* 'elm-tree': *t'eli car anptuł, or ē t'elōš* "a fruitless tree that is *t'elōš*".

In Turkish-Armenian dictionary (c. 1720 AD) by Elia Mušelyan Karnec'i (Karin/Xotorjur), Turk. *č'am yemiši* is glossed by *t'elōšea, t'elōši* [Č'ugaszyan 1986: 72^{Nr65}].

●DIAL Ačarıyan (1913: 357b; HAB 2: 172a) records only Łarabał *t'elūši* 'a kind of mountainous tree'. Davt'yan (1966: 356) cites Łarabał *t'elūši* and *t'elōši*, as well as *t'elūši* in Hadrut' and Šałax-Xcaberd (other dialects in the territory of Łarabał). He, too, does not specify the meaning. HayLezBrbBař (2, 2002: 99a) has Łarabał *t'elmši* 'a kind of mountainous tree'. This seems to reproduce the entry *t'elōši* in Ačarıyan 1913: 357b, with a misprinted -m- instead of -ō-. In this case, however, the alphabetical order would be disturbed. If *t'elmši* is correct (which is very uncertain),

one would be tempted to compare it with Georg. *t'elamuši* 'elm', on which see below.

I express my gratitude to Armen Sargsyan for supplying me with 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 Hät'am, the forest-guard of the village Kusapat, who in 2003 was ca. 55 years old. According to them, Łarabał *t'əluši* denotes a kind of *t'eli* 'elm-tree' (q.v.) with yellowish wood (which is good as fuel) and leaves that are smaller than those of the *t'eli* and, when green, serve as fodder for the goats. It is present in Xcaberd, T'atavard, Martakert. Armen Sargsyan himself saw one near the spring called *Čirákna* (5-6 km up from Kusapat).

In the dictionary by Malxaseanc' (HBB 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 Baġgirk' hayoc' (see above), NHB (1: 806a), and Ułurikean (see HAB 2: 172a) treat *t'etawš* as identical with or a kind of *t'eli* (note also the description of *t'etōš* by informants from Łarabał as a kind of *t'eli*), assuming, apparently, an etymological identity. This is accepted by Ĵahukyan (1987: 145) with some reservations, and by P. Friedrich (apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 178b), where *telōš* is represented as meaning 'wood', which is incorrect. Ačarıyan (HAB 2: 172a), however, leaves the origin of *t'etawš* open. Olsen (1999: 938) gives *t'etōš* as meaning 'oak' or 'pine' and as a word of unknown origin.

Ĵahukyan (1987: 380) mentions *t'et-awš* as the only example of the suffix *-awš*, and presents a separate entry for the suffix *-oš* found in the adjective *dandal-oš* vs. *dandal* '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'eli 'elm'. Late 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'eli* 'elm' with Gr. *πελέ-α*, Ion. *-η* 'elm, *Ulmus glabra*'. Ačarıyan (HAB 2: 171b) considers the anlaut problematic (see also Hübschmann 1897: 449) and prefers linking *t'eli* with Lat. *tilia* 'linden'. The sound change **pt-* > Arm. *t'-*, however, seems to be valid [Greppin 1982; Clackson 1994: 169]. Some scholars are more positive about the Greek correspondence (see Solta 1960: 420; Greppin 1982: 350; C. Arutjunjan 1983: 286; Ĵahukyan 1987: 145, 188, 302 – with some reservation), although others (Atabekyan 1979: 65; Clackson 1994: 169; Beekes 2003: 171-172) include Lat. *tilia* too.

Hübschmann (1897: 374-375, 449) is often said to have considered *t'eli* as a Greek loanword. However, Hübschmann, in fact, considers only Arm. *pt(e)l-* 'elm' (HAB 4: 111b) a Greek loan, and mentions the connection of Arm. *t'eli* with Gr. *πελέα*, not accepting it. Although Ačařyan (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 Greek. Pokorny (1959: 847) only accepts the Greek-Latin connection and treats Arm. *t'eli* 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. *t'ela* and Tush *t'el* 'elm' are borrowed from Armenian. Ačařyan (HAB 2: 172a) adds Georg. *t'elamuši* 'elm'. See also s.v. *t'etawš*.

*t'etik

●DIAL Only in Zeyt'un t'ələk 'snow-pile, avalanche' [Allahvėrtean 1884: 186; Ačařean 1913: 368b].

●ETYM Ačařyan (2003: 287) hesitantly reconstructs **t'etik* and treats the word as of completely unknown origin.

I think Zeyt'un **t'etik* reflects an *-ik* suffixation of Arm. *t'et* 'pile' (see HAB).

*t'en (dial.) 'vulva of a cow'

●DIAL Sebastia *t'en* 'vulva of a cow' [Ačařean 1913: 363a; Gabikean 1952: 202]; Gor. *t'in*, *t'an* 'vulva of female animals' [Margaryan 1975: 392a].

●ETYM Ačařyan (1913: 363a) does not mention any etymology. Ĵahukyan (1972: 310) derives from IE **tu-ēn-* (from **tēu-* 'to swell') comparing Gr. *σάθη* f. 'penis', *σάννιον* '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.⁵⁹ 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 Ačařyan (1947: 189, 267b), is borrowed from Turkish. For the semantic shift cf. Arm. *marmin* 'body' > dial. 'vulva' (Karin), 'vulva of an animal (Nor Bayazet)', *anjn* 'person; body' > Van *anj* 'vulva of a pregnant cow', etc.

*t'eši(k)

●DIAL Ararat *t'eši* 'spindle' [Nawasardeanc' 1903: 41a], Axalc'xa, Karin *t'ešik* 'id.' (Ačařean 1913: 357b; also Mxit'areanc' 1901: 306, glossing Širak *arč'kan* 'spindle'). For attestations of *t'eši* and gen. *t'ešu*, see Amatuni 1912: 57a.

●ETYM Amatuni (1912: 57a) marks *t'eši* as from Kurdish (abbrev. *k't*), not specifying the Kurdish form. He obviously means *tešī*, *tešū* 'spindle', cf. also *tešīle* 'bobbin', *tešīrēs* 'пряха, fem. spinner'; *tešwē* 'тесло' = 'adze' (see Kurdoev /

⁵⁹ Gabikean (1952: 202) asks: "Turkish?", not specifying the details.

Jusupova 1983: 154b). Ačařean (1913: 357b) equates Arm. *t'eš*i(k)* with East Turkish /t'eš*e/*.

Obviously, all these forms belong with Pers. *taš* 'hatchet, axe' [Steingass 302a], Sogd. *tš* 'axe' [Gharib 1995: 392a], Khot. *ttäš-* 'to cut', Arm. (Iranian LW) *tašem* 'to hew', Skt. *tákṣati* 'to form by cutting; to tool, hammer; to fashion, form, prepare', etc. (see HAB 4: 370; Bailey 1979: 129-130; Mayrhofer EWAia 1, 1992: 612-613; Cheung 2007: 384-385). Note also A. Petrosyan 2002: 49₁₇₀, mentioning Arm. dial. *t'eš*i(k)** in this context.

Formally, Arm. *t'eš*i(k)* can be regarded a Persian loanword. Although the semantic relationship between the weaving and hewing activities is possible (compare OHG *dehsa* 'axe' vs. MHG *dēhse* 'spindle' [Mallory/Adams 1997: 37-38], noted by A. Petrosyan 2002: 49₁₇₀; see also s.vv. *hiwsem* 'to weave, plait' and *hiwsn* 'carpenter'), the semantic difference between Pers. *taš* 'hatchet, axe' and Arm. *t'eš*i(k)* 'spindle' may be explained by the appurtenance of the two terms to the same PIE root rather than by considering the Armenian word as a Persian loanword. Note that the Indo-Iranian verbal root under consideration exclusively refers to cutting and hewing, and all the Iranian implement designations (apart from Kurdish *teš*i**, *teš*ū** 'spindle', the Armenian origin of which cannot be excluded) formed from this root denote only 'hatchet, axe' or 'adze'. Also the productive *-i* suffix seems to favour this solution.

If Arm. *t'eš*i(k)* is a native word, its proto-form cannot be structurally identical with that of the Indo-Iranian because the latter derives from a reduplicated *te-tk̑- (see the literature above), which would not yield Arm. *t'eš-. If at least some IE cognate forms point to a PIE *tek̑s- (see Mallory/Adams 1997: 37-38), this proto-form might also explain the Armenian form through the ruki-rule (see 2.1.12): QIE *tek̑s-*ijV-* > Arm. *t'eš*-i*. Otherwise, the Armenian form is indeed an Iranian loan.

*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, IPI t'ert'-*i-w-k'* (var. t'it'-*o-v-k'*) in Paterica, GDPI 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', Łarabał, Ararat, Ĵula 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 *bxkát'il* 'leaf of radish' < **bołk-a-t'el*, which corresponds to Łarabał *pxkát'er* [HAB 2: 176a] and Ararat *bołkat'er* 'id.' (see Amatuni 1912: 112b). Note also Nor Naxiřewan *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'rn 'butterfly' (see s.vv.), from PIE *pter- 'feather; wing', probably derived from *pet- 'to fly' (see Bugge 1893: 40; Ačařyan 1918: 161; HAB 2: 175-176, 183, 184-186; Pokorny 1959: 826; Greppin 1982: 348-349; Ĵahukyan 1987: 144), cf. Gr. *περόν* n. 'feather (mostly in pl.); bird's wing; wings of a bat and of insects; any winged creature, as the Sphinx; a beetle', *πέροϋζ* 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', in my view, presupposes an earlier meaning 'wing', cf. the semantic field of Engl. *wing*, as well as of Arm. *ku'n* '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, albeit with some reservations, by Ĵahukyan (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-ə'*, pl. *t'av-ir* 'лист = leaf', *äkänjə'* *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 (Ačarean 1913: 352b).

t'er, *i*-stem according to NHB 1: 806a, but only AblSg *i t'er-ē* (Eznik Kołbac'i, Cyril of Alexandria) is attested, 'side'. Numerous compounds (Bible+).

●DIAL Widespread in the dialects [HAB 2: 174-175].

●ETYM See s.v. **t'er* 'leaf'.

t'ew, *o*-stem: GDPI *t'ew-o-c'* (very frequent), ISg *t'ew-o-v*, IPI *t'ew-o-v-k'* (Bible); also IPI *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 the dialects [HAB 2: 177-178].

t'ew 'shoulder': in a Moks version of the epic (SasCr 1, 1936: 61^{L65f}):

Jenöv Hövan tli anun idi Davit';

Tlen 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 was correctly translated by Melik'-Öhanjanyan (SasUdal 2004: 56a^{L5}: "через плечо") and L. Petrosyan (1968: 37: *usin*).

In a Łarabał fairy-tale recorded by Ařak'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'etn₁ 'leaf of metal' (Bible+: NSg *t'it'etn*, API *t'it'etns*). Greppin (1982: 349) says that the meaning of *t'it'etn* is obscure, but it might mean 'gold leafing, gold', and the word is known 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'etn₂*.

t'it'etn₂, t'it'ein 'butterfly'.

The only attestation mentioned by Ačaryan (HAB 2: 183a) comes from the fables by Mxit'ar Gōš (12-13th cent.). Here the word is used in NPI *t'it'etnk'*, which, as

Ačaryan points out, presupposes NSg *t'it'eln [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 a butterfly' (see Pivazyan 1960: 132^{L13}, 155^{L40}). The two passages (Mxit'ar Gōš and Yovhannēs T'lkuranc'i) are cited in MijHayBař 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'eln* with 'butterfly'. Further, in a poem by Arak'el Siwnec'i (14-15th cent.); see Poturean 1914: p. 206, stanza 10.

The form *t'it'erñ* (with *-r-*) is only found in Bařgirk' hayoc', where *t'it'eln* is glossed as follows: *t'it'ramay, kam t'it'erñ, or ē t'it'erñik* (see Amalyan 1975: 120^{Nr155}; MijHayBař 1, 1987: 259a). This is mentioned by Greppin (1982: 349₆) as the only evidence for *t'it'eln* 'butterfly' (with *-l-*), which is incorrect.

The anthroponym *T'it'elnik* (11th cent.; see below) is in fact the oldest attestation of the word.

Greppin (1990: 70) cites *t'it'hum* 'butterfly', the source of which is unknown to me.

●DIAL There are two basic forms for 'butterfly' in the dialects: **t'it'erñ* and **t'it'eln*.

**t'it'erñ*

The unsuffixed form **t'it'er* is present in Muš [Amatuni 1912: 6b; Bařdasaryan-T'ap'alc'yan 1958: 255a]; Alaškert [Madat'yan 1985: 189b]; Hamšen [Ačaryan 1947: 229; Bläsing 1992: 78^{Nr137}]; Ararat [HAB 2: 183b]; Karčewan [H. Muradyan 1960: 193b]; Kak'avaberd (here, *t'it'erñə*) [H. Muradyan 1967: 171b]; Burdur [N. Mkrtč'yan 1971: 182a].

The suffixed forms are:

**t'it'erñ-uk* : Agulis *t't'ärñük* [Ačaryan 1935: 57 (§ 57), 353]; Dersim *t'ət'ärñug* [Bařramyan 1960: 14]; cf. Xarberd *t'ərt'ərug* [HAB 2: 183b];

**t'it'erñ-e/ik* : Muš and Alaškert *t'it'ərñek/g* [Amatuni 1912: 6b; HAB 2: 183b; Bařdasaryan-T'ap'alc'yan 1958: 255a; Madat'yan 1985: 189b]; Dersim *t'it'erñig* [Bařramyan 1960: 80b]; Erzuka *t'it'erñik* [Kostandyan 1979: 134a]; Ararat *t'it'erñek* [Markosyan 1989: 301b]; Ozim *t'ət'ərñeyk*, cf. Van *t'ərt'ərñek* [Ačaryan 1952: 261], Šatax *t'ərt'ənek* [M. Muradyan 1962: 196b]; Svedia *t'it'ərñäg* [Ačaryan 2003: 379, 567]; Adana *t'ət'erñik* (meaning 'light-minded person') [HAB 2: 183b; Ačaryan 2003: 310]; Sasun *t'it'erñik* 'a kind of sheep illness, when worms arise in the liver of sheeps' [Petoyan 1954: 122].

**t'it'erñ-ak* : Č'aylu and Marařa (in Łarabař) *t'it'erñak* [Davt'yan 1966: 357].

Dersim *t'it'grña* [Bařramyan 1960: 80b] probably reflects a metathesis of the *r* and *g*. Perhaps this has been supported by the folk-etymological association with *gərñag* (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'eln*

Zeyt'un *t'it'ex* [Ačaryan 2003: 13, 122, 310]; Svedia *t'it'ix* 'butterfly of the silkworm' [Andreasyan 1967: 224, 361b]; K'esab *t'it'ix* [HayLezBrbBař 2, 2002: 110a]; Akn *t'ət'ex* [HAB 2: 183b; Gabriėlean 1912: 268]; Xarberd [HayLezBrbBař

2, 2002: 110a] and Xotorjur *t'it'et* [YušamXotorj 1964: 451b] (both meaning 'a lung illness of animals'); Č'enkiler (Nikomidia) *t't'et* [HAB 2: 183b] (meaning 'butterfly of the silkworm' [Ačařean 1913: 363a]); Melri *t'et'axnə < t'it'eh* [Ałayan 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'grna* (see above).

With the suffix *-e/ik*: Muš *t'it'atnik*, cf. the form recorded by Rivola, namely *t'it'xnik* [HAB 2: 183b]; Aparan, Moks *t'it'xnek* [Amatuni 1912: 6b]; Tigranakert *t'et'elig* [HAB 2: 183b; Haneyan 1978: 186b].

On the meanings 'a kind of illness' and 'spirit' and on *t'it't-ot*, see below.

It is remarkable that some dialectal areas (Svedia, Xarberd, Muš, Agulis and Kak'avaberd vs. Melri, etc.) represent both the *r*- and *t*-forms side by side. The *r*-variant (Ararat, Agulis, etc.) may have once been present in Łarabał and adjacent dialects, too; cf. also Burdur (*t'it'er*), the speakers of which have migrated from Łarabał in the 17th century. It has been preserved in **t'it'er-mali* : Łarabał *t'it'irmate*, *t'at'armati/e*, in Mehtišen : *t'at'armati* [Davt'yan 1966: 357], Goris *t'it'rimati*, *t'at'armati*, *t'it'ilmati* [Margaryan 1975: 327a], Karčewan and Kak'avaberd *t'it'irmati* with semantic nuance 'a butterfly that flutters around the light' [H. Muradyan 1960: 214a; 1967: 192b]. Particularly transparent is Ararat *t'it'er-mati* [Markosyan 1989: 301b]. Ačařyan (HAB 2: 183b) treats **t'it'er-mati* as a compound containing *t'it'er* 'butterfly' and *mat-* 'to sift' and compares it with Łarabał, etc. **aliwr-mat(ik)* 'butterfly' = *aliwr* 'meal' + *mat-* 'to sift' (see Ačařyan 1913: 51-52, 365a; HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 18a). Note an interesting word-play found in a folk-song of the type *jangyulum* (see Grigoryan-Spandaryan 1971: 105^{Nr612}):

Amařn a t'at'armati,

Axči er allür mati,

K'u täšängy türür kyälət

Siroł säerts kədati.

'It is summer, (there is) a 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.⁶⁰ For the examination of *t'it'irmati* and the like, particularly interesting is *t'it'ramay* which is used in Bařgirk' hayoc' alongside *t'it'er(ik)* to render *t'it'eh* (see Amalyan 1975: 120^{Nr155}). Another trace might be Łarabał (Ganjak) *t'it'ra*, used as an epithet to *huš* 'bird' in meaning 'light' (see HayLezBrbBař 2, 2002: 110b) or 'fluttering' and the like.

⁶⁰ Compare Russ. *pekelëk* 'butterfly', if from *peklevát* '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 to reduplicated designations of the butterfly like Lat. *papiliō*, etc., and Arm. dial. **pipeřnak*, etc.

On the other hand, given the existence of *t'it'eln* in Melri (*t'ēt'axnə*), one might look for traces of the form also in Łarabał.⁶¹ 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; AčařAnjn 2, 1944: 309; DivHayVim 5, 1982: 144^{Nr486}): *Es Ohan kangnec'i zxač's inj ew amusin im T'it'etnikay: atawt'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'axt'amurik/k'* (GSg *t'axt'amorkə*⁶, NPI *t'axt'amorkatir (-kanir)*, see Orbeli 2002: 231) is considered by Ačařyan (HAB 2: 183b; cf. also Ačařyan 1952: 261) as isolated and independent. Ačařyan does not specify its structure. Given the association between the butterfly and the meal (*aliwr*), one may suggest that *t'axt'amurik* 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'axt'amur* 'дрожжи, закваска теста' = 'yeast, leaven' (see Orbeli 2002: 230-231). Here it is difficult to give preference to one of the varinats **t'ət'ər-* and **t'ət'ət-*. The latter explains the anlaut better (**t'ət'ət-* > *t'axt'*-, with the same contact metathesis as is seen in *t'axt'amur* 'yeast, leaven' < *t't'xmor*). 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'er*; *ptlor* 'dirty' > Łarabał, Goris, Agulis **prtōt*, etc.) > **t'xt'amorik*. For **t'ət'ət-*, cf. also Goris *t'it'ilmali*. It should also be borne in mind that the form with *-t-* does occur in Moks (*t'it'xnek* [Amatuni 1912: 6b]), although both Orbeli and Ačařyan record only *t'axt'amurik/k'*.

Despite the variation seen in the forms of such closely related dialects as Van (*t'ərt'ərnek*), Ozim (*t'ət'ərneyk*), Šatax (*t'ərt'ənek*) and Moks (*t'it'xnek*, *t'axt'amurik/k'*), two features seem common in all these forms: they have the suffix *-ek*, and they all represent the *-r-* 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 and Ararat **t'it'xot* 'angry, quick-tempered' (see Amatuni 1912: 165-166; Ačařean 1913: 365b; HayLezBrbBař 2, 2002: 110b) has not received an etymological explanation. Compare Xotorjur *t'it'xot* 'a kind of poisonous herb that is harmful to the lungs of animals' [YušamXotorj 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'ajk'-ot* 'angry, quick-tempered; lunatic' (see Ačařean 1913: 1099a). For a textual illustration, see Ananyan 1978: 359 (*k'ajkot*). 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

⁶¹ Goris *t'it'ilmali* seems interesting in this respect. However, the *-t-* instead of *r-* could be secondary.

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. *ψῶχῆ* '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'tnek* means 'a wingless worm that arises in the heart or the liver⁶² of the sheep as resulted from eating too much trefoil'. Ačaryan (HAB 2: 183b) compares this form to Mush *t'it'etnik*. The link is semantic, too, since Muš *t'it'etnik*, *t'it'tnek* also means 'a kind of worm in the liver of the sheep' according to HayLezBrbBař 2, 2002: 110a. Cf. also Sasun *t'it'errik* '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 the sheep) [ĖtimSlovSlavJaz 20, 1994: 84ff]. Note also Gr. *ψῶχῆ* '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 *mařkat'it'et* 'butterfly' (see Amatuni 1912: 6b). See s.vv. *mařkat'ew* and **mařkat'it'et/rn*.

●ETYM The lexicographers and scholars usually cite *t'it'erik* 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'etn₁*). Of the two forms meaning 'butterfly', only the latter, namely *t'it'etn* is attested in the literature. The form *t'it'erik* is a reduplication on the basis of **t'er-* < **pter-* 'feather; wing'; see there for a discussion and references.

The etymological relation between *t'it'erik* 'butterfly', *t'ir-* 'to fly', and *t'er(t')* 'leaf' and Gr. **περ-* 'wing of a bat, birds and insects' is obvious, as is the reduplicated nature of *t'it'erik*. In the Armenian dialects of Van and Xarberd, the reduplication has become full, namely **t'rt'r-* [HAB 2: 185a]. The use of *t'r/r't'r-* 'to flutter, tremble, vibrate' (see Malxaseanc' HBB 2: 127c, 130-132) referring to birds or butterflies is common in the dialects and Modern Armenian. A couple of random illustrations will suffice. In a story recorded in řuři (Łarabař) we read: "<...> the heart of Simon <...> is fluttering like a bird (*tuři mnan t'art'art'am*)" [Grigoryan-Spandaryan 1971: 307^{L25}]. In the variant of the famous fairy-tale "Hazaran Blbul" written by Xnko Aper, *t'rt'ral* appears alongside *t'it'er* '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'erik/t'it'etn* 'butterfly'. Further, he (HAB 2: 183ab) twice states that **t'it'etn* 'butterfly' (derivable from NPI *t'it'hunk'*) is secondary. Similarly, Ĵahukyan (1984: 36, 42) treats the anthroponym

⁶² It will be remembered that the female evil spirits named *al-k'* (see Ačaryan 1913: 53b) threaten the heart and the lungs of an embryo.

T'it'etnik (11th cent.) as a dialectal (SW) variant of *t'it'erñik* reflecting the sound-change $\acute{r} > t$. However, the female anthroponym *T'it'etnik* is also attested in Łarabał at the same period (see above), and the sound-change $\acute{r} > t$ is not specified any further. The priority of *t'it'erñ* seems to function even in such an early attempt as that of Gabriëlean (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'erñ* is discussed, see (apart from references already cited) Pedersen 1982: 126-145 (= 1906: 348, 145); Tumanjan 1978: 257-258; Greppin 1981b: 5; Ĵahukyan 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'erñ*. Moreover, *t'it'etn* is the only variant attested (although late) in the literature. In NHB, we find neither *t'it'erñ* nor *t'it'etn* 'butterfly'. Only the former is recorded in an addendum of dialectal words, s.v. *t'it'erñ(ik)* (see NHB 2: 1062b). For NHB, thus, the *-r-* 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'erñ* seems to have been the etymological relatedness with **t'ir-* 'to fly'. However, the very fact that the relation was and still is transparent suggests that *t'it'erñ* (although not necessarily) can be secondary, whereas *t'it'etn* can not, since there is no synchronical 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 to that of **t'er* 'leaf of dough' and **t'el* 'id.' (ibid.). These are rather archaic relics which, together with the cognates in **-l-* such as Gr. *πίλον* (mentioned also by Ačarıyan himself) and others strengthen the status of *t'it'etn*.

For *t'it'etn* 'butterfly' we have first to mention Gr. *πίλον* n. 'soft feathers, down; wing (properly of insects); the wing-like membrane in a kind of serpents', probably with a hypocoristic *-ίλο* suffix, which may be linked with the Armenian suffix *-il/ł* (on which see e.g. HAB 2: 479a). However, this suffix added to a verbal basis **pt-* is improbable. In that case, one may treat **pīlom* as a word of substratum origin (cf. *siwn*, etc.), which has later been contaminated with the native PArm. **t'er-* < PIE **pter-*. The form **pīl(o)m* 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'erñ* does to *πετρόν*. In the case the second component of Lat. *vespertiliō* 'bat' is cognate, the semantic side of the etymology would become much stronger, since denotations of the butterfly and the bat are very often related to each other (see s.v. **maškat'it'er/ñ*). Note also Gr. *τίλα* f. 'plucking; (pl.) flocks or motes floating in the air', *τιλλ[λ]ά · πετρα* (Hesychius).

Ačarıyan (HAB 2: 182ff) identified *t'it'etn* (Apl *t'it'huns*) 'leaf of metal' with *t'it'el/rñ* '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 Ačařyan'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 identical 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). The passage, in fact, refers to the golden plate (see RevStBible p. 83a; cf. Gr. *τὸ πέταλον τὸ χρυσοῦν* : Arm. *zt'it'etnn oski*) and has nothing to do with the butterfly.

One can offer two explanations for this problem:

(1) the Georgian translator has translated the text from (or has consulted) the Armenian Bible and confused Armenian *t'it'etn* 'leaf (of metal)' with the homonymous and etymologically identical word for 'butterfly'. This would imply that the meaning 'butterfly' of Arm. *t'it'etn* was already present in the time of the Georgian translation. That the Georgian Bible has originally been translated from Armenian is well known (see H. Anasyan, *HaykMaten* 2, 1976: 321-328; Cowe 1992: 239ff);

(2) there was a Georgian word for 'plate, leaf (of metal)' homonymous to the butterfly-word; in this case, the Georgian word would provide us with a parallel for the twofold semantics of Arm. *t'it'etn*. This alternative is less probable.

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 (op. cit. 233^{L20}) we read: *Haw t'it'huns arnēr zayn margartašarern*. We are obviously dealing with API *t'it'huns* of *t'it'etn* 'plate, leaf (of gold)' which indeed is attested three times (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, peteliūškė, peteliuškà, 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.

πετρόν, πέτροζ), 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'eln* 'butterfly'.

***t'it'lot** 'angry'.

●DIAL Van *t'it'xot* (see Ačārean 1913: 365b), Ararat (HayLezBrbBař 2, 2002: 110b), etc.

●ETYM See above, s.v. *t'it'eln₂*, *t'it'er_n* 'butterfly'. For the suffix, cf. **diw-ot* 'mad' from *dew* 'demon' [Ačārean 1913: 279b], *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'ir-** 'to fly', independently only in Step'anos Ōrbelean: *t'ir* (noun) 'flying'; ***t'ir-č'-im** 'to fly' (Bible+), ***t'ir-an-im** 'id.' (Proverbs, etc.), ***t'ir-n-um** 'id.' (Cyril of Alexandria, etc.).

●ETYM See s.v. **t'er* 'leaf', etc.

t'lk'i, **dtk'i** 'maple', spelled also as *t'lk(en)i*, *t'xki*, *dtk'i*, *txki* [Ališan 1895: 190^{Nr794}]. According to Béguinot/Diratzouyan (1912: 66, Nrs 303 and 304), *t'lk'i/txki* (with synonymous *bicti*) denotes 'Acer campestre', whereas 'Acer platanoides' is represented by **kat'n-terew/b-i*, on which see 2.1.15. See also Malxaseanc' HBB 4: 418a.

NHB (2: 1061c), only in the dialectal addendum: *dtki* 'a tree with valuable wood of which spoons are made'.

According to Ačāryan (HAB 2: 188b), attested in "Yalags cařoc" ("On trees"), in the form *dtk'i*. I cannot identify this source, since it is absent from the bibliography of HAB.

●DIAL Lori, Łazax, Łarabał, Łaradał *t'xki*, Łazax *t'lk-eni*, Muš, Bulanəx *dxki* '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'əłki* [Bařramyan 1960: 80b].

Although almost unattested in the literature and more widespread in the 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. *katnək'i* vs. class. *katni* 'oak', etc.). The root resembles **t'et-* found in *t'eti* 'elm' and *t'etawš* (see s.vv.). For a semantic association, cf. Oss. *wis-qæd* 'maple' from PIE **uīng-* 'elm' (see P. Friedrich apud Mallory/Adams 1987: 178b; see also s.v. *knjni* 'elm'), if the connection is accepted.

In this case, Dersim *t'əłki* (next to *t'əłki*) would be considered a metathesized form of *t'lk'i*, which seems strange. Therefore, one may alternatively assume that *t'lk'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 Bacbian *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/l-* is responsible for the Armenian word. The latter may have

been formed with the suffix found in tree-names like *kałamaxi*, *tawsax(i)*, etc. (see 2.3.1).

The alternation *t'-/d-* is reminiscent of the case of *t'awt'ap'em* and *p'lanim* (see Weitenberg 1992).

Alternatively, *t'fk'i* 'maple' can be compared with Oss. *tulz/tolzæ* '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: GDPI *t'z-i-c* (Plato) 'fig' (Bible+), 'a fig-like tumour' ("Bžškarán" 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 the 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 Šnoł (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', *συκῆ*, Dor. *σῦκέα*, Heracleian Dor. *σῦκία* f. 'fig-tree, Ficus Carica'. The Armenian and the Greek words 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 of 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*); Jahukyan 1987: 307, 309, 466; Mallory / Adams 1997: 433b; Olsen 1999: 936 ("a cultural loan")].

Patrubány (1908: 278a) derives the Armenian and the Greek words (as well as Slav. **tyky*, cf. Russ. *tykva* 'pumpkin') from PIE **tū-* 'to swell' and presents Lat. *ficus* separately (in the previous entry), from PIE **dʰē-* 'to suck'.⁶³ 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. *συκῆ* 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. **-k-*, and Lat. *f-* vs. Arm. and Gr. **tu-*, are not easily explicable. De Lagarde (1854: 30^{L820f}) compares the case of Arm. *xoz* 'pig' vs. Pers. *xūk* 'id.'. Patrubány (1908: 278a) assumes that Arm. **t'us-* yielded *t'uz* under the influence of *ənkoyz* 'walnut'. The

⁶³ A misunderstanding seems to have taken place in HAB 2: 202a, in the representation of Patrubány's etymology.

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. *fīcus*, etc. as borrowed from a substratum and posits an initial **p*-. One may posit a **tʰ*- with facultative voicing and aspiration (cf. Beekes 2008: 46 on Pre-Greek).

Jahukyan (1987: 307) points out that Arm. *t‘uz* cannot be derived from Greek, and that it implies a source form of the type **tugʰ*-, with an impossible root structure for an Indo-European word (a combination of a voiceless stop and a voiced aspirated one), unless **-gʰ*- is a determinative. He (op. cit. 466) also mentions the Semitic parallels (Akkad. *tītu(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. **tʰuōiḱ*- or **tū(i)ḱ*-. 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). Alternatively: **tʰyūḱ*-, which would also explain the Greek anlaut vacillation *t*-/*s*- (cf. Beekes 2008: 48, 52).

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, Baġirk‘ 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 Ačařyan (HAB 2: 210b) only records the existence of Pers. *tum* ‘dark’ and leaves the origin of the Armenian word 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 the 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, namely 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 OIc. *þjō* ‘Oberschenkel, Arschbacke’. For the twofold development of **-rs-* as *-r* and *-(r)š* Ałayan mentions *t‘arām*-/*t‘aršam-* (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. *tvorь* ‘appearance’, Pol. *twór* ‘creation, creature’,

Lith. *āptvaras* 'fence', etc.; OCS *tvoriti* 'do, make': Russ. *tvorít'*, Czech *tvoríti* 'to create, do', etc.; Lith. *tvirtas* 'strong, firm, solid'; OCS *tvrbǫb* 'firm, solid' < **turH-dʰo-*; **tuōrH-eh₂-*: OCS *tvarb* f., SCr. *tvār* 'creation, creature', Sln. *tvār* 'matter', Lith. *tvorà* 'fence', etc. Note the remarkable semantic identity of Czech *tvář*, Pol. *twarz*, Slk. *tvár* 'face, cheek' with Arm. *t'ur̄*, *t'uš* 'cheek'.

The semantic basis of *t'uš* might have been 'appearance' (cf. ORuss. *tvorǫ* '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, 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, namely *t'or̄* 'lobe of the ear' and *t'ort'oš* '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; Jahukyan 1987: 154), to the best of my knowledge, is not corroborated by cognates. However, such a proto-form might have been created at an early stage of Armenian: from verbal **tuHr-* (or **turH-*) 'to swell, etc.' an *s*-stem neuter was formed meaning 'swelling; cheek' (cf. Gr. *oĩdos* n. 'swelling', Arm. *ayt* 'cheek' from verbal *oidéw* 'to swell' and Arm. *ayt-n-un* '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 **ued-os-* n. 'water' (cf. Gr. *ũdos* n. 'water', Arm. *get*, *o*-stem 'river', q.v.). Thus: **tuHr-so-*.

Alternatively, *t'ur̄* (but not *t'uš*) may have been formed by the suffixal element **-r-* on the basis of **t(o)uH-s-* (cf. Skt. *táviṣī-* f. 'strength, power', etc.). Thus: **t(o)uH-s-r-* > *t'ur̄* (and, perhaps, **touH-s-r-* > PArm. **to(w)ar̄* > *t'or̄*). For other possible cases of such formations, see s.vv. *antar̄*, *getar̄*.

t'ur̄ probably 'cheek' and/or 'bite, a mouthful', 'swelling, fullness'.

Attested in Philo. In compounds: *t'ṛ-a-lir* (with *lir* 'full, replete') and *hask-a-t'ur̄* (with *hask* 'ear (of corn)'), both in Agat'angelos. For a philological discussion I refer to HAB 2: 208a; Ałayan 1974: 71-74. In Baḡirk' hayoc': *t'ur̄s*: *t'ušs* (see Amalyan 1975: 123^{Nr225}). Here, thus, *t'ur̄* is taken as synonymous to *t'uš* 'cheek'.

Some lexicographers present *t'ur̄* 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 (without ref.) '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. *τρώγω* (see s.v. for more detail). More probably, *t'urc* 'cheek' is comparable to Lat. *turgeō* 'to swell out, become swollen or tumid' and the other Armenian words for 'cheek', namely

t'uš and *t'ur* [Ałayan 1974: 74; Ĵahukyan 1987: 197], q.v. (see also s.v. *t'urc-2*). For the semantic development 'swollen' > 'cheek', see above s.v. *t'uš* 'cheek'.

t'urc-2 'to burn bricks or pots of clay in order to harden them'.

The verb *t'rcem* is attested from the Bible onwards. In Genesis 11.3: *t'rcesc'uk' zayn hrov = όπιήσωμεν αύτάς πυρί*. StRevBible translates: "let us <...> burn them (i.e. the bricks) thoroughly". Independently attested in John Chrysostom+, as adjective: *t'urc* 'hardened (in fire)'.

●DIAL The verb is widespread in the 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-*, 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 [HAB 2: 212b].

●ETYM Compared with Lat. *spuō*, Goth. *speiwan*, Gr. *πυῶ*, 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'eli* 'elm'), Greppin (1982: 351) also introduces Arm. *t'uk'* and Gr. *πυῶ*. According to Clackson (1994: 169), however, "the two languages have most likely made separate onomatopoeic creations or reformations". For a further discussion, see Hamp 1985; Orel 1994a: 39-40.

The *-k'* may be in a way related with coll.-pl. *-k'* found in *šuk'* 'shade', *c'amak'* 'dry; earth, dry land', *p'uk'* 'bellows', etc.

I

***i-** 'thing' and interrogative indefinite pronoun 'what': acc. *z-i*, gen. *ē-r*, dat.-loc. *i-m*, *hi-m*, abl. *i-m-ē*, instr. *i-w*; pl. **i-k'**, gen. *i-r-i-k'*, dat.-loc. *i-m-i-k'*, abl. *y-imek'-ē* (and *imek'* in Eznik Kołbac'i, see Meillet 1913: 63), instr. *i-w-i-k'* (an interesting form is *imik'i* var. lect. in Sirach 41.19, see HAB 2: 254-255) 'something'; **i-mn**, abl. *y-imemn-ē* 'a thing'; **in-č'**, obl. *ənč'-i-* 'a thing, something', **inč'-k**, *i*-stem: GDPI *ənč'-i-c'* 'property, possessions'; **i-r**, *a*-stem: GDPI *ir-a-c'*, IPI *ir-a-w-k'* 'thing, something' (note also frozen instr. *ir-a-w*, pl. *ir-a-w-k'* as adv. 'truly, indeed'; cf. *y-ir-aw-i* 'id.', as well as *iraw-* in compounds); ***hi-** in *hi-m* 'why' (Bible+) and in a few post-classical derivatives.

All the forms are widely attested since the oldest stage of Classical Armenian.

●DIAL The forms *ik'* (also *ir-k'* through contamination with *ir*) and *inč'* (in Łarabał, etc. with an initial *h-*) are widespread in the dialects [HAB 2: 245, 250b, 255b]; **iraw* 'true, truly' has been preserved in Ararat, Ozim, and in a number of NW, W and SW dialects [HAB 2: 251a]; **ēr* is present in a few SE peripheral dialects: Marala, T'avriz *her* and Astapat *ner* 'why'; cf. also Ararat *xi* and Łarabał *xē* 'why' [HAB 2: 119b; 3: 92a].

The initial *h-* of Łarabał *hinč* ‘what’ and Marala *her* ‘why’ is probably related with that of ClArm. *hi-* ‘why’. In view of Astapat *n-er*, one may also think of **y-* and **n-* forms of *ur* ‘where’ (see there for more detail). The ultimate origin of ClArm. *h-* and dialectal *x-* is unclear.

●ETYM Usually derived from PIE **k^wi-*. Compare structurally *o-mn*, *o-r*, *o-k*‘; for the material, references and a discussion, see HAB 2: 235, 242b, 250, 251a, 254-255; 3: 92-93. For references to the paradigms and a general discussion, see 2.2.5. The form *inč*‘ has been directly compared with Skt. *kīm-cit* (Meillet 1892: 162₁; Pedersen 1924: 224b = 1982: 307b; Tedesco 1945: 132₁₈; Pisani 1950: 166-167; Ravnæs 1991: 138, 147). For the typology of *-k*‘, *o-k*‘ and the like cf. Lat. *quis-quam* ‘any, any one, anybody, anything’, *quis-quis* ‘whoever, whatever’, Gr. *ὄσ-τε*, etc. (Jahukyan 1982: 149). On relation with *i-br*, *iw-r*, etc., see Meillet 1896b: 53.

The development of initial **k^w-* is problematic, however. For the initial *h-* and *x-*, see the dialectal section. For a further discussion, see s.vv. pronouns *o-* and *u-r*.

On the other hand, Arm. *i-r* ‘thing’ has been treated as a loan from Part. *īr* [‘yr] ‘thing, matter’ (Benveniste 1957-58: 57; 1964: 11-12; Schmitt 1972-74: 25; Perixanjan 1983: 126, 327₂; for the Parthian form, see also Boyce 1977: 24)). The resemblance is remarkable. However, the inner-Armenian interpretation and the parallelism between the sets of forms based on pronominal *i-* and *o-* make the Iranian interpretation improbable and unnecessary (cf. L. Hovhannisyan 1990: 213, 215; further cf. Olsen 1999: 883-884)⁶⁴. Theoretically, the Parthian form may have been borrowed from Armenian.

iž, *i-*stem: GDSg *iž-i*, GDPl *iž-i-c* ‘viper’ (Bible+).

For a philological discussion, see s.v. *k’arb* ‘basilisk, asp’.

●DIAL Alaškert *iž* ‘poisonous (snake)’, Sebastia *iž* ‘a malicious person’ [HAB 2: 239a].

●ETYM Related to Gr. *ἔχις*, *-εως*, GPI *ἔχων* m. (f.) [GSg *ἔχιος*; plural: dat. *ἐχίεσσι*, gen. *ἐχίων*, acc. *ἔχιας* (also *ἔχεις*); cf. also *ἔχιδνά* 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’ [Hübschmann 1897: 450; HAB 2: 238-239; Meillet 1936: 75; Pokorný 1959: 44; Jahukyan 1987: 112].

Compared with Gr. *ἔχις* first by de Lagarde 1854: 29^{L779}. For the problem of **é* 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^{wh}* - rather than palatovelar **-g^h*-. The association with *ozni* ‘hedgehog’ will then be secondary. The sibilant *-ž-* of Arm. *iž* instead of the expected affricate *-j-* is troublesome. The vocalism is usually considered to point to lengthened grade: **h₁ēg^{wh}-i-* (see the references above). This is possible, cf. the alternation **-ē-* : **-e-* seen in the following animal-names: Gr. *ἄλώπηξ*, *-εκος* f. ‘fox’ vs. Arm. *atuēs* ‘fox’, obl. *atues-*; Arm. *ak’is* ‘weasel’ vs. Skt. *kaśikā-* f. ‘Ichneumonweibchen’ or ‘weasel’, *kāsa-* ‘weasel’ (see s.vv.).

⁶⁴ Olsen 1999: 884 suggests a comparison with Olc. *īð* ‘deed, doing’.

We 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 a PIE *i*-stem. I am inclined to the explanation of Pedersen (1905: 205 = 1982: 67), which has been developed by de Lamberterie (1978: 266, 281) as follows: **eg^{wh}i-* > **eji-* > **eyji-* > **ēž*, cf. **med^h-io-* > Arm. *mēj*, cf. Lat. *medius* ‘mid, middle’, see also s.vv. *ēš* ‘donkey’ and *gišer* ‘night’, as well as 2.1.2.

The sibilant *ž* instead of the affricate *ǰ* in intervocalic position (cf. Meillet 1936: 28) is not explained satisfactorily. I therefore propose to start with a PIE HD *i*-stem: nom. **h₁ég^{wh}-(ō)i-*, gen. **h₁(e)g^{wh}-i-ós*, cf. Gr. gen. *ἔχιος*. An assibilation **-g^{wh}i-* > *-yǰy-* > *-yžy-* seems very likely. We arrive at PArm. nom. **e(y)ǰi-*, gen. **ēžyo-* > **ēž(i)* : **iž-* > *iž*, obl. *iž-*, with the nominative *iž* analogically reshaped after the oblique *iž-*, as has explicitly been pointed out by de Lamberterie (1978: 266, 281). The last step can probably also help to understand the vocalism of *ji* ‘horse’ (q.v.). For a further discussion on the labiovelar, see Speirs 1978: 7; Viredaz 2005-07: 9-10.

As is well known, the designations for ‘snake’ are liable to tabu-changes (see 2.1.36). In this particular case, however, the phonological explanation seems satisfactory.

il, *o*-stem (Proverbs 31.19 = Gr. *ἄτρακτος* ‘spindle’), **il-ik** (ISg *il-k-aw* in Kanonagirk‘) ‘spindle’.

●DIAL Widespread in the 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 Jahukyan (1972: 282; 1987: 122, 214, 277), Maraš⁶⁵ *ilēl* ‘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 regularly reflected as *ilēl* or *illil* in the dialects of Cilicia and Svedia, see HAB 3: 552a; Ačāryan 2003: 66, 332, 383, 582. Andreasyan (1967: 226-227, 378a), however, presents *illil* ‘to twist’ and its derivatives in the purely dialectal glossary, rendering ClArm. *olorel* as Svedia *uləril*, cf. Maraš *əlrel* [Danielyan 1967: 204a].

Several dialects have a homonymous *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 *xarəm-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 synonymous *uñ u cucə* ‘the true nature, the essence’ (Modern Armenian; see Malxaseanc‘, HBB 3: 597a), literally “the brain and marrow” (see *uteł*), 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,

⁶⁵ Misprinted “Marala”.

shoot, bud'. In the corresponding expression from Sebastia (see Gabikyan 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*). Ač'aryan (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. *leñkti* 'to bend, walk around'; Skt. *āñi-* m. 'axle-pin, lynch-pin; part of the leg above the knee' (RV+); Gr. *ἡλακάτη* f. 'spindle', and connects *il* 'spindle' with *otn* 'spine, etc.' and *uln* 'neck' (q.v.). Comparing the semantic development seen in Gr. *σφόνδύλος* 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-*₈ 'to bow, bend; elbow') and Ĵahukyan (1987: 122, 437) accept this etymology. Others are mostly sceptical about it, see HAB 2: 239; Olsen 1999: 955. It is remarkable that next to Arm. *ilik* 'spindle', there is yet another *ilik* (in a number of dialects; see above) in the meanings 'marrow', 'spinal column', etc., which is considered a loan from Turk. *ilik* 'marrow/moelle' (Ač'arean 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, namely 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-* (**Heh₁-* > Arm. *il*), which is uncertain.

ij, *i*-stem: GDPI *əj-i-c'* in Daniel 2.27 (Cowe 1992: 160); *a*-stem: ISg *əj-a-w* in Eusebius of Caesarea, 'desire' (Movsēs Xorenac'i 1.18, Book of Chries, etc.), 'witch, sorcerer' (Bible+); **əjiam**, **əjjanam** 'to desire, pray; to cast a spell' (Bible+).

For the semantic shift of *ij*, cf. Skt. *yā-* 'to request, implore' > *yātū-* m. 'sorcery, witchcraft' (RV+), Arm. *jatuk* 'sorcerer' (Iranian loan).

●DIAL Ač'aryan (HAB 2: 241a) questions the appurtenance of Larabał **ij-ot-v-il* 'to be angry with someone'. One may assume that the word originally referred to the ecstatic fury of prophets or sorcerers.

●ETYM Ač'aryan (HAB 2: 240b) rejects all the etymologies including those comparing *ij* with Skt. *eh-* 'to strive for, desire' (AV+), YAv. *iziiēiti* 'to desire', *aēzah-* n. 'desire', Gr. *ἰχάινω*, etc. This etymology is worth of consideration. Arm. *ij*, *i-* or *a*-stem 'desire' may be derived from **Hig^h-l-* > PArm. **(h)ij-l-* > *ij* through regular metathesis. The absence of cognates with **-l-* is not a decisive argument against the etymology, since *ij* may have been influenced by synonymous *baļj* (also *i*-stem) and *geļj*.

im 'my', etc.: see s.v. *es* 'I'.

inn, NPI *in(n)un-k'* in Luke 17.17, GDPI *inun-c'* in Genesis 17.24 (vars. *inuc'*, *innuc'*, *ənnuc'*, etc., see Zeyt'unyan 1985: 218), IPI *innam-b-k'* (John Chrysostom); GDPI *inn-u-c'* (Grigor Narekac'i), AblPI *y-inn-u-c'* (Grigor Astuacaban), IPI *innu-k'* (Eusebius of Caesarea); sg. rare and late: gen. *inan(n)* (Socrates, Elias on Aristotle),

loc. *y-inann* (Socrates) ‘nine’ (Bible+); *inn-erord*, *a*-stem: GDSg *innerord-i*, AblSg *y-innerord-ē* (Bible+), ISg *innerord-a-w* (Eusebius of Caesarea) ‘ninth’ (Bible+); *inn-ew-tasn* or *inn-u-tasn* ‘nineteen’, lit. ‘nine and ten’ (Bible+); *inn-sun* ‘ninety’ (q.v.).

●DIAL Ubiquitous in the dialects, mostly as **inə* or **innə* [HAB 2: 244a].

●ETYM From PIE **h₁neun* ‘nine’: Skt. *náya*, YAv. *nauua*, Gr. *έννέα*, Lat. *novem*, Goth. *niun*, OHG *niun*, OCS *devětъ*, Alb. *néntë/nāntë*, etc. Hübschmann 1897: 450-451; HAB 2: 243-244 with lit.; Pokorny 1959: 318; Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 24-25; Mallory/Adams 1997: 403a. For Albanian, see Kortlandt 1986: 45 = 2003: 74; Demiraj 1997: 294-295; 1997a.

The Armenian form has been explained from **h₁neun*, **h₁nun-* (see Beekes 1969: 45-46; Schrijver 1991: 17, 449; cf. Schmitt 1981: 130)⁶⁶. Olsen 1988-89: 481-482 suggests a metathesis **neun̄* > **enun̄-*. The proto-form **enun̄* (see Audouin 1892: 64; Hübschmann *ibid.*; HAB *ibid.*; Jahukyan 1982: 71; Olsen 1999: 6) is untenable, since it would yield Arm. **ing(a)n*. Winter 1965: 101; 1966: 203 starts with **Enewn* (**E* = **h₁*) > **inowan* reduced to **inown* under the influence of *tasn* ‘ten’ (but note that these two numerals are inflected differently). Eichner 1978: 152₃₅ assumes a restructuring **-un̄* > **-un* (see also Olsen 1999: 801, 805). For a critical discussion of these and other views, see Kortlandt 1976: 943; 1987: 62 = 2003: 3₃, 76; Ravnæs 1991: 18, 77-78; Clackson 1994: 124-126.

An interesting and plausible scenario has been proposed by Peters (1991; see also Viredaz 2001-02a: 1-2; sceptical Clackson 1994: 225-226₁₃₄): **h₁néun̄* > **inowan* > *inoan* > *ínon* (contraction and subsequent fixation of the penultimate accent) > *inn*. Beekes 2003: 165 posits **h₁neun* (not **-u-*) > **eneun* > *inn* with loss of the diphthong in last syllable. However, the simplest solution is to start with PArm. **enun-* < **h₁nun-o-*, with the zero grade vocalism taken from the ordinal (Kortlandt 1993: 11; 1994a: 255 = 2003: 103, 100). Such an influence of ordinals is also seen in other numerals, such as *vec* ‘six’ and *tasn* ‘ten’, perhaps also *e(a)wt’n* ‘seven’ (see s.vv.).

The ‘prothetic’ vowel **e-* in the Greek and Armenian forms (**en-* > Arm. *in-*) is now taken as a reflex of **h₁-*, Winter 1965: 101 (see above); Beekes 1969: 45-46; 1987b: 7; 2003: 165, 180; Rix 1970:101; Mayrhofer 1986: 126₁₁₅; Kortlandt 1987: 62; 2001: 12 = 2003: 76, 132; Greppin 1988-89: 479; Viredaz 2001-02a: 1; for a critical discussion and further references, see Olsen 1988-89: 481-482; 1999: 6, 763-764; Lindeman 1990: 28-30; 1997: 131; Clackson 1994: 124-126; Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 24. For a discussion of the ‘prothetic’ vowel, see also Audouin 1892: 61-62, 64; Meillet 1927: 132-133; 1936: 143; Winter 1989: 34.

inn-sun, *i*-stem: GDSg *innəsn-i* (Philo), *ənnəsn-i* (Nersēs Šnorhali), GDPI *innəsn-i-c* (Plato) ‘ninety’ (Bible+).

●DIAL Widespread in the dialects [HAB 2: 244b]. In a number of *kə*-dialects (Nor Naxijewan, Polis, Hamšen, Karin, Xarberd, Zeyt’un, Van, etc.) *innsun* has been replaced by *dəxsan* < Turk. *doqsan* [Ačarean 1902: 342; HAB 2: 244b]. Goris *innəssun*, Marala *innanac’c’un* and others are analogical after *eawt’anasun* ‘seventy’ and *vat’sun* > *vac’c’un* ‘sixty’.

⁶⁶ Szemerényi 1960: 171-173 reconstructs **neun̄*.

●ETYM The decimal form of *inn* ‘nine’, cf. Gr. *ἐνενήκοντα* ‘ninety’ (on which see Chantraine 1968-80: 349b), Lat. *nōnāgintā* ‘id.’, etc., see HAB 2: 244; Meillet 1936: 100-101. The Armenian form points to QIE **h₁nunēkomth₂*. PArm. **in(u)nisun* with penultimate accentuation would probably yield **innisun*. The medial **-i-* may have dropped due to re-analysis as *inn* + *-sun*. Compare *yisun* ‘fifty’, *vat’sun* ‘sixty’, *ut’sun* ‘eighty’. Further, see s.v. *inn* ‘nine’.

ink’n, GDSg *ink’ean*, ISg *ink’eam-b*, NPl *ink’ean-k’*, GDPl *ink’ean-c’* ‘self’ (Bible+).

●DIAL Ubiquitous in the dialects [HAB 2: 246a].

●ETYM See s.v. *iwr* ‘his own’.

irer, *y-/z-irear*, gen.-dat. *irer-a-c’*, instr. *irer-a-w-k’* recipr. ‘each other’ (Bible+).

●DIAL Widespread in the dialects, also with prepositions: Łarabał, Agulis, Ĵula, etc. **(ə)n-d-irear*, Moks **z-irear* [HAB 2: 252]. Muš, Alaškert *h’irar* (HAB *ibid.*) and Moks *h’irar* (Orbeli 2002: 278) point to **y-irear*.

●ETYM No etymology is accepted in HAB 2: 251a; AčařLiak 2, 1954: 118-131.

Rasmussen (1985: 46-48 = 1999: 124-127) suggests **eter-eter-ā-*, cf. OCS *eterь* ‘someone’, Skt. *yatará-* m. ‘which of the two’, Gr. *ἕτερος* ‘one of two’, Lat. *cēterus* ‘the other’, *cēterī* ‘the others’, etc.; typologically compare Latin *alter alterum*, etc. The vocalic problem may be solved by assuming an underlying **iter-* comparable with Skt. *itara-* ‘another, the other’ (Olsen 1999: 392). Thus, we may posit **iter-iter-eh₂-* > **irer-a-* through haplology and loss of the intervocalic **-t-*, although details remain unclear. The *-ear* may be identified with (or have been re-interpreted as containing) the collective marker *-ear* (cf. AčařLiak 2, 1954: 118).

iwr, GSg *iwr-o-y*, DSG *iwr-um*, ISg *iwr-o-v*, GDPl *iwr-o-c’*, IPl *iwr-o-v-k’* refl. pron. ‘his own, etc.’ (Bible+).

●DIAL Ubiquitous in the dialects [HAB 2: 254b].

●ETYM Continues PIE refl. **seue/o-* ‘sich’, cf. Gr. *ἐ, ἐέ*, Lat. *suus, sē*, gen. *suī*, Goth. *sik*, etc.; derived from **seue/o-ro-*, see Hübschmann 1897: 451; Pedersen 1905a: 22 = 1982: 26; Grammont 1918: 244; HAB 2: 253-254 with references; AčařLiak 2, 1954: 117-130; Pisani 1950: 185-186; Pokorny 1959: 882; Eichner 1978: 153₃₉; Schmitt 1981: 117; Ĵahukyan 1982: 39, 147-148; 1987: 146; for the forms, see also Rix 1992: 180; Beekes 1995: 209-210; Szemerényi 1996: 220-221.

The element *-r-* was probably taken from the other pronouns (cf. 1-2pl.pers.pron. *me-r* and *je-r*, see s.v. *mek’* ‘we’) and added to the PIE genitive **seue* at a relatively younger stage; *iwr* probably represents the unstressed form of **ew-r* (for a discussion of these issues, see Meillet 1936: 45, 92; Godel 1975: 111-112; Schmitt 1981: 117-118; Weitenberg 1983a: 118-119; Kortlandt 1983: 11; 1993: 11 = 2003: 41, 103). See also s.v. *hi/ewr* ‘guest’.

Also the *-k’(e)-* of *in-k’n*, *in-k’e-an* ‘self’ has been connected with this etymon (deriving it from **sue-*, cf. Skt. *svá-* ‘his, his own’, etc.), although details remain unclear; see HAB 2: 245-246 with references and a discussion (Ačařyan himself does not accept the etymology); AčařLiak 2, 1954: 118-120; Pokorny 1959: 882; Klingenschmitt 1982: 28-29 (“wohl **im suēm* ‘ihn selbst’”); Ĵahukyan 1982: 148; 1987: 146.

L

lanj-k', *a*-stem 'breast' (Bible+), 'mountain-slope' (Łazar P'arpec'i; dial.).

GDPI *lanj-a-c'* in Job 39.20 (Cox 2006: 253), referring to the breast of a horse; GDPI *lanj-a-c'* in Movsēs Xorenac'i 1.11 (1913=1991: 36^{L1}), referring to 'breast (of a man)'; IPI *lanj-a-w-k'* in Movsēs Xorenac'i 2.85 (1913=1991: 230^{L16}), referring to the chest of a horse. GDPI *lanj-a-c'* occurs also in the letter from Bishop Giwt (5th cent.) to Vač'ē (king of Ałuank') apud Movsēs Kałankatuac'i 1.11, referring to 'breast (of a man)' [V. Ařak'elyan 1983: 23^{L5}].

●DIAL Present in several dialects, in the meanings 'bosom, lap', 'mountain-slope', 'precipice', etc. [HAB 2: 265b].

●ETYM Probably from QIE **h₁lŋg^{wh}-ieh₂-*, cf. Gr. *ἐλαχύς* 'small, short, mean, little', *ἐλαφρός* 'light (in weight)', OIc. *lunga* 'lung', etc., see Meillet 1894: 165; HAB 2: 264-265; AčarLiak 6, 1971: 543; Ĵahukyan 1987: 135; Olsen 1999: 65-66. Alternatively: QIE dual **(h₁)lŋg^{wh}-ih₁-* (cf. Beekes 2003: 178, 190). For a discussion of the anlaut, see 2.1.17.2.

lar, *o*-stem: GDSg *lar-o-y* (Čarəntir), ISg *lar-o-v* (once in the Bible); *i*-stem: GDSg *lar-i* (Nersēs Lambronac'i), ISg *lar-i-v* (Ephrem, Grigor Narekac'i), GDPI *lar-i-c'* (Paterica; Yovhannēs Erzncac'i); *a*-stem: GDPI *lar-a-c'* (Grigor Aršaruni), IPI *lar-a-w-k'* (T'ovmay Arcruni) 'rope, rein, cable, cord, string' (Bible+), 'plumblineline of stone-masons' (Agat'angelos+), 'snare' (Paterica, Grigor Narekac'i), 'mile' (Alexander Romance), 'tendons of the neck' (Philo), 'string of a musical instrument' (Nersēs Lambronac'i, Yovhannēs Erzncac'i), etc. [NHB 1: 879-880]. Refers to the rope of a bridge in T'ovmay Arcruni 2.3 (1985: 150^{L18}; transl. Thomson 1985: 161): *hramayec' zlar kamurjac'n ktrel*: 'he ordered the rope of the bridge to be cut'. See also HAB s.v. *lar* 'a snake'. Verbal **larem** 'to stretch, extend' (Bible+).

For the *o*-stem, cf. Georgian *laro* 'cord, rope, snare' beside *lari* 'string, etc.', both borrowed from Armenian (HAB 2: 268a).

●DIAL The noun *lar* is widespread in the dialects [HAB 2: 267b]. Verbal *larel* means 'to line, make a row' in Suč'ava [AčarĴyan 1953: 267] and 'to chase away' in Muš, Alaškert, Aparan, Xoy [Amatuni 1912: 241-242].

●ETYM Compared with Gr. *ἐβλήρα*, Dor. *αβλήρα*, Hesychian *ἀβλήρα* 'reins' and Lat. *lōrum*, -ī, n. 'thong, rawhide whip, rein' [Lidén 1906: 100-101; HAB 2: 267b; Pokorny 1959: 1143]. The Greek, Latin and Armenian forms are usually derived from **ulēr-*, **ulōr-*, and **ulər-*, respectively. Now reconstructed as **h₁ul(e/o)h₁ro-* (see Beekes 1988: 71; Schrijver 1991: 74-75, 122-123; Clackson 1994: 39; Olsen 1999: 30, 769, 847, with **h₂-*). A QIE **h₁ulh₁ro-* would develop to PArm. **uláro-* > *lar*, *o*-stem. Beside this form, one also may posit a dual **h₁ulh₁r-i(h₁)* > *lar-k'*, *-i-c'* 'reins, tendons'. See also s.vv. *atawri* 'mill; female grinder', *erkan* 'mill'.

In view of phonological difficulties (see Beekes 1969: 64-65; Clackson 1994: 207₃₂ with references and a discussion; de Vaan 2008: 349), I posit a Mediterranean substratum term (see 3.11).

***law-/lap'-, *la/ow-, *lup'** 'flat (hand, stone, etc.)' (dial.), MidArm. **lawš** 'a thin flat bread' (Geoponica+, see MiĴHayBař 1, 1987: 315), dial. ***law(a)š** 'a thin flat bread'.

In Baġirk' hayoc' (Amalyan 1975: 181^{Nr166}, 252^{Nr208}), *lōš* glosses *hasteay* and *šōt'*, respectively.

●DIAL The forms for 'palm, flat of the hand': Muš **lup'*, Ozim **lap'*, Akn **lov-az*, etc. [Ačārean 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. Ařak'elyan 1984a: 147), etc. DialAdd apud NHB (2: 1062c) has *lēp'* and *lep'* 'flat roundish stone' as connected with Lat. *lapis* 'stone'.

Van **law-az*, **lawaz-ik* 'very thin' [Ačārean 1913: 414a], Moks *lāvāzik/k'* 'хворый, исхудалый, тощий' = 'ailing, gaunt, barren' [Orbeli 2002: 237].

Both **lawš* and **lawaš* 'a thin flat bread' are widespread in the dialects (DialAdd apud NHB 2: 1062c; HAB 2: 308b). In some of these, **lawš* also refers to 'broad (ear)' (HAB *ibid.*).

●ETYM Ačāryan (1913: 439-440; see also Saradževa 1986: 130) connects **lup'/lap'* and **lov-az* 'palm' with Goth. *lofa* 'flat of the hand', OHG *lappo* 'palm, blade of an oar', Lith. *lōpa*, Latv. *lāpa* 'paw', Russ. *lāpa* 'paw', etc. (see ĒtimSlovSlavJaz 14, 1987: 26-27; Saradževa 1986: 130), 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. In this connection the following words seem to be relevant: Lat. *lapis* m. 'stone, milestone' (see the dialectal section), Gr. *λέπας* n. 'bare rock, mountain', etc., especially Ibero-Romance **lappa* 'stone plate' (formally and semantically identical with Arm. **lap'* 'flat stone'). These forms are considered to be of non-IE origin (for references see Hamp 1967: 16, without Armenian).

Also **law-az* 'very thin' may belong here, though Ĵahukyan (1987: 135) represents it separately. Note the same suffix in **lov-az* 'palm'.

Various etymologies have been proposed for **law(a)š* 'a thin flat bread' (HAB 4: 639; N. Mkrtčjan 2005: 248-249; A. Petrosyan 2007: 8-10); none of them is entirely convincing. Ačāryan (HAB 2: 308a) notes that the form **lavaš* is found in Persian, Kurdish, Turkish, Georgian, etc. It is unknown, he proceeds, whether Arm. **lawaš* or Pers. *lavāš* is the source of all these. According to Cabolov (1, 2001: 595), Kurd. *lōš/lawāš* and Pers. *lavāš* (the Armenian forms are not mentioned) are loans from Turk. *lavaš*.

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. *matl-aš* from *matal* 'young, fresh', etc. (see HAB 3: 267b). Note that both **law-aš* and *matl-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 Ačāryan (HAB 2: 308a) informs, **lavaš* 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, *lavaš* 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-/lap'* 'flat', and Muš has **lup'*. European cognates point to PIE **loHp-eh₂-* or **leh₃p-eh₂-*. One may

hypothetically reconstruct a HD h_2 -stem: nom. **lōHp-eh₂*- or **lēh_{3p}-eh₂*-, gen. **lHp-h₂-ós*. This would yield PArm. nom. **luv*-, obl. **lap*'-. Of these, analogically: **lup*'-, **law*-, etc. This is, of course, highly hypothetical. We may be dealing with a substratum word.

For the phonological treatment of the alternation *-w/p*'-, see Weitenberg 1992.

leārn, GDSg *lerin*, LocSg *i lerin*, AllSg *i leārn*, AblSg *i leārn-ē*, ISg *leram-b*, NPl *lerin-k*', API *lerin-s*, GDPl *leran-c*', AblPl *i leranc*' (e.g. *i leranc' ənjuc*' : *ἀπὸ ὀρέων παρδάλεων* in Song of Songs 4.8), IPl *leram-b-k*' (abundant evidence in the Bible, see Astuacaturean 1895: 643-647); API *lerun-s* (Apocrypha) 'mountain' (Bible+).

●DIAL Present in Muš, Alaškert, and in a number of dialects of NW, W and SW peripheries. The other dialects use *sar* instead [HAB 2: 270b]. Ararat *leř* refers to 'hard stone' [HAB 2: 270b], *leř-k'ar* 'hard stone' [Markosyan 1989: 303a]; cf. also a textual illustration for Širak *leř-k'ar* [Mxit'areanc' 1901: 180^{L3}]. For the typology of this type of compounds, see s.v. *pal* 'rock'.

●ETYM The connection with Gr. *κλίτύς*, *ύος* f. 'slope, hill', Lat. *clivus*, *ī* m. 'sloping ground, slope', etc. (Bugge 1889: 7-8; Ernout/Meillet 1959: 127-128; cf. Pisani 1950: 179-180) is uncertain (see Hübschmann 1897: 451-452). These words belong with PIE **k₁lei-* 'to lean, incline' (cf. Mallory/Adams 1997: 348b without Armenian), and the Armenian word has been derived from **k₁leit_r-* with hesitation, cf. Goth. **hleipra* 'booth, tent', OHG (*h*)*leitar* 'ladder', etc. (Pokorny 1959: 601; Solta 1960: 39-40; Schmitt 1972-74: 25; Lehmann 1986: 187b; Saradževa 1986: 20; Jahukyan 1987: 132, 258). Ačaryan (HAB 2: 270) rejects this and other etymological suggestions and leaves the origin of *leārn* open.

Hamp 1967: 16-17 compares *leārn* with OIr. *lie* and Gr. *λίᾱς* m. 'stone'. For the Armenian form he posits **lēšə-re/ēn*, "which would be a nominalization in *-en* of **lēšə-ro-* 'stony' ". Olsen 1999: 122 accepts the comparison and assumes a heteroclitic **-ser/sen*-stem where the *-n* of the oblique cases (loc. *-en*) has somehow been added to the NAccSg **lēh_{2s}*'. She points out that the exact procedure cannot be determined.

Neither this etymology is convincing. It becomes slightly more probable if we consider also Alb. *lērē* f. 'Steinhalde, Geröllhalde; Felssturz', *ler* m., *lère* f. 'id.' (derivative *leránē* f. 'Steinhalde, Steinfeld; steiniger Bach'), which has been derived from **leh₁-ur* or **leu₁-r* (see Demiraj 1997: 237-238). We may be dealing with a Mediterranean-European substratum word.

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-boyt*' 'lobe of the liver' (Bible+); see s.v. *boyt*'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 the 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') *lerdagoy*n. Compare the dialectal meaning 'light, bright red' of *leard*.

●DIAL Widespread in the 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. *péčen* 'liver' : dial. 'clot of blood', pl. 'internal organs of the body (heart, lungs, liver)'; see SIRusNarGov 26, 1991: 348-349.

In Karin, *lert* 'refers to clotted blood [HAB, *ibid.*; H. Mkrtč'yan 1952: 146a]. According to HayLezBrbBař 2, 2002: 222a (with two textual illustrations), in this dialect 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+), NAccSg *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: **Hiek^wr(-t)*, gen. **Hiek^wn-ós*.

On the final **-t*, see Clackson 1994: 55-56. On the loss of the intervocalic **k^w*, 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 *leti* 'gall, bile', although the origin of this word is obscure, and/or *lanj* 'breast', etymologically 'lung'.

lezu, *a*-stem: GDSg *lezu-i*, AblSg *i lezu-ē*, ISg *lezu-a-w*, GDPl *lezu-a-c'*, IPl *lezu-a-w-k'* (rich evidence in the Bible, see Astuacaturean 1895: 647-648); *o*-stem: GDSg *lezu-o-y* and ISg *lezu-o-v* (Judges 7.5/6, Ephrem, Grigor Narekac'i, etc.) 'tongue; speech, language' (Bible+).

●DIAL Ubiquitous in the dialects. Some of them represent **lizu* instead of *lezu* [HAB 2: 272b].

●ETYM The word is a blend of PIE **dnǵ^hu(e)h₂-* 'tongue' (OIr. *tengae*, Goth. *tuggō*, OHG *zunga*, Skt. *jihvā-*, *juhū-* f., Av. *hizuuā-*, *hizū-* m., etc.) and PIE **leǵ^h-* > Arm. *lizem* 'to lick' (q.v.); cf. especially Lat. *lingua* vs. OLat. *dingua* and Lith. *liežiūvis* 'tongue'. See Hübschmann 1877: 25; 1897: 452; Pedersen 1906: 419 = 1982: 197; Meillet 1910-11a: 240; HAB 2: 272 with more references; Pokorny 1959: 223; Hilmarsson 1982: 356, 358; Mayrhofer EWAia 1, 1992: 591-593; Mallory/Adams 1997: 594; Olsen 1999: 67-68.

For a discussion of the vocalism of dial. **lizu* vs. ClArm. *lezu*, see Meillet 1894: 164; 1896b: 53; 1936: 11, 55; Pedersen 1906: 419 = 1982: 197; HAB 2: 272b;

Kortlandt 1987: 62 = 2003: 76; Olsen 1999: 67. For a critical discussion of the problems of the initial *l-*, the medial *-z-* and the vocalism, see Winter 1982: 171-173.

The QIE reconstruction of the Armenian words may be **l(e)ng^hu-eh₂-* > PArm. **l(e)nju-a-* ‘tongue’ and **leig^h-* > **leiz-* ‘to lick’.

lerk (*i*-stem in Gram.) ‘hairless’, dial. ‘smooth’ (Bible+). In “Adamgirk” (Araf‘el Siwnec‘i, 15th cent.): *lek* (with loss of *-r-*; cf. dial.).

●DIAL Alaškert *lerk* ‘*smooth (leather or mountain)’; Alaškert, Xotorjur, 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 (cf. Olsen 1999: 965). 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 *o-* only occurs in the form with *o*-ablaut is suggestive of the following idea. If Arm. *lanj-k* ‘breasts’ 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 *ɫ*); see 2.1.17.2. The reconstructed form would be, then, **h₁lerg^w-*. This is, of course, hypothetical.

See also s.v. *merk* ‘naked’.

***lēz-** ‘to lick’: *liz(an)em*, *lizum* ‘to lick’ (Bible+); **lez-* in *lezum* ‘id.’ (Bible+).

●DIAL Ubiquitous in the dialects [HAB 2: 278].

●ETYM From PIE **leig^h-* ‘to lick’: Skt. *reh-/leh-*, YAv. *riz-*, Gr. *λείχω*, Lith. *liēžti*, OCS *lizati*, *ližq*, Lat. *lingō*, etc., see NHB 1: 886b; Hübschmann 1877: 25; 1897: 452; Meillet 1910-11a: 239-242; HAB 2: 278a with more references; Pokorny 1959: 668; Saradževa 1986: 140; Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 463; Mallory/Adams 1997: 351-352; Beekes 2003: 157; Cheung 2007: 310-311.

The verbal variant *lezum* is due to influence of *lezu* ‘tongue’ (Hübschmann 1897: 452). Further see s.v. *lezu* ‘tongue, language’.

li (*o*-stem, NHB 1: 884c) ‘full, abundant; perfect, whole’, adv. ‘fully, completely, firmly’ (Bible+); **lir**, *i*-stem: ISg *lr-i-w* ‘plenitude’ (Bible+); **lnum** or **lñanim** 1sg.aor. *lc-i*, 3sg.aor. *e-lic*, med. *lc-a-*, imper. *lic*, partic. *lc-eal* ‘to fill; to fill oneself, be filled’ (Bible+); **li-anam** ‘to be filled to repletion, be overfilled, be satiate, luxuriate’ (Yovhannēs Ōjnec‘i /8th cent./, Grigor Narekac‘i, Nersēs Lambronac‘i); MidArm. **lman**, **i lman** ‘entire; entirely, fully’, various verbal forms in **lmm-** ‘to fill, fulfil, etc.’ (MijHayBař 1, 1987: 279, 308-309; marked as “mostly dialectal” in NHB 1: 891a).

●DIAL The forms **li-k* and **lin-k* ‘full’ and the verbal **lc(-n)-* ‘to fill’ are widespread in the dialects. Remarkable are Van *ilin* [Ačarıyan 1952: 263], Šatax *h’lin* [M. Muradyan 1962: 197a] (note also *hlin* in a riddle, S. Harut‘yunyan 1965: 9b^{Nr67Ae}), Polis, Nor Naxijewan *ilink*, Zeyt‘un *illenk*‘ə, etc. ‘full’, which point to a prepositional **i lin(-k)*. The preposition *i* is also seen in Sebastia *illenal* = *i* + the verb *lianal* (cf. Polis *lenal* from *lianal*), Muš, etc. *h’əlnal*, Sivri-Hisar *əllul*, Nor Naxijewan *ilink*‘c‘nel, etc. Further note Polis, Rodost‘o *lman* ‘entire’, etc. [HAB 2: 279-280].

●ETYM Since NHB 1: 884c, etc. (see HAB 2: 279), compared with Gr. *πίμπλημι*, *-αμαι* ‘to fill, make full’, intr. ‘to fill oneself, be/become full’, *πλήρης* ‘full’, *πλέως*, Ion. *πλέος* ‘full’, Lat. *plēre* ‘to fill’, *plērus(que)* ‘most of, majority, composing the greater part’, Skt. *par* ‘to fill’, pres. *pīparti*, **pīprati* (cf. 3sg.impf.med. *āpīprata* ‘hat gefüllt’), participle *prātā-* ‘filled’, MPers. *hambārīdan* ‘to fill’, etc. The verbal stem is reconstructed as PIE **pelh₁-* : **pleh₁-* (see Schrijver 1991: 139-140; Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 89-90; Mallory/Adams 1997: 201b; Rix 2003: 373; Cheung 2007: 295-297).

Arm. *li*, *o*-stem, and *li-r* derive from **pleh₁-(i)o-* or **pleh₁-to-* (cf. Gr. *πλέος* ‘full’, Skt. *prātā-* ‘filled’), and **pleh₁-r-* (cf. Gr. *πλήρης* ‘full’, Lat. *plērus*), respectively. For *li-r* vs. verbal **li-n-* cf. *di-r* vs. *d(i)-n-em* ‘to put’. See Hübschmann 1897: 452; HAB 2: 279; Pokorny 1959: 799; Ałabekyan 1979: 87; Ĵahukyan 1982: 126; 1987: 143, 185; Olsen 1999: 39. For *lnum* with **-nu-* see, apart from the references already mentioned, see Godel 1965: 26; 1975: 52, 69, 125; Ĵahukyan 1982: 184, 195; Klingenschmitt 1982: 253-255; Olsen 1999: 801, 805. Compare *hehum* ‘to pour’ < **pel(H)-nu-* (q.v.), probably belonging to the same verbal root. See further s.vv. *arnum* ‘to take’, *zgenum* ‘to clothe’, *ənkenum* ‘to cause to fall, throw down’. For the aorist *e-lic* < **e-plē-ske* (with **-ske/o-* added to the old root aorist **plē-(s)-*, cf. Ved. *āprās*, Gr. *ἔπλησε*, etc.), see Godel 1965: 37; 1975: 127.

The dialectal construction **i-lin* / *y-lin* is etymologically identical with *y-ti* ‘pregnant’, q.v. (for a discussion, see Weitenberg 1986: 96, 96₁₅, 97₁₈). Both contain reflexes of PIE **h₁en-* ‘in’. The derivatives are thus comparable with Lat. *im-pleō* ‘to fill, fulfil; to make pregnant’, etc. (see also s.vv. *yetc* ‘full’, *ytp’anam* ‘to be filled to repletion, be overfilled’, *yolov* ‘much, plenty’, all probably from the same etymon).

As to the form **lin*, it is tempting to link it with Lat. *plēnus* ‘full’. The latter form derives from **pleh₁-no-*, which reflects the PIE **plh₁-no-* (cf. Skt. *pūrñā-*, Lith. *pilnas*, etc.) analogically reshaped after the full-grade **pleh₁-* > *plēre* (Schrijver 1991: 184, 341, cf. 182). A similar process may be responsible for Arm. **lin*.

MidArm. and dial. *lman* 'entire; entirely, fully' is reminiscent of Skt. *pārīmaṇ-* 'completely, wholly'.

***lik'-** : *lk'anem*, 1sg.aor. *lk'-i*, 3pl.aor. *lk'-in* (Bible+), 3sg.aor. *lik'* in Nersēs Lambronac'i (no evidence for *e-lik'* in NHB 2: 908c), imper. *lik'* (Ephrem) 'to leave, let go, release, abandon' (Bible+); *lk'anīm*, 1sg.aor. *lk'-a-y*, 3sg.aor. *lk'-a-w*, 3pl *lk'-a-n* (Bible+) 'to be left, become weak or depressed, be dissolved, be desperate, desert' (Bible+), cf. also *lik' linel* (Ephrem); *lk'anam* 'to become weak or depressed' (Zgōn-Afrahāt); *das-a-lik'*, *i*-stem: ISg *dasalk'-i-w* (Ganjik'), *dasalk'-i-c'* (Philo) 'deserter' (Book of Chries, John Chrysostom, Philo, etc.).

●DIAL The form *lk'anam* has been preserved in Łazax *lk'anal* 'to become weak, be depressed with pain' [HAB 2: 288a]. Ačāryan HAB ibid. hesitantly adduces also Ararat, Łazax, Šulaver *lk'-lk'al* 'to become frightened, start trembling', *lk'-lk'-oc'* 'tremble, fear'.

●ETYM From PIE **l(e)ik^w-* 'to leave': Skt. *rec-*, pres. *riṇákti* 'to leave, let, release', Iran. **raič* 'to leave, let, abandon', Gr. *λείπω*, *λιμπάνω* 'to let, leave', Lat. *linquō*, *līquī* 'to leave, quit, forsake; to abandon',⁶⁷ OIr. *léicid* 'leaves' (see McCone 1998), etc. See Hübschmann 1883: 34; 1897: 455; HAB 2: 287-288; Pokorny 1959: 669; Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 457-458; Mallory/Adams 1997: 348-349; Cheung 2007: 307-308.

PIE nasal-infixed present **li-n-k^w-* was remodeled to **lik^w-η-* > Arm. pres. *lk'anem*. 3sg.aor. (*e-*)*lik'* is derived from thematic aorist **é-lik^w-e-t*, cf. Gr. *ἔλιπε*, and the imperative *lik'* reflects IE **lik^we*, cf. Gr. *λίπε*. For a discussion on these and related issues, see Hübschmann ibid.; HAB ibid.; Meillet 1936 104, etc. passim (see the index in 174-175); Kuiper 1937: 113, 117; Vaillant 1938: 26-27; Godel 1975: 117; Hamp 1975: 104, 106; Jasanoff 1979: 133; Kortlandt 1980: 102; 1996: 41 = 2003: 30, 115; K. Schmidt 1980: 42; 1980a: 2-3; 1985: 86; Schmitt 1981: 135, 145, 152; Ĵahukyan 1982: 178-179; Rix 1992: 216; Clackson 1994: 84-85; McCone 1998; Olsen 1999: 782; Viredaz 2001-02: 32-33; Beekes 2003: 177.

loganam 'to bathe, wash (the body)' (Philo, Alexander Romance, etc.), caus. *logac'-uc'-anem*, 3sg.aor. *logac'oyc'* (P'awstos Buzand 5.7, 1883=1984: 174^{L-10}); *logan-k'*, *a*-stem: *logan-a-c'* (Alexander Romance), IPI *logan-a-w-k'* (Philo) 'bath, washing'

●DIAL The verb *loganam* is present in a few W and SW dialects [HAB 2: 291a]. In Muš and Van groups we find a blend with *loł-* 'to swim': Muš, Alaškert *lołgənal*, Moks *löłkanal* vs. *lökənal* 'to bathe', etc. [HAB 2: 291a; Orbeli 2002: 239]; Moks -*kä-* is from *-ga-* through Ačāryan's Law.

●ETYM Related with Gr. *λούω*, *λο(φ)έ-σαι* 'to bathe, wash (the body)', Lat. *lavō*, *lavere* 'to wash; to bathe, soak', *lavāre* 'to bathe', etc., see Hübschmann 1897: 452; HAB 2: 291; Pokorny 1959: 692; Mallory/Adams 1997: 108b.

For a phonological and morphological discussion, see Winter 1965: 108; Beekes 1969: 22, 232; Kortlandt 1976: 93; 1983: 10 = 2003: 3, 40; Eichner 1978: 150₂₇, 151; Klingenschmitt 1982: 115-118; Ĵahukyan 1982: 184; Beekes 2003: 157. The PIE proto-form is usually reconstructed as **louh₃₋* (or **louh₁₋*, see Schrijver 1991:

⁶⁷ The comparison with Lat. *linquō* has first been suggested in NHB 1: 908c.

396-398, 444-446 with an extensive discussion). Further see s.v. *luanam* 'to wash, bathe'.

***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' (Ezrik Kołbac'i, Lazar P'arpec'i, Hexaameron, etc.).

Illustration: In Łazar P'arpec'i 1.16 (1904=1985: 27^{L15f}; transl. Thomson 1991: 63): *i loyc arajnardac* 'through dissolute leaders' (see the passage s.v. *metk* 'soft, weak, slack').

●DIAL *Juła lucel*, Axalc'xa, Ararat *lucel* (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', *λῶσ(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 a 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 **leuǵ-*: Skt. *rujāti* : *roj-* 'to break (open)', Iran. *rauǵ-* 'to break, burst', Lith. *láužti* 'to break', etc. (see Pokorny 1959: 686; Jahukyan 1987: 136, 178; Cheung 2007: 318; cf. Pedersen 1906: 359 = 1982: 137). Jahukyan (1987: 178) points out that a contamination is possible.

loys, *o*-stem 'light' (Bible+).

●DIAL Dialectally ubiquitous [HAB 2: 296a].

●ETYM Since Awetik'ean (1815, apud HAB 2: 296), connected with Lat. *lūx*, *lūcis*, f. 'light', Gr. *λευκός* 'clear, white', Skt. *róka-* m. 'light', OPers. *raucah-* n. 'day', etc. (see Hübschmann 1897: 453; HAB 2: 296; Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 463-464). See also s.vv. *lusn* 'white spot', *lusin* 'moon'.

***loyc'-**: pres. *luc'anem*, 1sg.aor. **luc'-i*, 3sg.aor. *e-loyc'*, 3pl.aor. *luc'-in* (Bible, Astuacaturean 1895: 657) 'to light, kindle, ignite, set on fire' (Bible+); *luc'ki*, *ea-* stem: GDPI *luc'ke-a-c'* (Yovhanēs Draxanakertc'i, 9-10th cent.) 'burning material, fuel, warming material, poultice' (Elišē, Afrahat/Zgōn, Nersēs Šnorhali, etc.); *luc'-umn* (Barseł Čon), GDSg *luc'-man* (Nersēs Lambronac'i, Yovhannēs Erznkac'i), ISg *luc'-mam-b* and NPI *luc'-mun-k'* (Grigor Narekac'i) 'lighting, kindling, ardour'; *-loyc'* in compounds (Zgōn-Afrahat, Movsēs Kałankatuac'i, etc.).

●DIAL Preserved in peripheral NW dialects: Hamšen *luc'-uš* 'to burn, kindle', 1sg.aor.act. *luc'-uc'-i*, imper. *luc'-ir*, participle *luc'-aj* 'burnt, kindled', mediopassive *lus-n-uš* < **luc'-(a)n-* 'to be burnt, kindled', 1sg.aor.med. *luc'-a* [HAB 2: 297a; Ačařean 1947: 68, 130, 232]; Xotorjur *luc'unul*, imper. *luc'-ur*; *luc'nil*, 3sg.aor.med. *luc'-a-w* [YušamXotorj 1964: 459].

●ETYM Together with *loys*, *o*-stem 'light' (q.v.), connected with Skt. *rócate*, aor. *aroci*, *rucāná-*, *arocišta* 'to shine, be bright, be radiant', *róka-* m. 'light' (see Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 463-464), Gr. *λευκός* 'clear, white, bright', Hitt. *lukk-* 'to

light; to set fire', etc. (see HAB 2: 296-297 with lit.; Saradževa 1986: 45; Mallory/Adams 1997: 505a).

Hübschmann 1897: 455 posits **louk-s-* or inchoative **(l)ouk-sk-* and compares with *harc'anem* 'to ask, question' (q.v.). The former solution is accepted in HAB 2: 296-297. Others prefer the **-sk-* inchoative or present (Meillet 1936: 107; Pokorny 1959: 687; Jahukyan 1982: 74, 179, 229₄₅; 1987: 136, 178). In the case of *harc'anem*, the **-sk-* is assured by cognate forms: Ved. *pr̥chāmi*, Lat. *poscō*, etc. (see s.v.), whereas for *luc'anem* no such corroborative evidence is found. I am therefore inclined to the sigmatic aorist **leuk-s-* (see Pedersen 1906: 425 = 1982: 203; Kortlandt 1987a: 51; 1994: 29; 1996: 42; 1999: 47 = 2003: 80-81, 105, 115-116, 129).

The derivation from **louk-je-* (Godel 1975: 82; Klingenschmitt 1982: 83; Olsen 1999: 51₁₀₅, 197-198, 236₄₇, 534, 811, 813₆₂) is untenable.

losdi 'salmon', unattested. According to Norayr, a MidArm. word (see HAB 2: 297a, without any further data or comment). Ališan (1920: 53) mentions *losdi* 'saumon' as a man-sized fish which enters up the rivers Kur and Erax/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. *lāšis*, 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 Jahukyan 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 **loks-* would yield Arm. **loc-*, and before a dental stop, **los-* or, perhaps better, **loš-*, as in *veštasan* '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'. 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 ref.) 'quail' (Hexaemeron, Aristakēs Lastivertc'i, etc.); **lor-a-marg**, *i*-stem (ISg *loramarg-i-w* (Zak'aria Kat'olikos, 9th cent.); *o*-stem: GDSg *loramarg-o-y* (Philo), **lor-a-marg-i** 'a quail-like bird' (both Bible+).

In Hexaemeron (NPI *lor-k'*), 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. *ὄρνιθο-μήτρα* f. 'a bird which migrates with quails, perhaps corncrake, landrail, Rallus crex' in the Bible. For attestations and a 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 Ačaryan (HAB 3: 276a; see also Olsen 1999: 689), the second component is **marg* 'bird' (Iranian loan, cf. YAv. *mərəya-*, Oss. *marǰ*, etc. 'bird', see Cheung

2002: 202-203), also found in *siramarg* ‘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. *ušturmury*, *šuturmury* ‘ostrich’ < ‘camel-bird’, cf. Arm. *ištrmut* ‘id.’ (13th cent.+) [HAB 2: 247-248], Khwar. *šmy* [*ušmuy], etc. [Teubner 1974: 301-302].

●DIAL Widespread in the dialects [HAB 2: 298a].

In a number of the 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. Ařak‘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); Greppin apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 249b. Clackson (1994: 182) considers the etymology 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, namely Arm. *karič* ‘scorpion’, dial. also ‘crayfish’ : Gr. *κᾶρίς* ‘Crustacea’ vs. Arm. *kor* ‘scorpion’ : Gr. *κοῦρίς*, *κωρίς* ‘Crustacea’ (see s.vv.).

The meaning of Hitt. *lari(ja)*- c. is unknown (ChicHittDict [1-n] 1989: 46b); it has been conjectured that the word refers to a sea-bird and is related with Gr. *λάρος* (see Tischler HethEtymGlos 2.5-6, 1990: 44 with lit.; Watkins 1995: 141₁₆). If this is accepted (which is far from certain), one is tempted to posit an *i*-stem Mediterranean-Anatolian bird-name probably of substratum origin, **lo/ar-i*: Arm. *lor*, *i*-stem, Gr. *λαρίς*, Hitt. *lari*-.

EArm. **(h)ülör*, **(h)əlör* : 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*. See also s.v. *orlor* ‘a kind of bird’. [Is the vocalism of *lor* also due to contamination with *oror*?]. In view of the Greek word, the etymological meaning of Arm. *lor* may be ‘sea-gull’, thus the contamination may have taken place at a relatively old stage 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 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.

Isem, aor. *lu-a-*, imper. *lu-r* (very rich evidence in the Bible, Astuacaturean 1895: 667), new aor. *lseac*‘ > *lsec*‘ Grigor Narekac‘i (10th cent.), etc. ‘to hear, listen; to

obey' (Bible+), *ls-u* 'obedient' in Timot'ēos Kuz = Timothy Aelurus, 5th or 6th cent. (Ačařean 1908-09a, 1: 371a^{Nr24}), Grigor Narekac'i; *lu arnem* 'to make hear, proclaim', *lu linim* 'to be heard, proclaimed' (both Bible+); *lu i lu* 'in hearing, to one's hearing, hearable' (Bible+), e.g. Job 13.17 (Cox 2006: 115): *zi patmec* 'ic' *jez lu i lu* "for I will declare in your hearing" : *ἀναγγελῶ γὰρ ὑμῶν ἀκουόντων*); *h-lu* 'obedient, compliant' (Bible+), *an-lu* 'disobedient' (Cyril of Jerusalem, Dionysius the Areopagite); *lu-r* 'hearing, fame, report, preaching, obedience' (q.v.); *lu-ř*, *a*-stem: GDPI *lř-a-c* (Book of Chries) 'silent', *lřem* 'to be silent', *luř-luř* 'silent, silently' (all Bible+), *luř-muř* 'silent, silently' (John Chrysostom).

For the paradigm pres. *lsem* vs. aor. *lu-a-*, see Meillet 1913: 105; Łaragyulyan 1961: 157-158; Ę. Tumanjan 1971: 385-388; Godel 1975: 53; Schmitt 1981: 154-155; Ęahukyan 1982: 188-189, 198; Kortlandt 1996: 36 = 2003: 111.

●DIAL The verb *lsem* with a generalized paradigm is ubiquitous in the dialects [HAB 2: 307b]. The root **lu* has been preserved in Łarabał *lũ* 'listen, wait!', e.g. *lũ kac* 'lũ asem 'listen, wait, let me say' (HAB 2: 307b); according to Davt'yan 1966: 368: *lũ kenal*, imper. *lũ kac* '.

See also s.v. *luř* 'silent'.

●ETYM Since long (see HAB 2: 307 for references), derived from PIE **kleu-* 'to hear': Skt. *śrav-*, aor. *á-śravam*, *á-śrot* 'to hear', *śru-tá-* 'heard, famous', Gr. *κλύω* 'to hear, obey', *κλυτός* 'famous', Lat. *clueō* 'to be called, be named, be reputed', OCS *shuti* 'be called', etc., Hübschmann 1883: 33; 1897: 453-454; Meillet 1908-09c; Pokorny 1959: 605; Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 666-667; Mallory/Adams 1997: 262b.

The present form **lu-s-* is considered to represent PIE **klu-s-* > **klu-k-* through assimilation like in *skesur* 'husband's mother', cf. *luř* which requires **klu-s-r-* vs. *lu-r-* from **klu-ro-* (Meillet 1908-09c: 338; HAB 2: 307a; Pokorny 1959: 605). The derivation from **klu-sk-* (Hübschmann 1897: 453-454 with hesitation) is untenable; one expects **luc-* from it. Others explain **lus-* from a present form **klu-k-* with the regular development **uk-* > PArm. **uk-*, and the aorist *lu-a-* is treated as inherited root or sigmatic (with loss of intervocalic **-s-*) aorist (see Meillet 1936: 133; Godel 1975: 78, 114, 122; Schmitt 1981: 154; Klingenschmitt 1982: 157-159; Ęahukyan 1982: 73, 171; Kortlandt 1995: 15 = 2003: 108); for a discussion and further references, see Clackson 1994: 86, 217120, 217121; on the **-k*-present, see also Weitenberg 1980: 209, 211-212; Beekes 1995: 231.

According to an ingenious explanation of Kortlandt (1987a: 50; 1996: 40-41; 1999: 48 = 2003: 80, 114, 130), *lsem* represents a sigmatic aorist stem with a secondary nasal infix **klu-n-s-*, just as *ampem* 'to drink' (q.v.). We can also start with an old present **kl(e)u-s-* (see Beekes 1995: 231) with addition of another present marker, infix **-n-*, at a relatively younger stage, when the function of the present **-s-* had become opaque. Typologically compare reduplicated present **pi-ph₃-e-ti* > **(h)ipem* > new present **(h)ip-ne-mi* > *ampem* 'to drink'; **sk*-present **gnH-sk-* + present **je-* > *čanač'em* vs. aor. *can-i* 'to know, be acquainted' (see s.vv.).

Arm. *hrč'ak* 'fame' has no satisfactory etymology (cf. HAB 3: 128b; Ałayan 1974: 41). Olsen (1999: 251, 960) takes it as a word of unknown origin with "a suggestively Iranian appearance". I tentatively suggest a derivation from an unattested Iranian **hu-srutya-* 'of good repute, famous', cf. Av. *hu-srauuah-*, MPers.

hu-sraw ‘of good repute, famous’, Skt. *su-śrávas-* ‘id.’, *śrútya-* ‘to be heard, famous, glorious’, *su-śrótu-* ‘gern erhörend’, *su-śrúṇa-* ‘gute Erhörung findend’, Gr. *εὐκλείης* ‘of good repute, famous’, etc. (for the forms, see Schmitt 1967: 81-93; Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 666-667). In view of the sound development *-sr- > Arm. -r-, which is characteristic of native Armenian words but not for Iranian loanwords, as well as *-tyV- > -č-, one may assume a very old Iranian borrowing, compare the well-known problems of *arcat* ‘silver’ (q.v.), *partēz* ‘garden’, etc. Thus: **hu-srutyā-ka-* ‘good repute, fame’ > Arm. **huṛuč’áka-* > *hrč’ak* ‘fame’. Structurally compare also *h-lu* ‘obedient’ (q.v.) composed of **hu-* < **su-* ‘good’ and **lu-* ‘hearing, heard’ from **klu-tV-*, although the semantic correspondence is not straightforward.

Further, see s.vv. **lu* ‘hearing’, *luṛ* ‘silent’, *lur* ‘hearing, fame, obedience’.

lu, *o*-stem: GDSg *lu-o-y* (1 Kings 24.15, Grigor Narekac’i), AblSg *lu-ē* (Fables by Vardan Aygekc’i), ISg *lu-o-v* var. *lw-o-v* in Eznik Kołbac’i (A. A. Abrahamyan 1994: 118^{L-2}); NPI *lu-an-k’* (Aṛak’el Siwnec’i, 14-15th cent.) ‘flea’ (Bible+).

Renders Gr. *ψύλλος* ‘flea’ in the only Biblical attestation, viz. 1 Kings 24.15.

MidArm. *lv-ič* ‘a kind of parasitic insect’ in Geoponica (MijHayBaṛ 1, 1987: 314a).

●DIAL Ubiquitous in the dialects. Xarberd has *lu-n*, gen. *lv-an*, pl. *lu-n-er*, cf. also Nor Naxijewan *lu*, pl. *lu-n-er* [HAB 2: 299b]. T’iflis *lvánir* (HAB *ibid.*) probably reflects pl. **lu-an* (cf. MidArm. *lu-an-k’* above) + the usual pl. marker *-(n)er*.

●ETYM Since Hübschmann (1883: 33; 1897: 453), derived from the PIE word for ‘flea’: Skt. *plúṣi-* m. ‘flea’, Gr. *ψύλλα* f. < **psul-ia*, Lat. *pūlex* f. (**pusl-*), OHG *flōh* m., Lith. *blusà*, Russ. *bloxá* ‘flea’, etc. (Pokorny 1959: 102; Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 197-198; Mallory/Adams 1997: 206a).

As far as the anlaut is concerned, Skt. *plúṣi-* is the closest to the Armenian form (Bugge 1889: 11); cf. also *ψύλλα* f. < **psul-ia* which seems to reflect **plusia*. Since **b^hlus-* or **blus-* would yield Arm. **ətbu-* and **ətpu-*, respectively, Arm. *lu*, *o*-stem, is derived from QIE **pluso-* (Meillet 1922g; cf. 1936: 47; HAB 2: 299; Jahukyan 1982: 72; Olsen 1999: 20). For an *o*-stem insect-name, possibly feminine in origin, and for *-ič*, see s.v. *mun* ‘itch; gnat, midge’; for the problem of gender compare also *nu* ‘daughter-in-law’, q.v. (see Meillet 1922g: 143; Olsen 1999: 820).

For the irregular alternation **p/b^h-* (cf. Lubotsky 1988: 30) compare **k/g^h-* in the word for ‘nit’ (see s.v. *anic* ‘nit’); cf. Meillet 1922g: 143.

Formally, Arm. *lu* ‘flea’ may also be derived from the word for ‘louse’: OHG, OEngl. *lūs* f. ‘louse’, MWelsh *lleu* ‘lice’, Lith. *liūlė* ‘louse’, Russ. *voš’*, Skt. *yūkā-* ‘louse’, Shughni *jūg* ‘plant-louse’, etc. (on this PIE etymon, see Pokorny 1959: 692; Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 535 = 1995, 1: 453; Schrijver 1995: 332-333; Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 415; Mallory/Adams 1997: 357). However, the derivation of Arm. *lu* ‘flea’ from **pluso-* ‘flea’ is impeccable.

***lu** ‘hearing, heard’, see s.v. *lsem* ‘to hear’.

●ETYM Usually derived from PIE **klu-to-*, cf. Skt. *śrutá-* ‘heard, famous’, Gr. *κλυτός* ‘famous’, Lat. *in-clutus* ‘renowned, celebrated’, OIr. *-cloth* ‘was heard’ (Hübschmann 1897: 453; Meillet 1936: 174; Schmitt 1981: 59, 61, 69; Kortlandt 1986: 39, 41 = 2003: 69, 71; Beekes 2003: 167, 174, 175, 206; Mallory/Adams 1997: 262b; Olsen 1999: 200-201), although **klu-ti-* (cf. Skt. *śrutí-* ‘hearing’) is

considered possible too (Hübschmann 1897: 453; Godel 1975: 78). Further see s.v. *lsem* ‘to hear’.

luanam, 3sg.aor. *luac*‘, imper. *lua* ‘to wash; to bathe’ (Bible+); **luali**, GDSg *lualw-o-y*, GDPI *luale-a-c*‘ ‘bath, bathing site’ (Bible+; for the structure, see Olsen 1999: 228).

●DIAL Ubiquitous in the dialects [HAB 2: 300b]. Some dialects display forms with metathesis, **vlal* (see 2.1.26.3).

●ETYM Mostly derived from PIE **pleu-* ‘to wash’: Gr. *πλύνω* ‘to wash, to clean’, *πλυτός* ‘washed’, *πλύσις* f. ‘washing’, *πλέω* ‘to sail, swim’, Skt. *plávate* ‘to float, swim’, Lith. *pláuti* ‘to rinse, wash off’, etc., see Gosche 1847: 68₁₄₁; Hübschmann 1897: 454 (hesitantly); HAB 2: 300 with more references; Meillet 1936: 111; Pokorny 1959: 836; Hamp 1975: 103-104 (assuming **plu-ə-*, resyllabified from **pluH-*, see Clackson 1994: 44, 207₄₃ with criticism); Klingenschmitt 1982: 115-116; Jähukyan 1982: 184; Clackson 1994: 44, 182; Mallory/Adams 1997: 561a.

Alternatively, *luanam* is connected with Gr. *λούω*, *λο(φ)έ-σαι* ‘to bathe, wash (the body)’, Lat. *lavō*, *lavere* ‘to wash, bathe’, etc. and thus identified with Arm. *loganam* ‘to bathe’, see NHB 1: 893c; Hübschmann 1897: 454 (hesitantly); HAB 2: 300b with more references; Klingenschmitt 1982: 116-117; Clackson 1994: 44. For the alternation *-u-* : *-og-* cf. *č’uem* vs. *č’og-* ‘to go, set off’ (q.v.).

luc, *o*-stem (Bible+); *a*-stem: ISg *lc-a-w* in Cyril of Alexandria, IPI *lc-a-w-k*‘ in Plato; *i*-stem: IPI *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]. Further, see 3.1.4.1.

●ETYM Since long, linked with Skt. *yugá-* 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; Jähukyan 1982: 40-41, 57, cf. 213₃₉; 1987: 173]. See also s.v. *leard* ‘liver’ and 2.1.7.

Some of the 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 **uγ-el-* ‘yoke’: Georg. *uγel-*, Megr. *uγul-*, Svan *u/ūγwa*, *uγwal*, cf. also the derivatives Georg. *uyleul-* : Megr. *uγul-* ‘team of oxen’, Georg. *me-uγl-e* ‘spouse’; see Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 723, 723₁; Klimov 1994: 68-72 (with references and a 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, namely *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 “Arjern bararan” (a dictionary published in Venice in 1865), see HAB 2: 301b.

●ETYM According to Ačaryan (HAB 2: 301b), composed of *luc* ‘yoke; Libra, Orion’ and unknown *-atli*.

In view of the resemblance between the Armenian characters *a* and *t*, *lucati* may be hypothetically emended into **luc-ali*, 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’.

lu-ř, *a*-stem: GDPI *lř-a-c* ‘(Book of Chries) ‘silent’, *lřem* ‘to be silent’, *luř-luř* ‘silent, silently’ (all Bible+), *luř-muř* ‘silent, silently’ (John Chrysostom).

For derivatives (apart from NHB and HAB), see Olsen 1999: 394-395, 456.

●DIAL Axalc‘xa *luř u munč*, T‘iflis *luř* ‘silent’, Xarberd *lř-ank* ‘patience’, Zeyt‘un *lřil* ‘to be silent’ [HAB 2: 302b]. Interesting is Xian *an-lř-ti* ‘garrulous, chattering, talkative’ < ‘who does not become silent’ (Ačaryan 1913: 100a); for *-ti* compare *lk-ti* ‘licentious’ from *lknim* ‘to be licentious’, *an-řr-di* ‘arid, not watered’, etc.

●ETYM From QIE **klu-s-r-*, see Bugge 1893: 9; Hübschmann 1897: 454; Pokorny 1959: 606; Jähukyan 1982: 73; Olsen 1999: 198. Compare the structure of *bar* ‘word’ (q.v.).

Further see s.v. *lsem* ‘to hear’.

***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 Ačaryan (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 *lúsemnə* ‘marten’ [HAB 2: 303a]. According to Ačaryan (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 1975: 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’. This is explicitly corroborated by Ananyan, HayKendAšx 1, 1961: 214, 227.

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 tlan” (“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 (ca. 1720 AD) by Ełia Mušelyan Karneći (Karin/Xotorjur), *lusam* renders Turk. *varšat* (*vāshak*) [Č‘ugaszyan 1986: 81, 118-119].

●ETYM Since Müller 1890: 3, connected with Gr. *λύγξ*, GSg *λυγκός* (-γγός) ‘lynx’, Lith. *lūšis*, dial. (Žem.) *lunšis*, *lunši*, OPr. *luyysis* (Euler 1985: 91), Russ. *рысь*, Mlr. *lug*, OHG *luhs* ‘id.’, etc.; perhaps also Khovar *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. The connection of these forms with Lat. *lupus* ‘wolf’, etc. (Speirs 1984: 411-412) can hardly be maintained.

Ačaryan (ibid.) derives Łarabał *lūsemnə* from **lus-emn* < **lus-amn*. Compare Łarabał *xašemnə* vs. Lori, Łazax *xašam* ‘dry leaves’ (see Amatuni 1912: 266a). Note also Łarabał *sālāmnə*, *sālemnə*, Goris *sālāmnə* vs. ClArm. *salam(b)* ‘a kind of partridge, francolin’ (q.v.). According to Łap‘anc‘yan (1961: 330), here we are dealing with the same suffix as is seen in *ayceamn* < **ayci-amn* ‘roe-buck’ (see s.v. *ayc* ‘goat’, *mrjīwn*, *mrjīmn* ‘ant’, and 2.3.1). < **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.) *lunšis* (Frisk 2: 142; see especially Weitenberg 1984, *Stelling* Nr. 9, where dial. **lus-amn* is mentioned in this context). If the Armenian reflects the original **luk-(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 **-nk-* yielded *-s-* in Armenian, as **-ns-* did, one may also reconstruct **lunk-* for Armenian. We can tentatively assume a QIE **lunk-mn-* or **luk-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 ClArm. as well as in all the remaining dialects cf. EArm. **anu/əm* versus ClArm. *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. *rukṃá-* m. ‘golden or silver plate which is worn as an ornament’ (RV+), *rukṃant-* ‘glänzend’, Olc. *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 Av. *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. *rúśant-* ‘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. *λεύκωμα* ‘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. *рысь* ‘lynx’ the initial *r-* of which is explained by the influence of **ryсь* ‘blond, light brown’.

This animal-name is more likely a European substratum word (Furnée 1972: 121-122). In this case, the association with ‘shine, light’ must indeed be folk-etymological. As to the formation of Arm. *lus-an-un-k’*, one may compare e.g. *ms-an-un-k’* ‘the fleshy part of loins’ from *mis* ‘flesh, meat’ (q.v.). Note also other animal-names with a comparable suffix such as Hitt. *ulipp-ana-* ‘wolf’ and *parš(a)na-* ‘leopard’.

Among amazing and man-eating beasts of Libya, the long recension of the 7th century Armenian Geography, *Ašxarhac’oyc’*, mentions *lingnas* (Soukry 1881: 19^{L6}). Ačaryan (HAB 2: 284a) considers this word an unknown foreign animal-name. Hewsen (1992: 50, 97₄₀) translates as ‘Lynx’ without any comment. Arm. *lingnas* possibly reflects an otherwise unattested Gr. **λυγγνας* < **lungnas*. For the semantics note the dialectal (Łazax) meaning of the Armenian word. If this interpretation is accepted, we can posit a **lunĝ/k̂-n-* which is to be compared with PArm. **lu(n)s-n-*.

That Anania Širakac’i testifies a Greek animal-name that has not been preserved in Greek itself is not impossible, cf. e.g. *p’osuřay* ‘glow-worm, firefly’ (A. G. Abrahamyan 1940: 40^{L7}) obviously reflecting an otherwise unattested Gr. **φωσουρά* ‘id.’, lit. ‘light-tailed’ (NHB 2: 954c; Hübschmann 1897: 387; HAB 4: 518a).

I conclude that this is an animal designation belonging to the European substratum, **lu(n)k̂/ĝ-(n)-*, and the association with ‘shine, light’ (an animal with shining eyes or a shining fur) is folk-etymological. A by-form **lu(n)k̂-mn* may be posited for EArm. **lus(e)amn*.

lusin ‘moon’ (Bible+; dial.); ‘month’ (Movsēs Xorenac‘i, Vardan Arewelc‘i; dial.), *i*-stem: GDPI *lusn-i* (abundant in the Bible, Astuacaturean 1895: 657), ISg *lusn-i-w* (Movsēs Xorenac‘i 2.77 [1913=1991: 216^{L9}], Movsēs Vardapet on Xosrov Anjewac‘i); *o*-stem: AblSg *i lusn-o-y* (Eznik Kołbac‘i), ISg *lusn-o-v* (Jeremiah 8.2); *a*-stem [not in NHB]: ISg (*z*-)*lusn-a-w* in Anania Širakac‘i (7th cent., A. G. Abrahamyan 1940: 58^{L20f}). Note that GDSg *lusn-i* may point to both *i*- and *a*-stems. The originality of the *a*-stem may be corroborated by the etymology (see below).

Combinations: beside ISg *lusn-a-w* (see above) and GDSg *lusn-i* (58^{L25f} and several times in 40), Anania Širakac‘i has GDSg *lusn-o-y* on the same page, 58^{L8}. Similarly, in Hexaameron (K. Muradyan 1984: 176, lines 2 and 13) one finds both *lusn-i* and *lusn-o-y* on the same page.

The meaning ‘month’ is seen in Movsēs Xorenac‘i 1.6 (1913=1991: 26^{L6}; transl. Thomson 1978: 80): *dadarē ar getovn erkusneay awurs* ‘he lingered by the river for two months’; also in Vardan Arewelc‘i, 13th cent. (see NHB 1: 902b). Further, see on the dialects.

●DIAL Widespread in the dialects [HAB 2: 296a]. See also s.v. *lusnakay*.

In Metri, one finds *lūsen* ‘moon’ and *lisnigəlōx* ‘the end of a lunar month’ (see Ałayan 1954: 271b, 301). The latter, a compound with *glux* ‘head’, points to the meaning ‘month’ of *lusin*, as we have seen in Vardan Arewelc‘i (13th cent.; Ganjak, Tavuš, Cilicia) and Movsēs Xorenac‘i.

●ETYM Related to *loys* ‘light’ and *lusn* ‘white spot’ (q.v.). For *lusin*, Hübschmann (1897: 453; see also HAB 2: 296; Schmitt 1981: 52, 63; Ĵahukyan 1987: 136) reconstructs **loukeno-*, cf. Skt. *rocana-* n. ‘luminous sphere, firmament’ (Lubotsky 1988: 111), YAv. *raocana-* adj. ‘shining, light’ (see Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 463-464). However, semantically more attractive is the derivation from **louksneh₂-* suggested by Meillet (1936: 21), cf. Lat. *lūna*, f. ‘moon, month’, Russ. *luna* ‘moon’, etc. (see also s.v. *lusn* ‘white spot’). Scholars often link *lusin* with Lat. *lūna*, etc., but they usually cite *lusin* only as an *o*-stem (Solta 1960: 40-41; Tumanjan 1978: 66; Ałabekyan 1979: 57; Saradževa 1986: 33). As we have seen, however, Arm. *lusin* is also attested as an *i*- and an *a*-stem. One may therefore directly derive *lusin*, *a*-stem, from PIE **louksneh₂-* ‘moon’. As to the problem of *-i-*, I follow the explanation of Morani (1987: 680) and Clackson (1994: 135), who treat *-i* as analogical; see also s.vv. *katin* ‘acorn’, place-name *Duin*, etc.

lusn, NPI *lusn-k* ‘a white spot on one’s eye’ (Bible+); ***haw-a-lusn*** ‘pelican’ (Bible+); ***Lusn-t’ag*** ‘the planet of Jupiter’, lit. ‘light-crown’, or, as a bahuvrīhi-compound, ‘der mit der Lichtkrone’ (see Eilers 1976: 39₈₆, 65, 83, 85).

●ETYM Connected with Av. *raoxšna-* adj., n. ‘shining, light’, Lat. *lūna* ‘moon’, OPr. *lauxnos* ‘Gestirne’, Russ. *luná* ‘moon; (dial.) ray of light, firmament, echo’, Czech *luna* ‘moon; month’, Pol. *luna* ‘reflection, glow, moon, flame’, etc. (see HAB 2: 294-296; ĘtimSlovSlavJaz 16, 1990: 173-174; PrJaz L, 1990: 179-188); see also s.vv. *loys* ‘light’, *lusin* ‘moon’. For the semantics cf. Gr. *λεύκωμα* ‘whiteness; a white spot in the eye, caused by a thickening of the cornea’ from the same root.

The root *lusn* is also seen in Arm. *haw-a-lusn* ‘pelican’, a compound with *haw* ‘bird’. For *lusn* here, cf. especially Slav. **lunь* ‘a bird’, of the same origin (see ĘtimSlovSlavJaz 16, 1990: 176-177). Note also Lith. *laiūkas* ‘having a white forehead or snout, having a bald forehead, bald’, dial. Žem. *láuukas*, Latv. *làuks*

‘having a white spot on the forehead, blazed’, *lāucis* ‘Pferd, Ochs mit Blesse auf der Stirn, schwarzes Bläß-, Wasserhuhn’, etc. (see Derksen 1996: 221-222).

lusnakay ‘moonlit night’ (Ezrik Kołbac‘i, Anania Širakac‘i); MidArm. *lusnika* (Nahapet K‘uč‘ak), *lusnkay* (Geoponica, Nahapet K‘uč‘ak) ‘moon’, *lusnkay* ‘moonshined (night)’ (Geoponica) [MijHayBař 1, 1987: 313b].

●DIAL Widespread in the dialects [HAB 2: 296a].

In folklore, *lusnkay* frequently refers to the full moon. In a wonderful Ascension folk-song (“jagyulum”) from Łarabał (probably Šušī) [Grigoryan-Spandaryan 1971: 219, Nr 1348]:

Lūsñngyān el ašk a tirāl

Lūs čəkatis vāeske p‘ořin.

“And the Moon has put his eye

On the golden coin of my forehead”.

In a traditional story [Grigoryan-Spandaryan 1971: 339^{L1f}], a girl named *Vart‘it‘er* is described as resembling *tasñehing črva püllörvac lūsñngyi* “the rounded moon of 15 days”. Then (340^{L21}), Arsen was working *lūsñngyin lūsñn takin* “under the light of the moon”; and (340^{L-2f}), *lūsñngyā* and the stars make a wedding for Arsen and *Vart‘it‘er*.

In a folk-song (Ř. Grigoryan 1970: 352^{Nr752}):

- *Lusunka k‘eri, uskuc‘ kugas?*

- *Abrahamu covu veren.*

- *Dun deřin, jinəd deřin,*

- *Moruk‘d eker goteteřin.*

“- Uncle *Lusunka*, where are you coming from?

- From over the sea of Abraham.

- You [are] yellow, your horse [is] yellow,

- Your beard has come down to your girdle-place”.

That *lusnkay* can refer to ‘the full moon’ is also seen, e.g., in a folk-song where *Lusanka* is described as being *klorik* ‘(diminutive) round’, and having eyes like black raisins [Ř. Grigoryan 1970: 300^{Nr637}].

In a song from Partizak [Tēr-Yakobean 1960: 314^{L-4}], as an adjective: *Lusnkay u erkan giřer* : “moonlit and long night”. As a noun, op. cit. 375^{L-2}.

As is pointed out by Ačarıyan (HAB 2: 296a), Nor Naxiřewan has preserved the semantic distribution between *lusin* and *lusnakay* : *lusin* ‘moon’ : *lusinga*, *lusninga*, *luslinga*, *lustnga* ‘moonlit night’. In this very dialect, *lusinka/lusninga* also refers to the Moon as the sister of the Sun, as is seen in children folk-songs (Ř. Grigoryan 1970: 297-298, Nrs. 631-632a; P‘ork‘řeyan 1971: 32^{Nr3}).

Meři līsñeke ‘moon’ [Ałayan 1954: 301]; cf. *lūsñen* < *lusin* (op. cit. 271b).
Sebastia **arew-lusinka č‘i tesnel* ‘to be locked at home’, etc. [Gabikean 1952: 90].

●ETYM Probably composed of *lusin* ‘moon’ and *kay* ‘station’, cf. *arew-kay*, *parz-kay* (see HAB 2: 504a); *kay* belongs with the verbal root *ka-* ‘to stand, be, stay’ probably from PIE **g^weh₂-* ‘to come, step’, and reflects a deverbative **g^wh₂-ti-*. For the typology of the compound, cf. Gr. *λνκάβαç, -αυτοç* probably ‘new moon’, Skt. *svargā-* m. ‘heaven’ from **sh₂ul-g^wm-* ‘going to the sun’. For the morphology compare *barjr-a-gñay lusin*, lit. ‘high-going moon’ in a late medieval folk-song (see Abeřyan 1940: 111^{Nr165}). Note also *lus-a-čem* (with *čem-* ‘to walk’), the name of the

9th nocturnal hour followed by *aṛawōt* ‘morning’ (Anania Širakac‘i, 7th cent.; see A. G. Abrahamyan 1944: 113). A variant of the hour-name *lus-a-čem* is *lus-a-gay*, from the root *ga-* ‘to come’ [Ałayan 1986: 80-81].

lu-r, imperative of *lsem* ‘to hear’ (q.v.); also *o*-stem: GDSg *lr-o-y* (Bible), ISg *lr-o-v* (Nersēs Lambronac‘i); GSg *lr-i* (NHB 2: 903b without evidence) ‘hearing, fame, report, preaching, obedience’ (Bible+).

●ETYM From QIE **kl(o)u-ro-*, see s.v. *lsem* ‘to hear’; comparable to *tu-r* (cf. Gr. *δῶρον* n. ‘gift, present’) vs. *tam* ‘to give’; cf. also *di-r* vs. *dnem* ‘to put’, *li-r* vs. *lnum* ‘to fill’ (Hübschmann 1897: 453-454; Meillet 1908-09c: 338; Schmitt 1981: 197; Ĵahukyan 1982: 73). The derivation from **klu-trom* (Olsen 1999: 35) is less probable because it isolates *lu-r* from the parallels above.

lurj *‘light, shiny’ [see below on *lrjac* ‘*uc’anem*, see also s.v. *aršalursj-k* ‘darkness before dawn, twilight’]; ‘cheerful, awake, sober, bright-minded, serious’ (Job 33.26, Philo, Ephrem, John Chrysostom, etc.); *lrjanam* ‘to be/become awake, serious, sober, bright-minded’ (Elišē, John Chrysostom); caus. *lrjac’uc’anem* ‘to make serious or cheerful (said of a face)’ (Sirach 7.14), ‘to light up, lighten, enlighten (the sad night with a camp-fire)’ (Wisdom 17.5); *i lrjē* (John Chrysostom, Evagrius of Pontus), *i lrjeac* (Eznik Kołbac‘i 15th cent./, “Čarəntir”), *i lrjuc* (Oskip‘orik) ‘in one’s waking hours’; cf. also *lrj(-a)-mit* adj. & adv. ‘serious/sober/bright-minded’ (John Chrysostom), *lrj-a-mt-ank* (Severian of Gabala), *lrj-mt-ut’iwn* ‘cheerfulness, light-heartedness, sober-mindedness’ (Romans 12.8, Łazar P‘arpec‘i, Elišē, Movsēs Xorenac‘i, John Chrysostom, Ephrem, Paterica, etc.); *ač‘-a-lurj* ‘serious-eyed’ in John Chrysostom, etc.; *lurj* ‘light blue’ (Plato, Paterica, etc.), ‘blue’ in Anania Širakac‘i, 7th cent. (A. G. Abrahamyan 1940: 40^{L12}, NHB 1: 903c has *lurt* ‘in this passage; cf. s.v. *detb* ‘yellow’), several times in Aṛak‘el Dawrižec‘i, 17th cent. [Xanlaryan 1990: 447 (lines 18, 19, 26), 450 (lines 29, 31), 451^{L4}]; *lurt* ‘blue’ in Anania Širakac‘i (see above), Mambṛē; *lrt’anam* ‘to grow (greyish-) blue’ in Hexaameron and Anania Širakac‘i; compounds: *lrt‘-a-loys* (with *loys* ‘light’ as the second member), var. *lrt‘-a-goyn*, with *goyn* ‘colour’, in Hexaameron (K. Muradyan 1984: 43^{L3}); *lrt‘-n-a-tesil*, with *tesil* ‘vision’ (T‘ovmay Arcruni), etc. [NHB 1: 907b].

In Job 33.26: *Yalač‘el iwrum aṛ Tēr ənduneli etic‘i nma: mtc‘ē lurj eresawk‘, dawanut‘eamb* ‘‘When he prays to the Lord, it will be acceptable to him; he will enter with a serious look, with a declaration’’ : *εὐζάμενος δὲ πρὸς κύριον, καὶ δεκτὰ αὐτῷ ἔσται, εἰσελεύσεται δὲ προσώπῳ καθαρῷ σὺν ἐξηγορίᾳ* [Cox 2006: 215].

As is correctly assumed in NHB 1: 266a and HAB 1: 330a, the compound *ač‘alurj* in Movsēs Xorenac‘i 2.42 is distinct from the homonymous *ač‘-a-lurj* ‘serious-eyed’ and rather belongs with *aršalursj-k* (q.v.).

●DIAL The form *lurj* has been preserved in a few dialects: Muš *lurč* ‘a kind of blue canvas that is made in Haleb (= Turk. *zal*)’; T‘iflis *lrč‘anal* ‘to turn blue’ (referring to a beaten and bitten body); Akn. *lrjuc* ‘in one’s waking hours’ [HAB 2: 304] (compare literary *i lrjuc* above).

In Syria: Svedia *lørč* ‘blue’ [Ačaryan 2003: 570], or *laurč/č* ‘violet (colour)’ [Andreasyan 1967: 149, 363b]; K‘esab *lørj* ‘light blue’ (also in derivatives)

[Č'olak'ean 1986: 204a, 244]; Aramo *laurč* 'blue' [Laribyan (1958: 54, 65a)]. The Muš form has probably been borrowed from the Syrian dialects, see 1.5.

Metri *lārjé, līrjī* 'in one's waking hours' < **līrj-i* [Ałayan 1954: 271b]; compare literary *i līrjē* and *i līrjeac'* above.

●ETYM No acceptable etymology is recorded in HAB 2: 304b. Still considered a word of unknown origin in Ĵahukyan 1987: 436; 1990: 63, 72 (semantic field 15). Olsen (1999: 205-206, 771) derives *lurj* from PIE **k̑leuH-*: Lat. *cluere, cloāre* (both only attested by grammarians) 'to clean', Welsh *clir* 'light, bright, clear, clean, joyful' < **k̑luH-ro-*, Lith. *šliuoti* 'to wipe', Gr. *κλύζω* < **k̑lu-d-īō* 'to wash (of the sea), cleanse', etc., positing QIE **k̑luh₁r-īō-*, or **k̑luh₁r-ih₂-*, or **k̑luh₁tr-īō/ih₂-*. I find this etymology attractive, but the alternative in *-*tr-* seems gratuitous, and *-*h₁-* is not motivated (unless it is based on her idea on *-*h₁t-* > Arm. -*t'*-, on which see below). Other cognates: Goth. *hlutrs* (only API m. *hlutrans*) 'pure, clean', OHG *luttar, hlūtar* 'bright, limpid, clear, pure' < **k̑luH-d-ro-*, OIc. *hlēr* 'sea' (see Pokorny 1959: 607; Lehmann 1986: 188b; Schrijver 1991: 394, 447-448; Mallory/Adams 1997: 108b).

For the variant *lurt'*, Olsen (1999: 206₃₈₉, 846) posits **k̑luh₁tro-*. This is improbable because: (1) the suffix *-*tro-* is not motivated here; (2) there are no cognate forms in *-*tro-*; (3) this proto-form would yield Arm. **lu(w)r*, cf. **ph₂tr-os* > *hawr*, gen. of *hayr* 'father' (q.v.). To solve the latter problem, Olsen (1999: 774) envisages a sound change *-*h₁t-* > Arm. -*t'*-, a view which I do not share. One may rather start with **k̑luH-d-ro-* (cf. the Germanic forms), which would yield Arm. **lurt*. Subsequently, **lurt* might become *lurt'* under the influence of *art'* 'awake', *zuart'* (beside *zuarč*) 'joyful, cheerful', *lazuart'* (beside *laj/čuard*) 'azure stone'. On the other hand, the alternation *lurj* : *lurt'* is reminiscent of that of *šurj* 'around; circle' : *šurt'n* 'lip; edge' (if these words are related with each other, as is assumed in HAB 3: 538-540).

I conclude that Arm. *lurj* 'light, shiny; light blue, blue; cheerful, awake, bright-minded' may be derived from QIE **k̑luH-r-īō-* or **k̑luH-r-īeh₂-* 'light, bright, clear, clean, joyful'. The by-form *lurt'* (not found in the old literature and the dialects) is not entirely clear; perhaps **k̑luH-d-ro-* > **lurt* > (secondarily) *lurt'*.

X

xacanem 'to bite, sting', iterative *xac-at-em* (Bible+).

Often refers to biting of snakes and beasts (see NHB 1: 912ab, s.v. *xacanem* and derivatives). A textual illustration from Deuteronomy 8.15 (Cox 1981: 113): *ur ōjn xacanēr ew karičn* : *ὄ ὄφις δάκνων καὶ σκορπίος*.

●DIAL Widespread in the *kə*-dialects. The verbal suffix -(a)n- is missing in Axalc'xa, Karin, Alaškert, Hamšen, Polis, Řodost'o and Sebastia *xaznel*, 1sg aor. *xaji* [HAB 2: 318a; Ačaryan 1941: 144, 216].

●ETYM Connected with Skt. *khādati* 'to chew, bite, eat, devour', perfect *cakhāda* (3sg.act.), YAv. *vī-xada-* 'to squeeze apart', Baluchi *khāḍay* 'to eat', Gr. *κνώδαλον* 'wild or harmful animal', Lith. *kąsti, kándu* 'to bite', etc. (HAB 2: 317-318, with references).

The appurtenance of the non-Aryan forms is uncertain (see Mayrhofer EWAia 1, 1992: 451-452; cf. Pedersen 1906: 424 = 1982: 202; Pokorny 1959: 560, 634; Ĵahukyan 1987: 134, 177). The *-c-* of the Armenian form may be explained by the sigmatic aorist form **-d-s-*, see Pedersen 1905: 206; 1906: 424 = 1982: 68, 202; Ĵahukyan 1982: 48, 74, 180; Kortlandt 1987a: 51; 1994: 27-28; 1996: 41-42 = 2003: 80-81, 104-105, 115-116. This might be corroborated by Parth. *x'z-* ‘to devour’ (Boyce 1977: 99), probably from **xād-s-*, as well as by Skt. 3pl.aor.act. *a-khāt-s-ur*. However, Skt. *akhātsur* seems to belong with Skt. *khidāti* ‘to tear; to press down’ and PIran. **xad-* ‘to beat, strike, inflict a wound, hurt’ (Cheung 2007: 445; Lubotsky, p.c.). On the other hand, Skt. *khidāti* has been linked with Lat. *caedō* ‘to cut, hew’, etc. (cf. Klingenschmitt 1982: 210-211), see s.v. *xayt* ‘sting, bite’.

In order to explain the voiceless affricate *-c-* of Arm. *xac-* ‘to bite, sting’, Klingenschmitt (1982: 210) suggests a few possibilities: **-ġ-*; **-dĵ-*; an Iranian loanword, cf. Parth. *x'z-* ‘to devour’. The first one is hardly possible, because we are dealing with a root in **-d-*. A sequence **-dĵ-* would yield Arm. *-č-* (see 2.1.22.1). Also the loan theory should be given up (the expected Armenian form is **xaz-*), unless one assumes a very old borrowing with consonant shift **j > c*, cf. the well-known case of *partēz* ‘garden’.

Armenian has *xaz* ‘line, writing mark, line in hand, scratch’, dial. also ‘parting line of hair’, *xazem* ‘to draw a line (also with a plough), scratch’ (late attest.; widespread in the dialects), dial. *xaz-xz-*, etc. ‘to scribble’; see NHB 1: 910bc; Ačarean 1913: 445ab; HAB 2: 310. Ačaryan (HAB 2: 310b) treats *xaz* as a Caucasian borrowing, cf. Georg. *xazi* ‘line, row’, Udi *xaz* ‘line’, etc. In fact, Arm. *xaz* may belong with the above-mentioned PIran. **xad-* ‘to beat, inflict a wound, hurt’ and Skt. *khidāti* ‘to tear; to press down’, going back to Iran. sigmatic aorist **xad-s-* > **xaz-* (cf. Skt. *a-khāt-s-ur*).

xayt ‘sting, bite’ (only in 2 Corinthians 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 the 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, although considered “not compelling” by Olsen (1999: 211), seems to be acceptable, see Schrijver 1991: 266-267, who reconstructs **kh₂ei-* and excludes Skt. *(s)khidāti*. The latter 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.).

There are other Armenian words which are undoubtedly related with *xayt*‘, although the ablaut alternations are not quite clear (see HAB 2, s.v.v.; Ĵahukyan 1987: 147, 191; on *xit*‘, see also Olsen 1999: 210), namely:

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 push, 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 the 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.vv.

Also in Sanskrit there are similar forms with unclear vocalic alternations. Next to the above-mentioned *khidāti* 'to press down; to tear' and *khādāti* 'to chew, bite, eat, devour' (see s.v. *xacanem* 'to bite, sting'), here one finds *khud-* 'hineinstoßen [des Penis]' (RV, AV+), with no secure etymology (see Mayrhofer EWAia 1, 1992: 456); for the labial vowel cf. Arm. *xot'* 'to bite, shove, poke'.⁶⁸

The meaning 'crocodile' (Paterica+) of *xit'* and *xoyt'* is corroborated 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. *kṛkalāsá* 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-* (instead of **-d-* seen in Lat. *caedō*), which is attested nowhere else. This would be unnecessary, however, if one assumes a solution similar to that of *mat'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-*.

The words *xayt'em* 'to bite (of insects and snakes)' and, especially, its ablated form *xit'*, *o*-stem 'pain, colic, twinge' can also be connected 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' (Bağirk' 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-*.

⁶⁸ One might assume that MIran. **xiδ-* or **xuδ-*, an unattested Iranian counterpart of Skt. *khid-* or *khud-*, has been borrowed into Arm. **xir-* or **xur-*, cf. *xrem* 'to poke' (Bible+; widespread in dialects; no etymology in HAB 2: 431a).

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): *and or xandayrn Artawazd* ‘Artavazd became jealous at this’.

In P‘awstos Buzand 4.15 /5th cent./ (1883=1984: 103^{L18f}; transl. Garsoĭan 1989: 144): *getgeteal xandatatur‘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. *kávdapoc*: *ánθpαζ* ‘charcoal’ (Hesychius), Skt. *cand-* (also *ścand-*) ‘to shine, glitter’, *candrá-* 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.

Jahukyan (1987: 130, 318) presents this etymology with a question mark, pointing out that the aspirated **k^h-* is nowhere attested, and comparing *xand* with Hitt. *ḫandāiš* ‘warmth, heat’, 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^hṽnd-ōs* > PArm. **xṽnd-u*, GSg **k^hnd-s-ós* > PArm. **xanjó-*. But *xand* is 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*, Ačařyan (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*. Although not recorded in Ačařyan 1913 and 1947, **xanjotat* seems to be present also in Hamšen: *xonjotod* ‘scorched wood’ (glossed in JaynHamš 2, 1979: 220a). One also finds independent evidence for *xanjot* in various dialects: Łarabał *xánjuł(nə)* [Davt‘yan 1966: 370], Goris *xanjul* [Margaryan 1975: 331a]; K‘esab *xêncüt* [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 -ǰ-, see s.v. *xonǰ* 'low, down; inside'.

●ETYM See s.v. *xand*.

xawt' (*i*-stem according to NHB, but without ref.) 'ill, sick (of body, eye, or ear)' (Bible+).

●DIAL Akn, Arabkir *xət'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 a rooster)' (Bible+).

●DIAL Widespread in the dialects. In Van, Marała and Nor Naxijewan only refers to the singing of a rooster [HAB 2: 434b]. Note also Sivri-Hisar **xōs-ot* 'rooster' and, with an initial *k*-, Zeyt'un **kus-ot* 'id.' (see Ačařean 1913: 161b, 607b).

●ETYM The etymological attempts implying IE origin (see HAB 2: 434; Frisk 1, 1960: 803-804; Olsen 1999: 90) are unsatisfactory.

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 $\delta > s$.

***xet'-:** *xet'em* 'to bit; to push, 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.vv. *xēt'* and *xayt'*.

xel' 'mutilated, lame (Bible+); sore (eye); abominable'. Numerous derivatives: *xelut'iw* 'mutilation', *xelat'iw* 'crooked (also morally)', *xelandam* 'mutilated', *xel(a)katak* 'mime, buffoon', etc.

●DIAL In the dialects, mostly in verbal usage: 'to become spoilt, undisciplined' (Akn, Xotorjur), 'to make silly jokes' (Č'arsančak' *xelktal*), 'to scoff, ridicule grimacing' (Zeyt'un) [HAB 2: 356b]. Although not recorded in HAB, also the adjective *xel* seems to be present in the dialects, cf. in the epic "Sasna cřer" (SasDav 1989: 379, 421b). Note also Sasun *xel-aj* 'crookedly sewed cloth' (see Petoyan 1954: 130; 1965: 482); the second component, namely *-aj*, is not clear to me.

●ETYM See s.vv. *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 ĵermamb ew sarsřov; ew xt'iwk' (vars. xet'iwk', xēt'iwk') ew erkiliw (vars. erkiwliw, erkewliw) ew xoršakaw ew gunov : πατάξει σε κύριος ἀπορία και πυρετῶ και ῥίγει και ἐρεθισμῶ και φόνῳ και ἀνεμοφθορία και τῆ ὄχρα* [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 presupposed by *xt'iwk'*) renders Gr. *ἐρεθισμός* 'irritation, provocation'.

In Canticum 1.5/6: *vasn zi xet'iw hayec'aw yis aregakn : ὅτι παρέβλεψέν με ὁ ἥλιος*. Here *xet'iw hayim* 'to scowl, look/regard with hate, suspicion, etc.' renders Gr. *παραβλέπω* '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): *ənd 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 zmels hamarjakut'eamb, a'anc' xit'i yamenayn č'aris darjealk'* : "they committed sins openly and insolently" (transl. Garsoian 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): *xtēi xayt'*.

Looking through the attestations of the word in NHB 1: 942-943, one notes that nom.-acc. mostly occurs with *-ē-* (*xēt'*, *xēt'-k'/s*), whereas the oblique stem chiefly appears as *xet'-*. This is reminiscent of cases like *ahuēs*, *nēr*, etc. (2.2.1.2). Thus: nom.acc. *xēt'*, obl. *xet'-*. Since the classical pattern is *-ē-* : *-i-Ŵ*, 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 Juła *xet'* 'spite, vengeance'; Juła, 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. *xēt'*.

In Grigor Narekac'i 26.3 (Xaç'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.

***xilt'** 'knag on a tree, a swelling in tree'.

●DIAL Ač'aryan (1913: 469a) records *xilt'* 'knag on a tree, remnant of a branch that has been cut off' not specifying the dialect location. The word is present in Lori (Jahukyan 1972: 280). I can testify that in this subdialect, the word *xil*, *xilt'* also refers to 'rough, gland/tumour-like substance in wood', which is to be understood as 'a gland or tumour of a tree', see s.v. *xoyl*, dial. *xil*.

Note also Ganjak *xilt ənknel* 'to stumble' (probably to be understood as 'to become knotted' said of feet), *xilt'* 'very dense, crowded' [HayLezBrbBař 2, 2002: 325b].

●ETYM Obviously belongs with *xoyl* 'swelling, gland' (q.v.), dial. *xil* 'knag on a tree' (Jahukyan 1967: 109, cf. 116; 1972: 280; 1985: 154; 1987: 131, 174, 255; see also N. Simonyan 1979: 242; H. Suk'iasyan 1986: 174-175). For *-t'*- cf. e.g. *kř-t'-un-k'* 'back' vs. *kuřn* 'back'.

xot'(ot)em 'to look with a scowling gaze; to bite, shove' (Philo, Ephrem, Eusebius of Caesaria, etc.).

●DIAL Widespread in the dialects, in the meaning 'to poke' (also 'to eat to much') [HAB 2: 384b].

●ETYM See s.v. *xayt'*.

xolorj in Mxit'ar Goš, 12-13th cent. (NHB 1: 957b) and Davit' Salajorc'i, 17th cent. (UšMjnHayBnst 2, 1987: 355^{L80}), **xolorjn**, GDSg *xolrjan* (in the song by Grigor Narekac'i called *Saylik* 'Little wagon', K'yoškeryan 1981: 61^{L18}, 64^{L49}) 'orchis'.

Corresponds to Orchis, Russ. ятрышник, Germ. Knabenkraut (Caturyan 1970: 84; R. Łazaryan 1981: 42a^{Nr489}), Modern Armenian *orj-armat* (lit. 'male root' or 'testicle-root'), *xol-orj laynaterew* 'Orchis latifolia L.' (Béguinot/Diratzouyan 1912: 35). According to other information, it denotes 'Vicia' (Ališan 1895: 258, having violet flowers), 'Vicia tenuifolia Roth.' (Béguinot/Diratzouyan 1912: 60-61), 'Vicia cracca' (HAB 2: 385b with ref.). According to Ačařyan (1913: 481a), the dialectal meaning is 'a plant which animals are fond of, with bluish flowers', and in Hamšen it denotes the plant called *K'ara yonča*.

I am not sure whether the MidArm. plant-name *xoyl* prob. 'Hesperis matronalis' (see Č'ugaszyan 1980: 200; MijHayBař 1, 1987: 347a) is related.

●DIAL Hamšen, Xarberd **xolorj* (HAB 2: 385b; for the meaning see above); Muš, Aparan, Širak *xolrs* (Amatuni 1912: 287a, with a thorough description); Sebastia **xolorj*, **xoylorj* 'Vicia sepium' [Gabikean 1952: 255], Balu *xolorj* 'a plant' [Sargisean 1932: 429]. Further see HayLezBrbBař 2, 2002: 346b.

●SEMANTICS The Middle Armenian and dialectal designations for species of this plant mostly contain 'testicle' as a compound member:

alves-a-ju-k', *alvesi juk'*, lit. 'testicles of fox' in Amirdovlat' Amasiac'i, 15th cent. (see S. Vardanján 1990: 182-183, § 940; MijHayBař 1, 1987: 33b);

šan-juk', lit. 'testicles of dog' in Amirdovlat' Amasiac'i (see S. Vardanján 1990: 183, § 941; MijHayBař 2, 1992: 208a); according to Béguinot/Diratzouyan (1912: 35), refers to 'Orchis palustris Jacq.' and corresponds to ModArm. *orj-armat*.

These designations are calques from (or typologically comparable with) the Arabic terms literally meaning 'testicles of fox' (Orchis hircina crants', 'Orchis antropophora L.', or 'Tulipa Gesneriana L.') and 'testicles of dog' ('Orchis morio L.', or 'Orchis papillionacea L.'), which are transliterated by Amirdovlat' as *xusat'-al-saylap* and *xusat'-al-k'alp*, respectively, see S. Vardanján 1990: 636, notes to §§ 940, 941.

Note also *toč'i plur* 'Orchis laxiflora Lam.', lit. 'testicles of ram' (Béguinot/Diratzouyan 1912: 35).

For a discussion of these designations, see also Ališan 1895: 28-29, 482. Ališan (1895: 322, Nr 1446) records another designation of Orchis, viz. *kolor/ičik*, suggesting a derivation from *klor* 'round' because of its 'testicle-like roots' (*juajew taker*). Typologically compare dial. *papke-plor* 'a plant with blue seed-like grains' (Ališan 1895: 523; Ačařean 1913: 896a), lit. probably 'grandfather's testicles'. For other names of Orchidaceae, see Suk'iasyan 1967: 268c; R. Łazaryan 1981: 42a^{Nr489}. For *orj-a-tak* and *orj-armat* (both basically meaning 'having testicle-like roots') and the corresponding denotata, see Malxaseanc' HBB 3: 584-585.

The pattern is also seen in other languages, cf. e.g. Russ. *jatryšnik*, *jadrišnik* 'Orchis maculata' from *jatro* n., pl. *jatra* 'entrails, eggs, testicles', *jadro* 'kernel, testicle' from Slav. **jet/dro*, cf. Vedic Skt. *āṇḍā*- n. 'egg', dual *āṇḍau* m. 'testicles', *āṇḍī*- f. 'testicles' (see Vasmer s.vv.; ÈtimSlovSlavJaz 6, 1979: 65-66, 72; Mayrhofer EWAia 1, 1992: 162; Černyx 1999, 2: 466-467). A well-known example is Gr. *ὄρχις* m. 'testicles', 'the plant orchid (because of the shape of the root)', 'a kind of olive

(because of the shape of the fruit)', which is most probably etymologically identical with the second component of Arm. *xol-orj(-n)*, see below.

●ETYM No etymology in HAB 2: 385b.

In view of the material presented in the semantic section, Arm. *xol-orj(-n)* seems to comprise **orj(i)-* 'testicle' (q.v.), cf. Gr. *ὄρχις* 'testicles; orchid'. As to the first component, we can think of *xo(y)l* 'swelling, tonsil, gland', which may have once referred to 'testicle' as well (especially if its connection with Russ. *šuló*, *šuljá* 'testicle', etc. is accepted, see s.v. *xoyl*). PArm. **orj* 'orchis' may have been lexicalized early (possibly an Armeno-Greek shared innovation). If this is true, the compound **xol-orj-* is to be understood as something like 'testicled or glanded orchis', that is 'a kind of orchis that resembles or has testicle- or gland-like parts'.

xoyl, *i*-stem according to NHB 1: 961a, but without evidence (spelled also as **xol**) 'swelling, tumour, gland' (this is the basic meaning of the word, see below on MidArm. and dial.), 'spot, stain, blot' perhaps from 'spherical spot' (Anania Širakac'i, 7th cent., see below), 'a swelling of the lymphatic glands, scrofulous gland' in (Step'annos Lehač'i, 17th cent., glossed by Lat. *strūma* and *scrōfula*, NHB 1: 961b); MidArm. **xul** 'swelling, tumour, gland' in *Bžškarán jioy* (twice *xul* and once *xoyl*, Č'ugaszyan 1980: 91, lines 1-4) and Grigoris [MijHayBař 1, 1987: 353a], **xoyl-ik** and **xul-ik** 'a kind of plague' in Smbat Sparapet and Samuēl Anec'i, perhaps also Matt'ēos Urhayec'i [HAB 2: 391; MijHayBař 1, 1987: 347]; MidArm. adj. **xol-ayin** 'swollen' in Mxit'ar Herač'i [MijHayBař 1, 1987: 346b]; **xol-xec'geti** 'ulcer, cancer (in a woman's breast)' (Paterica), a compound with *xec'geti* 'crayfish' [NHB 1: 957a]. See also s.v. **xol-orj** 'orchis'.

Anania Širakac'i (7th cent.) compares the spots of the moon with *xoyl-k'* 'of pits (*xořoč'ac'*) of a gem (A. G. Abrahamyan 1940: 40^{L19f}). Here *xoyl* may be understood as 'asperity, roughness of surface, a rough spot' (cf. ModArm. *xordubordut'yun* in the translation by Abrahamyan/Petrosyan 1979: 98; note also the semantics in the dialects of Goris and Łarabał), or simply 'spot, stain, blot'. Given the range of meanings displayed by *xoyl* in other literary sources and dialects, we should perhaps posit a basic meaning 'ball, gland; spherical spot' or the like.

●DIAL Widespread in the dialects, mostly in the meaning 'gland' 9HAB 2: 392a]. Note also Sebastia *xul* 'gland; Fr. fagoue, amygdale' [Gabikean 1952: 259], Balu *xol* 'gland' [Sargisean 1932: 429], Akn *xæl* 'ganglion' [Gabiřlean 1912: 282]. With other semantic nuances: Agulis *xuył* 'swelling' [HAB 2: 392a; Ačarean 1935: 358]; Adana, Hačən *xil* 'a swelling in flesh'; Łazax, Kot', Ganjak *xil* 'swelling on a tree' [Amatuni 1912: 291a; Ačarean 1913: 469a; 2003: 315; HAB 2: 392a; HayLez-BrbBař 2, 2002: 325a]; see also s.v. *xilt'* 'a knag on a tree, a tumour in wood'.

Goris *xül* displays several meanings: 'a small oval swelling', 'a rugged swelling, projection', 'dry twig' [Margaryan 1975: 403b], and adj. 'rugged', cf. also Łarabał *xül* 'rugged', and the compound **xul-u-boyt'n* 'rugged' (see Ačarean 1913: 488; HAB 2: 392a), cited as *xlaput'nə* 'rugged' in L. Harut'yunyan 1991: 362ab; see s.v. *boyt'(n)* 'thumb'. Textual illustrations for Łarabał *xül* in the meaning 'swelling in the body' can be found in a proverb (L. Harut'yunyan 1991: 211^{L7}: *janen* 'in the body'), and in a phrase (225^{L8}: *əngučumə* 'in the ear'). The meaning 'a swelling on a tree' (see above) is represented in another phrase: *katne xul* 'stubborn' (231^{L-3}), with *katne* 'oak' (unless one sees here *xul* 'dumb').

A meaning ‘asperity, roughness of surface, a rugged swelling’ or the like seems to unite the semantics of the Goris and Łarabał forms with the literary testimony of Anania Širakac‘i (see above). Note also Lori *xilt‘* ‘rough, gland/tumour-like substance in wood’ (q.v.).

●ETYM Petersson (1916: 277) compares Arm. *xoyl* with Russ. *šuló, šuljá* ‘testicle’, pl. *šuljáta* ‘testicles’, Byel. *šuljátý* ‘id.’, etc. (see also Vasmer s.v., considering all the etymologies of this Russian, etc. words uncertain). This etymology is recorded in Pokorny 1959: 588. It is possible that Arm. *xoyl* had a meaning ‘testicle’ as well, see s.v. *xol-orj* ‘orchis’. If the connection is accepted, one may assume an Armeno-Slavic correspondence perhaps of non-IE origin. The Armenian word formally requires **k^heul-* (or **k^ho/ulj-*, cf. *ayl* vs. Lat. *alius*) or the like.

Ačarjan (HAB 2: 391b) suggests a connection with Gr. *κήλη*, Att. *κόλη* f. ‘tumour; rupture, hernia’, OIc. *haull* m., OHG *hōla* f. ‘groin rupture’, Russ. *kilá* ‘id.’, also ‘knag on a tree’, Lith. *kūla* ‘thickening, swelling, knag’, etc. (on this etymon, see Pokorny 1959: 536-537; Chantraine 1968-80: 524-525; on Lat. *cūlus* ‘arse’, OIr. *cúl* ‘back’, etc. from **kuHlo-*, see Schrijver 1991: 232; 1995: 193).

This latter etymology is accepted by Jahukyan (1987: 131, 174, 255), who points out that this correspondence, despite the problematic vocalism, is obvious. He also adds *xil-t‘* ‘a swelling on a tree’ (see s.v. for other references). The cognate forms probably derive from IE **k(e)h₂u-l-eh₂-*. The Armenian form may go back to a zero-grade feminine **kh₂ul-ieh₂-* > PArm. **k^hul-ja-* (for **kH* > Arm. *x*, see 2.1.18.1) > **xuył* (cf. *ayl* vs. Lat. *alius*), graphically = *xoył*.

In *Bžškaran jioy* (13th cent.) one also finds *xoył* ‘army’, which has been treated as an Arabic loanword (Čugaszyan 1980: 44^{L18}, 200; MijHayBař 1, 1987: 347a). One may wonder whether this word is related with our *xoył* ‘swelling, tumour, gland, spheric spot’; for the semantics cf. Arm. *gund* ‘sphere, ball’ vs. *gund* ‘group, army’ (for a discussion of these two homonymous words of Iranian origin, see HAB 1: 593-595), and Łarabał *pūł* ‘ball of dough’ from. *boyl* ‘group’ (see Davt‘yan 1966: 329). If this is true, the IE etymology of *xoył* must be given up.

The derivation from IE **skūli-* with Swedish *skyl* ‘haycock’ (Mann 1963: 132) is untenable.

The relationship with *xlurd* ‘mole’, ‘tumour, ulcer’ (on which see HAB 2: 374) is unclear.

xonj₁ ‘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 *xonjenäl* [HAB 2: 394a; Haneyan 1978: 188a]. Next to *xonjenal*, Dersim also has *xonjel* (verb) and *xonj*.

●ETYM No etymology is accepted in HAB 2: 394a. Considered to be of unknown origin [Olsen 1999: 963].

One wonders whether *xonj₁* ‘tired, exhausted’ can be derived from *xonj₂* ‘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-*. From here: (1) **xog^hn-* > **xong-yV-* (with metathesis) > *xonj*, (2) **y-(h/x)og-Vn-* > *y-ogn*, pl. *y-og-un-k‘*.

xonj₂ ‘low, down’ (attested only in Eusebius of Caesarea), ‘inside’ (only in “Arjejn bařaran”, 1865, without textual evidence).

●DIAL No dialectal evidence in HAB 2: 394a.

According to Davt‘yan (1966: 375), Łarabał, Hadrut‘, Šařax *xənj/č‘-ə-xárav* ‘roasting inside’ is composed as *xonč* ‘inside’ + *-a-* + *xorov* ‘roast’. This is attractive, but risky. The first component may rather be identified with *xanj-* ‘to scorch, singe’ (q.v.). Although, according to HAB (2: 328-331), the root *xanj-* displays literary and dialectal (amongst others, also in the Łarabał-area and the surroundings) forms only with (or derivable to) *-j-*, one does find *-j-* forms in the Łarabał area, cf. Hadrut‘ *xənjəř-á-vəet* ‘smell of roasting/barbecue’, with *vəet* < *hot* ‘smell’ as the second member [A. Polosyan 1965: 69; Davt‘yan 1966: 370], Łarabał **xnjř-n-a-vet* ‘id.’, **xnj-p‘ut‘ut* ‘strong burning’ [HayLezBrbBař 2, 2002: 342b].

In DialAdd apud NHB 2: 1063b, one finds dial. *xunč* ‘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. *budhná-* 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 to the trunk of root of a tree [ÈtimSlovIranJaz 2, 2003: 187-189]), one may identify *xunč* ‘trunk of a tree’ with *xonj* ‘low, down’.

●ETYM No etymology is accepted in HAB 2: 394a.

See s.v. *xonj₁* ‘tired, exhausted’.

Hardly related to *xonarh* ‘low, down; humble; miserable, poor’ (Bible+; widespread in the 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‘ Anyalt‘, 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 “Arjejn bařaran”, is corroborated 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 telis* “rode into difficult and rocky parts”. See below.

Among derivatives: *ōtar-a-xort* ‘foreign/alien and step-’, in Elišē (5th cent.), Ephrem, Sargis Šnorhali Vardapet (12th cent.).

●DIAL Widespread in the dialects, mostly in the 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 Lofi, 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‘əbəřt* ‘rough’ [Ačārean 1926: 63-64, 400; HAB 2: 408a; Davt‘yan 1966: 376] is identical with *xort-a-bort-k* ‘hard, rough, stony places’ (Movsēs

Xorenac'i 3.55; see above). Thus, the compound **xort'-bort'* appears in the dialects in both meanings: 'rough, stony' and 'step-'.
 I wonder if we can also add the following words: Muš, Xian *xort'* 'young (man)', Sasun *xort'* 'a brave, valiant, heroic, heroic person' (see Ačařean 1913: 486a; in Petoyan 1954: 132; 1965: 486; Sasun *xort'* 'young?'). This connection is in fact already suggested by Bařdasaryan-Г'ар'ал'ян (1958: 258b), who glosses ClArm. *xort'* by Muš *xort'* 'orphan; courageous'. In Moks, we find 'daring, courageous, valiant, violent': *xort'* 'самомящий, смелый, дерзкий', *xor/řtut'in* 'насилие, беззаконие', *xortut'növ* 'насилъно' [Orbeli 2002: 249]. A textual illustration: *mek xort t'äk'äworäm* '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' and 'hard, rough, violent'.
 ●ETYM No acceptable etymology is recorded in HAB 2: 407b.

Řahukyan (1967: 117) proposed a connection with Oic. *skratti* 'Zauberer, Troll', *skrydda* 'alte Lederjacke', Germ. **skrattaz* 'Schrat, Waldteufel', Lith. *skriaudüs* '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) also derives *kord* 'unploughed (land, ground)' (q.v.). In 1987: 317, Řahukyan rejects the comparison with Hitt. *řartuwa-* '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 : tà κρόμμυα καὶ τὰ σκόρδα*.

●DIAL The later form, namely *sxtor*, marked in NHB and HAB as 'dialectal', is widespread in the dialects, whereas the older form *xstor* is restricted to Aslanbek (extreme NW) and Łarabał, Goris (extreme SE) [HAB 2: 428a].

●ETYM Ačařyan (1908: 123b; HAB 2: 428a) connects Gr. *σκόρ(ο)δον* n. 'garlic' and Alb. *hurdhë*, also *hurdhër* (Schriftsprache) f. 'garlic'. As Ačařyan points out, the comparison with the Greek word seems to have been suggested already in NHB 1: 988c; 2: 718b. According to Řahukyan (1987: 302), we may be dealing with common (probably independent) borrowings.

Ačařyan's etymology has largely remained unknown to the Indo-Europeanists, with a few exceptions (e.g. Mann 1963: 172). The Greek and Albanian forms 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 only occurs 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.

Ačaryan (ibid.; cf. also 2003: 422) 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, namely Arm. *sunkn* vs. Gr. *σπόγγος*, etc. (q.v.). For the metathesis, cf. also **šetb-ik* > Cilicia *xšbig* (see HAB s.v. *šetb* ‘knife-blade’). Then *xstor* became *sxtor* probably due to association with *sox* ‘onion’ (cf. the Biblical passage above; proverbs with *sox* : *sxtor* in e.g. Čulartean 1880: 147; Čanikean 1895: 265^{Nr764}; Łanalanyan 1960: 21a, 144a; YušMusLer 1970: 240; a folk-song sung by Mannik Hayrapet, Svazlyan 1994: 143b; a Partizak jocular dancing song, Tēr-Yakobean 1960: 360^{L4,9}; a superstition, Durean 1933: 149, etc.), but has been preserved in the opposite corners of the Armenian-speaking territory, namely Aslanbek and Łarabał.

Alternative: the form *sxtor*, albeit 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. This solution, albeit economical, seems less probable.

For a thorough discussion on Arm. *xstor*, see now Greppin 1998a.

***xt-it-** ‘to tickle; to excite’: *xt-t-em* (Ephrem), *xt-t-t-em* (Bible/Sirach 43.18/20, Eznik Kołbac‘i, Eusebius of Caesarea, etc.), *xt-t-k-im* (Grigor Magistros), *xt-t-t-em* (Jacob of Nisibis/Afrahat, John Chrysostom, Ephrem, Yovhannēs Drasxanakertc‘i /9-10th cent./), *xt-t-t-ot-em* (Jacob of Nisibis/Afrahat), 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 *xtit-ov* and *xt-t-t-ov* in Ephrem).

The only Biblical attestation (Sirach 43.20) reads as follows: *gelec‘kut‘iwn spitakut‘ean nora xttē zač‘s : κάλλος λευκότητος αὐτῆς ἐκθανύσσει ὀφθαλμός*.

The compound *akn-a-xt-it* and some dialectal forms (see below) point to a *t*-less stem **xi/ut-*.

According to Ačaryan (HAB 2: 428b), Udi *xitit* ‘tickling’ is an Armenian loan.

●DIAL Widespread in the 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 Naxijewan **xt-i(k)*, Šamaxi *təd-ət*, Łarabał *łldi*, *łldik*, Agulis *łldik* [HAB 2: 428b]. Note also Salmast *t‘di t‘di* and Polis *gədagədə* (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 a *t*-formation **xtt-t-*. Still, there are forms that reliably point to a *t*-less stem **xit-* or **xut-*.

One wonders if Łarabał, Agulis *łldi(k)* can be explained as follows: **xtt-i* > **xtl-i* (cf. *maraxl-* vs. *maraxut* ‘fog’, etc.) > **xlt-i* (late metathesis) > *łld-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-l-* 'burning desire' and *katalim* 'to be furious', Ĵahukyan (1967: 140, 306) connects with OIc. *hvata* 'anreizen, sich eilen', etc. from **k^ved-*. The comparison with *kt-l-* is possible, although that with *katalim* 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 *-ü-* points to *xoyt'*.

●ETYM See s.v. *xayt'*.

xuc', *i*-stem: GD *xc'-i*, LocSg *i xc'-i*, ISg (uncertain) *xc'-i-w* 'small chamber, cell', attested in Paterica, Sargis Šnorhali, etc. (for a philological discussion of uncertain attestations in a homily ascribed to Ehišē and in John Chrysostom, see HAB 2: 422b with references); **xc'-ik**, *an*-stem: GDSg *xc'k-an* (P'awstos Buzand /5th cent./, John Chrysostom), LocSg *i xc'k-an* (Ehišē), AblSg *i xc'k-an-ē* (Kirakos Erznkac'i) vs. *i xc'k-ē* (Paterica) 'small chamber, cell; hut'

●DIAL Suč'ava, Nor Naxijewan, Axalc'xa, Ewdokia, Sebastia, Muš, Zeyt'un, Ĵula, etc. *xuc'* 'cell'. With *r*-epenthesis: Akn *xurc'*; with an epenthetic nasal: Ozim, Sip'an [HAB 2: 422-423], Hamšen *xunc'* [Ačarıyan 1947: 234], Moks *xunc'*, gen. *xənc'ə* 'келья' [Orbeli 2002: 250].

The main meaning is 'cell, a small chamber in a church or in the yard of a church'. Also other meanings are found: Sip'an *xunc'* 'a part of a room for the young couple separated by a curtain' [Amatuni 1912: 292a]; Hamšen *xunc'* 'school', etc. [HAB 2: 423; Ačarıyan 1947: 234].

●ETYM The connection with OHG *hūs* 'house', Lat. *cutis* 'skin', *cūria* 'senate-house', Gr. *κεύθω* 'to conceal', etc. (Pátrubany 1902-03a: 163; Petersson 1916: 282-283; Pokorný 1959: 951; Ĵahukyan 1967: 118₈₆) is uncertain. The explanation of Mann (1963: 84; cf. Ĵahukyan 1967: 173₂₇, 216₇; 1982: 217₇₈) assuming **-tVs* > **-ts* > Arm. *-c'* is improbable, see *-T(i)* (2.3.1).

The Germanic word for 'house' has been compared with Yeniseian *qus* 'tent, house' (see Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 742₁, 939 = 1995, 1: 645₅, 832 with ref.). Arm. *xuc'* might be related with Germ. **hūs* if one posits a QIE **k^hut-s-* of substratum origin. Ĵahukyan (1980, 1: 117) hesitantly posits **k^hu-sk-*. Olsen (1999: 811) derives *xuc'* from **k^huh₁tjah₂₋*, cf. Germ. *Hütte*. However, **-tj-* would give Arm. *-č'* rather than *-c'* (see 2.1.22.1).

More probably, however, Arm. *xuc'* is a Semitic loanword, cf. Assyr. *hušsu* 'hedge; an additional part of a building', Hebr. *xūš* 'das Draussen, Strasse, Gasse, was ausserhalb der Stadt liegt', Arab. *xušš* 'hut made of reeds', etc. (Ačarıyan 1935a; HAB 2: 422-423; Ĵahukyan 1967: 329; 1987: 192, 462). D'jakonov (1981: 61, 75) assumes an Aramaic rather than Akkadian origin, cf. Aram. *hūš-* 'hut, cell'.

C

***cat-** ‘flower, blossom’ (see on the dialects); **catik**, *an*-stem: GDSg *catk-an*, NPI *catk-un-k*’, GDP1 *catk-a-n-c*’ in Agat’angelos §§ 643, 645 (1909=1980: 329-330), etc.; *a*-stem: AblSg *i catk-ē* and IPI *catk-a-w-k*’ in the Bible, etc.; *o*-stem: GDP1 *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 also present 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/ħkel* < *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 *atberanc’ 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, ἀνθεῖν* : ‘shine’, ‘bloom’; see also Pokorny 1959: 366; Jahukyan 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 *cater* and *catr-u*) ‘laugh, laughter; joke, mockery’ (Bible+); **catrem** (Łazar P’arpec’i, Movsēs Xorenac’i), **catr aĵnem** (Bible+) ‘to deride, mock, ridicule, laugh at; to joke’.

See also s.vv. *catracu* ‘mime, buffoon; mocking (words)’ and *ci-cat* ‘laughter’.

The compound **k’m-catrel** ‘to smirk, simper’, attested in Smbat Sparapet [MiĵHayBaĵ 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-cril* ‘to smile, simper’, with *cr-* ‘to curve’, found in Turkish-Armenian dictionary (ca. 1720 AD) by Elia Mušelyan Karnec’i (Karin/Xotorĵur), and *k’m-cr-el* ‘to grimace mockingly’ in the dialect of Manisa [Č’ugaszyan 1986: 42^{Nr22}, 173].

In Arak'el Siwnec'i (14-15th cent.) one finds the compound with a reversed order of the components: 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 Łarabał recorded by Arak'el Bahat'ryan in 1860 (HŽHek' 6, 1973: 80^{L6f}), *k'mk'əcicat* refers to a smile with opening of the teeth. Further, of a woman who tries to seduce: *xuselis tetn el k'amk'əcecat 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 [Ačařyan 1952: 267; M. Muradyan 1962: 198a], Muš, Alaškert, Ararat, Axalc'xa [HAB 2: 440a]. In Łarabał, etc. found in the compound *catr-a-tet* 'an object of derision, mockery' (Łarabał, Łazax, Ararat), with *tet* 'place, spot' as the second member [Ačařean 1913: 505b]. Independently: Łarabał *cātər* '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 gušu*/.⁶⁹ On /*mart'i*/ 'mouette', see HAB 3: 372a, s.v. *mrtimn*. Ačařyan (1913: 505b) has exactly the same: **catrik haw* "a kind of mew, /*mart'i*", but specifying the dialect: Muš. 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-cicat* 'smirk, simper, ironical smile' note the following forms: Ararat and Łarabał **k'mcicat*, **k'mk'əcicat* [Amatuni 1912: 675a], Goris *k'amk'əcicāt* [Margaryan 1975: 371b]; Muš *k'njttal* = Axalk'alak', Axalc'xa, Alek'sandrapol (Leninkan/Gyumri), Širak *k'aməc'əxtal* < **k'm-cicat-ot-* 'to smirk, smile ironically' [HAB 2: 456a; 4: 580a].

The opposite, namely *catr-a-k'am-* (Arak'el Siwnec'i; see above), is present in Moks: *cātrāk^oāmə^e* 'улыбка, насмешка', *cātrāk^oamil*, aor. *cātrāk^om-āv* 'улыбаться' (see M. Muradyan 1982: 137; Orbeli 2002: 252).

See also s.v. *catracu*.

•ETYM Since Brosset, connected with Gr. *γέλαω* 'to laugh', *γέλως* m. 'laughter', *γέλασμα* 'laughing', *γελαστός* 'laughable', *γαλήνη* f. 'stillness of the sea', *γαλήνός* 'still', etc., and with Arm. *ci-cat* 'laughter' [Hübschmann 1897: 455; HAB 2: 439-440; Jahukyan 1982: 120; 1987: 125].

One may reconstruct an animate *s*-stem for Greek and Armenian: NSg **ǵélh₂-ōs* (cf. Gr. *γέλως* m.), GSg **ǵlh₂-s-ōs* (cf. Gr. **γελασ-*); see Klingenschmitt 1982: 147; Kortlandt 1996a = 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 **cél-u*, obl. **cal-ah-*. Arm. **catu-* must have generalized the vocalism of the oblique stem.

Alternatively, one posits an old *u*-stem with NSg **-ōu(s)*. For an extensive philological and etymological discussion I refer to de Lamberterie 1978: 269-276; Clackson 1994: 126-132; Meissner 2006: 134-136.

⁶⁹ The final *-ō* of *mart'iō* in Amatuni 1912: 301a referring to NHB must be a misprint.

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 **cat-* is seen in *catel* ‘to deride, laugh at’ (HHB), *cat-k-u* ‘buffoon’ (John Chrysostom), *cat-bast* ‘laughable’, if these forms are reliable, as well as in *ci-cat* ‘laughter’ (q.v.) [HAB 2: 439a]. NHB (1: 1001c, 1003c, 1015c) suggested a connection between not only *caṭr* and *cicaṭ*, but also with *catik* ‘flower’ and *jat* ‘derision, mockery’ (see s.vv.). For a possible dialectal evidence for the root **cat-* ‘to blossom’, see s.v. *catik*.

caṭracu ‘mime, buffoon’; dial. ‘mystery, riddle’ (John Chrysostom+). In expressions like *caṭracu 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 Oljaberd (in Kotayk’) in 1945 (see HŽHek’ 1, 1959: 561-571), where the king wants to find out why the fish laughed, *caṭracu* is found several times referring to the mystery/riddle of the laughing fish: the king says: *Ari es jkan caṭracun xán* ‘Come (and) solve (literally: take out) the *caṭracu* of this fish!’ (567^{L-16}); *t’ot gan, jkan caṭracun xanen* ‘let them come (and) solve the *caṭracu* of the fish’ (567^{L-13}); *jkan caṭracun dus beri* ‘(that he) solves (literally: takes out) the *caṭracu* of the fish’ (568^{L7}); *es kpatmem jkan caṭracun* ‘I will tell you the *caṭracu* of the fish’ (569^{L10}); *et jkan caṭracun jer k’aša* ‘give up the *caṭracu* 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 *caṭr* ‘laughter; ridicule, mockery’ + *-ac-* ‘to bring’ + *-u*, thus: ‘laughter/ridicule bringing person or words’. For the structure and semantics, cf. **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 Maraša. In this dialect, the synonyms *čananč’* and *canot’* ‘acquainted’ make a contrastive pair: *čananč’* ‘acquainted (with a Turk)’ vs. *canot’* ‘acquainted (with an Armenian)’ [Ačařean 1926: 410; HAB 3: 182b]. Ačařyan (HAB 3: 182b) points out that this distinction is also present in the local Turkish.

●ETYM PIE **ǵnh₃-sk-ǵe-* > **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 ‘rainbow’ (Bible+), if from **ti-a-can* ‘divine sign’ (see s.v.);
can-ak(-) ‘disgrace’ (Bible+; dialect of Alaškert), probably from **can-* ‘sign, spot’; for the semantics cf. *xayt* ‘spotted’ : *xayt-aṛak* ‘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 the dialects [HAB 2: 452b].

●ETYM Since Klaproth, Brosset and NHB, connected with Gr. *γέρον* ‘old man’, etc., from **ġerH-*, cf. Skt. *jar* ‘to age, grow old’, *járant-* ‘old’, YAv. *zar-* ‘id.’, Oss. *zæron* ‘old’ [Hübschmann 1897: 452; HAB 2: 457-458; EWAia 1, 1992: 577-578; Cheung 2002: 254-255; 2007: 469-470]. For *cer-un* : Gr. *γέρον* cf. **ark’un* : Gr. *ἄρχων* (see s.v. *ark’ay* ‘king’).

ciacan, *a*-stem: GDSg *ciacan-i* (Łazar P’arpec’i, Philo apud NHB 1: 338c s.v. *Aramazday gōti*), ISg *ciacan-a-w* (Cyril of Alexandria) ‘rainbow’.

The oldest attestation is found in Revelation 10.1 (rendering Gr. *ἵρις*).

The well-known passage from Genesis 9.13 reads (Zeyt’unyan 1985: 184): *Zateṭn im edic’ yamps ew etic’i i nšanak yawitenakan uxtin and is ew and amenayn erkir* ‘I shall place my bow in the clouds, and it shall be a sign of the eternal covenant between me and the earth’. Here, Arm. *ateṭn* ‘bow’ (rendering Gr. *τόξον*) stands for the rainbow which is to serve as a divine sign, *nšanak* ‘sign’ (rendering Gr. *σημεῖον* ‘sign, mark’). Remarkably, both *ateṭn* and *nšanak* came to denote the rainbow in Armenian dialects. For the former cf. **ateṭn-ak* ‘rainbow’ (see s.v. *ateṭn* ‘bow’); as for the latter, note Akn *nšanak* ‘rainbow’ [HAB 3: 461a; Gabikean 1952: 425]. See also Andranik 1900: 170 (Dersim); Mxit’areanc’ 1901: 193 (Širak); G. Hakobyan 1974: 276 (Nerk’in Basen); Gyozyalyan, 2001: 227 (Musa Leṛ).

Quoting this passage, T’ovmay Arcruni (9-10th cent.) adds (V. Vardanyan 1985: 32^{L-6f.}; transl. Thomson 1985: 81): *or ē ciacand, zor omank’ hur mekneal yampoy asac’in, ew ordik’ tarrapaštic’n – gōti Aramazday* ‘which is the rainbow (*ciacan*). Some say that it is fire emerging from cloud, and those who worship the elements (say it is) the belt of Aramazd’. *Aramazday gōti* is attested in Philo (apud NHB 1: 338c; see also Thomson 1985: 81₃).

In Ēfīmērtē, *ciacan* ‘rainbow’ is put in contrast with *ciacand* ‘atmospheric phenomenon’, the latter being mentioned 13 times [HAB 2: 454b]. The final *-d* is perhaps due to misinterpretation of a usage with the article *-d* as in the passage from T’ovmay Arcruni (see above); cf. also *ciacan-d* in *Hin bark’* apud NHB 1: 1015b, and especially ISg *ciacanaw-d* (Cyril of Alexandria, *ibid.*).

●ETYM Considered to be a word of unknown origin; see HAB 2: 454b; Ĵahukyan 1990: 71 (sem. field 1); Olsen 1999: 943. Olsen (1999: 299) lists *ciacan* among nouns in *-an* with an obscure etymological background.

On the strength of Armenian dialectal designations of the rainbow such as ‘Mary’s belt’, ‘St. Karapet’s belt’, ‘Rain’s Bride’, **Covean* ‘lightning/thunder Goddess of the celestial Purple Sea’, **Orot-ik* ‘little Thunder’, etc. (Haneyan 2001), as well as the above-mentioned *gōti Aramazday* ‘the belt of Aramazd’ in Philo and

T'ovmay Arcruni, I propose to interpret *ciacan* 'rainbow' as **Ti(w)* 'Sky-god, Thunder-god' (from PIE **dieus*) + the conjunction *-a-* + **can-* '*sign, omen', thus: 'the sign of the Sky/Thunder-god'. For this meaning of **can-* cf. Russ. *znak* 'sign', etc., from the same PIE verbal root; another possible trace is *can-ak(-)* 'disgrace', see **can-* 'to know'. That the rainbow has been regarded as an omen is not surprising, compare dial. *nšanak* and the Biblical passage above.

The initial *c-* instead of *t-* may be due to assimilation *t...c* > *c...c*, cf. *taracem* 'to spread, stretch' > Van *crnjel* 'to spread a news', with assimilation *t...c* > *c...c*, epenthetic nasal and the voicing *-nc-* > *-nj-* (see Ačarean 1952: 61, 86, 294). If **cirani-gōti* 'rainbow' (lit. 'purple belt', see 2.1.26.3) is old, it may have supported the development **ti-a-* > *ci-a-*.

cic 'bosom' (Geoponica, etc.), **cuc** 'substance to be sucked' (Bible+), dial. 'marrow', **ccem** 'to suck' (Bible+).

●DIAL *cic* and *ccem* are widespread in the dialects; *cuc* – in the meaning 'marrow' [HAB 2: 472a].

●ETYM According to Ačaryan (HAB 2: 471b), a Caucasian borrowing; cf. Georg. *juju* 'teat', etc. See, however, s.v. *tit* 'teat'. Note also Hurr. *zizzi* 'mamma, female breast', *zizz-u/ohḥə*, *zuzz-u/ohḥə* 'spouted jar', Chechen *çuz-am* 'spout', etc. (see Diakonoff/Starostin 1986: 44); Akkad. *zīzu*, *dīdā* (Jahukyan 1980, 2: 102; 1987: 448).

***cicał** 'laughter' (in the dialects, see below); **cicałim** 'to laugh' (Bible+).

The noun *cicał* is practically unattested in the 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]: *ḡur manuacoy cicał cawal* (69^{L43}); *cawal cov cicał* (114^{L15}).

●DIAL According to Ačaryan (HAB 2: 456a), the verb *cicałim* is dialectally ubiquitous, whereas the noun *cicał* is present in several dialects only. On *k'm-cicał* 'smirk, simper, ironical smile' and comparable forms, as well as on synaesthesia, see s.v. *całr* 'laughter, mockery'.

●ETYM On the etymology, see s.v. *całr* 'laughter; mockery'. On the type of reduplication cf. Latv. *paīpala* 'Wachtel' from **pelpalo*, etc. (see Meillet 1903b: 217; 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-cał* 'laughter' (cf. Meillet 1903b: 217; Toporov, PrJaz 2, 1979: 188). Note also *catrik haw* 'a kind of mew/gull' (see s.v. *cał-r* 'laughter'). For another bird-name of the same type of reduplication cf. Arm. *ci-ce/ařn* 'swallow' (q.v.).

As we have seen, the noun *cicał* is practically unattested in the literature and is present in several dialects only (note also that *cicał* is represented in NHB 1: 1015b as a dialectal [*řamkōrēn*] word), whereas the verb *cicałim* 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 *cicał* to be original. This seems to be corroborated by the fact that the noun *cicał* is represented in the Northern (*kə*-class: Suč'ava, Nor Naxijewan, Axalc'xa; *um*-class:

T'iflis), Eastern (*um*-class: Ararat, Łarabał, Šamaxi, Agulis, Ĵula), and South-Western (*kə*-class: Hačən) peripheries and should be treated as an archaism.

On the other hand, one may think of a reduplicated present **ġi-ġlH-*, see s.v.v. *əmpem* 'to drink', *nist* 'seat'. Alternative: *cicat* is an onomatopoeic word, cf. Megr. *zic-*, Laz *zic-*, etc. 'to laugh' (on which see Klimov 1998: 268).

cicařn 'swallow'. For attestations, see Greppin 1978: 180-182.

●DIAL Ubiquitous in the dialects [HAB 2: 456-457].

Perhaps also **cicVtnik*. Note *cicřnik*, in a children song rhyming with *t'it'tnik* 'butterfly'; see Ę. Grigoryan 1970: 165^{Nr273}; cf. 163^{Nr266} (*t'it'ėrnik* – *cicėrnik*; from Muš). The form with *-t-* can be due to rhyming influence of *t'it'tnik* (on which, see s.v. *t'it'ėř/tn*). No independent evidence is known to me. Note, however, MidArm. *ctni* 'a kind of sea-bird resembling 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 type of reduplication (**ġoi-ġar-n-*), see AčarLiak 3, 1957: 91, with parallels. Note *čičřunk* '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'ėrn* 'butterfly' (note *cicėrn* 'swallow' vs. *cicařn*), *cicat* 'laughter' (q.v.) and perhaps dial. **titrak* from 'turtle-dove'. Elsewhere, Greppin (1981b: 6-7) is positive on the example of *siseřn* 'chickpea' vs. Lat. *cicer*, etc. Here (p. 5) he notes that **ġoi-ġar-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 *čičřunk* 'twittering of swallows', with *c* : *č* [Ĵahukyan 1967: 307].

cil, verbal **clēm** (Geoponica, etc.), **ciř**, *o*-stem, *i*-stem (Step'anos Tarōnec'i /10-11th cent./) 'sprout, bud, haulm', **ct-awt**, *i*-stem, *u*-stem 'haulm' (Dawit' Anyat', etc.), **ciwř** (in Elišė, as a reading variant, and with uncertain meaning), **ancřiřwř** 'blossom, sprout', **anc(i)wřtem**, etc. 'to germinate' (Bible+).

In Elišė 2 (Ter-Minasyan 1989: 104^{L23f}, ModArm. transl. 105; Engl. transl. Thomson 1982: 104) : *ciwk*' (vars. *ciwřk*', *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 Bařgirk' 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 *ciwř* found in the passage from Elišė is taken as an independent word meaning 'brushwood' [HAB 2: 455a]. The existence of the form may be corroborated by Ĵula *cuř* 'a piece of straw' (as Ačarġan stresses in HAB 2: 455b), and, if related, by *ən-cřiřwř* 'blossom, sprout' and *čiwř* 'branch'. Further, in the following entry of the same Bařgirk' hayoc' (Amalyan 1975: 152^{Nr66}) one finds *ciwř* · *xot kam čel* "grass or branch".

●ETYM IE proposals are not convincing (see HAB s.v.). On possibly related Caucasian forms, see Ĵahukyan 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+): IPI *cn-i-w-k* ‘in Movsēs Xorenac’i 1.12 (see below); in Bible: AblSg *i cn-ē* [Astuacaturean 1895: 734a; Olsen 1999: 99₂₀₉]; *cnot* or *cnawt*, *a*-stem ‘parent’ (Bible+); *cn-und*, *o*-stem, also *cnnd-ean* ‘birth, origin, generation’ (Bible+); *-cin* as the second member of numerous compounds.

In the meaning ‘base’, *cin* (IPI *cn-i-w-k*) is attested in Movsēs Xorenac’i 1.12 (1913=1991: 39^{L2}; transl. Thomson 1978: 89): *aṛ saḥmanōk’ noc’a, cniwk’ lerambk’ ew ezerōk’ daštīn* : “At the borders by the base of the mountains and edges of the plain”.

ant/d-o-cin, *a*-stem (later also *o*-stem) ‘a slave that is born in the house of his master’ (rendering Gr. *οικογενής*); see s.v.

●DIAL The verb is widespread in the 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 **anknil*, but some Eastern dialects have preserved the *-an-*, cf. Meṛi *nānil* [Atayan 1954: 262a], Areš *ənganel* [Lusenc’ 1982/197a], Ĵuḷa *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 AčaṙLiak 4b, 1961: 315); cf. e.g. Polis *jnil* which has both transitive and intransitive meanings [Ačaṙyan 1941: 220] whereas e.g. in Ĵuḷa we see a formal distinction: trans. *cnel* (aor. *cn-ec’i*) vs. intransitive *cn-v-el* (aor. *cn-v-ec’-i*) [Ačarean 1940: 367b].

The noun *cin* is found in several meanings: ‘birth of each year started with the fourth (of cow)’ (Karin, Bulanəx, Alaškert, Van, Ararat, etc.), ‘four-year-old cow or bullock’ (Karin), ‘womb of a cow’ (Łarabał), ‘birth-mark’ (Alaškert, Van), ‘a kind of spotted wound’ (Van), ‘time for giving birth (of cow)’ (Nor Naxijewan), ‘age of cattle’ (Łarabał) [HAB 2: 458a; Amatuni 1912: 308a], ‘skin enclosing the foetus, afterbirth (of animals)’ (Ararat) [Amatuni 1912: 308a; Ananyan 1984: 457^{L5}, Chapter 3.16].

●ETYM Since NHB (1: 1016b), linked with Skt. *jan-* ‘to be born; to produce, create’ (spelled in NHB as *čan-*), Gr. *γένεσις*, etc., see Hübschmann 1897: 456; HAB 2: 457-458. The noun *cin* is usually derived from PIE **ǵenh₁os*, *s*-stem neuter ‘birth, origin, race’: Gr. *γένος*, Lat. *genus*, Skt. *jānas-* (see Meillet 1936: 41; Pokorny 1959: 375; Schmitt 1981: 49; Ĵahukyan 1982: 35, 56; 1987: 125; Mallory/Adams 1997: 192b; Beekes 2003: 167, 175, 192; Meissner 2006: 45, 54). If this is true, the *i*-stem of Arm. *cin* instead of the expected *o*-stem must be treated as secondary, unless one assumes a derivation from **ǵenh₁-ti-*, cf. Gr. *γένεσις* (for a discussion, see Ĵahukyan 1982: 127; Matzinger 2005: 48-49; Olsen 1999: 99-100). Alternatively, Olsen *ibid.* assumes an influence of a compositional *i*-stem, cf. *mi-a-cin* = Gr. *μονογενής*. However, *miacin* is an *a*-stem: GDSg *miacn-i* (Bible), ISg *miacn-a-w* (John Chrysostom, Yovhannēs Ōjnec’i); cf. also *ant/docin* (see above, and s.v.).

Arm. *cnawt* ‘parent’ is usually derived from **ġenh₁-tlo-* (Ĵahukyan 1987: 125, 240; Matzinger 1997: 11). The word is an *a*-stem, however, and presupposes **ġenh₁-tl-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.). Ĵahukyan *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*).

cung-k‘ (pl.), *a*-stem (Bible+); later *o*-stem: IPI *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; MiĴHayBař 1, 1987: 370a); MidArm. and dial. pl. (< dual) **cn(k)vi** ‘knee’.

Spelled also as *cunk-k‘*. It is hard to determine which of the two (*cung-* or *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. GarsoĴan 1989: 189): *i nerk‘oy cnkac‘ nora* ‘under his knees’. In Anania Őirakac‘i, *cng-a-c‘* (A. G. Abrahamyan 1944: 329^{L28}).

In “BĴŝkaran jioy” (13th cent.): pl. *cnkvi* [Ĵ‘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 *cngyĄn* [Aĉaryan 1952: 125], Moks *cung^v*, GSg *cĄng^vĄn*, NPI *cĄng^vnir* [Orbeli 2002: 255], Őatax *cungy*, GSg *cĄngyĄn* (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 *jĄngvĄ(nĄ/a)* [Aĉaryan 2003: 152]. Polis *jung*, NPI *jĄngvĄner* [Aĉaryan 1941: 108].

Sebastia *cunk*, also *cuy* – in the expression *cuy mĄ, ėrku cunk atōt‘k‘* ‘a few prayers’, *glxun-cĄywun cecel* ‘to lament’, lit. ‘to beat one’s head and knees’ [Gabikean 1952: 279-280]. The latter expression presupposes a dual **cĄywi*.

Next to *cĄndĄr* < *cunr*, and *cung^v*, in Agulis one finds *cĄynĄ* [HAB 2: 473b; Aĉarean 1935: 361]. Aĉaryan (1935: 111) derives *cĄynĄ* from *cunkn*, although this development is exceptional; cf. *ėtungn* ‘nail’ > *ėtunk‘*, *sunk/gn* ‘mushroom’ > *sĄngĄn*. In p. 73 he notes that the development *u* > *ė* is found only in *cunk* > *cĄynĄ*, and *p‘unĴ* ‘stalk; bunch’ (Genesis 41.5, 22, etc.; dial.) > *p‘ėnĴ*. The vocalism of the latter may be due to the influence of the hushing affricate *Ĵ*, cf. examples with *ĉ‘*, *ŝ*, *Ĵ*, etc. (Aĉarean 1935: 77). Besides, it may somehow be compared with that of *p‘inĴ* ‘stalk, stem’, as well as Skt. *piñju/ĄlĄm* ‘a bunch of stalks or grass’ next to *puñĴilĄm* ‘id.’ and *puñĴa-* ‘a heap, mass, quantity, multitude’, although the etymology of the Sanskrit (see Mayrhofer, KEWA s.vv.) and Armenian (HAB, s.vv.) words is uncertain. Note also Turk. *pinĉak*, etc., considered to be Armenian loans (Dankoff 1995: 152), Tat *p‘ėnĴak* ‘heap of 5 or 10 bundles’ (Ananyan 1978: 96, deriving the word from *p‘ėnĴ* ‘five’); Łarabał Arm. *p‘ĄnĴak‘* (L. Harut‘yunyan 1991: 10^{L22}).

Thus, Agulis *p'enj* does not seem to be a good parallel to *céynə*. Note also that *cunkn* 'knee' and *sunkn* 'mushroom' yielded Łarabał *cóngnə/cúynə* and *sóngnə/sóynə*, respectively [Davt'yan 1966: 385, 472], thus Agulis *céynə* 'knee' vs. *sóngən* 'mushroom' may be remarkable, although one must admit that here we are on shaky grounds, and other explanations may be possible too. As for *etungn* 'nail' > Łarabał *téngnə/téynə* (see Davt'yan 1966: 344), we are dealing perhaps with metathesis *e...u* > *u...e*. Here Agulis has *étunk'* rather than **(u)teng(n)*, so the vocalism of *céynə* can hardly be interpreted by the influence of an unattested Agulis **téynə*.

●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 AčařLiak 3, 1957: 442; Eichner 1978: 147₁₇, 151; Clackson 1994: 47, 125. The idea that Arm. *-k/g-* comes from a guttural determinative (cf. Gr. *γνύζ* '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), MidArm. 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)váu* 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-nt-*) and Skt. GDu *jānunoh* seem to point to a heteroclitic declension (see Meillet 1903: 144), albeit at the PArm. rather than the 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 **cún(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.; or perhaps better: the original form was **cung-kn*, with the same suffix as in *akn* 'eye', *mukn* 'mouse', *unkn* 'ear', etc. (see s.vv.).

If Agulis *céynə* 'knee' reflects an old *e* (which is very uncertain; see above), one may compare it with Hitt. ^{UZU}*genu-* 'knee' and Lat. *genū*.

K

ka-: 1sg.pres. *ka-m*, 3sg.pres. *ka-y*, 1sg.aor. *ka-c'-i*, 3sg.aor. *e-kac'*, 3pl.aor. *kac'-in*, imper. *ka-c'*, plur. *ka-c'-ēk'*, 3.sg.impf. *kay-r* (rich evidence in the Bible, see Astuacaturean 1895: 744-747) 'to stay, stand, halt; to stop, rest; to wait; to appear; to dwell' (Bible+); *kay*, *i*-stem 'standing (still), place to stand, station, site' (Bible+); *kay-an*, *i*-stem: GDSg *kayan-i* (Esayi Nč'ec'i), LocSg *i kayan-i* (Bible), GDP1 *kayan-i-c'* (Gregory of Nyssa, Yačaxapatum, etc.), IPI *kayan-i-w-k'* (Book of Chries) 'standing (still), place to stand, station, site' (Bible+); *kayanam* 'to stand, stand still, halt, establish oneself' (Philo, Paterica, Grigor Narekac'i, etc.).

- DIAL The verb *kam kas kay* is ubiquitous in the dialects. Many dialects have also **kenal* < **kay(a)nal* [HAB 2: 505a].
- ETYM See s.v. *ek-* aor. 'to come'.

kat'n, GDSg *kat'in*, AblSg *i kat'an-ē*, ISg *kat'am-b* (all in Bible) 'milk' (Bible+).

- DIAL Ubiquitous in the dialects. The nasal is seen in Suč'ava *gat'ə*, gen. *gat'ni*, T'iflis *kát'ə*, gen. *kát'ni*, Łarabał, Goris, Šamaxi *kát'nə* [HAB 2: 481a], Lori *kat'ə* [M. Asatryan 1968: 80, 184b].

Remarkable are Agulis *kaxc'* (also in a number of compounds: *kxc'*), Havarik *kaxs* [HAB 2: 481a; Ačařean 1935: 362], Areš *kaxs* [Lusenc' 1982: 214a], Meři *kaxc'* [Ałayan 1954: 81, 274b], Karčewan *kaxc'* [H. Muradyan 1960: 196b]. In Kak'avaberd, *kaxc'* is found only in the village of Varhavar, whereas the other three villages have *kát'nə* [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). Baṅgānī *laktə* 'milk' (Zoller 1989: 198; see also Schrijver 1991: 480) is unreliable [Driem/Sharmā 1996: 135]. The various reconstructions with initial **ǵ-* (based on Nūristāni **dzara* 'milk', see Mallory/Adams 1997: 381-382), or **d* (see Hamp 1998: 242; cf. Szemerényi 1977: 90₃₅₈), or **m-* (Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 1: 98₁) should be rejected particularly in view of the Armenian, which is neglected in these works.

One reconstructs **ǵlgt-*, without an internal laryngeal; see Schrijver 1991: 479-480. According to Szemerényi (1977: 90, 90₃₅₈), Lat. *lact-* was borrowed from Gr. γαλακτ-. Schrijver (ibid.), however, takes the Latin word as native. The appurtenance of Hitt. *galaktar* n. 'soothing substance, balm, nutriment' (see Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 568; Mallory/Adams 1997: 381-382; cf. Szemerényi 1977: 90₃₅₈) is uncertain. On the etymology of this Hittite word, see Kloekhorst 2008 s.v. The peculiar structure of **ǵlgt* 'milk', as well as its restriction to Greek, Latin and Armenian point to Mediterranean origin. For a further discussion on this etymon, see Orel 1994a: 39. Note also Chinese **lak* 'Kumys' (Furnée 1972: 379; Witzel 2003: 17₆₃).

The *-x-* of some SEArm. dialects (Agulis, Meři, etc.) is remarkable. Gr. Vanc'ean (1899-1901, 1: 149a; see also N. Simonyan 1979: 199₂₄) assumed that Agulis *kałc'* 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' > *γɔxt*, 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 Ačařyan (1901: 79-80; 1935: 23; HAB 2: 480-481; AčařHLPatm 2, 1951: 430-431). He convincingly showed that the development *a* > Agulis *ɔ* has been blocked in position before *ł*, and Agulis *kaxc'* derives from **kałc'*; otherwise we would have **kɔxc'*. He correctly treats the *ł* as an archaic relic of the IE **-l-* seen in the Greek and Latin forms; see also Jähukyan 1959: 187-188; 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 Ačařean 1935: 99; H. Muradyan 1967: 80). Ačařyan (HAB 2: 480-481; AčařHLPatm 2, 1951: 431) assumes **kałt'* > **kałc'* comparing with cases like *xayt* : *xayc* (q.v.), etc.; see also N. Simonyan 1979: 232. Jähukyan (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. **kalc'* from acc. **głgt-m* and nom. **głgt-s* respectively.

It remains unclear why the **l* has been preserved in **kalc'*, but dropped in *kat'n*. Kortlandt (1987a: 52₁ = 2003: 81₁) takes *kat'n* as a case of loss of *-t-* before an aspirate. I tentatively propose the following solution. In 2.1.22.13, I argue that **RCt* yields Arm. *Rt'*. Next to this, there is some (albeit scanty and uncertain) material that points to the loss of **l* before affricate *c'* (see 2.1.22.9). If these developments are correct, the word for 'milk' would have had the following PArm. paradigm: nom. **głkt-s* > **kac'* vs. acc. **głkt-m* > **kalt'-n*. In ClArm., the paradigm **kac'* : **kalt'n* was levelled into **kac'* : **kat'n*, and the accusative was generalized, whereas in the SE periphery the opposite development has taken place: the paradigm was levelled to **kalc'* : **kalt'n*, and the nominative was generalized.

***kakal(ay)** (dial.) 'walnut; testicle, etc.'

●DIAL **kakal* 'walnut (together with the shell)': Karin, Xotorjur, Hamšen, T'iflis (in T'iflis – also 'eye-ball') [Ačarean 1913: 540a], also Ararat, Urmia, Sebastia [HayLezBrbBař 3, 2004: 21a].

**kakalay* : 'walnut; testicle' (Karin) [Ačarean 1913: 540a]; 'testicle' (Polis, K'hi, Amasia), 'unripe fruit' (Sebastia), etc. [HayLezBrbBař 3, 2004: 21-22].

●ETYM Ačaryan (1913: 540a) compares with Georg. *kačali* 'piece' and Kurd. */kake/* 'the kernel of the walnut', not specifying the nature of the relationship. According to Łap'anc'yan (1961: 90; 1975: 369), the Armenian has been borrowed from Laz-Megrelian.

Arm. **kakal* and the Kartvelian forms (Georg. *kačal-* 'walnut', Laz *kačal-* 'walnut', Megr. *kačal-* 'grain; piece', etc.) may be treated as a reduplication of **kal-*; cf. dial. **popok'*, see also s.v. *kokov-*. In that case, **kal-* 'round small object; walnut, etc.' may be related with the PIE word for 'acorn' (**g^{wh}th₂-(e)n-*; cf. Alb. *gogël* f. 'acorn; small and round object', if indeed belonging to this IE word); see s.v. *katin* 'acorn'.

Since the form **kakal* is found in a number of dialects mostly in the meaning 'walnut' whereas **kakal-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) **kałat* 'unripe, green walnut to make sweets with', q.v.

kałat, *i*-stem or *a*-stem according to NHB 1: 1036c, but only LocSg *i kałat-i* (Movsēs Xorenac'i 2.77) is cited 'den, lair'.

Movsēs Xorenac'i, Philo, Irenaeus, Aristakēs Lastivertc'i, etc. Often in apposition with synonymous *orj*, etc. (see NHB 1: 1036-1037).

In Movsēs Xorenac'i 2.77(1913=1991: 216^{L1f}, transl. Thomson 1978: 224): *orjac'eal yamurn Ani, ibr i kałati handartut'ean łōteal* '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 Yuzbařyan 1963: 129^{L11f}).

●ETYM Probably with the suffix *-at* (cf. *kenc* ‘-at’ ‘living’, etc.) and the root **kaṭ-* connected with Lith. *guðlis* ‘den, lair, (coll.) bed’, *gūltas* ‘bed, lair’, *gułti* ‘to lie down, fall ill’, Latv. *guðļa* ‘nest, den, lair, (coll.) bed’, etc., probably also Gr. *γωλεός* m. ‘hole’ [Lidén 1906: 48-49; Petersson 1916: 280; HAB 2: 492a; Pokorny 1959: 402; Jahukyan 1987: 126, 169]. Arm. **kaṭ-* is usually derived from a zero-grade **gbl-*. Perhaps better **guol-*, with the loss of **u* (cf. *jayn*, *i*-stem ‘voice, sound’ vs. OCS *zvонѣ* ‘sound’) and the development **o* in open syllables > Arm. *a* (on which see 2.1.3).

See also s.v. *koṭ* ‘rib, side’.

***kaṭaṭ** (dial.) ‘unripe, green walnut to make sweets with’.

●DIAL Agulis, Łarabaṭ [Ačarean 1913: 541b], also Łazax and Lori [Amatuni 1912: 326a].

●ETYM No etymological attempt is known to me.

It is hard to determine whether there is a relation with *katin* ‘acorn’ and/or **kakal* ‘walnut’ (see s.vv.).

Perhaps more promising is to compare Pers. *čayāla* ‘unripe fruit’ (on which see Monchi-Zadeh 1990: 12^{Nr27}).

kaṭamax (Isaiah 41.19, 2 Paralipomenon 2.8), **kaṭamax-i**, *ea*-stem: GDPI *kaṭamax-eac* (Hosea 4.13), NPI *kaṭamaxi-k* (Hexaemeron); ‘white poplar, *Populus alba*; aspen, *Populus tremula*’, probably also ‘pine’.

In Isaiah 41.19 and Hosea 4.13, Arm. *kaṭamax(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 kaṭamax i Libanan leṛnē : 2.7 καὶ ἀπόστειλὸν μοι ζύλα κέδρινα καὶ ἄρκεύθινα καὶ πεύκινα*. Thus: Arm. *saroy*, *mayr*, and *kaṭamax* match Gr. *κέδρος* ‘cedar-tree’, *ἄρκευθος* ‘juniper, *Juniperus macrocarpa*’, and *πεύκη* ‘pine’, respectively. If this set of correspondences is original, Arm. *kaṭamax* here refers to ‘pine’, thus. This seems to be corroborated by Hexaemeron (K. Muradyan 1984: 142^{L17}, cf. also 144^{L8}) where *kaṭamaxi*, according to the editor’s comment (K. Muradyan 1984: 340⁵⁷), corresponds to Gr. *πεύκη* ‘pine’.

In Agat‘angelos § 644 (1909=1984: 330^{L11}), *kaṭamax* (vars. *kaṭamaṭ*, *kaṭmax*, *kamaṭax*) is found in an enumeration of tree-names, between *gi* ‘juniper’ and *uṛi* ‘willow’.

Further: *kaṭamah/x* in Galen (rendering Gr. *λεύκη*, see Ališan 1895: 285-286; Greppin 1985: 71), and *kaṭmxi* (syncopated) in Geoponica.

●DIAL Muš *kaṭmxi*, Xotorjūr *gaxmxi* [HAB 2: 492b]. Ararat *kalama caṛ*, *k‘alambəṛ* [Markosyan 1989: 305a].

●ETYM Ačaryan (HAB 2: 492) treats as borrowed from an unattested Urartian source and mentions Salmast Turk. *k‘älämbär* or *k‘älämbur* ‘aspen’, T‘avriz/Tebriz Turk. *qälämä* ‘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 *täbrizi* ‘aspen’, lit. ‘of/from Tebriz’.

Now we can add two Hesychian glosses: *καλαμίνδαρ*: *πλάτανος ἡδονιεῖς* ‘plane’, obviously with **dar* ‘tree’, *καλαδία*: *ρύκάνη* ‘plane’, see Saradževa 1981a (referring

to Ĵahukyan p.c. for *καλαμίνδαρ*). See also Ĵahukyan 1987: 310, 437, 612 (Lezg. *къавах* ‘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); see H. Martirosyan 2008.

That *καλαμίνδαρ* contains **kalam-* and **dar* ‘tree’ is seen in Arm. Ararat *kalama car*, which is taken as equivalent to *k’alambər* (see above). The form must be closely linked with Salmast Turk. *k’älämbär* or *k’älämbur* ‘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 *καλαμίν-δαρ* ‘plane’, Turk. *qälämä* ‘poplar’, etc.) and the tree-suffix *-ax*.

katin, *o*-stem ‘acorn’ (Bible+); *katin-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 (16-17ch cent.), see D. M. Karapetyan 1993: 211; in the glossary: 349. See also Ališan 1895: 65-66, 287-288.

●DIAL Widespread in the 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 *tkóten* ‘hazel-nut’ (and metathesized *któten*, cf. Łarabał *t’ákušnə*), with an unexplained *t-* and with irregular change of *a* to *ɔ* (see HAB, *ibid.*; Ališan 1895: 342, 611, treating Łarabał *tkotin* as synonymous to *ark’akatin*, on which see above). Also Hadrut’ *təkwten* ‘id.’ [Połosyan 1965: 16].

For Svedia, Ačarıyan (HAB, *ibid.*) cites *gateɔn* (read /*gatön*/). Later, he (2003: 573) also records *g’ätəɔnd*, noting (p. 378) that the change ClArm. *i* > Svedia *ɛɔ* is irregular in this position. This form with epithetic *-d* is corroborated by other authors: *gälend* or *gähund* (see Andreasyan 1967: 36 and 367a, respectively), *gälend* [Hananyan 1995: 53, 187b]; K’esab *kätent* vs. *käten* [Č’olak’ean 1986: 206b].

The final *d* is exceptional since the other examples of the epenthetic or epithetic *d* (Ačarıyan 2003: 431; see also Hananyan 1995: 53) apply to specific conditions: *-nr* > *-ndr* and *-s(-)* > *-sd(-)*. Andreasyan (1967: 36, 373b) adds another example: *čapat* ‘spread’ > Svedia *jäbutd*, cf. verbal *jäbtıl* and *jäbəddıl*. The latter form is probably a misprint for **jäbətdıl* (note the resemblance of the Armenian characters for *d* and *t*); cf. K’esab *čəpətıl* ‘to spread, scatter’, perhaps also *čəpətıl* ‘to scratch with nails’ (see Č’olak’ean 1986: 261 and 262, respectively). The *-d-* here may be identified with the verbal intensive *-t-*, cf. *bek-t-* ‘to break repeatedly’ (see HAB 1: 436b).

●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. *žělud*, SCr. *žělūd* ‘acorn’, Lith. *gilė*, dial. *gylė* ‘acorn’, Latv. *zīle* ‘acorn’, etc. [HAB 2: 495-496].

Arm. dial. **kakal* ‘walnut; testicle’ (q.v.) must be related with Georg. *kaqal* ‘walnut’, Laz *kaqal* ‘walnut’, Megr. *kaqal* ‘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. *gogël* 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; Ačārean 1913: 540a; HayLezBrbBař 3, 2004: 21a).

The connection of *kakal*, etc. with the PIE word for ‘acorn’ is thus possible, albeit yet unclear. Note that, at least in the case of **kaka*, we are dealing with a Lallwort.

For a possible trace of Arm. **čet-* from **g^welh₂-* (cf. Russ. *želud*’, SCr. *žělūd* ‘acorn’, etc.), see s.v. **člopur* ‘walnut’.

It has been assumed that the initial *t-* of Łarabaṭ *tkóten* ‘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. **διφός βάλανος* ‘chestnut’ and Lat. *iūglāns* ‘walnut’ (on which see Walde/Hofmann 1, 1938: 727; Schrijver 1991: 273). On **tu/tw-*, see HAB s.v. *tiv* ‘day’; see also s.v. *ciacan* ‘rainbow’. As is pointed out by Laufer 1919: 369, 369₁, the pattern of Gr. *Διός 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, Łarabaṭ *šmbálut* ‘chestnut’ [Hübschmann 1897: 272; HAB 3: 486a]. Compare also *ark’a-katin* above. For vocalic assimilation **tukatin* > **tukutin* cf. *erdumn* ‘oath’ > Łarabaṭ *ürt’ümnə*. Unlike in **tukatin*, with voiceless stops, here we are dealing with voiced *d*, consequently, with Ačāryan’s Law: *rdu* > *rdü* > *rt’ü* (see 2.1.39.2).

It is tempting to identify the final dental stop of Arm. Svedia *g^vätənd* (on which see above) with that seen in Russ. *želud*’, SCr. *žělūd*, etc., and Lat. *glāns*, *glandis*. Alternatively, one might assume a contamination with Svedia *hənd* from Arm. *(h)und* ‘edible seed, grain’ (q.v.), although this seems less probable.

kaṭkanjel ‘to yelp, make a supplicating yelp as of hunger (said of dog)’ (Lex., see NHB 1: 1037c), MidArm. *kaṭkancel*, *kaṭknjal* ‘id.’ (MiĴHayBař 1, 1987: 378a), *kaṭkanj-ot-akan* ‘yelping’ (Grigor Narekac‘i 35.4, see Xaç‘atryan/Łazinyan 1985: 394^{L75}); *knj-a-jayn* ‘with voice of a fawning dog’ (Yovhan Mandakuni/Mayragomec‘i); MidArm. *kz-kncal* and *knj-kṭal* ‘to yelp (said of wolf)’ in Fables by Vardan Ayegekc‘i (MiĴHayBař 1, 1987: 395a, 402a).

●DIAL Muš, Alaškert *kaṭgənjəl* ‘to yelp (said of dog)’, T‘avriz *kaṭknjal* ‘to murmur, mutter’, Akn *kaṭkənjəl* ‘to speak timidly and unclearly when beseeching for something’; Ararat *kənjəl*, *kənjəkənjəl*, Łarabaṭ *kənjəkənjəl*, T‘iflis, Karin, Van, Ĵuṭa *kənjəkənjəl*, etc. ‘to yelp’ [HAB 2: 496]. NHB 1: 1037c records dial. **kaṭkanjel* and **knjknjal*.

●ETYM Ačařyan (HAB 2: 496a) treats the verb as a reduplication and offers no external comparanda.

It is tempting to follow Ařayan (1974: 86-87) in comparing the word to Skt. RV *garh-*, 3pl.pres.med. *gr̥hate* ‘to complain’, *gr̥hú* m. ‘beggar’, Av. root present *garəz-* ‘to lament, weep’, MPers. *garz-* ‘id.’, OHG *klagon* ‘to bewail, complain’, Germ. *klagen* ‘to complain’, OIr. *glám* ‘shouting, curse’ (for the forms, see Pokorny 1959: 350-351; Mayrhofer EWAia 1, 1992: 475, 495-496; Mallory/Adams 1997: 247a; Cheung 2007: 111-112).

Formally these forms presuppose **gVlǵ^h-* and **gl(a)ǵ^h-*. The vocalism probably points to an onomatopoeic origin. PARM. forms may be reconstructed as **kalkanj-* and **kalkunj-* and derived from redupl. **g_o-gl(o)ǵ^h-* > **kałka/unj-* through regular metathesis and with nasal epenthesis; for this type of iterative/expressive reduplication cf. e.g. *karkut* ‘hail’ vs. OCS *gradъ*, Lat. *grandō*, etc. ‘hail’ (see s.v.).

The further comparison with *koł-koł-* ‘to weep, etc.’ (Bible+; dial. Zeyt‘un *gɔłal* ‘to weep, lament’) suggested by Ařayan (ibid.; see also N. Simonyan 1979: 243-244) is uncertain. The *-ɔ-* in Muř and Alařkert *kołgənjal* may be due to contamination with this *koł-* ‘to weep, lament’.

kałjin, vars. *kałcin*, *kałč’in* (MidArm.) ‘mortar / Mörtel, a kind of clayey soil’; attested only in Geoponica (see HAB 2: 496b; MijHayBař 1, 1987: 378a).

●DIAL Preserved in the dialects of Muř, Alařkert, Karin, Van, Ozim, Moks; with some deviations: Xarberd *gałji* (cf. Dersim *gałji* ‘yellow clayey soil’ and [Berri] *gałjel*, Bařamyan 1960: 85b; 119b), Nor Bayazet and řatax *kavč’in*, Marařa *karčənkav* (a compound with *kaw* ‘clay’), Salmast *karč’in*. In Akn we have *gałjin* and *gap‘jin* (> Turk. dial.) as names for different types of soil [HAB 2: 496b].

Note the meaning ‘clay’ of Kurd. *kaxč’in*, which is considered a loan from Armenian (see HAB 2: 496b). The form *kavč’in* is due to contamination with *kaw* ‘clay’ and *kawič* ‘chalk’. The meaning of řatax *kavč’in* is ‘white clay of which pots are made’ [M. Muradyan 1962: 212b].

●ETYM No etymological attempt is recorded in HAB 2: 496b.

The word may have been composed of an otherwise unattested root **kałj-* and the suffix *-in* (in Xarberd one finds *-i*). For the latter compare parallels, also pertaining to the concept of soil: *ostin* adj. ‘arid’, subst. ‘arid place, soil’ (as an adjective - also in the dialects of Ararat, Van, Muř); *anjrdi(n)* ‘id.’ (q.v.); *řrarbi(n)* ‘well-watered’ in Hexaemeron [Muradyan 1984: 162] and řatax *čəřəřpin* ‘irrigated soil’ [M. Muradyan 1962: 213b]. As regards the root **kałj-*, it might originate from IE **gl-₁eh₂-* ‘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*, Engl. *clay*, etc. (see Pokorny 1959: 362-364; Chantraine 1968-80: 227-228). Probably here belongs also Lyd. *klida* ‘earth’, with **-y-* > *-d-* (Melchert 1994a: 184).

There are forms in the nasal suffix **-neh₂-*, too: Russ. *glina* ‘clay’, Gr. *γλίνη* ‘any glutinous substance, gum’ (Derksen 2008: 164). Therefore, one might even consider the suffix *-in* of the Armenian form as being original, too. If we assume that Armenian, exactly like Greek and Slavic, had forms both with and without the nasal suffixal element, that is **kalin-* and **kałj-*, it would be possible to explain *kałjin* 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 **kalj*.

I cannot offer an explanation for *-r-* of the dialectal (Salmast, Marala) form **karčin*. Perhaps, cf. Lat. *crēta* ‘clay, clayey soil; chalk’, Fr. *craie*, Germ. *Kreide*.

kamurj, *a*-stem: GDSg *kamrj-i* (Bible+), GDPl *kamrj-a-c* in Agat‘angelos § 33, *kamurj-a-c* in T‘ovmay Arcruni 2.3 (10th cent.) ‘bridge’ (Bible+). In 2 Kings 23.21, *kamurj* seems to denote a wooden construction (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*.

In T‘ovmay Arcruni 2.3 (1985: 150^{L17f}; transl. Thomson 1985: 161): *Ew Xosrov ark‘ay p‘axstakan gnac‘, ew anc‘eal zDeklat‘aw i Vehkawat, hramayec‘ 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 the dialects (Sebastia, Muš, T‘iflis, Ararat, Łarabał, Agulis, Ĵula, Moks, etc.), only in the form **karmunj* (see HAB 2: 503b), with an anticipation of the *r* and an epenthetic *-n-*. Rare exception: Kak‘avaberd, 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, although an internal explanation seems possible, too. The vowel *-i-* instead of the *-u-* may be explained by anticipative influence of the palatal *j*: **karmuj* > **karmuij* > *karmij*, cf. PIE **med^h-io-* > PArm. **meij-* > *mēj* (see 2.1.2).

Xotorj **kamurj* is described (YušamXotorj 1964: 468a) as follows: “a wood in water that serves as a base for the wheel”.

Hamšen (Čanik) *karmunj* (read *garmunj*, Ačařyan 1947: 236) means ‘a long thick pole with teeth on one side, used as a ladder’ (see KiwiHamš 1899: 753b, cf. 1900: 62b). One also finds Hamšen *garmāj* ‘a pole of a fence’, used three times in a traditional story recorded in Krasnodar region and published by Andranik Zeyt‘unyan (see JaynHamš 2, 1979: 30, glossed in 219b). The vocalism of the latter form is unclear to me.

●ETYM Since Müller, connected with Gr. *γέφυρα* f. (Boeot. *βέφυρα*, Cret. *δέφυρα*, Lac. /Hesychius/ *δίφουρα*) ‘bridge’ [HAB 2: 503]. According to Ačařyan (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, Ačařyan (AčařLiak 6, 1971: 722) explains the phonological irregularity by tabu, which is unlikely (cf. 2.1.36); cf. also Clackson 1994: 135. Viredaz (2001-02: 29₃; 2005-07: 10-11) assumes that **kawurj* became *kamurj* through an influence of *kamar* ‘arch, vault’, which is possible, but unsatisfactory.

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. *ἡμωρ* n. ‘day’, which is, however, a different case (see

Clackson 1994: 96-97). Thus, the sound correspondence, as Ĵahukyan (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; Schmitt 1972-74: 25; Clackson 1994: 227₁₅₄; Beekes 2002 [2004]. See also Hooker 1979; Hamp 1997. For **-rj-* > Arm. *-rj-*, see already Bugge 1889: 22. Further, see Ĵahukyan 1987: 128, 171-172.

Also Beekes (1969: 194; 2002 [2004]; see also 2003: 153) assumes that Gr. *γέφωρα* and Arm. *kamurj* are of substratum origin. Showing that the older meaning of *γέφωρα* 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^wəmblə*, 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. *γέφωρα* 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 *k'ip'orc'i* 'a log that serves as a bridge', which is compared with Arm. *kamurj* [Beridze 1912: 23a]. According to Ačaiyan (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^web^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 **kōpiür* / **kōp(i)rüg* 'bridge' (treated as borrowed from Gr. *γέφωρα*, see Šervažidze 1989: 79; sceptical – Tatarincev 1993, 1: 126). The affricate *-č'* of the Georgian dialectal form, however, seems to corroborate the Armenian origin.

I conclude: Gr. *γέφωρα* 'beam; bridge', Arm. *kamurj* 'bridge' (perhaps of wood, cf. 2 Kings 23.21; cf. also dial. Xotorjūr 'a wood in water that serves as a base for the wheel'), Hamšen 'a pole used as a ladder; a pole for a fence', Hattic *hamuru(wa)* 'beam', Abkhaz **q^wəmbər-* 'beam', and West-Georg. *k'ip'orc'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, namely **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'orc'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'.

The PArm. by-form **kaburj*- may have been reflected in Urart. *qaburzani* possibly meaning 'bridge' in a recently discovered inscription (Armen Petrosyan p.c., referring to M. Salvini, *Corpus dei testi urartei*, vol. 1. Roma, 2008, pp. 545-546).

The Iranian etymology suggested by Mušelyan 2003: 183-184 for *kamurj* is gratuitous.

kayt prob. 'mark on marble', attested only in Barseł Maškeronc'i/Čon (13-14th cent.): NPI *kayt-er*.

●ETYM In NHB 1: 1046c, a connection with *kayc* 'spark' is suggested. Ačařyan (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 Kiliķec'i (see Ališan 1895: 303; Anasyan 1967: 283^{L-2}; Hewsen 1992: 323), *kask-eni* 'chestnut-tree' in Fables by Mxit'ar Goš (HAB 2: 533b; MiĵHayBař 1, 1987: 385ab).

●ETYM The comparison with Gr. κάστανον n. 'chestnut', κάστανέα f. 'chestnut-tree' (de Lagarde 1886: 5; for other references to de 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. Łarabał, Łoři **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. *skriūblas* 'hornbeam', *skiřpstas* 'elm', Lat. *carpinus* 'hornbeam', etc.; perhaps also Hitt. ^{GIŠ}*karpina*- 'a kind of tree' (see P. Friedrich 1970: 99-106; P. Friedrich apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 273; Schrijver 1991: 430). If Lith. *skiřpstas* '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^hrHǵ-* '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. ^{GIŠ}*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 the dialects, in the meanings ‘to read’ and ‘to learn’ [HAB 2: 549b]. Note Łarabał *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 tüs 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].

Artial *g‘ard‘al* ‘to read’, *g‘ard‘alu* (Pol.), *kardal* (Hung.) ‘to sing’ [Ačařyan 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 OPr. *gerdaut* ‘dire’. Hübschmann (1897: 458) adds Lith. *giřsti* ‘vernehmen’ and *girdėti* ‘to hear’, but treats the etymology as uncertain. Ačařyan (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.

We are dealing with PIE **g^w(e)rH-* ‘to praise; to sing; to shout, recite’: Skt. *garⁱ* ‘to praise, honour, welcome’ (RV+), *gír-* f. ‘song of praise, invocation’ (RV+), OAv. *gar-* f. ‘song of praise’, Lith. *giriù*, *gyriau*, *girti* ‘to praise, boast’, etc. Arm. *kardam* probably derives from **g^wrH-d^hh₁-*, cf. Skt. *gíró dhā-*, OAv. *garō dā-* ‘to offer songs of praise’, Celtic **bar-do-* ‘poet’ [Watkins 1995: 117]. For the morphology, see Barton 1990-91: 33 and cf. *mnam* ‘to remain’ (q.v.).

Łarabał – Artial; if the meaning ‘to sing’ is directly comparable to the IE cognates, one should treat this as a semantic archaism preserved in Łarabał and Artial rather than a shared innovation.

kart‘ *i*-stem ‘fish-hook; leg’ (Bible+). It corresponds to Gr. *σκέλος* ‘leg’ in Leviticus 11.21 (in Zōhrapean edition: 11.31): *Ayl zayn utic‘ēk‘ i zeřnoc‘ t‘řč‘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^hi*, *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 *gárbana*, *garbanà* ‘Haarlocke’, Russ. *gorb* ‘hump’, dial. ‘back’, *górbit* ‘to arch, hunch, become bent’, Czech *hrb* ‘hump, mound, lump’, Sln. *gr̂b* m., *gr̂ba* f. ‘hump; back; wrinkle’, OHG *krapfo* ‘Haken, Krallen, Krapfen, Widerhaken’, etc., thus: **gr(b)-ti-* > Arm. **kar(p)t^hi-* > *kart‘*, *i*-stem; see also HAB 2: 550; Ĵahukyan 1987: 125 (next to *keř* and **koř* ‘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 ĘtimSlovSlavJaz 7, 1980: 187-200. See also s.v. *křt‘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 Kołbac‘i, Hexaemeron, Nonnus).

●DIAL Widespread in the dialects. Լարաթ *kári/eč* (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 Ačařyan (HAB 2: 551; 1937: 4), borrowed from a language of Asia Minor, cf. Gr. *κᾶρίς*, *-ίδος*, *-ἴδος* (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 Լարաթ. For the semantics cf. Arab. ‘*aqrab* ‘scorpion’ : ‘*aqrab-al-ma* ‘crayfish’ = ‘water-scorpion’, Lat. *nepa* ‘scorpion; crayfish’, etc. (Ačařyan *ibid.*). The etymology is accepted by Meillet (letter from 08.12.1930 to Ačařyan, see HAB 2: 551b). Arm. *č* is probably from **-d̥i-* (see Դահուկյան 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. *κᾶρίς*, *-ίδος* 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-jeħ₂-*. For the structure compare another Mediterranean insect/bogy-name: **mormon-* (cf. Gr. *Μορμών*, *-όνο* f. ‘she-monster, bogy’) > Arm. dial. **mormonj* ‘ant’ < **mormon-jeħ₂-*, 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 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. *gräd* ‘id.’, Lith. *grūdodas* ‘frozen dirt or earth’, Lat. *grandō*, *-inis* f. ‘hail, hail-storm’, etc.

Terviřean (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; Դահուկյան (1987: 126, from **gə-grōdo-*). Hübschmann (1899: 48) is sceptical about **ka-krut* > *karkut* for unspecified reasons. Rasmussen (1999: 153-154) assumes **gr-gróhd-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. *žydn* ‘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*, *smakrà* ‘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 Drasxanakertc‘i, etc.; see HAB 2: 611a), dial. *kt-kt-* (see Amatuni 1912: 376a; Ačařean 1913: 619a; Malxaseanc‘, HayBac‘Bař 2: 497b; Ałayan 1976, 1:769) and **kt-kut-* (HayLezBrbBař 3, 2004: 180-181) ‘sound of intensive beating’.

Aslanbek *gargünd* with *-n-* is reminiscent of the Latin form. Ačařyan (HAB 2: 556b) considers the resemblance accidental and explains the Aslanbek form through folk-etymological association with *gund* ‘ball’.⁷⁰

keam, 3sg.aor. *e-keac*‘, 3sg.subj. *kec*‘-c‘ē ‘to live’ (Bible+); derivational base *kec*‘-, and *-keac*‘ as the second member of a number of compounds (Bible+); **kean-k**‘, pl. tant. *a*-stem: acc. *kean-s*, loc. *i kean-s*, gen.-dat. *ken-a-c*‘, instr. *ken-a-w-k*‘ ‘life; living, manner of life; the course of a life; existence; property, wealth’ (Bible+); derivatives based on **ken-** (Bible+), **ken-s-** (Agat‘angelos, Łazar P‘arpec‘i, etc.), **ken-c**‘- (Movsēs Xorenac‘i, Elišē, Book of Chries, John Chrysostom, Philo, etc.); **ken-d-** in **kend-an-i**, *ea*-stem: GDSg *kendanw-o-y*, ISg *kendane-a-w*, GDP1 *kendane-a-c*‘, IPI *kendane-a-w-k*‘ adj. ‘living, alive; life-giving, refreshing’, subst. ‘being, animal’ (Bible+), **kendan-anam** ‘to come to life again, revive’ (Bible+), a number of compounds based on **kendan-**.

●DIAL The forms *keank*‘ and *kendan(i)* are widespread in the dialects [HAB 2: 566b].

●ETYM From PIE **g^weih₃-*, **g^wih₃-* or **g^wh₃i-* ‘to live’: Skt. *jīvati* ‘to live’, *jīrá-* ‘quick, active’, YAv. *jira-* ‘active, quick to understand’, Skt. *gáya-* m. ‘life, vital strength, live stock, possessions, property, residence’ and Av. *gaiia-* m. ‘life, vital strength’, YAv. *gaiia-* ‘name of the first man’ < **g^woih₃-o-*, Gr. fut. *βείουαι*, athem. aor. *έβίον*, *βιῶναι* ‘to live’, *βίος* ‘life’, *βίωτος* m., *βιωτή* f. ‘life’, Lat. *vīvere* ‘to live’, *vīvus* ‘alive, living, lively’, Osc. *BIVUS*, OCS *živq* ‘to live’, OIr. *biu*, *beo*, Welsh *byw* ‘alive’, etc.; cf. **g^wiēh₃-*: Gr. *ζῶω*, *ζῶ* ‘to live’, *ζῶον* ‘living being, animal’, Toch. A *šo-*, B *šāw-* < PToch. **šāw-*. See Hübschmann 1897: 459; HAB 2: 565-566 with lit.; Pokorny 1959: 469; Mayrhofer EWaia 1, 1992: 467-468, 593-595; Mallory/Adams 1997: 356b; for a discussion of the Greek facts, see Chantraine 1968-80: 176-177, 402-403; Klein 1988; Adams 1999: 627-628.

Arm. *kea-m* probably reflects (athematic) **g^weih₃-* together with Gr. *βείουαι*, although further details are unclear (see Klingenschmitt 1982: 85 with references; Klein 1988: 258, 272; Clackson 1994: 183, 216₉₃). A direct derivation **-eih₃-* > Arm. **-e(i)a-* is difficult, so the *a*-conjugation seems to be secondary, unless one assumes **g^wiēh₃-* or the like (cf. Hübschmann 1883: 35; 1897: 459; Meillet 1936: 45; Schmitt 1981: 64; Ĵahukyan 1982: 60, 176; Lindeman 1981; Olsen 1999: 772).

The absence of palatalization of **g^w* in Armenian is unclear (see Ĵahukyan 1975: 37; Clackson 1994: 55). Kortlandt (1975: 45; 1980a: 248 = 2003: 11-12, 17; Beekes 2003: 177) argues that both the Balto-Slavic and the Italo-Celtic evidence point to an IE root **g^wh₃i-* (see also Schrijver 1991: 245, 248-249, 526), which would also explain the absence of palatalization of the initial labiovelar in Armenian. Later

⁷⁰ One wonders if Pers. *tegarg* ‘hail’ can be derived from Arm. **t‘ak-kark(ut)*, an unattested compound with *t‘ak* ‘beat’; cf. Łarabat **karkt-a-* *t‘ak*, **karkut t‘akel*, etc. (see Ačařean 1913: 558a), with reversed order of the same components.

(2003: 12) he derives *keam* from $*g^w uih_3-$ with metathesis from $*g^w h_3iu-$. Klingenschmitt 1982: 148₈ assumes an analogical influence of the nominal forms such as Skt. *gáya-*, etc.⁷¹

For a discussion of *kea-n-k'*, obl. *ke-n-a-* < $*-neh_2-$ and derivation of *ke-nd-* from $*-nt-$, see Jähukyan 1982: 135; Olsen 1989: 225-226, 231, 233, 233-234₂₆; 1999: 305-308, 318-319, 772; Clackson 1994: 111, 207-208_{45A}.

ket, *o*-stem: GDSg *ket-o-y*, ISg *ket-o-v* (Bible+). Later: IPI *ket-ō-k'* (Sargis Šnorhali /12th cent./ and “Tašaran”), 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'oc'n* : *πατάζω σε κύριος ἐν ἔλκει Αἰγυπτίω*. Arm. *ket* renders Gr. *ἔλκος* ‘wound; sore, ulcer’.

The compound *č'ar-a-keł* is mentioned in P'awstos Buzand 4.13 (1883=1984: 95^{L-15f}) as synonymous to *žant* : *Ew sksaw hatanel zor č'arakełn imm 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'* Ačariyan (HAB 2: 567b) compares *barek'* (< *bari* ‘good’ + *-ak'*) and *armat-ak'-i* (with *armat* ‘root’). Note especially *boł-ok'-em* ‘to complain’, *oł-ok'-em* ‘to supplicate’.

●DIAL According to Ačariyan (HAB 2: 567b), preserved in Łarabał *kæł* ‘the outer hard part of a wound’, *kəł-ə-kaleł* ‘to become covered with *keł*’.

●ETYM Since Meillet (1894: 165; 1894b: 283), connected with Lith. *gėlti* ‘to hurt severely’, *gėlà* ‘acute pain’, *gelonis* ‘der verhärtete Eiter im Geschwür’, Russ. *žal* ‘pity’, Czech *žal* ‘grief, pain’, OHG *quelan* ‘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 $*g^w elh_1-$ ‘hit by throwing’. For the semantic development ‘to hit, strike’ > ‘wound’, see s.vv. *xayt'*, *xit'*, etc. Note also *hatanem* ‘to strike’, pertaining to *č'ar-a-keł* in the above-mentioned passage from P'awstos Buzand 4.13.

Arm. *keł*, *o*-stem, may be derived from IE *s*-stem neuter, cf. Gr. *βέλος*, *-εος*. If from $*-lh_1-$ one expects Arm. *l* rather than *t*, one may explain the *-t-* as analogical after the verb *ketem* from a nasal present $*g^w el-n-H-$, 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 Jähukyan (1963a: 91; 1967: 197; 1982: 60 [misprinted as *kełer*]; 1987: 128 [with a question mark]), **kełerj* ‘complaint, grievance, pain’ (q.v.) belongs here too. For the semantics he compares Russ. *žáloba* ‘complaint, grievance’ vs. *žalét'* ‘to begrudge, pity’ and *žálit'* ‘to bite, sting’. If indeed related, *keł-erj* may be derived from $*g^w elH-r-i(h_2)-$ or $*-r-je h_2-$.

⁷¹ One may also think of an influence of *kam* ‘to stay, rest, dwell’.

For the meaning of Լարաթ *kæł* ‘the outer hard part of a wound’, cf. Lith. *gelonis* ‘der verhärtete Eiter im Geschwür’.

The absence of palatalization of the initial velar in Armenian makes the etymology problematic. Jähukyan (1982: 59-60), however, considers the palatalization of *g and *k to be facultative.

Earlier attempts treating *ket* as borrowed from Gr. *κήλη*, Att. *κάλη* ‘tumour, especially rupture, hernia; hump’ are rightly rejected by Ačařyan (HAB 2: 567b). A word which is richly attested in a variety of forms (*ket-ek*-, **ket-erj*, etc.) and has been preserved in an extremely Eastern dialect can hardly be a Greek loan.

***ket** ‘crooked’, only in the compound *ket-a-karc* ‘doubtful’, attested in Yovhannēs Ōjnec‘i (8th cent.) onwards. Spelled also as *kał-a-karc*.

●ETYM According to NHB (1:1081b), *ket-a-karc*, *kał-a-karc* is composed of *kał* ‘lame’ (cf. *xet* ‘mutilated, lame, crooked’) and *karc* ‘opinion, supposition’: *xet kam kał karceōk*. Basically the same is assumed by Ačařyan (HAB 2: 490-491), who treats the compound as containing **ket* ‘crooked’, identical with *kał* ‘lame’ and etymologically perhaps related with *xet* and *šet* (see s.vv.), and *karc*. For the vocalic difference he mentions Georg. *k’eli* ‘lame’ which he takes as a loan from Armenian *kał* ‘lame’ and **ket* ‘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. *keč* ‘false’?”.

Pedersen (1906: 379 = 1982: 157), with reservation, identifies **ket* with the PIE word for ‘two’ with the sound change **dw-* > *k-*. This is accepted by Kortlandt (2003: 92, 95) who reconstructs **dwel-*. However, there is no trace of Arm. **ket* ‘two’ or ‘double’ elsewhere, and PIE **dwel-* is not corroborated by any cognate form. The “internal” etymology (NHB, Ačařyan), therefore, seems preferable.

See also s.v. *erku* ‘two’ and 2.1.22.6.

***keterj** probably ‘complaint, grievance, pain’: only in *keterj-akan*, which is frequent in Grigor Magistros (11th cent.).

●ETYM See s.v. *ket* ‘wound, sore’.

***keč‘i** ‘birch’, perhaps also ‘larch’.

As a dialectal word in DialAdd apud NHB 2: 1064a. In Galen, *keci/keč‘i* corresponds to Gr. *λάριξ* ‘larch, *Larix europaea*; Venice turpentine; coagulum’ (see Ališan 1895: 310; Greppin 1985: 69).

●DIAL Ararat, Lori, Լարաթ (*kič‘i*), Տիրակ, Muš [Amatuni 1912: 337b; Ačařean 1913: 563b]. See also Ališan 1895: 310 (also *keci*).

Perhaps here belongs Sasun *genč‘eni* or *genč‘ani* ‘a kind of tree with reddish bark that kindles like a candle’ (see Petoyan 1954: 111; 1965: 95, 454). For the epenthetic nasal frequent before affricates, see 2.1.29 and 2.1.30.1. That the bark of the tree *keč‘i* kindles easily is seen in e.g. G. Hakobyan 1974: 264.

●ETYM Jähukyan (1987: 296, cf. 264) considers **keč‘i* to be a loan from a Finno-Ugric source, cf. Finn. dial. *kaski* ‘offshoot of birch’, Karel. *kaški* ‘birch’, Udmurt. *kyž-*, etc. This is uncertain. The meaning ‘birch’ is recent here (Petri Kallio, p.c.).⁷²

⁷² Any relation with Finno-Ugric **kečje* or **käč3* ‘juniper’ (on which see Campbell 1990: 155)?

I alternatively propose a derivation from PIE **g^wetu-* ‘resin’: Skt. *jatu-* 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^weðu-*: 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’ < **betua* < **betujā* (Pokorny ibid.; Schrijver 1995: 326), Welsh *bedwen*, Breton *bezvenu* ‘birch’, Lat. (< Gaul.) *bētul(l)a* ‘birch’, Alb. *bléteze* (see P. Friedrich 1970: 149).

Arm. **keč^h-i* may derive from QIE **g^wet(u)-jēh₂-*, cf. the Celtic form. For **-tj-* Arm. **-č^h-*, see 2.1.22.1; for the absence of palatalization of the initial labiovelar, see 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 *jedu* ‘pitch produced on the stalk of a thorny plant called *p^hšagaz* which is gathered, dried and used as glue’ [Petoyan 1954: 154; 1965: 519] may be a recent borrowing from Persian (see above) or Kurdish.

keṛ ‘curved, crooked’, in MidArm.; cf. also *kṛ-a-cag* ‘with curved edge (of a beak)’ in Grigor Narekac^hi, and *kṛ-a-poz* ‘with curved horns’ in Grigor Magistros), etc. [HAB 2: 574a], which presuppose **kiṛ* or **kuṛ*.

- DIAL Widespread in the dialects [HAB 2: 574a].
- ETYM See s.v. *kor* ‘curved, crooked’.

ker-, suppletive aorist of *utem* ‘to eat’ (q.v.): 1sg *ker-a-y*, 3sg *ker-a-w* and *e-ker* (rich evidence in the Bible, see Astuacaturean 1895: 1222-1226; Klingenschmitt 1982: 279), *ker-ot*, *-awt* ‘eating, devouring’ (Bible+, for a discussion, see Clackson 1994: 214₆₃; Olsen 1999: 649-650); **ker**, *o*-stem: GDSg *ker-o-y*, GDPl *ker-o-c^h* ‘food (especially of animals); bait’ (Agat^hangelos, John Chrysostom, Philo, Zgōn-Afrahat, T^hovmay Arcruni, Aristakēs Lastivertc^hi, Nersēs Lambronac^hi, etc.); **-ker** in a number of compounds; **kerakur**, *o*-stem: GDSg *kerekr-o-y*, ISg *kerakr-o-v*, GDPl *kerakr-o-c^h*, IPl *kerakr-o-v-k^h* ‘food’ (Bible+), **kerakrem** ‘to feed’ (Bible+); **kur** ‘food (of animals)’, also **-kur** as the second member of a number of compounds (Bible+).

●DIAL Aor. *ker-a-* and the nouns *ker* and *kerakur* are ubiquitous in the dialects [HAB 2: 576a]. Some dialects (Muš, Alaškert, Moks, Salmast, etc.) have *kerakul* instead of *kerakur*, the final *-l* being due to contamination with *kul-* ‘swallow’ [HAB 2: 576a] (typologically cf. Toporov PrJaz [e-h], 1979: 349). Textual illustrations for *kerakul* and a denominative verb *keraklel* can be found e.g. in a Muš folk-tale recorded in Alek^hsandrapol in 1915 (HŽHek^h 13, 1985: 218, lines 1, 17, 26).

●ETYM Derived from PIE **g^werh₃-* ‘to swallow, devour’: Gr. *βopá* ‘fodder (of a predator)’, *βιβρώσκω* ‘to devour’, Lat. *vorō*, *-āre* ‘to devour, engulf, eat greedily’ (a denominative, see Schrijver 1991: 217), Skt. *gar^h*, *girāti* ‘to devour, swallow’, YAv. *garō* f.pl. ‘throats’, *aspō.garəm nərə.garəm* ‘who swallows horses (and) who swallows men’ (for Iranian forms, see Cheung 2007: 109), Lith. *gėrti*, *geriù* ‘to drink’, OCS *po-žrěti* ‘to eat (of animals), devour’, ORuss. *žbrati*, 1sg. *žbru*, Russ. *žrat^h*, *žru* ‘to eat (of animals), gobble’, etc., see Hübschmann 1897: 459-460; HAB

2: 575-576 with references; Pokorny 1959: 474; Mayrhofer EWAia 1, 1992: 469-470; Mallory/Adams 1997: 175b.

Arm. aor. *ker-a-* has been derived from the IE athematic root aorist $*g^w erh_3-$: 3sg *e-ker* < $*e-ker(a-t^h)$ < $*e-g^w erh_3t$, and 3sg *ker-a-w* is considered analogical after the medial aorists (Klingenschmitt 1982: 211₆₆, 279, 279₁; Kortlandt 1987a: 50 = 2003: 80; Weitenberg 1989a: 112; differently Lindeman 1982: 40). On the other hand, *e-ker* is taken as reflecting a thematic $*e-g^w erh_3-e-t$ (Beekes 1969: 234; Lindeman 1982: 40; K. Schmidt 1990: 43₄₂; Olsen 1999: 650). Further see s.v. *utem* 'to eat'.

Arm. *ker*, *o*-stem 'food' derives from $*g^w orh_3-o-$: Skt. *gará-* m. 'drink, liquid'; cf. also Gr. *βοπά* 'fodder (of a predator)'. The *-e-* of the Armenian noun may have been taken from the verb. This would explain the absence of palatalization of the initial labiovelar, which was preserved in the noun and extended to the verb (cf. Meillet 1936: 73; Kortlandt 1975: 44 = 2003: 11). Further on $*g^w$ unpalatalized in Armenian, see Clackson 1994: 55.

The reduplicated form *ker-a-kur* 'food' probably reflects an older iterative reduplication of the type of *atj-a-m-utj* 'darkness, twilight' (q.v.), etc., see Klingenschmitt 1982: 211-212₆₆; Weitenberg 1989a: 111-112 (a slightly different type is reflected in *karkut* 'hail', *mamul* 'press', *mamur* 'moss'), thus $*g^w er_3-g^w orh_3-$ > *ker-a-kur*, or first $*ker-kur$ with a subsequent adjustment to the productive type of compounds with the *a*-conjunction. The underlying pattern may be seen in Greek *ἔδωδή* 'food, meal' (see s.v. *utem* 'to eat'). Further see Olsen 1999: 757 and 757₁₀₇, with a comparison with Skt. *garagir-* and an explanation of *kur* through the rounding of $*-j-$ caused by the neighbouring labiovelar $*g^w$, as in *kul* 'swallow'. For a further discussion on *kerakur* and *kur* cf. *mamul* and $*mul/t$ (see s.v. *malem* 'to grind, crush').

A reduplication of the zero-grade root (cf. Gr. *βοπά*, etc.) is seen in *kokord* 'throat', which can be derived from $*g^w o-g^w orh_3-t/d^h(r)V-$ or the like, cf. OHG *querdar* 'bait', Gr. *βάπαθρον* n. 'gape, cleft, gorge'; further note Czech *hrdlo*, Russ. *górlo*, etc. 'throat' from $*g^w rh_3-tlóm$, etc. (Hübschmann 1897: 460; HAB 2: 619a; Greppin 1981b: 5; Ĵahukyan 1987: 129; Pokorny 1959: 474; Olsen 1999: 189, 189₃₅₀). The appurtenance of Gr. *βάπαθρον* to this PIE etymon is doubted, however (see Beekes 1969: 193, 233-234).

kēs, *o*-stem: GSg *kis-o-y*, GPI *kis-o-c'*, LocSg *i kis-um* (Eznik Kołbac'i, 5th cent.); later also *i*-stem: GDPI *kis-i-c'* (Grigor Magistros, 11th cent.) 'half' (Bible+).

●DIAL Ubiquitous in the dialects. In Havarik', Marala, Č'aylu: *κῶσῶρ* < *kēs-ōr* 'midday' [HAB 2: 582b; Davt'yan 1966: 395], with a vocalic assimilation.

●ETYM Pedersen (1906: 398, 400 = 1982: 176, 178) derives from the PIE word for 'two' reconstructing $*dwoiko-$, next to $*dwoukā-$ > Arm. *koys* 'side'. This is not accepted by Ačarıyan (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' : *ardhá-* 'half' (RV+). However, this etymology is improbable in view of the absence of cognate forms which would corroborate 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*, although no Iranian correspondent is indicated [Viredaz 2003: 64₂₂]. Earlier, Jahukyan (1967: 143) suggested a derivation from PIE **ken-* ‘to rub, scrape off’, which is untenable.

kēt₁, *i*-stem : GDSg *kit-i* in Agat‘angelos, Plato; GDPI *kit-i-c*‘ in Dionysius Thrax and Grigor Magistros (here, in the same passage, *-kit-o-v-k*‘ in compounds [NHB 1: 1094c]) ‘point, dot (in various senses, such as of time, appointment)’ (Agat‘angelos, Elišē, etc.), ‘goal, purpose’ (Philippians 3.14 = Gr. σκοπός), ‘target’ (Book of Chries), ‘centre’ (Plato), ‘odd’ (Ařak‘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 στιγμαίων τοῦ ἀγγελίου*); **kitak** ‘canon, rule’ (Dawit‘ Anyařt‘), etc.

●DIAL Juřa *ket* ‘time’ (e.g. *č‘ur es kets* ‘by now’); Łarabař *kæet*, Zeyt‘un, Suč‘ava *geđ* (the meaning is not specified; I assume ‘point, dot’; for an illustration in Łarabař, see Davt‘yan 1966: 395); Akn *ket* ‘obstacle’; Bulanəx *ket* ‘odd’ (cf. *kēt* ‘odd’ attested in Ařak‘el Vardapet, 15th cent.), in Northern and Eastern dialects (T‘iflis, Loři, Ganjak, Łarabař, 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.vv. *kēt₂* ‘a kind of biting fly’ and **kic-* ‘to bite’.

kēt₂ ‘a kind of fly that bites donkeys and cattle’.

Attested only in the fabels by Mxit‘ar Goř (12-13th cent., Ganjak).

●DIAL Łarabař *ket* ‘a kind of fly that chases calfs’, Łarabař, 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 Meřri, Ařayan (1974: 275b, 307) records *kéttil* ‘to run away swiftly’, with geminate *-tt-*, and *kæétil*.

Ačaryan (HAB 2: 583b) questions: “is it identical with Muř *knet* ‘biting fly’?”

M. Muradyan (1962: 210a) records řatax *zəřket*‘ *iřameřu* ‘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. *zəř* ‘rude, uncivilized’ (HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 409b), meaning also ‘step-’ in e.g. Moks *zəř-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. *zř-ik* ‘male ass’ found in Malxaseanc‘ HBB 2: 38b. If this word is relevant, the compound would parallel the synonym *iř-a-meřu* ‘bumble-bee’, literally ‘donkey-bee’.

Next to *zəřket*‘ one also finds dial. *zřkēc* ‘yellow bumble-bee’, with a final *-c* (Malxaseanc‘, HayBac‘Bař 2: 38b). Apparently, the first component is taken by Malxasyanc‘ as identical with *zəř* ‘yellow’ (see s.v. **deř-ez* ‘bee, bumble-bee’). Note also *kov-a-kēz* ‘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 Jahukyan, the word belongs with *kēt₁* ‘point, dot, etc.’ and **kic-* ‘to bite’ (see s.vv.).

Note that dial. *zřkēc* ‘bumble-bee’, with a final *-c*, can be seen as an interesting intermediary between *kēt* ‘a biting fly’ and **kic-* ‘to bite’ (unless it has been influenced by dial. **kec* < *kayc* ‘spark’). Note also *kic* ‘an annoying insect’.

***kt'**- 'to faint, become weak, feeble': *kt'-uc* 'weak, feeble, faint' (Bible+), 'to faint from thirst' (Yovhannēs Draxanakertc'i), *kt'-ot* 'feeble, weak' (Bible+); dial. 'to become tired'.

●DIAL Marāla *k'it'el* 'to become tired' (Garegin k'h. Petrosean apud Ačařean 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' (Ezrik Kołbac'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 Bařgirk 'hayoc', rendering *xayt'-oc* (see Amalyan 1975: 138^{Nr45}); MidArm. *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 the dialects. Note also Axalc'xa, Muš, Sebastia, etc. **kič* 'sting of scorpions, serpents, etc.'. The verb **kčel* is present in Axalc'xa, Hamšen, Polis, Řodost'o, Sebastia, Zeyt'un; in Nor Naxijewan it means 'to burn (e.g. by cold)'; Ararat *čič* 'the sting of a mosquito', etc. [HAB 2: 587ab].

●ETYM Ačařyan (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' Anyařt') 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. *kēt₁* '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 Scheftelowitz also in deriving Armenian *-c* from **-dy-*, which in fact, I believe, would yield *č*; for *c* one needs **ĝ* 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 *kēt₂* '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. *zř-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, although it is worth of further

consideration. I would also introduce *kt-t-* ‘to burn with desire’ (John Chrysostom, Book of Chries, Severian of Gabala) and especially *xt-t(-t)-* ‘to tickle’ (Bible+; widespread in the dialects); see s.vv. The *-t-* 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 to 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. *γαργαλίζω*, etc. This phenomenon may have played a role in forming Arm. *kt-t-* and, especially, *xt-t-t-* (nowadays the Armenian pronounce e.g. *xətətətə!* when tickling the children; see s.v. **xt-it*), although 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.). Note also Georgian-Zan **yiṭin-* ‘to tickle’ which, according to Klimov (1998: 229-230), “contains an element of sound symbolism” and can be compared with Arm. *xitil* (read *xtitil*) and Udi *xitik*.

Though some formal details are not clear, the group *kēt* ‘point, dot’ : **k(i)c-* ‘to bite, sting; to torment; pain; bitter, sharp’ : *kayc* ‘spark’ : *kt-t-* ‘burning desire’ : *kt-(u)t-* ‘to torment’ : *kayt-* ‘vivid, energetic’ : *kayt* ‘mark’ : PGerm. **kit-l-* ‘to tickle’ seems to correspond both formally and semantically to the following group: *xayt* : *xayc* : **xayt-ut-* ‘spot, etc.’ : *xt-t-* ‘to tickle; to excite’, dial. *xut-ut* ‘tickle’, etc.

According to the etymology proposed by Lidén (1934a: 1-4) and reflected in Pokorny 1959: 356 (see also Jahukyan 1982: 60 and 61, representing both etymologies), Arm. **kic-* ‘to bite’ derives from PIE **geig-*: Oss. *ānyezun* ‘gären’, lith. *gižti* ‘sauer werden’, *gaižūs*, *gižūs* ‘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 an unattested Iranian **kēt*, cf. Skt. *keta-* ‘mark, sign’, *ketú-* 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’.

kin, GDSg *knoj*, AblSg *i knoj-ē*, ISg *kn-a-w*, NPl *kan-ay-k*, APl *kan-ay-s*, GDP1 *kan-an-c*, IPl *kan-am-b-k* (rich evidence in the Bible, see Astuacaturean 1895: 784-790); GDP1 *kan-a-c* (Book of Chries, etc.); ISg *kn-oj-a-w*, GDP1 *kn-oj-an-c* (John Chrysostom) ‘woman; wife’ (Bible+).

●DIAL Ubiquitous in the dialects, everywhere (apart from Svedia *gen*) hypocoristic *kn-ik* [HAB 2: 590a].

●ETYM From PIE **g^wén-(e)h₂-*, gen. **g^wn-éh₂-s* ‘woman’: Skt. *jāni-* f. ‘woman, wife’, OAv. *jāni-* f. ‘woman, wife’, YAv. *jaini-* f. ‘woman, wife’, MPers. NPers. *zan* ‘wife’, Parth. *jn*, pl. *jnym* ‘wife’ vs. Skt. *gnā-* f. ‘divine female, mistress, lady’, OAv. *gəṇā-* f. ‘woman’, YAv. *gəṇā-* f. ‘woman’ (Indo-Iran. **janH-s*, gen. **gnaH-s*), Gr. *γυνή*, gen. *γυναικός*, voc. *γύναι* < **γυναικ*, Boeot. *βανά* f. ‘wife, woman’, OIr. *ben*, gen. *mná* ‘woman, wife’, Goth. *qino* f. ‘wife’ < **g^wen-eh₂-n-*, OCS *žena* ‘woman,

wife', Russ. *žená* 'wife', Luw. *vana-* 'woman' (Gusmani 1985), Toch. A *sām*, B *šana* f. 'woman, wife' vs. Toch. A *k_uli*, B *klīye* 'woman' (Adams 1999: 224-225, 621), etc. Hübschmann 1883: 88; 1897: 460; HAB 2: 589-590 with lit. (the earliest reference is to Awetik'ean 1815, with comparison to the Greek and Persian forms); Pokorny 1959: 473; Toporov PrJaz [e-h] 1979: 207-210; Mayrhofer EWAia 1, 1992: 503-504, 568-569; Huld apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 648.

The stem **-eh₂-* is reflected in ISg *kn-a-w* and GDPl *kan-a-c'* vs. *kan-an-c'*, which is analogical after *ayr*, *aran-c'* 'man'. PArm. **kan-ay-* is most probably identical with Gr. *γυvai-κ-* and may be derived from **g^wn(e)h₂-i(h₂)-*, **g^wṛnh₂eḷ-* or the like. For a discussion of these and related issues, see Hübschmann *ibid.*; Meillet 1894: 155; 1936: 84; Meillet p.c. apud HAB 2: 589a; Pedersen 1906: 398 = 1982: 176 (treating NPl *kanay-k'* as originally a singular collective in **-āti-*); Charpentier 1909: 252-254; HAB 2: 588-589; Pisani 1950: 170, 182-183; Ĵahukyan 1959: 182-183, 264; Hamp 1959-60: 200-203; 1979; Solta 1960: 168f; Frisk 1: 334-335; van Windekens 1964; Chantraine 1968-80: 242-243; Beekes 1969: 147₆₅, 177; 1976: 16-17; 1995: 185; Godel 1975: 74; Szemerényi 1977: 74₂₇₅; Schmitt 1981: 107; Bonfante 1981: 64; Klingenschmitt 1982: 148₈; C. Arutjunjan 1983: 294-295; Saradževa 1986: 241-242; Ę. Mkrč'yan 1992: 72-74; Rix 1992: 148-149; Stempel 1994: 10; Clackson 1994: 72 and espec. 136-137; Olsen 1999: 172-174; Matzinger 2005: 83-84.

For a discussion on *kn-oĵ*, see Meillet 1936: 84; HAB 4: 628a; Godel 1975: 104; Kortlandt 1984a: 100 = 2003: 47; Clackson 1994: 63-64, 213₃₇, 213₃₉; Olsen 1999: 173-174; Matzinger 2005: 83-84, 107-108.

According to Kortlandt (1975: 44 = 2003: 11; see also Klingenschmitt 1982: 148₈; Beekes 2003: 177), the unpalatalized initial *k-* was taken from the plural *kanayk'* or from the oblique cases of the singular.

***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 arak'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'.

Ačar'yan (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. *śvetá-* ‘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’), although the etymology is uncertain [HAB 4: 346b; Ĵahukyan 1987: 510, 565]; cf. also MPers. and Parth. *wcyd* ‘chosen’, Pahl. *vičītan* ‘to separate, distinguish’; see Nyberg 1974: 211a (with Arm. *včit*); 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)’, *skaistùs* ‘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. *vi-chitti-* f. ‘interruption, disturbance’ (KS+), Pahl. *wstn* /*wisistan*/ ‘to break, split’, etc. (on the latter, see also Périkhanian 1985: 78; Hovhannisyan 1990: 261).

Alternatively, **kit* is somehow related with Skt. *keta-* ‘mark, sign’, *ketú-* m. ‘appearance, mark’ (RV+), Arm. *kayt* ‘mark on marble’, etc. (see s.v. **kic-* ‘to bite’)?

Uncertain.

kič ‘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 *kič* ‘ and *kuc* ‘, the former has been preserved in Hamšen, Łarabał, Łazax, Muš, Akn, Sebastia (in Muš: *kič* ‘k’, a frozen plural; Łarabał has both *kič* ‘ and **kič* ‘-k’ > *kisk* ‘), whereas the latter – in Van, Moks, Ozim, Marala, Akn, Aparan, Łazax. 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 *kič* ‘ < **dui-sk-* “most convincing” and takes *erkič* ‘-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 *kič* ‘ “therefore developed a more remote meaning (from ‘*two together’)”.

The derivation from **g^wi-sk̑-* [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 *kič* ‘ as an ECauc borrowing, cf. Tindi *kuuļs* ‘knot’, etc.

kiw, *o*-stem ‘tree pitch, mastic, chewing-gum’, perhaps also ‘pine-tree’ (see below); **ku-eni** ‘pine-tree, larch’: Galen (= Gr. *πίττως*), Geoponica, etc. [NHB 1: 1101a, 1122ab; Ališan 1895: 335; HAB 2: 597a; Greppin 1985: 90].

The only cited independent evidence for *kiw* is *ku-oy krēz* “pitch of *kiw*” in a medieval dictionary. Since *krēz* means ‘pitch’, *ku-oy krēz* should be interpreted as “pitch of pine-tree”. Now we also find ISg *ku-o-v* in Geoponica (see MijHayBař 1, 1987: 398b).

●DIAL Axalc‘xa *kiv*, Xotorĵur, Hamšen *giv* ‘chewing-gum’; the tree: Hamšen *gəvəni*, Trapizon **kueni* ‘= Turk. /sagəz alačə/ [Ačařean 1913: 600-601; 1947: 238, 239]; Xotorĵur *kui* ‘Abies excelsa, = Turk. /sagəz alač/ [YuřamXotorĵ 1964: 473a], or, more precisely, *gvi* [HAB 2: 597a]. In Xotorĵur, the tar of this tree is called **p‘is*.

●ETYM Lidén (1906: 68) derived from **gieu-* ‘to chew’: Slav. **žbvati*, 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^wīū-* [Thurneysen 1937: 301-302; Pokorny 1959: 400, 482; Ĵahukyan 1987: 129]. The connection of Arm. *kiw* with the Slavic and the Celtic is attractive, although 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^wīeh₃-* ‘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’. Pisani (1950: 170) derives Arm. *kiw* from **g^witu-*.

Ĵahukyan (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 Ačařyan (1913: 574a) as separate entries. Ĵahukyan (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’. Uncertain. For a further discussion, see Bläsing 1995: 64.

On the other hand, note 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 [Ačařean 1913: 575a].

●ETYM See s.v. **klmp/b-*; also Ĵahukyan 1985: 153; 1990: 66. Further, compare Cabolov 1, 2001: 401-402.

knjni ‘*Ulmus campestris* L.’ (according to Béguinot/Diratzouyan 1912: 37^{Nr81}), attested only in Hexaameron (see K. Muradyan 1984: 144^{L7}, 374b). Aliřan (1895: 320) also mentions *knj-eni* ‘elm’.

●DIAL Ačařyan (HAB 2: 609b) does not record any dialectal forms. There is Sasun *knjni* ‘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 identical with ClArm. *knjni*. The consonant shift having taken place in Sasun (see Petoyan 1954: 13, 20ff) implies, however, that Sasun *knjni*, 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 **uinġ-*, **uiġ-* ‘elm’: Lith. *vinġsna*, Slav. **vežь* (Russ. *vjazь*, Pol. *wiaz* ‘*Ulmus campestris*’), OEngl. *wice* ‘Bergulme’, Alb. *vidh* (< **uinġo-*) ‘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). Jahukyan (1967: 270) mentions this etymology as one of the possible cases showing an irregular reflex of PIE **u*. Jahukyan 1987 vacat. Ališan (1895: 320₁; see also Jahukyan 1967: 270₁₅₇) noted the resemblance with Irish *oinsean*, *uinsean*.

On the semantics of the Ossetic form, see s.v. *t’ik’i* ‘maple’ (from ‘elm’?).

A PIE **uinġ-* would yield Arm. **gincj*. One would expect, thus, **g(i)ncni* or **g(i)njni*. Sasun *knjni* (see above), possibly from an older **gnj/cni*, is remarkable in this respect. On the whole, the etymology seems probable, although 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 *kogea-c*, with no evidence] ‘butter’.

●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. *gāvya-*, *gavyá-* ‘consisting of cattle’ (RV+), ‘coming from or belonging to a cow (as milk, curds, etc.)’, YAv. *gaoiia-* ‘coming from cattle, consisting of cattle’, Gr. *-βο(φ)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, Rōdost’o, Sebastia, Suč’ava *gōgōv* ‘testicles’ (pl. *kōyvāni* [Ačārean 1913: 588a]); without the final *-v*: *gōgō* ‘testicles’ (Nor Naxijewan), ‘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*.

The meaning ‘walnut’ is also found in: Šatax *kōk’γōv* [M. Muradyan 1962: 213a], Moks *kōk’γōv* [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: **kokol-* (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) > Arm. *gund* 'sphere, ball, wheel, etc.' (HAB 1: 593-594).

Further, note Alb. *gogël* f. 'acorn; small and round object'.

See also s.vv. *kakal*, *kaṭin*.

kokov-an-k', *a*-stem: IPI *kokovan-a-w-k'* 'boastful/vainglorious words' (John Chrysostom, Gregory of Nyssa, Cyril of Alexandria). Verbal **kokov-t-el** is found in Baṅgirk' 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. *śváyati* '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. *gónor* 'sound of voices, talk', etc., perhaps also Gr. *γοάω* 'to groan, weep', *γόης, -ητος* m. 'sorcerer'. For the structure, see 2.3.2.

kokord, GDSg *kokord-i* (Job 20.13, see Cox 2006: 148) 'larynx, throat' (Bible+).

●ETYM See s.v. *ker-* 'to eat' < 'to swallow, devour'.

koṭ, *i*-stem 'rib; side (of a mountain, etc.)' (Bible+), 'spouse' (Ephrem, Vardan Arewelc'i, etc.); *a*-stem (once in the Bible: GDPI *koṭ-a-c'*; see NHB 1: 1111a); later *o*-stem: *ənd koṭ-o-y* in Zak'aria Kat'olikos (9th cent.); ***koṭn** : IPI *koṭambk'* (or *koṭmambk'*) in Ezekiel 34.21, API *koṭun-s* in Zak'aria Kat'olikos (9th cent.); also seen in derivatives, e.g. *an-koṭin* 'bed'; **koṭmn**, *an*-stem: GDSg *koṭman*, AblSg *koṭman-ē*, NPI *koṭman-k'*, GDPI *koṭman-c'*, etc. 'side, region' (Bible+), 'rib-bone' (Ephrem).

In the Bible, *koṭ* occurs always in plural (apart from Genesis 2.22): nom. *koṭ-k'*, acc. *koṭ-s*, gen.dat. *koṭ-i-c'*, instr. *koṭ-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 koṭic' 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: *koṭambk'* (or *koṭmambk'*) *ew usovk' jerovk'* : *ἐπὶ ταῖς πλευραῖς καὶ ταῖς ὀμοῖς ὕμῶν* "with your ribs/sides and shoulders".

For *koṭ* 'rib, side' : *an-koṭin* 'bed' cf. the passage from Proverbs 22.27: *zankoṭins, or ənd koṭiwk' k'ovk' kayc'en* : *τὸ στρῶμα τὸ ὑπὸ τὰς πλευράς σου* "that bed (that is) under your ribs/sides".

●DIAL *koṭ(k')* is widespread in the dialects, while *ankoṭin* and *koṭmn* are present in a few of them [HAB 1: 201a; 2: 621a, 622b]. *Ḷuṭa koṭ* means both 'rib' and 'side' [Ačairean 1940: 370b; HAB 2: 622b].

Some forms of *ankotin* are without the prefix *an-*: Karin *gʷlinkʷ*, Axalcʷaxa *gʷlinkʷ*, Tʷiflis *gʷlenkʷ*, Van *gʷlvenkʷ*⁹. N. Simonyan (1979: 242-243) takes these to be “root” (*armatakan*) forms as opposed with the classical one. As is demonstrated already by Ačaryan (1952: 64), however, the initial voiced *g-* clearly indicates that these forms derive from **angotin-kʷ*, with regular voicing *-nk > -ng*, through the loss of the prefix.

Georgian *logini* ‘bed’ is considered an Armenian loan [HAB 1: 201], although Ačaryan does not specify the details. If this is true, the Georgian form should be derived from **gotin* through metathesized **login*. Remarkably, such a metathesis is indeed seen in Zeytʷun (Cilicia) *uhungan* ‘bed-blanket’ (see Ačaryan 2003: 137, 298). The borrowing must have taken place at an old stage anterior to the development **l > Arm. ł*.

●ETYM Meillet (1911-12c: 294) connects *kot(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 *kotmn* is compared with Gr. *κλίμα* in NHB 1: 1112b).

Olsen (1999: 91-92, 147, 506) does not mention Meillet’s etymology and relates *kot/kotmn* with *kotr* ‘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 *kot* in relation with **i/r-* paradigm, see s.v. *kotr*.

Patrubány (StugHetaz 1908: 153) derives *kot* from PIE **gol-*: Gr. *γολεός* ‘hole’, Lith. *guðlis* ‘den, lair, (coll.) bed’, etc. See s.v. *katał* ‘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: *kot* ‘rib, side’ > (*ən*)*kotnim* ‘to lie down’ (John Chrysostom, etc.); cf. *parak* ‘rib, side’ > *parakim* ‘to lie down’; note also *parak* ‘sheepfold’ from “a place to lie in” [HAB 4: 27-28]. 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.).

kotr, no attestations are cited for GDPI *koter-cʷ* and *koter-a-cʷ* [NHB 1: 1113c]; the only attested form (apart from NSg *kotr*) is API *koter-s* in Leviticus 23.40, “Yatags vardavarin xorhrdoy” attributed to Movsēs Xorenacʷi [MovsXorenMaten 1865: 330^{L1}] and Vardan Arewelcʷi (13th cent.) ‘branch’.

In Leviticus 23.40: *koters yarmaweneacʷ* : *κάλλονθρα φοινίκων* “branches of palm trees”. Here *kotr* renders, thus, Gr. *κάλλονθρον* ‘sweeper, duster made of palm-leaves’ (cf. *κάλλοντρον* ‘broom, brush’). Astuacaturean (1895: 795c) gives the entry as *koter* which is not correct. API *koter-s* is regular for NSg *kotr*.

In Hexaemeron, homily 5 (K. Muradyan 1984: 145^{L10f}): *armatkʷ ew urkʷ*, *kotr ew terew*, *xawaraci ew catik*, <...> : “roots and branches, *kotr* and leaf, *xawaraci* and blossom, <...>”. Here, *ur* and *xawaraci* render Gr. *κληματίς* ‘vine-branch; branch’ and *βλαστός* ‘offshoot’, respectively, and *kotr* has no Greek match [K. Muradyan 1984: 374-377].

●ETYM Meillet (1900b: 185) connected with Slavic **golbje* (cf. Russ. *golʷjá* ‘twig’, Sln. *goljè* ‘twigs without leaves’, etc.) assuming heteroclitic **i/r* stem from earlier

*r/n, cf. Skt. *nákti-* vs. Gr. *νόκτωρ*, 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; Jahukyan 1987: 126. In *ĒtimSlovSlavJaz* 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. *koł* ‘rib, side’ [Olsen 1999: 147], q.v. The *i*-stem of *koł* seems to corroborate Meillet’s *-i/r-.

It is uncertain whether there is 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‘; -ēn in the Bible) [HAB 2: 624-626, 627-628].

●DIAL Widespread in the dialects in various meanings: ‘beam’, ‘trunk’, ‘button’, ‘ankle’, etc. [HAB 2: 626a].

●ETYM Ačaryan (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 **guǵ-*, 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)ǵ-ǵV-*, which is uncertain.

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).

koys, *a*-stem ‘side’ (Bible+).

●DIAL *Julā kus* (cf. *nes-kus* < *ners koys*) ‘inside’, *Ľarabał kūs*, *Šamaxi gūs*, *Łzlar gus* (cf. *min gus* ‘aside’); also in T‘iflis, only in a proverb [HAB 2: 630b].

According to Ačaryan (HAB), *Ľarabał kūs* is found only in the following pronouns: *es-kūs* ‘this side’ (< *ays koys*), *en-gūs* ‘that side’ (-*nk-* > -*ng-*), *maš-k‘ūs* ‘inside’ (**měj-koys* : -*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 kyüsən* ‘‘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}].

Ľarabał 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 **dwoiko-* > *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 yet another case reflecting the development **dw-* > Arm. *k-* (on this, see 2.1.22.6).

However, *kōys* 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 (although Ačařyan does not accept it); Benveniste 1945: 73-74; Russell 1980: 107 (= 2004: 1); Ĵahukyan 1987: 574 (though not included into the list of Iranian loans); 1995: 184; Hovhannisyān 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’ (Lazar 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-i-*, connecting with PGerm. **kweþan* ‘to say, speak, call, name’: Goth. *qīþan*, OIc. *kveða*, OEngl. *cweþan*, etc. He (op. cit. 69) is sceptical about the appurtenance of Skt. *gádati* ‘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).

Ačařyan (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‘-*, etc. However, the onomatopoeic character of a word should not automatically exclude the possibility of external comparison.

The etymology is generally 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 verb, albeit accepted by Pokorny and Ĵahukyan, is uncertain [Mayrhofer EWAia 1, 1992: 460] or unacceptable [Greppin 1993: 22₈]; one expects **gádati*. 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).

kostł ‘twigs on which bird-lime is smeared to entangle birds’ (Lex.), MidArm. ‘cover of a book’ (MijHayBař 1, 1987: 406b).

●DIAL On Ararat *kostł* and *vostł* (HAB 2: 639a) see s.v. *ost* ‘branch’.

●ETYM Usually connected to *ost(i)* ‘branch’ (q.v.), although there is no consensus on the initial *k-* (for different views, see HAB 2: 639a; Ĵahukyan 1967: 272; Ałayan 1974: 87-88; Saradževa 1986: 124). One may think of ORuss. *kostyl’* (костыль) ‘rod, stick or spike with a curved edge’, Russ. ‘rod, stick’, dial. ‘stalk of sorrel with raceme’, Sln. *kostilja* ‘Celtis australis; whip-handle made of this tree’, etc. (for the forms, see ĘtimSlovSlavJaz 11, 1984: 167), though the nature of relationship is not quite clear. Further, see s.v. *kostł-i* ‘aquifolium (holly), ilex (holm-oak)’.

kostli ‘aquifolium (holly), ilex (holm-oak)’, only in Step‘anos Rošk‘a, 17-18 cent. (see Ališan 1895: 330; HAB 2: 639a).

●ETYM No etymology in HAB 2: 639a.

This tree-name can be interpreted as composed of *kostł* ‘twigs on which bird-lime is smeared to entangle birds’ and the tree-suffix *-i*. The semantic relation is impeccable since the bird-lime is a sticky substance prepared from holly-bark or mistletoe berries’.

Both the holly and mistletoe have berries, red and white, respectively. Also the cherry is placed in connection with the bird-lime, cf. Russ. *višnja* ‘cherry’ and OHG *wīhsila* ‘black cherry’ beside Gr. *ἰζός* ‘mistletoe, mistletoe berry; bird-lime prepared from it; sticky substance’ and Lat. *viscum* ‘mistletoe; bird-lime’ (see Pokorny 1959: 1134; Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 644₂ = 1995: 555₅₂; P. Friedrich apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 384a). Note also *sinj* ‘sticky substance’ vs. *sin(j)* ‘sorb, service-berry’ (q.v.).

Arm. *kosthi* is reminiscent of Sln. *kostilja* ‘*Celtis australis*; whip-handle made of this tree’, etc. (see s.v. *kostl* ‘twigs on which bird-lime is smeared to entangle birds’). If the Slavic word is indeed related, one may assume a Substratum word of a relatively younger period, note Arm. *k-* vs. **k* as in other substratum tree-names, *kask* and *kaṭamax(i)*, see s.vv. and 3.11.

kov, *u*-stem: GDPI *kov-u-c* ‘cow’ (Bible+).

●DIAL Dialectally ubiquitous [HAB 2: 639b].

●ETYM Since long, connected with Skt. *gāuh*, acc. *gām*, DSg *gāve*, GPI *gāvām/gónām*, etc. ‘cow, bull’ (RV+), Gr. *βοῦς* f.m., AccSg *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 *gov-ę-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. *βόσσω* ‘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’.

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 Basmaĵean 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’ [Ačařean 1913: 596a], Sasun *govjuj* ‘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 Eĥa Mušelyan Karnec‘i (Karin / Xotorĵur): *k‘alt‘ank‘araz yēšil* · *kōvcuc*, *salamandr* [Č‘ugaszyan 1986: 85^{Nr36}].

According to Bläsing (1992: 50), Turkish dialect of Hamšen *govéuĉ* ‘a kind of salamander’ is borrowed from WArm. *govajuj*. A corresponding form in Arm.

Hamšen, namely *gɔvjud* ‘green lizard’, is recorded in Ačařyan 1947: 261. The final *-d* of the Hamšen form is printed in bold type (see s.v. *tit* on this).

In Xotorjur: *kopçuc* ‘green lizard’ [YuřamXotorj 1964: 472a; HayLezBrbBař 3: 2004: 150a].

The form with an epenthetic *-r-*, namely *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 Gabikean (1952: 311); Xarberd, Partizak **kovrcuc* [HayLezBrbBař 3, 2004: 154b]. Dersim *gɔvəřjuj* ‘a big lizard’ [Bařramyan 1960: 125a]. For this form, Bařramyan (ibid.) records also a second meaning described as follows: *mi karič, kanač’ moles* “a scorpion, green lizard”. If this is reliable, Dersim *gɔvəřjuj* 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 Łarabał on **ēř-xřanj* ‘a poisonous insect’ (see 3.5.2.5). The description seems to corroborate the meaning ‘toad’. See also Martirosyan/Gharagozyan FW 2003 Łarabał, on jumping *kəřnək’ yala* ‘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 **korçuc*, 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. *žába* ‘toad’, etc. is uncertain. Compare e.g. Xurāsānī Pers. *boččoř* (= preverb *bi* + *čōř-* ‘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 Armenian 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, although this seems less probable. For the typology of *-ac*’, cf. **di-ac*’, see also the 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 **kuř* ‘id.’ (see s.v. *keř*), and *korč* ‘curved, crooked, rough’ (Gram.).

●DIAL **korč*, with final *-ř*, in several dialects [HAB 2: 645a].

●ETYM Ačařyan (HAB 2: 574a, 644-645) connects with *keř* ‘curved, crooked’ (q.v.) rejecting all the external comparisons, including that with Gr. *γῶρός* ‘round, curved’, *γῶρος* 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.

Ałayan (1967; 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.vv. *kart* ‘fish-hook’, *křt* ‘unk’ ‘back’, etc.

See also s.vv. *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.). Ačařyan (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 MijHayBař 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. Vardanjañ 1990: 193, § 1061.

In a medieval riddle [Mnac‘akanyan 1980: 261^{Nr112}] 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 zmardoyn 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 little mosquito’. In fact, I think, this is our word for ‘scorpion’.

The edition of Anania Širakac‘i cited by Ačařyan 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 corroborated 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 *Ateñawor* ‘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, Ałayan (1986: 90) disagrees with Ačařyan’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, Hačəñ, Akn Arabkir, Marała, etc. Ačařyan (HAB 2: 644a) especially calls attention to Č‘arsančak‘ *gəřč*‘, not commenting upon it. Note that in Dersim one finds both *gəř* ‘scorpion’ and *gəřj* ‘scorpion’ (see Bałramyan 1960: 87b, 125a).

Perhaps cf. also Urmia, Salmast *korməžik*, rendered as *šanačanč* ‘bumble-bee, dog-fly’ and *mžet* ‘a small mosquito’ [GwrUrmSalm 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 (Marala, Salmast). Note also the derivative **kor-agi* ‘scorpion’ (Svedia and Łarabał) below.

●ETYM According to Ačařyan (HAB 2: 644a), from *kor* ‘crooked’, a tabu-substitution of the word for ‘scorpion’; compare Łarabał *kəřəhák‘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.).

Ačařyan (HAB 2: 551ab) rejects the connection of *kor* ‘scorpion’ with *karič* ‘scorpion’ (Łarabał also ‘crayfish’), since the latter must be connected with Gr. *κᾱρίς, -ίῖδος* ‘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, -ίῖδος* ‘Crustacea’, which also displays forms with a labial vowel, namely *κουρίς, 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. *κουρίς/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, Lori, Ganjak, etc., basically meaning ‘unploughed, hard (ground); hard’ [HAB 2: 646b]; also in Xotorĵur [YušamXotorĵ 1964: 472].

●ETYM Ačařyan (HAB 2: 646) rejects all the etymological attempts including the comparison with Germ. *hart*, etc. and the place-name *Korduk‘* (Terviřyan). Ĵahukyan (1985a: 367; 1987: 432, 598; 1990: 68.), albeit with hesitation, treats Arm. *kord* and its Kartvelian correspondents as borrowed from Urart. *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.).⁷³

⁷³ Alternatively, one may derive *kord* from **g^hord^h-*: cf. Lith. *gařdas* m. ‘fence, enclosure, (sheep’s) pen’, OCS *gradb* m. ‘stronghold, town, garden’, etc.); cf. also **g^hor-t-*: Gr. *χόρτος*

In view of the vocalism it is hard to relate *kord* with MPers. 'gyrd 'unbearbeitet, unbestellt (Land)', ManParth. 'gyrd '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. γρύψ, -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. γρύψ, -γρῦπός 'gryphon, vulture' : 'anchor', see s.v. *angl* 'vulture'.

Olsen (1999: 958) mentions *korč* in her list of words of unknown origin.

křt'-un-k' (pl.), gen. *křt'-an-c'* '(anatom.) back' in Zeno (transl. into Armenian prob. in 6-7th cent.), Anania Širakac'i (7th cent.), etc.; dial. **křt'-n-il* 'to lean, recline, incline the body against an object for support'.

Ačāryan (HAB 2: 669b) cites only NPl *křt'-un-k'* in "Tōnakan matean", and GDPl *křt'-an-c'* in Anania Širakac'i (7th cent.) [A. G. Abrahamyan 1944: 329^{L6}].

Further attestations of NPl *křt'-un-k'* are found in Zeno [Xač'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, *křt'unk'* is mentioned as the body part associated with the constellation *Kše/ir* 'Libra'.

●DIAL Akn, Polis (according to Amatuni 1912: 372b, also Ararat and Nor Naxijewan) *křt'-n-il* 'to lean, recline, incline the body against an object for support', Ararat *křt' rnil* [HAB 2: 669b].

●ETYM Ačāryan (HAB 2: 669b) posits an unattested nom. **křt'n* or **křt'n* and offers no etymology.

Next to *křt'nel*, Amatuni (1912: 372b) cites also Lori *křnel* and points out that the root of *křt'nel* seems to be identical with *kuřn* 'back' (q.v.). This suggestion, not mentioned by Ačāryan, is plausible. Ałayan (1974: 106-107), independently, offers practically the same explanation. He posits **kuř-t'-n* < **gōrptə*, connecting with *ker*, *kor* 'crooked', *kart* 'fish-hook', etc. (q.v.). Ałayan's **gōrptə* is not convincing. More probably, **kuřt'-n* : *křt'unk'* is directly comparable with *kuřn* 'back', with suffixal element *-t'-*, on which see 2.3.1.

m. 'enclosed place; farmyard, in which the cattle were kept; pasturage; fodder', Lat. *hortus* m. 'garden; (pl.) pleasure-grounds', Osc. *hūrz*, acc. *hūrtum* '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).

kř-kř-al ‘to croak (said of birds, particularly crows, as well as of frogs, snakes, buffalos, etc.)’ in MidArm. [MijHayBař 1, 1987: 413b], widespread in the dialects [Ačafean 1913: 613b]; **kř-č-** ‘to croak, shriek (said of cranes, crows, and other birds)’ in Agat‘angelos, Philo, etc.; dial. Łarabał *křč-křč-al* ‘id.’, etc. [HAB 2: 670]; **kř-nč-** ‘to shriek, cry, etc.’ (Bible+), Muš, Alaškert *křinč* ‘croak of a crow’ [HAB 2: 669-670].

●ETYM Onomatopoeic verb [HAB 2: 669-670]. For IE comparable forms, see Pokorny 1959: 383-385. Further see s.v. *křunk* ‘crane’.

křunk ‘crane’ (Hexaemeron, Yovhannēs Erzñkac‘i); dictionaries have also *křunkn*, gen. *křnkan*, both without attestations. MidArm. *křuk*, *křunk*‘ (Vardan Aygekc‘i, see MijHayBař 1, 1987: 414a).

For attestations and a philological discussion, see Greppin 1978: 100-103.

●DIAL Axalc‘xa *křunk*, Muš, Alaškert, Salmast *křung*, T‘iflis *křung*, Van, Moks *křung*^v, Ozim *křčnk*^v, Xarberd, Nor Naxijewan, Řodost‘o *gřung*. In Nor Naxijewan the word refers to a different bird. Interesting is Ararat *křlung* [HAB 2: 673b].

●ETYM Since NHB 1: 1128c, linked with Gr. *γέρωνος* m., Lat. *grūs* m., and other forms continuing the PIE word for ‘crane’: OHG *krani/uh* m., Lith. *gėrvė*, Latv. *dzērve* ‘crane’, ORuss. *žeravľ*, Czech *žeráv* ‘crane’, etc. [Hübschmann 1897: 461; HAB 2: 673a; Pokorny 1959: 383-385; Greppin 1978: 103; Greppin apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 140b]. The forms derive from **gerh₂-no-* or **gerh₂-(ō)u-*, whereas Lat. *grūs*, GSg *gruis* f. ‘crane’ is based on **grh₂-u-* metathesized to **gruh₂-* [Schrijver 1991: 246].

QIE **geru-n-g-*, **guron-g-*, and similar proto-forms have been assumed for Armenian *křunk* (see references above). According to Kortlandt (1985b: 10-11; 1986: 42 = 2003: 58-59, 71), *křunk* ‘crane’ may be derived from the metathesized form of AccSg **gruHnm* (cf. OHG *krani/uh* ‘id.’), with oralization of the laryngeal as in *jukn* ‘fish’ and *mukn* ‘mouse’; see s.vv. and 2.1.19. In order to explain the absence of metathesis of **gr-* in Armenian, he (ibid.) assumes an analogical lengthened grade **-ē-* as in Gothic *qēns* ‘wife’, etc. He also proposes a similar analysis for *srun-k* ‘shin’ (q.v.).

Other explanations assume closer relationship with Gr. *γέρωνος* rather than with Lat. *grūs*. Olsen (1989a: 18) reconstructs **gē/ōrAōn-* (= **gē/ōrh₂ōn-*) explaining the *-r-* by a neighbouring laryngeal. Ravnæs (1991: 158, cf. 88₁) posits **gēron-g-*.

It should be borne in mind, however, that the word for ‘crane’ must have been strongly influenced by dialectally widespread onomatopoeic *kř-kř-al* ‘to croak (said of birds, particularly crows, as well as of frogs, snakes, buffalos, etc.)’ (q.v.). The final *-k* may be in a way comparable to not only the Germanic cognate (OHG *krani/uh*, etc.), but also Skt. *křūñc-* m. ‘Kranich, Wanderkranich’, which is “sicher lautnachahmend” [Mayrhofer EWAia 1, 1992: 413], and Pahl. *kulang* ‘crane’ [MacKenzie 1971: 52]. On the other hand, Ĵahukyan (1980, 2: 103) compares Arm. *křunk* with Akkad. *kurukku* ‘a kind of bird’. One may also think of a ‘broken reduplication’ seen e.g. in Arm. *ampro-p* ‘thunder’ (q.v.) from PIE **u^bh^hro-*: Skt. *abh^hrā-* ‘thunder-cloud, rain-cloud’, YAv. *aβra-* ‘rain-cloud’, Lat. *imber* ‘shower’, etc.

See also s.v. *grē* or *gray* ‘crane’.

ktim, spelled also as *ktm-* ‘to burn with furious desire’ (John Chrysostom, several times), *kt-an-k* ‘burning desire’ (GDPl *kt-an-a-c*, in Book of Chries), *kt-uc-k* ‘id.’ (Severian of Gabala).

- ETYM Ačařyan (HAB 2: 677a) does not accept the connection with *katalim* ‘to fury’ (Philo, Severian of Gabala, etc.; widespread in the dialects) and **xtil-* ‘to tickle’ (Bible+; widespread in the dialects). For an etymological discussion, see s.vv. **kic-* ‘to bite’ and **xtil-* ‘to tickle’.

krak, *a*-stem according to NHB 1: 1132b, but only the following oblique case-forms are attested: GDSg *krak-i* (Elišē, Łazar P‘arpec‘i, etc.), AblSg *i -krak-ē* (Eusebius of Caesarea), LocSg *i krak-i* (Bible, see Astuacaturean 1895: 814a) ‘fire’.

- DIAL Ubiquitous in the dialects [HAB 2: 679a].

- ETYM Lidén (1906: 123-124) proposed a connection with Germ. *Kohle* ‘coal’ and Ir. *gúal* ‘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/l-* ‘to burn, glow’: *jvālana-* m. ‘fire’, *jūrñi-* f. ‘glow, glowing fire’, *jvālā* ‘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 **ġ-*, 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 Ačařyan 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 Zangezur (*k‘urak*), referring to a pit at the side of *t‘ərən* < *t‘onir* (see Lisic‘yan 1969: 104). Note also Georg. *ķera-*, *ķira-*, *ķeraķ-* ‘hearth’ [Klimov 1994: 180].

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 (Xač‘atryan/Łazinyan 1985: 528^{L44}; Russ. transl. 1988: 225): *ænd 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: 121; 1892: 457; cf. 1889: 42) reconstructs **kir* < **dũitero-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 a 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*)*rkkrkino-* > (dissimil.) *krkin*. Harkness (1996: 12) points out that this dissimilation "would be completely unremarkable". Viredaz (2003: 64₂₀) rejects 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. *pjată* 'heel' : *o-pjat* 'again', etc. (see Vasmer, s.v. *о́пя́ть*). Compare also the dialectal meaning 'to return' of *krknel* with Xarberd (Berri) *gə̀rə̀ngel* '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^oin* 'for the third time' [M. Muradyan 1982: 137], apparently from *erek'-kin* 'threefold, triple, three times' (Bible+). Orbeli (2002: 236) has *irik^oir* 'в третий раз' instead, with a final *-r*. If not a misprint, *irik^oir* may go back to **erek'-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', albeit not recorded in the dialects, once has/have been present in (an older form of) the dialect of Moks.

krukn *an*-stem (GSg *krkan*, NPl *krkunk'*, GDPL *krkanc'*) 'heel' (Bible+). Spelled also as *kruk* and *krunk(n)*.

●DIAL Widespread in the 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 *küreng'* (for more variants, see Davt'yan 1966: 404), has also *krə̀g'nə* [HAB 2: 684a]; note also Akn pl. *gə̀rə̀y-vi* (ibid.), a dual form.

Xarberd (Berri) *gə̀rə̀ngel* means 'to turn back on one's heel' [Bařramyan 1960: 123a].

●ETYM Composed of *kur and -ukn. The root is compared with Gr. γῦρός ‘round, curved’, γῦρος m. ‘rounding, circle’; Arm. kurñ ‘back’ (q.v.), etc., although 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 Urart. 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 Archi 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-kl-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 the dialects.

●DIAL Widespread in the dialects: *kul tal, *kl(a)n- ‘to swallow’; in Łarabał, Łazax, Agulis, etc.: *kul ‘gullet, throat’ [HAB 2: 655-656].

Compare also *klat’an* ‘throat’, etc. See Ĵahukyan 1972: 286.

●ETYM Since long, connected with Lat. gula ‘gullet, throat’, Slav. *gľьtь ‘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^wh₁-, explaining -u- by a rounding effect of the labiovelar. However, as she admits (p. 778), this is at variance with *katin* ‘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 *ənklmem* ‘to sink’ is disputed; see Ĵahukyan 1987: 124, 167 (with references and a discussion). Klingenschmitt (1982: 211₆₅) accepts the connection with *kul- ‘to swallow’ and assumes a denominative to *ənd-kül-mo- ‘hinunter verschlungen, untergetaucht’.

kuł, GSg *kłi* or *kłoy* 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 (Хаč‘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 вплетаяю 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'-kł-i*, in Ecclesiastes 4.12: *aṛasan erek'kuł* (vars. *erek'-kł-i*, *erek'-kin*) *oč' vaṭvalaki xzesc'i : καὶ τὸ σπάρτιον τὸ ἐντρίτον οὐ ταχέως ἀπορραγήσεται* : “a threefold cord is not quickly broken”. Arm. *erek'-kuł* could actually mean ‘(consisting of) three threads’, and *aṛasan erek'kuł* 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' kułs oč' karē vaṭvalaki 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’ (Łarabał) or ‘a tie/cord of plough (*samii p'ok*)’; also Łarabał *kəl-án* ‘a leather strap, thong (to tie the yoke to the plough or wagon)’ [Davt'yan 1966: 401], Ararat, Bulanəx, Xian *kłel* ‘to fold the cord’, etc. [Ačārean 1913: 578b, 603b; HAB 2: 657a; HayLezBrbBař 3, 2002: 109, 206a].

V. Ařak'elyan (1979: 43-44) argues that both in the literature and the dialects *kuł* basically refers to ‘rope, cord’ rather than ‘fold, twisting, plait’.

●ETYM Bugge (1889: 42; 1892: 457) derives *kuł* ‘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 *kuł* seems to be ‘rope, cord, string, etc.’ (see above, also V. Ařak'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 *kuł* from **duoplo-* as improbable. The connection between *kuł* and *k'ut* has been suggested by Dervischjan (1877: 37-38). The alternation *k : k'* favours a loan origin.

See also s.vv. *erku* ‘two’, *erkiwt* ‘fear’, and 2.1.22.6.

***kumb** ‘emboss (of a shield)’: *kmb-eay* ‘embossed (shield)’ (John Chrysostom); *oski-kmb-ē* in P'awstos Buzand 5.32 (1883=1984: 196^{L-15}; transl. Garsoian 1989: 214): *oskikmbē vahanōk'n* “with gold-embossed shields”; cf. *oskekmbey vahanōk'* in the letter from Bishop Giwt (5th cent.) to Vač'ē (king of Ałuank') apud Movsēs Kařankatuac'i 1.11 [V. Ařak'elyan 1983: 21^{L14}]. The compound is also attested in John Chrysostom; in published editions: IPI *oski gmb-ē-i-w-k'*, GDPI *oski gmb-ē-i-c'*. Further: *kmbrawor* or *kmrbawor*, 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’ (Hexaameron, etc., widespread in the 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. *gūmbas* m. ‘Wölbung, Geschwulst, Knorren’, Latv. *gūmba* ‘Geschwulst’, OCS *gōba* ‘sponge’, Russ. *gubá* ‘lip’, Czech *houba* ‘mushroom, tree-fungus’, *huba* ‘snout, mouth’, SCr. *gūba* ‘mushroom, tree-fungus, leprosy, snout’, etc. [HAB 2: 658-659]. For a 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. *κύμβαχος* ‘head-foremost, tumbling; crown of a helmet’, next to *κύμβη* ‘head’, etc. (cf. Furnée 1972: 176, 284-285; de Vaan 1999: 11).

kuṛn, GDSg *kṛan* ‘(anatom.) back; side’ (Canon Law, John Chrysostom, etc.), ‘joint between the shoulder and arm’ (Grigor Tat‘ewac‘i); dial. also ‘arm’, ‘pelvis’, etc.

●DIAL Widespread in the dialects, in the meanings ‘back’, ‘arm’, ‘pelvis’, etc. [HAB 2: 663-664]. Clear textual illustrations for the meaning ‘arm’ of *kuṛ*, pl. *kəṛner* can be found, e.g., in a folk-tale from Ijewan, the village of Uzunt‘ala (A. Karapetyan < Hambarjum Karapetyan, 1959: HŽHek‘ 6, 1973: 416-417).

●ETYM If the basic meaning is ‘curved/bending body-part’, the word may be related (see Ałayan 1974: 88-91, 102-108) with *kor* ‘curved, crooked’, *kṛ-t-un-k* ‘back’, *krukn* ‘heel’ (see s.v.v.), although the vocalism is not quite clear. For the semantics, see 3.7.2.

H

ha ‘there!’ (John Chrysostom+), ‘now!, now then!’ (Paterica+), ‘yes’ (Dionysius Thrax+). See also s.v. *ayo* ‘yes’.

●DIAL Ubiquitous in the dialects: *há* ‘yes’; with regular sound changes: Agulis *hó* and Van-group *xá* [HAB 3: 3a].

●ETYM Onomatopoeic word. See s.v. *ayo* ‘yes’.

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*.

On the other hand, cf. Pahl. *xāmōš* ‘silent’ (see MacKenzie 1971: 93).

hay, *o*-stem ‘Armenian’ in Nersēs Lambronac‘i (GDSg *hay-o-y*), Nersēs Šnorhali; **hay** adj. ‘Armenian’ (Revelation, Łazar P‘arpec‘i, Movsēs Xorenac‘i, Anania Širakac‘i, Grigor Narekac‘i); **hay-er**, *o*-stem: coll. ‘Armenians’ in Łazar P‘arpec‘i and, gen/dat. *hayer-o-y*, in Yovhan Mamikonean; **hayerēn** ‘Armenian’, adv. (Esther 2.16, Eznik Kołbac‘i, Eusebius of Caesarea, etc.), adj. (Koriwn, Łazar P‘arpec‘i, etc.); **Hay-k**, *o*-stem: gen-dat. *Hay-o-c* (Bible [Astuacaturean 1895: 828a; Olsen 1999: 946]+); sg. **Hayastan** ‘Armenia, Armenian (world)’ (Agat‘angelos, P‘awstos Buzand, Koriwn, etc.).

This is the principal word for ‘Armenian’ and ‘Armenia’. For attestations and derivatives, see NHB 2: 29-32; Hübschmann 1904: 443. Note also the theonym and asterism *Hayk* ‘Orion’, see 3.1.1-3.1.4.

●ETYM The connection between *hay*, *Hay-k*‘ and *Hayk* is obvious, although there is no consensus on the nature of this relationship. Thomson (1978: 88₆), for instance, points out that the origin of *Hay-k*‘ ‘Armenians’ is obscure, and its etymology from *Hayk* is impossible. However, *Hay-k* can easily be derived from *hay/Hay-k*‘ with the suffix *-ik*. For references and a general discussion of the relationship with *Hayk*, the eponymous ancestor of the Armenians, see Durean 1933: 87-93; AčařAnjn 3, 1946: 31-36; Eremyan 1963: 62a; Adontz 1970 passim; Garsoian 1989: 379, 480-481; Hewsens 1992: 187₁₆₅; Olsen 1999: 946.

As for the origin of *Hay-k*‘, derivations from *Hatti* and *Hajša-* have been proposed. Jensen (1898: 109; 1904: 182a^{Nr7}; 1911: 333; see also Pedersen 1906: 452; 1924: 220a = 1982: 230, 303a) derives *hay* and *Hay-k* from **Hat(i)os* and interprets the final *-k* in *Hayk* as diminutive (on the suffix, see also A. Petrosyan 2006: 100).⁷⁴ On the origin of *Hay-k*‘ and its relationship with *Hayk*, *Hajša-*, *Hatti*, see Kretschmer 1933; Austin 1942: 23; Łap‘anc‘yan 1947; Nalbandian 1948; Ĵahukyan 1961; 1964; 1967b: 59; 1987: 279-285; 1988, 1-2; 1994: 12; D‘jakonov 1968: 235-237; 1971: 10₁₀; 1983; 1984: 179-180, 200-201; Schmitt 1972-74: 40-41; Greppin 1981c: 121₂; A. Petrosyan 2002: 53-63, 159-163, 173-178; 2003 passim; 2004: 207₅; 2007a passim). The most recent and comprehensive overview on this subject can be found in A. Petrosyan 2006, especially 70-88, 99-142.

The theory on the relation between *Hay-k*‘ and *Hajša-* (N. Martirosyan 1972: 164-166 < 1921-22; Roth 1927: 743; Ĵahukyan 1961: 386-389, see also references above; for a comprehensive bibliographical survey, see A. Petrosyan 2006: 118-119) has been met with hypercriticism. I admit that there is no physical linguistic evidence in favour of the presence of an Armenian population of *Hajša-*, but there is no reason to exclude it either, since nothing from the language(s) of *Hajša-* has come down to us apart from some onomastic and toponymic evidence (D‘jakonov 1984: 46). Some traces of Indo-European, particularly Aryan elements can be found in *Hajša-* onomasticon:

Marija- (see V. Xač‘atryan 1988) : Skt. (RV+) *márya-* m. ‘young man, young warrior’ (see Ĵahukyan 1961: 369-370; 1964: 35-37; 1976: 94-95; 1987: 327; 1988, 1: 65-66; Ivanov 1979; cf. Weidner 1917: 55; Diakonoff/Starostin 1986: 21);

Takšanaš ‘Weather-god’ : Skt. *tákšan-* m. ‘wood-cutter, carpenter’ (RV+), Av. *tašan-* m. ‘creator (of cattle)’ (see Hrach Martirosyan 1993: 56-57; A. Petrosyan 2002: 49; on the PIE background of this term, see s.v. *hiwsn* ‘carpenter’). The Hittite theory on the origin of this theonym (Forrer 1931: 8; Ĵahukyan 1964: 54-55; 1976: 95) is semantically less attractive.

For a possible trace of the Armenian language in the *Hajša-* onomasticon, note the theonym *Terittituniš*, which has been interpreted as ‘a deity with three tails’, composed of **tri-* ‘three’ and *ttun* ‘tail’, cf. also Gr. *Τριτών*, etc. (Łap‘anc‘yan 1947: 94-95; Ĵahukyan 1961: 355, 378-379; 1976: 96-97; 1988, 1: 61, 66-67; Toporov 1977: 104-105; A. Petrosyan 2002: 36₁₂₁).

⁷⁴ For further discussion, references and theories see also s.v. *hoy* ‘fright’.

In what follows I briefly summarize my provisional view which is based on my unpublished study, Hrach Martirosyan 1993.

The kingdom (according to D'jakonov 1984: 46, tribal confederation) of *Hajāša-* is attested only in Hittite texts from 14-13th centuries BC. It is located in NW peripheries of the historical Armenia, probably in the valley of the river Čorox and its surroundings (Forrer 1931; Ľap'anc'yan 1947: 9-64; Jahukyan 1961: 356-361; 1964: 15-22; D'jakonov 1984: 45-46, 149-150, 191; IstDrevVost 2, 1988: 144).

The territory of this land roughly coincides with that of the *Chalybes* in Pontus, who were famous for the preparation of steel (Gr. *χάλυψ* 'hardened iron, steel'), *οἱ σιδηροτέκτονες χάλυβες* (see Latyšev 1947, 2: 327; Arešyan 1975: 22).⁷⁵ According to D'jakonov (1984: 117, 162₁₀₃, cf. also 172₂₂₅, 184₁₅, 194₈₁), *Chalybes* is actually not a real ethnonym but means 'steel makers' or 'iron miners'.

In these areas, the iron metallurgy is known from the 2nd millennium or perhaps even earlier (for references and a discussion of this issue, as well as of Hatt. *ḫapalki-* and Akkad./Hurr. *ḫabalginnu* 'iron', see Xaxutajšvili 1974; 1988; Ivanov 1976: 82; 1977a: 27-28₇₆; 1983b: 53-56; Toporov, PrJaz (2), e-h, 1979: 200-203; Vartanov 1983; Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 710₁; IstDrevVost 2, 1988: 254). That the Armenians were in a close relationship with the Chalybians is witnessed by the term *Armenochalybes* (Adontz 1970: 47-48; Eremyan 1970: 53; Tirac'yan 1985: 201).

On the strength of this, I propose to revive the comparison of *Hajāša-* with the PIE word for 'metal, copper, iron', proposed by Jahukyan (1961: 388-389; 1964: 67, especially 67₁₂₂; cf. 1987: 283-284; see also A. Petrosyan 1997: 93-94). We are dealing with PIE **h₂ei-e/os-*, *s*-stem neuter: Skt. *áyas-* n. 'Nutzmetall' [in contrast with *híranya-* 'Edelmetall'], 'copper', later 'iron', *āyasá-* adj., f. *āyasī-* 'made of copper/iron' (RV+), OAv. *aiiah-* n. 'ordeal metal (at the last judgement)', YAv. *aiiah-* n. 'metal', Lat. *aes, aeris* n. 'copper ore, copper; bronze', Goth. *aiz* 'bronze', etc. (see Schrijver 1991: 39; Mayrhofer EWAia 1, 1992: 104). It is well known that PIE *s*-stem neuters are reflected as Armenian *o*-stems (see 2.2.2.1). PIE **h₂ei-e/os-* would regularly yield Arm. **hay, -oc'*. The Hittite rendering *Hajāša-* may reflect the Aryan oblique **Hayasa-* (unless it contains the suffix *-ša-*). That the vocalic shift PIE *e/o* > Aryan *a* had already taken place at the Mitanni period is clearly seen from *panza-* (Kikkuli) vs. Skt. *pāñca* 'five'. Thus, *Hay-k'*, *Hajāša-* may have actually meant 'the land of metal or iron', and Arm. *hay* referred to an inhabitant of the land of metal/iron'; compare the case of Gr. *χάλυψ* 'hardened iron, steel', the appellative of the *Chalybes*.

The Armenian *h-* instead of *x-* (cf. Hrozný 1921-22 p.c. apud N. Martirosyan 1972: 164-165; D'jakonov 1984: 191b) is not problematic, since the native origin of *Hay-k'* implies that *Hajāša-* with *ḫ* represents the Hittite reflection of the vernacular Armenian form and not the other way around (see also A. Petrosyan 2002: 178; 2006: 125-126). For Armenian *h-* as the regular outcome of PIE initial laryngeal followed by a vowel, see 2.1.16.1.

In respect with this theory, it is noteworthy that the Aryan word for 'metal, iron' is considered to be reflected in Abkhaz *ajḥa* 'iron' (Uslar (1887: 132). In recent times,

⁷⁵ Xenophon (Anabasis 5.5.1, see 2001: 416/417; Arm. transl. Krkyašaryan 1970: 121) informs us that most of the Chalybians gained their livelihood from working on iron.

both Indo-Aryan (Šagirov/Dzidzarija 1985: 59) and Iranian (Ardzinba 1988: 267) solutions have been proposed. According to Colarusso (1997: 144), Abkhaz *a-ayxa* and Abaza *ayxa* 'iron; metal' go back to PNWCauc. **a-yaxa*, which he relates to our PIE word (here reconstructed as **ǵ₄ay-so-/*ǵ₄y-əs- < *(h)ayxā*) in terms of Proto-Pontic.

Note also Arm. *darbin* 'smith', probably a cultural term of MedPont origin (cf. Lat. *faber* 'craftsman, artisan; metal worker, smith'), which has possibly been borrowed into Hurrian *tabiri* 'Metallgießer', probably also 'smith' (see s.v. *darbin* 'smith').

Other names of the Armenians

For literature and a discussion on *armen* 'Armenian', see D'jakonov 1968: 234-235; Schmitt 1980; 2008; Ĵahukyan 1987: 285-288; A. Petrosyan 2006: 103₂. Other names: *somexi* by Georgians and *fla* by Kurds (D'jakonov 1968: 234; Ĵahukyan 1987: 279); cf. also *getni* and *gtnik* glossed by *hay* in Baġgirk' hayoc' (HAB 1: 536a; Amalyan 1975: 64^{Nr121}, 67^{Nr210}; cf. S. Petrosyan 1976: 193; A. Petrosyan 1987: 67-68)⁷⁶; Arm. dial. of Artial *Kabzan* 'Armenian' (Ačařyan 1953: 195).

hayt'- 'to attach, adjust, put together' (Lex.), **hayt'ayt'em** (or *hayt'-hayt'em* in Yovhannēs Ōjnec'i) 'to devise, contrive, concoct, find a solution or pretext, make an effort' (Philo, Book of Chries, Gregory of Nyssa, etc.), **hayt'ayt'-an-k'**, *a*-stem: GDPI *-an-a-c'*, IPI *-an-a-w-k'* 'contrivance, way out, effort' (Eznik Koľbac'i, Elišē, Movsēs Xorenac'i, Łazar P'arpec'i, John Chrysostom, etc.); probably also privative **an-het'et'** or **an-heded** 'deformed, shapeless, hideous, monstrous; gigantic, enormous' (Eznik Koľbac'i, P'awstos Buzand, Movsēs Xorenac'i, Łazar P'arpec'i, Book of Chries, John Chrysostom, etc.).

●SEMANTICS The meaning 'to attach, adjust, put together', though recorded only by lexicographers, seems to be original. The semantic development into 'to devise, contrive, find a pretext, etc.' presupposes an intermediary 'to tie a lie, concoct a way out or a pretext'. For such a figurative usage, compare ClArm. *niwt'em* 'to twine, braid, spin' > 'to devise, contrive' (Dowsett 1965: 120); *yawdem* 'to tie, form, adjust, put together' > 'to concoct a lie' (HAB 3: 412b).

The form *an-het'et'/an-hedede*, if related (the vocalism and the vacillation *-t'/d-* are unclear, HAB 1: 202a), presupposes a basic meaning 'deformed' < 'un-shaped, un-formed, un-adjusted' or the like, compare the synonymous *an-ard-il* (with *ard* 'shape', q.v.), found alongside *anheded* in Book of Chries 5.5.8 (G. Muradyan 1993: 120^{L35}; Russ. transl. G. Muradjan 2000: 115). Alongside *anheded* is found also *an-ar-i* 'monstrous' (q.v.) in P'awstos Buzand 5.37 (1883=1984: 202^{L16f}), composed of the privative prefix *an-* and the root **ar-* 'to put together'.

Next to the meaning 'shapeless, ugly', *anhet'et'/anheded* displays a further semantic development into 'gigantic, enormous'. Here is a clear textual illustration from Sebēos (7th cent.), Chapter 20 (Xač'atryan/Eřiazaryan 2005: 104^{L1f}; transl. Thomson 1999: 39): *Ew ēr sa ayr anheded* (var. *anhet'et'* in 1851: 89^{L-2}) *anjamb ew getec'ik tesleamb, ew barjr ew layn hasakaw, ew burñ ew c'amak' marmnov* "He

⁷⁶ Theoretically, *getni(k)* could reflect **gath-ik* through Ačařyan's Law. One may consider a comparison with the Celtic ethnonym *Galli*, etc. from **gal-n-* < **g^hl-n-*, cf. Celtic **galā* 'valor, ability' (for consultations on the Celtic material I am indebted to Ranko Matasović).

was a man gigantic in stature and handsome of appearance, strong and of solid body".

●ETYM No etymology in HAB 3: 30.

Ĵahukyan (1963a: 92; 1987: 146) derives **hayt*'- from PIE **sai-t-* (see below on this etymon). He is sceptical on the appurtenance of *an-het*'*et*' (Ĵahukyan 1990: 74, noting only the privative prefix *an-*). This etymology is quite acceptable, though it has remained unknown to Indo-Europeanists.

The PIE word is now reconstructed as **séh₂i-*, **sh₂i-*: Skt. pres. *syāti*, *sināti*, perf. *ā siṣāya*, aor. *sāt*, caus. *sāyāyati* 'to bind, fasten, fetter', *sitá-* 'bound', *setár-* m. 'binding; fetter', Av. *hi-* 'to chain, bind', Khot. *hīyā* adj. 'bound', Hitt. *išhāi*, *išhianzi* 'to bind, wrap', OHG *seid* n. 'cord', Lith. *siėti* 'to bind, tie', *saītas*, *siėtas* 'cord, tie', Latv. *siēt* 'to bind, tie', *saīte* 'cord, cuff', OCS *sětb* 'snare, trap', Russ. *set* 'net', Old Czech *sít* 'twinning', etc.; cf. also **séh₂i-tu-*: Skt. *sētu-* m. 'band, fetter, dam, bridge', YAv. *haētu-* m. 'dam', Khot. *hī* 'bridge', Oss. *xid/xed* 'bridge', etc. For the forms and a discussion on this etymon, see Pokorny 1959: 891-892; Fraenkel 2, 1965: 756, 783; Lubotsky 1988: 47; Schrijver 1991: 519-520; Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 720-721, 745; Derksen 1996: 118-119, 205; Kulikov 2000; 2001: 506-508; Cheung 2002: 248; 2007: 135-136; Kloekhorst 2008: 391-393; Derksen 2008: 448; cf. Mallory/Adams 1997: 362a.

Arm. *hayt*'*em* and reduplicated *hayt*'-(*h*)*ayt*'*em* are thus denominative verbs based on an otherwise unattested noun **hayt*'- < **sh₂i-ti-* or **s(e)h₂i-tu-*.

In my opinion, this PIE verb is reflected in Arm. *hi-anam* 'to be astounded, stricken with amazement, terror or admiration' < 'to be bound' (q.v.).

A highly hypothetical trace of PArm. **hayt*'- 'cord, tie' may be seen in ClArm. *orogayt* 'snare, trap', if this is composed of **orog-* 'net, spider-web' (cf. **orog-al-* > Svedia *vurukal* 'trap, spider-web', see Andreasyan 1967: 277, 378b) and **hayt*'- 'cord, snare', cf. OCS *sětb* 'snare, trap', Russ. *set* 'net'; thus: 'net-trap, net-snare'. On the other hand, *orogayt*' may contain *gayt*' 'delusion; trap'.

Another possible trace may be seen in dial. **jmet*' or **jmayt*' 'snow blindness' (q.v.), if composed of **j(i)m-* 'snow' and **hayt*'- 'bond'.

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. *xīya*), 120^{Nr57} (3sg.pres. *kə-xə^ε*, neg. *č'ə-xə^ε*).

See also s.v. **hes-* 'to see'.

●ETYM Scheffelowitz (1904-05, 2: 33) compares with Skt. *pāyí-* 'guard, protector', Gr. *ποιμήν* m. 'herdsman', etc. See also s.vv. *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. Ĵahukyan (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'.

Patrubány (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-/pōi-* ‘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 οἶδε, καὶ οὗτοι ἐόντες πολυπρόβατοι*. For a ModArm. translation and commentary, 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 Patrubány.

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.vv. *y-ay-t*, *nayim*, *vayel*.

hayr, GSg *hawr*, ISg *har-b*, NPI *har-k*’, GDPI *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. *ὄμο-πατρία* in Leviticus 18.11: *hamhōreay k’oyr k’o ē : ὄμοπατρία ἀδελφή σου ἐστίν*. The same structure is found in *ham-mawr-eay* (cf. *ὄμο-μητρία*), only in Mxit’ar Goš (Law Code, 12th cent.), apparently analogical after *ham-hawr-eay*, since the passage is identical: *hamhōreay 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 the dialects. In some dialects replaced by *pap* ‘grandfather’ or by recent borrowings. CIArm. *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* [Ačařyan 1947: 12, 242].

●ETYM From PIE **ph₂tēr*, gen. **ph₂tr-ós* ‘father’: Skt. *pitá*, AccSg *pitáram*, VocSg *pítar*, DSg *pitré*, NPI *pitáras*, DPI *pitṛbhyas* (Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 128-129), Gr. *πατήρ*, AccSg *πατέρα*, GSg *πατρός*, Lat. *pater*, *patris*, Goth. *fadar*, OHG *fater*, Toch. A *pācar*, B *pācer*, etc.; see Hübschmann 1897: 463; HAB 3: 31-32 with references; Pokorny 1959: 829; Mallory/Adams 1997: 194-195.

On the paradigm and a discussion of gen. *hawr* < **ph₂trós*, instr. *har-b* < **ph₂tr-b^hi-* and other case forms, see Grammont 1918: 236; Meillet 1936: 81-82; Schmitt 1981: 73-75, 100, 110, 112; Olsen 1999: 150-151; Matzinger 2005: 20, 104, and espec. 126-131.

MidArm. **hawr-u* ‘stepfather’ (genitive *hōru-i*, hapax, 12th cent.) is considered analogical after *mawru* ‘stepmother’ (q.v.); cf. Gr. *πατρώος*, *πατριός* m. ‘stepfather’. It has been preserved 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, *o*-stem: GDAbISg *han-o-y* (Movsēs Xorenac'i, Canon Law, etc.; cf. below) 'grandmother' (attested also in John Chrysostom, Philo); **han-i**; *wo*-stem: LocSg *i hanw-o-y*, var. *i han-o-y* (2 Timothy 1.5, Grigor Narekac'i), IPl *hanw-o-v-k'* in the letter from Bishop Giwt (5th cent.) to Vač'ē (king of Ałuank') apud Movsēs Kałankatuac'i 1.11 (V. Ařak'elyan 1983: 20^{L14}) 'id.'; hypocoristic **han-ik**, GDSg *hank-an* (in a colophon; cf. the dialect of Ĵuła) 'id.' (Ephrem, Vardan Arewelc'i, Yaysmawurk').

In 2 Timothy 1.5: *bnakec'aw i hanwoy* (var. *hanoy*) *k'um* "dwelt in your grandmother" (said of the faith); locative *i hanwoy* = *év τῆ μάμμῆ*. In Grigor Narekac'i 36 (1985: 397^{L46}; reading variants: 770b): *han-oy-n*, vars. *hanwoyn*, *hangoy*, 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 Ĵuła: *xanik* 'grandmother' [HAB 3: 33b], with a regular shift *h* > *x* [Ačārean 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* [Ačārean 1940: 190, 372a]. Compare *hankan* above.

●ETYM Connected with Gr. *ἀνίς* 'mother-in-law', Lat. *anus* 'old woman', Lith. *anyta* 'husband's mother', etc. [Hübschmann 1897: 463; Szemerényi 1977: 48]. 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 2.1.16.1.

***hang** 'breath, rest' (dial.); **hangč'im**, 3sg.aor *hang-e-aw* 'to rest'; **hang-i-st**, GDSg *hangst-ean* 'rest, peace; resting place, grave' (Bible+).

●DIAL Both *hangč'im* and *hangist* are widespread in the dialects. The root-form is represented in Aparan, Alaškert, Ararat *hank'*, Muš *hang'*, Moks *xang'*, Van *xank'^o*, etc. 'breath, rest' [HAB 3: 35-36]. The meaning 'grave' of *hangist* can be seen e.g. in Ā. Grigoryan 1970: 320^{L7}. 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. **hangi-* 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^we*. For references and a discussion on *hang-i-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; Rix 2003: 368]; 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 Khwar. *hncy-* ‘to rest, repose’ (see Cheung 2002: 160). For the structure of these forms and Arm. *hangist* cf. also the Iranian source (**han-d₃-ta-*) of Arm. *handart* ‘quiet’ [HAB 3: 38-39].

hanem, 3.sg.aor. *e-han* ‘to take out, take off, draw out, remove, bring outside, bring forth, grab’ (Bible+).

For some Biblical attestations, see Klingenschmitt 1982: 131.

●DIAL Ubiquitous in the dialects [HAB 3: 34b].

●ETYM Etymology uncertain. For a comparison with Skt. *sanóti* ‘to win, gain’, etc., see s.v. *unim* ‘to take, have, obtain’. On the other hand, a relation with Hitt. *han-* ‘to draw, scoop’ has been proposed, see Lap‘anc‘yan 1961: 187-188; Schultheiss 1961: 225; Greppin 1973: 71; Polomé 1980: 21.

hask, *i*-stem: GDPI *hask-ic* ‘in Book of Chries and Cyril of Alexandria; loc. *i* *hask-i* in Hexaameron (K. Muradyan 1984: 135^{L12}); *a*-stem: GDPI *hask-a-c* ‘in Hexaameron (K. Muradyan 1984: 128^{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’awhūn* = *καλάμη* ‘stalk, stubble’: *kam ibrew zhask ink’nin ankeal i c’awhūn* ‘or as an ear of corn, fallen off the stalk of itself’: *ἢ ὥσπερ στάχυς αὐτόματος ἀποπεσὼν ἀπὸ καλάμης* (Cox 2006: 172); according to Rahlfs: *ἢ ὥσπερ στάχυς ἀπὸ καλάμης αὐτόματος ἀποπεσὼν*.

●DIAL Widespread in the dialects [HAB 3: 48b]. The Van-group has with an irregular *-š-*: Van, Moks, Ozim *xāšk* [Ačařyan 1952: 274], Šatax *xāšk* [M. Muradyan 1962: 57, 200a]. Orbeli (2002: 243) has Moks *xāšk*, GSg *xāšk^ε*, NPI *xāškir* ‘ко́лос (го́ловка)’. Ačařyan (1952: 85) hesitantly assumes an influence of Pers. *xūša*, Pahl. *xōšak* ‘ear of corn’.

●ETYM No acceptable etymology is recorded in HAB 3: 48b. Ĵahukyan (1967: 241) derived from **ak-* ‘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 **h₂ek-* ‘sharp’ which would yield Arm. **has-*. For the semantics cf. also OEngl. *egl* f. ‘awn’ < **h₂ek-ileh₂-*, Gr. *ἀκή* f. ‘point’, Lat. *aciēs* f. ‘sharp edge’, Lith. *akiotas* ‘awn’, etc. Most of these cognates are feminines, thus the *i-* and *a-*stems of Arm. *hask* probably point to fem. **ih₂-* and **eh₂-*. Goth. *ahs*, OHG *ahir* n., etc. ‘ear (of corn)’, Lat. *acus*, *-eris* n. ‘husks of grain or beans, chaff’, indirectly also Gr. *ἀκοστή* f. ‘barley’ reflect a neuter *s*-stem: **h₂ek-es-* (see Casaretto 2000: 219-221).

For the *-k-* alternative solutions can be offered: (1) derivaton on **h₂ek-u-*, cf. Lat. *acuō*, *-ere* ‘to sharpen’, Lith. *akiotas* ‘awn; fish-bone; cutting edge’ (from **aku-ōt-* or **ak-ōt-*, R. Derksen, p.c.; the absence of palatalization is unclear), etc.; thus:

**h₂ek̄-u-* > **hask-*; (2) an old suffix **-k-*, cf. Lith. *āšaka* ‘fish-bone; bran’, Russ. *osóka* ‘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: **h₂ek̄-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 identical.

For the problem of *-sk* from **k̄u-*, see 2.1.21.

hast ‘firm, steady, standing still, tough’ (Bible, Severian of Gabala, John Chrysostom, Ephrem, etc.), ‘thick, dense, broad’ (see the dialectal section); **hast**, *i*-stem: GDP1 *hast-i-c*‘ (Dionysius the Areopagite), IPI *hast-i-w-k*‘ (Cyril of Alexandria, George of Pisidia, Anania Narekac‘i), loc. *i hast-i* (Severian of Gabala, John Chrysostom) and *i hast-oj* (John Chrysostom) ‘firmness, the standing still, strength’; **hastem** ‘to affirm, assert, make hard, create’ (Bible+), **hast-ič**‘ ‘creator’, etc.; numerous compounds [HAB 3: 49a]. On **hast-a-m-est**, see de Lamberterie 1992a: 103-105.

See also s.vv. **hastatem** ‘to affirm, assert, reinforce; to build, found, set up, settle, establish a dwelling place; to create’, **hastoyr** ‘decisive’, **hasteay** attested only in API (*z-*)**hasteay-s** ‘a kind of pastry’.

●DIAL Ubiquitous in the dialects [HAB 3: 49b]. Especially widespread is the meaning ‘thick, dense, broad’, also in many compounds (see Ačarean 1913: 639-640; Malxaseanc‘ HBB 3: 60-62; HayLezBrbBař 3, 2004: 246-247). This meaning is attested in *Yaysmawurk*‘ and is marked as dialectal (*řmk.*) in NHB 2: 54b.

●ETYM Since Hübschmann (1883: 38), linked with the Germanic word for ‘hard, steady, strong, firm, dense’: Oic. *fastr*, OHG *festi*, *fasti*, Engl. *fast*, etc. (Pedersen 1924: 224b = 1982: 307b), subst. OHG *festī* ‘firmness, strength; shelter, stronghold, fortress’, Germ. *Feste*, *Festung*, probably also Skt. *pastyā-* n. ‘Wohnsitz, Wohnstätte, Aufenthalt, Haus’ < ‘fester Wohnsitz’, *pastyā-* f. ‘Wohnsitz, Haus, Hausgemeinschaft’ (according to some scholars, ‘Strom, Fluß’), and some less probable cognates [Hübschmann 1897: 464; Osthoff 1898: 1-2; HAB 3: 49; Pokorny 1959: 789; Klingenschmitt 1982: 165; Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 744₁ = 1995, 1: 648₁₀; Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 111; HerkWört 1997: 184b; Mallory/Adams 1997: 204b; Olsen 1999: 201, 850].

The Armenian *i*-declension is secondary (see Ĵahukyan 1982: 126-127; cf. 1987: 142), unless it points to an older **past-i(h₂)-* in a way reflected in OHG *festi*, *festī*, and/or Skt. *pastyā-*, *pastyā-*.

In view of the limited distribution (see also Salmons apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 204b) and the vowel **-a-*, we are hardly dealing with a PIE word. One may posit a European substratum word shared by Armenian, Germanic, possibly also Indo-Aryan. In view of the semantics of the Germanic and Indic cognates, as well as that of Arm. *hastatem* ‘to affirm, assert, reinforce; to build, found, set up, settle, establish a dwelling place’, one may posit a substratum technical term with an original meaning ‘foundation, settlement, fortified dwelling place, fortress’.

For an extensive philological and etymological discussion and for the relation with *astem* ‘to look for a bride, ask in marriage’, *hastim* ‘to be engaged, be betrothed (said of a girl)’, see de Lamberterie 1992a. Olsen (1999: 201₃₇₉) alternatively assumes a **ph₂k̄-to-*. A contamination is more probable. For more detail, see s.v. *astem*.

Łap'anc'yan (1961: 188-189) connects Arm. *hast* to Hitt. *ḫaštai-* 'bones; strength'. This is untenable.

hastat 'firm, steady, steadfast, solid, constant, sure, valid; certainly, surely, truly, really' (Bible, Canon Law, Ephrem, Grigor Narekac'i, etc.); *hastatem* 'to affirm, fasten, assert, reinforce; to build, found, set up, settle, establish a dwelling place; to create' (Bible+).

Rich material in the Bible [Astuacaturean 1895: 854-857].

●DIAL Widespread in the dialects, in the meanings 'firm, steadfast, solid, well-built, valid' [HAB 3: 50a]. Aslanbek *hasdad* 'thick' semantically replaced *hast* (see HAB 3: 49b).

●ETYM Derived from *hast* 'firm, steady, standing still' (q.v.). For the suffix *-at*, see Pedersen 1906: 475-476 = 1982: 253-254; Greppin 1975: 55; Ĵahakyan 1998: 16; Olsen 1999: 335-337.

hasteay attested only in API (*z-*)*hasteay-s* 'a kind of pastry'.

NHB and HAB cite only one attestation: *ararak' nma hasteays ew karkandaks* 'we made cakes for her' (Jeremiah 44.19).

Another attestation is found by L. Hovhannisyan (1991a: 152; 2000: 218) in Ephrem Asori: *Ew arnun zmarminn surb: uten zhasteays and šišats ew and surbs zsrbut'iwnn* 'And they take the holy body: (they) eat the *hasteay-s* with demons (*šišat-*) and the holiness with saints'.

In Baĝirk' hayoc' (Amalyan 1975: 181^{Nr166}), *hasteays* (API) is glossed as *barak hac'*, *kam lōš* 'thin bread, or *lōš*'. Not mentioned in NHB and HAB.

●ETYM The etymology is uncertain. Ačarıyan (HAB 3: 50) hesitantly compares with Gr. *ἀκτῆ* 'corn' and *πάστιη* > Lat. *pasta* > Fr. *pâte*, both of unknown origin. One may also consider Lat. *pānis* 'bread' < **pāstni-* and diminutive *pastillum* 'a form of sacrificial cake' from **peh₂s-t-*, probably containing the root **peh₂s-*: Lat. *pacō* 'to feed, pasture; to provide food for; to nurture (ground, crops, etc.); to gratify hunger' (see Schrijver 1991: 144 with references, mentioning also Arm. *hac* 'bread' < **pas-ki-* with a question-mark).

Arm. *hasteay(-k')* may be alternatively linked with Gr. *ἄζω* 'to dry, parch', Czech *ozd* 'dried malt', *ozditi* 'to dry malt', Arm. *ostin* 'dry', *ačiw* 'ash' (q.v.); it can be derived from PIE **h₂Hs-d-* or **h₂es-d-*, or a deverbative noun **h₂H(e)s-ti-*. For the semantics compare Lat. *fer(c)tum* 'a kind of sacrificial bread' vs. Skt. *bhṛjĵāti* 'to fry, roast (grains, etc.)', *bhṛṣṭa-* 'fried, roasted, baked' (Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 643, 699; Schrijver 1991: 255; Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 278).

Structurally, *hasteay-k'* may be interpreted as **hasti-* + the collective suffix *-ay(-k')*. The ultimate origin of **hasti-* remains obscure. The possibilities are: QIE **h₂ek-t-i(h₂-)*, cf. Gr. *ἀκτῆ* 'corn'; QIE **peh₂s-ti-*, cf. Lat. *pānis* 'bread' < **pāstni-*, *pastillum* 'a form of sacrificial cake'; QIE **h₂(H)es-d-i(h₂-)* or **h₂H(e)s-ti-*, cf. Czech *ozd* 'dried malt', etc. Also possible is **has(i/u)t-* or **hac'(i/u)t-* + *-eay* (for this suffix, see Olsen 1999: 377-385).

Finally, one may assume a loan from Hitt. ^{NINDA}*ḫaz(z)ita-* 'a kind of cake'. On this word, see s.v. *hac* 'bread'.

hastoyr, only in John Chrysostom, rendering Gr. *καίριος* 'coming at the right place, decisive, deadly' [NHB 2: 56c].

●ETYM Derived from *hast* ‘firm, steady, standing still’, q.v. [HAB 3: 49a]. For the suffix *-oyr*; see Jähukyan 1987: 236; 1998: 30.

Compared with Urart. mountain *Haštarae*, Hitt. city *Hašter(i)a* (Jähukyan 1988: 153; cf. N. Arutjunjan 1985: 228). Uncertain.

hat, *o*-stem (later also *i*-) ‘grain, seed; piece, cut, 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 denominative verb *y-awtem* (Paterica+) is based. Later also *hawt* ‘cut-off branch of vine’ (Geoponica), *hawtem* (Čarəntir). See also s.v. *hawt*, *i*-stem ‘flock of sheep, etc.’.

hatanem ‘to strike’ (about plague) in P^{awstos} Buzand 4.13 (1883=1984: 95^{L-15f}); for the passage, see s.v. *keł*.

The meaning ‘to end, expire’, widespread in the 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 the 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].

●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-tér*) and **tane-* < **dā-ne/o-* ‘teilen’, which is improbable. Ałayan (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*, *pjáuți* (**pēuiō*) ‘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 apud Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 655 = 1995: 564; Clackson 1994: 171), and, independently, by Morani (1991: 176-178). According to it (see especially Morani), *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 Av. **āδū-*, Sogd. (Buddh.) *’dw-k* ‘grain’, Hitt. *hat-*, if basically meaning ‘dried grain’. See also Pokorny 1959: 3; Watkins 1973; 1975a; Greppin 1983a: 13; Schrijver 1991: 38. On the connection of the Armenian word with the Hittite, see Wittmann 1964 apud Oettinger 1976: 147₅₂ (see also below). On Gothic, see Ramat 1974: 77-78. For further discussion and literature, see Szemerényi 1977: 29. Greppin (1983a: 13-14) adds Arm. *hačar* ‘spelt’ (Bible; Łarabał, etc.). For the latter compare Hitt. *hattar*, possibly ‘spelt’ (on which, see Watkins 1975: 184ff), although Arm. *-č-* is unclear.

As Morani (ibid.) explicitly points out, 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. *hattāi-* ‘to cut’ either as a native word (see Beekes 2003: 182) or as a loan (see Jahukyan 1987: 314; 1988, 2: 84). For Hittite, see the references above (especially Watkins 1973 and 1975a) and Oettinger 1976: 126. 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. Xaç‘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. *āti* ‘grass’, which is usually taken as cognate with 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 **-d_i-*) 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).

Conclusion

Arm. *hat*, *o*-stem ‘grain, seed; piece, cut’ may be derived from IE **h₂edos-* n. ‘sort of cereal, grain’. The verb *hatanem* ‘to cut’ should not be separated from *hat*. Not everything is clear, however. Synchronically, *hat* would be better understood as a deverbative noun (also Viredaz, p.c.). Neither the relation with the Hittite verb is clear. 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 **kāk-* ‘to knock, pound’, Georgian *kāka-* ‘grain, kernel (of fruit)’, *kākal-* ‘walnut’, Laz *kākal-* ‘walnut’, Megr. *kākal-* ‘grain; piece’, etc. (see Klimov 1964: 105; 1998: 85); on these words, see s.v. *kaṭin* ‘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, Ĵula, Salmast, etc. [HAB 3: 56-57].

●ETYM No acceptable etymology is recorded in HAB 3: 56b.

Ĵahukyan (1973: 20-21; 1986-1987: 30; 1987: 143, 186) suggests a connection with Skt. *pūrva-* ‘being before, going in front, first, former; eastern’ (RV+), OAv. *pouruuīia-* ‘first, intial, 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’š kyr’n* ‘south’ (see Cheung 2002: 216). In his table, Jahukyan (1987: 143, 186) notes the semantic identity of the Armenian and the Iranian words. Elsewhere, he (1986-1987: 30) writes: “Selon certains linguistes, la signification de l’aveistique *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”, Jahukyan (1986-1987) treats *hiwsis* ‘north’ (q.v.) as “côté inverse”, deriving it from PIE **seukoi-ki(y)o-*, with the basic meaning “qui se trouve à l’opposé”.

On the reflex of the internal laryngeal, see 2.1.20.

harawunkʼ ‘sowing, seeds; sowing-field; arable land’, attested (Bible+) in API *harawun-s*. See also s.v. *haruancʼ*.

●DIAL Muš *harvənkʼ*, Maškert, Kʼhi *harmunkʼ* ‘soil that has been softened by rains in spring and autumn and can be ploughed’ [HAB 3: 57a; Bałramyan 1960: 147a], also Sasun *harvənkʼ* ‘the appropriate time for sowing’ and a verb *harvənkʼil* ‘to prepare the soil for sowing’ (Petoyan 1954: 139; 1965: 495). For a thorough description, see Gabikean 1952: 332 (with Turk. *hernik* 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 *harawunkʼ* from **aramon-*, citing Lat. *aramentum*⁷⁷ 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 *harawunkʼ* open. Jahukyan (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. *ἀρουρα* f. ‘tilled or arable land; pl. corn-lands, fields’; Skt. *urvārā-* f. ‘arable land, field yielding crop’, Av. *uruuarā-* f. pl. ‘food plant, plant, ground covered with plants, flora’; Mİr. *arbor*, NPI *arbanna*, Oİr. gen. *arbe* ‘grain, corn’, etc. She also adds Arm. *araws* ‘virgin soil’ (q.v.; not mentioned by Jahukyan), as a semantic parallel noting Lith. *armenà* ‘aufgepflügte Schicht der Erdoberflächen’ (cf. also *Armenà* ‘right tributary of the Nėmunas’) from PIE **h₂erh₃-menā-* (see Derksen 1996: 154).

Apparently, the initial *h-* of *harawunkʼ* directly reflects the PIE laryngeal (**h₂e-* > Arm. *ha-*, see 2.1.16.1), 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.

⁷⁷ I could not find Lat. *aramentum* in OxfLatDict. Perhaps *armentum* ‘herd (of large cattle); a head of cattle’ is meant. Note the semantic difference.

Stating that in the 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. *ἄροισα* 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 corroborate 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. *armuō* '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 is unparallelled.

The above-mentioned argument of Olsen is not essential, since *harawunk* (pl.) can be analogical after the unpreserved NSg **harawr* (cf. Gr. *ἄροισα*). 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 *mrjwñ*, NPl *mrjmwñk* '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'; or else: *har(a)wunk* > dial. **har(a)munk*, (C)w...n > (C)m...n (assimilation of nasalization), cf. *Kaḷ(o/a)wan* > *Kaḷ(i)zman* (on which see HayTeĭBaĭ 2, 1988: 908-909);

(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 is comparable with Lat. *ar(a)mentum* (if related) and/or Lith. *armuō* 'arable land' (cf. the above-mentioned interpretation of Bugge), *armenā* 'aufgepflügte Schicht der Erdoberflächen'.

The latter solution seems to be slightly preferable.

harsn, GDSg *harsin*, AblSg *i hars-n-ē*, NPl *harsun-k*, GDPl *harsan-c* 'bride; daughter-in-law' (Bible+); **harsan-i-k**, pl. tant. *ea*-stem: GDPl *harsane-a-c* 'nuptial, wedding ceremony' (Bible+).

●DIAL Both *harsn* and *harsanik* are ubiquitous in the dialects [HAB 3: 62b]. Łarabał has vocative *hās-i* vs. nominative *hárt'nə*. The pl. tant. *harsanik* is represented in the Van-Marata group as a frozen API **xarsni-s*. Note in this relation, that ALocPl *harsani-s* is found seventeen (of the thirty in total) times in the Bible (see Astuacaturean 1895: 866).

●ETYM See s.v. *harc'anem* 'to ask, question, inquire'.

harc'anem, 1sg.aor. *harc* '-i, 3sg.aor. *e-harc* ', imper. *harc* ' (rich evidence in the Bible, see Astuacaturean 1895: 866-868) 'to ask, question, inquire' (Bible+); **harc'-uk**, *a*-stem: GDPI *harc* 'k-a-c' (Canon Law) 'sorcerer, magician' (Bible+); **harc** ', *i*-stem: GDSg *harc* '-i, GDPI *harc* '-i-c' 'question, inquiry, interrogation' (Agat'angelos, Philo, Severian of Gabala, Gregory of Nyssa, etc.).

●DIAL Ubiquitous in the dialects [HAB 3: 63b]. T'iflis has *harc* 'nɔt 'magician', cf. ClArm. *harc* 'uk 'sorcerer, magician' [HAB 3: 63b].

●ETYM From PIE present **prk̑-ske/o-*: Ved. *pr̥cchāmi*, MPers. *pursīdan* 'to ask', Lat. *poscō* 'to ask, demand', etc.; Arm. 3sg.aor. *e-harc* ' derives from thematic imperfect **e-prk̑-sk̑-et*, cf. Skt. *ap̥rcchat*. Note also Arm. imper. *harc* ' vs. Skt. *pr̥cchá*. The noun *harc* ', *i*-stem 'question, inquiry' probably reflects QIE fem. **pr̥k̑-sk̑-ih₂-* (next to **-sk̑-eh₂-*: Skt. *pr̥cchā-*, OAv. *f(ə)rasā-* f. 'question', OHG *forsca* 'question', etc.; see Pokorny 1959: 822; Schmitt 1981: 53)⁷⁸.

Here belongs also Arm. *harsn* 'bride' (q.v.), cf. Lat. *proculus*, *ī* m. 'suitor, wooer', Lith. *peršu* 'to ask for a girl's hand in marriage', OCS *prositi* 'to ask', Skt. *praśná*-m. 'question, point at issue, inquiry', YAv. *frašna-* m. 'question', etc. See also s.v. *p'esay* 'bridegroom, son-in-law'.

For an etymological discussion, see Meillet 1910-11a: 246; 1936: 106-107, 114, 119; Pokorny 1959: 821-822; Mayrhofer 1961: 188-189; Godel 1975: 113, 115-116; K. Schmidt 1980: 42; 1980a: 2; Schmitt 1981: 53, 135; 1985: 86; Klingenschmitt 1982: 60-63; Ĵahukyan 1982: 189; Kortlandt 1989: 44; 1996: 40-43 = 2003: 89, 114-116; Ravnæs 1991: 147; Clackson 1994: 105, 173; Beekes 1995: 230; Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 183-185; Mallory/Adams 1997: 33a, 369b, 468b; Olsen 1999: 90, 125.

For the meaning of *harc* '-uk 'sorcerer, magician' and dial. T'iflis *harc* 'nɔt 'magician' compare OEngl. *freht* f. 'Wahrsagung' (Ĵahukyan 1992: 19; cf. Saradževa 1985: 79).

hac ', *i*-stem: GDSg *hac* '-i, AblSg *i hac* '-ē, ISg *hac* '-i-w, AblPl *i hac* '-i-c', IPl *hac* '-i-w-k' (rich evidence in the Bible, Astuacaturean 1895: 868-870) 'bread; food, meal' (Bible+).

●DIAL Dialectally ubiquitous [HAB 3: 65a]. Interesting is Ĵula *axanc* ' from *an-hac* ' 'bread-less, without bread', with metathesis (see Ačarean 1940: 162, 373a). On the compound *hac* '-a-han see 2.1.33.2.

In Łarabał (Ačarean 1913: 647a) and Modern Armenian (Malxaseanc' HBB 3: 76b), *hac* ' refers also to 'honey with honeycomb'; cf. also **metr-a-hac* ' 'id.', composed of *metr* 'honey' and *hac* ' 'bread' (Ačarean 1913: 768b; Malxaseanc' HBB 3: 302). The same semantic shift is seen in *pan* 'a kind of round bread', which in the dialects of Cilicia and surroundings is synonymous to *metr-a-hac* '. This shift is quite old since it is attested by Nersēs Lambronac'i (12th cent., Cilicia) and others [HAB 4: 20a].

●ETYM Most of the etymological explanations (on which see HAB 3: 64-65; Charpentier 1909: 241-242; Clackson 1994: 231₂₁₉), including those connecting *hac* ' 'bread' with Skt. *sasyá-* n. 'corn, grain' (Bugge 1889: 17; 1893: 41; rightly rejected

⁷⁸ One might also think of a QIE root noun fem. **pr(e)k̑-s* with extension to *i*-declension, cf. Lat. *prex*, *-ecis* f. 'prayer; curse; good wishes'.

in Hübschmann 1897: 465 and Pedersen 1905: 209 = 1982: 71) or with Gr. *πατέομαι* 'to dine, eat and drink; to enjoy' and Goth. *fodjan* 'to feed' (**pat-ti-* > Arm. *hac'*, Pedersen 1906: 432 = 1982: 210) are untenable. Of these the two are worth of consideration.

Since long (for references, see HAB 3: 64), Arm. *hac'* is linked with cognate forms deriving from PIE **pek^w-* 'to cook, bake': Skt. *pac-* 'to cook; to ripen' (see Kulikov 2001: 300-304), YAv. *pač-* 'to cook' (see Bailey 1979: 199-200; Cheung 2007: 286-287), Lat. *coquō* 'to cook, boil, fry, bake, parch' < **k^wek^wō* < **pek^wō* (see Schrijver 1991: 466), Gr. *πέσσω* 'to bake, cook; to ripen', OCS *pekŕ* 'to bake', etc. A **-ti-*-derivative QIE **pok^w-ti-* has been assumed, cf. Gr. *πέψις* f. 'the cooking; the ripening', Ved. Skt. *pakti-*, *pákti-* f. 'cooking, cooked meal', etc. (Charpentier 1909: 241-245; Pokorny 1959: 798 (hesitantly); Jahukyan 1982: 73; 1987: 142 (hesitantly); Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 699 = 1995, 1: 604. Arm. *hac'* is not mentioned in Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 64; Mallory/Adams 1997: 125.

This etymology presents us with a number of difficulties: 1) the vowel *-*o-* cannot yield Arm. -*a-* in closed syllables; 2) the sound change *-*k^wti-* > Arm. -*c'* is untenable; 3) **-ti-*-derivatives usually require zero grade in the root. The explanation of Mann (1963: 83-84; cf. Jahukyan 1982: 217₇₈) assuming **-t(V)s* > Arm. -*c'* is improbable; for the counter-evidence, see *-T(i)*. Likewise untenable is **pok^w-s-om* 'baked' assumed by Patrubány (apud HAB 3: 64b). Olsen (1999: 83, 827; 2000: 404) posits **p^ok^w-t^h₂-* > **-t^h₂-*, a *vyk^l-*-derivative, with **-k^wt^h₂-* > -*c'* as "a potential parallel of the regular development **-t^h₂-* > -*c'*". I believe, however, that a **-t^h₂-* would yield Arm. -*č'* rather than -*c'* (see 2.1.22.1). Furthermore, **k^wt^h₂-* is more likely to develop into Arm. -*wč'* beside the regular change **-pt-* and **-kt-* > Arm. -*wt'*, cf. *eawt'n* 'seven', *ut'* 'eight', etc.

According to the etymology suggested by Patrubány 1902-03a: 163; 1904: 428 (accepted in Pedersen 1905: 209 = 1982: 71 and Meillet apud HAB 3: 65a; for further references, see Schrijver 1991: 144, mentioning also Arm. *hac'* 'bread' < **pas-ki-* with a question-mark), Arm. *hac'* 'bread' derives from **pāsk-i* or **pā-sk-i-* (read **p(e)h₂-sk-i-*), with the inchoative present suffix **-sk-*, and is linked with Lat. *pānis* 'bread' < **pāstni-*, *pastillum* 'a form of sacrificial cake', *pascō* 'to feed, pasture; to provide food for; to nurture (ground, crops, etc.); to gratify hunger' (see s.v. *hasteay* 'a kind of pastry'). More probably, Arm. *hac'* may reflect an old nominative **pāst-s* (see below).

Recently A. Petrosyan (unpublished) derived *hac'* from PIE **h₂Hs-k-*, a derivative of **h₂eHs-* 'to dry, parch'. To the best of my knowledges, however, there are no cognates pointing to a form with **-k-*. The Germanic forms (OHG *asca* 'ashes', etc.) and Arm. *ač-iwn* 'ash' and *askn* 'ruby' point to **-g-*. Nevertheless, this etymology is worth of consideration. One may assume a suffix **-sk-*, on which see Jahukyan 1987: 235-236. The semantic development 'baked, cooked' > 'bread, cake' is natural. One also may think of '(baked by placing under) ashes', cf. Arm. *nkan* 'a kind of bread' < 'bread that is baked by placing it under ashes' (HAB 3: 455-456); Partizak, Manišak < Hamšen *moxrac* (*moxrat'at*) *karkandak* '*ashed cake' (see Tēr-Yakobean 1960: 464); Tavuš *kərkeni* 'a cake' that is baked *moxri mič'in* 'in the ashes' (Xemč'yan 2000: 217b^{Nr19}). Compare also *hasteay* 'a kind of pastry, cake'

(q.v.), possibly from the same etymon (if derived from **has-t-* 'ash' rather than having resulted from a semantic development 'to parch, burn, etc.' > 'cake').

According to Jahukyan (1987: 318, 320), Arm. *hac* 'bread', if indeed of IE origin, may have been borrowed into Hitt. ^{NINDA}*haz(z)ita-* 'a kind of cake' (cf. also Hitt. ^{NINDA}*harzazu-* 'a kind of oily bread'). I suggest a connection between Hitt. ^{NINDA}*haz(z)ita-* 'a kind of cake' and Arm. *hasteay* 'id.' (q.v.).

To conclude, an IE origin of Arm. *hac* 'bread' is possible though the etymology is not entirely clear. The most popular theory, viz. the one positing **pok^wti-* (or **p_ok^w-ti_{h2-}*), is untenable. The derivation from QIE **h₂Hs-(s)k-* is quite possible. The most probable source for *hac* ' is, in my opinion, QIE **p(e)h₂s(-sk)-*. If Lat. **pās-t-* and Arm. *hac* ' (possibly also *hasteay* 'a kind of pastry') do not derive from PIE **peh₂s-* 'to feed, graze', they may point to a Mediterranean **pāst-* 'a kind of bread or cake'. Whether of PIE or substratum origin, Arm. *hac* ' may reflect an old nominative **pāst-s*, cf. Arm. *anic* 'nit, louse egg' from QIE **s(k)onid-s* vs. Gr. *κονίς* < **koniō-ς* (see s.v.). The consonant stem **pāst-* was changed to an *i*-stem of *hac* ', cf. Arm. *sirt*, *i*-stem 'heart' (q.v.).

hac'i, *ea*-stem: GDSg *hac* 'w-o-y (Yovhannēs Drasxanakert*'i*, 9-10 cent.), GDPI *hac* 'eac' (in place-names, see there) 'ash-tree'; **hac'-ut** 'place abounding in ash-trees', *hac* 'ut *purak* called *Hac* 'eac' *Draxt* 'Ash Grove' (P'awstos Buzand 3.14, 1883=1984: 33^{L17}).

●DIAL The forms *hac* '-i and *hac* '-eni 'ash-tree' are widespread in the dialects [HAB 3: 65b]. Note also Ozim *xac* 'əcār [Ačāryan 1952: 275]. For Salmast *xac* 'ik' (HAB ibid.) with a diminutive suffix, see s.v. place-name **Hac* 'eak-k'. The -w- in Muš, Alaškert *hac* 'veni (HAB ibid.) reflects the old genitive stem *hac* 'w-.

●ETYM Connected with Oic. *askr*, OGH *asc*, OEngl. *æsc* 'ash-tree', Alb *ah* 'beech', perhaps also Hitt. *haš(š)ik* n., *haššikka-* c. 'ein Obstbaum und seine Frucht'; without the **-k-*: Lith. *úosis* 'ash-tree', SCr. *jāsēn* 'ash-tree', Lat. *ornus* f. 'mountain-ash' < **oseno-*, OIr. *uinnius* m. 'ash-tree' < **osno-*, etc. [Bugge 1893: 14-15; Hübschmann 1897: 465; HAB 3: 65b; Pokorny 1959: 782; Fraenkel 2: 1167; P. Friedrich 1970: 92-98; ÈtimSlovSlavJaz 1, 1974: 78-80; Normier 1981; Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 625-626 = 1995: 537-538; P. Friedrich apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 32]. For Alb *ah* 'beech' from **osk-*, see Kortlandt 1986: 42-44 = 2003: 72-73; Demiraj 1997: 73 (with lit.). For Hittite, see Tischler 1, 1983: 200-201; Kloekhorst 2008 s.v.

The root is usually reconstructed as **Hh₃-e/os-*, beside full-grade **Heh₃-s-* in BSl. (see Schrijver 1991: 77-78, 187, 327; 1995: 39, 455; Derksen 2008 s.v.; de Vaan 2008: 435). Arm. *hac* 'i, *ea*-stem, reflects **Hh₃os-k-ieh₂₋* > PArm. **hoskīyā*, with pretonic **-o-* > *-a-* (on which see 2.1.3), or zero-grade (possibly also Germanic, see Schrijver 1991: 77-78), **HHs-k-ieh₂₋*. Olsen (1999: 813) posits **-ssk-*, which is improbable and unnecessary.

For Gr. *όζύα*, -η 'beech, spear', see s.v. *uši*, probably 'storax-tree; holm-oak'. The form with **-en-* is probably reflected in Arm. *hoyn* 'cornel' (q.v.).

haw₁, *u*-stem: GDSg *haw-u*, GDPI *haw-u-c* ' (rich evidence in the Bible, see Astuacaturean 1895: 870), (also *a-* and *o*-stems in NHB 2: 71b without evidence) 'bird' (Bible, Łazar P'arpec*'i*, Eusebius of Caesarea, Porphyry), 'rooster' (Bible), 'hen' (Bible).

For a thorough philological analysis, see Strohmeier 1983 who concludes that, in contrast with the generic term *t'rc'un* 'bird, any living thing which flies', *haw* has a more complex, although smaller, semantic range which primarily includes birds which are useful to men.

For the semantic development cf. Gr. *ῥοπις* 'bird', 'rooster', 'hen'.

●DIAL The word is widespread in the dialects as **haw* 'hen', whereas the frozen plural **haw-k'* (T'iflis, Muš, Van, etc.) means 'bird' [HAB 3: 66b].

According to Orbeli 2002: 245, Moks *xafk^o/xavk^o*, gen. *xafk^o-u* refers not only to 'bird' (see also 63^{L14,17} and 116^{L11} for textual illustrations), but also to 'ястреб = hawk'. For the semantic shift compare Gr. *αιετός* 'eagle' from the very same PIE etymon 'bird' (see below). Moks also has *xav*, gen. *xav-u* 'hen' [Orbeli 2002: 244].

●ETYM Since NHB 2: 71b, etc. (see HAB 3: 66), connected with Lat. *avis*, *-is* f. 'bird' (see also Hübschmann 1897: 465) and other words belonging to the PIE word for 'bird': Gr. *αιετός* < **awi-etos* m. 'eagle', Skt. *váy-*, NSg *véh/vih*, AccSg *vím*, GSg *véh*, NPI *váyah*, IPI *vibhih* m. 'bird', YAv. *vaii-* m. 'bird', NSg *vīš*, NPI *vaiiō*, GPI *vaiiam* 'bird', etc. (see Meillet 1894: 154; HAB 3: 66a; Pokorny 1959: 86; Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 537 = 1995, 1: 454-455; Mallory/Adams 1997: 66a).

The word is reconstructed as a PD *i*-stem: nominative **h₂éu-i-* (cf. Lat. *avis* 'bird' and Arm. *haw* 'id.') vs. genitive **h₂u-éi-s* (see Kuiper 1942: 61-62 = 221-222; Beekes 1969: 57, 128; 1985: 81-82; 1995: 175; Schrijver 1991: 30, 47; for a discussion, see also Schindler 1969: 146-148; Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 507-508; Olsen 1999: 110₂₃₀)⁷⁹.

The initial *h-* has been treated as non-etymological (Meillet 1892: 162; 1936: 38; Ernout/Meillet 1959: 58). However, the PIE full grade nominative **h₂éu-i-* (cf. Lat. *avis* 'bird') would yield Arm. *haw*, and the initial *h-* can reflect the laryngeal (Greppin 1973: 73; Polomé 1980: 25; Kortlandt 1983: 12; 1986: 43 = 2003: 42, 73; Schrijver 1991: 30, 47; Lindeman 1997: 39; Beekes 2003: 182).

The *u*-declension is due to the stem-final *-w* (Meillet 1936: 76; Jahukyan 1982: 127; Olsen 1999: 109-110, 790, 828); note also that the *u*-stem is frequent with animal names, cf. *ahuēs* 'fox', *arj* 'bear', *gayl* 'wolf', *inj* 'panther, leopard', *ul* 'kid', etc. On *u*-stem animal names, see A. A. Abrahamyan 1976: 42-43; Jahukyan 1982: 127; Olsen 1999: 105. The *u*-declension includes a considerable number of animal-names in the dialects. Tarōnean (1961: 33), for instance, presents a list of 54 such animal designations in Baš-Bitlis.

haw₂, *o*-stem: GDSg *haw-o-y* (Movsēs Xorenac'i, Eusebius of Caesarea), IPI *haw-o-v-k'* in the letter from Bishop Giwt (5th cent.) to Vač'ē (king of Atuank') apud Movsēs Kaňankatuac'i 1.11 [V. Aňak'elyan 1983: 20^{L14}]; *u*-stem: GDSg *haw-u* (Plato, John Chrysostom) 'grandfather, ancestor' (Bible+).

In some colophons, also 'uncle' [Mahé 1986-87a]; see below.

●ETYM Connected with Lat. *avus* 'grandfather', OIr. *ave* 'grandson', Goth. *awo* 'grandmother', Lith. *avýnas* 'maternal uncle', OPr. *awis* 'id.', Russ. *uj*, Pol. *wuj* 'maternal uncle', Hitt. *huḫḫaš* 'grandfather', etc. (NHB 2: 71b; HAB 3: 67a; Mallory/Adams 1997: 238a).

⁷⁹ Olsen 1999: 110 reconstructs **h₃-*.

On the meaning '(maternal) uncle' in some languages, see Benveniste 1969, 1: 223ff; Beekes 1976a; Toporov, PrJaz 1, 1975: 179-180. As has been shown by Mahé (1986-87a), also Arm. *haw* appears in the meaning 'uncle' in some colophons.

In view of Hitt. *huhḫaš* and SCr. *ujāk*, one reconstructs two laryngeals: **h₂euH-* [Schrijver 1991: 48]. The initial *h-* of the Armenian form, as well as that of *han* 'grandmother' (q.v.), although in both cases it corresponds to Hitt. *h-*, is considered "une aspiration secondaire due à un phénomène récent" [Benveniste 1969, 1: 224]. See, however, 2.1.16.1. The alternative derivation of Arm. *haw* from **papos* [Pokorny 1959: 89] is gratuitous (see also Szemerényi 1977: 47).

Remarkable is the absence of Greek and Aryan cognates next to the Armenian form (cf. however Szemerényi 1977: 47-48, 56-61).

hawari, see s.v. *getar(u)*.

hawt, *i*-stem 'flock of sheep, etc.; group' (Bible+). GDPI *hōt-i-c'* is attested in the Bible, as well as in P^aawstos 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^aarpecⁱ⁺), *hōt-erēc* (Philo, "V^{kayk} 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; 2000: 406) alternatively derives *hawt* from **p_eku-d-* (cf. Lat. *pecus*, *-udis*) > **hawut-*, but this is improbable.

The best solution is offered, I think, by A. Xaç^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^axa, Lori, Ararat, Łarabał, Van, Alaškert, Muš [Ačarean 1913: 676-677; HAB 3: 139a], Bulanəx, Širak, Aparan [Amatuni 1912: 407-408]. A secondary meaning is 'ploughman', also in the compound (Baberd) **hōtat-k^aar*, with *k^aar* 'stone' [Ačarean 1913: 676-677; HAB 3: 139a].

Ararat, Sip^aan **Hōtat-astł* 'Evening Star', lit. 'shepherd-star' [Amatuni 1912: 408a], called so because its appearance marked the return of flocks from pastures [Ačarean 1913: 677a; HayLezBrbBař 3, 2004: 305a]. On *Hotli astł* = *Lusastł* 'Venus' pictured on a New year ritual cake named *Tari* 'year' from the village of Abul of Axalk^aalak^a, see Bdoyan 1972: 441a. According to G. Hakobyan (1974: 275), Nerk^ain Basen *Hotli astł* refers to the planet Mars. According to Nždehyan (1902: 270, with a corresponding traditional story; see also Łanalanyan 1969: 9^{Nr6}), Alaškert *Godi hōtlu astł* 'star of the lazy herdsman' refers to *Erewak* 'Saturn'.

The word *hōtat* functions also as a star of the constellation Ursa Major, or Libra, or Orion, this time in the meaning 'ploughman'; see 3.1.4.1.

●ETYM Ačaryan (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. *paḥš-* ‘to protect’, etc. This verbal root is found in Arm. *hoviw* ‘shepherd’ (q.v.). A suffixed **peh₂-lo-* (cf. Skt. *avipālā-* ‘shepherd’, *gopālā-* ‘cowherd’) would yield Arm. **(h)at-*. Thus: **hawt-at* ‘shepherd’ < “sheepflock pasturer”.

That the word is not attested in the literature does not necessarily imply that it is recent. The dialectal spread and the fact that *hawt* ‘sheepflock’ has not been preserved in the dialects independently suggest that **hōtat* may be old.

For **hōtat(i)-astt* ‘Evening Star’, lit. ‘shepherd-star’, note an astonishing parallel in Old English: *swán(a)-steorra* ‘Evening Star’, lit. ‘shepherd-star’; the motivation is explained in the same way: “weil bei seinem Sichtbarwerden die Hirten heimtreiben” (Scherer 1953: 84). The same pattern of naming the planet Venus is also seen among Turkic peoples (Turkish *çobanyıldızı*, Turkmen *Чобан йылдызы*, etc.), although in this case the designation refers to the Morning Star (see Karpenko 1981: 79).

hawran, *a*-stem in NHB, but without evidence ‘flock of sheep or goats’ (Bible+), ‘sheepfold’ (Philo+).

●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’, *pātár-* 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; Jahukyan 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 *hapaх*, namely *pahran*, which seems to mean ‘pastureland’: ‘Weide’ (Karst) = ‘пастбище’ (Galstyan); see HAB 4: 12b; Galstyan 1958: 167. Ačariyan (HAB 4: 12b) mentions/offers no etymology. Jahukyan (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 Ir. **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 pasturer’ (see s.v. *Tuarac-a-tap*). One may, thus, reconstruct a MIran. **pahran* ‘pasturing’ 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’ [Ačariyan 1947: 51, 242], Xotorjūr *hɔru* [YušamXotorj 1964: 479a].

●ETYM See s.v. *mawru* 'stepmother'.

***hap'ap'em** 'to kidnap', hapax 3sg.aor. *hap'ap'ec'aw* 'she was kidnapped' in Eusebius of Caesarea

●ETYM Ačařyan (HAB 3: 72b) assumes a reduplication of an otherwise unknown **hap'*-. Further see s.v. *ap'* 'palm of the hand, handful'.

hecan, *a*-stem: ISg *hecan-a-w* (a few times in Grigor Narekac'i, 10-11th cent.) 'beam; log; staff, mace' (Bible+), later 'a kind of meteorological phenomenon'.

●DIAL Preserved in a few extremely W and SW dialects [HAB 3: 75b].

●ETYM No acceptable etymology in HAB 3: 75b. Olsen (1999: 299, 951) presents *hecan* as an etymologically obscure word.

Bediryan (1956: 44-45) and Ĵahukyan (1979: 27-28) independently derive *hecan* from *hecanim* 'to mount' < 'to sit' (q.v.) from PIE **sed-* 'to sit'. They treat *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.vv.). 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'). For a discussion of *-oc'* and *-anoc'*, see Greppin 1975: 43-44, 113; Ĵahukyan 1998: 13, 31; Olsen 1999: 311-313.

hecanim, 3sg.aor. *hec-a-w* 'to mount a horse, etc.; to come on board' + *i* 'in, on' (Bible+), **heceal**, *o*-stem: ISg *hecel-o-v*, GDPI *hecel-o-c'*, IPI *hecel-o-v-k'* 'horseman, rider, cavalryman' (Bible+), **hecel-a-zawr** 'cavalry' (Bible+); MidArm. **hec-n-um** 'to mount a horse' (Barseł Ćon, 13th cent., see NHB 2: 82b), **hej-n-um** 'id.' (Grigoris, 13th cent.), **hecne/il** 'id.' (12th cent.+), **hecman** 'horseman' (Bžškaran jioy, etc.), **hecel** 'cavalry; cavalryman' (abundant in MidArm.), etc. [MijHayBař 2, 1992: 32-33].

For attestations of the verb and derivatives, see Astuacaturean 1895: 878; NHB 2: 81-82; Klingenschmitt 1982: 195₄₃; Barton 1989: 147. For 3sg.aor. *hec-a-w* 'mounted (a horse)' and 2sg.subj. *hec-c'-i-s* (*et ē du yors hecc'is* "if you [mount to] go hunting") in the famous epic fragments, see Movsēs Xorenac'i 2.50 and 2.61 (1913=1991: 179^{L2}, 192^{L2f}; Thomson 1978: 192, 203).

●DIAL The verb is widespread in the dialects [HAB 3: 75]. Next to the basic meaning 'to mount a horse' one also finds sporadic data with different semantic nuances. For instance, in a folk-tale from the Karin-Ērzrum region (Basen, Narman-Ēk'rek) told by Hakob Sanosyan and recorded by Ervand Pezazyan in Alek'sandrapol-Gyumri in 1915 (HŽHek 4, 1963: 269^{L19}) we find *hecan gyamiin* 'they came on board of the ship'.

Derivatives include **hecel* 'robber' (Van), 'army' (Ařtial), **hecelwor* 'soldier' (Ařtial), etc. [HAB 3: 75].

●ETYM Derived from PIE **sed-* 'to sit', cf. Gr. *εἶζομαι*, Lat. *sedēre*, Goth. *sitan*, Lith. *sėdėti*, etc. (HAB 3: 75a; Pokorny 1959: 885; Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 692-693); further see s.vv. *nist* 'seat, site, location, abode', *teř* 'site, place'.

The etymology presents no serious difficulties (pace Kortlandt 1983: 11 = 2003: 41). For a discussion on the initial *h-* from word-initial **s-* or from a prefix, see Pedersen 1905: 206₁ = 1982: 68₁; Greppin 1975a: 47-48; Ĵahukyan 1982: 39;

Klingenschmitt 1982: 195-196; Kortlandt 1983: 11; 1987a: 51 = 2003: 41, 80; Ravnæs 1991: 107, 168-169.

The affricate *-c-* points to the sigmatic aorist **sed-s-* (Pedersen 1905: 206 = 1982: 68; Pokorny 1959: 885; Ĵahukyan 1967: 216; 1982: 74; Kortlandt 1987a: 51; 1994: 28-29 = 2003: 80, 105; Barton 1989: 147, 148₄₃; Olsen 1999: 810₅₅), cf. Skt. 3sg.subj.act. *sātsat*, etc. (for the forms see Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 692).

The explanation from pres. **sed-je/o-* (Klingenschmitt 1982: 195-196; see also Ravnæs 1991: 36, 168-169) has been criticised by Barton 1989: 147, 147₄₁ in the morphological context. Besides, **sed-je/o-* would yield Arm. **heč-* rather than *hec-* (see 2.1.22.1, 2.2.6.1).

See also s.vv. *hecan* ‘beam, log’ and *hecanoc* ‘winnowing fan; Milky Way’.

hecanoc, *a-*stem: GDSg *hecanoc* ‘*i*’ (Grigor Narekac ‘*i*, 10-11th cent.), ISg *hecanoc* ‘*a-w*’ (Šarakan, Čarəntir) ‘winnowing fan’ (Bible, Hexaameron, John Chrysostom, etc.), ‘Milky Way’ (Ališan 1910: 129-130 without source indication).

As is pointed out by Ališan *ibid.*, the second meaning must be due to the association of the Milky Way with ‘straw’ (see 3.1.3).

●ETYM No etymology in HAB 3: 76a and Ĵahukyan 1987. Olsen 1999: 955 lists *hecanoc* ‘among words of unknown origin.’

See s.v. *hecan* ‘beam, log’.

heĵamĵuk ‘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), *Aypiseaw anĵkaw heĵamĵuk eteal, vtangim* (var. *p ‘ĵkim*) *karōtut ‘eamb meroy hōrn* : “Oppressed by such an affliction I suffer from the loss of our father”.

In Movsēs Kałankatuac ‘*i*/Dasxuranc ‘*i* 3.22/23 (V. Ařak ‘elyan 1983: 339^{L9f}; transl. Dowsett 1961: 225): *bazumk ‘xorřakahar ew heĵamĵuk satakec ‘an* : “many perished by fire and drowning”. This passage is not cited in NHB and HAB.

The suffix-less form *heĵamuĵ* is attested in Kirakos Ganjakec ‘*i*, 13th cent. [HAB 3: 332b].

●ETYM Belongs with *heĵ-* ‘to drown, suffocate, strangle’ (Bible+); cf. also *xetd-* ‘id.’ (Bible+; dialectally ubiquitous). The IE etymological attempts (see HAB 2: 357; 3: 78a; Ĵahukyan 1967: 107, 112) are unconvincing. For the combined reduplication (*u*-type and *m*-type), cf. *aĵamuĵ* ‘darkness, twilight’ based on **aĵ-*, a word of IE origin (q.v.). If this interpretation is correct (Ačarjan is sceptical, HAB 3: 332), the independently attested *mĵ(u)k-* ‘to strangle’ (P‘awstos Buzand, John Chrysostom, etc.) should be regarded as secondary.

hetum, 3sg.aor. *e-het* ‘to pour, fill, flow over’ (Bible+), **hetet**, *a-*stem: GDSg *hetet-i*, AblSg *i hetet-ē*, ISg *hetet-a-w*, GDPl *hetet-a-c* ‘flood, torrent’ (Bible+), **hetetat**, *a-*stem: GDSg *hetetat-i*, AblSg *i hetetat-ē*, LocSg *i hetetat-i*, ISg *hetetat-a-w*, GDPl *hetetat-a-c*, IPl *hetetat-a-w-k* ‘torrent, the place of a torrential stream, ravine’ (Bible+); **z-etum** ‘to pour, pour out, shed; to flow out, be overfilled’ (Bible+); see also s.v. **otot(an)em** ‘to overflow, inundate, flood; to rinse’ (Bible+).

A textual illustration for the verb *hetum* from Ełiřē, Chapter 5 (Ter-Minasyan 1989: 214^{L25f}): *minč ‘ew hraman tueal erknayin covun hetul i veray c ‘amak ‘is* “He

even ordered the sea of heaven to flow over the dry land” (transl. Thomson 1982: 158-159).

That *heřet-at* refers not only to ‘torrent’ but also ‘ravine, torrent-bed’ is seen e.g. from the following attestations: Job 28.4 (Cox 2006: 182): *zxrām heřetati i p’ošwoy* ‘a cleft of a ravine, away from dust’; in Łazar P‘arpec‘i (5th cent.) 3.81 (1904=1985: 148^{L35}; transl. Thomson 1991: 208): *yezer heřetatin* ‘at the edge of the ravine’ (for the full passage, see s.v. *art* ‘cornfield’).

●ETYM The verb *heřum* is usually derived from QIE **pel(H)-nu-mi* (cf. Lith. *pilù, pilti* ‘to pour’, etc.) and connected with reduplicated *heřet* and *otot-* (Bugge 1893: 15; Meillet 1916e: 171; Meillet 1916g; 1919: 187; 1936: 48, 112, 114; HAB 3: 76-77; Pokorny 1959: 798; hesitantly: Hübschmann 1897: 466). For a discussion, see Klingenschmitt 1982: 244-246; Saradževa 1986: 24-25; Olsen 1999: 406₄₃₅. Further see s.v. *li* ‘full’ (note the verb *lnum* ‘to fill’ with the same verbal suffix **-nu-*).

Greppin (1981b: 6) notes that a proto-form **peln-peln-* is not agreeable. The solution may be simpler, however: reduplication of *heř-* ‘to pour’ on the Armenian ground (cf. Meillet 1936: 38; Klingenschmitt 1982: 244₁₉; Olsen 1999: 72, 406; on *heřet-at*, see Olsen 1999: 335). Elsewhere Greppin (1981c: 121₃) notes the derivation *heřum* < **pel-nu-mi* and adds: “However, an *o*-grade form, Arm. *otot* ‘inundation’, might be derived from Hitt. *alalam(m)a-* ‘roar (of a river)’”. However, the Armenian forms are not of onomatopoeic nature. I see no reason to separate *heřet* from *otot-*. The latter may be regarded as an *o*-grade verbal iterative-extensive reduplication (cf. Klingenschmitt 1982: 244₁₉), cf. *kokov-* ‘to boast’, *yorjorjem* ‘to call, name’.

***heř-** ‘far’: **heř-i** adv. ‘far (of time and space); isolated, foreign’, adj. ‘distant, far off, of long duration’ (Bible+), ‘without, except’ (Movsēs Xorenac‘i, Gregory of Nyssa), **heř-ust, i heř-ust** adv. ‘from a distance, at long range’ (Bible+), **heř-oy** ‘far’ (John Chrysostom), dial. ***heř-u** ‘far’ (NHB 2: 89a; see also the dialectal section); **heřanam**, 3sg.aor. *heřac’-aw*, 3pl.aor. *heřac’-an* ‘to leave, go away, move off, be far’ (Bible+); **heř-awor**, *a*-stem: GDPI *heřawor-a-c’* adj. ‘distant, far off, of long duration’ (Bible+), **heřewor** < **heři-awor* ‘id.’ (Ephrem), **heřastan** adj. ‘distant, far off, of long duration’, **i heřastan-ē** adv. ‘far, far off/away, from a distance, at long range’ (Bible+).

●DIAL The forms *heři* and *heřu* are widespread in the dialects. With a final nasal: Xarberd *härün* (beside *hären*), Muš, Alaškert *heřun*, Aslanbek *hären*, abl. *heřävän*, cf. Akn *heřvənc’*, etc. Rodost‘o *heřung* with the suffix *-unk*, cf. *xor-unk* ‘deep’, etc. [HAB 3: 82a]. The dialectal form *heřu* is recorded already in NHB 2: 89a.

●ETYM Since de Lagarde 1854: 14^{L295f} et al. (HAB 3: 82a) connected with Goth. *fairra* ‘far’, OHG *ferro* ‘far’, Skt. *parás* ‘far, further’, etc. See Klingenschmitt 1982: 121₁₇, 165 on the morphology of *heř-i* (derived by him from **persiō-*) and the verb *heř-anam*. For references and a discussion, see s.v. *ař* ‘at, by, to’.

***hes-**

●DIAL Meři *hīsnil* ‘to look at’ [Ałayan 1954: 314].

●ETYM According to Ałayan (1954: 314; 1974: 146-147), from PIE **(s)pek-* ‘to observe, see’: Skt. *(s)paś-* ‘to see (*paś-*); to observe, to watch, to spy (*spaś-*)’,

spaštá- ‘(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 Mehri *hīsnil* ‘to look at’ is not simply due to contamination of *hayim* ‘to watch, look at’ (which would be contracted in Mehri to **hi-*; cf. *hayeli* ‘mirror’ from the same verb > Mehri *hille* [Ałayan 1954: 277a]) with *tesanem* ‘to see’ (> Mehri *tə́snil* [Ałayan 1954: 288a]).

het, *o*-stem: GDPl *het-o-c* ‘foot’ (rare), ‘footstep, footprint, track; after’ (Bible+), ‘with, together’ (Elišē, John Chrysostom, etc.); **heti** (adv.) ‘on foot’ (Bible+); **y-et, y-et-oy** ‘behind, after, afterwards’ (Bible+); ***et**, only in expressions **et and et** ‘immediately’ (Ezriq Kołbac‘i, 5th cent.; T‘ēodoros K‘it‘enawor, 7th cent.), **et z-et-ē** ‘one after another’ (Gregory of Nyssa); cf. **het-z-het-ē** (John Chrysostom), **yet-z-yet-ē** (Naxadrut‘iwnk‘).

Textual illustrations for *yetoy* and *heti* : Genesis 18.10 [Zeyt‘unean 1985: 220]: *Ew Sarra unkn dnēr ar dran xoranin, k‘anzi yetoy nora kayr* : *Σαρρα δὲ ἤκουσεν πρὸς τῆ ἑύρα τῆς σκηνηῆς, οὕσα ὀπισθεν αὐτοῦ*. Arm. *yetoy* renders Gr. *ὀπισθεν* ‘(from) behind, at the back, afterwards’. Elišē (Ter-Minasyan 1989: 404^{L23}; transl. Thomson 1982: 246): *bok ew heti* “without shoes and on foot” (cf. Hac‘uni 1923: 145).

●DIAL The form *het* ‘together’ is ubiquitous in the dialects [HAB 3: 84b]. The meaning ‘footprint, track’ is represented by Hamšen *hed, hid* [Ačaryan 1947: 241], Svedia *hit k‘* [HAB *ibid.*; Ačaryan 2003: 576]; note also Tavuš *het* as attested in folk texts, Xemč‘yan 2000: 36b^{L-17} (*orsi heter* lit. ‘tracks of hunt’), 212a^{L2} (*hetəmə* ‘in the track’), 236a^{Nr74} (*het* ‘track’).

Relics of the original meaning ‘foot, footstep’ may be seen in the derivative **het-ik* ‘ski-like shoes to walk on snow’ in Dersim (*hetik*, see Andranik 1900: 114), Hamšen, etc. (Bdoyan HayŽotXał 2, 1980: 214 with thorough descriptions and drawings); Partizak, Manišak (< Hamšen) *hetik* ‘an implement for walking on snow’ [Tēr-Yakobean 1960: 472].

The meaning ‘time’ (attested in Šapuh Bagratuni: *arajin het* ‘first time’, HAB 3: 83a) is present in some eastern dialects, such as Goris *heti* [Margaryan 1975: 425b]. Note also Lori **ayl-het* ‘another time, again’, **ays-het* ‘this time’, etc.; a textual illustration from a folk-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: 70^{L-11f}): *Gnac‘ elet biju kuštə; asav: ‘Bijá, es het trkum en <...>’*: “He went again to the old man and said: ‘Old man, this time they are sending me to <...>’”.

●ETYM See s.v. *ot-* ‘foot’.

***hert** ‘turn, queue’ (see dial. section); MidArm. **hert‘-ov** adv. ‘in turn, by turns, in consecutive order’ (Grigor Tat‘ewac‘i, see MiĵHayBař 2, 1992: 36a).

●DIAL Ararat *hert*‘ [Amatuni 1912: 169b], T‘iflis, Łazax, Łarabał **hert*‘ [Ačarean 1913: 656b].

●ETYM According to Ĵahukyan 1972: 314, derived from PIE **ser-* ‘to put/bind together, link together in a series’ (cf. Lat. *serō* ‘to string together, put in a row’, *seriēs* ‘row, succession, series’, etc.) and thus related with *y-erum* ‘to tie, fasten or join together, link together in a series’ (q.v.).

For the determinative *-t*‘, see e.g. s.vv. *boyt*‘ ‘thumb, lobe’ probably from PIE **b^heuH-* ‘to grow’, *xil-t*‘ ‘knag on a tree, a swelling in tree’ vs. *xoyl* ‘swelling, tumour, gland’, *kr-t*‘-unk’ ‘back’ vs. *kuṛn* ‘back’. In these dialects the sequence *-rt*‘ may reflect both *-rt*‘- and *-rd*‘- (see Tomson 1890: 66; Davt‘yan 1966: 55; M. Asatryan 1968: 63; Markosyan 1989: 66). The OArm. form may have been, then, **her-t^h* or **her-d* < QIE **ser-t*‘.

heru ‘last year’ (Severian of Gabala, John Chrysostom, Paterica, John of Damascus, etc.); **i herun hetē** ‘since last year’ (2 Corinthians 8.10 and 9.2, rendering Gr. ἀπὸ πέρυσι, Ephrem Commentary on 2 Corinthians); **heruin am** ‘two years ago’ (John of Damascus), MidArm. **heruni am** ‘two years ago’ (a colophon of 14th cent., MijHayBar 2, 1992: 36b); **herwic i ver** ‘since last year’ (in a late medieval folk-song, Abelyan 1940: 99^{Nr134}).

●DIAL The basic form *heru* is widespread in the dialects [HAB 3: 89a]. Some forms display a nasal element and/or a locative *-i*, such as Agulis *hārvi*, C‘ina *hērvī* [Ačařean 1935: 370; M. Zak‘aryan 2008: 185], Areš-Havarik‘ *herunāi* [Lusenc‘ 1982: 220b], Łarabał *hārné, hārnú* vs. *hēru* [Davit‘yan 1966: 412], Goris *hārne* [Margaryan 1975: 343b], etc., cf. also T‘iflis *heru*, gen. *hervan* [HAB 3: 89a], Moks *xeru*, gen. *xervan*, abl. *xervāne* [Orbeli 2002: 246], Marała *xerūi*, gen. *xerva* [Ačařean 1926: 44, 408], Ařtial Suč‘ava *heru*, Polish *heru-s* with the deictic article, gen. *herovan* [Ačařyan 1953: 46, 138, 181, 276].

The form *heru* ‘last year’ underlies a few derivatives basically meaning ‘a male or female calf between one and two years’: Širak *hervnek* (*erinj* ‘heifer’) [Mxit‘areanc‘ 1901: 281-282], Sasun *hervānig* ‘one-year-old (animal)’ [Petoyan 1954: 139; 1965: 496], Šatax *xervānek* ‘a calf of one to two years’ [M. Muradyan 1962: 83], Bařeš-Bitlis *xervānek* [Tarōnean 1961: 33], Van, etc. *xerīnik* and *xer* ‘a male or female calf between one and two years’ [Ačařean 1913: 657b], Moks *xerīnik*, gen. *xerīnak-u*, pl. *xerīnak-tir* ‘годовалый теленок’, ‘молодая миловидная баба’ [Orbeli 2002: 245].

Interesting is Van, Moks, Salmast, Marała, etc. **herznam* ‘two years ago’, which can be compared with *heruin am* ‘two years ago’ and *heruni am* ‘two years ago’ and interpreted as **herun-z-am* or **heruin-z-am* (q.v.).

●ETYM Old adverb from PIE **peruti* ‘last year’, cf. Gr. πέρυσι, Dor. πέρυτι, Skt. *parut* ‘last year’, Oic. *fjord*, MHG *vert* ‘last year’, etc. (see Hübschmann 1897: 467; Meillet 1936: 101; HAB 3: 89a with earlier references to Windischmann, de Lagarde, Müller; Pokorny 1959: 1175; Olsen 1999: 209): **peruti* > PArm. **herūji* > *heru* (Meillet 1936: 57; Klingenschmitt 1982: 98).

The PIE adverb **peruti* derives from an earlier phrase with the locative **pér ueti*, with **per-* ‘forward, through’ and **uet-* ‘year’ (Pokorny 1959: 1175; Schindler 1967: 300; Brandenstein 1967: 18; Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 94-95; Baldi apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 654a) which has been reduced to **uti* when unaccented, cf. **me-ǵ^hsr-i* (> Arm. *merj* ‘near’, q.v.) from the phrase **me ǵ^hes(eri)*, see Clackson 1994: 150-152 for a thorough discussion.

The Armenian literary forms *heruin* and *heruni*, although attested late, may be regarded as reliable and old in view of dialectal forms ranging from the south-western to eastern and north-eastern peripheries, cf. Sasun *hervānig*, Bařeš, Šatax, etc. *xervānek* on the one hand, and Areš-Havarik‘ *herunāi*, Łarabał *hārné*, etc. on the other. The forms may be directly compared with Gr. πέρυσινός ‘from last year, last-

yearly' (on which see Frisk 2: 518-519; Chantraine 1968-80: 889-890): **perutinos* > PArm. **heruwino-* > *heruin*, loc. **perutin-i* > PArm. **heruw(i)ni* > **heruni*. For the accented locative marker *-i* > Łarabał *-é*, see 2.2.1.5.

For other adjectives and adverbs of place with *-in* from IE **-ino-* or **-ino-* such as *ařaj-in* adj. and adv. 'first', *ařawawt-in* 'pertaining to morning', *erekoy-in* 'pertaining to evening (adj.)', 'in the evening (adv.)', etc., see Meillet 1936: 76; Greppin 1975: 101; Ĵahukyan 1998: 26; Olsen 1999: 466-468.

Next to **per-* + **u(e)t-* 'year' one also reconstructs **per-* + **h₁(e)n-* 'year': Lith. *pérnai* 'last year', MHG *vern* 'id.', etc. (Huld apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 654). Further see s.v. *(y)erand* 'the day before yesterday'.

***herun-z-am** or ***heruin-z-am** (dial.) 'two years ago'.

●DIAL Van *xerznäm* [Ačarĳan 1952: 275], Salmast *xérznam*, Ozim *xərznam* [HAB 3: 89a], Marala **herznam* 'two years ago'; ablative **herznmanē*, Xizan **herznm-uk* 'two-year-old colt' [Ačarĳan 1913: 656b], Moks *xerznäm*, gen. *xerznämvan*, abl. *xerznäm(vən)ē* 'позапрошлый год' [Orbeli 2002: 246].

●ETYM Ačarĳan (1913: 656b; HAB 3: 89a) derives **herznam* 'two years ago' from *heru* 'last year' (q.v.), which is undoubtedly correct, and considers it a new word offering no explanation for its structure.

In my opinion, the word is closely related with the expressions with *am* 'year', *heruin am* 'two years ago' (John of Damascus) and *heruni am* 'two years ago' (a colophon of 14th cent., MĳHayBař 2, 1992: 36b). The only difference is the 'epenthetic' *-z-*, which seems to be identical with the preposition-prefix *z-* frequently found in expressions of time, compare *z-ayg-oy*, *z-ayg-u-ē* 'in the morning' from *ayg* 'morning' (q.v.), *z-tiw ew z-gišer* 'day and night', etc., cf. ORuss. *za-utra* 'tomorrow' < 'tomorrow morning'. Typologically compare also *zařam* 'senile' (q.v.), if composed of (or re-analyzed as such) *z-* and *am* 'year'.

Thus: **herun-z-am* or **heruin-z-am* 'two years ago' > **her(w)ənzam* > **herznam* through metathesis.

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'angelos+) 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 **hetc'*. 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*, 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. *galt-a-kur* (q.v.).

hianam, 3sg.aor. *hiac*‘-a-w, 3pl.aor. *hiac*‘-an ‘to be astounded, stricken with amazement, terror or admiration’ (Bible+); a deverbative noun *hiac*‘-umn ‘astonishment, numbness, terror, etc.’ (Bible+).

●DIAL Nor Naxiĵewan, T‘iflis *hiac*‘k ‘admirable’ [HAB 3: 92a].

●ETYM No acceptable etymology is recorded in HAB 3: 92a.

Ĵahukyan 1967: 106 suggests a connection with *hoy* ‘fear’ (q.v.), which is possible but uncertain; his ultimate derivation of them from PIE **k^vei-* (cf. Skt. *cay-/cāy-* ‘to perceive; to observe’, Gr. *τίω* ‘to esteem, deeply respect’, etc.) is untenable. Aĵayan 1974: 102 connects *hi-* to Lat. *pīus* ‘pious, religious, faithful, faithful, devout; dutiful’, etc. This etymology is unconvincing both formally (the Latin word seems to reflect **pūios* < **pHuio-*, see Schrijver 1991: 322-323, cf. 247) and semantically. Neither convincing is the derivation from **hi* ‘what?’ < **k^vid*, suggested by Klingenschmitt 1982: 126.

I propose a derivation from PIE **séh₂i-*, **sh₂i-* ‘to bind’, cf. Av. *hi-* ‘to chain, bind’, Khot. *hīyā* adj. ‘bound’, Skt. *syāti* ‘to bind, fasten, fetter’, *sitā-* ‘bound’, Lith. *siėti* ‘to bind, tie’, etc.; for the forms, see s.v. *hayt*‘- ‘to attach, adjust, put together’. The Armenian intransitive verb *hi-anam* may be based on an original transitive verb meaning ‘to bind, chain’. An Iranian origin may not be ruled out; cf. Av. *hi-* ‘to chain, bind’. Alternatively, we may posit an underlying PArm. **hi-* ‘bound, numb’ derived from < QIE **sh₂i-jo-/to-* or **sih₂jo-/to-*.

The semantic development is trivial, cf. e.g. Russ. *o-cepenét* ‘to grow torpid, freeze with e.g. fear’ < *cep* ‘chain’. Note also Arm. *arm-anam* ‘to be astounded’, *ənd-armanam* ‘to be astounded, stricken with amazement; to render senseless, benumb, deaden’ (q.v.), if from PArm. **arm-* ‘to bind fast, tie, fit’ (cf. *y-arm-ar* ‘fitting’, Gr. *ἀρμώζω* ‘to join, fit together, bind fast’, etc.). Further, see s.v. *papanjim* ‘to grow dumb, speechless’.

hin, *o*-stem: GDSg *hn-o-y*, ISg *i hn-o-y*, GDPI *hn-o-c*‘, etc. ‘old, ancient, worn-out’ (Bible+), note loc. *i hnumn* in Eznik Koĵbac‘i, Elišē, John Chrysostom, etc. (see NHB 2: 98b; Meillet 1936: 91); **hn-anam** ‘to become old’ (Bible+), a denominative verb on which see Ĵahukyan 1982: 183; Klingenschmitt 1982: 120.

●DIAL Widespread in the dialects [HAB 3: 94b].

●ETYM From PIE *o*-stem **seno-* ‘old’: Skt. *sána-* ‘old’, YAv. *hana-* ‘old, grey’, Gr. *ἔνος* ‘last year’s, old’, cf. Lat. *senex* ‘old, aged; old man, aged person’, *senior* ‘older’, etc., Hübschmann 1897: 467; HAB 3: 94 (with references to Windischmann, de Lagarde, Müller, etc.); Meillet 1936: 73; Pokorny 1959: 907 (mentioning also *hanapaz* ‘always’, which is an Iranian loanword); Ĵahukyan 1982: 129-130; Clackson 1994: 168; Mallory/Adams 1997: 409b; Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 695; Olsen 1999: 11, 20, 235, 820, 826.

Hübschmann (1897: 467) and Meillet (1919: 187, 188; 1936: 38) rightly reject the Iranian origin of *hin* (Müller) on the ground of the vocalism, but Meillet *ibid.* explains the initial *h-* by an Iranian influence (see also HAB 3: 94b). It seems more likely, however, that the *h-* is the regular reflex of PIE **s-* before front vowels, as is

also seen in e.g. *hecanim* ‘to mount a horse’, *helg* ‘lazy’, *himn* ‘foundation’, *hiwt* ‘sap’. For a discussion of this development, see Greppin 1975a: 47, 52; Godel 1975: 68, 77; Jahukyan 1982: 39; Klingenschmitt 1982: 196; Kortlandt 1983: 11 = 2003: 41; Olsen 1999: 766; Beekes 2003: 169.

hing (mostly uninflected, Meillet 1936: 100; Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 66), *i*-stem: GDPI *hng-i-c*‘ (Bible+), IPI *hng-i-w-k*‘ (Eusebius of Caesarea); later also IPI *hng-a-w-k*‘ (Šarakan) ‘five’, *hingerord*, gen.-dat. *hingerord-i* ‘fifth’; *hnge-tasan* ‘fifteen’, *hngetasan-erord* ‘fifteenth’ (all Bible+).

●DIAL Ubiquitous in the dialects [HAB 3: 95b].

●ETYM From PIE **pénk^we* ‘five’: Skt. *pāñca*, YAv. *pañca*, MPers. *panj*, Gr. *πέντε*, Aeol. *πέμπε*, Lat. *quīnque*, Goth. *fimf*, etc.; the **-e-* is seen in Arm. *hnge-tasan* ‘fifteen’, cf. Skt. *pāñca-daśa*, etc.; see Meillet 1896: 157-159; 1936: 31; Hübschmann 1897: 467; HAB 3: 95 (with references to Klaproth, Brosset, NHB, etc.); Pokorny 1959: 808; Szemerényi 1960: 94-95; Kortlandt 1994a: 254 = 2003: 99 (assuming a restoration of the final velar on the basis of the ordinal **pnk^wo-*); Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 65-66; Mallory/Adams 1997: 401-402, 404a.

See also s.v. *yisun* ‘fifty’.

hiwt‘, *o*-stem: GDSg *hiwt*‘-*o-y*, GDPI *hiwt*‘-*o-c*‘ [later also *i*-stem] ‘moisture, sap; deepness; element, matter, essence’.

Attested in the Bible, Eznik Koľbac‘i, Agat‘angelos, etc. For attestations, derivatives and a 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 Tērvišean) with Skt. *sutá-* ‘pressed out’, etc. Pedersen (1906: 437 = 1982: 215) connects *hiwt*‘ with OHG *fūht* ‘damp, wet’, etc.

Ačarġyan (HAB 3: 98-99; cf. also Jahukyan 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. *τρύγ-οἶπος* ‘straining-cloth for wine’, *εἶβω* ‘to drop’, OEngl. *sġpian* ‘durchsickern, tröpfeln’, Toch. A *sep-*, *sip-* ‘to anoint’, etc. On this root, see Pokorny 1959: 894; Frisk, s.v. *τρύγοιπος*. 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 Ačarġyan, 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)-*, namely **pi-tu-*, cf. Skt. *pitú-* 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-* < QIE **sip-to-*.

For the problem of the relation with *niwt'* 'matter, material, etc.', see Pedersen, *ibid.*; HAB 3: 455; Ĵahukyan 1987: 245; Olsen 1999: 55; and, especially, Dowsett 1965.⁸⁰

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 the dialects [HAB 3: 101b]. Nor Naxijewan attests *fsel*, and 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. *πέλω*, 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 *lūsil* as a result of contamination of *hiwsem* 'to weave, plait' with *lesum*, note especially Muš *losel* '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', Ačāryan (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. *tákṣati* 'to form by cutting, tool, hammer; to fashion, form, make, prepare' (RV+), Lat. *texō* 'to weave; to plait (together); to construct with elaborate care', etc., and Arm. *hiwsn* 'carpenter', directly equated with Skt. *tákṣan-* m. 'wood-cutter, carpenter' (RV+) and Gr. *τέκτων* m. 'carpenter, artist'; see also Mayrhofer 1986: 155. For the root, see s.v. **t'eš(i)k* 'spindle' and HAB 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. *πέλω*, Lat. *pectō* 'to comb', Lith. *pešù, pėšti* 'rupfen, ausreißen, an den Haaren ziehen', etc., and then proposes an alternative derivation from PIE **peuk-*, cf. Av. *pus-ā-* 'Diadem', Arm. *psak* (< Iran.), Gr. *πυκνός* 'dense, solid', etc. The latter etymology is also discussed by de Lamberterie who assumes a regular development of inherited **-eu-* to *-iw-* rather than *-oy-* (on this, see Clackson 1994: 233-234₂₇₇, with ref.).

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. *sùkti* 'drehen, wenden, kehren, betrügen, betören', Slav. *sukati* 'to turn', ORuss. *svkati* 'zwirnen, aufwickeln', russ. *skaty* (*sku, skešb*) 'aufwickeln (Fäden), zwirnen', Russ.

⁸⁰ Alternative: Arm. *hiwt'*, *o*-stem 'moisture' < QIE **sik^m-to-*: Skt. *siktá-* 'poured out, poured upon' (RV+), cf. OHG *sīhan* 'to strain', etc. (on these, see Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 744-745).

sukatb ‘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, namely *hiwsi(i)* ‘north’ (also with *-iw-*), if the etymology of this word suggested by Jahukyan (1986-1987) is acceptable (see s.v.). One may be tempted to explain the *-iw-* by assuming a reduplicated present, namely **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. *zhiwsiyoy*, *hissoy*, *hiwsioy*, etc.) *kaleal*. Apparently, Thomson (1978: 206) based himself on the readings *zhiwsiyoy*, etc. (confused with *hiwsi* ‘north’) since he translates the passage as follows: “and died on a journey, overwhelmed by northern snow”. The critical text, however, shows that *zhiwsiyoy* and the others are not the most reliable readings, and the meaning ‘avalanche’ makes more sense in the context, so one should follow Ačařyan (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 the dialects.

In colophons (15th cent.) one finds *usi* and *usin* (NHB, HAB), which are reminiscent of the dialectal forms of the Van-group in having no initial *h-*, and those of Muš and Bulanəx in having a final *-in* [Ačařyan 1952: 65].

●DIAL Preserved in a number of dialects of the *kə*-class: Xotorĵur *husi* (according to YušamXotorĵ 1964: 478b, *hüsi* /*hiwsi*/), Muš, Bulanəx *husin*, Van *usi*, Ozim *əwse^v*, Moks *usə* (according to Orbeli 2002: 305, *usə/usə^ε*, GSg *usu*, NPI *usik^o*, GPI *usə-k^o-tir-u*) [HAB 3: 102a; Ačařyan 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 Xotorĵur, 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 Xotorĵur, etc., as well as the meaning ‘snow-storm’ of Ararat *fəsan* (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. Garsoian 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 (spelled also as *hiwsiws*, *hiwsiwsi*, *hisis*, etc.), *o*-stem: GDSg *hiwsis-o-y*; *i*-stem: ISg *hiwsis-i-w*; **hiwsi**, *ea*-stem: GDSg *hiwsis(w)-o-y*, ISg *hiwsise-a-w* ‘north; northern wind’ (Bible+).

A textual illustration from Movsēs Xorenac’i 2.39 (1913=1991: 165^{L4f}; transl. Thomson 1978: 181): *ew i darnahot p’č’manē hiwsiwoy patac’eal juleal vtakn* : “the stream froze over from the bitter north winds”.

●DIAL Axalc’xa, Karin, Salmast *hüsis*; T’iflis, Ararat *husis*; Sebastia *hüsüs*; Muš *husus*; Xarberd *hisis* [HAB 3: 102a].

●ETYM No acceptable etymology is recorded in HAB 3: 102a.

S. Petrosyan (1977: 215) derives the word from PIE **seu-* ‘left’, also mentioning Russ. *séver* ‘North’ and Lith. *šjáurė* ‘North’. However, the Balto-Slavic forms belong with a root with an initial **k-* (see s.v. *c’urt* ‘cold’). Further on **seu-*, see below.

Ĵahukyan (1986-87; 1992: 18-19) derives *hiwsis(i)* ‘north’ from **seukoi-ki(y)o-*, a compound of PIE **seuk-e/oi-* (the locative form of **seuk-o-*, cf. Lith. *sukti* ‘to wind, turn’, Slav. *sukati* ‘to turn’; see s.v. *hiwsem* ‘to weave, plait’ on the etymon) and PIE **kei-* ‘se trouver’ (cf. Gr. *κεῖμαι* ‘to lie, be somewhere’; thus “qui se trouve á 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.

The interpretation of Ĵahukyan is plausible. Nevertheless, the derivation from PIE **seu-* ‘left’ (: Skt. *savyá-*, YAv. *haoiia-*, ORuss. *šujb*, etc., see Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 783; Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 716) seems worth of consideration, too. The left side is associated with ‘north’ (Volpe apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 349, concerning also the etymon **seu-*), cf. also Mlr. *tūath* ‘left; northern’ (see Pokorny 1959: 1079-1080). The second part of the Armenian word may be equated with **keik-* ‘cold wind; northern wind’ (: Russ. *čičer* ‘cold wind; northern wind’, Gr. *κακίας*, *-ov* ‘northeastern wind’, etc., see ÈtimSlovSlavJaz 4, 1977: 132). The vocalic alternation seems to point to a substratum word. Thus: QIE **seu-keik-i-* (perhaps based on locative) ‘northern cold wind’ > PArm. **seu-keikiV-* (with regular palatalization of the velar after **-u-*) > **seu-keik-i-* (assimilation of velars) > **hew-seisi-* > *hiwsis(i)* ‘northern wind’. This is, of course, highly hypothetical.

hiwsn (*an*-stem: GSG *hiwsan*, NPI *hiwsunk’*, GDPI *hiwsanc’*) ‘carpenter’ (Bible+). MidArm. *hus(n)*, pl. *huser* [MijHayBař 2, 1992: 50a].

In Movsēs Xorenac’i 1.32 (1913=1990: 88^{L5f}; transl. Thomson 1978: 124): *Oč’ unimk’ asel, imastun kam anhančar astanōr linel mez hiwsn, patkanawor kam oč’, zaynoc’ik ayžm uremn zkni hehuselov 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*, NPI *xsner*, Ozim *xows*, Salmast *xus* [Ačařyan 1952: 108, 125, 276; HAB 3: 102b].

●ETYM See s.v. *hiwsem* ‘to weave, plait’.

hiwr or **hewr**, *o*-stem: GDSg *hiwr-o-y* (Bible), GDPI *hiwr-o-c*‘ (Yačaxapatum), later GDSg *hiwr-i* ‘guest’ (Bible+).

●DIAL T‘iflis, Ararat *hur*, Van *xur*, gen. *xr-u* [HAB 3: 102b; Ačařyan 1952: 120, 276], Šatax *xur* [M. Muradyan 1962: 200b], Moks *xur* (in a folk-song, see Yovsēp‘eanc‘ 1892: 26^{L-9}); in a compound with *harsn* ‘bride’: Bulanəx *harsn-xur*, Salmast *xarsi-xur* [HAB 3: 102b].

●ETYM Ačařyan (HAB 3: 102b) rejects all the etymological attempts and leaves the origin of the word open. Ĵahukyan (1963a: 93; 1982: 39; 1987: 146) develops the idea of Halačean apud HAB on the connection with *iwr* ‘his own, etc.’ (q.v.) and posits QIE **seuro-* or **setro-* for *hi/ewr*. For the semantics he notes Lith. *svėčias* ‘guest’ < **sue-t-*, etc. (see Otrębski 1967: 77 for the forms). For the problem of *h-*, see s.v. *hin* ‘old’. The etymology is possible, but details are unclear.

Arm. *hiwr* has been considered a loan from Iran. **fr̄i-vara-* ‘friend’, a derivative of the root **fr̄ay-/fr̄i-* ‘to bless, etc.’ (Isebaert 1979: 366-367; Olsen 1999: 891; for the Iranian root, see Cheung 2007: 87-88). This etymology is untenable.

hlu, *a*-stem: GDPI *hlu-a-c*‘ (Grigor Narekac‘i, 10-11th cent.) ‘obedient, compliant’ (Bible+).

●ETYM Composed of **hu-* < **su-* ‘good’ and **lu* ‘hearing’ (Hübschmann 1897: 130; HAB 3: 103a); compare *an-lu* ‘disobedient’. Further see s.v. *lsem* ‘to hear’.

hnjan, *a*-stem [according to Olsen (1999: 299, 956), *i*-stem, but see below for instr. *hnjan-a-w(-k)* in Agat‘angelos] ‘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 Vałaršapat=Norak‘atafak‘ (nowadays Ējmiacin):

mtanēin i hnjanayarks aygestanwoyn, or kan šineal i hiwsişoy yarewelic‘ kusē (1909=1980: 85^{L15f}, § 150);

gteal linēin nok‘a i hnjanş şinuacoc‘n (90^{L1}, §161);

hasuc‘anēin ar durs hnjanin, ur ēin vank‘ noc‘a artak‘oy k‘atafak‘in (91^{L18f}, § 166);

ert‘eal ar hnjanōk‘n (= *hnjan-a-w-k‘-n*; vars. *hnj/canawn*), *ur ēinn isk yařaj vank‘ iwreanc‘* (104^{L9f}, § 192);

ew mi omn or andēn i nerk‘ş spanin i hnjani and, ur ēin vank‘ noc‘a (108^{L3f}, § 201);

ew amp‘op‘eac‘, ar gnac‘ i hnjann, 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, Muş, Bulanəx *hnjan*, Agulis *ənjun*, Mełri *ənján* (see Ałayan 1954: 243, 278a), Zeyt‘un *ənjən*, all meaning ‘grapes basin, wine-press’; Xarberd, Akn, Tigranakert (*h*)*ənjjan* ‘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 Bałdasaryan-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. Note also *Hnjan*, the name of a fountain in the vicinity of T‘amzara, in the Šapin-Garahisar region, in the basin (*awazan*) of which, according to a tradition, a guarding snake lives’ (see Lanalanyan 1969: 105^{Nr284}).

●ETYM Ačařyan (HAB 3: 105b) mentions only the connection with *hunj* ‘*mowing’ suggested in NHB, pointing out that it is semantically remote, 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, namely **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*.

hnoc‘, *a*-stem: GDSg *hnoc‘-i*, AblSg *i hnoc‘-ē*, ISg *hnoc‘-a-w* ‘oven, furnace’ (Bible+).

Two textual illustrations in combination with *hur* ‘fire’: Job 41.12: *hnoc‘i hroy kaycakanc* ‘“of a fiery furnace of burning coals” : *καμίνον καιομένης πυρι ανθρώπων* (Cox 2006: 263); in the letter from Bishop Giwt (5th cent.) to Vač‘ē (king of Ałuank‘) apud Movsēs Kałankatuac‘i 1.11 (V. Ařak‘elyan 1983: 21^{L14}): *i hur hnoc‘in* lit. ‘in fire of furnace’.

●DIAL No dialectal record in HAB 3: 106. According to V. Ařak‘elyan (1984a: 144), **hun* ‘fire’ has been preserved in the village of Kotayk‘/Elkavan, in the compound *xunt‘urc* ‘glowing ash applied on the wound’, which he interprets as **hun-t‘urc*, with *t‘urc-* ‘to burn bricks or pots of clay to make them stiff’ as the second member. Attractive but uncertain.

●ETYM Derived from the old oblique stem **hu-n-* of heteroclitic *hu-r* ‘fire’ (see there for more detail).

Recently A. Petrosyan 2007: 10-11 proposed an alternative etymology deriving Arm. *hun* from PIE **Hopn-* with Hitt. *ħappina-* ‘baking kiln, fire-pit’, OEngl. *ofen* ‘oven’, etc. The Hittite form points to **h₃ep-n-* (see Kloekhorst 2008: 297), which would indeed yield Arm. **hun-*. Nevertheless, the etymology is improbable because: 1) I see no solid reasons to abandon the traditional etymology; 2) the derivational suffix *-oc‘* (on which see Olsen 1999: 533-536) will be unmotivated in the interpretation of *hn-oc‘* ‘oven’ as **hun-* ‘oven’ + *-oc‘*, whereas **hun-* ‘fire’ + *-oc‘* = *hn-oc‘* ‘*fire-place’ is quite natural. For *-oc‘* cf. a synonymous word *t‘rc-oc‘* ‘furnace’ from verbal *t‘urc-* ‘to burn bricks or pots of clay to make them stiff’.

***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 Maccabees 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 zmets* : “they committed sins openly” (transl. Garsoïan 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’, *pólyj* ‘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. Garsoïan 1989: 212), and Step’anos Ōrbelean. MidArm. derivatives in the meaning ‘cemetery’: *hoł-va(y)r-k*’, *hoł-vrd-i*, etc. [MijHayBař 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. *xuł-u* [Ačarıyan 1952: 120, 276] vs. Moks *xuł*, gen. *xułə*, pl. *xułir* [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. Ačarıyan 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. *pólyj* ‘open, bare, empty’, which are usually derived from PIE **pelh₂-* ‘wide and flat’, cf. Hitt. *pahhi-* ‘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. *plóti*, Latv. *plāt* ‘to flatten’, Sorbian *plon* ‘Ebene’, Sln. *plán*, f. *plána* ‘frei von Baumwuchs’, *plánja* ‘offene, freie Fläche’, SCr. *planina* ‘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. *hoł* : “distantly related”), etc. For Arm. *hoł* different protoforms have been assumed: **polo-* [Ĵahukyan 1987: 143]; **pólnos*, cf. Slavic [Klingenschmitt 1982: 165; Olsen 1999: 53, with ref.]; **pólh₂os* (Olsen, *ibid.*).

Meillet (1894: 154), followed by Ačarıyan (HAB), Saradževa and Ĵahukyan (*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 *hoł* problematic. Discussing this phonological development, Pedersen (1906: 370 = 1982: 148) rejects Meillet’s etymology and suggests a connection with Lat. *solum*, *-ī* n. ‘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. *hoł* cannot belong to it since **sy-* 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 *hoł* through mutual influences. Compare cases like *ort* vs. dial. *hort* 'calf', etc. (see 2.1.16.2). For *holan-i* cf. *kend-an* : *kend-an-i* 'living, alive'.

According to Ačařyan (HAB 3: 112a), Kurd. *xōl(i)* '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 Bläsing 2000: 43-44.

hołm, *o*-stem 'wind' (Bible+); also **hołmn*, NPI *hołmunk* 'frequently in Aristotle [NHB 2: 117c]; In view of the absence of compounds which would corroborate **hołmn*, Ačařyan (AčařHLPatm 2, 1951: 428) considers the *-n* to be secondary.

●ETYM Usually derived from PIE **h₂onh₁mo-*: Gr. *ἄνεμος* m. 'wind', Lat. *animus* m. 'soul, mind, spirit' (< **anamo*, cf. Osc. *anamúm-*), etc. (see HAB 3: 112 with literature; **-nm-* > *-łm-* through dissimilation, cf. *nman* 'like' > dial. *łm-*); see also Meillet 1936: 48; Pokorny 1959: 39; Mallory/Adams 1997: 82a (< **honm*); Matzinger 2005: 20; de Vaan 2008: 43. The anlaut is problematic, however (Frisk 1: 105; cf. Untermann 2000: 98). Kortlandt (1980b: 127) is inclined to disagree both with Ruijgh's **h₂onh₁mos* and with Beekes' **h₂enh₁mos* and to posit **h₂nh₁emos*. See also Schrijver (1991: 91, 311, and espec. 316-318, with thorough discussion). Kortlandt (ibid.) notes that "Arm. *hołm* is probably of non-IE origin".

Beekes (1972: 129) points out that the etymology would imply **h₂onh₁mo-*, and adds: "However, it would require a dissimilation *nm* > *łm*, which cannot be demonstrated elsewhere (though it cannot be refuted either by a case with *-nm-* preserved)". Schindler (1994: 397) derives *hołm* from **h₂onh₁mo-*, and compares it with the case of *hoviw* 'shepherd' (q.v.).

Van Windekens (1961: 547-548) links *hołm* with Toch. B *on-olme* 'être vivant' (on the latter, see Adams 1999: 115). For other etymologies, see Schmitt 1972: 26.

One wonders if a contamination of **h₂onh₁mo-* with Skt. *ánila-* m. 'wind, air' < **h₂enh₁-lo-* (cf. Bugge 1892: 442) may have occurred.

hoy 'fright, fear', independently only in 1 Maccabees 3.25, with synonymous *ah* 'fear', together rendering Gr. *φόβος*. According to a suggestion by Grigor Magistros (11th cent.), appellative for the masculine anthroponym **Hoy** (*Hoy hrašakertn tesleamb*), see AčařAnjn 3, 1946: 94. In compounds: **hoy-a-kap** 'superb, wonderfoul, famous, praiseworthy', with *kapem* 'to tie, construct' (Bible+); **hoy-anun** 'famous', with *anun* 'name' (Book of Chries).

For the semantics of *hoy-a-kap* Ačařyan (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 Ačařyan (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.

Later, Ačařyan (1937: 4) expresses his surprise about 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, construct’, assuming an original meaning ‘bâti 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.⁸¹ Furthermore, this etymology forces us to abandon the derivation of *hoy-a-kap* from *hoy* ‘fear’ (demonstrated by Ačařyan himself; see above), which seems improbable and unnecessary.

Jahukyan (1967: 106, 106₄₈) considers Ačařyan’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), although the type of derivation of the Armenian is difficult to establish. QIE **peu-t-* would probably yield **hoyt*. 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. *βαίω* ‘to go’ and Lat. *veniō* ‘to come; to go’ from **g^wm-je-* (see also 2.2.6.1); thus: **pu-je-mi* > **huyem*. Uncertain.

hoyl, *i*-stem: GDPI *hoyl-i-c* ‘in Plato ‘group (of people, animals, etc.)’.

Plato, Lewond, etc. As the second member of compounds: Hexaameron+. Later also *hol-*, *holon-* ‘to collect, gather, assemble’.

●ETYM Scheffelowitz 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. Ačařyan (HAB 3: 113-114) rejects these and other etymologies and leaves the origin open.

⁸¹ Neither convincing are, as Meillet 1894: 153 points out, the attempts of deriving *hay* ‘Armenian’ from the same **poti-s*.

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 (**-lh₁C-* > Arm. *-oloC-*) is uncertain; see 2.1.20.

Jahukyan (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. *púsyati* ‘to thrive, flourish’, etc.

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*. Uncertain.

hoyn, *i*-stem: GDPI *hun-i-c*‘ (Grigor Magistros) ‘cornel, Cornus mas L.’ (Agat’angelos+). Spelled also as *hiwn* (Grigor Magistros). For Galen, see Greppin 1985: 56.

In Agat’angelos § 644 (1909=1984: 330^{L8}), *hoyn* is found in an enumeration of fruit-names, following *nurn* ‘pomegranate’ (the fruit) and *t’ut* ‘mulberry (the fruit)’. Thus, *hoyn* denotes the fruit rather than the tree. Lexicographers record *hun-i*, *hon-i*, *hn-i*, *hon-eni* ‘cornel-tree’ [Ališan 1895: 268-269, 374; HAB 3: 114a]. Attested also in T’ovma Kiliček’i’s addendum to Ašxarhac’oyc’ (Armenian Geography), as a product of Cilicia (A. Anasyan 1967: 283; Hewsens 1992: 323). Also **hiwn-i* in the place-name *Hiwneac’ jor* in Siwnik’ (see Hübschmann 1904: 445).

●DIAL T’iflis, Łazax *hun*, Goris, Łarabał *hün*, Ararat *fön*, Hačən *hin*. The tree: Łarabał *hüni*, Ararat *föni*, Hačən *hn-ən-i* [HAB 3: 114a].

Hačən *hin* [Ačařyan 2003: 89, 324] could also be from *hiwn*, cf. *jiwn* ‘snow’ > Hačən *j’in*, etc. (see Ačařyan 2003: 87-88). Note that ClArm. **ho-* regularly yields Hačən *fɔ-* [Ačařyan 2003: 106-107] or *fue-* (Gasparyan 1966: 41, 56). Two possibilities: (1) Hačən *hin* derives from **hiwn* and therefore does not show the sound change *ho-* > *fɔ-*; (2) Hačən *hin* derives from *hoyn*, and the sound change *ho-* > *fɔ-* postdates the development of the diphthong *-oy-*.

Hamšen *ɔni* ‘a kind of tree (= Russ. *grab*)’ is mentioned by Y. Muradean (1901: 121). Russ. *grab* means ‘hornbeam (Carpinus betulus)’. I wonder if this Hamšen word reflects Arm. *honi*, with loss of the initial *h-* as in *hačari* ‘beech’ > *ačri*. Phonologically this is not problematic, cf. *kori* > *gɔri*, *mozi* > *mɔzi*, *oçil* > *ɔč’il*, *ɔzni* > *ɔzni*, etc.

The dialectal distribution (Cilicia, Hamšen, T’iflis, Lori, Łarabał) corroborates the botanic evidence (compare FITurk 4, 1972: 539-541, 497^{Map74}, 549^{Map75}).

●ETYM No etymology in HAB 3: 114a. Jahukyan 1987 vacat.

I propose to derive Arm. *hoyn* ‘cornel’ from PIE **Hos-eno-* (or perhaps better: **Hh₃es-eno-*) ‘ash-tree’: Lat. *ornus* f. ‘mountain-ash’ < **ōsēno-*, cf. OIr. *uinnius* ‘ash-tree’ < **ōsno-*, Balto-Slavic **HoHs-* ‘ash’: Lith. *úosis*, Russ. *jásen*, etc. For references and a discussion of this tree-name, see s.v. *hac’i* ‘ash-tree’. A development **Hh₃es-eno-* > PArm. **hohéno-* > **ho(h)in(o)* > *hoyn* is formally impeccable. If the *i*-declension is old (which is uncertain), one might posit a QIE feminine **Hh₃es-en-ih₂-*.

The semantic shift ‘ash’ > ‘cornel’ may be explained by functional and cultural similarities; compare OIc. *askr* m. ‘ash-tree; spear’, OHG *asc* m. ‘ash-tree; spear’,

OEngl. *æsc* ‘ash-tree; spear’ on the one hand, and Gr. *κράνον*, n. ‘cornelian cherry’, *κράνεια* f. ‘cornelian cherry, Cornus mas’ also meaning ‘spear’, on the other. Note especially *kran* ‘cornel; ash’ (late attestations; probably preserved in the dialect of Muš), which must be compared with Gr. *κράνος*, Hom. *κράνεια* ‘cornel’ as a Greek loan or a Mediterranean substratum word. For the semantic relationship, see also s.v. *metex* ‘handle of an axe’.

If the form *hon* (lexicographers and dialect of Ararat) is old, one may posit **Hh₃os-n-V-* (cf. the Celtic forms) > PArm. **ho(s)n-*.

hoviw, *a*-stem: GDSg *hovu-i*, GDPl *hovu-a-c*‘ (Bible+), IPl *hovu-a-w-k*‘ [Job 24.2, Cox 2006: 167] ‘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*, *óĩος* and *oiός* ‘sheep’, Lat. *ovis*, 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.).

Although much debated, the etymology cannot be abandoned. Schindler (1994: 397) reconstructs 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 *hołm* ‘wind’ (q.v.). On Toch. B *ā(u)w* ‘ewe’ and *eye* ‘sheep’, see Adams 1999: 35, 92; Kim 2000.

The vocalism of *hoviw* is in contrast with the rule according to which **o* in initial **Ho-*, **so-*, *po-* becomes *a* in open syllables unless in 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’. Ĺahukyan (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 Ĺahukyan 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 1988: 29; 1990: 130; Schrijver 1991: 50; see also 2.1.16.1. 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 Ačařyan (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 ubiquitous in the dialects, in the generic sense ‘odour (pleasant or unpleasant)’. Hamšen *he(ə)d* refers to ‘bad smell’, opposed to *həm* ‘pleasant odour’ < *ham* (q.v.); see HAB 3: 118b; Ačařyan 1947: 240-241. On the semantics of the verb, see below.

●ETYM Since NHB (1: 123b), connected with Gr. *ὄδμη* ‘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 corroborate 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. *ὄδωδῆ* f. ‘smell’ derived from the perfect. Thus: **hot-(h)ot-* > *hotot-*. See also 2.3.2.

hor, *i*-stem ‘son-in-law, daughter’s husband’, twice in a homily by Philo: NPI *hor-k’* and GDPI *hor-i-c’* (for the passage, see NHB 2: 124a; HAB 3: 119b).

●ETYM No acceptable etymology in HAB 3: 119b.

Jahukyan (1987: 146, 259, 436) hesitantly derives *hor* from the PIE reflexive pronoun **s(e)ue-* (Arm. *iwr*) and posits a QIE **souo-ro-*. This is uncertain.

Recently, the word has been derived from IE **sjō(u)ro-*, cf. Skt. *syālā-* m. ‘wife’s brother’ and OCS *šurb, šurinъ* ‘wife’s brother’ [Huld apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 84-85, 85b; Mallory/Adams 2006: 215, 217]. For a discussion of this Indo-Slavic correspondence, see Pokorny 1959: 915; Szemerényi 1977: 94, 198; Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 761₂ = 1995, 1: 663₃₅; Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 782. This etymology is semantically attractive, but formal details are unclear.

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. Ačařyan (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. *πρόν* m. ‘protruding rocks, mountaintop’ and Skt. *pravaṇā-* ‘abfallend, geneigt, abschüssig’ is accidental. According to Karst (see M. Muradyan 1972: 281b), borrowed from Pers. *farāvand*.

The meaning of *farāvand* or *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; 1981: 84-85; cf. S. Harut‘yunyan 2000: 104-105, also mentioning Gr. *πρόν*, on which see above) suggests a connection with the mountain-name *Aruandu* (in Media) and derives both from PIE **peru-ŋ-to-*, cf. Skt. *pārvata-* ‘rocky, rugged; (m.) mountain, mountain-range’ (RV+), YAv. *pauruuatā-* f. ‘mountain-range’, etc. This is phonologically improbable; one rather expects **hergan(d)*.

Given the shape of the word, the Iranian origin is very probable (see also Jahukyan 1987: 558), although the details are not clear. A theoretical **fr(a)wan-* ‘rock’ (cf. the above-mentioned Gr. *πρόν*, etc.) is thinkable. If one starts with the meaning ‘balkony’, 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 ĒtimSlovIranJaz 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-skamba-* m. ‘porch’ next to Skt. *skambhā-* m. ‘prop, support, pillar’ (RV+) and Arm. *pat-šgam* ‘balcony’ (borrowed from Iranian, cf. MPers. *pdy-škm̄b* ‘space’, NPers. *pa-škam* ‘summer-house’), as well as Arm. *aṛa-stał* ‘ceiling’ < *‘at/on the pillar’ (q.v.).

hu ‘purulent blood’; hapax, in Mxit‘ar Herac‘i, 12th century: *Apa t‘ē iwr ēut‘iwnn awiri, na herje zeraksn ew i yandam min vat‘i, hu ew šaraw Encayi iwrmēn* (see HAB 3: 120b; MiĵHayBaṛ 2, 1992: 48b).

●ETYM Since Müller 1890: 4, compared with Skt. *pūya-* ‘pus’, *pūti-* (AV) ‘stinking, putrid’, Gr. *πύος* n. ‘purulence’, Lat. *pūs, pūris* n. ‘pus’, *pūteō* ‘to rot’, Lith. *pūti* ‘to rot’, etc. This etymology is accepted by Hübschmann (1897: 468). However, Ačāryan (1897a: 169b; 1898b: 371b; HAB 3: 120-121) considers Arm. *hu* a loan from Pers. *hū* ‘pus’ (cf. Kurd. *heu* ‘gangrene’).

Hübschmann (1899: 45, and p.c. apud HAB 3: 121a) agreed with Ačāryan and revised his opinion. This revision has generally remained unnoticed by scholars (see Pokorny 1959: 849; Ernout/Meillet 1959: 547a; Solta 1960: 174; Schrijver 1991: 534; Adams apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 471; Olsen 1999: 913₈₃; Meissner 2006: 64-65), with the exception of Clackson (1994: 45). If the Persian and Kurdish words do not have an acceptable etymology, one might assume that they are borrowed from Armenian, and that the latter is of native origin.

hum (*o*-stem in NHB 2: 124b without evidence) ‘raw, uncooked’ (Bible+).

●DIAL Ubiquitous in the dialects [HAB 3: 122a].

●ETYM Connected with Gr. *ὠμός* ‘raw, uncooked’ (already in NHB 2: 124b), Skt. *āmá-* ‘raw, uncooked’, Khot. *hāma-* ‘raw, unbaked, uncooked’, Sogd. *x‘m*, NPers. *xām* ‘raw’, OIr. *om* ‘raw, MWelsh *of* ‘id.’, etc. Hübschmann 1897: 468 (earlier, 1883: 39, he was sceptical about the etymology because of the Armenian initial *h-*); HAB 3: 121-123; Pokorny 1959: 777; Bailey 1979: 477b; Mayrhofer EWAia 1, 1992: 170; Mallory/Adams 1997: 478a; Olsen 1999: 195.

The assumption that PArm. *um took the initial *h-* from Iranian (Meillet 1919: 187; cf. HAB 3: 121b) is not compelling. We can rather assume a reflex of the PIE laryngeal. One reconstructs PIE **h₂eh₃-mo-* or **h₃eH-mo-* (for a discussion, see Kortlandt 1983: 12; 1986: 43 = 2003: 42, 73; Schrijver 1991: 77, 347-348, 350-351; 1995: 39; Beekes 2003: 183).

hun (*i*-stem: GDSg *hun-i* or *hn-i* in NHB 2: 124b without testimony; AblSg *i hn-ē* attested in Dawit' Anyalt' precludes an *o*-declension; see further Olsen 1999: 194 and foot-notes) 'ford, shallow' (Genesis 32.22/23 and Joshua 2.7 rendering Gr. *διάβασις*, Łazar P'arpec'i, Zgōn/Afrahat, etc.), adj. 'shallow' (T'ovmay Arcruni 3.8), 'passage, way' (Evagrius of Pontus, Dawit' Anyatt', Book of Chries), 'opening, gap' (P'awstos Buzand 3.1, see below);

an-hun, *i*-stem: *anhn-i-c'* (Dawit' Anyalt'), loc. *anhn-i* (Porphyry, Dawit' Anyalt'); also GDPI *anhun-c'* (Dawit' Anyalt') 'unfordable, impassable, inaccessible; bottomless; broad, wide; infinite, endless, countless' (Amos 5.24 rendering Gr. *ἄβατος*, Agat'angelos, Movsēs Xorenac'i, John Chrysostom, Ephrem, Lewond, Anania Narekac'i, etc.), adv. 'infinitely, limitlessly, without restraint' (Movsēs Xorenac'i 3.63, see below).

The two Biblical attestations of **hun** are found in:

Genesis 32.22/23 (Zeyt'unyan 1985: 299): *Ew yaruc'eal i nmin gišeri ar zerkus kanaysn ew zerkus ataxnaysn ew zmetasan ordis iwr ew anc' and hunn Yobokay : ἀναστὰς δὲ τὴν νύκτα ἐκείνην ἔλαβεν τὰς δύο γυναικας καὶ τὰς δύο παιδίσκας καὶ τὰ ἕνδεκα παιδιά αὐτοῦ καὶ διέβη τὴν διάβασιν τοῦ Ιαβοκ.*

Joshua 2.7: *zčanaparhn Yordananu i hunn* "the way of Jordan through the ford" : *ὁδὸν τὴν ἐπὶ τοῦ Ιορδάνου ἐπὶ τὰς διαβάσεις.* Compare *hunn Yordanan getoy* in Zgōn/Afrahat [NHB 2: 124b].

The word occurs in Sebēos (7th cent.) several times [G. Xaç'atryan 2004: 284 s.v.], very clearly referring to 'ford, a shallow place in a river where it can be crossed'. In Chapter 17 (Xaç'atryan/Ehiazaryan 2005: 96; Chapter 3.7 in 1851: 84; transl. Thomson 1999: 35): *i bac' ankec'in zkamurjn ew amrac'ealk' yanjukn pahēin zteli kamrjn. Kayin ar getezerbn ew xorhēin, t'ē zinč' aržan ē arnel. Ew ibrew oč' gtin hun, <...>, asen nma: "C'óyc' mez zhun getoys, apa t'ē oč' spanc'uk' zk'ez". Ew nora ařeal zzawrn, ec'oyc' zhunn i nerk'oy and :* "They destroyed the bridge, and posted themselves at the defile to defend the site of the bridge. They [the Greeks] stopped at the river-bank and pondered what they should do. Since they did not find a ford, <...>, said to him: 'Show us the ford over the river, otherwise we shall kill you'. He led the army and pointed out the ford below".

Two more attestations in Sebēos, Chapter 38 (Xaç'atryan/Ehiazaryan 2005: 174^{L18f}, 176^{L17f}; transl. Thomson 1999: 82, 83): *anc'anē and hun getoyn Erasxay, yawann Vrnjunis ew banakin yandastans nora* "he crossed the ford of the Araxes river at the town of Vrnjunik' and camped in its fields"; *anc'eal and Širak hasanē i hun getoyn Erasxay, ew anc' and getawn ar Vardanakertawn awanaw* "Passing through Shirak, he reached the ford of the Araxes river; having crossed the river by the town of Vardanakert".

In Chapter 2 of the 8th century History of Lewond (NHB 2: 124b): *anc'uc'anēin and getn Erasx, and hunn Ĵulayu* "they made them cross the River Erasx (Araxes)

through the ford of Ĵuła”. Arzoumanian (1982: 50) translates *hun* as ‘strait’. For a ModArm. translation of this passage, see Ter-Lewondyan 1982: 20.

The adjectival meaning ‘shallow’ is attested in T’ovmay Arcruni 3.8, 9-10th cent. (V. Vardanyan 1985: 260^{L-8}; transl. Thomson 1985: 232): *Ew ē zi i nurb ew i hun telis ĵurc’n ankeal, i nmin xreal kan anšarž, ew diwraw ankanic’i i ĵers orsordac’*: “And it happens that collapsing in narrow and shallow places in the water one may remain stuck there immobilised, and easily fall into the hands of hunters”.

Arnc’ĵoy hun and *Evanakac’ hun*, villages in Gełark’unik’, in the province of Siwnik’, attested in Step’anos Őrbelean (A. A. Abrahamyan 1986: 397ab; see Hübschmann 1904: 384, 402, 426). The meaning ‘opening, gap’ is attested in P’awstos Buzand 3.1 (1883=1984: 5^{L-5f}): *Bayc’ zi mi i miĵi meroy patmut’eans andhat erewesc’i hun mi, nšanakec’ak’; zor ōrinak atiws mi kargac i mēĵ ormoyn šinuacoy, i katarumn bovandakut’ean* “But, lest a gap appear in the midst of our narrative, we have noted [it], as a brick is set in the wall of a structure for the completion of the whole” (Garsoĵan 1989: 67, see also 21₉₂; cf. Malxasyanc’ 1987: 13).

The derivative *an-hun* ‘unfordable, impassable; bottomless, broad; infinite, endless, limitless’ is first attested in Amos 5.24: *ibrew zhetel anhun ōc ĵeimáppovc āβatoc*.

A number of attestations are to be found in Movsēs Xorenac’i 1.4, 1.10, 3.63 (1913=1991: 14^{L2f}, 32^{L20f}, 346^{L12f}; transl. Thomson 1978: 71, 85, 339): <...>, *zugeal hamematē anhun t’woc’ ararkut’eanc’s ar i hawasarel čšmartut’eann* “<...>, could he make them equal to the limitless numbers of these proposals”; *i mēĵ bazmakoyt skayic’n, anhun xōlac’ ew użaworac’* “amid the multitude of infinitely ferocious and strong giants”; *anhun sksaw ołotanel yanarāk c’ankut’iwns, minč’ew tatkanal i nmanē amenayn naxararac’n* “begun to plunge without restraint into licentious pleasures to the extent that all the princes became disgusted with him” (in the last attestation *anhun* is taken as an adverb, ‘infinitely, limitlessly, without restraint’).

In Book of Chries 8.7.2: *covu anhun lineloy cancałi anbaž ew vimac’*: “так как море бездонно, лишено мелей и скал” (G. Muradyan 1993: 200^{L3}; transl. 2000: 189); for *genetivus absolutus* here, see G. Muradyan 1993: 309₁₀₆.

In later literature we find *hun-awor* ‘limited, having a limit’, in contrast with *an-hun* ‘limitless’ (Oskip’orik, see NHB 2: 124c).

●DIAL Ačarıyan (HAB 3: 123a) records an independent *hun*, with unspecified semantics, in Muš and Bulanəx. Bałdasaryan-T’ap’alc’yan (1958: 262b) glosses Muš *hun* as *geti hun* ‘ford of a river’ (or perhaps ‘riverbed’). She also ascribes a meaning ‘voice, sound’ found only in the expression *hun u mun č’ka* “there is no information (about smb. or smth.)”. This is rather reminiscent of *hun(k’)-u-bun(k’)*, on which see below.

According to Elišē Melik’ean (1964: 510b), Xnus-Bulanəx *hun* refers to ‘ford, shallow of a river’. Note also the compound *naxr-hun* ‘ford for cattle, herd’ in Melik’ean 1964: 293^{L22f}: *hasank’ getap’ə ew naxrhunēn getə anc’nelov mtank’ K’arablurneru mēĵ*: “we reached the river-bank and, crossing the river through the cattle-ford, entered the ‘Stone-hills’”.

The meaning ‘ford’ is also present in Akn. According to Čanikean (1895: 31), here they say that the river Ep‘rat-Euphrates has a ford (*hun uni*) in the vicinity of Erēz.

In Modern Armenian one finds the meanings ‘ford, shallow’, ‘bottom of the sea, lake or river’, ‘riverbed’, ‘dried riverbed’, ‘way, direction, course’ [Malxaseanc‘ HBB 3: 137b; Ałayan 1976, 1: 910c]. The meaning ‘ford, shallow’ is seen e.g. in the proverb *Hunə č‘gıtc‘ac getə mnel* “To enter the river not knowing the ford” [Malxaseanc‘ HBB 3: 137b].

The meaning ‘way, direction, course’ is particularly seen in phrases such as *huni mej dnel* ‘to put into the right order or course, to give an adequate course or direction’, *huni mej ənknel* ‘to fall onto the right direction, to begin with an ordered work’, *hunic‘ hanel* ‘to take out of the right order’, etc. [HayLezDarjBař 1975: 374].

T‘iflis *hunk‘-u-bunk‘*, Ararat *hunk‘ u b‘unk‘*, Širak *unn u b‘unə*, Van *un-bun*, Łazax *unk‘-u-bunk‘*, ‘the essence of something, all the details of a deed; the entire tribe and origin of somebody’ [Amatuni 1912: 405; Mxit‘areanc‘ 1901: 179^{L-6f}; HAB 1: 484b; 3: 123a].

The derivative *an-hun* ‘unfordable; bottomless; endless(ly)’ is found in a late medieval folk-song (Abelyan 1940: 111^{Nr165}):

Im barjragray lusin,

Yu‘r kert‘as giřerəd anhun.

Literal translation: “My high-going moon, where are you going at that limitless/deep night?”.

This word is represented in the dialects mostly with an unclear medial *-a-*: Dersim *anahun* [Bařramyan 1960: 73a], Xarberd *anahun* ‘bottomless (sea)’, Aparan, Bulanəx ‘limitless (God)’ [HAB 3: 123a], Širak *anahun* ‘large, wide, broad, limitless’ [Mxit‘areanc‘ 1901: 306; Amatuni 1912: 29b]. Here *hun* displays the meanings ‘bottom’ and ‘limit, border, end, top’, the latter being present in Sebastia, particularly in expressions such as *hunə garun hanel* “to accomplish, fulfil smth.” (see Gabikean 1952: 350), lit. “to make the end/top of a work to springtime”; cf. Van *xun xanel* < *hun hanel* ‘to supplement, accomplish’ [Ačafyan 1952: 276]. See also in what follows.

Akn, Ewdokia, Muř, Č‘enkiler-Nikomidia *hun elnel* ‘to vanquish, surmount’, Ewdokia *hun-avor-il*, Sebastia *hn-avər-il* (according to Gabikean 1952: 350, *hunavər-il*) ‘id.’, Van **hun-avor-uil* ‘to settle, establish a dwelling, settlement’ [Ačafean 1913: 673a; HAB 3: 123a], cf. Van **hnaworuil* ‘to cope with everybody’ HAB 3: 105a, s.v. *hnar* ‘means’ (perhaps contamination; cf. *anhun anhnarin* in Ephrem, NHB 1: 188c).

Comparable dial. (*řmk.*) forms are recorded in NHB 2: 124bc: *hun-avor* ‘limited, having a limit or border’ in contrast with *an-hun* ‘limitless’ (Oskip‘orik), and a dial. phrase *i hun elanel* ‘to cope with, succeed in’ (124bc) with two illustrations from the same source, viz. Oskip‘orik: *mard het lezuani knoj oč‘ elanē i hun* “one cannot cope with a quarrelsome woman”; *brnut‘eamb ban i hun č‘elanē* “one cannot succeed by force”. The former illustration is similar to that from the fables of Vardan Aygekc‘i (see MiřHayBař 2, 1992: 49b).

●SEMANTICS The basic meaning ‘ford’, that is ‘a shallow place in a river where it can be crossed’, is securely attested in the literature since the Bible and has been preserved in the dialects. All the other meanings are derivable from this meaning.

The derivative *an-hun* ‘bottomless’ implies that *hun* refers also to ‘bottom of the sea or river’; for the semantic development cf. Lat. *vadum* ‘shallow, ford’, ‘bottom of the sea’. Hence we arrive at ‘bottom, base’, which is clearly seen in dial. *hun-k’-u-bun-k’* ‘the essence of something, all the details of a deed; the entire family/tribe and origin of somebody’, with *bun* ‘stem of a tree, base, bottom, origin, army-settlement’ as the second member. The basic meaning of the compound is thus ‘bottom and base’. A clear semantic parallel to this is dial. **azg-u-tak* ‘the entire family, tribe’, lit. ‘tribe and bottom’, with *tak* ‘bottom, base, root, tribe’ (see HAB 1: 85a; 4: 360). A meaning ‘settlement’ is seen in Van **hun-awor-uil* ‘to settle, establish a settlement’.

The second meaning of *an-hun*, viz. ‘endless, limitless’, implies a semantic development ‘bottom’ > ‘limit, border, end’, ‘top’. The latter meaning may also be seen in dialectal expressions such as *hun elnel* ‘to vanquish, surmount’, which is to be understood as ‘to come up to the top’; typologically compare dial. *glux elnel* ‘to succeed; to vanquish, surmount’, lit. ‘to come up to the top, head’ (Ačārean 1913: 238), *glux hanel/berel* ‘to cope with, successfully accomplish’, lit. ‘to take/bring to the top/head’ (Amatuni 1912: 138ab). Note also *hun-awor* ‘limited, having a limit or border’.

The phrase *i hun elanel* ‘to cope with, succeed in’ may be understood as ‘to come up to the top, to a successful accomplishment’. On the other hand it may imply an underlying meaning ‘way, manner’, compare dial. *γola gnal/ert’al* ‘to cope in a way’ vs. *γol* ‘way, road’ from Turk. *γol* ‘way; manner’ (see Ačārean 1902: 251; HayLezBrbBař 4, 2007: 117); cf. also Engl. *way* ‘way, road’: ‘way, manner’.

●ETYM Since long (Meillet 1892: 161; Bugge 1893: 71-72; Hübschmann 1897: 468-469, etc., see HAB 3: 123a; Pokorny 1959: 809; Godel 1975: 75; Polomé 1980: 26; Mallory/Adams 1997: 27b, 202a, 487b), connected with Skt. *pánthās*, AccSg *pánthām*, GAbISg *pathās*, LSg *pathí*, NPI *pánthās*, API *pathās* (RV+) ‘road, path, course’, OAv. AblSg *paθō*, LocSg *paithi*, API *paθō*, GPI *paθam*, IPI *padabīš*, YAv. *panthā*, ISg *paθa*, OPers. AccSg *pθim* ‘road’, Khot. *pande* ‘road, path’, MPers., NPers. *pand* ‘path; counsel, advice’, Gr. *πάτος* m. ‘road’, *πόντος* m. ‘sea’, Lat. *pons*, *pontis* m. ‘bridge across a river or sim.; plank, etc., bridging the gap between buildings, walls, and the like, gangway; platform, floor, deck’, OCS *poth* m. ‘road’, OPr. *pintis* ‘road’, etc.

The PIE word was a hysterodynamic h_1 -stem: NSg **pónt-eh₁-s*, GSg **pnt-h₁-ós*. The *-th-* in Sanskrit has been generalized from the oblique cases (see Beekes 1972a: 32; 1989a; 1995: 181; Schrijver 1991: 371-372; with **-h₂-*: Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 81-83, with rich literature; Mayrhofer 2005: 120; cf. Lehmann 1952: 80). For different explanations of the voiceless aspirate, see Szemerényi 1996: 168; Elbourne 2000: 3, 14, 16, 20-25.

In view of the initial *h-* we have to assume that the development **po-* > Arm. *o-* (cf. *otn* vs. *het* ‘foot, trace’) was posterior to **-oN-* > *-uN-*, see Kortlandt 1983: 10 = 2003: 40; Olsen 1999: 202 and 202₃₈₃; Beekes 2003: 171. It is remarkable that

Kartvelian languages (Georg. *p^honi*, etc., see HAB 3: 123a)⁸² have borrowed the Armenian word at a very old period, having preserved PArm. **fon-* (see Vogt 1958: 157; Aghayan 1985: 24; cf. Matzinger 2005: 26₁₂₅).

The absence of a reflex of PIE **-t-* in Armenian is much debated; see Olsen 1989; Clackson 1994: 56; Beekes 2003: 173-174. A derivation of *hun*, *i*-stem (NB no evidence for the declension class) from **pont-i-* beside Lat. *pons*, *pontis* and OCS *pōtь* (see e.g. Ałabekyan 1979: 53) is uncertain. Note that the Latin form has been derived from **-eh₁-*. It is possible to derive Arm. *hun* from analogical **pont-HV-* (> **pont^h-*), with generalization of the oblique stem exactly like in Sanskrit, assuming that the aspirated dental dropped after a nasal (see Pisani 1941-42: 269; Meillet 1936: 36; Olsen 1984: 115; 1999: 194-195, 677₂₉, 770). This is perhaps confirmed by **-kōmtH* > Arm. *-sun* (in *ere-sun* ‘thirty’, etc.). For a discussion, see Ravnæs 1991: 53-54, 55, 149₁, 179_{48a}; Viredaz 2005: 91-92, 97.

The variety of meanings represented by cognate forms and the semantic nuances of Skt. *pānthā-* point to an original meaning ‘tortuous path, forcing, forced crossing, traverse or passage by/into an unknown and/or hostile spot’ (see Benveniste 1954: 256-257; cf. Saradževa 1986: 115-116). Mallory/Adams 2006: 250 posits ‘(untraced) path’. The PIE word has been regarded as a derivative of a verb **pent-* ‘to find one’s way’ (see Benveniste *ibid.*; Bammesberger 1971: 48, 48₁₂; Mallory/Adams 1997: 202a).

***huř-** prob. ‘gilded, adorned by gems, linked together in a series, encrusted, embroidered’ or the like (rather than ‘hem of a skirt, lap’, as in HAB 3: 124-125), only in compounds with *oski* ‘gold’ and *margarit* ‘pearl’: *oske-huř*, *oske-huřn* ‘gilded, adorned with gold’ said of garment, coat, silk, cover, collar, tassels, etc. (Bible, Łazar P‘arpec‘i, Elišē, John Chrysostom, Ephrem, Philo, Hesychius of Jerusalem, etc.), *margart-a-huřn* ‘adorned with pearls’ (Paterica).

●DIAL No dialectal record in HAB 3: 124-125.

According to Lusenc‘ 1982: 152-153, 221b, 229b, here belong Areš *huř* ‘bracelet’ and *oskiyahuř*. The latter obviously continues the Classical Armenian compound *oskehuř(n)* < **oski-a-huř(n)*, with secondary restoration of the conjunction *-a-*.

●ETYM No etymology in HAB 3: 124-125. See s.v. *yerum* ‘to tie, fasten or join together, link together in a series, string together, put around (said of gems, etc.)’.

hur (singulative), *o*-stem: gen.-dat. *hr-o-y*, instr. *hr-o-v* (rich evidence in the Bible, see Astuacaturean 1895: 898-901), cf. instr. *hur-b* (a few attestations in the Bible) ‘fire’ (Bible+); *hr-at*, GSg *hrat-i* (Eusebius of Caesarea, Socrates, Aristakēs Lastivertc‘i) ‘camp-fire’ (Bible+), ‘the planet Mars’ (Anania Širakac‘i, etc.).

●DIAL Mostly preserved in derivatives, phrases and sayings [HAB 3: 126]. Independently present in T‘iflis *hur*, Polis *hur-k* ‘burning pain of wound’, Ewdokia, Akn, Ararat, Łazax *hur-k* ‘reflex of fire’ [HAB 3: 126], Sebastia *hur-k* ‘inflammation; passion; fever’ [Gabikean 1952: 351]. The suffix *-at* in Ararat, Łarabał redupl. *hur-hr-at-* ‘shining’ is reminiscent of ClArm. *hr-at* ‘camp-fire’.

⁸² According to Hübschmann (1897: 397), the resemblance is accidental.

●ETYM Since Hübschmann 1881: 176-177 and 1897: 469,⁸³ the singulative *hur* and oblique **hun-* ‘fire’ (in *hn-oc* ‘oven, furnace’, q.v.) are derived from the PIE heteroclitic PD neuter **péh₂-ur*, **ph₂-uén-s* ‘fire’: Hitt. *paḥhur*, GSg *paḥḥuenaš* ‘fire’, Gr. *πῦρ*, *πῦρός* n. ‘fire’, *πυρ-ά*, Ion. *-ή* f. ‘fireplace, pyre’, OHG *fuir*, Goth. *fon*, OPr. *panno* ‘fire’, etc., see HAB 3: 106, 125-126; Pokorny 1959: 828; Beekes apud Mallory/ Adams 1997: 202b. For a morphological and etymological discussion of the PIE word, see Rix 1992: 126-127; Beekes 1995: 187; Lindeman 1997: 108-110; Kloekhorst 2008: 613.

Also Germanic languages have preserved both stems, cf. OIc. *fǫrr*, *fýrr* m. ‘fire’, OHG *fuir*, German *Feuer*, etc. beside Goth. *fōn* < **puōn*, gen. *funins* ‘fire’, OIc. *funi* m. ‘fire’, OHG *funcho* ‘spark’, German *Funke* ‘spark’ (see Lehmann 1986: 120; K. Schmidt 1987: 45₁₈; Matzinger 2005: 61). For a discussion of the Germanic material and, in particular, of the etymology of *Funke* ‘spark’, see Beekes 1996a.

For a discussion of the generalized NAccSg form in **-r* (cf. Gr. *πῦρ*, *πῦρός* ‘fire’, Rix 1992: 126-127) and the transfer of the Armenian singulative *hur* into the *o*-declension (note Arm. older instr. *hur-b* vs. widely attested thematic *hr-o-v*) for the old oblique plural **hun-* and for *hn-oc* based on this **hun-* and other related problems, see Meillet 1920: 250-251; 1936: 82-83; Godel 1975: 97; Schmitt 1981: 57; Jāhukyan 1982: 101, 121; K. Schmidt 1987: 37-38; Clackson 1994: 45, 97; Olsen 1999: 48-49, 49₁₀₂, 533-536; Matzinger 2005: 21₁₀₇, 61, 81₃₆₄.

J

jag, *u*-stem: GDPI *jag-u-c*‘ (Bible) ‘youngling, nestling’ (Bible+), ‘a little bird, sparrow’ (Job 40.29 [Cox 2006: 260] and Luke 12.6-7, rendering Gr. dimin. *στρουθίον*); MidArm. ‘bird; child’ (MijHayBař 2, 1992: 55a).

MidArm. **aner-jag** ‘brother-in-law, wife’s brother’ [MijHayBař 1, 1987: 52a], lit. ‘father-in-law’s youngling’.

●DIAL Widespread in the dialects [HAB 3: 142a]. Beside the basic meaning ‘youngling, nestling’, the word appears with a number of semantic nuances: Svedia ‘bird’ [Andreasyan 1967: 160, 250]; Ewdokia ‘bird’ [Gabikian 1952: 354-355]; Xnus-Bulanəx *jag* generic term for ‘child, young’ said of people, animals and birds [Melik‘ean 1964: 511a]; Xotorjur pl.-coll. *jagus* [YušamXotorj 1964: 479b], probably from a frozen accusative *jag-oy-s*.

For dialectal evidence of MidArm. *aner-jag* ‘brother-in-law, wife’s brother’ cf. e.g. Moks *ānercäk^y*, gen. *ānercäk^y-u* ‘шурин, сын тестя’ [Orbeli 2002: 202]; further, see s.v. *aner* ‘father-in-law, wife’s father’.

Sivri-Hisar *jgnil* < **jag-n-il* ‘to bear a youngling’ [PtmSivHisHay 1965: 468a].

●ETYM Connected with Alb. *zog* ‘bird of small species; young animal; nestling’, probably also ManMPers. and ManParth. *zhg* [zahag] ‘offspring, progeny; child’ (Boyce 1977: 104), Pahl. *zhk*, *z’hk* [zahag], NPers. *zah* ‘child, offspring’ (MacKenzie 1971: 97), see HAB 3: 141-142 for early references; further, Pedersen

⁸³ The etymology of *hur* has been suggested by Brosset, Windischmann, Müller et al., see HAB 3: 125-126 for references; see also de Lagarde 1854: 11^{L190}, 29^{L804}.

1900: 341; 1906: 454 = 1982: 2, 232; Pokorny 1959: 409 (Iranian loanword); Kortlandt 1986: 40 = 2003: 70; Demiraj 1997: 429-430; Olsen 1999: 110-111.

Perhaps a substratum word of the shape *ǵ^hāǵ^h- or the like.

jagar, *a*-stem according to NHB 2: 144c, but without evidence ‘funnel’; attested in Agat’angelos § 109 (1909=1980: 65^{L2}); for the passage, see s.v. *tik* ‘winebag’. In “Čarəntir”: *Jagar edin i beran nora* “They put a funnel into his mouth”.

●DIAL Preserved in a number of *kə*-dialects [HAB 3: 142b].

●ETYM No acceptable etymology is recorded in HAB 3: 142.

Ĵahukyan (1987: 128) derives *jagar* from PIE *ǵ^heǵ- ‘to pour’, see s.v.v. *jew*, *joyl*. For the semantics, cf. e.g. Lat. *in-fundibulum* ‘a funnel for pouring liquids’ from *in-fundō* ‘to pour in’, Gr. *χόρῳνος*, *χώνη* ‘smelting furnace, funnel’, all based on the same *ǵ^heǵ- ‘to pour’. Arm. *jagar* may be derived from PArm. **jawar*- < **jəw-árV*- or **jow-árV*-; for the suffix, see Ĵahukyan 1987: 235; 1998: 16f; Clackson 1994: 118f; Olsen 1999: 337f.

Ačarjan (HAB *ibid.*) considers the resemblance with Georg. *jabri* ‘funnel’ as accidental. According to him, T’iflis *jabri* has been borrowed from Georgian. This is possible. However, the resemblance between Arm. *jagar* and Georg. *jabri* is remarkable, and a connection cannot be excluded. If the Indo-European origin of the Armenian word is accepted, one might regard Georg. *jabri* as a loan from PArm. **jaw(a)r*- > **jab(a)r*-; for **w* > *b*, compare, perhaps, MPers. *babr* ‘tiger’ vs. Mlr. **vagr*, Arm. *vagr*, Skt. *vyāghrá*- ‘tiger’.

jał (*u*-stem in NHB 2: 145b, but without evidence) ‘derision, mockery’ (Lazar P’arpec’i, John Chrysostom, etc.), **jał-an-k’**, *a*-stem ‘id.’, **jałem** ‘to deride’ (Bible+), ‘to conquer’ (Eusebius of Caesarea).

GDPI *jałan-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. Garsoġan 1989: 188): *t’snamans jałanac’ 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 *całr* ‘laughter’, etc. suggested in NHB (see s.v. *całr*) is rejected in view of the unagreement of the initial affricate [Meillet 1898: 280]. Meillet (*ibid.*) prefers connecting with Gr. *χλεύη* ‘joke, jest’, OIc. *glaumr* ‘jubilation’, OE *glēam* ‘jubilation, joy’, OCS *glumъ* ‘idle talk, boasting’, Russ. (dial.) *glum* ‘stupidity, mockery, joke, noise’. Ukr. *hlum* ‘mockery’, Pol. *glum* ‘mockery, torture, misfortune’, Czech *hluma* ‘mime, actor, comedian’, Bulg. *glumá* ‘joke’, etc. On Slavic and its alternative etymologies, see ĘtimSlovSlavJaz 6, 1979: 147-152.

The appurtenance of the Armenian is accepted by Hübschmann (1899: 48: from **g^hhllu-* with a question mark), Ačarjan (HAB 3: 143b), Ĵahukyan (1987: 127: from **ǵhlō-* 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.*), albeit with reservation, includes also *ĵmem* ‘to watch’ (only in HHB and Baġirk’ hayoc’ [HAB 3: 155b; Amalyan 1975: 194^{Nr49}, 398⁴⁹]), which is highly improbable.

jalk, *a*-stem: ISg *jalk-a-w* (Eusebius of Caesarea); later: *i*-stem (GDPI *jalk-i-c* in Mxit'ar Anec'i, 12-13th cent.) and *o*-stem (ISg *jalk-o-v* in Čarəntir) 'rod, stick, staff, whip, switch (often for beating)' (John Chrysostom, Eusebius of Caesarea, Dawit' Anyalt'), 'twig, branch' (Mxit'ar Anec'i), subst. 'beating, whipping' (in a homily ascribed to Elišē).

The word occurs also as an adjective: 'straight, upstanding, tense' said of *her* 'hair' (Gregory of Nyssa apud NHB 2: 146a) or *maz* 'hair' (Zeno, Xaç'ikyan 1949: 84b^{L25}, rendered as 'прямой' by Arewšatyan 1956: 326); cf. the compounds *jalk-a-her* (Severian of Gabala) and *jalk-a-maz* (Plato) 'having *jalk* hair'.

In the oldest stage of Classical Armenian we only find the verb ***jalk-em*** 'to beat with a rod', ***jalk-im*** 'to be beaten' (2 Corinthians 11.25, also in Eusebius of Caesarea, Čarəntir, Žamagirk'). The attestation in 2 Corinthians 11.25 reads: *eric's jatkec'ay* : *τρὶς ἐρραβδίσθη* "three times I was beaten with rods". Though attested late and absent in the dialects, the noun *jalk* is original, and the verb *jalk-em* is clearly denominative exactly like Gr. *ῥαβδ-ίζω* 'to beat with a rod' from *ῥάβδος* 'rod, twig, staff'. This is corroborated also by the etymology of *jalk*. Note that this very same Greek verb corresponds to Arm. *jalkem* in the passage from 2 Corinthians 11.25.

●DIAL The verb is widespread in the dialects, meaning 'to beat wool with a rod to make it soft' [HAB 3: 144a]. Other semantic nuances: 'to beat someone' in Sebastia [Gabikian 1952: 355] and Svedia [Andreasyan 1967: 250, 372b]; 'id.' and 'to beat the branches of a tree for making walnuts and the like fall down' in Arabkir [Ačarəan 1913: 679a] and Partizak [Tēr-Yakobean 1960: 509]; 'to shake' in Atap'azar [Ačarəan 1913: 679a].

Further see s.v. **jat-t-el* 'to beat'.

●ETYM Since Bugge 1889: 18, linked with Lith. *žalgà* 'long, thin stake', Goth. *galga* 'stake, cross', Oic. *galgi* 'gallows', *gelgja* 'pole, stake', OHG *galgo*, OEngl. *gealga*, Engl. *gallows* (see also Hübschmann 1897: 469; HAB 3: 143-144; Solta 1960: 314-315; Pokorny 1959: 411; Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 97 = 1995, 1: 84; Mallory/Adams 1997: 442b).

The forms are usually derived from IE **ǵ^halg^h*-. In view of the vocalism and the restriction of the word to Baltic, Germanic, and Armenian, one may assume a European substratum word.

On the other hand, it has been assumed that these forms are related with Lith. *žúolis* and Arm. *joł* 'pole', etc., which is possible. For references and a discussion, see HAB 3: 144a; Lehmann 1986: 142b; H. Suk'iasyan 1986: 194; Jahukyan 1987: 170-171. An original paradigm of *jalk*, etc. is reconstructed with nom. **ǵ^holg^h*- vs. gen. **ǵ^hlg^h-n-*, and the Arm. *jalk* with *a*-vocalism and *-k-* instead of *-g-* is explained from the genitive. For the vocalic problems and a further discussion, see s.vv. *je/otun* 'ceiling', *jlem* 'to furrow', *joł* 'pole'.

The above-mentioned solution for the problem of the Armenian *-k-* is not entirely satisfactory (see also Mallory/Adams 1997: 442b). One may rather think of a determinative *-k-* (possibly of iterative function, cf. e.g. dial. *cec-k-el* vs. ClArm. *cecem* 'to beat') in a way reflected also in e.g. *har-k-anem* 'to beat' (cf. H. Suk'iasyan 1986: 90-91). A form **jatg-k-* would be simplified to *jalk-*. Note also another iterative form of this word, **jat-t-el* 'to beat' (q.v.).

Arm. *jalk*, *a*-stem, points to fem. $*g^h(a)lg^h-eh_2-$, cf. OIc. *gelgja* ‘pole, stake’ from $*-ieh_2-$.

IE $*g^halg^h-$ ‘long thin pole’ has been borrowed into PFUgr. **salka*, Finn. *salko*, Mordvin *salgo* (Koivulehto 2001: 238; Witzel 2003: 11).

***jat(k)-t-el** (dial.) ‘to beat, whip’.

●DIAL Karin (*j’atdel*, H. Mkrtč‘yan 1952: 157a), Alek‘sandrapol, Arabkir, etc. **jattel* ‘to beat wool with a rod to make it soft’, *jatt-ič* ‘rod’ [Ačarean 1913: 679a; HAB 3: 144a; Gabikean 1952: 355; HayLezBrbBař 3, 2004: 319a].

●ETYM Belongs with *jatkem* ‘id.’ (HAB 3: 144a) and is possibly related also with *jot* ‘pole’, etc. (see s.vv.).

In order to explain the *-t-* in **jat-t-el*, Ĵahukyan (1972: 281) relates the word to Goth. *gilpa* ‘sickle’ (probably composed of $*g^hel-$ ‘to cut’ and $*(e)tā-$, see Ramat 1974: 78-79; Lehmann 1986: 156a) or posits $*g^hl-d-$ (1987: 127, cf. 170-171, 256). In my opinion, however, **jat-t-em* is in closer relationship with *jatkem* and may be derived from **jatk-t-em*, with the iterative *-t-* seen e.g. in *bek-t-em* vs. *bek-anem* ‘to break’.

jajn, *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 ang‘äv* ‘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 Ařak‘el Bahat‘ryan in 1860 (HŽHek‘ 6, 1973: 687^{L7}).

●ETYM Numerous attempts of connecting with OCS *zvomb* ‘sound’ are rejected on formal grounds (see HAB 3: 144b). More positive: Pokorny 1959: 490; Ĵahukyan 1982: 71-72, 75; 1987: 129 (deriving from $*g^hyn-ji-$); Olsen 1999: 100.

One may assume a $*-ni-$ formation as in synonymous *ban*, *i*-stem ‘speech, word’ from *ba-m* ‘to speak’ < PIE $*b^heh_2-$: 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 $*b^heh_2-sni-$, cf. OCS *basnъ* ‘tale’, Russ. *básnja* ‘fable’, etc. For the loss of $*-u-$ (see Ĵahukyan 1982: 75; Kortlandt 2003: 6, 18, 86, 122; Beekes 2003: 209) cf. perhaps *katal* ‘den’, probably from $*guol-$.

***je-** obl. stem of *du-k*‘ pl. ‘you’: acc.-dat. *jez*, gen. *jer*, abl. *i jēnĵ*, instr. *je-w-k*‘

See s.v. *du* ‘you’.

jetun, *an*-stem: GDSg *jetuan* in Eznik Kołbac‘i, Gregory of Nyssa, Eusebius of Caesarea, etc. ‘ceiling; palate’.

In the main meaning (‘ceiling’), *jetun* is attested since the Bible. For references and a discussion see Thomson 1992: 198.

ISg *jetmamb* (Anania Sanahneč‘i, 11th cent.) presupposes a (probably the original) by-form **jetumn* [NHB 2: 149c; HAB 3: 148a]. For *-u/wn* : *-mn*, see 2.1.22.11.

In John of Damascus, *jetun* refers to ‘palate’: *verin jetunk*‘ *beranoy* ‘upper ceiling of the mouth’.

In Eznik Kořbac'i 1.3 (1994: 12), the sun is metaphorically described as *črag mi i meci tan i mēj jehuan ew yataki* "a candle in the big house between the ceiling and the floor". A similar usage is found in Gregory of Nyssa (NHB 3: 2: 149c; 1010b): *erkin* <...> *zōrēn jehuan* "the sky <...> like a ceiling".

The by-form *jotun-k'* is attested in Severian of Gabala, as well as, in APl *jotun-s* (var. *jehun-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'xank'-i* [Ačarjan 1947: 35, 242]. On Trapizon/Hamšen, see below.

●SEMANTICS For 'palate' : 'ceiling' : 'sky', see 3.7.1.

●ETYM The connection with. Gr. *χελὼνη* 'lip, jaw' (see Adontz 1937: 9; Pokorny 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. *joł* 'log; pole' (see Bediryan 1955: 103; Ałayan 1974: 108-111). Klimov (1998: 285) reconstructs a Georgian-Zan **z₁el-* 'tree, wood', cf. also Megr. *ža-*, 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'awł-un* 'stalk, straw', q.v. For an attempt of reconstructing the original paradigm, see s.v. *joł*.

According to Ačarjan (HAB 3: 148b), Megr. *cxve/ini* 'ceiling' is borrowed from Armenian and resembles especially the Trapizon/Hamšen form *c'xink'*.

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'ł/xwin-k'* (a contamination of *jehun* and *c'uik'*) would be impossible since Arm. *-x-* comes from *-ł-* which is not compatible with Kartvelian **q* (note that the Georgian word is attested in the oldest literature, see Klimov 1964: 167).

Thus, Arm. dial. (Trapizon/Hamšen) *c'xin-k'* 'ceiling' should be separated from *jehun* 'ceiling' and be treated as borrowed from Megr. *cxwen(d)-*, *cxwin(d)-* 'ceiling'.

*jeř-: NAccSg *jeř-n*, AllSg *i jeř-n*, GDSg *jeř-in*, LocSg *i jeř-in*, AblSg *i jeř-an-ē*, ISg *jeř-am-b* (note an archaic instr. *jeř-b-* in compounds); plur. *a*-stem: NPl *jeř-k'*, AccPl *z-jeř-s*, LocAllPl *i jeř-s*, GDPl *jeř-a-c'*, AblPl *i jeř-a-c'*, IPl *jeř-a-w-k'* (extremely rich evidence in the Bible, see Astuacaturean 1895: 921-930) 'hand' (Bible+).

A number of derivatives with *jeř-n-*, *jeř-n-a-*, *jeř-a-*, and *jeř-b-a-*.

●DIAL Ubiquitous in the dialects, mostly as a frozen plural *jeřk'* [HAB 3: 149b].

●ETYM From Pie **g^hes-r-* 'hand': Hitt. *kešsar*, *kiššer-*, *kišr-* 'hand', Gr. *χείρ*, Dor. *χίρ*, gen. *χειρός*, Dor. *χηρός* f. 'hand'⁸⁴, Toch. A *tsar*, Toch. B *šar* 'hand', Alb. *dorë*, *-a* f. 'hand', etc. Hübschmann 1877: 25; 1883: 40; 1897: 470; HAB 3: 148-149; Pokorny 1959: 447; Mallory/Adams 1997: 254b; Adams 1999: 649-650. The root is seen in **g^hés-to-*: Skt. *hásta-* m. 'hand', Av. *zasta-*, OPers. *dasta-* m., MPers. *dast* 'hand', *dastak* 'bunch, bundle' (> Arm. *dastak* 'wrist', HAB 1: 626b), etc., see Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 812.

⁸⁴ The comparison with the Greek word has been suggested already by Awgorean, Klaproth, Brosset, et al., see HAB 3: 149.

Arm. singulative *jeṛn* derives from PIE acc. **ǵʰésr-ṇ*. The trilled *-r̥-* is not due to the following nasal but reflects **-sr-*, as is clearly seen from pl. *jeṛ-k* < **ǵʰésr-es*. The old genitive **jeṛ-* < **ǵʰésr-os* (cf. Hitt. *kišraš*, Gr. *χείρως*, Dor. *χηρός*) has been reshaped after *n*-declension. Archaic instr. **jeṛ-b* continues **je(h)ar-b* < **ǵʰésr-bʰi*. For these and other issues, see Meillet 1936: 78, 83-84; Schmitt 1981: 45, 62, 72-73, 78, 81-82, 102, 199; Kortlandt 1985b: 9; 1985: 19, 23 = 2003: 57, 63, 67; Ravnæs 1991: 101-102; Olsen 1999: 174-175; Viredaz 2000. For a discussion of the PIE paradigm, see Beekes 1973: 90.

Arm. plur. *jeṛ-a-* may be explained by the original feminine gender (Olsen 1999: 175); for a possible **ǵʰésr-eh₂-* cf. Alb. *dórë*, -a f. 'hand' (on which see Pedersen 1900: 341 = 1982: 2; Kortlandt 1986: 40 = 2003: 70; Demiraj 1997: 140-141).

jet, *o*-stem: GDSg *jet-o-y* (Proverbs 26.17), ISg *jet-o-v* (Step'annos Siwnec'i), GDPI *jet-o-c* (Judges 15.4) 'tail' (Bible+), MidArm. 'penis'.

The word refers to the tail of a dog and a fox in Proverbs 26.17 and Judges 15.4, respectively, rendering Gr. *κέρκος* 'tail of an animal' in both passages. In Eusebius of Caesarea and Step'annos Siwnec'i it refers to the tail of a dog and a lion, respectively [NHB 2: 154b].

The passage from Proverbs 26.17 reads: *or buṛn harkanic 'ē zšān jetoy : ὡσπερ ὁ κρατῶν κέρκου κυνός*.

The MidArm. meaning 'penis' is attested in *Datastanagirik'* (Law Code, 1265 AD) of Smbat Sparapet. One of the two attestations (MijHayBaṛ 2, 1992: 58-59) reads as follows: "<...> they cut off the testicles (*z-ju-k'-n*) and the penis (*z-jet-n*) of the abductor" [Galstyan 1958: 103].

●ETYM Connected with Av. *zadah-* m. 'Steiß, Hinterbacken', cf. further Skt. *hādati* 'to defecate', Gr. *χέζω* 'to defecate' < **ǵʰed-jo-*, *-κέχοδα*, *χόδανος* 'Steiß', Alb. *dhjes* 'to defecate', OIc. *gat* 'hole, opening', Russ. *zad* 'rump', etc., Hübschmann 1877: 25; 1883: 40; 1897: 470; HAB 3: 150a with references to Müller and Justi; Pokorny 1959: 423; Chantraine 1968-80: 1249-1250; Euler 1979: 227; Saradževa 1986: 132; Olsen 1999: 54, 44, 47, 854. See also, without the Armenian form, Demiraj 1997: 161-162; Adams apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 187a. Greppin (1985a: 463) notes: "Alb. *dhjes* 'defecate', IE **ǵʰed-* is absolutely not related to Arm. *jet* 'tail'".

The Armenian word is usually derived from *s*-stem **ǵʰedos-* (see especially Matzinger 2005: 44). Armenian *o*-stems regularly continue PIE *s*-stem neuters (see 2.2.2.1). Note, however, that the Avestan cognate is masculine (see Bartholomae 1904: 1657; Hintze 1994: 461). Ĵahukyan (1987: 127) posits **ǵʰed-o-*.

For the semantic shift 'rump' > 'tail' cf. Gr. *ῥπος* 'rump', *οὔρα* 'tail', OEngl. *ears* 'arse', OIr. *err* 'tail, back of chariot', etc. (see s.v. *or* 'rump'). For 'tail': 'rump': 'penis' cf. ÈtimSlovIranJaz 2, 2003: 479-481, s.v. Iran. **dum(b)a-* 'tail'. Note also MidArm. *ag-at* 'castrated' (Grigor Tat'ewac'i, see MijHayBaṛ 1, 1987: 12b) from *agi* 'tail' (q.v.).

jew, *o*-stem: GDPI *jew-o-y* (Bible+), ISg *jew-o-v* (John Chrysostom, Sargis Šnorhali), later also *i*-stem 'shape, fashion, form, mould, pattern' (Bible+), 'clothes, vestment' (John Chrysostom), **jewem** 'to form, shape' (Bible+).

●DIAL Both the noun and the verb are widespread in the dialects. The verb refers to 'form, cut out (said of clothes) [HAB 3: 150b].

●ETYM Since Meillet (1896b: 54), *jew* ‘shape, form’ and *joyl* ‘molten (mass)’ are connected with Gr. *χέρω, -ομαι* ‘to pour, spill, gush, shed, douse’, *χόφανος* m. ‘smelting furnace; funnel’, *χώνη* f. ‘funnel; smelting furnace’, *χυλός* m. ‘juice (of plants), barley-slime, broth’, *χύδαυ* ‘in streams, by heaps, disorderly’, *χυδ-αῖος* ‘abundant, ordinary, common’, Lat. *fundō, fūdī* ‘to pour out, shed; to cast (metals)’, *in-fundō* ‘to pour in’, Skt. *havis-* n. ‘libation, sacrificial liquid, sacrificial substance’ (RV+), *hav-*, pres. *juhóti* ‘to sacrifice, offer, pour (an oblation, ghee, etc.)’, etc., from PIE **ǵʰeu-* ‘to pour’ [Hübschmann 1897: 469; Petersson 1920: 106-107; HAB 3: 150; Pokorny 1959: 447; Klingenschmitt 1982: 57; Mallory/Adams 1997: 448a; Olsen 1999: 36, 47]. Arm. *jew*, *o*-stem, may derive from *s*-stem neuter **ǵʰeu-os* [Olsen 1999: 47] or thematic **ǵʰeu-o-*.

See also s.vv. *zut* ‘pure’, *jagar* ‘funnel’, *joyl* ‘molten (mass)’, *zor* ‘ravine’.

ji, *o*-stem: GDSg *ji-o-y*, ISg *ji-o-v*, GDPI *ji-o-c*, IPI *ji-o-v-k* ‘(abundant in the Bible, Astuacaturean 1895: 932-933) ‘horse’ (Bible+)’.

See also s.v. *dzi* ‘horse’.

●DIAL Dialectally ubiquitous [HAB 3: 152].

●ETYM Since Windischmann et al. (HAB 3: 151-152), connected with Skt. RV+ *háya-* m. ‘horse’ (see also Gosche 1847: 72^{Nr201}; de Lagarde 1854: 27^{L737}; Hübschmann 1877: 17, 25; 1897: 470; Meillet 1936: 142).

Arm. *ji* ‘horse’ and Skt. *háya-* m. ‘horse’ < ‘*Anspornung’ are usually derived from PIE **ǵʰei-* ‘to drive; to throw’: Skt. *hinóti* (3sg.act., present V), 3sg.act.perf. *jighāya* ‘to impel, set in motion; to hurl; to help’, OAv. *zaēman-* n. ‘state of waking’ (‘Wachsein’), Pahl. *zēn* ‘armour, weapon’, etc. (see Pokorny 1959: 424; Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 522, 544-545₁ = 1995: 440-441, 463₁; Lubotsky 1988: 68; Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 802-803; Mallory/Adams 1997: 274b; Cheung 2007: 461-462).

The vocalism of the Armenian form is problematic. Hübschmann (1899: 45) reconstructs **ǵʰēyo-* for Armenian and **ǵʰeyo-* or **ǵʰəyo-* for Sanskrit. Godel (1975: 88-89₇₅) assumes **ǵʰəyo-*, read **ǵʰH-io-*. See, however, s.v. *diem* ‘to suck’. One might also think of **ǵʰeiH-o-*, with loss of the laryngeal as in Skt. *páyas-* n. ‘milk’ (RV+) from **peiH-os-*. The problem with these explanations is that Skt. *háya-* is usually derived from *hay-* vs. *hinóti* ‘to impel, set in motion; to hurl; to help’, which does not have a laryngeal in the root. For other views, see Ravnæs 1991: 30-31.

I propose the following tentative explanation. A QIE **ǵʰei-o-* would yield Arm. **jē = *jei-*. But there are no Armenian words (particles and conjunctions apart) of the type *Cē*. Probably, the original nominative **jē* has become *ji* analogically after the genitive **jēyó(s)yo- > ji-oy*. A similar analysis has been applied to *iž* ‘viper’ (q.v.).

A substantivized **-to*-participle **ǵʰi-to-* as opposed to Skt. *háya-* < **ǵʰoi-os* (or **ǵʰoiH-os* considering the absence of Brugmann’s law) has been assumed by de Lamberterie apud Olsen 1994: 40; see also Viredaz 2005-07: 7-9.

Arm. *ji* ‘horse’ and Skt. *háya-* m. ‘horse’ represent a poetic word, belonging to the ‘language of gods’, as opposed to the PIE word for ‘horse’, viz. **h₁ékwo-* > Arm. *ēš* ‘donkey’ (Güntert 1921: 160; Watkins 1970: 7); for more detail, see s.v. *ēš* ‘donkey’ and 3.12.

See also s.v. *žori* ‘mule’.

jir, *i*-stem: GDSg *jr-i*, ISg *jr-i-w*, GDPl *jr-i-c* (Grigor Narekac'i) 'gift; favour, grace, boon, recompense' in Eznik Kołbac'i, 5th cent. (*jir arnuc'u* 'take a gift', see de Lamberterie 1978-79: 37; Clackson 1994: 181), John Chrysostom, Book of Chries, Nersēs Lambronac'i, Sargis Šnorhali, etc.; **jerem** (Ephrem), **jirem** in Timot'ēos Kuz (6th cent.), T'ēodoros K'rt'enawor (7th cent.), Anania Narekac'i (10th cent.), Xosrov Anjewac'i (10th cent.), etc., **jrem** (Grigor Skewrac'i, 12-13th cent.) 'to donate, gift, endue, do favour'; **jr-i**, *ea*-stem: GDSg *jr(w)oy* (Cyril of Jerusalem), GDPl *je-a-c* (Anania Širakac'i apud NHB 2: 161c, but *Šir. ył. kenac' iwroc'* is not found in the list of bibliographical abbreviations) 'gift, present, favour'; **jr-i** adv. 'without payment, freely, for nothing; in vain', abundant in the Bible, 5th cent. (rendering Gr. *δωρεάν* 'freely'), also attested in Eznik Kołbac'i (5th cent.), Etišē (de Lamberterie 1978-79: 40; Clackson 1994: 236₃₂₈), John Chrysostom, Grigor Narekac'i, Xosrov Anjewac'i, etc.

●ETYM Since long (NHB 2: 158a; Hübschmann 1897: 470), connected with Gr. *χάρις*, *-ιτος* 'grace, beauty; delight, enjoying; boon, gratefulness' and Lat. *grātia* 'grace, good-will, favour'. The appurtenance of the latter is now rejected. We are dealing with a PIE root **ǵ^her-* 'to yearn for'; further cognates are Gr. *χαρά* f. 'joy', *χαίρω* < **χαρι-ω* 'to rejoice, be glad', Lat. *horior* 'to encourage, urge', OEngl. *giernan* 'to yearn' > Engl. *yearn*, Skt. *hāryati* 'to enjoy, like', Toch. B *ker(y)-* 'to laugh', etc. [HAB 3: 153-154]. See also Pokorny 1959: 440-441; Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 804; Mallory/Adams 1997: 158a; Adams 1999: 197; Kulikov 2001: 487-491 (the Armenian form is not mentioned in these works).

Arm. *jir*, *i*-stem, is both semantically and formally close to Gr. *χάρις*, *-ιτος*. The forms may reflect **ǵ^hēr-i-* and **ǵ^hr-i-* respectively [Hübschmann 1897: 470; HAB 3: 153-154]. For a further discussion on this word and on the phrase 'to find favour' I refer to de Lamberterie 1978-79; Clackson 1994: 180-181. In this context, Arm. *jir*: Gr. *χάρις* is equivalent to Arm. *šnorh* 'gift, grace, favour', an Iranian loanword. Note Van dial. *šnoxk* 'a good-natured sprite, house-sprite, brownie, goblin' (see Xaratjan 1989 42b with ref.), which is to be derived from pl. *šnorh-k'* and interpreted as personified 'the Graces' comparable to Gr. *Χάριτες* 'the Charites' and Lat. *Grātia* 'the Graces'.

Arm. *jri*, *-(w)oy*, *-eac* may be derived from QIE **ǵ^hēr-i-to-*: Gr. *χάρις*, *-ιτος* (Hübschmann *ibid.*), or **ǵ^hēr-ieh₂-*. The adverb *jr-i* has been derived from **ǵ^hერიom*, possibly a vřddhi derivative [Olsen 1999: 449]. On the semantics of the adverb *jr-i* 'without payment, freely, for nothing' cf. Lat. *grātis* 'without payment, for nothing' vs. *grātia* 'grace, good-will, favour'. For a thorough discussion of the whole semantic field, see Benveniste 1969, 1: 199-202 = 1973: 159-162.

jiwn, *an*-stem: GDSg *jean* (Bible+), AblSg *i jiwn-ē* (John Climachus), IPl *jeam-b-k'* (Hexaameron) 'snow' (Bible+).

●DIAL Ubiquitous in the dialects [HAB 3: 155a]. In Suč'ava and Nor Naxijewan, *jiwn* 'snow' has been replaced by *b'uk'* and *p'uk'* 'snow', respectively, which continue ClArm. *buk'* 'snow-storm' [HAB 1: 490a; 3: 155a; Ačarjan 1953: 261].

●ETYM Together with *jmeřn* 'winter' (q.v.), derived from the PIE word for 'winter, snow': Gr. *χίον*, *-όνος* f. 'snow', *χειμα*, *-ατος* n. 'winter, storm', *χειμών*, *-ώνος* m. 'id.', *χειμ-έριος* 'hibernal, stormy', *-ερινός* 'concerning the winter, hibernal', Skt. *himá-* m. 'cold, frost', *hímā-* f. 'winter' (both RV+), OAv. GSg *zimō* 'winter', YAv.

NSg m. *ziiā*, AccSg *ziiqm(ca)*, GSG *zəmō*, *zəmahe* ‘winter’, Oss. *zymæg/zumæg* ‘winter’, Pashto *žómay* ‘winter’ (Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 815), Pahl. *zm* [zam], Parth. *zmg* ‘winter’ (MacKenzie 1971: 97), Wakhi *zam*, Sarikoli **zima* ‘snow’ (Morgenstierne 1974: 108a), Pers. *zam* ‘cold; a biting wind; wound’ (Steingass 620b), Hitt. *gimmant-* c. ‘winter’, Lat. *hiems*, *-emis*, *hiemps*, *-emis* f. ‘winter; stormy weather’, OCS *zima* ‘winter’, Lith. *žiemà*, Latv. *ziema* ‘winter’, etc. Hübschmann 1877: 24; 1883: 40; 1897: 470-471; Meillet 1936: 27; Pokorny 1959: 425; Mallory/Adams 1997: 504b.

The PIE word is reconstructed as a HD *m*-stem: nom. **g^héi-ōm* (Arm. *jiwn*, Gr. *χιών* ‘snow’, Av. *ziiā* ‘winter’, Lat. *hiems* ‘winter’), acc. **g^hi-ém-m* (Gr. *χι-όν-α*, Lat. *hiem-em*), gen. **g^hi-m-ós* (Av. *zimō*, Gr. *χι-όν-ος*, Lat. *hiem-is*, Arm. *jean*), loc. **g^hi-m-i* (Hitt. *gim-i*, Lat. *hiem-i* ‘in the winter’), see Beekes 1995: 178; cf. Szemerényi 1959-60a: 122; for Hittite, see Kloekhorst 2008: 475.

Arm. nom. *jiwn* ‘snow’ matches Gr. *χιών* ‘snow’ both formally and semantically (Meillet 1936: 142; C. Arutjunjan 1983: 295-296; Ĵahukyan 1987: 301). Clackson 1994: 137-138 argues that this agreement is an archaism rather than an innovation; the basic meaning of the PIE word may have been ‘snow’ > ‘snow-time’; cf. Szemerényi 1959-60a: 109, 123.

Both languages have generalized *-n* < nom. **-m* throughout the paradigm. The genitive *jean* has been compared with Gr. *χιόνος* (Meillet 1894: 154). In the oblique cases Greek has generalized the *o*-grade but Armenian has generalized the zero grade (Meillet 1936: 45; Clackson 1994: 117). One may assume that the original gen. **g^him-ós* has analogically been replaced by **g^hiṣṣ-ós* after the nominative *jiwn* < **jiwun* or **jiyun* < **g^h(e)j-ōm* and instr. *jeam-b* < **g^hiṣṣ-b^hi*. For a further discussion, see Grammont 1918: 244; Ĵahukyan 1959: 176; Szemerényi 1959-60a: 109; È. Tumanjan 1978: 264-265; Schmalstieg 1980; Ravnæs 1991: 99-100; Stempel 1993 < 1987: 151; Olsen 1999: 135; Matzinger 2005: 22₁₀₈, 103. Further compare *sun* ‘dog’, *stin* ‘breast of a woman’, *tun* ‘house’.

Arm. *jmeř-n* ‘winter’ < **g^him-er-* is comparable to Gr. *χειμερ-ινός* ‘hibernal’ and Lat. *hibernus* ‘of winter, wintry’; compare also Arm. *am* ‘year’ and *amarn* ‘summer’ (q.v.) vs. Skt. *sāmā-* ‘year, season’ and OHG *sumar* (for a discussion, see Hübschmann 1897: 470-471; HAB 3: 156a; Szemerényi 1959-60a; Ālabekyan 1979: 86; Stempel 1993 < 1987: 151-152; Olsen 1989: 225; 1999: 128, 276-278; Clackson 1994: 137-138); Vanséveren 1998.

The PArm. original genitive **jim-* < PIE **g^hi-m-ós* may have been preserved in dial. **jm-et* or **jm-ayt* ‘snow blindness’ (q.v.).

***jlem** ‘to furrow’, attested only in Commentary on 1 Timothy by John Chrysostom, in infinitive *jlel* [NHB 2: 159a]. Another manuscript has *c’elul* instead, thus Ačařyan (HAB 3: 155a) considers *jlel* an uncertain word.

●ETYM Connected with Skt. m. n. *hala-* ‘plough’ by de Lagarde 1854: 20^{L494}. Hesitant are Hübschmann 1883: 13; 1897: 471; Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 808. The Armenian and Sanskrit words have been linked with Lith. *žúolis* ‘dickes Stück Holz, Baumstamm’, Arm. *joł* ‘log, pole’, *jeł-un* ‘ceiling’, Goth. *gilpa* ‘sickle’, etc. (Pokorny 1959: 434; Ĵahukyan 1982: 56; 1987: 127, 171; Mallory/Adams 1997: 435a; sceptical: HAB 3: 155; Olsen 1999: 54₁₁₄); on Gothic see Ramat 1974: 78-79; Lehmann 1986: 156a.

The Armenian verb *jlem* 'to furrow' may be regarded as a denominative based on **jil-* or **jul-* 'plough', cf. *arawr* 'plough' > *arawrem* 'to plough'. The Armenian and cognate forms possibly point to a HD *l*-stem with nom. **g^hoh₁-(ō)l* (cf. Lith. *žúolis*, possibly also Arm. **jul-*), acc. **g^hh₁-el-* (cf. Skt. *hala-*, Arm. **jet-*, perhaps also Goth. *gil-þa*), probably also analogical **g^hh₁-ol-* (cf. Arm. *joł*). For further details, see s.vv. *jałk* 'rod, branch', *jetun* 'ceiling', *joł* 'log, pole'.

The semantic relationship between 'pole, branch' and 'plough' is impeccable, cf. e.g. Skt. *śākhā-* 'branch, twig', Goth. *hoha* 'plough', Lith. *šakā* 'branch', Russ. *soxá* 'plough', Arm. *c'ax* 'branch', dial. **c'ak'* 'harrow'.

It should be borne in mind, however, that *jlem* is an uncertain word.

***jmet'** or ***jmayt'** 'snow blindness' (dial.).

●DIAL Bałeš, Nor Bayazet **jmet'* [Ačařean 1913: 691a], Xotorřur *jimet'* [YušamXotorř 1964: 480a], Xnus-Bulanəx *jmet'* [Melik'ean 1964: 512a]. K'i *cmat'* [HayLezBrbBař 2, 2002: 415b], Urmia, Salmast *cmət* [GwřUrmSalm 2, 1898: 97].

K'esab *cəmet'* < **cm-oyt'* 'pinch' vs. *cəmət'il* 'to pinch' [Č'olakean 1986: 249] obviously belongs to *kcmt'el*, *kčmt'el* 'to pinch' (see s.v. *čm-* 'to squeeze, press') and is hardly related with our word for 'snow blindness'.

●ETYM Obviously derived from PArm. original genitive **jim-* < PIE **g^hi-m-ós* of the word for 'snow, winter', see s.v. *jiwn* 'snow' (Jahukyan 1972: 281; 1987: 127). The component **-et'* or **-ayt'* remains unclear.⁸⁵

jmerñ, GDSg *jmeran* (Paterica, T'ovmay Arcruni), GDPl *jmeran-c'* (var. lect. in Ełišē), NPl *jmerun-k'* in John Chrysostom and Grigor Narekac'i and LocPl *i jmerun-*s in Ephrem (these two forms are found with the meaning 'snow-storm'), ***jmer-** in GDPl *jmer-a-c'* (var. lect. in Ełišē, see below), loc. adv. *jmer-i* 'in the winter' *jmer-i* (Pitařut'iwnk', NHB 2: 160a) 'winter' (Bible+), 'snow-storm' (John Chrysostom, Philo, Ephrem, Grigor Narekac'i, etc.).

Derivatives include: ***jmer-ay(i)n**, gen. *jmeryn-o-y*, loc. *i jmerayn-i* 'winter, cold season, snow-storm' (Bible+); **jmer-ayin** or **jmeř(n)-ayin**, gen. *-aynoy* 'hibernal' (Łazar P'arpec'i, Movsēs Xorenac'i, John Chrysostom, Severian of Gabala, etc.); **jmerani** adv. 'in the winter' (Bible+); MidArm. **jmer-uk** 'water-melon' (q.v.).

A few textual illustrations:

Bazum jmerac' (vars. *jmeranc'n*, *jmeranc'*) *halec'an sařnamanik'* : "The ice of many winters melted" (Ełišē, see Ter-Minasyan 1989: 408^{L4}; transl. Thomson 1982: 247).

Hraman tay jean t'e ler yer kri ew jmeraynoy anjrewac' əst zorut'ean noc'a "He orders the snow, 'Come upon the earth!', and the winter rains according to their power" (Job 37.6, see Cox 2006: 236).

K'anzi ēr heřac'eal getn Erasx, ew i yer karel jmeraynoyn, ew i dařnahot p'č'manē hiwsisoy pałac'eal juleal vtakn, <...> : "for the river Araxes had shifted to a distance, and in the long winter and when the stream froze over from the bitter

⁸⁵ One might speculate on **hayt-* 'to attach, adjust, put together' (on which see HAB 3: 30); thus: 'tied by snow'. For the semantic shift cf. *varak-* 'to tie' > 'to be bound by a disease'. Or else, cf. OIr. *saeth* 'pain, sickness', Welsh *hoed* 'pain', etc. (on which see Mallory/Adams 1997: 413a).

north winds <...>“ (Movsēs Xorenac‘i 2.39, 1913=1991: 165^{L4f}, transl. Thomson 1978: 181).

●DIAL Ubiquitous in the dialects [HAB 3: 156b].

Next to *cmeṛ* ‘winter’, the regular reflex of *jmeṛn* (gen.-dat. *cmṛṅn*, *cmeṛvṅn*, abl. *cmṛṅnā*, Ačaṙyan 1947: 94-95, 242), Hamšen also has *zemer* ‘December’ (see T‘oṙlak‘yan 1986: 219a).

●ETYM Since NHB 2: 159b, compared with Gr. *χειμών*, Lat. *hiems*, Skt. *hīmā-*, Russ. *zima*, etc. ‘winter’. Note especially Gr. *χειμῆρ-ινός* ‘hibernal’ and Lat. *hibernus* ‘of winter, wintry’. For more details, see s.v. *jiwn* ‘snow’.

jmeruk, gen. *jmerk-i* ‘water-melon’ (MidArm.), see MijHayBar 2, 1992: 61b.

●DIAL Widespread in the dialects [HAB 3: 157a]. Agulis *cmbārūk*, gen. *cmbārūk-i*, *cmbārək-i*, pl. *cmbər(n)ātik⁹* [HAB 3: 157a; Ačaṙean 1935: 148, 372; M. Zak‘aryan 2008: 156] has an epenthetic *-b-* after *-m-*, cf. *hamarem* ‘to count’ > Agulis, etc. *hmbāril*.

●ETYM Derived from *jmer-*, oblique stem of *jmeṛn* ‘winter’ (q.v.); cf. Georg. *sazam^hro*, etc. (see HAB 3: 157a).

joṭ, *o*-stem ‘log, bar; pole’. Later, in Grigor Magistros (11th cent., Bjni) and Yovhannēs Erznkac‘i (13th cent.), also ‘a stripe of leather’ (Bible+). MidArm. (Smbat Sparapet, 13th cent., Cilicia) **joti*, in ISg *joṭw-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, Łarabaṭ, as well as (see Ałayan 1954: 315) in Meṙri. Axalc‘xa *j‘oṭ* means ‘back (of the human body)’.

**joti*: Ararat *joti* [HAB 3: 157b], Meṙri *júte* < *joti* [Ałayan 1954: 278b].

●ETYM Probably connected with Lith. *žúolis* ‘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 the literature, see HAB 3: 155, 157b; Fraenkel 2, 1965: 1323; Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 808. Mayrhofer (ibid.) does not mention Arm. *joṭ*. Fraenkel (ibid.) is sceptical to this view, and, with some reservation, connects Lith. *žúolis* to *žālias* ‘grün, roh, ungekocht’ and *žēlti* ‘grünend wachsen, bewachsen, aufgehen (von Pflanzen)’.⁸⁶ He considers the etymology “unsicher”.

On the strength of the relatedness of Arm. *joṭ* ‘log; pole’ with *jetun* ‘ceiling’, *joṭunk‘* (Severian of Gabala; dialect of Akn), and, possibly, Georgian *jeli* ‘log, bar’ etc, one may tentatively propose the following reconstruction: NSg **g^hoh₁-(ō)l* (> Lith. *žúolis* ‘dickes Stück Holz, Baumstamm’; probably also Arm. **jul* ‘plough’ (> *jlem* ‘to furrow’; cf. *arawr* ‘plough’ > *arawrem* ‘to plough’); AccSg **g^hh₁-el-* > Skt. m. n. *hala-* ‘plough’; Arm. **jet-* ‘log (supporting the ceiling)’, and, with *o*-grade, *joṭ* ‘log; pole’ (from analogical **g^hh₁-ol-*). Skt. *hala-* ‘plough’ and Arm. **jet-* ‘log’, *joṭ*, *o*-stem ‘log; pole’ can be interpreted as a shared innovation by means of the thematic **-o-*: **g^hh₁e/ol-o-*, cf. the cases of *erg* ‘song’ and *surb* ‘pure’. For the semantics cf. Russ. *soxá*, etc., see s.v. Arm. *c‘ax*.

***joṭ(-a)-har-i**

⁸⁶ Joachim Matzinger (p.c. apud Olsen 1999: 54) derives Arm. *joṭ* from the same colour root.

●DIAL Metri *jətháre* ‘a kind of poplar-tree’ [Ałayan 1954: 278b, 314], Karčewan *jəthári* ‘a tall tree of which logs/beams (*joł*) are made’ [H. Muradyan 1960: 221a].

Among the villages of the district of Ewaylax (in the province of Siwnik‘) Step‘anos Őrbelean (1250/60-1303/5) mentions *Jahayreank‘*, of which no etymological explanation is known to me. It seems to reflect the above-mentioned Metri form: **jəłahari* + *-an-k‘*.

●ETYM Ałayan (1954: 278b) reconstructs **jołhari* not specifying the structure and the origin.

As is implicitly suggested by H. Muradyan (see above), the compound seems to contain *joł* ‘log; pole’ (> Metri *júte*). The second component is *har-* ‘to beat, strike’, represented in another compound, namely Metri **tírivháre* [Ałayan 1954: 332], Kak‘avaberd *tírivhári* ‘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, namely ‘to cut’, although **terew-har-i* has, unlike **joł-har-i*, an agentive meaning. The actual meaning of **joł-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.).

joyl (spelled also as *joył*, *jiwl*), *o*-stem: GDSg *juł-o-y* (Genesis 24.22, see Zeyt‘unyan 1985: 247: note *joyl* vs. *jułoy* in the same sentence), *i*-stem: IPl *juł-i-w-k‘* (Hamam Arewelc‘i, 9th cent.), cf. LocSg *i juł-i* (*julealk‘ i julin* in 3 Kings 7.24) ‘molten, solid, cast (in particular said of metals); molten mass’ (Bible+), **julem** ‘to smelt, cast; to make solid’ (Bible+), **julacoy** ‘molten’ (Bible+).

Some textual illustrations: *ew ołn iwr joyl* (= Gr. *χρτός*) *erkat‘oy* ‘and its spine is of cast iron’ (Job 40.18, see Cox 2006: 258); in Movsēs Xorenac‘i 2.39 (1913=1991: 165^{L4f}, transl. Thomson 1978: 181): *i dārnahot p‘č‘manē hiwsišoy patac‘eal juleal vtakn* : ‘the stream froze over from the bitter north winds’. For further references and philological analysis, see Olsen 1999: 36.

●DIAL Muš *cul*, only said of silver and blood [HAB 3: 158a]. A textual illustration is found in a Van lullaby (Ř. Grigoryan 1970: 359): *Arewn ijav ver covun, / Covikn ktrav joł arun* ‘The sun set upon the sea, the little sea became solid/molten blood’.

●ETYM For etymology and references, see s.v. *jew* ‘shape, form, mould’. For *-l* see further Klingenschmitt 1982: 57; Ĵahukyan 132; Clackson 1994: 229₁₉₀; and especially Olsen 1999: 36, with an elaborate discussion on alternative solutions with **-lo-* or **-tlo-*. Both *jewem* and *julem* are denominative verbs [Ĵahukyan 1982: 173; Olsen 1999: 36, 47].

jor, *o*-stem: GDSg *jor-o-y*, GDPl *jor-o-c‘*, IPl *jor-o-v-k‘* ‘ravine, valley, bed of torrent’ (Bible+).

●DIAL Ubiquitous in the dialects [HAB 3: 158b].

●ETYM Usually derived from PIE **ǵ^heu-* ‘to pour, spill’: Gr. *χέρω, -ομαι* ‘to pour, spill, gush, shed’, etc., see s.vv. *jew* ‘shape, form, mould’, *joyl* ‘molten (mass)’: **ǵ^houero-* > **ǵ^houoro-* > *jor*, with loss of **-u-* as in e.g. *nor* ‘new’, *sor* ‘cave’ (Petersson 1920: 106-107; Pokorny 1959: 447; Eichner 1978: 150₂₇; Ĵahukyan 1987: 128; 1990a: 9).

Despite the scepticism of Ačařyan (HAB 3: 158b) and Olsen (1999: 31, 943-944), I find this etymology quite attractive. For a formal discussion, see especially s.v. *sor*, *o*-stem ‘cave, hole’ < **kouH-r-o-*. The semantic development ‘to pour, spill, gush’ > ‘bed of torrential stream, ravine’ goes parallel with *hetum* ‘to pour, fill, flow over’, *hetet* ‘flood, torrent’ > *hetet-at* ‘torrent, the place of a torrential stream, ravine’ (q.v.). Note also *corem* ‘to flow’ > *cor-cor* ‘ravine’.

One might alternatively think of a relation with Gr. *χωρος* m. ‘(free, empty) space, region, land’, *χωρα* f. ‘(free, empty) space, interspace, region, estate, land’, Toch. B *kāre* ‘pit, hole’, etc. from **ǵ^hoh₁ro-* ‘gap, empty space’ (Mallory/Adams 1997: 534b; Adams 1999: 153-154). For the semantic relation cf. Arm. *jor* ‘empty space’, ‘belly’, ‘ravine’, ‘district, region’ (see HAB 4: 518-519). The only problem is the vocalism; one expects Arm. **jur*, or, from a zero-grade form, **jar*. Perhaps Arm. *jor* is a blend of **ǵ^he/ou-* and **ǵ^hoh₁ro-*. However, this solution is less probable than the former etymology.

ju, *o*-stem: GDPI *ju-o-c*‘ (Deuteronomy 22.6, Cox1981: 162), AbIPI *i ju-o-c*‘ (Łazar P‘arpec‘i); *a*-stem: IPI *ju-a-w-k*‘ (Zgōn-Afrahāt) ‘egg’ (Bible+).

●DIAL Widespread in the dialects. MidArm. *juacet*, *juvajeł*, *jvazet* ‘omelet’ (MijHayBař 2, 1992: 62-63) is widespread in the dialects as well [HAB 3: 159b]. In MidArm. *ju* also refers to ‘testicle’ [MijHayBař 2, 1992: 62-63]; see also s.v. *xol-orj* ‘orchis’.

●ETYM Since long, derived from the PIE word for ‘egg’ (see HAB 3: 159 for references), cf. Gr. *ᾠόν* n., Lat. *ovum* n., Celt. **awyo-* ‘egg’ (Matasović 2009: 50), OCS *aice*, Russ. *jajcǫ*, Pers. *xāya*, etc. Hübschmann (1883: 40; 1897: 471) rightly considers the etymology uncertain because the initial *j-* is unexplained. Ačařyan (HAB 3: 159) is sceptical, too.

The PIE word for ‘egg’ is now interpreted as a vřddhi-formation derived from the word for ‘bird’ (see s.v. *haw* ‘bird’): **h₂ōuiom*. The Armenian form is usually explained from **iō(w)io-*, with assimilatory addition of **i-* (see Pedersen 1906: 406 = 1982: 184; Pisani 1950: 180, 182; Henning 1954; Pokorny 1959: 784; Frisk 2: 1150; Schindler 1969: 160; Ĵahukyan 1982: 132, 147; 1987: 142, 184; Schrijver 1991: 30, 126, 299-300; Greppin apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 176b; Olsen 1999: 54, 787). Nevertheless, the initial *j-* remains unclear.

For the egg in Armenian folk-beliefs, see A. Israyelyan 1999. On the egg in Indo-European traditions, see Cimino 1994.

jukn, *an*-stem: GDSg *jkan*, ISg *jkam-b*, NPI *jkun-k*‘, API *jkun-s*, GDPI *jkan-c*‘, IPI *jkam-b-k*‘ (abundant in the Bible, Astuacaturean 1895: 935) ‘fish’ (Bible+).

●DIAL Dialectally ubiquitous. Eastern peripheral dialects have preserved the final nasal: Łarabał *cūknə*, Šamaxi *cūg^vnə*, etc. [HAB 3: 160a].

MidArm. *jkn-kul*, lit. ‘fish-swallower’, refers to ‘cormorant’, [Greppin 1978: 10], or ‘Ardea cinerea’ [MijHayBař 2, 1992: 61a], GDSg *jəknkl-u*, is found in *Govank‘ t‘rč‘noc* ‘Praise of birds’ by Kirakos Episkopos, prob. 13-14th cent. (Mnac‘akanyan 1980a: 251^{L198f}; MijHayBař 2, 1992: 61a; transl. Greppin 1978: 11). It is present in a few dialects: Ararat *jknkuli* [Ačařean 1913: 690b], *jkna^kkuli* (used by Perč Prořyan, native to Ařtarak, see Amatuni 1912: 417b and Greppin 1978: 12₇ for the passage), Širak, Van *jknkul* [Mxit‘areanc‘ 1901: 323; Amatuni 1912: 417b], Xnus-Bulanəx

jknkul [Melik‘ean 1964: 512a], Hamšen *cgəngul* [Ačarjan 1947: 242]. For a description of this bird, see Ananyan HayKendAšx 3, 1965: 404-415. Note also Šulaver *jklkuli* ‘tadpole’ [HAB 3: 160a].

The word *jukn* ‘fish’ is also found in a few compounds meaning ‘calf of leg’, see 3.7.3 and s.v. *olok* ‘shin’.

●ETYM Since de Lagarde (Bötticher) et al. (see HAB 3: 160a), connected with the Baltic and Greek words for ‘fish’: OPr. *suckans*, Lith. *žuvis*, Latv. *zivs*, Gr. *ἰχθύς*, -*ύς* m. ‘fish’ [Hübschmann 1877: 25; 1897: 471; Meillet 1936: 142; Pokorny 1959: 416; Mallory/Adams 1997: 205].

Winter (1965: 104) points out that the *-k-* cannot go back to an IE velar **-k/k^w-* or **-g/g^w-* because in the position after **-u-* the (labio)velar would be replaced by the reflex of a palatovelar, and concludes that “it seems impossible not to connect it with the Proto-Indo-European laryngeal reflected by the vowel length of Gr. *ἰχθύς*”. A similar analysis has been given by Kortlandt (1985b: 9 = 2003: 57; see also Beekes 2003: 196) who derives Arm. *jukn* ‘fish’ from PIE AccSg **dǵ^huH-m*. The laryngeal origin of *-k-* is unconvincing. Likewise implausible is the assumption on acc. **ǵ^heuh^m* vs. gen. **ǵ^hhu-es* > PArm. **jegan* vs. **ju-* (see Eichner 1978: 152₃₄). For a further discussion, see Lindeman 1987: 97-98; 1997: 154-157; Rasmussen 1989: 158, 170-171₁₆; Ravnæs 1991: 143₂. The simplest and most attractive explanation is **ju-* + the suffix *-kn* (see 2.1.19).

For a discussion of the relation between Arm. *jukn* ‘fish’ (< **zutH-?* cf. Lith. dial. *žutis* ‘little fish’, Latv. *zutis* ‘eel’) and Georg., Megr. *zutx* ‘sturgeon’, see Jahukyan 1967a: 81, 185₆₄; Klimov 1994: 178-180; Greppin 1997a: 384₅.

ju**tb** ‘roe, spawn’.

Unattested. Used only by Kleopatra Sarafyan, *Banali gitut‘yan*, Sankt-Peterburg, 1788: 64 (in the form *culp* ‘икра’), see HAB 3: 160b; Jahukyan 1967: 100; 1991: 41. Compared with Arm. *ju-kn* ‘fish’ (Tašean apud references above).

Jahukyan (1991: 41-42) compares the component *-tb* with Mlr. reduplicated *lelap*, *lenap/b* ‘kleines Kind’, allegedly from IE **(s)leb/p-* ‘to hang down loosely’: Skt. *rāmbate*, *lāmbate* ‘to hang down limply (said of penis, breasts, etc.)’, MHG *limpfen* ‘to limp’, Engl. *limp* ‘schlaff herabhängend’, etc. (cf. Pokorny 1959: 655-657, 959; Schrijver 1991: 179; Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 436-437). The appurtenance of the Irish word to these IE forms is semantically improbable, so Jahukyan (ibid.) separates it from them and reconstructs an IE **leb^h-* ‘youngling, nestling, child’ for Celtic and Armenian. He derives Arm. *ju-tb* from QIE **ǵ^hū-leb^h-* ‘*fish-youngling’.

I tentatively propose to derive **-tb* from *atb* ‘excrement, dung’. For the semantics cf. dial. *c‘r(-t)-* ‘liquid excrement, dung’ vs. ‘to bear, give birth (said of animals)’, ‘to miscarry (said of animals)’, ‘small fish’, etc. (see Amatuni 1912: 645; Ačarjan 1913: 1058ab), *cirt* ‘dung (of birds and flies)’ vs. *crt-* ‘to spawn’ (see HAB 2: 460b).

Č

čanač‘em, aor. *caneay*, imper. *canir* ‘to know, recognize; to be acquainted, aware’ (Bible+); see also s.vv. **can-* ‘to know’, *can-ak* ‘disgrace’, *ciacan* ‘rainbow’.

●DIAL The verb *čanač'em* is ubiquitous in the dialects. Apart from Karin, Axalc'xa *čanč'el* and Hamšen *ǰənc'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, Łrabał, Agulis, Juła, etc.; and more widespread **čanč'nal* (+ *-n-*; infinitive in *-al*) in the rest. On Aslanbeg, see below. T'iflis has both: *čanánč'il* and *čanč'nal* [HAB 3: 182b].

The form **čanč'nal* seems to represent **čanač'anal* or **čanač'enal*. The latter is attested in Cyril of Alexandria (see NHB 2: 169b, with a note *řmk.* = 'dial.').

Dial. secondary *c'*-aorist is already attested in John Chrysostom (see NHB 2: 169b, with a note *řmk.* = 'dial.').

Ačarıyan (1898: 32b^{L1}, 35a, 85a) represents Aslanbek *köšnal* (aor. *köšc'a* < *čanč'c'a*) as showing exceptional developments *a* > *εə* (= *ö*), and *č* > *k*. In HAB 3: 182b, he has *gεəšna[l]*. See also Vaux 2001: 41, 42, 50: *göšnal*, aor. *göšc'a*. Ačarıyan does not specify the origin of the initial guttural.

Ačarıyan (HAB, *ibid.*) notes that in this meaning (i.e. 'to recognize, be acquainted' – HM) *g'idänil* < *gitenal* 'to know' is used in Svedia.

On Marała *canət'*, see s.v. **can-* 'to know, be acquainted'.

●ETYM Since NHB (2: 169ab), linked with Gr. *γινώσκω*, *γίνωσκω* '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 **-k̄j-* nor **-t̄j-* but not to **-sk̄j-*. In view of the *-t'* of *canawt'*, he is inclined to **-t̄j-*. However, **ǰnh₃-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).

Alternatively, **canač'em* and *canawt'*, *i*-stem, may be derived from QIE **ǰnh₃-k-je-* and **ǰnh₃-k-ti-*, respectively (Pedersen 1906: 348 = 1982: 126; Godel 1975: 80; Weitenberg 1980: 212). Ĵahukyan (1987: 168) points out that in this position **-k-* should drop. With loss of the intervocalic laryngeal, **ǰn(h₃)k-ti-* would yield Arm. **cant'(i)*, see 2.1.22.13. However, the intervocalic laryngeal seems to have been preserved before a cluster (see 2.1.20).

The connection of *canawt'* with Skt. *jñapti-h* 'Erkenntnis, Kunde' (Pokorny 1959: 376-377 and Ĵahukyan 1987: 125, 168, with refer.) is improbable.

*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 *čətšpur*, *čətšpur*, *čutšpur*, Hadrut', Šałaḡ *čutšpur*, Mehtišen *čətšpur* [Davt'yan 1966: 352]; Goris *čətšper*, *čutšper* [Margaryan 1975: 433a].

●ETYM 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- > *čl-. 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 *-l-* one might think of contamination with unattested *čel- ‘acorn’ from *g^welh₂-: Russ. *želud*’, SCr. *žělūd* ‘acorn’, etc. (vs. *g^wlh₂-: Lith. *gilė*, Arm. *kašin*, q.v.); this is highly hypothetical.

Ĵahukyan (1967: 167) mentions *čolopurt* ‘opex’ next to *kašin*, 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: Muš *člmil*. Widespread is ***čm-ř-(t‘-)em** (with metathesis: Aslanbek, Sebastia, Akn **jəřmel*; Salmast *mčřel* (for *mč-*, see also below, on **čmur*); with epenthetic *-b-*: T‘iflis *čmbril*) [Ačārean 1913: 725-726; HAB 3: 207a]. Also widespread is the noun ***čmur**. In Xarberd, Baberd, T‘iflis, Lori, Łarabał: *čambuř*, with epenthetic *-b-* [Ačārean 1913: 725]. In Marała, Moks, Rštunik‘: *mčur*; 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, Muš *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. [Ačārean 1913: 718b, 724-726]. Compare also Van, Bulanəx, etc. *kčmt/t‘el* and Ararat *čmkt‘el*, *čmkt‘el* (Amatuni 1912: 348b) which, together with MidArm. *kcmt‘el*, *kčmt‘el*, *kmčt‘el* ‘to pinch’ (also *kčmtil* in Grigoris, see MiĵHayBař 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‘, Šalař, Mehtišen *čəm-el* or *čəm-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 the Western dialects. It is still in use in Armenia, e.g. in my mother’s village Erazgavors.

Ačāryan (1913: 725a) records Łarabał *čmōril* ‘to trample down’ as identical with **čm-ř-el*, distinguished with a semantic nuance. Strictly speaking, this form reflects **čm-uř-el* (with regular development *-ú-* > Łarabał *-ó-*) and is secondarily based on the noun **čm-uř*: Łarabał *čəmōř(nə)* [Davit‘yan 1966: 421]. Since Łarabał has both the verbs *čəmřél* (Davit‘yan 1966: 421) and *čmōril* and the noun **čm-uř*, the relationship of the forms should be explained as follows: Łarabał *čəmřél* reflects the old, dialectally widespread **čm-ř-el*, which is probably a denominative verb based on **čm-uř* (also present in Łarabał) and comes therefore from **čmur-el*, whereas *čmōril* must be treated as due to secondary restoration of the vowel *-u-* (> *-ó-*).

●ETYM Pedersen (1906: 393 = 1982: 171) connects *čmlem* ‘to press’ and *čim*, *čem* ‘Zaum’ with each other and with Gr. *γένω* ‘he took’, *ῥγ-γεμος*: *συλλαβή*, OCS *žьтq*, *žęti* ‘to squeeze, press’, Mlr. *gemel* ‘fetter’; cf. also Olc. *kumla* ‘quetschen, verwunden’, Norwegian *kumla* ‘Klumpen; kneten, zusammenpressen’, etc.: PIE **gem-* ‘to seize, take; to squeeze, press’. Rejected by Ačāryan (HAB 3: 207a) but accepted by Pokorny (1959: 368) and Ĵahukyan (1987: 125).

M

ma (dial.) ‘mother’, ‘food, eating’ (a nursery word).

- DIAL Van (voc.) *ma* ‘mamma’; Polis *ma* ‘eating’ [Ačarean 1913: 740a, 747b]; Partizak, Hamšen, Karin, Muš, Moks *ma* ‘mamma’ [HayLezBrbBař 4, 2007: 7a].
- ETYM A nursery word probably of IE origin, cf. Skt. *mā* ‘mother’, Gr. *μᾶ* ‘mother’, NEngl. *ma*, etc. See s.v. *mam(a)* ‘mother’.

magil, *a*-stem: GDPl *magl-a-c*‘, IP1 *magl-a-w-k*‘ ‘claw’ (Bible+).

- ETYM See s.v. *ehungn* ‘nail’.

mal ‘bullock, cattle’, in a list of male animal names after *duar* ‘cattle’ (Grigor Magistros’s commentary on the Armenian translation of Dionysios Thrax, see Adonc‘ 1915=2008: 239^{L20}).

The meaning ‘ram’ (NHB 2: 189a) or ‘sheep’ (modern literature, see below) is conditioned by the wrong etymological association with Gr. *μῆλον* ‘sheep’. The dialectal evidence clearly points to ‘cattle’.

- DIAL Axalc‘xa, Karin *mal* ‘cattle’ [HAB 3: 224b]; the same is found in many other dialects [HayLezBrbBař 4, 2007: 10b].
- ETYM The comparison with Gr. *μῆλον* ‘small cattle, sheep and goats’, Celt. **mīlo-* ‘animal’, OIc. *smali* ‘small domesticated animals, esp. sheep’, Dutch *maal* ‘young cow’, etc. (NHB 2: 189a; Scheftelowitz 1904-05, 2: 46; Pokorny 1959: 724; Frisk 2: 226-227; Mallory/Adams 1997: 23b) is untenable. Likewise untenable is the connection with Gr. *μαλλός* ‘flock of wool, fleece’ (Greppin 1981d; for a discussion cf. Hamp 1982c). The Armenian word refers to ‘cattle’ rather than to ‘sheep’, as is frequently cited. Ačaryan (HAB 3: 224; see also Clackson 1994: 182, 232₂₅₀) convincingly identifies the word with MidArm. *mal* ‘property, possession; cattle’ (MijHayBař 2, 1992: 97-98) treating it as borrowed from Arab. *māl* ‘possession’.

malem ‘to grind, crush, break’ (Daniel 2.40 [Cowe 1992: 162], Seal of Faith, Zak‘aria Kat‘olikos, Gregory of Nyssa, etc.), ‘to castrate’ (Bible+); **mul-* ‘to grind; to rub’ in *ml-atac*‘ (*a*-stem in NHB 2: 283a without evidence) ‘miller, corn-grinder’, a compound with *at-* ‘to grind’ (Ephrem, Nersēs Lambronac‘i), and in *ml-ml-em* ‘to rub’ (Nilus of Ancyra, Paterica).

See also s.vv. *mamul* ‘pressing machine’; **ml-i/uk*, **ml-ak* ‘midge; bed-bug; nit’; *mat* ‘sieve’; *mt(m)et* ‘chaff, midge, etc.’; **mut* ‘the grinding of corn’, **mtmo/ut* ‘moth’

- DIAL HAB has no dialectal records for *malem*, *mamul*, *mlmlem*, *ml-atac*‘.

According to Ačaryan (HAB 3: 225a), here belongs Maškert (Xarberd-Arabkir region) *mut* ‘the grinding of corn’ (see also Gabikean 1952: 412).

- ETYM Derived from PIE **melH-*: Skt. *marⁱ*, *mṛṇāti* ‘to crush’, Gr. *μύλη* ‘handmill, mill; (the lower) millstone’⁸⁷, Lat. *molere* ‘to grind’, OIr. *meilid* ‘to grind’, Goth. *malan*, OHG *malan* ‘to grind, mill’, *melm* ‘dust’, OEngl. *melu* ‘meal’, Lith. *malti* ‘to grind, mill’, *mōlē* ‘grist’, Latv. *maīt* ‘to grind, mill’, OCS *mlěti*, *meljō* ‘to grind, mill’, Russ. *molót*‘, *meljú* ‘to grind, mill’, Hitt. *malla-i* ‘to mill, grind’, CLuw.

⁸⁷ The comparison of Arm. *ml-* with Gr. *μύλη* has been suggested already in NHB 2: 283a.

mal(h)u- ‘to break’, *mammal(h)u-* ‘to crush, break’, etc., see Hübschmann 1883: 41; 1897: 471; 1899: 45-46; Meillet 1924: 4-6; HAB 3: 225 with references, 327-328; Pokorny 1959: 716-718; Ĵahukyan 1987: 137-138; Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 319-320; Mallory/Adams 1997: 247a.

Lith. *málti* and Skt. *mṛṇāti* < **ml-né-H-ti* point to a laryngeal, which is usually considered to be **h₁-* on the ground of Gr. *μάλευρον* ‘flour’ (with *a-* probably taken from *ἄλευρον* ‘flour’), Myc. *mereuro* ‘flour’, *meretriya* ‘females who turn the mill’ (Chantraine 1968-80: 662a, 721; Klingenschmitt 1982: 145₄; Schrijver 1991: 103, 394). However, the Luwian evidence points to **-h₂-* (see Kloekhorst 2008: 547).

Meillet 1922m: 259 points out that the vocalism of Umbr. *maletu* agrees with that of Gaul. *malu* and Arm. *malem* ‘je mouds’ and not with that of Lat. *molitum* (see also Speirs 1984: 62-63; for a discussion of the Italic and Celtic forms, see Schrijver 1991: 103; 394, 445; 1995: 81-82). Thus *malem* can be derived from **ml(H)-e-* or **ml(H)-eie-* (for a discussion, see Klingenschmitt 1982: 145-147).

The noun *mamul* ‘press’ represents an iterative reduplication of the type of *karkut* ‘hail’, see Meillet 1898: 280; HAB 3: 243-244. Hübschmann 1899: 46 is sceptical on the etymology because of the semantic difference; note however the semantic development seen in Toch. B *mäl-* ‘to crush, repress, oppress’, *mely-* ‘to crush, squeeze, lay waste’ (on which see Adams 1999: 456-457, 470). For the reduplication type, see further s.vv. *aḷ-a-m-uḷj* ‘darkness, twilight’, *mamuṛ* ‘moss’, cf. also *kerakur* ‘food’ from *ker-* ‘to eat’ (q.v.).⁸⁸ The simplex **mul/t* may be regarded as a secondary creation based on *ma-mul*. On the other hand, one may think of an old derivative **mlH-* (or **molH-*, with *o*-vocalism as in *loganam* ‘to bathe’, q.v., see Schrijver 1991: 394 and espec. 445) with an obscure **-u-* (perhaps due to the labial **m-* before a syllabic resonant; cf. Olsen 1999: 779), compare Gr. *μύλη* ‘handmill, mill’. Some scholars posit **mu(e)lH-*, with an old **-u-* (Rasmussen 1985: 39-41 = 1999: 115-117; Olsen 1999: 27, 953). At any case, the group of **me/al-*, *mamul* and **mul/t* is structurally in a way comparable to *kerakur* and *kur* vs. *ker-* ‘to eat’ (q.v.).

If indeed belonging here, *malem* ‘to sieve’ can be derived from **ml-n-* (cf. Skt. *mṛṇā-* and PToch. **ml-nH-ske/o-*, see Adams 1999: 456-457) with analogical (*n*)-conjugation (cf. *aṛnem* ‘to make’ vs. aor. *ar-ar*, *k’amem* ‘to press’, etc.), unless one treats it as a denominative verb based on *maṭ*, *i*-stem ‘sieve’ < **ml(H)-* + **-ni-*, cf. *i*-stems *ban* ‘word’, *jayn* ‘voice’, etc. The basic meaning of *malem* ‘to sieve’ would then be ‘to pulverize’ < ‘to crush’.

It is not certain that PIE **melH-* ‘to grind’ is identical with **melh₂-* ‘soft’: Gr. *μαλακός* ‘weak, soft, tender’, etc. (Schrijver 1995: 78; cf. Beekes 1969: 198), on which see s.vv. *metk* ‘soft, weak, slack’, *metm* ‘soft, mild, gentle’. At any case, there are forms which probably show an association (either etymological or contamination) between these two sets of words, see s.vv. *metm* ‘soft, mild, gentle, calm; softly, gently’, dial. **m(e)ṭmet* ‘quiet, calm, fine; moth, midge’, *mṭ(m)et* ‘fine chaff, dust’, **mṭ-mo/ut* ‘moth, clothes moth’.

mah, *u*-stem: GDISg *mah-u*; *an*-stem: GDSg *mah-u-an*, AblSg *i mah-u-an-ē*, ISg *mah-u-am-b*, NPl *mah-un-k* (abundant evidence in the Bible, Astuacaturean 1895:

⁸⁸ Note also Skt. intensive *marmartu* ‘er soll zermalmen’ (see Klingenschmitt 1982: 146₆); on this word see, however, Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 319.

956-959) ‘death’, ‘massacre; pestilence’ (Bible+); *marh* ‘death’ (several times in Ephrem, see HAB 3: 233b); *mah-oy* ‘mortal’ (in a homily attributed to Elišē, see HAB 3: 233b).

For a morphological discussion, see Ĵahukyan 1959: 265, 326; 1982: 96, 122-123; Godel 1975: 106; Ē. Tumanjan 1978: 231, 296.

●DIAL Widespread in the dialects. A genitive **mah-man* is present in Polis and Akn [HAB 3: 234a].

●ETYM Arm. *mah* has been considered a native word related with Skt. *mṛtyú-* m. ‘death’, Av. *mərəθīiu-* m. ‘death’, Goth. *maurθr* ‘murder’, etc. (Hübschmann 1897: 472; Pokorny 1959: 735; Ałabekyan 1979: 93-94); for the forms, see Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 371-372; Lehmann 1986: 249). Further see *mard* ‘human being’, *meřanim* ‘to die’.

However, Arm. *mah*, *u*-stem ‘death’ is obviously an Iranian loanword, going back to a form derived from **mṛ-tu-* or **mṛ-ti-u-* (or **mṛtro-*), see HAB 3: 234a and Ĵahukyan 1959: 265, both with hesitation; Bailey 1930-31: 62; Bolognesi 1960: 17-19; Benveniste 1964: 2; Schmitt 1967: 69₄₂₄; 1983: 94; Godel 1975: 64; Ĵahukyan 1982: 123, 223₆₃; Ĵahukyan 1987: 181, 533, 551₇₂, 560, 562; L. Hovhannisyán 1990: 250-251; Olsen 1999: 859, 893.

mat̄, *i*-stem: GDSg *mat̄-i* (Plato), IPI *mat̄-i-w-k̄* (Paterica); *n*-stem: *i mat̄in-s* (Sirach 27.4/5); *o*-stem: GDPI *mat̄-o-c̄*, IPI *mat̄-o-v-k̄* (several attestations in Hexaemeron with the meaning ‘honeycomb’, see K. Muradyán 1984: 263-266) ‘sieve, winnowing basket’ in Sirach 27.4/5 (corresponding to Gr. *κόσκινον*) and Paterica, ‘basket’ in Plato, ‘honeycomb’ in Hexaemeron (see above), Evagrius of Pontus, John Chrysostom, Grigor Astuacaban; *mat̄em* ‘to sieve’ (Bible+).

●DIAL Ubiquitous in the dialects [HAB 3: 237a].

●ETYM Tērvišean and Müller (see HAB 3: 237a) connected *mat̄* to the group of *malem* ‘to grind, crush, break’ (see there for more detail). Ačarıyan (HAB *ibid.*) does not accept the comparison and leaves the origin of the word open.

mat̄, *i*-stem ‘prayer, supplication’ (IPI *mat̄-i-w-k̄* in Plato and Nersēs Šnorhali); *mat̄'em* ‘to implore, prey’, in Wisdom 13.18 (rendering Gr. *ἱκετεύω*), etc (Bible+).

In ModArm., *mat̄'el* means ‘to wish something to someone’ [Malxaseanc̄ HBB 3: 244a]. According to A. A. Abrahamyan (1970: 100-101, with discussion; 1994: 88/89), this meaning occurs in a troublesome passage from Eznik Kołbac̄i 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. *māldⁱ/mald-* ‘to recite, make a vow’, OS *meldōn* ‘to report, tell’, etc.) point to **me/old^h-* or **-d-*; therefore for Armenian a different form is postulated, namely **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 *mat̄* beside PIE **mel-d^h-* implies that either the Armenian word is a loan, or the **-d^h-* is a determinative, and Arm. *-t̄* 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 *małt'ēm* as a denominative verb based on *małt'*, *i*-stem, which can be explained as a **ti*-deverbative with a regular zero-grade: **mld^h-ti-* > PArm. **mał(d)t^hi-* > *małt'*, *-i*. See 2.1.22.13.

mam, *u*-stem ‘grandmother’ (Middle Armenian), hypocoristic *mam-ik* [HAB 3: 242a; MiġHayBař 2, 1992: 194]; dial. *mam(a)*, *mam-i(k)* ‘grandmother, mother’.

The plant-name *mamxopop* mentioned here by Ačařyan (HAB 3: 242a) belongs rather with *mamux* ‘a kind of wild plum’.

●DIAL The forms *mam*, *mama*, *mami*, *mamik* are widespread in the dialects, mostly meaning ‘grandmother’. In some dialects: ‘grandmother’, ‘nurse, midwife’, ‘old woman’, etc. Note voc. forms: Van *máma*, Muř, Byut‘ania *mámə*, etc. [Amatuni 1912: 456b; Ačařean 1913: 747-748; HAB 3: 242-243; HayLezBrbBař 4, 2007: 19].

●ETYM Ačařyan (HAB 3: 242) considered a borrowing from Gr. *μάμη* ‘mother, mother’s breast, grandmother’. This view is untenable since such a widespread nursery word would hardly be a Greek loan. One rather posits a nursery word of IE origin [Ĵahukyan 1972: 300; 1987: 56, 136, 179, 275, 427; Huld apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 386a]⁸⁹, cf. Lat. *mamma* ‘mother, nurse, grandmother, mother’s breast’, Lith. *mamà*, Russ. *máma*, Welsh *mam* ‘mother’, NPers. *mām* ‘mother’, etc. For further IE and non-IE forms and a discussion, see HAB 3: 242; Pokorny 1959: 694; Szemerényi 1977: 8; Huld apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 386a.⁹⁰

Note also *ma* ‘mother; food’ (q.v.), comparable with Skt. *mā* ‘mother’, Gr. *μᾶ* ‘mother’, NEngl. *ma*, Chinese *mā* ‘mother’, etc. Further see s.vv. *mama* ‘food, bread, eating’ and **mam-uk* ‘spider’.

mama (dial.) ‘food, bread, eating’.

●DIAL Polis *mam(m)a* ‘food’, Ararat *mama* ‘eating’ [Ačařean 1913: 747b], Sebastia *mama* ‘bread’ [Gabikean 1952: 386], etc. [HayLezBrbBař 4, 2007: 19b].

●ETYM A nursery word probably of IE origin. Further see s.vv. *mam(a)* ‘grandmother, mother’, *p‘ap‘a* ‘bread, food’.

***mam-uk** (dial.) ‘spider’.

●ETYM Composed of *mam* ‘mother, grandmother’ (cf. also *mam-ik* ‘id.’, see s.v.) and the diminutive suffix *-uk*. For the dialectal forms and for other examples of the semantic development ‘grandmother’ > ‘spider’ or ‘scorpion’ or ‘snail’, see 3.5.2.1.

mamul (*o*-stem: GDSg *maml-o-y*, GDPI *-o-c*‘ NHB 2: 200c without evidence) ‘squeezing implement, pressing machine’ (Agat‘angelos, Anania Širakac‘i, etc.), ‘the essence or purpose of a book’ (Evagrius of Pontus, etc.).

●ETYM See s.v. *malem* ‘to crush, grind’.

mamuř (*o*-stem according to NHB 2: 200c without evidence) ‘moss’ (Hexaemeron, Gregory of Nyssa, Paterica, etc.); *mamř-a-xndir* ‘moss-searching’ in Łazar P‘arpec‘i (1904=1985: 10^{L2}).

●DIAL Widespread in the dialects [HAB 3: 244b].

⁸⁹ Ĵahukyan (1987: 179) points out that Polis *mami* ‘nurse, midwife’ is obviously of Greek origin. Also *apomam* is a Greek loan (cf. s.v. *pap* ‘grandfather’).

⁹⁰ Georg. *mama* ‘father’ vs. *deda* ‘mother’ is noted already in NHB 2: 200b.

In a fairy-tale based on a folk-motif and written by H. T'umanyan (5, 1994: 227^{L16}), native of Lori, one finds *mur* referring to the green moss on stones in a river.
 ●ETYM Since Bugge 1893: 17, connected with OIc. *mosi* m. 'moss, moorland', OHG *mos* n. 'moss, marsh', Russ. *mox* 'moss', Lith. *mūsaĩ* pl. m. 'mould', *mūsos* 'id.', Lat. *muscus* m. 'moss', etc. HAB 3: 244 with references (Ačāryan himself does not accept the etymology); Pokorny 1959: 742; cf. Mallory/Adams 1997: 385b without Armenian.

Greppin (1981b: 6) considers the etymology as "impossible since Armenian does not show evidence for rhotacism". In fact, the Armenian form is usually explained as a reduplication of **mur* < **mus-ro-* (Bugge 1893: 17; Pokorny 1959: 742; Ĵahukyan 1987: 139, 182). The addition of **-ro-* may have been triggered by an influence of *mawr* 'mud, marsh'⁹¹, which is often taken as etymologically identical with *mamur* (cf. Ĵahukyan 1982: 70); note especially Russ. *murók* 'meadow grass', SCr. *múra* 'mud, clay', Lith. *máuras* 'mud', *mauraĩ* 'duckweed, silt, mud', Latv. *maĩrs* 'grass, lawn', etc. (for the forms, see ĒtimSlovSlavJaz 20, 1994: 191-195; Derksen 2008: 331). Most interesting is the direct equation of PArm. **mus-r-* with Slav. **mъx-r-* 'thin moss on trees and stones' explicitly stated in ĒtimSlovSlavJaz 20, 1994: 215-216, 217.

For the type of reduplication cf. *ka-rkut* 'hail' vs. OCS *gradъ* 'hail', *ma-mul* 'squeezing implement, pressing machine' from *malem* 'to crush, grind' (see s.vv.).

If reliable, dial. *mur* may be an archaic relic of the simplex **mur* < from **mus-ro-*.

***mayem** 'to bleat (of the sheep)' (Lex).

●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 (*mayuyel*), Akn (*me*yan* 'a cat that mews a lot'), Šamaxi *māyvъ*c* 'miaow' [HAB 3: 245a]. The Van form has an initial *p-*: *payel* (see also Ačāryan 1952: 279), which represents *bayel* (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', *āmīmet* 'brüllte', *mémyant-* 'meckernd', *māyū-* m. 'das Blöken, Brüllen' (RV+); Gr. *μηκάομαι* '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 reconstruct **meh₂-i-*. From this one may perhaps derive Iran. **maišá-* 'sheep' (Skt. *mešá-* m. 'ram, male sheep', f. *mešī-* 'female sheep'; YAv. *maēša-* 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. **maišá-* 'sheep' can reflect **meh₂i-so-*.

For a possible *k*-suffixation, see s.v. *mak'i*.

mayr₁ : GDSg *mawr*, ISg *mar-b*, NPl *mar-k'*, GDPl *mar-c'*, IPL *mar-b-k'* 'mother' (Bible +).

●DIAL Ubiquitous in the dialects [HAB 3: 247a].

⁹¹ Note also the synonymous *lawr* 'moss'.

●ETYM From PIE **meh₂ter-* f. ‘mother’: Skt. *mātár*, GSg *mātūr*, Gr. *μήτηρ*, *μητέρα*, Dor. *μάτηρ* ‘mother’, Lat. *māter*, OEngl. *mōdor*, Lith. *mótė* ‘wife; (dial.) mother’, etc., see Hübschmann 1897: 472; HAB 3: 246-247 with lit.

See also s.vv. *mawru* ‘stepmother’ and *mayr₂* ‘cedar, etc.’.

mayr₂, *i*-stem: GDPl *mayr-i-c*‘, IPl *mayr-i-w-k*‘ ‘cedar; pine’, prob. also ‘juniper’, etc. (Bible+).

In Biblical attestations Arm. *mayr* frequently corresponds to Gr. *κέδρος* ‘cedar’, *κέδρινος* ‘of cedar-wood’. In an enumeration of tree-names from 2 Paralipomenon 2.8 (Xalat‘eanc‘ 1899: 57a), Arm. *mayr* seems to render *ἄρκευθος* ‘juniper, *Juniperus macrocarpa*’ (see s.v. *katamax* for the passage). Elsewhere in Paralipomenon, however, it corresponds to Gr. *κέδρος* ‘cedar’, *κέδρινος* ‘of cedar-wood’: *p‘ayt mayr* : *ξύλα κέδρινα* in 1 Paralipomenon 14.1, *i tačars mayrakop‘eays* : *έν οἴκῳ κεδρίνω* in 17.1, *tačars mayrakop‘s* : *οἶκον κέδρινον* in 17.6, *p‘aytamayr* : *ξύλα κέδρινα* in 22.4, *zmayr p‘aytn* : *τάς κέδρους* in 2 Paralipomenon 1.15, etc. (Xalat‘eanc‘ 1899: 28a, 32b, 33a, 40b, 56a).

The word sometimes renders Gr. *πεύκη* ‘pine’, e.g. *erkus durs i p‘aytic‘ mayric‘* : *δύο θύρας ξύλων πευκίνων* (3 Kings 6.32); *etewnap‘aytiwk‘ ew p‘aytiwk‘ mayric‘* : *έν ξύλοις κεδρίνοις καὶ έν ξύλοις πευκίνου* (3 Kings 9.11).

In Psalms, Arm. *mayr* corresponds to Gr. *κέδρος* ‘cedar’ (28.5, 36.35, 79.11, 91.13, 103.16, 148.9). It is therefore clear that *mayr*, *-i-c*‘ ‘cedar’ is distinct from *mayri*, *-e-a-c*‘ ‘woods’ both formally and semantically, note *gtak‘ zna i dašts mayreac‘* : *εὔρομεν αὐτήν έν τοῖς πεδίοις τοῦ δρυμοῦ* (Psalms 131.6). Here thus *mayri* = Gr. *δρυμός* ‘bush, thicket’. In Hexaemeron homily 5, however, *mayr* occurs three times, rendering Gr. *κέδρος* ‘cedar’, *δρυμός* ‘bush, thicket’, and *πίτυς* ‘pine, fir, spruce’, see K. Muradyan 1984: 142^{L17}, 151^{L5} (on these passages see 340⁵⁷, 341⁷²), 162^{L7}; glossed 375b.

●ETYM The connections with OCS *smrěča* ‘juniper’ and *smřča* ‘cedar’ (Bugge 1893: 17-18; see also Hübschmann 1899: 48 and HAB 3: 248a with references to Pictet and Brugmann) and Latv. *mītra* ‘box-tree’, etc. (Lidén 1905-06: 493-494) are formally difficult. In the additional list of possible correspondences, in the last chapter of his book on PIE trees, P. Friedrich (1970: 151^{Nr20}, cf.45) links Arm. *mayr* with Latv. *mītra* ‘box-tree’, OCS *smrěča* ‘juniper’, *smřča* ‘cedar’. These forms have been compared with Proto-Finno-Ugric **mor3* ‘tree species’, Proto-Lapp **mōre* ‘tree’, Hungarian *mór* ‘spruce’, as well as with Tungus dialects *mar* ‘spruce’ (Campbell 1990: 163); cf. also Egypt. *mrw* ‘Lebanese cedar’, etc. (see Illič-Svityč 1976: 45; Bomhard 2008, 2: 819-820).

Jahukyan (1987: 137, 212, 231, 398) keeps citing the word as *mayri* (semantic paragraph 8.64), and once (264) – *mayr(i)*. In fact, the word (denoting a kind of tree) only appears as *mayr*, and the form with *-i* refers to ‘woods’ and ‘den, lair’, see s.vv. *mayri₁* and *mayri₂*, respectively.

Many attestations show that the wood of the tree *mayr* was used as building-material. One therefore connects the word with Lat. *māteria*, *māteriēs* ‘material, building materials; timber; subject-matter’ and Arm. *mayri* ‘forest, woods’ (q.v.), deriving them, as has been suggested by Müller 1890: 4, from the IE word for ‘mother’ (cf. *mayr₁* ‘mother’, q.v.), see also HAB 3: 247-248; Olsen 1999: 83-84. The basic meaning is thus ‘timber, wood’ > ‘woods’.

On the strength of the semantic and formal resemblance of *mayr* ‘cedar, pine’ with Proto-Finno-Ugric **mor3* ‘tree species’, Hungarian *mór* ‘spruce’, Tungus dialects *mar* ‘spruce’, Egypt. *mrw* ‘Lebanese cedar’, etc., as well as the Armenian forms with aberrant vocalism *mori* ‘forest’ (q.v.) which seems to somehow correspond to the labial element of some non-Armenian forms, one may assume a PArm. **marw* ‘cedar, pine, etc.’ or the like, a wandering tree-name, with a subsequent contamination with *mayri* ‘timber, wood; woods’.

mayri₁, *ea*-stem: GDP1 *mayre-a-c*‘ (Bible+), cf. also DLocSg *mayr-w-oj*‘ (Alexander Romance) ‘woods, forest, thicket’ (Bible+).

Some textual illustrations:

In Deuteronomy 19.5 (Cox 1981: 152): *ew or ok’ mtanic’ē and ankeri iwrum i mayri harkanel p’ayt* ‘and when a man goes into the forest with his friend to cut wood’. In Psalms 131.6: *gtak’ zna i dašts mayreac’*: *εὐρομεν αὐτήν ἐν τοῖς πεδίοις τοῦ ὄρουμοῦ*.

In Eñišē (Ter-Minasyan 1989: 46^{L19f}, transl. Thomson 1982: 77): *leranc’ ew daštac’ ew mayreac’* ‘on the mountains and plains and forests’.

In Movsēs Xorenac’i 2.41 (1913=1991: 166^{L14}): *Tnkē ew mayri mec <...>. Ew anuanē zantarn Cnndoc’*: ‘He also planted a great forest <...>. And he called the forest *Cnndoc’* (Genesis). Thomson (1978: 182) translates *mayri* as ‘forest of fir trees’. However, *mayri* is a generic term for ‘forest’. Note that according to P’awstos Buzand 3.8 (see Garsoian 1989: 75) this forest appears to be of oak (*katin*).

Similarly, the passage from 2.49 (177^{L1}), *Jeřntu lini nma ew Erasx p’aytiwk’ mayreac’*, is translated by Thomson (1978: 190) as follows: ‘The Araxes [river] provided him with pine wood’. In fact, *p’aytiwk’ mayreac’* should be understood as ‘with wood of forests’. Note also 2.6 (1913=1991: 108^{L5}), *i gijin ew i maraxlut telis mayreac’*, correctly translated by him (p. 135) as ‘to the wet and foggy regions of forests’.

The word *mayri* ‘woods, thicket’ seems to be identical with *mayri* ‘den, lair’ (q.v.). Note that both have aberrant alternative form *mori* (q.v.). For the contextual basis of this relation note e.g. the following attestations from the Alexander Romance (H. Simonyan 1989: 423^{L12}, 463^{L-2}, 476^{L14}): *gazank’ bazumk’ elin i mayrwoc’n* ‘numerous beasts came out of the woods’; *p’axean ew mtin i mēj mayrojñ* ‘they ran away and enter into the forest’; *banakec’an i mēj mayrwoj mioy* ‘they camped in a forest’. Note also Job 38.40 (Cox 2006: 248).

●DIAL Preserved in the dialects of Ařtial, Xotrjūr, Karin, Alaškert, T’iflis, Ararat, Moks [HAB 3: 248b]. Of these the Ařtial form *mōri* deserves particular attention. It is recorded from Suč’ava, Poland (see Ačarıyan 1953: 279), and Hungary (p. 194). For textual evidence, see op. cit. 251 (twice). The development *ay > ɔ* is not regular for Ařtial (cf. Ačarıyan 1953: 46-49). Interestingly, this dialectal form seems to be attested in this dialectal area since the 16th-century. For this and other MidArm. and dialectal attestations, see s.v. *mori*₁ ‘woods’.

In other dialects the word has been preserved in compounds, e.g. **mayri-a-haw* lit. ‘bird of woods’ > Łarabał *mir(i)háv*, Hadrut’ *miriháv* [Davt’yan 1966: 423], and Goris *mə/irhav* [Margaryan 1975: 443a], probably referring to ‘a kind of pheasant’ (Ananyan HayKendAšx 3, 1965: 184; Margaryan 1975: 443a; Bakunc’ 1, 1976:

72ff, 177ff, note by R. Išxanyan in 630) or ‘heath-cock, black-cock’ (see Lisic‘yan 1969: 141₅₈, glossing *mirhav* by Russ. *memepes*).

●ETYM Ačařyan (HAB 3: 247b) compares the word with Lat. *materia*, *materiēs* ‘material, building materials; timber; subject-matter’, which is possibly derived from the IE word for ‘mother’ (see s.v. *mayr*₁ ‘mother’). For this explanation of the Latin word (without Armenian), see Ernout/Meillet 1959: 390; Schrijver 1991: 384; de Vaan 2008: 367.

For the semantic development cf. also Pahl. *mādag* ‘essence, substance’ from *mād* ‘mother’, cf. *mātak* ‘female’, Arm. *matak*, etc. (see MacKenzie 1971: 53; Nyberg 1974: 128-129; HAB 3: 266-267). Note also Gr. *μήτρα*, Ion. *-η* f. ‘womb’ > ‘core, heart-wood of trees’.

For ‘wood’ > ‘forest’ cf. Fr. *bois*, Engl. *wood-s* (see s.v. *an-tar* ‘forest’; further see Jahukyan 1987: 137; Olsen 1999: 441). For the semantic relationship ‘pine-tree’ : ‘pinewood’ : ‘pine forest; coniferous forest; forest’ cf. OCS *боръ* and relatives (see Tolstoj 1969: 22-43; ĖtimSlovSlavJaz 2, 1975: 216-217). Another example can be found in Chirikba 1985: 102^{Nr79}.

The Latin word vacillates between the *iē-* and *iā-* declensions (for a discussion, see Steinbauer apud Mayrhofer 1986: 133, 133₁₅₀; Schrijver 1991: 367-370). If one assumes *-ia* < **-i(e)h₂-* and *-iēs* > **-ieh₁-*, the Armenian forms may be explained as follows: **meh₂ter-ieh₁-* > PArm. **máyrī-* ‘wood (as building material)’ > Arm. *mayr*, *i*-stem (tree); **meh₂ter-ieh₂-* > PArm. **mayrī(y)ā-* ‘wood (as building material); woods, forest’ > Arm. *mayri*, *-eac*’.

Arm. *mayri*₂ ‘den, lair’ (q.v.) is equated with *mayri*₁ ‘woods’ < ‘woods as dwelling-place for beasts’ (see HAB 3: 247b). It has a parallel classical form *mori*₂ ‘den, lair’ (q.v.). The vocalic correspondence *ay* vs. *o* is not clear (for a suggestion, see s.v. *mayr* ‘cedar, pine’). Arm. *mori*₁ ‘woods’ (q.v.) seems to be an important intermediary between class. *mayri* ‘woods’ and *mayri/mori* ‘den, lair’.

mayri₂, *ea*-stem: GDAblPI (*i*) *mayr-e-a-c*‘ (e.g. *i mayreac*‘ *arīwuc*‘ : *ἀπὸ μανδρῶν λέοντων* in Canticum 4.8) ‘den, lair’ (Bible+).

●ETYM Probably derived from *mayri*₁ ‘woods’ (q.v.). The basic meaning of *mayri*₂ (and *mori*₂) ‘den, lair’ is, then, ‘woods as dwelling-place for beasts’.

Alternatively, *mayri* ‘den, lair’ may be regarded as a substratum word, cf. Gr. *μάνδρα* f. ‘fold, pound, stable’ (also ‘cloister’ in *ἀρχι-μανδρίτης* ‘chief of a cloister, abbot’) and Skt. *mandirā-* n. ‘dwelling, house’, *mandurā* f. ‘stable’; cf. the phonological correspondence between Gr. *ἄτρον* ‘cave’ and Arm. *ayr*₂ ‘cave’ (q.v.). This is uncertain, however.

maškat‘ew, an epithet of the bat (*č‘ljikan*) in Hexaameron, homily 8, as an adjective describing the bat (see K. Muradyan 1984: 259^{L2}) or a 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 “Bžškarán” and Bařgirk‘ hayoc‘ (see Amalyan 1975: 209^{Nr137}, 264^{Nr38f}). Its only attestation is found, according to HAB 3: 261a, in Ařak‘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” *čəłjikan* (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'řč'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 zšēkn 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 *mašketep* ‘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 Ačarıyan 1947: 213, although it is not listed in the glossary of the monograph. See also s.v. **maškat'it'er/tn*. Note also Xotorjur *maškt'ep* ‘bat’ (see YušamXotorj 1964: 487a). Compare the Turkish *-p*. As Uwe Bläsing points out to me, 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 Ačarean 1913: 549a and 959b, respectively.

The word seems to have been borrowed into Georgian (*mač^hk^hat^hela*) and Udi (*mäškätıl*) [HAB 3: 261a; AčarHLPatm 1, 1940: 206-207; Ĵahukyan 1987: 591]. Ačarıyan 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'el*, with **t'it'etn* ‘butterfly’ (dial. **t't'el*) as the second member; see s.v. **maškat'it'er/tn*.

***maškat'it'er'n** ‘bat’, ***maškat'it'etn** ‘butterfly’.

●DIAL The word is found 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'el* 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. *περὸν* 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'er/tn* is composed of *mašk* ‘skin’ and *t'it'er'n* 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 *mäškätıl*, see s.v. *maškat'ew*.

mat- in *matč'im*, *matnum* (aor. *mateay*) ‘to approach, come close’ (Bible+); *mawt* ‘near, close’, also *i mawtoy* and *mawtim* ‘to approach’ (Bible+). *matoye*‘ (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. *matn*₂.

- DIAL *mōt* (= *mawt*) is widespread in the dialects [HAB 3: 373].
- 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 *matam-b*, NPl *matun-k*‘, GDPl *matan-c*‘ ‘finger; toe’ (Bible+).

- DIAL Dialectally ubiquitous. In Agulis, the meaning ‘finger’ is represented by *būt* ‘< *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’ (see Pokorny 1959: 703-704). The Armenian word would require **mh₁-d-*. Uncertain. If this is accepted, note the semantic relationship ‘finger’ : ‘thumb’ seen also in Agulis.

matn₂ ‘hill-side’; dial. ‘hill; slope’. Geoponica (13th cent.).

According to Ačařyan (HAB 3: 271a), the oldest attestation of teh root is found in Joshua 15.7: *ijanen i Gałgal, or ē handēp matuc* ‘in Odomimay : καὶ καταβαίνει ἐπὶ Γαλγαλ, ἣ ἐστὶν ἀπέναντι τῆς προσβάσεως Ἀδδαμιν. RevStBible here has: “turning toward Gilgal, which is opposite the ascent of Adummim”. Ačařyan points out that *matoyc*‘ corresponds to Hebr. ‘ascent’ and therefore means *zariver* ‘precipice, ascent’. However, Arm. *matoyc*‘ (GSg *matuc* ‘-i’) renders Gr. *πρόσ-βασις* f. ‘access’ and belongs with Arm. *mat-č*‘-im (*mat-uc*‘-) ‘to approach’, as correctly suggested in NHB 2: 215c (“*yařaj matč*‘umn”).

- DIAL Preserved in Lori *mat*, Zeyt‘un *məd* ‘hill’, Č‘arsančag *mad* ‘slope of a mountain’ [HAB 3: 271]. Ačařyan (2003: 13) mentions the Zeyt‘un form in his list of MidArm. : Zeyt‘un correspondences.
- ETYM No acceptable etymology is recorded by Ačařyan (HAB 3: 271a). He points out that the resemblance with Arab. *matn* ‘plateau’ and Syr. *maṯā* ‘earth, land’ is accidental. Bediryan 1956: 43 derives *matn* from *mat-* ‘to approach’, which is semantically unattractive.

Žahukyan (1972: 282; 1973: 21) compares *matn* 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 the word is not identical 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 identical with *koł* ‘rib’, and *tap*‘er. A comparable semantic relationship may be seen in PIE **pr-sth₂-* ‘standing before’: Lith. *pirštas* ‘finger’, OCS *prьstь* ‘finger’ : Skt. *pr̥ṣṭhā-* n. ‘back, mountain ridge’ (RV+), YAv. *paršta-* m. ‘back, spine, support in the back’ (see s.v. *erastan-k*‘). Note also Arm. Łarabał *pūt*‘nə ‘hill or rock’ (L. Harut‘yunyan 1991: 52^{L17}) vs. *boyt*‘n ‘thumb’ (q.v.).

mard, o-stem: GDSg *mard-o-y*, GDPl *mard-o-c*‘, pl. more frequently *mardik*, gen-dat. *mardk-an*, abl. *i mardkan-ē* (abundant evidence in the Bible, Astucaturean 1895: 979-986) ‘man, human being’ (Bible+). In the Bible, Arm. *mard* usually renders Gr.

ἄνθρωπος ‘man’, but in Job it several times stands for *βροτός* ‘mortal man’ (NHB 2: 219b; Cox 2006: 92 et passim).

●DIAL Dialectally ubiquitous [HAB 3: 279-280]. Next to the meaning ‘man, human being’, widespread is also ‘husband’ [Amatuni 1912: 196, 467a; Ačařean 1913: 761-763; HayLezBrbBař 4, 2007: 34b].

●ETYM From IE **m̥r-tó-* ‘mortal’: Gr. *βροτός* ‘mortal’, cf. Av. *maš(ii)a-* ‘man’, Skt. *mṛtá-* ‘died, dead’, *a-mṛta-* ‘immortal’, etc., Hübschmann 1897: 472-473; Pokorny 1959: 735; Meillet 1936: 74; Clackson 1994: 237₄; Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 318; Mallory/Adams 1997: 150a, cf. 366b. Here seems to belong Jatvingian *mard* ‘man’, unless this is to be identified as a variant of Old Polish *smard* ‘plebeius’ (see Schmalstieg 1986).

For a discussion of this PIE term, see also Thieme 1952: 15-34; Euler 1979: 125; H. Katz 1983. For a discussion on pl.-coll. *mard-ik(n)*, see Meillet 1913: 54, 70-71; 1936: 85; Jokl 1984: 20; Olsen 1999: 460-461. Further see s.vv. *meřanim* ‘to die’, *mah* ‘death’.

The word seems formally ambiguous, therefore one alternatively assumes an Iranian intermediation: loan or calque (see West 2007: 127 referring to Durante). However, I see no reason to reject the traditional interpretation. The voiced *-d* and the *o*-declension favour the native origin.

mari, *ea*-stem: GDPl *mare-a-c* ‘ (Proverbs 30.31) ‘female bird, hen’ (Proverbs 30.31, Zgōn-Afrahāt, Cyril of Jerusalem), MidArm. ‘female bee’ (Geoponica).

●DIAL Goris, Łarabał *mári* ‘female turkey’ [Ačařean 1913: 763b; HayLezBrbBař 4, 2007: 37b] or ‘female bird’ [HAB 3: 284b; Margaryan 1975: 348a].

●ETYM Since Patrubány (StugHetaz 1906: 344a), connected with Gr. *μῆρα* ‘girl’, Lat. *maritus* ‘married’, ‘husband, mate’, *marita* ‘wife’, Lith. *mergà* ‘girl’, *marti* f. ‘bride, young woman’, Welsh *morwyn*, OCor. *moroin* ‘girl, maiden’, Skt. *márya-m*. ‘young man, young warrior’, etc.

The Armenian form can be derived from **m₃rih₂-teh₂-* (Ĵahukyan 1987: 139; cf. HAB 3: 284a) or **m₃rieh₂-* > **mariya-*. In view of the Italic and Celtic forms possibly pointing to *o*-grade (see Schrijver 1991: 459-460; 1995: 248, 356-357), one may alternatively posit **morieh₂-* or **mori(h₂)-teh₂-* > PArm. **mariya-* > *mari*, *-ea-*.

See also s.v. *amuri* ‘wifeless’.

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 *muru 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’ [Ačařyan 1947: 12, 246], and Xotorĵur **moroy* ‘grandmother’ and *moru* ‘step-mother’ (see YušamXotorĵ 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. *μητρειά* 'stepmother', OEngl. *mōdrige* (*n*-stem) 'mother's sister', etc. (see Hübschmann 1897: 472; HAB 3: 246b; Szemerényi 1977: 60). For a discussion I refer to Beekes 1976a: 55-58; Clackson 1994: 145-147.

For the element **-u-* cf. Arm. GPI *mi-a-mōr-uc'* (see HAB 3: 246b).

See also s.v. *yawray* 'stepfather'.

mawruk', *a*-stem: GDPI *mawru-a-c'* (Bible+); **muruk'** (P'awstos Buzand, 5th cent.), gen-dat. *muruk-a-c'* (Łazar P'arpec'i, 5th cent.; Ephrem, etc.), also *MURUC'* (in Latin alphabet) in the early 10th-century Autun dictionary (Weitenberg 1997c: 342), rarely singular *mo/ōru* (Weitenberg 1997c: 340) 'beard' (Bible+).

●DIAL Widespread in the dialects [HAB 3: 375b]:

mōruk' in Polis, Xarberd, Sebastia, Tigranakert, etc. (also Zeyt'un and Hačən *muyuk'* probably represents *mawruk'*, Ačařyan 2003: 84).

muruk' in Muš, Alaškert, Šamaxi; see also below.

mīruk' in Ařtial, Axalc'xa, T'iflis, Hamšen, Karin, Ĵuła.

The dialectal form **mīruk'* is found in inscriptions since the 13th century: *miru(k')*, IPI *miru-a-w-k'* (S. A. Avagyan 1973: 190-191), as well as in Bařgirk' hayoc' (1975: 220^{Nr425}): *morus' miruk'*. Given the fact that Bařgirk' hayoc' abounds in dialectal forms peculiar to Łarabał and adjacent areas one may treat *mīruk'* of this gloss as the regular proto-form of Łarabał *māwək'*, etc. Note that these areas have penultimate accent, and *māwək'* presupposes **mīruk'* or **muruk'* rather than *mawruk'*.

As has been shown by Ačařyan (1935: 60, 84), Agulis *māyruk'* comes from an old dialectal **mīruk'* rather than *mōruk'*. Similarly, Mełri *meruk'* points to *mīruk'* [Ałayan 1954: 63]. Nor Naxijewan has both *mīruk'* and *mūrūk'* [Ačařean 1925: 65-66]. For a thorough philological analysis I refer to Weitenberg 1997c: 343-345, who concludes that *mīruk'* is of respectable antiquity and may represent the *e*-grade **smēkru-*.

Beside Ařtial *mīruk'* (also Hung.), Ačařyan (1953: 279) also mentions Pol. *mirug* 'chin' glossing it by Arm. *cnawt* 'chin', Pol. *broda*, Fr. *menton* 'chin'.

Van-Parskahayk' group has a frozen accusative: Van *murus*, Ozim *mōrus* [Ačařyan 1952: 281]; Šatax *murus* [M. Muradyan 1962: 202a]; Moks *murus* (in the village of Ařnac', *mōrus*), gen. *murus-ə'*, pl. *murus-k^o-ir*, *murus-nir* [Orbeli 2002: 294]; Marała *mūrūs* [Ačařean 1926: 78, 414; Davt'yan 1966: 433], Č'aylu *murūs* [Davit'yan 1966: 433]; Salmast *mrūs* [HAB 3: 375b]; Urmia-Xoy *māriūs* [M. Asatryan 1962: 202b].

It is remarkable that in the famous epic songs recorded by Movsēs Xorenac'i in Gołt'n (a district that is geographically very close to the region Van-Parskahayk'), one finds frozen nominative used as accusative, *z-mēj-k'* 'back', also allative *i mēj-k'* (Movsēs Xorenac'i 2.40, 1913=1991: 179^{L4f}, see AčařHLPatm 2, 1951: 72; Ĵahukyan 1987: 368, 376-377), whereas the word for 'beard' is found in the 'correct' accusative form *mawrus* (Movsēs Xorenac'i 1.31/32, 1913=1991: 86^{L3}). Now, modern dialects almost ubiquitously have a frozen nominative *mēj-k'* (though in some of them *-k'* is frozen only with respect to nom-acc., cf. Van *mēč'k'* vs. gen. *mēčac'*, etc., HAB 3: 313b), whereas in the Van-Parskahayk' area, as we have seen, the accusative form is petrified. The epic songs thus witness this contrast already in

the pre-Classical period. Note that the narrative tradition (19th and early 20th cent.) of the epic “Sasna çrêr” was in a way related with the wool-makers of the Van and adjacent regions. It is attractive to regard these two traditions within a single unbroken continuity.

Of special interest is Moks, the village of Kyumir, *mauran* [Orbeli 2002: 294], which has neither *-k'* nor *-s*. One wonders if this represents an old collective **mawru-an*.

●ETYM Since de Lagarde (see HAB 3: 375), connected with Skt. *śmāsru-* n. ‘beard’ (RV+), Lith. *smākras*, *smakrà* ‘chin’, Alb. *mjekër* ‘chin, beard’, Hitt. *zama(n)kur* ‘beard’, etc. Irish *smech* ‘chin’ from **smekā-*.

The Armenian *-w-* resulted from the depalatalization of **-k̂-* before **-r-*, seen also in Baltic and Albanian (Kortlandt 1985b: 10; 1985a: 59; 1986: 41 = 2003: 58, 60, 71; Beekes 2003: 175). For the meaning ‘chin’ in Celtic and Albanian cf. Arm. dialect of Aġtial (see above).

The by-form *muruk'* may reflect PIE **smokr-u-* > PArm. **mowru-* (see Pedersen 1906: 351 = 1982: 129; Weitenberg 1997c: 342). Also *miruk'* is of respectable antiquity and may represent the *e*-grade **smekru-* (cf. Celtic *e*-grade), see in the dialectal section. The form *moruk'*, with simple *-o-*, most probably is a secondary form which developed from *mawruk'* [Weitenberg 1997c: 341].

The origin of the vowel *-a-* of the basic form *mawru-k'* is much debated and is still unclear (see Weitenberg 1997c: 345).⁹² I tentatively propose the following scenario: nom. **smokur* vs. pl. **smokru-eh₂-* > PArm. nom. **mac^hur* (with *a* from **o* in open syllable, see 2.1.3) vs. pl. **mokru-a-* (to be developed to **mas(u)r* : **mowr-u-a-*). Then the *a* of the (subsequently lost) singular was generalized into *mawru-k'* (oblique *-u-a-*), whereas the old dial. **muruk'* perhaps directly reflects the original pl. **mowru-a-*.

mak'i, *ea*-stem ‘ewe’. (Bible, Eznik Kołbac'i, Hexaemeron, etc.)

In a 14-15th-century addendum (describing Cilicia) to Ašxarhac'oyc' written by T'ovma Kilihec'i we read that Cilicia has *mak'is vayri* (APl.) ‘wild sheep’ (see Anasyan 1967: 283^{L4}; Hewsen 1992: 322). One concludes from this that for the author *mak'i* rather denoted the sheep in general. This is directly corroborated 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 Ačařyan 2003: 428. According to Andreasyan (1967: 374b), however, it is *maka*. In the meaning ‘ewe’: Muš, Alaškert, Karin, Ararat, Ararat, Van, Ozim, Šatax (see M. Muradyan 1962: 202a; for the semantics, 83), Salmast, Marała (cf. Davt'yan 1966: 426), whereas Zeyt'un [Ačařyan 2003: 327], Svedia [Ačařyan 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’ (‘milch sheep’).

⁹² Beekes (2003: 175) points out that the *a* may be a reduced vowel in the zero grade, and dial. **miruk'* probably reflects the form with **e* : *-ew-* > *-iw-* > *-i-*.

In his glossary of purely dialectal words in the Šamaxi dialect, Bałramyan (1964: 243) records *mak^oajin* ‘female wild boar’. One wonders whether it is related with *makⁱ*.

●ETYM Since Diefenbach (see 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: Kannada *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) [Ačařyan 1913: 785a; Ĵahukyan 1972: 299; 1987: 137]. Alternatively, one may assume a feminine **meh₂k-eh₂-* (cf. Gr. *μηκάς*), gen. **mh₂k-h₂-ós*. The *-i* is secondary. See also below.

Formally, Arm. *makⁱ* and Gr. *μηκάς* can derive from **meh₂k-*, 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. Ĵahukyan (1987: 137) posits **mek- / *mækija- > makⁱ*, which is unconvincing.

As *makⁱ* generally denotes the female sheep, it can be linked with other designations of female animals in *-i* such as *ayc(i)*, *mari*, etc. However, we 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, *makⁱ* can be seen as an *i*-derivation from onomatopoeic **mV_k-* ‘to bleat’; thus: ‘bleating one’. Cf. typologically the *i*-derivation expressing the semantic development ‘field’ > ‘wild animal’ (see s.vv. *art-i*, *and-i*; cf. also *vayr-i* in Zeyt‘un).

***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/Gharagyozyan 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-* < **-ti_jV-* formation based on *manem* ‘to spin’ (class., widespread in the dialects, among them also in Goris). The voicing **t > d* after *-n-* and *-r-* is regular; see s.vv. *anjrdi*, *ordi*, etc.; cf. also *spand*, *i*-stem vs. *spananem* ‘to kill’), all being composed of the same suffix. Compare also *sard*, *i*-stem ‘spider’. 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 Ĵuła, 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 regarded as folk-etymological reshaping as ‘kerchief of a mouse’.

***mglim₁** ‘to rot, spoil, mould (verschimmeln)’.

Only attested in the compounds *mglahot* (Geoponica, 13th cent.) and *mğrahot* (Aṙakel Dawrižec‘i, 17th cent.), both meaning ‘smelling like mould’ (adj.). The former is also found in “Bžškaran jjoy” (13th cent.) in the meaning ‘smell of mould’ (subst.); see Č‘ugaszyan 1980: 82^{L-7}, 216; MijHayBaṙ 2, 1992: 121. It is preserved in Muš *mək‘lahod* (see Bałdasaryan-T‘ap‘ale‘yan 1958: 264b; the meaning is not specified), and in Łarabał, etc. in a different meaning, see s.v. **mglim₂*.

●DIAL Preserved in the dialects of Suč‘ava, Nor Naxijewan, Polis, Řodost‘o, Aslanbek, Sebastia, Akn, Xarberd, Hamšen, Karin, Alaškert (for Muš, see above), Axalc‘xa, Ararat, Zeyt‘un, Hačən (*mäg‘lel*) [HAB 3: 293a], as well as in Arabkir, Xian and Sivri-Hisar [Ačaṙean 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* [Ačaṙean 1913: 765b].

In Xotrjur one finds *aregkmeł, aregmknel* ‘to rot, to spoil under the sun’ [HayLezBrbBaṙ 1, 2001: 122a], the second component of which might be related, too.

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-* < **-tijV-* formation based on *manem* ‘to spin’. If this etymology is accepted, one should treat **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*.

In Turkish-Armenian dictionary (c. 1720 AD) by Eħia Mušetyan Karneč‘i (Karin/Xotorjur) one finds *muk‘l* with *borbos* ‘mould’ and *ort* ‘rendering Turk. *k‘uf* ‘mould, rust’ [Č‘ugaszyan 1986: 86^{Nr50}, 140]. Č‘ugaszyan (ibid.) does not identify *muk‘l*. I propose to treat it as a back-formation from the verb *mglim* ‘to rot, mould’.

●ETYM According to Ačaṙyan (HAB 3: 293a), related to **mglim₂* ‘to scorch, singe’ and **mglim₃* ‘to cloud’ with the basic meaning ‘to become black’. The connection with *mglim₄* suggested in NHB 2: 234a is semantically problematic.

***mglim₂** ‘to scorch, singe’.

●DIAL Only in dial. compound **mglahot* ‘smell of singeing’: Łarabał [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. *mglim₁*.

●ETYM According to Ačaṙyan (HAB 3: 293a), related to **mglim₁* ‘to rot, spoil, mould (verschimmeln)’ and **mglim₃* ‘to cloud’ with the basic meaning ‘to become black’.

***mglim₃** ‘to cloud’.

●DIAL Preserved in the dialects of Šulaver, Ararat, Nor Bayazet, Van, Ozim, Moks, Šatax, Muš, Alaškert [HAB 3: 293a; Ačaṙyan 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 Ačařyan (HAB 3: 293a), related to **mglim₁* ‘to rot, to spoil, to mould (verschimmeln)’ and **mglim₂* ‘to scorch, singe’ with the basic meaning ‘to become black’. Only **mglim₃* ‘to cloud’ has an external etymology. It is connected to *mēg* ‘fog’ (q.v.); cf. Skt. *meghā-* m. ‘cloud, gloomy weather’, Av. *maēya-* m. ‘cloud’, etc. PArm. **mig-la-* ‘cloud, fog’ may be derived from IE **h₃miĝ^h-leh₂-*, cf. Gr. *ὀμίχλη* ‘fog’, OCS *m_ogla* ‘mist, haze’, Lith. *miĝlā* ‘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 unaffixed 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.). Further note the *-l-* of the Dutch verb.

The archaic nature of Arm. *-l-* is suggested by Ačařyan (HAB 3: 311b; see also N. Simonyan 1979: 241; Alayan 1986: 61-62₅₂; Jahukyan 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 also belongs Arm. **amulj* found in *atj^hamulj* ‘darkness, twilight’, which is improbable; see s.v. **atj-*.

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, spoil, 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.

mglim₄ ‘to struggle’.

Only attested in John Chrysostom: *Oč’ ogoric’i ew oč’ janayc’ē, ew oč’ mglic’i, ayl diwraw heštaw imn zmarmn t’otuc’u.*

●ETYM In NHB 2: 234a, the above-cited passage is represented under *mglim₁* ‘to rot, to spoil, to mould (verschimmeln)’, although 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.

mec, *a*-stem: GDSg *mec-i*, ISg *mec-a-w*, GDPI *mec-a-c’*, etc. adj. ‘great, big, large’, adv. ‘much’ (Bible+); *mec-ar-em* ‘to honour, esteem highly’, *mecar-an-k’*, *a*-stem: GDPI *mecaran-a-c’* ‘honour’, *mecar-oy* ‘much respected, honorable’ (all Bible+; see Astuacaturean 1895: 997; Clackson 1994: 230₂₀₆; on *mecar-oy*, see Olsen 1999: 514).

For a considerable number of attestations of *mec* and its derivatives in the Bible and following literature, see NHB 2: 234-243; Astuacaturean 1895: 992-998; HAB 3: 295a.

●DIAL Ubiquitous in the dialects. A number of N, NW, SW and SE peripheral dialects display forms with an epenthetic *-n-*: **menc* [HAB 3: 295-296]. Next to

menj ǰuła has also *venj*, the initial *v-* of which may be due to nasal dissimilation [Ačařean 1940: 125, 376a]. Goris and Łarabał have forms with geminate *-cc* [HAB 3: 295b; Margaryan 1975: 348].

In some eastern dialects an exceptional vocalic reflection is seen: Meřri *mɔc* [Ałayan 1954: 35, 279b], Karčewan *muc* [H. Muradyan 1960: 29, 200b], Kak'avaberđ *muc* (in Varhavar), *mɔc* (in Agarak) [H. Muradyan 1967: 32, 179b], parts of Hadrut' *məɔc*, *mɔc* [Davt'yan 1966: 29, 426] (A. Połosyan, 1965: 17, records only *məc*).

These forms can hardly be explained from *mec* through an internal development and possibly point to an older **moc*. Of course, a secondary origin cannot be ruled out; for instance, one may think of vocalic labialization after *m-*. However, there are many counter-examples.

The verb *mecarem* has been preserved in T'iflis *mejril* 'to honour, entertain' [HAB 3: 295b]. Interesting is also T'iflis *minja-minja* (ibid.).

●ETYM Since long (Klaproth 1831: 101a; NHB 2: 234b; Gosche 1847: 72^{Nr201}, etc., see HAB 3: 295b), connected to the cognate forms going back to the PIE word for 'great': Skt. NAccSg *māhi* n. 'great', *mahānt-* 'great, dense, extensive, mighty, important', Gr. *μέγας* 'big', *μέγα* n. 'big', Lat. *magnus* 'great, large; much; noble, grand; mighty', Hitt. *mekki* 'much', etc., see Hübschmann 1897: 473; HAB 3: 295; Pokorny 1959: 708; Mallory/Adams 1997: 344a; Cabolov 1, 2001: 632.

Arm. **mec-a-* reflects PIE **megh₂-*, with **-h₂-* > *-a-* (Olsen 1999: 65; Beekes 2003: 189; Matzinger 2005: 55). The PIE paradigm is reconstructed as follows: nom. **meg₂-h₂-s*, acc. **mg₂-éh₂-m*, gen. **mg₂-h₂-ós*, dat. **mg₂-h₂-éi*, cf. Skt. NAccSg *māhi*, DSg *mah-é* < **m(e)g₂-h₂-éi*, hence also *-h-* in *mahá-* from **meg₂-oh₂-*, Av. *maza* 'big, spacious', Gr. *μέγα* 'big', adv. *ᾄγᾱν* 'much', Hitt. *mekki* 'much' < **meg₂-h₂-i(h₂)-* (for a discussion, see Beekes 1988b: 115; 1995: 144, 198; Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 337-339; 2005: 107₆₄, 116; Lindeman 1997: 148-150, 184; Oettinger 1997; Sims-Williams 1997: 319; Kloekhorst 2008: 572).

Jahukyan (1987: 137, 180) introduces also Arm. post-classical **moz* 'great, much, mighty, increased', positing **mog^h-* with a question-mark. One may assume that the genitive **mg₂-h₂-ós* developed into a secondary *o*-grade form **mog^hH-* through a procedure that is reminiscent of the scenario described e.g. in Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 1: 152ff. On the other hand one recalls the synonymous **polh₁u-* (see s.v. *γ-olov* 'much, plenty'). The PIE paradigm nom. **meg₂-h₂-s* vs. gen. **m(o)g₂-h₂-ós* may have developed into PArm. nom. **méc-a-* (> ClArm. *mec*, *a*-stem) vs. gen. **moz-ó-* > post-classical **moz*, as well as EArm. **moc* (on which see the dialectal section) with *-c-* after the nominative. It should be borne in mind, however, that **moz* is not reliable, and **mog^hH-* would rather yield **moj* (something like **mog^hh₂io-* may be assumed, cf. comp. *μέζων* from **meg^hh₂ios/n-*, Beekes 1976b: 90). Thus, the whole idea is highly hypothetical.

The dialectal form **menc* may be explained by a nasal epenthesis (e.g. Ačařean 1940: 159), which is very frequent in particular before dental stops and affricates (see 2.1.30.1). Nevertheless, it is tempting to alternatively posit an old **mec-n* in a way comparable to Lat. *magnus* 'great, large', etc. Note that the form **menc* is found in various peripheral dialects and may be archaic, although the epenthesis can also be explained through independent processes in individual dialects.

For references and a discussion of the equation Arm. *mecarem* ‘to honour’ : Gr. *μεγαίρω* ‘to grudge’ < ‘*to regard as too great’, see HAB 3: 295b; Pokorny 1959: 708; C. Arutjunjan 1983: 296-297, and especially Clackson 1994: 149-150.

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 : kai ēkpeσδὸν τὸ σιδήριον ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου*. Arm. *metex* renders Gr. *ξύλον* ‘wood; piece of wood; peg, lever; cudgel, club’ (here, said of *ἀξίνη* = *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. Ĵahukyan (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. *-ín* 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. *aesc* ‘ash-tree; spear’; Gr. *όξύα* ‘beech; spear-shaft made from its wood, spear’; see s.vv. *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. Vardanján 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 *lčp‘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 [Halaĵyan 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/Łazinyan 1985: 435^{L140}]: *yolovameĵj* (vars. *-metc*, *-miĵj*, *-merj*, see p. 798a) *cux*, *šogi c‘ndeli* : “дым с копотью, пар паряющийся” [Darbinjan-Melikjan/Xanlarĵan 1988: 160]; “heavy smoke, evaporating mist” [Khachatoorian 2001: 229].

●ETYM Ačaĵyan (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 *atĵ/atc* vs. Gr.

ǎpda f. ‘dirt’. However, this is improbable, as is the etymology of *at/c* (q.v.). On Jahukyan’s view, see s.v. **atj-* ‘dark’.

metk, *i*-stem in NHB, but without evidence ‘soft, weak, slack’: Eznik Kolbac’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’ek’* : *ἕως τίνος ἐκλυθήσεσθε* : “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 araj̄nordac’ 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.; see Hübschmann 1897: 473; HAB 3: 300b; Pokorny 1959: 718; Mallory/Adams 1997: 532b. 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; Weitenberg 1984a: 211; 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*)” (Solta 1966: 46; cf. Schrijver 1991: 20). If the *i*-stem of Arm. *metk* proves reliable, we can interpret it the same way; see 2.2.3.

Further see s.v. *malem* ‘to grind, crush, break’.

metm, *o*-stem: GDSg *metm-o-y*, ISg *metm-o-v* ‘soft, mild, gentle, calm; softly, gently’ (Bible+); dial. **m(e)tmet* ‘quiet, calm, fine; moth, midge’; cf. also *mt(m)et* ‘fine chaff, dust’ (q.v.).

●DIAL The form *metm* has been preserved in Muš, Moks, as well as in a Łarabał and Łazax derivative *metm-er-ε/uc* ‘softly burning’ [HAB 3: 301a].

For a deeper relation, note Agulis **mtmet* ‘moth’ (HAB 3: 225ab; for the correction to 225a, see HAB-Add 1982: 14) or *mātmət* ‘gnat, midge’ vs. *mtmet* ‘quiet, calm’ (M. Zak’aryan 2008: 224); Łarabał **mtmet* ‘softly, quietly (said e.g. of the blowing of a wind and of the process of boiling)’ [Ačarean 1913: 786b]; cf. Ararat *mtmet* ‘very fine straw; the smallest kind of mosquito, midge’ [Amatuni 1912: 483b].

Compare **mt-mo/ut* ‘moth, clothes moth’ (see s.v. **mut-* ‘grinding, crushing’).

●ETYM According to Ačaryan (HAB 3: 225ab), belongs with *malem* ‘to crush, grind’, *mt(m)et* ‘chaff’, etc. (see s.vv.). Olsen 1999: 27 posits *mueləj-mo-*.

The Agulis and other forms corroborate (both formally and semantically) the etymological or folk-etymological association between *metm* ‘soft, quiet’ and **mtme/o/ut* ‘moth, midge; fine straw, chaff; quiet, calm’.

metr, *r/u*-declension: GDSg *met-u* (Bible); *r*-stem: GDSg *meter* (Hexaameron, see K. Muradyan 1984: 263^{L16}, 265^{L1}, 265^{L18}, 266^{L18}); later also: *o*-stem: ISg *metr-o-v*; **mehu*, GDSg *mehu-i*, ISg *mehu-a-w* (cf. *as-u-i* vs. *asr*, gen. *as-u* ‘fleece’, q.v.) ‘honey’ (Bible+).

●DIAL Ubiquitous in the dialects. In a number of N, NW, W and SE peripheral dialects a metathesis has taken place: Aslanbek *mertə*, Axalc'xa, Karin, Xarberd *merł*, Sebastia *merł*, Salmast *merł*, Marała *mæert*. Some dialects display forms with a final *-ə*, Suč'ava *métrə*, Aslanbek *mertə*, Zeyt'un *métri/r/yə*, Goris, Šamaxi *métrə* [HAB 3: 303a].

Hamšen **xelar metr* or **xent' metr* 'wild intoxicating poisonous honey' (lit. 'crazy honey') made of **etri*, a shrub with yellow flowers resembling *lašī* (Ačařean 1913: 295b, 459a, 463b). It is remarkable that already ancient authors testify such honey in these areas. For instance, in Xenophon, *Anabasis* 4.8.20 (2001: 375; Arm. transl. 1970: 107; note by S. Krkyařaryan 26548) the Greeks who had eaten honey somewhere between the lands of Macronians and Colchians seemed like exceedingly drunk or even crazy.

●ETYM Derived from the PIE word for 'honey', **meli-t-*, cf. Hitt. *militt-/malitt-* n., CLuw. *mallit-* n., Gr. *μέλι, -ιτος* n., Lat. *mel, mellis* n., OIr. *mil*, Goth. *milip*, Alb. *mjáltë*, etc., see Hübschmann 1897: 473; HAB 3: 302; Pokorny 1959: 723; Starke 1990: 190-193; Mallory/Adams 1997: 271a; Demiraj 1997: 105, 270-271; Kloekhorst 2008: 580. One usually reconstructs a heteroclitic paradigm nom. **mel-it-*, obl. **mel-n-* (cf. Lat. gen. *mellis*), for a discussion and references, see Pokorny 1959: 723; Frisk 2: 201; Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 603 = 1995, 1: 517; Olsen 1999: 169.

In order to explain the *r/u*-declension (on which see s.v. *asr* 'fleece') of the Armenian word one assumes a blend of **meli-* 'honey' and **med^hu-* n. 'mead, sweet drink, honey'⁹³. Skt. *mádhu-* n. 'sweet drink, anything sweet, honey, soma', YAv. *mađu-* n. 'wine made of berries', Gr. *μέθυ* n. 'intoxicating drink, wine', Toch. B *mī* n. 'honey', OHG *mito* 'mead', OCS *medь* 'honey', etc. (Meillet 1890: 401; Gauthiot 1910-11: 268₁; HAB 3: 302; Pokorny 1959: 723; Ĵahukyan 1959: 185; 1982: 120, 135; Solta 1960: 182-184; Ę. Tumanjan 1978: 300-301; Clackson 1994: 126, 161; Olsen 1999: 168-169; Matzinger 2005: 59₂₅₆; for **med^hu-*, see also Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 302-303; Mallory/Adams 1997: 271; Adams 1999: 461).⁹⁴

The direct derivation of Arm. **metu-* from **med^hu-* (see Matzinger 2005: 59₂₅₆ with refer.) is untenable.

metu, *a*-stem: GDSg *metu-i* (Gëorg 13th cent.), GDPl *metu-a-c'* (twice in the Bible) 'bee' (Bible+).

●DIAL Widespread in the dialects. In T'iflis, Ararat and Łarabał *metu* has been replaced by **metr-a-čanč* lit. 'honey-bee'; note also Ozim *metri ttež* vs. Van *ttež* 'bumble-bee' [HAB 3: 301b]. Marała has diminutive forms *met-uk, mət-ik'* [Ačařean 1926: 412], cf. also Salmast *metr-uk*, through contamination with *metr* 'honey' [HAB 3: 301b], Kak'avaberd *mét-ak* 'wild bee' [H. Muradyan 1967: 179b].

●ETYM Derived from *metr*, gen. *met-u* 'honey' (q.v.). For *met-u* 'bee' vs. *met-r*, gen. *met-u* 'honey' compare *etjer-u* 'stag' vs. *etjewr* 'horn' (see HAB 2: 24a; Ĵahukyan 1982: 135; Clackson 1994: 117); compare also **asu*, gen. *asu-i* vs. *asr*, gen. *asu*

⁹³ A similar contamination has been assumed for OIr. *mil*, gen. *melo* (Mallory/Adams 1997: 271a).

⁹⁴ Note that Arm. *metr* has been compared to both lexemes since already NHB 2: 250a and others, see HAB 3: 302b for references.

‘wool, fleece’ (q.v.). For a discussion, see also Olsen 1999: 540, 542. Further note *ac-u* ‘garden-bed’ (q.v.).

Arm. *metu*, *a*-stem ‘bee’ may reflect a QIE feminine **melit-eh₂-* (cf. Gr. μέλισσα, -ττα f. ‘bee’, possibly from **melit-ih₂-*, see Frisk 2: 201) through analogical **melutā-* after PArm. **metu-* ‘honey’ and/or after the pattern of *etjer-u* ‘stag’ vs. *etjewr* ‘horn’.

mek(-k’) *a*-stem (mostly pl. tant.) ‘sin, crime’ (Bible+).

●DIAL Dialectally ubiquitous [HAB 3: 299a].

●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’, Mir. *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-eh₂-* (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 (Ačařyan is sceptical about the connection with **mol-*); Ĵahukyan 1987: 138; Olsen 1999: 64-65, 338. For the *o*-grade cf. also the Baltic evidence.

According to Bugge (1893: 18), here also belongs *metmex/ł*. Rejected by Ačařyan (HAB 3: 301b); accepted in Ĵahukyan 1987: 138; Olsen 1999: 64-65.

meřanim, 3sg.aor. *meř-a-w*, partic. *meř-eal* ‘dead’, etc. (abundant evidence in the Bible, Astuacaturean 1895: 1006-1010) ‘to die’ (Bible+); **an-meř** ‘immortal’ (Agat‘angelos).

●DIAL Dialectally ubiquitous [HAB 3: 304b].

●ETYM Since Klaproth, NHB, Petermann, etc. (see HAB 3: 304b), linked with cognate forms deriving from PIE **mer-* ‘to disappear, vanish’, ‘to die’, cf. Skt. *mar-* ‘to die’, Hitt. *mer-zi*, pret. 3sg. *me-ir-ta* ‘to disappear, vanish’, etc. (from an active root aorist 3sg. **mér-t*, Oettinger 1979: 104-106; Barton 1985: 13; 1989); pres. **mr-ie-* > PIlr. **mrya-*: Skt. *mriyáte* ‘to die’ vs. caus *māráyati* ‘to kill’, Av. *miriia-*, Oss. *mælyn/mæln* ‘to die’, Lat. *moriōr*, OCS *mrěti*, etc., see Hübschmann 1897: 473; HAB 3: 304; Pokorny 1959: 735; Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 318; Mallory/Adams 1997: 150a; Cheung 2007: 264-265; Kloekhorst 2008: 577.

The ‘unexpected’ trilled *-ř-* (Clackson 1994: 226¹⁴⁵; Ravnæs 1991: 88₁) most probably comes from sigmatic aorist *meř-* < **mer-s-* (Klingenschmitt 1982: 221, 242, 277; Barton 1989: 146-149; Kortlandt 1996: 41 = 2003: 115; cf. Ĵahukyan 1982: 181; 1987: 138, 181; differently or alternatively: Meillet 1892: 165; 1936: 54, 109; Schmitt 1981: 136; Klingenschmitt 1982: 220-221; Barton 1989: 145-146), cf. Skt. *mryš-i* 1.sg.inj. ‘ich möchte sterben’ (see Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 318).

merk, *o*-stem: GDSg *merk-o-y*, GDPl *merk-o-c’* (Bible+); GDPl *merk-u-c’* in Mark 14.51 (Astuacaturean 1895: 1012c; Olsen 1999: 54), later also *a*-stem ‘nude, naked; mere, bare’ (Bible+).

●DIAL The basic form *merk* is present in Nor Naxijewan, Axalc‘xa, Karin, Ararat, Moks, Hačən, etc.; Svedia and Zeyt‘un have **merk-ik*, with the diminutive suffix *-ik* [HAB 3: 308b].

A compound **mawr-ē-merk* ‘completely naked’ is found in Polis, Xarberd, Č‘arsančag [Ačařean 1913: 804a], Van, Nor Naxijewan, Sebastia, Aslanbek; cf.

Adana **merk i mōrē* ‘poor’ [HAB 3: 308b]; compare Muš, Xian **matorean* ‘completely naked’ from Persian *mādar* ‘mother’ + *ūryān* ‘naked’ through haplology (Ačariyan 1913: 804a).

The Armenian compound literally means ‘naked (as born) from the mother’; compare P’awstos Buzand 4.59 (1883=1984: 152^{L1f}; transl. Garsoian 1989: 179): *merkac’uc’in zna ibrew i mōrē* ‘stripped her naked as she had come from her mother’s [womb]’; 5.3 (160^{L8f}; transl. 189): *Et hraman <...> unel zna, ew merkanal ibrew i mōrē* : ‘ordered to seize him, strip him naked as he had come from her mother’s [womb]’.

●ETYM Related to PIE **neg^w-no-*: Skt. *nagná-* ‘naked’ (RV+), YAv. *mayna-* ‘naked’ (< **magna-*), Khot. *būnaa-*, Oss. *bægnæg* ‘naked’ (< **bagnaka-*), Gr. *γυμνός* ‘naked, unarmed’ (from **nog^w-no-*, with *-v-* due to the following labiovelar), Lith. *niogas* ‘naked’, etc. [HAB 3: 308; Pokorny 1959: 769; Frisk 1: 332-333; Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 5-6]. The **e*-grade is seen in Hitt. *nekumant-* ‘naked’ (for references, see below). The PIE word is considered to have had a static inflection: nom. **nog^w-s*, Gen. **neg^w-s* (see Beekes 1992: 183₁₂; 1994: 91-94; 1995: 196, 198).

The initial *m-* of Arm. *merk* has been linked with the Iranian (Meillet 1921: 227; 1922I: 227; see also Walde/Hofmann 2, 1954: 185; for other references, see HAB 3: 308b; Solta 1960: 228-229; on Petersson’s view, see below), and the *-r-* is explained by restoring a QIE **meg^w-ro-* (HAB 3: 308; Frisk 1: 333; Olsen 1999: 54-55). In view of the absence of cognate forms with the suffix **-ro-*, however, Meillet (1930: 186) welcomes the hypothesis of Benveniste (1930: 187), who derives *merk* from **meg^w(e)do-*: Lat. *nūdus*, etc. involving a development comparable to that of **dw > rk* and a subsequent metathesis *-kr > -rk* (see also Solta 1960: 228-229; de Lamberterie 1992: 257; sceptical: Olsen 1999: 55₁₁₅; Viredaz 2003: 71₅₈). For a further discussion on the PIE etymon, see Grammont 1909; Janda 1996: 89-92.

The Avestan form is explained through dissimilation *n...n > m...n*, although Meillet (1930: 186) considers this hypothesis as ‘téméraire’ because there are no other examples. Since all the Iranian forms, except for the Avestan, point to initial **b-*, Cheung (2002: 172; cf. Szemerényi 1966: 217) reconstructs PIr. **bagna-*, for the Avestan form assuming a (partial) assimilation: *b...n > m...n*. On the other hand, the theory on dissimilation **neg^wno- > *meg^wno-* would be comparable with **neg^wno- > *neg^wmo-* seen in Hitt. *nekumant-* ‘naked’ (see Tischler HEG 2.7, 1991: 307-309; Kloekhorst 2008: 602-603; cf. Lindeman 1965: 32). One may also think of a labial assimilation, cf. PIE **h₃nog^{wh}-* ‘nail’ > Toch. **mekwā* ‘nails’, perhaps also Arm. *magil* ‘claw’.

Arm. *merk* may be somehow associated with *lerk* ‘hairless’. From PIE **neg^w-no-* we might arrive at a PArm. **lerk* through dissimilation *n...n > l...n* (cf. Gr. *λυμνός*), with *-r-* as in *merk*. For literature and a discussion, see also Petersson 1920: 87-89; Makaev 1974: 59-60. Further see s.v. *lerk* ‘hairless’.

The complex relationship between *merk*, *lerk*, as well as *bok* ‘barefoot’ (< **b^hoso-*, cf. Lith. *bāsas*, OCS *bosъ* ‘barefooted’, etc.) is discussed by Winter 1980. A contamination of PArm. **nok-* (< **nog^w-*, cf. Lith. *niogas*, OCS *nagъ* ‘naked’) and **boho-* ‘barefoot’ would result in *bok* more easily if one takes into account also another theoretically possible form, viz. PArm. **be/okno-* (cf. Iran. **bagna*). Hamp (1986-87) treats *bok* ‘barefoot’ as **b^hoso-g^wo-*, a compound with **-g^wo-* ‘going’ (cf.

Olsen 1999: 208, 700, 786; Beekes 2003: 160, 170). For the contraction *-oso- > *-oho- > -o-, see Clackson 1994: 53.

Bearing in mind what has been said on Greek and Iranian forms, one may perhaps try to introduce another form which, as far as I am aware, has not received an etymological explanation, that is Arm. dial. *tkl-or and *tkl-oz ‘naked’ (see Ačařean 1913: 1031b): QIE *nog^w-no- > PArm. *nuk-no- > *tukno- > *tklor. Alternatively: *nog^we/od^hos- (cf. Lat. *nūdus*, OIr. *nocht*, OHG *nackt*, etc., see Walde/Hofmann 2, 1954: 185; Schrijver 1991: 274-275; Beekes 1994: 93-94; 1994a: 7) > PArm. *nuk(V)to- > *lukto- with *l-* as in (or from) *lerk* ‘hairless’ and Gr. *λυμνός*. This etymology is, of course, highly hypothetical.

Orel 1994a: 38 derives Arm. *merk* from IE *merag- ‘shine, shimmer’ (cf. Lith. *márgas* ‘motley’, etc.), which is unconvincing.

merj ‘near’, *merjim*, *merjenam* ‘to approach, touch’ (Bible+).

For Biblical attestations and a 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-ǵ^hr-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-ǵ^hsr-i (Frisk 2: 222; sceptical: Hamp 1983: 7). For a thorough discussion, see Clackson 1994: 150-152.

The proto-form *me-ǵ^hsr-i helps to explain the absence of depalatalization of *-ǵ^h- before *-r- in Armenian [Kortlandt 1985b: 10; 1986: 42 = 2003: 58, 71; Beekes 2003: 176, 207]. See also 2.1.22.7.

mekʼ, gen. *mer*, acc.-dat. *mez*, abl. *i mēnj*, instr. *me(a)wkʼ* ‘we’ (Bible+); *mer- in compounds [HAB 3: 309b].

The Armenian translator of the Grammar of Dionysius Thrax records a dual *monkʼ* ‘we both’ (Adoncʼ 1915=2008: 28; see also Ĵahukyan 1954: 98). According to Karst (1901: 134-135₃ = 2002: 135₂₅), *monkʼ* in fact must be seen as a plural form found in the dialect of Łarabał as *munkʼ*.

●DIAL Ubiquitous in the dialects, mostly with a nasal epenthesis, *menkʼ [HAB 3: 3109; AčařLiak 2, 1954: 58, 60]. The nasalless form is found in Hamšen *mekʼ*, *mek/kʼ* (e.g. *mekʼ astakʼ* ‘we said’, see Ačařyan 1947: 72, 245), Agulis *mikʼ*^o [Ačařean 1935: 147, 374], Mełri *meʼ/ikʼ*^o [Ałayan 1954: 181, 280a], Šamaxi *mekʼ* [Bałramyan 1964: 105, 214]; note also Hadrutʼ and Šalax-Xcaberd *mukʼ* vs. Łarabał *munkʼ* [Davtʼyan 1966: 427]. Further see H. Muradyan 1982: 327-328.

On Łarabał *munkʼ* (Patkanov 1869: 69; Davtʼyan 1966: 427; cf. Cirbied 1823: 753), see also above. The labial vowel may have been taken from *dukʼ* pl. ‘you’; typologically compare OCS *my* next to Lith. *mēs* and Arm. *mekʼ*, with -y taken from vy pl. ‘you’ (cf. Lith. *jūs*, etc.).

●ETYM Compared with Lith. *mēs*; Latv. *mēs*, OCS *my*, etc., see Meillet 1894: 161; 1936: 92; Hübschmann 1897: 474; HAB 3: 309b with further references; Schmitt 1981: 115, 117; Ĵahukyan 1982: 141, 147. For a further discussion, in particular of the relationship with PIE ‘you’ and the analogical nature of *m-*, as well as on *ns-me,

etc., see Rix 1992: 178-179; Beekes 1995: 208-209; Szemerényi 1996: 217-219; Mallory/Adams 1997: 454-455; Matzinger 1997a.

For a discussion on *-ro- of *me-r* and *je-r* (cf. Lat. *nostrum*, etc.; see also s.v. *iw-r*), see Meillet 1927b: 2; 1936: 92; Schmitt 1981: 117; Ĵahukyan 1982: 147, 150; Weitenberg 1983a: 113₁, 115-117; Kortlandt 1984a: 100 = 2003: 47.

The *-j* in 1pl.abl. *mēn-j* and 2pl.abl. *jēn-j* is hardly related with *-j* in *kn-oj* and *mi-oj*, as is assumed in Charpentier 1909: 253; AčařLiak 2, 1954: 57; Ĵahukyan 1982: 150. According to an ingenious explanation of Kortlandt (1984a: 103-104 = 2003: 50; cf. Beekes 1995: 117-118), it continues earlier *-j- from a PIE ending *-ios seen in AblPl **b^h-ios* vs. **-b^hos*.

mēg, *o*-stem: ISg *mig-o-v* in the Bible (three times); Movsēs Kałankatuac‘i (7th cent.) [V. Ařak‘elyan 1983: 188^{L9}]; Yovhannēs Drasxanakerc‘i (9-10th cent.); *i*- or *a*-stem: GDSg *mig-i* in the Bible (twice); IPL *mig-ō-k‘* [= *-a-w-k‘*] (Grigor Narekac‘i), if reliable, points to *a*-stem. LocSg *i mig-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 *mig-o-v* and LocSg *i mig-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 φωνῆς*. Here *mēg* renders Gr. *νέφος* ‘cloud’.

●DIAL See s.v. **mg-l-im₃* ‘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. *μίχλη* ‘mist, fog’, Lith. *miqlà* ‘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-eh₂-*. 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*.

Dial. **mg-l-im₃* ‘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-ǂ-* (see 2.1.17.3).

mēj, *o*-stem: GDSg *mij-o-y*, LocSg *i mij-i*, etc. (Bible+); later also *a*-stem: ISg *mij-a-w* in Plato (cf. also GDP1 *mij-a-c‘* in a number of dialects) ‘the middle; (anatom.)

back' (Bible+), 'mid, middle' (Agat'angelos, Paterica); *and mēj, i mēj* 'in the middle, amid' (Bible+).

●DIAL The forms *mēj* 'middle' and frozen pl. *mējk* (anatom.) 'back' are ubiquitous in the dialects [HAB 3: 313b]. Remarkably, the frozen *mējk* is attested already in the oldest epic fragments as accusative *z-mēj-k* and allative *i mēj-k* (Movsēs Xorenac'i 2.40, 1913=1991: 179^{L4f}), but in some dialects one still finds GDPI **mij-a-c* next to the nominative **mēj-k*. For more detail on these and related issues, see s.v. *mawru-k* 'beard'.

Hamšen has preserved the old singular *mēj* (anatom.) 'back' > *meč* [Ačaryan 1947: 245]. Traces of the old paradigm may also be found, cf. e.g. Sasun > T'alın *mičvu* 'of my back' attested in a famous folk-song (see Ā. Xač'atryan 1999: 118a, three times) vs. ClArm. gen. *mij-o-y*. The -v- of this form may be analogical after -vi (original dual) frequent in body-part names.

In some dialects, the form *mēj* 'in the middle' is found with a nasal epenthesis. For this form and Romani *mindž* 'female genitals' as a borrowing from Armenian, see Clackson 2004.

●ETYM From PIE **med^hio-*: Skt. *mādhyā*- adj. 'middle, located in the middle', subst. n. 'the middle' (RV+), *madhyā* adv. 'in the middle' (Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 303), OAv. *maidīia-*, YAv. *maidīia-* 'middle, the middle', Gr. *μέσος*, Aeol. *μέσσος*, Cret. Boeot. *μέτρος* 'middle' (Rix 1992: 90), Lat. *medius* adj. 'mid, middle', *medium* n. 'middle', Goth. *midjis*, OHG *mitti* 'located in the middle', Russ. *mežá* 'boundary', etc.

Arm. *mēj* derives from **med^hio-* > PArm. **meidjo-* through regular palatalization **-d^hi-* > *-j-* (2.1.22.1) and anticipation of **-i-* or development **-e-* > **-ei-* before palatal (2.1.2). For the etymology and a phonological discussion, see Klapproth 1831: 103a; NHB 2: 259a; HAB 3: 313 with lit.; Meillet 1936: 52, 73-74, 101; Pisani 1950: 179; Pokorny 1959: 706; Clackson 1994: 60, 211₉; Mallory/Adams 1997: 380b; Olsen 1999: 25, 811, 830, 911.

PArm. **meidya-* > **mij-a-* 'the back' (vs. **yo-* 'middle'), pl. tant. in practically all the dialects, possibly points to a neuter noun (cf. Skt. *mādhyā*- n. 'the middle', Lat. *medium* n. 'middle') and may be derived from neuter plural **med^hi(e)h₂-*. Less probably, it can be traced back to fem. **med^hieh₂-*, cf. Russ. *mežá* 'boundary', etc.

mi, gen. *mi-o-y*, dat.-loc. *mi-um*, instr. *mi-o-v*; also gen.-loc. *mi-o-j*, abl. *mi-o-j-ē* 'one', 'a' (Bible+); compositional *mi-a-* (Bible+), *me-* < **mi-a-* in *me-tasan*, *i*-stem: GDPI *metasan-i-c*, IPI *metasan-i-w-k* 'eleven' (Bible+), *me-kin* 'single, only, simple, mere, clear, explained' (Hexaemeron, John Chrysostom, Evsebius of Caesarea, Severian of Gabala, Cyril of Jerusalem, Book of Chries, Anania Širakac'i, George of Pisidia, etc.), *meknem* 'to divide, separate, isolate, stretch, explain' (Bible+); *mews*, *miws*, gen. *miws-o-y*, dat. *miws-um* (Agat'angelos, Evsebius of Caesarea, Gregory of Nyssa, etc.) 'another, the other' (Bible+) (= *mi* + *ews*, NHB 2: 282c); *mianam* 'to be united' (Bible+); *miayn* 'only' (Bible+), compositional *men-a-* (Bible+); *miayn-ak* 'alone' (Movsēs Xorenac'i, etc.); **mimean-* 'each other', acc. *mimean-s*, gen.-dat. *mimean-c*, instr. *mimeam-b-k* (Bible+); *miak* (Movsēs Xorenac'i, Philo, etc.), *mēk* (Plato, Mxit'ar Goš, etc.) 'one'; *mi-n* 'one' (George of Pisidia, Grigor Narekac'i, Nersēs Lambronac'i, etc.), *minawor* 'isolated' (Agat'angelos+); hellenophile *mu* 'one'.

For the paradigm and a morphological discussion, see Meillet 1913: 66-68; 1936: 90-91; Schmitt 1981: 128; Weitenberg 1984a; Clackson 1994: 64-67.

●DIAL Ararat *mi*, Akn postposed indefinite article *mi*. Reduced indefinite article *mə* (*m* before a vowel) in Polis, Hamšen, Sebastia, Xarberd, Tigranakert, Zeyt'un, etc.; note also postposed *-əm* in Axalc'xa and Karin. The form *min* is found in Łarabał, Ĵula, Polis, etc. The forms *mēk* 'one' and *miaynak* > **menak*, etc. 'alone' are ubiquitous [HAB 3: 319a]. Interesting is Ĵula *mekn* 'correctly, right, upright', referring e.g. to the way of sitting or holding a book (Ačarean 1940: 376a).

An exceptional and obscure form is found in Agulis, *muyn*, C'ħna *mun*, which is not explained by Ačaryan (1935: 60, 375; HAB 3: 318b; for textual illustrations, see M. Zak'aryan 2008: 228). The vocalism here can hardly be due to influence of the labial nasal *m-*, cf. *mis* 'meat' > *mays*, *mit-k* 'mind' > *maytk*', etc. The final *-an* yields Agulis *-un*, but this does not solve the problem either because the Agulis form is *muyn*, and a proto-form **mian* would be obscure. Nor do we have evidence for *-ayn* > Agulis *-uyn*, thus *min* > **mayn* > **muyn* is uncertain, too. One is tempted to consider Łarabał *mu-* in *mu-xrek* 'a bit', which Ačaryan (HAB 3: 319a) hesitantly compares with literary *mu*. If this proves to be correct, the form *mu* should be regarded as more than an artificial hellenizing creation. This is reminiscent of the case of Łarabał *munk*' and hellen. *monk*' vs. basic *mek*' 'we' (q.v.).

●ETYM Connected with Gr. *μία* f. 'one' < **smih₂-*, Alb. *një* 'one' (see Kortlandt 1986: 40 = 2003: 70; Clackson 1994: 175) vs. Gr. *εἷς* 'one' < **sem-s*, cf. Toch. A *sas*, B *še* 'one; same', in pl. 'some' (see Hilmarsson 1984; Adams 1999: 658-659), Gr. *ἅμα* 'at the same time, together', *ὁμός* 'one and the same', Skt. *samá-* 'the same', Av. *hama-*, MPers., NPers. *ham* 'the same', Lat. *semel* 'once, a single time', etc. Hübschmann 1883: 43; 1897: 474; HAB 3: 317-318 with rich lit.; Pokorny 1959: 902; Mallory/Adams 1997: 399a.

The PArm. original paradigm **hem-* < **sem-* (masc.) vs. **miya-* < **smijeh₂-* (fem.) was probably reshaped into **miyo-* (masc.) **miya-* (fasc.), cf. gen. *mioy*, etc.; traces of **miya-* > **mea-* may be seen in *mekin* 'single' and *metasan* 'eleven', see Hübschmann *ibid.*; HAB *ibid.*; Meillet 1978: 69-71 < RevEtArm 5, 1925: 1-4; 1936: 99-100; Schmitt 1981: 128, 131; for further references and a discussion, see Clackson 1994: 46-47, 175-176, 208₅₀; cf. Kortlandt 1994a: 253, 253 = 2003: 98, 101; Olsen 1999: 174, 812, 826-827; Beekes 2003: 190. On *mi-ayn*, see Meillet 1922h.

It has been argued that the oblique forms *mioy* and *mium* on the one hand and *mioj* on the other represent the original masc. and fem. sets of pronominal endings, respectively (Kortlandt 1984a: 100-101; 1994a: 253 = 2003: 47-48, 98; Weitenberg 1984a; 1989: 68-69). For a critical analysis of this view, see Clackson 1994: 63-67. The alternant form *mi-n* may reflect the accusative of *mi* (Kortlandt 1994a: 253, 256 = 2003: 98, 101, see also 59).

It is tempting to regard the dialectal (Axalc'xa, Karin) postposed form *-əm* 'a' as a relic of PArm. **(h)im* < **sem-* 'one'.

mi prohibitive particle 'not' (Bible+).

●DIAL Ubiquitous in the dialects; Łarabał has *mí*, *mír*, *mæér*, *míl*, *mél* (see Davt'yan 1966: 428), pl. *mrék*'; with a final *-n*: Agulis, Meṭri *mán* [HAB 3: 316a].

All the forms cited by Ačařyan (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. 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 Jahukyan (1987: 99, 137), Toch. and Phryg. or Thrac. are included, too.

mic, AblSg *i maceē* (Philo) '(fetid) mud' (Philo, Gregory of Nyssa, Dawit' Anyakt'); **mceal** 'dirty, dark' (in the dictionary entitled *Arjērn bařaran*, Venice, 1865); with expressive *z*:- **z-mc-eal** 'impure, sinful' in 2 Paralipomenon 27.2 (Xalat'eanc' 1899: 96b): *ew takawin žotovurdk'n zmceal ēin* : *καὶ ἔτι ὁ λαὸς κατεφθειρέτο*. For philological analysis of this Biblical form (unknown to NHB and Astuacaturean 1895), see Ačařean 1908a: 14-15; HAB 3: 321.

According to HAB 3: 321a, here belongs also **mjut'iwn** 'duskiness, darkness (of smoke)' in the letter from Bishop Giwt (5th cent.) to Vač'ē (king of Ałuank') apud Movsēs Kałankatuac'i 1.11, the passage see NHB 2: 286a. The critical text by V. Arak'elyan (1983: 22^{1.4}) has here **mlj-k-ut'iwn** (var. *mljut'iwn*), however. The passage runs as follows: *zmljku't'iwn cxoyn i spitaku't'iwn řuřani řrjec'er* "you turned <...> the darkness of the smoke into the witness of a lily" (transl. Dowsett 1961: 13). We may posit thus a by-form ***mlj-** probably metathesized from ***mic-t-** (or contaminated with *mlj-k-* 'to strangle, suffocate', on which see s.v. *hetj-a-mlj-uk* 'drowned, suffocated, oppressed'); see also s.v. **metc/j* prob. 'soot'.

●ETYM Scheffelowitz (1904-05, 2: 30) compares *mic* with Saxon *smitta* 'dirt, spot', OHG *smiz* 'spot', etc., positing ***smid-jo-** for Armenian. This is accepted in Pokorny 1959: 966, listing these Armenain and Germanic forms under ***smei-d-** 'to smear' and adding OCS *smědъ* 'dark, swarthy, dusky' (see also Saradževa 1986: 95). Adams apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 528b considers this connection uncertain.

The sound development ***-d₁-** > Arm. **-c-** is untenable. One rather expects **-č-** (see 2.1.22.1). More probably, *mic*, if etymologized correctly, reflects an analogical nominative ***(s)mid-s** (see 2.2.1.2). One may also consider an influence of other synonymous words such as *atc-* vs. *alt* 'dirt, filth', *pitc* 'filthy, abominable' vs. *přt-or* 'id.'. One may also assume a connection to (or contamination with) Arm. ***metc/j** prob. 'soot' and PIE ***smerd-** 'to stink', cf. Lith. *smirdžiu*, *smirdėti* 'to stink', etc. (see above on the by-form ***mlj-**).

mis, *o*-stem: GDSg *ms-o-y*, AblSg *i ms-o-y* (abundant evidence in the Bible, see Astuacaturean 1895: 1018-1019), *a*-stem: GDP1 *ms-a-c'*, AblP1 *i ms-a-c'* (Plato, Yovhannēs Sarkawag) 'flesh, meat' (Bible+); **ms-an**, *an*-stem: IPI *msan-am-b-k'* (a few attestations in Leviticus, rendering Gr. *μῆριον*, and once in Gregory of Nyssa) 'the fleshy part of loins' (Bible+).

●DIAL Dialectally ubiquitous [HAB 3: 324a].

●ETYM Since long (Schröder, Klaproth, NHB, etc., see HAB 3: 324a), connected with the PIE word for 'meat', ***mēmsō-**: Skt. *māmsā-* n. (vs. *mās*, acc.sg. n.), Goth. *mimz*, OCS *męso*, OPr. *menso*, *mensā*, Toch. B *mīsa* n., f. pl. tant., Alb. *mish*, etc. (Hübschmann 1897: 474; HAB 3: 323-324; Pokorny 1959: 725; Jahukyan 1987: 138; Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 343-344; Demiraj 1997: 269-270; Mallory/Adams

1997: 374-375; Adams 1999: 464; Olsen 1999: 22, 299; Beekes 2003: 168-169). For the development **-Ns* > Arm. *-s*, see 2.1.11.

For the form **ms-an-n* compare *mkan-un-k*, *mkan-an-c* ‘back’ (for a discussion, see Olsen 1999: 298-299); cf. also *lusanunk* which presupposes a NSg **lus-an-n* ‘lynx’ (q.v.). One may think of QIE **mē(m)s-n-* seen in Gr. *μῆνυζ* ‘skin, cuticle’, but the appurtenance of this Greek word is disputed.

According to Ačaryan (HAB 3: 323b), Arm. *mrc’-an-unk*, attested only in Oskip’orik, is an erroneous form. In the case the form is reliable, one is tempted to posit an older **mirs-* < **mis-r-* from **mēms-r-*, cf. Gr. *μηρός* m. ‘the upper fleshy part of the shank’, Lat. *membrum* n. ‘limb’, etc. This is, of course, highly conjectural.

Arm. *mis* has two stems: *o-* and *a-* (cf. Ĵahukyan 1959: 321b). It is remarkable that none of the 70 Biblical attestations listed in Astuacaturean 1895: 1018-1019 is in plural. Besides, the *o*-declension is not found in plural, whereas the evidence for *a*-declension comes almost exclusively from the plural. This makes me assume that, next to PARM. neuter singular **mis-o-* (reflected in GDSg *ms-o-y*), there was a PARM. neuter plural or collective **mis-a-* (reflected in GDPl *ms-a-c*) deriving from PIE **mēms-h₂-* (cf. Specht 1947: 50 and Adams 1999: 464 on Baltic, Tocharian, etc.).

mit, *a*-stem; frequently in pl. *mit-k*, GDPl *mt-ac*; 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 MidArm. we find *mitk’ dnel* ‘to pay attention, be attentive’ in Amirdovlat’ Amasiac’i (15th cent.) [MijHayBař 2, 1992: 138a], and in ModArm.: *mitk’(ə) dnel*, *mtk’in dnel*, *mtk’um* (loc.) *dnel* ‘to decide, intend, aim’ [Malxaseanc’ HBB 3: 339-340; HayLezDarjBař 1975: 436a, 444, 445a]. See also on dialects.

●DIAL Ubiquitous in the dialects, mainly as frozen **mit-k*. Alongside with **mit-k*, some dialects, such as T’iflis, Ararat, Agulis, Polis, have also *mit* [HAB 3: 325-326].

Frozen IPl *mtok* (< *mt-a-w-k*) is attested in the work of the 18th-century famous poet Sayat’-Nova, who spoke and wrote in the dialect of T’iflis (see K’oč’oyan 1963: 16, 131).

Nor Naxijewan, Polis *mitk’ə dnel* ‘to intend, decide to do smth.’ [Ačarean 1913: 782b].

●ETYM Related to Gr. *μῆδεα* ‘counsels, plans, arts’ (pl. of the unattested **μῆδος*, *-εος*, *s*-stem neuter), *μέδω* ‘to protect, rule over’, *μέδομαι* ‘to provide for, be mindful of; to plan, contrive, devise’, *μῆδομαι* ‘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 a discussion, see Beekes 1973: 92; 1988a: 30; Clackson 1994: 147-149; Meissner 2006: 72-73, 80-83. Arm. *mit(-k)* has been explained from a 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, MidArm., ModArm. and dialects, seems to continue PIE formula **mens- d^heh₁-* ‘to put in the mind’, replacing the first member by *mit* < **mēd-*.

***ml-i/uk, *ml-ak** (dial.) ‘midge; bed-bug; nit’

●DIAL Merteköz-Nikomidia *mlug* ‘nit’, T‘iflis, Ararat *mlak* ‘midge’, Nor Naxijewan *mlag* ‘mosquito’, Łarabał *mlak* ‘bed-bug’, Muš *mliġ*, Van *mlik* ‘bed-bug’ [HAB 3: 328b], Moks *məlik* [Orbeli 2002: 290].

●ETYM Together with *mlmlem* ‘to rub’, etc., related with *malem* ‘to crush, grind’ (q.v.), see Lidén 1906: 82-83; Meillet 1924: 4-5; HAB 3: 328b; Ĵahukyan 1987: 138.

mlet ‘dust, chaff, ash’ in Isaiah 5.24 (rendering Gr. *χνοῦς* ‘dust’), Philo, Gregory of Nyssa, Paterica), *mret* ‘id.’ (Paterica, Geoponica) through metathesis (cf. **baretn* < *batefn* ‘bindweed’); *mletem* ‘to make turn to dust, incinerate, destroy’ (Yovhan Őjniec‘i, Gregory of Nyssa, Colophons); dial. ***mt-met** ‘chaff’.

●DIAL Muš, Alaškert *mlet*, *mret*, Xarberd *mret*, Hačən *matot* ‘chaff’ [HAB 3: 332a], Moks *məret*, gen. *mərtan*, pl. *məret-k^oir* ‘самая мелкая мякоть соломы’ [Orbeli 2002: 291]; reduplicated: Ĵula *mtmet*, Ararat *mtmet* ‘chaff’ [HAB 3: 332a]; Xarberd *mrelet* ‘to annihilate, destroy’, Zeyt‘un *mretil* ‘to vanish, be annihilated, be destroyed’ [HAB 3: 332a].

●ETYM Probably belongs with *malem* ‘to crush, grind’ (q.v.), cf. OHG *melm* ‘dust, sand’, MHG *malmen* ‘to crush’, etc. (see HAB 3: 331-332 with references). Hesitantly Olsen 1999: 953. See also s.v. **mut-* ‘grinding, crushing’, **mtmet*, **mt-mo/ut* ‘moth, clothes moth’.

mnam, 1sg.aor. *mnac* ‘-i, 3sg.aor. *mnac* ‘, imper. *mna* (rich evidence in the Bible, see Astuacaturean 1895: 1024-1025) ‘to remain, stay, wait’ (Bible+).

●DIAL Ubiquitous in the dialects. Interesting are: T‘avriz, T‘ehran *mnna-* with geminate nasal; Muš, Alaškert aor. *mac* ‘i, imper. *manc* ‘i [HAB 3: 333b].

●ETYM From PIE **men-* ‘to remain, stay’: Skt. *man-* ‘to wait, remain’, YAv. *mān-* (*mān-*) ‘to remain, dwell’, MPers. NPers. *māndan* ‘to wait’, Gr. *μένω* ‘to stay, wait’, Lat. *manēō*, *ēre* ‘to stay, remain; to await; to last, endure’ < **m(o)n-ē-* < stative **m(o)n-eh₁-* (Beekes apud Schrijver 1991: 457-458; de Vaan 2008: 362; cf. Rikov 1998: 33-34, positing **mnh₁-eh₁-*), etc.; the Armenian form reflects **minam* < **men-ā-je-*, cf. iterative Gr. *ἐπι-μεμνῆσθαι*, etc.; 3.sg.aor. *mnac* ‘ ‘he remained’ < **(e-)menāsket*.

For the etymology and a morphological discussion, see NHB 2: 286c; Hübschmann 1897: 475; 1899: 46; Grammont 1918: 246; HAB 3: 333b with references; Meillet 1936: 48, 103, 110; Pokorny 1959: 729; Ernout/Meillet 1959: 383; Łaragyulyan 1961: 55-56, 75-76; Ałabekyan 1979: 67; K. Schmidt 1980: 42; 1980a: 1-2; Klingenschmitt 1982: 91-92; Ĵahukyan 1982: 166-168, 176, 186-187, 190-192; Clackson 1994: 80, 106; Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 306-307; Mallory/Adams 1997: 482a; Cheung 2007: 73-74.

mšuš ‘fog’, a MidArm. word [HAB 3: 336a; MiĴHayBař 2, 1992: 142b]. Recorded in Bařgirk‘ hayoc‘ [Amalyan 1975: 219^{Nr391}]. In this dictionary it is found also as *mšōš*, rendering *maraxut* ‘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*, although the word is not recorded here.

●DIAL Van [Ačařean 1913: 789], Ararat [Amatuni 1912: 485b], Sebastia [HAB 3: 336b]; for a possible indirect 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 Ačařyan (HAB 3: 336b) calls attention to Syriac *miš* 'fog', Assyrian *mušu* 'night', etc. but leaves the origin of the Armenian word open. Jahukyan (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 Jahukyan 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. **aļj-* 'darkness, twilight')?

***moz** 'great, much, mighty, increased', only in the verb *mozanam* 'to become large or mighty, increase' (John Chrysostom, Eusebius of Caesarea), caus. *mozac'uc'anem* (John Chrysostom).

The evidence is scarce, and there are reading variants with *-l-* and *-ř-* instead of *-z-*. Therefore the word should be regarded as uncertain [HAB 3: 337-338].

●ETYM No etymology is accepted by Ačařyan [HAB 3: 338a].

See s.v. *mec* 'great, big, large'.

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 Kořbac'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. Garsoian 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* <...> *zormzakan 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 the dialects [HAB 3: 340]. For the meaning in Svedia, see above.

●ETYM Compared with Dutch *mal* 'foolish, funny, crazy, cracked, mad', Skt. *malvá-* 'unbesonnen, töricht' (cf., however, Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 334), etc. [HAB 3: 339-340; Finck 1903]. See also *met(-k')*.

moš 'tamarisk; blackberry, bramble': *moš-a-vayri* 'wild tamarisk' in Jeremiah 17.6, rendering Gr. *ἀγριο-μυρίκη* f. 'tamarisk' (lit. 'wild-tamarisk'), also in Commentary

on Genesis by Vardan Arewelc'i (in contrast with *moreni* 'bramble'), *moř vayri* 'id.' ("Girk' t'it'oc'"); *moř-i* 'tamarisk' in Galen rendering Gr. *murik* = *μωρίκη* 'tamarisk' [NHB 2: 297a; Greppin 1985: 78], in MidArm. mostly 'bramble, blackberry-bush', cf. gen. *sew mořoy* 'of black bramble' in the 13th-century "Bžškaran jioy" [Č'ugaszyan 1980: 125^{L1}], and *moř* described as *mirg seaw* 'black fruit' of the thorny shrub *moři* in Bařgirk' hayoc' [Amalyan 1975: 219^{Nr412}]; *moř* also in Geoponica; *moř-eni*, GDPl *mořeneac* 'bramble, blackberry-bush' ("K'art'lis c'xovreba"). See also Aliřan 1895: 443; Malxaseanc' HBB 3: 358b.

●DIAL Agulis, Łarabał *mōři* 'bramble, blackberry-bush', Agulis, Łarabał, Łaradał, Łarak'ilisa, řamaxi *mōř* 'blackberry'; Muř *mōři* 'a bush from twigs of which besoms are made', Xarberd *mōři* 'a kind of tree' [HAB 3: 346a]. The actual meaning in Xarberd may be identical with that of Muř, namely 'a bush from twigs of which besoms are made' (cf. Bařamyān 1960: 154b on Dersim). Sasun *moř-i* seems to refer to 'bramble' since it is described as giving the fruit/berry *moř* (see Petoyan 1954: 146; 1965: 506).

The frequently cited *mořay* seems to be a ghost form deduced from *mořa-vayri*. Note, however, that Haneyan (1978: 193a) glosses ClArm. *mořay* by Tigranakert *mōře*. The final *-e* in this dialect can hardly reflect ClArm. *-i*, cf. *leti* 'gall' > *leti*, *oski* 'gold' > *osgi*, *p'oři* 'dust' > *p'oři*, etc. (see Haneyan 1978: 38). It rather points to **mořeay*. Compare also Georg. *t'ut'-a* vs. Arm. *t'ut'*, Aram. *tūtā*, etc. 'mulberry', as well as Hamřen *mōra* vs. *mor* 'blackberry' (see s.v.). Further, note the following.

Ačarıyan (1925: 61-62; HAB 3: 346a) notes that Nor Naxiřewan *muřay* (with final *-y*) 'a kind of herb grazed by livestock', albeit remarkable, must be a Tatar loan and has nothing to do with *moř*, which is a bush. I am not sure whether the Tatar word is of Turkic origin. Since the cognates of *moř/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 Naxiřewan *muřay* (and its Tatar match?) actually means 'mulberry' and is somehow related with this mulberry/blackberry term.

●SEMANTICS Since MidArm. and dial. *moř-i* refers mostly to 'bramble, blackberry-bush', and the meaning 'tamarisk' occurs practically only in the compound *moř-a-vayri* (Jeremiah 17.6 and one or two Bible-depending texts), one might assume that the basic meaning of Arm. *moř-i* is 'bramble, blackberry-bush', and the compound *moř-a-vayri* 'tamarisk' should be understood as 'wild bramble'.

Syntactically, the compound *moř-a-vayri* is reminiscent of *iř-a-vayr-i* 'onager' (Eznik Kořbac'i, Movsēs Xorenac'i, John Chrysostom, Paterica, etc.), cf. *ὄναγρος* = *ὄνος ἄγριος*. Its Greek match *ἀγριο-μωρίκη*, however, reflects a reversed order of the components.

●ETYM No etymology is recorded in HAB 3: 345-346.

Ĵahukyan correctly connects with *mor* 'blackberry', q.v.

mořanam, 1sg.aor. *mořac* '-a-y, imper. *mōra* 'to forget' (Bible+).

On *mořac* '-awn-k' 'oblivion' (Bible+), see Olsen 1999: 652-654, 840.

●DIAL Ubiquitous in the dialects [HAB 3: 346b].

In a few W and SW dialects one finds *-a-* instead of *-o-*: Zeyt'un *mārnəl* (vs. Hačən *mōrnəl*, *mōynəl*), Svedia *mārnil*, Xarberd *mārnəl* [HAB 3: 346b], Dersim *mārnəl* [Bařamyān 1960: 93a]. This *-a-* is difficult to explain within the dialects (cf.

e.g. Ačaryan 2003: 75 and 388 for Zeyt'un-Haçən and Svedia, respectively); further, see below.

●ETYM Derived from PIE **mers-* 'to forget': Skt. *maṛṣ-*, pres. *mṛ̥ṣyate* 'to forget', MPers. *fra/ā-muštan*, *fra-mōšīdan*, NPers. *farā-muštan* 'to forget' (MacKenzie 1971: 32), Lith. *už-miṛšti* 'to forget', Toch. AB *mārs-* 'to forget' < **mers-*, etc., see Bugge 1889: 23; 1892: 446; Hübschmann 1897: 475; HAB 3: 346 (referring also to Tērvišeān); Pokorny 1959: 737; Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 332; Mallory/Adams 1997: 209b; Adams 1999: 455-456; Cheung 2007: 268-269.

Arm. *moṛana-* has been compared to Toch. A pres. *mārsnā-* 'to forget' (Adams 1999: 455-456), thus **me/orsna-* > PArm. **moṛna-* or **mor(š)na* > **moṛna-* (cf. Meillet 1936: 40, 185; Kortlandt 1983: 10 = 2003: 40; Beekes 2003: 157) > *moṛanam* as (or after the type of) *loganam* 'to bathe' < **louH-*, cf. Gr. *λούω*, *λο(φ)έσαι*, Lat. *lavō*, *lavere* 'to wash; to bathe, soak', *lavāre* 'to bathe', etc.

On the other hand, the *o*-grade has been explained from an underlying unattested noun **morso-* 'einer, der vergißt' (Klingenschmitt 1982: 126-127) seen in Lith. *maṛšas* 'oblivion, forgetfulness', Skt. *dur-māṛṣa-* 'unforgettable', etc. (cf. also Skt. *maṛṣana-* 'enduring, forgiving', see Olsen 1999: 653-654, 840); note *gotanam* 'to steal' vs. *goṭ* 'thief' and *gaṭem* 'to hide, conceal'. In view of the absence of a noun **moṛ*, this solution is less probable.

According to N. Simonyan 1979: 247-248, the Armenian dialectal by-form **maṛ-(a)n-* (see the dialectal section) derives from an IE zero-grade form **mṛs-*. If this is accepted, one is tempted to treat this dialectal form as an archaic relic of the zero-grade present seen in e.g. Skt. pres. *mṛ̥ṣyate*. However, the dialectal *-a-* may still be secondary, even though it is not easily explicable at this stage.

mor₁ '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 Jahkec'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 corroborated by Malxaseanc' (HBB 3: 360c, referring also to Sepetčean) 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*, *τρύχνον* (see NHB 2: 298c; Ališan 1895: 445, Nr 2117; Béguinot/Diratzouyan 1912: 82; Malxaseanc' HBB 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 miṛoy 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 morenwoj*) : *ἐν τῷ βάτῳ*. In Mark 12.26: *i morenwoj* : *ἐπὶ τοῦ βάτου*. In Luke 6.44: *oč' i morenwoy kt'en xatot* : *οὐδὲ ἐκ βάτου σταφυλὴν τρυγῶσιν*. In Luke 20.37: *i morenwoj* : *ἐπὶ τῆς βάτου*. In Acts 7.35: *i morenwojn* : *ἐν τῇ βάτῳ*.

●DIAL Widespread in the 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, Šamšulde *mər* ‘blackberry’, Łarak‘ilisa (Loři) *mər* ‘raspberry’, Ararat, Goris *mōri*, Łarabał *mōre* ‘strawberry’ [HAB 3: 347b].

Hamšen *mör*, gen. *mər-i* ‘blackberry’ (the berry), *mərəni* (the shrub) [Ačaryan 1947: 245]. According to HAB 3: 347b: *mōra*. 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. *t^hut^h-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 *r* of this form is strange since, as Ačaryan (1941: 93) assures, “the pronunciation of *r* as *r̄* is very odd for this dialect” whereas the opposite, namely *r̄ > 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 > r̄* in Tigranakert except for the position before a consonant (see Haneyan 1978: 51, 62, and the glossary). I posit an old **mōr* 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 **mormuk*, see Amatuni 1912: 489a), Akn **morm-ik* ‘raspberry’, Binkean, Mertəköz (Nikomidia) **mormorik* ‘blackberry’, Aslanbek *mərm*, *məmr* ‘blackberry’, *mərmi p‘üs* ‘blackberry, bramble (the shrub)’, lit. ‘thorn of blackberry’ [HAB 3: 347b].

In Hamšen, also ‘wild strawberry; wild grapes’ (see Ačaryan 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 mōřen 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‘ HBB 3: 358b) considers this to be an unknown word. In my view, 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 evidence from 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’, *μωρέα*, -έη f. ‘mulberry-tree, *Morus nigra*’, Lat. *mōrum*, *ī*, n. ‘fruit of the black mulberry’, *mōrus*, *ī*, f. ‘black mulberry-tree’, Welsh *mer-wyddden* ‘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; Jahukyan 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)mōř- and a Central European (Carpathian?) **smi(i)or-*.

Jahukyan (1987: 72, 139, 255) adds also dial. **moř* (< **morš-*) and **moř* deriving them from **mor-s-*, but does not specify the origin of *-s- and the distribution of *r* : (*r*)*ř*. On this, see below. It should be noted that **moř* ‘tamarisk; blackberry’ is not purely dialectal (see s.v.).

Arm. *mor* has been compared with Lezg. *mer* ‘малина; ежевика’ [Šaumjan 1935: 423]. Jahukyan (1987: 605) places this comparison into Nostratic context noting also (p. 588) Georg. *marçqw-*, Svan *bāsq(i)-* (< **marçqw-*). On the alleged Nostratic **marja* ‘berry’, see Illič-Svityč 1976: 43-44; Jahukyan 1987: 72, 294. On Kartv. **marçqw-* ‘strawberry’, see Klimov 1998: 115 where no forms are cited outside Kartvelian.

Next to the above-mentioned Lezg. *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. *murķæ* ‘guelder rose’, further: Kab. *mārķ^wa* ‘strawberry, blackberry’, Abaza *marak^wa* ‘mulberry’, etc. [Nikolayev/Starostin 1994: 804-805].

Some further possibly related forms: Hittite *mu-uri-uš* ‘grape’; Finno-Ugr. **murā* ‘berry’, PU **mora* ‘raspberry, cloudberry’, FUgr. **marja* ‘berry’, etc. [Campbell 1990: 165-166]; Burushaski *biranč*, Basque *martšuka* ‘mulberry’ [P. Friedrich 1970: 150].

The appurtenance of Gr. *μορία* f. pl. (with or without *ἐλαῖαι*) ‘the sacred olives in the Academy’, generally ‘olives that grew in the precincts of temples’, and *μορίκη* f. ‘tamarisk’ is considered to be questionable (Heubeck 1949-50: 282, 282₇₇; see Frisk s.vv.; Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 646₁ = 1995: 556₅₄). In view of the semantic relation ‘tamarisk’: ‘blackberry’ reliably testified by Arm. *moš*, the derivation of Gr. *μορίκη* ‘tamarisk’ from QIE **mor-/mōr-* ‘blackberry, black mulberry’ seems probable. The aberrant vocalism of *μορίκη* points to non-IE origin and can be compared with that of Finno-Ugr. **murâ* ‘berry’, probably also Hittite *mu-uri-uš* ‘grape’.

Structurally, Gr. *μop-ík-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-i*, 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 Ačaryan (HAB, *ibid.*) derives Arm. dial. Arabkir *mamuř* ‘bramble, wild mulberry’ (for which see also Ačaryan 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. *βάτος* f., m. ‘bramble, blackberry (the plant, shrub)’ vs. *βάτον* 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. *μopέα*, *-έη* f. ‘mulberry-tree’, if from **mor-es-(e)h₂-*. The form for ‘fruit, berry’, namely **mor-(o)m*, may be seen in dial. **mor(n)* and older **mor-m-* of which *mor-m-eni* (the plant) is formed.

The dial. **mor* 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 **mor* 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 a berry; (3) there is no designation for the plant based on **mor*, in other words, no **mor-i* (this corroborates the original distribution: **mor-om* (or simply Arm. **mor-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) **mor(n)* 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 the 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 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 centered 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 **mor̄* for the berry (the latter – from neuter **mor-(o)m*) vs. fem. **mor-ieh₂-* > *mor-i* and **mor-s-ieh₂-* > **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.⁹⁵

mor₂ ‘tarantula, phalangium’ in Amirdovlat‘ Amasiac‘i (15th cent.), see S. Vardanian 1990: 134, § 616; comment: p. 613; MijHayBař 2, 1992: 145b), *mor-a-har* ‘bitten by a tarantula’ in Geoponica /13th cent./ [MijHayBař 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; MijHayBař 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*, Juła *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 Ējmiacin) *trišun*. The latter seems to be composed as *tri šun* ‘dog of stony places’; cf. *iric‘i šun* ‘caterpillar’, lit. “dog of a priest” (see Ł. Ałayan 1979: 641^{L-4}, footnote 641₁).

Andreasyan (1967: 252) records Svedia *čičə-mura, jĵə-mura* ‘spider’, *č/jič/jəmurə 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 MidArm. *mor*

⁹⁵ Glossing Łarak‘ilisa *mər* by ModArm. *ark‘ayamor* ‘raspberry’, Ačařyan (1913: 793b) cites two other equivalents, namely *malina* and *zmavula*. The former is certainly Russ. *малина* ‘raspberry’, but I cannot identify *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).

‘tarantula’. For this *i*-form cf. perhaps Georg. *morieli* ‘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’. Ačařyan (HAB 3: 347b) does not accept this etymology and leaves the origin of the Armenian word open.

As we have seen, MidArm. *mor/morm* ‘tarantula’ is dialectally represented in extreme peripheries: SW (Svedia/Syria) *mor* vs. E (Ararat, Ĵula) *morm*. The word may thus be old.

M. Ałabekyan (1980: 162-167) proposed a connection with *mrĵiwn* ‘ant’ (q.v.), cf. especially dialectal forms such as Lori *mormonĵ*, 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. *μύρμᾶξ*, *-ᾶκος* 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 *φαλάγγιον*, the latter being ‘a kind of venomous spider, especially Lathroedectus or malmignatte’, *μυρμήκ-ιον* n. ‘a species of spider’; note also *μόρμωρος* and *μύρμος*, both glossed by *φόβος* ‘panic fear’ in Hesychius.

Arm. Polis/Stambul **mořmořoz*, Crimea and Nor Naxiĵewan **mřmřas* ‘Easter bogy’ (see Ačařean 1913: 54a), of which no etymological attempt is known to me, strikingly resemble *μόρμωρος* ‘panic fear’ (see also Durean 1933: 102). 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 *mormorinĵ* (full reduplication of **mor-*, see above) and Lori *mormonĵ* deserve particular attention; see s.v. *mrĵiwn* ‘ant’. Since Gr. *Μορμών* is feminine, one can identify it with Lori *mormonĵ* which probably reflects QIE fem. **mormon-ĵeh₂-*. For the structure compare another insect-name of Mediterranean origin: *karič*, *a*-stem ‘scorpion’ < **karid-ĵeh₂-*, cf. Gr. *κᾶρίς*, *-ίδος* 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 *mrĵm-uk* ‘little ant’ [Abeghian 1899: 31] (cf. *mrĵm-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.

mori₁ ‘woods, forest’ Step‘annos Siwnec‘i (8th cent.), MidArm. and dial.

Ačaryan (HAB 3: 247b) mentions *mori* ‘den, lair’ linking it with *mayri* ‘den, lair’ (q.v.) and does not present a record of *mori* ‘woods, forest’. One finds some literary and dialectal evidence for this form. Step‘annos Siwnec‘i (8th cent.) mentions *mori* in the following list: <...>, *draxt*, *antar*, *mori*, *čatag*, *art*, <...> [Adonc‘ 1915=2008: 210^{L24f}]. The rest of evidence comes from the Middle Armenian period.

One finds *mori* and pl.-coll. *more-stan* ‘woods’ in a versified lamentation on the Armenians of *Ōlaxac‘ erkir* (the country of Olax‘s = Walachia, in Romania) written by the 16th-century emigrant poet Minas T‘oxat‘c‘i (UšMijnHBnst 1, 1986: 429^{L97}, 431^{L134}, 431^{L138}).

This is corroborated by two straightforward attestations in Simēon Lehac‘i, lit. ‘of Poland’, 17th cent. (SimLehUtegr 1936: 200^{L159f}): *Isk morin amēnn eēmiš ē: xncor, tanc* <...>. “And the forest is completely (full of) fruit: apple, pear, <...>”; (201^{L180}): *Ew ayl i vayr en xoru mōrik‘ ew lerink‘, or en Sasunk‘* “And in the place there are also deep forests and mountains, which are Sasunk’”. Glossed by Akinean (SimLehUtegr 1936: 442) as *mōri*, *mori* ‘forest’. Note also a direct dialectal evidence from Ařtial (Suč‘ava, Poland, Hungary), *mōri*, see s.v. *mayri* ‘woods’.

Further attested in medieval folk-songs recorded by Xaç‘gruz Łrimec‘i, of Crimea (early 17th cent., Matenadaran, manuscript Nr. 7709), with spelling variants *mori* and *mōri* (Mnac‘akanyan 1956: 124^{L11f}, 126^{L9}), as well as in *Govank‘ t‘rč‘noc‘* (Mnac‘akanyan 1980a: 249^{L133}), Nahapet K‘uč‘ak (MijHayBař 2, 1992: 146a).

In *Ořb Edesioy* by Nersēs Šnorhali (12th cent., Cilicia): *Ařiwc goč‘ēr i yantarin, ew gišaxanj arjn – i bayin* (see M. Mkrtč‘yan 1973: 73^{L466}). The word *bay* means ‘den, lair (especially of bear)’. In some manuscripts (Kesaria-group) it has been replaced by *antar* ‘forest’, in others (Karin-group) – by *mori* (LocSg *i morin*). Since Karin (Erzurum) is geographically very close to Hamšen and Dersim, this indirect evidence can be relevant for the geographical spread of this form, as well as for the semantic association ‘forest’ : ‘den, lair’ (see below).

●DIAL Apart from Ařtial *mōri* ‘forest’ (see above), here belong also Hamšen *mōri* (in a folk-song: *kac‘in ařa mta morin* “I took an axe and entered the forest”, T‘ořlak‘yan 1986: 88^{L1}; the context with blood from the tree points to a medieval song of the type *Awetis*, see Mnac‘akanyan 1956: 333-334, cf. 590-594); Dersim *mōri* ‘id.’ (Bařramyan 1960: 28, 93a), Erzinka *mōri* ‘small forest’ (Kostandyan 1979: 142a), Svedia *mira* ‘id.’ (Andreasyan 1967: 331, 375b). Łaribyan (1958: 58b) glosses ClArm. *antar* ‘forest’ by Aramo *mura*, *murastōin*. Apparently, *mura* continues *mori* (or *mōri*, see op. cit. 21), and *murastōin* is the plural-collective form *morestan* attested in Minas T‘oxat‘c‘i, 16th cent., see above.

The literary and dialectal evidence points to NW and SW peripheries of the Armenian speaking territories.

●ETYM See s.vv. *mayri*₁ ‘woods, forest’, *mayri*₂ ‘den, lair’, and *mori* ‘den, lair’.

mori₂, AblSg *i morw-o-y*, LocSg *i morwoĵ* and *i mori-s* ‘den, lair of beasts, especially of lions’ (Bible+).

For the attestations in the Bible (Astucaturean 1895 vacat), Eznik Kolbac‘i and Yovhannēs Draxanakerc‘i, see NHB 2: 298.

Further attestations: Dawt‘ak (7th cent.) apud Movsēs Kaġankatuac‘i 2.35 (1983: 226^{L13}; transl. Dowsett 1961: 146): *orpēs zariwc i morwoĵ* ‘like a lion in his lair’; according to T‘ovmay Arcruni (9-10th cent.) 3.29 (1985: 392; transl. Thomson 1985: 316), there were lairs (*mori-k*) of boars and lions in the banks of the river Araxes.

●ETYM See s.vv. *mayri₁* ‘woods’, *mayri₂* ‘den, lair’, *mori₁* ‘woods’.

mġmġam, mġrġmġem ‘to murmur’ (John Chrysostom, Movsēs Kaġankatuac‘i, etc.).

●DIAL Widespread in the dialects, mostly as **mġmġal*, as well as **mġ(r)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.

mrmunĵ, *o*-stem: GDPl *mrmnĵ-o-c* ‘in P‘awstos Buzand (5th cent.), John Chrysostom (note also late IPl *mrmnĵ-ōk* = *-a-w-k* ‘in Grigor Narekac‘i, formally pointing to *a*-stem) ‘mutter, maundering, lamentation, mourning song, whispered song’ attested in P‘awstos Buzand, Elišē, John Chrysostom, Eusebius of Caesarea, Grigor Magistros, etc. (NHB 2: 308b), also in Dionysius Thrax and in the Commentary on it by Dawit‘ P‘ilisop‘ay (see Adonc 1915=2008: 59^{L5}, 79^{L13}); *mrmnĵem* ‘to moan, mutter, maunder, mourn, say or sing in an undertone’ (Bible+), later also *mrmnĵal* ‘to sing a magic song, recite a magic spell’ (see below).

In P‘awstos Buzand 4.15 (1883=1984: 103^{L18f}; transl. Garsoġan 1989: 144): *jayniwk‘n mrmnĵoc‘n* ‘with moaning voices’, in the context of lament-singing (see the full passage s.v. **geġ-* ‘to sing’).

In the late medieval dictionary *Barġirk‘ hayoc* ‘edited/compiled by Eremia of Meġri (Amalyan 1975: 221^{Nr462}) *mrmnĵal* is glossed as *kardal* ‘to shout, call, recite loudly; to read’, which in the dialect of Ĵarabaġ refers to ‘to sing (said of birds)’, ‘to sing a religious song for magic purpose’, ‘to recite a magic spell’ (see s.v.).

That *mrmnĵal* refers to ‘to recite or whisper a magic spell’ is also seen e.g. in the story by Hovhannes T‘umanyan (native of Lori) entitled ‘Ĵelə = ‘The wolf’, see H. T‘umanyan 5, 1994: 106^{L11}).

●DIAL No dialectal record in HAB 3: 369-370. However, the word has been preserved in e.g. Goris (Margaryan 1975: 350b); in an incantation from Kapan, the same dialectal area as Goris, *mrmunĵ* refers to the hissing of a snake (Ark‘ayik 1910: 115a^{L13}; S. Harut‘yunyan 2006: 85a^{Nr27}). Combining these data with the evidence from *Barġirk‘ hayoc* ‘and Hovhannes T‘umanyan (see above), we may tentatively posit an EArm. form *mrmnĵal* ‘to recite or whisper a magic spell’.

The word is also recorded in HayLezBrbBaġ 4, 2007: 89a with no indication as to the dialectal distribution. Amatuni 1912: 492a and Aġarġyan 1913: 803a record only a homonymous word referring to the pain of a wound. The two forms may eventually be related with each other; for the parallelism of these two meanings cf. *mġmġal*.

●ETYM NHB 2: 308b and Dervischjan 1877: 33-34 compare *mrmun̥j* with *mun̥j* ‘dumb, mute, silent, speechless’ and its cognate forms (see s.v. *mun̥j* for more detail). Godel 1975: 81 suggests a **ie*-present, **murmun-je-* > **murmunje-*, with a regular development **-ŋj-* > Arm. *-nj-*. For *-nj-* compare semantically close words such as *barbanj-* ‘senile fables, mythic stories, whisper of sorcerers, sorcerous or delirious talk, nonsense (of fables), silly prattle, mauding’, *ššu-nj* vs. *ššu-k* ‘whisper’. For further examples of *-nj-*, see HAB 3: 369b, where Ačaryan treats Arm. *mrmun̥j* as an etymologically isolated onomatopoeic word. In my opinion, however, the relation with *mun̥j* ‘dumb, mute; mutter, murmur’ is at least quite plausible.

For the semantic field of *mrmn̥j-* ‘to moan, mutter, maunder, mourn, say or sing in an undertone; to sing a magic song, recite a magic spell’ and its IE cognate forms in meanings ‘to moan, mutter’, ‘to entreat, pray’, etc. note the well-known fact that magic spells and incantations must be recited or crooned in a low voice, or whispered (see Brown 1947: 14-15 with examples of Hermes the Whisperer and old Germanic *runes* ‘magic formulae of various sorts, including love-spells’), cf. OIc. *rūn* ‘secret, magic sign, rune’, *rýna* ‘sich vertraulich unterhalten; Runenzauber ausüben’, OEngl. *rūnian* ‘flüstern; sich verschwören’, OHG *rūna* ‘confidential talk, secret, whisper, advice’, OIr. *rūn* ‘secret’, etc. (see Pokorny 1959: 867-868; Lehmann 1986: 287-288; HerkWört 1997: 576a, 605). Note also Pers. *zanzam* ‘a low, whispering, buzzing sound made by the fire-worshippers’ (see Steingass 621b). On the semantic field of PIE **mū-*, see Toporov 1988: 60₈₃.

mr̥jiwn : NAccSg *mr̥jiwn* (Proverbs [twice], Philo, John Chrysostom), GDSg *mr̥jean* (Ezrik Kołbac‘i, Hexaameron, Anania Širakac‘i), AblSg *i mr̥jen-ē* (Anania Širakac‘i), GDPI *mr̥jean-c* (‘Čarəntir’); **mr̥jimm** : NAccSg *mr̥jimm* (Oskip‘orik, cf. MidArm. *mr̥r̥jum*, see MijHayBař 2, 1992: 155b, 159b), NPI *mr̥jmun-k* (Elišē, Ašxarhac‘oyc‘, Vardan Arewelc‘i), API *mr̥jmun-s* (Anania Širakac‘i), GDPI *mr̥jman-c* (Paterica) ‘ant’ (Bible+).

In order to reconstruct the original paradigm, we must look for a distribution of nom.acc. vs. oblique or singular vs. plural forms. NAccSg *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 GDPI *mr̥jean-c* in ‘Čarəntir’.

The original distribution thus may have been: sg. *mr̥jiwn* (< **mr̥jimm*, gen. **mr̥jman*, although 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 the 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‘úmənə*, *bərč‘émnə* (see Davt‘yan 1966: 64-65, 433). Note also *bərč‘im*, NPI *bərč‘imni* (next to the variant *mərmən̥j*) in a fairy-tale recorded in Šamšadin in 1979; see Xemč‘yan 2000: 38a. See below for the IE comparable cognates.

Artial (Hung.) *mərj‘əb‘un*, too, is remarkable; see HAB 3: 371b. Ačaryan (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 *brjimm (present in Łarabał) was *brjimmun-k'. Analogically after this, a secondary nominative *mrjibun has been formed, which in turn could yield Ařtial mǎrj'ǎb'un through metathesis.

Zeyt'un mǎrč'j'ǎm, Hačǎn mǎrj'im, Adana mǎrjǎm, Svedia mǎrj'ǎm are irregular [Ačǎryan 2003: 88, 329, 399, 580]. They probably reflect what was pronounced as /mrj(i)um/ rather than /mrjium/ or /mrjiwm/. For ClArm. -um > Svedia -ǎm cf. hum 'raw' > hǎm, ddum 'pumpkin' > d'ǎd'd'ǎm, erdumn 'oath' > ufd'ǎm [Ačǎryan 2003: 391-392]. The form under question is also seen in MidArm. (see above) and in the dialects of Hamšen, Xarberd, Nor Naxijewan, etc. In AblSg mǎrjūmē it is attested in a late medieval folk-song recorded by Xač'gruz Łrimec'i (early 17th cent., Matenadaran, manuscript Nr. 7709): Šǎk mǎrjūmē aǎrē dǎgal [Mnac'akanyan 1956: 114^{L36}].

Further: Šamaxi mǎrmǎrinj 'ant' [Bařramyan 1964: 215], Loři mǎrmǎnǎj 'ant' [M. Asatryan 1968: 60, 188b], Metri murinj 'a small greyish ant' [Ałayan 1954: 319].

●ETYM Since long (see HAB 3: 371), connected with the PIE word for 'ant': Gr. μύρμηξ, -ηκος, Dor. μύρμᾶξ, -ᾶκος m. 'ant; fabulous animal in India' (by-forms: μύρμος, βύρμαξ, βόρμαξ, ὄρμικας), Lat. formica f. 'ant', Skt. vamrá- m. 'ant' (RV+), YAv. vaoiri- m. 'ant', MPers., NPers. mǎr 'ant', etc. One usually assumes tabu-forms *uorm- : *moru- (cf. Ĵahukyan 1982: 109). Loři mǎrmǎnǎj is particularly interesting (see Ałabekyan 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 Łarabał, m-/v-/b-, is reminiscent of e.g. the word for 'violet': Arm. manušak < *manawšak < MPers. *manaššak : Zoroastrian vanašša, Pahl. vanaššag : Pers. bunašša, Kurd. banašš (see 2.3.1, on -awš). In this particular case, namely the word for 'ant', note Gr. μύρμηξ, Arm. mǎrjūn, *mormonǎj : Skt. vamrá-, Gr. ὄρμικας : Gr. βύρμαξ, βόρμαξ.

*muž (dial.), *mutǎj 'fog' (?).

●DIAL Xarberd muž-ik 'fog' [Ačǎrean 1913: 795a], Manisa (close to Zmürnia/Izmir) mǎz-ik 'fog' (op. cit. 778-779), Moks mǎž-mǎřamux 'fog' (HAB 3: 262b; see s.v. mǎřaxul 'fog'), [mǎž/mǎž], GSg mǎžǎž, NPl mǎžǎžir 'fog' [Orbeli 2002: 290]; mǎž, recorded in the prison of Van (T'ǎxBař apud Amatuni 1912: 703a). Perhaps also Č'enkiler (Nikomidia) *mǎžal 'to rain slightly', Xarberd *mǎžel, Maškert *mǎžūžel 'to knead preliminarily and slightly (immediately after pouring water into flour)' [Ačǎrean 1913: 778].

Note also Moks mǎžǎvil 'затуманиться; ослабнуть, терять остроту (о зрении)' [Orbeli 2002: 290], according to Ačǎryan (1913: 813a): Moks *mǎžǎwil and *nǎžǎwil (with initial n- and different order of of -w- and -ǎ-) 'to grow dim, gloomy (said of light, star)'. This Moks word can be explained, I think, through contamination of *muž 'fog' and nuatim 'to become dim; to faint, swoon, grow weak' (Bible+; dialects of T'iflis, Ararat, Agulis, Marała), a metathesized form of which (*nǎwil) is found in the dialects of Loři, Łazax, etc.

●ETYM H. Suk'iasyan (1986: 88, 204) connects *muž with *mutǎj found in aǎj-a-mutǎj '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. *aǎj-) > *mutǎj vs. *mu-s- > muž. The latter is impossible, however. Dial. *muž might rather derive from *mutǎj, which seems to have been lexicalized from aǎjamutǎj, a

reduplication of *atj̄- (see s.v.). However, an Iranian origin seems more probable (cf. Kurd. *mīž* < *muj̄*, etc., J. Cheung, p.c.). On Ĵahukyan's view, see s.v. *mšuš* 'fog'.

***mul-** 'to grind; to rub'

●ETYM See s.v. *malem* 'to crush, grind'.

mux, *o*-stem: GDSg *mx-o-y* (Matt'ēos Urhayec'i, 12th cent.) 'smoke' (Philo, Sebēos, Matt'ēos Urhayec'i, Mixayēl Asori).

●DIAL Widespread in the dialects [Ačārean 1913: 795b; HAB 3: 353b].

●ETYM Related with Mlr. *múch* 'smoke', Welsh *mwg* 'fire', MBret. *mog*, *moug* 'hearth', MHG *smouch* 'smoke', OEngl. *smoca* 'smoke', *smēocan* 'to smoke', NEngl. *smoke*, Gr. *σμῶχω* 'to cause to carbonise, be consumed in a slow fire, smoulder away', less probably Russ. *smúglyj* 'dark-complexioned', etc., see de Lagarde 1854: 29^{L805}; Bugge 1889: 18; 1893: 20; Meillet 1894b: 294; 1935 = 1978: 62; Hübschmann 1897: 475; HAB 3: 353a; Pisani 1950: 188; Pokorny 1959: 971; Makaev 1974: 60-61; Saradževa 1986: 45-46, 94; Ĵahukyan 1987: 149; Mallory/Adams 1997: 529.

This etymon presents as with difficulties concerning the vocalic length and the velar. We may be dealing with a European substratum word *(s)m(e)u/ūK/G^(h)-.

mukn, *an*-stem: NPl *mkun-k'*, GDPL *mkan-c* 'mouse' (Bible+).

●DIAL Ubiquitous in the dialects [HAB 3: 355a].

●ETYM From PIE *muHs-: Skt. *mūṣ-* m. f. 'mouse, rat' (RV), Gr. *μῦς* m. 'mouse', Lat. *mūs*, *mūris* m. 'mouse', etc.; see Hübschmann 1897: 475; HAB 3: 354-355 with literature; Pokorny 1959: 752-753; Mallory/Adams 1997: 387a.

Kortlandt (1985b: 9 = 2003: 57; see also Beekes 2003: 196) derives Arm. *mukn* from PIE AccSg *muHs-m. The explanation as *mu(h)- + -kn (see 2.3.1) seems preferable, see 2.1.19.

For a possible relic of the Armenian name for the Milky Way, containing the word for 'mouse', see 3.1.3.

***mut-** 'grinding, crushing'; **m̄tmet*, **m̄t-mo/ut* 'moth, clothes moth' (dialectal).

●DIAL For *mut* 'the grinding of corn', see s.v. *malem* 'to crush, grind'.

Łarabał, Łazax *m̄tm̄cł* 'moth' [Ačāryan 1908-09: 244; 1913: 787a; HAB 3: 225ab]. According to Amatuni (1912: 484a): Łarabał, Łazax, Zangezur, Łap'an *m̄tm̄cł* vs. Bananc' (a village in Ganjak) *m̄tm̄cł*. The latter form is also seen e.g. in a curse from Tavuš-Šamšadin [Xemč'yan 2000: 229b, Nr. 113/1051]: *Oskornik'd m̄tm̄cłn uit* : "May the *m̄tm̄cł* eat your bones". From the material represented in Ačārean 1913: 787a one concludes that the concrete meaning is 'clothes moth'. In the curse formula from Tavuš-Šamšadin it probably refers to 'worms'.

For Agulis **m̄tmet* 'moth', etc., see s.v. *metm* 'soft, fine, calm'.

●ETYM Ačāryan (see the references above) treats **m̄tmo/ut* as a reduplication of **moł* and links with *malem* 'to grind, crush' (q.v.), for the semantics comparing OCS *moľb* 'moth', Goth. *malo* 'moth', OIc. *mōlr* 'moth', etc. He (1908-09: 244) points out that Łarabał *m̄tm̄cł* represents **mołmoł* according to the law of reduplication of Łarabał.

An alternative **m(u)tmul* is possible, too. See also s.vv. *mtet* ‘dust, chaff, ash’, *mtelem* ‘to make turn to dust, incinerate, destroy’, *metm* ‘soft, fine, calm’, **mtmet* ‘chaff; quiet, calm’.

***mult-** ‘fog, darkness’, Only in derivatives and compounds, as *mtt-ut’iwn* ‘darkness’ in Anania Širakac’i (7th cent.), etc. See also s.v. *alt-a-mult* ‘darkness, twilight’.

●DIAL See s.v. *alt-a-mult*.

●ETYM For the etymology, see s.v. **alj-*.

mun, *o*-stem: ISg *mn-o-v* in Deuteronomy 28.27 (see below), Eznik Kořbac’i (A. A. Abrahamyan 1994: 118^{L-1}), GDP1 *mn-o-c*’ in Grigor Narekac’i 67.5 (Xač’atryan Łazinyan 1985: 519^{L94}); cf. also GDSg *mun-i* (in a work attributed to Eřiřē) ‘itch; gnat, midge’ (Bible+).

In Deuteronomy 28.27 (Cox 1981: 184): *harc’ē zk’ez t[ē]r keřov egiptac’oc’n* <...>, *ew mnov* : *πατάζει σε κύριος ἐν ἔλκει Αἰγυπτίῳ* <...> *καὶ κνήφῃ*. Arm. *mun* renders Gr. *κνήφῃ* ‘itch’. For the complete passage, see s.v. *k’os* ‘scab, itch’. Elsewhere (Exodus 8.16-17 = 8.12-14 in Septuaginta, Wisdom 19.10), *mun* refers to ‘gnat’ or the like and corresponds to Gr. *σκνίψ*.

●DIAL The form *mun* is present in various semantic nuances: Zeyt’un (*mən*), Ararat, Łarabař, Goris ‘small louse or the like’, T’iflis, Moks ‘a kind of small fly’ (according to Orbeli 2002: 294, Moks *mun* ‘клец = tick’), Alařkert ‘a small insect’ [HAB 3: 358b]; Polis, Axalc’xa, Karin dimin. *m(u)n-ik* ‘nit, small louse, etc.’ [HAB 3: 358b].

Interesting are Polis *mn-et* ‘small louse’ and *mnič* ‘a kind of louse’ (ibid.; also Ĵahukyan 1972: 280), Sasun *mun-ij* ‘ant’ [Petoyan 1965: 506], Urmia, Salmast *mn-uč*’, glossed as *hawu, ařawnoy ořil* ‘louse of hen or pigeon’ [GwrUrmSalm 2, 1898: 98]. For *-ič* cf. insect-names such as *gruič, luič, xařnič, karič, utič*, etc.; for *-et* cf. *boret, mřet*, etc.

Orbeli 2002: 291 records Moks *məndüt* ‘древесный червь, arboreal worm’ without a comment on its origin. Ačarıyan (HAB 1: 474b; 1952: 252) hesitantly mentions this form under the word *botot* ‘worm, belly-worm, wood-moth’, which is present in Van, a dialect closely related to Moks and Šatax. The same does M. Muradyan 1962: 58, 64, 70, 193b for Šatax *məndüt*, assuming a nasal epenthesis. If this is correct, one may suggest the following scenario: *botot* > **bontot* (nasal epenthesis) > **bundot* (voicing of *-t-* after the nasal) > **m(u)ndut* (nasal assimilation *b...n* > *m...n*) > *məndüt* (Ačarıyan’s Law). Some of these developments are certainly correct, but on the whole this scenario cannot be regarded as satisfactory. In view of the presence of *mun* ‘tick, small fly’ in the dialect of Moks, the form *məndüt* is likely to be a blend of *mun* and *botot*.⁹⁶

●ETYM From QIE **mus-no-*, a derivative of PIE **mus-* ‘fly, midge’: Gr. *μῦα* f. ‘fly’; Lith. *musė* ‘fly’; Russ. *múxa* ‘fly’, dial. ‘bee’, ‘gad-fly’, OCzech *múcha* ‘fly, mosquito’, etc. (ĒtimSlovSlavJaz 20, 1994: 170-171-174), Lat. *mus-ca* f. ‘fly’, etc., see Bugge 1893: 20-21; Hübschmann 1897: 476; HAB 3: 358; Pokorny 1959: 752;

⁹⁶ Alternatively, *məndüt* may be a compound consisting of *mun* and *bot* (also this ‘pure’ form is present in Van, see HAB 1: 474b; cf. S. Avagyan 1978: 114a^{L22f}): **mun-bot* > **mundot*, a sound development that would be parallel to that in IE **h²ud^hno-* > **an-bund-* > *andund-k* ‘abyss’ (q.v.).

Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 534 = 1995, 1: 452; Mallory/Adams 1997: 207b; Clackson 1994: 45; Olsen 1999: 29.

Meillet 1936: 74 points out that Arm. *mun*, *o*-stem, may have been feminine as the other cognate forms, and compares the problem of *nu* ‘daughter-in-law’ (q.v.). Remarkably, *mun* is also attested in GDSg *muni*, which, if old and reliable, points to **moyn/mun*, *i*-stem or *a*-stem, from QIE **m(o)us-n-ih₂*- or **m(o)us-n-eh₂*- respectively, compare Gr. *μῦα* and Lith. *musė* for the former option, and Russ. *múxa* and Lat. *musca* for the latter.

For the semantic development ‘an insect, gnat, louse, etc.’ > ‘itch’ cf. e.g. Gr. *σκνίψ* (corresponding to Arm. *mun* in a number of Biblical attestations, see above) and *ψώρα* ‘itch, scurvy; a disease of trees, scab; moth’.

Ačařyan (HAB 3: 358b) treats Georg. *muni* ‘itch, scab’ as an Armenian loanword and points out that the resemblance with Georg. *mumli* ‘a small fly, flea’ (cf. NHB 2: 300a) is accidental. I am not sure whether there is any relation between Arm. *mun* and Akkad. *mūnu* ‘caterpillar’ (on which see Landsberger 1950: 32).

munč‘ ‘word, speech’ (Grigor Magistros), **mnč‘em** ‘to moan, mutter, murmur’ (Bible, Łazar P‘arpec‘i, Hexaameron); note also **munč‘** ‘fool’ (Lex.).

●ETYM See s.v. *munj* ‘dumb, mute, silent, speechless’.

munj ‘dumb, mute, silent, speechless’ (Zgōn-Afrahāt, Barseł Čon, Čarəntir), dimin. **mnj-ik** (Elišē), **mnj-uk** (Irenaeus); prob. also ***munj-** ‘to mutter, murmur’ in **k‘rt‘-mnj-em** ‘to mutter, murmur, to complain whispering’ (Bible+), with an obscure *k‘rt-* (cf. Dervischjan 1877: 33-34, comparing it also with *mrmunj* ‘mutter, mauding, lamentation, mourning song, whispered song’)⁹⁷.

●DIAL Widespread in the dialects [HAB 3: 359b]. Note also Axalc‘xa *luř u munč* [HAB 2: 302b] with *luř* ‘silent’ (q.v.).

●ETYM Related with Gr. *μῦνδος*, *μῦδος*, *μυκός*, *μυττός* ‘dumb’, Lat. *mūtus* ‘silent, dumb, mute; speechless’, Skt. *mūka-* ‘dumb, mute, silent’, *mūñjati* ‘to sound’, etc., perhaps also Gr. *μύζω* ‘to mutter, moan’, Lat. *mūgiō* ‘to low, bellow, roar; to make a loud deep noise’, Hitt. *mūgae-* ‘to invoke, evoke, entreat’, etc., all probably from a sound-symbolic **mū-* (see Bugge 1893: 21; HAB 3: 359, 361; Pokorny 1959: 751; Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 803 = 1995, 1: 703; Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 362, 365; Mallory/Adams 1997: 149b; Kloekhorst 2008: 585).

According to Bugge and HAB *ibid.* (see also Petersson 1920: 108-109), here belongs also the synonymous *muř* (q.v.), which can be regarded as a rhyme-formation from *luř* ‘silent’, cf. *luř-muř* ‘silent, silently’; note also *mřmřam* ‘to murmur’ (q.v.).

Arm. *munj* ‘dumb, silent’, probably also **munč‘* ‘mutter’ and *munč‘* ‘fool’ (q.v.) have been derived from QIE **mund/t-jo-* (for a discussion, see HAB 3: 359; Pisani 1950: 178; Ĵahukyan 1987: 139, 182; Ravnæs 1991: 16₉₂; cf. Schmitt 1972-74: 10). More attractive is the derivation of *munj* from **munjo-*, a thematization of **muni-* seen in Skt. *mūni-* ‘ecstatic person, ascetic, hermit (especially one who has taken the vow of silence)’, cf. also Czech *muřa* ‘speechless, fool’ (Schmitt 1981: 70;

⁹⁷ It is unclear whether *k‘rt-* is related with **k‘ort-* of *řolok‘ort-* ‘to flatter’. Łap‘anc‘yan 1961: 150 compares Arm. *k‘rt‘mnj-* with Hitt. *kartimmije/a-* ‘to be angry’.

Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 362). For *-nj* cf. also *barbanj-* ‘whisper of sorcerers, sorcerous or delirious talk, maundering’, *ššu-nj* vs. *ššu-k* ‘whisper’. As to *munč‘* and *mnč‘em*, note a number of onomatopoeic verbs with *-nč‘* [HAB 3: 359a].

See also s.v. *mrnunj* ‘mutter, maundering, lamentation, mourning song, whispered song’ and the corresponding verb *mrnunjem*, which has been derived from present **murmun-je-* (Godel 1975: 81).

***muř** only in the compound *luř-muř* ‘silent, silently’ (John Chrysostom, see HAB 3: 361a); MidArm. *mřel* ‘to listen, obey’ attested in Frik, Vardan Aygekc‘i, Mařak‘ia Abela, 13th century colophons, Kostandin Erzncac‘i (MijHayBař 2, 1992: 155a), in a medieval folk-song (Abetyan 1940: 195, Nr. 349^{L2}); in *Barġirk‘ hayoc‘* (Amalyan 1975: 221^{Nr443}) it is glossed as *ansal*.

●DIAL The verb *mřel* is present in Ararat and in a few NW dialects – Polis, Sivri-Hisar, Kesaria, Akn, etc.; note also Baberd *mř-uk* ‘obedient’, Baberd, Polis, Aslanbek *xosk‘-mřuk* ‘obedient, who listens to someone’s word and obeys’, with *xos-k‘* ‘word’ (HAB 3: 361). A textual illustration for *mř-ot* can be found in a Trapizon proverb (Lanalanyan 1960: 277a). T‘iflis has *munj u mřunj*, a rhyming compound with the synonymous *munj* (HAB 3: 361b).

●ETYM See s.v. *munj* ‘dumb, mute, silent, speechless’.

Y

yalt‘ ‘wide, large, broad, spacious (land, space, territory)’ (Bible+), ‘mighty’ (Agat‘angelos+); **y‘alt‘em** ‘to conquer, win, defeat’ (Bible+); **yalt‘-k-u** ‘victorious, mighty’ (Philo+), **yalt‘-u** ‘id.’ (e.g., in Grigor Mařkuori, 12th cent.), **an-yalt‘-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 *yalt‘* ‘victory’: *skizbn arnu yalt‘oyñ i yasparizin* (Grigor Skewřac‘i, 12-13th cent.).

Some attestations:

In Deuteronomy 8.7: *tēr astuac k‘o tarç‘i zk‘ez yerkirñ i bari ew i yalt‘* [Cox 1981: 112]: *ὁ γὰρ κύριος ὁ θεός σου εἰσάγει σε εἰς γῆν ἀγαθὴν καὶ πολλήν*. Here *yalt‘* renders *πολλή*. The basic meaning seems to be ‘wide, broad spacious (land, space, territory)’; cf. also *anc‘in and covñ yalt‘* ‘“(they) passed the broad/spacious sea” (Agat‘angelos, see NHB 2: 315c), etc.

In Agat‘angelos § 767 (1909=1980: 398^{L10f}), *yalt‘* refers to ‘immense (stones)’; see the passage s.v. *arastoy*.

In Movsēs Xorenac‘i 2.37 (1913=1991: 162^{L6}), Eruand is described as *sřteay ew andamovk‘ yalt‘* ‘“courageous and strong limbed” (transl. by Thomson 1978: 179). Here, *yalt‘* may also refer to ‘broad’; cf. *layñ* ‘broad’ used next to *yalt‘* in Agat‘angelos § 123 (1909=1980: 71^{L12f}) describing the king Trdat: *buřñ oskerōk‘ ew yalt‘ marmnov*, <...>, *barjr ew layñ hasakaw*; cf. also *yalt‘ahasak*, *yalt‘amarmin*, *yalt‘andam*. Compare with *layñ* ‘broad’ in, e.g., *layñ-a-t‘ikunk‘* ‘broad-backed’ [MijHayBař 1, 1987: 299b], etc.

In Book of Chries 8.3.1 (G. Muradyan 1993: 190^{L34f}, Russ. transl. 2000: 180): *yalt' marmnov* “исполинского телосложения”.

●DIAL The verb *yalt'em* is ubiquitous in the dialects [HAB 3: 379b].

●ETYM Scheffelowitz (1904-05, 2: 27) compares *yalt'* with Skt. *prthú-*, f. *prthvī-* ‘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 Ačařyan (HAB 3: 379) are sceptical because of the semantic difference. For a discussion on *-ht'* and for other references, see Lidén 1933: 44, 44₃. For a discussion on the laryngeal in this PIE etymon, see Elbourne 2000: 17. Beekes (2003: 202) represents this etymology of *y-alt'* and notes: “The analysis of the Armenian word is uncertain”.

Ačařyan (HAB 4: 633-634) proposes a connection with Lat. *saltō* ‘to dance, jump’, *saltus* m. ‘leap, spring, jump’, *īn-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- > *halt' > yalt'* as a hypercorrection, which is not probable.

Olsen (1999: 964) mentions no etymology, presenting the word as of unknown origin.

I see no formal or semantic reasons to reject the comparison with PIE **plth₂-ú-*: Skt. *prthú-*, 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 Ačařyan’s etymology. The initial *y-* is the productive prefix seen in numerous words of similar semantics, namely ‘many, abundant, plenty, fat, etc.’ (see 2.3.1; see also Godel 1975: 74₅₇). Even if one accepts the derivation from **sl-t-*, the initial *y-* should be identified with the prefix; cf. Lat. *īn-sultō*.

One wonders if *yalt'-u* (cf. also *yalt'-k-u*), albeit poorly attested, goes back to PIE fem. **plth₂-u-ih₂-*: Skt. *prthvī-*, Av. *pərəθβī-*. (In Jahukyan 1987: 241: **-uṣjā-*). See 2.1.18.

yayt, *i*-stem: GDPl *yayt-i-c'* in Grigor Skewřac'i (13th cent.), “Tōnac'oyc'”, Mxit'ar Aparanc'i ‘known, evident, clear, visible’ (John Chrysostom, Ephrem, etc.); **yayt arñem/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, Karin, Ararat, Šamaxi, Agulis, as a literary loan, as Ačařyan (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.

Jahukyan (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 **āyis-* ‘obvious’ assuming “**en-* + **-ā-yid* with secondary association to **uid-* ‘know’, or even **en-* + **-āyi-yid* (**-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 Ačařean 1908a: 25.

●DIAL In dialects, mostly replaced by synonymous *tak*. Preserved in Lori *atak*, Axalc‘xa *hatak*, Xarberd *adag* ‘bottom’, etc. [HAB 3: 387a] 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 HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 57a) with the prefix *y*-, although the conditions of the development of the initial *y*- into Svedia *h*- are not clear; cf. Andreasyan 1967: 33, 376.

●ETYM Ačařyan (HAB 3: 386b) derives *yatak* from PIE **pe/od-* ‘foot’. This etymology does not seem convincing. The semantic relationship is not straightforward (though Ačařyan compares Gr. *δάπεδον* ‘bottom’, etc.; cf. also Saradževa 1986: 225-226), and the formal obstacles are not easy to surmount. Neither is Ałayan’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 Ałayan: Lat. *pavimentum* ‘a paved surface or floor, pavement’ < *paviō* ‘to thump, pound, strike; to ram down (earth, etc.)’. The suffix *-ak*₃ generally restricted to Iranian loans, also makes both etymologies dubious.

Jahukyan (1987: 142, 185, 551) mentions Ačařyan’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 reconstruct 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 *handü(n)d(k)*‘, too, appears in such contexts; see e.g. in the epic *Sasna crer* 1, 1936: 14, 131, 436 (in the latter passage – with *Siv ĵür* ‘Black water’, for which cf. also 282), 1062 (Van *hantüt*‘k’). For a similar use, see HŽHek‘ 1, 1959: 328 (Ararat, village of Őřakan): *covi andundə* ‘(to) the abyss of the sea’; HŽHek‘ 13, 1985: 11, 60: Muř *h’anundk*‘, *andund*.

Similarly, *yatak* ‘bottom’ can be used in relation with: (1) the Underworld, cf. *yataks džoxoc*‘ (with *džox-k*‘ ‘hell’) = *εις πνθιμένα ἄδου* in Proverbs 14.12 and 16.25; (2) a river, cf. *i yatakac*‘ *Yordananu* in BrsMrk apud NHB 2: 538c; or (3) 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 [Xač‘atryan/Lazinyan 1985: 341^{L59}, 435^{L151}]; on *an-yatakeli* ‘the bottom of which

cannot be found', see below. Also MidArm. *atak* referred to the sea-bottom (see MiĵHayBaĵ 1, 1987: 85b).

From the dialectal data recorded by Ačaĵyan (HAB 3: 387a), the Zeyt'un denominative *atkenal* 'to dive' is worth mentioning; cf. also Svedia *äggil* 'to dive' < **yatak* [Andreasyan 1967: 376a]. Further, Ačaĵyan says that Udi *atak* 'hell' seems to have been borrowed from Arm. *yatak*. This can be directly corroborated by Meĵri *étak* 'underworld; hell' [Aĵayan 1954: 280b] and especially Ľarabaĵ *atak* 'hell, underworld' [HayLezBrbBaĵ 1, 2001: 116a] and Őamőadin-Dilijan *atak* 'abyss' [Meőunc' 1989: 201b], which were unknown to Ačaĵyan.

The Ľarabaĵ word is illustrated in HayLezBrbBaĵ 1, 2001: 116a by *atakə k'ənac* 'he went to hell'; cf. also the curse: *ətaken takə k'yinis* [Ľaziyan 1983: 164a] 'may you go to the bottom of the Underworld'. Here, *ətaken takə* is equivalent to *antak covi takn et'as* (see HayLezBrbBaĵ 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. Ľumaő Avagyan and recorded by M. Grigoryan in Őuői (1922), *səev atak* 'Black Underworld' appears in a very impressive enumeration of words denoting 'hell', next to *jəhəndəm-gyov* and *istibujal* (see HőHek' 5, 1966: 37).

The verb *atak(v)el* 'to get lost (into hell)' is recorded in Ľarabaĵ and Sasun; cf. also *atakuk* 'lost, vanished' and *atakum* 'peace, riddance' [HayLezBrbBaĵ 1, 2001: 116b].⁹⁸ The semantic field of this denominative is comparable with *h'andə(n)del*. Compare Russ. *za-propast-it'sja* 'to get lost' from *prəpast* '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, Ľarabaĵ, Van, Muő) and 'sea-bottom; abyss' (Ararat, Van) [Ačaĵean 1913: 110b; HAB 1: 190b; HayLezBrbBaĵ 1, 2001: 67b]; see also S. 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 HayLezBrbBaĵ 1, 2001: 67b) 'may you go to the bottom of the bottomless sea', which is to be compared to Ľarabaĵ *ətaken takə k'yinis* [Ľaziyan 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 ili takn ert'as* [S. 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); MidArm. *anatak* 'bottomless', twice with *cov* 'sea' [MiĵHayBaĵ 1, 1987: 47b]; dial. (Ararat, Ĵavaxk', Sivri-Hisar) *an-atak* 'bottomless', also *anatakə gnal*, *anatakvel* 'to disappear' [HayLezBrbBaĵ 1, 2001: 55a]. Note **sew-anatak* 'Black-Bottomless' in curses of allative structure from Karin [H. Mkrťyan 1952: 177b] and Bulanəx of Muő [Movsisyan 1972: 131a]; cf. **sew ĵur* and **sew atak*.

⁹⁸ Some confusion with *atak* dial. 'leisure' seems to have taken place here; cf. Ačaĵean 1913: 143; HAB 1: 284b.

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) [S. 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; S. Harut‘yunyan 2000: 12]) could have played an important role in the process of the prefixation.

yawn-k', *a*-stem: GDPl *yawn-a-c'* (Philo, Severian of Gabala), IPl *yawn-a-w-k'* (Isaiah 3.16 [var. *yawn-i-w-k'*], Ephrem); *i*-stem: GDPl *yawn-i-c'* or *yun-i-c'* (Movsēs Xorenac‘i 2.42 [1913=1991: 167^{L10}], Nonnus, Grigor Narekac‘i, etc.), IPl *yawn-i-w-k'* (see above on Isaiah 3.16); rarely singular, *a*-stem: ISg *yawn-a-w* (Grigor Astuacaban) ‘eyebrows’ (Bible+).

Spelled also as *yun-k'* (in the later literature; see also in the dialectal section).

●DIAL Dialectally ubiquitous. A number of forms presuppose an older **yun-k'*. Note also **yō/unk'-vi*, originally dual [HAB 3: 414a].

●ETYM No acceptable etymology is recorded in HAB 3: 414a. Considered to be a word of unknown origin in Jahukyan 1990: 71 (sem. field 4), 72 (noting that this is a basic term which has neither native Armenian nor borrowed synonyms) and Olsen 1999: 941.

I propose to treat *yawn-k'* as composed of the prefix *y-* ‘in, on, at’ and **aw-n-* ‘eye’ from PIE **h₃k^w-n-*. For the **-n-* cf. Skt. *ākṣ-i-*, GSg *akṣ-ṇ-ās* ‘eye’, ‘head’, etc. (see also s.v. *u-n-kn* ‘ear’). We might alternatively posit **(s)neh₂-*. The *i*-declension may be explained through PIE dual **-i(h₁)*.

For the semantic pattern cf. Slav. **nad-očъje*, **nad-oči* and **ob-očъje*, **ob-oči* ‘eyebrows’, which are composed of **nad-* (cf. OCS *nadъ* ‘over, above’, Russ. *nad* ‘over, above, on’) or **ob-* (cf. OCS *o(b/bi)* ‘about, at, during’) (see ĖtimSlovSlavJaz 22, 1995: 11; 28, 2001: 126) and the word for ‘eye’, basically meaning, thus, ‘on/at/above eyes’.

Typologically compare also Shughni *būn* ‘beard’, if from **upā(ha)nā-*, cf. YAv. *ānghan-* ‘mouth’ [Morgensterne 1974: 19-20], or with OPr. *po-nasse* ‘upper lip’, cf. Gr. *ὐπίγη* f. ‘moustache’, if from ‘*[that] below the nose’; see s.v. *unč'-k'* ‘moustache, etc.’.

For the typology of such a pattern cf. further *dunč'* ‘the projecting part of the head, including the nose, mouth and jaws’ (Małak‘ia Abeta or Grigor Akanec‘i, 13th cent.), etc.; widespread in the dialects), if from **ənd-unč'*, as is interpreted in Margaryan 1971: 219-221.

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. *pitṛvya-* ‘father’s brother, paternal uncle’, *πάτρωος* ‘male relative, esp. father’s brother’, Lat. *patruus* ‘father’s brother’, etc., Hübschmann 1897: 463, 477; HAB 3: 414b; Bonfante 1984: 28.

Arm. *yawray* is treated as a native term (see Clackson 1994: 146) that has later been replaced by *hōru* (hapax, 12th cent.), analogical after *mawru* ‘stepmother’ (Hübschmann and HAB, *ibid.*); see s.vv. *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. *πάτω-* from **ph₂t_r-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. *πάτω-α*, 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 identical 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.

yēlc‘ ‘full’ (a medieval dictionary), **yēlc‘eal** ‘filled’ (Book of Chries), **-yēlc‘** ‘full of’ as the second member of a number of compounds (Hexaameron, Philo, John Chrysostom, etc.).

●ETYM Bugge 1893: 15 connects *yēlc‘* with *hetum* ‘to pour, fill’ (Hübschmann 1897: 466 with hesitation; H. Suk‘iasyan 1986: 207), see s.v. *li* ‘full’ for more detail on the etymon. For the final *-c‘* cf. *li-c‘*, which, like *yēlc‘*, appears as the second member of numerous compounds (on *li-c‘*, see HAB 2: 278-279; Olsen 1999: 744-745). For the *y-*, see s.v. *yłp‘anam* ‘to be filled to repletion, be overfilled, be satiate, luxuriate’.

yērum, imper. *yēř* (= Gr. *περίθου* in Proverbs 7.3), partic. *yēreal*, GDSg *yēř-el-oc‘* (Bible+), 1sg.aor.act. *yēř-i* (Severian of Gabala), 3.sg.aor.pass. *yēř-a-w* (Čarəntir), instr. of inf. *yēř(u)l-o-v* (Philo) ‘to tie, fasten or join together, link together in a series, string together, put around (said of gems, etc.)’ (Bible+), **yērum zban** ‘to compose, put together word/speech’ (Severian of Gabala, John Chrysostom, Eusebius of Caesarea); later **yēřem** ‘to tie, fasten or join together’ (*Ban xratu* attributed to Grigor Narekac‘i; Nersēs Lambrinac‘i, etc.), **yēř** adj. ‘joined together, stringed’ (Tōnakan matean).

●DIAL No dialectal forms are recorded in HAB 3: 396a.

I wonder if Van **eř* ‘line’ (gic), **eřel* ‘to draw a line’ (see Ačārean 1913: 296ab; Amatuni 1912: 176a, 690; HayLezBrbBar 1, 2001: 370ab; Srvanjtyanc‘ 1, 1978: 570) belongs here.

●ETYM Ačāryan (HAB 3: 396a) derives *yērum* from PIE **ser-* ‘to put/bind together, link together in a series’: Gr. *εἶρω* ‘to knit together’, Lat. *serō* ‘to string together, put in a row; to join, engage (in)’, *seriēs* ‘row, succession, series’, etc., positing QIE **ser-s-* for the Armenian verb (see also Jahukyan 1967: 212; 1987: 147; Greppin 1975a: 50₂₂; Barton 1989: 150-152). For the PIE etymon (without Armenian), see Pokorny 1959: 911; Chantraine 1968-80: 325; Mallory/Adams 1997: 354a.

For *y-eř-* with *y-* from **h₁en-* cf. Gr. *ἐν-εἶρω* ‘to fit together’, *ἐν-ερωσις* ‘das Hineinfügen, Hineinstecken’, Lat. *in-serō* ‘to put in; to insert’, *in-sertō* ‘to thrust in, introduce’ (see HAB 3: 396a; Klingenschmitt 1982: 241-242; Barton 1989: 150-151, 150₅₀).

Arm. **(h)er-* with trilled *-r-* points to **ser-s-*, for which Ačaryan (ibid.) compares Gr. *ἔνεροις*. The latter comes from **-ti-*, however (Jahukyan 1987: 190-191). One might assume an *s*-present or sigmatic aorist (see also the discussion s.v. *meřanim* ‘to die’). The *u*-conjugation points to *u-* or *nu*-present (on these, see Klingenschmitt 1982: 229-259). The latter option presupposes a development **-rn- > -rr- > -r-* comparable to **-ln- > *-ll- > -l-*. In that case the preservation of the nasal in *ar-nu-m*, *jeř-nu-m*, etc. may be due to secondary restoration. Note that the present suffix *-nu-* is analysable in cases such as *anke-nu-m* vs. aor. *anke-c-*, *z-ge-nu-m* vs. *z-ges-t*. In *yeřum* the nasal was probably not restored on the strength of the absence of the simplex **yer* (unlike the pairs such as *ar-nu-m* and *jeř-nu-m* vs. *ar* and *jeř*, respectively). For a further analysis, see Barton 1987; 1989: 150-152.

For *yeřum zban* ‘to compose word/speech’ cf. Gr. *εἰρομένη λέξις* (HAB 3: 396a; Barton 1989: 151₅₁).

From the same etymon are, probably, *orm*, *o*-stem ‘wall, fence’ from IE **sor-mo-* (cf. Gr. *ὄρμος* m. ‘chain, necklace, lace’), and **her-t* ‘turn, queue’ (see s.vv.). Here may belong also, in my opinion, PArm. **hur-* prob. ‘gilded, adorned by gems, linked together in a series, encrusted, embroidered’ or the like (q.v.), preserved in ClArm. *oske-hurñ* ‘gilded, adorned with gold’ said of garment, coat, silk, cover, collar, tassels, etc. (Bible+) and possibly reflecting a QIE **sōr-s-*, which would be somehow comparable to the lengthened grade seen in e.g. *utem* ‘to eat’ (q.v.). According to Lusenc’ 1982: 153, here belongs also *y-ur-ut* ‘incantation’, which he interprets as ‘magic beads’. The form *y-irem* ‘to join together, insert, etc.’ (q.v.) theoretically requires **sēr-*.

yisun, *i*-stem: GDSg *yisn-i*, AblSg *i yisn-ē* (Bible), IPI *ysn-i-w-k* (Ephrem); GDPI *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-*, *-jj-*, 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], **penk^wēkomth₂*: Gr. *πεντή-κοντα*, Lat. *quīnquāgintā*, Skt. *pañcā-śāt-* f., etc. For a discussion, see 2.3.1.

yirem ‘to join together, insert, etc.’ (Philo, Gregory of Nyssa, etc.).

●ETYM No etymology in HAB 3: 400b. Jahukyan (1987: 147) connects *yirem* with the synonymous *yeřum*, q.v. (cf. NHB 2: 361c), hesitantly positing a lengthened grade **sēr-*. The connection is plausible, but the vocalism remains uncertain.

yhi, *ea*-stem: GDSg *yhw-o-y*, GDPI *yte-a-c* ‘pregnant’ (Bible+), **ył-ut’iwn**, GDSg *yhut’ean*, GDPI *yhut’ean-c* ‘pregnancy’ (Bible+), **ył-anam** and **ył-enam** < **yhi-anam* ‘to become pregnant (both Bible+, see Klingenschmitt 1982: 121₁₇).

●DIAL Agulis *yēħta*, *yəłá*, *yatá*, the verb *yłanam* > *yəłánil* [Ačarean 1935: 123, 124, 377; HAB 3: 401a], Juła *h’ulí* [Ačarean 1940: 66, 126, 377b], Łarabał *yəłí*, *yəłé* ‘pregnant (said of animals)’ [Davt’yan 1966: 66, 436], Kak’avaberd *yəte* [H. Muradyan 1967: 93, 180a], Goris *yəte/i* [Margaryan 1975: 110, 351a], Zeyt’un [ħí], Svedia *aħta* [Ačaryan 2003: 114, 330, 415, 581], Hamšen, Van, etc. *əħi*, Muš *h’əħi*, etc. [HAB 3: 401a].

The initial *y-* of the eastern dialectal forms (ĻarabaĻ, Goris, etc.) is remarkable (see the references above). For the anlaut of this word, see also H. Muradyan 1982: 226-229; Weitenberg 1986: 96, 96₁₅, 97₁₈; L. Hovhannisyan 1991: 25₁.

Danielyan 1967: 168, 213 records Malat'ia *analok'* 'pregnant' as a purely dialectal word with no comment as to its origin. See below on this form.

●ETYM Composed of the prefix *y-* 'in' < PIE **h₁en* 'in' and PArm. **li-* 'full' from PIE **pleh₁-*. For other views and a discussion, see Meillet 1930: 184-185; HAB 3: 401a; Pokorny 1959: 843; Ĵahukyan 1967: 236, 236₄₈; Ravnæs 1991: 91; Olsen 1999: 448-449. See further s.v. *li* 'full'. For the semantics, Aĉarĳan (HAB 3: 401a) compares French *pleine* 'full' and 'pregnant'. A perfect etymological match would be Lat. *im-pleō* 'to fill', 'to make pregnant'. See also s.vv. *yetc'* 'full', *ytp'anam* 'to be filled to repletion, be overfilled', *yolov* 'much, plenty'.

Malat'ia *analok'* 'pregnant' obviously contains the suffix *-ok'* 'with, having' < ClArm. IPI *-awk'* (see Danielyan 1967: 180 on the suffix). I wonder if we can posit an underlying **anal(i)-* which would be composed of a preposition and the word *li* 'ful'. The preposition may be identical with ClArm. *an(a)-* (on which see Ĵahukyan 1987: 245, cf. Gr. *ἀνά* 'up along', Av. *ana*, OPers. *anā* 'on, along', etc.) or with an *o*-grade (cf. Beekes 1995: 221) or zero-grade form of **h₁en* 'in'. Alternatively, the root may be identical with PArm. **al-* 'kid', on which see s.vv. *aloĳ* and *ul*. This explanation is, of course, highly hypothetical.

ytp'anam 'to be filled to repletion, be overfilled, be satiate, luxuriate' (Bible+); **ytp'-ut'iw_n** 'satiety, repletion, abundance' (Bible+).

A textual illustration for the secondary meaning 'to delight, enjoy, luxuriate, relish' from Book of Chries 8.6.2 (G. Muradyan 1993: 198^{L14}, Russ. transl. 2000: 188): *ytp'anayi erĵankut'eamb* "наслаждался счастьем".

●ETYM No etymology is accepted in HAB 3: 401a.

I tentatively suggest a derivation from PIE **pleh₁-* 'to fill'. The underlying **hitp'-* probably reflects the reduplicated present **pi-pleh₁-* seen in Skt. *pīparti*, *pīprati* and Gr. *πίμπλημι*, *-αμαι* (see s.v. *li* 'full' for more detail on this etymon). The initial *y-* can easily represent the prefix *y-* < PIE **h₁en-* 'in', cf. Lat. *im-pleō* 'to fill, fulfil' and especially Gr. *ἐμ-πίμπλημι* 'to fill'; see also s.vv. *li*, dial. **i-lin* 'ful', *yetc'* 'full', *yli* 'pregnant', *yolov* 'much, plenty'.

The problem with this etymology is that the cluster **-pl-* would yield Arm. *-wt-* rather than *-tp'-* with metathesis and aspirated *-p'-*. In order to explain the problem one may assume a slightly different type of reduplication, **pi-plh₁-e-mi*, cf. **pi-ph₃-e-mi* 'to drink' (see s.v. *ampem* 'to drink'), with simplification of the cluster to **-lpH-* (for **pH* > Arm. *p'*, see 2.1.18.2). Needless to say, this explanation is highly hypothetical. Alternative: **pi-pl(H)-* + pres. suffix *-ne-*, as in the same *ampem* 'to drink' (cf. Gr. *πίμπλημι*, whether with nasal infix or epenthesis). Another possible example of a similar reduplication is *ci-caĻ-* 'to laugh' from **ĝ(e)i-ĝlH-* (q.v.).

yogn (spelled also *yok'n*): API *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-goy_n* 'very many' (Agat'angelos+), *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: *yog nec’aw žołovurdn i čanaparhin* : ὀλιγοψύχησεν ὁ λαὸς ἐν τῇ ὁδοῦ : “the people became discouraged on the way”. Arm. *yognim* renders Gr. ὀλιγοψύχέω ‘to be faint; to become discouraged’.

●ETYM Since Lidén (1906: 76-77), interpreted as **y-o-gn* = prefix/preposition *y-* + **o-g^{wh}hon-* or **o-g^{wh}no-* (cf. Skt. *ā-hanás-* ‘schwellend, üppig’, Pers. *āganiš* ‘full’), from **g^{wh}en-* ‘to swell, abound’: Skt. *ghaná-* ‘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; Jahukyan 1967: 59, 91₁₆; 1987: 129]. This etymology is possible. For **o-*, see Jahukyan 1987: 246. Nevertheless, the formation *y-o-gn* is not entirely clear (see Beekes 1992: 174₂). One therefore might seek for an alternative.

As is pointed out by Ačařyan (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-ὀχλέω ‘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 Ačařyan (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*)og^h- or *(*H/w*)og^{wh}-. 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-ὀχλέω ‘to trouble, annoy; to be troubled, annoyed; to be unwell, overburdened with work’.⁹⁹

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, Ĵula, etc. **xi/uz* ‘neck’ (see s.v. *awji-k*’).

yolov, *i*-stem: GDPI *yolov-i-c*‘ in Movsēs Xorenac‘i (see below), Movsēs Kařankatuac‘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‘ mkrtel anhawatic‘* “so that many of the unbelievers were baptized”. In 3.68 (1913=1991: 365^{L12f}; transl. Thomson 1978: 354): *hēnk‘ ekeal*

⁹⁹ Assuming that the voicing feature of the aspirated stops was facultative in the Mediterranean substratum (cf. s.v. *t‘uz* ‘fig’), one may also consider Arm. *nk‘otim* ‘to be dried, parched, tired, unwell (e.g. as resulted from hunger)’ (q.v.): **h₁en-(H/w)ok/g^{wh}-ol-* (cf. Gr. ἐν-ὀχλέω) > 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‘ot-*. 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.

anhatk' ew yolovic' kołmanc' “Brigands have come in abundance and from all sides”. Another attestation of *yolov-i-c'*: Movsēs Xorenac'i: 2.7 (109^{L19}).

In Movsēs Kafankatuac'i/Dasxuranc'i /7-10 cent./ 1.27 (V. Ařak'elyan 1983: 97^{L4}, transl. Dowsett 1961: 55): *Ew yolovic'n linēr bžškut'iwñ i tetwojñ*: “Many were healed in this place”.

●DIAL No dialectal forms are recorded in HAB 3: 403a.

The word is found in Xotorjur (see YuřamXotorj 1964: 491b): *ɔlov* ‘abundant’, with the following illustration: *ǰurn ɔlov a* “the water is abundant”; also verbal **yolovnal*, caus. **yolovc'nul*.

●ETYM Since Terviřean, Bugge, etc., connected with Skt. *purú-*, f. *pūrvī-* ‘much, abundant’ (RV+), *purú* (adv.) ‘often, very’ (RV+), OAv. *pouru-* ‘much’, Gr. *πολύς* (adj.) ‘much’, etc. [Meillet 1894b: 280₂; Hübschmann 1899: 48; HAB 3: 402-403].

Bugge (1893: 22) assumes a vocalic assimilation **yolev > yolov*. 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 (1990a: 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”.

Olsen (1999: 778, 808) explains *yolov* from the zero-grade **-pl_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.

I propose a direct derivation from **polh₁u-s* (cf. Gr. *πολύς* ‘much’, on which see Kuiper 1942: 34; Beekes 1992: 183-184; cf. Rix 2003: 373, 380₆₃): **poləw- > PArm. *(p)oləw > y-olov*. For the assimilation, implied also in Meillet's, Bugge'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*), corroborates 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 **pl_h1-u-ih₂-*. See 2.2.3. See also s.v. *hoyl*, *i*-stem ‘group’.

yotdołdem ‘to shake, move, cause to totter, waver’ (Nahum 3.10, John Chrysostom, Ephrem, etc.), **yotdołd**, *a*-stem: GDPI *yotdołd-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 Ačarıyan (HAB 3: 403b) treats this verb as a reduplication of an 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’: *anyotdołdeli vēm* ‘immovable wall’ in John Chrysostom apud NHB 1: 209a. Thus, *an-šarž* ‘immovable’ is synonymous to *an-yotdołd-eli*. Note Agat'angełos § 767 (1909=1980: 398^{L11f}), where the huge blocks of stone are said to be impossible to move (*šaržel*); 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. *cārati* ‘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. Further, see s.v. *y-orj-orjem* ‘to call’ and 2.2.6.1. As for *-d-*, one could compare with Gr. *τέλεθω* < **k^velh₁-d^he/o-* vs. *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). Thus QIE **h₁en-k^volh₁-d^h-* > PArm. **iṅ(g)old-* > *y-old-* (cf. s.v. *yisun* ‘fifty’).

yoyr, *i*-stem: GDP1 *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. *paeman* ‘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.

Alternatively, one might think of a connection with *gēr* ‘fat’, if this reflects an older **ueir-*. For the anlaut, cf. *yoyg* vs. *vēg* ‘knucklebone’, **yušap* vs. *višap* ‘dragon’, *yušk-a-parik* vs. *všk-a-pari-k* ‘a mythical being; ass-fairy’, etc. (see also s.v. **orj-i-* ‘testicle’).

y-orj, *i*-stem: IPI *y-orj-i-w-k*‘ (Hosea 5.6) ‘male sheep, ram’ in Hosea 5.6 (corresponding to Gr. *πρόβατον*) and Yovhan Mandakuni/Mayragomec‘i [NHB 2: 372b].

●DIAL Ararat, Širak, Muš, Van **orj* ‘a two-year-old male sheep’ [Amatuni 1912: 534a].

●ETYM From Armeno-Greek **h₁en-h₃orǵ^hi-* ‘uncastrated, male (ram or buck)’: Gr. *ἔν-ορχις* ‘provided with testicles, uncastrated’, cf. *ἔν-ορχ-ος*, *ἔν-ορχ-ης* meaning also ‘buck’. Further see s.v. **orj-i-* ‘testicle’.

yoryorjem ‘to name, call’ (Movsēs Xorenac‘i, Eusebius of Caesarea, Ephrem, etc.); **yoryorj-an-k**‘ (Hesychius of Jerusalem), API *-an-s* (Severian of Gabala), *a*-stem: GDP1 *yoryorj-an-a-c*‘ (Eusebius of Caesarea), IPI [*>* adv.] *yoryorj-an-a-w-k*‘ (Cyril of Jerusalem) ‘name, naming’, **yoryorj-umn** ‘name’ (Movsēs Xorenac‘i 2.63 [1913=1991: 196^{L5}], etc.), **yoryorj** ‘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 yoryorjeac*‘? “Why then did [Scripture] bestow on him alone the name of son” (concerning Noah). Further: *or Ewt‘atios yoryorjēr* : “which was named Euthalius” (2.80: 219^{L16}); *oroy koč‘mamb yoryorjēc‘an ew bałanik‘n* : “by which name the baths were also called” (2.88: 238^{L14f}; transl. 244).

●ETYM Ačaryan (HAB 3: 408b) treats this verb as a reduplication of an otherwise unattested **yory-* and does not record any acceptable etymology. Jahukyan (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* < **φείπω* '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 verb probably contains the prefix *y-* < PIE **h₁en-* 'in'; typologically cf. Lat. *in-vocō* 'to call upon, invoke', OPr. *enwackē* 'to call, invoke' (see Toporov, PrJaz 2, 1979: 59-60); also Lat. *in-titulāre*, Engl. *entitle*, etc.

Thus: QIE **h₁en-uor-je-* > PArm. **ijgorj-* > **i(η)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 *goč'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 *jōgūve* '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.

yuřt'i 'watered, irrigated, fertile' (Genesis 13.10, Gregory of Nyssa, Grigor Narekac'i, etc.), **yuřt'anam** 'to increase' (Nersēs Šnorhali); without the initial *y-*: **uřt'em** 'to sprinkle, irrigate' (Łazar P'arpec'i, 5th cent.), **uřt'anam** 'to be watered, prosperous' (Anania Narekac'i, 10th cent.).

In Genesis 13.10 (Zeyt'unyan 1985: 201): *zamenayn kołmans Yordananu, zi amenayn yuřt'i ēr : pāsan tēn perīχwopon toū Iorδάνου ὅτι pāsa ḥn potiζομένη*. Arm. *yuřt'i* renders Gr. *ποτιζομένη*, from the verb *ποτιζω* 'to give to drink; to water, irrigate'.

In Bařgirk' hayoc': *uřt'i · parart* [Amalyan 1975: 261^{Nr227}]. Compare also *urd·lc'eal* ['filled'] (op. cit. 262^{Nr242}); but see s.v. *urd*.

●DIAL Nor Bayazet *əřt'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-di* 'arid, vot-watered' (with privative *an-* and *jur* 'water'), *n-aw-t'i* 'hungry, fasting' < 'not having eaten/drank', etc.; see s.vv. and 2.3.1, on *-ti*. Typologically compare OHG *durst* 'thirst' from Germ. **þurs-ti-* 'thirst, drought'. Whether the root is identical with *uř-č-* 'to increase' (cf. Jahukyan 1967: 304) or *uř* 'to swell' is uncertain.

I tentatively propose a derivation from PIE **Huers-*: Skt. *varṣ-* 'to rain', *vṛṣṭi-* f. 'rain' (RV+), Hitt. *uarša-* 'rain-shower', Luw. *uarša-* 'drips', Gr. *έέρση, άέρση, έρση* f. 'dew', *ούρέω* 'to urinate', Mİr. *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. *vṛṣ-ti-*, as well as Mir. *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).

It is uncertain whether there is 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').

N

***n(a/o)-**, etc.

See s.v. **s(a/o)-* 'this'.

nayim 'to look, observe; to perceive by the mind, apprehend' (Bible+).

●DIAL Preserved in some extremely NW (Suč'ava, Nor Naxijewan, Polis, Rōdost'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 Patrúány 1897a: 234 (from **ni-hayim*) and Dumézil 1997: 3 (from **(i)n-hayim*). Ačarıyan (HAB) and Ĵahukyan (1987: 245) accept the derivation from **ni-* 'down', seen also in *ni-st*.

nan, nana, voc. *nan-ε, nene, nan-i* (dial., nursery word) 'mother', 'grandmother', 'lullaby, sleep'.

●DIAL Ararat, Łazax *nan* 'mother', Łarabał 'grandmother'; Alaškert, Muš, Surmalu *nan-ε* voc. 'mother', Xnus-Bulanəx *nan-ε* 'grandmother' [Melik'ean 1964: 547a]; Ararat, Lori, Łazax, Van *nan-i* voc. 'mother'; Ararat, Van, etc. *nana* 'mother; grandmother; lullaby, sleep', *nana-xat'un* 'grandmother'; Polis, Ewdokia, Akn, Muš, Łarabał, etc. *nene* 'mother', etc. (see Amatuni 1912: 3a, 500b; Ačarean 1913: 809-810; HayLezBrbBař 4, 2007: 137-138).

●ETYM A nursery word possibly of IE origin [Ĵahukyan 1972: 300-301; 1987: 56, 140, 182, 275], cf. Pers. *nana* 'mother, mamma' (Steingass 1428a), Shughni *nān* 'mother; grandmother', Khot. *nāni* 'mother', Skt. *nanā-* 'mother, mum', SCr. *nana, nena* 'mother', Gr. *vávvnē* 'aunt', Alb. *nēne* 'mother', Welsh *nain* 'grandmother', etc. (Morgenstierne 1974: 49b; Bailey 1979: 179b; Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 9-10; Huld apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 386a). Of non-IE languages cf. Abkhaz *nan* 'mother', Kabardin *nan* 'grandmother, old woman', Chechen, Ingush *nana* 'mother', etc. [Ĵahukyan 1987: 602, 608].

The form is probably a reduplication, cf. OHG *ana* 'grandmother', etc. (see s.v. *han-i* 'grandmother'). Note also Turk. *ana, anne* 'mother', cf. Arm. dial. *ana-xat'un* 'snail', fem. anthroponym *Ana-xat'un*, etc. (see 3.5.2.1). For the reduplicational pattern cf. Arm. *mam(a)* 'mother, grandmother', *pap(a)* 'father, grandfather', *tat(a)* 'grandmother, father', etc. (see s.vv.).

naw, *a*-stem: GDSg *naw-i*, AblSg *i naw-ē*, LocSg *i naw-i*, AllSg *i naw*, ISg *naw-a-w*, GDPl *naw-a-c*, AblSg *i naw-a-c*, IPl *naw-a-w-k*; *u*-stem: ISg *naw-u*, LocSg *i naw-u*, GDPl *naw-u-c*, IPl *naw-u-k*; *o*-stem: GDPl *naw-o-v-k* (rich evidence in the Bible, see Astuacaturean 1895: 1118) ‘boat, ship; battleship, trireme; navigation, seafaring’ (Bible+), ‘winepress basin (of stone)’ (Canon Law); **nawem** ‘to navigate’ (Bible+).

●DIAL Suč’ava, Nor Naxijewan, T’iflis, Rōdost’o, Alaškert, Juła, Marała *nav* ‘boat, ship’ [HAB 3: 433b]. In Karin, Xotorjur, Muš, Ararat, and in a number of E and SE dialects we find *nav* (Agulis and Łarabał *նոՎ*) referring to ‘mill-race’, ‘gutter’, ‘tube’, ‘basin or drain of a fountain’, ‘trough’ and the like (Amatuni 1912: 605b; Ačarean 1913: 810a; YušamXotorj 1964: 492a; Margaryan 1975: 449b; HayLezBrbBař 4, 2007: 141-142). Most of these meanings should be regarded as recent cultural innovations taken from Persian (HAB 3: 433-434; for the Iranian forms see below). However, one cannot exclude the possibility that the meaning ‘basin; trough’ has been developed within Armenian, cf. the literary meaning ‘winepress basin’ attested in Canon Law.

●ETYM Derived from the PIE word for ‘boat’: Skt. *nāu-* f. ‘boat’, Oss. *naw/nawæ* ‘boat’, Khot. *no* ‘boat’, Gr. *ναῦς* f. ‘ship’, Lat. *nāvis*, *is* f. ‘ship’, OIr. *nau* ‘ship’, Olc. *nōr* ‘ship’, etc. Considered native Armenian in Hübschmann 1883: 45; HAB 3: 433ab; Ernout/Meillet 1959: 432a; Kortlandt 1980: 104 = 2003: 31; Mallory/Adams 1997: 28; Beekes 2003: 164, 211. The native origin is disputed, however, because *naw* can also be regarded as an Iranian loanword; see Hübschmann 1897: 16-17, 201; HAB 3: 433 with lit.; Pokorny 1959: 755; Schmitt 1981: 54; 1987: 446b; Jahukyan 1987: 182, 551.

On the ground of the *a*-stem, Olsen 1999: 896-897 is inclined to the loan theory. This argument is not compelling, however. The PIE form **neh₂u-s* must have been feminine; there seems to be some Indo-Iranian evidence also for a secondary feminine **neh₂u-eh₂-*, cf. Skt. AccSg *nāvām*, MidInd. Pāli, etc. *nāvā-*, Oss. *naw/nawæ* ‘boat’, etc. (Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 59; Cheung 2002: 60, 208). A similar formation possibly underlies PArm. **naw-a-*.

The PIE word has been interpreted as an old *u*-stem of HD declension: nom. **neh₂u-s*, acc. **nh₂éu-m*, gen. **nh₂u-ós* (see Beekes 1985: 83; Nassivera 2000: 61-62; for a discussion, see also Schindler 1973: 148; Schrijver 1991: 129-131, 269; Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 59). If the derivation from PIE **(s)neh₂-* ‘to swim’ (see Mallory/Adams 1997: 74a; 2006: 249) is accepted, the assumption that the PIE term is a loan from Sem. (< Afr-As.) **’-n-w-* ‘jar, vessel; boat’ (Illič-Svityč 1964: 6, 8; Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 874-875; 1995, 1: 771-772) should be given up.

Arm. *nawaz* ‘boatman’ is certainly an Iranian loan, cf. Parth. *nāwāz* ‘skipper’, YAv. *nauuāza-* m. ‘id.’, Skt. *nāvājá-* m. ‘skipper, boatman’, etc.; see Hübschmann 1883: 45; 1897: 17, 201; HAB 3: 434a; Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 38. For the recent technical meanings in the Armenian dialects, compare NPers. *nāv* ‘trough, canal, aqueduct, roof-gutter, the sluice of a mill-dam, boat’ (Steingass 1382a), Pashto *nāwá* ‘gutter, tube’, Ormuri *nāwa* ‘valley’, Parachi *nāx* ‘roof-gutter’, Oss. *nuk/nokæ* ‘gutter’ prob. from **nau(a)kā-*, Munji *nawago*, Yidgha *nawogó* ‘mill-race’ (see Cheung 2002: 209).

Georg. *navi* 'boat', Svan *näv* 'id.', etc. are considered as borrowed from Armenian (HAB 3: 434a; Illič-Svityč 1964: 6₁₇, 8).

nawt'i, *ea*-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*, although later attested, is ubiquitous in the dialects, whereas *nawt'i* is seen only in Łarabał *nšt'æ* [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 Łarabał and adjacent dialects which have penultimate accent. A trace of the initial *a-* can be seen in the following by-forms: Łarabał *ənšt'i* [Davt'yan 1966: 313], Goris *ənšt'i* [Margaryan 1975: 314b].

●ETYM Ačarıyan (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, νηπ-τικός 'sober' [Hübschmann 1897: 479 (with reservation); Pokorny 1959: 754; Frisk 2: 318-319]. One reconstructs **nag^{wh}-tijo-* [Jahukyan 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 **η-h₁t^htijo-* < **η-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: 437₄₉₃.¹⁰⁰ 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), although 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 **η-(a)g^{wh}-ont-* entwickelt", and Arm. *nawt'i* "ist unklar".

For other possible/alleged cognates (e.g. OHG *nuohturn* 'sober'), for a discussion and other references or proposals, see HAB 3: 477-478; Dumézil 1997: 2-3; and especially Clackson 1994: 154-156.

If the cluster **-dt-* would rather yield Arm. *-wt-*, with unaspirated dental stop (see 2.1.22.12), one could 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.). Jahukyan (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 < **η-*"); Clackson 1994: 155, 231₂₂₂; Beekes 1988: 78.

100 For possible Luwian and Iranian cognates, see Meier-Brügger 1990.

The derivational type in **-ti-o-/-eh₂-* finds parallel in other Armenian words of the same semantic field: *an-jr-di* 'arid, vot-watered' (with privative *an-* and *jur* 'water'), *y-ur-t'i* 'watered, irrigated, fertile'; see s.vv. and 2.3.1. It is uncertain whether there is 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. *νευρά* 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. *išhunaṣar* 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)ur₁-t-* > **ne(w)r₁-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: ISg *net-i-w*, GDPI *net-i-c'*, IPI *net-i-w-k'* 'arrow' (Bible+); on MidArm. verbal *netem*, see below, in the dialectal section.

●DIAL Preserved in a number of dialects, basically in the meaning 'arrow': Agulis *net*, Muš *ned*, Moks, T'iflis *nit*, Zeyt'un *nid*, etc. [HAB 3: 442b]. In Łarabał and Goris, the word denotes a wooden part of the loom, see HAB 3: 442b; Lisic'yan 1969: 156-158. Moks *nit*, GSg *nit^ε/nətān*, NPI *nətk^yir* 'the pole of a plough' (see Orbeli 2002: 299).

Šulaver **net-ōj* 'a kind of snake', lit. 'arrow-snake' [Ačārean 1913: 811b; HAB 3: 442b], cf. Dersim (K'li) *ned-ig* 'a poisonous snake' (see Bałramyan 1960: 155a), on which, see 1.3.

MidArm. (Smbat Sparapet, etc.) denominative verb *netem* 'to throw (arrow, etc.)' is present in many *kə*-dialects [HAB 3: 442-443].

On the compound **net-u-ateln* 'arrow and bow', see s.v. *ateln* 'bow'.

●ETYM Since de Lagarde (1866: 67^{L3f}; see also Hübschmann 1897: 478; HAB 3: 442b), derived from IE **nedo-* 'reed': Skt. *naḍá-* 'reed', ManMPers. *n'yPahl. n'd* 'reed, cane; tube, pipe, flute, clarion', Parth. *nd* 'pipe, flute; cane, rod', NPers. *na/āy* 'reed, cane; flute, pipe', etc. [Pokorny 1959: 759; Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 7-8; Cheung 2007: 276-277].

As is pointed out in Mallory/Adams 1997: 481a, "the Armenian meaning reflects the widespread use of certain kinds of reeds for the making of arrowshafts". The meaning 'arrow' is also found, probably, in Hittite: *nāta-* c. 'reed, arrow, drinking straw' (cf. CLuw. *nātatta-* n. 'Rohr', see Starke 1990: 201₆₆₅, 418). Next to this form, going back to QIE **nód-o-*, once we find AccSg *nati-n*, pointing to an *i*-stem *nati-* (see Kloekhorst 2008: 597; see also Puhvel 2007). If this form is old, we might think of Armenian and Anatolian **ned-i-* 'reed; arrow'. Alternatively,

PArm. **net-i-* may be derived from QIE fem. **ned-ih₂-*, cf. Skt. *nāḍī-* ‘pipe, flute, vein’ (for a discussion, see Olsen 1999: 84).

nerťakn ‘rat’.

Not attested. Only in K’ajuni [HAB 3: 446a].

- ETYM No etymological attempt is known to me.

The status of the word is uncertain. Nevertheless, it seems obvious that *nerťakn* is a compound the second member of which is *t’akn* ‘mouse’. Ačāryan (HAB 2: 142b) considers *t’akn* to denote an unknown animal. He fails to note the fact that in one of the few attestations *t’akn* renders Greek ‘mouse’ [NHB 1: 792-793]. Under this light the connection of *t’akn* with Georgian *t^hagu* ‘mouse’ suggested by Mai becomes more probable.

As to the first component, it is tempting to equate it with *ner* ‘husband’s brother’s wife’ (q.v.). For the semantic relationship, see s.v. *ak’is* 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, namely *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* with 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 precludes an *o-*stem. These two attestations point to *i-* or *a-*stem (thus, not necessarily *i-*). Although 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-oy*) and NSg *ner* are analogical after NSg *nēr* and oblique *ner-*, respectively.

The word *nerťakn* ‘rat’ (only in K’ajuni) probably comprises Arm. *ner* ‘husband’s brother’s wife’ and *t’akn* ‘mouse’ (cf. Georgian *t^hagu* ‘mouse’); see s.v. and 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*, although 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 *dey* (ibid.).

NSg *nēr* : GSG **nir-oj*, cf. Zeyt’un *ney* : *nüyüč*, Xarberd *ner* : *nirčč* [HAB 3: 443; Ačāryan 2003: 187].

Svedia has *nir* and vocative **ner-tikin* (with *tikin* ‘mistress, lady’) > *nir/rdəgen* [Ačāryan 2003: 581, 589] or *nirdigen* [Andreasyan 1967: 260, 376b] or *nerdigayn* [Gyozalyan 2001: 144]; K’esab *nier* : *nartəken* [Č’olak’ean 1986: 213a].

- ETYM Since Tērvišean and Bugge, connected with the PIE word for ‘husband’s brother’s wife’: Gr. *εἰνάτερες* f. pl. ‘wives of brothers or of husbands’ brothers, sisters-in-law’, NSg *εἰνάτηρ*, voc. *εἴνατερ*, gen. *εἰνάτερος*, Skt. *yātar-* ‘id.’, Pers. *yārī* < **yārīr-*, Lat. pl. *ianitrīcēs*, Lith. *jentė* (17th cent.), *intė* ‘husband’s brother’s wife, wife’s sister, daughter-in-law’, Latv. *iētaļa*, etc. (HAB 3: 443a; Pokorny 1959: 505;

Huld apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 522a; for some other references, see Szemerényi 1977: 92₃₆₅). On Latin *ia-*, see Schrijver 1991: 107-108.

In view of the apparent phonological problems, the appurtenance of the Armenian has been considered uncertain [Hübschmann 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(er)* > *nēr* [Bugge 1889: 37; HAB 3: 443a]. For other references, see Jähukyan 1982: 214₄₂. Jähukyan (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 *-a-*, must be **-h₂-* (see Beekes 1969: 195; Schrijver 1991: 97), thus one expects Arm. **nayr*, gen. **nawr*. Hamp 1966: 11-12 assumes **jenatēr* > **i(i)nayr* > **ñjayr* > *nēr*.

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 do 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.¹⁰¹ 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. **inátēr* > **inayr* : **inatérn* > **ine(t)érn*, 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 *-é- : -i-ŷ-*. The original oblique stem in **-ter-* rather than **-tr-* parallels Gr. f.pl. *εἰνάτερες*, gen. *-τερος*. For *-ete-* > *-e-* cf. **treyes* 'three' > *erek* 'id.'

Alternative suggestions. The Armenian form had an *i-* or an *a-* stem, cf. GDSg *nir-i* in Ruth 1.15, AblSg *i ner-ē* in Ephrem. For a certain stage, thus, one may reconstruct an (old or recent) feminine in **-ih₂-*, namely **(H)ienh₂-ter-ih₂-*; cf. Iran. **yāθr-ī-*. Note the unspecified **neteri-* in Hübschmann 1897: 478; Jähukyan 1959:

¹⁰¹ [One may be sceptical about this hypothetical 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].

278a. IE **ienh₂-ter-ih₂-* would produce PArm. hypothetical **inatéri* and would strengthen the basis for the unaccented **ə* (see above).

The evidence for the *o*-stem is meagre: AblSg *i ner-o-y* in Ephrem next to AblSg *i ner-ē* (which suits *i-*, *a-* or other stems but not *o-*) in the same passage. If it is, 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 *atuēs*, 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 kinship term. The fact that Arm. *ne/ēr* is mainly represented in Western and Southern dialects corroborates, he claims, the Asia-Minor 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.

nist, *o*-stem: GDSg *nst-o-y* (Gregory of Nyssa, Step‘annos Őrbelean), *i-* or *a*-stem: GDSg *nst-i* (Gregory of Nyssa) ‘seat, site, standing, situation, location, abode, base, estate’ (Deuteronomy 11.30 [Cox 1981: 126], 4 Kings 19.27, Movsēs Xorenac‘i, Ephrem, etc.), ‘royal residence, capital, royal palace’ (Agat‘angelos, Asohik, etc.); **nstim**, 3sg.aor. *nst-a-w*, imper. *nist* and *nstaruk*‘, etc. (rich evidence in the Bible, Astuacaturean 1895: 1139-1143) ‘to sit, be seated; to rest’ (Bible+).

For the paradigm of the verb and a morphological discussion, see Meillet 1913: 98, 201a; 1936: 108; Łaragyulyan 1961: 73, 79, 109; Godel 1975: 39, 51, and especially 122; A. A. Abrahamyan 1976: 134, 153, 180; Schmitt 1981: 136, 146; Ĵahukyan 1982: 168, 174, 197; Klingenschmitt 1982: 274; Kortlandt 1981: 33 = 2003: 38.

For some Biblical attestations, see Klingenschmitt 1982: 88₆.

●DIAL The verb is dialectally ubiquitous. *Zeyt’un dā^asdā^al* is due to assimilation *n...d* > *d...d* (HAB 3: 454a; Ačaryan 2003: 114).

In the dialect of Hamšen the paradigm of the verb is synchronically aberrant and certainly archaic, cf. aorist *nsta*, *nstar*, *nstav*, *nstak*‘, *nstāk*‘, *nstən* < *nstan*, imperative *nist*, *nstek*‘ [Ačaryan 1947: 134].

In Hamšen one finds **alnist* ‘a kind of drowsiness-somnolence caused by a spirit’ (HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 17a); compare the semantics of a Turkish dialectal word going back to Arm. *xipilik* in the same dialect of Hamšen: ‘beklemmender Zustand in einer Art Halbschlaf mit dem Gefühl zu ersticken, Alpdruck’ (see Bläsing 1992: 84-85^{Nr153}). The word seems to be composed of *al* ‘a female spirit supposed to settle on young people and suffocate them’ (see Ačarean 1913: 53b) and *nist* ‘sitting, settling’; cf. Lat. *incubō* ‘to lie in or on; to sit upon; to brood over’ vs. *incubō* and *incubus* ‘a spirit supposed to settle on people in their sleep and suffocate them by its weight’ (further see Garamanlean 1931: 655-657; note also Engl. *night-mare* ‘a female spirit or monster supposed to settle on and produce a feeling of suffocation in a sleeping person or animal’, OxfEnglDict). On the other hand, Hamšen **alnist* is

reminiscent of derivatives of the same spirit-name **āl-* such as Tadjik *al-masti*, *al-basti*, Shughni *al-masti*, Azeri and Kurd. *hal-anas-*, Turk. *al-ana*, etc. (see Basilov apud MifNarMir 1: 58; ĖtimSlovIranJaz 1, 2000: 309). A direct borrowing of the Hamšen form from one of these forms is difficult to assert. If nevertheless the connection is accepted, one may assume a folk-etymological re-interpretation as '(somnolence caused by) the sitting of the nightmare-spirit'.

●ETYM Since long (for numerous references, see HAB 3: 454a), linked with words belonging with PIE **sed-* 'to sit' (see s.v. *hecanim* 'to mount a horse'), cf. Skt. *nīdā-* m.n. 'nest, lair, bird's nest', Lat. *nīdus* m. 'bird's nest, residence', OHG, OEngl. *nest* 'nest', etc. < **ni-sd-o-* on the one hand, and verbal Gr. *ἵζω* 'to sit down', Skt. *sīdati*, MPers. *nišastan* 'to sit', etc. on the other (Hübschmann 1897: 178; Meillet 1936: 39, 108; HAB 3: 453-454; Pokorný 1959: 885, 887; Łaragyulyan 1961: 73; Ğahukyan 1982: 67, 129; 1987: 146; Greppin apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 393a).

It has been assumed that Arm. verbal *nist-*, Skt. *sīdati*, etc. reflect **ni-* + reduplicated present **si-sd-*, see Godel 1975: 122; 1982: 20-21; Barton 1989: 148, 148₄₃; Ravnæs 1991: 106; Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 693; Adams apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 522; Beekes 2003: 160, cf. 167. For further references and a discussion, see Ğahukyan 1982: 228₂₉; Godel 1982: 20-21_{4a}; Klingenschmitt 1982: 85, 88, 217, and especially 129-131.

Some scholars assume structurally different proto-forms and derive the noun *nist* and the primary verb *nstim* from **ni-sd-o-* and **ni-si-sd-* (> **nihist-* > *nist-*), respectively (see e.g. Schmitt 1981: 66, 73, and especially 205). Since the meaning of *nist* is not 'bird's nest', it may be treated as a deverbative rather than a direct continuation of **nisdos* (Godel 1982: 20-21; Olsen 1999: 17₃₀, 224₂₃; cf. also Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 50).

Further see s.vv. **ař-ič* 'settlement, village', *z-ist* 'the fleshy parts between the loins and knee'. Note also *unĵ*₃, dial. also **uč* 'soot, rust' (q.v.), if from **sōd-īV-* 'soot, sediment'.

nu, *o*-stem: GDSg *nu-o-y* (a number of attestations in the Bible), AblSg *i nu-o-y* in Severian of Gabala, ISg *nu-o-v* in Yovhannēs Draxanakertc'ī (9-10th cent.); *a*-stem: ISg *nuaw* in Movsēs Xorenac'ī 3.67 (1913=1991: 356^{L7}), Yovhannēs Draxanakertc'ī (9-10th cent.); *n*-stem: NPl *nu-an-k'*, APl *nu-an-s* (Ruth 1.6-8), APl *nov-an-s* in John Chrysostom (HAB 3: 467a) 'daughter-in-law'.

Further attestations: NAccSg *nu* is widely attested in the Bible onwards. NPl *nu-k'* is found in Philo. NAPI *nu-an-k'/s* are found three times in Ruth 1.6-8, in juxtaposition with *erkok'/sin* 'both' [Astuacaturean 1895: 1137b; NHB 2: 447ab]; here the Armenian word renders Gr. *νύμφη*, not *νύος*.

●DIAL No dialectal forms are recorded in HAB 3: 467a. Possibly related are Kesaria *nunug* 'the elder daughter-in-law in the house' [Ant'osyan 1961: 289], Malkara *nunuk* glossed by *harsn-uk* 'little bride or daughter-in-law', Xarberd *nunu* 'tender' (epithet to *harsnuk*) [Ačārean 1913: 816b], Sebastia, Akn *munuk* 'a plant' [HayLezBrbBař 4, 2007: 178b], Sebastia *munuk* glossed by *harsnuk*, lit. 'little bride' [Gabikean 1952: 426].

Further, see s.vv. *nuik* 'arum', **nuin* '(nuptial) bed', **nurin* 'Rain-Maiden'.

●ETYM Since long (NHB 2: 447a; de Lagarde 1854: 31^{L864}; Hübschmann 1897: 479; HAB 3: 467a), connected with the IE word for 'daughter-in-law': Gr. *νύος* f.

‘daughter-in-law; bride’, Lat. *nurus*, *ūs* f. ‘daughter-in-law; young woman’, Skt. *snuṣā-* f. ‘daughter-in-law’, etc.

One usually reconstructs an original feminine, PIE **snusós* ‘daughter-in-law’, which was transferred to the common feminine class in **-eh₂-* independently in a number of cognate languages: Skt. *snuṣā-* f. ‘daughter-in-law’, Sogd. *šwnšh*, NPers. *suna*, *sun(h)ār*, OEngl. *snoru*, SerbCS *snъxa*, Russ. *snoxá*, etc. ‘id.’. An *u*-stem is seen in Lat. *nurus* (if not analogical after *socrus* ‘mother-in-law’) and OHG *snur* (dat. *snuri*). For a discussion, see Pedersen 1905: 228, 228-229₁ = 1982: 90, 90-91₁; Meillet 1936: 74; Jahukyan 1959: 183; 1982: 118, 129; 1987: 149; Frisk 2: 328; Godel 1975: 78; Szemerényi 1977: 68-69; Tumanjan 1978: 62; Schmitt 1981: 50; Rix 1992: 136; Clackson 1994: 156; Beekes 1995: 174; Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 771; Olsen 1999: 186; Matzinger 2005: 26-27.

Scholars practically always present Arm. *nu* only as an *o*-stem. However, it also is an *a*-stem: ISg *nu-a-w* (see above; also Matzinger 2005: 26-27₁₃₀). Armenian thus has both **-o-* and **-eh₂-*. The alternative *n*-stem (NAP1 *nu-an-k*’s in Ruth 1.6-8, with *erkok*’/sin ‘both’) may be analogical after the plural type *kus-an-k*’ of *koy*s ‘young girl, maiden, virgin’ (for references and a discussion, see Matzinger 2005: 26-27₁₃₀, 122₅₄₉), although *kusank*’ reflects the suffixed form *kus-an* ‘young girl, maiden, virgin’ (see Olsen 1999: 298). Olsen (1999: 186, 820, 833) assumes an individualizing secondary suffix corresponding to the Germanic feminine type in *-ōn-* < **-ān-* (vs. masculine *-an-* < **-on-*, found in the type Arm. *erēc* ‘elder’, pl. *eric*’unk’; for this paradigm, see Tumanjan 1971: 231). In what follows I nevertheless offer a tentative explanation of the nasal stem of *nu*.

The connection of this PIE term with Gr. *νύμφη* f. ‘young wife, bride; marriageable maiden; daughter-in-law; nympe’, Lat. *nūbō*, *-ere*, *-sī*, *-ptum* ‘to marry (a husband)’, OCS *snubiti* ‘lieben, freien’, Czech *snoubiti* ‘freien, verloben’, Alb. *nuse* ‘bride’, etc., and the reconstruction of **(s)neub^h-* (Walde/Hofmann 2: 183-184; Frisk 2: 325-326; Otrębski 1967: 76-77; Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 761₁ = 1995, 1: 663₃₄; Pokorny 1959: 977-978; Mallory/Adams 1997: 148a, 369ab; cf. Demiraj 1997: 302-303) is uncertain.

Regardless of its relationship with Lat. *nūbō*, etc. on the one hand, and with PIE **snusós*, on the other, Gr. *νύμφη* may be linked with an Armenian theoretical form **nuw-n-* reflecting a QIE **nub^h-n-*: nom. **nub^h-ōn* > PArm. **nuwu(n)* > *nu*, gen. **nub^h-n-ós* > Gr. **nump^h-*. It is possible that this **nub^h-n-* ‘bride’ was of substratum origin and has been contaminated with PArm. **nu(h)* < PIE **snusós* ‘daughter-in-law’. Compare another possible substratum word with the same paradigmatic explanation: nom. **p^hh₂-b^h-ōn-* > PArm. **atawun*, gen. **-b^h-n-os* > Lat. **palumb-* with metathesis as in Gr. **nump^h-* (see s.v. *atawni* ‘pigeon, dove’).

The PIE term has been derived from Proto-Nostratic **nus^v-* ‘woman, female; any female connected by marriage; wife, bride, daughter-in-law’, cf. Proto-Afrasian **nus^v-* ‘woman, female’ (Bomhard 2008, 2: 888-889; cf. Diakonoff/Starostin 1986: 37). Some interesting IE loans are found in Caucasian indigenous languages: Kabardian, Adyghe *nāsa* ‘(father’s) brother’s wife’, Laz *nusa*, *nisa* ‘daughter-in-law’, Avar, Chechen, etc. *nus* ‘daughter-in-law’, Andi *nusa* ‘daughter-in-law’, etc. (see Bomhard 2008, 2: 889, 935 with references). According to Ačaryan (HAB 3:

467a; see also Ĵahukyan 1987: 601^{Nr12}, 607^{Nr29}), Kabardian *nəsə*, Laz *nusa* and others have been borrowed from PArm. **nus-*.

A possible derivative of Arm. *nu* ‘daughter-in-law’ is *nu-ik* ‘arum, arum lily, Arum dracunculus L.’ (q.v.). If we may indeed assume a PArm. **nuw-n-* as cognate to *νύμφη* f. ‘bride; daughter-in-law; nymphe, goddess of lower rank’, then the connection between Arm. *nu-ik* ‘arum, arum lily, Arum dracunculus L.’ and Gr. *νυμφ-αία* f. ‘water-lily’ would not be merely a semantic one.

The comparison of Arm. *nu* ‘daughter-in-law’ with *nor* ‘new’, *nuēr* ‘gift’, *nuaz* ‘little’, etc. (S. M. Grigoryan 1999: 329-330) cannot be upheld.

nuik, nvik, nuič ‘arum, arum lily, Arum dracunculus L.’, only in late medieval medical writings: Kamarkapē‘i, Amirdovlat‘ Amasiac‘i, etc. (NHB 2: 451a; Ališan 1895: 467-468; S. Vardanjan 1990: 165, § 810; MiĴHayBař 2, 1992: 200).

In Armenian sources, Dracontium or Arum dracunculus (a plant with snakelike rhizome, OxfLatDict) is described as resembling the hide of snakes (see references above; cf. the same on synonymous *šawašariwn*, NHB 2: 474b). According to Amirdovlat‘ Amasiac‘i, from this plant they made an ointment, which was supposed to prevent one from being bitten by snakes; a species of this plant is called in Turkish *yılan kavi*, lit. ‘snake’s tinder’ [S. Vardanjan 1990: 165, 626_{810.3}]. According to a folk-belief recorded in Arčak (S. Avagyan 1978: 45a), snakes settle in the neighbourhood of *nvik*.

●DIAL Van, Moks *nvik* [Ačāryan 1952: 283], Arčak *nvik* [S. Avagyan 1978: 45a (with a through description), 78a], Šatax *nəvik* [M. Muradyan 1962: 202b], Zeyt‘un *nəvəg* [Ačāryan 2003: 331], Gamirk‘ *nuič* [T‘emurčyan 1970: 91a], Ararat *nvik*, Sebastia, Muš, Alaškert *nvig*, Aslanbek, Partizak, Akn *lvij*, Xarberd *lvinj*, etc. [HAB 3: 470b], Sasun *nvig* [Petoyan 1965: 97, 509], Sasun *nvij* [Petoyan 1954: 148], Kesaria *nəvig* [Ant‘osyan 1961: 289], Dersim *nəvinj*, *ləvinj* [Bařramyan 1960: 94b]; see also HayLezBrbBař 4, 2007: 177a. For a description and textual illustrations, see Amatuni 1912: 506a. For description of various denotata of *nuik/č* and the synonymous *šawašariwn* (on which see below), see Malxaseanc‘ HBB 3: 483b, 508-509.

Svedia *lväg* < **luik* is described as a plant belonging to the family of *šušan* ‘lily’ with flowers resembling *šušan* [Andreasyan 1967: 152-153]. According to Č‘olak‘ean (1986: 244), the roots of K‘esab *ləvek* was used against biting of poisonous insects (cf. Ačāřean 1913: 816a on Muš and K‘i). Urmia, Salmast *nuik* refers to a plant that was used as spice [GwřUrmSalm 2, 1898: 98]. Sebastia *nəvik* ‘arum’ was used for making a fasting dish [Gabikean 1952: 426].

The sound change *n- > l-* is seen in a number of cases in different conditions:

ClArm. *napastak* (Bible+; dial. of Sebastia) : MidArm. and dial. **lapastak*, *(a)*lapastrak* ‘hare’ [HAB 3: 428-429]¹⁰²;

MidArm. *narinj* ‘orange’ > Svedia *lařanj* (nasal dissimilation, Ačāryan 2003: 415); as is pointed out by Ačāryan (HAB 3: 431b), this sound change is totally identical with that in Spanish *naranja*, *laranja*;

ClArm. *neřn* ‘antichrist’ : dial. Łaradař *leř* [HAB 3: 441-442];

¹⁰² Contamination with some words with an initial *l-* (e.g. ZorPahl. *lp* < **lap*, etc. ‘lip’, cf. Bailey 1989: 2-4) is possible.

ClArm. *nig* ‘bolt, bar of a door; crowbar’ > dial. *ling* ‘id.’: 1) nasal epenthesis; 2) nasal dissimilation [HAB 3: 450-451];

Gr. *Nóτος* ‘south(-west) wind’ : Turk. *lodos* ‘id.’, Arm. Polis, Karin *lotos* ‘warm south wind’ (Ačarean 1902: 153; HayLezBrbBař 2, 2002: 244b).

In the case of *nuik*, one may also assume a contamination with Arab. *lūf*.

●ETYM Ačaryan (HAB 3: 470b) rejects all the etymological attempts, including the comparison with Arab. *lūf* (Ališan 1895: 467), and leaves the origin of the word open. I propose to interpret *nu-ik* as a native Armenian word. It is interesting to note that *nvik* is called *Hayoc* ‘*banĵar*’, lit. ‘Armenian herb’ (Ališan 1895: 358^{Nr1622}; Malxasean ‘HBB 3: 483b; HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 163a).

The word *nu-ik* is obviously composed of a stem **nu* and the productive diminutive suffix *-ik*. For the by-form in *-ič* cf. *aławn-ič* ‘a plant’ from *aławni* ‘dove’ [HAB 1: 122b]; *boł-ič* the resin of the plant *boł* [HAB 1: 464a]; *darń-ič* ‘a plant’ from *darń* ‘bitter’ [HAB 1: 624-625], etc.; from other semantic fields: *kaw-ič* ‘chalk’, *čah-ič* ‘morass’, etc. (HAB s.vv.).

In order to identify the root **nu*, we must consider other designations of this and other flowers, which are formally or culturally associated with the arum, e.g. arum lily, water-lily, etc. We start with Arm. *šawa(r)š-ariwn* ‘arum, arum lily, Arum dracunculus L.’, lit. ‘blood of Siyāvuš’, reflecting the name of the resurrecting hero of the Iranian epic, viz. Siyāva/uš; cf. Pers. *xūn-i-siyāvuš(ān)* ‘Dragon’s Blood; Brazilian wood, a sort of gum produced in Abyssinia’ (Steingass 488b); in other languages: ‘blood of brothers’ or ‘blood of dragon’ [Hübschmann 1897: 213; HAB 3: 505].

The prince Siyāvaš was desired by her stepmother, but he rejects her advances; the stepmother succeeds in turning the king against his son; Siyāvaš is exiled and eventually becomes the ruler of his own territory (see Skjærvø 1998); he is closely associated with the horse; he is regarded as a resurrecting divinity reborn as Arum dracunculus or lilies; he is honoured the first day of the year, the vernal equinox (M. D’jakonov 1951; Rapoport 1971: 20-21, 83-84, 115-117; Lelekov apud MifNarMir 2, 1982: 441). All these motifs are characteristic of dying and resurrecting mythological figures of the type Attis/Mithra, Armenian Mihr/Artawazd, as well as the prominent hero of the epic “*Sasna črēr*” (Daredevils of Sasun), Davit’.

Sahak Movsisyan (Bense) has recorded a traditional story, according to which the flower *numufar* ‘water-lily’ originated from the blood of Davit’, which was killed by Č‘mškik Sult’an in the river Mełraget (see Łanalanyan 1969: 113^{Nr313}; S. Movsisyan 1972: 51b). That *numufar* is an aquatic plant is clearly illustrated by late medieval folk-songs (see Abelyan 1940: 142, Nrs. 232 and *232; MiĵHayBař 2, 1992: 198b, 201a).

In “*Govasank* ‘*całkanc*’” (Praise of flowers) by Davit’ Salajorc’i, 17th cent. (UšMĵnHayBnst 2, 1987: 357^{L112f}) we read:

*Ayn numufar całikn or kay, busni yezers ĵrerun,
Ōĵern zink’n ku pahen, mard č’i k’atel noc’a ahun.*

“That flower *numufar* grows on shores of waters;
the snakes guard it, and people cannot pluck them for fear of them”.

As we can see, these two flower-names, viz. *nuik* ‘arum, arum lily’ and *numufar* ‘water-lily’, are related not only by the motif, but also by the association with

snakes. A number of designations of the arum reflect the patterns ‘blood of brothers’ and ‘blood of dragon’. The underlying myth seems to have had also a variant where the brothers had a loving sister (see Ananyan 1987: 150-153; cf. Łanalanyan 1969: 113^{Nr312A} on *lala* ‘tulip, poppy’, always crying for the brothers). Note that Svedia *lväg* < **luik* is described as a plant belonging to the family of *šušan* ‘lily’, which also occurs as a female anthroponym in the same mythological context (for more detail on Dawit‘, Šušan, etc., see Martirosyan/Gharagyozyan 2007). Note also Gr. *vvμφ-αία* f. ‘water-lily’ from *vvμφη* f. ‘young wife, bride; marriageable maiden; daughter-in-law; nympe, goddess of lower rank, esp. of springs; doll, puppet; pupa’.

Further typological parallels: Muš *nor-a-harsuk* ‘a flower resembling the poppy’, lit. ‘newly married little bride’, Turk. *kelinçik* *ç’iç’eyi* [Amatuni 1912: 505b]; Xian *arus-uk* ‘a kind of plant’ (as synonymous to *kakač’in*, cf. *kakač* ‘poppy’) from *arus* ‘bride, ritual doll’ (see Ačařean 1913: 153b, 535b; Petoyan 1965: 446; HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 137b), compare Arab. ‘*arūs an-Nīl* ‘lotus’ (Uwe Bläsing, p.c.); Sebastia *nunuk* glossed by *harsnuk*, lit. ‘little bride’ [Gabikean 1952: 426]; Łarabař *arana hart’nə*, or *č’olen hart’nə*, lit. ‘bride or daughter-in-law of the wild fields’ (L. Harut’yunyan 1991: 84-85^{Nr55}).

On the strength of this evidence, one may identify the stem **nu* of Arm. *nu-ik* ‘Arum dracunculus L.’ with *nu*, *o*-stem, *a*-stem ‘daughter-in-law’ (from PIE **snusos*, cf. Gr. *vvός* f. ‘daughter-in-law, bride’, Lat. *nurus*, *ūs* f. ‘daughter-in-law, young woman’, etc.; see s.v.).

***nuin** (dial.) ‘(nuptial) bed’.

●DIAL Šatax *nəvin* ‘(bride-)bed, nuptial bed’ [M. Muradyan 1962: 214b]; Moks *nəvin*, gen. *nəvnə*^ε, pl. *nəvən-k^o-ir* ‘все постельные принадлежности, постель, но не постланная’ [Orbeli 2002: 299]; Sasun *nvin* ‘bed’ (glossed by *ankotin*) [Petoyan 1954: 148]. Textual illustrations from Šatax folklore are found in LalVasp 2, 1914: 76: *mař nəvnin* ‘in the bed’, *nəvəni takin* ‘under/in the bed’. Glossed also in SasCř 2/2, 1951: 783b. The meaning ‘nuptial bed’ is found also in Moks, Van and Sasun (see HayLezBrbBař 4, 2007: 177a, with an epic attestation illustrating that meaning).

●ETYM No etymological explanation is known to me.

If the hypothesis on the theoretical Armenian **nuw-n-* ‘bride, daughter-in-law’ vs. Gr. *vvμφη* f. ‘young wife, bride; marriageable maiden; daughter-in-law; nympe’ (see s.v. *nu* ‘daughter-in-law’) is accepted, and if the Šatax meaning ‘nuptial bed’ is original, one may posit an old Armenian **nu(w)in* and derive it from **nuw-n-* (for the *-i-* compare the cases of *lusin* ‘moon’ and *kalin* ‘acorn’, see s.vv.). An interesting parallel would be Gr. *vvμφών*, *-ώνος* m. ‘bride-chamber’, derived from the same *vvμφη* (see Frisk 2: 326). This is, of course, highly hypothetical.

***nurin** (dial.) ‘the female personage of the rain-invoking ritual and the doll personifying her’, ‘Regenmädchen’.

●DIAL Ararat, Łarabař [Amatuni 1912: 507; Ačařean 1913: 816b; HayLezBrbBař 4, 2007: 179b], Širak [Mxit‘areanc‘ 1901: 273], Alaškert, Č‘aharmahal [Ř. Grigoryan 1970: 324-325]. In ritual songs *nurin* often rhymes with its epithet *ajb-a-huri* ‘wonderful fairy’, consisting of **ačp-* or **ajb-* ‘amazement’ and *huri* ‘fairy’.

For a collection of versions of this ritual song, see R. Grigoryan 1970: 324-326. For a description and a discussion, see further Abeghian 1899: 93-94 = 1975: 77-78; Abelyan 1941: 89-91; Bdoyan 1972: 491-493; P'iliposyan 2005, 2: 90-91.

●ETYM Abelyan (1941: 90) states that the etymology of *nurin* and its other synonyms is not known. The connection with Gr. *Nereus*, Arm. *Covi-nar*, etc., with *-a- > -u-* resulted from rhyming influence of *huri* 'fairy' in the following line of the 'rain-song' (Łap'anc'yan 1945: 86-87₁; see also Bdoyan, HayŽotXaġ 1, 1963: 163-164; Bdoyan 1972: 493b, 495b; A. Petrosyan 2002: 8,8₁₆) is uncertain. Likewise uncertain is the Sumero-Akkadian etymology (N. Mkrtč'yan 1979: 219; cf. D'jakonov 1981: 69).

Given the fact that most of the names of this personage and its ritual representative actually mean 'the bride (of Rain)' (of other languages cf. e.g. Kurd. *buka barane* 'the bride of the rain', Abelyan 1941: 91), Arm. **nurin* may be derived from Arm. *nu* 'daughter-in-law, bride' (q.v.); for the semantic development cf. also Gr. *νύμφη* f. 'young wife, bride; marriageable maiden; daughter-in-law; nymphe, goddess of lower rank, esp. of springs; doll, puppet; pupa'. The final *-n* may be secondary, and the *-ri-* due to influence of the synonymous *pup-ri-k* (which is perhaps in a way related with Lat. *pūpa* f. 'girl, doll', etc., see Abelyan 1941: 90₁), and the rhyming influence of *huri* 'fairy' (see above). Uncertain.

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 gaydmanē, zi nk't'eal em* : ἤψησεν δὲ Ἰακωβ ἔψευμα. ἤλθεν δὲ Ἡσαυ ἐκ τοῦ πεδίου ἐκλείπων. <...> Γεῦσόν με ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐμέματος τοῦ πωροῦ 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. Ařak'elyan (1979: 38), here belongs Ararat (Abovyan, the village of Kotayk') **naxt(ə)*, as the root of *nk't'em*, occurring in the expression *naxtə kədarvel* 'to faint, become weak from hunger', lit. 'one's **naxt* 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. *naxt-* can rather be derived from Arm. *nivt'* 'element, material, subject, properties', dial. 'sap; nourishment; subject; essence'. This is corroborated by Urmia/Xoy *nūt'ə kətarvel* 'to be/become exhausted' (see M. Asatryan 1962: 229b) which is identical with Kotayk' *naxtə kədarvel* 'to faint, become weak from hunger'.

●ETYM Meillet (1908-09: 356) connects *nk't'em* 'to starve, faint from hunger' with *nk'otim* 'to be dried, parched, tired, unwell (e.g. as resulted from hunger)' deriving them from PIE **nī-k-*: Skt. *nīcā* 'downwards', OCS *nicь* 'face downwards', ORuss. *ničati* 'to bend, bow, droop', Byel. dial. *nicy* '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 Byel. form; see also Arm. *xonj* 'tired, exhausted' vs. *xonj* 'low, down' (see s.vv.). 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 related to *nawt'i* 'hungry', q.v.

nk'ořim 'to be dried, parched, tired, unwell (e.g. as resulted from hunger)'.

In Numbers 11.6: *nk'oteal en anjink' mer; ew oć' urek', bayc' miayn i mananayn en ać'k' mer* : *νυνὶ δὲ ἡ ψυχὴ ἡμῶν κατὰ ξηρος, οὐδὲν πλὴν εἰς τὸ μαννα οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ ἡμῶν*. Here Arm. *nk'oteal* renders Gr. *κατὰ-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 errorđ ōr* : *ἠνωχλήθην ἐγὼ σήμερον τριταῖος*.

The form *nk'ot-eal* is also attested in Paterica, and *nk'ot-umn* occurs in Yovhannēs Drasxanakertc'i.

●ETYM Meillet (1908-09: 356) connects with *nk't'em*, q.v. Aćarıyan (HAB 3: 477b) leaves the origin open.

I suggest a tentative comparison to EBalt. **svel-* 'to burn, smoulder, steam' (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'. Arm. *n-k'ot-* may derive from **ni-* + **svol-*. Compare also Arm. *suat-* 'to starve?'. For an alternative, see s.v. *yogn* 'plenty; to be tired'.

Š

šatit, *o*-stem: ISg *šatġ-o-v* (Eznik Kořbac'i, John Chrysostom); *a*-stem: GDPl *šatġ-a-c'* (late, in Oskip'orik) 'raw flesh, body, corpse' attested in Exodus 21.34, Eznik Kořbac'i, Hexaameron, 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 **kalīlo-* 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 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 Aryan borrowing at the Mitanni period, perhaps even earlier if the *o*-stem corresponds to the Aryan proto-form: **śālīlo-* > Arm. **šalīlo-* > *šatit*, obl. *šat(i)to-*. Note that also the synonymous *marmin*, *o*-stem 'flesh, body' can be regarded as an Aryan loan.¹⁰³

šatim 'to be mistaken, confused'. Nersēs Lambronac'i (12th cent.).

¹⁰³ Bearing in mind that Skt. *śārīra-* is neuter, one may interpret Arm. GDPl *šatġ-a-c'* (vs. ISg *šatġ-o-v*) as reflecting an older neuter plural **-a-* inherited from PIE **-eh₂-*. The evidence for *šatġ-a-c'* is scanty, however.

- 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. šel ‘slanting, crooked, oblique’.

šant‘, *i*-stem (ISg *šand-i-w* in a homily ascribed to Ełišē, IPI *šant‘-i-w-k‘* in Yaysmawurk‘ and Vardan Arewelc‘i, GDPI *šant‘/d-i-c‘* in Philo and Movsēs Kałankatuac‘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‘i* ‘fiery iron’. For the verbal **šant‘em** ‘to strike, thunder, overthrow’ (Ełišē; dialects), see below.

The meaning ‘(fiery) bolt’ is seen e.g. in Job 41.11 (Cox 2006: 263). For the fiery connotations of *šant‘*, cf. also Bařgirk‘ 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· erknaħar, kam kaycaknaħar* ‘‘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-ħar* in Movsēs Xorenac‘i 3.37 (1913=1990: 304^{L19f}): *orpēs zšant‘ahar yerkir korcanēr zk‘ajñ* ‘‘smote the brave warrior to the ground as if he had been struck by a thunderbolt’’ (transl. by Thomson 1978: 298).

Anania Širakac‘i (A. G. Abrahamyan 1944: 321^{L7f}) enumerates the following atmospheric visual phenomena: *šant‘*, *kayc* ‘spark’, *ħur* ‘fire’, *p‘aylakn* ‘lightning’, *siwn hroy* ‘pillar of fire’, *yardagoł* ‘Milky Way’. Here, thus, *šant‘* and *p‘aylakn* are taken as non-identical notions.

●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; Ačarġan 1935: 379; 2003: 99, 331]. According to Amatuni (1912: 510b), Ararat *šant‘el* refers to the biting of snakes and scorpions.

The verb *šant‘em is not recorded in NHB or HAB. One finds it, however, in Ełišē (1989: 32), 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)’.¹⁰⁴

●ETYM Usually derived from PIE *k̑unti- (< *k̑eu- ‘to shine; bright’, cf. Skt. *śoṇa-* ‘red, purple’, etc.), see Petersson 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

¹⁰⁴ Note K‘esab *šašantil* ‘to fall head over heels, turn a somersault’ (see Č‘olak‘ean 1986: 269). Perhaps redupl. *ša-šant‘-, based on *šant‘em ‘to overthrow, strike’.

derivation from **kūnti-* would seem to be phonetically impossible”. For the problem of anlaut, see 2.1.21.

Since Jensen (1898: 117-119, 153-155, 160-163, 180-181, 186, 188; 1904: 184b^{Nr41}, cf. 272b^{Nr59}), 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. If of IE origin, Arm. *šant‘/d* may be regarded as the source of *Šanta* (Ĵahukyan 1992: 22-23).

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*, **Zavr-* 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 [Ľap‘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 (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” (see also Tirac‘yan 2006: 191-192₃₅; 2008: 83₂). 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: 16; 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* = *Orion*, see 3.1.1-2, 3.1.4) and the devil-striking 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 it 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. *κάνδαρος· άνθραξ* ‘charcoal’ (Hesychius), Skt. *cand-* (also *ścand-*) ‘to shine, glitter’, *candrá-* 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) this is uncertain. Ačāryan (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. *per̃ti* ‘to beat’, etc. – Ukr., Czech *perun* ‘thunder’, Slav. **Perunŭ* ‘Thunder-god’, Lith. *Perkūnas* ‘id.’, etc.; compare *har(k)-* ‘to beat, strike’, *orot* ‘thunder’ (q.v.).

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, although the etymological details are not entirely clear.

šet ‘slanting, crooked, oblique’, **šetem** ‘to crook’, **šetim** ‘to go astray’ (derivatives: *šetič*’, *šetut* ‘*awn*’, etc.). Mostly late attestations. First attested in **ar(i)-šet** ‘sloping(ly), crooked(ly)’ (Bible+).

●DIAL Polis, Axalc’xa *šet* [HAB 3: 508a; Ačaryan 1941: 235]; Moks *šex* ‘slanting, skew’, *šex-ā-k’ə*’ ‘obliquely’ (*šexāk’ə*’ *ert’äl* ‘to go obliquely’) [Orbeli 2002: 301]. In view of the Moks *k’*, it seems that the second component, namely **k’ə*’, represents the hypothetical **gi-* ‘to go’. More probably, however, *šex-ā-k’ə*’ reflects the Modern Armenian *šetaki* ‘obliquely’ (see Malxaseanc’ HBB 3: 510c), and the *k’* is erroneous or of other nature.

●ETYM Together with *xet* ‘mutilated, lame; sore (eye); crooked (also morally); abominable’, dial. **xet-* ‘to become spoilt, undisciplined; to make silly jokes; to scoff, ridicule grimacing’; *šil* ‘squint-eyed’, dial. ‘mad’, Łarabał ‘mistake’, **šil ənknel* ‘to be mistaken, confused; to err’; **šat-* (12th cent.; dial.) ‘to err, to be mistakenn, 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 the dialects) (see s.vv.), connected with Lat. *scelus*, GSg *sceleris* n. ‘misdeed, crime’; Gr. *σκελος* n. ‘leg (from the hip downwards)’, *σκελλός* ‘crook-legged’, *σκολιός* ‘wicked, crooked’; Skt. *skhálati* ‘to stumble, stammer, fail’, MPers. *škarwīdan*, NPers. *šikarfīdan* ‘to stumble, stagger’; OIc. *skjalgr*, OHG *scelah* ‘squint-eyed’, etc. (Bugge 1893: 57; HAB 2: 356; 3: 490a, 508a, 517a; on **sx-*, see Meillet 1903a: 18; on Iran. **skarf-* ‘to stumble’, see Cheung 2007: 346-347). The original meaning would be ‘Krümmung, Biegung’ (see Frisk, s.v.). Ačaryan (HAB 2: 490-491) also compares, albeit with some reservation, with *kat* ‘lame’, **ket* ‘crooked’ (q.v.). The alternation *x : k*, however, does not apply normally to native words. The meaning ‘mistake’ of Łarabał of *šil* is remarkable since it combines the form *šil* ‘squint-eyed’ with the semantics of *sxal* (cf. Jahukyan 1972: 292; 1987: 278). Elsewhere, Jahukyan (1987: 148) separates *šil* ‘squint-eyed’ (grouped with *šet* ‘crooked’, etc.) from Łarabał *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 vřddhi derivative **skēlo-* or **skēli-*. Given the possible reconstruction with an internal laryngeal, one might alternatively suggest an ablaut 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, namely **sk^wh₂el-* (or **sg^{wh}h₂el-*, Cheung 2007: 347 with ref.), together with Gr. *σφάλλω* ‘to overthrow, bring down’; Gr. *σφάλλομαι* ‘to fall, to stumble, be mistaken’ (see Hübschmann 1897: 490-491^{Nr369}; HAB 4: 224-225; Xaçaturova 1979: 365; Klingenschmitt 1982: 144, 169; Viredaz 2005: 91). Sometimes an exclusively Armeno-Indoaryan isogloss is suggested, see Pokorny 1959: 929; Jahukyan 1987: 148; Olsen 1999: 195₃₆₂; Beekes 2003: 169, 202, 211. Beekes (op. cit. 202) notes: ‘very doubtful Gr. *σφάλλω*, which would require *-k^w-*’. It is uncertain, however, whether the outcome of PIE **sk^wH-* would 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. *skhálate* and Arm. *sxalim* to Georg.-Zan **sxal-*: *sxl* (on which see Klimov 1964: 167, comparing with PIE *(s)lei-d^h- ‘slippery, to slide’, Pokorny 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 corroborated by *xayt* ‘xēt’/‘xit’ vs. *šit* ‘to bite’ (see s.vv.).

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 s.v. *šišat* ‘a kind of demon’.

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 -p‘; in Muš and Alaškert one finds GSg *šerb‘i* next to NSg *šerep‘*; see HAB 3: 511a. Bałdasaryan-T‘ap‘alc‘yan 1958 vacat.

●ETYM No acceptable etymology is recorded by Ačariyan (HAB 3: 511a). Ĵahukyan (1967: 261) connects to Russ. *čerep* ‘scull’, *čerpát* ‘to scoop, draw, ladle (out), *čerpak* ‘scoop, ladle’, etc. from PIE *(s)ker-p- ‘to chop, cut’ (see s.v. *k‘er-*, *k‘er-b-*, *k‘er-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 c‘- or k‘-, as well as the final -ep‘ might argue in favour of substratum origin: *sk^herep^h-; see also s.vv. *šert*, *še/ēr*. However, the derivation from PIE *(s)ker-p- might be possible if one assumes initial metathesis *sk- > *ks- and ruki-rule (see 2.1.12). Thus: *kser-ep^h- > *šerep*‘. In either case, the -ep‘ can be compared with another tool-name, namely *šatap*‘ ‘borer, gimlet’. Note the dependence of the vowel before *p^h upon the root vowel: *šer-ep*‘ vs. *šat-ap*‘ (cf. 2.1.23).

The root may be identical with *še/ēr*; thus: ladle made of storax-wood.

šert, *i*-stem: GDPI *šert-i-c* (3 Kings 18.34) ‘split wood, piece of wood, splinter’, attested in 3 Kings 18.33-38 (a few times, rendering Gr. *σχίδαζ* ‘id.’); later also ‘slice of cheese, etc.’, and *šertem* ‘to slice’.

●DIAL The forms *šert* ‘slice’ and *šertel* ‘to slice, split, break’ are present in several dialects: Ararat, Muš, Alaškert, Tigranakert, Svedia, Moks, etc. [HAB 3: 512].

●ETYM See s.v. **c’it-* ‘to cut, split, scratch’.

šer, *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 χλωρὰν καὶ καρυίνην καὶ πλατάνου* “a fresh/green rod of storax-tree, and of nut-tree, and of plane-tree”. Arm. *šēr* renders Gr. *στύραζ*, *-ἄκος* ‘storax-tree, Styrax officinalis; the fragrant gum-resin of the storax-tree’.

In Yaysmawurk’, the Biblical passage is rephrased as follows: *Arnul p’ayt dalar ankuzi, uši ew sōsi*. Ačařyan (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*, although 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. Vardanján 1990: 346, § 2206; MijHayBař 215a, 217a]. It has been assumed that Pers. *šīr-xi/ušt* ‘manna’ is composed of Xurāsānī *kšīru* ‘a tree resembling the ash’ and *vxišt* ‘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. *στύραζ*, *-ἄκος* ‘storax-tree’ which also refers to ‘spike at the lower end of a spear-shaft’; on ‘ash-tree’ > ‘spear, handle, shaft’, see s.vv. *hac’i*, *hoyn*, espec. *metex*; note also Arm. *šer-ep* ‘ladle’ which can derive from *šēr/šer-* ‘storax-tree’; (2) Gr. *στύραζ* ‘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. *uši/*hoši*.

***šit(-)** ‘bite; wound’, the oldest attestation comes from *šit’-oł* ‘biting’ (present participle), in homilies attributed to Yovhannēs Mandakuni (5th cent.) or Yovhannēs Mayragomec‘i (7th cent.). “Vark‘ haranc’” (Paterica) has *šit’-oł*, as well as *šit’eal* ‘bitten’. The latter is rendered in Bařgirk‘ hayoc‘ by *hareal* ‘struck; bitten’ (see Amalyan 1975: 249^{Nr111}). This (late) medieval dictionary also has the only evidence for the noun *šit*’, rendered as *c’aw aytuc’eal*, literally: “pain swollen” (see Amalyan

1975: 249^{Nr113}).¹⁰⁵ The noun *šit* ‘has been preserved in the dialect of Łarabał (see below). Combining the evidence from Baġirk‘ hayoc‘ with that of the dialect of Łarabał one may represent the semantics of *šit* ‘as *‘pain of a (swollen) wound’. Aristakēs Lastivertc‘i (11th cent.) has *šit*‘-oc‘ ‘bite (of a bee)’.

●DIAL Preserved only in the dialect of Łarabał: *šit* ‘the warmth of a wound’ [HAB 3: 516b], see above.

●ETYM NHB (s.v.) seems to identify with *xayt*‘em. Ačaryan (HAB 3: 516b) mentions only this, leaving the origin of the word open.

In view of the alternation *š-* / *x-* (see s.vv. *šel*, *xel*, etc.), one may indeed connect with *xayt*‘em ‘to bite (of insects and snakes)’ and, especially, its ablaut form *xit*‘, *o*-stem ‘pain, colic, twinge’ (see s.v.). Note that **šit*‘(-) ‘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 the dialects, in the meaning ‘squint-eyed’. In Łarabał: *šil* ‘mistake; disorder’, **šil* *ənknel* ‘to be mistaken, confused; to err’. In some other dialects – ‘mad’: Ĵuła [HAB 3: 517a; T. Abgarean 1966: 94]; Mełri [Ałayan 1954: 322]. Illustrations from Łarabał/Goris, e.g. in HŽHek‘ 7, 1979: 464, lines 10, -1 (‘disorder, confusion’).

Among new dialectal words, Ačaryan (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 Baġirk‘ hayoc‘ and in the dialects of Ararat and T‘iflis [Ačarean 1913: 831b]. In some dialects the *-t-* is voiced: Łarabał *šildi*, Šulaver *šildik* [Ačarean 1913: 829a], Ararat and Łalt‘ač‘i *šldik* [Amatuni 1912: 515b]. For the voicing cf. also Łarabał, Agulis *ldi(k)* ‘tickle’, if from **xtl-i* > **xtl-i* > **xtl-i* (see s.v. **xtil* ‘to tickle’).

I wonder if **šil-ti* can be viewed as a deverbative formation in *-ti* (see 2.3.1).

●ETYM See s.v. *šel* ‘slanting, crooked, oblique’.

šišay-k‘, in Baġirk‘ hayoc‘ (see Amalyan 1975: 249^{Nr114}), *šišayk*‘ is rendered by *ays-k*‘ ‘demons’.

●ETYM Ačaryan (HAB 3: 518a) takes *šišay* as the NSg form and compares it with Syriac *šlāsā* ‘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*‘ (see s.vv. *darbin* ‘smith’ - *darbn-ay-k*‘; *əngt-ay-k*‘ ‘sea-monster’ or ‘eel, siren, Nympe-Snake’). Thus: *šiš(a)t-ay-k*‘ > **šišt-ay-k*‘ > *šišayk*‘.

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

¹⁰⁵ Ačaryan (HAB 3: 516b) cites it as *šit*‘ac‘aw·*aytuc*‘*éal*, but the critical edition of Amalyan (1975) helps to clarify the gloss.

of Emesa and Ephrem Asori. The passages read respectively: *Zdews halaceac*; *zšišats xroveac* ‘“(he) drove away the devils, harassed the *šišat*-s”’; *Ew arnun zmarinn 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 **šat-* (< 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.vv. *šet* and *šatim*). The type of reduplication is identical with that found in *cicat* ‘laugh’, *cicarn* ‘swallow’, etc. (see s.vv.). 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. *catracu*). 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’ (Ezrik Kołbac’i), etc. (see s.v. **mol-*).

šl(n)i, probably **šil*, GDPI *šəl-a-c* ‘neck’, a MidArm. 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, MijHayBar 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): *Bṛnem 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 the 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 reconstruct **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 the dialects: *šlli* (Akn), *šlink*’, *šllink*’, *šllik*’, *šlnis* (Rivola), etc. ‘neck’ [HAB 3: 522b], Bulanəx *šəlak*’ [S. Movsisyan 1972: 71a]. Interesting is Hamšen *šnlik*’, *šnlink*’ ‘face’ [Ačařyan 1947: 73, 248]; for the metathesis, see 2.1.26.3. Ačařyan (HAB 4: 658a) describes the meaning of Bulanəx *šəlak*’ 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 to be erroneous).

●ETYM A connection with Lat. *collum*, *collus* ‘neck’ is suggested in NHB 2: 480a and Ĵahukyan 1967: 262. Ačařyan (HAB 3: 522b) mentions the assumption of NHB not accepting it, and adds no further notes or etymologies.

I propose to reconstruct a PArm. **šil-* ‘crooked, twisting (body part)’ and relate it with *šil*, etc.; see s.vv. *šet*, *šil*, and, for the semantics, 3.7.2.

šun, GDSg *šan*, NPI *šun-k*’, GDPI *šan-c*’ ‘dog; adulterer, adulteress, whore’ (Bible+).

Interesting are pl. *šn-ui* (a reading variant in Eusebius of Caesarea, see NHB 2: 486c; HAB 3: 534a with ref.) and MidArm. *švin* ‘dog’ in Fables of Vardan Aygekc‘i, 12-13th cent. (MijHayBař 2, 1992: 225b). On the asterism ‘Dog-Star’, see below.

●DIAL Ubiquitous in the dialects [HAB 3: 535a].

Remarkable is Kurd-P‘alan (Nikomidia) *šəvən* [HAB 3: 535a]. Note also Dersim *šun*, Mirak‘ *sun*, pl. *səv-di*, *səv-ni* [Bařramyan 1960: 95b]. On this form, on *šun* in folk-games and on ‘Dog-Star’, see below.

●ETYM Since long (NHB 2: 490b; de Lagarde 1854: 27^{L736}; for more references, see HAB 3: 534), derived from PIE **k̑uon-* ‘dog’: Skt. *śván-* m., NSg. *śvā*, AccSg *śvánam*, GSg *śúnas*, *śván-* f. ‘dog’, YAv. *span-*, Lat. *canis* m.f., Gr. *κύων*, GSg. *κυνός* ‘dog’, OIr. *cú*, GSg. *con*, Lith. *šuo*, OPr. *sunis*, *songos* (Euler 1985: 85), etc., see Hübschmann 1987: 480; Pokorny 1959: 632-633; Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 674-675; Mallory/Adams 1997: 168.

Arm. *skund* ‘dog’ (11th cent.+) is usually considered to belong here, too. One may assume the following distribution: *šun* < **šuu*n < PIE **k̑uōn* and *skund* ‘dog, puppy’ < **k̑uon-to/ā-*. For a discussion, other proposals and references, see Lidén 1911: 381-385; Bonfante 1937: 21; Pisani 1950: 172; Ĵahukyan 1982: 69, 75, 134, 218₁₀₇, 218-219₁₀₈; 1987: 134. Further see 2.1.21 and s.v. *skund* ‘dog, puppy’.

Godel (1975: 85) points out that “the oblique case stem *šan-* is the outcome of some unknown analogical process”. One may assume that the original genitive **k̑un-ós* (the Armenian reflex of which would be identical with the nominative *šun*) has been reshaped as **k̑u,n-ós* analogically after the nominative *šun* < **šuu*n < PIE **k̑uōn*; note also ISg **šan-b* < **k̑uṅ-b^{hi}*. For a discussion, see Ĵahukyan 1959: 175; 1982: 108; Schindler 1975: 55; de Lamberterie 1978: 263₁₀₅; Greppin 1984: 92-95; Stempel 1993 < 1987: 150-151; Olsen 1999: 133-134; Matzinger 2005: 71₃₂₃). A similar explanation may be assumed for *jiwn* ‘snow’, *tun* ‘house’, etc. Compare also the problem of Lat. *canis* ‘dog’ (see Schrijver 1991: 461).

Arm. dial. Kurd-P‘alan (Nikomidia) *šəvən* has been treated as an archaic form (Ĵahukyan 1972: 273; 1985: 157; 1987: 254); note also MidArm. *švin* and dial. Dersim pl. *səv-ni* (see above). It is tempting to assume a relic of an old intermediary form **šuwṅ-* or a relation with e.g. Skt. *śván-*.

On Nostratic **K̑ijnA* ‘wolf, dog’, see Illič-Svityč 1971: 361-362; Ivanov 1977: 206; Manaster Ramer 1997: 90-91; Bomhard 2008, 2: 416-417. A comparison between the PIE term and Old Chinese *koō?* ‘small dog’, *keēn?* ‘dog’ has been proposed (Zhou Jixu 2002: 3^{Nr12}; 2003: 8^{Nr31}, a discussion on 8-9). The Germanic forms with a dental (Goth. *hunds*, OFris. *hund* ‘dog’) are linked with OChin. **koond*, **koon?* ‘big dog’ [Zhou Jixu 2003: 8^{Nr32}].

Culturological excursus

Arm. pl. *šn-u/wi* comes from dual (see Ĵahukyan 1987: 375). Originally it may have referred to the two dogs of the *Dying-Rising God* (compare the two dogs *Zangi-Zrangi*, *arlez-s*, etc.), cf. Skt. dual *śvānau*, referring to the two dogs of Yama in RV X.14.10-12 (see Ivanov 1977: 189, with a Germanic parallel).

The asterism *Šn-astł*, lit. ‘dog-star’, mentioned by Anania Širakac‘i in the list of stars or constellations which indicate *zanjrewac* ‘*sastkut*‘*iwn* “abundance of rains” (A. G. Abrahamyan 1944: 331^{L1f}), must be identified with Sirius, the star of Orion’s dog (see Scherer 1953: 109-116); note also dimin. *Šn-ik* (Ališan 1910: 137-138).

This asterism is also present in modern dialects. According to Mkrtumjan 1974: 78b, Syunik‘ *Šani astl* refers to ‘Polar star’.

In folk-games *šun* refers to a playing dice (stone), see Ačařean 1913: 840-841; Bdoyan, *HayŽotXať* 3, 1983: 204-205, 209; *HayLezBrbBať* 4, 2007: 290a. Combining this to the dialectal expression *šan baxt uni* ‘he/she is very successful’, lit. ‘has a dog’s fortune’ (*HayLezBrbBať* 4, 2007: 295a), one may think of a comparison with Skt. (RV+) *śva-ghnīn-* ‘winning player, winner in the dice-game’, a derivative of **śva-ghn-á-* ‘slaying of the dog’ (Ivanov 1977: 199-201, with parallels from other IE traditions; Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 591₂; Falk 1986: 100-101, 108-111, 188; Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 674).

šunč‘, *o*-stem: GDSg *šnč‘-o-y*, ISg *šnč‘-o-v*, GDPl *šnč‘-o-c‘* (Bible+); *i*-stem: GDPl *šnč‘-i-c‘* (Plato) ‘breath; soul, person; blowing, wind’ (Bible+); **šnč‘em** ‘to breathe, blow’ (Bible+).

●DIAL Widespread in the dialects [HAB 3: 535b]. Some of them (Polis, Karin, Ararat, Muš, etc.) display forms with initial *s-*, which is due to dissimilation *š...č‘* > *s...č‘*.

●ETYM Ačařyan (HAB 3: 535b) treats *šunč‘* as an onomatopoeic word composed of *š-* and the suffix *-nč‘* which is frequent in onomatopoeic words.

Though this is basically correct, the connection with cognate forms should not be excluded, cf. Skt. *śvasiti* ‘to hiss, pant, snort’, Lith. *švañkšti* ‘to wheeze’, OIc. *hvæsa* ‘to hiss, snort’. For a discussion, see Meillet 1898: 278; Pedersen 1905: 198 = 1982: 60; Lidén 1911: 385; Grammont 1918: 252; Pokorný 1959: 632; Klingenschmitt 1982: 69; Ravnæs 1991: 147, 166₁; Olsen 1999: 16₂₆; for Sanskrit, see Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 677. On the anlaut, see also 2.1.21.

The Armenian root is perhaps **šu-* rather than **š-*. The words *ššu-nj* and *ššu-k* ‘whisper’ can be regarded as reduplicated forms of **šu-* containing *-nj* (see s.v. *munj-* ‘to mutter, murmur’) and the diminutive *-(u)k*, respectively.

O

***o-** interrogative indefinite pronoun (cf. *o ok‘*, etc. Agat‘angelos+), gen. *o-yr*, dat. *u-m*, abl. *y-um(m)-ē*, plur. nom. *oy-k‘*, gen.-dat. *oy-c‘* ‘who’; **o-v** uninflected ‘who’, also *ov ok‘* ‘who, which person’; **o-r**, gen. *or-o-y*, dat. *or-um*, abl. *y-or-m-ē*, instr. *or-o-v*, plur. gen.-dat. *or-o-c‘*, instr. *or-o-v-k‘* ‘which’; **o-v** uninflected ‘who’; **o-k‘**, gen. *u-r-u-k‘*, dat. *u-m-e-k‘*, abl. *y-umek‘-ē* (plural is based on *omn*) ‘someone, a person’; **y-o**, a prepositional accusative-allative ‘where to’

All the forms are widely attested since the earliest stage of Classical Armenian.

A remarkable textual illustration abounding in these and other pronominal forms is found in Movsēs Xorenac‘i 1.3 (1913=1991: 11^{L17f}; Thomson 1978: 69-70): *erkar ew šahawor gorcov zazgis meroy kargel zpatmut‘iwnn čšdiw, zt‘agaworac‘n ew znaxarakanac‘ azgac‘ ew tohmic‘, t‘ē óv yumē, ew zinč‘ iwraťanč‘iwr ok‘ i noc‘anē gorceac‘, ew óv ok‘ i c‘ētic‘s orošeloc‘ antani ew merazneay, ew óyk‘ omank‘ ekk‘ antanec‘ealk‘ ew meraznac‘ealk‘*: ‘to write the history of our nation in a long and useful work, to deal accurately with the kings and the princely clans and

families: who descended from whom, what each one of them did, which of the various tribes are indigenous and native and which are of foreign origin but naturalized”.

●DIAL The forms *ov* and *or* are ubiquitous in the dialects [HAB 3: 572a, 575a]. The ‘pure’ form **(h)o* has only been preserved in Łarabał *hu* ‘who’ and Nor Naxijewan rural *vɔ*, only in *vɔ gina* ‘who knows?’ [HAB 3: 549a]. Ačařyan (HAB 3: 571-572) points out that the Łarabał pair *hu* before a consonant vs. *huv* before a vowel reflects the original distribution of the OArm. forms *o* and *ov*. In Alaškert and Muš, *ov* ‘who’ has been replaced by *v/wor* [HAB 3: 549a].

Šatax, Moks, Muš *vir*, and Meři *hür* ‘whose’ reflect ClArm. *oyr* (see M. Muradyan 1962: 121 and 1982: 154 with the whole Šatax and Moks paradigms; Weitenberg 1986: 91, 97, 99 with paradigms and an extensive discussion). Also Łarabał has *hür* ‘whose, whom’, see textual illustrations in Grigoryan-Spandaryan 1971: 24^{L1} (*hür heti* ‘for whom?’), 326 (*hur* ‘to whom?’), 331^{L14} (*hür ci* ‘whose horse?’), 331^{L-11} (*hür* ‘to whom?’).

The form *omn* has been preserved in Ĵuła *mi vomn* ‘someone’ [HAB 3: 559b; Ačařean 1940: 380].

The form *ok* has not been preserved independently. It is reflected in the following forms: T’iflis *ɔk’min*, metathesized *ɔmk’in*, Ararat *ɔk’min*, metathesized *ɔk’nim* < *ok’ min* ‘someone, a person’; Ĵuła *vorɔk* < *or ok* ‘whichever’; Sebastia *več’ vek* < *oč’ ok* ‘nobody’; cf. also Agulis *úxman*, *úhman*, *úman*, Meři *únk’en*, etc., probably blends of *ok’(-min)* and *omn* [HAB 3: 620b].

ClArm. *y-o* ‘where to’ is reflected in Svedia *yeɔ* ‘where to’ (see HAB 3: 549a, 613b; Ačařyan 2003: 581; in Andreasyan 1967: 376, *yeu*).

●ETYM Usually derived from PIE **k^wo-*; for the Armenian material, an etymological discussion and references, see HAB 3: 548-549, 559b, 571-572, 574-575, 620. More probably, however, it reflects PIE **jo-*. For *o-r* cf. Goth. *hvar* ‘where’, etc. (Meillet 1927b). For a further philological and etymological discussion and for the problem of the initial *h-*, see s.vv. *i-* ‘thing, what’, *ur* ‘where’.

ozni, *ea*-stem (only GDPI *ozne-a-c* ‘in Vardan Barjrberec’i, 13-14th cent.) ‘hedgehog’ (Bible+). Arm. *ozni* renders Gr. *ἐχίνος* ‘hedgehog’ in the Bible and in Hexaemeron (K. Muradyan 1984: 298^{L14}, glossed in 376a). Later: *kozni* ‘id.’ (*Vkayabanut’iwn S. Yovsimiosi*).

In the late medieval dictionary *Barğirk’ hayoc* ‘we find *xozni* glossed by *kozni* (Amalyan 1975: 144^{Nr201}). This form is hardly erroneous since it stands in its alphabetically correct place, and there are no reading variants.

●DIAL Widespread in the dialects, in many of them with the diminutive suffix *-ik* [HAB 3: 550a].

Some eastern dialects display forms with an initial *k-*: Agulis *kózni*, *kúzni* [Ačařean 1935: 381], Tavuš *kuzni* ‘hedgehog’ [Xemč’yan 2000: 222b^{Nr203}], Łarabał *kózni*, Łazax *kuz*, Ĵuła *konjni*, Loři *kunjina*, etc., as well as *kuzni* in Sarafean 1788 apud HAB 3: 550a. Ačařyan (1935: 149; HAB 3: 550a) explains the initial *k-* through metathesis from diminutive *ozni-k* (note Šamaxi *kuznig*^v, with both the prothetic *k-* and the diminutive *-ik*), which is unconvincing. Ĵahukyan (1972: 272; 1985: 157) suggests that the initial *k-* and *x-* represent an Indo-European laryngeal,

which is lost everywhere. For a discussion of this highly improbable view, see the etymological section.

I think the forms *ko/uzni* and *xozni* are due to contamination with other ‘culturally’ related animal names, viz. *kuz* ‘marten’ (cf. especially Łazax *kuz* ‘hedgehog’, formally identical with *kuz* ‘marten’; for similar suggestions, see Musheghian 2000: 64; Ervandyan 2007: 35), and *xoz*, *koč-* ‘pig’. One important reason for the association with the marten could be the fact that the marten and its close relatives, such as the polecat and the weasel, like the hedgehog, kill (poisonous) snakes (see Ananyan HayKendAšx 1, 1961: 162, 166). As to the pig, compare Pahl. *xūkar(ag)* ‘hedgehog’ from *xūg* ‘pig’ [MacKenzie 1971: 94], English *hedgehog* vs. *hog*, etc.

Note also a widespread Armenian proverb: “They put the head of the pig on the table, but it rolled down and fell into the garbage”; “The head of a pig will not stay on a carpet/rug” [Łanalanyan 1960: 46a]. In the Ararat, Agulis, and Łarabał versions of this proverb we find **kozni* ‘hedgehog’ instead of *xoz* ‘pig’ [Amatuni 1912: 351a; Łanalanyan 1960: 46b]. This proverb is present in Tavuš with both *xoz* ‘pig’ and *kuzni* ‘hedgehog’, see Xemč‘yan 2000: 221b^{Nr154f} and 222b^{Nr203}, respectively¹⁰⁶.

As to the vocalism of the Agulis and Łarabał forms, Ačařyan 1899: 84 notes the absence of *o-* > *væ-* in Łarabał which would imply that the *k-* is old; otherwise we would have **kæźni*. But this cannot explain the Agulis vocalism. Ačařyan 1935: 70 points out that the expected forms of **kozni* or *(k-)ozni* in Agulis would be **ka/āzni* or **kezni*. In the dialect of Agulis the accented *u* in monosyllabic and dissyllabic words regularly yields *ɔ* (sometimes *u*), cf. *kupr* ‘tar’ > *kɔpr*, *mut* ‘dark’ > *mɔt*, *mukn* ‘mouse’ > *mɔknə*, *nuřn* ‘pomegranate’ > *nɔřnə*, *urag* ‘adze’ > *órag*, *urax* ‘happy’ > *órax*, *unim* ‘to have’ > *ónim*, *uři* ‘willow’ > *óri*, *utel* ‘to eat’ > *ótil*, etc. (see Ačařyan 1935: 72, 76-77). This holds also for Łarabał (see Davt‘yan 1966: 41-42). Hence, in my opinion, Agulis and Łarabał *kózni*, *kúzni* reflects **kuzni*, which corroborates the association with *kuz* ‘marten’.

Some dialects display forms with an affricate *j-*: Alaškert *ɔcni*, Muš *ɔjni* [HAB 3: 550a] and Bulanəx *ɔjni* [S. Movsisyan 1972: 72b, cf. 52a]; or *-nj-*: Moks *wonjnə* [Ačařyan 1952: 285; Orbeli 2002: 339], Ĵuła *konjni*, Loři *kunjina*, etc. [HAB 3: 550a].

According to Ačařyan (1940: 72, 101), Ĵuła *konjni* does not directly come from ClArm. *ozni* but reflects an old dialectal by-form. A similar view is expressed by Ĵahukyan 1972: 272 who assumes an IE by-form with a ‘supplementary’ *-n-*. At the first glance this seems true since the development *-nzn-* > *-njn-* is more difficult than the opposite (cf. e.g. *sinj-n* ‘sorb, service-berry, haw’ < Łarabał *séznə*, etc.). However, this is not sufficient enough to consider *konjni* archaic because such developments are often ambiguous, and the other features, viz. the nasal anticipation (cf. Ĵahukyan 1972: 272) and the prothetic *k-* are certainly recent. The affricate *-j-* may be explained by the influence of *awj* = *ōj* ‘snake’, which is particularly clear from Muš, etc. *ɔjni*. For the association of the hedgehog with the snake, see the etymological section.

¹⁰⁶ There is yet another variant, with *hət* ‘is’ ‘dung-beetle’ (Xemč‘yan 2000: 222b^{Nr229}).

Lexicographers record a plant-name *oznkan*, which is represented in HAB 3: 550b without an etymology. I wonder whether this derives from dial. **oznik* ‘hedgehog’ (cf. Van *voznik*, gen. *voznakan* or *voznakan*, see Ačařyan 1952: 126; Šerenc‘ VanSaz 2, 1899: 100^{L5}), compare the Greek plant-name *ἐχίνιον* derived from *ἐχῖνος* ‘hedgehog’.

●ETYM Since long (NHB, Pictet, etc., see HAB 3: 550a), connected with the word for ‘hedgehog’: Gr. *ἐχίνος* m. ‘hedgehog; sea-urchin’, Phryg. *εῤίς* ‘hedgehog’, Lith. *ežys* ‘hedgehog’, Russ. *ěž* ‘id.’, OHG *igil* ‘id.’, Oss. *wyzyn/uzun* ‘hedgehog’, etc., see Hübschmann 1877: 25; 1897: 481; HAB 3: 549-550; Pokorny 1959: 292. For Oss. *wyzyn/uzun*, see Cheung 2002: 245.

Arm. *ozni* has been derived from **ozini* (Hübschmann 1899: 46), with intervocalic **g^h* > Arm. *z* (see Clackson 1994: 107). One may also assume that the change of **-g^h-* to *-z-* is regular in intervocalic position and before a nasal (see Meillet 1896b: 54, with *ozni* as an example of **-jn- > -zn-*). For a further discussion on this issue and on the Armenian vocalism, see Considine 1978-79: 357; Greppin 1988-89: 479; Ravnæs 1991: 11, 38₁; Olsen 1999: 508-509. The prot-form would be **h₁og^hini_o-s* (Matzinger 2005: 20) or, perhaps better, **h₁og^hi-Hn-ieh₂-*, with the ‘Hoffmann-suffix’ **-Hn-*. Olsen 1999: 508 assumes a diminutive **(i)h₁no-*, which is uncertain. Clackson (1994: 124) points out that the **l-* suffix of Germanic may have replaced an earlier **n-* suffix, and the different vocalism of Greek and Armenian argues against a shared innovation.

The IE word for ‘hedgehog’ may be associated with ‘snake’ and is usually interpreted as ‘snake-killer’ or ‘snake-eater’, and this reputation is supported zoologically (Specht 1947: 39; Mallory 1982: 198-199; Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 526 = 1995: 444; Mallory/Adams 1997: 264-265). A direct derivation of the word for ‘hedgehog’ from ‘snake’ would imply that Gr. *ἐχίς* ‘viper’ is not cognate with YAv. *aži-*, Skt. *áhi-*, and Arm. *iž* (q.v.) since these forms point to **-g^{wh}-* (cf. Lubotsky 1988: 29₇). This is not very probable, however, and the association between ‘hedgehog’ and ‘snake’ may be secondary (see Mallory/Adams 1997: 264b).

Also in the Armenian tradition we find evidence for this association, both cultural and linguistic (cf. Muš *ojni*, etc. in the dialectal section; see also S. Movsisyan 1972: 52a). In a folk-tale recorded by Ařak‘el Bahat‘ryan in 1860 (HŽHek‘ 6, 1973: 77-78), a young bride puts on the hide of a hedgehog before going to his husband *Ōc‘-manuk* ‘Snake-child’. They argue with mutual demands to take off their hides. Subsequently, the snake turns into a man, and they become spouses. This motif is found in many other versions, e.g. in Van (Šerenc‘ VanSaz 2, 1899: 99-105). Note in particular a version originated from the Manazkert region (see HŽHek‘ 9, 1968: 231-237), where the hedgehog is represented by *ocni* < **ojni*, the form known from the whole Turuberan area.

The assumption that the initial *k-* and *x-* of the Armenian dialectal by-forms *ko/uzni* and *xozni* represent an Indo-European laryngeal (see the dialectal section) is highly improbable since: 1) the regular outcome of **h₂-* and **h₃-* is Armenian *h-*; 2) Gr. *ἐχίνος* shows that here we are dealing with **h₁-*, which is regularly lost even in Armenian and Anatolian; 3) the solution can be much simpler (see the dialectal section).

oloġn, *an*-stem (obl. *-an(c')*, NPl *-runk')* ‘pea, been; globule’ (Bible+). In Paterica: *oleġn* (cf. dial.).

●DIAL The plant-name has been preserved in several dialects: Muš *ɔlor*, Nor Naxijewan *uġel*, rural *uler*, Xotorġur *ɔġel*, Goris *hūleɔġnə*, Łarabał *hūleġnə* (cf. also *ūlléɔġne'g'* ‘a kind of abscess (*palar*)’). Most of the forms are identical with *oleġn* attested in Paterica. Ačarıyan questions whether Juła (rural) *hoġal* ‘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'ı) *k'əłur* ‘a kind of corn resembling oats’ [Bałramyan 1964: 175b], Dersim, Balu *xəłor* ‘millet-sized hail; a kind of millet-sized useless grain’ [Sargisean 1932: 426; Bałramyan 1964: 140b] (see N. Mkrtč'yan 1983: 31-32).

●ETYM Ačarıyan (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 **-lh₁C-* > Arm. *-oloC-* is uncertain, and *olor* ‘twisting’ is probably of a different origin. Besides, the plant-name has been compared with Semitic forms: 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 cultural word of Mediterranean and Near-Eastern areas. Note also another synonym of Mediterranean origin, namely *siseġn* ‘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 *oleġn* (Paterica; dialects) and **oġel* (Xotorġur, Nor Naxijewan). An influence of *siseġn*, GSg *sis(e)ġan* ‘pea’ (Agat'angelos+; widespread in the dialects) should be taken into account, too.

olok', *a-* or *o-*stem: GDSg *olok'-i* (Agat'angelos+), GDPl *olok'-ac'* in Agat'angelos (as a reading variant, see below), Plato; *olok'-oc'* (Philo), API *z-olog-s* and *z-olok'-un-s* (both in Yaysmawurk') ‘shin’.

In Agat'angelos § 102 (1909=1980: 61^{L16f}; transl. Thomson 1976: 119): *Ew et hraman berel kočets p'aytic', ew arnel 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 uźgin aġatkōk'*: “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 ‘shinbone’.

In Baġgirk' hayoc': *ōlox' čur* [Amalyan 1975: 338^{Nr29}].

●DIAL Preserved in the dialects of Muš, Axalc'xa, Nor Naxijewan, Juła, etc. The semantics in the literary attestations are specified as ‘the part of the leg between the knee and the heel’, while in the dialects ‘the part of the leg between the knee and ankle’ [HAB 3: 552; Ačarean 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, namely ‘stalk of wheat’ (see HAB 3: 552).

Ararat *əbrk‘* ‘shinbone’ and Adana (Turkish speaking) *əbrk‘* ‘shin’ (see HAB 3: 552ab) have an epenthetic *-r-*.

Particularly interesting is *cok-olok‘* ‘(anat.) calf’ in the dialect of Ozim (see Ačařyan 1913: 522b; HAB 3: 552b). Ačařyan (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 Ačařyan (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‘iloyeanc‘ 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‘šeyan 1971: 113b): *Jak oskorov lvanal* “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 Ačařyan (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 *локѣтъ*, Russ. *lókot‘*, Czech *loket* ‘elbow’, etc.; Lith. *alkūnė, elkūnė* ‘elbow’, Latv. *ēlks* ‘elbow, bend’ *ēlkuons* ‘elbow, bend’; Gr. *ὀλένη* ‘elbow’, etc. (see Lidén 1906: 95-97; HAB 3: 552; Pokorny 1959: 308; Saradževa 1986: 131-132; Ĵahukyan 1987: 122; 165); see also s.vv. *ořn* ‘spine, *uln* ‘neck’, etc. Skt. *řkšālā-* 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. *úolektis*, Latv. *uólektis* ‘ell’), which requires **HoHl-* or **Heh₃l-*. Note that this alternation of **-o-* and **-ō-* is also seen in *olok‘* ‘shin’ and *uluk* (in Łarabał, also **(h)uhuk‘*, 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*, comparable to the **-k-* of the Balto-Slavic and perhaps some other cognate forms. The same is found also in *ořn* and *uln* (q.v.), which are considered etymologically related with *ol-ok‘* and *ul-uk*. Theoretically, a PIE *k*-stem might look as follows: nom. **HóHl-ōk* (or **Héh₃l-ōk*), acc. **HoHl-ók-m*, gen. **HHl-k-ós* (cf. the HD paradigm of **nėp-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-*, *uluk/k‘* and *olok‘* have developed. One may alternatively

consider the possible dependence of an unstressed vowel on the stressed one (see 2.1.23).

otb, mostly plural, *o*-stem: GDSg *otb-o-y*, GDPl *otb-o-c'*, IPl *otb-o-v-k'* 'wail, lamentation' (Bible+), **otbam** 'to wail, lament' (Bible+).

●DIAL Widespread in the dialects. In Sivri-Hisar, it means 'to long for' [HAB 3: 553].

●ETYM Connected to Lith. *ulbioti* 'to call, sing', Gr. *ὀλοφύρομαι* 'to wail, lament, bewail, bemoan', *ὀλοφρονός* 'lamenting, wailing' (with a secondary *-o-*, see Beekes 2009 s.v.); see Hübschmann 1883: 46; 1897: 481; HAB 3: 553a with lit.; Ĵahukyan 1987: 121, 164; sceptical: Clackson 1994: 182.

The Armenian form may reflect **Hol-b^h-* or **h₃l-b^h-*; for a discussion, see Kortlandt 1987: 62 = 2003: 76; Beekes 1987b: 6-7; 2003: 188; Greppin 1988-89: 479; Lindeman 1990: 28-30; Derksen 1996: 110₆; Olsen 1999: 37.

otot-anam 'to wail, lament' (John Chrysostom), **otot-anim** 'id.' (John Chrysostom), **otot-ank'** 'wail, lamentation' (Ephrem); dial. **ulul-** 'to lament, cry'.

●DIAL Axalc'xa *ululal* 'to weep, cry, lament (said of women)'; Erzinka *ulul-ik anel* 'to cry, shout' [HAB 3: 555b]. The appurtenance of dimin. *ot-ik* is uncertain (see Amatuni 1912: 527a; Ačārean 1913: 1134b; HAB 3: 555b; Ž. Xač'atryan 1975: 56b, 56b₆₇). NHB 2: 511a suggests a relation between *otik* and ClArm. *otok* 'supplication'.

●ETYM Ačāryan (HAB 3: 555) interprets the verb *otot-* as reduplication of **ol-* and connects it to Gr. *ὀλολύζω* 'to cry out loudly, call, moan' (said especially of women), *ὀλολυγή* f. 'loud outcry'; forms with **u-* (for the etymon, see Mayrhofer EWAia 1, 1992: 230-231; Mallory/Adams 1997: 66b, cf. 412a); Skt. *ululī-* 'crying loudly', *ulūka-* m. 'owl', Lat. *ululāre* 'to howl, yell, shriek', *ulula* f. 'the tawny owl', Lith. *ulūloti* 'to shout', etc.

Further, see Ałayan 1974: 17, 62-63; N. Simonyan 1991: 303-304. The appurtenance of Arm. dial. *ulul-* has been suggested by Manandean p.c. 1899 in Ējmiacin (apud HAB 3: 593a). Ĵahukyan (1987: 121, 154, 164) separates **ul-* from **ot-*, but this is not compelling; the vocalic vacillation may be due to the onomatopoeic nature of the etymon. The etymology of Arm. **ot-/*ul-* remains unknown to scholars outside Armenia.

For the structure of Arm. dial. *ul-ul-ik* 'cry, shouting' and Gr. *ὀλ-ολ-υγή* f. 'loud outcry', cf. Gr. *ἀλ-αλ-αγή* 'shouting' vs. Arm. *at-at-ak* 'shouting' (q.v.).

ototem 'to overflow, inundate, flood; to rinse' (Bible+), **ototanem** 'id.' (Bible+), **ototanim** 'to plunge (into licentious pleasures)' (Movsēs Xorenac'i, etc.), **ototeal** 'licentious' (John Chrysostom); **otot** 'inundation, flood' (Agat'angelos).

For the moral context of the verb cf. Movsēs Xorenac'i 3.63 (1913=1991: 346^{L12f}; Thomson 1978: 339): *anhun sksaw ototanel yanarak c'ankut'iwns* "begun to plunge without restraint into licentious pleasures".

In Baġirk' hayoc' (Amalyan 1975: 254^{Nr40f}) *otot* and *ototel* are glossed by *hetel* 'flood' and *oʀogel* 'to irrigate', respectively.

●DIAL The verb *ototem* is widespread in the dialects [HAB 3: 555a].

●ETYM Belongs with *hetum* 'to pour, fill' and *hetel* 'flood, torrent' (q.v.).

otorm *o*-stem: ISg *otorm-o-v* in Yovhan Mandakuni ‘compassion; supplication’ (Bible+); **otormim** (Bible+).

●DIAL The verb is widespread in the dialects (note also the deverbative noun *otormis*, which reflects the frozen API form *otormi-s*), but the noun is not recorded in HAB 3: 557a. Traces of the latter may be found in Łarabał, e.g. in the formula (L. Harut‘yunyan 1991: 307^{L4}) *Astvac uturmə təni mart‘in srtumə* ‘May God put the compassion into the heart of the man’.

●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). Ĵahukyan (1987: 121, 164), however, prefers the connection to *etern* ‘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 (*satawart*, etc.).

otok‘, *o*-stem: GDSg *otok‘-o-y*, ISg *otok‘-o-v* (Agat‘angelos, P‘awstos Buzand) ‘supplication; fawning, flattery’ (Bible+), **otok‘em** ‘to supplicate, flatter, coax’ (Bible+), **otok‘-an-k‘**, pl. tant. *a*-stem: GDPI *otok‘-an-a-c‘*, IPI *otok‘-an-a-w-k‘* ‘supplication; flattery’ (Bible+).

●ETYM Pedersen (1906: 389-390 = 1982: 167-168) connects *otok‘* with Lat. *loquor* ‘to speak, talk, say; to mention’; further, see HAB 3: 557b. The Latin word may be derived from **tlok‘*^v (see Schrijver 1991: 476; cf. Mallory/Adams 1997: 535b).

More probably, *otok‘* derives from PArm. **ot-/at-* ‘to supplicate, pray, lament’ (see s.v.v. *atač‘em* ‘to supplicate, beseech, pray’ and *otot-* ‘to wail, lament’, cf. Pedersen *ibid.*; Ĵahukyan 1987: 121, 164; Clackson 1994: 174). For a vocalic discussion, see Kortlandt 1983: 10, 13 = 2003: 40, 43; Beekes 2003: 157. The *-ok‘* probably points to a rhyming formation next to *botok‘* ‘complain’ (q.v.). Note also *borb-ok‘-em* ‘to set on fire, kindle, inflame’ vs. *borb* ‘bright, aflame, burning’, and *keł-ek‘-em* ‘to tear, rend’ (see s.v.v.).

otn GDSg *otin*, in Elias (6th cent.) *otan*, ISg *otamb*, NPI *otunk‘*, GDPI *otanc‘* ‘spine, back(bone); spine with spinal marrow; marrow’; dial. also ‘hill-side, etc.’ (Bible+). Mxit‘ar Herac‘i (12th cent.) has *ot-o-šar* ‘spinal column’, which is considered dialectal by Ačarjan (HAB 3: 554a).

If the placenames *Ot-akan* and *Otin* (q.v.) belong here, the meaning ‘hill-side, etc.’, although attested only in the 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’); Xotorĵur *vət* ‘slope of a mountain’; Hamšen (*y)eot*, *yx* (GSg *otən* < *otan*, NPI *otnunk*) ‘long hillock’ (according to KiwlHamš 1899: 560a, *eotn* ‘high summit of a hill’), etc. [HAB 3: 554b; Ačarjan 1947: 12, 24, 248]; Mełri *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’. Ačarjan (HAB 3: 554b) compares this **ot-m-* to *ənd-otm-eal* (John Chrysostom), although 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 the synonymous *kolmanim* and *ən-kolman-im* (with the root *kolmn* ‘side’).

In sayings from the village of Xult‘ik (Bašəš), AblSg *yim yothen* ‘from my back’ is used referring to a mule and a donkey (see Tarōnean 1961: 183).

According to Hananyan (1995: 195ab), Svedia (Xtrbek) has *təut* for *utet*, and *təttäg* for *otn*. Formally, *təttäg*, too, seems to derive from *utet*. The form is mentioned s.v. *otn* because *təttäg*, 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/Yolun-ōluk), where Arm. *otn* and *utet* are glossed as *təut* and *təöt*, respectively. Here again, both forms are practically identical and clearly represent *utet*. In page 250, Andreasyan (1967) mentions only one *təut* (*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)təət, *tüt* ‘marrow’ s.v. *utet*, in the same opposition with *ben* < Arab. *beyn* ‘brain’.

Akn *ətəšar* ‘spinal column’ reflects MidArm. *ot-o-šar* ‘spinal column’ (see above). Note also *ətəšar* found in Turkish-Armenian dictionary (ca. 1720 AD) by Eħia Mušelyan Karnec‘i (Karin/Xotorĵur) [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. *ὠλένη* 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. *úolektis*, Latv. *uōlekts* ‘ell’, etc., as well as Arm. *uln* (GDSg *ulan*, NPI *ulunk*, GDPI *ulanc*) ‘neck’ (Bible+; dialect of Ĵuła), *uluk* ‘palm, distance from the thumb to the little finger’ (Bible+; dialect of Łarabał, with an initial *h-*), and *il(ik)* ‘spindle’ (q.v.), see Lidén 1906: 127-131; HAB 3: 554, 592; Pokorny 1959: 308; 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 exaggerated to me. 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 3.7.2). Note also that, in the dialect of Ĵuła, 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 *šl(n)-i* ‘neck’, if indeed related with **šil-* ‘crooked, twisting/bending’; see also s.v. *šet* and 3.7.2.

Important is also Muš *pareki hulunk* ‘spinal column’ which actually means ‘vertebrae of back’ and can be considered an important intermediary between *otn* 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. **ot-*), 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 *otn* < **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 *ateġn* ‘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’ > ‘shinbone’ and ‘marrow’.

Another etymology: Aġayan 1974: 19.

oġ, *o*-stem: GDPI *oġ-o-c*‘ (Bible+); GDSg *oġ-i* (Paterica) ‘whole, integral, complete, solid; sound, healthy, unhurt’ (Bible+); *ar-oġ* ‘sound, healthy, unhurt’ (q.v.).

●DIAL Widespread in the dialects [HAB 3: 558b].

●ETYM Meillet (1894: 154; 1936: 52) derives Arm. *oġ* from **ol-jo-*, cf. OIr. (*h*)*uile* ‘all, whole’, MWelsh *holl* < *(*s*)*ol-jo-* (unless from **sol-no-* with Lat. *sollus* ‘complete’, as is alternatively assumed by Schrijver 1995: 323). This is accepted in Pokorny 1959: 979; Godel 1975: 81; Ĵahukyan 1982: 41. The derivation from **solu-jo-* is unconvincing. For a discussion, see Müller 1890: 5^{Nr45}; Hübschmann 1897: 481; Pisani 1934: 180-182; 1950: 178; Ĵahukyan 1982: 213; Ravnæs 1991: 35, 107₁; Olsen 1999: 26, 798; Beekes 2003: 162. For a discussion of *-ġ-*, see also s.v. *ayl* ‘other, alien’.

For the semantic relationship ‘whole, integral, complete, solid’ vs. ‘sound, healthy’, see Toporov 1979a: 218-220. See also s.v. *amb-oġ* ‘whole, intact’.

oċ ‘not’ (Bible+).

●DIAL Preserved in Zeyt‘un, Muš, Hamšen, T‘iflis, Ararat, Łarabał, Agulis, etc. Note also Muš *məċ*‘ only in a proverb (cf. *on-c*‘ ‘how’ > dial. **monc*‘). More widespread is ċ‘-ē [HAB 3: 562a].

●ETYM Since NHB (2: 516a), linked with Gr. *oúk, oúki, oúxi* ‘not’ < **h₂oiu-k^wi(d)*. See also Meillet 1936: 143; Cowgill 1960; Ĵahukyan 1987: 134, 177; Kortlandt 2003 + Beekes 2003 passim (see the index). For a critical discussion, see Clackson 1994: 158; 2004-05: 155-156, who treats *o-ċ*‘ as an inner-Armenian creation: pronoun *o-* (as in *o-k*‘ and *o-mn*‘ ‘someone’) + simple negative ċ‘ < **kwid*, originally used in conjunction with **ne* which later fell out of use; cf. the fossilised phrase ċ‘-*ik*‘ ‘(there is) nothing’. Aċaryan (HAB 3: 561b < Meillet) connects the first component *o-* of *oċ*‘ ‘not’ with Skt. *áti* ‘beyond, over’, etc.

The inner-Armenian interpretation is most probable. That ċ‘ functioned as a negative also without the *o-* is seen not only in ċ‘-*ik*‘ but also in ċ‘-ē ‘not’ which is dialectally ubiquitous.

oř, *i*-stem in Geoponica, ‘rump’ (Paterica, Geoponica, etc. HAB 3: 564a; MijHayBař 2, 1992: 231-232).

●DIAL Dialectally ubiquitous. In the village of Hasknjaws of Moks, *yeř*, which, as is pointed out by Aċaryan, is reminiscent of PIE *e*-grade, cf. the Celtic form below [HAB 3: 564b]. Svedia *vəřř* ‘vulva (/bunoc‘/)’ [Aċaryan 2003: 436, 583].

●ETYM Since NHB (2: 517c), compared with PIE **h₁ors(o)-*: Gr. *ῥοπος* m. ‘rump’, *οὐπά* f. ‘tail’, OIc. *ars*, OHG *ars* ‘arse, buttocks, backside’, OEngl. *ears* ‘arse’, Engl. *arse*, OIr. *err* f. ‘tail, back of chariot’ < **ersā*, probably also Hitt. *ārra-*, *ārri-*, *arru-* ‘rump’ (Hübschmann 1897: 482; Bugge 1889: 23; 1892: 446; HAB 3: 564; Pokorny 1959: 340; Hanneyan 1979: 171; Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 817 = 1995: 717; Mallory/Adams 1997: 88b).

For Lat. *dorsum*, see s.v. **tor-* ‘neck’.

oski, *wo*-stem (and *ea*-stem; see below) ‘gold’.

wo-stem: GDSg *oskw-o-y*, AblSg *y-oskw-o-y*, ISg *oskw-o-v*, NPl *oski-k-*, AccSg *oski-s*, IPl *oskw-o-v-k-*. All these case forms, except for IPl *oskw-o-v-k-* (once, in 1 Maccabees 4.57), are abundantly attested in the Bible, see Astuacaturean 1895: 1173-1175. Instead of GDPl **oskw-o-c-*, however, we find here only *oske-a-c-* (Judges 8.26; Songs 5.15), which points to *ea*-stem. If these forms are reliable, we are dealing with a mixed declension *wo* + *ea* (cf. Jähukyan 1959: 237-238).

●DIAL Ubiquitous in the dialects:

with anlaut diphthongization: dialects with penultimate accentuation (Łarabał *vəéske*, Goris *véske*, Ararat, Šamaxi *vəski*, etc.) and Van-Salmast group (Van, Ĵula, Salmast *voski*, etc.);

without diphthongization: Nor Naxijewan, T‘iflis, Hamšen, Karin, Muš, Tigranakert *oski*, Hačən, Polis, Sebastia *osgi*;

with *o-* and *vo-* doublets: Akn (*v*)*osgi*, Suč‘ava (*v*)*osgi* (HAB 3: 566-567; for a discussion and chronology, see Weitenberg 1996: 100-103, 110-112; 2001: 71).

Agulis *áski* (see Ačarġean 1935: 63) seems to show that the change ClArm. *o-* > Agulis *a-* in disyllabic words antedates the diphthongization.

●ETYM Ačarġyan (HAB 3: 565-566) rejects all the etymological attempts, including those comparing Arm. *oski* with Sumer. *guškin* ‘gold’ (Patkanean 1880: 97; Bugge 1892: 444; Jensen 1898: 108; Vycichl 1965)¹⁰⁷, Finn. *vaski* ‘copper’, etc., as well as that of Patrubány (1908: 278a) who links *oski* with Lat. *aurum*, etc., deriving the Armenian form from **aus-g-iyos*, a derivative of PIE **aues-* ‘to light, shine’ (read **h₂(e)us-* ‘to shine’, cf. Lat. *aurōra*, etc. [Pokorny 1959: 87; Mallory/Adams 1997: 148], see s.v. *ayg* ‘morning’), and considers Finn. *vaski* ‘copper’ and Hung. *vas* ‘iron’ as loans from PArm. **uoski*. Ačarġyan (ibid.) leaves the origin of Arm. *oski* open. He does not mention the Armenian word in AčarHLPatm 1, 1940: 11 (with Lat. *aurum*, etc.) and 68 (in the complete list of Armenian words of IE origin), and suggests an Urartian origin in 182. Jähukyan (1987: 296, 452) treats *oski* as borrowed from Finno-Ugric languages and mentions the Sumerian form.

The IE forms of this word for ‘gold’ are Latin *aurum*, Lith. *áuksas*, Old Lithuanian *ausas*, and Old Prussian *ausis*, from IE **h₂eus-* (Schrijver 1991: 47), and Toch. A *wäs* m., B *yasa* n. ‘gold’ < PToch. **w‘äsā* f., from IE **h₂ues-eh₂-* (see Adams 1999: 487), unless a loan from Samoyed (see Schrijver 1991: 47 with refer.). This term is usually treated as a migratory word related with Finno-Ugric **vaš/ske* ‘copper, bronze’ and Sumer. *guškin* ‘gold’. For a discussion and references, see Aalto 1959; Pokorny 1959: 87; Lane 1970: 76, 81; Toporov, PrJaz [a-d] 1975: 168-

¹⁰⁷ Pedersen (1924: 219-220 = 1982: 302-303) assumes a dissimilatory loss of the initial *g-* of Sumer. *guškin* in Armenian.

170; Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 711, 713, 932, 939 = 1995: 615, 618, 825-826, 831; Rédei 1986: 42; Mallory/Adams 1997: 234; Carpelan/Parpola 2001: 127.

The appurtenance of Arm. *oski* to this term is accepted practically by everyone. However, the derivational basis is unclear. The proto-form **aus-g-iyos* assumed by Patrubány (cf. also **au-* > Arm. *o-* in Lane 1970: 81) would yield Arm. **a(w)skí(yo)-* or **a(w)scí(yo)-*. The interpretation of the word as *(v)oski* from **vask* (e.g. Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 713, 932) does not clarify much. Note that **HuV-* yields Arm. *gV-*, and the initial *v-* of the dialectal forms is secondary (see above).

Olsen (1999: 441, 803, 831) assumes dissimilatory umlaut *u-i* > *o-i* and putatively posits a substantivized **h₂ustyo-* ‘leuchtungsfähig’, cf. Skt. *kṛtvya-* (trisyllabic) ‘leistungsfähig, arbeitsvoll’. The development **-styo-* > Arm. *-sk-* is not impossible (see 2.1.22.6), but the structural analysis is not convincing. More probably, the *-ki-* is a non-IE suffixal element seen also in Finno-Ugric and Sumerian forms, as well as in other metal-names, such as Hatt. *ḫapalki-*, Akkad./Hurr. *ḫabalginnu* ‘iron’, Georg. *rḱina* ‘iron’, etc. The nature of *-k-* in Lith. *áuksas* ‘gold’ which is absent from the other Baltic forms and after which the *-s-* has not become *-š-*, is unclear (see Toporov, op. cit. 168).

One might derive Arm. *oski* from **əwoskiya*, with vocalic assimilation and loss of intervocalic *-w-* in pretonic position, see 2.1.23 and 2.1.33.1 respectively. If we are dealing with a word of substratum rather than a PIE word, the formation can be compared with that of *ozni* ‘hedgehog’, also a European substratum word with *o-* grade.

oskr (mostly in plur.), *er*-stem: ISg *osker-b* (Commentary on Judges by Ehišē) NPl *osker-k*‘, GDPl *osker-a-c*‘, IPl *osker-a-w-k*‘ (Bible+) ‘bone’ (Bible+).

●DIAL Ubiquitous in the dialects [HAB 3: 567-568].

●ETYM Derived from the PIE word for ‘bone’: Skt. *ásthi*, *asthnás* n. ‘bone’, Gr. *ὀστέον* n. ‘bone’, Lat. *os*, *ossis* n. ‘bone, leg’, Hitt. *ḫaštāi*, *ḫašti-* n. ‘bone; (metaphorically) strength; a measure of length’, CLuw. *ḫāš-* ‘bone’, see Hübschmann 1897: 482; HAB 3: 567; Pokorny 1959: 783; Mayrhofer EWAia 1, 1992: 150-151; Mallory/Adams 1997: 77a.

Arm. *oskr* points to **Host-uer-* (Meillet 1936: 51; Clackson 1994: 44; Olsen 1999: 147), and the plural stem *-a-* probably reflects the IE neuter pl. **-h₂* (Olsen ibid.). One reconstructs **h₂₋* (Mayrhofer EWAia ibid.; Mallory/Adams ibid.; Olsen 1999: 147) or **h₃₋* (Kloekhorst 2006: 92; 2008: 325). For a discussion, see also Greppin 1988-89: 479; Lindeman 1997: 47-48. The absence of an initial *h-* points to **Host-* for Armenian. On the *-i/n-* declension in relation with the problem of the laryngeal, see Beekes 1987c; Elbourne 2000: 17-18.

Hamp (1984) argues against reconstruction of a velar suffix in Armenian and Celtic, and denies the relation between ‘bone’ and ‘branch’ (*ost*, q.v.). He (op. cit. 198) explains Arm. *oskr* ‘bone’ through the following development: **ostur* > **oskar* > **osk^r* > *oskr*. For a discussion, see also Polomé 1980: 26; van Windekens 1990-91. Viredaz (2003: 73, 73₇₀) derives *oskr* from **ost-wr* and notes: “**-wr* probably added on the model of **ghrēwr* ‘horn’ (*ełjewr*) because **ost* was too short a word (or was about to be reduced to **os*). Hitt. *ḫastwer* ‘weed, waste’ is unrelated”.

ost, *o*-stem: GDPl *ost-o-c*‘, IPl *ost-o-v-k*‘ ‘branch’ (Bible+).

●DIAL Preserved in several dialects in the meaning ‘remnant of a cut-off branch’. Ararat has *vəst-l* and *kəst-l*, and Sebastia has *əst-r-* [HAB 3: 569a]. For the obscure *k-* in Ararat cf. *kostl* ‘a twig on which bird-lime is smeared to entangle birds’ (HAB 2: 639a; for an explanation, see Ałayan 1974: 87-88).

●ETYM Connected with Gr. *ῥῶος* m. ‘branch, twig, bough, offshoot; knot or eye on a tree’, Goth. *asts*, OHG *ast* ‘branch’, MDutch *ōst* ‘knot in wood’, etc. Hübschmann 1883: 46; 1897: 482; Meillet 1922j: 212 (on *-st*); HAB 3: 568-569 with lit.; Pokorný 1959: 785; Mallory/Adams 1997: 80a; Olsen 1999: 19. The analysis **o-sd-o-*, with the root of ‘to sit’ is untenable; one now reconstructs **Hosdo-* (Beekes 1992: 172; cf. Olsen 1999: 19₃₃). The appurtenance of Hitt. *ḫašduer-* is uncertain (see Kloekhorst 2006: 87; 2008 s.v.).

The connection between the words for ‘branch’ and ‘bone’ (Bailey 1983: 2) has been rejected by Hamp 1984.

*ot- ‘foot’: sg. *ot-n*, gen.-dat. *otin*, loc. *y-otin*, abl. *y-otan-ē*, instr. *otam-b*; plur. *ot-k’*, *i*-stem: acc. *ot-s*, gen.-dat. *ot-i-c’*, abl. *y-ot-i-c’*, instr. *ot-i-w-k’* (Bible+; rich evidence in the Bible, see Astuacaturean 1895: 1177-1179); MidArm *y-ot-a-c’*, pointing to *a*-stem (see below, the dialectal section); *het* ‘footstep, track’ (q.v.).

The paradigm richly attested in the Bible points to a clear restriction of the forms *otn* and *ot-i-* to singular and plural, respectively. The same forms are attested also in the original literature. We find GDPI *ot-i-c’* in Agat‘angelos §§ 102, 103, 221 (1909=1980: 61^{L17}, 62^{L1}, 62^{L8}, 116^{L15}) next to singular *otn*, e.g. *zmioy otanēn* (41^{L16f}). In Sebēos Chapter 20 (Xaç‘atryan/Ehiazaryan 2005: 104^{L1f}; transl. Thomson 1999: 39-40), one finds GDSg *ot-i-n* and ISg *otam-b* on the one hand, and API *ot-s* and IPI *ot-i-w-k’* on the other. The plural forms thus lack the nasal; further, see the Concordance of Sebēos (G. Xaç‘atryan 2004: 357-358).

IPI *ot-i-w-k’* is attested in P‘awstos Buzand 5.37 (1883=1984: 202^{L14}; transl. Garsoïan 1989: 218): *zi otīwk’n c’awac ēr* ‘because his feet hurt’; also in Ehišē (Ter-Minasyan 1989: 382^{L7}, 390^{L14}), Movsēs Kałankatuac‘i 2.41 (V. Ařak‘elyan 1983: 253^{L8}).

In compounds *ot* sometimes displays *o*-stem forms, cf. *stor-ot* ‘foot (of a mountain)’: ISg *storot-o-v*, several times in the Bible (Astuacaturean 1895: 1376a), IPI *storot-o-v(-k’)* in Movsēs Xorenac‘i 1.12: 1913=1991: 38^{L18} (*ař storotovk’ leranc’n*), 2.49: 176^{L11}; cf. *ař otamb lerinn* (1.12: 41^{L17f}) and *i leřnotin mium* (1.10: 33^{L9}). Paterica has *i kołmn storot-i lerinn* (NHB 2: 751c).

●DIAL The forms *ot* and frozen pl. *otk’* are widespread in the dialects. Zeyt‘un Akn, etc. have dual **ot-u-i*. Note the paradigm of Polis: NSg *ot’k’*, pl. *ədvī, ədvəner*. The final nasal of *otn* is present in Agulis, Łarabał, etc. [HAB 3: 574a].

The ClArm. GDPI *ot-i-c’* has been preserved in Malkara [Řodost‘o], in a frozen substantive meaning ‘shoes’ (see Ačārean 1913: 857b). Instead of this form (cf. Van GDPI *ač‘ič’ < ač‘ic’*, see s.v. *ač’-k’*), Van represents MidArm. *ot-a-c’*, which is probably analogical after *ceřac’ < ClArm. jeř-a-c’* vs. *jeřn* ‘hand’ (see Ačāryan 1952: 128-129). The form *otac’* is also found in Zeyt‘un and Nor Bayazet in the meanings ‘pants’ and ‘women underwear’, respectively, as well as in compounds like Č‘arsančag **otac’-šor* ‘pants’ and **otac’-aman* ‘shoes’ (see Ačārean 1913: 856-857).

●ETYM From PIE **pe/od-* ‘foot’: Skt. *pād-* ‘foot’, YAv. *pad-* m., Oss. *fad*, MPers. NPers. *pāy*, Parth. *pāδ* ‘foot’, Gr. *πός* m., gen. *ποδός* ‘foot’, Lat. *pēs*, gen. *ped-is* m. ‘foot’, OEngl. NPl. *fēt* < PGm **fōt-iz* ‘foot’, etc.; here belongs also *het* ‘foot, footstep, footprint, track’ (q.v.) < **pedo-* n. ‘footstep, footprint, track’: Skt. *padā-* n. ‘id.’, YAv. *paða-* n. ‘footstep’, OIc. *fet* ‘step’, cf. Gr. *πέδον* n. ‘floor, ground’, Hitt. *pedan* ‘place’, etc.; see Hübschmann 1897: 466-467, 482; Walde/Hofmann 2, 1954: 293-295; Pokorny 1959: 790-791; Frisk 2: 587-588; Lubotsky 1988: 78; Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 77-79; Mallory/Adams 1997: 27b, 208-209, 595b; Cheung 2007: 305.

The PIE word is reconstructed as a root noun of static inflexion: nom. **pōd(s)* ‘foot’ vs. acc., etc. **ped-*: Gr. *πούς*, *ποδός*, Lat. *pēd*, *pedis*, etc., see Beekes 1995: 189; cf. Schrijver 1991: 121, 135; for the paradigms and a discussion, see Szemerényi 1996: 164-166.

The Armenian singulative *ot-n* reflects PIE acc. **pōd-η*, cf. Gr. *πόδ-α*, etc.; pl. *ot-k* ‘has been derived from **pod-es* = Gr. *πόδ-εσ* (Meillet 1894: 156-157; 1916h: 188; 1936: 83-84; Grammont 1918: 224; Schmitt 1981: 53, 199; K. Schmitt 1987: 37; Ravnæs 1991: 100-101; Olsen 1999: 21, 175, 435; Matzinger 2005: 69-70, 89, 92). Hübschmann 1897: 482 assumes an original dual, cf. Gr. *πόδ-ε*. The *i*-declension remains unexplained, however. The explanation on the basis of GDABlPI **pod-isko-* > *otic* (Olsen 1999: 175) is not convincing. I tentatively posit PArm. dual **ot-i-* < QIE **pod-ih₁*, where the **-ih₁* was taken from neuter duals denoting body-part terms such as *ac’-k* ‘eye’ < PIE **h₃(o)k^w-ih₁* n. ‘both eyes’: Gr. *ὄσσε*, OCS *oči*, etc. Thus, singulative *ot-n* vs. pl.tant. *ot-k*, *-i* goes parallel with *ak-n* ‘eye’ vs. *ac’-k* (see s.vv.). It is tempting to compare Arm. dial. dual **ot-u-i* with Skt. dual *pādau*.

Further, see s.v. *het* ‘foot, footstep, footprint, track’ (< neuter **pedo-*, see above). For *heti* ‘on foot’ cf. Lat. *pedes*, *-itis* m. ‘pedestrian, foot-soldier’, OCS *pěšb* ‘pedestrian, on foot’, etc.; for *het* ‘after’ and *y-et* ‘after’, cf. Gr. *πεδά* ‘after, with, amid’, etc.

orb, *o*-stem ‘orphan’ (Bible+).

●DIAL Widespread in the dialects [HAB 3: 575b]. On **orb-ew-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)’, *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; Jahukyan 1987: 295 (with ref.); Viereck/Goldammer 2003: 406. According to Ačařyan (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* [Jahukyan 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 1999: 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., ĘtimSlovIranJaz 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, ĘtimSlovIranJaz 1, 2000: 215) and ‘servant’. In this case, Lat. *orbō* would be denominative.

ordi, *wo*-stem: GDSg *ordw-o-y*, GDPI *ordw-o-c*’, IPI *ordw-o-v-k*’ (abundant in the Bible, Astuacaturean 1895: 1181-1204); rarely *a*-stem: GDPI *orde-a-c*’ (NHB 2: 529b) ‘generation, sun/daughter’, espec. ‘son’ (Bible+). On *y-ordwoj* ‘in the son’ (Ezriq), see Clackson 1994: 61.

●DIAL Widespread in the dialects [HAB 3: 577a].

●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.vv. *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 ἐλάφωv*. That *ort*’ also refers to the young of *etn(ik)* ‘hind’ is corroborated 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 the dialects (mainly with dimin. *-ik* or *-uk*) with initial: (1) *v-*: Moks, Van, Salmast, Łarabał, Marała; (2) *h-*: Aslanbek, Hamšen, T’iflis, Axalc’xa, Ardvin, Karin, Xarberd, Muš, Alaškert, Svedia; (3) *f-*: Suč’ava, Nor Naxiĵewan, Sebastia, Ararat [HAB 3: 579a].

Agulis *árt’uk* reflects **ort’uk*, cf. *otner* ‘feet’ > *átnar*, *oski* ‘gold’ > *áski* [Ačařean 1935: 63].

Kak’avaberd has *hō/urt*’ in three villages and *vært*’ only in Agarak [H. Muradyan 1967: 181b]. Karčewan has *vært*’ [H. Muradyan 1960: 202b].

Ardvin *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.’, *πόρταζ* f. ‘calf’, Skt. *prthu-ka-* m. ‘boy, the young of any animal’, etc., see de Lagarde 1854: 27^{L730f}, Hübschmann

1897: 483 (“unsicher”); Pedersen 1905: 202; 1906: 360, 370 = 1982: 64, 138, 148; HAB 3: 578-579; Lidén 1933: 44; Saradževa 1980b: 232; Jahukyan 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 *-t'* in *ort'*, one has to start with **portH-*, although Skt. *pr̥thu-ka-* is not reliable; see Kortlandt 2003 (< 1976): 1-2; Beekes 2003: 202. I hypothetically reconstruct a PIE HD **-h₂-stem* feminine: NSg **pórt-eh₂-*, GSg **prt-h₂-ós* > PArm. **órd-a-*, obl. **hart^h-*. The Arm. nominative (as well as Skt. *pr̥thu-ka-*, if indeed related) took over the aspirated **-t^h-* 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 other views, see Ravnæs 1991: 130, 147, 152; Elbourne 2000: 17. For Arm. suffixal **-t^h* resulting from PIE **-t-* + **-h₂-* cf. especially *analut'* ‘a kind of deer, hind’, which is semantically close to *ort'* ‘calf; fawn’ (see s.v. and 2.3.1).

Arm. fem. **ord-a-* may still be seen in *awri-ord*, *a*-stem ‘virgin’ (Bibe+), q.v.

As we have seen, dial. **hort'*, with an initial *h-*, is present in numerous dialects ranging from extreme NW (Aslanbek, Hamšen) and N (T'iflis, etc.) to extreme SW (Svedia) and SE (Kak'avaberd), as well as to the centre (Alaškert, etc.). If the initial *f-* goes back to *h-* (see 2.1.16.2), 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 L̥arabał, etc., would have **xort'* from **hort'* [H. Muradyan 1982: 271]. The initial *h-*, thus, must be taken seriously. I assume that the above-mentioned PArm. paradigm (NSg *ort'* < **ord-a-*, obl. **hart^h-*) 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. **hart^h-*; the aspirated **-t^h-* spreads over the nominative: **ord-* > *ort'*; (2) proxi-Classical *ort'*, obl. **hart'-*; the initial *h-* spreads over the majority of the dialects.

ori, *wo-* or *ea-*stem: GSg. *orwoy* in Hexaameron 8 (according to NHB 2: 531a, also GDP1 *ore-a-c'*, but without ref.) ‘raven’ (Bibe+).

Gr. *κόραξ* ‘raven’ is rendered by *agr̥aw*, the principal Armenian word for ‘raven’, in Leviticus 11.15 (Zōhrapean 1805: 213; Wevers 1986: 127; cf. 1997: 148), but by the rare synonym *ori* in Deuteronomy 14.14 (Cox 1981: 136; Wevers 1977: 195; 1995: 246); cf. also s.v. *analut'* ‘a kind of deer’.

A few attestations in Hexaameron: NSg *ori*, GDSg (*z-*)*orw-o-y*, NPl *ori-k'* (K. Muradyan 1984: 273^{L11}, 280^{L14}, 268^{L1}, 268^{L6} respectively). Also here *ori* renders Gr. *κόραξ* ‘raven’ (K. Muradyan 1984: 359₄₁).

●ETYM Ačařyan (HAB 3: 580b) rejects all the comparisons, including the one with Goth. *ara* ‘eagle’ (Pictet), and leaves the origin open. Compare Gr. *ὄρνις* m. ‘bird’, Goth. *ara*, OIc. *orn* ‘eagle’, OIr. *irar* ‘eagle’, Lith. *erēlis* ‘eagle’, OCS *orьlbъ* ‘eagle’,

Hitt. *ḫāraš*, *ḫaran-* c. ‘eagle’ (Adams apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 173a, for the semantic field cf. *čay*, HAB s.v.). Further, see Beekes 1969: 140; Greppin 1978: 197-198; 1988: 185₁; Polomé 1980: 26.

One may reconstruct an original root noun of static inflexion (cf. PIE nom. **pōd(s)* ‘foot’ vs. acc., etc. **ped-*: Gr. *πούς*, *ποδός*, Lat. *pēd*, *pedis*, Arm. *het* vs. *ot-*, etc.; PIE nom. **uōk^w-s* ‘voice’ vs. **uok^w-*: Lat. *vōx* vs. Gr. acc. *ὄπα*, dat. *-ί*, see Beekes 1995: 189, cf. Schrijver 1991: 121, 135): nom. **h₃ōr-s*, obl. **h₃er-*. The paradigm would yield PArm. **ur* vs. **hor-* > > **ur* vs. *or-*. The old nominative has been preserved in Arm. reduplicated *urur*, and the oblique **h₃er-* is seen in IE *n*-stem ‘eagle’ and BSlav. **h₃er-il-*, as well as in Armenian reduplicated *oror*. In view of the absence of corroborative evidence outside Armenian, however, this must be regarded as highly hypothetical.

orlor ‘a kind of bird’, only in *Commentary on Genesis* by Vardan Arewelc’i (13th cent.).

●ETYM Ačařyan (HAB 3: 581a; cf. V. Ařak’elyan 1984a: 145-146) wonders whether *orlor* is a corruption for *or lor* ‘that <...> *lor* ‘quail’ and mentions no etymological attempt.

The form is not necessarily a corruption. We may be dealing with conflation of *oror* ‘gull’ and *lor* ‘quail’ (q.v.), cf. Areř *hülör*, řamaxi *halör*, Goris *ülör*, as well as Malat’ia *ulurik*. An alternative comparison with BSlav. **or-il-* ‘eagle’ (see s.v. *ori* ‘crow’), applying a metathesis *r...l > l...r*, would be uncertain.

***orj-i-** ‘testicle’: **orj**, *i*-stem: GDPl *orj-i-c* ‘(Geoponica, 13th cent.) ‘male’ said of people and animals (Bible+), ‘very hard, rugged, fruitless’ (Step’anos Őrbelean, etc., cf. also *orj-a-k’ar* below); **mi-orj-i** ‘having one testicle’ (rendering Gr. *μόνορχις* in Leviticus 21.20); **y-orj**, *i*-stem: IPl *y-orj-i-w-k* ‘(Hosea 5.6) ‘male sheep, ram’ in Hosea 5.6 (corresponding to Gr. *πρόβατον*) and Yovhan Mandakuni/Mayragomec’i [NHB 2: 372b]; **orj-i-k** ‘testicles’ in *Ařxarhac’oyc* ‘(Soukry 1881: 44^{L-6}); MidArm. **orj-i-k** ‘uncastrated men’ in Mxit’ar Goř, ‘uncastrated animals’ in Geoponica [NHB 2: 532b; HAB 3:m 582b; MijHayBař 2, 1992: 236b]; **xol-orj(n)** ‘orchis’ (q.v.); dial. ***am-orj-i-k** ‘testicles’ (q.v.).

The compound **orj-a-k’ar** ‘hard stone’, with *k’ar* ‘stone’, is attested in the Bible, Zgōn-Afrahāt, Vardan Arewelc’i [NHB 2: 532b], and Movsēs Xorenac’i 2.8, 2.42, (1913=1991: 115^{L4}, 168^{L1f}, 241^{L20}).

●DIAL The adjective *orj* ‘male’ is dialectally ubiquitous [HAB 3: 583a]. In Łarabał and Karin it refers to ‘hard (of radish used as seeds)’ and ‘hard, rugged (said e.g. of a woman)’, respectively [HAB 3: 582b]; cf. **orj-a-tu*, lit. probably ‘given to the male’ or perhaps better ‘(hard plant) given as seed’, is found in Łarabał *vārc’ātu* ‘a fruit tree that has become fruitless’ (Davt’yan 1966: 448; cf. Ačařean 1913: 864a), and Meři *āřjētu* ‘fruitless, sterile’ (Ałayan 1954: 283a). Moks *vārc* ‘озорник, mischievous person’ [Orbeli 2002: 340].

Ararat, řirak, Muř, Van **orj* ‘a two-year-old male sheep’ [Amatuni 1912: 534a] may be compared with ClArm. *y-orj* ‘ram’ (see below and s.v.).

Zeyt’un **orj* is the name of a star = Turk. *erk’āk* [Ačařean 1913: 863-864]. On literary testimony for *orj* ‘male’ and *ēg* ‘female’ stars, see NHB 2: 532b.

In a version of the epic *Sasna crer* (SasCr 2/2, 1951: 657), a thin but very strong brook that penetrates throughout the river Murad-Aracani is characterized as *vörc' jur* 'male water'.

ClArm. *orj-a-k'ar* 'hard stone' is represented in extremely eastern and western dialects: Łarabał, Hadrut', Šatax-Xcaberd *vərc'ak'ar*, Mehtišen *vəerc'ak'ar* [Davt'yan 1966: 448], Goris *vərc'ak'ar* [Margaryan 1975: 356b], Sebastia, Karin **orj-k'ar* [Gabikēan 1952: 447; HayLezBrbBař 4, 2007: 358b].

●ETYM Since Hübschmann (1877: 23, 25, 33; 1897: 483), derived from the PIE word for 'testicle': Gr. *ὄρχις*, *-εως*, Ion. *-ιος*, NPI Att. *ὄρχεις*, Ion. *ὄρχιες* m., frequently in plural 'testicles' (in females 'ovaries')¹⁰⁸, Av. *ərəzi* m. dual 'testicles' (Bartholomae 1904: 352), Hitt. *arki-*, NPI *ar-ki-i-e-eš* 'testicle', *ārk-i* / *ark-* 'to mount sexually', Oic. *argr* 'indecent, bad, libidinous, passive homosexual' (on this and other words, see especially Watkins 1975: 14ff; Puhvel 1982: 182-183; Polomé 1998; Petit 2006; cf. Mayrhofer EWAia 1, 1992: 249), Lith. *eřžilas*, dial. *ařžilas* 'stallion' vs. dial. *eržūs*, *aržūs* 'ardent, voluptuous, lustful', Russ. *erzat* 'to fidget, abrade', Alb. *herdhë* f. 'testicle', Mlr. *uirgge* f. 'id.', Toch. B *erkatstse* adj. 'testiculate' < **erk-* 'testicle', etc. (see Pokorny 1959: 782; Watkins 1975; Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 498, 817 = 1995, 1: 418, 716; Mallory/Adams 1997: 507a, 508b; 2006: 184; Adams 1999: 95).

Slavic **kь(r)norzъ* 'boar' has been interpreted as composed of **kьrn(o)*- 'maimed, mutilated' (secondarily associated with **krH-* 'to cut', see Derksen 1996: 226-227) + independently unattested **orzъ* 'testicle', thus 'with amputated testicles' (see ĚtimSlovSlavJaz 13, 1987: 234-235 with literature and a discussion; cf. Petit 2006: 356, 359-360). In view of the semantic controversy, '(uncastrated) boar' vs. 'castrated', Bańkowski 1989 is sceptical about the first component of the compound. Compare, however, Georg. *werz-* 'ram', dial. 'a sexually immature or a castrated ram' (see below).

Hittite *arki-* is derived from **h₃org^h-i-* (for a discussion and references, see Puhvel 1982: 182-183; HED 1-2, 1984: 142-143; Kimball 1987: 186, 189, 190₆; Melchert 1987: 20f; Eichner 1988; Vine 2005: 274-275, 275₈₁; Kloekhorst 2006: 85-86; 2008: 203) or, more probably, in view of its consistent short *a-* from zero-grade, **h₃rġ^h-i-* (Kloekhorst 2006: 89; cf. Lindeman 1997: 51₄₁ with ref). The verb *ārk-i* / *ark-* 'to mount sexually' reflects **h₃org^h-* / **h₃rġ^h-* (Kloekhorst 2006: 89; 2008: 203). The reconstruction **h₁org^h-i-* (see Watkins 1975; Lindeman 1997: 50-51; Olsen 1999: 195) is less probable (on the problem of Lith. *e-*, see Kloekhorst 2006: 89 and 2008: 203 with references).

Alb. *herdhë* f. 'testicle' reflects **e*-grade (Hirt 1899: 58) and is now mostly derived from **h₃erġ^h-* (for references and a discussion, see Kortlandt 1986: 40, 44 = 2003: 70, 73; Beekes 1988: 101; Demiraj 1997: 199). The reconstruction of a **h₄-* (Adams apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 507b, 508a; Adams 1999: 95) seems unnecessary.

In view of the absence of an initial *h-* (see 2.1.16), Arm. *orj-i* reflects **h₃rġ^h-i-* (Beekes 1988: 77) or, more probably, **h₃org^h-i-*, as Gr. *ὄρχις*, OIr. *uirgge*, etc. (see Rix 1970: 93-94; Kortlandt 1983: 12; 1986: 40, 44 = 2003: 42, 70, 73; Greppin

¹⁰⁸ The connection with Gr. *ὄρχις* has been suggested already in NHB 2: 532b.

1988-89: 479; Beekes 1988: 101; 2003: 157, 184, 188). Hübschmann (1877: 25₁; cf. Ĵahukyan 1982: 124) explains Arm. *orj* ‘male’ as ‘qui testiculos habet’. Olsen (1999: 195) assumes a **b^horós*-derivative, **h₁orǵ^hós* ‘mounter’ (on which see also Watkins 1975: 15), based on the verb which is reflected in Hitt. *ark-* ‘to mount sexually’, etc.

In order to explain the preservation of *-i-* in *orj-i-k*‘ one may assume an influence of the productive suffix *-i-k*‘ (on which see Greppin 1975: 99; Ĵahukyan 1987: 231; 1998: 28; Olsen 1999: 493-499). It is tempting to alternatively assume an underlying PArm. dual **orj-i* from IE **h₃(o)rǵ^h-ih₁*, cf. Av. *arazi* m. dual ‘testicles’. The form *orj-i-k*‘ is to be derived then from QIE **h₃(o)rǵ^h-ih₁-es* > **orj-i-eh* (with penultimate accentuation) > *orj-i-k*‘.

Georgian-Zan **werǰ₁-* ‘male, ram’: Georg. *werǰ-* ‘ram’ (corresponding to Gr. *κρίός* and Arm. *xoy* ‘ram’ in Leviticus 5.15 and 5.18)¹⁰⁹ and Megr. *erǰ-* ‘male, ram’ (with Zan consonant shift *ǰ₁* > *ǰ*), has been compared to PIE **uers-* ‘male’ (Klimov 1964: 84; 1994: 108-110; 1998: 52). According to Ĵahukyan (1987: 555, 590, 591₂; 1988, 2: 68-69), it may be treated as borrowed from Arm. *orj* ‘male’. For the puzzling vocalism of the Georgian-Zan form Ĵahukyan compares Georgian-Zan **werc₁xl-* ‘silver’ which seems to be in a way related with Arm. *arcat* ‘silver’ (q.v.).

One may tentatively derive Georgian-Zan **werǰ₁-* ‘male, ram’ directly from Arm. *y-orj* ‘ram’ < ‘testicled, male’ (cf. also dial. Ararat, Širak, Muš, Van **orj* ‘a two-year-old male sheep’, Amatuni 1912: 534a). This seems more satisfying both formally and semantically. Arm. */iorj/* may have been realized as */uirj/* or */werj/*, cf. Arm. *xoyt* ‘[xuyt’] vs. Georg. *xvit^hk^hi* ‘crocodile’ [HAB 2: 414]. One finds a similar kind of anlaut alternation in a few lexical pairs: *yoyg* vs. *vēg* ‘a playing bone’, **yušap* vs. *višap* ‘dragon’, *yuškaparik* vs. *vškaparik* ‘a mythical being’, etc. Note that the loss of the word-initial *w-* in Megrelian needs an explanation (Klimov *ibid.*). Perhaps this too can be explained by the anlaut of Arm. *yorj* ‘ram’. The assumption on the Armenian origin of the Georgian-Zan term for ‘ram’ (or the Georgian and Megrelian words taken separately) is not something unexpected. Note Georg. *arni* ‘wild sheep’ and *buc’i* ‘lamb’ which have been borrowed from Arm. *arṅ* ‘wild ram’ and *buc* ‘lamb’ respectively, the Armenian forms being of IE origin (see s.v.v.; cf. Ĵahukyan 1987: 555).

Arm. *y-orj*, *i*-stem ‘male sheep, ram’ (Hosea 5.6), with the prefix *y-* from PIE **h₁en-* ‘in’, perfectly matches Gr. *ἔν-ορχίς* ‘provided with testicles, uncastrated’, cf. *ἔν-ορχ-ος*, *ἔν-όρχ-ης* meaning also ‘buck’. We can posit an Armeno-Greek **h₁en-h₃orǵ^hi-* ‘uncastrated, male (ram or buck)’.

Gr. *ὄρχις* ‘testicle’ denotes also the plant ‘Orchis papilionacea, Orchis longicuris’, so called from the form of its root. Remarkably, PArm. **orj-i-* ‘testicle’ too is found in a compound designation of this plant, see s.v. *xol-orj* ‘orchis’. Here again we may be dealing with an Armeno-Greek innovation, although one cannot exclude the possibility that the semantic shift has taken place in two languages independently.

¹⁰⁹ According to Rayfield (1988: 240), in the Georgian Khevsureti dialect *verǰi* refers to a sexually immature or a castrated ram. For the semantic controversy ‘uncastrated’ vs. ‘castrated’ compare Slavic **kǝ(r)norzǝ* ‘boar’ probably from ‘with amputated testicles’ (see above).

orm, *o*-stem: GDSg *orm-o-y*, ISg *orm-o-v*, GDPl *orm-o-c*, IPl *orm-o-v-k* (abundant in the Bible, Astuacaturean 1895: 1205); *ormn* (1 Kings 18.11), NPl *ormun-k* ‘wall’ (Sirach 23.26), APl *ormun-s* (Paterica) ‘wall’; **orm* dial. ‘fence’.

Derivatives: *orm-ac* ‘fence’ in P‘awstos Buzand 4.15 (1883=1984: 102^{L-16}, transl. Garsoïan 1989: 143): *mot yormacs argeloc‘ac‘n orsoyn ērioc‘n* ‘near the fence enclosing the hunting [ground]’; *orm-z-orm-ayn* adv. ‘from one wall to another’ in Cyril of Jerusalem; *ormem* ‘to encircle with a wall’ in Xosrov Anjewac‘i, etc. [NHB 2: 532-533; HAB 3: 583].

Probably the place-name *Orm-ē*, *Orm-i* (q.v.), a town with a fortress west of Lake Urmia, belongs here as well. Note that both the location of this town-fortress and the dialectal distribution of the appellative *orm* ‘wall, fence’ point to the SE of the historical Armenia.

●DIAL Moks *worm* ‘wall’, espec. ‘wall of a garden’, *ĴuĴa vorm*, *XotorĴur vōrm*, *Agulis ūрман* [HAB 3: 583b], *MeĴri hurm* [AĴayan 1954: 45, 96, 283a], *Karĉewan hērmə* [H. Muradyan 1960: 37, 66, 202b], *Kak‘avaberd hūrmə*, *hērmə* [Muradyan 1967: 50, 98, 182a]. Note that the last three dialects show an initial *h*-. The *Karĉewan*, *Kak‘avaberd*, and *Agulis* forms point to *(*h*)*ormn*.

See also s.v. **aormi* (dial.) ‘a log or wooden framework that supports the wall or the ceiling of a house’.

●ETYM No acceptable etymology is recorded in HAB 3: 583b. A derivation from **ork-mo-* (cf. Lat. *arceō* ‘to keep off, prevent, protect’, etc., see s.v. *argel* ‘hindrance; prison’; cf. Osthoff 1898: 54-64) has been suggested (see Pokorny 1959: 66; Ĵahukyan 1987: 113, 233-234; Olsen 1999: 27, 765f). Olsen (ibid.) posits **h₂ork-(s)mo-* with a question-mark. This etymology is uncertain.

Ĵahukyan (1987: 552) states that the IE origin of *orm* seems more probable to him than the Iranian one, although he does not specify the latter etymology. Probably he means the etymology of Bailey (1979: 226a), according to which Arm. *orm* ‘wall’ and Georg. *ormo* ‘hole, pit’ (on the latter, see also HAB 3: 583b, sceptical) are Iranian loanwords, cf. Oss. *wærm/wærmæ* ‘hole-pit; cellar’ (on which see Cheung 2002: 241).

Ĵahukyan (1990a: 3-4) alternatively derives Arm. *orm* from QIE **sork-mo-*, cf. Gr. *ὄρκος*, *ὄρκάιν* ‘fence’, etc. (on PIE **se/ork-* ‘make a circle/hedge’, see Mallory/Adams 1997: 108a, 629a). This etymology is semantically more probable than the others.

None of these etymologies is entirely convincing. I propose to revive the etymology of Bugge (1893: 22-23; cf. also Hiwnk‘earpēyēntean apud HAB s.v.) who links Arm. *orm*, *o*-stem ‘wall, fence’ with OCS *xramъ* ‘temple’ and Gr. *ὄρμος* m. ‘chain, necklace, lace’ (cf. also *ὄρμαθός* m. ‘row, string, chain’) and reconstructs a PIE **sor-mo-*. For Armenian he assumes a basic meaning ‘der zusammengeflochtene, zusammengefügte’. This form derives from the verbal root **ser-* ‘to line up, string’: Gr. *εἶρω* ‘to knit together’, Lat. *serō* ‘to line up, join, link’, OIr. *sernaid* ‘arranges’, *sreth* (< **sytā-*) ‘row’, etc. (see s.v. *yeřum* ‘to line up’).

Hübschmann (1897: 483) rejects this etymology pointing out the problem of the Slavic initial *x*- and not mentioning Gr. *ὄρμος* m. ‘chain, necklace, lace’. Aĉaiřyan (HAB 3: 583b) likewise rejects the etymology and leaves the origin of Arm *orm* open. Presenting the etymology of Bugge, Aĉaiřyan confused this Gr. *ὄρμος* ‘chain,

necklace' with the homonymous *ὄρμος* 'anchorage, roadstead, harbour', the origin of which is uncertain (see Frisk s.v.; Lubotsky 1988: 133).

I conclude that PArm. **ormo-* 'wall, fence; row, string, circle' (> *orm*, *o*-stem 'wall, fence') goes back to IE **sor-mo-* (cf. Gr. *ὄρμος* m. 'chain, necklace, lace'). For the semantic relationship cf. ModArm. and dial. Nor Bayazet *patašar* 'waller' (Malxaseanc' HBB 4: 58a; Ačařean 1913: 899b) from *pat šarel* 'to line up a wall', *pat* 'wall', in Ľarabał: 'coil, skein, row' [Ačařean 1913: 898a; HAB 4: 33b].

In general, the additional *-n* is not necessarily old (cf. Weitenberg 1985). In the case of *ormn*, however, the following consideration may suggest that we are dealing with an Armeno-Greek rather than inner-Armenian innovation, although this is difficult to prove.

The initial *h-* in some peripheral eastern dialects might be a relic of IE **s-*. I therefore tentatively assume that beside PArm. **ormoy* vs. Gr. *ὄρμος* there also was pl. **her-mun-k'* < **hermn* < QIE **ser-mn-*, cf. Gr. *ἔρματα* pl. 'earhangers; sling' from **ser-mḡ-t-h₂*. Subsequently, **her-mn* (pl. *-mun-k'*) was analogically replaced by *ormn* (pl. *ormun-k'*) and dial. **hormn*.

oročam, oroče/im 'to chew, ruminate' (Bible+).

●DIAL Widespread in the dialects mostly as **oročal*. Some peripheral dialects have initial *a-*: Ararat, T'iflis *árčč*, Agulis, Ľarabał *áruč* [HAB 1: 584-585].

●ETYM Patrubány (1908: 26a) connected with Skt. *rádati* 'to gnaw, bite, dig, scratch', Lat. *rödere* 'to gnaw', *rädere* 'to scratch, shave, smooth', etc. The Armenian form has been explained by **rod-je-*, see HAB 3: 584b (with some reservation); Ľahukyan 1982: 62; 1987: 145, 188; Kortlandt 1994: 27 = 2003: 104. Olsen (1999: 764) considers the connection to be phonetically impossible "as **-dġ-* regularly yields *-c-*". However, I subscribe to the view of Ľahukyan and Kortlandt who consider **-dġ-* > Arm. *-č-* to be the regular development (see 2.1.22.1).

Lubotsky (1981: 134, 136) reconstructs PIE **reh₃d-* 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. *rädō* and reconstructs **Hreh₃d-* for Lat. *rödere* and Skt. *rádati*. Lubotsky and Schrijver do not mention the Armenian verb.

On the whole, the derivation **Hreh₃d-je-* 'to gnaw' > *oročem, oročam* 'to chew, ruminate' (EArm. dial. **aroč*) is possible, albeit 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 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; Ačařyan 1941: 237]. Further, note Svedia *girdil*, Łarabał and Goris *ərɔtal*, and Agulis *ərətól* [HAB 3: 587b; Ačařyan 2003: 583]. According to Ačařyan (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 *goram* ‘to dare, fight’ (Bible+), in the dialects: ‘to shout loudly’ and, especially, ‘to thunder’. Note especially Zeyt’un (which is very close to Svedia) *g’ərɔdadil* ‘to thunder’, which Ačařyan (2003: 304; HAB 1: 581a) derives from *goram*.

For textual passages, see in a fairy-tale from Łarabał (HŽHek’ 5, 1966: 370^{L1,15}, 372^{L-4}): *ergyink’ya 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’, *peřti* ‘to beat’, Skt. *přit-* m. ‘battle, strife, fight’, YAv. *pərət-* f. ‘battle’, etc. (see Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 160, with no Armenian form), etc. He reconstructs **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). For a further extensive discussion, see de Lamberterie 2006: 223-231.

orj, *i*-stem: GDPI *orj-i-c’* (in *Vkayk’ arewelic’*), AbIPI *y-orj-i-c’* (Gregory of Nyssa, Yovhannēs Ōjnec’i); *o*-stem (NHB 2: 537c without evidence) ‘den, lair’ (Bible+); denominative verbs *orjanam* ‘to live in a hole, hibernate, hide oneself as if in a lair’ (Movsēs Xorenac’i, Philo, Gregory Nazianzenus, etc.), *orjem* ‘id.’ (Paterica), *orjim* ‘id.’ (Mxit’ar Gōš).

Some textual illustrations: P’awstos Buzand 4.13 (1883=1984: 95^{L8f}): *ew dadark’ gazanac’ ew orjk’ gazanac’ ew orjk’ borenac’* ‘“lairs and dens for wild beasts and hyenas”, translated by Garsoian (1989: 138^{L4f}).

In Movsēs Xorenac’i 2.77(1913=1991: 216^{L1f}; transl. Thomson 1978: 224): *orjac’ eal yamurn Ani, ibr i kałati handartut’ ean tōteal* ‘“He had ensconced himself in the fortress of Ani, as if hidden in a tranquil lair”’.

●ETYM Ačařyan (HAB 3: 587-588) rejects the comparison (Dervischjan 1877: 84) with Gr. *λοχή, λόχη* ‘lair of wild beasts’, *λόχος* m. ‘ambush, childbed’, Germ. *Lager*, OCS *lože* ‘bed, den’ from **log^h-io-*, SCr. *lōg* ‘lair, den, riverbed’, etc. (on which see ĖtimSlovSlavJaz 15, 1988: 245-250; 16, 1990: 124-128) and leaves the origin of the Armenian word open.

The etymology of Dervischjan is indeed untenable. The forms derive from IE **leg^h-* ‘to lie’ (Mallory/Adams 1997: 352a). A QIE **log^h-io-* (cf. OCS *lože* ‘bed, den’) or fem. **log^h-i(e)h₂-* (cf. Gr. *λοχή* ‘lair’) would yield Arm. **e/o-tōj-*. One might assume a back loan from a substratum language with **/r/-* vacillation and speculate on a HD *i*-stem: nom. **róg^h-ōi*, gen. **rg^h-i-ós* > PArm. **rowg-u*, gen. **arj-* >> **or(u)j-* (cf. 2.2.2.4), but this is, of course, highly uncertain.

More promising is the etymology by Olsen (1999: 192-193) who posits QIE **por-io-* or **por-ih₂-*, derived from IE **per-* ‘to get through’, cf. Gr. *πείρω* ‘to perforate, pierce, pervade’, *πόρος* m. ‘passage, ford, narrowing’, etc. Since Arm. *orj* has *i*-stem, we may assume **pór-ih₂-*, obl. **p(o)r-iéh₂-* > PArm. **or-i-*, obl. **orj-a-* >> **orj-i-*. The etymology may be considered at least as possible.

ors, *o*-stem: GDSg *ors-o-y*, ISg *ors-o-v* (Bible, Łazar P‘arpec‘i, etc.); later also *i*-stem: GDPl *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 – *fors* < **hors*. The verb: Svedia *irsil* ‘to hunt’ [HAB 3: 588b]. Note also Šamšadin, Krasnoselsk *vərs* vs. Ijewan, Diliĵan *fərs*, *fors* [Mežunc‘ 1989: 196a]. For Šamšadin, Xemč‘yan (2000: 301b) records *fors* in the glossary, but in her texts *hors* is more frequent.

●ETYM The connection with Gr. *πόρκος* ‘a kind of fish-trap’ (Plato+) proposed by Patrubány (1904: 428) is adopted by Solta (1960: 428), Greppin (1974: 70), and Olsen (1999: 13), but Ačarĵan (HAB 3: 588a) and Ĵahukyan (1987: 144, 187) accept it with reservation.

Clackson (1994: 164) criticizes the etymology and advocates the suggestion of Ačarĵan, 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), *δορξ*, *δόρκος*, *ζορξ*, *ϊορκος*, 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, namely ‘roedeer’ : ‘antelope’, see Adams 1985: 276-278). On this Graeco-Celtic name for ‘roe deer, Capreolus capreolus’ and on the archaeological evidence for its denotatum, see Mallory 1982: 212, 216-217.

If one assumes a QIE **jork-o-* (with a palatalized **-k̑-*), Arm. *ors*, *-o-* would be a probable match. For the loss of the initial PIE **j-* 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 *naxčir*, Parth. *nxcyr* ‘game, quarry, chase’ [MacKenzie 1971: 58] > Arm. *naxčir* ‘slaughter (in hunt of war)’ (P‘awstos Buzand, Ełišē, etc.) [HAB 3: 422a] : Pers. *naxčir* ‘hunting, the game; prey, chase, a wild beast; a mountain-goat’ [Steingass 1391b]. Wakhi *naxčir*, *naxšir* ‘fox’ borrowed from Tajik *naxčir* ‘wild animal’ (for these and other Iranian forms, see especially Edelman 2003: 122, 123).

Č'

*č'asum probably 'blind mole-rat'.

●DIAL I find the word only in the dialect of Svedia: č'āsseum. According to Andreatyan (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, Andreatyan 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, Hay KendAšx 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 Bargirk' 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 Xotorjūr means both 'mole' and 'field-mouse'.

I conclude, that *č'asum probably means 'blind mole-rat'.

●ETYM Stating that this animal is in fact unknown and mysterious to many people, Andreatyan (1967: 161-162) suggests a connection to Arm. *jas̄m*, 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 *μυγαλή* 'field mouse'; see s.v. *ak'is*.

Bearing in mind what has just been said, I propose to relate *č'asum to *Hkeĕ- 'weasel' (late IE and/or of substratum origin), from which, I think, Arm. *ak'is* and OInd. *kaśīkā-*, *kāśa-* 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)keĕVm 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 would prove the existence of the Iranian form and may testify the reconstruction of *Hkeĕ-

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 was blocked by dissimilatory influence of the palatal **-k-* 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**, *o*-stem: AblSg *i č'or-o-y* (Aristotle), GDPI *č'or-o-c'* (Philo); *i*-stem: GDPI *č'or-i-c'* (Ephrem) 'dry' (Bible+).

● **dial** Both *č'ir* and *č'or* are widespread in the 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. *ζερόν* 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 Ač'aryan (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, Jähukyan (1987: 133, also with a question mark) posits **k(s)jēro-* and **k(s)joro-*, which is not corroborated by any cognate form. Mayrhofer (EWAia 1, 1992: 430) considers the connection of the Sanskrit with the Greek to be "unglaublich". For a further discussion on this etymon, see Schrijver 1991: 338-339.

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-*.

č'ogay, see s.v. **č'u**.

č'or-k' (pl. tant.), acc. *č'or-s*, gen.-dat. *č'or-i-c'* (Bible+), IPI *č'or-i-w-k'* (Eusebius of Caesarea) 'four' (Bible+); frozen acc. **č'ors** 'four' (Cyril of Jerusalem, etc.); **č'or-ir** 'fourth' (Ezekiel 5.12, etc.); **č'or-r-ord**, *a*-stem: gen.-dat. *č'orrord-i*, instr. *č'orrord-a-w*, loc. *i č'orrord-um* 'fourth' (Bible+); compositional **č'orek'-**, **č'ork'-** (Bible+), **č'ors-** (Anania Širakac'i, etc.); **k'ar-** 'four' and **k'arasun** 'forty' (q.v.).

● **DIAL** Ubiquitous in the dialects, mostly as a frozen acc. *č'ors*. The form *č'ork'* is reflected in Antiok' *č'uk'*, Juła *č'ok'*, Łarabał *č'örk'*, Agulis, Mełri *č'urk'* [HAB 3: 632a].

● **ETYM** From PIE **k^wetuores* 'four': Skt. NPI. m. *catvāras* (-ā- due to Brugmann's Law), API *catūras*, NAPI n. *catvāri*, NAPI f. *cātasras* < **k^wetesres*, YAv. *caθβārō*, ManSogd. *čtf'r*, Buddh. *čtb'r*, MPers. NPers. *čahār*, Toch. A *stwar* and B *stwer* < PToch. **s(ā)twēr*, Gr. *τέσσαρες*, Dor. NWGr. *τέτορες*, Lat. *quattuor*, OIr. *ceth(a)ir*, Goth. *fidwor*, Lith. *keturi*, OCS *četyre*; note also Arm. *k'ar-* (q.v.). See Klapproth 1831: 107a; NHB 2: 580a, 990c; Hübschmann 1897: 485, 503; Charpentier 1909: 244; HAB 3: 631-632 and 4: 555-556 with rich lit.; Pokorny 1959: 643; Mayrhofer EWAia 1, 1992: 526-527; Mallory/Adams 1997: 401; Adams 1999: 641-642. For a general discussion of this PIE word, see Beekes 1987d.

For a discussion of *č'or-k' < *k^wetuores* 'four' vs. *k'ar-* < **k^wtur-* (q.v.), the development **-es > -k'* in *erek'* 'three' and *č'ork'* 'four' and other issues, see, apart from the references above, Meillet 1892: 162; 1936: 70, 79, 100; O. Haas 1940: 101; Pisani 1975: 96; Stempel 1994: 8; Kortlandt 1975: 43; 1983: 14; 1994a: 254-256; 1996a: 57 = 2003: 10, 44, 99-101, 118; Ravnæs 1991: 89, 99; Clackson 1994: 183; Olsen 1999: 5₄, 482 (on *č'orir*), 628, 786; Beekes 2003: 176, 190, 194, 199. We may posit **k^wetores* with dissimilatory loss of **-u-* as in Gr. Dor. NWGr. *τέτορες* (Schmitt 1981: 129). For the archaic vocalism of *č'orek'*-, see Schmitt 1981: 129. The *i*-declension is due to influence of *erek'* 'three' (Meillet 1936: 100; Schmitt 1981: 129).

ARM. zero-grade form **k^wtur-* > **k'ar-* is best explained through influence of the ordinal, cf. Ved. *turīya-* 'fourth', etc.; note also Arm. *vat'-sun* 'sixty' vs. *vec'* 'six' (Kortlandt, see the references above).

In order to explain the trilled *-r-* of *k'ar-*, Kortlandt 1994a: 254 = 2003: 99 assumes an underlying **-rs-* taken from *k'ar'-ameay* 'quadrennial' (attested in Eusebius of Caesarea) = **k^wtur-* + **smh₂-* (> Arm. *am* vs. Skt. *sāmā-*). Others posit a 'long sonant' **-r̥-* (for references and a discussion, see Clackson 1994: 37-38, 41, 47). None of these explanations is satisfactory. Ĵahukyan 1982: 42 does not offer a clear explanation. One might consider an influence of fem. **k^wetesres*.

č'u, *o*-stem: LocSg *i č'u-i* in Łazar P'arpec'i (5th cent.), GDPl *č'u-o-c'* in Grigoris Aršaruni, 7-8th cent. [NHB 2: 580b], Grigor Narekac'i 25.2 [Xaç'atryan/Łazinyan 1985: 340^{L35}], IPl *č'u-o-v-k'* (var. *č'wovk'*) in Hexaameron 8 [K. Muradyan 1984: 260^{L6}] 'setting out, departure; campaign, expedition; military camp; journey' (Bible+), 'transmigration of birds' (Hexaameron, see above, also 278^{L16}); **č'uem**, 3sg.aor. *č'ueac'*, 3pl.aor. *č'uec'in* 'to go, set off, set forth, march off, break camp' (Bible+); **č'og-**, suppletive aorist of *ert'am* 'to go; to set off' (q.v.): 1sg *č'ogay* (Paterica), imper. *č'og* (John Chrysostom); secondary 1sg.pres. *č'ogam* (Plato), inf. *č'ogal*, etc.

According to Ačařyan (HAB 3: 632a; see also Ĵahukyan 1959: 321), **č'u** is an *a*-stem (later: *o*-stem). He obviously took into account IPl *č'uōk'* (= *č'uawk'*) in Hexaameron and LocSg *i č'u-i* in Łazar P'arpec'i (see NHB 2: 580b). However, the critical edition of Hexaameron has only *č'u-o-v-k'*, var. *č'wovk'* (see above), and loc. *i č'u-i* is also compatible with *o*-declension.

●DIAL Xarberd *č'vil*, Sebastia (crypt.) *č'vel* 'to go, set off' [HAB 3: 633a].

●ETYM Since long (Dervischjan 1877: 12, etc.), connected with Skt. *cyav-* '(to start) to move, stir; to undertake', *cyautná-* 'undertaking, action, act, work', *hásta-cyuti-* f. 'quick movement of the hand', OAv. *šauuaitē* 'to move', YAv. *fra-šūiti-* f. 'approach', OPers. *šiyav-* 'to set forth, go, march' (see Kent 1953: 211a; Brandenstein/Mayrhofer 1964: 143), Gr. *σεύομαι* 'to be in violent motion; to walk, rush (to)'. Arm. *č'uem*, *č'og-* and *č'u* are usually derived from **k̄ieu-*, **k̄jou-* and **k̄ju-ti-*, respectively [Hübschmann 1883: 48; 1897: 485-486; HAB 3: 632b; Pokorny 1959: 538-539; Schmitt 1981: 63, 70; Ĵahukyan 1987: 131; Mayrhofer EWAia 1, 1992: 552-554; Mallory/Adams 1997: 506b; Cheung 2007: 40-42]. On *č'og-*, see further Klingenschmitt 1982: 277; Olsen 1999: 32₅₈, 788.

Arm. *č'u* is usually derived from **k̄ju-ti-* (apart from the references above, see also Ĵahukyan 1982: 58, 215₅₇; Beekes 2003: 206). In view of *o*-stem, however, one

should posit **kju-to-* (see also Olsen 1999: 41 and 41₈₂, 783, 849, with literature and a discussion). Even an OArm. **č'uw-* must have been reflected in writing as *č'u*.

A QIE thematic **kieu-e-mi* would hardly yield Arm. *č'uem*. If the original aorist was athematic (see Klingenschmitt *ibid.*), one might posit a PArm. athematic present (analogical after the athematic aorist) **č'eu-mi > č'oy-mi* from QIE **kieu-mi*. In the course of thematization, **č'oy-émi* would give *č'uem* through the regular development pretonic *-oy- > -u-*.

An Armenian-Indo-Iranian-Greek isogloss based on PIE **kei-*.

P

pal 'rock', only in "Hawak'aban anuanc' kat'ulikoscac' 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 araji drac' ayrin sep ēr utford miapatał. ew i verust palanjaw 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; Ĵahukyan 1987: 114, 251.

●DIAL Muš, Bulanəx, Arčeš, Aparan, Nor Bayazet, Van, Old Ĵula **pal** 'large, immovable (stone, rock)'; *pal-pal k'arer* 'large, immovable stones, rocks'; Bulanəx *pal čakat* 'large, projecting forehead' [Ačařean 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 Ačařyan (*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'alc'yan 1958: 245₁; SasCř 2000: 156, 240 (several times); Amatuni, *ibid.*

I conclude that the basic meaning of dial. *pal* is 'rock', which is corroborated 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. *žayr* 'rock' : dial. *žer-k'ar*, *learn* 'mountain' : dial. *ler-k'ar*, *vēm* 'hard stone' : dial. *vem-k'ar* [HAB s.vv.; 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 Ačařyan (HAB 4: 4a) connected Arm. *pal/t* with Skt. *bála-* n. 'power, strength, vigour', Lat. *dē-bilis* 'weak, feeble', Gr. *βέλτερος* 'better', OCS *bolijb*

‘bigger’ (cf. Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 215, with lit.), OIr. *ad-bal* ‘mighty’, Alpien (pre-Romance) *pala*, *balú* ‘rock’, etc.

This etymology, although accepted by Ĵahukyan (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* (**p̄lso-*), Oic. *fell* ‘mountain, rock’, OHG *felisa* ‘rock, cliff’ (< **palis-*?), and Gr. *πέλλα*: *λίθος* (Hesychius), which is usually derived from PGr. **πελσᾶ* and linked with Skt. *pāṣānā-* 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. Ačaiyan (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 *pl̄tak’ar* in fact is a Middle Armenian form (Nersēs Lambrnac’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; MijHayBař 1, 1987: 139a, 167-168; 2, 1992: 355a), *erasanak* ‘bridle’ > *ersnak* [Č‘ugaszyan 1980: 72, several times], *pakasuc’anel* ‘to diminish’ > *pkasuc’anel*, *Hayrapet* > *Hrpēt* [H. Muradyan 1972: 75]. Therefore, *pl̄tak’ar* may simply come from **pał-pał-a-k’ar*. Compare dial. *pal-pal k’arer* ‘large, immovable stones, rocks’ (see above).

pałat₁ ‘entreaty, supplication’ in Ephrem and dial. (see also s.v. *pałat₂*); **pałatim** ‘to entreat, supplicate’ (Bible+); **pałatank’**, GDPl *pałatan-a-c’* ‘entreaty, supplication’, prob. also ‘prayer; solemn assembly, religious service’ (Bible+).

pałatim and *pałatank’* are abundantly attested from the Bible onwards.

The “pure” root *pałat* is found in Ephrem: *atač’ank’ ew pałat*.¹¹⁰ In this form, it has been preserved in the dialects of Č‘aylu and Marała; elsewhere in the dial. compounds *atač’-pałat* and *ałat-pałat*.

In classical sources such as the Bible and Agat’angelos (§ 773), *pałat-* is frequently used next to *ałōt’k’* ‘prayer’ (etymologically related with *atač’-*, perhaps also with *ałat-*); cf. also *ałōt’s ew pałatans matuc’anēin arađi sr̄buhwoyn*

¹¹⁰ For another possible attestation, see s.v. *pałat₂*.

(“Patmut‘iwn srboc‘ Hrip‘simeanc‘”; see MovsXorenMaten 1843: 299); *zalōt‘as surb zor pałatik‘* (“Talaran”), etc. From these and some other passages (see NHB 2: 589-590) one may conclude that *pałat-* also referred to ‘prayer’. The association between ‘supplication’ and ‘prayer’ is trivial.

In Joel 1.14 and 2.15, *pałat-an-k‘* refers to ‘solemn assembly, religious service or ceremony’. These two similar passages read as follows: *k‘arozec‘ēk‘ pałatans* : Gr. *κηρύσσετε θεραπείαν* [in RevStBible: “call a solemn assembly”]. Here Arm. *pałat-an-k‘* renders Gr. *θεραπεία* ‘service, attendance’. This usage seems to be parallel with that of the hitherto unnoticed *pałat₂* (q.v.), which, if my interpretation is correct, should join *pałat₁*.

One finds *pałēt* twice in “Zgōn”/Afrhat: *zpałēt atač‘anōk‘* and *zjermerand pałēt nxdruacovk‘*; note the parallelism of the synonyms *atač‘ank‘* and *xndruac* (both in IPI). It also appears as scribal variants to *pałat* in Ephrem. The *-ēt* can be explained by contamination with *atēt* ‘grief, disaster, compassion’.

●DIAL Preserved in the dialects of Nor Naxijewan, T‘iflis, Axalc‘xa, Ararat, Šamaxi, Łarabał, Č‘aylu, Marała, Salmast, Ĵula, Svedia, Sebastia. For (*atač‘-*)*pałat*, see above. The “pure” root *pałat* is only recorded in Č‘aylu and Marała; see Davt‘yan 1966: 456. Compare also Łarabał **anēck‘-ptēck‘* ‘curses’. See s.v. *atat-* ‘to lament, supplicate’.

●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: *pałat* 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.

pałat₂ prob. ‘religious / ceremonial recitation’.

Only in “Patmut‘iwn srboc‘ Hrip‘simeanc‘” (see MovsXorenMaten 1843=1865: 301): *ew nok‘a gnac‘in i glux lerinn Pałatoy, zor asēin sastik yoyž i nma leal divac‘n, tun Aramazday ew Astkay mecarēin. Ew yačax paštamambk‘ tōn kardayin, or ē Pałat* : “And they went to the summit of the mountain of Pałat which, they said, abounded in devils, [and] they worshiped the sanctuary [lit. house] of Aramazd and Asthik. And they frequently recited ceremonial recitation (with religious service), which is (called) Pałat”.

Ališan (1910: 53; see also Russell 1987: 159) cites the passage with significant differences. Here *Pałat* 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 *pałat₂* 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 *pałat₁* ‘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 srboč‘ Hrip‘šimeanc’”, *tawn*, directly equated to *pałat*₂, is used with the verb *kardam* ‘to recite’ and, therefore, refers to the religious service performed by recitation.

Note the mountain-name *Pałat* 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* ‘-dał’.

pap, *a*-stem: GDPI *pap-a-c*‘ (Philo), *u*-stem: GDSg *pap-u* (twice in Law Codex by Mxit‘ar Goš, 12-13th cent.) ‘grandfather’ (Philo, Yovhan Mamikonean, etc.), ‘patriarch, pope, etc.’ (Paterica, etc.); **papay** (Step‘anos Ōrbelean, 13th cent.); voc. **pāpa** ‘father’ (Paterica); **apopap** ‘third grandfather’ (Mxit‘ar Goš, Grigor Tat‘ewac‘i) [HAB 1: 236b; 4: 25-26]; dial. ***pap**, **pap-i(k)**, etc. ‘grandfather, father’.

●DIAL The form *pap* ‘grandfather’ is widespread in the dialects. It refers to ‘father’ in Alaškert, Zeyt‘un, Tigranakert, etc. Note Alaškert *pab* ‘father’ vs. *pabe* ‘grandfather’. Vocative: Goris *pāpi*, Łarabał *pāpē*, Agulis *pōpi* [HAB 4: 25b].

●ETYM Considered a loan from Middle Persian (cf. Pers. *bāb* < **pāb* ‘father’, *bābā* ‘father, grandfather’, Pahl. *pāpak* ‘father’, etc.) and, in the religious sense, from Gr. *πάππας*. The form *apopap* reflects Gr. *ἀπό-παππος* ‘third grandfather’ [NHB 2: 1045a; Hübschmann 1897: 221, 341, 370, 514; HAB 1: 236b; 4: 25-26; Jahukyan 1987: 582; L. Hovhannisyan 1990: 269a].

The forms *apopap*, *pap* in religious sense, and voc. *pāpa* in Paterica obviously come from Greek. The Iranian origin of the rest is possible but improbable and unnecessary. Arm. *pap(a/i)* should be regarded as a nursery word of IE origin. That similar forms are found in many languages is already noted in NHB 2: 599c. Apart from the Iranian forms, note also Gr. *πάππα* voc. ‘father’, *πάππος* ‘grandfather, ancestor’, Lat. *pāpa* ‘father; food’, Pal. *papaš* ‘father’, etc. (see Pokorny 1959: 789; Szemerényi 1977: 7-8; M. Huld apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 195a).

For the semantic fluctuation between ‘father’ and ‘grandfather’ and for the reduplicational pattern of nursery kinship terms, see s.vv. *tam(a)* ‘grandmother, mother’, *nan(a)* ‘mother, grandmother’, *tat(a)* ‘grandmother, father, etc.’. See also s.v. dial. *p‘ap‘a* ‘bread, food’.

papanjim ‘to grow dumb, speechless’ (Bible+).

●DIAL Widespread in the dialects [HAB 4: 26b]. On the nasal epenthesis of Goris *pəmbanjvel* [HAB, *ibid.*; Margaryan 1975: 358b], see 2.1.30.1. Aslanbek *batbənjil* [HAB, *ibid.*] is perhaps due to contamination with *pał* ‘cold’.

●ETYM Ačařyan (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-* : *hetj-* ‘to drown’, etc. but does not specify the origin of *j*.

Ĵahukyan (1982: 60-61) posits **b^hnd^h-j-* or **b^hnd^h-s-*. I think the former alternative is improbable. A possible trace of PIE **b^hnd^h-s-* may be seen in Iran. **bad-s-*, cf. Khwar. passive *fsȳ-*, *βsȳ-* < **bad-s-ya-*, *pcβsȳ-* < **pati-bad-s-ya-* ‘to be/become bound’ (see ĒtimSlovIranJaz 2, 2003: 69, 72).

One might also hypothetically posit a trace of reduplicated desiderative with *-s-* found in Indo-Iranian and Celtic (for a discussion and references, see Kulikov 2005: 441). I wonder if Skt. *bibhantsa-* can corroborate my suggestion, although it is found only by lexicographers. I am indebted to L. Kulikov for checking the Sanskrit form and for a reference 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. ἀρμόζω ‘to join, fit together; to bind fast’.

pind, *o*-stem: ISg *pnd-o-v* (John Chrysostom); *a*-stem: ISg *pnd-a-w* (Philo) ‘firm, dense, tight, strong, fastened’ (Bible+); ***pndem***, 1sg.aor. *pnd-ec* ‘-i, 3sg.aor. *pndec*’ ‘to affirm, make firm, fasten’ (Bible+), ***pndim***, 3sg.aor. *pndec* ‘-a-w’ ‘to become firm, be encouraged’ (Bible+).

●DIAL Ubiquitous in the dialects, mostly in the meaning ‘firm, strong’; in Ṛodost‘o it means ‘dense’, said of e.g. porridge [HAB 4: 83a].

●ETYM Connected with Skt. *bandh-* ‘to bind, fasten’, *bandhá-* m. ‘bond, fetter’ (RV+), Pahl. *band-*, *bastan* ‘to bind, fetter, fasten’, *band-ak* ‘servant, slave’, Parth. *bnd*, *bndyst* ‘n’ ‘prison’ (see Nyberg 1974: 43-44), Gr. *πείσμα* < **-sma-* n. ‘rope, cord’, OHG *bintan* ‘to bind’, Goth. *bandi* ‘fetter, bond’, etc.; see also s.v. *papanjim* ‘to grow dumb, speechless’ < ‘to be/become bound, tied up’; see HAB 4: 82-83 with references; Ĵahukyan 1987: 115-116.

The initial *p-* points to Grassmann’s Law. Although we have no further secure examples of this law in Armenian (for a discussion, see Ĵahukyan 1969: 66; 1978: 176₁₃; further, see 2.1.24.1), I see no compelling reasons for rejecting this etymology.

On the other hand, Arm. *pind* is considered an Iranian loan, cf. Khot. *piṇḍaa-* ‘lump’ (see Bailey 1955-56: 74-75; Perixanjan 1983: 53; Witzel 2003: 33). This is less probable (cf. L. Hovhannisyan 1990: 216-217). Olsen 1999: 965, 965₆₃ puts Arm. *pind* in her list of words of unknown origin and adds: “Probably Iranian”.

ptuk *o*-stem (later GSg *ptkan* [HAB 4: 646a]) ‘bud; nipple’; *ptke/im* ‘to bud, germinate’ (Bible+).

●DIAL Widespread in the dialects, mostly in the meaning ‘nipple’ or ‘the uddar of a cow’. Van, Goris, Łarabał: ‘bud’. Nor Naxijewan, Polis, Ṛodost‘o, and Turkish-speaking Adana have **ptuł* ‘nipple’ or ‘the uddar of a cow’. Note also Urmia, Salmast *ptuł* ‘nipple’ [GwrUrmSalm 2, 1898: 97]. According to Ačaryan (HAB 4: 112a; 1941: 69¹⁴⁷), this is due to contamination with *ptuł* ‘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, **ptuł* ‘nipple’ or ‘the uddar of a cow’ can directly belong to *ptuł* (q.v.).

●ETYM According to Ačaryan (HAB 4: 112a), from PIE **bud-* ‘to swell’, cf. Engl. *bud*, etc. See above, and s.vv. *ptuł* and *put*.

ptuṭ, *o*-stem: ‘fruit (Bible+); pupil (of the eye); grape, etc.’. Nerses Lambronac‘i (12th cent., Cilicia), etc. have a form with *-n* (GDSg *ptlan*, AblSg *i ptlanē*), in the meaning ‘fingertip, pinch’. Given the existence of Hačən (Cilicia) *bādet* < **ptet* ‘id.’, one may reconstruct **ptetn* (see HAB 4: 112b).

●DIAL Widespread in the dialects, mainly referring to ‘fruit’ and ‘eye-apple, pupil’. Polis *buduṭ* (on which see below) also means ‘bubble’. In Svedia (*bdeət*) the meaning ‘fruit’ has been specialized to ‘olive-fruit’ [Ačařyan 2003: 586].

Ačařyan (HAB; Ačařyan 1947) does not record any form in Hamšen. One may wonder, however, if Hamšen **pitet* ‘fruit of wild trees; wild acorn’ (see Ačařyan 1913: 910b) belongs here. See above for **ptetn*.

For the semantic field particularly interesting are the data from Moks. Ačařyan (1952: 289) records Moks *ptuṭ* not specifying its meaning, probably because he only knew the basic meaning ‘fruit’, which is represented by the corresponding form in Van (*cař-a-putuṭ* ‘(tree) fruit’ (ibid.). But Moks *pətuṭ* (NPI *pətətnir*) also refers to ‘pupil of the eye’ (*ač‘ič‘ pətuṭ* ‘глазное яблоко’) and ‘rain drop’, *pətuṭ-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^{L4}). Given the meaning ‘dot, spot’ of *put*, as well as the above-mentioned by-form **ptet(n)* of *ptuṭ*, one can also introduce another word from Moks, namely *pətet*, GSg *pətəṭ*, NPI *pətəṭ-nir/-k^oir* ‘a spot from splashed boiling food in oil’ (see Orbeli 2002: 314). Note also Šatax *pəttel* ‘to bud, germinate’ (see M. Muradyan 1962: 215b).

Moks **ptet* 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)’ [Ačařyan 1941: 240]; cf. Sebastia **ptil* [Gabikian 1952: 478]. This verb presupposes here a nominal root **ptuṭ* ‘eye-pupil; ink-spot’. Polis also has *buduṭ* (< *ptuṭ*) ‘nipple’ and ‘fruit’, usually represented as belonging to different lexical items (see HAB 4: 112a; Ačařyan 1941: 69¹⁴⁷, 240). All the three, however, may belong to one word. For **ptuṭ* ‘nipple’ (also in other dialects), see *ptuk*. Note also Sebastia **ptuṭ* ‘pupil (of the eye); nipple’ [Gabikian 1952: 478].

●ETYM See above, and s.vv. *ptuk* and *put*.

Next to *ptuṭ*, as we saw, there is some evidence for **ptet(n)* – Nerses Lambronac‘i (12th cent., Cilicia) **ptetn* and Hačən *bādet* ‘fingertip, pinch’; Moks *pətet* ‘a spot from splashed boiling food in oil’; and, perhaps, Hamšen **pitet* ‘fruit of wild trees; wild acorn’. Old, hypothetical paradigm: NSg *-ōl* > ClArm. *ptuṭ*; AccSg **-el-m* > **ptetn*. See s.vv. *acut* ‘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: *pətuṭ* ‘fruit; rain drop’ : *pətet* ‘a spot from splashed boiling food in oil’; *āse/it* ‘needle’ : *asut* ‘two small planks that tie the handle of a plough with the pole’.

put, *o*-stem ‘poppy (= Gr. *ἀνεμώνη*); a sky-blue lily, etc.’. John Chrysostom, etc. (see HAB 4: 102-103). In Galen, Gr. *ἀνεμώνη* ‘poppy, *Anemone coronaria*’ is rendered by *put* and *ōj-kakawi* (vars. *ōjakayi*, *ōjkakwi*, *ōjktawi*, *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 – *tōp*, with metathesis (see especially Margaryan 1977: 161-164), see also 2.1.26.2.

The meaning ‘poppy’ of Łarabał *tōp* (see Ačařean 1913: 1042a) can be corroborated by folklore texts. In a fairy-tale (see HŽHek’ 7, 1979: 116^{L17}) it is narrated that a boy sees a beautiful, red poppy (*min tāsāngy*, *kārmür 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 an Ascension-Day ritual song of the type *jangyulum* (see Grigoryan-Spandaryan 1971: 57^{Nr299}): *K’anc’ topə kyärmür č’ika*, *!Pæc’ anis særtə 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, namely *top-top*: *Sareran top-top k’atim* “May I pluck (a) poppy from the mountains” (ibid. 179^{Nr1093}; cf. also 190^{Nr1159}). This is identical with Łaradał **tuptup*, recorded in Ačařean 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, namely *putput* ‘a kind of edible poppy’ Mxit’areanc’ 1901: 277^{L1}, 331; Amatuni 1912: 566b. Note T’iflis *pučpuča* ‘a flower (digitalis)’ (see Ačařean 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 Ačařyan (HAB 4: 103a) links *put* with *poytn* ‘pot’ and mentions the folk-belief, according to which if someone plucks this flower, all the pots in his house will break down; cf. synonymous *amankotruk*, etc. But which one was original, the name, or the folk-belief? Ačařyan 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, namely *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 the 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', *nīlotpala* '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*₃ 'a small swelling' and is etymologically identical with *pt-uk* 'bud, gemma' and *ptut* '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. *ptut*. 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': Aṙak'el Davrižec'i (17th cent.). In Baṙgirk' 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 Aṙak'el Siwnec'i (14-15th cent.), see HAB 4: 103a; 3: 457b.

●DIAL Nor Naxiḡewan, Polis, Rōdost'o, Alaškert, Muš – 'drop'; Xarberd – 'dot'; T'iflis, 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 äriṇ* "one drop of blood" (= NmušLeṛnŁarab 1978: 16 /lines 1 and 3 from the bottom; glossed in 218b). In HŽHek' 7, 1979 (189, 736b), one finds *təptəporigy* 'spotted'. See also Ačaṙean 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 Aṙak'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. See also Ačaṙean 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 drops from his eye" (proverb); Xemč'yan 2000: 210b^{Nr156} (Tavuš / Šamšadin): *tptpurik botaz* "spotted throat" (of a goose).

●ETYM See s.v. *put*₁.

put₃ *'a small swelling'; attested only in Norayr as a MidArm. 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 Ačaṙyan (HAB 4: 103b), both forms come from *put*. The -*i-* of

the Łarabał form, however, points rather to **poyt*. A **put* would give **pɔt* in Łarabał.

●ETYM The combined evidence from MidArm. and dialects, as well as the semantics of the two previous homonymous words, namely *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 reconstruct the following semantic basis: ‘a small round/swollen formation (of water, plant, or other substance)’. See s.v. *put*₁.

puc‘ ‘vulva’ (according to Norayr, MidArm. word).

●DIAL Nor Naxijewan, Polis, Ararat, Łarabał **puc* ‘vulva’ [Ačarean 1913: 926b].

●ETYM Ačarıyan (HAB 4: 105) derives from QIE **bul-sk-*, cf. Skt. *buli-* f. ‘buttocks; vulva’, Lith. *bulis* (-iēs), *bùlė*, *bulė* ‘Hinterer, Gesäß’, as well as Arm. Erzknk *pllik* ‘vulva’. For the loss of **-l-* before the affricate, see 2.1.22.9.

ǰ

ǰan, *i*-stem: IPl *ǰan-i-w* (Bible+), GDPl *ǰan-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’; **ǰanam** ‘to zeal, labour, make effort’ (Bible+).

●DIAL The verb has been preserved in Suč‘ava *ǰ‘anal*, *ǰula ǰ‘ananal*. Note also Suč‘ava *glxi ǰanal* ‘to do harm, damage’, with *glux* ‘head’; T‘iflis *ǰan-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; Pisani 1950: 180). This etymology is largely accepted, although the Greek and Armenian words are now separated from **ies-* ‘to boil’ and are derived from **ieh₂-* ‘to strive’, cf. Skt. *yā-* ‘to request, implore’ (RV+), *yātū-* m. ‘sorcery, witchcraft’ (RV+), etc. Pokorny 1959: 501; Ĵahukyan 1982: 40; 1982: 130; Klingenschmitt 1982: 90; Olsen 1999: 90; Cheung 2007: 174).

The development **ǰV-* > Arm. *ǰV-* is uncertain, however, unless we assume an Iranian intermediation; cf. Arm. *ǰatuk* ‘sorcerer’ from the same Iranian root. I therefore tentatively propose to treat Arm. *ǰan* 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 Mİran. form with closer semantics, cf. YAv. *auua-iīā-* f. ‘penance’, Gr. *ζῆλος* ‘zeal’, *ζῆμία* ‘loss, damage, penalty’, etc. Interesting is the meaning ‘to do harm, damage’ in the dialect of Suč‘ava.

ǰer, *o*-stem: GDSg *ǰer-o-y* (John Chrysostom) ‘warmth; warm and bright weather’ (Bible+), ‘warm’ (Eznik Kołbac‘i), **ǰeranim** ‘to come down with fever, be fevered with disease; to burn with fever (said also of lust)’ (Bible+; for attestations see, apart from NHB and Astuacaturean s.v., Barton 1989: 150₄₉), **ǰerim** ‘to lust’ (Anania Narekac‘i); **ǰernum** or **ǰeranim**, 1sg.aor. *ǰer-a-y*, 3sg.aor. *ǰer-a-w* ‘to be/become warm, burn’ (Bible+); **ǰerm**, *o*-stem ‘warm; warmth, warm weather’ (Bible+), **ǰerm-**

uk, *a*-stem: GDPI *ĵermk-a-c* ‘hot spring’ (Hexaemeron, Eusebius of Caesarea, Ašxarhac‘oyc‘, etc., see below), **ĵermn**, *an*-stem: GDSg *ĵerman*, ISg *ĵermam-b* ‘fever’ (Bible+).

ĵermn : ISg *ĵermam-b* = Gr. *πυρετῶ* in Deuteronomy 28.22 (Cox 1981: 184). For the full passage, see s.v. *xēt* ‘bite, pain’.

According to the 7th century Armenian Geography *Ašxarhac‘oyc‘* [Soukry 1881: 30^{L5}; MovsXorenMaten 1865: 607; A. G. Abrahamyan 1944: 349^{L8}; Hewsens 1992: 59, 59A, 153₂₅], the province of *Barjr Hayk* ‘Upper Armenia’ has *ĵermuk-s* ‘hot springs’. Certainly the same location is meant in Sebēos (7th cent.) Chapter 17 (G. Xaç‘atryan 2004: 387 s.v.; Xaç‘atryan/Eliazaryan 2005: 94^{L-3f}; Thomson 1999: 34), where *ĵermuk* (allative *i ĵermuk* and loc. *i ĵermk-i* [var. *i ĵerm-i*, 1851: 83]) refers to a hot spring with healing mineral water close to Karin (see also Thomson 1999: 34₂₂₁). These springs are attested by ancient authors in the location called *Elegia* and are still observable nowadays in *Ilija* (Eremyan 1963: 98a; Hewsens 1992: 153₂₅).

●DIAL The form **ĵer** ‘warm; warmth, warm and bright weather’ and corresponding verbal forms have been preserved in Muš *ĵ’er* ‘warm and bright weather’, Van *čer* ‘bright night’, Loři *čer* ‘id.’; Van *čerel* ‘to become bright and clear (said of weather)’ [HAB 4: 126a; Ačařyan 1952: 289], Šatax *čer* ‘bright, clear’ [M. Muradyan 1962: 204b]; T‘iflis *ĵiranal* ‘to become warm’ [HAB 4: 126]; Svedia *čir* ‘warm (weather)’ [Andreasyan 1967: 37, 272, 381b].

The form **ĵerm** ‘fever’ is found in Nor Naxijewan, Aslanbek, Axalc‘xa, Karin, Sebastia, Agulis, Šamaxi; Łarabał and Goris have *čermel* ‘to have fever’; note also Evdokia *ĵermug* ‘hot spring’ [HAB 4: 126].

●ETYM Since long (Klaproth 1831 < 1823: 106a, etc.), linked with the cognate forms belonging to PIE **g^{wh}er(-mo)-* ‘warm’: Skt. *hāras-* n. prob. ‘flame, glow’, *ghṛṇá-* n. ‘heat, glow, blaze of the sun’, *gharmá-* m. ‘glow, heat, warmth, hot pot with milk’, Av. *garəma-* ‘warm’, n. ‘heat’, MPers., NPers. *garm* ‘warm, hot’, Gr. *θερμός* ‘warm’, Lat. *formus* ‘warm’, OIc. *varmr*, OEngl. *wearm* ‘warm’, etc., see Hübschmann 1883: 48; 1897: 486; Pisani 1950: 175; Pokorny 1959: 493; Toporov PrJaz [e-h] 1979: 278; Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 683 = 1995: 589; Saradževa 1986: 40-41; Schrijver 1991: 317, 420; Mayrhofer EWAia 1, 1992: 513, 515-516; 2, 1996: 804; Joe Salmons apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 263b, cf. 125b.

Arm. *ĵer*, *o*-stem ‘warmth, warm and bright weather’ continues PIE *s*-stem neuter **g^{wh}er-os* ‘warmth’: Skt. *hāras-* n. prob. ‘flame, glow’, Gr. *θέρπος* n. ‘summer; harvest’ (Meillet 1936: 28; Pokorny 1959: 493; È. Tumanjan 1978: 182; Euler 1979: 224; Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 1: 418 = 1995, 1: 365; K. Schmidt 1987: 37; Matzinger 2005: 50; cf. also Godel 1975: 75; Stempel 1994: 11₁₅).

For a discussion of the verbal forms *ĵernum* < **g^{wh}er-nu-*,¹¹¹ aor. *ĵer-a-* from **g^{wh}er-s-*, *ĵeranim*, and *ĵeranim*, see Hamp 1975: 103; K. Schmidt 1980a: 3-4; Klingenschmitt 1982: 160, 224, 248, 257, 278; Barton 1989: 149-150 with footnotes; Clackson 1994: 179-180; Kortlandt 1996: 41 = 2003: 115. Compare **ues-nu-mi* in Gr. *ἔννυμι* ‘to clothe’ and *z-genum* ‘id’ (q.v.).

¹¹¹ The Armenian verb may reflect an older form in zero-grade, **g^{wh}h₂n(e)u-*: Skt. *ghṛṇóti* ‘to glow, light’, the *-e*-grade being analogical; cf. *aṛnum* ‘to gain’ < **Hr-nu-*, but *zgenum* ‘to put on clothes’ in full grade.

jil, jīt, *a*-stem: IPI *jīl-a-w-k'* (Bible 2x, Ephrem), GDPI *jīl-a-c'* (Efišē, Yovhannēs Ōjneć'i); *i*-stem: ISg *jīl-i-w*, IPI *jīl-i-w-k'* (Plato) 'sinew, tendon'; a number of derivatives, with either *l* or *l̥*

●DIAL Widespread in the dialects. We find *jil* in T'iflis, Axalc'xa, and a number of E and SE peripheral dialects, whereas the rest have *jīt*. Interesting is Muš *j'et* vs. *j'il-k'* [HAB 4: 127b].

With a semantic shift: Maškert (Xarberd-Arabkir region) and Akn *jēt* 'shin, shank', Svedia pl.-dual *j'itva* 'the part of the leg above the knee' [HAB 4: 127b; Ačarjan 2003: 586].

●ETYM Müller 1890: 6 suggests a comparison with OCS *žila*, Russ. *žila* 'vein, sinew, tendon', SCr. *žila* 'tendon, vein, root', Lith. *gýsla* 'vein', Latv. *dzi(k)sla* 'vein', OPr. **gislo* 'id.'

Here belongs also Lat. *filum*, *fīn* 'thread, cord, string; a filament spun by a spider; a thread-like part of a plant, a vegetable fibre; texture', see Hübschmann 1897: 486; HAB 4: 127; Meillet 1936: 28, 47; Ernout/Meillet 1959: 235a; Godel 1975: 75; Toporov PrJaz [e-h] 1979: 250; Ałabekyan 1979: 65; Schmitt 1981: 51; Saradževa 1986: 122; Schrijver 1991: 242; de Vaan 2008: 220. The appurtenance of Alb. *dell* 'sinew, tendon; string' is improbable (see Demiraj 1997: 128 with a different etymology).

Arm. *jil*, *-a-* derives from **g^{wh}iH-(s)leh₂-* (Stempel 1994: 12-13). There is also some evidence for an *i*-stem. In order to explain the *-l/l̥* alternation and the twofold declension, one may tentatively posit a neuter NSg **g^{wh}iH-(s)lo-* as in Lat. *filum* vs. neuter plural **g^{wh}iH-(s)l-h₂-*, or feminine **g^{wh}iH-(s)l-eh₂-* as in Balto-Slavic > PArm. **jīl-a-* > Arm. *jīt* (with a final dark *-l̥* due to the following back vowel, **-slo-* or **-slā-*) vs. fem. **g^{wh}iH-(s)lih₂-* (or dual **-ih₁?*) > **jīl-i-*, with a palatal *-l-* between front vowels¹¹².

As far as the problem of *l̥* vs. *l* is concerned, one might also assume the following original distribution: *-l̥* in nom. *jīt* with addition of a secondary nom. **-s* vs. intervocalic (especially next to front vowels) *-l-* in oblique forms, cf. *an-ali* vs. *at* 'salt' (q.v.). In this respect it is interesting to note that in all the ten Biblical attestations, listed by Astuacaturean 1895: 1299c, the word is always found in plural and with *l*, nom. *jīl-k'*, acc. *jīl-s*, instr. *jīl-a-w-k'*. Four of these attestations can now be verified by critical editions: Zeyt'unyan 1985: 387 (Genesis 49.24), Cox 2006: 101, 195, 258 (Job 10.11, 30.17, 40.17). However, the rest of the evidence in NHB does not support the distribution, thus we must await an up-to-date lexical corpus with a thorough philological analysis. The dialectal data may be relevant, too; cf. e.g. Muš *j'et* vs. *j'il-k'*.

jīn, *a*-stem: IPI *jīn-a-w-k'* 'staff, stick for beating' (Philo); **jñem** 'to beat' (Book of Chries, Timothy Aelurus, Grigor Narekac'i, etc.); **o-jīn** 'bunch of sticks' (Paterica).

●ETYM Since Patrubány (1904: 427-428), connected with *jīnj* 'to annihilate, destroy' (q.v.).

The anlaut of *o-jīn* is unclear, cf. (*h*)*o-sin* vs. *sin* 'empty' (q.v.). One may tentatively assume an old and unproductive prefix **o-* from **h₂po-*, cf. Gr. *ἀπό* 'from, away

¹¹² Greppin 1986: 285 treats *-l* as the expected reflex of a post-consonantal **-l-* (cf. **-sl-*) and considers *jīt* "simply a dialectal variant". This view does not seem convincing to me.

from', OCS *po* 'after, by, at', etc. An interesting typological match for *o-jin* would then be Russ. *pó-sox* 'staff' from *soxá* 'wooden plough'. Thus: QIE **h₂po-g^{wh}en-V-* > **əwojínV-* > **o(w)ojin-* > *ojin*.

***jīnj-** 'to annihilate, destroy': **jñjem** 'to efface, wipe clean; annihilate, destroy' (Bible+), **-jīnj** as the second member of a number of compounds (Bible+); **jīnj** 'clean' (Bible+); **-junj** 'annihilated, destroyed' in a few post-classical compounds (John Chrysostom, Yovhan Mandakuni/Mayragomec'i, etc.).

●DIAL The verb *jñjel* is widespread in the dialects [HAB 4: 128b].

●ETYM Since Patrubány (1904: 427-428), linked with *jīn* 'staff, stick for beating' and *gan* 'beating, blow' (see s.vv.); the verbal stem **jīnjē-* is derived from PIE present **g^{wh}en-je/o-* 'to slay': Gr. *θείvo* 'to kill', Lith. *geniù* 'to prune, hem'; for the PIE root cf. Hitt. *kuenzi, kunanzi* 'to kill, slay, ruin', Skt. *hánti* 'to strike, slay; to kill' (RV+), OAv. *jaidiūi* 'to kill', YAv. *jaiñti* 'to slay, kill', *-jan-* 'breaking', MPers., NPers. *zadan, zan-* 'to strike, to hit', Parth. *jn-* 'to strike', OCS *žeti* 'to reap, mow', etc.; see also HAB 4: 127-128; Meillet 1936: 107; Pokorny 1959: 492; Toporov PrJaz [e-h] 1979: 344; Mallory/Adams 1997: 548b; García-Ramón 1998; Cheung 2007: 103.

Beekes (2003: 161) presents the Armenian verb *jñjem* 'to wipe clean' in this context, but then notes: "etym. unknown (not cognate with Gr. *θείvo*, Lith. *geniù*)". I wonder, as Clackson 2004-05: 157 does, what is the reason for this. Perhaps the scepticism is due to the semantics (cf. Godel 1965: 24₈). The meaning 'to clean' is secondarily derived from the widely attested meaning 'to annihilate, destroy; to efface, wipe clean'.

If the vocalism of *-junj* 'annihilated, destroyed' is relatively old, one may assume an underlying *o*-grade form **g^{wh}on-ieh₂-* > **gunj-* or the like (cf. Gr. *φόνος* m. 'murder', *-φόντης* 'murdering') with a subsequent analogical change to *-junj*.

***jmar** 'male person'.

●DIAL Łaradał *jmar* (Ačařean 1913: 938a, glossed as *ayr mard* 'male person'). Ĵahukyan (1972: 282) has "Łarabał", not indicating the source. However, he obviously took the word from Ačařean 1913, so the *-b-* in *Łarabał* must be a misprint.

●ETYM Ĵahukyan (1972: 282) compares with Skt. *jāmātar-* 'son-in-law, husband of the daughter' (RV+) from PIE **ĝemH-*. For the phonetic side he (op. cit. 282₆) compares with the case of *jambem*, 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 *j-* (without consonant shift) points to a relatively young period.

Perhaps borrowed from Persian *jawān-mard* 'a young man; a generous youth; brave, generous, manly', *jū-mard(um)* 'a liberal or generous man' (see Steingass 376b, 379a); cf. also Arm. dialect of Ararat *jomard* 'generous' (see Nawasardeanc' 1903: 102a). For loss of the final *-d* cf. *argand* 'womb' > Šamšadin *ārķ'ān* and Alaškert *argan* (see s.v.).

jori, *wo*-stem: LocSg *i jorw-o-j*, GDPl *jorw-o-c'*, IPl *jorw-o-v-k'* (abundant in the Bible, Astuacaturean 1895: 1300), *ea*-stem: GDPl *jore-a-c'* (Paterica), IPl *jore-a-w-k'* (P'awstos Buzand 5.4, 1883=1984: 166^{L-6}) 'mule'.

In the Bible and Hexaemeron *ĵori* renders Gr. *ἡμί-οῦς* ‘mule’, cf. Arm. *iš-a-kēs* ‘half-ass’ describing *ĵori* in Hexaemeron (K. Muradyan 1984: 226^{L7}, glossed in 377a).

Pl.-coll. *ĵore-an* (Matt’ēos Urhayec’i, 12th cent.).

●DIAL Dialectally ubiquitous [HAB 4: 132].

●ETYM Considered a word of unknown origin (HAB 4: 132; Ĵahukyan 1990: 71; Olsen 1999: 939).

I tentatively suggest a derivation from **ĵior-i* composed of PArm. **ji-o-* ‘horse’ (see s.v. *ji* ‘horse’) and the comparative suffix **-ero-* seen in Skt. *āpara-* ‘posterior, later, following’ (cf. s.v. *aner* ‘father-in-law, wife’s father’) or, perhaps better, **-tero-*, as Skt. *aśva-tarā-* ‘mule’ < ‘a better horse’ or ‘horse-nature’, cf. Khot. *khadara-* ‘mule’ < **xara-tara-* from *xara-* ‘ass’, Lat. *mater-tera* ‘mother’s sister’ (see Bailey 1979: 70-71; Mayrhofer EWAia 1, 1992: 140; Szemerényi 1996: 201).

For the sound change **jy- > Arm. ĵ-*, see 2.1.22.2. For the development **-etor- > -or-* cf. Arm. *č’or-k’* ‘four’ from **k’etuores*. The final *-i* may be identical with the suffix *-i* frequent in animal-names such as *ayci* ‘goat’, *mari* ‘female bird’, *mak’i* ‘ewe’, etc. In view of the evidence pointing to *ea*-stem (see above), one may also posit a feminine **-ter-ieh₂-*, cf. Skt. AV+ *aśvatarī-* f. ‘female mule’. Thus: **ĝ^hio-ter-i(h₂)-os* and **-ieh₂- > PArm. *j(i)yorio-* and **j(i)yorio- > ĵori, wo-* and *ea*-stems.

On *ĵoreak* ‘locust’ and ‘hyena’, see 3.5.2.2.

Ř

***rungn**, *an*-stem: only ISg *řānk/gam-b* in Šarakan apud NHB 2: 682a; also *-rungn* as the second member of a few compounds (such as *šn-řungn* in John Chrysostom, etc., with *šun* ‘dog’); pl. tant.: nom. *řng-un-k’* (Philo), acc. (also with prepositions) *řng-un-s* (6 times in the Bible, see Astuacaturean 1895: 1309c and Clackson 1994: 176, as well as in Etišē and Mxit’ar Gōš), IPl *řng-am-b-k’* (Etišē, Philo, Yovhannēs Ōjnec’i); **řung-k’*, *a*-stem: GDPl *řng-a-c’* (Philo, Grigor Magistros, Sisianos, Yovhannēs Sarkawag, Mxit’ar Gōš) ‘nostrils’.

●DIAL Ačāryan (HAB 4: 148a) wonders whether Agulis *řung* ‘the edge of a roof’ (see also Ačārean 1913: 948b; Ačārean 1935 vacat) is related. For the semantic shift cf. *pru(n)k/g* ‘lip’ > ‘edge’. Note, however, Mełri *(ə)řāngn-a-k’ar* ‘corner-stone’, and some other compounds in *(ə)řāngn-a-* with *bānd* ‘tie’ and *kap* ‘id.’ as the second member, recorded by Ałayan (1954: 297, 327) in the glossary of dialectal words, without any reference to a CIArm. correspondence (in 297: from unspecified **řōngun*).

The Mełri compound clearly reflects **řungn* ‘corner-stone’, an epenthetic variant of Arm. **řo/uk’(u)n* (Łewond) < Arab. *ruk*n ‘corner-stone’ [HAB 4: 149a], cf. Arm. dial. **řuk’* ‘corner’ (Alaškert), ‘the corner of a wall from outside’ (Aparan, Bulanəx), ‘corner-stone’ (Łarabał) [Ačārean 1913: 949a]: Łarabał *řək’, řuk’*; Hadrut’ *řuk’* ‘corner-stone’ [Davt’yan 1966: 466], Goris *əřək’* ‘corner-stone’ [Margaryan 1975: 362b, 513b].

That the nasal before the velar is epenthetic is corroborated by Karčewan (a dialect that is practically identical with Mełri) *ur'ók'nə* 'the big corner-stone of the wall'; in compounds: *ərək'n-a-* (see H. Muradyan 1960: 213, 232a).

Since Agulis is closely related to Mełri, Agulis *rung* 'the edge of the roof' can hardly be separated from Mełri **rungen* 'corner-stone'. For the meaning in Agulis cf. Aparan, Bulanəx **ruk* 'the corner of a wall from outside'.

I conclude that the Agulis and Mełri forms derive from **rō/u(n)k'-n* 'corner-stone' and are thus unrelated with *rungen* 'nose, nostrils', although contamination is possible.

●ETYM Since long (Gosche 1847: 24; Müller 1890: 6^{Nr55}; for further references, see HAB 4: 148a), connected with Gr. *ῥύγχος, ῥύγγεος* n. 'snout of a pig, snout, muzzle, beak'. Gr. *ῥ-* and Arm. trilled *ṛ-* point to a proto-form **srung^h-*; for a discussion and for other forms, the appurtenance of which is less certain, see Hübschmann 1897: 486-487; HAB 4: 147-148; Pokorny 1959: 1002; Solta 1960: 429; Winter 1962: 260; Ĵahukyan 1982: 114-115; Arutjunjan 1983: 302; Olsen 1999: 139; and especially Clackson 1994: 176-177¹¹³.

In view of the limited geographical distribution and the absence of a prothetic vowel in Armenian (cf. *a-ṛu* 'brook' from the PIE root **sreu-*)¹¹⁴ one may assume a common or independent borrowing from a non-IE language (see Ĵahukyan 1987: 302; Clackson 1994: 177). Thus, this is a possible candidate for a Mediterranean substratum word.

The Armenian form has transferred to the *n*-declension which is frequent with body-part terms (Ĵahukyan 1982: 114-115; Clackson 1994: 177; Olsen 1999: 123, 614). The original Proto-Armenian form may have been a neuter **rungo-* from **srung^h-e/os-* (cf. Gr. *ῥύγχος, -εος* n.). It is tempting to assume that the Armenian form without the final *-n*, viz. **rung-a-* pl. tant., cf. gen.-dat. *ṛng-a-c'* (Philo+), reflects an old neuter plural **srung^h-(e)h₂-*.

S

*s(a/o)- 'this' (with reference to the speaking person), *d(a/o)- 'that' (with reference to the addressed person), *n(a/o)- 'that' (with reference to a third person): dem. pron.; in:

sa 'is (hic)', *da* 'is (istic)', *na* 'is (illic)': acc. *z-sa z-da z-na*, gen. *sora dora nora*, dat. *sma dma nma*, abl. *i smanē i dmanē i nmanē*, instr. *sovaw dovaw novaw*; plur.: nom. *sok'a dok'a nok'a*, acc. *z-sosa z-dosa z-nosa*, gen.-dat. *soc'a doc'a noc'a*, abl. *i soc'anē i doc'anē i noc'anē*, instr. *sok'awk' dok'awk' nok'awk'*

soyn 'idem (hic)', *doyn* 'idem (istic)', *noyn* 'idem (illic)': acc. *z-s/d/noyn*, gen. *s/d/norin*, dat. *s/d/nmin*, abl. *i s/d/nmin*, instr. *s/d/novin* or *s/d/novim-b*; plur.: nom. *s/d/noyn-k'* or *s/d/nok'in*, gen.-dat. *s/d/noc'in* or *s/d/noc'un(c')*, acc. *z-s/d/noyn-s* or *z-s/d/nosin*, abl. *i s/d/noc'unc'*, instr. *s/d/nok'im-b-k'* or *s/d/novim-b-k'*

¹¹³ Whether Arm. *pṛu(n)k/g* 'lip; muzzle; edge' (HAB 4: 108b with no etymology) is somehow related with these forms is uncertain, too.

¹¹⁴ Olsen 1999: 614 explains the initial *ṛ-* as onomatopoeic.

ays ‘hic’, *ayd* ‘iste’, *ayn* ‘ille’: acc. *z-ay/s/d/n*, gen. *ays/d/n-r* or *-orik*, dat. *ays/d/n-m* or *-mik*, abl. *y-ays/d/n-m* or *-manē*, instr. *ays/d/n-u* or *-uik*; plur.: *ays/d/n-k* or *-ok’ik*, acc. *z-ays z-ayd z-ayn-s* or *z-ays/d/nosik*, gen.-dat. *ays/d/n-c* or *-oc’ik*, abl. *y-ays/d/n-c* (*-anē*) or *y-ays/d/n-oc’ik*, instr. *ays/d/nok’i-w-k* or *-m-b-k*

anaphoric articles **-s**, **-d**, **-n**

All Bible+.

●DIAL Ubiquitous in the dialects [HAB 1: 167a, 170, 171b, 609a; 3: 416b; 4: 150-151; AčarLiak 2, 1954: 188-240].

●ETYM From PIE **kō-* along with **kī-*: Hitt. *kā-*, *ki-* ‘this here’, Gr. *κι-* ‘here, this’, cf. *τήμερον*, *σήμερον* < **κι-ήμερον* ‘this day’, Lat. *ci-s* ‘on this side of, within’, OCS *sv*, f. *si*, n. *se* ‘this’, Lith. *šis*, Goth. *hi-* ‘this’; PIE **to-*: Skt. *tá-* ‘this’, Av. *ta-* ‘this’, Gr. *τό* ‘the’, Goth. *þa-*, Lith. *tàs* ‘the, this’, etc.; PIE **(h₂e)no-*, cf. Skt. *aná-* ‘this’, OCS *onъ*, f. *ona*, n. *ono* ‘he, she, it’, Lith. *anàs* ‘that’, prob. Hitt. *uni*, *ini* ‘that (one)’, etc.

For Armenian paradigms, cognate forms and an etymological discussion, see Hübschmann 1897: 437, 478, 487; Meillet 1897 = 1962: 5-35 and 1978: 291-319; 1913: 59-62; 1936: 88-89; Pedersen 1905a; HAB 1: 167a, 170a, 171b, 609a, 679; 3: 416b, 465; 4: 150, 242b; AčarLiak 2, 1954: 173-188; Pokorny 1959: 285, 286, 320, 609, 1086; Godel 1975: 107-108; A. A. Abrahamyan 1976: 79-85; Schmitt 1981: 119-122; Ĵahukyan 1982: 144, 146, 148-150; Weitenberg 1983a; Kortlandt 2003 (< 1983): 52-53; Adams apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 457-458. For more references to the Armenian and PIE pronouns, see 2.2.5. For a general discussion on the articles *-s*, *-d*, *-n*, see H. Petrosyan 1976; Weitenberg 1994; J. Klein 1996. For the problem of the voiced *d-*, see s.v. *du* ‘you’.

The particle **ay-* has been compared to Skt. *ay-* ‘this here, he’, *e-šá*, *e-tá* ‘this here’, OPers. *ai-ta*, Slav. *jino-* ‘other’, perhaps also Goth. *jains*, Hitt. *uni*, *ini* ‘that (one)’, etc., though the Armenian vocalism is not clear: **h₁(o)j-k-* > *ays* etc., or derived from (or contaminated with) **anjio-*, cf. Skt. *anyá-* ‘other’, or **seh₂-?*; for a discussion and cognate forms, see Meillet 1962: 18-19 < 1897 = 1978: 303-304; 1916a: 52; Pedersen 1905a: 11-12, 17-18, 26-27, 34-35; 1905: 240 = 1982: 15-16, 21-22, 30-31, 38-39, 102; AčarLiak 2, 1954: 180-181; Godel 1975: 107₁₀₃; Schmitt 1981: 120-121; Ĵahukyan 1982: 148; Greppin 1983: 282-283, 284-285; Kortlandt 2003 (< 1983): 52; Mayrhofer EWAia 1, 1992: 69, 103, 272-273; Adams apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 457-458.

The **-in* in the forms *so-yn* etc. is perhaps related with Gr. *ἐν*, cf. especially deictic pron. *ἐκεῖνος* < **e-ke-enos* (see Pokorny 1959: 286, 320 with refer.; for Greek see Rix 1992: 185; cf. HAB 3: 416a); thus: **kō-(h₁)eno-* > *so-yn*. On the other hand it is compared with Gr. *-iv* in *οὗτος-iv* from *οὗτος* ‘this, this/that one’ (see Meillet 1936: 88; AčarLiak 2, 1954: 181-182; Schmitt 1981: 122). For other inner-Armenian forms with *-in* and for further discussion see Meillet 1962: 22 < 1897 = 1978: 307; 1936: 88; Pedersen 1905a: 18-25; 1906: 402 = 1982: 22-29, 180; HAB 1: 679; Ĵahukyan 1982: 148-149; Olsen 1999: 280-281, 428, 518.

The element *-m-* in dat. *sma* < **sum-a* < **so-m-a* vs. gen. *so-r-a* is related with PIE **-sm-*: Skt. *tá-sm-ai* ‘diesem’, Goth. *þa-mm-a* ‘them’, etc. (Schmitt 1981: 119, cf. 122, 126); cf. also *ays-m* etc. (Meillet 1894: 161).

sag, *a*-stem: GDPI *sag-a-c'* (Hexaameron and Philo) 'goose' Łazar P'arpec'i (1904=1985: 10^{L27}), Hexaameron (K. Muradyan 1984: 277^{L14}), Philo, and Middle Armenian.

For the attestations, see Greppin 1978: 28-30.

●**ETYM** Since long (Hübschmann 1877: 26; Pedersen 1906: 454; 1982: 232, cf. also 275; see HAB 4: 152 for further references), Arm. *sag* has been derived from the PIE word for 'goose', through metathesis **gas* < **gans* < PIE **ǵʰh₂(e)ns-*: Skt. *haṃsá-* m. 'goose', Gr. *χίψ*, Dor., Boeot. *χάψ* m. 'goose', Lat. *ānser* m.f. 'goose', OHG *gans* 'goose', OE *gōs*, pl. *gēs* > NEngl. *goose*, pl. *geese*, Lith. *žqsis*, Latv. *zūoss*, Russ. *gus*', etc. (for this PIE etymon, see Pokorny 1959: 412; Schrijver 1991: 113; Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 799; Greppin apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 236a; Derksen 2008: 184).

This etymology is not attractive because it presupposes not only an unclear metathesis, but also 'Gutturalwechsel' (Lidén 1906: 80-81; Ravnæs 1991: 77). Hübschmann himself did not include it in his fundamental 1897. Ačaryan HAB 4: 152 does not accept it either.

Lidén 1906: 81-82 derives Arm. *sag*, *-a-* from IE **kaṷā-* with Russ. *sová*, Czech *sova*, SCr. *sóva sōva*, etc. 'owl', Welsh *cuan*, Bret. *kaouenn*, *kaouann* 'owl', Lat. *cavannus* 'owl' (Celtic loanword), cf. also OHG *hūwo* 'owl'; he assumes an onomatopoeic root seen in Lith. *šaikti* 'to cry, call out, name', etc.; thus, both the goose and the owl are named as 'crying/shouting bird'. For this etymon in general (without Armenian) and for a discussion of the vocalism, see Schrijver 1995: 99-100, 335; Greppin apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 412a. One also compares Skt. *śúka-* m. 'parrot' and Khot. *sūch-* 'to call, name', see Pokorny 1959: 536; Bailey 1979: 426b (mentioning also Arm. *sag* 'goose'); Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 644; cf. Lubotsky 1988: 68.

This etymology is accepted in HAB 4: 152a; Ĵahukyan 1982: 41, 135; 1987: 131, etc. Eichner 1978: 151 and Olsen 1999: 788 posit **kaṷHah₂*. Positive is also Ravnæs 1991: 77, 80, who discusses the problem of the Armenian *-g* instead of *-w*. Because of this phonological obstacle Kortlandt 1993: 11 = 2003: 103 rejects the etymology and prefers the derivation of *sag* from **gans* assuming a depalatalization of the initial obstruent before a laryngeal.

On the whole, the etymology of Lidén seems more plausible, although the problem of the velar needs further examination. One may posit an onomatopoeic **kaṷ-eh₂-* (or perhaps **kóṷ-eh₂-*, obl. **kū-h₂-* > PArm. nom. **sówa-* vs. obl. **sag-ŷ-* > analogically *sag*, *sag-a-*). If Skt. *śúka-* 'parrot' and others are not related, then we might be dealing with a European substratum word.

sal, *i*-stem: GDSg *sal-i* (Bible+), GDPI *sal-i-c'*, IPI *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 Elišē, 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. Garsoĭan 1989: 143): *Isk t'agaworn salac'eal, oč' inč' 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-στροτος* '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 the 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*₁, GSg *sal-ə̄*, NPl *sal-ir* 'плиты на крыше'; *sal*₂, GSg *sal-ə̄*, NPl *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*₁, 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 Barsel 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; cf. Wagner 1984a: 282. For the semantic shift 'stone' > 'anvil' cf. Skt. *āśman-* 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: **kHl-eh₂-* (see Ĵahukyan 1987: 590). In Łazar P'arpec'i, however, *sal* has *i*-stem, which points to another

feminine form: **kHL-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 **kHL-n*-. One wonders whether the Armenian district-name *Saln-a-jor* contains PArm. **sal-n*- ‘stone, rock’ (see s.v.).

salam (Middle Armenian), *u*-stem: GDSg *salam-u* in Mxit‘ar Herac‘i, 12th cent. [HAB 4: 156a]; **salamn* : NPl *salamun-k*‘ (Philo, see NHB 2: 683c; Greppin 1978: 97); *salamb*, *a*-stem: GDPl *salamb-a-c*‘ in Łazar P‘arpec‘i, 5th cent. (1904=1985: 10^{L24}) ‘a game bird, a kind of partridge’, probably ‘francolin’

It is generally accepted that *salam(b)* refers to ‘francolin’ (see HAB 4: 156; Greppin 1978: 85; MiĵHayBař 2, 1992: 305a). According to Ananyan (HayKendAšx 3, 1965: 89-90, especially 89₁), however, it refers to the grey partridge, i.e. ‘*Perdix perdix*’. For attestations, see Greppin 1978: 85-86; MiĵHayBař 2, 1992: 305a; in “Govank‘ t‘rč‘noc” (Praise of birds): Mnac‘akanyan 1980a: 255^{L330}.

Beside *salam*, “Govank‘ t‘rč‘noc” has also *šalam*, a singing and dancing bird resembling the young of a camel [Mnac‘akanyan 1980a: 253^{250f1}], perhaps ‘francolin’ [MiĵHayBař 2, 1992: 202b]. No etymology in HAB 3: 481a. Perhaps originally identical with *salam(b)* (cf. Greppin 1978: 86).

●DIAL Łarabař *sālāmnā*, *sālemnā* [Davt‘yan 1966: 466], Goris *sālāmnā* [Margaryan 1975: 362a]. Ačaryan (HAB 4: 156b) records only Muš compound *salam-kak‘av* (with *kak‘aw* ‘partridge’), in the expression *salam-kak‘vu pes man kig‘a* “(she) is walking like the francolin-partridge”. Orbeli (2002: 320) records Moks *salām kak‘av* ‘птица вроде курочки, но вдвое больше, пестрая, вкусная, живет на горах’, and (in the village of Aĵnanc‘) *sālāmp‘arez* ‘язычник’ (noun ‘heathen’).

In a folk-song (Ř. Grigoryan 1970: 142^{Nr204}): *Saric‘ sar es ert‘əlu*, / *Salam-kak‘av berelu* “You will go from mountain to mountain, to bring a francolin-partridge”. In another folk-song entitled “K‘ele, Sat‘o” (“Come on, Sat‘o”), which I heard, in particular, from my maternal grandfather Andranik Simonyan: *salam-kak‘avi pes p‘arvaz es anum*.

●ETYM No etymology in HAB 4: 156 and Greppin 1978: 85-86. The word is not listed in the indices of Jahukyan 1987; L. Hovhannisyān 1990; Olsen 1999.

Lat. *columba* f. ‘dove, pigeon’ and *columbus*, -ī m. ‘male pigeon’, of which *columba* is the old one, have been derived from **kol-on-b^h*- and hesitantly compared with Lat. *calidus* ‘with a white spot on the forehead’ [Schrijver 1991: 375, 427]. Greppin (apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 169a) points out that Gr. *κόλυμβος* ‘waterbird, especially the grebe’ is clearly related to Lat. *columba* but does not share the same semantics”.¹¹⁵

On the other hand, Lat. *columba* has been linked with PSlav. **golqubь* ‘pigeon, dove’: OCS *golqubь*, Russ. *gólubь*, Czech *holub*, etc. (see ĖtimSlovSlavJaz 6, 1979:

¹¹⁵ The partridge (*kak‘aw*; on *s/šalam* see above) is associated with pagan dancers and prostitutes (see Gojan 1952, 1: 230-234; Ananyan, HayKendAšx 3, 1965: 58-59; H. Hovhannisyān 1978 passim, in particular 225-227; Őrdoyan 1983: 117, 120-121; 1991: 49). Concerning the possible semantic relationship ‘partridge’ : ‘grebe’ above, note Russ. *pogānka* ‘grebe’ next to *pogānyj* ‘pagan, heathen, dirty’. Compare especially Moks *sālāmp‘arez* ‘язычник’ (noun ‘heathen’), see above.

215-217; Toporov, PrJaz E-H, 1979: 274-275; Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 1: 602₁; Derksen 2008, s.v).

I prefer to connect Lat. *columba* (perhaps also Gr. *κόλυμβος*) with the Armenian word under discussion. Lat *columba* and Arm. *salamb*, *a*-stem point to Mediterranean **kol(o)mb^h-(e)h₂-* > PArm. **salámba-* (on **-o-* > Arm. *-a-*, see 2.1.3). Remarkably, there is yet another possible Mediterranean bird-name of a similar structure, shared by Armenian and Latin; see s.v. *atawni* ‘dove’.

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; Jahukyan 1959: 310a).

In Job 9.9, Gr. *Πλειάδες* ‘Pleiades’, *Ἐσπερος* ‘evening-star, Venus’, and *Ἄρκτοῦρος* ‘the star Arcturus, Bearward’ are rendered by Arm. *Bazmastet-k*, *Gišer-a-var*, and *Sayl*, respectively (Cox 2006: 93).

In Anania Širakac’i (7th cent.): *saylk* ‘*astetac*’ *d* (in relation to 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. *σατίνη* f. ‘chariot’, *σάπιλλα*: *πλειὰς 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, 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 *σάπιλλα* (perhaps Thracian) can be derived from Mediterranean-Pontic substratum **kati-lih₂-*. For **-lih₂-*, see s.vv. *luc* ‘yoke; the constellation Libra’, *luc-a[t]li* ‘the constellation Orion’ and 2.3.1 s.v. *-(a)li*. 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 development **s* > **h* > 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 **k̑* (cf. Arm. *siserin* ‘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. Hambarjumyan (1998: 34-38) rejects the connection with *σάπιλλα* without serious argumentation and treats Arm. *sayl* as a native word derived from PIE **k^wel-*

‘wheel’ (cf. OIc. *hvél* ‘wheel’, Gr. *κύκλος* m. ‘circle, ring, wheel’, Skt. *cakrá-* n., rarely m. ‘wheel’, etc.), which is unacceptable.

sandut-k’, API *sandut-s* (spelled also as *sandux-k’*, -s); *o*-stem (GDPI *sandt-o-c’*) according to NHB 2: 693c, but without evidence ‘ladder, stairs’, 5 attestations in the Bible; Elišē (see NHB 2: 693-694; Astuacaturean 1895: 1318c); sg. **sandut** in Grigor Narekac’i 92.11 (Xaç’atryan/Lazinyan 1985: 618^{L198}); **sandux** in Paterica; with epithetic *-t* : **sandutd**, **sanduxt**, **sandux-t-k’** (and API -s) in Cyril of Alexandria and in Middle Armenian (and GDPI *sandtd-o-c’*, *sandxt-o-c’* in Yaysmawurk’, see NHB, *ibid.*); **sandutx** and **sanduxt** in Ephrem, etc. (HAB 4: 173b; MijHayBař 2, 1992: 311). A number of derivatives, in **sandt-a-** (NHB, *ibid.*).

A textual illustration from Genesis 28.12 (Zeyt’unyan 1985: 273): *Ew etes tesil; ew aha sandutk’* (vars. *sanduxk’*, *sandutxk’*, *santutk’*) *hastateal yer kri, oroy glux iwr hasanēr minč’ew yerkins, ew hreštakk’ Astucoy elanēin ew ijanēin and na : και έννπνιάσθη, και ίδου κλίμαζ έσθηριγμένη έν τή γή, ής ή κεφαλή άφικνείτο εις τον ούρανόν, και οι άγγελοι του θεου άνέβαινον και κατέβαινον έπ’ αυτης.*

●DIAL **sandut** > Zeyt’un *sandox*, Hačən *sandux* [Ačařyan 2003: 78, 337]. From petrified plural **sandut-k’** : Juřa *sanduk’*; Svedia *sandot’* (HAB 4: 173b; cf. Ačařyan 2003: 414, 586), or *sant/daug/t’* [Andreasyan 1967: 273, 382a], or (sub-dialect of Xtrbek) *sandoux* [Hananyan 1995: 197b]; K’esab *santot/x/k’* [Č’olak’ean 1986: 216b]. Note also Goris *sandux-k’*, referring to wooden or stony staircase leading from garden to second floor or balcony [Lisic’yan 1969: 106, 108].

NHB (2: 693-694) presents **sandut-t** (see above for literary evidence) as a dialectal form. This is seen in the T’iflis dialect *sanduxt*. According to Ačařyan (HAB 4: 173b), the meaning of the dialectal forms is “movable staircase”, i.e. ‘ladder’. As is explicitly described by Andreasyan (1967: 273), the Svedian form refers to ‘wooden ladder’, and *gädvə sandaut’* lit. ‘cat’s ladder’ refers to a kind of chain-like embroidery.

●ETYM Since Dervischjan (1877: 27), connected to Lat. *scālae*, *-ārum* f.pl. (rarely sg. *scāla*, *-ae*) ‘ladder; a scaling ladder; flight(s) of steps in a building stairway(s)’, *scandō* ‘to climb, mount, ascend’, *ascendō*, *-ere* ‘to go up (on foot or in a vehicle), climb, mount, ascend’, Skt. 3sg.pres.act. *skādati* ‘to leap, spring, fall off, squirt out, to run out’, etc. In view of Mlr. *scendid* ‘to jump’, etc., Lat. *scandēre* could be reconstructed as **skend-* [Schrijver 1991: 431-432; Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 749].

Although accepted by Ačařyan (HAB 4: 173), this etymology of Arm. *sandut-k’* remains largely unknown to Western scholars. The word is considered to be of unknown origin in Ĵahukyan 1990: 72, sem. field 7; Olsen 1999: 951. Nevertheless, the etymology is worth of consideration.

Arm. *sandut-* probably comes from **(s)knd-sleh₂-* (cf. Lat. *scāla* ‘ladder, etc.’) or **sknd-(s)l-o-* > PArm. **sand-(a)l-a/o-*. The nominative in *-u-* might be from QIE HD NSg **-ōl*, analogically after *acut* ‘coal’, etc. (see 2.2.2.5). We might be dealing with an Armeno-Italic isogloss (based on verbal **skend-*), belonging to the stage of MedPont cultural terms.

sarn, GDSg *sar-in* (several times in the Bible, Astuacaturean 1895: 1319b), ISg *saram-b* (Theophilus, Yovhannēs Erzncac’i [or *sar-mam-b*], Tařaran), GDPI *saran-*

c‘ (Oskip‘orik) ‘ice’ (Bible+), later ‘cold’ (Nersēs Lambronac‘i, 12th cent., etc.), **sař-aman-i-k**‘ (pl.) *ea*-stem: GDPI *sařamane-a-c*‘ (Theophilus), IPI *sařamane-a-w-k*‘ (Čařəntir) ‘ice, frost’ attested also in API *sařamani-s* in Job 37.10 (rendering Gr. *πάγος* ‘ice, frost’, see Cox 2006: 237) and Eznik Kořbac‘i (in meaning ‘cold wind’); **sař-n-aman-i-k**‘, *ea*-stem: GDPI *-eac*‘ ‘ice, frost’ (Agat‘angelos, Elišē, Movsēs Xorenac‘i, Aristotle, Anania Širakac‘i, etc.), rarely in sg., instr. ISg *sařnamane-a-w* (Barsel Čon); **sařim** (Bible+), later also **sařnum** and **sař-č‘-im** ‘to freeze’; **sařnanam** ‘to grow cold’ (Nersēs Lambronac‘i, Vardan Marat‘ac‘i, etc.); caus. **sař-uc‘-anem** (Elišē); **sař-oyc**‘ ‘ice’ (John Chrysostom, Anania Širakac‘i); **sař** ‘cold’ (gen. *sař-i* in Barsel Čon); numerous derivatives [NHB 2: 695-696; HAB 4: 176b].

A few textual illustrations for *sařn-aman-i-k*‘ ‘ice’:

in Elišē (Ter-Minasyan 1989: 408^{L4}, transl. Thomson 1982: 247): *Bazum jmerac*‘ (vars. *jmeranc‘n*, *jmeranc*‘) *halec‘an sařnamanik*‘; *ehas garun* : “The ice of many winters melted; spring arrived”;

in Movsēs Xorenac‘i 1.26 (1913=1991: 75^{L11f}, transl. Thomson 1978: 115): *oroy gagat‘nn sastkut‘eamb sařnamaneac*‘ *t‘uēr pateal* “whose peak appeared enveloped in thick ice”.

●DIAL *Ĵula sařn*, *ĴarabaĴ*, Goris *sārnə* ‘cold’, Agulis *sōrnə* ‘id.’, Ararat *sāřə*, T‘iflis *sāřə* ‘id.’; verb: *ĴarabaĴ*, Goris, Šamaxi, Ararat **sařč*‘-, T‘iflis *sāřil* and *sāřč‘il* [HAB 4: 177], Agulis *sāřčōnil* ‘to freeze, grow cold’, *sāřāhac* ‘frozen’ (Ačarean 1935: 387; M. Zak‘aryan 2008: 283 with textual illustrations); Mehtišen *sařuc*‘ [Davt‘yan 1966: 468], Axalc‘xa *sařuc*‘ ‘ice’; Muš *sur* ‘cold’, Ganjak *sur* ‘shiny icicle’; Muš *sařnamani* [HAB 4: 177b].

ĴarabaĴ, Goris *sārnə* is also a noun, ‘ice’ [Davt‘yan 1966: 468; Margaryan 1975: 466b]. A textual illustration is found in *ĴarabaĴ* folk-songs of the type *ĵangyulum* (Grigoryan-Spandaryan 1971: 219^{Nr1353}, 220^{Nr1357}): *Arev ōzec‘i, sařnə tvin* “I asked sun, but they gave ice to me”.

●ETYM Connected with OIc. *hĵarn* n. < **her(z)na-* ‘frozen snow’, OHG *hornung* ‘February’, Russ. *serēn*, *serenā* ‘crust over snow’, *sēren*‘, Ukr. *serēn* ‘frozen hard snow’, Lith. *šeřkšnas* m. < **k(e)r-sno-* ‘hoarfrost’, adj. ‘grey, whitish’, *šarmā* < **kōr-meh*₂- ‘frost’, etc. [Hübschmann 1883: 48; 1897: 488; Meillet 1936: 30; HAB 4: 176-177; Pokorny 1959: 573; Saradževa 1986: 34-35; Derksen 1996: 89; Beekes apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 287b].

It is uncertain whether the **-l-* forms (Lith. *šālti* ‘to freeze’, *šalnā* ‘hoarfrost’, etc.), often brought into connection, are related or not. Likewise uncertain is the appurtenance of the Indo-Iranian forms (compared with Arm. *sařn* since de Lagarde, 1854: 14^{L303f}, cf. also Dervischjan 1877: 48): Skt. *śisīra-* m. ‘Vorfrühling, kühle Jahreszeit’, ep.+ *śisīra-* m.n. ‘Kälte, Frost’, YAv. *sarəta-* ‘cold’ < **kōlh*₁_{to-} (cf. Lith. *šāltas* ‘cold’, de Vaan 2003: 589), etc. (see Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 641; Mallory/Adams 1997: 112b), cf. MPers., NPers. *sard* ‘cold’, *sard-īh* ‘coldness’, *sarmāg* ‘coldness’ [MacKenzie 1971: 74].

Ačāryan (HAB 4: 177a) hesitantly compares the **-l-*form **kēl-* to Arm. dial. **st-in*, **st-on* ‘ice, frost’ (q.v.). Ĵahukyan (1972: 293; 1985: 153; 1987: 131, 275) hesitantly posits redupl. **kī-klu-* (cf. Skt. *śisīra-*) for **slul* ‘coldness’ (q.v.), and **kēl-* (cf. OIc. *hēla* ‘frost’, OHG *hāli* ‘smooth, slippery’, Dutch *hal* n. ‘frozen ground’) for **st-on* (or **st-awn* with the suffix *-awn*, on which see Ĵahukyan 1998: 19). The form

**stin* is derived from QIE **kēl-eno-* and compared with Lith. *šalnà* ‘hoarfrost’, SCr., Bulg. *slána* ‘hoarfrost’, etc. [Jahukyan 1972: 293; 1987: 131]. Though details are unclear, this etymology of the Armenian dialectal forms is possible, unless the meaning ‘cold, freezing’ points to a recent derivation from dial. **sl-* ‘to blow (of wind), whistle’, or ‘to glide’, or ‘to shine’ (on which see Amatuni 1912: 592; Ačařean 1913: 972-973; cf. HAB 4: 242). Further, note *setē/i* or *setay* ‘hoarfrost’ in “Bařgirk‘ hayoc“ (Amalyan 1975: 286^{Nr143}), which is considered to be an Arabic loanword, see Amalyan 1972:141; 1975: 428^{Nr143}.

If we assume an IE term with a basic meaning ‘cold, coldness, frost’ for Arm. *sarñ* separating it from colour words (cf. for a discussion Pokorny 1959: 573-574; Derksen 1996: 87-90) and from *-*l*-forms, then we are left with Armenian, Germanic and Balto-Slavic (see Beekes apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 287b: “of late IE status”). Possibly an Armenian-European isogloss or a substratum word. The Armenian form may be derived from **k̑s-en-*: nom. **k̑s-ē(n)* > **sári(n)* > *sař-n*, gen. **k̑s-en-os* > **sař-ín(-oh)* > *sařin*. The reconstructions **k̑-no-* (Jahukyan 1987: 132), or PD **kérōn* vs. loc. **k̑rén* (Olsen 1999: 137), or **k̑rH-* (Beekes 2003: 194) are less probable. Note the compositional *sař-V-* and oblique *saři/an-*, always with trilled *-r-* pointing to an older *-*rs-*, unlike e.g. *amar-* (oblique and compositional) vs. nom. *amařn* ‘summer’, where the *-r-* of the nominative is due to the following nasal (see s.v., and HAB 1: 146a). If this interpretation is accepted, Arm. *sařn* is to be closely linked with OIc. *hjarñ* n. < **her(z)na-* ‘frozen snow’ and Lith. *šer̃kšnas* m. < **k̑(e)r-sno-* ‘hoarfrost’.

It is remarkable that Armenian shares four terms for ‘ice, cold, (hoar)frost’ with Balto-Slavic and Germanic or Celtic:

Arm. *eteamn* ‘hoarfrost’ vs. BSl. **h₁iH-ni-* ‘hoarfrost, rime’ (the etymology is uncertain, see s.v.);

Arm. *oyc* ‘cold’ vs. Lith. *áušti* ‘to become cold’, OIr. *ūacht* (subst.) ‘cold’;

Arm. *sařn* ‘ice, frost’ vs. OIc. *hjarñ* ‘frozen snow’ and Lith. *šer̃kšnas* ‘hoarfrost’;

Arm. dial. **st-in* ‘ice, frost’ vs. OIc. *hēla* ‘frost’, Lith. *šalnà* ‘hoarfrost’, SCr., Bulg. *slána* ‘hoarfrost’, etc.

For the suffixal element *-(*a*)*man-* in Arm. *sař(n)-aman-i-* cf. a number of words belonging to the same semantic sphere: *eteamn* ‘hoarfrost’, *jer* and *jer-m* ‘warm, warmth’ vs. *jer-mn* ‘fever’ (see s.vv.).

***satak** ‘corpse’ (preserved only in the dialects, see below); **satakem** ‘to kill; to destroy, annihilate, exterminate, spoil’, **satakim** ‘to die miserably, suffer a bitter death’ (Bible+), **satak-ič** ‘destroyer, killer’, **satak-umn** ‘dying miserably’ (all widely attested since the Bible, NHB 2: 697-698; Astuacaturean 1895: 1320-1323); **satak-a-mah** ‘dying miserably’ in 2 Maccabees 9.28, John Chrysostom (see NHB 2: 697c; Mladenov 1937: 101; Olsen 1999: 695).

●DIAL The noun ***satak** is recorded in NHB 2: 697c as a dialectal word meaning ‘corpse; dead body of an animal or an unbeliever’.¹¹⁶ It has been preserved in some Western *kə*-dialects: Karin, Polis, Č‘enkiler ‘dead body or corpse of a Turk’; Nikomidia ‘ghost appearing as a corpse’; Aynt‘ap ‘a weak, idle person’ [Ačařean 1913: 955b]. According to Ačařyan (1941: 240), Polis *sadag* is pejorative. Further:

¹¹⁶ NHB mixed this word with the homonymous *satak* ‘clear, mere, simple’; cf. HAB 4: 178b.

Sebastia **satak* ‘dead body (pejor.); dead body of a Turk’ [Gabikyan 1952: 490]; Dersim *sadag* ‘dead body of a Turk’ [Bałramyan 1960: 99b].

The verb *satakim* is widespread in the dialects, in the meaning ‘to die (about animals); to die (pejorative)’. Turkish speaking Adana has *sadgil əlmak* ‘id.’ [HAB 4: 179a].

●ETYM Ačařyan (HAB 4: 179a) rejects the connection with Lat. *cadō* ‘to fall (down, from); to be killed, die, perish; to be ruined, decay, abate; to happen; to end, close; to fall through, fail’, *cadāver*, *-eris* n. ‘dead body, corpse’, Skt. *śad-* ‘to fall out; to decay’, etc. (Dervišean, Müller) and leaves the origin of the Armenian word open. These IE forms are probably cognate with Arm. *c’acnum* ‘to become low, subside, cease’ (q.v.).

The same etymology has independently been proposed by Mladenov (1937: 100-101), who considers *satak* as a derivative in *-ak*. However, this suffix (for which Mladenov refers to Meillet 1913: 100) is diminutive, whereas the final *-ak* of our word is not analysable synchronically (in other words, there is no ClArm. **sat-*) and is hardly diminutive.

Nevertheless, the etymology should not be abandoned solely on the grounds of *-ak*. Since practically all the Armenian words with non-analysable (non-diminutive) *-ak* are Iranian loanwords, we can assume here a loan from an unattested Iranian source (cf. e.g. *nirh* ‘dormancy, slumber’) at a very early stage, with the consonant shift *d > t*, cf. the well-known example of *partēz* ‘garden’ from Iran. **pardēz-*. For the pattern of making a denominative verb ‘corpse’ > ‘to make/become a corpse’ cf. *diakn* ‘corpse’ > *diakn-anam* ‘to be(come) a corpse, fall as a corpse’, see HAB s.v. *di(akn)* ‘corpse’. For the semantic shift ‘to fall’ > ‘corpse’ cf. Lat. *cadō* : *cadāver* (see above), Gr. *πίπτω* ‘to fall’ : *πτῶ-μα* n. ‘fall, plunge; the fallen, corpse’, Russ. *padat* ‘to fall’ : *padal* ‘corpse’ (Mladenov, *ibid.*), Arm. *ank/ganim* ‘to fall; to die (especially in battle, war)’ : *ank-ac* ‘corpse’ (see NHB 1: 168a).

sar, *o*-stem: GDSg *sar-o-y* and AblSg *i sar-o-y* ‘tip, end; top, summit; ascent; summit of a mountain; mountain’ (Bible+).

●DIAL Widespread in the dialects [HAB 4: 183b]. For the problem of the trilled *ř* in Marala *sar*, see Ačařean 1926: 125-130. Hamšen *sar* refers to ‘forest’ [Ačařyan 1947: 253]. For the semantic development ‘mountain’ > ‘wooded mountain’ > ‘woods, forest’, see 3.4.1¹¹⁷.

●ETYM Since long (see HAB 4: 182-183 for references), linked with IE cognate forms going back to the PIE word for ‘head’: Skt. NAccSg *śiras-*, obl. *śīrśán-* (ISg *śīrśāńá*, GAbISg *śīrśāńás*, LocSg *śīrśāń*, LocPl *śīrśāńsu*) n. ‘head, top’, YAv. *sarah-* n. ‘head’, MPers., NPers. *sar* ‘head’, Oss. *sær* ‘head, top’, Gr. *κάρ* n. indecl. ‘head’, *κάρᾱ*, GSg *κάρᾱτος* n. ‘head’, pl.n. *κάρῃνα* ‘head, top’, *κέρας* n. ‘horn’, Lat. *cerebrum* n. ‘brain’ < **ker₂-s-ro-*, OHG *hirni* < **kerh₂-s-nio-*, etc. For the forms and a discussion of the original paradigm **k(e)rh₂-os*, gen. **krh₂-s-n-ós*, see Frisk 1:

¹¹⁷ For the contextual framework of this development note an illustration from a folk-tale told by the illiterate Nanuxas Ałekyan (native of the Alaškert region, village of Garak’ilisa) and recorded by Nazaret’ Martirosyan in Yerevan in 1915 [HŽHek’ 9, 1968: 200^{L1}]: *Mard mi ketni, gelni kert’a sar koč hanelu*. <...>, *kə zarke kac’in* : “There was a man. He goes to *sar* to bring a beam. <...>, he hits (with his) axe”.

784-785, 788, 825-827; 2: 6-7; Euler 1979: 238-240; Ringe 1988a; Beekes 1981-82: 111-113; 1989b; Schrijver 1991: 96; Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 638-639; Cheung 2002: 223.

Hübschmann (1883: 49; 1897: 236, 489) treats *sar* ‘tip, top; mountain’ as a native Armenian word directly comparable with Skt. *śiras-* n. ‘head’, etc., whereas for **sar-* ‘head’ in late compounds such as *aland-a-sar* ‘head of sectants’, *kaxard-a-sar* ‘head of wizards’ (HAB 4: 183b) he assumes an Iranian origin.

The native origin of *sar* ‘tip, mountain’ is largely accepted: HAB 4: 182-183; Pokorny 1959: 574; Solta 1960: 204-205; Mann 1968: 10 (confused with *sar-k*’, *u-* stem ‘armour, equipment, furniture’); Godel 1975: 76; Nussbaum 1986: 111; Ĵahukyan 1987: 132; Beekes 2003: 194. For PIE *s-* stem neuters regularly yielding *o-* stems in Armenian, see 2.2.2.1; see also Matzinger 2005: 31, 45. The assumption on an *s-* less form **k̂rr-o-* (Frisk 1: 785) is improbable and unnecessary.

Others treat the Armenian word as an Iranian loan (Meillet p.c. apud HAB 4: 183a; Bolognesi 1986: 1-11; Olsen 1999: 906). Indeed, the shape of Arm. *sar* is ambiguous (see also Euler 1979: 240; Matzinger 2005: 45). The semantics and the *o-* declension favour the native origin. The assumption that the Armenian *o-* inflection somehow reflects an Iranian word-final **-ah* (Rasmussen apud Olsen 1999: 860) is unconvincing.

Admittedly, each of these arguments, taken individually, cannot be viewed as decisive. Note in particular that MPers. *sar* referred also to ‘top, summit of a mountain’ (HAB 4: 183a; Bolognesi 1986: 5-6; for the forms, see MacKenzie 1971: 74; Nyberg 1974: 173b). Nevertheless, I do not share the view of Bolognesi (1986: 1-11) who, after a thorough and useful analysis of Armenian and Iranian materials, comes to a clearcut conclusion that the Armenian word is definitely an Iranism.

I conclude that Arm. *sar*, *o-* stem ‘tip, end; top, summit; mountain’ may reflect PIE *s-* stem neuter **k̂rh₂-e/os-* ‘head, top’ exactly like Skt. *śiras-*, etc., although the Iranian origin cannot be excluded either.¹¹⁸

sarem

●ETYM See s.v. *sari-k*’.

sarik ‘starling’ (Hexaameron, see below), ‘blackbird’ (Philo, rendering *keṛnex* in the margin); MidArm. *sarek* ‘starling’ (see NHB 2: 700bc; MiĵHayBaṛ 2, 1992: 316b); MidArm. *c’ax-sarek* ‘a small kind of singing bird, Troglodytes troglodytes’ containing *c’ax* ‘shrub’ (MiĵHayBaṛ 2, 1992: 401a).

Attested twice in Hexaameron alongside with synonymous *tarm-a-haw* (K. Muradyan 1984: 260^{L1f}, 279^{L4}, cf. 358₂₄, index: 377ab), see s.v. *tarm* ‘flock of birds, starling’. For a philological analysis, see Greppin 1978: 187-189, who concludes that *sarik* refers to the Rose-Colored Starling.

The Modern Standard Armenian form *sareak* is only found in dictionaries [HAB 4: 187a].

¹¹⁸ According to Ačařyan (HAB 4: 183b), Georg. *seri* ‘hill’ is borrowed from Arm. *sar* ‘mountain’. It is tempting to assume that the Georgian form underlies an Armenian by-form **ser-* from the old nominative **k̂erh₂-os*. This is, of course, highly uncertain.

●DIAL Van, *Ĵula sarek*, Muš, Alaškert *sareg*, Xarberd *sarek*⁹¹ [HAB 4: 187b], Dersim *sareg* [Bařramyan 1960: 99b], Sebastia **sarek* [Gabikean 1952: 491].

Some dialects have compounds with *sew* ‘black’ or *t’ux* ‘dark, blackish’: Moks *sivsārik*, gen. *sivsārk-u*, pl. *sivsārkātir* ‘скворец или дрозд’ = ‘starling or blackbird’ [Orbeli 2002: 326] < **sew-sarek* [HAB 4: 187b]; Svedia *txsārāg*, *t’əxsārāg* reflects **t’ux-sarek* ‘dark starling’ (see Andreasyan 1967: 161, 163, 382b), note also Svedia-Musa-Leř *dəxārāk* which refers to a blackish bird presumably from the family of starlings (Gyozalyan 2001: 85).

NHB 2: 700b records dial. *čarek* as equivalent to *sari/ek*. This is identical with Muš *čareg* ‘a kind of starling’ and may be interpreted as **čay-sarek*, a compound with *čay* ‘gull’ [HAB 3: 181a]¹¹⁹. For this type of compounds cf. Zeyt’un *jağřav* ‘a bird’ probably composed as **čay* ‘gull’ + *agrāw* ‘raven’ [HAB 3: 181a; Ačarıyan 2003: 325]; Muš, Alaškert *c’urur* [HAB 3: 618b], possibly composed as *c’in* + *urur*. Alternatively, *čareg* reflects **čř-sarek*, with *čř* ‘wild’, cf. Muš **čř-kak’aw* ‘a kind of bird’, with *kak’aw* ‘partridge’ (see Ačarean 1913: 716a).

●ETYM Since Gēorg Dpir and de Lagarde (HAB 4: 187b), connected with Pers. *sār*, *sārak*, *sāraĵ*, *sāri* ‘starling’, Pahl. **sār* ‘kite’ (cf. *sār-ř-gar* ‘a bird of prey’ < ‘kite of mountain’, Nyberg 1974: 174a); cf. Skt. *śāri-* ‘a kind of bird’ (YV+), *śārikā-* ‘Predigerkrāhe, preacher crow’ (Ep.), Lith. *šarka* ‘magpie’, SCR. *svrāka*, Russ. *sorōka* ‘magpie’, Alb. *sorrē* ‘crow’. The appurtenance of the Balto-Slavic form is uncertain (see Derksen 2008: 477), and the Albanian probably belongs with Skt. *kṛṣṇā-* ‘black’, etc. (see Demiraj 1997: 355).

The Armenian word has been treated as an Iranian loanword (Hübschmann 1897: 236-237; HAB 4: 187; Ĵahukyan 1987: 543, 569, 571; Perixanjan 1993: 26; Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 630). Others directly link it with Skt. *śāri-*, Russ. *sorōka*, etc. (Petersson 1916: 270; Pokorny 1959: 569). One should at least be aware that the Iranian origin of *sareak* is not compulsory (see also L. Hovhannisyan 1990: 216-217; cf. Ĵahukyan 1987: 208, with a question-mark), unlike *dayeak* ‘nurse’, which most certainly is an Iranian loanword. For Iranisms in *-ik* and *-eak*, see Ĵahukyan 1987: 569; 1993: 263. An Armenian origin is probable for *arbaneak* ‘servant’ and *tatruk* ‘turtle-dove’ (q.v.).

Greppin (1978: 189; apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 362a) distinguishes two Armenian words, *sarik* ‘starling’ and *sarek* ‘blackbird’, and assumes that *sarek* directly derives from IE, whereas *sarik* came via Iranian. However, the semantic distribution between the Armenian forms is not straightforward since *sarik* refers to ‘blackbird’ too (in the margin of Philo), and MidArm. *sarek* seems to denote ‘starling’. Besides, these formations may easily be explained within Armenian.

PArm. **sar-i-* may be derived from **kōri-* (cf. Skt. *śāri-*), **křH-i(h₂)*, **kēh₂r-i(h₂)*-, or **křH-i(h₂)*-. CIArm. *sarik* consists of **sar-* or **sari-* and the diminutive suffix *-ik*, and MidArm. *sarek* derives from **sareak* < *sari-* + dimin. *-ak*. Note other such diminutive formations based on Armenian bird-names that are definitely of non-Iranian origin, e.g. **atawne-ak*, **atun-ak*, **atun-ik*, **atawən-ik*, etc. from *atawni* ‘pigeon, dove’; **cicērn-ak* and **cicērn-ik* from *cice/ārñ* ‘swallow’.

¹¹⁹ However, note Megr. *čaro-* ‘fishing bird’ (on which see Klimov 1998: 309).

I conclude that there are no solid grounds for assuming an Iranian origin, although it cannot be excluded either. We may posit an Armeno-Indo-Iranian bird-name.

On the other hand, Arm. *sar-ik* is reminiscent of Gr. *ψάρ*, gen. *ψάρος*, Ion. *ψήρ*, gen. *ψηρός* m. 'starling', Hesychian *ψάρις* 'a kind of sparrow', etc. Ačařyan (HAB 4: 187b) points out that the resemblance is accidental, which is not necessarily the case. The Greek word may be regarded as a metathesized form of the words for 'sparrow': Olc. *sporr*, OHG *sparo*, OEngl. *spearwa*, Engl. *sparrow*, Gr. *σπαράσιον*, etc. (Frisk 2: 1130; Chantraine 1968-80: 1286; Greppin apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 543b, cf. 534b; for the forms, see also Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 541 = 1995, 1: 458). At any case, it seems to be a substratum word (see Beekes 1977a: 5). For such a metathesis cf. another substratum word, Arm. *sunkn* 'mushroom', probably from **psong-* vs. Gr. *σπόγγος*, *σφόνγγος* 'sponge', Lat. *fungus* 'fungus, mushroom' (q.v.). On the whole, however, this explanation of *sareak* is less convincing than the former one.

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^cawstos Buzand 4.16: *kapēr patēr erkat'i sareōk'* 'he chained and bound it with iron bands' (transl. Garsořian 1989: 147); P^cawstos Buzand 5.7: *ew arjakeac' zArřak <...> ew yanroc' paranoc'ēn řt'ayic'n sareac'n* 'And he freed Arřak from <...>, and from the bonds of the iron yoke upon his neck' (transl. Garsořian 1989: 199).

●ETYM Usually linked with Gr. *καῖρος* m. 'the row of threads connecting the warp-threads to the loom', *κειρία* (also *καίρια*, etc.) f. 'girth of a bedstead; swathing-band, bandage', *καιροσέων* (Homer) 'close-woven', *καιρώ* 'tie the *καῖροι* onto the loom'; Skt. *śṅkhalā-* 'chain, fetter', *śṅkhala-* '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; Jāhukyan 1987: 132, 175. On Skt. *śṅkhalā-*, 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 **ker-* 'to weave' rests on very slender evidence. However, Arm. *sar-i-k'* is connected with the verb *sarem*, which is largely known in the 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, namely verbal **sar-* 'to tie, attach, link' (on this etymon, see also de Vaan 2003: 99-100; Cheung 2007: 337). The relation of *sar-k'* with *aspar* 'shield' is doubtful.

I conclude that the restoration of **ker-* 'to tie, bind, attach; to weave' is probable. Arm. *sar-i-k'* and Gr. *καῖρος*, *κειρία* can be derived from the following paradigm: NSg **ker-ih₂-*, GSg **kr-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: **kr-ti-* > *sard*, obl. *sard-i(-)*. This “would imply a semantic transfer from abstract to concrete” [Olsen 1999: 193]. For the semantic fluctuation between ‘spider’ and ‘spider’s web’ cf. *sard*. Olsen (1999: 193) points out that there are other possibilities, such as e.g. **kr-d^hh₁o-*. Perhaps better: **kr-d^heh₁-* > PArm. **sar-dī-*.

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/Afrahat (*setx*), Mxit‘ar Goš, Galen (*setx* or *sext*), etc. Derivatives: *sex-eni*, GDP1 *se(t)xene-a-c’* (Bible+) and later *sex-astan* = Gr. *σικυ-ήλατον* ‘patch of gourds, cucumbers’. GDSg *sexen-o-y* is attested in Book of Chries 6.4.7 (G. Muradyan 1993: 144^{L3f}, Russ. transl. 2000: 136): *zōrēn sexenoy zeresōk’ erkri taraceal i koxumn*: “лежит подобно дыне, под ногами”.

●DIAL Aġtial/Suč‘ava *sex* (with a diphthongal /ie/, see Ačařyan 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’, *σέκουα* ‘id.’ (Hesychius), *σίκυος*, *σικνός* 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. *týkva* ‘pumpkin’. Treated as a loanword from Thracian or Phrygian (see HAB 4: 197b, with refer.) or an unspecified source; for a discussion, see Frisk 2: 704. The vocalic variation of the Greek forms points to Pre-Greek [Furnée 1972: 251, 357].

The appurtenance of the Slavic is uncertain, and the Armenian form (not mentioned by Frisk and Furnée) renders it even more difficult.

Probably MedPont **si/ek^hu-*. Irregularities from an Indo-European point of view: (1) vocalic alternation **-e/i-*; (2) **s-* > Arm. *s-*; (3) a voiceless aspirate.

ser ‘cream of milk, skin on milk or sour clotted milk’, attested in Zgōn-Afrahat, and in Middle Armenian: Geponica, Minas T‘oxat‘c‘i, Grigor Tat‘ewac‘i, Yovhannēs T‘lkuranc‘i, Nahapet K‘uč‘ak [NHB 2: 708b; HAB 4: 321b; MiĴHayBař 2, 1992: 321b].

●DIAL Widespread in the dialects [HAB 4: 204b]. In some dialects replaced by *eres* ‘face’ (Łarabař *ires*, Agulis *kxc’-iris* lit. ‘milk-face’) and recent loanwords such as *xaymax*, *laymat*, *ərařan* (see HAB 4: 204b; Ačařean 1902: 162; Davt‘yan 1966: 469, etc.). Orbeli (2002: 326) glosses Moks *sir* as ‘пенки, сливки молочные’. According to Nawasardeanc‘ 1903: 106a, Ararat *ser* refers to ‘cream on sour clotted milk’; cf. also the attestation from Yovhannēs T‘lkuranc‘i (see below for references).

Axalk‘alak‘ *seruc’* ‘thick skin on milk when being warmed’ [Ačařean 1913: 961a], Aslanbek *serünc’*, *serüsg* [HAB 4: 204b], Ararat *serusk* beside the simple *ser* [Markosyan 1989: 315a], and ModArm. *seruc’k’* ‘cream of milk, skin on warmed or

boiled milk' [Malxaseanc' HBB 4: 205c] point to *ser-oyc'*, *ser-oyc'-k'*, cf. *sař-oyc'* 'ice' vs. *sař(n)* 'cold; ice' (q.v.).

●ETYM Ačařyan (HAB 4: 204b) rejects the connections with Lat. *serum* 'whey' (NHB 2: 708b) and Skt. *sāra-* 'cream' (Dervischjan 1877: 99) and leaves the origin of the Armenian word open. Note that the initial *s- would drop in Armenian. One might assume a substratum origin (cf. the s- of *sex* 'melon', q.v.).

I tentatively suggest a connection to Skt. *śāras* n. 'cream, skin on milk', a word of obscure origin (see Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 617). An *s-stem neuter **ker-e/os-* would regularly yield Arm. *ser*, o-stem (see 2.2.2.1). The inflection-class of *ser* is unknown. The only inflected form known to me is the ISg *ser-o-v* in Yovhannēs T'lkuranc'i, 14-15th cent. (Pivazyān 1960: 222^{L1}, Russell 1987a: P App. III) and Nahapet K'uč'ak apud MiĵHayBař 2, 1992: 321b), which would point to o-stem. However, -ov has become the most dominant instrumental ending in Middle Armenian (Karst 1901: 146-149, 153, 156, etc.; L. Hovsep'yan 1975: 74-76; Ē. Mkrtč'yan 1980: 124-127), and an attestation from the 14/15th century cannot be taken as secure evidence of an original o-stem, although this remains a possibility.

Thus: Arm. *ser* 'cream of milk, skin on milk or sour clotted milk' and Skt. *śāras* n. 'cream, skin on milk' may be regarded as an Armeno-Indo-Aryan word reflecting a late IE **ker-e/os-* n. 'cream of milk'. If no other cognate forms are found, one may assume a cultural loan of substratum origin, although there are no specific formal reasons for that.

sin₁, o-stem: AblSg *i sn-o-y* 'empty' (John Chrysostom, Ephrem), *snanam* 'to become empty' (Bible+), *sn-ot'i*, wo-stem: GDP1 *snotw-o-c'*, IPl *snotw-o-v-k'*; ea-stem: GDP1 *snote-a-c'*, IPl *snote-a-w-k'* (both Bible+) 'empty, hollow; vain'; *sin* or *osin* 'thin, blighted' said of *hask* 'ear of corn' (Genesis 41.6,7,27, see Zeyt'unyan 1985: 339, 342); **hosin* in denominative verb *hosnil* (Grigoris Aršaruni's Commentary on Cyril of Jerusalem) and in the dialects (see below).

For attestations and derivatives of *sin*, see Clackson 1994: 139.

●DIAL Muš, Bulanəx *həsin* 'unmown dried grass', verb *həsnil* 'to wither' [HAB 4: 215a; Melik'ean 1964: 510b].

Ačařyan (HAB 4: 215a) does not record any dialectal forms of *sin*. One finds evidence from some eastern peripheral dialects. According to Ałayan 1954: 286b, here belongs Meřri *sen* 'empty, unused pot'. Bařramyan 1961: 199b records Kizen *sin* not specifying the semantics. Margaryan 1977: 159-160 introduces Goris *sen* 'empty, useless, lean' mostly said of milk.

●ETYM Derived from QIE **keno-* with Gr. Att. *κενός*, Hom. *κενε(φ)ός*, Ion. *κεινός* 'empty, idle' [Hübschmann 1897: 490; HAB 4: 215a with references; Pokorny 1959: 564; C. Arutjunjan 1983: 302-303; Mallory/Adams 1997: 179a].

Greek and Armenian seem to show disagreement in the suffixation. The Greek word may be regarded as a thematized *u*-stem **kenu-o-*, which would yield Arm. **sing* or **sin-r* (for a discussion, see Chantraine 1968-80: 514b; Eichner 1978: 152₃₅; Clackson 1994: 138-139). Perhaps a Mediterranean substratum word (cf. Ĵahukyan 1987: 301). The Armenian form points to **keno-* or **keneyo-* (or **ayo-*, Viredaz 2001-02a: 2; 2005: 94-95) through contraction, cf. another Mediterranean word with a similar problem, Arm. *t'et-i* 'elm' vs. Gr. *πελέ(φ)α* 'elm'.

The anlaut of (*h*)*o-sin* is unclear, cf. *o-ĵin* vs. *ĵin* 'staff'.

sin₂ ‘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*, albeit in HAB represented as 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]. Ačarıyan (HAB 4: 217a), albeit with reservation, compares with Arm. *sinc/j* ‘sticky substance’ (Philo+). On the plant-suffix *-j/z*, see 2.3.1.

Further, compare Sumer. *šennur* prob. ‘medlar’, and *šinig* ‘tamarisk’ (on which see Hoffner 1974: 118-119).

siserñ (GSg *siseran* in Fables of Mxit‘ar Goš; also *sisran* in NHB 2: 714b, but with no evidence) ‘chick-pea’, attested in Agat‘angelos, Paterica, Galen; **sisarñ** in the Fables of Vardan Aygekc‘i (13th cent.).

●DIAL Widespread in the dialects [HAB 4: 218]. The final *-n* is seen in Łarabał, Hadrut‘, etc. *siserñə*, *siser* [Davt‘yan 1966: 470], Agulis *sáysärñ* [Ačarean 1935: 388], as well as in the paradigm of Van: *siser*, gen. *sisran* [Ačarıyan 1952: 126].

●ETYM Connected with Gr. *κρίος* ‘chick-pea’, *κίκερροι*, Lat. *cicer* n. ‘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). Note also Russ. *čečevica* ‘lentil’, etc. (Pisani 1974).

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/k̄*, *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.

sirt, *i*-stem: GDSg *srt-i*, AblSg *i srt-ē*, ISg *srt-i-w*, AllSg *i sirt*, LocSg *i srt-i*, GDPl *srt-i-c*, IPl *srt-i-w-k*, AllLocPl *i sirt-s* (rich evidence in the Bible, see Astuacaturean 1895: 1344-1350) ‘heart’; **srt-mt-im**, 3sg.aor. *srtmtec* ‘-a-w (with *mit* ‘mind’) ‘to grow indignant, become angry’ (Bible+); **srtnum** ‘to grow indignant’ (John Chrysostom), **srtnim** ‘id.’ (Nersēs Lambronac‘i).

●DIAL Ubiquitous in the dialects [HAB 4: 221]. A huge number of phrases and derivatives: Amatuni 1912: 590-591, 601-602; Ačarean 1913: 966-971, 987-989; HayLezBrbBar 5, 2008: 334-353, 398-402.

●ETYM Since long, derived from the PIE word for ‘heart’, **k̑ērd*, **k̑rd-ós* (or PD **kr-ed-s*), **kȓd(i)-*: Hitt. *ker*, *kard(-i)-* ‘heart, core’, HLuw. *zart(i)-* n. ‘heart’, CLuw. ^{UZU}*zārt-* ‘heart’ (cf. however Starke 1990: 631₁), Gr. *κῆρ* n. ‘heart’, *καρδία*, Ion. *καρδίη* f. ‘heart; soul, spirit’, metaphorically ‘soul, spirit; heart of wood’, Lat. *cor*, *cordis* n. ‘heart; mind’, OIr. *crīde* n. ‘heart’ < **kr(e)d̑io-* (see Schrijver 1995: 319-320), OCS *sȓd̑bce*, Russ. *s̑rd̑ce* ‘heart’, Lith. *širdis* ‘heart’ (cf. OCS *sȓda* ‘middle, community, Wednesday’, Lith. *šerd̑is* f. ‘core, kernel, pith’, etc.), Goth. *hairto* n. ‘heart’; with unclear anlaut: Skt. *h̑ṛdaya-* n. ‘heart’, *su-h̑ārd-* ‘with a good heart, friendly’, OAv. *z̑aȓad-* n. ‘heart’, YAv. *z̑aȓadaīia-* n. ‘heart’, Parth. *zyrd*, Oss. *z̑ærdæ* ‘heart’, etc. vs. Skt. *śraddh̑ā-* ‘confidence, devotion’, Av. *z̑razdāiti-* f. ‘trust, confidence, believe’, cf. Lat. *cȓēdere* ‘to trust, believe’, etc. from **k̑red-d̑^heh₁-* ‘to trust, believe’ < ‘to put heart’ (on which see the excursus below), Hübschmann 1897: 490; HAB 4: 220-221; Pokorny 1959: 579-580; Frisk 1: 787-788; Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 800-801₁ = 1995, 1: 701₁; Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 663, 818; Mallory/Adams 1997: 262-263.

For the reconstruction of the PIE paradigm and related problems, see Szemerényi 1970; Rix 1970: 81; Eichner 1978: 154₄₄; Beekes 1987c: 51-53; 1990: 39, 39₇; 1995: 190; Schrijver 1991: 134-135, 484. The *i*-stem of Arm. *sirt* is compared with Hitt. *kardi-*, Gr. *καρδία*, *καρδίη*, OIr. *crīde*, etc. (apart from the references above, see also Hamp 1984: 200; Saradževa 1986: 134; cf. Szemerényi 1970: 515, 523, 526). For Arm. *srt-mt-im* ‘to grow indignant, become angry’ and semantically comparable derivatives in cognate languages, see Szemerényi 1970: 517-519.

Excursus: ‘to put in one’s heart’

In the Bible one finds a considerable number of attestations of the formula *dnem i sirt* or *i srti* ‘to put in one’s heart’. Some of them may represent Greek calques, but this can hardly hold true for others. Here are a few random examples without a philological analysis: Job 11.13: *Isk et’e du surb edir zsirt k’o* ‘‘If you have made your heart pure’’ : *εἰ γὰρ σὺ καθαρὰν ἔθου τὴν καρδίαν σου* (Cox 2006: 105). Deuteronomy 11.18 (Cox 1981: 124-125): *ew dijik’ zbans zays i sirts jer* ‘‘and you shall put these words in your hearts’’ : *καὶ ἐμβαλεῖτε τὰ ρήματα ταῦτα εἰς τὴν καρδίαν ὑμῶν*. Ezekiel 3.10: *dir i srti k’um* : *λαβὲ εἰς τὴν καρδίαν σου*. Revelations 17.17: *astuac ed i sirts noc’a* : *ὁ γὰρ θεὸς ἔδωκεν εἰς τὰς καρδίας αὐτῶν*.

The formula is also found in Middle Armenian, e.g. Vardan Aygekc’i: *i srtums dri zk’o xōsk’d* ‘‘in mein Herz habe ich deine Rede niedergelegt’’ (transl. Karst 1901: 4). In view of the locative form in *-um*, this passage is frequently cited as an example of early EastArm. dialectal features in Vardan (Yovnanean 1897, 1: 254; Karst 1901: 4 = 2002: 14-15; H. Muradyan 1972: 15).

In the late medieval dictionary entitled *Bargirk’ hayoc’* [Amalyan 1975: 296^{Nr422}], the verb *sp’op’em* ‘to comfort, console’ is rendered by *sirt dnel* and *kazdurel* (see also MiġHayBař 2, 1992: 329b). Note also ModArm. *sirt(ə) dnel* ‘to hide emotions in oneself; to be devoted to something, work zealously’ [HayLezDarġBař 1975: 523b, 525a] and dialectal *sirt dnel* ‘to encourage’ (Akn, Malat’ia, Łarabał), ‘to work zealously’ (Xarberd), ‘to satisfy’ (Nor Juła), see HayLezBrbBař 5, 2008: 335a.

A textual illustration for **sirt dnel* can be found in a Łarabał folk-tale (1929, Šuši) in the meaning ‘to give hope, encourage’: *Iti ink’ə ūrān sært tinelav aspasəm*

a darvišin “In this way giving herself hope (lit. putting heart), (she) is waiting for the *darviš*” [HŽHek‘ 5, 1966: 164]. See also L. Harut‘yunyan 1991: 307^{L4}: *Astvac ulurmə tənī mart‘in srtumə* “May God put the compassion into the heart of the man”.

Naturally, a careful philological analysis of this phrase is beyond of my scope here. Nevertheless, these examples taken from different stages of the history of Armenian can lead to a tentative reconstruction **sirt dnem* or *i srti dnem* ‘to put (hope, trust, belief, zeal, compassion) in one’s heart’.

The heart was obviously regarded as the organ of belief and spirit in both historical and recent times, cf. Agat‘angelos § 690 (1909=1980: 358^{L8}; transl. Thomson 2001: 223): *tal zHogin Astucoy bnakel i sirts mardkan* “to make the Spirit of God dwell in men’s hearts”. According e.g. to a 20th century record from Arčak, Van-region (S. Avagyan 1978: 105a), one believed that *hisani xokyin sər̄ti tayn i* “the soul of a person is under his heart”.

Remarkably, this was the case also in the period of PIE, as is clear from a similar formula that is securely reconstructed as PIE **kred-d^hedh₁-* ‘to put heart’, ‘sein Herz setzen auf etwas’, cf. Skt. *śrād dhā* ‘to trust’, *śraddhā*- f. ‘confidence, devotion’, Lat. *crēdō, crēdere* ‘to believe, trust; to entrust’, etc. For other forms and a discussion, see Schmitt 1967: 18, 216-219; Benveniste 1969, 1: 171-179 = 1973: 138-144 (sceptical); Ivanov 1976a: 259; 1981: 143-148; Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 800-801, 833-834 = 1995, 1: 701-702, 732; Schrijver 1991: 134-135; Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 663; Mallory/Adams 1997: 263a¹²⁰.

sirt or **sird** (vars. *sēron-sirt, seron-sird*) ‘hoarfrost bringing wind’, only in Anania Širakac‘i, 7th cent, with meteorological description (HAB 4: 220a; A. G. Abrahamyan 1940: 32^{L15}).

●ETYM Ačařyan (HAB 4: 220a) rejects the connection with Pers. *sard* ‘cold’ on formal and semantic grounds and leaves the origin of the word open. The Persian word belongs with YAv. *sarəta-* ‘cold’, Lith. *šāltas* ‘cold’, etc. from IE **kolh₁to-* (see s.v. *sar̄n* ‘ice’ on this word).

One may assume a connection with OCS *sěverь* ‘North, north wind’, Lat. *caurus* m. ‘north-western wind’, etc. For the determinative *-t-* cf. Arm. *c‘urt* ‘cold’ (q.v.), probably belonging here too. The determinative *-t-* may be derived from IE **-d-* seen e.g. in Oss. *særd/særdæ* ‘summer’, YAv. *sarəd-* f. ‘year’, Skt. *śarād-* f. ‘autumn; year’, possibly from ‘warm season’ if a derivative in **(e)d-* from **k^hl_h1-*: Lat. *calēre* ‘to be warm’, etc. (see Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 616; Cheung 2002: 223; cf. Schrijver 1991: 206-207)¹²¹.

Arm. *sirt* may be derived from QIE **k^her₁uer-d-* through contraction **-ēwe-* > **-iwe-* > *-i-* (cf. 2.1.33.1), and a zero-grade form QIE **k^hur-d-* could be reflected in *c‘urt*. Note that in the latter case we may be dealing with the possible development **k^hH* > Arm. *c‘* (see 2.1.18.1). Needless to say, this interpretation is highly hypothetical, particularly because *sirt/d* is a hapax.

¹²⁰ Orel 1995: 117 introduces Hebrew parallels for this formula.

¹²¹ If *sird* is the original reading variant, we have to posit a QIE **-t-* (cf. YAv. *sarəta-* ‘cold’, etc. above), with a regular voicing **-rt-* > Arm. *-rd-*, or **-d^h-* (see s.v. *awd* ‘air’, another atmospheric word).

siwn, *an*-stem: GDSg *sean*, ISg *seam-b*, AblSg *siwn-ē* (Exodus 26.32), NPI *siwn-k'*, API *siwn-s*, GDPI *sean-c'*, IPI *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 *siin* [Ačarean 1935: 88, 388], Łarabał, Č'aylu, etc. *siin* [Davt'yan 1966: 470], Hadrut' *siin* [A. Połosyan 1965: 34], Hačən *sin* [Ačaryan 2003: 88, 338], Svedia *sayn* [Ačaryan 2003: 399, 587], or *sāyn* (see Andreasyan 1967: 383a, but cf. 32), or *szyn* (see Hananyan 1995: 197b), Lori *sin* [M. Asatryan 1968: 60, 192a], Ararat *sun* [Baldasaryan-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*, *-οῦς* 'column, pillar' [NHB 2: 716b; Dervischjan 1877: 102]. Three reconstructions have been proposed: **kī(i)ōn* [Hübschmann 1897: 490; HAB 4: 221b; Pokorny 1959: 598; Ĵahukyan 1982: 43, 108, cf. 222₄₃; Mallory/Adams 1997: 28, 29 (otherwise: 442a)]; **kī(u)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]; **kīsōn* (for the references, see HAB 4: 222a; Clackson 1994: 140). In view of Myc. *ki-wo-qe* 'and a pillar' (see Clackson 1994: 140), **kīuōn* 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 a discussion and references, see especially Clackson 1994: 140-141.

Clackson (1994: 141-142) reconstructs NSg **kīwōm*, NPI **kīwŋmes* or NDU **kīwŋm(e)h₁*, assuming that the plural (dual) form might be reflected in Arm. *seam-k'* (pl.) 'doorpost'. Beekes (2000: 21₁) points out that the reconstruction **kīwŋmes* for *seam-k'* is unacceptable, and that "it may have generalized *am* < *ŋ* 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 **kīuōn* were unsuccessful (see Clackson 1994: 141-142, with a thorough critical analysis). Likewise unconvincing is the assumption that **kīH-uon-* "derived ultimately by laryngeal metathesis from **kīHi-uon-* which would derive from **kēH(i)-* 'sharpen', i.e., a pointed pole or stake" [Volpe/Adams/Mallory apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 442a].

According to Clackson (1994: 141, 142-143), **kīuōn* 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 *tiu* (see Ĵahukyan 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 **k-* into Arm. *s-*), see Clackson 1994: 142-143; cf. also Ĵahukyan 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. *κίλων* and Arm. *siwn* from

PIE **(s)kiHu-* ‘shin’: Russ. *cévka* ‘bobbin; (esp. hollow) bone; (dial.) shinbone’, OEngl. *scīa* ‘shin, leg’, Indo-Iranian **Hast-čiHya-*: Skt. *aṣṭhīvā(nt)-* ‘shin, shank’ and Av. *ascuuā-* ‘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.

slak‘, *a*-stem: IPI *slak‘-a-w-k‘* (P‘awstos Buzand 5.35 and Sebēos 11), AblSg *i slak‘-ē* (Grigor Narekac‘i); later *o*-stem: ISg *slak‘-o-v* (Epiphanius of Cyprus, Čarəntir) ‘arrow, pointed arrow, javelin, pike, point of arrow or lance’.

Attested in Proverbs 25.18, Psalms 54.22/23, P‘awstos Buzand 4.51, 5.35 (1883=1984: 137^{L4}, 200^{L17}; transl. Garsoian 1989: 168, 217), Movsēs Xorenac‘i 1.11 (1913=1991: 36^{L20}; transl. Thomson 1978: 87-88), Sebēos 11 (Xaç‘atryan/Eliazaryan 2005: 72^{L8}; transl. Thomson 1999: 22), Ephrem, etc.

●ETYM Since long (Dervischjan 1877: 4; Lidén 1906: 78-80), derived from PIE **kúH-lo-*: Skt. *śúla-* m. n. ‘spear, javelin, roasting-spit’ (RV+), Lat. *culex* ‘mosquito, gnat, midge’, OIr. *cuil* ‘mosquito, gnat’, Welsh *cylion* ‘midges’; accepted by Meillet p.c. 1931 apud HAB 4: 224a; Ačařyan HAB ibid.; Pokorny 1959: 626; Jahukyan 1987: 133; Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 651-652; Mallory/Adams 1997: 537a. The form **kūl-* with a short vowel seen in Latin and Celtic may reflect **kHul-*, but a secondary shortening is possible too (Schrijver 1991: 239, 527).

Arm. *slak‘* may be interpreted as PArm. **sulo-* > **sul-* + *-ak‘* or **sula-* (from QIE fem. **k(o)ul-eh₂-*) + *-k‘* < **-k-eh₂-*. For the suffix *-(a)k‘*, see e.g. s.v. *c‘amak‘*, *a*-stem ‘dry, dry land’. Further see Olsen 1999: 70 who compares the structure of *slak‘* with that of Lat. *culex*.

***slul** (dial.) ‘cold, coldness’.

●DIAL Ararat, Van, Muš, Č‘enkiler-Nikomidia *slul*, Širak *slol* subst. ‘cold, coldness’ [Amatuni 1912: 592b; Ačařean 1913: 972a]; Ararat, Van *sll-a-tar* ‘sensitive to cold, chilly (person); damaged by cold’ [Amatuni 1912: 592a; Ačařean 1913: 972a], lit. ‘taken by cold’.

●ETYM See s.v. *sarñ* ‘ice’.

sxal ‘mistake, failure; crime’, **sxalem**, **sxalim** ‘to err, be mistaken; to stumble; to fail, miss’ (Bible+).

●DIAL Widespread in the dialects. In some dialects (Ararat, T‘iflis, Ĵuła, Marała): *stal*, with voicing of the *-x-*. Akn and Nor Naxiřewan have *ztal*, with an initial *zt-*; cf. also Muš verbal *zattel* ‘to be mistaken’ (a misprint for *ztalel*?) [HAB 4: 225a]. On the literary evidence for *zt-*, as well as the semantics of the Nor Naxiřewan form, see s.v. *sxalak*.

Ačařean (1926: 96) points out that the development *x* > Marała *t* is exceptional.

Tigranakert *zəlaxvil* ‘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 **ztal-v-il*, with metathesis.

●ETYM See s.v. *šel* ‘slanting, crooked, oblique’.

sxalak ‘drunken, tipsy’ (Isaiah 24.20), **sxalakim** ‘to become drunken, tipsy, inebriated’ (Philo), **sxatakim** ‘id.’ (P‘awstos), **sxalakanam** (John Chrysostom), etc.

In Isaiah 24.20: *ibrew zarbealn ew zsxalak* “like a drunken man” (= Gr. *ὡς 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 Naxijewan: *ztalet* ‘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. *μεθ-σφαλέω* nachgemacht”. As demonstrated by Ačarjan (HAB 4: 225a), however, the dialectal (Nor Naxijewan *ztalet* ‘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’.

skesur, *a*-stem: GDSg *skesr-i*, AblSg *i skesr-ē* (Bible+), ISg *skesr-a-w* (John Chrysostom, Philo) ‘husband’s mother’ (Bible+); **kesur** in Eznik Kołbac‘i is usually taken as a dialectal form (NHB 2: 719b, cf. 1: 1089c; HAB 4: 228a; L. Hovhannisyan 1991: 26); **skesr-ayr** (according to NHB, also *skesr-eay*), GDSg *skesrayr-i* (1 Kings 4.21), AblSg *i skesr-ayr-ē* (Barseł Čon) ‘husband’s father’ (Bible+).

●DIAL The forms *skesur* and *kesur* ‘husband’s mother’ are widespread in the dialects [HAB 4: 228b].

For ‘husband’s father’ Ačarjan (HAB 4: 228b) mentions *Ĵuła skesrɔr* and *Xarberd gesar*. In other dialects it has been replaced by recent compounds, such as *Zeyt‘un ɔsgɔsuy-bɔb* ‘husband’s father’ = **skesur-pap* lit. ‘father at husband’s mother’ vs. *zək‘ənc‘-bɔb* ‘wife’s father’ = *zok‘ənc‘* ‘wife’s mother’ + *pap* ‘father’, thus ‘father at wife’s mother’ (HAB 1: 193a; Ačarjan 2003: 308, 338).

●ETYM Belongs with PIE **suekru-h₂-* f. ‘mother-in-law’: Skt. *śvaśrū-*, NPers. *xusrū*, Pashto *xwāše*, Gr. *ἐκνρά*, Lat. *socrus*, OHG *swigar*, OCS *svekry*, etc.

Arm. *skesur*, *-a-* and Gr. *ἐκνρά* derive from QIE fem. **suekur-(e)h₂-*, with *-ur-* which has been taken from the PIE form for ‘father-in-law’, **suekur-o-*: Skt. *śvāsura-*, YAv. *xⁿasura-*, MPers., NPers. *xusur*, Pashto *sxar*, Gr. *ἐκνρός*, Lat. *socer*, OLat. *socerus*, OHG *swehur*, CS *svekrъ* (**swešur-* was replaced by **swekr* < **swekr-* analogically after *svekry* ‘mother-in-law’, see Derksen 2008: 475), Lith. *šėšuras*, etc. The Armenian, Indic and Baltic forms are explained through a distant assimilation **s...k̂ > *k̂...k̂*. The Armenian word for ‘father-in-law’ was replaced by *skesr-ayr*, a compound with *ayr* ‘man, husband’; cf. Lat. *socer-pater*, Germ. *Schwiegervater*, etc.

For the etymology and a discussion of various issues related with this term, see Meillet 1896: 152; Hübschmann 1897: 491; Scheftelowitz 1904-05, 1: 290-292; Lidén 1911: 381-384; HAB 4: 228 with more references; Kortlandt 1976: 96-97 = 2003: 6 (with a thorough description within the chronological framework); Szemerényi 1977: 63-67; Greppin 1984: 94; Saradževa 1986: 257-258; Pârvulescu 1989a: 79-88; Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 675-676; Olsen 1999: 189; Viredaz 2003:

68₃₈ (**swekūrā* > **sweśura* > **śweśura* > *skesur*). For the problem of **kū-* > *sk-*, see also 2.1.21.

skund, *a*-stem (NHB 2: 722a without evidence) ‘dog, puppy’ (Grigor Magistros, Nersēs Šnorhali).

- DIAL Ačāryan (HAB 4: 231a) hesitantly mentions Ewdokia *kondik* ‘puppy’.
- ETYM Compared with OHG *hunt*, Germ. *Hund* ‘dog’, etc., from **kūon-to-*, cf. also Arm. *šun* ‘dog’ (Hübschmann 1877: 17, 21₁; Lidén 1911: 381-385; HAB 4: 230b with more references; Meillet 1936: 50-51; Specht 1947: 32, 221; Solta 1960: 57, 57₄; Hanneyan 1998: 160-161); for references and a discussion of the anlaut problem, see 2.1.21. For non-IE comparable forms (e.g. OChin. **koond* ‘big dog’) see s.v. *šun* ‘dog’.

Alternatively, Arm. *skund* is compared with Slav. **ščen-* ‘puppy’, Wakhi *skən*, *skön* ‘puppy’, etc. (see Pedersen 1905: 197; 1906: 422 = 1982: 59, 200; Grammont 1918 HAB 4: 230b; Abaev 1965: 14, 21-22; Kortlandt 1976: 96 = 2003: 6; sceptical: Greppin 1984: 93-94; Ravnæs 1991: 141-142, 166; cf. Schrijver 1991: 461).

***st-** (dial.) ‘ice, frost’.

- DIAL Dial. ***st-on** ‘ice pieces on river’ [DialAdd apud NHB 2: 1066c], Muš *stən* ‘id.’ [Amatuni 1912: 594a]; ***st-i(n)** ‘ice pieces on river, icy layer on river, hoarfrost’: Muš *šti*, Margari-Ējmiacin *stin* ‘ice pieces on river’ [Amatuni 1912: 594a], Nor Bayazet *stin* ‘very thin icy layer on river or water’ [Ačāfean 1913: 974b], Alaškert (Aparan-Aragac) *sətin* ‘ice, hoarfrost’ [Madat‘yan 1985: 239b]. Amatuni (1912: 705b) records also *stin* ‘frozen fruit (said of apple, pear, grapes)’ in the village of Zeyva, Ējmiacin district.
- ETYM See s.v. *sarñ* ‘ice’.

smk‘im ‘to grow dry’; Ačāryan (HAB 4: 234-235) only cites dialectal forms and MidArm. caus. *smk‘ec‘uc‘anem* ‘to make dry’ (Geoponica, 13th cent.). He does not accept the connection with *c‘amak‘* - suggested in NHB 2: 724a and leaves the origin of the word open.

- ETYM For other MidArm. attestations, dialectal forms and etymology, see s.v. *c‘amak‘* ‘dry; earth’.

sořim ‘to crawl, creep; to move smoothly on, steal, glide’ (Bible+), **sořam** ‘id.’ (John Chrysostom, Nersēs Šnorhali, “Čarəntir”, etc.), **soř-m-im** ‘id.’ (hapax, John Chrysostom); **sořun**, *o*-stem ‘reptile’ (Bible+; see Olsen 1999: 602-606), **soř-osk-**, in the verb *sořoske/im* ‘to glide, steal’ (Gregory of Nyssa, Paterica, Grigor Magistros, Nersēs Lambronac‘i, etc.) and a number of derivatives (Philo, Anania Narekac‘i, Grigor Magistros, Nersēs Lambronac‘i, etc.); **soř** ‘creeping’ (noun) in Łazar P‘arpec‘i (5th cent.), ‘creeping’ (adj.) in the Alexander Romance.

- DIAL The verb **sořam** is widespread in the dialects. The root **soř** is present in Łazax, in the compound verbs **soř linel* ‘to glide’, **soř tal* ‘to creep’. Hačən turkized *sořulmiš nəl* ‘to creep’ (or *sutulmiš nəl*, see Ačāryan 2003: 338). Derivatives: Van **soř-an* ‘creeping (animal)’, Van **soř-soř-ik* ‘lizard’, Łarabał, etc. **p‘or-a-soř* ‘creeping on one’s belly’ [HAB 4: 240-241].

According to Andreasyan (1967: 35), Svedia has *c‘util*, with an unclear *c‘-*. This is hardly a misprint (though in 383a one only finds *s-*) since the form is mentioned in

a list of words which display irregular consonantal correspondences. Moreover, this form is corroborated by K'esab *jutum* 'to crawl, creep', *jutun* 'reptile' (see Č'olak'eān 1986: 40, 217b), which presupposes an older *c'- or j-.

●ETYM Petersson (1916: 256) links with Skt. *tsárati* 'to steal, sneak; to stalk, creep up on', *tsáru-* m. 'a crawling animal (snake)', derived from *(H)d (cf. Lat. *ad* 'to') + *sel- (cf. Lith. *selėti* 'to creep', etc.); see Pokorny 1959: 900; Jáhukyan 1967: 251; Mayrhofer EWAia 1: 687 (with reservation); Mallory/Adams 1997: 141a. Later, Petersson (1920: 84) proposes another, less probable etymology.

The root underlying Skt. *tsárati*, etc. may be reconstructed as *tsel- (Lubotsky, p.c.). In this case, we are dealing with a development *tsV- > Arm. *sV- (cf. 2.1.22.5). As to the o-grade, one may tentatively assume that the original unattested PArm. verb *sel- took it from the deverbative *soł* 'creeping' attested in Łazar P'arpec'i (5th cent.) and in the Alexander Romance, and preserved in the dialect of Łazax. Compare *gat-* 'to hide, conceal' (late attestations; dialects) vs. *got* 'thief' and *gotanam* 'to steal' (both: Bible+, widespread in the dialects), *gotem* 'to hide' (Afrāhat/Zgōn, Paterica, Michael the Syrian). Or else, the verb *soł-* is an old iterative, as *gorcem* 'to work' (q.v.), on which see Meillet 1922i.

It is attractive to interpret Svedia and K'esab *c'ot- as an archaic reflex of IE *ts-.

Alternatively, the Armenian word may belong to PIE *kel-: Skt. *sárman-* n. 'cover, shelter, protection', OIr. *celid* 'to hide', Lat. *cēlāre* 'to hide', etc. (see Schrijver 1991: 124-125; Mayrhofer EWAia 2: 620); for the semantics compare Yazgh. *sar-/sard* 'to creep, steal, sneak up to, lie in ambush, spy upon', if indeed belongs here (see Morgenstierne 1974: 75a).

sosord, o-stem: ISg *sosord-o-v* 'throat' (Severian of Gabala, Gregory of Nyssa, etc.); *sos(o)r* 'id.' (Galen); dial. **sor-sor-ik* 'belly of animals'.

●DIAL Bulanəx *sor-sor-ik* 'belly of animals' [HAB 4: 244b].

●ETYM Ač'āryan (HAB 4: 244) rejects all the etymological suggestions, among them also the connection with *sor* 'hole, cave' (q.v.) suggested by Lidén 1906: 134. This etymology can be taken seriously especially if one accepts the appurtenance of Toch. B *kor* n. 'throat' to this PIE etymon (see Adams 1999: 203-204 for Tocharian).

In view of late *sos(o)r* and dialectal *sor-sor-ik*, we may tentatively posit a PArm. reduplicated **so(r)-sor* 'throat', which later became *sosord* through contamination with *kokord* 'throat'.

sor, o-stem: GDPI *sor-o-c* ' (Jeremiah 48.28) 'cave, hole, hollow; den, lair' (Bible+); *sorem* 'to go into (a cave, etc.)' (Bible+), *sor-sor-em* 'to be dispersed' (Bible+), etc.

A few textual illustrations:

In P'awstos Buzand 6.16, 5th cent. (1883=1984: 230^{L-7}; transl. Garsoian 1989: 239): *i sors k'aranjawac* ' "in stony caves"); *k'ar-anjaw* is composed of *k'ar* 'stone' and *anjaw* 'cave'.

In Grigor Narekac'i 40.2 (Xač'atryan/Łazinyan 1985: 409^{L16}; Russ. transl. 1988: 143; Engl. transl. 2001: 199): *Oč' p'apark' p'osic*, *oč' sork' heletac* : Ни впадины ям, ни русла потоков : "Nor cavities of pits, or beds of streams".

In Sebēos (7th cent.), Chapter 20 (Xač'atryan/Eřiazaryan 2005: 102^{L-6}; transl. Thomson 1999: 39): *ew ink'eank' aysr ew andr sorsoreal xusap'ein* "Then they dispersed here and there and stole away".

●DIAL Preserved in a few dialects referring to the continuous outflow of something from a hole [HAB 4: 246a]. Tʼiflis *soro* ‘hole, den, nest’ is a back loan from Georg. *soro* ‘hole, den, lair’ < PArm. **soro-* [HAB 4: 246].

●ETYM Related with Gr. *κῶρα* n. ‘a hole, as the eye of a needle; orifice of the ear’, Lat. *caverna* ‘cavern, grotto, cave, hole’, Skt. *śūna-* n. ‘emptiness’, YAv. *sūra-* ‘lacuna’, etc., see Meillet 1898: 278; Hübschmann 1899: 49; HAB 4: 246a; Pokorny 1959: 592-593; Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 650 (without the Armenian form); Mallory/Adams 1997: 96a¹²².

Arm. *sor* is usually derived from QIE **kouH(e)ro-* through vocalic assimilation and loss of *-w-*; for a discussion and various views, see Pisani 1950: 185; Ĵahukyan 1959: 233; 1990a: 9-10; Eichner 1978: 150₂₇; Ę. Tumanjan 1978: 183; Ałabekyan 1979: 86-87; Kortlandt 1980: 102; 1993: 10-11 = 2003: 29-30, 102-103; Ravnæs 1991: 81; Mallory/Adams 1997: 96a; Adams 1999: 204.

An alternative etymology has been proposed for the Iranian word: MPers. *sūrag* ‘hole, burrow’, MPers., NPers. *sūrāx* ‘hole’ [MacKenzie 1971: 78], Zor. Pahl. *sūrāk* ‘hole’, Pashto *sūrai* ‘hole’ < **subra-ka-*, cf. NPers. *surb* ‘cavern’, Skt. *śvābhra-* n. ‘Grube, Kluft, Erdspalte’, etc. (see Wikander 1974; Bailey 1979: 11b; Lubotsky 1988: 92; Lubotsky 2001a: 52-53; Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 675).

According to Adams (1999: 203-204), PIE **kūHr* ‘hole, opening’ may be reflected also in Toch. B *kor* n. ‘throat (both internal and external)’. If this is accepted, one is tempted to consider also Arm. *sosord* ‘throat’, dial. *sor-sor-ik* ‘belly’ (q.v.).

Arm. *sor* may reflect QIE **kouH(e)ro-* or, perhaps better, if the PIE word belonged to the **-r/n-* heteroclitic declension, old nominative **kouH-r* (cf. Gr. *κῶρα* n. ‘hole’) + thematic **-o-*, as Arm. *hur*, *o-*stem ‘fire’ (q.v.). Thus: **kouH-r* > PArm. **sówər* > **so(w)or* through assimilation and subsequent loss of *-w-*; or, less probably, **sow-r* > *sor*, with *-wr* > *-r* (see 2.1.23, 2.1.33.1). For the loss of **-u-* in similar conditions, see s.vv. *alewr* ‘flour’, *jor* ‘ravine’, *nor* ‘new’.

sprik ‘completely, perfectly’. Only in Socrates (see HAB 4: 266-267).

●ETYM According to Ačařyan (HAB 4: 266-267; see also Ĵahukyan 1959: 234), belongs with MidArm. *sprkik* ‘clean, pure’ and ClArm. *surb* (q.v.). In my view, it rather derives from Pahl. *spurrīk* ‘entire, complete, perfect’ (for which see MacKenzie 1971: 76; Nyberg 1974: 179a). Compare also Arm. *spar* and *spur* [HAB 4: 260-261].

stin, *an-*stem: GDSg *stean*, AblSg *i sten-ē*, ISg *steam-b*, GDPl *stean-c*‘, AblPl *i stean-c*‘, IPl *steam-b-k*‘ ‘breast of a woman’ (Bible+); *stn-di*, *-deay*, *-deac*‘ ‘milk-drinking (baby)’ (Bible+).

●ETYM Connected with Skt. *stāna-* m. ‘breast of a woman, mother’s breast, nipple’ (the comparison already in NHB 746a), *viśvā-psnya-* ‘providing milk/food to all’, YAv. *fštāna-* m ‘breast of a woman’, MPers., NPers. *pestān* ‘breast’, Gr. *στήνιον-στήθος* (Hesychius), Lith. *spenys* ‘nipple’, etc., cf. also Gr. *στήθος, -εος* n. ‘breast (of both sexes)’. See Hübschmann 1897: 493; Meillet 1978 (< 1923, BSL 23: 96): 192;

¹²² On the identification of Gr. *κῶρα* and Av. *sūra-* m. ‘Loch’ with Av. *sūra-* m. ‘hero’ see Frisk 1966: 35-38 (< 1938: 5-8). Note also the Armenian male anthroponyms *Sur* and *Suray*.

HAB 4: 275a with more references; Pokorny 1959: 990; Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 752; Mallory/Adams 1997: 81-82.

The anlaut of the PIE word (perhaps simplified from **spt-*, **pst-* or the like) and the *an*-declension of the Armenian word are troublesome. For a discussion see, apart from the references above, Pedersen 1906: 415 = 1982: 193; Ĵahukyan 1959: 177-178; Ravnæs 1991: 7, 171; Clackson 1994: 99; Olsen 1999: 135-136; Beekes 2003: 198.

The IE by-form **psten-* is considered a lexical agreement which unites Indo-Iranian, Greek and Armenian (see Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 1: 418 = 1995, 1: 365; Clackson 1994: 237_{6,4}). However, here belongs also, most probably, Toch. A *päsšäm*, B *päścane* dual 'woman's breasts' < PToch. **päścäne* < PIE thematic dual **pstenō*, cf. Skt. dual *stānā* (Duchesne-Guillemin 1940: 169; Mallory/Adams 1997: 81b; Adams 1999: 382).

sring (or *srink*), *a*-stem: GDSg *srng/ki*, GDPl *srng-a-c'*, IPl *srng-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. *σῶριγξ*, *-ιγγος* f. 'shepherd's pipe, panpipe', which is considered to be of Phrygian or Mediterranean origin (see thoroughly HAB 4: 283-284; Ĵahukyan 1987: 310; Greppin 1990b: 35). Gr. *σῶριγξ* and the synonymous *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.vv.). Ačāryan (1937: 3) treats Arm. *sring* and Greek *σῶριγξ* as borrowed from Phrygian, pointing out that the Armenian "ne peut pas être emprunté au grec, mais précisément au phrygien". Olsen 1999: 928 considers *sring* to be a Greek loanword.

Ačāryan (HAB 4: 284a) notes that Arm. *sring* might also be connected with Skt. *śṅga-* n. 'horn' (RV+) < **kr-n-g^(w)o-*, a derivative of PIE **ker(h₂)-* 'horn', but sound correspondences are irregular. On this and other issues, see Greppin 1990b and 1990c. One might assume **kr(H)-en-g-* or the like (cf. Skt. *pataṅgá-* adj. 'flying', m. 'bird; flying horse; sun' from heteroclitic **pat-r-* : **pat-an-g-*, see Nussbaum 1986: 13; Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 72-73, 75). On this and other issues, see Greppin 1990b and 1990c. Further, see s.v. *srun-k'* 'shin'.

To conclude, Arm. *sring* and Gr. *σῶριγξ* reflect a non-Indo-European Mediterranean cultural term, which may be of an ultimate IE origin. If the latter statement is accepted, we may be dealing with a late IE cultural back loan comparable to the cases of *agarak* 'landed property, estate', *burgn* 'tower, pyramis' and *durgn* 'potter's wheel' (see s.vv.).

srun-k' *i*-stem: GDPl *srōn-i-c'* (note *-ō-*, = *-aw-*) once in the Bible and in Paterica; *n*-stem: GDPl *sruan-c'* (twice in Nonnus of Nisibis), *srān-c'* (John Chrysostom, Anania Širakac'i), *o*-stem: GDPl *srn-o-c'* (Anania Širakac'i), etc. 'shin, shank; the leg', in Acts 3.7, perhaps, 'ankle', see Olsen 1999: 79 (= Gr. *σφουδρά*) (Bible+). Spelled also as *srungn*, *srunkn*, *srōn-k'* (in Vardan Aygekc'i; see above on GDPl *srōn-ic'*), etc. The compound *srn-a-pan-k'* 'greaves' (for the structure, see Olsen 1999: 322-323) is attested first in 1 Kings 17.6, in the story of David and Goliath: *srnapank' pñjik' i veray barjic' noray* = Gr. *καὶ κνημῖδες χαλκαῖ ἐπάνω τῶν 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*^v ‘the stem ends of wheat remaining attached to the soil after mowing (stubble)’ [HAB 4: 286a] (see also Orbeli 2002: 325, *sərunğ*^v). Ačaryan (HAB 4: 286a) questions whether Karin, Axalc‘xa *srnk‘-t-il* ‘to slip and fall down’ belongs here, too.

●ETYM Hübschmann (1881: 176; 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. *śróṇi-* 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].¹²³ One alternatively considers Arm. *srun-k‘* an Iranian loan, although in this case the semantics is remote (see Ĵahukyan 1981: 27-28; 1987: 176, 551; L. Hovhannisyan 1990: 215; Beekes 2003: 175, 196). For a 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 shinbone 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’ and *sring* ‘pipe’ (q.v.). In view of synonymous words containing the suffix *-un* (see s.v. *c‘awł*, *c‘awł-un* ‘stem, stalk; straw’), one may interpret Arm. *srun-k‘* as **sru-un* or **sru-wn*. In this respect, note especially GDPI *sruan-c‘*, which presupposes nom. **sru-w/mn* (see 2.1.22.11).

sulem ‘to whistle’ (Philo, Yovhannēs Ōjnec‘i, etc.), **slem** ‘id.’ (Grigor Magistros).

●DIAL Zeyt‘un, Svedia, Hamšen redupl. *sl-vl-* ‘to whistle’, Sved. *sl-vl-uk* ‘flute’, Van *sul-sul-* ‘to whistle’ [HAB 4: 242]. Hamšen *slvluš* refers to the whistling or hissing of people, birds and snakes [Ačaryan 1947: 253].

●ETYM Compared with Skt. *śvasiti* ‘to hiss, pant, snort’, Lith. *švañkšti* ‘to wheeze’, Olc. *hvæsa* ‘to hiss, snort’, Engl. *whistle*, etc., as well as Arm. *šunč‘* ‘breath, blowing, wind’ (q.v.); a possible proto-form of Arm. **soyl-* is QIE **keul-*; see Petersson 1916: 255; Pokorny 1959: 632; Ĵahukyan 1987: 133.

Ačaryan (HAB 4: 242a) does not accept the etymology and leaves the origin of the word open. He points out that the resemblance with Georg. *sivili* ‘whistling or hissing of arrows, snakes’ is accidental. This word is reminiscent of Arm. dial. *slvl-*, although the nature of relation is hard to determine.

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, etc.; GSg *snkan* in “Tōnanamak” and Yaysmawurk‘ (both – in the second meaning) [NHB 2: 732a; MiĴHayBař 2, 1992: 339a]. Dial. ‘(tree-)mushroom’.

¹²³ On a discussion of Gr. *κλόνις*, etc. see Huld 1997.

●DIAL Dialectally ubiquitous. The final nasal has been preserved in Ĵuła *sungn*, Ararat *sungə*, Agulis *sóngən*, Łarabał *sóng'nə*, *sýnə*. 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^v*, GSG *səng^v-ə^ε*, NPI *səng^v-ir* [Orbeli 2002: 326].

Ararat (Vałaršapat/Ējmiacin, Borč'alu/Lori) *sokon* [Amatuni 1912: 595b]; according to Nawasardeanc' (1903: 108b), also *səkə*. Borrowed from Georg. *soko* '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 Lidén (1933: 51-52), the abnormal sound correspondences (on which, see Furnée 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 (Lidén op. cit. 52₁; 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".

Ačaryan (HAB 4: 252a) treats Georg. *soko* 'mushroom' as an Armenian loan, and Arm. dial. *səkən* as a back-loan from Georgian. However, the word is present in all Kartvelian languages: **soko-* 'mushroom': Georg. (not in OGeorg.), Megrel., Laz *soko*, Svan *sok(w)* 'id.'; as well as in Nakho-Dagestanian languages: Bezhta, Hunzib *zoko*, 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. **soko-* '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.; Rédei 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. *σπομός* '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.; see also Ałayan 1964: 306), which presupposes a radical **soyt*.

●DIAL Dialectally ubiquitous. [HAB 4: 253b].

●ETYM Connected with Gr. *ψεύδομαι* ‘to lie’, *ψεῦδος* n. ‘lie’, also *ψύδος*, *ψύθος* [Bugge 1893: 25-26; HAB 4: 253], as well as, perhaps, Slovak. *šudit’* ‘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 reconstruct a PD neuter *s*-stem paradigm (NSg **pséudos*, GSg **psud-és-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 a discussion); *srb-an* ‘anus’ in Zgōn (Afrhat), dial. **srb-an-k* ‘placenta’.

For a non-religious context, see e.g. Hexaameron [K. Muradyan 1984: 76^{L19}]. For a general discussion of literary and dialectal data, see Mesropyan 2001.

In atmospheric context, *surb* ‘clean, bright’ is frequent in “Կաթնաբեր անասունները” by Anania Širakac‘i, 7th cent. (A. G. Abrahamyan 1944: 304ff).

MidArm. *sprkik*, *sprik*, *spkik*, *srbkik*, etc. (Nersēs Lambronac‘i, Ansizk‘, etc.) [NHB 2: 740ab; HAB 4: 256a; MijHayBař 2, 1992: 344ab]. In “Bžškaran jioy” (13th cent.), e.g.: *spkik* (Č‘ugaszyan 1980: 66 [three times], 71^{L16}, 110 [twice]); *sprkik* (52^{L4}); in the glossary: p. 238. Of these forms, *srb-k-ik* can be the original spelling. We are dealing with double diminutive. In this case, **srpkik* yielded *sprkik* through metathesis, to simplify the odd cluster *srpk-*.

Remarkably, one finds *supr* in the Latin-Armenian glossary of Autun [Weitenberg 1983: 18]. See below for a discussion.

●DIAL Dialectally ubiquitous [HAB 4: 256b].

**srb-an-k* ‘placenta’ in Łarabał [Ačařean 1913: 986a], Alaškert, Aparan, Sip‘an, Širak [Amatuni 1912: 308a], Bulanəx [S. Movsisyan 1972: 71b]. According to DialAdd apud NHB 2: 1067a: dial. *srb-an-k* ‘prenatal liquid of a cow’.

In Sivri-Hisar¹²⁴ one finds **surb* ‘a kind of small frog that lives in humid holes’ [Ačařean 1913: 981b]. Obviously, Ačařyan 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; cf. also Mesropyan 2001: 119) 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‘ **srb-or-ēk* ‘saints’ [Ačařean 1913: 986b], probably from coll. *srb-or-ay-k* .

¹²⁴ Not in Svedia, contra Mesropyan 2001: 119.

●ETYM Connected (since de Lagarde and Müller) with Skt. *śubhrá-* ‘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 **keu-* ‘to shine; bright’ : **ku-b^h-ro-*. Mostly treated as a native Armenian word [Hübschmann 1883: 50; 1897: 492; HAB 4: 256; Pokorny 1959: 594; Jähukyan 1987: 132; 1992: 21; Stempel 1988; L. Hovhannisyán 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 Jähukyan 1967b: 73). This is attractive, albeit uncertain. On some other uncertain cognates (Lycian, Phrygian), see e.g. Bugge 1897-1901, 1: 40; D’jakonov 1981: 71-72; Jähukyan 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; De Vaan 1999: 11. In view of the *o*-stem and regular metathesis **-b^hr- > -rb-*, Xaç‘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, namely **-b^h-* and **-ro-*, points to a shared innovation. Later, Xaç‘aturova (1979: 368) is inclined to the loan theory. Jähukyan (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 a 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; Cheung 2007: 368).

Since the root structure *T...D^h* is impossible in PIE, Lubotsky (1998a: 78-79; 2001a: 51) assumes a root with *s*-mobile, **(s)kub^h-ró-* : **(s)kub^h-* ‘clean, beautiful’, and connects the root with PIE **(s)keu(h₁)-* ‘to observe’: Gr. *κοέω* ‘to notice’, OHG *scouwōn* ‘to look at’, Goth. *skaums* ‘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 MidArm. *sprkik*, *sprik*, *spkik*, *srbkik*, etc. into consideration. The glossary is older than the MidArm. period (it has been compiled in or before the 9th century, see Weitenberg, op. cit. 13-14), so one might think that MidArm. *sprkik* directly reflects an OArm. unmetathesized by-form **subr-*, cf. Skt. *śubhrá-*. Since the development **-b^hro- > Arm. -rbo-* is unobjectionable and unvariable, one has to assume a by-form like **kub^h-r*, 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 *sp̄r-ik* ‘completely’ (in Socrates) belongs here, too. In my view, it rather derives from Pahl. *spurrīk* ‘entire, complete, perfect’ (for which see MacKenzie 1971: 76; Nyberg 1974: 179a). Compare also Arm. *spar̄* and *spur̄* [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’), go back to

*(s)ku-b^h-ro- rather than *k^u-b^h-ro-, and represent an Armenian-Indo(-Iranian) isogloss. Iranian origin of Arm. *surb* (an old borrowing with metathesis?) is not compelling.¹²⁵ For the anlaut development of Arm. *surb* from *(s)ku-b^h-ro- compare Arm. *sandut-k‘* ‘ladder, stairs’ vs. Lat. *scālae* ‘ladder’, *scandō* ‘to climb, mount, ascend’, etc. (see s.v.; compare also 2.1.22.5).

suk‘ ‘childless, sterile’, once in Zgōn-Afrahat said of a man, in contrast with *amul* ‘id.’ said of a woman: *ayr suk‘ ew kin amul*. For a philological analysis, see HAB 4: 257.

●ETYM The word was found by Ačāryan (HAB 4: 257), who does not record any etymology for it. The connection of *suk‘* with Gr. *ἀρχυός* ‘drought’, Russ. *suxoj* ‘dry’, etc. suggested by Jahukyan (1967: 252) must be considered untenable. It is not included by Jahukyan in his fundamental 1987.

I tentatively propose a comparison with Skt. *sūte* ‘to give birth, beget’, *sū-* f. ‘mother; birth’, *sūti-* f. ‘birth, origin’, *sūtu-* m. ‘pregnancy’, OIr. *suth* ‘birth, fruit’, etc. For the forms, see Pokorny 1959: 913-914; Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 714; Mallory/Adams 1997: 56b; see also s.v. *ustr* ‘son’. Arm. *suk‘* may be treated as a privative formation: *ḡ-suH-*, cf. Skt. *a-sū-* ‘nicht gebärend’.

Normally, a syllabic nasal gives Arm. *an-*. The absence of an *a-* here may be due to early loss of the initial syllabic nasal (on which see 2.1.11), although I know of no other example for this development. For the final *-k‘* compare e.g. *atok‘* ‘full, fat’, *barwok‘* ‘good, well’.

Thus: QIE **ḡ-suH-k-* ‘sterile, not capable of begetting or impregnating’ > **ḡ(n)su-k^h-* > *suk‘* ‘sterile’. Due to the loss of the privative **n-* the word became opaque early, and its privative structure was not sensed anymore. Probably this was the reason why no secondary *an-* forms have been re-made on the basis of **su-*. Compare *amul* ‘sterile, childless’ from a frozen privative formation **ḡ-pōlo-* vs. *ul* ‘kid’, and *ayri, ayrea-* ‘widow’ which synchronically seems to reflect an *i*-derivative of *ayr* ‘man, husband’ but should in fact be regarded as ‘husbandless’: **ḡ-Hnēr-ieh₂-* > PArm. **ananir-ia-* > *ayrea-*.

V

vat‘sun, *i*-stem: GDPI *vat‘sn-i-c‘* ‘sixty’ (Bible+).

●DIAL See s.v. *vec‘* ‘six’.

●ETYM Belongs to *vec‘* ‘six’ (q.v.) probably from QIE **suweks*. The explanation of the change *e* > *a* through the lowering influence of the *u* in the following syllable (Meillet 1936: 55; de Lamberterie 1978 271; Ravnæs 1991: 13; Clackson 1994 126-127, 206₂₁, 226₁₃₅) is disproved by PIE **peruti* > Arm. *heru* ‘last year’ (q.v.); for further references and a discussion, see s.vv. *asr* ‘fleece’, *catr* ‘laughter, mockery’, *kamurj* ‘bridge’, *tasn* ‘ten’. Most probably, the vowel *-a-* can be explained by

¹²⁵ Arm. *supr* (Autun), if not analogical after MidArm. *spr-k-ik* (metathesized from *srb-k-ik*), may be regarded as an Iranian loan.

assuming a zero-grade form taken from the ordinal, see Kortlandt 1994a: 255-256; 1996a: 57 = 2003: 100-101, 118; Beekes 2002 [2004]: 19; 2003: 156.

vay, *i*-stem: GDSg *vay-i* (Ezekiel 7.26, John Chrysostom, etc.), ISg *vay-i-w* (*vay z-vayiw* twice in Patmut'iwn srboc' Hrip'simeanc', see MovsXorenMaten 1865: 302^{L11f}), IPI *vay-i-w-k'* (Agat'angelos, Lewond, Aristakēs Lastivertc'i, Grigor Aršaruni); *o*-stem: GDSg *vay-o-y* (Agat'angelos, John Chrysostom), GDPI *vay-o-c'* (Paterica) 'cry of woe, disaster' (Bible, Agat'angelos, Elišē, John Chrysostom, etc.); **váy** 'ah! alas! woe!', abundant in the Bible (Astuacaturean 1895: 1391-1392), attested also in Eusebius of Caesarea, Hesychius of Jerusalem, Nersēs Lambronac'i, etc.; **vayem** 'to lament, utter a woe' in the Bible, P'awstos Buzand, Paterica, etc. [NHB 2: 775-776, 777-778].

A textual illustration of IPI *vay-i-w-k'* from Agat'angelos § 33 (1909=1980: 23^{L6f}, transl. Thomson 1976: 49): *Ew ink'eank' andrēn darjeal, vayiwk', čč'ovk' ew otbovk', ew amenayn erkirn žoloveal zt'agaworn ašxarēin* : "They themselves then returned with cries of woe and lamentation, and the whole land gathered to mourn the king".

●DIAL Widespread in the dialects [Ačarean 1913: 992-993].

●ETYM Not recorded in HAB and HAB-Add 1982.

An onomatopoeic word found in many languages (cf. NHB 2: 775c), probably inherited from PIE: Gr. *oái* 'alas!', Lat. *vae* 'ah! alas! woe!', Mir. *fae* 'alas', Goth. *vai* 'alas', etc. The preservation of **u-* in Armenian and Greek is undoubtedly due to the onomatopoeic/expressive nature of the word (Pokorny 1959: 1110; Ĵahukyan 1987: 198; Ravnæs 1991: 69; Mallory/Adams 1997: 313; Olsen 1999: 34, 787). Arm. *gayl* 'wolf' (q.v.), possibly belonging here as 'the howler', represents the regular sound change **u-* > Arm. *g-*.

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 Kołbac'i); **vayel-em** 'to enjoy' (Bible+), **vayel-uč'** 'decent; pleasant, delightful' (Bible+); for *-uč'*, see Olsen 1999: 616, with references and a discussion.

●DIAL The verb **vayel-el* 'to enjoy; to suit, be proper' is widespread in the dialects, mostly in contracted *vel-*. In Marała and Salmast: *level* metathesized from **velēl* [HAB 4: 300a; Ačarean 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. *ἔμαι* '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 Ačaryan (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 Drasxanakerc'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.

vadem ‘to drive away, destroy’ (John Chrysostom, Book of Chries).

●ETYM The verb has been compared with Goth. *wunds* ‘wounded’, etc. from **uen-* ‘to hit, wound’, see Scheftelowitz 1904-05, 2: 21, 43, 62; Pisani 1950: 185. Although accepted in Pokorny 1959: 1108 and Mallory/Adams 1997: 549a, the etymology is improbable. In view of the anlaut, the Armenian word can hardly be a native word (see HAB 4: 304b; Ravnæs 1991: 71).

veš-tasan, *i*-stem: GDPI *veštasan-i-c* ‘sixteen’ (Bible+).

●ETYM See s.v. *vec* ‘six’ probably from QIE **suweks*. The development **-ks-t-* > Arm. *-št-* in *veštasan* ‘sixteen’ should be explained in terms of the ruki-rule, see 2.1.12.

ver ‘upper brim’ (John 2.7, etc.), ***i ver*** ‘above, up, upwards’ (Bible+); ***i ver-a-y*** ‘on, over’ (Bible+), cf. pl. *ver-ay-s/c* (late); ***i ver-o-y*** ‘above, on top, from the top’ (Bible+); ***ver-in***, *o*-stem: GDSg *vern-o-y* adj. ‘upper, supreme’, ***ver-ust*** adj. ‘situated above’, ***i verust*** adv. ‘at/to a higher level, above, from above’, adv. ***verst-in*** ‘again, for the second time’ (all Bible+); ***veranam*** ‘to ascend, vanish’ (Bible+).

For the semantic contrast between *i veroy* ‘above, on top’ and *i veray* ‘on’ note Genesis 1.7 vs. 1.11 (Zeyt‘unyan 1985: 146, 147): *i meĵ ĵroyñ, or i veroy hastatut‘eann* (‘above the firmament’) : *ἀνὰ μέσον τοῦ ὕδατος ἐπάνω τοῦ στερεώματος*. <...> *i veray erkri* ‘upon the earth’ : *ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς*. For further attestations see AčařLiak 5, 1965: 174-177.

●DIAL CIArm. *i ver* and *i veray* are very widespread in the dialects (HAB 4: 331b; AčařLiak 5, 1965: 127, 176), but the preposition *i* has been lost almost everywhere, except for Svedia *i vir* and *ərva* (HAB 4: 331b; Ačařyan 2003: 588; Hananyan 1995: 198b) or *ərvan* (Andreasyan 1967: 384a), K‘esab *i vir*, *ərvä(n)* (Č‘olak‘ean 1986: 218a). For textual illustrations, see Svazlyan 1984: 181a (*irva-s* ‘on me’ in two oath formulae).

A number of dialects have also **verew*, cf. *stor-ew* ‘below’, etc. [HAB 4: 331b].

Particularly interesting are Łarabał, Hadrut‘, Goris, etc. *yer* and *yəra*, *yəřirä*, *yéře/i* [Davt‘yan 1966: 69-70, 477; Margaryan 1975: 95]. This development *v-* > *y-* is irregular [Ačařean 1899: 131] and is not easily explicable through a recent process, although there are also a few other examples, such as *Verginē* > *Yerginä* [Davt‘yan 1966: 70], *vayri* ‘wild’ > Goris *yeri* vs. *veri*, *vec* ‘six’ > Xnjoresk *yec‘c* vs. the basic Goris form *vec‘(c)* [Margaryan 1975: 95]. One might think of such examples as *yoyg* vs. *vēg* ‘a playing bone’, **yušap* vs. *višap* ‘dragon’, etc. On the other hand, it is tempting to treat Łarabał, etc. *yer* as an archaic reflex of *i ver* > **i(w)er* (cf. A. Połosyan 1974: 129-131).

●ETYM Since long (HAB 4: 330-331 with rich literature and a discussion), connected with Skt. *upāri* ‘above, over, upwards’, *ūpara-* ‘below, nearer’, YAv. *upara-* ‘upper, higher’, Gr. *ὑπερ* ‘over, plenty; beyond; above’, *ὑπέρα*, pl. *-αι* f. ‘upper ropes on the sails’, Lat. *s-uper* ‘above, on, over’, *superus* ‘upper; heavenly, celestial’, *suprā* ‘above, over, on the upper side of; beyond; earlier than; more than’,

OHG *ubir* ‘over’, OEngl. *ufera* ‘higher’, etc. (see Bugge 1889: 24; 1893: 56; Meillet 1936: 49-50; Pisani 1950: 184-185; Pokorny 1959: 1105; Schmitt 1981: 76, 189, 211; Mayrhofer EWAia 1, 1992: 220-221).

Also Arm. *ger* ‘above, higher, over, more than’ has been linked with these words (so also Meillet 1936: 49-50, although earlier, 1892: 164-165, he derived *ver* and *ger* from **uer-*; hesitantly Hübschmann 1897: 495; for further references, see HAB 4: 330-331).

For *ver-in*, *i veroy*, and *ver-ust*, see Olsen 466-468, 512, 620-621; for *ver-ay/oy* Schmitt 1981: 189, 211.

For the structure of *i ver* and *i veray*, compare Lat. *in-super* adv. ‘on top, above, in addition’, prep. ‘on to the top of, upon, over, above’, and *in-suprā* adv. ‘in addition, besides’.

verĵ, *i*-stem: GDSg *verĵ-i* (Elišē), AblSg *i verĵ-ē* (Bible+), GDPI *verĵ-i-w-k’* (see on *verĵ-k’*); *o*-stem: *i verĵ-oy(s)* (Book of Chries, John Chrysostom) ‘end, limit, edge’ (Bible+); **verĵ-k’**, *i*-stem: IPI *verĵ-i-w-k’* in Exodus 28.22, Movsēs Xorenac’i 1.11 [1913=1991: 35^{L20}, Thomson 1978: 87] pl. ‘tassels, fringe’ (Exodus 28.14, 22, 30), ‘plumes (of a helmet)’ (Movsēs Xorenac’i 1.11); **verĵ-ay-k’** ‘the last days of one’s life’ (Sirach 2.3, 30.1: *i verĵaysn k’o* : ἐπ’ ἐσχάτων σου; *i verĵaysn nora* : ἐπ’ ἐσχάτων αὐτοῦ); **verĵin**, *o*-stem: GSg *verĵn-o-y*, AblSg *i verĵn-um*, GDPI *verĵn-o-c’* ‘last, latter, utmost’ (Bible+). If reliable, **urĵ** ‘end’ (only in *Arĵerĵn baĵaran*, Venice, 1865; see HAB 3: 618b) may belong here (Jahukyan 1967: 264₁₃₅).

●DIAL Widespread in the dialects [HAB 4: 332b].

●ETYM No etymology is accepted in HAB 4: 332b. Jahukyan 1987 vacat. Godel (1975: 81) and Klingenschmitt (1982: 165-166₁₀) independently connect *verĵ* with *ver* ‘upper brim’, *i ver* ‘above, up, upwards’ from **upéri* (the same comparison has been suggested earlier by Patrubány and Pedersen, see HAB 4: 332b) and posit **uperĵo-* for *verĵ*.

This etymology seems quite acceptable both phonologically, as far as **uper-* > *ver-* is concerned, and semantically (‘upper brim’ > ‘end’). As to **ĵo-*, note that *verĵ* basically has an *i*-stem, although there is also some evidence for *o*- and *a*-stems. Olsen (1999: 84) posits a *vṛkĵ*-derivative **uperih₂* based on the thematic stem **upero-*. This can explain the *i*-stem, and the ending *-rĵ* would be due to influence of the oblique **-rĵeh₂-* or the parallel formation **uperĵo-* > *verĵ-o-*.

One may also think of an old dual in **-ih₁* referring to the two edges/tassels of something (cf. acc. *erku-s verĵ-s* vs. Gr. δύο κροσσῶτα in Exodus 28.14, instr. *verĵ-i-w-k’* in 28.22), and the *-ĵ-* of the *i*-stem *verĵ* may be due to a possible influence of *aĵaj-in* ‘first’.

For *verĵin*, *-ĵnoy* ‘last, latter, utmost’ from **-ino-* (cf. Lat. *supernus* ‘situated above’), see Olsen 1999: 466-468; cf. also *aĵaj-in* ‘first, prime, prior’ from *aĵaj* ‘front part, front’, q.v. (see also Kortlandt 1994a: 253 = 2003: 98). For *verĵ-ust*, cf. *ver-ust* (see s.v. *ver* ‘up’).

Arm. coll. *verĵay-k’* ‘the last days of one’s life’ probably derives from **uper-i-eh₂-i* > **uwerĵai*, cf. Gr. ὑπέραι f. pl. ‘upper ropes on the sails’. The only structural difference between the Armenian and Greek formations is that the former is based on the locative form **uperi*. It is possible that the original form was **ver-ay-(k’)*, exactly like Greek, and this form was analogically replaced by *verĵ-ay-k’*.

The derivation of *ver* and *verj* from PIE **uer-* and their connection with *ger* 'above, higher, over, more than' (Jahukyan 1967: 267, 305) is untenable.

vec' (generally uninflected, rarely *i*-stem) 'six' (Bible+), note also *vec'ic* 'six times' in Job 5.19 (Cox 2006: 75); **veš-tasan**, *i*-stem: GDPI *veštasan-i-c* 'sixteen' (Bible+); **vat'sun**, *i*-stem: GDPI *vat'sn-i-c* 'sixty' (Bible+).

•DIAL The form *vec'* is ubiquitous in the dialects. In the dialects of Svedia, Marała, Salmast, Łarabał, and Goris, thus in SW, SE and E peripheries we find forms with a final geminate *-c'c'* [HAB 4: 333b]; *vat'sun* is ubiquitous too [HAB 4: 294a], but *veštasan* has been replaced by forms such as *tasn-vec'*.

•ETYM Derives from the PIE word for 'six': Skt. *ṣát, ṣáṣ-*, Pāli+ *cha*, YAv. *xšuuuaš*, MPers., NPers. *šaš*, Gr. *ἕξ*, Dor., etc. *ῥέξ*, Lat. *sex*, etc., see NHB 2: 817b; Hübschmann 1897: 495; HAB 4: 333; Charpentier 1909: 243-244; Meillet 1922f: 140; Pisani 1950: 184; Pokorny 1959: 1044; Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 681-682; Mallory/Adams 1997: 402a.

The anlaut of this PIE word in general and the Armenian form in particular is troublesome. The proto-forms **sueks*, **seks*, and **ueks* would yield Arm. **k'ec'*, **ec'*, and **gec'*, respectively. Lubotsky 2000 reconstructs Proto-Indo-Iranian **šuačš*. For a discussion of the Armenian form see, apart from the references above, Szemerényi 1960: 78-79; Klingenschmitt 1982: 60-61₁, 84, 117; Winter 1989: 34-35; Ałabekyan 1998: 58 (assuming a loan from an IE language), etc.

The development **sueks* > **suueks* > *vec'* suggested by several scholars is plausible, but one must find a motivation for it. Szemerényi 1960: 78-79 starts with **ueks* assuming a secondary **s-* added on the analogy of **septm* 'seven'. More probably, we may posit **suueks* as a Lindeman form or with a secondary **u* from the ordinal **sukso-*, seen in OPr. *uschts* 'sixth' (cf. Kortlandt 1983: 14-15; 1994a: 254 = 2003: 44, 99; Beekes 2003: 165). For an extensive discussion, see Viredaz 1997.

See also s.vv. *vat'sun* 'sixty' and *veštasan* 'sixteen'.

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.); **and-vz-im** 'to rebel' (Bible+), **and-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 yat'ēr* "who used to win by a neck grip". In a couple of lines below one also finds the verb *andvzem* : *t'ap'eac' handerj andvzeal jaxjaxmamb* (218^{L5}).

•DIAL Widespread in the dialects [HAB 4: 338a].

Next to *viz*, some Eastern dialects have also forms with an initial *x-*, which, as Ačaryan hesitantly notes, may be identical with *viz* : Agulis *xáyzak* 'back of the head, occiput', also compounds Łarabał **xz-a-kot'* (with *kot'* 'handle, stem'), Łarabał, Agulis, Šamaxi, Łazax **xz-a-tak* (with *tak* 'under, bottom'), Łazax **xz-i-tak*, Ĵuła **xuz-a-tak*, next to "normal" *vz-a-kot'* and *vz-a-tak* in other dialects [HAB 4: 338a].

Agulis *xáyzak* presupposes **xizak*, cf. *siserñ* 'pea' > *sáysärñ*, *spitak* 'white' > *spáyťak*, *cicat* 'laughter' > *cáyčat*, etc. (see Ačarean 1935: 61-62). Łarabał, etc. **xz-*

implies **xiz* or **xuz*. Ĵula **xuz-a-tak* points to **xoyz* [xuyz], **xiwz* or **xuz*, unless the form is due to contamination with *xuz* ‘to cut hair’.

●ETYM See s.v. *awji-k* ‘collar’.

T

***ta-** / ***tu-** ‘to give, bestow; to hand; to pay, etc.’ (Bible+): 1sg.pres. *ta-m*, 3sg.pres. *ta-y*, 1sg.aor. *e-tu*, 2sg.aor. *e-tu-r*, 3sg.aor. *e-t*, 1pl.aor. *tu-a-k*, 3pl.aor. *e-tu-n*, 1sg.subj. *ta-c*, 3sg.subj. *ta-c-ē*, imper. *tu-r*, pl. *tu-k* (extremely rich evidence in the Bible, see Astuacaturean 1895: 1412-22); **tu-r** (imper., see above), **tur**, mostly pl. *tur-k*, *o*-stem: GDPI *tr-o-c* (Bible+); *i*-stem: GDPI *tr-i-c* (Basil of Caesarea, Paterica, Nersēs Lambronac‘i), IPI *tr-i-w-k* (Nersēs Lambronac‘i) ‘gift, giving, present, donation’ (Bible+); **-tu(r)** ‘-giver, -bestower’ as the second member of a number of compounds (Bible+), for the material, see Olsen 1999: 740.

A textual illustration from Genesis 3.12 (Zeyt‘unyan 1985: 156-157): *Kins, zor etur and is, sa et inj i cařoy anti ew keray*: “This woman whom thou gavest to be with me, she gave me [fruit] of the tree, and I ate”.

●DIAL Ubiquitous in the dialects [HAB 4: 358a].

●ETYM From PIE **deh₃-* ‘to give’: Skt. *dā-dā-ti* ‘to give, present, offer’, MPers. NPers. *dādan* ‘to give’, Gr. *δίδομι* ‘to give’, *δῶσις* f. ‘gift’, Lat. *dō*, *dare*, *datum* ‘to give’, *dōs*, *dōtis* f. ‘gift, talent, dowry’, Lith. *dúoti* ‘to give’, OCS *dati*, SCr. *dāti* ‘to give’, etc., probably also Hitt. *dā-* ‘to take’; see Klaproth 1831: 101a; NHB 2: 842b; HAB 4: 357 with lit.; Pokorny 1959: 223-225; Mayrhofer EWAia 1, 1992: 713-715; Mallory/Adams 1997: 224b.

Arm. *ta-* and *tu-* reflect PIE zero-grade **dh₃-* and full-grade **deh₃-*, respectively; cf. Lat. *dā-re* vs. Lith. *dúoti* ‘to give’, Gr. *δῶσις* ‘gift’ vs. *δίδομι* ‘to give’, etc. (see Schrijver 1991: 99, 147, 402). Meillet 1936: 132-133 derives *tam* from PIE pres. **dā-je-*, cf. OCS 1sg.pres. *dajō*. Godel (1965: 23, 23₇ with ref.) alternatively assumes an athematic present **dā-mi* (= **dh₃-mi*); see also Clackson 1994: 80-81. Arm. subj. *ta-c* reflects **dh₃-sk-* and corresponds to Greek *δόσκον* iterative of *δίδομι* (Clackson 1994: 82). The form *tu-r*, *o*-stem ‘gift’ corresponds to Gr. *δῶρον* n. ‘gift, present’, OCS *darъ* ‘gift’; for other examples, see s.v. *lu-r* ‘hearing’. Further note 1sg.aor. *e-tu* < **e-dōsom*, cf. OCS *daxъ* ‘he gave’; 3sg.aor. *e-t*, cf. Skt. *ádāt* < **e-dōt*. For the paradigm of *tam* and a discussion of these and related issues, see Grammont 1918: 213; Meillet 1936: 133; Łaragyulyan 1961: 155-156; Godel 1965: 27, 36, 38; 1975: 117-118, 126-127; Ę. Tumanjan 1971: 383-385; Klingenschmitt 1981: 85-86, 278; Schmitt 1981: 44, 50, 51, 54, 60, 149, 154 and especially 156; Saradževa 1986: 293-294.

The compositional **tu(r)* ‘giver, bestower’ may be derived from IE **deh₃-tōr*, cf. Gr. *δῶτωρ* ‘giver’, Skt. *dātar-*.

tal ‘husband’s sister’, attested only in Yovhannēs Erznkac‘i (13th cent. Gram., NHB 2: 837c) and in a 15th cent. colophon (MiĵHayBař 2, 1992: 371a, GDSg *tal-i*). There is no reliable 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, Ĵahukyan (1967: 182; 1987: 125, 167) repeatedly treats *tal* as an *o*-stem.

●DIAL Widespread in the 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 Marāḷa: *tavl* (not in Davt'yan 1966: 479).

Ĵuḷa has *taln*. Next to *dal*, Hamšen 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 corroborating Ĵuḷa *taln*. However, *dalnug* should be considered analogical after *haysnug* (note the rhyming context of the proverb), unless new evidence is found.

Svedia has *dul* and vocative **tal-tikin* (with *tikin* 'mistress, lady') > *daldə/igen* [Ačařyan 2003: 588; Andreatyan 1967: 277, 384b] or *daldigayn* [Gyozalyan 2001: 144].

●ETYM Since Bugge (1893: 27-28), connected to the PIE word for 'husband's sister': Gr. γάλωϑ, Phryg. γέλαροϑ· ἀδελφοῦ γυνή, Φρυγιστί (Hesichius; perhaps to be read as *γέλαφοϑ), Lat. *glōs*, OCS *zъlvna*, Russ. *zolónka*, etc. The expected form **cal* was influenced by *ta(y)gr* 'husband's brother' (Bugge *ibid.*; Meillet 1936: 144). Beekes (1976: 13-16; cf. also Schrijver 1991: 131-132) reconstructed a PIE HD *u*-stem: NSg **ǵélh₂-ōu-s*, GSG **ǵlh₂-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 corroborate Arm. *tal*, *-i* : Gr. γάλιϑ · γαλαός (Hes), Skt. *giri-* f. 'sister-in-law', see especially Eichner-Kühn 1976: 28-32; Szemerényi 1977: 90-91; 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, the dental *t-* in Arm. *tal* would be easily explained from **cal* with a dental affricate rather than from **kal*. Moreover, Skt. *giri-* 'sister-in-law' seems to be nonexistent (Griffiths/Lubotsky 2009).

The Armenian word is almost exclusively recorded in the dialects. Here we find two groups, representing **tal* and *talw*. According to Ačařyan (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-* (Tarōnean 1961: 34₁; Ĵahukyan /1972: 272; 1985: 157; 1987: 167, 254; N. Simonyan 1979: 227; A. Xač'atryan 1985: 116). Certainly, *-w* has an etymological value. However, it is not entirely clear why it has been preserved in some dialects and lost in others. (Ĵahukyan'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 attested since the 13th century). One should look for a distribution.

I see two possibilities:

(1) NSg **ǵ(é)lh₂-ōu-s* > PArm. **táluw* > **talw*; in this case, however, the absence of *-w* in *tal* would be hard to explain. From GSG **ǵlh₂-ū-ós* one expects Arm. **talaw(o)*.

(2) NSg **ǵlH-ōi* > **tálu(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, although 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 Ačaryan (1952: 101), *talw* is confined to the nominative in the dialect of Van. The same holds for Šatax *talv*, gen. *taloč*’ [M. Muradyan 1962: 108, 205], and Moks *taləv* (NPI *talv-ir*), GSg *talüč*’ (see Orbeli 2002: 330), and not **talvüč*’. I conclude that Arm. **tal(u)w* reflects the PIE nominative **ǵ(é)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).

Gr. γαλέη ‘weasel, marten’, Lat. *glīs*, *-īris* m. ‘dormouse’ and Skt. *giri(kā)*- ‘mouse’ (Lex.) are usually derived from the etymon under discussion, although 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 e.g. Turk. *gelin* ‘bride’, diminutive *gelincik* ‘little bride, little young woman; weasel’.

tac (*i*-stem in NHB 2: 838c without evidence) ‘care, nourishment, remedy, cultivation’ (Philo, Book of Chries, Yovhannēs Sarkawag), *tacem* ‘to take care for, look after, nourish (e.g. animals, soil, widows and orphans); to cultivate; to spend (a season)’ (Ezriac Kōbac’i, Movsēs Xorenac’i, Philo, Grigor Narekac’i, Grigor Magistros, Xosrov Anjewac’i); agent noun *tac-ič*’ (Eusebius of Caesarea, Philo, Paterica, Tałaran); action noun *tac-umn*, ISg *tac-mam-b*, GDPI *tac-man-c*’ (Movsēs Xorenac’i, Book of Chries, Grigor Narekac’i).

Textual illustrations from Movsēs Xorenac’i:

1.16 (1913=1991: 51^{L9}; transl. Thomson 1978: 99): *ew zayls ews eris orošmuns ođoc’n zovut’ean tacic’emk’ i Ninuē* “and the other three cooler seasons we shall spend in Nineveh”.

The action noun *tac-umn* is attested in 3.20 (279^{L20f}; transl. Thomson 1978: 274-275): *Sahmanē ew yamenayn giwls vans šinel, zi linic’in oțaranoc’k’, ew teti snndean orboč’ ew ceroc’, ew anunoțac’ tacumn*: “He also prescribed that lodgings be built in every village to serve as inns for strangers, and hospices for orphans and the aged and for the care of the poor”.

The word also appears as a reading variant in 3.68 (358^{L16f}; transl. Thomson 1978: 350, cf. foot-note 5 on this paragraph): *Oč’ ews tesanem zbanawor k’o hōt i vayri dalarwoj ew oč’ i jurs hangstean sneal* (vars. *sneals*, *taceal*, *taceals*) “No longer do I see your rational flock pastured in a verdant place and by peaceful waters”.

●ETYM No acceptable etymology in HAB 4: 360a. Ĵahukyan 1987 vacat.

I tentatively assume a derivative of the verb *acem* ‘to bring, lead, drive, move, encircle, beat, pour, etc.’ (q.v.) with the IE preposition-prefix reflected in Lat. *ad* ‘at, near by, about, before, to’, etc., etymologically identical with Lat. *adagiō*, *-ōnis* f. ‘proverb’, *adagium* n. ‘proverb’ (see s.v. *ar-ac* ‘proverb’). The Latin word seems semantically remote; but cf. below on *ar-acim*. Note another (though highly

hypothetical) similar Armeno-Italic correspondence with the same preposition: Lat. *dorsum* ‘back’ (if from **d-h₁orso-*) vs. Arm. dial. **tor* ‘neck’ (q.v.).

Here the verb *acem* figures with the meaning ‘to move (around), encircle’, cf. also *ař-ac-im* ‘to turn around’, *y-ac-im* ‘to move in a circle, walk around’; compare Lat. *circum-agō*, with the verb *agō* etymologically identical with Arm. *acem*. The basic meaning of **t-ac-* would be, then, something like ‘to move nearby, serve standing or moving around, surround someone with care’. As further semantic and structural parallels note Iran. **pari-štā-* ‘to stand around’, composed of **pari-* ‘around’ and **stā-* ‘to stand’ (Cheung 2007: 358-360) > Arm. *paštem* ‘to serve, care, worship’ (see Meillet 1922k: 217; HAB 4: 23-24), as well as Gr. *ἀμφίπολος*, Lat. *anculus*, Skt. *abhi-cara-*, *pari-cará-*, all meaning ‘servant’ and composed of a preposition ‘at, around’ and the IE root **k^we/olH-* ‘to move, walk around, wander’.

tał, *i*-stem: GDSg *tał-i* (Nersēs Šnorhali, see V. Łazaryan 1991: 220^{L12}), ISg *tał-i-w* (Nersēs Šnorhali, see NHB 2: 839bc), GDPl *tał-i-c* (Philo, Yovhannēs Erznkac‘i), ISg *tał-i-w-k* (Book of Chries 2.4.2); later *a*-stem: IPl *tał-a-w-k* in a *kafa*-poem to the Alexander Romance, in juxtaposition with *ařaspel* ‘myth, fable’ (H. Simonyan 1989: 170^{L11}) ‘poem; song, melody; epic song’.

In Dionysius Thrax (6-7th cent.): *ew ztahn k‘ařoloraki* : τὸ δὲ ἔπος εὐτόνωος [AdonDion 2008: 2^{L23}]. Arm. *tał* renders Gr. *ἔπος* ‘word, speech; song, epic poem’. In 58^{L1} *tał* is glossed as *č‘ap‘ov greal*, which points to the meaning ‘poem’.

In Book of Chries 2.2.1 (G. Muradyan 1993: 47^{L13}, cf. 271₂₁; Russ. transl. 2000: 49): *yiwr diwc‘azanakan tatsn* “своими героическими поэмами”. IPl *tał-i-w-k* is found in 2.4.2 (51^{L19f}).

IPl *tał-i-w-k* in Grigor Narekac‘i 61.1 (NHB 839b) is in fact *tawł-a-w-k*, IPl of *tawł* ‘harp’ (see Xaç‘atryan/Łazinyan 1985: 486^{L5}, a thorough discussion in 1069₂).

For other attestations and a discussion, see AdonDion 2008: cxxxvii-cxxxviii; A. Muradyan 1971: 160-161. On the meaning of *tał*, see also T‘ahmizyan 1985: 94-95, 116.

● DIAL Widespread in the dialects [HAB 4: 362b].

● ETYM Scheffelowitz (1904-05, 2: 27) presents the word as *tał* ‘Einprägung, Eindruck, Zeichen, Vers’, thus confusing it with the homonymous *tał* ‘mark (made by burning)’ and connects it with Lat. *dolāre* ‘to hew or chop into shape; to inflict blows on, batter’ and Gr. *δαιδάλλω* ‘to work artfully, decorate, embellish’, *δέλτος* ‘writing tablet’. The same confusion has taken place also in Pokorny 1959: 194, Makovskij 1986: 136, and HerkWört 1997: 823b. Arm. *tał*, *dał* ‘mark’ has been borrowed from Pers. *dāy* ‘mark’ and is thus unrelated (see HAB 4: 362-363; MiřHayBař 1, 1987: 163b).

Ačarıyan (HAB 4: 362) rejects all the etymological proposals and leaves the origin of *tał* ‘song, poem’ open. The appurtenance of Arm. *tał* with Gr. *δαιδάλλω*¹²⁶, Lat. *dolāre*, etc. (on which see Pokorny 1959: 194-196; Schrijver 1991: 215-216, 400; de Vaan 2008: 176-177) is uncertain. A better match is found in Germanic: OHG *zala* ‘Zahl; Menge; Aufzählung; Bericht; Rede’, Olc. *tal* ‘Zahl; Erzählung’, OEngl. *talū*,

¹²⁶ Gr. *δαιδάλλω* ‘to work artfully, decorate, embellish’ has been connected to Georgian-Zan **tal-* : *tl-* ‘to plane, shave, hew’: Georg. *tal-* : *tl-*, Megr. *tol-* (Furnée 1979: 42; Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 905 = 1995, 1: 800; on the Georgian-Zan verb see Klimov 1998: 66-67).

Engl. *tale* ‘Erzählung’, Dan. *tale* ‘Rede’, Dutch *taal* ‘language’, etc., OHG *irzellen*, etc., displaying the following semantic development: ‘aufzählen’ > ‘in geordneter Folge hersagen, berichten’ > ‘erzählen’ (HerkWört 1997: 823-824; Kluge/Seebold 1989: 188a, 804b; cf. also Polomé 1983: 226-227₆).

The etymology has been proposed by Ałayan (1974: 137-140) and is accepted by Ačarjan (p.c. apud Ałayan 1974: 140_{3,4}). He further assumes a connection with another Armenian word, *toł*, *i*-stem ‘line, rank, row of pearls, people, words, etc.’, *tołem* ‘to line up, organize in rows, plait together’, said of e.g. *atōt*’s ‘prayers’, *araspels* ‘mythic stories’, *bans* ‘words’, etc. (q.v.). Further, Arm. *tał*, *toł*, and the Germanic word have been compared to Hitt. *tulija* ‘assembly’ (see Ĵahukyan 1987: 117, 161, 319-320; cf. Łap‘anc‘yan 1961: 200-201). Note also Hitt. *tallije/a-zi* ‘to pray to, evoke (a deity)’ (Ĵahukyan 1987: 320-321), which is compared to OIc. *telja*, OEngl. *talian* ‘to tell’, Gr. *δόλος* ‘list’ (see Kloekhorst 2008: 819), or with OIc. *pułr* ‘Kultredner, Dichter’ (see Polomé 1975: 660-662; Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 808₁ = 1995, 1: 708₁₄; Tangherlini 1990: 88-89).

The semantic field (cf. Ałayan 1974: 138) can be represented as follows: ‘line of words’, ‘enumeration of deeds’, ‘count, account’, ‘narration, story, epic’, ‘epic song, song’. Compare Arm. *t’iw* ‘number; epic story, narrative’; Gr. *στείχω* ‘to march in (in order), *στίχος* ‘file, rank (of words, soldiers, trees, etc.), line (in verse and prose)’, *στοῖχος* ‘file or column of soldiers, choir members, ships, row of trees, poles, etc.’, *στοιχεῖον* ‘letter; line; (physical) element’; Lat. *putō* ‘to prune (trees), scour (wool); to make up (accounts), think, reckon’, *computare* ‘to calculate, reckon’, Engl. *count* vs. *account*, etc.

Arm *tał* and *toł* may be derived from **dl-(s)nih₂-* and **dol-(s)nih₂-*, respectively; cf. *ban*, *i*-stem ‘word, thing’ vs. *ba-m* ‘to speak’, Russ. *basnja* ‘fable’, etc.

For another Armeno-Germanic correspondence within the semantic field of ‘story, narrative, myth, etc.’, see s.v. *araspel* ‘fable, myth, proverb’.

tamal, GDSg *tamal-o-y* or ISg *tamal-i-w* in the Alexander Romance, GDSg *tamal-o-ĵ* in Proverbs 25.24; probably also **tamali** ‘roof, house-top; building’ (also ‘ruins’?).

In Proverbs 25.24: *Law e bnakel ar ankean tamaloĵ* <...> : *κρείττον οἰκεῖν ἐπὶ γωνίας δόματος 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-tamaloyñ 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 ἐστώς*, 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 Ačarjan’s general contextual translation “in unknown marginal regions” (*yancañōt’s cayragawarnerum*).

NHB and HAB also cite **tamali** (GSg *tamalwoy*). Ĵahukyan (1987: 462) even has GDPl *-eac*’. However, no attestations are referred to. Olsen (1999: 952) cites *tamalwoĵ* for the Biblical passage, but NHB and Astuacaturean (1895: 1425c) have

tamaloj instead. Nevertheless, the form **tamali-* may be corroborated by the following:

Step'anos Ōrbelean (1250/60-1303/5) three times 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: *Tämbäläsk*). This toponym could be interpreted as **tamali-ak*. For API *-ek-s* (in place-names) > *-esk* cf. *Xnjoresk* < API **xnjori-ak-s* (see 4.8). I think the stem **tamali-* may be etymologically identical with *tamal* 'roof'. The appellative meaning of this place-name might have been 'ruins' or 'building' (see below).

In Turkish-Armenian dictionary (c. 1720 AD) by Elia Mušetyan Karneč'i (Karin/Xotorjūr), 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 *Tämbäläsk*, see above.

•ETYM Ač'aryan (HAB 4: 367a; see also Ĵahukyan 1980, 1: 110) 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. Assy. *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 Ač'aryan.

I agree with Ĵahukyan (1987: 462) who considers the former etymology (< PIE **dom-* 'house', **dem(ə)-* 'to build') more probable. Ĵahukyan (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. Olc. *timbr*, OHG *zimbar*, etc.) from **demh₁-ro-*, etc. Arm. **tamal(i)* may reflect **dṃh₁-l(i)-*. For the suffix *-al(i)*, *-li*, see 2.3.1. The basic meaning is, then, 'building, structure, house', 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(i)-* 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 Elia Mušetyan Karneč'i (Karin/Xotorjūr), see Č'ugaszyan (1986: 82^{Nr25}).

ta(y)gr, *er*-stem: NPl *taygerk'* (var. *tagerk'*), ISg *tayger-b-k'* (var. *tagerbk'*), both in Movsēs Xorenac'i (5th cent.); pl. *a*-stem: GDPl *tager-a-c'* in Commentary on Matthew (13-14th cent.); dial. ***taygr** (gen. **tayger*), perhaps also ***tagr** (the possible original paradigm: nom. **táygr*, gen. **tagér*) 'husband's brother'.

In Movsēs Xorenac'i 3.32 (1913=1991: 296^{L16f}; transl. Thomson 1978: 289-290): *Ew k'anzi ēin dsterac' nora taygerk' i mec naxararut'eanc'n, i korovi ew i k'aj azgēn Apahuneac'*, <...>: "And because the brothers-in-law of his daughters were there, great princes of powerful and valiant Apahuni family, <...>". The overwhelming majority of manuscripts has *taygerk'*, whereas the reading *tagerk'* is

found only in five manuscripts of the Amsterdam group (between 1665 and 1675 AD) and in Kareneanc' Collation 2 (1694 AD). Once (1689 AD): *taykerk'* (see 1991: 471b).

ISg *tayger-b-k'* (vars. *tagerbk'*, etc.) is attested in Movsēs Xorenac'i 3.68 (1913=1991: 359^{L13}).

According to NHB 2: 837b, GDPI *tager-a-c'* is attested in Commentary on Matthew by Yovhannēs Erznkac'i/Corcorec'i (13-14th cent.).

●DIAL Widespread in the dialects. Most of the forms clearly point to *taygr* rather than *tagr* [HAB 4: 356]. Some forms seem to represent *tagr*, but they in fact go to *taygr*. Let us consider, for instance, Svedia *dak'r*, vocative *däk'räre* (Ačāryan 2003: 589; according to Andreasyan 1967: 277, 384b: *dakr* : voc. *däk'reri*, for the paradigm, see 55; in Gyožalyan 2001: 144: *däk'rärə*; cf. K'esab *tägər* : *têgrêriv* [Č'olak'ean 1986: 218b]).

Since the accented *a* yields Svedia *u*, *ü* or *ö*, whereas the development *ay* > Svedia *a* is quite regular, the form *dak'r* must reflect *taygr* rather than *tagr* (see Ačāryan 2003: 354-356, 394).

Some dialectal forms are ambiguous (cf. e.g. Kak'avaberd *tāgir*, H. Muradyan 1967: 60; on Łarabał, see below). A few of them may go back to *tagr*. For instance, Agulis *tāgir* (see Ačāryan 1935: 391) seems to reflect *tagr*, because Agulis accented *a* is not a regular reflex of ClArm. *ay* (see Ačāryan 1935: 79-81).

Several dialects preserve the classical declension, e.g. Van *tek'yr*, gen. *tekyer* (secondarily also *tek'yroč'*) [Ačāryan 1952: 47, 56, 294], Nor Ĵuła *tek'r*, gen. *teğ'er* [Ačāryan 1940: 94, 386a]. Note that these nominatives have *-k'r*, whereas in the genitive forms, ClArm. *-g-*, being in intervocalic position, has regularly yielded *-k^v-* and *-g'-* respectively.

Further, note Marała nominative *tek^ver* (from ClArm. gen. *tayger*), gen. *tek^ver-i*, with addition of the new genitive marker *-i* (Ačāryan 1926: 172); Łarabał nom. *tāk'ir* [HAB 4: 356b] or *tāk^vir*, gen. *tek'er* or *tak'er*, Northern *tak'or* (Davt'yan 1966: 103, 480).

I conclude that dialectal forms mainly represent *taygr*, but a few of them (e.g. Agulis and Łarabał) possibly point to *tagr*. Remarkable is the vocalic contrast in Łarabał between the nominative and oblique forms.

Andreasyan (1967: 277) points out that, in Svedia, a bride (*hars*) would never address her husband's brother without the vocative. This vocative form, *däk'räre* (see above), I think, contains *ayr* 'man' (cf. *tal-tikin*, voc. of *tal* 'husband's sister', with *tikin* 'Lady'). The final *-e* seems to reflect an older *-ē* (cf. the material in Ačāryan 2003: 375). For the *-ē*-vocative, see 2.2.1.1. Thus: vocative **taygr-ayr-ē*.

●ETYM Since long (NHB 2: 837b; Lagarde [Boetticher] 1850: 362^{Nr256}; Dervischjan 1877: 54; Hübschmann 1881: 176; 1883: 52^{Nr268}; 1897: 496), *taygr* is linked with IE forms of the word for 'husband's brother': Gr. *δᾱήρ* m. Acc. *-έρα*, voc. *δᾱερ* (but see Szemerényi 1977: 87₃₄₄ on this form), GPI *δᾱέρον*, Skt. *devár-*, Lat. *lēvir*, OHG *zeihhur*, OCS *děver-ь*, *diēveris*, etc. (see also Pokorny 1959: 179; Huld apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 84b).

The PIE term is usually reconstructed as **deh₂i-uer-*; for a discussion and the literature, see Szemerényi 1977: 87; Schrijver 1991: 269; Mayrhofer EWAia 1, 1992: 743-744. For Germanic, see Szemerényi, *ibid.*; Lindeman 1987: 97-98.

Summarizing the literary and dialectal evidence, I hypothetically reconstruct the following original paradigm: nom. **táyr*, gen. **tagér* from PArm. **dáywēr*, gen. **da(y)wéros*. Hence the vacillation between *-ay-* and *-a-*. For a similar scenario involving the change of pretonic **-aw-* to *-a-*, see s.v. *acut* ‘coal’.

tařatok, *a*-stem: ISg *tařatok-a-w* ‘a garment, cloak, coat’, attested only in Judges 3.16, rendering Gr. *μανδύας*.

●ETYM Hac‘uni 1923: 159 interprets the word as composed of *tarr* ‘element’ and *tok-* ‘to endure’. Ačaryan (HAB 4: 377a) does not accept this etymology and leaves the origin of the word open.

Ałayan 1974: 141-143 treats *tařatok* as composed of **tař* < **dř-s-* (see s.vv. *ter* ‘veil, coat’ and *teřem* ‘to flay’) and **tok*, an ablaut variant of *tik* ‘wineskin’. The first part of this etymology seems quite possible, but the interpretation of *tok* is untenable.

Olsen (1999: 947) places the word in her list of words of unknown origin not mentioning any etymological suggestion.

tasn, *i/u/an*-stem: GDSg *tasin* (Šarakan), AblSg *i tasan-ē* (Ephrem), NPl *tasun-k*‘ (Theophilus), API *tasun-s* (John Chrysostom), GDPl *tasana-c*‘ (Bible); *i*-stem: GDPl *tasn-i-c*‘ (Grigor Magistros, 11th cent.); *-tasana* in *me-tasana* ‘eleven’, *erko-tasana* ‘twelve’, etc. (see Meillet 1936: 100; Schmitt 1981: 130-131); *tasnerord*, GDSg *tasnerord-i*, LocSg *tasnerord-um* in the Bible (*a*-stem according to NHB 2: 849a, but no evidence for GDPl *tasnerord-a-c*‘) ‘tenth’ (Bible+); *tasanord*, *a*-stem: GDPl *tasanord-a-c*‘ ‘tenth part; tithe’ and denominative verb *tasanordem* ‘to tithe’ (Bible+).

●DIAL The form *tasn* is ubiquitous in the dialects. In most of the dialects the final *-n* is represented as *-ə* and is restored as *-n* before a vowel. Ĵuła has preserved *tasn* intact. A number of dialects have a geminate *-ss-*: Karin, Ararat, Łarabał, etc. *tássə*, Agulis *tóssə*, Svedia *dússə*, etc. [HAB 4: 379a].

●ETYM From PIE **dek̑n* ‘ten’: Skt. *dása*, Av. *dasa*, Parth. *das*, MPers. *dah*, Gr. *δέκα*, Lat. *decem*, cf. also **dek̑n-t-* in Skt. *daśát-* f. ‘a number of ten, decade’, Lith. *dėšimt*, *dešimtis* ‘ten’, OCS *desęty*, Russ. *désjat*‘, gen. *desjati*, Alb. *djhētë*, Goth. *taihun* ‘ten’, etc. Hübschmann 1897: 496; 1899: 46; HAB 4: 378; Pokorny 1959: 191-192; Schmitt 1981: 53, 61, 130; Mayrhofer EWAia 1, 1992: 708-709; Mallory/Adams 1997: 403b; Demiraj 1997: 162-163; Viredaz 2001-02: 25. The comparison is first suggested in Klaproth 1831: 107b and NHB 2: 848b.

Hübschmann *ibid.* derives *tasn* from **tesn* with the unexplained development **e* > *a*, on which see 2.1.1. Many scholars assume an assimilation **tesan* > *tasana*, cf. s.v. *garun* ‘spring’. More probably, however, *tasn* reflects a zero-grade form taken from the ordinal **dk̑mto-*, cf. also the compositional *-tasana* (for a discussion, see Pedersen 1906: 416 = 1982: 194; Grammont 1918: 245-246; Meillet 1936: 42; Szemerényi 1960: 21, 103-104; Ĵahukyan 1982: 37, 210; Kortlandt 1994a: 255 = 2003: 100; Clackson 1994: 206₂₁).

tat (dial.) ‘scorpion’.

●DIAL Metri, Karčewan, and Kak‘avaberd, *tat* ‘scorpion’ [Ałayan 1954: 331; H. Muradyan 1960: 231a; 1967: 206a].

●ETYM This word is recorded in glossaries of purely dialectal words without any remark on the origin (see references above). In view of the material presented in 3.5.2.1, one can identify this word with *tat* ‘grandmother’ (q.v.).

***tat(a)** ‘grandmother; midwife; father, etc.’ (see dial. section); **tat-ik** in a colophon from 1693 AD [HAB 4: 379a], fem. anthroponym **Tat-ik** (1683 AD), etc. [AčařAnjn 5, 1962: 140].

●DIAL Ararat, Łazax, Łarabał *tat* ‘grandmother’, Łazax voc. *tati* ‘id.’, Ararat *tatik* ‘grandmother’, Tigranakert *tata* ‘grandmother’; Akn, Adana *tat* ‘father’; T‘iflis *tat* ‘midwife’; Svedia *tata* ‘elder brother’, voc. *tatáy* [Ačařean 1913: 1016-1017]; Svedia *dud* ‘father’ < *tat* [Andreasyan 1967: 385a]; K‘esab *tāte* [Č‘olak‘ean 1986: 218b]. Widespread is also the compound **tat-mayr* ‘midwife’, with *mayr* ‘mother’ [Ačařean 1913: 1017a; HAB 4: 379b]. See also *dada* ‘sister, etc.’.

Also *tat* ‘scorpion’ must belong here, see s.v. and 3.5.2.1.

●ETYM Ačařyan (1913: 1016b; HAB 4: 379) links the word with IE and non-IE nursery words: Skt. *tatá-* m. (RV+), Gr. *τατᾶ*, Lat. *tata*, Luw. *tati(ia)-*, Lyc. *tedi*, *ddedi*, Lith. *iētis*, all meaning ‘father, daddy’, Alb. *tāt/ë,-a* ‘father, grandfather’, etc.; OCS *dědъ* ‘grandfather’, Czech *děd* ‘grandfather; forefather; old man’, *děda* m. ‘grandfather, old man’, *děda* f. ‘old woman’, Russ. *ded* ‘grandfather’, *djadja* ‘uncle’, Bulg. *djado* ‘grandfather; old man; father-in-law, wife’s father’, *dedá, dedo* ‘grandfather; old man; father-in-law, wife’s father’, *d’ádo* ‘grandfather; father-in-law, husband’s father’, *děda* ‘elder sister’, Maced. *dedo* ‘grandfather; old man; father-in-law, wife’s father’, SCr. *djèd* ‘grandfather’, *dědo, djědo* hypocoristic ‘grandfather; father-in-law, husband’s father’, *Dědo* anthroponym, dial. *děda* ‘father; grandfather; father-in-law, wife’s father’, Lith. *dėdė, dėdis* ‘uncle’; Gr. *τήθη* ‘grandmother’, *τηθίς* ‘father’s or mother’s sister, aunt’, *τηθία* ‘old woman’, Lith. *tetà*, Russ. *tetja* ‘aunt’ (on these forms, see Pokorny 1959: 1056; Szemerényi 1977: 61-62; ÈtimSlovSlavJaz 4, 1977: 227-228; Mayrhofer EWAia 1, 1992: 616; Demiraj 1997: 382-383; Huld apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 195); Georg. *deda* ‘mother’, Turk. *dada* ‘nurse’, etc.

Obviously related is also Arm. dial. *dada* ‘(elder) sister, uncle’s wife, nurse; grandmother; father’ (q.v.). The consonantal (*d* vs. *t*) and semantic fluctuation is not unusual with nursery words, see the above-listed IE and non-IE parallels. We can assume an IE inherited nursery word. Compare also Skt. *attā* ‘mother, older sister’ and Arm. dial. *atta* ‘mother’ (q.v.) vs. Hitt. *attaš*, Gr. voc. *ἄττα*, etc. ‘father, papa, daddy’. Remarkably, all the three Anatolian nursery words for ‘father’, viz. Hitt. *attaš*, Luw. *tatiš*, Pal. *papaš* (see Szemerényi 1977: 7; Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 765₂ = 1995, 1: 667₄₄) have comparable (mostly dialectal) forms in Armenian: *atta* ‘mother’, *tat(a)* ‘grandmother; father’, *papa* ‘father’.

In certain cases influence by (or borrowing from) neighbouring languages is possible. For instance, Ačařyan (1902: 332, 334) treats Arm. dial. Polis *tata* ‘wet-nurse’ and *tete* ‘grandfather’ as recent loans, cf. Turk., Pers. *dada* ‘wet-nurse’ and Turk. *dede* ‘grandfather’, respectively.

Some Germanic forms refer to ‘female breast, nipple’: Norwegian, Swedish *tätte* ‘Frauenbrust, Zitze’; cf. forms with *-i- and *-u-: Saxon *titt* ‘nipple, udder of a cow’, MHG *zitze* ‘Zitze’, Swedish *titta* ‘aunt’, MHG *zutzel* ‘Sauglappen’, Swedish *tytta* ‘old woman, aunt’, OHG *tutta, tuta* ‘nipple’. These forms are reminiscent of Arm.

cic ‘bosom’, *cuc* ‘substance to be sucked’, *tit* ‘teat, bosom’ and *titan* ‘nurse’ (see s.vv.).

Note also homophonous nursery words with *tat-* in different meanings, e.g. ‘standing’, ‘start walking’ (both said of a baby), ‘food’, ‘book’, etc. [Ačařean 1913: 262a, 1016-1017].

tatrak, *a*-stem: GDSg *tatrak-i*, GDPI *tatrak-a-c*‘ (Bible+); MidArm. GDSg *tatrak-u* ‘turtle-dove, Columba livia’.

Attested abundantly in the Bible (Astuacaturean 1895: 1431c) and once in Hexaemeron (K. Muradyan 1984: 272, 377b; see also Greppin 1978: 65-66, 135) rendering Gr. *τρογγών*, *-όνοϛ* f. ‘turtle-dove’, as well as in the native literature of different periods; see especially Greppin 1978: 134-136. The oldest native attestation found in Agat‘angelos §655 (1909=1980: 339^{L12}; see also Greppin 1978: 97, 134, 180-181) shows that *tatrak* is a seasonable bird, thus different from the Pigeons and the Collared Turtle-dove (Greppin 1978: 134). This attestation, as well as Middle Armenian *tatr-ik* (see Greppin 1978: 19) and *tatark-ik* (see below) are not cited in NHB and HAB.

Also attested in Book of Chries 5.5.20 (G. Muradyan 1993: 123^{L22}); rendered by Russian *гопмуца* ‘turtle-dove’ (G. Muradjan 2000: 117). For other attestations, see NHB 2: 850a

The bird *tatrak* ‘turtle-dove’ is a renowned singer. In a song by Grigor Narekac‘i, 10-11th cent. (K‘yoškeryan 1981: 144^{L49}): *tatrak k‘atc‘raxaws* ‘sweet-speaking turtle-dove’. In Aristakēs Lastivertc‘i, 11th cent., *tatrak* appears as a singer beside *atawni* ‘dove, pigeon’ (Yuzbařyan 1963: 56^{L13}; 1968: 80; Greppin 1978: 134). In ‘Govank‘ t‘ř‘noc‘’ (Praise of birds), composed by Kirakos Episkopos (13-14th cent.) rather than by Yovhannēs Kiprac‘i or Tēr Yovhannēs, *tatarkik*, with diminutive *-ik*, is described as a messenger that spoke sweetly and joyfully, prophesying the Spring (Mnac‘akanyan 1980a: 256^{L338f}; MiřHayBař 2, 1992: 380b; Greppin 1978: 136, with English translation). The same context is seen in a song by Simeon Aparanc‘i, 16th cent., gen. *tatrak-u* [Mnac‘akanyan 1956: 639]. In a folk-song in R. Grigoryan 1970: 355^{Nr759}, *tatrak-ik* and *artut-ik* (*artoyt* ‘lark’) are mentioned as sweet singers. Compare the descriptive name *arteri ařař* ‘a singer/minstrel of the fields’ given to the larks and turtle-doves in Nerk‘in Basen [Hakobyan 1974: 86].

●DIAL Moks *tatrak*, Muř *tadrag*, Ararat *tatarak* (if the second *-a-* is not a misprint). With an epenthetic *-u-*: Zeyt‘un *daduyog* (see also Ačařyan 2003: 126, 340), *dadurog* [HAB 4: 381b]. With an aberrant vocalism, *tétrak*, in Łarabał [Ačařean 1899: 45], Hadrut‘, řatax [Davt‘yan 1966: 24, 482], Goris [Margaryan 1975: 366b], řamaxi [Bařramyan 1964: 18, 227]; see also HAB 4: 381b. Note that in the overwhelming majority of examples for this aberrant development in these dialects, the vowel *-a-* > *-e-* follows a voiced consonant and may thus be explained through Ačařyan’s Law. It is therefore probable that this EArm. dial. form **tétrak* is old.

MidArm. GDSg *tatrak-u* (see above) occurs e.g. in a number of versions of a famous proverb from the Muř and Van regions (see Łanalanyan 1960: 229a; Orbeli 2002: 121^{Nr107}). In the řatax version of this proverb: *tatrak-i* (M. Muradyan 1962: 172).

MidArm. diminutive *tatrak-ik* is seen in Svedia *dādərgäg* (Ačařyan 2003: 365, 379, 589), although Andreev (1967: 385a) and Hananyan (1995: 199a) record only *dādrəg*. Note also Aslanbek *dadərdig* < **tatrtik* < *tatr(a)k-ik* [HAB 4: 381b] which may have resulted from a simultaneous process of assimilation and dissimilation (see 2.1.25): *t-t-k-k* > *t-t-t-k*.

●ETYM Since de Lagarde (1866: 227), Bugge (1889: 33; 1893: 70) and others (see HAB 4: 381), the word is compared with Skt. *tittirā-* m. ‘partridge’, *tittiri* m. ‘id.’, Iran. **tadarg* (or **tatray?*) > Arab. *tadruj* ‘Fasan’, NPers. *tadarv* (Eilers 1971: 585; according to Steingass 290b: NPers. *tazarv* ‘a cock pheasant, the jungle cock’), Gr. *τέτρας*, m. *-ακ/γος* ‘black-cock’ or ‘guinea-fowl’ or ‘large bustard’, *τέτρις*, *-ηγος* f. ‘a bird’ and other bird-names from Hesychius, such as *τεπρά(δ)ων*, *τεπράϊον*, *τατύρας*, etc., Russ. *téterev* ‘Birkhahn’, etc.

The appurtenance of *tatrak* to this PIE bird-name of onomatopoeic origin (cf. Gr. *τεπράζω* ‘to cackle’, etc.) as a native Armenian word is accepted in Bugge 1893: 70 (assuming an assimilation **tettrak* > *tatrak*); Pokorny 1959: 1079; Saradževa 1980: 106; 1986: 71; Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984: 541 = 1995: 459; Ĵahukyan 1987: 154, 208 (reconstructing **tētēr-*, with a question mark). The onomatopoeic nature of the PIE (see also Frisk 1: 886; Mayrhofer EWAia 1, 1992: 645-646) and Armenian (HAB 4: 381a; Greppin 1981b: 6^{Nr19}; Leroy 1986: 72) terms is accepted practically by everyone. Pedersen (1906: 374, 416 = 1982: 152, 194) separates Arm. *tatrak* from Skt. *tittirā-* and others and treats it as “eine andere onomatopoietische Bildung (eine noch andere ist gr. *τεπράζω*)”.

However, the correspondence **t* : Arm. *t* is not regular [Greppin 1981a: 505; 1981b: 6^{Nr19}]. Ĵahukyan (1967: 99; 1982: 51; 1987: 197) explains this by onomatopoeic character of the word, while Ačařyan (HAB 4: 381), noting also the ending *-ak*, follows Hübschmann (1897: 395^{Nr10}) in treating *tatrak* as borrowed from Iran. **tatur-ak*, cf. Med. *τατύρας* ‘pheasant’ (*τατύρας*: *ὁ φασιανὸς ὄρνις*) attested in Athenaeus 9.387. Greppin (apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 217a) states that Arm. *tetrak* (perhaps a misprint for *tatrak*, although such a form does exist in Łarabał and vicinities) is a loan, but he does not specify the source. Hovhannisyan (1990: 270c) places *tatrak* in his list of Iranian loans. Olsen (1999: 254, 939) mentions Gr. *τέτρας* and Med. *τατύρας*, and considers the precise origin of Arm. *tatrak* to be unknown.

The Iranian origin is possible in view of not only the unaspirated *t* and the ending *-ak*, but also the root vowel *-a-*, though, individually taken, none of these arguments is of decisive significance. There are some native Armenian designations of birds or flying insects with diminutive *-ak*, e.g. *t’it’et’rĭn* ‘butterfly’, *cice/aĭrĭn* ‘swallow’ (q.v.), although in the case of *tatrak*, no independent **tat(u)r-* is attested (but cf. below on Zeyt’un). Also the onomatopoeic nature of the word does not allow to take a clearcut decision.

According to Ačařyan (HAB 4: 381a), Łarabał, etc. *tetrak*, comparable with Gr. *τέτρας*, derives from an unattested ClArm. form which has been borrowed from a corresponding Median form. Since ClArm. stressed *i* yields Łarabał, etc. *é* (cf. *cicat* ‘laughter’ > *cécat*, *ciran* ‘apricot’ > *céran*, *hing* ‘five’ > *heng*’, *tiz* ‘tick’ > *tez*, etc., see Davt’yan 1966: 35 and in the glossary, and HAB s.vv.), one may alternatively posit an old Armenian by-form **tit(ə)r-* which can directly be linked with Skt.

tittirá- (or a corresponding unattested Iranian form) and/or be interpreted as a reduplication of the type *cicarn* ‘swallow’, see 2.3.2.

If the *-u-* in Zeyt’un *dadyoçg* is not an epenthesis (for some not very impressive examples, see Ačařyan 2003: 138; *tatrak* is not mentioned here), one might posit an older **tatur(a)-* comparable with the above-mentioned *ταύραç* ‘pheasant’.

targal ‘spoon’; attested in Movsēs Xorenac’i 2.47 (1913=1991: 174^{L5f}; transl. Thomson 1978: 187): *targal unel oski ew patařak’at*: “[the right] to have a golden spoon and fork”. For the context, see Xalat’janc 1896, 1: 256ff; Thomson 1978: 188₃.

Later forms: **targal** in Step’annos Siwnec’i, 8th cent. [Adonc’ 1915=2008: 190^{L6}], **t/drgal** in later Grammarians, Canons attributed to Sahak, and in Middle Armenian: **drgal** in Geoponica and ISg *drgal-ov* in Alēk’sianos (see also HAB 4: 644b), **dgāl** in Amirdovlat’ Amasiac’i, etc., **dk’al** in a 14th century colophon and a 16th century inscription [MijHayBař 1, 1987: 171a, 184ab].

●DIAL Ubiquitous in the dialects, almost everywhere with loss of the *-r-*. The only exception is Tigranakert *t’ark’al* [HAB 385a; Haneyan 1978: 47, 197b]. The forms are: Ařtial (Hung., Pol.) *d’ig’al* [Ačařyan 1953: 23, 287], Polis, Nor Naxijewan *t’k’al*, Xarberd *d’g’al* [HAB 4: 385a], K’esab *dəguł* [Č’olak’ean 1986: 200a], Svedia *d’ig’ul* [Ačařyan 2003: 589], Agulis *dügül*, instr. *dügül-äv* [M. Zak’aryan 2008: 88], etc. The other dialects display a metathetic form: **gdal* [HAB 4: 385a].

●ETYM From PIE **doru*, gen. **dréu-s*, n. ‘wood’: Skt. *dāru-*, GSg *drós*, *drúnaḥ*, ISg *drúnā* n. ‘wood’, *dārvi* f. ‘spoon’, *darví* f. ‘spoon’, *dróna-* n. ‘wooden vessel, trough, bucket’, YAv. *dāuru*, GSg *draoš* n. ‘piece of wood, tree-trunk’, OPers. *dāruv* ‘wood’, MPers., NPers. *dār* ‘wood, tree’, Gr. *δόρυ*, gen. *δόρατος* n. ‘wood, tree-trunk, spear’, *δρῦς*, *δρῦός* f. ‘tree’, oak’ (Frisk 1: 411-412, 421-422), OEngl. *trēo(w)* = Engl. *tree*, OCS *drъva* n. pl. ‘wood’, *drěvo* n. ‘tree’, Alb. *dru/drũ* m. ‘wood; tree; stem, trunk’ < **druuā* (Demiraj 1997: 146-148), etc. Dervischjan 1877: 54,¹²⁷ Lidén 1906: 66; HAB 4: 384-385; Pokorny 1959: 214; Mayrhofer EWAia 1, 1992: 704, 721, 761; Mallory/Adams 1997: 598.

According to Ačařyan (HAB 4: 421b, 422; see also Saradževa 1986: 66; Ĵahukyan 1987: 118, 162), here belong also *tořn* ‘pestle’ and *torg* ‘loom, weaving of spider-web’. Meillet (p.c. apud HAB 4: 421b) accepted the etymology of *tořn*. As is correctly pointed out by Ačařyan (HAB 4: 422b), the original meaning of *torg* was ‘wooden framework, loom’ (cf. the dialectal evidence), and the meaning ‘weaving, fabric, net’ (attested in Hexaameron) has secondarily been derived from ‘wooden framework’ > ‘woven framework, weaving’.

Skt. *dārvi* f. and *darví* f. ‘spoon’ are formally and semantically comparable to Arm. *torg* ‘wooden framework, loom’ and *targ-al* ‘spoon’ (HAB 4: 384b; Ĵahukyan 1982: 71). We can reconstruct Armeno-Aryan fem. **dory-i(h₂)-* vs. oblique and compositional **dřy-* which would yield Arm. *torg* and *targ-*, respectively. On the other hand, Arm. *torg* ‘wooden framework, loom’ is amazingly close to HLuw. *tarw-i(ia)-* prob. ‘wooden beam’ (see below), both formally and semantically.

The semantic shift ‘wood’ > ‘spoon’ is quite natural. In Svedia (Musa-leř = Musa Dagh), for instance, up to the Armenian Genocide in 1915, spoons were made only

¹²⁷ Dial. *drgal* is certainly secondary (pace Dervischjan 1877: 54).

of wood, mainly of ash-tree and box-tree (see Gyozyalyan 2001: 17-18, 88). Spoons and ladles were made of wood also in Zangezour (Lisic‘yan 1969: 164-165), Sasun (Petoyan 1965: 158), etc. (HAB 4: 384b; Lisician 1955: 195; Marutjan 1989: 135b).

Usually no cognate forms are cited for Arm. *-al-* in *targal*. Eichner 1978: 151 posits **d̥yū-ah₂-* + **-lah₂-*, citing no cognates with **-l-*. Klingenschmitt 1982: 238 posits **d̥yū-ālo-*. One may think of Maced. *δάρυλλος* f. ‘oak’ (on which see Pokorny 1959: 215), but this is not very impressive. In my opinion, Arm. *targal* is astonishingly identical with Hitt. ^{GIS}*taru-āli-* n., which refers to an implement used for grinding or crushing, probably something like ‘pestle’, ‘Mörser’, ‘Stößel’, cf. CLuw. *taruual-* ‘Mörser’ (see Hoffner 1967a: 357a; Starke 1990: 336; Rieken 1999: 434), itself a derivative of *tāru-* n. ‘wood’, cf. CLuw. ^{GIS}*tāru-* n. ‘wood’, *dāruš-* n. ‘statue’, HLuw. **taru-* n. ‘wood’, *tarw-i(i)a-* prob. ‘wooden beam’, *tarut-* n. ‘statue’ (see Kloekhorst 2008: 849). For **-al(i)* in designations for implements or the like cf. e.g. Hitt. ^{GIS}*hulāli-* n. ‘distaff’ (see Starke 1990: 300-343; Rieken 1999: 434); Arm. *tam-al(i)* ‘building, roof’ probably from QIE **dmh₁li(h₂)-*.

As to *toṛn* ‘pestle’, note especially Skt. *drōṇa-* n. ‘wooden vessel, trough, bucket’ (HAB 4: 421b). The Armenian word may be derived from **doru-no-* ‘wooden implement’ (Jahukyan 1982: 111), with analogical *o*-grade from nom. **doru*. One may also think of **doru-n-t-* (cf. Gr. gen. *δρόπατος*, if from **doruṇ-to-*). For the meaning ‘pestle’ cf. Hitt. ^{GIS}*taru-āli-*.

To conclude: PIE neuter **doru* ‘wood’ is largely involved in Armenian craft terminology. Here we find remarkable correspondences between Armenian, Aryan and Anatolian:

Arm. *torg* ‘wooden framework, loom’ : Skt. *dārvi* f. and *darvī* f. ‘spoon’ : HLuw. *tarw-i(i)a-* prob. ‘wooden beam’;

Arm. *toṛn* ‘pestle’ : Skt. *drōṇa-* n. ‘wooden vessel, trough, bucket’;

Arm. *targ-al* ‘spoon’ : Hitt. ^{GIS}*taru-āli-* n. ‘pestle’ or the like.

See also s.v. *tarr* ‘element, substance, principle’.

- *tart‘** (dial.) ‘stiff manure briquettes used for heating’, ‘thick layer of dirt on a body’.
- DIAL Baberd, Ararat, Nor Bayazet, L̄arabał, Surmalu, Van ‘stiff manure briquettes used for heating’ [Ač̄arean 1913: 1018a], Muš, Alaškert, Bulanəx ‘id.’ [Amatuni 1912: 619-620]; Xarberd, Van ‘thick layer of dirt on a body’ [Ač̄arean 1913: 1018a].
 - ETYM Jahukyan (1972: 285; 1987: 118) connects **tart‘* with *terem* ‘to flay’ or ‘to become callous, be covered with hard layer of skin’ (q.v.), comparing with OEngl. *tord* ‘dirt’, etc. and hesitantly positing **d̥r-tʰ-*. Since in the majority of dialects the sequence *-rt‘* may also go back to *-rd*, we can tentatively reconstruct **tard* and derive it from QIE **d̥r-tV-*, cf. Skt. *d̥ṛti* ‘leather bag’, Gr. *δάρτος*, etc. For the suffix or determinative *-t‘*, on the other hand, see e.g. s.vv. **xil-t‘* ‘knag on a tree, a swelling in tree’ and **her-t‘* ‘turn, queue’. Uncertain.
- *tarm**, *i*-stem: GDSg *tarm-i* in Dawt‘ak (7th cent.) apud Movsēs Kałankatuac‘i 2.35 (1983: 229^{L10}; Dowsett 1961: 148; Dowsett 1992: 156-157), Nersēs Šnorhali (12-13th cent.), GDPl *tarm-i-c‘* in Grigor Narekac‘i 67.5, Xač‘atryan/Lazinyan 1985: 519^{L98}, Esayi Nč‘ec‘i (13-14th cent.) ‘flock of birds’ (Grigoris Aršaruni, 7-8th cent., etc.), ‘swarm of gad-flies’ (Grigor Narekac‘i 67.5, see above); ‘starling’ in Nersēs Šnorhali etc., cf. *tarm-a-haw* ‘id.’ (twice in Hexaemeron alongside with synonymous

sarik, rendering Gr. *ψήρ* ‘starling’ and *σελευκίς* ‘a bird which eats locusts, *Pastor roseus*, the Rose-coloured Pastor’, K. Muradyan 1984: 260^{L1f}, 279^{L4}; index: 377ab); reduplicated adverb *tarm-a-tarm* ‘by flocks (said of birds)’ in Eznik Kołbac‘i (5th cent.), cf. adv. *tarm tarm* ‘id.’ (Ephrem); *tarm-a-jur* ‘mythological water which is followed by flocks of locust-chasing birds’ (Vardan Arewelc‘i etc.).¹²⁸

The adverb *tarm-abar* is attested in Dionysius Thrax, 6-7th cent. [AdonDion 2008: 31^{L25}].

According to Ačařyan (HAB 4: 387a, 422b), here belongs also **torm* ‘group of ships’ (q.v.).

•DIAL Agulis *torm* ‘a bird’, with regular vocalic development [Ačařean 1935: 22, 392], Balu *damr* ‘a bird of passage resembling the swallow’ (Sargisean 1932: 133-134, 537; HAB 4: 387a), T‘iflis *tarb* ‘a locust-killing bird of Masis’ (cf. Georg. *t‘arbi*, HAB 4: 387a).

•ETYM Ačařyan (HAB 4: 387a; 422-423) lists a few etymological suggestions, but does not accept any of them.

Ĵahukyan (1991: 42-43) derives Arm. *tarm* and **torm* from QIE **drg^h-(s)mo-* and **dorg^h-(s)mo-* respectively, connecting with Mir. *dremm*, Nir. *dream* ‘Schar, Abteilung von Menschen’ (**drg^h-smo-*), Bret. *dramm* ‘Bündel, Garbe’, Gr. *δράγμα* ‘handfull, esp. of (stalk of) corn’, *δράσσομαι* ‘to grasp, take handfulls’, etc., derived from PIE **derg^h-* ‘to grasp’ (see Pokorny 1959: 212-213). Perhaps a European substratum word.

tarr, pl. tant. in the Bible: loc. *i tarer-s*, gen.-dat. *tarer-c‘*, instr. *tarer-b-k‘* (Astuacaturean 1895: 1433c); NSg *tarr*, GDSg *tarer* (Eznik Kołbac‘i, Agat‘angelos, Barseł Kesarac‘i, Anania Širakac‘i, Grigor Narekac‘i, etc.); *i*-stem: GDSg *tarr-i* (Hamam Arewelc‘i), AblSg *i tarr-ē* (Grigor Narekac‘i), GDPl *tarr-i-c‘* (Plato, etc.); *a*-stem: ISg *tarer-a-w* (Nersēs Lambronac‘i), GDPl *tarer-a-c‘* (Book of Chries 5.5.16, 6.4.2); NPl *tarear-k‘*, GDPl *tarear-c‘* (Vardan Arewelc‘i) ‘element, matter, substance, body, principle’ (Bible+); **tarš**, *i*-stem ‘element; letter’ (see below).

Apart from the Biblical evidence, the word is attested several times in Elišē, Chapter 7 (Ter-Minasyan 1989: 350-352; transl. Thomson 1982: 221-222), APl *tarer-s* and GDPl *tarer-c‘*, referring to elements, in particular the four basic elements. GDPl *tarer-a-c‘* is found in Book of Chries 5.5.16, 6.4.2 (G. Muradyan 1993: 122^{L27}, 142^{L26}; Russ. transl. 2000: 117).

Anania Širakac‘i (7th cent.) describes the moon as follows (A. G. Abrahamyan 1940: 39^{L17}): *lusinn tarr ē setm, xist, mak‘ur, gndajew*. It seems natural to follow the ModArm. translation of Abrahamyan/Petrosyan 1979: 97: “the moon is a dense, hard, spherical body”. Thus, *tarr* is here to be understood as ‘substance, body’.

tarš ‘element; letter’: GDPl *tarš-i*, GDPl *tarš-i-c‘* in Dionysius Thrax, 6-7th cent. [AdonDion 2008: 4^{L11}, 40^{L24}]. Here we read on the connection between *tarr* and *tarš* (4^{L21f}): *Na ew noynk‘ isk taršk‘ koč‘in, vasn zi unin tarrumn imm ew dasut‘iwn : Tà δὲ*

¹²⁸ The connection of Arm. *tarmajur* to Hurr. *tarmani* and Urart. *tarmanlā* ‘source’ (see Greppin 1991b: 725b, 725b₄₈; 2008: 1₂) is uncertain. The etymology would imply that the association of the first part of the Armenian compound (an otherwise unattested **tarm-* ‘source?’) with *tarm* ‘flock of words’ is folk-etymological. See also Ĵahukyan 1987: 425 (confusing with Arm. *t‘arm* ‘fresh’).

αὐτὰ καὶ στοιχεῖα καλεῖται διὰ τὸ ἔχειν στοιχόν τινα καὶ τάξιν. Arm. *tar-k'* and *tarrumn* correspond to *στοιχεῖα* 'letters; lines; (physical) elements' and *στοῖχος* 'file or column of soldiers, etc., row of trees, poles, etc.' respectively. Also in Step'annos Siwnec'i [AdonDion 2008: 199^{L4f}].

On *tarr* and *tar*, see further AdonDion 2008: cxlvi-cxlviii; Ĵahukyan 1954: 127-130, 149, 189, 251; 1967: 11; Xač'eryan 1962: 346-347; and especially A. Muradyan 1971: 181-183. Further, see Ravnæs 1991: 88. On the notion of *tarr*, pl. *tarer-k'* 'element', see Thomson 1992: 195, 201. For the alternation *tarr* : *tar* cf. *er-* from *err-* 'three-' [HAB 2: 50b].

●ETYM Considered to be a word of unknown origin [HAB 4: 388b; Olsen 1999: 149, 961]. Ĵahukyan 1982: 106 in passing suggests a derivation from PIE **doru* 'wood' and reconstructs **daru-ro-*. Later he was apparently unsatisfied with this etymology since he did not include it in his fundamental 1987.

Nevertheless, the etymology is worth of consideration. Rather than a suffix **-ro-*, we may assume a nominative *-r* after the type of neuters following the *r/u*-declension, cf. *cun-r* vs. **gonu-* 'knee', etc. A number of such words display zero-grade roots, see s.vv. *asr* 'fleece', *barjr* 'high', *catr* 'laughter', etc. For a discussion of the *r/u*-declension, see especially s.v. *asr* 'wool, fleece'. See also s.vv. *artawsr* 'tear', *metr*, *met-u* 'honey'.

We may start with nom. **doru-r*, obl. **dr-(e)u-*. The nominative becomes **daru-r* > *tar(u)r* with analogical zero-grade. That the *r*-stem word has been generalized early and thus belongs to an *r*-stem instead of the expected *r/u*-declension (which presupposes gen. **taru-*) is not a decisive counter-argument, cf. e.g. *hur*, *o*-stem 'fire' (q.v.). Also in Greek, the PIE PD neuters of heteroclite **-r/n-* declension are reflected in different declension classes, note *ῥδωρ, -ατος* 'water' and *ἥπαρ, -ατος* 'liver' on the one hand, and *πῦρ, πῦρός* 'fire' on the other (see Rix 1992: 126-127).

For the semantic development compare Gr. *ῥλη* 'wood, timber', 'material, matter' > Arm. *hiwt(ē)* 'matter, element, substance, principle'.

tawn, *i*-stem 'feast' (Bible+). See s.v. *patat₂*.

●DIAL Widespread in the dialects. [HAB 4: 442b]

●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; Matasović 1996: 151) adds Irish *dúan* 'poem' (< **dapnā-*) to these words. Toch. B *tāpp-* 'to eat' is uncertain [Adams 1999: 286-287]. See also Pedersen 1924: 224b = 1982: 307b; Ĵahukyan 1992: 20.

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 Olc. *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’.

Note also Gr. *δεῖπνον* n. ‘meal’, which is usually regarded as a Mediterranean cultural word probably reflecting **daip-n-*; its relationship with *δαίς*, *δαίτη* is not clear; the whole group may be of a substratum origin (see Frisk 1: 358; van Windekens 1966: 96; Chantraine 1968-80: 258; Furnée 1972: 325-326; 339₂, 352; Beekes 1975: 80).

Further, note Arm. *tuar* ‘neat, cattle’ (dial. ubiquitous **tawar*, see HAB 4: 424b) in *tuarac* = *tuar* ‘cattle’ + *arac* ‘pasturing’ through haplology, meaning ‘pasturing’ (Eusebius of Caesarea: *i tuarac-i*) and ‘pasturer, herdsman’ (in a homily ascribed to Elišē), cf. also *tuarac-akan* ‘herdsman’ Bible+ [NHB 2: 890bc]; see also s.v. place-name *Tuarac-a-tap*’. Usually compared to OEngl. *tīber*, *tīfer* n. ‘sacrificial animal, sacrifice’, OHG *zebar* ‘id.’, late MHG *ungezibere*, Germ. *Un-ge-ziefer* n. ‘schädliches Kleingetier: vermin’, actually, ‘impure animal, not fit for sacrifice’, Oic. *tīvurr* m. (if meaning ‘offering’ and not ‘god’), Goth. **tibr* ‘offering’, etc.; see Lidén 1906: 8-10; HAB 4: 424; Pokorny 1959: 222; Ĵahukyan 1987: 118; Mallory/Adams 2006: 142. For a further discussion on this etymon, see Scardigli 1961: 138, 138₄; Hamp 1973: 322; Polomé 1975: 659-660; Lehmann 1986: 344; Pfeifer 1989, 3: 1873. This etymon has been compared to Semitic (< Afro-Asiatic) **ḏ-b-ḥ* ‘to sacrifice’: Ugar. *dbḥ* ‘sacrifice’, Hebr. *zēbah* ‘sacrificial animal’, Arab. *ḏ-b-ḥ* ‘to sacrifice’, *ḏibḥu* ‘sacrifice’; etc. (see Illič-Svityč 1964: 6^{Nr19}); note possible Kartvelian parallels: Svan *tbəl-* ‘to sacrifice’, etc. (ibid. 6₁₉). On the other hand, the Armenian dialectal form **tawar* is reminiscent of Semitic **táwar-* ‘bull’.

The relationship between all these IE and non-IE words is not quite clear. Regardless of the ultimate origin of the etymon and further details, one may tentatively posit a Mediterranean-Pontic-Neareastern cultural word **de/aip-n-* or **deip-r-* ‘sacrificial animal, sacrificial meal’.

tet, *a*-stem: GDPI *tet-a-c*’, IPI *tet-a-w-k*’ (also *o*-stem in NHB 2: 862c without evidence) ‘site, place’ (Koriwn, Elišē, Aristotle, Zenob, etc.); **teti**, *ea*-stem: GDSg *tetw-o-y*, LocSg *i tetw-o-j*, AblSg *i tetw-o-j-ē*, ISg *tefe-a-w*, AccSg *teti-s*, GDPI *tete-a-c*’ (rich evidence in the Bible, see Astuacaturean 1895: 1434-1436) ‘id.’; see also s.v. **et**, GDSg *etel* ‘id.’ (Bible+).

For the paradigm of *teti* and the locative in *-oj*, see Charpentier 1909: 252-256; Meillet 1936: 21, 65-67, 73, 91, 93; Clackson 1994: 61-62; Matzinger 2005: 108-109.

●DIAL The form *tet* is ubiquitous in the dialects [HAB 4: 394a].

●ETYM Pedersen 1906: 373-374 = 1982: 151-152 derives *et* and *teti* from PIE **sed-* ‘to sit’ comparing with Lat. *sella* ‘seat, chair, stool’. One usually reconstructs **sed-lo-* (HAB 4: 393b; Pokorny 1959: 886; Ĵahukyan 1959: 243; Ałabekyan 1979: 64; Volpe apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 505a). However, **sed-lo-* would yield Arm. *(*h*)*et*-. It is therefore better to reconstruct a **sed-el(o)-* > *et* (see Ę. Tumanjan 1978: 289-290; Ĵahukyan 1982: 105; 1987: 146; cf. Matzinger 2005: 73).

We can explain the forms *et* and *tet(i)* from an ablauting paradigm: HD **séd-ōl* vs. acc. **sd-él-m*, or PD **sed-l-* (> **sed-el-*) vs. gen. **sd-él-s* > PArm. *(*h*)*et-t* > **stet-* >> *et* vs. gen. *etel* and **tet-*. PArm. **tét-a-* (cf. GDPI. *tet-a-c*’, etc.) and **teti-*

a- (cf. *teři* and obl. *teř-e-a-*) point to **s(e)del-h₂* (cf. Lat. *sella* ‘seat’ from **sed-l-h₂*) and **s(e)del-ieh₂₋*, respectively.

For the etymon, see further s.vv. *hecanim* ‘to mount a horse’ and *nist* ‘seat’.

teř (*i*-stem according to NHB 2: 865c without evidence) ‘veil, coat’ (Genesis 38.14, Movsēs Xorenac’i 1.26, John Chrysostom).

The passage in Genesis 38.14 (Zeyt’unyan 1985: 328) reads as follows: *ehan zhanderjs ayruť ean iwroy yink’ enē, arkaw teř ew zardarec’aw* ‘she put off her widow’s garments, put on a veil (= Gr. *θέριαστρον*) and adorned herself’.

In Movsēs Xorenac’i 1.26 (1913=1991: 75^{L13f}; transl Thomson 1978: 116): *kin omn ciranazgest, erknağoyn unelov ziwreaw teř* ‘a woman dressed in purple and wrapped in a veil the color of the sky’. For testimony from John Chrysostom and for compounds, see NHB 2: 865; Hac’uni 1923: 130-131; HAB 4: 395a.

●ETYM For the etymology, see s.v. *teřem* ‘to flay’. Olsen (1999: 947) places the word in her list of words of unknown origin not mentioning any etymological suggestion. According to Ačarıyan (HAB 4: 395b), Georg. *t’eri* ‘all kind of cover, rug, mattress, etc.’ is an Armenian loanword.

teřates, GDSg *teřates-i* (Leviticus 15.33) ‘having an issue of blood’, said of menstruation (Bible+).

●DIAL No dialectal record in HAB 4: 395b. NHB 2: 865c informs that *teřates* dialectally (*řamkōrēn*) refers to haemorrhoids of men.

●ETYM Ačarıyan (HAB 4: 395b) derives this compound (with *tes-* ‘to see’) from *teřem* ‘to flay’ or ‘to become callous, be covered with hard layer of skin’ (q.v.) and points out that the semantic relationship is difficult to explain. Ałayan (1974: 141-142) explains the semantics through the meaning ‘veil, cloth’ referring to the usage of a piece of cloth for menstruation, cf. dial. *řor* and *halav* referring to ‘menstruation’ (on these words, see Ačar’Liak 6, 1971: 762).

Olsen (1999: 966) places the word in her list of words of unknown origin without mentioning any etymological suggestion.

teřem ‘to flay’ or ‘to become callous, be covered with hard layer of skin’ (Elišē, Vardan Arewelc’i), **ořn-teř** ‘wound on the back of a horse resulted from rubbing’ (Geoponica, see NHB 2: 508b), **teř**, IPI *teř-i-w-k* ‘callus on skin of sole’ (*Ptm. ar leh* apud NHB 2: 865c, bibliography vacat); **teř-a-zerc arñem** ‘to plunder, rob, despoil’ (Ezrik Kořbac’i, Eusebius of Caesarea, Canon Law), lit. ‘to flay, make skinless’, cf. the semantic development in Arm. dial. *plōkel*, etc. [HAB 4: 395b], **teř-a-zercem** ‘id.’ (Book of Chries); **třn-awor** ‘callous’ (Gregory of Nyssa).

A textual illustration from Elišē, Chapter 7 (Ter-Minasyan 1989: 354^{L5f}; transl. Thomson 1982: 223): *Jeřk’ mer p’apareal en i kac’ni, ew ořunk’ mer teřeal en i p’aytakri* ‘Our hands have become calloused from the axe and our backs worn from carrying wood’.

●ETYM Since Meillet 1894: 165 (for the comparison with Greek, see already NHB 2: 865c), connected with Lith. *deri*, *diřti* ‘to flay’, OCS *dero*, *dřrati* ‘to flay’, Czech *dřrati* ‘to tear’, Gr. *đēpo* ‘to flay’, *đēpaç* ‘skin, leather’, Skt. *dar-* ‘to crack, split, break, burst’, MPers., NPers. *darrīdan* ‘to tear up’, etc. The Armenian verb is derived from **der-s-* (see HAB 4: 395b; Pokorny 1959: 206, 210; Ĵahukyan 1987: 118). For the forms, see also Frisk 1: 368-370; Chantraine 1968-80: 265-266;

ÈtimSlovSlavJaz 4, 1977: 209; 5, 1978: 218-219; Mayrhofer EWAia 1, 1992: 701-702; Mallory/Adams 1997: 567b.

In view of the cognate forms referring to ‘leather garment’, ‘coat’, etc., Ačařyan (HAB 4: 396a; see also Ĵahukyan 1987: 118) identifies this *ter-* ‘*skin, leather’ with *ter* ‘veil, coat’ (q.v.). Further note *terates* ‘having an issue of blood’ said of menstruation (Bible+), which seems to contain **ter-* ‘cloth’ (see s.v.), as well as *tar-a-tok* ‘coat’ (q.v.), probably composed of **tar-* from zero-grade form **d̥rsV-* and an obscure **tok*. Note also *tor̄n* ‘rope’ (q.v.) probably derived from **dor(s)-n-*. Finally, dial. *tart* ‘stiff manure briquettes used for heating’, ‘thick layer of dirt on a body’ (q.v.) has been connected to these words as well.

According to Ałayan (1974: 142-143), *tr̄n-awor* ‘callous’ (see above) contains **tir̄n* or **tur̄n* from **d̄ers-en* or **d̄ors-en*, respectively. The vocalism remains uncertain.

Olsen 1999: 780 derives *terem* from **derh₂e-* (cf. Gr. *δέρας* ‘skin, leather’) assuming a development **-rh₂V- > -r̄(V)-*, which I do not share because none of the examples is unambiguous and convincing, see s.vv. *k̄runk* ‘crane’, an onomatopoeia, and *meranim* ‘to die’, probably from sigmatic aorist **mer-s-*; further see Ravnæs 1991: 88₁.

More probably, Arm. *ter-* reflects **der-s-* (see above), which may be identified with the sigmatic aorist **der-s-*, cf. Skt. subj. *darśasi*, etc. If the trilled *-r̄* of the noun *ter* ‘veil’ is not due to association with the verb *terem*, then one might think of **der-s-i-*, cf. Gr. *δέρις* f. ‘skin, leathern covering’. However, this Greek word seems to reflect **der-ti-* (see Clackson 1994: 54).

*ti ‘day’, only in *erk-ti* ‘two days’, attested in John Chrysostom, Commentaries on Philippians (twice), Colossians (once), Ephesians (three times); note also *erk-tiw* ‘id.’ in the same Commentary on Colossians

For the typology of the compound cf. dial. Muš *erkor* < **erk-ōr* ‘(for) two days’ e.g. in a fairy-tale recorded in Alek’sandrapol in 1915, see HŽHek 13, 1985: 221^{L1}: *or ma k’elec in, kam erkor* ‘they walked for one day or two’. Note also Moks *erkor* found in a tale (Orbeli 2002: 58^{L-5} [Nr 15]; transl. 134): *erkor mnac* ‘прошло два дня’. In a folk epic from Xarberd (Hut’sam 1895: 356^{L-22}): *or mə erkor anc’av* ‘one or two days passed’.

●ETYM Obviously related with *tiw* ‘day’ (q.v.). The loss of *-w* is not explained by Ačařyan [HAB 4: 403a, 410a]. The form is reminiscent of the accusative forms Skt. *dyām*, Gr. *Zḗν*, Lat. *diem* < **diēm*, OIr. *dé*, cf. the PIE word for ‘cow’ (see s.v. *kov* ‘cow’): **g^weh₃-u-* ‘cow’: Skt. *gauḥ*, acc. *gām*, Gr. *βοῦς*, acc. *βῶν*. For a discussion of the aberrant accusatives **diēm* and **g^wōm* (with loss of **-w-*), see Schindler 1973: 152-155; Watkins 1974; Mayrhofer EWAia 1, 1992: 479-480, 750-752; Schrijver 1991: 120, 129; 1995: 109-110; Szemerényi 1996: 181-182; Nassivera 2000: 59ff. Beekes (1990: 42, cf. 50) argues for an accusative with lengthened grade **diēum* rather than **diēum*. Lat. *diēs* ‘day’ is based on AccSg **diēm* (Schrijver 1991: 120).

Arm. **ti-* ‘day’, as Lat. *diēs*, may be derived from PArm. nom. **tīh* < QIE **diēs*, with loss of the **-w-* analogically after the accusative.¹²⁹

¹²⁹ Alternatively, **ti* ‘day’ may be derived from PIE **dih₂-t(i)-*: Alb. *ditë* f. ‘day’, cf. OCS *днь* ‘day’, etc. This is less probable.

For a possible trace of PArm. **ti-* ‘god’ or ‘Sky-god’, see s.v. *ciacan* ‘rainbow’. The PIE *u*-less form (Skt. *dīām*, Lat. *diem*, Gr. *Zḗν*) has been compared to Old Chinese **thiim*, **thiin* ‘sky’; **tjaus* ‘shine’; **tos* ‘day’; **tees* ‘God, the god who knows everything, whose name (**tees*) means ruling the world under heaven’, from an original meaning ‘heaven’ (see Zhou Jixu 2002: 3^{Nr12}; Zhou Jixu 2003: 9-10, 14-15; and especially Zhou Jixu 2005).

***ti (or **tin*)** prob. ‘fat’.

MidArm. *xoz-ti*, GDSg *xoztui* or *xoztini* ‘fat of swine’ is attested in Geoponica and “Bžškarān jioy” (13th cent.) [HAB 2: 382b; Č‘ugaszyan 1980: 104^{L-1-3}, 200; MiĵHayBař 1, 1987: 346a]. Derived from *xoz* ‘swine’, but the component **ti* is not specified (ibid.). The latter is hardly identical with the pl./coll. marker *-ti*. It probably is an otherwise unknown word meaning ‘fat’.

Another possible trace of the hypothetical **ti* ‘fat’ may be seen in *kalti*. 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, *kalti* and *bacin* are unknown, and *xer* and *ščuk*, both being dairy products, are very rare in the literature and present in a few dialects (see HAB s.vv.). The word *kalti* is listed between *kogi* ‘butter’ and *bacin* and may denote a kind of dairy product. It may be interpreted as **kal(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(i)in-* n. ‘oil, fat’ (on which see Starke 1990: 239-242).

tik, *a*-stem: ISg *tk-a-w* (Agat‘angelos), AblSg *i tk-ē* (Genesis 21.15, see Zeyt‘unyan 1985: 235), GDPl *tk-a-c*‘ (Agat‘angelos), LocSg *i tk-i* (Sargis Šnorhali) ‘wineskin, a vessel made of an animal’s skin (for wine, oil, water, etc.)’ < ‘goat, skin of goat’ (Bible+).

GDPl *tk-a-c*‘ and ISg *tk-a-w* are found in a passage from Agat‘angelos § 109 (1909=1980: 65^{L1f}; transl. Thomson 1976: 123): *Ēw sastkac*‘eal t‘agaworin, et pndel zots nora i hrapoyrs (var. *hrapars*) *tkac*‘, *ew kaxel zna glxivayr*; *ew et dnel jagar i nstoy telwoj nora*, *ew arkanel jur tkaw yorovayn nora* : “The king, even more incensed, ordered his feet to be bound with cords of wineskins and him to be hung upside down. And he had a funnel placed in his bottom and had water poured from a wine-skin into his belly”. Also Bolognesi (1995: 5) translates *hrapoyrs/hrapars tkac*‘ as “cords of wineskins”. The reading *hrapar-s* must be the correct one (see s.v. *arapar* ‘craggy place’). Norayr (see HAB 3: 132b) identifies the word with *hrapoyr* found in P‘awstos Buzand 4.55 (see also Thomson 1976: 465¹⁰⁹). Garsoĵian (1989: 176), however, takes the latter as identical with *hrapoyr* ‘charm, allurements, seduction, indulgence’ (Bible+).

MidArm. dimin. *tk-ik*, *tk-čor*, dimin. *tkčor-ak* ‘id.’ [MiĵHayBař 2, 1992: 391b].

See also s.v. *aratik* ‘rope, cord’.

●DIAL Widespread in the dialects [HAB 4: 406a].

The irregular g^v in Agulis *tag^v*, *tayg^v* points to an older **tig* [Ačařean 1935: 115]. Note also Łarabał *tek^v*, *teg^v*, *teyg^v* [Davtayan 1966: 483].

MidArm. *tk-čor* is reflected in Hačən *dägjōy*, Zeyt'un *deçgjūy/r* [HAB *ibid.*; Ačařyan 2003: 340]; cf. also Łarabał **tk-čr-v-il* 'to swell' (see HAB 4: 406a).

●SEMANTICS The leather vessels called *tik*, etc. were made of skin of various animals: goats, oxen, calves, buffaloes (Marutjan 1989: 129a with references). In literary and ethnographical attestations *tik* mostly refers to the winebag made of skin of goat. Here are a few examples. It says in a riddle by Nersēs Šnorhali, 12th cent., Cilicia, that the he-goat (*k'ōš*) has nice winebags for wine: *ginoy uni ahuor taker* (A. Mnac'akanyan 1980: 287). Abraham Kretac'i (18th cent.) mentions water-containers called *tik* made of skins of sheeps and goats (1870: 16, see L. Petrosyan 1968: 37). In a versified saying recorded in T'iflis (Tēr-Ałek'sandrian 1885: 52^{Nr69}): *Ul eir u tik dařar* "You were a kid, but turned into a wineskin". A few lines below *tkčur* is mentioned too.

It is not surprizing then that Arm. *tik* originally referred to 'goat' (see below). For examples from other languages displaying the same semantic development, see HAB 4: 405b.

●ETYM Since Lidén (1906: 10-14), connected with Germ. **igō* 'goat, he-goat' (cf. OHG *ziga*, Germ. *Ziege*, etc.) and Gr. Laconian *δίζα· αἴζ· Λάκωνες* (Hesychius). Alb. *dhi* f. '(she-)goat' (see Kortlandt 1986: 38 = 2003: 68, with ref.) rather belongs with *ayc* '(she-)goat' [Orel 1994: 358; Demiraj 1997: 160] (q.v.).

The Germanic form is derived from QIE **dig^h*- (Pokorny 1959: 222), which would yield Arm. **tig*, whereas the Laconian presupposes **δρι-ja* < **dig-ih₂*-. However, *δίζα* may be a corruption for **αἴζα* (see Kortlandt 1986: 38₁ = 2003: 68₁; Clackson 1994: 89, with ref.). The Armenian form requires a QIE **dig-* (see Pokorny 1959: 222, hesitantly assuming "tabuistische Entstellung"; cf. Ĵahukyan 1987: 118), which, with its two voiced stops, has an impossible root structure. Given the restriction of the word to Armenian, Germanic, perhaps also Greek, we may assume a substratum origin with a vacillation *-*g^h*-/*-*g-*, unless one prefers an assimilation **dig^h*- > PArm. **dig-* > Arm. *tik* (see further s.v. *karkut* 'hail'). It is tempting to explain EArm. **tig-* (reflected in Agulis, etc.) from the proto-form **dig^h*-.

On the other hand, the Armenian form is usually explained by linking it with Germanic diminutive geminate in *-kk-*: OHG *zicki*, OEngl. *ticken* 'Zicklein', etc. (Lidén *ibid.*; Meillet 1908-09: 356; Olsen 1999: 61, 826). For the issue, see also s.v. *buc* 'lamb'.

Nikolaev (1985: 72) compares PIE **dig^h*- with PAndi **t'uka* and PTsez **t'iga* 'he-goat' and OTurk. *teka* and points out that it is difficult to determine the primary source. On the other hand, he (*ibid.*) separates Gr. *πάγος* m. 'goat' from *πάγω* 'to nibble' (see s.v. *aracem* 'to pasture') and considers it a Caucasian loan, which is phonetically improbable. One may wonder if the ECauc. forms are borrowed from Armenian. A larger areal context is assumed by Ĵahukyan 1987: 607. On Georg. *t'ik'i*, etc. which are treated as Armenian loanwords, see HAB 4: 406a; Matzinger 2005: 26₁₂₅.

***tit** 'teat, bosom'; only in *merk-a-tit*, in P'awstos Buzand 4.15 /5th cent./ (1883=1984: 102^{L-6}, transl. Garsořian 1989: 144). The passage reads as follows: *Isk kinn spaneloyñ*

P'aranjemn zhanderjsn patareal, 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 Ačařyan (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’. Ačařyan (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, albeit 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 τὸν μαστός*), and Vardiman 1982: 292, 296, and the inset following p. 128 (= Russ. transl. 1990: 288, 292, inset following p. 192).

●ETYM For Ačařyan's opinion and a 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 the dialects), *cuc* ‘substance to be sucked’ (Bible+), dial. ‘marrow’, *ccem* ‘to suck’ (Bible+), perhaps also *tat* ‘grandmother’ (widespread in the dialects) [see s.vv.], derived from PIE **ǵeid-* ‘to suck’ and/or **iēta*, cf. Lith. *žįsti, židu* ‘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 *tit* (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. It is uncertain whether there is any connection between Arm. *titan* ‘nurse’ and the Luwian words. Further, see s.v. **tat(a)* ‘grandmother; midwife’.

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 Ačařyan (HAB 4: 409b) asks: “Made from Gr. *τίτην, τιτίον* ‘nurse’?” Note also *τιθήνη* ‘id.’.

For a further discussion, see s.v. *tit* ‘bosom’ (q.v.). If there was also a verbal **tit-* ‘to nurture’ (cf. Luw. **tit(a)ji-* ‘säugen’, *titan-* n. ‘(weibliche) Brust, Zitze (bei Tieren)’, *titant(i)-* ‘säugend’, etc. [Starke 1990: 229-230]), one might interpret *tit-an* as a deverbative noun with the suffix *-an*.

tiw, GDLocSg *tu-ənj-ean*, LocSg *tuənjēan*, *i tu-ē* (Bible+); later *o*-stem: ISg *təw-o-v* (Žamagirk‘) ‘day’ (Bible+); **tuənjēan** ‘morning’ (Hexaemeron); **tuənjēn-akan** ‘daily’ (Philo, Anania Širakac‘i, etc.), **tuənjēn-ayin** ‘daily’ (Movsēs Xorenac‘i 2.39 [1913=1991: 165^{L18}], etc.).

Frequently: *i tuē ew i gišeri* ‘at day and at night’ in the Bible (see Astuacaturean 1895: 1157-58) and the following literature, e.g. in Yovhan Mandakuni/Mayragomec‘i, 5th/7th cent. [2003: 1159b^{L5}] (*mišt i tuē ew i gišeri layi andadar* ‘I always cried, at day and at night continuously’); Movsēs Kařankatuac‘i/Dasxuranc‘i 1.21 (V. Ařak‘elyan 1983: 70^{L1}).

●ETYM From PIE **dieus* ‘heaven, day, Sky-God’: Skt. NSg *dyáuḥ*, AccSg *dyām*, LocSg *dyávi*, *divi* ‘heaven; Sky God, Father Sky; day’, *dívā* ‘by day’, Gr. *Zeús*, voc. *Zēv*, gen. *Δι(φ)ός*, dat.loc. *Δι(φ)ί*, dat. also *Διφεί*, acc. *Zḗv*, etc., Lat. *diēs*, *ēī* m. ‘day’, *in diem* ‘each day’, etc., see Hübschmann 1897: 498; HAB 4: 410 with lit.; Pokorny 1959: 185; Mallory/Adams 1997: 149b.

For a discussion of *tu(ə)njēan*, the final *-w* and other issues, see Charpentier 1909: 252-253; Meillet 1936: 85; Pisani 1950: 183; Godel 1975: 35; Ĵahukyan 1982: 123; Kortlandt 1984a: 100; 1989: 49 = 2003: 47, 93; Clackson 1994: 140, 163, 213₃₇; Olsen 1999: 176; Beekes 2003: 161, 164, 203-204; Matzinger 2005: 84. It is tempting to derive *tuənjēan* from PArm. **tiw-ini-* < **diu-(e)n-i-* in a way comparable to cognate formations in **-n-* as Hitt. *šiu-n(i)-*, *šuniija-* ‘divine’, etc. (for a discussion of these forms, see Watkins 1974: 104ff; Neu 1974: 122ff; Starke 1990: 167₅₅₁).

The derivation of Arm. *di-k* ‘god’ (q.v.) from this PIE word (O. Haas 1940: 104) is untenable, although a contamination is possible (cf. the epenthetic *-w-* in *diw-c-*). For possible traces of PArm. **Tiw* ‘Sky-god’, see s.vv. *ciacan* ‘rainbow’, *katin* ‘acorn’. Further, see s.v. **ti* ‘day’.

toł, *i*-stem: GDSg *toł-i* in Aristakēs Lastivertc‘i (11th cent.) and Yovhannēs Erzncac‘i, ISg *toł-i-w* in Grigor Narekac‘i (10-11th cent.) ‘line, rank; row of pearls, people, words, etc.’ (John Chrysostom etc.); **tołem** ‘to line up, align, organize in rows, plait together’, said of e.g. *atōt’s* ‘prayers’, *ařaspels* ‘mythic stories’, *bans* ‘words’, etc. (Agat‘angelos, Eusebius of Caesarea, Severian of Gabala, etc.).

For attestations and a semantic analysis, see Ařayan 1974: 139-140.

●DIAL Muš, Alaškert *toł*, Axalc‘xa, Ararat *toł*, Suč‘ava *doł* ‘line’; Nor Naxiřewan **toł* ‘ruler (for drawing straight lines)’; Bulanəx, Č‘arsančag *toł* ‘necklace’ [HAB 4: 418b].

●ETYM Since Scheftelowitz (1904-05, 2: 28) and Pedersen (1906: 372 = 1982: 150), connected with OHG *zala*, Germ. *Zahl*, OIc. *tal* ‘Zahl; Erzählung’, Engl. *tale*, etc. (see also Pokorny 1959: 193). Ařayan (1974: 138-140) connects these Armenian and Germanic forms with Arm. *tał* ‘poem; song, melody; epic song’ (q.v.) and stresses the semantic identity of *toł* with Saxon *toel*, *talū* ‘row’. Ačāryan (1908: 122b; HAB 4: 418) links *toł* with Georg. *t’olo*, *t’oli* ‘equal, resembling’ and assumes a common borrowing from an unattested Urartian source form. On this see, however, Ařayan 1974: 138-140.

***toř** ‘neck’.

●DIAL A dialectal word recorded only in the (sub)dialect of Axta/Hrazdan, as informed by Sofia Ačařyan, the wife of H. Ačařyan (see HAB 4: 658a). Used only in phrases: *tořə lc* ‘vel ē “his neck is thickened (lit. filled)”’; *tořə hastac* ‘rel ē “he has thickened his neck”’.

Sofia Ačařyan 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. AčařHLPatm 2, 1951: 388).

●ETYM Ačařyan (HAB 4: 658a) connects with Lat. *dorsum*, *ī* n. ‘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. *ořn* ‘spine, back’, *uln* ‘neck’, and 3.7.2. Lat. *dorsum* has been interpreted as **d-h₁orso-* (see Adams apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 88b), see s.v. *oř* ‘rump’. See also s.v. *tac* ‘care, nourishment, remedy, cultivation’.

tořn₁ ‘pestle’ (Nersēs Lambronac‘i); **sand-a-tořn** or **sand-i-tořn**, ISg *sanditořam-b* (Čařəntir) ‘pestle of mortar’ attested in Proverbs 23.31 (rendering Gr. *ῥπερον* ‘pestle’), Evagrius of Pontus, Čařəntir.

●ETYM See s.v. *targal* ‘spoon’.

tořn₂, *an*-stem: ISg *tořam-b*, NPl *tořun-k*‘, APl *tořun-s* (Bible+); *z-tořan-ē* (Hamam Arewelc‘i, 9th cent.) ‘rope, cord, noose’ (Bible+).

●DIAL Muš, Bulanəx *tōř* ‘leash, lead tied to a dog’ [HAB 4: 421b; Melik‘ean 1964: 538b], Alaškert, Řštunik‘ *tōř* ‘id.’ [Amatuni 1912: 634a].

●ETYM Usually derived from **dor(b^h)-n-*, cf. Skt. *dṛbhāti* ‘to tie together, tie in a bundle’, *darbhá-* m. ‘tuft of grass, bunch of grass’, OHG *zerben* ‘to turn about’, etc., Petersson 1916: 258-259; Pokorny 1959: 211-212; Ĵahukyan 1967: 62, cf. 136; 1987: 118; Mallory/Adams 1997: 607a; Olsen 1999: 140, 839. For a further discussion on the PIE etymon, see Mayrhofer EWAia 1, 1992: 703-704.

Ałayan 1974: 149 derives *tořn* from PIE **der-* ‘to flay’ (see s.v. *teřem* ‘to flay’) but reconstructs **dorb^hn-*, thus confusing it with the above etymon. The derivation of *toř-n* ‘rope’ < ‘leather rope’ from QIE **dor-* (cf. Gr. *δopá* f. ‘flayed skin’, *δopóc* m. ‘leather sack’, etc.) is plausible. For the final *-n*, see 2.2.1.3.

torg ‘*wooden framework’: *torg sardi ostayni* ‘weaving or framework of spider-web’ in Hexaemeron, where *torg* renders Gr. *ῥφασμα* ‘weaving, fabric’ (K. Muradyan 1984: 189^{L17f}, glossed in 377b).

●DIAL Łarabał and Łarak‘ilisa (= Kirovakan-Vanajor) **torg* ‘wooden framework on which rug is woven’ [HAB 4: 422b]; Goris *tōrk*‘, *tōrk*‘ (Margaryan 1975: 367b, 485b). A textual illustration is found in a story by Aksel Bakunc‘, native of Goris (Bakunc‘ 1, 1976: 176): *mankamard mi ařjik tork‘i arař gorg ēř gorcum* ‘‘a young girl was weaving a rug in front of the loom (*tork*‘)’. For more details on Zangezur *tōrk*‘, see Lisic‘yan 1969: 158-159. A textual illustration from Tavuš folklore can be found in Xemć‘yan 2000: 173b^{L17}, glossed in 299a. Šamaxi *tolk* shows unclear sound developments [Bałramyan 1964: 42, 63, 228].

In the dictionary of Koylaw (Venice, 1889) one finds *torg* ‘a cylindrical wood used for lifting heavy things’ [HAB 4: 422b].

●ETYM See s.v. *targal* ‘spoon’.

***torm** ‘group of ships, fleet’, only in *naw-a-torm*, with *naw* ‘ship’ (Philo), *naw-a-torm-il* (Philo), *torm-il* and *naw-a-torm-il* ‘id.’ (Eusebius of Caesarea).

●ETYM See s.v. *tarm* ‘flock of birds’.

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 (IPI *top'č'-a-w-k'*) ‘id.’ (Gēorg vardapet Skewřac'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* ‘to butt, slay’, Pol. *deptać* ‘to 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’ (see Witczak 1991). One should also take into account the possibility of an onomatopoeic word; see Ĵahukyan 1987: 319, introducing, albeit 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.

tuar ‘neat, cattle’, see s.v. *tawn* ‘feast’.

tun, *an*-stem: GDSg *tan*, LocSg. *i tan*, AblSg *i tan-ē*, ISg *tam-b*, GDPI *tan-c'*, IPI *tam-b-k'* ‘house; stanza; family, tribe; land, region’ (Bible+); **tan-i-k'**, pl. tant. *ea*-stem: acc. *tani-s*, loc.-all. *i tani-s*, gen.-dat. *tane-a-c'*, instr. *tane-a-w-k'* ‘roof’ (Bible+); **əntani**, *ea*-stem: GDSg *əntanw-o-y*, GDPI *əntane-a-c'* ‘domestic; family’ (Bible+).

●DIAL The word *tun* is ubiquitous in the dialects; *tani-k'* is present in several dialects, in some of them reflecting a frozen API *tanis* or coll. **tanear* [HAB 4: 428b]; *əntani(k')* is found in a number of dialects, in euphemistic usage for ‘wife’ [HAB 2: 132a].

●ETYM From PIE **dōm*, gen. *dém-s* ‘house’: Skt. *dám-*, GPI *dam-ām*, GSg **dám-s* in *pátir dán* ‘master of the house’, Av. *dam-*, GSg *dāng*, LocSg *dām*, YAv. LocSg *dāmi* ‘house’, Gr. *δῶ* n. ‘house’, *δῶμα* n. ‘house, temple’, *δεσ-πότης* ‘master of the house, lord’ (cf. Skt. *dám-pati-*, Av. *dāng pati-*); cf. also Skt. *dāma-* m. ‘house’, Gr. *δóμος* m. ‘house, room’, Lat. *domus* f. ‘house, household’, OCS *domъ* ‘house’, etc. Klaproth 1831: 101b; NHB 2: 891b; Hübschmann 1883: 53; 1897: 498; HAB 4: 427-428 with lit.; Pokorny 1959: 198; Szemerényi 1977: 95-96; Mayrhofer EWAia 1, 1992: 697, 699; Mallory/Adams 1997: 281b.

From **dom-o-* or the like we would have Arm. **tum*. One therefore derives Arm. *tun* from nom. **dōm* or acc. **dom-ŋ*. Unlike Greek, Armenian has generalized **-n* (from **-m*) throughout the paradigm. Compare *jiwn*, *jean* ‘snow’ vs. Gr. *χιών*, *-όνοσ* ‘snow’. For a discussion, see Schmalstieg 1980; Schmitt 1981: 51; Kortlandt 1985: 21, 23 = 2003: 65, 67; Saradževa 1986: 244, 282; Stempel 1993 < 1987: 150-151; Ravnæs 1991: 99-100; Clackson 1994: 137; Olsen 1999: 134; Beekes 2003: 157, 168; Matzinger 2005: 21-22₁₀₈, 71₃₂₃, 72₃₂₆. For a further discussion of the declension, see s.vv. *jiwn* ‘snow’, *šun* ‘dog’.

See also s.v. *tamal* ‘roof’.

t-k'un 'awake, sleepless' (Grigor Tat'ewac'i, 14-15th cent.), **t-k'nim** 'to be awake, sleepless' (Bible+), **t-k'n-ut'iwn** 'sleeplessness' (Bible+), adv. **tk'n-abar** (John Chrysostom), etc. [NHB 2: 900bc; Astuacaturean 1895: 1475c].

●DIAL Hačən *däg'g'un* 'awake, sleepless' [HAB 4: 592b]; Svedia *dk'nil* 'to be awake, sleepless' [Andreasyan 1967: 386a].

●ETYM Composed of the privative prefix *t-* and *k'un* 'sleep' (q.v.).

C'

c'ax, *o*-stem: ISg *c'ax-o-v* several times in Geoponica (13th cent.); *i*-stem: ISg *c'ax-i-w* in Nersēs Palienc' (14th cent.) 'fresh branch with leaves' (Geoponica, Nersēs Palienc', "Bžškarən jioy" [Č'ugaszyan 1980: 128^{L-10}]), 'a kind of tree, maple [NHB 2: 904b] or ash [HAB 4: 446a]'; **c'axem** 'to harrow' in Xosrov Anjewac'i [NHB 2: 904c]; **c'ax-ut** 'brushwood' in Geoponica [MijHayBař 2, 1992: 401a]. On **c'agan** 'harrow' (Grigor Tat'ewac'i), see below. Dial. **c'ax** 'branch; firewood; brushwood', **c'ak'** 'a thorny plant; harrow'.

In Bařgirk' hayoc' (Amalyan 1975: 318), *c'ax* is represented in three meanings: (1) a coniferous tree, probably 'fir, spruce': *car'n mar* <...> *kam etewin*, (2) 'brushwood, woods, forest': *mac'ar*, *kam antar*, (3) 'fuel (firewood)': *var'eli*.

A thorny place in the Goris region called **C'ak'ut** is mentioned in Step'anos Ōrbelean (A. A. Abrahamyan 1986: 226). On corroborative dialectal evidence, see below.

●DIAL **c'ax**: Van, Alaškert, Ararat 'brushwood, small dry branches broken off from trees or bushes and used as firewood' [Amatuni 1912: 640a]; Hamšen 'brushwood, bush; a shrub and the broom made of it'; T'iflis 'dry branches'; Ararat 'firewood'; Łarabał, Seoləz (Nikomidia) 'bush or branches for silkworm' (note the Georgian semantics below); Binkean (Sebastia, Tevrik region) 'leaves of juniper used as fodder'; Zeyt'un *c'ax*, *c'ox* 'leaf, especially of vine' [Ačařean 1913: 1051a; HAB 4: 447a]; Svedia *c'ux* 'twigs to be burnt in sunk oven' [Ačařyan 2003: 589].

A compound: Van, Muš, Bulanəx, Alaškert, Širak, Aparan, Ararat ***c'ax-awel** 'broom made of branches' [Amatuni 1912: 640]. Agulis *c'tavil* shows an exceptional and unexplained sound change *-x-* : *-t-* (Ačařean 1935: 108, 393). This may probably be explained by contamination with *jah* 'a kindling oily stick, torch', cf. T'iflis, Šamaxi *čat* [HAB 4: 119b; Bařramyan 1964: 223]. The same contamination may also explain the hushing *č-* in Łarabał *čxévül*, perhaps also Georg. *č^haxi* vs. *č^haxi* 'branches of mulberry for silkworm'; cf. also Georg. *č^haxe* 'a bush, былинка' (see HAB 4: 447a).

Derivative: Hamšen (*c'axud*), Trapizon ***c'ax-ut** 'woods, forest' [Ačařean 1913: 1051b; HAB 4: 447a], also 'mountain' (see 3.4.1). On **c'ax-an**, see below.

c'ak': Łarabał (*c'ak^o* in HAB 4: 447a and 452a, but *c'ak'* in Davt'yan 1966: 487), Łaradał, Agulis, Lori 'thorn; a thorny shrub, the branches of which are used for making hedges' [HAB 4: 447a]; Van, Muš, Bulanəx, Sip'an, Aparan 'harrow made of thorny bushes or tree-branches' [Amatuni 1912: 642a]; Moks *c'ak^o* 'борона из хвороста' (Orbeli 2002: 338; a textual illustration in 63^{Nr31}, Russ. transl.

138); Łarabał, Łazax, Lori, etc. **c'ak'-i** 'a thorny wild plant, *Paliurus aculeatus*' [HAB 4: 447a].

Łarabał **c'ak'-an** (*c'āk^oän*, Davt'yan 1966: 487) 'harrow made of thorny bushes or tree-branches' [Amatuni 1912: 642a] (this word, in variants **c'ak'an** and **c'axan**, is recorded in DialAdd apud NHB 2: 1067b). Šatax *cāk^oän* presupposes an older *c'agan*, which is corroborated by an attestation in Grigor Tat'ewac'i, 14-15th cent. [HAB 4: 446a]. Moks has *c'ak^oän* [Orbeli 2002: 337]. This -g- vs. -k'- : -x- is unclear. Note also Xotorjur **c'agi* 'a thorny shrub' [YušamXotorj 1964: 516a].

Łarabał, Łazax, Lori **c'ak'-at** 'branch-cutter' = *c'ak'* + *hat-* 'to cut'; Muš, Bulanəx, Aparan, Sip'an, Łarabał **c'ak'el** 'to harrow' (cf. Moks *c'ak^oil* 'боронить', Orbeli 2002: 338); Łarabał, Łazax, Širak **c'ak'-ut** 'place abounding in thorny bushes' [Amatuni 1912: 642]. The latter is also a place-name on the river Orotan: **C'ak'ut** [Amatuni 1912: 642b]. This is identical with the above-mentioned **C'ak'ut** attested in Step'anos Őrbelean (see HayTeĭBař 5, 2001: 155b). Also in Tavuš, *c'ak'ut* refers to 'brushwood' or 'woods'. Textual illustrations can be found in fairytales from HŽHek' 6, 1973; for instance: *mæer tan ĩak'i c'ak'utəmæ vaz-vaz a anəm* : '(she) is running to and fro in the *c'ak'ut* which is in front of our house" (492^{L-6}).

A compound with the copula *u* 'and': Ararat, Borč'alu (Lori) **c'ax-u-c'ak'** 'dry branches' [Amatuni 1912: 640b].

●ETYM Since long (de Lagarde [Boetticher] 1850: 363^{Nr268}, 1854: 23^{L592}; Hübschmann 1883: 53; 1897: 499), compared with Skt. *śākhā-* f. (RV+) 'branch, twig'; Sogd. (Man.) *š'yh* 'branch', Oss. *sagoj/sagojnæ* 'hay-fork', *sag* 'deer' (< **šāka-* lit. 'forked, having branches', see Cheung 2002: 222; see also s.v. *xač'eneak*); Goth. f. *hoha* 'plough'; Lith. *šakà* 'branch', *šākė* 'fork, pitchfork, dungfork'; Russ. *soxá* '(wooden) plough', ORuss. *soxá* 'stake, club, brace, plough', Pol. *socha* 'two-pronged fork', Czech *socha* 'statue, sculpture', Bulg. *soxá* 'stick with a fork', Sln. *sóha* 'pole with a cross-beam', SCr. *sóha* 'stick with a fork', Slk. *socha* 'column', etc. (see also Pokorny 1959: 523; Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 628; Mallory/Adams 1997: 80a).

Since PIE **k̑* regularly yields Arm. *s*, here one has assumed a QIE **k̑^h*- (perhaps secondary, through assimilatory influence of the *-*kH-* in the root) or **sk-*, with *s*-mobile (for a discussion, see Scheftelowitz 1904-05, 1: 288-289; Pedersen 1905: 204-205 = 1982: 66-67; Petersson 1920: 98) or **k̑s-* (Meillet 1936: 36). The fricative -*x* points to *-*k-* + *-*H-*, see Kortlandt 1976: 91 = 2003: 1; Lubotsky 1989: 56; Beekes 2003: 202 (see also 2.1.18.1). Lubotsky (1988: 104) reconstructs PIE **k̑ok^(w)-eh₂-*, gen. **k̑ok^(w)-h₂-os*. Skt. -*kh-* and Arm. -*x* have resulted from generalization of the oblique stem. Sceptical: Elbourne 2005: 10-11. For a discussion, see also Ravnæs 1991: 128-129.

As we have seen in the dialectal section, both **c'ak'** and **c'ax** are widespread in Armenian dialects. One of the meanings of the former is 'harrow' (compare 'plough' in Slavic and Gothic). The doublet -*k'* : -*x* (cf. Ĵahukyan 1987: 130, 253) points to an archaic distribution between the nominative and oblique stems of the original paradigm: PIE nom. **k̑ok-eh₂-*, gen. **k̑k-h₂-ós*. The PArm. paradigm was as follows: nom. **sókā-*, gen. **c'axó-* (from **k̑^haxó-* [with assimilation, see above] < **k̑₃k-h₂-ós*, with an anaptyctic shwa in the cluster) >> **c'ak'* : **c'ax*. Then these forms have been generalized into two forms with a semantic contrast: **c'ax** 'branch; firewood;

brushwood’, **c‘ak‘** ‘a thorny plant; harrow’. If one prefers the solution with *s*-mobile: PIE nom. **skók-eh₂-*, gen. **(s)k₂k-h₂-ós* > PArm. nom. **c‘ókā-*, gen. **saxó-* > > **c‘ak‘* : **c‘ax*. The *s*-mobile has been lost in the initial cluster of the genitive, but Armenian has restored it from the nominative.

c‘ac, *o*-stem (GDSg *c‘ac-o-y* in John Chrysostom), according to NHB 2: 904c also *i*-stem (but there is only GDSg *c‘ac-i* in Sargis Šnorhali, 12th cent., which points to either *i*- or *a*-stem) ‘low; modest, moderate, obedient’ (Bible+); **c‘acnum** (aor. *c‘aceay*) ‘to become low; to subside; to cease, become calm’; **c‘ac-un** ‘modest, calm’ (Bible+; on this derivative, see Klingenschmitt 1982: 257₁₆; Olsen 1999: 602, 604), *o*-stem: GDSg *c‘acn-o-y* in Eusebius of Caesarea, John Chrysostom, GDPI *c‘acn-o-c‘* in John Chrysostom.

●DIAL The form *c‘ac* is widespread in the dialects (mostly *kə*-group, but also Ararat, Salmast). In Van-group, T‘iflis, Ararat: *c‘acr*, analogically after *barjr* ‘high’. Marāṭa distinguishes between *c‘ac* adv. ‘low’ and *c‘ánjər* ‘low; modest’ [HAB 4: 447b]. Polis has *c‘aj* and the verb *c‘aznal*, 1sg aor. *c‘acca* [Ačařean 1941: 142, 144, 245].

●ETYM Scheftelowitz (1904-05, 1: 287) compares Arm. *c‘acnum* with Lat. *cadō*, *cadere* ‘to fall (down, from); to die, perish, end, close’, Skt. *śad-* ‘to fall out; to decay’ (perf. *śasāda*, fut. *śatsyanti*), *parṇa-śadā-* m. ‘fall of leaves’ (see Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 607, without Iranian and Armenian). Ačařyan (HAB 4: 447b) is sceptical since, as he explicitly states, one expects Arm. **sat* or **sac*. This is not decisive since the Proto-Armenian form can be explained by a form with *s*-mobile (see Mladenov 1937: 100; Ĵahukyan 1987: 130).

In order to explain the affricate *-c-* of the Armenian form, Scheftelowitz (ibid.) posits **kad-yo-*, which is accepted in Pokorny 1959: 516; Illič-Svityč 1971: 349; Ĵahukyan 1982: 61; 1987: 130 (sceptical: Klingenschmitt 1982: 258₁₉). However, **dy-* would yield Arm. *-č-* rather than *-c-* (see 2.1.22.1). A better solution would be to envisage a sigmatic aorist formation **-d-s-* (cf. Ĵahukyan 1982: 185).

The Indo-European root is reconstructed as **keh₂d-*, with loss of the laryngeal in Aryan (see Lubotsky 1981: 134). If this is accepted, Lat. *cadō* reflects **kh₂d-* [Schrijver 1991: 100]. The Proto-Armenian form would go back then to QIE sigm. aor. **sk(e)h₂d-s-*.

See also s.v. *satak* ‘corpse’.

Olsen (1999: 772, 802₄₈, 966), with reservation, derives Arm. *c‘ac* from **(h)uti-h₃k^wV-tjo-* or the like, assuming dissimilation from **c‘ac‘*, cf. Skt. *ava-* ‘off, away, down’, Gr. *αῦσιος* ‘in vain’, Goth. *auþja* ‘desert’. This is gratuitous.

c‘amak‘, *a*-stem: GDSg *c‘amak‘-i*, LocSg *i c‘amak‘-i*, ISg *c‘amak‘-a-w* (no evidence for the plural) ‘dry; earth, dry land’ (Bible+); **c‘amak‘im** ‘to grow dry’ (Bible+). On the denominative verb **c‘mk‘-**, **smk‘-** ‘to grow dry; to shrivel, shrink’ (MidArm. and dialects), see below.

A few textual illustrations for the two meanings:

In Job 24.19: *Erewesc‘i tunk noc‘a i veray c‘amak‘ erkri* ‘‘May their plants appear on dried-out earth’’ : *ἀναφανείη δὲ τὰ φυτόα αὐτῶν ἐπὶ γῆς ζηρὰ* (Cox 2006: 171).

In Genesis 1.10 (Zeyt‘unyan 1985: 146): *Ew koč‘eac‘ Astuac zc‘amak‘n erkir* : *καὶ ἐκάλεσεν ὁ θεὸς τὴν ζηρὰν γῆν*.

In Jonah 1.9 (Weitenberg 1992a: 10): *Asē c'nosa. caráy tearn em es, ew ztēr astuac erknic' paštem or arár zcov ew zc'amak' : καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτοῦς Δοῦλος κυρίου ἐγὼ εἰμι καὶ τὸν κύριον θεὸν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἐγὼ σέβομαι, ὃς ἐποίησεν τὴν θάλασσαν καὶ τὴν ξηράν.*

An illustration for the verb *c'amak'im* from Genesis 8.14 (Zeyt'unyan 1985: 180): *c'amak'ec'aw erkir : ἐξηράνθη ἡ γῆ.*

●DIAL The noun *c'amak'* is ubiquitous in the dialects [HAB 4: 448b], mainly in the meaning 'dry' [Amatuni 1912: 640b; Ačārean 1913: 1051-1052].

A denominative verb is found both with initial *c'-* and *s-*: Nor Naxijewan *c'mk'il*, Polis *c'amk'il*, Hamšen *c'omk'uš* 'to grow dry' [HAB 4: 448b], Muš, Alaškert *c'mk'il* 'to shrivel, shrink from fear', Širak *smk'il* 'id.' [Amatuni 1912: 594], Polis, Łarabał **smk'il* 'to grow dry', Arabkir, Ewdokia 'to shrivel, shrink', etc. [Ačārean 1913: 975b]. In Grigoris, a 13th-century medical writer, we find both *smk'-* and *c'mk'-* 'to grow dry', in both cases said of a breast' (see MiĵHayBař 2, 1992: 333b, 404b). The desaffrication of *c'-* into *s-* in the initial cluster is conceivable, and I see no solid reason to follow Ačāryan (HAB 4: 234-235) in separating *smk'im* (q.v.) from *c'amak'*.

●ETYM Since de Lagarde (1854: 19^{L461f}) and others (Bugge 1889: 18; Pedersen 1905: 204 = 1982: 66), Arm. *c'amak'* is interpreted as composed of the suffixal element *-k'* (from IE **-k-* or **-tu-*) and a root which is cognate with Skt. *kṣám-* f. 'earth, surface of the earth', NSg *kṣás*, GAbISg *jm-ás* and *gm-ás*, *kṣamā* 'on the floor', dual-dvandva *dyānvā-kṣāmā* 'heaven and earth', MPers. *zamīk* 'earth', Gr. *χθών*, gen. *χθονός* 'earth', *χαμαί* 'on the earth', Hitt. *tēkan* n. 'earth', Toch. A *tkam* 'earth', B *kem* 'earth' (< PToch. **tken-*, Adams 1999: 192), Lat. *humus* f. 'earth, soil, ground' (for the vocalism cf. Schrijver 1991: 204), Lith. *žėmė* 'earth, land', OCS *zemlja* 'earth, land', Czech *země*, etc. (Mayrhofer EWAia 1, 1992: 424-425; Derksen 1996: 63-64; for the Vedic inflection, see Kuiper 1942: 86-91 [246-251]).

The initial cluster rather represents a **d^hg^h-* (see Euler 1979: 167; Beekes 1995: 133-134). In Armenian, PIE **d^hg^h-* and **tk-* merged into a *c'-* (cf. Klingenschmitt 1982: 191, 191₃₅, operating with **g^hp* and **k^hp*), see also s.v. *c'in* 'kite'. Compare, however, *jukn* 'fish' (q.v.).

This PIE word is an old HD *m*-stem: nom. **d^hég^h-ōm* (Hitt. *tēkan*, Skt. *kṣá-s*, Gr. *χθών*), acc. **d^hg^h-ém-m* (Gr. *χθόν-α*, Lith. *žėm-ė*), gen. **d^hg^h-m-ós* (Hitt. *takn-aš*, Skt. *jm-ás*, Gr. *χθον-ός*), see Beekes 1995: 178. Skt. *kṣamā* and Gr. *χαμαί* are derived from an ending-less locative **d^hg^hm-eh₂* of a *h₂*-collective/abstract formation, probably via a Lindeman-variant **d^hg^hṛmmeh₂* (see Hajnal 1992, especially 213-217, 215₃₇).

According to Klingenschmitt (1982: 191₃₅; see also Olsen 1999: 71, 776-777), Arm. *c'amak'*, *a*-stem may be derived from **g^hpma-ko/ā-* 'auf der Erde befindlich'; for the suffix, see Jahukyan 1987: 232; Olsen 1999: 71₁₄₇, 852-854. I would prefer a form QIE **d^hg^hṛmm-eh₂-k-eh₂-*, with coll. *-k'*. The collective nature of the word is corroborated by the fact that no plural forms are attested.

On the other hand, Arm. *c'amak'* has been linked with Skt. *kṣāmá-* 'versengt, ausgedörrt', *kṣāmavant-* 'verbrannt, verkohlt' (YV+), etc. (on which see Mayrhofer EWAia 1, 1992: 430), with or without the words for 'earth', Bugge, Pedersen (see references above); Hübschmann 1897: 499; Pokorny 1959: 624; Jahukyan 1987:

133, 176, 259, 462 (with hesitation). They usually reconstruct initial **ks-*. However, **ks-* would probably yield Arm. *č'*-, see s.v. *č'ir* 'dried fruit', *č'or* 'dry' (cf. Gr. *ζερόν* 'terra firma', *ξηρός* 'dry; withered', Skt. *kṣāra-* 'caustic, pungent, saline', etc.) and 2.1.12.

Ačāryan (HAB 4: 448) rejects the IE origin of Arm. *c'amak'* and treats it as a Semitic loanword, cf. Hebrew *šmq* 'to dry', etc. This is less probable.

I conclude that Arm. *c'amak'* 'dry; earth, dry land' derives from the PIE word for 'earth' (cf. Skt. *kṣām-*, MPers. *zamīk*, Gr. *χθών*, Hitt. *tēkan*, etc.). The only difficulty is that the semantic development 'dry' > 'dry land, earth' is more probable than the opposite one. However, this is a minor problem and may have resulted from a secondary association (cf. Skt. *kṣāmá-* 'versengt, ausgedörrt').

c'ayem 'to rinse', MidArm. according to Norayr (HAB 4: 449a).

●DIAL Nor Naxiĵewan, Č'enkiller (Nikomidia), St'anoz, Xarberd, Sivrihisar *c'ayel* 'to rinse' (according to Amatuni 1912: 553b, also in Van); Baberd, Sebastia *c'ay-uk'* 'rinsed water'. In Axalk'alak' and Alek'sandrapol (Leninakan, now Gyumri), *c'ayel* 'to walk coquettishly' [HAB 4: 449a].

●ETYM No etymology in HAB 4: 449a. M. Ałabekyan (1980: 159-162) links *c'ayem* with Lat. *skateō* 'to gush out, to jump up (of water out of a well)', etc., see s.v. *c'aytem* 'to sprinkle, spray, strew, splash (on)'.

c'aytem 'to sprinkle, spray, strew, splash (on)' (4 Kings 9.33, Dawit' Anyalt'), 'to sparkle, twinkle, flash' (Nersēs Lambronac'i, 11th cent.); **c'ayt-k'** pl. 'splash, spray' (Canon Law); **c'ayt-uk'** 'splash, spray' (Nersēs Lambronac'i, 11th cent.); **c'ayt-umn** 'splash, spray; sparkle, flash' (Łazar P'arpec'i /5th cent./, etc.). With aspirated dental stop: **c'ayt'-** 'to (be)sprinkle' (Yovhannēs Vanandec'i Benik Vardapet, Nersēs Šnorhali, etc.), 'to sparkle, flash' (Elišē), 'to shine, rise (said of the sun)' (Geoponica, etc.); without -y-: MidArm. **c'at'el** 'to rise (said of the sun)', **c'at'il**, aor. *c'at'ec'ay* 'to rise (of the sun); to ray, radiate, send out shine or reflection' [MijHayBař 2, 1992: 401a]. In Amirdovlat' Amasiac'i (15th cent.): **c'at'-k-el** 'to jump down' [MijHayBař 2, 1992: 401a].

In 4 Kings 9.33: *c'aytec'aw yarenē nora zormovk'n ew zjiovk'n : ἐπραντίσθη τοῦ αἵματος αὐτῆς πρὸς τὸν τοῖχον καὶ πρὸς τοὺς ἵππους.*

●DIAL The verb *c'a(y)t-* (with non-aspirated -t-) has been preserved in the dialect of Ewdokia: *c'atel*. Beside the forms with initial *c'-* (Sebastia *c'at'el*, etc., there are also forms pointing to initial *c-*, Polis *jat'il*, Zeyt'un *cet'il*, Svedia *j'id'il* 'to rise (of the sun); to shine', etc. These forms reflect MidArm. *cat'il* (attested in Kostandin Erzncac'i), which, according to Ačāryan (HAB 4: 449b; Ačāryan 2003: 130, 422), is a blend of *c'ayt-* 'to jump' and *cag-* 'to rise (of the sun)'. Alternatively, one may assume a metathesis of aspiration: *c'ayt-* > *cayt-* with a subsequent assimilation to *c'ayt'*.

The basic meaning may be described as **'to jump (said of water and light)'*.

●ETYM Linked with Lat. *skateō* 'to gush out, jump up (of water out of a well)', Lith. *skàsti* (*skantù, skataiù*) 'to jump', etc. (Meillet apud HAB 4: 449b; see also Ałabekyan 1980: 159-162); on the vocalism of the Baltic (**skot-*) and Latin (possibly **sket-*) forms, see Schrijver 1991: 432), and, on the other hand (Dervischjan 1877: 47), with Skt. *skādati* 'to leap, spring, fall off', Lat. *scandō* 'to

climb, mount, ascend', Mir. *scendid* 'to jump', etc., see s.v. *sandut-k* 'ladder, stairs'. None of the etymologies is formally satisfying. One might assume that PArm. **c'at-* and **c'a(n)t-* have produced *c'ayt/t-* through influence of **c'ayem* from **skot-é-mi*, with **-o-* > *-a-* in the pretonic open syllable. Note MidArm. and dial. *c'ayem* 'to rinse' (see Ałabekyan 1980: 159-162), q.v.

c'ank/g, *o*-stem: GDSg *-o-y*, ISg *-o-v*, GDPI *-o-c* 'hedge, fence' (Bible+), 'list, table of contents' (Psalms, Movsēs Xorenac'i, see NHB 2: 908a); **c'ank/gem** 'to hedge, fence' (Agat'angelos, Philo, Ephrem, etc.).

●DIAL No dialectal forms are recorded in HAB 1: 197-199; 4: 450b. In 1913: 1052b, however, Ačařyan himself cites the verb **c'ankel* 'to fence' in Akn (cf. **c'ankac partēz* 'fenced garden'). The noun *c'ank* is found in an expression from Xian: **K'o c'ankn em kotrer, k'o aygin em mter?* "Have I broken your fence? Have I entered into your garden? [What a damage have I caused to you?]" (ibid. 90a), as well as in the dial. (the dialectal location not specified) compound **c'ank-a-cak-i* 'a small bird that can even pass through the holes of a fence', as a synonym of Łarabał 'half-Turkish' *č'əp'ə-cák-ε* (see Ačařean 1913: 1052), probably to be read as *č'əp'ər-cák-ε*, with *č'ap'ar* 'fence'.

●ETYM Usually interpreted as *c'-* 'to' + *ank/g-* 'to fall' and identified with *c'-ank/g* 'always' (cf. also *y-ang* 'end'), thus: 'hedge' is seen as the end, edge, border (NHB 2: 908a; HAB 1: 197-198; 4: 450b). Olsen (1999: 754) interprets the word as *c'-* + **ank/g-* < **paġ/g-* (see Pokorny 1959: 787-788), which is improbable. Likewise improbable is the connection with Skt. *śaṅkū-* m. 'pointed peg', etc. proposed by Scheftelowitz (1904-05, 1: 287-288).

The interpretation *c'-* 'to' + *ank/g-* 'to fall' is possible but not evident. I alternatively propose a connection with the Celtic-Germanic word for 'hedge, fence': MWelsh *cae* m. 'hedge, fence, enclosure, field; clasp, brooch; chaplet, diadem, garland', Late Cornish *ke*, British *kae* m. 'hedge', etc. < Late Proto-British **kai* < PCelt. **kayjo-* < Pre-Celt. **kag^h-*; OEngl. *hecge*, MDutch *hegghe*, OHG *hegga*, *hecka* < WGerm. **hayjō*, OEngl. *haga* 'fence', OIc. *hagi* *n*-stem 'fenced land, meadow' < **hayōn* (see Schrijver 1995: 306), OHG *hagan* 'brier', MHG *hagen* 'fencing' < PGerm. **hag-na-*, probably also Welsh *caen* f. 'Bedeckung, Haut' < **kag^h-nā-* (Pokorny 1959: 518).¹³⁰ The Armenian form may be derived from **s-kag^h-no-*. The oldest form is thus *c'ang*. We seem to be dealing with a European substratum word.

c'ankam or **c'ankanam** 'to long for, lust' (Bible, Eznik Kołbac'i, etc.); **c'ank-ut'iwn** 'wish, lust, desire' (Bible+), **c'ank** 'lust' (Philo).

●DIAL Šamaxi *c'anganal* 'to long for' [Bałramyan 1964: 228], Xarberd *c'anganal* 'to lust', Muš *c'anguten* 'wish' < *c'ank-ut'iwn* [HAB 4: 450b].

●ETYM No etymology is accepted in HAB 4: 450b.

One may wonder whether *c'ank(an)am* is composed of the prefix *c'-* and *ankanim* 'to fall down', which also means 'to sin, prostitute' (q.v.). See also s.vv. *ang-ti* 'prostitute' and *c'-ank* 'hedge, fence' (q.v.).

¹³⁰ The derivation from **kag^h-* 'to catch, seize' (see Mallory/Adams 1997: 199b, 564a) is not evident.

c'awł (Hexaemeron, Ephrem; dial.), **c'awł-un**, *o*-stem: GDPI *c'ohn-o-y* (Bible+) 'stem, stalk; straw'. The form *c'awł-un* (spelled also as *c'otun*) is more frequent in the 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', as is clearly seen in Job 24.24 (Cox 2006: 172), where a reference is made to *hask* 'ear of corn' (= *στάχυς* 'ear') fallen off the stalk (*c'awłun* = *καλάμη* 'stalk; stubble'); for the full passage, see s.v. *hask* 'ear of corn'. Besides, dial. **c'ot* (see below) refers both to the stalk and straw. Consequently, the meaning of *c'awł₂*, *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 Ačāryan (1952: 49, 296), Van has both forms, with and without *-un*, namely *c'ot* and *c'otun*. Note also Moks *c'ot* 'millet-straw', GSG *c'otə*, NPI *c'otir* [Orbeli 2002: 339]. On the importance of the Van and Moks forms, see below.

●ETYM The evidence from 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 Ačāryan 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*. Ačāryan (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'awłun* also has an *an*-stem in Nełos (GDSg *c'ohuan* and ISg *c'ohuamb*) [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'; note also *sru-il* 'a kind of musical instrument'), so the suffix can be the same *-un*. Unlike *c'awłun* (*o*-stem), *srun-k* has an *i*-stem, which is perhaps due to contamination with (the Iranian cognate of) PIE **krūs-ni-*, 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', etc. It may also have been a dual form. For the suffix cf. also *kot* 'stem, stalk; handle, shaft' – *kot-un* 'id.'; *joł* 'log, pole' – *jełun/jołun-k* 'ceiling' (q.v.).

There is no evidence for the declension class of *c'awł*. 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'awł*, which, albeit poorly attested in the literature, is the basic form represented by the dialects; *cawł-un* is its derivative in the suffix *-un*, found in a number of semantically close words.

No acceptable etymology is recorded in HAB 4: 466b. Jāhukyan (1967: 180) derives the word from PIE **kolH-* 'stubble', cf. *καλάμη* 'stalk; stubble', etc. (see Schrijver 1991: 327). The vocalism, however, does not suit, because the original Armenian form is *c'awł(un)*. One may consider a connection with **keh₂ulo-*: 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. *kaũls* m. 'bone, stem' (see Schrijver 1991: 268-269; on the suffix *-lo-, see Lubotsky 1988: 132).¹³¹

The only problem with this etymology is the absence of the *s*-mobile, which would explain the initial *c*'- (instead of the expected *k*'-). The same holds for Jahukyan's etymology. In the latter case we are dealing with a PIE **k̑-* rather than a **k-*. This is not relevant here, however, since both **s̑k̑* and **sk̑* result in Arm. *c*'. The PIE *s*-mobile is very unstable, thus we cannot rule out its postulation in *c'awt(un)* and some other words even if there are no traces of it in cognate languages (see also Jahukyan 1967: 177ff). Thus: QIE **(s)keh₂u-lo-* 'stem (of a plant); bone' > Arm. *c'awt* 'stem, stalk; straw'. We may be dealing with a Mediterranean-European substratum word.

*c'er (dial.) 'liquid excrements'; *c'er-d- 'id.', probably also 'placenta, menstruation' or the like (> 'miscarriage, misbirth').

●DIAL The dialectal word *c'er* (recorded already in DialAdd apud NHB 2: 1067bc) is present in Polis [Ačarean 1913: 1055a], Sebastia [Gabikian 1952: 541], Moks [Orbeli 2002: 338], Goris [Margaryan 1975: 368a], etc.; verbal *c'arel* in many dialects [Ačarean 1913: 1058a]. Akn *c'er* refers to 'uncooked egg' [Ačarean 1913: 1055a].

Some verbal forms have a dental determinative: *c'r-t'* or *c'r-d-* and means also 'to give birth (said of animals or, pejoratively, of women)' and 'to have miscarriage, give misbirth (said of animals)' [Ačarean 1913: 1058a].

●ETYM Ačaryan (HAB 4: 634) and, independently, Jahukyan (1963a: 95; 1972: 280; 1985: 153; 1987: 148, 275) derive Arm. *c'er* from PIE **s̑ker-*, cf. **sok̑-r/-n-* 'manure, dung': Hitt. *šakkar*, *šaknaš* 'excrement, dung, faeces', Av. *sairiia-* 'dung', Gr. *σκῶρ*, *σκατός* n. 'excrement', Lat. *-cerda* 'dung', OIc. *skarn* 'dung, manure' < PGerm. **skarna-*, Russ. *sor* 'filth, litter', Latv. *sārņi* 'dung', Lith. *šárvas* 'placenta, menstruation' (for the meaning 'placenta' compare the Armenian dialectal meanings), etc.

A semantically, formally and morphologically similar form **k̑ok̑^w-r/-n-* is reflected in Skt. NAccSg *śákṛt* n. (RV+), GSg *śaknāḥ* (AV+) 'dung, faeces', MPers. *sargēn* 'manure, dung' Gr. *κόπρος* f. 'manure, dung, faeces', etc. This PIE word is probably a derivative of the root **k̑ek̑^w-* found in Lith. *šikti* 'to shit'. For the forms and the morphology of these PIE synonymous words, both being neuters of **-r/n-* heteroclitic declension, see Schindler 1966b: 74-75; 1975: 4, 5; Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 602; Derksen 1996: 219-220; Mallory/Adams 1997: 186b.

Arm. *c'er* derives from **s̑ker-no-* (Jahukyan *ibid.*). For **c'er-T-* < **s̑ker-T-* compare Skt. *śákṛt*, Lat. *-cerda*, etc.

Further note MidArm. *cirt* 'dung (mostly of birds)' and ClArm. *crtem* 'to defecate (said of birds)' (Bible+), 'to spawn' (Hexaemeron); both forms are widespread in the dialects [HAB 2: 460b]; no etymology in HAB *ibid.* If we derive this word from our etymon, the initial *c-* instead of *c'*- and the vowel *-i-* will be aberrant. We might tentatively posit **s̑kēr-d-* > *cirt* through assimilation *c'...t* > *c...t*.

¹³¹ According to Beekes (1969: 178, 290), the Greek and Lithuanian words may be of substratum origin.

c'in, *o*-stem: AblPl *i c'n-o-c'* (Philo) 'kite' (Bible+); MidArm. *c'inayn* and *c'nin* 'kite' (HAB 4: 455a; MiĵHayBaĵ 2, 1992: 404b).

Arm. *c'in* renders Gr. *ἰκτινα* 'kite' in Deuteronomy 14.13 (Cox 1981: 136; Wevers 1977: 195; Wevers 1995: 245) and in Leviticus 11.14 (Zöhrpean 1805, 1: 214; Wevers 1986: 127; Wevers 1997: 148). In Isaiah 34.11 it corresponds to Gr. *ἰβις* 'ibis, Egyptian bird'. Further attested in Zgōn-Afrahat, Philo, etc. (NHB 2: 913b; Greppin 1978: 52-54). In a *kafā* to the Alexander Romance *c'in* appears as *sew haw* 'black bird' (H. Simonyan 1989: 229^{L4}).

●DIAL Agulis *c'ayn* [Ačarean 1935: 394]; Van *kor-c'anānek* 'kite' (HAB 4: 455b; Ačaryan 1952: 37, 296) probably containing *kor* 'curved, crooked', for the semantics, see s.v. *angt* 'vulture', *korč* 'gryphon, vulture'. The form *-c'anānek* and *c'nāni* (Rivola) must be identified with MidArm. *c'inayn* and *c'nin* 'kite'. Muš and Alaškert *c'urur* is unclear; perhaps a blend of *c'in* and the synonymous *urur* 'kite' [HAB 3, 618b; 4: 455b]. For this type of blended bird-names, see s.v. *sarik* 'starling, blackbird'.

●ETYM Since de Lagarde [Boetticher] 1850: 363^{Nr269}; 1854: 10^{L167f}; Müller 1870: 454; Dervischjan 1877: 22, 48 et al., connected with Skt. *śyenā-* m. 'bird of prey, falcon, eagle', Av. *saēna-* 'a big bird of prey', Gr. *ἰκτινος* m. 'kite'; the troublesome anlaut has been explained from **ks-*, **k̄y-*, **k̄p-*, etc., see Hübschmann 1883: 53; 1897: 499; Meillet 1900c: 317; 1936: 40; Pedersen 1905: 209; 1906: 397; 1924: 223b = 1982: 71, 175, 306b; Charpentier 1909: 243; HAB 4: 455; Pokorny 1959: 416, 417; Schmitt 1981: 51, 54_D; Olsen 1999: 197-198. Ĵahukyan 1987: 174 assumes **sk̄i-* > *c'*- since **k̄i-* would yield, he claims, Arm. *č'*. However, also **sk̄i-* seems to produce Arm. *č'*, as in *čanač'em* 'to know'.

The word is now reconstructed as **tk̄iH-(i)no-* or **tk̄iH-eno-*, and the Armenian *c'*- is plausibly explained from **tk̄-* > **t̄^hs-*; see Clackson 1994: 45-46, 143-144 (with a thorough discussion); Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 662; Beekes 2003: 195, 196, 200; cf. also Greppin 1978: 54-55. One also may think of the 'Hoffmann-suffix' **-Hn-*.

The MidArm. and dial. **c'nin(i)* is difficult to explain. One may speculate on an underlying **c'in-i* < **tk̄iHn-ieh₂*- (compare Arm. *ozni* 'hedgehog' (q.v.) < **h₁oġ^hi-Hn-ieh₂*- vs. Gr. *ἐχίνοσ* 'id.' < **h₁oġ^hi-Hn-os*) and an additional *-n* probably from acc. **-m* (on which see 2.2.1.3).

Xač'aturova 1987 suggests a comparison of the Armenian and Aryan words with Georgian *cxeni* 'horse'. For the association between 'eagle or kite' and 'horse', see s.v. *arcui* 'eagle'. The resemblance with Megr. *čxwik-*, Georg. *čxiķw-*, dial. *čxwink-*, etc. 'jay' (on which see Klimov 1984: 222) seems to be accidental.

Ĵahukyan (1987: 612) points out that the resemblance between Arm. *c'in* and some ECauc forms meaning 'eagle' (Avar *uĵuĵyn*, etc.) is accidental if the Armenian word is of IE origin. One may perhaps treat these forms as borrowed from PArm. **t̄^hčin-*. An opposite direction of borrowing (Nikolaev 1984: 71, **cc'iHma*) is impossible in view of the impeccable IE origin of *c'in*.

c'ir, *o*-stem: GDSg *c'r-o-y* (Job 11.12 [Cox 2006: 105], Canon Law, Grigor Narekac'i), GDPl *c'r-o-c'* in P'awstos Buzand 4.13 (see below), T'ovmay Arcruni 3.29 (V. Vardanyan 1985: 392^{L14}); *u*-stem: GDPl *c'r-u-c'* (Isaiah 32.14, Ephrem, Physiologus) 'onager, wild ass'.

Several attestations in the Bible (Astuacaturean 1895: 1483b), where *c'ir* renders Gr. *ὄναγρος* ‘onager, wild ass’, e.g. Psalms 103.11, Daniel 5.21 [Cowe 1992: 189], or *ὄνος ἄγριος* ‘wild ass’, e.g. Job 6.5, 39.5 [Cox 2006: 78, 250]. In Job 11.12: *hangoyñ ē c'roy anapatakani* ‘is like a wild desert ass’: *ἴσα ὄνω ἐρημίτη* [Cox 2006: 105]. In Job 24.5: *Dipēc'an ibrew zc'irs i vayri* ‘They proved to be like donkeys in a field’: *ἀπέβησαν δὲ ὡσπερ ὄνοι ἐν ἀγρῶ* [Cox 2006: 168].

In P'awstos Buzand 4.13 (1883=1984: 95^{L13}; transl. Garsoian 1989: 138^{L8f}): *čarakk' c'roc'* ‘pasture for wild asses’.

In the 7th-century Armenian Geography (Ašxarhac'oyc') by Anania Širakac'i (see Soukry 1881: 32), certainly referring to the onager, wild ass (see Eremyan 1963: 99a; Hewsen 1992: 179¹⁴³).

According to T'ovmay Arcruni (9-10th cent.) 3.29 (1985: 392; transl. Thomson 1985: 316), there were herds of onagers (*eramakk' c'roc'*) on the banks of the river Araxes, SE to the mountain Masis.

●DIAL No dialectal forms are recorded in HAB 4: 455b.

Zeyt'un **c'iptuk* is mentioned by Ačařyan (1913: 207b; HAB 1: 490b) as synonymous to *brinč'*, dial. **bro/ōš-*, **btinč'/j-* ‘snowball-tree, guelder rose (*Viburnum opulus*) and/or *Celtis australis* or *occidentalis*’, and dial. *tartatan* without any comment on its origin and composition. It seems to have been composed of **c'ar'* (a negative characterizer of plants, see Ačařean 1913: 1055a, 1058ab) and *ptuk* ‘shoot, a plant’ (see Ačařean 1913: 931b; HAB 4: 111-112).

However, Zeyt'un *bōdug* (< ClArm. *ptuk*, q.v.) only means ‘nipple’ (see HAB 4: 112a; Ačařyan 2003: 336). I therefore alternatively interpret **c'iptuk* as *c'ir* ‘onager’ + *ptuk* ‘nipple’, thus: ‘onager’s nipple’. An interesting parallel can be found in Caucasian languages. Next to Lak. *mamari* ‘blackberry’, Darg. **mVmVrV* (Chir. *mimre*) ‘raspberry’, Chechen *mürg* ‘guelder rose, snowball-tree’, etc. (see s.v. *mor* ‘blackberry’), Archi has a word *mam* ‘raspberry’, usually in the combination *g^{ac}:ilin mam*, lit. ‘mare’s nipple’ (see Nikolayev/Starostin 1994: 804).

●ETYM No acceptable etymology is recorded in HAB 4: 455b. Ĵahukyan 1987 vacat. According to Olsen (1999: 939), a word of unknown origin.

I tentatively propose a connection with Ir. *ciar* ‘dark brown’ < **kh₁ei-ro-* (the evidence for **h₁* is based only on this Irish form); Slav. **xoiro-* ‘grey’ < PIE **kh₁oiro-*: RuCS *sěrb*, Ru. *séryj*, Ukr. *siryj*, OCzech *šeryj*, etc.; OIc. *hárr*, OEngl. *hār* ‘grey’ < **kh₁oi-ro-*; OPr. *sasins* ‘hare’; Skt. *śása-* ‘hare’ < **kh₁-es-*; Lat. *cānus* ‘white, hoary, grey; old, aged’ < **kasnos, cascus* ‘old’, Paelign. *casnar* ‘senex’, etc. (for a discussion, see Lubotsky 1989: 56-57; Schrijver 1991: 86, 91, 109; Derksen 2008: 445). Further, see s.v. the mountain-name *Sim*.

Since PIE **k̂* regularly yields Arm. *s*, here the initial *c'*- requires an explanation. One possibility would be to assume *s*-mobile. Alternatively, Arm. *c'* may be due to **k̂ⁿ*- from **k̂H-* (see 2.1.18.1 and s.v. *c'ax* ‘branch’). This goes parallel with the development PIE **kH* > Arm. *x* beside **k* > Arm. *k'*, respectively. Thus: QIE **k̂He/oi-ro-* + secondary **-ro-* or **-so-* > Arm. *c'ir* ‘onager’ < ‘the grey or brown one’. If, however, the Slavic form has been borrowed from Germanic (see Vasmer s.v. for references), the reconstruction of the laryngeal becomes problematic.

*c'it- 'to cut, split, scratch': c'tem 'to cut, tear, scratch (the skin with a knife, nails, etc.)' (Bible+); danak-a-c'it 'cut with a knife' (Movsēs Kałankatuac'i). For Biblical attestations, see Astuacaturean 1895: 1487a; Klingenschmitt 1982: 144.

●DIAL Xarberd c'dil 'to be cut, torn (said of the body, skin)' [HAB 4: 456a].

●ETYM Connected with Skt. *chinátti*, pass. *chidy-* 'to split, break, cut off', Gr. *σχίζω* 'to split, cut, separate', Lat. *scindō*, *scidī*, *scissum* 'to split, cleave, tear apart; to separate', Lith. *skiedžiu* 'to separate, divide', Latv. *šķiēst* 'to scatter, spill, cut', etc. Meillet 1894b: 296; HAB 4: 455-456; Pokorny 1959: 920; Mallory/Adams 1997: 144a; Olsen 1999: 813-814.

The IE etymon is often reconstructed as *skei-d-. The problematic anlaut of Gr. *σχ-* and Skt. *ch-*, however (see Hiersche 1964: 250-251; Mayrhofer EWAia 1, 1992: 561 with references) points to a voiceless aspirate (Szemerényi 1996: 69). Rix 1992: 84-85 posits *sg^h.

Klingenschmitt (1982: 83, 144-145) reconstructs *sk^hide/o- or *sk^hideje/o- for Armenian. However, Arm. c'- points to *sk- or *sḳ- [HAB 4: 456a]. A voiceless aspirate *k^h-, whether of substratum origin or due to a neighbouring laryngeal (see 2.1.18), would yield Arm. š- (see 2.1.22.3). I do not share the view (see Olsen 1999: 91, 813-814 concerning this etymon) that *sk- yields Arm. š- before a front vowel.

Arm. *šert* 'split wood, piece of wood, splinter' has been compared to this etymon (cf. especially Lith. *skiedarà* 'chip, sliver, splinter', Latv. *skaīda* 'id.', *šķiēdra* 'Holzfaser', etc.) with hesitation, because the initial *sk- is regularly reflected as c'- in c'tim (Hübschmann 1897: 480; HAB 3: 511-512 with an extensive literature and discussion; cf. also L. Hovhannisyan 1990: 214, 215). If the reconstruction *skeh₁i-d- (Mallory/Adams 1997: 144a; against the laryngeal Elbourne 2000: 10) is accepted, one is tempted to posit ablaut *sk- vs. *skH- reflected in Armenian c'it- vs. *šert*. The latter may be derived from *sk^heid-r- > *šeidr-i- > *šert*, -i, through simplification of the diphthong before cluster (cf. HAB 3: 512a) and through regular metathesis.

Other explanations have been offered for *šert*, however. Ałayan 1974: 128-129 derives it from PIE *(s)ker- 'to scratch', cf. Engl. *shard*, *sherd* 'a fragment of broken earthenware; a fragment (of other material)', *shear* 'to cut with a sharp instrument' < *sker- 'to cut, divide, shear, shave', cf. OEngl. *sceard* 'cut, notch', etc.; but this does not solve the problem of the š-, however. Others assume a borrowing (see Lap'anc'yan 1961: 136; Schultheiss 1961: 221).

Ačar'yan (HAB 3: 512a) points out that the resemblance with Syriac *šarat* 'to tear' is accidental. Note also Akkad. *šertu* (GÍR.GAL) 'a weapon' (see Landsberger 1950: 48), which matches Arm. *šert* 'axe' both formally and semantically. However, the meaning 'axe' of *šert* is found only in *Arjeṛn bařaran 1865* and is unattested.

To conclude: Arm. c'tem 'to cut, tear, scratch' derives from IE *ske(h₁)i-d-. The etymology of *šert* 'split wood, piece of wood, splinter' is uncertain. If its appurtenance with this etymon is accepted, one may assume *skh₁eid-r- with *skh₁- taken from a zero-grade form *skh₁id-. At any case, the resemblance with Lith. *skiedarà* 'chip, sliver, splinter', etc. is remarkable (a substratum intermediation?).

c'ncam 'to joy, rejoice' (Bible+); 'to shine' (dial.).

●DIAL T'iflis c'njal 'to joy, rejoice', Muš c'njum 'joy'; Ararat c'njin tal 'to shine with a beautiful colour', said of the cornfield. In metaphorical or jocular usage:

Polis, Karin, Sebastia, Moks, Zeyt'un, Łarabał, Ĵula, etc. 'to pay' [HAB 4: 459]. Note also Zeyt'un *c'ənjəl* 'to joy' [Ačařyan 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'ənjəl* seems relevant. The infinitive ending *-əl* 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'ncəl > c'ənjəl* is regular too, cf. *targal* 'spoon' > Zeyt'un *d'əg'əl*, *xndal* 'to joy' > Zeyt'un *xəndəl*, *merkanal* > Zeyt'un *məyğənl* vs. *merk* 'naked' > *miyg*, etc. (see Ačařyan 2003: 24-25, 146, 198-201). This implies that Zeyt'un *c'ənjəl* 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. *sadaieiti* 'to appear', etc. and derives the Armenian from **skend-jo-*.

Ačařyan (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, although 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. *áchāntsar*, subj. *chantsat*, imper. *chantsi* (see Mayrhofer EWAia 1, 1992: 555-556; Lubotsky 2001a: 32; Baum 2006: 110). Note also Skt. (*ś*)*cand-* 'to shine, glitter', *candrā-* 'shining, light', *hāri-ścandra-* '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.

c'nor-k', *i*-stem: GDPl *c'nor-i-c'* (Bible+), IPl *c'nor-i-w-k'* (Agat'angelos+) 'fancy, fantasy, day-dream; bad dream, apparition, bogy' (Bible+); **c'norim** 'to be mad or furious, act crazily' (Agat'angelos, Eznik Kołbac'i, Ehišē, Movsēs Xorenac'i, John Chrysostom, Evagrius of Pontus, etc.).

In an appendix apud Ařak'el Dawrižec'i /17th cent./, *c'nork'* seems to contextually correspond to *vat eraz* 'bad dream' (see Xanlaryan 1990: 452, lines 9 and 26).

●DIAL The verb is widespread in the dialects, in the meaning 'to grow decrepit, grow mad as a result of senility' [HAB 4: 459b].

●ETYM Pedersen (1906: 480 = 1982: 258) treats *c'nor* as composed of **c'in-*, comparable with Goth. *skeinan*, and the suffix *-or*. Ačařyan (HAB 4: 459b) rejects this comparison and leaves the origin of the word open.

I tentatively propose to treat the word as *c'-* 'to, up to' from **h₁esk^(w)eh₁* (see 2.3.1) + **h₃nor-i(h₂)-* 'to/at dream, fantasy' (see s.v. *anurj-k'*, *i*-stem 'dream, day-dream, prophetic vision, vision'). Thus: **h₁esk^(w)eh₁-h₃nor-i(h₂)-* > PArm. **skē-(H)nor-i-* > **c'inór-i-* > *c'nor*, *i*-stem.

c'urt, *o*-stem: GDSg *c'rt-o-y* (Bible, Eznik Kołbac'i); *i*-stem: GDSg *c'rt-i* (John Chrysostom, Paterica), ISg *c'rt-i-w* (Paterica) 'cold; cold water' (Bible+).

●DIAL Widespread in the dialects [HAB 4: 464a].

●ETYM The word has been compared with Pers. *sard*, Arm. *sairn* ‘cold’ (q.v.), see apart from old attempts recorded in HAB 4: 463-464, also Jahukyan 1967: 180. On the other hand, it is compared with OCS *sěverь* ‘North, Northern wind’, SCr. *sjěvēr* ‘North’, Lith. *šiáurė* f. ‘North’ < **k̂eh₁uer-o-*; Lat. *caurus* m. ‘northwestern wind’ < **k̂h₁uer-o-* (see HAB *ibid.* for references; for a discussion, see Schrijver 1991: 597; Olsen 1999: 42, 771, 812, 814, 852; de Vaan 1999a; Derksen 2008: 448-449).

If the latter etymology is accepted, we have another possible example for the hypothetical development **k̂H* > Arm. *c*’ (see 2.1.18.1). Thus: QIE **k̂h₁ur-do-* > *c* ‘urt’. Further, see s.v. *sird/t* ‘hoarfrost-bringing wind’.

U

ut⁴, *i*-stem: GDPl *ut* ‘-i-c’ ‘eight’ (Bible+); **ut**⁵*sun*, *i*-stem: GDPl *ut* ‘sn-i-c’ ‘eighty’ (Bible+); **ut**⁶*erord*, *a*-stem: GDSg *ut* ‘erord-i’, GDPl *ut* ‘erord-a-c’ ‘eighth’ (Bible+).

●DIAL The form *ut* is ubiquitous in the dialects; *ut*⁵*sun* is widespread, but in some dialects it has been replaced by *sek* ‘sen’ of Turkish origin [HAB 3: 591].

●ETYM Derived from PIE **H(o)k̂t-* ‘eight’: Skt. *aṣṭā(u)*, Gr. *ὀκτώ*, Lat. *octō*, OIr. *ocht*, etc. The absence of palatalization of the **k̂-* in Armenian is due to influence of **septm̃* > *ewt* ‘n’ ‘seven’; cf. the Greek by-form *ὀπτώ*. See Hübschmann 1897: 483-484; HAB 3: 590-591; Meillet 1936: 32; Pokorny 1959: 775; Schmitt 1981: 75; Mallory/Adams 1997: 402-403.

It has been assumed that the absence of an initial *h-* in Armenian points to a zero-grade **h₃k̂t-* taken from the ordinal (Kortlandt 1983: 14; 1994a: 255 = 2003: 44, 99-100; Beekes 1987b: 7). This is plausible, although **Hok̂t-* perhaps remains a possibility (cf. Schrijver 1991: 49, 147).

ul, *o*-stem: GDPl *ul* ‘-o-c’ (Bible+); *u*-stem: GDSg *ul* ‘-u’ (once in the Bible and in Commentary on Genesis), GDPl *ul* ‘-u-c’ (Gregory of Nyssa) ‘kid’ (Bible+).

●DIAL Widespread in the dialects; in Łarabał, Goris, etc., with initial *h-* [HAB 3: 592].

●ETYM Since Patrubány (see HAB 3: 592-593), connected with Gr. *πῶλος* m. f. ‘young horse, foal, filly’, secondarily also of other young animals, metaph. ‘young girl, youth’, Goth. *fula*, OHG *folo* ‘id.’.

In order to explain the Greek *ō* we can either posit a “lengthened grade of a root noun, or, more plausible perhaps, reconstruct for Greek **poHlo-* and postulate a laryngeal metathesis in Germanic (**pHl-* > **plH-*)” [Lubotsky 1988: 132]. Beekes (1995: 36, 189-190; 2003: 171) posits a HD root noun: PIE nom. **pōlH-s*, gen. **plH-ós*.

Arm. *ul* ‘kid’ and *al-oj* ‘female kid’ (q.v.) may have belonged to the same original paradigm: nom. **pōlH-s* > PArm. **húl*, gen. **plH-ós* > PArm. **al-ó-*.¹³² For **pō-* > Arm. **hu-* cf. **pont(e)H-* > *hun* ‘ford’. The initial *h-* has been lost due to generalization of the oblique stem, but the Łarabał and adjacent dialects have

¹³² Alternatively, one may assume an old HD *l*-stem of subtype 4 of Beekes (1995: 177): nom. **péh₃-l-s*, gen. **ph₃-l-ós*.

retained it. For **plH-* > Arm. **al(V)-* cf. **plh₁u-* ‘many’ > *alaw-unk* ‘Pleiades’ (q.v.). The ending *-oĵ-* is unclear; perhaps due to influence of *oroĵ* ‘lamb’; cf. also *atičĵ* ‘virgin, girl’.

Hamp (1990: 21-22) assumes **plH-* > **polH-* > **pōl-*.

uln (GDSg *ulan*, NPI *ulunk*’, GDPI *ulanc*’) ‘neck’ (Bible+). Spelled also as *uġn* and *oln*. Norayr records MidArm. *yulanc*’ *tal* ‘to push (Fr. *pousser*)’ (see HAB 3: 592b).

●DIAL Ačařyan records only Ĵuġa *ulanc*’ *tal* ‘to push with one’s arm’ [HAB 3: 592b], which is identical with the MidArm. form of Norayr (see above). In Bařgirk’ *hayoc*’ (see Amalyan 1975: 191^{Nr453}), *hrel* is interpreted as *meržel*, *kam k’ri tal*, *kam ulans tal*.

Note also Muř *pareki hulunk*’ ‘spinal column’ glossed in HŽHek’ 12, 1984: 641a. Since *parek-i* means ‘of back’, *uln* here seems to refer to ‘vertebra’; see below.

●ETYM Derived from PIE **Heh₃l-en-* or **HoHl-en-*: Gr. *ὠλένη* f. ‘elbow, underarm’; Lat. *ulna* f. ‘elbow’; OHG *el(i)na* f. ‘ell’, etc., as well as Arm. *otn* (GDSg *otin*, ISg *otamb*, NPI *otunk*’, GDPI *otanc*’) ‘spine, back(bone); spine with spinal cord; marrow’ (q.v.). As to the semantic difference, one should pay attention to MidArm. *yulanc*’ *tal* ‘to push’. Naturally, one cannot push with one’s neck. In the dialect of Ĵuġa, 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 identical with the semantics of the PIE word. As to the association between Arm. *otn* ‘spine, backbone, etc.’ and *uln* ‘neck’, cf. Gr. *σφόνδυλος* m. ‘vertebra; (pl.) backbone, spine; neck; joint, etc.’. Note that the neck is, in fact, a part of the spinal column. Finally, Muř *pareki hulunk*’ ‘spinal column’ actually means ‘vertebrae of back’ and can be considered an important intermediary between *otn* and *uln*.

Lidén (1906: 129-130), albeit with some reservation, connects *uln* ‘neck’ with the homonymous *uln* (NPI *ulunk*’, GDPI *ulanc*’) ‘a piece of pearl or glass, bead; knucklebone; collarbone, clavicle’ (Bible+). See also Ĵahukyan 1987: 165.

uln (NPI *ulunk*’, GDPI *ulanc*’) ‘a piece of pearl or glass, bead; knucklebone; collarbone, clavicle’ (Bible+); in Grigoris Arřaruni (7-8th cent.): IPI *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}).

●DIAL Widespread in the dialects, mostly in the meaning ‘beads’.

●ETYM See s.v. *uln* ‘neck’.

***ulul-** (dial.) ‘to lament, cry’: see s.v. *otoġ-* ‘to wail, lament’.

uġet, *o*-stem: GDAbISg (*y-*)*uġt-o-y* in Eznik Koġbac’i, Grigor Narekac’i; GDPI *uġt-o-c*’ in Hebrews 4.12, Anania řirakac’i [NHB 2: 544ab]; IPI *uġt-o-v-k*’ in Eliřē (see below); some late evidence points to an *a*-stem: GDSg *uġt-i*, *utiwt-i*, AbISg *y-uġt-ē*, ISg *uġt-a-w* (Plato apud NHB, *ibid*) ‘brain’ (Eznik Koġbac’i, P’awstos Buzand, etc.), ‘marrow’ (Bible+; renders Gr. *μυελός* ‘marrow’).

Biblical attestations:

In Genesis 45.19 (Zeyt’unyan 1985: 365): *ew kerijik’ zutet erkris : kai fagesthe ton myelon tēs gēs*.

In Job 21.24: *utit nora ščesc'ē* “his marrow will become liquified” : *μυελὸς δὲ αὐτοῦ διαχεῖται* [Cox 2006: 156].

That *utet* also refers to the marrow of animals is exemplified by e.g. the passage from Ehišē (Ter-Minasyan 1989: 404^{L25}): *sneal ēin utlovk' zuarakac'* “had been raised on the marrow of the steers” (transl. Thomson 1982: 246).

Spelling variants: *utit, utiwt, ytit, ytet, ətut, ətet*.

●DIAL The dialects have two basic forms: *utet* and **utu/ot*. The latter variant which contains a labial vowel in the second syllable is also attested in later literature (see above). For Svedia (*ə)teɹt, hūt* ‘marrow’, see *otn*. The initial *u* of the form **utu* is mostly reduced to *ə* or zero. It has been preserved (or secondarily restored as in *ptut* ‘fruit’ > Marāla *putut*, etc.?) in Marāla and Č‘aylu *ətət* (see Ačaryan 1926: 70, 107, 418; Davt‘yan 1966: 449), Urmia (Xoy) *ətət* [M. Asatryan 1962: 204a], Kak‘avaberd *utət* (in two villages; in the other two – *tət*) [H. Muradyan 1967: 182a]; Nor-Naxijewan *ətət* ‘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-* (Łarabał *ətət, hətət, hutūt* [Davit‘yan 1966: 449]; Karčewan *ətət, hətət* [H. Muradyan 1960: 202b]), and *y-* (Muš *y‘et* next to *utet*).

Hamšen has *utet* and *etu* (GSg *uteti, etvi*) for ‘brain’, and (*ɹskri*) *yət* 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 *ut*. 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 *utloy*, the older NSg can be reconstructed as **utit* [Meillet 1913: 20].

The variants with a labial vowel in the second syllable, namely **utu*, and perhaps also *utiwt* [= /utūt/?], need an explanation. In view of the absence of reliable examples, Ačaryan (1926: 70) points out that the sound change seen in Marāla *ətət* cannot be specified. H. Muradyan (1960: 30) explains the Karčewan form (*h*)*ətət* from *utet* by regressive assimilation (*utet* > **utu*) 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 *uto*, Ĵula *ətet* and *ətut* (HAB), Mehtišen *ətət, ətət* [Davit‘yan 1966: 449]. Besides, the variant **utu* is widespread in many dialects ranging from Nor-Naxijewan and T‘iflis to Syria, Persia and Łarabał, and the spelling variant *utiwt* seems to have solid philological basis (cf. Olsen 1999: 56-57₁₂₀). Ĵahukyan (1987: 374), with some reservation, sees in *utiwt* a vowel palatalization. Olsen (ibid.) even treats *utiwt* as the original form, ascribing etymological value to *-w-*. She suggests a compound of *uti* ‘road’, here in the meaning ‘tube’ > ‘hollow bone’ (cf. in particular OPr. *aulis*

‘shinbone’) + **-plh₁o-* ‘fill’, so the original meaning would be ‘bone-filler’ [Olsen 1999: 56-57].

The reconstruction of such a compound, however, does not seem probable. Furthermore, this interpretation exaggerates the role of the form *utiwŭ* and ignores the other forms, of which *utet* 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* ‘coal’, *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 Ĵuŭa and Mehtišen are not known. In Muš, such a semantic differentiation is represented by the doublets differing in anlaut: *y’let* ‘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*, NPI *otunk*, GDPI *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. *uolektis*, Latv. *uōlekts* ‘ell’, etc., as well as Arm. *uln* (GDSg *ulan*, NPI *ulunk*, GDPI *ulanc*) ‘neck’ (Bible+; dialect of Ĵuŭa) and *uŭuk* ‘palm, distance from the thumb to the little finger’ (Bible+; dialect of Łarabaŭ, with an initial *h-*), see Lidén 1906: 127-130; HAB 3: 554, 592; Pokorny 1959: 308; 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 mentioning that Gr. *μω-ελός* m. ‘marrow’ (Homer+), all the etymological attempts of which deal with the root **μω-* (see Frisk 2: 264; Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984: 818 with ref.; Watkins 1995: 531₇, 535-536), has the same suffix **-elo-*. Note also Gr. *σφόνδ-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 *aletn*.

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 *yŭit* and *yŭet*, as well as dial. (Muš) *y’let* (next to *utet*), the initial *h-* Łarabaŭ and some adjacent dialects? Since the initial *u-* is in a pretonic syllable, it can have replaced an older **uy-* (in terms of the CIArm orthography, *oy-*). We arrive, then, at a **uyŭito-*. In some of the dialectal areas and/or at some stages, the initial **uy-* might yield *ü* and/or *yu-*. 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*).

uŭuk ‘palm, distance from the thumb to the little finger’ (Bible). Also *utk-ean* ‘handbreadth’ (Bible+), see Olsen 1999: 501-502.

●DIAL Լարաթ *hətók*, *hətók'*, 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 identical. 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 Baġgirk' hayoc' (see Amalyan 1975: 260^{Nr208}), *utuk* is glossed by *t'iz* and *tuk*. This implies that, in the 17th century, *tuk* was a living form [HAB 3: 597b]. Baġgirk' hayoc' also has *utkēn*, rendered as *t'zaw*, ISg of *t'iz* (see Amalyan 1975: 260^{Nr202}), which should be linked with *ulkean*.

●ETYM Ача́рян (HAB 3: 597) connects with Lat. *ulna* 'elbow; ell'; Goth. *aleina* 'ell (distance from elbow to finger tips)', etc. (see s.vv. *otn* and *uln*). This is accepted by Jahukyan (1987: 122). Olsen (1999: 941), albeit 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).

In view of the cognate forms with a **-k-*, namely Lith. *úolektis*, Latv. *uólekts* '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 correct, the word-final *-k'* in Լարաթ *hətók'* may become significant, and the internal *-u-* in *utuk* should be treated as secondary, unless *utuk* is from **HoHl-ōk*. Note also the identity of the root vocalism with the vowel preceding the *-k/k'* in *il-ik*, *ol-ok'*, and *ut-uk* (cf. 2.1.23). If the word-initial aspiration of Լարաթ *hətók/k'* is old, the corresponing EArm. proto-form would be **h₃eHl-* (vs. *utuk* < **HoHl-?*). See also s.vv. *olok'* and *otn*.

Compare Oss. **ulVng* 'distance between the thumb and the index finger', which is described by Gatuev (1933: 146) as follows: *улынг* 'мера длины, равная расстоянию между концами растянутых большого и указательного пальцев' (vs. *удисн* 'мера длины, равная расстоянию между концами растянутых большого пальца и мизинца').

unayn, *i*-stem and *o*-stem (some evidence from John Chrysostom and Philo, respectively) 'empty, hollow, void; vain; empty-handed' (Bible+).

●ETYM Related with Skt. *ūná-* 'deficient, not sufficient, less, too small', YAv. *ūna-* 'deficient', Lat. *vānus* 'empty, hollow; vain, idle', *vāstus* 'empty, desolate', Goth. *wans*, OEngl., OHG *wan* 'wanting, deficient', etc., see Hübschmann 1883: 47; 1897: 484; HAB 3: 600b with lit.; Pokorny 1959: 345; Mallory/Adams 1997: 179a.

The root is reconstructed as **ueh₂₋* or, if Gr. *εὐνις* 'desolate, empty' is related, **h₁ueh₂₋*, cf. Skt. *vā-* 'to wane, disappear, diminish', etc. (for a discussion, see Schrijver 1991: 146, 308; Mayrhofer EWAia 1, 1992: 241; 2, 1996: 538; Mallory/Adams 1997: 179a; cf. Speirs 1984: 123, 147). The derivation of the Armenian root **un* from **(h₁)e/ouh_{2-n-}* (> **oyn-*, HAB 3: 600b) is improbable; the behaviour of the medial laryngeal in Armenian and Greek is uncertain (cf. Schrijver 1991: 308), whereas a zero-grade form **(h₁)uh_{2-n-}* implies an unchanged stem **un-*, which is possible, cf. *sut-ak(-)* vs. *sut* 'lie', etc. For a further discussion, see Clackson 1994: 45-46. For *-ayn*, see Greppin 1975: 68; Clackson 1994: 44; Jahukyan 1998: 10.

und, *o*-stem: ISg *and-o-v* in Yovhan Mandakuni (2003: 1172a^{L16}); IPI *and-o-v-k'* (var. *and-a-w-k'*) in Ephrem. 'edible seed, grain' (Bible+). In Daniel 1.12 and 16: API *und-s*, AccSg *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 an *o*-stem, but he cites GDPI *hnd-i-c'* (Nonnus), which points to *i*-stem. In John Chrysostom: *det-a-hund* 'herb-seed'.

Compounds: *and-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 the 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'.

unim, 1sg.aor. *kal-a-y*, imper. *kal* 'to take, hold, have, obtain' (Bible+); **and-unim**, aor. **ən(d)-kal-*: 1sg.aor. *ənk'al-a-y*, imper. *ənk'al* 'to take (up), receive, accept' (Bible+); late **oy'n** 'possessed vigour, condition, state, valour' (Dionysius Thrax, Yovhannēs Draxanakertc'i, Grigor Magistros, Mxit'ar Anec'i, etc.), **un** 'id.' (Ganjik'); MidArm. **unen'al**, **unn'al** 'to possess, bear, sense' (MijHayBař 2, 1992: 241ab).

For the ClArm. suppletive paradigm *unim* vs. aor. *kal-a-*, see Łaragyulyan 1961: 167-168; Ę. Tumanjan 1971: 401-402. Ačāryan (HAB 3: 602a) considers the noun *oy'n/un* a Greek calque, cf. *ἔζις* from *ἔχω*. Note, however, the dialectal evidence.

●DIAL The verbal forms *unim* and *unen'al* are widespread in the dialects [HAB 3: 602b].

Ačāryan (HAB 3: 602b) records no dialectal form of the noun. According to Bařramyan 1960: 96b here belongs Dersim *un* 'handful; vigour'.

●ETYM Connected with Skt. *āpnóti* 'to reach, gain', Av. *apāna-* 'erreicht habend', *āpana-* n. 'gain, reaching', Hitt. 3sg.pres.act. *e-ep-zi*, 3pl.pres.act. *ap-pa-an-zi* 'to grab, catch', Lat. *apīscor* 'to reach, obtain, receive, grab', perf. *co-epī* < **co-ēpī* 'to begin, undertake' (see Scheftelowitz 1904-05, 2: 34; Charpentier 1909: 246-248; Meillet 1929; Pokorny 1959: 51; Mallory/Adams 1997: 563b). One assumes a reduplicated **h₁e-h₁p-* in Indo-Iran. *āp-*, Hitt. *ēp-* and Lat. *ēp-* (for the forms and a discussion, see Schrijver 1991: 28-29; Mayrhofer EWAia 1, 1992: 167; Vine 1999: 524; de Vaan 2003: 135, 159). Kloekhorst 2008: 242f reconstructs a normal root present **h₁ép-ti*, **h₁p-énti* for Hittite.

The Armenian vocalism has been explained from **ōp-ne-* (= **h₁op-ne-*), cf. the type of *utem* 'to eat' (Meillet 1929 = 1978: 216/1936: 47-48; Beekes 1973: 95-96). For more references and a discussion, see s.v. *utem* 'to eat' and Ĵahukyan 1982: 228₃₁. Schrijver 1991: 29 posits a perfect stem **h₁e-h₁op-* reflected in Arm. *unim* and Av. *āpana-*. For *oy'n* vs. *unim* and a further extensive discussion I refer to de Lamberterie 1978: 278-282; Isebaert 1982.

On the other hand, the Armenian word has been derived from PIE **senh₂-*, perf. **(se-)sonh₂e* ‘ich erlangte’, cf. Skt. *sanóti* ‘to win, gain’, OAv. *hanaēmā(cā)* ‘mögen wir gewinnen’, Hitt. *šanḫ-* ‘to seek, look for’, Gr. *ἀνύω, ἀνύω, ἀνυμι* ‘to complete, accomplish, bring to an end’, OHG *sinnan* ‘to strive after’, etc., see Schindler 1976; Schmitt 1981: 134, 157; K. Schmidt 1985: 86. For the PIE etymon (without Armenian), see Pokorny 1959: 906; Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 1: 198 = 1995: 170; Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 696-697; Mallory/Adams 1997: 3b. This etymology is less plausible. I see no solid reasons to abandon the traditional etymology.

PIE **senh₂-* is taken as reflected in Arm. *hanem* ‘to take out, draw out, take off, bring outside, bring forth, grab’ (q.v.), Meillet apud HAB; Hübschmann 1899: 48; see HAB 3: 33-34 for the material and references. Ačařyan himself does not accept the etymology. Sceptical is also Klingenschmitt 1982: 131-132, who identifies this verb with *henum* ‘to weave’.

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 GDPl *unkan-c’* in “Tataran”) ‘ear’; **unkn dnem** ‘to listen (to)’ (Bible+), e.g. in Genesis 18.10 [Zeyt‘unean 1985: 220]: *Ew Sarra unkn dnēr ar dran xoranin : Šarpa dē ḡkoušev prōs tḡ thūra tḡs skynḡs. 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 *vəng*, Akn *unk’*, Svedia *üng*, etc. [HAB 3: 604a], Juła *ungn*, gen. *əngn-i* [Ačařean 1940: 381a], Łarabat *əngnə, əynə* [Davt‘yan 1966: 450].

Ačařyan (HAB 3: 604a) points out that the basic meaning of the word, namely ‘ear’, has been preserved only in Šatax *unk^otal* ‘to hear, give importance, appreciation to what has been said’. In her CIArm. > 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^otal* ‘to hear, give importance/appreciation to what has been said’ can be treated as *unk^o/g^o 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. *οὔς*, GSg *οὔτος*, NAPI *ῶτα*, also GSg *οὔταος*, pl. *-ατα*; Dor. and Hellenistic NSg *ῶς*; *ῶτα* (Tarentinian gloss) n. ‘ear; handle of pitchers, cups, etc.’, Av. *uši* (dual) ‘ears’, Pahl. *ōš, ōš-īh*, ManMPers. 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. *áú*, 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 *οὔταος* < **-n-t-*, Germ. **ausōn*, Goth. gen. *ausins*, OPr. *ausins*, etc., and with the suffix *-kn* as in *akn* ‘eye’, *armukn* ‘elbow’, etc. [Bugge 1889: 24; Hübschmann 1897: 484; HAB, *ibid.*; Pisani 1950: 167; Lindeman 1980: 60-62]. 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. *ákṣi-*, GSg *akṣnás* ‘eye’, *śiras*, *śīrṣnás* ‘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-* < AccSg **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 *ἄτα* < **ἄφατα* [Schrijver 1991: 47]. Given the abundance of body-part terms with *o*-grade in the root, **h₂ous-* may be reconstructed 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.

unč'-k', *a*-stem 'nose; the part between the nose and the mouth; moustache' (Bible+).

●DIAL Preserved in the Łarabał expression **unč'ə č'ē* '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., NPI *nārēs*, Lith. *nósis*, 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. *unč'-k'* is the principal (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. *ὐπὴνη* f. 'moustache' (though there are formal problems), OPr. *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 haplology of **-eh₂-*) > **uwunj-* > **unj-*. Compare *lanj-k'*, *a*-stem 'breast', also a dual. The final *-č'* instead of **-j-* may be due to influence of *pinč'* 'nostrils' (Damask., etc.; in derivatives: John Chrysostom, Dawit' Anyał', etc.; widespread in the dialects, also meaning 'nose', 'muzzle', etc.), and *dunč'* 'the projecting part of the head, including the nose, mouth and jaws' (Małak'ia Abela or Grigor Akanec'i /13th cent./, etc.; widespread in the dialects), unless this comes from **ənd-unč'*, as is interpreted in Margaryan 1971: 219-221. Otherwise: QIE **upo-(H)neh₂s-* > PArm. **upún(a)-* > **un-* + *-č'* analogically after the above-mentioned *dunč'* and *pinč'*.

Alternative: QIE **up-ōs-nieh₂-* 'that above the mouth' (: Shughni *būn* 'beard', if from **upā(ha)nā-*, cf. YAv. *āñhan-* 'mouth'; see s.v. *yawn-k'*).

unj₁, *o*-stem: GDSg *ənj-o-y* in Gregory of Nyssa 'bottom, depth (of a sea, etc.); root; the underground, Underworld'. P'awstos Buzand, Hexaemeron, Philo, etc.

In P'awstos Buzand 4.18 (1883=1984: 109^{L9f}): *zi ēr hareal zxorann i jor yunĵ berdin* : “for the tent was pitched in the gorge beneath the fortress” (transl. Garsoĭan 1989: 149^{L3f}). In 4.8 (82^{L-6f}; transl. 128): API *unĵ-s* ‘roots’ and *ənĵ-ov-in* ‘with roots’. In 4.54 (143^{L-11f}): *ənd unĵ* “into the earth”. Further, see 4.8 on the place-name *K'ar(ah)unĵ*.

L. Hovhannisyān (1990a: 153) has found *an-unĵ* ‘bottomless’ (not in NHB) attested in Agat'angelos. Ačāryan (HAB 3: 604b) records the word referring to “Arjeŋ baŋaran” (1865) but not mentioning any literary attestation.

●ETYM No acceptable etymology is recorded in HAB 3: 604b.

See s.vv. *unĵ*₂ ‘treasure’, *unĵ*₃ ‘soot’, and 1.12.6.

unĵ₂ prob. ‘treasure, treasury, granary, barn’.

In P'awstos Buzand 5.6 (1883=1984: 171^{L17f}): *i gawaŋn Ayrayratu i mec i gewĵn ənĵin ark'uni, orum Ardeansn koč'en*. Garsoĭan (1989: 196, cf. also 312₂, 444-445) translates as follows: “to the large village named Ardeans, at the royal [fortress] of the district of Ararat”. Malxasyanc' (1987: 313) renders *ənĵ-in* by ModArm. *kalvac* ‘estate’.

●ETYM Ačāryan (HAB 3: 605a) identifies with Georg. *unĵi* ‘treasure’, of which *unĵ-eba* (verb) is derived, corresponding to Arm. *ganĵ-em* in the Bible. Then he (ibid.) notes that he does not know whether there is a connection with *unĵ*₁ ‘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 *unĵ* is attested in P'awstos Buzand in various senses: ‘bottom, below’, ‘depth’, ‘root’ (see s.v. *unĵ*₁), and ‘treasure, granary, barn’ (see the passage above). For semantic (cf. *ganĵ*) and etymological discussion, see 1.12.6. See also s.v. *unĵ*₃.

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.).

unĵ₃ ‘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 Abela or Grigor Akanec'i (13th cent.), and Oskip'orik.

●DIAL Preserved in some (mainly eastern) peripheral dialects, as *unĵ* or *ənĵ* (without an initial *h-*): Šamšadin/Dilijān [Mežunc' 1989: 196a]; Areš [Lusenc' 1982: 230a]; Šamaxi [Bałramyan 1964: 220], Kŕzen [Bałramyan 1961: 197a], Łarabał [Davt'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’.

Ačāryan specifies the semantic chain found in Łarabał etc. as follows: ‘soot; iron-rust; sooty spider-web near stoves’ [Ačārean 1913: 867b; HAB 3: 605a]. Concerning the spider-web, see below (Hin Juła); cf. also s.v. **mġlamandi*. The semantic relationship ‘soot’ : ‘spider-web’ parallels Akn *mlul/r* [HAB 3: 352b]. In Areš the meaning is ‘iron-rust’. Important is the meaning in Kŕzen: ‘rust; sediment’ (see below).

Amatuni (1912: 536b) records Van *unĵ* ‘rust of metals’. He refers to the word-collection of *T’ōxmaxean* compiled in the prison of Van, and one is not sure whether he had also an independent information for this word.

Šatax *uĉ* ‘soot’ (see M. Muradyan 1962: 203b) and Moks (the village of Sip) *auĉ* ‘soot’ (see HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 137-138), both unnoticed by Aĉaryan, 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 ĴuĶa *munĵ* ‘spider-web’, Van and MaraĶa *munĵ-kat’/muĉ-kat’* ‘dropping of sooty water from the chimney; sooty water that drops from chimneys’, Ararat *mnĵ-ot* ‘sooty’ [Aĉarean 1913: 796b; Aĉaryan 1952: 43, 82, 101, 286; HAB 3: 605a]. Aĉaryan (1952: 43) explains this *m-* by a confusion with *munĵ* ‘dumb’ (q.v.), which is semantically improbable. I think it should rather be explained by the influence of or contamination with *mur* and **murĉ-* ‘soot’, as well as *mocir/moĉir* ‘ash’. For *munĵ-kat’/muĉ-kat’* cf. the synonymous *mr-kat’* in Alaškert (see Aĉarean 1913: 802b). The variant *muĉ-kat’* can provide us with additional (indirect) evidence for the nasalless form **uĉ* (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 *unĵ₁* ‘bottom, depth’ (> *unĵ₂* ‘treasure’). Its basic meaning would then be ‘sediment/Bodensatz’ (< ‘settling, sinking down’); cf. *mur* ‘soot’ vs. *mrur* ‘sediment’. Remarkably, Křzen *unĵ* refers to not only ‘rust’ (*žang*), but also ‘sediment’ (*mrur*). The semantics is corroborated by *maĶ-unĉ* ‘sediment of grain left on the bottom of a sieve’ (with the first component *maĶ* ‘sieve’), attested in Oskip‘orik (probably by Grigor Tat‘ewac‘i, 14-15th cent.). According to HAB (3: 604b), this compound contains *unĵ₁* ‘bottom’. This can serve as a semantic intermediary between *unĵ₁* ‘bottom’ and *unĵ₃* ‘soot (< sediment)’. Also the following seems relevant for the connection: *unĵ₃* ‘soot (< sediment)’ has been preserved only in SE dialects (Goris, ĶarabaĶ, etc.), and *unĵ₁* ‘bottom’ is absent in the dialects. However, the latter is found in a number of place-names located in Goris and adjacent areas (cf. *K‘ar(ah)unĵ*), and Grigor T‘at‘ewac‘i (see above on *maĶ-unĉ*) has lived in Tat‘ew, in vicinity of Goris.

The etymology is uncertain. Besides, *unĵ₃* ‘soot’, being basically a dialectal word, has a by-form **uĉ* in Šatax and Sip (as well as, indirectly, in Van and MaraĶa), 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 *uĉ* the nasal has dropped. This is not convincing, because the only other example, that is *knunk* ‘baptism’ > *kənuĶ*‘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 M. Muradyan 1962: 64.

Arm. **uĉ* ‘soot’ can go back to IE **sōd-ĵV-* ‘soot’: PSlav. **sadĵa* (OCS *sažda* ‘ἄσβολος’, Czech *saze*, Russ. *saža*, etc.), Lith. *sūodžiai* pl., OIc. OEngl. *sōt*, Engl. *soot*, OIr. *sūide* f. (< **sōdĵā-*) (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. *unj*₁ ‘bottom, depth’ might be cognate, too. Compare e.g. MWelsh *sawdd* ‘Tiefe, Absinken’, also from **sed-* ‘to sit’.

On the other hand, *unj* ‘soot; rust’ is reminiscent of Arm. dial. **banj* ‘mould; rust’: Xarberd, Manisa, K‘hi *banjotil* ‘to mould’ [Ačařean 1913: 174b; Gabikean 1952: 107], Xarberd, Berri, Balu *banj* ‘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].

Ačařyan (1913: 174b) notes that the root is unknown to him.

Bearing in mind the Iranian anlaut fluctuation *v-/b-/m-*, one may tentatively connect **banj* ‘mould; rust’ (from an Iranian unattested form?) with *unj*₃ (dial. also **munj*) ‘soot; rust’. For the semantics, see s.v. *mglim*.¹³³

uši, *ho/uši probably ‘storax-tree’ and ‘holm-oak’. Attested only in Yaysmawurk‘, probably as equivalent to *šēr* = Gr. *σώραξ* ‘storax-tree, *Styrax officinalis*’, which is a resiniferous tree (q.v.).

●DIAL Ačařyan (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 *lōp‘i* [also the latter refers to ‘oak’, see Petoyan 1965: 477] serve as fodder for sheep in winter.

Dersim (K‘hi) *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.

●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*, namely *t‘əhuši*, is said to denote a kind of tree the leaves of which serve as fodder for goats. This matches the description of Muš, Sasun *hoši* above.

As for the association with a willow-like tree, see the material s.vv. *aygi* ‘vineyard’ and *gi* ‘juniper’. Compare also Gr. *σμίλαξ* ‘yew, or bindweed, or holm-oak’ rendered by Arm. *gelj* ‘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^hiūā-*. 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. *ὄζύα, -η* ‘beech; spear-shaft made from its wood, spear’. The vowel *-u-* in the Greek form is probably due to the etymological or folk-etymological relation with *ὄζύς* ‘sharp’ (see P.

¹³³ An alternative is: QIE **h₁ong^w-iV-* (cf. **h₁ong^w-(o/ō)l-* ‘coal’; see s.v. *acut/x* ‘coal; soot’) > *unj* ‘soot’.

Friedrich 1970: 95-96). 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-ieh₂-* > 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.vv. *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 *hōši* (which is our word) or *lōtp’i*. For more details, see s.vv. *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 Ōrbelean, 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 Gołt’an* ‘from the Eastern flank of the great mountain as far as the borders of Gołt’an’.

●DIAL Widespread in the dialects. With initial *h’-*: Ĵuła *h’us* [Ačařean 1940: 381a]; *y-*: Agulis *yōns* [HAB 3: 609-610]. Two textual illustrations of the Agulis form, transcribed as *eōns*, can be found in Patkanov 1869: 27.

Frozen plural instrumental: Łarabał *əs-uk’*: *min xurjīn əsuk’ə k’əc’ac* ‘a dubble-bag on/around the shoulders’ [HŽHek’ 5, 1966: 398^{L2}]; *xurjīnə* <...> *əsük’ə k’c’-* (ibid. 109^{L14}, 111^{L3}). The same expression is found in singular: *xurjīnə* <...> *əsava 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. *ámsa-* 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 **s̑* 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. *ámsa-*, or the lengthened grade as Gr. *ῶμος* [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 reconstructs 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 a 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-*, although 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 a 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. **néh₂-s-s*, acc. **nh₂-és-m*, gen. **nh₂-s-ós* [Beekes 1995: 180]. 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. **h₂m-s-ós*. Compare the word for ‘mouth’, another *s*-stem probably with *o*-grade in the nominative, although this is a neuter and should belong to PD type: nom. **HóH-os*, gen. **HH-és-(o)s*, cf. Skt. *ás-* 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 *γոս* 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, namely 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 **yi-* (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 *γոս* 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. Garsoian 1989: 145): *Bayc’ cnaw apa P’arānjem t’agaworin ustr mi, ew koč’ec’in zanun nora Pap* ‘‘But then P’arānjem 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’, *sunkà* ‘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. *υῖος* m. ‘son’, Skt. *sūnú-* ‘son’, etc.); see Pokorny 1959: 914; Szemerényi 1977: 19 (and 19₆₁ with lit.); Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984: 423, 765; Olsen 1999: 149. The analogical influence with *dustr* may have been mutual.

utem ‘to eat’ (Bible+). Alongside *utem* we have the suppletive aorist *ker-a-*. For the paradigm and a discussion of its origin, see Łaragyulyan 1961: 164-165; Barton 1989: 147, 147-148₄₂, 149-150, 152.

•DIAL Ubiquitous in the dialects [HAB 3: 613a].

•ETYM Since long (Klaproth, NHB, Petermann, Gosche, etc., see HAB 3: 612-613), connected with Gr. *ἔδω*, Lat. *edō*, Skt. *ad-*, pres. *átti*, *adánti* ‘to eat’, OCS *jasti* ‘to eat’, Goth. *itan* ‘to eat’, etc. from PIE **h₁ed-* ‘to eat’ (see Hübschmann 1897: 485; Meillet 1916h: 188-189; Pokorny 1959: 287; Mayrhofer EWAia 1, 1992: 61; Mallory/Adams 1997: 175a).

The Armenian form requires QIE **h₁ōd-e/o-* in lengthened grade, the origin of which is disputed. Meillet (1929; 1936: 47-48, 134; see also HAB 3: 612b) posits **ōd-* seen also in the Greek reduplicated noun *ἔδωδῆ* ‘food, meal’ and compares with *unim* ‘to have, hold’ (q.v.) from **ōp-ne-* vs. Hitt. *ep-mi*. Hamp 1967: 15 mentions this view and adds that “the vocalism of *utem* is reminiscent of a sort of perfect, as well as a nominal formation”. For his further analysis, see s.v. *ampem* ‘to drink’. Beekes (1973: 95-96; 1974: 183; cf. 1972: 127) posits a PD (proterodynamic) perfect ablauting paradigm with **ō* in singular and **e* in plural and compares with *unim* ‘to have, hold’.

According to Godel (1965: 26; 1975: 123), *utem*, substituted to the old athematic present **h₁ed-mi* (cf. Skt. *ádmi*, etc.), seems traceable to an iterative-durative present **ōdeye/o-* (for the **-ō-* cf. the instances like Gr. *ὠθέω* ‘I thrust, push’, etc.); see also Melchert 1979: 268; Schmitt 1981: 157; Klingenschmitt 1982: 157. Jahukyan (1982: 172, 228₂₆; cf. Saradževa 1986: 138) derived *utem* from PIE **ōd-mi* (with subsequent thematization > **ōd-e-mi*), citing Godel’s view without further comment. Kortlandt (1986: 40; 1998a: 20 = 2003: 70, 125; see also Beekes 2003: 181) suggests a formation with the prefix **som-* (cf. Ved. *sám-ad-*; Spanish *como* < *com-edo* ‘I eat’).¹³⁴

On the whole, the explanation through a perfect formation seems the most probable, although some of the other explanations (e.g. the assumption on an iterative-durative present) are worth of consideration, too. As to the comparison with the Greek reduplicated noun *ἔδωδῆ* ‘food, meal’, note Arm. *ker-a-kur* ‘food’ and denominative *kerakrem* ‘to feed’ (see s.v. *ker-* ‘to eat’).

ur ‘where, where to’ (interrog.), ‘wherever’ (Bible+). As explicitly pointed out by Ačaryan (HAB 3: 613a), the older distinction (*ur* static vs. *yo* allative/directive) has been removed at later stages.

¹³⁴ One may alternatively assume a reduplicated present: **h₁o-h₁d-* > *ut-*. For the *o*-vocalism cf. Lith. *dúodu* < **do-dh₃-* from **deh₃-* ‘to give’ (on which see Beekes 1995: 229; Derksen 2002-03: 7).

An old **y-ur* may be reconstructed on the basis of the dialectal forms.

In Nersēs Lambronaci (12th cent.), as well as in the dialect of Ĵuła (*h'ur*, see below), *ur* is used in the meaning 'why?' [HAB 3: 613b].

●DIAL Widespread in the dialects [HAB 3: 613b]. Note Suč'ava, etc. *urux* and T'iflis *uruk'-min* 'at some place'.

The initial *h'-* in Alaškert, Muš, Moks, Ĵuła, as well as, perhaps, *h-* in Łarabał, may testify for an old **y-ur* (see 2.3.1). *Zeyt'un yoy* and *Hačən yuy* (see HAB 3: 613b; Ačarıyan 2003: 334) may also continue **y-ur*, although this is uncertain, since these dialects display various reflexes for the initial *y-*, namely *h-*, *y-*, and zero (see Ačarıyan 2003: 113-114). For Ĵuła *h'-* < *y-*, see Ačارةan 1940: 125-127.

Hamšen *nir*, *ner*, *neor*, *nür*, *nur* (see Ačarıyan 1947: 250) and Agulis *nor* (see Ačارةan 1935: 383) represent an initial *n-*. On this, see below.

●ETYM Compared with Lith. *kuř* 'where' (adv.), or with Iran. **ku-tra*: 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 a discussion of the *-r-* and related problems, see Vanséveren 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 **i-* rather than **k^w-* (cf. Skt. *yá-* '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 **k^wu(r)* (see Mallory/Adams 1997: 456b). Ačarıyan (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, namely 'why?' (Nersēs Lambronaci, 12th century; Ĵuła *h'ur* [HAB 3: 613b]).

Next to a number of dialects showing probable reflexes of **y-ur*, as we saw above, Hamšen *nir*, *ner*, *neor*, *nür*, *nur* (see Ačarıyan 1947: 250) and Agulis *nor* (see Ačارةan 1935: 383) represent an initial *n-*. For other cases of addition of an initial *n-* in these dialects, see Ačarıyan 1947: 73 (*eraz* 'dream' – Hamšen *neraz*) and 1935: 147 (verbs starting with a vowel), without an explanation. Note also Astapat *ner* 'why?' next to Marala, Van, etc. *her* from *ēr* (see HAB 2: 119b; Ačarıyan 1952: 101, 259).¹³⁵ 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

¹³⁵ The Hamšen forms of **(n)ur* 'where to' with many vocalic variants may be due to contamination with *ēr* 'why'.

**h₁en-k^wur* > PArm. **iḡur* (cf. *yisun* ‘fifty’ from **penk^w*); on this, see 2.3.1. Alternatively, one may treat **n-ur* as **ənd-ur* > **ənnur* > *(ə)*nur*.¹³⁶

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. Note also *urd*: *lc‘eal* (‘filled’) in Baḡgirk‘ hayoc‘ [Amalyan 1975: 262^{Nr242}], which Ačāryan (HAB 3: 410b) places s.v. *yūrt‘i* (q.v.).

•DIAL *Ḷuḷa urd*, Agulis *ərd* [ōrd], Salmast *yūrt* (> Turk. dial. *yūrt*), Muš *urd*, Alaškert *ūrt*‘; 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 *hərt*‘ ‘water way; pool; brook-mouth’ (also ‘belly?’) [Margaryan 1975: 357b, 429a]; Meḡri *örd* ‘water way’ [Ałayan 1954: 283b].

Note also Urmia, Salmast *urj* ‘an island or peninsula in a river’ [GwřUrmSalm 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. *ύδροσ* m. ‘watersnake’, *ύδρα* 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.

Ałayan (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’. This is possible, but uncertain.

I alternatively propose a connection with Alb. *hūrdhë* f. ‘pond, pool; swamp’ (on which see Demiraj 1997: 205) < PALb. **urδā-* < IE **uh₁r-d^(h)eh₂₋*, from **ueh₁r-* ‘water’: Skt. *vār-*, *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. *ua-a-ar* ‘water’, OIc. *vari* m. ‘liquid, water’, OPr. *wurs* ‘pond, pool’, etc.

Perhaps composed as PIE **uh₁r-* ‘water’ + **d^heh₁₋* ‘to put, make’ (cf. Skt. *dhā-* ‘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).

urju, *a*-stem ‘stepson or stepdaughter’; attested in Severian of Gabala (GDPI *ərju-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’. Ačāryan (HAB 3: 618-619; 4: 641-642) rejects the connection and derives the word

¹³⁶ One wonders whether the *n-* is due to influence of Turk. *nere* ‘where’.

from PIE **putro-* (cf. Skt. *putrá-* 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; Olsen 1989a: 21; 1999: 21₃₄, 22₃₇]. Note that Olsen (1989a: 21) derives **ōrtyo-* > *urju* from the root of Gr. *ὄρνυμι* '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'

p'aycaṭn, *an*-stem: GDSg *p'aycaṭan* (Plato), *p'aycaṭan(n)* (Geoponica), ISg *p'aycaṭam-b* (Socrates); spelled also as *p'aycaṭn* (Socrates); **p'aycēṭn** (Grigor Tat'ewac'i, Amirdovlat' Amasiac'i) 'spleen'.

Attested in John Chrysostom, Philo, Plato, Grigor Magistros, etc. [NHB 2: 930b; HAB 4: 477; MiĵHayBaĵ 2, 1992: 411a].

●DIAL Agulis *p'áycāṭn*, *p'áycāt*, Šamaxi *p'ayc'ax*, Łarabaĵ *p'áccēṭnə*, *p'áccēṭnə*, Moks *p'acēṭ* (according to Orbeli 2002: 341, *p'acex*, pl. *p'acexk⁹ir*), Muš, Alaškert *p'ajeṭ*, Ararat *p'ec'et*, *p'ijex*, Ĵula *p'iceṭ*, Łazax *p'ic'ax*, T'iflis *p'icēṭ*, *p'ic'ax*, Xotorĵur *sipex*, etc. 'spleen' [HAB 4: 478a].

Šamaxi has *p'a(y)c'ax*, *p'acēṭnə*; in the village of K^{cy}ärk^{cy}änĵ: *p'oc'ex*, with an exceptional sound change *ay > o* [Baĵramyan 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 (de Lagarde [Boetticher] 1850: 363^{Nr270}; 1854: 26^{L702f}; Dervischjan 1877: 4), compared with the PIE word for 'spleen': Skt. *plīhán-* m., YAV. *spəwəzan-* m., MPers. *spurz*, *spul* < SWIr. **sprdan-*, 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 *slēzena*, Latv. *liēsa*, etc. [Walde 1909; HAB 4: 477-478; Pokorny 1959: 987; Klingenschmitt 1982: 166-167; Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 815; Ravnæs 1991: 120; 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 **spelġ^h-*, **splġ^hen-*, etc.

According to de Lagarde (1854: 26^{L702f}), Arm. *p'aycatn* derives from older **p'iaican*. Ačarıyan (HAB 4: 477b) posits Arm. *p'aycatn* and **p'acaytn* coming from older **p'aytcan*. Ĵahukyan (1987: 150) prefers **p'atcayn* and reconstructs **p^həlgñiā-* with a question mark.

If the Sanskrit and Latin forms allow reconstructing a by-form with internal **-i-* (which is uncertain), it may also account for the internal *-y-* of the Armenian, although details remain unclear.

According to Ĵahukyan (1967: 154²²⁵), the internal *-c'-* in some dialects, going back to **-j- < *-ġ^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' > Marafa *p'ut'ur*, Łarabał *t'ep'ur*, etc.

Ačarıyan (ibid.) derives the dialectal forms from *p'aycat[n]* and **p'acayt[n]* > **p'acēł*, with the exception of Xotorĵur *sipex*. According to him, the latter goes back to OArm. **sipetn* or **sipaytn*, 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 **-ġ^h-* as in Gr. *σπλήν*. This is accepted by Ĵahukyan (1982: 111), who posits dial. **spaytn*, and H. Suk'iasyan (1986: 231), who treats Xotorĵur *sipex* as a root variant, without the determinative **-ġ-*.

The analysis of Ačarıyan is not convincing. There is no evidence for variation **sp- : *sp^h-*. Alongside PIE **pV- > Arm. (h)V-*, we can speak of **sp- > Arm. sp-* and **(s)p- > Arm. p'-* (for the material and a discussion, see Hiersche 1964; 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 (Phárasa) *πεισάχι* 'spleen' is considered to be an Armenian loan; see Karolidēs (Καρολιδής) 1885: 96; de 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' > Łarabał *tɔp* 'id.', *p'etur* 'feather' > dial. (Zeyt'un, Xarberd, Hamšen, Karin, Alaškert, Łarabał, Agulis, Ĵuła, 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 *πεισάχι* 'id.' > Xotorĵur *sipex* 'id.' (on back-loans, see 1.10).

Arm. dial. Akn, Č'arsančag, Tivrik **kayc-ar* 'tongs, fire-tongs' [Ačarean 1913: 544b] has been borrowed into Cappadocian (Phárasa) *καϊζάρ* 'tongs' (see HAB 2: 507b for references and a discussion); according to Dawkins (1916: 605b): *καϊτσάρι*. Arm. *-ayc-* is reflected here as *-aič-* or *-aič-*, in contrast with *-eiš-* in the word for 'spleen'. The reason for this may be that Cappadocian *πεισάχι* '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 *-č-* 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'ayt, *i*-stem: GDSg *p'ayt-i*, AblSg *i/z-* *p'aytē*, ISg *p'ayt-i-w*, LocSg *i p'ayt-i*, GDPl *p'ayt-i-c'*, AblPl *i/z-* *p'ayt-i-c'* (rich evidence in the Bible, Astuacaturean 1895: 1492-1493) 'wood, piece of wood; tree; gallows' (Bible+).

Some textual illustrations for different semantic nuances: Deuteronomy 19.5 (Cox 1981: 152): *mtanic'ē and ankeri iwrum i mayri harkanel p'ayt* "goes into the forest with his friend to cut wood". Job 30.4 (Cox 2006: 192): *zarmats p'aytic' camēin i sastik sovoy* "chewed on tree roots out of great hunger". 2 Kings 23.21: *p'ayt kamrji* (see Clackson 1994: 227₁₅₃, and s.v. *kamurj* 'bridge'). Genesis 40.19 (Zeyt'unyan 1985: 337): *kaxesc'ē zk'ez zp'aytē, ew keric'en t'rc'unk' erknic' zmarmin k'o i k'ēn* "(he) will hang you on a tree, and the birds will eat the flesh from you".

Agat'angelos 102 (1909=1980: 61^{L16}): *kočels p'ayt-i-c'* 'blocks of wood' (see the passage s.v. *olok'* 'shin'). Movsēs Xorenac'i 2.49 (1913=1991: 177^{L1}): *Jerntu lini nma ew Erax p'aytiwk' mayreac'* "The Araxes [river] provided him with wood (of forests)"; for a discussion of this passage, see s.v. *mayri* 'woods'. The meaning 'a piece of wood (as a lot)' is found in Ehišē (Ter-Minasyan 1989: 102^{L19}; transl. Thomson 1982: 102): *p'ayt ankenuin ew vičaks arkanēin* "they threw sticks and drew lots"; cf. dial. *č'čp' k'c'el* and Pers. *čōb andāxtan* (HAB 4: 478a; Thomson 1982: 102₈).

In Movsēs Xorenac'i 2.6 (1913=1991: 109^{L6}; transl. Thomson 1978: 135) one finds a derivative *an-p'ayt* 'unwooded'.

●DIAL Dialectally ubiquitous [HAB 4: 478].

Interesting is Muš, Alaškert *p'ic'uk* (ibid.), Van, Aparan *p'icuk* (Amatuni 1912: 651b) < **p'it-(a)c'-uk* 'dead' (said of animals)', based on the denominative verb *p'it-n-al* 'to die (said of animals)', lit. 'to turn wood'; cf. *p'aytanam* 'to freeze' attested in Zgōn-Afrahāt and Paterica [HAB 4: 478]. Compare Melri *p'ēc'i* 'having paralysed hands' (Ałayan 1954: 333), which seems to reflect **p'ayt-ac'i*.

Unclear is Hamšen *p'ec* 'board' (see T'oflak'yan 1981: 148b); possibly a back-formation after the participle **p'ayt-(a)c'-ac*. Note also the infinitive *p'icel*, *p'icul* in Muš, Alaškert, etc. (Amatuni 1912: 269b), but this may be due to a wrong analysis. The Amatuni's textual illustrations point to causative (*kə p'ic'u* 'will kill') and past participle (*bicac* 'killed').

●ETYM No acceptable etymology is recorded in HAB 4: 478b.

Belardi (1950: 148-149) proposed a connection with Skt. *sphyá-* m. 'shoulder-blade', Gr. *σπάθη-* f. 'rowing blade, flat rib, shoulder-blade', *σφήν* 'wedge', Ic. *spoekja* 'trunk', and posited **p^həi-d-i-* for Armenian. Further note Germanic forms corroborating the dental determinative, OEngl. *spade*, *spadu* 'spade' (pointing to **sph₂-d^h-* together with Gr. *σπάθη-*, see Frisk 2: 755; Chantraine 1968-80: 1031b; Vine 2002: 289-290), Norwegian *spita* 'Pflock', as well as forms with **-k-*: Lat. *spīca* f. 'ear of corn', *spīculum* n. 'sting; javelin; arrow; sharp point of a weapon', Latv. *spikis* 'bayonet', OHG *speihha* 'Speiche, Strahl', Arm. *p'k'in* 'arrow', q.v. (see Petersson 1916: 267; Pokorny 1959: 981; Jahukyan 1967: 65, 89; 1982: 34, 48;

1987: 149). Olsen 1999: 937, however, places Arm. *p'ayt* in her list of words of unknown origin.

Skt. *sphyá-* is related with Shughni *f(i)yak* 'shoulder-blade, wooden shovel', Sogd. *βyk-* 'shoulder', Khwar. *fyk* 'rudder', Khotanese *phvai* 'spade, shovel', etc.; for these forms (without Armenian), see Morgenstierne 1974: 34b; Bailey 1979: 106b, 264a; Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 779.

A proto-form **ph₂(e)i-d-* is likely for Arm. *p'ayt*. The **-d-* seems to be found also in Germanic (cf. Norwegian *spita* 'stake, picket', OHG *spiz* 'Bratspieß', Sax. *spitu* 'id.').

See also s.v. *p'k'in* 'javelin'.

p'ast, *i*-stem (GDPl *p'ast-i-c'* in Yovhannēs Drasxanakertc'i) 'proof, argument, reason, true cause'; attested in Yovhannēs Drasxanakertc'i (9-10th cent.), etc. Earlier and more frequently found in compounds: Philo, John Chrysostom, Movsēs Kałankatuac'i, etc.

●ETYM No etymology is accepted in HAB 4: 484a. The connection with Gr. *φάσις* 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' (Jāhukyan 1967: 122-123) is problematic both formally and semantically. From the semantic point of view, the other Greek *φάσις*, meaning 'denunciation, information laid; appearance', would match better. Bailey (1986: 7) compares with Oss. *fāst*, *fārst(ā)* 'question, counsel', from Iran. *fras-* 'to question' (cf. YAv. *frašna-* m. 'question', Khot. *brašta-* 'questioned', etc.). Neither this is convincing.

Patrúány (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, albeit rejected by Ačāryan (HAB, *ibid.*), is worth of consideration.

The PIE root is represented by Skt. *(s)paś-* 'to see (*paś-*); to observe, watch, spy (*spaś-*)', *spaśā-* '(clearly) perceived, clear, visible', Gr. *σέπτεται* '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'oye'* (*i*-stem) 'show, indication, example' (Bible+) : 'proof' (Philo, Athanasius of Alexandria, etc.), also *apa-c'oye'* : *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'ap'a (dial.) 'bread, food'.

●DIAL Muš, Van, Agulis, Ararat *p'ap'a*, T'iflis *baba* 'bread', nursery words [Ačāryan 1913: 1066a]. Note also T'iflis *p'ap'a* 'a kind of porridge made of wheaten groats', considered a loan from Georg. *p^hap^ha* [Ačāryan 1913: 1066a].

●ETYM A nursery word probably of IE origin, cf. Lat. *pāpa*, *pappa* 'food' [Jāhukyan 1985: 153; 1987: 56, 142, 275]. Of non-IE languages cf. Georg., Zan *papa-* '(milk-)porridge', etc. [Jāhukyan 1987: 589]. Note homophonous nursery words with different semantics, e.g. Sebastia *p'ap'a* 'wound, pain' [Gabikean 1952: 546].

Further see s.v. *pap, papa* ‘father, grandfather’.

pʻesay, *i*-stem ‘bridegroom; son-in-law’ (Bible+).

●DIAL Dialectally ubiquitous [HAB 4: 497b].

●ETYM No acceptable etymology is recorded in HAB 4: 497b. Patrubány (1908: 277b) treats as composed of **(s)bʰendʰ-s* (cf. Gr. *πενθερός*, etc.) and the ending *-ay*, seen also in *caʻay*, *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. *peršu* ‘to ask for a girl’s hand in marriage’), and cites *arkʻay* ‘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.). Normier (1980: 22; see also Ravnæs 1991: 120₁) suggests a derivation from **spek-* ‘to look at’ semantically comparing Germ. *Braut-schau*, or an Iranian loan, cf. Manich. Sogd *pyšʻk* ‘bridegroom’. Olsen (1999: 946) considers *pʻesay* as a word of unknown origin.

Hardly related to Pahl., NPers. *pus, pusar*, ManMPers. *pwsr* ‘son’ (see the word in MacKenzie 1971: 69). On *pʻesawēr*, see Olsen 1999: 913.

pʻtj-uk (spelled also as *pʻtcuk, pʻtjuk*) ‘bitterness of heart’ (John Chrysostom, Vardan Arewelcʻi, etc.); **pʻtj-k-am** (*pʻtj-k-acʻ-eal* and *pʻtj-k-al-ov* in Łazar Pʻarpecʻi, 5th cent.), **pʻtj-k-im** (Movsēs Xorenacʻi, John Chrysostom, Ephrem), ‘to distress oneself, grieve, begin to sob’; **pʻtj-k-umn** (Łazar Pʻarpecʻi, etc.). For the attestation in Movsēs Xorenacʻi 3.68 (1913=1991: 361^{L10}), see s.vv. *anjuk* and *heljamtjuk*.

The compound *pʻtjk-a-lic* ‘full of sobbing/grieve’ (used with *šogi* ‘steam’) and the derivative *pʻtc-un* are attested in Anania Širakacʻi (A. G. Abrahamyan 1944: 319, lines 23 and 28) metaphorically, in atmospheric context.

●DIAL Muš *pʻxcakal* ‘to prepare oneself for sobbing’, Šamaxi *pʻxcakil*, Tʻiflis *pʻxcʻkil* ‘to distress oneself’ [HAB 4: 506b].

●ETYM No acceptable etymology is recorded in HAB 4: 506b.

Ĵahukyan (1967: 104) proposed a connection with Gr. *πλήσσω* ‘to beat’, *πληγή*, Dor. *πλάγá* 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; **plVk/g-* and **płk/g-* would yield Arm. **lVkʻk-* 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)lǵʰ-*, the word for ‘spleen’, see s.v. *pʻaycatn* ‘spleen’. A lengthened QIE **(s)pēlǵʰ-* would yield Arm. **pʰitj-*, of which regularly – *pʻtj-uk* and *pʻtj-k-a/im*. For the semantics note that the spleen is regarded as the seat of melancholy or morose feelings (OxfEnglDict). Compare also Gr. *σπλάγχνον* n., pl. *σπλάγχνα* ‘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'oyt', *o*-stem: GDSg *p'ut'-o-y*, ISg *p'ut'-o-v* 'zeal, diligence' (Bible+), 'haste (Ezrik Kołbac'i [*ar' p'ut'-i*], Nersēs Šnorhali); adj. *i*-stem: GDPl *p'ut'-i-c'* (John Chrysostom) 'zealous, diligent' (Movsēs Xorenac'i, Hexaameron, Yovhan Mandakuni/ Mayragomec'i, etc.); adv. 'hastily' (Movsēs Xorenac'i, Grigor Magistros, etc.), also in *and p'oyt'* (John Chrysostom), *p'oyt' and p'oyt'* (Movsēs Xorenac'i, etc.), *p'oyt' p'oyt'* (Anania Širakac'i), *p'oyt' i p'ut'oy* (Ephrem); **p'ut'am** 'to hasten, hurry, strive' (Bible+); adv. **p'ut'an-aki** 'hastily' (Bible+, for a discussion, see Olsen 1999: 267), **p'ut'-a-pēs** 'hastily' (Bible+).

●ETYM Since long (cf. NHB 2: 953a; Dervischjan 1877: 4, etc.), connected to Gr. *σπουδ-ή* f. 'haste, zeal', *σπεύδω* 'to hasten, hurry, strive', MPers., NPers. *pōy-* 'to run', ManParth. *pwd-* 'to hasten', etc., despite the obscure *-t'* instead of *-t*, see Hübschmann 1883: 54; 1897: 501; Bugge 1892: 455; Meillet 1898: 277; 1935 = 1978: 63; HAB 4: 515-516; Mallory/Adams 1997: 284b, 471b; Olsen 1999: 14. For Iranian, see Cheung 2007: 302. In view of the disagreement of the Arm. *t'* with PIE **-d-*, Beekes 2003: 197 assumes that the word may be non-Indo-European. He also points out that the etymology can hardly be rejected.

The problem of Arm. *-t'* can be solved by positing **(s)peud-to-* (Klingenschmitt 1982: 167; Clackson 1994: 155; cf. Petersson 1920: 61-62; Hiersche 1964: 237). For the simplification **-eud-t- > -oy(t)t'*, see 2.1.22.12-13. For a discussion of the initial *p'-*, see Hiersche 1964: 237; Klingenschmitt 1982: 165-172; Ravnæs 1991: 120-121.

p'os, *o*-stem (Bible, Movsēs Xorenac'i, Yovhannēs Drasxanakerc'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*, identical with *soyz* 'depth; hollow, den, lair' (Anania Širakac'i, Philo [NHB 2: 727c]).

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 [HAB 4: 517b].

●ETYM Since long, considered borrowed from Gr. *φόσσα* (< 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^hoso*, which is considered an Armenian loan [HAB 4: 517b; Ĵahukyan 1987: 590].

However, the word is very widespread in the 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^hoso*), and the resemblance with *p'or* 'hole; belly', 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 *φόσσα*, 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. *pārśāna-* '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 **pork̑-* 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).

Hardly any relation with Pahl. *pusyān* 'womb'.

p'orj, *o*-stem: ISg *p'orj-o-v* (3Kings 10.18, reading variant *p'orjel-ov*), AblSg *i p'orj-o-y* (John Chrysostom, Cyril of Jerusalem, etc.); *i*-stem: GDSg *p'orj-i* and AblPl *i p'orj-i-c'* (Philo), AblSg *i p'orj-ē* and ISg *p'orj-i-w* (Naxadrut'iwnk') 'proof, assay, attempt, test, experience; tried, assayed, experienced' (Bible+), late 'adventure, trouble'; **p'orjem** 'to try, assay, test, attempt, prove, approve' (Bible+); **p'orj-an-k'**, *a*-stem: GDPl *p'orjan-a-c'*, IPl *p'orjan-a-w-k'* 'trial, experiment, experience, test, trouble, temptation' (Bible+).

●DIAL The verb *p'orjem* and the noun *p'orjank'* are widespread in the dialects; *p'orj* has been preserved in Aslanbek, Karin, Marala [HAB 4: 521a].

●ETYM Since NHB 2: 955c and 956b, connected with Gr. *πειρα* f. 'test, research, experience', *πειράζω* 'to tempt, put the test, assault', *πειρασμός* m. 'temptation', Lat. *perītus* 'experienced, practised, skilful, expert', *perīculum* 'trial, proof, attempt; danger, peril', *ex-perior* 'to make trial of, put to the test; to attempt; to experience', etc., see Meillet 1935: 110 = 1978: 61; HAB 4: 520b; Pokorny 1959: 818; Ĵahukyan 1982: 129; 1987: 143; Mallory/Adams 1997: 36a. This etymology is semantically attractive but formally problematic. The assumption of a **porh₂io-* (Olsen 1999: 14) does not solve the problems.

On the other hand, one links Arm. *p'orj* with Skt. *sparh-*, pres. *spr̥hayanti* 'to be eager, strive after, desire', OAv. *aspərəzatā* prob. 'strives after', Gr. *σπέρχομαι* 'to rush', see Müller 1890: 8; Normier 1980: 20-21; for the Indo-Iranian forms, see Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 775; Cheung 2007: 353. Contrary to the former etymology, this interpretation is formally plausible (we can easily posit an *o*-grade deverbative noun **(s)porgʰ-o-*, **-ih₂-* > *p'orj*, *-o-*, *-i-*), but the semantic relationship is not evident. A contamination seems possible. For a further discussion I refer to the thorough analysis of de Lamberterie 1982a; 2006: 226.

p'ul 'fall, ruins' (not in 5th cent.); **p'lanim** 'to fall' (Bible+); later also **bl-** 'to fall, ruin'.

●DIAL Widespread in the dialects: *p'ul gal*, **p'/blil*, *p'/bl-č'-il*, etc. [HAB 4: 522b]. For the thorough representation of the dialectal forms and an 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 Ačāryan (HAB 1: 468a, s.v. *boyl*), Ararat *bulk* 'avalanche' belongs here, too. Earlier (1913: 204b), he linked the form to *boyl* (q.v.).

●ETYM Usually connected with Germ. **falla-* 'to fall', Lith. *pūlti* '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; cf. Elbourne 2000: 11).

According to Klingenschmitt (op. cit. 172), the original present PArm. **palŋ-* < PIE **ph₃lnH-* has been replaced by **pʰulani-* < PArm. **pōlŋ-* analogically after aor. **pʰul(a)-* < PArm. **pōla-*. However, neither PArm. **pa-* nor **pō-* would yield **pʰV-*. In order to explain the aspirated stop *pʰ-* in the Armenian form, one needs an unambiguous sequence **pHV-*. The reconstruction of **pʰōl-* (see Pokorny 1959: 851; Ĵahukyan 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‘ul* 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 reconstruct the following paradigm at a certain age of Proto-Armenian:

NSg **péh₃-ōl*,
 AccSg **ph₃-él-m*,
 GSg **ph₃-l-ós*.

Then, PArm. **pōl* became **p^hōl* > *p‘ul* 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‘-* 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 reconstruct 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.

p‘k‘in, *a*-stem: ISg *p‘k‘n-a-w*, IPl *p‘k‘n-a-w-k‘* ‘javelin’ (Bible+).

Renders Gr. *σχιζα* ‘split wood, piece of wood; shaft, javelin’ in the Bible.

●ETYM The connection with Pers. *paykān* ‘arrow’ (NHB 2: 966a; Hac‘uni 1923: 159) is untenable for chronological reasons; *p‘k‘in* is attested since the 5th century, whereas the Iranian word reflects an older **patkān-* > Arm. *patkan-* (see Dervischjan 1877: 6; HAB 4: 44a, 536b). Ačařyan (HAB 4: 536b) rejects this and other etymologies including the comparison with Lat. *spīca* f. ‘ear of corn’, *spīculum* n. ‘sting; javelin; arrow; sharp point of a weapon’, Latv. *spikis* ‘bayonet’, etc. suggested by Petersson (1916: 267; Pokorny 1959: 981).

The latter etymology is worth of consideration. Probably a European substratum word.

Further see s.v. *p‘ayt* ‘wood’.

K‘

k‘akor, *o*-stem: gen. *k‘akor-o-y* in Nersēs Lambronac‘i (11th cent.) ‘dung’ (Bible+).

●DIAL Moks *k^vakur*, Van *k^vakor*, Salmast *k‘akor*, Marała *k‘akōr*, Łarabał *k‘ák‘ur*, Łaradał *k‘ák‘urñə* ‘dung’ [HAB 4: 539b].

●ETYM From PIE **kakka-* ‘to defecate’ (a “nursery word”, “Lallwort der Kindersprache”): Gr. *κάκκη* ‘human ordure’, *κακκάω* ‘to defecate’, OIr. *cacc* f. < PCelt. **kakkā*, etc. (Meillet 1908-09c: 339-340; HAB 4: 539; Pokorny 1959: 521; Ĵahukyan 1987: 130; Adams apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 187a). Arm. *-k-* points to gemination (see also Olsen 1999 183, 585-586; cf. s.v. *ak‘atał* ‘rooster’ on

geminate). From the non-geminate: Lat. *cacāre*, Russ. *kāka*, Pers. *kaka*, *kakī*,¹³⁷ Arm. *k‘ak‘* ‘human ordure, excrement’ (q.v.), etc.

Concerning the suffix *-or*, see Dervischjan 1877: 17; Pedersen 1906: 480 = 1982: 258; Ĵahukyan 1987: 439; Olsen 1999: 524-525. Compare especially *ktit* ‘dung’, dial. *ktt-or* (see HAB 2: 677a). On the other hand, *-or* is reminiscent of another PIE word of the same semantics, namely Hitt. *š/zakkar* ‘excrement, dung’, Gr. *σκῶρ* n. ‘muck, excrement’, Arm. *c‘er‘* ‘liquid excrement’, etc.

k‘atak‘, *a*-stem ‘city’ (Bible+).

●DIAL Dialectally ubiquitous [HAB 4: 543a].

●ETYM The connection with Gr. *πόλις*, *πόλις* f. ‘citadel, fort, city’ and Skt. *pūr* (Winter 1965: 105) is untenable. The Armenian word is obviously a Semitic or Iranian loanword (see HAB 4: 542-543; Bailey 1979: 50b, 398a; Clackson 1994: 39). For other references, see Schmitt 1972-74: 27; Matzinger 2005: 55²³³.

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‘atayd‘*, *k‘atard‘*, Hačən *k‘ateyt‘* [HAB 4: 544a]. The *-u-* in Zeyt‘un *k‘utayd‘* cited in Ačarĳan 2003: 343 must be a misprint since the word is not mentioned in Ačarĳan’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‘atayd‘*.

●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). Ačarĳan (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: έντερα. 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. **želqđьkъ* ‘stomach’ (cf. Russ. *želúdok*, Pol. *żółdek*, 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-* < **-ηd-* should be given up”. In view of phonetic irregularities (**g^h/k/g*, *e/o/a*, *l/l*), 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

¹³⁷ The Persian word has been compared with Arm. *k‘akor* and *k‘ak* by Hiwnk‘earpēyēntean, see HAB 4: 539a. For the comparison of *k‘akor* with Lat. *cacāre* see Pedersen 1906: 378 = 1982: 156.

latter cases we would have had **k'atirt* and **k'atiwr*, 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. *έντερα*, 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'ar-** 'four': *k'arasun*, *i*-stem: GDPI *k'arasn-i-c'* 'forty' (Bible+); *k'ar-a-kus-i* 'four-square' in Revelations 21.16 (rendering Gr. *τετράγωνος*), Euclid, etc., with *koys* 'side' as the second member; *k'ar-ameay* 'quadrennial' (Eusebius of Caesarea), *k'aream* = **k'ari-am* 'quadrennium' (Movsēs Xorenac'i, John Chrysostom); a number of other compounds with *k'ar-* (Book of Chries, Philo, Anania Širakac'i, etc.); *k'ar*, *i*-stem, *a*-stem, *ea*-stem 'four' (Philo, T'ovmay Arcruni, Grigor Narekac'i, Grigor Magistros, etc.).

●DIAL The numeral *k'arasun* 'forty' is ubiquitous in the dialects. There are forms with geminate *-rř-* (Łarabał, Goris, Šamaxi) or *-ss-* (Agulis) [HAB 4: 556-557].

●ETYM See s.v. *č'or-k'* 'four'.

k'ar, GDSg *k'ar-i*, ISg *k'ar-i-w*, NPI *k'ar-in-k'*, API *k'ar-in-s*, GDPI *k'ar-an-c'*, IPI *k'ar-am-b-k'* (rich evidence in the Bible, see Astuacaturrean 1895: 1540-1541), NPI *k'ar-k'* (a reading variant in Ephrem) 'stone' (Bible+).

For the declension type, see s.v. *erēc* 'elder, presbyter'.

●DIAL Ubiquitous in the dialects [HAB 4: 559].

MidArm. *k'ar-a-tak* 'rock', attested in the fables by Vardan Aygekc'i (12-13th cent., Cilicia) [MijHayBař 2, 1992: 436a], is continued in a few dialects: Zeyt'un **k'ar-tak* 'a big rock' [Ačařean 1913: 1106a]; Karčewan, Kak'avaberd *k'aratak* 'the bottom of a stone/rock; a small cave' [H. Muradyan 1960: 234a; 1967: 208a], Goris *k'aratak* 'a cave carved in a rock' [Lisic'yan 1969: 96-98, 105; Margaryan 1975: 498b].

●ETYM See s.v. mountain-name *K'ark'-ē*.

k'arb, *i*-stem: GDSg *k'arb-i*, GDPI *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'arbic'* (90.13). In the former attestation the pair *iž*: *k'arb* renders Gr. *όφις* 'serpent': *άσπίς* 'the Egyptian cobra, Coluber haie', whereas in the latter: *άσπίς* 'Egyptian cobra' and *βασιλισκος* 'a kind of serpent, basilisk, perhaps Egyptian cobra'.

In Hexaemeron, the same pair (GDPI *ižic' ew k'arbic'*) renders Gr. *έχις* 'viper' and *άσπίς* 'Egyptian cobra, Coluber haie'; see K. Muradyan 1984: 313^{L14}, 373b, 378a. Note also *ižic' ew k'arbic'* in a *kafa*-poem to the Alexander Romance (H. Simonyan 1989: 236^{L4}).

In P'awstos Buzand 4.15 one finds *k'arb oĵ*, with *awĵ* 'snake' (1883=1984: 101^{L-3}): *ibrew oĵi k'arbi*. Garsoian (1989: 143) translates "a deaf asp", although the

Armenian text has no word for 'deaf'.¹³⁸ Note also *ōjk' iżk' ew k'arbk'* in 5.27 (187^{L23}). Garsoïan (1989: 207) translates "adders, asp 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'arbič'n ōjic'* (see K'yoškeryan 1987: 251^{L50}); in Step'anos Kelec'i, prob. 16th cent. [H. Sahakyan, UŠMjnHayBnst 1, 1986: 374^{L31}]: *t'iwnawor k'anc' k'arbi ōji* "(more) poisonous than *k'arb-ōj'*". Compare *iž mi k'arb* in Hexaameron, 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 ōj* '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'arbič'* "venom of aspics".

In Bařgirk' hayoc' (Amalyan 1975: 128^{N50}), *iž*, as female, is contrasted with *k'arb*, a male.

●DIAL Preserved in Svedia, in a compound with *ōj* 'snake': *k'arb'(ə)uc'* [HAB 4: 561a] or *k'arpuč* (< **k'arbi ōj*) or *k'arp'a*, *k'arp'əuc'* 'a kind of very poisonous snake of gray colour with white spots, of the size to 1,5 m, = Turkish /*boz yəlan'* [Andreasyan 1967: 163, 388b] (with a small head and narrow neck – Ačarıyan). For the compound **k'arb-ōj* cf. the above-mentioned attestations in P'awstos Buzand, etc.

●ETYM Derived from IE **(s)ker-* 'to cut', see s.vv. *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, namely Gr. *κάρις*, *-ίδος* 'Crustacea': Arm. *karič* 'scorpion', dial. 'crayfish' (q.v.), which is typologically comparable with *σκορπί(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), albeit rejected by Ačarıyan (HAB 4: 561a), is worth considering. 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. *κάρραβος* m. 'horned or cerambycid beetle; a prickly crustacean, crayfish', *κάρραβίς*, *-ίδος* f. 'id.', diminutive *κάρραβιον* = *ἐφόλιον* n. 'small boat towed after a

¹³⁸ This (confusion?) is somehow reminiscent of Pers. *kar* 'deaf; a snake not yielding to incantation', see Steingass 1019b.

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. *σκορπίος* '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. *κάρραβος* 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. *σκορπίς*, *σκορπίος* 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 a generalization 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 *skṛp-. Alternatively, one may think of substratum *-a/o- vacillation seen in some other animal designations of Mediterranean origin; see s.vv. *lor* 'quail' and *karič/kor* 'scorpion'.

*k'arp/bičon prob. 'scorpion' or 'horned beetle'.

●DIAL Trapizon *k'arpičon 'an uncertain kind of horny insect' [Ačarean 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,

Kɔtošvənin cərcəroni.

The answer is *k'arpinčon*, described as a *eļjiwrawor 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 [AčarHLPatm 2, 1951: 344]). Although 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: *gɔdešvəni* [Ačaryan 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', although not recorded in Hamšen, is present in the other side of the river Čorox, namely in Baberd, also in a reduplicated form *ɔrjɔr* [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* [Ačaryan 1947: 51]. The sound change *an* > *ɔn* is restricted to few dialects, among them Hamšen (see Bałramyan 1965: 80-81); Trapizon is not mentioned in this context; cf. also AčarHLPatm 2, 1951: 343-345. A quick look at the texts in the Trapizon dialect [Ačarean 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. Bałramyan 1965: 90. Ačaryan (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. Ačařyan 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' [Ačařean 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*, namely 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. *κάρις*, -*ιδος* 'Crustacea' (see s.v.).¹³⁹

k'ac'ax, *o*-stem: ISg *k'ac'ax-o-v* (three times in the Bible), LocSg *i k'ac'ax-i* (Ruth 2.14) 'vinegar (made from wine, etc.)', attested in the Bible (9 times, rendering Gr. *ὄζος* 'wine vinegar'), Plato, Barsel Čon; **k'ac'axem**, caus. **k'ac'axec'uc'anem** 'to make sour' (Paterica, Grigor Narekac'i, Barsel Čon).

Some biblical illustrations: in Numbers 6.3: *k'ac'ax i ginwoy* : *ὄζος ἐξ οἴνου* "vinegar made from wine" and *i c'k'woy* : *ἐκ σικερα* "made from strong drink"; in Ruth 2.14: *t'ac'c'es zpatař k'o i k'ac'axid* "dip your morsel in your wine vinegar" : *βάψεις τὸν ψωμὸν σου ἐν τῷ ὄξει*.

●DIAL The noun *k'ac'ax* 'vinegar' is widespread in the dialects. The verb **k'ac'axil* 'to turn sour (said of e.g. stomach)' is present in Suč'ava, T'iflis, Polis, Aslanbek, Sebastia, Xarberd, Agulis [HAB 4: 565b]. Other semantic nuances: Sebastia *k'ac'ax* 'very sour, leavened (dough)', *k'ac'xil*, *k'asxil* 'to be leavened', *m*-reduplication *k'ac'x-ε-mc'xil*, *k'as-msxil*, *k'ac'/sxmil* 'to become sour (said of heart)' [Gabikyan 1952: 567]; Ararat *k'ac'axel* means 'to be very angry' [Amatuni 1912: 671b], etc.

●ETYM No etymology in HAB 4: 565b.

Jahukyan (1967: 229; 1982: 74; 1987: 133, 236; hesitantly: 1990: 75) derives *k'ac'ax* from IE **kuāt-so-*: OCS *kvasъ* 'leaven, fermented drink, kvass', Czech *kvas* 'id.', Sln. *kvās* 'leaven, ferment', SCR. *kisati* 'to turn sour, boil', *kīsati* 'to rise (said of dough), pickle', OCS *kysělu* 'sour', etc.; Lat. *cāseus* m. 'cheese'. The relation of these forms with Skt. *kvathī* 'Blasen werfen, aufwallen, aufschäumen', Goth. *hvaþiþ* 'to foam, froth', etc., is uncertain; for the forms and a discussion, see Pokorny 1959: 627-628; Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 1: 31 = 1995, 1: 28; Lehmann 1986: 199; ÈtimSlovSlavJaz 13, 1987: 151-159, 268-275; Schrijver 1991: 251-252; Mayrhofer EWAia 1, 1992: 420; Mallory/Adams 1997: 199-200; Derksen 2008: 258, 266-267. With few exceptions (e.g. Olsen 1999: 949₃₁), the Armenian word is unknown to scholars outside Armenia.

¹³⁹ A considerable number of animal designations in the Hamšen dialect belong to the 6th declension with gen. *-on* and abl. *-ä* (see Ačařyan 1947: 95-96). One may therefore wonder whether *k'arpičon* 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/Hamšen word.

The connection of *k'ac'ax* with at least the Slavic word is semantically impeccable, cf. Arm. dial. 'leaven' vs. ClArm. 'wine vinegar, etc.' on the one hand, and SCr. dial. *kvàsina* 'vinegar' (ĖtimSlovSlavJaz 13, 1987: 152) vs. 'leaven, ferment, kvass' in other Slavic languages, on the other. The appurtenance of the Latin form is possible too. Olsen (1999: 949₃₁) hesitantly posits **k_uat^(h)ih₂ko-* for Armenian. This is phonologically impossible. Most probably, *k'ac'ax* is to be linked with the Slavic and Latin forms with the suffixal element **-s-*. As to the suffix *-ax*, Ĵahukyan (1990: 70-75; cf. 1987: 354) lists some other examples and assumes a substratum (cf. Urtart. *-hi/e*) origin.

Whether with Urtartian intermediation or not, the suffix *-ax* probably points to a Mediterranean-European substratum origin, cf. *ka_lam-ax* 'aspen' vs. Hesychian *καλαμίν-δαρ* 'plane', *me_l-ex* 'the handle of an axe' (if related with Gr. *μελία* 'manna ash, ashen spear'), possibly also *šalax* 'mortar, solute', *tawsax* 'box-tree', etc.

According to Ačarĳan (HAB 4: 565b), Laz *k^hac^háxi*, *k^hac^háxuri* 'sour water of unripe grapes (*azox*) that is used in food as vinegar'¹⁴⁰ and Georg. *k'ac'axi* 'sour, unripe' are Armenian loanwords. Ĵahukyan (1987: 607; cf. 1967: 229₃₅) relates Arm. *k'ac'ax* 'vinegar' with Avar etc. *къанула* 'vinegar' (mentioned also by Ačarĳan, HAB 4: 565b) and other North-East Caucasian forms in terms of IE-Cauc. areal (or Nostratic) relationship. Klimov (1994: 180-181) suggests a comparison between Georg. *kvet-* 'ferment' ('сычуг, закваска') and IE **k_uat(h)-*.

To sum up, Arm. *k'ac'ax* 'wine vinegar', dial. 'very sour, leavened (dough)', verbal *k'ac'ax-* 'to make/turn sour, be leavened' most probably derives from a cultural term of Mediterranean-European substratum origin, **k_uats-* or **k_uács-* 'ferment, leaven, sour wine', reflected also in Slavic (OCS *kvāsъ* 'leaven, fermented drink, kvass', Sln. *kvās* 'leaven, ferment', SCr. dial. *kvàsina* 'vinegar', etc.), Lat. *cāseus* m. 'cheese', and in some Caucasian words. The appurtenance of the other IE forms is uncertain. The suffix *-ax* occurs also in a few other words of substratum origin. Note another cultural term of a similar areal distribution and belonging to the same semantic field: Arm. *aw_ti* 'a strong fermented drink, intoxicating beverage', Russ. CS *объ* 'a kind of fermented drink', Lith. *alus* 'beer', Pruss. *alu* 'mead', OEngl. *ealu(p)*, Engl. *ale* 'beer'; Oss. *ælūton* 'a kind of beer', Georg. (*a*)*ludi* 'beer', etc.

k'ak' 'human ordure, excrement' (late, Norayr apud HAB 4: 567b).

●DIAL Widespread in the dialects: Nor Naxijewan, Polis, Axalc'xa, Akn, Muš, Moks, Hačən, Svedia, Salmast, Ararat, Łarabał, etc. [HAB 4: 567b].

●ETYM Connected with the PIE *Lallwort* for 'excrement': Russ. *káka*, Pers. *kaka*, Gr. *κάκη*, etc. [Ačarĳean 1908: 121b]. Similar words are found also in non-IE languages [HAB 4: 567b]. For a further discussion and references, see s.v. *k'akor* 'dung'.

k'ez, acc. and dat. of *du* sg. 'you' (q.v.).

●ETYM From PIE **tue-ǵ^hi*. For a discussion, see s.vv. *du* 'you', *es* 'I', *k'o* 'your'.

¹⁴⁰ It is remarkable that Arm. *azox* 'unripe grapes' (Bible+), in my opinion, may be related with Abkhaz *azaxua* 'grape-vine' (see Akaba 1984: 65), according to V. Chirikba (p.c.), *a-žaq^wa*.

k'eni 'wife's sister' (Łazar P'arpec'i, Canon Law, Matt'ēos Urhayec'i).

●DIAL Widespread in the dialects [HAB 4: 570a].

●ETYM Related with Lith. *svainė* 'wife's sister', *svainis* 'wife's sister's husband', Latv. *svaine* 'wife's sister', ORuss. *svestb* 'wife's sister', Russ. dial. *svest*, *svestka* 'id.', Russ. *svojak* 'wife's sister's husband', OHG *ge-swīo* 'Schwager', MHG *ge-swīe* 'Schwägerin', etc. HAB 4: 569-570; Bonfante 1984: 27; Saradževa 1986: 260-262. For the cognate forms (without Armenian), see Pokorny 1959: 884; Szemerényi 1977: 45-46, 94.

The comparison is most probably correct; especially remarkable is the formal and semantic resemblance with Lith. *svainė* 'wife's sister'. There is no consensus on reconstruction of the Proto-Armenian vocalism, however. The proto-forms such as **suenijo-* (HAB 4: 569b), **suenijeh₂-* (Jahukyan 1987: 146), **suoiniijeh₂-* (Huld apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 85ab, 521-522) or the like would probably yield Arm. **k'ini-*. Hübschmann therefore posits **k'eani* < **svesanyo-* (1897: 503), or **sveyenyā-* or **sveynyā-* (1899: 46).

k'eri, *ea*-stem: GDSg *k'erw-o-y* (Leviticus 20.20), AblPl *i k'ere-a-c'* (Movsēs Xorenac'i 3.48, 1913=1991: 319^{L16}) 'mother's brother, maternal uncle' (attested also in Yovhannēs Draxanakerc'i, Law Code by Mxit'ar Goš, etc.).

●DIAL Widespread in the dialects [HAB 4: 570b].

●ETYM Since Awetik'ean 1815, etc. (see HAB 4: 570a for references), derived from *k'er*, the genitive form of *k'oyr* 'sister' (q.v.). Hübschmann 1883: 55 mentions this view with hesitation and notes also OSax. *swiri* m. 'cousin'.

Later Hübschmann (1897: 504) rejects the etymology for semantic reasons. Indeed, the Armenian word refers to 'mother's brother, maternal uncle'. Benveniste (1969, 1: 231 = 1973: 185) points out that the maternal uncle, **swesriyos*, is literally designated as 'he of the sister' ('celui de la soeur'), after his sister, who is the mother of *ego*. The same has been suggested earlier by Ačāryan (Armeniaca apud HAB 4: 666-667; see also Olsen 1999: 443, 443₅₀₉). This is somewhat unexpected, however; 'celui de la soeur' could only refer to 'sister's son', i.e. 'nephew' (Skt. *svasrīya-* m. 'sister's son, nephew' YV+, see Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 796; cf. also OSax. *swiri* m. 'cousin'); to indicate 'mother's brother' one rather expects 'celui de la mère' [Beekes 1976a: 52; Szemerényi 1977: 192-193], cf. e.g. Skt. *mātula-* m. 'maternal uncle' (Br.+), from the word for 'mother' (see Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 345, 347)¹⁴¹.

The explanation can be that this word, originally meaning 'sister's son', was not only used by women and could then, on the basis of reciprocity, come to denote the other member of the relation, the uncle; cf. e.g. MHG *vetere*, originally 'father's brother', which refers to both 'uncle' and 'nephew' > Germ. *Vetter* 'cousin' (Beekes 1976a: 52; Szemerényi 1977: 193; Huld apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 521a). For a discussion, see also Pârvulescu 1989a: 75-76, who links Arm. *k'eri* closely with OSax. *swiri* m. 'Vetter', OFris. *swire* f. 'Veterschaft', etc., all going back to **suesr-ja* (cf. above on Hübschmann 1883: 55).

¹⁴¹ Jahukyan (1963a: 95-96; 1987: 146, 189) posits an independent creation of **sue-* 'his own, etc.'.

k'erda(y) 'scribe'. Only in Baġirk' hayoc' (Amalyan 1975: 333^{Nr111}, see also note 442₁₁₁): *k'erda·gragir*. Reading variants: *k'erday*, *k'erday*, *k'erdoyn*.

●ETYM Ačařıyan (HAB 4: 572a) mentions no etymological suggestion. Amalyan (1975: 442₁₁₁) assumes that *k'erda(y)*, *k'erday(n)* is a corruption for *k'erd/t'ot*. However, this is not corroborated by any manuscript. The appurtenance to *k'er-t'*- 'to scratch, chop, carve' is possible. For *-ay* in person-designations, see s.vv. *ark'ay* 'king', *yawray* 'stepfather', *p'esay* 'bridegroom', cf. *cařay* 'servant'. Compare also *darbn-ay-k'*, coll/pl. of *darbin* 'smith' (q.v.).

It is tempting to compare Arm. *k'erday/k'erday* 'scribe' with Welsh *cerdd* 'craft; poetry, poem', OIr. *cerd* 'craft; poetry', 'craftsman, artisan, gold- and silversmith; poet' from QIE. **kerdā-*, cf. Gr. *κέρδος* n. 'gain, profit, desire to gain, cunning, wiles' (see Brown 1947: 22-23; Watkins 1995: 75-76, 117; Mallory/Adams 1997: 139ab). Uncertain.

k'erem 'to scratch, rub, chop, skin' (Bible+), 'to write, carve' (Grammarians, Ephrem, Nersēs Šnorhali); **k'er-t'-em** 'to rub, chop, remove the skin from' (Nersēs Šnorhali), 'to write a poem' in Plato, etc. (in derivatives - also Movsēs Xorenac'i, Book of Chries, Philo, etc.); **k'er-c-**, 3sg.aor. *e-k'erc* 'to scratch, rub, chop' (Bible+); **k'er-b-em** 'to rub, chop, remove the skin from' in Parakanon šarakanner (cf. dial. Ewdokia *k'erp'el*, see HAB 4: 572b); **k'or** 'itch' (Girk' molut'eanc'), **k'orem** 'to scratch, itch' (Severian of Gabala, John Chrysostom, Evagrius of Pontus, etc.), redupl. **k'or-k'orem** (Ařak'el Dawriřec'i).

On **k'erel**: *grel* 'to write' see AdonDion 2008: 4^{L14f}; *k'erakanut'iwñ* = Gr. *γραμματική* in Dionysius Thrax, 6-7th cent. [AdonDios 2008: 1^{L1f}]. Note also **k'er-d-** in a number of derivatives in Dionysius Thrax [Adonc' 1915=2008]: *k'erd-ot* (= Gr. *ποιητής* 'creator, producer, poet'), *a*-stem: GDP1 *k'erdot-a-c'* (1^{L5}, 2^{L29}), *k'erd-ot-akan* [*zruc'atrut'iwñ ast nergoys k'erdotakan yetanaks*: *ἐξήγησις κατὰ τοὺς ἐνυπάρχοντας ποιητικοὺς τρόπους*, 1^{L11f}], *k'erd-ac* (= Gr. *ποίημα* 'poem'), *a*-stem: GDP1 *k'erdac-a-c'* (1^{L21f}, 2^{L6}, 4^{L4}), API *k'erdac-s* (4^{L9}), *k'erd-ut'iwñ* = Gr. *ποίησιν* (2^{L24f}, cf. 31^{L22}), *k'erd-oc'-eal* = Gr. *ποιηθέν* (16^{L1}), *k'erdeal* = Gr. *πεποιημένον* (21^{L18}). Also in Commentary by Step'annos Siwnec'i, see Adonc' 1915=2008: 186^{L10}, 190^{L19}, 191^{L14f}, etc.

On *k'er(d/t')*- in grammatical sense, see further AdonDion 2008: cxxiv-cxxxiii; Ĵahukyan 1954: 38, 160-163, 178-179; A. Muradyan 1971: 161, 168-170, 175, 228-229, 286-287. Note also *k'erday* 'scribe' (q.v.); for *-ay*, cf. e.g. *darbn-ay-k'* (see s.v. *darbin* 'smith').

●DIAL The verbal forms *k'er-* and *k'ert'-* are ubiquitous in the dialects; *k'erc-* is present in Axalc'xa, Ararat, Łarabař; the forms *k'or* and *k'orem* are widespread [HAB 4: 572a, 573ab, 589a]; on *k'erp'-*, see above. See also Ĵahukyan 1972: 280.

●ETYM From PIE *(s)ker- 'to cut, split': Gr. *κείρω* 'to cut (off), shave, mow off, ravage', OHG *sceran* 'to cut', Lith. *skiriù*, *skirti* 'to separate', etc.; see HAB 4: 571, 572-573, 589 with literature; Pokorny 1959: 941; Mallory/Adams 1997: 143b.

For *k'er-t'/d-*, cf. Skt. *kart-* 'to cut, cut off, split, break', YAv. *kart-* 'to cut', OHG *scrinden* 'to split', Lith. *kertù* 'to fell, cut down', Slav. **čьrta* 'line', **čьrtati* 'to scratch, engrave; to draw', **čьrtiti* 'to charm', etc. (see ÈtimSlovSlavJaz 4, 1977: 75-76, 161-163, 164-166; Mayrhofer EWAia 1, 1992: 315-316; Cheung 2007: 243-244). See also s.v. *k'erda(y)* 'scribe'. The development **-rt-* > Arm. *-rd-* is regular.

The by-form with *-rt-* may be from **k(e)rt-tV-*, cf. Skt. *kṛttá-*, etc. (see 2.1.22.13). Arm. *k'erc-* (aor. *e-k'erc*) possibly reflects sigm. aor. **kerd-s-*.

The form *k'er-b/p-* points to PIE **(s)ker-p-* 'to chop, cut': OHG *scirbi* 'potsherd', Lat. *carpere* 'to pick, pluck', Lith. *kiṛpti* 'to chop, cut', Latv. *cīrpt* 'to shave', Czech *čerep* (arch., dial.) 'broken piece of pottery', Russ. *čerep* 'scull', *čerpát* 'to scoop, draw, ladle (out)', *čerpak* 'scoop, ladle', etc. (see *ĒtimSlovSlavJaz* 4, 1977: 70-74). See also s.v. *k'arb* 'basilisk, asp'.

According to Kortlandt 1975: 44 = 2003: 11, the unpalatalized initial *k-* was taken from *k'orem* 'to scratch'. The latter, with iterative-prone semantics, continues an iterative formation **(s)kor(H)-eje-*, see Klingenschmitt 1982: 142; Barton 1989: 153. For a further discussion, see Pisani 1950: 165f; Ravnæs 1991: 136; Olsen 1999: 806₅₁.

k'ist, *o*-stem: ISg *k'st-o-v* in Hexaemeron (K. Muradyan 1984: 135^{L12}) and Ephrem 'seta (of wheat)'; attested in Koriwn, Hexaemeron, Ephrem, etc.; later also **k'is** (Grigor Tat'ewac'i); **k'st-umn** 'bristling' (Ezrik Koḅbac'i), **k'st-mn-īm** 'to bristle from terror, be terrified' (Bible+).

●DIAL Preserved in several dialects, generally meaning 'seta (of wheat)', apart from Ganjak, where *k'ist* denotes 'fish-bone or snake-sting'. In Muš, Moks, Xarberd, Svedia: **k'is*. Ararat *k'istl* and Juḷa *k'estx* (rural *k'istx*) point to **k'ist-l* [HAB 4: 580b].

I wonder whether the following forms belong here, too:

Hamšen *k'ist* 'weaver's comb' (see Ačařean 1913: 1115b). Łarabał *k'ist* 'the penis of a child' (see Ačařean 1913: 1115b). Note that Ganjak, where *k'ist* means also 'fish-bone', belongs to the dialect-group of Łarabał. We may be dealing, thus, with the semantic field reflected e.g. in cognate forms deriving from PIE **keh₂ul-*: Lat. *caulis* m. 'stem (of a plant), cabbage; penis'; Gr. *καυλός* m. 'stem, pole'; OIr. *cúal* f. 'faggot, bundle of sticks'; Lith. m. *káulas* 'bone', Latv. *kaūls* m. 'bone, stem', etc. (see s.v. *c'awt-un* 'stem, stalk; straw').

●ETYM Ačařyan (HAB 4: 580b) does not accept any etymological attempt.

Arm. *k'ist* is reminiscent of Slav. **kistb* displaying the following meanings: 'raceme', 'seta', 'brush', 'bunch', 'cluster', 'wrist', etc. (see *ĒtimSlovSlavJaz* 13, 1987: 276-277). Uncertain.

k'irtn, *an*-stem: AblSg *i k'rtan-ē*, GDPl *k'rtan-c'*, IPl *k'rtam-b-k'* (Bible+), NPl *k'rtun-k'* (Luke 22.44), API *k'rtun-s* (P'awstos Buzand, Paterica), NPL also *k'rtin-k'* (John Chrysostom, Plato) 'sweat', metaphorically 'toil, hard labour' (Bible+); denominative verb **k'rtnem**, 3sg.aor. *k'rtneac'* (Nersēs Lambronac'i, Nersēs Šnorhali), 2pl.aor. *k'rtneac'ik'* (Nersēs Šnorhali), **k'rtnim**, 1sg.aor. *k'rtn-ec'ay* (Grigor Narekac'i), 3sg.aor. *-ec'aw* (Ephrem, Nersēs Šnorhali), 3pl.aor. *-ec'an* (Łazar P'arpec'i), 3sg.subj. *k'rtnes-c'i* (Agat'angelos, Nersēs Lambronac'i) 'to sweat; to toil, labour hard' (5th cent.+; Agat'angelos, Łazar P'arpec'i, etc.), **k'rtnam** (*k'rtnal-ov* in Philo), **k'rtanel** inf. (Zak'aria Catholicos, 9th cent.) 'id.'; 3sg.caus. **k'rtnac'uc'anē** (Agat'angelos).

●DIAL The frozen plural *k'rtink'* 'sweat' is widespread in the dialects [HAB 4: 581a]. Hamšen has *k'aydink'* and *k'aydnink'* [Ačařyan 1947: 258]. Some E and SE peripheral dialects display forms reflecting *k'rt(n)unk'*: Agulis *k'rt'unk'* and Juḷa

k'rt'unk' through assimilation *k'...t > k'...t'* [Ačařean 1935: 136, 398; 1940: 146, 390a; M. Zak'aryan 2008: 329]; Łarabał, Goris *k'rt'nənk'* [HAB 4: 581a]. Note also Łarabał *k'ər'(t)nənk'*, *k'ərt'nunk'*, etc. vs. *k'ərt'nink^o*, *k'ərt'ink^o* [Davt'yan 1966: 498], Šamaxi *k'ərt'nənk'* vs. *k'rt'ink'/k^o* [Bařramyan 1964: 231].

Denominative verbal forms: Marala *k'ərnəl* (vs. subst. *k'ərt'ink^o*) [Ačařean 1926: 122, 430; Davt'yan 1966: 501], Łarabał *k'ər/rtənk'əl*, *k'ərt'ənk'əl*, *k'əřənk'əl*, *k'əřhynəl*, *k'əřnənk'əl* [Davt'yan 1966: 501], Šamaxi *k'ərt'ənk'il* [Bařramyan 1964: 232]; Hamšen *k'əydnuš*, *k'əydnənk'uš*, caus. *k'əydnec'ənuš* [Ačařyan 1947: 258]. For other verbal forms and for derivatives, see Ačařyan 1913: 1129-1130.

●ETYM From PIE **suid-r-*: Gr. *ἰδρώς*, *-ᾠτος*, ep. acc. *ἰδρῶ* 'sweat', Latv. pl. *sviēdri* 'id.', Alb. *djėrsē* f. 'perspiration, sweat', *djers* 'to sweat'; stem **sueid-*: Skt. *svēd-* 'to sweat', *svēda-* m. 'sweat', YAv. *x^vaēda-* m. 'sweat', MPers. *xwīstan* 'to sweat', *xwēy* 'sweat', NPers. *xway* 'sweat', Oss. *xīd/xed* 'sweat', Lat. *sūdō*, *-āre* 'to sweat, perspire', *sūdor*, *-ōris* m. 'sweat, perspiration; toil, exertion' (cf. the semantic development of the Armenian word), OHG *sweiz* 'sweat', Latv. *svīstu* 'to sweat', etc. Hübschmann 1883: 55; 1897: 503; Meillet 1894: 156-157; HAB 4: 581a with lit.; Rudnicki 1938; Pokorny 1959: 1043; Kortlandt 1986: 43 = 2003: 72; Mallory/Adams 1997: 560a; Beekes 2003: 197, 206; for the cognate forms, see also Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 798-799; for an etymological discussion of the Albanian form, see Rix 1985: 340; Demiraj 1997: 139-140; Kortlandt 2003: 119.

Beekes 1972a: 35-36 reconstructs HD *r*-stem: nom. **sue/oid-ē/ōr* (cf. Latv. *sviēdri*), gen. **suid-r-ós*, cf. Arm. *k'irtn*, Gr. *ἰδρώς*. The Greek and Armenian forms represent a combination of *r*-stem and *s*-stem possibly seen in Lat. *sūdor*, *-ōris* m. 'sweat' (cf. Chantraine 1968-80: 456; for Latin, see Rix 1985)¹⁴². Most probably, Arm. *k'irtn* reflects QIE accusative **suidr-os-ṃ*, cf. Gr. acc. *ἰδρῶ* prob. from *-όα < *-os-ṃ* (see Kortlandt 1996a: 58 = 2003: 119; Viredaz 2001-02a: 4). On the other hand, one assumes a transfer to *n*-declension by analogy of *n*-stem body-part designations (see Jähukyan 1982: 114; cf. Schmitt 1981: 71, 103; Rix 1985: 340). For a further discussion of these and other views, see Clackson 1994: 226₁₃₆; Olsen 1999: 128-129.

For the regular metathesis **-dr- > Arm. -rt-*, see 2.1.26.2.

k'n-ac, *i*-stem: *k'nac-i-c'* 'id.' (John Chrysostom, Evagrius of Pontus, Yovhannēs Erznkac'i), *k'nēac* 'sleepy, drowsy' (Bible+), *k'n-ac-u* 'somniferous' (Eznik Kołbac'i, 5th cent.; Mařtoc' Jahkec'woc', 14th cent.).

●ETYM Composed of *k'un* 'sleep' (q.v.) and the participle ending *-ac*, originated from *acem* 'to lead'. The form *k'n-ac* 'sleepy, drowsy' may be directly compared with Skt. *á-svapnaj-* 'schlummerlos' (see Olsen 2000: 403; Rasmussen 2003: 355).

k'o, gen. of 2.sg.pers.pron. *du* 'you' (q.v.); 2.sg.poss.pron. **k'o**, gen. *k'oy*, *k'oyoy* 'your'.

●ETYM The forms *k'o* (gen. of 2sg.pers.pron.) and *k'oy* (gen. of 2.sg.poss.pron.) derive from **tue/o(so)* and **tuosjo*, respectively, with the regular sound change **tū- > k'-*, cf. Skt. *tvá-*, Gr. *σός*, Lat. *tuus* 'thy', etc. (Hübschmann 1897: 504; Pedersen 1905: 197-198 = 1982: 59-60; Grammont 1918: 251-253; AčařLiak 2, 1954: 45, 56;

¹⁴² Lat. *sūdor* is ambiguous; **r*-stem is possible, too (see Beekes 1972a: 35-36).

Godel 1975: 111; Schmitt 1981: 116-117; Ĵahukyan 1987: 154; Ravnæs 1991: 167-168; Weitenberg 1999-2000: 18; on PIE, see Szemerényi 1996: 220). For forms and a further discussion, see s.vv. *es* 'I' and *du* 'you'.

k'ot'anak 'linen garment' (Evagrius of Pontus, Philo, etc.).

●**ETYM** No acceptable etymology is recorded in HAB 4: 585b. The word has been linked with Skt. *kanthā* 'cloth made of patches', Pāli *kāthina-*, Lat. *centō* 'garment made of several patches', OHG *hadar* 'rags' (see Ravnæs 1991: 130₁ for the reference to Belardi 1958: 29ff, in *Ricerche linguistiche* 4). This etymology is widely accepted: Pokorny 1959: 567; Ravnæs 1991: 130 ("this can possibly be a migratory word, but it can nevertheless be IE of origin"); Schrijver 1991: 432-433 (assuming a **kot(H)-* for the Armenian and OHG forms); Mallory/Adams 1997: 110a.

Since NHB 2: 1010a (also HAB 4: 585b; Ĵahukyan 1987: 464), however, Arm. *k'ot'anak* 'linen garment' has been correctly compared with the word for 'linen, linen garment, cotton, cloth' widespread in the Near East and Europe: Phoen. *ktn* 'linen garment' (> Gr. *χιτών* 'chiton'), Akkad. *kitū(m)*, Pers. *katān*, Engl. *cotton*, etc.; as well as Arm. *ktaw* 'linen, cloth, linen garment'¹⁴³ (Bible+; widespread in the dialects), MidArm. and dial. *k'(a)t'an* 'linen', *k't'et* 'linen garment' (see Hübschmann 1897: 308; Ačarean 1902: 356; 1913: 1111; HAB 2: 675-676; 4: 577; Ĵahukyan 1987: 452, 464, 467; Greppin 1989a: 77, 80). Whether the IE forms above (Skt. *kanthā* 'cloth made of patches', OHG *hadar* 'rags', etc.) are related with this migratory term is uncertain.

k'oyr, GDSg *k'er*, AblSg *i k'er-ē*, ISg *k'er-b*, NPl *k'or-k'*, APl *k'or-s*, GDPl *k'er-c'* (rich evidence in the Bible, see Astuacaturean 1895: 1548-1549); later: GDSg *k'uer*, *k'əwer* (Paterica, Step'anos Taronec'i Asolik, Nersēs Lambronac'i), *k'ōr* (Law Code by Mxit'ar Goš), ISg *k'uer-b* (Law Code by Mxit'ar Goš), NPl *k'er-i-k'* (Canon Law), APl *k'er-s* (Ephrem), etc. 'sister' (Bible+).

●**DIAL** Ubiquitous in the dialects [HAB 4: 587a]. Beside the nominative *k'ur*, Łarabał has a vocative *ā-k'er*, genitive *k'əver*, *k'uver*, *k'əvər*, etc. (HAB 4: 587a; Davt'yan 1966: 53, 79, 500, and especially, with paradigms, 108-109, 112). For the Agulis paradigm (*k'vir*, etc.), see Ačarean 1935: 209.

●**ETYM** Derived from PIE **suesor-* 'sister': Skt. *svāsar-* f. 'sister' (RV+), YAv. *x'əhhar-* f. 'sister', Gr. (Hes.) *ἔορ θυγάτηρ, ἀνεπιός*, Lat. *soror* 'sister', OIr. *siur*, gen. *sethar* (instead of **sesar* in analogy to *máthair*, *máthar*, etc.), Goth. *swistar*, Lith. *sesuō* 'sister', OCS *sestra*, etc. Hübschmann 1897: 504; HAB 4: 586-587 with lit.; Pokorny 1959: 1051; Szemerényi 1977: 32-47; Mallory/Adams 1997: 521.

Arm. nom *k'oyr*, gen. *k'er*, instr. *k'er-b* and nom.pl. *k'or-k'* derive from PIE **suesōr* (> **-ehu-* > **-eu-* > *-oy-*)¹⁴⁴, **suesr-ós*, **sues-r-b^hi*, and **suesor-es*, respectively; for a discussion see, apart from the references above, Hübschmann 1883: 55, 87; Meillet 1936: 39; Ĵahukyan 1959: 169-171; Kortlandt 1980: 100-101;

¹⁴³ It has been suggested that the ultimate source of Arm. *kt-aw* 'linen' and related words may be Arm. *kut* 'seed' (HAB 2: 675-676; N. Mkrtč'yan 1970: 251; Ĵahukyan 1976a: 46-47; 1980, 2: 104; 1987: 126, 437, 452, 467).

¹⁴⁴ Klingenschmitt 1982: 154 suggests **h₂eu^hhūr* > **k^hóu(h)ur* > **k^hour*, with *u*-epenthesis; cf. also Olsen 1999: 153.

1984a: 101; 1985: 20-21, 23 = 2003: 28-29, 48, 64-65, 67; Schmitt 1981: 105; K. Schmidt 1987: 36; 1992: 38; Clackson 1994: 53, 210₇₇; Olsen 1999: 153; Viredaz 2000; Beekes 2003: 170, 197, 209, 211.

The secondary forms GDSg *k'u-er*, NAPI *k'uer-k'/s*, GDPI *k'uer-c'* have been explained through an adaptation to *-er*-declension (cf. *dustr*, gen. *dster* 'daughter'), and the forms *k'or* and *k'vor* (next to NSg *k'ur*) may be analogical after CIArm. pl. *k'or-k'*, as well as genitives *hawr* 'of father', *etbawr* 'of brother', etc. (for a discussion, see AčafLiak 3, 1957: 539-540; Ałayan 1958: 72-74; 2003: 78-80, 120; Ĵahukyan 1959: 170; Ę. Tumanjan 1971: 226, 226₁₀₆; A. A. Abrahamyan 1976: 56; Ervandyan 2007: 37).

The vocalism of Łarabał nom. *k'er* and *k'ir* may be taken from the vocative *á-k'er*. Here the change *-oy-* > *-e-* may be due to the unaccented position.¹⁴⁵

See also s.v. *k'erri* 'maternal uncle'.

k'os, *o*-stem: ISg *k'os-o-v* in Deuteronomy 28.27; IPI *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'oc'n ew t'anč'iwk' ew zayrac'eal k'osov, ew mnov, zi mí karasc'es bžškel* : *πατάζει 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*¹⁴⁶ *ἀγρία* "with malignant itch/scurvy" is rendered by *zayrac'eal k'osov*.

Refers also to a disease of trees (Evagrius) and to "stone-moss" (*k'ar-a-k'os* in Agat'angelos+).

●DIAL Widespread in the dialects [HAB 4: 588a]. On **k'awt'ar-k'osi*, see 3.5.2.2.

●ETYM The etymology of *k'os* is uncertain; derived from **kosso-* (cf. Lith. *kasýti* 'to scratch constantly', etc.) or compared with Arm. *k'or* 'scratch, itch' (see HAB 4: 588a; Ĵahukyan 1967: 124₁₀₅; Olsen 1999: 44).

k'san, mostly uninflected (some evidence for *i*-stem) 'twenty' (Bible+).

●DIAL Ubiquitous in the dialects. Marafa and Agulis have geminate *-ss-* [HAB 4: 599a].

●ETYM From PIE **uīk̑nti* 'twenty' < **dui-dk̑mt-* 'two tens': Skt. *vim̑sati-* f., YAv. *vīsaiti*, MPers. *wīst*, NPers. *bīst*, Gr. *εἴκοσι*¹⁴⁷ < **euīkosi*, cf. Dor. *φίκασι*, Lat. *uīginti*, OIr. *fiche*, gen. *fichet* < **uikant-s*, **-os*, MWelsh *ugeint*, etc. from **uikantī* (Schrijver 1995: 159), Toch. A *wiki* and B *ikām* < PToch. **wikän*, etc.; PArm. **gisan* > **gsan* > *k'san* through unvoicing of **g-* before the sibilant *-s-*. See Hübschmann 1883: 55; 1897: 504; Meillet 1910-11: 217; 1936: 40; HAB 4: 598-599 with lit.; Pokorny 1959: 1177; Szemerényi 1960: 23-24; Schmitt 1981: 131; Clackson 1994: 46; Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 550-551; Mallory/Adams 1997: 404b; Adams 1999: 61-63; Olsen 1999: 628.

¹⁴⁵ Hardly from PIE vocative **suésor* > **k'é(ha)r*.

¹⁴⁶ Gr. *ψώρα* 'itch, scurvy; a disease of trees, scab; moth'.

¹⁴⁷ The comparison with the Greek word has already been suggested in NHB 2: 1013c.

Winter 1965: 106-107 explains the Armenian aspirated *k'*- instead of *g*- as a reflex of PIE *Xw*-. A somewhat similar explanation has been offered by Kortlandt (1976: 96; 1983: 14; 1994a: 255-256 = 2003: 5, 43, 100-101): **e*- in Greek **euīkosi* reflects the glottal element of the (preglottalized) *d*, of which the obstruent, the plosive element, disappeared through dissimilation; the glottal stop was vocalized into an *e*- in Greek, exactly as happened with **h₁*- (see also Beekes 1989:28; 1995: 213-214; Schrijver 1991: 83, 182; also lit. in Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 551); in Armenian it devoiced the following **u* in the same way as **h*- from **s*-, e.g. in *k'oŷr* < **syesōr* 'sister'. For further references and a discussion on this issue I refer to Huld 1980a. In my opinion, the traditional explanation (**gisan* > **gsan* > *k'san*) is more plausible.

The loss of the dental in the expected PArm. **k'sand(i)* may be analogical after the higher decades in *-sun* < **komth₂*, compare a similar influence responsible for the vowel *-o-* of the Greek form. For a different explanation of the Armenian auslaut, see Olsen 1989: 221-222.

k'un, *o*-stem: GDSg *k'n-o-y*, ISg *k'n-o-v* (Bible) 'sleep' (abundant in the Bible, Astuacaturean 1895: 1549-1550); **k'nem** 'to sleep' (Porphyry); **k'unem** 'to sleep' (Proverbs 3.24; John Chrysostom, Gregory of Nyssa, etc.; see below for an illustration from Book of Chries), 'to die' (Bible), 'to have a sexual relation' + *and* 'with' (Bible, Astuacaturean 1895: 1550a); **k'nēac** see also s.vv. **t-k'un** 'sleepless', **k'un-k'** 'temple (of head)', **k'n-(ē)ac** 'sleepy'.

A textual illustration for *k'unem* 'to sleep' in a *xrat* (gnome, aphorism) from Book of Chries 2.0 (G. Muradyan 1993: 44^{L5f}, Russ. transl. 2000: 47): *Oč' ē part zamenayn gišern k'unel*: "He следует спать всю ночь". For the Greek passage, see G. Muradyan 1993: 270₂).

The derivative *k'n-aran* 'place to sleep, bed; grave' (Grigor Narekac'i, etc.) contains the suffix *-aran* of Iranian origin (on which see Greppin 1975: 48-49; Jahukyan 1998: 17; Olsen 1999: 339-341).

●DIAL The noun **k'un** is dialectally ubiquitous [HAB 4: 592b]. Numerous derivatives and phrases [Amatuni 1912: 675; Ačārean 1913: 1117b, 1123; Gabikean 1952: 576].

The verb **k'unel** 'futuere' (noted also in NHB 2: 1012b): Polis *k'un-v-il*, iterative *k'un-v-t-il*, coll. noun *k'un-v-t-uk'*, caus. *k'un-c'n-el*, Łarabał iterative *k'un-k'un-at-el*, abusive compounds starting with **k'unac-a-* [Ačārean 1913: 1124a], Goris **k'unac-a-* 'id.' [Margaryan 1975: 497a], Sebastia *k'unel* 'futuere', *k'un-ič'* 'penis' [Gabikean 1952: 576], etc. It is widespread in contemporary dialects and in the modern vulgar language in not only in abusive expressions but also as the principal verb for 'futuere'.

The word **k'n-ap** 'slumberous, somnolent', attested in Grigor Tat'ewac'i (14-15th cent., Syunik'), is present in the same area of Syunik' and surroundings: Goris *k'anap* [Margaryan 1975: 496b], Łarabał **k'nap* [Ačārean 1913: 1117b], *k'unap* [L. Harut'yunyan 1991: 381].

●ETYM Since Petermann, Windischmann et al. (see HAB 4: 592), linked with the PIE word for 'sleep', **suop-no-*: Skt. *svāpna-* m. 'sleep, dream', Av. *x'afna-* m. 'sleep, dream', Gr. *ὑπνος* 'sleep', Lat. *somnus* 'sleep', Lith. *sāpnas* 'dream', OCS *сьнь* 'sleep', etc. (Hübschmann 1897: 504; Meillet 1936: 32; Benveniste 1967: 12-

15; Schindler 1966b: 73; Clackson 1994: 111; Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 791-792; Olsen 1999: 29).

For the aberrant vocalism of *k'unem* beside the regular *k'nem* see Hübschmann 1897: 504; de Lamberterie 1978: 281; Clackson 1994: 168, 234₂₇₈; Olsen 1999: 15.

A. Petrosyan (2007: 11-12) assumes that the meaning 'futuere' has been resulted from contamination with PIE **keh₂-* 'love': Skt. *kā-* 'to desire, like', *kāma-* m. 'wish, desire', Lat. *cā-rus* 'dear, costly; precious, loved', Goth. *hō-rs* 'adulterer', OEngl. *hōr* 'adulterer', *hōre* 'whore', NEngl. *whore*, etc. (see Schrijver 1991: 95, 112; Mayrhofer EWAia 1, 1992: 334, 338-339; Mallory/Adams 1997: 357b). The appurtenance of Arm. *k'unem* to this etymon is formally improbable. Note that Toch. B *kāñm-* 'to play' and its derivation from **kōm-ne/o-* is uncertain (Adams 1997: 150). Besides, the Armenian form *k'unem* is not limited to the meaning 'futuere', and the semantic shift intrans. 'schlafen' > trans. 'beschlafen' (see Gabikian 1952: 576) is quite possible.

k'un-k' 'temple (of head)' (Gregory of Nyssa, etc.).

●DIAL Replaced by various compounds with *k'un* 'sleep' as the first member [Amatuni 1912: 675b; Ačārean 1913: 1117b; HAB 4: 592b], also *k'n-er-k'* in DialAdd apud NHB 2: 1067c.

●ETYM Since NHB 2: 1012b, derived from *k'un* 'sleep', cf. Czech *spánky*, Germ. *Schläfe*, etc. [Pedersen 1906a: 237₁ = 1982: 105₁; HAB 4: 592-593].

PLACE-NAMES

Atk‘ or **Tuzasar**, a village in the vicinity of Sebasta [Gabikian 1952: 673].

●ETYM From *alt* ‘salt’ (q.v.). This is corroborated by the alternative name of the village *Tuz-a-sar*, lit. ‘mountain of salt’, with Turk. *tuz* ‘salt’ (cf. Arm. dial. *t’uz*, Ačařean 1902: 137). This place-name must be old because *alt* ‘salt’ has not been preserved in the dialects.

Ardean-k‘ (API *Ardean-s*) a large village in the province of Ayrarat, attested only in P‘awstos Buzand 5.6 (1883=1984: 171^{L17f}). The passage reads: *i gawařn Ayrayratu i mec i gewłn ənjın 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 API *Ardean-s* and implies NPI *Ardean-k*‘ [Garsořan 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. *unĵ*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*‘, API *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 in 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 řirak, 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 řarayi orkorn ē, asen, mer řirakay ambark‘n č‘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. *arāspel*. The high quality and abundance of bread in řirak 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}). A similar fame is traditionally ascribed to 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).¹⁴⁸ In this respect the following seems interesting.

The territory of the province of Moks roughly coincides with the Urartian country of *Aiduni/Ařadu*, South of Lake Van, the name of which has survived in the district-name *Aytu-an-k*‘. In *Aiduni/Ařadu* there is a place-name *Ardiunak* which, according to řahukyan (1988: 157, 159-160), derives from Arm. *ardiun-k*‘ ‘earth

¹⁴⁸ I wonder if this word is related with MPers. *m‘dy‘n* [mādayān] ‘capital (of wealth)’, Boyce 1977: 55; see also MacKenzie 1971: 53. Further, note *m‘yg* ‘substance, nature’, NPers. *māyah*, see Nyberg 1974: 129b.

products'. If this is correct, one wonders whether Urart. *Ardiunak* is identical 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 4.3. 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'.

Aracani, Eastern Euphrates, Assyr. *Aršania*, ancient *Arsanias* (Pliny 5.20), now known as Murad-su, see Hübschmann 1904: 204, 361, 404; Adontz 1970 (< 1908): 14, 16, 29-32, 241, et passim; Eremyan 1963: 38b; Hewsens 1992: 156⁴², 164⁶⁴. Not attested in the 5th century. In P'awstos Buzand (5th cent., several times) and Yovhannēs Drasxanakerc'i (9-10th cent., T'osunyan 1996: 38^{L-6}, 178^{L-3}) this river is referred to as *Ep'rat*, which is the principal name of the (Western) Euphrates (see Hübschmann 1904: 426-427; Garsoïan 1989: 461-462).

Aracani occurs in the long recension of *Ašxarhac'oyc'*, the 7th century Armenian Geography by Anania Širakac'i, in the description of the province of *Cop'-k'* [Soukry 1881: 30^{L-17f}]: *Dēgik gawař*, <...> *Gawrēg gawař*, and *ors ekeal Aracani xarņi yEp'rat i k'atak'n Lusat'arič* "the district of *Dēgik*, <...> the district of *Gawrēg*, through which flows the Aracani [River] which joins the Euphrates at the city of Lusat'arič" (cf. Hewsens 1992: 59). Then *Aracani* is mentioned three times in the context of the province of Ta(w)ruberan [Soukry 1881: 31; Hewsens 1992: 63].

The beginning of Aracani is described in the context of the province of Ayrarat [Soukry 1881: 34^{L-5f}]: *Ew Aracani zskizbn uni i Całkotnē, i tełwojēn or koč'i Oskik'*, *ew gnalov and hiwsiwsi patelov zNpatakan lerambn, ar Bagwan dełwojñ, xarņi i Bagrewan get* "The Aracani begins in Całkotn at the place called Oskik', then flows north around Mount Npat near the village of Bagwan and enters the River Bagrewan" [Hewsens 1992: 65]. Further, abl. *y-Aracanw-o-y* is attested in Soukry 1881: 38^{L-14}, Hewsens 1992: 71.

Several attestations in Yovhan Mamikonean: gen.-dat. *Aracn-o-y*, vars. *Aracanoy*, *Arcnoy*, *Arcnwoy*, *Araca(y)nu* (A. Abrahamyan 1941: 113^{L-9}, 210^{L-8}, 233^{L-9}, 263^{L-7}, 270^{L-5}); and *yAracni* (vars. *and Arcni*, *and Aracani*, etc.) 'through Aracani' (op. cit. 200^{L-5f}).

Aracani, gen. *Aracanoy*, is attested in the Alexander Romance, rendering Euphrates, also as the source of *Ep'rat* (see H. Simonyan 1989: 199^{L-3}, 200 three times, 206^{L-8}, 396 three times, and the note 564-565²³⁴). It is also found in Lewond (see Ter-Lewondyan 1982: 119; Arzoumanian 1982: 136, 190⁴⁴).

●ETYM No etymology in Hübschmann 1904: 404 (considered 'vorarmenisch').

Together with **Arč-ēš* (probably due to assimilation from **Arc-ēš*), *Aracani* has been derived from PIE **h₂(e)rǵ-* 'shiny, whitish', cf. *arcat* 'silver' (see Ĵihanyan 1991: 232, 233-234; S. Petrosyan 1991: 129-131; A. Petrosyan 2006: 12-14). Possible cognate place-names: *Arga* in Spain, *Argà* or *Arge* in Lithuania, Gr. *Ἄργος*, Thrac. *Ἀρζος*, Illyr. *Argya*, etc. (see Krahe 1955: 94; 1963: 292, 292₂, 315-316; Pârulescu 1989: 290-291), as well as Av. *arazi-* f. 'Name eines Zuflusses des Sees Kašaoiia' in Yt 19.67g (see Hintze 1994: 416). For the typology, compare *Arcat'-atber-k'*, a plain in Basean, literally: 'Silver Springs' (Hübschmann 1904: 404), attested in Łazar P'arpec'i (5th cent.) 3.79 [1904: 146^{L-9}]: *i daštin atberakanc'*, *zor*

Arcat'atbersn koč'en "in the plain of springs which is called 'Silver Springs'" (transl. Thomson 1991: 204).

Although not attested in the 5th century, the river-name *Aracani* must be very old since it is attested in the form **Arcani-* in Assyrian sources onwards.¹⁴⁹ The form *Aracani* vs. **Arcani-* and the ending *-ani* have not received a proper interpretation. In what follows I offer a tentative explanation for them.

The cognate forms of the PIE appellative point to:

**h₂(e)rǵ-*: Hitt. *ḫarki-* 'white, bright', Skt. *ṛjrá-* 'shining reddishly, brightcoloured; quick', Gr. *ἀργός* 'shining white; quick' (Caland-system **-i-* vs. **-ro-*, Collinge 1985: 23-27; Beekes 1995: 170; Szemerényi 1996: 193-194; Kloekhorst 2008: 307; see also Mayrhofer EWAia 1, 1992: 253-254);

**h₂erǵ-u-*: Toch. A *ārki*, B *ārkwī* 'white' < PToch. **ārkw(ä)i* < **h₂erǵ-u(i)-n-* (cf. Toch. A *ārkyañc*), Skt. *árjuna-* 'light, white, silver-coloured', Gr. *ἄργυρος* m. 'silver', *ἄργυρος* 'silver-shining', etc. (Specht 1947: 113-115; Huld/Adams apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 641b; Adams 1999: 49-50, and references below);

**h₂(e)rǵ-nt-*: YAv. *ərəzata-* n., OPers. *ardata-* 'silver', Lat. *argentum* n. 'silver', etc. (see s.v. *arcat* 'silver'); on Skt. *rajatá-*, see below.

The PIE hypothetical paradigm **h₂erǵ-u-* vs. **h₂rǵ-e/ont-* might produce PArm. nom. **(h)arc-u-r* (cf. also Gr. *ἄργυρος* 'silver') vs. oblique and compositional **arcan(t)* 'white, silver-shining'. Both forms may be seen in river-names, **Arcan-* and **Arcur-* (q.v.). For the paradigm, compare *barj-r*, GDSg *barj-u*, NPl *barjun-k'*, GDPl *barjan-c'* 'high' vs. Hitt. *parku-* 'high' : Skt. *bṛhánt-* (f. *bṛhatī-*), YAv. *bərazant-* (f. *bərazait-*), Oss. *bərzond*, etc. 'high' (see s.v. *barjr* 'high'). Note especially the 'Old European' hydronym *Brigantia* (on which see Krahe AltFluß 3, 1951-52: 225-227; 1963: 322). Note also other European hydronyms in *-(a)nt-*, *-antia* and the like, especially *Argentia* (see Krahe AltFluß 3, 1951-52: 1ff, 236ff; 4, 1953: 37ff, 243; Krahe 1959: 11-12; 1963: 316a).

Next to the root form **h₂(e)rǵ-* (see above), in Indo-Iranian one also finds **h₂reǵ-*: Skt. *rajatá-* 'silver-coloured, shining white, made of silver', n. 'silver' (cf. Mallory/Huld 1984: 4-5¹⁵⁰; Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 1: 229 = 1995, 1: Mayrhofer EWAia 1, 1992: 116; 2, 1996: 425-426). If the theory on early Iranian or Aryan borrowings in Armenian is accepted (see s.vv. *arcat* 'silver', *arcui* 'eagle'), one may tentatively assume that the Armenian by-form **Aracan-* (vs. regular **Arcan-*) is due to influence of an Aryan unattested **raj-(a)nt-* 'silver-coloured, shining white'.

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 1303/5); also other derivatives [Hübschmann 1904: 404-405]. Note also **Arcəv-boyn*, lit. 'eagle's nest', cf. *Arcə[v]bunoy S. Astuacacni vank'* in Rštunik' (see Oskean 1939a: 162f). This compound toponym structurally parallels Persian *Alamūt*,

¹⁴⁹ One also finds *Aršiani* in a recently discovered Urartian text (Armen Petrosyan p.c., referring to M. Salvini, *Corpus dei testi urartei*, vol. 1. Roma, 2008, pp. 545-546).

¹⁵⁰ It has been suggested that Skt. *rajatá-* belongs rather with *raj-* 'to colour; to become red; to become excited', cf. Gr. *πέζω* 'to dye, paint', *πέγος* n. 'carpet, rug', etc. (Mallory/Huld 1984: 4-5; for the forms see Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 424).

a fortress in the mountains of Rūdbār, lit. probably ‘nid de l’aigle’ (for a discussion of this Persian toponym, see Huart 1908-09).

●ETYM = *arcui*, *arciw* ‘eagle’ from **h₂rǵipió-*: Skt. *ṛjipyá-*, etc.; cf. Av. *ərəzifīia-*, see Hintze 1994: 416; for Iranian and other parallels, see Eilers 1987: 26 (note especially Indian mountain-name *Ḡḍhra-kūta* m. ‘Geierspitze’, structurally comparable with Arm. *Arciw-a-katar*).

There are many Armenian place-names based on *arcv-* ‘eagle’ (see HayTeġBař 1, 1986: 451-454). One of them (also in Siwnik‘) deserves a closer look: *Arcvanik*, a village located 16 km NE to Kapan. It seems that this place-name too contains *arciw* ‘eagle’. In fact, the older, historical version of this toponym is *Eric* ‘-vanik (from the anthroponym *Eric* ‘-ak < *erēc* ‘priest’, see AčařAnjn 2, 1944: 143) and modern *Arcvanik* should be seen as its modification (Abrahamyan/Šahinyan 1975: 116; A. G. Abrahamyan 1978: 182-183; A. A. Abrahamyan 1986: 431²⁰⁰; HayTeġBař 1, 1986: 452), perhaps through contamination with *arciw* ‘eagle’.

Arcurak, a river in the vicinity of Xarberd, paired with *Sew getak* ‘Black River’ (see Srvanjtyanc‘ 1, 1982: 362).

●ETYM In view of the contrast with *Sew get-ak* ‘Black River’, *Arcur-ak* may contain a PArm. **arcur-* ‘white, shiny’, derived from PIE **h₂(e)rǵ-* (S. Petrosyan 1991: 129-130; A. Petrosyan 2002: 67²⁴⁰). Note especially Gr. *ἄργυρος* m. ‘silver’, and Av. *ərəzura-*, *arəzūra-* name of a mountain (see Hintze 1994: 416; Eilers 1987: 12). Further, see s.v. *Aracani*.

Getar(u), *Ge/ētaru*, a river (= *Agri-č‘ay*) and a district in Aġuank‘, attested in Ptolemy 5.11.2 (*Γαιτάρα*) and Ašxarhac‘oyc‘ [Eremyan 1963: 47b, 105a^{L15f}; HayTeġBař 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 *Dedaru*, not specifying the manuscript. MovsXorenMaten 1865: 606 vacat.

Getar, *Getar-Č‘ay*, a river in contemporary Armenia traversing the capital Yerevan, a left tributary of the river Hrazdan [HayTeġBař 1, 1986: 845b-c; G. D. Asatryan 1990: 6-7, 17].

Getar-su (*Gadar-su*), a river in the Urmia basin, probably identical with *Arasx* [HayTeġBař 1, 1986: 845c; Hewsens 1992: 178¹³⁷].

Getar, a village in vicinity of Kars [HayTeġBař 1, 1986: 845c].

●ETYM Hewsens (1992: 178¹³⁷) interprets the river-name *Getar-su* (*Gadar-su*) as *get* ‘river’ + *Ar[asx]* (?). In my view, this and the others contain the appellative *getar* ‘river-bed; river-shore; outbranching river’ (in Łazar P‘arpec‘i: *getaru*), q.v.

Gēn, **Gēn* (*Ginay get* ‘the river of **Gēn*’), close to Artašat (Movsēs Xorenac‘i). Perhaps identical 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.

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 Őrbelean (1250/60-1303/5), as well as *Ginoy blur*, a hill in front of *Duin* (see Hübshmann 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) [Ĵihanyan 1991: 240]; see also HAB s.v. *gēš* ‘corpse; bad’.

As pointed out by Ĵihanyan (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. *rāsa-* m. ‘juice (of plants), liquid’, PIran. **raha-ka-* ‘blood-vessel, vein’, OCS *rosa* ‘dew’, etc. (cf. the Armenian river-name *Erasx*, on which see Ĵihanyan 1991: 241-244).

Gis, a village in the extremely Eastern province of Uti-k‘ attested only in Movsēs Kałankatuac‘i/Dasxuranc‘i /7-10th 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. Ařak‘elyan (1969: 277₇₀, without any references) states, however, that this *Gis* should not be confused neither with *K‘iš* close to Nukha, nor with *Giš* in Łarabał (in the district of Martuni). See also Ulubabyan 1971: 176-177.

In Movsēs Kałankatuac‘i/Dasxuranc‘i 1.27 (V. Ařak‘elyan 1983: 95^{L12f}; ModArm. transl. 1969: 70): *Anc‘anelov ənd Hayastan, čanaparhordē hasanel i sahmans arewelic‘, i gawarñ Utiakan. Ew mteal bnakēin i čaxčaxut telis ew i lōraboys 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)ik-*: Skt. *viś-* 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. *οἶκος* ‘house, dwelling-place; one’s household goods, substance; a reigning house’, Lat. *vīcus* ‘village; district of Rome; street’ (from **uoik-*), *vīlla* ‘rural dwelling with associated farm buildings’, OCS *vsb* f. ‘village, terrain’, etc. (See also s.v. *giwt* ‘village’).

PIE **uik-* ‘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; HayTetBař 1, 1986: 17-20 (45 place-names); *Giwt-ik*, diminutive from *giwt* ‘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 (1250/60-1303/5) [A. A. Abrahamyan 1986: 404a; Ališan 1893: 480a].

According to Hübschmann (1904: 420), the first place-name was situated in Apahunik' (in the province of Turuberan). However, the passage from P'awstos Buzand 3.20 (1883=1984: 45-46; transl. Garsoĭan 1989: 97) reads as follows: <...>, *xalac'uc'in yerkrēn Apahuneac'*. *Ibrev ekin hasin i gewł mi, orum anun Dalaris koč'ēin; yoržam ekn emut zōravarn Parsic' i nerk's i gewłn Dalaris, acēr kapeal zark'ayn Tiran and 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' šolac'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 [Garsoĭan 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*, although 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, namely *Dalarink'* (in Siwnik'). Furthermore, one may assume that *Dalarik'* was situated in the district of *Dalar*, bordering with Apahunik' in the north-west, and its name was identical 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 *Dəvin*, *Dəvnay*, *i Dəvnay* (3.1, see 1851: 48); *Dəwni* (Abgaryan 1979: 67^{L1}, 91^{L21}), *Dəwnay* (74^{L24}, 111^{L28}), etc. In T'ovmay Arcruni (9-10th cent.): *Dvnay* (3.9), *Duni* (3.22); Ananun: *Dunay* (10); Yovhannēs Draxanakertc'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 Buzand (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 Artašatu* "to the hill in the plain of the Mecamōr called Duin, which is on the Northern side of the great city of Artašat" (transl. Garsoĭan 1989: 75). According to Movsēs Xorenac'i 3.8 (1913=1991: 265^{L12f}), King Xosrov P'ok'r (Kotak) transferred the Armenian capital from Artašat to Duin (probably in the second half of the fifth century) because of its healthier climate: *veroy antarin 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).¹⁵¹ 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; Garsoĭan 1989: 460-461.

●DIAL In a fairy-tale told in Ašarak 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 *-dūvīn* which is "pleinement attesté dans la toponymie de la région clairement délimitée au sud-est de la mer Caspienne".

The testimony of Movsēs is placed under new light by the comparison with Irish *dūn* 'hill', OEngl. *dūn* 'mountain', etc., from PIE **d^heu-* (see Jahukyan 1963a: 96-97; 1987: 584, developing the idea of Norayr Biwzandac'i; K'oc'aryan 2000). Despite the absence of direct evidence from Indo-Iranian languages,¹⁵² thus, Movsēs may be right. If the Iranian origin is not accepted, one might think of a European substratum word shared by Armenian, Celtic and Germanic (cf. the synonymous *blur* 'hill', q.v.), or of an IE term with an origin meaning 'burial hill', cf. Lat. *fūnus* 'funeral; corpse; death' (see Pokorny 1959: 260, 263; Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 745 = 1995, 1: 649; Mallory/Adams 1997: 150b, 210a). In the latter case we are dealing with an innovation shared by the three dialects. The Celtic and possibly the Armenian forms may reflect a technical term meaning 'fortified/enclosed high place, fort on top of a hill, city': PArm. **doyn/duin* 'city on a hill', OIr. *dūn* 'fort', Welsh

¹⁵¹ 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).

¹⁵² An Iranian-European isogloss in terms of Abaev 1965?

din, dinas ‘fort’; cf. also a Celtic loan in Germanic: OEngl. *tūn* ‘enclosed place, homestead’, Engl. *town*, OHG *zun* ‘fence, hedge’, etc. (see the references above).

An Iranian **dūn* or QIE **d^heun-* would yield Arm. **doyn* (or **dun*). The form *Duin* may be explained by a process in a way comparable to that involved in Clackson’s interpretation of *lusin* ‘moon’ and *katin* ‘acorn’ (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* = *Judi-Dagh* upon which Noah’s Ark is said to have come to rest. Attested in “Patmut’iwn srboč’ 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 *Bētmānīn* or *Heštāne*. See Hübschmann 1904: 333-334 (= 1907: 202-203); Eremyan 1963: 53b; Hewsens 1992: 170₂, 174-175₁₁₆.

●ETYM In “Patmut’iwn srboč’ 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. *ṯamānūna* ‘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-ijewan* “erste Station” [Hübschmann 1904: 455; 1901: 73-79 = 1990: 99-105] (for the corresponding story, see Łanalanyan 1969: 157^{Nr402}); *Aṛnos* as if from **ar’(z)Noys* “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. Mir. *temen*, Russ. *temnyj*, etc. Mountain-names are frequently named ‘dark’ or ‘black’ (see 4.6). I think, this etymology becomes more probable under the light of Arm. (Baṛgirk’ 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. tāmīsrā-* f. ‘dark night’, etc.) > Lat. **temafrā-* > *tenebrae* f.pl. ‘darkness’. Especially important is Illyr. *Tóμapoc*, which is a mountain-name, too (see Mallory/Adams 1997: 147a). One may also wonder if *Ał-t’amar* (a rocky island and fortress in Van Lake) is composed of **Ał(i)* ‘Van Lake’ and **t’amar* ‘mountain’, identical with Illyr. *Tóμapoc*.

In these areas there was a district named *Tmorik’* (see Hübschmann 1904: 336-337). According to Hewsens (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 *Tόμαρος*.

Lsin, a locality in the neighbourhood of Šahapiwan, probably a hill (or at a hill), close to the enclosed hunting grove called **Siws*. Attested only in P'awstos Buzand 4.15 (1883=1984: 102^{L21}; see Ačařyan 1925a: 169; Garsoian 1989: 143, 476).

●ETYM No etymological attempt is known to me. I assume a basic meaning 'wooded hill', 'grove', 'enclosed forest' or the like and suggest a comparison with Lat. *lūcus* m. 'sacred grove, wood', *Lūcīna* 'cognomen of Jūnō, invoked by women when giving birth' from PIE **louko-* m. 'open space in the woods': Skt. *rokā-* m. 'open space' (RV+), Lith. *laũkas* 'field, open air', OHG *lōh* 'grove, wood, tanning-bark', etc. (see Derksen 1996: 212; de Vaan 2008: 350); cf. also Welsh *llwyn* m. 'bush, shrub, grove', possibly from **luk-no-* (see Schrijver 1995: 357, 431-432 for a discussion).

For *-in*, see s.vv. *Duin* and *Olin*.

Kogovit, *Kogayovit*, GDSg. *Kogayovti*; a district in the province of Ayrarat, on western slopes of the mountain *Masis*. Attested in Movsēs Xorenac'i 3.23, 3.37, "Ašxarhac'oyc'", etc.

●ETYM Composed of **kog-* and *hovit* 'valley'. According to Hübschmann (1904: 441), *Kog* (GSg *Kogay*) is the oldest name of the district, and the original *Kogay-(h)ovit* has been contracted into *Kogovit*. However, there is no independent evidence for **Kog*. I propose to treat *Kog-ovit* as composed of *kog-* (GSg of *kov* 'cow', q.v.) and *hovit* 'valley', thus: 'valley/pastureland of cow'. At a certain stage, the component *kog* became semantically opaque (which is quite obvious since *kog-* is the archaic, etymological genitive), and the place-name has been reshaped as *Kogay-(h)ovit*. For the toponymical pattern, cf. *Erñj-a-tap* = *erinj* 'heifer' + *tap* 'plain', etc. (see 4.4, also s.v. *Tuarac-a-tap*). Note also Skt. *gávyūti-* f. 'pasture, cattle-meadow', Skt. *gávyūti-* f. 'pasture, cattle-meadow', YAv. *gaoiiaoiiti-* f. 'pasture'.

Kotb, a village in Ayrarat, in the district of Čakatk', now *Tuzluca* [Hewsen 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*, Jähukyan (1986a: 51, 51₂₆) proposed a connection with Gr. *γλάφυ* n. 'hollow, cavern', *γλαφυρός* 'hollow(ed)'. Jihanyan (1991: 248) independently suggests the same etymology referring to PIE **gelebh-* '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. *δελφός*, *-ύος* f. 'womb', *δορφός*· *ή μήτρα* (Hesychius) which comes from PIE **g^welb^hu-* 'womb', cf. Skt. *gárbha-*, Av. *garəβa-* m. 'womb', with *o*-grade (Mayrhofer EWAia 1, 1992: 474-475; for *o*-grade, see also Oettinger 2000: 396₇). 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 2009 s.v.; Gindin 1977: 113-115).

The derivation **g^wolb^h* > Arm. *Koḷb* 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.

Hay-k’ ‘Armenia’: see s.v. *hay* ‘Armenian’.

***Hac’eak-k’**, gen.pl. *Hac’ek-ac’*, in Tarōn (Koriwn+); ***Hac’i-k’** in Vayoc’ jor (Step’anos Ōrbelean, see Hübschmann (1904: 444); **Hac’eac’** in various place-names (see below).

In Koriwn 3: <...> *ēr Mašt’oc’ anun, i Tarōnakan gawarēn, i Hac’ekac’ geḷjē, ordi arn eranelwoy Vardan koč’ec’eloy*. “Mashtots was the name <...>. He was from the province of Taron, the village of Hatsekats, son of a blessed man named Vardan”. *Xas geḷ* and *Xasik* are the Kurdish variants of the name of the village; the village *Xas geḷ* was still in existence up to the Armenian Genocide (see Hübschmann 1904: 326; Pivazyayn 1981: 84, 275, 308₅₁, 337₅₈, 357₅). Also in Movsēs Xorenac’ i 3.47: <...> *Mesropay, or ēr i Hac’ekac’ Tarōnoy* [1913=1991: 316^{L11f}], Thomson 1978: 309]. The GDPI *Hac’ekac’* presupposes NPI unattested **Hac’eak-k’* (Hübschmann 1904: 444). According to Inčičean (see Hübschmann 1904: 326 = Hiwbšman 1907: 190; Lanalanyan 1969: 275^{Nr739b}), also the Kurdish population of the village venerated the church calling it *Ziarēt’ ēl-Xasik* ‘uxt of *Xasik*’ or *Tēr ēl-Xasik* ‘church of *Xasik*’. The grave of Maštoc’ is said to be in this church, although Maštoc’ is actually buried in Ōšakan, a village in the vicinity of Aštarak in Armenia proper.

The village is also mentioned in P’awstos Buzand 3.19 (1883=1984: 42): <...>, *ayl ēr nora* [i.e. *Papay* – HM] *harč mi i gawarēn Tarōnoy, i Hac’eac’ geḷjē karčazatac’n; ew mnac’ or i harčē anti Hac’ekac’woyn, orum anun iwr ordwoy harč’in Vrik koč’ēr*. It seems that *Hac’eac’* and *Hac’ekac’i* are alternating names of the same village and, as Malxasyanc’ (1987: 426-427₅₇) points out, are reminiscent of the village of St. Maštoc’, *Hac’ekac’*. In her translation of the passage, Nina Garsoĭian (1989: 94) omits the variant *Hac’eac’*: “But he [i.e. Pap – HM] had a concubine from the **karčazat* village of *Hac’ekac’* in the district of Tarōn, and he left a son named Vrik by his concubine”. For her, too, in this passage we are dealing with the village of *Hac’ekac’*, the birthplace of St. Maštoc’ (ibid. 262₁₀, 427, 467). On *Hac’eac’ draxt*, see below. *Hac’eac’ vank’* in Yovhannēs Draxanakertc’i, 9-10th cent. (T’osunyan 1996: 48^{L2}).

●ETYM Hübschmann (1904: 444) interprets *Hac’ekac’* as GDPI of **hac’eak-k’* (= **hac’i-ak-k’*), namely ‘village of small ash-trees’. N. Garsoĭian (1989: 467) translates *Hac’ekac’ gewḷ* as ‘Ash Village’, suggesting that the underlying word is *hac’i* ‘ash-tree’ (q.v.). For the form with a diminutive suffix note Salmast *xac’ik’* (see HAB 3: 65b), cf. *hačar-(u)k-i* ‘beech-tree’. For the typology of a place-name of the structure /tree-name + diminutive suffix/ one may compare the names of villages such as *Tanjeak* = *tanji* ‘pear-tree’ + *-ak*, *T’eteak* = *t’eti* ‘elm-tree’ + *-ak*, etc. [Margaryan 1992: 137-138]. Note especially *Xnjoresk*, also formed with a plural marker: = *xnjori* ‘apple-tree’ + *-ak* + API *-s* (see 4.8).

This analysis becomes even more transparent when we take into account the alternative name of the village, *Hac’eac’*, which reflects GDPI *hac’eac’*. In the same

district of Tarōn, about one stone's throw (*k'arəngēc'*) below the site of the famous temple of Heraklēs = Vahagn (and Anahit and Astlik, see Agat'angelos § 809, 1909=1980: 422) at Aštišat, where St. Grigor first laid the foundations of the holy church, there was a small wood of ash trees (*hac'ut purak*) called *Hac'eac' Draxt* 'Ash Grove'; at this place were situated the spring at which St. Grigor had baptized a great host, as well as St. Daniēl's cell/cave, see P'awstos Buzand 3.14 (1883=1984: 33^{L17}, 37^{L19}; Garsoian 1989: 87, 90, 467). See also Movsēs Xorenac'i 3.14 [1913=1991: 272^{L18}; Thomson 1978: 267₇].¹⁵³

According to HayTeġBaġ (3, 1991: 396a), *Hac'eac' draxt*, abounding in manna, probably was a heathen cult place, the homonymous monastery is identical with S. Karapet. Note the association of the ash-tree with mann in IE tradition (see Dumont 1992).

Since at Aštišat there were also the shrines of Anahit and Astlik (divinities, nymphs), one may hypothetically assume a connection between the Nymph(s) and the ash-trees, exactly like the Nymphs of the ash-tree in Greek mythology, see Taxo-Godi apud MifNarMir 2: 219, 549.

Remarkably, a similar association is seen in Łarabaġ, district of Martuni, where there is a spring called *Anahiti axpur* "spring of Anahit" in the village of *Hac'i*. Here the king Vač'agan met for the first time the beautiful and wise Anahit, an inhabitant of the village of *Hac'i* (see Łanalanyan 1969: 98^{Nr264} referring to Avagyan 1966, in "Hayrenik'i jayn", Nr 32 [n.v.]).

Another traditional story on this spring is recorded in NmušLeinŁarab 1978: 141, where *Anahit* was not only very beautiful and wise, but also skilful in making rugs. In a Łarabaġ folk-tale entitled 'Anahit' (HŽHek' 7, 1979: 54-56), she used writing ornaments on her rugs. This is reminiscent of another folk-tale recorded by M. Grigoryan in 1928 in Č'anaxč'i (Avetaranoc'), where *Aždahak* (Dragon) enters the room of a dragon (*ošap'*) in the Underworld (see HŽHek' 5, 1966: 421) and sees a beautiful girl, and on the wall, a rug (*gyaba*), on which the story of the girl is narrated in old Armenian language (*k'yohnā hay lüzvav*).

From a traditional story recorded in 1958 in the same village of *Hac'i* (see L. Harut'yunyan 1991: 89^{Nr66}), we learn that here there was a church named *Anahit*, and this place was venerated in the context of rain-bringing rites. The text reads as follows: *Hac'va kleran ten, Ərvaluk' saran mote min vank' a əläl, anumə Anahit. Vank'ə en a əläl Ərbanun tap'umə. Koxke hłac'en el əseis ən əläl Ərbanun hłe. Hac'va Anahitin əxpran knanek'ə kužavur ən əläl tneis, vank'en k'arerə lvənayis, hanc'u t'or' kya. Arašt taren ver vank'en k'arerə hłac'ral ən, t'or' a ekal.*

One might think that this Anahit is merely taken from the famous fairy-tale "Anahit" by Ł. Ałayan, 1881. In fact, this tale is based on the folklore (see H. T'umanyan 6, 1994: 367-369). Thus, we seem to be dealing with an EArm. relic of the ancient Armenian goddess Anahit. In the village of *Hac'i* there is a Surb Astuacacin church [M. Barxutareanc' 1895/1995: 81]. One may assume a shift of the worship of Anahit onto Mary.

¹⁵³ *Hac'eac' gewł* and *Hac'eac' purak* are not exactly in the same location, see Hewsens 2001: 48 A5, 105 D4 (Buz. *Hatsou*), 193 C4 (Ott. *Hasik*), but not very far from each other either.

I conclude that we can consider an old female divinity and a water-nymph (to be identified with *Astlik*, a theonym of native origin later replaced by the famous Iranian *Anahit*), which was skilful in rug-making (like Athena) and was associated with ash-trees (like Nymphs).

Meł, 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’ [N. Sargisean 1864: 226; Hübschmann 1904: 323; Ĵihanyan 1991: 252-253]. Usually identified with *Τηλεβόας* mentioned in *Xenophon, Anabasis* 4.4.3 [2001: 326/327]; see Markwart, *Philologus* 10/1: 236 (n.v.); Eremyan 1963: 70b; Krkyašaryan 1970: 260¹⁷; Hewsen 1992: 165⁶⁵.

In the long recension of Ašxarhac‘oyc‘ we read on the district of Tarawn: *yorum gay getn Meł ew ankani yEp‘rat*: “par où passe le fleuve de Megh (*Meł*) qui tombe dans l’Euphrate” [Soukry 1881: 31^{L5}, French transl. 41; Engl. transl. Hewsen 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 S. Petrosyan 1991: 130-131; Ĵihanyan 1991: 252-253; A. Petrosyan 2003: 207, 213, 215). On the Thracian, Pamphylian, and Kappadocian river-name *Μέλας* usually identified with Gr. *μέλας* ‘black’, as well as for numerous parallels and semantic discussion, see Pârvulescu 1989. Remarkably, the etymological semantics of Arm. *meł* is corroborated by the modern Turkish name: *Kara-su*, lit. ‘black water’ (see Ĵihanyan, *ibid.*). Thus, the more common Armenian name, namely *Metr-a-get*, lit. ‘honey-river’, must have been resulted from folk-etymology.¹⁵⁴

Ołakan, 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; Garsoian 1989: 485]. Nowadays: village of *Axkan* (Eremyan, *ibid.*). Usually identified with *’Ολανή* (pro *’Ολα[κα]νή*) in Strabo (Geogr. 11.14.6); cf. also *Volandum* (Tacitus, Ann. 13.39). But Strabo’s *’Ολανή* is located near Artašat (see Ačařyan 1940a: 59, 117; for a discussion, see H. P. Tēr-Pōlosean 1944: 9-14, 19, 30). Thus, only the name can be identical.

The ruins of the fortress are still seen on precipitous rocks on the bank of Aracani [Tomaschek 1896: 11; Hübschmann 1904: 460]. Cuiet (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*’”.

¹⁵⁴ How old is the association with ‘honey’? On the village of **Metr-a-gom*, see Hübschmann 1904: 323. The rivername *Meł* seems identical with the place-name *Melti* by Zenob Glak and Yovhan Mamikonean [Hübschmann 1904: 323; Ĵihanyan 1991: 253]. One wonders if there is any relation with Hitt. *melit* ‘honey’.

Attested in P'awstos Buzand 5.3 (1883=1984: 160); Movsēs Xorenac'i 2.84 (1913=1991: 228^{L5}); Ehišē (1989: 138^{L1}), etc. In Yovhan Mamikonean: *Otkan*, with syncope (see A. Abrahamyan 1941 passim).

For *Otkan*, see also Srvanjtyanc' 1: 72; Petoyan 1965: 365-366; the map apud Petoyan 1954; Hewsens 2001: 55 (map 48 A5).

●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 compound with Arm. *ōt* 'ring' which would be impossible in view of the vowel 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 the dialects (including Muš, located on the same territory of Tarōn) refers to 'a slope of a mountain', 'a 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 Habḫi (south of Lake Van) attested in Assyrian sources from 9-8th centuries (see N. Arutjunjan 1985: 160), which may be related to this IE form whether or not it is identical with Arm. *Ot-*. An underlying **poli(V)n* can be compared with Arm. *Olin* (q.v.); note that the loss of **p-* before the vowel *-o-* is regular in Armenian.

(2) cf. Gr. *Όλυμπος*, name of mountains in Greece and Asia Minor.

Olin, a village probably in (or in vicinity of) Aršamunik', attested in Łazar P'arpec'i (5th cent.) 3.83 (1904=1985: 150^{L26f}, transl. Thomson 1991: 210).

●ETYM No etymology is known to me. Hübschmann 1904 vacat.

I suggest a tentative comparison with Arm. *ot-n* 'spine, back(bone)'; dial. also 'hill-side, etc.' (q.v.); see s.v. *Ot-akan*. For *-in*, see s.vv. *Duin* and *Lsin*.

Ormē, Ormi, a town with a fortress to the West of Lake Urmia, 22 km from its shore. The Arabic sources have *Urmija'*, *Urmi'* [Bittner 1896: 89^{Nr52}], mentioned as a town of *Arminia* [B. Harut'yunyan 1989, 2: 34-35]. The lake (= *Kaputan cov*, *Řezaye*) is named after the town (see Hewsens 1992: 266; HayTeġBař 5, 2001: 214-215).

●ETYM *Orm-i*, probably the original name of the fortress, can be derived from *orm* 'wall; fence' (q.v.), a native Armenian word from **sor-mo-*, cf. Gr. *ὄρμος* m. 'chain, necklace, lace', etc. For the ending *-ē/-i* compare *K'ark'ē* (q.v.).

There is geological evidence that the towns of Urmia, Marāta and even Tabriz once lay on the shores of Lake Urmia [Hewsens 1992: 266]. One therefore is tempted to think of a close association with Gr. *ὄρμος* 'anchorage, roadstead, harbour' (on which, see s.v. *orm* 'wall; fence'), which would imply that *Ormi* once was a harbour. In view of its shallow waters (see HayTeġBař 5, 2001: 214b), however, Lake Urmia was hardly navigable.

***Ĵerm-**: *Ĵerm*, get *Ĵerm-a-y* 'river of Ĵerm', the Bohtan-su, a tributary of the Tigris; attested in Sebēos (7th cent.) Chapter 17 (Xač'atryan/Ehiazaryan 2005: 96^{L2f};

Thomson 1999: 34-35): *ew noc'a haseal merj yamurn, anc'in zgetovn, or koč'i Ĵermay and kamurjn, or anuaneal koč'i Daniēli kamurj* "When they had arrived close to the fortress, they crossed the river called [river] of Ĵerm by the bridge which is called the bridge of Daniel". The fortress mentioned here may be identified with the impregnable fortress called Zrayl [Thomson 1999: 34₂₂₄], *Ĵrel* [Eremyan 1963: 78b].

Found also in *Ĵerm-a-jor*, lit. valley of the river *Ĵerm*, attested in the 7th century Armenian Geography, *Ašxarhac'oyc'*, in the context of the province of Mokk' (MovsXorenMaten 1865: 608^{L7}; Soukry 1881: 32^{L6f}; A. G. Abrahamyan 1944: 349^{L29}; see also Hewsens 1992: 63; Eremyan 1963: 78b). The version of T'ovmas Kilikec'i (14th cent.) has reading variants *Ĵerm-a-jor* and *Ĵer-a-jor* [Anasyan 1967: 281^{L15}]; see s.v. *ĵer(m)* 'warm(th)'.
 Further: *Ĵermay*, a *k'atak'agiwt* probably in Mananali (in the province of *Barjr Hayk'*); attested in Chapter 23 of the "History" of the 11th century author Aristakēs Lastivertc'i (see Yuzbašyan 1963: 129^{L19}): *i k'atak'agiwt'n or koč'i Ĵermay*.

Note also *Ĵermuk*, Kurd. *Germav*, a large thermal source in Sasun, the district of Šatax (see Thierry 1992: 332); Sebastia *Bori Ĵermuk* (Gabikean 1952: 671), probably with *bor* 'leprosy'; thus: a thermal source which cures the leprosy.
 Further, see Hübschmann 1904: 464-465.

●ETYM Obviously from Arm. *ĵerm* 'warm(th)' < PIE *g^wer(-m)- (q.v.); see Hübschmann 1904: 464-465; Ĵihanyan 1991: 255. From the same PIE root are: *Γερμανία/Γερμανή* < Thracian *germo- < IE *g^wermo- 'warm', Dacian *Germi-sara*, both denoting places with thermal springs (Wagner 1984: 127-128), etc.; see also Toporov PrJaz [e-h] 1979: 277-278.¹⁵⁵

Saln-a-jor, vars. *Saln-oy jor*, *San-o-jor* : a district in the province of AĴjnik', 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 Lake Van (for ref., see Hübschmann 1904: 447).

See Hübschmann 1904: 314, 317, 465; Eremyan 1963: 79b; Hewsens 1992: 162₅₇).

●ETYM Usually interpreted as containing an unknown **Salin* or **Salun* [Hübschmann 1904: 465; Hewsens 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, namely *Xoyt'/Xut'* (south of the province of Turuberan), also contains an appellative meaning 'rock, reef; hill' (see s.v. *xut'/xoyt'*). Uncertain.

Sim, a famous mountain in Sasun. Commenting upon Movsēs Xorenac'i 2.8 (see below), Hewsens (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

¹⁵⁵ Compare also Urart. *Zirma*, to the north of Lake Urmia, possibly reflecting Arm. *ĵerm* 'warm'; for the reflex of the affricate, cf. *Ĵawax-k'* vs. *Zabaħa* (see Ĵahukyan 1988: 155).

the South separating it from Sanasunk', the later Sasun". Nowadays it is called *Kurtik-dat* [Eremyan 1963: 80b], *Kur'tak/Kurtak'* (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 (*erkklusneay 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 leaṛn* "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*): *zleaṛnn 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 Lap'anc'yan (1945: 20-21), 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 untenable. Improbable are also the comparison with Arm. *s/šeam* 'Pfosten, Schwelle' (see Tomaschek 1896: 5; Xaç'konc' 1899: 82b), and the ancient association with the Biblical *Sem* (T'ovmay Arcruni 1.1, 1985: 16^{L-4}; Thomson 1985: 70).

I propose a derivation from PIE **kieh₁mo-*, cf. Skt. *šyāmá-* 'black, dark-coloured' (AV+), Av. *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 *Šyāmā*, literally meaning 'black' (see Pârvulescu 1989: 290). Mountain-names are frequently named 'dark' or 'black'; see 4.6. Moreover, this etymology may be directly corroborated by the other name of the mountain Sim, namely *Sev-sar*, lit. "Black-mountain" (see Sasna crier 2/2, 1951: 870; Abetyan 1985: 22; A. Petrosyan 2002: 143-144 = 2002a: 155). Even if Sim/Kurtik and Sew-sar are not identical, 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 (1250/60-1303/5) [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 and 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’angelos § 33 (1909=1980: 23^{L6}; transl. Thomson 1976: 49): *i Tap’erakan kamrjac’n getavēž arnēin znosa* : “from the bridge of *Tap’er* they cast them into the river”. Here, the bridge is mentioned next to the bridge of Artašat and must be identical or close to it. Note that in the beginning of the same paragraph 33 (p. 22^{L6}) more than one bridges are mentioned at the gate of the city of Artašat (*i xels kamrjac’n ar druns Artašat k’atak’i*), although 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 Elišē), 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” (*tehi 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 V. Xaçatryan 1980: 111. Note that only the meaning ‘herdsman’ is present in the dialects (see Ačařean 1913: 1019b). For ‘pasturer’ > ‘pasturing’, see also s.v. *hawran*. Note dial. *tavar-a-tap’* ‘gathering place of cattle’ (see Mkrtumjan 1974: 73b).

Ačařyan (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 Yuzbařyan. The passage reads as follows: <...>, *xatay ijanē i Tuaracoy Tap’*, *ew anti ijanē yəndarjak dařtn 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” [Yuzbařyan 1963: 89^{L20f}, 158b; 1968: 101, 166₁₈].

The place-name is obviously reflected in Urart. *Ṭuarařini ħubi*, see Kapancjan, *ibid.*; Eremyan 1963: 86; Arutjunjan 1965: 195-197; V. Xaçatryan 1980: 111; Diakonoff/Kashkai 1981: 87; 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 natural, cf. e.g. *Kog-ovit* (q.v.). Moreover, as we can see from an Urartian inscription, *Ṭuarařini ħubi* must have had a considerable quantity of cattle and flock [Arutjunjan 1965: 196-197].

K'ark'ē, gen. *K'ark'eay*, a mountain in the province of Turuberan, in the districts of Tarōn and Palunik', on the river Euphrates-Aracani (Agat'angelos, Zenob Glak, Yovhan Mamikonean).

In Agat'angelos § 809 (1909=1980: 421-422; transl. Thomson 1976: 347), the temple of Vahagn is said to be situated *i snars lerinn K'ark'eay* "on the summit of the mountain K'ark'ē", at the site called *Yaštišat*. In *The History of Tarōn* by Yovhan Mamikonean, the mountain-name is found in nominative-allative *K'ark'ē*, ablative *i K'ark'ēoy* (see A. Abrahamyan 1941: 109^{L4}, 200^{L6}, 232^{L3}).

For the site (*Y*)*aštišat*, the mountain *K'ark'ē* and the shrines on its slopes, as well as on the famous monastery *St. Karapet*, see Hübschmann 1904: 370-371, 400-401; Lusararean 1912: 142 (spelled as *K'arkē*); Thomson 1976: 489-490. The mountain was also called *Bazm-a-sar*, lit. 'multiple mountain' (N. Sargisean 1864: 225, 228-229). *K'ark'ē* probably was a very important cult centre in the cuneiform stage as well (cf. Hmayakyan 1990a: 160-161). For the problem of the origin of this cult centre, see also Martoyan 2004. On the religious importance of *Aštišat*, see also s.v. place-name **Hac'eak-k'*.

●ETYM The identification with the Urartian mountain-/land-name ^{ŠADŪ/KUR}*Gurqu* (for references and a discussion, see N. Arutjunjan 2001: 506-507; further see Jahukyan 1988: 153-154) is formally uncertain.

The comparison of Arm. *K'ark'*- with the onomastic element *Kark-/Krk-* (cf. *Krkov*), Hitt. *Karkija-*, etc. (A. Petrosyan 2002: 153-154; 2004: 214) seems quite plausible. The onomastic element *Kark-/Krk-* referring to the Carpathian Mountains has been discussed within a mythological context and in relation with OEngl. *hearg* 'heathen temple, altar, sanctuary, idol', etc. (see Ivanov/Toporov 1974: 175-177), cf. OHG. *harug* referring to an area in the open for cult practice, OIc. *harg* probably originally referring to clumps of stones in a locality for cult practice, etc. (Markey 1972: 367-370).

The Germanic etymon is also found in place-names; the proto-form may be reconstructed as **kar-k-u-* or **kar-ko-* (Markey *ibid.*; Boutkan p.c. 1999). Further, note the Illyrian mountain-names *Κερκέτιον ὄρος* (*mons Cercetius, Cercetii*), *Κερκίμη*, cf. Pruss. *Kercus*, etc. (see Krahe 1955: 85; Toporov 1964: 55; cf. Neroznak 1974: 47-48; Toporov PrJaz [i-k] 1980: 323).

The etymon **kar-k-* 'stony rise (where cultic rites were practised)' is probably related with Welsh *carrog* 'stony river' < **karrākā*, Oir. *carrac* 'cliff', *carn* 'stone grave', etc.; also forms reflecting **kar-ant-* (see Pokorny 1959: 531-532; Markey 1972: 370; cf. Krahe 1955: 118; Vennemann 1994: 226, Tabelle I). Arm. *k'ar* 'stone' seems to belong here too (HAB 4: 558-559). The Armenian appellative **k'ar-k'* may be identical with Germ. **kar-k-*. The sequence **-rk-* normally yields Arm. *-rg-*. In this particular case, the voicing did not take place because the word is formed (or has been re-interpreted) as a broken reduplication, cf. PIE **ṛb^hro-* > *ampro-p* 'thunder', **pter-* > *t'er-t'* vs. *t'er* 'leaf' (see s.v.v.); alternatively, we may posit substratum **k^har-k^h*.

It has been suggested that OEngl. *hearg* as a heathen temple is identified with hell (Markey 1972: 367). This is reminiscent of the Armenian *duṛn džoxoc* 'gate to hell' in the cult centre on the mountain *K'arkē*, the shrine of St. Karapet the Baptist (on which see Srvanjtyanc' 2, 1982: 93-95).

Conclusion

The Armenian *K'ark'ē*, the name of a mountain of a considerable religious importance, reflects substratum **kar-k-* 'stony rise (where cultic rites were practised)', itself a derivative of **kar-* > Arm. *k'ar* 'stone'. Particularly impressive is the Germanic cognate, **karko/u-* 'stony rise (where cultic rites were practised)'. Typologically compare Arm. *Erēz*, the name of a village where the famous temple of the goddess Anahit was located, probably derived from *erēz* 'stony place, pile of stones' (Hübschmann 1904: 425 hesitantly, not specifying the semantic motivation). For the ending *-ē*, cf. *Ormē*, a town with a fortress west of Lake Urmia, probably from *orm* 'wall, fence' (q.v.).

PART II

EVALUATION AND OUTLOOK

1. ARMENIAN DIALECTS

1.1 Preliminaries: the treatment of archaic features in dialects

The foundations of Armenian dialectology have been laid by Hrač'ya Ačařyan, 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 AčařHLPatm and AčařLiak, and especially in his crowning work, the Etymological Dictionary of Armenian (HAB).

Unfortunately, most of the works of Ačařyan (as well as those of Ĵahukyan and others) are written in Armenian and are therefore inaccessible to many students of Indo-European linguistics.

Besides Ačařyan's and Ĵahukyan's works, the following general dialectological research and handbooks should be mentioned: Patkanov 1869; Yovnanean 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) considers 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 claim needs to be reviewed, adding 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. He (142-143) mentions the case of *-n* (see 2.2.1.3), stating that dial. *astelnə* (vs. ClArm. *ast* 'star', q.v.), for example, "cannot have been taken from the Classical dialect; it must have been selected at an earlier stage". Similarly, 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 evidence from the 5th century, see s.v. *ays* 'spirit; wind'.

Issues regarding the origin of the Armenian dialects and their existence in the classical period, as well as numerous archaic dialectal words and features, are dealt with in AčaṙHLPatm 2, 1951: 114-141, 324-439; Winter 1966; Jahukyan 1972; 1985; N. Simonyan 1979.

In the said works, dialectal archaisms are mostly represented as a preservation of what has been lost in the classical language and/or other dialects. Methodologically speaking, such an approach is not completely justifiable. Throughout the following chapters and the lexical corpus, I aim at establishing the philological background of the lexical data, while conducting a systematic evaluation of the deviant dialectal forms and features. In order to give an idea of how I treat and evaluate dialectal archaisms and to demonstrate the importance of dialectal data for etymological research, I refer to my treatment, for example, of dial. **anum* vs. ClArm *anun* 'name' from PIE **h₃neh₃-mn* 'name' and Agulis *γոս* vs. ClArm. *us* 'shoulder' from PIE **Homsos* 'shoulder'.

The importance of the Armenian dialectal archaisms goes beyond Armenology *per se*. The Armenian peripheral dialects may provide us with information that can prove indispensable even for establishing the status of the Indo-European cognate forms. I shall mention one example, whereby Greek, Latin and Armenian cultural terms of a so-called Mediterranean substratum obtain an invaluable additional material from Armenian dialects, thus corroborating the connection and clarifying the status and spread of the terms.

Arm. *kat'n* 'milk' has been considered to be cognate with 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 Meṙri reflect a form, which preserved the liquid: **kate* ' < nom. **glkt-s* [Weitenberg 1985: 104-105]. This form shows that the various attempts to reconstruct the word with an initial **g-*, **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 ancient, 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 Weitenberg's rule on the reconstruction of an additional *y-* and related chronological issues, such as Ačaṙyan's Law and consonant shift (see 2.3.1).

As is shown by Weitenberg's treatment of Ačaṙyan's Law, one can posit an old contrast between (a) Western dialects (Muš, Alaškert, Karin/Erzrum, etc.) and (b) Eastern-Southeastern dialects (Agulis, Łarabał, Van, etc., groups 6 and 7). For a discussion of a possible historical evidence 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; for example, 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 follows the remaining dialect 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 leads to remarkable conclusions. For example, *getar* ‘river-bed; river-shore; outbranching river’ is present in the Eastern dialects: Ararat (Erevan, Ošakan), Mełri, Ĵula. The only claimed exception is Muš. However, the only source for the latter is Amatuni, and I have an impression that the evidence he presents as from Muš in fact originates from the Muš-speakers of the Ararat area (Aštarak, Yerevan, etc.), where many immigrants from Muš have been living since the 19th century. Another such example may be *argat* (q.v.).

The same distribution is also found with literary attestations. Łazar P‘arpec‘i (5th cent.) was a 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 shall attempt to discuss this point elsewhere). This also holds for the place-name *Getar(u)*: (1) a river (= *Agri-č‘ay*) and a district in Ałuank‘; (2) a left tributary of the river Hrazdan. Thus, we are perhaps dealing with a word, dialectally restricted, since the 5th century, to Eastern Armenia.

1.3 Dialectal words: new or old?

Throughout his dictionary (HAB), Ačarıyan records numerous dialectal formations, labelling them as *nor bařer* (‘‘new words’’). Sometimes, however, one doubts whether this definition is justifiable. Let us take a look at some examples.

According to Ačarıyan (HAB 2: 621a), dial. **arıkoł* and **arikoł* are new words. The forms are: Muš, Van **arikoł* ‘stony place; precipice’ [Amatuni 1912: 57b; Ačarean 1913: 133a]; Xotorĵur **arıkoł* ‘sloping, precipitous’ [YušamXotorĵ 1964: 430a; HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 99b]; Hamšen *arəngel* [Ačarean 1913: 135; 1947: 221]. Next to *z-ar-i-koł(-eal)* ‘precipitous’ (‘‘Book of Chries’’ etc.), one also finds *ar-i-koł-eal* ‘precipitous, sloped’ in Movsēs Xorenac‘i 1.16 (1913= 1991: 51^{L13}; transl. Thomson 1978: 99). Thus, the dialectal forms are not recent.

**giřer(n)uk*: Among several dialectal derivatives from *giřer* ‘night’, which denote ‘bat’, Ačarıyan (Ačarean 1913: 230b) also mentions Mařkert (Arabkir/Xarberd) *giřeruk* and Łazax *giřernuk*.

Compare Lat. *vesper-ugō* ‘bat’. Since Arm. *giřer* and Lat. *vesper*, as well as, probably, Arm. *-uk* and Lat. *-ugō* are etymologically related (for the suffix, see Olsen 1999: 584-592), and since Mařkert and Łazax are located in the opposite peripheries of the Armenian-speaking territory, Arm. **giřer(n)uk* is a potentially old formation, although the independent creation of these forms cannot be excluded.

Darman-a-goł ‘Milky Way’, lit. ‘Straw-Thief’, is considered to be a new word [HAB 1: 640a]. The word is found only in the Eastern dialects, Ararat, Loři and Łarabał, and may indeed be a recent replacement of the older **Yard(a)goł*. However, this is hard to verify since, in Łarabał, next to ‘Milky Way’, *Darmanagoł* denotes a small ‘straw-stealing’ cloud, and this may reflect older folk-beliefs, since a similar association between ‘Milky Way = Straw-Thief’ and a ‘straw-stealing wind’ is

recorded in Xotorĵur, which is, both geographically and dialectally, quite far from ĽarabaĽ. For more details, see 3.1.3.

***erat‘at‘:** Aĉaryan (HAB 2: 55a) cites ĽarabaĽ, Lori *hərat‘at‘* < **er-a-t‘at‘*, composed of *eri* ‘shoulder’ (q.v.) and *t‘at‘* ‘arm, paw’, as a new word. Probably, Xotorĵur **erelt‘at‘* ‘shoulder-blade’ [YušamXotorĵ 1964: 447b] belongs here too, although 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’ [Aĉarean 1913: 811b], obviously *net* ‘arrow’ + *ōj* ‘snake’. Aĉaryan (HAB 3: 442b) cites it as a new dialectal word derived from *net* ‘arrow’. One finds Dersim (K‘i) *nədig* ‘a poisonous snake’, featured by BaĽramyan (1960: 155a) only in the glossary of dialectal words. It certainly reflects a diminutive 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?

Aĉaryan (HAB 4: 413a) places **taĽĵik** ‘a young girl/woman’ in his list of new dialectal words. The compound is present in the dialects Davrež/Tabrez [Aĉarean 1913: 1032b], and Melri (*təĽáxč‘ek‘*, see AĽayan 1954: 332). Certainly composed of *tlay* ‘child’ and *aĽjik* ‘girl’. Given the literary attestation of *tlay aĽjik* ‘a small girl’, as well as the fact that in Southeastern and Eastern dialects *tlay* means ‘boy’ rather than (the generic) ‘child’ (see HAB 4: 412b), one can assume that *taĽĵik* is relatively old.

k‘atoc‘ ‘mowing time’ (in Karin, see Aĉarean 1913: 1092b), a derivative of ClArm. *k‘atəm* ‘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 also reckon, next to linguistic details, 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), have, in the final edition, been replaced by dialectal equivalents:

mot-ēz ‘lizard’ (Bible+); widespread in the dialects, also in the form **moloz-*. In the earliest edition of the Alexander Romance (see H. Simonyan 1989: 431^{L5}): *motēzk‘ meck‘ orpēs višapk‘* “lizards as big as dragons”; the final edition has here: *motozk‘ k‘an zvišaps mec ēin* (306^{L4f}). The classical form *motēz*, thus, has been replaced by dialectal **moloz-*, present in Van, Moks, Salmast, etc.

The word **maškat‘ew** ‘(having) a wing of skin’, an epithet of the bat (*č‘Ľjikan*) 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 *čəĽjikan* instead (op. cit. 290^{L-3}). Since *maškat‘ew* ‘bat’ is attested poorly and

late and is preserved only in some peripheral dialects, namely Hamšen and Xotorĵur (see s.v.), whereas *č'ijĵ*, *č'ĵikan* (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 was a native of a peripheric dialect, where *maškat'ew* was the term for 'bat'. The later editor(s) considered *maškat'ew* odd or little known and has(ve) replaced it with the 'more normal' *č'ĵikan*.

But, sometimes, details are unclear. For instance, instead of *sex* 'melon' (Bible+), preserved in several dialects, the final edition has *metrapop* (see H. Simonyan 1989: 306^{L3}, 431^{L5}), which is attested from the Bible onwards, but is absent in dialects. Moreover, it denotes a particular kind of melon (synonymous with MidArm. *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 from the "Book of Chries" onwards and judged by Ačāryan (HAB 1: 593-594) as belonging to the more widespread *gund* 'ball', although some philological details are unclear. In the 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/ač'ap'ar/ĵ* as words for 'crayfish', see H. Simonyan 1989: 261 (three times *xec'getin*, and once *xēč'ip'ar*), 290 (pl/coll. *xec'getneay*), 413 (*xec'geti*, or *ē xič'ip'ar*), 423 (*xēč'ip'ar*), 478 (three times *xāč'ap'ar*). In a 16th-century *kafa*, Zak'aria Gnunc'ĭ (of Gnuni) introduces *saratlanay* as synonymous with *xēč'ip'ar* (see H. Simonyan 1989: 261). The form astonishingly resembles the word for 'crayfish' in the dialect of Moks, namely *sälātrāna* (Orbeli 2002: 320, rendered by Russ. *krab* 'crab'), cf. also Van *salatrana* 'Satan'.¹⁵⁶ Zak'aria of Gnuni introduced *saratlanay* probably because it was a normal word in his vernacular dialect. The original domain of the Gnuni seems to have been found around the areas (*Atiovit* etc.) immediately North and East of Lake Van (see Adontz 1970: 240; Toumanoff 1963: 205; Garsoĭan 1989: 374-375; Hewsen 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. *bar* 'word' : dial. Van *p'ar*, with an initial aspirated *p'* which is explained by assuming a loan from the literary language of Polis (see Ačārean 1952: 53, with a few other examples of the same type).

Arm. **brinč'* etc. 'snowball-tree': Agulis *b/prāšnə*, with allophonic *b-* and *p-* (the shift *b > p* being irregular for this dialect), is considered to be a loan from Łarabał

¹⁵⁶ Ačāryan (1952: 72, 104, 290; HAB 4: 164a) placed these forms s.v. *salamandr* 'salamander'.

prěšnə [Ačaryan 1935: 93]. The latter probably reflects **brōš-* or **brōš-*, cf. Łazax *p' rōš*, Łaradał *brōšni* (see 1.12.1).

In the Hamšen region, the initial *g-* yields *g'-* in Mala, *k-* in Čanik, and *g-* in Trapizon. In view of this, Ačaryan (1947: 42) treats ClArm. *gerandi* 'scythe' > Hamšen *gerəndi* (also *k'ereṇdi*), *gətikur* 'a plant' > *gałgur*, etc. as borrowed from other dialects, such as Trapizon. Further on *gerandi*, see 1.10.

lurj 'light, shiny; awake; cheerful; (light) blue' (q.v.) has been preserved in few dialects: Muš *lurč'* 'a kind of blue canvas that is made in Haleb (= Turk. *zal*)'; T'iflis *lrč'anal* 'to turn blue' (referring to a beaten and bitten body); Akn. *lrjuc'* 'in one's waking hours'; as well as in Syria: Svedia *lōrč'* 'blue', K'esab *lōrj* 'light blue', Aramo *laurč'* 'blue'. As we can see, the "pure" adjectival colour designation *lurj* 'blue' has been preserved only in the Armenian 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.

Šamšadin/Diliĵan *xemk'* 'the wooden frame of a sieve' (see Mežunc' 1989: 205b), for which cf. Van, Moks *xim*, *xemk'*, Ĵuła *xemk'*, etc. from *himn* 'basis' (see HAB 3: 93-94); cf. especially Xnus-Bulanəx *xemk'* 'the wooden frame of a sieve' (Melik'ean 1964: 499b). The initial *x-* is irregular for Šamšadin, Łazax and adjacent areas. One therefore might assume that the initial *x-* in Šamšadin/Diliĵan *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. *ateln* '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.

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 car* or *hačar-a-car* '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; Hewsen 1992: 65, 65A]. In the version of T'ovmas Kilikec'i (14th cent.): *nalut*', *hačarik' car ew srovel ew tōsax* [Anasyan 1967: 282^{L-12}].

The tree-name *hačar-* 'beech' (Agat'angelos+; see HAB s.v.; Greppin 1983a) has been preserved only in Hamšen, Lori, Łazax, Łarabał [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.; FlorTurk 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 [FlorTurk 7, 1982: 657-658, 887: map 77]. It is one of the most typical trees of the Hamšen area (see espec. T'orlak'yan 1981: 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}; FlorTurk 7, 1982: 887^{M77}; Mallory/Adams 1997: 59. The distribution thus perfectly corresponds to the dialectal spread (Hamšen, Lori, Łazax, Łarabał) and the testimony of Ašxarhač'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 [FlorTurk 7, 1982: 631, 886^{M74}]. On Hamšen see T'orlak'yan 1981: 25, 28, 31. From FlorTurk 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 Ačařyan 1947: 12, 92-93, 255), perhaps also in Svedia (Musa-leř), if *t'usug* 'box-tree' (recorded in Gyozyalyan 2001: 88 without a note on its origin) is related. The word *tawsax* is probably composed of **taws-* (from **tak^hs-*? cf. Hurr. *taškar-* 'id.') + tree-suffix *-ax* (see 2.3.1). The Svedian form seems to contain a different suffix, viz. *-uk*, cf. *hačar-uk* 'beech'. The accented *-u-* in the final syllable usually yields Svedia *-ö-* or *-ü-* or *-u-*, cf. *cacuk* > *jäjög*, *t'mbuk* > *t'mbüg*, *čnčtuk* > *jänjəhug* (see Ačařyan 2003: 391-393). The initial aspirated dental may be due to a distant assimilation of the sibilant *-s-*. Thus, **taws-uk* > Svedia *t'usug* or **t'usüg* seems quite possible.

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 (Ērzrum), Axalc'xa [HAB 1: 499b]. Since the district of Karin neighbours with Turuberan, and Axalc'xa belongs to the dialect group of Karin, one can speak of the original dialectal restriction of this word.

The oldest attestations are found in Ašxarhač'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 identical with or resembling bustard’, only in the long recension of Ašxarhac‘oyc‘; probably identical with Xotorjūr **earoš* ‘a kind of bird with very tasty flesh, which sings in whistling voice, big partridge’.

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 MidArm. *zarne/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 *zarik* and *zarnix* refer to ‘arsenic’ is clearly shown by Amirdovlat‘ Amasiac‘i (15th cent.), who treats these forms as equivalent to Pers. *zīnex* and Arm. *mkn-det*, literally ‘mouse-poison’, and describes the varieties and the medical use of the arsenic (see S. Vardanjān 1990: 119 § 525, comments 606₅₂₅). He also notes that arsenic is used to get rid of armpit 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 *zarik* 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 match the evidence from Ašxarhac‘oyc‘ (7th century) with that of Garegin Srvanjtyanc‘ (1884 AD) identifying mines of arsenic in the district of Čahuk.

According to Strabo (16.1.24), Korduk‘ (in Korčayk‘) produced *γαγγητις λίθος* ‘lignite’, i.e. ‘a variety of brown coal’, which keeps serpents away (see Ačařyan 1940a: 90, ModArm. transl. 91). This is obviously identical with the evidence presented by G. Srvanjtyanc‘ on coal in this area.

1.8 Anania Širakac'i¹⁵⁷

Parallel to *Karič*, the standard term for the constellation Scorpio, Anania Širakac'i (see A. G. Abrahamyan 1944: 329^{L10}, 330^{L12}) sometimes uses the vernacular form *Kor* (see s.vv.). The word *karič* is widely attested from the 5th century onwards in both meanings 'scorpion' and 'the constellation Scorpio', and is widespread in the dialects ranging from Sebastia, Muš and Karin to Agulis, Salmast and Łarabał, and from Axalc'xa and T'iflis to Moks and Ozim. In contrast, *kor* is attested only in Širakac'i (7th cent., Širak) and some later, MidArm. sources (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]) and has been preserved in some W and SW dialects (Cilicia, Xarberd, Akn, Arabkir [*kə*-class]), as well as in two Southeasternmost villages of Marała and Salmast (assuming that Sal., absent from the list of abbreviations, stands 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 *Arkawł* 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 thus be regarded as a vernacular term for Orion, Orion's belt, or Sagittarius, although Širakac'i normally uses the standard terms *Kšir* and *Atelnawor* (see 3.1.4). In the latter 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 arnē kotor-kotor,
Xayt'ē zardoyn ač'k'n zed kor.*

There comes from the North [an] equestrian,
Rides as a sword, as if having wings,
Breaks pine-trees into pieces,
Bites the eye of the man like 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 also called *Pontic*, in areas close to Xotorjur [HAB 4: 62b]. Preserved in Xotorjur, Baberd *barxar*, Zeyt'un *baxar/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], Hačən, Svedia [HAB 4: 503-504].

kor 'scorpion' is further attested only in Anania Širakac'i (7th cent., Širak) and some later, MidArm. sources: in Fables by Vardan Aygekc'i (12-13th cent., Tluk', Cilicia), Geoponica (13th cent.), Amirdovlat' Amasiac'i (15th cent., Amasia); it is

¹⁵⁷ On this author, see 1.6 and 1.7.

preserved in some W and SW dialects (Cilicia, Xarberd, Akn, Arabkir), as well as in extreme SE (Marala, Salmast).

Thus, three words in the same riddle by Nersēs Šnorhali (Cilicia), namely *kor*, *parxar*, *p'iči*, seem to be restricted mostly to the NW and SW dialects of the *kə*-class, particularly in the Cilicia, Pontic and adjacent areas.

1.10 Back loans

For the notion and examples of *back loans* or *Rückentlehnungen* see e.g. Krahe 1970: 92. Here I list a few examples from Armenian. That this issue is relevant for etymological research is clearly illustrated by Arm. *p'aycatn* 'spleen' > Cappadocian Greek *πεισάχι* 'id.' > Xotorjur *sipex* 'id.' (see s.v.); this helps to eliminate the theory on the extremely archaic nature of this Armenian dialectal form.

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.): Łarabał *k'ārāndi* (vs. regular *kerāndu*) and Kizen *k'ārānt'i* can be explained as back loans from Azerbaijani. Similarly, Hamšen *k'erendi* may have been borrowed from Laz *k^herendi*, which in turn is considered to be an Armenian loan.

As is demonstrated by Ačařyan (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 Ačařyan (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).

A number of cases with Turkish or Tatar:

Nor Naxijewan rural *egerek* 'the summer staying place of bullocks in fields' is a back loan from Crimean Tatar **egerek* (cf. Turk. *ekrek* in numerous place-names of Asia Minor) < Arm. *agarak* 'landed property, estate, a house with all possessions, village' (q.v.).

Metri *gärmāši* vs. *germast* 'snowball-tree, guelder rose' (Ałayan 1954: 265b) can be explained by a Turkish intermediation (see HAB 1: 546 for the forms).

Arm. dial. *di/alama*, *deleme* 'ferment for cheese' is interpreted as a loan from a Turkish dialectal form, which in turn has been borrowed from Arm. *da(y)l* 'colostrum' (q.v.).

1.11 Re-borrowings in dialects

Iranian lexemes borrowed into Classical Armenian may, in individual dialects, be independently re-borrowed in different forms. Two well-known examples: dial. *bazar* 'market' vs. ClArm. *vačar* 'trade, market', cf. Pahl. *vāčār* vs. Pers. *bāzār* [HAB 4: 298-299; Jahukyan 1987: 491; HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 145a]; Arm. dial.

bet'ar 'worse, ugly' vs. ClArm. *vatt'ar* 'bad, worse, evil' (Bible+; T'iflis 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 *rang* [Nawasardeanc' 1903: 103b] or (*h*)*ərang* [Markosyan 1989: 370b] and Goris *ərang* [Margaryan 1975: 513a].

Alongside *rang*, Persian also has *ranj* 'colour' (see Steingass 587b), which seems to be reflected in some Arm. dialectal compounds. Whether Ozim *narenj* 'dyed thread' belongs with *narinj* 'orange' is uncertain (see HAB 3: 431b). In my view, the word is more probably composed of **nar-* 'to dye' + **ranj* 'colour' (see 2.3.1 under the suffix *-awt*, on *narawt* 'coloured thread or plait/braid'). Further, Ararat *mknarinj* 'mouse-coloured (e.g., of a horse or 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

In many respects, the examination of the dialectal material plays an indispensable role in etymological research. 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.vv. *kat'n*, *katin*, *c'ax/k'*, *us*, etc.), one has to reckon with the dialectal material when dealing primordially with 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 dialects provide us with valuable information bridging the gaps in the literary evidence. 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.'

břinč' (the fruit), *břnč'-(en)i* (the tree); dial. **břo/ōš-*, **břinč'/j-*, etc. 'Celtis australis or occidentalis' (see Ališan 1895: 101^{Nr387}; HAB 1: 490b) or 'snowball-tree, guelder rose (*Viburnum opulus*)'. According to Malxaseanc' (HBB 1: 397b), *břnč'-i* means '*Viburnum opulus*', whereas the alternating dialectal forms *pršni* and *p'řšni* are taken as synonymous with *ltt-eni* and denote 'Celtis australis' or, according to Sepetčean, 'Celtis caucasica' (Malxaseanc' HBB 2: 221c; 4: 129a, 528b). Abeghyan (Abeghian 1899: 61) distinguishes between *břnč'-i* '*Viburnum opulus*' and *bři* 'Celtis australis' (the latter form is unknown to me).

Attested in Galen (*bṛinč*‘, *blinč*‘, etc., see Ališan 1895: 101^{Nr387}; Greppin 1985: 139) and Juanšēr [HAB 1: 490b]. NHB (2: 1061b) considers it as a dialectal word.

Preserved in the dialects of Akn, Arabkir, Xarberd, etc. **bṛinč*‘, **bṛnč*‘-i. Muš, Bałeš, Bulanəx have **b*‘*tinč*‘ [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 **blinč*‘-k is corroborated by Moks *pəlinč*‘k, gen. *pətanč*‘kə^ε, pl. *pətanč*‘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*‘*tinjk*‘, *p*‘*tnj*‘k-i vs. Northern *p*‘*ršni*, describing the word as denoting ‘a shrub with hard wood and sweet fruit of the size of a small acorn’ and identifying it, albeit hesitantly, with *bṛinč*‘. Note Sasun *ptinč*‘, *prinč*‘, *ptinjk*‘ [Petoyan 1954: 153; 1965: 517-518].

Agulis *bṛāšnə*, *prāšnə* Łarabał *prēšnə* (the berry), *pršnéne* (the tree), Łazax *p*‘*rəš*, Łaradał *bṛošni* [HAB 1: 490b].

Ačarıyan (HAB 1: 490b) notes the resemblance with Assy. *burāšu*, Hebr. *b^εrōš*, 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 correct meaning of Akkad. *burāšu* is ‘Juniperus giganteus’, which is identical with the meaning of Arm. **bṛoš-ni*, **bṛaš-nə*. He also notes that the Armenian form *bṛinč*‘ may have a different origin, which seems improbable.

The semantic difference is not a decisive argument against the connection. The snowball-tree, the juniper and the like are strongly marked in Armenian tradition. Arm. *bṛnč*‘i is a powerful ‘Abwehrmittel’ against the Evil Eye [Abeghian 1899: 61]. Note also the curse formula from Axalc‘xa: *bṛnč*‘i *terew ute* ‘may he eat the leaf of the snowball-tree’ (see Ačarean 1913: 207b). In a number of traditional stories, the juniper protects Jesus Christ, or is related to certain saints (Łanalanyan 1969: 115f).

The tree-names under question come from Mediterranean and Near-Eastern areas: Gr. *βράθv* n. ‘savin, Juniperus sabina; Juniperus foetidissima’ (also *βόρατον* n., *βορατίvη*), Lat. *bratus* (Pliny) ‘an Anatolian cypress’; Aram. *b^εrāt*, Hebr. *b^εrōš*, Assy. *burāšu* ‘cypress’ < Proto-Semitic **brāθu* (see Huld 1981: 303). Georgian *brinjaos-xe* ‘Celtis australis or caucasica’ is considered an Armenian loan [HAB 1: 491a].

Some of the Armenian dialectal forms from Łazax and Łaradał point to **bṛoš* or **bṛōš*, which is derivable from Semitic, cf. Assy. *burāšu* and Hebr. *b^εrōš*. Considering forms in the closely related Łazax and Łaradał, Łarabał *prēšnə*, too, seems to reflect **bṛoš*. Given the allophones with initial *b*- and *p*-, Agulis *b/prāšnə* is considered to be a loan from Łarabał [Ačarıyan 1935: 93]. Since the accented penultimate *-ó-* yields *-a-* in Agulis (see Ačarıyan 1935: 66-67), one may reconstruct **bṛoš-* for Agulis.

Some comments on Łarabał vocalism are in order. In view of such examples, as *boxi* ‘hornbeam’ > *péxi*, the derivation **bṛoš-* > Łarabał *prēšnə* seems regular. A closer look, however, shows that Łarabał *-ε-* reflects an older *-o-* only when it follows an initial *b*- or *v*- (see 2.1.39.1). Here, two possibilities come to mind: either

(1) the rule also operated with **bro-*; or (2) Łarabał *préšnə* reflects a form different from the one seen in Łazax, Łaradał and Agulis and, therefore, requires another solution. Since accented *i* yields Łarabał *ε* (see Ačařean 1899: 68; Davt'yan 1966: 35), one may derive Łarabał *préšnə* from **brinč'-n-*, cf. 2.1.11. The same solution is given by Ałayan (1954: 39, 84) for Metri *bəřéšnə*.

How to reconcile **broš-* with the other forms, namely **brinč'* and **blinč'/?*? The latter forms may be due to an epenthetic *-n-* (see 2.1.30.1) or to a metathesis of the nasal element of the tree-suffix: **-Vš-n- > *-Vnš-> *-Vnč'*. The vowel *-i-* may be analogical; thus: **br(ō/u)š-ni > *brnč'i* (the tree) >> **brinč'* (the berry). The shift *-nš-> -nč'* is uncertain, however. Note that next to forms with sibilant *-š-*, there are also forms with dental stops, cf. Gr. *βόρατον*, Aram. *brūtā*, etc., so the Armenian may reflect a substratum form with an affricate. One can also offer alternatives for *-inč'/?*: (1) **-in-ieh₂- > Arm. -inj*, cf. Gr. *βορατ-ίνη* vs. *βόρατον*; (2) compare other Armenian plant-names (Persian/Arabic loans), such as *t'urinj*, *narinj* 'orange' (see HAB s.vv.).

Arm. **br-o/ōš* vs. *brī* (Abelyan) and **br/linč'* may have been synchronically interpreted as containing a "plant-suffix" *-o/ōš*, as seen in *t'eł-awš* vs. *t'eł-i* 'elm' (q.v.); see also 2.3.1.

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 the dialects [HAB 1: 493b]; e.g. Moks *pərut* 'гончар' [Orbeli 2002: 315].

Jahukyan (1987: 313) considers *brut* as possibly borrowed from Hitt. *purut* 'clay'. We are probably dealing with an older (derivative?) **purut-i* (cf. Jahukyan, 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 Jahukyan. A philological discussion is in order. Rather than arguing against the Hittite etymology of the word, the following aims to demonstrate that the philological background and the internal data deserve more careful consideration.

The meaning 'clay' of dial. **brt-in* can hardly directly reflect the Hittite semantics, since *-in* points rather to a derivative. Besides, Ačařyan (1913: 212b) does not specify the form or location of the dialectal word. Such a form is found, for example, 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, for example, 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, namely 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 Ačařyan (HAB 2: 642-643), although 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 Ačařyan s.v. *kotor* (HAB 2: 643a), *Marala kutir* presents a special interest; see also Davt'yan 1966: 400.

In the dialects of Van, Sasun and Šatax, there is a similar form, namely *kətir*, meaning 'flock of sheep' (see Ačařean 1913: 619a; M. Muradyan 1962: 212b). According to A. Xaç'atryan (1993: 107), the word is connected with *ktr-em* 'to cut'. This is corroborated by semantic parallels presented in 3.9.1. Here, I suggest to add *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 "Bařgirk' hayoc" (Amalyan 1975: 113^{Nr95}, cf. 145^{Nr224}), *xočič* is glossed alongside *xrtuilak* 'scarecrow' and **bo-xoxič* (q.v.). The root seems to be *xuč* 'scarecrow, bogy' (pl. *xuč-k*), found in John Chrysostom. Ačařyan (HAB 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 *xəxəj* 'bogy', Erzinka ets. **xox* 'etc.'. He (Ačařean 1913: 481a) compares the latter with Pers. *kux*.

A more careful internal examination shows that Ačařyan's analysis must be revised. First of all, *xuč-k*, as attested in John Chrysostom, shows that the root may be **xuč* rather than **xox*. Sebastia *xəxəj* can easily be regarded as reduplicated. 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 a drought-ritual by children' (see Kostandyan 1979: 152b, in the glossary of dialectal words). Further: Vařaršapat/Ėjmiacin *xunč'-ak* 'scarecrow' (Amatuni 1912: 292a), P'arpi *xonj-ol-oz* 'an evil spirit' (P'iliposyan 2005, 2: 84), Nor Bayazet *xuč'-kurur-ik* 'doll of the drought-ritual' (Ačařean 1913: 489-490).

The element *-ap* is not entirely clear. Nevertheless, compare *tagnap*, which is synonymous with *xučap* (see Łap'anc'yan 1961: 164).

Thus: **xuč-*: *xo/uč-ič*, with the suffix *-ič*, and redupl. **xu-xuč*. The latter has been re-analysed as derived from **xo/ux*. Note also secondary forms based on this **xo/ux* and containing the element *-l-* and/or the same suffix *-ič*, cf. **xox-ič* (see s.v. **bo-xoxič* 'scarecrow'). Sebastia **xuxuč* may either be due to vocalic assimilation or reflect 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.); *čkoyt'*, *o-stem* (Bible+); *čkik* (Ařak'el Dawrižec'i, 17th cent.) 'the little finger'.

Widespread in the 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 to 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: *Larabał ckéynə, kcéynə, Ĵuła ck-ik* (next to rural *čfkit'*, for which I posit *čkoyt'* = /čkuít' / > *čkwit' > *čkwit', through metathesis), *Šamaxi ckla mat, Agulis clayg' büit'*, *Ganjak ccink'*, etc.; cf. also *Aza, Marała *čltik* [HAB 3: 205a]. In *K'esab*, one finds an intermediate form, namely *čəkek* (see Č'olak'ean 1986: 206a).

Ařak'el Davrižec'i lived very close to *Nor Ĵuła* and witnessed the well-known migration of *Ĵuła*. The form *ckik*, used only by him, can be seen, in fact, as a first-hand record of the dialectal form from *Ĵuła* in the 17th century.

Ačarıyan (HAB 3: 204-205) reconstructs a proto-form **c(u)lkoyt'* and treats it as borrowed from Kartvelian languages; cf. *Laz cılu k'it'i* (lit.) 'little finger'. Internal derivation, however, points to a **čk-/ck-*, which has adopted the suffix *-oyt'* (see s.vv. *boyt'*, *bl-it'*, and 2.3.1) in the literary language and in *kə*-dialects, but not in SE and E dialects. *Ačarıyan's* etymology can be correct only if one assumes that *ckoyt'* has been reduced to **ck-* in those dialects and, subsequently, has adopted 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 among them. An illustrious example is *unj*, with its three homonymous forms:

*unj*₁, *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.*);

*unj*₂ prob. 'treasure, treasury, granary, barn' (*P'awstos Buzand 5.6*); cf. *Georg. unji* 'treasure';

*unj*₃, 'soot (in stoves; resulted by smoke); rust', attested in "History of the nation of the Archers (i.e. the Mongols)" and *Oskip'orik*, preserved mainly in Eastern peripheral dialects; cf. also *Moks uč*. See s.vv.

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:

ganj, *u*-stem, *i*-stem 'store, treasure' (Bible+; several dialects), probably an Iranian loan: *Pahl. ganj* 'treasure, treasury' [MacKenzie 1971: 35], *Pers. ganj* 'store, hoard, hidden treasure; granary, store-house, mart; case' [Steingass 1098a], *MIran. ganj* 'treasury'; also Iranian loans: *Skt. gañja-* '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 *-j'*, *Arm. ganj* (cf. also *Georgian ganji* '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 a '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}*, etc.), 'wallet, case' (*Yovhannēs Vanakan Vardapet Tawušec'i, 12-13th cent.*). *Ačarıyan* (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 Jahukyan 1987: 520, with a question mark. 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 the 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’ (cf. the place-name *Kotb*, see s.v., for the semantic field) and connect it 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* (together with related Iranian and other forms) with Arm. *unj*. The proto-form may 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. **wánj-ōi-* > Arm. **ganj-u(i)*, with a hissing affricate; gen. **unj-jo-* > *unj*, with a hushing affricate. If this is true, the paradigm is identical to 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. Naturally, this is highly hypothetical.

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 cannot rule out the possibility that the source of the forms in other languages (or at least of some of them) was Armenian.¹⁵⁸

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, although, more naturally, *unj* could be regarded as an epenthetic form of an original **uč*. For more detail, see s.v. *unj*₃.

¹⁵⁸ The connection of Arm. *ganjak* with Skt. *vakṣānā* ‘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. *vakṣānā* from substr. **u(a)ng^h-s-* and connect it to PArm. **uánj-(ō)i*, obl. **unj-*, which has developed into Arm. *ganj*, *u-* 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 an Iranian loan, this word can be seen as a back-loan into Armenian.

2. ASPECTS OF HISTORICAL GRAMMAR

In the following, I shall provide a comprehensive overview of various features resulting from the individual discussions 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. *ἕκῃτι*, and *tasn* 'ten' vs. Gr. *δέκα*, IE *e yielded a "unter unbekanntem Umständen". But the Iranian origin of *vasn* cannot be doubted (see HAB 4: 309-310). It has been assumed that *e lowers to a before a syllable containing -u- (for a further discussion, including references, see Clackson 1994: 126-127, 159, 206₂₁). Kortlandt (1994a: 255-256; 1996a: 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 an analogical zero-grade taken from the ordinals. For a further discussion, see Greppin 1980a. Note also *awri-ord* 'virgin, young girl', if one can assume the latter is related to Urt. *huri* 'lord' (see s.v.). Further, see Gayseryan 1990: 85.

On substratum fluctuation *-e/a-, see s.vv. *kamurj* 'bridge' and *pal* 'rock'.

2.1.2 PIE *e > Arm. ē or i before the sibilants š and ž

Arm. *gišer* 'night' vs. Lat. *vesper*, OCS *večerъ*, etc.; Arm. *iž*, *i*-stem 'viper' vs. Gr. *ἔχις*, Skt. *āhi-*, YAv. *aži-*, etc.; *ēš* 'donkey' vs. Lat. *equus* 'horse' etc. In these examples, the rise of e to i is explained by the following palatals: š and ž (see Pedersen 1905: 205 = 1982: 67; Bonfante 1937: 27; de Lamberterie 1978: 264-266). This development may be related to that of *med^h-io- > Arm. *mēj*, cf. Lat. *medius* 'mid, middle'. For more detail, see s.vv. *gišer* 'night', *ēš* 'donkey' and *iž* 'viper'.

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 a discussion and literature I refer to Grammont 1918: 223f; Bonfante 1975; Kortlandt 1980: 105; 1983: 10; 1985b: 9 (= 2003: 32, 40, 58); Jahukyan 1983a; 1990a: 3-6; Morani 1994.

Of words that may be relevant for this issue note e.g. *ali-k* 'waves', *asr* 'fleece', *hac* 'i' 'ash-tree' (see s.vv.).

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. *κᾶρίς*, *-ίῆδος* ‘Crustacea’ vs. *κουρίς*, *κωρίς* ‘id.’. Note the element **-id-* seen in both sets of words (*λαρίς*, *-ίδος* and *κᾶρίς*, *-ίῆδος*).

Compare also Gr. *πάρδαλις* vs. *πόρδαλις* f. ‘leopard’.

Another possible example is Lat. *columba* f. ‘dove, pigeon’ vs. Arm. *salamb*, *a-*stem ‘francolin’ (q.v.).

2.1.4 PIE **pe-* : **po-* > Arm. *he-* : *o-*

A clear example of this distribution is *het* : *ot* ‘foot’ from **ped-* and **pod-*, respectively. Ačařyan (AčařLiak 6, 1971: 519-520) argues against this rule, mentioning *holani* ‘uncovered’ and *hot* ‘earth, soil’ as counter-examples. On the latter words, see s.vv.

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-* (2.1.16.1). 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 to derive these words from zero-grade proto-forms (see also Greppin 1988: 184; Beekes 1991: 242) through 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-és-s* > PArm. **oĭt-*, **aĭt-* (with analogical *-ĭ-* after the nominative). Subsequently, the oblique stem was generalized. This analysis may be corroborated by *amp* ‘cloud’, *bark* ‘lightning’, etc.; see s.vv. and 2.2.2.1.

See also s.vv. *aygi* ‘vineyard’, *ayc* ‘goat’, and *ayc* ‘visit, inspection’.

2.1.6 PIE **ĵ-* > Arm. zero

Since a sound change **k^w-* > Arm. zero is untenable (if not impossible), and the development **ĵ-* > Arm. *ĵ-* or *j-* (for references and discussion and/on the theory of **Hĵ-* see Pisani 1950: 180-182; Minshall 1955; Winter 1965: 113-114; Polomé 1980: 20; Beekes 1981-82: 113; Ravnæs 1991: 64-68; Ałabekyan 1998: 71-79) is not convincing either, one should posit PIE **ĵ-* > 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 **ĵ-* rather than **k^w-* forms: PIE **ĵo-*, cf. Skt. *yá-* ‘who, which’ etc.; note Pol. *jak* ‘how’ beside Russ. *kak* ‘how’ (Pisani 1950: 181; 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) **iorĵ-o-* ‘deer, roe’; see s.vv.

Further, see s.vv. *du*, obl. *je-* ‘you’, *ju* ‘egg’.

2.1.7 PIE *ǵ- > Arm. *l-*

Examples: *leard* ‘liver’ vs. Skt. *yákr̥t* etc.; *luc* ‘yoke’ vs. Skt. *yugá-*, Lat. *iugum*, etc.

Different explanations have been offered for these words (see s.vv.). Hamp (1982: 191) assumes $l < [\lambda] < *[j] < *[i]$, “an unspectacular phonetic sequence known from current attestation in dialects of a number of languages”.

The alternation *ǵ- : *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 *lüsil*, *yesan* ‘whetstone’ > Alaškert, Muš, Sasun *lesan*. In some cases, contamination is possible. For Łarabał *lüsil*, Ačarıyan (HAB 3: 101b) assumes contamination with PIE *plek- ‘to weave’. Muš *listag* may be due to the 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 to 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 [Ačarıyan 1913: 423a] and Moks [HayLezBrbBař 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 Ačarıyan 1952: 108; M. Muradyan 1962: 85; M. Muradyan 1982: 139); cf. Van/Šatax *yezner*, Moks *iznir*, the plural of *yez* (Moks *iz*) < CIArm. *ezn* ‘bullock’. This implies that the older nominative form of the word under discussion would have been *lezn. One wonders, then, if *lez-n ‘buffalo’ is identical with the synonymous by-form *ye/iz < CIArm. *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 Bałdasaryan-T‘ap‘alc‘yan 1958: 266a). Note that here, too, the following consonant is a sibilant, although 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: Grammont 1918: 225; Pisani 1950: 185-186; Ałabekyan 1981; 1981a; Godel 1982a; Olsen 1986; Morani 1991; Ravnæs 1991: 76-86; 1998: 52-71; 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.vv. *anjaw* ‘cave’, *arew/g* ‘sun’, *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. *nagná-* ‘naked’, Lith. *niúogas* ‘naked’, etc.; Arm. *magil* ‘claw’ : Gr. *ὄνυξ, -ὄχος* 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 *nualim* ‘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; Ĵahukyan 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 of *ariwn* ‘blood’.

2.1.11 PIE **-Ns-* > Arm. *-s* (N = any nasal)

Examples: *amis* ‘month’ vs. Lat. *mēnsis*, Gr. *μήν*, Skt. *mās-*, etc.; *is* ‘me’ (acc.) next to gen. *im*, dat. *inj* : **h₁me-*; *mis* ‘meat’ vs. OCS *męso* ‘flesh, meat’, Goth. *mimz* ‘meat’, etc.; *us* ‘shoulder’ vs. Gr. *ὤμος*, Lat. *umerus*, Skt. *ámsa-*, etc.

All the forms of Armenian (CIArm., MidArm. 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 *յոս* 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’* > Łarabał *š*, giving only one example: *matnašurt’n* ‘a suppurative swelling on one’s finger-tip’ > *mənnášəš*. This sound development is improbable. Next to *matnašurt’n* (lit. ‘finger-lip/edge’; attested in “Bžškaran” apud NHB 2: 215a, preserved in Van *matišurt’*), there is a dialectal (Muš, Karin, T’iflis, etc.) equivalent **matnašunč’*, lit. ‘finger-breath’ (see Amatuni 1912: 465a). Ačařyan (1913: 759a) derives Łarabał *mənnášəš* from this compound. Alternatively, Łarabał *mənnášəš* may be linked with Agulis *mtnášəřž* etc., with *šurj* ‘around’ as the second member (on this, see HAB 3: 539b): **matnašurj* > **mtnášo(r)ž* > Łarabał *mənnášəš*.

Another example of the sound change *-nč’* > *-š* is *Astuacašunč’* ‘Bible’ > Aslanbek *asvajašüš* [HAB 3: 535b].

The sound change is more transparent when *-nč’-* is followed by another consonant; cf. examples from Meřri [Ałayan 1954: 84], among which *bəřéšnə* from **brinč’-n-* ‘snowball-tree’, cf. also Łarabał *préšnə* (unless one prefers to link it with Łazax, Łaradał, Agulis **brəš-*, see 1.5 and especially 1.12.1).

2.1.12 The ruki-rule

On *veštasan* ‘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 *veštasan*, 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*”. Pedersen (1905: 208; 1906: 432 = 1982: 70, 210; see also AčařLiak 6, 1971: 560-561) 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 **-rsj-*, cf. Skt. *tṛṣyati* and *hṛṣyati*, respectively. Meillet (1950: 85-86; cf. also 1900c: 316; 1936: 39-40) accepts **-rsj-* > *-rš-*, but is sceptical about **-ksjo-* > *-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 **-tk-* 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 **-rsj-* seems unconvincing and unnecessary. In what follows, I shall try to explain these and other cases by means of the well-known ruki-rule.

Let us sum up the evidence. The first case, namely *veštasan* ‘sixteen’ < **sueks-d(e)km* vs. *vec* ‘six’ < **sueks*, is practically the only example of the ruki-rule in Armenian commonly cited in Indo-European literature. Also, the following two words, *t’aršam* and *garšim*, have played some role in relevant discussions:

***t’aršam** (adj.) : ***t’aršam-ém(i)** (verb) ‘to wither’; for a 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’.

goloršī, *-ea-c* ‘vapour, steam’, if from QIE **uol-HuVrs-ieh₂-* ‘warm vapour’ (cf. Hitt. *uarša-* ‘fog, mist’, Gr. *έέρση* ‘dew’, etc.) > PArm. **wol-ə(w)oršiya-*; see s.v. *gol* ‘warmish, lukewarm; warmth’.

giřer ‘night’ vs. Gr. *έσπερος*, Lat. *vesper*, Lith. *vākaras*, OCS *večerъ*, etc. on the one hand, and Welsh *ucher* < **ewksero-*, Bulg. dial. (Vinga) *uščer*, on the other; perhaps contaminated with the other synonymous word: YAv. **xšapar-*, Skt. *kšáp-*, Hitt. *ispan-* ‘night’, etc.), thus: **ueksepero-* > PArm. **we(k)še(w)eřo-* > *geiřero-* > *giřer*.

moř(-) ‘blackberry’, **moř-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)ř* is mostly found in derivatives (*moř-a-vayri* in Jeremiah 17.6, *moř-i*, etc.) and probably points to the tree/plant-name **morš-i-* derived from PArm. **mor-s-ieh₂-* (see also s.vv.).

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. *ὄζύα*, *-η* 'beech; spear', Erzamordvin *uks(o)* 'elm, ash', etc.) or **HoHks-* from **HoHs-* (cf. Lith. *úosis* 'ash-tree' etc.) > PArm. **ho(k)šiya-* > **hoši*, and **u(k)šiya-* > *uši* (see s.v.).

The rule did not operate in Arm. **-rs-* < PIE **-rk-*, cf. *hars-n* 'bride' from **pr^hk-*; see also s.vv. *ors* 'hunt-animal', *p'esay* 'bridegroom', etc.

Conclusion

On the strength of the presented evidence, I tentatively 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) considers this as one of the isoglosses shared by the dialects of Nor Naxijewan and Sivri-Hisar. Both are 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. [Gabikean 1952: 329], Č'aharmahal *hašnik* [Eremean 1923: 79a] and rural Juła *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 ruki-rule for ClArm., which seems to have operated only in initial or internal position.

We thus find the reflex of the ruki-rule in this word in the following areas: NW – Nor Naxijewan and Sivri-Hisar (both probably from Ani) : SW – Hačən, Sebastia : SE – Č'aharmahal, rural Juła (migrated from the Ararat region). One might assume that the operation of the ruki-rule continued in a certain area. Otherwise, we are dealing with a more recent comparable development. Compare also the distribution of the development *VrV-* > *ž/šV* in Nor Naxijewan, Sivri-Hisar, and Hačən (see s.v. *erek* 'three').

Note also *hangoyc* 'knot' : **hangu(r)st* > Sebastia *hankušt* (see Gabikean 1952: 329).

2.1.13 Loss of intervocalic **-t-*

Alongside well-known examples, such as *hayr* 'father' < PIE **ph₂tēr*, *mayr* 'mother' < **meh₂tēr* etc., this development is also seen in a non-IE word with an *i*-stem: *sayl*, 'wagon; Ursa Major and Minor, Arcturus' vs. Hesychian *σάτιλλα: πλειὰς τὸ ἄστρον* (see s.v.), as was pointed out by Jahukyan (1987: 346).

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 *geġj-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; Ačařyan 1952: 79; Ĵahukyan 1967: 196; 1982: 216₇₅; Kortlandt 1975: 43-44 = 2003: 10-11)¹⁵⁹.

If related with Skt. *kaśikā-* ‘Ichneumonweibchen’ or ‘weasel’ and *káśa-* ‘weasel’, *ak^his* ‘weasel’ derives from **Hkeġ-ih₂-* and shows a similar depalatalization: **k - k̂ > k^h - s* instead of *ġ^h - s*.

The rule seems also to function with the affricates originated from palatalization of dentals, cf. Arm. *gġj*, *o*-stem ‘moist’ (Bible+; several dialects) from QIE **g^weid^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. **keġ^h-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.).

The absence of palatalization may be due to the onomatopoeic nature of certain words. A probable example is **geġ-*, *geġ-geġ-* ‘to sing’ (P^hawstos Buzand, Hexaemeron, etc.) from PIE **g^hel-*, cf. Olc. *gala* ‘to call, sing’, OHG *galan* ‘to sing’, etc. Compare Arm. dial. onomatopoeic **gl-gl-*, referring to water or laughing (see Amatuni 1912: 135a; Ačařean 1913: 232b).

Arm. *mak^hi* ‘ewe’ is perhaps of onomatopoeic origin (see Olsen 1999: 808). Arm. *gerdastan*, *a*-stem ‘body of servants and captives; possessions; estate, landed property’ (Bible+) has been derived from PIE **g^herd^h-*, cf. Skt. *grhá-* m. ‘house, residence’ (RV+), YAv. *gərəða-* m. ‘house of daēvic beings’, Goth. *gards* m. ‘house, housekeeping’, etc. The absence of palatalization of the initial guttural is unexplained; one may treat the Armenian form as an Iranian loanword.

Further see s.v.v. *keam* ‘to live’, *ker-* ‘to eat’, *kin* ‘woman, wife’, *kiw* ‘tree pitch’.

2.1.15 Stops

The PIE (labio)velars yield palatovelars in Armenian in a position after the vowel **u* (see Meillet 1892a). This holds also for the secondary **u* which has resulted through anticipation (or metathesis) of the labial element of a labiovelar (see 2.1.27.1). For a further discussion and references, see s.vv. *alawsunk* ‘Pleiades’, *acut* ‘coal’, *araws*

¹⁵⁹ Ačařyan (1906-08; AčařLiak 6, 1971: 542; 1952: 79-80) adduced some dialectal parallels to this dissimilatory development: *j(r)atalac^h-k^h* ‘water-mill’ > Aslanbek *k^hatalašk^h*; *ġ^horek^hšabt^hi* ‘Wednesday’ > Van *k^hörök^həšpät^h* and *ġ^hörök^həšpät^h*. He assumes that the palatals *j* and *ġ^h* have turned into their velar correspondent *k^h* through dissimilatory influence of *š*. However, an assimilatory influence of *-k^h-* seems more likely and simpler (an alternative mentioned but rejected by Ačařyan himself).

‘virgin soil’, *awcanem* ‘to anoint’, *awj* ‘snake’, **boyc-*, *bucanem* ‘to feed’, *boys* ‘plant’, *loys* ‘light’, *luc* ‘yoke’.

2.1.16 Initial **H-*

2.1.16.1 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 sceptical is Benveniste (1969, 1: 224) who treats the initial *h-* of Arm. *han* ‘grandmother’ and *haw* ‘grandfather’, albeit corresponding to Hitt. *ḫ-*, 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 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: Winter 1965: 102-103; Jahukyan 1967b: 66; 1994: 14; Greppin 1973; 1981c: 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 *ḫ-* 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 a discussion of the problem, see Winter 1965; Greppin 1975b; 1988; Polomé 1980. See further s.vv. *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’ and *hot* ‘smell, odour’. In some cases, traces of *h-* can be found in later literature and dialects, see e.g. s.vv. *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.vv. **atj-* ‘darkness, twilight’, *ayg* ‘morning’, *ayc* ‘visit, inspection’, etc.

The assumption that Arm. *x-* and *k-* are 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 reflects 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 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, namely *kuz* ‘marten’ and *xoz* ‘pig’, cf. English *hedgehog* : *hog*.

2.1.16.2 PArm. *(h)o- > dial. fo-

In a few ClArm. words with initial *o-* or *ho-* one finds dialectal forms with **fo-*: (*h*)*ogi* ‘soul; spirit’, *hoł* ‘earth, ground’, *hot* ‘smell’, *hor* ‘pit’, *ort* ‘calf’, *ors* ‘hunt’ (see H. Muradyan 1982: 267-276). One may add *hoyn* ‘cornel’.

Ačaryan (2003: 106-107) notes that this development occurs in monosyllables and is conditioned by the vowel *o*. He (AčarHLPatm 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-* > *fo-*), 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-* > *fo-* 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 *væert* ‘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 **jo-* (*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 *fo-* 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-* > *fo-* has taken place only in words with old *ho-* (from **h₃e-*, perhaps also **jo-*?) 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 appears with *ho-* or *fo-* in dialects, I suggest to examine the problem of **h/fort* within the context of the aspirated *-t*, see s.v. *ort*. See also s.v. *hoł* ‘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 *fo-* forms. Whatever the ultimate origin of these words (cf. also *hewam* ‘to breathe heavily’), the absence of *fo-* forms in the case of *hov* is easily explained by labial dissimilation (see Ačaryan 2003: 106-107). These words possibly derive from **peu-*, cf. Lith. *pūsti* ‘to blow’, etc. (see HAB 3: 89-90). The form *ogi* would not display *fo-* forms for two reasons: (1) it is disyllabic; (2) its anlaut would be **po-*; cf. the cases *otn* ‘foot’ and *ordi* ‘son’ never displaying *fo-* forms. One can assume that *hog* and *hogi* obtained the *h-* from the verb *hewam*, and this secondary *ho-* yields *fo-* 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-*) > *fo-*. Cases with **po-* > *fo-* like *(h)ort* ‘calf’ are exceptional/uncertain and may be explained by analogical processes, see e.g. s.v. *ort* ‘calf’.

For a phonetic discussion of the development *ho-* > *fo-*, I would like to mention a unique case of the same development *h* > *f* in auslaut¹⁶⁰: Arm. *srah* ‘hall’ (Bible+) > Zeyt’un *սրշփ, սրշփ*, vs. *srah* in Łarabał, Ararat, etc., and *srax* in Muš, Moks, Salmast, etc. [HAB 4: 281-282], of which Ačařyan (2003: 108, 338) offers no explanation. Since the only dialect showing the development is Zeyt’un, where, unlike in the other dialects, the vowel *-a-* regularly yielded *-ɔ-*, one can reconstruct the following development: *srah* > Zeyt’un **sroh* > *սրշփ*. 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 Ačařyan 2003: 108.

2.1.17 Prothetic vowel

2.1.17.1 Preliminaries

The so-called “prothetic vowel”, viz. Gr. *á-* (and *ó-*) : Arm. *a-*, and Gr. *é-* : 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 reflex¹⁶¹.

For the material and discussion I refer to Audouin 1892; Meillet 1927; Bonfante 1937: 19; Hovdhaugen 1968; Beekes 1975b: 428; 1991: 237; Considine 1978-79; Muller 1984; Olsen 1984; 1985; 1988-89; Peters 1986: 377-378; Beekes 1987b; Picard 1989; Ravnæs 1991: 16-26; as well as the literature cited in 2.1.16.1. See also under relevant entries. Here I would like to draw attention to some considerations. For discussion of dialectal data see Ałayan 1958: 67-72.

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. *ἐλαχύς* ‘small, short, mean, little’, *ἐλαφρός* ‘light (in weight)’, OIc. *lunga* ‘lung’, etc.;

lerk ‘hairless’, dial. ‘smooth’ : *o-tork* ‘smooth, polished’ vs. cf. Mir. *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, albeit 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

¹⁶⁰ Typologically compare Alb. final *-h* > *-f* in many dialects (M. de Vaan, p.c.).

¹⁶¹ Sceptical: Lindeman 1990.

and is assimilated to the root vowel. Compare Arm. *orcam* ‘to vomit’ < **orucam* vs. Gr. *ἐρεύγομαι*, 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 an open syllable), cf. *anēc-k-* ‘curse’ vs. Gr. *ὄνειδος* n. ‘reprimand, abuse’, Lith. *niedėti* ‘to despise’, etc.

On the other hand, there are two words which, in my view, may point to a development PIE **h₃NV-* > PArm. **oNV-* > *(*u*)*m-V-*, if the nasal is **m*, whether original or secondary:

Arm. *mēg*, *o-* or *a-* stem ‘mist, fog’ < **h₃meig^h-o-* or **h₃meig^h-eh₂-*, cf. dial. **mglim* ‘to cloud’ vs. Gr. *ὀμίχλη* ‘fog’, OCS *mogla* ‘mist, haze’, Lith. *miglà* ‘fog’, Dutch dial. *miggelen* ‘to drizzle’. I do not subscribe to the theory that the Armenian word is an Iranian loan (see s.v. for a discussion).

Arm. *magil* ‘claw’ vs. Gr. *ὄνυξ*, *-vxoç* m. ‘talon, claw, nail’, OHG *nagal* ‘nail’, etc. Perhaps: QIE **h₃nog^{wh}-ōl-eh₂-* (a coll. form, based perhaps on an old HD nom. **-ōl*, cf. s.vv. *acut* ‘coal’ and *asetn* ‘needle’) > PArm. **onog^wūla-* > **on^wag^wul(a)-* > **umag^ul-*, obl. **mag(u)l-á-*, with the regular developments **oN-* > *uN-* and *-o-* > *-a-* (on the latter, see 2.1.3). The shift **n* > *m* may be due to assimilatory influence of the labiovelar in 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^wno-*, perhaps also in *mutⁿ* ‘dark; darkness’, if from PIE **nok^wt-* ‘night’.

The other Armenian reflex of the same PIE word, namely *etungn* ‘nail’, may be explained as follows: **h₃nog^{hw}-* > **onu(n)g^w-* > *(*u*)*lung-* (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) **h₁lV-* (where *-V-* is a non-labial vowel) > PArm. **-elV-* > **ilV-* > *lV-*; (2) **h₃m/n^wV-* > PArm. **omV-* > **umV-* > *mV-*. This evidence, together with the contrast between e.g. Arm. *erek(-oy)* ‘evening’ : Gr. *ἔρεβος*, Goth. *riqis*, etc. (PIE **h₁reg^w-e/os-*) and Arm. *arew* ‘sun’ : Skt. *ravi-* ‘sun, sun-god’, cf. Hitt. *haru^wanai-* ‘to become bright, to dawn’ (PIE **h₂reu-i-*), may be treated in terms of the triple reflex 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 **h₁-* and **h₂-* 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 the dialects) from PIE **g^wr(e)h₂-n-*: Lith. *gìrna* ‘millstone’, OCS *žrěny*, cf. Skt. *grávan-* ‘pressing-stone’, etc.; *etbayr* ‘brother’ < PIE **b^hreh₂tēr* ‘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.vv.).

On the other hand, the prothetic vowel is *a-* if the word contains a labial vowel or diphthong:

aru ‘brook, etc.’ from PIE **sru-* (cf. Greppin 1980a: 97, who assumes **e-ru-* > *a-ru*, with “erratic **e* > *a*”) and *arog-* ‘to water, wet, sprinkle, irrigate’ from PIE **srou-* ‘to stream, flow’; see s.v. Better attested is the variant *orog(an)em*, which, as well as *oroč-* ‘to chew, ruminate’ (cf. Skt. *rādati* ‘to gnaw, bite, scratch’, Lat. *rōdere* ‘to gnaw’) and *orcam* ‘to vomit’ (vs. Gr. *ἐρέγγουμαι*) 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 Ačařyan (HAB 1: 331b), is borrowed from Armenian.¹⁶²

Further: *araws*, *arawš* ‘bustard’, if from Iran. **rūš*.¹⁶³

2.1.18 PIE **p/t/k* + **H*

2.1.18.1 PIE **kH* > Arm. *x* vs. **k* > Arm. *k*‘; **k̂H* > *c*‘ vs. **k̂* > *s*

Arm. *xaxank*‘ ‘loud laughter’ (Ephrem+) next to Skt. *kákhati* ‘to laugh’, Gr. *καχάζω*, OCS *xoxotati* ‘to laugh loudly’, and *c’ax* ‘branch’ (Geoponica, etc.; widespread in dialects) next to Skt. *śákhā-* f. (RV+) ‘branch, twig’, are considered to represent PIE **k^h* [Meillet 1894b: 294; 1936: 35; 1950: 78-83]. For a discussion on voiceless aspirates see Hiersche 1964; Greppin 1984a; Elbourne 2000.

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 Bomhard 1979: 73; 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 Megr. *bax(-)* ‘to beat’, as well as Russ. *bac*, *babax(-)*, Engl. *bang*, etc., all of onomatopoeic origin (see s.v.).

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.

The PIE palatovelar **k̂*, the regular outcome of which is Arm. **s*, is sometimes reflected as *c*‘. In these cases scholars often posit an *s*-mobile, despite its absence in cognate forms. I alternatively propose to consider a sound change **k̂H* > Arm. *c*‘.

¹⁶² Greppin (1980a: 98) points out that the expected form is **e-r-*.

¹⁶³ The rule seems in a way comparable with the dependence of the reflex of ClArm. *ere-* in the Ĵula dialect on the vowel of the third syllable, as is formulated by Ačařyan (1940: 56-57): *ereCa-* > (*h*‘)*areCa-* vs. *ereCo/u-* > (*h*‘)*araCo/u-*.

For discussion see s.vv. *c'ax* 'branch' (assimilatory influence of *x* ?), *c'ac* 'low', *c'ank/g* 'hedge, fence', *c'awł(un)* 'stem, stalk', *c'ir* 'onager, wild ass', *c'urt* 'cold'.

2.1.18.2 PIE **tH* and **pH*

A similar development may be posited for **tH* and **pH*, although the material is not conclusive; see s.vv. *analut* 'deer', *t'arp* / *b* 'fishing-basket', *yaht* '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 PIE **-uH(s)m* > Arm. *-ukn*

Kortlandt (1985b: 9 = 2003: 57; see also Beekes 2003: 196) derives Arm. *jukn* 'fish' and *mukn* 'mouse' from PIE AccSg **dḡ^huH-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-*. For literature and discussion of this problem, see Winter 1965: 104-105; Lindeman 1987: 98. Another possible case is, according to Kortlandt (1985b: 10-11; 1986: 42 = 2003: 58-59, 71), *kṛunk* 'crane' if it reflects a metathesized AccSg **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 *kṛunk*, 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 of which some show *-a-* as a reflex of a laryngeal (e.g., *arawr* 'plough' etc.) whereas the others (*dustr* 'daughter', *armukn* 'elbow', etc.) show a zero reflex, Greppin (1988: 75-76) concludes: "I see no systematic explanation for this contradiction". Commenting on 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.vv.). 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.vv. **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 **-p^hlh₁b^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 *olorn* ‘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. Uncertain is also the interpretation of *holonem* ‘to collect, gather, assemble’ as a denominative from **p^hlh₁no-* ‘full’ since *holon-* is a later and poorly attested derivation from ClArm. *hoyl* ‘group’ (q.v.).

2.1.21 PIE **k̂* > Arm. *š* when followed by **-u-* (or **-u-*)

The regular reflex of PIE **k̂u* is considered to be Arm *š*, see s.vv. *ēš* ‘donkey’, *šun* ‘dog’, etc., though next to this there are also examples with *sk*, viz. *skesur* ‘mother-in-law’, *skund* ‘dog’, q.v.; see Scheftelowitz 1904-05, 1: 290-292; Pedersen 1905: 197-198; 1906: 422 = 1982: 59-60, 200; Lidén 1911; Grammont 1918: 252; Meillet 1936: 50-51; Bonfante 1937: 21; Schmitt 1972-74: 40; Godel 1975: 84-85; Kortlandt 1976: 92, 96-97; 1980: 99, 104; 1986: 39; 1988: 72, 73; 1989: 45 = 2003: 2, 6, 27-28, 31, 69, 84, 86, 89-90; Greppin 1978c: 119-122 (assuming a Luwian origin, cf. 1984: 92; for Luwian see Oshiro 1989; Oettinger 1994: 74-75); de Lamberterie 1978: 263, 263₁₀₆ with references to older literature; Morani 1981: 5; Jahukyan 1982: 75, 218₁₀₇; Ravnæs 1991: 166-168; Ałabekyan 1998: 56-58; Beekes 2003: 209, 211; Viredaz 2003: 68₃₈.

If one accepts the appurtenance of *skund* to the PIE word for ‘dog’ (cf. Arm. *šun* ‘dog’) and the derivation of *hask*, *i*-stem ‘ear of corn’ from QIE **h₂ek-u-ih₂-* (> PArm. **hask-i-*, see s.v.), the following distribution could be assumed: PIE **k̂u* and **k̂u* > Arm. *š* and *sk*, respectively. In this case, Arm. *ēš*, *o*-stem and *u*-stem ‘ass’ may reflect an original PIE *u*-stem: **h₁ek̂-u*. This is, however, highly hypothetical¹⁶⁴.

2.1.22 Clusters

2.1.22.1 PIE **-Tj-* (T = any dental stop)

According to Pedersen (1906: 396-397 = 1982: 174-175): **-tj-* > *-č-*, **-d̥j-* > *-č-*, **-d^hj-* > *-j-*. This is shown e.g. by the following examples:

¹⁶⁴ Beside ClArm. *hask* ‘ear of corn’, the dialects of the Van group have **hašk* > *xašk*, with an unexplained *-š*. If one accepts the developments PIE **k̂u* > Arm. *sk* vs. **k̂u* > *š*, the *-š* of **hašk*, unless due to influence of Pers. *xūša* ‘ear of corn’, may be explained as follows: PIE nom. **h₂ék-(ē/ō)u* : gen. **h₂k̂-u-ós* (and/or **h₂ek̂-u-ih₂-*) > PArm. **hašu* vs. **(h)ask-* > *hask* and **hašk*. Of course, this is highly hypothetical, too.

gēj ‘moist’ < **g^{wh}e/oid^h-jo-* vs. cf. Russ. *židkij*, SCr. *židak*, etc. ‘liquid, watery’; *koč* ‘em’ ‘to call, invite’ < **g^wot-je-* vs. Goth. *qīþan* etc.; *mēj* ‘middle’ < **med^h-jo-* vs. Lat. *medius* etc.; see s.vv., 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 to PArm. affricates. See the following entry.

2.1.22.2 PArm. *-cĭ- > -č-, *-jĭ > -j-

Possible examples: *koškočem* < **koč-koč-em* ‘to beat, break’ < **koc-koc-je-mi*, from *koc-* ‘to beat; to lament by beating one’s chest’, possibly a reduplicated present in *o*-grade with the present suffix **-je-* (see 2.2.6.1);

Further, nom. **wánj-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).¹⁶⁵

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 a discussion, see s.vv. *xayt* ‘sting, bite’, *šant* ‘lightning, thunderbolt, spark’, *šet* ‘slanting, crooked, oblique’, *šert* ‘split wood, piece of wood, splinter’, *sxal* ‘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 Ač‘arean 1913: 929-930, without etymology). The root seems to be **pot* ‘fiery coal’ (Łarabał; see Ač‘arean 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 Ač‘arean 1913: 914a). The first part of the compound, namely **ps-*, may be identical with Ararat, Łarabał, T‘iflis etc. **pec* ‘spark’, cf. Van *pc-ar* ‘spark’) [Ač‘arean 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) synonymous roots are common; cf. **kayc-u-pot-un* (Łarabał *kəcəpətun* [Ač‘arean 1913: 545a], Goris *kəcəpuətun* [Margaryan 1975: 414a]) ‘fiery’, comprising *kayc* ‘spark’ and the very

¹⁶⁵ In view of Skt. *aśva-* ‘horse’ > *aśvatará-* ‘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 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)yori* > *jori*.

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-pł-al* ‘to shine’.

Arabkir, Polis, Karin etc. *kas-karmir* ‘entirely red’ (see Ačārean 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, cf. 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.vv. *san*, *sandut*, *sareak*, *sunkn*. See also my treatments s.vv. *sunkn* ‘mushroom’ (cf. Gr. *σπόγγος* ‘sponge, tonsil’), *sandut-k* ‘ladder, stairs’, *surb* ‘pure; holy’.

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, although in this case the starting point is PIE **k̑u-*: 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). This is 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 the 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 *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’; **kasřapa-* > 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. *stakán* '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), *istakan* (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* [AčařAnjn 4, 1948: 600]. The form *Sep'an* is found three times 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 *Cmenan*. Further: in Nor Bayazet: *Sub-Sep'anos* < *Surb* 'holy' *Step'annos* [P'ilojeanc' 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 *ket-a-karc* 'doubtful', *kuł* (allegedly) 'fold, double', *kic* 'conjoined', *kēs* 'half', *koyš* 'side', and *krkin* 'twice, again', which is not convincing; most of these etymologies are doubtful or simply wrong (see s.vv.; see also Meillet 1908-09: 353-354). Arm. *erkar* 'long' (< **dueh₂-ro-*, cf. Gr. *δῆρός*, Dor. *δᾶρός* '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; AčařLiak 6, 1971: 402-403; Grammont 1918: 251-252; Pisani 1934: 185; Dumézil 1938b: 51-52; Belardi 1950: 148; 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); Ravnæs 1991: 162-166; de Lamberterie 1992: 257; Bolognesi 1994: 34-35; Harkness 1996; Olsen 1999: 270-271; Beekes 2003: 199-200, 209; Viredaz 2003.

See also s.vv. *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: **duō* 'two' > **tuō* > **tg^wō* > **tk^wū* > *erku*. This is met with scepticism (cf. e.g. Szemerényi 1985: 791-794). If, nevertheless,

one accepts this development, it would be tempting to treat Kartv. **tqub-* ‘twins’ (on which see Klimov 1998: 194) as reflecting (or somehow related with) the theoretical PArm. **tk^wu-* ‘two’. Note also PNWCauc. **t’q’o* ‘two’ which has been linked with the PIE word in terms of Proto-Pontic [Colarusso 1997: 143]. All this is attractive but uncertain. Similarly, nothing can be based on Juła *y’etkar* or *yetkar* ‘far away’ from *erkar* (q.v.).

In non-initial position: PIE **meldu-i(h₂)-* (cf. Skt. *mṛdvī* 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-*

An example: *mawru-k* ‘beard’ (Bible+; widespread in the dialects, also **miruk*, **muruk*) < PIE **smokru-*, cf. Lith. *smākras*, *smakrà* ‘chin’ vs. Skt. *śmāśru-* n. ‘beard’, etc.

A possible example with **l* may be Arm. *giwt* ‘village’, if from QIE **ue/oik(s)-l-ih₂-* (see s.v.).

See also s.vv. *artawsr* ‘tear’ and *erinj* ‘heifer, young cow’ (if from **k̑r-*).

There are no cases with **ġ* and **ġ^h*. A special development is found in *art* ‘cornfield’ from **h₂(e)ġro-*, which is hard to explain (see s.v.). Kortlandt (1980: 101 = 2003: 28) notes that the palatal articulation of **-ġ^h-* before **-r-* was preserved in *merj* ‘near’ (cf. Gr. *μέγρι* ‘near’), but later assumes **me-ġ^hsr-i* (see s.v. *merj* ‘near’).

2.1.22.8 PIE **-ln-* > Arm. *-ł-*

For examples and references, see Lidén 1933: 42₂; Meillet 1936: 48; Bonfante 1937: 19. See also s.vv. *atam* ‘to grind’, *arastat* ‘ceiling’, *astł* ‘star’, etc.

Note also *Atiwn*, a district of the province of *Barjr Hayk* ‘Upper/Higher Armenia’, if from **Alnib/wn*, cf. *Analibna* (Ptolemy) etc.

2.1.22.9 PIE **-łc-* > Arm. *-c-*

According to Ačaryan (HAB 4: 105), MidArm. and dial. (Nor Naxijewan, Polis, Ararat, Łarabał) **puc* ‘vulva’ (see Ačarean 1913: 926b) derives from QIE **bul-sk-*, cf. Skt. *buli-* f. ‘buttocks; vulva’, Lith. *bulis* (-iēs), *bülė*, *bulė* ‘Hinterer, Gesäß’, as well as Arm. Erznka *pllik* ‘vulva’. If true, the sound change can be linked to the following possible cases.

PIE **pelk-sk-* or **pelk-s* (cf. OHG *felga*, OEngl. *felg(e)* ‘felloe’) > **hetc-* > *hec-* (*i*-stem) ‘felloe’ (q.v.). See especially s.v. *kat’n* ‘milk’ on the loss of **-l-*, which has been preserved in Agulis and Metri **kalc-*.

Compare also *atjamulj* ‘darkness, twilight’ > Łarabał *žəmaženk-* (see s.v. **atj-*).

2.1.22.10 PIE **-mp-* > Arm. *-m-*

See Meillet 1922c, on *amul* ‘childless’. Other examples are adduced in Adontz 1937: 12; Dumézil 1938; 1997: 3-4. However, not all of these etymologies are convincing. An example is *amayi*, *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.), which has no acceptable etymology in HAB 1: 144b. The word has been interpreted as **an-pat-iyo-* (cf. Gr. *πατέομαι* 'manger' etc.) 'lieu sans fourrage' [Adontz 1937: 12; Dumézil 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. *maiiah-* n. 'satisfaction, pleasure', Sogd. *my'kcyk* 'fortunate/happy', Skt. *máyas-* 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* (GDPI *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^mm-pol-*, Dumézil (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 *mrjīwn*: pl. *mrjīmunk'* '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 the 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.vv. *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 the 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-* < **mədu-*.

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 the 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.vv. *acut'* 'coal', *awji-k'* 'collar'). Some of the proposals are mentioned in the following. For a general discussion, see also Winter 1966: 204; A. Xač'atryan 1993.

Klingenschmitt (1982: 153-154) treats the *-w-* in *artawsr*, *arawt*, *hawt* etc. as an "*u*-epenthese nach betontem *a* der ursprünglichen Pänultima", e.g. *artawsr* 'tear' < **drākūr* : *artasu-k'* (pl.) < **drākū-ə₂*, assuming that *arawt* is composed of the PIE prefix **pr(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.) reconstructs an old **i*-stem with **-ōi* in the nominative (as in *gewt*, q.v.): NSg **pah₂dō(i)* > **fātū* > **hā^utu* > **hā^utu*, 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 *-r-*: *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, Elišē) with Skt. *ā-vitti-* f. 'not-finding' (AV); see s.v. *git-*.

The third subtype may be explained as follows: **ġnh₃-sk-ie-* > **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.vv. *arawt*, *but*, *mut*. The development

of **-dt-* to *-wt-* seems to contradict that seen in *p'oyt'* '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*, *maht'em*, etc., which may be denominative verbs based on *i*-stem nouns, see s.vv. 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 **treHġ-*, *arawt* (*i*-stem) would point to **trHġ-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.+).¹⁶⁶

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.vv. and especially *xayt'*.

For a discussion of other cases, see s.vv. *an(u)t'* 'armpit', *ert'am* 'to go', *kat'n* 'milk', *maht'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, in my view, the direct derivation from **polh₁u-s* (cf. Gr. *πολύς* 'much'). The vowel of the final syllable underwent an assimilatory influence by that of the first syllable. It is remarkable that *alawunk'* 'Pleiades' (q.v.), which

¹⁶⁶ 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 assibilated **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*.

apparently derives from the same PIE word (cf. YAv. **parūjainī-*, NPers. *parvīn*, Greek *Πλειάδες*), underwent the same assimilation, starting with the *-a-* from the zero-grade form (cf. Ir. **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‘* NPI of *k‘oyr* ‘sister’ from **č‘ewor-k‘* < **k‘w‘etores* and **k‘ehor-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’ (q.v.) 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’, *gej-k‘* ‘glands’, *dēz* ‘pile’, etc.

For a further discussion see Rasmussen 1989: 170-171₁₆.

2.1.24.2 *r...r* > *l...r*. Apart from the well-known cases of Indo-European origin, namely *abewr* ‘spring, well’ and *etbayr* ‘brother’ (q.v.), this dissimilation is also seen in *otorm* ‘compassion; supplication’ (Bible+; widespread in the 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: *salawart* ‘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 the dialects:

orar, urar ‘stole, tippet’ attested in Eusebius of Caesarea etc. < Gr. *ὀράριον* [Hübschmann 1897: 369; HAB 3: 615a]; widespread in the dialects: T‘iflis, Axalc‘xa, Łarabał, Polis, Sebastia., Muš etc. *urar*, Tigranakert *urär*, Marala *ürar*, Zeyt‘un *uyɔy, urɔr* [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* [Bałramyan 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, namely *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 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.vv.). 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].

Ačaryan (HAB 1: 181a, 462b) compares the development with that of *anapak-uk* ‘waterless, oilless, pure’ > Sebastia **ampakuk* > **ampapuk* > *ambəbug* and mentions only the assimilatory process. For an explicit description of a simultaneous process of assimilation and dissimilation, see Ałayan 1987: 269-270, 280.

The form *bobik* in turn underwent a further development: **bobik* > Łarabał **topik* > *tépegʻ* (Ałayan 1987: 280₂₃). This development probably started from the compound with *otn* ‘foot’, cf. Goris *vəndəpəpik*, *vənnəpəpik* (see Margaryan 1975: 474a). **otnapopik* > **otnatopik* is to be understood then as *t...p...p* > *t...t...p* (ABB > AAB).

Examples for vocalic assimilation + dissimilation: *eraxay* ‘child’ > dial. **erexa*, Mİran. **Mihrakān* > Arm. *mehekan* ‘the 7th month of the ancient Armenian calendar’.

Further examples:

zokʻančʻ ‘wife’s mother’ > Łarabał *zánkʻučʻ*, *zámkʻučʻ*, *zénkʻučʻ*, *zémkʻučʻ* [Davtʻyan 1966: 351]: *zokʻančʻ* > **zakʻončʻ* > *zä/enkʻučʻ* > *zä/emkʻučʻ*, 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.

xatol ‘grape’ > **xavot* (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 **havot* < the same *xatol* ‘grape’. This is, thus, a combination of two dissimilatory developments: (1) *x-t-t* > *h-t-t*, (2) *x-t-t* > *x-v-t*.

**net-u-atel(n)* > Zeytʻun *ləmbʻatəl*: **nedv-* > **nidb-* > **ninb-* > **nimb-* > **limb-*; see s.v. *ateln* ‘bow’.

tatr(a)k-ik > **tatrık* > Aslanbek *dadərdig*: *t-t-k-k* > *t-t-t-k* (see s.v. *tatrak* ‘turtle-dove’).

tzruk ‘leech’ is reflected in Ĵula as *pzdruk* ‘a leech-like water worm’ [HAB 4: 400a]. In order to explain this form, Ačaryan (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 stop before *r*, cf. *tʻmril* > Ĵula *dʻmbrel*, *manr* > Ĵula *mandr*, etc. (see Ačarean 1940: 159-160); (2) **tzdruk* > *pzdruk*, with dissimilatory simplification of the initial cluster comprising four dental phonemes.

Amatuni (1912: 442a) records Muš, Alaškert *čšnarət* ‘truly’ (unknown to Ačaryan), 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, it only appears in the oath formula **čšmarit Astuac* “true God” [HAB 3: 209]. The vowel *-ɔ-* 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).

An example of BAA > 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 *dagaŋ-k* ‘coffin’ > Malat’ia, Sebastia **gagatk*’.

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 substratum words. For instance, alongside ClArm. *oloŋn* ‘pea, bean; globule’ (Bible+; dialects), there are other variants: *oleŋn* (Paterica; several dialects), and **orel* (dialects of Xotorĵur, Nor Naxiĵewan). Both philological (*oloŋn* is the basic form and is attested from the Bible onwards) and etymological (cf. Akkad. *ħallūru*, *ħi/ullūru*, etc.; probably also Gr. *ὄλυραι*) considerations suggest that *oloŋn* must have served 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 reflects 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 should be taken into account. The vocalism of **oleŋn* (and **orel*) seems to have resulted analogically after *siseŋn*, GSg *sis(e)ŋan* ‘pea’ (Agat’angelos+; widespread in the dialects). Further, note *gaylagŋaw*, lit. ‘wolf-raven’ > Łarabaŋ *kəŋaklav*, Hadrut’ *kəŋaklāv* [Davit’yan 1966: 332], perhaps due to influence of onomatopoeic *kŋ-* ‘to croak’ (said of crows).

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. *ĵulah(a)*, *ĵulāh(a)* ‘spider; weaver’. Some forms have an “epenthetic” *-w-* or *-f-*: Č’*mškacag č’uvulag*, Karin *ĵuflak* next to *ĵulfa(k)*, Axalc’xa *ĵ’uflak* [HAB 4: 133a], Berri (Dersim) *ĵiväläg* ‘spider-web’ [Baġramyan 1960: 164a], Tigranakert *č’üvläg*, *č’uläg* [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, namely **ĵuhalak*, is directly corroborated by Zeyt’un *č’halog*, *ĵ’halog* ‘weaver; spider’ [HAB 4: 133a; Ač’aryan 2003: 337], Ararat *ĵuhlak* [Nawasardeanc’ 1903:

102a] or *juhlag*, T'iflis *júhlak*, Ĵula *júxlak* (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 **juhalak* matches Malat'ia *juvalag*. The Svedia and Hačən forms have the unmetathesized sequence *-lh-* (see Ačaryan 2003: 337, 586). As to the development *-uha-* > *-uwa-*, see 2.1.32, on *zohal*.

Next to Moks *terəxri* '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 a compound 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 *terəxri* 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'.

In what follows I will present several sets of (mainly dialectal) examples of metathesis.

2.1.26.2. Stops

PIE **-Dr-* and **-D^hr-* are subject to metathesis in Classical Armenian (see s.vv. *atbawr* 'spring, well', *artawsr* 'tear', *darbin* 'blacksmith', *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'alirt*, *a*-stem 'stomach of animals', if from **k'alit^h-ra-* (q.v.).

Examples from the dialects:

Labial : dental

put 'poppy' > Łarabał *tɔp* 'id.', *put* 'drop' > Łarabał *tɔp* 'id.' (q.v.), see especially Margaryan 1977: 161-164;

p'etur 'feather' > dial. (Zeyt'un, Xarberd, Hamšen, Karin, Alaškert, Łarabał, Agulis, Ĵula, etc.) **tep'ur* 'id.'.

Arm. *p'aycatn* 'spleen' > Cappadocian Greek *πεισάχι* 'id.' > Xotorĵur *sipex* 'id.', s.v. *p'aycatn*.

This material can be used to create new etymologies. For instance, *t'epək* '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.vv.).

Next to *kałin* 'acorn' (q.v.), the dialect of Łarabał has *tkóten* and metathesized *któten* 'hazel-nut'.

čakat 'forehead' (Bible+; widespread in the dialects) > Řodost'o *jadag*, gen. *jadgi* [HAB 3: 176a].

Next to ClArm. *čkoyt* ‘ and *ckoyt* ‘the little finger’, Łarabał has *ckéynə*, *kcéynə*, etc. (cf. also Ĵula *ck-ik*, Šamaxi *ckla mat*, etc.). The form *kcéynə*, found also in Goris (see Margaryan 1975: 346a), reflects a metathesis *ck-* > *kc-*.

Velar : dental

kayc-or-ik ‘glow-worm, firefly’ > Łarabał *cikúri* [HAB 2: 506-507];

kant ‘handle’ > Ararat, Łarabał, Goris, Mełri etc. *tank/g* ‘id.’ [Margaryan 1977: 160-162];

kot ‘handle’ > Svedia *dük* [Ačařyan 2003: 430].

2.1.26.3 Nasals, resonants, spirants

r...N > N...r

Arm. *erani* ‘blissful’ > Łarabał (*h*)*ənérak*, *nérak*.

For the dialect of Hamšen, Ačařyan (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* [Ačařyan 1941: 220], Erzinka *cirani gōdi* [Kostandyan 1979: 157b], Svedia *cirānə kudək* [Andreasyan 1967: 366b], K‘esab *cirānə 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.vv. *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. *arñ*, gen. of *ayr* ‘man’ (q.v.). Here, however, we are dealing with contact rather than distant metathesis.

n...r > r...n

anarat ‘pure, spotless’ > Svedia *äränud* [Andreasyan 1967: 353b]; *t‘onir* ‘ground-hearth’ > Łarabał *t‘órun*, etc.

l...n > n...l

This metathesis is found e.g. in MFr. *alumette* > Fr. *omelette* ‘omelet’.

For the dialect of Hamšen, Ačařyan (1947: 73) mentions only one case: *šlni* ‘neck’ (q.v.) > *šnlik* ‘face’. *xnlink* ‘ from *xlink* ‘snivel’, mentioned by Ačařyan (ibid.; see also p. 233) as a case of nasal epenthesis may also belong here. 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 *pənlink/k* ‘ alongside with *pənlik/k* ‘. The form *xnl-* is corroborated by

other NW dialects such as *Ġodost'o*, *Ewdokia* and *Karin*. Here, *Ačarıyan* (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; *Ačarean* 1913: 222b; *Gabikian* 1952: 135; *HayLezBrbBař* 1, 2001: 232a). As is shown by *Bläsing* (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*).

Bläsing (ibid.) argues that the metathesis *ln > nl* "erst bei oder nach der Entlehnung ins Türkeitürkische 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*, although the metathesized form **gdanloc'* is not recorded here. It should be borne in mind that *Ačarıyan'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' [*Ačarıyan* 1947: 62, 255]). In either case, we are dealing with a clear case of *ln > nl* metathesis in this region.¹⁶⁷

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/k'*, *pɔnlink/k'* (see *Ačarıyan* 1947: 56, 220, 222). A dissimilation from *n...n* results in *n...l* in *ananux* 'mint' > *Hamšen ɔnluxk'*, cf. also *annman* 'not resembling' > *ɔnləmɔn* (see *Ačarıyan* 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. [*Ačarıyan* 1947: 56]. One may assume that the metathesis *l...n > n...l* is relatively old and predates the syncope of *-a-*. Thus, (1) **gdalanoc'* > *gdanaloc'* (metathesis); (2) **gdanaloc'* > **gdanloc'* (syncope). Otherwise we would have **gdalloc'*.

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 (*lc'-i*, *lc'-ir*, *ε-lic'* etc.) and imperative (*lic'*, *lc'-ek'*), see *Ačarıyan* 1947: 133, 232, thus a metathesized

¹⁶⁷ An interesting though highly hypothetical case may be *Atiwn* ("Ašxarhac'oyc'") vs. *Analib(n/la)* (Ptolemy etc.), name of a district in the province of *Barjr Hayk'* '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.

**nəlum* would not be tolerated in the paradigm where the other forms have an initial *l*-. The same holds for *elanem* ‘to rise’ > *elluš* : *ela*, *yél*, 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* > *ənli*, etc.; (2) *l...n* > *n...l* (cf. *šlni* > *šnlik*’, etc.); (3) *n...n* > *l...n* (cf. *ananux* > *ənluxk*’, 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 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*

olorn ‘pea, bean; globule’ (Bible+; several dialects) : **orel* (dialects of Xotorjur, Nor Naxiĵewan). The same metathesis is present also in Semitic forms (see s.v. *olorn*). Probably we are dealing with independent developments of a similar nature.

h...v > *v...h*

hawak’em ‘to gather’ > Łarabał *həvák’el* and *vəhák’el* [Davt’yan 1966: 411]. A textual illustration can be found in a fairy-tale from Łarabał recorded by Grigor Bahat’ryan in 1860 (HŽHek’ 6, 1973: 67^{L20}): *vəhak’al ən* ‘they have gathered’.

lv > *vl*

luanam ‘to wash’ (Bible+; widespread in the dialects) > Polis, Aslanbek, Karin, Muš, Xarberd, Zeyt’un, Van, Salmast, etc. **vlal* (see HAB 2: 300b).

v...l > *l...v*

vayel-em ‘to enjoy; to suit’ > **vel-el* (contraction as in *hayeli* ‘mirror’ > **hili*, etc.) > Marała and Salmast *level* [HAB 4: 300a; Ačařean 1926: 76, 424].

awelc’uk ‘remnant’ > Svedia *ləvcäk* [Hananyan 1995: 54].

m...n > *n...m*

mananay ‘manna’ > Šamaxi *nəmana* [Bałramyan 1964: 67, 213].

2.1.26.4 Vowel metathesis

Examples: *zok’anč* ‘wife’s mother’ > Łarabał *zánk’uč*’, *zámk’uč*’, *zénk’uč*’, *zémk’uč*’ [Davt’yan 1966: 351]; *zok’anč*’ > **zak’onč*’ > **zänk’uč*’.

lezu ‘tongue’ > Larabəl *lūzi* [Davt‘yan 1966: 366].
Martiros > Gor. *Mərtüris* (see Lisic‘yan 1969: 273).
 See also s.v. *utet*, *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. *pīdāku-*, Sogd. *pwrδnk-*, Gr. *πάροδαλις* ‘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.) *pundarīka-* m. ‘tiger’.

This is reminiscent of the following example: next to Akn, Polis *krt‘n-il* ‘to lean, recline, incline the body against an object for support’ (see s.v. *krt‘unk‘* ‘back’), Ararat attests *knt‘rnil*, with metathesis, as is pointed out by Ačařyan (HAB 2: 669b). One of the possible scenarios is: (1) **-t‘n- > -nt‘n-* (anticipated or epenthetic *-n-*); (2) **krtnt‘n- > *knt‘rn-*.

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

Other types of metathesis are found in the following words:

čm-l-em ‘to squeeze, press’ (Bible+; several dialects) > Muš *člmil*, next to it we find dial. (widespread) **čm-r-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*, *čmkt‘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 **kč-m-*. See s.v. *čm-*.

Šahmar > *Šamxar*, found in a fairy-tale (1918/1965, Nor Bayazet – Yerevan), see HŽHek‘ 9, 1968: 552-554.

šišat ‘demon’ (q.v.) : NPI *šitš-ay-k‘*.

2.1.27 Anticipation

2.1.27.1 Anticipation or metathesis of *-i/y-* and *-u/w-*

Classical Armenian words of Indo-European origin: *ayg* ‘morning’, *ayl* ‘other’, *ayr* ‘man’, **ant‘a(y)r-*, *jayn* ‘voice’, *p‘ayl* ‘shine’. Note also PIE **med^h-io-* > PArm. **meij-* > *měj* ‘middle’. Further, see s.vv. *ayg* ‘morning’ and *ēg* ‘female’. For later periods: *žayn* vs. *žanik* ‘tusk’.

A comparable example from later periods for the development seen in *měj* may be *kamurj* ‘bridge’ (q.v.) > Kak‘avaberd *kármij* in the village of Varhavar (vs. *kármunj* in other villages, as well as in other Armenian dialects). Perhaps we may assume **karmuj* > **karmuij* > *kármij*.

Ačařyan (1935: 35) cites three examples of the irregular sound change ClArm. *a* > Agulis *ay* : *asetn* ‘needle’ > *áysät(nə)*, *calel* ‘to fold’ > *cáyilil*, *halel* ‘to melt’ > *háylil*. 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*.

For anticipation or metathesis of *-u/w-* see s.vv. *acul* ‘coal’, *awcanem* ‘to anoint’, *awji-k* ‘collar’, *awti* ‘a strong drink’, *awr* ‘day’.

This *-y-* or *-w-* is sometimes regarded as ‘epenthetic’. For a discussion and further references see Morani 1981; Olsen 1984: 113-114; 1985: 6; Olsen 1999: 176-177; Kortlandt 1985a: 59 = 2003: 60; Clackson 1994: 96; Beekes 2003: 169, 204-205.

2.1.27.2 Anticipation of a nasal

Anticipation of a nasal is found in the following cases:

**ayg-hot-k* ‘ceremony on the next morning after a funeral’, Eastern **ayg-n-a-hot* > *Ĵula nagnaxot* and *Šamaxi ink‘nahot*. See s.v. *ayg* ‘morning’. See further in the next sections.

gtanem ‘to find’ > Van etc. *kəndənil*.

xlink ‘snivel’ > Hamšen *xnlink*, see above on metathesis, 2.1.26.3.

2.1.28 Perseveration

Ačaryan (AčarLiak 6, 1971: 716-717) presents a number of cases with perseveration: *kanač* ‘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’ > **menk*, *mawruk* /*miruk* ‘beard’ > **mirunk*, etc.

Similarly, *Łarabał hrištrak* from *hreštak* ‘angel’ may be a mere case of *r*-epenthesis, cf. *lōštak* (a plant) > Van, *Šatax lōštrak*, *napastak* ‘hare’ > Van *lapəstrak*, *Šatax ləpəstrak*, etc. (see Ačaryan 1952: 101; M. Muradyan 1962: 64).

Probable case of perseveration: PIE **ḡb^hro-* > PArm. **amb/pro-* > *ampro-p* ‘thunder’ (q.v.). Note also *kṛunk* ‘crane’ (q.v.).

2.1.29 Perseveration or anticipation of a nasal

In H. Petrosyan 1987: 478 we find the following examples of anticipation: *akanj* ‘ear’ > Muš *anganj* (see HAB 1: 104b);

atač‘ank ‘supplication’ > Kĭzen *tanč‘ank* [Bałramyan 1961: 173b];

zok‘anč ‘wife’s mother’ > dial. (mostly western) **zonk‘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 Kĭzen: *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 Kĭzen *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. Kĭzen *angəj* and *zānk^o‘äč* (see Bałramyan 1961: 81, explicitly positing metathesis). The form **zo/ank‘ač* is widespread and is represented in Northern and Eastern dialects, as well as in Alaškert and Ararat [HAB 2: 110b]. One may assume that also Western **zonk‘anč* reflects the metathesized form **zonk‘ač* with subsequent

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 Muš; (3) **ankaj* in the rest (Suč‘ava, Nor Naxiĵewan, Polis, T‘iflis, Hamšen, Sebastia, Alaškert, Łarabał, Agulis, Marała, 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’ > Hamšen, Agulis, Ĵuła **dændum*, whereas the majority of the dialects has no epenthetic *-n-*. Since Hamšen is located in extreme NW, while Agulis and Ĵuła 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, Hamšen) *xunc* [HAB 2: 422-423].

**ccruk* ‘leech’ (cf. Aparan, Bulanəx *ccruk* from *tzruk*, due to contamination with *ccel* ‘to suck’) > Nor Bayazet *jnĵruk* (with an epenthetic *-n-*).

kamurj ‘bridge’ > **karmunj* (late attestations), which is the only form found in dialects.

karkut ‘hail’ (q.v.): Aslanbek *gargünd*. Ačarıyan (HAB 2: 556b) assumes a folk-etymological association with *gund* ‘ball’.

kēt₁ ‘point, dot’ : E and N dial. *kent* ‘odd’.

hnjan ‘wine-press’, if from **ha/ouzan*.

mec ‘big’ > **menc*.

mēj ‘middle’ > **manj*, etc.

The epenthetic nasal is also seen in recent borrowings, e.g. Turk. *suč* > Aĵtial (Pol.) *sunj* ‘sin’ (see Ačarıyan 1953: 188, 197).

For *amač‘el* ‘to be shy’ > Kĵzen *həmanč‘el* etc., see 2.1.29.

Before a labial stop

ĵpit ‘smile’, *ĵptim* ‘to smile’ (Bible+) : *ĵmtim* (Philo etc.), *ĵmb(ə)tim* (Knik‘hawatoy= “Seal of faith”, 7th cent.). Dial.: Ararat *ĵəpətel* : Moks, Salmast, T‘iflis, Alaškert **ĵmtal*, Kĵrin *ĵmnil* [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 Ĵahukyan 1967: 200) implies that the nasal in the Armenian form is original. However, the etymology is highly uncertain, and *ĵpit* is the oldest and principal form. In my view, *ĵp(i)t-* has developed to **ĵmbt-* (cf. “Knik‘hawatoy”) with nasal epenthesis, then **ĵmbt-* was simplified to **ĵmt-*.

**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/Gharagozyan, FW 2003, Łarabał).

xipilik ‘demon, nightmare’ > dial. *xmblik* ‘house spirit or goblin, brownie’ (T‘ōxBař apud Amatuni 1912: 696a).

hapalas ‘bilberry, *Vaccinium Myrtillus* L.’ (Geoponica) from Arab. *ħabb-al-ās* : Svedia *ħambālus* [HAB 3: 44-45; Ačāryan 2003: 575; Andreasyan 1967: 176, 370b; Gyozalyan 2001: 17]. See also s.v. *aletn* ‘bow’.

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’) > Łarabał *šmbālut* ‘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 Ačāryan 2003: 139. Here Ačāryan 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 on the morning after a funeral’ > Łarabał *ik‘nāvəet*, Ararat *ek‘nafštek*, Ĵula *nagnaxot*, Šamaxi *ink‘nahot*, etc.; also Łarabał *ik‘nārət* (with *arawt* ‘pasturing’); see s.v. *ayg* ‘morning’.

**ar-i-koł* ‘precipitous, sloped’ (cf. *ar-i-koł-eal* in Movsēs Xorenac‘i 1.16 vs. *z-ar-i-koł(-eal)* ‘precipitous’ in “Book of Chries” etc.) > Hamšen *arəngət* (cf. Xotorĵur **arikoł*, Muš, Van **arikoł*); 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’ (MidArm. and dialects of Cilicia, Van, Agulis, etc. Ačāryan (HAB 1: 601) assumes that Van, Salmast, Nor Bayazet *krunj* is the original form and for the sound change *nj* > *z* compares *koriz* ‘stone or hard seed of fruits’ which appears in Łarabał (*kórenj*) and the Van-group (**kolinj*) 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 Ĵula *kləz* and Agulis *kləz*. It is more probable, then, that *koriz* is the original form, and Łarabał/Van **kor/tinj* has a non-etymological epenthetic *-n-* or should be explained as follows: **koltiz* > **koltiz-n* (additional *-n-*, on which see 2.2.1.3) > **kolinj*. 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’ (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, Marala **arceli* [HAB 1: 102b].

acu ‘garden-bed’ < PIE **h₂(e)ǵ-us-ih₂-* (cf. Gr. *ἄγυια*, pl. *ἀγυιαί* f. ‘street, road’ (q.v.) > Nor Juła *arcu* (see HayLezBrbBař 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 the dialects; borrowed from Iran. **baž-*) is spelled as *baržan-* in a number of sources like Xosrovik (8th cent.) etc. The -r-, as is explicitly pointed out by Ačarıyan (HAB 1: 381b), has no etymological value.

hosem ‘to make flow, pour down, winnow’ (Bible+; dial.). From this verb a derivative in *-eli* is found in dialects designating a ‘winnowing-fan’, namely **hoseli*. A number of dialects (Muš, Bulanəx, Ararat, Łazax) have **horseli*. For the description of the object, see HayLezBrbBař 3: 2004: 308a. According to Ačarıyan (HAB 3: 315), the latter is the original form, and the -r- has dropped everywhere else. It is not clear, however, why the -r- would drop in the underlying verb without there being a single trace in the whole of classical and MidArm. literature, but be preserved in some dialectal forms in 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 like **arc-u*, **arc-eli*, **hors-eli*.

Similarly, in the Armenian dialects of Syria, ClArm. *astt* ‘star’ (q.v.) is reflected as *ust/dt*, but its diminutive suffixed as well as plural forms have an inserted -r- or -r-: Svedia *arəsdtag*, *arəstig*, K‘abusie *arastək*, pl. *aras(ə)tənnir* or *-nnəyr*, 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’ [Ačarean 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 *asterc* (or *sterč*). According to N. Simonyan (1979: 245-246), Moks **sterc* has preserved the original form, with *-r-*.

Other: Xotorjur, Sebastia **kałart*’ vs. Hamšen, Trapizon *kałat*’ ‘a big basket’ from Gr. *κάλαθος*, see Ačařean 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: **pahrež*. Compare **bahel* ‘to spade’ > Kak‘avaberd *bihrıl*, *pihrıl*. 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.vv. *arū*, *arog*).

-snC- > *-stnC-*

Nor Naxiřewan *lustnga* ‘moony night’ (< *lusn(a)kay*) vs. *lusin* ‘moon’ [HAB 2: 296a].

2.1.31 Epithetic *-t* after sibilants

ałuēs ‘fox’ (q.v.) > Karčewan *átvest* [Muradyan 1960: 188b].

ak‘is (*i*-stem) ‘weasel’ (q.v.) > Xotorjur *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 *arnēt* ‘rat’ (HAB s.v.).

šrēš ‘a kind of edible mountain-herb that produces a sticky paste’ (late and poorly attested; widespread in the 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, Marała, Ĵula [HAB 3: 545a; GwřUrmSalm 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’ < **srēš-* (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 connect the Armenian *-t* to those Iranian forms with *-t-*, although an epithetic *-t* should not be ruled out completely.

poz ‘horn’ : *Ĵuła pozd*, *Agulis puzt* [HAB 4: 93b].

hangoyc ‘knot’ > dial. **hangust* [HAB 3: 37b].

patroyc ‘inoculation, grafting’ > Hamšen *badrust*, Muš *padrust*, Svedia *badrest*, *Ĵuła patrurst* [HAB 4: 54a].

For more examples in Hamšen see Ačaryan 1947: 74. For a 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 also in modern borrowings from Russian: *fokus* > Axalk‘alak‘ *fok‘ust* (in a manuscript written by the father of Mane-Erna Širinyan), Russ. *kolbasá* ‘sausage’ > Arm. dial. *kalbast*, *rus* ‘Russian’ > *rust* (for these and some more examples, see Ačaryan 1952: 85).

2.1.32 Hiatus, glide

The glide *-h-* is found in a few dialectal and late literary forms belonging to words of native origin, cf. **ar-a-h-orm-i* vs. **ar-orm-i* ‘a log or wooden structure that supports the wall or the ceiling of a house’, *gi-h-i* vs. *gi* ‘juniper’, **e-h-al* ‘to go’, place-name *K‘ar-a-hunj* = *k‘ar* + *-a-* + *unj* ‘bottom’.

Examples from loanwords: dial. **dahek* < *dayeak* ‘nurse’ (q.v.); 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.).

Before a labial vowel we often find *-w-*, e.g. *ark‘ayut‘iwn* ‘kingdom’ > Łarabał *ark‘əvót‘un* [HAB 1: 347a], Moks *ärk‘äwut‘in*, *ark‘awot‘in* [Orbeli 2002: 99^{L21}, 124^{Nr203}], etc. Compare the development *V^whV* > *V^wwV* in e.g. *ĵul(a)hak* ‘weaver’, dial. also ‘spider; spider-web’ (from Pers. *ĵulāhak* ‘weaver’) > **ĵuhalak* (with metathesis, cf. Zeyt‘un *čhaləg*, *j‘halog*, T‘iflis, Ararat **ĵuhlak*, *Ĵuła ĵuxlak*) > **ĵuwalak*, cf. Malat‘ia *ĵuvalag*, Tigranakert *č‘üvläg*, etc.¹⁶⁸

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 *atber* ‘well’ and *aler* ‘flour’ from **atbewar(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-*. Note also *golorši*, *-ea-c* ‘vapour, steam’, if from QIE **uol-HuVrs-ieh₂-* ‘warm vapour’ (cf. Hitt. *uarša-* ‘fog, mist’, Gr. *έέρση* ‘dew’, etc.) > PArm. **wol-ə(w)oršiya-*; see s.v. *gol* ‘warmish, lukewarm; warmth’.

¹⁶⁸ Note also *zohal*, *zōhal* ‘the planet Saturn’ > *Zval Astł*, the princess of India (*Hndkastan*) in a folk-tale from Bateš (see HŽHek‘ 9, 1968: 361-375). However, *Zval* is the modernized orthographic variant of *Zual Astł* ‘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*.

Kortlandt (2003: 29-30 = 1980: 102) adduces 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*. On 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 details see s.vv. *atbewr* and *alewr*. As for *sor* ‘hole, den, cave’ (cf. Gr. *κῶρα* n. ‘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. *gìrna* 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’; **smok₁ru-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. *εἰνάτερες*, Skt. *yātar*-, Lat. pl. *ianitrīcēs*, etc. (see s.v.). See also HAB, s.vv. *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 the dialects) > Łarabał, Goris, Šamaxi *cili* (> Udi *cili*), Agulis *céli* [HAB 1: 102b; Margaryan 1971: 211]; *akanat* ‘trap’ > Łarabał *kánat* ‘net for catching birds’ [HAB 1: 109ab].

**ayg-hot-k* ‘ceremony on the morning after a 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].

katamar ‘inkpot’ from Gr. *καλαμάριον* (Paterica, Grigor Magistros, etc.) > Ĵula *łambar* (Ačařean 1940: 111, 159, 368a; T. Abgarean 1966: 94); cf. *katampar* in Karin and Axalc’xa, with an epenthetic *p* [HAB 2: 492-493], also in the Turkish-Armenian dictionary (c. 1720 AD) by Eřia Muřelyan Karnec’i [Č’ugaszyan 1986: 42^{Nr2}, 123].

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].

*č'-*erekoy* > Łarabał č'ürügü 'until evening' [Ačarean 1913: 879b], probably from *(*min*)č'-*erekoy*.

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 [K'amaleanc' 1893: 35^{L-5}, 45^{L-2}, 65^{L-5}] and žžmank'-in, the latter being rendered as ałjamułjin [Lalayan 2, 1988: 443], Meri žəməžunk' [Ałayan 1954: 299], Hadrut' iżimäženk'⁹ [Połosyan 1965: 15], etc. The -nk' forms are more frequent in folklore texts. One may derive this word from ClArm. ałjamułj 'darkness', positing a formation with -ayn-k' found with other terms for time (cf. hram-ēn-k', vałord-ayn, see HAB s.vv.): *(ał)jamułj-ayn-k' > *žamužaynk' > žəməžánk'. The more widespread by-form *žəməženk' 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 ałj-a-m-ałj (see Karst 1930: 109), with internal -a-, really exists, it may strengthen the postulation of Łarabał *žamaž-ayn-k'.

Goris čəřavand 'thick beams as part of the ceiling' [Margaryan 1975: 434a], Łarabał *čřawand 'id.' [Ačarean 1913: 734b]. I suggest a composition of a(w)čar 'ceiling' (cf. Łarabał, Lori, Moks etc. *o/ōčor-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)čar-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^hersáyi > *p'esay*, *tersaném(i) > *tesanem* : *hárs-n > *harsn*. The -r- is lost, then, 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.).

There is no loss of -r- in *ors*, o-stem 'hunt; animal for hunting' (Bible+; dial.), perhaps from PIE *iork-o- 'deer, roe' (cf. Gr. δόρκος, ζόρξ, ἰορκος, etc.; Corn. *yorch*, 'roe', Welsh *iwrch*); see s.v.

Further: -*parišt* vs. *paštem* 'to adore', from Iranian **pari-štā*- (see Meillet 1922k: 217; HAB 4: 23-24).

On Moks šəřäk'lk'⁹ 'retention of the urine' < *šř-a(r)gil-k see 2.1.39.2 (Ačaryan'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 *Ṭuarasini 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 *væxčarac* ‘shepherd’ [Xemč‘yan 2000: 35a^{L-13}], with the same kind of haplology: *oč‘xar* ‘sheep’ + *arac*.

A dialectal example is *xatot* ‘grapes’ > Hamšen *havöt* and *xatōt* vs. *xatōt-eni* > Hamšen *xatēni*, with haplological loss of *-(o)t-* [Ačar‘yan 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 final position.

Haplology may also occur when the two groups of phonemes are partially identical; cf. **orb-ew-ayri* ‘widow’ > Nor Naxijewan *ɔrfari*, *ɔfari* (older *erp‘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 speech (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 derivations of *hayr* ‘father’: *hōr-etbayr* ‘paternal uncle’: Suč‘ava *hōb‘ar*, Hamšen *hōrb‘er*, Łarabał *hōrp‘er* [HAB 3: 32b], Karčewan *hērbār* [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 haplologized form: **horak‘ur* > *hāk‘ur*.

Other examples: **orb-ew-ayri* ‘widow’ > Nor Naxijewan *ɔrfari*, *ɔfari* (older *erp‘evari*); see 2.1.34 (on haplology).

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?’ [GwrUrmSalm 1, 1897: 544].

Metri **k‘šan-* ‘early morning’, probably from **gišer-hana-*, unless very old (see s.v. *gišer* ‘night’).

2.1.36 Tabu, euphemism

As we know, some notions, in particular certain animals (such as ‘bear’, ‘wolf’, ‘snake’, ‘ant’, ‘spider’), are liable to formal or semantic distortions or to replacements for reasons of tabu.¹⁶⁹

Arm. *arj* cannot be derived from PIE **h₂rtko-* ‘bear’ (cf. Gr. *ἄρκτος*, Skt. *ṛkṣa-*, Hitt. *ḫartagga-*, etc.) through regular sound developments. The irregularity may be explained by tabu [HAB 1: 334b; Ačařyan 1971: 722]. Typologically similar phenomena of distortion of the words for e.g. ‘bear’ and ‘snake’ for tabu purposes are found in other IE languages (see Edelman 2003: 126-127). On tabu of ‘bee’ see Gauthiot 1910-11. In the case of Arm. *arj* perhaps a contamination with *arjn* ‘black’ too played a role. This is conceivable in view of the variety of designations for ‘bear’ in different languages (for some examples see Uspenskij 1978: 125; Ićiro 1989: 458; Edelman 2003: 124). This variety 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 been 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 Gabikean (1952: 224; see also HayLezBrbBař 2, 2002: 221a), Sebastia *leřan catkakox* refers to ‘wolf’. Note also dial. *arj-a-blo* ‘ghost, monster’, composed of *arj* ‘bear’ and **bolo* ‘bogy, ghost, monster’. For other examples see A. S. Petrosyan 1995: 163.

This phenomenon, however, has been misused frequently. For instance, Ačařyan (Ačařyan 1971: 722) explains the phonological irregularity of *kamurj* ‘bridge’ vs. Gr. *γέφυρα* (Boeot. *βέφυρα*, Cret. *δέφυρα*, Lac. /Hesychius/ *δίφυρα*) by tabu. It is not conceivable, however, why would a word for ‘bridge’ undergo a tabu-influence. Besides, the word can be of substratum origin (see H. Martirosyan 2007: 97-99 for more detail). Therefore one should try to corroborate the assumption on a concrete 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). For comparable data from Russian ethnography see e.g. Uspenskij 1978: 120 with lit.

In the dialect of Metri, beside the regular form *arj* ‘bear’, one finds *arj* with irregular vocalism which was used 1) by hunters; 2) by people when supposing a danger. Ałayan (1954: 85, cf. 263b) explains this irregularity through tabu and notes also *göl* from *gayl* ‘wolf’ (q.v.). One may wonder: why *o*-? Perhaps the form has been taken from the neighbouring dialect of Agulis, where *arj* regularly stands for ClArm. *arj* (see Ačařean 1935: 21; M. Zak‘aryan 2008: 335). Note, however, that in Metri and adjacent dialects the same irregularity is found also in a few other words, such as *gam* ‘to come’, *garn* ‘lamb’, *gari* ‘barley’, *mayri* ‘forest’, etc. Further see s.v. *gayl* ‘wolf’.

Also the snake often became subject for tabu (see above). Ałayan (1987: 397) records a folk-belief in the villages of Metri according to which the snake will appear if you mention its name, so people used words meaning ‘rope’ (*t’ok*, *ć’at’u*, *paran*) instead; cf. also *lar* ‘a kind of snake’ from ‘cord, rope’. In view of this, the

¹⁶⁹ On tabu in Armenian see Ĵahukyan 1992: 21.

explanation of the peculiar form of the word *awj* ‘snake’ through tabu (see Ačařyan 1971: 722) seems plausible. However, even here one has to be cautious since there is a phonological explanation: PIE **h₂ng^{wh}-i-* > PArm. **an^wgi* > **awg^hi* (with **g^h* > **g^h* regularly before **u/w*) > **awj-i-*.

See also s.vv. *mor(m)* ‘tarantula’, *mrjwn* ‘ant’.

Some words have been replaced by semantically related forms. For instance, *antanik* ‘family’ substitutes the word for ‘wife’ (see AčařLiak 2005: 11). Similarly: Van *andivor* ‘family’ > ‘wife, spouse’ [HAB 1: 186b].

I wonder if Skt. *jāyā-* f. ‘woman, wife’ (RV+) can be explained in the same way. If this word indeed belongs to *janⁱ* ‘to be born, produce’, its basic meaning might have been something like ‘race, tribe, family’ (cf. *jātá-* ‘born, birth, origin, race’, *jāmf* ‘child, family, descentance’, etc.). In this case we might be dealing with ‘tribe, family’ > ‘wife’ comparable to the development of Arm. *antanik* ‘.

As is convincingly demonstrated by Ačařyan (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 Ačařyan’s inquiry (ibid.).

2.1.37 Folk-etymology; blend or contamination

For examples and discussion of sound changes based on folk-etymological reinterpretation see AčařLiak 6, 1971: 728-733, 840; Ařayan 1984: 88-91; 1987: 269. For examples and the notion of folk-etymology in general see e.g. Krahe 1970: 91-92. In what follows I adduce a few examples from Armenian dialects.

The Arm. compound **ayg-hot-k* ‘ceremony at the next morning after the funeral’ is imposed of *ayg* ‘morning’ and *hot* ‘earth’. In Šamaxi this word is continued in two forms that are difficult to explain through regular phonetic developments: *ink’nahot* and *k’nahot*. These forms can be due to folk-etymological reinterpretation as *ink* ‘(n) ‘himself’ + *-a-* + *hot* ‘earth’ (cf. Ařayan 1984: 88) and *k’un* ‘sleep’ + *-a-* + *hot* ‘earth’, respectively; see s.v. *ayg* ‘morning’.

Arm. *andund* ‘abyss’ is represented by Łarabał *andóxtə*, which might be explained by a folk-etymological reinterpretation as **ənd oxt(n)* ‘at the seven(th) layer of the Underworld’; see s.v. *andund-k* ‘abyss’.

The compound **ayri-knik* ‘widowed woman’ (cf. Zeyt’un *erigánóg*) has become *erig-gnig* < **ayrik-knik* ‘widow’, lit. ‘husband-wife’ or ‘man(ly)-wife’ in Tigranakert; see s.v. *ayri* ‘widow’.

Arm. *šařgam* ‘turnip’ is attested in the 12th century onwards, and is widespread in dialects. The by-form *šořgam* is found in “Geoponica” (13th cent.), and in the dialects of Akn, Xarberd, Tigranakert (**šořgam*), Zeyt’un (*šuxg’ə/om*), Sebastia (*žəxbank’*) [HAB 3: 489-490]. One may wonder if the by-form *šořgam* is due to folk-etymological association with *šoř* ‘ray, shine’; cf. the following riddle from Bałeš, the village of Xult’ik (see Tarōnean 1961: 113, 164):

Gluxn i xot,
Murusn i šot

“The head - in soil, the beard - in ray, shine”.

Examples for blend or contamination can be found s.vv. *asr* ‘fleece’, *lezu* ‘tongue’, *loganam* ‘to bathe’, *meṛ* ‘honey’, *mun* ‘itch, gnat’.

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 2.1.16.2. 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: *hég⁽⁹⁾i* ‘person’, with the regular vocalic reflex, and *hók‘i* ‘soul’, a literary loan, with no vocalic shift [Ačarean 1935: 67, 69, 370; HAB 3: 108b]. More illustrative is Ĵuṭa 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* [Ačarean 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’.

Examples from Alaškert: ClArm. *əntrem* > Alaškert *həndərel* ‘to select’ vs. *əntrel* ‘to make one’s choice, vote’ [Madat‘yan 1985: 189₂]; ClArm. *azg* > Alaškert *ask* ‘relative, kinsman, kindred’ vs. *azg* ‘people, nation, nationality’ [Madat‘yan 1985: 180₁]; in both cases the latter by-forms must be recent literary loans. A similar picture is seen in Agulis, *g^vurc* ‘weaving, embroidery’ vs. *gorc* ‘work, opus, composition’ (see s.v. *gorc* ‘work, labour’). Further, see s.v. *naw* ‘boat, ship’.

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’ (Elišē, 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; ĖtimSlovIranJaz 2, 2003: 306-310].

This word is widespread in the 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 *teṽ* ‘devil, Satan’ : *deṽ* ‘monster’ [HAB 1: 658b; Ačaryan 1952: 256, cf. 57]; Maraṭa *teṽ* ‘devil, Satan’ : *deṽ* ‘mythical dragon’ [Ačarean 1926: 89, 391; HAB 1: 658b].

Of these by-forms, *teṽ* is undoubtedly the older one since it reflects the shift *d > t* regular for these dialects. The meaning of the older form *teṽ* is religious and suits the classical literary context. For an illustration compare a proverb from Moks (Orbeli 2002: 119^{Nr4(3)}): *Inč‘ teṽ* (var. *sätāna*) *xač‘ic‘ kəp‘axə^ε* : “(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 Łarabał has doublets *tēv/dēv*, although 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 to Skt. *dhárman*- n. ‘support, firm hold, fixed order, law’ (RV+) from PIIr. **d^har-* ‘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 found 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 *tärman* ‘straw’ vs. *därman* ‘remedy’ [Ačārean 1952: 255, cf. 57]; Urmia/Xoy *tärmän* ‘straw’ vs. *därman* ‘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. *dhárman* ‘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^{L11}); 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.

Morphological alternants, too, seem to display semantic differentiation. For possible examples see s.vv. *asełn* ‘needle’, *ptul* ‘fruit’, *utel* ‘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; Ałayan 1964: 227-229; 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 *-e-* (the examples are taken from the glossary in Davt'yan 1966: 299: 503):

boxi 'hornbeam' > *pöxi/e, péxi*,
bokik 'barefoot' > *pəépig^v, pépeg^v*,
bolk 'radish' > *pəɔxk/pöxk* and *pexk*,

bor 'bumble-bee, drone' > Hadrut' and Šałax *per*, next to Łarabał *pörnə, pürnə* [Davit'yan 1966: 329, 363];

also word-internally: *borbos-* 'to mould' > *pərp'éšne/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'ört(t')nuk, k'ért'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 *pe-* (next to *pö-*). This can be due to labial dissimilation.

A similar case is found with initial *o-* which regularly yields Łarabał *vəé-* or *vé-* (also word-internally, cf. *sovorem* 'to learn' > *səvəérel*). 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 Łarabał *mö-*, but one does find one instance with *mo-* > *məe-*: *mocak* 'mosquito' > *məécak*.

As to *gortn-uk* 'little frog' > *k'ért'nuk/kért'nuk*, we may be dealing with dissimilative loss of the first of two labial vowels.

For Łarabał *préšnə*, probably from **broš-* (cf. Łazax *p'róš*, Łaradał *brošni*) or *brinč'* 'snowball-tree', see 1.12.1.

This material corroborates the assumption of A. Xaç'atryan 1984: 321-322 that Łarabał *pérp'el* is the regular outcome of ClArm. *borb-* 'to inflame' rather than an archaic reflex of an otherwise unattested *e*-grade form **berb-*.

Similarly untenable is the derivation of Łarabał *kétel* and Mełri *gétil* 'to hide, conceal oneself' of an archaic **get-*; A. Xaç'atryan 1984: 321 convincingly argues that these forms rather continue *gatel* 'to hide' through Ačaryan's Law.

2.1.39.2 Ačaryan's Law in inlaut

Ačaryan's Law also operated in inlaut, cf. *arjasp* 'vitriol' : Šatax *arčäps*, Moks *arčäsp* or *arčäp's/arčäfs* vs. Alaškert *arčasp*, Muš *arčaps*, etc. (see s.v.). For more examples and some remarks concerning the relative chronology, see s.vv. *argand* 'womb', *ard* 'shape'. The law can be applied successfully in etymological research:

Moks *šəṛäkʷlkʷ* ‘задержание мочи’ (= ‘retention of the urine’); e.g. *šəṛäkʷlkʷ əʷ* ‘у него задержание мочи’ [Orbeli 2002: 302]. The first component of this word is surely *šer* ‘urine’ (Geoponica) which is widespread in the dialects [HAB 3: 510a].

There are MidArm. and dial. derivatives referring to the retention of urine: *š(e)r-kap* and *šr-at* [HAB, *ibid.*; Amatuni 1912: 147a; Ačarean 1913: 246b; Ter-Mkrtčʷyan 1970: 150₁₁; MijHayBaṛ 2, 1992: 214a], with *kap-* ‘to tie, bind’ and **(h)at-* ‘to cut’ respectively. It is conceivable that our *šəṛäkʷlkʷ* 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-* (Ačarıyan’s Law). This brings us to ClArm. *argel-* ‘to forbid, obstacle, hinder, etc.’, cf. Ozim *argʷilil* etc. (see s.v.). Thus, Moks *šəṛäkʷlkʷ* ‘retention of 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

According to Ačarıyan (AčarıLiak 6, 1971: 283, 336), in both Classical and Modern Armenian, the vocative is sometimes accented on the first syllable, cf. *háyrık* ‘father’, *máyrık* ‘mother’, *Kárapet*, *Lázar(ē)*, *Pétr-ē/Pétros*, etc. Traces of initial accentuation of vocative forms have been preserved in Armenian manuscripts [Torbiörnsson 1945; Weitenberg 2001: 65₁]. The vocative frequently appears with the accented interjection particle *óv* (medieval and dial. *áy*). In this case the word itself loses the accent, e.g. *óv (áy) mard* ‘you man!’, *áy tša* ‘you boy!’, etc. (see Marr 1903: 57; AčarıLiak 6, 1971: 283). A few examples are found in the Armenian rendering of the grammar of Dionysius Thrax: *ó Hamuni*, *ó Mani*, *ó Nuni* [Adoncʷ 1915=2008: 246].

Armenian dialects provide rich evidence for vocative forms accented on the first syllable. Note e.g. Hamšen voc. *háyrı* ‘father’, *máyrı* ‘mother’, cf. *yéba*, *yéma* [Ačarıyan 1947: 175]. Also in the dialect of Tʷiflis the accent is put on the first syllable when a word consists of two or more syllables, and monosyllables take an accented particle *á*, e.g. *áxper* ‘brother’, *vúrtʷı* ‘son’, *á šun* ‘dog’, etc. (Tomson 1890: 190).

Here are some more examples from folklore texts: in Pʷiloyeancʷ 1888 (Nor Bayazet): *hársē* (21^{L1}, 22^{L-6}, 23^{L9}); *Hóromsim* (25^{L4}, 26^{L7}); *Máyrán* (31^{L5}); *Márgarıt* (34^{L-4}), *Bátdasar*, *tʷágävur* (Moks, see SasCr 1, 1936: 315^{L263f}), etc. The same is observable even when we are dealing with lexicalized expressions or formulae, such as *tnákolner* ‘you whose house may be destroyed!’ (Pʷiloyeancʷ 1888: 23^{L11}), or word combinations, *túrban harse* ‘you, dear sister-in-law (to whom may I be sacrificed)’ (Pʷiloyeancʷ 1888: 21^{L1}).

When used with a vocative particle, the noun loses the accent. In some dialects this can also be seen in the vocalic difference, cf. Łarabał vocative *á-kʷer* vs. nominative *kʷur* from ClArm. *kʷoyr* ‘sister’ (see HAB 4: 587a). Note also the auslaut reduction in e.g. *á may* < *mayr* ‘mother’ (see HŽHekʷ 6, 1973: 409^{L3,22}, 522^{L7,8}). In

dialects which have penultimate accentuation, the last vowel of a disyllabic word may drop, cf. Tavuš vocative *á vǝ́rt* vs. *vǝ́rt'i* from ClArm. *ordi* 'sun or daughter, offspring', see Xemč'yan 2000: 59b^{L17f}, 62a^{L22}, 130a^{L21} (here note a vocative *vǝ́rt'i* in a few lines above, 130a^{L4}, without the particle *á* and for this reason with the final *i* preserved).

The vocative with initial accentuation may be regarded as Indo-European inheritance (see Jahukyan 1959: 151-152; Ałabekyan 1998: 123-124). In Vedic Sanskrit, the vocative, when accented, has the acute on the first syllable, e.g. *pítar* vs. NSg *pitā́* (see Whitney 1960: 108-109; Macdonell 1993: 457; Szemerényi 1996: 189; Burrow 2001: 235). The same is found in Greek: *ἄδελφε* 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). For further discussion see Shields 1982: 53-524. 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.

Apart from accentuation and particles, in Middle Armenian and especially in dialects the vocative can be formed with endings such as *-i*, *-e*, *-ə*, *-a*.

A typologically interesting way of forming vocatives is found in the Armenian dialects of Syria. Here the vocative of *taygr* 'husband's brother' (Svedia *dak'r*, K'esab *tāgār*) is a compound with *ayr* 'man': Svedia *dāk'rāre*, K'esab *tēgrēriv* [Ačariyan 2003: 589; Andreasyan 1967: 55, 277, 384b; Č'olak'ean 1986: 218b; Gyozalyan 2001: 144]. Note also Svedia **ner-tikin* and **tal-tikin*, vocative forms of *nēr* 'husband's brother's wife' and *tal* 'husband's sister' respectively, both containing *tikin* 'mistress, lady'.

2.2.1.2 Nominative *-s

A clear relic of an old nominative **-s* is seen in *anic* 'nit, louse egg' < QIE **s(k)onid-s* vs. Gr. *κονίς* < **koniδ-ς*. Further note **kalc'* vs. *kat'n* 'milk', and *hec'* 'felloe', if from **pelk'-s* (see s.vv.). Another possible example is dial. (Urmia, Salmast) *urj* 'an island or peninsula in a river', if 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 *athues-*. 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*.

For further possible examples see s.vv. *at* 'salt', *hac* 'bread', *mic* 'mud, dirt'.

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 Metri **kalc'*. 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 as the original form, so we are dealing with loss of final *-n* in the 7th century.

2.2.1.4 Genitive

PIE GSg**-osyo-*: Skt. *-asya*, Gr. *-oio*, *-ov*, Arm. *-oy*, etc. see Meillet 1900a: 17; Lehmann 1981; Beekes 1990-92; Eska/Wallace 2001. For *-oĵ* see Meillet 1900a: 18-19; see also below on locative.

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 ĽarabaĽ.

Locative in *-i* in ĽarabaĽ

händ-i ‘in pasture-land’: *Vart* ‘in <...> ešəm a, tæsnum 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 Ačarıyan’s Law).

əra/üz-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/üz-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 ĽarabaĽ, 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 ĽarabaĽ LocSg. *(y)*eraz-i* is identical with ClArm. LocSg. *y-eraz-i* ‘in a dream’ (frequent in the Bible) should be taken seriously.

ĽarabaĽ has a locative adverb meaning ‘yesterday’ from ClArm. *erək*, *-i* ‘yesterday’ : *erek(oy)* ‘evening’ (< PIE **h₁reg^wos*), in the following variants: *ərek/g-i* and *yərək/g^y-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 ĽarabaĽ. 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].

Discussion

The Łarabał and adjacent dialects normally have a penultimate accent. Nevertheless, they display locative forms with both ultimate and penultimate accentuation, cf. *yarké* and *hərné* vs. *yerégi* and *héru* and Agulis *hárv* (see s.vv. *erēk* ‘yesterday’, *heru* ‘last year’).

It is tempting to assume that the Armenian locative-adverbial marker *-i* goes back to the PIE locative marker **-i* which probably was accented, cf. PIE LocSg **ped-í* ‘foot’: Skt. *pad-í*, Gr. dat. *ποδ-ί*, etc. (Rix 1992: 43, 149, 154; Szemerényi 1996: 164ff). The *-i* escaped the apocope because it preserved the accent (or obtained a secondary accent) in order to retain its morphological role (unless we posit a thematization of the locative, **h₁reg^w-i-jo-* > **ereki-yo* > **ereki*, cf. *ayg* ‘morning’, etc., see below). As to the alternating forms with accented and unaccented *-i*, compare the three types of locative singular in Sanskrit, illustrated by the alternative forms of locative of the word for ‘eye’: *akṣán*, *akṣáni*, *akṣñi*, the third one being the latest (see Burrow 2001: 234).

Traces of the PIE locative **-i* may be seen in some time-words which can be interpreted as frozen locatives, see s.vv. **atj-* ‘darkness, twilight’, *ayg* ‘morning’, *ere/ik(-)* ‘evening’ and *erēk* ‘yesterday’. Note also EArm. dial. **heru-i* vs. *heru* < PIE **peruti* ‘last year’ (q.v.).

2.2.1.6 Instrumental

Arm. instrumental ending *-w / -(m)b* derives from PIE **-b^hi*, cf. IPI (Skt. *-bhis*, Av. *-biš*, Opers. *-biš*), DAbIPI (Skt. *-bhyas*, Av. *-byō*); Homeric Greek attests *-φι-* as a marker of the ablative, instrumental and locative in both singular and plural markers; cf. also Lat. DAbIPI *-bus*, OIr. DPl *-b*, etc. (for the forms and discussion see Meillet 1950: 120-123; K. Schmidt 1980: 46-47, 50; Shields 1982: 50-52; Beekes 1995: 115-116, 117-118). According to Shields (1982: 51), **-b^h(i)* is also to be found in Toch. A additive particle *-pi*.

The instrumental forms may be relevant for etymological and morphological discussion, cf. e.g. Arm. *har-b* from **ph₂t₂-b^hi-* (see s.v. *hayr* ‘father’).

-av : -ək’ in Łarabał

Ačarjan (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’ > *xrrável*, *kov* ‘cow’ > *kav*, etc.

The plural has *-ək’/-uk’*. For instance: ClArm. *us* ‘shoulder’ : Łarabał IPI *əs-uk’* : *min xurjin əsuk’ə k’əc’ac* [HŽHek’ 5, 1966: 398^{L2}]; *xurjinə* <...> *əsük’ə k’c’-* (ibid. 109^{L14}, 111^{L3}). The same expression is found in the singular: *xurjinə* <...> *əsavə 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 identical 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. *jer-k’*, IPI *jer-a-w-k’* ‘*jer-ō-k’* ‘hand’ : Łarabał IPI *cəerok’* (see e.g. HŽHek’ 6, 1973: 466^{L12}).

Unlike the numerous petrified adjectives of the type *xelok’* ‘clever, intelligent’, *arok’-p’arok’* ‘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^{L-4}, 402^{L5}]. Of these adjectives, *xelōk‘* and *p‘arōk‘* reflect the ClArm. IPI forms in *-aw-k‘ = -ōk‘* of *xel-k‘* and *p‘ar-k‘*, both *a*-stems. The others are analogical.

Also other dialects display frozen instrumentals, e.g. T‘iflis *k‘ar-ōk‘* ‘with stones’, *maz-ōk‘* ‘with hair(s)’ (see Tēr-Alek‘sandrecan 1885: 189^{L-6} and 190^{L1}, respectively).

2.2.1.7 Accusative pl. -s

The Classical Armenian accusative plural ending *-s* has been lexicalized in many dialects. For instance, *kriw-s*, API of *kriw* ‘fight’, appears in Ararat, Łarabał, Łazax etc. *kriws tal* ‘to struggle’, literally ‘to give fights’ (see Ačařean 1913: 613a). Textual illustrations are found e.g. in a fairy-tale from Sisian, in Zangezur (HŽHek‘ 6, 1973: 236^{L-11}), and, in Ł. Ałayan 1979: 615^{L12}. For a discussion, see s.v.v. *mawru-k‘* ‘beard’, *mēj‘* ‘middle’.

For examples of frozen API ending *-s* in toponyms see 4.8.

2.2.2 Paradigmatic solutions for a phonological or morphological irregularity

2.2.2.1 *s-stem neuters

For a discussion of *s*-stem neuters which are mostly continued as Arm. *o*-stems see Meillet 1936: 74; Olsen 1999: 44-48; ; Matzinger 2005: 31-52; Meissner 2006: 55; see also s.vv. *get* ‘river’, *erek* ‘evening’, *hay* ‘Armenian’, *Hay-k‘* ‘Armenia’, *jer* ‘warmth’.

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. *véφος* n. ‘cloud’, OCS *nebo* ‘sky’, etc. The Armenian old nominative **neb-* (< **néb^hos*) was replaced by *amp* after the genitive **amp-* from **nb^hés-s*. The possible influence of *amprop* ‘thunder’ (< **mb^hró-* : Skt. *abhrá-* n. ‘thunder-cloud’, etc.) must also be taken into account. See s.vv. *amp* and *amprop*.

ayt ‘cheek’ : Gr. *oĩδος* etc. (see s.v.). The Armenian old nominative **oĩt-* (> **ēi*) from **h₂óid-os* was replaced by the oblique stem **aĩt-* (from NSg GSg. **h₂id-és-os*); see also 2.1.5.

bark ‘lightning’ (q.v.), if related with Skt. *bhārgas-* n. ‘radiance, splendour, light’ (RV+), would have had an old nominative **berk* from **b^hérg^(w)-os*. It became *bark* analogically after the oblique **b^hrg^(w)-és-* > **bark-*.

sut, *o*-stem ‘false; falsehood, lie’ (Bible+; dial.) : Gr. *ψεῦδος* n. ‘lie’, also *ψύδος*. NSg **pséudos*, GSg **psud-és-os*; see s.v.

2.2.2.2 Other *s-stems

See the discussion s.vv. *hot* ‘smell, odour’, *jet* ‘tail’, *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 to (1) **anuwn* : **anwan* > ClArm. *anun* : *anuan*, with generalization of *-w-; (2) **anumn* : **anman* > *anum*, with generalization of *-m-. See s.v. *anun* ‘name’.

For a possible example of a HD *n*-stem consider Arm. *deł* ‘herb’ and *θαλλός* m. ‘green twig, sprout’ (see s.v.).

2.2.2.4 PIE HD *i*-stem

Arm. *tal* (*i*-stem according to NHB, 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) rather than *u*-stem (cf. Gr. γάλωσ, OCS *zъlvъna*, etc.), the following paradigm may be reconstructed: NSg **ǵlH-ōi* > **táləu* > **talw*, oblique **ǵlH-i-* > **tal(i-)*. See s.v. *tal*.

For a discussion and other examples see s.vv. *arew* ‘sun’ and especially *giwt* ‘village’. Further, see s.vv. *gol* ‘warmish, lukewarm’ vs. *gatj* ‘id.’; *k’arb* ‘a snake’.

2.2.2.5 **l*-stems

See s.vv. *asetn* ‘needle’, *joł* ‘log, bar’, *ptul* ‘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 **pontH-* in Skr. *pánthās* 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. *rañhā-* 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* (dial. also **hort*) ‘calf; fawn’, the aspirated -t’- of which needs an explanation. One may reconstruct a PArm. HD **-h₂*-stem paradigm (whether original or secondary) in the same way as we have seen above: NSg **pórt-eh₂*, GSg **pnt-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.vv. *ordi* and *ort*’.

Arm. *c’ax* ‘branch’ (Geoponica etc.; widespread in the dialects) vs. Skt. *śákhā-* f. (RV+) ‘branch, twig’ etc. In some Armenian dialects (Łarabał, 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.vv. *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 the 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. *metk*, *i*-stem according to NHB 'soft' (q.v.).

yatt 'wide, broad spacious (land, space, territory); mighty' (5th cent.), *yatt* '-*k-u* 'victorious, mighty' (Philo+), also spelled *yatt* '-*u* (e.g., in Grigor Maškuori, 12th cent.). While *y-alt* (q.v.) can be derived from PIE **plth₂-ú-* (cf. Skt. *prthú-* etc.), *y-alt* '-*u* must have had one syllable more and can theoretically go back to PIE fem. **plth₂-u-ih₂-* (Skt. *prthvī*, Av. *pərəθβī-*). 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 Ĵahukyan 1987: 241).

For other possible examples see s.vv. *yolov* 'many' and *yoyr* 'fat'.

2.2.4 Numerals

For an extensive study on numerals see AčarLiak 1, 1952: 131-453. For individual treatments of the Armenian numerals see s.v. *mi*, *erku*, *erek*, *č'ork*, *hing*, *vec*, *eawt'n*, *u*, *inn*, *tasn*, *k'san*, *k'arasun*, *yisun*. See also Kortlandt 1994a (= 2003: 98-101, with a small addition).

'11' etc. are formed as follows: *me-tasan* 'eleven' < **tasan-i*, cf. Lat. *ūn-decim* < **ūn-decimi* [Meillet 1916b: 63-64], etc. For a complete list of the Armenian numerals including also '11' to '19' as well as the decimals and ordinals see Meillet 1936: 99-101; Schmitt 1981: 128-132; Beekes 1995: 214. For lists and discussion see also Szemerényi 1960; Saradževa 1986: 89-91. For surveys on the PIE system see Beekes 1995: 212-217; Szemerényi 1996: 221-229; C. Justus apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 397-405.

2.2.4.1 Stability and replacements

For the PIE sources of Armenian numerals see Kortlandt 1994a (= 2003: 98-101, with a small addition). The numbers from '11' are formed as follows: *me-tasan* 'eleven' < **tasan-i*, cf. Lat. *ūn-decim* < **ūn-decimi* [Meillet 1916b: 63-64], etc. For a complete list of the Armenian numerals including also '11' to '19' as well as the decimals and ordinals see Meillet 1936: 99-101; Schmitt 1981: 128-132; Beekes 1995: 214.

In general, the native numerals are stable in dialects. In some of them, however, numerals like '70' etc., as well as the ordinals are replaced by Turkish or Arabic 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'örsagã* < *č'ors-akan* 'four by four', *ergergü* < *erk-erku* 'two by two', etc. [Ačařean 1898: 83-84, 85b^{L-5} and note 1; Vaux 2001: 43, 51, 62₄₃].

In Van, *vat'sun* '60' is followed by Turkish loans, *yet'miš* '70', *sähysän* '80' and *döxsan* '90' [Ačařyan 1952: 26, 147]. For an illustration of the juxtaposition of native *vat'sun* '60' and the loan *et'miš* '70' in Alaškert folklore see HŽHek '9, 1968: 154 (three times: in lines 4-5, 5, -3). '.

In the dialect of Aramo, the numerals '70', '80', '90', as well as the ordinals, are Arabic [Łaribyan 1958: 10, 34]. This also seems to be the case in K'abusie, since the numerals for '70', '80', and '90' are absent from the list (see op. cit. 99).

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". This is considered as taken from the Caucasian system [Ačařean 1913: 307a]. A similar system is found in e.g. Moks (see Orbeli 2002: 22; M. Muradyan 1982: 113, 181).

2.2.4.2 Collective numerals

ClArm. *erkok'in*, *erkok'ean* 'both' (Bible+) has been preserved in Łarabał *arkók'an*, *ε/urkók'an*, Mełri *arkók'en* (see s.v. *erku* 'two'). ClArm. *erek'in*, *erek'ean* 'all three' (Bible+) has been preserved in Łarabał *érék'an*, *irék'an* and Karčewan *irik'én*, but in other parts of Mełri region one finds forms with *-k'k'* or *-k'k-*: Mełri *irik'k'én*, Kak'avaberd *irék'kan* (see s.v. *erek'* 'three'). The other forms are: *č'orek'in* or *č'orek'ean* 'all four' > Łarabał *č'urk'ek'an* vs. *č'ursek'an* and *č'urek'an*; *hngek'in* or *hngek'ean* 'all five' > *hängek'an* (emphatic *hngék'k'an*), *vec'ek'in* or *vec'ek'ean* 'all the six' > *vəc'ek'an*, etc. [Davt'yan 1966: 126]; Mełri *č'ark'ek'én*, *hing'ek'én* or *hängek'én*, *vəc'c'ek'én*, etc. [Ałayan 1954: 179-180]; Kak'avaberd *č'érék'kan*, *hingék'kan*, *vi/ec'ek'kan*, etc. [H. Muradyan 1967: 127-128]. See also AčařLiak 1, 1952: 325-326.

One might treat the gemination in Mełri *irik'k'én* and Kak'avaberd *irék'kan* (for *erek'ean*) as emphatic. More probably, however, they go back to analogical **erek'-k'ean* (that is, *erek'* > *irék'* 'three' + *-k'ean*) after *arkók'en* which is analysed as *ark-* (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 Mełri *č'ark'ek'én* and Kak'avaberd *č'ák'ék'kan*.

The analogy has functioned differently in Karčewan. Here we find *yarkén*, *irik'én*, *č'ák'én*, *hingén*, etc. [H. Muradyan 1960: 110]. These forms can hardly reflect different formations since: (1) there is no alternative way to satisfactorily explain Karčewan *yarkén*; (2) Karčewan is dialectally and geographically very close, actually almost identical with Kak'avaberd and Mełri, so that one hardly expects a significant variety with respect such archaic grammatical features; (3) Karčewan *irik'én* exactly corresponds to ClArm. *erek'ean* (or *-in*); (4) the paradigm of *yarkén*, namely gen. *yarkunc'ú* etc. (see H. Muradyan 1960: 110) clearly continues that of Classical Armenian: *erkok'in*, *erkoc'un*, etc.

One must therefore start from Karčewan *irik'én* < ClArm. *erek'ean*. Apparently, this form has been analysed as *erek'* 'three' (> Karčewan *irik'én* 'id.') + *-ean* or *-in*.

Then, *erkok'ean* has been replaced by analogical *yarkén*, as if composed of *erku* 'two' (> Karčewan *yórku* '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 *arkuk'an-ɔc'* etc. (see Davt'yan 1966: 127), with analogical *-c' > -k'* after the nominative, whereas in the Mełri-region the *-c'* has been preserved (see AčarLiak 1, 1952: 325-326). Note further Karčewan gen. *yarkunc'ú*, etc. [H. Muradyan 1960: 110]. For Mełri, Ałayan (1954: 180) records by-forms with *-k'* and *-c'*: *arkɔc'un* and *arkɔk'en-u*. Kak'avaberd has analogical *irék'-c'-un* etc. [H. Muradyan 1967: 128].

Sometimes *erkok'ean* is replaced by *juxek'yan* [AčarLiak 1, 1952: 326], obviously with *juxt* 'pair' of Iranian origin, cf. Pahl. *juxt*, Pers. *juft* 'pair, couple'.

2.2.5 Pronouns

For the paradigms and discussion on the Armenian pronouns see Meillet 1913: 59-67; 1936: 86-92; AčarLiak 2, 1954; Godel 1975: 107-112; A. A. Abrahamyan 1976: 75-93; Schmitt 1981: 115-127; Ĵahukyan 1982: 140-150; Kortlandt 2003: 52-53. For surveys on the PIE system see Beekes 1995: 201-211; Szemerényi 1996: 203-221; Adams apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 454-458.

Further see s.vv. personal pronouns *es* 'I', *du* 'you', *mek'* 'we', demonstratives **s(a/o)-*, **d(a/o)-*, **n(a/o)-*, reflexive *iwr* 'his own etc.', reciprocal *irear* 'each other', interrogative *i-* 'thing', *o-r* 'which' and *o-v* 'who'. For a number of issues see s.v. *ur* 'where, where to' (interrog.), 'wherever'.

2.2.6 Verbs

For extensive treatments of the origin and development of the Armenian verbal system see AčarLiak 4a, 1959; 4b, 1961; Łaragyulyan 1961; Godel 1965; Ant'osyan 1975; Klingenschmitt 1982; Kortlandt 1996 = 2003: 110-116. The rest can be found in following sections and under the relevant lexical entries.

2.2.6.1 *-je-presents

For these formations see Meillet 1936: 107-108; 1950: 109-110; Ĵahukyan 1982: 171; cf. e.g. **j(i)nje-* 'to efface, annihilate, destroy' < **g^{wh}en-je/o-*: Gr. *θείνω* 'to kill', etc. (q.v.). See further s.vv. *goč'em* 'to call', *koč'em* 'to call', as well as *y-orj-orj-em* 'to call'; all are synonymous verbs with *o*-grade and **je*-present.

koškočem < **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. *βαίνω* 'to go' and Lat. *veniō* 'to come; to go' from **ǵ^{wh}n-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 Presents with a nasal element

For nasal presents, see e.g. s.vv. *ar̄nem* ‘to make’, *dnem* ‘to put’. Further see s.vv. *ampem* ‘to drink’, *lsem* ‘to hear’, *yhp’anam* ‘to be filled to repletion, be overfilled, be satiate, luxuriate’. For the type *-anem* going back to PIE nasal-infixed presents see s.vv. *bekanem* ‘to break’, *lk’anem* ‘to leave’. An interesting case is *har-k-anem* vs. aor. *har-i* ‘to strike’, of uncertain origin. A group of *-anem* verbs derive from sigmatic aorist (see below). The *sk*-present or inchoative is reflected in e.g. *harc’anem* ‘to question’ and *čanač’em* (aor. *can-*) ‘to know, be acquainted’ (see s.vv.).

For **nu*-presents, see Klingenschmitt 1982: 246-259; see also s.vv. *ar̄num* ‘to gain, obtain, win, plunder, take, grasp’, *zgenum* ‘to put on clothes’, *li : lnum* ‘to fill’, *jer̄num* ‘to be/become warm, burn’.

In the dialect of Agulis, the verbs of the 2nd class, that is those with a suffix *-ánim* (*-ánim*) in present, form their aorist and imperative without the nasal element: *-áham* (*-áham*) and *-áhi* (*-áhi*), respectively (see Ačaryan 1935: 245-249). The *-h-* is perhaps a glide.

2.2.6.3 Sigmatic aorist

Traces of PIE sigmatic aorist may be found in a number of Armenian verbs such as *anicanem* ‘to curse’, *luc’anem* ‘to light, kindle, set on fire’, *xacanem* ‘to bite’, *hecanim* ‘to mount, ride’, *meřanim* ‘to die’, *teřem* ‘to flay’, *c’ncam* ‘to rejoice’, etc. (see s.vv.). For a discussion, see Pedersen 1906: 423ff = 1982: 201ff; Frisk 1944: 30 = 1966: 278; Godel 1965; Ĵahukyan 1982: 74, especially 180; Olsen 1984: 114₉; Kortlandt 1987a; 1995 = 2003: 79-82, 107-109; Ravnæs 1991: 169₁.

2.2.6.4 Denominative and iterative verbs **-o-* + **-eie-*

The pattern of denominative verbs is reflected in e.g. PIE **uosn-eie-* ‘to buy, sell’: Gr. *ὀνέομαι* and Skt. *vasnayāti*, from **uesno-* ‘price’: Skt. *vasná-*, Lat. *vēnum*, Arm. *gin* ‘price’, cf. also **uog^h-eie-* from **uog^ho-* ‘carrying’ (see Beekes 1995: 229-230; Szemerényi 1996: 300). For a discussion and other examples, see Klingenschmitt 1982: 141-143. Note also *y-arag-em* ‘to expose to the sun’ (= Gr. *ἐξ-ηλιάζω* in 2 Kings 21.6, 9, 13) probably from **h₂rou-eie-* < **h₂reu-i-*, see s.v. *areg-* ‘sun’.

For iteratives note *gorcem* ‘to work’, *k’orem* ‘to scratch’ (see Meillet 1936: 105; Klingenschmitt 1982: 142).

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-

**luc-ali* [if *lucati* is a corruption] ‘yoke; beam of balance; the constellation Orion=Hayk’ = *luc* ‘yoke; the constellation Libra’ + *-ali-*, perhaps from fem. **lih₂*- (cf. Lat. *iugula* f. ‘a part of the constellation Orion’); note also *luc-l-il-k* ‘a pair of cerebral veins’ (Oskip’orik); see s.vv. *luc* ‘yoke’ and *luca[t]li* ‘Orion’. For *sayl*, another asterism with **lih₂*-, see next.

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 *σάπιλλα*: *πλειὰς τὸ ἄστρον* (perhaps of Thracian origin), next to Gr. *σατίμη* f. ‘chariot’. Probably from Mediterranean/Pontic substratum **kati-lih₂*-.

tam-al(i) ‘building; roof’ from QIE **dmh₁-li(h₂)-* (see s.v.).

targ-al ‘spoon’ from QIE **ty₂-l-i-*, cf. Hitt. ^{GIS}*taru-āli*- n. ‘pestle’ (see s.v.).

As we can see, the suffix *-al(-i)-* is found especially in designations for implements and constructions. In this respect it is particularly interesting to note Anatolian implement names in *-ala-* c. and especially *-a/āli-* n. seen in Hitt. ^{GIS}*hulāli-* n. ‘distaff’ and the above-mentioned ^{GIS}*taru-āli-* n. ‘pestle’ (see Starke 1990: 300-343).

Further, see s.v. *am-l-ik* ‘one-year-old child or lamb’.

-(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 *eleanmn* = **eti-amn* ‘hoar-frost’ (q.v.), *pašt-awn*, *-aman* ‘service’, etc. He further (op. cit. 139-140, 142, 146_i) also mentions the animal-names *t’ož-iwn* ‘(bear-)cub’, *kor-iwn* ‘cub’, *mrjiwn/-imn* ‘ant’. Other animal-names: *ayceamn* ‘roe-buck’ (see Clackson (1994: 89; Jahukyan 1998: 9, noting that the origin of the suffix is unclear.); 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’, *jełun*, GDSg *jełuan* ‘ceiling’, *srun-k*, GDPI *sruan-c* ‘(vs. *sru/ōn-i-c* etc.) ‘shin, shank’, etc. (see s.vv.) are derived from **anuwn*, **jełuwn*, **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 *jełun*, note ISg *jełmamb* (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. *πελέε-α*, Ion. *-η* ‘elm’, Lat. *tilia* ‘linden’; note also Georg. *t^helamušī* ‘elm’ (see s.vv.).

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’et-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-r-oš* ‘big-bellied’ (a deverbative adjective) and *brd-oš* ‘medley’ (a deverbative noun). All of these three words are, however, dialectal and may also represent *-awš* (= *-oš*).

Further possible examples:

brinč ‘snowball, Viburnum opulus’ (poorly attested; dial.) : Łazax and Łaradat **brōš* or **brōš*.¹⁷⁰

kokr-oš vs. *kokor* ‘water-lily; currant’ (late; dial. of Łarak‘ilisa) [HAB 2: 618b];

kokan ‘blackthorn’, only in *kokan-eni*, attested in “Bžškaran”; present in some dialects [HAB 2: 617b]; Ararat, Lori *tōtn-oš* ‘a kind of black round plum, *hapalasi* [‘bilberry, Vaccinium Myrtillus L.’], found in the Northern parts of Armenia’ (see HayLezBrbBař 3, 2004: 355a) probably belongs here;

p’otoš ‘muraena, moray eel’ (Step‘anos Leħac‘i), if from *p’ot* ‘pipe’ (see s.v. *angłayk*‘).

An interesting example seems to be the Iranian word for ‘violet’: Pahl. *wanařřag*, Pers. *bunařřa* ‘violet’ [MacKenzie 1971: 86], Zoroastrian *vanařřa*, Arabic-Persian *banarřař*, *manarřař* [Bailey 1985: 29], Kurd. *banarř* [Cabolov 1, 2001: 115]; Iranian borrowings: Turk. *menekře* > Arm. dial. *menek’ře* [Ačarean 1902: 233], Turk. *menerře* (cf. Arm. *manōřřay* in Amirdovlat‘ etc.), Syriac *mānīřkā*, etc.; Arm. *manuřřak* < **manawřřak* < MPers. **manarřak* (Agat‘angelos+, dial. widespread) vs. *maniřřak* (Nersēs Lambronac‘i+; dialects of Muř, Alařkert, Ararat, Agulis, Łarabał, 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. *řov* [< **řiov*], DPl *řaři* [řa] n. ‘violet’, *řia* (= *řia*) *řvřh* (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*, Mlr. **vagr* (cf. Arm. *vagr*, Georg. *vigri*) vs. Skt. *vyāghra-* ‘tiger’. We might be dealing with a Mediterranean-Iranian/Near-Eastern flower-name, as in the case of Gr. *řódov* < **řpódov*, Aeol. *řpódov* 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. **-arř* can be regarded as a suffix of substratum origin comparable with Arm. *-awř* in *t’et-awř* etc.

¹⁷⁰ Ačaryan (HAB 1: 490b) notes the resemblance with Assyr. *burāřu*, Hebr. *b^erōř*, Aram. *brūtā* (on these forms see s.v. *barti* ‘poplar’). However, he leaves the etymology open since the Semitic words mean ‘cypress’; see 1.12.1.

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. *πτελέ-α* 'elm' and Lat. *tilia* 'linden'.

-awt

Next to *kar-awt*, Ĵahukyan (1990: 74) mentions *ar-aw-awt* 'morning' and *ct-awt* 'straw', and points out that the attempts to interpret *-awt* as IE are not convincing, although IE origin of the roots is conceivable.

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 yōdeal*).

The same *-arawt* occurs in another synonym: *hamarawt* 'brief' (Bible+), also an *i*-stem; cf. *hamarōt-i-w-k* in Eusebius of Caesarea, etc.

According to Ačarĳan (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 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 Hexaemeron 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 tied to the horns of an animal (NHB 2: 405c). The word is widespread in the dialects, in the meaning 'motley thread tied around 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 tied around the neck of a child when being baptized.

Ačarĳan (HAB 3: 431b) mentions Ozim *narenĳ* 'dyed thread' s.v. *narinĳ* 'orange' and questions whether it belongs there (i.e. to *narinĳ* 'orange'; cf. Moks *narənĳə* 'оранжевый (цвет)', Orbeli 2002: 297). In fact, the word 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* (?) [Ĵahukyan 1987: 536; Olsen 1999: 896]. The element *-awt*, however, 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. *raktá-* '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 Derviřyan, who interprets the word as **n-arak-t*, comparing the second component with Skt. *raktá-* (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. *yatt* ‘broad’; other examples: see 2.1.18. In body-part terms: see s.vv. *bl-it* ‘a roundish soft bread’; *boyt*, *boyt’n* ‘thumb’, **boyt* ‘a soft lump of flesh, lobe’; *kř-t-un-k* ‘back’ vs. *kuřn* ‘back’. Compare Skt. *pr̥śthá-* n. ‘back, mountain-ridge, top’ (RV+) from PIE **pr̥sth₂-*, cf. YAv. *paršta-* m. ‘back, spine, support in the back’, *paršti* ‘back’, Lith. *pirštas* ‘finger’, OCS *prěstъ* ‘finger’, etc., vs. Skt. *pr̥śtī-* f. ‘rib’ (RV+).

For the morphology compare Skt. *rátha-* 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 Ačařean 1913: 200a), if related to the PIE word for ‘beech-tree’, cf. OHG *buohha*, etc., see Ĵahukyan 1972: 317, with reservation because of the vocalism and the *-k-* in rural Łarabał *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 *kałam-ax* ‘aspen’ (alongside Hesychian *καλαμίν-δαρ*, etc.) with the ending of numerous Greek tree-names probably of Mediterranean origin, such as *σμίλαξ* ‘Taxus’ etc. Here are some other possible examples from Armenian.

tawsax ‘box-tree, Buxus sempervirens’ (Bible+), according to Ařxarhač’oyc’, a species of the Northern Armenian province of Gugark’; preserved in the dialect of Hamřen: *dəsxı*, *dəsxəni* (see 1.6).¹⁷¹

met-ex, *o*-stem, *i*-stem ‘the handle of an axe’ (Deuteronomy 19.5, Ephrem, “Naxadrut‘iwk” Ecclesiastes), if related with Gr. *μελία* ‘manna ash, Fraxinus ornus; ashen spear’ (see s.v.).

From these examples one gets the impression that the vowel before *x* agrees with the vocalism of the root: *met-ex* vs. *kałam-ax* and *taws-ax*. **bo/u(k)xi* may be explained through **buk-(u)x-i* > **bu(k)xi*. Note that the tree-suffix *-i* is accented even in dialects with penultimate accent, such as Łarabał. See also s.v. **třk’i** ‘maple’.

Since *kałam-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*: *kałamax-i*, *tawsax-i*.

¹⁷¹ Somehow related with Hurr. *tařkar-* ‘box-tree’: **tak^hsar-* + *-(a)x?*

-k – diminutive > plant-suffix

From the examples for the determinative *-k* in H. Suk‘iasyan 1986: 90, the following are reliable: *bot-k* ‘radish’ (q.v.) and *jatk* ‘branch’ (q.v.).

Alongside *hačar cař* or *hačar-a-cař* ‘beech-tree’, one finds *hačar-uk* as the designation for ‘beech-nut’ in Agat‘angelos § 644 (1909=1984: 330^{l.8}). Łarabał, 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-iķ*: Gr. *μυρ-ίκ-η* ‘tamarisk’.

-kn

For examples see Ĵahukyan 1987: 238. For a discussion see s.vv. *armukn* ‘elbow’ and *unkn* ‘ear’.

Kortlandt (1985b: 9-10 = 2003: 57-58) offers a different explanation for *akn* ‘eye’, *jukn* ‘fish’, *mu-kn* ‘mouse’ (q.v.), see 2.1.19.

-j/z in animal and 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 words designating animals.

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.vv.); *kuz* ‘cat; marten’ (< Iran. – Sem.); etc. Cf. also Latv. *luōss* ‘weasel’, Russ. *łaska* ‘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 **-āčá-* (see de Vaan 2000) and probably related **-āj^há-* found in Ilr. **uarāj^há-* ‘wild boar’ (> Finno-Volgian **oraše* ‘(castrated) boar’; cf. Arm. *varaz*, Iranian loan) which are thought to be of substratum origin (see Mallory 1982: 211; Rédei 1986: 54; Lubotsky 2001: 303, 304, 307, 309, and espec. 312). The latter contains a **-j^há-* comparable Arm.-IAr. **siŋ^ho-*: Skt. *siṃhá-* ‘lion’, *inj* ‘panther’. Note also **h₁el-k̂-*: Gr. *ἄλκη* ‘elk’, Skt. *ṛśa-* m. ‘male antelope’ (AV), etc.

Other possible examples:

xl-ēz ‘lizard’ (MidArm.), dial. also ‘snail’; cf. *xłunjn* ‘snail’, Ařtial *xəxanč* ‘crayfish’ (see Ačarıyan 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.

moł-ēz ‘lizard’ (Bible+; widespread in the 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 *mołoz* (see 1.4).

Ačarġyan (HAB 3: 342) compares the word with Pers. *mālūs* or *mālōs* ‘green lizard’. I wonder if there is a relation with ORuss. *smolžb* ‘snail’, Byel. *смоўжк* ‘snail’, Polab. *mouz* ‘snail’, Chech *mlž* ‘shellfish’, Pol. *małz* ‘id.’ (see Fasmer 3: 690). On the semantic correlation ‘lizard’ : ‘snail’, see above on *xlēz* ‘lizard’ and ‘snail’; cf. also Arm. *xrñjayl* ‘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/ul-*, respectively. This may be corroborated by Kartvel. **mxul-* ‘lizard’: Georg. *mxuliv-* ‘lizard’, Laz *mtxola(r)-*, *xolura-*, Megr. *xolar-*, etc. (see Klimov 1964: 144; 1998: 134).

Remarkably, Aparan and Surmalu *mołoz-r-ik* ‘lizard’, and especially Trapizon and Hamšen **moł-or-ik* ‘a small poisonless snake’ (see HAB 3: 342b; Ačarġyan 1947: 263), with a suffixal *-r-*, are reminiscent of the Kartvelian forms like Laz **m(t)xolar-*. Note also the MidArm. hapax *martis* ‘a kind of reptile’ [Amatuni 1912: 469b], for 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* (with metathesis).

It is also interesting that Arm. *xlēz* has forms with initial *m-*: *məglēz*, *mgəldrez*, *mrxlēz*. One might assume contamination with synonymous *mołēz* and/or contamination with *mukn* ‘mouse’. This is possible, but I would not exclude the possibility that this *m-* is somehow related to the Kartvelian *m-*. At any rate, the correlation of *xlēz* and *mlēz* and Kartvel. **mxul-*, whether original or contaminative, seems very plausible. For the suffix, compare further Van, Šatax **deł-ez* ‘bumble-bee’, if from *deł-* ‘yellow’.

y-

It has often been stated that PIE initial **p-* and **s-* sometimes irregularly yield *y-* instead of *h-* (see AčarġLiak 6, 1971: 519; Ałayan 1964: 162-164; 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^wēkōmth₂* > *yisun* ‘fifty’; **ph₂t-ēr* > *hayr* ‘father’ : *yawray* ‘stepfather’; etc. Greppin (1983b) discusses this conflicting evidence within the context of a reverse development, namely ClArm. *yV-* > ModArm. and dial. *hV-*, and explains the forms with *y-* as hypercorrections. He also (ibid.) adduces *yalt'em* ‘to overcome, subdue’ (q.v.).

Admitting the alternative development **p-* and **s-* > *y-* (alongside 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 vines’ (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.

Next to ClArm. *hiwsem* ‘to weave, plait’ (q.v.), there is a later and poorly attested variant in *y-*: *yus-*, *yōs-* (Ephrem, Paterica). This is taken by Winter (1966: 202-204) to be 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*.

Postulating a 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 **penk^wēkōmth₂* ‘fifty’: Gr. *πεντή-κοντα*, Lat. *quīnquāgintā*, Skt. *pañcā-śāt-* f., etc.) is usually explained as **hingisun* [Meillet 1936: 40, 101; cf. Szemerényi 1977: 19, 19₆₃] > **hingsun* > **hi(n)sun*, with common loss of nasal before *-s-* [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* : **hiŋisun* > **(h)i(ŋ)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 s.v. *yorjorjem* ‘to name, call’.

As is noted by Lidén (1906: 76), numerous words meaning ‘many, abundant, plenty, fat, etc.’ contain the prefix/preposition *y-*. Lidén mentions *y-ač-ax*, *y-olov*, *y-oyž*, and *y-ogn* (see s.vv.). More examples can be found s.v. *y-ur-t’i*.

In the dialects

Bearing in mind that the Classical *y-* yields voiced *h-* (*h’*) in Šatax whereas it disappears in Van (see Ačařyan 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 AčařHLPTm 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 reconstruct an old parallel form with an additional *y-* if the initial *a-* of a Classical word corresponds to Šatax *h’ä-*, Van *ä-* 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). For a further discussion on this and related issues, see Weitenberg 2008.

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 into 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 ((spring-)water, 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, 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.vv.

For further examples, see s.vv. *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.vv. 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 *spanđ*, *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’ [HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 55a], *anaburd dił* ‘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 some formations in *-ti*, with a voiceless unaspirated *-t-*. ClArm. *lk-ti* ‘licentious’ seems to derive from verbal *lk-n-im* ‘to be/become licentious’ (on which, see HAB 2: 289-290, in separate entries). This may help to etymologize some other words. For instance, *ang-ti* ‘prostitute’ (John Chrysostom) probably

derives from *ank/ganim* ‘to fall down; to sin, prostitute’ (q.v.). In “Bargirk‘ hayoc“ (Amalyan 1975: 252^{Nr186}) one finds *špti*, glossed by *lkti* ‘licentious’. This form is hardly a corruption for *h̄pit* (as has been assumed by Ačařyan, HAB 3: 129a, who also cites *šptil* in Philo). It may rather be regarded as a *ti*-derivation of *šp‘-anam* ‘to boast’ (John Chrysostom), dial. ‘to become spoilt, mischievous’ (on which, see HAB 3: 546a).

dial. (Xian) *an-lr-ti* ‘garrulous, chattering, talkative’; Ačařyan (1913: 100a) writes: “it seems composed of the privative *an-* and the verb *lr̄el* ‘to be silent’”. He does not specify *-ti*, which is clearly a deverbative suffix here. Thus, *an-lr-ti* basically means ‘who does not become silent’.

Urmia, Salmast *anlr̄ti* ‘insatiable (for eating and drinking)’ [GwrUrmSalm 1, 1897: 545] is probably composed of privative *an-*, *l(i)r-* ‘full’ and the suffix *-ti*.

c‘-

c‘ (prep.) ‘to, up to’; lexicalized in e.g. *c‘-ayg* ‘night’ < ‘*to morning’, *c‘-erek* ‘day’ < ‘*to evening’. Further, see s.vv. *c‘ank/g* ‘hedge, fence; list, table of contents’, *c‘nor-k* ‘fancy, day-dream; bad dream, apparition, boggy’.

Connected with Skt. *ácchā* (adv.) ‘to, towards’ (see Hübschmann 1897: 499 with lit.; Matzinger 2005: 132; Mayrhofer EWAia 1, 1992: 50 with lit.). Ačařyan (HAB 4: 446a; see also Ĵahukyan 1987: 245) links Arm. *c‘-* with Lat. *ad* ‘to, towards, near by, at, before, up to, until’ etc., assuming **ad-sk-*. Olsen (1999: 811) derives *c‘-* from **potj-*, which is untenable. One expects **oč‘-* from **potj-*.

The best solution is to directly connect Arm. *c‘-* with Skt. *ácchā* (adv.) ‘to, towards’ < PIIran. **a-sčā*, probably from PIE **h₁esk^(w)eh₁*, especially Lubotsky 2001a: 41-42. As has been pointed out by Lubotsky (ibid.), “the initial **e-* has disappeared in Armenian, due to the proclitic nature of the word, cf. *əst* ‘after’ < **post*, *ənd* ‘to’ < **anti*, etc.”.

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.vv. *koškočem* ‘to beat, break’, *yoldoldem* ‘to shake, move, cause to totter, waver’, *y-orj-orj-em* ‘to call’.

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 Hittito-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*; although in some cases we have no reduplicated formations in cognate languages, one still has to reckon with the fact that they are of IE origin; see e.g. s.v. *helel* ‘flood’; further, note e.g. *kokov-* ‘to boast’ vs. Skt. intensive *jóguve* ‘to call, announce’ from *gav-* ‘to call, invoke, praise’ (see s.v.); (3) words like *xaxank‘*, *m̄m̄ram*, *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 their

onomatopoeic nature; (4) Greppin himself accepts *kokord* ‘throat’ and *siserñ* ‘chickpea’; (5) there are only a couple of examples where we may be dealing with Hittite loans, and all of these represent full reduplication only (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* ‘laughter’, cf. also s.v. *šišat* ‘demon’) and *Ca-CuC (see below) are of IE origin.

In Classical Armenian, **intensive reduplication** occurs not only to form new words, but also merely as a repetition, or in distributive function, or to express the meaning ‘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’, kołmanc’ kołmanc’, p’ori p’ori, zašxarhi ašxarhi, acin žotovec’in i k’atak’n Naxčawan, zi and ēr zōražotov 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 ὥσει ἡμέραι θερισμοῦ πυρῶν*. As is clear from the collation of the passage, the Armenian phrase is not a Greek calque. Ačarjan (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, a/u, 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 Łarabał it has been replaced by *hōvhōvel* (HAB), a reduplication of **hov* or **huv*, unless one assumes 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.

For a remarkable type *a/u*-reduplication see s.vv. *ałjamułj* ‘darkness, twilight’, *karkut* ‘hail’, *mamul* ‘press’, *mamuř* ‘moss’. Note also *kerakur* ‘food’ (see s.v. *ker-* ‘to eat’). All these words are of IE origin.

3. 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 of the Mediterranean-Pontic substratum lexicon, which mainly comprises animal and plant names, 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 with a thousand holes/eyes’, see Puhvel 1991. This is reminiscent of Axalk‘alak‘ **astucoy matə* ‘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)?” [Ačařean 1913: 141b].

This equation is also found in a widespread type of Armenian riddles where the starry sky is portrayed as a sieve (see S. Harut‘yunyan 1965: 8-11). Compare ‘a thousand eyes’ in variants from Lori (10a^{Nr70}) and Axalc‘xa (11b^{Nr79}), in the latter referring to the Milky Way.¹⁷² A Partizak riddle on *astner* ‘stars’ reads [Tēr-Yakobean 1960: 389^{L1}]: *Mer tan vray mał mə hawkit* : “A sieve of eggs above our house”. In a riddle from Moks (Karčkana Nanəkanc‘) told by Armařan Martirosyan [Haykuni 1906: 350^{L10}], *astler* ‘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. *‘Αρκτοῦρος* ‘the star Arcturus, Bearward’ in Job 9.9) vs. Gr. *σατίνη* f. ‘chariot’, *σατίλλα· πλειὰς 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.).

¹⁷² Note that Axalc‘xa is geographically and dialectally very close to Axalk‘alak‘.

Hayk ‘Orion’ (see Ališan 1910: 130ff; B. Arak‘elyan 1941), dial. *Xek*‘ (on which, see below, on Pleiades); cf. also Van *xek‘er* ‘starry sky’ [HayLezBrbBař 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 astronyms. 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 thus being 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 to doves-Pleiades.

Van *Xeyk*‘ is also attested in a late medieval folk-song (Šērenc‘, VanSaz 1, 1885: 52; see also Abelyan 1940: 14). In a footnote, Šērenc‘ (ibid.) describes *Xeyk*‘ as follows: “A group of stars that is seen from in the East much before dawn”.

As is well known, one of the seven stars of Pleiades is barely visible, so in many cultures their canonic number is six, unlike the 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’ < **bazulaká-*, Skt. *bahú-* ‘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; MijHayBař 1, 1987: 108b; Amatuni 1912: 80b]. Cf. also Moks *pāzūnk*‘y [Ačāryan 1952: 249], Šatax *pāzunk*^o [M. Muradyan 1962: 193a], Svedia *pāzānk*‘ (*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*‘ or based on the “pure” **bazu-* ?). The above-mentioned **bazuk*‘, however, 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*‘ (pl. marker).

Thus, **bazuk* ‘Pleiades’ (< ‘many’) is an old dialectal word preserved in Van *pāzük* (next to *pāzūmk*‘ < *bazum-k*‘) [Ačāryan 1952: 43, 99, 105, 249], Meři *bézuk* [Ałayan 1954: 25, 264], Łarabał *pāzuk*, *pézuk* [Davt‘yan 1966: 323], Šamšadin/

Diliġan *pāzük* [Mežunc' 1989: 185a], Borč'alu (Lori) *bazuk* [Amatuni 1912: 80b], as well as in Hamšen **bazuk* (see Y. Muradean 1901: 80).

To my knowledge, no Iranian forms (neither with a suffix *m*, nor with *k*) meaning 'Pleiades' have been mentioned in connection with the Armenian forms. The forth asterism of the Sogdian Lunar Zodiac may be *Strβ'zk*, interpreted by Bogoljubov (1987: 9-10) as reflecting **Star-Bāzuka-*, the second component of which, namely *bāzu-* 'hand', corresponds to the Indian equivalent asterism: *Bāhu-* (cf. Monier-Williams 1899: 730b: 'the constellation Ārdrā', by lexicographers). If this is true, Arm. **bazuk* 'Pleiades' (< 'many') is etymologically different. I cannot determine whether confusion has taken place here. At any rate, however, there seems to be a correlation; cf. Skt. *bahulá-* '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* 'Pleiades' (see below). [The resemblance of *boyl(k)* with Skt. *bahulá-* and *bāhula-* seems to be accidental]. Numerous other parallels can be found in various languages (see Scherer 1953: 141f; Pârvulescu 1988: 103f; Puhvel 1991; etc.).

Next to *boyl-k* 'Pleiades' (from *boyl*, *i*-stem 'group' < **b^heuH-l-i-*, cf. Skt. *bhūri-* 'much, abundant, numerous', OAv. *būiri-* 'abundant'), Malat'ia has *p'ork* < **boyr-k*, probably borrowed from Miran. **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* 'Pleiades' as containing the zero-grade form of *y-olov* 'many' (< **polh₁us*, cf. Gr. *πολύς* 'many'), namely **plh₁u-* (cf. Skt. *purú-*, 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)got : In "Yalags ampoc' ew nšanic" by Anania Širakac'i, 7th cent. (A. G. Abrahamyan 1944: 307^{L11f}): *Astetk' en oroc' xarñakeal čanaparhk' linin gnac'ic' ; or anuaneal koč'i[n] yardgot* : "There are piles of stars that stretch as a road and is called *yardgot*" (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 s.v. *atawni* 'dove' for the syncope). See also below, on the dialect of Xotorġur.

In "Yalags kendantesakac" by the same author (see A. G. Abrahamyan 1944: 326^{L14f}), in API: *yardagots - zhet astuacoc'n* : "the trace of gods".

In another passage, Anania Širakac‘i (A. G. Abrahamyan 1944: 321^{L7f}) mentions *yardgot* ‘Milky Way’ in an enumeration of atmospheric visual phenomena.

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 trail of the Straw-Thief’, explicitly interpreting it by the myth on the god Vahagn, the ancestor of the Armenians (*naxni Hayoc‘*), who steals straw from Baršam, the ancestor of the Assyrians (cf. also ModArm. transl. Abrahamyan/Petrosyan 1979: 95-96; for the passage with English translation see Russell 1987: 170).

For other attestations of *Yardgot* see Ališan 1910: 126-130.

Xotorĵur **erdgot* 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‘ HBB 2: 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 *erdgot*-s arose/appeared, let us cover the straw” [otherwise they will steal the straw]. [YušamXotorĵ 1964: 444b]. Then (op. cit. 447b), Hačean introduces another entry: *erdgot* ‘Milky Way’. I conclude that these two entries must be combined in the following way: *erdgot* (pl. *erdgotni*) denotes the Milky Way and is associated with the straw-stealing wind. See also below on Łarabał **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 Širakac‘i (7th cent.) was native of Širak which is close to Xotorĵur both dialectally and geographically, one may regard **Yard(-a)-got* as a potential case of an areal restriction recorded in the 7th century. Both Anania Širakac‘i and the dialect of Xotorĵur 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). Note also Alaškert *Sanamər yerd* [Nždehean 1902: 271]. For other designations of Milky Way comprising *sanamayr* ‘the mother of a baptized child for the godfather and godmother’ see below. See also s.v. *hecanoc* ‘winnowing fan’, ‘Milky Way’.

In the eastern dialects, namely Ararat, Lori [Amatuni 1912: 162a; Ačarean 1913: 270a] and Łarabał [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 Łarabał is *Termanuköli čənapar* “the road/way of the Straw-Thief” or *Termani həli* “the road/way of straw” [Lisic‘yan 1981: 66b]; according to Džejanov (1898: 91), *tarmānu-koli čənapar* in Čajkend-Getašen.

Łarabał *Termankyöt* : **Darmangot* occurs e.g. in an Ascension folk-song (“jāngyulum”) from Łarabał (probably Šuši) [Grigoryan-Spandaryan 1971: 219, Nr 1348]:

Kyetə k‘əšəm a Termankyötin,
Ast‘xerin šoxkn a catkin c‘otin,

Lüsnəngyän el ašk a tiräl

Lüs čəkatis vəeske p'otin.

The river drives the *Darmangoł*,
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, *Darmangoł* refers here to Milky Way; the river drives down the reflection of the Milky Way.

In Varanda (a region of Łarabał), *Darmanagoł* 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-Thief’ with ‘straw-stealing wind’ see above on Xotorjur.

On corresponding beliefs particularly in connection with the testimony from Eznik Kołbac'i (5th cent.) see Garamanlean 1931: 515a; Abelyan 1941: 18, 23-25, 30-31; B. Ařak'elyan 1951: 80. For the comparison with Pers. *kāh kašān* and some discussion see Russell 1987: 170, 174.

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 Łarabał 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; Mxit'areanc' 1901: 181^{L-13f}; Nždehean 1902: 271; 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-Gharagyozyan, FW 2003) are mostly connected with the idea of stealing, cf., apart from the above mentioned *Yard(a)goł* and *Darmanagoł* ‘Straw-Thief’, also *Derman hti* ‘Straw-way’, as well as a number of designations comprising *sanamayr* ‘the mother of a baptized child for the godfather and godmother’: *Sanamər čanba* (‘way’), *Sanamər yerd* (‘straw’), *Sanamər k'aš* (‘track’), etc.

On the other hand, the mouse is often considered to be ‘a stealer’, note e.g. a proverb from Nor Naxijewan (see P'ork'sheyanyan 1971: 111b^{L-11f}). 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 vocalism. Still, there are other examples confirming the association of the mouse with stealing, see Emeneau 1993: 199¹⁷³. One may therefore assume that “Vahagn

¹⁷³ Compare also perhaps 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; this is uncertain, however.

the Straw-Thief” was a chthonic deity somehow associated with the mouse, like Apollo *Σμινθεύς* (from *σμίνθος* ‘mouse’) and Mars Sminthianus (for which see Toporov 1977a: 55; Toporov 1977b: 48-49; Gindin 1977: 107-108_{22a}, 112), and the Milky Way has originally been considered “the way of Vahagn the Mouse / the Straw-Thief”. This reconstruction may receive some support from Russ. *мышьяна тропка* (*myšina trópka*) ‘Milky Way’, literally: “the Way of the Mouse”, dial. *Myšiny 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. Nevertheless, we do find some possible indirect evidence, which would corroborate the hypothesis.

A riddle from Daralagyaz-Keč‘ut, recorded by S. Harut‘yunyan (1965: 8b^{Nr61}), reads:

ժը ցնա՛,
մուկը մնա՛
The day passed,
the mouse stayed.

The answer of the riddle is: *ASTLER* ‘stars’. S. Harut‘yunyan (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 hypothetically assume that this riddle possibly betrays an otherwise lost denotation (or idea) of the Milky Way as “the Way of the Mouse / the Straw-Thief”.

This putative interpretation of the Armenian *Vahagn the Dragonslayer-Thundercloud* as a kind of Apollo *Σμινθεύς* receives some support from the well-known association of the mouse with thunder and its role in the ‘Thunder-myth’ (see Toporov 1977a: 52-57 with literature and discussion). For the association of Apollo *Smintheus* with Armenian Vahagn = St. Karapet, and on the giant mouse of Nemrud in the Muš plain (where Vahagn/Karapet was venerated) see A. Petrosyan 2002: 140-141.

In the Armenian folklore one finds possible traces of the association of the mouse with thunder. In Alek‘sandrapol (Leninakan, nowadays Gyumri), when it thundered, the children touch walls with their backs and said (K‘ajberuni 1902: 83^{Nr1}):

Ամբը ցո՛րա՛,
Մուկը ճ՛րրա՛,
Մայրամ չա՛տ՛ուն
Դ՛ախձը նստա՛ւ
The cloud cried,
the mouse squeaked,
Mariam-Lady
sat on the wooden bed.

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 from which the scales are suspended’ (Bible+), ‘the constellation Libra’ (Zak‘aria Kat‘olikos, 9th cent.), ‘pair’ (Geoponica); Muš/Bulanəx *luc-k*‘ is a constellation consisting of eight stars, each of them representing an actor in 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 or of a carriage; beam of a balance; the constellation Libra’ are cognate with 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’, Marala **k‘ar-kširk*‘ ‘id.’ [Ačařean 1913: 582b, 1104a]. According to S. Movsisyan (1972: 55b), Bulanəx *Kšerk*‘ 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 evidence from Anania Širakac‘i’s “Yalags kendantesakac“ (“On zodiacal constellations”), which states that the constellation *Kšir* consists of three stars (see A. G. Abrahamyan 1944: 332^{L8}) and is thus, in fact, identical with the girdle of Orion. In another chapter (323^{L12f}), Arm. *Kšir* is presented as equivalent to Gr. *ziwgaws/ziwgos* (cf. ζυγός ‘yoke; beam of the balance; the constellation Libra’) and Pers. *t[a]razuk*, on which, see below. On **šamp‘ur-kširk*‘ also 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.’ [Ačařean 1913: 820b; HAB 3: 492b]. For the association between *Hayk* [= Orion], *Kšir*, and *Šamp‘ur*, see also “Bařirq hayoc“: Amalyan 1975: 178^{Nr108}, 270^{Nr144}; Ališan 1910: 133-137.

Sasun *Šahink* ‘Libra’ [Petoyan 1965: 340]; on the appellative *šähink* ‘balance, scales’, see Petoyan 1954: 148; 1965: 509.

Conclusion

Different designations follow 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, namely ‘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 Nebrovť 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 from 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=Nebrovť 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}).¹⁷⁴

As we have seen, the ancestor of the Armenians, Hayk, the skillful archer (*atēnawor*), 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 is commonly associated with the number three because the three bright stars in Orion’s Belt are easily seen even with the full moon nearby. For corresponding designations, as well as for the relation of Orion with Sirius compare e.g. the Maya traditions (see Milbrath 1999: 39a). Orion’s dog is identified with Sirius, the Dog-Star (see Scherer 1953: 109-116), Arm. *Šn-ast’* (lit. ‘dog-star’), attested in Anania Širakac’i as the first asterism in the list of eighteen stars or constellations which indicate *zanjrewac’ sastkut’iwn* ‘abundance of rains’ (A. G. Abrahamyan 1944: 331^{L1f}). On Orion’s Belt and the Dog-Star see also Ališan 1910: 132-133, 137-138. On Hayk/Orion : Pleiades : Dog-

¹⁷⁴ At the Workshop in Michaelbeuern, Austria (July 2007), Satenik Gharagozyan and myself presented a joint paper on this subject.

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; see also s.v.v. *hay* and *Hayk* and place-name.

We have also seen that the girdle of Orion (the Three-Star) was often named ‘beam of a balance’. In view of this, one may assume that the Persian theonym and asterism *Tūr*, 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 *tūr-andāz* ‘archer’. Note the Indo-Iranian term for the Orion’s girdle seen in the designation of Sirius **tištriija-* < **tri-str-ijo-* ‘belonging to the Three Stars’: YAv. *tištriiaēniō*, *-aēniias-catištriia-* ‘Sirius-Stars’ [Hoffmann/Forssman 1996: 127], *Tištriia-* m. name of Sirius, worshipped as a god, Pahl. *Tištar* ‘Sirius’, considered as confused with *Tūr* ‘the planet Mercury’, cf. also Pers. *tūr* ‘arrow’ [MacKenzie 1971: 83; Nyberg 1974: 193b], Skt. *tiṣyā-* (*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 **Tištriija-* involving *tig-ri-* ‘arrow’ etc., see Scherer 1953: 113 with ref.). I putatively conclude that Pers. *tūr-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 *Arāḡawor-a-c* (*arāḡ-awor* ‘going in front, forerunner’) belongs to the movable feast-cycle at 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 Geḡec‘ik) and his dog, which always preceded the saint and was therefore called **arāḡ-awor* ‘forerunner’, played an essential role in the traditional background of this fasting, the latter having been determined to honour the dog **arāḡawor* which was killed by wolves [HAB 1: 252-253; Čanikean 1895: 471; Matikean 1930: 153-170; Ļap‘anc‘yan 1945: 61-68; A. Petrosyan 2001: 158].

Diachronically, the fasting *Arāḡ-awor-a-c* of the movable calendar seems to be somehow related with the fixed feast *tearḡ-and-arāḡ* (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 variant names of the feast are *Terəndez* [Amatuni 1912: 625a; Davt‘yan 1966 (Č‘aylu)] or **Terntas* [Ačaḡean 1913: 1025-1026] (found in numerous dialects); Ararat, Muš *drndez* [Amatuni 1912: 172]; Ļarabaḡ *Dərdōra(n)č* [Davit‘yan 1966: 482] or *Dəndōrōnḡ* [Lisic‘yan 1981: 70b], Goris *Dərdaranč* [Lisic‘yan 1969: 262-263], etc. [Bdoyan 1972: 445_{a68}]. For an extensive description for Sebastia see Gabikean 1952: 528. NHB (2: 862b) presents *Tērəntas* as a dialectal equivalent to *Tearḡ-and-arāḡ* and *Tēr-and-ays*, the latter being a re-interpretation as ‘Lord with this’ (see also HAB 4: 402b). Note Hačən *Deyəndez* ‘New Year’ vs. Zeyt‘un *deyindäs* ‘Candlemas’ [HAB 4: 402b; Ačaḡyan 2003: 95, 340].

In the same dialect of Hačən, the term for ‘Candlemas’ is substituted by *šved*, which goes back to *šuoṭ* ‘February, the month of freedom from devils; the demon of February’ [HAB 3: 537-538].

Kesaria **kučuk* ‘a spirit personifying February’, in the village of Karmir – ‘the feast of *Teaṛnəndaṛaṅ* (February 13/14)’ [Ačaṛean 1913: 604a; Hoy 1898]. Ačaṛyan (ibidem) separately mentions Partizak **kučuk* ‘short, with broken handle’ (said of a spoon). Ant‘osyan (1961: 262) takes these two together: *güjüg* ‘a spoon without a handle; February; the little finger’.

The feast *Teaṛnəndaṛaṅ/Tēṛəntas* ‘Candlemas’ is especially characterized, apart from the display of candles, by a bonfire. The young people (including the barren women, e.g., in Goris) jumped over it, young couples walked round the fire, and the girls and women singed the hems of their 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. *šuoṭ* ‘demon’ : ‘February’ etc.) and immediately followed by the resurrection of the sun and nature and the establishing of the ‘cosmic order’.

In both the 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 somewhere between the 3rd and 2nd millennia when the point of vernal equinox was located near 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 summary of the above.

1) The feast *Teaṛnəndaṛaṅ* ‘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 *Aṛaṅawor-a-c* (*aṛaṅ-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 preceding the saint and was therefore called **aṛaṅ-awor* ‘forerunner’. The fasting has been established for commemoration of the dog which was killed by wolves. The dog is a prominent character in this cycle, in association with *aralēz-k* and the like (cf. the well-known motifs of *Aray Geṭec‘ik*, *Artawazd*, *Zangi-Zrang*, 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 Lanalanyan 1969: 254-255), was associated with the dog.

3) The month February with *Tearnəndaraj* '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, *Devendez* < **Terənt/das/z* 'Candlemas' has shifted its meaning to 'New Year' (hardly due to influence by *dayi* < *tari* 'year'), and the meaning 'Candlemas' is represented by *šved*, which goes back to *šuo* 'February, the month of freedom from devils; the demon of February'.

For the contrast with wolves see above under 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 to the ploughmen.

4) In a deeper perspective, **Tearnəndaraj* 'Candlemas' can be interpreted as '(the feast of) the Archer Hayk/Orion = Iran. **Tištiriia-*' in association with Pleiades, marking the vernal equinox and, subsequently, the New Year, and Sirius, Orion's dog. Iranian *Tištiriia-* conquered the demon of drought and released the waters. Similarly, the skillful archer Hayk, the ancestor and eponym of the Armenians, kills Bēl/Nebrov't and (indirectly) gives rise to the underground sources of the river *Mehraget*, lit. 'honey-river' (see S. Harut'yunyan 2000: 226, 230, espec. 232; A. Petrosyan 2003: 203-204). The names of both *Tištiriia-* and Hayk are related with the asterism 'Orion's belt': 'Three-Star'. Note also Arm. *Šn-ast* 'Sirius', lit. 'dog-star', the first in Širakac'i's list of the asterisms which indicate "abundance of rains".

5) Arm. dial. **Terənt/das/z* 'Candlemas' can hardly be explained as a corrupted or re-interpreted form of *Tearnəndaraj*. The connection with the theonym *Tir* proposed by Durean (1933: 46; accepted by P. Xaç'atryan 1990: 81-82) is more plausible. One may treat **Terənt/das/z* as reflecting (or influenced by) Pers. *tīr-andāz* 'archer' and testifying by this the unattested theonymical/astrol aspect of the latter, comparable to the divine/astrol archer Hayk/Orion/*Tištiriia-* (see under point 4 above). 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

Of names comprising native Armenian components most important are those of Venus, first of all *Gišer-a-var*, lit. 'Night-leader' (Bible+, see NHB 1: 555a), with *gišer* 'night' (q.v.), compare the etymologically related forms: Gr. *ἕσπερος* m. 'evening; evening-star, Venus', Lat. *vesper* 'evening; evening-star'.

In a homily by Zak'aria Kat'olikos (9th cent.) we find *Etjeru* 'Deer, stag' as the name of a planet, presumably the Venus (NHB 1: 657a; cf. HAB 1: 339a; 4: 126b; see also Ališan 1910: 121-123; Ałayan 1986: 79-80; A. Petrosyan 2002: 61₂₂₁); further, see G. Muradyan 2006: 1-2.

In a tale written by H. T'umanyan (5, 1994: 89^{L1f}, var. 611^{L-1}) entitled 'Ełjerun = The stag', *Ełjeru-Lusastł* 'Venus, Morning Star' appears at dawn.

I propose to treat this asterism as 'the star of the wild animal, Tierstern', cf. Early German *tierstern* 'Evening Star' from *tier* 'wild animal', Lith. *žvėrinė* 'Evening Star' from *žvėris* 'wild animal' (Scherer 1953: 83-84). Note also Slavic designations of the types 'star of the wild animal' and 'star of the wolf' (Karpenko 1981: 80). Since the deer is usually associated with 'wolf' and with the general notion of 'wild animal' (see 3.5.2.3; cf. also Engl. *deer* vs. Germ. *Tier* 'animal, beast'), one may link Arm. *Ełjeru* and those German and Balto-Slavic designations of the planet Venus as reflecting the same general pattern: 'Tierstern'.

For the association of the planet Venus with the Venus-like goddess note *Astł-ik* < 'little star'; further see e.g. Lisic'yan 1969: 143. For the cult of the deer and see Mnac'akanyan 1977; Deweĵyan 1982; for its association with the star and cross see Mnac'akanyan 1977: 18-20, 35.

Another interesting asterism with IE and non-IE semantic parallels is dial. **hōtal-astł* 'Evening Star', see s.v. **hawt-at* 'shepherd'.

Dialects mostly display compounds of the type e.g. Sasun *Lus-astł* [Petoyan 1965: 340, 478], Bulanəx *Lusu-asył* [S. Movsisyan 1972: 55b]. Note also **Bari lusoy astł*: Arčak *Pari lusu astł* '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 Abeĵyan 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).

Most of the planet-names are loanwords or calques (see Eilers 1976 passim; G. Muradyan 2006). These are beyond the scope of my work. Here I will limit myself to *Aprayoyz* 'the planet Saturn', found in K'ajuni [HAB 1: 243; L. Hovhannisyan 1990: 220]. Though comprising Iranian components, this compound is an Armenian creation. It is composed as **apr* < Pahl. *abr* 'cloud', Pers. *abr* 'cloud' (see MacKenzie 1971: 4) from PIE **ǵb^hro-* (see s.v. *amprop* 'thunder') + *-a-* + *yoyz* 'to move, stir', lit. 'cloud-mover, rain-bringer' [HAB 1: 243; L. Hovhannisyan 1990: 220]. This is corroborated by Ařak'el Siwnec'i (14-15th cent.) who describes Saturn, *Zawhal astł*, as *amp-a-(y)holov* (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 "Yałags ampoc' ew nřanac'" by Anania řirakac'i, 7th cent. (A. G. Abrahamyan 1944: 305-309). Note also *hołm-a-yoyz-k'*, with *hołm* 'wind' as the first member (Hexaameron); *anjrew-a-yoyz*, with *anjrew* 'rain' as the first member, in Hexaameron (see K. Muradyan 1984: 195^{L20}) and Movsēs Xorenac'i 3.68 (1913=1991: 365^{L1}; transl. Thomson 1978: 354): *amařn 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”.

3.1.6 Celestial Purple Sea and Otherworld

Criticizing heathen notions about the world structure, Anania Širakac‘i (7th cent.) writes (A. Abrahamyan 1940: 15^{L1f}): *Zcovē asen xelagareal p‘ilisop‘ayk‘n het‘anosac‘, t‘ē pat areal zerkrav, ew i miji 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 recorded by Movsēs Xorenac‘i (1.31); see Abelean 1, 1955: 34; Saradževa 1976: 192. See the passage s.v. *erkn* ‘labour pains, pang (of childbirth); fear, grief, sorrow’.

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 Gełark‘unik‘ (Ř. 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 ...” (Ř. 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*)” [Ř. 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 (Lori) *aren cov*, *arin cov* (on this and on Purple Sea in general, see Abeghian 1899: 77; S. Harut‘yunyan 1965: 11-12, 223-224; 2000: 80-83; A. Petrosyan 2002: 13-14). In geographically unspecified 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 (Ř. Grigoryan 1970: 352^{Nr752}), *Lusunka k‘eri* “Uncle Lusunka” says he is coming *Abrahamu covu veren* “from over the sea of Abraham”. Compare *ariün köl* “Blood Lake” in a similar riddle from Akn (Čanikean 1895: 188).

In an incantation prayer against the evil eye entitled *gir č‘ar ač‘k‘i* “writing against the evil eye” written down in a *hmayil* (see Xaç‘ikyan 1963: 150) we read: *El hoviwn Cirani, aracēr yovitn Cirani* “The purple shepherd arose; (he) was pasturing in the Purple valley”. In another incantation, entitled *gir cəcac‘awi*

“writing against breast-pain” (ibid.), *mayr* (‘mother’) *Cirani*, *dusdr* (‘daughter’) *Cirani*, and *dētər* (?) *Cirani* are mentioned (Xaç‘ikyan op. cit. 151).

We can thus consider a hypothetical female deity *Cirani mayr* ‘Purple Mother’ of the celestial *Cirani cov* ‘Purple Sea’; see the theonym *Covean*.

The *Purple pasture* of the incantation above may reflect the IE picture of the Otherworld as a pasture (on which, see Thieme 1952: 48ff; Puhvel 1969; Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 823-824; Mallory/Adams 1997: 153b; Beekes 1998). Compare Arm. dial. Sebastia *grotin*¹⁷⁵ *antə* ‘cornfield/pastureland of the Otherworld’ preserved in proverbs and in a curse formula, see Gabikyan 1952: 60, 157, who explicitly refers to *and* ‘cornfield, pastureland’ and assumes mythological origin.¹⁷⁶

A curse formula in Xotorjur [YušamXotorj 1964: 466b] reads: *Coveyn anc‘nis*. The ending *-eyn* points to pl. *-er* + the article *-n*. In Xotorjur, the sonant *-r-* develops into *-y-* before a dental stop [YušamXotorj 1964: 392] like in neighbouring dialects such as Hamšen. This probably holds true also for the position before *-n-*, as in Hamšen; cf. *beran* ‘mouth’ > Hamšen *perən*, GSg *peyni*, etc. [Ačařyan 1947: 65]. The formula should then be translated as follows: “May you pass over the seas”. Since this is a curse, it seems most logical that here a reference is made to the “Otherworld, Valley of Death”, which is situated beyond the water or seas (cf. Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 825-826).

3.2 Sun; Moon

The PIE word for ‘**sun**’, **sh₂u-l/n-* (Beekes 1984), has been replaced by the Indo-European or Armeno-Aryan poetic designation of the sun: Arm. *arew* and Skt. *ravi-* (for discussion see Schmitt 1967: 259-260), cf. Hitt. *haruṽanai-* ‘to become bright, to dawn’ (see especially Eichner 1978).

Of the two IE designations for ‘**moon**’ (Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 684-685), Armenian inherited **louks-no-/-neh₂-* as *lusin* ‘moon’, cf. also *lusn-kay*, whereas the other is reflected in *amis* ‘month’ (see s.vv.).

‘**sun**’: ‘**eye**’. In a few Indo-European traditions the sun was considered as an eye; compare also OIr. *súil* ‘eye’ < **sūli-* from the PIE word for ‘sun’, **sh₂u-l/n-* (see Bammesberger 1982; Schrijver 1995: 422; Adams and Beekes apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 188a and 556b).

Arm. *areg-akn* ‘sun’ is interpreted as ‘eye of the sun’ (or ‘das Auge, das die Sonne ist’, see Scherer 1953: 52); for discussion and parallels from other languages see Ališan 1910: 93; HAB 1: 107-108, 310b; Garamanlean 1931: 428-431, 501; Benveniste 1965: 5, 7-14; Ivanov 1983: 41; Olsen 1999: 675-676. Compare also ClArm. expressions where the sun is described as *akn* ‘eye’ (S. Harut‘yunyan 2000: 40-43). The interpretation as ‘Quelle der Sonne’ (Abeghian 1899: 41, cf. 89; Schmitt 1967: 219) seems to be gratuitous.

¹⁷⁵ *Grot* is the divine scribe.

¹⁷⁶ Hardly related to Sebastia *antən* ‘the afterlife’, which is from ClArm. adverbial *and*, *and-ēn* ‘there’ (op. cit. 68-69).

‘Wheel of the sun’: Skt. *sūryasya cakrā-*, Gr. *ἡλίου κύκλος*, etc. (see Schmitt 1967: 166-169; Ivanov/Toporov 1974: 221; Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 1: 350-351; 2: 720-721; Kazanskij 2005). For the association ‘sun’ : ‘wheel’ in Armenian literature (especially Eznik Kołbac‘i) and folklore see Srvanjtyanc‘ 1, 1978: 77, 168; Garamanlean 1931: 431, 495, 501; H. Israyelyan 1973: 69.

‘Chariot of the sun’ in IE and non-IE traditions, see Ivanov apud MifNarMir 1: 664-665 with lit.; Mallory/Adams 1997: 627b; **‘Horses of the sun’**: for Greek and Aryan passages see Schmitt 1967: 165-166. For the ‘Viergespann’ of the sun in Greek note the Armenian belief recorded by Ališan (1910: 98-99; see also H. Israyelyan 1973: 65-69; S. Harut‘yunyan 2000: 44). In this relation it is remarkable that Armenian both *arew* ‘sun’ and *ji* ‘horse’ belong to the poetic language shared with Indo-Aryan (see s.vv.; also Porzig 1954: 162 = 1964: 239-240; Xačaturova 1973: 198; Ritter 2006: 413-414). For another pair belonging to the poetic language (this time from Armenian-Greek-Indo-Iranian unity) see s.vv. *arcui* ‘eagle’ and *c‘in* ‘kite’.

Both *arew* ‘sun’ and *lusin* ‘moon’ have been **deified** (see Abeghian 1899: 41-49; Ališan 1910: 93-115; S. Harut‘yunyan 2000: 40-64); see also s.v. *areg* ‘sun’.

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 temporal 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. *teł* ‘while’ (< *teł* ‘place’); cf. in a fairy-tale from Lori: *manelis teł* ‘while spinning’; *xac‘ə gnalis teł* ‘while going to the Cross’ (see HŽHek‘ 8, 1977: 73^{L2} and 75^{L18}, respectively); in Šamšadin (Tavuš): *ərek‘nakə mer mtnilis teł* “when the sun was setting” [Xemč‘yan 2000: 28a^{L9}].

Next to these examples, Ačařyan (HAB 1: 286-287) also mentions Pers. *gāh*. One may add more:

Parth. *ter* [**tažar*] ‘palace, dwelling’; as an astronomical term, ‘double hour, period of two hours’ [Boyce 1977: 86];

Lat. *saeculum, -ul-* 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 mtnel* ‘to marry’, lit. ‘to enter into the 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 being ‘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. *amaṛn* ‘summer’ : OHG *sumar* ‘summer’ vs. *am* ‘year’ : Skt. *sāmā-* ‘year, season’ etc. (see s.vv.), 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]. In the Indo-Iranian calendar, the year was divided into six seasons (on Iranian *gāhānbārs*, six well-defined solar dates rather than seasons, see Hartner 1985: 749-756), of the Indic names of which only two reflect PIE seasonal terms: *vasantá-* ‘spring’ and *hemantá-* ‘winter’ (see Ęrlix 1989: 246).

The Armenian seasonal terms are usually stable. Some exceptional replacements have taken place in a few dialects. In Nor Naxiḡewan, *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 *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 aḡeg er, ama erb amaṛə egav, cin p’erac’av* “In autumn, winter and in fasts, the horse was very good, but when summer came, the horse <...>“. As we can see, the winter and summer are represented by the native terms *cmeṛ* and *amaṛ*, whereas *kiz* appears instead of *ašun* ‘autumn’, and *pah-er* ‘fasts’ functions for the 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 *aməṛ* from ClArm. *amaṛn* ‘summer’ (q.v.), of native/IE origin (see HAB 1: 146; Ačarıyan 2003: 296), the dialect of Zeyt’un has also *t’amuz* (gen. *t’amzən*) ‘summer’, borrowed from Arab. *tammūz* ‘July’ (Ačarıyan 2003: 186).

3.4 Geographical terms

3.4.1 ‘mountain’ : ‘forest’

Regarding the 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. *giri-* m. 'mountain, hill', OCS *gora*, Czech *hora* 'mountain', Pol. *góra* 'mountain': Lith. *girià* 'wood', Slk. *hora* '(wooded) mountain', Sln. *góra* 'mountain, (dial.) wood', etc. For the meaning 'wooded mountain', see also Nagy 1974: 116, on **perk^wunio-*.

In Armenian, this semantic shift is reflected in *sar* 'mountain' > Hamšen *sar* 'forest' [Ačaryan 1947: 253]. See also *antar* 'forest'. The opposite development: Arm. **c'axut* > Hamšen dial. *c'axud* 'forest' [Ačaryan 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. *sraujà*, Latv. *strauja* 'stream', Skt. *srav-* 'to stream, flow', etc. (see s.vv. *arū, arōg*); Skt. *dvīpá-* '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. For more examples, see Jordán-Cólera 1997.

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.'. Further *morč, morč'* 'young branch, stick' > Xarberd *morč(ik)*, Dersim *mərj* 'thicket; young branch' [HAB 3: 349b; Bałramyan 1960: 93a] : Sebastia *manuk-morčuk* 'young (children, orphans)' [Gabikean 1952: 410] : Akn *morč-ik* 'offspring, son or daughter' [HAB 3: 349b].

'beetroot'

The beetroot 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), which refers to 'beet' in several dialects' (see HAB 4: 360). For the semantic association 'beet' : 'young branches, shoots' note Arm. *bazuk* 'arm', which has generally shifted its semantics to 'beet', but in some dialects it refers to 'thin and green branches of vine' (Arabkir), 'the

stalk, stem of a plant' (Akn), etc. [HAB 1: 377]; *čakəndli bazuk* in "Bžškarən 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. *σευτλίον* 'beet' and Arm. *čakndet* 'beet'. In this respect, a Partizak riddle [Tēr-Yakobean 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 bovine animals are frequently found in riddles concerning different subjects; cf. *karmir kov* 'red cow' referring to 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' = *botk* 'radish' in Moks (Karčkana Nanəkanc') [Haykuni 1906: 350^{L16}]. In view of what has been said above on Gr. *σευτλίον* 'beetroot' etc., nevertheless, the equation 'beetroot' : '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' is listed in glossaries of dialectal words without any inner-Armenian correspondence (see H. Muradyan 1960: 221b and 1967: 198b, respectively).

Formally, it can be compared to Arm. *čiw* 'shin, shank', which also refers to the leg of humans and other vertebrates, as well as to the arm and wing (cf. T'iflis, Ararat, Łazax, Łarabał *haw-či/aw* 'poultry' [Ačařean 1913: 652a]), but a connection with **čaw* 'leaf of beet' seems semantically more attractive, especially in view of Meri *gəł-a-čev* 'the child of a thief' (see Ałayan 1954: 294) = *got* 'thief' + *-a-* + *čev*, where *čev* apparently means something like 'child, generation' and should be linked with Karčewan and Kak'avaberd *čev* 'young animal'. The development *a > ε* after unvoiced consonants in monosyllables is not very common in Kak'avaberd, but we do have some examples here, cf. *čanč* 'fly' > *čenj* or *čänj*, *čas* 'dinner' > *češ*, *č'ap* 'measure' > *č'ep* (Varhavar), etc. (see H. Muradyan 1967: 21). In Karčevan 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. De Lagarde (see HAB 2: 85a) and Ĵahukyan (1967: 210, 308) link *čawak* with *zawak* *a*-stem 'child, offspring, tribe, generation' (Bible+; widespread in the 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*, 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. *zqθwa* > **zahwak* > *zawak* (Marr, see HAB 2: 85). Olsen (1999: 151²⁸⁵, 244-245, 769¹⁴, 784, 858) derives it from Ir. **zanθa-(ka-)* < **ğenh₁to-*, cf. Av. *zqθa* 'birth etc.', MPers. *z'hk* 'child, offspring' vs. *z'tk* 'child', with the

development $\vartheta < w$ 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-zēntu-* ‘of good lineage, noble’, *haozqθβa-* n. ‘good relationship’, Skt. *jātu* ‘from birth, by nature’, *jantú-* m. ‘creature, being, tribe, race’, from **ġ(e)nh₁-tu-* (cf. Marr’s etymology), or Iran. **zā-va-ka-* < *ġnh₁-uo-*.

For the alternation $\check{c} - z$ Jähukyan (1967: 308) only mentions *čawak* : *zawak*, but there are more of such examples, e.g. *xoz* vs. *xoč-* ‘pig’.

The internal comparison thus helps to reconstruct Arm. **čaw(-)* ‘child, generation; young animal; leaf of a beet(root)’. All three aspects (viz. human, fauna and flora) are present.

3.5.2 ‘terrestrial beasts or insects’ : ‘pagan, abominable, demon’ : ‘grandmother, lady’¹⁷⁷

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 *māmeüg* ‘spider’ < **mam-uk* [Andreasyan 1967: 374a], Polis, Nor Naxijewan *mamuk* ‘id.’, see Ačārean 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); Melri, Karčewan, Kak‘avaberd *tat* ‘scorpion’, literally, ‘grandmother’ (see s.v. *tat* ‘grandmother’).

mor, morm ‘tarantula’ (MidArm. and dial.): Gr. *Μορμώ, -όος -οῦς, Μορμών, -όνος* f. ‘she-monster, bogy’ (also used by nurses to frighten children), generally ‘bugbear’, Lat. *formīdō, inis* f. ‘fear, terror; a thing which frightens, bogy’; note also Gr. *μόρμηξ* ‘ant; fabulous animal in India’, Lat. *formīca* ‘ant’, and especially Arm. dial. (Lori) *mormənǰ* (see s.v. *mor, morm* ‘tarantula’).

Similar formations can also be found for the **snail**, cf. Łarabał *ana-xat’un* [Ačārean 1913: 93b], *ala-xat’un* (see HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 12a; also Martirosyan/Gharagozyan FW 2003, Goris). In both forms the second component is *xat’un* ‘Lady’. According to Ačāryan (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}.

Melri, Karčewan, Kak‘avaberd *tat* ‘scorpion’, literally, ‘grandmother’; see s.v. *tat*.

¹⁷⁷ This chapter is based on a study for which I received funding support from the Knights of Vartan FAS, to whom I express my deepest gratitude. Part of it was presented in a joint report with Satenik Gharagozyan at the 10th General Conference of the AIEA, Vitoria-Gasteiz, 7-10 September 2005 (see Martirosyan/Łaragozyan 2005), and at the Workshop *Cultural, linguistic and ethnological interrelations in and around Armenia* in Michaelbeuern, July 4-7, 2007.

In a poem by Arak'el Siwnec'i /14-15th cent./ [Poturean 1914: 52, stanza 30] the Virgin Mary is equated with a spider:

*Sard es lusetēn yankean,
Aranc' niwt' hines zostayn;
Ansermn yəłac' 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. dial. 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 dommului*, etc.

'frog'

In a traditional story (about 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 women (particularly when pregnant) [Bdoyan 1972: 476-478, 495-497; A. Israyelyan 1979: 86]. On an oracular practice related to a big frog living in a well in the village of Šxnoc' (Karin/Erzrum region) see Łanalanyan 1969: 104^{Nr283}. Compare the oracular practice of the Finno-Ugric "Golden Woman" and a silvern frog (see Sokolova 1990: 156).

The motif of a girl transforming into a frog is widespread in fairy-tales as well; 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. Gharagyozyan). In two of these, namely those from HŽHek' 9: 195 and 343-346, *Křkřian Sanamer* and *Xořxoř xanum* seem to implicitly represent an aquatic female deity personified as a frog and associated with weaving. For *Xořxoř* cf. the homonymous spring under the rock of the Van fortress (see Srvanjtyanc' 1: 78).

In a fairy-tale edited/retold by Nazinyan (1986: 79) one finds a contrast *gort* 'frog' (female) : *agrav* '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 females. 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. *vařde*.

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 *Agrion Virgo*, and kindred species, called in French *demoiselle*’ from *damsel* ‘a young unmarried woman’ (OxfEnglDict).

3.5.2.2 ‘Hyena’, ‘wolf’, etc.

‘Hyena’, ‘wolf’, ‘mule’

Arm. *řoreak* ‘a kind of small locust’ is attested in the Bible, rendering Gr. *βροῦχος* e.g. in Leviticus 11.22 (see Wevers 1997: 150). It seems to be composed of *řori* ‘mule’ (Bible+, widespread in dialects) and the diminutive suffix *-ak* [NHB 2: 676a].

Ačarıyan (HAB 4: 132a) points out that in Geoponica (13th cent.) the word occurs with uncertain semantics since it corresponds to Greek ‘hyena’; he records no dialectal forms. We in fact have strong evidence for MidArm. and dial. *řoreak* ‘hyena’.

In Amirdovlat’ Amasiac’i (see S. Vardanjan 1990: 94-95, § 397, comment 596₃₉₇; MijHayBař 1, 1987: 138a; cf. NHB 1: 508b) one finds *gayl-řori* (gen. *gayl-řoru*), *gayl-řorek* ‘hyena’, with *gayl* ‘wolf’ as the first member. Since in such compounds *gayl* usually functions as attributive to the animal represented by the second member of the compound (cf. *gayl-agřaw* ‘a kind of raven’, with *agřaw* ‘raven’), *gayl-řorek*, literally ‘wolf-hyena’, may be interpreted as ‘a kind of hyena’. The compound is corroborated by dial. (Büt’ania/Nikomedia) **gayl-řori* ‘a kind of predator’ < *gayl* ‘wolf’ + *řori* (see Ačarıean 1913: 219a), where an unsuffixed *řori* is used instead of *řoreak*. Note that both Amasia and Nikomedia are located in the NW margins of the Armenian-speaking territories.

The existence of *řoreak* ‘hyena’ is corroborated 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 *řoreak* is represented as follows:

Az niw uni ink’n řanik’,

Iřxanayk’ mi ir handipik’;

Gerezmanac’ uni balnik’,

Uti zmeřealn u zoskrtik’.

He has tusks of a good kind;

Do not you dare to encounter him!

He has the key to the graves,

He eats the dead and bones.

In the glossary of the book, Mnac'akanyan (1980: 503b) records *ĵoreak* 'locust' referring to the very same riddle Nr 189. This does not make any sense. Given the evidence above, one can safely postulate the meaning 'hyena' of *ĵoreak*, and this perfectly fits in the context. The hyena was also named *mard-a-gayl* 'werewolf' (see s.v. *gayl* 'wolf') and *k'avt'ar-k'osi* (see below) and is said to take out corpses from cemeteries (see Ananyan HayKendAšx 1, 1961: 421-433).

In an incantation, *Hmayil* Nr 1 of Matenadaran (Harut'yunyan 2006: 158a, Nr. 4, Line 11), *ĵore(a)k* (abl. *i ĵorek-ē*) occurs in a list of beasts between *gayl* 'wolf' and *arēwc* 'lion'. S. Harut'yunyan (op. cit. 473a) hesitantly identifies the word with the insect-name *ĵoreak*. Here again we are rather dealing with *ĵoreak* 'hyena'.

In his list of animal-names in Svedia, Andreasyan (1967: 162) mentions *čiræg* 'hyena' glossing it by Arm. *boreni* and Arab. */dabaa/*. Taking the word as "formally identical with *ĵori* 'mule' " (> Svedia *čira*, op. cit. 381b; in Ačarjan 2003: 586, *ĵ'ira*), he does not give any further comment. I think it simply reflects *ĵoreak* 'hyena'. Note that Nersēs Šnorhali is from Cilicia, and the dialects of Cilicia and Svedia form an appropriate locus for MidArm. items (cf. Ačarjan 2003: 12-13, 350). On Svedia **ĵore-patik* 'hyena' see 1.2.

In a famous dance-song from Svedia / Musa Leř we read (see YušMusLer 1970: 222 with ModArm. translation where *ĵirek* is correctly interpreted as 'hyena'):

Itew tunə mirek i,
Mire kinot ĵirek i
 Behind the house there is brushwood,
 In the brushwood stays the hyena.

Č'olak'ean (1986: 216a, 277) records K'esab *ĵurik* or *ĵirik* 'hyena' and derives it from *ĵoreak*.

The association 'mule' : 'hyena' should not surprise anyone. Firstly, both animals are considered "outlaws". For the wolf and hyena, 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}), and the traditional stories according to which the mule has been cursed by Christ (see e.g. Lalayan 2, 1988: 428) seem to be sufficient to demonstrate its special status. Secondly, both meanings can derive from 'brown or grey animal', cf. Gr. *κίλλος* 'grey' : *κίλλος* m. 'ass' and Cyprian 'cicada' (glossed as *τέττιζ προϊνός* in Hesychius); French *grison* 'donkey' vs. *gris* 'grey'; Arm. **bor-* 'brown (animal)' : *bor-eni* 'hyena', perhaps also *vorak* 'locust' (lex.).

'Hyena', 'wolf', 'witch'

In the dialect of Svedia we find a compound *j'irəbätlig* 'hyena' [Ačarjan 2003: 350, 426, 527, 585] or *čirəbätəg* 'an animal of the kind and size of the jackal' [Andreasyan 1967: 162]. According to Ačarjan (2003: 350, 426, 585; HAB 4: 61b), *j'irəbätlig* 'hyena' is composed of *j'ira* < ClArm. *ĵori* 'mule' and ClArm. *parik* 'a mythical being, spirit', thus: **ĵori-(a-)parik* 'mule-demon/witch' > 'hyena'; cf. also Svedia *bəřə-j'irig* 'hyena' = Arab. *barrī* 'wild' + *ĵoreak* [HAB 4: 61b].

A compound **ĵori-a-parik* 'mule-demon/witch' goes parallel with *yušk-a-parik* (Bible+), *všk-a-pari-k'* (John Chrysostom) 'a mythical being', 'ass-demon/fairy', which renders Gr. *ὄνοκένταυρος* in Isaiah 13.22, 34.11, 34.14, and is composed of

**yušk/vušk-* ‘ass’ (cf. Pers. *vušk* ‘ass’, Khot. *jūšda-* < **yauž-da-* ‘ibex, mountain goat’), and *parik* ‘fairy’ (cf. YAv. *pairikā-* f. ‘sorceress, witch’, Pahl. *parīg* ‘witch’, Bartholomae 1904: 863-864; MacKenzie 1971: 65) [Hübschmann 1897: 199-200; HAB 3: 410; Bailey 1968: 157-158; 1979: 112a; Russell 1987: 449]. On the ‘hyenic’ aspect of *jori* ‘mule’ see above.

Elsewhere (Ačaryan 2003: 527), the first component is considered to be *jur* ‘water’. Compare in this respect **jr-parik* which is recorded by Ačaryan (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 incantations’. This can be identified with Akn *jrporik* ‘old woman’, perhaps ‘witch’, which, according to S. Erēc’ (1898: 380a), reflects **jr-parik* with the sound change *a > ɔ*. In all his examples, however, as well as in those of Gabriëlean 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 **jr-parik* ‘old woman, witch, sorceress’ indeed comprises *jur* ‘water’ and *parik*, its original meaning would have been ‘female water spirit, nymph’. Svedia *j’irəbätig* hardly contains *jur* ‘water’ because it refers to ‘hyena’ (unless one assumes a subsequent semantic development ‘female water spirit’ > ‘old witch, sorceress’ > ‘hyena’).

Ačaryan (2003: 426) mentions the change *-r- > -l-* not specifying it any further. The sound change may be dissimilatory. On the other hand, one should also take into account other factors such as contamination. Note, for instance, Sebastia *čr-pašu* ‘frog; (pejorative) a new-born child of a woman’ (see Gabikean 1952: 379).

Further, note Marzvan **gayl-parəv* ‘a female evil spirit which, like the *ali-parəw*, strangles new-born children’ [Ačarean 1913: 219a], obviously composed of *gayl* ‘wolf’ and *parəw* ‘old woman’.

‘Hyena’, ‘wolf’, ‘witch’, ‘leprosy, scab’

The basic Armenian word for ‘hyena’ is *boreni*, *wo*-stem: GDSg *borenwoy* (Jeremiah 12.9), AblSg *i borenwoy* (Paterica); *borean*, *i*-stem: GDPI *borenic* (P’awstos Buzand 4.13). The word seems to be related with **bor* ‘brown or motley/spotted animal’ (cf. Karin *borek* ‘a dark-complexioned cow with white spots’, Ačaryan 1913: 203b; Muš *bor hort’ik* ‘brown or motley calf’, HŽHek’ 13, 1985: 161ff; etc.); *bor* ‘leprosy’ (cf. *bor-ot* ‘leprosy’, Bible+); Pahl. *bōr* ‘reddish-brown, bay, chestnut (horse)’, Kurd. *bōr* ‘grey; brown’, etc.

The word for ‘leprosy’ is also associated with the notions of ‘(moral) dirt, heresy’, cf. *bor-ot* ‘leprosy’ > Georg. *borot’i* ‘evil, bad, unjust, dangerous’, Arm. dialect of Malat’ia *borot* ‘heretic’ (see HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 212a); Arm. *pisak* ‘spotted; leprosy’, dial. of Van and Łarabał *p’is* ‘dirty’ vs. Pers. *pīs* ‘leprosy; dirty’ (see HAB 4: 84b; Ačarean 1902: 352); Arm. dial. Van *kr-ot* ‘leprosy; bad, useless’. The latter is identical with Ararat, Muš, Nor Bayazet *gr-ot* ‘id.’ (see Amatuni 1912: 154b; Ačarean 1913: 257b; HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 286b).

Arm. dial. *k’awt’ar-k’os(i)* ‘hyena; old witch’ is present in T’iflis, Łarabał [Ačarean 1913: 1107a; HAB 4: 567a], Łazax [Ananyan 1961: 421]. Ačaryan (HAB 4: 567a) correctly presents the word with the meaning ‘hyena; old witch’, though earlier (1913: 1107a) he had described the animal as ‘a kind of rabid wolf’. Ananyan

(1961: 421, 425, 427, 429, 432) corroborates the meaning ‘hyena’ and repeatedly states that this is the animal otherwise called *mard-a-gel* ‘werewolf’.

The first component of the compound is *k’awt’ar/r’* ‘hyena; old witch’, which is poorly attested but is widespread in the dialects [HAB 4: 567a]. In the late medieval dictionary *Baġirk’ hayoc’* (Amalyan 1975: 58^{Nr367}, 337^{Nr212}), *k’awt’ar’* and *k’ōt’arinē* are represented as synonymous to *boreni* ‘hyena’, and the denotatum is said to eat the flesh of corpses. The word is borrowed from Pers. *kaftār* ‘hyena’ (cf. Pahl. *haftār* ‘hyena’, MacKenzie 1971: 39).

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, häßlicher 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/š* 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), cf. *k’os-ot* ‘scabbed’, in dialects also ‘dirty, useless’ [Ačārean 1913: 1121b; HAB 4: 588a]¹⁷⁸. If this is accepted, Azerbaijani *kaftarkus*, Turkish dialectal *kaftarküç* etc. should be regarded as Armenian loans. Note that the geographical distribution of Turkish dialectal (Kars, Ardvin) and Azerbaijani forms is roughly compatible to that of the Armenian term (T’iflis, Ārabaġ).

3.5.2.3 Wolf as a ‘wild animal, animal of God’ and ‘outlaw’

The wolf and the deer

In many IE and non-IE languages derivatives denoting ‘animals of God’ are used to designate ‘wild (not domesticated) animals’, cf. Hitt. *šunaš ħuitar* ‘wild animals’, lit. ‘animals of God’, Latv. *dieva zuosis* ‘wild geese’, lit. ‘geese of God’, etc.¹⁷⁹

The deer and the wolf are often considered wild animals *par excellence*, animals of God, cf. Latv. *dieva suns* ‘wolf’, lit. ‘dog of God’, Russ. dial. of Kolyma *božij olen* ‘wild deer’, lit. ‘deer of God’, cf. Yakut *taġara tabata* ‘id.’, lit. ‘deer of Heaven-God’, etc. [Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 486-488 = 1995, 1: 406-408; Edelman 2003: 125-126], Polab. *dajvā korvo* ‘deer’, lit. ‘wild cow, cow of God’ [Toporov PrJaz i-k, 1980: 242]; Pashto *lewā* ‘wolf’ < **daiy-ja-* ‘of God’ (rather than ‘daevic’, see Edelman 2003: 125-126). Note Arm. dial. of Zeyt’un *veye, vere* ‘deer’ from *vayr-i* ‘wild’, a derivative of < *vayr* ‘field, commons’ [HAB 4: 301b; Ačāryan 2003: 65, 339]. Further, see s.v. *arti(k)* ‘wild sheep’.

Such a parallelism between the deer and the wolf is also seen in designations of the planet Venus. In a homily by Zak’aria Kat’olikos (9th cent.) we find *Eġjeru* ‘Deer, Stag’ as the name of a planet, presumably the Venus. One may link Arm. *Eġjeru* with Early German *tierstern* ‘Evening Star’ from *tier* ‘wild animal’, Lith. *žvėrinė* ‘Evening Star’ from *žvėris* ‘wild animal’ (Scherer 1953: 83-84), Slavic designations of the types ‘star of the wild animal’ and ‘star of the wolf’ (Karpenko

¹⁷⁸ It is uncertain whether **-k’os-i* is in a way related with NPers. *kūse* ‘shark; sea-devil; having little beard’ (on which see BasPerzNed 2007: 199b).

¹⁷⁹ Typologically compare Nor Naxijewan, Polis **astucoy leġnerā* ‘very wild, uninhabited (places)’, lit. ‘mountains of God’ (see Ačārean 1913: 141).

1981: 80). All these names reflect the same general pattern ‘Star of the wild animal, esp. deer or wolf’, ‘Tierstern’. See 3.1.5 for more details.

Another illustration of the parallelism between the wolf and the deer can be seen in designations of the sun-shower in Armenian [Amatuni 1912: 69b; HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 235a] and other languages often referring to the wolf [Abeghian 1899: 108; A. Petrosyan 1987: 58₁₁] or to the hind (see e.g. Lalayean 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 Hakobyan 1974: 277).

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’ and other related problems see also Gerstein 1974; Ivanov 1975: 401-405; Ivanov 1977: 152-153). 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 on the strength of a similar expression in Chapter 40 of the *History* of Lewond, 8th century [Šahnazareanc‘ 1857: 196^{L-1f}]: *ew xortakēr zk‘atc‘r luc hawatoyñ or i K‘ristos, ew orošiwñ i hōtēñ Tearñ ew zgenoyñ zkerparan gayloy, ew partawor arñēr 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}] 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”.¹⁸⁰

¹⁸⁰ Compare Akkad. *barbaru* ‘wolf’ vs. Sumer. *barbar* ‘foreigner’; cf. Gr. *βάρβαρος* ‘foreign(er), non-Greek; uncivilised, raw’, Skt. *barbara-* ‘stammer’.

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:

*Ē annman atuor tikiñ,
Ink‘n cnani zmayrn oĵin*

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 Vardanjan 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 (*eĵeru*) 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 figure (which is commonly represented by a demon in fairy-tales), 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 anĵrew galis, asum en, etniknerə kə cnin* “when it rains during sunshine, 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 Cułrut‘ close to Axalc‘xa), see P. Hakobyan 1979: 6. It says that dragons are born from hinds in mountains at the time of *banĵarbusuk*. The latter refers to a kind of soft snow or hail in early spring [Amatuni 1912: 89b; Ačarėan 1913: 174b]. Remarkably, it is synonymous with *siklik* or *səklik*, which seems to refer to one of the daughters of Satan etymologically (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. Diliĵan/Połosk ‘ilisa *baxri p’rp’ur* lit. ‘foam of deer’ (see Ananyan 1980: 370) vs. Atap‘azar *satanayi črag* and Polis *satanayi arapa* (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 will propose some ideas.

Dragons are born from hinds at 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 *səklik*, which, according to Amatuni (1912: 589a), has been preserved in Trapizon. The word is synonymous with *banĵarbusuk*. No etymological explanation of *si/əklik* is known to me. I think this word may be identified with one of the two daughters of Satan: *Səlik* and *Bəlik*, in Ewdokia [Gazančean 1899: 22, 54] and in Sebastia [Gabikean 1952: 499]; cf. the light-minded (*giž*) spouses *Sklik* and *Baklik* in a fairy-tale [HŽhek‘ 3, 1962: 388-390].

Dial. (Muš, Van) *xazal-əj* ‘a kind of snake’, with *əj* (= *awj*) ‘snake’ as the second component (see Ačarean 1913: 445a), or simply *xazal* [HayLezBrbBař 2, 2002: 260b], can be identical with dial. (Muš, Van, Sasun, Moks) *xəzal/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 ehung* ‘obsidian’, lit. ‘Satan’s nail. Earlier the mountain was called *Paxray*, possibly identical with *paxray* ‘cattle; hind, deer, stag’. Aristakēs Lastivertc‘i relates a traditional story on this mountain and a Holy Cross destroyed by “servants of Satan”. It is thus possible 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); Deweĵyan 1982; cf. also the famous song by Grigor Narekac‘i entitled “Tař 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 *xoc‘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 *etĵeru* ‘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

Žahukyan 1998: 23). Bearing in mind that the basic meaning of *xac̣* ‘and *xēč* ‘cross’ (q.v.) was ‘stick, staff; forked branch, pole’, one may identify *xac̣’eneak* with the stag. The fact that *ełjeru* 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 *ełjeru* and *xac̣’eneak*, mentioned next to each other, might be synonymous. Besides, *xac̣’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. *soxátjy* ‘elk’ which derive from Oss. *sagoj/sagojnæ* ‘hay-fork’ (cf. Sogd. (Man.) š’yh ‘branch’) and Russ. *soxá* ‘(wooden) plough’ (cf. Pol. *socha* ‘two-pronged fork’, Bulg. *soxá* ‘stick with a fork’, Sln. *sóha* ‘pole with a cross-beam’ etc.), see Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984: 519; Cheung 2002: 222 (see also s.v. *c’ax*). Thus, the derivation of *xac̣’eneak* ‘(prob.) stag’ from *xac̣* ‘cross’ may be based on both metaphoric and cultural motivations.

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’: Xotorjūr *ešxranj* ‘a wild, poisonous spider’ (see YušamXotorj 1964: 447b; in HayLezBrbBař 2, 2002: 26a – *ēšxranč*) 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* [Ačařean 1913: 225a, 399b], also Muš, Van *iša/əxařanč* and Nor Juła *išixarič* ‘a kind of black insect’ (see Amatuni 1912: 233a; HayLezBrbBař 2, 2002: 177b). According to Davt’yan (1966: 363), Łarabał and Hadrut *išə/ixáranč* refers to ‘bumble-bee, dog-bee’ and is synonymousal to *púrno* < *boř*. The latter is described by Ačařyan (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 terrestrial animal, 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 *xhunjn* ‘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. *κοχλίας* in Galen [NHB 1: 986a; Greppin 1985: 62-63] and Georg. *q’urinč’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*.

Ačaryan (1953: 269) mentions Aṛtial *xəxanč* ‘crayfish’. Further, note Urmia, Salmast *xəjʃala* is rendered as *xəč‘ap‘ar* ‘crayfish’ in GwrUrmSalm 2, 1898: 97. Dial. **salatrana* ‘crayfish’ (Moks): ‘Satan’ (Van), see HAB 4: 164a.

Note that some designations of the spider and other insects 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-dōdō* ‘spider’ < ‘camel-Dodo’.

3.5.2.6 Chthonic animals

Slav. **aščerъ*: OCS m. *ašterъ* ‘lizard’, Russ. *jáščer* ‘inflammation of the tongue of cattle, horses’, *jáščur* ‘a kind of mouse or dormouse’, *jáščerica* ‘lizard’, Czech dial. *jaščur* ‘salamander’, Upper Sorbian *ješčer* ‘otter; grass-snake’, etc.; cf. Lith. *skėrỹs* m. ‘locust’, Latv. *skīrgailis* m. ‘lizard’, etc., perhaps also Gr. *σκίουρος* m. ‘squirrel’; note also Slav. **gu-ščerъ* ‘lizard’ [ĚtimSlovSlavJaz 1, 1974: 87-89; 7, 1980: 179].

Slav. **ščur* designates terrestrial animals such as the sand martin, rat, mole, grass-snake, salamander, earthworm, grasshopper, cricket or scorpion; the prefixed form **prá-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. *jáščur* 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 terrestrial animals of substratum origin; compare Arm. Moks **swor-ik* ‘squirrel’.

All these words seem to be in a way related with each other, although it is not easy to establish exact formal correspondences. They cover a broad semantic field ranging from reptiles and lizards to harmful insects and rodents. Traditionally, these animals are grouped around the notion *chthonic animals*. It is not surprising, then, that such designations are sometimes related with designations of illnesses (note Russ. *jáščer* ‘inflammation of the tongue of cattle, horses’ above; cf. also HAB 2: 374 on *xlurd* ‘mole’) and/or demons. For interesting illustrations in Armenian, see s.vv. *t‘it‘etn* ‘butterfly’ and *t‘it‘ot* ‘mad’, *mor(m)* ‘tarantula’. Further, see 2.1.36 on tabu.

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 by striking it 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. *Schmetterling*, *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 terrestrial animals’ and should be treated in relation with the traditional belief that the lizards are cowmilkers. Note also Ukr. *molokosis* ‘lizard’, lit. ‘milksucker’ (see Fasmer 3: 690).

West Circassian *ħadepčeməʔ^w* (Temirgoy dial.), *ħadečeməʔ^w* (Shapsugh dial.) ‘tortoise’ may contain *čemə* ‘cow’, although the first component (cf. *ħade* ‘corpse’?) is unclear (R. Smeets, p.c.). For the association between ‘tortoise/turtle’ and ‘frog’ cf. Iran. **kašjapa-* (cf. YAv. *kašiiapa-* 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. (Ařtial, Hungary) *taštov gort* ‘tortoise’ < ‘a frog with a basin’, see Ačarıyan 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 the synonymous *kov-(a)-cuc* or *kov-r-cuc* (see s.v. *kovadiac* ‘). Commenting on the etymology of Sebastia *kov-r-cuc*, Gabikean (1952: 311) informs us that, as people say, the lizard likes sucking the cow’s udder, which then becomes 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-beliefs around this lizard, probably to be identified with the toad, the following seems interesting.

In the dialect of Van, Ačarıyan (1913: 760b) records **mac’oc* ‘, **kanač’-m’ac’oc* ‘, rural **matot*, **kanač’-matot* ‘a kind of green large lizard which is believed to provide snakes with his poison’. The first component of the compounds is *kanač* ‘green’.

No etymological attempt is known to me. This lizard is obviously identical with Svedia *ucə-xmc’näg* (< **ōji-xmc’nuk*, lit. ‘who gives the serpent to drink’) ‘a kind of green lizard’ (see Andreasyan 1967: 161, 264). Note also K’esab *ujə xumc’ənuət* ‘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 Sargisean (1932: 457) on Balu **kovrcuc* ‘a large poisonous lizard that jumps onto a human face, and from which the snake gets 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* ‘lizard, toad’).

The element *-ac* in **xm-ac-ōj* is probably identical with that found in the synonymous *kov-a-di-ac* ‘a lizard, toad’, lit. ‘who drinks the milk of a cow’ (q.v.). The structure is completely identical: *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 important 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*, which 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) Ačarjan 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-*), we have a problem;
- 2) Where does the variant **matot* come from? Perhaps through an intermediate dissimilated variant **matoc* and/or some kind of folk-etymology?

3.5.2.8 Eels

Papen *atanak* ‘a long kind of worm that lives in mud’ [HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 36a]. In the word-collection of Arsēn vardapet T‘ōxmaxean collected 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 the swamps; the intestine-like semen of frogs’. It must be identical with Van *atanak* ‘a kind of animal which, like a turtle, consists of a large lump of flesh, lives in brooks and sings sweetly at night’ [Ačařean 1913: 73a]. According to Ačarjan (ibid.), the same animal is called *kror* in Muš.

I think this is the eel. The description of both Papen and Van forms fits here. The eels are nocturnal feeders in and they in the mud for most of the day-time. They also sing or at least are believed to sing. The association with female sea-monsters or sirens is plausible, see s.v. *anglayk*. Eels are rare in Armenia, but they are still 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* ‘little bride, little young woman; weasel’. Gr. *γαλέη* ‘weasel, marten’, Lat. *glīs, -īris* m. ‘dormouse’ and Skt. *giri(kā)-* ‘mouse’ (Lex.) are usually derived from the PIE word for ‘husband’s sister’: Gr. *γάλις* f. ‘sister-in-law’, etc., see s.v. *tal* ‘husband’s sister’. This is due to metaphorical or tabuistic use of ‘sister-in-law’ for ‘weasel’ (see Szemerényi 1977: 90, with refer.). Details (e.g. the laryngeal) are not clear, however; see Mallory/Adams 1997: 387, 521-522. For the (erotic) association between a young girl or woman and weasel compare RV 1, 126.6 where a young woman “trembles like *kašikā-* (‘Ichneumonweibchen or weasel’)”. Here the context is clearly erotic. If Arm. *ak‘is* (*i*-stem) ‘weasel’ (q.v.) is related with Skt. *kašikā-*, one may derive it from a PIE feminine noun in **-ih₂-*. This would be another piece

of evidence supporting the “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’. This probably refers to the weasel, cf. *cərmuk* ‘weasel’ (< *jar-muk*), described by people as *balak* = *xatutik* (see Martirosyan/Gharagozyan 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’ [Gabikian 1952: 329]; cf. also *nert’akn* (q.v.).

In the fable “The weasel and the mouse” of Olympian (see ArOłomp 1854: 171-172; transl. by Orbeli 1956: 125), the goddess of love Astłik 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 to *hatanem* ‘to cut’ (q.v.)¹⁸¹. 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 independent 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 that between *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’ (which is, however, rejected by Szemerényi 1959/60: 247); Engl. *spelt* ‘a type of grain (*Triticum spelta*)’ : ‘to husk or pound (grain)’.

3.7 Body parts

3.7.1 ‘ceiling’ : ‘palate’ : ‘sky, heaven’

aṛastat ‘ceiling’ (Bible+) > MidArm. (mainly in medical literature) and dial. ‘palate’; see s.v.

In Partizak, Sebastia, Xotorjur etc., Arm. *aṛik* ‘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 Kołbac’i etc.).

¹⁸¹ Whether Arm. *hačar* ‘spelt’ (Bible; Łarabał etc.) is related, is uncertain.

Dial. *tamał* ‘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 *cerac’ 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’ Ačāryan 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).

‘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 mountain-home of *Mar’am* is described as having a roof of midnight-stars: “звезды полночные – крыша” [Gatuev 1932: 27].

All three components, as in the case of *arastal*, are found in Slav. **nebo* ‘sky, heaven’ (from PIE **neb^h*- ‘sky; cloud’, see s.v. *amp*): SCr. *něbo* ‘sky, heaven’, dial. ‘ceiling; palate’, Sln. *nebô* ‘id.’, Russ. *něbo* ‘palate’, etc. (see ĖtimSlovSlavJaz 24, 1997: 101-102). On the semantic field, see also Pisani 1950b.

Šatax *asthunk’y* ‘uvula, windpipe’ is formally identical with Van etc. *asthunk* ‘stars’, thus we may be dealing with a shift ‘sky (= stars)’ > ‘palate’, unless it is derived from *arastal* ‘palate’ with loss of *-r-* and/or contamination with *asthunk* ‘stars’; see s.v. *arastal* ‘ceiling; palate’. For the relationship ‘star’ : ‘sky’ cf. E.g. Kassit. *da-ka-áš* ‘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. For ‘heavenly’ > ‘star or planet’, see s.v. *ampar*.

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. *āñcati* ‘to bend’, *āñkas-* 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 Kartvelian. 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 *uluk* ‘palm, distance from the thumb to the little finger’ with Gr. *ὀλένη* ‘elbow, underarm’, Lat. *ulna* ‘elbow’, *uilen* ‘angle’, etc., points to a basic meaning ‘joint, a moving (twisting and/or bending) body part’ (see s.vv., especially *otn*).

Similar semantics is found in the set *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 also belong, I think, Arm. *šl(n)-i* ‘neck’ (q.v.). This would match the meaning ‘neck’ of the above-mentioned *uln* (see s.v. *oġn*).

A case of ‘shoulder’ : ‘spine, back’ : ‘chest, breast’ is found in MPers., NPers. *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 a Turkish intermediate [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, namely *jukn*. Łarabał **jukn-a-mis* ‘(anat.) calf’ (see Ačārean 1913: 690b) literally means ‘meat of fish’. We find it, for example, in a fairy-tale: *vəennis cüknamesə* ‘the **juknamis* of my leg’ [HŽHek‘ 5, 1966: 523]. Note also Bulanəx *juk*, glossed as *msi mkanunk* ‘muscles of meat’ [S. Movsisyan 1972: 71a]

This curious semantic relationship can be compared with that of Russ. *ikrá* ‘roe, spawn, caviar’, ‘(anat.) calf’ (see s.v. *leard* ‘liver’).

In the dialect of Ozim, the calf (of the leg) is called *cok-olok*. Ačāryan (1913: 522b) treats it with some reservation 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 *cök* ‘fish’ and *olok* ‘shin’. For the analysis, see s.v. *olok* ‘shin’.

3.8 The 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. Urt. *euri* ‘lord’ or Iran. **ahur-i-* ‘lordly’) and **ord-* ‘offspring, son/daughter’; see s.v. If this is accepted, we are dealing with a 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’. In what follows, a case with the opposite development is discussed.

Arm. *dšxoy* ‘queen’ (Bible+) is an Iranian loan, although the element *-oy* is not entirely clear (L. Hovhannisyan 1990: 239, with references), cf. MPers. *duxš* [duxš] ‘maiden, virgin; one of the women’ [Boyce 1977: 37], *duxš* ‘princess’, OPers. **duxčī-* 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 the dialects [Amatuni 1912: 81; Ačařean 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 jernhas [harsn] t‘axanjs ew ktirs i mēř berel?* [NHB 1: 1131a]. No acceptable etymology is known to me. Ačařyan (HAB 2: 677a) only mentions the improbable connection with *antir* ‘selected, excellent’ proposed by Hiwnk‘earpēyēntean.

The word can be linked to **ktir* ‘cut’, dial. ‘sheep-flock’ (see 1.12.3) going back to *kotor*, *ktur-k* ‘cut, share’, demonstrating, thus, the same semantic development as in *bažin-k*.

3.9 Crafts and occupations

3.9.1 ‘to cut, divide’ > ‘a division of flock’ > ‘flock of sheep’

As convincingly demonstrated by Ačařyan (HAB 3: 204a), Van, Muř, Alařkert, Bulanəx **čiwł* ‘flock of sheep’ derives from *čiwł* ‘branch’ and *čel-* ‘to divide’. In the folk-story “Karos Xač” one finds *čyul mə oč‘xar* (Srvanjtyanc‘ 1, 1978: 608; Karos Xač‘ 2000: 63a). According to Ačařyan (ibid.), Kurd. *čel* ‘(sheep-)flock’ and perhaps Arab. *ǧul* ‘flock of sheep; group’ are borrowed from Armenian. Sasun **čol* ‘flock of sheep’ (see Ačařean 1913: 739b) have been reborrowed from Kurdish; see 1.10 on back-loans.

Also notice Mush *čla* ‘a part of a sheep-flock’ (see HŽHek‘ 13, 1985: 519a), if it belongs to the 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 sheeps or goats’ (Sasun) [Ačařean 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 Xač” (2000: 60a, 67b; 68b, 69a; also S. Avagyan 1978: 135b^{L12}), in the very same passage where *čiwł* occurred (see above): *k(y)aršun ktir oč‘xar* ‘forty flocks of sheep’. A. Xač‘atryan (1993: 107) connects the word to *ktr-em* ‘to cut’ (see 1.12.3 on **ktir*).

Citing these two semantic parallels, A. Xač‘atryan (ibid.) convincingly connects Arm. *hawt*, *i*-stem ‘flock of sheep’ (q.v.) to *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 Shinbone > implement

The hollow shinbone was used for making flutes and other objects (e.g., bobbins) in and around the house, cf. OEngl. *scīa* ‘shin, leg’; Russ. *čevka* ‘bobbin; (esp. hollow) bone; (dial.) shinbone’, OCS *čevnica* ‘flute’, SCr. *ci‘jev* ‘tube, spool, shinbone’, *čjevnica* ‘shinbone, 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 *čur* ‘shank’, the dialect of Sebastia also has *čura*, *čəɹə* ‘a kind of (small) flute’ [Gabikeyan 1952: 378], see Martirosyan 2005: 83. See also s.v. *srunk* ‘shinbone’.

Meiri *č’ak* ‘shinbone of cattle; instrument for carding wool’ [Ałayan 1954: 323]; Moks *č’äk*⁹ ‘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. *sc-a* ‘shin, leg’ next to MHG *sch-e* ‘post’, etc. [Lubotsky 2002: 323b] (see also *siwn* ‘pillar’). Further: Oss. *zæng* / *zængæ* ‘shin; stalk’, cf. Skt. *jānghā-* f. ‘ankle’ (RV+); YAv. *zānga-* m. ‘ankle’, MPers. *zang* ‘ankle, shank’ (see Cheung 2002: 254).

Further, see s.v. *srunk* ‘shin, shank’.

3.9.3 ‘weaving, plaiting’ : ‘multiplicity, abundance’

In P’awstos Buzand 3.14, Arm. *hiwsem* ‘to weave, plait’ refers to the thickness or piling up 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-* (*kṛnātti*, 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 from ‘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’.

3.9.4 ‘plaited, twisted’ > ‘felloe’

Gr. *ἴτις* ‘felloe’ and Lat. *vitus* ‘fellow’ are **-tu-* derivatives from a PIE verb meaning ‘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-k-* ‘to turn, wind’ (a form of **plek-* ‘to plait’?) > OHG *felga*, OEngl. *felg(e)* ‘felloe’, probably also Arm. *hec* ‘felloe’ (if from **hefc*), q.v. See also s.v. *boyt*₂ ‘felloe’.

3.10 Miscellaneous

In the territory of Łarabał, e.g., one finds five synonyms for ‘hungry’: *anōt’i*, *k’atc’ac*, *sovac*, *tūznə* and *naštāv* [Davt’yan 1966: 313]. The first two 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. *dozrn*, without any comment. ClArm. *dozrn* means 'few, a few, small, miserable; insignificant (person)' (Bible+) and has no acceptable etymology [HAB 1: 678b]. Ačařyan (HAB *ibid.*) does not record any dialectal forms. The derivation of Լարաթ etc. *tūznə* from *dozrn* 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'.

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 research, one must reckon, apart from philological analysis, 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. loans, the matter is 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 North (but, e.g., Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 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 (1996; 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 research, I have applied the aforementioned methodology to the so-called Mediterranean substratum words in Armenian, which consist mostly of plant names, animal names and 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, and they cannot be assumed to loanwords from one another.

The Armenian words that are frequently considered to be of Mediterranean origin are: *gini* 'wine', *ewl/iwl* 'oil', *t'uz* 'fig', *spung* 'sponge', *sunk/g(n)* 'mushroom' [Meillet 1908-09b; 1936: 143; Meillet/Vendryes 1924: 16-17; AčařHLPatm 1, 1940: 100-104; Ĵahukyan 1987: 307-308]. Ačařyan (1937: 3) treats Arm. *gini* 'wine',

ewt/iwt ‘oil’, *sring* ‘pipe, fife’, and their Greek cognates as loans from Phrygian or from the Aegean civilization. Jahukyan (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)οἶνος, Lat. *vīnum*, Hitt. *uījan-*, 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 a discussion, see also Jahukyan 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); see also below. 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. *žēlud*, SCr. *žēlūd* ‘acorn’, Lith. *gīlė*, dial. *gylė* ‘acorn’, Latv. *zīle* ‘acorn’, etc.) may reflect a common innovation undergone 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 reflect 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: *anurj* ‘prophetic dream, vision’, *kamurj* ‘bridge’ (*-rj- : Arm. *rj*); *kat’n* ‘milk’, *kamurj* ‘bridge’ (*g/g^w : Arm. *k*); *ors* ‘hunt, game’, *sisejn* ‘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’; *dalar* ‘green, fresh’, *dalar-i* ‘greenery, grass, herb’; *ewt* ‘oil’ (if from ‘olive’); *t’etawš* ‘holm-oak, cedar, pine’, *t’eli* ‘elm’; *t’uz* ‘fig’; *xstor* ‘garlic’; *kaṭamax(i)* ‘white poplar, aspen’, probably also ‘pine’; *kask* ‘chestnut’; *kṛan* ‘cornel; ash’ (see s.v. *hoyn* ‘cornel’); *metex* ‘the handle of an axe’ (if from ‘ash-tree’); *moš* ‘tamarisk; blackberry, bramble’, *mor* ‘blackberry (the fruit of bramble)’; *siserñ* ‘chick-pea’; *sunk/g(n)* ‘mushroom’; *uši/*(h)oši* probably ‘storax-tree’ and ‘holm-oak’.

fauna: *atawni* ‘dove’; *erbuc* ‘breast of animals’; *lor* ‘quail’ (prob. from ‘seagull’); *karič* ‘scorpion’; *kor* ‘scorpion’; *mor(m)* ‘tarantula’; *ozni* ‘hedgehog’; *ors* ‘hunt, hunted animal, game’ (if from ‘a kind of deer, roe’); *salam(b)* ‘francolin’; *k’atirt* ‘stomach of animals’; *k’arb* ‘basilisk, asp’.

physical world: *pal* ‘rock’.

products: *ewt* ‘oil’ (cf. above, on “flora”); *kat’n* ‘milk’.

craft, implements, buildings: *damban* ‘tomb, grave’; *darbin* ‘blacksmith’, *t’arp* ‘a large wicker fishing-basket, creel’; *lar* ‘rope, rein, cable, cord, string, plumbline of stone-masons’; *kamurj* ‘bridge’; *sayl* ‘wagon’; *sring* ‘pipe, fife’.

religion, spiritual world: *anurj* ‘prophetic dream, vision’.

For the problem of the European substratum, see above. Some possible examples: *blur* ‘hill’, **boxi/buk’i* ‘hornbeam’, *geran* ‘beam, log’, *gom* ‘fold/stall for sheep or cattle’, **doyn* ‘hill’ (a possible appellative of the toponym *Duin*, q.v.), *kiw* ‘tree-pitch’, *knjni* ‘elm’, *hec* ‘felloe’, *k’ar* ‘stone’, etc.

3.12 Language of gods vs. language of men

For the opposition ‘language of gods’ vs. ‘language of men’ in the Indo-European poetic tradition see Güntert 1921; J. Friedrich 1954; Watkins 1970; 1995: 269; Ivanov 1977a: 33; de Lamberterie 1978: 262-263; 2006; Elizarenkova/Toporov 1979: 43-54; Toporov 1981: 200-214; Kleinlogel 1981: 265-266; Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 476 = 1995: 397.

A possible trace of this opposition may be seen in the semantic hierarchy between two words for ‘horse’, Arm. *ēš* (> ‘donkey’) : Skt. *ásva-* (semantically unmarked: ‘language of men’) vs. Arm. *ji* : Skt. *háya-* (semantically marked: ‘language of gods’; cf. Güntert 1921: 160), which, as has been demonstrated by Watkins (1970: 7), resulted in the semantic shift ‘horse’ > ‘donkey’ of Arm. *ēš* (q.v.).

Another similar example may be Skt. *ravi-* vs. Arm. *areg-* ‘sun’ (q.v.).

4. PLACE-NAMES

4.1 Preliminaries

Unlike the Armenian anthroponyms which are abundantly present in AčarAnjn (= Ačařyan 1942-1962, 5 vols.), Armenian place-names have not been studied in such a thorough way. The voluminous HayTeřBař 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. Aliřan, T. Hakobyan, S. Eremyan, R. Hewsen, and others. Urartian place-names are systematically treated in N. Arutjunjan 1985.

Numerous Armenian place-names are treated etymologically 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 of Lake Van (!), attested in the 8th cent. BC (see Diakonoff/Kashkai 1981; 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 present only a few etymologies (some of them being my own) 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 another homonymous place-name (in Siwnik‘) on which he comments: “sicher nicht zu *čahuk* ‘Herde’ (von Füchsen)”. Ĵihanyan (1991: 250) reconstructs an unattested river-name **Čahuk* identical with modern *Ĵatri-č‘ay* and derives it, albeit 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 Sebēos (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 synonymous appellatives (see 4.3).

Note also Agulis *Šumb* ‘name of a spring’ < *šamb* (see Ačařean 1935: 24, 379). Agulis too is located in the vicinity of Naxčawan.

4.3 Synonymous 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 these (often synchronically opaque) variants, there is yet another name that has synchronically transparent semantics not corroborated 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* are corroborated by the modern Turkish name: *Kara-su*, lit. ‘black water’. Thus, the more common Armenian name *Metr-a-geť*, lit. ‘honey-river’, must be the result of 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 Mananańi, 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 Lastivertc‘i (see Yuzbařyan 1963: 128^{L17}) we read: *I hatuac(s) lerinn Paxray or ayřm koč‘i Gaylaxazut*, <...> “In a part of the mountain *Paxray* which now is called *Gaylaxazut*, <...>”. Yuzbařyan (1968: 124) translates the beginning of the passage slightly differently: “близ горы Пахрай”. The Divine sign (*Astuacayin nřan*) was

established here in the village of *Bazm-atbiwr* (lit. “abounding in springs”), and the village has been renamed *Xaç* ‘(‘cross’). Then the historian tells us that the “servants of Satan” (*kamarar mšakk’n satanayi*) destroyed the Cross and returned “to their snake-dwelling lairs” (*yōjabnak orj’s iwreanc* ‘“в свои <...>, змеиные 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 an unattested **Paxir*. The latter statement is not necessarily true. *Paxray* may in fact be identical with *paxrē*, *paxray* ‘cattle’, which denotes the hind/deer in the dialects of Ararat, T’iflis, Łazax (*páxra*), and the stag in Łarabał (*báxra*); see HAB 4: 7; Ačārean 1913: 891a. 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 Ačāryan (1913: 956a), *satani etung* is identical 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 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 identical with *paxray* ‘hind, deer’. Note also the association of the stag with the ‘cross’ (see 3.5.2.4 on *xaç’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 synonymous appellatives.

Siah-kuh lerink‘ = modern *Łara-dał* (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 derives from Arm. *ardion-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 naming pattern is common; cf. those place-names with *tap*‘ ‘earth, plain, field’, e.g. *Ernj-a-tap*‘, a village close to Aparan, on the NE slopes of the mountain called *Arayi leř* [HayTetBař 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 are 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. *meyel*, 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 the 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 Jahukyan 1987: 417. On *Arj-ovit*, see 4.4. The hind or the stag frequently appear in this function: *Ełanc* 'berd' or *Ełnut*, probably *Ełjeruenik*' (see Hübschmann 1904: 423-424), etc. The mountain-name *Paxray*, later *Gaylaxazut*, as noted by Aristakēs Lastivertc'i (see Yuzbašyan 1963: 128^{L17}), probably located in Mananali (in the province of Barjr Hayk'), seems to be identical with *paxrē*, *paxray* 'cattle', dial. 'hind/deer; stag'; see 4.3. See also s.v. *Arciw*.

Interesting is *Yelin axpür* < **Elin atbiwr* 'spring of hind' in Łarabał (close to the village of Kusapat; see Lisic'yan 1981: 56b, 59), which is not attested in literature but reflects the classical genitive *elin*.

4.6 Mountains named as 'dark' or 'black'

Mt'in learn 'the Dark mountain' (= *Kangar-k*'), in the province of Gugark'; attested in Movsēs Xorenac'i 2.8 (1913=1991: 113^{L16}) and Asofik (11th cent.); see Hübschmann 1904: 354, 453.

**Mt'in learn* or *Mut'n ašxarh* = *Masis*, see Xaç'kone' 1898: 486-487; Hübschmann 1904: 453.

Seaw learn 'the Black mountain' (Cilicia), attested in Matt'ēos Urhayec'i (12th cent.) etc. [Hübschmann 1904: 466].

Siah-kuh lerink' = *Lara-dał* (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.vv.).

4.7 Place-name > wind-name

Step'anos Ōrbelean (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. Ačařyan (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 derived meaning, not the other way around. This suggestion is quite probable and may be corroborated typologically by the example of *Parxar* (mountain-name) > *parxar*, *pa(r)xr-c'i* ‘a cold Northern 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 (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, although 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 the rise of those dialectal features. In this and the following chapters I present some examples from the Northwestern (Hamšen/Xotorĵur) and especially from the Eastern (ĽarabaĽ/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 a once existant 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’).

ĽarabaĽ *Kōhak* 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/Gharagyozyan, FW 2003]. It may be identical 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 Ōrbelean, both from the Eastern part of Armenia. One is tempted to assume, therefore, that the place-name under question continues the EArm. dial. word, although it has been lost later.

On ĽarabaĽ **Elin 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 *Tāmbālāsk*, 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 (1250/60-1303/5); see Margaryan 1992: 135-138. In a colophon from 1654, as well as in Abraham kat‘olikos 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’ > Meñri *p’osk* [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)unj, *K’arunj*, the name of a village in the district of Ewaylax (in the province of Siwnik’) mentioned by Step’anos Ōrbelean (1250/60-1303/5). This seems to be the *k’atak’agiwłn K’arunjoy*, in Yovhannēs Draxanakertc’i (9-10th cent.) [1912=1980: 333^{L4}], identified with the present-day village of *K’arahunj* not far from Goris (see T’osunyan 1996: 379₁₂₅). The variant with the conjunctive *-a-*, namely *K’ar-a-hunj*, is attested in Abraham kat’olikos Kretac’i (1735); see Margaryan 1988: 129.

There are also other place-names in Zangezur and Łarabał named *K’ar-a-hunj*. In Lori one finds *K’arinj*, the name of a village close to Dseł, on the foot of the mountain Č’at’in-dał. It is composed of *k’ar* ‘stone’ and *unj*₁ ‘bottom, depth’ (q.v.) (see Hübschmann 1904: 387, 479, 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 *unj* reads as follows: *zi ēr hareal zxorann i jor unj berdin* : “for the tent was pitched in the gorge beneath the fortress” (transl. Garsoian 1989: 149^{L3f}).

The component *unj* seems to be also found in other compounded place-names, although not all the components are entirely clear: *Arp’-unj-n*, *Unj-i-jor* (see Hübschmann 1904: 387 and 462, respectively), *unj-or-k*’ (also in Step’anos Ōrbelean).

Compare also the fortress *Brd-a-honj Łala*, see Barxudaryan 1995 (< 1885): 87 (the author cites also *Berdaunc*’ between brackets). This is perhaps to be understood as **berd-a-(h)unj*. Compare with *yunj 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 *unj* 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 *unj* in Goris etc. are *unj* or *ənj*, without an initial *h-* (for the connection of *unj*₁ ‘bottom’ with *unj*₃ ‘soot < sediment’, see s.v. *unj*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 *-inji* : *erku-h-inji* ‘second’, *č’ors[ə]-h-inji* ‘fourth’,

oxtə-h-inji ‘seventh’, etc. Note the symmetry of the semantic field (and perhaps even the etymological identity) of *ganj(ak)* and *unj* (see s.v. *unj* and 1.12.6).¹⁸²

4.9 Place-names attested in the literature and containing dialectal words or features

Ameṛnap‘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 (1250/60-1303/5). Hübschmann (1904: 398, cf. 389) posits a compound of unknown **ameṛn* and *p‘or* ‘valley, ravine, district’. In my view, **ameṛn* can be identified with Łarabał *ámæṛnə* and Goris *ameṛnə* < ClArm. *amaṛn* ‘summer’ (q.v.).

Dizap‘ayt, a mountain in the South of Łarabał, 2496 m; also called *Ziarat‘* [Lisic‘yan 1981: 55ab; V. Aṛak‘elyan 1969: 281₁₃₇].

Attested in Movsēs Kałankatuac‘i/Dasxuranc‘i 2.5 (V. Aṛak‘elyan 1983: 119^{L12f} [also in the title of the chapter]; transl. Dowsett 1961: 70): *Yaraĵ k‘an ztesč‘aworeln tearn Abasay Ałuanic‘ ašxarhis i t‘šnameac‘ hrdehec‘an vkayarank‘n: i Dizap‘ayt lerinn i Kataroy vans, <...>. Amenek‘ean sok‘a i learinn 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. Aṛak‘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 place of the old monastery of *Dizap‘ayt*, as well as a ruined martyrion named *Oxtə-dṛne-xut‘* “rock with seven doors”, situated on a rock/*k‘erc* (ibid.). The vernacular pronunciation of the name is *Tə‘zzäp‘äd‘* in Hadrut‘, and *Təzzap‘ad* in Šałax, Xcaberđ, Xrmanĵuł etc. [Połosyan 1965].

According to a traditional story, *Dizap‘ayt* is composed of *dēz* ‘heap’ and *p‘ayt* ‘wood’: *Het‘anosk‘ žołoveal i glux lerins zbazums i k‘ristonēic‘, ew dizeal zp‘ayt bazum, hroy čarak etun zamenesean, usti anuanec‘aw Dizap‘ayt* [Jalaleanc‘, 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 Ačaṛean 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’.

¹⁸² 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.

The basic semantics of **diz-a-p'ayt* is thus 'Haufenholz', just as Hübschmann correctly expects it to be. This Łarabał mountain-name reflects **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 further implies that Łarabał **dizap'ayt* is not a "new word", as is assumed by Ačaryan (HAB 1: 659b).

Jħahayreank', a village of the district of Ewaylax (in the province of Siwnik') attested by Step'anos Őrbelean (1250/60-1303/5). No etymological explanation is known to me. One may reconstruct **joł-a-har-i*, identifying it with Meħri *jəłħáre* 'a kind of poplar-tree', Karčewan *jəłħári* 'a tall tree of which logs/beams (*joł*) are made', composed of *joł* 'log, pole' (> Meħri *júte*) and *har-* 'to beat, strike, cut'; see s.v. **joł(-a)-har-i*.

See also s.v. place-name **Getar(u)**.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aalto, Pentti
1959 Ein alter Name des Kupfers. In: *Ural-Altäische Jahrbücher* 31 (Gedenkband Julius von Farkas). Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz; pp. 33-40.
- Abaev, V. I.
1949 Osetinskij jazyk i fol'klor. Vol. 1. Moscow, Leningrad: Academy Press.
1958-95 (1-5), Istoriko-ètimologičeskij slovar' osetinskogo jazyka. 1: 1958; 2: 1973; 3: 1979; 4: 1989; [5] Ukazatel': 1995. (Moscow), Leningrad: Academy Press "Nauka".
1963 Ob iranskix nazvanijax stali. In: *Fs Zarubin 1963* : 203-207.
1964 Preverby i perfektivnost': ob odnoj skifo-slavjanskoj izoglosse. In: *PrIndEvrJaz* : 90-99.
1965 Skifo-evropejskie izoglossy: na styke Vostoka i Zapada. Moscow: GRVLI "Nauka". Akademija Nauk SSSR. Institut jazykoznanija.
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.
- Abelyan, Manuk
1899 (Abeghian), Der armenische Volksglaube. Leipzig: Druck von W. Drugulin. [ModEArm. transl. by Sargis Harut'yunyan: in M. Abelyan 1975: 11-102].
1940 Gusanakan žołovrdakan tałer, hayrenner yev antuniner (uraxut'yan, siru, harsank'i, ororoc'i, lac'i). Yerevan: Academy Press.
1941 "Višapner" koč'vac kot'ołnern ibrev Astlik-Derketo dic'uhu arjanner. Yerevan: Academy Press.
1955-59 (1-2) (Abelean), Hayoc' hin grakanut'ean patmut'iwn (2nd publ.). Vol. 1, 1955; vol. 2, 1959. Beyrut': "Sewan".
1975 Erker. Vol. 7. Yerevan: Academy Press.
1985 Erker. Vol. 8. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- Abgaryan, G. V.
1979 (ed.), Patmut'iwn *Sebēosi* (critical text with introduction and commentary). Yerevan: Academy Press.
- Abgarean, T.
1966 Nor Ĵulayi barbari k'erakanut'iwnic'. In: *HandAms* 80.1-3: 93-100.

- Abrahamyan, Anahit
 2006 Gorcik'aniš baġerə V dari hay matenagrut'yan meġ ew dranc' artac'olumə hayereni barbarnerum. In: *IntConfArmLett 2006* : 335-342.
- Abrahamyan, A. A.
 1958 Baġak'nnakan ditolut'yunner. In: *TelHasGit* 1958, Nr. 4: 61-64.
 1970 Ezniki erki bnagrayin mi k'ani meknabanut'yunner. In: *PBH* 1970, Nr 2: 93-106.
 1985 Bnagragitakan ditarkumner Step'anos Ōrbelyani patmakan erkum. In: *PBH* 1985, Nr 3: 55-67.
 1986 *Step'anos Ōrbelyan*, Syunik'i patmut'yun. Yerevan: "Sovetakan groġ".
 1994 See *Sources* : Eznik Koġbac'i.
- Abrahamyan, Ašot Arseni
 1962 Bayə žamanakacic' hayerenum. Book 1. Yerevan: Academy Press.
 1976 Grabari jeġnark. Yerevan: "Luys".
- Abrahamyan, A.
 1952-53 Davit' Alavka ordu kanonnerə. In: (1) *Ēĵmiacin* 1952, Sept-Oct: 48-57; (2) *Ēĵmiacin* 1953, Jan: 56-62; (3) Febr: 53-60; (4) March: 51-63.
- Abrahamyan, Ašot Gareġini
 1940 (ed.) *Anania Širakac'i*, Tiezeragitut'iwn ew tomar (redacted by H. Ačaġyan). Yerevan: State Press of Armenia (HayPetHrat).
 1941 (ed.), *Yovhan Mamikonean*, Patmut'iwn Tarōnoy (critical text and introduction). Yerevan: Matenadaran/Gitamankavaržakan hratarakč'. tparan. [I am not sure whether this author is identical with the others named A. Abrahamyan.]
 1944 Anania Širakac'u matenagrut'yunə: usumnasirut'yun. Yerevan: Matenadaran Press.
 1963 Naxamaštoc'yan hay matenagrut'yunə ew danielyan grerə. In: *PBH* 1963, Nr 4: 131-144.
 1978 Haykakan cackagrut'yun. Yerevan: University Press.
 1979 Tomaratiezeragitakan erek' bnagrer. In: *BngTxnPtmHay* 7: 38-66.
 1982 Naxamaštoc'yan hay gir ew grč'ut'yun. Yerevan: "Hayastan".
- Abrahamyan, A. G. & Petrosyan, G. B.
 1979 *Anania Širakac'i*, Matenagrut'yun: introduction, translation and commentary. Yerevan: "Sovetakan groġ".
 1987 Hovhannes Erzncac'u "Yaġags erknyayin šaržmann" ašxatut'yan norahayt jeġagirə. In: *BngTxnPtmHay* 8: 52-80.
- Abrahamyan, A. G. & Šahinyan, A. N.
 1975 Arcvaniki hayeren norahayt cackagirə ew nra vercanut'yunə. In: *PBH* 1975, Nr 3: 113-125.
- Abrahamyan, Lewon
 2004 Bawiġ-labirint'os: Artavazdyan aġaspelə kovkas-aġajavorasiakan hamateqstum. In: *HayŽotMšak* 12 (Republication Scientific Conference. Yerevan: "Mulni"): 13-18.

- 2006 (Abrahamian), Hero chained in a mountain: on the semantic and landscape transformations of a Proto-Caucasian myth. In: *Aramazd* 1: 208-221.
- Ačarjan, Hrač'ya Hakobi
- 1897 Anuank' haykakan amsoc'. In: *Bazmavēp* 55: 391-394.
- 1897a Haykakank'. In: *Bazmavēp* 55: 169-171, 259-261.
- 1898 (Ačarēan), K'nnut'iw n Aslanbēgi barbarin. In: *Bazmavēp* 56, 1: 31-35; 2: 83-88.
- 1898a (Ačarēan), K'nnut'iw n Aslanbēgi barbarin (reprinted from 1898). Venice: S. Lazar. (Usumnasirut'iw nner haykakan gawařabanut'ean, 1).
- 1898b Haykakank'. In: *Bazmavēp* [>] 56, 370-372.
- 1899 (Ačarēan), K'nnut'iw n Ľarabałi barbarin. Reprinted from "Ararat" 1899. Vařarřapat: Tparan Mayr At'ořoy S. Ęjmiacni. (Usumnasirut'iw nner haykakan barbařaxōsut'ean, 3).
- 1901 Barbařaxōsut'ean ōgutnerə ew matenaxōsakan 'Ewdokioy gawařabarbař'-in. (Review of Gazančean 1899). In: *Banasēr* (Paris) 3: 76-82.
- 1902 (Ačarēan), T'urk'erēnē p'oxařeal bařer hayerēni mēj (= Ęminean azgagrakan řořovacu, vol. 3). Moscow, Vařarřapat.
- 1906-08 (Adjarian), Gutturales issues de semi-occlusives par dissimilation. In: *MSL* 14: 288.
- 1908 Hayerēn stugabanut'iw nner. In: *HandAms* 22: 120-124.
- 1908a (Ačarēan), Hayerēn nor bařer Noragiwt Mnac'ordac' Groc' mēj. Vienna: Mxit'arean Tparan. (Azgayin Matenadaran, 56).
- 1908-09 (Adjarian), Ętymologies armėniennes: 1-9. In: *MSL* 15: 242-245.
- 1908-09a, 1-2 (Ačarēan), Hayerēn nor bařer Timot'ēos Kuzi Hakačarut'ean mēj. In: *HandAms* 22, 1908: 367-372 (1); 23, 1909: 44-47, 148-153 (2).
- 1911 (Ačarēan), Hay barbařagitut'iw n: uruagic ew dasaworut'iw n hay barbařneri (barbařagitakan k'artēsov). Moskua, Nor-Naxiřewan. (Ęminean azgagrakan řořovacu, vol. 8). [Armenian dialectology: a sketch and classification of Armenian dialects (with a dialect map)].
- 1913 (Ačarēan), Hayerēn gawařakan bařaran. T'iflis (Ęminean azgagrakan řořovacu, vol. 9).
- 1918 (Adjarian), Ętymologies armėniennes: 10-20. In: *MSL* 20: 160-163.
- 1925 (Ačarēan), K'nnut'iw n Nor-Naxiřewani (Xrimi) barbaři. Yerevan.
- 1925a Buzandi siws bařə. In: *HamGitTeł* 1, 1925: 169-170.
- 1926 (Ačarēan), K'nnut'iw n Marařayi barbaři. Yerevan.
- 1935 (Ačarēan), K'nnut'iw n Agulisi barbaři. Yerevan: PetHrat (State Press).
- 1935a (Adjarian), 1. Arm. *xuř*. 2. Pehlėvi *dařn*. In: *Gd Marr* 1935: 125.
- 1937 (Adjarian), De l'affinitė du grec et de l'armėnien. In: *Mėlanges Boisacq* 1: 3-4.
- 1937a (Adjarian), Etymologie du mot arm. *mełc*. In: *Fs Pedersen* 1937: 125-126.
- 1940 (Ačarēan), K'nnut'iw n Nor-řuřayi barbaři. Yerevan.

- 1940a Strabon (select. and transl.). Yerevan: University Press. (Otar ałbyurner hayeri masin, Nr 1; Hunakan ałbyurner, Nr 1).
- 1940-51 (AčařHLPatm 1-2): Hayoc' lezvi patmut'yun, vol. 1, Yerevan: University Press, 1940; vol. 2, Yerevan: State Press of Armenia (HayPetHrat), 1951.
- 1941 K'nnut'iwn Polsahay barbari. In: *Gitakan ašxatut'yunner* of Yerevan State University, vol. 19: 19-250.
- 1942-62 Hayoc' anjnanunneri bařaran [AčařAnjn 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 Ařtiali barbari. Yerevan: Academy Press. (Hayeren barbařner, 1).
- 1955-05 (AčařLiak): 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 AčařLiak 2005.
- 1967 Kyank'is hušeric'. Yerevan: "Mitk'", Yerevan State University.
- 1971-79 (HAB), Hayerēn armatakan bařaran, in 4 vols (second edition). Yerevan: University Press. [The original edition: 1926-1935, in 7 volumes, Yerevan: University Press].
- 2003 K'nnut'yun Kilikiayi barbari. Yerevan: University Press.
- Ačařean, Hrač'ey & Ačařean, Armenuhi
- 1902 Hawak'acoy Pōlsahay řamkakan angir grakanut'ean. In: *Azghand*, year 7, book 9: 160-196.
- Adams, Douglas Q.
- 1984 Tocharian A. *šišäk*, B *šecake*, and the Proto-Indo-European word for 'lion'. In: *ZVS* 97.2: 284-286.
- 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 Ačařyan
- Adonc', N.
- 1911 Tork' astuac hin Hayoc'. In: *Yušarjan*. Vienna: 389-394.
- 1915 Dionisij Őrakijskij i armjanskije tolkovateli (texts and study). Petrograd: Tipografija Imperatorskoj Akademii Nauk. (Bibliotheca Armeno-Georgica, 4). [See also Adonc' 2008 and *Bibliographical abbreviations*, AdonDion 2008].
- 1927 *Tarkou* chez les anciens armēniens. In: *RevEtArm* 7: 185-194.

- 1937 Quelques étymologies arméniennes. In: *Mélanges 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".
- 2006 *Nikolayos Adonc'*. Erker. Vol. 1: Patmagitakan usumnasirut'yunner (ed. by P. H. Hovhannisyán). Yerevan: University Press.
- 2008 *Nikolayos Adonc'*. Erker. Vol. 2: Hayerenagitakan usumnasirut'yunner (ed. by P. H. Hovhannisyán). Yerevan: University Press. [Here is also *AdonDion 2008* (see abbreviations), which is a new Armenian edition of Adonc 1915].
- Adontz, N., see Adonc', N.
- Adrados, Francisco R.
- 1985 Gr. *ἀλώπηξ*, O.I. *lopāsá-*, Av. *urupis*, Lat. *uolpēs* and the IE laryngeals with appendix. In: *Fs Knobloch 1985*: 21-28.
- Aghayan, E., see Ałayan.
- Akaba, L. X.
- 1955 Abxazy Očamčirskogo rajona. In: *KavkÈtnSbor 1*: 48-112.
- 1984 Istorickéskie korni arxaičeskix ritualov abxazov. Suxumi: "Alašara".
- Akinean, H. N.
- 1936 (ed.), *Simēon dpri Lehac'woy* Ułegrut'iwn: taregrut'iwn ew yišatakarak'. Nkaragir ulworut'ean i Lvovē i K. Polis, i Hřom, i Muš ew yErusefēm yamsn 1608-1619. Vienna: Mxit'arean Tparan. (Azgayin Matenadaran, 141).
- Ałabekyan, Melada A.
- 1979 Hay-italyan bařayin zugabanut'yunner. In: *Hayoc' lezvi hamematakan k'erakanut'yan harc'er*. Yerevan: Academy Press : 23-127.
- 1980 Stugabanakan ditolut'yunner. In: *PBH 1980*, Nr 3: 159-168.
- 1981 Hndevropakan *u bałajaynə hayerenum. In: *PBH 1981*, Nr 4: 95-108.
- 1981a Hndevropakan jaynavor ew jaynord *u-n hayerenum. In: *LrHasGit 1981*, Nr 8: 56-63.
- 1984 Šeštə ew nra het kapvac hnč'yunakan p'op'oxut'yunnerə naxapatmakan řřjani hayerenum. In: *IntSympArmLing 1984* : 7-14.
- 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, Artasēs
- 2002 Bun haykakan metałagorcakan terminneri cagumə ew stugabanut'yunə. In: *PBH 2002*, Nr 1: 210-216.
- Ałayan, Ē. B.
- 1954 Meřru barbař. Yerevan: Academy Press.

- 1958 Barbařayin hnaguyn tarberut'yunner hayerenum. In: *TelHasGit* 1958, Nr 5: 67-80.
- 1964 Grabari k'erakanut'yun. Volume 1, Sinxronia. Book 1, Hnč'yunabanut'yun. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- 1965 (Agajan), Ob odnom fonetičeskom zakone drevnearmjanskix dialektov. In: *LingPosn* 10: 7-14.
- 1967 Hndevropakan *Ger armatə hayerenum. In: *LrHasGit* 1967, Nr 5: 62-65.
- 1973 Bařak'nnut'yun ew stugabanut'yun. In: *PBH*, Nr 2: 16-26.
- 1974 Bařak'nnakan ew stugabanakan hetazotut'yunner. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- 1976 Ardi hayereni bac'atrakan bařaran. Vol. 1 (letters A- J); vol. 2 (letters Ł-F). Yerevan: "Hayastan".
- 1977 Naxamařtoc'yan hay gri u grakanut'yan, mesropyan aybubeni ew harakic' harc'eri masin. Yerevan: University Press.
- 1980 (Aghayan), Declinasion [read *déclinasion*, HM] en -iwn/-ean, -un/-uan de l'arménien classique. In: *ProcFICAL 1980* : 139-146.
- 1984 Əndhanur ew haykakan bařagitut'yun. Yerevan: University Press.
- 1985 On the chronology of Indo-European *ō* and *ǒ* (*ǒm*, *ǒn*) > Armenian *u* sound shift. In: *AnnArmLing* 6: 21-25.
- 1986 Aknarkner hayoc' tomarneri patmut'yan. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- 1987 Lezvabanut'yan himunk'ner. Yerevan: University Press.
- 2003 Lezvabanakan hetazotut'yunner (ed. by Ğ. S. Łazaryan, introd. by H. Z. Petrosyan). Yerevan: University Press.
- Ałayan, Łazaros
- 1979 Erker (ed. by B. H. Ananikyan). Yerevan: "Sovetakan groř" (Hay dasakanneri gradaran).
- Aliřan, Lewond
- 1876 see *Sources*: Assizes of Antioch.
- 1895 Haybusak kam haykakan busabařut'iwn. Venice: S. Lazar.
- 1910 Hin hawatk' kam het'anosakan krōnk' Hayoc'. Venice: S. Lazar.
- 1920 Yuřikk' hayreneac' hayoc'. Venice: S. Lazar.
- Alishan, Leonardo P.
- 1986 The sacred world of *Sasna tsřer*: steps toward an understanding. In: *JourSocArmStud* 2, 1985-86 [1986]: 107-139.
- Allahvėrtean, Y.
- 1884 Ulnia kam Zeyt'un. K-Polis: Pałtatlean/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 Miĵnadaryan Hayastani baĵaranagrakan hušarjanner (V-XV dd.). Yerevan: Academy Press.
 1971 Miĵnadaryan Hayastani baĵaranagrakan hušarjanner (XVI-XVII dd.). Yerevan: Academy Press.
 1971a Eremia Meĵrec‘u baĵaranə hay banasirut‘yan meĵ. In: *BanbMaten* 10: 251-258.
 1972 Baĵak‘nnakan ditoĵut‘yunner. In: *PBH* 1972, Nr 2: 131-144.
 1975 Baĵgirk‘ hayoc‘. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- Amatuni, Sahak Vardapet
 1912 Hayoc‘ baĵ u ban. Vaĵaršapat.
- Ananyan, V. S.
 1961-75 see HayKendAšx 1-5.
 1978 Hin vrani p‘ok‘rik bnakič‘ə. Yerevan: “Sovetakan groĵ”.
 1980 Ur en tanum kacannerə? Yerevan: “Sovetakan groĵ”.
 1984 (1-4), Erker. In: 4 volumes. Yerevan: “Sovetakan groĵ”. [Whenever the volume number is not indicated, the volume 4 (“Hovazajori gerinerə”) is meant].
 1987 Sewani ap‘in. Yerevan: “Arewik”. (Arkacayin gradaran).
- Anasyan, Arsen
 1967 T‘ovmas Kilikec‘u ašxarhagrut‘yunə. In: *BanbMaten* 8: 275-284.
- Anasyan, Hakob Sedraki
 1959-76 (HaykMaten 1-2), Haykakan matenagitut‘yun: 5-18 dd (redacted by V. A. Hakobyan). Vol. 1, 1959; vol. 2, 1976. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- Andranik
 1900 Tĵrsim: čanaparhordut‘iwn ew teĵagrut‘iwn. T‘iflis: Aragatip M. Martiroseanc‘i. (T‘iflisi hayoc‘ hratarakč‘akan ənkerut‘iwn, 188).
- Andreasyan, Tigran
 1967 Svediyai barbaĵə (K‘ist‘inəgi lezun). Yerevan: Academy Press.
- Ant‘osyan, S. M.
 1961 Kesariayi barbaĵə. Yerevan: Academy Press.
 1972 Bayə ew nra xonarhman hamakargə. Č‘t‘ek‘voĵ xosk‘i maser. In: *Aknarkner mijin grakan hayereni patmut‘yan*. Vol. 1. Yerevan: Academy Press: 297-490.
 1975 Xonarhman hamakargi zargac‘man ənt‘ac‘k‘ə. In: *HayLezPatmK‘er* 2: 159-377.
- Anttila, Raimo
 1986 Deepened joys of etymology, Grade a (and ä). In: *Journal de la Société finno-ougrienne* 80: 15-27.
 2000 Greek and Indo-European etymology in action: Proto-Indo-European *aĵ-. Amsterdam, Philadelphia. John Benjamins Publishing Company. (Amsterdam studies in the theory and history of linguistic science. Series IV, Current issues in linguistic theory, 200).

- Arak'elyan, B. N.
 1941 Hayk-Örion. In: *TetGAHF* 1941, Nr 8 (13): 29-36.
 1951 Ditołut'yunner Višapak'al Vahagni masin. In: *TetHasGit* 1951, Nr 2: 75-81.
 1988 Urartun ew hay žołovrdi kazmavorumə. In: *UrHay* 1988: 5-46.
- Arak'elyan, Varag
 1969 *Movses Kałankatvac'i*, Patmut'yun Ałvanic' ašxarhi (ModEArm. translation and commentary). Yerevan: "Hayastan".
 1975 Grigor Narekac'u lezun ew oča. Yerevan: Academy Press.
 1979 Bařak'nnakan ditołut'yunner. In: *PBH* 1979, Nr 4: 35-45.
 1981 Aknarkner hayoc' grakan lezvi patmut'yan (V dar). Yerevan: Academy Press.
 1982 See *Sources*: Kirakos Ganjakec'i.
 1983 (ed.), *Movsēs Kałankatuac'i*, Patmut'iwn Ałuanic' ašxarhi (critical text and introduction). Yerevan: Academy Press.
 1984 Hingerord dari hay t'argmanakan grakanut'yan lezun ew oča. Yerevan: Academy Press.
 1984a Bařak'nnakan ditołut'yunner. In: *PBH* 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.
 1985 Nartskij sjužet o roždenii geroja iz kamnja. In: *DrevAnat* 1985: 128-168.
- Arešyan, G. E.
 1975 Železo v drevnej Zapadnoj Azii. (candidate dissertation: avtoreferat). Leningrad.
- Arevšatyan, S.
 1956 (Arevšatjan), Traktat Zenona Stoika "O prirode" i ego drevnearmjanskij perevod. In: *BanbMaten* 3: 315-342.
- Ark'ayik
 1908 Łap'ani awandut'iwnneric'. In: *AzgHand* 11th year, 18th book, 1908, Nr 2: 106-108.
 1910 Łap'ani banawor grakanut'iwnic': ĵangilumner; ałot'k'ner. In: *AzgHand* 12th year, 20th book, 1910, Nr 2: 112-115.
- Arutjunjan, Covinar R.
 1983 Armjano-grečeskie leksičeskie izoglossy. In: *OčSrLekArm* 1983: 221-354.

- Arutjunjan, N. V.
 1965 Nekotorye voprosy toponimiki Urartu. In: *PBH* (= IFŽ) 1965, Nr 1: 187-200.
 1978 K interpretaciji urartskoj nadpisi iz Xagi. In: *DrevVost* 3: 153-167.
 1985 Toponimika Urartu. Yerevan: Academy Press.
 2001 Korpus urartskix klinoobraznyx nadpisej. Yerevan: Academy Press 'Gitutjun'.
- 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'oxařut'yunner nor parskerenum? In: *PBH* 1990, Nr 3: 139-144.
 1992 Kontakty armjanskogo s novoiranskimi jazykami (doctoral dissertation: avtoreferat). Yerevan: Academy Press.
- Asatryan, M. E.
 1962 Urmiaji (Xoyi) barbařə. Yerevan: University Press.
 1968 Lořu xosvack'ə. Yerevan: "Mitk'", University Press.
- Asmanguljan, A. A.
 1984 Nekotorye voprosy istoriko-ėtimologičeskogo izučenija terminov rodstva armjanskogo jazyka. In: *IntSympArmLing 1984*: 15-30.
- Astuacaturean, T'.
 1895 Hamabarbař Hin ew Nor Ktakaranac'. Jerusalem: St Jacob.
- Atkins, Samuel D.
 1941 Pūšan in the Rig-Veda. Princeton: Princeton University dissertation.
- Audouin, E.
 1892 Prothèse vocalique. In: *MSL* 7: 61-64.
- 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 bařak'nnut'yun. Yerevan: University Press.
 1986 Vimagrakan prptunner. Yerevan: University Press.
- Avagyan, Serine Movsesi
 1978 Arčak. *HayAzgBan* 8. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- Avetisyan, Ė. S.
 1989 Kirakos Episkoposi "Vasn t'řč'noc'" banastelcut'yunə. In: *BanbErewHamals* 1989, Nr 3: 122-126.

- Bader, Françoise
 1986 An I.E. myth of immersion-emergence. In: *JourIndEurStud* 14.1-2: 39-123.
- Bailey, Harold W.
 1930-31 To the Zamasp Namak I-II. In: *BSOS* 6.1 (1930): 55-85; 6.3 (1931): 581-600.
 1955-56 Indo-Iranian studies III. In: *TrPhilSoc* 1955 [1956]: 55-82.
 1956 Armeno-Indo-iranica. In: *TrPhilSoc* 1956: 88-126.
 1961 Indagatio Indo-Iranica. In: *TrPhilSoc* 1960 [1961]: 62-86.
 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.
 1983 Armenian *azbn* and *pelem*. In: *AnnArmLing* 4: 1-4.
 1985 Armenian *sin* and *zger* (*zker*). In: *AnnArmLing* 6: 27-30.
 1986 An Iranian miscellany in Armenian. In: *Gd Berbērian 1986*: 1-8.
 1987 Armenia and Iran IV. Iranian influences in Armenian. 2. Iranian loanwords in Armenian. In: *EnclIran* 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.
- Baldasaryan-T'ap'alc'yan, S. H.
 1958 Mšo barbařə. Yerevan: Academy Press.
 1971 Bařimasti p'op'oxut'yan mi k'ani erewuyt'ner Araratyan barbařum. In: *PBH* 1971, Nr 4: 217-234.
 1973 Araratyan barbaři xosvac'nerə Hoktemberyani řřjanum. Yerevan: Academy Press.
 1976 (Bagdasarjan-Tapalcjan), Meždialektnye kontakty v Araratskoj doline. In: *LingGeogrDiallStJaz*: 100-108.
- Balles, Irene
 1997 Reduktionserscheinungen in langen Wortformen als Ursprung morphologischer Doppelformen im Urindogermanischen: die Suffixformen *-jo- und *-ijo-. In: *Die Sprache* 39.2: 141-167.
- 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: *PBH* 1965, Nr 4: 79-95.
 1972 Hayereni barbařner: Sewana lři avazani xosvacqnerə. Yerevan: Haykakan petakan mankavarřakan institut.
 1974 Hayeren bařer "K'it'abi dada Gorgudum". In: *PBH* 1974, Nr 1: 162-174.

- Bammesberger, Alfred
 1970 Litauisch *lāpė* und lateinisch *volpēs*. In: *Fs Stang 1970*: 38-43.
 1971 Urgermanisch **funsaz*. In: *Die Sprache* 17.1: 46-49.
 1982 Le mot irlandais désignant l'oeil. In: *ÉtCelt* 19: 155-157.
- Bańkowski, Andrzej
 1989 Slavic **kьnorzь* as a relic of a primitive Indo-European adjective-building class. In: *LingPosn* 30, 1987 [1989]: 39-45.
- Barnasjan, Ĵemma
 2006 Hayoc' hin amsanunneri cagman harc'i šurj. In: *IntConfArmLett 2006*: 343-348.
- 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: *ÈllBIVizIr*: 102-112.
- Barton, Charles R.
 1963 The etymology of Armenian *ert'am*. In: *Language* 39.4: 620.
 1985 Hittite *me-ri-ir, epp-* and a note on the ablaut of root verbs. In: *ZVS* 98: 13-19.
 1987 Greek *eirw*, Latin *sero*, Armenian *yerum*. In *AmJPhil* 108.4: 672-674.
 1988 Gk. *ǎesa*, Arm. *agay* and PIE **h₁*. In: *LaryngTheor 1988*: 49-58.
 1989 PIE. **mer-*, Arm. *meřanim* 'die'. In: *IndogForsch* 94: 135-157.
 1990-91 On the denominal *a*-statives of Armenian. In: *RevEtArm* n.s.22: 29-52.
- Barxudareanc', Makar Vard./Epis.
 1883 (Makar Vard.), Pələ-Puři. 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: "Arör".
- 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 bařaran 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.
 1963-83 (HayŽolXař 1-3), Hay žolovrdakan xařer. Vol. 1: 1963; vol. 2: 1980; vol. 3: 1983. Yerevan: Academy Press.

- 1964 Šarac'an sistemə Vana lči avazanum. In: *PBH* 1964, Nr 1: 249-257.
- 1972 Erkragorcakan mšakuyt'ə Hayastanum. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- 1986 Haykakan ałamanner. Yerevan: "Sovetakan grof".
- Bediryan, P. S.
- 1955 Hayereni mi k'ani bařeri stugabanut'yan řurjə. In: *TelHasGit* 1955, Nr 9: 95-104.
- 1956 Stugabanakan verlucut'yunner. In: *TelHasGit* 1956, Nr 7: 39-48.
- 1962 Mi k'ani stugabanut'yunner. In: *PBH* 1962, Nr 1: 139-147.
- 1966 Stugabanut'yunner. In: *PBH* 1966, Nr. 2: 217-225.
- 2003 Bařeri xorhrdavor ařxarhum: zruyc'ner. Yerevan: "Zangak".
- Beekes, Robert S. P.
- 1969 The development of the Proto-Indo-European laryngeals in Greek. The Hague, Paris: Mouton.
- 1971 μόνυχες ἴπποι. In: *Orbis* 20.1: 138-142.
- 1971a A European substratum word. In: *Orbis* 20.1: 132-137.
- 1972 H₂O. In: *Die Sprache* 18: 117-131.
- 1972a The nominative of the Hysterodynamic noun-inflection. In: *ZVS* 86.1: 30-63.
- 1973 The Proterodynamic 'Perfect'. In: *ZVS* 87: 86-98.
- 1973a The Greek *i-* and *u-*stems and πόνις, -ηος. In: *Glotta* 51: 228-245.
- 1973b Lat. *prae* and other supposed datives in *-ai*. In: *ZVS* 87: 215-221.
- 1973c Review of *Hahn 1969*. In: *Mnemosyne* 26.4: 399-401.
- 1974 Another proterodynamic verb in Hittite. In: *ZVS* 88: 181-184.
- 1975 Review of *Furnée 1972* (Part I: General). In: *Lingua* 36: 69-82. (For Part II see Kuipers 1975).
- 1975a Two notes on PIE stems in dentals. In: *FlexWortb 1975*: 9-14.
- 1975b Review of *W. F. Wyatt*, The Greek prothetic vowel. Cleveland, 1972. In: *Mnemosyne* 28.4: 427-430.
- 1976 Some Greek aRa-forms. In: *MünStudSpr* 34: 9-20.
- 1976a Uncle and nephew. In: *JourIndEurStud* 4: 43-63.
- 1976b Review of *E. Seebold*, Das System der indogermanischen Halbvokale, Heidelberg, 1972. In: *IndIranJour* 18: 88-96.
- 1977 Greek nouns in *-υς, -υος*. In: *Orbis* 26: 253-261.
- 1977a Κῆρες, Κᾶρες: root nouns of the type *Cēr, Cārós?* In: *MünStudSpr* 36: 5-7.
- 1981-82 Review of *Peters 1980*. In: *Kratylos* 26, 1981 [1982]: 106-115.
- 1982 GAv. *mā*, the PIE word for 'moon, month', and the perfect participle. In: *JourIndEurStud* 10: 53-64.
- 1984 PIE 'sun'. In: *MünStudSpr* 43: 5-8.
- 1985 The origins of the Indo-European nominal inflection. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft, 46).

- 1986 ‘You can get new children...’: Turkish and other parallels to ancient Greek ideas in Herodotus, Thucydides, Sophocles and Euripides. In: *Mnemosyne* 39.3-4: 225-239.
- 1986a Review of *A. Bammesberger*, *Studien zur Laryngaltheorie*, Göttingen, 1984. In: *Kratylos* 31: 70-75.
- 1987 Gr. (ἀ)στεροπή, ἀστραπή. In: *MünStudSpr* 48: 15-20.
- 1987a On Indo-European ‘wine’. In: *MünStudSpr* 48: 21-26.
- 1987b The PIE words for ‘name’ and ‘me’. In: *Die Sprache* 33.1-2: 1-12.
- 1987c Indo-European neuters in *-i*. In: *Fs Hoenigswald 1987*: 45-56.
- 1987d The word for ‘four’ in Proto-Indo-European. In: *JourIndEurStud* 15: 215-219.
- 1988 Laryngeal developments: a survey. In: *LaryngTheor 1988*: 59-105.
- 1988a PIE. *RHC-* in Greek and other languages. In: *IndogForsch* 93: 22-45.
- 1989 The nature of Proto-Indo-European laryngeals. In: *NewSouIndEur 1989*: 23-33.
- 1989a Old Persian *p-θ-i-m*. In: *MünStudSpr* 50: 7-13.
- 1989b Review of *Nussbaum 1986*. In: *Kratylos* 34: 55-59.
- 1990 Wackernagel’s explanation of the lengthened grade. In: *SprPhil 1990*: 33-53.
- 1990a Bloem en blad. In: *100 jaar etymologisch woordenboek van het Nederlands*, ed. by A. Moerdijk, W. Pijnenburg, P. van Sterkenburg. The Hague: 375-382.
- 1990-92 The genitive in **-osio*. In: *FollingHist* 11.1-2, 1990 [1992]: 21-25.
- 1991 Review of *LaryngTheor 1988*. In: *AmstBeiAltGerm* 33: 237-245.
- 1992 ‘Widow’. In: *HistSpr* 105.2: 171-188.
- 1994 ‘Right’, ‘left’ and ‘naked’ in Proto-Indo-European. In: *Orbis* 37: 87-96.
- 1994a The neuter plural of thematic nouns. Derivatives from a stem in *-e-* from thematic nouns. In: *FrMitSpIdg 1994* : 1-15.
- 1995 Comparative Indo-European linguistics: an introduction. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- 1996 Ancient European loanwords. In: *HistSpr* 109.2: 215-236.
- 1996a The etymology of Germ. *Funke* ‘spark’. In: *AmstBeiAltGerm* 46: 1-8.
- 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.
- 2001 God is non-Indo-European. In: *AmstBeiAltGerm* 54: 27-30.
- 2002 [2004] Hom. *γέφυρα*, and Arm. *kamurj* ‘bridge’. In: *Glotta* 78, 1-4: 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.

- 2004 Armenian *gišer* and the Indo-European word for ‘evening’. In: *Fs Rasmussen 2004*: 59-62.
- 2008 Palatalized consonants in Pre-Greek. In: *Fs Kortlandt 2008*, 1: 45-56.
- 2009 Etymological Dictionary of Greek (with the assistance of Lucien van Beek). Leiden: Brill.
- Beekes, R. S. P. & van der Meer, L. B.
1991 De Etrusken spreken. Muiderberg: Dick Coutinho.
- Béguinot, Augusto & Diratzouyan, P. Nersès
1912 Contributo alla flora dell’Armenia. Venezia: Tipografia Armena di S. Lazzaro.
- Behr, Wolfgang
2004 *Hinc sunt leones*: two ancient Eurasian migratory terms in Chinese revisited (1). In: *International journal of Central Asian studies*. Seoul, Institute of Asian culture and development; Tashkent, International association of Central Asian studies. 2004: 1-24.
2005 *Hinc sunt leones*: two ancient Eurasian migratory terms in Chinese revisited (2). In: *International journal of Central Asian studies*. Seoul, Institute of Asian culture and development; Tashkent, International association of Central Asian studies; vol. 10: 1-28.
- Belardi, Walter
1950 Arm. *nerkanem*. Arm. *p’ayt e payt’em*. In: *RicLing* 1.1: 147-148 and 148-149.
- 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 Hemşinli. 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.
1954 Problèmes sémantiques de la reconstruction. In: *Word* 10.2-3: 251-264.
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 *aregakn* ‘soleil’ et la formation nominale en *-akn*. In: *RevEtArm* n.s. 2: 5-19.

- 1966 Une correspondance indo-européenne en arménien. In: *RevEtArm* n.s. 3: 7-10.
- 1967 Un fait de supplétisme lexical en indo-européen. In: *Fs Pokorny 1967*: 11-15.
- 1969, 1-2 Le vocabulaire des institutions indo-européennes. 1. économie, parenté, société; 2. pouvoir, droit, religion. Paris: Les Editions de Minuit. Engl. transl. see 1973.
- 1973 Indo-European language and society. Summaries, table and index by Jean Lallot; translated (from 1969) by Elizabeth Palmer. London: Faber and Faber Limited.
- Berbérian, H.
1974 Une racine arménienne méconnue: *ał-*. In: *Gd Szuszkiewicz 1974*: 39-40.
- Bernštejn, S. B.
1984 Nekotorye voprosy metodiki izučenija problem ètnogeneza slavjan. In: *ÈtnNarBalk 1984*: 11-17.
- Bezenberger, 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.
- Bittner, Maximilian
1896 Der Kurdengau Uschnûje und die Stadt Urûmije: Reiseschilderungen eines Persers, im Originaltexte herausgegeben, übersetzt und erläutert von Dr. M. Bittner. In: *Sitzungsberichte der philosophisch-historischen Classe der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften*. 133.3. Wien.
- Blanchard, Monica J. & Young, Robin Darling
1998 A Treatise on God written in Armenian by Eznik of Kolb (floruit c. 430-c. 450). An English translation, with introduction and notes. Leuven: Peeters.
- Bläsing, Uwe
1992 Armenisches Lehngut im Türkeitürkischen am Beispiel von Hemşin. Amsterdam/Atlanta: Rodopi.
1995 Armenisch – Türkisch: etymologische Betrachtungen ausgehend von Materialien aus dem Hemşingebiet nebst einigen Anmerkungen zum Armenischen, insbesondere dem Hemşindialekt. Amsterdam/Atlanta: Rodopi.
1995a Bemerkungen zu arm. *kolinj* 'Schnecke'. In: *NewApprMedArm*: 111-119.
2000 Irano-Turcica: weitere iranische Elemente im Türkeitürkischen. In: *FoOrient* 36 (Studia in honorem Stanisłai Stachowski dicata): 33-61.

- 2001 Arm. *p'ilunc'* vs. laz. *bilonc-*, grg. *blenc-*. Ein Beitrag zu den Bezeichnungen von Farnen (Pteropsida) im Kaukasus und Anatolien. In: *StudEtymCrac* 6: 15-78.
- 2007 Armenian in the vocabulary and culture of the Turkish Hemshinli. In: *H. Simonian 2007*: 279-302.
- Blažek, Václav
- 1995 Indo-European personal pronouns (1st & 2nd persons). In: *Dhumbadji! Journal of the history of language* 2.3 Dec: 1-15.
- 1998 Is Indo-European **H₁ekwo-* 'horse' really of Indo-European origin? In: *StudIndogLodz* 2: 21-32.
- 1998-99 Baltic and Slavic 'fox'. In: *Linguistica Baltica* 7, 1998-99, 25-31.
- 2001 On the Baltic theonyms: Baltic-Italic correspondences in divine-names. In: *JourIndEurStud* 29, 3-4: 351-365.
- 2001a Tocharian A *muk* 'yoke' and A *maku*, B *mekwa* pl. '(finger)nails' - why *m-*? In: *HistSpr* 114.1: 191-195.
- 2002 The 'beech'-argument – State-of-the-Art. In: *HistSpr* 115.2: 190-217.
- 2003 Slavic **ezero* vs. **ozero*. In: *Studia etymologica Brunensia* 2. Praha: Lidové noviny: 243-257.
- 2003a A Tocharian key to the etymology of the bird-name **srgó-* 'stork'. In: *TochIndEurStud* 10: 15-16.
- 2004 A little light upon 'night'. In: *Fs Rasmussen 2004*: 63-68.
- 2005 Hic erant leones: Indo-European 'lion' et alii. In: *JourIndEurStud* 33.1-2: 63-101.
- 2008 Celtic 'smith' and his colleagues. In: *Fs Kortlandt 2008*, 1: 67-85.
- forthc. Indo-European 'smith' and his divine colleagues.
- 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 Iranskie nazvanija utrennej zvezdy. In: *VoprJaz* 1989, Nr 4: 88-91.
- Boisacq, Émile
- 1910-11 Grec. *ἐλίκη* 'saule'. In: *MSL* 16: 261-263.
- 1911-12 Grec *κέλωρ* 'fils' et homonymes. In: *MSL* 17: 113-116.
- Bolognesi, Giancarlo
- 1960 Le fonti dialettali degli imprestiti iranici in armeno. Milano: Società Editrice Vita e Pensiero. (Pubblicazioni dell'Università cattolica del Sacro cuore. Serie 3: Scienze filologiche e letteratura, 1).
- 1986 Armeniaca: emprunts iraniens et calques grecs en arménien. In: *PlacArmLIE* 1986: 1-15.

- 1986a (Bolonyezi), Hayereni stugabanakan ew hnč'yunabanakan harc'er. In: *PBH* 1986, Nr 1: 34-42.
- 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.
- 1979 The Indo-European phonological system: new thoughts about its reconstruction and development. In: *Orbis* 28.1: 66-110.
- 1986 An etymological note: PIE **Hs-tér-* 'star'. In: *JourIndEurStud* 14, 1-2: 191-192.
- 2008, 1-2 Reconstructing Proto-Nostratic: comparative phonology, morphology, and vocabulary (2 volumes). Leiden, Boston: Brill. (LeidIEEDSer, 6/1-2).
- Bonfante, Giuliano
- 1937 Les isoglosses gréco-arméniennes. I. Faits phonétiques. In: *Fs Pedersen 1937*: 15-33.
- 1974 Das Problem des Weines und die linguistische Paläontologie. In: *AntiqIndog 1974*: 85-90.
- 1975 Un capitolo di fonologia dell'indoeuropeo: il problema dell'ō breve. In: *Fs Benveniste 1975*: 47-54.
- 1981 Hayereni dirk'ə hndevropakan lezunerī mej. In: *PBH* 1981, Nr 2: 54-67.
- 1984 The Armenian family-terminology. In: *IntSympArmLing 1984*: 26-30.
- 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
- 1957 The Parthian *gōsān* and Iranian minstrel tradition. In: *JourRoyAsSoc*: 10-45.
- 1977 A word-list of Manichaean Middle Persian and Parthian (with a reverse index by Ronald Zwanziger). Leiden: E.J. Brill; Téhéran-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
- 1967 Ein Beitrag zur Entstehung des aktiven Indikativs. In: *Fs Pokorny 1967*: 17-19.
- Brandenstein, Wilhelm & Mayrhofer, Manfred
- 1964 Handbuch des Altpersischen. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

- Bratcher, Robert G. & Reyrburn, 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.
 1834 Aperçu général de la langue géorgienne. In: *JourAsiat* 1834, November: 369-405.
 1870 Deux historiens arméniens: Kiracos de Gantzac, XIII^e s., Histoire d'Arménie; Oukhtanès d'Ourha, X^e s., Histoire en trois parties. St.-Pétersbourg.
- Brown, Norman O.
 1947 Hermes the thief: the evolution of a myth. The University of Wisconsin Press.
- Brugmann, Karl
 1902-03 Wortgeschichtliche Miscellen. In: *IndogForsch* 13: 144-163.
 1904 Etymologische Miscellen. In: *IndogForsch* 16: 491-509.
- 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. Brøggers Buchdruckerei. (Videnskabselskabets Skrifter. II. Historisk-filosofisk Klasse. 1897, Nr 7; 1901, Nr 4).
 1899 Einige Zahlwörter im Lykischen. In: *IndogForsch* 10: 59-61.
 1903 Armen. *magil*. In: *ZArmPhil* 1: 164-166.
- Burrow, Thomas
 2001 The Sanskrit language. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers Private Limited; London: Faber and Faber (< 1973 < 1955).
- Cabolov, 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'iwnk' Aknay. T'iflis: Tparan M. D. Rōtineanc'i. (T'iflisi hayoc' hratarakč'akan ənkerut'iwñ, 89).
- Cardona, George
1987 On Sanskrit *bhunákti* 'aids, serves, protects'. In: *Fs Hoenigswald 1987*: 65-72.
- Carpelan, Christian & Parpola, Asko
2001 Emergence, contacts and dispersal of Proto-Indo-European, Proto-Uralic and Proto-Aryan in archaeological perspective. In: *EarlContUralIndEur 2001*: 55-150.
- Casaretto, Antje
2000 Korpusssprachen und Produktivität: Einige Überlegungen zu den gotischen *s*-Stämmen. In: *HistSpr* 113: 210-238.
- Caturyan, T' G.
1970 Buyseri anunneri latineren-hayeren-fuseren bařaran (2nd revised ed.). Yerevan: University Press.
- Černyx, Pavel Jakovlevič
1999 (1-2), Istoriko-ètimologičeskij slovar' sovremennogo russkogo jazyka (2 volumes). Moscow: "Russkij jazyk".
- Chantraine, Pierre
1968-80 Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque: histoire des mots (4 volumes). Paris: Klincksieck.
- Chapman, Donald & Chapman, Norma
1975 Fallow deer: their history, distribution and biology. Lavenham, Suffolk: Terence Dalton Limited.
- Charpentier, Jarl
1909 Kleine Beiträge zur armenischen Wortkunde. In: *IndogForsch* 25: 241-256.
- Cheung, Johnny
2002 Studies in the historical development of the Ossetic vocalism. Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag.
2007 Etymological dictionary of the Iranian verb. Leiden, Boston: Brill. (Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary series, 2).
- Chirikba, Vyacheslav A.
1985 (Čirikba), Baskkij 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).
2006 Abkhaz loans in Megrelian. In: *IranCauc* 10.1: 25-76.
- Cilvan, G. L.
1899 T'amar ew Ōvan. In: *Biwrakn 1899*: 197-200.

- Cimino, Rosa Maria
 1994 An exceptional find in India: a small sculpture depicting Eros issuing from an egg. In: *SouthAsArch* 1994, 1: 171-182.
- Cirbied, Jacques Chahan (Yakovb Šahan Ĵrpetean)
 1823 Grammaire de la langue arménienne: où l'on expose les principes et les règles de la langue, d'après les meilleurs grammairiens, et les auteurs originaux et suivant les usages particuliers de l'idiome Haïkien. Paris: de l'Imprimerie d'Éverat.
- Civ'jan, T. V.
 1977 Balkanske dopolnenija k poslednim issledovanijam indoevropskogo mifa o Gromoveržce. In: *BalkLingSbor* 1977: 172-195.
- Clackson, James
 1994 The linguistic relationship between Armenian and Greek. Oxford, Cambridge: Blackwell (Publications of the Philological Society, 30).
 1999-2000 Arm. *ariwn* 'blood'. In: *AnnArmLing* 20: 27-45.
 2004 Minge - a loanword study. In: *Fs Rasmussen 2004*: 109-115.
 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, Jakob
 1986 K'esapi barbařa. Haleb.
- Colarusso, John
 1997 Proto-Pontic: phyletic links between Proto-Indo-European and Proto-Northwest Caucasian. In: *JourIndEurStud* 25.1-2: 119-151.
- 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.
- Connolly, Leo A.
 1984 Altnordisch *e* < indogermanisch *i*. In: *ZVS* 97.2: 267-280.
- Considine, Patrick
 1978-79 Review of *J. A. C. Greppin*, Initial vowel and aspiration in Classical Armenian, Vienna: Mechitarist Press, 1973. In: *RevEtArm* n.s. 13: 355-364.
 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, Bojan
 1955 Etyma. In: *Linguistica* 1: 28-33 [*non vidi*; cited 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
 1960 Greek *ou* and Armenian *oč*'. In: *Language* 36.3: 347-350.
 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 **ǵh/ghel-* 'hell, glänzend' im Griechischen und Slavischen. In: *ZVS* 81, 3/4: 181-196.
- Čugaszyan, B. L.
 1980 see *Sources*: Bžškaran jioy ew arhasarak grastnoy (13th cent.).
 1986 (ed., with introduction and commentary), *Elia Mušeťyan Karnec'i*, T'urk'eren-hayeren bařaran. 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 Ařack' azgayink'. Venice: S. Lazar.
- Cuny, A.
 1937 Questions d'apophonie vocalique. In: *Mélanges Boisacq* 1, 1937: 227-231.
- Dadean, A.
 1908 Varandayi banawor grakanut'iwnic': řan-giwlumner. In: *AzgHand* 11th year, XVIII book, 1908, Nr 2: 25-32.
- 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 lezvamřakut'ayin ařnč'ut'yunner (candidate avtoreferat). Yerevan.
 2004 "Sasna cřeri" ew ōsakan "Nart'yan dic'avepi" hamematakan k'nnut'yan urvagcer. In: *SasCřGit* 2004: 82-87.

- Danielyan, T'ewan
 1967 Malat'iaiyi barbaṛə. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- Danka, Ignacy R. & Witczak, Krzysztof T.
 1997 Indo-European **k̑w̑Hos* and its meanings in the Neolithic and Post-Neolithic times. In: *JourIndEurStud* 25.3-4: 361-369.
- Dankoff, Robert
 1995 Armenian Loanwords in Turkish. Wiesbaden. Harrassowitz Verlag ("Turcologica", ed. by Lars Yohanson; vol. 21).
- Darbinjan-Melikjan, M. O. & 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, H. M.
 1973 *T'ueleac' ergeri anvanman aṛt'iv*. In: *Ējmiacin* 30, 1973, Nr 7: 46-48.
 1976 Mi parzabanum "Baṛgirk' hayoc'i" 1698 t'. tpaṛrut'yan veraberyal. In: *PBH* 1976, Nr 2: 182-188.
- Davt'yan, K. S.
 1966 Leṛnayin Łarabali barbaṛayin k'arteṛə. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- Dawit'-Bēk, Melik' S.
 1919 Arabkiri gawaṛabarbaṛə: jaynabanakan ew k'erakanakan usumnasiru'iw. Vienna: Mxit'arean Tparan. (Azgayin Matenadaran 79).
- 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 Silli, 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).
 1997a Idg. */h₁neyn/ : alb. */nan(-)/ - zwei Fragen der albanischen Lautgeschichte. In: *Fs Beekes 1997*: 15-20.

- 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).
- 2002 'Rozwadowski's change' in Baltic. In: *Baltu filologija* 11.1: 5-12.
- 2002-03 On the reception of Winter's law. In: *Baltistica* 37.1, 2002 [2003]: 5-13.
- 2008 Etymological dictionary of the Slavic inherited lexicon. Leiden, Boston: Brill. (LeidIEEDSer, 4).
- Dervischjan, P. Seraphin
- 1877 Armeniaca I: Das Altarmenische. Wien: Mechitharisten Buchdruckerei.
- 1887 Hayakank' VI. In: *Lezu* 1887: 89-91.
- 1885 (Tērvišean, 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 Berbērian 1986*: 243-263.
- 1992 A lamentation of ostriches? In: *RevEtArm* 23: 155-189.
- 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.
- Duchesne-Guillemin, J.
- 1940 Tocharica. In: *BSL* 41: 140-183.
- Dumézil, Georges
- 1938 Traitement de *m + p* en arménien. In: *BSL* 39: 241-242.
- 1938a Notes sur quelques tournures et formes participiales de l'arménien. In: *BSL* 39: 93-102.
- 1938b Séries étymologiques arméniennes. In: *BSL* 40: 48-54.
- 1940 Séries étymologiques arméniennes V-VI. In: *BSL* 41: 65-69.
- 1963 Le puits de Nechtan. In: *Celtica* 6: 50-61.
- 1964 Notes sur le parler d'un Arménien musulman de Hemşin. In: *Académie Royale de Belgique: Mémoires de la Classe des Lettres* (Bruxelles) 57.4: 3-52.
- 1965 Notes sur le parler d'un Arménien musulman d'Ardala. In: *RevEtArm* n.s. 2: 135-142.

- 1967 Trois récits dans le parler der arméniens musulmans de Hemşin. In: *RevEtArm* n.s. 4: 19-35.
- 1967a 'Vin' et 'bière' dans deux noms propres scythiques. In: *Fs Pokorny 1967*: 29-31.
- 1986-87 Un roman policier en arménien d'Ardala. In: *RevEtArm* n.s. 20: 5-27.
- 1997 *Vartan Matiossian* (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.
- Durante, Marcello
1968 Untersuchungen zur Vorgeschichte der griechischen Dichtersprache. Die Terminologie für das dichterische Schaffen. In: *IndogDicht 1968*: 261-290 ($<$ 1960: 231-249).
- Durean, Elišē Patriark'
1933 Hayoc' hin krōnə kam haykakan dic'abanut'iwn. Jerusalem: Tparan Srboč' Yakobeanc'. (Durean Matenadaran, 3).
- Duridanov, Ivan
1974 Zur etymologie des Wortes (*h*)urda. In: *LingBalk* 17, 1: 51-62.
- Dvoreckij, I. X.
1986 Latinsko-russkij slovar'. Moscow: "Russkij jazyk".
- D'jatonov, I. M.
1968 Predistorija 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: *PBH* (= IFŽ) 1981, Nr 1: 56-78.
1982 (Diakonoff), Ancient Near Eastern substrata in Armenian. In: *AnnArmLing* 3: 13-18.
1983 K praistorii armjanskogo jazyka: o faktax, svidetel'stvax i logike. In: *PBH* (= IFŽ) 1983, Nr 4: 149-178.
1984 (Diakonoff), The pre-history of the Armenian people (transl. from D'jatonov 1968 by Lori Jennings; with revisions by the author). Delmar, New York: Caravan Books (Anatolian and Caucasian studies).

- 1985 Hurro-Urartian borrowings in Old Armenian. In: *JAmOrSoc* 105.4: 597-603.
- 1992 First evidence of the Proto-Armenian language in Eastern Anatolia. In: *AnnArmLing* 13: 51-54.
- Diakonoff, I. M. & Starostin, S. A.
1986 Hurro-Urartian as an Eastern Caucasian language (MünStudSpr, Beiheft 12, N.F.). München: R. Kitzinger.
- Diakonoff, I. M. & Kashkai, S. M.
1981 Geographical names according to Urartian texts. Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag. (Tübinger Atlas des Vorderen Orients: Beihefte, Reihe B, Bd. 9).
- D'jakonov, M. M.
1951 Obraz Sijavuša v sredneaziatskoj mifologii. In: *Kratkie soobščeniya instituta istorii material'noj kul'tury* (Moscow: Academy Press) 40: 34-44.
- Džejranov, O. I.
1898 Selenie Čajkend, Elisavetpol'skago uezda, toj že gubernii. In: *SMOMPK* 25.2: 59-100.
- Edelman, Džoj (Joy) I.
2003 Some taboo-words in Iranian languages of Central Asia. In: *Fs Winter 2003*: 121-130.
- Eichner, Heiner
1978 Die urindogermanische Wurzel *H₂reu 'hell machen'. In: *Die Sprache* 24: 144-162.
1982 Zur hethitischen Etymologie. In: *Gd Kronasser 1982*: 16-28.
1988 Anatolisch und Trilaryngalismus. In: *LaryngTheor 1988*: 123-151.
- 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.
1967-83 (DeutPersWört 1-2), *Deutsch-Persisches Wörterbuch*. Vol. 1: A-D, 1967; vol. 2: E-Feucht, 1983. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
1971 Iranisches Lehngut im Arabischen. In: *Actas. IV Congresso de Estudos Árabes e Islâmicos*. Coimbra-Lisbon, September 1-8, 1968. (Congress of Arabic and Islamic Studies, 4). Leiden: E. J. Brill. (pp. 581-660).
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 Āl, 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.
- Eilers, Wilhelm & Mayrhofer, Manfred
 1962 Kurdish *būz* und die indogermanische ‘Buchen’-Sippe. In: *MitAntGesWien* 92: 61-92.
- Elbourne, Paul
 2000 Plain voiceless stop plus laryngeal in Indo-European. In: *HistSpr* 113: 2-28.
- Elizarenkova, T. Ja.
 1982 Grammatika vedijskogo jazyka. Moscow: GRVLI “Nauka”.
 1989 (ed.) *Rigveda* : mandaly I-IV. Moscow: “Nauka”.
- Elizarenkova, T. Ja. & Toporov, V. N.
 1979 Drevneindijskaja poëtika i ee indoevropskie istoki. In: *LitKDSInd* 1979: 36-88.
- 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).
- Erēc‘, S.
 1898 Hmac‘[!]akner: Nuēr ar H. L. A. In: *Biwrakn* 1898, June 11: 380.
- Eremean, Aram
 1923 Č‘aharmahali hay žoľovrdakan banahiwsut‘iwnə. Vienna: Mxit‘arean tparan. (Azgayin Matenadaran, 96).
 1930 P‘šrank‘ner Jułahay ew Hndkahay banahiwsut‘iwnic‘: taľer ew žoľovrdakan erger (17-19rd dar). Vienna: Mxit‘arean Tparan. (Azgayin Matenadaran, 129).
 1953 (Eremyan), Step‘anos Erec‘i mecaržek‘ jeřagir matyanə. In: *Ējmiacin*, 1953, 7-8: 26-32.
- Eremyan, S. T.
 1963 Hayastanə əst Ašxarhac‘oyc‘-i: p‘orj VII dari haykakan k‘artezi verakazmut‘yan žamanakacic‘ k‘artezagrakan himk‘i vra. Yerevan: Academy Press.

- 1970 Hay žołovrdi kazmavorman ənt'ac'k'ə. In: *PBH* 1970, Nr 2: 27-56.
- 1972-73 "Ašxarhac'oyc'i" skzbnakan bnagri verakangnman p'orj. A) in: *PBH* 1972, Nr 4: 209-230; B) in *PBH* 1973, Nr 1: 238-252; C) in: *PBH* 1973, Nr 2: 261-274.
- Eren, Hasan
1999 Türk dilinin etimolojik sözlüğü. Ankara.
- Èrlix, V. R.
1989 Korčaga iz Majkopskogo muzeja. In: *SovArx* 1989, Nr 2: 244-247.
- Ernout, A. and Meillet, A.
1959 Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine: histoire des mots (4th ed.). Paris: Librairie C. Klincksieck.
- Ervandyan, Zuxra
2007 Łarabali barbari bařayin kazmi hastatman gorcənt'ac'ə. Yerevan: Heřinakayin hratarakut'yun.
- Eska, Joseph F.
1992 Further to ανδοονναβο. In: *Journal of Celtic Linguistics* 1: 119-125.
- Eska, Joseph F. & Wallace, Rex E.
2001 Remarks on the thematic genitive singular in ancient Italy and related matters. In: *Incling* 24: 77-97.
- Euler, Wolfram
1979 Indoiranisch-griechische Gemeinsamkeiten der Nominalbildung und deren indogermanische Grundlagen. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft).
1985 Tiernamen im Altpreußischen. In: *ZVS* 98: 84-98.
- Evans, David
1974 Dodona, Dodola, and Daedala. In: *MythIEAnt* : 99-130.
- Falk, Harry
1986 Bruderschaft und Würfelspiel: Untersuchungen zur Entwicklungsgeschichte des Vedischen Opfers. Freiburg: Hedwig Falk.
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. See also Vasmer 1950-58.
- Feydit, F.
1979 (Feydi), Hnč'yunabanakan ditołut'yunner. In: *PBH* 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: 196-201.
- 1905a Review of *Matthaeus Much*, Die Heimat der Indogermanen, Berlin 1902. In: *BKIGS* 29: 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.
- Ford, Patrick K.
- 1974 The Well of Nechtan and 'La Gloire Lumineuse'. In: *MythIEAnt* 1974: 67-74.
- Forrer, Emil
- 1931 Hajasa-Azzi. In: *Caucasica* 9: 1-24.
- 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.
- 1955-65 (1-2), Litauisches etymologisches Wörterbuch. Heidelberg: Carl Winter. Universitätsverlag; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Freitas, Lima de
- 1987 Labyrinth. In: *EncRel* 8: 411-419.
- Frejman, A. A.
- 1958 Tadžikskoe *pūst* 'koža, kožura, kora, oboločka, skorlupa, šeluxa, škura'. In: *SovVost* 1958, Nr 6: 77-81.
- Friedrich, Johannes
- 1954 Göttersprache und Menschensprache im hethitischen Schrifttum. In: *Fs Debrunner 1954*: 135-139.
- 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: *GötHögÅrs* 50, 1944, 1: 1-36 (= 1966: 253-280).
- 1960-72 (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.
- Furnée, Edzard Johan
 1972 Die wichtigsten konsonantischen Erscheinungen des Vorgriechischen: mit einem Appendix über den Vokalismus. The Hague, Paris: Mouton.
 1979 Vorgriechisch-Kartvelisches: Studien zum ostmediterranen Substrat nebst einem Versuch zu einer neuen pelasgischen Theorie. Leuven: Peeters.
 1989 Die Urbaskisch und Urkartvelisch: Indizien für eine Verwandtschaft. Leiden: The Hakuchi Press.
- Gabikēan, Karapet
 1952 Baḡirk' Sebastahay gawaḡalezui. Erusałēm: St Jacob.
- Gabriēlean, M. S.
 1912 Aknay gawaḡabarbaḡə. 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. Yerevan: "Sovetakan grof".
- Galstyan, A. G.
 1958 See *Sources*: Smbat Sparapet.
- Galustean, Gr. H. (Kilikec'i)
 1934 Maraš kam Germanik ew heros Zēyt'un. New York: "Koč'nak" (Maraši hayrenak'akan miut'wn).
- 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 Žoļovrdakan 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: Hreštaknern u satananerə hay žoļovrdakan hawatk'in mēj].
- García-Ramón, J. L.
 1998 Indogermanisch *g^{uh}en- '(wiederholt) schlagen', 'töten'. In: *Fs Watkins 1998*: 139-154.

- Garsoïan, Nina G.
 1989 The Epic Histories attributed to P'awstos Buzand (*Buzandaran Patmut'iwnk'*): translation and commentary. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Gasparian, H.
 1966 Haĵəni barbaṛə. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- Gatuev, Dzaxo
 1932 Amran: osetinskij èpos. Russ. transl. and commentary. (Introduction and redaction by N. Marr). Moscow, Leningrad: Academia.
- Gauthiot, Robert
 1910-11 Des noms de l'abeille et de la ruche en indo-européen et en finno-ougrien. In: *MSL* 16: 264-279.
 1916 Iranica. In: *MSL* 19: 125-132.
- Gayseryan, V. A.
 1990 Sepagir albyurneri ^{KUR}Etiu erkri toponimikayi harc'er. In: *LrHasGit* 1990, Nr 3: 76-87.
- Gazančean, Yovhannēs
 1899 Ewdokioy hayoc' gawaṛabarbaṛə. 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. *HayAzgBan* 10. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- Geworgyan, T'amar
 1999 Loṛi (Taširk' – Joraget). *HayAzgBan* 20. Yerevan: Academy Press "Gitut'yun".
- Gharib, B.
 1995 Sogdian dictionary: Sogdian-Persian-English. Tehran: Farhang Publications.
- Gindin, L. A.
 1977 Mif o poedinke i mifologii Apollona (na materiale I-III gomerovskix gimnov). In *SlavBalkJaz* 1977: 96-117.
- 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
- 1965 Les origines de la conjugaison arménienne. In: *RevEtArm* n.s. 2: 21-41.
- 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.
- Gojan, Georg
- 1952 (1-2), Teatr drevnej Armenii: po pamjatnikam material’noj kul’tury i drevnim tekstam. Vols. 1-2. Moscow: State Press “Iskusstvo”.
- 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).
- Götze, Albrecht & Pedersen, Holger
- 1934 Muršilis Sprachlähmung: ein hethitischer Text mit philologischen und linguistischen Erörterungen. København: Levin & Munksgaard. (Det Kgl. Danske Videnskabernes Selskab. Historisk-filologiske Meddelelser. 21.1).
- Grammont, Maurice
- 1909 Grec γρῦνός ‘nu’. In: *IndogForsch* 25: 371-374.
- 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].

- Greenfield, Jonas C. & Mayrhofer, Manfred
 1967 The 'alğumm-m/'almugg-m-problem reexamined. In: *Fs Baumgartner 1967*: 83-89.
- Greppin, John A. C.
 1972 Xet'a-haykakan mi zugaheř. In: *PBH 1972*, Nr. 3: 221-222.
 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 izučenija armjanskix laringalov. In: *PBH 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.
 1978c Luwian elements in Armenian. In: *DrevVost 3*: 115-126.
 1978-79 Armeno-Luwica. In: *RevEtArm n.s. 13*: 7-13.
 1978-79a Review of *van Windekens 1976*. In: *RevEtArm n.s. 13*: 426.
 1978-79b Review of *J. Friedrich & A. Kammenhuber*, Hethitisches Wörterbuch, Lief. 1-2, 1975-1977. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag. In: *RevEtArm n.s. 13*: 433-435.
 1979 *Lumri, sakr ew dahuč* bařeri stugabanut'yunə. In: *PBH 1979*, Nr 1: 213-216.
 1980 The origin of Arm. *z* from IE **gh* and **dh*. In: *ProcFICAL 1980*: 131-137.
 1980a A note on the alternation of *E* and *A* in Classical Armenian. In: *AnnArmLing 1*: 97-103.
 1980b A note on Arm. *bosor* 'Carnelian'. In: *RevEtArm n.s. 14*: 471-472.
 1981 Some comments on Arm. *eluzanem* 'extract', *etł* 'place' and *etřewr* '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.
 1981c Concerning the reply of Kerns and Schwartz to Austin. In: *Gd Kerns 1981*, 1: 119-126.
 1981d Gk. *μαλλός* 'fleece, lock of wool'. In: *Glotta 59*: 70-75.
 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 **k̑w* to Arm. *š*. In: *AnnArmLing* 5: 91-97.
- 1984a The reflexes of the Indo-European 'voiceless aspirates' in Armenian. In: *IntSympArmLing 1984*: 35-48.
- 1985 *Bark' Gaġianosi: the Greek-Armenian dictionary to Galen*. Delmar, New York: Caravan Books.
- 1985a Review of *Huld 1984*. In: *RevEtArm* n.s. 19: 462-463.
- 1985b *Bařaverġi *-s > *-h > -k' hnč'yunap'oxut'yunə hayerenum*. In: *PBH* 1985, Nr 1: 169-171.
- 1986 The development of Armenian *l* and *t*. In: *Gd Berbėrian 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.
- 1988-89 A rejoinder to Birgit Olsen on the sole color of the laryngeal in Armenian being *A*. In: *RevEtArm* n.s. 21: 477-480.
- 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. *σῦριξ* 'pipe'. In: *HistSpr* 103: 35-37.
- 1990c A note on Armenian *zurna*. In: *FolOrient* 27: 185-188.
- 1990-91 The etymology of Arm. *astem* and *tarm* and the Hurro-Urartian hypothesis with a bibliographical excursion. In: *RevEtArm* n.s. 22: 17-21.
- 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 *atalanč*‘ ‘duck?’. In: *AnnArmLing* 17: 73-77.
- 1997 Armenian phonology. = Chapter 38 in *PhonAsAfr 1997*: 777-793.
- 1997a A note on Georgian *USX*- and Indo-Europeanisms in the Kartvelian languages. In: *JourIndEurStud* 25.3-4: 383-386.
- 1998 Arm. *gini*, Grg. *γvino* ‘wine’. In: *AnnArmLing* 19: 65-69.
- 1998a Arm. *xstor* ‘garlic’. In: *AnnArmLing* 19: 57-63.
- 2008 More material on the Urartian substratum in Armenian. In: *JourIndEurStud* 36.1-2: 1-9.
- 2008a Did the good wines come from Armenia? In: *Aramazd* 3.1: 47-52.
- Greppin, John A. C. & Khachaturian, Amalya A.
- 1986 A handbook of Armenian dialectology. Delmar, New York: Caravan Books. (Append.: see Ĵahukyan 1986 and H. Muradyan 1986).
- Griffiths, A. & Lubotsky, A.
- 2009 Two words for ‘sister-in-law’? Notes on Vedic *yātar-* and *giri-*. In: *Fs Kellens 2009*: 115-121.
- Grigoryan, A. V.
- 1957 *Hay barbařagitut‘yan dasent‘ac*‘. Yerevan: University Press.
- Grigoryan, Ĵ. H.
- 1970 *Hay řolovrdakan řoroc‘ayin ew mankakan erger*. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- 1983 *Geřark‘unik*‘. *HayAzgBan* 14. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- Grigoryan, S. A.
- 1988 *Hayereni armatakan gunanunnerę, nranc‘ imastayin tarberakumn u stugabanut‘yunę*. In: *BanbErevHamals* 1988, Nr 2: 188-192.
- Grigoryan, S. M.
- 1999 *Bnik t‘e p‘oxařyal bařer?* In: *PBH* 1999, Nr. 1: 327-334.
- Grigoryan-Spandaryan, M. M.
- 1971 *Leřnayin Łarabali banahyusut‘yunę*. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- Grossfeld, Bernard
- 1988 *The Targum Onqelos to Deuteronomy (English translation, apparatus, notes)*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark Ltd. (The Aramaic Bible, 9).
- Grottanelli, Cristiano
- 1986 *Yoked horses, twins, and the powerful lady: India, Greece, Ireland and elsewhere*. In: *JourIndEurStud* 14.1-2: 125-152.
- Güntert, Hermann
- 1921 *Von der Sprache der Götter und Geister: bedeutungsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zur homerischen und eddischen Göttersprache*. Halle: Max Niemeyer.
- Gurney, O. R.
- 1977 *Some aspects of Hittite religion*. Oxford University Press. (The Schweich lectures of the British Academy 1976).

- Gurshtein, Alexander A.
 2005 Did the Pre-Indo-Europeans influence the formation of the Western Zodiac? In: *JourIndEurStud* 33.1-2: 103-150.
- Gurunyan, Hakob
 1991 Hamšenahay banahyusut‘yun. Yerevan: “Luys”.
- Gusmani, Roberto
 1985 Lydisch *kâna*- und luwisch *wana*-. In: *Fs Knobloch 1985*: 127-132.
- Gyozalyan (Getuni), Grigor Mat‘ewosi
 2001 Musa leřan azgagrut‘yunə (compiled and edited by Veržine Svazlyan). Yerevan: Academy Press “Gitut‘yun”.
- Gyulnazaryan, Xažak
 1984 Hetk‘er getni vra ew getni tak. Yerevan: “Sovetakan groř”.
- Gyurjinyan, Davit‘
 1987 *Ař* naxdri bařakazmakan aržek‘ə. In: *LrHasGit* 1987, Nr 3: 28-34.
- Haas, Otto
 1939 Über die phrygischen Sprachreste und ihr Verhältnis zum Armenischen. In: *HandAms* 53.7-12: 225-235.
 1939a *Ακουω* - ansam. In: *HandAms* 53.7-12: 235-237.
 1940 Das armenische Pluralzeichen *-k‘*. In: *HandAms* 40.1-6: 96-106.
 1961 Phrygische Inschriften: Berichtigte Lesungen – verbesserte Deutungen. In: *Die 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).
- Hac‘uni, H. Vardan V.
 1910 Erdumn hin Hayoc‘ mēř. Venice: S. Lazar.
 1923 Patmut‘iwn hin hay tarazin (patkerazard). Venice: S. Lazar.
 1936 Hayuhin patmut‘ean arřew. Venice: S. Lazar.
- Hahn, Emma Adelaide
 1969 Naming-constructions in some Indo-European languages. Cleveland (Ohio): Press of Case Western Reserve University. (Philological monographs of the American Philological Association; monograph 27).
- Hajnal, Ivo
 1992 Griechisch *χαμαί* – ein Problem der Rekonstruktion? In: *RekRelChr* 1992: 207-220.
- Hakobyan, G. A.
 1974 Nerk‘in Baseni azgagrut‘yunə ew banahyusut‘yunə. Yerevan: “Hayastan”.

- Hakobyan, P. H.
 1999 “Sasna crer” herosakan ēposi arajin arjagank’nerə Arewelyan Hayastanum. In: *PBH* 1999, Nr 1: 301-320.
- 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. *HayAzgBan* 5. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- Hambarjumyan, V. G.
 1995 Movses Xorenac’u Patmut’yan “Tenč’ay Sat’enik tikin” hatvacə. In: *PBH* 1995, Nr 2: 227-236.
 1997 Hayeren atjik baři stugabanut’yunə. In: *PBH* 1997, Nr 2: 149-152.
 1998 Aknarkner hayoc’ lezvi hamematakan bařagitut’yan. Yerevan: Academy Press “Gitut’yun”.
 2002 Hndevropakan armati tarberakaynut’yunə ew hayeren astuac baři cagumn u tipabanut’yunə. In: *PBH* 2002, Nr 3: 242-260.
- Hamp, Eric P.
 1959-60 Notes on early Greek phonology. In: *Glotta* 38.3-4: 187-203.
 1966 Three Armenian etymologies. In: *RevEtArm* n.s. 3: 11-15.
 1967 Two Armenian etymologies: 1. *əmpem*. 2. *learn* ‘mountain’. In: *RevEtArm* n.s. 4: 15-17.
 1970 Sanskrit *duhitā*, Armenian *dustr*, and IE internal schwa. In: *JAOS* 90.2: 228-231.
 1973 *Mōrum*. In: *AmerJourPhil* 94.2: 167-169.
 1973a Religion and law from Iguvium. In: *JourIndEurStud* 1.3: 318-323.
 1975 On the nasal presents of Armenian. In: *ZVS* 89: 100-109.
 1979 Indo-European *g^wen-H_a. In: *ZVS* 93.1: 1-7.
 1981 Arm. *am* ‘year’; Armenian *k’ez*. In: *AnnArmLing* 2: 13-14.
 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.
 1982b Two roots *H₁bhel-. In: *Glotta* 60: 227-230.
 1982c *μᾶλλός*: a clarification. In: *Glotta* 60: 61-62.
 1982d Armenian miscellanea. In: *AnnArmLing* 3: 53-56.
 1983 Philologica varia. In: *RevEtArm* n.s. 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 meř. In: *PBH* 1983, Nr 1: 38-42.
 1984 Indo-European ‘bone’ reconsidered. In: *ZVS* 97.2: 197-201.
 1984a Armenian *anurj*. In: *ZVS* 97.1: 130.
 1985 Greek *πτ-* and Armenian. In: *AnnArmLing* 6: 51-52.

- 1986 Armenian *yisun*. In: *Gd Berbérian 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.
- 1990-91 Armenian and IE *u*-stem derivatives. In: *RevEtArm* n.s. 22: 9-12.
- 1991 Erastank‘. In: *AnnArmLing* 12: 5.
- 1994 Arm. *gewt* ‘village’. In: *AnnArmLing* 15: 24-26.
- 1996 Once again *arajin*. In: *AnnArmLing* 17: 61-62.
- 1997 The Celtic road to the *γέφωρα*. 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.
- 2001 Armenian *gind* ‘earring’ and *asr* ‘wool’. In: *AnnArmLing* 21: 9-10.
- Hananyan, Gał‘uhi Karapeti
1995 Svediayi barbařə (Xtrbeki xosvack‘). Yerevan: University Press.
- Haneyan, A. N.
1978 Tigranakerti barbařə. Yerevan: Academy Press.
1985 Grabari bařaskzbi y jaynordi artac‘olumə ardi hayereni barbařnerum. In: *Hayereni barbařagitakan atlas: usumnasirut‘yunner ew nyut‘er 2*. Yerevan: Academy Press : 22-45.
1985a Grabari *oy ew iw* erkbarbařneri patmakan hnč‘yunap‘oxut‘yan řurřə. In: *HayLezPatmHarc‘ 2*: 37-58.
2001 Hay barbařnerum ‘ciacan’ [‘rainbow’] haskac‘ut‘yan bařanvanumneri hogewor-mřakut‘ayin arřek‘ə. In: *Hay Srb 2001*: 109-113.
- Hanneyan, 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 bařapařari t‘ematik-imastayin mi k‘ani xmberi tarack‘ayin bnut‘agirə (tntesakan gorcuneut‘yun artahaytoř bařer). In: *Hayoc‘ lezvi hamematakan k‘erakanut‘yan harc‘er 2*. Yerevan: “Anania řirakac‘i”: 145-227.
- Harđarson, Jón Axel
1995 Griechisch *τῆλε*. 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, B. H.
 1989, 1-2 Mec Hayk'i Parskahayk' ašxarhn əst Ašxarhac'oyc'-i. (1) In: *PBH* 1989, Nr 2: 26-39. (2) In: *PBH* 1989, Nr 3: 18-36.
- Harut'yunyan, Covinar (Tsovinar), see C. Arutjunjan.
- Harut'yunyan, Lewon
 1991 Nšxarner Arc'axi banahyusut'yan. Yerevan: University Press.
- Harut'yunyan, N. V., see N. Arutjunjan.
- Harut'yunyan, Sargis
 1960 Hay žoľovrdakan hanelukner: usumnasirut'yun (Armenian folk riddles: a study). Yerevan: Academy Press.
 1965 Hay žoľovrdakan hanelukner (Armenian folk riddles). Yerevan: Academy Press.
 1975 Aneck'i ew ōrhnanċ'i žanrə hay banahyusut'yan meċ (Жанр проклятий и пожеланий в армянском фольклоре). Yerevan: Academy Press.
 1987 Hndevropakan taľac'ap'ut'yan mi k'ani aľanjnahatċut'yunneri drseworumnerə hay hin banastelċut'yan ew banahyusut'yan meċ. In: *PBH* 1987, Nr 4: 48-60.
 2000 Hay aľaspelabanut'yun. Beyrut'. "Hamazgayin": Vahē Sēt'ean tľaran.
 2006 Hay hmayakan ew žoľovrdakan aľot'k'ner (Armenian incantations and folk prayers). Yerevan: University Press.
- Harut'yunyan, Sargis & Xač'atryan, Ženya
 2000 (eds.), Karos xač': usumnasirut'yunner ew bnagrer: Yerevan: Academy Press "Gitut'yun".
- Haykuni, S.
 1895 See Hut'Sam 1895.
 1902 Žoľovrdakan hēk'eat'. *ĒmAzgŽot* 4. Moscow, Vaľaršapat.
 1906 Žoľovrdakan erg, aľac, asac, haneluk, erdum, ōrhnanċ', anēċ', ew ayn. *ĒmAzgŽot* 6. Moscow, Vaľaršapat.
- Hayrapetyan, T'amar
 2004 Anjrewaber ew anjrewaxap'an ceseri erkhakadir ənkalumneri šurċ. In: *PBH* 2004, Nr 3: 217-227.
- Henning, W. B.
 1935-37 Soghdische Miscellen. 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.
 1977 The Kurdish elm. In: *W. B. Henning Selected papers* 2 (Acta Iranica 15. Série 2. Hommages et Opera minora; vol. 6). Téhéran-Liège: Bibliothèque Pahlavi; Leiden: Brill. (pp. 68-72).
- 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: *RevEtArm* n.s. 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.
- Hiersche, Rolf
- 1964 Untersuchungen zur Frage der Tenues aspiratae im Indogermanischen. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Hilmarsson, J. G.
- 1982 Indo-European 'tongue'. In: *JourIndEurStud* 10: 355-367.
- 1984 Reconstruction of a Tocharian paradigm: the numeral 'one'. In: *ZVS* 97.1: 135-147.
- 1984a East Tocharian *kñom* 'the expanded hood or neck of a serpent'. In: *ZVS* 97.2: 287-290.
- 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.
- Hiwnk'earpēyēntean, Tēr Yovhannēs k'ahanay
- 1894 Stugabanakan bařaran hay lezui. Kostandnupolis: Tparan G. Pařtatlean.
- Hmayakyan, S. G.
- 1990 Vani t'agavorut'yan petakan kronə. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- 1990a Kueřa-Kuar' astvacut'yan pařtamunk'ə Haykakan leinařxarhum. In *PBH* 1990, Nr 1: 152-167.
- Hobosyan, Suren
- 2004 *Aygin* miřnadaryan hayeren vimagrurum. In: *HayřotMřak* 12 (Republication Scientific Conference. Yerevan: "Muřni"): 80-85.
- Hoffmann, Karl
- 1982 Vedica. In: *MünStudSpr* 41: 61-94.
- Hoffmann, Karl & Forssman, Bernhard
- 1996 Avestische Laut- und Flexionslehre. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck. (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft, 84).
- Hoffner, Jr. Harry A.
- 1964 The laws of the Hittites. Brandeis University PhD thesis, 1963.
- 1967 An English-Hittite Glossary. In: *RevHitAs* 25, fasc. 80: 5-99.

- 1967a Review of *Johannes Friedrich*, Hethitisches Wörterbuch. 3, Ergänzungsheft. Heidelberg: Winter, 1966. In: *JAmOrSoc* 87.3: 353-357.
- 1974 *Alimenta Hethaeorum: food production in Hittite Asia Minor*. New Haven, Connecticut. (American Oriental series, 55).
- Hofmann, Erich
1932 Kultur und Sprachgeist in den Monatsnamen. In: *ZVS* 59: 132-142.
- 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 mijnadaryan 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 Łarabali barbaři ařnč'ut'yan harc'i šurjə. In: *PBH* 1977, Nr 1: 141-152.
1979 Bařayin hnabanut'yunner Łarabali barbařum. In: *LrHasGit* 1979, Nr 9: 52-60.
1987 Norahayt bařer hay matenagrut'yan mej: 1. Evsebios Emesac'u čařerum; 2. Ep'rem Asoru kc'urdnerum. In: *PBH* 1987, Nr 4: 130-138.
1988 Hayereni iranakan p'oxařut'yunneri gorcařakan mi k'ani ařanjnahatkut'yunner. In: *PBH* 1988, Nr 3: 126-134.
1988a Hay-iranakan zugadipumner. In: *BanbErewHamals* 1988, Nr 3: 168-173.
1990 Hayereni iranakan p'oxařut'yunnerə. Yerevan: Academy Press.
1990a Nor Haykazean bařaranum č'vkayvac bařer V dari ink'nuruyn grakanut'yunic'. In: *PBH* 1990, Nr 2: 149-158.
1990b Łarabali barbařum iranakan mi k'ani p'oxařut'yunneri masin. In: *LrHasGit* 1990, Nr 11: 65-70.
1991 Bařayin tarberakner V dari grabarum. In: *HayLezPatmHarc* '3: 5-60.
1991a V daric' vkayvac mi k'ani bařeri k'nnut'yun. In: *PBH* 1991, Nr 2: 147-152.
2000 Łarabali barbaři bařapařari hnaguyn šerterə. In: *LrHasGit* 2000, Nr 1: 117-122.
2000a Bařak'nnakan nkatařumner "Bařgirk' hayoc'um" teř gtac mi k'ani bařeri veraberyal. In: *PBH* 2000, Nr 2: 213-221.

- 2001 Stugabanakan nkatarumner. In: *PBH* 2001, Nr 1: 181-189.
- 2008 Grabari bařapařari imastayin xmberi k'nnut'yun (I mas). Yerevan: Academy Press "Gitut'yun".
- Hovhannisyan, N. G.
 1991 Nařař Hovnat'ani tařeri lezun orpes vař ařarhabari artahaytut'yun. In: *HayLezPatmHarc' 3*: 61-192.
- Hovsep'yan, L. S.
 1975 Jewabanut'yun: holovum. In: *Aknarkner mijin grakan hayereni patmut'yan*. Vol. 2. Yerevan: Academy Press: 5-130.
 1987 Grabari bařakazmut'yunə. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- Hovsep'yan, N. E.
 1966 Ozmi barbaři mi k'ani ařanjnahatkut'yunneri masin. In: *PBH* 1966, Nr 2: 226-238.
- Hoy
 1898 Tearəndařařə Karmiru mēř. In: *Biwrakn* 1898, June 11: 380-381.
- Huart, Cl.
 1908-09 La forteresse d'Alamüt. In: *MSL* 15: 130-132.
- Hübschmann, H.
 1876 Review of *Dervischjan 1877*. In: *ZeitDeutMorgGesel* 30: 774-779.
 1877 Ueber die stellung des armenischen im kreise der indogermanischen sprachen. In: *ZVS* 23 [N.F. 3.1]: 5-49. [ModEArm. transl. by Liana Hovsep'yan, see Hübschmann 1985; 1990: 46-88].
 1877a Armeniaca. In: *ZVS* 23 [N.F. 3]: 400-407.
 1881 Armeniaca I. In: *ZeitDeutMorgGesel* 35: 168-180.
 1883 Armenische Studien. 1/1. Grundzüge der armenischen Etymologie. Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel.
 1894 Arisches und Armenisches. In: *IndogForsch* 4: 112-120.
 1897 Armenische Grammatik. 1. Theil: Armenische Etymologie. Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel.
 1899 (On Hübschmann 1897). In: *Anzeiger zu IndogForsch* 10: 41-50.
 1899a Review of *P. Horn*, Neupersische Schriftsprache. (Grundriss der iranischen Philologie, hrsg. von W. Geiger und E. Kuhn; I.2), Strassburg: Trübner, 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: Hiwbřman 1907.
 1907 (Hiwbřman), Hin Hayoc' telwoy anunnerə (ModWArm. translation from Hübschmann 1904 by H. B. Pilėzikėean). Vienna: Mxit'arean Tparan.
 1985 (Hyubřman), Hayereni dirk'ə hndevropakan lezuneru řřjanum (řřark'um) (ModEArm. transl. of 1877 by Liana Hovsep'yan). In: *PBH* 1985, Nr 4: 27-54.
 1990 (Hyubřman), 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.
 1984a On Armenian *k'san*. In: *AnnArmLing* 5: 59-67.
 1997 The loins of Antimachus. In: *JourIndEurStud* 25.3-4: 409-414.
- Humbach, Helmut
 1982 Der metaphorische Gebrauch von av. *gau-* 'Rind' und die Jātakas. In: *MünStudSpr* 41: 103-117.
- Hutter, Manfred
 2003 Aspects of Luwian religion. In: *Melchert* (ed.) 2003, Chapter 6: 211-280.
- Ičiro, Ito
 1989 Obščeslavjanskij fol'klornyj istočnik gogolevskogo 'Vija'. In: *Izvestija Akademii nauk SSSR: serija literatury i jazyka* 48.5: 454-459.
- 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-Ķ) (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-ž). 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 (redaction by V. A. Dybo). Moscow: "Nauka".
- Isebaert, L.
 1979 Études étymologiques. In: *Orbis* 28.2: 365-368.
 1982 Nouvelle note sur l'arménien. In: *RevEtArm* n.s. 16: 17-19.
- Israyelyan, Astik
 1979 "Bužič" ulunk'-pahpanakner. In: *LrHasGit* 1979, Nr 3: 80-88.
 1999 Havkit'-pahpanaknerə hay žoľovrdakan havatalik'nerum. In: *PBH* 1999, Nr 2-3: 331-341.
- Israyelyan, H. Ğ.
 1973 Paštamunk'n u havatalik'ə uš bronzedaryan Hayastanum (əst hnagitakan nyut'eri). Yerevan: Academy Press.
 1980 Erkvoryakneri paštamunk'i hetk'erə hin Hayastanum. In: *PBH* 1980, Nr 3: 216-228.

- 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.
 1964 Drevneindijskij mif ob ustanovlenii imen i ego parallel' v grečeskoj tradicii. In: *IndDrev 1964*: 85-94.
 1974 Opyt istolkovanija drevneindijskix ritual'nyx i mifologičeskix terminov, obrazovannyx ot *ašva-* 'kon'. In: *Gd Vorob'jev-Desjatovskij 1974*: 75-138.
 1975 Rekonstrukcija indoevropskix slov i tekstov, otažajuščix kul't volka. In *Izvestija Akademii nauk SSSR: serija literatury i jazyka* 34.5: 399-408.
 1976 Problemy istorii metallov na Drevnem Vostoke v svete dannyx lingvistiki. In: *PBH (=IFŽ) 1976*, Nr 4: 69-86.
 1976a Očerki po istorii semiotiki v SSSR. Moscow: "Nauka".
 1977 Drevnebalkanskij i obščeeindoevropskij tekst mifa o geroe-ubijce psa i evrazijskie paralleli. In: *SlavBalkJaz 1977*: 181-213.
 1977a Drevnie kul'turnye i jazykovye svjazi južnobalkanskogo, ègejskogo i maloazijskogo (anatolijskogo) arealov. In: *BalkLingSbor 1977*: 3-39.
 1977b K balkano-balto-slavjanskim paralleljam. In: *BalkLingSbor 1977*: 143-164.
 1979 Urartsk. *mari*, xurritsk. *marianne*, xajassk. *Marija-*. In: *Peredneaziatskij sbornik* 3: 101-112.
 1979a Èstetičeskoe nasledie drevnej i srednevekovoj Indii. In: *LitKDSInd 1979*: 6-35.
 1981 Slavjanskij, baltijskij i rannebalkanskij glagol: indoevropskie istoki. Moscow: "Nauka".
 1983 Vydelenie raznyx xronologičeskix sloev v drevnearmjanskom i problema pervonačal'noj struktury teksta gimna Va(x)agnu. In: *PBH (=IFŽ) 1983*, Nr 4: 22-43.
 1983a Prus. *emnes*, *emmens* 'imja': ierogl. luv. *atimaza* : xet. *laman*. In: *BaltSlavIssl 1982*; 1983: 104-108.
 1983b K probleme sootnošenija drevnegrečeskoj i xattskoj tradicij. In: *Slavjanskoe i balkanskoe jazykoznanie: problema jazykovyx kontaktov*. Moscow: 53-61.
 1985 Ob otnošenii xattsckogo jazyka k severozapadnokavkazskim. In: *DrevAnat 1985*: 26-59.
 1999 On terms for 'half, moiety' in Indo-European and Germanic. In: *Fs Lehmann 1999*, 1: 172-182.
 2003 On the origin of Tocharian terms for GRAIN. In: *Fs Winter 2003*: 189-210.

Ivanov, V. V. & Toporov, V. N.

- 1973 K probleme dostovernosti pozdnix vtoričnyx istočnikov v svjazi s issledovanijami v oblasti mifologii: dannye o Velese v tradicijax Severnoj Rusi i voprosy kritiki pis'mennyx tekstov. In: *TrudZnakSist* 6 = Festschrift M. M. Baxtin. (UZTGU, 308).
- 1974 Issledovanija v oblasti slavjanskix drevnostej: leksičeskie i frazeologičeskie voprosy rekonstrukcii tekstov. Moscow: "Nauka".
- 1983 K rekonstrukcii Mokoši kak ženskogo personaža v slavjanskoj versii osnovnogo mifa. In: *BaltSlavIssl* 1982 [1983]: 175-197.

Ivanova, Ju. V.

- 1983 Obrjadovyj ogon'. In: *KalObyč* 1983: 116-130.

Jasanoff, Jay H.

- 1979 Notes on the Armenian personal endings. In: *ZVS* 93: 133-149.

Ĵahukyan, G. B.

- 1954 K'erakanakan ew uĴagrakan ašxatut'yunnerə hin ew miĴnadaryan Hayastanum (V-XV dd.). Yerevan: University Press.
- 1959 Hin hayereni holovman sistemə ew nra cagumə. Yerevan: University Press.
- 1961 The Hayaša language and its relation to the Indo-European languages. In: *ArchOr* 29: 353-405.
- 1963 (Džaukjan), Urartskij i indoeuropejskie jazyki. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- 1963a Stugabanut'yunner. In: *PBH* 1963, Nr 4: 85-98.
- 1964 Xajasskij jazyk i ego otnošenje k indoeuropejskim jazykam. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- 1965 Stugabanut'yunner. In: *PBH* 1965, Nr 1: 251-261.
- 1967 (Džaukjan), Očerki po istorii dopis'mennogo perioda armjanskogo jazyka. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- 1967a (Džaukjan), Vzaimootnošenje indoeuropejskix, xurritsko-urartskix i kavkazskix jazykov. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- 1967b Hayereni ew xet'a-luvakan lezunerə bařayin kazmi cagumnayin zugadipunnerə. In: *PBH* 1967, Nr 4: 57-74.
- 1968 Hayerenə ew p'ryugerənə. In: *PBH* 1968, Nr 3: 121-137.
- 1969 (Djahukian), Armenische Miscellen. In: *Fs Pagliaro* 1969, 2: 65-71.
- 1970 Hayerenə ew hndevropakan hin lezunerə. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- 1971 Stugabanut'yunner. In: *BanbErewHamals* 1971, Nr 1: 49-56.
- 1972 Hay barbařagitut'yan neracut'yun: vičakagrakan barbařagitut'yun. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- 1973 Stugabanut'yunner. In: *LrHasGit* 1973, Nr 6: 17-22.
- 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.

- 1976 Hayasayi lezvi hinanatoliakan cagman varkacə. In: *PBH* 1976, Nr 1: 89-110.
- 1976a Stugabanut'yunner. In: *LrHasGit* 1976, Nr 12: 41-51.
- 1978 Obščee i armjanskoe jazykoznanie. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- 1979 Stugabanut'yunner. In: *LrHasGit* 1979, Nr 3: 23-34.
- 1980, 1-2 (Džaukjan) Ob akkadskix zaimstvovanijax v armjanskom jazyke. Part 1 in *PBH* 1980, Nr 3: 107-119; part 2 in *PBH* 1980, Nr 4: 96-106.
- 1981 Hay-iranakan zugadipumner. In: *BanbErewHamals* 1981, Nr 2: 21-29.
- 1981a Movses Xorenac'u "Hayoc' patmut'yan" arajin grk'i lezvakan albyurnerə. In: *PBH* 1981, Nr 3: 48-63.
- 1982 (Džaukjan), Sravnitel'naja grammatika armjanskogo jazyka. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- 1982a (Djahukian), Akkadian loan words in Armenian. In: *AnnArmLing* 3: 1-12.
- 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: *PBH* 1984, Nr 4: 32-44.
- 1984a Ob ètimologičeskix dubletax i paraleljax v armjanskom jazyke. In: *IntSympArmLing 1984*: 146-160.
- 1985 (Djahukian), Die archaischen Schichten armenischer Dialektwörter. In: *Fs Winter 1985*: 151-160.
- 1985a (Džaukjan), Urartskie zaimstvovanija v armjanskom jazyke. In: *Kul'tNaslVost 1985*: 364-372.
- 1986 (Djahukian), Introduction. In: *Greppin/Khachaturian 1986*: 9-26.
- 1986a Haykakan šertə urartakan dic'aranum. In: *PBH* 1986, Nr 1: 43-58.
- 1986-87 L'étymologie des mots *haraw* "sud", *hiwsis(i)* "nord" et le système d'orientation des anciens Arméniens. In: *RevEtArm* n.s. 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. (1) in: *PBH* (= *IFŽ*) 1988, Nr 1: 60-79; (2) in: *PBH* 1988, Nr 2: 68-88.
- 1990 Hayereni anhayt cagman bařarmatnerə. In: *PBH* 1990, Nr 2: 62-77.
- 1990a (Djahukian), Combinatory vowel changes in Armenian. In: *AnnArmLing* 11: 1-16.
- 1991 Stugabanut'yunner. In: *PBH* 1991, Nr 2: 36-44.
- 1991a Arc'axahay (Łarabali) barbari kazmavorman masin. In: *LrHasGit* 1991, Nr 5: 52-58.
- 1992 Lezvakan nor tvyalner hayoc' naxak'ristoneakan kroni ew havatalik'neri masin, In: *PBH* 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: *PBH 1995*, Nr 2: 183-186.
- 1998 Hin hayereni verʒacanc'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.
- 1969 The Slavic god Veles'' and his Indo-European cognates. In: *Fs Pisani 1969*: 579-599.
- Janda, Michael
- 1996 Altgriechisch νεβρός 'Hirschkalb' und νεβραξ 'Küchlein'. In: *Die Sprache 38.1*: 87-92.
- Jasanoff, Jay H.
- 1997 Gathic Avestan *cikōitərəš*. In: *Fs Beekes 1997*: 119-130.
- Jensen, Hans
- 1959 Altarmenische Grammatik. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.
- Jensen, P.
- 1898 Hittiter und Armenier. Strassburg: Verlag von Karl J. Trübner.
- 1904 (Ensēn), Haterēn ew hayerēn. In: *HandAms 18*: 180-184, 271-276.
- Jeremiás, É. M. & Maróth, M.
- 1977 Drei mitteliranische wörter für 'Sonne'. In: *Fs Harmatta 1977* (= *ActAntHung 25*): 221-226.
- Ĵihanyan, V. G.
- 1991 Haykakan leřnašxarhi řranunnerə. In: *HayLezPatmHarc' 3*: 193-276.
- Johansons, Andrejs
- 1970 Die lettischen Benennungen der Schlange. In: *Fs Stang 1970*: 222-229.
- Jokl, Norbert
- 1984 Sprachliche Beiträge zur Paläo-Ethnologie der Balkanhalbinsel: zur Frage der ältesten Griechisch-Albanischen Beziehungen (aus dem Nachlass hrsg. von Oskar E. Pfeiffer mit einem Vorwort von Georg R. Solta). Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Johnson, Buffie
- 1986 Lady of the beasts: ancient images of the Goddess and her sacred animals. HarperSanFrancisco (a division of HarperCollins Publishers).
- Jordán-Cólera, Carlos
- 1997 The etymology of *insula*, *aestus* and *aestuarium*. In: *JourIndEurStud 25.3-4*: 353-360.
- Joseph, Brian D.
- 1984 Lindeman versus Kortlandt: summary and evaluation. In: *AnnArmLing 5*: 45-50.

- Ĵrpetean, Yakovb Šahan, see Cirbied, Jacques Chahan
- Justi, Ferdinand
 1895 *Iranisches Namenbuch*. Marburg. (Reprinted in 1963, Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung).
- Kagarov, E. G.
 1928 *Mifologičeskij obraz dereva, rastuščego kornjami vverx*. In: *DoklANSSSR 1928*: 331-335.
- K‘ajberuni
 1902 *Haykakan sovorut‘iwnner*. In: *AzgHand*, year 7, book 9: 83-116.
- K‘alant‘ar, A.
 1895 *Sasun*. [T‘iflis].
- K‘amaleanc‘, S.
 1893 *Covinar (hĕk‘eat‘)*. T‘iflis: Tipografija I. Martirosianca.
- 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 ałbyurneri Alia k‘alak‘ə*. In: *LrHasGit 1975*, Nr 4: 89-99.
- Karapetyan, Donara M.
 1986 *Hovasap‘ Sebastac‘u “Bžškaran əntreal tarrakan maxc‘i” bnaġitakan erkə*. In: *Banber Matenadarani 15*: 288-316.
 1993 See *Sources* : Asar Sebastac‘i.
- Karapetyan, Ełiazar Karapeti
 1962 *Sasun: azgagrakan nyut‘er*. Yerevan: State Press of Armenia (HayPetHrat).
- Karpenko, Ju. A.
 1981 *Nazvanija zvezdnogo neba*. Moscow: “Nauka”. (Series “Literaturovedenie i jazykoznanie”).
- Karolidēs (Καρολίδης), Paulos
 1885 *Γλοσσαριον συγκριτικον ελληνοκαπαδοκιων λεξεων ητοι η εν Καπαδοκια λαλουμενη Ελληνικη διαλεκτος και τα εν αυτη σωζομενα ιχνη της αρχαιας. Καπαδοκικης γλωσσης – υπο Π. Καρολιδου. Συμυρη: εκ του τυπογραφειου “Ο Τυπος”*.
- 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, Hartmut
1983 Zu idg. *mrtó-. In: *Die Sprache* 29: 174-177.
- 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.
2000 Evening dress: the metaphorical background of Latin *uesper* and Greek *ἔσπερος*. In *Karlene Jones-Bley, Martin E. Huld, Angela Della Volpe* (eds.), Proceedings of the eleventh Annual UCLA Indo-European conference. Los Angeles, June 4-5, 1999. Washington, DC: Institute for the Study of Man. (Journal of Indo-European Studies Monograph Series, 35): 69-93.
- Kazanskij, N. N.
2005 K rekonstrukcii indoevropskoj formuly "koleso solnca". In: *Fs Ivanov 2005*: 148-154.
- K'ēč'ean, Aṛak'ēl & Parsamean, Mkrtič'
1952 *Akn ew Aknc'ik'*. Initiated and compiled by Aṛak'ēl K'ēč'ean; composed and edited by Mkrtič' Parsamean. Paris: Compatriotic Association of Eguen.
- Kellens, Jean
1995 Liste du verbe avestique (avec un appendice sur l'orthographe des racines avestiques par Eric Pirart). Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag.
- 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.
1987 *H₃ in Anatolian. In: *Fs Hoenigswald 1987*: 185-192.

- 1999 Hittite historical phonology. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck. (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft, 95).
- Kiwlēsērean, Babgēn Vardapet
1899-1900 Čaniki vičakin mēj gtnuoł hamšēnc'ineru gawařabarbara (KiwlHamš 1899-1900). In: *Biwrakn*, vol. 17, 1899, Nr 31-32: 508-513; Nr 35: 558b-560a; Nr 38-39: 603b-605b; Nr 41: 654b-656a; Nr 44: 699b-700b; Nr 47-48: 752b-754b; Nr 49: 779b-780b; vol. 18, 1900: Nr 1: 14-16; Nr 2: 29b-31a; Nr 3: 42-43; Nr 4: 59b-62b; Nr 6: 82b-84b; Nr 8: 120-121.
- Klaproth, Julius
1831 Asia polyglotta (2nd ed.). Paris: Verlag von Heideloff & Campe.
- Klein, Jared S.
1988 Proto-Indo-European *g^wiH₃- 'live' and related problems of laryngeals in Greek. In: *LaryngTheor 1988*: 257-279.
1996 On personal deixis in Classical Armenian: a study of the syntax and semantics of the *n*-, *s*-, and *d*- demonstratives in manuscripts E and M of the Old Armenian Gospels. Dettelbach: Verlag J. H. Röhl. (MünStudSpr: Beiheft, N.F. 17).
- Kleinlogel, Alexander
1981 Götterblut und Unsterblichkeit. In: *Poetica* 13: 252-279.
- 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: *Vopr.Jaz* 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: *Vopr.Jaz* 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
1970 Griechisch ἰλάσκεσθαι. In: *MünStudSpr* 28: 75-88.
1974 Griechisch παρθένος. In: *AntiqIndog 1974*: 273-278.
1982 Das altarmenische Verbum. Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag.
- Kloekhorst, Alwin
2006 Initial laryngeals in Anatolian. In: *HistSpr* 119: 77-108.
2008 Etymological dictionary of the Hittite inherited lexicon. Leiden, Boston: Brill. (LeidIEEDSer, 5).

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. **aíz* 'Vermögen' und die Beteiligung mit irdischen Gütern. In: *AntiqIndog 1974*: 349-351.

K'oc'aryan, Gayane

- 2000 Dvin tēlanvan vaļemut'yan harc'ə. In: *LrHasGit 2000*, Nr 2: 132-138.
2001 Dvin amroc'-srbavayrə Hayoc' darji naxōrein. In: *HaySrb 2001*: 289-296.

K'oc'oyan, A. K.

- 1963 Sayat'-Novayi hayeren xaļeri bařaran. Yerevan: Academy Press.

Koivulehto, J.

- 2001 The earliest contacts between Indo-European and Uralic speakers in the light of lexical loans. In: *EarlContUralIndEur 2001*: 235-263.

Kortlandt, Frederik H. H. (all the papers up to 2001, 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: *LingPosn 23*: 127-128.
1981 On the Armenian personal endings. In: *AnnArmLing 2*: 29-34.
1983 Notes on Armenian historical phonology III: *h-*. In: *StudCauc 5*: 9-16.
1984 PIE. **H-* in Armenian. In: *AnnArmLing 5*: 41-43.
1984a Proto-Armenian case endings. In: *IntSympArmLing 1984*: 97-106.
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.
1988 The Thraco-Armenian consonant shift. In: *LingBalk 31*: 71-74.
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 The Proto-Armenian verbal system. In: *ProcFICAL 1996*: 35-43.
- 1996a Arm. *całr* '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.
- 1998a Arm. *gom* 'am'. In: *AnnArmLing* 19: 19-20.
- 1999 The Armenian causative. In: *AnnArmLing* 20: 47-49.
- 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.
- 2004 Indo-Uralic consonant gradation. In: *Fs Koivulehto 2004*: 163-170.
- 2008 Arm. *ewł*. In: *Aramazd* 3.1: 40-41.
- Kossian, Aram V.
- 1997 On Anatolian-Urartian linguistic contacts. In: *JourIndEurStud* 25.1-2: 27-34.
- Kostandyan, D. M.
- 1979 *Erznkayi barbařə*. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- Kostanyan, S.-A. S.
- 1983 "Hazarapet" termini masin. In: *PBH* 1983, Nr 2-3: 178-189.
- Krahe, Hans
- 1949/50- (AltFluß), Alteuropäische Flußnamen. In: *BeitrNamenf* 1, 1949/50, etc.
- 1955 Die Sprache der Illyrier. I: Die Quellen. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- 1959 Sprachliche Aufgliederung und Sprachbewegungen in Alteuropa. Wiesbaden: Verlag der Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur in Mainz. (Abhandlungen der Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse, Jhrg. 1959, Nr. 1).
- 1963 Die Struktur der alteuropäischen Hydronymie. Wiesbaden: Verlag der Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur in Mainz. (Abhandlungen der Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse, Jhrg. 1962, Nr. 5).
- 1970 Einleitung in das vergleichende Sprachstudium (hrsg. von Wolfgang Meid). Innsbruck. (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft).
- Krause, Wolfgang & Thomas, Werner
- 1960-64 (1-2), Tocharisches Elementarbuch. Bd. I: Grammatik, 1960. Bd. II: Texte und Glossar, 1964. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.
- Kretschmer, Paul
- 1933 Der nationale Name der Armenier. In: *Anzeiger der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien: Philosophisch-historische Klasse*. 69. Jahrgang 1932. Wien und Leipzig: 28-36.

- 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.
 1937 Die indogermanischen Nasalpräsentia: ein Versuch zu einer morphologischen Analyse. Amsterdam: Noord-Hollandsche Uitgeversmaatschappij.
 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.
- Kuipers, A. H.
 1975 Review of *Furnée 1972* (Part II: Caucasian materials). In: *Lingua* 36: 82-100. (For Part I see Beekes 1975).
- Kulagina, A.V.
 1999 Russkaja èrotičeskaja častuška. In *M. Levitt, A. Toporkov* (eds.), *Eros and Pornography in Russian Culture*. Moscow: "Ladimir": 94-162.
- Kulikov, Leonid
 2000 The Vedic type *syāti* revisited. In: *IndIranIndog 2000*: 267-283.
 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.
- Kurdoev, K. K. & Jusupova, Z. A.
 1983 *Kurdsko-russkij slovar' (sorani)*. Moscow: "Russkij jazyk".
- K'yoškeryan, Armine
 1981 (ed.) *Grigor Narekac'i*, Taġer ew ganjer. Yerevan: Academy Press.
 1987 (ed.) *Nerses Šnorhali*, Taġer 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 *Beitraege 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. (*Žoġovrdagrakan niwt'er*, 2).
 1897 *Ĵawaxk'* (reprinted from "Azgagrakan handēs"). T'iflis: Tparan M. D. *Ĵotineanc'i*.
 1902 *Ara Geġec'ik*. In *AzgHand*, year 7, book 9: 144-159.

- 1912-14 (LalVasp 1-2), Vaspurakan: banahyusut'iwñ (reprinted from AzgHand). Volume 1, 1912, T'iflis: N. Ałaneanc'; vol. 2, Šataxi barbařov, 1914, T'iflis: "Ĕsperanto".
- 1983- (1-), Erker. Vol. 1, 1983 (Ĵavaxk'); vol. 2, 1988 (Arc'ax); vol. 3, 2004 (Borč'alui gavař). Yerevan: Academy Press.
- Lamberterie, Charles de
- 1978 Armeniaca I-VIII: études lexicales. In: *BSL* 73: 243-285.
- 1978-79 Armeniaca X: une isoglosse gréco-arménienne. In: *RevEtArm* n.s. 13: 31-40.
- 1980 Échange de gutturales en arménien. In: *ProcFICAL (1979)*: 221-223.
- 1982 Poids et force: reconstruction d'une racine verbale indo-européenne. In: *RevEtArm* n.s. 16: 21-55.
- 1982a La racine *(s)per-ĝh- en arménien. In: *RevEtArm* n.s. 16: 57-68.
- 1986 Deux isoglosses entre l'arménien et l'indo-iranien. In: *PlacArmLIE 1986*: 48-61.
- 1986a Arménien *barjraberj* 'très haut'. In: *Gd Berbérian 1986*: 469-476.
- 1990 (1-2), Les adjectifs grecs en -vç: 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.
- 1992a Fiançailles arméniennes et germaniques. In: *RevEtArm* 23: 91-119.
- 1997 L'arménien. In: *LangIndEur 1997*: 139-165.
- 2006 Traces de la langue poétique indo-européenne dans le lexique arménien. In: *LangPoétIndEur 2006*: 213-234.
- Łanalanyan, Aram
- 1960 Ařacani. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- 1969 Avandapatum. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- Landsberger, B.
- 1950 B. Landsberger's lexicographical contributions. In: *JCunSt* 4: 1-62.
- Lane, George S.
- 1967 The Beech argument: a re-evaluation of the linguistic evidence. In: *ZVS* 81.3-4: 197-212.
- 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: *Telekagir HXSH gitut'yan yev arvesti instituti* 1927, Nr 2: 77-104, 105-113.
- 1939 K proisxořdeniju nacional'nogo imeni gruzin Kharthveli. In: *Gitakan ařxatut'yunner* of Yerevan State University, vol. 11: 5-21.

- 1945 Ara Gelec'ki paštamunk'ə. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- 1947 Xajasa – kolybel' armjan: ètnogenez armjan i ix načal'naja istorija. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- 1951 (Kapancjan), Xurritskie slova armjanskogo jazyka. In: *TetHasGit* 1951, Nr 5: 25-50. (= 1951b).
- 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.
- Łaragyulyan, T'ereza Aršaviri
1961 Hin hayereni xonarhman hamakargi cagumə. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- Łaribyan, Ararat Sahaki
1953 Hay barbařagitut'yun: hnč'yunabanut'yun ew jewabanut'yun. Yerevan: Armenian State External [*heraka*] Pedagogical Institute Press.
- 1958 Hayereni norahayt barbařneri mi nor xumb. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- 1966 Review of Davt'yan 1966. In: *PBH* 1966, Nr 4: 273-276.
- Latyšev, V. V.
1947, 1-2 Izvestija drevnix pisatelej o Skifii i Kavkaze. In: *VestDrIst* 1947, Nr 1: 263-316; Nr 2: 247-332.
- 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-ètnografičeskij očerk). In: *KavkÈtmSbor* 1: 5-47.
- Łazaryan, Ė. S.
1981 Busanunneri hayeren-latineren-ruseren-angleren-franseren-germaneren bařaran. Yerevan: University Press.
- 2001 Miřin grakan hayereni bařapařarə. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- Łazaryan, Ė. S., Avetisyan, H.M.
1987-92 See MiřHayBař.
- Łazaryan, Vigen
1991 *Nerses Šnorhali*, 'Hisus ordi': vipasanakan ořbergut'yun (introduction and Modern EArm translation). Yerevan: "Apolon".
- Łaziyan, Alvard S.
1983 Arc'ax. *HayAzgBan* 15. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- Łaziyan, Alvard & Vardanyan, Svetlana
2004 Bak'vi hayoc' banahyusut'yunə. Yerevan: "Zangak".

- Lehmann, Winfred P.
 1952 Proto-Indo-European phonology. Austin: University of Texas Press and Linguistics Society of America.
 1981 The genitive singular ending in **-syo*: how an Indo-Europeanist works. In: *Gd Kerns 1981*, 1: 179-188.
 1986 A Gothic Etymological Dictionary (based on the 3rd ed. of Feist's dictionary). Leiden: E. J. Brill.
 1988 'The Divine Twins' or 'The Twins ... Divine?'. In: *Fs Polomé 1988*: 373-380.
- 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.
- Leskien, A.
 1902-03 Litauisches *žavėti* 'zaubern'. In: *IndogForsch* 13: 117-119.
- 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
 1940/53 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 without mentioning it explicitly].
- Lidén, Evald
 1905 [apud HandAms 1905: 191b, on *sayl*].
 1905-06 Baumnamen und Verwandtes. In: *IndogForsh* 18: 485-509.
 1905-06a Altenglische Miscellen. In: *IndogForsch* 18: 407-416.
 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
 1965 Note phonologique sur hittite *eku-* 'boire'. In: *RevHitAs* 23.76: 29-32.
 1978-79 Note étymologique. In: *RevEtArm* n.s. 13: 41-42.

- 1980 Indo-European and Classical Armenian: a phonological note. In: *ProcFICAL 1980*: 59-66.
- 1981 L'arménien *keam*. In: *RevEtArm* n.s. 15: 19-20.
- 1982 The triple representation of Schwa in Greek and some related problems of Indo-European phonology. Oslo, Bergen, Tromsø: Universitetsforlaget.
- 1982a Varia. In: *ÉtCelt* 19: 159-163.
- 1986 A note on the morphology of Class. Arm. *anun*. In: *AnnArmLing* 7: 57-58.
- 1986a Remarques sur l'étymologie de l'aoriste *eki* en arménien ancien. In: *Gd Berbérian 1986*: 497-498.
- 1987 Introduction to the 'Laryngeal Theory'. Oslo: Norwegian University Press (Universitetsforlaget AS).
- 1989 Review of *LaryngTheor 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.
- 1990a On the word for 'wool' in Indo-European. In: *HistSpr* 103: 22-24.
- 1997 Introduction to the 'Laryngeal Theory'. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck. (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft; Bd. 91). A revised and augmented edition of 1987.
- 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.
- 2003a Indo-European **H₃ek^w-* 'to see; eye': a speculative 'laryngeal' note. In: *IndogForsch* 108: 47-57.
- Lisic'yan, Step'an D.
- 1935 (Lisician), Košun-daš: megalitičeskoe gorodišče v Sisiane (Zangezura). In: *Gd Marr 1935*: 709-721.
- 1955 (Lisician) Očerki étnografii dorevoljucionnoj Armenii. In: *KavkÉtnSbor* 1: 182-264.
- 1969 Zangezuri hayerə. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- 1981 Leřnayin Łarabałi hayerə: azgagrakan aknark. In: *HayAzgBan* 12: 7-84.
- Littleton, C. Scott
- 1973 Poseidon as a reflex of the Indo-European 'Source of Waters' god. In: *JourIndEurStud* 1.4: 423-440.
- Loewenthal, John
- 1928 Lat. *vesper*. In: *ZVS* 55: 4-5.
- Lowenstam, Steven
- 1979 The meaning of IE **dhal-*. In: *TrAmPhilAss* 109: 125-135.

- Łreĵyan, Lusine
 2004 Erkvoryakneri araspelnerə “Sasna crer” ēposum. In: *SasCrGit 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.
 1985 The PIE word for ‘dry’. In: *ZVS* 98: 1-10.
 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).
 1989 Against a Proto-Indo-European phoneme **a*. In: *NewSouIndEur 1989*: 53-66.
 1990 La loi de Brugmann et **H₃e-*. 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.
 2002b (ed.), *Atharaveda-Paippalāda, kāṇḍa five* (text, translation, commentary). Cambridge: Department of Sanskrit and Indian Studies, Harvard University. (Harvard Oriental Series; Opera Minora; 4).
 2004 Vedic *pṛdākusānu-*. 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.

- Lusararean, Karapet
 1912 Gawazanagirk': yaĵordut'iwnk' vanaharc' uxtis S. Karapeti Tarōnoy. Erusałēm: Tparan Arak'. at'oroy S. Yakovbeanc'.
- 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: *StudEymCrac* 1: 25-37.
- MacKenzie, D. N.
 1966 The dialect of Awroman (Hawrāmān-ī 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.), *Arak'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.
 1990-91 Remarques philologiques sur l'arménien *astem* 'demander une femme en mariage' et *tarm* 'bande (d'oiseaux)'. In: *RevEtArm* n.s.22: 23-28.
- Makaev, È. A.
 1974 Armjano-kel'tskie izoglossy. In: *KelKelJaz* : 51-62.
- Makovskij, M. M.
 1986 Anglijskaja ètimologija. Moscow: "Vysšaja škola".
- Maksoudiantz, M.
 1911-12 Arménien *ařac*. In: *MSL* 17: 356.
- 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. & Adams, D. Q. (eds.)
 1997 Encyclopedia of Indo-European culture. London, Chicago: Fitzroy Dearborn Publishers.
 2006 The Oxford introduction to Proto-Indo-European and the Proto-Indo-European world. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mallory, J. P. & Huld, Martin E.
 1984 Proto-Indo-European 'silver'. In: *ZVS* 97.1: 1-12.
- Malxaseanc', Step'an
 1944-45 (HBB 1-4), Hayerēn bac'atrankan bařaran. Yerevan. (Reprinted in 1955-56 and 1983, Pēyrut': "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'awstos 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.
 1997 Nostratic from a typological point of view. In: *JourIndEurStud* 25.1-2: 79-104.
 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 Barbařayin bařeri meknut'yunner: 1-7. In: *PBH* 1971, Nr 3: 210-222.
 1973 Barbařayin bařeri meknut'yunner: 8-13. In: *PBH* 1973, Nr 4: 127-136.
 1975 Gorisi barbařə. Yerevan: University Press.
 1975a Barbařayin bařeri meknut'yunner: 14-19. In: *PBH* 1975, Nr 2: 183-191.
 1977 Barbařayin bařeri meknut'yunner: 20-24. In: *PBH* 1977, Nr 3: 157-164.
 1980 Barbařayin bařeri meknut'yunner: 25-28. In: *PBH* 1980, Nr 2: 98-104.
 1988 Mi k'ani telanunneri cagman masin. In: *PBH* 1988, Nr 4: 123-130.
 1992 Telanvanakan meknut'yunner. In: *PBH* 1992, Nr 1: 133-139.
- Markey, Thomas L.
 1972 Germanic terms for temple and cult. In: *Fs Haugen 1972*: 365-378.
- Markosyan, Ėazmik Ararati
 1989 Araratyan barbař. Yerevan: "Luys".
- Marr, N. Ja.
 1903 Grammatika drevnearmjanskago jazyka: ètimologija. Sanktpeterburg: Tipografija Imperatorskoj Akademii Nauk. (Izdaniya fakul'teta vostochnych jazykov Imperatorskago Sanktpeterburgskago universiteta, 11).

- 1925 (Marr/Kipšidze), Materialy po xemšinskomu narečiju armjanskogo jazyka: po zapisi I. A. Kipšidze. In: *Zapiski Kollegii Vostokovedov* (Leningrad: Academy Press). 1: 73-80.
- 1927 Egipetskij, šumerskij, kitajskij i ix paleontologičeskie vstreči. In: *DoklANSSSR* : 82-84.
- Martirosyan, H. A. (= Martirosjan A. A.)
- 1964 (Martirosjan A. A.), Armenija v èpoxu bronzy i rannego železa. 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 meknut'yan nor p'orj* [New attempt of interpretation of *artaxur xawart*]. In: *PBH* 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.
- 2007 Mediterranean-Pontic substratum words. In: *Aramazd: Armenian journal of Near-Eastern studies*, vol. 2, 2007 (Yerevan: Association for Near Eastern and Caucasian Studies): 88-123.
- 2008 Development of some dialectal features in the Artsax region. In: *8th International Conference on Armenian Linguistics* (16-17 August 2008).
- forthc. On Armenian *andund-k* 'abyss'. In: *Fs Weitenberg*.
- Martirosyan, Hrach & Gharagozyan, Sat'enik
- 2003 (FW), Field work: 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.
- forthc. Death of the Armenian epic hero Davit'. Paper presented at the Workshop "*Cultural, linguistic and ethnological interrelations in and around Armenia*", Michaelbeuern, July 4th to 7th, 2007.
- Martirosyan, Nšan
- 1972 Npast mə het' ew hay bařak'nnut'yan. In: *PBH* 1972, Nr. 2: 163-186.
- Martoyan, Gagik
- 2004 Taroni Innaknya vayri pařtamunk'i cagman xndri řurj. In: *PBH* 2004, Nr 3: 235-251.

- Marut'yan, Harut'yun T.
 1989 (A. Marutjan), Inter'er armjanskogo narodnogo žilišča (vtoraja polovina XIX - načalo XX v.): materialy k "Kavkazskomu istoriko-ètnografičeskomu atlasu". In: *HayAzgBan* 17: 63-142 (+ illustrations).
- Matasović, Ranko
 1996 A theory of textual reconstruction in Indo-European linguistics. Frankfurt am Main, Berlin, etc.: Peter Lang, Europäischer Verlag der Wissenschaften. (Schriften über Sprachen und Texte, 2).
 2009 Etymological dictionary of Proto-Celtic. Leiden, Boston: Brill. (LeidIEEDSer, 9).
- Mat'ewosyan, A. S.
 See *Sources*: 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.
 1997a Zu armenisch *mek' 'wir'*. In: *HistSpr* 110.1: 83-92.
 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 *ewt/iwt' 'Öl'*. In: *Fs Pisowicz 2006*: 71-72.
- Mawet, Francine
 1983 The motif of the bird in Armenian epic literature and its relations with Iranian tradition. In: *MedArmCult* 1983 [1984]: 179-193.
 1990 L'expression de l'alterité en arménien classique. In: *AnnArmLing* 11: 49-65.
 1992 Altérité, appartenance sociale et tolérance. In: *ActOrBelg* 7 (Philosophy. Tolerance): 153-158.
 1993 Les adjectifs primaires en *-u-*: review of *de Lamberterie 1990*. In: *RevEtArm* n.s. 24: 301-305.
- Mayrhofer, Manfred
 1952 Stern. In: *BeiGesDeuSprLit* 74: 316-318.
 1956-80 See KEWA.
 1961 Indogermanische Randglosse zu "Kluge-Mitzka". In: *Die 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.
- 2005 Die Fortsetzung der indogermanische Laryngale in Indo-Iranischen. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. (Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften: Philosophisch-historische Klasse. Sitzungsberichte, 730).
- McCone, Kim
- 1998 'Double nasal' presents in Celtic, and Old Irish *léicid* 'leaves'. In: *Fs Watkins 1998*: 465-476.
- 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).
- Meid, Wolfgang
- 1974 Dichtkunst, Rechtspflege und Medizin im alten Irland: zur Struktur der altirischen Gesellschaft. In: *AntiqIndog* 1974: 21-34.
- 1982 'See' und 'Meer'. In: *Gd Kronasser 1982*: 91-96.
- 1994 Die Terminologie von Pferd und Wagen im Indogermanischen. In: *IndogPferd 1994*: 53-65.
- Meier-Brügger, Michael
- 1990 Zu griechisch *ἄγρωστις*. In: *HistSpr* 103: 33-34.
- 1990a Zu griechisch *ἀρήν* und *κρῖός*. In: *HistSpr* 103: 26-29.
- 1993 Zu griechisch *νῆσος*. In: *HistSpr* 106: 302.
- Meillet, A.
- 1892 Notes de phonétique. In: *MSL* 7: 161-167.
- 1892a Les groupes indo-européens. In: *MSL* 7: 57-60.
- 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.
- 1896b Étymologies slaves. In: *MSL* 9: 49-55.
- 1897 Recherches sur la syntaxe comparée de l'arménien. I: Les démonstratifs. In: *MSL* 10: 241-271. (= 1962: 5-35; Arm. transl. 1978: 291-319).
- 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.
- 1910-11 Sur une origine de grec *o*. In: *MSL* 16: 217-220.
- 1910-11a Deux notes sur des formes verbales indo-européennes. In: *MSL* 16: 239-246.
- 1911 Remarques sur les *l* 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 **melg*₁- '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 *aṛn*. 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.
- 1919 D'une action de l'iranien sur l'arménien. In: *MSL* 21.4: 187-188.
- 1920 Les noms du 'feu' et de l' 'eau' et la question du genre. In: *MSL* 21.6: 249-256.
- 1921 Notes iraniennes. In: *MSL* 22: 219-227.
- 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 *féργον*. 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*, *aregakn* et *p'aylakn*. In: *HandAms* 41: 757-762.
- 1927b À propos de l'interrogatif et relatif *or*. In: *RevEtArm* 7.1: 1-3.
- 1929 Sur l'étymologie de arménien *unim*. In: *MSL* 23: 276-277.
- 1930 Observations sur l'étymologie de l'arménien. In: *RevEtArm* 10.2: 183-186 (= Meye 1978: 223-226).
- 1930a Arménien *barjr*. In: *MSL* 23: 328 (= Meye 1978: 222-223).
- 1935 Les sourdes aspirées en arménien. In: *BSL* 36: 109-120 (= Meye 1978: 61-65).
- 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.
- 1937 Arménien *erkin* et *erkir*. In: *Mélanges Boisacq* 1, 1937: 1-2.
- 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.
- 1962 Études de linguistique et de philologie arméniennes. Lisboa: Imprensa Nacional de Lisboa. I: Recherches sur la syntaxe comparée de l'arménien, suivis de la composition en arménien. Avant-propos de E. Benveniste. (Bibliothèque arménienne de la Fondation Calouste Gulbenkian).
- 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.

- Meissner, Torsten
 2006 S-stem nouns and adjectives in Greek and Proto-Indo-European: a diachronic study in word formation. Oxford: Oxford University Press. (Oxford classical monographs).
- Melchert, H. Craig
 1979 Three Hittite etymologies. In: *ZVS* 93: 262-271.
 1987 Reflexes of **h₃* in Anatolian. In: *Die Sprache* 33.1-2: 19-28.
 1994 Anatolian historical phonology. Amsterdam, Atlanta: Rodopi. (LeidStudIndEur, 3).
 1994a PIE **y* > Lydian *d*. In: *Gd Klíma 1994*: 181-187.
 2003 (ed.), *The Luwians*. Leiden, Boston: Brill (Handbuch der Orientalistik, 1/68).
- Mēlik'-Dawit'pēk, S.
 1896 Jaynakan usumnasirut'iwn Maraši barbarin. In: *HandAms* 1896: 43-45, 113-114, 229-232, 354-357.
- Melik'ean, Elišē Y.
 1964 Hark'-Xnus. Ant'īlias, Lebanon: Tparan Kat'olikosut'ean Hayoc' Meci Tann Kilikiyoy.
- Melik'-Ōhanjanyan, K. A.
 1961 See *Sources*: Kirakos Ganjakec'i.
- Melik'-Šahnazareanc', Kostandin K. (Tmblač'i Xač'an)
 1907-08 (1-2), *Zuřna-tmbla*. Vol. 1, 1907; vol. 2, 1908. Vařaršapat: Elēk'trašarž Tparan M. At'ořoy S. Ējmiacni.
- Menevischean, P. G.
 1889 Faustus von Byzanz und Dr. Lauer's deutsche Übersetzung. In: *WienZeitKundMorg* 3: 51-68.
- Meščaninov, I. I.
 1925 Kamennye statui ryb-višapy na Kavkaze i v Severnoj Mongolii. In: *Zapiski Kollegii Vostokovedov pri Aziatskom Muzeje Rossijskoj Akademii Nauk*. Leningrad. Vol. 1: 401-409.
 1978 Annotirovannyj slovar' urart'skogo (Biajnskogo) jazyka. Leningrad: "Nauka", Leningradskoe otdelenie.
- Mesropyan, Haykanuš
 2001 *Surb* baři gorcacut'yan ařanjnahatkut'yunnerə hayereni tarber drseworumnerum. In: *HaySrb 2001*: 118-124.
- Meye/ē, see Meillet, A.
- Meyer, Gustav
 1892 Etymologisches. In: *IndogForsch* 1: 319-329.
- Mežunc', B. X.
 1989 Šamšadin-Diliřani xosvack'ə. Yerevan: University Press.
- Mik'ayelyan, G. H.
 1980 Nor Bayazet. *HayAzgBan* 11. Yerevan: Academy Press.

- Milbrath, Susan
 1999 Star gods of the Maya: astronomy in art, folklore, and calendars. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Minassian, Martiros
 1978-79 A. Meillet et l'adaptation inachevée du *Dictionnaire étymologique arménien* d'Ačařyan. In: *RevEtArm* n.s. 13: 15-30.
- Minasyan, Šoter Marlesti
 1999 Łarabali barbari darjvacnerə (atenaxosut'yan seřmagir). Yerevan.
- Minorsky, M. V.
 1930 Le nom de Dvin. – Kasāl/Қazař. In: *RevEtArm* 10/1: 117-123.
- Minshall, Robert
 1955 'Initial' Indo-European */y/ in Armenian. In: *Language* 31.4: 499-503.
- Mkrtč'yan, Ĕmma L.
 1980 Ařxarhabari tarrerə miřnadari grakan huřarjannerum. Yerevan: University Press.
 1992 Grabarum hognaki t'vi kazmut'yan ařanjnahatkut'yunneri masin. In: *BanbErewHamals* 1992, Nr 2: 67-74.
- Mkrtč'yan, H. M.
 1952 Karno barbař. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- Mkrtč'yan, Hasmik
 1987 Hay-arabakan banahyusakan kaperi patmut'yunic'. In: *LrHasGit* 1987, Nr 3: 54-60.
- Mkrtč'yan, Manik
 1973 (ed.) *Nersēs Šnorhali*, Oľb Edesioy. Yerevan: Academy Press.
 1981 (ed.) *Nersēs Šnorhali*, Vipasanut'iwn. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- Mkrtč'yan, Nerses Alek'sani
 1969 Xet'a-haykakan mi k'ani bařayin əndhanrut'yunner. In: *PBH* 1969, Nr 1: 238-246.
 1970 Mi k'ani hin semakan bařer hayerenum. In: *PBH* 1970, Nr 2: 241-251.
 1970a Xet'a-haykakan əndhanrut'yunner. In: *PBH* 1970, Nr 7: 58-69.
 1971 Burduri barbař. Yerevan: Academy Press.
 1979 (Mkrtčjan), 'Otklonenija' ot zakonomernostej armjanskogo jazyka v svete dannyx akkadskogo jazyka. In: *PBH* 1979, Nr 4: 219-234.
 1980 Araberen p'oxařut'yunner hayerenum: naxk'an arabneri arřavank'ə Hayastan. In: *LrHasGit* 1980, Nr 3: 49-64.
 1983 (Mkrtčjan), Substratnye nazvaniya rastenij v armjanskom jazyke. In: *Drevnij Vostok* (Yerevan: Academy Press) 4: 24-37. [English summary: 286-287].
 1984 Araberen p'oxařut'yunner hayerenum. In: *LrHasGit* 1984, Nr 2: 72-82.
 1987 Araberen p'oxařut'yunner hayerenum. In: *LrHasGit* 1987, Nr 10: 54-60.
 1988 (Mkrtčjan), Utočnenie akkadskix nazvanij rastenij po dannym armjanskogo jazyka. In: *Drevnij Vostok* (Yerevan: Academy Press) 5: 187-202.

- 1995 Sivri-Hisari gałt'ōjaxi ew barbari masin. In: *PBH* 1995, Nr 2: 205-214.
- 2005 (Mkrtčjan), *Semitskie Jazyki i armjanskij*. Yerevan: "Drazark".
- 2006 Anatoliayi norahayt hay barbarnerə ew banahyusut'yunə. Yerevan: "Örenk' ew irakanut'yun". (Heřinakayin hratarakut'yun).
- Mkrtumyan, Yu. I.
- 1974 (Mkrtumjan), *Formy skotovodstva v Vostočnoj Armenii: vtoraja polovina XIX - načalo XX v. (istoriko-ětnografičeskoe issledovanie)*. In: *HayAzgBan* 6: 5-90.
- 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: *MatGNŽot* 1: 178-181.
- 1956 Haykakan miřnadaryan žołovrdakan erger. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- 1969 (Mnacakanjan), *O literature Kavkazskoj Albanii*. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- 1971 Dic'abanakan anunner ew bařer *ot* ew *ut* verřacanc'nerov. In: *LrHasGit* 1971, Nr 11: 52-64.
- 1977 Dic'abanakan ełjerun miřnadaryan hay arvestum. In: *BanbMaten* 12: 7-49.
- 1980 Hay miřnadaryan hanelukner (5-18 dd.). Yerevan: Academy Press.
- 1980a "Govank' t'řč'noc"" tałařark'ə, nra heřinakə 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. Leiden: E. J. Brill. (*Acta Iranica* 29).
- Monier-Williams, Monier
- 1899/1999 *A Sanskrit-English dictionary*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers.
- Morani, Moreno
- 1977 Noterelle etimologiche. In: *Orbis* 26.2: 371-376.
- 1980-82 Arménien *ənker*. Pour l'histoire d'un calque structurel. In: *Orbis* 29.1-2: 169-175.
- 1981 In margine a una concordanza greco-armena. In: *ArchGlottItal* 66.1-2: 1-15.
- 1987 A proposito della vocale compositiva *-a-* in armeno. In: *HandAms* 101: 677-684.
- 1990 Sul trattamento di liquide e nasali in sillaba finale in armeno. In: *RendLombLett* 123 [1989]: 155-165.
- 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. (Beiträge zur Iranistik, 6).
 2003 A new etymological vocabulary of Pashto. Compiled and edited by J. Elfenbein, D. N. MacKenzie and Nicholas Sims-Williams. Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag. (Beiträge zur Iranistik, 23).
- Movsisyan, Sahak (Bense)
 1972 Hark' (Mšo Bulanəx). *HayAzgBan* 3. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- Msereanc', Lewon
 1899 Hayerēn barbařaxōsut'iwn. (Arm. transl. from Russian by Gabriēl Mēnēvišean). Vienna: Mxit'arean Tparan. (Azgayin Matenadaran, 30).
- Muldusyan, Zohrab
 1985 Haykakan naxamayr astvacut'yan ew Xaldii harc'i šurjə. In: *LrHasGit* 1985, Nr 7: 61-71.
- Müller, Friedrich
 1870 Armeniaca II. In *Sitzungsberichte der philosophisch-historischen Classe der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften*. 64.2. Wien: 447-456.
 1877 Schwan und Taube [Miscellanea 1]. In: *BKIGS* 1: 163.
 1890 Armeniaca VI. In *Sitzungsberichte der philosophisch-historischen Classe der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften*. 122.1. Wien: 1-8.
- 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.
- Muradean, Y.
 1901 Hamšēnc'i hayer. T'iflis: K. Martiroseanc'i tparan (reprinted from "Azagrakakan handēs").
- Muradyan, A. N.
 1971 Hunaban dproc'ə ew nra derə hayereni k'erakanakan terminabanut'yan stelcman 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.
 2006 (Muradean), Hrat, Lusaber, P'aylacu, Erewak, Lusnt'ag. In: *HandAms* 120, Nr 1-12: 1-18.
- Muradyan, H. D.
 1960 Karčewani barbařə. Yerevan: Academy Press.
 1967 Kak'avaberdi barbařə. Yerevan: Academy Press.
 1972 Neracut'yun; Hnč'yunabanut'yun. In: *Aknarkner mijin grakan hayereni patmut'yan*. Vol. 1. Yerevan: Academy Press: 7-165.

- 1982 Hayoc' lezvi patmakan k'erakanut'yun, vol. 1. Hnč'yunabanut'yun. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- 1982a Havelakan h//h'-n hayereni barbaġnerum. In: *BanbErewHamals* 1982, Nr 2: 202-206.
- 1985 Review of *Weitenberg 1983*. In: *PBH* 1985, Nr 3: 219-226.
- 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 Hexaameron.
- Muradyan, M. H.
- 1962 Šataxi barbaġ. Yerevan: University Press.
- 1972 Baġagitut'yun. In: *Aknarkner mijġn grakan hayereni patmut'yan*. Yerevan: Academy Press: 167-296.
- 1975 Baġagitut'yun. In: *HayLezPatmK'er* 2: 5-158.
- 1982 Urvagic Moksi barbaġi. In: *Hayereni barbaġagitakan atlas: usumnasirut'yunner ew nyut'er* 1. Yerevan: Academy Press: 108-183.
- Muradyan, P.
- 1996 Kovkasyan mšakut'ayin ašxarhə ew Hayastanə: Armeno-Georgica. In: *PBH* 1996, Nr 1-2: 117-136.
- Murvalyan, A. A.
- 1955 Hayoc' lezvi baġayin kazmə (usumnasirut'yun). Yerevan: Academy Press.
- Mušeġyan, Armen H.
- 1997 (Musheghian), Armenian etymologies. In: *AnnArmLing* 18: 51-57.
- 2000 (Musheghian), Essays on history of the Armenian language. Vol. 1: Historical-etymological studies. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- 2003 Stugabanakan ditarkumner. In: *PBH* 2003, Nr 2: 181-187.
- Mxit'arean, Step'an
- 1898 Hayerēnē p'oxaġeal baġer t'urk'erēni mēġ. In: *Biwrakn* 1898: 788-790, 865-866.
- Mxit'areanc', A.
- 1901 P'šrank' Širaki ambarneric'. (= Ēminean azgagrakan žoġovacu, vol. 1). Moscow, Alek'sandrapol.
- Nagy, Gregory
- 1974 Perkúnas and Рерунъ. In: *AntiqIndog* 1974: 113-131.
- Nalbandian, Vartouhie Calantar
- 1948 About the theory of the Babylonian origin of the Armenian people. In: *ArmRev* 1.1: 15-19; 1.3: 90-94.
- 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- (HŽHġk' 1-), Hay-žoġovrdakan hġk'iat'ner.

- 1903 Baġirk' Araratean barbari. T'iflis: Tparan Movsēs Vardaneanc'i. (See also HŽHĕk' 5, 1889: 81-141).
- Nazaryan, Asthik
1978 Ējmiacni ew Aštarakı banahyusut'yunic'. In: *HayAzgBan* 9: 73-173.
- Nazinyan, Artašes
1986 Hay žoľovrdakan hek'iat'ner. Yerevan: "Sovetakan Grof".
- Nejxardt, A. A.
1982 Skifskij rasskaz Gerodota v otečestvennoj istoriografii. Leningrad: "Nauka", Leningradskoe otdelenie.
- Nestle/Aland
1984=93 See *Sources*: Bible.
- Nevskaja, L. G.
1974 Baltijskie nazvanija bolot v sopostavlenii so slavjanskimi: semasiologičeskie nabljudenija. In: *BaltSlavIssl* 1974: 155-182.
- 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.
1984 Severokavkazskie zaimstvovanija v armjanskom. In: *LingRek* 1984, 1: 70-73.
1985 Severokavkazskie zaimstvovanija v xettskom i drevnegrečeskom. In: *DrevAnat* 1985: 60-73.
- Nikolayev, 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
1911 K'nnut'iwn Malxasean hratarakut'eanc' Agat'angelosi ew Łazaray P'arpec'woy. In: *Yušarjan* 1911: 161-174.
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: *Die Sprache* 27: 22-29.
- Nšanean, Mesrop Vardapet
1915 (ed.) Žamanakagrut'iwn *Grigor Vardapeti Kamaxec'woy kam Daranac'woy*. Erusaľem: St Jacob.

- Nussbaum, Alan J.
 1986 Head and Horn in Indo-European. Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter. (Untersuchungen zur Indogermanischen Sprach- und Kulturwissenschaft, N.F. 2).
- Nyberg, H. S.
 1974 A manual of Pahlavi. Part 2. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Nždehean, K.
 1902 Paṛawašunč. In: *AzgHand* 7th year, 9th book: 263-271.
 1910 Alaškerti banawor grakanut‘iwnic. In: *AzgHand* 12th year, 20th book, 1910, Nr 2: 108-111.
- Oberlies, Thomas
 2000 Pūšans Zahnlücken und Hermes’ Vorliebe für Backwerk: ererbte Strukturen des Pantheons der ṛgvedischen Religion (mit einer Nachbemerkung von Stefan Zimmer [see Zimmer 2000]). In: *IndIranIndog 2000*: 369-387.
- O’Brien, Steven
 1982 Dioscuric elements in Celtic and Germanic mythology. In: *JourIndEurStud* 10.1-2: 117-136.
- Ōdabašyan, A. A.
 1976 (Odabašjan), Narodnye verovanija armjan (po materialam rukopisnyx talismanov 15-19 vv.). In: *KavkĖtnSbor* 6. Mosow: “Nauka”, 107-130.
 1978 Amanorə hay žoľovrdakan tonac‘uyc‘um. In: *HayAzgBan* 9: 5-72.
 1986 Tiezerasteľcman aṛaspeli veraprukayin tarrern axtark‘um. In: *PBH* 1986, Nr 3: 138-149.
 1987 Tiezerakan caṛə hin hayoc‘ dic‘abanakan hamakargum. In: *LrHasGit* 1987, Nr 10: 61-71.
- Oettinger, Norbert
 1976 Der indogermanische Stativ. In: *MünStudSpr* 34, 1976: 109-149.
 1979 Die Stammbildung des hethitischen Verbuns. Nürnberg: Verlag Hans Carl. (Erlanger Beiträge zur Sprach- und Kunstwissenschaft, 64).
 1994 Pferd und Wagen im Altiranischen und Anatolischen. In: *IndogPferd 1994*: 67-76.
 1997 Altindisch *mahānt-* ‘groß’ und indogermanisch *-nt-*. In: *Fs Beekes 1997*: 205-207.
 1998 Semantisches zu Pan, Pūšan und Hermes. In: *Fs Watkins 1998*: 539-548.
 2000 Die Götter *Pūšan*, *Pan* und das Possessivsuffix **-h₃en*. In: *IndIranIndog 2000*: 393-400.
 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.
 - 1989a Three notes on Armenian historical phonology. In: *AnnArmLing* 10: 5-25.
 - 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).
 - 2000 On the origin of the types *deví* and *vṛkíh*. In: *IndIranIndog 2000*: 401-408.
- Oranskij, I. M.
- 1975 Indo-iranica 4: tadjik (régional) *buruř* 'bouleau'. In: *Fs Benveniste 1975*: 435-440.
 - 1977 Est' li ètimologičeskaja svjaz' meždú russk. *bereza* i tadž. *burs* 'arča'? In: *Ètimologija 1975*. Moscow: "Nauka": 138-140.
- Orbeli, I. A.
- 1956 *Basni srednevekovoj Armenii*. Moscow, Leningrad: Academy Press.
 - 1956a *Armjanskij geroičeskij èpos*. Yerevan: Academy Press.
 - 1982 *Fol'klor i byt Moksa*. Moscow: GRVLI "Nauka".
 - 2002 *Izbrannye trudy v dvux tomax*, vol. 2. Yerevan: Academy Press "Gitutjun".
- Ördoyan, Grigor Vruyri
- 1983 *Mimakan arvesti gcerə Kilikyan miřavayrum*. In: *PBH* 1983, Nr 1: 117-124.
 - 1991 *T'atronə Kilikyan Hayastanum (12-13 dd.)*. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- Orel, Vladimir
- 1984 Albanskij i južnoindoevropskie jazyki. In: *LingRek 1984*, 1: 76-78.
 - 1994 Albanian and Indo-European. In: *Pedersen Kolloquium 1994*: 349-364.
 - 1994a Armenian etymologies. In: *AnnArmLing* 15: 37-42.
 - 1995 Indo-European notes. In: *IndogForsch* 100: 116-128.
- Oshiro, Terumasa
- 1989 On Hieroglyphic Luwian sign *sù* or *zú*. In: *JourIndEurStud* 17.1-2: 181.

- Oskean, H. H.
 1939 Bznuneac' covi kłzineru anapatnern u vank'erə. In: *HandAms* 53.1-6: 25-77.
 1939a Rštuneac' gawari vank'erə. In: *HandAms* 53.7-12: 159-195 (continued in vol. 54, 1940, Nr 1-6, pp. 21ff).
- Osthoff, Hermann
 1898 Griechische und lateinische Wortdeutungen (dritte Reihe). In: *IndogForsch* 8, 1-2: 1-68.
 1905 Zwei artikel zum ablaut der *āu*-basen. In: *BKIGS* 29: 249-258.
- Otkupščikov, Ju. V.
 1985 Ob indoeuropejskom proisxoždenii lat. *vīnum*, dr.-greč. (φ)οῖνος 'vino'. In: *VoprJaz* 1985, Nr 4: 95-103.
- Otrębski, Jan
 1966 Die ältesten germanischen Lehnwörter im Baltischen und Slavischen. In: *Die Sprache* 12: 50-64.
 1967 Die von dem indoeuropäischen Reflexivpronomen **se*, **seye*, **sue* usw. abgeleiteten Verwandtschaftsnamen. In: *Fs Pokorny 1967*: 73-77.
- Otten, H.
 1950 Die Gottheit Lelvani der Boğazköy-Texte. In: *JCunSt* 4: 119-140.
 1988 Die Bronzetafel aus Boğazköy: ein Staatsvertrag Tutḫalijas IV. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz. (StBoT, Beiheft 1).
- Palean, T. V.
 1898 Mankakan ōrōr Aknay barbařov. In: *Biwrakn* 1898: 601-602.
 1898a Antuni (Aknay gawařabarbařov). In: *Biwrakn* 1898: 393-394.
- Papanastassiou, Georges C.
 1994 Compléments au Dictionnaire étymologique du grec ancien de Pierre Chantraine (Λ-Ω). Thessalonique: Magia.
- Parpola, Asko
 1985 The sky-garment. Helsinki (Studia Orientalia edited by the Finnish Oriental Society, 57).
- Pârvulescu, Adrian
 1986 Arm. *amusin* 'spouse'. In: *AnnArmLing* 7: 45-49.
 1989 'Black water' in the Thracian hydronymy. In: *ThracMyc 1989*: 290-295.
 1989a Blood and IE. Kinship terminology. In: *IndogForsch* 94: 67-88.
- 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.
 1880 (Patkanean, K'), T'ē inč' tel ē bīnum hayerēn lezun hndka-ewropakan lezuni šrjanum. In: *P'orj* 4.3:

Patrubány, Lukas v.

- 1897 Beiträge zur armenischen Ethnologie. In: *EthnMittUng* 5, 1896: 139-153.
 1897a Armenische Etymologien. In: *EthnMittUng* 5, 1896: 234.
 1902-03 Idg. *e/ozg^h im Armenischen. In: *IndogForsch* 13: 124-125.
 1902-03a Armeniaca. In: *IndogForsch* 13: 163-164.
 1904 Miscellen. In: *ZVS* 37: 427-428.
 1906-08 (Badrupanean, Łukas), [StugHetaz] Stugabanakan hetazōtut'iwnk'. In: *HandAms* <...>; vol. 18, 1904: 94, 184-185, 334b; vol. 20, 1906: 23-25, 55-58, 71-73, 172-174, 341-347, 366-368; vol. 21, 1907: 16-17, 89-90, 303-306; vol. 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

- 1900 Albanesisch und Armenisch. In: *ZVS* 36: 340-341 (= 1982: 1-2).
 1905 Zur armenischen Sprachgeschichte. In: *ZVS* 38: 194-240 (=1982: 56-102).
 1905a Les pronoms démonstratifs de l'ancien arménien. In: *Det Kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskabs Skrifter Sectietitel. Sjette Række: Historisk og filosofisk Afdeling* 6.3: 5-51 [303-353] (= 1982: 8-55).
 1906 Armenisch und die Nachbarsprachen. In: *ZVS* 39: 334-485 (= 1982: 112-263). ModWArm. translation: Pedersøn 1907.
 1906a Zur Akzentlehre. In: *ZVS* 39: 235-243 (= 1982: 103-111).
 1907 (Pedersøn), Hayerēn ew drac'i lezunerə (ModWArm. translation of Pedersen 1906 by H. T'ovmas Ketikean). Vienna: Mxit'arean Tparan.
 1924 Armenier. B. Sprache. In: *Max Ebert* (ed.), *Reallexikon der Vorgeschichte*. Vol. 1. Berlin, pp. 219-226 (= 1982: 302-309).
 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)

- 1966 Une inscription araméenne du roi Artasēs trouvée à Zangéour (Siwnik'). In: *RevEtArm* n.s. 3: 17-29.
 1982 Ètimologičeskie zametki I. In: *PBH* (= IFŽ) 1982, Nr 1: 55-62.
 1983 Obščestvo i pravo Irana v parfjanskij i sasanidskij periody. Moscow: GRVLI "Nauka".
 1985 (P'ërikhanian), Arm. *dašxuran* et arm. *vsestak*. In: *AnnArmLing* 6: 75-80.
 1993 *Materialy k ètimologičeskomu slovarju drevnearmjanskogo jazyka*. Part 1. Yerevan: Academy Press.

- Peščereva, E. M.
 1963 Nekotorye dopolnenija k opisaniju prazdnika tjul'pana v Ferganskoj doline. In: *Fs Zarubin 1963*: 214-218.
- 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).
 1986 Probleme mit anlautenden Laryngalen. In: *Die Sprache* 32.2: 365-383.
 1987 λῆνος aus **h₂sl̥h₁náh₂*. In: *Die Sprache* 33.1-2: 114-115.
 1988 Zur Frage strukturell uneinheitlicher Laryngalreflexe in idg. Einzelsprachen. In: *LaryngTheor 1988*: 373-381.
 1991 Idg. '9' im Armenischen und Griechischen. In: *ZeitPhonSprKom* 44.3: 301-310.
 1997 Der armenische Flexionstyp *gitem*, *gitac'i* und das ion.-att. Plusquamperfekt. In: *Fs Beekes 1997*: 209-217.
- 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.
 1926 Armenische Etymologien. In: *IndogForsch* 43: 69-79.
- Petit, Daniel
 2006 Lituanien *Eržvilkas*, une formule poétique indo-européenne? In: *LangPoétIndEur 2006*: 343-366.
- Petoyan, Vardan A.
 1954 Sasuni barbařə. Yerevan: Academy Press.
 1965 Sasna azgagrut'yunə. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- Petrosyan, A. S.
 1989 Gayli paštamunk'ə hay žoľovrdakan havatalik'nerum. In: *BanbErewHamals* 1989, Nr 2: 72-80.
 1995 Arji paštamunk'ə hay žoľovrdakan havatalik'nerum. In: *BanbErewHamals* 1995, Nr 3: 163-170.
- Petrosyan, Armen
 1987 (Petrosjan), Otrazenie indoevropskogo kornja **uel-* v armjanskoj mifologii. In: *LrHasGit (= VON)* 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 ařaspelə hndevropakan ařaspelabanut'yan hamatek'stum ew hayoc' azgacagman xndirə. Yerevan: Van Aryan.
- 1997a Haykakan ėposi hnaguyn akunk'nerə: hndevropakan ařaspelner ew patmakan naxatiper. Yerevan: Van Aryan.
- 2001 Ara Geřec'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: *PBH 2003*, Nr 2: 189-224.
- 2004 Haykakan dic'arani hnaguyn akunk'nerə. In: *PBH 2004*, Nr 2: 205-233.
- 2006 Hayoc' azgacagman harc'er. Yerevan: "Noravank".
- 2006a Aramazd: kerpar, pařtamunk', naxatiper. Yerevan: Van Aryan.
- 2006b Tir ew Mařtoc': dprut'yan astvacə ew greri steřcolə. In: *IntConfArmLett 2006*: 41-53.
- 2007 Stugabanut'iwnner. In: *HandAms 121.1-12*: 1-24.
- 2007a The problem of identification of the Proto-Armenians: a critical review. In: *JourSocArmStud 16*: 25-66.
- Petrosyan, Ėmma X.
- 1989 (Petrosjan, Ė.), Ritual'no-mifologiĉeskaja i teatral'no-zrelishchnaja sistema armjan: opyt rekonstrukcii (doctoral dissertation: avtoreferat). Yerevan.
- Petrosyan, H. Z.
- 1976 Aknarkner hayereni patmakan jewabanut'yan: hodayin karg. Yerevan: University Press.
- 1987 Hayerenagitakan bařaran. Yerevan: "Hayastan".
- Petrosyan, L. N.
- 1968 Hay řolovrdakan p'oxadramijoc'nern əst matenagrut'yan. In: *LrHasGit 1968*, Nr 9: 36-48.
- 1974 Hay řolovrdakan p'oxadramijoc'ner. A. Hetiotn ew grastayin p'oxadramijoc'ner (patma-azgagrakan usumnasirut'yun). In: *HayAzgBan 6*: 91-156 + Tables.
- Petrosyan, S. G.
- 1976 Merjsewanyan c'ĕleri miut'yunə Haykakan leřnařxarhi hyusis-arewelk'um (m. t'. a. 6-5 dd.). In: *PBH 1976*, Nr 1: 187-198.
- 1977 T'raķa-kimerakan c'ĕleri miut'yunnerə Haykakan leřnařxarhum (m. t'. a. 6-5 dd.). In: *PBH 1977*, Nr 2: 207-220.
- 1979 Hin Marastani tarack'i errord ĕt'nikakan tarri masin. In: *PBH 1979*, Nr 4: 46-58).

- 1981 “Vahagni ergi” akrostik‘osneri verakangnman ew vercanman p‘orj. In: *LrHasGit* 1981, Nr 4: 78-88.
- 1991 Erkguyn-erkhark tiezerk‘i masin araspelabanakan patkerac‘umə Haykakan lernašxarhum. In: *LrHasGit* 1991, Nr 2: 126-131.
- 1999 Gnuni naxarakan tohmi ew ginu paštamunk‘i šurj. In: *PBH* 1999, Nr 2-3: 175-189.
- Petrosyan, Sargis & Petrosyan, Covinar
2001 Hnaguyn Cop‘k‘i dic‘akan glxavor eryaki šurj. In: *ŠirGitAšx* 4: 79-96.
- Petruševskij, I.
1930 O doxristianskix verovanijax krest‘jan Nagornogo Karabaxa. Izvestija Azerbajdžanskogo Gosudarstvennogo Naučno-Issledovatel’skogo Instituta: Istoriko-ètnografičeskoe i arxeologičeskoe otdelenie. 1.5. Baku: Izdatel’stvo AzGNII.
- Pfeifer, Wolfgang
1989 (1-3), Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Deutschen. Erarb. von einem Autorenkollektiv des Zentralinstituts für Sprachwissenschaft unter der Leitung von Wolfgang Pfeifer. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag. Bd. 1: A-G; Bd. 2: H-P; Bd. 3: Q-Z. 1989.
- Picard, Marc
1989 A reanalysis of Armenian prothesis and metathesis. In: *FoLLingHist* 10.1-2: 61-69.
- P‘iliposyan, Rafik Elišei
2005 P‘arpi: P‘arpi gyuli patmut‘yunə (ed. by Paruyr Muradyan). Yerevan: P‘arpi gyuli gyulapetaran. [Consists of two parts, each having its own pagination].
- P‘iloyeanc‘, S.
1888 Korac margarit: Nor-Bayazēdi keank‘ic‘. T‘iflis: Tparan M. D. Rōtineanc‘i.
- Pinault, Georges-Jean
2002 Tokh. B *k_ucaññe*, A *k_ucim* et skr. *tokharika*. In: *IndIranJour* 45: 311-345.
- Piotrovskij, B. B.
1940 Urartskaja bronzovaja statuètka Gos. Muzeja Armenii. In: *SovArx* 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.
1944 Armenische Studien. In: *ZVS* 68: 157-177.
1950 Studi sulla fonetica dell’armeno. I. Palatalizzazioni ed esiti di s + gutturale; esiti delle semivocali. In: *RicLing* 1/2: 165-193.
1950a Gr. *ἄπτος*. In: *RicLing* 1/1: 141.
1950b Russo *potolok*. In: *RicLing* 1/2: 271-272.

- 1957 Indoiranische Miscellen. In: *ZDMG* 107 (N.F. 32): 551-553.
- 1966 Armenische Miscellen. In: *Die Sprache* 12: 227-236.
- 1974 Russ. *čečevica*. In: *Gd Szuskiewicz 1974*: 179-180.
- 1975 Zum armenischen Pluralzeichen *-k'*. In: *ZVS* 89.1: 94-99.
- Pisowicz, Andrzej
- 1986 Quelques remarques sur le développement des sonores en arménien ancien. In: *Gd Berbérian 1986*: 659-661.
- 1989 Die armenischen Entlehnungen in türkischen Dialekten. In: *FoIOr* 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, Ē.
- 1951 (ed.), *Mxit'ar Goš*, Ařakner (critical text and introduction). Yerevan: Academy Press.
- 1960 *Hovhannes T'lkuranc'i*, Tařer: texts, introduction, commentary. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- Pokorny, Julius
- 1959 *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, vol. 1. Bern, Stuttgart: Francke [> 1994].
- Polomé, Edgar C.
- 1975 Old Norse religious terminology in Indo-European perspective. In: *NordLangModLing 1975*: 654-665.
- 1980 Armenian and the Proto-Indo-European laryngeals. In: *ProcFICAL*: 17-33.
- 1983 The etymological dictionary of Dutch: an analysis of the work of Jan de Vries. In: *EtymWört 1983*: 217-228.
- 1997 Thoughts about the Celtic religious vocabulary. In: *Gd Campanile 1997*, 2: 809-814.
- 1998 Some considerations on Dutch *erg*, etc. In: *Fs. Watkins 1998*: 603-606.
- Pořosyan, A. M.
- 1965 *Hadrut'i barbařə*. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- 1974 *Ni masnikə ew nra bařakazmakan nřanakut'yunn u imastayin ařumnerə hayereni barbařnerum*. In: *PBH 1974*, Nr 2: 124-144.
- Pořosyan, H. M.
- 1969 *Zeyt'uni patmut'yunə (1409-1921 t't')*. Yerevan: "Hayastan".
- Pomorska, Marzanna
- 1996 Some names for 'button' in Turkic languages. In: *StudEtymCrac 1*: 63-76.
- P'ork'řeyan, X. A.
- 1971 *Nor Naxiřewani hay řořovrdakan banahyusut'yunə*. *HayAřgBan 2*. Yerevan: Academy Press.

- Porzig, Walter
 1954 Die Gliederung des indogermanischen Sprachgebiets. Heidelberg: Winter. (Indogermanische Bibliothek. 3. Reihe: Untersuchungen).
 1964 (Porzig, V.), Členenie indoevropskoj jazykovej oblasti. (Russian translation of Porzig 1954; ed. by A. V. Desnickaja). Moscow: "Progress".
- Poturean, H. Mkrtič
 1914 *Aṛak'el Siwnec 'i ew ir k'ert'uacnerə*. Venice: S. Lazar.
- Praust, Karl
 1996 Armenisch *əmpem* 'trinke'. In: *Die Sprache* 38.2: 184-200.
- Puhvel, Jaan
 1969 "Meadow of the Otherworld" in Indo-European tradition. In: *ZVS* 83: 64-69.
 1970 Aspects of equine functionality. In: *MythLawIndEur 1970*: 159-172.
 1971 Hittite *ḫurkiš* and *ḫurkel*. In: *Die Sprache* 17: 42-45.
 1973 Aquam extinguere. In: *JourIndEurStud* 1.3: 379-386.
 1974 Indo-European structure of the Baltic pantheon. In: *MythIEAnt 1974*: 75-85.
 1982 Baltic-Anatolian lexical isoglosses. In: *Gd Kronasser 1982*: 179-185.
 1984 (HED 1-), Hittite etymological dictionary. Vol. 1-2 (1: *A* + 2: *E* and *I*). 1984. Berlin, New York, Amsterdam: Mouton. (Trends in linguistics. Documentation 1).
 1985 Sober thoughts on Latin *ēbrius*. In: *Fs Winter 1985*: 693-696.
 1987 Comparative mythology. Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press.
 1991 Names and numbers of the Pleiad. In: *Fs Leslau 1991*, 2: 1243-1247.
 2003 Eventide in Hatti-land. In: *Fs Winter 2003*: 347-349.
 2007 Reed and arrow in Anatolia and beyond. In: *Aramazd 2*: 85-87.
- Pulju, Tim
 1997 Indo-European **dA > *dh*. In: *JourIndEurStud* 25.3-4: 387-399.
- 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 Južnyj Ural v predstavlenijax drevnix irancev i finno-ugrov vo II – načale I tys. do n. è". In: *SovArx* 1990, Nr 3: 151-154.
- Rahlfs, Alfred
 1931 (ed.), *Psalmi cum Odis*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. (Septuaginta, vol. 10).
 1979 See *Sources*: Bible.

- Raingear, P.
 1934 Hermès Psychagogue: essai sur les origines du culte d'Hermès. Paris thesis. Rennes: Oberthur.
- 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.
 1989 Die Tenues Aspiratae: Dreiteilung oder Vierteilung des indogermanischen Plosivsystems und die Konsequenzen dieser Frage für die Chronologie einer Glottalreihe. In: *NewSouIndEur 1989*: 153-176.
 1989a Erwiderung auf P. J. Hopper's 'Remarks'. In: *NewSouIndEur 1989*: 249-254.
 1999 Selected papers on Indo-European linguistics: with a section on comparative Eskimo linguistics. Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum Press, University of Copenhagen. (Copenhagen studies in Indo-European, 1).
 2003 An integrated view on ablaut and accent in Indo-European. In: *Fs Winter 2003*: 351-362.
- Ravnæs, Erling
 1991 The chronology of the sound changes from Proto-Indo-European to Classical Armenian. Thesis. University of Oslo.
- Rayfield, Donald
 1988 Sheepkeeping terminology in the Caucasus. In: *Studia Caucasologica* 1. Fridrik Thordarson (ed.), Proceedings of the third Caucasian colloquium; Oslo, July. Oslo: Norwegian University Press: 239-250.
- Rédei, Károly
 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.
- Rieken, Elisabeth
 1999 Untersuchungen zur nominalen Stammbildung des Hethitischen. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag. (StBoT 44).
- Rikov, G. T.
 1998 The development of Indo-European **CN_hV* in Latin. In: *Fs Toporov 1998*: 30-36.

- Ringe, Donald A. Jr.
 1984 Ionic ὀνονημένα. In: *Glotta* 62.1-2: 45-56.
 1988 Laryngeal isoglosses in the western Indo-European languages. In: *LaryngTheor* 1988: 415-441.
 1988a Review of *Nussbaum 1986*. In: *JAmOrSoc* 108.1: 186-187.
- Ritter, Ralf-Peter
 1983 Eine verkannte Etymologie für armen. *aniw* 'Rad'. In: *MünStudSpr* 42: 191-196.
 2006 Zur Frage der Reste indogermanischer Dichtersprache im Armenischen. In: *LangPoétIndEur* 2006: 413-417.
- Rix, Helmut
 1969/72 Review of *Beekes 1969*. In: *Kratylos* 14: 176-187.
 1970 Anlautender Laryngal vor Liquida oder Nasalis sonans im Griechischen. In: *MünStudSpr* 27, 1969 [1970]: 79-110.
 1985 *Sūdōr* und *sīdus*. In: *Fs Knobloch* 1985: 339-350.
 1992 Historische Grammatik des Griechischen: Laut- und Formenlehre. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
 2003 The Latin imperfect in *-bā-*, the Proto-Indo-European root **b^hueh₂-* and full grade I forms from *seṭ*-roots with full grade II. In: *Fs Winter* 2003: 363-384.
- 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.
- Řōzmēri
 1898 *T'p̄la, yang, groḷ, kroḷ*. In: *Biwrakn* 1898: 867-868 (with an addendum by the editor, prob. G. Andrēasean).
- Rudnyćkyj, Jaroslav B.
 1974 Slavic terms for 'god'. In: *AntiqIndog* 1974: 111-112.
- Rudnicki, Mikołaj
 1938 Étude sémantique sur la racine i.-e. **sweyd-*. In: *Mélanges Boisacq* 2, 1938: 225-229.
- Russell, James R.
 1980 The word *k'ustik* in Armenian. In: *ProcFICAL*: 107-114 (= 2004: 1-8).
 1985-86 The name of Zoroaster in Armenian. In: *JourSocArmStud* 2: 3-10 (= 2004: 57-64).
 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).
- Šagirov, A. K. & Dzidzarija, O. P.
1985 K probleme indoarijskix (praindijskix) leksičeskix zaimstvovanij v severokavkazskix jazykax. In: *VoprJaz* 1985, Nr 1: 58-62.
- Sahakyan, Hasmik
1986-87 See UšMjnHayBnst 1-2.
- Šahnazareanc', Karapet
1857 (ed.), *Lewond Vardapet Hayoc'*, Aršawank' Arabac' i Hays. Paris: Šahnazareanc'.
- Šahpazean, Y.
1913 Bun haykakan stelcagorcut'yun. Lalat'ia: Tparan "Šant".
- Samuelian, Thomas J.
2001 Speaking with God from the depths of the heart: the Armenian prayer book of *St. Gregory of Narek* (English translation and introduction). Yerevan: "Vem Press".
- Sani, Saverio
1994 La serie lessicale di sskr. *nabh*. In: *Fs Belardi 1994*, 1 : 83-97.
- Saradževa, L. A.
1976 Sravnitel'no-tipologičeskoe issledovanie cvetovyx oboznačenij v drevnearmjanskom i staroslavjanskom jazykax. In: *PBH (=IFŽ)* 1976, Nr 4: 186-198.
1980 Armjano-slavjanskije leksiko-grammatičeskije paralleli. Yerevan: Academy Press.
1980a K voprosu o dialektnom var'irovanii indoevropskoj zemledeľ'českoj terminologii (na materiale armjanskogo i slavjanskix jazykov). In: *LrHasGit (=VON)* 1980, Nr 1: 52-63.
1980b Životnovodčeskaja terminologija indoevropskogo proisxoždenija v armjanskom i slavjanskix jazykax. In: *PBH (=IFŽ)* 1980, Nr 1: 230-242.
1980c Ètimologičeskije zametki. In: *BanbErewHamals (=VEU)* 1980, Nr 1: 207-209.
1981 Sravnitel'no-tipologičeskoe issledovanie indoevropskoj botaničeskoj terminologii v drevnearmjanskom i slavjanskix jazykax. In: *Ètimologija 1979*. Moscow: "Nauka": 156-167.
1981a Ètimologija armjanskogo nazvanija osiny – *kałamax*. In: *PBH (=IFŽ)* 1981, Nr 4: 227-229.
1983 Vzaimodejstvie fonetičeskix i morfologičeskix processov v konce slova v armjanskom i slavjanskom jazykax (na materiale konečnogo *-s). In: *HayLezGrak* 1-2: 228-232.

- 1985 Drevnejšie religioznye predstavlenija praarmjan i praslavjan v svete dannyx sravnitel'no-istoričeskogo jazykoznanija. In: *PBH* 1985, Nr 2: 73-84.
- 1986 Armjano-slavjanskije leksiko-semantičeskije paralleli: sravnitel'no-istoričeskoe issledovanie genetičeski obščej leksiki. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- 1991 Odnostoronnie armjano-baltijskie izoglossy. In: *PBH (=IFŽ)* 1991, Nr 2: 170-175.
- Sargisean, Nersēs
1864 *Telağrut'iwnk' i P'ok'r ew i Mec Hays*. Venice: S. Lazar.
- Sargisean, Yarut'iwñ K'hñ. (Alewor)
1932 *Balu: ir sovoroyt'nerə, krt'akan u imac'akan vičakə ew barbařə*. Cairo: "Sahak-Mesrop".
- Sargsyan, Armen Yu.
2002 *Arc'axahay barbaři usumnasirut'yan patmut'yun*. In: *Arcaxskij Gosudarstvennyj Universitet: učenye zapiski: lingvistika (priloženie)*, Stepanakert. Vol. 1: 3-6.
- Sargseanc', Sargis
1883 *Agulec'oc' barbařə (zōkeri lezun): lezuabanakan hetazōtut'iwñ*. Vols. 1-2. Moscow: Skoropečatnja O. Gerbeka.
- Sargsyan, G. X.
1956 *Ałbyurneri oğtagorcman ełanakə Movses Xorenac'u mot*. In: *BanbMaten* 3: 31-42.
1967 (Sarkisjan), *O dvux znachenijax termina dastakert v rannix armjanskix istočnikax*. In: *ÈllBIVVizIr*: 97-101.
1988 *Urartakan terut'yunə ew hayerə (hay žolovrdi kazmavorman xndri šurjə)*. In: *UrHay* 1988: 47-126.
1988a *Mi havelum*. In: *UrHay* 1988: 169.
- Sargsyan, Vahan
1988 *Baskern Ararat leřan storotum*. In: *Garun* 1988, Nr 3: 66-74.
- Saryan, Sarkis S.
1982 *Language connections: kinship of Armenian with sister Indo-European languages*. Yarmouth, MA: Sarmen Book Co.
- Šaumjan, R. M.
1935 *Armeniaca-Lesgica (Armjano-lezginskije leksiko-morfologi-českie paralleli)*. In: *Gd Marr* 1935: 419-426.
- Sausverde, Ē.
1987 *Hayeren cov baři stugabanut'yunə*. In: *ThesSISAL 1987* : 159 [Not published in *ProcSISAL (1987) 1993*].
- Scardigli, Pier Giuseppe
1961 *Zu gotisch aibr 'Opfergabe'*. In: *Die Sprache* 7: 138-139.
- 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: *Die Sprache* 12: 77-78.
 1966a Idg. **d̥u-* im Tocharischen. In: *IndogForsch* 71: 236-238.
 1966b Bemerkungen zum idg. Wort für 'Schlaf'. In: *Die Sprache* 12: 67-76.
 1967 Zu hethitisch *nekuz*. In: *ZVS* 81.3-4: 290-303.
 1969 Die idg. Wörter für 'Vogel' und 'Ei'. In: *Die Sprache* 15: 144-167.
 1972 L'apophonie des noms-racines indo-européens. In: *BSL* 67: 31-38.
 1973 Bemerkungen zur Herkunft der idg. Diphthongstämme und zu den Eigentümlichkeiten ihrer Kasusformen. In: *Die Sprache* 19: 148-157.
 1975 Armenisch *erkn*, griechisch *ὄρνυς*, irisch *idu*. In: *ZVS* 89: 53-65.
 1975a L'apophonie des thèmes indo-européens en *-r/n*. In: *BSL* 70, 1: 1-10.
 1975b Zum Ablaut der neutralen *s*-Stämme des Indogermanischen. In: *FlexWortb* 1975: 259-267.
 1976 Armenisch *unim*. In: *HandAms* 90, Nr 1-12: 339-344.
 1978 Hittite *šalpa-*. In: *Die Sprache* 24.1: 45.
 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.

Schmalstieg, William R.

- 1980 A note on Armenian *tun* and *jiwn*. In: *AnnArmLing* 1: 45-50.
 1987 Armenian and Jatvingian *mard*: a shared lexical item. In: *AnnArmLing* 7: 59-61.

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.
- 1980 Armenian and Indo-European. In: *ProcFICAL 1980*: 35-58.
- 1980a Altarmenische Miscellen. In: *AnnArmLing* 1: 1-5.
- 1985 On aspect in Old Armenian and Proto-Kartvelian. In: *AnnArmLing* 6: 85-90.
- 1987 The Indo-European background of the Classical Armenian noun declension. In: *AnnArmLing* 8: 35-47. (For an Armenian translation of this paper, see *PBH* 1987, Nr. 1: 29-39).
- 1990 The Indo-European basis of Proto-Armenian: principles of reconstruction. In: *AnnArmLing* 11: 33-47.
- 1992 Contributions from new data to the reconstruction of the proto-language. In: *RecLangCult 1992*: 35-62.

Schmidt, Manfred Erwin

- 1916 Armen. *aner* 'Vater der Frau'. In: *ZVS* 47: 189.

Schmitt, Rüdiger

- 1964 Desaffrizierung im Armenischen? In: *MünStudSpr* 16: 89-93.
- 1966 Die Hesychglosse $\sigma\acute{\alpha}\tau\iota\ \square\ \alpha$. Eine Nachprüfung. In: *Glotta* 44: 148-151.
- 1967 Dichtung und Dichtersprache in indogermanischer Zeit. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- 1970 Der 'Adler' im Alten Iran. In: *Die Sprache* 16.1: 63-77.
- 1971 Iranica auf kleinasiatischen Inschriften. In: *Die Sprache* 17.2: 177-180.
- 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: *EnclIran* 2, 1987: 417-418; 445-459.
- 1988 (Šmitt), Pragmatika i sistematika v laringal'noj teorii. In: *VoprJaz* 1988, Nr 1: 23-31.
- 2008 Zu der Fremdbezeichnung Armeniens altpers. *Armina-*. In: *Fs Kortlandt 2008*, 1: 499-508.

- 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.
 1998 The British word for 'fox' and its Indo-European origin. In: *JourIndEurStud* 26.3-4: 421-434.
 2001 Lost languages in Northern Europe. In: *EarlContUralIndEur 2001*: 417-425.
- 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.
- Selbosyan, K. V.
 1974 Arhestavorakan avanduyt'nerə ew dranc' artahaytut'yunnerə leninakanc'ineri kenc'alum (patma-azgagrakan usumnasirut'yun). In: *HayAzgBan* 6: 157-252.
- Serebrennikov, B. A.
 1971 Ètimologičeskie zametki. In: *Ètimologija 1968*: 207-214.
- Šterenc', Gëorg G.
 1885-99 [VanSaz 1-2], Vanay saz. Vol. 1. Hawak'acoyk' Vaspurakani žoľovrdakan ergeri, hëk'eat'neri, ařacneri ew hanelukneri (teľakan barbařov). T'iflis: Tparan Yovhannëš Martiroseanc'i, 1885. Vol. 2. Hawak'acoyk' Vaspurakani žoľovrdakan ergeri, hëk'eat'neri, ařacneri, hanelukneri, õrhnut'iwnneri ew anëck'neri (teľakan barbařov). T'iflis: Tparan K. Martiroseanc'i, 1899.

- 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.
- Shapiro, Michael
 1982 Neglected evidence of Dioscurism (Divine Twinning) in the Old Slavic pantheon. In: *JourIndEurStud* 10.1-2: 137-165.
- Shields, Kenneth Jr.
 1982 Indo-European noun inflection: a developmental history (foreword by William R. Schmalstieg). University Park and London; Pennsylvania State University Press.
 1990 Sound change, child language, and Gothic *atta*. In: *MankQuart* 30.4: 329-335.
- Siebs, Theodor
 1904 Anlautstudien. In: *ZVS* 37: 277-324.
- Simonian, Hovann H.
 2007 (ed.), *The Hemshin: history, society and identity in the Highlands of Northeast Turkey*. London and New York: Routledge. 2007. (Caucasus world; series editor: Nicholas Awde).
- Simonyan, Hasmik
 1989 (ed.), *Patmut'iwn Ałek'sandri Makedonac'woy: haykakan xmbagrut'yunner*. Yerevan: Academy Press. See *Sources: Alexander Romance*.
- Simonyan, N. M.
 1979 Hay barbaŋneri 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.
- Sims-Williams, Nicholas
 1997 The denominal suffix *-ant-*. In: *Fs Beekes 1997*: 317-325.
- 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.
- Skjærvø, P. O.
 1998 Eastern Iranian epic traditions I: Siyāvaš and Kunāla. In: *Fs Watkins 1998*: 645-659.

- 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: *Die Sprache* 12: 26-47.
- Soukry, P. Arsène
 1881 Géographie de Moïse de Corène d'après Ptolémée. Texte Arménien, traduit en Français. Venise: Imprimerie Arménienne.
- Specht, Franz
 1944 Ai. *godhā*. In: *ZVS* 68: 217.
 1947 Der Ursprung der indogermanischen Deklination. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Speirs, A. G. E.
 1978 The Proto-Indo-European labiovelars. Amsterdam: Verlag Adolf M. Hakkert. (Bibliotheca slavonica, 18).
 1984 Proto-Indo-European laryngeals and ablaut. Amsterdam: Verlag Adolf M. Hakkert. (Bibliotheca Slavonica, 24).
- Spinage, C. A.
 1968 The book of the giraffe. London: Collins.
- Springer, Otto
 1987 Greek *φαλιός*, Latin **balan*, Old High German *bal* (?) 'marked by a blaze': a horse fanciers' multilingual symposium. In: *Fs Hoenigswald 1987*: 375-383.
- Srvanjtyanc', Garegin
 1978-82 (1-2) Erker. Vol. 1: 1978; vol. 2: 1982. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- Stalmaszczyk, P. & Witczak, K. T.
 1990 Celto-Tocharica I: three Celtic-Tocharian terms for certain parts of the body. In: *TochIndEurStud* 4: 35-44.
- 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: *NJbGeolPal* 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.
 1993 Reste indogermanischer *nt*-Stämme im Armenischen. In: *ProcSISAL 1993*, 2: 147-153.
 1994 Final IE *-s and the Old Armenian plural marker -k'. In: *AnnArmLing* 15: 1-19.
 2000 Armenisch und Indoiranisch. In: *IndIranIndog 2000*: 515-522.
- Step'anyan, Gaṙnik
 1976 Ačarjani het: hušer. Yerevan: "Hayastan".
- Step'anyan, Lusik
 2003 See *Sources*: Yovhan Mandakuni.
- Steuerwald, Karl
 1972 Türkisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Stokes, Whitley
 1901 Irish etymologies. In: *IndogForsch* 12: 185-195.
 1904 Hibernica. In: *ZVS* 37: 250-261.
- Stone, Michael E.
 1979 The Armenian version of IV Ezra. University of Pennsylvania: Scholars Press (University of Pennsylvania Armenian texts and studies, 1).
- Strohmeyer, Jr. Virgil B.
 1978-79 The meaning of *haw* and *t'řč'un* in Classical Armenian. In: *RevEtArm* n.s. 13: 43-48.
- Stüber, Karin
 1997 Urindogermanisch **h₁nóm-ŋ* 'Name', **h₂óng^h-ŋ* 'Salbe' und der Ablaut der neutralen *n*-Stämme. In: *Die Sprache* 39.1: 74-88.
- Sudnik, T. M. & Civ'jan, T. V.
 1981 Mak v rastitel'nom kode osnovnogo mifa (Balto-Balcanica). In: *BaltSlavIssl 1980*: 300-317.
- Suk'iasyan, A. M.
 1967 Hayoc' lezvi homanišneri bařaran. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- Suk'iasyan, A. M. and Galstyan, S. A.
 1975 See *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
 1973 Sargis Haykuni: kyank'n u gorcuneut'yunə. In: *HayAzgBan* 4: 5-82.
 1984 Musa lef. *HayAzgBan* 16. Yerevan: Academy Press.
 1994 Kilikia: Arewmtahayoc' banavor avandut'yunə (Cilicia: the oral tradition of Western Armenians). Yerevan: Academy Press "Gitut'yun".
- 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, Oswald
 1954 Latin *promulgare*. In: *Emerita* 22: 159-174.
 1959-60 Etyma Latina I (1-6). In: *Glotta* 38, 3-4: 216-251.
 1959-60a Latin *hibernus* and Greek *χειμερινός*: the formation of time-adjectives in the Classical languages. In: *Glotta* 38.1-2: 107-125.
 1960 Studies in the Indo-European system of numerals. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, Universitätsverlag.
 1966 Iranica II. In: *Die Sprache* 12: 190-226.
 1970 The Indo-European name of the 'heart'. In: *Fs Stang 1970*: 515-533.
 1977 Studies in the kinship terminology of the Indo-European languages: with special reference to Indian, Iranian, Greek, and Latin. In: *Varia 1977* (Acta Iranica, Série 3. Textes et mémoires, 7): 1-240. Téhéran-Liège: Bibliothèque Pahlavi; Leiden: Brill.
 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).
 1982 Anatolica II (8-10). In: *Gd Kronasser 1982*: 215-234.
 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.
- T'ahmizyan, N. K.
 1985 Grigor Narekac'in ew hay eražštut'yunə V-XV dd. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- Takács, Gábor
 1996 Egyptian lexics in an Afrasian perspective: new etymologies. In: *StudEtymCrac* 1: 125-171.

- 1997 Note on the origin of PIE **pes-* ‘penis’. In: *JourIndEurStud* 25.3-4: 371-382.
- Tangherlini, Timothy R.
1990 Some Old Norse hang-ups: ritual aspects of Hávamál 134. In: *MankQuart* 31.1-2: 87-108.
- Tašean, 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 iskonnoja leksika? (K probleme drevnix slov inojazyčnogo proisxoždenija v tjurkskix jazykax). In: *VoprJaz* 1993: (1) Nr. 1: 114-128; (2) Nr. 2: 83-95.
- Taxo-Godi, Aza Alibekovna
1989 Grečeskaja mifologija. Moscow: “Iskusstvo”.
- Tedesco, P.
1945 Persian *čīz* and Sanskrit *kīm*. In: *Language* 21.3: 128-141.
- Telegin, D. Ya.
2005 The Yamna culture and the Indo-European homeland problem. In: *JourIndEurStud* 33.3-4: 339-357.
- T‘emurčyan, V. S.
1970 Gamirk‘i hayerə. In: *HayAzgBan* 1: 7-140.
- Tēr-Alek‘sandrean, Gēorg
1885 T‘iflisc‘oc‘ mtawor keank‘ə. T‘iflis: Yovhannēs Martiroseanc‘i tparan.
- Ter-Davt‘yan, K‘. S. & Arewšatyan, S. S.
2004 (Ter-Davtjan/Arevšatjan), *Agatangelos*, Istorija Armenii (transl. from ClArm. with introduction and commentary). Yerevan: “Nairi”. (Pamjatniki drevnearmjanskoj literatury).
- Ter-Lewondyan, Aram
1982 *Lewond*, Patmut‘yun. Translation, introduction and commentary. Yerevan: “Sovetakan grof”.
1983 See *Sources: Agat‘angelos*.
- Ter-Minasyan, E.
1989 (ed.): *Ehišē*, 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. In: *HayAzgBan* 1: 143-198.
- Ter-Połosyan, Avetik‘
1939 Hayastani kladoc‘ernerə 3: Step‘anavani šrjani kladoc‘ernerə. In: *ErHamGitAšx* 9: 5-46.
- Tēr-Pōlosean, Gr.
1921-22 Havariki barbařə. In: *Banber Hayastani Gitakan Instituti*. Vol. 1-2: 160-177.

- Tēr-Pōlosean, H. P.
 1944 Təlagrakan hetazōtut'iwinner. In: *HandAms* 58, Nr. 1-12: 9-35.
 1960 Stugabanakan ditōlut'iwinner. In: *HandAms* 74, Nr. 10-12: 519-525.
- Tēr-Vardanean, Gurgēn
 1968 Erzuka-Kamax gawarabarbarə ew azgagrakan yußer. Erusalēm.
- Tērvišeän, H. Serovbē, see Dervischjan, P. Seraphin.
- Tēr-Yakobean, Yakob
 1960 Partizakə xatutik. Yaweluacabar – Manuřak 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.
 1953 Die Heimat der indogermanischen Gemeinsprache. In: *Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur in Mainz: geistes- und sozialwissenschaftliche Klasse*, 1953.11 [1954]: 35-86. Wiesbaden.
 1968 Die Wurzel vat. In: *IndogDicht* 1968: 187-203.
- Thierry, J. M.
 1992 Sasun: voyages archéologiques. In: *RevEtArm* n.s. 23: 315-391.
- 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 *Lazar P'arpec'i*. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press. (Columbia University Program in Armenian Studies. Suren D. Fesjian Academic Publications, 4).
 1992 A medieval Armenian view of the physical world: the cosmology of Vardan Arewelc'i in his Chronicle. In: *RevEtArm* 23: 191-208.
 1995 A bibliography of Classical Armenian literature to 1500 AD. Turnhout: Brepols.

- 2001 The teaching of Saint Gregory: translation, commentary and introduction (revised edition). New Rochelle, New York: St. Nersess Armenian Seminary. (Avant: Treasures of the Armenian Christian Tradition, 1).
- 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 of the volume number, which is, naturally, 1].
- Thurneysen, R.
1937 Zwei irische Etymologien. In: *Fs Pedersen 1937*: 301-302.
- Tigō
1889 Լալի ատա՛ներան քա՛ղեր. Կ՛ատտ ք՛օլատ քրի. Թ՛իֆլիս: Կովհաննէս Մարտիրոսեան՛ի Թրարան.
- Tigranean, Gēorg
1892 Արա՛կ՛, ասա՛ւաճ՛ և Զրոյ՛կ՛ հայո՛ւ Նոր-Նախիճեանի. Բոստոն (Դօնի քաղաք): Թրարան Կովհաննէս Թէր-Աբրահամեան.
- Tiracjan, G. A.
1983 K antičnym istokam armjanskoj rannesrednevekovoju kul'tury (po arxeologičeskim dannym). In: *PBH (=IFZ) 1983*, Nr 2-3: 55-64.
1985 Hayeri oč՛ hndevropakan naxninerə, xurri urartac՛inerə և Urartu-Hayastan problemə. In: *PBH 1985*, Nr 1: 195-207.
- Tirac՛yan, Nvard
2006 Ivarša և Marduk astvacneri paštamunk՛ə Araratyan daštum. In: *PBH 2006*, Nr 2: 187-193.
2008 (Tiratsyan), Luwian gods in Urartu? In: *Aramazd 3.1*: 79-86.
- Tischler, Johann
1983- HethEtymGlos: Hethitisches etymologisches Glossar (mit Beiträgen von von Günter Neumann und Erich Neu). Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck. (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft, 20).
- Tokarev, S. A. & Filimonova, T. D.
1983 Obrjady i obyčai, svjazannye s rastitel՛nost՛ju. In: *KalObyč 1983*: 145-160.
- Tolstoj, N. I.
1969 Slavjanskaja geografičeskaja terminologija: semasiologičeskie etjudy. Moscow: "Nauka".
- Tomaschek, Wilhelm
1896 Sasun und das Quellengebiet des Tigris: historisch-topographische Untersuchung. In: *Sitzungsberichte der philosophisch-historischen Classe der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften*. 133.4. Wien.

- Tomson, A.
 1887 Lingvističeskija izsledovanija. Vol. 1. S.-Peterburg: Tipografija E. Evdokimova.
 1890 Istoričeskaja grammatika sovremennago armjanskago jazyka goroda Tiflisa. S.-Peterburg: Tipografija E. Evdokimova.
- Toporov, V. N.
 1964 Neskol'ko illirijsko-baltijskix paralelej iz oblasti toponomastiki. In: *PrIndEvrJaz*: 52-58.
 1974 Slavjanske komentarii k neskol'kim latinskim arxaizmam. In: *Ėtimologija 1972*. Moscow: "Nauka": 3-19.
 1974a Ob indoevropskix sootvetstvijax odnomu baltijskomu mifologičeskemu imeni, balt. *Puš(k)ait-*: dr.-ind. *Pūšán*, dr.-gr. *Πáv*. In: *BaltSlavIssl 1974*: 3-36.
 1975- See *PrJaz*.
 1977 Ob otaženii odnogo indoevropskogo mifa v drevnearmjanskoj tradicii. In: *PBH (= IFŽ) 1977*, Nr 3: 88-106.
 1977a Μουσα 'Muzy': soobraženija ob imeni i predystorii obraza (k ocenke frakijskogo vkladu). In: *SlavBalkJaz 1977*: 28-86.
 1977b K drevnebalkanskim svjazjam v oblasti jazyka i mifologii. In: *BalkLingSbor 1977*: 40-58.
 1977c K frakijsko-baltijskim jazykovym paralleljam 2. In *BalkLingSbor 1977*: 59-116.
 1977d Xettsk. *purullija*, lat. *parīlia*, *palīlia* i ix balkanske istoki. In: *BalkLingSbor 1977*: 125-142.
 1977e Zametki o rastitel'nom kode osnovnogo mifa (*perec*, *petruška* i t.p.). In: *BalkLingSbor 1977*: 196-207.
 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.
 1979a O dvux tipax drevneindijskix tekstov, traktujuščix otnošenie celostnosti-rasčlenennosti i spasenija. In: *Peredneaziatskij sbornik 3*, Moscow: 215-228.
 1981 Die Ursprünge der indoeuropäischen Poetik. In: *Poetica 13*: 189-251.
 1981a Ešče raz o baltijskix i slavjanskix nazvanijax bož'ej korovki (*Coccinella septempunctata*) v perspektive osnovnogo mifa. In: *BaltSlavIssl 1980, 1981*: 274-300.
 1988 O rituale: vvedenie v problematiku. In: *ArxRit 1988*: 7-60.
 1995 Mif. Ritual. Simvol. Obraz: issledovanija v oblasti mifopoètičeskogo (izbrannoe). Moscow: Progress-Kul'tura.
- Toporova, T. V.
 1989 Jazyk i mif: germ. **walundaz*, **wēlundaz*. In: *Izvestija Akademii nauk SSSR: serija literatury i jazyka 48.5*: 442-453.

- Torbiörnsson, Tore
 1945 Armenisk akcentuering. In: *Årsbok. Kungl. Humanistiska Vetenskaps-Samfundet i Uppsala* (pp. 85-96). Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksells boktryckeri; Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz.
- T'oflak'yan, Barunak G.
 1981 Hamšenahayeri azgagrut'yunə. *HayAzgBan* 13. Yerevan: Academy Press.
 1986 Nšxarner Hamšeni ew Trapizoni banahyusut'yan. Yerevan: University Press.
- T'osunyan, G. B.
 1983 Grabari naxadrut'yunnerə (V-XI dd.). In: *LezOčHarc' 7*: 5-115.
 1996 See *Sources*: Yovhannēs Drasxanakertc'i.
- Toumanoff, Cyril
 1963 Studies in Christian Caucasian history. Georgetown University Press.
- Tovar, Antonio
 1974 Etymologisches zu air. *guth* 'Stimme'. In: *AntiqIndog 1974*: 293-294.
- T'umanyan, E. G.
 1971 (Tumanjan), Drevnearmjanskij jazyk. Moscow: "Nauka".
 1978 (Tumanjan), Struktura indoevropskix iměn v armjanskom jazyke: opyt rekonstrukcii. Moscow: "Nauka".
- T'umanyan, Hovhannes
 1988- (1-), Erkeri liakatar žołovacū (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.
- T'ux-Křpō
 1898 Dewer. In: *Biwrakn 1898*: 461-463.
- Uhlenbeck, C. C.
 1942 De oudere lagen van den Baskischen woordenschat. In: *Mededeelingen der Nederlandsche Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afdeling Letterkunde* 5.7: 327-376.
- Ullmann, Manfred
 1979 Wa-ḥairu l-ḥadīṭi mā kāna laḥnan (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.

- Untermann, Jürgen
 2000 Wörterbuch des Oskisch-Umbrischen. Heidelberg: C. Winter Universitätsverlag. (Indogermanische Bibliothek: Reihe 1, Lehr- und Handbücher. Handbuch der italischen Dialekte; Bd. 3).
- Uspenskij, B. A.
 1978 Kul't Nikoly na Rusi v istoriko-kul'turnom osveščeenii: specifika vosprijatija i transformacija isxodnogo obraza. In: *TrudZnakSist* 10. Semiotika kul'tury. (UZTGU, 463).
- Vaan, Michiel de
 1999 The PIE root structure **Te(R)D^h*-. In: *HistSpr* 112.1: 1-25.
 1999a The etymology of English shower. In: *Die Sprache* 41.1: 39-49.
 2000 The Indo-Iranian animal suffix **-ācá-*. In: *IndIranJour* 43: 279-293.
 2001 Reconsidering Dutch *rups*, German *Raupe* 'caterpillar'. In: *AmstBeiAltGerm* 54: 151-174.
 2003 The Avestan vowels. Amsterdam, New York: Rodopi. (LeidStudIndEur, 12).
 2004 'Narten' roots from the Avestan point of view. In: *Fs Rasmussen 2004*: 591-599.
 2008 Etymological dictionary of Latin and the other Italic languages. Leiden, Boston: Brill. (LeidIEEDSer, 7).
- Vaillant, André
 1938 L'imparfait slave et les prétérīts en *-ē-* et en *-ā-*. In: *BSL* 40: 5-30.
- 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.
- Vanséveren, Sylvie
 1995 A propos de arm. *ur* étymologique pronominale. In: *AnnArmLing* 16: 37-44.
 1998 Arm. *jmeṛn*: Thèmes indo-européens en **-m-* et dérivés en **-r/n*. In: *AnnArmLing* 19: 21-32.
- Vardanean, H. Aristakēs
 1910 Hayerēn nor baṛer 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 1911*: 309-314.
- Vardanyan, R. H.
 1989 Hayastani č'ap'ern u kširnerə (V-XV darer). Yerevan: Academy Press.
- Vardanjan, R. O. (= H.), Asatrjan, D. G.
 1980 Nekotorye zamečanija po metrologii Urartu. In: *PBH (= IFŽ)* 1980, Nr 2: 166-178.
- Vardanyan, Stella A.
 1974 See *Sources*: Abusayid.
 1971 Hay bžškakan terminabanut'yunə XII darum. In: *BanbMaten* 10: 185-212.

- 1990 (Vardanjan), *Amirdovlat Amasiaci*, Nenužnoe dlja neučej. Moscow: "Nauka".
- Vardanyan, Vardan H.
1989 *Hovhan Mamikonyan*, Taroni patmut'yun (introduction, ModEArm. translation, commentary). Yerevan: "Xorhrdayin grof".
- Vardanyan, V. M.
1973 "Patmut'iw n tann Arcruneac" erkum hišatakvac mi k'ani telanunneri masin. In: *PBH* 1973, Nr 1: 111-122.
1985 *T'ovma Arcruni ew Ananun*: Patmut'yun Arcruneac' tan. Yerevan: University Press (Usanoli 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, Gohar Dereniki
1991 (Vardumjan), Doxristianskie kul'ty armjan. In: *HayAzgBan* 18: 59-146 (+ illustrations).
- Vardumyan, Gohar & T'oxat'yan, Karen
2004 Luysi ew arewi paštamunk'i drseworumnerə "Sasna crer" ēposum. In: *SasCrGit 2004*: 88-101.
- Vartanov, Ju. P.
1983 Proisxoždenie semitskix nazvanij metallov. In: *DrevVost* 4: 83-98.
- Vartapetjan, N. A.
1962 Sjunikskij dialekt (PhD candidate dissertation: avtoreferat). Yerevan: Academy Press.
- Vasil'ev, M. A.
1999 Jazyčestvo vostočnyx slavjan nakanune kreščenija Rusi: religiozno-mifologičeskoe vzaimodejstvie s iranskim mirom: jazyčeskaja reforma knjazja Vladimira. Moscow: "Indrik". Rossijskaja Akademija Nauk. Institut slavjanovedenija.
- 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. è". 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.
- Vasmer, Max
1950-58 Russisches etymologisches Wörterbuch. Heidelberg. See Fasmer 1964-73.

- Vaumas, E. de
 1965 al-Furāt. In: *EncIsl* 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.
 2007 Homshetsma: the language of the Armenians of Hamshen. In: *H. Simonian 2007*: 257-278.
- Veljus, N.
 1981 *Velnio banda*: 'stado Vjal'njasa'. In: *BaltSlavIssl* 1980; 1981: 260-269.
- Vendryes, J.
 1914 La famille du latin *mundus* 'monde'. In: *MSL* 18: 305-310.
 1920 Étymologies. In: *MSL* 21: 39-44.
- Vennemann, Theo
 1986 Syllable-based sound changes in early Armenian. In: *AnnArmLing* 7: 27-43.
 1994 Linguistic reconstruction in the context of European prehistory. In: *TrPhilSoc* 92.2: 215-284.
 1998 Etymology and phonotactics: Latin *grandis* vs. Basque *handi* 'big' and similar problems. In: *JourIndEurStud* 26, 3-4: 345-390.
- Viereck, Wolfgang & Goldammer, Matthias
 2003 Ouvrier, Arbeiter, workman, rabočij, obrero, operaio. In: *Fs Winter 2003*: 405-417.
- Vine, Brent
 1985 On the Germanic type *lūkan*. In: *ZVS* 98: 60-81.
 1999 Latin **opiō* and *optāre*. In: *Fs Ivanov 1999*: 520-526.
 2002 [2006] Gk. *σφήν*, Eng. *spoon*: a note on 'Eichner's Law'. In: *MünStudSpr* 62: 289-299.
 2005 Remarks on Rix's Law in Greek. In: *JourIndEurStud* 33.3-4: 247-290.
- Viredaz, Rémy
 1997 'Six' en indo-européen. In: *IndogForsch* 102: 112-150.
 2000 *k'erb, jerb, χερσί*. In: *HistSpr* 113: 290-307.
 2001-02 Sur le traitement arménien des sonantes voyelles. In: *Slovo* 26-27, *Actes du 6^e CILA* (5-9 juillet 1999), Inalco, 2001-2002: 24-36.
 2001-02a Contractions et place de l'accent en ancien arménien. In: *RevEtArm* 28: 1-11.
 2002 The Great Armenian Puzzle is not thorny. In: *AnnArmLing* 22-23: 59-81.
 2003 Notes on Armenian historical phonology. In: *AnnArmLing* 24-25: 85-103.
 2005-07 Notes d'étymologie arménienne I. In: *RevEtArm* n.s. 30: 1-14.
 forthc. Grec *korésai*, arménien *serem*, latin *cresco*. Forthcoming.
 prepar1 *eřjewr, iř, yisun*: a new palatalization law in Armenian? In preparation.
 prepar2 Notes on Armenian historical phonology II. In preparation.

- Vogt, Hans
 1938 Arménien et Caucasique 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),
- Vycichl, Werner
 1965 Sumerisch *guskin*, armenisch *oski* 'Gold'. In: *HandAms* 79.1-3: 81-84.
 1967 Sumerisch AN.BAR, armenisch *erkath* 'Eisen'. In: *HandAms* 81.1-3: 67-70.
- Wackernagel, Jacob, & Debrunner, Albert
 1954 *J. Wackernagel, Altindische Grammatik. Band II, 2. Die Nominalsuffixe von A. Debrunner.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Wagner, Norbert
 1984 *Belisarius*. In: *ZVS* 97.1: 123-129.
 1984a Die idg. Wurzel in got. *hallus*. In: *ZVS* 97.2: 281-283.
- 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.
- Ward, Donald J.
 1970 An Indo-European mythological theme in Germanic tradition. In: *IndEur&IndEur 1970* : 405-420.
- Watkins, Calvert
 1970 Language of gods and language of men: remarks on some Indo-European metalinguistic traditions. In: *MythLawIndEur 1970*: 1-17.
 1973 An Indo-European agricultural term: Latin *ador*, Hittite *hat-*. In: *HarvStudClasPhil* 77: 187-193.
 1974 'god'. In: *AntiqIndog 1974*: 101-110.
 1974a I.-E. 'star'. In: *Die Sprache* 20: 10-14.
 1975 La famille indo-européenne de grec ὄρητις: linguistique, poétique et mythologie. In: *BSL* 70.1: 11-26.
 1975a Latin *ador*, Hittite *hat-* again: addenda to *HSCP* 77 (1973), 187-193. In: *HarvStudClasPhil* 79: 181-187.
 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).

- Weidner, Ernst F.
 1917 Aus den hettitischen Urkunden von Boghazköi. In: *Mitteilungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft zu Berlin*. Mitteilung Nr. 58, August 1917: 53-78 + a map.
- 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.
 1980 Armenian action nouns in *-st*. In: *ProcFICAL 1980*: 209-219.
 1981 Armenian *əntocin*. In: *AnnArmLing* 2: 85-89.
 1983 Armenian dialects and the Latin-Armenian glossary of Autun. In: *MedArmCult 1983*: 13-28.
 1983a Remarks on the pronominal genitive in Classical Armenian. In: *RevEtArm* n.s. 17: 113-121.
 1984 Die hethitischen *u*-stämme. Amsterdam: "Rodopi".
 1984a The inflexion of *mi* 'one' as a trace of Proto-Armenian nominal gender. In: *IntSympArmLing 1984*: 195-218.
 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: *Hanĵamana* (ed. by Subhadra Kumar Sen. Calcutta University): 109-112.
 1991 The meaning of the expression "to become a wolf" in Hittite. In: *Fs Polomé 1991-92*, 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.
 1992a Parallel aligned text and bilingual concordance of the Armenian and Greek versions of the Book of Jonah. Amsterdam, Atlanta, GA: Rodopi. (Dutch studies in Armenian language and literature, 1).
 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.
- 1994 Text chronological aspects of the use of the article *-s* and *-d* in Gospel manuscripts M and E. In: *Text and context: studies in the Armenian New Testament* (Conference, 1992): 97-113.
- 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.
- 2004 Armenian *barwok* ‘good, well’. In: *Fs Rasmussen 2004*: 627-632.
- 2006 Aspects of Classical Armenian orthography: Armenian *e*, *ē* and the Greek names in the Gospels. In: *Fs Pisowicz 2006*: 215-228.
- 2008 Diphthongization of initial *e-* and the development of initial *y-* in Armenian. In: *Fs Kortlandt 2008*, 1: 609-616.
- Weitenberg, J. J. S. and van Weenen, A. de Leeuw
 1990 Lemmatized index of the Armenian version of Deuteronomy. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press. (Septuagint and cognate studies series, 32; Leiden Armenological publications, 1).
- West, M. L.
 1971 Early Greek philosophy and the Orient. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
 2007 Indo-European poetry and myth. Oxford: University Press.
- Wevers, J. W.
 1977 (ed.), *Septuaginta: vetus testamentum Graecum*. Vol. 3.2. Deuteronomium. Adiuvante U. Quast. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht.
 1986 (ed.), *Septuaginta: vetus testamentum Graecum*. Vol. 2.2. Leviticus. Adiuvante U. Quast. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht.
 1995 Notes on the Greek text of Deuteronomy. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press. (Septuagint and cognate studies series, 39).

- 1997 Notes on the Greek text of Leviticus. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press. (Septuagint and cognate studies series, 44).
- Whitehead, G. Kenneth
1972 Deer of the world. London: Constable.
- Whitney, William Dwight
1885 The roots, verb-forms, and primary derivatives of the Sanskrit language: a supplement to his Sanskrit grammar. Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel; London: Trübner; Ludgate Hill. (Bibliothek indogermanischer Grammatiken, 2.2). Reprinted: New Haven, Connecticut: American Oriental Society, 1945. (American Oriental Society, 30).
- 1889 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, 1960).
- Whittaker, Gordon
2004 Word formation in Euphratic. In: *IndEurWordForm 2004*: 381-423.
2005 The Sumerian question: reviewing the issues. In: *EthnAncMesop 2005*: 409-429.
- Wikander, Stig
1974 Aramäisch *sprb*, Sanskrit *śvabhra*. In: *Gd Szuszkiewiczza 1974*: 271-272.
- Windekens, A. J. van
1961 Sur trois mots arméniens. In: *HandAms* 75.10-12: 545-548.
1964 Essai de solution d'un vieux problème: la formation d'arm. *kanay-* = gr. *γυναι-* 'femme'. In: *HandAms* 78.4-6: 185-190.
1976 Le tokharien confronté avec les autres langues indo-européennes. Vol. 1: La phonétique et le vocabulaire. Louvain: Centre International de Dialectologie Générale. (Travaux publiés par le Centre International de Dialectologie Générale de l'Université Catholique Néerlandaise de Louvain).
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.
1990-91 Arménien *oskr* et hittite *ḫašduir*. In: *RevEtArm* n.s. 22: 13-16.
- 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: *LingPosn* 23: 209-214.

- 1980a Tocharisch B *yok*, A *yok* 'Körperhaar, Farbe' und Verwandtes. In: *Fs Seiler 1980*: 469-472.
- 1982 Indo-European words for 'tongue' and 'fish': a reappraisal. In: *JourIndEurStud* 10: 167-186.
- 1983 Nochmals arm. *hiwsn* 'Zimmermann'. In: *Die Sprache* 29: 177-181.
- 1986 Hayereni anvanakan t'ek'man mi k'ani harc'er. In: *PBH* 1986, Nr 2: 17-24.
- 1989 Nekotorye mysli ob indoevropejskix čislitel'nyx. In: *VoprJaz* 1989, Nr 4: 32-45.
- 1997 Armenian *arj* 'bear'. In: *Fs Beekes 1997*: 349-351.
- 1999 Consonant harmony in Armenian. In: *Fs Lehmann 1999*, 1: 313-319.
- Witczak, K. T.
- 1991 Armenian *op'i* 'white poplar, *Populus alba* L.' and the development of **ps* in Armenian. In: *AnnArmLing* 12: 65-75.
- 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.
- Witzel, Michael
- 2003 Linguistic evidence for cultural exchange in Prehistoric Western Central Asia. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, Department of East Asian Languages and Civilizations. (Sino-Platonic papers, 129).
- 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*, *δέω* and *δεῖσα*. 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).
- Wutz, Franz
- 1914 *Onomastica sacra: Untersuchungen zum Liber interpretationis nominum hebraicorum des Hl. Hieronymus*. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung. Hälfte 1: Quellen und System der Onomastika. (Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur. 3. Reihe, Bd. 11, der ganzen Reihe 41. Band).
- Xač'atryan, A. E.
- 1982 Ač'aryanə ew hay barbařagitut'yunə. In: *HayBrbAtl* 1: 28-107.
- 1984 Jayndarji hin erewuyt'ner hay barbařnerum. In: *IntSympArmLing 1984*: 318-326.
- 1985 Hnč'yunabanut'yan usumnasirut'yan skzbunk'nerə hay barbařagitakan 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. & Eñazaryan Vano A.
2004 (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, Hayk Harut'yuni
1988 Sosyac' antař. Yerevan : "Arewik".
- Xaç'atryan, M. M.
1979 Haykakan leřnařxarhn u P'ok'r Kovkasə əst Ptłomeosi. In: *BngTxnPtmHay 7*: 158-181.
1980 Haykakan leřnařxarhn əst Ptłomeosi k'artezagrakan tvyalneri. In: *PBH* 1980, Nr 2: 199-211.
- Xaç'atryan, P. M. & Łazinyan, A. A.
1985 (eds.), *Grigor Narekac'i*, Matean ołbergut'ean. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- Xaç'atryan, Āaisa
1999 T'alın. *HayAzgBan* 20. Yerevan: Academy Press "Gitut'yun".
- Xaç'atryan, Valerij N.
1971 Vostočnye provincii Xettskoj imperii: voprosy toponimiki. Yerevan: Academy Press.
1978 Strana Xajk' v sostave Urartu. In: *LrHasGit (= VON)* 1980, Nr 6: 101-112.
1988 Marija – titul xajasskix carej. In: *DrevVost* 5: 57-62.
- Xaç'atryan, Ženya Kamsari
1975 Ĵavaxk'i hay žołovrdakan parerə: azgagrakan usumnasirut'yun (pp. 5-14 + Figures 1-18); Łaragöz: stverneri t'atron (pp. 105-124 + Figures 1-24). In: *HayAzgBan* 7.
- Xaç'aturova, E. G.
1973 Ob armjano-indijskix leksičeskix izoglossax. In: *PBH (= 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'eryan, L. G.
1962 'Grč'ut'yan arvesti' lezvakan-k'erakanakan tesut'yunə mijnadaryan Hayastanum: usumnasirut'yun ew bnagrer. Yerevan: Academy Press.

- Xaç'ikyan, L. S.
 1941 "Yalags taremtin i Vanakan Vardapetē asac'eal" (introduction, critical text and commentary). In: *MatGNŽot* 1: 151-169.
 1949 Zenoni "Yalags bnut'ean" erki haykakan t'argmanut'yunə. In: *MatGNŽot* 2, 1949 [1950]: 65-98.
 1963 Naxamesropyan gri harc'ə ew hmayagrərə. In: *PBH* 1963, Nr 4: 145-158.
- Xaç'konc', D.
 1898 "Mut'-ašxarhk'i" verlucumə. In: *Biwrakn* 1898, 26: 484-487.
 1899 'Ön', 'C'rōnk' u 'Žankari'. In: *Biwrakn* 1899, 6: 81-83.
- Xalat'eanc', Grigor
 1896 (Xalat'janc), Armjanskij èpos v istorii Armenii Moiseja Xorenskago: opyt kritiki istočnikov (Part 1, Issledovanie. Part 2, Materialy). Moscow: Tipografija Varvary Gatsuk.
 1899 *Girk' mnac'ordac'* əst hnagoyn hay t'argmanut'ean. Moscow: Tparan Varvařē Gate'uk.
- Xanlaryan, L. A. (Xanlarjan)
 1973 (ed.), *Arakel Davrižeci*, Kniga istorij. Russian translation with introduction and commentary. Moscow: GRVLI "Nauka". (Pamjatniki pis'mennosti Vostoka, 37).
 1976 (ed.), *Kirakos Gandzakeci*, Istorija Armenii. Russian translation with introduction and commentary. Moscow: GRVLI "Nauka". (Pamjatniki pis'mennosti Vostoka, 53).
 1990 (ed.), *Ařak'el Dawrižec'i*, Girk' patmut'eanc'. The critical ClArm. text with introduction and commentary. Yerevan: Academy Press. (Matenadaran).
- Xařatyan, Zaven V.
 1989 (Xaratjan), Kul'tovye motivy semejnıx obyčaeıv i obrjadov u armjan. In: *HayAzgBan* 17: 5-62.
 1989a Amusnakan zuygi ulin hayoc' harsanik'um. In: *LrHasGit* 1989, Nr 11.
- Xaxutajšvili, D. A.
 1974 (Khakhutaishvili), A contribution of the Kartvelian tribes to the mastery of Iron metallurgy in the ancient Near East. In: *ActAntHung* 22: 337-348.
 1988 Drevnekolxidskoe železo i Bližnij Vostok. In: *KavkBližVostSbor* 8: 168-172.
- Xemč'yan, Ėst'er H.
 2000 Tavuš. *HayAzgBan* 21. Yerevan: Academy Press "Gitut'yun".
- X. K'.
 1899 Yisusin nuēr. In: *Biwrakn* 1899: 17-18.
- Yovnanean, Lewond
 1897 Hetazōtut'iwnk' naxneac' řamkōrēni vray: usumnasirut'iwnk' ew k'aluack'ner (2 vols.). Venice: S. Lazar. (Azgayin Matenadaran, 23-24).

- Yovsēp‘eanc‘, Garegin Sarkawag
 1892 P‘šrank‘ner žoľovrdakan banahyusut‘iwnic‘. T‘iflis: M. Šarajē.
- Yuzbašyan, Karen N.
 1963 (ed.), Patmut‘iwn *Aristakisi Lastiverte‘woy*. Yerevan: Academy Press.
 1968 (Juzbašjan), Povestvovanie Vardapeta Aristakèsa Lastivertei. Russian transl. with introduction and commentary. Moscow, Leningrad: GRVLI “Nauka”. (Pamjatniki pis’mennosti Vostoka, 15).
- Zak‘aryan, Mari G.
 2008 Agulisi barbařə: ink‘nut‘yan bac‘ahaytum. Yerevan: “Iravunk‘”.
- Zatikyan, Hovhannes
 1992 Karin. Yerevan: “Hayastan”.
- Zavaroni, Adolfo
 2003 Etr. *ana*, lat. *ānus*, *annus*, got. *aþn*, germ. **ansi-*. In: *IndogForsch* 108: 223-247.
- Zekiyan, 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‘ cnndoc‘*: critical text. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- Zhou Jixu
 2002 Correspondences of the basic words between Old Chinese and Proto-Indo-European. Philadelphia: Department of Asian and Middle Eastern Studies, University of Pennsylvania. *SinPlatPap* 115, April 2002.
 2003 Correspondences of cultural words between Old Chinese and Proto-Indo-European. Philadelphia: Department of East Asian Languages and Civilizations, University of Pennsylvania. *SinPlatPap* 125, July 2003.
 2005 Old Chinese **tees* and Proto-Indo-European **deus*: similarity in religious ideas and a common source in linguistics. Philadelphia: Department of East Asian Languages and Civilizations, University of Pennsylvania. *SinPlatPap* 167, December 2005.
- Ziegler, Joseph
 1939 (ed.), *Septuaginta*. Vol. 14: Isaias. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Zimansky, Paul E.
 1998 Ancient Ararat: a handbook of Urartian studies. Delmar, New York: Caravan Books. (Anatolian and Caucasian Studies).
- Zimmer, Stefan
 1997 Gallisch DIVERTOMV, kymrisch *llawer*, tocharisch A *want-wraske*. In: *Fs Beekes 1997*: 353-358.
 2000 Nachbemerkung zum Beitrag von Thomas Oberlies [see Oberlies 2000]. In: *IndIranIndog 2000*: 389-391.

- 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 the book, the citations refer to pages and lines. A minus-sign 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. “Yalaḡs 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. Kanayeanč‘. Tp‘lis (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. English translation of The Teaching of Saint Gregory (revised edition) with commentary and introduction: Thomson 2001. For the palimpsest, see Galēmkk‘earean 1911. For a Russian translation, see Ter-Davtjan/Arevšatjan 2004.
- 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: Basmaḡean 1926. Russ.: see S. Vardanjan 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 & 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 1972-73. English translation with introduction and commentary: Hewsen 1992. ModArm. Translation: A. G. Abrahamyan & G. B. Petrosyan 1979: 258-312.
- Araḡ‘el Dawrižec‘i (17th cent., T‘avriz-Ējmiacin). The critical text with introduction and commentary: Xanlaryan 1990; Russian translation with introduction and commentary: Xanlarjan 1973.
- Araḡ‘el Siwnec‘i (14-15th cent.): “Adamgirk‘”, critical text: Madoyan 1989; poems: Poturean 1914.
- 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.

- ArOłomp 1854 – Ařakk‘ Ołompianu (apud Mxit‘ar Goř 1854).
- Asar Sebastac‘i (16-17th cent., native of Sebastia), “Girk‘ břřkakan arhesti” (16-17th cent.), ed. by D. M. Karapetyan. Yerevan: Academy Press, 1993.
- Assizes of Antioch – *Ansiz Antiok‘ay* (Crusader Law Code), translated by Smbat Sparapet (13th cent.). The text with French translation: Aliřan, *Assises d’Antioche*. Venice: Imprimerie Arménienne Médaille. 1876. (See also Thomson 1995: 36, 198).
- Bible: the complete ClArm. text: Zōhrapēan 1805; separate editions: Xalat‘eanc‘ 1899; Stone 1979; Cox 1981; Zeyt‘unyan 1985; Cowe 1992; Weitenberg 1992a; Cox 2006.
- 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 *Bibliographical abbreviations*: *BiblSacrPolygl* 1, 1657.
- 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.
- Břřkaran jioy ew arřasarak grastnoy (13th cent.). Ed. by B. L. Č‘ugaszyan. Yerevan: Academy Press, 1980.
- Colophons*: see HayJeřHiř.
- Dawit‘ Alawkay Ordi (11-12th cent., Ganjak/Kirovabad): A. Abrahamyan 1952-53.
- Dawt‘ak (7th cent.): see Movsēs Kařankatuac‘i (Dasxuranc‘i).
- Dionysius Thrax (grammarian of the 2nd century BC; the Armenian text: 6-7th cent.). See Adonc‘ 1915, 2008, and AdonDion 2008. (For French translations 1830 and 1970, see Thomson 1995: 45).
- DivHayVim 5, 1982: *Divan hay vimagrut‘yan*. Vol. 5: Arc‘ax. Compiled by S. G. Barxudaryan; redacted by B. N. Ařak‘elyan. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- Eřia Muřetyan 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.
- Eřiřē (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 Kořbac‘i (5th cent.; the village of Kořb in Čakatk‘, Ayrarat): Eřc ařandoc‘ “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 žolovrdakan hek'iat'ner (HŽHek'), redacted by H. Örbeli et al. Yerevan: Academy Press. Vol. 1 (Ararat), ed. by A. M. Nazinyan (1959). Vol. 2 (Ararat), ed. by A. M. Nazinyan (1959). Vol. 3 (Ararat), ed. by A. M. Nazinyan (1962). Vol. 4 (Širak – Alek'sandrapol, Basen, Javaxk'), ed. by M. S. Mkrtč'yan (1963). Vol. 5 (ĽarabaĽ), ed. by A. M. Nazinyan & M. M. Grigoryan (Spandaryan) (1966). Vol. 10 (Muš-Bulanəx), ed. by S. Tarone'i (1967). Vol. 9 (Alaškert etc.), ed. by M. S. Mkrtč'yan (1968). Vol. 6 (Arc'ax/ĽarabaĽ-Utik'), ed. by A. M. Nazinyan & V. G. Svazlyan (1973). Vol. 8 (Gugark'), ed. by A. M. Nazinyan & Ğ. H. Grigoryan (1977). Vol. 7 (ĽarabaĽ-Zangezür), ed. by A. M. Nazinyan & M. N. AĽak'elyan (1979). Vol. 11 (Muš-Bulanəx), ed. by M. S. Mkrtč'yan (1980). Vol. 12 (Mšo dašt/Taron/Turuberan), ed. by V. G. Svazlyan (1984). Vol. 13 (Muš/Taron/Turuberan), ed. by A. S. Ľaziyan (1985). Vol. 14 (Van/Vaspurakan), ed. by A. Ľaziyan (1999).
- HŽHek' 1980: Haykakan žolovrdakan hek'iat'ner (ed. by N. A. Hakobyan & A. S. Sahakyan). Yerevan: University Press.
- Grigor DaranaĽe'i or Kamaxec'i (or Grigor Buk') (ca. 1576 /Kamax/ – 1643). See Nšanean 1915.
- Grigor Narekac'i (circa 947 – after 1003; South of Lake Van). Matean Olbergut'ean (1001-1003 AD). Critical edition: P. M. Xač'atryan, A. A. Ľazinyan. 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 translations: Khachatoorian 2001; Samuelian 2001. Songs: K'yoškeryan 1981.
- HayJerHiš V-XII: Hayeren jeĽagreri hišataranner: V-XII dd. Ed. by A. S. Mat'ewosyan. Yerevan: Academy Press, 1988.
- Hayrens*: see Mnac'akanyan 1995.
- Herodotos: ModArm. transl. and commentary: Krkyašaryan 1986.
- Hexaameron: BarseĽ Kesarac'i, YaĽags 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'-Öhanjanyan. 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 AĽak'elyan: Hayoc' patmut'yun. Yerevan: "Sovetakan groĽ", 1982.
- Koriwn: Vark' Maštoc'I, "The life of Maštoc'" (5th cent.). Ed. by M. Abelyan / Ę. 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.
- Ľazar P'arpec'i (5th cent.; P'arpi, a village close to Aštarak): Hayoc' patmut'iwn. T'uĽt' aĽ Vahan Mamikonean. Ed. by G. Tēr-Mkrtč'ean, St. Malxasean. Tp'lis

- (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 (7-10th cent.); critical text: V. Ařak'elyan 1983; English translation: Dowsett 1961; ModEArm. translation: V. Ařak'elyan 1969. The chapter 2.35 comprises "The elegy on the death of the great prince Juanšer" by *Dawt'ak* (7th cent.), an acrostic poem (see V. Ařak'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'iwñ Hayoc'*) gives an account of the history of the Armenian nation from the origin to the death of Mesrop Mařtoc' in 440 AD. Critical edition: M. Abełean & S. Yarut'iwnean, *Movsisi Xorenac'woy Patmut'iwñ Hayoc'*. Tř'lis (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" (*Ařxarhac'oyc'*), see *Anania řirakac'i*.
- Mxit'ar Goř (12-13th cent.); Ařakk' Mxit'aray Goři. Venice: St. Lazar (with fables of Olympian [pp. 165-189], see AřOłomp 1854). The critical text: Pivazyan 1951.
- Mxit'ar Herac'i (12th cent.); see Seidel 1908.
- Nersēs řnorhali (1101/02-1173, Cilicia): Ołb Edesioy; see M. Mkrtč'yan 1973. *Vipasanut'iwñ*: M. Mkrtč'yan 1981. Songs: K'yořkeryan 1987. *Yisus ordi*: V. Łazaryan 1991.
- Patmut'iwñ srboc' Hřip'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'iwñ* or *Buzandaran Patmut'iwñk'* (5th cent.). The text: K'. Patkanean. St. Peterburg, 1883. A facsimile reproduction with an introduction by Nina G. Garsořian. 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: Garsořian 1989.
- Philo (6th century).
Physiologus; see Pitra 1855.

- Sasna crer (SasCr): Armenian epic, “Daredevils of Sasun”. 1: 1936; 2.1: 1944; 2.2: 1951: M. Abelyan (ed.) with the assistance of K. Melik‘-Öhanjanyan. Yerevan: State Press. 3, 1979 and 4, 1999: ed. by Sargis Harut‘yunyan & Arusyak Sahakyan. Yerevan: Academy Press. SasCr 2000, ed. by Roza Grigoryan & 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 below, SasUdal.
- SasDav 1977: Sasunc‘i Davit‘: nor patumner; compiled and edited by Grigor Grigoryan & Vahagn Grigoryan. Yerevan: “Sovetakan grof”.
- SasDav 1989: Sasunc‘i Davit‘: haykakan žolovrdakan ēpos (introd. by Lewon Mkrtč‘yan). Yerevan: “Arewik”.
- SasUdal, Armjanskij narodnyj èpos *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. An older edition: 1851, Kostandnupolis: Yovhannēs Miwhēntisean. A 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 Leahac‘i (17th cent.): *Ulegrut‘iwn*, see Akinean 1936.
- Smbat Sparapet (13th cent., Cilicia), Datastanagirk‘. Ed. (with a Russian translation) by A. G. Galstyan. Yerevan: State Press of Armenia (HayPetHrat), 1958.
See also Assizes of Antioch.
- Step‘anos Örbelean (ca. 1250/60-1303/5, Siwnik‘). He wrote a history of the province of Siwnik‘, see A. A. Abrahamyan 1986 (introduction, ModEArm translation, commentary).
- 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.
- T‘ovmas Kiliyec‘i (14th cent.); with an addendum to Ašxarhac‘oyc‘, on Cilician Armenia. The text with study: A. Anasyan 1967; English translation: Hewsen 1992: 322-324.
- Vanakan Vardapet Tawušec‘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), “Bžškarān 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 [non vidi]. 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'ialias, Lebanon, 2003 (pp. 1153-1288).
- Yovhannēs Drasxanakertc'i (9-10th cent.)
 1912=1980: Yovhannu kat'olikosi 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.

AčarAnjn 1-5, see Ačaryan 1942-62.

AčarHLPatm 1-2, see Ačaryan 1940-51.

AčarLiak, see Ačaryan 1955-2005.

ActAntHung

Acta Antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae. Budapest.

ActOrHung

Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae. Budapest.

ActOrBelg

Acta Orientalia Belgica (published by Société Belge d'Études Orientales).
Leuven.

AdonDion 2008

Aruest Dioniseay k'erakani ew hay meknut'iwkn' norin. In: *Adonc' 2008*: IX-CLXXXIII (the study), 1-305 (the texts). This is a new edition of *Adonc 1915*. The Armenian translation of the study (IX-CLXXXIII) and the commentary (425-448) by Olga Vardazaryan.

AltorForsch

Altorientalische Forschungen.

AmJPhil

American journal of philology.

AmstBeiAltGerm

Amsterdamer Beiträge zur älteren Germanistik. Amsterdam, Atlanta GA: Rodopi.

AncIEDial 1966

H. Birnbaum, J. Puhvel (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

M. Mayrhofer, W. Meid, B. Schlerath, R. Schmitt (eds.), *Antiquitates indogermanicae: Studien zur indogermanischen Altertumskunde und zur Sprach- und Kulturgeschichte der indogermanischen Völker. Gedenkschrift für Hermann Güntert*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck. (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft, 12).

Anzeiger zu IndogForsch:

Anzeiger für indogermanische Sprach- und Altertumskunde. Beiblatt zu den *Indogermanischen Forschungen*.

APILKU

Arbejds papirer: Institut for Lingvistik. Københavns Universitet.

Aramazd

Aramazd: Armenian journal of Near-Eastern studies. Yerevan.

ArchGlottItal

Archivio Glottologico Italiano. Firenze.

ArmPont 2009

Richard G. Hovannisian (ed.), *Armenian Pontus: the Trebizond-Black Sea communities*. (UCLA Armenian history and culture series. Historic Armenian cities and provinces, 8).

ArmRev

The Armenian Review.

ArxRit 1988

Arxaičeskij ritual v fol'klornyx i ranneliterurnyx pamjatnikax. Moscow: GRVLI.

AzgHand

Azgagrakan handēs.

ArchOr

Archiv Orientální. Prague.

BalcLingIssl 1979

Balcanica: Lingvističeskie issledovanija. Moscow: "Nauka", 1979.

BalkLingSbor

T. V. Civ'jan (otv. red.), *Balkanskij lingvističeskij sbornik*. Moscow: "Nauka".

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 MatGNŽoł.

BasPerzNed 2007

Basiswoordenboek Perzisch-Nederlands. By Asghar Seyed-Gohrab, Gabrielle van den Berg and Marjolijn van Zutphen. Leidschendam: Quist.

BeiAssSemSpr

Beiträge zur Assyriologie und semitischen Sprachwissenschaft. Leipzig.

BeiGesDeuSprLit

Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur. Halle (Saale).

BeitrNamenf

Beiträge zur Namenforschung.

- BiblSacPolygl 1, 1657 *B. Walton* (ed.), *Biblia Sacra polyglotta*. 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 žoľovacu). 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).
- ChicHittDict
 Chicago Hittite dictionary: The Hittite dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago. Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago. Vol. *L-N*, 1989 [fascicles 1-4, 1980-1989], vol *P*, 1997 (ed. by Hans G. Güterbock and Harry A. Hoffner), vol. *Š*, fasc. 1, 2002, fasc. 2, 2005 (ed. by Hans G. Güterbock, Harry A. Hoffner, Theo P. J. van den Hout).
- DerSöz 1963-82
 (1-12), Türkiye‘de Halk Ağzından, Derleme sözlüğü. Vol. 1, 1963 – vol. 12, 1982. Ankara.
- DeutPersWört 1-2
 See Eilers 1967-83.
- 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”.
- DrevVost
 Drevnij Vostok. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- DrJazMalAz
I. M. D’jakonov & V. V. Ivanov (eds.), *Drevnie jazyki Maloj Azii: sbornik statej*. Moscow: “Progress”.
- EarContUralIndEur 2001
Christian Carpelan, Asko Parpola & 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).

ÈIBIVVizIr 1967

Èllinističeskij Bližnij Vostok, Vizantija i Iran: istorija i filologija. Moscow: "Nauka".

ÈmAzgŽoł

Èminean azgagrakan žołovacu.

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.

EncRel 8, 1987

Mircea Eliade (editor-in-chief), *The encyclopedia of religion*. Vol. 8. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company. London: Collier Macmillan Publishers.

ErHamGitAšx

Yerevani petakan hamalsaran: gitakan ašxatut'yunner. Yerevan: University Press.

ÈtCelt

Ètudes celtiques. Paris.

EthnAncMesop 2005

W. H. van Soldt (ed., in coop. with R. Kalvelagen and D. Katz), *Ethnicity in ancient Mesopotamia*. Papers read at the 48th Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale. Leiden, 1-4 July 2002. Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten.

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

V. S. Rastorgueva & D. I. Èdel'man, Ètimologičeskij slovar' iranskix jazykov. Vol. 1, 2000; 2, 2003; 3, 2007 -. Moscow: "Vostočnaja Literatura" Publishers.

ÈtimSlovSlavJaz

O. N. Trubačev (ed.), Ètimologičeskij slovar' slavjanskix jazykov. Vol. 1, 1974 – vol. 32, 2005 (in progress). Moscow: "Nauka".

ÈtnNarBalk 1984

L. A. Gindin (red.), Ètnogenez narodov Balkan i Severnogo Pričernomor'ja: lingvistika, istorija, arxeologija. Moscow: "Nauka".

EtymDictAltLang 2008

Sergei Starostin, Anna Dybo, Oleg Mudrak; with assistance of *Ilya Gruntov & Vladimir Glumov*. Etymological dictionary of the Altaic languages. Leiden etc.: Brill.

EtymWört 1983

Alfred Bammesberger (ed.), Das etymologische Wörterbuch: Fragen der Konzeption und Gestaltung. Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet. (Eichstätter Beiträge 8: Abteilung Sprache und Literatur).

EvidLaryng

Winter, Werner (ed.), Evidence for laryngeals. The Hague, London, Paris: Mouton.

EWAia 1-3

M. Mayrhofer, Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen, 3 vols., 1992-2001. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag C. Winter.

FlexWortb 1975

Helmut Rix (ed.), Flexion und Wortbildung: Akten der V. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft (Regensburg, 9-14 September 1973). Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag.

FlorTurk

P. H. Davis e.a. (ed.), Flora of Turkey and the East Aegean Islands. Vol. 1 (1965) etc. Edinburgh: University Press.

FolLingHist

Folia linguistica historica. Societas Linguistica Europaea.

FolOrient

Folia Orientalia. Kraków.

FrMitSpIdg 1994

George E. Dunkel, Gisela Meyer, Salvatore Scarlata, Christian Seidl (eds.), Früh-, Mittel-, Spätindogermanisch: Akten der IX. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 5. bis 9. Oktober 1992 in Zürich. Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag, 1994.

Fs Baumgartner 1967

Hebraische Wortforschung. Festschrift zum 80. Geburtstag von Walter Baumgartner. Leiden: E. J. Brill.

Fs Beekes 1997

A. Lubotsky (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

P. Cipriano, P. Di Giovine, M. Mancini (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 Debrunner 1954
Sprachgeschichte und Wortbedeutung: Festschrift Albert Debrunner gewidmet von Schülern, Freunden und Kollegen (mit Vorwort und Verzeichnis seiner Schriften von Georges Redard). Bern: Francke Verlag.
- 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 Haugen 1972
Evelyn Scherabon Firchow, Kaaren Grimstad, Nils Hasselmo, Wayne A. O'Neil (eds.), Studies for Einar Haugen: presented by friends and colleagues on the occasion of his 65th birthday. The Hague, Paris: Mouton.
- Fs Hoenigswald 1987
George Cardona & 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 Ivanov 1999
Poëtika, istorija literatury, lingvistika: sbornik k 70-letiju Vjačeslava Vsevolodoviča Ivanova = Essays in poetics, literary history and linguistics: presented to Viacheslav Vsevolodovich Ivanov on the occasion of his seventieth birthday. Moscow: OGI.
- Fs Ivanov 2005
Antropologija kul'tury. Vypusk 3. K 75-letiju V. V. Ivanova. Moscow: "Novoe izdatel'stvo", 2005.
- Fs Kellens 2009
É. Pirart & X. Tremblay (eds.), Zarathushtra entre l'Inde et l'Iran. Études indo-iranniennes et indo-européennes offertes à Jean Kellens à l'occasion de son 65e anniversaire. Wiesbaden: Reichert. (Beiträge zur Iranistik, 30).
- Fs Knobloch 1985
Hermann M. Ölberg & 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 Kortlandt 2008, 1-2

Evidence and counter-evidence: essays in honour of Frederik Kortlandt; ed. by Alexander Lubotsky, Jos Schaeken, Jeroen Wiedenhof, with the assistance of Rik Derksen and Sjoerd Siebinga. Vol. 1: Balto-Slavic and Indo-European linguistics; vol. 2: General linguistics. Amsterdam, New York: Rodopi. (Studies in Slavic and general linguistics, 32-33).

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 Lehmann 1999, 1-2

Edgar C. Polomé & Carol F. Justus (eds.), Language change and typological variation: in honor of Winfred P. Lehmann on the occasion of his 83rd birthday. Vol. 1: Language change and phonology; vol. 2: Grammatical universals and typology. Washington: Institute for the Study of Man. (JourIndEurStud Monograph Numbers 30 and 31).

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'occsion de son soixante-dixième anniversaire, 7 avril 1937. Aarhus: Universitetsforlaget; København: Levin & Munksgaard. (Acta Jutlandica: Aarsskrift for Aarhus Universitet, IX1).

Fs Pisani 1969

Studi linguistici in onore di Vittore Pisani (2 parts). Brescia: Paideia.

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 Pokorny 1967

Wolfgang Meid (ed.), Beiträge zur Indogermanistik und Keltologie: Julius Pokorny zum 80. Geburtstag gewidmet. Innsbruck: Sprachwissenschaftliche Institut der Universität Innsbruck. (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Kulturwissenschaft; Bd. 13).

Fs Polomé 1988

Mohammad Ali Jazayery and Werner Winter (eds.), Languages and cultures: studies in honor of Edgar C. Polomé. Berlin, New York, Amsterdam: Mouton de Gruyter. (Trends in linguistics. Studies and monographs, 36).

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 Rasmussen 2004

Per aspera ad asteriscos: studia indogermanica in honorem J. E. Rasmussen sexagenarii Idibus Martiis anno MMIV. Innsbruck.

Fs Schlerath 1994, see IndogPferd 1994.

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 Bretschneider & Christian Lehmann (eds.), Wege zur Universalienforschung: sprachwissenschaftl. Beitr. zum 60. Geburtstag von Hansjakob Seiler. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag. (Tübinger Beiträge zur Linguistik, 145).

Fs Stang 1970

Velta Rūķe-Draviņa (ed.), Donum Balticum: to Professor Christian S. Stang on the occasion of his seventieth birthday 15 March 1970. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell.

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 & 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. Civ'jan (eds.), Πολυτροπον. To 70th birthday of Vladimir Toporov. Moscow: "Indrik".
- Fs Watkins 1998
Jay Jasanoff, H. Craig Melchert & Lisi Oliver (eds.), *Mír curad: studies in honor of Calvert Watkins*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft, 92).
- Fs Weller 1954
Johannes Schubert & Ulrich Schneider (eds.), *Asiatica: Festschrift Friedrich Weller*. Zum 65. Geburtstag gewidmet von seinen Freunden Kollegen und Schülern. Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz.
- 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. (Trends in Linguistics. Studies and Monographs 144).
- Fs Zarubin 1963
Iranskij sbornik: k semidesjatiptiletiju prof. I. I. Zarubina. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Vostočnoj Literatury.
- Gd Berbérian 1986
Dickran Kouymjian (ed.), *Armenian studies in memoriam Haïg Berbérian (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 Klíma 1994
Petr Vavroušek (ed.), *Iranian and Indo-European studies: memorial volume of Otakar Klíma*. Prague: Enigma Corporation. (Prague: Prospektrum).
- Gd Kronasser 1982
Erich Neu (ed.), *Investigationes philologicae et comparativae: Gedenkschrift für Heinz Kronasser*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Gd Marr 1935
I. I. Meščaninov (ed.), *Akademija Nauk SSSR XLV: Akademiku N. Ja. Marru*. Moscow, Leningrad: Academy Press. 1935.

Gd Meillet 1987

L'opera scientifica di Antoine Meillet: atti del Convegno della Società italiana di glottologia, Pisa, 12-14 dicembre 1986; testi raccolti a cura di Adriana Quattordio Moreschini. Pisa: Giardini, 1987. (Biblioteca della Società italiana di glottologia, 11).

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 Słuszkiewicz 1974

Jan Reychman (ed.), *Anantapāram kila śabdaśāstram ...: księga pamiątkowa ku czci Eugeniusza Słuszkiewicza*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego.

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).

GRVLI "Nauka"

Glavnaja redakcija vostočnoj literatury izdatel'stva "Nauka".

GwīUrmSalm 1897-98

(1-2), Banasēr, Gawaṛakan baṛer Urmioy ew Salmasti hayoc'. In: *Bazmavēp*: (1) 1897: 544-547; (2) 1898: 96-98.

HAB, see Ačāṛyan 1971-79, 1-4.

HAB-Add 1982

Hr. Ačāṛyan, Hayerēn armatakan baṛaran: havellik' ew uḥelik'. Yerevan: University Press.

HamGitTet

Hayastani Petakan hamalsarani gitakan telekagir. Yerevan. 1-, 1925-.

HarvStudClasPhil

Harvard Studies in Classical Philology.

HayAzgBan

Hay azgagrut'yun ew banahyusut'yun: nyut'er ew usumnasirut'yunner (Armjanskaja ètnografija i fol'klor: materialy i issledovanija). Yerevan: Academy Press.

HayBrbAtl

Hayereni barbaṛagitakan atlas: usumnasirut'yunner ew nyut'er. Yerevan: Academy Press, vol. 1, 1982; vol. 2, 1985.

HayKendAšx 1-5

V. S. Ananyan, Hayastani kendanakan ašxarhə: hnaguyn žamanakneric' minč'ew mer òrerə. Vol. 1, 1961; vol. 2, 1962; vol. 3, 1965; vol. 4, 1967; vol. 5, 1975. Yerevan: "Hayastan" (vols. 1 and 2: HayPetHrat, State Press of Armenia).

HaykHamHanr 1-4

Haykakan hamaṛot hanragitaran (Armenian concise encyclopedia). Vol. 1, 1990; vol. 2, 1995; vol. 3, 1999; vol. 4, 2003. Editor-in-chief: K. S. Xudaverdyan (vols.

- 1-2), H. M. Ayvazyan (vols. 3-4); president of the scientific editorial council: V. H. Hambarjumyan (vols. 1-2), F. T. Sargsyan (vols. 3-4). Yerevan: Haykakan (Xorhrdayin) Hanragitarani Glxavor Xmbagrut'yun (vol. 4: Haykakan Hanragitaran).
- HayLezBrbBař 1-
(2001-), *A. Sargsyan et al.* (eds.), Hayoc' lezvi barbařayin bařaran. Vol.1, 2001 [letters a-z]; vol. 2, 2002 [letters ē-c]; vol. 3, 2004 [letters k-č]; vol. 4, 2007 [letters m-č']; vol. 5, 2008 [letters p-s]. Yerevan: Academy Press "Gitut'yun".
- HayLezDarjBař 1975
A. M. Suk'iasyan & S. A. Galstyan, Hayoc' lezvi darjvacabanakan bařaran. Yerevan: University Press.
- HayLezGrak
Hayoc' lezu ew grakanut'yun: gitakan ařxatut'yunneri mijbuhakan řolovacu. Yerevan: University Press.
- HayLezPatmHarc'
Hayoc' lezvi patmut'yan harc'er. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- HayLezPatmK'er
Hayoc' lezvi patmakan k'erakanut'yun. Yerevan: Academy Press. Vol. 1, 1982 (see H. Muradyan 1982); vol. 2, 1975 (see S. Ant'osyan 1975; M. Muradyan 1975).
- HaySrb 2001
Sargis Harut'yunyan & Aram K'alant'aryan (eds.), Hayoc' srberē ew srbavayrerē: akunk'nerē, tiperē, pařtamunk'ē. Yerevan: "Hayastan" (Nat. Acad. of Sciences of the Republic of Armenia: Institute of Archaeology and Ethnography).
- HayTeřBař 1-5
(1986-2001), *T'. X. Hakobyan, St. T. Melik'-Baxřyan, H. X. Barseřyan*. Hayastani ew harakic' řrřanneri teřanunneri bařaran. Vol. 1, 1986; vol. 2, 1988; vol. 3, 1991; vol. 4, 1998; vol. 5, 2001. Yerevan: University Press.
- HayřolMřak
Hay řolovrdakan mřakuyt'. Yerevan: Institute of Archaeology and Ethnography.
- HerkWört 1997
Herkunftswörterbuch der deutschen Sprache (bearb. von Günther Drosdowski). Mannheim, Leipzig, Wien, Zürich: Dudenverlag. (Duden, 7).
- HHB
Mxit'ar Vardapet Sebastac', Bařgirk' Haykazean lezui (2 vols.). Venice, 1749-1769. [See also NHB].
- HistSpr
Historische Sprachforschung. Göttingen. See also *KZ* and *ZVS*.
- Hut'Sam 1895
Hut'ut'ik ew Samēl Hovik, recorded by S. Haykuni, with introduction by N. K'. In: *Biwrakn* 29.9: 354-361.

HŽhek', see *Sources*: Folk-tales.

IncLing

Incontri linguistici. Pisa, Roma.

IndDrev 1964

V. V. Struve, G. M. Bongard-Levin (eds.), *Indija v drevnosti* (collection of papers). Moscow: GRVLI "Nauka".

IndEur&IndEur 1970

George Cardona, Henry M. Hoeningwald & Alfred Senn (eds.), *Indo-European and Indo-Europeans*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. (The Haney Foundation series, University of Pennsylvania, 9).

IndEurWordForm

James Clackson & Birgit Anette Olsen (eds.), *Indo-European word formation: proceedings of the conference held at the University of Copenhagen October 20th – 22nd 2000*. Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum Press. (Copenhagen studies in Indo-European, 2).

IndIranIndog 2000

Bernhard Forssman & Robert Plath (eds.), *Indoarisch, Iranisch und die Indogermanistik: Arbeitstagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 2. bis 5. Oktober 1997 in Erlangen*. Wiesbaden: Reichert Verlag.

IndIranJour

Indo-Iranian journal.

IndoIranLangPeop

Nicholas Sims-Williams (ed.), *Indo-Iranian languages and peoples*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2002. (Proceedings of the British Academy, 116).

IndogCaucas 1994

Indogermanica et Caucasia: Festschrift für Karl Horst Schmidt zum 65. Geburtstag. 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

R. Schmitt (ed.), *Indogermanische Dichtersprache*, Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

IndogForsch

Indogermanische Forschungen. Strassburg: Karl J. Trübner.

IndogPferd 1994

Die Indogermanen und das Pferd: Akten des internationalen interdisziplinären Kolloquiums Freie Universität Berlin, 1.-3. Juli 1992 (hrsg. von Bernhard Hänsel und Stefan Zimmer unter Mitwirkung von Marie-Luise Dunkelmann und Almut Hintze). Bernfried Schlerath zum 70. Geburtstag gewidmet. Budapest: Archaeolingua Alapítvány.

IntConfArmLett 2006

International Conference dedicated to the 1600th anniversary of the Armenian letters creation (Yerevan, September 12-17, 2005): collection of papers. Yerevan: Academy Press "Gitut'yun".

- IntJourSlavLingPoet
International journal of Slavic linguistics and poetics. 's-Gravenhage: Mouton & Co.
- IntSympArmLing 1984
International symposium on Armenian linguistics (Yerevan, September 21-25, 1982): Reports. Yerevan: Academy Press, 1984.
- IranCauc
Iran and the Caucasus: research papers from the Caucasian Centre for Iranian studies, Yerevan. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- IsslStrTekst 1987
Issledovanija po strukture teksta. Moscow: "Nauka".
- IstDrevVost 1-2
Istorija drevnego Vostoka: zoroždenie drevnejšix klassovyx obščestv i pervye očagi rabovladel'českoj civilizacii. Part 1. Mesopotamija, 1983. Part 2. Perednjaja Azija. Egipet, 1988. Moscow: GRVLI "Nauka".
- JAmOrSoc
Journal of the American Oriental Society.
- JaynHamš
Jayn hamšenakan. Vol. [1]: *Sero Xanzadyan* (ed.), Yerevan: "Hayastan", 1971; vol. 2: *A. Zeyt'unyan* (ed.), Yerevan: "Sovetakan groġ", 1979; vol. 3: *Sergey Vardanyan* (ed.), Yerevan: "Xorhrdayin groġ", 1989; vol. 4: *Sergey Galstyan & Lyudvig Karapetyan* (eds.), Yerevan: "Vernatun", 1999.
- JCunSt
Journal of Cuneiform Studies.
- JourAsiat
Journal asiatique.
- JourHellStud
Journal of Hellenic studies.
- JourIndEurStud
Journal of Indo-European studies.
- JourRoyAsSoc
Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland. London.
- JourSocArmStud
Journal of the Society for Armenian Studies.
- KalObyč 1983
Kalendarnye obyčai i obrjady v stranax zarubežnoj Evropy: istoričeskie korni i razvitie obyčaev. Moscow: "Nauka".
- KavkĖtnSbor
Kavkazskij Ėtnografičeskij sbornik. Moscow: Academy Press.
- KavkBližVostSbor
Kavkazsko-bližnevostočnyj sbornik. Tbilisi: "Meeniereba".
- KelKelJaz 1974
Jarceva, Serebrennikov, Makaev, Korolev (eds.), *Kel'ty i kel'tskie jazyki*: Moscow: "Nauka", 1974.

KEWA 1-4

M. Mayrhofer, Kurzgefaßtes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen (A concise etymological Sanskrit dictionary). Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag. Bd. 1-4, 1956-1980.

KiwlHamš, see Kiwlēsērean 1899-1900.

Kluge/Seebold, see Kluge 1989.

Kul'tNaslVost

Kul'turnoe nasledie Vostoka: problemy, poiski, suzdenija. Leningrad: "Nauka", 1985.

K'ristHayast 2002

K'ristonya Hayastan: hanragitaran (encyclopedia). Redactor-in-chief and director: H. M. Ayzazyan. Yerevan: Haykakan hanragitarani glxavor xmbagrut'yun.

KZ

Kuhns Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung. See also *HistSpr* and *ZVS*.

LALIES

Actes des sessions de linguistique et de littérature 10 (Aussois, 1988-1989). Paris: Presses de la Sorbonne Nouvelle. 1992.

LalVasp 1-2

see Lalayean 1912-14.

LangIndEur 1997

Langues indo-européennes (sous la direction de Françoise Bader). Paris: CNRS Éditions.

LangPoétIndEur 2006

Georges-Jean Pinault et Daniel Petit (eds.), La langue poétique indo-européenne: actes du Colloque de travail de la Société des Études Indo-Européennes (Indogermanische Gesellschaft/Society for Indo-European Studies), Paris, 22-24 octobre 2003. Leuven, Paris: Peeters. (Collection linguistique, 91).

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

Alfred Bammesberger (ed.), Die Laryngaltheorie und die Rekonstruktion des indogermanischen Laut- und Formensystems. Heidelberg: Carl Winter: Universitätsverlag.

LeidIEEDSer

Alexander Lubotsky (ed.), Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary series. Leiden, Boston: Brill.

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.
- LingBalk
Linguistique Balkanique (Balkansko ezikoznanie). Sofia: Academy Press.
- LingGeogrDiallIstJaz
Lingvističeskaja geografija, dialektologija i istorija jazyka. Yerevan: Academy Press, 1976.
- LingPosn
Lingua Posnaniensis.
- LingRek 1984, 1-5
Lingvističeskaja rekonstrukcija i drevnejšaja istorija Vostoka: tezisы i doklady konferencii. Moscow.
- LitKDSInd 1979; 1987
Literatura i kul'tura drevnej i srednevekovoj Indii (sbornik statej). Moscow: GRVLI "Nauka".
- LrHasGit
Lraber hasarakakan gitut'yunneri = Vestnik obščestvennyx nauk (VON). Yerevan: Academy Press.
- MankGAŽoł
Erewani X. Abovyani anvan Haykakan petakan mankaržakan instituti gitakan ašxatut'yunneri žołowacu. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- MankQuart
Mankind quarterly.
- MatGNŽoł
Matenadaran: gitakan nyut'eri žołowacu; vol. 1, 1941; vol. 2, 1949 [1950]. Since vol. 3: Banber Matenadaran.
- MedArmCult 1983
Thomas J. Samuelian & Michael E. Stone (eds.), *Medieval Armenian culture*. 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 Boisacq
1-2, 1937-1938: *Mélanges Émile Boisacq*. Annuaire de l'Institut de Philologie et d'Histoire Orientales et Slaves. 5, 1937; 6, 1938. Bruxelles.
- MežIssArm 1990
S. A. Esajan & G. E. Arešjan (eds.), *Meždisciplinarnye issledovanija kul'turogeneza i ètnogeneza Armjanskogo nagor'ja i sopredel'nyx oblastej*. 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), *Lazaryan, Ā. S. & Avetisyan, H.M.*, Miġin hayereni bařaran, vol. 1, 1987; vol. 2, 1992. Yerevan: University Press.

MitAntGesWien

Mitteilungen der Anthropologischen Gesellschaft in Wien. Horn, Wien: Verlag Ferdinand Berger.

MovsXorenMaten

Srboy hōrn meroy *Movsēsi Xorenac* 'woy Matenagrut'iwk'. Venice: S. Lazar, 1843; 1865. (See *Sources*: 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.

MythLawIndEur 1970

Jaan Puhvel (ed.), *Myth and law among the Indo-Europeans: studies in Indo-European comparative mythology*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press. (Publications of the UCLA center for the study of comparative folklore and mythology; 1).

NewSouIndEur 1989

Theo Vennemann (ed.), *The new sound of Indo-European: essays in phonological reconstruction*. The seventh international conference on historical linguistics held Sept. 9-13, 1985 at the University of Pavia. Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter. (Trends in linguistics. Studies and monographs, 41).

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 bařgirk' haykazean lezui*, 2 vols., Venice: St Lazar (1836-1837); reprinted: Yerevan: University Press (1979-1981).

NJbGeolPal

Neues Jahrbuch für Geologie und Paläontologie. Stuttgart.

NmušLeřnŁarab 1978

Nmušner Leřnayin Łarabali ųolovrdakan banahyusut'yunic' (compiled by Mik'ayel Ařak'elyan & Āobert Łahramanyan). Yerevan: "Hayastan".

NordLangModLing 1975

Karl-Hampus Dahlstedt (ed.), *The Nordic languages and modern linguistics 2: proceedings of the Second International Conference of Nordic and General Linguistics*, University of Umeå, June 14-19, 1973. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International.

NovVulgBiblSac

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 & Christian Zinko (eds.), 125 Jahre Indogermanistik in Graz. Leykam.

OsnIranJaz-Dr 1979

Osnovy iranskogo jazykoznanija: drevneiranske jazyki. Ed. by V. A. Abaev, M. N. Bogoljubov, V. S. Pastorgueva (otv. red.). Moscow: "Nauka".

OsnIranJaz-Sr 1981

Osnovy iranskogo jazykoznanija: sredneiranske jazyki. Ed. by V. A. Abaev, M. N. Bogoljubov, V. S. Pastorgueva (otv. red.). Moscow: "Nauka".

OsnIranJaz-Nov 1-2

Osnovy iranskogo jazykoznanija: novoiranske jazyki. Ed. by V. A. Abaev, M. N. Bogoljubov, V. S. Pastorgueva (otv. red.). Moscow: "Nauka", 1982, 1987.

OxfLatDict

Oxford Latin dictionary (ed. by P. G. W. Glare). Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1982.

PBH

Patma-banasirakan handes = Istoriko-filologičeskij žurnal (IFŽ). Yerevan: Academy Press.

Pedersen Kolloquium 1994

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

Maurice Leroy & Francine Mawet (eds.), La place de l'arménien dans les langues indo-européennes. Louvain: Peeters.

PhonAsAfr 1997

Alan S. Kaye (ed.), Phonologies of Asia and Africa (including the Caucasus). Technical advisor: Peter T. Daniels. Eisenbrauns.

Poetica

Poetica: Zeitschrift für Sprach- und Literaturwissenschaft. München. Since 1974: Amsterdam.

PresDayDial 2002

Jan Berns & Jaap van Marle (eds.), *Present-day dialectology: problems and findings*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter. (Trends in linguistics: Studies and monographs, 137).

PrIndEvrJaz 1964

V. N. Toporov (ed.), *Problemy indoevropskogo jazykoznanija: ètjudy po sravnitel'no-istoričeskoj grammatike indoevropskix jazykov*. Moscow: "Nauka".

PrJaz

V. N. Toporov, *Prusskij jazyk: slovar'*: A-D (1975); E-H (1979); I-K (1980); K-L (1984); L (1990); not completed. Moscow: "Nauka".

ProcFICAL 1980

Proceedings of the First international symposium on Armenian linguistics (11-14 July 1979); ed. By John Greppin. Delmar, New York: Caravan Books.

ProcFICAL 1996

Proceedings of the Fifth international conference on Armenian linguistics. Delmar, New York: Caravan Books.

ProcSISAL 1993, 1-2

Proceedings of the Second international symposium on Armenian linguistics (21-23 Sept. 1987); 2 vols. Yerevan: Academy Press. See also *ThesSISAL 1987*.

PtmSivHisHay 1965

Grigor Tēr Yovhannēsean (ed.), *Patmagirk' Sivri-Hisari hayoc': teğrakan, patmakan ew azğagrakan* (initiated by Mihran Nersēsean). Pēyruť: Tparan Mšak.

RecLangCult 1992

Edgar C. Polomé & Werner Winter (eds.), *Reconstructing languages and cultures*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter. (Trends in linguistics: Studies and monographs, 58).

RecLar 1990

La reconstruction des laryngales (= Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Liège, fascicule CCLIII). Liège-Paris.

RekRelChr 1992

R. Beekes, A. Lubotsky, J. Weitenberg (eds.), *Rekonstruktion und relative Chronologie: Akten der Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft; 8* (Leiden, 1987). Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft.

REIE

Revue des études indoeuropéennes.

RendLombLett

Rendiconti: Reale Istituto Lombardo di Scienze e Lettere, Milano; classe di lettere.

RevEtArm

Revue des études arméniennes. Paris.

RevHitAs

Revue hittite et asianique. Paris.

RicLing

Ricerche linguistiche. Roma. 1950-.

SasCr; SasUdal , see *Sources*: Sasna crer.

SasCrGit 2004

Azat Etiazaryan, Sargis Harut'yunyan, Armen Petrosyan [editor-in-charge], *Varag Nersisyan* (eds.), Haykakan "Sasna crer" ėposə ew hamařarhayin řarangut'yunə: miřazgayin gitařořovi zekuc'umnerə, 4-6 November, 2003, Cařkajor (The Armenian epic "Daredevils" of Sassoun and the world epic heritage: international conference's reports). Yerevan: Academy Press.

SemEtymDict 1-2

Militarev, Alexander & Kogan, Leonid, Semitic etymological dictionary. Vol. 1: Anatomy of man and animals, 2000; vol. 2: Animal names, 2005. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag. (Alter Orient und Altes Testament, 278/1-2).

SinPlatPap

Sino-Platonic papers.

řirGitAřx

Gitakan ařxatut'yunner: řiraki hayagitakan hetazotut'yunneri kentron; National Academy of Sciences of Republic of Armenia. Gyumri: Academy Press "Gitut'yun".

SlavBalkJaz 1977

Slavjanskoe i balkanskoe jazykoznanie: antičnaja balkanistika i sravnitel'naja grammatika. Moscow: "Nauka".

SlovRusNarGov 1-

F. P. Filin (ed.), Slovar' russkix narodnyx govorov. Leningrad: Nauka, 1963-.

SMOMPK

Sbornik materialov dlja opisanija mestnostej i plemen Kavkaza. Tiflis.

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

Harry Spitzbardt (ed.), Sprache und Gesellschaft. Friedrich-Schiller-Universität Jena.

SprKultIndog 1998

Wolfgang Meid (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).
- SprPhil 1990
Heiner Eichner & Helmut Rix (eds.), Sprachwissenschaft und Philologie: Jacob Wackernagel und die Indogermanistik heute. Kolloquium der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 13. bis 15. Oktober 1988 in Basel. Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag.
- StBoT
 Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten.
- StudCauc
 Studia Caucasica.
- StudEtymCrac
 Studia etymologica Cracoviensia. Kraków.
- StudIndogLodz
 Studia indogermanica Lodziensia. Łódź.
- StudRedup
Bernhard Hurch (ed.), Studies on reduplication. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. (Empirical approaches to language typology, 28).
- TeġGAHF
 Teġkagir SSRM Gitut'yunneri Akademiayi Haykakan Filiali. Yerevan: ArmFAN.
- TeġHasGit
 Teġkagir: hasarakakan gitut'yunner. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- ThesSISAL 1987
 The Second international symposium on Armenian linguistics (21-23 Sept. 1987). Theses of reports. Yerevan: Academy Press. See also *ProcSISAL (1987) 1993*, 1-2.
- ThracMyc 1989
Jan G. P. Best & Nanny M. W. de Vries (eds.), Thracians and Mycenaeans: proceedings of the Fourth International Congress of Thracology, Rotterdam, 24-26 September 1984. Leiden etc.: E. J. Brill, 1989.
- TochIndEurStud
 Tocharian and Indo-European studies. Reykjavík: Iceland University, Institute of Linguistics. Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum Press.
- T'ōxBař
Arsēn vardapet T'ōxmaxean, Bařakoyt Haykakan lezui (unpublished manuscript); a collection of (dialectal) words compiled in the prison of Van (cited in Amatuni 1912).
- TrPhilSoc
 Transactions of the Philological Society. London.
- TrudZnakSist
 Trudy po znakovym sistemam. Tartu: University Press.

- TurkArmDict, see Č'ugaszyan 1986 and *Sources*: Elia Muşelyan Karneć'i.
- UšMjñHayBnst 1-2
Hasmik Sahakyan (ed.), Uš miñnadari hay banastełcut'yunə. Yerevan: Academy Press. Vol. 1, 1986; vol. 2, 1987.
- UrHay 1988
B. N. Arak'ełyan, G. B. Ĵahukyan, G. X. Sargsyan, Urartu-Hayastan. Yerevan: Academy Press.
- UZTGU
 Učenyje zapiski Tartuskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta (Transactions of the Tartu State University). Tartu: University Press.
- VanSaz 1-2, see Šērenc' 1885-1899.
- VestDrIst
 Vestnik drevnej istorii. Moscow.
- VoprJaz
 Voprosy jazykoznanija. Moscow.
- WörtSach
 Wörter und Sachen.
- WienZeitKundMorg
 Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes.
- YušamXotorĵ 1964
H. Yarut'iwn v. Hulunean & H. Matt'ēos v. Hačean, Yušamatean Xotorĵuri. Vienna: Mechitharisten.
- Yušarĵan 1911
Nersēs Akinean (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.
- YušMusLer 1970
 Martiros Gušagčean and Pōłos Matuřean, *Yušamatean Musa Leran*. Pēyrut': Tparan "Atlas".
- ZArmPhil
 Zeitschrift für armenische Philologie. Vol. 1, 1903; vol. 2, 1904. Marburg (Hessen): N. G. Elwert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung.
- ZeitDeutMorgGesel
 Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft.
- ZeitPhonSprKom
 Zeitschrift für Phonetik, Sprachwissenschaft und Kommunikationsforschung. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
- ZeitSlavPhil
 Zeitschrift für slavische Philologie.
- ZVS
 Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung. See also *HistSpr* and *KZ*.